

## A Note on Horseshoe Lemma for M-Projective and M-Injective Modules

A. S. Ranadive

Department of Mathematics, Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur (M.P.), India

(Received December 13, 1997)

**Abstract :** In this paper we have dualized a result of Singh *et. al.*<sup>1</sup> We also generalize one result of same author to get Horseshoe lemma for *M*-projective and *M*-injective modules.

### Preliminaries

Through out this paper *R* denotes a ring with unity and all the modules considered are left unitary modules over *R*.

The following definitions are due to Azumayya *et al.*<sup>2</sup>

**Definition 1 :** An *R*-module *U* is called *M*-projective if given a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & U & \\ & \downarrow f & \\ M & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & N \rightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

of *R*-modules and *R*-homomorphisms with exact row there is a *R*-homomorphism  $g : U \rightarrow M$  such that the resulting diagram is commutative.

**Definition 2 :** An *R*-module *U* is called *M*-injective if given a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \alpha & & \\ & & \downarrow f & & \\ O & \rightarrow & N & \rightarrow & M \end{array}$$

of *R*-modules and *R*-homomorphisms with exact row there is a *R*-homomorphism  $g : M \rightarrow U$  such that the resulting diagram is commutative.

**Proposition 1 :** Any *R*-module *U* is *M*-projective if and only if given a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & U & & \\ & & \downarrow f & & \\ M & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y & \xrightarrow{\beta} & Z \end{array}$$

of *R*-modules and *R*-homomorphisms with exact row and  $\beta \circ f = 0$  there exists a *R*-homomorphism  $g : U \rightarrow M$  such that the resulting diagram is commutative.<sup>1</sup>

**Proposition 2 :** An  $R$ -module  $U$  is  $M$ -injective if and only if given a diagram of  $R$ -modules and  $R$ -homomorphisms of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \alpha & & \beta & \\ Z & \rightarrow & Y & \rightarrow & M \\ & f \downarrow & & & \\ & U & & & \end{array}$$

in which row is exact and  $f|_{\text{Im } \alpha}$  is monic there exists a  $R$ -homomorphism  $g : M \rightarrow U$  such that the resulting diagram is commutative.

**Proof :** Let  $U$  be  $M$ -injective. Since row is exact  $f|_{\text{ker } \beta}$  is also monic so we have a  $R$ -homomorphism  $f' : \text{Im } \beta \rightarrow U$  given by  $f'(x) = f(y)$  where  $y \in Y$  is such that  $\beta(y) = x$ . Thus if  $i : \text{Im } \beta \rightarrow M$  is the natural injection we have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Im } \beta & \xrightarrow{i} & M \\ & & f \downarrow & \nearrow g' & \\ & & U & & \end{array}$$

in which the row is exact. Since  $U$  is  $M$ -projective there exists a  $R$ -homomorphism  $g' : M \rightarrow U$  such that  $g' \circ i = f'$ . If  $j : Y \rightarrow \text{Im } \beta$  is defined by  $j(y) = \beta(y)$  we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \alpha & & \beta & \\ Z & \rightarrow & Y & \rightarrow & M \\ & j \downarrow & & & \parallel I \\ 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Im } \beta & \xrightarrow{i} & M \\ & & f \downarrow & \nearrow g' & \\ & & U & & \end{array}$$

where  $f' \circ j = f$  and  $I : M \rightarrow M$  is the identity homomorphism. Converse is easily seen to be true by letting  $Z = 0$ .

**Remark :** Here we observe that the proposition 2 above dualizes the proposition 1 of Singh *et. al.*<sup>1</sup> However we can't dualize the proposition 2 of Singh *et. al.*<sup>1</sup>

**Definition 3 :** For any module  $M$  let  $C_p(M)$  (respectively  $C_i(M)$ ) denotes the class of  $M$ -projective (respectively  $M$ -injective) modules.<sup>2</sup>

**Proposition 3 :**  $C_p(M)$  (respectively  $C_i(M)$ ) is closed under direct sums (respectively direct products) and direct summands (respectively direct factors).<sup>3</sup>

## 2. Main Result

**Proposition 4 :** Consider the diagram of  $R$ -modules and  $R$ -homomorphisms of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\
& U'_1 & & U''_1 & & & \\
& \alpha_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta_1 & & & \\
& U'_0 & & U''_0 & & & \\
& \alpha_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta_0 & & & \\
0 \rightarrow & M' & \xrightarrow{f} & M & \xrightarrow{g} & M'' & \rightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & \\
& 0 & & & & 0 & 
\end{array}$$

in which the row is exact and columns are complexes with each  $U'_i$  and  $U''_i$  as  $M$ -projective,  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Then, there exists a  $M$ -projective resolution of  $M$  and chain maps so that the columns form an exact sequence of complexes.

**Proof :** Since for each  $i$ ,  $U'_i$  and  $U''_i$  are  $M$ -projective it follows that  $U'_i \oplus U''_i$  is also  $M$ -projective for each  $i$ . Also for each  $i$  the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow U'_i \xrightarrow{f_i} U'_i \oplus U''_i \xrightarrow{g_i} U''_i \rightarrow 0$$

is split exact where  $f_i$  is the  $i$ -th canonical injection and  $g_i$  is the  $i$ -th canonical projection. It now follows from proposition 3 that there exists a map  $\gamma_0 : U'_0 \oplus U''_0 \rightarrow M$  such that the resulting squares are commutative. The remaining proof now follows by induction using Lemma 6.20 and  $3 \times 3$  lemma<sup>4</sup>.

**Proposition 5 :** Consider the diagram of  $R$ -modules and  $R$ -homomorphisms of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& 0 & & 0 & & & \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\
0 \rightarrow & M' & \xrightarrow{f} & M & \xrightarrow{g} & M'' & \rightarrow 0 \\
& \alpha_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta_0 & & & \\
& U'_0 & & U''_0 & & & \\
& \alpha_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta_1 & & & \\
& U'_1 & & U''_1 & & & \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\
& \vdots & & \vdots & & & \\
& \vdots & & \vdots & & & \\
& \vdots & & \vdots & & & 
\end{array}$$

in which the row is exact and columns are complexes with each  $U'_i$  and  $U''_i$  as  $M$ -injective,  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Then there exists a  $M$ -injective resolution of  $M$  and chain maps so that the columns form an exact sequence of complexes.

**Proof :** Since

$$\bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i \subset \prod_{i \in I} A_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i = \prod_{i \in I} A_i$$

if  $I$  finite it follows that the proof of proposition 4 can be dualized to prove the result using proposition 3.

### Acknowledgement

The author is thankful to Prof. R. K. Singh, Vice Chancellor, Guru Ghasidas University for constant inspiration, encouragement and financial aid made available through minor research project entitled "Modules and Dual Concepts".

### References

1. R. S. Singh and R. K. Wadbudey :  $M$ -projective modules, *Proc. Math Soc. B.H.U.* Vol. 4 (1988) 121- 129.
2. G. Azumayya, F. Mbuntum and K. Varadarajan : On  $M$ -projective and  $M$ -injective modules, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* Vol. 59, No. 1 (1974) 9-16.
3. M. S. Shrikhande : On hereditary and cohereditary modules, *Canadian J. of Math.* XXV (1973) 892-896.
4. J. J. Rotman : *An introduction to homological algebra*, Academic Press, 1979.