

Principally Goldie*-Lifting Modules

Ayşe Tuğba Güroğlu* and Elif Tuğçe Meriç†

ABSTRACT. A module M is called principally Goldie*-lifting if for every proper cyclic submodule X of M , there is a direct summand D of M such that $X\beta^*D$. In this paper, we focus on principally Goldie*-lifting modules as generalizations of lifting modules. Various properties of these modules are given.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 16D10, 16D40, 16D70.

Keywords: Principally supplemented, Principally lifting, Goldie*-lifting, Principally Goldie*-lifting .

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper R denotes an associative ring with identity and all modules are unital right R -modules. $Rad(M)$ will denote the Jacobson radical of M . Let M be an R -module and N, K be submodules of M . A submodule K of a module M is called *small* (or superfluous) in M , denoted by $K \ll M$, if for every submodule N of M the equality $K + N = M$ implies $N = M$. K is called a *supplement* of N in M if K is a minimal with respect to $N + K = M$, equivalently K is a supplement (weak supplement) of N in M if and only if $K + N = M$ and $K \cap N \ll K$ ($K \cap N \ll M$). A module M is called *supplemented module* (*weakly supplemented module*) if every submodule of M has a supplement (weak supplement) in M . A module M is \oplus -*supplemented module* if every submodule of M has a supplement which

*Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Mathematics, Muradiye, Manisa, Turkey.
e-mail : tugba.guroglu@cbu.edu.tr

†Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Mathematics, Muradiye, Manisa, Turkey.
e-mail : tugce.meric@cbu.edu.tr

is a direct summand in M . [1] defines principally supplemented modules and investigates their properties. A module M is said to be *principally supplemented* if for all cyclic submodule X of M there exists a submodule N of M such that $M = N + X$ with $N \cap X$ is small in N . A module M is said to be \oplus -*principally supplemented* if for each cyclic submodule X of M there exists a direct summand D of M such that $M = D + X$ and $D \cap X \ll D$. A nonzero module M is said to be *hollow* if every proper submodule of M is small in M . A nonzero module M is said to be *principally hollow* which means every proper cyclic submodule of M is small in M . Clearly, hollow modules are principally hollow. Given submodules $K \subseteq N \subseteq M$ the inclusion $K \xrightarrow{cs} N$ is called *cosmall* in M , denoted by $K \hookrightarrow N$, if $N/K \ll M/K$.

Lifting modules play an important role in module theory. Also their various generalizations are studied by many authors in [1], [4], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10] etc. A module M is called *lifting module* if for every submodule N of M there is a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $D \subseteq N$ and $D' \cap N \ll M$. A module M is called *principally lifting module* if for all cyclic submodule X of M there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $D \subseteq X$ and $D' \cap X \ll M$. G.F.Birkenmeier et.al. [4] defines β^* relation to study on the open problem ‘Is every H -supplemented module supplemented?’ in [8]. They say submodules X, Y of M are β^* equivalent, $X\beta^*Y$, if and only if $\frac{X+Y}{X}$ is small in $\frac{M}{X}$ and $\frac{X+Y}{Y}$ is small in $\frac{M}{Y}$. M is called *Goldie*-lifting* (or briefly, \mathcal{G}^* -*lifting*) if and only if for each $X \leq M$ there exists a direct summand D of M such that $X\beta^*D$. M is called *Goldie*-supplemented* (or briefly, \mathcal{G}^* -*supplemented*) if and only if for each $X \leq M$ there exists a supplement submodule S of M such that $X\beta^*S$ (see [4]).

In Section 2, we recall the equivalence relation β^* which is defined in [4] and investigate some basic properties of it.

In section 3 we define principally Goldie*-lifting modules as a generalization of lifting modules. We give some necessary assumptions for a quotient module or a direct summand of a principally Goldie*-lifting module to be principally Goldie*-lifting. Principally lifting, principally Goldie*-lifting and principally supplemented modules are compared. It is also shown that principally lifting, principally Goldie*-lifting and \oplus -principally supplemented coincide on π -projective modules.

2 Properties of β^* Relation

Definition 2.1. (See [4]) Any submodules X, Y of M are β^* equivalent, $X\beta^*Y$, if and only if $\frac{X+Y}{X}$ is small in $\frac{M}{X}$ and $\frac{X+Y}{Y}$ is small in $\frac{M}{Y}$.

Lemma 2.2. (See [4]) β^* is an equivalence relation.

By [[4], page 43], the zero submodule is β^* equivalent to any small submodule.

Theorem 2.3. (See [4]) Let X, Y be submodules of M . The following are equivalent:

- (a) $X\beta^*Y$.
- (b) $X \xrightarrow{cs} X+Y$ and $Y \xrightarrow{cs} X+Y$.
- (c) For each submodule A of M such that $X+Y+A = M$, then $X+A = M$ and $Y+A = M$.
- (d) If $K+X = M$ for any submodule K of M , then $Y+K = M$ and if $Y+H = M$ for any submodule H of M , then $X+H = M$.

Lemma 2.4. Let $M = D \oplus D'$ and $A, B \leq D$. Then $A\beta^*B$ in M if and only if $A\beta^*B$ in D .

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $A\beta^*B$ in M and $A+B+N = D$ for some submodule N of D . Let us show $A+N = D$ and $B+N = D$. Since $A\beta^*B$ in M ,

$$M = D \oplus D' = A + B + N + D'$$

implies $A+N+D' = M$ and $B+N+D' = M$. By [[11], 41], $A+N = D$ and $B+N = D$. From Theorem 2.3, we get $A\beta^*B$ in D .

(\Leftarrow) Let $A\beta^*B$ in D . Then $\frac{A+B}{A} \ll \frac{D}{A}$ implies $\frac{A+B}{A} \ll \frac{M}{A}$. Similarly, $\frac{A+B}{B} \ll \frac{D}{B}$ implies $\frac{A+B}{B} \ll \frac{M}{B}$. This means that $A\beta^*B$ in M . \square

Lemma 2.5. If a direct summand D in M is β^* equivalent to a cyclic submodule X of M , then D is also cyclic.

Proof. Assume that $M = D \oplus D'$ for some submodules D, D' of M and X is a cyclic submodule of M which is β^* equivalent to D . By Theorem 2.3, $M = X + D'$. Since $\frac{X+D'}{D'} = \frac{M}{D'} \cong D$, D is cyclic. \square

3 Principally Goldie* - Lifting Modules

In [4], the authors defined β^* relation and they introduced two notions called Goldie*-supplemented module and Goldie*-lifting module depend on β^* relation. M is called *Goldie*-lifting* (or briefly, \mathcal{G}^* -lifting) if and only if for each $N \leq M$ there exists a direct summand D of M such that $N\beta^*D$. M is called *Goldie*-supplemented* (or briefly, \mathcal{G}^* -supplemented) if and only if for each $N \leq M$ there exists a supplement submodule S of M such that $N\beta^*S$. A module M is said to be *H-supplemented* if for every submodule N there is a direct summand D of M such that $M = N + B$ holds if and only if $M = D + B$ for any submodule B of M . They showed that Goldie*-lifting modules and *H-supplemented* modules are the same in [[4], Theorem 3.6]. In this section, we define principally Goldie*-lifting module (briefly principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module) as a generalization of \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module and investigate some properties of this module.

Definition 3.1. A module M is called *principally Goldie*-lifting module* (briefly principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting) if for each cyclic submodule X of M , there exists a direct summand D of M such that $X\beta^*D$.

Clearly, every \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. However the converse does not hold.

Example 3.2. Consider the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Q} . Since $Rad(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}$, every cyclic submodule of \mathbb{Q} is small in \mathbb{Q} . By [[4], Example 2.15], the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Q} is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. But the \mathbb{Z} -module \mathbb{Q} is not supplemented. So it is not \mathcal{G}^* -lifting by [[4], Theorem 3.6].

A module M is said to be *radical* if $Rad(M) = M$.

Lemma 3.3. *Every radical module is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. Let $m \in M$. If M is radical, $mR \subseteq Rad(M)$. By [[11], 21.5], $mR \ll M$. So we get $mR\beta^*0$. Thus M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let M be a module. Consider the following conditions:*

- (a) M is principally lifting,
- (b) M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting,
- (c) M is principally supplemented.

Then (a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c).

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) Let $m \in M$. Then mR is cyclic submodule of M . From (a), there is a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ with $D \leq mR$ and $mR \cap D' \ll M$. Since $D \leq mR$, $\frac{mR + D}{mR} \ll \frac{M}{mR}$. By modularity, $mR = D \oplus (mR \cap D')$. Then $\frac{mR}{D} \cong mR \cap D'$ and $\frac{M}{D} \cong D'$. If $mR \cap D' \ll M$, by [[11], 19.3], $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. It implies that $\frac{mR + D}{D} \ll \frac{M}{D}$. Therefore it is seen that $mR\beta^*D$ from Definition 2.1. Hence M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.

(b) \Rightarrow (c) Let $m \in M$. By hypothesis, there exists a direct summand D of M such that $mR\beta^*D$. Since $M = D \oplus D'$ for some submodule D' of M and D' is a supplement of D , D' is a supplement of mR in M by [[4], Theorem 2.6(ii)]. Thus M is principally supplemented. \square

The following example shows that a principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module need not be principally lifting in general:

Example 3.5. Consider the \mathbb{Z} -module $M = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$. By [[10], Example 3.7], M is H -supplemented module. Then M is \mathcal{G}^* -lifting by [[4], Theorem 3.6]. Since every \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting, M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. But from [[1], Examples 7.(3)], M is not principally lifting.

Theorem 3.6. *Let M be an indecomposable module. Consider the following conditions:*

- (a) M is principally lifting,
- (b) M is principally hollow,
- (c) M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.

Then (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Leftrightarrow (c)

Proof. (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) It is easy to see from [[1], Lemma 14].

(b) \Rightarrow (c) Let M be principally hollow and $m \in M$. Then $mR \ll M$ implies that $mR\beta^*0$.

(c) \Rightarrow (b) Let mR be a proper cyclic submodule of M . By (c), there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$. Since M is indecomposable, $D = M$ or $D = 0$. Let $D = M$. From [[4], Corollary 2.8.(iii)], we obtain $mR = M$ but this is a contradiction. Thus $mR\beta^*0$ and so $mR \ll M$. That is, M is principally hollow. \square

We shall give the following example of modules which are principally supplemented but not principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.

Example 3.7. Let F be a field, x and y commuting indeterminates over F . Let $R = F[x, y]$ be a polynomial ring and its ideals $I_1 = (x^2)$ and $I_2 = (y^2)$ and the ring $S = R/(x^2, y^2)$. Consider the S -module $M = \bar{x}S + \bar{y}S$. By [[1], Example 15], M is an indecomposable S -module and it is not principally hollow. Then M is not principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting from Theorem 3.6. Again by [[1], Example 15], M is principally supplemented.

A module M is said to be *principally semisimple* if every cyclic submodule of M is a direct summand of M .

Lemma 3.8. *Every principally semisimple module is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. It is clear from the definition of semisimple modules and the reflexive property of β^* . \square

Recall that a submodule N is called *fully invariant* if for each endomorphism f of M , $f(N) \leq N$. A module M is said to be *duo module* if every submodule of M is fully invariant. A module M is called *distributive* if for all submodules A, B, C of M , $A + (B \cap C) = (A + B) \cap (A + C)$ or $A \cap (B + C) = (A \cap B) + (A \cap C)$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ be a duo module (or distributive module). Then M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting if and only if M_1 and M_2 are principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $m \in M_1$. Since M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting, there is a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$ in M . As M is duo module $M_1 = (M_1 \cap D) \oplus (M_1 \cap D')$, $mR = (mR \cap D) \oplus (mR \cap D')$ and $D' = (M_1 \cap D') \cap (M_2 \cap D')$. We claim that $mR\beta^*(M_1 \cap D)$ in M_1 . Since $\frac{mR + (M_1 \cap D)}{mR} \leq \frac{mR + D}{mR}$ and $\frac{mR + D}{mR} \ll \frac{M}{mR}$, we have $\frac{mR + (M_1 \cap D)}{mR} \ll \frac{M}{mR}$ by [[11], 19.3(2)]. From isomorphism theorem and the direct decomposition of mR

$$\frac{mR + (M_1 \cap D)}{M_1 \cap D} \cong \frac{mR}{mR \cap (M_1 \cap D)} = \frac{mR}{mR \cap D} \cong mR \cap D'.$$

Since D' is a supplement of mR , $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. By [[11], 19.3(5)], $mR \cap D' \ll M_1 \cap D'$. Further $M_1 \cap D' \cong \frac{M_1}{M_1 \cap D}$. This shows that

$\frac{mR + (M_1 \cap D)}{M_1 \cap D}$ is small in $\frac{M_1}{M_1 \cap D}$ and also in $\frac{M}{M_1 \cap D}$. From Definition 2.1 we get $mR\beta^*(M_1 \cap D)$ in M . Then $mR\beta^*(M_1 \cap D)$ in M_1 by Lemma 2.4.

(\Leftarrow) Let $m \in M$. If M is a duo module, for cyclic submodule mR of M , $mR = (mR \cap M_1) \oplus (mR \cap M_2)$. So $mR \cap M_1 = m_1R$ and $mR \cap M_2 = m_2R$ for some $m_1 \in M_1, m_2 \in M_2$. Since M_1 and M_2 are principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting, there are decompositions $M_1 = D_1 \oplus D'_1$ and $M_2 = D_2 \oplus D'_2$ such that $m_1R\beta^*D_1$ in M_1 and $m_2R\beta^*D_2$ in M_2 . By Lemma 2.4, $m_1R\beta^*D_1$ and $m_2R\beta^*D_2$ in M . Since $mR = m_1R + m_2R$, by [[4], Proposition 2.11], $mR\beta^*(D_1 \oplus D_2)$. \square

Proposition 3.10. *Let any cyclic submodule of M have a supplement which is a relatively projective direct summand of M . Then M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. Let $m \in M$. By hypothesis, there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $M = mR + D'$ and $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. Because D is D' -projective, $M = A \oplus D'$ for some submodule A of mR by [[8], Lemma 4.47]. So M is principally lifting. It follows from Theorem 3.4 that M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. \square

Proposition 3.11. *Let M be principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting and N be a submodule of M . If $\frac{N + D}{N}$ is a direct summand in $\frac{M}{N}$ for any cyclic direct summand D of M , then $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. Let $\frac{mR + N}{N}$ be a cyclic submodule of $\frac{M}{N}$ for $m \in M$. Since M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$. Then D is also cyclic Lemma 2.5. By hypothesis, $\frac{D + N}{N}$ is a direct summand in $\frac{M}{N}$. We claim that $\frac{mR + N}{N}\beta^*\frac{D + N}{N}$. Consider the canonical epimorphism $\theta : M \rightarrow M/N$. By [[4], Proposition 2.9(i)], $\theta(mR)\beta^*\theta(D)$, that is, $\frac{mR + N}{N}\beta^*\frac{D + N}{N}$. Thus $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. \square

Corollary 3.12. *Let M be principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

- (a) *If M is distributive (or duo) module, then any quotient module of M principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*
- (b) *Let N be a projection invariant, that is, $eN \subseteq N$ for all $e^2 = e \in \text{End}(M)$. Then $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. In particular, $\frac{M}{A}$ is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting for every fully invariant submodule A of M .*

Proof. (a) Let N be any submodule of M and $M = D \oplus D'$ for some submodules D, D' of M . Then

$$\frac{M}{N} = \frac{D \oplus D'}{N} = \frac{D + N}{N} + \frac{D' + N}{N}.$$

Since M is distributive, $N = (D + N) \cap (D' + N)$. We obtain $\frac{M}{N} = \frac{D + N}{N} \oplus \frac{D' + N}{N}$. By Theorem 3.11, $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.

(b) Assume that $M = D \oplus D'$ for some $D, D' \leq M$. For the projection map $\pi_D : M \rightarrow D$, $\pi_D^2 = \pi \in \text{End}(M)$ and $\pi_D(N) \subseteq N$. So $\pi_D(N) = N \cap D$. Similarly, $\pi_{D'}(N) = N \cap D'$ for the projection map $\pi_{D'} : M \rightarrow D'$. Hence we have $N = (N \cap D) + (N \cap D')$. By modularity,

$$M = [D + (N \cap D) + (N \cap D')] + (D' + N) = [D \oplus (N \cap D')] + (D' + N).$$

and

$$[D \oplus (N \cap D')] \cap (D' + N) = [D \cap (D' + N)] + (N \cap D') = (N \cap D) + (N \cap D') = N$$

Thus $\frac{M}{N} = \frac{D \oplus (N \cap D')}{N} \oplus \frac{D' + N}{N}$. By Theorem 3.11, $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. \square

Another consequence of Proposition 3.10 is given in the next result.

A module M is said to have the *summand sum property* (SSP) if the sum of any two direct summands of M is again a direct summand.

Proposition 3.13. *Let M be a principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module. If M has SSP, then any direct summand of M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. Let $M = N \oplus N'$ for some submodule N, N' of M . Take any cyclic direct summand D of M . Since M has SSP, $M = (D + N') \oplus T$ for some submodule T of M . Then

$$\frac{M}{N'} = \frac{D + N'}{N'} + \frac{T + N'}{N'}$$

By modularity,

$$(D + N') \cap (T + N') = N' + [(D + N') \cap T] = N'.$$

So we obtain

$$\frac{M}{N'} = \frac{D + N'}{N'} \oplus \frac{T + N'}{N'}.$$

Thus N is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting from Proposition 3.11. \square

Next we show when $M/Rad(M)$ is principally semisimple in case M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module.

Proposition 3.14. *Let M be principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting and distributive module. Then $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$ is a principally semisimple.*

Proof. Let $m \in M$. There exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$. By [[4], Theorem 2.6(ii)], D' is a supplement of mR , that is, $M = mR + D'$ and $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. Then

$$\frac{M}{Rad(M)} = \frac{mR + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)} + \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}.$$

Because M is distributive and $mR \cap D' \ll D'$,

$$(mR + Rad(M)) \cap (D' + Rad(M)) = (mR \cap D') + Rad(M) = Rad(M).$$

Hence $\frac{mR + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}$ is a direct summand in $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$, this means that $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$ is a principally semisimple module. \square

Proposition 3.15. *Let M be a principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting module and $Rad(M) \ll M$. Then $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$ is principally semisimple.*

Proof. Let $\frac{X}{Rad(M)}$ be a cyclic submodule of $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$. Then $X = mR + Rad(M)$ for some $m \in M$. There exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$. By [[4], Theorem 2.6(ii)], D' is a supplement of mR in M . It follows from [[4], Corollary 2.12] that $(mR + Rad(M))\beta^*D$. Therefore

$$\frac{M}{Rad(M)} = \frac{X}{Rad(M)} + \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}.$$

By modularity and $X \cap D' \subseteq Rad(M)$,

$$\frac{X}{Rad(M)} \cap \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)} = \frac{(X \cap D') + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}.$$

Then we obtain that $\frac{M}{Rad(M)} = \frac{X}{Rad(M)} \oplus \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}$. \square

Proposition 3.16. *Let M be principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. If $\text{Rad}(M) \ll M$, then $M = A \oplus B$ where A is principally semisimple and $\text{Rad}(B) \ll B$.*

Proof. Let A be a submodule of M such that $\text{Rad}(M) \oplus A$ is small in M and $m \in A$. By hypothesis, there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$. Then D is cyclic from Lemma 2.5. By [[4], Theorem 2.6(ii)], $M = mR + D'$ and $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. So $mR \cap D' = 0$ because $mR \cap D'$ is a submodule of $\text{Rad}(M)$. That is, $M = mR \oplus D'$. Hence $mR = D$. Since $D \cap \text{Rad}(M) = 0$, D is isomorphic to a submodule of $\frac{M}{\text{Rad}(M)}$. By Proposition 3.15, $\frac{M}{\text{Rad}(M)}$ is principally semisimple. Thus D is principally semisimple. \square

In general, it is not true that principally lifting and principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting modules coincide. As we will see the following theorem, we need projectivity condition.

Proposition 3.17. *Let M be a π -projective module. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) M is principally lifting,
- (b) M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting,
- (c) M is \oplus -principally supplemented.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) follows from Theorem 3.4.
(b) \Rightarrow (c) follows from [[4], Theorem 2.6(ii)].
(c) \Rightarrow (a) Consider any $m \in M$. From (c), mR has a supplement D which is a direct summand in M , that is, $M = mR + D$ and $mR \cap D \ll D$. Since M is π -projective there exists a complement D' of D such that $D' \subseteq mR$ by [[5], 4.14(1)]. Thus M is principally lifting. \square

Proposition 3.18. *Let M be a π -projective module. Then M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting if and only if every cyclic submodule X of M can be written as $X = D \oplus A$ such that D is a direct summand in M and $A \ll M$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let M be principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting and π -projective module. By Proposition 3.17, M is principally lifting. Then for any cyclic submodule X of M there exists a direct decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $D \leq X$ and $X \cap D' \ll M$. By modularity, we conclude that $X = D \oplus (X \cap D')$.
(\Leftarrow) By assumption and [[6], Lemma 2.10], M is principally lifting. Hence from Proposition 3.17 M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. \square

Now we mention that principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting and \mathcal{G}^* -lifting modules are coincide under some condition.

Proposition 3.19. *Let M be Noetherian and have SSP. Then M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting if and only if M is \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Clear.

(\Rightarrow) If M is Noetherian, for any submodule X of M there exist some $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n \in M$ such that $X = m_1R + m_2R + \dots + m_nR$ by [[11], 27.1]. Since M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting, there exist some direct summands D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n of M such that $m_1R\beta^*D_1, m_2R\beta^*D_2, \dots, m_nR\beta^*D_n$. $D = D_1 + D_2 + \dots + D_n$ is also a direct summand in M because of SSP. By [[4], Proposition 2.11], $X\beta^*D$. Hence M is \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. \square

Proposition 3.20. *Let any submodule N of M be the sum of a cyclic submodule X and a small submodule A in M . Then M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting if and only if M is \mathcal{G}^* -lifting.*

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Clear.

(\Rightarrow) Let $N = X + A$ for a cyclic submodule X and a small submodule A of M . Since M is principally \mathcal{G}^* -lifting, there exists a direct summand D of M such that $X\beta^*D$. From [[4], Corollary 2.12], $(X + A)\beta^*D$, that is, $N\beta^*D$. Hence M is \mathcal{G}^* -lifting. \square

References

- [1] Acar, U., Harmanci, A., *Principally Supplemented Modules*, Albanian Journal of Math., Vol 4, 3, (2010), 79-88.
- [2] Al-Khazzi, I., Smith, P. F., *Modules with Chain Condition on Superfluous Submodules*, Comm. Algebra, 19(8), (1991), 2331-2351.
- [3] Anderson, F.W., Fuller, K.R. *Rings and Categories of Modules*, Springer, New York, (1992).
- [4] Birkenmeier, G.F., Mutlu, F.T., Nebiyev, C., Sokmez, N., Tercan, A., *Goldie*-supplemented Modules*, Glasgow Math. Journal, 52(A), (2010), 41-52.
- [5] Clark, J., Lomp, C., Vanaja, N., Wisbauer, R., *Lifting Modules: Supplements and Projectivity in Module Theory*, Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel, Switzerland (2006).
- [6] Kamal, M., Yousef A., *Principally Lifting Modules*, Int. Electron. J.Algebra, 2, (2007), 127-137.
- [7] Kosan, T., Tutuncu Keskin D., *H-supplemented Duo Modules*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications, Vol. 6, No. 6, (2007), 965-971.
- [8] Mohamed. S., Muller, B.J., *Continuous and Discrete Modules*, Cambridge University Press, (1990).
- [9] Talebi, Y., Hamzekolae, A.R., Tercan, A., *Goldie-Rad-supplemented Modules*, An. St. Univ. Ovidius Constanta, (2014).
- [10] Yongduo, W., Dejun, W., *On H-supplemented Modules*, Comm. in Algebra, 40, (2012), 3679-3689.
- [11] Wisbauer, R., *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*, Gordon and Breach, (1991).