Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.
VOL. 21 NO. 4 (1998) 801-814

TAG-MODULES WITH COMPLEMENT SUBMODULES H-PURE

SURJEET SINGH
Department of Mathematics
Kuwait university
PO Box 5969
Safat 13060
Kuwait
MOHD Z. KHAN
Department of Mathematics
Aligarh Muslim university
Aligarh, (U.P.) 202001
India

(Received February 5, 1996 and in revised form August 11, 1997)

ABSTRACT

The concept of a QTAG-module M_R was given by Singh[8]. The structure theory of such modules has been developed on similar lines as that of torsion abelian groups. If a module M_R is such that $M \oplus M$ is a QTAG-module, it is called a strongly TAG-module. This in turn leads to the concept of a primary TAG-module and its periodicity. In the present paper some decomposition theorems for those primary TAG-modules in which all h-neat submodules are h-pure are proved. Unlike torsion abelian groups, there exist primary TAG-modules of infinite periodicities. Such modules are studied in the last section. The results proved in this paper indicate that the structure theory of primary TAG-modules of infinite periodicity is not very similar to that of torsion abelian groups.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES: QTAG-modules, complement submodules, h-pure submodules, h-neat submodules, and basic submodules.

1991 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES: 16D70; 20K10

ξ 1 INTRODUCTION

A module M_R satisfying the following two conditions is called a TAG-module [2].

(I) Every finitely generated submodule of any homomorphic image of M is a direct sum of uniserial modules.

(II) Given any two uniserial submodules U and V of a homomorphic image of M, for any submodule W of U, any homomorphism $f: W \to V$ can be extended to a homomorphism $g: U \to V$ provided the composition length $d(U/W) \leq d(V/f(W))$.

If a module satisfies condition (I), it is called a QTAG-module [8]. The main purpose of this paper is to prove some decomposition theorems for a module M, such that $M \oplus M$ is a QTAG-module and that
is to prove some decomposition theorems for a module M, such that $M \oplus M$ is a QTAG-module and that
every h-neat (complement) submodule of M is h-pure. An example of such an h-reduced primary TAG -

module, which is not decomposable, is given at the end of the paper. However, it follows fron the results in this paper that any torsion reduced module over a bounded (hnp)-ring, with every complement submodule pure, is decomposable. The main results are given in Theorems (5.5), (5.12) and (5.14). In section 3, a necessary and sufficient condition for a QTAG-module to admit only one basic submomdule is given. In section 4 the concept of neat height of a uniform element in a QTAG-module is discussed. The concept of neat height is used to give, in Theorems (4.6) and (4.7), some criterians for a QTAGmodule, such that every h-neat module is l-embedded in the sense of Moore[5]. The results in sections 3 and 4 can be of independent interest.

§ 2 PRELIMINARIES

A module in which the lattice of its submodules is linearly ordered under inclusion is called a serial module; in addition if it has finite composition length, it is called a uniserial module. Let M_R be a QTAG-module. An $x \in M$ is called a uniform element, if xR is a non-zero uniform (hence uniserial) submodule of M. For any module A_R with a composition series, d(A) denotes its composition length. Let $x \in M$ be uniform. Then $e(x) = d(xR)$ is called the exponent of x. The equation $[x, y] = n$, will give that y is a uniform element of M, such that $x \in yR$ and $d(yR/xR) = n$. For basic definitions of height of an element of M, the submodule $H_k(M)$ for $k \geq 0$, one may refer to [6] or [8]. For any submodule N of M, and any $y \in N$, $h_N(y)$ will denote the height of y in N; however we write $h(y)$ for $h_M(y)$. A submodule N of M is said to be h-pure in M, if $H_k(M) \cap N = H_k(N)$ for every $k \geq 0$. For any module K, soc(K) denotes the socle of K. M_R is said to be decomposable, if it is a direct sum of uniserial modules.

By using [8, Lemma(2.3)], one can prove the following:

Proposition(2.1). A submodule N of a QTAG-module M is h-pure in M if and only if for any uniform $x \in soc(N)$, $h_N(x) = h(x)$.

The following is of frequent use in this paper.

Proposition(2.2) [8, Lemma(3.9)]. Let N be any h-pure submodule of a QTAG-module M. Then for any uniform $x \in M$, there exists a uniform $x' \in M$, such that for $\bar{x} = x + M \in M/N$, $e(\bar{x}) = e(x')$, $\bar{x} = \bar{x'}$ and $M \cap x'R = 0$.

By using the above proposition, we get that if M/N is decomposable for some h-pure submodule N, then $M = T \oplus N$, for some decomposable submodule T of M. Let K_R be any module. For the definitions of K-injective modules and K-projective modules one may refer to [1]. Lemmas (2.2) and (2.4) in [8] give the following:

Proposition(2.3). Let A and B be two uniserial submodules of a QTAG-modules M, such that $A \cap B = 0$.

(i) If $d(A) \leq d(B)$, then B is A-injective.

(ii) If $d(A) \geq d(B)$, then B is A-projective.

(iii) If $d(A) = d(B)$, then $A \cong B$ if and only if either $soc(A) \cong soc(B)$, or $A/H_1(A) \cong B/H_1(B)$.

M is said to be bounded, if for some k, $H_k(M) = 0$. Any h-pure bounded submodule of M is a summand of M [8, Remark(3.8)]. M is said to be h-divisible, if $h(x) = \infty$ for every $x \in M$. If a uniform element $x \in soc(M)$ has finite height, then for any uniform $y \in M$, with $[x, y] = h(x)$, yR being an h-pure submodule of M, is a summand of M. For general properties of rings and modules one may refer to [3].

ξ3 BASIC SUBMODULES

Throughout M_R is a QTAG-module. A submodule B of M is called a basic submodule of M, if B is a decomposable h-pure submodule of M, such that M/B is h-divisible [7]. As pointed out in [8, Remark(3.12)], M has a basic submodule and any two basic submodules of M are isomorphic.

Lemma(3.1). Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$ be any finitely many uniserial summands of M, such that $d(A_i) < d(A_{i+1})$ and $N = \sum_{i=1}^{k} A_i = \oplus \sum_{i=1}^{k} A_i$. Then N is an h-pure submodule of M.

Proof. Consider a uniform element $x \in soc(N)$. Then $x = \Sigma x_i$, $x_i \in A_i$. If for any $i < j$, $x_i \neq 0 \neq x_j$, then by the hypothesis $h(x_i) < h(x_j)$. Thus $h(x) = \{h(x_i) : x_i \neq 0\}$. As each A_i is h-pure, $h(x_i) = h_{A_i}(x_i) = h_N(x_i)$. This gives $h(x) = h_N(x)$. Hence N is -pure.

Lemma(3.2). Let M be such that $\cap_k H_k(M) = 0$ and let M have a basic submodule $B \neq M$. Then for some simple submodule S of soc(M), there exists an h-pure submodule $N = \oplus \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_i R$ such that every y_iR is uniserial, $d(y_iR) < d(y_{i+1}R)$ and $S \cong soc(y_iR)$. The heights of the (non-zero) elements of the homogeneous components of soc(M), determined by S, do not have an upper bound.

Proof. Let $\bar{M} = M/B$. Consider a uniform $\bar{z}$ in $soc(\bar{M})$. By (2.2) there exists a uniform $z_1 \in soc(M)$ such that $\bar{z} = \bar{z}_1$. As $\cap_k H_k(M) = 0$, $h(z_1)$ is finite. Let $h(z_1) = n_1$. Then there exists $y_1 \in M$, such that $[z_1, y_1] = n_1$. Then y_1R is an h-pure submodule of M and $B \cap y_1R = 0$. However $h(\bar{z}) = \infty$. So there exists a uniform $u_1 \in M$ with $soc(\bar{u}_1) = \bar{z}R$ and $e(\bar{u}_1) > n_1$ By (2.2) we get uniform $z_2 \in soc(M)$ with $\bar{z}_2 = \bar{z}$, $h(z_2) = n_2 > n_1$. We get $y_2 \in M$ such that $[z_2, y_2] = n_2$. By continuing this process, we get an infinite sequence of uniform elements $\{y_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ of M, such that each y_iR is an h-pure uniserial submodule, $soc(y_iR) = z_iR$ for some $z_i \in M$ satisfying $\bar{z} = \bar{z}_i$, $[z_i, y_i] = n_i = h(z_i)$ and $n_i < n_{i+1}$. If $K = \sum_i y_i R$ is not a direct sum, we get a smallest $i \geq 2$, such that $z_i \in \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} z_k R$. Then $N = \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} y_k R = \oplus \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} y_k R$. By (3.1) N is an h-pure submodule of M. For any uniform $v \in N$, if $v = \Sigma v_j$, with $v_j \in y_jR$, then $h(v) = \min\{h(v_j)\}$ This gives $h(z_i) \leq \max\{h(z_k) : 1 \leq k \leq i-1\}$. This is a contradiction,as $h(z_j) < h(z_i)$ for $j < i$. Hence $K = \oplus\Sigma y_iR$. By using (3 1) we get that K is an h-pure submodule. Clearly soc(K) is homogeneous. The last part is obvious.

Lemma(3.3). Let M be a QTAG-modue such that $M = \oplus \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_i R$, y_iR uniserial, $soc(y_iR) \cong soc(y_{i+1}R)$ and $d(y_iR) < d(y_{i+1}R)$. Then M has a basic submodule $B \neq M$.

Proof. By (2.3)(i) we get monomorphisms $\sigma_i : y_iR \to y_{i+1}R$. Write $\sigma_i(y_i) = w_i$. Then w_i is uniform and $e(w_i) = e(y_i)$. Consider $B = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} w_iR$, and $\overline{M} = M/B$ Let $z \in B$. Then $z = \sum_{i=1}^{s}(y_i - \sigma_i(y_i))r_i = y_1R + \sum_{i=2}^{s}(y_ir_i - \sigma_{i-1}(y_{i-1})r_{i-1}) - \sigma_s(y_s)r_s$, for some $r_i \in R$ and a positive integer s. Here $y_ir_i - \sigma_{i-1}(y_{i-1})r_{i-1} \in y_iR$ and $-\sigma_s(y_sr_s) \in y_{s+1}R$.. Using this, it can be easily proved that $B = \oplus\Sigma w_iR$ and $y_1R \cap B = 0$. Now $\overline{y_1} = \overline{\sigma_1(y_1)}$, and $e(\sigma_1(y_1)) = e(\overline{\sigma_1(y_1)})$. So that $\sigma_1(y_1)R \cap B = 0$. As $\sigma_1(y_1)R \subseteq y_2R$, we get $y_2R \cap B = 0$. By continuing this process, we get $y_iR \cap B = 0$. Clearly $\bar{y}_1 R < \bar{y}_2 R <\ldots$, gives $\overline{M}$ is a serial module of infinite length. It only remains to prove that B is h-pure. In view of (3.1) it is enough to prove that each w_iR is h-pure. Now $y_iR \oplus y_{i+1}R$ being a summand of M, is h-pure. But $y_iR \oplus y_{i+1}R = w_iR \oplus y_{i+1}R$. So w_iR is h-pure in M. This completes the proof.

Theorem(3.4). A QTAG-module M_R has no basic submodule other than M if and only if M is h-reduced and for each homogeneous component K of soc(M), there exists an upper bound on the heights of members of K

Proof. Let M be its only basic submodule. Then by definition M is decomposable and h-reduced. For a simple submodule S of M, we get a summand M_S of M, such that $soc(M_S)$ is the homogeneous component of soc(M) determined by S. If heights of members of $soc(M_S)$ do not have an upper bound, we get a summand $N = \oplus\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_iR$ of M_S such that each y_iR is uniserial and $d(y_iR) < d(y_{i+1}R)$. By (3.3) N has a basic submodule $B_1 \neq N$. As N is a summand of M, we get a basic submodule B of M of which B_1 is a summand and $B \neq M$. This is a contradiction. Conversely let the given conditions hold. Then $\cap_k H_k(M) = 0$. The rest follows from (3.3).

§ 4. H-NEAT HEIGHT

Throughout M_R is a QTAG-module. A submodule N of M is called an h-neat submodule of M if $H_1(M) \cap N = H_1(N)$. As observed in [8], any submodule N of M is h neat if and only if it is a complement submodule of M, any maximal essential extension K′ of a submodule K of M, is an h-neat submodule of M. Any such K′ is called an h-neat hull of K. For any uniform $x \in M$, the minimum of all $d(K'/xR)$, where K′ runs over all h-neat hulls of xR, is called the h-neat height of x : it is denoted by $h'(x)$. If $x \in N \subseteq M$, then $h'_N(x)$ will denote the neat height of x in N. If N is an h-neat submodule of M, then any h-neat submodule of N is h-neat in M, so that for any uniform $x \in N$, $h'(x) \leq h'_N(x)$. We put $h'(0) = \infty$. In an h-divisible QTAG-module M, every uniform element is of infinite h-neat height.

For any two modules A_R and B_R any homomorphism from a submodule of A into B is called a subhomomorphism from A to B; the set of all subhomomorphisms from A to B is denoted by SH(A, B). An $f \in$ SH(A, B) is said to be maximal, if it has no extension in SH(A, B). Now (2.3) gives the following:

Lemma(4.1). Let xR and yR be any two uniserial submodules of M, such that $xR \cap yR = 0$. Then

(a) For any maximal $f \in$ SH(xR, yR), either domain(f) = xR or range(f) = yR.

(b) Let $z \in xR \oplus yR$ be unifrom, $z = x' + y'$, $x' \in xR$, $y' \in yR$ and $d(x'R) \geq d(y'R)$. The following hold:

(i). $zR \cong x'R$.

(ii) Given any $u = v+w$, $v \in xR$, $w \in yR$ such that $z \in uR$,

(α) if $y' \neq 0$, then $[x', v] = [y', w]$;

(β) if $y' = 0$, then $e(w) \leq [x', v]$

Lemma (4.2). Let xR and yR be two uniserial submodules of M such that $xR \cap yR = 0$. Let $z = x'+y'$, $x' \in xR$, $y' \in yR$, be uniform such that $d(y'R) \leq d(x'R)$. For $T = xR \oplus yR$, the following hold:

(i). For $y' \neq 0$, $h'_T(z)$ is the minimum of $[x', x]$ and $[y', y]$.

(ii). For $y' = 0$, let $f \in SH(xR, yR)$ be maximal with $s = d(\ker f))$, minimal under the condition that $x'R \subseteq \ker f$. If domain(f) = uR, then $h'_T(z) = [x', u]$ = minimum of $[x', x]$ and $e(y) + s - e(x')$.

Proof. $g : x'R \to y'R$ such that $g(x'r) = y'r$ is an R-epimorphism. If $w = a+b$, $a \in xR$, $b \in yR$, is uniform and $z \in wR$, then $f : aR \to bR$ such that $f(ar) = br$, is an extension of g; further $[z, w] = [x', a]$. Any extension $h : a'R \to yR$, $a' \in xR$, of g gives uniform $w' = a' + h(a')$ such that $z \in w'R$. Consequently wR is an h-neat hull of zR if and only if f is maximal. In that case by (4.1) either domain(f) = xR or range(f) = yR. Thus for domain(f) = aR, and uR = ker f, e(a) is the minimum of e(x) and e(y)+e(u). To minimize e(a), we need to minimise s = e(u). So that for minimal e(u), $h'_T(z) = [x', a] = e(a) - e(x') = \min\{e(x), e(y)+e(u)\} - e(x') = \min\{[x', x], e(y)+e(u) - e(x')\}$, as $e(x) - e(x') = [x', x]$ If $y' \neq 0$, then $e(x') = e(u)+e(y')$, so that $e(y)+e(u) - e(x') = e(y) - e(y') = [y', y]$. For $y' = 0$, it is obvious that $x'R \subseteq \ker f$. This proves the result.

Lemma(4.3). Let $M = A \oplus B$ and $x \in M$ be uniform. If $x = a+b$, $a \in A$, $b \in B$ and $d(aR) \geq d(bR)$, then the following hold:

(i). For $b \neq 0$, $h'(x) = \min\{h'_A(a), h'_B(b)\}$.

(ii). If $b = 0$, and B is h-divisible, then $h'(x) = h'_A(a)$

Proof. Now $g : aR \to bR$ given by $g(ar) = br$, is an epimorphism. Let π_1 and π_2 be the projections $A \oplus B \to A$, and $A \oplus B \to B$ respectively. Consider an h-neat hull K of xR. Then K is serial. Let $K_i = \pi_i(K)$. As $d(bR) \leq d(aR)$, we get an epimorphism $\sigma : K_1 \to K_2$ such that for any $x_1 \in K_1$, $\sigma(x_1) = x_2$ if and only if $x_1+x_2 \in K$. Further $aR \subseteq K_1$, $bR \subseteq K_2$ and $d(K/xR) = d(K_1/aR)$ By using (2.3) we get that either K_1 is h-neat or K_2 is h-neat in M.

Case I : $b \neq 0$. Then either K_1 is an h-neat hull of aR or K_2 is an h-neat hull of bR. So that $h'(x) \geq \min\{h'_T(a), h'_T(b)\}$. Let $t = \min\{h'_A(a), h'_B(b)\} < h'(x)$. To be definite let $t = h'_A(a)$. Then we get an h-neat hull a_1R of aR with $[a, a_1] = t$, and a uniform b_1 in M with $[b, b_1] \geq t$. By (2.3) g extends to a homomorphism $f: a_1R \to b_1R$. Then $(a_1+f(a_1))R$ is an h-neat hull of xR with $[x, a_1+f(a_1)] < h'(x)$ This is a contradiction. Similar arguments hold if $t = h'_B(b)$ This proves (i).

Case II : $b = 0$ and B is h-divisible. Any h-neat serial submodule of B is either zero or of infinite length. Thus for K to be an h-neat hull of xR it is necessary and sufficient that K_1 is an h-neat hull of aR.

Thus for $x = a$, $h'(x) = h'_A(a)$

Lemma(4.4). Let $K_R = \oplus\sum_{i=1}^{t} x_i R$ be a QTAG-module with each x_iR uniserial. Let $z = \Sigma z_i$, $z_i \in x_iR$, be uniform. Let z_u be such that $e(z) = e(z_u)$. Then $h'(z)$ is the minimum of the following numbers :

(i). All $[z_i, x_i]$. with $z_i \neq 0$.

(ii). The neat heights of z_u in various $x_uR \oplus x_jR$, with $z_j = 0$.

Proof. The hypothesis on z_u gives that for any i, $\sigma_i : z_uR \to z_iR$ such that $\sigma_i(z_ur) = z_ir$ is an epimorphims. Let $y = \Sigma y_i$, $y_i \in x_iR$, be any uniform element in K such that $z \in yR$. Then $\eta_i : y_uR \to y_iR$ given by $\eta_i(y_ur) = y_ir$ is an extension of σ_i. Clearly if a $z_i \neq 0$, then $[z_u, y_u] = [z_i, y_i]$. So that e(y) is not more than s, the minimum of all those $[z_i, x_i]$ for which $z_i \neq 0$. Thus $h'(z) \leq s$. However, if every $z_i \neq 0$, then by (2.3), it is immediate that for yR to be an h-neat hull of zR, it is necessary that $[z, y] = s$, i.e $h'(z) = s$. Suppose that for some j, $z_j = 0$ and that for $T = x_uR \oplus x_jR$, $h'_T(z_u) < s$. We have a maximal f $\in SH(x_uR, x_jR)$ with ker f of smallest length among those containing z_uR. Let w_uR = domain(f), then $s' = h'_T(z_u) = [z_u, w_u]$. By using (2.3), we obtain a uniform $y = \Sigma_i y_i$ with $z \in yR$, $y_u = w_u$ and $y_j = f(w_u)$. Then yR is an h-neat hull of zR such that $[z, y] = s'$. Thus $h'(z) \leq s_0$, the minimum of the numbers listed in (i) and (ii). Suppose $h'(z) < s_0$. We get a uniform $w = \Sigma w_i$, $w_i \in x_iR$ such that wR is an h-neat hull of zR and $[z, w] = h'(z)$. Then for some j, $w_jR = x_jR$. For this j, $z_j = 0$ and $(w_u+w_j)R$ is an h-neat hull of z_uR. Consequently for $T = x_uR \oplus x_uR$, $h'_T(z_u) \leq h'(z)$. This is a contradiction. This completes the proof.

We now give a criterian in terms of h-neat heights, for a QTAG-module , in which every h-neat submodule is h-pure. We shall give a more general result. Analogous to the definition of an l-embedded subgroup of an abelian p-group given by Moore [5], we define an l-embedded submodule of a QTAG-module. Let Z^+ be the set of all non-negative integers and $l : Z^+ \to Z^+$ be any function such that $n \leq l(n)$, $n \in Z^+$. A submodule N of a QTAG-module M is said to be l-embedded if $H_{l(n)}(M) \cap N \subseteq H_n(N)$ for every $n \in Z^+$. Thus if I is the identity map on Z^+, a submodule N of M is h-pure in M if and only if N is I-embedded. Given $l : Z^+ \to Z^+$ satisfying $l(n) \geq n$, we define $l_1 : Z^+ \to Z^+$ such that for any $n \in Z^+$, $l_1(n)$ is the minimum of all $l(k)$, $k \geq n$. Then l_1 is monotonic. Further any submodule N of M is l-embedded if and only if it is l_1-embedded. So without loss of generality we assume that l is monotic. Further define $l(\infty) = \infty$.

Proposition 4.5. Let M be an h-reduced QTAG-module and $l : Z^+ \to Z^+$ be a monotonic function such that $n \leq l(n)$, $n \in Z^+$. Then every h-neat submodule of M is l-embedded if and only if $h(y) \leq l(h'(y) + 1) - 1$ for every uniform $y \in M$.

Proof. Let every h-neat submodule of M be l-embedded. Consider a uniform $y \in M$. As M is h-reduced, every h-neat hull of yR is of finite length. Let zR be an h-neat hull of yR such that $[y, z] = h'(y) = t$. Then $H_t(zR) = yR$ and $H_{t+1}(zR) < yR$. Then by the hypothesis, $H_{l(t)}(M) \cap zR \subseteq H_t(zR) = yR$, but $H_{l(t+1)}(M) \cap zR < yR$. Consequently $h(y) \leq l(t+1)-1 = l(h'(y) + 1) - 1$ Conversely let the inequality hold. So every uniform $y \in M$ has finite height. Let there exist an h-neat submodule N of M that is not l-

embedded. We get smallest positive integer n such that $H_{l(n)}(M) \cap N \not\subset H_n(N)$. Then $H_{l(n-1)}(M) \cap N \subset H_{n-1}(N)$. There exists a uniform $y \in H_{l(n)}(M) \cap N$ such that $y \notin H_n(N)$. As $l(n) \geq l(n-1)$, $y \in H_{n-1}(N)$. So that $h_N(y) = n-1$. Consequently $h'(y) \leq n-1$. By the hypothesis $h(y) \leq l(h'(y)+1)-1 \leq l(n)-1$. However as $y \in H_{l(n)}(M)$, $h(y) \geq l(n)$. This is a contradiction. This proves the result.

Theorem(4.6). Let M be any QTAG-module and $l : Z^+ \to Z^+$ be a monotonic function such that $n \leq l(n)$, $n \in Z^+$. Then every h-neat submodule of M is l-embedded if and only if for any uniform $y \in M$, $h(y) \leq l(h'(y)+1)-1$.

Proof. Let every h-neat submodule of M be l-embedded. Write $M = L \oplus D$, where D is the largest h-divisible submodule of M. Now L is h-reduced and every h-neat submodule of L is l-embedded in L. Consider a uniform $y \in M$. Write $y = y_1+y_2$, $y_1 \in L$, $y_2 \in D$. Suppose $y_1 \neq 0$. Then $h(y) = h(y_1)$. By (4.3), $h'(y) = h'_L(y_1)$ By using (4.5), we get $h(y) = h(y_1) \leq l(h'(y)+1)-1$. Suppose $y_1 = 0$. then $y = y_2 \in D$, hence and $h(y) = \infty$. Let K be any h-neat hull of yR. Consider any $n \geq 0$. Then $H_{l(n)}(M) = H_{l(n)}(L) \oplus D$. As $K \cap D \neq 0$, $H_{l(n)}(M) \cap K \subseteq H_n(K)$, we get $H_n(K) \neq 0$. So that $d(K) = \infty$, $h'(y) = \infty = h(y)$. Once again $h(y) = l(h'(y)+1)-1$. Conversely let the given condition be satisfied. By essentially following the arguments in (4.5), we complete the proof.

Theorem(4.7). Let $M = L \oplus D$ be a QTAG-module such that L is h-reduced and D is h-divisible. For a monotonic function $l : Z^+ \to Z^+$ satisfying $n \leq l(n)$, every h-neat submodule of M is l-embedded if and only if

(i) every h-neat submodule of L is l-embedded in L; and

(ii) for any serial submodue W of D, any non-zero homomorphism $f : W \to L$ is a monomorphism.

Proof. Let every h-neat submodule of M be l-embedded. Then obviously (i) hold. Consider a non-zero homomorphism $f : W \to L$ with $\ker f \neq 0$. then $bR = soc(W) \subset \ker f$. Consider $soc(f(W)) = b_1R$. As $h(b_1) < \infty$, by using (2.3) we can choose W to be such that $f(W)$ is h-neat in L. Then $L_1 = \{x+f(x) : x \in W\}$ is an h-neat hull of bR. So that $h'(b) < \infty$. By (4.6) $h'(b) = \infty$. This gives a contradiction.

Conversely, let the conditions be satisfied. Consider a uniform $y \in M$. Let $y = y_1+y_2$, $y_1 \in L$, $y_2 \in D$. Suppose $y_1 \neq 0$. Then by (4.3) $h(y) = h_L(y_1) \leq l(h'_L(y_1)+1)-1$. Suppose $y_1 = 0$. Then $y = y_2 \in D$. Let K be any h-neat hull of yR. Let K_1 and K_2 be projections of K in L and D respectively. Then $K \cong K_2$ and we get an epimorphism $f : K_2 \to K_1$ with $y \in \ker f$. By (ii), $f = 0$. Consequently $K \subseteq D$ and hence $d(K) = \infty$. So once again $h(y) = l(h'(y)+1)-1$. Hence (4.6) completes the proof.

By taking $l = I$, we get the following:

Corollary (4.8). Let $M = L \oplus D$ be a QTAG-module such that L is h-reduced and D is h-divisible Then the following are equivalent:

(i) Every h-neat submodule of M is h-pure in M.

(ii) For any uniform $y \in M$, $h(y) = h'(y)$.

(iii) Evey h-neat submodule of L is h-pure and for any uniserial submodule W of D any non-zero homomorphism $f : W \to L$ is a monomorphism

ξ 5. H-NEAT SUBMODULES

A module M_R is called a strongly TAG-modue, if $M \oplus M$ is a QTAG-module. We start with the following:

Lemma(5.1). Let M_R be a strongly TAG-module, A and B be two uniserial submodules of some homomorphic images of M . Then the following hold:

(i) If $d(A) \leq d(B)$, then B is A-injective.

(ii) If $d(A) \geq d(B)$, then B is A-projective.

(iii) If $d(A) = d(B)$, then $A \cong B$, whenever $soc(A) \cong soc(B)$ or $A/H_1(A) \cong B/H_1(B)$.

(iv) M is a TAG-module.

Proof. Now A and B are submodules of M/K and M/L for some submodules K and L of M. As $N = M/K \oplus M/L$ is a homorphic image of $M \oplus M$, $A\times 0$, $0\times B$ are submodules of N with zero intersection, (i), (ii), and (iii) follow from (2.3). Finally (iv) follows from (i).

Let M_R be a strongly TAG-module. Let spec(M) be the set of all simple R-modules which occur as composition factors of some finitely generated submodules of M. Let $S, S' \in spec(M)$. Then S' is called an immediate predecessor of S (and S is called an immediate successor of S') if for some uniserial submodule A of M, $A/H_1(A) \cong S'$ and $H_1(A)/H_2(A) \cong S$. By using (5.1) we get that any $S \in spec(M)$ does not have more than one immediate successor and more than one immediate predecessor.(see also [9]). Let $S, S' \in spec(M)$, S' is called a k-th successor of S, if there exists a sequence $S = S_0, S_1, \dots, S_k = S'$ of k+1 distinct members S_i of spec(M), such that for $i < k$, S_{i+1} is an immediate successor of S_i; in this situation S is called a k-th predecessor of S'. S is called its own 0-th successor(0-th predecessor). $S'$is called a successor of S , if S' is a k-th successor of S for some positive integer k. Define $S \sim S'$ if for some $k \geq 0$, S' is a k-th successor or k-th predecessor of S. This is an equivalence relation. Any equivalence class C determined by this relation is called a primary class. For a torsion abelian group, each such C is a singleton. However for a torsion module over a bounded (hnp)-ring, each C is finite. For any primary class C in spec(M), the submodule M_c of all those $x \in M$ such that every composition factor of xR is in C, is called the C-primary submodule of M. By using (5.1) one can easily see that M is a direct sum of its C-primary submodules. A module M is called a primary TAG-module if $M \oplus M$ is a TAG-module such that spec(M) is a primary class. Consider a primary TAG-modue M. Let spec(M) have k members, then either k is finite or countable. This k is called the periodicity of M. In this section we study primary TAG-modules.

Lemma(5.2). Let M_R be an h-reduced primary TAG-module of finite periodicity. If there exists a function $f : Z^+ \to Z^+$ such that for any uniform $x \in M$, $h(x) \leq f(h'(x))$, then M is bounded.

Proof. Let M be of periodicity k. For any uniform $x \in M$, $h'(x) < \infty$. This gives $h(x) \leq f(h'(x)) < \infty$. Suppose M is not bounded. Then M has uniserial summands of arbitrarily large lengths. So we can write $M = x_1R \oplus x_2R \oplus M'$, with x_iR non-zero uniserial, $z_iR = soc(x_iR)$, $h(z_2) > \max\{f(j) : 1 \le j \le k+d(x_1R)\}$and $e(x_2) > k$. Now $h(z_2) = [z_2, x_2]$. As M is of periodicity k and $e(x_2) > k$, we get $y_2 \in x_2R$ such that $[z_2, y_2] \le k-1$ and $soc(x_2R/y_2R) \cong soc(x_1R)$. This gives a maximal $g \in SH(x_2R, x_1R)$ with d(ker g) $\le k$ and $z_2R \subseteq$ ker g. Consequently $d(domain(g)) \le k+d(x_1R)$, $h'(z_2) \le k+d(x_1R)$. As $h(z_2) \le f(h'(z_2))$, we get $h(z_2) \le \max\{f(j) : 0 \le j \le k+d(x_1R)\}$. This is a contradiction. Hence M is bounded.

Lemma(5.3).Let M_R be any primary TAG-module of finite periodicity. If every h-neat submodule of M is h-pure, then either M is h-divisible or h-reduced.

Proof. Let M be neither h-reduced nor h-divisible. Then $M = xR \oplus A \oplus M_1$ for some uniform element x and a serial module A of infinite length. Let zR = soc(A). Then $h(z) = \infty$. If the periodicity of M is k, then for some u, $1 \le u \le k$, we get a submodule of A of length u satisfying $soc(A/yR) \cong soc(xR)$. By (2.3), we get a maximal $f \in SH(A, xR)$ with $d(domain(f)) \le e(x)+u$. This gives an h-neat hull K of zR length e(x)+u. As K is h-pure, we get $h(z) = d(K)-1 < \infty$. This is contradiction.Hence the result follows.

Lemma(5.4). Let M_R be a primary TAG-module of finite periodicity k. Let $T = xR \oplus A$ be a submodul eof M, with xR uniserial, such that every h-neat submodule of T is h-pure in T. Then the following hold:

(i) If $soc(xR) \cong soc(A)$, then $d(A) \le d(xR)+k$.

(ii). If soc(xR) is the u-th predecessor of soc(A) for some $u \ge 1$, then $d(A) \le d(xR)+u$.

Proof. Let soc(A) = zR. Let $soc(xR) \cong zR$. For a maximal $f \neq 0$ in SH(A, xR) with $zR \subseteq$ker f and d(ker f) minimal, we have d(ker f) = k, domain(f) = $yR \subseteq A$; further $h'(z) = e(y)-1 = [z, y] \le e(x)+k-1$. However by (4.8), $h'(z) = h(z)$. So yR = A. Consequently $e(y) = d(A) \le d(xR)+k$. Similarly (ii) follows.

We now prove the first decomposition theorem.

Theorem(5.5). Let M_R be a primary TAG-module ofperiodicity $k < \infty$. Then every h-neat submodule of M is h-pure if and only if either M is h-divisible or $M = \oplus\sum_{\alpha\in\Lambda} x_\alpha R$ such that :

(i). each $x_\alpha R$ is uniserial; and

(ii) for any two distinct $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ the following hold :

(a) if $soc(x_\alpha R) \cong soc(x_\beta R)$, then $d(x_\beta R) \le d(x_\alpha R)+k$,

(b) if $soc(x_\beta R)$ is a u-th predecessor of $soc(x_\alpha R)$, $1 \le u \le k-1$, then $d(x_\alpha R) \le d(x_\beta R)+u$.

Proof. Let every h-neat submodule of M be h-pure. By (5.2) M is either h-divisible or h-reduced Let M be h-reduced. By (5.2) M is bounded. So that $M = \oplus\sum_{\alpha\in\Lambda} x_\alpha R$, for some uniserial submodules $x_\alpha R$ By applying (5.4) we complete the necessity. Conversely let the given conditions be satisfied. If M is h-divisible, then every h-neat submodule N of M being h-divisible, is a summand of M, consequently N is h-pure. Let M be h-reduced. Consider a uniform $z = \sum_{\alpha\in\Lambda} z_\alpha \in M$ with $z_\alpha \in x_\alpha R$. Then $h(z) = \min\{h(z_\alpha) : z_\alpha \neq 0\} = \min\{[z_\alpha, x_\alpha] : z_\alpha \neq 0\}$. Consider $T = x_\alpha R \oplus x_\beta R$ with $z_\alpha \neq 0$, $z_\beta \neq 0$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$. Let $f \in SH(x_\alpha R, x_\beta R)$ be maximal with the property that $z_\alpha R \subseteq$ ker f and d(ker f) is minimal. Either domain(f) = $x_\alpha R$ or range(f)

$= x_\beta R$. If $f = 0$, obviously domain(f) $= x_\alpha R$. Let $f \neq 0$. If $soc(x_\alpha R) \cong soc(x_\beta R)$, then d(ker f) $= \lambda k$ for some $\lambda > 0$. If $soc(x_\alpha R) \not\cong soc(x_\beta R)$, then for some $u \geq 1$ $soc(x_\beta R)$ is the u-th predecessor of $soc(x_\alpha R)$ and d(ker f) $= u+\mu k$ for some $\mu \geq 0$. Thus (a) and (b) yield domain(f) $= x_\alpha R$. Cosequently $h'_T(z_\alpha) = [z_\alpha , x_\alpha] = h(z_\alpha)$ By (4.4), $h'(z) = h(z)$. This proves the result.

The periodicity of a torsion abelian p-group is one. We get the following:

Corollary(5.6). Every neat subgroup of an abelian p-group G . p a prime number, is pure subgroup if and only if either G is a divisible group or $G = A \oplus B$, such that for some positive integer n, A is a direct sum of copies of $Z/(p^n)$ and B is a direct sum of copies of $Z/(p^{n+1})$.

We now discuss the case of a primary TAG-module of infinite periodicity. Henceforth M_R will be a primary TAG-module of infinite periodicity.

Lemma(5.7). Let xR and yR be two h-neat uniserial submodules of M such that $soc(xR) \not\cong soc(yR)$ and soc(yR) is a predecessor of soc(xR). Then :

(i) SH(yR, xR) = 0.

(ii) For any h-neat hull K of $xR \oplus yR$ in M, yR is a summand of K; if in addition xR is h-pure in M, then $K = xR \oplus yR$.

(iii) If xR and yR both are h-pure, then $xR \oplus yR$ is h-pure in M.

Proof. As M is of infinite periodicity and soc(yR) is a predecessor of soc(xR), soc(xR) is not a predecessor of soc(yR). Consequently SH(yR, xR) = 0. Let K be an h-neat hull of $xR \oplus yR$. As rank(K) = 2, $K = A_1 \oplus A_2$ with A_i serial. Consider the projections $f_i : A_1 \oplus A_2 \to A_i$. The restrictiion of one of f_i ,say of f_1 to xR ia a monomorphism. Then $soc(xR) \cong soc(A_1)$ and $soc(yR) \cong soc(A_2)$. Further f_2 embeds yR in A_2. By (i) $SH(A_2, A_1) = 0$. This yields $yR \subseteq A_2$. As $yR \subset' A_2$ annd yR is h-neat, we get $yR = A_2$. Let xR be h-pure in M. So that xR is h-pure in K. Consequently xR is a summand of K. As $xR \not\cong yR$, we get $K = xR \oplus yR$. This proves (ii). Finally let both xR and yR be h-pure in M.Then $M = xR \oplus M_1$ for some submodule M_1. Then $K = xR \oplus (K \cap M_1)$. This gives $yR = K \cap M_1$. So $K \cap M_1$ is h-pure in M_1. Thus $K \cap M_1$ is a summand of M_1. Hence K is a summand of M. This gives (iii).

Lemma(5.8). Let K be any submodule of M with soc(K) homogeneous. Then :

(i) Given any two uniserial submodules A and B of M, either $A \cap B = 0$ or they are comparable under inclusion,

(ii) for any uniform $x \in K$, $h_K(x) = h'_K(x)$, and

(iii) any h-neat submodule of K is h-pure in K.

Proof. (i) Let $A \cap B \neq 0$ and $d(A) \geq d(B)$. Then $A+B = A \oplus C$, with C a proper homomorphic image of B. Suppose $C \neq 0$, then $soc(A) = soc(B) \not\cong soc(C)$. This contradicts the hypothesis that soc(K) is homogeneous. Thus $C = 0$, so $B \subseteq A$. This proves (i). Consider a uniform $x \in K$. Then by (i) xR has unique h-neat hull D in K. Then $h'_K(x) = d(D)-1$. The uniqueness of D gives D is h-pure. Consequently $h_K(x) = d(D)-1$. This proves (ii). The last part is immediate from (ii)

Corollary(5.9). Let xR and yR be two uniserial submodules of M with $xR \cap yR = 0$. Every h-neat submodule of $T = xR \oplus yR$ is h-pure in T if and only if

(i) soc(xR) ≅ soc(yR), or

(ii) soc(xR) ≇ soc(yR), one of them say soc(xR) is a u-th predecessor of soc(yR) for some u ≥ 1 and $d(yR) \leq d(xR)+u$.

Proof. Let every h-neat submodule of T be h-pure. Let soc(xR) ≇ soc(yR), and soc(xR) be a u-th predecessor of soc(yR). Then as in (5.4), we get $d(yR) \leq d(xR) + u$. Conversely, let T satisfy the given conditions. If soc(xR) ≅ soc(yR), then soc(T) is homogeneous, so by (5.8) every h-neat submodule of T is h-pure in T. Let (ii) hold, soc(yR) be a u-th predecessor of soc(xR). As M is of infinite periodicity, soc(xR) is not a predecessor of yR. So SH(yR, xR) = 0, and for any $0 \neq f \in$ SH(xR, yR), d(ker f) = u. Consider a uniform $z = x_1 + y_1$, $x_1 \in xR$, $y_1 \in yR$.. Let $e(x_1) \geq e(y_1)$. If $y_1 \neq 0$, then $e(x_1) = e(y_1)+u$. So $[x_1, x] \leq [y_1, y]$, and hence $h'_T(z) = [x_1, x] = h_T(z)$. Suppose $y_1 = 0$. Consider a maximal $f \in$ SH(xR, yR) with $z \in \ker f$. Then either f = 0 or d(ker f) = u. As $d(xR) \leq d(yR)+u$, domain(f) = xR. Once again $h'_T(z) = [x_1, x] = h_T(z)$. Let $e(y_1) > e(x_1)$, then $x_1 = 0$, as SH(yR, xR) = 0. Then for any uniform $v \in T$, with $z \in z_1R$, we have $z_1 \in yR$. So yR is the only h-neat hull of zR in T. Thus in all cases $h'_T(z) = h_T(z)$. By (4.8), the result follows.

Lemma(5.10). Let N be the submodule of M generated by those uniform elements $x \in M$ such that soc(xR) has no predecessor in soc(M). Then:

(i) Soc(N) is homogeneous.

(ii). N is an h-pure submodule of M.

(iii) Any h-neat submodule of N is h-pure in M.

Proof. Let A be the set of those uniform $x \in M$ such that soc(xR) has no predecessor in soc(M). For any $x, y \in A$, if soc(xR) ≇ soc(yR), then one of them being a successor of the other, contradicts the hypothesis. So that soc(xR) ≅ soc(yR) for all $x, y \in A$. Consider a uniform $z \in$ soc(N). For some $y_i \in A$, $z \in \sum y_iR = \oplus\sum B_j$, B_j's uniserial. For some j, $zR \cong soc(B_j)$. But B_j is a homomorphic image of some y_iR. As soc(y_iR) has no predecessor in soc(M), we get $y_iR \cong B_j$. Hence soc(N) is homogeneous. It is now immediate that if for any uniform $x \in M$, soc(xR) ⊆ N, then $x \in N$. This fact gives (ii). By using (4.8) we get (iii).

The submodule N of M generated by those uniform elements $x \in M$, such that soc(xR) has no predecessor in soc(M) is called a terminal submodule of M. We denote this submodule by Ter(M).

Proposition(5.11). Let M_R be a primary TAG-module of infinite periodicity and N = Ter(M). Then :

(i) Any submodule K of N has unique h-neat hull in M,

(ii) for any uniform $x \in N$, $h(x) = h'(x)$; and

(iii) for any decomposition $M = \oplus\sum_{i\in\Lambda} A_i$, $N = \sum(A_i \cap N)$.

Proof. By (5.10) soc(N) is homogeneous. So given a uniform $x \in N$, by (5.8) any two uniform submodules of N containing x are comparable under inclusion. Thus there is unique h-neat hull A_x of xR in M, and by (5.10) $A_x \subseteq N$. For K, the sum L of those A_x for which $x \in K$, is the unique h-neat hull of K. (ii) is immediate from (i). Consider any uniform $x \in N$. Then $x = \sum x_i$, $x_i \in A_i$. If some $x_i \neq 0$, and the mapping $xR \to x_iR$, $xr \to x_ir$ is not one-to-one, then soc(xR) will have a predecessor in soc(M). This gives a contradiction. Hence $xR \cong x_iR$, whenever $x_i \neq 0$. Thus $x_i \in N$ and (iii) follows.

Theorem(5.12). Let M_R be an h-reduced primary TAG-module of infinite periodicity. Then every h-neat submodule of M is h-pure if and only if $M = \oplus\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} K_j \oplus \text{Ter}(M)$ satisfying the following conditions :

(i) for each j, K_j is decomposable and soc(K_j) is homogeneous,

(ii) for $j_1 < j_2$, with $K_{j_1} \neq 0 \neq K_{j_2}$, if z_1R and z_2R are uniseserial summands of K_{j_1} and K_{j_2} respectively, then soc(z_2R) is a u-th predecessor of soc(z_1R) for some positive integer u depending upon j_1 and j_2, and $d(z_1R) \leq d(z_2R) + u$; and

(iii) if t is the length of a smallest length uniserial summand of N, and S is the simple module determining soc(N), then for any $K_j \neq 0$, if S is a v_j-th predecessor of the simple module S_j determining soc(K_j), we have $d(zR) \leq t + v_j$ for any uniserial summand zR of K_j.

Proof. Let every h-neat submodule of M be h-pure. Now N = Ter(M). As N is h-reduced, it has a uniserial summand xR of smallest length, say t. Consider $\overline{M} = M/N$. Let S be a simple submodule of $\overline{M}$. Consider any uniform $\bar{y} \in \overline{M}$ such that $S \cong \text{soc}(\bar{y}R)$. By (2.2), we choose y to be uniform such that $yR \cap N = 0$. Then soc(xR) $\not\cong$ soc(yR). As soc(xR) has no predecessor in soc(M), it is a v-th predecessor of soc(yR) = zR for some $v \geq 1$. Now $h(z) = h'(z) < \infty$. We get $y_1 \in M$ such that $[z, y_1] = h(z)$. Then in $xR \oplus y_1R$, both the summands are h-pure in M. By (5.7) $xR \oplus y_1R$ is h-pure. By (5.9), $d(y_1R) \leq d(xR) + v$. So there is an upper bound on the heights of elements of a particular homogeneous component of soc($\overline{M}$). Hence by (3.4) $\overline{M}$ is its only basic submodule, so it is decomposable. As N is h-pure , by the observation following (2.2), we get $M = K \oplus N$, with K its only basic submodule. As M is primary, spec(M) is countable. We get $K = \oplus\sum_{j=-\infty} K_j$ satisfying (i). Finally (ii) and (iii) follow from (5.9).

Conversely, let M satisfy the given conditions.. Then K satisfies conditions analogous to those given in (5.5). So on the simalar lines as in (5.5), every h-neat submodule of K is h-pure. Consider any uniform $y \in M$. Now $y = y_1 + y_2$. $y_1 \in K$, $y_2 \in N$. If $y_1 = 0$, $y \in N$ and by (5.11), yR has unique h-neat hull in M ; obviously then $h(y) = h'(y)$. Let $y_1 \neq 0$. Suppose $y_2 \neq 0$. then by using (4.3) $h'(y) = h(y)$. Suppose $y_2 = 0$ and $h'(y) < h(y)$. We get an h-neat hull zR of yR with $[y, z] = h'(y)$. Let $z = z_1 + z_2$, $z_1 \in K$, $z_2 \in N$. As $h'_K(y) = h(y)$, $z_2 \neq 0$. One of z_1R and z_2R is h-neat. As $yR \subseteq z_1R$ and $[y, z_1] < h(y) = h_K(y)$, z_1R is not h-neat in K and so in M. Consequently z_2R is h-neat in N, and by (5.10) it is h-pure. For some v, soc(z_1R) is a v-th predecessor of soc(z_2R). So that $d(z_1R) = d(z_2R) + v$. Write soc(z_1R) = gR. Then by using condition (iii), we get $[g, z_1] \leq h(g) \leq d(z_2R) + v - 1 = [g, z_1]$. Conseuently $d(z_1R) - 1 = h(g)$. So z_1R is h-pure. This is a contradiction. This completes the proof.

We now discuss the case of M being not necessarily h-reduced. Write $M = M_1 \oplus D$, where D is the largest h-divisible submodule of M.

Lemma(5.13). If every h-neat submodule of M is h-pure and $D \neq 0$, then Ter(M) $\subseteq$ D ; further Ter(M) is h-divisible.

Proof. Suppose $N = Ter(M) \not\subset D$. We get a uniform $x \in soc(N)$, such that $h(x) < \infty$. Then $x = y + z$. Now $0 \neq y \in M_1$, $z \in D$. By (5.11) $y \in N$. Consider any simple submodule S of D. By the definition of S, it is not a predecessor of soc(yR). So that soc(yR) is a predecessor of S. As D is h-divisible, there exists a uniserial submodule A of D and a homomorphism $f : A \to M_1$ with range(f) = yR and $S \subseteq \ker f$. This contradicts (4.8). Hence $N \subseteq D$. As N is h-pure, it must be h-divisible.

Theorem(5.14) Let M_R be a primary TAG-module of infinite periodicity such that M is not h-divisible and let N = Ter(M). Then every h-neat submodule of M is h-pure if and only if the following hold:

(a) N is h-divisible ,and

(b) $M = N \oplus \sum_{j=-\infty}^{j=\infty} K_j$, where K_j satisfy the following conditions:

(i) if some $K_j \neq 0$, then $soc(K_j)$ is a homogeneous component of soc(M),

(ii) each K_j is a direct sum of serial modules,

(iii) if for some $i < j$, $K_i \neq 0 \neq K_j$ and K_i is not h-divisible , then the simple submodule S_i determining $soc(K_i)$ is a v-th predecessor of the simple submodule determining $soc(K_j)$ for some positive integer v depending on i and j , and for any uniserial submodule A of K_j, $d(A) \leq t + v$, where t is the length of the smallest length uniserial summand of K_i , and

(iv) if for some j, $K_j \neq 0$ and is not h-reduced, then for any $i < j$, K_i is h-divisible.

Proof. Let D be the largest h-divisible submodule of M. Then $D \neq 0$. Let every h-neat submodule of M be h-pure. By (5.13) N is h-divisible. Thus $M = N \oplus M_1 \oplus M_2$ such that $D = N \oplus M_1$ and M_2 is h-reduced. By applying (5.12) to M_2 and using the fact that M_1 is a direct sum of serial modules, we get $M_1 \oplus M_2 = \oplus \sum_{j=-\infty}^{j=\infty} K_j$ satisfying (i), (ii), and (iii). Finally (iv) is an immediate consequence of (iii).

Conversely let the given conditions be satisfied. By comparing these conditions with those in (5.12), we get $M = D \oplus L$ such that $N \subseteq D$. Then $SH(N, L) = 0$. Consider a uniserial submodule W of D and let $f : W \to L$ be a non-zero homomorphism. Then $W \not\subset N$. For some j, W is isomorphic to a submodule of K_j. This K_j is not h-reduced, $f(W) \subseteq L$, and for some t, f(W) is isomorphic to a submodule of K_t . If j = t, obviously f is a monomorphism. Suppose $t < j$ Then K_t is h-divisible. Let xR = soc(f(W)). As $xR \subseteq L$, $h(x) < \infty$. On the other hand $x \in soc(K_t)$ yields $h(x) = \infty$. This is a contradiction. Hence $j < t$. So $SH(K_j, K_t) = 0$. This once again contradicts the fact that $f \neq 0$. Thus j = t. Hence f is a monomorphism. So by (4.8) the result follows.

We end this paper by giving an example of an h-reduced primary TAG-module M of which every h-neat submodule is h-pure, but it is not decomposable. Such a module has to be of infinite periodicity.

Example. Let F be a Galois field and R be the ring of infinite lower triangular matrices $[a_{ij}]$ over F, where i, j are indexed over the set P of all positive integers. Let $\{e_{ij} : i, j \in P\}$ be the usual set of matrix units in R. Then $M_{kk} = e_{kk}R$ is a uniserial R-module with $d(M_k) = k$; it is annihilated by the ideal A_k of R consisting of those $[a_{ij}] \in R$, such that $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i \leq k$. Observe that each R/A_k is isomorphic to the ring of k×k lower triangular matrices over F. So that any R/A_k-module is a TAG-module. Each M_k embeds in

M_{k+1} under the mapping $e_{kk}r \to e_{k+1,k}r$, $r \in R$. Let $T = \Pi_k M_k$. Then $M_R = \{x \in T : xA_k = 0 \text{ for some } k\}$ is a primary TAG-module of infinite periodicity. Its socle is homogeneous. By (5 8) every h-neat submodule of M is h-pure. M is h-reduced. Consider a uniform $x \in soc(M)$. then $x = (x_k)$, $x_k \in M_k$. Let u be the smallest integer such that $x_u \neq 0$. Then $xR \cong x_uR$. As $d(M_u) = u$, by using (2.3) it can be easily seen that $h(x) = u-1$. So that for any $i > 1$, $soc(H_{i-1}(M))/soc(H_i) \cong soc(M_i)$. Suppose that M is decomposable, Then $M = \oplus \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} N_j$, where N_j is a direct sum of uniserial modules of length j. Then

$soc((H_{i-1}(M))/soc(H_i(M)) \cong soc(N_i)$. Thus $soc(N_i) \cong soc(M_i)$, a simple module. Consequently each N_i is a uniserial module. As F is finite, N_i is a finite set. Consequently M is countable. But by construction M is uncountable This is a contradiction. Hence M is not decomposable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research of Surjeet Singh was supported by the Kuwait University Research Grant No. SM075, and of Mohd. Z. Khan by a travel grant by The Third World Academy of Sciences, Trieste. The authors are highly thankful to the referee for his valuable comments.

REFERENCES

[1]. G. Azumaya, F. Mbuntum and K. Varadarajan: On M-projective and M-injective modules, Pacific J. Math. 59(1975), 9-16.

[2]. K. Benabdallah and S. Singh, On torsion abelian group-like modules, Proc.Conf. Abelian Groups, Hawaii, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Sringer Verlag, 1006(1983), 639-653.

[3]. C. Faith, Algebra II, Ring Theory, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenchaften, 191, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1976.

[4]. L. Fuchs, Abelian Groups, Pergamon Press, N. Y. 1960.

[5]. J D. Moore, On quasi-complete abelian p-groups, Rocky Mountain J. Math., 5(1975), 601-609.

[6]. S. Singh, Some decomposition theorems in abelian groups and their generalizations, Proc. Ohio Univ. Conf.. Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Math., Marcel Dekker, 25(1976), 183-186.

[7]. S. Singh, Some decomposition theorems on abelian groups and their generalizations-II, Osaka J. Math., 16(1979), 45-55.

[8]. S. Singh, Abelian group like modules, Acta Math. Hung., 50(1987), 85-95.

[9]. S.Singh, On generalized uniserial rings, Chinese J. Math. , 17(1989), 117-137.

Current Address:

Surjeet Singh
Department of Mathematics
King Saud University
P.O. Box 2455
Riyadh 11451
SAUDI ARABIA