Annales Univ. Sci. Budapest., Sect. Comp. 51 (2020) 275–288

CHARACTERIZATIONS OF QF-RINGS IN TERMS OF PSEUDO C*-INJECTIVITY

Phan Hong Tin (Hue, Vietnam)
Muhammet Tamer Koşan (Ankara, Turkey)
Truong Cong Quynh (Da Nang, Vietnam)
Le Van Thuyet (Hue, Vietnam)

Communicated by Bui Minh Phong

(Received January 24, 2020; accepted April 15, 2020)

Abstract. As a generalization of quasi-injective modules, an R-module M is pseudo N-c*-injective for every R-module N iff M is injective. In view of this new fact, we can get new generalizations of the following important observations taking the pseudo N-c*-injectivity instead of the continuity and the injectivity, respectively: if R is right continuous, left min-CS and satisfies ACC on its right annihilators then R is quasi Frobenius, and if $R_R^{(\mathbb{N})}$ is injective then R is quasi Frobenius.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, R is an associative ring with identity and all modules are unitary. M_R ($_RM$) denotes a right (left) R-module. For a module M, we use $E(M)$ and $End(M_R)$ to denote the injective hull and the endomorphism ring of M, respectively. We write $N \leq M$ if N is a submodule of M, $N \leq^{ess} M$ if N is an essential submodule of M and $N \leq^{\oplus} M$ if N is a direct summand of M. We denote by $\mathbb{M}_n(R)$ for the $n \times n$ matrix ring over R.

Key words and phrases: Pseudo c*-injective modules.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16D40, 16E50, 16N20.
Le Van Thuyet and Phan Hong Tin is funded by Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) under grant number 101.04-2018.02. Le Van Thuyet and Truong Cong Quynh would like to thank Hue University for the received support.

We first recall some known notions and facts needed in the sequel.

For any submodule K of M the family of submodules N satisfying $K \cap N = 0$ has a maximal member by Zorn's Lemma, which is called *complement* of K in M. A submodule N of M is called a *complement* in M if N is a complement of a submodule of M. It is well known that a submodule is a complement in M if and only if it has no proper essential extensions in M (namely, a closed submodule). A module is called a *CS-module*, or *extending*, or it satisfies (C1) provided every complement submodule is a direct summand. Note that semi-simple modules, uniform modules and injective modules are CS. Injective modules and CS-modules are very important in algebra because their structures are well known for many classes of rings and each module has a unique injective envelope. There are other generalizations of injectivity;

C2: Every submodule of M that is isomorphic to a direct summand of M is itself a direct summand of M.

C3: If A and B are direct summands of M with $A \cap B = 0$, then $A \oplus B$ is also a direct summand of M.

Clearly, each C2-module is also a C3-module. However, if R is any integral domain which is not a field, then R is C3, but not C2.

A module M is *quasi-injective* in case each homomorphism $g : N \to M$ from a submodule N of M extends to M. For example, each semisimple module is quasi-injective. A module M is *continuous*, if M is both C1 and C2; M is *quasi-continuous* if M is both C1 and C3. We have the following hierarchy for any module M: M is injective $\Rightarrow$ M is quasi-injective $\Rightarrow$ M is continuous $\Rightarrow$ M is quasi-continuous. Let R be any hereditary two-sided noetherian right V-ring. By [4, Proposition 5.19(3)], the classes of all quasi-injective and all injective modules coincide and the class Ci ($i = 2, 3$) is closed under finite direct sums if and only if Ci ($i = 2, 3$) coincides with the class of all injective modules if and only if R is a semisimple artinian ring by [16, Theorem 3.2].

A module M is called continuous (resp., quasi - continuous) if it satisfies C1 and C2 (resp., C1 and C3).

As natural generalizations of quasi-injective modules:

An R-module M is called *GQ-injective* (*generalized quasi-injective*) if, for any submodule N which is isomorphic to a complement K of M, every left R-homomorphism of N into M extends to an endomorphism of M [10].

A module X is called *M-c-injective* if, for every closed submodule K of M, every homomorphism $f : K \to X$ can be lifted to M ([3]). The module M is called self-c-injective if M is M-c-injective.

A module M is called *pseudo-injective* if M is invariant under any monomorphism of its injective hull $E(M)$. By [8], a module is quasi-injective if and only if it is pseudo-injective CS.

A submodule N of M is called an *automorphism-invariant* submodule if $fN \subseteq N$ for every automorphism f of M, and a module is called an *automorphism-invariant module* if it is an automorphism-invariant submodule of its injective hull [12].

A module N is said to be *pseudo M-c*-injective* if for any submodule A of M which is isomorphic to a closed submodule of M, every monomorphism from A to N can be extended to a homomorphism from M to N ([15]). A module M is called *pseudo c*-injective* if M is pseudo M-c*-injective. A ring R is called right (resp., left) pseudo c*-injective if R_R (resp., $_RR$) is pseudo c*-injective.

It is easy to see that automorphism-invariant modules are pseudo c*-injective. We have some examples showed that there exist automorphism-invariant modules which are not quasi-injective or self-injective.

In the present paper, we continue to develop properties of these modules. Here we prove that the class of pseudo c*-injective modules is closed under taking direct summands. By [15], the class of pseudo c*-injective modules is a proper extension of the class of continuous modules and it is a proper subclass of modules which satisfy the C2 condition.

A ring R is called *quasi Frobenius* if R is two-sided self injective two-sided Artinian and R is called right *min-CS* if every its minimal right ideal is essential in a direct summand of R. It is easy to see that, if R is right (resp., left) CS then R is right (resp., left) min-CS. The converse is not true in general. For example, let $R = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_4 & \mathbb{Z}_4 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_4 \end{pmatrix}$, then R is right min-CS but it is not right CS ([13, page 86]).

In [14], Nicholson and Yousif proved that, if R is right continuous, left min-CS and satisfies ACC on its right annihilators then R is quasi Frobenius. In Theorem 3.12, we proved that if R is right pseudo c*-injective, two-sided min-CS and satisfies ACC on its right annihilators then R is quasi Frobenius.

In [7], the authors C. Faith and D. V. Huynh proved if $R_R^{(\mathbb{N})}$ is injective then R is quasi Frobenius. In Corollary 3.13, we proved that if $R_R^{(\mathbb{N})}$ is pseudo c*-injective then R is quasi Frobenius.

2. Examples

Recall that quasi-injective or self-injective modules are automorphism invariant and automorphism invariant modules are pseudo c*-injective.

The following two examples give us that there exists an indecomposable module with finite Goldie dimension which is automorphism invariant but not quasi-injective.

Example 2.1. Let $R = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{F}_2 & \mathbb{F}_2 & \mathbb{F}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{F}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{F}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ where $\mathbb{F}_2$ is the field of two elements. Take $M := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{F}_2 & \mathbb{F}_2 & \mathbb{F}_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = e_{11}R$, where e_{11} is a primitive idempotent. Clearly M is an indecomposable right R-module. Since R is a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_2$-algebra, M is an artinian right R-module and hence it has finite Goldie dimension.

Note that M has two simple submodules $S_1 = e_{12}R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{F}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $S_2 = e_{13}R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \mathbb{F}_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, which implies that M is automorphism invariant. But clearly M is not quasi-injective as it is not uniform.

Example 2.2. Let $A = \mathbb{F}_2[x]$ where $\mathbb{F}_2$ is the field of two elements and $R = \begin{bmatrix} A/(x) & 0 \\ A/(x) & A/(x^2) \end{bmatrix}$. Take $M := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ A/(x) & A/(x^2) \end{bmatrix} M = e_{22}R$, where e_{22} is a primitive idempotent. Clearly, M is an indecomposable right R-module. Note that M has two simple submodules $S_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ A/(x) & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $S_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (x)/(x^2) \end{bmatrix}$ such that $S_1 \oplus S_2$ is essential in M. Clearly, R is a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_2$-algebra. Then M is automorphism invariant. But M is not quasi-injective as M is not uniform.

Example 2.3. Consider the ring R consisting of all eventually constant sequences of elements from $\mathbb{F}_2$. Clearly, R is a commutative automorphism-invariant ring as the only automorphism of its injective envelope is the identity automorphism. But R is not self-injective.

Example 2.4. Let D be a PCI-domain, that is not a division ring. Denote by $E(D)$ the injective hull of D. Then $E(D)/D$ is semisimple, and so $E(D)$ has a maximal submodule M containing D. It follows that M is a continuous right D-module and not injective. Then, M is pseudo c*-injective. Assume that M is automorphism invariant, then M would be injective by [9, Corrolary 3.3], a contradiction. Thus, M is not automorphism invariant.

3. Results

We begin with recalling the basic properties of pseudo M-c*-injective modules.

Lemma 3.1 ([15, Lemma 3.1]). *Let M and N be two modules.*

(1) *If N is pseudo M-c*-injective and A is a direct summand of N, A is pseudo M-c*-injective.*

(2) *If N is pseudo M-c*-injective and B is a closed submodule of M, N is pseudo B-c*-injective.*

(3) *If M is pseudo c*-injective, A is pseudo c*-injective for all fully invariant closed submodule A of M.*

Lemma 3.2. *Let M, M', N, N' be modules, $M \cong M'$ and $N \cong N'$. If M is pseudo N-c*-injective then M' is pseudo N'-c*-injective.*

Proof. Let $K \leq M'$. Assume K is isomorphic to a closed submodule of M' and consider the monomorphism $f : K \to N'$. If $\varphi : M' \to M$, $\psi : N' \to N$ is an isomorphism, then $\varphi(K)$ is closed in M and $\psi f : K \to N$ is a monomorphism. Set $g = \psi f \varphi^{-1}_{|\varphi(K)} : \varphi(K) \to N$. By the hypothesis, there exists a homomophism $h : M \to N$ such that it is an extension of g. Now, we show that $\psi^{-1} h\varphi : M' \to N'$ is an extension of f. For every $k \in K$, we get $(\psi^{-1}h\varphi)(k) = \psi^{-1}(h\varphi(k)) = \psi^{-1}(g\varphi(k)) = \psi^{-1}(\psi f(k)) = f(k)$, as desired. ■

Theorem 3.3. *Let M and N be two modules.*

(1) *If M is a pseudo c*-injective module, then*

  (a) *Every direct summand of M is also pseudo c*-injective.*

  (b) *If $N \cong M$, then N is pseudo c*-injective.*

(2) *If $N = \Pi_{i\in I} N_i$ is pseudo M-c*-injective then N_i is pseudo M-c*-injective for all $i \in I$.*

(3) *Let $M = \oplus_{i\in I} M_i$, M_i is uniform module for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n$. Then M is continuous if and only if M is pseudo c*-injective.*

Proof. (1) This follows from Lemmas 3.1 and Lemma 3.2.

(2) Let $N = \Pi_{i\in I} N_i$ be a pseudo M-c*-injective, A be a submodule which is isomorphic to a closed submodule of M and $f_i : A \to N_i$ be a monomorphism. Consider the natural inclusions $\eta_i : N_i \to N$ and the canonical projections $\pi_i : N \to N_i$. Clearly, $g_i = \eta_i \circ f_i : A \to X$ is a monomorphism. Then, there

exists a homomorphism $\varphi_i : M \to X$ which extends to g_i. Set $\psi_i = \pi_i \circ g_i$. It is easy to see that ψ_i is an extension of f_i. Thus, N_i is pseudo M-c*-injective.

(3) This is [15, Theorem 3.4]. ■

Recall that a ring R is called right *hereditary* (resp., *semihereditary*) if every right (resp., finitely generated) ideal of R is projective as R-module. In [11, Corollary 2.28], Lam proved that a ring R is right semihereditary if and only if every right finitely generated projective submodule of R-module is projective. We have:

Theorem 3.4. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *Every right closed ideal of R is projective;*

(2) *Every factor module of a pseudo R_R-c*-injective module is also pseudo R_R-c*-injective;*

(3) *Every factor module of a pseudo R_R-injective module is pseudo R_R-c*-injective;*

(4) *Every factor module of an injective module is pseudo R_R-c*-injective.*

Proof. (2) ⇒ (3) ⇒ (4) This is clear.

(1) ⇒ (2) Let E be a pseudo R_R-c*-injective module and consider the epimorphism $\pi : E \to B$. Let $f : I \to B$ be a monomorphism, where I is a right ideal of R. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & I & \stackrel{i}{\longrightarrow} & R \\ & g \swarrow & f\downarrow & & \\ E & \stackrel{\pi}{\longrightarrow} & B & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where i is the canonical monomorphism. By (1), I is projective. Then, there exist a homomorphism $g : I \to E$ such that $\pi g = f$. Since E is pseudo R_R-c*-injective, there exists a homomorphism $h : R \to E$ such that $hi = g$. Set $\varphi = \pi g : R \to B$. Then $\varphi i = f$ and so B is pseudo R_R-c*-injective.

(4) ⇒ (1) Let I be a closed right ideal of R and consider the epimorphism $h : A \to B$ and the homomorphism $\alpha : I \to B$. Clearly, $\psi : B = h(A) \to \to A/\operatorname{Ker} h$ is an isomorphism defined by $\psi(h(a)) = a + \operatorname{Ker} h$. For the monomorphism $\iota_1 : A/\operatorname{Ker} h \to E(A)/\operatorname{Ker} h$, set $j = \iota_1\psi$ and consider the

following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & I & \xrightarrow{i} & R \\ & & \downarrow \alpha & & \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & B & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow j & & \\ E(A) & \xrightarrow{p} & E(A)/\operatorname{Ker} h & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

By (4), $E(A)/\operatorname{Ker} h$ is pseudo R_R-injective. Then, there exists a homomorphism $\alpha' : R \to E(A)/\operatorname{Ker} h$ such that $\alpha' i = j\alpha$. Since R_R is projective, there exists a homomorphic $\alpha'' : R \to E(A)$ such that $p\alpha'' = \alpha'$. Set $h' = \alpha'' i : I \to E(A)$. Clearly, $h'(I) \leq A$, so there exists a homomorphism $\varphi : I \to A$ such that $\varphi(x) = h'(x)$ for all $x \in I$.

Now, we show $h\varphi = \alpha$. For every $x \in I$, we have $j\alpha(x) = \alpha'(i(x)) = \alpha'(x) = = p\alpha''(x) = ph'(x) = p\alpha(x)$. Since, α is an epimorphism, $\alpha(x) = h(a)$ for some $a \in A$. Then $j\alpha(x) = j(h(a)) = a + \operatorname{Ker} h$. Hence, $a + \operatorname{Ker} h = \varphi(x) + \operatorname{Ker} h$, i.e., $h(a - \varphi(x)) = 0$. It follows $\varphi(x) = h(a) = \alpha(x)$. Thus, I is projective. ■

Theorem 3.5 ([15, Theorem 3.3]). *If $M \oplus N$ is a pseudo c^*-injective then M is N-injective.*

Corollary 3.6. *A ring R is right quasi injective if and only if $(R \oplus R)_R$ is pseudo c^*-injective.*

From Corollary 3.6 and [13, Theorem 1.50], we have:

Corollary 3.7. *A ring R is quasi Frobenius if and only if R satisfies ACC on right (or left) annihilators and $(R \oplus R)_R$ is pseudo c^*-injective.*

Theorem 3.8. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *The direct sum of every two pseudo c^*-injective modules is pseudo c^*-injective;*

(2) *Every pseudo c^*-injective module is injective;*

(3) *The direct sum of any family of pseudo c^*-injective modules is pseudo c^*-injective.*

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2) Assume M is pseudo c*-injective. By the hypothesis, $M \oplus E(R_R)$ is pseudo c*-injective. By Theorem 3.5, M is $E(R_R)$-injective, so M is R_R-injective. Hence, M is an injective R-module.

(2) ⇒ (3) We first prove R is a right Noetherian. Consider a family simple modules $(S_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $E_i = E(S_i)$ be the injective envelopes of S_i. Since $\oplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} S_i$

is semisimple, it is pseudo c*-injective. By the hypothesis, $\oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} S_i$ is injective. Hence, $\oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} S_i$ is direct summand of $\oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} E_i$. However, $\oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} S_i \leq^e \oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} E_i$. It follows $\oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} S_i = \oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} E_i$. So, $\oplus_{i\in\mathbb{N}} E_i$ is injective. By [11, Therem 3.46], R is right Noetherian. Now, assume $(M_i)_{i\in I}$ is a family of pseudo c*-injective R-modules. Since, M_i is injective for all $i \in I$, we get $\oplus_I M_i$ is injective. Hence, $\oplus_I M_i$ is pseudo c*-injective.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) This is clear. ■

Recall the following hierarchy for any module M: M is injective $\Rightarrow$ M is quasi-injective.

Theorem 3.9. *The following statements are equivalent for an R-module M:*

(1) *M is injective;*

(2) *M is pseudo N-c*-injective for every R-module N.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) This is clear.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) Consider the external direct sum $M \oplus E(M)$. Then, $M \oplus 0$ is a closed submodule of $M \oplus E(M)$ and $M \cong 0 \oplus M \cong M \oplus 0$. Consider the homomorphism $\alpha : M \to 0 \oplus M$ defined by $\alpha(m) = (0, m)$ for all $m \in M$. Clearly, α is an isomorphism. By the hypothesis, M is pseudo $M \oplus E(M)$-c*-injective. There exists a homomorphism $\beta : M \oplus E(M) \to M$ such that $\beta j = \alpha^{-1}$, where $j : 0 \oplus M \to M \oplus E(M)$ is the canonical projection. We have $\beta j \alpha = \alpha^{-1}\alpha = 1_M$ and $j\alpha = \iota_2\iota$ where $\iota : M \to E(M), \iota_2 : E(M) \to M \oplus E(M)$ are inclusions. Hence $(\beta\iota_2)\iota = 1_M$. So, M is a summand of $E(M)$, i.e., M is injective. ■

For a module M, we use $J(M)$ and $\mathrm{Soc}(M)$ to denote the Jacobson radical and the socle of M, respectively.

Proposition 3.10. *If R is a right pseudo c*-injective ring and $R/\mathrm{Soc}(R_R)$ satisfies ACC on right annihilators, then $J(R)$ is nilpotent.*

Proof. Assume $R/\mathrm{Soc}(R_R)$ has ACC on right annihilators. Set $S = \mathrm{Soc}(R_R)$ and $\overline{R} = R/S$. Take $\overline{a} \in \overline{R}$ such that $\overline{a} = a + S$ where $a \in R$.

For $a_1, a_2, ... \in J(R)$, we have

$$r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_1) \leq r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1) \leq \cdots \leq r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_n...\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1).$$

By the hypothesis, there exists a positive integer m such that

$$r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_n...\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1) = r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_m...\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1)$$

for all $n > m$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $r(a_{n+1}a_n...a_1) \leq^e R_R$ since $a_{n+1}a_n...a_1 \in$ $\in J(R) = Z(R_R)$. Hence $S \leq r(a_{n+1}a_n...a_1)$. Now we shall prove

$$r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_n...\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1) \leq r(a_{n+1}a_n...a_1)/S \leq r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_{n+1}...\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1).$$

If $b + S \in r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_n...\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1)$, then $a_n...a_1b \in S$. Since $S \leq r(a_{n+1})$, we get $a_{n+1}a_n...a_1b = 0$. Thus $b \in r(a_{n+1}a_n...a_1)$ which implies that $b+S \in r(a_{n+1}a_n...a_1)/S$. Clearly, $r(a_{n+1}a_n...a_1)/S \leq r_{\overline{R}}(\overline{a}_{n+1}...\overline{a}_2.\overline{a}_1)$. Hence,

$$r(a_{m+1}a_n...a_1)/S = r(a_{m+2}a_{m+1}...a_1)/S.$$

Then,

$$r(a_{m+1}a_n...a_1) = r(a_{m+2}a_{m+1}...a_1).$$

So, $a_{m+1}a_m...a_1R \cap r(a_{m+2}) = 0$. As $r(a_{m+2})$ is closed right ideal of R, we have $a_{m+1}a_m...a_1 = 0$ which shows $J(R)$ is right T-nilpotent and $(J(R)+S)/S$ is a right T-nilpotent ideal. By [2, Proposition 29.1], $(J(R)+S)/S$ is nilpotent. There exists a positive integer number k such that $J(R)^k \leq S$. So, $J(R)^{k+1} \leq$ $\leq SJ(R) = 0$, i.e., $J(R)$ is nilpotent. ■

Recall that a family $\{A_i | i \in I\}$ of submodules of a module M is independent if and only if the sum of the A_i is a direct sum. Equivalently, the map $\oplus_{i\in I}A_i \to$ $\to \sum_{i\in I} A_i$ is an isomorphism. A family $\{A_i | i \in I\}$ of independent submodules of a module M is said to be a *local direct summand* if for any finite subset $J \subset I$, $\oplus_{i\in J}A_i$ is a direct summand of M.

Lemma 3.11 ([15, Corollary 3.6]). *If R is right pseudo c^*-injective and satisfies ACC on right annihilators, then R is semiprimary.*

By [13], a ring R is quasi Frobenius if only if R is right continuous, left min-CS and satisfies ACC on its right annihilators.

Theorem 3.12. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *R is quasi Frobenius;*

(2) *R is right pseudo-c^*-injective, two-sided min-CS and satisfies ACC on right annihilators.*

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2) This is clear.

(2) ⇒ (1) Since R is right pseudo-c^*-injective and satisfies ACC on right annihilators, by [15, Corollary 3.6], R is semiprimary. Assume $\mathrm{Soc}(R_R) = \oplus_{i\in I}S_i$ where each S_i is a simple. As R is right min-CS, there exists idempotents f_i of R such that $S_i \leq^e f_iR$. On the other hand, $(S_i)_{i\in I}$ is independent, so $(f_iR)_{i\in I}$ is independent and $\mathrm{Soc}(R_R) \leq \oplus_{i\in I}f_iR$. Hence, $\oplus_{i\in I}f_iR \leq^e R_R$. By [15, Theorem 3.1], R_R satisfies the C2 condition. Then $\oplus_{i\in I}f_iR$ is a local direct

summand of R_R. In addition, R satisfies ACC on right annihilators, by [6, Lemma 8.1(1)], $\oplus_{i\in I} f_i R$ is closed submodule of R_R. Since $\oplus_{i\in I} f_i R \leq^e R_R$, we get $R_R = \oplus_{i\in I} f_i R$. So $R_R = \oplus_{i=1}^n f_i R$ (for some positive integer n) and $f_i R$ are uniforms for all $i = 1, 2, ..., n$. By Theorem 3.3, R is right continuous and so R is quasi Frobenius by [13, Theorem 4.22]. ■

By [7], if $R_R^{(\mathbb{N})}$ is injective, (i.e., R is right countable injective) then R is quasi Frobenius.

Corollary 3.13. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *R is quasi Frobenius;*

(2) *$R_R^{(\mathbb{N})}$ is pseudo c^*-injective.*

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2) This is clear.

(2) ⇒ (1) This follows from Theorem 3.5 and [7, Corollary 9.1]. ■

Corollary 3.14. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *R is quasi Frobenius;*

(2) *R is left Noetherian, right pseudo c^*-injective and two-sided min-CS.*

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2) This is clear.

(2) ⇒ (1) As R is left Noetherian, $R/J(R)$ is also a left Noetherian ring. By [15, Corollary 3.4], $R/J(R)$ is a von Neumann regular ring, so $R/J(R)$ is a semisimple Artinian ring. By Proposition 3.10, $J(R)$ is nilpotent and so R is semiprimary. Thus R is a left Artinian ring which implies that R satisfies ACC on right annihilators. By Theorem 3.12, R is QF. ■

We finish this part with a question: Is there a right pseudo c*-injective and right min-CS ring but it is not right continuous?

4. On rings in which every cyclic module is pseudo c*-injective

In this section, we study rings R in which every cyclic right R-module is pseudo c*-injective.

An R-module M is called a C4-module if, whenever A_1 and A_2 are submodules of M with $M = A_1 \oplus A_2$ and $f : A_1 \to A_2$ is an R-homomorphism with $ker(f) \leq^{\oplus} A_1$, we have $Im(f) \leq^{\oplus} A_2$ [5].

Proposition 4.1. *Let R be a ring in which every cyclic right R-module is pseudo c^*-injective and let e and f be orthogonal idempotents of R. Then the following conditions holds:*

(1) *If* $eaf \neq 0$ *for some* $a \in R$*, then* $eafR \subseteq^{\oplus} eR$.

(2) *If* $fR \cong eR$*, then for every* $0 \neq b \in eR$*,* bR *contains a nonzero idempotent of* R*. In particular* $rad(eR) = rad(fR) = 0$.

(3) *If* e, f *are indecomposable and* $eaf \neq 0$ *for some* $a \in R$*, then* $eR \cong fR$ *and they are minimal right ideals of* R.

Proof. Let e and f be orthogonal idempotents of R. Then, we have that eR and fR are orthogonal summands and obtain $eR \oplus fR = (e+f)R$. Hence o $eR \oplus fR$ is a summand of R.

(1) We define $g : fR \longrightarrow eR$ by $g(fr) = eafr$. Clearly, g is a well-defined non-zero homomorphism with $Im(g) = eafR$. Set $K = Ker(g)$ and consider the monomorphism $h : fR/K \longrightarrow eR$ defined by $h(a+K) = g(a)$, for all $a \in fR$. Since every cyclic right R-module is pseudo c*-injective, $(e+f)R/K \cong$ $\cong fR/K \oplus eR$ is a pseudo c*-injective module. So $eafR = Im(g) = Im(h)$ is a direct summand of eR.

(2) Let $fR \cong eR$, and $b \in eR$ with $b \neq 0$. One can check that $b = eb$. Now, if $eb(1-e) \neq 0$, then, by (1), $eb(1-e)R \subseteq^{\oplus} eR$. Since $eb(1-e)R \subseteq ebR = bR$, we get bR contains a non-zero idempotent, as required. If $eb(1-e) = 0$, then $b = eb = ebe$. We see $ebeR \oplus eR \cong ebeR \oplus fR = (ebe+f)R$ and so, by hypothesis, $ebeR \oplus eR$ is a $C4$-module. Consequently, $ebeR \subseteq^{\oplus} eR$ and bR contains a non-zero idempotent, since $ebeR = ebR = bR$. Now, if $K \subseteq eR$ is a small submodule of eR and $0 \neq k \in K$, then kR contains a non-zero idempotent $g \in R$ by the first part of the proof, and so gR is small in eR, a contradiction. Hence $rad(eR) = 0$. Therefore, $rad(fR) = 0$.

(3) By (1), we get $eafR$ a direct summand of R, and so $eafR = eR$ is projective. Therefore, the epimorphism $g : fR \to eafR$ given by $g(fr) = eafr$ splits by the projectivity of $eafR$. Thus, $eR = eafR \cong fR$. Now, if $0 \neq$ $\neq b \in eR$, then bR contains a nonzero idempotent of R by (2) and since eR is indecomposable $bR = eR$. Hence eR as well as fR is minimal. ■

Corollary 4.2. *Let* R *be a ring in which every cyclic right* R*-module is pseudo* c^**-injective such that* $R = C \oplus A \oplus B$ *where* $A \cong B$ *and* C *embeds in* $A \oplus B$*. Then* $rad(R) = 0$.

In particular, if every cyclic right R*-module is pseudo* c^**-injective such that* $R = A \oplus B$ *where* $A \cong B$*, then* $rad(R) = 0$.

A ring is called an *I-finite ring* if it contains no infinite sets of orthogonal idempotents.

Theorem 4.3. *Let* $R/J(R)$ *be an I-finite ring. Then every cyclic right* R*-module is pseudo* c^**-injective if and only if* $R = S \oplus T$*, where* S *is semisimple artinian and* T *is a finite direct sum of semilocal rings with no nontrivial idempotents in which every cyclic right module is pseudo* c^**-injective.*

Proof. Assume that $R/J(R)$ is an I-finite ring. Then R is an I-finite ring, and so the ring R has an indecomposable decomposition $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R \oplus \cdots \oplus e_nR$, where e_i are pairwise orthogonal primitive idempotents of R. Denote

$$[e_tR] = \sum_i \{e_iR : e_iR \cong e_tR\}.$$

Renumbering if necessary, we may write $R = [e_1R] \oplus [e_2R] \oplus \cdots \oplus [e_kR]$. By Proposition 4.1, each $[e_iR]$ is an ideal of R. If $[e_iR]$ contains more than one direct summands, then $[e_iR]$ is a simple artinian ring by Proposition 4.1. If $[e_jR]$ consists of exactly one direct summand, then $T_j := [e_jR] = e_jR = e_jRe_j$ is a rings with no nontrivial idempotents in which every cyclic right module is pseudo c*-injective. Next, we show that each T_j is a semilocal ring. In fact, we have that $R/J(R)$ is an I-finite ring and obtain that the ring $T_j/J(T_j)$ is too. Note that e_jR is a pseudo c*-injective module. It follows that $T_j/J(T_j)$ is a regular ring. We deduce that T_j is a semilocal ring. ■

Corollary 4.4. *Let R be a semiperfect ring. Then every cyclic right R-module is pseudo c*-injective if and only if $R = S \oplus T$, where S is semisimple artinian and T is a finite direct sum of local rings with no nontrivial idempotents in which every cyclic right module is pseudo c*-injective.*

We denote by $\mathbb{M}_n(R)$ for the $n \times n$ matrix ring over R.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $n \geq 2$. The following are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *Every n-generated R-module is a pseudo c*-injective module.*

(2) *Every cyclic $\mathbb{M}_n(R)$-module is a pseudo c*-injective module.*

Proof. Let $P = (R^n)_R$ and $S = \mathrm{End}(P_R)$. Then

$$Hom_R(P, -) : N_R \mapsto Hom_R({}_SP_R, N_R)$$

defines a Morita equivalence between Mod-R and Mod-S with the inverse equivalence $- \otimes_S P : M_S \mapsto M \otimes P$. For any n-generated R-module N, $Hom_R(P, N)$ is a cyclic S-module, and, for any cyclic S-module M, $M \otimes_S P$ is an n-generated R-module. Moreover, a Morita equivalence preserves the pseudo c*-injectivity for modules. Thus, every cyclic S-module is a pseudo c*-injective module if and only if every n-generated R-module is a pseudo c*-injective module. ■

Corollary 4.6. *The following are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *Every cyclic $\mathbb{M}_2(R)$-module is a pseudo c*-injective module.*

(2) *Every 2-generated R-module is a pseudo c*-injective module.*

(3) *R is semisimple.*

Proof. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) This follows from Lemma 4.5

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) & (2) They are obvious.

(1) & (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) First we show that every cyclic right R-module is quasi-injective. In fact, let $M = mR$ be a cyclic right R-module with $m \in M$. By hypothesis, the 2-generated right R-module $mR \oplus mR$ is pseudo c*-injective, and so $M = mR$ is quasi-injective, as required. Now, we show that $rad(R) = 0$. Clearly, by (1), every cyclic $\mathbb{M}_2(R)$-module is a pseudo c*-injective module. We have $M_2(R) = \begin{bmatrix} R & R \\ R & R \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} R & R \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ R & R \end{bmatrix}$ is a direct sum of two isomorphic right ideals. By Corollary 4.2, $rad(M_2(R)) = 0$ Consequently, $rad(R) = 0$ since $rad(M_2(R)) = M_2(rad(R))) = 0$. Inasmuch as R has the property that every cyclic right R-module is quasi-injective and $rad(R) = 0$, we infer from [1, Corollary], that R is semisimple. ∎

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank the referee for carefully reading the paper. The suggestions of the referee have improved the presentation of this paper.

References

[1] **Ahsan, J.,** Rings all whose cyclic modules are quasi-injective, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **27(3)** (1973), 425–439.

[2] **Anderson, F.W. and K.R. Fuller,** *Rings and Categories of Modules*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974.

[3] **Clara, C.S. and P.F. Smith,** Which are self-injective relative to closed submodules, *Contemporary of Mathematics*, 259, American Math. Soc. Providence, pp. 487–499, 2000.

[4] **Cozzens, J. and C. Faith,** *Simple Noetherian Rings*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1975.

[5] **Ding, N., Y. Ibrahim, M.F. Yousif and Y. Zhou,** C4-modules, *Commun. Algebra*, **45(4)** (2017), 1727–1740.

[6] **Dung, N.V., D.V. Huynh, P.F. Smith and R. Wisbauer,** *Extending Modules*, Pitman Research Notes in Math. 313, Longman, Harlow, New York, 1994.

[7] **Faith, C. and D.V. Huynh,** When self-injective rings are QF: A report on a problem, *Journal of Algebra and its Applications*, **1(1)** (2002), 75–105.

[8] **Ganesan, L. and N. Vanaja,** Strongly discrete modules, *Commun. Algebra*, **35** (2007), 897–913.

[9] **Hai, D.Q.,** A note on pseudo-injective modules, *Commun. Algebra*, **33(2)** (2005), 361–369.

[10] **Harada, M.,** Modules with extending properties, *Osaka J. Math.* **19** (1982), 203–215.

[11] **Lam, T.Y.,** *Lectures on Modules and Rings*, Springer-Verlag, 1999.

[12] **Lee, T.K. and Y. Zhou,** Modules which are invariant under automorphisms of their injective hulls, *J. Algebra Appl.*,**12(2)** (2013), 1250159, 9pp.

[13] **Nicholson, W.K. and M.F. Yousif,** *Quasi-Frobenius Rings*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.

[14] **Nicholson, W.K. and M.F. Yousif,** Continuous rings with chain conditions, *J. Pure Applied Algebra*, **97** (1994), 325–332.

[15] **Quynh, T.C. and P.H. Tin,** Modules satisfying extension conditions under monomorphism of their closed submodules, *Asian-European J. Math.*, **5(3)** (2012), 12 pages.

[16] **Sahinkaya, S. and J. Trlifaj,** Generalized injectivity and approximations, *Commun. Algebra*, **44(9)** (2016), 4047–4055.

[17] **Singh, S. and S.K. Jain,** On pseudo injective modules and self pseudo injective rings, *The Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, **2(1)** (1967), 125–133.

P. H. Tin
Hue Industrial College
Hue
Vietnam
phtin@hueic.edu.vn

M. T. Koşan
Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Sciences
Gazi University
Ankara
Turkey
mtamerkosan@gazi.edu.tr
tkosan@gmail.com

T. C. Quynh
Department of Mathematics
The University of Danang
University of Science and Education
Danang
Vietnam
tcquynh@ued.udn.vn

L. V. Thuyet
Department of Mathematics
College of Education
Hue University
Hue
Vietnam
lvthuyet@hueuni.edu.vn