Some Homological Properties of Almost Gorenstein Rings

Janet Striuli and Adela Vraciu

Abstract. We show that the residue field k is a direct summand of the second syzygy of the canonical module for some almost Gorenstein rings. This implies that over a Teter ring the only totally reflexive modules are the free ones. We provide an example of an almost Gorenstein ring which has infinitely many non-isomorphic totally reflexive modules.

Introduction

Totally reflexive modules are the object of extensive research activity, and yet it is an open problem to determine conditions that are necessary and sufficient for the existence of a non-free totally reflexive module, see for example [**5**]. The starting point of our investigation was to consider the problem for some artinian local rings, and in particular for the class of *Teter rings*, for which we show that the only totally reflexive modules are the free ones, see Corollary 2.1.

Teter rings are a particular example of *almost Gorenstein* rings, defined in [**10**]:

Definition 0.1. An artinian local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \mathsf{k})$ is *almost Gorenstein* if the inclusion $0 :_R (0 :_R I) \subseteq I :_R \mathfrak{m}$ holds for every ideal $I \subseteq R$.

Our investigation led us to the study of the syzygies of the canonical module for a certain class of almost Gorenstein rings, for which we prove the following:

Main Theorem. Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \mathsf{k})$ be a local noetherian ring which is almost Gorenstein with canonical module ω_R. Assume that R is not Gorenstein, and write $R = S/J$, where S is an artinian Gorenstein ring. Denote by c the dimension of the k-vector space $(J :_S \mathfrak{m})/(\mathfrak{m}J :_S \mathfrak{m})$ and assume $c > 0$. Then the vector space k^c is a direct summand of the second syzygy of the canonical module ω_R.

Issues concerning direct summands of syzygies have played an important role in criteria for regularity, see [**11**], and finite G-dimension, see [**15**]. In particular the result of [**15**] implies that for a local ring, the canonical module cannot appear as a summand of a syzygy module of the residue field unless the ring is regular.

The Main Theorem gives information on the size of the minimal free resolutions of the canonical module for a certain class of almost Gorenstein rings. A sequence

Key words and phrases. Almost Gorenstein ring, totally reflexive module, canonical module.
J. S. was partly supported by NSF grant DMS-0901427 and by the Science Institute Grant.
A.V. was partly supported by NSA grant H98230-09-1-0057.

$\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ has exponential growth if there exists an integer $A > 1$ such that $a_i \geq A^i$ for all $i \gg 0$. Studies on the exponential growth of the sequence of the Betti numbers of the canonical module can be found for example in [**13**], [**9**]. As an immediate consequence of the above theorem, we obtain a new family of ring for which the Betti numbers of the canonical module have exponential growth. This follows immediately from the fact that the Betti numbers of the residue field have exponential growth if the ring is not a complete intersection, see for example [**4**].

The paper is organized in the following way. In Section 1 we prove the Main Theorem and in Section 2 we give some examples of almost Gorenstein rings. The connection between the Main Theorem and the existance of totally reflexive modules is given in Section 3 where we also give, in contrast, an example of an almost Gorenstein ring that admits a totally reflexive modules. In Section 4 we consider almost Gorenstein rings that are quotients of a polynomial ring by a monomial ideal, and we show that k is a direct summand of the first or the second syzygy of the canonical module.

In the following $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \mathsf{k})$ will denote a local noetherian ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ and residue field k.

1. The canonical module over almost Gorenstein rings

In this section we will prove the Main Theorem. Given two ideals of R, I and J, we will often use the colon ideal $I :_R J$. When I is generated by a single element $I = (f)$, to abbreviate the notation $I :_R J$ will be denoted by $f :_R J$. Similarly, when $J = (f)$ we will write $I :_R f$ instead of $I :_R (f)$. We will often use that $0 :_R (0 :_R I) = I$ for every ideal $I \subset R$, provided that R is a Gorenstein artinian ring. For easy reference, we collect two properties of the colon ideal in the following

LEMMA 1.1. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \mathsf{k})$ a noetherian local ring and I_1 and I_2 two ideals of R. Then the following hold:*

(1) $(0 :_R I_1) :_R I_2 = (0 :_R I_1 I_2) = (0 :_R I_2) :_R I_1$;
(2) *If R is Gorenstein and artinian, then* $0 :_R (I_1 :_R I_2) = I_2(0 :_R I_1)$.

PROOF. (1) is straightforward. For (2), as the ring R is Gorenstein, it is enough to show that

$$0 :_R (0 :_R (I_1 :_R I_2)) = 0 :_R (I_2(0 :_R I_1)).$$

But $0 :_R (I_2(0 :_R I_1)) = (0 :_R (0 :_R I_1)) :_R I_2$ by (1) and applying twice the assumption that R is Gorenstein, we obtain $(0 :_R (0 :_R I_1)) :_R I_2 = I_1 :_R I_2 = 0 :_R (0 :_R (I_1 :_R I_2))$. □

For any artinian ring R, one may assume, by the Cohen Structure Theorem, that R is a quotient S/J where S is a Gorenstein artinian ring. If S is a Gorenstein ring, then $0 :_S (0 :_S I) = I$ for all ideals I in S. Therefore without loss of generality we may assume that $J = 0 :_S K$ for some ideal $K \subseteq S$. The following result is an adaptation of Proposition 4.1 in [**10**].

LEMMA 1.2. *Let $(S, \mathfrak{m}_S)$ be a Gorenstein artinian local ring and let K be an ideal minimally generated by $f_1, \dots, f_n$ such that the ring $R = S/(0 :_S K)$ is almost Gorenstein, but not Gorenstein. Denote by K_i the ideal $(f_1, \dots, \hat{f_i}, \dots, f_n)$, where the element f_i is dropped from the list $f_1, \dots, f_n$. Then the equality*

$$\mathfrak{m}_S = f_i :_S K_i + (K_i(f_i :_S K_i)) :_S f_i,$$

holds for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

In particular, the equality

$$\mathfrak{m}_S = f_i :_S K_i + K_i :_S f_i,$$

holds for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Proof. The last statement follows from the first, as $(f_i :_S K_i)K_i \subset K_i \subset \mathfrak{m}_S$.

Without loss of generality we may assume that $i = 1$. Let $I = (0 :_S f_1)$ and denote by $J = (0 :_S K)$. As $J \subseteq I$ and S/J is almost Gorenstein, one has the inclusion

$$J :_S (J :_S I) \subseteq I :_S \mathfrak{m}_S. \tag{1.0.1}$$

We first show that $J :_S (J :_S I) = (0 :_S K(f_1 : K))$. Indeed, the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} J :_S (J :_S I) &= (0 :_S K) :_S (J :_S I), && \text{by definition of } J, \\ &= (0 :_S K(J :_S I)), && \text{applying Lemma 1.1 (1)}, \\ &= (0 :_S K((0 :_S K) :_S I))), && \text{by definition of } J, \\ &= (0 :_S K((0 :_S I) :_S K)), && \text{applying Lemma 1.1(1)}, \\ &= (0 :_S K(f_1 :_S K)), && \text{as } I = (0 :_S f_1) \text{ and } S \text{ is Gorenstein.} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the right hand side of inclusion (1.0.1) can be written as

$$I :_S \mathfrak{m}_S = (0 :_S f_1) :_S \mathfrak{m}_S = 0 :_S f_1\mathfrak{m},$$

where the first equality holds by the definition of I and the second equality holds by Lemma 1.1(1).

Now inclusion (1.0.1) becomes $(0 :_S K(f_1 :_S K)) \subseteq 0 :_S f_1\mathfrak{m}$ and this, together with the assumption that S is Gorenstein, implies that

$$f_1\mathfrak{m}_S = K(f_1 :_S K).$$

In particular, for every element $x \in \mathfrak{m}_S$ we can write $xf_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i f_i$, with $u_i \in (f_1 :_S K) = (f_1 : K_1)$ and hence $(x - u_1)f_1 = \sum_{i=2}^n u_i f_i$. This implies that $(x - u_1)f_1 \in (f_1 : K_1)K_1$. Finally x is an element of

$$((f_1 :_S K_1)K_1) :_S f_1 + f_1 :_S K_1.$$

As x is an arbitrary element in the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, we have the thesis.

$\square$

Remark 1.3. The conditions in Lemma 1.2 are not sufficient for a ring to be almost Gorenstein. Take for example $S = \mathsf{k}[x, y, z, u]/(x^2, y^2, z^2, u^2)$, $f_1 = xz$, $f_2 = yz, f_3 = xu$, $f_4 = yu$ so that $R = \mathsf{k}[|x, y, z, u|]/(x^2, y^2, z^2, u^2, xy, zu)$. For the ideal $I = (u)$ we obtain $0 :_R (0 :_R I) = \mathfrak{m}_R$ but $I :_R \mathfrak{m}_R = (u, yz, xz)$, showing that R is not almost Gorenstein.

On the other hand it is easy to check that $K_i :_S f_i = \mathfrak{m}_S$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, 4$.

Now we give the proof of the Main Theorem, Theorem 1.4. We will use $\Omega^i_R(M)$ to denote the ith syzygy of an R-module M.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}_R, \mathsf{k})$ be a local noetherian ring which is almost Gorenstein with canonical module ω_R. Assume that R is not Gorenstein, and write $R = S/J$, where $(S, \mathfrak{m}_S, \mathsf{k})$ is an artinian Gorenstein local ring. Let $c = \dim_{\mathsf{k}}(J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)/(\mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)$ and assume $c > 0$. Then the vector space k^c is a direct summand of the second syzygy of the canonical module ω_R.*

Proof. In the following, denote by y' the image in R of an element $y \in S$. Since S is Gorenstein, we may assume that $J = (0 :_S K)$, for some ideal $K = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$. The canonical module ω_R is given by

$$\operatorname{Hom}_S(R, S) = \operatorname{Hom}_S(S/(0 :_S K), S) \cong 0 :_S (0 :_S K) = K,$$

where equality holds as S is Gorenstein. Let

$$\cdots \longrightarrow R^p \xrightarrow{\partial_2} R^m \xrightarrow{\partial_1} R^n \xrightarrow{\partial_0} K \longrightarrow 0$$

be a minimal presentation of the canonical module.

By the last statement in Lemma 1.2, we can choose a set of minimal generators $x_1, \dots, x_e$ of the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_S$, such that $x_i \in f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots f_n)$ or $x_i \in (f_2, \dots, f_n) :_S f_1$ for every $i = 1, \dots, e$.

Let $u \in (J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) \setminus (\mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)$. There exists an $h \in \{1, \dots, e\}$ such that $x_h u \notin \mathfrak{m}_S J$, and there is a relation $a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2 + \cdots + a_n f_n = 0$ in S, such that either $a_1 = x_h$ or $a_2 = x_h$. The column vectors $D' = (a'_1, \dots, a'_n)$ is part of a minimal generating set for the module of first syzygies. After a choice of basis, we may assume that $D'_1 = D', D'_2, \dots, D'_m$ are the columns of ∂_1. Let $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m$ denote the liftings of these vectors to S^n, and let D denote the matrix with columns $D_1, \dots, D_m$.

We claim that the m-tuple $\mathbf{u}' \in R^m$ which has u' in the first entry and zero in all the other entries is part of a minimal generating set for the module $\Omega^2_R(\omega_R)$. To prove the claim, denote by $B' = (b'_{ij})$ the matrix representing ∂_2. It is clear by the choice of u that $\mathbf{u}'$ is in the kernel of ∂_1. Assume that $\mathbf{u}'$ is not part of a minimal set of generators of the second syzygy and denote by $\mathbf{u}$ the lift of $\mathbf{u}'$ to S^m where all the entries are equal to zero except the first entry which is equal to u. This implies that we can write the $\mathbf{u}$ as follow

$$\mathbf{u} = c_1 \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} \\ \vdots \\ b_{m1} \end{pmatrix} + \cdots + c_p \begin{pmatrix} b_{1p} \\ \vdots \\ b_{mp} \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{j}$$

where c_i are elements of the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_S$ and $\mathbf{j} \in JS^m$. Moreover we have

$$b_{1i} D_1 + \cdots + b_{mi} D_m \in JS^n$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, p$. This implies that $\partial_1 \mathbf{u} = \sum c_j (b_{1j} D_1 + \cdots + b_{mj} D_m) \in \mathfrak{m} JS^n$. On the other hand, either the first component or the second component of $D\mathbf{u}$, according to whether x_h appears in the first component or the second component of D_1, is equal to $x_h u$ which by assumption is not in $\mathfrak{m}_S J$.

If $u_1, \dots, u_c$ are elements in $(J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)$ such that their representatives in $(J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)/(\mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)$ are a basis, one can then construct vectors $\mathbf{u}'_i \in R^m$ using the same procedure as above, and the same argument shows that they are part of a minimal system of generators of $\Omega^2_R(\omega_R)$. The R-module spanned by these vectors is isomorphic to k^c, and it is a direct summand of $\Omega^2_R(\omega_R)$.

□

Before closing the section, we record a remark which gives a condition equivalent to the hypothesis in the Main Theorem; it will be used in the later sections.

REMARK 1.5. Assume $R = S/J$ it is the quotient of an artinian Gorenstein ring S, and we write $J = 0 :_S K$, for some ideal $K \subset S$, then we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S \neq J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{m}_S K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S \neq K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S.$$

Indeed, one has $J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S = \mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S$ if and only if

$$(0 :_S \ K) : \mathfrak{m}_S = \mathfrak{m}_S(0 :_S K) :_S \mathfrak{m}_S,$$

or equivalently, as S is Gorenstein, if and only if

$$0 :_S ((0 :_S \ K) :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) = 0 :_S (\mathfrak{m}_S(0 :_S K) :_S \mathfrak{m}_S). \tag{1.0.2}$$

The first term of the equality (1.0.2) is equal to $0 :_S (0 :_S \mathfrak{m}_S K)$ by (1.1)(1) applied to K and $\mathfrak{m}_S$, and hence it is equal to $\mathfrak{m}_S K$ as S is Gorenstein.

For the second term in the equality (1.0.2) the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 :_S (\mathfrak{m}_S(0 :_S K) :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) &= \mathfrak{m}_S[0 :_S \mathfrak{m}_S(0 :_S K)], && \text{by Lemma 1.1(2),} \\ &= \mathfrak{m}_S((0 :_S (0 :_S K)) :_S \mathfrak{m}_S), && \text{by Lemma 1.1(1),} \\ &= \mathfrak{m}_S(K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) && \text{as } S \text{ is Gorenstein.} \end{aligned}$$

In particular (1.0.2) holds if and only if $\mathfrak{m}_S(K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) = \mathfrak{m}_S K$ or, equivalently, if and only if $K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S = \mathfrak{m}_S K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S$.

2. Examples of Almost Gorenstein Rings

REMARK 2.1. A ring R is called *Teter* if $R = S/(\delta)$ where S is a Gorenstein artinian ring with socle element generated by δ. By Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.1 of [**10**] a Teter ring is an almost Gorenstein ring.

In [**10**], the authors prove that quotiens of Cohen-Macaulay rings of finite Cohen-Macaulay type via a *special* system of parameters are almost Gorenstein. We adapt their proof to show the following

PROPOSITION 2.2. Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \mathsf{k})$ be a Cohen-Macaulay ring such that $\mathfrak{m}\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(M, R) = 0$ for all maximal Cohen-Macaulay module M. Then $R/(\boldsymbol{x})$ is an almost Gorenstein ring for all systems of parameters $\boldsymbol{x}$.

PROOF. Let I be any ideal of R containing the ideal generated by $\boldsymbol{x}$. We need to show that $(\boldsymbol{x}) :_R ((\boldsymbol{x}) :_R I) \subseteq I :_R \mathfrak{m}$. Assume that I is generated by $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ and consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x}) : I} \to \left(\frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x})}\right)^n \to N \to 0,$$

where the first map is given by $\overline{u} \to (\overline{f_1 u}, \ldots, \overline{f_n u})$. Applying the functor $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\quad , R/(\boldsymbol{x}))$ to the short exact sequence we obtain:

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(N, \frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x})}) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(\frac{R}{I}, \frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x})})^n \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(\frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x}) : I}, \frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x})}) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(N, \frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x})}).$$

The cokernel of the middle map is the cokernel of:

$$\oplus \frac{(\boldsymbol{x}) :_R I}{(\boldsymbol{x})} \to \frac{(\boldsymbol{x}) :_R ((\boldsymbol{x}) :_R I)}{(\boldsymbol{x})}$$

given by $(\overline{u}_1, \dots, \overline{u}_n) \to \overline{f_1 u_1 + \cdots + f_n u_n}$. The cokernel is therefore isomorphic to $\frac{(\boldsymbol{x}):_R((\boldsymbol{x}):_R I)}{I}$ and embeds in $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(N, R/(\boldsymbol{x}))$. As $(\boldsymbol{x}) \subseteq \operatorname{ann}_R \operatorname{Ext}^1_R(N, \frac{R}{(\boldsymbol{x})})$, we obtain the isomorphism $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(N, R/(\boldsymbol{x})) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^{d+1}_R(N, R)$ which is isomorphic to $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(\Omega^d(N), R)$ and therefore annihilated by $\mathfrak{m}$. This implies that $\mathfrak{m}\frac{(\boldsymbol{x}):_R((\boldsymbol{x}):_R I)}{I} = 0$ and therefore the thesis. $\square$

3. Almost Gorenstein rings and totally reflexive modules

We begin with the definition of totally reflexive modules.

Definition 3.1. An R-module M is totally reflexive if and only if $M^{**} \cong M$ and $\operatorname{Ext}^i_R(M, R) = 0 = \operatorname{Ext}^i_R(M^*, R)$, for all $i > 0$.

The following lemma is well-known by the experts. We include the proof for easy reference.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \mathsf{k})$ be a local ring with canonical module ω_R. If k is a direct summand of any syzygy of ω_R then there are no non-free totally reflexive modules.*

Proof. Let X be a totally reflexive module. By definition, $\operatorname{Ext}^i_R(X, F) = 0$ for every free module F and for every $i > 0$. Applying the functor $\operatorname{Hom}_R(X, \quad)$ to the short exact sequence $0 \to \Omega^1_R(\omega_R) \to F \to \omega_R \to 0$, one obtains the equalities $\operatorname{Ext}^1_R(X, \omega_R) = \operatorname{Ext}^{i+1}_R(X, \Omega^i_R(\omega_R))$ for every R-module M. In particular, $\operatorname{Ext}^{i+1}_R(X, \mathsf{k}) = 0$ if k is a direct summand of $\Omega^i_R(\omega_R)$. This shows that X has finite projective dimension and therefore it is free, by the Auslander-Bridger formula (see for example Theorem 1.4.8 [**7**]) and the Auslander-Buchsbaum formula (see for example Theorem 1.3.3 [**6**]). $\square$

Remark 3.3. In [**12**] Theorem 1.6 and Remark 1.8 (e) it is shown that if a local ring R can be written as a quotient S/J , where $(S, \mathfrak{m}_S)$ is a local ring such that $\dim_{\mathsf{k}}(J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)/(\mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) \geq 2$ then there are no non-free totally reflexive modules. The Main Theorem and Lemma 3.2 show that for almost Gorenstein rings the conclusion holds even in the case when $\dim_{\mathsf{k}}(J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)/(\mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) \geq 1$.

Corollary 3.4. Let R be a Teter ring, then R does not admit totally reflexive modules which are not free.

Proof. let S be an artinian Gorenstein ring such that $R = S/(\delta)$, where δ generates the socle of S. As $\delta :_S \mathfrak{m}_S$ strictly contains $\mathfrak{m}_S \delta :_S \mathfrak{m}_S = 0 :_S \mathfrak{m}_S$, by Remark 2.1 the conditions of the Main Theorem are satisfied and therefore the corollary follows from Lemma 3.2. $\square$

Teter rings are the ring of smallest Gorenstein colength, for a definition see [**1**]. The following example shows that it is possible to have totally reflexive modules over rings of Gorenstein colength 2.

Example 3.5. The ring $R = \mathsf{k}[|x, y, z|]/(x^2, y^2, z^2, yz)$ has totally reflexive modules which are not free. On the other hand, let $S = \mathsf{k}[|x, y, z|]/(x^2, y^2, z^2)$ and $J = (yz)S$ then $J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S = (\mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)$. The ring R has Gorenstein colength 2.

We conclude the section with an example of an almost Gorenstein ring that admits a totally reflexive module, and therefore infinitely many by [**8**]. For the argument we use some facts which we collect in the following three remarks.

Remark 3.6. In [**3**], Theorem 3.1, the authors prove that if $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring and $\boldsymbol{y} = y_1,\dots,y_d$ is a regular sequence in $\mathfrak{m}^2$ then $R/(\boldsymbol{y})$ has a totally reflexive module.

Remark 3.7. Let $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring. Let M be a finitely generated R-module and $0 \to \Omega_R^1(M) \to F \to M \to 0$ be the beginning of a minimal free resolution of M. For every element x of the maximal ideal, denote by μ_x the multiplication by x. If for every x in a minimal set of generators of $\mathfrak{m}$ there exists a linear map ϕ_x such that the diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & \Omega_R^1(M) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\mu_x"] & F \arrow[r] \arrow[dl, "\phi_x"] & M \arrow[r] & 0 \\ 0 \arrow[r] & \Omega_R^1(M) \arrow[r] & F \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

commutes, then $\mathfrak{m}\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(M,N) = 0$ for all modules N.

Remark 3.8. Let $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ be a local Cohen-Macaulay ring with canonical module ω_R. For every R-module N, denote by $N^\vee$ the R-module $\operatorname{Hom}_R(N,\omega_R)$. Let M and L be two maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules. There exists an isomorphism $\phi : \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(M,L) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(L^\vee, M^\vee)$ such that $\phi(\xi_1) = \xi_2$ where

$$\xi_1 : 0 \to L \to X \to M \to 0$$

and

$$\xi_2 : 0 \to M^\vee \to X^\vee \to L^\vee \to 0$$

is obtained by applying $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\quad, \omega_R)$ to ξ_1.

Example 3.9. The ring $R = \mathbb{C}[[x,y,z,u,v]]/(xz-y^2, xv-yu, yv-zu)$ is of finite Cohen Macaulay type and its only indecomposable maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules are R, the ideals $\omega_R \cong \alpha = (x,y)$, $\alpha^2 = (x^2,y^2,xy)$, $\beta = (x,y,u)$ and the R-module $\Omega_R^1(\beta)$. For a proof of this see for example [**14**]. In the following we show that the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ annihilates all the R-modules $\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(M,R)$ for M maximal Cohen-Macaulay.

For the ideal α, the first syzygy $\Omega_R^1(\alpha)$ is generated by

$$[-v,u], [-z,y], [-y,x].$$

The following list gives the maps of Remark 3.7

$$\phi_x = \begin{pmatrix} y & z-y \\ -x & -y+x \end{pmatrix} \qquad \phi_y = \begin{pmatrix} -y & 0 \\ x & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\phi_z = \begin{pmatrix} z & 0 \\ -y & 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \phi_v = \begin{pmatrix} v-y & -z \\ -u+x & y \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\phi_u = \begin{pmatrix} y & 0 \\ -u & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

In particular, by Remark 3.7, we have that $\mathfrak{m}\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(\alpha,N) = 0$ for every R-module N.

For every maximal Cohen-Macaulay module M, the following holds:

$$\operatorname{ann}_R(\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(M,R)) = \operatorname{ann}_R(\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(\omega_R, M^\vee) = \operatorname{ann}_R(\operatorname{Ext}_R^1(\alpha, M^\vee)) = \mathfrak{m},$$

where the second equality follows from Remark 3.8. Now the sequence x^2, v^2, z^2+u^2 is a system of parameters of R contained in $\mathfrak{m}^2$. Therefore $R/(x^2,v^2,z^2+u^2)$ is almost Gorenstein by Lemma 2.2 and has a totally reflexive module by Remark 3.6.

4. The monomial case

The main result of this section deals with artinian almost Gorenstein rings which are obtained as quotients of polynomial rings by monomial ideals.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let $S = \mathsf{k}[x_1, \ldots, x_d]/(x_1^{A_1}, \ldots, x_d^{A_d})$, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ be monomials in S such that $R = S/0 :_S (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ is almost Gorenstein. Then the residue field is a direct summand of the first or second syzygy of the canonical module ω_R .*

The proof of Theorem 4.1 will be given after we prove the following:

THEOREM 4.2. *Let $S = \mathsf{k}[x_1, \ldots, x_d]/(x_1^{A_1}, \ldots, x_d^{A_d})$, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ be monomials in S such that*

(1) *f_i does not divide f_j for every $i \neq j$;*
(2) *x_i divides f_j for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$ and for all $j \in \{1, \ldots n\}$;*
(3) *$(x_1, \ldots, x_u) \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^n f_i :_S (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$.*

Then, one of the following conclusions holds:

(A) *There exists an $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and a $j \in \{1, \ldots, u\}$ such that*
$$\frac{f_i}{x_j} \in (f_1, \ldots, f_n) :_S (x_1, \ldots, x_u);$$
(B) *There exist mutually disjoint sets $S_1, \ldots, S_n \subseteq \{1, \ldots, u\}$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and all $j \in \{1, \ldots, u\}$, $x_j f_i \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow j \in S_i$.*

PROOF. Before we proceed with the proof, we establish some claims that we will use later. Write each $f_j = \Pi_{i=1}^n x_i^{N_{ji}}$, with $N_{ji} < A_i$.

Claim 1: If $x_i f_j \in (f_k)$, for some integers i, j, k then one of the following cases hold:

(i) $\begin{cases} N_{ji} = N_{ki} - 1 \\ N_{jl} \geq N_{kl}, \quad \text{for every} \quad l \neq i \end{cases}$

(ii) $N_{ji} = A_i - 1$

Moreover, for fixed j, k, the first case can hold for at most one i.

Proof of Claim 1: Note that (ii) is equivalent to $x_i f_j = 0$ in S. If $0 \neq x_i f_j \in (f_k)$, then (i) is obtained by comparing the exponents of each variable for $x_i f_j$ and f_k. The fact that $N_{ji} = N_{ki} - 1$ is due to the assumption that f_k does not divide f_j. For the last statement, assume that there are two indeces i_1 and i_2 such that
$$\begin{cases} N_{ji_1} = N_{ki_1} - 1 \\ N_{jl} \geq N_{kl}, \quad \text{for every} \quad l \neq i_1 \end{cases}$$
and
$$\begin{cases} N_{ji_2} = N_{ki_2} - 1 \\ N_{jl} \geq N_{kl}, \quad \text{for every} \quad l \neq i_2 \end{cases}$$
then, $N_{ki_2} - 1 = N_{ji_2} \geq N_{ki_2}$ which is a contradiction.

Claim 2: If conclusion B holds but A does not hold, then we have the following:

(i) each set S_i has cardinality at least 2;
(ii) for every $k \in S_i$ we have $x_k \in (f_i) :_S (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$, and $x_k \notin f_j :_S (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ for all $j \neq i$.

Proof of Claim 2: Assume that there exist indeces i and k such that $S_i = \{x_k\}$. Since $x_k f_j = 0$ for all $j \neq i$, it follows that case (A) holds, as

$$\frac{f_i}{x_k} \in f_i :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n).$$

For (ii), let $k \in S_i$. Assume that $x_k \in f_j :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ for some $j \neq i$. Then $0 \neq x_k f_i \in (f_j)$. As we may assume (i), there exists an $l \in S_i$ such that $l \neq k$. By Claim 1, we have $N_{il} \geq N_{jl}$. As $l \notin S_j$, we have $x_l f_j = 0$, and thus $N_{jl} = A_l - 1$. This contradicts the fact that $N_{il} < A_l - 1$.

The proof of the theorem goes by induction on the number of variables d, the case $d = 1$ being obvious. Assume that the theorem holds for $d - 1$ variables. We now induct on the number n of polynomials. Assume that the theorem holds in the case of $n - 1$ polynomials.

Claim 3: If there exists $k \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ such that $x_k f_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then we are done by induction on the number of variables. In particular, whenever conclusion B holds for a subset of $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ with respect to a subset $\{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$ of $\{x_1, \dots, x_u\}$, we may assume that the sets $S_1, S_2, \dots,$ asserted in Conclusion B form a partition of $\{1, \dots, s\}$.

Indeed, we can write $f_i = x_k^{A_k - 1} f'_i$, with $f'_i \in \mathsf{k}[x_1, \dots, \hat{x_k}, \dots, x_d]$. Assumptions (1), (2), (3) hold for $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_n\}$ viewed as monomials in $d - 1$ variables. If conclusion (A) holds for $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_n\}$, then it also holds for $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$. Similarly, if conclusion (B) holds for $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_n\}$, then it also holds for $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ (with the same choice of the sets S_i).

Claim 4: Assume that conclusion B holds for $\{f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}\}$ with respect to a set of variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$, with $s \leq u$. Let $S'_1, \dots, S'_{n-1} \subset \{1, \dots, s\}$ be the sets asserted in conclusion B. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, and let $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ be such that $k \in S'_i$.

Then we have either $x_k \in f_i :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, or $x_k \in f_n :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$. Among the k's for which the first situation occurs, we can have $x_k f_n \neq 0$ for at most one such k.

Proof of Claim 4: By Claim 2 (ii), we cannot have $x_k \in f_j :_S (f_1, \dots, f_{n-1})$ for any $i \neq j \leqslant n - 1$. Thus, we have either $x_k \in f_i :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, or $x_k \in f_n :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$. For the last part of the claim, assume that $x_{k_1} f_n \in (f_{i_1})$, and $x_{k_2} f_n \in (f_{i_2})$, with $k_1 \in S'_{i_1}$, and $k_2 \in S'_{i_2}$. We need to show that one of $x_{k_1} f_n$ or $x_{k_2} f_n$ is zero. If $i_1 = i_2$, this follows from Claim 1. Assume that $i_1 \neq i_2$ and $x_{k_1} f_n \neq 0$. Then $N_{nk_1} = N_{i_1 k_1} - 1$, $N_{nl} \geqslant N_{i_1 l}$ for all $l \neq k_1$. In particular, $N_{nk_2} \geqslant N_{i_1 k_2}$. Since $k_2 \notin S'_{i_1}$, we have $x_{k_2} f_{i_1} = 0$, and thus $x_{k_2} f_n = 0$.

Claim 5: If

$$(x_1, \dots, x_u) \subseteq \sum_{l \neq i} f_l :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n).$$

for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then conclusion A holds.

Proof of Claim 5: Assume that $(x_1, \dots, x_u) \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$. The assumptions (1),(2),and (3) in the theorem are satisfied for $\{f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}\}$ with respect to the variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_u\}$, and by the induction hypothesis either A of B holds. If (A) holds for $\{f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}\}$ then it also holds for $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, and we are done.

Assume that (B) holds for $\{f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}\}$. Let $\{1, \dots, u\} = S'_1 \cup \dots \cup S'_{n-1}$ be the partition asserted in conclusion (B). By Claim 4, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ we have either $x_k \in f_i :_S f_n$ or $x_k \in f_n :_S f_i$, where $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ is such that $k \in S'_i$.

If the first situation occurs for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, u\}$, then Claim 3 shows that $x_k f_n = 0$ for all values of k except one, say k_0. Then conclusion A holds, with

$$\frac{f_n}{x_{k_0}} \in (f_1, \ldots, f_n) :_S (x_1, \ldots, x_u).$$

Assume that there exists a k_0 such that $x_{k_0} f_{i_0} \in (f_n)$ holds, where i_0 is such that $k_0 \in S'_{i_0}$. Note that $x_{k_0} f_{i_0} \neq 0$, so we have $N_{i_0 l} \geqslant N_{nl}$ for all $l \neq k_0$. By Claim 2(i), we may assume that S'_{i_0} has cardinality at least two. Let $k' \in S_{i_0}$, $k' \neq k$.

Since $N_{nk'} \leqslant N_{i_0 k'} < A_{k'} - 1$, it follows that $x_{k'} f_n \neq 0$ for all $k_0 \neq k' \in S'_{i_0}$. Also, by Claim 1, we cannot have $x_{k'} f_{i_0} \in (f_n)$. The only remaining possibility is that $0 \neq x_{k'} f_n \in (f_{i_0})$, and therefore $N_{nl} \geqslant N_{i_0 l}$ for all $l \neq k'$. In particular, $x_j f_n = 0$ for all $j \notin S'_{i_0}$. It follows that conclusion A holds, with

$$\frac{f_n}{x_{k_0}} \in (f_1, \ldots, f_n) :_S (x_1, \ldots, x_u).$$

Indeed, for $k' \in S_{i_0}$, $k' \neq k_0$ we have $x_{k'} f_n \in (f_{i_0})$, and $N_{nk_0} = N_{i_0 k_0} + 1$, from which we see that

$$\frac{f_n}{x_{k_0}} x_{k'} \in (f_{i_0}).$$

Claim 5 allows us to rename the variables so that we may assume that

$$x_1, \ldots, x_s \notin f_n :_S (f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}, f_n) \tag{4.0.1}$$

$$x_{s+1}, \ldots, x_u \in f_n :_S (f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}, f_n) \tag{4.0.2}$$

We apply the induction hypothesis to $\{f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}\}$ with respect to the variables $\{x_1, \ldots, x_s\}$.

Assume that conclusion B holds for $\{f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}\}$ with respect to $\{x_1, \ldots, x_s\}$, but A does not. Let $\{1, \ldots, s\} = S'_1 \cup \ldots \cup S'_{n-1}$ be the partition asserted by B.

We claim that

$$x_l f_1 = \ldots x_l f_{n-1} = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad s+1 \leq l \leq u. \tag{4.0.3}$$

Indeed, assume by way of contradiction that there exists an $l \in \{s+1, \ldots, u\}$ and an $i \leqslant n-1$ such that $x_l f_i \neq 0$. Since $x_l f_i \in (f_n)$, we must have $N_{ik} \geqslant N_{nk}\ \forall k \neq l$. In particular, for $k \in S'_i$, we have $N_{ik} < A_k - 1$, and thus $N_{nk} < A_k - 1$, which means that $x_k f_n \neq 0$. Since we may assume that S'_i has cardinality at least two, Claim 4 shows that there exists a $k \in S'_i$ with $x_k f_i \in (f_n)$. The fact that both $x_j f_i$ and $x_k f_i$ are nonzero elements in (f_n) contradicts Claim 1.

Equation 4.0.1 and Claim 4 show that we have two possibilities:

(1) There exists a $k \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ with $0 \neq x_k f_n \in (f_i)$, where $k \in S'_i$, and $x_l f_n = 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$, $l \neq k$. Then we also have $x_l f_n = 0$ for all $l \in \{s+1, \ldots, u\}$, because $N_{nl} \geqslant N_{il}$, and Equation 4.0.3 shows that $N_{il} = A_l - 1$. It follows that conclusion A holds, as

$$\frac{f_n}{x_k} \in (f_1, \ldots, f_n) : (x_1, \ldots, x_u).$$

(2) $x_k f_n = 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$. If $x_l f_n \neq 0$ for all $l \in \{s+1, \ldots, u\}$, then conclusion B holds for $\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\}$, $\{x_1, \ldots, x_u\}$, with $S_i = S'_i$ for $i \leqslant n-1$, and $S_n = \{s+1, \ldots, u\}$. Otherwise, assume that $x_l f_n = 0$ for some $l \in \{s+1, \ldots, u\}$.

Use Equation 4.0.3 to see that $x_l f_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and thus we are done by induction on the number of variables, by Claim 3.

Now assume that conclusion A holds for $\{f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}\}$ with respect to the variables $\{x_1, \dots x_s\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\frac{f_1}{x_1} \in (f_1, f_2, \dots f_{n-1}) :_S (x_1, \dots, x_s). \tag{4.0.4}$$

If

$$x_l \frac{f_1}{x_1} \in (f_n), \quad \text{for every} \quad s+1 \leq l \leq u, \tag{4.0.5}$$

then conclusion A would hold for $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, $\{x_1, \dots, x_u\}$, and we would be done. We know that $x_l f_1 \in (f_n)$ for all $s+1 \leq l \leq u$ by equation 4.0.2. If $x_l f_1 = 0$ for all $s+1 \leq l \leq u$, or if $N_{11} > N_{n1}$ then equation 4.0.5 holds. Without loss of generality we may assume that

$$N_{11} \leq N_{n1} \tag{4.0.6}$$

and $x_l f_1 \neq 0$ for some $s+1 \leq l \leq u$. By Claim 1, there exists just one value of l, say $l = s+1$ such that $x_l f_1 \neq 0$ (since we have $x_l f_1 \in (f_n)$ for all $l \geqslant s+1$). So we may assume

$$x_{s+1} f_1 \neq 0, \;\; N_{11} = N_{n1} \text{ and } x_l f_1 = 0, \text{ for all } s+2 \leq l \leq u \tag{4.0.7}$$

Claim 6: With the above assumptions, the following holds:

$$x_2 f_1 = \dots x_s f_1 = 0 \tag{4.0.8}$$

If, say, $x_2 f_1 \neq 0$, then

$$0 \neq x_2 \frac{f_1}{x_1} \in (f_i)$$

for some $i \leq n-1$, which implies that $N_{11} > N_{i1}$ and $N_{1s+1} \geqslant N_{is+1}$. As, by equation 4.0.2, $x_{s+1} f_i \in (f_n)$ then we obtain the following two possibilities:

(1) either $x_{s+1} f_i = 0$, which implies $x_{s+1} f_1 = 0$, contradicting 4.0.7; or
(2) $N_{i1} \geq N_{n1}$, which implies $N_{11} > N_{n1}$, contradicting 4.0.6.

This proves Claim 6.

Because of Claim 5, we may assume that there exists an index j, such that $1 \leq j \leq s$ and

$$x_j \in f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots, f_n) \tag{4.0.9}$$

We may assume that

$$x_1 f_1 \neq 0, \;\; \text{and therefore } x_1 f_n \neq 0 (\text{since} N_{11} = N_{n1}). \tag{4.0.10}$$

Otherwise, by 4.0.7 and 4.0.8, $x_l f_1 = 0$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, s, s+2, \dots, u\}$, and it follows that condition A holds:

$$\frac{f_1}{x_{s+1}} \in (f_1, \dots, f_n) : (x_1, \dots, x_u).$$

The following cases finish the proof of the theorem.

(1) Assume $j = 1$. Since $x_1 f_n \in (f_1)$ and $N_{11} = N_{n1}$, by 4.0.7, then $x_1 f_n = 0$ contradicting 4.0.10.
(2) Assume $j \geq 2$. We may assume $j = 2$. By 4.0.7 and 4.0.8 we have $x_l f_1 = 0$ for all $l \neq 1, s+1$. We may assume that $x_1 f_1 \neq 0$, by 4.0.10.

(a) Assume that $x_2 f_n \neq 0$. We know $x_1 \in f_i :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. As $0 \neq x_2 f_n \in (f_1)$ and $x_1 f_n \neq 0$, by Claim (1) it follows that $2 \leq i \leq n-1$ (because $N_{12} > N_{n2} \geqslant N_{i2}$, so $i \neq 1$). For such an i, we claim that

$$\frac{f_i}{x_1} \in (f_1, \dots, f_n) : (x_1, \dots, x_u). \tag{4.0.11}$$

First notice that $N_{i1} = N_{n1} + 1 = N_{11} + 1$, since $0 \neq x_1 f_n \in (f_i)$ and by 4.0.6. Moreover, as $x_2 f_n \neq 0$, by multiplying $x_1 f_n$ by x_2 we obtain that $0 \neq x_2 f_i \in (f_1)$ (we have $x_2 f_i \in (f_1)$ by equation 4.0.9, and we have $x_2 f_i \neq 0$ because $N_{i2} \leqslant N_{n2}$). Moreover, $\dfrac{x_2 f_i}{x_1} \in (f_1)$, since $N_{i1} > N_{11}$). If $x_l f_i \neq 0$ for some $l \notin \{1, 2, s+1\}$, then $x_l f_1 \neq 0$, contradicting 4.0.6 and 4.0.7. As $x_{s+1} \in (f_n) : (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, we obtain $x_{s+1} f_i \in (f_n)$ and since $N_{i1} = N_{n1} + 1$ also $x_{s+1} \frac{f_i}{x_1} \in (f_n)$.

(b) Assume that $x_2 f_n = 0$. If $x_2 f_i = 0$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ then we are done by Claim 3. So we may assume that there is a $t \notin \{1, n\}$ such that $x_2 f_t \neq 0$ and $x_2 f_t \in (f_1)$. Therefore $N_{12} = N_{t2} + 1$. As $x_l f_t \in (f_n)$ for every $s + 1 \leq l \leq u$, if $x_l f_t \neq 0$ then $A_2 - 1 = N_{n2} \leq N_{t2}$ which contradicts $x_2 f_t \neq 0$. Therefore we have that $x_l f_t = 0$ for all $s + 1 \leq t \leq u$. Also, as $0 \neq x_2 f_t \in (f_1)$, we have $N_{tk} \geq N_{1k}$ for all $k \neq 2$. As $x_l f_1 = 0$ for all l
$notin \{1, s+1\}$, it follows that $x_l f_t = 0$ for all $l \notin \{1, 2\}$. If also $x_1 f_t = 0$ then conclusion A holds as

$$\frac{f_t}{x_2} \in (f_1, \dots, f_n) :_S (x_1, \dots, x_u).$$

Assume that $x_1 f_t \neq 0$. Recall that $x_1 \in f_i :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ for some $i \leqslant n - 1$. We claim that

$$\frac{f_i}{x_1} \in (f_1, \dots, f_n) :_S (x_1, \dots, x_u).$$

As $0 \neq x_1 f_t \in (f_i)$, we have $N_{il} \leq N_{tl}$ for all $l \neq 1$. As $x_2 f_t \neq 0$ this implies that $x_2 f_i \neq 0$. As $x_2 f_i \in (f_1)$ by equation 4.0.9, and since $x_l f_1 = 0$ for $l \notin \{1, s+1\}$, we obtain that $x_l f_i = 0$ for $l \notin \{1, 2, s+1\}$. To prove the claim, it is therefore enough to prove that $\frac{f_i}{x_1} x_2 \in (f_1)$ and $\frac{f_i}{x_1} x_{s+1} \in (f_n)$. As $0 \neq x_1 f_1 \in (f_i)$ we obtain $N_{i1} = N_{11} + 1 = N_{n1} + 1$, where the last equality follows from 4.0.7. This, together with the fact that $x_2 f_i \in (f_1)$ by equation 4.0.9, and $x_{s+1} f_i \in (f_n)$ by equation 4.0.2 concludes the claim.

□

Now we give the proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. We may apply Theorem 4.2 to $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, $\{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$.

Indeed, the assumption that $R = S/0 :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is almost Gorenstein implies hypothesis (3) of Theorem 4.2 by Lemma 4.3 . We may assume without loss of generality that (1) holds by choosing $f_1, \dots, f_n$ to be a minimal set of generators for the ideal they generate. In order to establish hypothesis (2), note that R does not change if we replace S by $S' = \mathsf{k}[x_1, \dots, x_d]/(x_1^{A_1+1}, \dots, x_d^{A_d+1})$, and $f_1, \dots, f_n$ by $f'_1, \dots, f'_n$, where $f'_i = (x_1 \cdots x_d) f_i$.

If (A) holds, then we may apply Theorem 1.4 to conclude that a copy of the residue field k splits off the second syzygy of ω_R. Take $K = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \subset S$. From conclusion (A) of Theorem 4.2, we have

$$\frac{f_i}{x_j} \in (K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S) \setminus (\mathfrak{m}_S K :_S \mathfrak{m}_S)$$

which, by Remark 1.5, implies $J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S \neq \mathfrak{m}_S J :_S \mathfrak{m}_S$, where $J = 0 :_S K$, and now Theorem 1.4 applies.

If (B) holds, we will check that k is a direct summand of the first syzygy of ω_R. Let $S_1, \dots, S_n$ be the sets asserted in Conclusion (B). We have

$$(x_1^{A_1}, \dots, x_d^{A_d}) :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n) = (x_1^{A_1}, \dots, x_d^{A_d}) + (x_j x_{j'} \mid j, j' \text{ not in the same } S_i).$$

The relations on the generators $f_1, \dots, f_n$ of ω_R are $x_j f_i = 0$ for $j \notin S_i$, and $(\Pi_{j \in S_i} x_j^{A_j - 1}) f_i - (\Pi_{j \in S_{i'}} x_j^{A_j - 1}) f_{i'} = 0$. Note that the latter relations are killed by the maximal ideal, thus each of them generates a copy of k which splits off the first syzygy.

□

Lemma 4.3. *Let $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_d]/(x_1^{A_1}, \dots, x_d^{A_d})$ and let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in S$ be monomials such that $S/0 :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is almost Gorenstein. Then we have $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \subseteq \Sigma_i f_i :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$.*

Proof. We will use N_{ik} to denote the exponent of the variable x_k in the monomial f_i.

By Lemma 1.2, the almost Gorenstein assumption implies

$$x_i \in f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots, f_n) + [f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots, f_n)][(f_2, \dots, f_n)] :_S f_1$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Without loss of generality, we will show that $x_1 \in f_j :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

If $x_1 f_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots n$ then the conclusion follows. So there exist a j such that $x_1 f_j \neq 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the set of indexes j such that $x_1 f_j \neq 0$. There are two cases: either $x_k f_j = 0$ for all $k \neq 1$ and for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$ or there exists a $k \neq 1$ such that $x_k f_j \neq 0$ for some $j \in \mathcal{S}$,

In the first case we have that $f_1 = x_1^{N_11} x_2^{A_2 - 1} \dots x_d^{A_d - 1}$

Assume that for a such that $x_1 f_j \neq 0$ one has $x_k f_j = 0$ for all $k \neq 1$.

Choose a j (say $j = 1$) such that $x_1 f_j \neq 0$, and $x_k f_j \neq 0$ for some $k \neq 1$. If no such j exists, it is easy to see that $x_1 \in f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots, f_n)$ (where we assume that $x_1 f_1 \neq 0$ and $x_2 f_1 = \ldots = x_d f_1 = 0$).

Assume $x_1 \notin f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots, f_n)$. Then there exists a $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, say $j = 2$, such that $x_1 f_1 = a_2 f_2$ for some $a_2 \in f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots, f_n)$.

Assume that $x_2 f_1 \neq 0$.

We know that $x_2 f_1 \notin (f_2)$ by comparing the exponents of x_1 ($N_{1k} \geqslant N_{2k}$ for $k \neq 1$, and $N_{11} = N_{21} - 1$). So $x_2 \notin f_2 :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, thus there exists a j such that $x_2 f_2 = a_j f_j$ with $a_j \in f_2 :_S (f_1, \dots, f_n)$. Note that $j \neq 1$, since $x_2 f_2 \notin (f_1)$ (by comparing the exponents of x_j, $j > 2$ -if there are more than 2 variables).

We may assume $j = 3$. We will use a_{ik} to denote the exponent of the variable x_k in the monomial a_i. We have $a_2 \in f_1 :_S (f_2, \dots, f_n)$, so in particular $a_2 f_3 \in (f_1)$.

This means that either $a_2f_3 = 0$, or, by comparing exponents in each variable, $a_{2k} + N_{3k} \geqslant N_{1k}$ for all k.

We claim that a_2f_3 cannot equal zero in S. If $a_2f_3 = 0$, we must have $a_{2k} + N_{3k} \geqslant A_k$ for some k. Since $a_{2k} = N_{1k} - N_{2k}$ for all $k \neq 1$, and since $N_{2k} \geqslant N_{3k}$ for $k \neq 2$, we see that $a_{2k} + N_{3k} \leqslant N_{1k} \leqslant A_k$ for all $k \neq 1, 2$. For $k = 1$, we have $a_{21} = 0$, so $a_{21} + N_{31} = N_{31} < A_1$. For $k = 2$, we have $N_{22} = N_{32} - 1$, so $a_{22} + N_{32} = N_{12} - N_{32} + 1 + N_{32} = N_{12} + 1$, which is less that A_2 since we are assuming $x_2f_1 \neq 0$. This concludes the proof of the claim.

Now we have $a_{2k} + N_{3k} \geqslant N_{1k}$ for all k.

For $k \neq 1$, this means $N_{1k} - N_{2k} + N_{3k} \geqslant N_{1k}$, thus $N_{3k} \geqslant N_{2k}$. Since we already knew the inequality in the other direction, it follows that $N_{3k} = N_{2k}$ for $k \neq 1, 2$. Thus, we have $a_{3k} = 0$ for $k \neq 1, 2$, and we also know that $A_{32} = 0$, $a_{31} + N_{21} - N_{31}$, where $N_{21} = N_{11} + 1$ and $N_{31} \geqslant N_{11}$, so that a_{31} can be at most one. It follows that $a_3 = x_1$, and by our assumption on a_3 we now have $x_1 \in f_2 :_S (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ as desired. $\square$

References

1. H. Ananthnarayan, *The Gorenstein colength of an Artinian local ring*, J. Algebra **320** (2008), no. 9, 3438–3446. MR 2455508 (2009h:13032)
2. Maurice Auslander and Mark Bridger, *Stable module theory*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 94, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1969. MR 0269685 (42 #4580)
3. Luchezar L. Avramov, Vesselin N. Gasharov, and Irena V. Peeva, *Complete intersection dimension*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1997), no. 86, 67–114 (1998). MR 1608565 (99c:13033)
4. Luchezar L. Avramov, *Infinite free resolutions*, Six Lectures in Commutative Algebra (Bellaterra, 1996), 1–118, Progr. Math., 166, Birkhuser, Basel (1998). MR 1648664 (99m:13022)
5. Luchezar L. Avramov and Alex Martsinkovsky, *Absolute, relative, and Tate cohomology of modules of finite Gorenstein dimension*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **85** (2002), no. 2, 393–440. MR 1912056 (2003g:16009)
6. Winfried Bruns and Jürgen Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 39, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR 1251956 (95h:13020)
7. Lars Winther Christensen, *Gorenstein dimensions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1747, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000. MR 1799866 (2002e:13032)
8. Lars Winther Christensen, Greg Piepmeyer, Janet Striuli, and Ryo Takahashi, *Finite Gorenstein representation type implies simple singularity*, Adv. Math. **218** (2008), no. 4, 1012–1026. MR 2419377 (2009b:13058)
9. Lars Winther Christensen, Janet Striuli and Oana Veliche, *Growth in the minimal injective resolution of a local ring*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2), **81**, (2010), no. 1, 24–44. MR 2580452
10. Craig Huneke and Adela Vraciu, *Rings that are almost Gorenstein*, Pacific J. Math. **225** (2006), no. 1, 85–102. MR 2233726 (2007f:13035)
11. Sankar Dutta, *Syzygies and homological conjectures*, Commutative Algebra (Berkeley, CA, 1987), 139–156, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. **15**, Springer, New York, 1989.
12. David Jorgensen, Meri Hughes, and Liana Sega, *Acyclic complexes of finitely generated free modules over local rings*, preprint (2008).
13. David A. Jorgensen and Graham J. Leuschke, *On the growth of the Betti sequence of the canonical module*, Math. Z., **256**, (2007), no. 3, 647–659. MR 2299575 (2008a:13018)
14. Idun Reiten, *Cohen-Macaulay modules over isolated singularities*, Séminaire d'algèbre Paul Dubreil et Marie-Paule Malliavin, 37ème année (Paris, 1985), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1220, Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp. 25–32. MR 926295 (89c:14003)
15. Takahashi, Ryo, *Syzygy modules with semidualizing or G-projective summands*, J. Algebra, **295**, (2006), no. 1, 179–194. MR 2188856 (2006j:13010)

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Fairfield University, Fairfield, CT 06824.
E-mail address: jstriuli@fairfield.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208.
E-mail address: vraciu@math.sc.edu