

# Characterizing $S$ -flat modules and $S$ -von Neumann regular rings by uniformity

Xiaolei Zhang<sup>a</sup>

E-mail: zxlrgj@163.com

## Abstract

Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . An  $R$ -module  $T$  is called  $u$ - $S$ -torsion ( $u$ - always abbreviates uniformly) provided that  $sT = 0$  for some  $s \in S$ . The notion of  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequences is also introduced from the viewpoint of uniformity. An  $R$ -module  $F$  is called  $u$ - $S$ -flat provided that the induced sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \rightarrow B \otimes_R F \rightarrow C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact for any  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ . A ring  $R$  is called  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular provided there exists an element  $s \in S$  satisfying that for any  $a \in R$  there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $sa = ra^2$ . We obtain that a ring  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring if and only if any  $R$ -module is  $u$ - $S$ -flat. Several properties of  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules and  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular rings are obtained.

*Key Words:*  $u$ - $S$ -torsion module,  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence,  $u$ - $S$ -flat module,  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 13C12, 16D40, 16E50.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this article,  $R$  is always a commutative ring with identity and  $S$  is always a multiplicative subset of  $R$ , that is,  $1 \in S$  and  $s_1 s_2 \in S$  for any  $s_1 \in S, s_2 \in S$ . Let  $S$  be a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Recall from [12, Definition 1.6.10] that an  $R$ -module  $M$  is called an  $S$ -torsion module if for any  $m \in M$ , there is an  $s \in S$  such that  $sm = 0$ .  $S$ -torsion-free modules can be defined as the right part of the hereditary torsion theory  $\tau_S$  generated by  $S$ -torsion modules (see [11]). Early in 1965, Năstăsescu et al. [10] defined  $\tau_S$ -Noetherian rings as rings  $R$  satisfying that for any ideal  $I$  of  $R$  there is a finitely generated sub-ideal  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $I/J$  is  $S$ -torsion. However, to tie together some Noetherian properties of commutative rings and their polynomial rings or formal power series rings, Anderson and Dumitrescu [1] defined  $S$ -Noetherian rings  $R$ , that is, any ideal of  $R$  is  $S$ -finite in 2002. Recall from [1] that an  $R$ -module  $M$  is called  $S$ -finite provided that  $sM \subseteq F$  for some  $s \in S$  and some finitely generated submodule  $F$  of  $M$ . One can see that there is

some uniformity is hidden in the definition of  $S$ -finite modules. In fact, an  $R$ -module  $M$  is  $S$ -finite if and only if  $s(M/F) = 0$  for some  $s \in S$  and some finitely generated submodule  $F$  of  $M$ . In this article, we introduce the notion of  $u$ - $S$ -torsion modules  $T$  for which there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $sT = 0$ . The notion of  $u$ - $S$ -torsion modules is different from that of  $S$ -torsion modules (see Example 2.2). In the past few years, the notions of  $S$ -analogues of Noetherian rings, coherent rings, almost perfect rings and strong Mori domains are introduced and studied extensively in [1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 7].

In this article, we introduce the notions of  $u$ - $S$ -monomorphisms,  $u$ - $S$ -epimorphisms,  $u$ - $S$ -isomorphisms and  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequences according to the idea of uniformity (see Definition 2.7). Some properties of  $u$ - $S$ -torsion modules and  $S$ -finite modules with respect to  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequences are given in Proposition 2.8 and Proposition 2.9. We say an  $R$ -module  $F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat provided that the induced sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \rightarrow B \otimes_R F \rightarrow C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact for any  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  (see Definition 3.1). Some basic characterizations of  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules are given (see Theorem 3.2). It is well known that an  $R$ -module  $F$  is flat if and only if  $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F) = 0$  for any ideal  $I$  of  $R$ . However, the  $S$ -analogue of this result is not true (see Example 3.3). It is also worth remarking that the class of  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules is not closed under direct limits and direct sums (see Remark 3.5). If an  $R$ -module  $F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat, then  $F_S$  is flat over  $R_S$  (see Corollary 3.6). However, the converse does not hold (see Remark 3.7). A new local characterization of flat modules is given in Proposition 3.9. A ring  $R$  is called a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring if there exists an element  $s \in S$  satisfies that for any  $a \in R$  there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $sa = ra^2$  (see Definition 3.12). A ring  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular if and only if any  $R$ -module is  $u$ - $S$ -flat (see Theorem 3.13). Every  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring is locally von Neumann regular at  $S$  (see Corollary 3.14). However, the converse is also not true in general (see Example 3.15). We also give a non-trivial example of  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular which is not von Neumann regular (see Example 3.18). Finally, we give a new local characterization of von Neumann regular rings in Proposition 3.19.

## 2. $u$ - $S$ -TORSION MODULES

Recall from [12, Definition 1.6.10] that an  $R$ -module  $T$  is said to be an  $S$ -torsion module if for any  $t \in T$  there is an element  $s \in S$  such that  $st = 0$ . Note that the choice of  $s$  is decided by the element  $t$ . In this article, we care more about the uniformity of  $s$  on  $T$ .

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . An  $R$ -module  $T$  is called a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion (abbreviates uniformly  $S$ -torsion) module provided that there exists an element  $s \in S$  such that  $sT = 0$ .

Obviously, the submodules and quotients of  $u$ - $S$ -torsion modules are also  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Note that finitely generated  $S$ -torsion modules are  $u$ - $S$ -torsion and any  $u$ - $S$ -torsion modules are  $S$ -torsion. However,  $S$ -torsion modules are not necessary  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. We also note that every  $R$ -module does not have a maximal  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule.

**Example 2.2.** Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  be the ring of integers,  $p$  a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $S = \{p^n \mid n \geq 0\}$ . Let  $M = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module where  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$  is the localization of  $\mathbb{Z}$  at  $S$ . Then

- (1)  $M$  is  $S$ -torsion but not  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.
- (2)  $M$  has no maximal  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule.

*Proof.* (1) Obviously,  $M$  is an  $S$ -torsion module. Suppose there is an  $p^n$  such that  $p^n M = 0$ . However,  $p^n(\frac{1}{p^{n+1}} + \mathbb{Z}) = \frac{1}{p} + \mathbb{Z} \neq 0 + \mathbb{Z}$  in  $M$ . Thus  $M$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.

(2) Suppose  $N$  is a maximal  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule of  $M$ . Then there is an element  $p^n \in S$  such that  $p^n N = 0$ . Note  $N$  is a submodule of  $M_n := \{\frac{a}{p^n} + \mathbb{Z} \in M \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Since  $M_{n+1} := \{\frac{a}{p^{n+1}} + \mathbb{Z} \in M \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule of  $M$  and  $N$  is a proper submodule of  $M_{n+1}$ . It is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.3.** Let  $R$  be a ring and  $M$  an  $R$ -module. Let  $S$  be a multiplicative subset of  $R$  consisting of finite elements. Then  $M$  is  $S$ -torsion if and only if  $M$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.

*Proof.* If  $M$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, then  $M$  is trivially  $S$ -torsion. Let  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$  and  $s = s_1 \dots s_n$ . Suppose  $M$  is an  $S$ -torsion module. Then for any  $m \in M$ , there is an element  $s_i \in S$  such that  $s_i m = 0$ . Thus  $sm = 0$  for any  $m \in M$ . So  $sM = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . If an  $R$ -module  $M$  has a maximal  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule, then  $M$  has only one maximal  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule.

*Proof.* Let  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  be maximal  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodules of  $M$  such that  $s_1 M_1 = 0$  and  $s_2 M_2 = 0$  for some  $s_1, s_2 \in S$ . We claim that  $M_1 = M_2$ . Indeed, otherwise we may assume there is an  $m \in M_2 - M_1$ . Let  $M_3$  be a submodule of  $M$  generated by  $M_1$  and  $m$ . Then  $s_1 s_2 M_3 = 0$ . Thus  $M_3$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule properly containing  $M_1$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Recall from [12, Definition 1.6.10] that an  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be an  $S$ -torsion-free module if  $sm = 0$  for some  $s \in S$  and  $m \in M$  implies that  $m = 0$ . The classes of

$S$ -torsion modules and  $S$ -torsion-free modules constitute a hereditary torsion theory (see [11]). From this result it follows immediately the next result (see [12, Theorem 6.1.6]). However we give direct proof for completeness.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Then an  $R$ -module  $F$  is  $S$ -torsion-free if and only if  $\text{Hom}_R(T, F) = 0$  for any  $u$ - $S$ -torsion module  $T$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $F$  is an  $S$ -torsion-free module and let  $T$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion module and  $f \in \text{Hom}_R(T, F)$ . Then there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $sT = 0$ . Thus for any  $t \in T$ ,  $sf(t) = f(st) = 0 \in F$ . Thus  $f(t) = 0$  for any  $t \in T$ . Conversely suppose that  $sm = 0$  for some  $s \in S$  and  $m \in F$ . Set  $F_s = \{x \in F \mid sx = 0\}$ . Then  $F_s$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion submodule of  $F$ . Thus  $\text{Hom}_R(F_s, F) = 0$ . It follows that  $F_s = 0$  and thus  $m=0$ . So  $F$  is  $S$ -torsion-free.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $R$  be a ring,  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$  and  $T$  a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion module. Then  $\text{Tor}_n^R(M, T)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion for any  $R$ -module  $M$  and  $n \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion module with  $sT = 0$ . If  $n = 0$ , then for any  $\sum a \otimes b \in M \otimes_R T$ , we have  $s \sum a \otimes b = \sum a \otimes sb = 0$ . Thus  $s(M \otimes_R T) = 0$ . Let  $0 \rightarrow \Omega(M) \rightarrow P \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence with  $P$  projective. Then  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, T)$  is a submodule of  $\Omega(M) \otimes_R T$  which is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Thus  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, T)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. For  $n \geq 2$ , we have an isomorphism  $\text{Tor}_n^R(M, T) \cong \text{Tor}_1^R(\Omega^{n-1}(M), T)$  where  $\Omega^{n-1}(M)$  is the  $(n-1)$ -th syzygy of  $M$ . Since  $\text{Tor}_1^R(\Omega^{n-1}(M), T)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by induction,  $\text{Tor}_n^R(M, T)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.  $\square$

**Definition 2.7.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Let  $M, N$  and  $L$  be  $R$ -modules.*

- (1) *An  $R$ -homomorphism  $f : M \rightarrow N$  is called a  $u$ - $S$ -monomorphism (resp.,  $u$ - $S$ -epimorphism) provided that  $\text{Ker}(f)$  (resp.,  $\text{Coker}(f)$ ) is a  $u$ - $S$ -torsion module.*
- (2) *An  $R$ -homomorphism  $f : M \rightarrow N$  is called a  $u$ - $S$ -isomorphism provided that  $f$  is both a  $u$ - $S$ -monomorphism and a  $u$ - $S$ -epimorphism.*
- (3) *An  $R$ -sequence  $M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} L$  is called  $u$ - $S$ -exact provided that there is an element  $s \in S$  such that  $s\text{Ker}(g) \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$  and  $s\text{Im}(f) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g)$ .*

It is easy to verify that  $f : M \rightarrow N$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -monomorphism (resp.,  $u$ - $S$ -epimorphism) if and only if  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N$  (resp.,  $M \xrightarrow{f} N \rightarrow 0$ ) is  $u$ - $S$ -exact.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $R$  be a ring,  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$  and  $M$  an  $R$ -module. Then the following assertions hold.*

- (1) Suppose  $M$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion and  $f : L \rightarrow M$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -monomorphism. Then  $L$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.
- (2) Suppose  $M$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion and  $g : M \rightarrow N$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -epimorphism. Then  $N$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.
- (3) Let  $f : M \rightarrow N$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -isomorphism. If one of  $M$  and  $N$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, so is the other.
- (4) Let  $0 \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \rightarrow 0$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. Then  $M$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion if and only if  $L$  and  $N$  are  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.

*Proof.* We only prove (4) since (1), (2) and (3) are the consequences of (4).

Suppose  $M$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion with  $sM = 0$ . Since  $\text{Ker}(f)$  (resp.,  $\text{Coker}(g)$ ) is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion with  $s_1\text{Ker}(f) = 0$  (resp.,  $s_2\text{Coker}(g) = 0$ ) for some  $s_1 \in S$  (resp.,  $s_2 \in S$ ), it follows that  $ss_1L = 0$  (resp.,  $ss_2N = 0$ ). Consequently,  $L$  (resp.,  $N$ ) is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Now suppose  $L$  and  $N$  are  $u$ - $S$ -torsion with  $s_1L = s_2N = 0$  for some  $s_1, s_2 \in S$ . Since the  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence is exact at  $M$ , there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $s\text{Ker}(g) \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$  and  $s\text{Im}(f) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g)$ . Let  $m \in M$ . Then  $s_2g(m) = g(s_2m) = 0$ . Thus there exists  $l \in L$  such that  $ss_2m = f(l)$ . So  $s_1ss_2m = s_1f(l) = f(s_1l) = 0$ . So  $M$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.  $\square$

Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Recall from [1] that an  $R$ -module  $M$  is called  $S$ -finite provided that there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $sM \subseteq N \subseteq M$ , where  $N$  is a finitely generated  $R$ -module. Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module,  $\{m_i\}_{i \in \Lambda} \subseteq M$  and  $N = \langle m_i \rangle_{i \in \Lambda}$ . We say an  $R$ -module  $M$  is  $S$ -generated by  $\{m_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  provided that  $sM \subseteq N$  for some  $s \in S$ . Thus an  $R$ -module  $M$  is  $S$ -finite provided that  $M$  can be  $S$ -generated by finite elements.

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $R$  be a ring,  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$  and  $M$  an  $R$ -module. Then the following assertions hold.*

- (1) Let  $M$  be an  $S$ -finite  $R$ -module and  $f : M \rightarrow N$  a  $u$ - $S$ -epimorphism. Then  $N$  is  $S$ -finite.
- (2) Let  $0 \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \rightarrow 0$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. If  $L$  and  $N$  are  $S$ -finite, so is  $M$ .
- (3) Let  $f : M \rightarrow N$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -isomorphism. If one of  $M$  and  $N$  is  $S$ -finite, so is the other.

*Proof.* (1) Consider the exact sequence  $M \xrightarrow{f} N \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$  with  $sT = 0$  for some  $s \in S$ . Let  $F$  be a finitely generated submodule of  $M$  such that  $s'M \subseteq F$  for some  $s' \in S$ . Then  $f(F)$  is a finitely generated submodule of  $N$  such that  $ss'N \subseteq f(F)$ .

(2) Suppose  $0 \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \rightarrow 0$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. Let  $L_1$  and  $N_1$  be finitely generated submodules of  $L$  and  $N$  such that  $s_L L \subseteq L_1$  and  $s_N N \subseteq N_1$

for some  $s_L, s_N \in S$  respectively. Let  $M_1$  be a finitely generated submodule of  $M$  generated by the finite images of generators of  $L_1$  and the finite pre-images of finite generators of  $N_1$ . Then for any  $m \in M$ ,  $s_N g(m) \in N_1$ . Thus there exists  $m_1 \in M_1$  such that  $s_N g(m) = g(m_1)$ . We have  $s_N m - m_1 \in \text{Ker}(g)$ . Since there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $s \text{Ker}(g) \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$ . So there exists  $l \in L$  such that  $s(s_N m - m_1) = f(l)$ . Then there exists  $l_1 \in L_1$  such that  $s_L l = l_1$ . Thus  $s_L s(s_N m - m_1) = s_L f(l) = f(s_L l) = f(l_1)$ . Consequently,  $s_L s s_N m = s_L s m_1 + s f(l_1) \in M_1$ . So  $s_L s s_N M \subseteq M_1$ . Since  $M_1$  is finitely generated, we have  $M$  is  $S$ -finite.

(3) It is a consequence of (2).

□

### 3. $u$ - $S$ -FLAT MODULES AND $u$ - $S$ -VON NEUMANN REGULAR RINGS

Recall from [12] that an  $R$ -module  $F$  is called *flat* provided that for any short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ , the induced sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \rightarrow B \otimes_R F \rightarrow C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is exact. Now, we give an  $S$ -analogue of flat modules.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $R$  be a ring,  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . An  $R$ -module  $F$  is called  $u$ - $S$ -flat (abbreviates uniformly  $S$ -flat) provided that for any  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ , the induced sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \rightarrow B \otimes_R F \rightarrow C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact .*

Recall from [12] that an  $R$ -module  $F$  is flat if and only if  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) = 0$  for any  $R$ -module  $M$ , if and only if  $\text{Tor}_n^R(M, F) = 0$  for any  $R$ -module  $M$  and  $n \geq 1$ . We give an  $S$ -analogue of this result.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $R$  be a ring,  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$  and  $F$  an  $R$ -module. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat;
- (2) for any short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$ , the induced sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{f \otimes_R F} B \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{g \otimes_R F} C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact;
- (3)  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion for any  $R$ -module  $M$ ;
- (4)  $\text{Tor}_n^R(M, F)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion for any  $R$ -module  $M$  and  $n \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2), (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) and (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Trivial.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Let  $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow P \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence with  $P$  projective. Then there exists a long exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F) \rightarrow F \otimes L \rightarrow P \otimes F \rightarrow M \otimes F \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by (2).

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4): Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Denote by  $\Omega^{n-1}(M)$  the  $(n-1)$ -th syzygy of  $M$ . Then  $\text{Tor}_n^R(M, F) \cong \text{Tor}_1^R(\Omega^{n-1}(M), F)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by (3).

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): Let  $F$  be an  $R$ -module satisfies (2). Suppose  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. Then there is an exact sequence  $B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$  where  $T = \text{Coker}(g)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Tensoring  $F$  over  $R$ , we have an exact sequence

$$B \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{g \otimes_R F} C \otimes_R F \rightarrow T \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0.$$

Then  $T \otimes_R F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by Corollary 2.6. Thus  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{f \otimes_R F} B \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{g \otimes_R F} C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact at  $C \otimes_R F$ .

There are naturally two short exact sequences:  $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow B \rightarrow \text{Coker}(f) \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\text{Ker}(f)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Consider the induced exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} &\rightarrow \text{Ker}(f) \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{i_{\text{Ker}(f)} \otimes_R F} A \otimes_R F \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0, \\ &\rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{i_{\text{Im}(f)} \otimes_R F} B \otimes_R F \rightarrow \text{Coker}(f) \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Ker}(i_{\text{Im}(f)} \otimes_R F)$  and  $\text{Ker}(i_{\text{Ker}(f)} \otimes_R F)$  are  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. We have the following pull-back diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & \text{Im}(i_{\text{Ker}(f)} \otimes_R F) & \xlongequal{\quad} & \text{Im}(i_{\text{Ker}(f)} \otimes_R F) & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & A \otimes_R F & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(i_{\text{Im}(f)} \otimes_R F) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(i_{\text{Im}(f)} \otimes_R F) & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(f) \otimes_R F & \longrightarrow & \text{Im}(i_{\text{Im}(f)} \otimes_R F) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

Since  $\text{Ker}(f)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, so is  $\text{Ker}(f) \otimes_R F$  by Corollary 2.6. Hence  $\text{Im}(i_{\text{Ker}(f)} \otimes_R F)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, and thus  $Y$  is also  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by Proposition 2.8. So the composition  $f \otimes_R F : A \otimes_R F \rightarrow \text{Im}(i_{\text{Im}(f)} \otimes_R F) \rightarrow B \otimes_R F$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -monomorphism. Thus  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{f \otimes_R F} B \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{g \otimes_R F} C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact at  $A \otimes_R F$ .

Since the sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact at  $B$ , there exists  $s_1 \in S$  such that  $s_1 \text{Ker}(g) \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$  and  $s_1 \text{Im}(f) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g)$ . By (2), there are two exact sequences  $0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow s_1 \text{Ker}(g) \otimes_R F \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \otimes_R F$  with  $s_2 T_1 = 0$  for some  $s_2 \in S$ , and  $0 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow s_1 \text{Im}(f) \otimes_R F \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g) \otimes_R F$  with  $s_3 T_2 = 0$  for some  $s_3 \in S$ . Consider

the induced sequence  $0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g) \otimes_R F \rightarrow B \otimes_R F \rightarrow \text{Coker}(g) \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  with  $s_4 T = 0$  for some  $s_4 \in S$ . Set  $s = s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4$ , we will show  $s \text{Ker}(g \otimes_R F) \subseteq \text{Im}(f \otimes_R F)$  and  $s \text{Im}(f \otimes_R F) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g \otimes_R F)$ . Consider the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g) \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{i_{\text{Ker}(g)} \otimes_R F} B \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{g \otimes_R F} C \otimes_R F.$$

Then  $\text{Im}(i_{\text{Ker}(g)} \otimes_R F) = \text{Ker}(g \otimes_R F)$ . Thus  $s \text{Ker}(g \otimes_R F) = s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4 \text{Ker}(g \otimes_R F) = s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4 \text{Im}(i_{\text{Ker}(g)} \otimes_R F) \subseteq s_1 s_2 s_3 \text{Ker}(g) \otimes_R F \subseteq s_3 \text{Im}(f) \otimes_R F = s_3 \text{Im}(f \otimes_R F) \subseteq \text{Im}(f \otimes_R F)$ , and  $s \text{Im}(f \otimes_R F) = s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4 \text{Im}(f) \otimes_R F \subseteq s_2 s_4 \text{Ker}(g) \otimes_R F \subseteq s_2 \text{Im}(i_{\text{Ker}(g)} \otimes_R F) = s_2 \text{Ker}(g \otimes_R F) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g \otimes_R F)$ . Thus  $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \rightarrow B \otimes_R F \rightarrow C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  is  $u$ - $S$ -exact at  $B \otimes_R F$ .  $\square$

By Corollary 2.6 and Theorem 3.2, flat modules and  $u$ - $S$ -torsion modules are  $u$ - $S$ -flat. And  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules are flat provided that any element in  $S$  is a unit. Moreover, if any element in  $S$  is regular and all  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules are flat, then any element in  $S$  is a unit. Indeed, for any  $s \in S$ , we have  $R/\langle s \rangle$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat and thus flat. So  $\langle s \rangle$  is a pure ideal of  $R$ . By [5, Theorem 1.2.15], there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $s(1 - rs) = 0$ . Since  $s$  is regular,  $s$  is a unit.

The following example shows that the condition “ $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, F)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion for any  $R$ -module  $M$ ” in Theorem 3.2 can not be replaced by “ $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion for any ideal  $I$  of  $R$ ”.

**Example 3.3.** Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  be the ring of integers,  $p$  a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $S = \{p^n \mid n \geq 0\}$  as in Example 2.2. Let  $M = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, M)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion for any ideal  $I$  of  $R$ . However,  $M$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -flat.

*Proof.* Let  $\langle n \rangle$  be an ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . It follows from [4, Chapter I, Lemma 6.2(a)] that  $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}/\langle n \rangle, M) \cong \{m \in M \mid nm = 0\} = \{\frac{b}{p^a} + \mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z} \mid a, b \text{ satisfies } p^a \mid nb\}$ . Write  $n = p^k m$  where  $(p, m) = 1$ . If  $k = 0$ , then  $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}/\langle n \rangle, M) = 0$ . If  $k \geq 1$ , then  $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}/\langle n \rangle, M) = \{\frac{b}{p^k} + \mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Thus  $p^k \cdot \text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}/\langle n \rangle, M) = 0$ . So  $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}/\langle n \rangle, M)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion for any ideal  $\langle n \rangle$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . However,  $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong t(\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$  by [4, Chapter I, Lemma 6.2(b)]. Since  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by Example 2.2,  $M = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -flat.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Then the following statements hold.

- (1) Any pure quotient of  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules is  $u$ - $S$ -flat.
- (2) Any finite direct sum of  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules is  $u$ - $S$ -flat.
- (3) Let  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. If  $A$  and  $C$  are  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules, so is  $B$ .



- (4) Let  $A \rightarrow B$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -isomorphism. If one of  $A$  and  $B$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat, so is the other.
- (5) Let  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. If  $B$  and  $C$  are  $u$ - $S$ -flat, then  $A$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat.

*Proof.* (1) Let  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  be a pure exact sequence with  $B$   $u$ - $S$ -flat. Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then there is an exact sequence  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, B) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, C) \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, B)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion,  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, C)$  also is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Thus  $C$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat.

(2) Let  $F_1, \dots, F_n$  be  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules. Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then there exists  $s_i \in S$  such that  $s_i \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F_i) = 0$ . Set  $s = s_1 \dots s_n$ . Then  $s \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \bigoplus_{i=1}^n F_i) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n s \text{Tor}_1^R(M, F_i) = 0$ . Thus  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n F_i$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat.

(3) Let  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. Then there are three short exact sequences:  $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g) \rightarrow B \rightarrow \text{Im}(g) \rightarrow 0$  and  $0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(g) \rightarrow C \rightarrow \text{Coker}(g) \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $\text{Ker}(f)$  and  $\text{Coker}(g)$  are all  $u$ - $S$ -torsion and  $s \text{Ker}(g) \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$  and  $s \text{Im}(f) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g)$  for some  $s \in S$ . Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Suppose  $A$  and  $C$  are  $u$ - $S$ -flat. Then

$$\text{Tor}_1^R(M, A) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(f)) \rightarrow M \otimes_R \text{Ker}(f)$$

is exact. Since  $\text{Ker}(f)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion and  $A$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat, it follows that  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(f))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Note

$$\text{Tor}_2^R(M, \text{Coker}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, C)$$

is exact. Since  $\text{Coker}(g)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, then  $\text{Tor}_2^R(M, \text{Coker}(g))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by Corollary 2.6. Thus  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(g))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion as  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, C)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. We also note that

$$\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, B) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(g))$$

is exact. Thus to verify  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, B)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, we just need to show  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(g))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Set  $N = \text{Ker}(g) + \text{Im}(f)$ . Consider the following two exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g) \rightarrow N \rightarrow N/\text{Ker}(g) \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } 0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow N \rightarrow N/\text{Im}(f) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then it is easy to verify  $N/\text{Ker}(g)$  and  $N/\text{Im}(f)$  are all  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Consider the following induced two exact sequences

$$\text{Tor}_2^R(M, N/\text{Im}(f)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, N/\text{Im}(f)),$$

$$\text{Tor}_2^R(M, N/\text{Ker}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(f)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, N/\text{Ker}(g)).$$

Thus  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(g))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion if and only if  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(f))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Consequently,  $B$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat since  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(f))$  is proved to be  $u$ - $S$ -torsion as above.

(4) It can be certainly deduced from (3).

(5) Let  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$  be a  $u$ - $S$ -exact sequence. Then, as in the proof of (3), there are three short exact sequences:  $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(f) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Im}(f) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}(g) \rightarrow B \rightarrow \text{Im}(g) \rightarrow 0$  and  $0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(g) \rightarrow C \rightarrow \text{Coker}(g) \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $\text{Ker}(f)$  and  $\text{Coker}(g)$  are all  $u$ - $S$ -torsion and  $s\text{Ker}(g) \subseteq \text{Im}(f)$  and  $s\text{Im}(f) \subseteq \text{Ker}(g)$  for some  $s \in S$ . Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Note that

$$\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(f)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, A) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(f)) \rightarrow M \otimes_R \text{Ker}(f)$$

is exact. Since  $\text{Ker}(f)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, then  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(f))$  and  $M \otimes_R \text{Ker}(f)$  are  $u$ - $S$ -torsion by Corollary 2.6. It just need to verify  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Im}(f))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. By the proof of (3), we just need to show  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(g))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Since

$$\text{Tor}_2^R(M, \text{Im}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, \text{Ker}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, B)$$

is exact and  $\text{Tor}_1^R(M, B)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, we just need to show  $\text{Tor}_2^R(M, \text{Im}(g))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Note that

$$\text{Tor}_3^R(M, \text{Coker}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_2^R(M, \text{Im}(g)) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_2^R(M, C)$$

is exact. Since  $\text{Coker}(g)$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion and  $C$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat, we have  $\text{Tor}_3^R(M, \text{Coker}(g))$  and  $\text{Tor}_2^R(M, C)$  are  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. So  $\text{Tor}_2^R(M, \text{Im}(g))$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion.  $\square$

*Remark 3.5.* It is well known that any direct limit of flat modules is flat. However, every direct limit of  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules is not  $u$ - $S$ -flat. Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  be the ring of integers,  $p$  a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $S = \{p^n \mid n \geq 0\}$  as in Example 3.3. Let  $F_n = \mathbb{Z}/\langle p^n \rangle$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. Then  $F_n$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, and thus  $u$ - $S$ -flat. Note that each  $F_n$  is isomorphic to  $M_n = \{\frac{a}{p^n} + \mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . It is easy to verify  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} M_n \cong \lim_{\rightarrow} F_n$ . However,  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -flat (see Example 3.3).

It is also worth noting infinite direct sums of  $u$ - $S$ -flat modules need not be  $u$ - $S$ -flat. Let  $M_n = \{\frac{a}{p^n} + \mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z} \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  as above. Then  $M_n$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat. Set  $N = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n$ . Then  $N$  is a torsion module. Thus  $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}, N) = N$  by [4, Chapter I, Lemma 6.2(b)]. It can similarly be deduced from the proof of Example 2.2 that  $N$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. Thus  $N$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -flat.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . If  $F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat over a ring  $R$ , then  $F_S$  is flat over  $R_S$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $I_S$  be a finitely generated ideal of  $R_S$ , where  $I$  is a finitely generated ideal of  $R$ . Then there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $s\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F) = 0$ . Thus  $0 = \mathrm{Tor}_1^R(R/I, F)_S \cong \mathrm{Tor}_1^{R_S}(R_S/I_S, F_S)$ . So  $F_S$  is flat over  $R_S$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.7.* Note that the converse of Corollary 3.6 does not hold. Consider  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $M = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$  in Example 2.2. Let  $S = \{p^n \mid n \geq 0\}$ . Then  $M_S = 0$  and thus is flat over  $\mathbb{Z}_S$ . However,  $M$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -flat over  $\mathbb{Z}$  (see Example 3.3).

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $F$  an  $R$ -module. Let  $S$  be a multiplicative subset of  $R$  consisting of finite elements. Then  $F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat over a ring  $R$  if and only if  $F_S$  is flat over  $R_S$ .*

*Proof.* We just need to show that if  $F_S$  is flat over  $R_S$ , then  $F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat over a ring  $R$ . Let  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence over  $R$ . By tensoring  $F$ , we have an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow A \otimes_R F \xrightarrow{f \otimes_R F} B \otimes_R F \rightarrow C \otimes_R F \rightarrow 0$  where  $T$  is the kernel of  $f \otimes_R F$ . By tensoring  $R_S$ , we have an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow T_S \rightarrow A_S \otimes_{R_S} F_S \rightarrow B_S \otimes_{R_S} F_S \rightarrow C_S \otimes_{R_S} F_S \rightarrow 0$  over  $R_S$ . Since  $F_S$  is flat over  $R_S$ ,  $T_S = 0$ . Thus  $T$  is  $S$ -torsion. By Proposition 2.3,  $T$  is  $u$ - $S$ -torsion. So  $F$  is  $u$ - $S$ -flat over a ring  $R$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime ideal of  $R$ . We say an  $R$ -module  $F$  is  $u$ - $\mathfrak{p}$ -flat shortly provided that  $F$  is  $u$ - $(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ -flat.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $F$  an  $R$ -module. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $F$  is flat;
- (2)  $F$  is  $u$ - $\mathfrak{p}$ -flat for any  $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ ;
- (3)  $F$  is  $u$ - $\mathfrak{m}$ -flat for any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{Max}(R)$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) : Trivial.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) : Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then  $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, F)$  is  $(R \setminus \mathfrak{m})$ -torsion. Thus for any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{Max}(R)$ , there exists  $s_{\mathfrak{m}} \in S$  such that  $s_{\mathfrak{m}}\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, F) = 0$ . Since the ideal generated by all  $s_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is  $R$ ,  $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, F) = 0$ . So  $F$  is flat.  $\square$

Recall that a ring  $R$  is called *von Neumann regular* provided that for any  $a \in R$ , there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $a = ra^2$ . One of the main topics is the  $S$ -analogue of von Neumann regular rings. In order to study further, we will characterize when a ring  $R_S$  is von Neumann regular in the next result.

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $R_S$  is a von Neumann regular ring;

- (2) any principal ideal of  $R$  is  $S$ -generated by an idempotent;
- (3) any  $S$ -finite ideal of  $R$  is  $S$ -generated by an idempotent;
- (4) for any  $a \in R$ , there exist  $s \in S$  and  $r \in R$  such that  $sa = ra^2$ ;
- (5) any  $R_S$ -module is flat over  $R_S$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (5) : It is well known. (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) : Trivial.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) : Let  $a \in R$ . Then there exists  $\frac{r_1}{s_1} \in R_S$  such that  $\frac{a}{1} = \frac{r_1}{s_1} \frac{a^2}{1}$ . Thus there exists  $s_2 \in S$  such that  $s_1 s_2 a = s_2 r_1 a^2$ . Set  $s = s_1 s_2$  and  $r = s_2 r_1$ , (4) holds naturally.

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) : Let  $\frac{a}{s}$  be an element in  $R_S$ . Then there are  $s' \in S$  and  $x \in R$  such that  $s'a = xa^2$ . Thus  $\frac{a}{s} = \frac{sx}{s'} (\frac{a}{s})^2$ . So  $R_S$  is a von Neumann regular ring.

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) : Let  $\langle a \rangle$  be a principal ideal of  $R$ . Then there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $sa = ra^2$  for some  $r \in R$ . Set  $e = ra$ . Then  $se = e^2$  and  $e \in \langle a \rangle$ . Since  $sa = ea \in \langle e \rangle$ , we have  $s\langle a \rangle \subseteq \langle e \rangle \subseteq \langle a \rangle$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) : Let  $K$  be an  $S$ -finite ideal and  $I = Ra_1 + \cdots + Ra_n$  be a finitely generated sub-ideal of  $I$  such that  $s'K \subseteq I$  for some  $s' \in S$ . By (2), for each  $i$  there is an idempotent  $e_i \in Ra_i$  such that  $s_i \langle a_i \rangle \subseteq \langle e_i \rangle$  for some  $s_i \in S$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ). Set  $s = s' s_1 \cdots s_n$ . Then  $s \langle a_i \rangle \subseteq \langle e_i \rangle$ . Set  $J = Re_1 + \cdots + Re_n$ . Then  $J$  is a sub-ideal of  $I$  (thus of  $K$ ) such that  $sK \subseteq s_1 \cdots s_n I \subseteq J$ . Claim that  $J$  is generated by an idempotent. Indeed, for any  $x \in J$ , we have  $x = r_1 e_1 + \cdots + r_n e_n = r_1 e_1^2 + \cdots + r_n e_n^2 \in J^2$ . Thus  $J^2 = J$ . Since  $J$  is finitely generated,  $J = \langle e \rangle$  for some idempotent  $e \in I$  by [12, Theorem 1.8.22].

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) : Let  $a \in R$ . Then there is an idempotent  $e$  such that  $s\langle a \rangle \subseteq \langle e \rangle \subseteq \langle a \rangle$ . If  $e = ba$  for some  $b \in R$ , then  $e = e^2 = b^2 a^2$ . Thus  $sa = ce = cb^2 a^2$  for some  $cb^2 \in R$ . So (4) holds.  $\square$

Recall from [3] that a ring  $R$  is called  $c$ - $S$ -coherent if any  $S$ -finite ideal  $I$  is  $c$ - $S$ -finitely presented, that is, there exists a finitely presented sub-ideal  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $sI \subseteq J \subseteq I$ . By Proposition 3.10, the following result holds since any ideal generated by an idempotent is projective, and thus is finitely presented .

**Corollary 3.11.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . If  $R_S$  is a von Neumann regular ring, then  $R$  is  $c$ - $S$ -coherent.*

It is certain that for a ring  $R$  such that  $R_S$  is von Neumann regular, the element  $s \in S$  such that  $sa = ra^2$  for some  $r \in R$  depends on  $a \in R$  by Proposition 3.10. Now we give the definition of  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring for which the element  $s \in S$  is uniform on any element  $a \in R$ .

**Definition 3.12.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ .  $R$  is called a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring (abbreviates uniformly  $S$ -von Neumann regular ring)*

provided there exists an element  $s \in S$  satisfying that for any  $a \in R$  there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $sa = ra^2$ .

Let  $\{M_j\}_{j \in \Gamma}$  be a family of  $R$ -modules. Let  $\{m_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda_j} \subseteq M_j$  for each  $j \in \Gamma$  and  $N_j = \langle m_{i,j}\rangle_{i \in \Lambda_j}$ . We say a family of  $R$ -modules  $\{M_j\}_{j \in \Gamma}$  is  $u$ - $S$ -generated by  $\{\{m_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda_j}\}_{j \in \Gamma}$  provided that there exists an element  $s \in S$  such that  $sM_j \subseteq N_j$  for each  $j \in \Gamma$ . It is well known that a ring  $R$  is a von Neumann regular ring if and only if every  $R$ -module is flat, if and only if any principal (finitely generated) ideal is generated by an idempotent (see [12, Theorem 3.6.3]). Now we give an  $S$ -analogue of this result.

**Theorem 3.13.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring;
- (2) for any  $R$ -module  $M$  and  $N$ , there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(M, N) = 0$ ;
- (3) there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, R/J) = 0$  for any ideals  $I$  and  $J$  of  $R$ ;
- (4) there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, R/J) = 0$  for any  $S$ -finite ideals  $I$  and  $J$  of  $R$ ;
- (5) there exists  $s \in S$  such that  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/\langle a \rangle, R/\langle a \rangle) = 0$  for any element  $a \in R$ ;
- (6) any  $R$ -module is  $u$ - $S$ -flat;
- (7) the class of all principal ideals of  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -generated by idempotents;
- (8) the class of all finitely generated ideals of  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -generated by idempotents.

*Proof.* (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (5) : It follows from the equivalences:  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/\langle a \rangle, R/\langle a \rangle) = 0$  if and only if  $\frac{s\langle a \rangle}{\langle a^2 \rangle} = 0$ , if and only if there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $sa = ra^2$ .

(2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (6), (8)  $\Rightarrow$  (7) and (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (5) : Trivial.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Set  $M = N = \bigoplus_{I \triangleleft R} R/I$ . Then (3) holds naturally.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) : Suppose  $M$  is generated by  $\{m_i \mid i \in \Gamma\}$  and  $N$  is generated by  $\{n_i \mid i \in \Lambda\}$ . Well-order  $\Gamma$  and  $\Lambda$ . Set  $M_0 = 0$  and  $M_\alpha = \langle m_i \mid i < \alpha \rangle$  for each  $\alpha \leq \Gamma$ . Then  $M$  have a continuous filtration  $\{M_\alpha \mid \alpha \leq \Gamma\}$  with  $M_{\alpha+1}/M_\alpha \cong R/I_{\alpha+1}$  and  $I_\alpha = \text{Ann}_R(m_\alpha + M_\alpha \cap Rm_\alpha)$ . Similarly  $N$  has a continuous filtration  $\{N_\beta \mid \beta \leq \Lambda\}$  with  $N_{\beta+1}/N_\beta \cong R/J_{\beta+1}$  and  $J_\beta = \text{Ann}_R(n_\beta + N_\beta \cap Rn_\beta)$ . Since  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I_\alpha, R/J_\beta) = 0$  for each  $\alpha \leq \Gamma$  and  $\beta \leq \Lambda$ , it is easy to verify  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(M, N) = 0$  by transfinite induction on both positions of  $M$  and  $N$ .

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) : By [12, Exercise 3.20], we have  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, R/J) = \frac{s(I \cap J)}{IJ}$  for any ideals  $I$  and  $J$  of  $R$ . So we just need to show  $s(I \cap J) \subseteq IJ$ . Let  $a \in I \cap J$ . Since  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/\langle a \rangle, R/\langle a \rangle) = \frac{s\langle a \rangle}{\langle a^2 \rangle} = 0$ , it follows that  $sa \in s\langle a \rangle \subseteq \langle a^2 \rangle \subseteq IJ$ . Thus  $s\text{Tor}_1^R(R/I, R/J) = 0$ .

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (7) : Let  $s$  be an element in  $S$  such that  $sa = ra^2$  for some  $r \in R$  and any  $a \in R$ . Set  $e = ra$ . Then  $se = e^2$  and  $e \in \langle a \rangle$ . Since  $sa = ea \in \langle e \rangle$ , we have  $s\langle a \rangle \subseteq \langle e \rangle \subseteq \langle a \rangle$  for any  $a \in R$ .

(7)  $\Rightarrow$  (8) : Let  $\{I_j = Ra_{1,j} + \cdots + Ra_{n_j,j} \mid j \in \Gamma\}$  be the family of all finitely generated ideals of  $R$ . By (3), there exists an element  $s \in S$  such that for each  $j \in \Gamma$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n_j$  there is an idempotent  $e_{i,j} \in Ra_{i,j}$  such that  $s\langle a_{i,j} \rangle \subseteq \langle e_{i,j} \rangle$ . Set  $J_j = Re_{1,j} + \cdots + Re_{n_j,j}$ . Then  $J_j$  is a sub-ideal of  $I_j$  such that  $sJ_j \subseteq I_j \subseteq J_j$ . Claim that  $J_j$  is generated by an idempotent. Indeed, for any  $x \in J_j$ , we have  $x = r_1e_1 + \cdots + r_n e_n = r_1e_1^2 + \cdots + r_n e_n^2 \in J_j^2$ . Thus  $J_j^2 = J_j$ . Since  $J_j$  is finitely generated,  $J_j = \langle e_j \rangle$  for some idempotent  $e_j \in I_j$  by [12, Theorem 1.8.22]. So  $\{I_j \mid j \in \Gamma\}$  is  $u$ - $S$ -generated by  $\{\langle e_j \rangle \mid j \in \Gamma\}$ .

(7)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) : There are an element  $s \in S$  and a family of idempotents  $\{e_a \mid a \in R\}$  such that  $s\langle a \rangle \subseteq \langle e_a \rangle \subseteq \langle a \rangle$  for any  $a \in R$ . Write  $e_a = ba$  for some  $b \in R$ . Then  $e_a = e_a^2 = b^2a^2$ . Thus  $sa = ce_a = cb^2a^2$  for some  $cb^2 \in R$ . So  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.14.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . If  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring, then  $R_S$  is a von Neumann regular ring. Consequently, any  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring is  $c$ - $S$ -coherent.*

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 3.10, Corollary 3.11 and Theorem 3.13.  $\square$

Note that a ring  $R$  such that  $R_S$  is von Neumann regular is not necessary  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular.

**Example 3.15.** *Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  be the ring of all integers,  $S = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $\mathbb{Z}_S = \mathbb{Q}$  is a von Neumann regular ring. Let  $p$  be a prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $M = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $\text{Tor}_1^{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z}$  by [4, Chapter I, Lemma 6.2(b)]. It is easy to verify that  $n\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}/\mathbb{Z} \neq 0$  for any  $n \in S$ . Thus  $M$  is not  $u$ - $S$ -torsion, and so  $\mathbb{Z}$  is not a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring.*

**Corollary 3.16.** *Let  $R$  be a ring. Let  $S$  be a multiplicative subset of  $R$  consisting of finite elements. Then  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring if and only if  $R_S$  is a von Neumann regular ring.*

*Proof.* We just need to show that if  $R_S$  is a von Neumann regular ring then  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring. Let  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ . Set  $s = s_1 \cdots s_n$ . By Proposition 3.10, for any  $a \in R$ , there exists  $s_i \in S$  and  $r_a \in R$  such that  $s_i a = r_a a^2$ . Thus  $sa = ra^2$  for any  $a \in R$  and some  $r \in R$ .  $\square$

Since every flat module is  $u$ - $S$ -flat, von Neumann regular rings are  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular. The following result shows  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular rings are always

von Neumann regular provided  $S$  is a regular multiplicative set, i.e., the multiplicative set  $S$  is composed of non-zero-divisors.

**Proposition 3.17.** *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $S$  a regular multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Then  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular if and only if  $R$  is von Neumann regular.*

*Proof.* We just need to show if  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular, then  $R$  is von Neumann regular. Suppose  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring. Then there exists  $s \in S$  such that for any  $a \in R$  there exists  $r \in R$  satisfying  $sa = ra^2$ . Taking  $a = s^2$ , we have  $s^3 = rs^4$ . Since  $s$  is a non-zero-divisor of  $R$ , we have  $1 = sr$ . Thus  $s$  is a unit. So for any  $a \in R$  there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $a = (s^{-1}r)a^2$ . It follows that  $R$  is a von Neumann regular ring.  $\square$

However, the condition that “any element in  $S$  is a non-zero-divisor” in Proposition 3.17 cannot be removed. Let  $R$  be any ring and  $S$  a multiplicative subset of  $R$  containing a nilpotent element. Then  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring. Indeed, let  $s$  be a nilpotent element in  $R$  with nilpotent index  $n$ . Then  $0 = s^n \in S$ . Thus for any  $a \in R$ , we have  $0a = 0a^2 = 0$ . So  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular. If the multiplicative subset  $S$  of  $R$  does not contain 0, the condition that “any element in  $S$  is a non-zero-divisor” in Corollary 3.17 also cannot be removed.

**Example 3.18.** *Let  $T = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  be a semi-simple ring and  $s = (1, 0) \in T$ . Then any element  $a \in T$  satisfies  $a^2 = a$  and  $2a = 0$ . Let  $R = T[x]/\langle sx, x^2 \rangle$  with  $x$  the indeterminate and  $S = \{1, s\}$  be a multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Then  $R$  is a  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular ring, but  $R$  is not von Neumann regular. Indeed, let  $r = a + b\bar{x}$  be any element in  $R$ , where  $\bar{x}$  is the residual element of  $x$  in  $R$  and  $a, b \in T$ . Then  $sr = s(a + b\bar{x}) = sa = sa^2 = s(a^2 + 2ab\bar{x} + b^2\bar{x}^2) = s(a + b\bar{x})^2 = sr^2$ . Thus  $R$  is  $u$ - $S$ -von Neumann regular. However, since  $R$  is not reduced,  $R$  is not von Neumann regular by [12, Theorem 3.6.16(2), Exercise 3.48].*

Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime ideal of  $R$ . We say a ring  $R$  is a  $u$ - $\mathfrak{p}$ -von Neumann regular ring shortly provided  $R$  is an  $u$ - $(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ -von Neumann regular ring. The final result gives a new local characterization of von Neumann regular rings.

**Proposition 3.19.** *Let  $R$  be a ring. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $R$  is a von Neumann regular ring;
- (2)  $R$  is a  $u$ - $\mathfrak{p}$ -von Neumann regular ring for any  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$ ;
- (3)  $R$  is a  $u$ - $\mathfrak{m}$ -von Neumann regular ring for any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) : Let  $F$  be an  $R$ -module and  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$ . Then  $F$  is flat, and thus  $u$ - $\mathfrak{m}$ -flat. So  $R$  is an  $u$ - $\mathfrak{m}$ -von Neumann regular ring.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) : Trivial.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) : Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module. Then  $M$  is  $\mathfrak{m}$ -flat for any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$ . Thus  $M$  is flat by Proposition 3.9. So  $R$  is a von Neumann regular ring.  $\square$

### Acknowledgement.

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

### REFERENCES

- [1] D. D. Anderson, T. Dumitrescu, *S-Noetherian rings*, Commun. Algebra **30** (2002), 4407-4416.
- [2] S. Bazzoni, L. Positselski, *S-almost perfect commutative rings*, J. Algebra **532** (2019), 323-356.
- [3] D. Bennis, M. El Hajoui, *On S-coherence*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **55** (2018), no. 6, 1499-1512.
- [4] L. Fuchs, L. Salce, *Modules over Non-Noetherian Domains*, Providence, AMS, 2001.
- [5] S. Glaz, *Commutative Coherent Rings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. **1371**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [6] J. S. Golan, *Torsion Theories*, Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics Series, Vol. 29, New York, Longman Scientific and Technical, 1986.
- [7] H. Kim, M. O. Kim, J. W. Lim, *On S-strong Mori domains*, J. Algebra **416**, (2014): 314-332.
- [8] J. W. Lim, *A note on S-Noetherian domains*, Kyungpook Math. J. **55**, (2015), 507-514.
- [9] J. W. Lim, D. Y. Oh, *S-Noetherian properties on amalgamated algebras along an ideal*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **218**, (2014), 2099-2123.
- [10] C. Năstăsescu, C. Nita, *Objects noethériens par rapport à une sous-catégorie épaisse d'une catégorie abélienne*, Rev. Roum. Math. Pures et Appl. **9**, (1965), 1459-1468.
- [11] B. Stenström, *Rings of Quotients*, Die Grundlehren Der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Berlin: Springer-verlag, 1975.
- [12] F. G. Wang, H. Kim, *Foundations of Commutative Rings and Their Modules*, Singapore, Springer, 2016.