

# A NOTE ON WEAKLY PROREGULAR SEQUENCES AND LOCAL COHOMOLOGY

RYOYA ANDO

ABSTRACT. In this note, we give an elementary proof of the result given by Schenzel that there are functorial isomorphisms between local cohomology groups and Čech cohomology groups, by using weakly proregular sequences. In [Sch03], he used notions of derived category theory in his proof, but we do not use them in this paper.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this note, we assume all rings are commutative with identity element. Let  $A$  denote a ring and  $I$  an ideal of  $A$ . The functor  $\Gamma_I$  is defined by

$$\Gamma_I(M) = \{x \in M \mid I^n x = 0 \text{ for some } n \geq 0\}$$

for an  $A$ -module  $M$ . Here  $H_I^i(-)$  denote the local cohomology functors, defined as the right derived functors of  $\Gamma_I(-)$ . In other words, let  $J^\bullet$  be an injective resolution of the  $A$ -module  $M$ , then  $H_I^i(M) \cong H^i(\Gamma_I(J^\bullet))$ . In Noetherian cases, the local cohomology can be written by using Čech cohomology. Let  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r$  be a sequence of elements of  $A$ , and  $I = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$ .  $\check{H}^i(\underline{a}, M)$  denote the Čech cohomology (see Definition 3.1). It is well-known that there are isomorphisms;

$$(*) \quad H_I^i(M) \cong \check{H}^i(\underline{a}, M)$$

for any  $A$ -module  $M$  if  $A$  is a Noetherian ring and  $I = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$ , see for example [BH97, Theorem 3.5.6.].

This result was generalised by [Sch03]. For arbitrary ring  $A$ , he showed that formula (\*) is true for any  $A$ -module  $M$  if and only if  $\underline{a}$  is a weakly proregular sequence. Let  $H_i(\underline{a})$  be the Koszul homology of the sequence  $\underline{a}$ . A system of elements  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r$  is called a weakly proregular sequence if for any  $1 \leq i \leq d$  and for each  $n > 0$  there is an  $m \geq n$  such that the natural map;

$$H_i(\underline{a}^m) \rightarrow H_i(\underline{a}^n)$$

is zero map, note that  $\underline{a}^n$  is the sequence defined by  $a_1^n, \dots, a_r^n$ .

The goal of this note is the explanation of the following result without using notions of derived category theory.

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 5.3). *Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r$  a system of elements of  $A$  and  $I = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$ .  $\underline{a}$  is a weakly proregular sequence if and only if for any  $i$  and  $A$ -module  $M$ ,  $H_I^i(M) \cong \check{H}^i(\underline{a}, M)$ .*

---

*Date:* September 21, 2021.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D03 (Primary) 13D45 (Secondary).

In section 2, we summarise the  $\delta$ -functors. It is also mentioned in [Har77, Chap.3.1] without proof. And in section 3 we resume the definition of Čech cohomology in commutative algebra. In section 4, we present the theory of weakly proregular sequences, following [Sch03, Sect.2]. Finally, We introduce the main results in section 5.

## 2. $\delta$ -FUNCTORS

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be an Abelian categories, and  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injectives. Let  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be an additive left exact functor.  $I^\bullet$  denote an injective resolution of  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . The functor;

$$R^i F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}; A \mapsto H^i(F(I^\bullet))$$

is called the **right derived functor** of  $F$ .

Note that derived functors are independent up to natural transformation of the selection of injective resolution. The following is a characteristic property of the derived functor.

**Proposition 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be Abelian categories, and assume  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injectives. Let  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be additive left exact functor. Then

- (1)  $R^0 F \cong F$  (as functors).
- (2) For any exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$ ;

$$0 \longrightarrow A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2 \xrightarrow{g} A_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

for each  $i \geq 0$ , there are **connecting morphisms**  $\delta^i: R^i F(A_3) \rightarrow R^{i+1} F(A_1)$  such that;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F(A_1) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(A_2) & \xrightarrow{F(g)} & F(A_3) \xrightarrow{\delta^0} \dots \\ & & \xrightarrow{\delta^{i-1}} & R^i F(A_1) & \xrightarrow{R^i F(f)} & R^i F(A_2) & \xrightarrow{R^i F(g)} R^i F(A_3) \xrightarrow{\delta^i} \dots \end{array}$$

is exact sequence in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

- (3) Given a commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{A}$  of the form (where the rows are exact);

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & A_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & A_2 & \xrightarrow{g} & A_3 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \alpha \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & B_1 & \xrightarrow{f'} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{g'} & B_3 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

for any  $i \geq 0$  the following diagram;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R^i F(A_3) & \longrightarrow & R^{i+1} F(A_1) \\ \downarrow R^i F(\alpha) & & \downarrow R^{i+1} F(\gamma) \\ R^i F(B_3) & \longrightarrow & R^{i+1} F(B_1) \end{array}$$

is commutative in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

- (4) For each injective object  $I \in \mathcal{A}$ , for any  $i > 0$ ,  $R^i F(I) = 0$ .

See a textbook on homological algebra for the proof of this proposition. The  $\delta$ -functor can be thought of as an extract of the above property.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be an Abelian categories. Families of additive functors  $T^\bullet := \{T^i\}$  are called  **$\delta$ -functors** when the following conditions hold;

- (1) For any exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$ ;

$$0 \longrightarrow A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2 \xrightarrow{g} A_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

for each  $i \geq 0$ , there are **connecting morphism**  $\delta^i: T^i(A_3) \rightarrow T^{i+1}(A_1)$  such that;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T^0(A_1) & \xrightarrow{T^0(f)} & T^0(A_2) & \xrightarrow{T^0(g)} & T^0(A_3) \xrightarrow{\delta^0} \dots \\ & & \xrightarrow{\delta^{i-1}} & T^i(A_1) & \xrightarrow{T^i(f)} & T^i(A_2) & \xrightarrow{T^i(g)} & T^i(A_3) \xrightarrow{\delta^i} \dots \end{array}$$

is exact sequence in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

- (2) Given a commutative diagram in  $\mathcal{A}$  of the form (where the rows are exact);

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & A_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & A_2 & \xrightarrow{g} & A_3 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \gamma \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & B_1 & \xrightarrow{f'} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{g'} & B_3 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

then for any  $i \geq 0$  the following diagram;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^i(A_3) & \longrightarrow & T^{i+1}(A_1) \\ \downarrow T^i(\gamma) & & \downarrow T^{i+1}(\alpha) \\ T^i(B_3) & \longrightarrow & T^{i+1}(B_1) \end{array}$$

is commutative in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Let us define that two  $\delta$ -functors are isomorphic in the following way. Let  $T^\bullet, U^\bullet$  be a  $\delta$ -functor. Families of natural transformation  $\theta^\bullet = \{\theta^i: T^i \Rightarrow U^i\}$  is called **morphism of  $\delta$ -functors** when for each exact sequence ;

$$0 \longrightarrow A_1 \longrightarrow A_2 \longrightarrow A_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the following diagram;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^i(A_3) & \xrightarrow{\delta_T^i} & T^{i+1}(A_1) \\ \downarrow \theta_{A_3}^i & & \downarrow \theta_{A_1}^{i+1} \\ U^i(A_3) & \xrightarrow{\delta_U^i} & U^{i+1}(A_1) \end{array}$$

is commutative. An isomorphism is a morphism which has a two-sided inverse.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be Abelian categories. The  $\delta$ -functor  $T^\bullet$  is called **universal** when for each  $\delta$ -functor  $U^\bullet$  and natural transformation  $\theta: T^0 \Rightarrow U^0$ , there is a unique morphism of  $\delta$ -functors  $\theta^\bullet: T^\bullet \rightarrow U^\bullet$  such that  $\theta^0 = \theta$ .

By definition, two universal  $\delta$ -functors such that  $T^0 = U^0$  are isomorphic up to unique isomorphism. So for each additive functor  $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ , a universal  $\delta$ -functor  $T^\bullet$  with  $T^0 = F$  is unique up to unique isomorphism if it exists. A universal  $\delta$ -functor  $T^\bullet$  with such a property is called a right satellite functor of  $F$ .

The following property gives a condition for the  $\delta$ -functor to be universal, which shows that the derived functor is so if  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injectives.

**Definition-Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be Abelian categories,  $F$  an additive functor.  $F$  said to be **effaceable** if for each  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , there are  $M \in \mathcal{A}$  and injection (monomorphism)  $u: A \rightarrow M$  such that  $F(u) = 0$ . A  $\delta$ -functor  $T^\bullet$  is universal if for each  $i > 0$ ,  $T^i$  is effaceable.*

*Proof.* Let  $U^\bullet$  be  $\delta$ -functor and  $\theta: T^\bullet \Rightarrow U^\bullet$  natural transformation. We show that there exists uniquely a morphism of  $\delta$ -functor  $\theta^\bullet: T^\bullet \rightarrow U^\bullet$  such that  $\theta^0 = \theta$ . We construct it inductively. For any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , there is injection  $u: A \rightarrow M$  such that  $T^1(u) = 0$  since  $T^1$  is effaceable. Let  $C$  be the cokernel of  $u$ . We consider the long exact sequences induced by  $0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} M \xrightarrow{\pi} C \longrightarrow 0$ . So we get the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T^0(M) & \xrightarrow{T^0(\pi)} & T^0(C) & \xrightarrow{\delta_T^0} & T^1(A) & \xrightarrow{T^1(u)=0} & 0 \\ \downarrow \theta_M & & \downarrow \theta_C & & \downarrow & & \\ U^0(M) & \xrightarrow{U^0(\pi)} & U^0(C) & \xrightarrow{\delta_U^0} & U^1(A) & & \end{array}$$

Now  $\theta_{A,u}^1 := \delta_U^0 \circ \theta_C \circ (\delta_T^0)^{-1}: T^1(A) \rightarrow U^1(A)$  is well-defined since the rows are exact. We show  $\theta_{A,u}^1$  is independent of the choice of  $u$ . Let  $u': A \rightarrow M'$  be an injection such that  $T^1(u') = 0$ .  $M \sqcup_A M'$  denote co-fibre products of  $M$  and  $M'$  on  $A$ . Then we get an injection  $u'': A \rightarrow M \sqcup_A M'$  such that  $T^1(u'') = 0$ . Let  $C''$  be the cokernel of  $u''$ . Then the following diagram;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & T^0(C) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T^1(A) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & 0 \\ & \swarrow & \downarrow \theta_{C''} & & \downarrow \theta_{A,u}^1 & & \\ T^0(C'') & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T^1(A) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & 0 & & \\ \downarrow \theta_{C''} & & \downarrow \theta_{A,u''}^1 & & \downarrow & & \\ & & U^0(C) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & U^1(A) & & \\ \downarrow \theta_{C''} & \swarrow & \downarrow \theta_{A,u''}^1 & & \downarrow & & \\ U^0(C'') & \xrightarrow{\quad} & U^1(A) & & & & \end{array}$$

is commutative. So we have  $\theta_{A,u}^1 = \theta_{A,u''}^1$ , similarly we obtain  $\theta_{A,u'}^1 = \theta_{A,u''}^1$ , then we get  $\theta_{A,u}^1 = \theta_{A,u'}^1$ . So  $\theta_A^1$  is independent of the choice of  $u$ .

Secondly, we show that for each  $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, B)$  the following diagram;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^1(A) & \xrightarrow{T^1(f)} & T^1(B) \\ \downarrow \theta_A^1 & & \downarrow \theta_B^1 \\ U^1(A) & \xrightarrow{U^1(f)} & U^1(B) \end{array}$$

is commutative to prove  $\theta^1$  is a natural transformation. For any injections  $u: A \rightarrow M$  and  $v: B \rightarrow N$  with  $T^1(u) = T^1(v) = 0$ , we take co-fibre product;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{u} & M \\ \downarrow v \circ f & & \downarrow \\ N & \xrightarrow{u'} & M \sqcup_A N \end{array}$$

then  $u'$  is injective. So we have an injection  $u' \circ v: B \rightarrow M \sqcup_A N$  with  $T^1(u' \circ v) = 0$ . Then we replace  $N$  by  $M \sqcup_A N$  and get the following commutative diagram with exact rows;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{---} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

So  $\theta^1$  is a natural transformation since the following diagram;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & T^0(C) & \longrightarrow & T^1(A) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & \swarrow & \downarrow & & \swarrow T^1(f) & \downarrow \theta_A^1 & \\ T^0(C') & \longrightarrow & T^1(B) & \longrightarrow & 0 & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \theta_B^1 & & \downarrow & & \\ U^0(C) & \longrightarrow & U^1(A) & & & & \\ \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow & \swarrow U^1(f) & & & \\ U^0(C') & \longrightarrow & U^1(B) & & & & \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Finally, we show that  $\theta_A^1$  is commutative with the connecting morphism. Let  $0 \longrightarrow A_1 \longrightarrow A_2 \longrightarrow A_3 \longrightarrow 0$  be the short exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$ , we use the same method as above for the injection  $u: A_1 \rightarrow M$  with  $T^1(u) = 0$  so that each row of the following commutative diagram is exact.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & A_2 & \longrightarrow & A_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & A_1 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

We consider the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & T^0(A_3) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & T^1(A_1) \\
& \theta_{A_3} \swarrow & \downarrow & & \swarrow \theta_{A_1}^1 \\
U^0(A_3) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & U^1(A_1) & & \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & T^0(C) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & T^1(A_1) \\
& \theta_C \swarrow & \downarrow & & \swarrow \theta_{A_1}^1 \\
U^0(C) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & U^1(A_1) & & 
\end{array}$$

The desired commutativity of  $\theta_{A_1}^1, \theta_{A_3}$  and  $\delta$  follows from commutativity of other squares, which follow from the construction of  $\theta_{A_1}^1$  and the facts that  $T^\bullet$  and  $U^\bullet$  are  $\delta$ -functor and that  $\theta$  is a natural transformation.

This shows that  $\theta^1$  is a natural transformation commutative with connecting morphism, and its uniqueness can be seen from its construction (the universality of cokernel). In this way  $\theta^1$  to  $\theta^2$  can be created and continued inductively.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  be Abelian categories, and  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injectives. Let  $T^\bullet: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a universal  $\delta$ -functor, then  $T^0$  is left-exact and for each  $i \geq 0$  there is a natural isomorphism  $T^i \cong R^i T^0$ .*

*Proof.*  $T^0$  is left exact by the definition of  $\delta$ -functor, so there are right derived functors  $R^i T^0$ . For each  $i > 0$ ,  $R^i T^0$  is effaceable by (4) of Proposition 2.2, then  $R^\bullet T^0$  is a universal  $\delta$ -functor. Now  $R^0 T^0 = T^0$ , so there is a unique isomorphism  $R^\bullet T^0 \cong T^\bullet$  by universality.  $\square$

### 3. ČECH COHOMOLOGY AND KOSZUL COMPLEX

In this section, we review the Čech cohomology of rings and modules. Let  $A$  be a ring and fix a sequence  $a_1, \dots, a_r$  of elements of  $A$ . For each  $I = \{j_1, \dots, j_i\} \subset \{1, \dots, r\}$  ( $j_1 < \dots < j_i$ ), let  $a_I = a_{j_1} \dots a_{j_i}$ .  $e_1, \dots, e_r$  denotes the standard basis of  $A^r$  and let  $e_I = e_{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{j_i}$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq r$ ,  $C^i(\underline{a})$  is the complex defined by following equations;

$$\begin{aligned}
C^i(\underline{a}) &= \sum_{\#I=i} A_{a_I} e_I, \\
d^i: C^i(\underline{a}) &\rightarrow C^{i+1}(\underline{a}); e_I \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^n e_I \wedge e_j.
\end{aligned}$$

And for  $i = 0$ , defined by  $C^0(\underline{a}) = A, d^0: a \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^r a e_j$  so  $C^\bullet(\underline{a})$  form a complex. It called **Čech complex**.  $\check{H}^i(\underline{a})$  denote the cohomology of this complex and it is called **Čech cohomology**.

For  $A$ -module  $M$ , we define  $C^\bullet(\underline{a}, M) := C^\bullet(\underline{a}) \otimes M$ . Here  $\check{H}^i(\underline{a}, M)$  denote the  $i$ -th cohomology of  $C^i(\underline{a}, M)$ . This form complex, denoted by  $\check{H}^\bullet(\underline{a}, M)$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $A$  be a ring, for each  $a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ ,  $\check{H}^\bullet(\underline{a}, -)$  is a  $\delta$ -functor.*

*Proof.* Consider an exact sequence  $0 \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow M_3 \longrightarrow 0$  of  $A$ -modules. Since  $C^\bullet(\underline{a}, M) = C^\bullet(\underline{a}) \otimes M$  and each component of the Čech complex is a flat  $A$ -modules, the following sequence of complexes is exact;

$$0 \longrightarrow C^\bullet(\underline{a}, M_1) \longrightarrow C^\bullet(\underline{a}, M_2) \longrightarrow C^\bullet(\underline{a}, M_3) \longrightarrow 0$$

then there are connection morphisms. So  $\check{H}^\bullet(\underline{a}, -)$  is  $\delta$ -functor.  $\square$

For the result we want, we need to look at the relationship between Čech complex and Koszul complex.

For  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ , let  $\{e_i\}$  be the standard basis of a free  $A$ -module  $A^r$ .  $f: A^r \rightarrow A; e_i \mapsto a_i$  induces a chain complex  $K_\bullet(\underline{a})$ . In other words  $K_\bullet(\underline{a})$  is the complex defined by the following equation;

$$K_i(\underline{a}) = \bigwedge^i A^r,$$

$$d_i: K_i(\underline{a}) \rightarrow K_{i-1}(\underline{a}); x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_i \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^i (-1)^{j+1} f(x_j) x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{x}_j \wedge \dots \wedge x_i.$$

Note that  $K_\bullet(\underline{a})$  does not depend on the order of  $a_i$ .

We get a co-chain complex  $K^\bullet(\underline{a})$  from a contravariant functor  $\text{Hom}(-, A)$ ;

$$K^\bullet(\underline{a}): 0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(K_1(\underline{a}), A) \longrightarrow \dots$$

$K^\bullet(\underline{a})$  is called a Koszul complex. For each  $A$ -module  $M$ ,  $K^\bullet(\underline{a}, M) = K^\bullet(\underline{a}) \otimes M$ . Here  $H^i(\underline{a}, M)$  denote the cohomology of Koszul complex.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $A$  be a ring and  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq r$ ;*

$$\varphi^i: K^i(\underline{a}) \rightarrow C^i(\underline{a}); (e_I)^* \mapsto (1/a_I)e_I$$

*is a morphism of complexes.*

*Proof.* Let  $\delta^i$  be the derivative in the Koszul complex. Then;

$$\delta^i(e_I^*)(e_J) = \begin{cases} a_j & (j \notin I, J = I \cup \{j\}) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

So;

$$\varphi^{i+1} \circ \delta^i(e_I^*) = \sum_{j \notin I} \frac{a_j}{a_I a_j} e_I \wedge e_j = \sum_{j \notin I} \frac{1}{a_I} e_I \wedge e_j$$

is equal to  $d^i \circ \varphi^i(e_I^*)$ .  $\square$

For any pair  $n \leq m$ ;

$$\varphi_{mn}^\bullet: K^\bullet(\underline{a}^n) \rightarrow K^\bullet(\underline{a}^m); (e_I)^* \mapsto (a_I)^{m-n} (e_I)^*$$

then  $\{K^\bullet(\underline{a}^n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an inductive system.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $A$  be a ring,  $a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ . Then;*

$$\varinjlim K^\bullet(\underline{a}^n) \cong C^\bullet(\underline{a}).$$

*Proof.* We define  $\varphi_n^\bullet: K^\bullet(\underline{a}^n) \rightarrow C^\bullet(\underline{a}^n) = C^\bullet(\underline{a})$  in the same way as above lemma. Then  $\varphi_m^\bullet \circ \varphi_{nm}^\bullet = \varphi_n^\bullet$  where  $n \leq m$ . So we have  $\varphi: \varinjlim K^\bullet(\underline{a}^n) \rightarrow C^\bullet(\underline{a})$ . Each element of  $C^i(\underline{a})$  is represented finite sum of  $(b_I/a_I^{n_I})e_I$ , so it can be displayed as  $\sum(1/a_I^n)b_Ie_I$  by taking the maximum of  $n$  and replacing  $b_I$ . Then it is image of  $\sum(b_Ie_I) \in K^i(\underline{a}^n)$ , so  $\varphi$  is surjective.

Secondly, we show  $\varphi$  is injective. Assume  $\varphi_n^i(x) = 0$  for  $x \in K^i(\underline{a}^n)$ . If  $x = \sum b_Ie_I^*$  then  $\varphi_n^i(x) = \sum(b_I/a_I^n)e_I^* = 0$ , so  $b_I/a_I^n = 0$  in  $A_{a_I^n}$ . Therefore if we take a sufficiently large  $l$ ,  $a_I^l b_I = 0$ . So  $\varphi_{nm}^l(x) = 0$  by increasing  $l$  if necessary, then  $\varphi$  is injective.  $\square$

Since the functor of taking the inductive limit is exact, the following Corollary follows.

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $A$  be a ring,  $a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ . For each  $A$ -module  $M$ ;*

$$\check{H}^i(\underline{a}, M) \cong \varinjlim H^i(\underline{a}^n, M).$$

#### 4. WEAKLY PROREGULAR SEQUENCES

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an Abelian category,  $(X_n, \varphi_{mn})$  a projective system in  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $(X_n)$  is said to be **essentially zero** or **pro-zero** if for each  $n$ , there is  $m \geq n$  such that  $\varphi_{mn}: X_m \rightarrow X_n$  is zero map.

Obviously, if  $(X_n)$  is essentially zero then  $\varprojlim X_n = 0$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an Abelian category. We consider a exact sequence of projective system in  $\mathcal{A}$ ;*

$$0 \longrightarrow (X_n) \xrightarrow{(f_n)} (Y_n) \xrightarrow{(g_n)} (Z_n) \longrightarrow 0.$$

*Then  $(Y_n)$  is essentially zero if and only if the other two are essentially zero.*

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) Trivial. ( $\impliedby$ ) For each  $n$ , there is  $m \geq n$  such that  $X_m \rightarrow X_n$  since  $(X_n)$  is essentially zero. Similarly there is  $l \geq m$  such that  $Z_l \rightarrow Z_m$  is zero map, then we have the following commutative diagram with the rows are exact;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & X_l & \xrightarrow{f_l} & Y_l & \xrightarrow{g_l} & Z_l & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi_{lm} & & \downarrow 0 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X_m & \xrightarrow{f_m} & Y_m & \xrightarrow{g_m} & Z_m & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow 0 & & \downarrow \varphi_{mn} & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X_n & \xrightarrow{f_n} & Y_n & \xrightarrow{g_n} & Z_n & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

So we get  $\varphi_{ln} = \varphi_{mn} \circ \varphi_{lm} = 0$  by easy diagram chasing.  $\square$

We use same symbols as before for the Koszul and Čech complexes. Note that  $(K_i(\underline{a}^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a projective system defined by  $K_i(\underline{a}^m) \rightarrow K_i(\underline{a}^n); e_I \mapsto a_I^{m-n}e_I$  ( $m \geq n$ ).

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $A$  be a ring.  $a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$  is called a **weakly proregular sequence** if for each  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , the projective system  $\{K_i(\underline{a}^n)\}$  is essentially zero.



The property of being weakly proregular does not depend on the order by the definition.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ .  $\underline{a}$  is a weakly proregular sequence if and only if  $\check{H}^\bullet(\underline{a}, -)$  is an effaceable  $\delta$ -functor.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\underline{a}$  is a weakly proregular sequence. Let  $I$  be an injective module. Now there is an isomorphism  $H^i(\underline{a}^n, I) \cong \text{Hom}(H_i(\underline{a}^n), I)$  since  $K^\bullet(\underline{a}^n, I) = \text{Hom}(K_\bullet(\underline{a}^n), I)$  and  $\text{Hom}(-, I)$  is an exact functor. For each  $n \geq 0$ , there is  $m \geq n$  such that  $H_i(\underline{a}^m) \rightarrow H_i(\underline{a}^n)$  is zero map since  $H_i(\underline{a}^n)$  is essentially zero. So  $\check{H}^i(\underline{a}, I) = \varinjlim H^i(\underline{a}^n, I) = 0$ .

Secondly, assume that  $\check{H}^\bullet(\underline{a}, -)$  is effaceable  $\delta$ -functor. For each  $n \geq 0$ , we have injective module  $I$  and injection  $\varepsilon: H_i(\underline{a}^n) \rightarrow I$ . Then there is  $m \geq n$  such that;

$$H_i(\underline{a}^m) \longrightarrow H_i(\underline{a}^n) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} I$$

is zero map by  $\varepsilon \in H^i(\underline{a}^n, I)$  and  $\varinjlim H^i(\underline{a}^n, I) = 0$ . □

Then Čech cohomology is the derived functor of  $\check{H}^0(\underline{a}, -)$  if  $\underline{a}$  is a weakly proregular sequence. So the next question of interest is when is a sequence weakly proregular?

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ .  $\underline{a}$  is called **proregular sequence** if for each  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $n > 0$ , there is  $m \geq n$  such that  $((a_1^m, \dots, a_{i-1}^m) : a_i^m A) \subset ((a_1^n, \dots, a_{i-1}^n) : a_i^{m-n} A)$ .

Note that a regular sequence is proregular and this phenomenon is characteristic of non-Noetherian rings.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $A$  be a Noetherian ring. For each  $a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$  is a proregular sequence.*

*Proof.* Let  $J_m = ((a_1^m, \dots, a_{i-1}^m) : a_i^m A)$ ,  $I_{n,m} = ((a_1^n, \dots, a_{i-1}^n) : a_i^{m-n} A)$ . Now  $\{I_{n,m}\}_{m \geq n}$  is an ascending chain of ideals, then there is  $m_0 \geq n$  such that for each  $m \geq m_0$ ,  $I_{n,m_0} = I_{n,m}$ . Let  $m = m_0 + n$ , then for each  $a \in J_{m_0}$ ,  $aa_i^{m-n} = aa_i^{m_0} \in (a_1^{m_0}, \dots, a_{i-1}^{m_0}) \subset (a_1^n, \dots, a_{i-1}^n)$ . So  $a \in I_{n,m} = I_{n,m_0}$ . □

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $A$  be a ring. A proregular sequence is weakly proregular.*

*Proof.* We use induction on  $r$ . When  $r = 1$ , let  $a \in A$  be proregular. Then for each  $n > 0$ , there is  $m \geq n$  such that  $\text{Ann } a^m \subset \text{Ann } a^{m-n}$ . So  $(H_1(a^n))$  is essentially zero since  $H_1(a^n) = \text{Ann } a^n$ . Now we assume that claim up to  $r - 1$ . The exact sequence of complexes;

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow K_\bullet(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n) &\longrightarrow K_\bullet(a_1^n, \dots, a_r^n) \\ &\longrightarrow K_\bullet(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n)(-1) \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

induces the exact sequence of homology;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & & \longrightarrow & H_i(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n) & \xrightarrow{(-1)^i a_r^n} & & \\ & & & & & & \\ H_i(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n) & \longrightarrow & H_i(a_1^n, \dots, a_r^n) & \longrightarrow & H_{i-1}(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n) & \xrightarrow{(-1)^{i-1} a_r^n} & \\ & & & & & & \\ H_{i-1}(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n) & \longrightarrow & \cdots & & & & \end{array}$$

Then we have the following exact sequence;

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_0(a_r^n, H_i(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n)) & \longrightarrow & H_i(a_1^n, \dots, a_r^n) & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & \longrightarrow & H_1(a_r^n, H_{i-1}(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n)) & \longrightarrow & & \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

and this induces the exact sequence of projective systems. The first projective system is essentially zero by the assumption of induction. Also for each  $i > 1$ , the third system is essentially zero since  $H_1(a_r^n, H_{i-1}(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n)) = \{x \in H_{i-1}(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n) \mid a_r^n x = 0\}$ . If  $i = 1$ , the system with ;

$$H_1(a_r, H_0(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n)) = \{x \in H_0(a_1^n, \dots, a_{r-1}^n) \mid a_r^n x = 0\}$$

is essentially zero since  $\underline{a}$  is proregular. So this completes the proof by induction.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let  $A$  be a Noetherian ring. For each  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ ,  $\underline{a}$  is weakly proregular.*

## 5. LOCAL COHOMOLOGY

Let  $A$  be a ring and  $I$  an ideal of  $A$ . The functor  $\Gamma_I$  is defined by;

$$\Gamma_I(M) = \{x \in M \mid I^n x = 0 \text{ for some } n \geq 0\}$$

for an  $A$ -module  $M$ . Note that  $\Gamma_I(M) = \varinjlim \text{Hom}_A(A/I^n, M)$  and this isomorphism is functorial in  $M$ . By the definition,  $\Gamma_I$  is a left exact functor.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $A$  be a ring and  $I$  an ideal of  $A$ .  $H_I^i(-)$  denote the derived functor of  $\Gamma_I(-)$  and it is called **local cohomology**.

Note that  $H^i(M) \cong \varinjlim \text{Ext}^i(A/I^n, M)$ . We summarize the relationship between local cohomology and Čech cohomology. First, we note that the 0-th parts of each cohomology are naturally isomorphic.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ , and  $I = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$ . For each  $A$ -module  $M$ ;*

$$\Gamma_I(M) \cong \check{H}^0(\underline{a}, M).$$

*Proof.* Here  $\check{H}^0(\underline{a}, M)$  is the kernel of

$$M \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^r M_{a_i} e_i; x \mapsto (x/1)e_i.$$

Then for each  $x \in \check{H}^0(\underline{a}, M)$  and  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , there is  $n_i \geq 0$  such that  $a_i^{n_i}x = 0$ . So we have  $x \in \Gamma_I(M)$ . Similarly the converse is true, so they are equal as submodules of  $M$ .  $\square$

With the preparations we have made above, we can prove the results we have been aiming for.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\underline{a} = a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$  and  $I = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$ .  $\underline{a}$  is a weakly proregular sequence if and only if for any  $i$  and  $A$ -module  $M$ ,  $H_I^i(M) \cong \check{H}^i(\underline{a}, M)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\underline{a}$  is weakly proregular.  $\check{H}^\bullet(\underline{a}, -)$  is a  $\delta$ -functor by Proposition 3.2. Moreover  $\check{H}^\bullet(\underline{a}, -)$  is universal by Proposition 4.4 and Definition-Proposition 2.5. So  $H_I^i(M) \cong \check{H}^i(\underline{a}, M)$  by above lemma. The converse is true by Proposition 4.4.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** I thank Hisanori Ohashi, and Yuya Matsumoto for helpful comments and discussions.

#### REFERENCES

- [BH97] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen–Macaulay Rings (Revised ed.)*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997.
- [GM92] J. P. C. Greenlees and J. P. May, *Derived functors of  $I$ -adic completion and local homology*, *Journal of Algebra* **149** (1992), no. 2, 438–453.
- [Gro57] A. Grothendieck, *Sur quelques points d’algèbre homologique, I*, *Tohoku Math. J.* **9** (1957), no. 2, 119–221.
- [Gro66] ———, *Local cohomology, notes by R. Hartshorne*, Springer, 1966.
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Springer, 1977.
- [Sch03] P. Schenzel, *Proregular sequences, local cohomology, and completion*, *Math. Scand.* **92** (2003), 161–180.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE, 2641 YAMAZAKI, NODA, CHIBA, 278-8510, JAPAN

*Email address:* ryoya31026@gmail.com

*Email address:* andou@ma.noda.tus.ac.jp