

Semi M -Projective and Semi N -Injective Modules

HAMZA HAKMI

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Damascus University, Damascus, Syria

e-mail: hhakmi-64@hotmail.com and h.hakmi@damasuniv.edu.sy

ABSTRACT. Let M and N be modules over a ring R . The purpose of this paper is to study modules M, N for which the bi-module $[M, N]$ is regular or *pi*. It is proved that the bi-module $[M, N]$ is regular if and only if a module N is semi M -projective and $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^{\oplus} N$ for all $\alpha \in [M, N]$, if and only if a module M is semi N -injective and $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^{\oplus} N$ for all $\alpha \in [M, N]$. Also, it is proved that the bi-module $[M, N]$ is *pi* if and only if a module N is direct M -projective and for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$ there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Im}(\alpha\beta) \subseteq^{\oplus} N$, if and only if a module M is direct N -injective and for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$ there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Ker}(\beta\alpha) \subseteq^{\oplus} M$. The relationship between the Jacobson radical and the (co)singular ideal of $[M, N]$ is described.

1. Introduction

In this paper rings R , are associative with identity unless otherwise indicated. All modules over a ring R are unitary right modules. The category of right R -modules is denoted by $\text{mod} - R$. Maps are written on the left. A submodule N of a module M is said to be *small* in M , if $N + K \neq M$ for any proper submodule K of M [1]. Also, a submodule Q of a module M is said to be *large* (*essential*) in M if $Q \cap K \neq 0$ for every nonzero submodule K of M [1]. For a submodule N of a module, we use $N \subseteq^{\oplus} M$ to mean that N is a direct summand of M , and write $N \leq_e M$ and $N \ll M$ to indicate that N is a large, respectively small, submodule of M . Also, we write $J(R)$ and $U(R)$ for the Jacobson radical and the group of units of a ring R respectively. If M_R and N_R are modules, We use the notation: $E_M = \text{End}_R(M)$, and $[M, N] = \text{hom}_R(M, N)$. Thus, $[M, N]$ is an (E_N, E_M) -bimodule.

An important line of research in module theory is to investigate substructures

Received September 6, 2014; revised May 24, 2015; accepted November 3, 2015.
 2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 16E50, 16E70; Secondary: 16D40, 16D50.

Key words and phrases: Regular ring, Semi-potent ring, Radical Jacobson, Semi M -injective (N -projective) modules, direct M -injective (N -projective) modules, Endomorphism ring.

such as the radical, the singular and co-singular ideals, and (semi)regularity, semipotency or (pi) of $[M, N]$ which are similar to ones in countered in the ring and module theory.

Our main concern is about when the endomorphism ring E_M of some module $M \in \text{mod } -R$ is regular or pi -ring. In section 3, 4 it is proved that for any modules $M, N \in \text{mod } -R$, $[M, N]$ is regular if and only if N is semi M -projective and $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus N$ for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$ if and only if M is semi N -injective and $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$. It is also proved that for a semi N -projective module M , $J[M, N] = \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}$ and for a semi M -injective module N , $J[M, N] = \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\} \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}$. In section 5, it is proved that for any two modules $M, N \in \text{mod } -R$; $[M, N]$ is pi if and only if N is direct M -projective and for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$ there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Im}(\alpha\beta) \subseteq^\oplus N$ if and only if M is direct N -injective and for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$ there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Ker}(\beta\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$.

2. Some Properties of $[M, N]$

Lemma 2.1. ([4, Lemma 2.9]) *Let M_R, N_R be modules and $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\beta \in [N, M]$. The following statements hold:*

- (1) $\text{Im}(\alpha) + \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N$.
- (2) $\text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Im}(\alpha) \cap \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta)$.
- (3) $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \cap \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\}$.
- (4) $\text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Ker}(\alpha) + \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$.

Proof. We have $\alpha\beta \in E_N$ and $\beta\alpha \in E_M$.

(1) It is clear that $N = \text{Im}(\alpha\beta) + \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha) + \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) \subseteq N$. Similarly (3) holds.

(2) It is obvious that $\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Im}((1_N - \alpha\beta)\alpha) \subseteq \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta)$ and $\text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Im}(\alpha(1_M - \beta\alpha)) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha)$. So $\text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha) \cap \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta)$.

Let $x \in \text{Im}(\alpha) \cap \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta)$; $x \in N$ and $x = \alpha(y) = (1_N - \alpha\beta)(z)$ where $y \in M$, $z \in N$. So $x = z - \alpha\beta(z)$, $z = x + \alpha\beta(z) = \alpha(y) + \alpha\beta(z) = \alpha(y + \beta(z))$. Let $y_0 = y + \beta(z) \in M$. Then $z = \alpha(y_0)$ and $x = (1_N - \alpha\beta)(z) = (1_N - \alpha\beta)\alpha(y_0) = (\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)(y_0) \in \text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)$. Thus, $\text{Im}(\alpha) \cap \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)$. Similarly (4) holds. (5) and (7) are clear.

(6) It is clear that $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)$ and $\text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)$, so $\text{Ker}(\alpha) + \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)$. Let $x \in \text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)$. Then $x \in M$ and $\alpha(x) = \alpha\beta\alpha(x)$. Since $x = \beta\alpha(x) + (1_M - \beta\alpha)(x)$ and $\beta\alpha(x) \in \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$, $(1_M - \beta\alpha)(x) \in \text{Ker}(\alpha)$, hence $(1_M - \beta\alpha)(\beta\alpha(x)) = \beta\alpha(x) - \beta\alpha\beta\alpha(x) = \beta\alpha(x) - \beta\alpha(x) = 0$, $\alpha(1_M - \beta\alpha)(x) = \alpha(x) - \alpha\beta\alpha(x) = \alpha(x) - \alpha(x) = 0$. So $x \in \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) + \text{Ker}(\alpha)$. Thus, $\text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\alpha) + \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$. Similarly (8) holds. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let M_R, N_R be modules and $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\beta \in [N, M]$. The following*

statements hold:

- (1) $\text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N$ if and only if $\text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = M$.
- (2) $\text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \{0\}$ if and only if $\text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\}$.
- (3) $1_N - \alpha\beta \in U(E_N)$ if and only if $1_M - \beta\alpha \in U(E_M)$.

Proof. (1)(\Rightarrow) Assume that $\text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N$. Then by Lemma 2.1(4) $\text{Im}(\beta) \cap \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \text{Im}(\beta - \beta\alpha\beta) = \beta(\text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta)) = \text{Im}(\beta)$, which shows that $\text{Im}(\beta) \subseteq \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$. Lemma 2.1(3) implies that $M = \text{Im}(\beta) + \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$. Similarly (\Leftarrow) holds.

(2)(\Rightarrow) Assume that $\text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \{0\}$. Let $x \in \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$. Then $(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)(x) = (1_N - \alpha\beta)(\alpha(x)) = 0$, so $\alpha(x) \in \text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \{0\}$, thus $\alpha(x) = 0$ and that $x \in \text{Ker}(\alpha)$, which shows that $\text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\alpha)$. Lemma 2.1(5) implies that $\{0\} = \text{Ker}(\alpha) \cap \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$. Similarly (\Leftarrow) holds.

(3)(\Rightarrow) If $1_N - \alpha\beta \in U(E_N)$. Then $\mu(1_N - \alpha\beta) = 1_N$ for some $\mu \in E_N$. So, $(1_M + \beta\mu\alpha)(1_M - \beta\alpha) = (1_M - \beta\alpha) + \beta\mu\alpha(1_M - \beta\alpha) = (1_M - \beta\alpha) + \beta\mu(1_N - \alpha\beta)\alpha = 1_M$. The proof for right inverses is similar. Similarly, (\Leftarrow) holds. \square

Lemma 2.3. Let M_R, N_R be modules and $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\beta \in [N, M]$. The following statements hold

- (1) $E_N = \alpha[N, M] + (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$.
- (2) $E_N = [M, N]\beta + E_N(1_N - \alpha\beta)$.
- (3) $E_M = \beta[M, N] + (1_M - \beta\alpha)E_M$.
- (4) $E_M = [N, M]\alpha + E_M(1_M - \beta\alpha)$.
- (5) $(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M] = \alpha[N, M] \cap (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$.
- (6) $[N, M](\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = [N, M]\alpha \cap E_M(1_M - \beta\alpha)$.
- (7) $(\beta - \beta\alpha\beta)[M, N] = \beta[M, N] \cap (1_M - \beta\alpha)E_M$.
- (8) $[M, N](\beta - \beta\alpha\beta) = [M, N]\beta \cap E_N(1_N - \alpha\beta)$.
- (9) $[M, N] = \alpha E_M + (1_N - \alpha\beta)[M, N]$.
- (10) $[M, N] = E_N\alpha + [M, N](1_M - \beta\alpha)$.

Proof. (1) Since $1_N = \alpha\beta + (1_N - \alpha\beta)$, for any $\lambda \in E_N$, $\lambda = \alpha\beta\lambda + (1_N - \alpha\beta)\lambda \in \alpha[N, M] + (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$, so $E_N \subseteq \alpha[N, M] + (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N \subseteq E_N$. Similarly (2), (3) and (4) hold.

(5) Since $(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M] = (1_N - \alpha\beta)\alpha[N, M] \subseteq (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$ and $(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M] = \alpha(1_M - \beta\alpha)[N, M] \subseteq \alpha[N, M]$, we have $(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M] \subseteq \alpha[N, M] \cap (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$.

Let $\lambda \in \alpha[N, M] \cap (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$. Then $\lambda = \alpha\gamma = (1_N - \alpha\beta)\mu$ where $\gamma \in [N, M]$, $\mu \in E_N$, so $\mu = \lambda + \alpha\beta\mu = \alpha\gamma + \alpha\beta\mu = \alpha(\gamma + \beta\mu) \in \alpha[N, M]$. Suppose that $\mu = \alpha\theta$ where $\theta = \gamma + \beta\mu \in [N, M]$. Then $\lambda = (1_N - \alpha\beta)\mu = (1_N - \alpha\beta)\alpha\theta = (\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)\theta \in (\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M]$, which shows that $\alpha[N, M] \cap (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N \subseteq (\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M]$. Similarly (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10) hold. \square

Lemma 2.4. Let M_R, N_R be modules and $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\beta \in [N, M]$. The following are equivalent:

- (1) $\text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N$.
- (2) $\text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = M$.
- (3) $\text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Im}(\alpha)$.
- (4) $\text{Im}(\beta - \beta\alpha\beta) = \text{Im}(\beta)$.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) By Lemma 2.2(1) and (1) \Rightarrow (4) by Lemma 2.1(2).

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Assume (4) hold. Then $\text{Im}(\beta) = \text{Im}(\beta - \beta\alpha\beta) = \text{Im}(\beta) \cap \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$, which shows that $\text{Im}(\beta) \subseteq \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$, so $M = \text{Im}(\beta) + \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha)$, proving (1). Similarly, the equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) holds. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let M_R, N_R be modules and $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\beta \in [N, M]$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \{0\}$.
- (2) $\text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\}$.
- (3) $\text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Ker}(\alpha)$.
- (4) $\text{Ker}(\beta - \beta\alpha\beta) = \text{Ker}(\beta)$.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) By Lemma 2.2(2) and (1) \Rightarrow (4) by Lemma 2.1(8).

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Assume (4) hold. Then $\text{Ker}(\beta) = \text{Ker}(\beta - \beta\alpha\beta) = \text{Ker}(\beta) + \text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta)$, which shows that $\text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)$, so $\text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \text{Ker}(\beta) \cap \text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \{0\}$, proving (1). Similarly, the equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) holds. \square

Let M_R and N_R be modules. Write:

$$\widehat{\nabla}[M, N] = \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}.$$

It is clear that $\widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$ is a non empty subset in $[M, N]$, ($0 \in \widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$). By using Lemma 2.2(1) it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\nabla}[M, N] &= \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}. \\ &= \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Im}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = M \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition to, $\widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$ is an ideal in $\text{mod} - R$, which means that it is closed under arbitrary multiplication from either side, by the following Lemma:

Lemma 2.6. *For arbitrary $M, N, X, Y \in \text{mod} - R$ the following statements hold:*

- (1) $\widehat{\nabla}[M, N][X, M] \subseteq \widehat{\nabla}[X, N]$.
- (2) $[N, Y]\widehat{\nabla}[M, N] \subseteq \widehat{\nabla}[M, Y]$.
- (3) $[N, Y]\widehat{\nabla}[M, N][X, M] \subseteq \widehat{\nabla}[X, Y]$.

Proof. (1) Let $\alpha \in \widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$ and $\lambda \in [X, M]$. Then $\alpha\lambda \in [X, N]$ and for all $\beta \in [N, X]$, $\text{Im}(1_N - (\alpha\lambda)\beta) = \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha(\lambda\beta)) = N$, hence $\lambda\beta \in [N, M]$. Thus, $\alpha\lambda \in \widehat{\nabla}[X, N]$. (2) is analogous. (3) by (1) and (2). \square

Again, let M_R and N_R be modules. Write:

$$\widehat{\Delta}[M, N] = \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \{0\} \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}.$$

It is clear that $\widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$ is a non empty subset in $[M, N]$, ($0 \in \widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$). By using Lemma 2.2(2) it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Delta}[M, N] &= \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Ker}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \{0\} \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}. \\ &= \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\} \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition to, $\widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$ is an ideal in $\text{mod} - R$, which means that it is closed under arbitrary multiplication from either side, by the following Lemma:

Lemma 2.7. *For arbitrary $M, N, X, Y \in \text{mod} - R$ the following statements hold:*

- (1) $\widehat{\Delta}[M, N][X, M] \subseteq \widehat{\Delta}[X, N]$.
- (2) $[N, Y]\widehat{\Delta}[M, N] \subseteq \widehat{\Delta}[M, Y]$.
- (3) $[N, Y]\widehat{\Delta}[M, N][X, M] \subseteq \widehat{\Delta}[X, Y]$.

Proof. As in Lemma 2.6. □

Following [2, 7], the Jacobson radical of the bimodule $[M, N]$ defined by Kasch as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J[M, N] &= \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; (1_N - \alpha\beta) \in U(E_N) \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}. \\ &= \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; (1_M - \beta\alpha) \in U(E_M) \text{ for all } \beta \in [N, M]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.8. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following statements hold:*

- (1) $J[M, N] \subseteq \widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$.
- (2) $J[M, N] \subseteq \widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$.

Proof. This is obvious. □

Let M_R and N_R be modules. Recall that a morphism $\alpha \in [M, N]$ is *regular* [2], if there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\alpha = \alpha\beta\alpha$. Also, $[M, N]$ is called regular if and only if every $\alpha \in [M, N]$ is *regular*.

Lemma 2.9. ([7]) *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $[M, N]$ is regular.
- (2) For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus N$ and $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$.

In particular, for a module M , E_M is regular if and only if $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ and $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ for all $\alpha \in E_M$, [5, Lemma 3.1].

Proposition 2.10. *Let M and N be modules and $\alpha, \beta \in [M, N]$. If $[M, N]$ is regular. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Im}(\beta)$ if and only if $\alpha[N, M] \subseteq \beta[N, M]$.

- (2) $\text{Im}(\alpha) = \text{Im}(\beta)$ if and only if $\alpha[N, M] = \beta[N, M]$.
- (3) $\alpha[N, M] = \{\mu : \mu \in E_N; \text{Im}(\mu) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha)\}$.
- (4) $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)$ if and only if $[N, M]\beta \subseteq [N, M]\alpha$.
- (5) $\text{Ker}(\alpha) = \text{Ker}(\beta)$ if and only if $[N, M]\beta = [N, M]\alpha$.
- (6) $[N, M]\alpha = \{\mu : \mu \in E_M; \text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\mu)\}$.

Proof. (1) (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Im}(\beta)$. Since $[M, N]$ is regular, there exists $\mu \in [N, M]$ such that $\beta = \beta\mu\beta$. For $e = \beta\mu$; $e^2 = e \in E_N$ and $\text{Im}(e) = \text{Im}(\beta)$, so $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Im}(e)$. Thus, for all $x \in M$, $e(\alpha(x)) = \alpha(x)$, so $\alpha = e\alpha = \beta\mu\alpha \in \beta E_M$. Therefore, $\alpha[N, M] \subseteq \beta E_M[N, M] \subseteq \beta[N, M]$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $\alpha[N, M] \subseteq \beta[N, M]$. Since $[M, N]$ is regular, $\alpha = \alpha\lambda\alpha$ for some $\lambda \in [N, M]$. Since $\alpha\lambda \in \alpha[N, M] \subseteq \beta[N, M]$, $\alpha\lambda = \beta\delta$ for some $\delta \in [N, M]$. Thus, $\text{Im}(\alpha) = \text{Im}(\alpha\lambda\alpha) = \text{Im}(\beta\delta\alpha) \subseteq \text{Im}(\beta)$.

(2) and (3) are clear by (1).

(4) (\Rightarrow) Suppose that $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)$. Then $\beta(\text{Ker}(\alpha)) = 0$. Since $[M, N]$ is regular, there exists $\mu \in [N, M]$ such that $\alpha = \alpha\mu\alpha$. For $e = \mu\alpha \in E_M$; $e^2 = e$ and $\text{Ker}(\alpha) = \text{Ker}(e)$, so $\beta(\text{Ker}(\alpha)) = \beta(\text{Ker}(e)) = \beta(\text{Im}(1_M - e)) = \text{Im}(\beta(1_M - e)) = 0$. Thus, $\beta(1_M - e) = 0$ and that $\beta = \beta e = \beta\mu\alpha \in (E_N)\alpha$. So $[N, M]\beta \subseteq [N, M](E_N)\alpha \subseteq [N, M]\alpha$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $[N, M]\beta \subseteq [N, M]\alpha$. Since $[M, N]$ is regular, $\beta = \beta\delta\beta$ for some $\delta \in [N, M]$ and $\delta\beta \in [N, M]\beta \subseteq [N, M]\alpha$. So $\delta\beta = \lambda\alpha$ for some $\lambda \in [N, M]$. Thus, $\beta = \beta\lambda\alpha$ and $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)$.

(5) and (6) are clear by (4). \square

3. Semi M-Projective Modules.

Theorem 3.1. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *For every submodule $K \subseteq N$ and every epimorphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$, homomorphism $\lambda : N \rightarrow K$ there exists $\beta : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\alpha\beta = \lambda$.*
- (2) *For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\alpha[N, M] = [N, \text{Im}(\alpha)]$.*
- (3) *For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\alpha[N, M] = \{\lambda : \lambda \in E_N; \text{Im}(\lambda) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha)\}$.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let $\alpha \in [M, N]$. It is clear that $\alpha[N, M] \subseteq [N, \text{Im}(\alpha)]$. Let $\lambda \in [N, \text{Im}(\alpha)]$. Then by assumption there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\alpha\beta = \lambda$, so $\lambda \in \alpha[N, M]$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let K be a submodule of N , $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$ be an epimorphism and $\lambda : N \rightarrow K$ be a homomorphism. Since $\text{Im}(\lambda) \subseteq K = \text{Im}(\alpha)$, we have $\lambda \in [N, \text{Im}(\alpha)] = \alpha[N, M]$ by assumption. So there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\alpha\beta = \lambda$, which proves (1). The equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) is clear. \square

Let M_R and N_R be modules. Now a module N is called semi M -projective if M, N satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.1.

We remark that a module M_R is semi projective [6], if and only if M is a semi M -projective module.

Theorem 3.2. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $[M, N]$ is regular.
- (2) For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus N$, and N is a semi M -projective module.
- (3) For every finite set $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subseteq [M, N]$, $\Sigma_{i=1}^n \text{Im}(\alpha_i) \subseteq^\oplus N$, and N is a semi M -projective module.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) If $\alpha \in [M, N]$. Then $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus N$ by Lemma 2.9. On the other hand, since $[M, N]$ is regular, $\alpha[N, M] = \{\mu : \mu \in E_N; \text{Im}(\mu) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha)\}$ for every $\alpha \in [M, N]$ by Proposition 2.10(3). So Theorem 3.1(3) implies that N is semi M -projective.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) We prove (3) by induction on n . The case $n = 1$ holds by (2). Assume that $n > 1$ and $\Sigma_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Im}(\alpha_i) = \text{Im}(e)$, where $e^2 = e \in E_N$, hence $\Sigma_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Im}(\alpha_i) \subseteq^\oplus N$. Since $1_N - e \in E_N$ and $\alpha_n \in [M, N]$, $(1_N - e)\alpha_n \in [M, N]$, so $\text{Im}((1 - e)\alpha_n) \subseteq^\oplus N$ and by assumption $\text{Im}((1 - e)\alpha_n) = \text{Im}(f)$ where $f^2 = f \in E_N$. Then $ef = 0$, and for $\mu = e + f - fe$, we have $\mu^2 = \mu \in E_N$. Since $f\mu = f$ and $\mu e = e$, $\text{Im}(\mu) = \text{Im}(e) + \text{Im}(f)$. Therefore $\text{Im}(\alpha) = \text{Im}(e) + \text{Im}(f) = \text{Im}(e) + \text{Im}((1 - e)\alpha_n)$. Thus $\Sigma_{i=1}^n \text{Im}(\alpha_i) = \Sigma_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Im}(\alpha_i) + \text{Im}(\alpha_n) = \text{Im}(e) + \text{Im}(\alpha_n) = \text{Im}(e) + \text{Im}((1 - e)\alpha_n) = \text{Im}(e) + \text{Im}(f) = \text{Im}(\mu) \subseteq^\oplus N$, proving (3).

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Let $\alpha \in [M, N]$. Then $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus N$ by assumption. Denote by $\pi : N \rightarrow \text{Im}(\alpha)$ the projection. Then $\pi \in E_N$ and $\text{Im}(\pi) = \text{Im}(\alpha)$, so $\pi \in [N, \text{Im}(\alpha)] = \alpha[N, M]$ by Theorem 3.1, hence N is semi M -projective. Thus $\pi = \alpha\beta$ for some $\beta \in [N, M]$. Since $\alpha(x) \in \text{Im}(\alpha) = \text{Im}(\pi)$ for all $x \in M$; $\pi\alpha(x) = \alpha(x)$ and $\alpha(x) = \alpha\beta\alpha(x)$, so $\alpha = \alpha\beta\alpha$, which shows that α is regular, proving (1). \square

Following [4, Lemma 2.1], for any module M , $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ for every $\alpha \in E_M$ if and only if $\text{Im}(\alpha)$ is semi M -projective for every $\alpha \in E_M$. From [4, Lemma 2.1] and Theorem 3.2 in case $N = M$, we derive the following:

Corollary 3.3. *Let M_R be a module. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) E_M is a regular rings.
- (2) For every $\alpha \in E_M$; $\text{Im}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ and M is a semi projective module.
- (3) For every $\alpha \in E_M$, $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus$ and $\text{Im}(\alpha)$ is semi M -projective for every $\alpha \in E_M$.
- (4) For every finite set $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subseteq E_M$; $\Sigma_{i=1}^n \text{Im}(\alpha_i) \subseteq^\oplus M$, and M is a semi projective module.

Following [2], let M_R, N_R be modules, the co-singular ideal of $[M, N]$ is

$$\nabla[M, N] = \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Im}(\alpha) \ll N\}.$$

Corollary 3.4. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. If N is semi M -projective, then:*

- (1) $J[M, N] = \widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$.
- (2) $\nabla[M, N] \subseteq J[M, N]$.

Proof. (1) By Lemma 2.8 we have $J[M, N] \subseteq \widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$.

Let $\alpha \in \widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$. Then $\text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = N$ for all $\beta \in [N, M]$, by Lemma 2.1(2), $\text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Im}(\alpha)$. Since N is semi M -projective and that $\alpha, \alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha \in [M, N]$, $[N, \text{Im}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)] = (\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M]$, $[N, \text{Im}(\alpha)] = \alpha[N, M]$, so $\alpha[N, M] = (\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha)[N, M] = \alpha[N, M] \cap (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$, by Lemma 2.3(5). This shows that $\alpha[N, M] \subseteq (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$, again by Lemma 2.3(1) it follows that $E_N = (1_N - \alpha\beta)E_N$, thus $\alpha \in J[M, N]$.

(2) Let $\alpha \in \nabla[M, N]$. Then by Lemma 2.1(1), $N = \text{Im}(\alpha) + \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta) = \text{Im}(1_N - \alpha\beta)$ for all $\beta \in [N, M]$, hence $\text{Im}(\alpha) \ll N$. So $\alpha \in \widehat{\nabla}[M, N]$, by (1) $\alpha \in J[M, N]$. \square

4. Semi N -Injective Modules.

Theorem 4.1. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *For every factor module K of M and every monomorphism $\alpha : K \rightarrow N$, homomorphism $\lambda : K \rightarrow M$, there exists $\beta : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\beta\alpha = \lambda$.*
- (2) *For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$; $[N, M]\alpha = \{\beta : \beta \in E_M; \text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)\} = \{\beta : \beta \in E_M; \beta(\text{Ker}(\alpha)) = 0\}$.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let $\alpha \in [M, N]$. It is clear that $[N, M]\alpha \subseteq \{\beta : \beta \in E_M; \text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)\}$.

Let $\beta \in E_M$ such that $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)$. Then the map $\alpha' : M/\text{Ker}(\alpha) \rightarrow N$ defined by $\alpha'(\bar{x}) = \alpha(x)$ for all $\bar{x} \in M/\text{Ker}(\alpha)$ is a monomorphism. Also, since $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta)$, the map $\beta' : M/\text{Ker}(\alpha) \rightarrow M$ defined by $\beta'(\bar{x}) = \beta(x)$ for all $\bar{x} \in M/\text{Ker}(\alpha)$ is a homomorphism. By assumption, there exists $\lambda : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\lambda\alpha' = \beta'$. Thus, $\lambda\alpha(x) = \lambda\alpha'(\bar{x}) = \beta'(\bar{x}) = \beta(x)$ for all $x \in M$, so $\lambda\alpha = \beta$ and $\beta \in [N, M]\alpha$, proving (2).

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let K be a factor module of M , $\alpha : K \rightarrow N$ be a monomorphism and $\lambda : K \rightarrow M$ be a homomorphism. Denote by $\pi : M \rightarrow K$ the canonical homomorphism of a module M onto factor module K . Then $\lambda\pi \in E_M$, $\alpha\pi \in [M, N]$ and $\text{Ker}(\alpha\pi) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\lambda\pi)$. By assumption $\lambda\pi \in [N, M](\alpha\pi)$, so there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\lambda\pi = \beta(\alpha\pi)$. Let $y \in K$. Then $y = \pi(x)$ for some $x \in M$ and $\lambda(y) = \lambda\pi(x) = \beta\alpha\pi(x) = \beta\alpha(y)$. Thus, $\lambda = \beta\alpha$, this proves (1). \square

Let M_R and N_R be modules. Now a module M is called semi N -injective if M, N are satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.1.

We remark that a module N_R is semi injective [6], if and only if N is a semi N -injective module.

Theorem 4.2. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *$[M, N]$ is regular.*
- (2) *For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$, and M is a semi N -injective module.*
- (3) *For every finite set $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subseteq [M, N]$; $\cap_{i=1}^n \text{Ker}(\alpha_i) \subseteq^\oplus M$, and M is a semi N -injective module.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) If $\alpha \in [M, N]$. Then $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ by Lemma 2.9. On the

other hand, since $[M, N]$ is regular, $[N, M]\alpha = \{\mu : \mu \in E_M; \text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\mu)\}$ for all $\alpha \in [M, N]$ by Proposition 2.10(6). So Theorem 4.1 implies that M is semi N -injective.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) We prove (3) by induction on n . The case $n = 1$ holds by (2). Assume $n > 1$ and that $X = \cap_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{Ker}(\alpha_i) \subseteq^\oplus M$, say $M = X \oplus Y$ where Y is a submodule of M . Denote by $\pi : M \rightarrow X$ the projection. Then $\alpha_n \pi \in [M, N]$ and $\text{Ker}(\alpha_n \pi) = [X \cap \text{Ker}(\alpha_n)] \oplus Y$. Since $\text{Ker}(\alpha_n \pi) \subseteq^\oplus M$ by assumption, $[X \cap \text{Ker}(\alpha_n)] \subseteq^\oplus M$. Thus, $\cap_{i=1}^n \text{Ker}(\alpha_i) = X \cap \text{Ker}(\alpha_n) \subseteq^\oplus M$ which proves (3).

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Let $\alpha \in [M, N]$. Then $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ by assumption, say $M = \text{Ker}(\alpha) \oplus P$ for some submodule P of M . Denote by $\pi : M \rightarrow P$ the projection. Then $\pi \in E_M$ and $\text{Ker}(\pi) = \text{Ker}(\alpha)$. Also, since $\alpha(\text{Ker}(\pi)) = \alpha(\text{Im}(1 - \pi)) = 0$, $\alpha = \alpha\pi$. On the other hand, since $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\pi)$ and M is semi N -injective, by assumption $\pi \in [N, M]\alpha$ by Theorem 4.1, so $\pi = \beta\alpha$ for some $\beta \in [N, M]$, which gives $\alpha = \alpha\beta\alpha$, proving (1). \square

Taking $N = M$ in Theorem 4.2 gives

Corollary 4.3. *Let M_R be a module. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) E_M is a regular ring.
- (2) For every $\alpha \in E_M$, $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$ and M is a semi injective module.
- (3) For every finite set $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subseteq E_M$; $\cap_{i=1}^n \text{Ker}(\alpha_i) \subseteq^\oplus M$, and M is a semi injective module.

Following [2], let M_R, N_R be modules, the singular ideal of $[M, N]$ is

$$\Delta[M, N] = \{\alpha : \alpha \in [M, N]; \text{Ker}(\alpha) \leq_e M\}.$$

Corollary 4.4. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. If M is semi N -injective, then:*

- (1) For any $\alpha, \theta \in [M, N]$ such that $\text{Ker}(\alpha) = \text{Ker}(\theta)$, then $[N, M]\alpha = [N, M]\theta$.
- (2) $J[M, N] = \widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$.
- (3) $\Delta[M, N] \subseteq J[M, N]$.

Proof. (1) Assume $\alpha, \theta \in [M, N]$ with $\text{Ker}(\alpha) = \text{Ker}(\theta)$. Let $\beta \in [N, M]\alpha$. Then $\beta \in E_M$ and by Theorem 4.1, $\beta(\text{Ker}(\alpha)) = \{0\}$, so $\beta(\text{Ker}(\theta)) = \{0\}$, thus $\beta \in [N, M]\theta$, therefore $[N, M]\alpha \subseteq [N, M]\theta$. The converse is analogous.

(2) By Lemma 2.8 we have $J[M, N] \subseteq \widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$.

Let $\alpha \in \widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$. Then for all $\beta \in [N, M]$; $\text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\}$, so by Lemma 2.1(6) $\text{Ker}(\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = \text{Ker}(\alpha)$ and by (1), $[N, M](\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = [N, M]\alpha$, hence $\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha, \alpha \in [M, N]$. Thus by Lemma 2.3(6), $[N, M]\alpha = [N, M](\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) = [N, M]\alpha \cap E_M(1_M - \beta\alpha)$, which shows that $[N, M]\alpha \subseteq E_M(1_M - \beta\alpha)$. By Lemma 2.3(4), $E_M = [N, M]\alpha + E_M(1_M - \beta\alpha) = E_M(1_M - \beta\alpha)$, so $\alpha \in J[M, N]$.

(3) Let $\alpha \in \Delta[M, N]$. Then $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \leq_e M$. Since for all $\beta \in [N, M]$, $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \cap \text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\}$ implies that $\text{Ker}(1_M - \beta\alpha) = \{0\}$, so $\alpha \in \widehat{\Delta}[M, N]$, by (2) $\alpha \in J[M, N]$. \square

5. Direct M -Projective (N -Injective) Modules.

Lemma 5.1. ([6]) *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *For any submodule K of M and any direct summand P of N such that $M/K \cong P$ we have $K \subseteq^\oplus M$.*
- (2) *For any direct summand P of N , every epimorphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow P$ splits.*
- (3) *For every direct summand K of N and every epimorphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$, there exists $\beta : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\alpha\beta = \pi$ where $\pi : N \rightarrow K$ is the projection.*

Let M_R and N_R be modules. Recall a module N is direct M -projective if M, N are satisfy the conditions of Lemma 5.1. From Lemma 5.1 we derive the following:

Corollary 5.2. *Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *A module N is direct M -projective.*
- (2) *For every direct summand K of N and every epimorphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$, $\alpha[N, M] = [N, K]$.*
- (3) *For every direct summand K of N and every epimorphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$, $\alpha[N, M] = \{\beta : \beta \in E_N; \text{Im}(\beta) \subseteq K\}$.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let K be a direct summand of N and $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$ be an epimorphism. It is clear that $\alpha[N, M] \subseteq [N, K]$. Let $\lambda \in [N, K]$. Since N is direct M -projective, there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\alpha\beta = \pi$. Since $\text{Im}(\lambda) \subseteq K = \text{Im}(\pi)$, for every $x \in N$, $\lambda(x) \in K$, $\pi(\lambda(x)) = \lambda(x)$, so $\lambda = \pi\lambda = \alpha\beta\lambda \in \alpha[N, M]$, proving (2).

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let K be a direct summand of N and $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$ be an epimorphism. Denote by $\pi : N \rightarrow K$ the projection. Since $\pi \in [N, K] = \alpha[M, N]$, by assumption, there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\alpha\beta = \pi$, proving (1). The equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) is clear. \square

Let M_R and N_R be modules. Recall that $[M, N]$ is semi-potent [7], if for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$, $\alpha \notin J[M, N]$ there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $0 \neq (\alpha\beta)^2 = \alpha\beta \in E_N$, [6]. In particular, a ring R is called semi-potent (or I_0 -ring [3]), if every principal right ideal not contained in $J(R)$ contains a nonzero idempotent. $[M, N]$ is called *partial invertible* or *pi* [2], if $\beta = \beta\alpha\beta$ for some $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$ which is equivalent to that $[M, N]$ is semi-potent and $J[M, N] = 0$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let M_R and N be a modules, $\alpha \in [M, N]$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *An element α is partial invertible.*
- (2) *There exists $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Im}(\alpha\beta)$ and $\text{Ker}(\alpha\beta)$ are direct summands of N .*
- (3) *There exists $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Im}(\beta\alpha)$ and $\text{Ker}(\beta\alpha)$ are direct summands of M .*

Proof. Is obvious. \square

Proposition 5.4. *Let M_R and N be a modules. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$, α is partial invertible.
 (2) A module N is direct M -projective and for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$, there exists $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Im}(\alpha\beta) \subseteq^\oplus N$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let $\alpha \in [M, N]$. By assumption $\beta = \beta\alpha\beta$ for some $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$. Since $(\alpha\beta)^2 = \alpha\beta \in E_N$, $\text{Im}(\alpha\beta) \subseteq^\oplus N$.

Let K be a direct summand of N and $\alpha : M \rightarrow K$ be an epimorphism. Denote by $\pi : N \rightarrow K$ the projection. By assumption $\beta = \beta\alpha\beta$ for some $0 \neq \beta \in [N, N]$. Then for $e = \alpha\beta$; $0 \neq e^2 = e \in E_N$ and $\text{Im}(e) = \text{Im}(\alpha\beta) \subseteq \text{Im}(\alpha) = K$. Since for any $x \in N$, $x = e(x) + (1_N - e)(x)$ and $e(x) \in K$ implies that $\pi(x) = e(x)$. This shows that $\alpha\beta = \pi$, by Lemma 5.1 which implies that a module N is direct M -projective. (2) \Rightarrow (1) Let $\alpha \in [M, N]$. By assumption there exists $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Im}(\alpha\beta) \subseteq^\oplus N$. Since N is direct M -projective, the epimorphism $\alpha\beta : M \rightarrow \text{Im}(\alpha\beta)$ splits, so $\text{Ker}(\alpha\beta) \subseteq^\oplus N$, by Lemma 5.2 which implies that α is pi. \square

Lemma 5.5. ([6]) Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:

- (1) For any submodule K of N and any direct summand P of M such that $K \cong P$, we have $K \subseteq^\oplus N$.
 (2) For any direct summand P of M , every monomorphism $\alpha : P \rightarrow N$ splits.
 (3) For every direct summand K of M and every monomorphism $\alpha : K \rightarrow N$, there exists $\beta : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\beta\alpha = \tau$ where $\tau : K \rightarrow M$ the inclusion.

Let M_R and N_R be modules. Recall a module M is direct N -injective if M, N are satisfy the conditions of Lemma 5.4. From Lemma 5.5 we derive the following:

Corollary 5.6. Let M_R and N_R be modules. The following are equivalent:

- (1) A module M is direct N -injective.
 (2) For every direct summand K of M and every monomorphism $\alpha : K \rightarrow N$, $[N, M]\alpha = [K, M]$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume (1) holds. It is clear that $[N, M]\alpha \subseteq [K, M]$. Let $\lambda \in [K, M]$. By assumption there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\beta\alpha = \tau$ where $\tau : K \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion, so $\lambda = \lambda\tau = \lambda\beta\alpha \in [N, M]\alpha$, proving (2).

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Assume (2) hold. Let K be a direct summand of M , $\alpha : K \rightarrow M$ be a monomorphism and $\tau : K \rightarrow M$ be the inclusion. By assumption $\tau \in [K, M] = [N, M]\alpha$, so there exists $\beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\beta\alpha = \tau$, proving (1). \square

Proposition 5.7. Let M_R and N be modules. The following are equivalent:

- (1) For every $\alpha \in [M, N]$; α is partial invertible.
 (2) A module M is direct N -injective and for any $\alpha \in [M, N]$ there exists $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Ker}(\beta\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let $\psi \in [M, N]$. By assumption $\beta = \beta\psi\beta$ for some $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$. Since $(\beta\psi)^2 = \beta\psi \in E_M$, $\text{Ker}(\beta\psi) \subseteq^\oplus M$.

Let K be a direct summand of M and $\alpha : K \rightarrow N$ be a monomorphism. Denote by $\pi : M \rightarrow K$ the projection. Then $\alpha\pi \in [M, N]$. By assumption $\mu = \mu\alpha\pi\mu$ for

some $0 \neq \mu \in [N, M]$ and $\pi\mu = \pi\mu\alpha\pi\mu$. Then for $e = \pi\mu\alpha\pi$, $0 \neq e^2 = e \in E_M$ and $\text{Im}(e) \subseteq K$. Since for any $x \in M$, $x = e(x) + (1_M - e)(x)$ and $e(x) \in K$ we have that $\pi(x) = e(x)$. So for any $x \in K$, $x = \pi(x) = e(x) = \pi\mu\alpha(x)$. For $\beta = \pi\mu \in [N, M]$, $\beta\alpha = \tau$ where $\tau : K \rightarrow M$ the inclusion. By Lemma 5.4 it follows that a module M is direct N -injective.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let $\alpha \in [M, N]$. By assumption there exists $0 \neq \lambda \in [N, M]$ such that $\text{Ker}(\lambda\alpha) \subseteq^\oplus M$. Then $M = \text{Ker}(\lambda\alpha) \oplus K$ for some submodule K of M . Since $\text{Ker}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\lambda\alpha)$, $\alpha : K \rightarrow M$ is a monomorphism. Hence M is direct N -injective and so there exists $\varphi \in [N, M]$ such that $\varphi\alpha = \tau$ where $\tau : K \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion. Let $\pi : M \rightarrow K$ the projection. Note for any $m \in M$, $\pi(m) \in K$ implies that $\varphi\alpha\pi = \pi$ and that $(\pi\varphi)\alpha(\pi\varphi) = \pi\varphi$. Then, for $\beta = \pi\varphi$, $\beta\alpha\beta = \beta$ where $0 \neq \beta \in [N, M]$. This shows that α is pi . \square

Acknowledgement. The author thank the referee for very careful reading of the manuscript and many valuable suggestions that improved the paper by much.

References

- [1] F. Kasch, *Modules and Rings*, Academic Press, London, New York, 1982.
- [2] F. Kasch, A. Mader, *Rings, Modules, and the Total*, Front. Math., Birkhauser Verlag, Basel, 2004.
- [3] W. K. Nicholson, *I- Rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **207**(1975), 361–373.
- [4] T. C. Quynh, M. T. Kosan, and P. T. Hai, *Note on regular morphisms*, Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest., Sect. Comp., **41**(2013), 249–260.
- [5] R. Ware, *Endomorphism Rings of Projective Modules*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 155(1971), 233–256.
- [6] R. Wisbaure, *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*, Philadelphia: Gordon and Breach, 1991.
- [7] Y. Zhou, *On (Semi)regularity and the total of rings and modules*, Journal of Algebra, **322**(2009), 562–578.