ROCKY MOUNTAIN
JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Volume 32, Number 4, Winter 2002

GENERALIZED TRIANGULAR MATRIX RINGS AND THE FULLY INVARIANT EXTENDING PROPERTY

GARY F. BIRKENMEIER, JAE KEOL PARK AND S. TARIQ RIZVI

ABSTRACT. A module M is called (*strongly*) FI-*extending* if every fully invariant submodule of M is essential in a (fully invariant) direct summand of M. A ring R with unity is called *quasi-Baer* if the right annihilator of every ideal is generated, as a right ideal, by an idempotent. For semi-prime rings the FI-extending condition, strongly FI-extending condition and quasi-Baer condition are equivalent. In this paper we fully characterize the 2-by-2 generalized (or formal) triangular matrix rings which are either (right) FI-extending, (right) strongly FI-extending, or quasi-Baer. Examples are provided to illustrate and delimit our results.

0. Introduction. All rings are associative with unity and all modules are unital. Throughout this paper T will denote a 2-by-2 generalized (or formal) triangular matrix ring

$$\begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix},$$

where R and S are rings and M is an (S,R)-bimodule.

Generalized triangular matrix rings have proven to be extremely useful in ring theory. They provide a good source of examples and counterexamples, e.g., see [**11**, pp. 46–48 and 79–80] and [**10**], as well as providing a framework to explore the connections between $\operatorname{End}(M_R)$, M and R when $S = \operatorname{End}(M_R)$.

Recently several aspects of injectivity and projectivity in the context of generalized triangular matrix rings have been investigated by Haghany-Varadarajan [**8, 9**] and Tercan [**13**]. Tercan was able to obtain a characterization of the right nonsingular right extending (or CS)

1991 AMS *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16S50, 16D70, Secondary 16D20.
Received by the editors on July 13, 2001, and in revised form on September 17, 2001.

condition on T when ${}_SM$ is faithful (recall a module is *extending*, or *CS*, if every submodule is essential in a direct summand).

In [**1, 4**] and [**5**], the FI-extending property was introduced and investigated. A module is said to be (*strongly*) *FI-extending* if every fully invariant submodule is essential in a (fully invariant) direct summand. Observe that many distinguished submodules of a module are fully invariant, e.g., the Jacobson radical, the singular submodule, the socle, any torsion submodule, etc. Thus, in an FI-extending module, these submodules can be "essentially split-off." From [**4**, Theorem 4.7] and [**5**, Proposition 1.5], for nonsingular modules and semi-prime rings, the FI-extending and strongly FI-extending properties are equivalent. A description of the strongly FI-extending Abelian groups was obtained in [**1**]. The classes of (strongly) FI-extending rings and modules, in general, exhibit better behavior with respect to various algebraic constructions than the class of extending modules. For example, the class of FI-extending modules is closed under direct sums; and the class of right strongly FI-extending rings is Morita invariant. Thus, these results show, at a minimum, how much of the extending property is preserved by these constructions. For further details and examples, see [**4**] and [**5**].

In the first two sections of this paper we fully characterize the generalized triangular matrix rings which are right FI-extending and right strongly FI-extending. In [**13**, Theorem 2.4] Tercan determines four conditions which are satisfied by a right extending generalized triangular matrix ring. However, in [**13**, Theorem 3.5] he shows that these conditions are not sufficient to ensure that a generalized triangular matrix ring is right extending. Our Theorem 1.4 shows that these conditions do ensure that the generalized triangular matrix ring is right FI-extending.

Chatters and Khuri [**6**, Theorem 2.1] showed that a right nonsingular right extending ring is a Baer ring. In [**4**, Proposition 4.4 and Theorem 4.7] it was shown that a right FI-extending ring which is either semiprime or right nonsingular is quasi-Baer. Recall that a ring R is (*quasi-*) *Baer* if the right annihilator of every (ideal) nonempty subset is generated, as a right ideal, by an idempotent. In Section 3 we characterize the quasi-Baer generalized triangular matrix rings. Some examples to illustrate and delimit our results are presented in the last section.

We use ${}_SM$ or M_R to denote that M is a left S-module or a right R-module, respectively. The symbols $N_R \leq M_R$, $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} M_R$, ${}_SN \leq {}_SM$ and ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$ are used for N is a right R-submodule, N is an essential right R-submodule, N is a left S-submodule, and N is a subbimodule of M, respectively. Some subscripts may be omitted if the context is clear. A submodule $N_R \leq M_R$ is called *fully invariant* in M_R, denoted $N \trianglelefteq_R M$ (or simply, $N \trianglelefteq M$) if $f(N) \subseteq N$ for all $f \in \text{End}\,(M_R)$. Observe that the fully invariant submodules of R_R are the ideals of R. An idempotent $e \in R$ is called *left* (*right*) *semicentral* if $Re = eRe$ ($eR = eRe$). The set of all left (right) semicentral idempotents is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_l(R)$ ($\mathcal{S}_r(R)$). Equivalently, $e = e^2 \in R$ is left (right) semicentral if $eR \trianglelefteq R$ ($Re \trianglelefteq R$). An idempotent e is called *semicentral reduced* if $\mathcal{S}_l(eRe) = \{0, e\}$. If $1 \in R$ is semicentral reduced, then R is said to be *semicentral reduced*. See [**2**] or [**3**] for further details on semicentral idempotents. The Jacobson radical and the right singular ideal of R are denoted by $\mathbf{J}(R)$ and $Z(R_R)$, respectively. If $N_R \leq M_R$, respectively ${}_SN \leq {}_SM$, then $\text{Ann}_R(N) = \{r \in R \mid Nr = 0\}$, respectively $\text{Ann}_S(N) = \{s \in S \mid sN = 0\}$. If $\varnothing \neq B \subseteq S$ and M is a left S-module, then $r_M(B) = \{m \in M \mid Bm = 0\}$ and $r_S(B) = \{a \in S \mid Ba = 0\}$. The ring of n-by-n upper triangular matrices over R is denoted by $T_n(R)$.

1. The FI-extending property. In this section we completely characterize the FI-extending property for a generalized triangular matrix ring T. This characterization is refined under the assumptions that ${}_SM$ is faithful or $S = \text{End}\,(M_R)$. We include the following two lemmas for completeness since they are used repeatedly in the sequel.

Lemma 1.1 [**4**, Theorem 1.3]. *Direct sums of modules with the* FI-*extending property again have the* FI-*extending property.*

Lemma 1.2 [**1**, Lemma 1.2]. *If the module $A = B \oplus C$ has the* FI-*extending property and B is a fully invariant summand, then both B and C have the* FI-*extending property.*

Corollary 1.3. *For a ring R, let e be a left semicentral idempotent of R. Then R_R is* FI-*extending if and only if eR_R and $(1-e)R_R$ are*

FI-*extending.*

Proof. This result follows immediately from Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2. $\square$

Theorem 1.4. *For rings S and R, assume that ${}_SM_R$ is an (S,R)-bimodule. Let $T = \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$ be a generalized triangular matrix ring. Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) T_T *is* FI-*extending.*

(2) (i) *For any ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$ and any ideal I of S with $IM \subseteq N$, there is $f = f^2 \in S$ such that $I \subseteq fS$, $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} fM_R$, and $(I \cap \text{Ann}_S(M))_S \leq^{\text{ess}} (fS \cap \text{Ann}_S(M))_S$; and*

(ii) R_R *is* FI-*extending.*

Proof. Let $E_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in T$.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Since $\begin{pmatrix} \text{Ann}_S(M) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$, an idempotent $c \in T$ exists such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{Ann}_S(M) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_T \leq^{\text{ess}} cT_T = cE_{11}T = \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T = \begin{pmatrix} eS & eM \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

for some $e = e^2 \in S$. If $eM \neq 0$, then choose $0 \neq em \in eM$ with $m \in M$. So we have $0 \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & em \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T \cap \begin{pmatrix} \text{Ann}_S(M) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. But $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & em \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T \cap \begin{pmatrix} \text{Ann}_S(M) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, $eM = 0$ and hence $e \in \text{Ann}_S(M)$. Thus $eS \subseteq \text{Ann}_S(M)$ and so $\text{Ann}_S(M) = eS$.

For (i), let ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$ and I be an ideal of S with $IM \subseteq N$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is a fully invariant T-submodule of $E_{11}T$. As above, $f = f^2 \in S$ exists such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_T \leq^{\text{ess}} \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} E_{11}T_T = \begin{pmatrix} fS & fM \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $fM = 0$, then $N = 0$ and so $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} fM_R$. Suppose $fM \neq 0$. For $0 \neq fm \in fM$, we have $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & fm \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T \cap \begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0$ and so $fmR \cap N \neq 0$. Thus $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} fM_R$.

Next if $fS \cap eS = 0$, then $I \cap eS = 0$. Thus $(I \cap \mathrm{Ann}_S(M))_S \leq^{\mathrm{ess}} (fS \cap \mathrm{Ann}_S(M))_S$. Assume $fS \cap eS \neq 0$. Then for $0 \neq fs \in fS \cap eS$ with $s \in S$, we have that

$$\begin{pmatrix} fs & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T = \begin{pmatrix} fsS & fsM \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} fsS & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So it follows that

$$0 \neq \begin{pmatrix} fs & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T \cap \begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} fsS & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cap \begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus we have $0 \neq fsS \cap I = fsS \cap (I \cap eS)$. Therefore $(I \cap eS)_S \leq^{\mathrm{ess}} (fS \cap eS)_S$. Since E_{11} is left semicentral, (ii) follows immediately from Corollary 1.3.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Suppose (i) and (ii) hold. By (ii), $(1 - E_{11})T_T$ is FI-extending. Now to prove $E_{11}T_T$ is FI-extending, let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a fully invariant T-submodule of $E_{11}T$. Then $\mathfrak{A} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with I an ideal of S, ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$ and $IM \subseteq N$. By (ii), there is $f = f^2 \in S$ such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} fS & fM \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this case, note that $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathrm{End}(E_{11}T_T)$. So $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\left(\begin{smallmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is a T-direct summand of $E_{11}T$. Now we claim that

$$\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_T \leq^{\mathrm{ess}} \begin{pmatrix} f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_T = \begin{pmatrix} fS & fM \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Take $0 \neq \left(\begin{smallmatrix} fs & fm \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \left(\begin{smallmatrix} fS & fM \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

Case 1. $fm \neq 0$. Then since $N_R \leq^{\mathrm{ess}} fM_R$, $N \cap fmR \neq 0$, and so

$$\begin{pmatrix} fs & fm \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T \cap \begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0.$$

Case 2. $fm = 0$. Then $fs \neq 0$. Thus $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} fs & fm \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) T = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} fsS & fsM \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. If $fsM \neq 0$, then $fsm_0 \neq 0$, for some $m_0 \in M$. So $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & fsm_0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in$

$\left(\begin{smallmatrix} fsS & fsM \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ and hence $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & fsm_0R \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \subseteq \left(\begin{smallmatrix} fsS & fsM \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. But since $fsm_0R \cap N \neq 0$, we have that $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} fsS & fsM \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \cap \left(\begin{smallmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \neq 0$. If $fsM = 0$, then $fs \in \mathrm{Ann}_S(M)$ and so $0 \neq fs \in fS \cap \mathrm{Ann}_S(M)$. Thus by (ii), $fsS \cap (I \cap \mathrm{Ann}_S(M)) \neq 0$, so

$$\begin{pmatrix} fs & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T \cap \begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0.$$

From Cases 1 and 2, $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)_T \leq^{\text{ess}} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} fS & fM \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)_T$, and hence $E_{11}T_T$ is FI-extending. Therefore T_T is FI-extending, by Corollary 1.3. $\square$

Corollary 1.5. *Let T_T be* FI-*extending. Then a left semicentral idempotent $e \in S$ exists such that $\mathrm{Ann}_S(M) = eS$ and eS_S is* FI-*extending. In particular, if $M \neq 0$ and S is semicentral reduced, then ${}_SM$ is faithful.*

Proof. In the proof of (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) of Theorem 1.4, $\mathrm{Ann}_S(M) = eS$ for some left semicentral idempotent e of S. To show that eS_S is FI-extending, let $I_S \leq eS_S$ be a fully invariant S-submodule of S. Since $eS \trianglelefteq S$, I is an ideal of S. Applying condition 2(i) of Theorem 1.4 with $N = 0$, we see that $fM = 0$, hence $f \in eS$. So $fS \subseteq eS$. Now $I = (I \cap eS)_S \leq^{\text{ess}} (fS \cap eS)_S = fS$ and fS is an S-direct summand of eS by the modular law. Thus eS_S is FI-extending. $\square$

Corollary 1.6. *Let ${}_SM$ be faithful. Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) T_T *is* FI-*extending.*

(2) (i) *For any ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$, $f = f^2 \in S$ exists such that $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} fM_R$; and*

(ii) R_R *is* FI-*extending.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Assume that T_T is FI-extending. Since ${}_SM$ is faithful, $\mathrm{Ann}_S(M) = 0$. By taking $I = 0$ in Theorem 1.4, we have (i). Then (ii) follows from Theorem 1.4.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Assume (i) and (ii) hold. Let ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$ and I be an ideal of S such that $IM \subseteq N$. By (i), there is $f = f^2 \in S$ such that $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} fM_R$. Since $IM \subseteq N \subseteq fM$, $fn = n$ for all $n \in N$, in particular $fsm = sm$ for any $s \in I$ and $m \in M$. Thus $(s - fs)M = 0$ for any $s \in I$ and hence $s - fs = 0$ for any $s \in I$. So $I = fI \subseteq fS$. Therefore by Theorem 1.4, T_T is FI-extending. $\square$

Since M_R is always a left S-module for $S = \text{End}\,(M_R)$ or $S = \mathbf{Z}$, we consider these cases in our next two results.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $S = \mathbf{Z}$. Then T_T is* FI-*extending if and only if ${}_{\mathbf{Z}}M$ is faithful , M_R is uniform and R_R is* FI-*extending.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{Z}$ is semicentral reduced, Corollaries 1.5 and 1.6 yield the result. $\square$

Corollary 1.8 [**4**, Theorem 2.4]. *Let $S = \text{End}\,(M_R)$. Then T_T is* FI-*extending if and only if M_R and R_R are* FI-*extending.*

Proof. This result follows immediately from Corollary 1.6. $\square$

Thus from Corollary 1.8 and [**4**, Proposition 1.2], if $M \trianglelefteq R$ and $S = \text{End}\,(M_R)$ then T_T is FI-extending if and only if R_R is FI-extending. The next corollary applies our results to the endomorphism ring of certain Abelian groups.

Corollary 1.9. *Let G be an Abelian group such that $G = M \oplus C$ where M is a direct sum of finite cyclic groups and C is an infinite cyclic group. Then* $\text{End}\,(G_{\mathbf{Z}})$ *is right FI-extending.*

Proof. Observe $\text{End}\,(G_{\mathbf{Z}}) \cong \begin{pmatrix} \text{End}\,(M_{\mathbf{Z}}) & M \\ 0 & \mathbf{Z} \end{pmatrix}$. Since every cyclic group is an FI-extending $\mathbf{Z}$-module, Lemma 1.1 shows that M is an FI-extending $\mathbf{Z}$-module. Now Corollary 1.8 yields the result. $\square$

From our previous results, we have two classes of rings which are right FI-extending, but not left FI-extending as the following examples illustrate.

Example 1.10. Note that if $T = \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$ is left FI-extending, then by a similar method as in the proof of (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) of Theorem 1.4, $\mathrm{Ann}_R(M) = Rf$ for some right semicentral idempotent f of R.

(i) Let R be a right self-injective ring with $\mathbf{J}(R) \neq 0$. Let

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} R/\mathbf{J}(R) & R/\mathbf{J}(R) \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the ring $R/\mathbf{J}(R)$ is right self-injective. So it can be easily checked that $R/\mathbf{J}(R)$ is an FI-extending right R-module because $R/\mathbf{J}(R) \cong \mathrm{End}((R/\mathbf{J}(R))_R)$. Thus the ring T is right FI-extending by Corollary 1.8. If ${}_TT$ is FI-extending, then $\mathrm{Ann}_R((R/\mathbf{J}(R))_R) = \mathbf{J}(R) = Rf$ for some right semicentral idempotent f of R. Thus $f = 0$ and hence $\mathbf{J}(R) = 0$, a contradiction.

(ii) Let R be a prime ring with a nonzero prime ideal P. Let

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} R/P & R/P \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that prime rings are both left and right strongly FI-extending. Therefore as in part (i), the ring T is right FI-extending, but not left FI-extending.

(iii) Let R be a left or right principal ideal domain and let I be a nonzero proper ideal of R. Then the ring R/I is QF. Thus as in part (i), the ring

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} R/I & R/I \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$$

is right FI-extending, but not left FI-extending.

2. The strongly FI-extending property. The ring T in Example 1.10 (ii) is isomorphic to $\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{End}\,((R/P)_R) & R/P \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$. By Corollary 1.8, T is right FI-extending because R/P and R in the righthand column are FI-extending. Since R and R/P are prime rings, then R_R and $(R/P)_R$ are strongly FI-extending. However, in contrast to the FI-extending case, the righthand column being strongly FI-extending in each component does not ensure that Λ_Λ is strongly FI-extending. In fact Λ_Λ is not strongly FI-extending because $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{smallmatrix}\right) \trianglelefteq \Lambda$, but there does not exist $b \in \mathcal{S}_l(\Lambda)$ such that $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is right essential in $b\Lambda$.

In this section we determine necessary and sufficient conditions to ensure that a 2-by-2 generalized triangular matrix ring is right strongly FI-extending.

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be a right ideal of R such that $X_R \leq^{\text{ess}} bR_R$ for some $b \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$. If $X_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eR_R$ where $e = e^2$, then $bR = eR$ and $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$.*

Proof. Observe that $X_R \leq^{\text{ess}} (eR \cap bR)_R$. Then $eR \cap bR = ebR$, where $eb = (eb)^2$. Hence $eR = ebR = bR$. Since $eR \trianglelefteq R$, $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$.

Definition 2.2. Let $N_R \leq M_R$. We say N_R has a *direct summand cover* $\mathcal{D}(N_R)$ if $e = e^2 \in \operatorname{End}(M_R)$ exists such that $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eM_R = \mathcal{D}(N_R)$. In general a submodule may have several direct summand covers; however, Lemma 2.1 yields that if M_R is a strongly FI-extending module then every fully invariant submodule has a *unique* direct summand cover.

Let M be an (S,R)-bimodule and ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$. If there is $e = e^2 \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$ such that $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eM_R$, then we write $\mathcal{D}_S(N_R) = eM$.

For $N_R \leq M_R$, let $(N_R : M_R) = \{a \in R \mid Ma \subseteq N\}$. Then $\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R)$ denotes a direct summand cover of the right ideal $(N_R : M_R)$ in R_R.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $e = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} e_1 & k \\ 0 & e_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in T = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & R \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, where $e_1 = e_1^2$ and $e_2 = e_2^2$.*

(1) *$e \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$ if and only if*

(i) *$e_1 \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$;*

(ii) *$e_2 \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$;*

(iii) *$e_1k = k$; and*

(iv) $e_1me_2 = me_2$ *for all* $m \in M$.

(2) $e_1k = k$ *if and only if* $eT \subseteq \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix} T$.

(3) *If* $e_1me_2 = me_2$ *for all* $m \in M$, *then* $\begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix} T \subseteq eT$.

(4) *If* $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$, *then* $eT = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix} T$.

Proof. Observe $e = e^2$ if and only if $e_1 = e_1^2$, $e_2 = e_2^2$ and $e_1k + ke_2 = k$. Let $t = \begin{pmatrix} s & m \\ 0 & r \end{pmatrix} \in T$. Then $te = \begin{pmatrix} se_1 & sk+me_2 \\ 0 & re_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $ete = \begin{pmatrix} e_1se_1 & e_1sk+e_1me_2+kre_2 \\ 0 & e_2re_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

(1) Assume $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$. Then $te = ete$. Hence conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied. Letting $s = 1$, $m = 0$ and $r = 0$ yields $k = e_1k$. So condition (iii) is satisfied. Also $k = e_1k + ke_2$ implies $ke_2 = 0$. Since $sk = se_1k = e_1se_1k = e_1sk$ and $kre_2 = ke_2re_2 = 0$, then $e_1me_2 = me_2$. Hence condition (iv) is satisfied. The converse is routine.

(2) This proof is straightforward.

(3) Observe $e \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & -ke_2 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus $\begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix} T \subseteq eT$.

(4) This is a consequence of the previous parts. $\square$

The next result gives a characterization for the strongly FI-extending condition for a 2-by-2 generalized triangular matrix ring.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume* M *is an* (S, R)*-bimodule, and let* $T = \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$. *Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) T_T *is strongly* FI-*extending.*

(2) (i) *For any* ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$ *and any ideal* I *of* S *with* $IM \subseteq N$, $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$ *exists such that* $I \subseteq eS$, $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eM_R$ *and* $(I \cap \text{Ann}_S(M))_S \leq^{\text{ess}} (eS \cap \text{Ann}_S(M))_S$;

(ii) R_R *is strongly* FI-*extending; and*

(iii) *for any* ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$,

$$\mathcal{D}_S(N_R)\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R) = M\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R).$$

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Assume T_T is strongly FI-extending. Then, by [**5**, Theorem 2.4], $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T_T$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} T_T$ are strongly FI-extending. So, as in Theorem 1.4, we can show that (i) and (ii) hold. For (iii), let ${}_S N_R \leq {}_S M_R$ and put $A = (N_R : M_R)$. By (i) and (ii), there are $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ such that $\mathcal{D}_S(N_R) = eM$ and $\mathcal{D}(A_R) = fR$. Since $MA \subseteq N$, it follows that $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & N \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$. So $\theta^2 = \theta \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$ exists such that $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & N \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix}_T \leq^{\text{ess}} \theta T_T$. By Lemma 2.3, there exist $e_0 \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$ and $f_0 \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ such that $\theta T = \begin{pmatrix} e_0 & 0 \\ 0 & f_0 \end{pmatrix} T$ and $\begin{pmatrix} e_0 & 0 \\ 0 & f_0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$. Hence $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} e_0 M_R$ and $A_R \leq^{\text{ess}} f_0 R_R$. So $\mathcal{D}_S(N_R) = eM = e_0 M$ and $\mathcal{D}(A_R) = fR = f_0 R$. Thus, from the fact that $e_0 M f_0 = M f_0$, it follows that $eMf = Mf$. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_S(N_R)\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R) = M\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R)$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$. Then ${}_S N_R \leq {}_S M_R$, $I \trianglelefteq S$ and $IM \subseteq N$. So by (i), there exists $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$ such that $I \subseteq eS$ and $\mathcal{D}_S(N_R) = eM$. Since $A \trianglelefteq R$, by (ii), $f \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ exists such that $\mathcal{D}(A_R) = fR$. Also, by (ii), $\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R) = f_0 R$ for some $f_0 \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$. Since $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$, we have $MA \subseteq N$ and so $A \subseteq (N_R : M_R)$. Thus $A_R \leq^{\text{ess}} (fR \cap f_0 R)_R = f_0 f R$ with $f_0 f \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$. So $\mathcal{D}(A_R) = f_0 f R$. By Lemma 2.1, $fR = f_0 f R$ and hence $f_0 f = f$. Since $\mathcal{D}_S(N_R)\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R) = M\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R)$, part (iii) yields $eMf_0R = Mf_0R$. So $eMf_0 = Mf_0$. Thus $eMf_0f = Mf_0f$, so $eMf = Mf$. Since $I \subseteq eS$, we have $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix}_T \leq \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} T_T$. By (i), $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_T \leq^{\text{ess}} \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T_T$. Because $A_R \leq^{\text{ess}} fR_R$, we have $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix}_T \leq^{\text{ess}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} T_T$. So $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix}_T \leq^{\text{ess}} \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} T_T$. Since $eMf = Mf$, Lemma 2.3 yields $\begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$. Therefore T_T is strongly FI-extending. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. *Let ${}_S M$ be faithful. Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) T_T *is strongly* FI-*extending.*

(2) (i) *For any* ${}_S N_R \leq {}_S M_R$, $e^2 = e \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$ *exists such that* $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eM_R$;

(ii) R_R *is strongly* FI-*extending; and*

(iii) *for any* ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$,

$$\mathcal{D}_S(N_R)\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R) = M\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Corollary 1.6. $\square$

Corollary 2.6. *Let* $S = \mathbf{Z}$. *Then* T_T *is strongly* FI-*extending if and only if* ${}_{\mathbf{Z}}M$ *is faithful,* M_R *is uniform and* R_R *is strongly* FI-*extending.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{Z}$ is semicentral reduced, Corollaries 1.5 and 2.5 yield the result. $\square$

Observe in Theorem 2.4 that, for $S = \mathrm{End}\,(M_R)$ and T_T strongly FI-extending if $A \trianglelefteq R$ and $MA = 0$, then $M\mathcal{D}(A_R) = 0$.

Corollary 2.7. *For a right* R*-module* M, *let* $T = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & R \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ *with* $S = \mathrm{End}\,(M_R)$. *Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) T_T *is strongly* FI-*extending.*

(2) (i) M_R *is strongly* FI-*extending;*

(ii) R_R *is strongly* FI-*extending; and*

(iii) *for any* $N_R \trianglelefteq M_R$,

$$\mathcal{D}(N_R)\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R) = M\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Corollary 1.8. $\square$

Theorem 2.8. *Assume* R *is a ring. Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) R *is right strongly* FI-*extending.*

(2) $T_n(R)$ *is right strongly* FI-*extending for every positive integer* n.

(3) $T_n(R)$ *is right strongly* FI-*extending for some positive integer* $n > 1$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Assume that R is right strongly FI-extending. We proceed by induction.

Step 1. Assume $n = 2$. Then $T_2(R) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & R \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Take $M = R$, then ${}_RM$ is faithful. Let ${}_RN_R \leq {}_RM_R$. Since R_R is strongly FI-extending, $e = e^2 \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ exists such that $N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eM_R$. Now note that $(N_R : M_R) = N_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eR_R = eM_R$. So we have that $\mathcal{D}_R(N_R)\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R) = eReR = ReR = M\mathcal{D}((N_R : M_R)_R)$. Therefore $T_2(R)$ is a right strongly FI-extending ring by Corollary 2.5.

Step 2. Assume that $T_n(R)$ is right strongly FI-extending. Then we need to show that $T_{n+1}(R)$ is right strongly FI-extending. Note that $T_{n+1}(R) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} R & M \\ 0 & T_n(R) \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, where $M = (R, R, \dots, R)$ (n-tuple). Let ${}_RN_{T_n(R)} \leq {}_RM_{T_n(R)}$ with $N = (N_1, N_2, \dots, N_n)$. Then $N_i \trianglelefteq R$ for each i and $N_1 \subseteq N_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq N_n$. Since R_R is strongly FI-extending, $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ exists such that $N_{nR} \leq^{\text{ess}} eR_R$. It can be easily checked that $N = (N_1, N_2, \dots, N_n)_{T_n(R)} \leq^{\text{ess}} e(R, R, \dots, R)_{T_n(R)} = eM$.

Note that

$$(N_{T_n(R)} : M_{T_n(R)}) = \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & N_2 & \cdots & N_n \\ 0 & N_2 & \cdots & N_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & N_n \end{pmatrix}_{T_n(R)} \leq^{\text{ess}} (eI_n)T_n(R)_{T_n(R)}$$

where I_n is the identity matrix in $T_n(R)$. Hence $\mathcal{D}_R(N_{T_n(R)})\mathcal{D}((N_{T_n(R)} : M_{T_n(R)})_{T_n(R)}) = e(R, R, \dots, R)(eI_n)T_n(R)$ and so we have that $M\mathcal{D}((N_{T_n(R)} : M_{T_n(R)})_{T_n(R)}) = M(eI_n)T_n(R) = eM(eI_n)T_n(R) = \mathcal{D}_R(N_{T_n(R)})\mathcal{D}((N_{T_n(R)} : M_{T_n(R)})_{T_n(R)})$ because $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$.

Next, by the induction hypothesis, $T_n(R)$ is a right strongly FI-extending ring. Therefore, from Corollary 2.5, $T_{n+1}(R)$ is a right strongly FI-extending ring.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is obvious. (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is a consequence of Theorem 2.4. $\square$

Corollary 2.9 [**4**, Corollary 2.5]. *A ring R is right* FI-*extending if and only if $T_n(R)$ is right* FI-*extending for every positive integer n if and only if $T_n(R)$ is right* FI-*extending for some positive integer $n > 1$.*

Proof. The proof follows by using Theorem 1.4 and an argument similar to that used in the proof of Theorem 2.8.

3. Quasi-Baer rings. As indicated in the introduction, for rings, the FI-extending property and the quasi-Baer property are closely linked. In fact, for semi-prime rings, R_R is FI-extending if and only if R_R is strongly FI-extending if and only if R is quasi-Baer [**4**, Theorem 4.7]. In this section we characterize the quasi-Baer property for 2-by-2 generalized triangular matrix rings.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$. *Then*

$$r_T\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} r_S(I) & r_M(I) \\ 0 & r_R(L) \cap \mathrm{Ann}_R(N) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Clearly $\begin{pmatrix} r_S(I) & r_M(I) \\ 0 & r_R(L)\cap \mathrm{Ann}_R(N) \end{pmatrix} \subseteq r_T\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix}\right)$. Let $\begin{pmatrix} s & m \\ 0 & r \end{pmatrix} \in r_T\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix}\right)$. Then $Is = 0$, $Lr = 0$ and $Im + Nr = 0$. Hence $s \in r_S(I)$, $r \in r_R(L) \cap \mathrm{Ann}_R(N)$ and $m \in r_M(I)$. So $r_T\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} r_S(I) & r_M(I) \\ 0 & r_R(L)\cap \mathrm{Ann}_R(N) \end{pmatrix}$. $\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Let* $T = \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$. *Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) T *is quasi-Baer.*

(2) (i) R *and* S *are quasi-Baer*;

(ii) $r_M(I) = (r_S(I))M$ *for all* $I \trianglelefteq S$; *and*

(iii) *if* N *is any* ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$, *then* $\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) = aR$ *for some* $a = a^2 \in R$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). By [**13**, p. 128], R and S are quasi-Baer. Let $I \trianglelefteq S$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} I & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$. Hence $r_T\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = eT$, where $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$. Let $e = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & k \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix}$, so $eT = \begin{pmatrix} e_1S & e_1M+kR \\ 0 & e_2R \end{pmatrix}$. By Lemma

2.3, $kR = e_1kR$. Thus $e_1M = e_1M + kR$. By Lemma 3.1, $e_1S = r_S(I)$ and $r_M(I) = e_1M = e_1SM = (r_S(I))M$.

Now let ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$. So $r_T\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & N \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = cT$ where $c \in \mathcal{S}_l(T)$. Let $c = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & h \\ 0 & c_2 \end{pmatrix}$. By Lemma 3.1, $\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) = r_R(0) \cap \mathrm{Ann}_R(N) = c_2R$. Therefore, conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) are satisfied.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let $\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq T$. Since $I \trianglelefteq S$, $L \trianglelefteq R$ and ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$, $e_1 \in \mathcal{S}_l(S)$, $f \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ and $a = a^2 \in R$ exist such that $r_S(I) = e_1S$, $r_R(L) = fR$ and $\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) = aR$. Observe that, since $\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) \trianglelefteq R$, then $a \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$. Let $e_2 = af$. Then $af \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ and $afR = r_R(L) \cap \mathrm{Ann}_R(N)$. Let $e = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $eT = \begin{pmatrix} e_1S & e_1M \\ 0 & e_2R \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} r_S(I) & r_M(I) \\ 0 & r_R(L)\cap\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) \end{pmatrix}$. From Lemma 3.1, $eT = r_T\left(\begin{pmatrix} I & N \\ 0 & L \end{pmatrix}\right)$. Therefore T is a quasi-Baer ring. $\square$

Theorem 3.2 easily yields that if $R = S$ and $M \trianglelefteq R$, then T is quasi-Baer if and only if R is quasi-Baer. Observe that [**4**, Example 4.11] provides a 2-by-2 generalized triangular matrix ring T which is quasi-Baer, left and right nonsingular, but neither right nor left FI-extending.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $S = \mathbf{Z}$. Then T is quasi-Baer if and only if*

(i) *R is quasi-Baer*;

(ii) *${}_{\mathbf{Z}}M$ is torsion-free; and*

(iii) *if $N_R \leq M_R$, then $\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) = aR$ for some $a = a^2 \in R$.*

One can construct examples illustrating Corollary 3.3 by taking R to be a direct sum of simple rings and M any R-module whose additive group is torsion-free.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $S = \mathrm{End}\,(M_R)$. Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) *T is quasi-Baer.*

(2) (i) *R is quasi-Baer*;

(ii) $r_M(I)$ *is a direct summand of* M *for all* $I \trianglelefteq S$; *and*

(iii) *if* ${}_SN_R \leq {}_SM_R$, *then* $\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) = aR$ *for some* $a = a^2 \in R$.

Proof. The proof follows from Theorem 3.2 and a routine argument which shows that the condition "$r_M(I)$ is a direct summand of M" is equivalent to "S is quasi-Baer and condition (ii) of Theorem 3.2."

Corollary 3.5. *Let* M_R *be a nonsingular* FI-*extending module and* $S = \mathrm{End}\,(M_R)$. *Then the following are equivalent*:

(1) T *is quasi-Baer.*

(2) (i) R *is quasi-Baer*; *and*

(ii) *for* $N \trianglelefteq M$, $\mathrm{Ann}_R(N) = aR$ *for some* $a = a^2 \in R$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). This implication follows from Theorem 3.2.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). By [**5**, Proposition 4.8], S is quasi-Baer. Since M_R is FI-extending and $r_M(I) \trianglelefteq M$, $e = e^2 \in \mathrm{End}\,(M_R)$ exists such that $r_M(I)_R \leq^{\mathrm{ess}} eM_R$. Let $em \in eM$. There exists $L_R \leq^{\mathrm{ess}} R_R$ such that $IemL = 0$. Hence $Iem = 0$. Thus $r_M(I) = eM$. By Corollary 3.4, T is quasi-Baer. □

Examples illustrating Corollary 3.5 can be constructed by taking R to be a finite direct sum of simple rings and M any nonsingular FI-extending R-module, e.g., any fully invariant submodule of a projective R-module. For another illustration, take R to be a right primitive ring and M a faithful irreducible R-module. By Corollary 1.8, the above examples are at least right (and in some cases strongly) FI-extending.

4. Examples and constructions. In this section we provide some examples and constructions illustrating and delimiting our results in previous sections.

From [**4**, Theorem 4.7], if R is semi-prime and either quasi-Baer or FI-extending, then R is strongly FI-extending. By [**5**, Proposition 1.5], if R_R is nonsingular and FI-extending, then R_R is strongly FI-extending. Hence one may wonder if there are any right strongly FI-extending rings R that are neither semi-prime, quasi-Baer, nor right nonsingular.

Our first example provides a class of such rings.

Example 4.1. Let A be a commutative principal ideal domain which is not a field. Let p be a nonzero prime in A. For $n \geq 2$, let $R = T_2(A/p^nA)$. Then: (1) R is not semi-prime; (2) R is not right nonsingular; (3) R is not right extending; (4) R is not quasi-Baer; but (5) R_R is strongly FI-extending.

Clearly R is neither semi-prime nor right nonsingular. Consider the right ideal

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & p \end{pmatrix} R.$$

Assume R is right extending. Then $e = e^2 \in R$ exists such that $X_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eR_R$. But the only possible such e is the unity. So $X_R \leq^{\text{ess}} R_R$. But $X \cap \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) R = 0$, which is a contradiction. So R is not right extending. Since A/p^nA is commutative QF and not reduced, A/p^nA is strongly FI-extending but not quasi-Baer. By Theorems 2.8 and 3.2, the ring R is right strongly FI-extending.

By [**4**, Proposition 1.2], fully invariant submodules of an FI-extending module are FI-extending. However this does not hold for the case of strongly FI-extending modules as indicated in our next example.

Example 4.2. Let R be as in Example 4.1. Then R_R is strongly FI-extending, but R contains a nonzero ideal I such that I_R is not strongly FI-extending. Let

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A/p^nA \\ 0 & p^{n-1}A/p^nA \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $I \trianglelefteq R$. First we show that $\operatorname{End}(I_R) \cong \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A/p^nA & A/p^nA \\ p^{n-1}A/p^nA & A/p^nA \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Let $g \in \operatorname{End}(I_R)$. Then g is completely determined by $g\left[\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right]$ and $g\left[\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p^{n-1} \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right]$. Let $g\left[\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right] = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & a \\ 0 & p^{n-1}b \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ and $g\left[\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & p^{n-1} \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right] = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & p^{n-1}c \\ 0 & p^{n-1}d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then it can be checked that $g(\alpha) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ p^{n-1}b & d \end{smallmatrix}\right) \cdot \alpha$, for $\alpha \in I$. So $\operatorname{End}(I_R) \cong \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A/p^nA & A/p^nA \\ p^{n-1}A/p^nA & A/p^nA \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

Now let $J = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & p^{n-1}A/p^nA \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then $J \trianglelefteq R$ and $J \subseteq I$. It is easy to see that J is a fully invariant submodule of I_R. We show that I_R is not strongly FI-extending. Assume to the contrary that I_R is strongly FI-extending. Then, since J_R is a fully invariant submodule of I_R, a fully invariant R-direct summand K of I_R exists such that $J_R \leq^{\text{ess}} K_R$. Since K_R is a fully invariant submodule of I_R, K_R is a fully invariant submodule of R_R by [**4**, Proposition 1.2]. Hence $K \trianglelefteq R$. So candidates for K are of the form $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & C \\ 0 & D \end{smallmatrix}\right) I$ with $C \subseteq A/p^nA$, $D \subseteq p^{n-1}A/p^nA$ and $D \subseteq C$. Since $D \subseteq p^{n-1}A/p^nA$, we have the following two cases.

Case 1. $D = 0$. Then $K = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & p^kA/p^nA \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ where $0 \leq k \leq n$.

Case 2. $D = p^{n-1}A/p^nA$. Then $K = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & p^kA/p^nA \\ 0 & p^{n-1}A/p^nA \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, where $0 \leq k \leq n$. Since $J_R \leq^{\text{ess}} K_R$, Case 2 and the case when $K = 0$ cannot hold. Also note that $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & p^kA/p^nA \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, with $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, cannot be an R-direct summand of I_R. So the only possible candidate for K is $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & A/p^nA \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. But $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & A/p^nA \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is not a fully invariant submodule of I_R. In fact, take $g \in \text{End}\,(I_R)$ such that g is represented as right multiplication by $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & c \\ p^{n-1}b & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then $g\left[\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & A/p^nA \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right] = \left\{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & ax \\ 0 & p^{n-1}bx \end{smallmatrix}\right) \mid x \in A/p^nA\right\}$ which may not be contained in $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & A/p^nA \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ by choosing $b = 1$. Therefore the fully invariant submodule I_R of the strongly FI-extending module R_R is not a strongly FI-extending module.

As in Example 4.2 let $I = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & A/p^nA \\ 0 & p^{n-1}A/p^nA \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then it can be seen that $\text{End}\,({}_RI) \cong A/p^nA$, so every left R-module homomorphism of ${}_RI$ can be represented as a right multiplication by an element in A/p^nA. Thus all fully invariant submodules of ${}_RI$ are all ideals of R contained in I. Also it can be verified that all these nonzero ideals are essential submodules of ${}_RI$. Thus ${}_RI$ is strongly FI-extending.

We also can apply our characterizations of strongly FI-extending generalized matrix rings to construct a right strongly FI-extending ring which is not left FI-extending, thereby showing that the strongly FI-extending property is not left-right symmetric.

Example 4.3. Assume that R is a right strongly FI-extending ring, e.g., a prime ring. Let $M = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & R \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Then M can be considered as a left R-right $T_2(R)$-bimodule. Now we show that the generalized triangular matrix ring

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} R & M \\ 0 & T_2(R) \end{pmatrix}$$

is right strongly FI-extending, but it is not left FI-extending (hence not left strongly FI-extending). Note that ${}_RM$ is faithful. For any ${}_RN_{T_2(R)} \leq {}_RM_{T_2(R)}$, an ideal I of R exists such that $N = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Since R_R is strongly FI-extending, there is $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$ such that $I_R \leq^{\text{ess}} eR_R$. Therefore, we have that $N = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)_{T_2(R)} \leq^{\text{ess}} e\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & R \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)_{T_2(R)}$. Since R is right strongly FI-extending, $T_2(R)$ is also right strongly FI-extending by Theorem 2.8.

Now $\mathcal{D}_R(N_{T_2(R)}) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & eR \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) = e\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & R \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) = eM$. Also $(N_{T_2(R)} : M_{T_2(R)}) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & I \end{smallmatrix}\right)_{T_2(R)} \leq^{\text{ess}} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & eR \end{smallmatrix}\right)_{T_2(R)}$. Observe that $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & eR \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e \end{smallmatrix}\right) T_2(R)$ and $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathcal{S}_l(T_2(R))$. So $\mathcal{D}((N_{T_2(R)} : M_{T_2(R)})_{T_2(R)}) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & eR \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Therefore we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_R(N_{T_2(R)})\mathcal{D}((N_{T_2(R)} : M_{T_2(R)})_{T_2(R)}) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & eR \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & eR \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & eReR \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$M\mathcal{D}((N_{T_2(R)} : M_{T_2(R)})_{T_2(R)}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & R \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & eR \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ReR \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $e \in \mathcal{S}_l(R)$, $ReR = eReR$ and so it follows that

$$\mathcal{D}_R(N_{T_2(R)})\mathcal{D}((N_{T_2(R)} : M_{T_2(R)})_{T_2(R)}) = M\mathcal{D}((N_{T_2(R)} : M_{T_2(R)})_{T_2(R)}).$$

Therefore, T_T is strongly FI-extending by Corollary 2.5. But note that $\text{Ann}_{T_2(R)}(M)$ is not generated, as a left ideal, by a right semicentral idempotent in $T_2(R)$. Thus ${}_TT$ is not FI-extending.

Since the quasi-Baer condition is left-right symmetric and is related to the strongly FI-extending condition, one may conjecture that a quasi-Baer right strongly FI-extending ring is left FI-extending. In Example 4.3, by taking R to be a prime ring and using Theorem 3.2, it can be seen that T is quasi-Baer and right strongly FI-extending but not left FI-extending.

In the following example, which appears in [**7**], there is a right self-injective and right strongly bounded, i.e., every nonzero right ideal contains a nonzero ideal, ring which is not strongly FI-extending on either side, and is not quasi-Baer.

Example 4.4 [**7**, Example 5.2]. Let $R = \begin{pmatrix} D & S \\ 0 & Q \end{pmatrix}$, where Q is a non-semisimple commutative injective regular ring, M is a maximal essential ideal of $Q, S = Q/M$ and $D = \mathrm{End}\,(S_Q)$. Then R is right self-injective, right strongly bounded, $Z(R_R) \neq 0$ but $Z({}_RR) = 0$. Take $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix} \trianglelefteq R$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix}_R \leq^{\text{ess}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Q \end{pmatrix}_R$ but $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Q \end{pmatrix}$ is not an ideal of R. So R_R is not strongly FI-extending.

On the other hand, $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix}$ is not essential as a left R-submodule of R. Also it is not essential as a left R-submodule of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & S \\ 0 & Q \end{pmatrix}$. Thus R is not left strongly FI-extending. From Corollary 3.4, R is not quasi-Baer.

Acknowledgments. The authors wish to express their gratitude to the referee for his/her helpful suggestions and comments for the improvement of the paper. The first author appreciates the gracious hospitality at Busan National University and at Ohio State University at Lima. The second author is grateful for the kind hospitality he received at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. Also the second author was partially supported from the Korea Research Foundation with Research Grant Project No. DP0004 in 2000–2001. The third author is thankful for the kind hospitality he received at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and for the partial support he received from OSU-Lima Research grant No. 7569.

REFERENCES

1. G.F. Birkenmeier, G. Călugăreanu, L. Fuchs and H.P. Goeters, *The fully-invariant-extending property for abelian groups*, Comm. Algebra **29** (2001), 673–685.

2. G.F. Birkenmeier, H.E. Heatherly, J.Y. Kim and J.K. Park, *Triangular matrix representations*, J. Algebra **230** (2000), 558–595.

3. G.F. Birkenmeier, J.Y. Kim and J.K. Park, *Semicentral reduced algebras*, *International Symposium on Ring Theory* (G.F. Birkenmeier, J.K. Park and Y.S. Park, eds.), Birkhäuser, Boston, 2001, pp. 67–84.

4. G.F. Birkenmeier, B.J. Müller and S.T. Rizvi, *Modules in which every fully invariant submodule is essential in a direct summand*, Comm. Algebra, **30** (2002), 1395–1415.

5. G.F. Birkenmeier, J.K. Park and S.T. Rizvi, *Modules with fully invariant submodules essential in fully invariant summands*, Comm. Algebra, **30** (2002), 1833–1852.

6. A.W. Chatters and S.M. Khuri, *Endomorphism rings of modules over non-singular CS rings*, J. London Math. Soc. **21** (1980), 434–444.

7. C. Faith and S. Page, *FPF ring theory*: *Faithful modules and generators of Mod-R*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series **88**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1984.

8. A. Haghany and K. Varadarajan, *Study of formal triangular matrix rings*, Comm. Algebra **27** (1999), 5507–5525.

9. ———, *Study of modules over a formal triangular matrix rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **147** (2000), 41–58.

10. I.N. Herstein, *A counterexample in Noetherian rings*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **54** (1965), 1036–1037.

11. T.Y. Lam, *Lectures on modules and rings*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

12. A. Pollingher and A. Zaks, *On Baer and quasi-Baer rings*, Duke Math. J. **37** (1970), 127–138.

13. A. Tercan, *On certain CS-rings*, Comm. Algebra **23** (1995), 405–419.

Department of Mathematics, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, Louisiana 70504-1010, USA
E-mail address: `gfb1127@louisiana.edu`

Department of Mathematics, Busan National University, Busan 609-735, South Korea
E-mail address: `jkpark@hyowon.cc.pusan.ac.kr`

Department of Mathematics, Ohio State University at Lima, Lima, Ohio 45804-3576, USA
E-mail address: `rizvi.1@osu.edu`