

GENERALIZED RIGID MODULES AND THEIR POLYNOMIAL EXTENSIONS

MOHAMED LOUZARI AND ARMANDO REYES

ABSTRACT. Let R be a ring with unity, σ an endomorphism of R and M_R a right R -module. In this paper, we continue studying σ -rigid modules that were introduced by Gunner et al. [13]. We give some results on σ -rigid modules and related concepts. Also, we study the transfer of σ -rigidness from a module M_R to its extensions, as triangular matrix modules and polynomial modules.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, R denotes an associative ring with unity and modules are unitary. We write M_R to mean that M is a right module. Let \mathbb{N} be the set of all natural integers. Throughout, σ is an endomorphism of R with $\sigma(1) = 1$. The set of all endomorphisms (respectively, automorphisms) of R is denoted by $End(R)$ (respectively, $Aut(R)$). For a subset X of a module M_R , $r_R(X) = \{a \in R \mid Xa = 0\}$ and $\ell_R(X) = \{a \in R \mid aX = 0\}$ will stand for the right and the left annihilator of X in R respectively. A ring R is called *semicommutative* if for every $a \in R$, $r_R(a)$ is an ideal of R (equivalently, for any $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0$ implies $aRb = 0$). In [7], a module M_R is semicommutative, if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ implies $mRa = 0$. A module M_R is called σ -semicommutative [8] if, for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ implies $mR\sigma(a) = 0$.

Following Annin [4], a module M_R is σ -compatible, if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ if and only if $m\sigma(a) = 0$. An σ -compatible module M is called σ -reduced if for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma = 0$ implies $mR \cap Ma = 0$. The module M_R is called reduced if it is id_R -reduced, where id_R is the identity endomorphism of R (equivalently, for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, $ma^2 = 0$ implies $mRa = 0$) [15].

According to Krempa [14], an endomorphism σ of a ring R is called *rigid*, if $a\sigma(a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$ for any $a \in R$, and R is called a σ -rigid ring if the endomorphism σ is rigid. Motivated by the properties of σ -rigid rings that have been studied in [10, 11, 12, 14], Guner et al. [13], introduced σ -rigid modules as a generalization of σ -rigid rings. A module M_R is called σ -rigid, if $ma\sigma(a) = 0$ implies $ma = 0$ for any $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. Clearly, σ -reduced modules are σ -rigid, but the converse need not be true [13, Example 2.18]. Recall that, a module M_R is σ -reduced if and only if it is σ -semicommutative and σ -rigid [13, Theorem 2.16]. Thus, the concept of σ -reduced modules is connected to the σ -semicommutative and σ -rigid modules. A module M_R is called *rigid*, if it is id_R -rigid.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16U80, 16S36

Key words and phrases. Generalized rigid modules, Rigid modules, Reduced modules, Semicommutative modules

In [15], Lee-Zhou introduced the following notations.

$$M[x; \sigma] := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^s m_i x^i : s \geq 0, m_i \in M \right\},$$

$$M[x, x^{-1}; \sigma] := \left\{ \sum_{i=-s}^t m_i x^i : t \geq 0, s \geq 0, m_i \in M \right\}.$$

Each of these is an abelian group under an obvious addition operation, and thus $M[x; \sigma]$ becomes a module over $R[x; \sigma]$ under the following scalar product operation. For $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n m_i x^i \in M[x; \sigma]$ and $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m a_j x^j \in R[x; \sigma]$,

$$(*) \quad m(x)f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n+m} \left(\sum_{k=i+j} m_i \sigma^i(a_j) \right) x^k$$

The module $M[x; \sigma]$ is called the *skew polynomial extension* of M . If $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(R)$, then with a scalar product similar to (*), $M[x, x^{-1}; \sigma]$ becomes a module over $R[x, x^{-1}; \sigma]$, this is called the *skew Laurent polynomial extension* of M . In particular, if $\sigma = \text{id}_R$ then we get the classical extensions $M[x]$ and $M[x, x^{-1}]$.

According to Zhang and Chen [8], a module M_R is called σ -skew Armendariz, if $m(x)f(x) = 0$ where $m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n m_i x^i \in M[x; \sigma]$ and $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m a_j x^j \in R[x; \sigma]$ implies $m_i \sigma^i(a_j) = 0$ for all i and j . Also, M_R is an Armendariz module if and only if it is id_R -skew Armendariz. A ring R is skew-Armendariz if and only if R_R is a skew-Armendariz module.

In this work, we study some connections between rigid, σ -rigid, semicommutative, σ -semicommutative, abelian and σ -reduced modules. Also, we show that the class of σ -rigid modules is not closed under homomorphic images and some module extensions. Moreover, we examine the transfer of σ -reducibly, σ -semicommutative and σ -rigidness from a module M_R to its extensions of the form $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ where $n \geq 2$ is an integer, and vice versa. Indeed, if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -reduced (respectively, $\bar{\sigma}$ -rigid, $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative) as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module, then M_R is σ -reduced (respectively, σ -rigid, σ -semicommutative). However, the converse is not true. Furthermore, for a module M_R , we study the behavior of σ -rigidness regarding to its skew polynomial extensions.

1. GENERALIZED RIGID MODULES AND RELATED MODULES

In this section, we give some connections between rigid, σ -rigid, semicommutative, σ -semicommutative and abelian modules. We begin with the next definition.

Definition 1.1. Let M_R be a module, $m \in M$ and $a \in R$. We say that M_R satisfies the condition:

- (1) (C_1) , if $ma = 0$ implies $m\sigma(a) = 0$.
- (2) (C_2) , if $m\sigma(a) = 0$ implies $ma = 0$.

Lemma 1.2. (1) *Every rigid (respectively, σ -semicommutative) module satisfying (C_2) is σ -rigid (respectively, semicommutative).*

(2) *Every σ -rigid (respectively, semicommutative) module satisfying (C_1) is rigid (respectively, σ -semicommutative).*

(3) *For σ -compatible modules, the notions of rigidity (respectively, semicommutativity) and σ -rigidity (respectively, σ -semicommutativity) coincide.*

Proof. The verification is straightforward. \square

A module M is called *abelian* [1], if for any $m \in M$ and any $e^2 = e, r \in R$, we have $mer = mre$.

Lemma 1.3. *Let M_R be a module and σ an endomorphism of R . Then*

- (1) *If M_R is rigid, then it is abelian,*
- (2) *If M_R is σ -rigid which satisfies the condition (C_1) , then it is abelian,*
- (3) *If M_R is σ -semicommutative, then it is abelian.*

Proof. (1) Let $e^2 = e, r \in R$ and $m \in M$, we have $[er(1-e)]^2 = 0$ then $m[er(1-e)]^2 = 0$, since M_R is rigid then $m[er(1-e)] = 0$ which gives $mer = mere$. On the other side, we have $[(1-e)re]^2 = 0$, with the same manner as above, it gives $mre = mere$. Thus $mer = mre$ for all $r \in R$.

(2) If M_R is σ -rigid with the condition (C_1) , then it is rigid by Lemma 1.2(2).

(3) Suppose that M_R is σ -semicommutative, then M_R satisfies the condition (C_1) . Let $m \in M$ and $e^2 = e \in R$, we have $me(1-e) = 0$ then $meR\sigma((1-e)) = 0$, so $mer(1-e) = 0$ for all $r \in R$, by [15, Lemma 2.9]. Also, we have $m(1-e)e = 0$ which gives $m(1-e)re = 0$ for all $r \in R$. Therefore $mer = mre$ for all $r \in R$. \square

The class of σ -rigid modules need not to be closed under homomorphic images.

Example 1.4. Consider $R = \mathbb{Z}$, the ring of all integer numbers. Take $M = \mathbb{Z}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $N = 12\mathbb{Z}$ a submodule of M . It is clear that M is rigid, however M/N is not rigid. Consider $m = 3 + N \in M/N$ and $a = 2 \in R$. We have $ma^2 = 0$ and $ma \neq 0$.

Recall that a module M_R is said to be *torsion-free* if for every non zero-divisor $a \in R$ and $0 \neq m \in M$, we have $ma \neq 0$. A submodule N of a module M is called a *prime submodule* of M if whenever $ma \in N$ for $m \in M$ and $a \in R$, then $m \in N$ or $Ma \subseteq N$.

Proposition 1.5. *Let M_R be a module over a ring R that has no zero divisors, and N be a prime submodule of M such that M/N is torsion-free. Then M is σ -rigid if and only if N and M/N are σ -rigid.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow). Clearly, N is σ -rigid. Now, let $\bar{m} \in M/N$ such that $\bar{m}\sigma(a) = 0$, hence $ma\sigma(a) \in N$. Since N is prime then $m \in N$ or $Ma\sigma(a) \subseteq N$. If $m \in N$ then $ma \in N$, so $\bar{m}a = 0$. Now, if $Ma\sigma(a) \subseteq N$, then $(M/N)a\sigma(a) = 0$ in M/N . Since M/N is torsion-free and R without zero-divisors, we get $a\sigma(a) = 0$. Then $ma\sigma(a) = 0$, which implies $ma = 0$ because M is σ -rigid. Thus $\bar{m}a = 0$. Hence M/N is σ -rigid.

(\Leftarrow). Let $m \in M$ and $a \in R$ such that $ma\sigma(a) = 0$. If $m \in N$, we have $ma = 0$ because N is σ -rigid. Now, suppose that $m \notin N$. Since N is prime, then from $ma\sigma(a) \in N$, we get $Ma\sigma(a) \subseteq N$. Hence $(M/N)a\sigma(a) = 0$ in M/N . But M/N is σ -rigid, then $(M/N)a = 0$ which implies $a = 0$, since M/N is torsion-free and R has no zero divisors. Therefore $ma = 0$. \square

The next example shows that the condition “ R has no zero divisors” is not superfluous in Proposition 1.5.

Example 1.6. Let F be a field, $R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$ and σ an endomorphism of R such that $\sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$. Consider the right R -module $M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & F \\ F & F \end{pmatrix}$ and the submodule $K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & F \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$.

(1) By [13, Example 2.6], K and M/K are σ -rigid but M is not σ -rigid.

(2) K is a prime submodule of M . Let $m = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ \alpha & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \in M$ and $a = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \in R$.

We have $ma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta z \\ \alpha x & \alpha y + \gamma z \end{pmatrix}$. Then $ma \in K \Leftrightarrow \alpha = 0$ or $x = 0$. If $\alpha = 0$, we have $m \in K$. Now, suppose that $\alpha \neq 0$, so $x = 0$. We can easily see that $Ma \subseteq K$. Thus K is prime.

(3) The ring R has zero divisors. For $a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in R$, we can take any element of R of the form $b = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \alpha \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with $\alpha \neq 0$. We have $ab = ba = 0$. Hence, a is a divisor of zero.

2. TRIANGULAR MATRIX MODULES AND POLYNOMIAL MODULES

In this section, we observe the σ -rigidness of some module extensions, as triangular matrix modules, ordinary polynomial modules and skew polynomial modules. The class of σ -rigid modules need not be closed under module extensions by Examples 2.6 and 2.7.

For a nonnegative integer $n \geq 2$. Consider

$$V_n(M) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & \dots & m_{n-1} \\ 0 & m_0 & m_1 & m_2 & \dots & m_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & m_0 & m_1 & \dots & m_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & m_0 \end{pmatrix} \mid m_0, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{n-1} \in M \right\}$$

and

$$V_n(R) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \dots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a_0 & a_1 & \dots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & a_0 \end{pmatrix} \mid a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1} \in R \right\}$$

We denote elements of $V_n(R)$ by $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$, and elements of $V_n(M)$ by $(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{n-1})$. Clearly, $V_n(M)$ is a right $V_n(R)$ -module under the usual matrix addition operation and the following scalar product operation.

For $U = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}) \in V_n(M)$ and $A = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in V_n(R)$, $UA = (m_0a_0, m_0a_1 + m_1a_0, \dots, m_0a_{n-1} + m_1a_{n-2} + \dots + m_{n-1}a_0) \in V_n(M)$. Furthermore, $V_n(M) \cong M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ where $M[x](x^n)$ is a submodule of $M[x]$ generated by x^n and $V_n(R) \cong R[x]/(x^n)$ where (x^n) is an ideal of $R[x]$ generated by x^n . The endomorphism σ of R can be extended to $V_n(R)$ and $R[x]$, and we will denote it in both cases by $\bar{\sigma}$. From now on, we will freely use the isomorphisms

$$V_n(M) \cong M[x]/M[x](x^n) \text{ and } V_n(R) \cong R[x]/(x^n).$$

Proposition 2.1. *Let M_R be a module and an integer $n \geq 2$. Then*

(1) *If $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative (as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module), then M_R is*

σ -semicommutative,

(2) If $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -rigid (as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module), then M_R is σ -rigid.

Proof. Let $U = (m, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \in V_n(M)$ and $A = (a, 0, 0, \dots, 0) \in V_n(R)$ with $m \in M_R$ and $a \in R$.

(1) Suppose that $ma = 0$. Then $MA = (ma, 0, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$, since $V_n(M)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative, we have $UB\bar{\sigma}(A) = 0$ for any $B = (r, 0, \dots, 0) \in V_n(R)$ with r be an arbitrary element of R . But $UB\bar{\sigma}(A) = (mr\sigma(a), 0, \dots, 0) = 0$, hence $mr\sigma(a) = 0$ for any $r \in R$. Therefore M_R is σ -semicommutative.

(2) Suppose that $ma\sigma(a) = 0$. Then $UA\bar{\sigma}(A) = (ma\sigma(a), 0, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$. Since $V_n(M)_{V_n(R)}$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -rigid, we get $UA = 0 = (ma, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$, so $ma = 0$. Therefore M_R is σ -rigid. \square

Corollary 2.2. Let M_R be a module and $n \geq 2$ an integer. If $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -reduced (as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module), then M_R is σ -reduced.

Corollary 2.3 ([3, Proposition 2.14]). If the ring $R[x]/(x^n)$ is semicommutative for any integer $n \geq 2$. Then R is a semicommutative ring.

All reduced rings are Armendariz. There are non-reduced Armendariz rings. For a positive integer n , let $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ denotes ring of integers modulo n . For each positive integer n , the ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is Armendariz but not reduced whenever n is not square free [9, Proposition 2.1].

Corollary 2.4. If $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -reduced as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module, then M_R is σ -skew Armendariz.

Proof. If M_R is σ -reduced then it is σ -skew Armendariz (see [2, Theorem 2.20]). \square

Note that, the converse of Corollary 2.4 need not be true, since $M = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is Armendariz but not reduced (n is not square free) and so $V_n(M)$ is not reduced, by Corollary 2.2. Furthermore, the converse of Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 may not be true by the next examples. For the first one, if M_R is σ -semicommutative then the right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ need not to be $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative.

Example 2.5 ([5, Example 2.9]). Consider the ring $R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$, with an endomorphism σ defined by $\sigma \left(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}$. The module R_R is σ -semicommutative by [5, Example 2.5(1)]. Take

$$A = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad B = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in V_2(R).$$

We have $AB = 0$, but for $C = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in V_2(R)$, we get $AC\bar{\sigma}(B) =$

$\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \neq 0$. Thus, $V_2(R)$ is not $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative as a right $V_2(R)$ -module.

Now, if M_R is σ -reduced (respectively, σ -rigid) then the right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is not $\bar{\sigma}$ -reduced (respectively, $\bar{\sigma}$ -rigid).

Example 2.6. Let \mathbb{K} be a field, then \mathbb{K} is reduced as a right \mathbb{K} -module. Consider the polynomial $p = \bar{x} \in \mathbb{K}[x]/x^2\mathbb{K}[x]$. We have $p \neq \bar{0}$, because $x \notin x^2\mathbb{K}[x]$ but $p^2 = \bar{0}$. Therefore, $\mathbb{K}[x]/x^2\mathbb{K}[x] \simeq V_2(\mathbb{K})$ is not reduced as a right $V_2(\mathbb{K})$ -module

Example 2.7. Let $R = \mathbb{K}\langle x, y \rangle$ be the ring of polynomials in two non-commuting indeterminates over a field \mathbb{K} . Consider the right R -module $M = R/xR$. The module M is rigid but not semicommutative by [13, Example 2.18].

Now, for $U = \begin{pmatrix} 1+xR & xR \\ 0 & 1+xR \end{pmatrix} \in V_2(M)$ and $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in V_2(R)$. We have $UA^2 = 0$, however $UA = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1+xR \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0$. Thus $V_2(M)$ is not rigid as a right $V_2(R)$ -module.

Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer, we have:

$$\begin{array}{c} V_n(M) \text{ is } \bar{\sigma}\text{-rigid} \\ \Updownarrow \\ M_R \text{ is } \sigma\text{-rigid} \\ \Updownarrow \\ M[x] \text{ is } \bar{\sigma}\text{-rigid} \end{array}$$

Question 2.8. Under which conditions we have M_R is σ -rigid $\Rightarrow V_n(M)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -rigid?

Proposition 2.9. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and M_R a σ -rigid module. If M_R is σ -semicommutative, then $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.*

Proof. Let $U = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}) \in V_n(M)$ and $A = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}), B = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}) \in V_n(R)$ such that $UA = 0$. We will show $UB\bar{\sigma}(A) = 0$. We have $UA = (m_0a_0, m_0a_1 + m_1a_0, \dots, m_0a_{n-1} + \dots + m_{n-1}a_0)$, $UB = (m_0b_0, m_0b_1 + m_1b_0, \dots, m_0b_{n-1} + \dots + m_{n-1}b_0) = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})$ and $UB\bar{\sigma}(A) = (\beta_0\sigma(a_0), \beta_0\sigma(a_1) + \beta_1\sigma(a_0), \dots, \beta_0\sigma(a_{n-1}) + \beta_1\sigma(a_{n-2}) + \dots + \beta_{n-1}\sigma(a_0))$. From $UA = 0$, we get the following system of equations.

$$\begin{array}{ll} (0) & 0 = m_0a_0 \\ (1) & = m_0a_1 + m_1a_0 \\ & \vdots \\ (n-1) & = m_0a_{n-1} + m_1a_{n-2} + \dots + m_{n-1}a_0 \end{array}$$

Equation (0) implies $m_0a_0 = 0$, then $m_0R\sigma(a_0) = 0$. Multiplying Equation (1) on the right side by $\sigma(a_0)$, we get $m_0a_1\sigma(a_0) + m_1a_0\sigma(a_0) = 0$ (1'). Since $m_0a_1\sigma(a_0) = 0$ because $m_0R\sigma(a_0) = 0$, we have $m_1a_0\sigma(a_0) = 0$. But M_R is σ -rigid then $m_1a_0 = 0$. From Equation (1) we have also $m_0a_1 = 0$. For both cases, we have $m_1R\sigma(a_0) = m_0R\sigma(a_1) = 0$. Summarizing at this point: $m_0a_0 = m_0a_1 = m_1a_0 = 0$ and $m_0R\sigma(a_0) = m_0R\sigma(a_1) = m_1R\sigma(a_0) = 0$. Suppose that the result is true until i , multiplying Equation (i+1) on the right side by $\sigma(a_0)$, we get

$$(i+1)' \quad 0 = m_0a_{i+1}\sigma(a_0) + m_1a_i\sigma(a_0) + \dots + m_i a_1\sigma(a_0) + m_{i+1}a_0\sigma(a_0)$$

By the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$m_0 a_{i+1} \sigma(a_0) = m_1 a_i \sigma(a_0) = \cdots = m_i a_1 \sigma(a_0) = 0.$$

Then $m_{i+1} a_0 \sigma(a_0) = 0$, which gives $m_{i+1} a_0 = 0$ and so $m_{i+1} R \sigma(a_0) = 0$. Continuing with the same manner by multiplying Equation $(i+1)'$ on the right side, respectively by $\sigma(a_1), \sigma(a_2), \dots, \sigma(a_i)$ we get $m_k a_{i+1-k} = 0$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, i+1$. Hence, we get the result for $i+1$. That is $m_i a_j = 0$, and so $m_i R \sigma(a_j) = 0$ for all integers i and j with $i+j \leq n-1$. Therefore, all components of $UB\bar{\sigma}(A)$ are zero. Thus $V_n(M)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative. \square

Corollary 2.10. (1) If M_R is σ -reduced then $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.

(2) If M_R is reduced then $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is semicommutative as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.

(2) If R is reduced then $R[x]/(x^n)$ is semicommutative.

Corollary 2.11 ([8, Theorem 3.9]). (1) If M_R is a σ -rigid module. Then M_R is σ -semicommutative if and only if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.

(2) If M_R is a rigid module. Then M_R is semicommutative if and only if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is semicommutative as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.

Proof. It follows from Propositions 2.1(1) and 2.9. \square

Corollary 2.12. Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer. If $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is Armendariz as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module, then $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is semicommutative as a right $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.

Proof. It follows from [15, Theorem 1.9] and Corollary 2.10(2). \square

For $U = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{n-1}) \in V_n(M)$, $A = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in V_n(R)$.

Consider $\alpha_i \in V_n(M)$, such that $\alpha_i = m_0 a_i + m_1 a_{i-1} + \cdots + m_i a_0$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$.

We have $UA = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ and $UA\bar{\sigma}(A) = (\alpha_0 \sigma(a_0), \alpha_0 \sigma(a_1) + \alpha_1 \sigma(a_0), \dots, \alpha_0 \sigma(a_{n-1}) + \alpha_1 \sigma(a_{n-2}) + \cdots + \alpha_{n-1} \sigma(a_0))$.

Proposition 2.13. Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and M_R a σ -reduced module. If $UA\bar{\sigma}(A) = 0$ then $\alpha_i \sigma(a_j) = 0$ for all nonnegative integers i, j with $i+j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. From $UA\bar{\sigma}(A) = 0$, we get the following system of equations.

$$\begin{aligned} (0) \quad & 0 = m_0 \sigma(a_0) \\ (1) \quad & = m_0 \sigma(a_1) + m_1 \sigma(a_0) \\ & \vdots \\ (n-1) \quad & = m_0 \sigma(a_{n-1}) + m_1 \sigma(a_{n-2}) + \cdots + m_{n-1} \sigma(a_0) \end{aligned}$$

For $i+j = 0$, Equation (0) implies $\alpha_0 \sigma(a_0) = 0$. Assume that $k \geq 0$, and suppose that $\alpha_i \sigma(a_j) = 0$ for all i, j with $i+j \leq k$. Now, multiplying Equation $(k+1)$ on the right side by $\sigma^2(a_0)$ we get:

$$(k+1)' \quad \alpha_0 \sigma(a_{k+1}) \sigma^2(a_0) + \alpha_1 \sigma(a_k) \sigma^2(a_0) + \cdots + \alpha_{k+1} \sigma(a_0) \sigma^2(a_0) = 0$$

By the inductive hypothesis, we have $\alpha_i \sigma(a_0) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$, then $\alpha_i R \sigma^2(a_0) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$ because M_R is σ -semicommutative. Thus, Equation $(k+1)'$ gives

$\alpha_{k+1}\sigma(a_0)\sigma^2(a_0) = 0$ which implies $\alpha_{k+1}\sigma(a_0) = 0$, by the σ -rigidness of M_R . So, Equation $k + 1$ becomes:

$$(k + 1)'' \quad \alpha_0\sigma(a_{k+1}) + \alpha_1\sigma(a_k) + \cdots + \alpha_k\sigma(a_1) = 0$$

Multiplying Equation $(k + 1)''$ on the right side by $\sigma^2(a_1)$ and use the fact that $\alpha_i R \sigma^2(a_1) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$, we get $\alpha_k \sigma(a_1) \sigma^2(a_1) = 0$, which implies $\alpha_k \sigma(a_1) = 0$. Continuing this procedure yields $\alpha_i \sigma(a_j) = 0$ for all i, j such that $i + j = k + 1$. Therefore, $\alpha_i \sigma(a_j) = 0$ for all nonnegative integers i, j with $i + j = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$. \square

Let R be a commutative domain. The set $T(M) = \{m \in M \mid r_R(m) \neq 0\}$ is called the *torsion submodule* of M_R . If $T(M) = M$ (respectively, $T(M) = 0$) then M_R is *torsion* (respectively, *torsion-free*).

Corollary 2.14. *Let R be a commutative domain, M_R a torsion-free module. Then for any integer $n \geq 0$, we have:*

- (1) M_R is σ -reduced if and only if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -reduced as $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.
- (2) M_R is reduced if and only if $M[x]/M[x](x^n)$ is reduced as $R[x]/(x^n)$ -module.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Obvious from Corollary 2.2. (\Rightarrow) From Proposition 2.9, $V_n(M)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -semicommutative. On the other hand, if we take U and A as in Proposition 2.13 such that $UA\bar{\sigma}(A) = 0$, then we get $\alpha_i \sigma(a_j) = 0$ for all i, j , then $\alpha_i = 0$ for all i , because M_R is torsion-free and so $UA = 0$. Therefore $V_n(M)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -rigid. Hence $V_n(M)$ is $\bar{\sigma}$ -reduced. \square

A regular element of a ring R means a nonzero element which is not zero divisor. Let S be a multiplicatively closed subset of R consisting of regular central elements. We may localize R and M at S . Let σ be an endomorphism of R , consider the map $S^{-1}\sigma: S^{-1}R \rightarrow S^{-1}R$ defined by $S^{-1}\sigma(a/s) = \sigma(a)/s$ with $\sigma(s) = s$ for any $s \in S$. Then $S^{-1}\sigma$ is an endomorphism of the ring $S^{-1}R$. Clearly $S^{-1}\sigma$ extends σ , we will denote it by σ . In the next, we will discuss when the localization $S^{-1}M$ is σ -rigid as a right $S^{-1}R$ -module.

Lemma 2.15. *For a multiplicatively closed subset S of a ring R consisting of all central regular elements. A right R -module M is σ -rigid if and only if $S^{-1}M$ is σ -rigid (as a right $S^{-1}R$ -module).*

Proof. Clearly, if $S^{-1}M$ is σ -rigid then M is σ -rigid, because the class of σ -rigid modules is closed under submodules. Conversely, suppose that M_R is σ -rigid, let $(m/s) \in S^{-1}M$ and $(a/t) \in S^{-1}R$ such that $(m/s)(a/t)\sigma((a/t)) = 0$ in $S^{-1}M$. Then $ma\sigma(a) = 0$, by hypothesis $ma = 0$. Hence $(m/s)(a/t) = 0$, so that $S^{-1}M$ is σ -rigid. \square

Proposition 2.16. *Let M be a right R -module. Then $M[x]_{R[x]}$ is σ -rigid if and only if $M[x, x^{-1}]_{R[x, x^{-1}]}$ is σ -rigid.*

Proof. Consider $S = \{1, x, x^2, \dots\} \subseteq R[x]$. It is clear that S is a multiplicatively closed subset of the ring $R[x]$ consisting of all central regular elements. Also, we have $S^{-1}M[x] = M[x, x^{-1}]$ and $S^{-1}R[x] = R[x, x^{-1}]$. By Lemma 2.15, we get the result. \square

Corollary 2.17. *Let R be a ring and M a right R -module. Then*

- (1) $M[x]_{R[x]}$ is rigid if and only if $M[x, x^{-1}]_{R[x, x^{-1}]}$ is rigid,
- (2) $R[x]$ is rigid if and only if $R[x, x^{-1}]$ is rigid.

Proof. Clearly from Proposition 2.16. \square

Proposition 2.18. *If $M[x; \sigma]_{R[x; \sigma]}$ is rigid then M_R is σ -rigid.*

Proof. Assume that $M[x; \sigma]$ is rigid. Consider $m(x) = m \in M[x; \sigma]$ and $f(x) = ax \in R[x; \sigma]$ such that $ma\sigma(a) = 0$. We have $m(x)[f(x)]^2 = ma\sigma(a)x^2 = 0$, then $m(x)f(x) = 0$ because $M[x; \sigma]$ is rigid. But $m(x)f(x) = 0$ implies $ma = 0$. Which completes the proof. \square

According to Krempa [14], if a ring R is σ -rigid then $R[x; \sigma]$ is reduced, hence $R[x; \sigma]$ is rigid. Also, if a module M_R is σ -rigid and σ -semicommutative, then $M[x; \sigma]_{R[x; \sigma]}$ is reduced [15, Theorem 1.6]. However, we do not know if we can drop the σ -semicommutativity from this implication?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are deeply indebted to the referee for many helpful comments and suggestions for the improvement of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Agayev, G. Gungoroglu, A. Harmanci et al., *Abelian modules*, Acta Mathematica Universitatis Comenianae, 78(2), (2009), 235-244.
- [2] N. Agayev, A. Harmanci and S. Halicioğlu, *On reduced modules*, Commun. Fac. Sci. Univ. Ank. Series A1, 58(1), (2009), 9-16.
- [3] N. Agayev and A. Harmanci, *On Semicommutative Modules and Rings*, Kyungpook Math. J. 47(2007), 21-30.
- [4] S. Annin, *Associated primes over skew polynomials rings*, Comm. Algebra, 30 (2002), 2511-2528
- [5] M. Başer, A. Harmanci and T. K. Kwak, *Generalized semicommutative rings and their extensions*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 45 (2008), No. 2, 285-297.
- [6] A. M. Buhphang, S. Halicioğlu, A. Harmanci, K. H. Singh, H. Y. Kose, M. B. Reg, *On rigid modules*, East-West J. of Mathematics 15(1), (2013) 70-84.
- [7] A. M. Buhphang and M. B. Rege, *semicommutative modules and Armendariz modules*, Arab J. Math. Sciences, 8 (2002), 53-65.
- [8] J. L. Chen and C. P. Zhang, *σ -skew Armendariz modules and σ -semicommutative modules*, Taiwanese J. Math., 12(2) (2008), 473-486.
- [9] S. Chhawchharia and M. B. Rege, *Armendariz rings*, Proc. Japan. Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci., 73 (1997), 14-17.
- [10] Y. Hirano, *On the uniqueness of rings of coefficients in skew polynomial rings*, Publ. Math. Debrecen 54 (1999), 489-495.
- [11] C. Y. Hong, N. K. Kim and T. K. Kwak, *Ore extensions of Baer and p.p.-rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 151(3) (2000), 215-226.
- [12] C. Y. Hong, N. K. Kim and T. K. Kwak, *On Skew Armendariz Rings*, Comm. Algebra 31(1) (2003), 103-122.
- [13] E. Guner and S. Halicioğlu, *Generalized rigid modules*, Revista Colomb. Mat. 48(1), (2014), 111-123.
- [14] J. Krempa, *Some examples of reduced rings*, Algebra Colloq., 3(4) (1996), 289-300.
- [15] T. K. Lee and Y. Zhou, *Reduced Modules*, Rings, modules, algebras and abelian groups, 365-377, Lecture Notes in Pure and App. Math. 236 Dekker, New york, (2004).

MOHAMED LOUZARI, UNIVERSITY ABDELMALEK ESSAADI, FACULTY OF SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TETOUAN, MOROCCO
Email address: mlouzari@yahoo.com

ARMANDO REYES, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COLOMBIA, SEDE BOGOTÁ, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, COLOMBIA
Email address: mareyesv@unal.edu.co