



HAL
open science

Pure-injective hulls of modules over valuation rings

Francois Couchot

► **To cite this version:**

| Francois Couchot. Pure-injective hulls of modules over valuation rings. 2004. hal-00003336v1

HAL Id: hal-00003336

<https://hal.science/hal-00003336v1>

Preprint submitted on 22 Nov 2004 (v1), last revised 7 Sep 2006 (v2)

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.

PURE-INJECTIVE HULLS OF MODULES OVER VALUATION RINGS

FRANÇOIS COUCHOT

ABSTRACT. If \widehat{R} is the pure-injective hull of a valuation ring R , it is proved that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ is the pure-injective hull of M , for every finitely generated R -module M . Moreover $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M \simeq \bigoplus_{1 \leq k \leq n} \widehat{R}/A_k \widehat{R}$, where $(A_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ is the annihilator sequence of M . The pure-injective hulls of uniserial or polyserial modules are also investigated. Any two pure-composition series of a countably generated polyserial module are isomorphic.

The aim of this paper is to study pure-injective hulls of modules over valuation rings. If R is a valuation domain and S a maximal immediate extension of R , then, in [9], Warfield proved that S is a pure-injective hull of R . Moreover, for each finitely generated R -module M , he showed that $S \otimes_R M$ is a pure-injective hull of M and a direct sum of $\text{gen } M$ indecomposable pure-injective modules. We extend this last result to every valuation ring R by replacing S with the pure-injective hull \widehat{R} of R . As in the domain case \widehat{R} is a faithfully flat module. Moreover, for each $x \in \widehat{R}$ there exist $r \in R$ and $y \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$ such that $x = ry$. This property allows us to prove most of the main results of this paper. We extend results obtained by Fuchs and Salce on pure-injective hulls of uniserial modules over valuation domains ([5, chapter XIII, section 5]). We show that the length of any pure-composition series of a polyserial module M is its Malcev rank $\text{Mr } M$ and its pure-injective hull \widehat{M} is a direct sum of p indecomposable pure-injective modules, where $p \leq \text{Mr } M$. But it is possible to have $p < \text{Mr } M$ and we prove that the equality always holds if and only if R is maximal (Theorem 4.5). This result is a consequence of the fact that R is maximal if and only if R/N and R_N are maximal, where N is the nilradical of R (Theorem 4.4). If U_1, \dots, U_n are the factors of a pure-composition series of a polyserial module M then the collection $(\widehat{R} \otimes_R U_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ is uniquely determined by M . To prove this, we use the fact that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is a unshrinkable uniserial T -module for each uniserial R -module U , where $T = \text{End}_R(\widehat{R})$. When R satisfies a countable condition, the collection of uniserial factors of a polyserial module M is uniquely determined by M (Proposition 3.7).

In this paper all rings are associative and commutative with unity and all modules are unital. As in [3] we say that an R -module 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. 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 [10, Theorem 1]. Consequently a module E over a valuation ring R is fp-injective if and only if it is divisible.

An R -module F is **pure-injective** if for every pure exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow L \rightarrow 0$$

of R -modules, the following sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(L, F) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M, F) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(N, F) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. An R -module B is a **pure-essential extension** of a submodule A if A is a pure submodule of B and, if for each submodule K of B , either $K \cap A \neq 0$ or $(A + K)/K$ is not a pure submodule of B/K . We say that B is a **pure-injective hull** of A if B is pure-injective and a pure-essential extension of A . By [9] or [5, chapter XIII] each R -module M has a pure-injective hull and any two pure-injective hulls of M are isomorphic.

In the sequel R is a valuation ring, P its maximal ideal, Z its subset of zerodivisors and \widehat{M} the pure-injective hull of M , for each R -module M . As in [5, p.69], for every proper ideal A , 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 $\{0\}^\# = Z$. When $A^\# = P$, we say that A is an **archimedean** ideal. Then A is archimedean if and only if R/A is self fp-injective.

1. PROPERTIES OF \widehat{R}

The first assertion of the following proposition will play a crucial role to prove the main results of this paper.

Proposition 1.1. *The following assertions hold:*

- (1) *For each $x \in \widehat{R}$ there exist $a \in R$, $p \in P$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$ such that $x = a + pay$.*
- (2) *For each archimedean ideal A of R , $\widehat{R}/A\widehat{R}$ is an essential extension of R/A .*
- (3) *$\widehat{R}/P\widehat{R} \simeq R/P$.*

Proof. The third assertion is an immediate consequence of the first.

We also deduce the second assertion from the first. Since R is a pure submodule of \widehat{R} , the natural map $R/A \rightarrow \widehat{R}/A\widehat{R}$ is monic. Let $x \in \widehat{R} \setminus R + A\widehat{R}$. We have $x = a + pay$ for $a \in R$, $p \in P$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$. Hence $pa \notin A$. Since A is archimedean, there exists $r \in (A : pa) \setminus (A : a)$. So $rx \in R + A\widehat{R} \setminus A\widehat{R}$.

We proceed by steps to prove the first assertion.

Step 1. Suppose that R is self fp-injective. In this case, $\widehat{R} \simeq E_R(R)$ by [5, Lemma XIII.2.7]. We may assume that $x \notin R$. Then there exists $d \in R$ such that $dx \in R$ and $dx \neq 0$. Since R is a pure submodule of \widehat{R} we have $dx = db$ for some $b \in R$. By [1, Lemma 2] $(0 : x) = (0 : b)$, whence $x = bz$ for some $z \in \widehat{R}$ since \widehat{R} is divisible. In the same way, there exists $c, u \in R$ such that $cz = cu \neq 0$. We get that $(0 : u) = (0 : z) = b(0 : b) = 0$. So u is a unit of R . Since $z - u \notin R$, there exists $s, q \in R$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$ such that $0 \neq sq = s(z - u) \in R$ and $z - u = qy$. We have $c \in (0 : z - u) = (0 : q)$. So $q \in P$. Now we put $a = bu$ and $p = qu^{-1}$ and we get $x = a + pay$.

Step 2. Now we prove that $\widehat{R}/r\widehat{R} \simeq E_{R/rR}(R/rR)$ for each $0 \neq r \in P$. If $\bigcap_{a \neq 0} aR = 0$ then it is an immediate consequence of [3, Theorem 5.6]. Else P is

not faithful, R is self fp-injective and $\widehat{R} \simeq E_R(R)$. By Step 1 and the implication $1 \Rightarrow 2$ the second assertion holds. So it remains to show that $\widehat{R}/r\widehat{R}$ is injective over R/rR . Let J be an ideal of R such that $Rr \subset J$ and $g : J/Rr \rightarrow \widehat{R}/r\widehat{R}$ be a nonzero homomorphism. For each $x \in \widehat{R}$ we denote by \bar{x} the image of x in $\widehat{R}/r\widehat{R}$. Let $a \in J \setminus Rr$ such that $\bar{y} = g(\bar{a}) \neq 0$. Then $(Rr : a) \subseteq (r\widehat{R} : y)$. Let $t \in R$ such that $r = at$. Thus $ty = rz$ for some $z \in \widehat{R}$. It follows that $t(y - az) = 0$. So, since $at = r \neq 0$, we have $(0 : a) \subset Rt \subseteq (0 : y - az)$. The injectivity of \widehat{R} implies that there exists $x \in \widehat{R}$ such that $y = a(x + z)$. We put $x_a = x + z$. If $b \in J \setminus Ra$ then $a(x_a - x_b) \in r\widehat{R}$. Hence $x_b \in x_a + (r\widehat{R} :_{\widehat{R}} a)$. Since \widehat{R} is pure-injective, by [9, Theorem 4] there exists $x \in \bigcap_{a \in J} x_a + (r\widehat{R} :_{\widehat{R}} a)$. It follows that $g(\bar{a}) = a\bar{x}$ for each $a \in J$.

Step 3. Now we prove the first assertion in the general case. If $\bigcap_{r \neq 0} rR \neq 0$, then R is self fp-injective. So the result holds by Step 1. If $\bigcap_{r \neq 0} rR = 0$, we put $F = \bigcap_{r \neq 0} r\widehat{R}$. We will show that $F = 0$. Let $x \in F \cap R$. Then $x \in R \cap r\widehat{R} = rR$ for each $r \in R$, $r \neq 0$. Therefore $x = 0$ and $F \cap R = 0$. Let $x \in \widehat{R}$, $r, a \in R$ and $z \in F$ such that $rx = a + z$. There exists $y \in \widehat{R}$ such that $z = ry$. So $r(x - y) = a$, whence there exists $b \in R$ such that $rb = a$. It follows that R is a pure submodule of \widehat{R}/F . Since \widehat{R} is a pure-essential extension of R we deduce that $F = 0$. Let $x \in \widehat{R}$. We may assume that $x \notin R$. There exists $0 \neq r \in R$ such that $x \notin r\widehat{R}$. If $x \in R + r\widehat{R}$ then $x = a + ry$, with $a \in R$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$. We have $a \notin rR$ else $x \in r\widehat{R}$. So $r = pa$ for some $p \in P$. If $x \notin R + r\widehat{R}$ then, since R/Rr is self fp-injective, from Steps 1 and 2 we deduce that $x - a - paz \in r\widehat{R}$ for some $a \in R$, $p \in P$ and $z \in \widehat{R}$. It is obvious that $a \notin rR$. Now it is easy to conclude. \square

As in the domain case we have:

Proposition 1.2. *\widehat{R} is a faithfully flat R -module.*

Proof. Let $x \in \widehat{R}$ and $r \in R$ such that $rx = 0$. By Proposition 1.1 there exist $a \in R$, $p \in P$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$ such that $x = a + pay$. So $rpay \in R$. It follows that there exists $b \in R$ such that $ra(1+pb) = 0$. Hence $ra = 0$ and $r \otimes x = ra \otimes (1+py) = 0$. \square

2. PURE-INJECTIVE HULLS OF UNISERIAL MODULES

The following lemma and Proposition 2.2 will be useful to prove the pure-injectivity of some modules in the sequel.

Lemma 2.1. *Let U be a module and F a flat module. Then, for each $r, s \in R$, $F \otimes_R (sU :_U r) \simeq (F \otimes_R sU :_{F \otimes_R U} r)$.*

Proof. We put $E = F \otimes_R U$. Let ϕ be the composition of the multiplication by r in U with the natural map $U \rightarrow U/sU$. Then $(sU :_U r) = \ker(\phi)$. It follows that $F \otimes_R (sU :_U r)$ is isomorphic to $\ker(\mathbf{1}_F \otimes \phi)$ since F is flat. We easily check that $\mathbf{1}_F \otimes \phi$ is the composition of the multiplication by r in E with the natural map $E \rightarrow E/sE$. It follows that $F \otimes_R (sU :_U r) \simeq (sE :_E r)$. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Every pure-injective R -module F satisfies the following property: if $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ is a family of elements of F and $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ a family of ideals of R such that the family $\mathcal{F} = (x_i + A_i F)_{i \in I}$ has the finite intersection property, then \mathcal{F} has a non-empty intersection. The converse holds if F is flat.*

Proof. Let $i \in I$ such that A_i is not finitely generated. By [1, Lemma 29] either $A_i = Pr_i$ or $A_i = \bigcap_{c \in R \setminus A_i} cR$. If, $\forall i \in I$ such that A_i is not finitely generated, we replace $x_i + A_i F$ by $x_i + r_i F$ in the first case, and by the family $(x_i + cF)_{c \in R \setminus A_i}$ in the second case, we deduce from \mathcal{F} a family \mathcal{G} which has the finite intersection property. Since F is pure-injective, it follows that there exists $x \in F$ which belongs to each element of the family \mathcal{G} by [9, Theorem 4]. We may assume that the family $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ has no smallest element. So, if A_i is not finitely generated, there exists $j \in I$ such that $A_j \subset A_i$. Let $c \in A_i \setminus PA_j$ such that $x_j + cF \in \mathcal{G}$. Then $x - x_j \in cF \subseteq A_i F$ and $x_j - x_i \in A_i F$. Hence $x - x_i \in A_i F$ for each $i \in I$.

Conversely, if F is flat then by Lemma 2.1 we have $(sF :_F r) = (sR : r)F$ for each $s, r \in R$. We use [9, Theorem 4] to conclude. \square

Proposition 2.3. *Let U be a uniserial module and F a flat pure-injective module. Then $F \otimes_R U$ is pure-injective.*

Proof. Let $E = F \otimes_R U$. We use [9, Theorem 4] to prove that E is pure-injective. Let $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of elements of F such that the family $\mathcal{F} = (x_i + N_i)_{i \in I}$ has the finite intersection property, where $N_i = (s_i E :_E r_i)$ and $r_i, s_i \in R, \forall i \in I$.

First we assume that $U = R/A$ where A is a proper ideal of R . So $E \simeq F/AF$. If $s_i \notin A$ then $N_i = (s_i F :_F r_i)/AF = (Rs_i : r_i)F/AF$. We set $A_i = (Rs_i : r_i)$ in this case. If $s_i \in A$ then $N_i = (AF :_F r_i)/AF = (A : r_i)F/AF$. We put $A_i = (A : r_i)$ in this case. For each $i \in I$, let $y_i \in F$ such that $x_i = y_i + AF$. It is obvious that the family $(y_i + A_i F)_{i \in I}$ has the finite intersection property. By Proposition 2.2 this family has a non-empty intersection. Then \mathcal{F} has a non-empty intersection too.

Now we assume that U is not finitely generated. It is obvious that \mathcal{F} has a non-empty intersection if $x_i + N_i = E, \forall i \in I$. Now assume there exists $i_0 \in I$ such that $x_{i_0} + N_{i_0} \neq E$. Let $I' = \{i \in I \mid N_i \subseteq N_{i_0}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}' = (x_i + N_i)_{i \in I'}$. Then \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' have the same intersection. By Lemma 2.1 $N_{i_0} = F \otimes_R (s_{i_0} U :_U r_{i_0})$. It follows that $(s_{i_0} U :_U r_{i_0}) \subset U$ because $N_{i_0} \neq E$. Hence $\exists u \in U$ such that $x_{i_0} + N_{i_0} \subseteq F \otimes_R Ru$. Then, $\forall i \in I', x_i + N_i \subseteq F \otimes_R Ru$. We have $F \otimes_R Ru \simeq F/(0 : u)F$. From the first part of the proof $F/(0 : u)F$ is pure-injective. So we may replace R with $R/(0 : u)$ and assume that $(0 : u) = 0$. Let $A_i = ((s_i U :_U r_i) : u), \forall i \in I'$. Thus $N_i = A_i F, \forall i \in I'$. By Proposition 2.2 \mathcal{F}' has a non-empty intersection. So \mathcal{F} has a non-empty intersection too. \square

Let U be an R -module. As in [5, p.338] we set

$$U_{\sharp} = \{s \in R \mid \exists u \in U, u \neq 0 \text{ and } su = 0\} \text{ and } U^{\sharp} = \{s \in R \mid sU \subset U\}.$$

Then U_{\sharp} and U^{\sharp} are prime ideals.

Now it is possible to determine the pure-injective hull of each uniserial module. We get a generalization of [5, Corollary XIII.5.5]

Theorem 2.4. *The following assertions hold:*

- (1) *Let U be a uniserial R -module and $J = U^{\sharp} \cup U_{\sharp}$. Then $\widehat{R}_J \otimes_R U$ is the pure-injective hull of U . Moreover \widehat{U} is an essential extension of U if $J = U_{\sharp}$.*
- (2) *For each proper ideal A of R , $\widehat{R}/A\widehat{R}$ is the pure-injective hull of R/A . Moreover $\widehat{R}/A\widehat{R} \simeq E_{R/A}(R/A)$ if A is archimedean.*

Proof. (1) If $s \in R \setminus J$ then multiplication by s in U is bijective. So U is an R_J -module. After replacing R with R_J , we may assume that $J = P$. We put $\widetilde{U} = \widehat{R}_J \otimes_R U$.

Suppose that $P = U^\sharp$. By [9, Proposition 6] $\tilde{U} = \widehat{U} \oplus V$ where V is a submodule of \tilde{U} . Let $v \in V$. Then $v = x \otimes u$ where $u \in U$ and $x \in \widehat{R}$. By Proposition 1.1 $x = a + pay$, where $a \in R$, $p \in P$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$. Since $pU \subset U$, $\exists u' \in U \setminus (Pu \cup pU)$. Then $u = cu'$ for some $c \in R$ and $x = cau' + pcay \otimes u'$. We have $y \otimes u' = z + w$ where $w \in V$ and $z \in \widehat{U}$. So $cau' + pcaz = 0$. Since U is pure in \widehat{U} , there exists $z' \in U$ such that $cau' + pcaz' = 0$. If $x \neq 0$ then $cau' \neq 0$. By [1, Lemma 5] we get that $u' \in pU$, whence a contradiction. Hence $V = 0$.

Now suppose that $P = U_\sharp$. If $0 \neq z \in \tilde{U}$ then $z = x \otimes u$ where $u \in U$ and $x \in \widehat{R}$. By Proposition 1.1 there exist $a \in R$, $p \in P$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$ such that $x = a + pay$. So $z = au + y \otimes pau$. Let $A = (0 : au)$. By [1, Lemma 26], $A^\sharp = P$. So $(0 : pau) = (A : p) \neq A$. Let $r \in (A : p) \setminus A$. Then $0 \neq rz \in U$.

(2) We apply the first assertion by taking $U = R/A$. In this case, $U^\sharp = P$. The pure-injective hull of R/A is the same over R and over R/A . Since R/A is self fp-injective when A is archimedean then we use [5, Lemma XIII.2.7] to prove the last assertion. \square

In the previous theorem, if U is not cyclic and if $U^\sharp \subseteq U_\sharp$ then \widehat{U} is not necessarily isomorphic to $E_{R/(0:U)}(U)$. For instance:

Example 2.5. Assume that $P = Z$ and P is faithful. We choose $U = P$. Then $U^\sharp = U_\sharp = P$, $\widehat{U} = P\widehat{R}$ and $E_R(U) = \widehat{R}$.

If U is a non-standard uniserial module over a valuation domain R then \widehat{U} is indecomposable by [3, Proposition 5.1] and there exists a standard uniserial module V such that $\widehat{U} \simeq \widehat{V}$ by [5, Theorem XIII.5.9]. So, $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U \simeq \widehat{R} \otimes_R V$ doesn't implies $U \simeq V$. However, it is possible to get the following proposition:

Proposition 2.6. *Let U and V be uniserial modules and $J = U^\sharp \cup U_\sharp$. Assume that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U \simeq \widehat{R} \otimes_R V$. Then U and V are isomorphic if one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

- (1) $U^\sharp = J$ and $J \neq J^2$,
- (2) U is countably generated.

Proof. Let $\phi : \widehat{R} \otimes_R U \rightarrow \widehat{R} \otimes_R V$ be the isomorphism. Let $0 \neq u \in U$. Then $\phi(u) = x \otimes v$ for some $x \in \widehat{R}$ and $v \in V$. By proposition 1.1 we may assume that $x = 1 + py$ for some $p \in P$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$. First we shall prove that $(0 : u) = (0 : v)$. It is obvious that $(0 : v) \subseteq (0 : u)$. Let $r \in (0 : u)$. Then $x \otimes rv = 0$. From the flatness of \widehat{R} we deduce that there exist $s \in R$ and $z \in \widehat{R}$ such that $x = sz$ and $srv = 0$. If $s \in P$ then we get that $1 = qe$ for some $q \in P$ and $e \in \widehat{R}$. Since R is pure in \widehat{R} , it follows that $1 \in P$. This is absurd. Hence s is a unit and $r \in (0 : v)$.

Let v, v' be nonzero elements of V and $x, x' \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$ such that $x \otimes v = x' \otimes v'$. There exists $t \in R$ such that $v = tv'$. Now we shall prove that t is a unit of R . We get that $(x' - tx) \otimes v' = 0$. If $t \in P$, as above we deduce that $v' = 0$, whence a contradiction.

Let $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ as in the first part of the proof. By [1, Lemma 26] we have $U_\sharp = (0 : u)^\sharp = (0 : v)^\sharp = V_\sharp$. Let $p \in P$. We shall prove that $u \in pU$ if and only if $v \in pV$. If $v = pw$ for some $w \in V$ then $\phi(u) = px \otimes w = r\phi(z)$ for some $z \in \widehat{R} \otimes_R U$. Since U is a pure submodule, then $u = pu'$ for some $u' \in U$. Conversely, if $u = pu'$ for some $u' \in U$ and $\phi(u') = x' \otimes v'$ where $v' \in V$ and

$x' \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$, we get that $x' \otimes pv' = x \otimes v$. From above, we deduce that $v \in pV$. So, $U^\# = V^\#$.

Now we can prove that U and V are isomorphic when the first condition is satisfied. In this case U and V are modules over R_J . Since $J \neq J^2$, JR_J is a principal ideal of R_J . Since $JU \subset U$ and $JV \subset V$, U and V are cyclic over R_J . Let $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ as in the first part of the proof, and suppose that $U = R_J u$. If $v = rw$ for some $r \in R_J$ and $w \in V$ then we get, as above, that $u = ru'$ for some $u' \in U$. So r is a unit and U and V are isomorphic.

Let $\{u_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a spanning set of U . For each $i \in I$, let $v_i \in V$ and $x_i \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$ such that $\phi(u_i) = x_i \otimes v_i$. Suppose that $(0 : U) \subset (0 : u)$, $\forall u \in U$. From the first part of proof we deduce that $(0 : V) \subset (0 : v)$, $\forall v \in V$. We have $\bigcap_{i \in I} (0 : u_i) = (0 : U)$. Thus $\bigcap_{i \in I} (0 : v_i) = (0 : V)$. So, for each $v \in V$ there exists $i \in I$ such that $(0 : v_i) \subset (0 : v)$. Hence $v \in Rv_i$. Now, suppose $\exists u \in U$ such that $(0 : u) = (0 : U)$. By [5, Lemma X.1.4] $J = U^\#$. We may assume that $J = J^2$ and I is infinite. Then $JU = U$ and $JV = V$. Let $v \in V$. There exists $p \in J$ such that $v \in pV$. But there exists $i \in I$ such that $u_i \notin pU$. So, $v_i \notin pV$. Hence $v \in R_J v_i$. Now suppose that $I = \mathbb{N}$. Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of elements of P such that $u_n = a_n u_{n+1}$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. We put $\varphi(u_0) = v_0$. Suppose that $\varphi(u_n) = s_n v_n$ where s_n is a unit. By the second part of the proof there exists a unit t_n such that $a_n v_{n+1} = t_n \varphi(u_n)$. Hence we set $\varphi(u_{n+1}) = t_n^{-1} v_{n+1}$. So, by induction on n , we get an isomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$. \square

Let $T = \text{End}_R(\widehat{R})$. Then T is a local ring by [3, Proposition 5.1] and [5, Theorem XIII.3.10]. For each R -module M , $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ is a left T -module. As in [4] we say that a left uniserial T -module F is **shrinkable** if there exists two T -submodules G and H of F such that $0 \subset H \subset G \subset F$ and $F \simeq G/H$. Otherwise F is said to be **unshrinkable**.

Proposition 2.7. *Let U be a uniserial R -module. Then:*

- (1) $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is a left unshrinkable uniserial T -module.
- (2) $\text{End}_T(\widehat{R} \otimes_R U)$ is a local ring.

Proof. (1) Let $x \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$. First we prove that Rx is a pure submodule of \widehat{R} . Let $a, b \in R$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$ such that $by = ax$. By Proposition 1.1 $y = c + pcz$ for some $c \in R$, $p \in P$ and $z \in \widehat{R}$. Suppose that $a \notin Rbc$. Then $bc = ra$ for some $r \in P$. If $x = 1 + qx'$ for some $q \in P$ and $x' \in \widehat{R}$, we get that $a(1 - r) = a(rpz - qx') = aty'$ for some $t \in P$ and $y' \in \widehat{R}$. Since R is a pure submodule of \widehat{R} there exists $s \in R$ such that $a(1 - r - ts) = 0$. We deduce that $a = 0$, whence a contradiction. So $a \in Rbc$. By using similar arguments we easily show that Rx is faithful.

Let $z, z' \in \widehat{R} \otimes_R U$. We have $z = x \otimes u$ and $z' = x' \otimes u'$ where $x, x' \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$ and $u, u' \in U$. Assume that $u' = ru$ for some $r \in R$. The homomorphism $\phi : Rx \rightarrow Rrx'$ such that $\phi(x) = rx'$ is well defined and can be extended to \widehat{R} . We get that $\phi z = z'$. Hence $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is uniserial over T .

Suppose that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is shrinkable over T . By [4, Lemma 1.17] there exists $z \in \widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ such that Tz is shrinkable. We have $z = x \otimes u$ where $x \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$ and $u \in U$. So $Tz = \widehat{R} \otimes_R Ru$. There exist $z' \in Tz$ and a non-injective T -epimorphism $\alpha : Tz' \rightarrow Tz$. Let $K = \text{Ker } \alpha$. We may assume that $\alpha(z') = z$. We have $z' = x' \otimes ru$ where $x' \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$ and $r \in R$. Let y be a nonzero element of K . Thus

$y = tz' = ay' \otimes ru$ for some $t \in T$, $y' \in 1 + P\widehat{R}$ and $a \in R$. But there exist $s, s' \in T$ such that $x' = sy'$ and $y' = s'x'$. So $0 \neq ax' \otimes ru \in K$. Since $y \neq 0$ we have $aru \neq 0$. On the other hand $x \otimes aru = \alpha(ax' \otimes ru) = 0$. It follows that $aru = 0$ whence a contradiction. So $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is unshrinkable.

(2) is an immediate of (1) and [4, Proposition 9.24]. \square

Proposition 2.8. *Let \mathfrak{c} be a cardinal. Consider a \mathfrak{c} -generated R -module M and U a pure uniserial R -submodule of M . Then U is \mathfrak{c} -generated.*

Proof. We easily check that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is a pure submodule of $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$. By Proposition 2.3 $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is pure-injective. Hence $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is a summand of $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$. On the other hand $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ is a \mathfrak{c} -generated T -module. Then $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is also \mathfrak{c} -generated over T . We may assume that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U$ is generated by $(1 \otimes u_i)_{i \in I}$, where I is a set whose cardinal is \mathfrak{c} and $u_i \in U$, $\forall i \in I$. Let V be the submodule of U generated by $(u_i)_{i \in I}$. Then the inclusion map $V \rightarrow U$ induces an isomorphism $\widehat{R} \otimes_R V \rightarrow \widehat{R} \otimes_R U$. Since \widehat{R} is faithfully flat it follows that $V = U$. \square

From Theorem 2.4 we deduce the following corollary on the structure of indecomposable injective modules.

Corollary 2.9. *Let E be an indecomposable injective module, $J = E_{\#}$ and $\mathcal{A}(E) = \{(0 :_{R_J} x) \mid 0 \neq x \in E\}$. Then:*

(1) $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{A}(E)$, $A \subseteq B$ there exists a monomorphism

$$\varphi_{A,B} : \widehat{R}_J / B\widehat{R}_J \rightarrow \widehat{R}_J / A\widehat{R}_J$$

such that $\varphi_{A,C} = \varphi_{A,B} \circ \varphi_{B,C}$, $\forall A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}(E)$, $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$.

(2) $E \simeq \varinjlim \{(\widehat{R}_J / A\widehat{R}_J, \varphi_{A,B}) \mid A, B \in \mathcal{A}(E), A \subseteq B\}$.

(3) $E \simeq \widehat{R}_J / (0 :_{R_J} e)\widehat{R}_J$ if $(0 :_{R_J} e) = (0 :_{R_J} E)$ for some $e \in E$.

(4) Suppose that E contains a uniserial R_J -module U such that $\mathcal{A}(E) = \mathcal{A}(U)$ (We know that this condition holds if R satisfies an additional hypothesis: see [1, Corollary 22], [8, Theorem 5.5] or Remark 3.6). Then $E \simeq \widehat{R}_J \otimes_R U$. Moreover, $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{A}(E)$, $A \subseteq B$, there exists $r \in R$ such that one can choose $\varphi_{A,B} = \mathbf{1}_{\widehat{R}_J} \otimes \bar{r}$ where $\bar{r} : R_J/B \rightarrow R_J/A$ is defined by $\bar{r}(a+B) = ar + A$, $\forall a \in R$.

Proof. (1) If $A \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ then $A^{\#} = J$ by [1, Lemma 26]. So A is an archimedean ideal of R_J . By Theorem 2.4 there exists an isomorphism

$$\phi_A : \widehat{R}_J / A\widehat{R}_J \rightarrow (0 :_E A).$$

Let $u_{A,B} : (0 :_E B) \rightarrow (0 :_E A)$ be the inclusion map, $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{A}(E)$, $A \subseteq B$. We set $\varphi_{A,B} = \phi_A^{-1} \circ u_{A,B} \circ \phi_B$. It is easy to check the first assertion.

(2) and (3) These assertions are now obvious.

(4) First we prove that U is fp-injective. Let $x \in E$ and $s \in R$ such that $0 \neq sx \in U$. We put $u = sx$. From $\mathcal{A}(E) = \mathcal{A}(U)$, it follows that $\exists v \in U$ such that $(0 :_{R_J} v) = (0 :_{R_J} x)$ and consequently $u = tv$ for some $t \in R$. We set $A = (0 :_{R_J} x)$. We get that $(0 :_{R_J} u) = (A :_{R_J} t) = (A :_{R_J} s)$. By [1, Lemma 26] $A^{\#} = E_{\#} = J$. It follows that $R_J s = R_J t$. So U is a pure submodule of E . We conclude by Theorem 2.4 and [5, Lemma XIII.2.7] that $E \simeq \widehat{R}_J \otimes_R U$.

Let $u, v \in U$ such that $(0 :_{R_J} u) = A$ and $(0 :_{R_J} v) = B$. There exists $r \in R$ such that $v = ru$ and $B = (A : r)$ (if $A = B$ we take $v = u$ and $r = 1$). So \bar{r} is a monomorphism. \square

3. PURE-INJECTIVE HULLS OF POLYSERIAL MODULES

We say that a module M is **polyserial** if it has a pure-composition series

$$0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \cdots \subset M_n = M,$$

(i.e. M_k is a pure submodule of M , for each k , $0 \leq k \leq n$) where M_k/M_{k-1} is uniserial for each k , $1 \leq k \leq n$. By [5, Lemma I.7.8], if M is finitely generated, M has a pure-composition series, where $M_k/M_{k-1} \simeq R/A_k$ and A_k is a proper ideal, for each k , $1 \leq k \leq n$. We denote by $\text{gen } M$ the minimal number of generators of M . By [5, Lemma V.5.3] $n = \text{gen } M$. The following sequence (A_1, \dots, A_n) is called the **annihilator sequence** of M and is uniquely determined by M , up to the order (see [5, Theorem V.5.5]).

Now we can extend the result obtained by Warfield[9] in the domain case for finitely generated modules.

Theorem 3.1. *Let M be a finitely generated R -module. Then $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M \simeq \widehat{M}$. Moreover, $\widehat{M} \simeq \widehat{R}/A_1 \widehat{R} \oplus \cdots \oplus \widehat{R}/A_n \widehat{R}$ where (A_1, \dots, A_n) is the annihilator sequence of M .*

Proof. It is easy to verify that M is a pure submodule of $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$. We have that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M_1$ is a pure submodule of $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ too. By Proposition 2.3 $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M_1$ is pure-injective. It follows that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M \simeq (\widehat{R} \otimes_R M_1) \oplus (\widehat{R} \otimes_R M/M_1)$. By induction on n we get that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M \simeq \widehat{R}/A_1 \widehat{R} \oplus \cdots \oplus \widehat{R}/A_n \widehat{R}$. So $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ is pure-injective. By [9, Proposition 6] \widehat{M} is a direct summand of $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$. So $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M \simeq \widehat{M} \oplus V$, where V is a submodule of $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$. From Proposition 1.1 we deduce that, for each $x \in \widehat{R} \otimes_R M$, there exist $m \in M$, $p \in P$ and $y \in \widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ such that $x = m + py$. Assume that $x \in V$. There exists $z \in \widehat{M}$ and $v \in V$ such that $x = m + pz + pv$. It follows that $x = pv$, whence $V = PV$. On the other hand, $\widehat{R}/A \widehat{R}$ is indecomposable by [3, Proposition 5.1] and $\text{End}_R(\widehat{R}/A \widehat{R})$ is local by [11, Theorem 9] or [5, Theorem XIII.3.10], for every proper ideal A . By Krull-Schmidt Theorem $V \simeq \widehat{R}/A_{k_1} \widehat{R} \oplus \cdots \oplus \widehat{R}/A_{k_p} \widehat{R}$ where $\{k_1, \dots, k_p\}$ is a subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. If $V \neq 0$, by Proposition 1.1 we get $V \neq PV$. This contradiction completes the proof. \square

The **Malcev rank** of a module N is defined as the cardinal number

$$\text{Mr } N = \sup\{\text{gen } M \mid M \subseteq N, \text{ gen } M < \infty\}.$$

The following proposition is identical to the first part of [5, Proposition XII.1.6]. Here one gives a different proof.

Proposition 3.2. *The length of any pure-composition series of a polyserial module M equals $\text{Mr } M$.*

Proof. Let $0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \cdots \subset M_n = M$ be a pure-composition series of M with uniserial factors. By [5, Corollary XII.1.5] $\text{Mr } M \leq n$. Equality holds for $n = 1$. From the pure-composition series of M , we deduce a pure-composition

series of M/M_1 of length $n - 1$. By induction hypothesis M/M_1 contains a finitely generated submodule Y with $\text{gen } Y = n - 1$.

Assume that Y is generated by $\{y_2, \dots, y_n\}$. Let $x_2, \dots, x_n \in M$ such that $y_k = x_k + M_1$ and F be the submodule of M generated by x_2, \dots, x_n . If $F \cap M_1 = M_1$ then $M_1 \subseteq F$ and M_1 is a pure submodule of F . In this case M_1 is finitely generated by Proposition 2.8. It follows that the following sequence is exact:

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{M_1}{PM_1} \rightarrow \frac{F}{PF} \rightarrow \frac{Y}{PY} \rightarrow 0.$$

So we have $\text{gen } Y = \text{gen } F - \text{gen } M_1 \leq n - 2$. We get a contradiction since $\text{gen } Y = n - 1$. Hence $F \cap M_1 \neq M_1$. Let $x_1 \in M_1 \setminus F \cap M_1$. Let X be the submodule of M generated by x_1, \dots, x_n . Clearly $Rx_1 = M_1 \cap X$. We will show that $Px_1 = Rx_1 \cap PX$. Let $x \in Rx_1 \cap PX$. Then $x = p \sum_{k=2}^{k=n} a_k x_k = rx_1$ where $p \in P$ and r, a_1, \dots, a_n are elements of R . It follows that $p \sum_{k=2}^{k=n} a_k x_k = (r - pa_1)x_1$. So $(r - pa_1)x_1 \in M_1 \cap F \subset Rx_1$. We deduce that $r - pa_1 \in P$ whence $r \in P$. Hence $x \in Px_1$. Consequently the following sequence is exact:

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{Rx_1}{Px_1} \rightarrow \frac{X}{PX} \rightarrow \frac{Y}{PY} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then $\text{gen } X = n$. □

Now we study the pure-injective hulls of polyserial modules.

Theorem 3.3. *Let M be a polyserial module with the following pure-composition series:*

$$0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \dots \subset M_n = M$$

For each integer k , $1 \leq k \leq n$ we put $U_k = M_k/M_{k-1}$. Then:

- (1) *There exists a subset I of $\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid 1 \leq k \leq n\}$ such that $\widehat{M} \simeq \bigoplus_{k \in I} \widehat{U}_k$.*
- (2) *$\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ is pure-injective and isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{k=1}^{k=n} \widehat{R} \otimes_R U_k$.*
- (3) *The collection $(\widehat{R} \otimes_R U_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ is uniquely determined by M .*

Proof. (1) Let N be a pure submodule of M . The inclusion map $N \rightarrow \widehat{N}$ can be extended to $w : M \rightarrow \widehat{N}$. Let $f : M \rightarrow \widehat{N} \oplus \widehat{M/\widehat{N}}$ defined by $f(x) = (w(x), x + N)$, for each $x \in M$. It is easy to verify that f is a pure monomorphism. It follows that \widehat{M} is a summand of $\widehat{N} \oplus \widehat{M/\widehat{N}}$. So, by induction on n , we easily get that \widehat{M} is a summand of $\bigoplus_{k=1}^{k=n} \widehat{U}_k$. Since, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, \widehat{U}_k is indecomposable by [3, Proposition 5.1] and $\text{End}_R(\widehat{U}_k)$ is local by [11, Theorem 9] or [5, Theorem XIII.3.10], we apply Krull-Schmidt Theorem to conclude.

(2) We do as in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

(3) Since $\widehat{R} \otimes_R M$ and $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U_k$ are T -modules, we conclude by Proposition 2.7 and Krull-Schmidt theorem. □

Corollary 3.4. *Let the notations be as in Theorem 3.3 and assume that M is countably generated. Then any two pure-composition series of M are isomorphic.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.3 the collection $(\widehat{R} \otimes_R U_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ is uniquely determined by M . It remains to show that, if U and V are uniserial modules such that $\widehat{R} \otimes_R U \simeq \widehat{R} \otimes_R V$ then $U \simeq V$. It is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.6. □

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.

The following proposition completes [1, Corollary 35].

Proposition 3.5. *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 .*
- (3) *Each uniserial module is countably generated.*

(1) \Leftrightarrow (2) holds by [1, Corollary 35]

(3) \Rightarrow (2) Let J be a prime ideal. Then J and R_J are uniserial R -modules. So there are countably generated. If R_J is generated by $\{t_n^{-1} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $t_n \notin J \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $J = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Rt_n$. Now it is easy to get the second condition.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Let U be a uniserial module and $J = U^\# \cup U_\#$. Then U is an R_J -module. But R/J countably cogenerated is equivalent to R_J countably generated. Hence U is countably generated over R if and only if U is countably generated over R_J . So we may assume that $J = P$.

First assume that $U^\# = P$. If $PU \subset U$ then $U = Ru$ where $u \in U \setminus PU$. Now suppose that $PU = U$. Let $r, s \in P$ such that $rU \neq 0$. If $rU = rsU$ then by [1, Lemma 5] we have $U = sU$, hence a contradiction. Let $\{p_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a spanning set of P such that $p_{n+1} \notin Rp_n$. Then $U = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} p_n U$. We may assume that $p_n U \neq 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. So $p_n U \subset p_{n+1} U$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $u_n \in p_{n+1} U \setminus p_n U$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then U is generated by $\{u_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Now suppose that $U_\# = P$. Assume that $(0 : u) = (0 : U)$ for some $u \in U$. Let $v \in U$ such that $u = av$ for some $a \in R$. By [1, Lemma 2] $(0 : u) = ((0 : v) : a)$. We get that $(0 : v) = ((0 : v) : a) = (0 : U)$. Since $(0 : v)^\# = P$ by [1, Lemma 26] a is a unit, and consequently U is cyclic. Now we assume that $(0 : U) \subset (0 : u)$ for each $u \in U$. We have $(0 : U) = \bigcap_{u \in U} (0 : u)$. By [1, Lemma 30] there exists a countable family $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of U such that $(0 : U) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (0 : u_n)$ and $u_{n+1} \notin Ru_n, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $u \in U$, since $(0 : u) \neq (0 : U)$, then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(0 : u_n) \subset (0 : u)$. Hence $u \in Ru_n$ and U is generated by $\{u_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. \square

Remark 3.6. In the same way, one can prove that the two first conditions of [1, Proposition 32] (respectively [1, Corollary 34]) are equivalent to the following: each indecomposable injective module E such that $E_\# = P$ contains a uniserial pure submodule which is countably generated (respectively each indecomposable injective module contains a uniserial pure submodule which is countably generated).

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose that R satisfies the equivalent conditions of Proposition 3.5. Then any two pure-composition series of a polyserial R -module are isomorphic.*

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.4. \square

4. TWO CRITERIA FOR MAXIMALITY OF R

By Theorem 3.1, if M is finitely generated, then \widehat{M} is a direct sum of $\text{gen } M$ indecomposable pure-injective modules and $\text{gen } M = \text{Mr } M$ by [5, Corollary XII.1.7]. But Theorem 4.5 proves that, if M is polyserial, then \widehat{M} is not necessarily a direct sum of $\text{Mr } M$ indecomposable pure-injective modules.

As in [7], if $x \in \widehat{R} \setminus R$, we say that $B(x) = \{r \in R \mid x \notin R + r\widehat{R}\}$ is the **breath ideal** of x . Then Proposition 4.2 is a generalization of [7, Proposition 1.4]. The following lemma is useful to prove this proposition.

Lemma 4.1. *Let J be a proper ideal such that $J = \bigcap_{c \notin J} cR$. Then $J\widehat{R} = \bigcap_{c \notin J} c\widehat{R}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.4 $\widehat{R}/J\widehat{R}$ is the pure-injective hull of R/J . In the proof of Step 3 of Proposition 1.1 it is already shown that $\bigcap_{a \neq 0} a\widehat{R} = 0$ if $\bigcap_{a \neq 0} aR = 0$. So we apply this result to R/J to get the lemma. \square

Recall that the **ideal topology** of R is the linear topology which has as a basis of neighborhoods of 0 the nonzero principal ideals.

Proposition 4.2. *Let A be a proper ideal. Then R/A is Hausdorff and non-complete in its ideal topology if and only if $A = B(x)$ for some x in $\widehat{R} \setminus R$.*

Proof. To show that $R/B(x)$ is Hausdorff, we do as in [7, Proposition 1.4], we prove that $a \notin B(x)$ implies that $pa \notin B(x)$ for some $p \in P$. We have $x = r + ay$ where $r \in R$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$. By Proposition 1.1, $\widehat{R} = R + P\widehat{R}$. So $y = s + pz$, for some $s \in R$, $p \in P$ and $z \in \widehat{R}$. Therefore we get $x = r + as + paz \in R + pa\widehat{R}$. For each $a \notin B(x)$, $x \in r_a + a\widehat{R}$ for some $r_a \in R$. If the family $(r_a + aR)_{a \notin B(x)}$ has a non-empty intersection then, by using Lemma 4.1, we get that $x \in R + B(x)\widehat{R}$, whence a contradiction. So $R/B(x)$ is non-complete.

Conversely, assume that R/A is Hausdorff and non-complete. Then there exists a family $(r_a + aR)_{a \notin A}$ which has the finite intersection and an empty total intersection. Since \widehat{R} is pure-injective, the total intersection of the family $(r_a + a\widehat{R})_{a \notin A}$ contains an element x which doesn't belong to R . Clearly $B(x) \subseteq A$. If $x = r + b\widehat{R}$ for some $r \in R$ and $b \in A$ then $r \in r_a + aR$ for each $a \notin A$, since R is a pure submodule of \widehat{R} . We get a contradiction. So $A = B(x)$. \square

The following lemma is a generalization of [7, Lemma 1.3]. It will be useful to prove Theorem 4.4.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $x \in \widehat{R}$ such that $x = r + ay$ for some $r, a \in R$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$. Then $B(y) = (B(x) : a)$.*

Proof. Let $t \notin B(y)$. Then $y = s + tz$ for some $s \in R$ and $z \in \widehat{R}$. It follows that $x = r + as + aty$. So $t \notin (B(x) : a)$.

Conversely, if $t \notin (B(x) : a)$ then we get the following equalities $x = r + ay = s + taz$ for some $s \in R$ and $z \in \widehat{R}$. Since R is a pure submodule of \widehat{R} it follows that $a(y - tz - b) = 0$ for some $b \in R$. From the flatness of \widehat{R} we deduce that $(y - tz - b) \in (0 : a)\widehat{R}$. But $ta \notin B(x)$ implies that $ta \neq 0$, whence $(0 : a) \subset Rt$. Hence $t \notin B(y)$. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Let N be the nilradical of R . Then R is maximal if and only if R/N and R_N are maximal.*

Proof. Suppose that R is maximal. It is obvious that R/N is maximal. By [6, Lemma 2] R_N is maximal too.

Conversely assume that R/N and R_N are maximal. Let K be the kernel of the natural map $R \rightarrow R_N$. Then $K^2 = 0$. So K is an R/K -module. Thus R is maximal if and only if R/K is maximal. In the sequel we may assume that $K = 0$. So $N = Z$ and it is an R_N -module. It is enough to show that N is a linearly compact module. Let $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of ideals contained in N and $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ a family of elements of N such that the family $\mathcal{F} = (x_i + A_i)_{i \in I}$ has the finite intersection property. We put $A = \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$. We may assume that $A \subset A_i, \forall i \in I$.

First suppose that $N \subset A^\#$. Assume that the total intersection of \mathcal{F} is empty. Then R/A is non-complete in its ideal topology. By Proposition 4.2 there exists $x \in \widehat{R} \setminus R$ such that $B(x) = A$. Let $b \in A^\# \setminus N$. There exists $a \in (A : b) \setminus A$. Since $B(x) = A$ we have $x = r + ay$ for some $r \in R$ and $y \in \widehat{R}$. By Lemma 4.3 $B(y) = (A : a)$. Since $b \in B(y)$ we have $N \subset B(y)$. By Proposition 4.2 $R/B(y)$ is non-complete in its ideal topology. This contradicts that R/N is maximal. So the total intersection of \mathcal{F} is non-empty in this case.

Now we assume that $N = A^\#$. Then A is an ideal of R_N . By [1, Lemma 29] either $A = Na$ for some $a \in N$ or $A = \bigcap_{a \notin A} aR_N$.

First we assume that $A = Na$. We may suppose that $A_i \subseteq aR_N, \forall i \in I$. Since \mathcal{F} has the finite intersection property, $x_i + aR_N = x_j + aR_N, \forall i, j \in I$. Let $y \in x_i + aR_N$ for each $i \in I$. Then $(x_i - y + A_i)_{i \in I}$ is a family of cosets of aR_N which has the finite intersection property. But aR_N/aN is a uniserial module over R/N . Then aR_N/aN is linearly compact since R/N is maximal. Thus $\bigcap_{i \in I} (x_i - y + A_i) \neq \emptyset$. Hence the total intersection of \mathcal{F} is non-empty.

Now suppose that $A = \bigcap_{a \notin A} aR_N$. By Proposition 3.5 and [1, Lemma 30] there exists a countable family $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of $N \setminus A$ such that $A = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n R_N$ and $a_n \notin a_{n+1} R_N, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. By induction on n we get a subfamily $(A_{i_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the family $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $A_{i_n} \subset a_n R_N$ in the following way: we choose $i_0 \in I$ such that $A_{i_0} \subset a_0 R_N$ and, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, we pick i_{n+1} such that $A_{i_{n+1}} \subset A_{i_n} \cap a_{n+1} R_N$. Then the family $(x_{i_n} + a_n R_N)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has the finite intersection property. Since R_N is maximal there exists $x \in x_{i_n} + a_n R_N, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. But the equality $A = \bigcap_{a \notin A} aR_N$ implies that, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an integer $m > n$ such that $a_m R_N \subseteq A_{i_n}$. Since $x - x_{i_m} \in a_m R_N$ and $x_{i_m} - x_{i_n} \in A_{i_n}$ we get that $x \in x_{i_n} + A_{i_n}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence \mathcal{F} has a non-empty total intersection. The proof is now complete. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Then R is maximal if and only if, for each polyserial R -module M , \widehat{M} is direct sum of Mr M indecomposable pure-injective modules.*

Proof. If R is maximal, then each polyserial module M is a direct sum of Mr M pure-injective uniserial modules by [5, Proposition XII.2.4].

If R is not maximal then R/N or R_N is not maximal by Theorem 4.4.

Assume that $R' = R/N$ is not maximal. Then $E = \widehat{R'}/R'$ is a nonzero torsion-free R' -module. Let $x \in \widehat{R'} \setminus R'$, \bar{x} be its image in E and U the submodule of E such that $U/R'\bar{x}$ is the torsion submodule of $E/R'\bar{x}$. Then U is a pure submodule of E , a rank one torsion-free module and a uniserial module. Let M be the inverse image of U by the natural map $\widehat{R'} \rightarrow E$. Then M is a pure submodule of $\widehat{R'}$ and a non-uniserial polyserial module with the two following (standard) uniserial factors:

R' and U . We have $\text{Mr } M = 2$. Let W be a submodule of $\widehat{R'}$ such that $M \cap W = 0$ and $M \rightarrow \widehat{R'}/W$ is a pure monomorphism. Thus $R' \cap W = 0$ and $R' \rightarrow \widehat{R'}/W$ is a pure monomorphism too. It follows that $W = 0$ and $\widehat{M} = \widehat{R'} \subset \widehat{R'} \oplus \widehat{U}$. (Let us observe that M and U are not finitely generated by Theorem 3.1.)

Suppose that $R' = R_N$ is not maximal. After replacing R' with R'/rR' , where r is a non-unit of R' , we may assume that R' is coherent and self fp-injective by [1, Theorem 11]. Then $E = \widehat{R'}/R'$ is a nonzero fp-injective R' -module. By [2, Lemma 6] E contains a pure uniserial submodule U . We define M as above. Then $\text{Mr } M = 2$ and M is an essential submodule of $\widehat{R'}$. So $\widehat{M} = \widehat{R'}$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Couchot, Injective modules and fp-injective modules over valuation rings. *J. Algebra* **267** (2003), 359–376.
- [2] F. Couchot, Local rings of bounded module type are almost maximal valuation rings, to appear in *Comm. Algebra*
- [3] A. Facchini, Relative Injectivity and Pure-injective Modules over Prüfer Rings. *J. Algebra* **110** (1987), 380–406.
- [4] A. Facchini, Module theory. Endomorphism rings and direct sum decompositions in some classes of modules. (English) Progress in Mathematics (Boston, Mass.). 167. Basel: Birkhauser. xii, 285 p. (1998).
- [5] L. Fuchs and L. Salce, Modules over Non-Noetherian Domains, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 84, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2001.
- [6] D.T. Gill, (1971). Almost maximal valuation rings. *J. London Math. Soc.* **4**: 140–146.
- [7] L. Salce and P. Zanardo, Some cardinals invariants for valuation domains. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **74** (1985), 205–217.
- [8] T.S. Shores and W.J. Lewis, Serial modules and endomorphism rings. *Duke Math. J.* **41**, (1974), 889–909.
- [9] R.B. Warfield, Purity and algebraic compactness for modules. *Pac. J. Math.* **28(3)** (1961), 689–719.
- [10] R. Warfield, Decomposability of finitely presented modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **25**, (1970), 167–172.
- [11] B. Zimmermann-Huisgen and W. Zimmermann, Algebraically compact rings and modules. *Math. Z* **161** (1978), 81–93.

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES NICOLAS ORESME, CNRS UMR 6139, DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET MÉCANIQUE, 14032 CAEN CEDEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: couchot@math.unicaen.fr