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Abstract

Let \( R \) be a commutative ring with identity and \( S \) a multiplicative subset of \( R \). In this paper, we introduce and study the notions of \( S \)-pure \( S \)-exact sequences and \( S \)-absolutely pure modules which extend the classical notions of pure exact sequences and absolutely pure modules. And then we characterize \( S \)-von Neumann regular rings and uniformly \( S \)-Noetherian rings using \( S \)-absolutely pure modules.
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1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, \( R \) always is a commutative ring with identity, all modules are unitary and \( S \) always is a multiplicative subset of \( R \), that is, \( 1 \in S \) and \( s_1s_2 \in S \) for any \( s_1 \in S, s_2 \in S \).

The notion of absolutely pure modules was first introduced by Maddox [10] in 1967. An \( R \)-module \( E \) is said to be absolutely pure provided that \( E \) is a pure submodule of every module which contains \( E \) as a submodule. It is well-known that an \( R \)-module \( E \) is absolutely pure if and only if \( \text{Ext}^1_R(N,E) = 0 \) for any finitely presented module \( N \) ([14, Proposition 2.6]). So absolutely pure modules are also studied with the terminology FP-injective modules (FP for finitely presented), see Stenström [14] and Jain [7] for example. The notion of absolutely pure modules is very attractive in that it is not only a generalization of that of injective modules but also an important tool to characterize some classical rings. A ring \( R \) is semihereditary if and only if any homomorphic image of an absolutely pure \( R \)-module is absolutely pure ([11, Theorem 2]). A ring \( R \) is Noetherian if and only if any absolutely pure \( R \)-module is injective ([11, Theorem 3]). A ring \( R \) is von-Neumann regular if and only if any \( R \)-module is absolutely pure ([11, Theorem 5]). A ring \( R \) is coherent if and only if the class of absolutely pure \( R \)-modules is closed under
direct limits, if and only if the class of absolutely pure $R$-modules is a (pre)cover ([14, Theorem 3.2], [4, Corollary 3.5]).

One of the most important methods to generalize the classical rings and modules is in terms of multiplicative subsets $S$ of $R$ (see [1, 2, 3, 8, 9] for example). In 2002, Anderson and Dumitrescu [1] introduced $S$-Noetherian rings $R$ in which for any ideal $I$ of $R$, there exists a finitely generated sub-ideal $K$ of $I$ such that $sI \subseteq K$. Cohen’s Theorem, Eakin-Nagata Theorem and Hilbert Basis Theorem for $S$-Noetherian rings are given in [1]. However, the choice of $s \in S$ such that $sI \subseteq K$ in the definition of $S$-Noetherian rings as above is not uniform. Hence, Qi et al. [12] introduced the notion of uniform $S$-Noetherian rings and obtained the Eakin-Nagata-Formanek Theorem and Cartan-Eilenberg-Bass Theorem for uniformly $S$-Noetherian rings. Recently, the first author of the paper [17] introduced the notions of $S$-flat modules and $S$-von Neumann regular rings which can be seen as $S$-versions of flat modules and von Neumann regular rings. In this paper, we generalized the classical pure exact sequences and absolutely pure modules to $S$-pure $S$-exact sequences and $S$-absolutely pure modules, and then obtain $S$-versions of some classical characterizations of pure exact sequences and absolutely pure modules (see Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3.2). Finally, we characterize $S$-von Neumann regular rings and uniformly $S$-Noetherian rings using $S$-absolutely pure modules (see Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.7). As our work involves the uniformly $S$-torsion theory, we provide a quick review as below.

Recall from [17], an $R$-module $T$ is said to be uniformly $S$-torsion (with respect to $s$) provided that there exists an element $s \in S$ such that $sT = 0$. An $R$-sequence $\cdots \rightarrow A_{n-1} \xrightarrow{f_n} A_n \xrightarrow{f_{n+1}} A_{n+1} \rightarrow \cdots$ is $S$-exact, if for any $n$ there is an element $s \in S$ such that $s\ker(f_{n+1}) \subseteq \text{im}(f_n)$ and $s\text{im}(f_n) \subseteq \ker(f_{n+1})$. An $R$-sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$ is called a short $S$-exact sequence (with respect to $s$), if $s\ker(g) \subseteq \text{im}(f)$ and $s\text{im}(f) \subseteq \ker(g)$ for some $s \in S$. An $R$-homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ is an $S$-monomorphism (resp., $S$-epimorphism, $S$-isomorphism) (with respect to $s$) provided $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N$ (resp., $M \xrightarrow{f} N \rightarrow 0$, $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N \rightarrow 0$) is $S$-exact (with respect to $s$). Suppose $M$ and $N$ are $R$-modules. We say $M$ is $S$-isomorphic to $N$ if there exists an $S$-isomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$. A family $\mathcal{C}$ of $R$-modules is said to be closed under $S$-isomorphisms if $M$ is $S$-isomorphic to $N$ and $M$ is in $\mathcal{C}$, then $N$ is also in $\mathcal{C}$. It follows from [18, Proposition 1.1] that the existence of $S$-isomorphisms of two $R$-modules is actually an equivalence relation.

Recall from [12, Definition 4.1] that an $R$-module $E$ is called $S$-injective provided that the induced sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(C, E) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(B, E) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A, E) \rightarrow 0$$
is $S$-exact for any $S$-exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$. Following from [12, Theorem 4.3], an $R$-module $E$ is $S$-injective if and only if for any short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, the induced sequence $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(C, E) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(B, E) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A, E) \rightarrow 0$ is $S$-exact, if and only if $\text{Ext}^1_R(M, E)$ is uniformly $S$-torsion for any $R$-module $M$, if and only if $\text{Ext}^n_R(M, E)$ is uniformly $S$-torsion for any $R$-module $M$ and $n \geq 1$.

2. S-pure S-exact sequences

Recall from [13] that an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ is said to be pure provided that for any $R$-module $M$, the induced sequence $0 \rightarrow M \otimes_R A \rightarrow M \otimes_R B \rightarrow M \otimes_R C \rightarrow 0$ is also exact. Now we introduce the $S$-version of pure exact sequences.

Definition 2.1. Let $R$ be a ring, $S$ a multiplicative subset of $R$. A short $S$-exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ is said to be $S$-pure provided that for any $R$-module $M$, the induced sequence $0 \rightarrow M \otimes_R A \rightarrow M \otimes_R B \rightarrow M \otimes_R C \rightarrow 0$ is also $S$-exact.

Obviously, any pure exact sequence is $S$-pure. In [16, 34.5], there are many characterizations of pure exact sequences. The next result generalizes some of these characterizations to $S$-pure $S$-exact sequences.

Theorem 2.2. Let $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{f'} C \rightarrow 0$ be a short $S$-exact sequence of $R$-modules. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{f'} C \rightarrow 0$ is an $S$-pure $S$-exact sequence;
2. there exists an element $s \in S$ satisfying that if a system of equations $f(a_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m r_{ij}x_j$ (i.e., $r_{ij} \in R$ and unknowns $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ has a solution in $B$, then the system of equations $sa_i = \sum_{j=1}^m r_{ij}x_j$ (i.e., $r_{ij} \in R$ and unknowns $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ has a solution in $A$.
3. there exists an element $s \in S$ satisfying that for any given commutative diagram with $F$ finitely generated free and $K$ a finitely generated submodule of $F$, there exists a homomorphism $\eta : F \rightarrow A$ such that $s\alpha = \eta i$;

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \xrightarrow{i} & F \\
\alpha & \downarrow & \eta \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
\]
(4) There exists an element $s \in S$ satisfying that for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$, the induced sequence $0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, A) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \to 0$ is $S$-exact with respect to $s$.

**Proof.** (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Set the set $\Gamma = \{(K, R^n) \mid K$ is a finitely generated submodule of $R^n$ and $n < \infty\}$. Define $M = \bigoplus_{(K, R^n) \in \Gamma} R^n / K$. Then $0 \to M \otimes_R A \xrightarrow{\text{1}_{\otimes f}} M \otimes_R B \to M \otimes_R C \to 0$ by (1). So there is an element $s \in S$ such that $s \text{Ker}(1_M \otimes f) = 0$. Hence $s \text{Ker}(1_{R^n \otimes K} \otimes f) = 0$ for any $(K, R^n) \in \Gamma$. Now assume that there exists $b_j \in B$ such that $f(a_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}b_j$ for any $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Let $F$ be a free $R$-module with basis $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$, and let $K \subseteq F$ be the submodule generated by $m$ elements $\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{ij}e_i \mid j = 1, \cdots, m\}$. Then, $F/K$ is generated by $\{e_1 + K, \cdots, e_n + K\}$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{ij}(e_i + K) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{ij}e_i + K = 0 + K$ in $F/K$. Hence, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} ((e_i + K) \otimes f(a_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} ((e_i + K) \otimes (\sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}b_j)) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} ((\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{ij}(e_i + K)) \otimes b_j) = 0$$

in $F/K \otimes B$. And so $\sum_{i=1}^{n} ((e_i + K) \otimes a_i) \in \text{Ker}(1_{F/K} \otimes f)$. Hence, $s \sum_{i=1}^{n} ((e_i + K) \otimes a_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} ((e_i + K) \otimes sa_i) = 0$ in $F/K \otimes R A$. By \cite[Chapter I, Lemma 6.1]{Reference}, there exists $d_j \in A$ and $t_{ij} \in R$ such that $sa_i = \sum_{k=1}^{t} l_{ik}d_k$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{m} l_{ik}(e_i + K) = 0$, and so $\sum_{k=1}^{m} l_{ik}e_i \in K$.

Then there exists $t_{jk} \in R$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{m} l_{jk} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_{jk} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{ij}t_{jk})e_i$.

Since $F$ is free, we have $l_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}t_{jk}$. Hence

$$sa_i = \sum_{k=1}^{t} l_{ik}d_k = \sum_{k=1}^{t} (\sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}t_{jk})d_k = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} (\sum_{k=1}^{t} t_{jk}d_k)$$

with $\sum_{k=1}^{t} t_{jk}d_k \in A$. That is, $sa_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}x_j$ is solvable in $A$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let $s \in S$ satisfying (2) and $M$ be an $R$-module. Then we have an $S$-exact sequence $M \otimes_R A \xrightarrow{\text{1}_{\otimes f}} M \otimes_R B \to M \otimes_R C \to 0$ by \cite[Theorem 1.5]{Reference}. We will show that $\text{Ker}(1 \otimes f)$ is uniformly $S$-torsion. Let $\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_{i}^\lambda \otimes a_i^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ be the generators of $\text{Ker}(1 \otimes f)$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^\lambda \otimes f(a_i^\lambda) = 0$ in $M \otimes_R B$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. By \cite[Chapter I, Lemma 6.1]{Reference}, there exists $r_{ij}^\lambda \in R$ and $b_j^\lambda \in B$ such that $f(a_i^\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}^\lambda b_j^\lambda$
and \( \sum_{i=1}^{n_\lambda} u_i^\lambda r_{ij}^\lambda = 0 \) for each \( \lambda \in \Lambda \). So \( sa_i^\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{m_\lambda} r_{ij}^\lambda x_j^\lambda \) have a solution, say \( a_j^\lambda \) in \( A \) by (2). Then

\[
 s(\sum_{i=1}^{n_\lambda} u_i^\lambda \otimes a_i^\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\lambda} u_i^\lambda \otimes sa_i^\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\lambda} u_i^\lambda \otimes (\sum_{j=1}^{m_\lambda} r_{ij}^\lambda a_j^\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_\lambda} ((\sum_{i=1}^{n_\lambda} r_{ij}^\lambda u_i^\lambda) \otimes a_j^\lambda) = 0
\]

for each \( \lambda \in \Lambda \). Hence \( s \ker(1 \otimes f) = 0 \), and \( 0 \to M \otimes_R A \to M \otimes_R B \to M \otimes_R C \to 0 \) is \( S \)-exact.

(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (3): Let \( s \in S \) satisfying (2) and \( \{e_1, \cdots, e_n\} \) the basis of \( F \). Suppose \( K \) is generated by \( \{y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} e_j \mid i = 1, \cdots, m\} \). Set \( \beta(e_j) = b_j \) and \( \alpha(y_i) = a_i \), then \( f(a_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} b_j \). By (2), we have \( sa_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} d_j \) for some \( d_j \in A \). Let \( \eta: F \to A \) be \( R \)-homomorphism satisfying \( \eta(e_j) = d_j \). Then \( \eta i(y_i) = \eta i(\sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} e_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} \eta(e_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} d_j = sa_i = s \alpha(y_i) \), and so we have \( s \alpha = \eta i \).

(3) \( \Rightarrow \) (4): Let \( s \in S \) satisfying (3). Note that \( A \) is \( S \)-isomorphic to \( \text{Im}(f) \) and \( C \) is \( S \)-isomorphic to \( \text{Coker}(f) \). Thus, by [18, Proposition 1.1], we have homomorphisms \( t_1: A \to \text{Im}(f) \) with \( t_1(a) = f(a) \) for any \( a \in A \) and \( t_1': \text{Im}(f) \to A \) such that \( t_1 t_1' = s_1 \text{Id}_{\text{Im}(f)} \) and \( t_1' t_1 = s_1 \text{Id}_A \), and homomorphisms \( t_2: \text{Coker}(f) \to C \) and \( t_2': C \to \text{Coker}(f) \) such that \( f' = t_2 \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} \), \( t_2 t_2' = s_2 \text{Id}_C \) and \( t_2' t_2 = s_2 \text{Id}_{\text{Coker}(f)} \) for some \( s_1, s_2 \in S \) where \( \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)}: B \to \text{Coker}(f) \) is the natural epimorphism. Let \( N \) be a finitely presented \( R \)-module with \( 0 \to K \to F \to N \to 0 \) exact where \( F \) is finitely generated free and \( K \) finitely generated. Let \( \gamma \) be a homomorphism in \( \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \). Considering the exact sequence \( 0 \to \text{Im}(f) \to B \to \text{Coker}(f) \to 0 \), we have the following commutative diagram with rows exact:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
0 & \to & K & \xrightarrow{i_K} & \text{Im}(f) & \xrightarrow{i_{\text{Im}(f)}} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{Coker}(f)}} & \text{Coker}(f) & \to & 0 \\
& & h & \downarrow g & & & \downarrow t_2' \gamma & & & \\
0 & \to & \text{Im}(f) & \xrightarrow{i_{\text{Im}(f)}} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{Coker}(f)}} & \text{Coker}(f) & \to & 0
\end{array}
\]

By (3), there exists an homomorphism \( \eta: F \to A \) such that \( st_1' h = \eta i_K \). So \( ss_1 h = st_1 t_1' h = t_1 \eta i_K \). So the following diagram is also commutative:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
0 & \to & K & \xrightarrow{i_K} & F & \xrightarrow{\pi_N} & N & \to & 0 \\
& & ss_1 h & \downarrow t_1 \eta & & & & & \\
0 & \to & \text{Im}(f) & \xrightarrow{i_{\text{Im}(f)}} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{Coker}(f)}} & \text{Coker}(f) & \to & 0
\end{array}
\]
So by [15 Exercise 1.60], there is an \( R \)-homomorphism \( \delta : N \to B \) such that \( ss_1 t'_2 \gamma = \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} \delta \). Hence \( f^* : \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \) is an \( S \)-epimorphism with respect to \( ss_1 s_2 \). Consequently, one can verify the \( R \)-sequence \( 0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, A) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \to 0 \) is \( S \)-exact with respect to \( ss_1 s_2 \) by [20 Theorem 1.3].

(4) \( \Rightarrow \) (2): Let \( s \in S \) satisfying (4) and \( 0 \to A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \to 0 \) a short \( S \)-exact sequence of \( R \)-modules. Similar with the proof of (3) \( \Rightarrow \) (4), we have homomorphisms \( t_1 : A \to \text{Im}(f) \) with \( t_1(a) = f(a) \) for any \( a \in A \) and \( t'_1 : \text{Im}(f) \to A \) such that \( t_1 t'_1 = s_1 \text{Id}_{\text{Im}(f)} \) and \( t'_1 t_1 = s_1 \text{Id}_A \), and homomorphisms \( t_2 : \text{Coker}(f) \to C \) and \( t'_2 : C \to \text{Coker}(f) \) such that \( f' = t_2 \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} \), \( t_2 t'_2 = s_2 \text{Id}_C \) and \( t'_2 t_2 = s_2 \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} \) for some \( s_1, s_2 \in S \) where \( \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} : B \to \text{Coker}(f) \) is the natural epimorphism.

Suppose that \( f(a_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m r_{ij} b_j \) (\( i = 1, \ldots, n \)) with \( a_i \in A, b_j \in B \) and \( r_{ij} \in R \). Let \( F_0 \) be a free module with basis \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\} \) and \( F_1 \) a free module with basis \( \{e_1', \ldots, e_n'\} \). Then there are \( R \)-homomorphisms \( \tau : F_0 \to B \) and \( \sigma : F_1 \to \text{Im}(f) \) satisfying \( \tau(e_j) = b_j \) and \( \sigma(e_j') = f(a_i) \) for each \( i, j \). Define \( R \)-homomorphism \( h : F_1 \to F_0 \) satisfying \( h(e'_j) = \sum_{j=1}^m r_{ij} e_j \) for each \( i \). Then \( \tau h(e'_j) = \sum_{j=1}^m r_{ij} \tau(e_j) = \sum_{j=1}^m r_{ij} b_j = f(a_i) = \sigma(e_j') \). Set \( N = \text{Coker}(h) \). Then \( N \) is finitely presented. Thus there exists a homomorphism \( \phi : N \to \text{Coker}(f) \) such that the following diagram commutative:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F_1 & \xrightarrow{h} & F_0 \\
\downarrow{\sigma} & \downarrow{\tau} & \downarrow{\phi} \\
0 & \xrightarrow{t_{\text{Im}(f)}} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{Coker}(f)}} & \text{Coker}(f) & \to 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Note that the induced sequence

\[
0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, \text{Im}(f)) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, \text{Coker}(f)) \to 0
\]

is \( S \)-exact with respect to \( s_1 s_2 s \) by (4). Hence there exists a homomorphism \( \delta : N \to \text{Coker}(f) \) such that \( ss_1 s_2 \delta = \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} \delta \). Consider the following commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F_1 & \xrightarrow{h} & F_0 \\
\downarrow{s_1 s_2 s} & \downarrow{\eta} & \downarrow{s_1 s_2 s} \\
0 & \xrightarrow{t_{\text{Im}(f)}} & B & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\text{Coker}(f)}} & \text{Coker}(f) & \to 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

We claim that there exists a homomorphism \( \eta : F_0 \to \text{Im}(f) \) such that \( \eta f = s_1 s_2 s \sigma \). Indeed, since \( \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} \delta g = s_1 s_2 s \phi g = \pi_{\text{Coker}(f)} s_1 s_2 s \tau \), we have \( \text{Im}(s_1 s_2 s \tau - \delta g) \subseteq \ldots \)
Ker(π_{Coker(f)}) = \text{Im}(f). Define \( \eta : F_0 \to \text{Im}(f) \) to be a homomorphism satisfying \( \eta(e_i) = s_1s_2\tau f(e_i) - \delta g(e_i) \) for each \( i \). So for each \( e'_i \in F_1 \), we have \( \eta f(e'_i) = s_1s_2\tau f(e'_i) - \delta g f(e'_i) = s_1s_2\tau f(e'_i) \). Thus \( i_{\text{Im}(f)}(s_1s_2\sigma) = s_1s_2\text{Im}(f)\sigma = s_1s_2\tau f = i_{\text{Im}(f)}\eta f \). Therefore, \( \eta f = s_1s_2\sigma \). Hence \( s_1s_2\tau f(a_i) = s_1s_2\sigma(e'_i) = \eta f(a_i) \).

\[ \eta(b_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} \eta(e_j) \text{ with } \eta(e_j) \in \text{Im}(f) \text{. So we have } s_1^2 s_2 s a_i = s_1s_2 t'_1 f(a_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} t'_1 \eta(e_j) \text{ with } t'_1 \eta(e_j) \in A \text{ for each } i. \]

Recall from [19, Definition 2.1] that a short \( S \)-exact sequence \( 0 \to A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \to 0 \) is said to be \( S \)-split provided that there is \( s \in S \) and \( R \)-homomorphism \( t : B \to A \) such that \( tf(a) = sa \) for any \( a \in A \), that is, \( tf = s\text{Id}_A \).

**Proposition 2.3.** Let \( \xi : 0 \to A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \to 0 \) be an \( S \)-split short \( S \)-exact sequence. Then \( \xi \) is \( S \)-pure.

**Proof.** Let \( t : B \to A \) be an \( R \)-homomorphism satisfying \( tf = s\text{Id}_A \). Let \( f(a_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} x_j \) be a system of equations with \( r_{ij} \in R \) and unknowns \( x_1, \ldots, x_m \) has a solution, say \( \{ b_j \mid j = 1, \ldots, m \} \), in \( B \). Then \( sa_i = tf(a_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} t(b_j) \) with \( t(b_j) \in A \). Thus \( sa_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij} x_j \) is solvable in \( A \). So \( \xi \) is \( S \)-pure by Theorem 2.2. \( \square \)

Recall from [17, Definition 3.1] that an \( R \)-module \( F \) is called \( S \)-flat provided that for any \( S \)-exact sequence \( 0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0 \), the induced sequence \( 0 \to A \otimes_R F \to B \otimes_R F \to C \otimes_R F \to 0 \) is \( S \)-exact. By [17, Theorem 3.2], an \( R \)-module \( F \) is \( S \)-flat if and only if \( \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) \) is uniformly \( S \)-torsion for any \( R \)-module \( M \).

**Proposition 2.4.** An \( R \)-module \( F \) is \( S \)-flat if and only if every \((S-)\)exact sequence \( 0 \to A \to B \to F \to 0 \) is \( S \)-pure.

**Proof.** Suppose \( F \) is \( S \)-flat module. Let \( M \) be an \( R \)-module and \( 0 \to A \to B \to F \to 0 \) a short \( S \)-exact sequence. Then by [18, Theorem 1.5], there is a \( S \)-exact sequence \( \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) \to M \otimes_R A \to M \otimes_R B \to M \otimes_R F \to 0 \). Since \( F \) is \( S \)-flat, \( \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) \) is uniformly \( S \)-torsion by [17, Theorem 3.2]. Hence \( 0 \to M \otimes_R A \to M \otimes_R B \to M \otimes_R F \to 0 \) is \( S \)-exact. So \( 0 \to A \to B \to F \to 0 \) is \( S \)-pure.

On the other hand, considering the exact sequence \( 0 \to A \to P \to F \to 0 \) with \( P \) projective, we have an exact sequence \( 0 \to \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) \to M \otimes_R A \to M \otimes_R P \to M \otimes_R F \to 0 \) for any \( R \)-module \( M \). Since \( 0 \to A \to P \to F \to 0 \) is \( S \)-pure, \( \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) \) is uniformly \( S \)-torsion. So \( F \) is \( S \)-flat. \( \square \)
Proposition 2.5. Let \( \xi : 0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0 \) be a short \( S \)-exact sequence where \( B \) is \( S \)-flat. Then \( C \) is \( S \)-flat if and only if \( \xi \) is \( S \)-pure.

Proof. Suppose \( C \) is \( S \)-flat. Then \( \xi \) is \( S \)-pure by Proposition 2.4.

On the other hand, let \( M \) be an \( R \)-module. Then we have an \( S \)-exact sequence

\[
\text{Tor}_1^R(M, B) \to \text{Tor}_1^R(M, C) \to M \otimes_R A \to M \otimes_R B \to M \otimes_R C \to 0.
\]

Since \( B \) is \( S \)-flat, \( \text{Tor}_1^R(M, B) \) is uniformly \( S \)-torsion by [17, Theorem 3.2]. Since \( \xi \) is \( S \)-pure by assumption, \( 0 \to M \otimes_R A \to M \otimes_R B \to M \otimes_R F \to 0 \) is \( S \)-exact. Then \( \text{Tor}_1^R(M, C) \) is also uniformly \( S \)-torsion. Thus \( C \) is \( S \)-flat by [17, Theorem 3.2] again. \( \square \)

3. \( S \)-Absolutely Pure Modules

Recall from [10] that an \( R \)-module \( E \) is said to be absolutely pure provided that \( E \) is a pure submodule of every module which contains \( E \) as a submodule, that is, any short exact sequence \( 0 \to E \to B \to C \to 0 \) beginning with \( E \) is pure. Now we give the \( S \)-analogue of absolutely pure modules.

Definition 3.1. Let \( R \) be a ring, \( S \) a multiplicative subset of \( R \). An \( R \)-module \( E \) is said to be \( S \)-absolutely pure provided that any short \( S \)-exact sequence \( 0 \to E \to B \to C \to 0 \) beginning with \( E \) is \( S \)-pure.

Theorem 3.2. Let \( R \) be a ring, \( S \) a multiplicative subset of \( R \) and \( E \) an \( R \)-module. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(1) \( E \) is \( S \)-absolutely pure;
(2) any short exact sequence \( 0 \to E \to B \to C \to 0 \) beginning with \( E \) is \( S \)-pure.
(3) \( E \) is an \( S \)-pure submodule in every \( S \)-injective module containing \( E \);
(4) \( E \) is an \( S \)-pure submodule in every injective module containing \( E \);
(5) \( E \) is an \( S \)-pure submodule in its injective envelope;
(6) there exists an element \( s \in S \) satisfying that for any finitely presented \( R \)-module \( N \), \( \text{Ext}^1_R(N, E) \) is uniformly \( S \)-torsion with respect to \( s \);
(7) there exists an element \( s \in S \) satisfying that if \( P \) is a finitely generated projective, \( K \) a finitely generated submodule of \( P \) and \( f : K \to E \) is an \( R \)-homomorphism, then there is an \( R \)-homomorphism \( g : P \to E \) such that \( sf = gi \).

Proof. (1) \( \Rightarrow \) (2) \( \Rightarrow \) (3) \( \Rightarrow \) (4) \( \Rightarrow \) (5): Trivial.
(5) \( \Rightarrow \) (6): Let \( I \) be the injective envelope of \( E \). Then we have an \( S \)-pure exact sequence \( 0 \to E \to I \to L \to 0 \) by (5). Then, by Theorem 2.2, there is an element \( s \in S \) such that \( 0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, E) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, I) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, L) \to 0 \) is \( S \)-exact with respect to \( s \) for any finitely presented \( R \)-module \( N \). Since \( 0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, E) \to \)
\[ \text{Hom}_R(N, I) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, L) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(N, E) \to 0 \text{ is exact. Hence } \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(N, E) \text{ is uniformly } S\text{-torsion with respect to } s \text{ for any finitely presented } R\text{-module } N. \]

(6) \implies (1): Let \( s \in S \) satisfying (6). Let \( N \) be a finitely presented \( R\)-module and \( 0 \to E \to B \to C \to 0 \) an \( S\)-exact sequence with respect to \( s_1 \). Then, by [20, Theorem 1.3], there is an \( S\)-exact sequence \( 0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, E) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(N, E) \) with respect to \( s_1 \) for any finitely presented \( R\)-module \( N \). By (6), \( 0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, E) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \to 0 \) is \( S\)-exact with respect to \( ss_1 \) for any finitely presented \( R\)-module \( N \). Hence \( E \) is \( S\)-absolutely pure by Theorem 2.2.

(6) \implies (7): Let \( s \in S \) satisfying (6). Considering the exact sequence \( 0 \to K \xrightarrow{i} P \to P/K \to 0 \), we have the following exact sequence \( \text{Hom}_R(P, E) \xrightarrow{i_*} \text{Hom}_R(K, E) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(P, E) \to 0 \). Since \( P/K \) is finitely presented, \( \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(P, E) \) is uniformly \( S\)-torsion with respect to \( s \) by (6). Hence \( i_* \) is an \( S\)-epimorphism which implies that \( s\text{Hom}_R(K, E) \subseteq \text{Im}(i_*) \). Let \( f : K \to E \) be an \( R\)-homomorphism. Then there is an \( R\)-homomorphism \( g : P \to E \) such that \( sf = gi \).

(7) \implies (6): Let \( s \in S \) satisfying (7). Let \( N \) be a finitely presented \( R\)-module. Then we have an exact sequence \( 0 \to K \xrightarrow{i} P \to N \to 0 \) where \( P \) is finitely generated and \( K \) is finitely generated. Consider the following exact sequence \( \text{Hom}_R(P, E) \xrightarrow{i_*} \text{Hom}_R(K, E) \to \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(N, E) \to 0 \). By (7), we have \( s\text{Hom}_R(K, E) \subseteq \text{Im}(i_*) \). Hence \( \operatorname{Ext}_R^1(N, E) \) is uniformly \( S\)-torsion with respect to \( s \).

\[ \square \]

**Proposition 3.3.** Let \( R \) be a ring and \( S \) a multiplicative subset of \( R \). Then the following assertions hold.

1. Any absolutely pure module and any \( S\)-injective module is \( S\)-absolutely pure.
2. Any finite direct sum of \( S\)-absolutely pure modules is \( S\)-absolutely pure.
3. Let \( 0 \to A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \to 0 \) be an \( S\)-exact sequence. If \( A \) and \( C \) are \( S\)-absolutely pure modules, so is \( B \).
4. The class of \( S\)-absolutely pure modules is closed under \( S\)-isomorphisms.
5. Let \( 0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0 \) be an \( S\)-pure \( S\)-exact sequence. If \( B \) is \( S\)-absolutely pure, so is \( B \).

**Proof.** (1) Follows from Theorem 3.2.

(2) Suppose \( E_1, \ldots, E_n \) are \( S\)-absolutely pure modules. Then there exists \( s_i \in S \) such that \( s_i \text{Ext}_R^1(M, E_i) = 0 \) for any finitely presented \( R\)-module \( M \) (\( i = 1, \ldots, n \)). Set \( s = s_1 \cdots s_n \). Then \( s\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \bigoplus_{i=1}^n E_i) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n s\text{Ext}_R^1(M, E_i) = 0 \). Thus \( \bigoplus_{i=1}^n E_i \) is \( S\)-absolutely pure.
(3) Let $0 \to A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \to 0$ be an $S$-exact sequence. Since $A$ and $C$ are $S$-absolutely pure modules, then, by Theorem 3.2, $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, A)$ and $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, C)$ are uniformly $S$-torsion with respect to some $s_1, s_2 \in S$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Considering the $S$-sequence $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, A) \to \text{Ext}^1_R(N, B) \to \text{Ext}^1_R(N, C)$ ([20, Theorem 1.3]), we have $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, B)$ is uniformly $S$-torsion with respect to $s_1, s_2$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Hence $B$ is $S$-absolutely pure by Theorem 3.2 again.

(4) Considering the $S$-exact sequences $0 \to A \to B \to 0 \to 0$ and $0 \to 0 \to A \to B \to 0$, we have $A$ is $S$-absolutely pure if and only if $B$ is $S$-absolutely pure by (3).

(5) Let $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$ be an $S$-pure $S$-exact sequence with respect to some $s \in S$. Then, by [20, Theorem 1.3], there exists an $S$-sequence $0 \to \text{Hom}_R(N, A) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, C) \to \text{Ext}^1_R(N, A) \to \text{Ext}^1_R(N, B)$ with respect to $s$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Note that the natural homomorphism $\text{Hom}_R(N, B) \to \text{Hom}_R(N, C)$ is an $S$-epimorphism. Since $B$ is $S$-absolutely pure, $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, B)$ is uniformly $S$-torsion with respect to some $s_1 \in S$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$ by Theorem 3.2. Then $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, A)$ is uniformly $S$-torsion with respect to $ss_1$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Thus $A$ is $S$-absolutely pure by Theorem 3.2 again. $\square$

Let $p$ be a prime ideal of $R$. We say an $R$-module $E$ is $p$-absolutely pure shortly provided that $E$ is $(R - p)$-absolutely pure.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $R$ be a ring and $E$ an $R$-module. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. $E$ is absolutely pure;
2. $E$ is $p$-absolutely pure for any $p \in \text{Spec}(R)$;
3. $E$ is $m$-absolutely pure for any $m \in \text{Max}(R)$.

**Proof.** $(1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3)$: Trivial.

$(3) \Rightarrow (1)$: Since $E$ is $m$-absolutely pure for any $m \in \text{Max}(R)$, we have $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, E)$ is uniformly $(R - m)$-torsion for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Thus for any $m \in \text{Max}(R)$, there exists $s_m \in S$ such that $s_m \text{Ext}^1_R(N, E) = 0$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Since the ideal generated by all $s_m$ is $R$, $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, E) = 0$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. So $E$ is absolutely pure. $\square$

Recall from [17, Definition 3.12] a ring $R$ is called $S$-von Neumann regular provided there exists an element $s \in S$ satisfies that for any $a \in R$ there exists $r \in R$ such that $sa = ra^2$. It was proved in [17, Theorem 3.13] that a ring $R$ is $S$-von Neumann regular if and only if any $R$-module is $S$-flat.
Theorem 3.5. A ring $R$ is $S$-von Neumann regular if and only if any $R$-module is $S$-absolutely pure.

Proof. Suppose $R$ is an $S$-von Neumann regular ring. Let $M$ be an $R$-module and $I$ its injective envelope. Then $M/I$ is $S$-flat by [17, Theorem 3.13]. Hence $M$ is an $S$-pure submodule of $I$ by Proposition 2.4. So $M$ is $S$-absolutely pure by Theorem 3.2.

On the other hand, let $M$ be an $R$-module and $\xi : 0 \to K \to P \to M \to 0$ an exact sequence with $P$ projective. Then $P$ is $S$-flat. Since $K$ is $S$-absolutely pure, the exact sequence $\xi$ is $S$-pure. By Proposition 2.5 $M$ is also $S$-flat. Hence $R$ is $S$-von Neumann regular by [17, Theorem 3.13]. □

It follows from Proposition 3.3 that every absolutely pure module is $S$-absolutely pure. The following example shows that the converse is not true in general

Example 3.6. [17, Example 3.18] Let $T = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ be a semi-simple ring and $s = (1, 0) \in T$. Then any element $a \in T$ satisfies $a^2 = a$ and $2a = 0$. Let $R = T[x]/\langle sx, x^2 \rangle$ with $x$ the indeterminate and $S = \{1, s\}$ be a multiplicative subset of $R$. Then $R$ is an $S$-von Neumann regular ring, but $R$ is not von Neumann regular. Thus there exists an $S$-absolutely pure module $M$ which is not absolutely pure by Theorem 3.5.

Recall from [12] that a ring $R$ is called a uniformly $S$-Noetherian ring provided that there exists an element $s \in S$ such that for any ideal $J$ of $R$, $sJ \subseteq K$ for some finitely generated sub-ideal $K$ of $J$. Following from Theorem [12, Theorem 4.10] that if the multiplicative subset $S$ of $R$ is composed of non-zero-divisors, then $R$ is uniformly $S$-Noetherian if and only if any direct sum of injective modules is $S$-injective. Now we give a new characterization of uniformly $S$-Noetherian rings.

Theorem 3.7. Let $R$ be a ring, $S$ a multiplicative subset of $R$ composed of non-zero-divisors. Then the following statements are equivalent:

1. $R$ is a uniformly $S$-Noetherian ring;
2. any $S$-absolutely pure module is $S$-injective;
3. any absolutely pure module is $S$-injective.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose $R$ is a uniformly $S$-Noetherian ring. Let $s$ be an element in $S$ such that for any ideal $J$ of $R$, $sJ \subseteq K$ for some finitely generated sub-ideal $K$ of $J$. Let $E$ be an $S$-absolutely pure module. Then there exists $s_2 \in S$ such that $s_2 \text{Ext}^1_R(N, E) = 0$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Let $s_1$ be an element in $S$. Consider the induced exact sequence $\text{Hom}_R(R, E) \to \text{Hom}_R(Rs_1, E) \to \text{Ext}^1_R(R/Rs_1, E) \to 0$. Since $R/Rs_1$ is finitely presented, $s_2 \text{Ext}^1_R(R/Rs_1, E) = 0$.
$s_2(E/s_1E) = 0$ as $s_1$ is a non-zero-divisor. Then $s_2E = s_1s_2E$, and thus $s_2E$ is $S$-divisible. Since $s_2E$ is $S$-isomorphic to $E$, $s_2E$ is also $S$-absolutely pure by Proposition 3.3. Hence there exists $s_3 \in S$ such that $s_3\text{Ext}_R^1(N, E) = 0$ for any finitely presented $R$-module $N$. Consider the induced $S$-exact sequence $\text{Hom}_R(J/K, s_2E) \to \text{Ext}_R^1(R/J, s_2E) \to \text{Ext}_R^1(R/K, s_2E)$. Since $R/K$ is finitely presented, we have $s_3\text{Ext}_R^1(R/K, s_2E) = 0$. Note that $\text{Hom}_R(J/K, s_2E) = 0$. Then $s_3s_3\text{Ext}_R^1(R/J, s_2E) = 0$. Since $s_2E$ is $S$-divisible, we have $s_2E$ is $S$-injective by [12, Proposition 4.9]. Since $s_2E$ is $S$-isomorphic to $E$, $E$ is also $S$-injective by [12, Proposition 4.7].

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Trivial.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Let $\{I_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ be a family of injective modules, then $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I_\lambda$ is absolutely pure, and thus is $S$-injective by assumption. Consequently, $R$ is a uniformly $S$-Noetherian ring by [12, Theorem 4.10].

It is well-known that any direct sum and any direct product of absolutely pure modules are also absolutely pure. However, it does not work for $S$-absolutely pure modules.

**Example 3.8.** Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ be the ring of integers, $p$ a prime in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $S = \{p^n \mid n \geq 0\}$. Then an $R$-module $M$ is $S$-absolutely pure module if and only if it is $S$-injective by Theorem 3.7. Let $\mathbb{Z}/\langle p^k \rangle$ be cyclic group of order $p^k$ ($k \geq 1$). Then each $\mathbb{Z}/\langle p^k \rangle$ is uniformly $S$-torsion, and thus is $S$-absolutely pure. However, the product $M := \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{Z}/\langle p^k \rangle$ is not $S$-injective by [12, Remark 4.6], so it is also not $S$-absolutely pure.

We claim that the direct sum $N := \bigoplus_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{Z}/\langle p^k \rangle$ is also not $S$-absolutely pure. Indeed, consider the following exact sequence induced by the short exact sequence $0 \to \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \to 0$:

$$0 = \text{Hom}_\mathbb{Z}(\mathbb{Q}, N) \to \text{Hom}_\mathbb{Z}(\mathbb{Z}, N) \to \text{Ext}_\mathbb{Z}^1(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}, N) \to \text{Ext}_\mathbb{Z}^1(\mathbb{Q}, N) \to 0.$$ 

Since the submodule $N = \text{Hom}_\mathbb{Z}(\mathbb{Z}, N)$ is not uniformly $S$-torsion, $\text{Ext}_\mathbb{Z}^1(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}, N)$ is also not uniformly $S$-torsion. Then $N$ is not $S$-injective by [12, Theorem 4.3]. So the direct sum $N := \bigoplus_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{Z}/\langle p^k \rangle$ is also not $S$-absolutely pure.

We also note that, in Theorem 3.2, the elements $s \in S$ in the statement (6) (similar in the statement (7)) is uniform for all finitely presented $R$-modules $N$.

**Example 3.9.** Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ be the ring of integers, $p$ a prime in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $S = \{p^n \mid n \geq 0\}$. Let $J_p$ be the additive group of all $p$-adic integers (see [5] for example). Then $\text{Ext}_R^1(N, J_p)$ is uniformly $S$-torsion for any finitely presented $R$-modules $N$. However, $J_p$ is not $S$-absolutely pure.
Proof. Let $N$ be a finitely presented $R$-module. Then, by [5, Chapter 3, Theorem 2.7], $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} (\mathbb{Z}^n/\langle p^i \rangle)^n \oplus T$, where $T$ is a finitely generated torsion $S$-divisible torsion-module. Thus

$$\text{Ext}^1_R(N, J_p) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} \text{Ext}^1_R(\mathbb{Z}^n/\langle p^i \rangle, J_p) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} (J_p/p^i J_p) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{Z}^n/\langle p^i \rangle$$

by [5, Chapter 9, section 3 (G)] and [5, Chapter 1, Exercise 3(10)]. So $\text{Ext}^1_R(N, J_p)$ is obviously uniformly $S$-torsion. However, $J_p$ is not $S$-injective by [12, Theorem 4.5]. So $J_p$ is not $S$-absolutely pure by Theorem 3.7. $\square$
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