RENDICONTI
del
SEMINARIO MATEMATICO
della
UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA

CHRISTOPHER P. L. RHODES

The *S*-transform and its dual with applications to Prüfer extensions

Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, tome 95 (1996), p. 201-216

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=RSMUP_1996__95__201_0>

© Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, 1996, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova » (http://rendiconti.math.unipd.it/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM
Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

REND. SEM. MAT. UNIV. PADOVA, Vol. 95 (1996)

The S-Transform and its Dual with Applications to Prüfer Extensions.

CHRISTOPHER P. L. RHODES (*)

1. – Introduction.

We shall develop themes begun by J. Hays in [9] where the S-transform was introduced. Whereas the setting for [9], and for subsequent work in [1], was the quotient field of an integral domain, we shall deal with an arbitrary commutative ring U with 1 and a subring R containing 1. For an ideal I of R, $S(I)$ ($= S_R(I)$) consists of all $a \in U$ such that, for each $y \in I$, $y^n a \in R$ for some integer $n \geq 1$. The standard *ideal transform*, defined by $T(I) = \bigcup_n I^{-n}$ [15], satisfies $T(I) \subseteq S(I)$ with equality if I is finitely generated (see [9, Theorem 1.3]).

Hays called I a *maximal S-ideal* if $J \supset I$ implies $S(J) \neq S(I)$. The maximal S-ideals determine a transform S^{-1}, introduced in § 2, which takes subsets of U to ideals of R and has properties mirroring those of the S-transform. We show in particular that, for $A \subseteq U$, $S^{-1}(A)$ is the intersection of all prime ideals P of R such that $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq A$. Paragraph 3 concerns finiteness conditions. Extending results of J. Brewer [3] and P. Schenzel [19], we provide sufficient conditions on I for $S(I)$ to be of the form $T(J)$. Paragraph 4 concerns the effect of changing the base ring R, mainly by localisation.

In the remaining sections, we assume that R is Prüfer in U(see [18]). Some connections between the transforms $R_{[P]}$, $S(P)$, $T(P)$, P^{-1} and $P:P$ of a prime ideal P are obtained in § 5. Hays characterised prime ideals which are not maximal S-ideals in a valuation domain, and in § 6 we determine the extent to which his characterisation

(*) Indirizzo dell'A.: School of Mathematics, University of Wales College of Cardiff, P.O. Box 926, Cardiff CF2 4YH, Wales.

extends to Prüfer rings. This involves connections between S^{-1}-transforms and the property (#) studied in [6].

TERMINOLOGY. Unless otherwise stated, $S(I)$ means $S_R(I)$; *ideal* means R-ideal (ideal of R); *submodule* means R-submodule of U; *subalgebra* means R-subalgebra of U) containing R; *finitely generated* means finitely generated as a module over R. For $H \subseteq U$, $R[H]$ denotes the smallest subalgebra containing H. We write $H:K$ for $\{a \in U | aK \subseteq H\}$, $H:_A K$ for $(H:K) \cap A$, H^{-1} for $R:H$, and H^{-n} for $(H^n)^{-1}$ when $n \geq 2$. For a submodule K and a multiplicatively closed subset D of U, we take $K_{[D]} = \{a \in U | da \in K \text{ for some } d \in D\}$ but, for a prime ideal P, $K_{[R \setminus P]}$ is usually denoted by $K_{[P]}$ (cf. [8]). (Note: it can happen that $K_{[D]} \neq K \cdot R_{[D]}$.) For $I \subseteq R$, denote by $\mathrm{D}(I)$ the set of all prime ideals not containing I.

Recall that a *G-ideal* is a prime ideal which is not the intersection of the prime ideals strictly containing it. We call a prime ideal Q *branched* if it is neither minimal in R nor the union of a chain of prime ideals strictly within Q; otherwise call Q *unbranched*. This is consistent with Gilmer's use of the term «branched» in a Prüfer domain [5, Theorem 23.3(*e*)].

Given a subalgebra A, an ideal is called *A-regular* if it contains a finite intersection of submodules of the form $R:a$ where $a \in A$ (see [18]). In general «A-regular» differs from «regular» in its usual sense as in [11]; extreme examples are given by the cases $A = R$ and $A = R[X]$ with X an indeterminate. If A is the total quotient ring of R the two terms are equivalent. By [18, Lemma 1.1(1)], a prime ideal P is A-regular if and only if $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq A$ (a condition which will appear frequently).

2. – The transforms S and S^{-1}.

For $I \subseteq R$, we define the *S-transform of I* to be the subalgebra $S(I)$ $(= S_R(I)) = \{a \in U | \operatorname{rad}(R:_R a) \supseteq I\}$. As in [1, Prop. 2.2], $S\left(\sum_\alpha I_\alpha\right) = \bigcap_\alpha S(I_\alpha)$ for ideals I_α.

For $A \subseteq U$, we define the *S^{-1}-transform of A* to be the radical ideal $S^{-1}(A)$ $(= S_R^{-1}(A)) = \{x \in R | S(x) \supseteq A\}$. For submodules A_α, one verifies that $S^{-1}\left(\sum_\alpha A_\alpha\right) = \bigcap_\alpha S^{-1}(A_\alpha)$. Note that $S^{-1}(a) = \operatorname{rad}(R:_R a)$ for all $a \in U$. Hence $S(I) = \{a \in U | S^{-1}(a) \supseteq I\}$, which shows the dual nature of S and S^{-1}.

Our definition of S^{-1}-transforms is modelled on Hays' construction [9, Theorem 2.3] of maximal S-ideals (see § 1). Hays shows, in effect, that maximal S-ideals are those of the form $S^{-1}S(I)$, and that

$SS^{-1}S(I) = S(I)$. We add that, for $K \subseteq R$,

$$(*) \qquad \text{if } S(K) = S(I) \quad \text{then } K \subseteq S^{-1}S(I)$$

since $S(K) = \bigcap_{x \in K} S(x)$ and so $S(x) \supseteq S(I)$ for all $x \in K$. Using the dual of $(*)$ we obtain $SS^{-1}(A) \supseteq A$. It follows that $S^{-1}(A) \supseteq S^{-1}SS^{-1}(A)$. Since, by $(*)$, $I \subseteq S^{-1}S(I)$ where $I = S^{-1}(A)$, we obtain $S^{-1}SS^{-1}(A) = S^{-1}(A)$. Thus it is only the restrictions of the maps S and S^{-1}, each acting on the set of images of the other, which are really mutually inverse. One verifies that an ideal I is a maximal S-ideal if and only if it is an S^{-1}-transform. By duality, a subalgebra A is an S-transform if and only if it is maximal amongst all subalgebras B such that $S^{-1}(B) = S^{-1}(A)$.

(2.1) PROPOSITION. For $I \subseteq R$, $S(I) = \bigcap\{R_{[P]} \mid P \in \mathbb{D}(I)\}$.

PROOF. First, let $P \in \mathbb{D}(I)$. As in [9], choosing $x \in (I \setminus P)$ gives $S(I) \subseteq S(x) \subseteq R_{[P]}$. Secondly, let $a \in R_{[P]}$ for all $P \in \mathbb{D}(I)$. Then † (see Remark (2.2)) $(R :_R a) \not\subseteq P$ whenever $P \in \mathbb{D}(I)$. Hence $\operatorname{rad}(R :_R a) \supseteq I$ which means that $a \in S(I)$. ∎

The second part of the proof of (2.1) is related to [1, Theorem 2.7] and, particularly, [10, Prop. 4.3]. Hays proved (2.1) for a domain in its quotient field. His proof cannot be used here since it depends on two results, one invalid for an arbitrary commutative ring (see [3, Footnote p. 301]) and the other [3, Cor. 1.2] requiring $xS(x) = S(x)$ (i.e., x is a unit in U) for all x in a system of generators for I.

(2.1$^{\mathrm{d}}$) THEOREM. For $A \subseteq U$, $S^{-1}(A) = \bigcap\{P \mid P$ is a prime ideal and $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq A\}$.

PROOF. Since $S^{-1}(a) = \operatorname{rad}(R :_R a)$, for all a in U we have

$$S^{-1}(a) =^{\dagger} \bigcap\{P \mid P \supseteq (R :_R a)\} = \bigcap\{P \mid a \notin R_{[P]}\}.$$

Hence

$$S^{-1}(A) = \bigcap_{a \in A} S^{-1}(a) = \bigcap_{a \in A} \left(\bigcap\{P \mid a \notin R_{[P]}\}\right) =$$

$$= \bigcap\{P \mid a \notin R_{[P]} \text{ for some } a \in A\}. \quad \blacksquare$$

(2.2) REMARK. Although there is an evident duality between statements (2.1$^{\mathrm{d}}$) and (2.1) (regarding P and $R_{[P]}$ as dual entities), in neither case is the natural dual proof available. At † in the proof of (2.1) the dual

fails since the implication $x \in P \Rightarrow (R:x) \not\subseteq R_{[P]}$ may be false if x is not a unit (e.g. take $x = 0$, $P = (0)$ in a domain in its quotient field). In the proof of (2.1^d), the dual of equation † (i.e. that $S(x) = \bigcap\{R_{[P]} \mid R_{[P]} \supseteq (R:x)\}$) is true, but its validity seems to depend on the case $I = Rx$ of (2.1). ■

We shall give particular attention to conditions for prime ideals to be S^{-1}-transforms. For R a Prüfer domain and U its quotient field, the next result is effectively contained in [9].

(2.3) PROPOSITION. For a prime ideal P, consider the conditions (i) $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$, (ii) $P = S^{-1}(a)$ for some $a \in U$, (iii) $P = S^{-1}(A)$ for some $A \subseteq U$. Then (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). When P is a G-ideal, all three conditions are equivalent.

PROOF. (iii) implies $S(P) = SS^{-1}(A) \supseteq A$ and, if P is a G-ideal, (2.1^d) gives $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq A$ whence (i). For (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii), note that $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq \bigcap_{Q \in \mathbb{D}(P)} R_{[Q]}$ is equivalent to the existence of an element a in U such that, for all $Q \in \mathbb{D}(P)$, $(R :_R a) \not\subseteq Q$ but $(R :_R a) \subseteq P$. By (2.1), $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$ if and only if $P = \operatorname{rad}(R :_R a)$ for some a. ■

(2.3^d) REMARKS. Consider the dual conditions (i^d) $P \not\supseteq S^{-1}(R_{[P]})$, (ii^d) $R_{[P]} = S(x)$ for some $x \in R$, (iii^d) $R_{[P]} = S(I)$ for some $I \subseteq R$. It may be verified that (i^d) $\Rightarrow$ (ii^d) $\Rightarrow$ (iii^d). Also, (iii^d)$\Rightarrow$(i^d) when $R_{[P]}$ is not an intersection of rings of form $R_{[Q]}$ strictly containing it, with Q a prime ideal. However (ii^d) $\not\Rightarrow$ (i^d), e.g., take $(x) = P = (0)$ to be an intersection of S^{-1}-transforms in a domain in its quotient field. Also (iii^d) $\not\Rightarrow$ (ii^d), e.g., if P is both an intersection and a union of prime ideals distinct from P in a valuation domain, then $S(P) = R_{[P]}$ but, for all x, $R_{[P]} \neq S(x)$; this example also shows that (iii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (ii) in (2.3). ■

(2.4) REMARKS. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a set of prime ideals with the property that if $P \in \mathbb{P}$ and Q is a prime ideal containing P then $Q \in \mathbb{P}$. Noting that every prime ideal is an intersection of G-ideals [13, § 1.3], it follows from (2.3) that all the ideals in $\mathbb{P}$ are S^{-1}-transforms if and only if each ideal in $\mathbb{P}$ is an intersection of prime ideals each of which is regular relative to its S-transform.

When R is a Hilbert ring, we deduce that each radical ideal (being an intersection of maximal ideals) is an S^{-1}-transform if and only if $R_{[M]} \not\supseteq S(M)$ for all maximal ideals M. ■

Recall from [13] that, for R a domain and U its quotient field, 0 is a G-ideal if and only if $U = S(x)$ for some $x \in (U \backslash 0)$, i.e., if and only if 0 is

not an S^{-1}-transform. The next result adds to the «only if» part of this, but the case $U = R[X]$ with R a domain shows that the non-minimality assumption in (2.5) cannot, in general, be omitted. Concerning the converse of (2.5) in a Prüfer extension, see (6.3).

(2.5) COROLLARY. Suppose that $R :_R a$ is finitely generated for all $a \in U$. An unbranched G-ideal, which is not a minimal prime ideal in R, is not an S^{-1}-transform.

PROOF. Suppose that P is a G-ideal and an S^{-1}-transform. By (2.3)(iii)$\Rightarrow$(ii), $P = \mathrm{rad}(R :_R a)$ for some a. If P were non-minimal unbranched, then $(R :_R a) \subsetneq Q \subset P$ for some prime ideal Q; hence P must be branched. ∎

3. – Finiteness conditions.

As a possible dual for the T-transform we introduce the *T^d-transform* defined by $T^d(A) = \mathrm{rad}(A^{-1} \cap R)$ for all $A \subsetneq U$. Then $T^d(a) = S^{-1}(a)$ for all $a \in U$. Whereas $R[A]$ and A have the same S^{-1}-transform, their T^d-transforms can differ (e.g. for R a d.v.r. with quotient field U, maximal ideal generated by x, and $A = Rx^{-1}$). Further duals of properties of T and S are given in the next result.

(3.1) PROPOSITION. (i) $T^d(A) \subsetneq S^{-1}(A)$. (ii) If A is a finitely generated submodule then $T^d(A) = S^{-1}(A)$.

PROOF. (i) is clear. (ii) Let $A = \sum_{k=1}^{n} Ra_k$. Then

$$S^{-1}(A) \supseteq T^d(A) = \mathrm{rad}\left(\bigcap_k (R :_R a_k)\right) = \bigcap_k \mathrm{rad}\,(R :_R a_k) \supseteq S^{-1}(A). \quad \blacksquare$$

Next we exploit an argument used at the end of [19] where, in a Noetherian context, Schenzel effectively showed that if $IA = A \subsetneq T(I)$ then a subalgebra A is finitely generated. In his domain case, Brewer [3] showed that $IA = A \subsetneq T(I)$ implies $A = T(I) = S(I)$.

(3.2) THEOREM. Let I be an ideal and A a subalgebra. (i) If $IA = A \subsetneq S(I)$ then $S(I)$ is a finitely generated subalgebra, $A = S(I) = S(J) = T(J) = S(B^{-1}) = T(B^{-1})$ and $S^{-1}S(I) = T^d(B)$ for finitely generated submodules J, B such that $J \subsetneq I$ and $B \subsetneq A$. (ii) If $IA = A \subsetneq T(I)$ then $T(I) = S(I)$.

PROOF. (i) Let 1 be the finite sum $\sum x_k a_k$, where $x_k \in I$ and $a_k \in A$ for each k. Put $\sum Rx_k = J$ and $R[\{a_k\}] = C$. For each $b \in S(I)$, there

exists $n \geq 1$ such that $J^n b \subseteq R$. Then $b = b(\sum x_k a_k)^n \in bJ^n C \subseteq C \subseteq A \subseteq S(I)$. Hence $C = A = S(I)$. But $JC = C = S(I) \subseteq S(J)$, and replacing I by J gives $C = S(J)$ which is $T(J)$ by the finite generation of J. Setting $R + \sum Ra_k = B$, we have $S^{-1}(C) = S^{-1}(B) = T^d(B)$ by (3.1). Also $I \subseteq S^{-1}S(I) = S^{-1}(C) = T^d(B) = \mathrm{rad}(K)$, where K denotes B^{-1}, and so $S(K) \subseteq S(I)$. If $a \in S(I)$ then, for some $n \geq 1$, $a \in B^n \subseteq K^{-n} \subseteq T(K)$, and so $S(I) \subseteq T(K)$. Since $T(K) \subseteq S(K)$, we obtain $S(I) = T(K) = S(K)$. (ii) Since $T(I) \subseteq S(I)$, (i) gives $T(I) = S(I)$. ∎

(3.3) REMARK. It is clear that the sufficient conditions for $S(I) = T(I)$ given in [9, Lemma 1.11] do extend to our context. An argument similar to that of Hays shows that $S(I) = T(I)$ is also implied by the existence of a finitely generated ideal J such that $J \supseteq I$ and $S(J) = S(I)$. ∎

For a submodule I, denote $(I^{-1})^{-1}$ by I_v.

(3.4) THEOREM. Let P be a prime ideal. (i) If $PS(P) = S(P)$ then $S^{-1}S(P) = P$. (ii) If $PT(P) = T(P)$ and P^{-1} is finitely generated then $P_v = P$.

PROOF. (i) By [18, Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2] we obtain $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$. Hence, by (2.3), $P = S^{-1}(a)$ for some a, and so $S^{-1}S(P) = S^{-1}(a) = P$. (ii) By (3.2), $T(P) = S(P)$ and $T(P) = R[B]$ where B is a finitely generated submodule. Since $T(P) \supseteq P^{-1}$ we may assume that $B \supseteq P^{-1}$. Then $S^{-1}T(P) = S^{-1}(B) = T^d(B)$ by (3.1). Choose $k \geq 1$ such that $B \subseteq P^{-k}$ whence $T^d(B) \supseteq T^d(P^{-k})$. It may be verified that $(P_v)^k \subseteq (P^k)_v$ and so $T^d(P^{-k}) = T^d(P^{-1})$. It follows that $P = S^{-1}T(P) = T^d(B) \supseteq T^d(P^{-1}) = \mathrm{rad}(P_v)$ and so $P = P_v$. ∎

4. – Change of the base ring.

So far we have taken R to be fixed in considering the transform $S_R(I)$. The following result is a companion to [16, Lemma 2.5]. In particular, we see that fixing I and taking a second S-transform based on the ring $S_R(I)$ gives nothing new.

(4.1) PROPOSITION. For a subalgebra B contained in $S_R(I)$, we have $S_B(I) = S_R(I)$.

PROOF. Let $a \in S_B(I)$. For all $x \in I$ there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $ax^n \in B \subseteq S_R(I)$, whence $ax^n x^m \in R$ for some $m \geq 1$. Thus $a \in S_R(I)$. Trivially $S_B(I) \subseteq S_R(I)$, whence equality. ∎

Although the next result is not dual to the preceding one, there is some duality between the proofs.

(4.2) PROPOSITION. Let A, B be subalgebras such that $A \supseteq B$. Then $S_R^{-1}(A) = S_R^{-1}(B) \cap S_B^{-1}(A)$.

PROOF. If $x \in S_B^{-1}(A)$ then, for all $a \in A$, there exists $n \geqslant 1$ such that $x^n a \in B$. If also $x \in S_R^{-1}(B)$, there exists $m \geqslant 1$ such that $x^m x^n a \in R$. Thus $x \in S_R^{-1}(A)$. Since trivially $S_R^{-1}(A) \subseteq S_R^{-1}(B) \cap S_B^{-1}(A)$, the required equality follows. ■

From now on, D will denote a non-empty multiplicatively closed subset of R not containing 0. Whereas $S(I)$ may continue to denote $S_R(I)$, we shall denote $S_{R_D}(I_D)$ and $S_{R_{[D]}}(I_{[D]})$ by $S_D(I_D)$ and $S_{[D]}(I_{[D]})$, respectively. For a prime ideal Q, S_Q will denote $S_{(R\setminus Q)}$. Similar conventions will be used for S^{-1}. It may be shown that, for an ideal I, $S_D(I_D) \supseteq (S_R(I))_D$ with equality if $S_R(I) = S_R(K)$ for some finitely generated ideal $K \subseteq I$. Dually for submodule A, $S_D^{-1}(A_D) \supseteq (S_R^{-1}(A))$ with equality if $S_R^{-1}(A) = S_R^{-1}(C)$ for some finitely generated submodule $C \subseteq A$. Analogous statements hold with $[D]$ in place of D.

Consequences include that the ideals $H = (S_R^{-1} S_R(I))_D$ and $L = S_D^{-1} S_D(I_D)$ satisfy (i) $H \subseteq L$ if I is finitely generated, and (ii) $H \supseteq L$ if $S_R(I)$ is a finitely generated subalgebra; dual statements also hold. From (ii) we see that if I is a maximal S-ideal (i.e., $I = S_R^{-1} S_R(I)$) and $S(I)$ is a finitely generated subalgebra, then I_D is a maximal S_D-ideal.

The next result sharpens (2.1). Also, even in the domain case it effectively improves Hay's result [9, Prop. 1.9] that $S_R(I) = \bigcap S_M(I \cdot R_M)$ where the intersection is taken over all maximal ideals M of a domain R in its quotient field. For if M is a maximal ideal containing a prime ideal P, then $S_{[P]}(I_{[P]}) = S_{[P]}(I) \supseteq S_{[M]}(I) = S_{[M]}(I_{[M]})$. ■

(4.3) PROPOSITION. For an ideal I, $S_R(I) = \bigcap_P S_{[P]}(I_{[P]})$ where the intersection is taken over all $P \in \mathbb{D}(I)$. Dually, for a submodule A, $S_R^{-1}(A) = \bigcap_P S_{[P]}^{-1}(A_{[P]})$ where the intersection is taken over all prime ideals P such that $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq A$.

PROOF. Using (2.1) we have

$$S_R(I) = \bigcap_{x \in I} S_R(x) = \bigcap_{x \in I} \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{D}(x)} R_{[P]} .$$

Since $S_R(x) \subseteq R_{[P]}$ if $x \notin P$, we obtain

$$S_R(I) = \bigcap_{x \in I} \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{D}(x)} (S_R(x))_{[R \setminus P]} = \bigcap_{x \in I} \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{D}(x)} S_{[P]}(x) = \bigcap_{x \in I} \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{D}(I)} S_{[P]}(x) =$$

$$= \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{D}(I)} \bigcap_{x \in I} S_{[P]}(x) = \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{D}(I)} S_{[P]}(I) = \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{D}(I)} S_{[P]}(I_{[P]}).$$

The dual is proved similarly. ∎

The following correspondences will be useful in the Prüfer context. We shall use $\overline{G}$ to denote the natural image in $U_D/(R_D : U_D)$ of a subset G of U_D.

(4.4) LEMMA. Consider the sets of ideals:

$\mathrm{A}_0 = \{I \mid I$ is a U-regular R-ideal and $I = I_{[D]} \cap R\}$,

$\mathrm{A} = \{H \mid H$ is a U-regular $R_{[D]}$-ideal such that $H = H_{[D]}\}$,

$\mathrm{B} = \{E \mid E$ is a U_D-regular R_D-ideal$\}$,

$\mathrm{C} = \{F \mid F$ is a $\overline{U_D}$-regular $\overline{R_D}$-ideal$\}$.

There are natural one-one correspondences between each two of these four sets, determined by the rule that, for a U-regular R-ideal I, the ideals $I_{[D]} \cap R$ in A_0, $I_{[D]}$ in A, I_D in B, $\overline{I_D}$ in C correspond. In these correspondences regular primary ideals correspond, a U-regular primary R-ideal being in A_0 precisely if it does not meet D.

PROOF. The correspondence $I = I_{[D]} \cap R \leftrightarrow I_D$ between the set of all ideals of form $I_{[D]} \cap R$ in R and the ideals of R_D is standard. Replacing R by $R_{[D]}$ gives the correspondence between ideals of form $H = H_{[D]}$ in $R_{[D]}$ and the ideals of R_D, since $(R_{[D]})_D = R_D$. We note that it is implicit and easily verified that

$$(*) \qquad (K \cap R)_{[D]} = K_{[D]} \quad \text{for each } R_{[D]}\text{-ideal } K.$$

Now we turn to the effect of imposing the regularity conditions. First, take $I = I_{[D]} \cap R \in \mathrm{A}_0$ and suppose that $I \supseteq \bigcap_k (R : a_k)$ for some finite subset $\{a_k\}$ of U. Then $I_D \supseteq \bigcap (R : a_k)_D = \bigcap (R_D : a_k) \supseteq (R_D : U_D)$, hence $\overline{I_D} \supseteq \bigcap (\overline{R_D} : \overline{a_k})$ and $\overline{I_D} \in \mathrm{C}$. Next, let $\overline{I_D} \in \mathrm{C}$ where I is an R-ideal. Then $\overline{I_D} \supseteq \bigcap_k (\overline{R_D} : \overline{f_k})$ for some finite subset $\{f_k\}$ of U_D, and it follows easily that $I_D \supseteq \bigcap_k (R_D : f_k)$, whence $I_D \in \mathrm{B}$. Given $I_D \in \mathrm{B}$, we have $I_D \supseteq \bigcap_k (R_D : f_k)$ for a finite set of elements $f_k = a_k d_k^{-1}$ where $a_k \in U$, $d_k \in D$. Again, it follows that $I_{[D]} \supseteq \bigcap_k (R_{[D]} : a_k)$ and so $I_{[D]} \in \mathrm{A}$. Finally, let $H \in \mathrm{A}$. By $(*)$,

$H = I_{[D]}$ for some R-ideal I. For some finite set $\{a_k\}$ we have $I_{[D]} \supseteq \supseteq \bigcap_k (R_{[D]} : a_k)$, and intersecting with $R(= R:1)$ gives that $I_{[D]} \cap R$ is U-regular. The rest is straightforward. ∎

5. – Prüfer extensions.

From now on we shall assume that R is Prüfer in U. See [18] for a study of this condition. We shall obtain connections between $S(P)$ and other transforms of a prime ideal P. Various preliminaries are needed. We say that an ideal I is *U-invertible* if $IJ = R$ for some $J \subseteq U$. Our Prüfer assumption means that a U-regular R-ideal is U-invertible if and only if it is finitely generated. In particular, $R :_R a = R : (R + Ra)$ is U-invertible for each $a \in U$. By [18, Lemma 1.2 and Theorem 2.1], an ideal I is U-regular if and only if $IU = U$. The method of proof of $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$ in [18, Theorem 2.1] shows that $(R_{[P]}, P_{[P]})$ is a Manis valuation (MV) subalgebra of U for all U-regular prime ideals P. Then the conductor $R_{[P]} : U$ is contained in $P_{[P]}$ and is a prime ideal of both $R_{[P]}$ and U (see e.g. [17]).

(5.1) PROPOSITION. Let M be a U-regular prime ideal. (i) For an ideal I such that $I = I_{[M]} \cap R$, if I is U-regular then $I \supset (R_{[M]} :_R U)$, and if I is not U-regular then $I \subseteq (R_{[M]} :_R U)$. (ii) If J and K are ideals and J is U-regular then $J_{[M]}$ and $K_{[M]}$ are comparable. The U-regular prime ideals contained in M form a chain whose intersection is $R \cap N$, where $N = S_{[M]}^{-1}(U)$. (iii) A minimal prime ideal of R is not U-regular.

PROOF. Since $(R_{[M]}, M_{[M]})$ is (MV) and $(R_{[M]})_{M_{[M]}} = R_M$, [17, Theorem 2.5] gives that $\overline{R_M}$ is a valuation domain of the field $\overline{U_M}$. Taking $D = (R \backslash M)$ in (4.4), C is the chain of non-zero $\overline{R_M}$-ideals and B is the set of all $\overline{R_M}$-ideals which strictly contain the prime ideal $R_M : U_M$. For (i), suppose first that I is not U-regular. Then, by (4.4), I_M is not U_M-regular. By [17, Theorem 2.5], (R_M, M_M) is local (MV) in U_M. Hence, by [18, Lemma 1.3 (1,4)], I_M is contained in all U_M-regular ideals of R_M and so $I_M \subseteq (R_M : U_M)$. Taking inverse images in U we find that $I_{[M]} \subseteq \subseteq (R_{[M]} : U)$, whence $I \subseteq (R_{[M]} :_R U)$. Now let I be U-regular. Since $I \in \mathbb{A}_0$ we have $I_M \in \mathbb{B}$ and $I_M \supset (R_M : U_M)$. Taking inverse images in R gives $I = I_{[M]} \cap R \supseteq (R_{[M]} :_R U)$. Hence $I \supset (R_{[M]} :_R U)$, since $R_{[M]} \neq U$ so $U(R_{[M]} :_R U) \neq U$ whence the $R_{[M]}$-ideal $R_{[M]} :_R U$ is not U-regular. (ii) If $K_{[M]}$ is U-regular, both $J_{[M]}$ and $K_{[M]}$ are in the set A of (4.4) and hence they are comparable since C is a chain. If $K_{[M]}$ is not U-regular then $J_{[M]} \cap R \supset (R_{[M]} :_R U) \supseteq K_{[M]} \cap R$, and so $J_{[M]} \supset K_{[M]}$ by $(*)$ in (4.4). The U-regular prime ideals within M correspond to the U-regular prime

$R_{[M]}$-ideals. The latter form a chain and, by (2.1^d), their intersection is N. (iii) If P is U-regular then $P \supset (R_{[P]} :_R U)$ and $R_{[P]} :_R U$ is prime. ∎

(5.2) PROPOSITION. Let P be a U-regular prime ideal. Then P^n is P-primary for all $n \geqslant 1$.

PROOF. First, let M be a maximal ideal such that $M \supseteq P$. By [5, Theorem 17.3(b)], $(\overline{P_M})^n$ is a $\overline{P_M}$-primary ideal of the valuation domain $\overline{R_M}$. Since $PU = U$ we deduce that P^n and, hence, $(P^n)_{[M]} \cap R$ are U-regular. Now $((P^n)_{[M]} \cap R)_M = P_M^n$ so that, by the proof of (5.1), $P_M^n \supset (R_M : U_M)$. Thus the inverse image in R of $(\overline{P_M})^n$ is $(P^n)_{[M]} \cap R$, and this is P-primary. Secondly, if M is a maximal ideal such that $M \not\supseteq P$ then $(P^n)_{[M]} = R_{[M]}$. Hence, by [8, Prop. 9], P^n is an intersection of P-primary ideals and so is itself P-primary. ∎

(5.3) LEMMA. Let J and Q be U-regular ideals such that Q is P-primary, $\operatorname{rad}(J) \supseteq P$ and $J \not\subseteq Q$. Then $J \supset Q$.

PROOF. Let M be a maximal ideal. If $M \not\supseteq P$ we have $M \not\supseteq \operatorname{rad}(J)$ and so $J_{[M]} = R_{[M]} = Q_{[M]}$. Suppose now that $M \supseteq P$. Then $Q_{[M]} = Q$ and, by (5.1), $J_{[M]}$ and $Q_{[M]}$ are comparable. Hence $J_{[M]} \supseteq Q_{[M]}$. Since $J_{[M]} \supseteq Q_{[M]}$ for all maximal M, it follows by [8, Prop. 9] that $J \supseteq Q$, so $J \supset Q$. ∎

For a prime ideal P, we shall write $R_{[P]} \cap S(P) = Y(P)$. The proof of our next result involves adapting the proof of [6, Lemma 3] which, in the domain case, concerned the ring $R' = R_{[P]} \cap \bigcap_\alpha R_{[M_\alpha]}$, where $\{M_\alpha\}$ is the set of all maximal ideals not containing P. First, we verify that $R' = Y(P)$ by using (2.1). That $R' \supseteq Y(P)$ is clear. Let Q be a prime ideal such that $Q \not\supseteq P$. If Q is not U-regular then $R_{[Q]} = U \supseteq R'$. Suppose Q is U-regular and let M be a maximal ideal containing Q. If $M \supseteq P$ then $P \supset Q$ by (5.1), since P not U-regular would imply $P \subseteq (R_{[M]} :_R U) \subset Q$; hence $R_{[Q]} \supseteq R_{[P]} \supseteq R'$. If $M \not\supseteq P$ then $R_{[Q]} \supseteq R_{[M]} \supseteq R'$. It follows that $R' \subseteq Y(P)$.

(5.4) PROPOSITION. (i) For a prime ideal P, we have $Y(P) = (P : P)$. (ii) Either $Y(P) = S(P)$, or $Y(P)$ is the unique maximum proper subalgebra of $S(P)$.

PROOF. Using [18, Lemma 1.1(2)] and an argument in [7, Prop. 10], one verifies that each subalgebra is an intersection of rings of form $R_{[Q]}$ with Q a prime ideal. So if A is a subalgebra such that $A \subset S(P)$, then

$A = S(P) \cap \bigcap_{Q \in \mathbf{Q}} R_{[Q]}$ where $\mathbf{Q}$ is a set of prime ideals Q such that $Q \supseteq P$ and so $R_{[Q]} \subseteq R_{[P]}$. Thus $A \subseteq Y(P)$, which gives (ii). For (i), we obtain $(P:P) \supseteq Y(P)$ by adapting [6, Proof of Lemma 3]. Replacing D' and R_P in [6] by $Y(P)$ and $R_{[P]}$, the adaptation is straightforward apart from the need to verify that if M is a maximal ideal containing P then $PR_{[P]} \subseteq \subseteq R_{[M]}$. For this, note that $R_{[M]} \subseteq R_{[P]}$ and that the R-ideal P is not $R_{[P]}$-regular. Replacing U by $R_{[P]}$ in (5.1) yields $P \subseteq (R_{[M]} : R_{[P]})$. Now suppose $(P:P) \neq Y(P)$. Since $S(P) \supseteq P^{-1} \supseteq (P:P) \supset Y(P)$, (ii) gives $S(P) = = (P:P)$. Since $Y(P) \neq S(P)$, we have $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$ and so $PS(P) = S(P)$, which contradicts $(P:P) = S(P)$. ∎

The domain case of (5.5)(i⇒ii) was given in [9, Prop. 1.15].

(5.5) THEOREM. The following conditions are equivalent for a prime ideal P:

(i) $T(P) \neq S(P)$.

(ii) $T(P) = Y(P)$ and $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$.

(iii) $T(P) = P^{-1}$ and $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$.

(iv) $P = P^2$ and $P = S^{-1}(a)$ for some a.

(v) $P = \mathrm{rad}(I)$ for some U-invertible ideal I such that, for all $n \geq 1$, $P^n \not\subseteq I$.

PROOF. Since $S(P) \supseteq T(P) \supseteq P^{-1} \supseteq Y(P) = R_{[P]} \cap S(P)$ and, by (5.4), there is no ring strictly between $S(P)$ and $Y(P)$, we obtain (i)⇒(ii). (ii)⇒(iii) is clear. (iii)⇒(iv) By (2.3), $P = S^{-1}(a) = \mathrm{rad}(R :_R a)$ for some a. Supposing $P \neq P^2$, choose $x \in (P \backslash P^2)$ and put $Rx + (R :_R a) = J$. Then J is U-invertible, $\mathrm{rad}(J) = P$ and $J \not\subseteq P^2$. By (iii) P is U-regular, and so P^2 is P-primary by (5.2). Therefore $J \supset P^2$ by (5.3), and so $J^{-1} \subseteq P^{-2}$. Now $T(P) = P^{-1} = P^{-2}$. Hence $J^{-1} \subseteq P^{-1}$ and so $P = JJ^{-1}P \subseteq J$, whence $P = J$. Thus P is U-invertible and so $P^{-2} \neq P^{-1}$, a contradiction. We conclude that $P = P^2$. Now assume (iv). Then $P = \mathrm{rad}(I)$ where $I = (R :_R a)$ is U-invertible. Since $P \subseteq I$ would imply $P \neq P^2$, (v) holds. Finally, assuming (v), take $I^{-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} Ra_k$. Then, for each k, $P = \mathrm{rad}(I) \subseteq \mathrm{rad}(R :_R a_k)$ and so $a_k \in S(P)$. But if $a_k \in T(P)$ for each k, we would have $I^{-1}P^n \subseteq R$ for some n, and so $P^n \subseteq I$. Thus $a_k \notin T(P)$ for some k, whence (i) holds. ∎

(5.6) COROLLARY. For each prime ideal P there is an ideal I such that $S(P) = T(I)$.

PROOF. Suppose $S(P) \neq T(P)$. Then $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$ by (5.5), so $PS(P) = S(P)$ and, by (3.2), $S(P) = T(I)$ for some I. ∎

(5.7) PROPOSITION. For a prime ideal P, the following conditions are equivalent: (i) $P^{-1} \neq S(P)$, (ii) $R_{[P]} \not\supseteq S(P)$, (iii) P is the radical of a U-invertible ideal.

PROOF. (i) implies $(P:P) \neq S(P)$, whence (ii) by (5.4)(i). For (ii) $\Rightarrow$ $\Rightarrow$ (i), let $P^{-1} = S(P)$. Then $(P^{-1})^2 = P^{-1}$ so P is not U-invertible. Let $a \in S(P)$, whence $aP \subseteq R$ and $(R:_R a) \supseteq P$. If $a \notin R_{[P]}$ then $(R:_R a) \subseteq P$ whence $P = (R:_R a)$, contradicting P not U-invertible. (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) by (2.3). Assuming (iii), we may take $P = \operatorname{rad}(L^{-1})$ where $L = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Ra_i$, so that

$$P = \operatorname{rad}\left(\bigcap_i (R:_R a_i)\right) = \bigcap_i \operatorname{rad}(R:_R a_i).$$

Then $P = (R:_R a_i) = S^{-1}(a_i)$ for some i, giving (ii) by (2.3). ∎

(5.8) REMARK. One verifies that, for a prime ideal P, the three conditions: $P^{-1} = (P:P)$, $R_{[P]} \supseteq P^{-1}$, and P is not U-invertible, are equivalent. This extends [12, Cor. 3.6] since for a valuation domain in its quotient field $(P:P) = R_P$. ∎

(5.9) PROPOSITION. The following conditions are equivalent.

(i) $S(P) = U$ for all prime ideals P which are not U-regular.

(ii) For every subalgebra $A \neq U$, each maximal A-ideal is U-regular.

(iii) $(U, (R:U))$ is a local ring.

PROOF. By (2.1), $S(P) = U$ is equivalent to P being contained in every U-regular prime ideal. For (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i), P not U-regular implies $PU \neq U$ so that $P \subseteq (R:U)$, and $R:U$ is contained in every U-regular ideal. Assuming (i), let $A \neq U$ be a subalgebra and H a non-U-regular prime A-ideal. For some U-regular prime R-ideal Q we have $A \subseteq R_{[Q]}$ (see proof of (5.4)). Then $QA \neq A$, and QA is a U-regular A-ideal since $QAU = QU = U$. The prime R-ideal $H \cap R$ is not U-regular, so $S(H \cap R) = U$ whence $H \cap R \subseteq Q$. But, from the proof of (5a) $\Rightarrow$ (5b) in [18, Theorem 2.1], $H = (H \cap R)A$ and so $H \subseteq QA$. Thus (ii) holds. Assuming (ii), let M be a U-regular maximal R-ideal. Then, by [18, Theorem 3.4.3], we obtain that $(R_{[M]}, M_{[M]})$ is local and so, by (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) of [8, Prop. 5], $(U, (R_{[M]}:U))$ is local. By (5.10), $(R:U) = (R_{[M]}:U)$ which gives (iii). ∎

(5.10) REMARK. Let M denote the set of all U-regular maximal R-ideals. By [8, Prop. 9],

$$(R:U) = \bigcap_{a \in U}\left(\left(\bigcap_{M \in \mathrm{M}} R_{[M]}\right) : a\right) = \bigcap_{a}\left(\bigcap_{M}(R_{[M]} : a)\right) = \bigcap_{M}(R_{[M]} : U).$$

Hence $(R:U)$ is radical as a U- and R-ideal. ■

6. – Property (#) in a Prüfer extension.

We say that our Prüfer extension $R \subseteq U$ satisfies the property (#) *if* $\bigcap_{M \in \mathrm{L}} R_{[M]} \neq \bigcap_{M \in \mathrm{N}} R_{[M]}$ *for all distinct non-empty subsets* L *and* N *of the set* M *of U-regular maximal ideals.* A deep study of this property for Prüfer domains was made in [6]. In considering connections between S^{-1}-transforms and the condition (#), we shall find two properties of valuation domains, which, at least under the *ACC* on prime ideals, extend to Prüfer domains (and extensions) only to the extent that (##) *holds for R, i.e. that for each subalgebra $A \neq U$, the extension $A \subset U$ satisfies* (#). (The deletion of «U-regular» in our definition of (#) would give an alternative generalisation of the Gilmer-Heinzer definition. One verifies that the effect on property (##) of taking this alternative would be to impose additionally the conditions of (5.9).)

(6.1) LEMMA. If (##) holds and P is a branched U-regular prime ideal then $P = S^{-1}(a)$ for some a.

PROOF. Adapting the proof of [6, Theorem 3 $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$] we obtain a U-invertible ideal $I \subseteq P$ such that each maximal ideal containing I also contains P. Also, there is a prime ideal Q_0 which is maximal subject to $Q_0 \subset P$. Choose $x \in (P \backslash Q_0)$ and set $I + Rx = J$. Let Q be a prime ideal containing J, and hence U-regular. Then each maximal ideal containing Q must contain P. Hence, by (5.1), the ideals P, Q and Q_0 form a chain. It follows that $Q \supseteq P$. Hence $\mathrm{rad}(J) = P$ and so, by (5.7) and (2.3), $P = S^{-1}(a)$ for some a. ■

(6.2) LEMMA. For the following conditions on R, we have $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$.

(a) Every U-regular prime ideal which is not an S^{-1}-transform is unbranched.

(b) Every U-regular prime ideal which is not an S^{-1}-transform is a G-ideal.

PROOF. Let P be a U-regular prime ideal which is not a G-ideal, and let Q be a prime ideal such that $Q \supset P$. Now Q is the union of the set,

$\{Q_\alpha\}$ say, of all prime ideals within it that are minimal over principal ideals. Clearly, each Q_α is either branched or minimal over (0). Also, by (5.1), each Q_α is either part of the chain of U-regular prime ideals within Q or satisfies $Q_\alpha \subsetneq (R_{[Q]} :_R U) \subset P \subset Q$. Thus $Q \supseteq Q_\alpha \supset P$, for some α, where Q_α must be branched and so, by (a), be an S^{-1}-transform. Since P is the intersection of all prime ideals Q such that $Q \supset P$, it is an intersection of S^{-1}-transforms and so is itself an S^{-1}-transform. ∎

For R a valuation domain and U its quotient field, the next result is [9, Cor. 2.10].

(6.3) THEOREM. A U-regular prime ideal P is not an S^{-1}-transform if and, when (##) holds, only if P is an unbranched G-ideal.

PROOF. By (5.1)(iii), the «if» part is a special case of (2.5). Combine (6.1) and (6.2) to obtain the «only if» part. ∎

The domain case of the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) in the next result is in [6]. The ACCRP (ascending chain condition for U-regular prime ideals) in R implies the ACCRP in every subalgebra A, since contraction to R of prime A-ideals is one-one (by [18]) and maintains U-regularity (since $A_{[H]} \supseteq R_{[H \cap R]}$ for H prime in A).

(6.4) PROPOSITION. The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) In every subalgebra A, each U-regular prime A-ideal is an S_A^{-1}-transform.

(ii) The conditions (##) and ACCRP hold.

(iii) The ACCRP holds and each U-invertible ideal has only finitely many minimal prime ideals.

PROOF. (ii) ⇒ (i) By (5.1) a U-regular prime A-ideal is non-minimal, hence is branched by ACCRP, and hence is an S_A^{-1}-transform by (6.1). (i) ⇒ (ii) For a U-regular prime ideal P, $(R_{[P]}, P_{[P]})$ is (MV) Prüfer in U. By [18, Theorem 3.4.3], $P_{[P]}$ is a maximal U-regular $R_{[P]}$-ideal, hence a G-ideal. By (2.5) and (5.1)(iii), $P_{[P]}$ is branched. Hence P is branched, by the correspondence between prime ideals within P and prime $R_{[P]}$-ideals within $P_{[P]}$. Thus the ACCRP holds. Let H be a maximal U-regular A-ideal. By (2.3), $A_{[H]} \not\supseteq S_A(H)$. Hence $A_{[H]} \not\supseteq \bigcap A_{[K]}$ with the intersection taken over all maximal U-regular A-ideals K such that $K \neq H$; it is easy to see that this property for all H is equivalent to (#) for the extension $A \subset U$. Thus (##) holds.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) holds by natural adaptation of the proof of $(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ in [6, Theorem 4], but for (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) some deviation from the method in [6] is necessary. Let $\{M_\lambda\}$ be the set of prime ideals minimal over a U-invertible ideal I. As in [6, Prop. 3] we can assume that $\{M_\lambda\}$ is the set M of (5.10). Let $M \in \mathrm{M}$. Then M is branched and so, by (6.1), $M = \mathrm{rad}(J)$ for some U-invertible ideal J. Put $A = J + I$ and $B = IA^{-1}$. Then $B \subseteq R$ and $BA = I \subseteq M_\lambda$ for all λ. If $M_\lambda \neq M$ then $M_\lambda \not\supseteq J$ whence $M_\lambda \not\supseteq A$, and so $M_\lambda \supseteq B$. In the local ring R_M, $M_M = \mathrm{rad}(I_M)$ and so $J^n R_M \subseteq I_M$ for some n. Replacing J by J^n we have $A_M = I_M = B_M A_M$. Hence $B_M = R_M$, so $B \not\subseteq M$ and $M + B = R$. For some $x \in M$, $b \in B$ we have $1 - x = b \in M_\lambda$ for all $M_\lambda \neq M$. Finally, that $\{M_\lambda\}$ is finite follows from [4, Lemma 8] applied to the ring R/I. ■

(6.5) REMARKS. Consider the conditions: (1) Condition (6.4)(i). (2) condition (##). (3) For all subalgebras A, each branched U-regular prime A-ideal is $\mathrm{rad}(A :_A b)$ for some $b \in U$. (4) Condition (a) of (6.2) for all subalgebras. We have (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) by (6.4) and (6.1). Also, (4) $\Rightarrow$ (1) under the ACCRP since, by (5.1)(iii), no U-regular prime ideal is unbranched. Assuming the ACCRP, (4) $\Rightarrow$ (2) shows that the validity of the «only if» part of (6.3) for all subalgebras requires (##).

Example 2 in [6] gives a 2-dimensional Prüfer domain such that condition (2) fails. Hence (1) and, since the ACCRP holds, (3) and (4) also fail. In particular, there exists an overring A containing a branched U-regular prime A-ideal which is not an S_A^{-1}-transform.

Finally, for R a Prüfer domain with quotient field U, condition (3) is effectively the equivalence, for all prime ideals $P \neq 0$, of the conditions «P is branched» and «P is the radical of an invertible ideal» proved in [5, Theorem 17.3(e)] for a valuation domain. By the foregoing remarks, this equivalence fails in general Prüfer domains but holds if and, assuming the ACCRP, only if (##) holds. ■

REFERENCES

[1] D. F. ANDERSON - A. BOUVIER, *Ideal transforms, and overrings of a quasilocal integral domain*, Ann. Univ. Ferrara, 32 (1986), pp. 15-38.

[2] J. T. ARNOLD - J. W. BREWER, *On flat overrings, ideal transforms and generalized transforms of a commutative ring*, J. Algebra, 18 (1971), pp. 254-263.

[3] J. W. BREWER, *The ideal transform and overrings of an integral domain*, Math. Z., 107 (1968), pp. 301-306.

[4] R. W. GILMER, *Overrings of Prüfer domains*, J. Algebra, 4 (1966), pp. 331-340.

[5] R. W. GILMER, *Multiplicative Ideal Theory*, Marcel Dekker, New York and Basel (1972).
[6] R. W. GILMER - W. J. HEINZER, *Overrings of Prüfer domains. II*, J. Algebra, **7** (1967), pp. 281-302.
[7] M. GRIFFIN, *Prüfer rings with zero divisors*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **239-240** (1969), pp. 55-67.
[8] M. GRIFFIN, *Valuations and Prüfer rings*, Can. J. Math., **26** (1974), pp. 412-429.
[9] J. H. HAYS, *The S-transform and the ideal transform*, J. Algebra, **57** (1979), pp. 223-229.
[10] W. J. HEINZER - J. OHM - R. L. PENDLETON, *On integral domains of the form* $\cap D_P$, *P minimal*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **241** (1970), pp. 147-159.
[11] J. A. HUCKABA, *Commutative Rings with Zero Divisors*, Marcel Dekker, New York and Basel (1988).
[12] J. A. HUCKABA - I. J. PAPICK, *When the dual of an ideal is a ring*, Manuscripta Math., **37** (1982), pp. 67-85.
[13] I. KAPLANSKY, *Commutative Rings*, Polygonal Publishing House, Washington, New Jersey (1994).
[14] R. MATSUDA, *Generalizations of multiplicative ideal theory to commutative rings with zerodivisors*, Bull. Fac. Sci. Ibaraki U., Ser. A Math., **17** (1985), pp. 49-101.
[15] M. NAGATA, *A treatise on the* 14*-th problem of Hilbert*, Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto, **30** (1956), pp. 57-70.
[16] M. NAGATA, *Some sufficient conditions for the fourteenth problem of Hilbert*, Actas Del Coloquio Internac. Sobre Geometria Algebraica (1965), pp. 107-121.
[17] C. P. L. RHODES, *On valuation subalgebras and their centres*, Glasgow Math. J., **31** (1989), pp. 115-126.
[18] C. P. L. RHODES, *Relatively Prüfer pairs of commutative rings*, Comm. Algebra, **19** (1991), pp. 3423-3445.
[19] P. SCHENZEL, *When is a flat algebra of finite type?*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **109** (1990), pp. 287-290.

Manoscritto pervenuto in redazione il 23 settembre 1994
e, in forma revisionata, il 22 febbraio 1995.