

Restrict Nearly Prime Submodules

Khudhayer O. khadem¹, Haibat K. Mohammed ali²

¹"Department of Mathematics / College of Computer Science and Mathematics / Tikrit University / Iraq"
Corresponding E-mail Address: Khudhayer1981@gmail.com

²"Department of Mathematics / College of Computer Science and Mathematics / Tikrit University / Iraq"
Corresponding E-mail Address: H.mohmmadali@tu.edu.iq

Abstract: We note in this work Restrict Nearly prime submodules was defined as a new popularization of prime submodules. Several basic properties, characterizations and examples of Restrict Nearly Prime submodules were given. Furthermore, some of its properties were established.

Keywords: prime submodule, Restrict Nearly prime submodule.

1. INTRODUCTION

A prime submodule was first introduced by Dauns in 1978 [4]. This concept was generalized to primary submodules by Lu in 1989 [8], and to semiprime submodules by Athab in 1996 [9], and to quasi prime submodules by Abdul-Razak in 1999 [11]. Many others focused on generalizing prime submodules such as quasi primary submodules by Shahcbaddin in 2006 [10], and in 2019 Ali Sh. And Haibut introduced the concept (Approximaitly prime, Approximaitly semi-prime) submodules as generalizations of prime submodules see [13, 14]. We denoted to the submodule by submodule.

2. Basic notions

Definition 2.1 [4]

A proper submodule \mathcal{A} of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω is named a prime submodule if $r\omega \in \mathcal{A}$ for $r \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ implies that either $\omega \in \mathcal{A}$ or $r \in [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$.

Definition 2.2 [5]

The residule of a submodule \mathcal{A} of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω shortened by $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is an ideal of \mathfrak{R} defined by $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] = \{r \in \mathfrak{R} : r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A}\}$.

Definition 2.3 [6]

The socle of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω shortened by $\text{soc}(\Omega)$ is defined as the intersection of all essential submodule of Ω .

Definition 2.4 [3]

A non-zero submodule \mathcal{A} of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω is named an essential in Ω if $\mathcal{A} \cap N \neq (0)$ for each non-zero submodule \mathcal{A} of Ω .

Definition 2.5 [6]

The Jacobson of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω shortened by $J(\Omega)$ is defined as the intersection of all max submodule of Ω .

Proposition 2.6 [10, p. 16]

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and \mathcal{A} be a submodule of \mathfrak{R} , J is an ideal of \mathfrak{R} , then $[\mathcal{A} :_{\Omega} \mathfrak{R}] = \mathcal{A}$ and $[J : \mathfrak{R}] = J$.

Proposition 2.7 [1, Theo. (5.1)]

Let J be a proper ideal of a ring \mathfrak{R} . Then J is max ideal iff $J + \langle r \rangle = \mathfrak{R}$ for any $r \notin J$.

Proposition 2.8 [7, Coro. (2.14)(i)]

If Ω be a faithful multiplication \mathfrak{R} -module, then $\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R})\Omega = \text{soc}(\Omega)$.

Definition 2.9[11, Remark, P14]

If Ω be a faithful multiplication \mathfrak{R} -module, then $J(\mathfrak{R})\Omega = J(\Omega)$.

Defenition 2.10 [9]

A submodules \mathcal{A}, β of an R-module \mathcal{M} is called comaximal if $\mathcal{A} + \beta = \mathcal{M}$

3. Charctrizations of RNP submodules Multiplication Modules.

Definition 3.1

A proper submodule \mathcal{A} of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω is named a (Restrict nearly Prime) (for short RNP) submodule of Ω , if whenever $r\omega \in \mathcal{A}$, for $r \in \mathfrak{R}, \omega \in \Omega$ implies that either $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (J(\Omega) \cap \text{Soc}(\Omega))$ Or $r \in \left[\left(\mathcal{A} + (J(\Omega) \cap \text{Soc}(\Omega)) \right) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega \right]$.

And an ideal J of a ring \mathfrak{R} is named an RNP ideal of \mathfrak{R} if J is RNP \mathfrak{R} -submodule of an \mathfrak{R} -module \mathfrak{R} .

Example and Remarks 3.2

1. Consider the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Z}_{60} , we see that the only essential submodules of \mathbb{Z}_{60} are \mathbb{Z}_{60} itself and the submodules $\langle \bar{2} \rangle$, so $\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) = \mathbb{Z}_{60} \cap \langle \bar{2} \rangle = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$. And the only maximal submodules of \mathbb{Z}_{60} are $\langle \bar{2} \rangle, \langle \bar{3} \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{5} \rangle$, so $J(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) = \langle \bar{2} \rangle \cap \langle \bar{3} \rangle \cap \langle \bar{5} \rangle = \langle \bar{30} \rangle$. Hence $\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) = \langle \bar{2} \rangle \cap \langle \bar{30} \rangle = \langle \bar{30} \rangle$.

2. The submodules $\langle \bar{2} \rangle, \langle \bar{3} \rangle, \langle \bar{4} \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{5} \rangle$ of the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Z}_{60} are RNP submodules of \mathbb{Z}_{60} . Since $r\bar{w} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle$, for $\bar{w} \in \mathbb{Z}_{60}, r \in \mathbb{Z}$, implies that either $\bar{w} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) = \langle \bar{4} \rangle + \langle \bar{30} \rangle = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$ or $r \in [\langle \bar{4} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) : \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = [\langle \bar{2} \rangle : \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = 2\mathbb{Z}$, for example 2. $\bar{2} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle$, for $\bar{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{60}, 2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, implies that $\bar{2} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$ or $2 \in [\langle \bar{4} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) : (\mathbb{Z}_{60})] = [\langle \bar{2} \rangle : (\mathbb{Z}_{60})] = 2\mathbb{Z}$. Similarly for the other elements of $\langle \bar{4} \rangle$.

3. The submodules $\langle \bar{6} \rangle, \langle \bar{10} \rangle, \langle \bar{12} \rangle, \langle \bar{15} \rangle, \langle \bar{20} \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{30} \rangle$ of the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Z}_{60} are not RNP submodules of \mathbb{Z}_{60} . Since $r\bar{w} \in \langle \bar{6} \rangle$, for $\bar{w} \in \mathbb{Z}_{60}, r \in \mathbb{Z}$, implies that either $\bar{w} \in \langle \bar{6} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) = \langle \bar{6} \rangle + \langle \bar{30} \rangle = \langle \bar{6} \rangle$ or $r \in [\langle \bar{6} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) : \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = [\langle \bar{6} \rangle : \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = 6\mathbb{Z}$, for example 3. $\bar{2} \in \langle \bar{6} \rangle$, for $\bar{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{60}, 3 \in \mathbb{Z}$, but $\bar{2} \notin \langle \bar{6} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) = \langle \bar{6} \rangle$ and $3 \notin [\langle \bar{6} \rangle + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) : (\mathbb{Z}_{60})] = [\langle \bar{6} \rangle : (\mathbb{Z}_{60})] = 6\mathbb{Z}$. Similarly for the other elements of $\langle \bar{6} \rangle$.

4. The submodule $4\mathbb{Z}$ of \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Z} is not RNP submodule of \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Z} since $2 \cdot 2 \in 4\mathbb{Z}$, for $2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, but $2 \notin 4\mathbb{Z} + (\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap J(\mathbb{Z})) = 4\mathbb{Z} + (0) = 4\mathbb{Z}$.

5. The residue of RNP submodule \mathcal{A} of an \mathbb{R} -module Ω need not to be an RNP ideal of \mathbb{R} . For example consider the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Z}_{60} , and the submodule $\mathcal{A} = \langle \bar{4} \rangle$ is RNP submodule by (2) but $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = [\langle \bar{4} \rangle :_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = 4\mathbb{Z}$ is not RNP ideal of \mathbb{Z} by (4).

6. The intersection of two nonzero RNP submodules is not necessarily RNP submodules For example let $\mathfrak{R} = \mathbb{Z}, \Omega = \mathbb{Z}_{60}, \mathcal{A}_1 = \langle \bar{2} \rangle, \mathcal{A}_2 = \langle \bar{3} \rangle$ we have $\langle \bar{2} \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{3} \rangle$ are RNP submodules of \mathbb{Z}_{60} , but $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2 = \langle \bar{2} \rangle \cap \langle \bar{3} \rangle = \langle \bar{6} \rangle$ This submodule is not RNP submodule since $3 \cdot \bar{2} \in \langle \bar{6} \rangle$ for $3 \in \mathbb{Z}, \bar{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{60}$, but $\bar{2} \notin \langle \bar{6} \rangle + (J(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap \text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) = \langle \bar{6} \rangle + \langle \bar{30} \rangle = \langle \bar{6} \rangle$ and $3 \notin [\langle \bar{6} \rangle + (J(\mathbb{Z}_{60}) \cap \text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{60})) : \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = [\langle \bar{6} \rangle + \langle \bar{30} \rangle : \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = [\langle \bar{6} \rangle : \mathbb{Z}_{60}] = 6\mathbb{Z}$.

7. If $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ are submodules of Ω such that $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2$. If \mathcal{A}_2 is an RNP submodule of Ω , but \mathcal{A}_1 need not to be RNP submodule of Ω . As in the following:

The submodules $\mathcal{A}_1 = \langle \bar{6} \rangle, \mathcal{A}_2 = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$ of the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Z}_{60} , for $\langle \bar{6} \rangle \subseteq \langle \bar{2} \rangle$, we show that $\langle \bar{2} \rangle$ is an RNP submodule of \mathbb{Z}_{60} by (2). But $\langle \bar{6} \rangle$ is not RNP submodule of \mathbb{Z}_{60} by (3).

8. Every prime submodule \mathcal{A} of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω is RNP submodule but not conversely.

Proof

Assume that \mathcal{A} be a prime submodule of Ω , and $r\omega \in \mathcal{A}$, for $r \in \mathfrak{R}, \omega \in \Omega$. Since \mathcal{A} is a prime submodule, then either $\omega \in \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (J(\Omega) \cap \text{Soc}(\Omega))$ implies that $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (J(\Omega) \cap \text{Soc}(\Omega))$ or $r \in [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$, that is $r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (J(\Omega) \cap \text{Soc}(\Omega))$ implies that $r \in \left[\left(\mathcal{A} + (J(\Omega) \cap \text{Soc}(\Omega)) \right) : \Omega \right]$. Hence \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω . ■

For the converse consider the following example the submodule of the Z -module $Z_{60} \langle \bar{4} \rangle$ is not prime since $2 \cdot \bar{2} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle$ for $2 \in Z, \bar{2} \in Z_{60}$, but $\bar{2} \notin \langle \bar{4} \rangle$ and $2 \notin [\langle \bar{4} \rangle :_Z Z_{60}] = 4Z$. On the other hand $\langle \bar{4} \rangle$ is RNP submodule since $\text{Soc}(Z_{60}) \cap J(Z_{60}) = \langle \bar{2} \rangle \cap \langle \bar{30} \rangle = \langle \bar{30} \rangle$, and $\mathcal{A} + (\text{Soc}(Z_{60}) \cap J(Z_{60})) = \langle \bar{4} \rangle + \langle \bar{30} \rangle = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$ it follows that for $r \bar{w} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle$ for $r \in Z, \bar{w} \in Z_{60}$ implies that $\bar{w} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle + (J(Z_{60}) \cap \text{Soc}(Z_{60})) = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$ and, $r \in [(\langle \bar{4} \rangle + (J(Z_{60}) \cap \text{Soc}(Z_{60}))) : Z_{60}] = 2Z$. For example whenever $2 \cdot \bar{2} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle$ for $2 \in Z, \bar{2} \in Z_{60}$, implies that $\bar{2} \in \langle \bar{4} \rangle + \langle \bar{30} \rangle = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$, or $2 \in [(\langle \bar{4} \rangle + \langle \bar{30} \rangle) :_Z Z_{60}] = [\langle \bar{2} \rangle : Z_{60}] = 2Z$. Similarly for other elements in $\langle \bar{4} \rangle$.

The following properties are characterizations of RNP submodules.

Proposition 3.3

Suppose that Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and \mathcal{A} be a submodule of Ω . Then \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω if and only if for every submodule y of Ω and every ideal I of \mathfrak{R} with $Iy \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, implies that either $y \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $I \subseteq [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$.

Proof

(\Rightarrow) Assume that $Iy \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, for y is a submodule of Ω and I is an ideal of \mathfrak{R} , with $y \not\subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$, then there exists $x \in y$ such that $x \notin (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. Since $Iy \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ then for any $a \in I, ax \in \mathcal{A}$. But \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω and $x \notin \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ then $a \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ that is $I \subseteq [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $a \omega \in \mathcal{A}$, for $a \in \mathfrak{R}, \omega \in \Omega$, then $(a)(\omega) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, by hypothesis either $(\omega) \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $(a) \subseteq [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$. That is either $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $a \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$. Hence \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω . ■

The following corollaries are a direct consequence of above proposition.

Corollary 3.4

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module and \mathcal{A} be a submodule of Ω . Then \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω if and only if for every submodule y of Ω and every $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ with $ry \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, implies that either $y \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $r \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$.

Corollary 3.5

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and \mathcal{A} be a proper submodule of M . Then \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω if and only if whenever $J \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ for J is an ideal of $\mathfrak{R}, \omega \in \Omega$, implies that either $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $J \subseteq [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$.

The following proposition indicates that the residue of an RNP submodule is an RNP ideal of \mathfrak{R} under certain condition.

Proposition 3.6

Let \mathcal{A} be an RNP submodule of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω , with $\text{soc}(\Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and $J(\Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Then $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is an RNP ideal of \mathfrak{R} .

Proof

Assume that \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω and $rJ \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ for $r \in \mathfrak{R}, J$ is an ideal of \mathfrak{R} implies that $rJ\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, where $J\Omega$ is a submodule of Ω . Since \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω then by corollary (3.4) either $J\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. But $(\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ implies that $\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) = \mathcal{A}$, it follows that either $J\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ or $r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. That is either $J \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))$ or $r \in [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R})) = [[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R})) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathfrak{R}]$ by proposition(2.7), hence by corollary (3.5) $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is an RNP ideal of \mathfrak{R} . ■

Proposition 3.7

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and \mathcal{A}, y are submodules of Ω , with \mathcal{A} is a proper submodule of y , and \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω and $(\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) \subseteq (\text{soc}(y) \cap J(y))$, then \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of y .

Proof

Suppose that $r \omega \in \mathcal{A}$, for $r \in \mathfrak{R}, \omega \in y$. Since y is a submodule of Ω implies that $\omega \in \Omega$. Now, for \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω , then either $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. But $(\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) \subseteq (\text{soc}(y) \cap J(y))$, it follows that either $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(y) \cap J(y))$ or $r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(y) \cap J(y))$. That is \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of y . ■

Proposition 3.8

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and \mathcal{A} be a submodule of Ω with $[\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is a max ideal of \mathfrak{R} . Then \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω .

Proof

Suppose that $r\omega \in \mathcal{A}$, for $r \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, with $r \notin [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$. Since $[\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is a maximal ideal of \mathfrak{R} , then by proposition (2.6) $\mathfrak{R} = \langle r \rangle + [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$, where $\langle r \rangle$ is an ideal of \mathfrak{R} generated by r , it follows that $\exists a \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $b \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ such that $1 = ar + b$, hence $\omega = ar\omega + b\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. Hence \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω . ■

Proposition 3.9

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and J be a maximal ideal of \mathfrak{R} , with $J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ is a proper submodule of Ω . Then $J\Omega$ is an RNP submodule of Ω .

Proof

Since $J\Omega \subseteq J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$, implies that $J \subseteq [J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$, that is there exists $a \in [J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ and $a \notin J$, but J is a maximal ideal then by proposition (2.7) $J + \langle a \rangle = \mathfrak{R}$, where $\langle a \rangle$ is an ideal of \mathfrak{R} generated by a , thus $\exists r \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $j \in J$ such that $1 = j + ar$, it follows that $\omega = j\omega + ar\omega$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$. Hence $\omega \in J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, that is $\Omega \subseteq J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$, hence $\Omega = J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ which is a contradiction. Then $a \in J$ and hence $[J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] \subseteq J$, it follows that $[J\Omega + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] = J$ is a maximal ideal of \mathfrak{R} , hence by proposition (3.8) $J\Omega$ is an RNP submodule of Ω . ■

Proposition 3.10

Let Ω be a faithful multiplication \mathfrak{R} -module and \mathcal{A} a proper submodule of Ω . Then \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω if and only if $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is an RNP ideal of \mathfrak{R} .

Proof

(\Rightarrow) Let $r\omega \in [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ for $r, \omega \in \mathfrak{R}$, implies that $r(\omega\Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. But \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω , then by corollary (3.5) either $\omega\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. Since Ω is multiplication, then $\mathcal{A} = [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]\Omega$, and since Ω is faithful multiplication, then by proposition (2.8) and (2.9) $(\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))\Omega = (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R})\Omega \cap J(\mathfrak{R})\Omega) = (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. Thus either $\omega\Omega \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]\Omega + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))\Omega$ or $r\Omega \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]\Omega + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))\Omega$, it follows that either $\omega \in [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))$ or $r \in [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R})) = [[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R})) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathfrak{R}]$. Hence $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is RNP ideal of \mathfrak{R} .

(\Leftarrow) Let $rK \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ for $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ and K is a submodule of Ω . Since Ω is a multiplication, then $K = J\Omega$ for some ideal J of \mathfrak{R} , that is $rJ\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, implies that $rJ \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$, but $[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is an RN-prime ideal of \mathfrak{R} , then by corollary (3.5) either $J \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))$ or $r \in [[\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R})) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \mathfrak{R}] = [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))$. Hence either $J\Omega \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]\Omega + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))\Omega$ or $r\Omega \subseteq [\mathcal{A} :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]\Omega + (\text{soc}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap J(\mathfrak{R}))\Omega$. Hence by proposition (2.8) and (2.9) either $J\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $r\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. That is either $K \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $r \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$. Thus by corollary (3.4) \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω . ■

Proposition 3.11

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and \mathcal{A} be a proper submodule of Ω , with $[L :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] \not\subseteq [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$, and $\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ is a proper submodule of L for each submodule L of Ω such that $[\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) :_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is a prime ideal of \mathfrak{R} . Then \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω .

Proof

Suppose that $r\omega \in \mathcal{A}$, for $r \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, with $\omega \notin \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. Then $\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) \subsetneq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) + \langle \omega \rangle = L$ and so $[L:_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega] \not\subseteq [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)):_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$, then there exists $a \in [L:_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ and $a \notin [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)):_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$. That is $a\Omega \subseteq L$ and $a\Omega \not\subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. Thus $a\Omega \subseteq L$, implies that $ra\Omega \subseteq r(\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) + \langle \omega \rangle) \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. It follows that $ra \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)):_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$. But $[\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)):_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ is a prime ideal of \mathfrak{R} , and $a \notin [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)):_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$ then $r \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)):_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$. Hence \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule of Ω . ■

Proposition 3.12

Let Ω be an \mathfrak{R} -module, and \mathcal{A}, β are submodules of Ω , with \mathcal{A}, β are comaximal and $\beta \subseteq (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$, if $\mathcal{A} + \beta$ is a RNP submodule of Ω then \mathcal{A} is a RNP submodule of $\mathcal{A} + \beta$.

Proof

Suppose that $S\omega \in \mathcal{A} + \beta$, for $S \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$. Now, $\mathcal{A} + \beta$ is a RNP submodule of Ω , then either $\omega \in (\mathcal{A} + \beta) + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) = \mathcal{A} + (\beta + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)))$ or $S\omega \in (\mathcal{A} + \beta) + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)) = \mathcal{A} + (\beta + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)))$. But we have $\beta \subseteq (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$, it follows that either $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $S\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$. Then by (2.10) $\mathcal{A} + \beta = \Omega$, implies that $\omega \in \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\mathcal{A} + \beta) \cap J(\mathcal{A} + \beta))$ or $S(\mathcal{A} + \beta) \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\mathcal{A} + \beta) \cap J(\mathcal{A} + \beta))$ therefore $S \in [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\mathcal{A} + \beta) \cap J(\mathcal{A} + \beta)):_{\mathfrak{R}} (\mathcal{A} + \beta)]$. That is \mathcal{A} is a RNP submodule of $(\mathcal{A} + \beta)$. ■

4. Conclusion

In this paper an RNP submodules are introduced and studied as a new generalization of prime submodules. The main results of this study are the following.

- 1) A proper submodule Ω of an \mathfrak{R} -module \mathcal{A} is an RNP submodule if and only if for every submodule y of Ω and every ideal I of \mathfrak{R} with $Iy \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, implies that either $y \subseteq \mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega))$ or $I \subseteq [\mathcal{A} + (\text{soc}(\Omega) \cap J(\Omega)):_{\mathfrak{R}} \Omega]$.
- 2) Every prime submodule of an \mathfrak{R} -module Ω is RNP submodule but not conversely see proposition (Example 8).
- 3) We introduced and studied and state several basic properties of this notion for example see(3.2).

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Burton, D. M., (1970), "First Course in Rings and Ideal", University of New Hampshire, p.380.
- [2] Sharpe, D. W. and Vomos, P., (1972), "Injective Module", Cambridge University, Inc. press. p.175
- [3] Goodearl, K. R., (1976), "Ring Theory", Markel Dekker, Inc. New York and Basel, p.206., Vol. (2), pp. (156-181).
- [4] Dauns, J., (1978), "Prime Modules", Journal Reine Angew. Math., Vol. (2), pp. (156-181).
- [5] Lu, C. P., (1981), "Prime submodule of Module", Comm.Math. Japan, University Spatula, Vol. (33), pp. (61-69).
- [6] Kasch F., (1982). "Module and Rings," London Mathematical Society Monographs, Vol.17, New York; Academic Press.
- [7] El-Best, Z. A. and Smith, P. F., (1988). "Multiplication Modules", Comm. In Algebra, Vol.(16), No. (4), pp. (755-779).
- [8] Lu, C., (1989), "M-radical of Submodules in Modules", Math. Japan, Vol. (34), pp. (211-219).
- [9] Ahmad, A. A., (1993), "On Submodules of Multiplication Modules", M. Sc. Thesis, University of Baghdad.
- [10] Athab, E. A., (1996), "Prime and Semi-Prime", M.Sc. Thesis, University of Baghdad.
- [11] Nuha, H. H., (1996), "The Radical of Modules", M.Sc. Thesis, University of Baghdad.
- [12] Abdul-Razak, M. H., (1999), "Quasi-Prime Modules and Quasi-Prime Submodules", M.Sc. Thesis, University of Baghdad.
- [13] Shahadaddin E. and Ahmad Y., (2006), "On Quasi primary Submodules", Chiang Mai Journal of Sci., Vol. (33), No. (2), pp. (249-254).
- [14] Ali Sh. and Haibat K., (2019), "Approximately Prime Submodules and Some Related Concepts", Ibn Al-Haitham Journal for Pure and Applied Sci. Vol.(32), No. (2), pp. (103-113).
- [15] Ali Sh. and Haibat K., (2019), "Approximately Semi-prime Submodules and Some Related Concepts", Ibn Al-Haitham Journal for Pure and Applied Sci. Vol. (32), No. (3), pp. (117-128).



Khudhayer Obeas khadem,

Department of Mathematics / College of Computer Science and Mathematics /
Tikrit University / Iraq.



Haibat Karem Mohammed ali,

Department of Mathematics / College of Computer Science and Mathematics /
Tikrit University / Iraq.