

## On quasi-Baer modules

M. Shafiee-Mousavi\*

Department of Mathematics, South Tehran Branch,  
Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

Received 29 May 2016; Revised 13 August 2016; Accepted 23 August 2016.

---

**Abstract.** Let  $R$  be a ring,  $\sigma$  be an endomorphism of  $R$  and  $M_R$  be a  $\sigma$ -rigid module. A module  $M_R$  is called *quasi-Baer* if the right annihilator of a principal submodule of  $R$  is generated by an idempotent. It is shown that an  $R$ -module  $M_R$  is a quasi-Baer module if and only if  $M[[x]]$  is a quasi-Baer module over the skew power series ring  $R[[x; \sigma]]$ .

© 2016 IAUCTB. All rights reserved.

---

**Keywords:** Quasi-Baer modules,  $\sigma$ -rigid modules, quasi-Armendariz modules.

### 1. Introduction

Throughout the paper  $R$  always denotes an associative ring with unity and  $M_R$  will stand for a right  $R$ -module. Recall from [15] that  $R$  is a *Baer* ring if the right annihilator of every nonempty subset of  $R$  is generated by an idempotent.

In [15] Kaplansky introduced Baer rings to abstract various properties of von Neumann algebras and complete  $*$ -regular rings. The class of Baer rings includes the von Neumann algebras. In [10] Clark defines a ring to be *quasi-Baer* if the left annihilator of every ideal is generated, as a left ideal, by an idempotent. Then he used the quasi-Baer concept to characterize when a finite-dimensional algebra with unity over an algebraically closed field is isomorphic to a twisted matrix units semigroup algebra. Every prime ring is a quasi-Baer ring. In 1974, Armendariz considered the behavior of a polynomial ring over a Baer ring by obtaining the following result: Let  $R$  be a *reduced* ring (i.e.,  $R$  has no nonzero nilpotent elements). Then  $R[x]$  is a Baer ring if and only if  $R$  is a Baer ring ([3], Theorem B). Armendariz provided an example to show that the reduced condition

---

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: mshafieemousavi@azad.ac.ir (M. Shafiee-Mousavi).

is not superfluous. In [6] Birkenmeier, Gary F.; Kim, J.Y.; Park, J.K. showed that the quasi-Baer condition is preserved by many polynomial extension.

From now on, we always denote the skew power series ring by  $R[[x; \sigma]]$ , where  $\sigma : R \rightarrow R$  is an endomorphism. The skew power series ring  $R[[x; \sigma]]$  is then the ring consisting of all power series of the form  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i x^i$  ( $a_i \in R$ ), which are multiplied using the distributive law and the Ore commutation rule  $xa = \sigma(a)x$ , for all  $a \in R$ . Given a right  $R$ -module  $M_R$ , we can make  $M[[x]]$  into a right  $R[[x; \sigma]]$ -module by allowing power series from  $R[[x; \sigma]]$  to act on power series in  $M[[x]]$  in the obvious way, and applying the above "twist" whenever necessary. The verification that this defines a valid  $R[[x; \sigma]]$ -module structure on  $M[[x]]$  is almost identical to the verification that  $R[[x; \sigma]]$  is a ring, and it is straightforward.

For a nonempty subset  $X$  of  $M$ , put  $\text{ann}_R(X) = \{a \in R \mid Xa = 0\}$ . In [20], Lee-Zhou introduced Baer, quasi-Baer and p.p.-modules as follows:

- (1)  $M_R$  is called *Baer* if, for any subset  $X$  of  $M$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(X) = eR$  where  $e^2 = e \in R$ .
- (2)  $M_R$  is called *quasi-Baer*, if for any submodule  $X \subseteq M$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(X) = eR$  where  $e^2 = e \in R$ .
- (3)  $M_R$  is called *p.p.* if, for any element  $m \in M$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(m) = eR$  where  $e^2 = e \in R$ .

Clearly, a ring  $R$  is Baer (resp. p.p. or quasi-Baer) if and only if  $R_R$  is Baer (resp. p.p. or quasi-Baer) module. If  $R$  is a Baer (resp. p.p. or quasi-Baer) ring, then for any right ideal  $I$  of  $R$ ,  $I_R$  is Baer (resp. p.p. or quasi-Baer) module.

A module  $M_R$  is called *principally quasi-Baer (or simply p.q.-Baer)* if, for any  $m \in M$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(mR) = eR$  where  $e^2 = e \in R$ . It is clear that  $R$  is a right p.q.-Baer ring if and only if  $R_R$  is a p.q.-Baer module. Every submodule of a p.q.-Baer module is p.q.-Baer and every Baer module is quasi-Baer.

We use  $I(R)$ ,  $S_\ell(R)$  and  $C(R)$  to denote the set of idempotents, the set of left semi-central idempotents and the center of  $R$ , respectively.

In this paper we show that, if  $M_R$  is a  $\sigma$ -rigid module, then  $M[[x]]$  is quasi-Baer over  $R[[x; \sigma]]$  if and only if  $M_R$  is quasi-Baer. As a corollary, we show that if  $R$  is  $\sigma$ -rigid then  $R[[x; \sigma]]$  is quasi-Baer if and only if  $R$  is quasi-Baer.

## 2. Quasi-Baer modules

According to Kim et al. [16], a ring  $R$  is called *power-serieswise Armendariz* if whenever  $f(x)g(x) = 0$  where  $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i x^i$ ,  $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j x^j \in R[[x]]$ , we have  $a_i b_j = 0$  for all  $i, j$ . Let  $\sigma \in \text{End}(R)$  and  $M$  be an  $R$ -module.

According to Lee and Zhou [20], a module  $M_R$  is called  *$\sigma$ -Armendariz of power series type* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) For  $m \in M$  and  $a \in R$ ,  $ma = 0$  if and only if  $m\sigma(a) = 0$ .
- (2) For any  $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} m_i x^i \in M[[x]]$  and  $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i x^i \in R[[x; \sigma]]$ ,  $m(x)f(x) = 0$  implies  $m_i \sigma^i(a_j) = 0$  for all  $i, j$ .

**Definition 2.1** Given a module  $M_R$  and an endomorphism  $\sigma : R \rightarrow R$ . Then  $M_R$  is called a  *$\sigma$ -rigid* module if for each  $m \in M, a \in R$ ,  $ma = 0$  if and only if  $m\sigma(Ra) = 0$ .

**Theorem 2.2** Let  $M_R$  be a  $\sigma$ -rigid module.

- (1) If  $M[[x]]_{R[[x; \sigma]]}$  is p.q.-Baer, then  $M_R$  is p.q.-Baer.
- (2) If  $M_R$  is p.q.-Baer, then  $M$  is *power-serieswise  $\sigma$ -quasi-Armendariz*.

**Proof.** (1) Let  $m \in M$ . Since  $M[[x]]_R$  is p.q.-Baer, there exists an idempotent  $e(x) = e_0 + e_1(x) + \dots \in R[[x; \sigma]]$ , such that  $\text{ann}_{R[[x; \sigma]]}(mR[[x; \sigma]]) = e(x)R[[x; \sigma]]$ .

Since  $mRe(x) = 0$ ,  $mRe_0 = 0$ . Thus  $e_0R \subseteq \text{ann}_R(mR)$ . Let  $b \in \text{ann}_R(mR)$ . Then  $b \in \text{ann}_{R[[x;\sigma]]}(mR[[x;\sigma]])$ , since  $M$  is a  $\sigma$ -rigid module. Thus  $b = e(x)b$  and  $b = e_0b \in e_0R$ . Therefore  $\text{ann}_R(mR) = e_0R$  and  $M_R$  is p.q.-Baer.

(2) Assume that  $(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} m_i x^i)R[[x;\sigma]](\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j x^j) = 0$  with  $m_i \in M, b_j \in R$ . Let  $c$  be an arbitrary element of  $R$ . Then we have the following equation:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\sum_{i+j=k} m_i x^i c b_j x^j) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\sum_{i+j=k} m_i \sigma^i(c b_j)) x^k = 0$$

and hence

$$\sum_{i+j=k} m_i \sigma^i(c b_j) = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0. \tag{1}$$

We show that  $m_i x^i R b_j x^j = 0$  for all  $i, j$ . We proceed by induction on  $i + j$ . From equation 1, we obtain  $m_0 R b_0 = 0$ . This proves the case  $i + j = 0$ . Now suppose that  $m_i x^i R b_j x^j = 0$  for  $i + j \leq n - 1$ . Then  $b_j \in \text{ann}_R(m_i R)$  for  $j = 0, \dots, n - 1$  and  $i = 0, \dots, n - 1 - j$ , since  $M$  is  $\sigma$ -rigid. Now  $\text{ann}_R(m_i R) = e_i R$  for some idempotent  $e_i \in R$ . Thus  $e_i b_j = b_j$  for  $j = 0, \dots, n - 1$  and  $i = 0, \dots, n - 1 - j$ . If we put  $f_j = e_0 \dots e_{n-1-j}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, n - 1$ , then  $f_j b_j = b_j$  and  $f_j \in \text{ann}_R(m_0 R) \cap \dots \cap \text{ann}_R(m_{n-1-j} R)$ . For  $k = n$  replacing  $c$  by  $c f_0$  in 1 and using  $\sigma$ -rigid property of  $M$ , we obtain  $m_0 c b_n = m_0 c f_0 b_n = 0$ . Hence  $m_0 R b_n = 0$ . Continuing this process (replacing  $c$  by  $c f_j$  in 1, for  $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$  and using  $\sigma$ -rigid property of  $M$ ), we obtain  $m_i R b_j = 0$  and so  $m_i x^i R b_j x^j = 0$  for  $i + j = n$ . Therefore  $M_R$  is power-serieswise  $\sigma$ -quasi-Armendariz. ■

**Lemma 2.3** Let  $M_R$  be an  $\sigma$ -rigid module and  $M_R$  be a p.q.-Baer module. Let  $\text{ann}_T(m(x)T) = e(x)T$  for some idempotent  $e(x) = e_0 + e_1 x + \dots \in T$ . Then  $\text{ann}_T(m(x)T) = e_0 T$  and  $e_0$  is an idempotent of  $R$ .

**Proof.** Let  $m(x) = m_0 + m_1 x + \dots$ . By Theorem 2.2,  $M$  is power serieswise  $\sigma$ -quasi-Armendaris. Since  $m(x)T e(x) = 0$ , so  $m_i R e_0 = 0$ , for each  $i \geq 0$ . Hence  $e_0 \in \text{ann}_T(m(x)T)$ , and  $e_0 T \subseteq e(x)T$ . Now let  $f(x) = b_0 + b_1 x + \dots \in \text{ann}_T(m(x)T)$ . Then  $m_i R b_j = 0$ , for all  $i, j$ , since  $M$  is power serieswise  $\sigma$ -quasi-Armendariz and  $\sigma$ -rigid. Thus  $b_j \in \text{ann}_T(m(x)T) = e(x)T$ , since  $M_R$  is  $\sigma$ -rigid. Hence  $b_j = e(x)b_j$  and  $b_j = e_0 b_j$  for each  $j$ . Therefore  $f(x) = e_0 f(x) \in e_0 T$ . ■

**Theorem 2.4** Let  $M$  be an  $\sigma$ -rigid module and  $T = R[[x;\sigma]]$ . Then  $M[[x]]_T$  is p.q.-Baer if and only if  $M_R$  is p.q.-Baer and the right annihilator of any countably-generated submodule of  $M$  is generated by an idempotent.

**Proof.** If  $M[[x]]_T$  is p.q.-Baer, then by Theorem 2.2,  $M_R$  is p.q.-Baer. Let  $X = \{a_0, a_1, \dots\}$  be a countable subset of  $M$  and  $\langle X \rangle$  be the right submodule of  $M$  generated by  $X$ . Let  $m(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \dots$ .  $M[[x]]_T$  is p.q.-Baer, so by Lemma 2.3, there exists an idempotent  $e \in R$  such that  $\text{ann}_T(m(x)T) = eT$ . Clearly,  $eR \subseteq \text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle)$ . Let  $b \in \text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle)$ . Then  $a_i R b = 0$  for each  $i$ . Hence  $m(x)T b = 0$ . Since  $M_R$  is  $\sigma$ -rigid,  $b = e b \in eR$ . Consequently,  $\text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle) = eR$ .

Now assume  $M_R$  is p.q.-Baer and the right annihilator of any countably-generated submodule of  $M$  generated by an idempotent. Let  $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} m_i x^i \in M[[x]]$ . Let  $N$  be the submodule of  $M$  generated by the coefficients  $\{m_0, m_1, \dots\}$ . Then  $\text{ann}_R(N) = eR$

for some idempotent  $e \in R$ . Since  $m_i R e = 0$  for each  $i$  and  $M_R$  is  $\sigma$ -rigid, so by  $\sigma$ -rigid property of  $M_R$ ,  $m(x) T e = 0$  and that  $e T \subseteq \text{ann}_T(m(x) T)$ . Now let  $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j x^j \in \text{ann}_T(m(x) T)$ . Then  $m_i R a_j = 0$ , for each  $i, j$ , since  $M$  is power serieswise  $\sigma$ -quasi-Armendariz. Then  $a_j \in e R$ , for each  $j$ , and  $a_j = e a_j$ . Therefore  $f(x) = e f(x) \in e T$ . Consequently,  $M[[x]]_T$  is p.q.-Baer. ■

**Corollary 2.5** Let  $M$  be a right  $R$ -module. Then  $M[[x]]_{R[[x]]}$  is right p.q.-Baer if and only if  $M_R$  is right p.q.-Baer and for any countably-generated submodule  $N$  of  $M$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(N) = e R$  for an idempotent  $e \in R$ .

**Remark 1** In [20], it was proved that, if  $M_R$  is  $\sigma$ -Armendariz of power series type, then  $M[[x]]_T$  is p.p. if and only if for any countable subset  $X$  of  $M$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(X) = e R$  where  $e^2 = e \in R$ . By Zaleskii and Neroslavskii [9], there is a simple Noetherian ring  $R$  which is not a domain and in which 0 and 1 are the only idempotents. Thus  $R_R$  is p.q.-Baer ring which is not right p.p. Therefore our corollary 2.4, is not implied from [20].

The following example show that the condition “for any countably-generated submodule  $N$  of  $M$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(N) = e R$  for an idempotent  $e \in R$ ” in corollary 2.5 is not superfluous. On the other hand there is p.q.-Baer module  $M_R$  such that  $M[[x]]_{R[[x]]}$  is not p.q.-Baer.

**Example 2.6** Let  $M_1$  be a right p.q.-Baer  $R_1$ -module. Let

$$M = \{(m_n) \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n \mid m_n \text{ is eventually constant} \}$$

where  $M_n = M_1$  for  $n > 1$  and let

$$R = \{(a_n) \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} R_n \mid a_n \text{ is eventually constant} \}$$

where  $R_n = R_1$  for  $n > 1$ . Clearly  $M$  is a right  $R$  module. Clearly  $M$  is right p.q.-Baer. Let  $m$  be a nonzero element of  $M_1$ . Let  $m_1 = (m, 0, 0, \dots)$ ,  $m_2 = (m, 0, m, 0, 0, \dots)$ ,  $m_3 = (m, 0, m, 0, m, 0, 0, \dots)$ , .... Let  $\langle X \rangle$  be the submodule of  $M$  generated by  $X = \{m_1, m_2, \dots\}$ . One can show that  $\text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle)$  is not generated by any idempotent, hence by Theorem 2.4,  $M[[x]]_{R[[x]]}$  is not right p.q.-Baer.

**Definition 2.7** (Z. Liu [21]). Let  $\{e_0, e_1, \dots\}$  be a countable family of idempotents of  $R$ . We say  $\{e_0, e_1, \dots\}$  has a generalized join in  $I(R)$  if there exists an idempotent  $e \in I(R)$  such that:

- (1)  $e_i R(1 - e) = 0$
- (2) If  $f \in I(R)$  is such that  $e_i R(1 - f) = 0$ , then  $e R(1 - f) = 0$ .

**Lemma 2.8** Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S_\ell(R) \subseteq C(R)$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $R$  is right p.q.-Baer and any countable family of idempotents in  $R$  has a generalized join in  $I(R)$ .
- (2)  $R$  is right p.q.-Baer and the right annihilator of any countably-generated right ideal of  $R$  is generated by an idempotent.

**Proof.** (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Let  $X = \{a_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a countable subset of  $R$  and  $\langle X \rangle$  be the right ideal of  $R$  generated by  $X$ . Then for each  $a_i \in X$ ,  $\text{ann}_R(a_i R) = e_i R$  for some idempotent  $e_i \in R$ . Let  $h$  be a generalized join of the set  $\{1 - e_i \mid i \in I\}$ . Then  $(1 - e_i) R(1 - h) = 0$ . Hence  $r(1 - h) = e_i r(1 - h)$  for all  $r \in R$ . Since  $e_i \in S_\ell(R) \subseteq C(R)$ ,  $a_i r(1 - h) = a_i e_i r(1 - h) = 0$

for all  $i$  and each  $r \in R$ . Hence  $(1-h) \in \text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle)$  and  $(1-h)R \subseteq \text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle)$ . Suppose that  $b \in \text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle)$ . Hence  $b = e_i b$  for each  $i$ . Since  $e_i \in S_\ell(R) \subseteq C(R)$ ,  $bR(1-e_i) = 0$  for each  $i$ . Since  $R$  is right p.q.-Baer, so  $\text{ann}_R(bR) = fR$ , where  $f$  is a left semicentral idempotent of  $R$ . Thus  $(1-e_i) \in \text{ann}_R(bR) = fR$ , so  $(1-e_i) = f(1-e_i)$  for each  $i$ . Hence from  $(1-e_i) \in C(R)$ , we have  $(1-e_i)R(1-f) = 0$ . Since  $h$  is a generalized join of the set  $\{1-e_i \mid i \in I\}$ ,  $hR(1-f) = 0$ . Hence  $b = b - bf = (1-f)b = (1-h)(1-f)b \in (1-h)R$ . Therefore  $\text{ann}_R(\langle X \rangle) = (1-h)R$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Suppose that  $\{e_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots\}$  is a countable family of idempotent of  $R$ . Let  $J$  be the right ideal of  $R$  generated by  $\{e_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots\}$ . then  $\text{ann}_R(J) = eR$  for some left semicentral idempotent  $e$ . Let  $h = 1 - e$ . Then  $e_i r(1-h) = 0$  for each  $r \in R$ . Suppose that  $f$  is an idempotent of  $R$  such  $e_i R(1-f) = 0$  for each  $i$ . Then  $r(1-f) \in \text{ann}_R(J)$  for each  $r \in R$ . Thus  $r(1-f) = er(1-f)$  and  $hr(1-f) = (1-e)r(1-f) = 0$ . Hence  $h$  is a generalized join of the set  $\{e_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots\}$ . ■

**Theorem 2.9** Let  $R$  be a ring with  $S_\ell(R) \subseteq C(R)$  and  $\sigma$  be an endomorphism of  $R$ . Let  $R_R$  be a  $\sigma$ -rigid module. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $R[[x; \sigma]]$  is right p.q.-Baer.
- (2)  $R$  is right p.q.-Baer and any countable family of idempotents of  $R$  has a generalized join in  $I(R)$ .

**Proof.** This follows from Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 2.8. ■

**Corollary 2.10** (Z. Liu [21]). Let  $R$  be a ring with  $S_\ell(R) \subseteq C(R)$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1)  $S = R[[x]]$  is right p.q.-Baer.
- (2)  $R$  is right p.q.-Baer and any countable family of idempotents in  $R$  has a generalized join in  $I(R)$ .

## References

- [1] D. D. Anderson, V. Camilo, Armendariz rings and gaussian rings. *Comm. Algebra* 26 (1998) 2265-2275.
- [2] S. Aninn, Associated primes over skew polynomials rings. *Comm. Algebra* 30 (2002) 2511-2528.
- [3] E. P. Armendariz, A note on extensions of Baer and p.p.rings. *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* 18 (1974) 470-473.
- [4] G. F. Birkenmeier, J. Y. Kim, J. K. Park, On quasi-Baer rings. *Algebra and its applications* (Athens, OH) (1999) 67-92.
- [5] G. F. Birkenmeier, J. Y. Kim, J. K. Park, Principally quasi-Baer rings. *Comm. Algebra* 29 (2011) 639-660.
- [6] G. F. Birkenmeier, J. Y. Kim, J. K. Park, Polynomial extensions of Baer and quasi-Baer rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 159 (2001) 25-42.
- [7] G. F. Birkenmeier, Idempotents and completely semiprime ideals. *Comm. Algebra*. 11 (1983) 567-580.
- [8] J. W. Brewer, Power series over commutative rings. *Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 64, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York 1981.
- [9] A. W. Chatters, C. R. Hajarnavis, Rings with chain conditions. *Research Notes in Mathematics*. 44, Pitman, Boston, Mas.-London, 1980.
- [10] W. E. Clark, Twisted matrix units semigroup algebras. *Duke Math. J.* 34 (1967) 417-424
- [11] E. Hashemi, A. Moussavi, Polynomial extensions of quasi-Baer rings. *Acta Math. Hungar.* 107 (2005) 207-224.
- [12] Y. Hirano, On annihilator ideals of a polynomial ring over a non commutative ring. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*. 168 (2002) 45-52.
- [13] C. Y. Hong, N. K. Kim, T. K. Kwak, On skew Armendariz rings. *Comm. Algebra*. 31 (2003) 103-122.
- [14] C. Huh, Y. Lee, Smoktunowicz, Agata, Armendariz rings and semicommutative rings. *Comm. Algebra*. 30 (2002) 751-761.
- [15] I. Kaplansky, Rings of operators. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1968.
- [16] N. K. Kim, K. H. Lee, Y. Lee, Power series rings satisfying a zero divisor property. *Comm. Algebra*. 34 (2006) 2205-2218.
- [17] N. K. Kim, Y. Lee, Armendariz rings and reduced rings. *J. Algebra* 223 (2000) 447-488.
- [18] J. Krempa, Some examples of reduced rings. *Algebra Colloq.* 3 (1996) 289-300.
- [19] T. K. Lee, Y. Zhou, Armendariz and reduced rings. *Comm. Algebra*. 32 (2004) 2287-2299.
- [20] T. K. Lee, Y. Zhou, Reduced modules. Rings, modules, algebras and abelian groups. 365-377. *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, 236. Marcel Dekker, New York, 2004.

- [21] Z. Liu, A note on principally quasi-Baer rings. *Comm. Algebra.* 30 (2002) 3885-3890.
- [22] M. B. Rege, S. Chhawharia, Armendariz rings. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.* 73 (1997) 14-17.
- [23] L. Zhongkui, Z. Renyu, A generalization of p.p.-rings and p.q.-Baer rings. *Glasgow Math. J.* 48 (2006) 217-229.