

Research Article

δ -Small Submodules and δ -Supplemented Modules

Yongduo Wang

Received 9 January 2007; Accepted 18 June 2007

Recommended by Akbar Rhemtulla

Let R be a ring and M a right R -module. It is shown that (1) $\delta(M)$ is Noetherian if and only if M satisfies ACC on δ -small submodules; (2) $\delta(M)$ is Artinian if and only if M satisfies DCC on δ -small submodules; (3) M is Artinian if and only if M is an amply δ -supplemented module and satisfies DCC on δ -supplement submodules and on δ -small submodules.

Copyright © 2007 Yongduo Wang. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction and preliminaries

In this note, all rings are associative with identity and all modules are unital right modules unless otherwise specified.

Let R be a ring and M a module. The concept of δ -small submodules was introduced by Zhou in [1]. Motivated by [2–4], we study modules with ACC (resp., DCC) on δ -small submodules and prove that $\delta(M)$ is Noetherian (resp., Artinian) if and only if M satisfies ACC (resp., DCC) on δ -small submodules in Section 2. In Section 3, we give the concepts of (amply) δ -supplemented modules via δ -small submodules. It is shown that M is Artinian if and only if M is an amply δ -supplemented module and satisfies DCC on δ -supplement submodules and on δ -small submodules. In Section 4, we introduce the concept of δ -semiperfect modules and investigate the connections between δ -supplemented modules and δ -semiperfect modules.

Let M be a module and $N \leq M$. N is said to be δ -small in M (see [5]) if, whenever $N + X = M$ with M/X singular, we have $X = M$. $\delta(M) = \text{Rej}_M(\wp) = \cap \{N \leq M \mid M/N \in \wp\}$, where \wp be the class of all singular simple modules. M is called an *amply supplemented* module if for any two submodules A and B of M with $A + B = M$, B contains a supplement of A . M is called a *supplemented module* if for each submodule A of M there exists

a submodule B of M such that $M = A + B$ and $A \cap B \ll B$. The notions which are not explained here will be found in [6].

LEMMA 1.1 (see [7, Proposition 5.20]). *Suppose that $K_1 \leq M_1 \leq M$, $K_2 \leq M_2 \leq M$, and $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$. Then $K_1 \oplus K_2 \leq_e M_1 \oplus M_2$ if and only if $K_1 \leq_e M_1$ and $K_2 \leq_e M_2$.*

2. Modules with chain conditions on δ -small submodules

In this section, we study modules with chain conditions on δ -small submodules and prove that $\delta(M)$ is Noetherian (resp., Artinian) if and only if M satisfies ACC (resp., DCC) on δ -small submodules. Let us start with the following.

LEMMA 2.1 (see [1, Lemma 1.3]). *Let M be a module.*

- (i) *For submodules N, K, L of M with $K \leq N$,*
 - (1) *$N \ll_\delta M$ if and only if $K \ll_\delta M$ and $N/K \ll_\delta M/K$;*
 - (2) *$N + L \ll_\delta M$ if and only if $N \ll_\delta M$ and $L \ll_\delta M$.*
- (ii) *If $K \ll_\delta M$ and $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a homomorphism, then $f(K) \ll_\delta N$. In particular, if $K \ll_\delta M \leq N$, then $K \ll_\delta N$.*
- (iii) *Let $K_1 \leq M_1 \leq M$, $K_2 \leq M_2 \leq M$, and $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$. Then $K_1 \oplus K_2 \ll_\delta M_1 \oplus M_2$ if and only if $K_1 \ll_\delta M_1$ and $K_2 \ll_\delta M_2$.*

LEMMA 2.2 (see [1, Lemma 1.5]). *Let M and N be modules.*

- (1) *$\delta(M) = \Sigma\{L \leq M \mid L \text{ is a } \delta\text{-small submodule of } M\}$.*
- (2) *If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a homomorphism, then $f(\delta(M)) \leq \delta(N)$.*
- (3) *If $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$, then $\delta(M) = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \delta(M_i)$.*
- (4) *If every proper submodule of M is contained in a maximal submodule of M , then $\delta(M)$ is the unique largest δ -small submodule of M .*

THEOREM 2.3. *Let M be a module. Then $\delta(M)$ is Noetherian if and only if M satisfies ACC on δ -small submodules.*

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ” It is clear by Lemma 2.2.

“ \Leftarrow ” Suppose that $\delta(M)$ is not Noetherian. Let $A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \dots$ be an infinite ascending chain of submodules of $\delta(M)$. Let $a_1 \in A_1$ and $a_j \in A_j - A_{j-1}$ for each $j > 1$. For any $k \geq 1$, let $N_k = \Sigma_{j=1}^k a_j R$. Then N_k is finitely generated and $N_k \leq \delta(M)$. Hence $N_k \ll_\delta M$. It is clear that $N_1 \leq N_2 \leq \dots$ and so M fails to satisfy ACC on δ -small submodules. This completes the proof. \square

Recall that a module M has finite uniform dimension k , for some nonnegative k , if M does not contain any infinite direct sum of nonzero submodules and k is the maximal number of summands in a direct sum of nonzero submodules of M . In this case, we call k the uniform dimension of M , and write $\text{udim } M = k$.

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Let M be a module. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *$\delta(M)$ has finite uniform dimension.*
- (2) *Every δ -small submodule of M has finite uniform dimension and there exists a positive integer k such that $\text{udim } N \leq k$ for any $N \ll_\delta M$.*
- (3) *M does not contain an infinite direct sum of nonzero δ -small submodules.*

Proof. “(1) \Rightarrow (2)” It is obvious because $\text{udim } N \leq \text{udim } \delta(M)$ for any $N \ll_\delta M$.

“(2) \Rightarrow (3)” Let $N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus \cdots$ be an infinite direct sum of nonzero δ -small submodules of M . Then $N_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus N_{k+1}$ is a δ -small submodule of M and $\text{udim}(N_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus N_{k+1}) \geq k+1$. This is a contradiction.

“(3) \Rightarrow (1)” Let $N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus \cdots$ be an infinite direct sum of nonzero submodules of $\delta(M)$. For every $i \geq 1$, let n_i be a nonzero element of N_i . Then $n_i R \ll_\delta M$. Thus $n_1 R + n_2 R + \cdots$ is an infinite direct sum of nonzero δ -small submodules of M . This is a contradiction and so $\delta(M)$ has finite uniform dimension. \square

THEOREM 2.5. *Let M be a module. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) $\delta(M)$ is Artinian.
- (2) Every δ -small submodule of M is Artinian.
- (3) M satisfies DCC on δ -small submodules.

Proof. “(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3)” They are clear.

“(3) \Rightarrow (1)” It suffices to prove that any factor module of $\delta(M)$ is finitely cogenerated. If there exists a factor module of $\delta(M)$ that is not finitely cogenerated, then the set Ω of submodules of $\delta(M)$, such that $\delta(M)/L$ is not finitely cogenerated, is nonempty. Let $\{L_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ be any chain of submodules in Ω . Let $L = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} L_\lambda$. If $L \notin \Omega$, then $\delta(M)/L$ is finitely cogenerated and hence $L = L_\lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Thus $L \in \Omega$. By Zorn’s lemma, Ω has a minimal member A . \square

Let N be a finitely generated submodule of $\delta(M)$. Then N is a δ -small submodule of M and hence Artinian by hypothesis. Thus $\delta(M)$ is locally Artinian. Now let $x \in \delta(M)$, $x \notin A$. Then xR is Artinian and $(xR + A)/A \simeq xR/(xR \cap A)$. So $(xR + A)/A$ is a nonzero Artinian module and hence $\delta(M)/A$ has essential socle. Let S denote the submodule of $\delta(M)$, containing A , such that S/A is the socle of $\delta(M)/A$. Thus S/A is not finitely generated by [7, Proposition 10.7].

Next we show that $A \ll_\delta M$. If $M = A + B$ for some $B \leq M$ and M/B is singular, then $S = A + (S \cap B)$. Suppose that $A \cap B \neq A$. Then $\delta(M)/(A \cap B)$ is finitely cogenerated by the choice of A . But $S/A = (A + (S \cap B))/A \simeq (S \cap B)/(A \cap B) \leq \text{Soc}(\delta(M)/(A \cap B))$ and hence S/A is finitely generated. This is a contradiction. Thus $A = A \cap B \leq B$ and we have $M = A + B = B$. So $A \ll_\delta M$.

Now suppose that $M = S + V$ of some submodule V of M and M/V is singular. Then $M/(A + V) = (S + V)/(A + V) \simeq S/(A + (S \cap V))$. Thus $M/(A + V)$ is semisimple. If $M \neq A + V$, then there exists a maximal submodule W of M such that $A + V \leq W$. But $S \leq \delta(M) \leq W$ since M/W is a singular simple module and this gives the contradiction $M = W$. Thus $M = A + V$, hence $M = V$ since $A \ll_\delta M$. Thus $S \ll_\delta M$ and hence S is Artinian by hypothesis. It follows that S/A is Artinian, and, in particular, S/A is finitely generated. This is a contradiction. Thus $\delta(M)$ is Artinian.

Example 2.6. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$, p is a prime and $M = \mathbb{Z}_{(p^\infty)}$, the Prüfer p -group, then every proper submodule of M is Noetherian, but M is not Noetherian. Indeed, every proper submodule of M is δ -small. Moreover, $M = \delta(M)$. Thus every δ -small submodule of M is Noetherian, but $\delta(M)$ is not Noetherian.

COROLLARY 2.7. *Let R be a ring which satisfies DCC on δ -small right ideals. Then R satisfies ACC on δ -small right ideals.*

Let $N \leq M$. N is called a δ -semimaximal submodule of M if $N = \bigcap_{i=1}^n L_i$ with M/L_i singular simple for any $i = 1, \dots, n$.

PROPOSITION 2.8. *Let M be a module. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) M is Artinian.
- (2) M satisfies DCC on δ -small submodules and on δ -semimaximal submodules.
- (3) M satisfies DCC on δ -small submodules and $\delta(M)$ is a δ -semimaximal submodule.

Proof. “(1) \Rightarrow (2)” It is clear.

“(2) \Rightarrow (3)” Suppose that M satisfies DCC on δ -semimaximal submodules. Let N be a minimal δ -semimaximal submodule of M . Clearly $\delta(M) \leq N$. If $M = \delta(M)$, then $\delta(M) = N$. Suppose that $M \neq \delta(M)$. If P is a maximal submodule of M with M/P singular, then $N \cap P$ is a δ -semimaximal submodule of M and hence $N = N \cap P$, so that $N \leq P$. It follows that $N \leq \delta(M)$. Hence $N = \delta(M)$. Thus $\delta(M)$ is a δ -semimaximal submodule of M .

“(3) \Rightarrow (1)” It is clear $\delta(M)$ is Artinian. If $M = \delta(M)$, then M is Artinian. Suppose that $M \neq \delta(M)$. Then $\delta(M) = P_1 \cap P_2 \cap \dots \cap P_n$, where M/P_i is singular simple for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. It follows that $M/\delta(M)$ embeds in the finitely generated semisimple module $M/P_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M/P_n$. Hence $M/\delta(M)$ is Artinian and so M is Artinian. \square

3. δ -supplemented modules

Let M be a module. Let N and L be submodules of M . N is called a δ -supplement of L if $M = N + L$ and $N \cap L \ll_{\delta} N$. N is called a δ -supplement submodule if N is a δ -supplement of some submodule of M . M is called a δ -supplemented module if every submodule of M has a δ -supplement. On the other hand, M is called an amply δ -supplemented module if for any submodules A, B of M with $M = A + B$ there exists a δ -supplement P of A such that $P \leq B$. Clearly, supplemented modules are δ -supplemented modules and every amply δ -supplemented module is δ -supplemented. But the converses are not true.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let M be a δ -supplemented module. Then*

- (1) $M/\delta(M)$ is semisimple;
- (2) L a submodule of M with $L \cap \delta(M) = 0$, then L is semisimple.

Proof. (1) Let N be any submodule of M containing $\delta(M)$. Then there exists a δ -supplement K of N in M , that is, $M = N + K$ and $N \cap K \ll_{\delta} K$. Thus $M/\delta(M) = N/\delta(M) \oplus (K + \delta(M))/\delta(M)$, and so every submodule of $M/\delta(M)$ is a direct summand. Therefore $M/\delta(M)$ is semisimple.

(2) It is clear by (1), since $L \cong L \oplus \delta(M)/\delta(M) \leq M/\delta(M)$. \square

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let M be an amply δ -supplemented module. Then homomorphic images are amply δ -supplemented modules.*

Proof. Assume M is amply δ -supplemented and $f : M \rightarrow N$ is any epimorphism. We want to show that N is amply δ -supplemented. Let $N = A + B$. Then $M = f^{-1}(A) + f^{-1}(B)$.

Since M is amply δ -supplemented, there exists a submodule X of M such that $M = f^{-1}(A) + X$, $f^{-1}(A) \cap X \ll X \leq f^{-1}(B)$. Now, $N = A + f(X)$ and $A \cap f(X) = f(f^{-1}(A) \cap X) \ll_\delta f(X)$. Clearly $f(X) \leq B$. \square

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let M be a δ -supplemented module. Then $M = N \oplus L$ for some semisimple module N and some module L with $\delta(L) \leq_e L$.*

Proof. For $\delta(M)$, there exists $N \leq M$ such that $N \cap \delta(M) = 0$ and $N \oplus \delta(M) \leq_e M$. Since M is a δ -supplemented module, there exists $L \leq M$ such that $N + L = M$ and $N \cap L \ll_\delta L$. Since $N \cap L = N \cap (N \cap L) \leq N \cap \delta(L) \leq N \cap \delta(M) = 0$, $M = N \oplus L$. By Lemma 3.1, N is semisimple. Thus $\delta(M) = \delta(N) \oplus \delta(L)$. Since $N \oplus \delta(L) \leq_e M = N \oplus L$, $\delta(L) \leq_e L$ by Lemma 1.1. This completes the proof. \square

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $M_1, U \leq M$ and let M_1 be a δ -supplemented module. If $M_1 + U$ has a δ -supplement in M , then so does U .*

Proof. Since $M_1 + U$ has a δ -supplement in M , there exists $X \leq M$ such that $X + (M_1 + U) = M$ and $X \cap (M_1 + U) \ll_\delta X$. For $(X + U) \cap M_1$, since M_1 is a δ -supplemented module, there exists $Y \leq M_1$ such that $(X + U) \cap M_1 + Y = M_1$ and $(X + U) \cap Y \ll_\delta Y$. Thus we have $X + U + Y = M$ and $(X + U) \cap Y \ll_\delta Y$, that is, Y is a δ -supplement of $X + U$ in M . Next, we will show that $X + Y$ is a δ -supplement of U in M . It is clear that $(X + Y) + U = M$, so it suffices to show that $(X + Y) \cap U \ll_\delta X + Y$. Since $Y + U \leq M_1 + U$, $X \cap (Y + U) \leq X \cap (M_1 + U) \ll_\delta X$. Thus $(X + Y) \cap U \leq X \cap (Y + U) + Y \cap (X + U) \ll_\delta X + Y$ by Lemma 2.1, as required. \square

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Let M_1 and M_2 be δ -supplemented modules. If $M = M_1 + M_2$, then M is a δ -supplemented module.*

Proof. Let U be a submodule of M . Since $M_1 + M_2 + U = M$ trivially has a δ -supplement in M , $M_2 + U$ has a δ -supplement in M by Lemma 3.4. Thus U has a δ -supplement in M by Lemma 3.4 again. So M is a δ -supplemented module. \square

PROPOSITION 3.6. *If M is a δ -supplemented module, then every finitely M -generated module is a δ -supplemented module.*

Proof. From Proposition 3.5, we know that every finite sum of δ -supplemented modules is a δ -supplemented module. Next we will show that every factor module of a δ -supplemented module is again a δ -supplemented module.

Let M be a δ -supplemented module and M/N any factor module of M . For any submodule L of M containing N , since M is a δ -supplemented module, there exists $K \leq M$ such that $L + K = M$ and $L \cap K \ll_\delta K$. Thus $M/N = L/N + (N + K)/N$ and $(L/N) \cap ((N + K)/N) = (N + (L \cap K))/N \ll_\delta (N + K)/N$, that is, $(N + K)/N$ is a δ -supplement of L/N in M/N , as required. \square

PROPOSITION 3.7. *Let M be a module. If every submodule of M is a δ -supplemented module, then M is an amply δ -supplemented module.*

Proof. Let $L, N \leq M$ and $M = N + L$. By assumption, there is $H \leq L$ such that $(L \cap N) + H = L$ and $(L \cap N) \cap H = N \cap H \ll_\delta H$. Thus $H + N \geq H + (L \cap N) = L$ and hence $H + N \geq (N + L) = M$. Therefore, $M = H + N$ as desired. \square

COROLLARY 3.8. *Let R be any ring. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *Every module is an amply δ -supplemented module.*
- (2) *Every module is a δ -supplemented module.*

A module M is said to be π -projective if for every two submodules U, V of M with $U + V = M$ there exists $f \in \text{End}(M)$ with $\text{Im } f \leq U$ and $\text{Im}(1 - f) \leq V$.

THEOREM 3.9. *Let M be a module. If M is a π -projective δ -supplemented module, then M is an amply δ -supplemented module.*

Proof. Let A, B be submodules of M such that $M = A + B$. Since M is π -projective, there exists an endomorphism e of M such that $e(M) \leq A$ and $(1 - e)(M) \leq B$. Note that $(1 - e)(A) \leq A$. Let C be a δ -supplement of A in M . Then $M = e(M) + (1 - e)(M) = e(M) + (1 - e)(A + C) \leq A + (1 - e)(C) \leq M$, so that $M = A + (1 - e)(C)$. Note that $(1 - e)(C)$ is a submodule of B . Let $y \in A \cap (1 - e)(C)$. Then $y \in A$ and $y = (1 - e)(x) = x - e(x)$ for some $x \in C$. Next $x = y + e(x) \in A$, so that $y \in (1 - e)(A \cap C)$. But $A \cap C \ll_{\delta} C$ gives that $A \cap (1 - e)(C) = (1 - e)(A \cap C) \ll_{\delta} (1 - e)(C)$. Thus $(1 - e)(C)$ is a δ -supplement of A in M . It follows that M is an amply δ -supplemented module. \square

THEOREM 3.10. *Let M be a module. Then M is Artinian if and only if M is an amply δ -supplemented module and satisfies DCC on δ -supplement submodules and on δ -small submodules.*

Proof. The necessity is clear. Conversely, suppose that M is an amply δ -supplemented module which satisfies DCC on δ -supplement submodules and on δ -small submodules. Then $\delta(M)$ is Artinian by Theorem 2.5. Next, it suffices to show that $M/\delta(M)$ is Artinian. It is clear that $M/\delta(M)$ is semisimple by Lemma 3.1.

Now suppose that $\delta(M) \leq N_1 \leq N_2 \leq N_3 \leq \dots$ is an ascending chain of submodules of M . Because M is an amply δ -supplemented module, there exists a descending chain of submodules $K_1 \geq K_2 \geq \dots$ such that K_i is a δ -supplement of N_i in M for each $i \geq 1$. By hypothesis, there exists a positive integer t such that $K_t = K_{t+1} = K_{t+2} = \dots$. Because $M/\delta(M) = N_i/\delta(M) \oplus (K_i + \delta(M))/\delta(M)$ for all $i \geq t$, it follows that $N_t = N_{t+1} = \dots$. Thus $M/\delta(M)$ is Noetherian, and hence finitely generated. So $M/\delta(M)$ is Artinian, as desired. \square

Example 3.11. For $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the only δ -supplement submodules are 0 and \mathbb{Z} and the only δ -small submodule is 0, but $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is not Artinian.

COROLLARY 3.12. *Let M be a finitely generated δ -supplemented module. Then M is Artinian if and only if M satisfies DCC on δ -small submodules.*

Proof. “ \Leftarrow ” Since $M/\delta(M)$ is semisimple and M is finitely generated, $M/\delta(M)$ is Artinian. Now that M satisfies DCC on δ -small submodules, $\delta(M)$ is Artinian by Theorem 2.5. Thus M is Artinian.

“ \Rightarrow ” It is clear. \square

Remark 3.13. Let R be a ring. If R_R is an amply δ -supplemented module, then R is a right Artinian ring if and only if R satisfies DCC on δ -small right ideals. Thus a right perfect ring which satisfies DCC on δ -small right ideals is a right Artinian ring.

Let us end this section with the following.

PROPOSITION 3.14. *If M is a δ -supplemented module and satisfies DCC on δ -small submodules, then so does M/A for any submodule A of M .*

Proof. Let A be any submodule of M and $B_1/A \leq B_2/A \leq \dots$ where each $B_i/A \ll_\delta M/A$. Let C be a δ -supplement of A in M . Then $M/A = (A + C)/A \simeq C/A \cap C$. Since B_i/A is δ -small in M/A , $B_i/A \simeq D_i/A \cap C \ll C/A \cap C$ for some D_i . Next we prove that $D_i \ll_\delta M$. Let $D_i + E = M$ with M/E singular. Then $(D_i + (E + A \cap C))/A \cap C = M/A \cap C$. Hence $E + A \cap C = M$ and $E = M$. Thus we have $D_1 \leq D_2 \leq \dots$. Since M satisfies ACC on δ -small submodules, there exists n such that $D_k = D_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq n$. Thus $B_k/A = B_{k+1}/A$ for all $k \geq n$. Therefore M/A satisfies ACC on δ -small submodules, as required. \square

4. δ -semiperfect modules

In this section, we introduce the concept of δ -semiperfect modules and investigate the interconnections between δ -supplemented modules and δ -semiperfect modules. Let P and M be modules, we call an epimorphism $f : P \rightarrow M$ a δ -cover in case $\text{Ker } f \ll_\delta P$. A δ -cover $f : P \rightarrow M$ is called a projective δ -cover in case P is a projective module.

Definition 4.1. A module M is called a δ -semiperfect module if any homomorphic image of M has a projective δ -cover.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is an epimorphism with $\text{Ker } f \leq \delta(M)$, then $\delta(N) = f(\delta(M))$.*

Proof. It follows from [7, Corollary 8.17]. \square

LEMMA 4.3. *If both $f : P \rightarrow M$ and $g : M \rightarrow N$ are δ -covers, then $gf : P \rightarrow N$ is a δ -cover.*

Proof. If both $f : P \rightarrow M$ and $g : M \rightarrow N$ are δ -covers, then $\text{Ker } f \ll_\delta P$ and $\text{Ker } g \ll_\delta M$. We want to show that $\text{Ker } gf \ll_\delta P$. Let $P = \text{Ker } gf + L$ with P/L singular. Then $M = \text{Ker } g + f(L)$. Since $M/f(L)$ is singular, $M = f(L)$. This implies that $P = L$ since P/L is singular and $\text{Ker } f \ll_\delta P$, as desired. \square

LEMMA 4.4. *If each $f_i : P_i \rightarrow M_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) is a δ -cover, then $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n f_i : \bigoplus_{i=1}^n P_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_i$ is a δ -cover.*

Proof. It is straightforward. \square

THEOREM 4.5. *Let M be a module and $U \leq M$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) M/U has a projective δ -cover.
- (2) If $V \leq M$ and $M = U + V$, then U has a δ -supplement $U' \leq V$ such that U' has a projective δ -cover.
- (3) U has a δ -supplement U' which has a projective δ -cover.

Proof. “(1) \Rightarrow (2)” Let $f : P \rightarrow M/U$ be a projective δ -cover. Since $M = U + V$, $g : V \rightarrow M/U$ via $v \mapsto v + U$ is an epimorphism. Since P is projective, there is a homomorphism $h : P \rightarrow V$ such that $f = gh$. It is easy to see that $M = U + h(P)$, where $h(P) \leq V$. Now $\text{Ker } f \ll_\delta P$, so we have $U \cap h(P) = h(\text{Ker } f) \ll_\delta h(P)$ and $h(P)$ is a δ -supplement of U in M . Since $\text{Ker } h \leq \text{Ker } f \ll_\delta P$, $h : P \rightarrow h(P)$ is a projective δ -cover.

“(2) \Rightarrow (3)” It is obvious.

“(3) \Rightarrow (1)” Let $f : P \rightarrow U'$ be a projective δ -cover. Since U' is a δ -supplement of U , the natural epimorphism $g : U' \rightarrow U'/U \cap U' \simeq U + U'/U = M/U$ is a δ -cover. Hence $hgf : P \rightarrow M/U$ is a projective δ -cover by Lemma 4.3, where $h : U'/U \cap U' \simeq U + U'/U$ is an isomorphism \square

THEOREM 4.6. *Let M be a module. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) M is δ -semiperfect.
- (2) M is amply δ -supplemented by δ -supplements which have projective δ -covers.
- (3) M is δ -supplemented by δ -supplements which have projective δ -covers.

Proof. It is clear from Theorem 4.5. \square

Example 4.7. A δ -semiperfect module is not necessarily semiperfect. Let $Q = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$, where each $F_i = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let R be the subring of Q generated by $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$ and 1_Q . Then R_R is δ -semiperfect but not semiperfect. It is also seen that R_R is a δ -supplemented module but not a supplemented module (see [1, Example 4.1]).

References

- [1] Y. Zhou, “Generalizations of perfect, semiperfect, and semiregular rings,” *Algebra Colloquium*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 305–318, 2000.
- [2] E. P. Armendariz, “Rings with DCC on essential left ideals,” *Communications in Algebra*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 299–308, 1980.
- [3] I. Al-Khazzi and P. F. Smith, “Modules with chain conditions on superfluous submodules,” *Communications in Algebra*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 2331–2351, 1991.
- [4] V. Camillo and M. F. Yousif, “CS-modules with ACC or DCC on essential submodules,” *Communications in Algebra*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 655–662, 1991.
- [5] Y. Wang and N. Ding, “Generalized supplemented modules,” *Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 1589–1601, 2006.
- [6] R. Wisbauer, *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*, vol. 3 of *Algebra, Logic and Applications*, Gordon and Breach Science, Philadelphia, Pa, USA, German edition, 1991.
- [7] F. W. Anderson and K. R. Fuller, *Rings and Categories of Modules*, vol. 13 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 1974.

Yongduo Wang: Department of Applied Mathematics, Lanzhou University of Technology, Lanzhou 730050, China

Email address: ydwang333@vip.sohu.com

Special Issue on Time-Dependent Billiards

Call for Papers

This subject has been extensively studied in the past years for one-, two-, and three-dimensional space. Additionally, such dynamical systems can exhibit a very important and still unexplained phenomenon, called as the Fermi acceleration phenomenon. Basically, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration (FA) is a process in which a classical particle can acquire unbounded energy from collisions with a heavy moving wall. This phenomenon was originally proposed by Enrico Fermi in 1949 as a possible explanation of the origin of the large energies of the cosmic particles. His original model was then modified and considered under different approaches and using many versions. Moreover, applications of FA have been of a large broad interest in many different fields of science including plasma physics, astrophysics, atomic physics, optics, and time-dependent billiard problems and they are useful for controlling chaos in Engineering and dynamical systems exhibiting chaos (both conservative and dissipative chaos).

We intend to publish in this special issue papers reporting research on time-dependent billiards. The topic includes both conservative and dissipative dynamics. Papers discussing dynamical properties, statistical and mathematical results, stability investigation of the phase space structure, the phenomenon of Fermi acceleration, conditions for having suppression of Fermi acceleration, and computational and numerical methods for exploring these structures and applications are welcome.

To be acceptable for publication in the special issue of Mathematical Problems in Engineering, papers must make significant, original, and correct contributions to one or more of the topics above mentioned. Mathematical papers regarding the topics above are also welcome.

Authors should follow the Mathematical Problems in Engineering manuscript format described at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	December 1, 2008
First Round of Reviews	March 1, 2009
Publication Date	June 1, 2009

Guest Editors

Edson Denis Leonel, Departamento de Estatística, Matemática Aplicada e Computação, Instituto de Geociências e Ciências Exatas, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Avenida 24A, 1515 Bela Vista, 13506-700 Rio Claro, SP, Brazil ; edleonel@rc.unesp.br

Alexander Loskutov, Physics Faculty, Moscow State University, Vorob'evy Gory, Moscow 119992, Russia; loskutov@chaos.phys.msu.ru