

THE CONDUCTOR IDEALS OF MAXIMAL SUBRINGS IN NON-COMMUTATIVE RINGS

ALBORZ AZARANG

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematical Sciences and Computer,
Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz-Iran
a_azarang@scu.ac.ir
ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-9598-2411

ABSTRACT. Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T , and $(R : T)$, $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ denote the greatest ideal, left ideal and right ideal of T which are contained in R , respectively. It is shown that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime ideals of R and $|\text{Min}_R((R : T))| \leq 2$. We prove that if T_R has a maximal submodule, then $(R : T)_l$ is a right primitive ideal of R . We investigate that when $(R : T)_r$ is a completely prime (right) ideal of R or T . If R is integrally closed in T , then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime one-sided ideals of T . We observe that if $(R : T)_l T = T$, then T is a finitely generated left R -module and $(R : T)_l$ is a finitely generated right R -module. We prove that $\text{Char}(R/(R : T)_l) = \text{Char}(R/(R : T)_r)$, and if $\text{Char}(T)$ is neither zero or a prime number, then $(R : T) \neq 0$. If $|\text{Min}(R)| \geq 3$, then $(R : T)$ and $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r$ are nonzero ideals. Finally we study the Noetherian and the Artinian properties between R and T .

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. In [11], Frerand and Oliver studied minimal ring extension of commutative rings. Note that whenever $R \subseteq T$ is a minimal ring extension (i.e., R is a maximal subring of T), then the integral closure of R in T , say S , is a subring between R and T and therefore by the minimality of the extension we infer that either $S = R$ (i.e., R is integrally closed in T) or $S = T$ (i.e., T is integral over R , equivalently T is a finitely generated R -module). They proved that T is integral over R if and only if $(R : T) \in \text{Max}(R)$, see [11, Proposition 4.1]. Moreover, if R is integrally closed in T , then $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of T , [11, Lemma 3.2]. Hence in any cases we deduce that $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of R .

In this paper, motivated by the previous results, we are interested to study the conductor ideals of minimal ring extension in non-commutative rings. More exactly, if $R \subseteq T$ is a minimal ring extension of rings, i.e., R is a maximal subring of T (where T is an arbitrary ring which is not necessary commutative), then we would like to study the properties of $(R : T)$, the largest ideal of T which is contained in R , $(R : T)_l$, the largest left ideal of T which is contained in R , and $(R : T)_r$, the largest right ideal of T which is contained in R . For example, we proved that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime ideals of R .

It is interesting to know that each ring R can be considered as a maximal subring of a larger ring T , see [1, Theorem 3.7]. Note that if T is a ring and A be a one-sided ideal of T , then the idealizer of A in T is the largest subring of T , which A is a two-sided ideal of it. More exactly, if A is a right ideal of T , then the idealizer of A is the subring $\mathbb{I}_T(A) := \{r \in T \mid rA \subseteq A\}$. By this definition we have the following facts:

- Theorem 1.1.**
- (1) [1, Theorem 4.1]. *Let T be a ring and A be a maximal right/left ideal of T which is not a two-sided ideal of T . Then the idealizer of A is a maximal subring of T . In particular, either a ring has a maximal subring or is a quasi duo ring (i.e., each maximal left/right ideal is two-sided).*
 - (2) [1, Proposition 4.2]. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T which contains a maximal one-sided ideal A of T which is not a two-sided ideal of T . Then R is the idealizer of A in T .*
 - (3) [1, Theorem 4.4]. *Let T be a ring which is not a division ring. If either T is a simple ring or a left/right primitive ring, then T has a maximal subring.*

In particular, if a ring T has no maximal subring, then T is a right primitive ring if and only if T is a left primitive ring. Moreover, if T has no maximal subring, then the following sets of ideals of T are coincided:

the set of all maximal right/left ideals, the set of all left/right primitive ideals, the set of all maximal ideals.

In particular, for each M in any of the above sets, $\frac{T}{M}$ is a division ring, and $J(T) = \bigcap_{M \in Max(T)} M$.

In [5, 6, 15, 16, 20], the authors proved that if R is a maximal subring of a ring T and R is a finite ring, then T is finite too. In [3, Theorem 3.8], it is shown that if R is a maximal subring of a commutative ring T , then R is Artinian if and only if T is Artinian and is integral over R , which immediately implies the latter facts for commutative rings. It is clear that, if R is a maximal subring of a commutative ring T , then T is Noetherian whenever R is Noetherian, for $T = R[\alpha]$, for each $\alpha \in T \setminus R$ and use the Hilbert Basis Theorem. Motivated by these results in commutative case, we are interested to study (left/right) Artinian and (left/right) Noetherian properties in minimal ring extension of non-commutative rings too.

Finally, we refer the reader to [8, 9, 12, 13, 7, 26], for minimal ring extension of commutative rings and [10] for non-commutative case. Also, we refer the reader to [23, 2, 3, 4] for maximal subrings in commutative rings and [1] for maximal subrings of non-commutative rings.

1.2. Review of the results. Assume that R is a maximal subring of a ring T . We prove that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime ideals of R . Moreover $Min_R((R : T)) \subseteq \{(R : T)_l, (R : T)_r\}$ and in fact $|Min_R((R : T))| = 1$ if and only if $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are comparable if and only if $(R : T)$ is prime ideal of R (which means either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$ or $(R : T) = (R : T)_r$). In particular, if R is a zero-dimensional ring (that is each prime ideal of R is maximal), then either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ or $(R : T)_l + (R : T)_r = R$. We show that if T/R as right R -module has a maximal submodule (in particular, if T_R is finitely generated), then $(R : T)_l$ is a right primitive ideal of R . Conversely, we observe that if either $(R : T)_l \in Max_r(R)$ or R is a right Artinian ring, then T/R has a maximal right R -submodule. We investigate whether $(R : T)_r$ is a completely prime (right) ideal of T or of R . In particular, if $(R : T)_r$ is a completely prime right ideal of T , then $(R : T)_r$ is a completely prime ideal of R (that is $R/(R : T)_r$ is a domain) and $T/(R : T)_r$ is a torsionfree left $R/(R : T)_r$ -module; conversely if $T/(R : T)_r$ is a torsionfree left $R/(R : T)_l$ -module, then either $(R : T)_r$ is an ideal of T or $(R : T)_r$ is a completely prime right ideal of T and R is the idealizer of $(R : T)_r$ in T . Moreover, if R is right Artinian and $(R : T)_r$ is a completely prime right ideal of T , then either R/P or T/P is a division ring. We prove that the ring $End((T/R)_R)$ and therefore the ring $End_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)$ contains a copy of $R/(R : T)_r$. Consequently, the ring $End_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)$ contains a copies of $R/(R : T)_r$ and $R/(R : T)_l$. In particular, the characteristic of the ring $End_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)$ is either zero or a prime number and thus $Char(R/(R : T)_l) = Char(R/(R : T)_r)$. We show that if $Char(T)$ is not a prime number, then either there exists a prime number p such that $pT \subseteq (R : T)$ (and therefore $(R : T) \neq 0$) or $Char(T) = Char(End_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)) = 0$. In particular, if $Char(T)$ is neither zero or a prime number, then $(R : T) \neq 0$. We prove that either R contains $C_T(R)$ (and therefore $C(T)$) or $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ and there exists $\alpha \in T$ such that $T = R[\alpha]$ and for each $r \in R$, $r\alpha = \alpha r$. We show that if $(R : T)_l T = T$, then T is a finitely generated left R -module, $(R : T)_l$ is a finitely generated right ideal of R and R is the idealizer of $(R : T)_l$. In particular, if $(R : T) \in Max(T) \setminus Spec(R)$, then ${}_R T$, T_R , $(R : T)_l$ as right ideal of R and $(R : T)_r$ as left ideal of R , are all finitely generated. Consequently, if $(R : T) \in Max(T)$ and R is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian), then either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$ or T is a right Noetherian (resp. Artinian) ring. We prove that if $|Min(R)| \geq 3$, then $(R : T)$ and $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r$ are nonzero ideals of R . We show that if R is (2-)integrally closed in T , then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime one-sided ideals of T . In particular, in this case $(R : T)$ is a semiprime ideal of T and either $(R : T)$ is a prime or semiprime ideal of R . We show that if R is a Noetherian (resp. an Artinian) ring and $(R : T) \neq 0$, then $T/l.ann_T((R : T)_l)$ and $T/r.ann_T((R : T)_r)$ are left and right Noetherian (resp. Artinian) rings, respectively. Moreover, if in addition T is semiprime, then $T/ann_T((R : T))$ is a Noetherian (resp. an Artinian) ring. In particular, if T is prime, then T is finitely generated as left and right R -modules and consequently T is a Noetherian (resp. an Artinian) ring. Finally, if R is a Noetherian ring, T is not a prime ring and R contains a prime ideal Q of T , then either T is Noetherian or $Q = (R : T)$ (therefore Q is unique), Q is a minimal prime ideal of T and either $Q = (R : T)_l$ or $Q = (R : T)_r$.

1.3. Notations and Definitions. All rings in this paper are unital and all subrings, modules and homomorphisms are also unital. If $R \subsetneq T$ is a ring extension and there exists no other subring between

R and T , then R is called a maximal subring of T , or the extension $R \subseteq T$ is called a minimal ring extension. If T is a ring and R and S be subrings of T , then clearly T is a (R, S) -bimodule and therefore we can consider (R, S) -subbimodule of T . In particular, if $t \in T$, then the (R, S) -subbimodule of T which is generated by t is denoted by $RtS = \{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i t s_i \mid r_i \in R, s_i \in S, n \geq 0\}$. It is clear that if $R \subseteq S$ and $t \in S$, then $R + RtS$ and $R + StR$ are also subrings of T which contains R . In particular, for each $t \in T$, the subrings $R + RtT$ and $R + TtR$ of T contain R . More generally, if I is left (resp. right) ideal of T , then $R + IR$ (resp. $R + RI$) is a subring of T which contains R . If T is a ring, I is an ideal of T and M is a left (resp. right) T -module, then $Min_T(I)$, $Max_r(T)$, $Max_l(T)$, $Max(T)$, $l.ann_T(M)$ (resp. $r.ann_T(M)$) denote the set of all minimal prime ideals of I in T , the set of all maximal left ideals of T , the set of all maximal right ideals of T , the set of all maximal ideals of T , the left annihilator of M in T (resp. the right annihilator of M in T), respectively. We use $Min(T)$ for $Min_T(0)$. $J(T)$ denotes the Jacobson radical of a ring T and for an ideal I of T , we denote the prime radical of I by $rad_T(I)$. The characteristic of a ring T is denoted by $Char(T)$. If X is a subset of a ring T , then $C_T(X)$ is the centralizer of X in T , in particular, $C(T) = C_T(T)$ is the center of T . A ring T is called left (resp. right) quasi duo if each maximal left (resp. right) ideal of T is a two-sided ideal of T , see [19]. T is called quasi duo if T is left and right quasi duo ring. A ring T is called left (resp. right) duo if each left (resp. right) ideal of T is two-sided. Similarly duo rings are defined. If R is a subring of a ring T and $t \in T$, then we say that t is left (resp. right) n -integral over R if t is a root of a left (resp. right) monic polynomial of degree n over R ($n \geq 1$). R is called left (resp. right) n -integrally closed in T , if every left (resp. right) n -integral element of T over R belongs to R . R is called n -integrally closed in T whenever R is left and right integrally closed in T . R is called left (resp. right) integrally closed in T , if R is left (resp. right) n -integrally closed in T , for each n . R is integrally closed in T , if R is left and right integrally closed in T . For other notations and definitions we refer the reader to [14, 17, 18, 22, 25].

2. THE CONDUCTOR IDEALS OF MAXIMAL SUBRINGS

Let $R \subseteq T$ be a ring extension, then we have three type of conductor ideals: $(R : T) := \{x \in T \mid TxT \subseteq R\}$, $(R : T)_l := \{x \in T \mid Tx \subseteq R\}$, $(R : T)_r := \{x \in T \mid xT \subseteq R\}$. In other words, $(R : T)$ is the largest common ideal between R and T , $(R : T)_l$ (resp. $(R : T)_r$) is the largest common left (resp. right) ideal between R and T . It is clear that $(R : T)_l = r.ann_R((\frac{T}{R})_R)$ and therefore $(R : T)_l$ is a two sided ideal of R . Finally note that $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$. In particular, if $R \neq T$, then $(R : T)_l + (R : T)_r \neq T$. Now we want prove some generalization of the results in [11]. Let us first review some fact from [11]. If T is a commutative ring and R is a maximal subring of R , then $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of R . In fact, since R' , the integral closure of R in T , is a ring between R and T , then by maximality of R either $R' = T$, i.e., T is integral over R (equivalently T is a finitely generated R -module) or $R' = R$, i.e., R is integrally closed in T . Moreover, T is integral over R if and only if $(R : T) \in Max(R)$ (and therefore is a prime ideal of R); and if R is integrally closed in T , then $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of T and therefore is a prime ideal of R (moreover for each $x, y \in T$, if $xy \in R$, then $x \in R$ or $y \in R$). Hence in any cases, $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of R . Now the following is in order.

Theorem 2.1. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . Then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime ideals of R .*

Proof. Let $a, b \in R$ and $aRb \subseteq (R : T)_l$. Thus $TaRb \subseteq R$. Now assume that $a \notin (R : T)_l$, i.e., $Ta \not\subseteq R$. Thus $TaR \not\subseteq R$. Since R is a maximal subring of T we conclude that $R + TaR = T$ and thus $Tb = Rb + TaRb \subseteq R$, i.e., $b \in (R : T)_l$. Hence $(R : T)_l$ is a prime ideal of R . Similarly $(R : T)_r$ is a prime ideal of R . \square

Now we have the following immediate result.

Corollary 2.2. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . Then the following hold:*

- (1) $rad_R((R : T)) = (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$.
- (2) $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of R if and only if either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$ or $(R : T) = (R : T)_r$ if and only if $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are comparable.
- (3) $|Min_R((R : T))| \leq 2$. In fact, $|Min_R((R : T))| = 1$ if and only if $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are comparable. Otherwise $Min_R((R : T)) = \{(R : T)_l, (R : T)_r\}$ and either $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of T or there exist Q_l and Q_r in $Min_T((R : T))$ such that $Q_l \cap R = (R : T)_l$, $Q_r \cap R = (R : T)_r$, $R/(R : T)_l \cong T/Q_l$ and $R/(R : T)_r \cong T/Q_r$; moreover, if R is a zero-dimensional ring, then Q_l and Q_r are distinct maximal ideal of T .
- (4) $(R : T)$ is a semiprime ideal of R if and only if $(R : T) = (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$.

- (5) If R is a zero dimensional ring, then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are maximal ideals of R . Hence either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ or $(R : T)_l + (R : T)_r = R$.
- (6) $(R : T) = r.\text{ann}_T(T/(R : T)_r) = l.\text{ann}_T(T/(R : T)_l) = l.\text{ann}_R(T/(R : T)_l) = r.\text{ann}_R(T/(R : T)_r)$. In particular, if $(R : T)_l \in \text{Max}_l(T)$ (resp. $(R : T)_r \in \text{Max}_r(T)$), then $(R : T)$ is a left (resp. right) primitive ideal of T (hence, in any cases, is a prime ideal of T).
- (7) If $(R : T) \in \text{Max}(R)$, then $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$.
- (8) If $J(R)$ is nilpotent (in particular, if R is a one-sided Artinian ring), then $J(R) \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$ and $J(R)^2 \subseteq (R : T)$.
- (9) If $\text{Nil}^*(R)$ is nilpotent (in particular, if R is a one-sided Noetherian ring), then $\text{Nil}^*(R) \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$ and $(\text{Nil}^*(R))^2 \subseteq (R : T)$.

Proof. Since $((R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r)^2 \subseteq (R : T)_l(R : T)_r \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$ and $(R : T)_l, (R : T)_r$ are prime ideals of R , we conclude that $\text{rad}_R((R : T)) = (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$. Hence (1) holds. The first part of (2) is evident. It is clear that if either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$ or $(R : T) = (R : T)_r$, then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are comparable. Conversely, suppose that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are comparable. For example let $(R : T)_l \subseteq (R : T)_r$. Let $x \in (R : T)_l$, therefore $Tx \subseteq (R : T)_l \subseteq (R : T)_r$. Thus $TxT \subseteq R$. Hence $x \in (R : T)$. Thus $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$. For (3), by the proof of (1) note that for each prime ideal Q of R which contains $(R : T)$, we have $(R : T)_l \subseteq Q$ or $(R : T)_r \subseteq Q$ and therefore $\text{Min}_R((R : T)) \subseteq \{(R : T)_l, (R : T)_r\}$. Hence $|\text{Min}_R((R : T))| = 1$ if and only if $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are comparable. For the next part of (3), assume that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are incomparable and therefore $\text{Min}_R((R : T)) = \{(R : T)_l, (R : T)_r\}$. Now note that if $A \subseteq B$ is a minimal ring extension with $(A : B) = 0$, and P is a minimal prime ideal of A , then either B is a prime ring or P is a contraction of a minimal prime ideal of B . To see this, note that $A \setminus P$, is a m -system in A and therefore in B , thus there exists a prime ideal Q of B such that $Q \cap A \subseteq P$. If $Q = 0$, then B is prime, otherwise $A + Q = B$, for A is a maximal subring of B and $(A : B) = 0$. Thus $A/(A \cap Q) \cong B/Q$ as rings. Hence $A \cap Q$ is a prime ideal of A and therefore $Q \cap A = P$, for P is minimal. Clearly we may assume that Q is a minimal prime of B . Applying this fact to the minimal ring extension $R/(R : T) \subseteq T/(R : T)$, we deduce that either $(R : T) \in \text{Spec}(T)$ or there exist minimal prime ideals Q_l and Q_r of $\text{Min}_T((R : T))$ such that $Q_l \cap R = (R : T)_l$ and $Q_r \cap R = (R : T)_r$. If $Q_l \subseteq R$, then $(R : T)_l \subseteq Q_l \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_r$ which is absurd. Thus Q_l , and similarly Q_r , are not contained in R . Thus by maximality of R we conclude that $R + Q_l = T = R + Q_r$ and therefore $R/(R : T)_l \cong T/Q_l$ and $R/(R : T)_r \cong T/Q_r$. Thus if R is a zero dimensional ring, then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are distinct maximal ideals of R . Hence Q_l and Q_r are maximal ideal of T . Since $R = (R : T)_l + (R : T)_r \subseteq Q_l + Q_r$, we conclude that $Q_l + Q_r = T$ and therefore $Q_l \neq Q_r$. (4) is evident by (1). (5) is clear. For (6), let $x \in T$ (or $x \in R$), then $x \in (R : T)$ if and only if $TxT \subseteq R$ if and only if $xT \subseteq (R : T)_l$ if and only if $x \in l.\text{ann}_T(T/(R : T)_l)$ (or $x \in l.\text{ann}_R(T/(R : T)_l)$), hence $(R : T) = l.\text{ann}_T(T/(R : T)_l) = l.\text{ann}_R(T/(R : T)_l)$. The proof of the other equalities of (6) are similar. The final part of (6) is obvious, for whenever $(R : T)_l \in \text{Max}_l(T)$, then $T/(R : T)_l$ is a simple left T -module and therefore $l.\text{ann}_T(T/(R : T)_l) = (R : T)$ is a left primitive ideal of T and hence a prime ideal of T . (7) is clear, for $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are proper ideals of R which contains $(R : T)$. Finally for (8) and (9), let I be a nilpotent one-sided ideal of R , then clearly $I \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$, for $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime ideals of R . Consequently, $I^2 \subseteq (R : T)_l(R : T)_r \subseteq (R : T)$. \square

Example 2.3. Let D be a division ring and $T = \mathbb{M}_2(D)$. It is not hard to see that $R = \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 \\ D & D \end{pmatrix}$ is a maximal subring of T . It is clear that $(R : T)_l = \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 \\ D & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $(R : T)_r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ D & D \end{pmatrix}$, hence $(R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ D & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq (R : T) = 0$. Also note that $(R : T) = 0$ is a prime (in fact maximal) ideal of T , but is not a prime ideal in R .

Lemma 2.4. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and M be a proper right R -submodule of T which contains R . Then $r.\text{ann}_R(T/M) = (R : T)_l$.*

Proof. Since $R \subseteq M$, we immediately conclude that $(R : T)_l \subseteq r.\text{ann}_R(T/M)$. Now assume that $x \in r.\text{ann}_R(T/M)$, but $x \notin (R : T)_l$. Thus $Tx \not\subseteq R$ and therefore $R + TxR = R$, for R is a maximal subring of T . Since $Tx \subseteq M$ and M is a right R -submodule of T , we deduce that $TxR \subseteq M$. Thus $T = R + TxR \subseteq M$ which is absurd. Thus we are done. \square

Now we have the following immediate fact.

Corollary 2.5. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . If T/R as right R -module has a maximal submodule, then $(R : T)_l$ is a right primitive ideal of R . In particular, if T/R (i.e. T_R) is a finitely generated right R -module, then $(R : T)_l$ is a right primitive ideal of R .*

Remark 2.6. The above corollary is a generalization of the commutative minimal ring extension. In fact, if T is a commutative ring and R is a maximal subring of T , then the following are equivalent:

- (1) T is integral over R (i.e., T is a finitely generated R -module).
- (2) $(R : T) \in \text{Max}(R)$.
- (3) T has a maximal R -submodule which contains R .
- (4) T/R is a semisimple $R/(R : T)$ -module.

To see this, note that (1) and (2) are equivalent by [11, Proposition 4.1]. Clearly, (1) implies (3), conversely (3) implies (2) by the previous corollary and the fact that in commutative ring maximal ideals and primitive ideals are coincided. Now assume that (2) holds. Thus T/R is an $R/(R : T)$ -module. Since $R/(R : T)$ is a field, we immediately conclude that T/R is a semisimple $R/(R : T)$ -submodule and therefore (4) holds. Finally, suppose that T/R is a semisimple $R/(R : T)$ -module, then T/R has a maximal R -submodule and hence (3) holds.

Corollary 2.7. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . If $(R : T)_l \in \text{Max}_r(R)$, then T has a maximal right R -submodule which contains R .*

In [3, Theorem 3.8], it is proved that if R is a maximal subring of a commutative ring T , then R is Artinian if and only if T is Artinian and is integral over R . An essential key for the proof of this fact, by the previous remark, is the fact that in this case $(R : T)$ is a maximal ideal of R . Now we have the following result.

Proposition 2.8. *Let R be a right Artinian ring which is a maximal subring of a ring T . Then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are maximal ideals of R . T/R as right $R/(R : T)_l$ -modules (resp. $R/(R : T)_r$) is an isotypic semisimple (and therefore has maximal submodules).*

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, $P := (R : T)_l$ is a prime ideal of R and since R is a right Artinian ring we immediately conclude that $R/P \cong \mathbb{M}_n(D)$, for some division ring D and natural number n . Hence R/P is a simple ring and therefore P is a maximal ideal of R . Also note that T/R is a nonzero right R/P -module. Thus T/R is a semisimple R/P -module. Finally note that since $R/P \cong \mathbb{M}_n(D)$, we immediately conclude that each simple component of T/R is isomorphic to other one. The proof for $(R : T)_r$ is similar. \square

Corollary 2.9. *Let R be a right Artinian local ring which is a maximal subring of a ring T . Then $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$.*

A proper right ideal P of a ring S is called completely prime right ideal if for each $a, b \in S$, whenever $aP \subseteq P$ and $ab \in P$, then $a \in P$ or $b \in P$, see [24]. A prime ideal of a ring S is called completely prime if S/P is a domain.

Proposition 2.10. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and $P = (R : T)_r$. If P is a completely prime right ideal of T , then R/P is a domain (i.e., P is a completely prime ideal of R) and T/P is a torsionfree left R/P -module. Conversely, if P is a completely prime ideal of R and T/P is a torsionfree left R/P -module, then either P is an ideal of T (and therefore $(R : T) = P$) or P is a completely prime right ideal of T and $R = \mathbb{I}_T(P)$.*

Proof. First assume that P is a completely prime right ideal of T . Let $a, b \in R$ and $ab \in P$. Since P is an ideal of R , we conclude that $aP \subseteq P$, therefore by the assumption $a \in P$ or $b \in P$. Thus R/P is a domain. Since $P = (R : T)_r$ is a right ideal of T and P is an ideal of R , we conclude that T/P is a left R/P -module. Now we show that T/P is a torsionfree left R/P -module. Hence assume that $(r + P)(t + P) = 0$, where $r \in R$ and $t \in T$. Thus $rt \in P$ and $rP \subseteq P$. Hence by our assumption either $r \in P$ or $t \in P$ and therefore we are done. Conversely, suppose that R/P is a domain and T/P is a torsionfree left R/P -module. Let $a, b \in T$ such that $aP \subseteq P$ and $ab \in P$. We have two cases, either P is an ideal of T (and therefore $P = (R : T)$) or P is not an ideal of T . In the latter case, since P is an ideal of R and R is a maximal subring of T , we immediately conclude that $R = \mathbb{I}_T(P)$. Thus $a \in R$ and therefore $(a + P)(b + P) = 0$. Hence by our assumption either $a \in P$ or $b \in P$. \square

Corollary 2.11. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and $P = (R : T)_r \in \text{Max}_r(T)$. Then P is a completely prime ideal of R (i.e., R/P is a domain) and T/P is torsionfree left R/P -module.*

Proof. Note that by [24, (A) of Corollary 2.10], P is a completely prime right ideal of T and therefore we are done by the previous proposition. \square

Corollary 2.12. *Let R be a maximal subring of a right Artinian ring T and $P = (R : T)_r$ be a completely prime right ideal of T . The either T/P or R/P is a division ring.*

Proof. We have two cases. Either P is an ideal of T or not. First assume that P is an ideal of T , then by [24, (B) of Corollary 2.10], we conclude that $P \in \text{Max}_r(T)$ and therefore T/P is a division ring. If P is not an ideal of T , then $R = \mathbb{I}_T(P)$, for R is a maximal subring of T and P is an ideal of R . Again by [24, (B) of Corollary 2.10], $P \in \text{Max}_r(R)$ and hence R/P is a division ring. \square

Proposition 2.13. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . Then either $(R : T)$ is equal to $P = (R : T)_r$ or $Q = (R : T)_l$, or $R = \mathbb{I}_T(P) = \mathbb{I}_T(Q)$.*

Proof. Note that $(R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$. Hence if either $(R : T)_l$ or $(R : T)_r$ is an ideal of T , then we immediately conclude that $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$ or $(R : T) = (R : T)_r$. Hence assume that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are not ideals of T . Since these are ideals of R and R is a maximal subring of T , we deduce that $R = \mathbb{I}_T(P) = \mathbb{I}_T(Q)$. \square

Remark 2.14. Let T be a ring and A be a right ideal of T , then the map $\phi : \mathbb{I}(A)/A \rightarrow \text{End}((T/A)_T)$, where $\phi(r + A) = f_{r+A}$ and $f_{r+A}(x + T) = rx + A$, for each $r \in \mathbb{I}(A)$ and $x \in T$ is a ring isomorphism, see [21, Lemma 1.3]. In particular, if R is a maximal subring of T and $A = (R : T)_r$, then either $R/A \cong \text{End}((T/A)_T)$ or $\phi(R/A)$ is a maximal subring of $\text{End}((T/A)_T) \cong T/A$.

Lemma 2.15. *Let R be a subring of a ring T and $A = (R : T)_r$. Then the map $\psi : R/A \rightarrow \text{End}((T/R)_R)$, where $\psi(r + A) = g_{r+A}$ and $g_{r+A}(x + R) = rx + R$, is a ring monomorphism, i.e., up to ring isomorphism, R/A is a subring of $\text{End}((T/R)_R)$. In particular, up to ring isomorphism R/A is a subring of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)$.*

Proof. The proof of ψ is a ring homomorphism is similar to [21, Lemma 1.3]. Only we prove that $\text{Ker}(\psi) = 0$. To see this note that $x + A \in \text{Ker}(\psi) \iff g_{x+A} = 0 \iff g_{x+A}(t + R) = 0$ for each $t \in T$, $\iff xt + R = 0$, for each $t \in T$, i.e., $xT + R = 0 \iff xT \subseteq R \iff x \in A$. \square

Corollary 2.16. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . Then $\text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R))$ is either 0 or is a prime number. Moreover, $\text{Char}(R/(R : T)_l) = \text{Char}(R/(R : T)_r) = \text{Char}(R/(R : T))$.*

Proof. By the previous lemma, up to ring isomorphism $R/(R : T)_l$ and $R/(R : T)_r$ are subrings of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)$ which are prime rings, by Theorem 2.1. Also note that the center of a prime ring is an integral domain and the characteristic of an integral domain is either 0 or is a prime number. Hence $\text{Char}(R/(R : T)_l) = \text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)) = \text{Char}(R/(R : T)_r)$. Finally, we have two cases: If $\text{Char}(R/(R : T)_l) = \text{Char}(R/(R : T)_r) = 0$, then it is clear that $\text{Char}(R/(R : T)) = 0$, for $R/(R : T)_l$ and $R/(R : T)_r$ are quotients of the ring $R/(R : T)$. Hence assume that $\text{Char}(R/(R : T)_l) = \text{Char}(R/(R : T)_r) = p$, where p is a prime number. Thus $pT = Tp \subseteq R$ and clearly $pT = Tp = TpT \subseteq R$ and thus $\text{Char}(R/(R : T)) = p$. \square

Now we have the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 2.17. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . Assume that the map $\text{Char} : \text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, where $P \mapsto \text{Char}(R/P)$ is one-one. Then $(R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$, in particular $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ is a prime ideal of R which is an ideal of T .*

Example 2.18. (1) Assume that $R := \mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, where $n > 1$ is a natural number. Then for each prime number q , it is clear that \mathbb{Z} is a maximal subring of $S := \mathbb{Z}[1/q]$ and therefore R is a maximal subring of $T := \mathbb{M}_n(S)$. It is obvious that, the map Char mentioned in the previous corollary is one-one for R . Hence $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$.

(2) Let $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n$, where $n > 1$ and each R_i is a simple ring with $\text{Char}(R_i) = p_i$ is a prime number. Assume that $p_i \neq p_j$ for $i \neq j$. If R is a maximal subring of a ring T , then $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_{i-1} \times 0 \times R_{i+1} \times \cdots \times R_n$, for some i .

(3) Let R be a one-sided Artinian ring which is a maximal subring of a ring T . Assume that $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{M}_{n_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times \mathbb{M}_{n_k}(D_k)$, where n_i and k are natural numbers and D_i is a division ring for each i . Then either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ or there exist $i \neq j$ such that $\text{Char}(D_i) = \text{Char}(D_j)$.

Corollary 2.19. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T with $\text{Char}(T)$ is not prime number. Then either there exists a prime number p such that $pT \subseteq (R : T)$ or $\text{Char}(T) = \text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)) = 0$.*

Proof. By the Corollary 2.16, $\text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R))$ is either 0 or is a prime number. If $\text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)) = p$, where p is a prime number, then $p \cdot 1_{T/R} = 0$ (note that $1_{T/R}$ denotes the identity map of T/R , i.e., $1_{T/R}(t + R) = t + R$, for each $t \in T$). Hence for each $t \in T$, $pt + R = 0$, i.e., $pT \subseteq R$. Thus $0 \neq pT \subseteq (R : T)$, (note $\text{Char}(T)$ is not a prime number and therefore $pT \neq 0$ and it is clear that $pT = Tp$ is an ideal of T). Otherwise, assume that $\text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)) = 0$. If $\text{Char}(T) = m > 0$, then it is clear that for each $\phi \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)$, we have $m\phi = 0$, for $m\phi(t) = \phi(mt) = \phi(0) = 0$, for each $t \in T$. Thus $\text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)) > 0$ which is absurd. Therefore $\text{Char}(T) = \text{Char}(\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(T/R)) = 0$ and hence we are done. \square

Corollary 2.20. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T with $\text{Char}(T)$ is neither zero or a prime number. Then $(R : T) \neq 0$.*

Proposition 2.21. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . The one of the following holds:*

- (1) $C_T(R) \subseteq R$. Therefore R contains the center of T .
- (2) $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$, and $T = R[\alpha]$, where $\alpha r = r\alpha$, for each $r \in R$.

Proof. Assume that R does not contain $C_T(R)$. If $R = \mathbb{I}_T((R : T)_r)$, then clearly $C_T(R) \subseteq C_T((R : T)_r) \subseteq \mathbb{I}_T((R : T)_r) = R$, which is absurd. Thus $(R : T)_r$ is an ideal of T . Similarly, $(R : T)_l$ is an ideal of T and hence the first part of (2) holds. The second part is evident for $C_T(R) \not\subseteq R$. \square

Proposition 2.22. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and $P = (R : T)_l$. If $PT = T$, then $R = \mathbb{I}_T(P)$, T is a finitely generated left R -module, P is a finitely generated right R -module which is a right primitive ideal of R and T is not a left quasi duo ring. Moreover, if in addition R is a left Artinian/Noetherian ring, then so is T .*

Proof. Since P is a left ideal of T which is a two sided ideal of R and P is not an ideal of T , we conclude that $R = \mathbb{I}_T(P)$. From $PT = T$, we deduce that if M is a left maximal ideal of T which contains P , then M is not an ideal of T and therefore T is not a left quasi duo ring. Since $T = PT$, we conclude that $1 = y_1t_1 + \cdots + y_nt_n$ for some $y_i \in P$, $t_i \in T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus for each $x \in T$ we have $x = x1 = (xy_1)t_1 + \cdots + (xy_n)t_n$. Now note that $y_i \in P$ which is a left ideal of T , therefore $xy_i \in P \subseteq R$ which immediately shows that $T = Rt_1 + \cdots + Rt_n$. Also note that for each $p \in P$, we have $p = 1p = y_1t_1p + \cdots + y_nt_np$. Now since $t_ip \in Tp \subseteq P \subseteq R$, we deduce that $P = y_1R + \cdots + y_nR$ and therefore P is a finitely generated right R -module. Since ${}_R T$ is finitely generated, we deduce that P is a right primitive ideal of R , by Corollary 2.5. The final part is evident for ${}_R T$ is finitely generated. \square

Corollary 2.23. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and $(R : T) \in \text{Max}(T)$. If $(R : T) \subsetneq (R : T)_l, (R : T)_r$ (i.e., $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are not ideals of T), then the following hold:*

- (1) ${}_R T$ and T_R are finitely generated.
- (2) $(R : T)_l$ is finitely generated right R -module which is a right primitive ideal of R . In particular, $l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l) = l.\text{ann}_T(p_1) \cap \cdots \cap l.\text{ann}_T(p_m)$ for some $p_1, \dots, p_m \in (R : T)_l$.
- (3) $(R : T)_r$ is finitely generated left R -module which is a left primitive ideal of R . In particular, $r.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_r) = r.\text{ann}_T(q_1) \cap \cdots \cap r.\text{ann}_T(q_m)$ for some $p_1, \dots, q_m \in (R : T)_r$.

In particular, if $(R : T) \in \text{Max}(T) \setminus \text{Spec}(R)$, then (1) – (3) hold.

Proof. Since $(R : T) \subsetneq (R : T)_l, (R : T)_r$, we conclude that $(R : T)_l T = T$ and $T(R : T)_r = T$, for $(R : T)$ is a maximal ideal of T . Hence we are done by the previous proposition. For the final part note that if $(R : T)$ is not a prime ideal of R , then by Theorem 2.1, $(R : T)$ is not equal to either $(R : T)_l$ or $(R : T)_r$. \square

Corollary 2.24. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and $(R : T) \in \text{Max}(T)$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) If R is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian), then either T is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) or $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$. Therefore $(R : T)_l \subseteq (R : T)_r$ (resp. $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$).
- (2) If R is right Noetherian (resp. Artinian), then either T is right Noetherian (resp. Artinian) or $(R : T) = (R : T)_r$. Therefore $(R : T)_r \subseteq (R : T)_l$ (resp. $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$).

Proof. For (1), note that either $(R : T)_l = (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_r$ or $(R : T) \subsetneq (R : T)_l$ and therefore by the previous corollary ${}_R T$ is finitely generated and hence T is a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) R -module. Hence T is a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) ring. Also note that if R is a left Artinian ring, then by

Theorem 2.1, $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are maximal ideals of R , thus in the case $(R : T)_l = (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_r$, we conclude that $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$. The proof of (2) is similar. \square

Corollary 2.25. *Let R be a maximal subring of a simple ring T . Then the following hold:*

- (1) *If R is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian), then either T is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) or $(R : T)_l = 0$ (resp. $(R : T)_l = (R : T)_r = 0$, $R = \mathbb{M}_n(D)$, where D is a division ring and $T = \mathbb{M}_n(S)$, for a simple ring S and D is a maximal subring of S).*
- (2) *If R is right Noetherian (resp. Artinian), then either T is right Noetherian (resp. Artinian) or $(R : T)_r = 0$. (resp. $(R : T)_l = (R : T)_r = 0$, $R = \mathbb{M}_n(D)$, where D is a division ring and $T = \mathbb{M}_n(S)$, for a simple ring S and D is a maximal subring of S).*

Proof. For (1), the Noetherian part is clear by the previous result. In case, R is a left Artinian, if T is not left Artinian ring, then by the previous corollary $(R : T)_l = 0$. Since $(R : T)_l$ is a prime ideal of R , we conclude that $R = \mathbb{M}_n(D)$, for some division ring D and $n \geq 1$ (hence R is a right Artinian too). Thus $T = \mathbb{M}_n(S)$, for a simple ring S , for R is a subring of T and T is a simple ring. Since R is a maximal subring of T , we immediately conclude that D is a maximal subring of S . The proof of (2) is similar. \square

Proposition 2.26. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and R be a left Noetherian ring. Then either $C_T(R) \subseteq R$ or T is a left Noetherian ring and $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$.*

Proof. Assume that $C_T(R)$ is not contained in R and $\alpha \in C_T(R) \setminus R$. Since α commutes with any element of R , we immediately conclude that $R[\alpha]$ is a left Noetherian ring, by Hilbert's Basis Theorem. Clearly $T = R[\alpha]$, for R is a maximal subring of T and $\alpha \in T \setminus R$. Hence T is a left Noetherian ring. Finally, if $(R : T)_l$ is not an ideal of T , then by Proposition 2.13, we deduce that $R = \mathbb{I}_T((R : T)_l)$ and therefore R contains $C_T(R)$ which is absurd. Thus $(R : T)_l$ is an ideal of T and similarly $(R : T)_r$ is an ideal of T . Hence $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ and we are done. \square

Proposition 2.27. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . If $l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)) + r.\text{ann}_T((R : T)) = T$, then $(R : T)^2 = 0$. (in particular, $\text{Nil}_*(R) \neq 0 \neq \text{Nil}_*(T)$).*

Proof. By the assumption, there exist $a \in l.\text{ann}_T((R : T))$ and $b \in r.\text{ann}_T((R : T))$ such that $a + b = 1$. Therefore $(R : T)a = (R : T)$ and $(R : T) = b(R : T)$. Now note that $ab \in l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)) \cap r.\text{ann}_T((R : T))$. Thus $(R : T)^2 = (R : T)(R : T) = (R : T)ab(R : T) = 0$. \square

Theorem 2.28. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T . Then the following hold:*

- (1) *If $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are incomparable, then $l.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l) + r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l) \subseteq (R : T)_r$ and $l.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_r) + r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l) \subseteq (R : T)_l$.*
- (2) *If $(R : T) = 0$ or $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r = 0$, then $\text{Min}(R) \subseteq \{(R : T)_l, (R : T)_r\}$. In particular, if $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are incomparable, then $(R : T)_l = l.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_r)$ and $(R : T)_r = r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l)$ are exactly minimal prime ideals of R .*
- (3) *If $(R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r = 0$ and $(R : T)_l \neq 0 \neq (R : T)_r$, then $(R : T)_l = l.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_r) = r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_r)$ and $(R : T)_r = r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l) = l.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l)$ are exactly minimal prime ideals of R (and R is a semiprime ring). In particular, if T is a prime ring, then either $(R : T)_l = 0$ or $(R : T)_r = 0$.*
- (4) *If R is a reduced ring, $(R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r = 0$ and $(R : T)_l \neq 0 \neq (R : T)_r$, then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are completely prime ideals of R . Hence R embeds in a product of two domains.*

Proof. (1) is clear, for $l.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l)(R : T)_l = (R : T)_l r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l) = 0 \subseteq (R : T)_r$ and $(R : T)_r$ is a prime ideal of R , which does not contain $(R : T)_l$ by our assumption. For (2), first note that $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r \subseteq (R : T)$, hence if $(R : T) = 0$, we conclude that $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r = 0$. Hence assume that $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r = 0$. This immediately shows that $\text{Min}(R) \subseteq \{(R : T)_l, (R : T)_r\}$. Now assume that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are incomparable. Let $P = (R : T)_l$ and $I = (R : T)_r$. Thus $PI = 0$ and $I \neq 0$ (by incomparability). It is clear that $P \subseteq l.\text{ann}_R(I)$. Now since $l.\text{ann}_R(I)I = 0 \subseteq P$ and P is a prime ideal of R which does not contain I , we deduce that $P = l.\text{ann}_R(I)$. Finally, if P is not a minimal ideal of R , then let Q be a prime ideal which properly is contained in P . Then $l.\text{ann}_R(I)I = 0 \subseteq Q \subsetneq P = l.\text{ann}_R(I)$ implies that $I \subseteq Q \subseteq P$, which is absurd for I and P are incomparable. Hence P is a minimal prime ideal of R . Similarly, $(R : T)_r = r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_l)$ is a minimal prime ideal of R and hence (2) holds. For (3), note that since $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are ideals of R , then we infer that $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r$ and $(R : T)_r(R : T)_l$ are subsets of $(R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$. Hence if $(R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r = 0$, we conclude that $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r = 0$ and $(R : T)_r(R : T)_l = 0$. By a similar argument of (2), the conclusion of (3) can be proved. For the final part of (3), since $(R : T)_l \neq 0$, we infer

that $(R : T)_l \subseteq r.\text{ann}_R((R : T)_r) \subseteq r.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_r)$, and therefore $(R : T)_r = 0$, for T is prime. For (4), since R is reduced, we conclude that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are incomparable and therefore by (2) or (3), are minimal prime ideal of R . Hence by [17, Lemma 12.6], $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are completely prime ideals of R , i.e., $R/(R : T)_l$ and $R/(R : T)_r$ are domains and clearly R embeds in product of them. \square

Corollary 2.29. *Let R be a ring which is a maximal subring of a ring T with $|\text{Min}(R)| \geq 3$, then $(R : T)$ and $(R : T)_l(R : T)_r$ are nonzero.*

Proposition 2.30. *Let R be a maximal subring of a left duo ring T . Then $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$ is a completely prime ideal of R . Moreover, if T is a duo ring, then $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ is a completely prime ideal of R .*

Proof. First note that since T is a left duo ring, we immediately conclude that for each $x \in T$, $xT \subseteq Tx$ and therefore each left ideal of T is an ideal of T . Thus we deduce that $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$. Now assume that $a, b \in R$ such that $ab \in (R : T)$ and $a \notin (R : T) = (R : T)_l$. Therefore $Tab \subseteq R$ and $Ta \not\subseteq R$. Since R is a maximal subring of T and Ta is an ideal of T , we infer that $R + Ta = T$. Hence $Tb = (R + Ta)b = Rb + Tab \subseteq R$, i.e., $b \in (R : T) = (R : T)_l$. Thus $(R : T) = (R : T)_l$ is a completely prime ideal of R . The final part is evident. \square

As we mentioned before in the introduction of this paper, if R is a maximal subring of a commutative ring T and R is integrally closed in T , then $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal in T . Now we want to study when $(R : T)_r$ (or $(R : T)_l$) is a prime one-sided ideal in non-commutative case.

Theorem 2.31. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T , $P = (R : T)_r$, $a, b \in T$ such that $aTb \subseteq P$. If $a, b \notin P$, then the following hold:*

- (1) *a is right integral over R and b is left integral over R .*
- (2) *If $a \notin R$, then $T = R + RaR$.*
- (3) *If $b \notin R$, then $T = R + RbR$.*

In particular, if $b \notin R$, then $a \notin R$; and if $a \notin R$, then either $b \notin R$ or $b \in (R : T)_l$.

Proof. First note that by our assumption, $aTbT \subseteq R$, $aT \not\subseteq R$ and $bT \not\subseteq R$. Hence $R + RaT = T = R + RbT$. Thus there exist $r_i \in R$ and $s_i \in T$ such that $a = r_0 + r_1bs_1 + \cdots + r_nbs_n$. By multiplying this equation from left to a , we have $a^2 = ar_0 + ar_1bs_1 + \cdots + ar_nbs_n$. Now for each i , $ar_ibs_i \in aTbT \subseteq R$. Therefore $r := ar_1bs_1 + \cdots + ar_nbs_n \in R$ and $a^2 = ar_0 + r$ which shows a is right integral over R . By a similar argument (from $aTb \subseteq P \subseteq R$ and $T = R + RaT$) we deduce that b is left integral over R . Hence (1) holds. Now we prove (2). Assume that $a \notin R$. We claim that $S := R + RaR$ is a subring of T . To see this it suffices to show that if $x, y, u, v \in R$, then $(xay)(uav) \in S$. We have $(xay)(uav) = xayur_0v + xayur_1bs_1v + \cdots + xayur_nbs_nv$. The first term of the sum is clear in RaR and therefore in S . For the other parts note that since $ayur_ibs_i \in aTbT \subseteq R$, we immediately conclude that $xayur_ibs_iv \in R$. Therefore $xayur_1bs_1v + \cdots + xayur_nbs_nv \in R$. Hence $(xay)(uav) \in S$ and thus S is a subring of T which properly contains R (for $a \notin R$). Thus $S = T$, for R is a maximal subring of T . The proof of (3) is similar (by the use of $aTb \subseteq P \subseteq R$). Finally for the final part of the theorem, assume that $b \notin R$ but $a \in R$. Thus $T = R + RbR$ by (3). Therefore $aT = aR + aRbR \subseteq R + aTbT \subseteq R$, i.e., $a \in P$ which is absurd. Now assume that $a \notin R$ but $b \in R$. Thus by (2), $T = R + RaR$ and therefore $Tb = Rb + RaRb \subseteq R$. Thus $b \in (R : T)_l$. \square

Remark 2.32. Similar to the previous result and its proof we can prove that, if R is a maximal subring of a ring T , $P = (R : T)_l$, $a, b \in T$ such that $aTb \subseteq P$ and if $a, b \notin P$, then the following hold:

- (1) *a is right integral over R and b is left integral over R .*
- (2) *If $a \notin R$, then $T = R + RaR$.*
- (3) *If $b \notin R$, then $T = R + RbR$.*

In particular, if $a \notin R$, then $b \notin R$; and if $b \notin R$, then either $a \notin R$ or $a \in (R : T)_l$.

Let T be a ring and P be a proper one-sided ideal of R . P is called prime if for each $a, b \in T$, if $aTb \subseteq P$, then either $a \in P$ or $b \in P$. Now the following is in order.

Corollary 2.33. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T which is integrally closed in T , then $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime one-sided ideals of T .*

Remark 2.34. Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T which is integrally closed in T . If $a, b \in T$ such that $aTb \subseteq (R : T)$, but $a, b \notin (R : T)$, then the following hold:

- (1) $a, b \in R$

- (2) $RaT \subseteq R$, but $TaR \not\subseteq R$. In particular, $T = R + TaR$.
- (3) $TbR \subseteq R$, but $RbT \not\subseteq R$. In particular, $T = R + RbT$.
- (4) $a \in (R : T)_r$, $b \in (R : T)_l$, $a \notin (R : T)_l$ and $b \notin (R : T)_r$.

To see these, first note that (1) is an immediate consequences of Theorem 2.31 and Remark 2.32. Also note that (4) is obvious from (2) and (3). We prove $TaR \not\subseteq R$ and $TbR \subseteq R$, the proof of the other parts of (3) and (4) are similar. Since $b \notin (R : T)$ we conclude that $TbT \not\subseteq R$ and therefore by maximality of R , we deduce that $R + TbT = T$. Hence $aR + aTbT = aT$ and therefore $TaR + TaTbT = TaT$. From $a \notin (R : T)$, we have $TaT \not\subseteq R$ and from $aTb \subseteq (R : T)$ we have $TaTbT \subseteq R$. Thus by $TaR + TaTbT = TaT$, we conclude that $TaR \not\subseteq R$ and therefore $Ta \not\subseteq R$. Hence $a \notin (R : T)_l$ and since $aTb \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l$, we infer that $b \in (R : T)_l$, by the previous corollary. Hence $Tb \subseteq R$ and therefore $TbR \subseteq R$.

Lemma 2.35. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T and $x \in (R : T)_l \cup (R : T)_r$. If $xTx \subseteq (R : T)$, then $x \in (R : T)$.*

Proof. Assume that $x \in (R : T)_l$, thus $Tx \subseteq R$ and therefore $TxR \subseteq R$. Suppose $x \notin (R : T)$, thus $TxT \not\subseteq R$ and hence $R + TxT = T$, by maximality of R . Since $xTx \subseteq (R : T)$, we infer that $TxTxT \subseteq R$. Therefore $TxT = TxR + TxTxT \subseteq R$, which is absurd. Thus $x \in (R : T)$. The proof for the case $x \in (R : T)_r$ is similar. \square

Theorem 2.36. *Let R be a maximal subring of a ring T which is integrally closed in T (or whenever $x \in T$ and $x^2 \in R$, then $x \in R$). Then $(R : T)$ is a semiprime ideal of T . Moreover, either $(R : T)$ is a prime ideal of T or $(R : T)$ is still semiprime in R and therefore $(R : T) = (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$.*

Proof. We must prove that when $x \in T$ and $xTx \subseteq (R : T)$, then $x \in (R : T)$. Since $xTx \subseteq R$, we infer that $x^2 \in R$ and therefore $x \in R$, by our assumption. Hence $xRx \subseteq xTx \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$. Therefore $xRx \subseteq (R : T)_l$ and hence $x \in (R : T)_l$, for $(R : T)_l$ is a prime ideal of R , by Theorem 2.1. Thus $x \in (R : T)$, by the previous lemma. Hence $(R : T)$ is a semiprime ideal of T . Therefore there exists a family Q_i , $i \in I$, of prime ideals of T , such that $(R : T) = \bigcap_{i \in I} Q_i$. Now we have two cases. If there exists $i \in I$, such that $Q_i \subseteq R$, then $Q_i \subseteq (R : T)$, and therefore $(R : T) = Q_i$ is a prime ideal of T . Hence assume that for each $i \in I$, $Q_i \not\subseteq R$. Thus for each $i \in I$, we conclude that $R + Q_i = T$, by maximality of R . This immediately implies that $R/(Q_i \cap R) \cong T/Q_i$, as rings, which means $Q_i \cap R$ is a prime ideal of R . Now it is clear that $(R : T) = \bigcap_{i \in I} (Q_i \cap R)$, and therefore $(R : T)$ is a semiprime ideal of R . The final part is evident by (4) of Corollary 2.2. \square

Theorem 2.37. *Let T be a ring and R be a Noetherian (resp. Artinian) maximal subring of T with $(R : T) \neq 0$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) $T/l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l)$, in particular, $T/l.\text{ann}_T((R : T))$, are left Noetherian (resp. Artinian).
- (2) $T/r.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_r)$, in particular $T/r.\text{ann}_T((R : T))$, are right Noetherian (resp. Artinian).
- (3) If T is semiprime, then $T/\text{ann}_T((R : T))$ is Noetherian (resp. Artinian).
- (4) If T is prime, then T is finitely generated as left and right R -modules. In particular, T is Noetherian (resp. Artinian). Moreover, $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are right and left primitive ideals of R , respectively.

Proof. (1) Since R is a right Noetherian ring, there exist $x_1, \dots, x_n \in (R : T)_l$ such that $(R : T)_l = x_1R + \dots + x_nR$. Thus $l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l) = l.\text{ann}_T(x_1) \cap \dots \cap l.\text{ann}_T(x_n)$. Therefore $T/l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l)$ embeds in $Tx_1 \times \dots \times Tx_n$ as a left T -module and therefore as a left R -module too. Since $Tx_i \subseteq R$, we conclude that $T/l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l)$ embeds in R^n as a right R -module and therefore $T/l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l)$ is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) for R is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian). Thus the first part of (1) holds. Also note that $(R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l$ and therefore $l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l) \subseteq l.\text{ann}_T((R : T))$. Hence $T/l.\text{ann}_T((R : T))$ is left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) too. Similarly (2) holds. For (3), first note that since T is a semiprime ring, we immediately conclude that the left and right annihilators of $(R : T)$ are coincided. Thus by (1) and (2), we deduce that $T/\text{ann}_T((R : T))$ is Noetherian (resp. Artinian). Finally, for (4), since $0 \neq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l$, we infer that $l.\text{ann}_T((R : T)_l) = 0$, thus by the proof of (1), T is isomorphic to a left submodules of R^n , hence T is a finitely generated left R -module. Similarly, T is a finitely generated right R -module. This immediately shows that T is Noetherian (resp. Artinian). The final part is evident by Corollary 2.5. \square

In [15] and [16], the authors proved that if a finite ring R is a maximal subring of a ring T , then T is finite too. In the following remark we prove this result by the previous theorem in special case.

Remark 2.38. Let T be a prime ring with a finite maximal subring R . If $(R : T)_l \neq 0$, then T is finite. To see this, note that by the proof of (1) of the previous theorem, $T/l.ann_T((R : T)_l)$ embeds in R^n . Since T is prime we deduce that $l.ann_T((R : T)_l) = 0$ and therefore T embeds in R^n and hence T is finite.

Proposition 2.39. *Let R be a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) ring which is a maximal subring of a ring T . Assume that $(R : T)_l$ is a finitely generated as right ideal of R and $(R : T)$ contains a prime ideal Q of T . Then either $(R : T) = (R : T)_l \subseteq (R : T)_r$ (resp. $(R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$) or T is a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) ring.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of the previous theorem $T/l.ann_T((R : T)_l)$ is a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) R -module. Since $l.ann_T((R : T)_l)(R : T)_l = 0 \subseteq Q$ and Q is a prime ideal of T , we have two cases either $(R : T)_l \subseteq Q$ or $l.ann_T((R : T)_l) \subseteq Q$. If $(R : T)_l \subseteq Q$, then $(R : T)_l \subseteq (R : T)$ and therefore $(R : T)_l = (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_r$ (resp. $(R : T)_l = (R : T) = (R : T)_r$ for R is a left Artinian ring and $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime ideals of R , by Theorem 2.1). Hence assume that $l.ann_T((R : T)_l) \subseteq Q$ and therefore $l.ann_T((R : T)_l) \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq R$. Thus $l.ann_T((R : T)_l)$ is a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) R -module. Therefore T is a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) R -module and hence is a left Noetherian (resp. Artinian) ring. \square

Proposition 2.40. *Let T be a ring which is not prime and R be a Noetherian maximal subring of T with $(R : T) \neq 0$. If R contains a prime ideal Q of T , then either T is Noetherian or $Q = (R : T) = (R : T)_l$ or $Q = (R : T) = (R : T)_r$ is a minimal prime ideal of T (thus Q is unique). Moreover if T is neither left Noetherian nor right Noetherian then $Q = (R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$.*

Proof. First note that $Q \subseteq (R : T)$. Now we have two cases: (a) $Q \neq (R : T)$. This immediately implies that $l.ann_T((R : T)), r.ann_T((R : T)) \subseteq Q$. Thus by (1) and (2) of the Theorem 2.37, we conclude that T/Q is Noetherian and since $Q \subseteq R$, we deduce that T is Noetherian too. (b) Hence assume that $Q = (R : T)$. Now suppose that $Q' \in Min(T)$ and $Q' \subsetneq Q$, thus $Q' \subsetneq (R : T)$ and therefore by the first case we conclude that T is Noetherian and we are done. Hence $Q = (R : T)$ is a minimal prime ideal of T . Now assume that $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are not contained in $Q = (R : T)$. Then we deduce that $l.ann_T((R : T)_l)$ and $r.ann_T((R : T)_r)$ are contained in Q . Therefore by (1) and (2) of the Theorem 2.37, T/Q is left/right Noetherian ring and therefore T is Noetherian, for $Q \subseteq R$. By a similar argument and using (1) and (2) of the Theorem 2.37 and the fact that Q is prime, we conclude the final part too. \square

Corollary 2.41. *Let R be an Artinian maximal subring of a prime ring T . Then either $R \cong \mathbb{M}_n(D)$ for a division ring D (in particular, $T = \mathbb{M}_n(S)$, where D is a maximal subring of S) or $T \cong \mathbb{M}_n(D')$ for a division ring D' .*

Proof. If R is a prime ring, then clearly the first part of the statement of theorem holds. Hence assume that R is not a prime ring. Hence $(R : T)_l \neq 0$ and therefore $l.ann_T((R : T)_l) = 0$ for T is prime. Thus by (1) of Theorem 2.37, we conclude that T is a left Artinian ring and hence we are done (note T is prime). \square

Proposition 2.42. *Let T be a ring which is not prime and R be an Artinian maximal subring of T with $(R : T) \neq 0$. Then either T is Artinian or $dim(T) = 0$ or R contains a unique (minimal) prime ideal of T , say Q , and $T/Q \cong \mathbb{M}_n(S)$ where S has a maximal subring D which is a division ring. In particular, in the latter case, S has one of the following holds:*

- (1) S is a simple ring. Thus $Q \in Min(T) \cap Max(T)$.
- (2) $S \cong D \times D$, where D is a division ring.
- (3) S has a unique nonzero proper ideal I . I is maximal left/right ideal of S . In particular, S is local and $S = D \oplus I$.

Proof. Assume that T is not Artinian. We have two cases: (a) each prime ideal Q of T is not contained in R . Thus $R + Q = T$, for $Q \neq 0$ (note T is not prime) and R is a maximal subring of T . Thus $R/(R \cap Q) \cong T/Q$, which immediately shows that Q is a maximal ideal of T . (b) Hence assume that there exists a prime Q of T such that $Q \subseteq R$. Therefore $Q \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_l \cap (R : T)_r$. Now, if $l.ann_T((R : T))$ is not contained in Q , we conclude that $(R : T)_l \subseteq Q \subseteq (R : T) \subseteq (R : T)_r$, for Q is a prime ideal of T . Now since R is an Artinian ring and $(R : T)_l$ and $(R : T)_r$ are prime ideals in R we conclude that $(R : T)_l = Q = (R : T) = (R : T)_r$. Similarly if $r.ann_T((R : T)_r)$ is not contained in Q , the previous equalities hold. Thus assume that Q contains $l.ann_T((R : T)_l)$ and $r.ann_T((R : T)_r)$. Hence by (1) and (2) or Theorem 2.37, we deduce that T/Q is an Artinian ring. Since $Q \subseteq R$, we conclude that T is Artinian too which is absurd. Hence we have $Q = (R : T) = (R : T)_l = (R : T)_r$ which is a maximal

ideal of R . Thus $R/Q \cong \mathbb{M}_n(D')$ for a division ring D' and a natural number n . Since R/Q is a maximal subring of T/Q , we conclude that $T/Q \cong \mathbb{M}_n(S)$, where S has a maximal subring $D \cong D'$. The final part is an immediate consequences of [1, Theorem 2.13]. \square

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to the Research Council of Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz (Ahvaz-Iran) for financial support (Grant Number: SCU.MM1402.721)

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Azarang, Non-quasi duo rings have maximal subrings, *Int. Math. Forum*, **5** (20) (2010) 979-994.
- [2] A. Azarang, O.A.S. Karamzadeh, On the existence of maximal subrings in commutative Artinian rings, *J. Algebra Appl.* **9** (5) (2010) 771-778.
- [3] A. Azarang, O.A.S. Karamzadeh, On Maximal Subrings of Commutative Rings, *Algebra Colloq.* **19** (Spec 1) (2012) 1125-1138.
- [4] A. Azarang, O.A.S. Karamzadeh, Most Commutative Rings Have Maximal Subrings, *Algebra Colloq.* **19** (Spec 1) (2012) 1139-1154.
- [5] H.E. Bell and F. Guerriero, Some condition for finiteness and commutativity of rings, *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.* **13** (3) (1990) 535-544.
- [6] H.E. Bell and A.A. Klein, On finiteness of rings with finite maximal subrings, *Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.* **16** (2) (1993) 351-354.
- [7] L.I. Dechene, *Adjacent Extensions of Rings*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Riverside, (1978).
- [8] D.E. Dobbs and J. Shapiro, A classification of the minimal ring extensions of an integral domain, *J. Algebra* **305** (2006) 185-193.
- [9] D.E. Dobbs and J. Shapiro, A classification of the minimal ring extensions of certain commutative rings, *J. Algebra* **308** (2007), 800-821.
- [10] T. J. Dorsey, Z. Mesyan, On Minimal Extension of Rings, *Comm. Algebra*, **37** (10) (2009) 3463-3486.
- [11] D. Ferrand, J.-P. Olivier, Homomorphismes minimaux d'anneaux, *J. Algebra* **16** (1970) 461-471.
- [12] R. Gilmer, Some finiteness conditions on the set of overring an integral domain. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **131** (8) (2003) 2337-2346.
- [13] R. Gilmer and W.J. Heinzer, Intersection of quotient rings of an integral domain. *J. Math Kyoto Univ.* **7** (2) (1967) 133-150.
- [14] K. R. Goodearl, R. B. Warfield, JR, "An Introduction to Noncommutative Noetherian Rings", Cambridge University Press, Second Edition, (2004).
- [15] A.A. Klein, The finiteness of a ring with a finite maximal subrings. *Comm. Algebra* **21** (4) (1993) 1389-1392.
- [16] T.J. Laffey, A finiteness theorem for rings, *Proc. R. Ir. Acad.* **92** (2) (1992) 285-288.
- [17] T.Y. Lam, *A First Course in Noncommutative Rings*, Sec. Ed, Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [18] T.Y. Lam, *Lectures on Modules and Rings*, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [19] T. Y. Lam and A. S. Dugas, Quasi-Duo Rings and Stable Range Descent, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **195** (2005) 243-259.
- [20] T. Kwen Lee, K. Shan Liu. Algebra with a finite-dimensional maximal subalgebra. *Comm. Algebra* **33** (1) (2005) 339-342.
- [21] Levy, Lawrence S.; Robson, J. Chris, *Hereditary Noetherian prime rings and idealizers*. *Math. Surveys Monogr.*, 174 American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011, iv+228 pp.
- [22] J. C. MacConnell and J. C. Robson, *Noncommutative Noetherian Rings*, New York 1987, Wiley-Interscience.
- [23] M.L. Modica, *Maximal Subrings*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1975.
- [24] Reyes, Manuel L. A one-sided prime ideal principle for noncommutative rings. *J. Algebra Appl.* **9** (6) (2010) 877-919.
- [25] L. Rowen, *Ring theory*. Vol. I. *Pure Appl. Math.*, 127 Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988. xxiv+538 pp.
- [26] G. Picavet and M. Picavet-L'Hermitte. About minimal morphisms, in: *Multiplicative ideal theory in commutative algebra*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (2006) pp. 369-386.