

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

RINGS WITH QUASI-PROJECTIVE LEFT IDEALS

SURENDER KUMAR JAIN AND SURJEET SINGH

RINGS WITH QUASI-PROJECTIVE LEFT IDEALS

S. K. JAIN AND SURJEET SINGH

A ring R is a left qp -ring if each of its left ideals is quasi-projective as a left R -module in the sense of Wu and Jans. The following results giving the structure of left qp -rings are obtained. Throughout R is a perfect ring with radical N : (1) Let R be local. Then R is a left qp -ring iff $N^2 = (0)$ or R is a principal left ideal ring with dcc on left ideals, (2) If R is a left qp -ring and T is the sum of all those indecomposable left ideals of R which are not projective, then T is an ideal of R and $N = T \oplus L$, L is a left ideal of R such that every left subideal of L is projective, R/T is hereditary, and R is hereditary iff $T = (0)$. (3) If R is left qp -ring then $R = \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix}$, where S is hereditary, T is a direct sum of finitely many local qp -rings and M is a (S, T) -bimodule. (4) A perfect left qp -ring is semi-primary. (5) Let R be an indecomposable ring such that it admits a faithful projective injective left module. Then R is a left qp -ring iff R is a local principal left ideal ring or R is a left-hereditary ring with dcc on left ideals. (6) Let R be an indecomposable QF -ring. Then R is a left qp -ring if each homomorphic image of R is a q -ring (each one-sided ideal is quasi-injective). (7) If a left ideal A of left qp -ring R is not projective then the projective dimension of A is infinite, thus $lgl. \dim R = 0, 1$, or ∞ . An example of a left artinian left qp -ring which is not right qp -ring is also given.

Clearly all left hereditary rings are left qp -rings. However, the class of commutative principal ideal artinian rings which are not direct sum of fields distinguishes qp -rings from hereditary rings. Commutative pre-self-injective rings studied by Klatt and Levy [8] and by Levy [11] form a class dual to the class of commutative qp -rings. Dual to the noncommutative qp -rings are rings for which every cyclic module is quasi-injective investigated by Ahsan [1] and by Koehler [9]. In this paper we study perfect left qp -rings.

2. A ring R is said to be right (left) perfect if it satisfies dcc on principal left (right) ideals and R is called perfect if it is both right and left perfect [3]. An artinian principal ideal ring is called uniserial.

A ring R with Jacobson radical N is called local if R/N is a division ring. We assume that all nonzero rings have nonzero identity elements

and all modules are unital. An R -module M is said to be quasi-projective if for every submodule N of M , the induced sequence $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, M/N) \rightarrow 0$ is exact. For basic properties of quasi-projective modules we refer to Wu and Jans [14]. Quasi-injective modules are defined dually in [7]. The following theorems give the structure of a quasi-projective module over a perfect ring.

THEOREM 1. (Wu and Jans [14]). *A finitely generated indecomposable quasi-projective left module over a right perfect ring R is of the form Re/Ae where e is a primitive idempotent and A is an ideal of R (Indeed the theorem is proved when R is semi-perfect.).*

THEOREM 2. (Koehler [10]). *Let R be a right perfect ring. A left R -module M is quasi-projective if and only if*

$$M = \bigoplus \sum_{i=1}^k (Re_i/Ae_i)^{s(i)}$$

Where A is an ideal and e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k are indecomposable orthogonal idempotents; the number of nonisomorphic simple R -modules is k , and Re_1, Re_2, \dots, Re_k are the corresponding nonisomorphic projective covers. In addition the decomposition is unique upto automorphism.

As defined by Miyashita [12], a module M is called perfect if for any pair of submodules A, B of M with $A + B = M$ there exists a submodule B_0 of B that is minimal with respect to the property that $A + B_0 = M$. In this case B_0 is called a d -complement of A (in M).

THEOREM 3. (Miyashita [12]). *If every homomorphic image of a module M has a projective cover then M is perfect. Further if M is perfect and quasi-projective then the sum of two submodules of M which are d -complements of each other is direct.*

Finally, in this section we state a lemma which is analogous to the lemma in Rangaswamy and Vaneja [13].

LEMMA 1. *Let $A \oplus B$ be a quasi-projective left R -module. Then every epimorphism from A to B splits.*

3. In all the Lemmas 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 which follow it is assumed that R is a perfect left qp -ring and we write $R = Re_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Re_n$, where $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ are primitive orthogonal idempotents. Denote the Jacobson radical of R by N .

LEMMA 2. *Let A and B be two indecomposable left ideals of R . Then either $A \cap B = (0)$ or A and B are comparable.*

Proof. Let $A \not\subset B$ and $B \not\subset A$. As $A + B$ is quasi-projective perfect left R -module, by Theorem 3, there exist nonzero left subideals A_0 of A and B_0 of B such that $A + B = A_0 \oplus B_0$. Then $A = A_0 \oplus (A \cap B_0)$ yields that $A = A_0$ as A is indecomposable. Similarly $B = B_0$. Hence $A \cap B = (0)$.

LEMMA 3. *If an indecomposable left ideal A is not projective then for some i , $A \subset Ne_i$ and $A = Re_i x e_i$ for some $e_i x e_i \in e_i Ne_i$; further for this i , $Re_i Re_j = (0)$ for all $j \neq i$. In particular, if $e Ne \neq (0)$ then $\text{hom}(Re, Rf) = 0$ for all primitive idempotents f not equal to e . Also conversely, any left ideal of the form $A = Re_i x e_i$, $e_i x e_i \in e_i Ne_i$ is an indecomposable nonprojective left ideal.*

Proof. By Theorem 1, $A \cong Re_i/Ie_i$ for some ideal I of R . If $A \not\subset Re_i$, then by Lemma 2, $A \cap Re_i = (0)$. But then the left ideal $Re_i \oplus A$ of R is quasi-projective and there exists an epimorphism $\sigma: Re_i \rightarrow A$ which must split by Lemma 1. So σ is an isomorphism and A is projective which is a contradiction. Hence $A \subset Ne_i$, since Ne_i is the unique maximal left subideal of Re_i . Further, A being a homomorphic image of Re_i , $A = Re_i x e_i$ for some $e_i x e_i \in e_i Ne_i$. For proving $Re_i Re_j = 0$, $i \neq j$, let us assume that for some j , $Re_i Re_j \neq 0$. So there exists $a \in R$ such that $Re_i a e_j \neq 0$. As $Re_i \oplus Re_i a e_j$ is quasi-projective, Lemma 1 yields that $Re_i \cong Re_i a e_j$. Then $Re_i a e_j \oplus A$ is quasi-projective and A is a homomorphic image of $Re_i a e_j$. Consequently, Lemma 1 gives that A is projective which is a contradiction. Hence for all $j \neq i$, $Re_i Re_j = (0)$.

LEMMA 4. *For a fixed i , either the family of all nonzero left ideals of the form $Re_i a e_i$, $e_i a e_i \in e_i Ne_i$ are isomorphic or $Re_i Ne_i = Re_i n e_i$ for some $e_i n e_i \in e_i Ne_i$.*

Proof. Since R is a perfect ring, N is both right and left T -nilpotent. We assert that there exists a maximal left ideal in the family $F = \{Re_i x e_i \mid e_i x e_i \in e_i Ne_i\}$. For if $Re_i b e_i$ is not maximal then we can find $Re_i b_1 e_i \supset Re_i b e_i$. This gives $e_i b e_i = (e_i x_1 e_i)(e_i b_1 e_i)$ with $e_i x_1 e_i \in e_i Ne_i$. If $Re_i b_1 e_i$ is not maximal then we can find $Re_i b_2 e_i \supset Re_i b_1 e_i \supset Re_i b e_i$. This yields $e_i b e_i = (e_i x_2 e_i)(e_i b_1 e_i)$ and thus $e_i b e_i = (e_i x_2 e_i)(e_i x_1 e_i)(e_i b e_i)$. By continuing this process, we get a sequence $(e_i x_j e_i)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, with $e_i x_j e_i \in e_i Ne_i$. Since N is T -nilpotent this sequence cannot be infinite. Hence we can find a maximal left ideal,

say, $Re_i ne_i$ in the family F . We claim that either $Re_i Ne_i = Re_i ne_i$ or all left ideals of the form $Re_i ae_i$, $e_i ae_i \in e_i Ne_i$ are isomorphic. So if $Re_i Ne_i \neq Re_i ne_i$ then there exists some $x \in N$ such that $Re_i xe_i \not\subset Re_i ne_i$. Then by Lemma 2, $Re_i xe_i \cap Re_i ne_i = (0)$. Let $A = Re_i ne_i \oplus Re_i xe_i$. A is a quasi-projective left ideal of R and both $Re_i ne_i$, $Re_i xe_i$ have same projective cover Re_i . So by Theorem 2, $Re_i ne_i \cong Re_i xe_i$. We now show for every $a \in N$, $Re_i ae_i$ is isomorphic to $Re_i ne_i$. By Lemma 2 and maximality of $Re_i ne_i$, $Re_i ae_i$ must have zero intersection with one of the two left ideals $Re_i ne_i$, $Re_i xe_i$. In either case we get by invoking Theorem 2 again that $Re_i ae_i \cong Re_i ne_i$. Hence all left ideals of the form $Re_i ae_i$ are isomorphic as desired. This completes the proof.

LEMMA 5. *For a fixed i either $(e_i Ne_i)^2 = (0)$ or $e_i Re_i$ is a principal left ideal ring with dcc (all proper left ideals are powers of $e_i Ne_i$) and all left subideals of Re_i generated by subsets of $e_i Ne_i$ satisfy dcc.*

Proof. There is a 1-1 inclusion preserving correspondence between all left ideals of $e_i Re_i$ and all those left subideals of Re_i which are generated by subsets of $e_i Ne_i$. If, as in the Lemma 4, all nonzero principal left subideals of Re_i of the form $Re_i ae_i$, $e_i ae_i \in e_i Ne_i$ are isomorphic, we derive that all the principal left subideals of $e_i Ne_i$ in $e_i Re_i$ are isomorphic and hence minimal. Consequently, $(e_i Ne_i)^2 = (0)$. In the other case we have $Re_i Ne_i = Re_i ne_i$. This implies $e_i Re_i Ne_i = e_i Re_i ne_i$ and so $e_i Ne_i = e_i Re_i ne_i$. Thus in the local ring $e_i Re_i$, the radical is a principal left ideal generated by a nilpotent element. This yields that all the left ideals of $e_i Re_i$ are of the form $e_i Re_i (e_i ne_i)^t (= (e_i Ne_i)^t)$, $t = 1, 2, \dots, k$, where k is the index of nilpotency of $e_i Ne_i$. But then this gives that all the left subideals of Re_i generated by the subsets of $e_i Ne_i$ are of the form $R(e_i ne_i)^t$. This completes the proof.

THEOREM 4. *Let R be a perfect left qp-ring. Then for any primitive idempotent e of R , eRe is also a left qp-ring.*

Proof. Let $R = Re_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Re_n$, where e_i are primitive orthogonal idempotents. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $e = e_1$. Let $N = J(R)$ be the Jacobson radical. If $(e_1 Ne_1)^2 = (0)$, then $e_1 Ne_1$ is a completely reducible left $e_1 Re_1$ -module. Trivially then every left ideal of $e_1 Re_1$ is quasi-projective. Suppose $(e_1 Ne_1)^2 \neq 0$. By Lemma 5, any proper left-ideal of $e_1 Re_1$ is a power of $e_1 Ne_1$, and thus it is isomorphic to $e_1 Re_1 / (e_1 Ne_1)^t$ for some positive integer t which is quasi-projective. Hence $e_1 Re_1$ is a left qp-ring.

Combining Theorem 4 and the above lemmas we obtain:

THEOREM 5. *Let R be a local perfect ring. Then R is a left qp-ring if and only if*

- (i) $N^2 = (0)$, or
- (ii) R is a principal left ideal ring with dcc on left ideals.

Next we prove a proposition which is also of an independent interest.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let R be a left perfect ring. If every left ideal contained in the radical N is projective, then R is left hereditary.*

Proof. Since idempotents modulo the radical can be lifted, given any left ideal I of R , $I = Rf_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Rf_n \oplus J$, for some idempotents f_1, \dots, f_n and for some left ideal $J \subset N$. By hypothesis J is projective. Hence I is projective and so R is left hereditary.

LEMMA 6. *Any nonzero left subideal of Ne (e primitive idempotent) of the form $Reae$ in a perfect ring R cannot have nonzero homomorphism into any indecomposable left ideal B which is a homomorphic image of some Rf with f , a primitive idempotent, such that $Rf \neq Re$.*

Proof. Let $A = Reae$. Since $eNe \neq (0)$, by Lemma 3, $ReRf = (0)$, where f is a primitive idempotent not equal to e . Since A is not projective, each of its nonzero homomorphic image is also not projective. So let B be an indecomposable homomorphic image of $A = Reae$. Since B is an indecomposable quasi-projective (but not projective) left ideal, by theorem 1, B is of the form Rf/Xf where $Xf \neq 0$ and f is some primitive idempotent. We wish to show that $f = e$. By Lemma 3, $B \subset Rf$. But then we get a nonzero homomorphism $Re \rightarrow Reae \rightarrow B \rightarrow Rf$ which is a contradiction unless $e = f$. Thus $Reae$ cannot map onto any Rf/Xf with $Rf \neq Re$. This completes the proof.

THEOREM 6. *Let R be a perfect left qp-ring and let $e_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, be a maximal set of primitive orthogonal idempotents in R . Suppose $T = \sum_{i=1}^n Re_iNe_i$. Then (i) T is the sum of all those indecomposable left ideals of R which are not projective, (ii) T is an ideal of R contained in N , and (iii) $N = T \oplus L$ for some left ideal L of R such that every left subideal of L is projective.*

Proof. By Lemma 6, $Re_iNe_iRe_j = (0)$ for $i \neq j$. So T is an ideal of R . Also, by Lemma 3, an indecomposable left ideal A of R is not projective if and only if $A = Re_ia e_i$ for some $0 \neq e_ia e_i \in e_iNe_i$. Thus it is immediate that T is the sum of all nonprojective indecomposable left

ideals of R . We now proceed to prove (iii). Since Ne_i is quasi-projective, we can write $Ne_i = \bigoplus \Sigma B_k$, where B_k are indecomposable left subideals of Ne_i (Theorem 2). Consider $0 \neq e_i x e_i \in e_i Ne_i$. Then $Re_i x e_i$ has nonzero projection into some B_k . By Lemma 6, B_k itself is of the type $Re_i y e_i$, $e_i y e_i \in e_i Ne_i$. It follows from Lemma 3 that $Re_i Ne_i$ is a sum of those indecomposable left ideals B_k which are homomorphic images of Re_i . Also if some B_k is not homomorphic image of Re_i , then this B_k must be projective. Hence we can write $Ne_i = Re_i Ne_i \oplus C_i$ where C_i is projective. This gives $N = T \oplus C$ where C is projective. Consider a left ideal $B (\neq 0)$ contained in C . Now $B = \bigoplus \Sigma X_\alpha$, where X_α are indecomposable left ideals. If some X_α is not projective, then by Lemma 3, X_α is of type $Re_i x e_i$ with $e_i x e_i$ in $e_i Ne_i$ and hence $X_\alpha \subset T$ which is a contradiction. This shows that B is projective, thus proving the theorem.

THEOREM 7. *Let R be a perfect left qp -ring, and T be the ideal as in Theorem 6. Then R/T is left hereditary and R is left hereditary if $T = (0)$.*

Proof. Consider a left ideal $A/T \subseteq N/T$. Since $N = T \oplus C$, we get $A = T \oplus (A \cap C)$. But all left subideals of C are projective. So $A \cap C$ is projective as a left R -module. Also $T(A \cap C) = (0)$ gives that $A \cap C$ is projective as left R/T -module. Then by Proposition 1, R/T is left hereditary. The last assertion in the theorem is obvious. This completes the proof.

The next theorem gives us a representation of a perfect left qp -ring as a triangular matrix ring.

THEOREM 8. *Let R be a left, right perfect left qp -ring. Then*

- (1) R is semi-primary
- (2) R is an upper-triangular matrix ring of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix}$$

where S is a hereditary semi-primary ring, T is a finite direct sum of local left qp -rings, and M is an (S, T) -bimodule such that ${}_S M$ is projective.

Before we prove this theorem we establish some preliminaries and prove three lemmas. Let R be a perfect left qp -ring and N be its radical. Let Rf_1, Rf_2, \dots, Rf_m be a maximal set of nonisomorphic indecomposable left ideals of R generated by primitive idempotents. By invoking Lemma 1 we note that any nonzero R -

homomorphism of Rf_i into Rf_j is a monomorphism. Define a relation \leq in the set $\{Rf_1, \dots, Rf_m\}$ as follows: $Rf_i \leq Rf_j$ if and only if there exists a nonzero R -homomorphism of Rf_i into Rf_j , that is, $f_i Rf_j \neq (0)$. By using the fact that in a right perfect ring R no principal left ideal Ra of R can be isomorphic to its own proper left subideal, we get that $\{Rf_1, \dots, Rf_m\}$ is a partially ordered set with respect to \leq . Further, recall Lemma 3 which says that for a given primitive idempotent f , either all left subideals of Rf are projective or $fNf \neq (0)$ and for any primitive idempotent e with $Rf \neq Re$, $fRe = (0)$. So if for some f_i , Rf_i has a left subideal which is not projective then $Rf_j \not\leq Rf_i$ for all $i \neq j$. Hence we can arrange Rf_1, \dots, Rf_m in such a way that there exists a positive integer u (possibly zero) which is less than or equal to m satisfying the following:

- (i) $f_j Rf_i = (0)$ for $i < j$.
- (ii) Every left subideal of Rf_i is projective and $f_i Rf_i$ is a division ring for $i \leq u$.
- (iii) $f_j Nf_i \neq (0)$ and $f_j Rf_i = (0)$ for $j > u$ and $i \neq j$.

Write

$$R = (Rf_{11} \oplus \dots \oplus Rf_{1t_1}) \oplus (Rf_{21} \oplus \dots \oplus Rf_{2t_2}) \oplus \dots \oplus (Rf_{m1} \oplus \dots \oplus Rf_{mt_m})$$

where f_{ij} are orthogonal primitive idempotents with their sum equal to 1 such that $Rf_{ik} \cong Rf_i$ for every k and i . Clearly, by what is stated above, $t_i = 1$ for $i \geq u + 1$; and $f_{ik} Rf_{ik}$ is a division ring whenever $i \leq u$. Let $E_i = \sum_{k=1}^{t_i} f_{ik}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $E = \sum_{i=1}^m E_i$. Then we have the following:

- LEMMA 7. (1) For $i \leq u$, $E_i R E_i$ is simple artinian.
 (2) $E_j R E_i = (0)$ whenever $i < j$.
 (3) N is nilpotent.

Proof. Since $Rf_{ik} \cong Rf_i$, $1 \leq k \leq t_i$ and $RE = \bigoplus_{k=1}^m Rf_{ik}$, we get $E_i R E_i$ is anti-isomorphic to the $t_i \times t_i$ matrix ring $D_i^{(t)}$ where $D_i^{(t)} = f_i R f_i$ is a division ring. This proves (1).

The proof of (2) is immediate consequence of the fact that $f_j Rf_i = (0)$ for $i < j$.

Finally, to prove (3), let $A = \sum_{i < j} E_i R E_j$. Then A is a nilpotent ideal and

$$\begin{aligned} R/A &\cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^u E_i R E_i \oplus \bigoplus_{i=u+1}^m E_i R E_i \\ &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^u E_i R E_i \oplus \bigoplus_{i=u+1}^m f_{i1} R f_{i1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since each $E_i R E_i$, $1 \leq i \leq u$, is simple artinian and by Theorems 4 and 5 each $f_{i1} R f_{i1}$, $u + 1 \leq i \leq m$ is a local ring with nilpotent maximal

ideal, we obtain that the radical of R/A is nilpotent. Hence N is nilpotent since A is nilpotent.

LEMMA 8. $S = ERE$ is hereditary.

Proof. Since $V = \sum_{i < j \leq u} E_i RE_j$ is the radical of S and S is semi-primary, in order to prove S is hereditary it is enough to prove that ${}_S V$ is projective. Now

$$V = \bigoplus_{i < j \leq u} E_i NE_j = \bigoplus_{j=1}^u E NE_j = \bigoplus_k \sum_{j=1}^u ENf_{jk}.$$

Also by our arrangement Nf_{jk} is projective as left R -module whenever $j \leq u$. Thus ENf_{jk} is projective as left ERE -module and hence ${}_S V$ is projective as desired.

LEMMA 9. $M = ER(1 - E)$ is a projective left ERE -module.

Proof. Consider

$$A = RER(1 - E) = \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{i \leq u} \sum_k Rf_{ik}a,$$

$a \in R(1 - E)$. Hence A is a homomorphic image of a projective module $P = \bigoplus_{a \in ER(1-E)} \sum_k \sum_{i \leq u} X_{ika}$ where $X_{ika} \cong Rf_{ik}$ for $a \in R(1 - E)$. Now A has a projective cover $Q = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} X_{\alpha}$ such that each $X_{\alpha} \cong Rf_{i(\alpha)}$, $1 \leq i(\alpha) \leq m$. As A is a left ideal of R , A is quasi-projective. So by Koehler's theorem (Theorem 2) there exists an ideal $B \subset N$ such that $A = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda} Y_{\alpha}$, $Y_{\alpha} \cong (R/B)\bar{f}_{i(\alpha)}$. Since Q is a projective cover of A , Q is a direct summand of P . Thus, for each $i(\alpha)$, there exists a nonzero R -homomorphism of $Rf_{i(\alpha)}$ into one of Rf_i with $i \leq u$. This along with (2) of Lemma 7 yields that $i(\alpha) \leq u$ for all α . Since $Y_{\alpha} \subseteq R(1 - E)$ and $i(\alpha) \leq u$, an application of the Lemma 1 gives that the canonical homomorphism $Rf_{i(\alpha)} \rightarrow (R/A)\bar{f}_{i(\alpha)} = Y_{\alpha}$ is an isomorphism. Hence $Y_{\alpha} \cong X_{\alpha}$ for all α and A is projective.

Proof of the Theorem 8. Since N is nilpotent, R is semiprimary. Further, write

$$R = ERE \oplus ER(1 - E) \oplus (1 - E)R(1 - E).$$

By the above lemmas $S = ERE$ is hereditary and $M = ER(1 - E)$ is a projective left S -module. Also $T = (1 - E)R(1 - E) = \bigoplus_{i=u+1}^n f_i Rf_i$ is a direct sum of local left qp -rings. Hence $R \cong \begin{pmatrix} S & M \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix}$ where S , T and M are as stated in the theorem.

4. In this section we prove a theorem for a perfect left qp -ring which admits a uniform projective left module. This theorem then enables us to characterize perfect left qp -rings which admit a faithful projective injective left module (Theorem 10). We begin with

THEOREM 9. *Let M be a uniform projective left module over a perfect left qp -ring R . Then $M \cong Re_i$ for some primitive idempotent e_i , and either (i) All left subideals of Ne_i are homomorphic image of Re_i and $Re_iRe_j = (0) = Re_jRe_i$ where e_j is a primitive idempotent such that $Re_i \neq Re_j$, or (ii) Ne_i is projective and all its left ideals are projective. In each case Re_i satisfies dcc on left subideals.*

Proof. $M \cong Re_i$ follows from well known result of Bass [3]. As in the proof of Theorem 6, we can write $Ne_i = Re_iNe_i \oplus B_1$ where B_1 is projective. Since Re_i is uniform either $Ne_i = Re_iNe_i$ or $Ne_i = B_1$. In case $Ne_i = Re_iNe_i$, there exists $e_in_ei \in e_iNe_i$ such that $Ne_i = Re_in_ei$. Since e_in_ei is nilpotent, we get that every left subideal of Re_i is of the form $R(e_in_ei)' = (Re_in_ei)'$ which is obviously a homomorphic image of Re_i . It also follows that Re_i has only a finite number of left subideals. By Lemma 3, we know $Re_iRe_j = (0)$ where $Re_i \neq Re_j$. We show that Re_jRe_i is also zero. Suppose not then we can choose $xe_i \in Re_i$ with $Re_jxe_i \neq 0$ and $Re_jxe_i \subset Re_i$. Lemma 1 yields that Re_jxe_i is projective and thus $Re_jxe_i \cong Re_i$. But this is a contradiction since R is perfect. This proves (i).

(In the other case we have $Ne_i = B_1$ and B_1 is projective (also uniform). So B_1 is isomorphic to some Re_j . Also by theorem 6 every subideal of B_1 is projective and hence isomorphic to some Re_k . Further by Lemma 2 it follows that the subideals of Ne_i are totally ordered. Since no subideal ($\neq Re_j$) of Re_j can be isomorphic to Re_j , we conclude that there are only a finite number of subideals of Ne_i . This completes the proof.

The next theorem characterizes perfect left qp -rings admitting a faithful projective injective module.

THEOREM 10. *Let R be an indecomposable (as a ring) perfect ring such that it admits a faithful projective injective left R -module M . Then R is a left qp -ring if and only if*

- (i) R is a local principal left ideal ring, or
- (ii) R is a left hereditary ring with dcc on left ideals

Proof. Sufficiency is obvious. So let R be a left qp -ring. If we write $R = Re_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Re_n$, e_i primitive orthogonal idempotents, then by Bass [3] M is a direct sum of copies of Re_i 's, say, Re_{i+1}, \dots, Re_n . Then

$A = Re_{t+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus Re_n$ is a faithful injective projective left R -module. We claim that each Re_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, is uniform. If $i \geq t+1$ then it is clear that Re_i is uniform. So let $i < t$. As A is faithful, $e_i Re_j \neq (0)$ for some $j \geq t+1$. By using Lemma 1, we get that Re_i is isomorphic to a left subideal of Re_j . Hence Re_i is uniform, since Re_j is uniform.

Now by Theorem 9, Re_i satisfies *dcc*. It is also clear from the proof of that theorem that each of the left subideals in Re_i is principal. Hence R satisfies *dcc* on left ideals. In case $n = 1$, R is of type (i). So consider the case when $n > 1$. We claim Ne_i is projective. For if Ne_i is not projective, then by Theorem 9, Re_i and $\sum_{j \neq i} Re_j$ are two nonzero ideals and $R = Re_i \oplus \sum_{j \neq i} Re_j$. This contradicts the assumption that R is indecomposable. Hence Ne_i is projective. So $N = \bigoplus \sum Ne_i$ is projective as a left R -module. Hence R is left hereditary left artinian. This completes the proof.

As a special case of the above theorem we have the following characterization of *QF*-rings.

THEOREM 11. *Let R be an indecomposable *QF*-ring. Then R is a left *qp*-ring iff each homomorphic image of R is a *q*-ring (each one-sided ideal is quasi-injective).*

Proof. Since a left hereditary *QF*-ring is semisimple artinian, Theorem 10 gives that either R is simple or local uniserial. In a local uniserial ring every one sided ideal is two sided and every homomorphic image is *QF*-ring. Consequently, every homomorphic image is a *q*-ring [6].

Conversely, if every homomorphic image of R is a *Q*-ring then also R is uniserial (R is uniserial iff every homomorphic image of R is *QF*, Fuller [5]). Further R is isomorphic to a full $n \times n$ matrix ring over a local ring B . If $n = 1$ then R is local uniserial. If $n > 1$ then R must be simple artinian, since R is a *q*-ring (c.f. Jain, Mohamed and Singh [6], Theorem 2.4) [6]. In each case R is a left *qp*-ring. This completes the proof.

5. In this section we study left global dimension of a perfect left *qp*-ring.

THEOREM 12. *Let R be a perfect left *qp*-ring and A be a left ideal of R . Then the projective dimension of A as a left R -module is 0 or ∞ .*

Proof. We first prove a sublemma.

SUBLEMMA. *Under the hypothesis of the theorem if e is a primitive idempotent and $0 \neq exe \in eNe$ and $1_R(exe)$ denotes the left annihilator of exe in R then $1_R(exe) = L \oplus M$, where $L = Re$, $0 \neq eye \in eNe$, is not projective.*

Proof of the sublemma. By Theorem 2 we can write $1_R(exe) = \bigoplus \Sigma A_\alpha$ where A_α are indecomposable left ideals. Also it follows from Lemma 5 that $1_R(exe) \cap eNe \neq 0$. Let us choose $0 \neq eye \in 1_R(exe) \cap eNe$. Then $Reue$ has nonzero homomorphism into one of A_α 's. By Lemma 6, $A_\alpha = Re$ for some eye in eRe . Indeed $eye \in eNe$ since $Re \not\subset 1_R(exe)$. Hence A_α is not projective. This completes the proof of the sublemma.

We now prove the theorem. Since A is a direct sum of indecomposable left ideals (Theorem 2) we may assume that A is a nonzero indecomposable left ideal. If A is projective then the projective dimension is zero. So let A be not projective. Then by Lemma 3, $A = Rexe$ for some $0 \neq exe \in eNe$ (e being some primitive idempotent). We construct an infinite projective resolution of A

$$\cdots P_n \xrightarrow{f_n} P_{n-1} \cdots \rightarrow P_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} P_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} A \rightarrow 0$$

such that for every n , $\ker f_n \cong A_n \oplus B_n$ where A_n is nonprojective indecomposable left ideal of R and is of the form $Rex_n e$, $0 \neq ex_n e \in eNe$. Choose $P_0 = Re$ and let f_0 be the natural R -homomorphism of Re onto $Rexe$. Then $\ker f_0 = 1_R(exe) = A_0 \oplus B_0$ where $A_0 = Rex_0 e$ is not projective (sublemma). Suppose we have constructed P_0, P_1, \dots, P_n with exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker f_n \xrightarrow{\lambda} P_n \xrightarrow{f_n} P_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} A$$

where λ is injection. By induction hypothesis $\ker f_n = A_n \oplus B_n$, where $0 \neq A_n = Rex_n e \in Ne$.

Consider short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow 1_R(ex_n e) \xrightarrow{\sigma_n} Re \xrightarrow{\eta_n} A_n \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow D_{n+1} \xrightarrow{\sigma'_n} Q_n \xrightarrow{\eta'_n} B_n \rightarrow 0$$

where η_n is a natural R -homomorphism, σ_n is an injection and Q_n is some projective module.

Set $P_{n+1} = Q_n \oplus Re$ and $f_{n+1} = \lambda(\eta'_n \oplus \eta_n)$. Then $\ker f_{n+1} = \ker \eta'_n \oplus \ker \eta_n$. Also $\ker \eta_n = 1_R(ex_n e) = Rex_{n+1}e \oplus K$ (by sublemma). Thus f_{n+1} has the required property. Since P_{n+1} is projective, we have obtained the desired projective resolution of A .

Recall that if R is not a semisimple artinian ring then

l. $gl \dim R = 1 + \sup \{1. \dim_R A \mid A \text{ is a left ideal}\}$.

The previous theorem then yields the following

THEOREM 13. *Let R be a perfect left qp -ring. Then*
 l. $gl \dim R = 0, 1$, or ∞ .

6. It is well known that a left hereditary semiprimary ring is also right hereditary [2]. Here we give an example of a local primary ring which is a left qp -ring but is not a right qp -ring.

EXAMPLE. Let F be a field which has an isomorphism $a \rightarrow \bar{a}$ that is not an automorphism, and let \bar{F} be the subfield of the images $\bar{a}, a \in F$. Take x to be an indeterminate over F . Let $F[x]$ be the ring of polynomials of the form $a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2, a_i \in F$; multiplication being defined by the rule $xa = \bar{a}x, x^3 = 0$ together with distributive law. It is well known that such rings are principal left ideal rings. Its radical $N = \{a_1x + a_2x^2 \mid a_i \in F\}$ is such that $N^2 \neq (0), N^3 = (0)$ and is a maximal left ideal of R . So R is a local perfect ring. Also N is not principal as a right ideal. So by Theorem 5, R is a left qp -ring but not a right qp -ring.

REFERENCES

1. J. Ahsan, *Rings all of whose cyclic modules are quasi-injective*, Proc. London Math. Soc., **27** (1973), 425–443.
2. M. Auslander, *On the dimension of modules and algebras III, global dimension*, Nagoya Math. J., **9** (1955), 67–77.
3. H. Bass, *Finitistic dimension and a homological generalization of semiprimary rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **95** (1960), 466–488.
4. C. Faith, *Algebra-Rings, Modules and Categories I*, Springer Verlag (1973).
5. K. Fuller, *Generalized uniserial rings and their Kupisch Series*, Math. Zeitschr., **106** (1968), 248–260.
6. S. K. Jain, S. Mohamed, and S. Singh, *Rings in which every right ideal is quasi-injective*, Pacific J. Math., **31** (1969), 73–79.
7. R. E. Johnson and E. T. Wong, *Quasi-injective modules and irreducible rings*, J. London Math. Soc., **36** (1961), 260–268.
8. G. Klatt and L. Levy, *Pre-self-injective rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **137** (1969), 407–419.
9. A. Koehler, *Rings with quasi-injective cyclic modules*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford, Ser. 2 (1974), 51–55.
10. ———, *Quasi-projective and quasi-injective modules*, Pacific J. Math., **36** (1971), 713–720.

11. L. Levy, *Commutative rings whose homomorphic images are self-injective*, Pacific J. Math., **18** (1966), 149–153.
12. Y. Miyashita, *Quasi-projective modules, perfect modules, and a theorem for modular lattices*, J. Fac. Sci. Hokkaido University, Ser. 1 **19** (1966), 86–110.
13. K. Rangaswamy and N. Vaneja, *Quasi-projectives in abelian and module categories*, Pacific J. Math., **43** (1972), 221–238.
14. L. Wu and J. Jans, *On quasi-projectives*, Illinois J. Math., **11** (1967), 439–448.

Received February 11, 1974. A part of this work was done while Surjeet Singh was at Bedford College, London, under the Younger Scientists Exchange Programme between India and U.K.

OHIO UNIVERSITY, ATHENS, OHIO 45701

AND

ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY, INDIA.

D. E. Bennett, <i>Strongly unicoherent continua</i>	1
Walter R. Bloom, <i>Sets of p-spectral synthesis</i>	7
R. T. Bumby and D. E. Dobbs, <i>Amitsur cohomology of quadratic extensions: Formulas and number-theoretic examples</i>	21
W. W. Comfort, <i>Compactness-like properties for generalized weak topological sums</i>	31
D. R. Dunninger and J. Locker, <i>Monotone operators and nonlinear biharmonic boundary value problems</i>	39
T. S. Erickson, W. S. Martindale, 3rd and J. M. Osborn, <i>Prime nonassociative algebras</i>	49
P. Fischer, <i>On the inequality $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \frac{f(p_i)}{f(q_i)} \geq 1$</i>	65
G. Fox and P. Morales, <i>Compact subsets of a Tychonoff set</i>	75
R. Gilmer and J. F. Hoffmann, <i>A characterization of Prüfer domains in terms of polynomials</i>	81
L. C. Glaser, <i>On tame Cantor sets in spheres having the same projection in each direction</i>	87
Z. Goseki, <i>On semigroups in which $X = XYX = XZX$ if and only if $X = XYZX$</i>	103
E. Grosswald, <i>Rational valued series of exponentials and divisor functions</i>	111
D. Handelman, <i>Strongly semiprime rings</i>	115
J. N. Henry and D. C. Taylor, <i>The $\bar{\beta}$ topology for w^*-algebras</i>	123
M. J. Hodel, <i>Enumeration of weighted p-line arrays</i>	141
S. K. Jain and S. Singh, <i>Rings with quasiprojective left ideals</i>	169
S. Jeyaratnam, <i>The diophantine equation $Y(Y+m)(Y+2m) \times (Y+3m) = 2X(X+m)(X+2m)(X+3m)$</i>	183
R. Kane, <i>On loop spaces without p torsion</i>	189
Alvin J. Kay, <i>Nonlinear integral equations and product integrals</i>	203
A. S. Kechris, <i>Countable ordinals and the analytic hierarchy, I</i>	223
Ka-Sing Lau, <i>A representation theorem for isometries of $C(X, E)$</i>	229
I. Madsen, <i>On the action of the Dyer-Lashof algebra in $H_*(G)$</i>	235
R. C. Metzler, <i>Positive linear functions, integration, and Choquet's theorem</i>	277
A. Nobile, <i>Some properties of the Nash blowing-up</i>	297
G. E. Petersen and G. V. Welland, <i>Plessner's theorem for Riesz conjugates</i>	307

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 60, No. 1

September, 1975

Donald Earl Bennett, <i>Strongly unicoherent continua</i>	1
Walter Russell Bloom, <i>Sets of p-spectral synthesis</i>	7
Richard Thomas Bumby and David Earl Dobbs, <i>Amitsur cohomology of quadratic extensions: formulas and number-theoretic examples</i>	21
W. Wistar (William) Comfort, <i>Compactness-like properties for generalized weak topological sums</i>	31
Dennis Robert Dunninger and John Stewart Locker, <i>Monotone operators and nonlinear biharmonic boundary value problems</i>	39
Theodore Erickson, Wallace Smith Martindale, III and J. Marshall Osborn, <i>Prime nonassociative algebras</i>	49
Pál Fischer, <i>On the inequality $\sum_{i=0}^n [f(p_i)/f(q_i)]p_i \geq i$</i>	65
Geoffrey Fox and Pedro Morales, <i>Compact subsets of a Tychonoff set</i>	75
Robert William Gilmer, Jr. and Joseph F. Hoffmann, <i>A characterization of Prüfer domains in terms of polynomials</i>	81
Leslie C. Glaser, <i>On tame Cantor sets in spheres having the same projection in each direction</i>	87
Zensiro Goseki, <i>On semigroups in which $x = xyx = xzx$ if and only if $x = xyzx$</i>	103
Emil Grosswald, <i>Rational valued series of exponentials and divisor functions</i>	111
David E. Handelman, <i>Strongly semiprime rings</i>	115
Jackson Neal Henry and Donald Curtis Taylor, <i>The $\bar{\beta}$ topology for W^*-algebras</i>	123
Margaret Jones Hodel, <i>Enumeration of weighted p-line arrays</i>	141
Surender Kumar Jain and Surjeet Singh, <i>Rings with quasi-projective left ideals</i>	169
S. Jeyaratnam, <i>The Diophantine equation $Y(Y+m)(Y+2m)(Y+3m) = 2X(X+m)(X+2m)(X+3m)$</i>	183
Richard Michael Kane, <i>On loop spaces without p torsion</i>	189
Alvin John Kay, <i>Nonlinear integral equations and product integrals</i>	203
Alexander S. Kechris, <i>Countable ordinals and the analytical hierarchy. I</i>	223
Ka-Sing Lau, <i>A representation theorem for isometries of $C(X, E)$</i>	229
Ib Henning Madsen, <i>On the action of the Dyer-Lashof algebra in $H_*(G)$</i> ...	235
Richard C. Metzler, <i>Positive linear functions, integration, and Choquet's theorem</i>	277
Augusto Nobile, <i>Some properties of the Nash blowing-up</i>	297
Gerald E. Peterson and Grant Welland, <i>Plessner's theorem for Riesz conjugates</i>	307