VNU Journal of Science, Mathematics - Physics 23 (2007) 189-193

Some results on (IEZ)-modules

Le Van An[1,*], Ngo Si Tung[2]

[1] *Highschool of Phan Boi Chau, Vinh city, Nghe An, Vietnam*
[2] *Department of Mathematics, Vinh University, Nghe An, Vietnam*

Received 16 April 2007; received in revised form 11 July 2007

Abstract. A module M is called $(IEZ)-$module if for the submodules A, B, C of M such that $A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = 0$, then $A \cap (B \oplus C) = 0$. It is shown that:

(1) Let $M_1, ..., M_n$ be uniform local modules such that M_i does not embed in $J(M_j)$ for any $i, j = 1, ..., n$. Suppose that $M = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$ is a $(IEZ)-$module. Then

(a) M satisfies (C_3).

(b) The following assertions are equivalent:

(i) M satisfies (C_2).

(ii) If $X \subseteq M, X \cong M_i$ (with $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$), then $X \subseteq^{\oplus} M$.

(2) Let $M_1, ..., M_n$ be uniform local modules such that M_i does not embed in $J(M_j)$ for any $i, j = 1, ..., n$. Suppose that $M = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$ is a nonsingular $(IEZ)-$module. Then, M is a continuous module.

1. Introduction

Throughout this note, all rings are associative with identity, and all modules are unital right modules. The Jacobson radical and the endmorphism ring of M are denoted by $J(M)$ and End(M). The notation $X \subseteq^e Y$ means that X is an essential submodule of Y.

For a module M consider the following conditions:

(C_1) Every submodule of M is essential in a direct summand of M.

(C_2) Every submodule isomorphic to a direct summand of M is itself a direct summand.

(C_3) If A and B are direct summands of M with $A \cap B = 0$, then $A \oplus B$ is a direct summand of M.

A module M is defined to be a CS-module (or an extending module) if M satisfies the condition (C_1). If M satisfies (C_1) and (C_2), then M is said to be a continuous module. M is called quasi-continuous if it satisfies (C_1) and (C_3). A module M is said to be a uniform - extending if every uniform submodule of M is essential in a direct summand of M. We have the following implications:

We refer to [1] and [2] for background on CS and (quasi-)continuous modules.

In this paper, we give some results on $(IEZ)-$modules with conditions $(C_1), (C_2), (C_3)$.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: 84-0383569442.
E-mail: levanan_na@yahoo.com

2. The results

A module M is called $(IEZ)-$module if for the submodules A, B, C of M such that $A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = 0$, then $A \cap (B \oplus C) = 0$.

Examples

(a) Let F be a field. We consider the ring

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} F & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & F & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & F \end{pmatrix}$$

Then R_R is a $(IEZ)-$module.

Proof. Let A, B, C be submodules of $M = R_R$ such that $A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = 0$. Then, there exist the subsets I, J, K of $\{1, ..., n\}$ with $I \cap J = I \cap K = J \cap K = \emptyset$ such that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & A_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $A_{ii} = F \ \forall i \in I$, and $A_{ii} = 0 \ \forall i \in I'$, with $I' = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash I$,

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & B_{22} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & B_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $B_{ii} = F \ \forall i \in J$, and $B_{ii} = 0 \ \forall i \in J'$, with $J' = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash J$,

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & C_{22} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & C_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $C_{ii} = F \ \forall i \in K$, and $C_{ii} = 0 \ \forall i \in K'$, with $K' = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash K$.

Therefore,

$$B \oplus C = \begin{pmatrix} X_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & X_{22} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & X_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $X_{ii} = F \ \forall i \in (J \cup K)$, and $X_{ii} = 0 \ \forall i \in H$, with $H = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash (J \cup K)$. Since $I \cap (J \cup K) = \emptyset$, thus $A \cap (B \oplus C) = 0$.

Hence R_R is a $(IEZ)-$module.

Remark. Let

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} F & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

....

$$M_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & F \end{pmatrix},$$

then M_i which are simple modules for any $i = 1, ..., n$ and $R_R = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$ where R_R in example. Therefore, M_i are uniform local modules such that M_i does not embed in $J(M_j)$ for any $i, j = 1, ..., n$.

(b) Let F be a field and V is a vector space over field F. Set $M = V \oplus V$. Then M is not $(IEZ)-$module.

Proof. Let $A = \{(x, x) \mid x \in V\}$, $B = V \oplus 0$, $C = 0 \oplus V$ be submodules of M. We have $A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = 0$ but $A \cap (B \oplus C) = A \cap M = A$. Hence, M is not $(IEZ)-$module.

We give two results on $(IEZ)-$module with conditions $(C_1), (C_2), (C_3)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $M_1, ..., M_n$ be uniform local modules such that M_i does not embed in $J(M_j)$ for any $i, j = 1, ..., n$. Suppose that $M = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$ is $(IEZ)-$module. Then*

(a) M satisfies (C_3).

(b) The following assertions are equivalent:

(i) M satisfies (C_2).

(ii) If $X \subseteq M, X \cong M_i$ (with $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$), then $X \subseteq^{\oplus} M$.

Theorem 2. *Let $M_1, ..., M_n$ be uniform local modules such that M_i does not embed in $J(M_j)$ for any $i, j = 1, ..., n$. Suppose that $M = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$ is a nonsingular $(IEZ)-$module. Then M is a continuous module.*

3. Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2

Lemma 1. ([3, Lemma1.1]) *Let N be a uniform local module such that N does not embed in $J(N)$, then $S = End(N)$ is a local ring.*

Lemma 2. *Let $M_1, ..., M_n$ be uniform local modules such that M_i does not embed in $J(M_j)$ for any $i, j = 1, ..., n$. Set $M = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$. If $S_1, S_2 \subseteq^{\oplus} M$; $u - dim(S_1) = 1$ and $u - dim(S_2) = n - 1$, then $M = S_1 \oplus S_2$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1 we have $End(M_i)$ which is a local ring for any $i = 1, ..., n$. By Azumaya's Lemma (cf. [4, 12.6, 12.7]), we have $M = S_2 \oplus K = S_2 \oplus M_i$. Suppose that $i = 1$, i.e., $M = S_2 \oplus M_1 = (\oplus_{i=2}^{n} M_i) \oplus M_1$; $M = S_1 \oplus H = S_1 \oplus (\oplus_{i \in I} M_i)$ with $\mid I \mid = n - 1$. There are cases:

Case 1. If $1 \notin I$, then $M = S_1 \oplus (M_2 \oplus ... \oplus M_n)$. By modularity we get $S_1 \oplus S_2 = (S_1 \oplus S_2) \cap M = (S_1 \oplus S_2) \cap (S_2 \oplus M_1) = S_2 \oplus ((S_1 \oplus S_2) \cap M_1) = S_2 \oplus U$, where $U = (S_1 \oplus S_2) \cap M_1$. Therefore, $U \subseteq M_1, U \cong S_1 \cong M_1$. By our assumption, we must have $U = M_1$, and hence $S_1 \oplus S_2 = S_2 \oplus M_1 = M$.

Case 2. If $1 \in I$, then there is $k \neq 1$ such that $k = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash I$. By modularity we get $S_1 \oplus S_2 = S_2 \oplus V$, where $V = (S_1 \oplus S_2) \cap M_1$. Therefore, $V \subseteq M_1, V \cong S_1 \cong M_k$. By our assumption, we must have $V = M_1$, and hence $S_1 \oplus S_2 = S_2 \oplus M_1 = M$, as desired.

Proof of Theorem 1. (a), We show that M satisfies (C_3), i.e., for two direct summands S_1, S_2 of M with $S_1 \cap S_2 = 0$, $S_1 \oplus S_2$ is also a direct summand of M. By Lemma 1 we have $End(M_i)$, $i = 1, ..., n$ is a local ring. By Azumaya's Lemma (cf. [4, 12.6, 12.7]), we have $M = S_1 \oplus H = S_1 \oplus (\oplus_{i \in I} M_i) = (\oplus_{i \in J} M_i) \oplus (\oplus_{i \in I} M_i)$ (where $J = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash I$) and $M = S_2 \oplus K = S_2 \oplus (\oplus_{j \in E} M_j) = (\oplus_{j \in F} M_j) \oplus (\oplus_{j \in E} M_j)$ (where $F = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash E$). We imply $S_1 \cong \oplus_{i \in J} M_i$ and $S_2 \cong \oplus_{j \in F} M_j$. Suppose that $F = \{1, ..., k\}$. Let φ be isomorphism $\oplus_{i=1}^{k} M_j \longrightarrow S_2$. Set $X_j = \varphi(M_j)$, we have $X_j \cong M_j, S_2 = \oplus_{i=1}^{k} X_j$. By hypothesis $S_2 \subseteq^{\oplus} M$, we must have $X_j \subseteq^{\oplus} M$, $j = 1, ..., k$. We show that $S_1 \oplus S_2 = S_1 \oplus (X_1 \oplus ... \oplus X_k)$ is a direct summand of M.

We first prove a claim that $S_1 \oplus X_1$ is a direct summand of M. By Azumaya's Lemma (cf. [4, 12.6, 12.7]), we have $M = X_1 \oplus L = X_1 \oplus (\oplus_{s \in S} M_s) = M_\alpha \oplus (\oplus_{s \in S} M_s)$, with $S \subseteq \{1, ..., n\}$ such that $card(S) = n - 1$ and $\alpha = \{1, ..., n\} \backslash S$. Note that $card(S \cap I) \geq card(I) - 1 = m$. Suppose that $\{1, ..., m\} \subseteq (S \cap I)$, i.e., $M = (S_1 \oplus (M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_m)) \oplus M_\beta = Z \oplus M_\beta$ with $\beta = I \backslash \{1, ..., m\}$ and $Z = S_1 \oplus (M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_m)$. By M is a $(IEZ)-$module and $X_1 \cap S_1 = X_1 \cap (M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_m) = S_1 \cap (M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_m) = 0$, we have $Z \cap X_1 = 0$. By $Z, X_1 \subseteq^{\oplus} M$, $u - dim(Z) = n - 1$, $u - dim(X_1) = 1$, i.e., $u - dim(Z) + u - dim(X_1) = n$ and by Lemma 2 we have $M = Z \oplus X_1 = S_1 \oplus (M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_m) \oplus X_1 = (S_1 \oplus X_1) \oplus (M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_m)$. Therefore, $S_1 \oplus X_1 \subseteq^{\oplus} M$.

By induction we have $S_1 \oplus S_2 = S_1 \oplus (X_1 \oplus ... \oplus X_k) = (S_1 \oplus X_1 \oplus ... \oplus X_{k-1}) \oplus X_k$ is a direct summand of M, as desired.

(b), The implication $(i) \Longrightarrow (ii)$ is clear .

$(ii) \Longrightarrow (i)$. We show that M satisfies (C_2), i.e., for two submodules X, Y of M, with $X \cong Y$ and $Y \subseteq^{\oplus} M$, X is also a direct summand of M.

Note that, since $u - dim(M) = n$, we have $u - dim(Y) = 0, 1, ..., n$, the following case is trival: $u - dim(Y) = 0$.

If $u - dim(Y) = 1, ..., n$. By Azumaya's Lemma (cf. [4, 12.6, 12.7]) $X \cong Y \cong \oplus_{i \in I} M_i, I \subseteq \{1, ..., n\}$. Let φ be isomorphism $\oplus_{i \in I} M_i \longrightarrow X$. Set $X_i = \varphi(M_i)$, thus $X_i \cong M_i$ for any $i \in I$. By hypothesis (ii), we have $X_i \subseteq^{\oplus} M, i \in I$. Since $X = \oplus_{i \in I} X_i$ and X satisfies (C_3), thus $X \subseteq^{\oplus} M$, proving (i).

Lemma 3. *Let $M = M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n$, with all M_i uniform. Suppose that M is a nonsingular $(IEZ)-$module. Then M is a $CS-$module.*

Proof. We prove that each uniform closed submodule of M is a direct summand of M. Let A be a uniform closed submodule of M. Set $X_i = A \cap M_i$, $i = 1, ..., n$. Suppose that $X_i = 0$ for any $i = 1, ..., n$. By hypothesis, M is $(IEZ)-$module, we have $A = A \cap M = A \cap (M_1 \oplus ... \oplus M_n) = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, there is a $X_j \neq 0$, i.e., $A \cap M_j \neq 0$. By property A and M_j are uniform submodules we have $A \cap M_j \subseteq^e A$ and $A \cap M_j \subseteq^e M_j$. By A and M_j are closure of $A \cap M_j$, M is a nonsingular module, we have $A = M_j \subseteq^{\oplus} M$. This implies that M is uniform - extending.

Since M has finite uniform dimension and by [1, Corollary 7.8], M is extending module, as desired.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 3, M is a $CS-$module. We show that M satisfies (C_2). By Theorem 1, we prove that if $X \subseteq M, X \cong M_i$ (with $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$), then $X \subseteq^{\oplus} M$.

Set X^* is a closure of X in M. Since M_i is a uniform module, thus X is also uniform. Therefore X^* is a uniform closed module. We imply X^* is a direct summand of M. We have $X^* = M_j$, thus $X \subseteq M_j$.

If $X \subseteq M_j, X \neq M_j$ then $X \subseteq J(M_j)$. Hence $M_i \cong X \subseteq J(M_j)$, a contradiction. We have $X = M_j \subseteq^{\oplus} M$, as desired.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to Prof. Dinh Van Huynh (Department of Mathematics Ohio University) for many helpful comments and suggestions. The author also wishes to thank an anonymous referee for his or her suggestions which lead to substantial improvements of this paper.

References

[1] N. V. Dung, D.V. Huynh, P. F. Smith, R. Wisbauer, *Extending Modules*, Pitman, London, 1994.

[2] S.H. Mohamed, B.J. Müller, *Continuous and Discrete Modules*. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. Cambridge University Press, Vol. 147 (1990).

[3] H.Q. Dinh, D.V. Huynh, Some Results on Self-injective Rings and Σ-CS Rings, *Comm. Algebra* 31 (2003) 6063.

[4] F.W. Anderson, K.R Furler, *Ring and Categories of Modules*, Springer - Verlag, NewYork - Heidelberg - Berlin, 1974.

[5] K.R. Goodearl, R.B. Warfield, *An Introduction to Noncommutative Noetherian Rings*, London Math. Soc. Student Text, Cambridge Univ. Press, Vol. 16 (1989).

[6] D. V. Huynh, S. K. Jain, S. R. López-Permouth, Rings Characterized by Direct Sum of CS-modules, *Comm. Algebra* 28 (2000) 4219.

[7] N.S. Tung, L.V. An, T.D. Phong, Some Results on Direct Sums of Uniform Modules, *Contributions in Math and Applications*, ICMA, December 2005, Mahidol Uni., Bangkok, Thailan, 235.

[8] L.V. An, Some Results on Uniform Local Modules, Submitted.