

GRADED MODULES OVER OBJECT-UNITAL GROUPOID GRADED RINGS

JUAN CALA, PATRIK LUNDSTRÖM, AND H. PINEDO

ABSTRACT. In a previous article (see [6]), we introduced and analyzed ring-theoretic properties of object unital $\mathcal{G}$ -graded rings R , where $\mathcal{G}$ is a groupoid. In the present article, we analyze the category $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ of unitary $\mathcal{G}$ -graded modules over such rings. Following ideas developed earlier by one of the authors in [9], we analyse the forgetful functor $U: \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod} \rightarrow R\text{-mod}$ and aim to determine properties $\mathcal{P}$ for which the following implications are valid for modules M in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$: M is $\mathcal{P} \Rightarrow U(M)$ is $\mathcal{P}$; $U(M)$ is $\mathcal{P} \Rightarrow M$ is $\mathcal{P}$. Here we treat the cases when $\mathcal{P}$ is any of the properties: direct summand, projective, injective, free, simple and semisimple. Moreover, graded versions of results concerning classical module theory are established, as well as some structural properties related to the category $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R denote an associative, but not necessarily unital, ring, and let M be a left R -module. If R is unital, then we let 1_R denote the multiplicative identity of R . If $X \subseteq R$ and $Y \subseteq M$, then we let XY denote the set of finite sums of elements of the form xy for $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Following [1], we say that M is *unitary* if $RM = M$. We denote by $R\text{-md}$ ($R\text{-mod}$) the category having (unitary) left R -modules as objects and R -module homomorphisms as morphisms. Analogously, the category $\text{md-}R$ ($\text{mod-}R$) of right (unitary) modules is defined.

Let G be a group. Recall that R is said to be *graded by G* (or *G -graded*) if for all $g \in G$ there is an additive subgroup R_g of R such that $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ and for all $g, h \in G$ the inclusion $R_g R_h \subseteq R_{gh}$ holds. The class of group graded rings contains numerous important mathematical structures, such as polynomial rings, skew and twisted group rings, crossed products and partial versions of these (see e.g. [4, 12, 13] and the references therein). Therefore, a theory of group graded rings can be applied to the study of completely different types of constructions. This not only gives new results for all of these constructions simultaneously, but also serves as a unification of a multitude of known theorems concerning these.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16D10, 16D40, 16D50, 16D90 .

Key words and phrases. groupoid graded module; free, finitely generated, finitely presented, projective, injective, small and flat modules; pure sequences.

Many relevant examples of rings, for instance rings of matrices, crossed product algebras defined by separable extensions, crossed groupoid algebras, including twisted and skew groupoid algebras, and partial versions of these, are not, in any natural way, graded by groups, but instead by groupoids (see for instance [9], [10], [11] and [15]). Also, many of these structures are non-unital. This inspired us in [6] to introduce and analyse the class of *object unital groupoid graded rings*, thereby extending some of the results from [9, 10, 11] to cover non-unital rings. Let us briefly describe these structures.

A groupoid $\mathcal{G}$ is a small category with the property that all morphisms are isomorphisms. Equivalently, this can be defined by saying that $\mathcal{G}$ is a set equipped with a unary operation $\mathcal{G} \ni \sigma \mapsto \sigma^{-1} \in \mathcal{G}$ (inversion) and a partially defined multiplication $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} \ni (\sigma, \tau) \mapsto \sigma\tau \in \mathcal{G}$ (composition) such that for all $\sigma, \tau, \rho \in \mathcal{G}$ the following four axioms hold: (i) $(\sigma^{-1})^{-1} = \sigma$; (ii) if $\sigma\tau$ and $\tau\rho$ are defined, then $(\sigma\tau)\rho$ and $\sigma(\tau\rho)$ are defined and $(\sigma\tau)\rho = \sigma(\tau\rho)$; (iii) the *domain* $d(\sigma) := \sigma^{-1}\sigma$ is always defined and if $\sigma\tau$ is defined, then $d(\sigma)\tau = \tau$; (iv) the *range* $r(\tau) := \tau\tau^{-1}$ is always defined and if $\sigma\tau$ is defined, then $\sigma r(\tau) = \sigma$. The maps d and r have a common image denoted by $\mathcal{G}_0$, which is called the *unit space* of $\mathcal{G}$. The set $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} \mid \sigma\tau \text{ is defined}\}$ is called the set of *composable pairs* of $\mathcal{G}$. For more details about groupoids, the interested reader may consult for example [8] or [17].

Recall from [9] that a ring R is said to be *graded by $\mathcal{G}$* (or *$\mathcal{G}$ -graded*) if there for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ is an additive subgroup R_σ of R such that $R = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} R_\sigma$ and for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{G}$ the inclusion $R_\sigma R_\tau \subseteq R_{\sigma\tau}$ holds, if $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$, and $R_\sigma R_\tau = \{0\}$, otherwise. From [6] we say that a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring R is *object unital* if for all $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$ the ring R_e is unital and for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $r \in R_\sigma$ the equalities $1_{R_{r(\sigma)}} r = r 1_{R_{d(\sigma)}} = r$ hold.

Suppose that R is a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring and M is a left R -module. Recall from [9] that the module M is said to be *graded by $\mathcal{G}$* (or *$\mathcal{G}$ -graded*) if there for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ is an additive subgroup M_σ of M such that $M = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} M_\sigma$ and for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{G}$ the inclusion $R_\sigma M_\tau \subseteq M_{\sigma\tau}$ holds, if $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$, and $R_\sigma M_\tau = \{0\}$, otherwise. If N is another left R -module graded by $\mathcal{G}$, then a left R -module homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be *graded* if for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ the inclusion $f(M_\sigma) \subseteq N_\sigma$ holds. The collection of (unitary) $\mathcal{G}$ -graded left R -modules and the collection of graded homomorphisms together form an abelian category which we denote by $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$). In fact, it is not hard to show that $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ is even a Grothendieck category. Analogously, the category $\mathcal{G}\text{-md-}R$ ($\mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$) of (unitary) $\mathcal{G}$ -graded right R -modules is defined.

A natural class of functors to study from a categorical perspective are the forgetful functors, which simply forget parts of the structure. In this article, we study the *ungrading* functor $U : \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod} \rightarrow R\text{-mod}$ which is defined by forgetting the grading. More precisely, we wish to answer the following

Question 1. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}$ is a groupoid and R is an object unital $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring. For which graded modules M in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ and for what properties $\mathcal{P}$ are either of the following two implications valid?

$$M \text{ has property } \mathcal{P} \implies U(M) \text{ has property } \mathcal{P}$$

$$U(M) \text{ has property } \mathcal{P} \implies M \text{ has property } \mathcal{P}$$

When R is unital and $\mathcal{G}$ is a group, then Question 1 has been investigated for many different properties $\mathcal{P}$ including: direct summand, free, finitely generated, finitely presented, projective, injective, essential, small and flat (see [12, Sections I.2–I.3]). Several of these results have been extended to the case when $\mathcal{G}$ is a groupoid and R is unital (see [9, 10, 11]). The aim of this article is to establish these and other results in the non-unital situation. Here is a detailed outline of the article.

In Section 2, we state our conventions on rings and modules and fix some notation with respect to these objects. After that, we define various concepts related to graded rings and modules. We also give some examples of graded rings (see Example 3 and Example 4). At the end of the section, we prove a result (see Proposition 5) that connects the categories $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$.

In Section 3, we introduce suspension for modules in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and we prove some auxiliary results about these (see Propositions 8–10). After that, we introduce the additive group of semi-graded maps between objects in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ (see Definition 11) and we prove some structural results for these objects (see Prop. 12, Prop. 14, Prop. 16, Prop. 17 and Cor. 19). At the end of the section, we state and prove a groupoid graded version of a well-known result regarding the hom and tensor functors for bimodules (see Proposition 22).

In Section 4, we deal with Question 1, in a non-unital situation, that is we analyse properties of the ungrading functor U from $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ (or $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$) to $R\text{-md}$ (or $R\text{-mod}$), including the properties direct summand, free, finitely generated, finitely presented, projective, injective, essential, small and flat.

In Section 5, we prove a graded non-unital version of a classical result concerning semisimple unital rings (see Proposition 55). After that, we show that semisimplicity is well behaved under the preimage of the forgetful functor (see Proposition 56). At the end of this section, we obtain a result relating graded simplicity of R (as an object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$) to graded injectivity and graded projectivity (see Proposition 58).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Rings and modules. Let R be a ring. By this we mean that R is associative but not necessarily unital. Then R is called *idempotent* if $RR = R$. Following Fuller [7], we say that R has *enough idempotents* if there exists a set $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$ of orthogonal idempotents in R (called a complete set of idempotents for R) such that $R = \bigoplus_{i \in I} Re_i = \bigoplus_{i \in I} e_i R$. Following

Ánh and Márki [1], we say that R is *locally unital* if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$ there is an idempotent $e \in R$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the equalities $er_i = r_i e = r_i$ hold. Following Tominaga [20], we say that R is *s-unital* if for all $r \in R$ the relation $r \in Rr \cap rR$ holds. The following chain of implications hold (see e.g. [14]) for all rings

$$\text{unital} \Rightarrow \text{enough idempotents} \Rightarrow \text{locally unital} \Rightarrow \text{s-unital} \Rightarrow \text{idempotent}.$$

Let M denote a left R -module. By this we mean that M is an additive group equipped with a biadditive map $R \times M \ni (r, m) \mapsto rm \in M$. In that case, we write ${}_R M$ to indicate this. We say that ${}_R M$ is unitary if $RM = M$. Analogously, (unitary) right R -modules M_R are defined.

If M and N are left (or right) R -modules, then we let $\text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ denote the additive group of R -linear maps $M \rightarrow N$. We denote by $R\text{-md}$ ($R\text{-mod}$) the category having (unitary) left R -modules as objects and R -module homomorphisms as morphisms. Analogously, the category $\text{md-}R$ ($\text{mod-}R$) of right (unitary) modules is defined. Let S be another ring. We say that an additive group M is an (unitary) R - S -bimodule if M is simultaneously a (unitary) left R -module and a (unitary) right S -module which also is balanced, that is having the property that $(rm)s = r(ms)$ for $r \in R$, $m \in M$ and $s \in S$. We denote by $R\text{-md-}S$ ($R\text{-mod-}S$) the category having (unitary) R - S -bimodules as objects and R - S -bimodule homomorphisms as morphisms.

Since we are considering modules over non-unital rings, freeness in the usual sense, that is, that the module has a basis, seems too restrictive. Instead, we say that a left R -module M is *weakly free (of finite type)* if M is isomorphic, as a module, to a (finite) direct sum of copies of R .

2.2. Graded rings. Let $R = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} R_\sigma$ be a ring graded by the groupoid $\mathcal{G}$. Then R is said to be *object unital* if for all $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$ the ring R_e is unital and for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $r \in R_\sigma$ the equalities $1_{R_{r(\sigma)}} r = r 1_{R_{d(\sigma)}} = r$ hold. The set $H(R) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} R_\sigma$ is called the set of *homogeneous elements of R* . If $r \in R_\sigma \setminus \{0\}$, then we say that r is of *degree σ* and write $\deg(r) = \sigma$. Any $r \in R$ has a unique decomposition $r = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} r_\sigma$, where $r_\sigma \in R_\sigma$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$, and all but finitely many of the r_σ are zero.

A non-empty subset $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ is called a *subgroupoid* of $\mathcal{G}$ if (i) $h \in \mathcal{H} \Rightarrow h^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}$, and (ii) $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{G}_2 \Rightarrow h_1 h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. In that case, $\mathcal{H}$ is called a *wide subgroupoid* of $\mathcal{G}$ if $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{G}_0$.

Proposition 2 ([6, Proposition 4]). *If R is object unital and we put*

$$\mathcal{H} = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{G} \mid 1_{R_{r(\sigma)}} \neq 0 \text{ and } 1_{R_{d(\sigma)}} \neq 0\},$$

then $\mathcal{H}$ is a subgroupoid of $\mathcal{G}$ and $R = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{H}} R_\sigma$. The subgroupoid $\mathcal{H}$ is wide if and only if for all $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$ the element 1_e is non-zero.

In light of Proposition 2, we will from now on make the following

Assumption. If R is object unital, then for all $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$, $1_{R_e} \neq 0$.

There are many examples of object unital groupoid graded rings (see [6]). Here, we describe two large such classes.

Example 3. Suppose that we are given a collection $A = (A_e)_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0}$ of non-zero unital rings A_e and put $A_0 = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} A_e$. For all $e, f \in \mathcal{G}_0$ let $\text{Iso}_{e,f}(A)$ denote the set of ring isomorphisms $A_f \rightarrow A_e$ (respecting identity elements). We let $\text{Iso}(A)$ denote the disjoint union $\biguplus_{e,f \in \mathcal{G}_0} \text{Iso}_{e,f}(A)$ and we define a groupoid structure on $\text{Iso}(A)$ in the following way. Take $e, e', f, f' \in \mathcal{G}_0$. The partial composition on $\text{Iso}(A)$ is defined to be the usual composition of functions $\text{Iso}_{e,f}(A) \times \text{Iso}_{e',f'}(A) \rightarrow \text{Iso}_{e,f'}(A)$, when $f = e'$, and otherwise undefined. By an *object crossed system* we mean a quadruple $(A, \mathcal{G}, \alpha, \beta)$ where $\alpha : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Iso}(A)$ and $\beta : \mathcal{G}_2 \rightarrow U^{\text{gr}}(A_0)$ are maps satisfying the following axioms for all $(\sigma, \tau, \rho) \in \mathcal{G}_3$ and all $a \in A_{d(\tau)}$

- $\alpha_\sigma : A_{d(\sigma)} \rightarrow A_{r(\sigma)}$ and $\alpha_e = \text{id}_{A_e}$ for $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$;
- $\beta_{\sigma,\tau} \in U(A_{r(\sigma)})$ and $\beta_{\sigma,d(\sigma)} = \beta_{r(\sigma),\sigma} = 1_{A_{r(\sigma)}}$;
- $\alpha_\sigma(\alpha_\tau(a)) = \beta_{\sigma,\tau} \alpha_{\sigma\tau}(a) \beta_{\sigma,\tau}^{-1}$;
- $\beta_{\sigma,\tau} \beta_{\sigma\tau,\rho} = \alpha_\sigma(\beta_{\tau,\rho}) \beta_{\sigma,\tau\rho}$.

The map α is called a *weak action* of $\mathcal{G}$ on A and β is called an α -*cocycle*. Suppose that $(A, \mathcal{G}, \alpha, \beta)$ is an object crossed system. Let $\{u_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}}$ be a copy of $\mathcal{G}$. We let $A \rtimes_\beta^\alpha \mathcal{G}$ denote the set of formal sums of the form $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a_\sigma u_\sigma$ where $a_\sigma \in A_{r(\sigma)}$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$, and $a_\sigma = 0$, for all but finitely many $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$. If $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a_\sigma u_\sigma$ and $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a'_\sigma u_\sigma$ are two such formal sums, then their sum is defined to be $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a_\sigma u_\sigma + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a'_\sigma u_\sigma = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} (a_\sigma + a'_\sigma) u_\sigma$. The product of two such formal sums is defined to be the additive extension of the relations $a_\sigma u_\sigma \cdot a'_\tau u_\tau = a_\sigma \alpha_\sigma(a'_\tau) \beta_{\sigma,\tau} u_{\sigma\tau}$, when $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$, and $a_\sigma u_\sigma \cdot a'_\tau u_\tau = 0$, otherwise. For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ we put $(A \rtimes_\beta^\alpha \mathcal{G})_\sigma = A_{r(\sigma)} u_\sigma$. With this grading, $A \rtimes_\beta^\alpha \mathcal{G}$ is an object unital $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring which is called an *object crossed product* (for the details, see [6, Proposition 16]). In the special case when all of the rings A_e coincide with the same ring B , all $\beta_{\sigma,\tau} = 1_B$ and all $\alpha_\sigma = \text{id}_B$, then the corresponding object crossed product equals $B[\mathcal{G}]$, the *groupoid ring* of $\mathcal{G}$ over B .

Example 4. Let A be a ring and suppose that $\alpha = (A_\sigma, \alpha_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}}$ is a *unital partial action* of $\mathcal{G}$ in A . Recall from [3] that this means that for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{G}$,

- A_σ is an ideal of $A_{r(\sigma)}$ and $A_{r(\sigma)}$ is an ideal of A ;
- there exists a central idempotent 1_σ of A such that $A_\sigma = A 1_\sigma$;
- $\alpha_\sigma : A_{\sigma^{-1}} \rightarrow A_\sigma$ is a ring isomorphism;
- $\alpha_{\sigma\tau}$ is an extension of $\alpha_\sigma \circ \alpha_\tau$, provided that $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

The corresponding *partial skew groupoid ring* $A \star_\alpha \mathcal{G}$ is defined to be the set of formal sums of the form $\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} a_g \delta_g$, where $a_g \in A_g$ and $a_g = 0$ for all but finitely many $g \in \mathcal{G}$. If $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a_\sigma \delta_\sigma$ and $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a'_\sigma \delta_\sigma$ are two such formal sums, then their sum is defined to be

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a_\sigma \delta_\sigma + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} a'_\sigma \delta_\sigma = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} (a_\sigma + a'_\sigma) \delta_\sigma.$$

The product of two such formal sums is defined to be the additive extension of the relations $a_\sigma \delta_\sigma \cdot a'_\tau \delta_\tau = a_\sigma \alpha_\sigma(a'_\tau 1_{\sigma^{-1}}) \delta_{\sigma\tau}$, when $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$, and $a_\sigma \delta_\sigma \cdot a'_\tau \delta_\tau = 0$, otherwise. For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ we put $(A \star_\alpha \mathcal{G})_\sigma = A_\sigma \delta_\sigma$. With this grading $A \star_\alpha \mathcal{G}$ is an object unital $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring with $1_{(A \star_\alpha \mathcal{G})_e} = 1_e \delta_e$, for $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

2.3. Graded modules. Let $M = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} M_\sigma$ be a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded left R -module. If $N = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} N_\sigma$ is another left R -module graded by $\mathcal{G}$, then a left R -module homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be *graded* if for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ the inclusion $f(M_\sigma) \subseteq N_\sigma$ holds. We let $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N)$ denote the set of graded R -module homomorphisms $M \rightarrow N$. The collection of (unitary) $\mathcal{G}$ -graded left R -modules and the collection of graded homomorphisms together form a category which we denote by $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$). Analogously, the category $\mathcal{G}\text{-md-}R$ ($\mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$) of (unitary) $\mathcal{G}$ -graded right R -modules is defined. If S is another $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring, then we say that an R - S -bimodule is graded if it is graded both as a left R -module and as a right S -module. The collection of (unitary) $\mathcal{G}$ -graded R - S -modules and the collection of graded homomorphisms together form a category which we denote by $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md-}S$ ($\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod-}S$). The set $H(M) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} M_\sigma$ is called the set of *homogeneous elements* of M . If $m \in M_\sigma$ is a non-zero element, then we say that m is of *degree* σ and write $\deg(m) = \sigma$. Any $m \in M$ has a unique decomposition $m = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} m_\sigma$, where $m_\sigma \in M_\sigma$, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$, and all but a finite number of the m_σ are zero. If N is an R -submodule of M , then it is called a graded submodule if $N = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} (N \cap M_\sigma)$. In the sequel, we will make repeated use of the following

Proposition 5. *If R is object unital and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-md-}R$), then $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ ($M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$) if and only if for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $m_\sigma \in M_\sigma$, the equality $1_{R_{r(\sigma)}} m_\sigma = m_\sigma$ ($m_\sigma = m_\sigma 1_{R_{d(\sigma)}}$) holds.*

Proof. First we show the “if” part. Suppose that for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $m_\sigma \in M_\sigma$, the equality $1_{R_{r(\sigma)}} m_\sigma = m_\sigma$ ($m_\sigma = m_\sigma 1_{R_{d(\sigma)}}$) holds. Take $m \in M$. Then there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m_{\sigma_i} \in M_{\sigma_i}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that $m = \sum_{i=1}^n m_{\sigma_i}$. Let $T = \{r(\sigma_i) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ and put $u = \sum_{t \in T} 1_{R_t}$. Then, clearly, $um = m$, and hence M is unitary.

Now we show the “only if” part. We will show the part about $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. The part about $\mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$ is analogous and is left to the reader. Let M be a module in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. Take $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m_\sigma \in M_\sigma$. Since M is unitary, it follows that there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau_i, \rho_i \in \mathcal{G}$, $r_i \in R_{\tau_i}$ and $m_i \in M_{\rho_i}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that $m_\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i m_i$ and $\tau_i \rho_i = \sigma$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $r(\sigma) = r(\tau_i \rho_i) = r(\tau_i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we get that $1_{R_{r(\sigma)}} m = \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{R_{r(\tau_i)}} r_i m_i = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i m_i = m$. $\square$

Corollary 6. *If R is a unital ring and $M \in R\text{-md}$ ($M \in \text{md-}R$), then $M \in R\text{-mod}$ ($M \in \text{mod-}R$) if and only if for all $m \in M$ the equality $1_R m = m$ ($m 1_R = m$) holds.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 5 upon letting $\mathcal{G}$ be the trivial group. $\square$

2.4. Graded abelian groups. An additive group A is said to be $\mathcal{G}$ -graded if there for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ is an additive subgroup A_σ of A such that $A = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} A_\sigma$ as additive groups. If B is another $\mathcal{G}$ -graded additive group, then a group homomorphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be *graded* if for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ the inclusion $f(A_\sigma) \subseteq B_\sigma$ holds. The collection of $\mathcal{G}$ -graded additive groups and the collection of graded homomorphisms together form an abelian category which we denote by $\text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Groups of this type can always, in a natural way, be viewed as graded left $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{G}_0]$ -modules, since $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{G}_0]$ is an object unital graded subring of $\mathbb{Z}[\mathcal{G}]$. We call this the *trivial grading* of the objects in $\text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$.

3. GRADED HOMOMORPHISMS

Throughout this section, R denotes a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring.

Definition 7. If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$, then the σ -suspension of M is the graded additive subgroup $M(\sigma)$ of M defined in the following way. If $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$, then put:

$$M(\sigma)_\tau = \begin{cases} M_{\tau\sigma} & \text{if } (\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2 \\ \{0\} & \text{if } (\tau, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 8. If R is a (object unital) $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring, $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$), then, with the induced left action by R , for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$, $M(\sigma) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($M(\sigma) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$).

Proof. First we show that $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$. To this end, take $\sigma, \tau, \rho \in \mathcal{G}$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: Suppose $(\rho, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

Case 1.1 $(\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(\rho\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$ and so $R_\rho M(\sigma)_\tau = R_\rho M_{\tau\sigma} \subseteq M_{\rho\tau\sigma} = M(\sigma)_{\rho\tau}$.

Case 1.2 $(\tau, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(\rho\tau, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$ and so $R_\rho M(\sigma)_\tau = R_\rho \{0\} = \{0\} = M(\sigma)_{\rho\tau}$.

Case 2: Let $(\rho, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$.

Case 2.1 : $(\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(\rho, \tau\sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$ and so $R_\rho M(\sigma)_\tau = R_\rho M_{\tau\sigma} = \{0\}$.

Case 2.2 : $(\tau, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $R_\rho M(\sigma)_\tau = R_\rho \{0\} = \{0\}$.

Now suppose R object unital and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. Take $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m \in M(\sigma)_\tau$. We wish to show that $1_{R_{\tau(\tau)}} m = m$. If $(\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $m \in M_{\tau\sigma}$ and therefore $1_{R_{\tau(\tau)}} m = m$. If $(\sigma, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $m = 0$ and so $1_{R_{\tau(\tau)}} m = 0 = m$. The claim now follows from Proposition 5. $\square$

Proposition 9. If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{G}$, then, as $\mathcal{G}$ -graded additive groups, we have that:

$$M(\tau)(\sigma) = \begin{cases} M(\sigma\tau) & \text{if } (\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2 \\ \{0\} & \text{if } (\sigma, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Take $\sigma, \tau, \rho \in \mathcal{G}$.

Case 1: $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

Case 1.1: $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $M(\tau)(\sigma)_\rho = M(\tau)_{\rho\sigma} = M_{\rho\sigma\tau} = M(\sigma\tau)_\rho$.

Case 1.2: $(\rho, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(\rho, \sigma\tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$ and hence $M(\tau)(\sigma)_\rho = \{0\} = M(\sigma\tau)_\rho$.

Case 2: $(\sigma, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$.

Case 2.1: $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Since $(\rho\sigma, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$, we get that $M(\tau)(\sigma)_\rho = M(\tau)_{\rho\sigma} = \{0\}$.

Case 2.2: $(\rho, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $M(\tau)(\sigma)_\rho = \{0\}$. $\square$

Proposition 10. *If $M \in \mathcal{G}$ -R-md and $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$, then, the following assertions hold.*

- (a) *As additive groups, we have that $M(\sigma) = M(d(\sigma))$.*
- (b) *As objects in $\mathcal{G}$ -R-md the decomposition $M = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} M(e)$ holds.*
- (c) *If $\mathcal{G}$ is a group, then for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ the equality $M(\sigma) = M$ holds.*

Proof. (a) Take $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$ with $(\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $M(\sigma)_\tau = M(\tau\sigma) = M(\tau\sigma d(\sigma)) = M(d(\sigma))_{\tau\sigma}$. Therefore

$$M(\sigma) = \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}, (\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2} M(\sigma)_\tau = \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}, (\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2} M(d(\sigma))_{\tau\sigma} \subseteq M(d(\sigma)).$$

Therefore $M(\sigma) \subseteq M(d(\sigma))$. Now we show the reversed inclusion. Take $\rho \in \mathcal{G}$, it is enough to check that $M(d(\sigma))_\rho \subseteq M(\sigma)$. Suppose $d(\rho) = d(\sigma)$, then $M(d(\sigma))_\rho = M_{\rho d(\sigma)} = M_{\rho\sigma^{-1}\sigma} = M(\sigma)_{\rho\sigma^{-1}} \subseteq M(\sigma)$, as desired.

(b) We have

$$M = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} M_\sigma = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}, d(\sigma)=e} M_\sigma \stackrel{(a)}{=} \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} M(e)$$

as additive groups.

(b) This follows from Proposition (a) and (b). $\square$

Definition 11. Suppose that $M, N \in \mathcal{G}$ -R-md. If $f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$, then we say that f is a map of degree σ if for all $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $f(M_\tau) \subseteq N(\sigma)_\tau$. We put

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\sigma &= \{f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N) \mid f \text{ is of degree } \sigma\} \\ \text{HOM}_R(M, N) &= \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\sigma \\ \text{END}_R(M) &= \text{HOM}_R(M, M). \end{aligned}$$

The elements of $\text{HOM}_R(M, N)$ will from now on be called *semi-graded maps*.

Proposition 12. *If $M, N, P \in \mathcal{G}$ -R-md and $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{G}$, then:*

- (a) $\text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\sigma = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-R}}(M, N(\sigma))$;
- (b) *as additive groups $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-R}}(M(\sigma^{-1}), N)$ is a direct summand in $\text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\sigma$;*
- (b) $\text{HOM}_R(N, P)_\sigma \circ \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\tau \subseteq \text{HOM}_R(M, P)_{\sigma\tau}$, *if $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$, and $\text{HOM}_R(N, P)_\sigma \circ \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\tau = \{0\}$, otherwise.*

- (c) $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N) \supseteq \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_e$ with equality if $\mathcal{G}_0$ is finite;
- (d) with the grading $\text{END}_R(M) = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathcal{G}} \text{HOM}_R(M, M)_\sigma$, $\text{END}_R(M)$ is a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring.

Proof. (a) This follows immediately from the definition of the suspension.
 (b) Define the additive map

$$p : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N(\sigma)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M(\sigma^{-1}), N)$$

by restriction. Let us show that p is well defined. Take $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N(\sigma))$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$.

Case 1: $d(\sigma) = d(\tau)$. Then $f(M(\sigma^{-1})_\tau) = f(M_{\tau\sigma^{-1}}) \subseteq M_{\tau\sigma^{-1}\sigma} = M_\tau$.

Case 2: $d(\sigma) \neq d(\tau)$. Then $f(M(\sigma^{-1})_\tau) = f(\{0\}) = \{0\} \subseteq M_\tau$.

Thus $p(f) \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M(\sigma^{-1}), N)$. Define the additive map

$$i : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M(\sigma^{-1}), N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N(\sigma))$$

in the following way. Given $g \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M(\sigma^{-1}), N)$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$, we put $i(g)|_{M(\sigma^{-1})} = g$ and $i(g)|_{M_\tau} = \{0\}$, if $r(\sigma) \neq d(\tau)$. Now we show that i is well defined.

Case 1: $r(\sigma) = d(\tau)$. Then $i(g)(M_\tau) = i(g)(M_{\tau\sigma\sigma^{-1}}) = i(g)(M(\sigma^{-1})_{\tau\sigma}) = g(M(\sigma^{-1})_{\tau\sigma}) \subseteq N_{\tau\sigma} = N(\sigma)_\tau$.

Case 2: $r(\sigma) \neq d(\tau)$. Then $i(g)(M_\tau) = \{0\} \subseteq N(\sigma)_\tau$. It is clear that $p \circ i = \text{id}_{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M(\sigma^{-1}), N)}$.

(c) Take $f \in \text{HOM}_R(N, P)_\sigma$ and $g \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\tau$. Take $\rho \in \mathcal{G}$. Then we get that $(f \circ g)(M_\rho) = f(g(M_\rho)) \subseteq f(M(\tau)_\rho) \subseteq N(\tau)(\sigma)_\rho$.

Case 1: $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Now Proposition 9 gives $(f \circ g)(M_\rho) \subseteq N(\sigma\tau)_\rho$. Thus $f \circ g \in \text{HOM}_R(M, P)_{\sigma\tau}$.

Case 2: $(\sigma, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Proposition 9 again implies that $(f \circ g)(M_\rho) = \{0\}$. Thus $f \circ g = 0$.

(d) From (a) we get that

$$\bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_e = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} \text{HOM}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N(e)) \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N).$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{G}_0$ is finite. For all $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$ let $p_e : N \rightarrow N(e)$ be the projection. Then $p_e \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(N, N(e))$ and $\sum_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} p_e = \text{id}_N$. Take $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N)$. Then, for all $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$, $p_e \circ f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N(e))$, and thus $f = \text{id}_N \circ f = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} p_e \circ f \in \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N(e))$. $\square$

Remark 13. If we let $\mathcal{G}$ be a group in Proposition 12, then clearly the kernel of the map p equals zero. Thus, we retrieve the equality

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M, N(\sigma)) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R}(M(\sigma^{-1}), N)$$

from [13, p. 25].

Proposition 14. Suppose that $M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}md$.

- (a) The inclusion $\text{HOM}_R(M, N) \subseteq \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ holds.
(b) If R is object unital and $M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, then

$$\text{HOM}_R(M, N) = \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$$

holds if $\mathcal{G}$ is finite or M is finitely generated as an object in $R\text{-mod}$.

Proof. (a) This is trivial. Now we show (b). Suppose first that $\mathcal{G}$ is finite. Take $f \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$. From Proposition 5, it follows that $1_{r(\sigma)}M_\sigma = M_\sigma$. Hence $f(M_\sigma) = f(1_{r(\sigma)}M_\sigma) = 1_{r(\sigma)}f(M_\sigma)$. Thus

$$f(M_\sigma) \subseteq 1_{r(\sigma)}N = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{G} \\ r(\alpha)=r(\sigma)}} N_\alpha = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{G} \\ r(\alpha)=r(\sigma)}} N_{\sigma\sigma^{-1}\alpha} = \sum_{\substack{\tau \in \mathcal{G} \\ r(\tau)=d(\sigma)}} N_{\sigma\tau}.$$

Take $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$. Now we define $f_\tau \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\tau$ in the following way. Take $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m_\sigma \in M_\sigma$. If $r(\tau) \neq d(\sigma)$, then put $f_\tau(m_\sigma) = 0$. If $r(\tau) = d(\sigma)$, then let $f_\tau(m_\sigma)$ be the component of $f(m_\sigma)$ of degree $\sigma\tau$. It is clear that $f = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}} f_\tau \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)$.

Now suppose that M is finitely generated as an object in $R\text{-mod}$. Take $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \mathcal{G}$ and non-zero $m_i \in M_{\sigma_i}$, for $i = 1, \dots, p$, such that $M = \sum_{i=1}^p Rm_i$. Take $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. There is a finite subset S_i of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $f(m_i) \in \sum_{\sigma \in S_i} N_\sigma$. From Proposition 5, it follows that $1_{r(\sigma_i)}m_i = m_i$. Thus $f(m_i) = 1_{r(\sigma_i)}f(m_i)$ and we can therefore assume that $r(\sigma_i) = r(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma \in S_i$. Put $T_i = \sigma_i^{-1}S_i$. This is a well defined set since $d(\sigma_i^{-1}) = r(\sigma_i) = r(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in S_i$. Let $T = \bigcup_{i=1}^p T_i$. Take $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$. Then $M_\sigma = \left(\sum_{i=1}^p Rm_i \right)_\sigma = \sum_{i, d(\sigma_i)=d(\sigma)} R_{\sigma\sigma_i^{-1}}m_i$. Write $f(m_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_{ij}} n_{ij}$ for some $n_{ij} \in N_{\alpha_{ij}}$ where $\alpha_{ij} \in \mathcal{G}$. Therefore $f(M_\sigma) = \sum_{i, d(\sigma_i)=d(\sigma)} R_{\sigma\sigma_i^{-1}}f(m_i) =$

$$\sum_{i, d(\sigma_i)=d(\sigma)} \sum_{j=1}^{q_{ij}} R_{\sigma\sigma_i^{-1}}n_{ij}. \text{ Put } S_\sigma = \{\sigma_i^{-1}\alpha_{ij} \mid d(\sigma) = d(\sigma_i), r(\sigma_i) = r(\alpha_{ij})\}.$$

The above calculation shows that $f(M_\sigma) \subseteq \sum_{\tau \in S_\sigma} N_{\sigma\tau}$. Take $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$. Now we define $f_\tau \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\tau$ in the following way. Take $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m_\sigma \in M_\sigma$. If $\tau \notin S_\sigma$, then put $f_\tau(m_\sigma) = 0$. If $\tau \in S_\sigma$, then let $f_\tau(m_\sigma)$ be the component of $f(m_\sigma)$ of degree $\sigma\tau$ in $\sum_{\tau \in S_\sigma} N_{\sigma\tau}$. It is clear that $f = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}} f_\tau \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)$. $\square$

Remark 15. If $\mathcal{G}$ is infinite or if M is not finitely generated, then the equality $\text{HOM}_R(M, N) = \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ does not always hold (see [12, p. 11] for a counterexample in the case when $\mathcal{G}$ is a group).

Now we gather groupoid graded versions of some results concerning bi-module actions on groups of homomorphisms (see e.g. [18, p. 78] for the ungraded situation).

Proposition 16. Suppose that R and S are $\mathcal{G}$ -graded rings.

- (a) If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}md\text{-}S$ (with S object unital and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}mod\text{-}S$) and $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}md$, then $\text{HOM}_R(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}S\text{-}md$ ($\text{HOM}_R(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}S\text{-}mod$), where

$$(sf)(m) = f(ms)$$

, for $s \in S$, $f \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)$ and $m \in M$.

- (b) If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}md\text{-}S$ (with R object unital and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}mod$) and $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}md\text{-}S$, then $\text{HOM}_S(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}md\text{-}R$ ($\text{HOM}_S(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}mod\text{-}R$), where

$$(fr)(m) = f(rm),$$

for $f \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)$, $r \in R$ and $m \in M$.

- (c) If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}md\text{-}S$ and $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}md\text{-}S$ (with R object unital and $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}mod$), then $\text{HOM}_S(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}md$ ($\text{HOM}_S(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}mod$), where

$$(rf)(m) = rf(m),$$

for $r \in R$, $f \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)$, and $m \in M$.

- (d) If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}md$ and $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}md\text{-}S$ (with S object unital and $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}mod\text{-}S$), then $\text{HOM}_R(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}md\text{-}S$ ($\text{HOM}_R(M, N) \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}mod\text{-}S$), where

$$(fs)(m) = f(m)s,$$

for $f \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)$, $s \in S$ and $m \in M$.

Proof. We only show (a). The rest of the statements are shown in a similar fashion and are therefore left to the reader. It is clear that the action of S defines a left S -module structure on $\text{HOM}_R(M, N)$. What is left to check are the statements concerning the grading. To this end, take $\sigma, \tau, \rho \in \mathcal{G}$ and $f_\tau \in \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_\tau$.

Case 1: $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

Case 1.1: $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(S_\sigma f_\tau)(M_\rho) = f_\tau(M_\rho S_\sigma) \subseteq f_\tau(M_{\rho\sigma}) \subseteq M(\tau)_{\rho\sigma} = M(\tau)(\sigma)_\rho = M(\sigma\tau)_\rho$, by Proposition 9.

Case 1.2: $(\rho, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(S_\sigma f_\tau)(M_\rho) = f_\tau(M_\rho S_\sigma) = \{0\} = M(\sigma\tau)_\rho$. From Proposition 12(a) it now follows that $S_\sigma f_\tau \subseteq \text{HOM}_R(M, N)_{\sigma\tau}$.

Case 2: $(\sigma, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$.

Case 2.1: $(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(S_\sigma f_\tau)(M_\rho) = f_\tau(M_\rho S_\sigma) \subseteq f_\tau(M_{\rho\sigma}) \subseteq M(\tau)_{\rho\sigma} = \{0\}$.

Case 2.2: $(\rho, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(S_\sigma f_\tau)(M_\rho) = f_\tau(M_\rho S_\sigma) = \{0\}$. Therefore, $S_\sigma f_\tau = \{0\}$.

Now suppose that S is object unital and that M_S is unitary. We wish to use Proposition 5 to show that $\text{HOM}_R(M, N)$ is unitary as a left S -module. Take $m_\rho \in M_\rho$. Case 1: $(\rho, \tau) \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(1_{R_{r(\tau)}} f_\tau)m_\rho = f_\tau(m_\rho 1_{R_{r(\tau)}}) = f_\tau(m_\rho)$. Case 2: $(\rho, \tau) \notin \mathcal{G}_2$. Then $(1_{R_{r(\tau)}} f_\tau)m_\rho = f_\tau(m_\rho 1_{R_{r(\tau)}}) = f_\tau(0) = 0 = f_\tau(m_\rho)$. Therefore $1_{R_{r(\tau)}} f_\tau = f_\tau$. $\square$

Proposition 17. Suppose that R is an object unital ring and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}mod$. If we equip $\text{HOM}_R(R, M)$ with the $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-}mod$ structure defined in Proposition

16(a), then the map $\alpha : M \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(R, M)$, defined by $\alpha(m)(r) = rm$, for $m \in M$ and $r \in R$, is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$.

Proof. Clearly α is an R -linear graded map. Define a map

$$\beta : \text{HOM}_R(R, M) \rightarrow M$$

in the following way. Take $f \in \text{HOM}_R(R, M)$. Take $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $f = \sum_{i=1}^n f_{\sigma_i}$ and $f_{\sigma_i} \in \text{HOM}_R(R, M)_{\sigma_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Put $\beta(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_{\sigma_i}(1_{r(\sigma_i)})$. Clearly β is additive. Also, since $f_{\sigma_i}(1_{r(\sigma_i)}) \in M_{r(\sigma_i)\sigma_i} = M_{\sigma_i}$, we get that β is graded. Now we show that β respects left multiplication by homogeneous elements from R . To this end, take $\tau, \sigma \in G$, $r_\tau \in R_\tau$ and $f_\sigma \in \text{HOM}_R(R, M)_\sigma$.

Case 1: $d(\tau) \neq r(\sigma)$. Then $\beta(r_\tau \cdot f_\sigma) = \beta(0) = 0 = r_\tau f_\sigma(1_{r(\sigma)}) = r_\tau \beta(f_\sigma)$.

Case 2: $d(\tau) = r(\sigma)$. Then $\beta(r_\tau \cdot f_\sigma) = \beta(f_\sigma(r_\tau)) = f_\sigma(1_{r(\tau\sigma)}r_\tau) = f_\sigma(1_{r(\tau)}r_\tau) = f_\sigma(r_\tau) = f_\sigma(r_\tau 1_{d(\tau)}) = f_\sigma(r_\tau 1_{r(\sigma)}) = r_\tau f_\sigma(1_{r(\sigma)}) = r_\tau \beta(f_\sigma)$.

Finally we show that $\beta \circ \alpha = \text{id}_M$ and $\alpha \circ \beta = \text{id}_{\text{HOM}_R(R, M)}$. Take $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$ and $m_\sigma \in M_\sigma$. Then $\beta(\alpha(m_\sigma)) = \alpha(m_\sigma)(1_{r(\sigma)}) = 1_{r(\sigma)}m_\sigma = m_\sigma$. Next, take $(\tau, \sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_2$, $f_\sigma \in \text{HOM}_R(R, M)_\sigma$ and $r_\tau \in R_\tau$. Then $\alpha(\beta(f_\sigma))(r_\tau) = \alpha(f_\sigma(1_{r(\sigma)}))(r_\tau) = r_\tau f_\sigma(1_{r(\sigma)}) = f_\sigma(r_\tau 1_{r(\sigma)}) = f_\sigma(r_\tau 1_{d(\tau)}) = f_\sigma(r_\tau)$. $\square$

Remark 18. Suppose that R is an object unital $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$. If we equip $\text{HOM}_R(R, M)$ with the $\mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$ structure defined in Proposition 16(b), then, in a fashion similar to the proof of Proposition 17, one can show that the map $\alpha' : M \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(R, M)$, defined by $\alpha'(m)(r) = mr$, for $m \in M$ and $r \in R$, is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$.

Corollary 19. *If R is an object unital $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring, then the maps*

$$\alpha : R \rightarrow \text{END}_R(R)$$

and

$$\alpha' : R \rightarrow \text{END}_R(R),$$

from Proposition 17 and Remark 18 are isomorphisms in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod-}R$.

The proofs of the following two proposition is similar to the ungraded case (found e.g. in [18]).

Proposition 20. *The following assertions hold.*

(a) *If M , $\{N_i\}_{i \in I}$, $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$, then the isomorphism*

$$\text{HOM}_R(\oplus_{i \in I} N_i, M) \cong \oplus_{i \in I} \text{HOM}_R(N_i, M)$$

holds in $\text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$.

(b) *If $M \rightarrow N \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$, then the induced sequence in $\text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$:*

$$0 \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(P, Q) \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(N, Q) \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(M, Q)$$

is exact.

Definition 21. If M is a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded right R -module and N is a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded left R -module, then we may consider $M \otimes_R N$ as an object in $\text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$, where the grading is defined by letting $(M \otimes_R N)_{\sigma}$, $\sigma \in \Gamma$, be the $\mathbb{Z}$ -module generated by all $m_{\tau} \otimes n_{\rho}$, $d(\tau) = r(\rho)$, $\tau\rho = \sigma$, $m_{\tau} \in M_{\tau}$, $n_{\rho} \in N_{\rho}$. To see that this is well defined, note that $M \otimes_R N = M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N/L$ where L is the graded subgroup of $M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N$ generated by the elements of the form $mr \otimes n - m \otimes rn$. The grading on $M \otimes_R N$ is therefore induced by the grading on $M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} N$. If S is another $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring and N is a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded R - S -bimodule, then if we consider $M \otimes_R N$ with its right S -module structure it is a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded right S -module.

The usual relation between Hom and $\otimes$ carry over to the $\mathcal{G}$ -graded situation:

Proposition 22. *If R and S are $\mathcal{G}$ -graded rings, $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-md-}R$, $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md-}S$ and $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-md-}S$, then the map*

$$\varphi : \text{HOM}_S(M \otimes_R N, P) \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(M, \text{HOM}_S(N, P))$$

defined by $\varphi(f)(m)(n) = f(m \otimes n)$, for $f \in \text{HOM}_R(M \otimes_R N)$, $m \in M$ and $n \in N$, is a well defined isomorphism in $\text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$. In that case, if R and S are object unital, $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}R$, $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod-}S$ and $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}S$, then the functors

$$M \otimes_R - : \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}S$$

and

$$\text{HOM}_S(-, P) : \mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}S \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$$

form an adjoint pair.

Proof. From Proposition 16(b) it follows that $\text{Hom}_S(N, P)$ is a (unitary) $\mathcal{G}$ -graded right R -module (if N is unitary as a left R -module). It is clear that φ is graded. To show that φ is an isomorphism we proceed as in the classical case (see e.g. [18, p. 92]). To prove the last statement, let ϕ denote the restriction of φ to the sum of the components of degree in $\mathcal{G}_0$. Then we get that

$$\phi : \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} \text{HOM}_S(M \otimes_R N, P)_e \rightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} \text{HOM}_R(M, \text{HOM}_S(N, P))_e.$$

is an isomorphism, or, in other words, that

$$\phi : \text{HOM}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-mod-}S}(M \otimes_R N, P) \rightarrow \text{HOM}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}}(M, \text{HOM}_S(N, P))$$

is an isomorphism. $\square$

4. THE UNGRADING FUNCTOR

Throughout this section, R denotes a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring. In this section, we analyse properties of the ungrading functor U from $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ (or $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$) to $R\text{-md}$ (or $R\text{-mod}$), including the properties direct summand, free, finitely generated, finitely presented, projective, injective, essential, small and flat. Note that a large part of the results that we are about to present have already been obtained in the unital situation (see [13] for the group graded

case and [9] for the groupoid graded situation). Therefore, we will often just sketch the proofs or refer to the existing proofs in the unital case. The following lemma will be used in the sequel.

Lemma 23. *Suppose that $M, N, P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and $f : M \rightarrow P$, $g : N \rightarrow P$ and $h : M \rightarrow N$ are R -linear maps such that $f = g \circ h$. If f and g (f and h) are graded, then there is a graded map $h' : M \rightarrow N$ ($g' : N \rightarrow P$) such that $f = g \circ h'$ ($f = g' \circ h$).*

Proof. The proof of [9, 3.1.1 Lemma] works in the non-unital situation also. $\square$

Let A and B be objects in an abelian category. Recall that B is called a direct summand of A if there is an object C in the category such that $A \cong B \oplus C$.

Corollary 24. *Suppose that $M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ and R is object unital). If N is a graded submodule of M , then N is a direct summand of M in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$) if and only if $U(N)$ is a direct summand of $U(M)$ in $R\text{-md}$ ($R\text{-mod}$).*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 23. $\square$

Definition 25. Suppose that $L, M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($L, M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ and R is object unital). We say that a short exact sequence of graded maps:

$$(1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \longrightarrow 0$$

splits if there is a graded isomorphism $h : M \rightarrow L \oplus N$ making the following diagram commutative:

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L & \xrightarrow{f} & M & \xrightarrow{g} & N \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \text{id}_L \downarrow & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow \text{id}_N \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L & \xrightarrow{\iota_L} & L \oplus N & \xrightarrow{\pi_N} & N \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Proposition 26. *With the notation from Definition 25, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *The sequence (1) splits.*
- (ii) *There exists a graded map $\varphi : M \rightarrow L$ such that $\varphi \circ f = \text{id}_L$.*
- (iii) *There exists a graded map $\psi : N \rightarrow M$ such that $g \circ \psi = \text{id}_N$.*

Proof. The ungraded proof of the implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) and the equivalence (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) (see e.g. [18]) carry over to the graded situation, taking into account Lemma 23. The implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) can be proved in a similar way, using the Five Lemma for abelian categories (see e.g. [5, Theorem 5.9]). $\square$

Definition 27. If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ (R is object unital and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$), then we say that M is (finite) free by suspension if there is a (finite) set I and $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{G}$, for $i \in I$, such that $M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} R(\sigma_i)$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ ($\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$).

Remark 28. In [9] the concept “free by suspension” is called just “free”. However, since not all groupoid graded modules that are free by suspension are free in the usual module theoretic sense (see [9, Example 3.2.1]), that is, that the module has a “basis” with the property that none of the elements of this basis can be annihilated by non-zero action of the ring, we have chosen to introduce this new adjective, in order to not confuse the reader.

Proposition 29. *Let R be a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded ring.*

- (a) *The ring R is free by suspension.*
- (b) *If R has the property that $R_e = \{0\}$, for all but finitely many $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then R is finite free by suspension.*
- (c) *If R is unital, then R is finite free by suspension.*

Proof. From Proposition 10 it follows that $R = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} R(e)$ as $\mathcal{G}$ -graded rings, if we consider R as a $\mathcal{G}$ -graded module over itself. Therefore (a) holds. (b) follows from the proof of (a); (c) follows from (b) and [9, Proposition 2.1.1]. $\square$

Proposition 30. *If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ is (finite) free by suspension, then there is $M' \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ such that M is (finite) free by suspension and $U(M \oplus M')$ is weakly free (of finite type).*

Proof. We use the proof of [9, Proposition 3.2.2.]. It is enough to prove the claim when $M = R(\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$. Put $M' = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0 \setminus \{d(\sigma)\}} R(e)$. Then $U(M \oplus M') = U(R)$ which is weakly free of finite type. $\square$

Definition 31. Let $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$. If n is a non-negative integer, then we say that M has a (finite) presentation of length n if there is an exact sequence $F_n \rightarrow F_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ of maps and modules in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ which all are (finite) free by suspension. If M has a (finite) presentation of length 0, then we say that M is (finitely) generated. If M has a (finite) presentation of length 1, then we say that M is (finitely) presented.

Proposition 32. *Suppose that $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$.*

- (a) *If M has a finite presentation of length n , then $U(M)$ has a finite presentation of length n .*
- (b) *The module M is (finitely) generated if and only if $U(M)$ is finitely generated.*

Proof. Using Proposition 30 it is clear that the proof of [9, Proposition 3.3.1] works in the non-unital situation also. $\square$

Proposition 33. *Suppose that $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

- (a) *The module M admits a presentation of length n .*
- (b) *There is $F \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$, with F free by suspension, and a graded submodule K of F such that F/K and M are isomorphic in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$.*
- (c) *The module M is presented.*

- (d) *The module M is the direct limit of a direct system of graded maps and finitely presented graded modules.*

Proof. The proof of [9, Proposition 3.3.4] works in the non-unital situation also. $\square$

Recall that an object A in an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ is called projective if the functor $\text{hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, -) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$ is exact. Similarly to the ungraded situation, there is a characterization of projective objects in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$:

Proposition 34. *A module $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ is projective if and only if for every surjective $g : M \rightarrow N$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and every $h : P \rightarrow N$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$, there exists $\bar{h} : P \rightarrow M$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ such that $h = g \circ \bar{h}$.*

Proposition 35. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an abelian category. Then:*

- (i) *If $(P_i)_{i \in I}$ is a family of objects in $\mathcal{A}$, then $\bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i$ is projective if and only if each P_i is projective.*
- (ii) *If $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \xrightarrow{\alpha} C \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence in $\mathcal{A}$, then the sequence splits if and only if there is $\beta : C \rightarrow B$ such that $\alpha \circ \beta = \text{id}_C$.*

Proof. These are standard facts which can be found in [19]. $\square$

Lemma 36. *If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ is free by suspension, then M is projective in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 23, Proposition 33(b) and Proposition 35(i), it is clear that we can use the proof of [9, Lemma 3.2.1] in the non-unital situation also. $\square$

Now we give a graded version of [2, Proposition 2.2].

Lemma 37. *With the above notations:*

- (a) *If $e \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and $u \in R_e$ is an idempotent, then Ru is projective as an object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$.*
- (b) *If R is object unital, then R is projective as an object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$.*

Proof. (a) Suppose that $g : M \rightarrow N$ and $h : Ru \rightarrow N$ are morphisms in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ with g surjective. Since $u = u^2$, we get that $u \in Ru$. Thus, from the surjectivity of g , it follows that there exists $m' \in M$ such that $g(m') = h(u)$. Put $m = um'$. Then $g(m) = g(um') = ug(m') = uh(u) = h(u^2) = h(u)$. Define $\bar{h} : Ru \rightarrow M$ by $\bar{h}(ru) = rm$, for $r \in R$. Now we show that $\bar{h}$ is well defined. Suppose that $ru = 0$ for some $r \in R$. Then $rm = r(um') = (ru)m' = 0m' = 0$. It is clear that $\bar{h}$ is R -linear. By Lemma 23, we can choose $\bar{h}$ so that it is graded.

(b) This follows from (a) above, Proposition 10(a) and Proposition 35(a), since $R = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} R(e) = \bigoplus_{e \in \mathcal{G}_0} R1_e$ as objects in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. $\square$

Remark 38. Notice that if A is a non-unital ring then ${}_A A$ is not necessarily projective. Indeed, ${}_A A$ is in general locally projective (see [1, Proposition 2]) .

Proposition 39. *Suppose that R is object unital and $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $U(P)$ is projective.
- (ii) $U(P)$ is projective in $R^1\text{-mod}$, where $R^1 = R \times \mathbb{Z}$ is the unitalization of R .
- (iii) P is projective.
- (iv) Every short exact sequence in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$

$$(3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} P \longrightarrow 0$$

splits.

- (v) P is a direct summand in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ of a module which is free by suspension.

Proof. (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii): This follows from (ii) of [2, Proposition 2.4] and the fact that R is locally unital.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & P & \\ \bar{h} \swarrow & \downarrow h & \\ M & \xrightarrow{g} N & \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

of morphisms in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ where g is surjective. Since P is projective in $R\text{-mod}$ there is $\bar{h}: P \rightarrow M$ in $R\text{-mod}$ such that $h = g \circ \bar{h}$. But then by Lemma 23 the map $\bar{h}$ can be considered in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ and so P is projective.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): This can be done as the second part of the proof of [9, Proposition 3.4.3.].

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv): Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & P & & & \\ & & & \downarrow \text{id}_P & & & \\ & & \varphi \swarrow & & \searrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L & \xrightarrow{f} & M & \xrightarrow{g} & P \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

If P is projective, there is $\varphi: P \rightarrow M$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ such that $g \circ \varphi = \text{id}_P$. By Proposition 26, the sequence (3) splits.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (v): By Proposition 33(b) there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Ker } \varphi \hookrightarrow F \xrightarrow{\varphi} P \longrightarrow 0$$

with F free by suspension. By hypothesis, this sequence split in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, so P is a direct summand of F .

(v) $\Rightarrow$ (i): By Lemma 36 and Proposition 35 it follows that P is projective. On the other hand, the proof of Lemma 37 can be used to show that every free module by suspension is projective in $R\text{-mod}$ (specifically, every $R(\sigma)$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}$). Therefore, $U(P)$ being a direct summand of a direct sum of projective modules, is projective in $R\text{-mod}$. $\square$

Corollary 40. *If R is object unital and $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, then P is projective finitely generated if and only if $U(P)$ is projective finitely generated.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 32 and Proposition 39. $\square$

Recall that an object A in an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ is called injective if the functor $\text{hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, A) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Ab}$ is exact. Similarly to the ungraded situation, there is a characterization of injective objects in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$:

Proposition 41. *A module $Q \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ is injective if and only if for every injective $f : M \rightarrow N$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ and every $h : M \rightarrow Q$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$, there exists $\bar{h} : N \rightarrow Q$ in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ such that $h = \bar{h} \circ f$*

Proposition 42. *Let $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of objects in an abelian category. Then $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ is injective if and only if each A_i is injective.*

Proof. These are standard facts which can be found in [19]. $\square$

Now we give a description of the injective objects in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ analogous to Baer's criterion (see e.g. [18]).

Proposition 43. *The following statements for $Q \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ are equivalent:*

- i) Q is injective.
- ii) Every short exact sequence in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$

$$(4) \quad 0 \rightarrow Q \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \rightarrow 0$$

splits.

- (iii) The functor $\text{HOM}_{\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}}(-, M) : R\text{-md} \rightarrow \text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is exact.
- (iv) For every graded left ideal I of R , the canonical map

$$\text{HOM}_R(R, M) \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(I, M)$$

is surjective.

Proof. It is clear that if we use Proposition 42, then we can proceed as in the proof of [9, Proposition 3.5.2] in the non-unital situation also. $\square$

Corollary 44. *If $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ has $U(M)$ is injective, then M is injective.*

Remark 45. The converse of Corollary 44 does not hold in general. For a counterexample when $\mathcal{G}$ is a group, see [12, p. 8].

Let A be an object in an abelian category. Recall that a subobject B of A is called essential (small) in A if $B \cap C \neq 0$ ($B + C \neq A$) for every nonzero subobject C of A .

Proposition 46. *Suppose that R is object unital and $M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ where N is a graded submodule of M .*

- (a) *The module N is essential in M if and only if $U(N)$ is essential in $U(M)$.*
- (b) *If $U(N)$ is small in $U(M)$, then N is small in M .*

Proof. The proof of [9, Proposition 3.6.1] works in the non-unital situation also. $\square$

Remark 47. (a) The reversed implication in Proposition 46(b) does not hold in general. For a counterexample in the case when $\mathcal{G}$ is a group, see [12, p. 10].

(b) It is not clear to the authors if Proposition 46 holds for general groupoid graded rings R and $M, N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$.

We say that $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-md}$ is flat if the functor $- \otimes_R M : \mathcal{G}\text{-md-}R \rightarrow \text{Ab}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is exact.

Proposition 48. *If R is object unital and $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, then the following five statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The module $U(M)$ is flat.*
- (ii) *The module M is flat.*
- (iii) *For every finitely presented $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, the canonical graded map $\text{HOM}_R(P, R) \otimes_R M \rightarrow \text{HOM}_R(P, M)$ is surjective.*
- (iv) *For every finitely presented $P \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ and each semi-graded map $u : P \rightarrow M$, there is $F \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, free of finite type, such that $U(F)$ is free of finite type, and semi-graded maps $v : P \rightarrow F$ and $w : F \rightarrow M$, such that $u = w \circ v$.*
- (v) *The module M is the direct limit of $F_i \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, $i \in I$, of finite type, such that each $U(F_i)$ is free of finite type.*

Proof. The proof of [9, Proposition 3.7.2] works in the non-unital situation also. $\square$

5. SEMISIMPLICITY

Throughout this section, R denotes an object unital $\mathcal{G}$ -gradd ring. In classical module theory, given $M \in R\text{-mod}$, the following properties are equivalent:

- M is semisimple;
- M is a direct sum of simple modules;
- every submodule of M is a direct summand.

In this section, we prove a graded version of this result (see Proposition 55). After that, we show that semisimplicity is a well behaved under the preimage of the forgetful functor (see Proposition 56). At the end of this section, we obtain a result relating graded simplicity of R (as an object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$) to graded injectivity and graded projectivity (see Proposition 58).

Definition 49. Let $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. We say that M is *simple* if $\{0\}$ and M are the only graded submodules of M . We say that M is *semisimple* if M is the direct sum of a family of simple modules in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$.

Lemma 50. *Let $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ and suppose that $M = \sum_{i \in I} M_i$, where, for all $i \in I$, $M_i \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ is a simple module. If $N \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ is a graded submodule of M , then there exists $J \subseteq I$ such that $M = N \oplus \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$.*

Proof. Consider the non-empty set

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ J \subseteq I : N + \sum_{j \in J} M_j \text{ is direct} \right\}.$$

The set $\mathcal{M}$ is partially ordered by inclusion. We claim that $\mathcal{M}$ is inductive. If we assume that the claim holds, then by an application of Zorn's Lemma, the maximal element of $\mathcal{M}$ is exactly M .

Now we show the claim. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a chain in $\mathcal{M}$. Put $K = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{B}} J$. Then K is an upper bound for $\mathcal{B}$ and $K \in \mathcal{M}$. For, if $K \notin \mathcal{M}$, there will be $j_1 \in J_1, \dots, j_r \in J_r$ and $n \in N, m_1 \in M_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_r} \in M_{j_r}$ not all zero such that

$$0 = n + \sum_{t=1}^r m_{j_t}.$$

Being $\mathcal{B}$ chain, there is $J \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $j_1, \dots, j_r \in J$ and consequently the sum $N + \sum_{j \in J} M_j$ will not be direct, which is impossible. Therefore, Zorn's Lemma provides a maximal $J \subseteq I$ with the property that $L = N + \sum_{j \in J} M_j$ is direct. If we can show that $L = M$ we will be end. For this, is enough to see that $M_i \subseteq L$, for every $i \in I$. But this follows immediately since if $M_i \cap L = \{0\}$ then $J \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{M}$. $\square$

Proposition 51. *The following properties of an object $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ are equivalent:*

- (i) M is semisimple.
- (ii) M is a direct sum of simple modules.

Proof. The implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) follows from Definition 49. Suppose that (i) holds. Let $M = \sum_{i \in I} M_i$ be a sum of simples modules. The claim now follows from Lemma 50 by taking $N = \{0\}$. $\square$

Proposition 52. *Let $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ be a sum of simple modules and let N be a graded submodule of M . Then:*

- (i) N is a direct summand.
- (ii) $N \cong \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$, for some $J \subseteq I$ and the isomorphism is given in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$.

Proof. (i) follows directly from the proof of Lemma 50. Now we prove (ii). By (i), there is a graded submodule K of M such that $M = N \oplus K$. By an application of Zorn's Lemma as in the proof of Lemma 50, $M = L \oplus \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$ for some $J \subseteq I$. Therefore, $N \cong M/L \cong \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$ and the isomorphism is given in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. $\square$

Corollary 53. *Every graded submodule and every quotient of a semisimple module is semisimple.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 52. $\square$

Lemma 54. *If M is an object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ and M is finitely generated, as an object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, then M contains a maximal graded submodule.*

Proof. Consider the collection $\mathcal{L}$ of all proper graded submodules of M . This is a non-empty set partially ordered by inclusion. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a chain in $\mathcal{L}$ and put $N = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{K}} L$. Then N is an upper bound for $\mathcal{K}$ and $N \in \mathcal{L}$. Otherwise $N = M$ and there would be a finite set $I \subseteq H(M)$ such that $N = \sum_{m \in I} Rm$. But then every $m \in I$ would belong to the graded submodule Rm in $\mathcal{K}$ and since $\mathcal{K}$ is a chain, the finite sum $N = \sum_{m \in I} Rm \in \mathcal{K}$, leading to the contradiction $M \in \mathcal{K}$. From this, Zorn's Lemma provides a maximal graded submodule of M . $\square$

Proposition 55. *For an object $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ the following properties are equivalent:*

- (i) M is semisimple
- (ii) M is a direct sum of simple modules.
- (iii) Every graded submodule of M is a direct summand.

Proof. The equivalence (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) follows from Proposition 52. The implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) follows from Lemma 50. Finally, we prove the implication (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Suppose that every graded submodule of M is a direct summand. Then, in particular, $L = \sum\{N : N \text{ is a graded simple submodule of } M\}$ is a direct summand of M . It is enough to show that the complement of L is $\{0\}$. To this end, note that every graded submodule of M contains a simple submodule. In fact, since every graded submodule is a sum of homogeneous cyclic modules, is enough to see this assertion is valid for every Rm , $m \in H(M)$. Given $m \in H(M)$ since R is object unital then Rm is finitely generated and then by Lemma 54 there exists a maximal graded submodule K of Rm . By hypothesis, $M = K \oplus K'$ with K' graded submodule of M . But $Rm = M \cap Rm = K \oplus (K' \cap Rm)$, then $Rm \cap K' \cong Rm/K$ is a simple submodule of Rm due to the maximality of K over Rm . Summarizing, $L = M$ is a sum of simple modules. $\square$

Proposition 56. *Let $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. If $U(M)$ is semisimple then M is semisimple.*

Proof. Let N be a graded submodule of M . If $U(M)$ is semisimple then $U(N)$ is a direct summand, so there is $f : M \rightarrow N$ in $R\text{-mod}$ such that $f \circ \iota_N = \text{id}_N$, where $\iota_N : N \rightarrow M$ is the canonical inclusion. By Lemma 23 we can assume that f is graded and hence N is a direct summand of M in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$. $\square$

Definition 57. We say that R is *semisimple* as a graded ring if it is semisimple considered as an object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$.

Proposition 58. *If R is an object-unital ring, then the following properties are equivalent:*

- (i) The ring R is semisimple as a graded ring.

- (ii) Every graded left ideal I of R is a direct summand of R .
- (iii) Every object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ is injective.
- (iv) Every object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ is projective.
- (v) Every object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$ is semisimple.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): This follows from Proposition 55.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): Let $M \in \mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, I, J be graded left ideals of R such that $R = I \oplus J$ and $g \in \text{HOM}_R(I, M)$. The function $f: R \rightarrow M$ defined by $f(i + j) = g(i)$, for every $i \in I$ and every $j \in J$, satisfies $g = f \circ \iota$, where $\iota: I \rightarrow R$ is the inclusion, and $f \in \text{HOM}_R(R, M)$. By Baer's Criteria (Proposition 43), M is injective.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv): If

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

is a short exact sequence in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, that L is injective implies by Proposition 43 that the sequence splits. But this is equivalent to (iv) by Proposition 39.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (v): For every object in $\mathcal{G}\text{-}R\text{-mod}$, any graded submodule induces a short exact sequence that split by hypothesis, turning it into a direct summand.

(v) $\Rightarrow$ (i): This is clear. □

REFERENCES

- [1] P. N. Ánh and L. Márki, *Morita equivalence for rings without identity*, Tsukuba J.Math. 11(2) (1987), 1–16.
- [2] G. Aranda, K M. Rangaswamy and M. S. Molina, *Weakly Regular and Self-Injective Leavitt Path Algebras Over Arbitrary Graphs*, Algebr. Represent. Theor, (2011) 14:751–777.
- [3] D. Bagio and A. Paques, Partial Groupoid Actions: Globalization, Morita Theory, and Galois Theory. *Comm. Alg.* **40**, 3658–3678 (2012).
- [4] E. Batista, Partial actions: what they are and why we care, *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin* Volume 24, Number 1 (2017), 35–71.
- [5] D. A. Buchsbaum, Exact Categories and Duality, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **1**, 1–34 (1955).
- [6] J. Cala, P. Lundström and H. Pinedo, Object-unital groupoid graded rings, crossed products and separability. Accepted for publication in *Communications in Algebra*.
- [7] K. R. Fuller, *On rings whose left modules are direct sums of finitely generated modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 54 (1976), 39–44.
- [8] M. V. Lawson, *Inverse Semigroups. The Theory of Partial Symmetries* (World Scientific Pub. Co., 1995).
- [9] P. Lundström, The category of groupoid graded modules, *Colloq. Math.* **100**(4), 195–211 (2004).
- [10] P. Lundström, Crossed product algebras defined by separable extensions, *J. Algebra* **283** (2005), 723–737.
- [11] P. Lundström, Strongly groupoid graded rings and cohomology, *Colloq. Math.* **106**(1), 1–13 (2006).
- [12] C. Năstăsescu and F. Van Oystaeyen, *Graded Ring Theory*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York (1982).
- [13] C. Nastasescu and F. van Oystaeyen, *Methods of graded rings*, Springer Lecture Notes (2004).

- [14] P. Nystedt, *A survey of s-unital and locally unital rings*, *Revista Integración*. **37** (2), 251–260 (2019).
- [15] P. Nystedt, J. Öinert, H. Pinedo, Epsilon-strongly groupoid graded rings, the Picard inverse category and cohomology, *Glasgow Math. J.* **62** (1), 233–259 (2020).
- [16] N. Popescu, *Abelian Categories with Applications to Rings and Modules*. Academic Press, Inc. (1973)
- [17] J. Renault, *A Groupoid Approach to C^* -algebras*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **793**(2) (1980).
- [18] J. Rotman, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra*, Academic Press (1979).
- [19] B. Stenström, *Rings of Quotients*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg (1975).
- [20] H. Tominaga H., On s-unital rings, *Math. J. Okayama univ.* **18** (1976), 117–134.

ESCUELA DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD INDUSTRIAL DE SANTANDER, CARRERA
27 CALLE 9, EDIFICIO CAMILO TORRES APARTADO DE CORREOS 678, BUCARAMANGA,
COLOMBIA

Email address: jccalab@gmail.com

UNIVERSITY WEST, DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE, SE-46186 TROLLHÄTTAN,
SWEDEN

Email address: patrik.lundstrom@hv.se

ESCUELA DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD INDUSTRIAL DE SANTANDER, CARRERA
27 CALLE 9, EDIFICIO CAMILO TORRES APARTADO DE CORREOS 678, BUCARAMANGA,
COLOMBIA

Email address: hpinedot@uis.edu.co