

# **La conjecture des anneaux de Hermite en dimension 1**

**Ihsen Yengui**

**Département de Mathématiques,  
Faculté des Sciences de Sfax, Tunisie  
Email: [ihsen.yengui@fss.rnu.tn](mailto:ihsen.yengui@fss.rnu.tn)**

**JNCF 08, Luminy, Octobre 2008**

**The Hermite ring conjecture 1972:** *If  $\mathbf{R}$  is an Hermite ring, then  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  is also Hermite.*

⇕

*If  $\mathbf{R}$  is a ring and  $v = (v_0(X), \dots, v_n(X))$  is a unimodular row over  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  such that  $v(0) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ , then  $v$  can be completed to a matrix in  $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R}[X])$ .*

Recall that a ring  $\mathbf{A}$  is said to be Hermite if any finitely generated stably free  $\mathbf{A}$ -module is free. Examples of Hermite rings are local rings, rings of Krull dimension  $\leq 1$ , polynomial rings over Bezout domains.

I will prove constructively that for any finite-dimensional ring  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $n \geq \dim \mathbf{R} + 2$ , the group  $E_n(\mathbf{R}[X])$  acts transitively on  $Um_n(\mathbf{R}[X])$ .

In particular, I obtain, without any Noetherian hypothesis, that for any finite-dimensional ring  $\mathbf{R}$ , all finitely generated stably free modules over  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  of rank  $> \dim \mathbf{R}$  are free.

More particularly, I obtain that for any ring  $\mathbf{R}$  with Krull dimension  $\leq 1$ , all finitely generated stably free modules over  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  are free. This settles the Hermite ring conjecture for rings of Krull dimension  $\leq 1$ .

The proof relies heavily on the very nice paper of **M. Roitman** "*On stably extended projective modules over polynomial rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 97 (1986) 585-589".

**Lemma 0:** *Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a ring, and  $f, g \in \mathbf{R}[X]$  with  $f$  a monic polynomial. Then*

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \mathbf{R}[X] \iff \text{Res}(f, g) \in \mathbf{R}^\times.$$

**Proof:** “ $\Leftarrow$ ” This is an immediate consequence of the fact that  $\text{Res}(f, g) \in \langle f, g \rangle \cap \mathbf{R}$ .

“ $\Rightarrow$ ” Let  $u, v \in \mathbf{R}[X]$  such that  $uf + vg = 1$ . Since  $f$  is a monic polynomial, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}(f, vg) &= \text{Res}(f, v) \text{Res}(f, g) \\ &= \text{Res}(f, vg + uf) = \text{Res}(f, 1) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 1:** *Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a ring, and  $I$  an ideal in  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  that contains a monic polynomial. Let  $J$  be an ideal in  $\mathbf{R}$  such that  $I + J[X] = \mathbf{R}[X]$ . Then  $(I \cap \mathbf{R}) + J = \mathbf{R}$ .*

**Classical Proof:** Use the “going-up” property of integral extensions.

**Constructive Proof:** Let us denote by  $f$  a monic polynomial in  $I$ . Since  $I + J[X] = \mathbf{R}[X]$ , there exist  $g \in I$  and  $h \in J[X]$  such that  $g + h = 1$ . It follows that  $\langle \bar{f}, \bar{g} \rangle = (\mathbf{R}/J)[X]$  where the classes are taken modulo  $J[X]$ . By virtue of Lemma 0, we obtain that  $\text{Res}(\bar{f}, \bar{g}) \in (\mathbf{R}/J)^\times$ . As  $f$  is a monic polynomial,  $\text{Res}(\bar{f}, \bar{g}) = \overline{\text{Res}(f, g)}$ , and thus  $\langle \text{Res}(f, g) \rangle + J = \mathbf{R}$ . The desired conclusion follows from the fact that  $\text{Res}(f, g) \in I \cap \mathbf{R}$ .

**Lemma 2 (Roitman):** *Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a ring, and  $f(X) \in \mathbf{R}[X]$  of degree  $n > 0$ , such that  $f(0) \in \mathbf{R}^\times$ . Then for any  $g(X) \in \mathbf{R}[X]$  and  $k \geq \deg g(X) - \deg f(X) + 1$ ,  $\exists h_k(X) \in \mathbf{R}[X]$  of degree  $< n$  such that  $g(X) \equiv X^k h_k(X) \pmod{\langle f(X) \rangle}$ .*

**Proof:** Let  $f(X) = a_0 + \cdots + a_n X^n$ ,  $g(X) = c_0 + \cdots + c_m X^m$ . Let  $g(X) - c_0 a_0^{-1} f(X) = X h_1(X)$ . Then  $g(X) \equiv X h_1(X) \pmod{\langle f(X) \rangle}$  and  $\deg h_1(X) < \max(m, n)$ . Similarly we obtain  $h_2(X)$  such that  $h_1(X) \equiv X h_2(X) \pmod{\langle f(X) \rangle}$ ,  $g(X) \equiv X^2 h_2(X) \pmod{\langle f(X) \rangle}$ ,  $\deg h_2(X) < \max(m - 1, n)$ , and so on.

**Lemma 3 (Vaserstein):** *Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a ring, and  $(x_0, \dots, x_r) \in \text{Um}_{r+1}(\mathbf{R})$ ,  $r \geq 2$ , and let  $t$  be an element of  $\mathbf{R}$  which is invertible mod  $\langle x_0, \dots, x_{r-2} \rangle$ . Then there exists  $E \in \mathbf{E}_{r+1}(\mathbf{R})$  such that  $E(x_0, \dots, x_r) = (x_0, \dots, x_{r-1}, t^2 x_r)$ .*

**Proof:** This is also Proposition III.6.1.(b) of **T. Y. Lam's** book "*Serre's Problem on Projective Modules*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics, 2006". The proofs given by Lam and Roitman are constructive and free of any Noetherian hypothesis.



**Lemma 4 (Bass):** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{R}$  a ring,  $f_1, \dots, f_r \in \mathbf{R}[X]$  with degrees  $\leq k - 1$ , and  $f_{r+1} \in \mathbf{R}[X]$  monic with degree  $k$ . If the coefficients of  $f_1, \dots, f_r$  generate the ideal  $\mathbf{R}$  of  $\mathbf{R}$ , then  $\langle f_1, \dots, f_r, f_{r+1} \rangle$  contains a monic with degree  $k - 1$ .*

**Proof:** Let us denote by  $\mathfrak{a} = \langle f_1, \dots, f_r, f_{r+1} \rangle$  and  $\mathfrak{b}$  the ideal formed by the coefficients of  $X^{k-1}$  of the elements of  $\mathfrak{a}$  having degree  $\leq k - 1$ . It suffices to prove that  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathbf{R}$ . In fact we will prove that  $\mathfrak{b}$  contains all the coefficients of  $f_1, \dots, f_r$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , denoting by  $f_i = b_0 + b_1X + \dots + b_{k-1}X^{k-1}$  and  $f_{r+1} = a_0 + \dots + a_{k-1}X^{k-1} + X^k$ , we have  $b_{k-1} \in \mathfrak{b}$  and  $f'_i = Xf_i - b_{k-1}f = b'_0 + b'_1X + \dots + b'_{k-1}X^{k-1} \in \mathfrak{a}$  with  $b'_j \equiv b_{j-1} \pmod{\langle b_{k-1} \rangle}$ . Thus,  $b'_{k-1} = b_{k-2} - a_{k-1}b_{k-1} \in \mathfrak{b}$ ,  $b_{k-2} \in \mathfrak{b}$ , and so on until getting that all the  $b_i$ 's are in  $\mathfrak{b}$ .

**Lemma 5 (Suslin):** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a commutative ring. If  $\langle v_1(X), \dots, v_n(X) \rangle = \mathbf{A}[X]$  where  $v_1$  is monic and  $n \geq 2$ , then there exist  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_\ell \in E_{n-1}(\mathbf{A}[X])$  such that, denoting by  $w_i$  the first coordinate of  $\gamma_i^t(v_2, \dots, v_n)$ , we have*

$$\langle \text{Res}(v_1, w_1), \dots, \text{Res}(v_1, w_\ell) \rangle = \mathbf{A}.$$

**Proof:** A constructive proof is given in I. Y “*Making the use of maximal ideals constructive.* Theoretical Computer Science **392** (2008) 174-178”.

**Stable range Theorem:** *Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a ring of dimension  $\leq d$ ,  $n \geq d+1$ , and let  $v = (v_0, \dots, v_n) \in \text{Um}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R})$ . Then there exists  $E \in \text{E}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R})$  such that  $Ev = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ .*

**Stable range Theorem, bis:** *For any ring  $\mathbf{R}$  with Krull dimension  $\leq d$ , all finitely generated stably free  $\mathbf{R}$ -modules of rank  $> d$  are free.*

**Proof:** A constructive proof is given by **T. Coquand, H Lombardi and C. Quitté** in “*Generating non-noetherian modules constructively*. Manuscripta mathematica **115** (2004) 513–520”.

Recall that the boundary ideal of an element  $a$  of a ring  $\mathbf{R}$  is the ideal  $\mathcal{I}(a)$  of  $\mathbf{R}$  generated by  $a$  and all the  $y \in \mathbf{R}$  such that  $ay$  is nilpotent. Moreover,  $\dim R \leq d \Leftrightarrow \dim (\mathbf{R}/\mathcal{I}(a)) \leq d - 1 \forall a \in \mathbf{R}$ .

This defines the Krull dimension recursively initializing with “ $\dim \mathbf{R} \leq -1 \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{R}$  being trivial”.

See the paper by **T. Coquand T, H. Lombardi, and M.-F. Roy** “*An elementary characterization of Krull dimension*, From sets and types to analysis and topology: towards practicable foundations for constructive mathematics (L. Corsilla, P. Schuster, eds), Oxford University Press, 2005”.

**Main Theorem:** *Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a ring of dimension  $\leq d$ ,  $n \geq d + 1$ , and let  $v(X) = (v_0(X), \dots, v_n(X)) \in \text{Um}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R}[X])$ . Then there exists  $E \in \mathbf{E}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R}[X])$  such that  $E v(X) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ .*

**Proof:** By virtue of the Stable range Theorem, it suffices to prove that there exists  $E \in \mathbf{E}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R}[X])$  such that  $E v(X) = v(0)$ . For this, by the local-global principle for elementary matrices, we can suppose that  $\mathbf{R}$  is local. Moreover, it is clear that we can suppose that  $\mathbf{R}$  is reduced.

We prove the claim by double induction on the number  $N$  of nonzero coefficients of  $v_0(X), \dots, v_n(X)$  and  $d$ , starting with  $N = 1$  (in that case the result is immediate) and  $d = 0$  (in that case the result is well-known).

We will first prove a first claim:  $v(X)$  can be transformed by elementary operations into a vector with one constant entry.

Let  $N > 1$  and  $d > 0$ . We may assume that  $v_0(0) \in \mathbf{R}^\times$ . Let us denote by  $a$  the leading coefficient of  $v_0$  and  $m_0 := \deg v_0$ . If  $a \in \mathbf{R}^\times$  then the result follows from Suslin's lemma. So we may assume  $a \in \text{Rad}(\mathbf{R})$ . By the induction hypothesis applied to the ring  $\mathbf{R}/\langle a \rangle$ , we can assume that  $v(X) \equiv (1, 0, \dots, 0) \pmod{(a\mathbf{R}[X])^{n+1}}$ .

By Roitman's Lemma, we assume now  $v_i = X^{2k}w_i$ , where  $\deg w_i < m_0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . By Vaserstein's Lemma, we assume  $\deg v_i < m_0$ .

If  $m_0 \leq 1$ , our first claim is established. Assume now that  $m_0 \geq 2$ .

Let  $(c_1, \dots, c_{m_0(n-1)})$  be the coefficients of  $1, X, \dots, X^{m_0-1}$  in the polynomials  $v_2(X), \dots, v_n(X)$ . By Lemma 1, the ideal generated in  $\mathbf{R}_a$  by  $\mathbf{R}_a \cap (v_0\mathbf{R}_a[X] + v_1\mathbf{R}_a[X])$  and the  $c_i$ 's is  $\mathbf{R}_a$ . As  $m_0(n-1) \geq 2d > \dim \mathbf{R}_a$ , by the Stable range Theorem,

$$\exists (c'_1, \dots, c'_{m_0(n-1)}) \equiv (c_1, \dots, c_{m_0(n-1)})$$

$$\text{mod } (v_0\mathbf{R}[X] + v_1\mathbf{R}[X]) \cap \mathbf{R}$$

such that  $c'_1\mathbf{R}_a + \dots + c'_{m_0(n-1)}\mathbf{R}_a = \mathbf{R}_a$ .



Assume that we have already  $c_1\mathbf{R}_a + \cdots + c_{m_0(n-1)}\mathbf{R}_a = \mathbf{R}_a$ . By Bass' Lemma, the ideal  $\langle v_0, v_2, \dots, v_n \rangle$  of  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  contains a polynomial  $w(X)$  of degree  $m_0 - 1$  which is unitary in  $\mathbf{R}_a$ . Let us denote the leading coefficient of  $w$  by  $ua^k$  where  $u \in \mathbf{R}^\times$  and that of  $v_1$  by  $b$ . Using Vaserstein's Lemma, we can by elementary operations make the following transformations

$$\begin{aligned} (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n) &\rightarrow (v_0, a^{2k}v_1, \dots, v_n) \rightarrow \\ &(v_0, a^{2k}v_1 + (1 - a^k u^{-1}b)w, v_2, \dots, v_n). \end{aligned}$$

Now,  $a^{2k}v_1 + (1 - a^k u^{-1}b)w$  is unitary in  $\mathbf{R}_a$ . So we can assume that  $v_1$  is unitary in  $\mathbf{R}_a$ , and  $\deg(v_1) := m_1 < m_0$ .

By Vaserstein's Lemma, as  $a$  is invertible modulo  $\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$ , by elementary operations,  $(v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  can be transformed into  $(v_0, v_1, a^\ell v_2, \dots, a^\ell v_n)$  for a suitable  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  so that we can divide (like in Euclidean division) all  $a^\ell v_2, \dots, a^\ell v_n$  by  $v_1$ , and thus we can assume that  $\deg v_i < m_1$  for  $2 \leq i \leq n$ .

Repeating the argument above we lower the degree of  $v_1$  until reaching the desired form of our first claim.

Assume now that  $v_0 = a \in \mathbf{R}$ . Let us consider the ring  $\mathbf{T} := \mathbf{R}/\mathcal{I}(a)$ . Since  $\dim \mathbf{T} \leq d - 1$  and  $(\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n) \in \text{Um}_n(\mathbf{T}[X])$ , there exists  $E_1 \in \mathbf{E}_n(\mathbf{R}[X])$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & E_1(v_1, \dots, v_n) \\ &= (1 + ah_1 + y_1\tilde{h}_1, ah_2 + y_2\tilde{h}_2, \dots, ah_n + y_n\tilde{h}_n), \end{aligned}$$

where  $h_i, \tilde{h}_i \in \mathbf{R}[X]$ ,  $y_i \in \mathbf{R}$  with  $ay_i = 0$ .

Denoting by  $E_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & E_1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbf{E}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R}[X])$ , we have

$$E_2 v = (a, 1 + ah_1 + y_1\tilde{h}_1, ah_2 + y_2\tilde{h}_2, \dots, ah_n + y_n\tilde{h}_n).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{1,2}(-a)E_{2,1}(-h_1) \cdots E_{n+1,1}(-h_n) E_2 v \\ &= (0, 1 + y_1\tilde{h}_1, y_2\tilde{h}_2, \dots, y_n\tilde{h}_n) =: \tilde{v}, \end{aligned}$$

and we can easily find  $E_3 \in \mathbf{E}_{n+1}(\mathbf{R}[X])$  such that  $E_3 \tilde{v} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ .

**Corollary 1:** *For any ring  $\mathbf{R}$  with Krull dimension  $\leq d$ , all finitely generated stably free modules over  $\mathbf{R}[X]$  of rank  $> d$  are free.*

**Corollary 2:** *The Hermite ring conjecture is true for rings with Krull dimension  $\leq 1$ .*

**Conjecture 1:** *For any ring  $\mathbf{R}$  with Krull dimension  $\leq d$ , all finitely generated stably free modules over  $\mathbf{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$  of rank  $> d$  are free.*

**Question 1:** *Is it true that for any ring  $\mathbf{R}$  of Krull dimension  $\leq d$ , all finitely generated stably free modules over  $\mathbf{R}[X, X^{-1}]$  of rank  $> d$  are free?*

**Conjecture 2:** For any ring  $\mathbf{R}$  of Krull dimension  $\leq 1$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , all finitely generated stably free modules over  $\mathbf{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$  are free.

**Conjecture 3:** Let  $\mathbf{R}$  be a ring of Krull dimension  $\leq 1$  and  $n \geq 3$ . Then every matrix  $M \in \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbf{R}[X])$  is congruent to  $M(0)$  modulo  $\mathrm{E}_n(\mathbf{R}[X])$ .

$\Updownarrow$

**Conjecture 3':** Suppose  $\mathbf{R}$  is a local ring of Krull dimension  $\leq 1$ , and

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} p & q & 0 \\ r & s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbf{R}[X]).$$

Then  $M \in \mathrm{E}_3(\mathbf{R}[X])$ .

## Question ouverte

$\exists ? u_0, u_1, u_2 \in (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})[x_0, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3] \mid$

$$1 \in \langle x_0u_1 - x_1u_0, x_0u_2 - x_2u_0, x_1u_2 - x_2u_1, \\ x_0^2 + x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 - 1 \rangle$$

Si  $x_0^2 + x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 - 1 \leftrightarrow x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2y_2 - 1$ ,  
la réponse est oui (facile, calcul direct sur le  
vecteur  $(x_0, x_1, x_2)$  )

Si  $x_0^2 + x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 - 1 \leftrightarrow x_0y_0 + x_1y_1 + \\ x_2y_2 - 1$ , la réponse est non (difficile, arguments  
topologiques compliqués)