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#### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to introduce some new classes of modules which is closely related to the classes of sharp modules, pseudo-Dedekind modules and $T V$-modules. In this paper we introduce the concepts of $\Phi$-sharp modules, $\Phi$-pseudoDedekind modules and $\Phi$ - $T V$-modules. Let $R$ be a commutative ring with identity and set $\mathbb{H}=\{M \mid M$ is an $R$-module and $\operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a divided prime submodule of $M\}$. For an $R$-module $M \in \mathbb{H}$, set $T=(R \backslash Z(M)) \cap(R \backslash Z(R)), \mathfrak{T}(M)=T^{-1}(M)$ and $P:=$ $\left(\operatorname{Nil}(M):_{R} M\right)$. In this case the mapping $\Phi: \mathfrak{T}(M) \longrightarrow M_{P}$ given by $\Phi(x / s)=x / s$ is an $R$-module homomorphism. The restriction of $\Phi$ to $M$ is also an $R$-module homomorphism from $M$ in to $M_{P}$ given by $\Phi(m / 1)=m / 1$ for every $m \in M$. An $R$-module $M \in \mathbb{H}$ is called a $\Phi$-sharp module if for every nonnil submodules $N, L$ of $M$ and every nonnil ideal $I$ of $R$ with $N \supseteq I L$, there exist a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and a submodule $L^{\prime} \supseteq L$ of $M$ such that $N=I^{\prime} L^{\prime}$. We prove that Many of the properties and characterizations of sharp modules may be extended to $\Phi$-sharp modules, but some can not.


## 1. Introduction

We assume throughout this paper all rings are commutative with $1 \neq 0$ and all modules are unitary. An element $x$ of an integral domain $R$ is called primal if whenever $x \mid y_{1} y_{2}$, with $x, y_{1}, y_{2} \in R$, then $x=z_{1} z_{2}$ where $z_{1} \mid y_{1}$ and $z_{2} \mid y_{2}$. Cohn in [18] introduced the concept of Schreier domains.

[^0]An integral domain $R$ is called a pre-Schreier domain if every nonzero element of $R$ is primal. If in addition $R$ is integrally closed, then $R$ is called a Schreier domain. In [27], Z. Ahmad, T. Dumitrescu and M. Epure introduced the notion of sharp domains. A domain $R$ is said to be a sharp domain if whenever $I \supseteq A B$ with $I, A, B$ nonzero ideals of $R$, then there exist ideals $A^{\prime} \supseteq A$ and $B^{\prime} \supseteq B$ such that $I=A^{\prime} B^{\prime}$. Let $R$ be a ring with identity and $\operatorname{Nil}(R)$ be the set of nilpotent elements of $R$. Recall from [19] and [12], that a prime ideal $P$ of $R$ is called a divided prime ideal if $P \subset(x)$ for every $x \in R \backslash P$; thus a divided prime ideal is comparable to every ideal of $R$. Badawi in [9], [10], [12], [13], [14] and [15], the scond-named author investigated the class of rings $\mathcal{H}=\{R \mid R$ is a commutative ring with $1 \neq$ 0 and $\operatorname{Nil}(R)$ is a divided prime ideal of $R\}$. Anderson and Badawi in [6] and [7] generalized the concept of Prüfer, Dedekind, Krull and Bezout domain to context of rings that are in the class $\mathcal{H}$. Lucas and Badawi in [11] generalized the concept of Mori domains to the context of rings that are in the class $\mathcal{H}$. Also, authors this paper in [25] generalized the concept of sharp domains to the context of rings that are in the class $\mathcal{H}$. Let $R$ be a ring, $Z(R)$ the set of zero divisors of $R$ and $S=R \backslash Z(R)$. Then $T(R):=S^{-1} R$ denoted the total quotient ring of $R$. We start by recalling some background material. A nonzero divisor of a ring $R$ is called a regular element and an ideal of $R$ is said to be regular if it contains a regular element. An ideal $I$ of a ring $R$ is said to be a nonnil ideal if $I \nsubseteq \operatorname{Nil}(R)$. If $I$ is a nonnil ideal of $R \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\operatorname{Nil}(R) \subset I$. In particular, it holds if $I$ is a regular ideal of a ring $R \in \mathcal{H}$. Recall from [6] that for a ring $R \in \mathcal{H}$, the map $\phi: T(R) \longrightarrow R_{\text {Nil }(R)}$ given by $\phi(a / b)=a / b$, for $a \in R$ and $b \in R \backslash Z(R)$, is a ring homomorphism from $T(R)$ into $R_{\mathrm{Nil}(R)}$ and $\phi$ resticted to $R$ is also a ring homomorphism from $R$ into $R_{\operatorname{Nil}(R)}$ given by $\phi(x)=x / 1$ for every $x \in R$. Let $R \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $R$ is called a $\phi$-sharp ring if whenever for nonnil ideals $I, A, B$ of $R$ with $I \supseteq A B$, then $I=A^{\prime} B^{\prime}$ for nonnil ideals $A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}$ of $R$ where $A^{\prime} \supseteq A$ and $B^{\prime} \supseteq B[25]$.

For a nonzero ideal $I$ of $R$ let $I^{-1}=\{x \in T(R): x I \subseteq R\}$. It is obvious that $I I^{-1} \subseteq R$. An ideal $I$ of $R$ is called invertible, if $I I^{-1}=R$. The $\nu$-closure of $I$ is the ideal $I_{\nu}=\left(I^{-1}\right)^{-1}$ and $I$ is called divisorial ideal ( or $\nu$ - ideal ) if $I_{\nu}=I$. A nonzero ideal $I$ of $R$ is called $t$-ideal if $I=I_{t}$ in which

$$
I_{t}=\bigcup\left\{J_{\nu} \mid J \subseteq I \text { is a nonzero finitely generated ideal of } R\right\}
$$

Let $R \in \mathcal{H}$. Then a nonnil ideal $I$ of $R$ is called $\phi$-invertible if $\phi(I)$ is an invertible ideal of $\phi(R)$. A nonnil ideal $I$ is $\phi$ - $\nu$-ideal if $\phi(I)$ is a $\nu$-ideal of $\phi(R)$ [11]. A nonnil ideal $I$ of $R$ is a $\phi$-t-ideal if $\phi(I)$ is a $t$-ideal of
$\phi(R)$ [25]. Let $R \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $R$ is called a $\phi$-pseudo-Dedekind ring if the $\nu$-closure of each nonnil ideal of $R$ is $\phi$-invertible. Also, $R$ is said to be a $\phi-T V$ ring in which every $\phi$ - $t$-ideal is a $\phi$ - $\nu$-ideal [25].

Let $R$ be a ring and $M$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is a multiplication $R$-module if every submodule $N$ of $M$ has the form $I M$ for some ideal $I$ of $R$. If $M$ be a multiplication $R$-module and $N$ a submodule of $M$, then $N=I M$ for some ideal $I$ of $R$. Hence $I \subseteq\left(N:_{R} M\right)$ and so $N=I M \subseteq\left(N:_{R} M\right) M \subseteq N$. Therefore $N=\left(N:_{R} M\right) M$ [16]. Let $M$ be a multiplication $R$-module, $N=I M$ and $L=J M$ be submodules of $M$ for fome ideals $I$ and $J$ of $R$. Then, the product of $N$ and $L$ is denoted by $N . L$ or $N L$ and is defined by $I J M$ [5]. An $R$-module $M$ is called a cancellation module if $I M=J M$ for two ideals $I$ and $J$ of $R$ implies $I=J[1]$. By [21, Corollary 1 to Theorem 9], finitely generated faithful multiplication modules are cancellation modules. It follows that if $M$ is a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module, then $\left(I N:_{R} M\right)=I\left(N:_{R} M\right)$ for all ideals $I$ of $R$ and all submodules $N$ of $M$. If $R$ is an integral domain and $M$ a faithful multiplication $R$-module, then $M$ is a finitely generated $R$-module [17]. Let $M$ be an $R$-module and set

$$
\begin{aligned}
T & =\{t \in S: \text { for all } m \in M, t m=0 \text { implies } m=0\} \\
& =(R \backslash Z(M)) \cap(R \backslash Z(R)) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $T$ is a multiplicatively closed subset of $R$ with $T \subseteq S$, and if $M$ is torsion-free then $T=S$. In particular, $T=S$ if $M$ is a faithful multiplication $R$-module [17, Lemma 4.1]. Let $N$ be a nonzero submodule of $M$. Then we write $N^{-1}=\left(M:_{R_{T}} N\right)=\left\{x \in R_{T}: x N \subseteq M\right\}$. Then $N^{-1}$ is an $R$-submodule of $R_{T}, R \subseteq N^{-1}$ and $N N^{-1} \subseteq M$. We say that $N$ is invertible in $M$ if $N N^{-1}=M$. Clearly $0 \neq M$ is invertible in $M$. An $R$-module $M$ is called a Dedekind module if every nonzero submodule of $M$ is invertible [20]. An $R$-module $M$ is called a valuation module if for all $m, n \in M$, either $R m \subseteq R n$ or $R n \subseteq R m$. Equivalently, $M$ is a valuation module if for all submodules $N$ and $K$ of $M$, either $N \subseteq K$ or $K \subseteq N[3]$. The $\nu$-closure of $N$ is the submodule $N_{\nu}=\left(N^{-1}\right)^{-1}$ and $N$ is called $\nu$-submodule if $N=N_{\nu} M$ [23] and [3]. If $M$ is a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module, then $N_{\nu}=\left(N:_{R} M\right)$. Consequently, $M_{\nu}=R$. Let $M$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module, $N$ a submodule of $M$ and $I$ an ideal of $R$. Then $N$ is a $\nu$-submodule of $M$ if and only if $\left(N:_{R} M\right)$ is a $\nu$-ideal of $R$. Also $I$ is $\nu$-ideal of $R$ if and only if $I M$ is a $\nu$-submodule of $M$ [2]. If $N$ is an invertible submodule
of a faithful multiplication module $M$ over an integral domain $R$, then $\left(N:_{R} M\right)$ is invertible and hence is a $\nu$-ideal of $R$. So $N$ is a $\nu$-submodule of $M$ [2]. If $R$ is an integral domain, $M$ a faithful multiplication $R$-module and $N$ a nonzero submodule of $M$, then $N_{\nu}=\left(N:_{R} M\right)_{\nu}$ [2, Lemma 1].

Let $M$ be an $R$-module. An element $r \in R$ is said to be zero divisor on $M$ if $r m=0$ for some $0 \neq m \in M$. The set of zero divisors of $M$ is denoted by $Z_{R}(M)$ (briefly, $Z(M)$ ). It is easy to see that $Z(M)$ is not necessarily an ideal of $R$, but it has the property that if $a, b \in R$ with $a b \in Z(M)$, then either $a \in Z(M)$ or $b \in Z(M)$. A submodule $N$ of $M$ is called a nilpotent submodule if $\left[N:_{R} M\right]^{n} N=0$ for some positive integer $n$. An element $m \in M$ is said to be nilpotent if $R m$ is a nilpotent submodule of $M$ [4]. We let $\operatorname{Nil}(M)$ to denote the set of all nilpotent elements of $M$; then $\operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a submodule of $M$ provided that $M$ is a faithful module, and if in addition $M$ is multiplication, then $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=\operatorname{Nil}(R) M=\bigcap P$, where the intersection runs over all prime submodules of $M$, [4, Theorem 6]. If $M$ contains no nonzero nilpotent elements, then $M$ is called a reduced $R$-module. A submodule $N$ of $M$ is said to be a nonnil submodule if $N \nsubseteq \operatorname{Nil}(M)$. Recall that a submodule $N$ of $M$ is prime if whenever $r m \in N$ for some $r \in R$ and $m \in M$, then either $m \in N$ or $r M \subseteq N$. If $N$ is a prime submodule of $M$, then $p:=\left[N:_{R} M\right]$ is a prime ideal of $R$. In this case we say that $N$ is a $p$-prime submodule of $M$. Let $N$ be a submodule of multiplication $R$-module $M$, then $N$ is a prime submodule of $M$ if and only if $\left[N:_{R} M\right.$ ] is a prime ideal of $R$ if and only if $N=p M$ for some prime ideal $p$ of $R$ with $\left[0:_{R} M\right] \subseteq p$, [17, Corollary 2.11]. Recall from [3] that a prime submodule $P$ of $M$ is called a divided prime submodule if $P \subset R m$ for every $m \in M \backslash P$; thus a divided prime submodule is comparable to every submodule of $M$.

Now assume that $T^{-1}(M)=\mathfrak{T}(M)$. Set

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{H}=\{M \mid M \text { is an } R \text {-module and } \operatorname{Nil}(M) \text { is a divided prime } \\
& \text { submodule of } M\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

For an $R$-module $M \in \mathbb{H}, \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a prime submodule of $M$. So $P:=$ $\left[\operatorname{Nil}(M):_{R} M\right]$ is a prime ideal of $R$. If $M$ is an $R$-module and $\operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a proper submodule of $M$, then $\left[\operatorname{Nil}(M):_{R} M\right] \subseteq Z(R)$. Consequently, $R \backslash Z(R) \subseteq R \backslash\left[\operatorname{Nil}(M):_{R} M\right]$. In particular, $T \subseteq R \backslash\left[\operatorname{Nil}(M):_{R} M\right]$ [22]. Recall from [22] that we can define a mapping $\Phi: \mathfrak{T}(M) \longrightarrow M_{P}$ given by $\Phi(x / s)=x / s$ which is clearly an $R$-module homomorphism. The restriction of $\Phi$ to $M$ is also an $R$-module homomorphism from $M$ in to $M_{P}$ given by $\Phi(m / 1)=m / 1$ for every $m \in M$. A nonnil submodule
$N$ of $M$ is said to be $\Phi$-invertible if $\Phi(N)$ is an invertible submodule of $\Phi(M)$ [26]. Let $M \in \mathbb{H}$. Then $M$ is a $\Phi$-Dedekind $R$-module if every nonnil submodule of $M$ is $\Phi$-invertible [26]. In this paper we introduce a generalization of $\phi$-sharp rings and give some properties of this class of modules.

## 2. $\Phi$-sharp modules

Definition 2.1. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is called a $\Phi$-sharp module if for every nonnil submodules $N, L$ of $M$ and every nonnil ideal $I$ of $R$ with $N \supseteq I L$, there exist a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and a submodule $L^{\prime} \supseteq L$ of $M$ such that $N=I^{\prime} L^{\prime}$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ with $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. Then $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module if and only if $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a sharp module.

Proof. Since $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$, then $\operatorname{Nil}(R)=\left(\operatorname{Nil}(M):_{R} M\right)=$ $\left(Z(R) M:_{R} M\right)=Z(R)$ by $[22$, Proposition 1]. Let $M$ be a $\Phi$-sharp module and let $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M), L / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ be nonzero submodules of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ and $I$ be a nonzero ideal of $R$ with $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M) \supseteq I(L / \operatorname{Nil}(M))$. Then $N \supseteq I L$ and so there exist a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and a submodule $L^{\prime} \supseteq L$ of $M$ such that $N=I^{\prime} L^{\prime}$. Thus $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)=I^{\prime}\left(\left(L^{\prime} / \operatorname{Nil}(M)\right)\right.$ for nonzero ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and for a nonzero submodule $L / \operatorname{Nil}(M) \supseteq L^{\prime} / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ as well.

Conversely, let $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ be a sharp module and let $N, L$ be nonnil submodules of $M$ and $I$ a nonnil ideal of $R$ such that $N \supseteq I L$. Then $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M), L / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ are nonzero submodules of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ and $I$ is a nonzero ideal of $R$ with $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M) \supseteq I(L / \operatorname{Nil}(M))$. So, $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)=$ $I^{\prime}\left(\left(L^{\prime} / \operatorname{Nil}(M)\right)\right.$ for nonzero ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and for a nonzero submodule $L / \operatorname{Nil}(M) \supseteq L^{\prime} / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$. Therefore $N=I^{\prime} L^{\prime}$ for a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and for a submodule $L^{\prime} \supseteq L$ of $M$. Thus $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module.

Lemma 2.3. ([26, Lemma 2.6]) Let $R$ be a ring and $M$ a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module with $M \in \mathbb{H}$. Then $\frac{M}{\operatorname{Nil}(M)}$ is isomorphic to $\frac{\Phi(M)}{\operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))}$ as $R$-module.

Corollary 2.4. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module with $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. Then $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module if and only if $\frac{\Phi(M)}{\operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))}$ is a sharp module.

Theorem 2.5. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ with $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. Then $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module if and only if $\Phi(M)$ is a sharp module.

Proof. Let $M$ be a $\Phi$-sharp module and let $\Phi(N) \supseteq I \Phi(L)$ for nonnil submodules $N, L$ of $M$ and nonnil ideal $I$ of $R$. Since $\operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a divided prime submodule of $M$ and $N, L$ properly contain $\operatorname{Nil}(M)$, so both contain $\operatorname{Ker}(\Phi)$ by [26, Propoition 2.1]. Therefore $N \supseteq I L$ and hence $N=I^{\prime} L^{\prime}$ for a nonnil submodule $L^{\prime} \supseteq L$ of $M$ and a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$. Thus $\Phi(N)=I^{\prime} \Phi\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ for a submodule $\Phi\left(L^{\prime}\right) \supseteq \Phi(L)$ and an ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$. So $\Phi(M)$ is a sharp module.

Converesly, Let $\Phi(M)$ be a sharp module and let $N, L$ be nonnil submodules of $M$ and $I$ an ideal of $R$ with $N \supseteq I L$. Thus $\Phi(N) \supseteq I \Phi(L)$ and so $\Phi(N)=I^{\prime} \Phi\left(L^{\prime}\right)$ for a submodule $\Phi\left(L^{\prime}\right) \supseteq \Phi(L)$ and an ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$. By the same reason as above, we have $N=I^{\prime} L^{\prime}$ for a nonnil submodule $L^{\prime} \supseteq L$ of $M$ and a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$. Hence $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module.

Corollary 2.6. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module with $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. The following statements are equivalent:
(1) $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module;
(2) $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a sharp module;
(3) $\frac{\Phi(M)}{\operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))}$ is a sharp module;
(4) $\Phi(M)$ is a sharp module.

Proposition 2.7. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module with $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. If $M$ is a $\Phi$ Dedekind module, then $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module.

Proof. If $M$ is a $\Phi$-Dedekind module, then $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a Dedekind module by [26, Theorem 2.10]. So, by [23, Corollary 3.5], $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a sharp module. Therefore, by Theorem $2.2, M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module.

In [26] it is shown that for each prime ideal $P$ of $R,(M / \operatorname{Nil}(M))_{P}=$ $M_{P} /(\operatorname{Nil}(M))_{P}=M_{P} / \operatorname{Nil}\left(M_{P}\right)$ and $M_{P} \in \mathbb{H}$.

Proposition 2.8. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a $\Phi$-sharp module with $\mathrm{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. Then $M_{P}$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module for each prime ideal $P$ of $R$.

Proof. We have $\operatorname{Nil}(R) \subseteq \operatorname{Ann}\left(\frac{M}{\operatorname{Nil}(R) M}\right)=\operatorname{Ann}\left(\frac{M}{\operatorname{Nil}(M)}\right)$. If $M$ is a $\Phi-$ sharp module, then by Theorem $2.2, M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a sharp module. So, by
[23, Proposition 3.8], $(M / \operatorname{Nil}(M))_{P}=M_{P} / \operatorname{Nil}\left(M_{P}\right)$ is a sharp module. Therefore, by Theorem $2.2, M_{P}$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module.

Theorem 2.9. Let $R$ be a ring and $M$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module. The following statements are equivalent:
(1) If $R \in \mathcal{H}$ is a $\phi$-sharp ring, then $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module;
(2) If $M \in \mathbb{H}$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module, then $R$ is a $\phi$-sharp ring.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow(2)$ Let $R \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, by [22, Proposition 3], $M \in \mathbb{H}$. Let $R$ be a $\phi$-sharp ring and let $N, L$ be nonnil submodules of $M$ and $I$ be a nonnil ideal of $R$ with $N \supseteq I L$. Then $\left(N:_{R} M\right),\left(L:_{R} M\right)$ are nonnil ideals of $R$ such that $\left(N:_{R} M\right) \supseteq I\left(L:_{R} M\right)$. So $\left(N:_{R} M\right)=I^{\prime} J^{\prime}$ for nonnil ideals $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ and $J^{\prime} \supseteq\left(L:_{R} M\right)$ of $R$. Thus $N=I^{\prime}\left(J^{\prime} M\right)$ for a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and a nonnil submodule $J^{\prime} M \supseteq L$ of $M$. Therefore $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module.
$(2) \Rightarrow(1)$ Let $M \in \mathbb{H}$. Then, by [22, Proposition 3$], R \in \mathcal{H}$. Let $M$ be a $\Phi$-sharp module and let $I, J, K$ be nonnil ideals of $R$ with $K \supseteq I J$. So $K M, J M$ are nonnil submodules of $M$ such that $K M \supseteq I(J M)$. Thus $K M=I^{\prime} L^{\prime}$ for a nonnil ideal $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ of $R$ and a nonnil submodule $L^{\prime} \supseteq J M$ of $M$. Therefore $K=I^{\prime}\left(L^{\prime}:_{R} M\right)$ for nonnil ideals $I^{\prime} \supseteq I$ and $\left(L^{\prime}:_{R} M\right) \supseteq J$ of $R$. So $R$ is a $\phi$-sharp ring.

Definition 2.10. Let $R$ be a ring and $M$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is said to be a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module if the $\nu$-closure of each nonnil submodule of $M$ is $\Phi$-invertible.

Theorem 2.11. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module if and only if $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a pseudoDedekind module.

Proof. Let $M$ be a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module and $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ be a nonzero submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$. Then $N$ is a nonnil submodule of $M$ and so the $\nu$-closure of $N$ is $\Phi$-invertible, i.e, $N_{\nu}$ is $\Phi$-invertible. Thus, by [24, Lemma 3.6], $(N / \operatorname{Nil}(M))_{\nu}=N_{\nu} / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is invertible as well.

Conversely, let $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ be a pseudo-Dedekind module and $N$ be a nonnil submodule of $M$. Thus $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a nonzero submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ and so $N_{\nu} / \operatorname{Nil}(M)=(N / \operatorname{Nil}(M))_{\nu}$ is invertible. So, by [24, Lemma 3.6], $N_{\nu}$ is $\Phi$-invertible. Therefore, $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module.

By Lemma 2.3, we have the following theorem.

Corollary 2.12. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module. Then $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module if and only if $\frac{\Phi(M)}{\operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))}$ is a pseudo-Dedekind module.

Theorem 2.13. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module if and only if $\Phi(M)$ is a pseudo-Dedekind module.

Proof. Let $M$ be a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module and $\Phi(N)$ be a submodule of $\Phi(M)$ for a nonnil submodule $N$ of $M$. Thus $N_{\nu}$ is $\Phi$-invertible. Hence $\Phi\left(N_{\nu}\right)=(\Phi(N))_{\nu}$ is invertible.

Conversely, let $\Phi(M)$ be a pseudo-Dedekind module and $N$ be a nonnil submodule of $M$. Then $\Phi(N)$ is a submodule of $\Phi(M)$ and so $(\Phi(N))_{\nu}=\Phi\left(N_{\nu}\right)$ is invertible submodule of $\Phi(M)$. Therefore $N_{\nu}$ is $\Phi$-invertible.

Corollary 2.14. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module. The following are equivalent:
(1) $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module;
(2) $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a pseudo-Dedekind module;
(3) $\Phi(M) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))$ is a pseudo-Dedekind module;
(4) $\Phi(M)$ is a pseudo-Dedekind module.

Theorem 2.15. Let $R$ be a ring and $M$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module. The following statements are equivalent:
(1) If $R \in \mathcal{H}$ is a $\phi$-pseudo-Dedekind ring, then $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudoDedekind module;
(2) If $M \in \mathbb{H}$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module, then $R$ is a $\phi$-pseudoDedekind ring.

Proof. Since $\operatorname{Nil}(R) \subseteq \operatorname{Ann}\left(\frac{M}{\operatorname{Nil}(R) M}\right)=\operatorname{Ann}\left(\frac{M}{\operatorname{Nil}(M)}\right)$, we have:
$(1) \Rightarrow(2)$ Let $R \in \mathcal{H}$. Then, by [22, Proposition 3], $M \in \mathbb{H}$. If $R$ is a $\phi$-pseudo-Dedekind ring, then by [25, Theorem 2.10], $\frac{R}{\operatorname{Nil}(R)}$ is a pseudoDedekind domain. So, by [23, Theorem 3.12], $\frac{M}{\operatorname{Nil}(M)}$ is a pseudo-Dedekind module. Therefore, by Theorem $2.11, M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module.
$(2) \Rightarrow(1)$ Let $M \in \mathbb{H}$. Then, by [22, Proposition 3], $R \in \mathcal{H}$. If $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module, then by Theorem 2.11, $\frac{M}{\operatorname{Nil}(M)}$ is a pseudoDedekind module. So, by [23, Theorem 3.12], $\frac{R}{\operatorname{Nil}(R)}$ is a pseudo-Dedekind domain. Therefore, by [25, Theorem 2.10], $R$ is a $\phi$-pseudo-Dedekind ring.

Proposition 2.16. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module. If $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module, then $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module.

Proof. Let $M$ be a $\Phi$-sharp module. Then, by Theorem $2.2, M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a sharp module. So, by [23, Lemma 3.11], $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a pseudoDedekind module. Therefore, by Theorem $2.11, M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module.

Recall from [26], an $R$-module $M \in \mathbb{H}$ is called a $\Phi$-valuation module if for every $u \in R_{\left(\operatorname{Nil}(R):{ }_{R} M\right)}$, we have $u \Phi(M) \subseteq \Phi(M)$ or $u^{-1} \Phi(M) \subseteq \Phi(M)$; equivalently, for every $a, b \notin\left(\operatorname{Nil}(R):_{R} M\right)$, either, $a \Phi(M) \subseteq b \Phi(M)$ or $b \Phi(M) \subseteq a \Phi(M)$.

Theorem 2.17. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $\Phi$-valuation $R$-module. Then the following are equivalent:
(1) $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module;
(2) $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module.

Proof. $(1) \Rightarrow(2)$ is given by Proposition 2.16 .
$(2) \Rightarrow(1)$ Let $M$ is a $\Phi$-pseudo-Dedekind module. Then, by Theorem 2.11, $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a pseudo-Dedekind-module. Since $M$ is a $\Phi$ valuation module, then by [26, Theorem 2.13], $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a Valuation module. So $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is sharp module by [23, Proposition 3.14]. Therefore, by Theorem $2.11, M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module.

Definition 2.18. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. A nonnil submodule $N$ of $M$ is called a $\Phi$-t-submodule of $M$ if $\Phi(N)$ is a $t$-submodule of $\Phi(M)$.

It is worthwhile to note that $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $t$-submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ if and only if $\Phi(N) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))$ is a $t$-submodule of $\Phi(M) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))$.

Lemma 2.19. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module and let $N$ be a nonnil submodule of $M$. Then $N$ is a $\Phi$-t-submodule of $M$ if and only if $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $t$-submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$.

Proof. Let $N$ be a $\Phi$ - $t$-submodule of $M$. Then $\Phi(N)$ is a $t$-submodule of $\Phi(M)$. Thus $\Phi(N)=\Phi(N)_{\nu} \Phi(M)$ and so

$$
\Phi(N) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))=\left(\Phi(N)_{\nu} / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))\right)(\Phi(M) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M)))
$$

Therefore $\Phi(N) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))$ is a $t$-submodule of $\Phi(M) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))$. Hence $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $t$-submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$. Conversely is same.

Definition 2.20. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is said to be a $\Phi-T V$ module if every $\Phi$ - $t$-submodule is a $\Phi$ - $\nu$-submodule.

Theorem 2.21. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is a $\Phi-T V$ module if and only if $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $T V$-module.

Proof. Let $M$ be a $\Phi-T V$ module and $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ be a $t$-submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$. Then, by Lemma $2.19, N$ a is $\Phi$ - $t$-submodule of $M$ and so $N$ is a $\Phi$ - $\nu$-submodule of $M$. Hence, by [24, Lemma 3.6], $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $\nu$-submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$. Thus $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $T V$-module.

Conversely, let $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ be a $T V$-module and $N$ be a $\Phi$ - $t$-submodule of $M$. Then, by Lemma $2.19, N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $t$-submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ and so $N / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $\nu$-submodule of $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$. Therefore, by [24, Lemma 3.6], $N$ is a $\Phi$-t-submodule of $M$ as well.

Corollary 2.22. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is a $\Phi-T V$ module if and only if $\Phi(M) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))$ is a $T V$-module.

Theorem 2.23. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module. Then $M$ is a $\Phi-T V$ module if and only if $\Phi(M)$ is a TV module.

Proof. Let $M$ be a $\Phi-T V$ module and $\Phi(N)$ be a $t$-submodule of $\Phi(M)$. Then $N$ is a $\Phi$-t-submodule of $M$ and so $N$ is a $\Phi-\nu$-submodule of $M$. Therefore, $\Phi(N)$ is a $\nu$-submodule of $\Phi(M)$. Hence $\Phi(M)$ is a $T V$ module.

Conversely, let $\Phi(M)$ be a $T V$ module and $N$ be a $\Phi$-t-submodule of $M$. Then $\Phi(N)$ is a $t$-submodule of $\Phi(M)$ and so $\Phi(N)$ is a $\nu$-submodule of $\Phi(M)$. Thus $N$ is a $\Phi-\nu$-submodule of $M$. Therefore $M$ is a $\Phi-T V$ module.

Corollary 2.24. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module. The following are equivalent:
(1) $M$ is a $\Phi-T V$ module;
(2) $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a $T V$ module;
(3) $\Phi(M) / \operatorname{Nil}(\Phi(M))$ is a TV module;
(4) $\Phi(M)$ is a $T V$ module.

Theorem 2.25. Let $R$ be a ring and $M$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module. The following statements are equivalent:
(1) If $R \in \mathcal{H}$ is a $\phi-T V$ ring, then $M$ is a $\Phi-T V$ module;
(2) If $M \in \mathbb{H}$ is a $\Phi-T V$ module, then $R$ is a $\phi-T V$ ring.

Proof. By [22], [23] and [25], the proof is the same of the proof of Theorem 2.15.

The notion of a $\Phi$-sharp- $T V$ module means that a module that is both a $\Phi$-sharp module and a $\Phi-T V$ module.

Theorem 2.26. Let $R$ be a ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be a finitely generated faithful multiplication $R$-module with $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. If $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp $T V$ module, then $M$ is a $\Phi$-Dedekind module.

Proof. Let $M$ be a $\Phi$-sharp $T V$ module. Then, by Theorem 2.2 and Theorem $2.21, M / \mathrm{Nil}(M)$ is a sharp $T V$ module. So, by [23, Corollary 3.21], $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a Dedekind module. Therefore $M$ is a $\Phi$-Dedekind module by [26, Theorem2.10].

Theorem 2.27. Let $R$ be a countable ring and $M \in \mathbb{H}$ be an $R$-module with $\operatorname{Nil}(M)=Z(R) M$. If $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module, then $M$ is a $\Phi$ Dedekind module.

Proof. If $M$ is a $\Phi$-sharp module, then $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a sharp module by Theorem 2.2. So, by [23, Theorem 3.7], $R$ is a sharp domain and hence by [27, Corollary 17], $R$ is a Dedekind domain. Thus $M / \operatorname{Nil}(M)$ is a Dedekind domain. Therefore, by [26, Theorem2.10], $M$ is a $\Phi$-Dedekind module.
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