


**Algebra 2**  
**Professor. Amritanshu Prasad**  
**Department of Mathematics**  
**The Institute of Mathematical Science**  
**Krull-Schmidt Theorem**

(Refer Slide Time: 00:15)

Krull-Schmidt theorem

Thm: Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module satisfying the ACC and DCC.  
 Suppose  $M = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k$   
 $= N_1 \oplus \dots \oplus N_l$   
 are decompositions into direct sums of indecomposable modules.  
 Then  $k=l$ , and there exists a bijection  $\sigma: \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, l\}$   
 such that  $N_{\sigma(i)} \cong M_i \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq k$ .

Pf: Proceed by induction on  $k$ .  
 If  $k=1$ ,  $M$  is indecomposable, and there is nothing to prove.  
 If  $k \geq 2$



In this lecture, I will prove the Krull-Schmit Theorem. So, the theorem says let  $M, R$  can be any ring, let  $M$  be an  $R$  module satisfying the ACC and the DCC. We know already that such  $R$  modules can be written as a direct sum of indecomposable sub modules. And suppose we have two such compositions. Suppose,  $M$  equals  $M_1$  direct sum  $M_k$  and  $N_1$  direct sum  $N_l$  are decompositions of  $M$  into indecomposable sub modules, into direct sums of indecomposable modules.

Then  $k$  is equal to  $l$  and there exists a bijection,  $\sigma: 1$  to  $k$  to  $1$  to  $l$  such that  $N_{\sigma(i)}$  is isomorphic to  $M_i$  for all  $i$  between  $1$  and  $K$ . In other words, the sum adds in this decomposition are uniquely determined up to the reordering of sum adds. The proof will use the locality of the endomorphism algebra and also use the calculus of projections. So, but, so the proof will proceed by induction on  $K$ . If  $k$  equals  $1$ , there is nothing to prove.  $M$  is indecomposable and so  $N$  itself must also have only  $1$  sum adds. Otherwise, let us assume that  $k$  is greater than or equal to  $2$ . Now, we have these decompositions.

(Refer Slide Time: 03:45)

Pf: Proceed by induction on  $k$ .

If  $k=1$ ,  $M$  is indecomposable, and there is nothing to prove.


If  $k \geq 2$ . Let  $\text{id}_M = p_1 + \dots + p_k$   
 $= q_1 + \dots + q_k$   
 be the partitions of unity associated to (1) & (2) respectively.

$p_1 = p_1(\text{id}_M) = p_1 q_1 + p_1 q_2 + \dots + p_1 q_k$

$p_1|_M \in \text{End}_R M_1$ , a local ring

$\text{id}_{M_1} = p_1 q_1|_M + \dots + p_1 q_k|_M \in \text{End}_R M_1$

Claim:  $p_1 q_j|_M$  is an isomorphism  $M_1 \rightarrow M_1$  for at least one  $j$ .



Let identity of  $M$  equals  $p_1$  plus  $p_k$  and  $q_1$  plus  $q_l$  be the partitions of unity associated to, the two direct sub decompositions which maybe I can give them names 1 and 2, respectively. So, now let us look at  $p_1$ . Well  $p_1$  is  $p_1$  times identity of  $M$ , but then identity of them as a decomposition. So, it is  $q_1$  plus  $q_2$  plus  $q_l$ . So,  $p_1 q_1$  plus  $p_1 q_2$  plus  $p_1 q_l$ .

Now,  $p_1$  restricted to  $M_1$ ,  $p_1$  anyway its image is contained in  $M_1$ . So, we can think of people restricted to  $M_1$  as an element of  $\text{end } R M_1$  and by the theorem which I proved in the previous lecture, this is a local ring and what we have is that the identity of  $M_1$  equals  $p_1 q_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  plus  $p_1 q_n$  restricted to  $M_1$ .

Now I claim that  $p_1 q_j$  is an isomorphism or maybe I should say  $p_1 q_j$  restricted to  $M_1$  is an isomorphism from  $M_1$  to  $M_1$  for at least one  $j$ . Why is that, well this whole thing is happening inside  $\text{end } R M_1$  and this  $\text{end } R M_1$  is a local ring and so, if none of these sum adds where isomorphisms, then by the theorem that we proved in the last lecture, they would all be nilpotent.

And so, but then and there's sum also would be nilpotent. Because all these nilpotent elements, they form a two sided idea. But then the sum is the identity, which is clearly not nilpotent. So, it is a contradiction. So,  $p_1 q_j$  must be an isomorphism for at least 1  $j$ .

(Refer Slide Time: 07:25)

Assume  $p_1 q_1|_{M_1}$  is an isomorphism.

Claim:  $(q_1 p_1)|_{N_1}$  is also an isomorphism.  
 If not, since  $N_1$  is indecomposable

And so let us assume without loss of generality that  $p_1 q_1$  by renumbering is an isomorphism. So, what we have is we have  $M_1$ , so I should say  $p_1$ . So, what we have is we have  $M_1$ , so I should say  $p_1$ , so we have  $M_1$  and then we have  $M_1$  and we have this isomorphism  $p_1 q_1$  is raise to  $M_1$  and we can look at  $p_1$ . So,  $q_1$  goes from,  $q_1$  restricted to  $M_1$ , its goes to  $N_1$  because the image of  $Q_1$  is contained in  $N_1$  and  $P_1$  restricted to  $N_1$  goes back into  $M_1$  and what we are saying as this composition is an isomorphism. Now, I claim that  $q_1 p_1$  restricted to  $N_1$  is also an isomorphism. Why is that?

(Refer Slide Time: 09:01)

Claim:  $(q_1 p_1)|_{N_1}$  is also an isomorphism.  
 If not, since  $N_1$  is indecomposable,  $\text{End}_R N_1$  is local.  

$$p_1 (q_1 p_1|_{N_1})^n q_1 = 0 \text{ for some } n > 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow (p_1 q_1|_{M_1})^{n+1} = 0, \text{ a contradiction.}$$
 Since  $p_1 q_1|_{M_1}$  is an is,  $p_1|_{M_2}$  is surjective onto  $M_1$   
 $q_1|_{M_1}$  is injective.  
 $\therefore M_1 \cong N_1.$

If not since  $N_1$  is indecomposable  $\text{end } R N_1$  is also local and in fact, by the previous the theorem, in the previous lecture what we have is  $q_1 p_1$  restricted to  $N_1$  to the power  $n$  is 0 for

some  $N$  greater than 0. But now what you can do is, you can multiply this on the left by  $p_1$  and on the right by  $q_1$  and what you will get is  $p_1 q_1$ . So, here you are multiplied by  $p_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  and here  $q_1$  restricted to  $N_1$ . So, what you will get is  $p_1 q_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  to the power  $n + 1$  is equal to 0. But that contradicts the fact that  $p_1 q_1$  is an isomorphism.

So, now since  $p_1 q_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  is an isomorphism we have  $p_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  is surjective,  $p_1$  is surjective on,  $p_1$  is surjective on to,  $p_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  is surjective on to  $M_1$  and we also have that  $q_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  is injective. And therefore,  $p_1$  restricted to  $N_1$  and  $q_1$  restricted to  $M_1$  define isomorphisms between  $M_1$  and  $N_1$ . So,  $M_1$  is isomorphic to  $N_1$ .

So, we found from these decompositions, we have been able to pick out one sum add from the first decomposition one sum add from the second decomposition that are isomorphic. In fact, we just renumbered the second composition to make that the first sum add. So, what we have is that  $M_1$  is isomorphic to  $N_1$ . Now, for induction to work, to kick in it suffices to show that.

(Refer Slide Time: 11:57)

We will show that

$$M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k \cong N_2 \oplus \dots \oplus N_k.$$

Let  $M' = N_1 + M_2 + \dots + M_k \subset M$ .

If  $n \in N_1 \cap (M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k)$

$p_1(n) = 0$ , since  $p_1|_N$  is injective,  $n = 0$ .

So  $M' = N_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(M') &= \ell(N_1) + \ell(M_2) + \dots + \ell(M_k) \\ &= \ell(N_1) + \ell(M_2) + \dots + \ell(M_k) = \ell(M) \end{aligned}$$

$\therefore M' = M$

We will show that  $M_2$  plus  $M_k$  is isomorphic to  $N_2$  plus  $N_k$  that is not really obvious yet. So, let  $M'$  be just the sum  $N_1$  plus  $M_2$  plus  $M_k$ . What I mean is just, you could just put plus here, but this part of the sum will be direct and this part, this is a sub module of  $M$ . Now, if  $N$  belongs to  $N_1$  intersect  $M_2$  plus  $M_k$ , then what we have is that  $p_1 n$  has to be 0 because  $p_1$  vanishes on  $M_2$  direct sum  $M_k$ .

But recall that  $p_1$  restricted  $N$  is injective, it is an isomorphism on to  $M_1$ , we get that  $n$  is equal to 0. So, this  $N_1$  intersect  $M_2$  direct sum  $N_k$  is 0 and so we have  $M$  prime is  $N_1$  direct sum  $M_2$  direct sum  $M_k$ . So, I want to show that  $M$  prime is actually equal to  $M$ , we can do this by comparing lengths. Length of  $M$  prime is length of  $N_1$  plus length of  $M_2$  plus length of  $M_k$ .

If you have a Jordan-Holder series for each sum add you can combine them to get a Jordan-Holder series for the direct sum and this is equal to well  $N_1$  is isomorphic to  $M_1$ . So, the length of  $N_1$  is equal to the length of  $M_1$  plus length of  $M_2$  plus length of  $M_k$  that is equal to the length of  $M$ . So, since  $M$  prime is a sub module of  $M$  with the same length as  $M$  prime,  $M$  prime must be equal to.

(Refer Slide Time: 14:46)

Handwritten mathematical proof on a whiteboard:

$$\begin{aligned} &\therefore M' = M \\ &\therefore M = N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k \\ &\quad M_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k \\ \Rightarrow &M/N_1 \cong M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k \\ &\cong N_2 \oplus \dots \oplus N_k \text{ (by (2))} \\ \therefore &M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k \cong N_2 \oplus \dots \oplus N_k \\ \text{get: } &k=2, \exists \sigma: [2, \dots, k] \rightarrow [2, \dots, 1] \\ &\text{such that } N_{\sigma(i)} \cong M_i \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

So, what we have is,  $m$  is  $N_1$  direct sum  $M_2$  direct sum  $M_k$  and  $M$  is also  $M_1$  direct sum  $M_2$  direct sum  $M_k$ . So, it follows that  $M \text{ mod } N_1$  is isomorphic to  $M_2$  direct sum  $M_k$ , but also by the decomposition 2 that we had up here, it follows that  $M \text{ mod } N_1$  is isomorphic to  $N_2$  direct sum  $N_1$ .

By the decomposition 2 and therefore,  $M_2$  direct some  $N_k$  is isomorphic to  $N_2$  direct sum  $N_1$ , so the induction hypothesis on  $k$  kicks in and, so what we get is  $k$  minus 1 is equal to 1 minus 1 which is the same as saying that  $k$  equals 1 and there exists a bijection from 2 to  $k$  2 to 1, such that  $N$  sigma  $i$  is isomorphic to  $M_i$ , for each  $i$ , for 2 less than or equal to  $i$ , less than or equal to  $k$  and putting the act together with the fact that  $M_1$  is isomorphic to  $N_1$  proves the theorem for Krull-Schmit for  $M$ .