



HAL
open science

Injective modules and fp-injective modules over valuation rings

Francois Couchot

► **To cite this version:**

Francois Couchot. Injective modules and fp-injective modules over valuation rings. *Journal of Algebra*, 2003, 267, pp.359-376. 10.1016/S0021-8693(03)00373-9 . hal-00002951

HAL Id: hal-00002951

<https://hal.science/hal-00002951>

Submitted on 27 Sep 2004

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

INJECTIVE MODULES AND FP-INJECTIVE MODULES OVER VALUATION RINGS

F. COUCHOT

ABSTRACT. It is shown that each almost maximal valuation ring R , such that every indecomposable injective R -module is countably generated, satisfies the following condition (C): each fp-injective R -module is locally injective. The converse holds if R is a domain. Moreover, it is proved that a valuation ring R that satisfies this condition (C) is almost maximal. The converse holds if $\text{Spec}(R)$ is countable. When this last condition is satisfied it is also proved that every ideal of R is countably generated. New criteria for a valuation ring to be almost maximal are given. They generalize the criterion given by E. Matlis in the domain case. Necessary and sufficient conditions for a valuation ring to be an IF-ring are also given.

In the first part of this paper we study the valuation rings that satisfy the following condition (C): every fp-injective module is locally injective. In his paper [5], Alberto Facchini constructs an example of an almost maximal valuation domain satisfying (C) which is not noetherian and gives a negative answer to the following question asked in [1] by Goro Azumaya: if R is a ring that satisfies (C), is R a left noetherian ring? From [5, Theorem 5] we easily deduce that a valuation domain R satisfies (C) if and only if R is almost maximal and its classical field of fractions is countably generated. In this case every indecomposable injective R -module is countably generated. So, when an almost maximal valuation ring R , with eventually non-zero zerodivisors, verifies this last condition, we prove that R satisfies (C). Conversely, every valuation ring that satisfies (C) is almost maximal.

In the second part of this paper, we prove that every locally injective module is a factor module of a direct sum of indecomposable injective modules modulo a pure submodule. This result allows us to give equivalent conditions for a valuation ring R to be an IF-ring, i.e. a ring for which every injective R -module is flat. It is proved that each proper localization of Q , the classical ring of fractions of R , is an IF-ring.

It is well known that a valuation domain R is almost maximal if and only if the injective dimension of the R -module R is less or equal to one. This result is due to E. Matlis. See [12, Theorem 4]. In the third part, some generalizations of this result are given. Moreover, when the subset Z of zerodivisors of an almost maximal valuation ring R is nilpotent, we show that every uniserial R -module is “standard” (see [7, p.141]).

In the last part of this paper we determine some sufficient and necessary conditions for every indecomposable injective module over a valuation ring R to be countably generated. In particular the following condition is sufficient: $\text{Spec}(R)$ is a countable set. Moreover, when this condition is satisfied, we prove that every ideal of R is countably generated and that every finitely generated R -module is countably cogenerated.

In this paper all rings are associative and commutative with unity and all modules are unital. An R -module E is said to be *locally injective* (or finitely injective, or strongly absolutely pure, [14]) if every homomorphism $A \rightarrow E$ extends to a homomorphism $B \rightarrow E$ whenever A is a finitely generated submodule of an arbitrary R -module B . As in [6] we say that E is *divisible* if, for every $r \in R$ and $x \in E$, $(0 : r) \subseteq (0 : x)$ implies that $x \in rE$, and that E is *fp-injective* (or absolutely pure) if $\text{Ext}_R^1(F, E) = 0$, for every finitely presented R -module F . A ring R is called *self fp-injective* if it is fp-injective as R -module. An exact sequence $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow E \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$ is *pure* if it remains exact when tensoring it with any R -module. In this case we say that F is a *pure* submodule of E . Recall that a module E is fp-injective if and only if it is a pure submodule of every overmodule ([17, Proposition 2.6]). A module is said to be *uniserial* if its submodules are linearly ordered by inclusion and a ring R is a *valuation ring* if it is uniserial as R -module. Recall that every finitely presented module over a valuation ring is a finite direct sum of cyclic modules [18, Theorem 1]. Consequently a module E over a valuation ring R is fp-injective if and only if it is divisible. A valuation ring R is *maximal* if every totally ordered family of cosets $(a_i + L_i)_{i \in I}$ has a nonempty intersection and R is *almost maximal* if the above condition holds whenever $\bigcap_{i \in I} L_i \neq 0$.

We denote $\text{p.d.}_R M$ (resp. $\text{i.d.}_R M$) the projective (resp. injective) dimension of M , where M is a module over a ring R , $E_R(M)$ the injective hull of M , $\text{Spec}(R)$ the space of prime ideals of R , and for every ideal A of R , $V(A) = \{I \in \text{Spec}(R) \mid A \subseteq I\}$ and $D(A) = \text{Spec}(R) \setminus V(A)$.

When R is a valuation ring, we denote by P its maximal ideal, Z its subset of zerodivisors and Q its classical ring of fractions. Then Z is a prime ideal and $Q = R_Z$.

1. VALUATION RINGS WHOSE FP-INJECTIVE MODULES ARE LOCALLY INJECTIVE

From [5, Theorem 5] we easily deduce the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Let R be a valuation domain. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *Every fp-injective module is locally injective.*
- (2) *R is almost maximal and $\text{p.d.}_R Q \leq 1$.*
- (3) *R is almost maximal and Q is countably generated over R .*
- (4) *R is almost maximal and every indecomposable injective module is countably generated.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Since Q/R is fp-injective, it is a locally injective module. By [14, Corollary 3.4], Q/R is injective and consequently R is almost maximal by [12, Theorem 4]. From [5, Theorem 5], it follows that $\text{p.d.}_R Q \leq 1$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) is proved in [5, Theorem 5].

(2) \Leftrightarrow (3). See [7, Theorem 2.4, p.76].

(3) \Leftrightarrow (4). By [12, Theorem 4] $E_R(R/A) \simeq Q/A$ for every proper ideal A . Consequently, if Q is countably generated, every indecomposable injective module is also countably generated. \square

If R is not a domain then the implication (4) \Rightarrow (1) holds. The following lemma is needed to prove this implication and will be useful in the sequel too.

Lemma 1.2. *Let R be a valuation ring, M an R -module, $r \in R$ and $y \in M$ such that $ry \neq 0$. Then:*

- (1) $(0 : y) = r(0 : ry)$.
- (2) *If $(0 : y) \neq 0$ then $(0 : y)$ is finitely generated if and only if $(0 : ry)$ is finitely generated.*

Proof. Clearly $r(0 : ry) \subseteq (0 : y)$. Let $a \in (0 : y)$. Since $ry \neq 0$, $(0 : y) \subset rR$. There exists $t \in R$ such that $a = rt$ and we easily check that $t \in (0 : ry)$. The second assertion is an immediate consequence of the first. \square

Theorem 1.3. *Let R be an almost maximal valuation ring. Assume that every indecomposable injective R -module is countably generated. Then every fp-injective R -module is locally injective.*

Proof. Let F be a non-zero fp-injective module. We must prove that F contains an injective hull of each of its finitely generated submodules by [14, Proposition 3.3]. Let M be a finitely generated submodule of F . By [9, Theorem] M is a finite direct sum of cyclic submodules. Consequently, we may assume that M is cyclic, generated by x . Let E be an injective hull of M and $\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ a spanning set of E . By [9, Theorem] E is a uniserial module. Hence, for every integer n , there exists $c_n \in R$ such that $x_n = c_n x_{n+1}$. We may suppose that $x = x_0$. By induction on n we prove that there exists a sequence $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of F such that $y_0 = x$, $(0 : x_n) = (0 : y_n)$ and $y_n = c_n y_{n+1}$. Since $x_n = c_n x_{n+1}$, $(0 : c_n) \subseteq (0 : x_n) = (0 : y_n)$. Since F is fp-injective, there exists $y_{n+1} \in F$, such that $y_n = c_n y_{n+1}$. We easily deduce from Lemma 1.2 that $(0 : x_{n+1}) = (0 : y_{n+1})$. Now, the submodule of F generated by $\{y_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is isomorphic to E . \square

We don't know if the converse of this theorem holds when R is not a domain. However, for every valuation ring R , condition (C) implies that R is almost maximal.

Theorem 1.4. *Let R be a valuation ring. If every fp-injective R -module is locally injective then R is almost maximal.*

Some preliminary results are needed to prove this theorem. The following Lemma will often be used in the sequel. This lemma is similar to [7, Lemma II.2.1].

Lemma 1.5. *Let R be a local commutative ring, P its maximal ideal, U a uniserial R -module, $r \in R$, and $x, y \in U$ such that $rx = ry \neq 0$. Then $Rx = Ry$.*

Proof. We may assume that $x = ty$ for some $t \in R$. It follows that $(1-t)ry = 0$. Since $ry \neq 0$ we deduce that t is a unit. \square

Proposition 1.6. *Let U be a uniform fp-injective module over a valuation ring R . Suppose there exists a nonzero element x of U such that $Z = (0 : x)$. Then:*

- (1) U is a Q -module.
- (2) *For every proper R -submodule A of Q , U/Ax is faithful and fp-injective.*

Proof. (1) For every $0 \neq y \in U$, $(0 : y) = sZ$ or $(0 : y) = (Z : s) = Z$ (see [13]). Hence $(0 : y) \subseteq Z$. If $s \in R \setminus Z$ then the multiplication by s in U is injective. Since U is fp-injective this multiplication is bijective.

(2) If $R \subseteq A$ there exists $s \in R \setminus Z$ such that $sA \subset R$ and there exists $y \in U$ such that $x = sy$. Then $Ax = Asy$ and $(0 : y) = Z$. Consequently we may assume

that $A \subset R$, after eventually replacing A with As and x with y . Let $t \in R$. Since $(0 : t) \subseteq Z$ there exists $z \in U$ such that $x = tz$. Therefore $0 \neq x + Ax = t(z + Ax)$ whence U/Ax is faithful. Let $t \in R$ and $y \in U$ such that $(0 : t) \subseteq (0 : y + Ax)$. Therefore $(0 : t)y \subseteq Ax \subset Qx$. It is easy to check that $(0 : t)$ is an ideal of Q . Since Qx is the nonzero minimal Q -submodule of U we get that $(0 : t) \subseteq (0 : y)$. Since U is fp-injective we conclude that U/Ax is fp-injective too. \square

Now, we prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. If $Z = P$ then R is self fp-injective by [9, Lemma 3]. It follows that R is self injective by [14, Corollary 3.4] and that R is maximal by [11, Theorem 2.3].

Now we assume that $Z \neq P$. In the same way we prove that Q is maximal. From [9, Theorem] it follows that $E_Q(Q/Z) \simeq E_R(R/Z)$ is uniserial over Q and R . Let $H = E_R(R/Z)$ and $x \in H$ such that $Z = (0 : x)$. By Proposition 1.6 H/Px is fp-injective. This module is injective by [14, Corollary 3.4]. Hence $E(R/P) \simeq H/Px$ is uniserial. By [9, Theorem] R is almost maximal. \square

From Proposition 1.6 we easily deduce the following corollary which generalizes the second part of [12, Theorem 4].

Corollary 1.7. *Let R be an almost maximal valuation ring, $H = E(R/Z)$ and $x \in H$ such that $Z = (0 : x)$. For every proper and faithful ideal A of R , $H/Ax \simeq E(R/A)$.*

Proof. By [9, Theorem] $E(R/A)$ is uniserial. It follows that its proper submodules are not faithful. We conclude by Proposition 1.6. \square

2. VALUATION RINGS THAT ARE IF-RINGS

We begin this section with some results on indecomposable injective modules over a valuation ring. In the sequel, if R is a valuation ring, let $E = E(R)$, $H = E(R/Z)$ and $F = E(R/Rr)$ for every $r \in P$, $r \neq 0$. Recall that, if r and s are nonzero elements of P , then $E(R/Rr) \simeq E(R/Rs)$, (see [13]).

Proposition 2.1. *The following statements hold for a valuation ring R .*

- (1) *The modules E and H are flat.*
- (2) *The modules E and H are isomorphic if and only if Z is not faithful.*

Proof. First we assume that $Z = P$, whence R is fp-injective. Let $x \in E$, $x \neq 0$, and $r \in R$ such that $rx = 0$. There exists $a \in R$ such that $ax \in R$ and $ax \neq 0$. Then $(0 : a) \subseteq (0 : ax)$, so that there exists $d \in R$ such that $ax = ad$. By Lemma 1.2 $(0 : d) = (0 : x)$, whence there exists $y \in E$ such that $x = dy$. We deduce that $r \otimes x = rd \otimes y = 0$. Hence E is flat. Now if $Z \neq P$, then $E \simeq E_Q(Q)$. Consequently E is flat over Q and R .

Since Q is self-fp-injective, $E_Q(Q/Z) \simeq H$ is flat by [4, Theorem 2.8].

If Z is not faithful there exists $a \in Z$ such that $Z = (0 : a)$. It follows that $H \simeq E(Ra) = E$. \square

We state that E and F are generators of the category of locally injective R -modules. More precisely:

Proposition 2.2. *Let R be a valuation ring and G a locally injective module. Then there exists a pure exact sequence: $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow I \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$, such that I is a direct sum of submodules isomorphic to E or F .*

Proof. There exist a set Λ and an epimorphism $\varphi : L = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} R_\lambda \rightarrow G$, where $R_\lambda = R, \forall \lambda \in \Lambda$. Let $u_\mu : R_\mu \rightarrow L$ the canonical monomorphism. For every $\mu \in \Lambda$, $\varphi \circ u_\mu$ can be extended to $\psi_\mu : E_\mu \rightarrow G$, where $E_\mu = E, \forall \mu \in \Lambda$. We denote $\psi : \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Lambda} E_\mu \rightarrow G$, the epimorphism defined by the family $(\psi_\mu)_{\mu \in \Lambda}$. We put $\Delta = \text{hom}_R(F, G)$ and $\rho : F^{(\Delta)} \rightarrow G$ the morphism defined by the elements of Δ . Thus ψ and ρ induce an epimorphism $\phi : I = E^{(\Lambda)} \oplus F^{(\Delta)} \rightarrow G$. Since, for every $r \in P, r \neq 0$, each morphism $g : R/Rr \rightarrow G$ can be extended to $F \rightarrow G$, we deduce that $K = \ker \phi$ is a pure submodule of I . \square

Recall that a ring R is *coherent* if every finitely generated ideal of R is finitely presented. As in [3] we say that R is an *IF-ring* if every injective R -module is flat. From Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 we deduce necessary and sufficient conditions for a valuation ring to be an IF-ring.

Theorem 2.3. *Let R be a valuation ring which is not a field. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is coherent and self-fp-injective
- (2) R is an IF-ring
- (3) F is flat
- (4) $F \simeq E$
- (5) P is not a flat R -module
- (6) There exists $r \in R, r \neq 0$, such that $(0 : r)$ is a nonzero principal ideal.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (4). By [3, Corollary 3], for every $r \in P, r \neq 0$, there exists $t \in P, t \neq 0$, such that $(0 : t) = Rr$. Hence $R/Rr \simeq Rt \subseteq R \subseteq E$. We deduce that $F \simeq E$.

(4) \Rightarrow (3) follows from Proposition 2.1.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) If G is an injective module then by Proposition 2.2 there exists a pure exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow I \rightarrow G \rightarrow 0$ where I is a direct sum of submodules isomorphic to E or F . By Propositions 2.1 I is flat whence G is flat too.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). See [3, Theorem 2].

(1) \Rightarrow (6) is an immediate consequence of [3, Corollary 3].

(6) \Rightarrow (5) We denote $(0 : r) = Rt$. If $r \otimes t = 0$ in $Rr \otimes P$ then, by [2, Proposition 13, p. 42], there exist s and d in P such that $t = ds$ and $rd = 0$. Thus $d \in (0 : r)$ and $d \notin Rt$. Whence a contradiction. Consequently P is not flat.

(5) \Rightarrow (1). If $Z \neq P$, then $P = \bigcup_{r \notin Z} Rr$, whence P is flat. Hence $Z = P$. If R is not coherent, there exists $r \in P$ such that $(0 : r)$ is not finitely generated. By Lemma 1.2 $(0 : s)$ is not finitely generated for each $s \in P, s \neq 0$. Consequently, if $st = 0$, there exist $p \in P$ and $a \in (0 : s)$ such that $t = ap$. It follows that $s \otimes t = sa \otimes p = 0$ in $Rs \otimes P$. Whence P is a flat module. We get a contradiction. \square

The following theorem allows us to give examples of valuation rings that are IF-rings.

Theorem 2.4. *The following statements hold for a valuation ring R :*

- (1) For every $0 \neq r \in P$, R/Rr is an IF-ring.
- (2) For every prime ideal $J \subset Z$, R_J is an IF-ring.

Proof. (1) For every $a \in P \setminus Rr$ there exists $b \in P \setminus Rr$ such that $r = ab$. We easily deduce that $(Rr : a) = Rb$ whence R/Rr is an IF-ring by Theorem 2.3.

(2) The inclusion $J \subset Z$ implies that there exist $s \in Z \setminus J$ and $0 \neq r \in J$ such that $sr = 0$. If we set $R' = R/Rr$ then $R_J \simeq R'_J$. From the first part and [4, Proposition 1.2] it follows that R_J is an IF-ring. \square

The two following lemmas are needed to prove the important Proposition 2.7.

Lemma 2.5. *The following statements hold for a valuation ring R :*

- (1) *If $Z \neq P$ then $E = PE$.*
- (2) *If $Z = P$ then $E = R + PE$ and $E/PE \simeq R/P$.*

Proof. (1) If $p \in P \setminus Z$ then $E = pE$.

(2) For every $x \in PE$, $(0 : x) \neq 0$ whence $1 \notin PE$. Let $x \in E \setminus R$. There exists $r \in R$ such that $0 \neq rx \in R$. Since R is self-fp-injective there exists $d \in R$ such that $rd = rx$. By Lemma 1.2 $(0 : d) = (0 : x)$. We deduce that $x = dy$ for some $y \in E$. Then $x \in PE$ if $d \in P$. If d is a unit, in the same way we find $t, c \in R$ and $z \in E$ such that $tc = t(x - d) \neq 0$ and $x - d = cz$. Since $r \in (0 : x - d) = (0 : c)$ then $c \in P$ and $x \in R + PE$. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let R be a valuation ring and U a uniform R -module. If $x, y \in U$, $x \notin Ry$ and $y \notin Rx$, then $Rx \cap Ry$ is not finitely generated.*

Proof. Suppose that $Rx \cap Ry = Rz$. We may assume that there exist $t \in P$ and $d \in R$ such that $z = ty = tdx$. It is easy to check that $(Rx : y - dx) = (Rx : y) = (Rz : y) = Rt \subseteq (0 : y - dx)$. It follows that $Rx \cap R(y - dx) = 0$. This contradicts that U is uniform. \square

Proposition 2.7. *Let R be a valuation ring which is not a field. Apply the functor $\text{Hom}_R(-, E(R/P))$ to the canonical exact sequence*

$$(S) : 0 \rightarrow P \rightarrow R \rightarrow R/P \rightarrow 0. \text{ Then :}$$

- (1) *If R is not an IF-ring one gets an exact sequence*
 $(S_1) : 0 \rightarrow R/P \rightarrow E(R/P) \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$, *with $F \simeq \text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P))$,*
- (2) *If R is an IF-ring one gets an exact sequence*
 $(S_2) : 0 \rightarrow R/P \rightarrow E(R/P) \rightarrow F \rightarrow R/P \rightarrow 0$, *with $PF \simeq \text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P))$.*

Proof. (1) (S) induces the following exact sequence:

$0 \rightarrow R/P \rightarrow E(R/P) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P)) \rightarrow 0$. By Theorem 2.3 P is flat whence $\text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P))$ is injective. Let f and g be two nonzero elements of $\text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P))$. There exist x and y in $E(R/P)$ such that $f(p) = px$ and $g(p) = py$ for each $p \in P$. Let Rv be the minimal nonzero submodule of $E(R/P)$. By Lemma 2.6 there exists $z \in (Rx \cap Ry) \setminus Rv$. Then the map h defined by $h(p) = pz$ for each $p \in P$ is nonzero and belongs to $Rf \cap Rg$. Thus $\text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P))$ is uniform. Now let $a \in R$ such that $af = 0$. It follows that $Pa \subseteq (0 : x) = Pb$ for some $b \in R$. We deduce that $(0 : f) = Rb$. Hence $F \simeq \text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P))$.

(2) First we suppose that P is not finitely generated. From the first part of the proof it follows that $\text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P)) \subseteq F$. We use the same notations as in (1). We have $(0 : f) = Rb$ and there exists $c \in P$ such that $(0 : c) = Rb$. Consequently $f \in cF \subseteq PF$. Conversely let $y \in PF$ and $b \in P$ such that $(0 : y) = Rb$. Since $R' = R/Pb$ is not an IF-ring it follows from the first part

that $\text{Hom}_R(P/bP, E(R/P)) \simeq \{x \in F \mid bP \subseteq (0 : x)\} \simeq E_{R'}(R'/rR')$ where $0 \neq r \in P/bP$. Hence $\text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P)) = PF$. We deduce the result from Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 2.5.

If $P = pR$ then $E(R/P) \simeq E \simeq F$. Then multiplication by p induces the exact sequence (S_2) . \square

Remark 2.8. In [6, Theorem 5.7] A. Facchini considered indecomposable pure-injective modules over a valuation ring R . He proved that $\text{Hom}_R(W, G)$ is indecomposable for every indecomposable injective R -module G , where W is a faithful uniserial module such that $(0 : x)$ is a nonzero principal ideal for each $x \in W$. This result implies that $\text{Hom}_R(P, E(R/P))$ is indecomposable when R is an IF-ring and P is faithful.

From Proposition 2.7 we deduce a sufficient and necessary condition for a valuation ring to be an IF-ring. As in [17], the *fp-injective dimension* of an R -module M ($\text{fp-i.d.}_R M$) is the smallest integer $n \geq 0$ such that $\text{Ext}_R^{n+1}(N, M) = 0$ for every finitely presented R -module N .

Corollary 2.9. *Let R be a valuation ring. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is not an IF-ring.
- (2) $\text{i.d.}_R R/P = 1$.
- (3) $\text{fp-i.d.}_R R/Z = 1$.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2). It is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.7.

(1) \Leftrightarrow (3). If R is an IF-ring then $Z = P$ and $\text{fp-i.d.}_R R/Z > 1$ by Proposition 2.7. Assume that R is not an IF-ring and $Z \neq P$. Let $x \in H$ such that $Z = (0 : x)$. By Proposition 1.6 H/Rx is fp-injective. It follows that $\text{fp-i.d.}_R R/Z = 1$. \square

3. INJECTIVE MODULES AND UNISERIAL MODULES

Proposition 2.7 allows us to give generalizations of well known results in the domain case. This is a first generalization of the first part of [12, Theorem 4].

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a valuation ring. Then R is almost maximal if and only if F is uniserial.*

Proof. By [9, Theorem] F is uniserial if R is almost maximal. Conversely if F is uniserial, by using the exact sequence (S_1) or (S_2) of Proposition 2.7, it is easy to prove that $E(R/P)$ is uniserial. We conclude by using [9, Theorem]. \square

Now we shall prove the existence of uniserial fp-injective modules. This is an immediate consequence of [9, Theorem] when R is an almost maximal valuation ring. The following proposition will be useful for this.

Proposition 3.2. *Let R be a commutative local ring, P its maximal ideal, U a uniserial module with a nonzero minimal submodule S . Then U is a divisible module if and only if it is faithful.*

Proof. First we suppose that U is faithful. Let $0 \neq s \in P$ and $0 \neq y \in U$ such that $(0 : s) \subseteq (0 : y)$. There exists $t \in R$ such that $x = ty$ where x generates S . Thus $t \notin (0 : s)$ and consequently stU is a nonzero submodule of U . It follows that there exists $z \in U$ such that $x = stz$. By Lemma 1.5 $y \in sU$. Conversely

let $0 \neq s \in P$. Then $(0 : s) \subseteq P$ implies that $x \in sU$. We conclude that U is faithful. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Let R be a valuation ring such that $Z = P$. Assume that R is coherent, or $(0 : P) \neq 0$, or 0 is a countable intersection of nonzero ideals. Then there exist two uniserial fp-injective modules U and V such that $E(U) \simeq E(R/P)$ and $E(V) \simeq F$. When P is principal then $U \simeq V \simeq R$.*

Proof. If P is principal then R is an IF-ring and it is obvious that $U \simeq V \simeq R$.

Now suppose that R is an IF-ring and P is not finitely generated. Consequently P is faithful. Let $\phi : E(R/P) \rightarrow F$ be the homomorphism defined in Proposition 2.7. Thus $F \simeq E$ and $\text{Im}\phi = PF$. It is obvious that $PF \cap R = P$. We put $V = R$ and $U = \phi^{-1}(P)$. Since P is faithful, U is faithful too. It is easy to prove that U is uniserial. Then U is fp-injective by Proposition 3.2.

Now we assume that P is not faithful and not finitely generated. Then R is not an IF-ring. By Corollary 2.9 $\text{i.d.}_R(R/P) = 1$. It follows that $R/(0 : P)$ is fp-injective. In this case we put $U = R$ and $V = R/(0 : P)$.

Now we suppose that 0 is a countable intersection of nonzero ideals. We may assume that R is not coherent and P is faithful. By [16, Theorem 5.5] there exists a faithful uniserial R -module U such that $E(U) \simeq E(R/P)$. By Proposition 3.2 U is fp-injective. Let $u \in U$ such that $(0 : u) = P$. Since R is not an IF-ring, then by using Corollary 2.9 it is easy to prove that U/Ru is fp-injective. We put $V = U/Ru$. \square

Remark 3.4. By [6, Theorem 5.4] it is obvious that every faithful indecomposable pure-injective R -module is injective if R is a valuation ring such that $(0 : P) \neq 0$. In this case the module W in remark 2.8 doesn't exist. By [6, Theorem 5.7] and Proposition 2.7, PF is the only faithful indecomposable pure-injective R -module which is not injective, when R is an IF-ring and $(0 : P) = 0$.

As in [7, p.15], for every proper ideal A of a valuation ring R we put $A^\# = \{s \in R \mid (A : s) \neq A\}$. Then $A^\#/A$ is the set of zerodivisors of R/A whence $A^\#$ is a prime ideal. In particular $0^\# = Z$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let R be a valuation ring, A a proper ideal of R and $t \in R \setminus A$. Then $A^\# = (A : t)^\#$.*

Proof. Let $a \in (A : t)^\#$. If $a \in (A : t)$ then $a \in A^\#$. If $a \notin (A : t)$ there exists $c \notin (A : t)$ such that $ac \in (A : t)$. It follows that $act \in A$ and $ct \notin A$ whence $a \in A^\#$. Conversely let $a \in A^\#$. There exists $c \notin A$ such that $ac \in A$. If $a \in (A : t)$ then $a \in (A : t)^\#$. If $a \notin (A : t)$ then $at \notin A$. Since $ac \in A$ it follows that $c = bt$ for some $b \in P$. Since $c \notin A$ it follows that $b \notin (A : t)$. From $abt \in A$ we successively deduce that $ab \in (A : t)$ and $a \in (A : t)^\#$. \square

If J is a prime ideal contained in Z , we put $ke(J)$ the kernel of the natural map: $R \rightarrow R_J$.

Corollary 3.6. *Let R be a valuation ring. Then:*

- (1) *For every prime ideal $J \subset Z$ there exist two uniserial fp-injective modules $U_{(J)}$ and $V_{(J)}$ such that $E(U_{(J)}) \simeq E(R/J)$ and $E(V_{(J)}) \simeq E(R_J/rR_J)$, where $r \in J \setminus ke(J)$.*

- (2) If Q is coherent, or Z is not faithful, or 0 is a countable intersection of nonzero ideals, there exist two uniserial fp-injective modules $U_{(Z)}$ and $V_{(Z)}$ such that $E(U_{(Z)}) \simeq H$ and $E(V_{(Z)}) \simeq E(Q/rQ)$, where $0 \neq r \in Z$.
- (3) If Q is coherent, or Z is not faithful, or 0 is a countable intersection of nonzero ideals, then for every proper ideal A such that $Z \subset A^\#$ there exists a faithful uniserial fp-injective module $U_{(A)}$ such that $E(U_{(A)}) \simeq E(R/A)$.

Proof. (1) is a consequence of Theorem 2.4 and Proposition 3.3.

(2) follows from the above proposition.

(3) is a consequence of (2) and Proposition 1.6. More precisely, since $Z \subset A^\#$ we may assume that A is faithful, eventually after replacing A with $(A : a)$ for some $a \in A^\#$. Then we put $U_{(A)} = U_{(Z)}/Au$ where $u \in U_{(Z)}$ and $(0 : u) = Z$. \square

From Theorem 3.1, Corollary 1.7, Corollary 3.6 and Corollary 2.9 we deduce another generalization of [12, Theorem 4].

Theorem 3.7. *Let R be a valuation ring. Suppose that Q is coherent or maximal, or Z is not faithful, or 0 is a countable intersection of nonzero ideals. Let $U_{(Z)}$ be the fp-injective uniserial module defined in Corollary 3.6 and $u \in U_{(Z)}$ such that $Z = (0 : u)$. Then:*

- (1) *If R is not an IF-ring then R is almost maximal if and only if $U_{(Z)}/Ru$ is injective.*
- (2) *If R is almost maximal then for every proper and faithful ideal A of R , $U_{(Z)}/Au \simeq E(R/A)$.*

Proof. (1) If $U_{(Z)}/Ru$ is injective then $F \simeq U_{(Z)}/Ru$ is uniserial. By Theorem 3.1 R is almost maximal. Conversely, $U_{(Z)}/Ru$ is a fp-injective submodule of F by Corollary 2.9 and F is uniserial by [9, Theorem]. Let $0 \neq x \in F$. There exists $a \in R$ such that $0 \neq ax \in U_{(Z)}/Ru$. It follows that $\exists y \in U_{(Z)}/Ru$ such that $ax = ay$. By using Lemma 1.5 we deduce that $x \in U_{(Z)}/Ru$. Hence $U_{(Z)}/Ru$ is injective.

(2) is an immediate consequence of Corollary 1.7 \square

Let us observe that $U_{(Z)} = Q$ when Z is not faithful and consequently we have a generalization of [12, Theorem 4].

Now this is a generalization of [7, Theorem VII.1.4].

Theorem 3.8. *Let R be an almost maximal valuation ring and suppose that Z is nilpotent. Then:*

- (1) *Every indecomposable injective R -module is a faithful factor of Q .*
- (2) *An R -module U is uniserial if and only if it is of the form $U \simeq J/I$ where $I \subset J$ are R -submodules of Q .*
- (3) *If $I \subset J$ and $I' \subset J'$ are R -submodules of Q then $J/I \simeq J'/I'$ if and only if $I = (I' : q)$ and $J = (J' : q)$ for some $0 \neq q \in Q$.*

Proof. (1) Q is an artinian ring and Z is its unique prime ideal. If A is an ideal such that $A^\# = Z$, then A is a principal ideal of Q and $Q \simeq E_R(R/A)$.

(2) We have $E(U) \simeq Q/I$ for some ideal I of R .

(3) We adapt the proof of [7, Theorem VII.1.4]. Suppose that $\phi : J/I \rightarrow J'/I'$ is an isomorphism. Since $J/I \simeq sJ/sI$ for every $s \in R \setminus Z$ we may assume that I and I' are proper ideals of R . Then $E(J/I) \simeq E(J'/I')$ implies that $I = (I' : t)$ for

some $0 \neq t \in R$. Since $(J' : t)/(I' : t) \simeq J'/I'$ we may assume that $I' = I$. By [7, Theorem VII.1.4] we may assume that $Z \neq 0$ and consequently that R is maximal by [9, Proposition 1]. The isomorphism ϕ extends to an automorphism φ of $E(J/I)$. Let $a \in Z$ such that $Z = (0 : a)$. If $I^\# = Z$ then $Q = E(J/I)$, and if $I^\# \neq Z$ then, by eventually replacing I, J and J' with respectively $(I : b), (J : b)$ and $(J' : b)$ for some $b \in R$, we may assume that I is faithful and $Q/Ia = E(J/I)$. By [7, Corollary VII.2.5] φ is induced by multiplication by some $0 \neq q \in Q \setminus Z$. Hence $J = (J' : q)$. In the two cases there exists $x \in E(J/I)$ such that $I = (0 : x) = (0 : \varphi(x))$. By using Lemma 1.2 it follows that $I = (I : q)$. \square

From Proposition 2.7 we deduce the following result on the injective dimension of the R -module R .

Proposition 3.9. *Let R be an almost maximal valuation ring such that $R \neq Q$. Then:*

- (1) *If Q is not coherent then $\text{i.d.}_R R = 2$.*
- (2) *If Q is coherent and not a field then $\text{i.d.}_R R = \infty$. More precisely, for every R -module M and for every integer $n \geq 1$, then $\text{Ext}_R^{2n+2}(M, R) \simeq \text{Ext}_R^1(M, Q/Z)$ and $\text{Ext}_R^{2n+1}(M, R) \simeq \text{Ext}_R^2(M, Q/Z)$.*

Proof. (1) If we apply Proposition 2.7 to Q we deduce that $\text{i.d.}_R Q/Z = 1$. Since R is almost maximal, by Corollary 2.9 $\text{i.d.}_R R/Z = 1$. By using the exact sequence: $0 \rightarrow R/Z \rightarrow Q/Z \rightarrow Q/R \rightarrow 0$, we get $\text{i.d.}_R Q/R = 1$. We deduce the result from this following exact sequence: $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow Q \rightarrow Q/R \rightarrow 0$.

(2) By using the same exact sequences as in (1) we easily deduce that $\text{Ext}_R^{p+1}(M, R) \simeq \text{Ext}_R^p(M, Q/Z)$, for each $p \geq 3$. On other hand if we apply Proposition 2.7 to Q we can build an infinite injective resolution of Q/Z with injective terms $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $E_p \simeq H$ if p is even and $E_p \simeq E(Q/Qa)$, for some $0 \neq a \in R$, if p is odd. Now it is easy to complete the proof. \square

Recall that $\text{i.d.}_R R = 1$ if and only if R is almost maximal when R is a domain which is not a field ([12, Theorem 4]) and that $\text{i.d.}_R R = 0$ if and only if R is almost maximal and $R = Q$ ([11, Theorem 2.3]).

Let U be a uniform module over a valuation ring R . Recall that if x and y are nonzero elements of U such that $(0 : x) \subseteq (0 : y)$ there exists $t \in R$ such that $(0 : y) = ((0 : x) : t)$: see [13]. As in [7, p.144], we set $U_\# = \{s \in R \mid \exists u \in U, u \neq 0 \text{ and } su = 0\}$. Then $U_\#$ is a prime ideal and the following lemma holds.

Lemma 3.10. *Let R be a valuation ring and U a uniform R -module. Then for every nonzero element u of U , $U_\# = (0 : u)^\#$.*

Proof. We set $A = (0 : u)$. Let $s \in A^\#$. There exists $t \in (A : s)$ such that $tu \neq 0$. We have $stu = 0$ whence $s \in U_\#$. Conversely let $s \in U_\#$. There exists $0 \neq x \in U$ such that $s \in (0 : x) \subseteq (0 : x)^\# = A^\#$. The last equality holds by Lemma 3.5. \square

Proposition 3.11. *Let R be a valuation ring and U a uniform fp-injective module. Assume that $U_\# = Z = P$. Then:*

- (1) *U is faithful when P is finitely generated or faithful.*
- (2) *If P is not faithful and not finitely generated then $\text{ann}(U) = (0 : P)$ if $E(U) \not\simeq E(R/P)$ and U is faithful if $E(U) \simeq E(R/P)$.*

Proof. If $E(U) \simeq E(R/P)$ let $u \in U$ such that $(0 : u) = P$. Then for each $0 \neq t \in P$, $(0 : t) \subseteq P$. Hence there exists $z \in U$ such that $tz = u \neq 0$. Hence U is faithful. We assume in the sequel that $E(U) \not\simeq E(R/P)$.

(1) First we suppose that $P = Rp$. Then for every non-finitely generated ideal A it is easy to check that $A = (A : p)$. Consequently, for each $u \in U$, $(0 : u)$ is principal, whence $E(U) \simeq E$. Now we assume that P is faithful. Then P is not principal. For some $0 \neq u \in U$ we put $A = (0 : u)$. Let $0 \neq t \in P$. Then $(0 : t) \subset P$. The equality $A^\# = P$ implies that there exists $s \in P \setminus A$ such that $(0 : t) \subset (A : s)$. We have $su \neq 0$ and $(0 : su) = (A : s)$. It follows that there exists $z \in U$ such that $tz = su \neq 0$.

(2) We use the same notations as in (1). If $t \notin (0 : P)$ we prove as in the first part of the proof that there exists $z \in U$ such that $tz \neq 0$. On the other hand for every $s \notin (0 : A)$, $(0 : P) \subseteq sA$. Hence $\text{ann}(U) = (0 : P)$. \square

From the previous proposition we deduce the following corollary.

Corollary 3.12. *Let R be a valuation ring and U an indecomposable injective R -module. Then the following assertions are true:*

- (1) *If $Z \subset U_\#$ then U is faithful. Moreover, if R is almost maximal then U is a factor module of H .*
- (2) *If $U_\# \subset Z$ then $\text{ann}(U) = ke(U_\#)$.*
- (3) *If $U_\# = Z$ then U is faithful if Z is faithful or finitely generated over Q . If Z is not faithful and not finitely generated over Q then $\text{ann}(U) = (0 : Z)$ if $U \not\cong H$ and H is faithful.*

4. COUNTABLY GENERATED INDECOMPOSABLE INJECTIVE MODULES

When R is not a domain we don't know if condition (C) implies that every indecomposable injective module is countably generated. However it is possible to give sufficient and necessary conditions for every indecomposable injective R -module to be countably generated, when R is an almost maximal valuation ring.

The following lemmas will be useful in the sequel:

Lemma 4.1. *Let R be a valuation ring and A a proper ideal of R . Then $A \neq \bigcap_{r \notin A} Rr$ if and only if there exists $t \in R$ such that $A = Pt$ and $\bigcap_{r \notin A} Rr = Rt$.*

Proof. Let $t \in (\bigcap_{r \notin A} Rr) \setminus A$. Clearly $Rt = \bigcap_{r \notin A} Rr$, whence $A = Pt$. \square

Recall that an R -module M is *finitely* (respectively *countably*) *cogenerated* if M is a submodule of a product of finitely (respectively countably) many injective hulls of simple modules.

Lemma 4.2. *Let R be a valuation ring and A a proper ideal of R . Suppose that R/A is not finitely cogenerated. Consider the following conditions:*

- (1) *There exists a countable family $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of ideals of R such that $A \subset I_{n+1} \subset I_n, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n$.*
- (2) *There exists a countable family $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of R such that $A \subset Ra_{n+1} \subset Ra_n, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Ra_n$.*
- (3) *R/A is countably cogenerated.*

Then (1) implies (2) and (3) is equivalent to (2).

Proof. If we take $a_n \in I_n \setminus I_{n+1}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Ra_n$. Consequently (1) \Rightarrow (2). It is obvious that $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Ra_n$ if and only if $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Pa_n$, and this last condition is equivalent to: R/A is a submodule of $\prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (R/Pa_n) \subseteq E(R/P)^{\mathbb{N}}$. Hence conditions (2) and (3) are equivalent. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let R be a ring (not necessarily commutative). Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *Every cyclic left R -module is countably cogenerated.*
- (2) *Each finitely generated left R -module is countably cogenerated.*

Proof. Only (1) \Rightarrow (2) requires a proof. Let M be a left R -module generated by $\{x_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq p\}$. We induct on p . Let N be the submodule of M generated by $\{x_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq p-1\}$. The induction hypothesis implies that N is a submodule of G and M/N a submodule of I , where G and I are product of countably many injective hulls of simple left R -modules. The inclusion map $N \rightarrow G$ can be extended to a morphism $\phi : M \rightarrow G$. Let φ be the composition map $M \rightarrow M/N \rightarrow I$. We define $\lambda : M \rightarrow G \oplus I$ by $\lambda(x) = (\phi(x), \varphi(x))$ for every $x \in M$. It is easy to prove that λ is a monomorphism and conclude the proof. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let R be a valuation ring such that $Z = P$. Consider the following conditions:*

- (1) *R and $R/(0 : P)$ are countably cogenerated.*
- (2) *P is countably generated.*
- (3) *Every indecomposable injective R -module U such that $U_{\#} = P$ is countably generated.*

Then conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent, and they are equivalent to (3) when R is almost maximal.

Moreover, when the two first conditions are satisfied, every ideal A such that $A^{\#} = P$ is countably generated and R/A is countably cogenerated.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). We may assume that P is not finitely generated. If $(0 : P) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Rs_n$, where $s_n \notin (0 : P)$ and $s_n \notin Rs_{n+1}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then, by using [11, Proposition 1.3], it is easy to prove that $P = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (0 : s_n)$. Since $(0 : s_n) \subset (0 : s_{n+1})$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we deduce that P is countably generated.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). First we assume that P is principal. Then $(0 : P)$ is the nonzero minimal submodule of R , and $(0 : P^2)/(0 : P)$ is the nonzero minimal submodule of $R/(0 : P)$. Hence R and $R/(0 : P)$ are finitely cogenerated. Now assume that $P = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Rt_n$ where $t_{n+1} \notin Rt_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As above we get that $(0 : P) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (0 : t_n)$. Since $(0 : t_{n+1}) \subset (0 : t_n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it follows that $R/(0 : P)$ is countably cogenerated. If $(0 : P) \neq 0$ then R is finitely cogenerated.

(3) \Rightarrow (1). It is sufficient to prove that $R/(0 : P)$ is countably cogenerated. We may assume that P is not principal. Then $F \not\cong E(R/P)$ and $F_{\#} = P$. Let $\{x_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a generating subset of F such that $x_{n+1} \notin Rx_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition 3.11 the following equality holds: $(0 : P) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (0 : x_n)$. We claim that $(0 : x_{n+1}) \subset (0 : x_n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ else $Rx_{n+1} = Rx_n$. Consequently $R/(0 : P)$ is countably cogenerated.

(1) \Rightarrow (3). If P is principal then an ideal A satisfies $A^{\#} = P$ if and only if A is principal (see the proof of Proposition 3.11). It follows that $U \simeq R$. Now we suppose that P is not finitely generated. Assume that there exists $x \in U$ such that $(0 : x) = (0 : P)$. If $(0 : P) = 0$ then $Rx \simeq R$. It follows that $U = Rx$. If $(0 : P) \neq 0$

then $Rx \simeq R/(0 : P)$. Since R is not an IF-ring in this case, $R/(0 : P)$ is injective by Corollary 2.9. It follows that $U = Rx$. If $(0 : P) \neq 0$ then $E(R/P) \simeq R$. Hence, if U is not finitely generated, we may assume that $(0 : P) \subset (0 : x)$ for each $x \in U$. We know that $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Rs_n = (0 : P)$ where $s_n \notin (0 : P)$ and $s_{n+1} \notin Rs_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of elements of U obtained by the following way: we pick x_0 a nonzero element of U ; by induction on n we pick x_{n+1} such that $(0 : x_{n+1}) \subset (0 : x_n) \cap Rs_{n+1}$. This is possible since $\text{ann}(U) = (0 : P)$ by Proposition 3.11. Then we get that $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (0 : x_n) = (0 : P)$. If $x \in U$ then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(0 : x_n) \subseteq (0 : x)$. Hence $x \in Rx_n$ since U is uniserial.

Now we prove the last assertion. If P is principal then A is also principal and R/A finitely cogenerated. Assume that $P = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Rs_n$. If $A = Pt$ for some $t \in R$ then A is countably generated and R/A is finitely cogenerated. We may assume that $(A : t) \subset P$ for each $t \in R \setminus A$. Clearly $A \subseteq \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A : s_n)$. If $b \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A : s_n)$, then $b \in (A : P)$ and it follows that $P \subseteq (A : b)$. Hence $b \in A$, $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A : s_n)$ and R/A is countably cogenerated. Let $s \in P \setminus (0 : A)$. Thus $((0 : A) : s) = (0 : sA) \supset (0 : A)$. It follows that $(0 : A)^\# = P$. Therefore $R/(0 : A)$ is countably cogenerated. If $(0 : A) = Pt$ for some $t \in R$, then tA is the nonzero minimal ideal of R and by using Lemma 1.5 we show that A is principal. If $(0 : A) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Rt_n$ then we prove that $A = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (0 : t_n)$, by using [11, Proposition 1.3], when A is not principal. Hence A is countably generated. \square

Recall that a valuation ring R is *archimedean* if its maximal ideal P is the only non-zero prime ideal, or equivalently $\forall a, b \in P, a \neq 0, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b^n \in Ra$. By using this last condition we prove that P is countably generated.

Lemma 4.5. *Let R be an archimedean valuation ring. Then its maximal ideal P is countably generated.*

Proof. We may assume that P is not finitely generated. Let $r \in P$. Then there exist s and t in P such that $r = st$ and there exists $q \in P$ such that $q \notin Rs \cup Rt$. Hence for each $r \in P$ there exists $q \in P$ such that $q^2 \notin Rr$. Now we consider the sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of P defined in the following way: we choose a nonzero element a_0 of P and by induction on n we choose a_{n+1} such that $a_{n+1}^2 \notin Ra_n$. We deduce that $a_n^{2^n} \notin Ra_0$, for every integer $n \geq 1$. Let $b \in P$. There exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b^p \in Ra_0$. Let n be an integer such that $2^n \geq p$. It is easy to check that $b \in Ra_n$. Then $\{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generates P . \square

By using this lemma, we deduce from Proposition 4.4 the following corollary.

Corollary 4.6. *Let R be a valuation ring and N its nilradical. Consider the following conditions:*

- (1) *For every prime ideal $J \subseteq Z$, J is countably generated and R/J is countably cogenerated.*
- (2) *For every prime ideal $J \subseteq Z$ which is the union of the set of primes properly contained in J there is a countable subset whose union is J , and for every prime ideal $J \subseteq Z$ which is the intersection of the set of primes containing properly J there is a countable subset whose intersection is J .*
- (3) *Every indecomposable injective R -module is countably generated.*

Then conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent and they are equivalent to (3) when R is almost maximal.

Moreover, when the two first conditions are satisfied, every ideal A of Q is countably generated and Q/A is countably cogenerated.

Proof. (3) \Rightarrow (1). For each prime ideal $J \subseteq Z$, R_J is an indecomposable injective R -module. Hence R_J is countably generated. It is obvious that $J = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Rt_n$, where $t_n \notin J$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if and only if $\{t_n^{-1} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generates R_J . Hence R/J is countably cogenerated. By Proposition 4.4 JR_J is countably generated over R_J . It follows that J is countably generated over R too.

(1) \Rightarrow (3). Since R/J is countably cogenerated and J is countably generated it follows that R_J and JR_J are countably generated. By Proposition 4.4 U is countably generated over R_J and over R too, for every indecomposable injective R -module U such that $U_{\#} = J$. The result follows from Corollary 1.7.

(1) \Rightarrow (2). Suppose that J is the union of the prime ideals properly contained in J . Let $\{a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a spanning set of J such that $a_{n+1} \notin Ra_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We consider $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of prime ideals properly contained in J defined in the following way: we pick I_0 such that $a_0 \in I_0$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we pick I_{n+1} such that $Ra_{n+1} \cup I_n \subset I_{n+1}$. Then J is the union of the family $(I_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Now if J is the intersection of the prime ideals containing properly J , in a similar way we prove that J is the intersection of a countable family of these prime ideals.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). By Lemma 4.2 we may assume that $V(J) \setminus \{J\}$ has a minimal element I . If $a \in I \setminus J$ then $J = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Ra^n$. Now we prove that J is countably generated. If $J = N$ then R_J is archimedean. If $J \neq N$, we may assume that $D(J)$ has a maximal element I . Then R_J/IR_J is archimedean too. In the two cases JR_J is countably generated over R_J by Lemma 4.5. On the other hand R/J is countably cogenerated, whence R_J is countably generated over R . Let us observe that $JR_J \simeq J/ke(J)$. It follows that J is countably generated over R too.

Now we prove the last assertion. We put $J = A^{\#}$. Then $J \subseteq Z$. By Proposition 4.4 A is countably generated over R_J . Since R_J is countably generated over R it follows that A is countably generated over R too. On the other hand, since R_J/AR_J is countably cogenerated, the inclusion $Q/A \subseteq R_J/AR_J$ implies that Q/A is countably cogenerated too, by Lemma 4.2. \square

From this corollary we deduce the following results:

Corollary 4.7. *Let R be a valuation ring. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *Every finitely generated R -module is countably cogenerated and every ideal of R is countably generated.*
- (2) *For each prime ideal J which is the union of the set of primes properly contained in J there is a countable subset whose union is J , and for each prime ideal J which is the intersection of the set of primes containing properly J there is a countable subset whose intersection is J .*

Proof. It is obvious that (1) \Rightarrow (2).

(2) \Rightarrow (1). When R satisfies the condition (D): $Z = P$, this implication holds by Corollary 4.6. Now we return to the general case. Let A be a non-principal ideal of R and $r \in A, r \neq 0$. Then the factor ring R/Rr satisfies the condition (D). Hence A is countably generated and R/A is countably cogenerated. If R is a domain then as in the proof of Corollary 4.6 we show that R is countably cogenerated. If R is not a domain, then Q satisfies (D) and consequently Q is countably cogenerated over Q . By Lemma 4.2 R is countably cogenerated. We conclude by Lemma 4.3. \square

Corollary 4.8. *Let R be a valuation ring such that $\text{Spec}(R)$ is a countable set. Then:*

- (1) *Every finitely generated R -module is countably cogenerated.*
- (2) *Every ideal is countably generated.*
- (3) *Each fp-injective R -module is locally injective if and only if R is almost maximal.*

Remark 4.9. Let R be a valuation ring and $\Gamma(R)$ its value group. See [15] for the definition of $\Gamma(R)$. If $\text{Spec}(R)$ is countable, then by [15, Theorem 2] and [8, Lemma 12.11, p. 243] we get that $\aleph_0 \leq |\Gamma(R)| \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$. Conversely if $|\Gamma(R)| \leq \aleph_0$ it is obvious that every ideal is countably generated and that each finitely generated R -module is countably cogenerated.

Let us observe that if an almost maximal valuation ring R satisfies the conditions of Corollary 4.6, then every indecomposable injective R -module U such that $U_{\#} \subset Z$ is flat since R_J is an IF-ring. It follows that $\text{p.d.}_R U \leq 1$ by [8, Proposition 9.8 p.233]. On the other hand, when R is a valuation domain that satisfies (C), first it is proved that $\text{p.d.}_R Q = 1$ and afterwards, by using [7, Theorem 2.4 p.76], or by using methods of R.M. Hamsher in [10], it is shown that Q is countably generated. When R is not a domain it is possible to prove the following proposition:

Proposition 4.10. *Let R be a valuation ring and J a nonmaximal prime ideal. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *R_J is countably generated.*
- (2) *$\text{p.d.}_R R_J = 1$.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). By [8, Proposition 9.8 p.233], $\text{p.d.}_R R_J = 1$ since R_J is flat and countably generated.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). If $R' = R/ke(J)$ then $\text{p.d.}_{R'} R_J = 1$ since R_J is flat. Then, after eventually replacing R with R' , we may assume that every element of $R \setminus J$ is not a zerodivisor. We use similar methods as in [10]. If S is a multiplicative subset (called semigroup in [10]) of R then $R \setminus S$ is a prime ideal. First, if $s \in P \setminus J$ we prove there exists a prime ideal J' such that $s \notin J'$, $J \subseteq J'$, $R_{J'}$ is countably generated and $\text{p.d.}_R (R_J/R_{J'}) \leq 1$: we do a similar proof as in [10, Proposition 1.1]. Now we prove that $R_{J'}/tR_{J'}$ is free over R/tR , for every non-zerodivisor t of R : we do as in the proof of [10, Proposition 1.2]. Suppose that $J' \neq J$ and let $t \in J' \setminus J$. Since s divides $R_{J'}/tR_{J'}$, and that this module is free over R/tR , we get that $R_{J'} = tR_{J'}$, whence a contradiction. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Azumaya, Finite splitness and finite projectivity. *J. Algebra* **106** (1987), 114–134
- [2] N. Bourbaki, *Algèbre commutative*, Chapitre 1, Hermann, Paris, 1961.
- [3] R. Colby, Flat injective modules. *J. Algebra* **35** (1975), 239–252
- [4] F. Couchot, Exemples d'anneaux auto-fp-injectifs. *Comm. Algebra* **10(4)** (1982), 339–360.
- [5] A. Facchini, Absolutely pure modules and locally injective modules, in: *Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math.*, vol. 153, 105–109. *Commutative ring theory: Proceedings of the Fès international conference, April 20-24, 1992*. ed: P.J Cahen, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- [6] A. Facchini, Relative Injectivity and Pure-injective Modules over Prüfer Rings. *J. Algebra* **110** (1987), 380–406.
- [7] L. Fuchs and L. Salce, Modules over valuation domains, in: *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, vol. 97, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1985.

- [8] L. Fuchs and L. Salce, *Modules over Non-Noetherian Domains*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 84, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2001.
- [9] D.T. Gill, Almost maximal valuation rings. *J. London Math. Soc.* **4** (1971), 140–146.
- [10] R.M. Hamsher, On the structure of a one-dimensional quotient field. *J. Algebra* **19** (1971), 416–425.
- [11] G.B. Klatt and L.S. Levy, Pre-self injective rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137** (1969), 407–419.
- [12] E. Matlis, Injective modules over Prüfer rings. *Nagoya Math. J.* **15** (1959), 57–69.
- [13] M. Nishi, On the ring of endomorphisms of an indecomposable module over a Prüfer ring. *Hiroshima Math. J.* **2** (1972), 271–283.
- [14] V.S Ramamurthi and K.M Rangasmy, On finitely injective modules. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* **XVI(part 2)**, (1973), 239–248.
- [15] T. S. Shores, On generalized valuation rings. *Michigan Math. J.* **21**, (1974), 405–409.
- [16] T.S. Shores and W.J. Lewis, Serial modules and endomorphism rings. *Duke Math. J.* **41**, (1974), 889–909.
- [17] B. Stenström, Coherent rings and FP-injective modules. *J. London Math. Soc.* **2(2)**, (1970), 323–329.
- [18] R. Warfield, Decomposability of finitely presented modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **25**, (1970), 167–172.