International Journal of Mathematical Archive-7(8), 2016, 148-154
IJMA Available online through www.ijma.info ISSN 2229 – 5046

NPQ-INJECTIVE MODULES

S. WONGWAI*
Office of Academic Promotion and Registration,
Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Pathumthani 12110, Thailand.

M. KAEWNEAM
Department of Mathematics and Applied Statistics,
Faculty of Science and Technology, Bansomdejchaopraya Rajaphat University, Thailand.

(Received On: 30--07-16; Revised & Accepted On: 25-08-16)

ABSTRACT

Let M be a right R-module. A right R-module N is called nonessential principally M-injective (briefly, NPM-injective) if, for each nonessential principal submodule mR of M, any R-homomorphism from mR to N can be extended to an R-homomorphism from M to N. M is called nonessential principally quasi –injective (briefly, NPQ-injective) if, it is NPM-injective. In this paper, we give some characterizations and properties of NPQ-injective modules.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: *13C10, 13C11, 13C60.*

Keywords and phrases: *NPQ-injective Modules and Endomorphism Rings.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be a ring. A right R-module M is called *principally injective* (or $P-$*injective*), if every $R-$homomorphism from a principal right ideal of R to M can be extended to an R-homomorphism from R to M. Equivalently, $l_M r_R(a) = Ma$ for all $a \in R$ where l and r are left and right annihilators, respectively. This notion was introduced by Camillo [2] for commutative rings.

In [7], Nicholson and Yousif studied the structure of principally injective rings and gave some applications. Nicholson, Park, and Yousif [8] extended this notion of principally injective rings to the one for modules. In [5], W. Junchao introduced the definition of Jpc-injective rings, a ring R is called right Jpc-injective if for each $a \in R \setminus Z_r$, any R-homomorphism from aR to R can be extended to an R-homomorphism from R to R.

In this note we introduce the definition of NPQ-injective modules and give some characterizations and properties. Some results on principally quasi-injective modules [8] are extended to these modules.

Throughout this paper, R will be an associative ring with identity and all modules are unitary right $R-$modules. For right $R-$modules M and N, $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)$ denotes the set of all $R-$homomorphisms from M to N and $S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$ denotes the endomorphism ring of M. If X is a subset of M the right (resp. left) annihilator of X in R (resp. S) is denoted by $r_R(X)$ (resp. $l_S(X)$). By notation $N \subset^{\oplus} M$ $(N \subset^{e} M)$ we mean that N is a direct summand (an essential submodule) of M.

*Corresponding Author: S. Wongwai**
Office of Academic Promotion and Registration,
Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Pathumthani 12110, Thailand.

2. NPM -INJECTIVE MODULES

Recall that a submodule K of a right $R-$module M is *essential* (or *large*) in M if, every nonzero submodule L of M, we have $K \cap L \neq 0$.

Definition 2.1: Let M be a right R-module. A right R-module N is called *nonessential principally* M *- injective* (briefly, NPM *-injective*) if, for each nonessential principal submodule mR of M, any R-homomorphism from mR to N can be extended to an R-homomorphism from M to N.

Example 2.2: Let $R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$ where F is a field.

(1) Let $M_R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $N_R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$. Then N is not M -injective but N is NPM -injective.

(2) If $M_R = R_R$ and $N_R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, then N is NPM -injective.

Proof: (1) It is obvious that $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & F \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$. For any R-homomorphism $\alpha : \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$ with $\alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{pmatrix}$ for some $x \in F,$ then

$\alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for every $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, so $\alpha = 0.$ Therefore N is not M -injective.

We see that only $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is a nonessential principal submodule of M, then N is NPM -injective.

(2) For $M_R = R_R$ and $N_R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, so it is clear that only $X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$, $X_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & F \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $X_3 = N$ are nonzero proper nonessential principal submodules of M. Let $\varphi : X_1 \to N$ be an $R-$homomorphism. Since $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in X_1$, there exists $x_{11}, x_{12} \in F$ such that $\varphi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Then
$$\varphi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \varphi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right)\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that $x_{11} = 0$.

Define $\hat{\varphi} : M \to N$ by $\hat{\varphi}(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. It is clear that $\hat{\varphi}$ is an $R-$homomorphism.

Then $\hat{\varphi}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \hat{\varphi}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right)\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

This show that $\hat{\varphi}$ is an extension of φ. By the similar proof of $X_1,$ we can show for X_2 and it is clear for X_3. Then N is NPM -injective.

Lemma 2.3: Let M and N be right $R-$modules. Then N is NPM-injective if and only if for each nonessential principal submodule mR of M,

$$\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)m = l_N r_R(m).$$

Proof: Clearly, $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)m \subset l_N r_R(m)$.

Let $n \in l_N r_R(m)$. Define $\varphi : mR \to nR$ by $\varphi(mr) = nr$ for every $r \in R$. Then φ is well-defined because $r_R(m) \subset r_R(n)$. It is clear that φ is an $R-$homomorphism. Since N is NPM-injective, there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\hat{\varphi} : M \to N$ such that $\hat{\varphi}\iota_1 = \iota_2\varphi$, where $\iota_1 : mR \to M$ and $\iota_2 : nR \to N$ are the inclusion maps. Hence $n = \hat{\varphi}(m) \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)m$.

Conversely, let $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$ and $\varphi : mR \to N$ be an $R-$homomorphism. Then $\varphi(m) \in l_N r_R(m)$ so by assumption, we have $\varphi(m) = \hat{\varphi}(m)$ for some $\hat{\varphi} \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)$. This shows that N is NPM-injective.

Lemma 2.4: Let N_i $(1 \le i \le n)$ be NPM-injective modules. Then $\oplus_{i=1}^n N_i$ is NPM-injective.

Proof: Let $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$ and $\varphi : mR \to \oplus_{i=1}^n N_i$ be an $R-$homomorphism. Then for each i, there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\varphi_i : M \to N_i$ such that $\varphi_i \iota = \pi_i \varphi$ where $\pi_i : \oplus_{i=1}^n N_i \to N_i$ is the projection map, and $\iota : mR \to M$ is the inclusion map. Put $\hat{\varphi} = \iota_1\varphi_1 + \ldots + \iota_n\varphi_n : M \to \oplus_{i=1}^n N_i$. Then it is clear that $\hat{\varphi}$ extends φ.

Lemma 2.5:

(1) N is NPM-injective if and only if N is NPX-injective for any submodule X of M.

(2) Any direct summand of an NPM - injective module is again NPM - injective.

Proof: The sufficiency is trivial. For the necessity, let $m \in X$ with $mR \not\subset^e X$ and $\varphi : mR \to N$ be an $R-$homomorphism. Since $mR \not\subset^e M$, there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\hat{\varphi} : M \to N$ such that $\varphi = \hat{\varphi}\iota_2\iota_1$ where $\iota_1 : mR \to X$ and $\iota_2 : X \to M$ are the inclusion maps. Then $\hat{\varphi}\iota_2$ extends φ.
(2) By definition.

Lemma 2.6: If $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$ and mR is NPM-injective, then $mR \subset^{\oplus} M$.

Proof: Since mR is NPM-injective, there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\varphi : M \to mR$ such that $\varphi\iota = 1_{mR}$ where $\iota : mR \to M$ is the inclusion map. Then by [1, Lemma 5.1], ι is a split monomorphism, therefore $mR \subset^{\oplus} M$.

Theorem 2.7: The following conditions are equivalent for a projective module M.

(1) Every $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$, mR is projective.

(2) Every factor module of an NPM-injective module is NPM-injective.

(3) Every factor module of an injective $R-$module is NPM-injective.

Proof:
$(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ Let N be an NPM-injective, X a submodule of. N, $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$ and let $\varphi : mR \to N/X$ be an $R-$homomorphism. Then by (1), there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\beta : mR \to N$ such that $\varphi = \eta\beta$ where $\eta : N \to N/X$ is the natural $R-$epimorphism. Since N is NPM-injective, there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\hat{\varphi} : M \to N$ which is an extension of β to M. Then $\eta\hat{\varphi}$ is an extension of φ to M.

$(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ is clear.

$(3) \Rightarrow (1)$ Let $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$, $h : A \to B$ an $R-$epimorphism, and let $\alpha : mR \to B$ be an $R-$homomorphism. Embed A in an injective module E [1, 18.6]. Let $\sigma : B \to A / Ker(h)$ be an $R-$isomorphism. Since $E / Ker(h)$ is NPM -injective, there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\hat{\alpha} : M \to E / Ker(h)$ such that $\iota_1\sigma\alpha = \hat{\alpha}\iota_2$ where $\iota_1 : A / Ker(h) \to E / Ker(h)$ and $\iota_2 : mR \to M$ are the inclusion maps.

Since M is projective, $\hat{\alpha}$ can be lifted to $\beta : M \to E$. Let $x \in mR$. Then $\sigma\alpha(x) = a + Ker(h)$ for some $a \in A$, so $\beta(x) + Ker(h) = \eta\beta(x) = \hat{\alpha}(x) = \sigma\alpha(x) = a + Ker(h)$ where $\eta : E \to E / Ker(h)$ is the natural $R-$epimorphism. Hence $\beta(x) - a \in Ker(h) \subset A$ so $\beta(x) \in A$. This shows that $\beta(mR) \subset A$. Therefore we have lifted α.

3. NPQ-INJECTIVE MODULES

A right R-module M is called *nonessential principally quasi –injective* (briefly, *NPQ -injective*) if, it is NPM -injective.

Lemma 3.1: Let M be a right $R-$module and $S = End_R(M)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.

(1) M is NPQ-injective.

(2) $l_M r_R(m) = Sm$ for each $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$.

(3) $r_R(m) \subset r_R(n)$, where $m, n \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$, implies that $Sn \subset Sm$.

(4) $l_M(r_R(m) \cap aR) = l_M(a) + Sm$ for all $a \in R$ and $m \in M$ with $maR \not\subset^e M$.

(5) If $\alpha : mR \to M$ is an $R-$homomorphism, $mR \not\subset^e M$, then $\alpha(m) \in Sm$.

Proof:
$(1) \Leftrightarrow (2)$ by Lemma 2.3

$(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ If $r_R(m) \subset r_R(n)$, where $m, n \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$, then $l_M r_R(n) \subset l_M r_R(m)$. Then $Sn \subset l_M r_R(n) \subset l_M r_R(m) = Sm$ by (2).

$(3) \Rightarrow (4)$ Let $a \in R$ and $m \in M$ with $maR \not\subset^e M$ and let $x \in l_M(r_R(m) \cap aR)$.
Then $r_R(ma) \subset r_R(xa)$, and hence by (3), $Sxa \subset Sma$. Thus $xa = \varphi(ma)$, $\varphi \in S$ and so $(x - \varphi(m)) \in l_M(a)$. It follows that $x \in l_M(a) + Sm$. The other hand is clear.

$(4) \Rightarrow (5)$ Put $a = 1_R$ in (4), then $\alpha(m) \in l_M r_R(m) = l_R(r_R(m) \cap 1R) = l_M(1_R) + Sm = Sm$ because $m1R \not\subset^e M$.

$(5) \Rightarrow (1)$ Let $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$ and let $\varphi : mR \to M$ be an $R-$homomorphism.
Then by (5), $\varphi(m) \in Sm$ so there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\hat{\varphi} \in S$ is an extension of φ to M.
Following [8], a right $R-$module M is called a *principal self-generator,* if every element $m \in M$ has the form $m = \gamma(m_1)$ for some $\gamma : M \to mR$. If $uR \neq 0$ is uniform, we call u a *uniform element* of M. We call a right R-module M is a *duo module* if every submodule of M is fully invariant.

Theorem 3.2: Let M be a duo, NPQ -injective module and $m, n \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$.

(1) If mR embeds into nR, then Sm is an image of Sn.

(2) If nR is an image of mR, then Sn can be embedded into Sm.

(3) If $mR \simeq nR$, then $Sm \simeq Sn$.

Proof: (1) Let $\sigma : mR \to nR$ be an $R-$monomorphism and let $\iota_1 : mR \to M$ and $\iota_2 : nR \to M$ be the inclusion maps. Since M is NPQ-injective, there exists an $R-$homomorphism $\hat{\sigma} : M \to M$ such that $\hat{\sigma}\iota_1 = \iota_2\sigma.$ Let $\varphi : Sn \to Sm$ defined by $\varphi(\alpha(n)) = \alpha\hat{\sigma}(m)$ for every $\alpha \in S$. Since $\varphi(\alpha(n)) = \alpha(\hat{\sigma}(m)) = \alpha(\sigma(m)) \in \alpha(nR),$ φ is well-defined. It is clear that φ is an S-homomorphism. Since $\hat{\sigma}|_{mR}$ is monic and M is a duo module, $\hat{\sigma}(mR) \subset mR$ so $\sigma(mR) \not\subset^e M.$ Since $r_R(\sigma(m)) \subset r_R(m),$ $Sm \subset S\sigma(m)$ byLemma3.1Then $m \in S\sigma(m) \subset \varphi(Sn).$

(2) By the same notations as in (1), let $\sigma : mR \to nR$ be an $R-$epimorphism. Write $\sigma(ms) = n,\ s \in R.$ Since M is NPQ-injective, σ can be extended to $\hat{\sigma} : M \to M$ such that $\hat{\sigma}\iota_1 = \iota_2\sigma.$ Define $\varphi : Sn \to Sm$ defined by $\varphi(\alpha(n)) = \alpha\hat{\sigma}(ms)$ for every $\alpha \in S$. It is clear that φ is an $S-$homomorphism. If $\alpha(n) \in Ker(\varphi)$, then $0 = \varphi(\alpha(n)) = \alpha\hat{\sigma}(ms) = \alpha(n).$ This shows that φ is an $S-$monomorphism.

(3) Follows from (1) and (2).

Theorem 3.3: Let M be a principal module which is a principal self-generator. Then the following conditions are equivalent.

1. (1) M is NPQ-injective.
2. (2) $l_S(Ker(\alpha) \cap mR) = l_S(m) + S\alpha$ for all $m \in M$ and $\alpha \in S$ with $\alpha(m)R \not\subset^e M.$
3. (3) $l_S(Ker(\alpha)) = S\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in S$ with $\alpha(M) \not\subset^e M.$
4. (4) $Ker(\alpha) \subset Ker(\beta),$ where $\alpha, \beta \in S$ with $\alpha(M) \not\subset^e M,$ implies that $S\beta \subset S\alpha.$

Proof: $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ Clearly, $l_S(m) + S\alpha \subset l_S(Ker(\alpha) \cap mR).$ Let $\beta \in l_S(Ker(\alpha) \cap mR).$
Then $r_R(\alpha(m)) \subset r_R(\beta(m)),$ so $l_M r_R(\beta(m)) \subset l_M r_R(\alpha(m)).$ Since $\alpha(m)R \not\subset^e M,$
$S\beta(m) \subset l_M r_R(\beta(m)) \subset l_M r_R(\alpha(m)) = S\alpha(m)$ by Lemma 3.1, so $\beta(m) = \gamma\alpha(m)$ for some $\gamma \in S.$ It follows that $(\beta - \gamma\alpha) \in l_S(m),$ and hence $\beta \in l_S(m) + S\alpha.$

$(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ If $M = m_0R,$ take $m = m_0$ in (2).

$(3) \Rightarrow (4)$ $Ker(\alpha) \subset Ker(\beta),$ then $l_S(Ker(\beta)) \subset l_S(Ker(\alpha)).$ It follows that $S\beta \subset l_S(Ker(\beta)) \subset l_S(Ker(\alpha)) = S\alpha.$

$(4) \Rightarrow (1)$ Let $m \in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M,$ $\varphi : mR \to M$ be an $R-$homomorphism.

Since M is a principal self-generator, there exists $\beta \in S$ such that $\beta(m_1) = m,$ so $Ker(\beta) \subset Ker(\varphi\beta)$ and $\beta(M) \not\subset^e M.$ Then by (4), $S\varphi\beta \subset S\beta$ hence $\varphi\beta = \hat{\varphi}\beta$ for some $\hat{\varphi} \in S.$ This shows that $\hat{\varphi}$ is an extension of $\varphi.$

Theorem 3.4: Let M be a duo, NPQ-injective module. If u is a *uniform element* of M with $uR \not\subset^e M,$ then $M_u = \{\alpha \in S \mid Ker(\alpha) \cap uR \neq 0\}$ is a unique maximal left ideal of S containing $l_S(u).$

Proof: Since uR is uniform, M_u is a left ideal of $S.$ It is clear that $l_S(u) \subset M_u \neq S.$
Let X be a left ideal of S containing $l_S(u)$ and $X \neq S.$ If $\alpha \in X - M_u$, then $Ker(\alpha) \cap uR = 0.$ Since M is a duo module, $\alpha(u)R \not\subset^e M$ and so by Theorem 3.3 we have $S = l_S(Ker(\alpha) \cap uR) = l_S(u) + S\alpha \subset X$ a contradiction. Thus $X \subset M_u.$

Definition 3.5: Let M be a right $R-$-module, $S = End_R(M)$. The module M is called *almost* NPQ*-injective* if, for each nonessential principal submodule mR of M, there exists an S-submodule X_m of M such that $l_M(r_R(m)) = Sm \oplus X_m$ as left S-modules.

Theorem 3.6: Let M be a right R-module, $S=\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ and $m\in M$ with $mR \not\subset^e M$.

(1) If $\mathrm{Hom}_R(mR,M)=S\oplus Y$ as left S-modules, then $l_M(r_R(m))=Sm\oplus X$ as left S-modules, where $X=\{f(m):f\in Y\}$.

(2) If $l_M(r_R(m))=Sm\oplus X$ for some $X\subset M$ as left S-modules, then we have $\mathrm{Hom}_R(mR,M)=S\oplus Y$ as left S-modules, where $Y=\{f\in \mathrm{Hom}_R(mR,M):f(m)\in X\}$.

(3) Sm is a direct summand of $l_M(r_R(m))$ as left S-modules if and only if S is a direct summand of $\mathrm{Hom}_R(mR,M)$ as left S-modules.

Proof: Define $\theta:\mathrm{Hom}_R(mR,M)\to l_M(r_R(m))$ by $\theta(f)=f(m)$ for every $f\in \mathrm{Hom}_R(mR,M)$. It is obvious that θ is an S-monomorphism. For $x\in l_M(r_R(m))$, define $g:mR\to M$ by $g(mr)=xr$ for every $r\in R$. Since $r_R(m)\subset r_R(x)$, g is well-defined, so it is clear that g is an R-homomorphism. Then $\theta(g)=g(m)=x$. Therefore θ is an S-isomorphism. Let $\alpha(m)\in Sm$. Since $\alpha(m)\in l_M(r_R(m))$, there exists $\varphi\in \mathrm{Hom}_R(mR,M)$ such that $\theta(\varphi)=\alpha(m)$, so $\varphi(m)=\alpha(m)$. Define $\hat{\varphi}:M\to M$ by $\hat{\varphi}(x)=\alpha(x)$ for every $x\in M$. It is clear that $\hat{\varphi}$ is an R-homomorphism and is an extension of φ. Then $\alpha(m)=\hat{\varphi}(m)=\theta(\hat{\varphi})$. This shows that $Sm\subset\theta(S)$. The other inclusion is clear. Then $\theta(S)=Sm$ and $X=\theta(Y)=\{f(m):f\in Y\}$. Then the Lemma follows.

Theorem 3.7: The following conditions are equivalent:

(1) M is almost NPQ-injective.

(2) There exists an indexed set $\{X_m : m\in M\}$ of S-submodules of M with the property that if $mR\not\subset^e M$, $m\in M$, then $l_M(r_R(m)\cap aR)=(X_{ma}:a)_l+Sm$ and $(X_{ma}:a)_l\cap Sm\subset l_M(a)$ for all $a\in R$, where $(X_{ma}:a)_l=\{n\in M: na\in X_{ma}\}$ if $ma\neq 0$ and $(X_{ma}:a)_l=l_M(aR)$ if $ma=0$.

Proof:

$(1)\Rightarrow(2)$ Let $m\in M$ with $mR\not\subset^e M$. Then there exists an S-submodule X_m of M such that $l_M(r_R(m))=Sm\oplus X_m$ as left S-modules. Let $a\in R$. If $ma=0$, then $aR\subset r_R(m)$ so (2) follows. If $ma\neq 0$, then any $x\in l_M(r_R(m)\cap aR)$ we have $r_R(ma)\subset r_R(xa)$ and so $xa\in l_M(r_R(xa))\subset l_M(r_R(ma))=Sma\oplus X_{ma}$ because $maR\not\subset^e M$. Write $xa=\alpha(ma)+y$ where $\alpha\in S$ and $y\in X_{ma}$. Then $(x-\alpha(m))a=y\in X_{ma}$, so $x-\alpha(m)\in(X_{ma}:a)_l$. It follows that $x\in(X_{ma}:a)_l+Sm$. This shows that $l_M(r_R(m)\cap aR)\subset(X_{ma}:a)_l+Sm$.

Conversely, it is clear that $Sm\subset l_M(r_R(m)\cap aR)$. Let $y\in(X_{ma}:a)_l$. Then $ya\in X_{ma}\subset l_M(r_R(ma))$. If $as\in r_R(m)\cap aR$, then $mas=0$ and so $yas=0$. Hence $y\in l_M(r_R(m)\cap aR)$. This shows that $(X_{ma}:a)_l\subset l_M(r_R(m)\cap aR)$. Therefore $l_M(r_R(m)\cap aR)=(X_{ma}:a)_l+Sm$.

If $\beta(m)\in(X_{ma}:a)_l\cap Sm$, then $\beta(m)a\in X_{ma}\cap Sma=0$. Hence $\beta(m)\in l_M(a)$.

$(2)\Rightarrow(1)$ Let $m\in M$ with $mR\not\subset^e M$. Then there exists an S-submodule X_m of M such that $l_M(r_R(m))=l_M(r_R(m)\cap R)=(X_m:1)_l+Sm$ and $(X_m:1)_l\cap Sm\subset l_M(1)=0$.

Note that $(X_m:1)_l=X_m$. Then (1) follows.

REFERENCES

1. F. W. Anderson and K. R. Fuller, “Rings and Categories of Modules”, Graduate Texts in Math.No.13, Springer-verlag, New York, 1992.
2. Camillo V., *Commutative rings whose principal ideals are annihilators*, Portugal. Math., 46(1989), p. 33-37.

3. N. V. Dung, D. V. Huynh, P. F. Smith and R. Wisbauer, "Extending Modules", Pitman, London, 1994.
4. Lam T. Y., A First Course in Noncommutative Rings, Graduate Texts in Mathematics Vol. 131, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
5. W. Junchao, *Jcp-Injective Rings* International Electronic Journal of Algebra, Volume 6 (2009), 1-22.
6. S. H. Mohamed and B. J. Muller, "Continuous and Discrete Modules", London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series 14, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.
7. W. K. Nicholson and M. F. Yousif, *Principally injective rings*, J. Algebra, 174(1995), 77--93.
8. W. K. Nicholson, J. K. Park and M. F. Yousif, *Principally quasi-injective modules*, Comm. Algebra, 27:4 (1999), 1683--1693.
9. R. Wisbauer, "Foundations of Module and Ring Theory", Gordon and Breach London, Tokyo e.a., 1991.
10. S. Wongwai, *On the endomorphism ring of a semi-injective module*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenianae, Vol.71, 1 (2002), pp. 27-33.
11. S. Wongwai, *Almost Mininjective Rings*, Thai Journal of Mathematics, 4(1) (2006), 245-249.

Source of support: Nil, Conflict of interest: None Declared