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A ring $R$ is called strongly regular if for every element $a \in R$ there exists an element $x \in R$ such that $a=a^{2} x$. As is well-known, $R$ is strongly regular if and only if one of the following equivalent conditions is satisfied:
(A) For every element $a \in R$ there holds $a \in a R$ and there exists a central idempotent $e$ such that $a R=e R$.
(B) $R$ is a regular ring without nonzero nilpotent elements. Obviously, the notion "strongly regular" is right-left symmetric. Next, a ring $R$ is called a right [left] duo ring if every right [left] ideal of $R$ is an ideal. Finally, a ring $R$ is called a right [left] $V$-ring if $R^{2}=R$ and every right [left] ideal of $R$ is an intersection of maximal right [left] ideals of $R$.

It is the purpose of this note to prove the following that contains [2; Theorem 2], [5; Theorem] and [7; Theorem 3 and Corollary 1]:

Theorem. The following conditions are equivalent:
(1) $R$ is strongly regular.
(2) $R$ is a regular ring and is a subdirect sum of division rings.
(3) $\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{x}=\mathfrak{l x}$ for every left ideal $\mathfrak{l}$ and every right ideal $\mathfrak{x}$ of $R$.
(4) $R$ contains no nonzero nilpotent elements and $R / p$ is regular

(5) $R$ is a regular, right duo ring.
(6) $\mathfrak{r} \cap \mathfrak{r}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{r x}^{\prime}$ for each right ideals $\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r}^{\prime}$ of $R$.
(7) $R$ is a right duo ring such that every ideal is idempotent.
(8) $R$ is a right duo, right $V$-ring.
(9) $R$ contains no nonzero nilpotent elements and every completely prime ideal $\sqsubseteq R$ is a maximal right ideal.
(5')-(9'). The left-right analogues of (5)-(9).
In the proof of our theorem, we shall use several familiar results, which are summarized in the next lemma.

Lemma. Let $R$ be a ring without nonzero nilpotent elements, and let $a, b$ be elements of $R$.
(a) If $a b=0$ then $b a=0$, and so the right annihilator $r(a)$ coincides with the left one $l(a)$.
(b) If $a$ is nonzero then $R / r(a)$ contains no nonzero nilpotent elements and the residue class $\bar{a}$ of $a \bmod r(a)$ is a non-zero-divisor.
(c) If $R$ is a prime ring then $R$ contains no nonzero zero-divisors.

Proof of Theorem. (2) $\Rightarrow(1) \Rightarrow(4),(1) \Rightarrow(5) \Rightarrow(6) \Rightarrow(7)$, (1) (and (6)) $\Rightarrow(3) \Rightarrow(6)$ : These are easily seen.
$(7) \Rightarrow(1)$ : Let $a$ be an arbitrary element of $R$, and (a) the (right) ideal generated by $a$. Then, $(a)=(a)^{2}=(a) R(a)=a R(a)=\left(a^{2}\right)$, whence it follows that $a=a^{2} x$ with some $x$.
$(1) \Rightarrow(2)$ : $\quad$ Since a regular ring is semi-simple, it suffices to prove that a strongly regular prime ring $R$ is a division ring. Given a nonzero $a \in R$, there exists a central idempotent $e$ such that $a \in a R=e R$. Since $e(x-e x)=0$ for every $x \in R, R=e R=a R$ by Lemma (c). Hence, $e$ is the identity of $R$ and $a$ is invertible.
$(1) \Rightarrow(8)$ : It remains only to prove that an arbitrary ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of $R$ is an intersection of maximal ideals. Let $b$ be not in $\mathfrak{a}$, and $e$ a central idempotent such that $b \in b R=e R$. There exists then an ideal $\mathfrak{m \supseteq a}$ which is maximal with respect to the exclusion of $b$. Since the set $\{e\}$ is multiplicatively closed and $\mathfrak{m}$ is maximal with respect to the exclusion of $\{e\}, \mathfrak{m}$ is a prime ideal. As was shown in the proof of $(1) \Rightarrow(2), R / \mathfrak{m}$ is a division ring, nemely, $\mathfrak{m}$ is maximal.
$(8) \Rightarrow(1): \quad$ Suppose that there exists an element $a$ not contained in $a^{2} R$. We can find then a maximal (right) ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ such that $a^{2} R \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ and $a \notin \mathfrak{m}$. Since $R / \mathfrak{m}$ is a division ring, we have $a^{3} \notin \mathfrak{m}$, which contradicts $a^{2} R \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$.
$(4) \Rightarrow(9)$ : This is obvious by the proof of $(1) \Rightarrow(2)$.
$(9) \Rightarrow(1)$ : Let $a$ be a nonzero element of $R$. Then, by Lemma (b), $\bar{R}=R / r(a)$ contains no nonzero nilpotent elements, $\bar{a}$ is a non-zerodivisor of $\bar{R}$, and every completely prime ideal $\subseteq \bar{R}$ is a maximal right ideal of $\bar{R}$. Now, let $M$ be the multiplicative semigroup generated by all the elements $\bar{a}-\bar{a}^{2} \bar{x}(x \in R)$. Although the existence of the identity of $\bar{R}$ is not assumed, we may write $\bar{a}-\bar{a}^{2} \bar{x}=\bar{a}(1-\bar{a} \bar{x})$. First, we claim that $M$ contains 0 . In fact, if not, there exists a completely prime ideal $\bar{p}$ excluding $M$ (see [1]). However, the existence of the inverse of $\bar{x} \bmod \bar{p}$ yields a contradiction. Now, let $\bar{a}\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{1}\right) \cdots \bar{a}\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{n}\right)=0$, where $n$ is chosen to be minimal. If $n>2$ then $\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{1}\right) \cdots \bar{a}\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{n}\right)=0$ yields a contradiction $\bar{a}\left\{\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{n}\right)\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{1}\right)\right\} \cdots \bar{a}\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{n-1}\right)=0($ Lemma (a)). Next, if $n=2$ then $\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{1}\right) \bar{a}\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{2}\right) \bar{a}^{2}=0$ yields $\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{2}\right) \bar{a} \bar{a}\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{1}\right)=0$, and hence $\bar{a}\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{1}\right)\left(1-\bar{a} \bar{x}_{2}\right)=0$ again by Lemma (a). We have seen therefore $a-a^{2} x_{1} \in r(a)=l(a)$, whence it follows $\left(a-a^{2} x_{1}\right)^{2}=0$, namely, $a=\alpha^{2} x_{1}$.

Remark. In [7; Theorem 3], E. T. Wong proves also that if $R$ is a strongly regular ring with 1 then for each $a \in R$ there exists a unit $u$ such that $a^{2} u=a$. But, G. Ehrlich [3; Theorem 3] has proved the same with an elementary proof. Next, as a corollary to our theorem,
we have the following theorem due to R. Hamsher: A commutative ring $R$ is regular if and only if it has no nonzero nilpotent elements and every prime ideal $\subsetneq R$ is maximal. Combining this with a theorem of W. Krull [4; Satz 10], we obtain at once the result of H. Lal [6; Theorem]: A commutative ring $R$ with 1 is regular if and only if every primary ideal $\sqsubseteq R$ is maximal.
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