

## THE NATURAL PARTIAL ORDER ON MODULES

T. PAKEL, T. P. CALCI, S. HALICIOGLU, A. HARMANCI, AND B. UNGOR

**ABSTRACT.** The Mitsch order is already known as a natural partial order for semigroups and rings. The purpose of this paper is to further study of the Mitsch order on modules by investigating basic properties via endomorphism rings. And so this study also contribute to the results related to the orders on rings. As a module theoretic analog of the Mitsch order, we show that this order is a partial order on arbitrary modules. Among others, lattice properties of the Mitsch order and the relations between the Mitsch order and the other well-known orders, such as, the minus order, the Jones order, the direct sum order and the space pre-order on modules are studied. In particular, we prove that the minus order is the Mitsch order and we supply an example to show that the converse does not hold in general.

**2010 MSC:** 06A06, 06F25, 06F99, 16B99

**Key words:** Mitsch order, minus order, Jones order, direct sum order, space pre-order

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper  $R$  denotes an associative ring with identity  $1_R$  and modules are unitary right  $R$ -modules. For a module  $M$ ,  $S = \text{End}_R(M)$  stands for the ring of all right  $R$ -module endomorphisms of  $M$ . It is well known that  $M$  is a left  $S$ -right  $R$ -bimodule. In this work, for the  $(S, R)$ -bimodule  $M$ ,  $l_S(\cdot)$  and  $r_R(\cdot)$  stand for the left annihilator of a subset of  $M$  in  $S$  and the right annihilator of a subset of  $M$  in  $R$ , respectively. If the subset is a singleton, say  $\{m\}$ , then we simply write  $l_S(m)$  and  $r_R(m)$ , respectively. For a ring  $R$ ,  $C(R)$  denotes the center of  $R$ .

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a semigroup and  $a \in \mathcal{S}$ . Any solution  $x = a^-$  to the equation  $axa = a$  is called an *inner generalized inverse* of  $a$ . If in addition  $xax = x$ , then  $x$  is called a *reflexive inverse* of  $a$  and denoted by  $a^+$ . If such  $a^-$  exists, then  $a$  is called *regular*, and if every element in a semigroup  $\mathcal{S}$  is regular, then  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a *regular semigroup*. Hartwig [6] introduced the *plus order*  $\leq^+$  on regular semigroups using

generalized inverses. For a regular semigroup  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $a, b \in \mathcal{S}$ , we write

$$a \leq^+ b \text{ if } a^+a = a^+b \text{ and } aa^+ = ba^+ \quad (1)$$

for some reflexive inverse  $a^+$  of  $a$ . It is shown that the plus order is a partial order.

On the other hand, consider

$$a \leq^- b \text{ if } a^-a = a^-b \text{ and } aa^- = ba^- \quad (2)$$

for some inner generalized inverse  $a^-$  of  $a$ . The relation  $\leq^-$  is usually called *minus order*. It is well known that definitions (1) and (2) are equivalent. In [7], the plus partial order was renamed as minus partial order.

Let  $S$  be any semigroup and  $S^1$  denote the set  $S$  if  $S$  has an identity. In [12], the Mitsch order was introduced for semigroups by Mitsch as follows: for  $a, b \in S$ ,

$$a \leq b \text{ if } a = xb = by, xa = a$$

for some  $x, y \in S^1$ . Then it is a partial order on  $S$  which is called the *Mitsch order*.

Principally projective rings were introduced by Hattori [8] to study the torsion theory, that is, a ring is called *left (resp. right) principally projective* if every principal left (resp. right) ideal is projective. This is equivalent to the left (resp. right) annihilator of any element of the ring is generated by an idempotent as a left (resp. right) ideal, i.e., the ring is *left (right) Rickart*. If a ring  $R$  is both left and right Rickart, then it is said to be *Rickart*.

Some partial orders are defined on Baer and Rickart rings in the literature (see [3], [10] and [14]). Let  $R$  be a ring and  $a, b \in R$ . Then we write  $a \leq^- b$  if there exist idempotent elements  $p, q \in R$  such that

$$l_R(a) = R(1_R - p), \quad r_R(a) = (1_R - q)R, \quad pa = pb, \quad \text{and} \quad aq = bq. \quad (3)$$


It was proved in [3] that this relation  $\leq^-$  is indeed a partial order when  $R$  is a Rickart ring. In [5], the Mitsch order defined in a ring in the following way: For any ring  $R$ , a natural partial order  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $R$  defined by  $x\mathcal{M}y$  for given  $x, y \in R$  if either  $x = y$  or there exist  $p, q \in R$  such that  $px = py = x = xq = yq$ . In [4], it is shown that the minus order and the Mitsch order are the same on Rickart rings.

Let  $M$  be a module. Then an element  $m \in M$  is called (*Zelmanowitz*) *regular* if  $m = m\varphi(m) \equiv m\varphi m$  for some  $\varphi \in M^*$  where  $M^* = \text{Hom}_R(M, R)$  denotes the dual of  $M$ . For a ring  $R$ , let  $a \in R$  be a regular element (in the sense of von Neumann), i.e., there exists  $a^- \in R$  such that  $a = aa^-a$ . Define the map  $\varphi : R \rightarrow R$  with  $\varphi(r) = a^-r, r \in R$ . Then  $\varphi \in R^* = \text{End}_R(R)$ . We have  $a\varphi a = a\varphi(a) = aa^-a = a$

which yields that  $a$  is regular in  $R_R$  (in the sense of Zelmanowitz, see also [17]). Let now  $R$  be a ring and suppose  $a$  is a regular element in  $R_R$  (in the sense of Zelmanowitz), i.e., there exists  $\varphi \in R^*$  such that  $a = a\varphi a$ . Define  $a^- = \varphi(1_R)$ . Then  $a = a\varphi a = a\varphi(1_R)a = a\varphi(1_R a) = a\varphi(a) = a\varphi a = a$ . We may conclude that  $a \in R$  is regular if and only if  $a$  is regular in  $R_R$  (or, similarly, in the left- $R$  module  ${}_R R$ ). A module  $M$  is called *regular* (in the sense of Zelmanowitz) if every element of  $M$  is regular.

Recently, some of the present authors study the minus order in a more general setting. The notion of the minus order was extended to modules using their endomorphism rings in [15]. Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$  if there exists  $\varphi \in M^*$  such that  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1$ ,  $m_1\varphi = m_2\varphi$  and  $\varphi m_1 = \varphi m_2$ . They called the relation  $\leq^-$  the *minus order* on  $M$ , and proved that it is a partial order on regular modules. In the same work, the authors also defined the Mitsch order on modules, that is,  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  if there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2 a = f m_2$  and  $m_1 = f m_1$ . It is showed in [15] that the minus order and the Mitsch order coincide on regular modules.

Although the minus order on various algebraic structures has been an area of intense research in the past few years, the main properties of the Mitsch order is not studied in detail. Motivated by the aforementioned works on the minus order, the goal of this paper is to investigate properties of the Mitsch order on arbitrary modules. The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we show that the Mitsch relation is a partial order on modules, and give some characterizations of this partial order in various ways. We determine the way how to define the Mitsch order from a module to its factor modules. In Section 3, the relations between the Mitsch order and the other well-known orders on modules are studied and the following diagram is obtained:



We supply examples to show that all implications in this diagram are strict. Section 4 deals with lattice properties of the Mitsch order on modules. The maximal elements of modules with respect to the Mitsch order are determined. Finally, we focus on the compatibility of the Mitsch order with the addition and multiplication.

## 2. BASIC PROPERTIES OF THE MITSCH ORDER

In [12], Mitsch generalized Hartwig's definition of the minus partial order to arbitrary semigroups. Suppose  $a, b$  are two elements of an arbitrary semigroup  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then we write

$$a \leq_M b \quad \text{if} \quad a = xb = by \quad \text{and} \quad xa = a \quad (4)$$

for some elements  $x, y \in \mathcal{S}^1$ , where  $\mathcal{S}^1$  denotes the set  $\mathcal{S}$  if  $\mathcal{S}$  has an identity. Mitsch proved that  $\leq_M$  is indeed a partial order for any semigroup  $\mathcal{S}$  and that for  $a, b \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$a \leq_M b \quad \text{if and only if} \quad a = xb = by \quad \text{and} \quad xa = ay = a \quad (5)$$

for some elements  $x, y \in \mathcal{S}^1$ . One can easily generalize this definition to a ring  $R$  as follows.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $R$  be a ring and  $a, b \in R$ . We write  $a \leq_M b$  if there exist  $x, y \in R$  such that  $a = xb = by$  and  $a = xa$ .

It can be easily seen that the Mitsch order is a partial order on rings.

**Proposition 2.2.** Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (1) There exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ .
- (2) There exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = m_1a$ .
- (3) There exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1 = m_1a$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) If there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ , then  $m_1 = fm_2a = m_1a$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) If there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = m_1a$ , then  $m_1 = m_1a = fm_2a = fm_1$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) It is obvious. □

Following the above ideas, we now consider the relation  $\leq_M$  on a module  $M$  which was defined in [15].

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . We write  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  if one of the equivalent conditions in Proposition 2.2 is satisfied. We call the relation  $\leq_M$  the *Mitsch order on  $M$* .

In the sequel of this section, we examine the main properties of the Mitsch order on modules in detail.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $M$  be a module. The Mitsch order is a partial order on  $M$ .*

*Proof.* **Reflexivity:** Obvious.

**Antisymmetry:** Let  $m_1, m_2 \in M$  with  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $m_2 \leq_M m_1$ . Then there exist  $f, g \in S$  and  $a, b \in R$  such that

$$m_1 = m_2a = fm_2, \quad m_1 = fm_1$$

and

$$m_2 = m_1b = gm_1, \quad m_2 = gm_2.$$

Hence  $m_1 = m_2a = gm_2a = gm_1 = m_2$ .

**Transitivity:** Let  $m_1, m_2, m_3 \in M$  with  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $m_2 \leq_M m_3$ . Then there exist  $f, g \in S$  and  $a, b \in R$  such that

$$m_1 = m_2a = fm_2, \quad m_1 = fm_1$$

and

$$m_2 = m_3b = gm_3, \quad m_2 = gm_2.$$

Hence  $m_1 = m_3(ba) = (fg)m_3$  and  $m_1 = fm_1 = fm_2a = fgm_2a = (fg)m_1$  and so  $m_1 \leq_M m_3$ . Therefore the Mitsch order is a partial order on  $M$ .  $\square$

In the next result, we show that there are many different ways to express the Mitsch order.

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . The following are equivalent.*

- (1)  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ .
- (2) There exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a^n = f^n m_2$  and  $m_1 = f^n m_1$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .
- (3) There exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a^n = f^n m_2$  and  $m_1 = m_1a^n$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .
- (4) There exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a^n = f^n m_2$  and  $m_1 = f^n m_1 = m_1a^n$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2) Let  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ , then there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ . We show that  $m_1 = m_2a^n = f^n m_2$  and  $m_1 = f^n m_1$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . If  $n = 1$  there is nothing to show. Assume  $n > 1$

then  $m_1 = fm_1 = ffm_1 = \cdots = \underbrace{ff \cdots f}_{n\text{-times}} m_1 = f^n m_1$ ,  $m_1 = fm_1 = ffm_2 = \cdots = \underbrace{ff \cdots f}_{n\text{-times}} m_2 = f^n m_2$  and  $m_1 = m_2 a = m_2 a a = \cdots = m_2 \underbrace{a a \cdots a}_{n\text{-times}} = m_2 a^n$ . The converse is clear.

(1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) and (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (4) can be proved similar to the proof of (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2).  $\square$

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.5 which is a new characterization of the Mitsch order on rings.

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $a, b \in R$ . The following are equivalent.*

- (1)  $a \leq_M b$ .
- (2) There exist  $x, y \in R$  such that  $a = bx^n = y^n b$  and  $a = y^n a$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .
- (3) There exist  $x, y \in R$  such that  $a = bx^n = y^n b$  and  $a = ax^n$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .
- (4) There exist  $x, y \in R$  such that  $a = bx^n = y^n b$  and  $a = y^n a = ax^n$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

In the next result, we give some basic properties of the Mitsch order.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ , then the following hold.*

- (1)  $l_S(m_2) \subseteq l_S(m_1)$ .
- (2)  $r_R(m_2) \subseteq r_R(m_1)$ .
- (3)  $m_1 R \subseteq m_2 R$ .
- (4)  $S m_1 \subseteq S m_2$ .

*Proof.* It is straightforward.  $\square$

We now give an example to show that the converse of Proposition 2.7 need not be true.

**Example 2.8.** Let  $R = M_2(\mathbb{Z})$ , and  $M = R_R$ . Consider  $m_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $m_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $a = f = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in M$ . Since  $m_1 = m_2 a = f m_2$  we have  $l_S(m_2) \subseteq l_S(m_1)$ ,  $r_R(m_2) \subseteq r_R(m_1)$ ,  $m_1 R \subseteq m_2 R$ ,  $S m_1 \subseteq S m_2$ . On the other hand, it can be seen that  $m_1 \not\leq_M m_2$ .

Let  $M$  be a module and  $N$  a submodule of  $M$ . It is natural to ask if it is possible to extend the Mitsch order from  $N$  to  $M$  and vice versa. The following result answers these questions.

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $M$  be a module,  $N$  a submodule of  $M$  and  $m_1, m_2 \in N$ .*

- (1) *If  $N$  is a direct summand of  $M$  and  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $N$ , then  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $M$ .*
- (2) *If  $N$  is fully invariant in  $M$  and  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $M$ , then  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $N$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $N$ . Then there exist  $f \in \text{End}_R(N)$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ . If  $N$  is a direct summand of  $M$ , then there exists a submodule  $K$  of  $M$  such that  $M = N \oplus K$ . Hence  $f \oplus 0_K \in S$  and  $m_1 = m_2a = (f \oplus 0_K)m_2$  and  $m_1 = (f \oplus 0_K)m_1$ . Therefore  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $M$ .

(2) Since  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $M$ , there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = fm_2 = m_2a$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ . The submodule  $N$  being fully invariant yields that  $f|_N \in \text{End}_R(N)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $M$  be a module and  $N$  a submodule of  $M$ . In the next result, we determine under what conditions the Mitsch order on  $M$  can be described on  $M/N$ .

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $N$  a submodule of  $M$ . If  $N$  is fully invariant, then Mitsch order on  $M$  can be defined on  $M/N$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a module,  $N$  a fully invariant submodule of  $M$  and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Assume that  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $M$ . Then there exists  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ . Define  $g \in \text{End}_R(M/N)$  as  $g(m+N) = fm+N$  for  $m+N \in M/N$ . Hence  $g$  is well defined map on  $M/N$ . In fact,  $m+N = m_1+N$  implies  $m-m_1 \in N$ . Since  $N$  fully invariant,  $f(m-m_1) = f(m) - f(m_1) \in f(N) \subseteq N$ . Thus  $g(m+N) = f(m) + N = f(m_1) + N$ . Since  $f$  is an endomorphism of  $M$ ,  $g$  is also an endomorphism of  $M/N$ . Let  $m_1 + N, m_2 + N \in M/N$  with  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  on  $M$ . By assumption  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ . Then  $m_1 + N = m_2a + N = (m_2 + N)a$  and  $m_1 + N = fm_2 + N = g(m_2 + N)$ .  $m_1 + N = fm_1 + N = g(m_1 + N)$ . It entails that  $m_1 + N \leq_M m_2 + N$  on  $M/N$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.11.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $I$  an ideal of  $R$ . Then the Mitsch order on  $R$  can be defined on  $R/I$ .*

### 3. ORDERS VERSUS THE NATURAL PARTIAL ORDER ON MODULES

In this section, we investigate the relations between the Mitsch order and the other well-known orders, namely, the minus order, the Jones order, the direct sum order and the space pre-order on modules.

Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . In [15], recall that  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$  if there exists  $\varphi \in M^*$  such that  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1$ ,  $m_1\varphi = m_2\varphi$ , and  $\varphi m_1 = \varphi m_2$ . The relation  $\leq^-$  is called the *minus order* on  $M$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$ , then  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ . The converse holds if  $M$  is a regular module.*

*Proof.* If  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$ , then there exists  $\varphi \in M^*$  such that  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1$ ,  $m_1\varphi = m_2\varphi$ , and  $\varphi m_1 = \varphi m_2$ . Take  $a = \varphi m_1 \in R$  and  $f = m_1\varphi \in S$ . Then  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1 = m_2\varphi m_1 = m_2a$ ,  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1 = m_1\varphi m_2 = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1 = fm_1$ . Therefore  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ . Conversely, if  $M$  is a regular module and  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ , then from [15, Theorem 5.6] we have  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$ .  $\square$

The following example shows that the regularity condition in Proposition 3.1 is not superfluous.

**Example 3.2.** Consider  $M = \mathbb{Z}_{12}$  as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. Since  $M^* = 0$ ,  $M$  is not a regular module. Let  $a = 3 \in \mathbb{Z}$  and the homomorphism  $f \in S$  defined by  $f(\bar{n}) = \bar{n}a$  for all  $\bar{n} \in M$  we have  $\bar{6} = \bar{2}a = f(\bar{2})$  and  $\bar{6} = f(\bar{6})$  which yields that  $\bar{6} \leq_M \bar{2}$ . But since  $M^* = 0$ ,  $\bar{6} \not\leq^- \bar{2}$ .

In [15], the Jones order on modules is defined in the following way: Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then we write  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$  if there exist  $f^2 = f \in S$  and  $a^2 = a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$ . In the next result, we obtain the relation between the Mitsch order and the Jones order.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$ , then  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$ . Then  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  for some  $f^2 = f \in S$  and  $a^2 = a \in R$ . From  $m_1 = fm_2$  we obtain  $fm_1 = fm_2 = m_1$ . Therefore  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ .  $\square$

The following example shows that there are Mitsch ordered elements which are not Jones ordered in a module.

**Example 3.4.** Let  $C$  be the commutative semigroup on generators  $a, b$  and  $c$  with relations  $ac = a = cb$  as in [9, Example 2.9]. Consider the semigroup ring



$R = \mathbb{Z}_2[C]$ . Being  $ac = a = cb$  implies  $ab = acb = a^2$ . It can be listed the distinct elements of  $C$  and  $R$  as

$$C = \{a, a^2, \dots, a^n, \dots; b, b^2, \dots, b^n, \dots; c, c^2, \dots, c^n, \dots\}$$

$$R = \left\{ \sum_i \sum_j \sum_k a^i b^j c^k \mid a, b, c \in C \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that  $C$  is idempotent-free and the idempotents of  $R$  are trivial. The commutativity of  $C$  and  $R$  entails that in the equalities  $m_1 = m_2d = fm_2$ ,  $m_1 = fm_1$  we replace  $m_1$  by  $a$ ,  $m_2$  by  $b$ ,  $d$  by  $c$  and  $f$  by  $c$  to get  $m_1 = m_2d$  to  $a = bc$ ,  $m_1 = fm_2$  to  $a = cb$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$  to  $a = ca$ . Then  $m_1 = m_2d = fm_2$ ,  $m_1 = fm_1$  is  $a = bc = cb$ ,  $a = ca$ . Hence we have  $a \leq_M b$ . Since  $R$  has only trivial idempotents  $\{0, 1\}$ ,  $a \not\leq_J b$ .

A natural question is to ask under which conditions Mitsch ordered elements of a module are Jones ordered.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then we have the following.*

- (1) *If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $r_R(m_2) = l_S(m_2) = 0$ , then  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$ .*
- (2) *If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $m_1$  is regular, then  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ , then there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1 = m_1a$ . Hence  $fm_2 = fm_1 = f^2m_2$  and  $m_2a = m_1a = m_1a^2$ . Thus  $(f - f^2)m_2 = 0$  and  $m_2(a - a^2) = 0$ . Since  $r_R(m_2) = l_S(m_2) = 0$  then  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  are idempotent elements. Therefore  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$ .

(2) Let  $m_1 \in M$  be regular and  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ . The regularity of  $m_1$  yields there exists  $\varphi \in M^*$  such that  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1$ . Then  $m_1\varphi \in S$  is an idempotent and  $\varphi m_1 \in R$  is an idempotent. Consider  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1 = (m_2r)(\varphi m_1) = m_2(r\varphi m_1) = m_2e$  where  $e = r\varphi m_1$ . We claim that  $e^2 = e$ . In fact  $e^2 = (r\varphi m_1)(r\varphi m_1) = (r\varphi)(m_1r)(\varphi m_1) = (r\varphi)(m_1)(\varphi m_1) = r\varphi m_1 = e$ . Next we consider  $m_1 = m_1\varphi m_1 = (m_1\varphi)(sm_2) = (m_1\varphi s)m_2 = fm_2$  where  $m_1\varphi s = f \in S$  and we claim  $f^2 = f$ . In fact  $f^2 = (m_1\varphi s)(m_1\varphi s) = (m_1\varphi)(sm_1)(\varphi s) = (m_1\varphi)(m_1)(\varphi s) = m_1\varphi s = f$ . The net result is  $m_1 = m_2e$  and  $e^2 = e \in R$  and  $m_1 = fm_2$  and  $f^2 = f \in S$ . It follows that  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$ ,  $m_1 = fm_2 = m_2e = fm_1e = fm_2e$ .  $\square$

Recall that the direct sum order on modules is defined in [15] as follows: Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then  $m_1 \leq^\oplus m_2$  if  $m_2R = m_1R \oplus (m_2 - m_1)R$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ , then  $m_1 \leq^\oplus m_2$ . The converse holds if  $M$  is a regular module.*

*Proof.* If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ , then  $m_1R \subseteq m_2R$  and  $(m_2 - m_1)R \subseteq m_2R$  from Proposition 2.7(3). It is clear that  $m_2R = m_1R + (m_2 - m_1)R$ . Let  $m \in m_1R \cap (m_2 - m_1)R$  then there exists  $a, b \in R$  such that  $m = m_1a = (m_2 - m_1)b$ . Since  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ ,  $m_1 = m_1r = m_2r$  for some  $r \in R$ . Thus  $m = m_2ra = (m_2 - m_2r)b$ . Hence  $m_2(ra + rb - b) = 0$ . From Proposition 2.7(1)  $m_1(ra + rb - b) = 0 = m_1a + m_1b - m_1b = m_1a = m$ . Therefore  $m_1R \cap (m_2 - m_1)R = 0$  and  $m_2R = m_1R \oplus (m_2 - m_1)R$ . The converse is clear from [15, Theorem 5.11] and Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

As the following example shows, the condition being regular is not superfluous in Proposition 3.6.

**Example 3.7.** Let  $F$  be a field and  $R = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 & b \\ 0 & c & d \\ 0 & 0 & e \end{bmatrix} \mid a, b, c, d, e \in F \right\}$  be the

subring of  $U_3(F)$  the ring of  $3 \times 3$  upper triangular matrices over  $F$ .

Let  $m_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $m_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , and so  $m_2 - m_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . Then

$m_1R = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & a \\ 0 & 0 & a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mid a \in F \right\}$ ,  $m_2R = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & b \\ 0 & c & d \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mid b, c, d \in F \right\}$  and

$(m_2 - m_1)R = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s & t \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mid s, t \in F \right\}$ . Since  $F$  is a field, it is easy to check that

$m_2R = m_1R \oplus (m_2 - m_1)R$ . So  $m_1 \leq^\oplus m_2$ . On the other hand, we claim that there

is not an element  $f$  in  $R$  such that  $m_1 = fm_2$ . Otherwise, let  $f = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 & b \\ 0 & z & u \\ 0 & 0 & e \end{bmatrix} \in R$

such that  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 & b \\ 0 & z & u \\ 0 & 0 & e \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & a \\ 0 & z & z \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . It entails that  $1 = 0$ .

This contradiction shows that  $m_1 \not\leq_M m_2$ .

In [11], the space pre-order on complex matrices was introduced by Mitra. Recently, the space pre-order is extended to modules in [16]. Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then  $m_1 \leq_S m_2$  if  $Sm_1 \subseteq Sm_2$  and  $m_1R \subseteq m_2R$ .

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ , then  $m_1 \leq_S m_2$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear from Proposition 2.7. □

One may suspect that the converse of Proposition 3.8 holds. But the following example erases the possibility.

**Example 3.9.** Let  $R = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z} & 2\mathbb{Z} \\ 2\mathbb{Z} & \mathbb{Z} \end{bmatrix}$ , and  $M = R_R$ . Consider  $m_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 9 & 6 \\ 6 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $m_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $a = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $f = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \in M$ . Since  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  we have  $m_1 \leq_S m_2$ . It can be seen that  $m_1 \not\leq_M m_2$ .

We close this section by obtaining the relation between the minus order and the Jones order. So the following result completes the diagram which is given at the end of Introduction.

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$ , then  $m_1 \leq_J m_2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$ , then there exist  $f^2 = f \in S, a^2 = a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = fm_1 = fm_2 = m_1a = m_2a$ , by [15, Lemma 5.2]. □

The next example shows that the converse of Proposition 3.10 need not be true.

**Example 3.11.** Let  $n$  be a positive integer and consider the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . Then the dual module  $\mathbb{Z}_n^* = 0$ . Let  $0 \neq m \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ . On the one hand, since  $\mathbb{Z}_n^* = 0$ , we have  $m \not\leq^- m$ . On the other hand, clearly,  $m \leq_J m$ .

#### 4. LATTICE PROPERTIES OF THE MITSCH ORDER

In this section, we study lattice properties of the Mitsch order on modules. Hence we present various characterizations of the Mitsch order as an application. We characterize the maximal elements of modules with respect to the Mitsch order. We

investigate the compatibility of the Mitsch order with the addition and multiplication. We give examples to show that the Mitsch order is not compatible with the addition and multiplication in general.

Let  $R$  and  $S$  be rings,  ${}_R V_S$  and  ${}_S W_R$  be bimodules. Then the 4-tuple  $(R, V, W, S)$  is said to be a *Morita context* if there exist products  $V \times W \rightarrow R$  defined by  $(v, w) \mapsto vw$  and  $W \times V \rightarrow S$  defined by  $(w, v) \mapsto wv$ . With these requirements,  $\begin{bmatrix} R & V \\ W & S \end{bmatrix}$  is an associative ring using matrix operations and it is called a *Morita context ring* [13].

**Remark 4.1.** Let  $M$  be a module. Then  ${}_S M_R$  is a bimodule. Also,  $M^*$  is a right  $S$ -module via composition of maps, and  $M^*$  becomes a left  $R$ -module as follows: For  $\varphi \in M^*$  and  $r \in R$  define  $r\varphi \in M^*$  by  $(r\varphi)x = r(\varphi x)$  for all  $x \in M$ . Hence we have  ${}_S M_R$  and  ${}_R(M^*)_S$  bimodules. Also, if  $m \in M$  and  $\varphi \in M^*$ , then  $\varphi m \in R$  and dually  $m\varphi \in S$  with  $(m\varphi)x = m(\varphi x) \equiv m\varphi x$  for all  $x \in M$ . If  $m \in M$  is regular, then  $m = m\varphi m$  for some  $\varphi \in M^*$ , so we have idempotent elements  $\varphi m \in R$  and  $m\varphi \in S$ . It is easy to verify that  $(R, M^*, M, S)$  is a Morita context, called *the standard context* of the module  $M$ .

In [2], Chen et al. defined *left invertible* and *right invertible* elements of a module by using the Morita context as follows. Let  $(R, M^*, M, S)$  be a standard context of the module  $M$ . Then

$$m \in M \text{ is called } \begin{cases} \text{left invertible if } \varphi m = 1_R \text{ for some } \varphi \in M^*, \\ \text{right invertible if } m\varphi = 1_S \text{ for some } \varphi \in M^*. \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  then the following hold.*

- (1) *If  $m_1$  is left invertible, then  $m_1 = m_2$ .*
- (2) *If  $m_1$  is right invertible, then  $m_1 = m_2$ .*
- (3) *If  $m_2 \in m_1 R$ , then  $m_1 = m_2$ .*
- (4) *If  $m_2 \in S m_1$ , then  $m_1 = m_2$ .*
- (5) *If  $m_2 \in N$  for a submodule  $N$  of  $M$ , then  $m_1 \in N$ .*
- (6)  *$m_2 - m_1 \leq_M m_2$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $m_1$  is left invertible. Then there exist  $a \in R$  and  $f \in M^*$  such that  $m_1 = m_1 a = m_2 a$  and  $f m_1 = 1_R$ . Hence  $a = f m_1 a = f m_1 = 1_R$ .

Therefore  $m_1 = m_2$ .

(2) It can be proved similar to the proof of (1).

(3) Let  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $m_2 \in m_1 R$ . Then there exist  $b \in R$  and  $f \in S$  such that  $m_2 = m_1 b$  and  $f m_1 = f m_2 = m_1$ . Thus  $m_2 = m_1 b = f m_1 b = f m_2 = m_1$ .

(4) It can be proved similar to the proof of (3).

(5) It is clear.

(6) Let  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ . Then  $m_1 = m_2 a = f m_2$  and  $m_1 = f m_1$  for some  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$ . Therefore  $m_2 - m_1 = m_2(1 - a) = (1 - f)m_2$  and  $m_2 - m_1 = (1 - f)(m_2 - m_1)$ . Hence  $m_2 - m_1 \leq_M m_2$ .  $\square$

Note that zero is the minimum element of the poset  $(M, \leq_M)$ . In the following, we determine the maximal elements of the module with respect to the Mitsch order.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m \in M$ . Then  $m$  is a maximal element of the the poset  $(M, \leq_M)$  if any of the following holds.*

- (1)  $m$  is left invertible.
- (2)  $m$  is right invertible.
- (3) For every  $b \in r_R(m)$ ,  $b + 1$  is invertible.
- (4) For every  $g \in l_S(m)$ ,  $g + 1$  is invertible.
- (5)  $r_R(m) = 0$ .
- (6)  $l_S(m) = 0$ .

*Proof.* (1) and (2) follow from Theorem 4.2.

(3) Let  $n \in M$  and  $m \leq_M n$ , then there exists  $a \in R$  such that  $m = na = ma$ . Hence  $m(a - 1) = 0$ . Therefore  $a \in R$  is invertible and  $na = ma$  implies that  $n = m$ . Thus  $m$  is a maximal element of the poset  $(M, \leq_M)$ .

(4) It can be proved similar to the proof of (3).

(5) and (6) are clear from (3) and (4), respectively.  $\square$

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3.

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let  $M$  be module.*

- (1) *If  $M_R$  or  ${}_S M$  is a faithful module, then every nonzero element of  $M$  is maximal with respect to  $\leq_M$ .*
- (2) *If  $M_R$  or  ${}_S M$  is a cyclic module generated by  $m$ , then  $m$  is a maximal element of  $M$  with respect to  $\leq_M$ .*
- (3) *All torsion-free elements of  $M$  are maximal with respect to  $\leq_M$ .*

One may suspect that a module  $M$  becomes a lattice with respect to the Mitsch order. But the following remark reveals that this is not the case.

**Remark 4.5.** Let  $M$  be a regular module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . By Proposition 3.1,  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  implies  $m_1 \leq^- m_2$ . Assume that  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  have an upper bound  $m \in M$  in the lattice of the Mitsch order on  $M$ . Then  $m$  is also an upper bound of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  in the lattice of minus order on  $M$ . It is known by [1, Example 3.6] that the minus order on a regular module  $M$  need not form a lattice on  $M$ . Therefore  $M$  need not be a lattice with respect to the Mitsch order in general.

In the following example, we show that the Mitsch order is not always compatible with the scalar multiplication.

**Example 4.6.** Let  $R = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z} & \mathbb{Z}_6 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_6 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $M = R_R$ . Consider  $m_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & \bar{2} \\ 0 & \bar{3} \end{bmatrix}$  and  $m_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & \bar{0} \\ 0 & \bar{1} \end{bmatrix}$  in  $M$ . Then for  $a = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \bar{1} \\ 0 & \bar{3} \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $f = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \bar{2} \\ 0 & \bar{3} \end{bmatrix} \in R$  we have  $m_1 = m_2 a = f m_2$  and  $m_1 = f m_1$ . Hence  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ . Set  $g = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & \bar{0} \\ 0 & \bar{3} \end{bmatrix} \in R$ . Since there is no solution for the equation  $\bar{3}x = 4$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_6$ , we obtain  $g m_1 \not\leq_M g m_2$ .

We have the following result for which the Mitsch order is compatible with the scalar multiplication. Recall that a ring  $R$  is called a *right (resp., left) duo ring* if every right (resp., left) ideal of  $R$  is an ideal; equivalently  $Ra \subseteq aR$  (resp.,  $aR \subseteq Ra$ ) for every  $a \in R$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then we have the following.*

- (1)  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  if and only if  $g m_1 \leq_M g m_2$  for every invertible element  $g \in S$ .
- (2)  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  if and only if  $m_1 b \leq_M m_2 b$  for every invertible element  $b \in R$ .
- (3) If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $b \in C(R)$ , then  $m_1 b \leq_M m_2 b$ .
- (4) If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $g \in C(S)$ , then  $g m_1 \leq_M g m_2$ .
- (5) If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $R$  is a right duo ring, then  $m_1 b \leq_M m_2 b$  for all  $b \in R$ .
- (6) If  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $S$  is a left duo ring, then  $g m_1 \leq_M g m_2$  for all  $g \in S$ .

*Proof.* (1) Assume that  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ . Then there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2 a = f m_2$  and  $m_1 = f m_1$ . Let  $g \in S$  be invertible. Then  $g m_1 =$

$gm_2a = gfm_2$  and  $gm_1 = gfm_1$ . Since  $g$  is invertible,  $gm_1 = gm_2a = gfg^{-1}gm_2$ . Therefore  $gm_1 \leq_M gm_2$ . Conversely, if  $gm_1 \leq_M gm_2$  for an invertible  $g \in S$ , then  $g^{-1}gm_1 \leq_M g^{-1}gm_2$  and so  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ .

(2) It can be proved similar to the proof of (1).

(3) Assume that  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ . Then there exist  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$  such that  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$ . Since  $b \in C(R)$ ,  $m_1b = m_2ab = m_2ba = fm_2b$  and  $m_1b = fm_1b$ . Therefore  $m_1b \leq_M m_2b$ .

(4) It can be proved similar to the proof of (3).

(5) Let  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $b \in R$ . Then  $m_1 = fm_2 = m_2a$  and  $m_1 = m_1a$  for some  $f \in S$  and  $a \in R$ . It follows that  $m_1b = fm_2b = m_2ab = m_1ab$ . Since  $R$  is right duo, there exists  $c \in R$  such that  $ab = bc$ . Thus  $m_1b \leq_M m_2b$ .

(6) It can be proved similar to the proof of (5).  $\square$

In Example 4.6, we show that the Mitsch order is not compatible with the scalar multiplication. Following example shows that the Mitsch order also is not compatible with addition.

**Example 4.8.** Let  $R = M_2(\mathbb{Q})$  and  $M = R_R$ . Consider  $m_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $m_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 5 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $f = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $a = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \frac{2}{5} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in M$ . Since  $m_1 = m_2a = fm_2$  and  $m_1 = fm_1$  we have  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$  and  $0 \leq_M m_2$ . Since there is no  $b \in R$  such that  $(m_2 + m_2)b = m_1b = m_1$  we have  $m_1 \not\leq_M m_2 + m_2$ .

We give the following result in which cases the Mitsch order is compatible with the addition.

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m_1, m_2 \in M$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1)  $m_1 \leq_M m_2$ .
- (2)  $nm_1 \leq_M m_2$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- (3)  $nm_1 \leq_M nm_2$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* It is clear.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $m \in M$ .*

- (1) *If  $mR$  is a fully invariant submodule of  $M$ , then  $fm \leq_M m$  for every  $f^2 = f \in S$ .*

(2) If  $mR$  is a homomorphic image of  $M$ , then  $me \leq_M m$  for every  $e^2 = e \in R$ .

*Proof.* (1) Assume that  $f^2 = f \in S$  and  $mR$  is fully invariant in  $M$ . Then  $fm = ffm$  and since  $fm \in mR$ , there exists  $a \in R$  such that  $fm = ma$ . Therefore  $fm \leq_M m$ .

(2) Similar to the proof of (1). □

The next result is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.10.

**Corollary 4.11.** *Let  $M$  be a module.*

(1) *If  $M$  is duo, then  $fm \leq_M m$  for all  $m \in M$  and  $f^2 = f \in S$ .*

(2) *If  $M$  is 1-epi-retractable, then  $me \leq_M m$  for all  $m \in M$  and  $e^2 = e \in R$ .*

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. R. Argun, T. P. Calci, S. Halicioglu, A. Harmanci and B. Ungor, *Lattice properties of the minus order on regular modules*, Rocky Mountain J. Math., 52(1)(2022), 15–27.
- [2] H. Chen, W. K. Nicholson and Y. Zhou, *Unit-regular modules*, Glasg. Math. J., 60(1)(2018), 1-15.
- [3] D. S. Djordjević, D. S. Rakić and J. Marovt, *Minus partial order in Rickart rings*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, 87(3-4)(2015), 291-305.
- [4] G. Dolinar, B. Kuzma and J. Marovt *A note on partial orders of Hartwig, Mitsch, and Šemrl*, Appl. Math. Comput., 270 (2015), 711–713.
- [5] M. P. Drazin, *Generalizations of Fitting’s lemma in arbitrary associative rings*, Comm. Algebra, 29(8)(2001), 3647-3675.
- [6] R. E. Hartwig, *How to partially order regular elements*, Math. Japon., 25(1)(1980), 1-13.
- [7] R. E. Hartwig and G. P. H. Styan, *On some characterizations of the “star” partial ordering for matrices and rank substractivity*, Linear Algebra Appl., 82(1986), 145-161.
- [8] A. Hattori, *A foundation of torsion theory for modules over general rings*, Nagoya Math. J., 17(1960), 147-158.
- [9] P. M. Higgins, *The Mitsch order on a semigroup*, Semigroup Forum, 49(2)(1994), 261-266.
- [10] J. Marovt, *On partial orders in Rickart rings*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, 63(9)(2015), 1707-1723.
- [11] S. K. Mitra, *Matrix partial order through generalized inverses: unified theory*, Linear Algebra Appl., 148(1991), 237-263.
- [12] H. Mitsch, *A natural partial order for semigroups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 97(3)(1986), 384-388.
- [13] K. Morita, *Duality for modules and its applications to the theory of rings with minimum condition*, Sci. Rep. Tokyo Kyoiku Daigaku Sect. A, 6(1958), 83-142.
- [14] B. Ungor, S. Halicioglu, A. Harmanci and J. Marovt, *Partial orders on the power sets of Baer rings*, J. Algebra Appl., 19(2020), 2050011 (14 pp).



- [15] B. Ungor, S. Halicioglu, A. Harmanci and J. Marovt, *Minus partial order in regular modules*, Comm. Algebra, 48(10)(2020), 4542-4553.
- [16] B. Ungor, S. Halicioglu, A. Harmanci and J. Marovt, *On properties of the minus partial order in regular modules*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, 96(1-2)(2020), 149-159.
- [17] J. Zelmanowitz, *Regular modules*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 163(1972), 341-355.

TUGBA PAKEL, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ANKARA UNIVERSITY, TURKEY  
*Email address:* `tpakel@ankara.edu.tr`

TUGCE PEKACAR CALCI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ANKARA UNIVERSITY, TURKEY  
*Email address:* `tcalci@ankara.edu.tr`

SAIT HALICIOGLU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ANKARA UNIVERSITY, TURKEY  
*Email address:* `halici@ankara.edu.tr`

ABDULLAH HARMANCI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY, TURKEY  
*Email address:* `harmanci@hacettepe.edu.tr`

BURCU UNGOR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ANKARA UNIVERSITY, TURKEY  
*Email address:* `bungor@science.ankara.edu.tr`