

## DIRECT SUM OF $\tau$ -INJECTIVE MODULES

By

Kanzo MASAIKE and Takanori HORIGOME

Throughout this paper  $R$  is a ring with identity and every  $R$ -module is unital. Let  $\tau$  be a hereditary torsion theory with respect to  $R$  (see Golan [3]). A submodule  $N$  of a right  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be  $\tau$ -dense in  $M$ , if  $M/N$  is a  $\tau$ -torsion module. We shall denote the set of all  $\tau$ -dense right ideals of  $R$  by  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ . A right  $R$ -module  $M$  is called  $\tau$ -injective, if for every right  $R$ -module  $L$  and its  $\tau$ -dense submodule  $N$  every  $R$ -homomorphism  $N \rightarrow M$  is extended to  $L \rightarrow M$ . Let us denote by  $E(L)$  the injective hull of the right  $R$ -module  $L$ . Then,  $E_\tau(L) = \{x \in E(L) \mid \text{there exists } I \in \mathcal{L}_\tau \text{ such that } xI \subset L\}$  is said to be  $\tau$ -injective hull of  $L$ . If  $N$  is a submodule of  $L$ ,  $E_\tau(N)$  is contained in  $E_\tau(L)$ .

By a result of Matlis [5] and Papp,  $R$  is right Noetherian, if and only if every injective right  $R$ -module is a direct sum of (injective) indecomposable submodules. It is to be noted that this result was generalized to injective  $\tau$ -torsion free right  $R$ -modules by Teply [7]. Let  $\tau_G$  be the Goldie torsion theory with respect to  $R$ . Clearly, injective indecomposable right  $R$ -modules coincide with those modules each of which is a  $\tau_G$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule. Furthermore, if  $R$  is right Noetherian, the ring of quotient of  $R$  with respect to  $\tau_G$  is semi-simple Artinian (cf. Kutami and Oshiro [4]) and hence  $\tau_G$  is a perfect torsion theory (see [3], [6]). Now, concerning the above result of Matlis and Papp we shall study in this paper a right  $R$ -module  $M$  such that  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ , where each  $M_i$  is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule. In the following such a module  $M$  will be said to be  $\tau$ -completely decomposable.

Now, at first we shall prove the next

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $\tau$  be a hereditary torsion theory with respect to  $R$ . Then,  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  satisfies the ascending chain condition, if and only if, every  $\tau$ -injective  $\tau$ -torsion  $R$ -module is  $\tau$ -completely decomposable.*

A ring  $R$  is called right semi-Artinian, if every non-zero right  $R$ -module has a non-zero socle. Then, we shall prove the following

---

Received June 25, 1979. Revised October 10, 1979.

The authors wish to express their gratitude to the referee for his helpful advice.

THEOREM 2. *The following are equivalent, if  $\tau$  is a perfect torsion theory.*

(i)  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  satisfies the ascending chain condition and the ring of quotient  $R_\tau$  of  $R$  with respect to  $\tau$  is right semi-Artinian.

(ii) Every  $\tau$ -injective right  $R$ -module is an essential extension of a  $\tau$ -injective  $\tau$ -completely decomposable  $R$ -module.

Let  $\tau_G$  be a Goldie torsion theory. Then every  $\tau_G$ -torsion free direct summand of a  $\tau_G$ -completely decomposable module is quasi-injective (see [4]). In Theorem 3, we shall see that this result remains true, even if  $\tau$  is an arbitrary hereditary torsion theory.

LEMMA 1. *Let  $M$  be a right  $R$ -module such that  $M$  is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule. Then  $\text{End}(M_R)$  is a local ring.*

PROOF. Let  $f \in \text{End}(M_R)$  be a non-zero element. Since  $M$  is uniform and  $\text{Ker } f \cap \text{Ker } (1-f) = 0$ ,  $f$  or  $1-f$  is a monomorphism and hence a unit.

LEMMA 2. *Let  $M$  be a submodule of a right  $R$ -module  $K$  such that  $M = \bigoplus_{a \in A} M_a$  and  $K = \bigoplus_{b \in B} K_b$ , which are  $\tau$ -complete decompositions. If the cardinal number  $|A|$  is at most countable, there exists a subset  $C$  of  $B$  such that  $M \cong \bigoplus_{c \in C} K_c$ .*

PROOF. Let  $a \in A$ . Put  $A_a = \{d \in A \mid M_d \cong M_a\}$  and  $B_a = \{b \in B \mid K_b \cong M_a\}$ . It suffices to show  $|A_a| \leq |B_a|$ . Let  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n$  be distinct elements of  $A_a$ . Assume  $x_i$  be a non-zero element of  $M_{d_i}$ ,  $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ . Then,  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{d_i} = E_\tau(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n x_i R)$ , which is contained in a direct sum of finite number of  $K_b$ ,  $b \in B$ . Let  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_t$  be elements of  $B$  such that there exists a monomorphism  $f: \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{d_i} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j=1}^t K_{b_j}$  and for every  $p$  ( $p=1, 2, \dots, t$ ) there is no monomorphism from  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{d_i}$  to  $K_b \oplus K_{b_2} \oplus \dots \oplus K_{b_{p-1}} \oplus K_{b_{p+1}} \oplus \dots \oplus K_{b_t}$ . Let  $\pi_{b_p}$  be the projection  $K \rightarrow K_{b_p}$ . Then, for every  $p$  ( $p=1, \dots, t$ ) we can pick up  $y_p \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{d_i}$  so that  $\pi_{b_p} f(y_p) \neq 0$  and  $\pi_{b_s} f(y_p) = 0$ ,  $s \neq p$ . Put  $N = y_1 R \oplus \dots \oplus y_t R$ . Since  $f(N) = f(y_1) R \oplus \dots \oplus f(y_t) R \subset K_{b_1} \oplus \dots \oplus K_{b_t}$ , we have  $E_\tau(\bigoplus_{i=1}^t f(y_i) R) = K_{b_1} \oplus \dots \oplus K_{b_t}$ . Therefore,  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_{d_i} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^t K_{b_j}$ . Then, by Lemma 1 and a theorem of Azumaya [1] every  $K_{b_j}$  is isomorphic to  $M_a$ . Since  $t=n$ , the consequence is immediate when  $|A|$  is finite. Assume  $A_a$  is infinite. Then, the above argument implies  $B_a$  is an infinite set. Hence  $|A_a| \leq |B_a|$ .

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.

Assume  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  satisfies the ascending chain condition. Let  $M$  be a  $\tau$ -injective

$\tau$ -torsion  $R$ -module. If  $0 \neq x \in M$ , then  $xR \cong R/I$  for some  $I \in \mathcal{L}_\tau$ . Therefore,  $R/I$  is a Noetherian right  $R$ -module and hence contains a uniform submodule  $U$ . Since  $E_\tau(U)$  is contained in  $M$ ,  $M$  has a  $\tau$ -injective submodule which is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule. Let  $\{M_j\}_{j \in J}$  be a maximal independent set of submodules of  $M$  such that each  $M_j$  is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule, where  $J$  is an index set. Let  $y \in M$  be a non-zero element. As is shown above  $E_\tau(yR)$  contains a submodule which is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule and hence  $\bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j \cap yR \neq 0$ . It follows  $\bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$  is an essential submodule of  $M$ . On the other hand, since  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  satisfies the ascending chain condition, by [3, p. 128, Proposition 14.2]  $\bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$  is  $\tau$ -injective. Since  $M$  is a  $\tau$ -injective  $\tau$ -torsion module,  $\bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$  is a direct summand of  $M$ . Thus we have  $M = \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$ .

Conversely, assume every  $\tau$ -injective  $\tau$ -torsion  $R$ -module is  $\tau$ -completely decomposable. Let  $\{P_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a class of (non-isomorphic) representatives of all  $\tau$ -injective  $\tau$ -torsion uniform  $R$ -modules. Then, each  $P_i$  is the  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule. Let us denote  $P_i^{(N)}$  the direct sum of countably copies of  $P_i$ . Since  $E_\tau(\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i^{(N)})$  is a  $\tau$ -torsion module, it has a  $\tau$ -complete decomposition such that  $E_\tau(\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i^{(N)}) = \bigoplus_{j \in J} Q_j$ , where  $J$  is an index set. From Lemma 2  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i^{(N)}$  is isomorphic to a direct summand of  $\bigoplus_{j \in J} Q_j$ . Hence we have  $(\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i)^{(N)}$  is  $\tau$ -injective. Let  $K_1 \subset K_2 \subset K_3 \subset \dots$  be a strictly ascending chain of right ideals in  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ . Then,  $R/K_j$  ( $j=1, 2, \dots$ ) is a submodule of a  $\tau$ -torsion  $\tau$ -completely decomposable  $R$ -module  $E_\tau(R/K_j)$ . It follows  $K_j$  is an annihilator right ideal of a subset of  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$ . Therefore, we can choose  $a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots \in \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$  such that  $a_j K_j = 0$  and  $a_j K_{j+1} \neq 0$  ( $j=1, 2, 3, \dots$ ). Put  $K = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty K_j$ . Clearly, the map  $f: K \rightarrow (\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i)^{(N)}$  by  $f(x) = (a_1 x, a_2 x, \dots)$ ,  $x \in K$ , is an  $R$ -homomorphism. Since  $K \in \mathcal{L}_\tau$ ,  $f$  is extended to  $R \rightarrow (\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i)^{(N)}$ . However this is a contradiction, since for every integer  $n > 0$  there exists  $x \in K$  such that  $a_n x \neq 0$ . This completes the proof.

In the following let us denote  $T_\tau(M)$  the  $\tau$ -torsion submodule of  $M$ .

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Let  $M$  be a  $\tau$ -injective  $R$ -module. Since  $E_\tau(T_\tau(M))$  is contained in  $M$ , it is equal to  $T_\tau(M)$ . Then,  $T_\tau(M)$  is  $\tau$ -completely decomposable by Theorem 1. We may assume  $T_\tau(M)$  is not an essential submodule of  $M$ . Let  $N$  be a closed submodule of  $M$  such that  $N \cap T_\tau(M) = 0$  and  $N \oplus T_\tau(M)$  is essential in  $M$ . Since  $N$  has no essential extension in  $M$ ,  $N$  is  $\tau$ -injective. Then,  $N$  becomes a

right  $R_\tau$ -module, which has an essential socle  $S = \bigoplus_{h \in H} S_h$ , where  $S_h$  is a simple right  $R_\tau$ -module. Let  $L$  be a non-zero  $R$ -submodule of  $S_h$ . Then,  $S_h = LR_\tau$  and hence  $L$  is a  $\tau$ -dense submodule of  $S_h$ . On the other hand, since  $\tau$  is a perfect torsion theory,  $S$  is  $\tau$ -injective  $\tau$ -completely decomposable and so is  $S \oplus T_\tau(M)$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). Let  $N$  be a  $\tau$ -injective  $\tau$ -torsion  $R$ -module. Since every  $\tau$ -injective submodule of  $N$  is a direct summand,  $N$  is  $\tau$ -completely decomposable and  $\mathcal{L}_\tau$  satisfies the ascending chain condition. Let  $K$  be a right  $R_\tau$ -module. Since  $K$  is a  $\tau$ -injective  $R$ -module it contains an essential  $\tau$ -completely decomposable  $R$ -submodule. In view of [3, p. 186 Corollary] we have that this submodule is a socle of the right  $R_\tau$ -module  $K$ . Hence  $R_\tau$  is right semi-Artinian.

REMARK. Assume  $\tau_G$  is the Goldie torsion theory. Put  $\mathcal{C}_{\tau_G} = \{\text{right ideal } I \text{ of } R \mid R/I \text{ is } \tau_G\text{-torsion free}\}$ . If  $\mathcal{C}_{\tau_G}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_G}$  satisfy the ascending chain condition, then every injective right  $R$ -module is a direct sum of indecomposable submodules in view of Theorem 1 and [7, Theorem 1.2] and hence  $R$  is right Noetherian. When  $R$  is right non-singular, this is a case of Yamagata [9, Theorem 9].

LEMMA 3. *Let  $M$  be a  $\tau$ -torsion free right  $R$ -module. Assume  $M = \sum_{i \in I} M_i$ , where  $M_i$  is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule. Then, there exists a subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $M = \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$ .*

PROOF. Let  $\{M_j\}_{j \in J}$  be a maximal independent subset of the class  $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ . For every  $i \in I$   $M_i \cap \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$  contains a non-zero element  $x$ , say. Therefore, there exists a finite subset  $\{j_1, \dots, j_n\}$  of  $J$  so that  $E_\tau(xR)$  is contained in  $\bigoplus_{k=1}^n M_{j_k}$ . Let  $0 \neq y \in E_\tau(xR) + M_i$ . Put  $y = y_1 + y_2$ ,  $y_1 \in E_\tau(xR)$ ,  $y_2 \in M_i$ . Then, there exist  $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{L}_\tau$  such that  $y_1 L_1 \subset xR$  and  $y_2 L_2 \subset xR$ . So  $0 \neq y(L_1 \cap L_2) \subset xR$ . This implies  $xR$  is (an essential)  $\tau$ -dense submodule of  $E_\tau(xR) + M_i$ . Since  $M_i$  is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of  $xR$ , too, we have  $E_\tau(E_\tau(xR) + M_i) = E_\tau(xR) = M_i$ . Hence  $M_i$  is a submodule of  $\bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$ .

THEOREM 3. *Let  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$  be a  $\tau$ -complete decomposition. If  $N$  is a  $\tau$ -torsion free direct summand of  $M$ , then  $N$  is quasi-injective.*

PROOF. Let  $0 \neq x \in N$ .  $E_\tau(xR)$  is contained in a sum of finite number of  $M_i$ ,  $i \in I$ . Let  $\pi : M \rightarrow N$  be the projection. Then, the restriction  $\pi|E_\tau(xR)$  is a monomorphism. This implies we may assume  $E_\tau(xR)$  is contained in  $N$ . Now,  $E_\tau(xR)$  is isomorphic to a direct sum of finite number of  $M_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , by the same method as in the proof of Lemma 2. Therefore,  $N = \sum_{x \in N} E_\tau(xR)$  is  $\tau$ -completely decom-

posable by Lemma 3. Let  $N = \bigoplus_{h \in H} N_h$  be the  $\tau$ -complete decomposition and  $E(N)$  the injective hull of  $N$ . To see that  $N$  is quasi-injective, it suffices to show  $f(N) \subset N$  for every  $f \in \text{End}(E(N)_R)$ . Let  $f_h$  be the restriction  $f|_{N_h}$ . Suppose  $f_h \neq 0$ . Then  $f_h$  is monic (cf. [3, Proposition 18.2]) and hence  $\text{Im } f_h$  is a  $\tau$ -injective hull of its every non-zero submodule. Since  $\bigoplus_{h \in H} N_h$  is an essential submodule of a  $\tau$ -torsion free module  $E(N)$ , it is easy to check that  $\text{Im } f_h \subset \bigoplus_{h \in H} N_h$  from the proof of Lemma 3. This proves the Theorem.

REMARK. In [2] it is proved that if  $M$  is an injective right  $R$ -module which is a direct sum of indecomposable modules, then so is its direct summand. Now, let  $M$  be a right  $R$ -module such that  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ , where every proper factor module of each  $M_i$  is  $\tau$ -torsion. Assume  $N$  is a  $\tau$ -injective direct summand of  $M$ . Then by the same method as in [8, Lemma 2], it is not hard to see that there is a submodule  $N'$  of  $M$  such that  $M = N \oplus N'$  and  $N' = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i'$ , where  $M_i' \subset M_i$  ( $i \in I$ ). Especially, when  $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$  is a  $\tau$ -complete decomposition, there exists a subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $N' = \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$ . Hence  $N$  has a  $\tau$ -complete decomposition, too.

### References

- [1] Azumaya, G., Corrections and supplements to my paper concerning Krull-Remak-Schmidt's theorem. Nagoya Math. J., 1 (1950) 117-124.
- [2] Faith, C. and Walker, E.A., Direct sum representations of injective modules. J. Algebra 5 (1967) 203-221.
- [3] Golan, J.S., Localization of Non-commutative Rings. Marcel Dekker, New York (1975).
- [4] Kutami, M. and Oshiro, K., Direct sums of non-singular indecomposable injective modules. Math. J. Okayama Univ. 20 (1978) 91-99.
- [5] Matlis, E., Injective modules over Noetherian rings. Pac. J. Math. 8 (1958) 514-528.
- [6] Stenström, B., Rings of Quotients. Grundlehren Math. Wiss. Vol 217, Springer-Verlag Berlin-Heiderberg-New York.
- [7] Teply, M., Torsion free injective modules. Pac. J. Math. 28 (1969) 441-453.
- [8] Warfield Jr, R.B., Decompositions of injective modules. Pac. J. Math. 31 (1969) 263-276.
- [9] Yamagata, K., Non-singular rings and Matlis' problem. Sci. Rep. Tokyo Kyoiku Daigaku A 11 (1971) 114-121.

Department of Mathematics  
Tokyo Gakugei University