

A REMARK ON DECOMPOSABLE MODULES

Roger Yue Chi Ming

(Received September 12, 1977)

Introduction

Throughout, A denotes an associative ring with identity and "module" means "left, unitary A -module". An A -module M is called indecomposable if the only direct summands are 0 and M . M is called completely decomposable (abbreviated c. d.) if it is a direct sum of indecomposable injective submodules. M is irreducible if every non-zero submodule is essential in M . Then an indecomposable, injective module is irreducible [5, Proposition 2.2]. In [5], E. Matlis asked whether every direct summand of a c.d. module is c.d. The answer is positive for the following classes of c.d. modules M : (1) M injective [3, Theorem 6.4]; (2) M well-complemented (that is, the intersection of any two closed submodules of M is closed in M) [2, Theorem 3]. A result of R.E. Johnson states that non-singular modules are well-complemented (cf. [6, p. 45]). In fact, M is well-complemented if every non-zero closed submodule of M contains $Z(M)$ (cf. Lemma 1 (iii) below). The purpose of this note is to show that Matlis' conjecture holds for larger classes of c.d. modules.

Let M be an A -module, N a submodule of M . We recall that (a) N is closed in M iff N has no proper essential extension in M ; (b) The closure of N in M is $C1_M(N) = \{y \in M / (N : y) \text{ is essential in } A\}$ and the singular submodule of M is $Z(M) = C1_M(0)$. M is called non-singular if $Z(M) = 0$. Write $Z_2(M) (C1C1(N))$ for $C1_M(Z(M)) (C1_M(N))$. Then $C1C1(N)$ is the (unique) maximal essential extension of $C1(N)$ in M [7, Lemma 1]. As usual, $E(N)$ will denote the injective hull of N . Obviously, $E(N) \subseteq M$ iff there exists an injective submodule Q of M such that $N \subseteq Q$.

Lemma 1. *Let M be an A -module, N a submodule of M .*

(i) *If R, Q are submodules of M such that $R \subseteq N \subseteq R \oplus Q = S$, then $C1_S(N) = R \oplus C1_Q(N \cap Q)$;*

- (ii) If N is a direct summand of M , then $C1C1(N) = N \oplus P$, with $P \subseteq Z_2(M)$;
- (iii) $N + Z(M)$ is essential in $C1(N)$.

Proof. (i) We first show $C1_S(N) = R \oplus (C1_S(N) \cap Q)$. Let $y \in C1_S(N)$. Then $y = r + q$, $r \in R$, $q \in Q$ and $q = y - r \in C1_S(N)$ implies $y \in R \oplus (C1_S(N) \cap Q)$. Since the reverse inclusion is obvious, $C1_S(N) = R \oplus (C1_S(N) \cap Q)$. Now if $z \in R \oplus (C1_S(N) \cap Q)$, $z = z_1 + z_2$, $z_1 \in R$, $z_2 \in C1_S(N) \cap Q$ and there exists an essential left ideal L such that $Lz_2 \subseteq N \cap Q$ which implies $z_2 \in C1_Q(N \cap Q)$. Thus $R \oplus (C1_S(N) \cap Q) \subseteq R \oplus C1_Q(N \cap Q)$. Since $C1_Q(N \cap Q) \subseteq C1_S(N)$, $R \oplus C1_Q(N \cap Q) \subseteq R \oplus (C1_S(N) \cap Q)$ which proves (i).

(ii) If N is a direct summand of M , then N is a direct summand of $C1C1(N)$. Let $C1C1(N) = N \oplus P$. Let $0 \neq y \in P$. Then $Ly \subseteq C1(N)$ for some essential left ideal L of A . If $Ly = 0$, $y \in Z(M) \subseteq Z_2(M)$. If $Ly \neq 0$, for any $k \in L$ such that $ky \neq 0$, there exists an essential left ideal J such that $Jky \subseteq N$. If $Jky \neq 0$, then $N \cap P \neq 0$, a contradiction. Therefore $Jky = 0$ which implies $ky \in Z(M)$. Then $Ly \subseteq Z(M)$ which implies $y \in Z_2(M)$. This proves that $P \subseteq Z_2(M)$.

(iii) Suppose there exists a non-zero submodule P of $C1(N)$ such that $(N + Z(M)) \cap P = 0$. If $0 \neq y \in P \subseteq C1(N)$, $Ly \subseteq N$ for some essential left ideal L of A which implies $Ly \subseteq N \cap P = 0$. Thus $y \in Z(M)$ and $y \in (N + Z(M)) \cap P = 0$, a contradiction. This proves (iii).

Lemma 2. Let M be a c.d. module. Then $Z_2(M)$ is c.d. and a direct summand of M . If N is a direct summand of M , $Z_2(N)$ is a direct summand of $Z_2(M)$.

Proof. Let $M = (\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i) \oplus (\bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j)$ be a direct sum of indecomposable injectives with $Z(M_i) = 0$ for every $i \in I$ and $Z(M_j) \neq 0$ for every $j \in J$. Then $Z(M) = (\bigoplus_{i \in I} Z(M_i)) \oplus (\bigoplus_{j \in J} Z(M_j)) = \bigoplus_{j \in J} Z(M_j)$. With $S = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ and $R = \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$, by Lemma 1 (i), $C1_M(R) = R \oplus C1_S(R \cap S) = R \oplus Z(S) = R$. Since $Z(M_j)$ is essential in M_j for every $j \in J$, then $Z(M)$ is essential in R . Therefore $R \subseteq Z_2(M) \subseteq C1_M(R) = R$ implies $R = Z_2(M)$.

If N is a direct summand of M , then by Zorn's Lemma, $N = (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \oplus W$, where each N_k is non-singular, indecomposable injective and W is an essential extension of $Z(N)$. By [7, Lemma 1], W is essential in $Z_2(N)$. Since W is a direct summand of $Z_2(N)$, then $W = Z_2(N)$ which implies $Z_2(N)$ a direct summand of $Z_2(M)$.

In [6, p. 40], G. Renault proved the equivalence of the following conditions: (i) M is well-complemented; (ii) Given a submodule P of M , P is closed in M iff for any $y \in M$, $y \notin P$ implies there exists $a \in A$ with $ay \neq 0$ and $Aay \cap P = 0$. Call M a g.w.c. — module (generalised well-complemented) if M has the following property: For any injective submodule Q of M , $y \in M$, $y \notin Q$ implies there exists $a \in A$ with $ay \neq 0$ and $Aay \cap Q = 0$. Clearly, M well-complemented implies M a g.w.c. — module. (Which, in turn, implies every submodule of M is g.w.c.). Next, call M a s.c.i. — module if there exists an injective sub-

module Q of M containing $Z(M)$. We now prove our main result which extends [3, Theorem 6.4] and [2, Theorem 3].

Theorem 3. *Let M be a c.d. module.*

- (i) *If N is a direct summand of M , then $C1C1(N)$ is c.d.;*
- (ii) *If N is a direct summand of M containing $Z(M)$, then N is c.d.;*
- (iii) *If M is s.c.i., then every direct summand of M is c.d.;*
- (iv) *If N is a g.w.c. — submodule of M and $E(C) \subseteq N$ for every cyclic submodule C of N , then N is c.d.;*
- (v) *If M is g.w.c., then every direct summand of M is c.d.*

Proof. With the notation of Lemma 2, $Z_2(M) = \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$.

(i) By Lemma 1 (ii), $C1C1(N) = N \oplus P$, $P \subseteq Z_2(M)$. If $N = (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \oplus Z_2(N)$ as in Lemma 2, then $C1C1(N) = (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \oplus Z_2(N) \oplus P \subseteq (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) + Z_2(M)$. Since $Z(\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) = \bigoplus_{k \in K} Z(N_k) = 0$, then $(\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \cap Z(M) = 0$ implies $(\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \cap Z_2(M) = 0$ by [7, Lemma 1]. Therefore $C1C1(N) = (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \oplus Z_2(M) = (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \oplus (\bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j)$.

(ii) By Lemma 1 (iii), $N = C1_M(N)$. Then $N = C1C1(N)$ is c.d. by (i).

(iii) Let Q be an injective module such that $Z(M) \subseteq Q \subseteq M$. Then $E(Z(M)) \subseteq Q$ implies $E(Z(M)) \subseteq Z_2(M)$ and by [7, Lemma 1], $Z_2(M) = E(Z(M))$ is injective. If N is a direct summand of M , then $N = (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \oplus Z_2(N)$ with $Z_2(N)$ a direct summand of $Z_2(M)$ as in Lemma 2. Since $Z_2(M)$ is c.d. (Lemma 2), by [3, Theorem 6.4], $Z_2(N)$ is c.d. which proves N c.d.

(iv) By [4, Theorem 3], N contains an essential submodule $P = \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$ with P_i irreducible. If $0 \neq y_i \in P_i$, $E(Ay_i) \subseteq N$. Then $N' = \bigoplus_{i \in I} E(Ay_i)$ is essential in N . We prove $N = N'$. For any $0 \neq y \in N$, $E(Ay) \subseteq N$ and by [3, Proposition 6.2], $E(Ay) = \bigoplus_{s=1}^n R_s$ with R_s indecomposable injective. If $0 \neq r \in R_s$, there exists $a \in A$ such that $0 \neq ar \in N'$.

Then $ar \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^m E(Ay_{ij}) = Q$ (injective), $i_j \in I$. Therefore $R_s \cap Q \neq 0$ and for any non-zero submodule R of R_s , $R \cap Q \neq 0$ since R_s is irreducible. Since N is g.w.c., $R_s \subseteq Q \subseteq N'$. Then $E(Ay) \subseteq N'$ implies $y \in N'$ and hence $N = N' = \bigoplus_{i \in I} E(Ay_i)$ is c.d.

(v) Any direct summand N of M is g.w.c. and for every cyclic submodule C of N , $E(C) \subseteq N$ by [3, Lemma 6.1]. By (iv), N is c.d.

It is well-known that if A is left Noetherian, then every direct summand of any c.d. module is c.d. [5]. If every A -module M is s.c.i., A is not neces-

sarily Noetherian (in fact, A may not satisfy the maximum condition on left annihilators). Otherwise, commutative rings whose singular modules are injective are semi-simple, Artinian by [8, Theorem 7] and [9, Theorem 2], contradicting [1, p. 161 (Remark)]. Corollary 4. *Let A be such that every A -module is either s.c.i. or g.w.c. Then every direct summand of any c.d. module is c.d.*

If M is a well-complemented, c.d. module, K a closed submodule of M , then $E(F) \subseteq K$ for every finitely generated submodule F of K [2, Lemma 3]. In this direction, we have the following:

Corollary 5. *Let M be a g.w.c. module which is c.d. The following are equivalent for a submodule N :*

- (i) N is a direct summand of M ;
- (ii) N is c.d.;
- (iii) $E(C) \subseteq N$ for any cyclic submodule C of N .

Proof. Apply [3, Lemma 6.1], [4, Theorem 3] and Theorem 3.

Corollary 6. *Let M be a c.d. module such that $Z(M)$ is a closed, g.w.c. submodule of M . Then any direct summand of M is c.d.*

Proof. $Z(M) = Z_2(M)$ [7, Lemma 1] is c.d. and a direct summand of M by Lemma 2. If N is a direct summand of M , $N = (\bigoplus_{k \in K} N_k) \oplus Z_2(N)$ as in Lemma 2, where $Z_2(N)$ is a direct summand of $Z_2(M)$. By Corollary 5, $Z_2(N)$ is c.d. which proves N c.d.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cateforis, V. C. and Sandmierski, F. L., *The singular submodule splits off*. J. Algebra 10 (1968), 149—65.
- [2] Chamard, J. Y., *Modules riches en co-irréductibles et sous-modules complémentés*. C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris 264 (1967), 987—90.
- [3] Faith, C. and Walker, E. A., *Direct sum representation of injective modules*. J. Algebra 5 (1967), 203—21.
- [4] Fort, J., *Sommes directes de sous-modules coirréductibles d'un module*. C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris 262 (1965), 1239—42.
- [5] Matlis, E., *Injective modules over Noetherian rings*. Pac. J. Math. 8 (1958), 511—28.
- [6] Renault, G., *Etude des sous-modules complémentés dans un module*. Bull. Soc. Math. France, série „Mémoires“ № 9, thèse, Paris (1966).
- [7] Yue Chi Ming, R., *A note on singular ideals*. Tôhoku Math. J. 21 (1969), 337—42.
- [8] YUE CHI Ming, R., *On simple p -injective modules*. Math. Japonicae 19 (1974), 173—76.
- [9] YUE CHI Ming, R., *On von Neumann regular rings. II*. Math. Scand. 39 (1976), 167—70.

Université Paris VII
U.E.R. de Mathématiques
2, Place Jussieu
75005 Paris
France