

## QUASI-MULTIPLICATION AND QUASI-COMULTIPLICATION MODULES

F. FARSHADIFAR <sup>(1)</sup> AND H. ANSARI-TOROGHY <sup>(2)</sup>

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we will introduce the notion of quasi-multiplication (resp. quasi-comultiplication) modules over a commutative ring as a generalization of multiplication (resp. comultiplication) modules and explore some basic properties of these classes of modules.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper,  $R$  will denote a commutative ring with identity and  $\mathbb{Z}$  will denote the ring of integers.

Multiplication rings are introduced by W. Krull in 1925 as a generalization of Dedekind domains [9]. In 1981, Barnard [6] has given the concept of multiplication modules. An  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be a *multiplication module* if for every submodule  $N$  of  $M$  there exists an ideal  $I$  of  $R$  such that  $N = IM$  [6]. Equivalently,  $M$  is a multiplication module if and only if for each submodule  $N$  of  $M$ , we have  $N = (N :_R M)M$ . There is a large body of research concerning multiplication modules. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifer introduced [2] the notion of comultiplication module as a dual notion of multiplication module and investigated some properties of this class of modules. An  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be a *comultiplication module* if

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 13C13, 13C99.

*Key words and phrases*. Multiplication module, quasi-multiplication module, comultiplication module, quasi-comultiplication module.

Copyright © Deanship of Research and Graduate Studies, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

Received: Oct. 6, 2018

Accepted: Dec. 9, 2018 .

for every submodule  $N$  of  $M$  there exists an ideal  $I$  of  $R$  such that

$$N = (0 :_M I) = \{m \in M \mid Im = 0\},$$

equivalently, for each submodule  $N$  of  $M$ , we have  $N = (0 :_M \text{Ann}_R(N))$  [2].

The purpose of this paper is to introduce the notions of quasi-multiplication and quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -modules as generalizations of multiplication and comultiplication  $R$ -modules, respectively and investigate some properties of these classes of modules.

## 2. QUASI-MULTIPLICATION MODULES

**Definition 2.1.** We say that an  $R$ -module  $M$  is a *quasi-multiplication module* if whenever  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  for each  $r \in R$ , then  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** Every multiplication  $R$ -module is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a multiplication  $R$ -module and  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  for some  $r \in R$ . Then there exists an ideal  $I$  of  $R$  such that  $(0 :_M r) = IM$ . It follows that  $I \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . Therefore,  $I \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(M)$  and so  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ .  $\square$

The converse of Lemma 2.2 need not be true in general as explained in Example 2.3 below.

**Example 2.3.** Let  $M$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Since

$$(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus 0 :_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2) = 0 \neq \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus 0,$$

$M$  is not a multiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. If  $r$  is an even integer, then we have

$$2\mathbb{Z} = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M) \neq \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(rM) = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(0) = \mathbb{Z}.$$

If  $r$  is an odd integer, then  $\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(rM) = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M) = 2\mathbb{Z}$  and  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ . Therefore,  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. In either of the following cases,  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module.

- (a)  $(0 :_M r) = ((0 :_M r) :_R M)M$  for each  $r \in R$ .
- (b) If  $(Rm :_R M) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  for each  $m \in M$ , then  $Rm = 0$ .

*Proof.* First assume that part (a) holds. Let  $r \in R$  and  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Then by part (a) we have

$$(0 :_M r) = ((0 :_M r) :_R M)M = \text{Ann}_R(rM)M = \text{Ann}_R(M)M = 0.$$

Therefore,  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module. Now assume that part (b) holds. Let  $r \in R$  and  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Suppose that  $m \in (0 :_M r)$ . Then

$$(Rm :_R M) \subseteq ((0 :_M r) :_R M) = \text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M).$$

Thus  $(Rm :_R M) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  because the reverse inclusion is clear. Now by part (b),  $Rm = 0$ . It follows that  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module.  $\square$

Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. The dual notion of  $Z_R(M)$ , the set of zero divisors of  $M$ , is denoted by  $W_R(M)$  and defined by

$$W_R(M) = \{a \in R : aM \neq M\}.$$

$M$  is said to be *Hopfian* (resp. *co-Hopfian*) if every surjective (resp. injective) endomorphism  $f$  of  $M$  is an isomorphism.

A submodule  $N$  of  $M$  is said to be *pure submodule* if  $IN = N \cap IM$  for every ideal  $I$  of  $R$  [1].

A submodule  $N$  of  $M$  is said to be *copure* if  $(N :_M I) = N + (0 :_M I)$  for every ideal  $I$  of  $R$  [5].

**Theorem 2.5.** Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then we have the following.

- (a) If  $W_R(M) = Z_R(R/Ann_R(M))$  and  $M$  is a co-Hopfian  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication module.
- (b) If  $M$  is a Hopfian quasi-multiplication module, then  $W_R(M) = Z_R(R/Ann_R(M))$ .
- (c) If  $N$  is a pure submodule of an  $R$ -module  $M$  such that  $Ann_R(N) \not\subseteq W_R(M/N)$ , then  $N$  is a direct summand of  $M$ .
- (d) If  $N$  is a copure submodule of an  $R$ -module  $M$  such that  $Ann_R(M/N) \not\subseteq Z_R(N)$ , then  $N$  is a direct summand of  $M$ .

*Proof.* (a) Let  $r \in R$  such that  $Ann_R(rM) = Ann_R(M)$ . If  $rM = M$ , then  $(0 :_M r) = 0$  because  $M$  is co-Hopfian. So suppose that  $rM \neq M$ . Hence  $r \in W_R(M)$ . Thus by assumption, there exists  $t \in R \setminus Ann_R(M)$  such that  $rt \in Ann_R(M)$ . Therefore,  $t \in Ann_R(rM) = Ann_R(M)$ . This is a desired contradiction.

(b) Clearly,  $Z_R(R/Ann_R(M)) \subseteq W_R(M)$ . Let  $r \in W_R(M)$ . Then  $rM \neq M$ . Now as  $M$  is co-Hopfian,  $(0 :_M r) \neq 0$ . So by assumption, we can choose  $t \in Ann_R(rM) \setminus Ann_R(M)$ . It follows that  $r \in Z_R(R/Ann_R(M))$ , as required.

(c) Let  $r \in Ann_R(N) \setminus W_R(M/N)$ . Then  $rN = 0$  and  $r(M/N) = M/N$ . Thus  $M = rM + N$  and  $0 = rN = rM \cap N$  because  $N$  is pure.

(d) Let  $r \in Ann_R(M/N) \setminus Z_R(N)$ . Then  $rM \subseteq N$ . Thus  $M \subseteq (N :_M r) = N + (0 :_M r)$ . As  $r \notin Z_R(N)$ ,  $N \cap (0 :_M r) = 0$  as needed.  $\square$

A proper submodule  $P$  of an  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be *prime* if for any  $r \in R$  and  $m \in M$  with  $rm \in P$ , we have  $m \in P$  or  $r \in (P :_R M)$  [7].  $M$  is said to be a *prime module* if the zero submodule of  $M$  is a prime submodule of  $M$ .

An  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be a *second module* if  $M \neq 0$  and for each  $a \in R$ , the endomorphism  $M \xrightarrow{a} M$  is either surjective or zero [11].

**Proposition 2.6.** Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then we have the following.

- (a) If  $M$  is a prime module, then  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication module.

- (b) If  $t \in R \setminus W_R(M)$  and  $tM$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module.
- (c) If  $R$  is an integral domain and  $M$  is a faithful quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a prime module.
- (d) If  $M$  is a second quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a prime  $R$ -module.

*Proof.* (a) This is clear.

(b) Let  $r \in R$  such that  $\text{Ann}_R(M) = \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . Then  $\text{Ann}_R(tM) = \text{Ann}_R(rtM)$ . So by assumption,  $(0 :_{tM} r) = 0$ . Now let  $mr = 0$  for some  $m \in M$ . As  $t \notin W_R(M)$ ,  $tM = M$ . Thus  $m = ty$  for some  $y \in M$ . Hence,  $tyr = 0$  implies that  $ty \in (0 :_{tM} r) = 0$ . Thus  $m = ty = 0$ . Therefore,  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ .

(c) Let  $r \in R$  such that  $(0 :_M r) \neq M$ . Clearly,  $\text{Ann}_R(M) \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . Now let  $t \in \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . Then  $tr \in \text{Ann}_R(M) = 0$ . As  $R$  is an integral domain and  $(0 :_M r) \neq M$ , we have  $t \in \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Hence  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Therefore,  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Thus  $(0 :_M r) = 0$  since  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module.

(d) Let  $r \in R$ . Then by assumption,  $rM = 0$  or  $\text{Ann}_R(M) = \text{Ann}_R(M/(0 :_M r)) = \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . Thus  $rM = 0$  or  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ , as required.  $\square$

**Remark 2.7.** The converse of part (a) of Proposition 2.6, is not true in general because if it is true, then every multiplication module is prime by Lemma 2.2.

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $M$  be a finitely generated  $R$ -module and  $S$  be a multiplicatively closed subset of  $R$  such that  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ . Then we have the following.*

- (a)  $\text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}((r/1)S^{-1}M) = \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M)$  implies that  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ .
- (b)  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module if and only if  $S^{-1}M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $S^{-1}R$ -module.

*Proof.* (a) Let  $t \in \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . As  $M$  is finitely generated,

$$\begin{aligned} S^{-1}\text{Ann}_R(rM) &= \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}((r/1)S^{-1}M) = \\ &= \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M) = S^{-1}\text{Ann}_R(M). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $t/1 \in S^{-1}\text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Hence  $ths = as$  for some  $h, s \in S$  and  $a \in \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Since  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ ,  $hsM = M$ . Therefore,  $t \in \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Thus  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  because the reverse inclusion is clear.

(b) First assume that  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module and

$$\text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}((r/1)S^{-1}M) = \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M)$$

for some  $r \in R$ . Then  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  by part (a). Thus  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ . Therefore,  $(0 :_{S^{-1}M} r/1) = 0$ . Conversely, suppose that  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Then as  $M$  is finitely generated,

$$\begin{aligned} S^{-1}\text{Ann}_R(rM) &= \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}((r/1)S^{-1}M) = \\ &= \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M) = S^{-1}\text{Ann}_R(M). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $(0 :_{S^{-1}M} r/1) = 0$ . Now let  $m \in (0 :_M r)$ . Then  $rm = 0$ . Thus  $(m/1)(r/1) = 0$ . It follows that  $m/1 \in (0 :_{S^{-1}M} r/1) = 0$ . Hence,  $sm = 0$  for some  $s \in S$ . As  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ , and  $Z_R(M) \subseteq W_R(M)$ , we have  $m = 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

### 3. QUASI-COMULTIPLICATION MODULES

**Definition 3.1.** We say that an  $R$ -module  $M$  is a *quasi-comultiplication module* if whenever  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  for each  $r \in R$ , then  $rM = M$ . This can be regarded as a dual notion of quasi-multiplication module.

**Remark 3.2.** Every comultiplication  $R$ -module is a quasi-comultiplication module by [3, 3.2]. But we see in the Example 3.3 that the converse is not true in general.

**Example 3.3.** Let  $M$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Since

$$(0 :_{\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2} \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus 0)) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2 \neq \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus 0,$$

$M$  is not a comultiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. If  $r$  is an even integer, then we have

$$2\mathbb{Z} = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M) \neq \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(rM) = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(0) = \mathbb{Z}.$$

If  $r$  is an odd integer, then  $\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(rM) = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M) = 2\mathbb{Z}$  and  $rM = M$ . Therefore,  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module.

The following example shows that not every quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module is a quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module.

**Example 3.4.** Let  $M$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ . Then for each integer  $r$ ,  $\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(rM) = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M) = 0$ . Since for each integer  $r$ ,  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ , we have  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. But  $2M \neq M$ , implies that  $M$  is not a quasi-comultiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module.

The following example shows that not every quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module is a quasi-multiplication  $R$ -module.

**Example 3.5.** Let  $M$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_{p^\infty} \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{p^\infty}$ . Then for each integer  $r$ ,  $\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(rM) = \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M) = 0$ . As  $(0 :_M p) = (1/p + \mathbb{Z})\mathbb{Z} \oplus (1/p + \mathbb{Z})\mathbb{Z} \neq 0$ , we have  $M$  is not a quasi-multiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. But since for each integer  $r$ ,  $rM = M$ ,  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module.

Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. A proper submodule  $N$  of  $M$  is said to be *completely irreducible* if  $N = \bigcap_{i \in I} N_i$ , where  $\{N_i\}_{i \in I}$  is a family of submodules of  $M$ , implies that  $N = N_i$  for some  $i \in I$ . It is easy to see that every submodule of  $M$  is an intersection of completely irreducible submodules of  $M$  [8].

**Remark 3.6.** [4] Let  $N$  and  $K$  be two submodules of an  $R$ -module  $M$ . To prove  $N \subseteq K$ , it is enough to show that if  $L$  is a completely irreducible submodule of  $M$  such that  $K \subseteq L$ , then  $N \subseteq L$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. In either of the following cases,  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module.

- (a)  $rM = (0 :_M \text{Ann}_R(rM))$  for each  $r \in R$ .
- (b) If  $\text{Ann}_R(L) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  for each completely irreducible submodule  $L$  of  $M$ , then  $L = M$ .

*Proof.* First assume that part (a) holds. Let  $r \in R$  and  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Then by part (a) and the fact that  $(0 :_M \text{Ann}_R(M)) = M$  we have

$$rM = (0 :_M \text{Ann}_R(rM)) = (0 :_M \text{Ann}_R(M)) = M.$$

Now assume that part (b) holds. Let  $r \in R$  and  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Let  $L$  be a completely irreducible submodule of  $M$  such that  $rM \subseteq L$ . Then  $\text{Ann}_R(L) \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . It follows that  $\text{Ann}_R(L) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Thus by assumption,  $L = M$ . Hence,  $rM = M$  by Remark 3.6.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.8.** Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then we have the following.

- (a) If  $Z_R(M) = Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(M))$  and  $M$  is a Hopfian  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication module.
- (b) If  $M$  is a co-Hopfian quasi-comultiplication module, then

$$Z_R(M) = Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(M)).$$

*Proof.* (a) Let  $r \in R$  such that  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . If  $(0 :_M r) = 0$ , then  $rM = M$  because  $M$  is Hopfian. So suppose that there exists  $0 \neq m \in M$  such that  $rm = 0$ . Hence  $r \in Z_R(M)$ . Thus by assumption, there exists  $t \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(M)$



such that  $rt \in \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Therefore,  $t \in \text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . This is a desired contradiction.

(b) Clearly,  $Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(M)) \subseteq Z_R(M)$ . Let  $r \in Z_R(M)$ . Then there exists  $0 \neq m \in M$  such that  $rm = 0$ . This implies that  $(0 :_M r) \neq 0$ . Now as  $M$  is co-Hopfian,  $rM \neq M$ . So by assumption, we can choose  $t \in \text{Ann}_R(rM) \setminus \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . It follows that  $r \in Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(M))$ , as required.  $\square$

A non-zero submodule  $N$  of an  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be *secondal* if  $W_R(N) = \{a \in R : aN \neq N\}$  is an ideal of  $R$  [4].

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module and  $S$  be a multiplicatively closed subset of  $R$  such that  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ . Then we have the following.*

(a) *If  $M$  is an Artinian quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module, then*

$$W_{S^{-1}R}(\text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(M))) = S^{-1}(W_R(M)).$$

(b) *If  $M$  is an Artinian quasi-comultiplication secondal  $R$ -module, then*

$$\text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(M)) \text{ is a secondal } S^{-1}R\text{-module.}$$

(c) *If  $Z_R(M) \subseteq W_R(M)$ , then  $S^{-1}(W_R(M)) = W_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M)$ .*

*Proof.* (a) Let  $r/s \in W_{S^{-1}R}(\text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(M)))$ . If  $r/s \notin S^{-1}(W_R(M))$ , then  $r \notin W_R(M)$ . Thus  $rM = M$  and so  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Hence

$$\text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(rM)) = \text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(M)).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (r/s)\text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(M)) &= (r/1)\text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(M)) = \\ &= \text{Hom}_R(S^{-1}R, \text{Ann}_R(M)). \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. Conversely, suppose that  $r/s \in S^{-1}(W_R(M))$ . Then  $rM \neq M$ . Now since  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication secondal module,  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) \neq \text{Ann}_R(M)$ .

If  $r/s \notin W_{S^{-1}R}(Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(M)))$ , then

$$(r/s)Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(M)) = Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(M)).$$

Thus

$$Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(rM)) = Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(M)).$$

It follows that

$$\phi(Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(rM))) = \phi(Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(M))),$$

where  $\phi : Hom_R(S^{-1}R, Ann_R(rM)) \rightarrow Ann_R(rM)$  is the natural homomorphism defined by  $f \mapsto f(1_{\overline{R}})$ . Thus by [10],  $tAnn_R(rM) = hAnn_R(M)$  for some  $t, h \in S$ . Hence,  $tMAnn_R(rM) = 0$ . Since  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ ,  $tM = M$ . Therefore,  $MAnn_R(rM) = 0$ . Thus  $Ann_R(M) = Ann_R(rM)$ , a contradiction.

(b) This follows from part (a).

(c) Let  $r/s \in S^{-1}(W_R(M))$ . Then  $r/s = a/t$  for some  $a \in W_R(M)$  and  $s \in S$ . Thus  $aM \neq M$ . Hence there exist  $m \in M \setminus aM$ . If  $a/tS^{-1}M = S^{-1}M$ , then  $m/1 = (a/t)(m_1/h)$  for some  $m_1 \in M$  and  $h \in S$ . Thus  $kthm = kam_1$  for some  $k \in S$ . Since  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ ,  $kthM = M$ . Hence  $m_1 = kthm_2$  for some  $m_2 \in M$ . It follows that  $kth(m - kam_2) = 0$ . If  $(m - kam_2) \neq 0$ , then  $kth \in Z_R(M) \subseteq W_R(M)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $m \in aM$ , which is a required contradiction. Therefore,  $S^{-1}(W_R(M)) \subseteq W_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M)$ . To see the reverse inclusion, let  $r/s \in W_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M)$ . If  $r \notin W_R(M)$ , then  $rM = M$ . This implies that  $(r/s)S^{-1}M = S^{-1}M$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $M$  be a finitely generated  $R$ -module and  $S$  be a multiplicatively closed subset of  $R$  such that  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ . Then  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module if and only if  $S^{-1}M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $S^{-1}R$ -module.*

*Proof.* First assume that  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module and

$$\text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}((r/1)S^{-1}M) = \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M)$$

for some  $r \in R$ . Then  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$  by part (a) of Theorem 2.8. Thus  $rM = M$ . Therefore,  $(r/1)S^{-1}M = S^{-1}M$ . Conversely, suppose that  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_R(M)$ . Then as  $M$  is finitely generated,

$$S^{-1}\text{Ann}_R(rM) = \text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}((r/1)S^{-1}M) =$$

$$\text{Ann}_{S^{-1}R}(S^{-1}M) = S^{-1}\text{Ann}_R(M).$$

hus  $(r/1)S^{-1}M = S^{-1}M$ . Now let  $0 \neq m \in M$ . Then  $m/1 \in S^{-1}M = (r/1)S^{-1}M$ . Thus  $shm = srm_1$  for some  $s, h \in S$  and  $m_1 \in M$ . As  $S \cap W_R(M) = \emptyset$ , we have  $hM = M$ . Therefore,  $m_1 = hm_2$ . Thus  $m = rm_2$  because  $sh \notin Z_R(M) \subseteq W_R(M)$ , as required.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.11.** Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then we have the following.

- (a) If  $M$  is a second module, then  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication module.
- (b) If  $t \in R \setminus Z_R(M)$  and  $tM$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module.
- (c) If  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication Hopfian  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a quasi multiplication module.
- (d) If  $M$  is a quasi-multiplication co-Hopfian  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication module.
- (e) If  $R$  is an integral domain and  $M$  is a faithful quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a second module.
- (f) If  $M$  is a prime quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module, then  $M$  is a second  $R$ -module.

*Proof.* (a), (c), and (d) These are clear.

(b) Let  $r \in R$  such that  $\text{Ann}_R(M) = \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . Then  $\text{Ann}_R(tM) = \text{Ann}_R(rtM)$ . So by assumption,  $tM = trM$ . Now let  $m \in M$ . Then  $tm = rtrm$  for some  $rm \in M$ . Thus  $t(m - rrm) = 0$ . As  $t \notin Z_R(M)$ ,  $m = rrm$  and so  $M \subseteq rM$ , as needed.

(e) Let  $r \in R$  such that  $rM \neq 0$ . As  $R$  is an integral domain and  $M$  is a faithful  $R$ -module,  $\text{Ann}(rM) = \text{Ann}(Rr) = \text{Ann}_R(M) = 0$ . Thus  $rM = M$  since  $M$  is a quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module.

(f) Let  $r \in R$ . Then by assumption,  $rM = 0$  or  $\text{Ann}_R(M) = \text{Ann}_R(rM)$ . Thus  $rM = 0$  or  $M = rM$ , as required.  $\square$

**Remark 3.12.** The converse of part (a) of Proposition 3.11, is not true in general because if it is true, then every comultiplication module is second by Remark 3.2.

**Proposition 3.13.** Let  $M$  be a finitely generated non-zero quasi-comultiplication  $R$ -module. Then  $\text{Ann}_R(rM) \neq \text{Ann}_R(M)$  for each  $r \in \text{Jac}(R)$ , where  $\text{Jac}(R)$  denotes the Jacobson radical of  $R$ .

*Proof.* This follows from Nakayama Lemma.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

1. W. Anderson and K.R. Fuller, *Rings and Categories of Modules*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1974.
2. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *The dual notion of multiplication modules*, Taiwanese J. Math. **11** (4) (2007), 1189–1201.
3. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *On multiplication and comultiplication modules*, Acta Math. Sci. **31B** (2) (2011), 694–700.
4. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *The dual notion of some generalizations of prime submodules*, Comm. Algebra, **39** (2011), 2396–2416.
5. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *Strong comultiplication modules*, CMU. J. Nat. Sci. **8** (1) (2009), 105–113.
6. A. Barnard, *Multiplication modules*, J. Algebra **71** (1981), 174–178.

7. Dauns, J. *Prime submodules*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **298**, 156-181, (1978).
8. L. Fuchs, W. Heinzer, and B. Olberding, *Commutative ideal theory without finiteness conditions: Irreducibility in the quotient field*, in : Abelian Groups, Rings, Modules, and Homological Algebra, Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math. **249** (2006), 121–145.
9. W. Krull, *Über Multiplikationsringe*, Sitzber. Heidelberg. Akad. Wiss. Abhandl., **5** (1925), 13-18.
10. L. Melkersson and P. Schenzel, *The co-localization of an Artinian module*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. **38** (2) (1995), 121-131.
11. S. Yassemi, *The dual notion of prime submodules*, Arch. Math (Brno) **37** (2001), 273–278.

(1) (CORRESPONDING AUTHOR) ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FARHANGIAN UNIVERSITY, TEHRAN, IRAN.

*E-mail address:* f.farshadifar@cfu.ac.ir

(2) DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF GUILAN, P. O. BOX 41335-19141, RASHT, IRAN.

*E-mail address:* ansari@guilan.ac.ir