PUBLICATIONS DE L'INSTITUT MATHÉMATIQUE
Nouvelle série, tome 97(111) (2015), 233–238 DOI: 10.2298/PIM140620001P

BASS NUMBERS OF GENERALIZED LOCAL COHOMOLOGY MODULES

Sh. Payrovi, S. Babaei, and I. Khalili-Gorji

Abstract. Let R be a Noetherian ring, M a finitely generated R-module and N an arbitrary R-module. We consider the generalized local cohomology modules, with respect to an arbitrary ideal I of R, and prove that, for all non-negative integers r, t and all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)$ the Bass number $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H^t_I(M,N))$ is bounded above by $\sum_{j=0}^{t} \mu^r\left(\mathfrak{p}, \operatorname{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M, H^j_I(N))\right)$. A corollary is that $\operatorname{Ass}\left(H^t_I(M,N)\right) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{t} \operatorname{Ass}\left(\operatorname{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M, H^j_I(N))\right)$. In a slightly different direction, we also present some well known results about generalized local cohomology modules.

1. Introduction

The local cohomology theory has been a significant tool in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry. As a generalization of the ordinary local cohomology modules, Herzog [**8**] introduced the generalized local cohomology modules and these had been studied further by Suzuki [**15**] and Yassemi [**16**] and some other authors. They studied some basic duality theorems, vanishing and other properties of generalized local cohomology modules which also generalize several known facts about Ext and ordinary local cohomology modules.

An important problem in commutative algebra is to determine when the Bass numbers of the i-th local cohomology module is finite. In [**9**] Huneke conjectured that if $(R, \mathfrak{m}, k)$ is a regular local ring, then for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R the Bass numbers $\mu^i(\mathfrak{p}, H^j_I(R)) = \dim_{k(\mathfrak{p})} \operatorname{Ext}^i_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(k(\mathfrak{p}), H^j_{IR_\mathfrak{p}}(R_\mathfrak{p}))$ are finite for all i and j. There is evidence that this conjecture is true. It is shown by Huneke and Sharp [**10**] and Lyubeznik [**11**] that the conjecture holds for regular local ring containing a field. This conjecture is also true for unramified regular local rings of mixed characteristic; this is part of the main theorem of [**12**]. On the other hand there is a negative answer to the conjecture (over non-regular ring) that is due to Hartshorne [**7**]. In [**5**] Dibaei and Yassemi studied the relationship between the Bass numbers of a module and its local cohomology modules. We would like to study

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* Primary 13D45; Secondary 14B15.
Key words and phrases: generalized local cohomology, Bass numbers.
Communicated by Žarko Mijajlović.

the relationship between the Bass numbers of generalized local cohomology modules $H^i_I(M,N)$ and $\mathrm{Ext}^i_R(M,H^j_I(N))$ whenever R is a Noetherian ring, M is a finitely generated R-module and N is an arbitrary R-module.

2. Main results

Throughout this section R is a Noetherian ring, I is an ideal of R, M is a finitely generated R-module, N is an arbitrary R-module and r,t are non-negative integers. For a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R the r-th Bass number of M is denoted by $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p},M)$.

The following lemma will be used to prove the main result of this paper.

Lemma 2.1.

$$\mu^r(\mathfrak{p},H^1_I(M,N)) \leqslant \mu^r(\mathfrak{p},\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M,\Gamma_I(N))) + \mu^r(\mathfrak{p},\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,H^1_I(N))).$$

Proof. In view of [**3**, Corollary 11.1.6] and [**6**, Lemma 2.1] $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p},H^t_I(M,N)) = \mu^r(\mathfrak{p}R_\mathfrak{p},H^t_I(M_\mathfrak{p},N_\mathfrak{p}))$; also in view of [**3**, Corollary 4.3.3]

$$\mu^r(\mathfrak{p},\mathrm{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M,H^j_I(N))) = \mu^r(\mathfrak{p}R_\mathfrak{p},\mathrm{Ext}^{t-j}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(M_\mathfrak{p},H^j_{IR_\mathfrak{p}}(N_\mathfrak{p}))).$$

So, we may assume that R is a local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. We denote $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p},M)$ by $\mu^r(M)$ and we have to show that

$$\mu^r(H^1_I(M,N)) \leqslant \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M,\Gamma_I(N))) + \mu^r(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,H^1_I(N))).$$

By Theorem 11.38 of [**14**] there is a Grothendieck spectral sequence

$$E_2^{p,q} := \mathrm{Ext}^p_R(M,H^q_I(N)) \Rightarrow_p H^{p+q}_I(M,N) = E^{p+q}$$

and there exists a finite filtration $0 = \phi^2E^1 \subseteq \phi^1E^1 \subseteq \phi^0E^1 = H^1_I(M,N)$ such that $E^{0,1}_\infty = E^1/\phi^1E^1$ and $E^{1,0}_\infty \cong \phi^1E^1$. Thus $\mu^r(E^1) \leqslant \mu^r(E^{0,1}_\infty) + \mu^r(E^{1,0}_\infty)$. Now, by the sequence $0 \longrightarrow E^{0,1}_2 \xrightarrow{d^{0,1}_2} E^{2,0}_2$ we have $E^{0,1}_\infty \cong E^{0,1}_3 \cong \ker d^{0,1}_2$. Also $E^{1,0}_\infty \cong E^{1,0}_2$. Hence, $\mu^r(E^1) \leqslant \mu^r(\ker d^{0,1}_2) + \mu^r(E^{1,0}_2) \leqslant \mu^r(E^{0,1}_2) + \mu^r(E^{1,0}_2)$ from which the result follows. □

Theorem 2.1. *We have* $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p},H^t_I(M,N)) \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^t \mu^r(\mathfrak{p},\mathrm{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M,H^j_I(N)))$.

Proof. The proof which we include for the reader's convenience, is based on [**5**, Theorem 2.1]. By the same argument as Lemma 2.1 we may assume that R is a local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. We have to show that

$$\mu^r(H^t_I(M,N)) \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^t \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M,H^j_I(N))).$$

We use induction on t. In the case $t=0$, we have $H^0_I(M,N) = \mathrm{Hom}_R(M,\Gamma_I(N))$ so that there is nothing to prove. In the case when $t=1$, the claim follows from Lemma 2.1. We therefore assume, inductively, that $t>1$ and the result has been proved for smaller values of t. Then the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_I(N) \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow N/\Gamma_I(N) \longrightarrow 0$ induces a long exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H^t_I(M,\Gamma_I(N)) \longrightarrow H^t_I(M,N) \longrightarrow H^t_I(M,N/\Gamma_I(N)) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

which implies that

$$\mu^r(H^t_I(M,N)) \leqslant \mu^r(H^t_I(M,\Gamma_I(N))) + \mu^r(H^t_I(M,N/\Gamma_I(N))).$$

Let E be an injective hull of $\Gamma_I(N)$ and let $L = E/\Gamma_I(N)$. Then by the sequence $0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_I(N) \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow 0$ it follows that $H^{i-1}_I(M,L)) \cong H^i_I(M,\Gamma_I(N))$, for all $i \geqslant 2$. Thus by induction hypothesis for $t-1$, we have

$$\mu^r(H^{t-1}_I(M,L)) \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1-j}_R(M,H^j_I(L))) = \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^t_R(M,\Gamma_I(N)))$$

since $H^i_I(L) \cong H^{i+1}_I(\Gamma_I(N)) = 0$, for all $i \geqslant 1$. Also, the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_I(N) \longrightarrow \Gamma_I(E) \longrightarrow \Gamma_I(L) \longrightarrow 0$ shows $\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^0_I(L)) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^t_R(M,\Gamma_I(N)))$ because $\Gamma_I(E)$ is an injective R-module. Let E' be an injective hull of $N/\Gamma_I(N)$ and let $K = E'/N/\Gamma_I(N)$. Then by the sequence $0 \longrightarrow N/\Gamma_I(N) \longrightarrow E' \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow 0$ it follows that $H^{i-1}_I(M,K)) \cong H^i_I(M,N/\Gamma_I(N))$, for all $i \geqslant 2$. Thus by induction hypothesis for $t-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^r(H^{t-1}_I(M,K)) &\leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1-j}_R(M,H^j_I(K))) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1-j}_R(M,H^j_I(K))) + \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^0_I(K))) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1-j}_R(M,H^{j+1}_I(N/\Gamma_I(N)))) + \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^0_I(K))) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1-j}_R(M,H^{j+1}_I(N))) + \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^0_I(K))) \\
&= \sum_{j=2}^{t} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M,H^j_I(N))) + \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^0_I(K))).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_I(E') \longrightarrow \Gamma_I(K) \longrightarrow H^1_I(N/\Gamma_I(N)) \longrightarrow 0$ shows that $\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^0_I(K)) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^1_I(N/\Gamma_I(N))) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^1_I(N))$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^r(H^{t-1}_I(M,K)) &\leqslant \sum_{j=2}^{t} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M,H^j_I(N))) + \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-1}_R(M,H^1_I(N))) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{t} \mu^r(\mathrm{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M,H^j_I(N))).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^r(H_I^t(M,N)) &\leqslant \mu^r(H_I^t(M,\Gamma_I(N))) + \mu^r(H_I^t(M,N/\Gamma_I(N)))\\ &= \mu^r(H_I^{t-1}(M,L)) + \mu^r(H_I^{t-1}(M,K))\\ &\leqslant \mu^r(\operatorname{Ext}_R^t(M,\Gamma_I(N))) + \sum_{j=1}^{t}\mu^r(\operatorname{Ext}_R^{t-j}(M,H_I^j(N)))\end{aligned}$$

which is claimed. □

COROLLARY 2.1. [**13**, Theorem 1.1] *We have*

$$\operatorname{Ass}(H_I^t(M,N)) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{t}\operatorname{Ass}(\operatorname{Ext}_R^{t-j}(M,H_I^j(N))).$$

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(H_I^t(M,N))$. Then $\mu^0(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^t(M,N)) \neq 0$. So, by Theorem 2.1 we have $\sum_{j=1}^{t}\mu^0(\mathfrak{p}, \operatorname{Ext}_R^{t-j}(M,H_I^j(N))) \neq 0$. Hence, there exists $0 \leqslant j \leqslant t$ such that $\mu^0(\mathfrak{p}, \operatorname{Ext}_R^{t-j}(M,H_I^j(N))) \neq 0$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{p} \in \bigcup_{j=0}^{t}\operatorname{Ass}(\operatorname{Ext}_R^{t-j}(M,H_I^j(N)))$. □

DEFINITION 2.1. An R-module X is said to be I-cofinite, whenever $\operatorname{Supp}(X) \subseteq V(I)$ and $\operatorname{Ext}_R^i(R/I,X)$ is finitely generated R-module, for all $i \geqslant 0$.

COROLLARY 2.2. *If* $\operatorname{Supp}(M) \subseteq V(I)$ *and* $H_I^j(N)$ *is* I*-cofinite, for all* $0 \leqslant j \leqslant t$*, then* $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^i(M,N)) < \infty$*, for all* $0 \leqslant i \leqslant t$*. In particular, if* I *is an ideal of* R *with* $\operatorname{Spec}(R) = V(I)$ *and* $H_I^j(N)$ *is* I*-cofinite, for all* $0 \leqslant j \leqslant t$*, then* $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^i(N)) < \infty$*, for all* $0 \leqslant i \leqslant t$*.*

PROOF. In view of [**4**, Proposition 1] $\operatorname{Ext}_R^{t-j}(M,H_I^j(N))$ is a finitely generated R-module, for all $0 \leqslant j \leqslant t$. Now, the claim is obvious by Theorem 2.1. □

COROLLARY 2.3. *If* $\operatorname{Supp}(M) \subseteq V(I)$ *and* N *is a finitely generated* R*-module for which* $H_I^j(N)$ *is finitely generated, for all* $0 \leqslant j < t$*, then* $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^i(M,N)) < \infty$*, for all* $0 \leqslant i \leqslant t$*. In particular, if* I *is an ideal of* R *with* $\operatorname{Spec}(R) = V(I)$ *and* N *is a finitely generated* R*-module for which* $H_I^j(N)$ *is finitely generated, for all* $0 \leqslant j < t$*, then* $\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^i(N)) < \infty$*, for all* $0 \leqslant i \leqslant t$*.*

PROOF. In view of [**1**, Theorem 2.5] and [**4**, Proposition 1] $\operatorname{Ext}_R^{t-j}(M,H_I^j(N))$ is a finitely generated R-module, for all $0 \leqslant j \leqslant t$. Now, the claim follows by Theorem 2.1. □

COROLLARY 2.4. [**2**, Proposition 5.2] *Let* $\operatorname{pd} M < \infty$ *and let* $\dim N < \infty$*, then* $H_I^t(M,N) = 0$*, for all* $t > \operatorname{pd} M + \dim N$*. In particular,*

$$\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^{\operatorname{pd} M+\dim N}(M,N)) \leqslant \mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, \operatorname{Ext}_R^{\operatorname{pd} M}(M, H_I^{\dim N}(N))).$$

PROOF. By Theorem 2.1 it follows that $\mu^0(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^t(M,N)) = 0$, for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R and for all $t > \operatorname{pd} M + \dim N$. Thus $H_I^t(M,N)) = 0$. The second assertion also follows by Theorem 2.1. □

COROLLARY 2.5. [**16**, Theorem 2.5] *Let* $\operatorname{pd} M < \infty$ *and let* $\operatorname{ara}(I) < \infty$*; then* $H^t_I(M,N) = 0$*, for all* $t > \operatorname{pd} M + \operatorname{ara}(I)$*, where* $\operatorname{ara}(I)$*, the arithmetic rank of the ideal* I*, is the least number of elements of* R *required to generate an ideal which has the same radical as* I*. In particular,*

$$\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H_I^{\operatorname{pd} M+\operatorname{ara}(I)}(M,N)) \leqslant \mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, \operatorname{Ext}_R^{\operatorname{pd} M}(M, H_I^{\operatorname{ara}(I)}(N))).$$

PROOF. It follows by the same argument as that of Corollary 2.4. □

THEOREM 2.2. *We have*

$$\mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, \operatorname{Ext}^t_R(M, H^0_I(N))) \leqslant \sum_{j=2}^{t} \mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, \operatorname{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M, H^{j-1}_I(N))) + \mu^r(\mathfrak{p}, H^t_I(M,N)).$$

PROOF. We may assume that R is a local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. So we have to show that

$$\mu^r(\operatorname{Ext}^t_R(M, H^0_I(N))) \leqslant \sum_{j=2}^{t} \mu^r(\operatorname{Ext}^{t-j}_R(M, H^{j-1}_I(N))) + \mu^r(H^t_I(M,N)).$$

Theorem 11.38 of [**14**] shows that there is a Grothendieck spectral sequence

$$E_2^{p,q} := \operatorname{Ext}^p_R(M, H^q_I(N)) \Rightarrow_p H^{p+q}_I(M,N) = E^{p+q}.$$

Now, the exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow E_2^{t-2,1} \xrightarrow{d_2^{t-2,1}} E_2^{t,0} \longrightarrow 0$$

and $E_3^{t,0} = E_2^{t,0}/\operatorname{Im} d_2^{t-2,0}$ show that $\mu^r(E_2^{t,0}) \leqslant \mu^r(E_2^{t-2,1}) + \mu^r(E_3^{t,0})$. Also, the exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow E_3^{t-3,2} \xrightarrow{d_3^{t-3,2}} E_3^{t,0} \longrightarrow 0$$

and $E_4^{t,0} = E_3^{t,0}/\operatorname{Im} d_3^{t-3,2}$ show that $\mu^r(E_3^{t,0}) \leqslant \mu^r(E_4^{t,0}) + \mu^r(E_3^{t-3,2})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^r(E_2^{t,0}) &\leqslant \mu^r(E_2^{t-2,1}) + \mu^r(E_3^{t-3,2}) + \mu^r(E_4^{t,0}) \\
&\leqslant \mu^r(E_2^{t-2,1}) + \mu^r(E_2^{t-3,2}) + \mu^r(E_4^{t,0}) \\
&\leqslant \cdots = \sum_{j=2}^{t} \mu^r(E_2^{t-j,j-1}) + \mu^r(E_{t+1}^{t,0}) \\
&= \sum_{j=2}^{t} \mu^r(E_2^{t-j,j-1}) + \mu^r(E^t)
\end{aligned}$$

since $E_k^{t-j,j-1}$ is a subquotient of $E_2^{t-j,j-1}$, for all $3 \leqslant k \leqslant t$, and $E_{t+1}^{t,0}$ is a subquotient of E^t, where $E_\infty^{t,0} \cong \phi^t E^t/\phi^{t+1}E^t \cong \phi^t E^t \subset E^t$ and

$$0 = \phi^t E^t \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \phi^1 E^t \subseteq \phi^0 E^t = E^t$$

is a finite filtration. This completes the proof. □

Acknowledgment. The authors are deeply grateful to the referee for his/her careful reading of the manuscript and very helpful suggestions.

References

1. K. Bahmanpour, R. Naghipour, *On the cofiniteness of local cohomology modules*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **136** (2008), 2359–2363
2. M. H. Bijan-Zadeh, *A common generalization of local cohomology theories*, Glasgow Math. J. **21** (1980), 173–181.
3. M. Brodmann, R. Y. Sharp, *Local Cohomology: An Algebraic Introduction with Geometric Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
4. D. Delfino, T. Marley, *Cofinite modules and local cohomology*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **121** (1997), 45–52.
5. M. T. Dibaei, S. Yassemi, *Bass Numbers of local cohomology modules with respect to an ideal*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **11** (2008), 299–306.
6. K. Divaani-Aazar, R. Sazeedeh, M. Tousi, *On vanishing of generalized local cohomology modules*, Algebra Coll. **12** (2005), 213–218.
7. R. Hartshorne, *Affine duality and cofiniteness*, Invent. Math. **9** (1970), 145–164.
8. J. Herzog, *Komplex Auflosungen und Dualita in der lokalen Algebra*, Habilitationsschrift, Universitat Regensburg, 1974.
9. C. Huneke, *Problems on local cohomology. Free Resolutions in Commutative Algebra and Algebraic Geometry*, Res. Notes Math. **2** (1992), 93–108.
10. C. Huneke, R. Y. Sharp, *Bass numbers of local cohomology modules*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **339** (1993), 765–779.
11. G. Lyubezink, *Fininiteness properties of local cohomology modules (an application of D-modules to commutative Algebra)*, Invent. Math **113** (1993), 41–55.
12. ———, *Finiteness properties of local cohomology modules for regular local rings of mixed characteristic: the unramified case*, Comm. Algebra **28** (2000), Special issue in honor of Robin Hartshorne, 5867–5882 .
13. A. Mafi, *On the aassociated primes of generalized local cohomology modules*, Comm. Algebra **34** (2006), 2489–2494.
14. J. Rotman, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1979.
15. N. Suzuki, *On the generalized local cohomology and its duality*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **18** (1978), 71–85.
16. S. Yassemi, *Generalized section functor*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **95** (1994), 103–119.

Department of Mathematics
Imam Khomeini International University
Qazvin, Iran
shpayrovi@sci.ikiu.ac.ir
sbabaei@educ.ikiu.ac.ir
i.khalili@edu.ikiu.ac.ir

(Received 06 11 2013)