

SPLITTING OF SHORT EXACT SEQUENCES FOR MODULES

KEITH CONRAD

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be a commutative ring. A sequence of R -modules and R -linear maps

$$N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} P$$

is called *exact* at M if $\text{im } f = \ker g$. For example, to say $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{h} P$ is exact at M means h is injective, and to say $N \xrightarrow{h} M \rightarrow 0$ is exact at M means h is surjective. The linear maps coming out of 0 or going to 0 are unique, so there is no need to label them.

A *short exact sequence* of R -modules is a sequence of R -modules and R -linear maps

$$(1.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$$

which is exact at N , M , and P . That means f is injective, g is surjective, and $\text{im } f = \ker g$.

Example 1.1. For an R -module M and submodule N , there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M/N \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the map $N \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion and the map $M \rightarrow M/N$ is reduction modulo N .

Example 1.2. For R -modules N and P , the direct sum $N \oplus P$ fits into the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow N \oplus P \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the map $N \rightarrow N \oplus P$ is the standard embedding $n \mapsto (n, 0)$ and the map $N \oplus P \rightarrow P$ is the standard projection $(n, p) \mapsto p$.

Example 1.3. Let I and J be ideals in R such that $I + J = R$. Then there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I \cap J \longrightarrow I \oplus J \xrightarrow{+} R \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the map $I \oplus J \rightarrow R$ is addition, whose kernel is $\{(x, -x) : x \in I \cap J\}$, and the map $I \cap J \rightarrow I \oplus J$ is $x \mapsto (x, -x)$. This is *not* the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow I \oplus J \rightarrow J \rightarrow 0$ as in Example 1.2, even though the middle modules in both are $I \oplus J$.

Any short exact sequence that looks like the short exact sequence of a direct sum in Example 1.2 is called a *split* short exact sequence. More precisely, a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$ is called split when there is an R -module isomorphism $\theta: M \rightarrow N \oplus P$ such that the diagram

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \xrightarrow{f} & M & \xrightarrow{g} & P \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \text{id} \downarrow & & \theta \downarrow & & \text{id} \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & N \oplus P & \longrightarrow & P \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

1

commutes, where the bottom maps to and from the direct sum are the standard embedding and projection.

In Section 2 we will give two ways to characterize when a short exact sequence of R -modules splits. Section 3 will discuss a few consequences. Before doing that, we want to stress that being split is not just saying there is an isomorphism $M \rightarrow N \oplus P$ of R -modules, but *how* the isomorphism works with the maps f and g in the exact sequence: commutativity of (1.2) says $f: N \rightarrow M$ behaves like the standard embedding $N \rightarrow N \oplus P$ and $g: M \rightarrow P$ behaves like the standard projection $N \oplus P \rightarrow P$. (Notice that the outer vertical maps in (1.2) are both the identities.)

Example 1.4. Let $R = \mathbf{Z}$, so R -modules are just abelian groups. Fix a positive integer $a > 1$. Set

- $N = \mathbf{Z}$,
- $P = (\mathbf{Z}/a\mathbf{Z})^{\mathbf{N}}$ (a countable direct product of copies of $\mathbf{Z}/a\mathbf{Z}$ indexed by $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$),
- $M = N \oplus P = \mathbf{Z} \oplus (\mathbf{Z}/a\mathbf{Z})^{\mathbf{N}}$.

Even though M literally equals the direct sum of N and P , we will build a short exact sequence

$$(1.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$$

that does *not* split.

Define $f: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z} \oplus (\mathbf{Z}/a\mathbf{Z})^{\mathbf{N}}$ and $g: M \rightarrow P$ by

$$f(n) = (an, \mathbf{0}), \quad g(x, \overline{y_0}, \overline{y_1}, \dots) = (\overline{x}, \overline{y_0}, \overline{y_1}, \dots).$$

In words, g reduces the first component modulo a and shifts the other components over one position. Both f and g are $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear (*i.e.*, they are additive), f is obviously injective, g is obviously surjective, and $\text{im } f = a\mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{0} = \ker g$, so we get a short exact sequence (1.3) where $M = N \oplus P$. We will show there is no isomorphism $\theta: M \rightarrow N \oplus P$ making (1.2) commute.

If there were an isomorphism $\theta: M \rightarrow N \oplus P$ making (1.2) commute then the second component of $\theta(x, \mathbf{y})$ in P must be $g(x, \mathbf{y})$. Write the first component as $f'(x, \mathbf{y})$: $\theta(x, \mathbf{y}) = (f'(x, \mathbf{y}), g(x, \mathbf{y}))$. Commutativity of (1.2) in this example tells us $\theta(f(n)) = (n, \mathbf{0})$ for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}$, so $f'(f(n)) = n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}$. Thus

$$n = f'(f(n)) = f'(an, \mathbf{0}) = f'(a(n, \mathbf{0})) = af'(n, \mathbf{0})$$

for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}$, which is a contradiction when $n = 1$ since $a > 1$.

The lesson of this example is that being split is not about a module being isomorphic to a direct sum in an arbitrary way: the linear maps in the short exact sequence matter just as much as the modules.

2. WHEN A SHORT EXACT SEQUENCE SPLITS

Theorem 2.1. Let $0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence of R -modules. The following are equivalent:

- (1) There is an R -linear map $f': M \rightarrow N$ such that $f'(f(n)) = n$ for all $n \in N$.
- (2) There is an R -linear map $g': P \rightarrow M$ such that $g(g'(p)) = p$ for all $p \in P$.
- (3) The short exact sequence splits: there is an isomorphism $\theta: M \rightarrow N \oplus P$ such that the diagram (1.2) commutes.

If we replace R -modules with groups and R -linear maps with group homomorphisms, conditions (1) and (2) are not equivalent: for a short exact sequence $1 \rightarrow H \xrightarrow{f} G \xrightarrow{g} K \rightarrow 1$, (1) corresponds to G being a direct product of H and K while (2) corresponds to G being a semidirect product of H and K . The reason (1) and (2) are no longer equivalent for groups is related to noncommutativity. For an exact sequence of abelian groups, (1) and (2) are equivalent (this is the special case $R = \mathbf{Z}$, since abelian groups are $\mathbf{Z}$ -modules).

Proof. We will first show (1) and (3) are equivalent, and then (2) and (3) are equivalent.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Define $\theta: M \rightarrow N \oplus P$ by

$$\theta(m) = (f'(m), g(m)).$$

Since f' and g are R -linear, θ is R -linear.

To see that the diagram (1.2) commutes, going around the top and right of the first square has the effect $n \mapsto f(n) \mapsto \theta(f(n)) = (f'(f(n)), g(f(n))) = (n, 0)$ and going around the left and bottom has the effect $n \mapsto n \mapsto (n, 0)$. Going both ways around the second square sends $m \in M$ to $g(m) \in P$.

To see θ is injective, suppose $\theta(m) = (0, 0)$, so $f'(m) = 0$ and $g(m) = 0$. From exactness at M , the condition $g(m) = 0$ implies $m = f(n)$ for some $n \in N$. Then $0 = f'(m) = f'(f(n)) = n$, so $m = f(n) = f(0) = 0$.

To show θ is surjective, let $(n, p) \in N \oplus P$. Since g is onto, $p = g(m)$ for some $m \in M$, so $p = g(m) = g(m + f(x))$ for any $x \in N$. To have $\theta(m + f(x)) = (n, p)$, we seek an $x \in N$ such that

$$n = f'(m + f(x)) = f'(m) + f'(f(x)) = f'(m) + x.$$

So define $x := n - f'(m)$. Then $m + f(x) = m + f(n) - f(f'(m))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(m + f(x)) &= (f'(m + f(x)), g(m + f(x))) \\ &= (n, g(m)) \\ &= (n, p). \end{aligned}$$

Thus θ is an isomorphism of R -modules.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Suppose there is an R -module isomorphism $\theta: M \rightarrow N \oplus P$ making (1.2) commute. From commutativity of the second square in (1.2), $\theta(m) = (*, g(m))$. Let the first coordinate of $\theta(m)$ be $f'(m)$: $\theta(m) = (f'(m), g(m))$. Then $f': M \rightarrow N$. Since θ is R -linear, f' is R -linear. By commutativity in the first square of (1.2), $\theta(f(n)) = (n, 0)$ for $n \in N$, so $(f'(f(n)), g(f(n))) = (n, 0)$, so $f'(f(n)) = n$ for all $n \in N$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): To get an isomorphism $M \rightarrow N \oplus P$, it is easier to go the other way. Let $h: N \oplus P \rightarrow M$ by

$$h(n, p) = f(n) + g'(p).$$

This is R -linear since f and g' are R -linear.

To show h is injective, if $h(n, p) = 0$ then $f(n) + g'(p) = 0$. Applying g to both sides, $g(f(n)) + g(g'(p)) = 0$, which simplifies to $p = 0$. Then $0 = f(n) + g'(0) = f(n)$, so $n = 0$ since f is injective.

To show h is surjective, pick $m \in M$. We want to find $n \in N$ and $p \in P$ such that

$$f(n) + g'(p) = m.$$

Applying g to both sides, we get

$$g(f(n)) + g(g'(p)) = g(m) \Rightarrow p = g(m).$$

So we define $p := g(m)$ and then ask if there is $n \in N$ such that $f(n) = m - g'(g(m))$. Since $\text{im } f = \ker g$, whether or not there is such an n is equivalent to checking $m - g'(g(m)) \in \ker g$:

$$\begin{aligned} g(m - g'(g(m))) &= g(m) - g(g'(g(m))) \\ &= g(m) - g(m) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $h: N \oplus P \rightarrow M$ is an isomorphism of R -modules. Let $\theta = h^{-1}$ be the inverse isomorphism.

To show the diagram (1.2) commutes, it is equivalent to show the “flipped” diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \xrightarrow{f} & M & \xrightarrow{g} & P \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \uparrow \text{id} & & \uparrow h & & \uparrow \text{id} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & N \oplus P & \longrightarrow & P \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

commutes ($h = \theta^{-1}$). For $n \in N$, going around the first square along the left and top has the effect $n \mapsto n \mapsto f(n)$, and going around the other way has the effect $n \mapsto (n, 0) \mapsto h(n, 0) = f(n) + g'(0) = f(n)$. In the second square, for $(n, p) \in N \oplus P$ going around the left and top has the effect $(n, p) \mapsto g(h(n, p)) = g(f(n)) + g(g'(p)) = 0 + p = p$, while going around the other way has the effect $(n, p) \mapsto p \mapsto p$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Let $g': P \rightarrow M$ by $g'(p) = \theta^{-1}(0, p)$. Since $p \mapsto (0, p)$ and θ^{-1} are R -linear, g' is R -linear. For $p \in P$, the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{g} & P \\ \theta \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} \\ N \oplus P & \longrightarrow & P \end{array}$$

implies commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{g} & P \\ \theta^{-1} \uparrow & & \uparrow \text{id} \\ N \oplus P & \longrightarrow & P \end{array}$$

so $g(g'(p)) = g(\theta^{-1}(0, p)) = p$. □

Example 2.2. Every short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$ where P is free splits, by using condition (2). Let $\{e_i\}$ be a basis of P and pick preimages: $e_i = g(m_i)$ for all i . Then define $g': P \rightarrow M$ by $g'(e_i) = m_i$ and extend this by R -linearity: $g(\sum r_i e_i) = \sum r_i m_i$ where the sum is finite. Since $g(g'(e_i)) = g(m_i) = e_i$, we have $g(g'(p)) = p$ for all $p \in P$ by linearity of both sides of the equation.

From exactness at N , $N \cong f(N)$. From exactness at M , $f(N) = \ker g$. An isomorphism $\theta: M \rightarrow f(N) \oplus P$ is $\theta(m) = (m - g'(g(m)), g(m))$.

Remark 2.3. It turns out that every short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} N \oplus P \xrightarrow{g} P \rightarrow 0$ with a direct sum in the middle is equivalent to the usual short exact sequence for $N \oplus P$

from Example 1.2 when R is a Noetherian ring and N and P are finitely generated R -modules.¹ Example 1.4 is a non-split short exact sequence with a direct sum in the middle, where $R = \mathbf{Z}$ is Noetherian and the module P is not finitely generated.

3. CONSEQUENCES

Let's take another look at the short exact sequence in Example 1.3:

$$(3.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow I \cap J \longrightarrow I \oplus J \xrightarrow{+} R \longrightarrow 0,$$

where I and J are ideals with $I + J = R$ and the map from $I \cap J$ to $I \oplus J$ is $x \mapsto (x, -x)$. It turns out this splits: $I \oplus J$ is isomorphic to $(I \cap J) \oplus R$ in a manner compatible with the maps in the short exact sequence. That is, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & I \cap J & \longrightarrow & I \oplus J & \xrightarrow{+} & R \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \theta & & \downarrow \text{id} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & I \cap J & \longrightarrow & (I \cap J) \oplus R & \longrightarrow & R \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

commutes for some isomorphism θ . The bottom row is the usual short exact sequence for a direct sum of R -modules. To show the sequence (3.1) splits, we use the equivalence of (2) and (3) in Theorem 2.1. From $I + J = R$ we have $x_0 + y_0 = 1$ for some $x_0 \in I$ and $y_0 \in J$. Let $g': R \rightarrow I \oplus J$ by $g'(r) = (rx_0, ry_0)$. Then $rx_0 + ry_0 = r$, so g' is a right inverse to the addition map $I \oplus J \rightarrow R$ and that shows (3.1) splits.

Although $I \oplus J \cong (I \cap J) \oplus R$ as R -modules, it need not be the case that either I or J is isomorphic to $I \cap J$ or R .

Example 3.1. Let $R = \mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$, $I = (3, 1 + \sqrt{-5})$, and $J = (3, 1 - \sqrt{-5})$. Then $I + J$ contains 3 and $1 + \sqrt{-5} + 1 - \sqrt{-5} = 2$, so it contains 1 and thus $I + J = R$. From $I + J = R$, $I \cap J = IJ$ and $IJ = 3R \cong R$. Therefore

$$I \oplus J \cong R \oplus R$$

as R -modules. The ideals I and J are not isomorphic to R as R -modules since they are nonprincipal ideals: $I^2 = (2 - \sqrt{-5})$, $J^2 = (2 + \sqrt{-5})$, and there are no solutions to $\alpha^2 = \pm(2 + \sqrt{-5})$ or $\beta^2 = \pm(2 - \sqrt{-5})$ in $\mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$.

Using Theorem 2.1, we can describe when a submodule $N \subset M$ is a direct summand.

Theorem 3.2. *For a submodule $N \subset M$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) N is a direct summand: $M = N \oplus P$ for some submodule $P \subset M$.
- (2) There is an R -linear map $f': M \rightarrow N$ such that $f'(n) = n$ for all $n \in N$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Let $f': M \rightarrow N$ by $f'(n + p) = n$. This is well-defined from the meaning of a direct sum decomposition, and it is R -linear. Obviously $f'(n) = n$ for $n \in N$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1): There is a standard short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M/N \longrightarrow 0.$$

¹See T. Miyata, *Note on direct summands of modules*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **7** (1967), 65–69, where the result is attributed to Toda. See also <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/167701/>.

Since f' is a left inverse to the inclusion map $N \rightarrow M$ in this short exact sequence, the equivalence of (1) and (3) in Theorem 2.1 implies there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & M/N \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \theta & & \downarrow \text{id} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & N \oplus (M/N) & \longrightarrow & M/N \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where $\theta(m) = (f'(m), \overline{m})$ is an R -module isomorphism. For $n \in N$, $\theta(n) = (f'(n), \overline{n}) = (n, 0)$, so using θ^{-1} shows M has a direct sum decomposition with N as the first summand. $\square$

Example 3.3. Using $R = \mathbf{Z}$, there is no direct sum decomposition of abelian groups $\mathbf{Z} = 2\mathbf{Z} \oplus P$ for a subgroup P of $\mathbf{Z}$, since P would have to be isomorphic to $\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$ and no element of $\mathbf{Z}$ has order 2. This failure of (1) in Theorem 3.2 implies the failure of (2), *i.e.*, there is no additive map $f': \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow 2\mathbf{Z}$ such that $f'(n) = n$ for all $n \in 2\mathbf{Z}$, which can also be seen directly: from $f'(2) = 2$ we have $2f'(1) = 2$, and there is no solution for $f'(1)$ in $2\mathbf{Z}$.

Theorem 3.4. For an injective R -linear map $N \xrightarrow{f} M$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $f(N)$ is a direct summand of M .
- (2) There is an R -linear map $f': M \rightarrow N$ such that $f'(f(n)) = n$ for all $n \in N$.

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.2.

Example 3.5. In Example 1.4, $f: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z} \oplus (\mathbf{Z}/a\mathbf{Z})^{\mathbf{N}}$ is the injective $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear map $n \mapsto (an, \mathbf{0})$, where $a > 1$. There is no $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear map $f': \mathbf{Z} \oplus (\mathbf{Z}/a\mathbf{Z})^{\mathbf{N}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ such that $f'(f(n)) = n$ for all $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ since the left side is $f'(an, \mathbf{0}) = af'(n, \mathbf{0})$, which is a multiple of a , and not all n in $\mathbf{Z}$ are multiples of a (*e.g.*, $n = 1$). Theorem 3.4 tells us that also $f(\mathbf{Z})$, which is $a\mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{0}$, is not a direct summand of $M := \mathbf{Z} \oplus (\mathbf{Z}/a\mathbf{Z})^{\mathbf{N}}$ even though $f(\mathbf{Z}) \cong \mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{Z}$ is a direct summand of M .

We can directly show $a\mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{0}$ is not a direct summand of M as follows. Set $A = a\mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{0}$ and assume A is a direct summand of M , so there is a complementary subgroup B : $M = A + B$ with $A \cap B = \mathbf{0}$. Then $aM = aA + aB$. From the definition of M and A , $aM = a\mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{0} = A$, so $A = aA + aB$. Thus $aB \subset A \cap B = \mathbf{0}$, so $A = aA$. However A is an infinite cyclic group and $a > 1$, so aA is a proper subgroup of A . We have a contradiction, so $f(\mathbf{Z}) = A$ is not a direct summand of M .