

4. The Chinese Remainder Theorem:

□

Classic result in number theory: let $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, pairwise coprime.

For any sequence $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}$ that solves the system

$$\begin{cases} x \equiv a_1 \pmod{n_1} \\ \vdots \\ x \equiv a_k \pmod{n_k}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, all solutions are congruent modulo $N = n_1 n_2 \dots n_k$.

This is in fact a special case of a much more general result.

Let R, S be rings. It is easy to define $R \oplus S$, and $R_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R_n$ in the obvious fashion. This is comm. iff each R_i is, and has $1 = (1, \dots, 1)$ iff each R_i has 1.

Recall that if $H \leq G$, then $x \equiv y \pmod{H}$ iff $y^{-1}x \in H$ (or $x-y \in H$ if G is additive & abelian).

If I is an ideal of R , then write $x \equiv \text{mod } I$ iff $x-y \in I$.

If I, J are ideals, then $IJ = (ab : a \in I, b \in J)$
 $= \{a_1 b_1 + \dots + a_n b_n : a_i \in I, b_i \in J\}$.

Note: $IJ \subseteq I \cap J$.

Example: $(9)(6) = (54) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ (product)
 $(9) \cap (6) = (18) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ (lcm)
 $(9) + (6)$ (gcd)

Similarly, we can define $\prod_{i=1}^n I_i$ in the obvious manner.

Motivation: In \mathbb{Z} , $(x, y) = 1$ iff $\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ s.t. $ax + by = 1 \in U(\mathbb{Z})$ or equivalently, $(x) + (y) = \mathbb{Z}$.

[2]

Prop 4.1 (The case for 2 ideals): let R be a ring with 1 , I, J ideals of R s.t. $I+J=R$. Then for any $r_1, r_2 \in R$, $\exists r \in R$ s.t. $r-r_1 \in I$ and $r-r_2 \in J$, i.e., $\exists r \in R$ that solves the system:
$$\begin{cases} x \equiv r_1 \pmod{I} \\ x \equiv r_2 \pmod{J} \end{cases}$$

Pf: Write $1=a+b$, $a \in I$, $b \in J$, and set $r=r_2a+r_1b$.

Claim: This works.

$$\begin{aligned} r-r_1 &= (r-r_1)b + r_1(b-1) = r_2a + r_1(b-1) = r_2a - r_1a \\ &\quad = (r_2-r_1)a \in I \quad \checkmark \\ r-r_2 &= (r-r_2)a + r_2(a-1) = r_1b + r_2(a-1) = r_1b - r_2b \\ &\quad = (r_1-r_2)b \in J \quad \checkmark \end{aligned}$$

□

Prop 4.2 (The Chinese Remainder Theorem): let R be a ring with $1 \in I_1, \dots, I_n$ ideals s.t. $I_j + I_k = R$ if $j \neq k$. Then for any $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$, $\exists r \in R$ s.t. $x=r$ solves the system
$$\begin{cases} x \equiv r_1 \pmod{I_1} \\ \vdots \\ x \equiv r_n \pmod{I_n} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, any 2 solutions are congruent modulo $I_1 \cap \dots \cap I_n$.

Pf: For $j=2, \dots, n$, write $1=a_j+b_j$, $a_j \in \underline{I_1}$, $b_j \in I_j$.

$$\text{Then, } 1 = 1^{n-1} = (a_2+b_2)(a_3+b_3)\dots(a_n+b_n) \in I_1 + \prod_{j=2}^n I_j = R.$$

[3]

Now apply Prop 4.1: $\exists s_i \in R$ s.t. $\begin{cases} s_i \equiv 1 \pmod{I_1} \\ s_i \equiv 0 \pmod{\prod_{j=2}^n I_j} \end{cases}$

Since $\prod_{j=2}^n I_j \subseteq I_k$ ($k \geq 1$), $s_i \equiv 0 \pmod{I_k}$ ($k \geq 1$).

Choose s_k similarly, i.e., so $\begin{cases} s_k \equiv 1 \pmod{I_k} \\ s_k \equiv 0 \pmod{\prod_{j \neq k} I_j} \end{cases}$

Now, set $r = \sum_{k=1}^n r_k s_k$. Claim: This works.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Note: } r - r_j &= \sum_{i \neq j} r_i \underbrace{s_i}_{\equiv 0 \pmod{I_j}} + r_j \underbrace{(s_j - 1)}_{\equiv 0 \pmod{I_j}} & 1 \leq j \leq n \end{aligned}$$

If $s \in R$ is another solution, then $s \equiv r_j \equiv r \pmod{I_j}$,
so by definition, $s \equiv r \pmod{\prod_{j=1}^n I_j}$. \square

Cor 4.3: Let I_1, \dots, I_n be ideals of R . Then \exists ring homom

$$g: R/(I_1, \dots, I_n) \longrightarrow R/I_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R/I_n.$$

Moreover, if $1 \in R$ and $I_j + I_n = R \quad \forall j \neq n$, then g is an isom.

Pf: Define $f: R \rightarrow R/I_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R/I_n$.

$$\text{by } f(r) = (r+I_1, \dots, r+I_n),$$

This is clearly a homom, ?

$$\ker f = I_1, \dots, I_n.$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{f} & R/I_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R/I_n \\ & \searrow \eta & \nearrow g \\ & R/(I_1, \dots, I_n) & \end{array}$$

4

By the FHT for rings, $\exists! g$ that we seek.
 (Exercise: show g is 1-1).

If R has 1 and $I_j + I_k = R$ for all $j \neq k$, then g is onto
 by the Chinese Remainder Theorem, so g is an isomorphism. \square

Note: • Surjectivity of g holds because every system can be solved
 • Injectivity of g holds because all solns are congruent
 modulo $\bigcap_{i=1}^k I_i$.

Note: If R is a Euclidean domain, then the proof of the
 CRT is constructive!

Specifically, use the Euclidean algorithm to write

$$c_k m_k + d_k \prod_{j \neq k} m_j = \text{GCD}(m_k, \prod_{j \neq k} m_j) = 1, \text{ where } I_j = (m_j).$$

Then set $s_k = d_k \prod_{j \neq k} m_j$ and $r = r_1 s_1 + \dots + r_n s_n$ is the soln.

Example: $R = \mathbb{Z}$. If I_1, \dots, I_n are ideals, with $I_j = (m_j)$
 and $(m_i, m_j) = 1 \quad i \neq j$, then $I_1, \dots, I_n = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$

and $\mathbb{Z}_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{m_n}$.

Cor: Let $n = p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2} \dots p_n^{a_n}$ p_i 's distinct primes. Then

$$\mathbb{Z}_n \cong \mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{a_1}} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{p_n^{a_n}}$$