

ERRATUM TO "LOCALIZATION OF EQUIVARIANT COHOMOLOGY RINGS"

BY
J. DUFLOT

This note corrects the proof of Theorem 3.8 of [1].

THEOREM 3.8. *If G is finite, the isolated primary ideals of $H_G(X)$ are of the form*

$$\mathfrak{g}_{(A, c)} = \ker(H_G(X) \rightarrow H_{C_G(A, c)}(c)),$$

where (A, c) is a maximal pair of $\mathcal{A}(G, X)$.

PROOF. Consider the map

$$H_G(X) \xrightarrow{r_{G, c}} H_{C_G(A, c)}(c).$$

Let $\mathfrak{p}^C = \mathfrak{p}_{(A, c)}^C$ and $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_{(A, c)}$ be as in the proof of 3.7. Since \mathfrak{p}^C is the only associated prime of $H_{C_G(A, c)}(c)$ (this ring is Cohen-Macaulay by [2], so has no embedded primes, and \mathfrak{p}^C is the only *minimal* prime by [3]), we see that {zero divisors of $H_{C_G(A, c)}(c)$ } = \mathfrak{p}^C . (In general, the set of zero divisors in a commutative Noetherian ring is the union of the associated primes.) Therefore, one has

$$H_{C_G(A, c)}(c) \hookrightarrow (H_{C_G(A, c)}(c))_{\mathfrak{p}^C}.$$

As shown in the proof of 3.7, $(H_{C_G(A, c)}(c))_{\mathfrak{p}^C} = (H_{C_G(A, c)}(c))_{\mathfrak{p}}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{(A, c)} &= \ker(H_G(X) \rightarrow H_{C_G(A, c)}(c)) \\ &= \ker(H_G(X) \rightarrow (H_{C_G(A, c)}(c))_{\mathfrak{p}^C}) \\ &= \ker(H_G(X) \rightarrow (H_{C_G(A, c)}(c))_{\mathfrak{p}}) \\ &= \ker(H_G(X) \rightarrow (H_{C_G(A, c)}(c))_{\mathfrak{p}}^{W_G(A, c)}). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 3.2, this last ideal equals $\ker(H_G(X) \rightarrow H_G(X)_{\mathfrak{p}})$.

Now, from commutative algebra one knows that \mathfrak{q} is an isolated primary component belonging to the minimal prime \mathfrak{p} in a commutative ring R if and only if

$$\mathfrak{q} = \ker(R \rightarrow R_{\mathfrak{p}}). \quad \text{Q.E.D.}$$

Received by the editors October 22, 1984.

©1985 American Mathematical Society
0002-9947/85 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

It is easy to see that the first sentence of the original “proof” of Theorem 3.8 is not true; in general, there are many ideals in a commutative ring R that are primary for a single minimal prime \mathfrak{p} . For example, \mathfrak{p} is primary for \mathfrak{p} , and so is the isolated primary component for \mathfrak{p} ; of course, these need not be the same.

I would like to thank Peter Landweber for pointing out this error and for his version of the above proof.

REFERENCES

1. J. Duflot, *Localization of equivariant cohomology rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **284** (1984), 91–105.
2. ———, *Depth and equivariant cohomology*, Comment. Math. Helv. **56** (1981), 627–637.
3. D. G. Quillen, *The spectrum of an equivariant cohomology ring*, I, II, Ann. of Math. (2) **94** (1971), 549–602.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02354

Current address: Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523