

WEAK CS-MODULES AND FINITE DIRECT SUM OF INJECTIVE MODULES

NIDHI MISHRA, U. K. KHEDLEKAR*

Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
Dr. Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya, (A Central University), Sagar (M.P.)-India.

(Received On: 27-12-16; Revised & Accepted On: 24-01-17)

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we investigate a generalization of CS-modules (or extending modules) called weak CS-modules, study the nature of their interaction with other modules and find results to show their relationship with CS-modules, quasi-continuous modules and other modules. We emphasize the study of finite direct sum of modules, their interaction with other modules namely, quasi-continuous modules, CS-modules and weak CS-modules.

Keywords: Weak CS-modules, CS modules, quasi-continuous module.

1. INTRODUCTION

A module M is called CS (or extending) if every submodule of M is essential in its direct summand. Alternatively, a module M is called CS (or extending) if every complement of M is a direct summand. It is well known that every CS module is CESS-module and every CESS-module is weak CS-modules [1]. Some properties of weak CS-modules behave like the of CS modules. It was drafted in [2], that a finite direct sum of relatively injective weak CS-modules is weak CS. In this paper, we discuss the properties of weak CS-modules and study the relationship between weak CS-modules, CS-modules, uniform modules, quasi-continuous (QC) modules and other modules.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, R will denote a ring with identity and M a unitary right R - module. A right R -module M is said to be *indecomposable* if it is nonzero and cannot be expressed as a direct sum of two nonzero R -submodules of M . We consider the following conditions for a module M :

(C₁) Every submodule of M is essential in a direct summand of M .

(C₂) Every submodule isomorphic to a direct summand of M is itself a direct summand of M .

(C₃) If A, B are direct summand of M with $A \cap B = 0$, then $A \oplus B$ is a direct summand of M .

A module M is CS if it satisfies condition (C₁). A module M is called a *CESS-module* if every complement in M with essential socle is a direct summand of M .

Definition 2.1: A module M is called *weak CS-module* if every semisimple submodule of M is essential in a direct summand of M . Semisimple modules, (Quasi-) injective modules, (Quasi-) continuous modules are all examples of weak CS-modules.

Definition 2.2: A module M is called *weak quasi-continuous* if M is a weak CS-module and satisfies the condition (C₃). And a module M is called *weak continuous* if M is a weak CS-module and satisfies the condition (C₂).

Definition 2.3: A module is called a *uniform* module if the intersection of any two non-zero submodules is nonzero. Equivalently, M is uniform if every nonzero submodule of M is essential in M .

Lemma 2.1: ([1], Lemma 1.1) *Every CS-module is weak CS-module.*

Remark: The converse of the above lemma may not hold true in general. Consider the following example.

Corresponding Author: U. K. Khedlekar*
Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
Dr. Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya, (A Central University), Sagar (M.P.)-India.

Example 2.1: The Z -module $M = Z/pZ \oplus Q$, where p is prime, is a weak CS-module but not a CS-module. The Z -module Z/pZ is simple and hence CS and Q is an injective Z -module. Clearly, M is a weak CS-module but not a CS-module. As we see that M satisfies the condition (C_2) but not (C_1) . Similarly, we can say that M is a weak continuous module but not a continuous module.

Lemma 2.2: ([2] Corollary 1.5; [5])

2.2.1 Any direct summand of weak CS-module is weak CS.

2.2.2 Any direct summand of weak QC-module is weak QC.

Lemma 2.3: ([2], Theorem 1.9)

If $M = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n$ is a finite direct sum of weak CS-modules M_i , where for each i , M_i is M_j -injective, $j \neq i$, then M is a weak CS-module.

We shall now proceed to the main findings of this paper.

Theorem 3.1: Let $M = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n$ be a finite direct sum of modules. If M is a quasi-continuous module, then M is a weak CS-module.

Proof: If $M = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n$ is quasi-continuous module, then each M_i is quasi-continuous and M_j -injective for all $j > i$, by ([5], Corollary 2.14)

It is known that any quasi-continuous module is CS, which implies that M_i is CS and by Lemma 2.1, one can conclude that each M_i is weak CS-module.

Then, for $M = \bigoplus_{i=1, \dots, n} M_i$, where each M_i is M_j -injective, $j > i$, M is weak CS-modules by Lemma 2.3.

Corollary 3.2: A finite direct sum of relatively injective QC module is weak CS-module.

Proof: Let $M = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n$, where each M_i is relatively injective quasi-continuous module. Then, according to [5, Corollary 2.14], M is quasi-continuous and hence a CS-module.

Now as we know, by lemma 2.1, that any CS-module is weak CS-module, we finally conclude that M is a weak CS-module.

Example 3.1: ([4], Example 3.2.5)

Consider a Z -module $M = Z_2 \oplus Z_8$, where Z_2 and Z_8 are weak CS but not relatively injective and M being a weak CS-module.

Proof: An Z_2 is simple, Z_8 is uniform, clearly Z_2 and Z_8 are weak CS-modules. But Z_2 is not Z_8 injective.

REFERENCES

1. Çelik, C.: CESS-modules, Tr. J. of Mathematics, 22(1998), 69-75.
2. Er. N.: Direct sums and summands of weak CS-modules and continuous modules, Rocky Mountain J. of Mathematics, 29 (1999), 491-502.
3. Harmanci, A., Smith, P.F.: Finite direct sums of CS-modules, Houston J. Math., 19(1993), 523-532.
4. Jantagan, P On the class of weak CS-modules, Grad. Thesis, Chiang Mai University, Thailand 1998.
5. Mohd., S.H. and Muller, B. J.: Continuous and discrete modules, London Math. Soc., Lecture Notes Series 147, Cambridge, 1990.
6. Muller B. J. and Rizvi, S.T. On the decomposition of Continuous modules, Can. Math. Bull. 25 (3) (1982), 296-301.
7. Muller B. J. and Rizvi, S.T., Direct sums of indecomposable modules, Osaka J. Math., 21 (1984), 365-374.
8. Musili C, Introduction to rings and modules, Narosa Pub. House, 1994.
9. Smith, P.F.: CS-modules and weak CS-modules, Non-commutative ring theory, Springer LNM 1448 (1990), 99-115.

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

[Copy right © 2016. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the International Journal of Mathematical Archive (IJMA), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.]