

## 57. A Note on Modules

By VENKATESWARA Reddy Yenumula and SATYANARAYANA Bhavanari

Department of Mathematics, Nagarjuna University,  
Nagarjunanagar-522 510, A. P. India

(Communicated by Shokichi IYANAGA, M. J. A., June 9, 1987)

**Introduction.** Let  $R$  be a fixed (not necessarily commutative) ring. Throughout this note, we are concerned with left  $R$ -modules  $M, A, H, \dots$ . Like in Goldie [1], we shall use the following terminology. A non-zero submodule  $K$  of  $M$  is called *essential* in  $M$  (or  $M$  is an *essential extension* of  $K$ ) if  $K \cap A = 0$  for any other submodule  $A$  of  $M$ , implies  $A = 0$ .  $M$  has *finite Goldie dimension* (abbr. FGD) if  $M$  does not contain a direct sum of infinite number of non-zero submodules. Equivalently,  $M$  has finite Goldie dimension if for any strictly increasing sequence  $H_0, H_1, \dots$  of submodules of  $M$ , there is an integer  $i$  such that for every  $k \geq i$ ,  $H_k$  is essential submodule in  $H_{k+1}$ .  $M$  is *uniform*, if every non-zero submodule of  $M$  is essential in  $M$ . Then it is proved (Goldie [1]) that in any module  $M$  with FGD, there exist non-zero uniform submodules  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n$  whose sum is direct and essential in  $M$ . The number  $n$  is independent of the uniform submodules. This number  $n$  is called the *Goldie dimension* of  $M$  and denoted by  $\dim M$ . It is easily proved that if  $M$  has FGD then every submodule of  $M$  has also FGD and  $\dim K \leq \dim M$  ( $K$  being a submodule of  $M$ ).

Furthermore, if  $K, A$  are submodules of  $M$ , and  $K$  is a maximal submodule of  $M$  such that  $K \cap A = 0$ , then we say that  $K$  is a *complement* of  $A$  (or a complement in  $M$ ). It is easily proved that if  $K$  is a complement in  $M$ , if and only if there exists a submodule  $A$  in  $M$  such that  $A \cap K = 0$  and  $K' \cap A \neq 0$  for any submodule  $K'$  of  $M$  containing  $K$ . In this case we have  $K + A$  is essential in  $M$ .

We are now introducing a notion "*E-irreducible submodule of  $M$* ". A submodule  $H$  of  $M$  is said to be *E-irreducible* if  $H = K \cap J$ ,  $K$  and  $J$  are submodules of  $M$ , and  $H$  is essential in  $K$ , imply  $H = K$  or  $H = J$ . Every complement submodule is an *E-irreducible* submodule, but the converse is not true.

**Example 1.** Consider  $Z$ , the ring of integers and  $Z_{12}$ , the ring of integers modulo 12. Write  $R = Z$  and  $M = Z_{12}$ . Now the principal submodule  $K$  of  $M$  generated by 2, is *E-irreducible* submodule, but not a complement submodule.

**Example 2.** Consider  $R = Z$  and  $M = Z_8 \times Z_3$ . Now the submodule  $K = (4) \times (0)$  of  $M$  is not *E-irreducible* (since  $K = (Z_8 \times (0)) \cap ((4) \times Z_3)$  and  $K$  is essential in  $Z_8 \times (0)$ ).

The purpose of this note is to prove the following result.