Pacific Journal of Mathematics

RINGS WHOSE PROPER CYCLIC MODULES ARE QUASI-INJECTIVE

Surender Kumar Jain, Surjeet Singh and Robin Gregory Symonds

Vol. 67, No. 2 February 1976

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 67, No. 2, 1976

RINGS WHOSE PROPER CYCLIC MODULES ARE QUASI-INJECTIVE

S. K. JAIN, SURJEET SINGH, AND R. G. SYMONDS

A ring R with identity is a right $PCQI$-ring (PCI-ring) if every cyclic right R-module $C \not\cong R$ is quasi-injective (injective). Left $PCQI$-rings (PCI-rings) are similarly defined. Among others the following results are proved: (1) A right $PCQI$-ring is either prime or semi-perfect. (2) A nonprime nonlocal ring is a right $PCQI$-ring iff every cyclic right R-module is quasi-injective or $R \cong \begin{pmatrix} D & D \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$, where D is a division ring. In particular, a nonprime nonlocal right $PCQI$-ring is also a left $PCQI$-ring. (3) A local right $PCQI$-ring with maximal ideal M is a right valuation ring or $M^2 = (0)$. (4) A prime local right $PCQI$-ring is a right valuation domain. (5) A right $PCQI$-domain is a right Öre-domain. Faith proved (5) for right PCI-domains. If R is commutative then some of the main results of Klatt and Levy on pre-self-injective rings follow as a special case of these results.

Since, in a commutative Dedekind domain D, for each nonzero ideal A, D/A is a self-injective ring, or equivalently D/A is a quasi-injective D-module, every commutative Dedekind domain is a $PCQI$-ring. An example of a $PCQI$-ring which is not a Dedekind domain is given in Levy [14]. Commutative $PCQI$-rings are precisely the pre-self-injective rings characterized by Klatt and Levy [11]. PCI-rings have recently been investigated by Faith [4]. Right self-injective right $PCQI$-rings are qc-rings which have been studied by Ahsan [1] and Koehler [13].

1. Definitions and preliminaries. Throughout all modules are unitary and right unless specified. An R-module X is called injective relative to an R-module M if for each short exact sequence $0 \to N \to M \to M/N \to 0$ the sequence $0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(M/N, X) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, X) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(N, X) \to 0$ is exact. X is called quasi-injective if X is injective relative to itself. Any R-module injective relative to all R-modules is called injective. Relative projectivity is defined dually.

A ring R is called a right q-ring if each of its right ideals is quasi-injective (see Jain, Mohamed, and Singh [9]). For more results, see [7], [8], [13], [15]. Dually, a ring R is called a right q^*-ring if each cyclic right R-module is quasi-projective (see Koehler [12]).

A ring R is right qc-ring if each cyclic right R-module is quasi-injective (see Ahsan [1]). A well-known result of Osofsky [16] states that R is semisimple artinian iff each cyclic R-module is injective. Koehler [13] showed that R is a right qc-ring iff R is a finite direct sum of rings each of which is semisimple artinian or a rank o duo maximal valuation ring. As a consequence, every qc-ring is both a q-ring and q^*-ring.

In this paper the classes of rings initially called q-rings, q^*-rings, and qc-rings have been called Q-rings, Q^*-rings, and QC-rings respectively.

Let $J(R)$ denote the radical of a ring R. R is called semiperfect if $R/J(R)$ is semisimple artinian and idempotents modulo $J(R)$ can be lifted to R. If R is semiperfect, then there exists a finite maximal family of primitive orthogonal idempotents $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ such that $R = \bigoplus \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i R$.

R is called a local ring if it has a unique maximal right ideal which must be the radical $J(R)$.

R is a right valuation ring if the set of all right ideals is linearly ordered. R is a maximal valuation ring if every family of pairwise solvable congruences of the form $x \equiv x_\alpha (\text{mod } A_\alpha)$ has a simultaneous solution where $x_\alpha \in R$ and each A_α is an ideal in R. R is called an almost maximal valuation ring if each of its proper homomorphic images is a maximal valuation ring.

A ring is right duo if every right ideal is two-sided. A ring R has rank O if every prime ideal is a maximal ideal. By duo rings or valuation rings, we shall mean both right and left.

3. General results.

SUBLEMMA 1. *Let I be a right ideal in a ring R such that $R/I \cong R$. Then $R = I \oplus J$, where J is a right ideal, and thus $I = eR$, $e = e^2 \in R$.*

Proof. $R/I \cong R$ implies R/I is projective, and hence I is a direct summand of R.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let R be a right PCQI-ring. If I is a right ideal of R such that $R/I \cong R$, then I is contained in every nonzero two-sided ideal of R.*

Proof. Let S be a nonzero two-sided ideal of R. Then R/S is a qc-ring, hence is semiperfect. Let $f: R/I \to R$ be an isomorphism. Since $1 + I$ generates R/I, $\bar{R} = xR$, where $x = f(1 + I)$. Then $I = \text{ann}\, x = \{r \in R \mid xr = 0\}$. So there exists $y \in R$ such that $xy = 1$. Since R/S is semiperfect, $(x + S)(y + S) = 1 + S = (y + S)(x + S)$. Then $1 - yx \in S$. Let $a \in I$, i.e., $xa = 0$. Then $(1 - yx)a = a - yxa = a$, hence $a \in S$. So $I \subseteq S$.

PROPOSITION 3. *Let R be a right PCQI-ring. Then either R is a prime ring or R is semiperfect with nil radical.*

Proof. Suppose R is not prime, and $P \neq 0$ is a prime ideal. Then R/P is a qc-ring, and hence a q-ring. So R/P is simple artinian [9]. Thus P is maximal, hence primitive. So the Jacobson radical is nil.

Since R is not prime, there exist nonzero ideals A, B such that $AB = 0$. Since R is a right $PCQI$-ring, R/A and R/B are semiperfect, hence each of them has finitely many prime ideals. Since every prime ideal of R contains A or B, it follows that R has finitely many prime ideals as well. Thus $R/J(R)$ is semisimple artinian, and since $J(R)$ is nil, R is semiperfect.

4. Nonlocal semiperfect $PCQI$-rings.

By Proposition 3, all nonprime right $PCQI$-rings are semiperfect, so the results of this section hold for the class of nonprime nonlocal right $PCQI$-rings. The case of local right $PCQI$-rings is discussed in the next section.

LEMMA 4. *Let R be a semiperfect ring. Then R/A is a proper cyclic right R-module, for all nonzero right ideals A.*

Proof. There exists a positive integer n such that R is a direct sum of n indecomposable right R-modules, and R cannot be expressed as a direct sum of more than n right R-modules. Now, if $R/A \cong R$, then, by Lemma 1, $R = A \oplus B$ and $B \cong R$. So $A = (0)$, proving the lemma.

Let R be a nonlocal semiperfect ring, and let $\{e_i\}_{1 \leqq i \leqq n}$ be a maximal set of primitive orthogonal idempotents in R. Then $R = \bigoplus \sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i R$ and $n \geqq 2$. Throughout this section, e_i's will denote primitive idempotents. We shall often use a well-known fact that if $A \oplus B$ is a quasi-injective module then any monomorphism $A \rightarrow B$ splits.

LEMMA 5. *Let R be a semiperfect nonlocal right PCQI-ring. If $\sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(e_i R, e_j R)$ such that $\sigma \neq 0$, where $i \neq j$, then* $\ker \sigma = (0)$.

Proof. Suppose $\ker \sigma \neq (0)$, where $0 \neq \sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(e_i R, e_j R)$, $i \neq j$. Then $R/\ker \sigma \cong \bigoplus \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^{n} e_k R \times \mathrm{Im}\, \sigma$, and $R/\ker \sigma$ is quasi-injective. Since $\mathrm{Im}\, \sigma \subsetneqq e_j R$, the inclusion map $i \colon \mathrm{Im}\, \sigma \rightarrow \bigoplus \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^{n} e_k R$ is a monomorphism. Since $R/\ker \sigma$ is quasi-injective, the inclusion map splits. So $\mathrm{Im}\, \sigma$ is a direct summand of $e_j R$, hence $\mathrm{Im}\, \sigma = e_j R$. Since $e_j R$ is projective, $\sigma \colon e_i R \rightarrow e_j R$ splits. Thus $\ker \sigma = (0)$.

LEMMA 6. *Let R be a semiperfect nonlocal right PCQI-ring with decomposition $\bigoplus\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_iR$, where $n > 2$. Then* $\mathrm{Hom}_R(e_iR, e_jR) \neq 0$ *iff* $e_iR \cong e_jR$, i.e., $e_jRe_i \neq 0$ *iff* $e_iR \cong e_jR$.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(e_iR, e_jR)$ such that $\sigma \neq 0$. By Lemma 5, $\ker \sigma = 0$. Since $n > 2$, $e_iR \oplus e_jR \cong R/\bigoplus\sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\neq i,j}}^{n} e_kR$ is quasi-injective. Then σ splits, and $0 \neq \mathrm{Im}\,\sigma$ is a direct summand of e_jR. So $\mathrm{Im}\,\sigma = e_jR$, and σ is an isomorphism. The converse is trivial.

PROPOSITION 7. *Let R be a semiperfect nonlocal right PCQI-ring with decomposition $R = \bigoplus\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_iR$, where $n > 2$. Then R is a qc-ring.*

Proof. For each i, $e_iR \cong R/\bigoplus\sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\neq i}}^{n} e_kR$. So e_iR is quasi-injective, for each i. Let A_i be the sum of all those e_iR which are isomorphic to each other. Then $R = \bigoplus\sum_{i=1}^{p} A_i$. We claim that A_i is a two-sided ideal of R, for each i. Clearly A_i is a right ideal. Consider e_jR such that $e_jR \not\subseteq A_i$. Define $f\colon e_iR \to e_jR$, where $e_iR \subseteq A_i$, by $f(e_ir) = e_jxe_ir$, for $x \in R$. Then $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(e_iR, e_jR)$. Since e_iR and e_jR are not isomorphic, $f = 0$ by Lemma 6. So, for $e_jR \subsetneqq A_i$, $e_jRA_i = 0$. So $RA_i \subset A_i$. Since A_i is a finite direct sum of isomorphic quasi-injective right ideals, A_i is quasi-injective, hence a *qc*-ring. Thus, by Koehler [13], R is a *qc*-ring.

PROPOSITION 8. *Let R be a semiperfect right PCQI-ring such that $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R$. If $e_1R \cong e_2R$, then R is a qc-ring.*

Proof. Now $e_1R \cong e_2R$ and $R/e_2R \cong R/e_1R$, hence e_2R and e_1R are quasi-injective. Since $e_1R \cong e_2R$, $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R$ is quasi-injective, hence right self-injective. So R is a *qc*-ring.

PROPOSITION 9. *Let R be a semiperfect right PCQI-ring such that $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R$. If $e_1Re_2 = 0$ and $e_2Re_1 = 0$, then R is a qc-ring.*

Proof. If $e_1Re_2 = 0$ and $e_2Re_1 = 0$, then e_1R and e_2R are two-sided ideals of R. Thus $e_1R \cong R/e_2R$ and $e_2R \cong R/e_1R$ are *qc*-rings. Then $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R$ is a *qc*-ring.

PROPOSITION 10. *Let R be a semiperfect right PCQI-ring such that $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R$. If $e_1Re_2 \neq 0$ and $e_2Re_1 \neq 0$, then R is a qc-ring.*

Proof. $e_1Re_2 \neq 0$ and $e_2Re_1 \neq 0$ imply that there exist nonzero homomorphisms, hence monomorphisms by Lemma 5, from e_1R to e_2R and from e_2R to e_1R. Thus, by Bumby [2], $e_1R \cong e_2R$, and Proposition 8 yields the result.

PROPOSITION 11. *Let* $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R$ *be a semiperfect right PCQI-ring where* $e_1R \not\cong e_2R$ *and exactly one of* e_1Re_2 *or* e_2Re_1 *is zero. Then* R *is nonprime with nil radical.*

Proof. It follows from that the fact that if $e_1Re_2 \neq 0$, then e_1Re_2 is a nilpotent ideal.

THEOREM 12. *Let* R *be a nonlocal right PCQI-ring. Then* R *is semiperfect iff* R *is nonprime or simple artinian.*

Proof. Necessity follows by Proposition 3, and sufficiency follows from Proposition 7-11 and Koehler's characterization of qc-rings [13] (cf. definitions and preliminaries).

THEOREM 13. *Let* R *be a semiperfect nonlocal ring. Then* R *is a right PCQI-ring iff either* (i) $R = \bigoplus \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i$, *where* R_i *is semisimple artinian or a rank o duo maximal valuation ring or* (ii) $R = \begin{pmatrix} D & D \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$, *where* D *is a division ring.*

Proof. Let R be a right $PCQI$-ring. By Propositions 7-10, R is a qc-ring unless $R = e_1R \oplus e_2R$, where e_1R and e_2R are not isomorphic and exactly one of e_1Re_2 or e_2Re_1 is zero, say $e_1Re_2 \neq 0$ and $e_2Re_1 = 0$. If R is a QC-ring, we get (i) by Koehler [13]. Otherwise, we have $R \cong \begin{pmatrix} e_1Re_1 & e_1Re_2 \\ 0 & e_2Re_2 \end{pmatrix}$. We claim that e_1Re_1 and e_2Re_2 are isomorphic division rings and $M = e_1Re_2$ is a (D, D)-bimodule such that $\dim_D M = 1 = \dim M_D$, where $D \cong e_1Re_1 \cong e_2Re_2$. Clearly e_1Re_2 is nilpotent ideal and since it is nonzero, R is not prime. So, by Proposition 3, the radical N of R is a nil ideal. Thus e_2Ne_2 is nil. We claim that $e_2Ne_2 = 0$. Let $e_2xe_2 \in e_2Ne_2$. Define $\sigma\colon e_2R \to e_2R$ by $\sigma(e_2y) = e_2xe_2y$. Then $\sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(e_2R, e_2R)$, and since e_2xe_2 is nilpotent, σ is not a monomorphism. So $\ker \sigma \neq (0)$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_R(e_2R, e_1R) \neq 0$, there exists an embedding $\eta\colon e_2R \to e_1R$. Now $\eta\sigma\colon e_2R \to e_1R$, and since $\ker \sigma \neq (0)$, $\ker \eta\sigma \neq (0)$. By Lemma 5, $\eta\sigma = 0$. Since η is a monomorphism, we have $\sigma = 0$. Thus $e_2xe_2 = 0$, and $e_2Ne_2 = 0$. So e_2Re_2 is a division ring. Further $e_2Re_2 = e_2R$ since $e_2Re_1 = (0)$. Thus $e_2N = 0$, and e_2R is a minimal right ideal. Now e_1R is uniform because it is quasi-injective and indecomposable. Since $0 \neq e_1Re_2R$ is the sum of the images of all R-homomorphisms of e_2R into e_1R, the fact that e_2R is minimal and e_1R is uniform yields that e_1Re_2R itself is the unique minimal right subideal of e_1R, is isomorphic to e_2R, and is contained in every nonzero right subideal of e_1R. We claim that $e_1Ne_1 = 0$. Let $0 \neq e_1xe_1 \in e_1Ne_1$. Since N is nil, e_1xe_1 is nilpotent. Then $\sigma\colon e_1R \to e_1R$ defined by $\sigma(e_1r) = e_1xe_1r$ is an endomorphism of e_1R with $\ker\sigma \neq (0)$. Let $A = \ker\sigma$. Then $e_1Re_2R \subset A$, and we have $e_1xe_1Re_2 = (0)$. On the other hand, $e_1Re_2R \subseteqq e_1xe_1R$ yields that $e_1xe_1Re_2 \neq (0)$. This is a contradiction. Hence $e_1Ne_1 = (0)$, and e_1Re_1 is a division ring. Now using the fact that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(e_1R, e_1R)$ is a division ring and that e_1R is quasi-injective, it follows that every member of $\mathrm{Hom}(e_1Re_2R, e_1Re_2R)$ admits a unique extension to an endomorphism of e_1R. Further, every endomorphism of e_1R maps e_1Re_2R into itself since e_1Re_2R is the unique minimal subideal of e_1R. Thus $\mathrm{Hom}(e_1Re_2R, e_1Re_2R) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(e_1R, e_1R)$. Since $e_1Re_2R \cong e_2R$, we obtain $e_1Re_1 \cong e_2Re_2$.

Now $e_1N = e_1Ne_2$ because $e_1Ne_1 = (0)$. Since $e_1Re_2R \subseteqq e_1N$, we get $e_1N = e_1Re_2 = e_1Re_2R$. Thus $M = e_1Re_2$ is a one-dimensional right vector space over $D = e_2Re_2$. We show that M is also a one-dimensional left e_1Re_1-space. Let $X = \begin{pmatrix} e_1Re_1 & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cong R/A$, where $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$. Then X is quasi-injective. Let $0 \neq x \in M$, and let $y \in M$. Consider $\sigma\colon \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ defined by $\sigma\begin{pmatrix} 0 & xc \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & yc \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, for $c \in D$. Then σ is an R-endomorphism, so it can be extended to an endomorphism η of X. Let $\eta\begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \sigma\begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \eta\begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ax \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus $y = ax$, so $M = e_1Re_1x$. So M is a one-dimensional left vector space over e_1Re_1. Thus, for each $d \in e_1Re_1$, there exists a unique $d' \in e_2Re_2$ such that $dx = xd'$. Define $\theta\colon e_1Re_1 \to e_2Re_2$ by $\theta(d) = d'$. Then θ is an isomorphism, and we may identify d and d'. Then $\eta\colon \begin{pmatrix} D & D \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} D & M \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$ defined by $\eta\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & bx \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ is an isomorphism.

Conversely, if R satisfies (i), then, by Koehler [13], R is a QC-ring, hence a $PCQI$-ring. If R satisfies (ii), then straightforward computation shows that R is a right $PCQI$-ring.

Since every right QC-ring is a left QC-ring and $\begin{pmatrix} D & D \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$ is also a left $PCQI$-ring, we get the following corollary.

COROLLARY. *A nonlocal semiperfect right PCQI-ring is also a left PCQI-ring.*

5. Local $PCQI$-rings. Theorem 13 and Theorems 14, 15, and 16 which follow generalize Klatt and Levy's [11] theorems for commutative pre-self-injective rings which are not domains. Throughout this section M will denote the unique maximal right ideal of a local ring R. M is then the Jacobson radical of R, and R/M is a division ring.

THEOREM 14. *Let R be a local right PCQI-ring with maximal ideal M. Then either R is a right valuation ring or $M^2 = (0)$ and M_R has composition length* 2.

Proof. First note that for all nonzero right ideals A, R/A is indecomposable quasi-injective and hence uniform. Now we show that all nonzero right ideals are either minimal or essential. Let A, B be nonzero right ideals such that $A \cap B = (0)$. We claim that A is minimal. Let C be a nonzero right ideal properly contained in A. Then R/C is quasi-injective and not uniform since $A/C \cap (B + C)/C = 0$. This is a contradiction, so A is minimal. Similarly, B is minimal. In particular, it follows that any maximal independent family of minimal right ideals can contain at most two members.

If $\operatorname{Soc} R_R = (0)$, then all nonzero right ideals are essential. Let A, B be two nonzero right ideals. If neither $A \subsetneqq B$ nor $B \subsetneqq A$, then $R/A \cap B$ is quasi-injective but not uniform since $A/(A \cap B) \cap B/(A \cap B) = (0)$. As before, this is a contradiction. So either $A \subseteqq B$ or $B \subseteqq A$.

If $\operatorname{Soc} R_R$ consists of a unique minimal right ideal then it is clear that R is a right valuation ring.

Finally, suppose $\operatorname{Soc} R_R = A \oplus B$, where A, B are minimal right ideals. Then R cannot be prime. Let $x \in M$, and consider xR. If xR is not minimal, then xR is quasi-injective and decomposable. Then $xR = A \oplus B$. In any case, for all $x \in M$, $x \in \operatorname{Soc} R_R$. This implies that $M^2 = (0)$, and the composition length of M is 2, completing the proof.

The next two theorems give the structure of non-prime local right $PCQI$-rings. Prime local $PCQI$-rings are discussed in the next section.

THEOREM 15. *For a nonprime right valuation ring R, the following are equivalent*:

(i) *R is a right PCQI-ring.*

(ii) *R is a right duo almost maximal valuation ring of rank 0 such that any left ideal containing a nonzero right ideal is two-sided.*

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Since R is not prime, M is nil by Proposition 3. So, if xR is a nontrivial principal right ideal of R, xR is quasi-injective. Since xR is essential in R, the injective hull of xR is the same as that of R. Hence, by Johnson and Wong [10], $RxR \subseteqq xR$. So xR is a two-sided ideal of R. Thus R is a right duo ring. Since each proper homomorphic image of a $PCQI$-ring is a QC-ring, the proof of (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) as well as that of (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) is completed by a theorem of Koehler [13].

THEOREM 16. *For a local ring R with $M^2 = (0)$ and the composition length of M_R equal to 2, the following are equivalent*:

(i) *R is a right PCQI-ring.*

(ii) *For each nonzero right ideal A in R and for each $m_1, m_2 \notin A$, the congruence $xm_1 \equiv m_2 (\operatorname{mod} A)$ has a solution, $x = \alpha$, such that $\alpha A \subset A$.*

Proof. Under the hypothesis the only nonzero right ideals A of R different from M and R are minimal right ideals, and M/A is a simple right R-module.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (2) Let A be a nontrivial right ideal in R, and let $m_1, m_2 \in R$ such that $m_1, m_2 \notin A$. Then $\bar{m}_1 R = M/A = \bar{m}_2 R$, and the mapping $\sigma: M/A \rightarrow M/A$ which sends $\bar{m}_1 r$ to $\bar{m}_2 r$ is a well-defined R-homomorphism. Since R/A is quasi-injective, σ can be lifted to $\sigma^* \in \operatorname{Hom}_R (R/A, R/A)$. Let $\sigma^*(\bar{1}) = \bar{\alpha}$. Then $\bar{\alpha} m_1 = \bar{m}_2$. Hence $xm_1 \equiv m_2 (\operatorname{mod} A)$ has a solution $x = \alpha$. Clearly $\alpha A \subset A$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) We only need to prove that if A is a nontrivial right ideal of R and $\sigma: M/A \rightarrow R/A$, is a nonzero R-homomorphism, then σ can be extended to an R-homomorphism $\sigma^*: R/A \rightarrow R/A$. Let $m \in M$, where $m \notin A$. Then $M/A = \bar{m}R$. Also, $\sigma(M/A) = M/A$. Let $\sigma(\bar{m}) = \bar{m}r$. Since $M^2 = (0)$, $r \notin M$. So r is invertible, and $mr \notin A$. Let $\alpha \in R$ be chosen such that $\alpha m \equiv mr (\operatorname{mod} A)$, and $\alpha A \subseteqq A$. Then $\sigma^*(\bar{r}) = \bar{\alpha} R$ is well-defined, and it extends σ, completing the proof.

The example which follows shows that a local right *PCQI*-ring is not necessarily a left *PCQI*-ring.

EXAMPLE. Let F be a field which has a monomorphism $\rho: F \rightarrow F$ such that $[F: \rho(F)] > 2$. Take x to be an indeterminate over F. Make $V = xF$ into a right vector space over F in a natural way. Let $R = \{(\alpha, x\beta) \mid \alpha, \beta \in F\}$. Define

$$(\alpha_1, x\beta_1) + (\alpha_2, x\beta_2) = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_1, x\beta_1 + x\beta_2)$$

and

$$(\alpha_1, x\beta_1)(\alpha_2, x\beta_2) = (\alpha_1\alpha_2, x(\rho(\alpha_1)\beta_2 + \beta_1\alpha_2)) \ .$$

Then R is a local ring with identity with the maximal ideal

$$M = \{(0, x\alpha) \mid \alpha \in F\} \ .$$

In fact, M is also a minimal right ideal and $M^2 = (0)$. Thus R is a right *PCQI*-ring. Further, if $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a basis of F as a vector space over $\rho(F)$ then straightforward computations yield that $M = \bigoplus \sum R(0, x\alpha_1)$ as a direct sum of irreducible left R-modules $R(0, x\alpha_i)$. Since card $I > 2$, it follows by Theorem 14 that R is not a left *PCQI*-ring.

6. Prime local *PCQI*-rings.

THEOREM 17. *Let R be a prime local right PCQI-ring. Then R is a right valuation domain, hence right semihereditary.*

Proof. By Theorem 14, R is a right valuation ring. Let A denote the intersection of all nonzero two-sided ideals of R. The proof that R is a domain falls into three cases.

(i) $A = (0)$.

Let $x, y \in R$ such that $xy = 0$. Suppose $y \neq 0$. Then yR is a nonzero right ideal of R. Since R is right valuation and $A = (0)$, yR must contain a nonzero two-sided ideal of R. Further, each proper homomorphic image of R is a local QC-ring, hence a duo ring [13]. This implies that yR is two-sided. Hence $x = 0$, and R is an integral domain.

(ii) $A \neq (0)$ and $A \neq M$.

Under these hypotheses, A cannot be a prime ideal. So there exist $x, y \in R$ such that $xRy \subseteqq A$, $x \notin A$ and $y \notin A$. Since R is right valuation, $A \subseteqq xR$ and $A \subseteqq yR$. So both xR and yR are two-sided ideals. For definiteness, let $xR \subseteqq yR$. Then $(xR)^2 \subseteqq (xR)(yR) \subseteqq AR = A$ gives that $(xR)^2 = A$ by the minimality of A. Also $A = A^2$, hence $(xR)^2 = (xR)^4$. It follows that $x^2R = x^4R$. Then $x^2 = x^4r$, for some $r \in R$, and $x^2(1 - x^2r) = 0$. So $x^2 = 0$. Thus $A = (0)$, and this case cannot occur.

(iii) $A = M$.

Let $S \subset R$, and let $r(S)$ denote the right annihilator of S in R. Let $Z(R) = \{x \in R \mid r(x) \text{ is an essential right ideal}\}$. Then $Z(R)$ is an ideal in R called the right singular ideal.

Since R is a right valuation ring, R is immediately a domain if $Z(R) = (0)$.

So assume that $Z(R) \neq (0)$. Then $Z(R) = M$, and each element in M is a right zero divisor. So $x \in M$ implies that xR is proper cyclic, hence quasi-injective. Also xR is an essential right ideal in R. By Johnson and Wong [10], $RxR \subseteqq xR$. Hence xR is two-sided. So R is a prime right duo ring, and it follows that R is a domain.

7. *PCQI*-domains.

In this section we discuss right *PCQI*-rings which are integral domains and prove that these are right Öre-domains. This generalizes the result of Faith [4]. Our proof, in this case, though it runs on the same lines as that of Faith, does not use Faith's result.

PROPOSITION 18. *Let R be a right PCQI-domain, and let I be a nonessential right ideal of R. Then R/I is an injective right R-*

module containing a copy of R.

Proof. Since I is nonessential, there exists a nonzero right ideal J in R such that $I \cap J = 0$. Let $a \in J$ such that $a \neq 0$. Then $aR \cap I \subseteqq J \cap I = 0$. Consider $r(a + I) = \{x \in R \mid ax \in I\}$. Clearly $r(a + I) = 0$. So R/I contains a copy of R. Since R/I is also quasi-injective, this implies that R/I is injective by [17].

For a right R-module A, let $\hat{A}$ denote the injective hull of A.

PROPOSITION 19. *Let R be a right PCQI-domain which is not a right Öre-domain. Then $\hat{R}$ is finitely presented.*

Proof. Let $a \in R$ such that $a \neq 0$ and aR is not essential. Then R/aR is injective. Since R/aR contains a copy of R and is injective, R/aR contains a copy of $\hat{R}$. Then $R/aR = Y/aR \oplus X/aR$, where $X/aR \cong \hat{R}$. Now Y/aR is cyclic. So $Y = aR + bR$, for some $b \in R$, and the short exact sequence $0 \to Y \to R \to R/Y \cong X/aR \cong \hat{R} \to 0$ shows that $\hat{R}$ is finitely presented.

THEOREM 20. *A right PCQI-domain R is a right Öre-domain.*

Proof. Let R be a right $PCQI$-domain. Suppose R is not a right Öre-domain. Then, as in Proposition 19, there exists $a \in R$ such that $R/aR = Y/aR \oplus X/aR$, where $X/aR \cong \hat{R} \cong R/Y$ and $Y = aR + bR$. We also get that $R = X + Y$, where $X \cap Y = aR$. This yields an exact sequence $0 \to aR \to X \times Y \to R \to 0$ which splits. So $X \times Y \cong aR \times R \cong R \times R$. This implies that $Y = aR + bR$ is a finitely generated projective right ideal. Since $\hat{R} \cong R/Y$, $0 \to Y \to R \to \hat{R} \to 0$ is exact. Then $Y \otimes_R \hat{R} \to R \otimes_R \hat{R} \to \hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R} \to 0$ is exact. Also, a finitely generated projective R-module is essentially finitely related. So, by Cateforis ([3], Proposition 1.7), $(aR + bR) \otimes_R \hat{R}$ is projective as an $\hat{R}$-module. Then $Y \otimes_R \hat{R}$ is a direct summand of a free $\hat{R}$-module. Now $Z(\hat{R}_{\hat{R}}) = 0$, hence $Z(Y \otimes_R \hat{R}) = 0$ because $Y \otimes_R \hat{R}$ is a direct summand of a free $\hat{R}$-module. Now consider $Y \otimes_R \hat{R} \xrightarrow{i} R \otimes_R \hat{R} \to \hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R} \to 0$. Again, by Cateforis ([3], Lemma 1.8), $\ker i = Z(Y \otimes_R \hat{R}) = 0$. So $0 \to Y \otimes_R \hat{R} \xrightarrow{i} R \otimes_R \hat{R} \to \hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R} \to 0$ is exact. Since $R \otimes_R \hat{R} \cong \hat{R}$, let $f\colon R \otimes_R \hat{R} \to \hat{R}$ be the canonical isomorphism. Then $fi\colon Y \otimes_R \hat{R} \to \hat{R}$ is a monomorphism, and $Y \otimes_R \hat{R} \cong Y\hat{R}$. Since Y is finitely generated, $Y\hat{R}$ is a finitely generated right ideal of $\hat{R}$. So $Y\hat{R} = e\hat{R}$, where $e^2 = e$. Thus we have the following exact sequence: $0 \to e\hat{R} \to \hat{R} \to \hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R} \to 0$, and $\hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R} \cong \hat{R}/e\hat{R} = (1 - e)\hat{R}$. Hence $\hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\hat{R}$. Since $Z(\hat{K}_R) = 0$, $Z(\hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R}) = 0$. Since $\hat{R} = xR$, for some $x \in \hat{R}$, the kernel of the canonical map $f: \hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R} \to \hat{R}$ defined by $f(a \otimes b) = ab$ is contained in $Z(\hat{R} \otimes_R \hat{R})$ and hence must be zero. Since f is surjective, f is an isomorphism. By Silver ([18], Proposition 1.1), there exists an epimorphism in the category of rings from R to $\hat{R}$.

Let M be a right $\hat{R}$-module which is quasi-injective as a right R-module. We claim that M is quasi-injective as a right $\hat{R}$-module. Let $0 \to A_{\hat{R}} \to M_{\hat{R}} \to B_{\hat{R}} \to 0$ be exact. Consider $0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\hat{R}}(B_{\hat{R}}, M_{\hat{R}}) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\hat{R}}(M_{\hat{R}}, M_{\hat{R}}) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\hat{R}}(A_{\hat{R}}, M_{\hat{R}})$. By Silver ([18], Corollary 1.3), $\mathrm{Hom}_{\hat{R}}(N, N^1) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(N, N^1)$, where N, N^1 are right $\hat{R}$-modules. Also $0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(B, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(A, M) \to 0$ is exact since M_R is quasi-injective. Thus $0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\hat{R}}(B, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\hat{R}}(M, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(A, M) \to 0$ is exact. So $M_{\hat{R}}$ is quasi-injective. Let K be a cyclic right R-module. Then K is a cyclic right R-module. Since R is a right $PCQI$-domain, K_R is quasi-injective. Thus $K_{\hat{R}}$ is quasi-injective. Since $\hat{R}$ is right self-injective, $\hat{R}$ is a QC-ring. So $\hat{R}$ is semiperfect and simple, hence simple artinian. Thus $\hat{R}$ is a division ring. This proves that R is a right Öre-domain.

We conclude by a remark that we have not studied arbitrary prime right $PCQI$-rings. This case remains open. Indeed, a characterization of right $PCQI$-domains has not yet been obtained.

REFERENCES

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

2. R. Bumby, *Modules which are isomorphic to submodules of each other*, Archiv. der Math., **16** (1965), 184-185.

3. V. C. Cateforis, *Flat regular quotient rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **138** (1969), 241-249.

4. C. Faith. *When are proper cyclics injective*, Pacific J. Math., **45** (1973), 97-112.

5. ———, *Lectures on Injective Modules and Quotient Rings*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1967.

6. M. Harada, *Note on Quasi-injective modules*, Osaka J. Math., **2** (1965), 351-356.

7. D. A. Hill, *Semi-perfect q-rings*, Math. Ann., **200** (1973), 113-121.

8. G. Ivanov, *Non-local rings whose ideals are all quasi-injective*, Bull. Australian Math. Soc., **6** (1972), 45-52.

9. S. K. Jain, S. Mohamed and Surjeet Singh, *Rings in which every right ideal is quasi-injective*, Pacific J. Math., **31** (1969), 73-79.

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

11. G. B. Klatt and L. S. Levy, *Pre-self-injective rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **137** (1969), 407-419.

12. A. Koehler, *Rings for which every cyclic module is quasi-projective*, Math. Ann., **189** (1970), 311-316.

13. ———, *Rings with quasi-injective cyclic modules*, Quar. J. Math. Oxford (2), **25** (1974), 51-55.

14. L. S. Levy, *Commutative rings whose homomorphic images are self-injective*, Pacific J. Math. **18** (1966), 149-153.

15. S. Mohamed, *q-rings with chain conditions*, J. London Math. Soc., **2** (1970), 453–460.
16. B. L. Osofsky, *Noncyclic injective modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **19** (1968), 1383–1384.
17. E. deRobert, *Projectifs et injectifs relatifs*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. A, **286** (1969), 361–364.
18. L. Silver, *Noncommutative localizations and applications*, J. Algebra, **7** (1967), 44–76.

Received November 19, 1976.

OHIO UNIVERSITY, ATHENS, OHIO

Present address: Surjeet Singh, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, India.
Present address: Robin Symonds, Indiana University at Kokomo, Kokomo, Indiana 46901.

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

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. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of your manuscript. You may however, use them in the displayed equations. 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. 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 triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. **39**. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics expects the author's institution to pay page charges, and reserves the right to delay publication for nonpayment of charges in case of financial emergency.

100 reprints are provided free for each article, only if page charges have been substantially paid. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$72.00 a year (6 Vols., 12 issues). Special rate: \$36.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

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.), 8-8, 3-chome, Takadanobaba, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160, Japan.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 67, No. 2 February, 1976