

REMARKS ON SEPARATIVITY OF REGULAR RINGS

A. ALAHMADI, S.K. JAIN, AND A. LEROY

ABSTRACT. Separative von Neumann regular rings exist in abundance. For example, all regular self-injective rings, unit regular rings, regular rings with a polynomial identity are separative. It remains open whether there exists a non-separative regular ring. In this note, we study a variety of conditions under which a von Neumann regular ring is separative. We show that a von Neumann regular ring R is separative under anyone of the following cases: (1) R is CS; (2) R is pseudo injective (auto-injective); (3) R satisfies the closure extension property: the essential closures in R of two isomorphic right ideals are themselves isomorphic. We also give another characterization of a regular perspective ring (Proposition 3.3)

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

A ring R is von Neumann regular if for any $a \in R$ there exists $b \in R$ such that $a = aba$. A ring R is separative if for any finitely generated projective right modules M and N , the isomorphisms $M \oplus N \cong M \oplus M \cong N \oplus N$ imply $M \cong N$. Many regular rings are separative. For example, right (or left) self-injective regular rings, unit regular rings, regular rings with polynomial identity are separative. The separativity condition for regular rings is connected with the following two important properties for a nonunit element $a \in R$:

$$(1.1) \quad l(a)R = Rr(a) = R(1 - a)R$$

where $r(a) = \{x \in R \mid ax = 0\}$ and $l(a) = \{x \in R \mid xa = 0\}$.

$$(1.2) \quad \text{The element } a \text{ is a product of idempotents.}$$

In [5] Hannah and O'Meara proved the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let R be a regular right self-injective ring and let $a \in R$. Then a is a product of idempotents if and only if $Rr(a) = l(a)R = R(1 - a)R$.*

The following remarkable equivalence is due to O'Meara ([12]).

Theorem 1.2. *Let R be a regular ring. Then R is separative if and only for every non unit $a \in R$, conditions (1.1) and (1.2) are equivalent.*

The right maximal quotient ring of a right nonsingular ring is a von Neumann regular right self injective ring. In particular, the above two theorems show that the right maximal quotient ring Q of a regular ring is always separative. So any regular ring R can be

embedded in a regular separative ring viz. its maximal right quotient ring $Q(R)$. We are thus interested on the question when the separativity property goes down from $Q(R)$ to R ? In the next section we will give some sufficient conditions for this to happen.

2. MAIN RESULT

The following lemma is a key result that will be invoked at several places.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a regular ring and $Q = Q(R)$ be its right maximal quotient ring. If for any finite set of idempotents, $e_1, \dots, e_n, f_1, \dots, f_l$ in R , $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$ implies $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$, then the ring R is separative.*

Proof. Suppose that, for any idempotents e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n and f_1, f_2, \dots, f_l of R we have $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$ implies that $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$. Since the ring R is regular, finitely generated projective right R -modules are isomorphic to direct sums of principal ideals of the form eR . Suppose M, N are two right finitely generated projective R -modules such that

$$M \oplus N \cong M \oplus M \cong N \oplus N.$$

Tensoring with $Q = Q_{\max}(R)$ over R , we get

$$M \otimes Q \oplus N \otimes Q \cong M \otimes Q \oplus M \otimes Q \cong N \otimes Q \oplus N \otimes Q.$$

Since $M \otimes Q$ and $N \otimes Q$ are also finitely generated, the fact that Q is separative implies that $M \otimes Q \cong N \otimes Q$. Since the ring R is regular, we can write finitely generated projective right R -modules as $M \cong \prod_{i=1}^n e_i R$ and $N \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$. We then have $M \otimes Q \cong \prod e_i R \otimes Q \cong \prod e_i Q$ and similarly $N \otimes Q \cong \prod f_j Q$. Therefore $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$. So by hypothesis $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$ hence $M \cong N$ and the ring is separative. \square

Remark 2.2. (see Lam Exercise 21.13 [9]) This may be of the interest for the reader to know that if R is a subring of a ring Q (say for example right maximal quotients of R) and if $eR \cong fR$ for any two idempotents e, f in R then $eQ \cong fQ$. However, the converse need not be true.

For presenting the first case as when a regular ring is separative we need the notion of pseudo injective module now known as auto invariant modules. A module M is called pseudo injective if every monomorphism from a submodule N of M can be extended to an endomorphism of M ([7]). It has been shown in [6] that M is pseudo injective if and only if M is invariant under automorphism of $E(M)$ where $E(M)$ is the injective hull of M (See the recent book [14]). In view of this, pseudo injective modules are called auto invariant modules. Note that auto invariant modules need not be CS, as is the case for quasi continuous (π -injective), quasi injective and injective modules. We illustrate this by first proving the following lemma. This result is in proposition 3.2, Chapter 12 in [15]. We offer here a direct simple proof.

Lemma 2.3. *The maximal quotient ring of a Boolean ring is again Boolean.*

Proof. Let B be a Boolean ring and $Q = Q(B)$ its right maximal quotient ring. As is well-known and easy to check, R and Q are both commutative. For any $q \in Q$ there exists a right essential ideal E of R such that $qE \subset B$. So for any $x \in E$, $(qx)^2 = qx$. This gives $qx = q^2x^2 = q^2x$ for every $x \in E$. This leads to $(q^2 - q)E = 0$ and hence $q^2 = q$. \square

As a consequence we get the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Every boolean ring is pseudo injective but not necessarily CS.*

Proof. Since the quotient ring $Q = Q(R)$ is Boolean, the only invertible element of Q is the element 1. Hence we obtain that the units of Q all belong to R . This implies that the ring R is auto invariant and hence pseudo injective. A boolean ring need not be CS as is shown in the remark below. \square

Remark 2.5. A boolean ring need not be CS or continuous but it is always pseudo injective (auto-invariant). We give two examples of this situation. The first one comes from Lambek's book ([10], p. 45): let R be the boolean ring of finite and cofinite subset of the natural numbers \mathbb{N} , with usual operations of intersections and unions. This ring is Boolean, hence commutative, regular and pseudo injective. It is not CS (equivalently continuous or quasi continuous) since its injective hull is the class of all subsets of natural numbers.

The second example is extracted from Goodearl (cf. [4], p. 174): we define Q to be the \mathbb{F}_2 algebra $Q = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{R}} F_i$, where for every real number i , $F_i = \mathbb{F}_2$. Let R be the \mathbb{F}_2 subalgebra of Q generated by 1 and the set

$$J = \{x \in Q \mid x_i = 0 \text{ for all but countably many } i \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Then R and its maximal ring of quotients Q are both Boolean (hence unit regular) and so R is pseudo injective. However R is not CS (equivalently not quasi continuous) since all idempotents of Q do not belong to R . Let us remark that this is yet another example of a ring which is pseudo injective but not quasi injective.

Our next result is based on the following lemma. Its proof can be found in ([7], lemma 3.2).

Lemma 2.6. *Let M be a right pseudo injective nonsingular module with injective hull $E(M)$. If N is a closed submodule of $E(M)$ and σ is an injective morphism from N into $E(M)$, then $\sigma(N \cap M) = \sigma(N) \cap M$.*

Proposition 2.7. *A regular right self pseudo injective ring is separative.*

Proof. Let Q be the right maximal quotient ring of R . We will again use Lemma 2.1. So assume that $\{e_i, f_j \in R \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq l\}$ are idempotents in R such that $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$, and denote this isomorphism by σ . We can consider both $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q$ and $\prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$ as submodules of Q^{n+l} . We denote by σ_i the restriction of σ to $e_i Q$. $\sigma(\prod e_i R) = \prod \sigma_i(e_i R) = \prod \sigma_i(e_i Q \cap R)$. Since R is pseudo injective we use the above lemma 2.6 and get $\prod \sigma_i(e_i Q \cap R) = \prod (\sigma_i(e_i Q) \cap R) = (\prod \sigma_i(e_i Q)) \cap R^{n+l} = \sigma(\prod (e_i Q)) \cap R^{n+l} = \prod f_j Q \cap R^{n+l} = \prod f_j R$. Then Lemma 2.1 finishes the proof. \square

Next we will give another sufficient condition for a regular ring to be separative. For another application of the above lemma 2.1 we introduce the following definition.

Definition 2.8. A nonsingular ring R is said to have the closure extension property if any R -isomorphism between two right ideals of R can be extended to an isomorphism between their essential closures in R .

Proposition 2.9. *Let R be a regular ring and suppose that R satisfies the closure extension property. Then R is separative.*

Proof. Let $e_1, \dots, e_n, f_1, \dots, f_l$ be idempotents in R , such that $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$, where $Q = Q_{max}^r(R)$. According to Lemma 2.1, we need to show that $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R \cong \prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$. Now, $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R$ is essential in $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q$ hence, $\sigma(\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R)$ is essential in $\sigma(\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q) = \prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$. Next $\prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$ is essential in $\prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$ and so $I' := \sigma(\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R) \cap (\prod_{j=1}^l f_j R)$ is essential in $\prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q$ and indeed in $\prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$. Similar arguments with σ^{-1} gives that $I := \sigma^{-1}(\sigma(\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R) \cap (\prod_{j=1}^l f_j R)) \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n e_i R$ is essential in $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q$ and hence essential in $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \prod_{i=1}^n e_i Q & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \prod_{j=1}^l f_j Q \\
 \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 \prod_{i=1}^n e_i R & & \prod_{j=1}^l f_j R \\
 \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 I & \xrightarrow{\cong} & I'
 \end{array}$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R$ is closed in R^n , $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R$ is the essential closure of I and our hypothesis gives that σ induces an isomorphism between $\prod_{i=1}^n e_i R$ and $\prod_{j=1}^l f_j R$, as desired. \square

Before presenting an application, let us notice that for a regular ring the notions of CS, quasi-continuous and continuous module are all equivalent. In ([12]) O'Meara shows that a regular continuous ring is separative. We give here a direct proof for the CS (equivalently continuous) case.

Proposition 2.10. *A regular CS (equivalently continuous or quasi continuous) ring R is separative.*

Proof. Corollary 2.32 in [11] exactly says that isomorphic submodules of a quasi-continuous module have isomorphic closures. In our situation this means that a regular CS ring has the closed extension property and hence is separative. \square

We do not have an example of a regular ring that is not separative. According to comments by O'Meara (cf. [12]), a good "playground" for finding such an example would be the ring $Q = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} M_n(F)$, where F is a countable field. Let us remark that this ring is the maximal quotient ring of its socle $S = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^* M_n(F)$, where $\prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}}^* M_n(F)$ stands for

sequences of $\prod M_n(F)$ with only finitely many nonzero entries. Clearly the right (left) maximal quotient ring of a subring of Q containing the socle is Q itself.

3. PERSPECTIVE AND SEPARATIVE RINGS

A ring R is perspective if for any two idempotents $e, f \in R$ such that $eR \cong fR$ there exists an idempotent $g \in R$ such that $eR \oplus gR = R = fR \oplus gR$. This notion is left right symmetric and it is well known that a regular ring R is perspective if and only if R is unit regular and hence separative. In the previous section we tried to push down the separativity condition from the right maximal quotient ring $Q(R)$ to R itself. In this section we will analyze the separativity condition.

Lemma 3.1. *Let R be a von Neumann regular ring with right maximal quotient ring Q and suppose that e, f are isomorphic idempotents of R . Let g be an idempotent in Q such that $eQ \oplus gQ = Q = fQ \oplus gQ$, then there exists $e_1, f_1, g_1, g_2 \in Q$ such that*

- (1) $ee_1 + gg_1 = 1 = ff_1 + gg_2$.
- (2) $gg_1e = ee_1g = ff_1g = gg_2f = 0$
- (3) $e = ee_1e, f = ff_1f, ee_1Q = eQ, ff_1Q = fQ, gg_1Q = gQ$.
- (4) $(1 - e)gQ = (1 - e)Q$ and $((1 - e)gQ) \cap R = (1 - e)R$.
- (5) $(1 - e)(gQ \cap R) \subseteq_e (1 - e)R$ and $(1 - f)(gQ \cap R) \subseteq_e (1 - f)R$
- (6) $E((1 - e)(gQ \cap R)) = (1 - e)Q$ and $E((1 - f)(gQ \cap R)) = (1 - f)Q$
- (7) $eR \oplus (gQ \cap R)$ and $fR \oplus (gQ \cap R)$ are essential right ideals in R .

Proof. (1) This is clear from $eQ \oplus gQ = Q = fQ \oplus gQ$.

(2) Right multiplying the equality $ee_1 + gg_1 = 1$ by e we get $e(1 - e_1e) = gg_1e \in eQ \cap gQ = 0$. Hence $gg_1e = 0$ and $e = ee_1e$. The other equalities are obtained similarly.

(3) These are easy facts that we leave to the reader.

(4) Left multiplying $eQ \oplus gQ = Q$ by $(1 - e)$ we get $(1 - e)gQ = (1 - e)Q$ intersecting this equality with R gives $(1 - e)gQ \cap R = (1 - e)R$.

(5) Let $(1 - e)gx \in (1 - e)gQ = (1 - e)Q$, and let E be an essential right ideal of R such that $\{0\} \neq gx E \subseteq gQ \cap R$. Then, since $gQ \cap eQ = 0$ we get $0 \neq (1 - e)gx E \subseteq (1 - e)(gQ \cap R)$. This shows that $(1 - e)(gQ \cap R) \subseteq_e (1 - e)Q$ and hence also $(1 - e)(gQ \cap R) \subseteq_e (1 - e)R$, as desired.

(6) This is clear: since $(1 - e)(gQ \cap R) \subseteq_e (1 - e)R \subseteq_e (1 - e)Q$, we get that $E((1 - e)gQ \cap R) = (1 - e)Q$.

(7) Computing the injective hull we get $E(eR \oplus gQ \cap R) = eQ \oplus gQ = Q$. Hence $eR \oplus gQ \cap R \subseteq_e Q$ and so $eR \oplus gQ \cap R \subseteq_e R$. \square

For a regular ring, perspectivity characterizes unit regularity (cf. Corollary 4.4 [4]). The statement (7) of the above lemma 3.1 leads to an equivalent characterization of unit regular rings as shown in Proposition 3.3. But first we need the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *Let R be a regular ring and e, f two idempotents in R such that there exists $g \in Q = Q_{\max}^r(R)$ with $eQ \oplus gQ = fQ \oplus gQ = Q$ then $eR \oplus (gQ \cap R) = fR \oplus (gQ \cap R)$ if and only if $e \in ee_1fR$ and $f \in ff_1eR$.*

Proof. First suppose that $eR \oplus gQ \cap R = fR \oplus gQ \cap R$. Lemma 3.1 (3) shows $gg_1Q = gQ$ and by the hypothesis $e \in eR \oplus gg_1Q$. Hence there exist an element $g_1 \in Q$ such that $e = fx + gg_1y$ for some $x \in R$ and $y \in Q$ with $gg_1y \in R$. Since $gg_1e = 0$, we then have $0 = gg_1e = gg_1fx + gg_1y$. This gives that $gg_1y = -gg_1fx \in R$ and hence, $e = fx + gg_1y = fx - gg_1fx = (1 - gg_1)fx = ee_1fx$. So that $e \in ee_1fR$. The fact that $f \in ff_1eR$ is obtained similarly. Conversely, suppose that $e \in ee_1fR$, then we have that $eR = ee_1fR$. We write $e = ee_1fx = (1 - gg_1)fx = fx - gg_1fx \in fR \oplus gQ \cap R$. \square

We say that two idempotents e, f in a ring R are isomorphic if $eR \cong fR$. It is well-known that this notion is left-right symmetric. We will give a characterization of perspectivity by using the classical module theoretic notion of complement of a submodule. We recall that for any submodule N_R of M_R there exists, by Zorn lemma, a maximal submodule $K_R \subseteq M$ with the property of being disjoint from N . In this case $N \oplus K \subseteq_e M$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let R be a regular ring. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The ring R is unit regular.*
- (2) *The ring R is perspective.*
- (3) *For isomorphic idempotents $e, f \in R$, there exists a right ideal I of R such that $eR \oplus I = fR \oplus I \subseteq_e R$.*
- (4) *For isomorphic idempotents $e, f \in R$, there exists $g^2 = g \in Q = Q_{\max}^r(R)$ such that $eR \oplus gQ \cap R = fR \oplus gQ \cap R \subseteq_e R$.*

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2): This is classical (cf. [4], corollary 4.4)

(2) \Rightarrow (3): This is clear.

(3) \Rightarrow (4): Starting with $eR \oplus I = fR \oplus I \subseteq_e R$ and taking injective hulls we get $eQ \oplus E(I) = fQ \oplus E(I) = Q$. Since there exists an idempotent $g \in Q$ such that $E(I) = gQ$, we get $eQ \oplus gQ = fQ \oplus gQ = Q$. Since $e \in fR \oplus I \subseteq fR \oplus gQ \cap R$ and $f \in eR \oplus I \subseteq eR \oplus gQ \cap R$, we get $eR \oplus gQ \cap R = fR \oplus gQ \cap R$. Lemma 3.1 (7) proves (3) implies (4).

(4) \Rightarrow (2): By hypothesis we have idempotents $e, f \in R$, and $g \in Q = Q_{\max}^r(R)$ such that $eR \oplus gQ \cap R = fR \oplus gQ \cap R \subseteq_e R$. Since R is a regular ring there exist idempotents $h, p \in R$ such that $eR = hR \oplus (eR \cap fR)$ and $fR = pR \oplus (eR \cap fR)$. Therefore we obtain $eR \oplus gQ \cap R = hR \oplus (eR \cap fR) \oplus (gQ \cap R)$. Similarly $fR \oplus (gQ \cap R) = pR \oplus (eR \cap fR) \oplus (gQ \cap R)$. so, the hypothesis gives $hR \oplus (eR \cap fR) \oplus (gQ \cap R) = pR \oplus (eR \cap fR) \oplus (gQ \cap R)$. This shows that $hR \cong pR$, let φ be the isomorphism from hR to pR . By setting $S = \{x + \varphi(x) \mid x \in hR\}$, we obtain $eR + fR = eR \oplus S = fR \oplus S$. Since R is regular we can write $R = (eR + fR) \oplus E$ for some right ideal E and we obtain $R = eR \oplus (S \oplus E) = fR \oplus (S \oplus E)$. This proves (4) implies (2). \square

Remark 3.4. One would like to know what property is inherited by R if $Q = Q_{\max}^r(R)$ is assumed to be perspective (equivalently unit regular).

For instance, a weaker version of the closure extension property given in Section 2 will be sufficient for the perspective property: to go down from $Q_{max}(R)$ to R . Let us give more details.

If a regular ring R satisfies the property that for two isomorphic right ideals their essential closures are subisomorphic. Then if Q is perspective (equivalently unit regular) so is R .

We need to show that if $e, f \in R$ are idempotents and $eR \cong fR$ then $(1 - e)R$ is isomorphic to $(1 - f)R$ (cf.[4]). Since $eR \cong fR$ we have that $eQ \cong fQ$ and the fact that Q is perspective implies that there exists $g^2 = g \in Q$ such that $eQ \oplus gQ = fQ \oplus gQ = Q$. Lemma 3.1 then shows that $eR \oplus gQ \cap R \subseteq_e R$ and $fR \oplus gQ \cap R \subseteq_e R$. We first show that $(1 - e)(gQ \cap R) \subseteq_e (1 - e)R$. Let $x \in (1 - e)R$, and let E be an essential right ideal of R such that $\{0\} \neq xE \subseteq eR \oplus gQ \cap R$. Then, since $x = (1 - e)x$, we have $0 \neq xE = (1 - e)xE \subseteq (1 - e)(gQ \cap R)$, as desired. So we conclude that the essential closure of $(1 - e)(gQ \cap R)$ in R is $(1 - e)R$ and similarly the closure of $(1 - f)(gQ \cap R)$ is $(1 - f)R$. Since $gQ \cap R$ is disjoint from eR and from fR , left multiplication by $(1 - e)$ and by $(1 - f)$ are 1-1 map on $gQ \cap R$ and hence $(1 - e)(gQ \cap R) \cong gQ \cap R \cong (1 - f)(gQ \cap R)$. The weak extension property then implies that $(1 - e)R$ and $(1 - f)R$ are subisomorphic. We thus have a 1-1 map $\varphi : (1 - e)R \rightarrow (1 - f)R$. This map with our initial isomorphism ψ gives us an injective map $eR \oplus (1 - e)R \xrightarrow{(\psi, \varphi)} fR \oplus (1 - f)R$. The map $\theta = (\psi, \varphi)$, has a left inverse. Since Q is Dedekind finite, the same is true for $End_R(R) = R$. Thus, θ and φ are isomorphisms. This implies that R is unit regular.

We now close the paper with the following example due to O'Meara [13] which shows that the property mentioned in the above remark is not true in general

Example 3.5. Let Q be the ring of all countably-infinite, column-finite matrices over a field F . Let $K = socle(Q)$. Let $R = K + D$ where D is the ring of all diagonal matrices over F . Note R is regular. Let $e = diag(1, 0, 1, 0, \dots)$ be the diagonal matrix. Now consider the right ideals of R : $I = eK$, $I' = (1 - e)K$. I and I' are isomorphic right ideals of R and their essential closures in R are $eQ \cap R = eR$ and $(1 - e)Q \cap R = (1 - e)R$. A map from eR to $(1 - e)R$ would be given by left multiplication of some element of $(1 - e)Re$. Since $(1 - e)Re \subset K$, left multiplication by an element of this set cannot induce a 1-1 map.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Ara, K. R. Goodearl, K. C. O'Meara and E. Pardo, Separative cancellation for projective modules over exchange rings, Israel J. Math. 105 (1998) 105-137.
- [2] , H. Chen, Rings related to stable range conditions, Series in Algebra Volume 11, World scientific (2011).
- [3] Ehrlich, G., Units and one sided units in regular rings, Trans. American Math. Soc. **216**, (1976), 81-90
- [4] K.R. Goodearl, Von Neumann regular rings, Krieger Publishing company Malabar, Florida, (1991).
- [5] J. Hannah and K. C. O'Meara, Products of Idempotents in Regular Rings, II. Journal of Algebra Vol. (123), (1989) 223-239.
- [6] N. Er, S.Singh, AR Srivastava, Rings and modules which are stable under automorphisms of their injective hulls Journal of Algebra (2013) 379 223-229.

- [7] S. K. Jain and S. Singh, On pseudo injective modules and self pseudo injective rings, *Journal Math. Sc.* **(2)** (1967), 23-31.
- [8] T. Y. Lam, *Lectures on modules and rings*, Springer Verlag GTM **(189)**.
- [9] T. Y. Lam, *Exercises in classical ring theory*, second edition, Springer Verlag, problem books in mathematics (2003).
- [10] J. Lambek, *Lectures on rings and modules*, Blaisdell Publishing Company (1966).
- [11] S. H. Mohamed and B. Müller *Continuous and discrete modules*, London Mathematical Society lecture Note Series, Cambridge University press , New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Cambridge university press.
- [12] K. C. O'Meara, Products of idempotents in separative regular rings, *Journal of Algebra and Its Applications* Vol. 13, No. 8 (**2014**) 1450071 (14 pages)
- [13] , Private communication.
- [14] A. Srivastava, A. Tuganbaev, P.A. Guil Asensio, Invariance of modules under automorphisms of their envelopes and covers.
- [15] Bo Stenström, *Rings of quotients*, Springer Verlag (1975).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KING ABDULAZIZ UNIVERSITY, JEDDAH, SA, EMAIL:ADELNIFE2@YAHOO.COM

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OHIO, ATHENS, USA, EMAIL: JAIN@OHIO.EDU

ARTOIS UNIVERSITY, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE LENS, UR 2462 , F-62300, LENS, FRANCE, EMAIL: ANDRE.LEROY@UNIV-ARTOIS.FR