

## EUCLIDEAN MODULES

AMIR M. RAHIMI

**Abstract.** The main result of this paper is that a torsion-free cyclic module over a commutative ring with identity is an (so-called) Euclidean module if and only if the ring is an Euclidean ring.

### 1 Introduction

An Euclidean module is a natural extension of an Euclidean ring. Any nonzero submodule of an Euclidean  $R$ -module is a cyclic  $R$ -module. It is shown that a torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module is Euclidean if and only if  $R$  is an Euclidean ring. The concept of side divisors and universal side divisors in a ring are generalized and studied in the cyclic modules. It is shown that a torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module has no universal side divisors if and only if  $R$  has no universal side divisors. Also, a torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module with no universal side divisors over an integral domain can never be an Euclidean  $R$ -module. Stable  $R$ -modules are defined and it is shown that any torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module is stable if and only if  $R$  is a stable ring. Finally, it is shown that a stable torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module over a principal ideal domain is an Euclidean  $R$ -module.

All rings (unless otherwise indicated) are commutative rings with identity and modules are unitary modules.

### 2 Main results

**Definition.** Let  $N$  be the set of nonnegative integers and  $A$  a unitary  $R$ -module.  $A$  is an Euclidean  $R$ -module if there is a function  $\phi : A \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow N$  such that (1) if  $r \in R$ ,  $a \in A$ ,  $ra \neq 0$ , and  $a \neq 0$ , then  $\phi(a) \leq \phi(ra)$  and (2) if  $a$  and  $b$  are elements of  $A$  with  $b \neq 0$ , then there exist  $r \in R$  and  $c \in A$  such that  $a = rb + c$  with  $c = 0$  or  $c \neq 0$  and  $\phi(c) < \phi(b)$ .

*Example 1.* Every Euclidean ring  $R$  is an Euclidean  $R$ -module.

*Example 2.* Any nonzero submodule of an Euclidean  $R$ -module is an Euclidean  $R$ -module. Thus, every nonzero ideal of an Euclidean ring  $R$  is an Euclidean  $R$ -module.

*Example 3.* Let  $R[X]$  be the Euclidean ring of polynomials over the field of real numbers with the Euclidean function  $\phi(f) = \deg(f)$  for each nonzero element  $f \in R[X]$ . It is clear that the ideal  $I = (X^2)$  is an Euclidean  $R[X]$ -module which is not an Euclidean ring under the function  $\phi$  since  $X^3 = XX^2 + 0$  and  $X \notin I$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Every nonzero submodule of an Euclidean  $R$ -module is a cyclic  $R$ -module.*

**PROOF:** If  $B$  is a nonzero submodule of an Euclidean  $R$ -module  $A$  with the Euclidean function  $\phi$ , choose an element  $b \in B$  such that  $\phi(b)$  is the least integer in the set of nonnegative integers  $\{\phi(x) \mid x \neq 0, x \in B\}$ . If  $a \in B$ , then for some  $r \in R$  and  $c \in A$ ,  $a = rb + c$  with  $c = 0$  or  $c \neq 0$  and  $\phi(c) < \phi(b)$ . Now, the minimality of  $\phi(b)$  and the fact that  $c \in B$  implies the desired result.  $\square$

**Remark.** It is not difficult to show that in any Euclidean  $R$ -module with the Euclidean function  $\phi$ ,  $\phi(ra) = \phi(-ra)$  for all  $r \in R$  and  $a \in A$  whenever  $ra \neq 0$  and  $a \neq 0$ . Moreover, for any generator  $a$  of  $A$ ,  $\phi(b) = \phi(a)$  if and only if  $b$  is a generator of  $A$ . Note that for any  $c \in A$  and any generator  $a$  of  $A$ , we have always  $\phi(a) \leq \phi(c)$ . Recall that for any nonzero element  $r$  in an Euclidean ring  $R$  with the Euclidean function  $\phi$ ,  $\phi(1_R) \leq \phi(r)$ , and  $\phi(r) = \phi(1_R)$  if and only if  $r$  is a unit in  $R$ .

**Theorem 2.** *A torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module  $A$  is an Euclidean  $R$ -module if and only if  $R$  is an Euclidean ring.*

**PROOF:** For the sufficiency, let  $A = \langle x \rangle$  be a torsion-free cyclic module over an Euclidean ring  $R$  with the Euclidean function  $\phi$ . Define  $\psi : A \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow N$  as  $\psi(a) = \psi(rx) = \phi(r)$  for each nonzero  $a$  in  $A$ . The proof can be followed directly from the definition if we show that  $\psi$  is a well-defined function. Suppose,  $y$  is a generator of  $A$ . Thus,  $x = ry = rsx$  implies  $1_R = rs$  which makes  $\psi(y) = \psi(sx) = \phi(s) = \phi(1_R) = \psi(x)$ . Now, suppose  $a = rx = sy$  for some nonzero  $r$  and  $s$  in  $R$  and  $y$  a generator of  $A$ . Hence,  $a = rx = sy = stx$ , for some  $t \in R$ , implies  $r = st$  which makes  $\psi(a) = \psi(rx) = \phi(r) \geq \phi(s) = \psi(sy)$ . Again, by a similar argument,  $\psi(sy) = \phi(s) \geq \phi(r) = \psi(rx)$ . For the necessary part, suppose  $A = \langle x \rangle$  and define  $\psi : R \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow N$  as  $\psi(r) = \phi(rx)$  for each nonzero  $r$  in  $R$ . Next, we show that  $\psi$  is a well-defined function on  $R \setminus \{0\}$  and the rest of the proof which can be followed directly from the definition is left to the reader. Suppose  $\psi(r) = \phi(rx)$  and  $\psi(r) = \phi(ry)$  for an arbitrary generator  $y$  of  $A$ . Since  $A$  is an Euclidean  $R$ -module,  $\phi(rx) = \phi(rsy) = \phi(sry) \geq \phi(ry)$  and similarly  $\phi(ry) = \phi(rtx) = \phi(trx) \geq \phi(rx)$ . Consequently,  $\phi(rx) = \phi(ry)$ .  $\square$

**Definition.** For a cyclic  $R$ -module  $A$ , let  $\bar{A}$  denote the set of all generators of  $A$  together with 0. An element  $a \in A \setminus \bar{A}$  is said to be a side divisor of an element  $b \in A$  whenever  $(b - c)$  is a multiple of  $a$  for some  $c \in \bar{A}$ . That is  $(b - c) = ra$  for some  $r \in R$ . We shall call an element  $a \in A \setminus \bar{A}$  a universal side divisor in  $A$  whenever  $a$  is a side divisor of each element  $b \in A$ .

For a detailed study of "side divisors" and "universal side divisors" in a commutative ring, the reader is referred to [2].

**Remark.** It is not difficult to show that in a torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module  $A = \langle x \rangle$ ,  $rx$  is a generator of  $A$  if and only if  $r$  is a unit in  $R$ . Note that for the sufficient part,  $A$  needs not be a torsion-free  $R$ -module. Thus,  $a = rx$  is in  $A \setminus \bar{A}$  if and only if  $r$  is in  $R \setminus \bar{R}$ , or equivalently,  $a = rx \in \bar{A}$  if and only if  $r \in \bar{R}$  (where  $\bar{R}$  is the set of all units in  $R$  together with zero). Consequently, by virtue of the next theorem,  $A = \langle x \rangle$  has no universal side divisors if and only if  $R$  has no universal side divisors.

**Theorem 3.** For a cyclic  $R$ -module  $A = \langle x \rangle$  if  $r$  is a side divisor of  $s$  in  $R$ , then  $rx$  is a side divisor of  $sx$  in  $A$ . Conversely, for a cyclic torsion-free  $R$ -module  $A = \langle x \rangle$  if  $a = rx$  is a side divisor of  $b = sx$  in  $A$ , then  $r$  is a side divisor of  $s$  in  $R$ .

PROOF: The proof can be followed directly from the definition and the first part of the above remark.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.** A torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module  $A$  over an integral domain can never be an Euclidean  $R$ -module if  $A$  has no universal side divisors.

PROOF: In [3], it is shown that an integral domain with no universal side divisors cannot be an Euclidean domain. Now, the result is an immediate consequence of the above remark and Theorem 2.  $\square$

**Definition.** An  $R$ -module  $A$  is said to be stable if whenever  $\langle a, b \rangle = A$ , there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $\langle a, b \rangle = \langle a + rb \rangle = A$ .

See [2] for the definition of stable ring.

**Theorem 5.** A torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module  $A$  is stable  $R$ -module if and only if  $R$  is a stable ring.

PROOF: We just give a proof for the necessary part and leave the other part to the reader. Suppose  $A = \langle x \rangle$  is a stable torsion-free  $R$ -module and  $(r, s) = R$ . Thus,  $rr' + ss' = 1_R$  for some  $r', s' \in R$ . Consequently,  $r'rx + s'sx = x$  implies  $\langle rx, sx \rangle = A$ . Now, by hypothesis for some  $t \in R$ ,  $\langle rx, sx \rangle = \langle rx + rsx \rangle$  implies  $rx + tsx = ux$  for some unit  $u$  in  $R$ . Hence,  $(r + ts) = R$  which means that  $R$  is a stable ring.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.** Any stable torsion-free cyclic  $R$ -module over a principal ideal domain  $R$  is an Euclidean  $R$ -module.

PROOF: Since by Theorem 5.3 in [1] any stable principal ideal domain is an Euclidean domain, then the result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5 and Theorem 22 above.  $\square$

**Remark.** In the following examples, it is shown that the converse of the above theorem is not always true.

*Example 4.* It is a well-known fact that  $Z$ , the ring of integers, is an Euclidean ring with the Euclidean function  $\phi(n) = |n|$  for any nonzero  $n \in Z$ . Consequently,  $Z$  is an Euclidean  $Z$ -module which is not stable since  $(3, 5) = Z$  is not stable in  $Z$ . Note that 1 and  $-1$  are the only units in  $Z$ . For a detailed study of stable rings and side divisors, see [2].

*Example 5.* In [2], it is shown that  $R[X]$  is not a stable ring for any ring  $R$ . Thus, any nonzero ideal of  $R[X]$  is an Euclidean  $R[X]$ -module which is not a stable  $R[X]$ -module whenever  $R$  is a field.

## References

1. D. Estes and J. Ohm, *Stable range in commutative rings*, J. Algebra 7 (1967), 343–362.
2. A.M. Rahimi, *Stable rings and side divisors*, Missouri Journal of Mathematical Sciences, Volum 10, No. 2, Spring 1998.
3. K.S. Williams, *Note on non-Euclidean principal ideal domains*, Math. Mag., May–June (1975), 176–177.