

# A Generalization of Basis and Free Modules Relatives to a Family of A

# Generalization of Basis and Free Modules

# Relatives to a Family of R-Modules

*By* Fitriani Fitriani

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

5

## A Generalization of Basis and Free Modules Relatives to a Family $\mathcal{F}$ of $R$ -Modules

6

To cite this article: Fitriani *et al* 2018 *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **1097** 012087View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

**IOP | ebooks™**

Bringing you innovative digital publishing with leading voices to create your essential collection of books in STEM research.

Start exploring the collection - download the first chapter of every title for free.

5

## A Generalization of Basis and Free Modules Relatives to a Family $\mathcal{U}$ of $R$ -Modules

Fitriani<sup>1,2</sup>, I E Wijayanti<sup>1</sup> and B Surodjo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, Universitas Gadjah Mada

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, Universitas Lampung

Corresponding author: fitriani27@mail.ugm.ac.id

**Abstract.** Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a family of  $R$ -modules and  $V$  be a submodule of a direct sum of some elements in  $\mathcal{U}$ . The aim of this paper is to generalize basis and free modules. We use the concept of  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module and  $X$ -sublinearly independent to provide the definition of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis and  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module. We construct a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$  as a pair  $(X, V)$ , which a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$  and  $M$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module. Furthermore, we define  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$  as a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis which has the maximal element on the first component and the minimal element on the second component of a pair  $(X, V)$ . The results show that the first component of  $(X, V)$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis is closed under submodules and intersections. Moreover, we prove that the second component of  $(X, V)$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis is closed under direct sums. We also determine some  $\mathcal{U}$ -free modules related to a family  $\mathcal{U}$  which contains all  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}$  modulo  $p$  power of  $n$ , where  $p$  prime and  $n \geq 2$ .

### 1 Introduction

Let  $R$  be a ring,  $A, B$  and  $C$  be  $R$ -modules and let  $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$  be an exact sequence, i.e.  $\text{Im } f = \ker g$  [1,2]. Davvaz and Pamian-Garamaleky establish a quasi-exact sequence as a generalization of exact sequence. Let  $U$  be a submodule of  $C$ . A sequence  $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$  is  $U$ -exact in  $B$  if  $\text{Im } f = g^{-1}(U)$  [3]. For a submodule  $V$  of  $A$ , they also define a  $V$ -coexact sequence as a dual of a  $U$ -exact sequence.

Then, Anvari<sup>25</sup> and Davvaz [4] generalize the Schanuel Lemma by using the quasi-exact sequences. Furthermore, Davvaz and Shabani-Solt [5] give a generalization of homological algebra. In [6], Anvari<sup>25</sup> and Davvaz investigate the connections between projective modules and  $U$ -split sequences. Then, Madanshekaf [7] gives some results about quasi-exact sequences. In [8], Amizadeh et al. provide a quasi-exact sequence of  $S$ -acts.

Motivated by definition of  $U$ -exact sequence, Fitriani et al. [9] introduce a sub exact sequence as a generalization of an exact sequence of modules. As an application of a sub-exact sequence, Fitriani et al. also establish the notion of an  $X$ -sub-linearly independent module as a generalization of the linearly independent set in  $R$ -modules [10]. Furthermore, Fitriani et al. [11] introduce a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module by using coexact sequence. We can say that this notion is a dual of  $X$ -sub-linearly independent module. This concept is motivated by the definition of  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module from [12-14].



In this paper, we use the concept of  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module and  $X$ -sub-linearly independent module to construct a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis and a  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module which are a basis and a free module relative to a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. Moreover, we determine some  $\mathcal{U}$ -free modules, where  $\mathcal{U}$  is a family of all  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules  $\mathbb{Z}$  modulo  $p^n$ ,  $p$  prime and  $n$  is an integer greater than 2.

## 2.2 Methods

The aim of this paper is to generalize basis and free modules to basis and free modules relative to a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. If a free module  $F$  has a basis  $X$ , then  $F \cong \bigoplus_{x \in X} R_x$  with each  $R_x \cong R$ . We can choose  $\mathcal{U} = \{R\}$  so that  $F$  is a free module relative to  $\mathcal{U}$ . In this case, a family  $\mathcal{U}$  only contain  $R$  as an  $R$ -module.

We construct a basis and a free module relative to a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda\}_\Lambda$ , where  $U_\lambda$  is an  $R$ -module, for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . We use the concept of  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module and  $X$ -sublinearly independent module to provide this concept. We construct a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$  as a pair  $(X, V)$ , which a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$  and  $M$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module. Next, we define  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$  as a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis which has the maximal element on the first component and the minimal element on the second component of a pair  $(X, V)$ . Furthermore, we determine some  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module, where  $\mathcal{U}$  is a family of all  $\mathbb{Z}$  modulo  $p^n$ ,  $p$  prime,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \geq 2$  as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module by using the properties of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  as an Abelian group.

## 3. Results and Discussions

We recall the definition of a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module as follows: Given a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda\}_\Lambda$  of  $R$ -modules,  $V$  be a submodule of  $\bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda$ . An  $R$ -module  $N$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated if there exists a surjective homomorphism from  $V$  to  $N$  [11]. If we take  $V = \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda$ , then a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module. From this fact, we can say that every  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module. But, the converse need not be true.

Now, we define the following sets:

$$\sigma(0, \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M) = \{X \subseteq \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda \mid \mathcal{U} \text{ is } X\text{-sub-linearly independent to } M\} \quad (1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}(M) = \{V \subseteq \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda \mid M \text{ is } V\text{-generated}\} \quad (2)$$

The set  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$  contains all submodules of  $\bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda$  which is  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$ . Hence, if there is an injective homomorphism from  $Y$  to  $M$ , where  $Y$  is a submodule of  $\bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda$ , then  $Y$  is in the set  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$ .

Suppose that  $X$  is in  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$ . Consequently, a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$ . Therefore, there exists a monomorphism  $f$  from  $X$  to  $M$ . We already know that for every submodule  $X'$  of  $X$ , we always have a monomorphism  $i$  from  $X'$  to  $X$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is also  $X'$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$ , for every submodule  $X'$  of  $X$  [10]. Similarly, if a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules is  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to an  $R$ -module  $M$  for every  $i \in I$ , then a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is also  $\bigcap_{i \in I} X_i$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$ .

Consider the set  $\mathcal{U}(M) = \{V \subseteq \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda \mid M \text{ is } V\text{-generated}\}$ . In this set, we collect all submodules  $V$  of  $\bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda$  which  $M$  is  $V$ -generated. If  $V$  is in  $\mathcal{U}(M)$ , we have a surjective homomorphism  $g$  from  $V$  to  $M$ . If  $R$ -module  $X_1$  is  $\mathcal{U}_{V_1}$ -generated and  $R$ -module  $X_2$  is  $\mathcal{U}_{V_2}$ -generated, then  $X_1 \oplus X_2$  is  $\mathcal{U}_{V_1 \oplus V_2}$ -generated, where  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  be submodules of  $\bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda$ ,  $U_\lambda \in \mathcal{U}$ , for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . Based on [11], we have the set  $\mathcal{U}(M)$  is closed under direct sums and homomorphic images. We will use the properties of the set  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$  and  $\mathcal{U}(M)$  to investigate some characteristics of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis and  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module.

Now, we will construct the definition of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis and  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module by using the concept of  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to an  $R$ -module  $M$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module.

**Definition 2.1.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. A pair of submodules  $(X, V)$  of  $\bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}$  is said to be a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M$  if  $\mathcal{U}$  is an  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$  and  $M$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module. From Definition 2.1,  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M$  is a pair of two submodules  $X$  and  $V$  of  $\bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}$  which  $\mathcal{U}$  is an  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$  and  $M$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated module. In other words, if  $(X, V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M$ , then there are a monomorphism  $f$  from  $X$  to  $M$  and an epimorphism  $g$  from  $V$  to  $M$ . Then we will give some examples of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module.

**Example 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{Z_p \mid p \text{ prime}\}$ , a family of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules, where  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a set of integers. We consider  $\mathbb{Z}_6$  as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. We will find  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_6$ . We can define monomorphisms from  $0, \mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_3$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3$  to  $\mathbb{Z}_6$ . Also, we can define an epimorphism from  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3$  to  $\mathbb{Z}_6$ . Therefore, we have some  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_6$  as follows:  $(0, \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3), (\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3), (\mathbb{Z}_3, \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3, \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_3)$ .

**Example 2.3.** Let  $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathbb{Z}\}$ , a family of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module, where  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a set of integers. We will find  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ . Clearly, there is a monomorphism from  $0$  to  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  and hence a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $0$ -sub-linearly independent to  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ . Furthermore, we can define an epimorphism from  $\mathbb{Z}$  to  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ . As a consequence,  $(0, \mathbb{Z})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ . In general, we can show that  $(0, \mathbb{Z})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ , for every  $n \geq 2$ .

Now, we will give some properties of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$ . We already know that the set  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$  is closed under intersections [10]. We will use this property to show the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.4.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. If  $(X_{\alpha}, V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$ , for every  $\alpha \in A$ , then  $(\cap_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}, V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ .

**Proof.** Suppose that  $(X_{\alpha}, V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$ , for every  $\alpha \in A$ . Consequently, a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $X_{\alpha}$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$ , for every  $\alpha \in A$ . Hence,  $X_{\alpha} \in \sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$ , for every  $\alpha \in A$ . Based on [10], the set  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$  is closed under intersections. As a consequence, we have  $(\cap_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}, V)$  is in  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$ . In other words, a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $\cap_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$  and hence we have  $(\cap_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}, V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ . QED

Next, we will use the fact that the set  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$  is closed under submodules to proof the following property of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. If  $(X, V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M$ , then a pair  $(X', V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ , for every submodule  $X'$  of  $X$ .

**Proof.** Let a pair  $(X, V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$ . Then a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $X$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$ . This implies that  $X \in \sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$ . Based on [10],  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$  is closed under submodules. So, for every submodule  $X'$  of  $X$ ,  $X'$  is in  $\sigma(0, \bigoplus_{\lambda} U_{\lambda}, M)$ . Therefore,  $(X', V)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ , for every submodule  $X'$  of  $X$ . QED

In the next proposition, we focus on the second component of a pair  $(X, V)$  which is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$ . We will use the property of the set  $\mathcal{U}(M)$  to proof the next property of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis.

**Proposition 2.6.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. If  $(X, V_{\beta})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M$ , for every  $\beta \in B$ , then  $(X, \bigoplus_{\beta} V_{\beta})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ .

**Proof.** Suppose that  $(X, V_{\beta})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M$ , for every  $\beta \in B$ . Then  $M$  is a  $\mathcal{U}_{V_{\beta}}$ -generated module. This implies  $V_{\beta} \in \mathcal{U}(M)$ , for every  $\beta \in B$ . Based in [11], we already know that the set  $\mathcal{U}(M)$  is closed under direct sums. Therefore, we have  $\bigoplus_{\beta} V_{\beta} \in \mathcal{U}(M)$ . In other words, we can say  $M$  is a  $\mathcal{U}_{\bigoplus_{\beta} V_{\beta}}$ -generated module. Hence, a pair  $(X, \bigoplus_{\beta} V_{\beta})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ . QED

**Proposition 2.7.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. If  $(X_{\gamma}, V_{\gamma})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M_{\gamma}$ , for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , then  $(\bigoplus_{\gamma} X_{\gamma}, \bigoplus_{\gamma} V_{\gamma})$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\bigoplus_{\gamma} M_{\gamma}$ .



**Proof.** Suppose that  $(X_\gamma, V_\gamma)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M$ , for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . From this we have a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $X_\gamma$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M_\gamma$  and  $M_\gamma$  is  $\mathcal{U}_{V_\gamma}$ -generated. This implies  $X_\gamma \in \sigma(0, \oplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$  and  $V_\gamma \in \mathcal{U}(M)$ , for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . Therefore, we have a monomorphism from  $X_\gamma$  to  $M$  and an epimorphism from  $V_\gamma$  to  $M_\gamma$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . Clearly, we can construct a monomorphism from  $\oplus_\Lambda X_\lambda$  to  $\oplus_\Lambda M_\lambda$ . Also, we can define an epimorphism from  $\oplus_\Lambda V_\lambda$  to  $\oplus_\Lambda M_\lambda$ . Hence  $\oplus_\Gamma X_\gamma \in \sigma(0, \oplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, \oplus_\Lambda M_\lambda)$  and  $\oplus_\Gamma V_\gamma \in \mathcal{U}(\oplus_\Lambda M_\lambda)$ . Therefore,  $(\oplus_\Gamma X_\gamma, \oplus_\Gamma V_\gamma)$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\oplus_\Lambda M_\lambda$ . QED

We can see from Example 2.2 that  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$  is not uniquely determined. From this fact, we will choose a maximal element in first part of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$  and a minimal element in second part of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ . In other words, we will find a maximal element of the set  $\sigma(0, \oplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$  and a minimal element of  $\mathcal{U}(M)$ . Based on [10], the set  $\sigma(0, \oplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$  always has a maximal element. We will denote  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$  which has a maximal element in the first component and a minimal element in the second component of a pair  $(X, V)$ , a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ . Now, we give the formal definition of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module.

**Definition 2.8.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. A pair  $(X, V)$  is said to be a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis if  $(X, V)$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ ,  $X$  is a maximal element of  $\sigma(0, \oplus_\Lambda U_\lambda, M)$  and  $V$  is a minimal element of  $\mathcal{U}(M)$ . An  $R$ -module  $M$  is called  $\mathcal{U}$ -free if  $M$  has  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis.

**Example 2.9.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. Then a pair  $(0, 0)$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $0$ .

**Example 2.10.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{Z_n \mid n \text{ prime}\}$  of  $Z$ -modules. From Example 2.2, we have some  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $Z$ -module  $Z_6$ , i.e.  $(0, Z_2 \oplus Z_3)$ ,  $(Z_2, Z_2 \oplus Z_3)$ ,  $(Z_3, Z_2 \oplus Z_3)$ ,  $(Z_2 \oplus Z_3, Z_2 \oplus Z_3)$ . Therefore, we have  $Z_2 \oplus Z_3$  is a maximal element in the first component of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis and also a minimal element of the second component of  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $Z_6$ . Hence, a pair  $(Z_2 \oplus Z_3, Z_2 \oplus Z_3)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $Z$ -module  $Z_6$ .

**Example 2.11.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $Z$ -module. Based on Example 2.3, we have a pair  $(0, Z)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $Z$ -module  $Z_n$ , where  $n \geq 2$ .

We already know that  $Z$ -module  $Z_n$  is not a free module. But, from Example 2.11 we have  $Z$ -module  $Z_n$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module relative to a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{Z\}$  of  $Z$ -module, where  $n \geq 2$ .

In the Proposition 2.7, we have proved that a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$  is closed under direct sums. A similar result holds for an  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$ .

**Proposition 2.12.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. If  $(X_\gamma, V_\gamma)$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $M_\gamma$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , then  $(\oplus_\Gamma X_\gamma, \oplus_\Gamma V_\gamma)$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $\oplus_\Gamma M_\gamma$ .

In the previous examples, a submodule  $X$  and  $V$  of  $\oplus_\Lambda U_\lambda$  which is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$  need not be isomorphic. In case  $X$  is isomorphic to  $V$ , we will introduce a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis and a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module as follows:

**Definition 2.13.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. A pair  $(X, V)$  is said to be a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis if  $(X, V)$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$  and  $X$  is isomorphic to  $V$ . An  $R$ -module  $M$  is called a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free if  $M$  has  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis.

Since  $X$  is isomorphic to  $V$ , we simply write  $X$  instead  $(X, V)$  as a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis of an  $R$ -module  $M$ . We will determine family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules to regard a free module as a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module. We already know that if a free module  $F$  has a basis  $X$ , then  $F \cong \oplus_{x \in X} R_x$  with each  $R_x \cong R$ . We can choose  $\mathcal{U} = \{R\}$  as a family of  $R$ -module. Hence, we have  $\oplus_{x \in X} R_x = F^{(X)}$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis of  $F$ . This implies  $F$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free. From this fact, we can say that every free  $R$ -module  $F$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module. Based on Example 2.9, a pair  $(0, 0)$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $R$ -module  $0$ , for any family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -modules. As a consequence,  $R$ -module  $0$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free.

Moreover, in case  $X$  is an element of  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $X$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free. Furthermore, we consider the result of Proposition 2.12. If  $M_i$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module for every  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , then  $\oplus_{i=1}^n M_i$  is also a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module. Now, we will give some examples of  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free modules.

10

**Example 2.14.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unit and  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\lambda\}_\Lambda$  be a family of  $R$ -modules, where  $U_\lambda = \text{Hom}_R(R, M_\lambda)$  for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . Based on [1], we can define a homomorphism  $\varphi$  from  $\text{Hom}_R(R, M_\lambda)$  to  $M_\lambda$ , where  $\varphi(f) := f(1)$ . We can show that  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism. This implies that a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $U_\lambda$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M_\lambda$  and  $M_\lambda$  is  $\mathcal{U}_{v_\gamma}$ -generated. Therefore, we can conclude that  $M_\lambda$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free.

**Example 2.15.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{Z_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 2\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. Let  $M = Z_4^{(\mathbb{N})}$  and  $N = Z_2 \oplus M$  be  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. Since a family  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $M$ -sub-linearly independent to  $M$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ -generated,  $(M, N)$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis of  $M$ . We will show that  $M$  is not isomorphic to  $N$ . Assume that there is an isomorphism  $f$  from  $M$  to  $N$ . Since  $(1, 0, 0, \dots) \in N$ , there is  $0 \neq (a_i) \in M$  such that  $f((a_i)) = (1, 0, 0, \dots)$ . Then  $f(2(a_i)) = 2f((a_i)) = 2(1, 0, 0, \dots) = 0$ . By hypothesis,  $f$  is a monomorphism. So, we have  $2(a_i) = 0$ . Therefore,  $a_i = 0$  or 1 and  $a_i = 0$  or 2, for  $i \geq 2$ . So, there is  $(b_i) \in M$  such that  $(a_i) = 2(b_i)$ . This implies  $b_1 = 0$  or 1 and  $b_i = 0$ , 1 or 2 for  $i \geq 2$ . Hence,  $0 = 2f((b_i)) = f(2(b_i)) = f((a_i))$ . But  $1 = f((a_i))_1 = 0$ , a contradiction. We can conclude that  $M$  is not isomorphic to  $N$  and hence  $(M, N)$  is not  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis of  $M$ .

Now, we consider following properties of  $Z_n$  as an Abelian group.

**Theorem 2.16.** [15] Let  $m$  and  $n$  be positive integers. If  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  (i.e.  $m$  and  $n$  are relative prime), then  $Z_m \times Z_n$  is cyclic and is isomorphic to  $Z_{mn}$  and  $(1, 1)$  is a generator of  $Z_m \times Z_n$ .

**Theorem 2.17.** [15] The group  $\prod_{i=1}^n Z_{m_i}$  is cyclic and isomorphic to  $Z_{m_1 m_2 \dots m_n}$  if and only if the numbers  $m_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  are pairwise relative prime, that is, the gcd of two of them is 1.

Therefore, by using Theorem 2.16 and 2.17, we can determine some  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free modules as follows.

**Proposition 2.18.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{Z_p \mid p \text{ prime}\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules and  $q, r$  be two distinct primes. Then  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $Z_{qr}$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free.

**Proof.** Since  $q$  and  $r$  are relative primes,  $Z_q \oplus Z_r$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis of  $Z_{qr}$ . Hence,  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules  $Z_{qr}$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free. QED

**Proposition 2.19.** Given a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{Z_p \mid p \text{ prime}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. Then  $Z_n$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module, for every positive integer  $n \geq 2$ .

**Proof.** We already know that every positive integer  $n$  can be uniquely factorized as a product of distinct prime number  $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \dots p_r^{n_r}$ , where  $p_i$  prime and  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ . By Theorem 2.17, we have:

$$Z_n \cong Z_{p_1^{n_1}} \times Z_{p_2^{n_2}} \times \dots \times Z_{p_r^{n_r}}$$

Therefore, we have  $Z_{p_1^{n_1}} \times Z_{p_2^{n_2}} \times \dots \times Z_{p_r^{n_r}}$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly basis of  $Z_n$ . This implies that  $Z_n$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module, for every positive integer  $n$ . QED

From Proposition 2.18, we have some  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free modules, where  $\mathcal{U}$  is a family of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules  $Z_p$  modulo  $p$ ,  $p$  prime.  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $Z_{qr}$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free for every two distinct primes  $q$  and  $r$ . Moreover, based on Proposition 2.19, we have  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules  $Z_n$  are  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module relative to a family  $\mathcal{U}$  which contains all  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules  $Z_p$ ,  $p$  prime, for every positive integer  $n \geq 2$ .

We already know that since  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $Z_n$  is not linearly independent,  $Z_n$  is not a free module, for every positive integer  $n$  greater than 2. But, this module is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module relative to a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{Z_p \mid p \text{ prime}\}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. Consequently,  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module is a generalization of a free module. If we take  $\mathcal{U} = \{R\}$ , where  $R$  is a ring, then an  $R$ -module  $M$  is  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free if and only if  $R$ -module  $M$  is free. But, if  $\mathcal{U}$  is another family of  $R$ -module, then not every  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module is a free module.

#### 4. Conclusions

A  $\mathcal{U}$ -basis and a  $\mathcal{U}$ -free modules are a basis and  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module relative to a family  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $R$ -module. These notions are the generalization of the concept of a basis and a free module. Every free module  $F$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module, where  $\mathcal{U} = \{R\}$  as a family of  $R$ -module. But not every  $\mathcal{U}$ -free module is a free module. For example,  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module, but  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  is not a free module.

If  $\mathcal{U}$  be a family of all  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , where  $p$  prime, then  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_{qr}$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module, where  $q$  and  $r$  be distinct primes. Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{U}$  be a family of all  $\mathbb{Z}$  modulo  $p$  power of  $n$ , where  $p$  prime and  $n$  positive integer larger than 2,  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  is a  $\mathcal{U}$ -strictly free module, for every positive integer  $n \geq 2$ .

#### Acknowledgment

The authors thank the Directorate of Research and Community Service of the Republic of Indonesia for the funding of PDD-2018 with contract number 385/UN26.21/PN/2018.

#### References

- [1] Adkins W A and Weintraub S H 1992 *Algebra, An Approach via Module Theory* (New York: Springer-Verlag)
- [2] Dummit D S and Foote R M 2004 *Abstract Algebra* (USA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.)
- [3] Davvaz B and Parnian-Garamaleky Y A 1999 A Note on Exact Sequences *Bull. Malaysian Math. Soc.* **22** 53–6
- [4] Anvanriyeh S M and Davvaz B 2005 On Quasi-Exact Sequences *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* **42** 149–55
- [5] Davvaz B and Shabani-Solt H 2002 A generalization of homological algebra *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **39** 881–98
- [6] Anvanriyeh S M and Davvaz B 2002 U-Split Exact Sequences *Far East J. Math. Sci.* **4** 209–19
- [7] Madanshekaf A 2008 Quasi-Exact Sequence and Finitely Presented Modules *Iran. J. Math. Sci. Informatics* **3** 49–53
- [8] Aminizadeh R, Rasouli H and Tehranian A 2017 Quasi-exact Sequences of S-Act *Bull. Malaysian Math. Soc.*
- [9] Fitriani, Surodjo B and Wijayanti I E 2016 On sub-exact sequences *Far East J. Math. Sci.* **100** 1055–65
- [10] Fitriani, Surodjo B and Wijayanti I E 2017 On X-sub-linearly independent modules *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **893**
- [11] Fitriani, Wijayanti I E and Surodjo B 2018 Generalization of  $\mathcal{U}$ -Generator and  $\mathcal{M}$ -Subgenerator Related to Category  $\sigma[M]$  *Journal Math. Res.* **10** 101–6
- [12] Anderson F W and Fuller K R 1992 *Rings and Categories of Modules* (New York: Springer-Verlag)
- [13] Wisbauer R 1991 *Foundation of Module and Ring Theory* (Philadelphia, USA: Gordon and Breach)
- [14] Clark J, Lomp C, Vanaja N and Wisbauer R 2006 *Lifting modules : supplements and projectivity in module theory* (Birkhäuser Verlag)
- [15] Hill V E 2000 *Groups and characters* (Chapman & Hall/CRC)



# A Generalization of Basis and Free Modules Relatives to a Family ofA Generalization of Basis and Free Modules Relatives to a Family of R-Modules

ORIGINALITY REPORT

17%

SIMILARITY INDEX

## PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Paul E. Bland. "10 More on Rings and Modules", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2011 <small>Crossref</small>	109 words — 3%
2	Mahima Ranjan Adhikari, Avishek Adhikari. "Basic Modern Algebra with Applications", Springer Nature, 2014 <small>Crossref</small>	94 words — 2%
3	<a href="#">earchive.tpu.ru</a> <small>Internet</small>	51 words — 1%
4	Piotr A. Krylov, Askar A. Tuganbaev. "Modules over Discrete Valuation Domains", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2008 <small>Crossref</small>	45 words — 1%
5	<a href="#">repository.lppm.unila.ac.id</a> <small>Internet</small>	40 words — 1%
6	<a href="#">repository.uhamka.ac.id</a> <small>Internet</small>	39 words — 1%
7	<a href="#">www.tandfonline.com</a> <small>Internet</small>	30 words — 1%
8	A. Ghorbani, M. Naji Esfahani, Z. Nazemian. "Some new dimensions of modules and rings", Communications in Algebra, 2016 <small>Crossref</small>	24 words — 1%

9	MA, S.y.. "Variable-rate convolutional network coding", The Journal of China Universities of Posts and Telecommunications, 201006 Crossref	20 words — < 1%
10	openaccess.iyte.edu.tr Internet	20 words — < 1%
11	Septimiu Crivei. "Σ-Extending Modules, Σ-Lifting Modules, and Proper Classes", Communications in Algebra, 2008 Crossref	19 words — < 1%
12	Frontiers in Mathematics, 2016. Crossref	17 words — < 1%
13	Gustina Elfiyanti, Intan Muchtadi-Alamsyah, Fajar Yuliawan, Dellavitha Nasution. "On the Category of Weakly U-Complexes", European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 2020 Crossref	17 words — < 1%
14	M. Arabi-Kakavand, Sh. Asgari, Y. Tolooei. "Rings Over Which Every Module Is Almost Injective", Communications in Algebra, 2015 Crossref	14 words — < 1%
15	Adhikari, Mahima Ranjan, and Avishek Adhikari. "Modules", Basic Modern Algebra with Applications, 2014. Crossref	14 words — < 1%
16	epdf.pub Internet	12 words — < 1%
17	paperzz.com Internet	12 words — < 1%
18	1pdf.net Internet	11 words — < 1%
19	e4-0.ipn.mx Internet	

10 words — < 1%

20 Yasser Ibrahim, Mohamed Yousif. "Rings all of whose right ideals are U-modules", Communications in Algebra, 2017

Crossref

10 words — < 1%

21 ofsbrandssitesbucket.s3.amazonaws.com

Internet

10 words — < 1%

22 Henrik Holm. "Gorenstein homological dimensions", Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra, 2004

Crossref

10 words — < 1%

23 "Algebra and its Applications", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2016

Crossref

9 words — < 1%

24 vdocuments.site

Internet

9 words — < 1%

25 cnf.sttu.ac.ir

Internet

9 words — < 1%

26 Guoyin Zhang. "Multiplication Modules in Which Every Prime Submodule is Contained in a Unique Maximal Submodule#", Communications in Algebra, 1/1/2004

Crossref

8 words — < 1%

27 Babak Amini, Afshin Amini. "On Strongly Superfluous Submodules", Communications in Algebra, 2012

Crossref

8 words — < 1%

28 Schmidt, W.M.. "Construction and estimation of bases in function fields", Journal of Number Theory, 199110

Crossref

8 words — < 1%

29 Lixin Mao, Nanqing Ding. "Relative Cotorsion Modules and Relative Flat Modules", Communications in Algebra, 2006

Crossref

8 words — < 1%

30

Stuart A. Steinberg. "The Category of f-Modules",  
Lattice-ordered Rings and Modules, 2010

Crossref

8 words — < 1%

31

Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, 1976.

Crossref

6 words — < 1%

EXCLUDE QUOTES    ON  
EXCLUDE            ON  
BIBLIOGRAPHY

EXCLUDE MATCHES    OFF