Airo International Research Journal
Peer Reviewed Multidisciplinary Indexed Journal
ISSN: 2320-3714
Volume:22 Issue:3 March 2020

The Class of Coretractable Modules and Certain Assumptions

[1]*Vaishnavi Sandip Mahajan*; [2]*Mahendrasingh Poonia*

[1]PhDResearchScholar,DepartmentofMathematics,JJTUniversity,Jhunjhunu,Rajasthan,India

[2]PhDAssociateProfessor,DepartmentofMathematics,JJTUniversity,Jhunjhunu,Rajasthan,India

Abstract: We give a large number of new relationships in this paper between coretractable and other related modules. We also study a number of assumptions of coretractablemodules and provide several links with coretractablemodules.

Keywords:coretractable modules, Rickart modules, epi-coretrractable modules, mono-coretractable modules, fi-coretractable modules and Endocoprime modules.

Introduction: Let M be a correct R-module, where R is a unit ring. Amini studied and developed the notion of coretractable module in which 'R-module M is retractable if a non-zero R-homorphismo f: M / AA as a result exists for each proper A of M submodule. Equivalently M can be retracted if there are 0 bisfEnd(M) as a f(N)=0; N kerf' for each proper A of M submodule. Some writers add many generalisations of coretractable modules, epicoretractable (co-compressible) and monocorectable (co-epi-retractable) modules for example , for example. In addition the terms, firmly retractable modules, C-coretractable modules, Y-coretractable and P-coretractable, weakly retractable, have been developed and tested. In section two, we establish new relations between coretractable modules and other related concepts, like polyforma modules, injective module hull, and Rickart modules. This paper consists of four sections.We also give a coretractable R module characterisation when R is an inherited ring and M is injective.

In Section 3 we discuss epicoretractable modules that incorporate a variety of essential properties and connexions. We note that under the class of multiplication and coprime modules the two concepts that are coretractable and epicoretractable modules match. Then we study monocored modules and their relationships with other related modules.

We research fi-coretractable modules in section four. This definition includes many findings. Many findings. We prove that the direct sum of two coretractable modules is fi-coretractable and direct summand of fi-coretractable, weak duo module is fi-coretractable modules. In addition, a lot of links are presented between fi-coretractable modules and other concepts like Endo-coprime module.

On Coretractable Modules

We will add some ties between the coretractable modules and some relevant principles in this section. Firstly: "A polyforme is called an R-modulus, if Ker is not essential in L for any Submodul L M and any 0: L M. Similarly, L M and any: M, Ker e L implies = 0." [12, p.54]. Notice that 'if M and Q are R-module M, Q shall be known as an injective hull, M as E(M) is known;) (shall be known, if Q is an injective (quasi-injective) module and M as E(M);' If a R exists b R so that a = Aba, a R is called the Von Neumann ordinary ring.

In the next result, the following are necessary.

"Theorem (2.1): M is an R-module if and only when EndR) (is a normal Von Neumann ring, which contains a quasi-injector hull of M."

We have the following,

Proposal (2.2): If M is an R-modulus polyform and a retractable one. Then M is a module that can be retracted.

Proof: Because M is polyform, End(R) (is normal to Von Neumann by Theorem(2.1). However it means that the module of [3, Proposition(4.4)] is semi-single, which is why M is semi-simple. So M can be recovered.

If M is non singular, M is polyform [12, P.54]. It is understood that M is not singular. Therefore we explicitly obtain the following Corollary;

Corollary(2.3):If M is an uninhabitable R module and can be retracted. M is a module that can be retracted. Proposal(2.4): Cause M to become a primary R-module. If it is an interlocking node, M is an interlocking node. Evidence:

Since the R-module is predominantly M, J(End(R))=0 is then [14,Theorem3.4, P.34]. This is semi-easy and thus M is semi-easy. M is also a module that can be retracted.

Proposal(2.5): If E(M) is a coretractable module, let M be an unmatched R-Module. Then M is a module that can be retracted.

Proof:

If E(M) is an R-module that can be retracted. Since M is a nonsingular module, E(M), by [1, P.247], is a nonsingular R-module, so E(M) is semisimple by [10]. So M can be retracted.

Airo International Research Journal
Peer Reviewed Multidisciplinary Indexed Journal
ISSN: 2320-3714
Volume:22 Issue:3 March 2020

Project(2.6): A coretractable module is the injective hull of any module over an Artiniancommutatory ring.

Proof:

May M be an artinian Ring commuting module. Then M, by [2,Corolary(3.13), is a Kasch module and hence, E(M) by [2] is a cogenerator, and therefore E(M) is coretractable by [21].

Note:

Every non-singular module over an Artinian ring is coretractable with the application of proposal (2.6) and proposal (2.5), e.g. M = above is coretractable.

Enable M to be the proper R-modulus and enable S = EndR(M). Recall "R-ModulM is called a Rickart module when a Rickart module in M generates a single element of S. Similarly, M is called the Rickart module if kerfM" for all fS[10]. Richart module M is often called the "Rickart module" For eg, the Z-module Z is a Z-module, but the Z-module Z4 is not a Rickart because the f End(Z4) does exist such that f(x)=2x is not a direct Summand of Z4 for all x Z4 and kerf= <> module.

The following suggestion is to define coretractable modules in the Rickart class.

Proposal(2.7): Let M be the module of the Rickart R. Then, M can be retracted only where the right summand of M is located for each non-zero submodule N of M.

Proof:

Let N be a M submodule that is non-zero. Since M is coretractable, the non-zero mapping f EndR(M), so f(N)=0, therefore N kerf, exists. But 0 for the Rickart R module, because M. Thus N in the right direct summand of M is found.

Let N be a suitable M and N to be a substitution 0. In the event that M is immediate, a strong summand W exists such that N W, therefore U W = M exists for any U of M submodule. Set f: M M for all u+w M to f(u+w)=u, then kerf = W M to f(u+w)=u for every U+w. If N=(0), I End(M) I is mapping identity) and (N) = (0) will be available. M is therefore an intersecting module.

Proposal(2.8): M is indissoluble for any R-Module if and only if M is simple.

Proof:

Let K be an appropriate M submodule. Since M is a coretractable module, EndR(M), f = 0 and f(K) are therefore accessible.

= 0, kerf then. But M is the module Rickart, Kerf M is that. In the other hand M is an indescriptible module, therefore kerf = M and thus f = 0, an inconsistency, or kerf = 0, meaning K = 0. So M is an easy module.

That's easy.

Remember, if S = EndR(M) is Von Neumann normal ring [10], the R- module M is considered an endoregular one.

The next lemma that appears in [10] is required.

"Lemma(2.9): For R-module M and S = EndR(M), the following are the same terms.

(1) M is a module that is undivided and endoregular;

(2) S is a ring of division "[12, 4.2.2, p.123].

Example(2.10): EndR(M) is regular (So M is endoregular) while EndR(M)=M2(Zp) is not division ring. M = Zp is an indecomposable module.

We now obtain the following suggestion from Lemma (2.9) and Proposition (2.8):

Proposal(2.11): The module M is straightforward if and only if M is coretractable and intractable. Example(2.12): Z-module Zp alternatively is undegradable and coretractable. But M is not simple, so M by Proposition (2.11) is not endo-regular.

Return to the fact that, if every proper N N nonzero submodul M is almost-invertible when a N of M submodule is called almost-invertible when the HomR(M / N, M)=0 "[22] is called. [23]. Recall: Similarly, "M shall be a near-decliness of the R- module if f shall be monomorphism, for every non-zero f EndR(M); kerf=(0)" [13,Theorem(1.5), P.26].

Rickart is unbreakable if the R-Module M is and only if the M is an almost Dedekind module. Lemma (2.13)

Proof:

Let f EndR(M), f 0, let f Assume 0 kerf, preceded by M kerf. But M is indiscriminate and kerf = 0. So it is an inconsistency, Kerf = M and therefore F=0. So M is a module that is nearly Dedekind.

Enable f EndR(M), f to be set. Since M is a near-Dedekind module, kerf=0 is a Rickart module, then kerf M is a therefore M. M is a quasi-decency module, which means M is unbreakable by [13,Note(1.3)].

Corollary(2.14): Let M be an R-modul. Then equivalent are the following statements:

Airo International Research Journal
Peer Reviewed Multidisciplinary Indexed Journal
ISSN: 2320-3714
Volume:22 Issue:3 March 2020

(1) M is a coretractableRickart module that can not be compared;

(2) M is an unbreakable endoregularcoretractable module;

(3) M is a module that is simple;

(4) M is a divisional ring and End R(M).

Proof:

(1) (3) M is virtually committed, as M is uncomposable and Rickart then Lemma(2.13). Let N be a suitable M submodule since M can be coretracted, f fEndR(M) and f(N) = 0, i.e. N kerf, are available. However, kerf = o, so N=0. So M is clear.

(3) (1) It's obvious.

(2) (3) Proposal(2.11) follows.

(2) (4) Lemma(2.9) shall automatically be followed.

Recall that 'R is said to be a hereditary right (left) ring while of (left) ideal is projective. R is a hereditary ring both right and left.' [21].

Note(2.15): Note:

(1) The hereditary is any semi-simple ring.

(2) Every key ideal domain R is hereditary, and thus any ideal nonzero is isomorphic to R.'

Proposal(2.16): Cause R to be an inherited ring and M to be an injective R-module, and then M to be coretractable for each submodule N of M, f: M / N M, f0, and Imf M are present.

Proof:

() Let N be a suitable sub module of M, as the module is coretractable therefore there is f:M/N M, f da, thus, (M/N)/kerf Imf. Yet M is injective and R is heritary, M/N is also injective [3, Theorem(5.5.6)]. Again, by the module [3, Theorem(5.5.6)], (M/N)/kerf is injective.

It's obvious.

Proposition (2.17): R should be an inherited ring and M an R-module should be coretractable. U is then an injective module for every simple submodule U of M.

Proof:

Let U be a basic M, so U M / K for a maximum K of M submodule. But M is an R-module that is coretractable. Then f: M / K M is open, f everything. So (M / K) imf. So (M / K). Since M / K is straightforward and f is 0 kerf = 0, M / K Imf and so U Imf. But R is the legacy Ring that means that [3,Theorem(5.5.6)] is injective. Thus U is a module for injection.

REFERENCES

[1]Abass M.S., 1991 On fully stable modules. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Baghdad, Iraq.

[2]Albu T. and Wisbauer R. 1997 Kasch modules. in Advances in Ring Theory (Birkhäuser, Basel), pp. 1–16.

[3]Amini B., Ershad M. and Sharif H. 2009 Coretractable Modules. J. Aust. Math. Soc. 86, 289–304.

[4]Ansari-Toroghy H. and Farshadifar F. 2011 On Multiplication And Comultiplication Modules. ActaMathematica Scientia,31B(2):694–700.

[5]Ansari-Toroghy H. And Farshadifar F. 2007 The Dual Notion Of Multiplication Modules. Taiwanese J. Of Math. Vol. 11, No. 4, Pp. 1189-1201.

[6]Al-Hosainy A.M.A. and Kadhim H.A. 2014 Co-compressible Module. International Research Journal of Scientific Findings1(6).

[7]AL-JuboryTh.Y. 2015 Modules With Closed Intersection (Sum) Property. Ph.D. Thesis, Al-Mustansiriya University, Baghdad, Iraq.

[8]Clark J.; Lomp C.; Vanaja N.; Wisbauer R. 2006 Lifting Modules, Frontiers In Mathematics. Birkhäuser.

[9]Gang Y. and Zhong-kui L. 2007 On Hopfian and Co-HopfianModules.Vietnam Journal of Mathematics 35:1, 73–80.

[10]Lee G. 2010 Theory OfRickart Modules. Ph.D. Thesis, the Ohio State University, Ohio State, U.S.A.

[11]Ghorbani A. 2010 Co-Epi-Retractable Modules And Co-Pri-Rings. Comm. Algebra 38, No. 10, 3589-3596.

[12]HadiI.M.Ali and Al-aeashi S. N. 2017 Strongly Coretractable Modules. Iraqi journal of sciences, 58(2C).

[13]HadiI.M.Ali and Al-aeashi Sh. N. 2016 Strongly Coretractable Modules and Some Related Concepts. Journal of advances in Mathematics, Vol.12, No.12, 6881-6888.

[14]HadiI.M.Ali and Al-aeashi S. N. 2017 Y-coretractable and Strongly Y-Coretractable Modules. Asian Journal of Applied Sciences, Vol. 5, No. 2, Pp.427-433.

[15]HadiI.M.Ali and Al-aeashi S. N. 2017 P-coretractable and Strongly P-Coretractable Modules. Asian Journal of Applied Sciences, Vol. 5, No. 2, Pp.477-482.

[16]Hadi I. M. and Al-aeashi S. N. 2017 Studying Some Results about Completely Coretractable Ring (CC-ring). Global Journal of Mathematics Vol. 10, No.1, Pp. 644-647.

[17]Hadi I. M. and Al-aeashi S. N. 2017 Some Results About Coretractable Modules. Journal of AL-Qadisiyah for computer science and mathematics. Vol. 9, No. 2, Pp. 40-48.

[18]HadiI.M.Ali and Al-aeashi S. N. 2018 Weakly coretractable modules. J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 1003 012061.

[19]Kalati T.A., Tutuncu D.K. 2013 Annihilator-Small Submodules. Bulletin Of The Iranian Mathematical Society Vol. 39 No. 6, Pp 1053-1063.

[20]Kalaf R. I. 2010 The Dual Notion Of Prime Submodule. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Baghdad, Iraq.

[21]Lam T. Y. Lectures on Modules and Rings. (Springer, New York, 1999).

[22]Mijbass A.S. 1997 Quasi-Dedekind Modules. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Baghdad, Iraq.

[23]Ozcan A. C., Harmanci A. and Smith P. F. 2006 Duo Modules. Glasgow Math. J. 48, 533–545.

[24]Shihab B. N. 2004 Scalar Reflexive Modules. Ph.D. Thesis, University Of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq.

[25]Varadarajan K. 1992 Hopfian and Co-Hopfian objects. Publications Matematiques 36, 293–317.

[26]Wijayanti I. E. 2006 Coprime Modules and Comodules. Ph.D. Thesis, University of D¨usseldorf, Germany.

[27]Yaseen S. M. Coquasi-Dedekind Modules. Ph.D. Thesis, University Of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq.