

A REMARK ON A PROJECTIVE COVER OF A MODULE

Y.S. PARK

In this short note, we point an error which appeared in pp.74-75 of Rotman's book, an introduction to homological algebra. He characterized there injective envelopes as follows: A monomorphism $i : M \rightarrow E$, where E is injective, is an injective envelope if and only if a monic dashed arrow always exists below

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow{i} & E \\
 & & \downarrow j & \swarrow \text{dotted} & \\
 & & D & &
 \end{array}$$

whenever j is an imbedding of M into an injective D .

Dualizing the notion of an injective envelope, he defined a *projective cover* of a module M iff it is an epimorphism $\varepsilon : P \rightarrow M$, where P is projective, so that an epic dashed arrow always exists below

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \uparrow & & \\
 P & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & \swarrow \text{dotted} & \uparrow \psi & & \\
 & & Q & &
 \end{array}$$

whenever ψ is an epimorphism from a projective Q .

He also characterized an epimorphism $\varepsilon : P \rightarrow M$, where P is projective, is a projective cover if and only if $\text{Ker } \varepsilon$ is superfluous. But, we recalled that a projective cover of a module M is an epimorphism $\varepsilon : P \rightarrow M$, where P is projective, such that $\text{Ker } \varepsilon$ is superfluous, in any standard books in theory of rings and modules.

In this short remark, we show that the above characterization of a projective cover is not always true in the following proposition.

PROPOSITION. *An epimorphism $\varepsilon : P \rightarrow M$, where P is projective, is a projective cover (in sense of Rotmann) if $\text{Ker } \varepsilon$ is superfluous. But its converse is not always true.*

Proof. Consider given a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & 0 & \\
 & & & \uparrow & \\
 & & \varepsilon & & \\
 P & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & \swarrow \phi & \uparrow \psi & & \\
 & & Q & &
 \end{array}$$

where ϕ is any epimorphism from a projective Q .

Since Q is projective, there exists an homomorphism ϕ such that $\varepsilon\phi = \psi$. Since $\text{Ker } \varepsilon + \text{Im } \phi = P$ and $\text{Ker } \varepsilon$ is superfluous, it follows that ϕ is epic. To see that its converse is not always true, let $\varepsilon : \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$ be the canonical epimorphism as \mathbf{Z} -modules. Then it is known that $\text{Ker } \varepsilon$ is not superfluous.

Consider given a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & 0 & \\
 & & & \uparrow & \\
 & & \varepsilon & & \\
 \mathbf{Z} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \uparrow \phi & & \\
 & & Q & &
 \end{array}$$

where Q is an \mathbf{Z} -projective and ϕ is any epimorphism from

Q to $\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$. Since Q is \mathbf{Z} -free, we may assume that $Q = \coprod \mathbf{Z}_\alpha$, where $\mathbf{Z}_\alpha = \mathbf{Z}$ for each α . Let $u_\alpha : \mathbf{Z}_\alpha \rightarrow \coprod \mathbf{Z}_\alpha$ be the α th injection. By assumption ϕ is an epimorphism, and so there exists α such that $\phi u_\alpha = \varepsilon$.

For each α define $\phi_\alpha : \mathbf{Z}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ as follows:

$$\phi_\alpha = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \phi u_\alpha = \varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{if } \phi u_\alpha = 0, \end{cases}$$

where 1 is the identity map on Z and 0 is the trivial homomorphism on Z .

Thus $\varepsilon\phi_\alpha = \phi u_\alpha$ for all α . Let $\phi = \coprod \phi_\alpha$ be the coproduct map of the family $\{\phi_\alpha\}$. Then it is easy to show that ϕ is an epimorphism by using the existence of α such that $\phi u_\alpha = \varepsilon$. Moreover, we have

$$\phi u_\alpha = \varepsilon\phi_\alpha = \varepsilon\phi u_\alpha$$

for all α . Hence we have $\phi = \varepsilon\phi$.

Reference

1. J.J. Rotman, *An introduction to homological algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1979.

Kyungpook National University
Taegu, Korea