

On uniformly S -coherent rings

Xiaolei Zhang^a

a. School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong University of Technology, Zibo 255049, China
E-mail: zxlrgjhj@163.com

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce and study the notions of uniformly S -finitely presented modules and uniformly S -coherent rings (modules) which are “uniform” versions of (c) - S -finitely presented modules and (c) - S -coherent rings (modules) introduced by Bennis and Hajoui [3]. Among the results, uniformly S -versions of Chase’s result, Chase Theorem and Matlis Theorem are obtained.

Key Words: uniformly S -coherent ring; uniformly S -finitely presented module; uniformly S -coherent modules; u - S -flat module; u - S -injective module.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 13E99.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, all rings are commutative with identity. Let R be a ring. For a subset U of an R -module M , we denote by $\langle U \rangle$ the submodule of M generated by U . A subset S of R is called a multiplicative subset of R if $1 \in S$ and $s_1 s_2 \in S$ for any $s_1 \in S$, $s_2 \in S$.

The study of commutative rings in terms of multiplicative sets began with Anderson and Dumitrescu [1], who introduced the notion of S -Noetherian rings. Recall that a ring R is called an S -Noetherian ring if for any ideal I of R , there is a finitely generated sub-ideal K of I such that $sI \subseteq K$ for some $s \in S$. Cohen’s Theorem, Eakin-Nagata Theorem and Hilbert Basis Theorem for S -Noetherian rings are also given in [1]. However, the element $s \in S$ in the definition of S -Noetherian rings is not “uniform” in general. This situation make it difficult to study S -Noetherian rings via module-theoretic methods. To overcome this difficulty, Qi et al. [16] defined uniformly S -Noetherian rings as S -Noetherian rings in which definition the choice of s is fixed. Then they characterized uniformly S -Noetherian rings using u - S -injective modules.

Recall from [7] that a ring R is said to be a coherent ring provided that any finitely generated ideal is finitely presented. The notion of coherent rings, which is a

generalization of Noetherian rings, is another important rings defined by finiteness condition. Many algebraists studied coherent rings in terms of various of modules. Early in 1960, Chase [5, Theorem 2.1] showed that a ring is coherent exactly when the class of flat modules is closed under direct product. In 1970 Stenström [19, Theorem 3.2] obtained coherent rings are rings when any direct limits of absolutely pure modules is absolutely pure. In 1982, Matlis [14, Theorem 1] proved that a ring R is coherent if and only if $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is flat for any injective modules M and E .

To extend coherent rings by multiplicative sets, Bennis et al. [3] introduced the notions of S -coherent rings and c - S -coherent rings. They also gave an S -version of Chase's result to characterize S -coherent rings using ideals. Recently, the authors in this paper et al.[17] characterized S -coherent rings in terms of S -Mittag-Leffler modules and S -flat modules (which can be seen as flat modules by localizing at S).

The main motivation of this paper is to introduce and study the “uniform” version of S -coherent rings for extending uniformly S -Noetherian rings. The organization of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we introduce and study uniformly S -finitely presented modules and their connections with u - S -flat modules and u - S -projective modules (see Proposition 2.8). In Section 3, we introduce uniformly S -coherent modules and uniformly S -coherent rings. In particular, we study the ideal-theoretic characterizations of uniformly S -coherent rings (see Proposition 3.11). Moreover examples of S -coherent rings and c - S -coherent rings which are not uniformly S -coherent of are provided (see Example 3.15). In Section 4, Chase Theorem and Matlis Theorem for uniformly S -coherent rings are obtained (see Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.7).

Since the paper involves uniformly torsion theory, we give a quick review (see [21] for more details). An R -module T is called u - S -torsion (with respect to s) provided that there exists $s \in S$ 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 u - S -exact, if for any n there is an element $s \in S$ such that $s\text{Ker}(f_{n+1}) \subseteq \text{Im}(f_n)$ and $s\text{Im}(f_n) \subseteq \text{Ker}(f_{n+1})$. An R -sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$ is called a short u - S -exact sequence (with respect to s), if $s\text{Ker}(g) \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$ and $s\text{Im}(f) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g)$ for some $s \in S$. An R -homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ is an u - S -monomorphism (resp., u - S -epimorphism, u - 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 u - S -exact (with respect to s). Suppose M and N are R -modules. We say M is u - S -isomorphic to N if there exists a u - S -isomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$. A family \mathcal{C} of R -modules is said to be closed under u - S -isomorphisms if M is u - S -isomorphic to N and M is in \mathcal{C} , then N is also in \mathcal{C} . One can deduce from the following [24, Lemma 2.1] that the existence of u - S -isomorphisms of two R -modules is actually an equivalence relationship.

2. UNIFORMLY S -FINITELY PRESENTED MODULES

Recall from [1] that an R -module M is called S -finite (with respect to s) provided that there is an element $s \in S$ and a finitely generated R -module F such that $sM \subseteq F \subseteq M$. Trivially, S -finite modules are generalizations of finitely generated modules. For generalizing finitely presented R -modules, Bennis et al. [3] introduced the notions of S -finitely presented modules and c - S -finitely presented modules. Following [3, Definition 2.1] that an R -module M is called S -finitely presented provided that there exists an exact sequence of R -modules $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ with K S -finite and F finitely generated free. Certainly, an R -module M is S -finitely presented if and only if there exists an exact sequence of R -modules $0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ with N finitely presented and $sT_1 = 0$ for some $s \in S$. Following [3, Definition 4.1] that an R -module M is called c - S -finitely presented provided that there exists a finitely presented submodule N of M such that $sM \subseteq N \subseteq M$ for some $s \in S$. Trivially, an R -module M is called c - S -finitely presented if and only if there exists an exact sequence of R -modules $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$ with N finitely presented and $sT_2 = 0$ for some $s \in S$. Next we will give the notion of uniformly S -finitely presented modules which generalize both S -finitely presented modules and c - S -finitely presented modules.

Definition 2.1. Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R and $s \in S$. An R -module M is called u - S -finitely presented (abbreviates uniformly S -finitely presented) (with respect to s) provided that there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow F \xrightarrow{f} M \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$$

with F finitely presented and $sT_1 = sT_2 = 0$.

Trivially, S -finitely presented modules and c - S -finitely presented modules are all u - S -finitely presented. Certainly, every u - S -finitely presented R -module is S -finite. Indeed, since in definition 2.1 we have $sT_2 = 0$, so $sM \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$. Note that the fact that $\text{Im}(f)$ is finitely generated implies M is S -finite.

By [24, Lemma 2.1], an R -module M is u - S -finitely presented if and only if there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{g} F \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$ with F finitely presented and $s'T_1 = s'T_2 = 0$ for some $s' \in S$. So an R -module M is u - S -finitely presented if and only if it is u - S -isomorphic to a finitely presented R -module.

Theorem 2.2. Let $\Phi : 0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} L \rightarrow 0$ be a u - S -exact sequence of R -modules. The following statements hold.

- (1) The class of u - S -finitely presented modules is closed under u - S -isomorphisms.
- (2) If M and L are u - S -finitely presented, so is N .

- (3) Any finite direct sum of u - S -finitely presented modules is u - S -finitely presented.
- (4) If N is u - S -finitely presented, then L is u - S -finitely presented if and only if M is S -finite.

Moreover, if Φ is an exact sequence, the both side of conditions in (2) and (4) can be taken to be “uniform” with respect to a same $s \in S$.

Proof. (1) It follows from the fact that an R -module M is u - S -finitely presented if and only if it is u - S -isomorphic to a finitely presented R -module.

(2) Since u - S -finitely presented modules are closed under u - S -isomorphisms, we may assume Φ is an exact sequence by (1). Consider the following push-out:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow{f} & N & \xrightarrow{g} & L & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow l & & \parallel & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_1 & \xrightarrow{m} & X & \xrightarrow{n} & L & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

with F_2 finitely presented, $\text{Ker}(h)$ and $\text{Coker}(h)$ u - S -torsion. So l is also a u - S -isomorphism. Consider the following pull-back:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_1 & \xrightarrow{m} & X & \xrightarrow{n} & L & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow k & & \uparrow j & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_1 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & F_2 & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

with F_2 finitely presented, $\text{Ker}(j)$ and $\text{Coker}(j)$ u - S -torsion. So k is also a u - S -isomorphism. Since F_1 and F_2 are finitely presented, Y is also finitely presented. Hence N is u - S -isomorphic to a finitely presented R -module, and thus is u - S -finitely presented.

(3) Follows from (2).

(4) Since u - S -finitely presented modules and S -finite modules are closed under u - S -isomorphisms respectively, we may assume Φ is an exact sequence by (1). Suppose M is S -finite. Since N is u - S -finitely presented, there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow F \xrightarrow{l} N \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$ with F finitely presented and $sT_1 = sT_2 = 0$ for some $s \in S$. Consider the following pull-back of f and l :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow{f} & N & \xrightarrow{g} & L & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow s & & \uparrow l & & \uparrow t & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & F & \longrightarrow & K & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Since l is a u - S -isomorphism, s and t are both u - S -isomorphisms. So Z is also S -finite. Note that L is u - S -isomorphic to K which is u - S -finitely presented (see

[3, Theorem 2.4(4)). So L is u - S -finitely presented. Suppose L is u - S -finitely presented. Considering the above pull-back, we have K is also S -finitely presented. Hence Z is S -finite by [3, Theorem 2.4(5)] which implies that M is also S -finite.

The ‘‘Moreover’’ part can be checked by the proof of (2) and (4). \square

Recall from [4] that an R -module M is said to be S -Noetherian provided that any submodule of M is S -finite. A ring R is called S -Noetherian if R itself is S -Noetherian R -module.

Proposition 2.3. *Let R be a ring and S a multiplicative subset of R . Then a ring R is S -Noetherian if and only if any S -finite module is u - S -finitely presented.*

Proof. For necessity, let M be an S -finite module. Then there is a u - S -epimorphism $f : F \rightarrow M$ with F finitely generated free. Since R is an S -Noetherian ring, we have F is also S -Noetherian (see [4]). Hence M is u - S -finitely presented by Theorem 2.2(4). For sufficiency, let I be an ideal of R . Then R/I is S -finite, and thus u - S -finitely presented. By Theorem 2.2(4) again, I is S -finite. \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R consisting of finite elements. Then an R -module M is a u - S -finitely presented R -module if and only if M_S is a finitely presented R_S -module.*

Proof. Suppose M is a u - S -finitely presented R -module. there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$ with N finitely presented and $sT_1 = sT_2 = 0$. Localizing at S , we have $0 \rightarrow (T_1)_S \rightarrow N_S \xrightarrow{f} M_S \rightarrow (T_2)_S \rightarrow 0$. Since $sT_1 = sT_2 = 0$, $(T_1)_S = (T_2)_S = 0$. So $M_S \cong N_S$ is a finitely generated R_S -module. On the other hand, suppose M_S is a finitely generated R_S -module. Suppose $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ and set $s = s_1 \cdots s_n$. We may assume that M_S is generated by $\{\frac{m_1}{s}, \dots, \frac{m_n}{s}\}$. Consider the R -homomorphism $f : R^n \rightarrow M$ satisfying $f(e_i) = m_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. It is easy to verify f is a u - S -epimorphism. Consider the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f_S) \rightarrow R_S^n \xrightarrow{f_S} M_S \rightarrow 0$. Then $\text{Ker}(f_S)$ is a finitely generated R_S -module, and thus $\text{Ker}(f)$ is S -finite. By Theorem 2.2(2), M is u - S -finitely presented. \square

Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of R . We say an R -module M is (simply) \mathfrak{p} -finite provided R is $(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ -finite.

Lemma 2.5. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R and M an R -module. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) M is finitely generated R -module;
- (2) M is \mathfrak{p} -finite for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$;

(3) M is \mathfrak{m} -finite for any $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) Trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) For each $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$, there exists an element $s^{\mathfrak{m}} \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ and a finitely generated submodule $F^{\mathfrak{m}}$ of M such that $s^{\mathfrak{m}}M \subseteq F^{\mathfrak{m}}$. Since $\{s^{\mathfrak{m}} \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)\}$ generated R , there exist finite elements $\{s^{m_1}, \dots, s^{m_n}\}$ such that $\langle s^{m_1}, \dots, s^{m_n} \rangle = R$. So $M = \langle s^{m_1}, \dots, s^{m_n} \rangle M \subseteq F^{m_1} + \dots + F^{m_n} \subseteq M$. Hence $M = F^{m_1} + \dots + F^{m_n}$. It follows that M is finitely generated. \square

Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of R . We say an R -module M is (simply) u - \mathfrak{p} -finitely presented provided R is u - $(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ -finitely presented.

Proposition 2.6. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R and M an R -module. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) M is a finitely presented R -module;
- (2) M is u - \mathfrak{p} -finitely presented for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$;
- (3) M is u - \mathfrak{m} -finitely presented for any $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) Trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) By Lemma 2.5, M is finitely generated. Consider the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ with F finitely generated free. By Theorem 2.2, K is \mathfrak{m} -finite for any $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$. So K is also finitely generated, and thus M is finitely presented. \square

Let $\{M_j\}_{j \in \Gamma}$ be a family of R -modules and N_j a submodule of M_j generated by $\{m_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda_j} \subseteq M_j$ for each $j \in \Gamma$. Recall from [21] that a family of R -modules $\{M_j\}_{j \in \Gamma}$ is u - S -generated (with respect to s) by $\{\{m_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda_j}\}_{j \in \Gamma}$ provided that there exists an element $s \in S$ such that $sM_j \subseteq N_j$ for each $j \in \Gamma$, where $N_j = \langle \{m_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda_j} \rangle$. We say a family of R -modules $\{M_j\}_{j \in \Gamma}$ is u - S -finite (with respect to s) if the set $\{m_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda_j}$ can be chosen as a finite set for each $j \in \Gamma$. Recall from [16] that an R -module M is called a u - S -Noetherian R -module provided the set of all submodules of M is u - S -finite. A ring R is u - S -Noetherian provided that R itself is a u - S -Noetherian R -module.

Theorem 2.7. *Let R be a ring and S a multiplicative subset of R . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) A ring R is u - S -Noetherian;
- (2) Any S -finite module is u - S -Noetherian;
- (3) Any finitely generated module is u - S -Noetherian;
- (4) There is $s \in S$ such that any finitely generated module is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let M be an S -finite module. Then there is a u - S -epimorphism $f : F \rightarrow M$ with F finitely generated free. Since R is u - S -Noetherian, we have F is also u - S -Noetherian, and so is M (see [16, Proposition 2.13]).

(2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4) Trivial.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Let I be an ideal of R . Then R/I is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s . So I is S -finite with respect to s by Theorem 2.2(4), implying R is u - S -Noetherian. \square

Recall from [21, 24] that an R -module P is called u - S -projective (resp., u - S -flat) provided that the induced sequence $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(P, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(P, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(P, C) \rightarrow 0$ (resp., $0 \rightarrow P \otimes_R A \rightarrow P \otimes_R B \rightarrow P \otimes_R C \rightarrow 0$) is u - S -exact for any u - S -exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$. It was proved in [24, Proposition 2.9] that any u - S -projective module is u - S -flat.

Proposition 2.8. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R . Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *Every S -finite u - S -projective module is u - S -finitely presented.*
- (2) *Every u - S -finitely presented u - S -flat module is u - S -projective.*

Proof. (1) Let P be an S -finite u - S -projective module, then there is a u - S -exact sequence $\Psi : 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f) \xrightarrow{i} F \xrightarrow{f} P \rightarrow 0$ with F finitely generated free. Since P is u - S -projective, the sequence Ψ is u - S -split by [24, Theorem 2.7]. So there is a u - S -epimorphism $i' : F \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f)$ such that $i' \circ i = s\text{Id}_{\text{Ker}(f)}$ for some $s \in S$. Hence $\text{Ker}(f)$ is S -finite, and so P is u - S -finitely presented by Theorem 2.2.

(2) Let M be a u - S -finitely presented u - S -flat module. Then there is a u - S -exact sequence $\Upsilon : 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f) \xrightarrow{i} F \xrightarrow{f} M \rightarrow 0$ with F finitely generated free and $\text{Ker}(f)$ S -finite. Since M is u - S -flat, Υ is u - S -pure by [22, Proposition 2.4]. It follows from [22, Theorem 2.2] that Υ is u - S -split. Thus M is u - S -projective. \square

3. UNIFORMLY S -COHERENT MODULES AND UNIFORMLY S -COHERENT RINGS

Recall that an R -module is said to be a coherent module if it is finitely generated and any finitely generated submodule is finitely presented. A ring R is said to be a coherent ring if R is a coherent R -module. In this section, we will introduce a “uniform” version of coherent rings and coherent modules.

Definition 3.1. Let R be a ring and S a multiplicative subset of R . An R -module M is called u - S -coherent (abbreviates uniformly S -coherent) (with respect to s) provided that there is $s \in S$ such that it is S -finite with respect to s and any finitely generated submodule of M is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s .

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\Phi : 0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} L \rightarrow 0$ be a u - S -exact sequence of R -modules. The following statements hold.*

- (1) *The class of u - S -coherent modules is closed under u - S -isomorphisms.*
- (2) *If L is u - S -coherent, then M is u - S -coherent if and only if N is u - S -coherent.*
- (3) *Any finite direct sum of u - S -coherent modules is u - S -coherent.*
- (4) *If N is u - S -coherent and M is S -finite, then L is u - S -coherent.*

Proof. (1) Let $h : A \rightarrow B$ be a u - S -isomorphism with $s_1\text{Ker}(h) = s_1\text{Coker}(h) = 0$. Suppose B is u - S -coherent with respect to s_2 , then one can check A is u - S -coherent with respect to s_1s_2 . Similarly, if A is u - S -coherent, then B is also u - S -coherent (see [24, Lemma 2.1]).

(2) By (1), we can assume that Φ is an exact sequence. Suppose M and L are u - S -coherent with respect to s . Then one can check N is u - S -coherent with respect to s from the proof of Theorem 2.2(2). Suppose N and L are u - S -coherent with respect to s . Then M is S -finite with respect to some $s \in S$ by Theorem 2.2(4). Since N is u - S -coherent with respect to s , M is u - S -coherent with respect to s .

(3) Follows by (2).

(4) Assume that Φ is an exact sequence. Suppose N is u - S -coherent with respect to s and M is S -finite with respect to s for some $s \in S$. Then L is also S -finite with respect to s . Let K be a finitely generated submodule of L . Then the sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow g^{-1}(K) \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0$ is exact. So $g^{-1}(K)$ is S -finite. Consider the following commutative diagram with rows and columns exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(m) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(n) & \longrightarrow & K_1 \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & R^n & \longrightarrow & R^{n+s} & \longrightarrow & R^s \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow m & & \downarrow n & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & g^{-1}(K) & \longrightarrow & K \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & & & & & \downarrow \\
& & & & & & 0
\end{array}$$

where m and n are u - S -epimorphisms. Since N is u - S -coherent, $\text{Ker}(n)$ is S -finite, and so is K_1 . Thus L is u - S -coherent (with respect to s). \square

Corollary 3.3. *Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be an R -homomorphism of u - S -coherent modules M and N . Then $\text{Ker}(f)$, $\text{Im}(f)$ and $\text{Coker}(f)$ are also u - S -coherent.*

Proof. Using Theorem 3.2 and the exact sequences $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f) \rightarrow M \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow N \rightarrow \text{Coker}(f) \rightarrow 0$. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let M and N be u - S -coherent sub-modules of a u - S -coherent module. Then $M + N$ is u - S -coherent if and only if so is $M \cap N$.*

Proof. Following by Theorem 3.2 and the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \cap N \rightarrow M \oplus N \rightarrow M + N \rightarrow 0$. \square

Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of R . We say an R -module M is (simply) u - \mathfrak{p} -coherent provided R is u - $(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ -coherent.

Proposition 3.5. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R and M an R -module. The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) M is a coherent R -module.
- (2) M is u - \mathfrak{p} -coherent for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$.
- (3) M is u - \mathfrak{m} -coherent for any $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) Trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) By Lemma 2.5, M is finitely generated. Let N be a finitely generated of M , then M is u - \mathfrak{m} -finitely presented for any $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$. So M is finitely presented by Proposition 2.6. \square

Definition 3.6. Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R and $s \in S$. Then R is called a u - S -coherent (abbreviates uniformly S -coherent) ring (with respective to s) provided that R itself is a uniformly S -coherent R -module with respective to s .

Trivially, every coherent ring is u - S -coherent for any multiplicative set S . And if S is composed of units, then u - S -coherent rings are exactly coherent rings.

The proof of the following result is easy and direct, so we omit it.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $R = R_1 \times R_2$ be direct product of rings R_1 and R_2 , $S = S_1 \times S_2$ a multiplicative subset of R . Then R is u - S -coherent if and only if R_i is u - S_i -coherent for any $i = 1, 2$.*

The following example shows that not every u - S -coherent rings is coherent.

Example 3.8. Let R_1 be a coherent ring and R_2 a non-coherent ring, $S_1 = \{1\}$ and $S_2 = \{0\}$. Set $R = R_1 \times R_2$ and $S = S_1 \times S_2$. Then R is u - S -coherent non-coherent ring.

Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of R . We say a ring R is (simply) u - \mathfrak{p} -coherent provided R is u - $(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ -coherent.

Proposition 3.9. *Let R be a ring and S a multiplicative subset of R . The following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) R is a coherent ring.
- (2) R is a u - \mathfrak{p} -coherent ring.
- (3) R is a u - \mathfrak{m} -coherent ring.

Proof. Follows by Proposition 3.5. □

Proposition 3.10. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R . If R is a u - S -Noetherian ring, then R is u - S -coherent.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 2.7. □

Trivially, u - S -coherent rings are not u - S -Noetherian in general. Indeed, we can find a non-Noetherian coherent ring in the case that $S = \{1\}$.

In 1960, Chase characterized coherent rings by considering annihilator of elements and intersection of finitely generated ideals in [5, Theorem 2.2]. Now, we give a “uniform” version of Chase’s result.

Proposition 3.11. (*Chase’s result for u - S -coherent rings*) *Let R be a ring and S a multiplicative subset of R . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a u - S -coherent ring;
- (2) there is $s \in S$ such that $(0 :_R r)$ is S -finite with respect to s for any $r \in R$, and the intersection of two finitely generated ideals of R is S -finite with respect to s ;
- (3) there is $s \in S$ such that $(I :_R b)$ is S -finite with respect to s for any element $b \in R$ and any finitely generated ideal I of R .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Suppose R is u - S -coherent with respect to s . Considering the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow (0 :_R r) \rightarrow R \rightarrow Rr \rightarrow 0$, we have $(0 :_R r)$ is S -finite with respect to s by Theorem 2.2. For any two finitely generated ideals I, J of R , we have $I \cap J$ is S -finite with respect to s by Corollary 3.4 and Theorem 2.2.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Let $I = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$ be a finitely generated ideal of R . We claim that I is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s by induction on n . Suppose $n = 1$. the claim follows by the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow (0 :_R r) \rightarrow R \rightarrow Rr \rightarrow 0$. Suppose $n = k$, the claim holds. Suppose $n = k + 1$. the claim holds by the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \langle a_1, \dots, a_k \rangle \cap \langle a_{k+1} \rangle \rightarrow \langle a_1, \dots, a_k \rangle \oplus \langle a_{k+1} \rangle \rightarrow \langle a_1, \dots, a_{k+1} \rangle \rightarrow 0$. So the claim holds for all n .

(1) \Rightarrow (3): Suppose R is u - S -coherent with respect to s . Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R and b an element in R . Consider the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & (I :_R b) & \longrightarrow & R & \longrightarrow & R/(I :_R b) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & I & \longrightarrow & Rb + I & \longrightarrow & (Rb + I)/I \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Since R is u - S -coherent with respect to s , we have $Rb + I$ is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s . Since I is finitely generated, $(Rb + I)/I$ is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s by Theorem 2.2. Thus $(I :_R b)$ is S -finite with respect to s by Theorem 2.2 again.

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R generated by $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. We will show I is u - S -finitely presented by induction on n . The case $n = 1$ follows from the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow (0 :_R a_1) \rightarrow R \rightarrow Ra_1 \rightarrow 0$. For $n \geq 2$, let $L = \langle a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle$. Consider the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow (L :_R a_n) \rightarrow R \rightarrow (Ra_n + L)/L \rightarrow 0$. Then $(Ra_n + L)/L = I/L$ is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s by (3) and Theorem 2.2. Consider the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow I \rightarrow I/L \rightarrow 0$. Since L is finitely presented by induction and I/L is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s , I is also u - S -finitely presented with respect to s by Theorem 2.2. \square

Recall from [3] that a ring R is S -coherent (resp., c - S -coherent) provided that any finitely generated ideal is S -finitely presented (resp., c - S -finitely presented).

Proposition 3.12. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R . If R is a u - S -coherent ring, then R is both S -coherent and c - S -coherent.*

Proof. Let I be a finitely generated ideal and $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$ an exact sequence with F finitely generated free. Then K is S -finite by Theorem 2.2(4). Thus I is S -finitely presented, and so R is S -coherent. Consider the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} I \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$ with N finitely presented and $sT_1 = sT_2 = 0$. Note that since $sT_2 = 0$, we have $sI \subseteq \text{Im}(f) \cong N/T_1$. Since $sT_1 = 0$, s^2I can be seen as a submodule of N . Hence I is c - S -finitely presented. Consequently, R is c - S -coherent. \square

Proposition 3.13. *Let R be a ring and S a multiplicative subset of R consisting of finite elements. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) R is a u - S -coherent ring.
- (2) R is an S -coherent ring.
- (3) R is a c - S -coherent ring.

Proof. Suppose $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ and set $s = s_1 \cdots s_n$.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) and (1) \Rightarrow (3) Follows by Proposition 3.12.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R . Then there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$ with F finitely generated free and K S -finite. Let X be a submodule of K such that $s_i K \subseteq X$ for some $s_i \in S$. So $sK/X = 0$ Then the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K/X \rightarrow F/X \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$ makes I u - S -finitely presented with respect to s . So R is a u - S -coherent ring.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R . Then there is a finitely presented sub-ideal J of R such that $s_i I \subseteq J = 0$. So $s(I/J) = 0$. Then the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow J \rightarrow I/J \rightarrow 0$ makes I u - S -finitely presented with respect to s . So R is a u - S -coherent ring. \square

Let R be a ring, M an R -module and S a multiplicative subset of R . For any $s \in S$, there is a multiplicative subset $S_s = \{1, s, s^2, \dots\}$ of S . We denote by M_s the localization of M at S_s . Certainly, $M_s \cong M \otimes_R R_s$

Proposition 3.14. *Let R be a ring and S a multiplicative subset of R . If R is a u - S -coherent ring with respect to some $s \in S$, then R_s is a coherent ring.*

Proof. Suppose R is u - S -coherent ring with respect to $s \in S$. Let J be a finitely generated ideal of R_s . Then $J \cong I_s$ for some finitely generated ideal I of R . So there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow K \rightarrow I \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$ with K finitely presented and $sT_1 = sT_2 = 0$. Localizing at S_s , we have $(T_1)_s = (T_2)_s = 0$. So $J \cong I_s \cong K_s$ which is finitely presented over R_s . So R_s is a coherent ring. \square

Next, we will give an example of an S -coherent ring and a c - S -coherent ring which is not u - S -coherent.

Example 3.15. Let R be a domain. Set $S = R - \{0\}$. First, we will show R is c - S -coherent. Let I be a nonzero finitely generated ideal of R . Suppose $0 \neq r \in I$. Then we have $rI \subseteq Rr \subseteq I$. Since $Rr \cong R$ is finitely presented, R is a c - S -coherent ring.

Next we will show R is S -coherent. Let I be a nonzero finitely generated ideal of R generated by nonzero elements $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Set $a = a_1 \cdots a_n$. Consider the natural exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow R^n \xrightarrow{f} I \rightarrow 0$ satisfying $f(e_i) = a_i$ for each i . Claim K is S -finite with respect to a by induction on n . Set $I_k = \langle a_1, \dots, a_k \rangle$. Suppose $n = 1$. Then $K = 0$ as a_1 is a non-zero-divisor. So the claim trivially holds. Suppose the claim holds for $n = k$. Now let $n = k + 1$. Consider the following

commutative diagram with exact rows and columns.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & K_k & \longrightarrow & R^k & \longrightarrow & I_k & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & K_{k+1} & \longrightarrow & R^{k+1} & \longrightarrow & I_k + Ra_{k+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & (I_k :_R Ra_{k+1}) & \longrightarrow & R & \longrightarrow & (I_k + Ra_{k+1})/I_k & \longrightarrow & 0,
\end{array}$$

Since $a(I_k :_R Ra_{k+1}) \subseteq aR \subseteq (I_k :_R Ra_{k+1})$, So $(I_k :_R Ra_{k+1})$ is S -finite with respect to a . By induction, K_k is S -finite with respect to a . It is easy to check K_{k+1} is also S -finite with respect to a . So the claim holds. Consequently, R is S -coherent.

Now, suppose R is a domain satisfying R_s is not coherent for any $s \neq 0$. We will show R is not a u - S -coherent ring. On contrary, suppose R is u - S -coherent. Then there is a $s \neq 0$ such that R_s is a coherent ring by Proposition 3.14, which is a contradiction.

4. MODULE-THEORETIC CHARACTERIZATIONS OF UNIFORMLY S -COHERENT RINGS

In this section, we will characterize uniformly S -coherent rings in terms of u - S -flat modules and u - S -injective modules. The following lemma is basic and of independent interest.

Lemma 4.1. *Let R be a ring, $r \in R$ and M an R -module. Suppose N is a pure submodule of M . Then we have the following natural isomorphism*

$$\frac{rM}{rN} \cong r\left(\frac{M}{N}\right).$$

Consequently, suppose $\{M_i \mid i \in \Lambda\}$ is a direct system of R -modules. Then

$$r \lim_{\longrightarrow} M_i \cong \lim_{\longrightarrow} (rM_i).$$

Proof. Consider the surjective map $f : \frac{rM}{rN} \rightarrow r\left(\frac{M}{N}\right)$ defined by $f(rm + rN) = r(m + N)$. It is certainly R -linear. We will check it is also well defined. Indeed, $f(rn + rN) = r(n + N) = r(0 + N) = 0$. So f is an R -epimorphism. Let $rm + rN \in \text{Ker}(f)$. Then $rm \in N$. Since N is a pure submodule of M , there is $n \in N$ such that $rm = rn$. So $rm + rN = rn + rN = 0$. Hence f is an isomorphism. Suppose $\{(M_i, f_{ij}) \mid i, j \in \Lambda\}$ is a direct system of R -modules. Then there is a pure exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow \bigoplus M_i \rightarrow \lim_{\longrightarrow} M_i \rightarrow 0$ where $K = \langle x - f_{ij}(x) \mid x \in M_i, i \leq j \in I \rangle$

(see [8, (2.1.1)]). Note that $\{(rM_i, f_{ij}) \mid i, j \in \Lambda\}$ is also a direct system of R -modules. We have the following equivalence

$$\lim_{\rightarrow} (rM_i) \cong \frac{\bigoplus rM_i}{K'} = \frac{r \bigoplus M_i}{rK} \cong r \frac{\bigoplus M_i}{K} \cong r \lim_{\rightarrow} M_i$$

where $K' = \langle rx - f_{ij}(rx) \mid rx \in rM_i, i \leq j \in I \rangle$. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let E be an injective cogenerator. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) T is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s ;
- (2) $\text{Hom}_R(T, E)$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Follows from [16, Lemma 4.2].

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Let $f : sT \rightarrow E$ be an R -homomorphism and $i : sT \rightarrow T$ the embedding map. Since E is injective, there exists an R -homomorphism $g : T \rightarrow E$ such that $f = gi$. Let $st \in sT$, we have $f(st) = sg(t) = 0$ as $s\text{Hom}_R(T, E) = 0$. So $\text{Hom}_R(sT, E) = 0$. Hence $sT = 0$ as E is an injective cogenerator. \square

Next, we give some new characterizations of u - S -flat modules

Proposition 4.3. *Let R be a ring, S a multiplicative subset of R . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) F is u - S -flat;
- (2) there exists an element $s \in S$ satisfying that $\text{Tor}_1^R(N, F)$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s for any finitely presented R -module N ;
- (3) $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is u - S -injective for any injective module E ;
- (4) $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is u - S -absolutely pure for any injective module E ;
- (5) if E is an injective cogenerator, then $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is u - S -injective;
- (6) if E is an injective cogenerator, then $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is u - S -absolutely pure.

Moreover, if S is composed of non-zero-divisors, then all above are equivalent to the following assertions:

- (7) there exists $s \in S$ satisfying that $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F)$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s for any ideal I of R ;
- (8) there exists $s \in S$ satisfying that, for any ideal I of R , the natural homomorphism $\sigma_I : I \otimes_R F \rightarrow IF$ is a u - S -isomorphism with respect to s ;
- (9) there exists $s \in S$ satisfying that $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/K, F)$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s for any finite generated ideal K of R ;
- (10) there exists $s \in S$ satisfying that, for any finite generated ideal K of R , the natural homomorphism $\sigma_K : K \otimes_R F \rightarrow KF$ is a u - S -isomorphism with respect to s .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Set the set $\Gamma = \{(K, R^n) \mid K \text{ is a finitely generated submodule of } R^n \text{ and } n < \infty\}$. Define $M = \bigoplus_{(K, R^n) \in \Gamma} R^n/K$. Then $s\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) = s \bigoplus_{(K, R^n) \in \Gamma} \text{Tor}_1^R(R^n/K, F) = 0$ for some $s \in S$. Let N be a finitely presented R -module, then $N \cong R^n/K$ for some $(K, R^n) \in \Gamma$. Hence $\text{Tor}_1^R(N, F) = 0$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s .

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Let M be an R -module. Then $M = \varinjlim N_i$ for some direct system of finitely presented R -modules $\{N_i\}$. So $s\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) = s\text{Tor}_1^R(\varinjlim N_i, F) \cong s(\varinjlim \text{Tor}_1^R(N_i, F)) \cong \varinjlim (s\text{Tor}_1^R(N_i, F)) = 0$ by Lemma 4.1. Hence F is u - S -flat by [21, Theorem 3.2]

(1) \Rightarrow (3): Let M be an R -module and E an injective R -module. Since M is u - S -flat, then $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F)$ is uniformly S -torsion. Thus $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, \text{Hom}_R(F, E)) \cong \text{Hom}_R(\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F), E)$ is also uniformly S -torsion by [16, Lemma 4.2]. Thus $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is u - S -injective by [16, Theorem 4.3].

(3) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (6) and (3) \Rightarrow (5) \Rightarrow (6): Trivial.

(6) \Rightarrow (2): Let E an injective cogenerator. Since $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is u - S -absolutely pure, there exists $s \in S$ such that $\text{Hom}_R(\text{Tor}_1^R(N, F), E) \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(N, \text{Hom}_R(F, E))$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s for any finitely presented R -module N . Since E is an injective cogenerator, $\text{Tor}_1^R(N, F)$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s for any finitely presented R -module N by Lemma 4.2.

(2) \Rightarrow (9), (7) \Rightarrow (9), (7) \Leftrightarrow (8) and (9) \Leftrightarrow (10): Obvious.

(10) \Rightarrow (8): Let $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i \in \text{Ker}(\sigma_I)$. Let K be the finitely generated ideal generated by $\{a_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Consider the following commutative diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K \otimes_R F & \xrightarrow{i \otimes 1} & I \otimes_R F \\ \downarrow \sigma_K & & \downarrow \sigma_I \\ KF & \xrightarrow{i'} & IF \end{array}$$

Let $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i$ be the element in $K \otimes_R F$ such that $i \otimes 1(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i \in I \otimes_R F$. Since $i' \sigma_K(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i) = \sigma_I(i \otimes 1(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i)) = \sigma_I(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i) = 0$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i \in \text{Ker}(\sigma_K)$ since i' is a monomorphism. Then $s \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i = 0 \in K \otimes_R F$. So $s \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i = si \otimes 1(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i) = i \otimes 1(s \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes x_i) = 0 \in I \otimes_R F$. Hence $s\text{Ker}(\sigma_I) = 0$.

Now suppose S is composed of non-zero-divisors.

(7) \Rightarrow (5) Let E be an injective cogenerator. Since $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F)$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s , we have $\text{Hom}_R(\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F), E) \cong \text{Ext}_R^1(R/I, \text{Hom}_R(F, E))$ is uniformly S -torsion with respect to s by Lemma 4.2. Since s is regular and E is injective, we have E is s -divisible. So $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is also s -divisible. Hence $\text{Hom}_R(F, E)$ is u - S -injective by [16, Proposition 4.9]. \square

In 1960, Chase also characterized coherent rings in terms of flat modules (see [5, Theorem 2.1]). Now, we are ready to give a “uniform” S -version of Chase Theorem.

Theorem 4.4. (*Chase Theorem for u - S -coherent rings*) *Let R be a ring and S is a regular multiplicative subset of R . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a u - S -coherent ring;
- (2) there is $s \in S$ such that any direct product of flat modules is u - S -flat with respect to s ;
- (3) there is $s \in S$ such that any direct product of projective modules is u - S -flat with respect to s ;
- (4) there is $s \in S$ such that any direct product of R is u - S -flat with respect to s .

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4) Trivial.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose R is u - S -coherent with respect to some $s \in S$. Let $\{F_i \mid i \in \Lambda\}$ be a family of flat R -modules and I a finitely generated ideal of R . Then I is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s . So we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T' \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{f} I \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$ with K finitely presented and $sT = sT' = 0$. Set $\text{Im}(f) = K'$. Consider the following commutative diagrams with rows exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T' \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i & \longrightarrow & K \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i & \longrightarrow & K' \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \gamma \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \beta & & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (T' \otimes_R F_i) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (K \otimes_R F_i) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (K' \otimes_R F_i) & \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} K' \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i & \longrightarrow & I \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i & \longrightarrow & T \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \beta \downarrow & & \downarrow \theta & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (K' \otimes_R F_i) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (I \otimes_R F_i) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (T \otimes_R F_i) & \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

By [8, Lemma 3.8(2)], γ is an isomorphism. Then $\text{Ker}(\beta) \cong \text{Coker}(\alpha)$ which is u - S -torsion with respect to s . Since K' is finitely generated, we have β is an epimorphism by [8, Lemma 3.8(1)]. Since $T \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i$ and $\text{Ker}(\beta)$ are all u - S -torsion with respect to s , so $\text{Ker}(\theta)$ is also u - S -torsion with respect to s .

Now we consider the following commutative diagram with rows exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{i \in I} F_i) & \longrightarrow & I \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i & \longrightarrow & R \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} F_i \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow \theta & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longleftarrow & \prod_{i \in I} \text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F_i) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (I \otimes_R F_i) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (R \otimes_R F_i),
\end{array}$$

Note $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{i \in I} F_i) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\theta)$. So $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{i \in I} F_i)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to s , Hence $\prod_{i \in I} F_i$ is u - S -flat (with respect to s) by Proposition 4.3.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R . Consider the following commutative diagram with rows exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
I \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} R & \xrightarrow{f} & R \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} R & \longrightarrow & R/I \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} R & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
g \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (I \otimes_R R) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (R \otimes_R R) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (R/I \otimes_R R) \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

Since $\prod_{i \in I} R$ is a u - S -flat module with respect to s , then f is a u - S -monomorphism. So g is also a u - S -monomorphism with respect to s .

Let $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow F \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence with F finitely generated free. Consider the following commutative diagram with rows exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
L \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} R & \longrightarrow & F \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} R & \longrightarrow & I \otimes_R \prod_{i \in I} R & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
h \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow g & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (L \otimes_R R) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (F \otimes_R R) & \longrightarrow & \prod_{i \in I} (I \otimes_R R) \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

Since g is a u - S -monomorphism with respect to s , h is a u - S -epimorphism with respect to s . Set Λ equal to the cardinal of L . We will show L is S -finite with respect to s . Indeed, consider the following exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
L \otimes_R R^\Lambda & \xrightarrow{h} & L^\Lambda & \longrightarrow & T & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& \searrow & \nearrow & & & & \\
& & \text{Im}h & & & &
\end{array}$$

with T a u - S -torsion module with respect to s . Let $x = (m)_{m \in L} \in L^\Lambda$. Then $sx \subseteq \text{Im}h$. Subsequently, there exist $m_j \in L, r_{j,i} \in R, i \in L, j = 1, \dots, n$ such that for each $t = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$sx = h\left(\sum_{j=1}^n m_j \otimes (r_{j,i})_{i \in L}\right) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n m_j r_{j,i}\right)_{i \in L}.$$

Set $U = \langle m_j \mid j = 1, \dots, n \rangle$ be the finitely generated submodule of L . Now, for any $m \in L$, $sm \in \langle \sum_{j=1}^n m_j r_{j,m} \rangle \subseteq U$, thus the embedding map $U \hookrightarrow L$ is a u - S -isomorphism with respect to s and so L is S -finite with respect to s . Consequently, I is u - S -finitely presented with respect to s . Hence, R is u - S -coherent with respect to s . \square

In 1982, Matlis [14, Theorem 1] showed that a ring R is coherent if and only if $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is flat for any injective modules M and E . The rest of this paper is devoted to obtain a “uniform” S -version of this result.

Lemma 4.5. *Let R be a ring, S is a regular multiplicative subset of R and E an injective cogenerator over R . Suppose $\text{Hom}_R(E, E)$ is u - S -flat with respect to $s \in S$, then $\text{Hom}_R(E, E)/R$ is also u - S -flat with respect to s .*

Proof. Let I be an ideal of R . Set $H = \text{Hom}_R(E, E)$. Let $i : R \rightarrow H$ be the multiplicative map. Suppose H is u - S -flat with respect to $s \in S$. Then there is a long exact sequence

$$\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, H) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, H/R) \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R R \xrightarrow{R/I \otimes i} R/I \otimes H.$$

Note that $\text{Ker}(R/I \otimes i) \cong (HI \cap R)/I = 0$ by [14, Proposition 1(2)]. Since $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, H)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to $s \in S$, $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, H/R)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to $s \in S$, which implies that H/R is also u - S -flat with respect to s . \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let R be a ring, S is a regular multiplicative subset of R . Suppose that $\{A_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a family of u - S -flat modules with respect to $s \in S$, and that B_λ is a submodule of A_λ such that A_λ/B_λ is u - S -flat with respect to s for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda$ is u - S -flat with respect to s if and only if so is $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda$ and $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda/B_\lambda$.*

Proof. Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R . Then there is an exact sequence

$$\text{Tor}_2^R(R/I, \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda/B_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda).$$

By [21, Theorem 3.2], we just need to show $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda/B_\lambda$ is u - S -flat with respect to s . Consider the following exact sequence

$$\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda/B_\lambda) \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda \xrightarrow{f} R/I \otimes_R \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda.$$

Since $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to s , to show $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda$ is u - S -flat with respect to s , we just need to show $\text{Ker}(f)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to

s . Note that $\text{Ker}(f) \cong (\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda \cap I(\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_\lambda))/I \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_\lambda \cong \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (B_\lambda \cap IA_\lambda)/IB_\lambda$ as I is finitely generated. Consider the following exact sequence $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, A_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, A_\lambda/B_\lambda) \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R B_\lambda \xrightarrow{f_\lambda} R/I \otimes_R \prod A_\lambda$. We have $\text{Ker}(f_\lambda) \cong (B_\lambda \cap IA_\lambda)/IB_\lambda$ is u - S -torsion with respect to s since A_λ/B_λ is u - S -flat with respect to s . So $\text{Ker}(f) \cong \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \text{Ker}(f_\lambda)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to s . \square

Theorem 4.7. (Matlis Theorem for u - S -coherent rings) *Let R be a ring and S is a regular multiplicative subset of R . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) R is a u - S -coherent ring;
- (2) there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s_1 for any M a u - S -absolutely pure module with respect to s_2 and any injective module E ;
- (3) there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s_1 for any M u - S -injective module with respect to s_2 and any injective module E ;
- (4) there is $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that if E is injective cogenerators, then $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s_1 for any M u - S -injective module with respect to s_2 ;
- (5) there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that $\text{Hom}_R(\text{Hom}_R(M, E_1), E_2)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s_1 for any M a u - S -flat module with respect to s_2 and any injective modules E_1, E_2 ;
- (6) there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$ such that if E_1 and E_2 are injective cogenerators, then $\text{Hom}_R(\text{Hom}_R(M, E_1), E_2)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s_1 for any M a u - S -flat module with respect to s_2 ;
- (7) there is $s \in S$ such that if E_1 is an injective cogenerator, then $\text{Hom}_R(E_1, E_2)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s for any injective cogenerator E_2 .

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (7) and (5) \Rightarrow (6): Trivial.

(3) \Leftrightarrow (5) and (4) \Leftrightarrow (6): Follows from Proposition 4.3.

(1) \Rightarrow (2): Suppose R is a uniformly S -coherent ring with respect to some element $s \in S$. Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R . Then we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T' \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{f} I \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$ with K finitely presented and $sT = sT' = 0$. Set $\text{Im}(f) = K'$. Consider the following commutative diagrams with exact rows

$((-, -)$ is instead of $\text{Hom}_R(-, -)$):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} (M, E) \otimes_R T' & \longrightarrow & (M, E) \otimes_R K & \longrightarrow & (M, E) \otimes_R K' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow \psi_{T'}^1 & & \psi_K \downarrow \cong & & \psi_{K'} \downarrow & & \\ ((T', M), E) & \longrightarrow & ((K, M), E) & \longrightarrow & ((K', M), E) & \longrightarrow & 0, \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Tor}_1^R((M, E), R/K') & \longrightarrow & (M, E) \otimes_R K' & \longrightarrow & (M, E) \otimes_R R & \longrightarrow & (M, E) \otimes_R R/K' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \psi_{R/K'}^1 & & \psi_{K'} \downarrow & & \psi_R \downarrow \cong & & \psi_{R/K'} \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (\text{Ext}_R^1(R/K', M), E) & \longrightarrow & ((K', M), E) & \longrightarrow & ((R, M), E) & \longrightarrow & ((R/K', M), E) & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{Tor}_1^R((M, E), T) & \longrightarrow & \text{Tor}_1^R((M, E), R/K') & \longrightarrow & \text{Tor}_1^R((M, E), R/I) & \longrightarrow & (M, E) \otimes_R T \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi_{R/K'}^1 & & \psi_{R/I}^1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (\text{Ext}_R^1(T, M), E) & \longrightarrow & (\text{Ext}_R^1(R/K', M), E) & \longrightarrow & (\text{Ext}_R^1(R/I, M), E) & \longrightarrow & ((T, M), E) \end{array}$$

Since ψ_K is an isomorphism by [2, Proposition 8.14(1)] and [10, Theorem 2], $\psi_{K'}$ is a u - S -isomorphism with respect to s , and so is $\psi_{R/K'}^1$. Then $\psi_{R/I}^1$ is a u - S -isomorphism with respect to s^3 (see the proof of [23, Theorem 1.2]). Since M is u - S -absolutely pure, $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/I, M)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to s_2 (s_2 is independent of I). Then $\text{Tor}_1^R(\text{Hom}_R(M, E), R/I)$ is u - S -torsion with respect to $s_1 := s^3 s'$, and thus $\text{Hom}_R(M, E)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s_1 by Proposition 4.3.

(7) \Rightarrow (1): Let E be an injective cogenerator and set $H = \text{Hom}_R(E, E)$. Then H is u - S -flat with respect to s by assumption. Since $R \subseteq H$, we have that H/R is u - S -flat with respect to s by Lemma 4.5. Let Λ be an index set. Set $H_\lambda = H$, $R_\lambda = R$ and $E_\lambda = E$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Since $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} E_\lambda$ is also a injective cogenerator, $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} H_\lambda \cong \text{Hom}_R(E_\lambda, \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} E_\lambda)$ is u - S -flat with respect to s by assumption. Hence $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} R_\lambda$ is u - S -flat with respect to s by Lemma 4.6. So R is a u - S -coherent ring by Theorem 4.4. \square

Acknowledgement.

The author was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12061001).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. D. Anderson, T. Dumitrescu, *S-Noetherian rings*, Comm. Algebra **30** (2002), 4407-4416.
- [2] L. Angeleri Hügel, D. Herbera, *Mittag-Leffler conditions on modules*, Indiana Math. J. **57**, (2008), 2459-2517.
- [3] D. Bennis, M. El Hajoui, *On S-coherence*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **55** (2018), no. 6, 1499-1512.
- [4] Z. Bilgin, M. L. Reyes, and U. Tekir, *On right S-Noetherian rings and S-Noetherian modules*, Comm. Algebra **46** (2018), 863-869.
- [5] S. U. Chase, *Direct products of modules*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **97** (1960), 457-473.
- [6] L. Fuchs, L. Salce, *Modules over Non-Noetherian Domains*, Providence, AMS, 2001.
- [7] S. Glaz, *Commutative Coherent Rings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. **1371**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [8] R. Gobel, J. Trlifaj, *Approximations and Endomorphism Algebras of Modules*, De Gruyter Exp. Math., vol. **41**, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 2012.
- [9] S. Jain, *Flat and FP-injectivity*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **41** (1973), 437-442.
- [10] E. Lenzing, *Endlich präsentierbare Moduln*, Arch. Math., **20** (1969), no. 3, 262-266.
- [11] J. W. Lim, *A Note on S-Noetherian Domains*, Kyungpook Math. J. **55**, (2015), 507-514.
- [12] J. W. Lim, D. Y. Oh, *S-Noetherian properties on amalgamated algebras along an ideal*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **218**, (2014), 2099-2123.
- [13] B. Maddox, *Absolutely pure modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (1967), 155-158.
- [14] E. Matlis, *Commutative coherent rings*, Can. J. Math. **6** (1982), 1240-1244
- [15] C. Megibben, *Absolutely pure modules*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **26** (1970), 561-566.
- [16] W. Qi, H. Kim, F. G. Wang, M. Z. Chen, W. Zhao, *Uniformly S-Noetherian rings*, submitted. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.07913>.
- [17] W. Qi, X. L. Zhang, W. Zhao, *New characterizations of S-coherent rings* J. Algebra Appl., to appear. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219498823500780>.
- [18] J. J. Rotman, *An introduction to homological algebra*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, **85**, Academic Press, Inc. New York-London, 1979.
- [19] B. Stenström, *Coherent rings and FP-injective modules*, J. London Math. Soc. **2** (1970), no. 2, 323-329
- [20] F. G. Wang, H. Kim, *Foundations of Commutative Rings and Their Modules*, Singapore, Springer, 2016.
- [21] X. L. Zhang, *Characterizing S-flat modules and S-von Neumann regular rings by uniformity*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. to appear, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.07941>.
- [22] X. L. Zhang, *On uniformly S-absolutely pure modules*, submitted, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.06851>.
- [23] X. L. Zhang, *The u-S-weak global dimension of commutative rings*, Commun. Korean Math. Soc., submitted, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.00535>.
- [24] X. L. Zhang, W. Qi, *Characterizing S-projective modules and S-semisimple rings by uniformity*, submitted, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.10441>.