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#### Abstract

Inspired by the notions of the $U$-exact sequence introduced by Davvaz and Parnian-Garamaleky in 1999, and of the chain $U$-complex introduced by Davvaz and Shabani-Solt in 2002, Mahatma and Muchtadi-Alamsyah in 2017 developed the concept of the $U$-projective resolution and the $U$-extension module, which are the generalizations of the concept of the projective resolution and the concept of extension module, respectively. It is already known that every element of a first extension module can be identified as a short exact sequence. To the simple, there is a relation between the first extension module and the short exact sequence. It is proper to expect the relation to be provided in the $U$-version. In this paper, we aim to construct a one-one correspondence between the first $U$-extension module and the set consisting of equivalence classes of short $U$-exact sequence. Keywords: Chain $U$-complex, $U$-projective resolution, $U$-extension module


## 1. Motivation

In [1] Davvaz and Shabani-Solt introduced the notion of the chain $U$-complex which generalizes the concept of the chain complex. The main idea was by replacing the kernel of every homomorphism in the sequence with the inverse image of a possibly nonzero submodule. For more details, a sequence of modules and module homomorphisms

$$
\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{p+2}} C_{p+1} \xrightarrow{d_{p+1}} C_{p} \xrightarrow{d_{p}} C_{p-1} \xrightarrow{d_{p-1}} \cdots
$$

is called a chain $U$-complex if, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}, U_{k} \subseteq \operatorname{Im}\left(d_{k+1}\right) \subseteq d_{k}^{-1}\left(U_{k-1}\right)$ where $U_{k}$ is submodule of $C_{k}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. By this definition, the ordinary chain complex now can be regarded as a chain $U$-complex with $U_{k}=0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. As an example of chain $U$-complex, consider the sequence

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\cdots \xrightarrow{4} \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{3} & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{2} & \mathbb{Z} & \xrightarrow{2} 2 \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{3} 3 \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{4} \cdots \\
\uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\
4 \mathbb{Z} & 3 \mathbb{Z} & 2 \mathbb{Z} & 2 \mathbb{Z} & 6 \mathbb{Z}
\end{array}
$$

where the arrow " $m \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{k} n \mathbb{Z}$ " denotes the map $x \mapsto k x$ for every $x \in m \mathbb{Z}$. The objects written in the bottom row are the submodule $U_{k}$ s.

As the chain $U$-complex was defined, we can consider a modified concept of exactness of a sequence by replacing the subset relation $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{k+1}\right) \subseteq d_{k}^{-1}\left(U_{k-1}\right)$ with equality for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. In fact, Davvaz and Parnian-Garamaleky [2] has introduced in advance the notion of $U$-exact sequences before the chain $U$-complex was. Nevertheless, the definition does not yet contain the conditions necessary for a $U$-exact sequences to be seen as a special case of chain $U$-complex, for it does not require the submodule $U_{k}$ to be contained in $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{k+1}\right)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. However, experience shows that there are more advantages when a $U$-exact sequences is also a chain $U$-complex.

Projective resolution is a kind of exact sequence that is used widely in representation theory. As the concept of exact sequences was generalized, Mahatma and Muchtadi-Alamsyah [3] proposed a method to construct the $U$-projective resolution as the generalization of the projective resolution. Furthermore, they continued in the same article with a method to induce the $k$-th $U$-extension module form a $U$-projective resolution for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, as the projective resolution does to the $k$-th extension module for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We assume throughout this paper that $R$ is commutative algebra. It is known that for any $R$-modules $M$ and $N$ there exists one-one correspondence between the first extension $R$-module $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M, N)$ and the set $e(M, N)$ consists of all equivalence classes of short exact sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow E \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ (see Chapter 7 of [4]). By this result, we can define the $R$-module structure for $e(M, N)$. The goal of this paper is to investigate the analogous result in the $U$ version where $U$ is nonzero submodule of $M$.

## 2. The $\boldsymbol{U}$-Extension

Given $R$-modules $M$ and $N$, the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$ is also known as the extension of $N$ by $M$. We start this paper with the notion generalizing the concept of the extension by replacing the property that $\operatorname{Im}(f)=\operatorname{ker}(g)$ with $\operatorname{Im}(f)=g^{-1}(U)$ where $U$ is nonzero submodule of $M$. This concept would require that the module $N$ should be large enough so that it can be mapped onto $U$.

Let $M$ and $N$ be $R$-modules and $U$ be a submodule of $M$. The sequence $0 \rightarrow$ $N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$ such that $f$ is one-one, $g$ is onto, and $f(N)=g^{-1}(U)$ is called the $U$-extension of $N$ by $M$. We shall also call such sequence as a short $U$-exact sequence.

We restrict the discussion in this paper only for the module $N$, which is direct sum of $U$, and only for the short $U$-exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$ with property that if $N=U \oplus V$ then $f(V)=\operatorname{ker}(g)$ and $g f(u)=u$ for every $u \in U$.

Therefore, every short $U$-exact sequence throughout this paper will be assumed to be of that form. Notice that if we allow the submodule $U$ to be 0 , then the case $U=0$ gives us exactly the ordinary extension of $N$ by $M$.

Let $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$ denotes the set of all $U$-extension of $N$ by $M$. Let $\mathbf{E}: 0 \rightarrow$ $N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$ be an element of $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$. A short $U$-exact sequence $\mathbf{F}: 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f^{\prime}} F \xrightarrow{g^{\prime}} M \rightarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$ is said to be equivalent to $\mathbf{E}$, denoted by $\mathbf{E} \approx \mathbf{F}$, if there exists a morphism $\delta: E \rightarrow F$ such that $g^{\prime} \delta=g$ and $f^{\prime}=\delta f$, that is if the diagram

$$
\begin{align*}
& 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow 1 \quad \downarrow \delta \xrightarrow{\downarrow} \quad \downarrow 1  \tag{2.1}\\
& 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f^{\prime}} F \xrightarrow{g^{\prime}} M \rightarrow 0
\end{align*}
$$

commutes. It is easy to verify that $\delta$ is an isomorphism and hence " $\approx$ " is an equivalence relation in $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$. For every $\mathbf{E} \in \mathscr{E}(M[U], N)$, the class of all short $U$-exact sequence equivalent to $\mathbf{E}$ will be denoted by $[\mathbf{E}]$. Thus, the set $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$ partitioned by " $\approx$ " will consist of all classes $[\mathbf{E}]$ where $\mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$. We denote those set by $e(m[U], N)$. Thus,

$$
e(M[U], N)=\mathcal{E}(M[U], N) / \approx=\{[\mathbf{E}] \mid \mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{E}(M[U], N)\} .
$$

## 3. The $\boldsymbol{U}$-Projective Resolution and the $\boldsymbol{U}$-Extension Module

Let $M$ be $R$-module, and $U$ be a nonzero submodule of $M$. Consider the sequence $P_{0} \xrightarrow{d_{0}} M \rightarrow 0$ where $P_{0}$ is projective. Let $P_{1}$ be a projective module such that the sequence $P_{2} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{0}} M \rightarrow 0$ is $U$-exact at $P_{0}$, that is $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right)=d_{0}^{-1}(U)$. Set $U_{0}:=d_{0}^{-1}(U)$ and let $P_{2}$ be a projective module such that the sequence $P_{2} \xrightarrow{d_{2}}$ $P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{0}$ is $U_{0}$-exact at $P_{1}$, or $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{2}\right)=d_{1}^{-1}\left(U_{0}\right)$. Set $U_{1}:=d_{1}^{-1}\left(\operatorname{ker}\left(d_{0}\right)\right)$ and let $P_{3}$ be a projective module such that the sequence $P_{3} \xrightarrow{d_{3}} P_{2} \xrightarrow{d_{2}} P_{1}$ is $U_{1}$ exact at $P_{2}$, or $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{3}\right)=d_{2}^{-1}\left(U_{1}\right)$. Continue the process by setting the submodule $U_{k}:=d_{k}^{-1}\left(\operatorname{ker}\left(d_{k-1}\right)\right)$ and choose the projective module $P_{k+2}$ such that the sequence $P_{k+2} \xrightarrow{d_{k+2}} P_{k+1} \xrightarrow{d_{k}+1} P_{k}$ is $U_{k}$-exact at $P_{k+1}$, or $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{k+2}\right)=d_{k+1}^{-1}\left(U_{k}\right)$.

The infinite sequence $\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{2}} P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{0} \xrightarrow{d_{0}} M \rightarrow 0$ obtained from the process above is called the $U$-projective resoultion of $M$, denoted by $\mathbf{P}: P_{\bullet}\left(U_{\bullet}\right) \xrightarrow{d_{\bullet}} M(U)$. From the construction above, it seems that the sequence obtained depends on the choice of the module $P_{k}$ s. Nevertheless, in [3] Mahatma and Muchtadi-Alamsyah showed that the $U$-projective resolution is unique op to the so-called $(U, U)$ homotopy, that is if $\mathbf{P}: P_{\bullet}\left(U_{\bullet}\right) \xrightarrow{d_{\bullet}} M(U)$ and $\mathbf{Q}: P_{\bullet}^{\prime}\left(U_{\bullet}^{\prime}\right) \xrightarrow{d_{\bullet}^{\prime}} M(U)$ both are $U$-projective resolution of $M$ then there exist chain $\left(U, U^{\prime}\right)$-map $\mathbf{f}: \mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ and chain $\left(U^{\prime}, U\right)$-map g: $\mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$ such that $\mathbf{g f} \simeq 1_{P}$ and $\mathbf{f g} \simeq 1_{Q}$ (see also [1] for detail of the map between two $U$-complexes). Now notice that, in a $U$-projective resolution of $M$, since $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right)=d_{0}^{-1}(U)=U_{0}$ then we may choose $P_{2}:=P_{1}$ and set $d_{2}:=1_{P_{1}}$. Hence every $U$-projective resolution of $M$ is of the form $\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{3}} P_{1} \xrightarrow{1_{P_{1}}} P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{0} \xrightarrow{d_{0}} M \rightarrow 0$.

For the example of the $U$-projective resolution, let us consider the case when the algebra $R$ is hereditary. Here we consider two cases: when module $M$ is projective and when it is not. According to the method given in the beginning of this section, if $M$ is projective, then the $U$-projective resolution of $M$ will be of the form

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
0 \rightarrow U \xrightarrow{1} U \xrightarrow{1} M \xrightarrow{1} M \rightarrow 0 \\
\uparrow & \uparrow \\
U & U
\end{array}
$$

while if $M$ is not projective, then the $U$-projective resolution of M will be of the form

Recall that the objects written in the bottom row denote the submodule $U_{k} s$. Here, when the $U_{k}$ is not written, we mean that $U_{k}=0$. The detail of these constructions can be found in [5].

Let $\mathbf{P}: P_{\bullet} \xrightarrow{d_{\bullet}} M(U)$ be the $U$-projective resolution of $M$. If $P_{n} \neq 0$ and $P_{i}=0$ for all $i>n$ then we say that the length of $\mathbf{P}$ is $n$. Hence, if $R$ is hereditary, we have that the $U$-projective resolution length is either 2 or 3. Moreover, in [5] Baur, Mahatma, and Muchtadi-Alamsyah showed that an algebra $R$ is hereditary if and only if, for $U \neq 0$, every $U$-projective resolution of an $R$-module has length of either 2 or 3 .

Given an $R$-module $M$, a nonzero submodule $U$ of $M$, and $U$-projective resolution of $M \mathbf{P}: P_{\bullet}\left(U_{\bullet}\right) \xrightarrow{d_{\bullet}} M(U)$, let $\left(\mathbf{P}_{M}\right)$ be the sequence $\cdots \xrightarrow{d_{3}} P_{2} \xrightarrow{d_{2}}$ $P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{0} \rightarrow 0$ obtained by removing $M$ from $\mathbf{P}$. Given an $R$-module $N$, apply the functor $\operatorname{Hom}(-, N)$ to $\left(\mathbf{P}_{M}\right)$ to obtain the sequence $0 \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}\left(P_{0}, N\right) \xrightarrow{\bar{d}_{1}^{N}}$ $\operatorname{Hom}\left(P_{1}, N\right) \xrightarrow{\bar{d}_{2}^{N}} \cdots$, where $\bar{d}_{k}^{N}$ denotes the map $\operatorname{Hom}\left(d_{k}, N\right)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define the submodules $A_{k}^{N}:=\left\{\alpha d_{k-1} d_{k} \mid \alpha: \operatorname{Im}\left(d_{k-1}\right) \rightarrow N\right.$ and $Z_{k}^{N}:=\left(\bar{d}_{k+1}^{N}\right)^{-1}\left(A_{k+1}^{M}\right)$ of $\operatorname{Hom}\left(P_{k}, N\right)$. Note first that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a morphism $z \in \operatorname{Hom}\left(P_{k}, N\right)$ is in $Z_{k}^{N}$ if and only if there exists a morphism $\alpha: \operatorname{Im}\left(d_{k}\right) \rightarrow N$ such that $\bar{d}_{k+1}^{N}(z)=z d_{k+1}=\alpha d_{k} d_{k+1}$. Next, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ define the submodule $B_{k}^{N}:=\left\{\mu d_{k}+\lambda d_{(k-1, k)} \mid \mu: P_{k-1} \rightarrow N, \lambda: U_{k-2} \rightarrow N\right\}$ where $d_{(k-1, k)}$ is the morphism $d_{k-1} d_{k}$ regarded as single morphism. Finally, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the $k$-th $U$-extension module of $N$ by $M$ by $\operatorname{Ext}^{k}(M[U], N):=Z_{k}^{N} / B_{k}^{N}$.

From the construction above, the module obtained depends on the choice of the $U$-projective resolution used as the basic material. Nevertheless, in [3] Mahatma and Muchtadi-Alamsyah showed that the $k$-th $U$-extension module is unique up to isomorphism for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

## 4. The First $\boldsymbol{U}$ - Extension Module

Let $M$ be $R$-module, and $U$ be a nonzero submodule of $M$. Given any $R$-module $X$, we have seen that, for every $k \in N$, the construction of $E x t^{k}(M[U], X)$ involves many steps, that make the structure of the module obtained seems so complicated. We can describe the module $E x t^{1}(M[U], X)$ very simply.

To do so, recall first that, in the $U$-projective resolution of $M, P_{2}=P_{1}$ and $d_{2}=$ $1_{P_{1}}$. Hence the module $Z_{1}^{X}$ and $B_{1}^{N}$ can be simplified to $Z_{1}^{X}=\left\{\alpha d_{1} \mid \alpha: \operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right) \rightarrow\right.$ $X\}$ and $B_{1}^{X}=\left\{\mu d_{1} \mid \mu: P_{0} \rightarrow X\right\}$, respectively. Thus the module $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U, X])=$ $Z_{1}^{X} / B_{1}^{X}$ consists of all classes $[z]$ of morphisms in $\operatorname{Hom}\left(P_{1}, X\right)$ whose form $\alpha d_{1}$ where $\alpha: \operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right) \rightarrow X$, where two classes $\left[z_{1}\right]$ and $\left[z_{2}\right]$ in $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], X)$ are considered to be the same if and only if $z_{1}-z_{2}$ whose form $\mu d_{1}$ where $\mu: P_{0} \rightarrow X$. As a consequence, $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], X)=0$ if and only if every morphism $\alpha: \operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right) \rightarrow X$ can be extended into $\alpha^{\prime}: P_{0} \rightarrow X$. This could happen when $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right)=d_{0}^{-1}(U)$ is a direct summand of $P_{0}$. Especially, we have that $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[M], X)=0$ for any $R$-module, since if $U=M$ then $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right)=d_{0}^{-1}(U)=d_{0}^{-1}(M)=P_{0}$.

## 5. Construction of the Correspondence

Suppose given an $R$-module $M$, nonzero submodule $U$ of $M$, and an $R$-module $N=U \oplus V$. For every $\mathbf{E} \in \mathscr{E}(M[U], N)$, we will identify the class $[\mathbf{E}] \in e(M[U], N)$ by an element $\left[z_{\mathbf{E}}\right] \in \operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$ and vice versa.

Consider the sequence $P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{0} \xrightarrow{d_{0}} M \rightarrow 0$, where $P_{i}$ s are projective and $\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right)=d_{0}^{-1}(U)$. Let $\mathbf{E}: 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$ be an element in $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$. Consider the diagram

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{0} \xrightarrow{d_{0}} M \rightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow 1 \\
& 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that since $g$ is surjective and $P_{0}$ is projective, then there exists a morphism $h: P_{0} \rightarrow E$ satisfying $g h=d_{0}$. Let $d(0,1)$ be the composition $d_{0} d_{1}$ regarded as a single morphism from $P_{1}$ to $U$. Consider that $h d_{1}-f d_{(0,1)}$ is a morphism from $P_{1}$ to $E$ satisfying $g\left(h d_{1}-f d_{(0,1)}\right)=d_{0} d_{1}-g f d_{(0,1)}=0$ since $\left.g f\right|_{U}=1_{U}$. Hence, $\operatorname{Im}\left(h d_{1}-f d_{(0,1)}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{ker}(g)=f(V)$, and since $P_{1}$ is projective, then there exists a morphism $z: P_{1} \rightarrow V$ satisfying $f z=h d_{1}-f d_{(0,1)}$.

Define the morphism $\alpha: d_{1}\left(P_{1}\right) \rightarrow V$ by $\alpha d_{1}(p):=z(p)$ for every $p \in P_{1}$. Notice that if $d_{1}(p)=0$ then $z(p)=0$ and hence $\alpha$ is well-defined. Since $z=\alpha d_{1}$ then $z \in Z_{1}^{V}$.

Now suppose that $h^{\prime}: P_{0} \rightarrow E$ is another morphism satisfying $g h^{\prime}=d_{0}$. Let $z^{\prime} \in Z_{1}^{V}$ satisfy $f z^{\prime}=h^{\prime} d_{1}-f d_{(0,1)}$. Since $g\left(h-h^{\prime}\right)=0$ then $\operatorname{Im}\left(h-h^{\prime}\right) \subseteq$ $\operatorname{ker}(g)=f(V)$. Since $P_{0}$ is projective, then there exists a morphism $\mu: P_{0} \rightarrow V$ satisfying $f \mu=h-h^{\prime}$. Thus we have $f\left(z-z^{\prime}\right)=\left(h-h^{\prime}\right) d_{1}=f \mu d_{1}$, which implies $z-z^{\prime}=\mu d_{1} \in B_{1}^{N}$. Therefore $[z]=\left[z^{\prime}\right]$ in $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$.

The paragraph above shows how to construct a map from $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$ to $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$. For this map let us denote the image of $\mathbf{E}$ by $z_{\mathbf{E}}$. Now sup-
pose that $\mathbf{F} \in[\mathbf{E}]$. Let $\delta: E \rightarrow F$ be the isomorphism that makes the Diagram 2.1 commutes. Now, to obtain the morphism $z_{\mathbf{F}} \in Z_{1}^{V}$ which represents the image of $\mathbf{F}$, we may set $h_{\mathbf{F}}:=\delta h$ and choose $z_{\mathbf{F}}$ as the morphism satisfy$\operatorname{ing} f^{\prime} z_{\mathbf{F}}=h_{\mathbf{F}} d_{1}-f^{\prime} d_{(0,1)}$ or $\delta f z_{\mathbf{F}}=\delta h_{\mathbf{E}} d_{1}-\delta f d_{(0,1)}$. Since $\delta$ is an isomorphism, then we get $f z_{\mathbf{F}}=h_{\mathbf{E}} d_{1}-f d_{(0,1)}=f z_{\mathbf{E}}$ which implies $z_{\mathbf{F}}=z_{\mathbf{E}}$.

We have just constructed a map $\varphi: e(M[U], N) \rightarrow \operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$ where $\varphi([\mathbf{E}])=\left[z_{\mathbf{E}}\right]$ for every $[\mathbf{E}] \in e(m[U], N)$. Our goal is to show that $\varphi$ is a oneone correspondence.

Theorem 5.1. The map $\varphi$ is onto.
Proof. Suppose that $[z] \in \operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$. Define the submodule $I \quad:=$ $\left\{\left(d_{(0,1)}(x) \oplus z(x)\right) \oplus d_{1}(-x) \mid x \in P_{1}\right\}$ of $N \oplus P_{0}$ and the module $E:=\left(N \oplus P_{0}\right) / I$. Remember that every $n \in N$ can be written uniquely as $n_{U} \oplus n_{V}$ where $n_{U} \in U$ and $n_{v} \in V$. Create a sequence $N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M$ where $f(n):=(n \oplus 0)+I$ for every $n \in N$ and $g((a \oplus b)+I):=a_{U}+d_{0}(b)$ for every $(a \oplus b)+I \in E$. To show that the morphism $g$ is well-defined, notice that if $a \oplus b \in I$ then there exists an $x \in P_{1}$ such that $\alpha=d_{(0,1)}(x) \oplus z(x)$ and $b=d_{1}(-x)$. Since $\operatorname{Im}(z) \subseteq V$ then we have $a_{U}=d_{(0,1)}(x)$ and hence $g((a \oplus b)+I)=d_{(0,1)}(x)+d_{0} d_{1}(-x)=0$. So $g$ is well-defined. Furthermore, since $d_{0}$ is onto then $g$ is onto.

Now, if $f(n)=0$ then $n \oplus 0 \in I$. Hence, there exists an $x \in P_{1}$ such that $n=d_{(0,1)}(x) \oplus z(x)$ and $0=d_{1}(-x)$. Since $z \in Z_{1}^{V}$ then $z=\alpha d_{1}$ for a morphism $\alpha: d_{1}\left(P_{1}\right) \rightarrow V$. Therefore, $n=0 \oplus 0$ and hence $f$ is one-one.

Next, notice that for every $n \in N, g f(n)=g((n \oplus 0)+I)=n_{U} \in U$. Hence $\operatorname{Im}(g f) \subseteq U$ and so $\operatorname{Im}(f) \subseteq g^{-1}(U)$. Now, if $(a \oplus b)+I \in g^{-1}(I)$ then $g((a \oplus b)+I)=a_{U}+d_{0}(b) \in U$. Since $a_{u} \in U$ then we have $d_{0}(b) \in U$ and so $b \in d_{0}^{-1}(U)=\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right)$. Let $b=d_{1}(p)$ where $p \in P_{1}$. We see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(a \oplus b)+I & =\left(a \oplus d_{1}(p)\right)+I \\
& =\left(a+\left(d_{(0,1)}(p) \oplus z(p)\right) \oplus 0\right)+I \\
& =f\left(a+\left(d_{(0,1)}(p) \oplus z(p)\right)\right) \\
& \in f(N) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $g^{-1}(U) \subseteq \operatorname{Im}(f)$. Hence we have $\operatorname{Im}(f)=g^{-1}(U)$.
Next, if $v \in V$ then $v_{U}=0$ and hence $g f(v)=g((v \oplus 0)+I)=0+d_{0}(0)=$ 0 . Therefore, $f(V) \subseteq \operatorname{ker}(g)$. Now suppose that $(a \oplus b)+I \in \operatorname{ker}(g)$. Since $g((a \oplus b)+I)=a_{U}+d_{0}(b)=0$ then $d_{0}(b)=-a_{U} \in U$. Hence $b \in d_{0}^{-1}=\operatorname{Im}\left(d_{1}\right)$. Let $b=d_{1}(x)$ where $x \in P_{1}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
(a \oplus b)+I & =\left(\left(-d_{(0,1)}(x) \oplus a_{V}\right) \oplus d_{1}(x)\right)+I \\
& =\left(\left(0 \oplus\left(a_{V}+z(x)\right)\right) \oplus 0\right)+I \\
& =f\left(0 \oplus\left(a_{V}+z(x)\right)\right) \\
& \in f(V) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\operatorname{ker}(g) \subseteq f(V)$ and we have $f(V)=\operatorname{ker}(g)$.
Finally, if $u \in U$ then $u_{V}=u$ and hence $g f(u)=g((u \oplus 0)+I)=u+d_{0}(0)=u$.
We have just shown that the sequence $\mathbf{E}: 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$ satisfies all criterions in $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$. Thus, $\mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$. We will show that $\varphi([\mathbf{E}])=[z]$.

Define the morphism $h: P_{0} \rightarrow E$ by $h(q):=(0 \oplus q)+I$ for every $q \in P_{0}$. We see that for every $q \in P_{0}, g h(q)=g((0 \oplus q)+I)=d_{0}(q)$. Hence $g h=d_{0}$. Next, notice that for every $p \in P_{1}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
h d_{1}(p) & =\left(0 \oplus d_{1}(p)\right)+I \\
& =\left(\left(d_{(0,1)}(p) \oplus z(p)\right) \oplus 0\right)+I \\
& =f\left(d_{(0,1)}(p) \oplus z(p)\right) \\
& =f d_{(0,1)}(p)+f z(p) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The equation above gives us $f z=h d_{1}-f d_{(0,1)}$. Hence $[z]$ is the map of the class $[\mathbf{E}] \in e(M[U], N)$ by $\varphi$. thus, $[z]$ has a pre-image in $e(M[U], N)$ by $\varphi$. Since $[z]$ is arbitrary then $\varphi$ is onto.

To show that $\varphi$ is one-one we will show that every element in $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$ has unique pre-image in $e(m[U], N)$ by $\varphi$.

Theorem 5.2. For every $[z] \in \operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$, the pre-image of $[z]$ by $\varphi$ is unique
Proof. Given $z \in \operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$, suppose that $\mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$ is the $U$-exact sequence constructed using the method given in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Thus, $[z]=\left[z_{\mathbf{E}}\right]$. Let $\mathbf{F}: 0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f^{\prime}} F \xrightarrow{g^{\prime}} M \rightarrow 0$ be an element in $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$ with $\left[z_{\mathbf{F}}\right]=\left[z_{\mathbf{E}}\right]$. Our goal is to show that $[\mathbf{E}]=[\mathbf{F}]$, that is there exists a morphism $\delta: E \rightarrow F$ which makes the Diagram 2.1 commutes, that is $g^{\prime} \delta=g$ and $f^{\prime}=\delta f$.

Consider the diagram

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{1} \xrightarrow{d_{1}} P_{0} \xrightarrow{d_{0}} M \rightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow z^{\prime} \\
\downarrow h^{\prime} & \downarrow 1 \\
0 \rightarrow & N \xrightarrow{f^{\prime}} F \xrightarrow{g^{\prime}} M \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}
$$

with $g^{\prime} h^{\prime}=d_{0}$ and $f^{\prime} z^{\prime}=h^{\prime} d_{1}-f^{\prime} d_{(0,1)}$. Since $\left[z_{\mathbf{F}}\right]=\left[z_{\mathbf{E}}\right]$ then $z^{\prime}-z \in B_{1}^{V}$ and hence there exists a morphism $\mu: P_{0} \rightarrow V$ such that $z^{\prime}=z+\mu d_{1}$. Let us define the morphism $\delta: E \rightarrow F$ by $\delta((a \oplus b)+I):=f^{\prime}(a)+\left(h^{\prime}-f^{\prime} \mu\right)(b)$ for every $(a \oplus b)+I \in E$. Notice that if $(a \oplus b)+I=I$ then $\alpha=d_{(0,1)}(x) \oplus z(x)$ and $b=d_{1}(-x)$ for an $x \in P_{1}$. Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta((a \oplus b)+I) & =f^{\prime}\left(d_{(0,1)}(x) \oplus z(x)\right)+\left(h^{\prime}-f^{\prime} \mu\right) d_{1}(-x) \\
& =f^{\prime} d_{(0,1)}(x)+f^{\prime} z(x)+f^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}-z\right)(x) \\
& =f^{\prime} z(x)-f^{\prime} z^{\prime}(x)+f^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}-z\right)(x) \\
& =0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, $\delta$ is well-defined.
Next, note that for every $a \in N, g^{\prime} f^{\prime}(a)=g^{\prime} f^{\prime}\left(a_{U} \oplus a_{V}\right)=g^{\prime} f^{\prime}\left(a_{U} \oplus 0\right)+$ $g^{\prime} f^{\prime}\left(0 \oplus a_{V}\right)=a_{U}+0=a_{U}$. Hence, for every $(a \oplus b)+I \in E$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
g^{\prime} \delta((a \oplus b)+I) & =g^{\prime}\left(f^{\prime}(a)+\left(h^{\prime}-f^{\prime} \mu\right)(b)\right) \\
& =g^{\prime} f^{\prime}(a)+g^{\prime} h^{\prime}(b)-g^{\prime} f^{\prime} \mu(b) \\
& =a_{U}+d_{0}(b) \\
& =g((a \oplus b)+I)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the third row holds since $\operatorname{Im}(\mu) \subseteq V$ and $f^{\prime}(V) \subseteq \operatorname{ker}\left(g^{\prime}\right)$. Hence $g^{\prime} \delta=g$. Next, for every $n \in N$, we have $\delta f(n)=\delta((n \oplus 0)+I)=f^{\prime}(n)+\left(h^{\prime}-f^{\prime} \mu\right)(0)=f^{\prime}(n)$. Hence, $\delta f=f^{\prime}$. We have shown that $[\mathbf{E}]=[\mathbf{F}]$.

## 6. Result and Discussion

We have shown that given any $R$-module $M$ and nonzero submodule $U$ of $M$, if $N=U \oplus V$ then there exists one-one correspondence between the set $e(M[U], N)$ of all equivalence classes in $\mathcal{E}(M[U], N)$ with the module $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[U], V)$. We have known in Section 4 that $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}(M[M], V)=0$. Clearly, the only $M$-extension of $M \oplus V$ by $M$ is given by the sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow M \oplus V \xrightarrow{1+\varphi} M \oplus W \xrightarrow{1 \oplus 0} M \rightarrow 0$ where $\varphi: V \rightarrow W$ is an isomorphism.

As we know that there exists one-one correspondence between the module $\operatorname{Ext}^{k}(M, N)$ with the set of equivalence classes of exact sequences off the form $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow E_{k} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow E_{2} \rightarrow E_{1} \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$, it would be interesting to investigate whether the result in this paper could be extended for another value of $k$. But we must leave a note here that the construction of $U$-extension module give results that $\operatorname{Ext}^{2}(M[U], X)=0$ for any module $X$. Nevertheless, we may expect that there will be relation between the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow E_{2} \rightarrow E_{1} \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ and some nonzero modules $\operatorname{Ext}^{k}(M[U], N)$ with $k>2$.
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