A Note on Generalizations of PCI-rings

By Si-Joo Kim

1. Introduction

In $\{1\}$, rings whose cyclic left R-modules not isomorphic to ${}_RR$ are injective (called left PCI-rings) are considered. A left R-module M is called CF-injective if for any finitely generated left R-module F, any cyclic left submodule C of F, every left R-homomorphism of C into M extends to one of F into M. A left R-module M is called MP-injective if for any principal left ideal P of R, any left R-monomorphism of P into M extends to a left R-homomorphism of R into M. In $\{7\}$, CF-injectivity and MP-injectivity, generalizations of injectivity are introduced and connections between injectivity, CF-injectivity, MP-injectivity and N-Neumann regularity are found.

In this note, we introduce PCM-ring and PCF-ring, generalizations of PCI-ring and prove that if R is left self-injective and every singular left R-module is injective, then a left PCM-ring R is left V-ring. If R is a directly finite left PCF-ring, then either R is a regular ring or a left semihereditary simple domain. Furthermore, a ring R is finitely embedded left PCF-ring iff R is a semisimple.

Throughout this note, R means an associative ring with identity and every left R-module is unitary. If a left R-module M is essential extension of a left R-module N, we write $N \leq {}_{e}M$ to denote this situation.

2. PCM-rings and PCF-rings

We introduce the following generalizations of PCI-rings.

Definition (1) If every cyclic left R-module C not isomorphic to $_RR$ is MP-injective, then R is called a left PCM-ring.

(2) A ring is a left PCF-ring if every cyclic left R-module not isomorphic to ${}_{R}R$ is CF-injective.

Let R be a left non-singular ring such that $_RR$ is not finite dimensional. Then injective hull E(R) of R is a regular ring but not semisimple ring. By (proposition 6.

11, 1], E(R) is not a left PCI-ring but it is a left PCM-ring by proposition 2. 2 below.

Lemma 2. 1. If a cyclic submodule C of a finitely generated left R-module M is CF-injective, then C is a direct summand of M. Moreover, a principal MP-injective left ideal of R is direct summand of R.

Proof. Consider identity map $1_c: C \to C$. Since C is CF-injective, 1_c extends to a homomorphism $f: M \to C$ and $fi = 1_c$ where inclusion map $i: C \subset M$. Thus C is a direct summand of M. The latter part can be shown by similar method.

Corollary. If a cyclic submodule C of a finitely generated left R-module M is a direct summand of some CF-injective submodule of M, then C is a direct summand of M.

Proposition 2. 2. Every cyclic left R-module is MP-injective iff R is a (Von Neumann) regular ring.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that every left R-module is MP-injective by [7]. Let M be a left R-module. Consider a monomorphism $f: P \to M$ for any principal left ideal P of R. Since P is MP-injective, the identity map $1_P: P \to P$ extends to a homomorphism $g: R \to P$. Then $fg: R \to M$ is an extension of f.

Corollary. Every essential left ideal of R is MP-injective iff every principal left ideal of R is MP-injective iff R is a regular ring.

Proof. For any principal left ideal Rx of R for $x \in R$, there exists a left ideal L of R such that $Rx \oplus L \leq_{e} R$. Hence Rx is MP-injective and a direct summand of R by lemma 2.1.

Proposition 2. 3. A left PCM-ring R is left non-singular.

Proof. Consider a principal left ideal Rx of R. If Rx is not isomorphic to $_RR$, then Rx is MP-injective. By lemma 2.1, Rx is a direct summand of R. Consider an exact sequence

 $0 \rightarrow 1(x) \rightarrow R \rightarrow Rx \rightarrow 0$ where $l(x) = \{ r \in R \mid rx = 0 \}$.

Since Rx is projective for any $x \in R$, $R = l(x) \oplus J$ for some left ideal J of R. If $x \neq 0$, $l(x) \neq R$ and $J \neq 0$. Since $l(x) \cap J = 0$, $l(x) \nleq_e R$. Thus x is not contained in the left singular ideal of R.

Proposition 2. 4. Let R be a left self-injective ring and let every singular left R-module be injective. Then left PCM-ring R is a left V-ring.

Proof. Let M be a simple left R-module. If M is isomorphic to R, M is in-

jective left R-module. If M is not isomorphic to R, then M is MP-injective. Consider a non-zero homomorphism $f\colon L\to M$ for any essential left ideal L of R. Let B be a left ideal of R in L maximal with respect to the property $B\cap Ker(f)=0$. If $B\neq 0$, the restriction map $f|_{Rx}:Rx\to M$ is an isomorphism for some non-zero $x\in B$. Hence Rx is MP-injective. By lemma 2.1, Rx is a direct summand of R and hence injective. If B=0, $Ker(f)\leq_e L$. Since $_RR$ is non-singular by proposition 2.3, L is non-singular and L/Ker(f) is singular. Since M is isomorphic to L/Ker(f), M is injective. Thus every simple left R-module is injective and R is a left V-ring.

Proposition 2. 5. If R is a left PCF-ring containing a non-trivial central idempotent, then R is a regular ring.

Proof. If e is a non-trivial central idempotent in R, then neither Re nor R(1-e) is isomorphic to R. Thus $R=Re\oplus R(1-e)$ is CF-injective since a finite direct sum of CF-injective left R-modules is CF-injective. Thus every principal left ideal of R is CF-injective and hence a direct summand of R by lemma 2.1. Therefore R is a regular ring.

Proposition 2. 6. (1) If R is a left PCF-ring, then R is semi-prime.

- (2) If R is a left PCF-domain, then R is left semihereditary.
- Proof. (1) For any $a \neq 0 \in R$, if Ra is not isomorphic to $_RR$, Ra is CF-injective and hence a direct summand of R. Thus there exists a non-zero idempotent element $e \in R$ such that Ra = Re. Hence we have $(Ra)^2 \neq 0$. If there exists an isomorphism $f: Ra \rightarrow_R R$, we can find $c \in Ra$ such that f(c) = 1. Then l(c) = 0 and this implies $0 \neq Ra c \subset (Ra)^2$. This proves that R is semi-prime.
- (2) Let P be any non-zero projective left ideal of R and $a \in R$. If C = Ra + P is such that C/P is isomorphic to $_RR$, then there exists $x \neq 0 \in R$ such that $L(x) = \{ r \in R \mid ra \in P \}$. Since R is domain, this implies that $Ra \cap P = 0$ and hence $C = Ra \oplus P$. If Ra is not isomorphic to $_RR$, then Ra is a direct summand of projective $_RR$ and hence C is projective.
- If C/P is not isomorphic to ${}_RR$, then C/P is CF-injective. Lemma 2.1. shows that C/P is a direct summand of R/P. Let D be a left ideal of R containing P such that D/P is a relatively complement of C/P in R/P. Then R = C + D and $P = C \cap D$. Hence we have an exact sequence
- $0 \to P \to C \oplus D \to R \to 0$. Thus $C \oplus D$ is isomorphic to projective left R-module $P \oplus R$. Hence C is projective. Since any principal left ideal of R is projective, in-

duction on the number of generators of P shows that any finitely generated left ideal of R is projective.

Compliary. If R is a left PCF-ring with finitely generated non-zero left (right) socle, then R is a regular ring.

Proof. Since R is semi-prime by proposition 2.6, its left socle is equal to its right socle. Since the socle Soc(R) of R is two-sided ideal of R, Soc(R) is generated by a central idempotent element of R. If R = Soc(R), clearly R is regular. If $R \neq Soc(R)$, Soc(R) is generated by a non-trivial central idempotent element. By proposition 2.5 R is a regular ring.

Proposition 2.7. If R is a left PCF-ring, then R is a left V-ring.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that every simple left R-module is CF-injective by [7]. Let M be a simple left R-module. If M is not isomorphic to RR, then M is CF-injective. If M is isomorphic to RR, then simple R as a left R-module is a left self-injective. Hence M is CF-injective.

Recall that R is directly finite if xy=1 implies yx=1 for any $x, y \in R$. Then R is directly finite iff ${}_{R}R \oplus {}_{R}M$ is isomorphic to ${}_{R}R$ implies M=0.

Proposition 2.8. Let R be a directly finite left PCF-ring. Then R is either a regular ring or a left semihereditary simple domain.

Proof. If R is a domain, R is left semihereditary and V-domain by proposition 2.7. Also R is simple. Suppose that R is not a domain. Then there exists a non-zero element $x \in R$ such that $l(x) \neq 0$. It is easy to show that Rx is projective. Thus l(x) = Re for some non-trivial idempotent $e \in R$. Since R is directly finite, Re and R(1-e) must be CF-injective. Hence $R = Re \oplus R(1-e)$ is CF-injective. Therefore every principal left ideal of R is a direct summand of R which implies that R is regular.

3. Finitely embedded modules

A left R-module M is essentially finitely generated if M has a finitely generated essential submodule. In particular, when Soc(M) of a left R-module M is a finitely generated essential submodule of M, M is called a finitely embedded module.

Proposition 3.1. If B is a closed submodule of a finitely embedded left R-module M, then M/B is finitely embedded.

Proof. Let B be a closed submodule of finitely embedded left R-module. Since $Soc(M) \leq_e M$, $B + Soc(M) \leq_e M$ and $(B + Soc(M)) / B \leq_e M / B$. Let $p: M \rightarrow M / B$ be the projection. Since $p(Soc(M)) \subset Soc(M/B)$, Soc(M/B) = (B + Soc(M)) / B and (B + Soc(M)) / B is finitely generated. Hence M/B is finitely embedded.

Corollary. Let C be a cyclic CF-injective submodule of a finitely generated, finitely embedded left R-module M. Then M/C is finitely embedded.

Proposition 3. 2. If a left R-module M is essentially finitely generated and every finitely generated submodule of M is finitely embedded, then M is finitely embedded.

Proof. Since M is essentially finitely generated, there exists a finitely generated submodule N of M such that $N \leq_e M$. Thus N is finitely embedded, i.e., Soc(N) is finitely generated and $Soc(M) = Soc(N) \leq_e N \leq_e M$. Hence M is finitely embedded.

Lemma 3.3. A proper essential submodule of a left R-module M is finitely embedded iff M is finitely embedded.

Proof. M is finitely embedded iff Soc(M) is finitely generated and $Soc(M) \leq_e M$. Let S be a proper finitely embedded essential submodule of M. Then $Soc(S) \leq_e S \leq_e M$ and Soc(S) = Soc(M) is finitely generated.

Proposition 3.4. A ring R is finitely embedded left PCF-ring iff R is semisimple.

Proof. Let L be an essential left ideal of R. Since R is finitely embedded, $Soc(L) = Soc(R) \leq_e L \leq_e R$ and Soc(L) is finitely generated. Since R is a regular ring by corollary of proposition 2.6, Soc(L) is a direct summand of R. Hence Soc(L) = R. Therefore, R is semisimple. Since R is semisimple iff every cyclic left R-module is injective, the converse part is trivial.

References

- 1. Cozzens & Faith, Simple neotherian rings, Cambridge Univ. Press, (1975).
- 2. J. Lambek, Lectures on rings and modules, Chelsea Pub. Co., (1976).
- 3. K. R. Goodearl, Ring theory, Marcel Dekker, Inc., (1976).
- 4. R. P. Kurshan, Rings whose cyclic modules have finitely generated socle, J. Algebra 15, (1970), 376-386.
- 5. G. O. Michler & O. E. Villamayor, On rings whose simples module are injective, J. Algebra 25, (1973), 185-201.
- 6. R. Yue Chi Ming, Von Neumann regularity and weak p-injectivity, Yokohama Math. J. Vol. 28, (1980), 59-68.
- 7. R. Yue Chi Ming, On Von Neumann regular rings, VIII, J. Korean Math. Soc. Vol. 19, No. 2, (1983), 97-104.

An-Dong National College