Pacific Journal of Mathematics

QUASI-PROJECTIVE AND QUASI-INJECTIVE MODULES

ANNE BRAMBLE SEARLE KOEHLER

Vol. 36, No. 3

BadMonth 1971

QUASI-PROJECTIVE AND QUASI-INJECTIVE MODULES

ANNE KOEHLER

This paper contains results which are needed to prove a decomposition theorem for quasi-projective modules over left perfect rings.

An *R*-module *M* is called quasi-projective if and only if for every *R*-module *A*, every *R*-epimorphism $q: M \to A$, and every *R*-homomorphism $f: M \to A$, there is an $f' \in \operatorname{End}_{R}(M)$ such that the diagram



commutes, that is, $q \circ f' = f$. An *R*-module *M* is called quasi-injective if and only if for every *R*-module *A*, every *R*-monomorphism $j: A \to M$, and *R*-homomorphism $f: A \to M$, there is an $f' \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$ such that the diagram



commutes.

The first section of this paper contains results which are needed to prove a decomposition theorem for quasi-projective modules over left perfect rings (Theorem 1.10). This decomposition is a characterization for quasi-projective modules over left perfect rings. A ring is left perfect if a projective cover (the dual concept of injective envelope) exists for every left *R*-module [4, p. 467]. It is known, for example, that left Artinian rings are left perfect [4, p. 467]. Some of the propositions are stated for semiperfect rings which are rings such that every finitely generated module has a projective cover [4, p. 471].

In the second section the decomposition for quasi-projective modules is used to obtain a decomposition for quasi-injective modules over a special class of rings. For these rings this decomposition characterizes quasi-injective modules. This decomposition theorem (Theorem 2.5) is specialized to the cases where the ring is quasi-Frobenius and where it is a finite dimensional algebra.

It will be assumed that all rings have an identity and that the

modules are unital. Modules will be left R-modules, and homomorphisms will be *R*-homomorphisms unless otherwise stated. When *S* is the centralizer of $_{\mathbb{R}}M$ in the sense of Jacobson [8], the notation will be abused and be written $S = \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(M)$. Actually, *S* operates on the right is anti-isomorphic to $\operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(M)$. The radical will mean the Jacobson radical and be denoted by *N*. A direct sum of card (*I*) copies of *M* will be written $M^{\mathbb{I}}$ unless card (I) = $n < \infty$, and then M^n will be used in place of $M^{\mathbb{I}}$. Also $\sum_{i=1}^k \bigoplus M_i^{g(i)}$ is a direct sum where $M_i^{g(i)}$ is g(i) copies of *M*, and g(i) can be any cardinal number. If g(i) = 0, then $M_i^{g(i)} = 0$.

I wish to thank Professor Azumaya who suggested that I investigate quasi-projective modules.

1. Quasi-projective modules. The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.10 which is a characterization of quasi-projective modules over left perfect rings. The first proposition to be presented was proved by Wu and Jans.

PROPOSITION 1.1. Let R be a semi-perfect ring. Then M is a finitely generated, indecomposable, quasi-projective module if and only if M = Re/Je where e is an indecomposable idempotent, and J is an ideal of R [12, Thm. 3.1].

PROPOSITION 1.2. Let R be a semi-perfect ring. If $Re/Je \neq 0$ where e is an indecomposable idempotent and J is an ideal, then Je = J'ewhere J' is an ideal contained in the radical N.

Proof. The module Ne is small in Re [4, p. 473]. Since Re is indecomposable and the projective cover of Re/Ne, Re/Ne is indecomposable. It is known that R/N is completely reducible if R is semi-perfect [4, Thm. 2.1]. Thus Re/Ne is simple, and Ne is maximal in Re. Now $Je \subseteq Ne$ because Ne is both maximal and small in Re. Let $J' = J \cap N$.

PROPOSITION 1.3. If M is quasi-projective and has a projective cover $P \xrightarrow{\pi} M \longrightarrow 0$ and if $P = \Sigma \bigoplus P_a$ ($a \in I$, and indexing set), then $M = \Sigma \bigoplus M_a$ and $P_a \xrightarrow{\pi_a} M_a \longrightarrow 0$ is the projective cover of M_a where $\pi_a = \pi | P_a$.

Proof. The proof for the finite case [12, Prop. 2.4] will work here also.

PROPOSITION 1.4. Let $P_a \xrightarrow{\pi_a} M_a \longrightarrow 0$ be the projective cover of M_a where $a \in I$, an indexing set. If $f(Ker \pi_a) \subseteq Ker \pi_b$ for every $a, b \in I$ and $f \in Hom_R(P_a, P_b)$, then $\Sigma \bigoplus M_a$ is quasi-projective.

Proof. It is sufficient to show that $\Sigma \bigoplus Ker \pi_a$ is an $\operatorname{End}_R(\Sigma \bigoplus P_a)$ module [12, Prop. 1.1]. Let q_c be the projection of $\Sigma \bigoplus P_a$ onto P_c and $f \in \operatorname{End}_R(\Sigma \bigoplus P_a)$. We will be done if we show $f(Ker \pi_b) \subseteq$ $\Sigma \bigoplus \operatorname{Ker} \pi_a$. Let $x \in \operatorname{Ker} \pi_b$. Since $q_a \circ (f|P_b) \in \operatorname{Hom}_R(P_b, P_a)$, f(x) = $(q_{a_1} \circ f)(x) + \cdots + (q_{a_n} \circ f)(x) \in \operatorname{Ker} \pi_a + \cdots + \operatorname{Ker} \pi_{a_n} \subseteq \Sigma \bigoplus \operatorname{Ker} \pi_a$.

REMARK. If I is finite or R is left perfect, then the converse is true, that is, if $\Sigma \bigoplus M_a$ is quasi-projective, then $f(\text{Ker } \pi_a) \subseteq \text{Ker } \pi_b$ for every $a, b \in I$ and $f \in \text{Hom}_R(P_a, P_b)$.

COROLLARY 1.5. If M is quasi-projective and has a projective cover, then M^{I} is quasi-projective.

PROPOSITION 1.6. If M_1 and M_2 are quasi-projective and have projective covers P_1 and P_2 which are isomorphic and $M_1 \bigoplus M_2$ is quasi-projective, then $M_1 \cong M_2$.

Proof. The proof of the dual theorem for quasi-injective modules [7, Prop. 2.4] can be dualized.

Bass has shown [4. p. 473] that if R is a left perfect ring and P is a projective module, then $P = \Sigma \bigoplus Re_i$ where Re_i/Ne_i is simple and e_i is an idempotent in R. This result will be stated in a different form in the next proposition.

PROPOSITION 1.7. Let R be left perfect. Then P is projective if and only if $P = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus (Re_i)^{g(i)}$ where Re_i is the projective cover of a simple module, e_i is an indecomposable idempotent, k is the number of non-isomorphic simple modules, and $Re_i \ncong Re_j$ if $i \neq j$.

Proof. Ne_i is small in Re_i [4. p. 473]. Hence Re_i is the projective cover of Re_i/Ne_i and is indecomposable by Proposition 1.3. Since R/N is left Artinian [4, p. 467], and the simple R-modules and the simple R/N-modules are the same, there are only a finite number of nonisomorphic simple modules. Also, simple modules are isomorphic if and only if their projective covers are isomorphic.

PROPOSITION 1.8. Let R be semi-perfect and M be a finitely generated, quasi-projective module. Then M is indecomposable (non-zero) if and only if $End_{\mathbb{R}}(M)$ is a local ring.

Proof. (i) If M is not indecomposable, then $\operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(M)$ has a nonzero idempotent e which is different from the identity. Since neither e nor 1 - e is a unit, $\operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(M)$ is not a local ring.

(ii) If M is indecomposable, then M = Re/Je where J' is an ideal of R and e is an indecomposable idempotent. Thus $M = R^*e^*$ where $R^* = R/J$. R^* is semi-perfect [4, Lemma 2.2]. Since M is indecomposable as an R^* -module, e^* is an indecomposable idempotent. In addition $\operatorname{End}_R(M) = \operatorname{End}_{R^*}(R^*e^*) = e^*R^*e^*$. Finally, $e^*R^*e^*$ is a local ring because R^* is semi-perfect and e^* is indecomposable [10, p. 76].

LEMMA 1.9. Let R be semi-perfect and $1 = e_1 + \cdots + e_n$ where $e_1, \cdots e_n$ are orthogonal, indecomposable idempotents. If

$$Re_1/J_1e_1 \oplus Re_2/J_2e_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus Re_m/J_me_m$$

is quasi-projective where J_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, is an ideal, then there is an ideal J such that $Je_i = J_ie_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Proof. The projective cover of $\sum_{i=i}^{m} \bigoplus Re_i/J_ie_i$ is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \bigoplus Re_i \xrightarrow{\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \bigoplus Re_i / J_i e_i \longrightarrow 0$$

where Ker $\pi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \bigoplus J_i e_i$. Since $\operatorname{End}_R(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \bigoplus Re_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} \bigoplus e_i Re_j$, it follows that $J_i e_i \cdot e_i Re_j \subseteq J_j e_j$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ [12. Prop. 2.2]. Let

$$J = \sum\limits_{i=1}^m \bigoplus J_i e_i \oplus \left(\sum\limits_{i=1}^m \bigoplus J_i e_i
ight) R \left(1 - \sum\limits_{i=1}^m e_i
ight)_{lacksymbol{\cdot}}$$

Then J is an ideal because $R = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \bigoplus \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bigoplus e_i Re_i$. Also, $Je_i = J_i e_i$ for $i = 1 \cdots, m$.

REMARKS. 1. The proof for Lemma 1.9 remains valid if any subcollection of $e_1, \dots e_n$ is used rather than the first *m* of them.

2. The result that for a semi-perfect ring $1 = e_1 + \cdots + e_n$ where e_1, \cdots, e_n are orthogonal indecomposable idempotents can be found in [10].

THEOREM 1.10. Let R be left perfect. Then M is a quasiprojective module if and only if

$$M=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus {(Re_i/Je_i)^{g(i)}}$$

where J is an ideal, e_1, \dots, e_k are indecomposable idempotents, the number of nonisomorphic simple R-modules is k, and Re_1, \dots, Re_k are the corresponding nonisomorphic projective covers. In addition the decomposition is unique up to automorphism.

Proof. (i) Let M be quasi-projective. If M = 0, then we can choose J = R and be done. If $M \neq 0$, let $P \to M \to 0$ be the projective cover of M. By Proposition 1.7 $P = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus (Re_i)^{g(i)}$ where Re_1, \dots, Re_k are the nonisomorphic indecomposable projective covers of all the simple modules. By Proposition 1.3 $M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus \sum_{a \in I_i} \bigoplus M_{ai}$ where card $(I_i) = g(i)$. Proposition 1.6 shows that $M_{ai} \cong M_{bi}$ for every $a, b \in I_i$. From Proposition 1.1 $M_{ai} = Re_i/J_ie_i$ with J_i an ideal and e_i an indecompotent. As a result of Lemma 1.9 and the remark following it, there is an ideal J such that $Je_i = J_ie_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

(ii) Conversely, if $M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus (Re_i/Je_i)^{\sigma(i)}$ with the same notation as in the statement of the theorem and $J \neq R$, then Propositions 1.2 and 1.4 show that M is quasi-projective. If J = R, then M = 0 and is, of course, quasi-projective.

(iii) Uniqueness. Using Proposition 1.8 and a generalized Krull-Remark-Schmidt theorem which was proved by Azumaya [1, Thm. 1], we have the following result: if $\sum_{a \in A} \bigoplus M_a$ and $\sum_{b \in B} \bigoplus M'_b$ are two decompositions of quasi-projective module into indecomposable, modules, then there is a 1 to 1, onto mapping $f: A \to B$ such that $M_a \cong M'_{f(a)}$.

REMARKS. 1. Theorem 1.10 is true for semi-perfect rings if M is finitely generated.

2. If M is nonzero in Theorem 1.10, then J can be chosen is the radical of the ring.

2. Quasi-injective modules. In the first section a decomposition theorem for quasi-projective modules was obtained. The motivation for attempting to prove this proposition came from a paper by Harada on quasi-injective modules [7]. Now Theorem 1.10 will be used to obtain a characterization for quasi-injective modules over left Artinian rings which have a finitely generated, lower distinguished (contains an isomorphic copy of every simple module), and injective module. This class of rings includes quasi-Frobenius rings and finitely generated algebras over commutative Artinian rings [2].

PROPOSITION 2.1. Let R be left Artinian. Then R has a finitely generated, lower distinguished, injective module if and only if the injective envelope of every simple module is finitely generated.

Proof. (Given by G. Azumaya). Assume Q is finitely generated, lower distinguished, and injective. Let Q_1, \dots, Q_k be the non-isomorphic injective envelopes of all the simple modules. Then

ANNE KOEHLER

 $Q = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus Q_i^{h(i)}$ where $0 \leq h(i) < \infty$ [2, Thm. 11, p. 268]. Since Q is lower distinguished, $h(i) \neq 0$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$. It follows that each Q_i is finitely generated. The converse is clear.

PROPOSITION 2.2. If R is left Artinian and has a finitely generated, lower distinguished, injective module, then every indecomposable quasi-injective module is finitely generated.

Proof. Let M be indecomposable and quasi-injective, and let Q be its injective envelope. Q is indecomposable [7, Proposition 2.3], so it is the injective envelope of a simple module [2, Thm. 1, p. 268]. Hence, Q is finitely generated by Proposition 2.1. Since R is left Noetherian, M is finitely generated.

REMARK. If R is perfect, then every indecomposable quasi-projective module is finitely generated by Proposition 1.7.

The following proposition was proved by Azumaya for the class of rings in the last two propositions and will be stated without giving his proof.

PROPOSITION 2.3. (Duality Theorem). Let R be a left Artinian ring which has a finitely generated, injective, and lower distinguished module Q, and let $S = End_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$. Then for any finitely generated left R-module X, $X^* = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(X, Q)$ is a finitely generated right S-module and $(X^*)^* = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S}}(X^*, Q) = {}_{\mathbb{R}}X$. The same is true for finitely generated S-modules [2, Thm. 8, p. 262].

PROPOSITION 2.4. If R is left Noetherian and M is quasi-injective, then M^{I} is quasi-injective.

Proof. Let Q be the injective, envelope of M. Since R is left Noetherian, Q^{I} is the injective envelope of M^{I} . With this result and a theorem of Johnson and Wong [9, Thm. 1.1], a procedure which is similar to the one found in the proof of Proposition 1.4 can be used to see that M^{I} is quasi-injective.

THEOREM 2.5. Let R be left Artinian and have a finitely generated, lower distinguished, and injective module Q. Then M is quasi-injective if and only if

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus (\operatorname{Hom}(e_i S/e_i J, Q))^{\mathfrak{o}(i)}$$

where $S = \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(Q)$, e_i is an indecomposable idempotent in S for $i = 1, \dots, k, J$ is an ideal of S, the number of nonisomorphic simple

R-modules is k, and for $i \neq j$ $e_i S \ncong e_j S$. This decomposition is unique up to automorphism.

Proof. If M = 0, we can choose J = S. Thus we will assume that M is a nonzero quasi-injective module. It is known that if R is left Artinian, then it is left Noetherian and has only a finite number of simple R-modules. Harada has shown that for left Noetherian rings $M = \sum \bigoplus M_a$ where the M_a 's are indecomposable quasi-injective modules and that this decomposition is unique up to automorphism [7, Prop. 2.5]. If Q_a is the injective envelope of M_a , then it is the injective envelope of a simple module (see proof of Prop. 2.2). By the dual theorem of Proposition 1.6 and the result that nonisomorphic simple modules have nonisomorphic injective envelopes, $M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus M_i^{g(i)}$ and $M_i \not\cong M_j$ for $i \neq j$.

As a result of Proposition 2.2, M_i is finitely generated. By the Duality Theorem $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, Q)$ is a finitely generated, indecomposable, quasi-projective, right S-module. Also, S is right Artinian [2, Thm. 6, p. 259]. Hence, $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M_i, Q) = e_i S/e_i J_i$ where e_i is an indecomposable idempotent in S, and J_i is an ideal of S. Since $\sum_{g(i)\neq 0} \bigoplus M_i$ is a direct summand of M it is quasi-injetive. It follows that $\operatorname{Hom}(\sum_{g(i)\neq 0} \bigoplus M_i, Q) = \sum_{g(i)\neq 0} \bigoplus \operatorname{Hom}(M_i, Q) = \sum_{g(i)\neq 0} \bigoplus e_i S/e_i J_i$ and is quasi-projective. For $i \neq j$ $M_i \ncong M_j$, so $e_i S \not\cong e_j S$. By Lemma 1.9 and a remark following it we can choose $J_i = J$ for $g(i) \neq 0$. In addition $M_i = \operatorname{Hom}(\operatorname{Hom}(M_i, Q), Q) = \operatorname{Hom}_S(e_i S/e_i J, Q)$.

(ii) Suppose $M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus (\operatorname{Hom}_{S}(e_{i}S/e_{i}J, Q)^{g(i)})$ with the same notation as in the statement of the theorem. Let $M' = \sum_{g(i)\neq 0} \bigoplus \operatorname{Hom}_{S}(e_{i}S/e_{i}J, Q)$. Then $\operatorname{Hom}_{R}(M', Q) = \sum_{g(i)\neq 0} \bigoplus e_{i}S/e_{i}J$ which is quasi-projective by Theorem 1.10. Thus M' is quasi-injective. Let $m = \max\{g(i)\}_{i=1}, \dots, k$ and $M'' = (M')^{m}$. Proposition 2.4 gives us that M'' is quasi-injective. Therefore the direct summand M is quasi-injective.

COROLLARY 2.6. Let R be quasi-Frobenius. Then M is quasiinjective if and only if

$$M=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} igoplus (\operatorname{Hom}_{R}\left(e_{i}R/e_{i}J,\ R
ight))^{g\left(i
ight) }.$$

Proof. R being quasi-Frobenius implies R is left Artinian, self injective, lower distinguished, and finitely generated [2, Thm. 6, p. 259]. Also, $R = \operatorname{End}_{R}(R)$.

COROLLARY 2.7. Let R be a finitely generated algebra over a commutative Artinian ring K. Then M is quasi-injective if and only if

$$M=\sum\limits_{i=1}^k \bigoplus \left(\operatorname{Hom}_{\scriptscriptstyle K}(e_iR/e_iJ,\,F)
ight)^{g(i)}$$

where F is the K-injective envelope of K/rad K.

Proof. R has a finitely generated, lower distinguished, injective module Q such that $R = \operatorname{End}_R(Q)$ [2, Prop. 19, p. 273]. The functors $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot, F)$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(\cdot, Q)$ are naturally equivalent for finitely generated R-modules [2, Thm. 20, 275].

COROLLARY 2.8. Let R be a finite dimensional algebra over a field K. Then M is quasi-injective if and only if

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus (\operatorname{Hom}_{K} (e_{i}R/e_{i}J, K))^{g(i)}.$$

Proof. K = F in Corollary 2.7.

References

1. G. Azumaya, Corrections and supplementaries to my paper concerning Krull-Remak-Schmidt's theorem, Nagoya Math. J. 1 (1950), 117-124.

_____, A duality theory for injective modules, Amer. J. Math. 81 (1959), 249-278.
 _____, Completely faithful modules and self-injective rings, Nagoya Math. J. 27 (1966), 697-708.

4. H. Bass, Finitistic dimension and a homological generalization of semi-primary rings, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 95 (1960), 466-488.

5. ____, The Morita theorems, mimeographed notes.

6. S. Eilenberg, Homological dimension and syzygies, Ann. of Math. 64 (1956), 328-336.

7. M. Harada, Note on quasi-injective modules, Osaka J. Math. 2 (1965). 351-356.

8. N. Jacobson, Structure of rings, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1964.

9. R. E. Johnson and E. T. Wong, *Quasi-injective modules and irreducible rings*, J. London Math Soc., **36** (1961), 260-268.

 J. Lambek, Lectures on Rings and Modules, Blaisdell Publishing Co., Toronto, 1966.
 E. Matlis, Injective modules over Noetherian rings, Pacific J. Math., 8 (1958), 511-528.

12. L. E. T. Wu and J. P. Jans, On quasi-projectives, Ill. J. Math. 11 (1967), 439-447.

Received August 19, 1968. This paper is part of the author's thesis at Indiana University and was partially supported by NSF Grant No. GP5799 and an NSF Traineeship.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401 AND MIAMI UNIVERSITY OXFORD, OHIO 45056

720

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

H. SAMELSON Stanford University Stanford, California 94305

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington 98105

C. R. HOBBY

J. DUGUNDJI Department of Mathematics University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007

RICHARD ARENS

University of California Los Angeles, California 90024

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

| E. F. BECKENBACH B. H. NEUMANN F. | . WOLE | K. Yoshida |
|-----------------------------------|--------|------------|
|-----------------------------------|--------|------------|

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON OSAKA UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA STANFORD UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF UTAH WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

* * * AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY CHEVRON RESEARCH CORPORATION NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. The editorial "we" must not be used in the synopsis, and items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. Index to Vol. **39**. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints are provided free for each article; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is \$8.00; single issues, \$3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$4.00 per volume; single issues \$1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 7-17, Fujimi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

Pacific Journal of MathematicsVol. 36, No. 3BadMonth, 1971

| E. M. Alfsen and B. Hirsberg, <i>On dominated extensions in linear subspaces of</i> $\mathscr{C}_{C}(X)$ | 567 |
|--|-----|
| Joby Milo Anthony, Topologies for quotient fields of commutative integral domains | 585 |
| V. Balakrishnan, G. Sankaranarayanan and C. Suyambulingom, <i>Ordered cycle</i> lengths in a random permutation | 603 |
| Victor Allen Belfi. Nontangential homotopy equivalences | 615 |
| Jane Maxwell Day. Compact semigroups with square roots | 623 |
| Norman Henry Eggert, Jr., Quasi regular groups of finite commutative nilpotent algebras | 631 |
| Paul Frdős and Frnst Gabor Straus. Some number theoretic results | 635 |
| George Rudolph Gordh. Jr., Monotone decompositions of irreducible Hausdorff | 000 |
| continua | 647 |
| Darald Joe Hartfiel, <i>The matrix equation</i> $AXB = X$ | 659 |
| James Howard Hedlund, <i>Expansive automorphisms of Banach spaces</i> . II | 671 |
| I. Martin (Irving) Isaacs. The p-parts of character degrees in p-solvable | |
| groups | 677 |
| Donald Glen Johnson, <i>Rings of quotients of</i> Φ-algebras | 693 |
| Norman Lloyd Johnson, Transition planes constructed from semifield | |
| planes | 701 |
| Anne Bramble Searle Koehler, <i>Quasi-projective and quasi-injective modules</i> | 713 |
| James J. Kuzmanovich, Completions of Dedekind prime rings as second | |
| endomorphism rings | 721 |
| B. T. Y. Kwee, On generalized translated quasi-Cesàro summability | 731 |
| Yves A. Lequain, <i>Differential simplicity and complete integral closure</i> | 741 |
| Mordechai Lewin, On nonnegative matrices | 753 |
| Kevin Mor McCrimmon, Speciality of quadratic Jordan algebras | 761 |
| Hussain Sayid Nur, Singular perturbations of differential equations in abstract | |
| spaces | 775 |
| D. K. Oates, A non-compact Krein-Milman theorem | 781 |
| Lavon Barry Page, Operators that commute with a unilateral shift on an | |
| invariant subspace | 787 |
| Helga Schirmer, Properties of fixed point sets on dendrites. | 795 |
| Saharon Shelah, On the number of non-almost isomorphic models of T in a nower | 811 |
| Robert Moffatt Stephenson Ir Minimal first countable Hausdorff spaces | 810 |
| Masamichi Takesaki, <i>The quotient algebra of a finite von Neumann</i> | 019 |
| algebra | 827 |
| Benjamin Baxter Wells, Jr., <i>Interpolation in</i> $C(\Omega)$ | 833 |