

CO-ABSOLUTELY CO-PURE MODULES

by V. A. HIREMATH

(Received 30th November 1983)

B. Maddox [15] defined absolutely pure modules and derived some interesting properties of these modules. C. Megibben [17] continued the study of these modules and found more interesting properties. We introduce in this paper co-absolutely co-pure modules as dual to absolutely pure modules. We first prove that over a commutative classical ring these modules are precisely the flat modules. As a biproduct we get a projective characterization of flat modules over a commutative co-noetherian ring. Secondly, over a quasi-Frobenius ring R , co-absolutely co-pure right R -modules turn out to be projective modules. Finally we get a characterization of almost Dedekind domains in terms of co-absolutely co-pure modules.

Throughout this paper by a ring R we mean an associative ring R with identity and by an R -module M we mean an unitary right R -module M .

Before defining a co-absolutely co-pure module we recall:

Definition 1. (i) An R -module M is said to be *finitely embedded* [22] (later called by Jans [14] *co-finitely generated*) if $E(M) = E(S_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus E(S_n)$ for some simple R -modules S_1, \dots, S_n (here $E(X)$ denotes the injective hull of an R -module X).

(ii) An R -module M is said to be *co-free* [10, Definition 6] if M is isomorphic to $\prod \{E(S_\alpha) : S_\alpha \text{ is a simple } R\text{-module, } \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ for some index set Λ .

(iii) An R -module M is said to be *co-finitely related* [10, Definition 14] if there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules where N is co-finitely generated, co-free and K is co-finitely generated.

(iv) A short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules is said to be *co-pure* [11, Definition 3] if every co-finitely related R -module is injective relative to this sequence.

(v) A ring R is said to be *right co-noetherian* [14, p. 588] if every homomorphic image of a co-finitely generated R -module is co-finitely generated.

(vi) A submodule A of an R -module B is said to be *pure* [4, p. 383] if for every left R -module M , the induced map $A \otimes_R M \rightarrow B \otimes_R M$ of abelian groups is a monomorphism.

More generally, a monomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ of R -modules is said to be *pure* if for any left R -module M , the induced map $f \otimes 1_M: A \otimes_R M \rightarrow B \otimes_R M$ is a monomorphism. We then say that a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules is pure if f is a pure monomorphism.

(We remark that Warfield [24, Proposition 3] has proved that a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules is pure if and only if every finitely presented R -module

is projective relative to this sequence. Using this characterization of pure short exact sequences we dually defined co-purity (iv) noting that “co-finitely related” is the dual of “finitely presented”.)

(vi) An R -module A said to be *absolutely pure* [15, 17] if A is a pure submodule of every R -module in which it is contained (or equivalently, every short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules is pure).

Dually we define:

Definition 2. An R -module C is said to be *co-absolutely co-pure* (c.c. in short) if every short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules is co-pure.

Remark 3. Clearly every projective R -module is c.c. But the converse need not be true.

Example. The additive group \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers being flat as a Z -module it is c.c. as a Z -module by [21, Proposition I.11.1] since purity and co-purity are equivalent for Z -modules [11, Theorem 20]. But \mathbb{Q} is not projective as a Z -module.

Proposition 4. For a ring R the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) every R -module is c.c.;
- (ii) every co-finitely related R -module is injective;
- (iii) every short exact sequence of R -modules is co-pure;
- (iv) R is a right V -ring.

Proof. (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv) follow from [11, Proposition 5]. (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) are obvious.

Now we derive a few equivalent conditions for the class of c.c. modules.

Proposition 5. The following conditions are equivalent for an R -module C :

- (i) C is c.c.;
- (ii) there is a co-pure short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{i} P \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules with P projective;
- (iii) $\text{Ext}_R^1(C, M) = 0$ for every co-finitely related R -module M .

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is obvious.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): For any co-finitely related R -module M we have the induced exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_R(P, M) \xrightarrow{i^*} \text{Hom}_R(K, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(C, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(P, M) = 0$$

of abelian groups (where i^* is the map induced by i) the last group being zero as P is projective. By the co-purity of the exact sequence in (ii), i^* is an epimorphism. Hence $\text{Ext}_R^1(C, M) = 0$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{i} B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence of R -modules. For any co-

finitely related R -module M , we have the induced exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_R(B, M) \xrightarrow{i^*} \text{Hom}_R(A, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(C, M) = 0$$

of abelian groups where the last group is zero by hypothesis. Then i^* is an epimorphism showing the co-purity of the given sequence. Thus C is c.c.

Corollary 6. *The class of c.c. modules is closed under taking arbitrary direct sums and direct summands.*

Before stating the next proposition we recall [18, p. 136] that if ε is a class of short exact sequences of R -modules, an R -module M is said to be ε -projective if M is projective relative to each member of ε .

Proposition 7. *The following conditions are equivalent for an R -module C :*

- (i) C is c.c.;
- (ii) C is ε -projective where ε is the class of all short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules where X is co-finitely related;
- (iii) C is ε -projective where ε is the class of all short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules where X is co-finitely related and Y is injective;
- (iv) C is ε -projective where ε is the class of all short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules where Y is co-finitely generated, injective and Z is co-finitely generated.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \rightarrow 0$ be any short exact sequence of R -modules with X co-finitely related. This yields us the exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_R(C, Y) \xrightarrow{g_*} \text{Hom}_R(C, Z) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(C, X) = 0$$

of abelian groups. Since X is co-finitely related, the last group is zero by Proposition 5. Hence g_* is an epimorphism.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) are obvious.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i): Let M be any co-finitely related R -module. Then we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{g} K \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules with N co-finitely generated, co-free (so injective) and K co-finitely generated. This yields us the exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_R(C, N) \xrightarrow{g_*} \text{Hom}_R(C, K) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(C, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^1(C, N) = 0$$

of abelian groups. The last group is zero since N is injective and g_* is an epimorphism by (iv). Hence $\text{Ext}_R^1(C, M) = 0$. Thus C is c.c. by Proposition 5.

Corollary 8. *If R is a right co-noetherian ring, then the c.c. R -modules are precisely*

the ε -projective R -modules where ε is the class of short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules where Y is artinian and injective.

Proof. The proof follows from (i) \Leftrightarrow (iv) of the above Proposition 7 and the facts that over a right co-noetherian ring R , the co-finitely generated R -modules are precisely the artinian R -modules ([22], Proposition 2*) and every homomorphic image of a co-finitely generated R -modules is co-finitely generated.

Before stating the next corollary we recall [12, Definition 1] that an R -module A is said to be *co-finitely projective* if it is ε -projective where ε is the class of all short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules where Z is co-finitely generated.

Corollary 9. *Every co-finitely projective R -module is c.c.*

Remark 10. The converse of the Corollary 9 need not be true.

Example. We have observed in Remark 3 that the additive group \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers is c.c. as a Z -module. But \mathbb{Q} is not co-finitely projective as a Z -module by [12, Proposition 6].

We now compare co-absolute co-purity with flatness and projectivity.

For the next proposition we recall the following from [23].

- (i) An R -module M is said to be *linearly compact* if every family of cosets in M with finite intersection property has non-empty intersection.
- (ii) A commutative ring R is said to be *classical* if $E(S)$ is linearly compact for every simple R -module S .

Proposition 11. *Over a commutative classical ring every flat module is c.c.*

Proof. The proof follows from [21, Proposition I.11.1] and the fact that purity implies co-purity for a commutative classical ring [13, Corollary 16].

Remark 12. In general a flat module need not be c.c.

Example. Since there are Von Neumann regular rings which are not V -rings (for example, the ring of linear operators of an infinite dimensional vector space), by Proposition 4 and [7, Theorem 11.24] there is a flat module which is not c.c.

Proposition 13. *For a commutative ring R , co-purity implies purity.*

Proof. Let $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \rightarrow 0$ be a co-pure short exact sequence of R -modules. To prove the purity of this short exact sequence we need only prove, by [4, p. 384], that the induced sequence $0 \rightarrow A \otimes_R M \rightarrow B \otimes_R M \rightarrow C \otimes_R M \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules (note that R is commutative) is exact for every finitely presented R -module M . Since, by [10, Proposition 2], the family $\{E(S): S \text{ a simple } R\text{-module}\}$ is a family of co-generators for $\text{mod-}R$, the category of all R -modules and all R -homomorphisms, it suffices to prove

that the induced sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(C \otimes_R M, E(S)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(B \otimes_R M, E(S)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A \otimes_R M, E(S)) \rightarrow 0$$

of R -modules is exact for every finitely presented R -module M and for every simple R -module S . Since $\text{Hom}_R(M, E(S))$ is co-finitely related whenever M is finitely presented and S is simple the exactness of the last sequence follows from the co-purity of the given short exact sequence and from the adjoint isomorphism Hom and \otimes . This proves the proposition.

Corollary 14. *Over a commutative ring R every c.c. R -module is flat.*

Proof. Follows from Proposition 13 and [21, Proposition I.11.1].

Remark 15. In general a c.c. module need not be flat.

Example. Cozzens [5] has constructed the ring $R = k[x, D]$ of all differentiable polynomials in an indeterminate x with coefficients in an universal field k with a derivation D (here the multiplication is given by $ax = xa + D(a)$, $a \in k$). Cozzens has proved that R is a right V -domain (that is, a right V -ring which is a domain) and not a field. Then by [7, Theorem 11.24] and by Proposition 4 there is a c.c. module which is not flat.

From Proposition 11 and Corollary 14 we have:

Corollary 16. *If R is a commutative classical ring then the c.c. R -modules are precisely the flat R -modules.*

Since a commutative co-noetherian ring is classical [22, Theorem 2], and [23, Proposition 4.1] we have, from Corollaries 8 and 16, the following projective characterization of flat modules over a commutative co-noetherian ring.

Proposition 17. *If R is a commutative co-noetherian ring, the flat R -modules are precisely the ε -projective R -modules where ε is the class of all short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules with B artinian, injective.*

We next prove that the c.c. modules are projective over a quasi-Frobenius ring.

Proposition 18. *Let R be a right co-noetherian, right perfect ring [1]. Then an R -module is c.c. if and only if it is projective.*

We need the following lemma for the proof of this proposition.

Lemma 19. *If R is a right co-noetherian ring then an R -module cannot contain a non-zero co-pure small submodule.*

Proof. Let K be a small co-pure submodule of an R -module A . Suppose $K \neq 0$. Let $0 \neq x \in K$ and let L be a submodule of K maximal with respect to $x \notin L$. Then K/L is

subdirectly irreducible and hence is co-finitely generated. Since R is right co-noetherian, K/L is co-finitely related. As K is co-pure in A , K/L is a direct summand of A/L by [11, Proposition 11]. Now K/L is small in A/L as K is small in A . So $K/L=0$, that is, $L=K$, a contradiction since $x \in K \setminus L$. Thus $K=0$.

Proof of the proposition. We need only prove the “only if” part. Let C be a c.c. R -module. Since R is right perfect, C has a projective cover, say, $C=P/K$ where P is a projective R -module and K is a small submodule of P . But K is co-pure in P as C is c.c. Then $K=0$ by the above lemma. Thus $C=P$ is projective.

We recall [8, p. 204] that a ring R is said to be *quasi-Frobenius (QF)* if R is both left and right artinian and R is right self-injective.

Lemma 20. *Every QF ring is right co-noetherian.*

Proof. Let R be a QF ring. To prove that R is right co-noetherian we need only prove that the injective hull of every simple R -module is artinian. Let S be a simple R -module. Since $E(S)$ is projective, by [8, Theorem 24.20], $E(S)$ is contained in a direct sum of cyclic R -modules. Then $E(S)$ is finitely generated by [8, Proposition 20.14]. Since R is right artinian it follows that $E(S)$ is also artinian. Thus R is right co-noetherian.

Since every QF ring (more generally, any left or right artinian ring) is right perfect [1, Theorem P] we have the following proposition as a consequence of Proposition 18 and Lemma 20.

Proposition 21. *Over a quasi-Frobenius ring R , the c.c. R -modules are precisely the projective R -modules.*

We are not able to characterize the rings for which every c.c. R -module is projective. However we have:

Proposition 22. (i) *If R is a commutative perfect ring then every c.c. R -module is projective.*

(ii) *If R is a commutative classical ring such that every c.c. R -module is projective then R is artinian.*

Proof. (i) follows from [1, Theorem P] and Corollary 14.

(ii) follows from [1, Theorem P] and [23, Proposition 4.6].

We next investigate the rings for which the co-absolute co-purity is a hereditary property.

Prior to this, we derive some results for flat modules. We recall [2, p. 122] that if M is an R -module and n is a non-negative integer then we define n to be the weak dimension of M (notation: $n=w.\dim M$) if n is the largest integer such that $\text{Tor}_n^R(M, N) \neq 0$ for some left R -module N . Our weak dimension is the flat dimension of Rotman [20, p. 180, Exercise 9.13]. We define the *right global weak dimension of R* (notation: $\text{r.gl.w.dim } R$) to be the supremum of the weak dimensions of all R -modules.

Similarly we define the weak dimension of a left R -module and the left global weak dimension of R . Since, by [20, Theorem 9.16], $\text{r.gl.w.dim } R = \text{l.gl.w.dim } R$ we denote this common value by $\text{gl.w.dim } R$ and call it the *global weak dimension of R* .

Proposition 23. *For a ring R the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) *Every submodule of a flat R -module is flat.*
- (ii) *Every right ideal of R is flat as an R -module.*
- (iii) *$\text{gl.w.dim } R \leq 1$.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is obvious.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Let I be any right ideal of R . Then the natural short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow R \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow 0$ of R -modules gives us the exact sequence

$$\text{Tor}_2^R(R, A) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_2^R(R/I, A) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(I, A)$$

of abelian groups, for any left R -module A . In this latter exact sequence the first and the last abelian groups are zero by [20, Theorem 8.7] as both R and I are flat R -modules. Hence $\text{Tor}_2^R(R/I, A) = 0$ for any left R -module A so that $\text{w.dim } R/I \leq 1$. Hence, by [20, Theorem 9.18], $\text{w.gl.dim } R \leq 1$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Let M be a flat R -module and let N be a submodule of M . Then, for any left R -module A , we have the exact sequence

$$\text{Tor}_2^R(M/N, A) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(N, A) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^R(M, A)$$

of abelian groups. Now the first member of this sequence is zero as, by hypothesis, $\text{w.gl.dim } R \leq 1$ and the last member is zero as M is flat [20, Theorem 8.7]. Thus $\text{Tor}_1^R(N, A) = 0$ for any left R -module A . So N is flat by [20, Theorem 8.8].

Corollary 24. *If R is a right semi-hereditary ring then the flatness is a hereditary property for R -modules.*

Proof. Follows from [3, Theorem 4.1] and Proposition 23 by noting the left–right symmetry of global weak dimension of R .

We now return to c.c. modules.

Proposition 25. *For a ring R the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *every submodule of a c.c. R -module is c.c.;*
- (ii) *every right ideal of R is c.c. as an R -module;*
- (iii) *every quotient of an injective R -module by a co-finitely related submodule is injective.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is obvious.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Let Q be an injective R -module and let A be a co-finitely related submodule

of Q . Let $f: I \rightarrow Q/A$ be any R -homomorphism of a right ideal I of R into Q/A . Since I is c.c., by (ii), there is a homomorphism $g: I \rightarrow Q$, by Proposition 7, such that $\eta g = f$ where $\eta: Q \rightarrow Q/A$ is the canonical map. Now g will be given by multiplication by an element $x \in Q$ as Q is injective. Since f is then given by multiplication by $\eta(x) \in Q/A$ the injectivity of Q/A follows.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Let B be a c.c. R -module and let A be a submodule of B . Let Q be an injective R -module and let K be a co-finitely related submodule of Q . Let $f: A \rightarrow Q/K$ be any homomorphism. Since Q/K is injective, by (iii), f has an extension g to B . Then by Proposition 7 and by the co-absolute co-purity of B there is an $h: B \rightarrow Q$ such that $\eta h = g$ where $\eta: Q \rightarrow Q/K$ is the canonical map. If $k = h|_A: A \rightarrow Q$, k has the property that $\eta k = f$ proving, by Proposition 7, the co-absolute co-purity of A .

Corollary 26. (i) *If R is a right hereditary ring then every submodule of a c.c. R -module is c.c.*

(ii) *If R is a commutative classical semi-hereditary ring then every submodule of a c.c. R -module is c.c.*

Proof. (i) follows from Proposition 25.

(ii) follows from the Corollaries 16 and 24.

We recall [23, p. 126] that a commutative ring R is said to be a *valuation ring* if the ideals of R are totally ordered under inclusion. A valuation ring R is said to be *almost maximal* if every proper homomorphic image of R , as an R -module, is linearly compact and R is said to be *maximal* if R is linearly compact as an R -module.

Since every almost maximal valuation domain is classical [23, Proposition 4.4] and semi-hereditary [6, Theorem 2], we have:

Corollary 27. *For an almost maximal valuation domain R , every submodule of a c.c. R -module is c.c.*

We do not know whether, in general, for a right semi-hereditary ring R , every submodule of a c.c. R -module is c.c.

Proposition 28. *For a commutative co-noetherian ring R the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *every submodule of a c.c. R -module is c.c.;*
- (ii) *every submodule of a flat R -module is flat;*
- (iii) *$w.gl.\dim R \leq 1$;*
- (iv) *$R_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a discrete valuation ring for each maximal ideal \mathcal{M} of R .*

Proof. (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) follow from Corollary 16.

(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) follow from Proposition 23.

(iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv) follow from [6, Proposition 11] and the facts that for a co-noetherian ring R , $R_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a noetherian ring for each maximal ideal \mathcal{M} of R [22, Theorem 2] and a noetherian valuation domain is a discrete valuation ring (in [6] a valuation ring is assumed to be a domain).

A commutative integral domain R is said to be an *almost Dedekind domain* [9, p. 434] if $R_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a noetherian valuation ring i.e., a discrete valuation ring for each maximal ideal \mathcal{M} of R .

We now have:

Corollary 29. *A commutative co-noetherian domain is an almost Dedekind domain if and only if every submodule of a c.c. R -module is c.c.*

Acknowledgements. The author thanks Professor K. M. Rangaswamy for suggesting the problem, for discussions and encouragement.

This work is based on the author's doctoral dissertation and was supported by the University Grants Commission and Madurai Kamaraj University.

The author thanks the referee for Proposition 13.

REFERENCES

1. H. BASS, Finitistic dimension and homological generalization of semi-primary rings, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **95** (1960), 466–488.
2. H. CARTAN and S. EILENBERG, *Homological Algebra* (Princeton University Press, 1956).
3. S. U. CHASE, Direct product of modules, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **97** (1960), 457–473.
4. P. M. COHN, On the free product of associative rings, *Math. Z.* **71** (1959), 380–398.
5. J. H. COZZENS, Homological properties of the ring of differential polynomials, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **76** (1970), 75–79.
6. S. ENDO, On semi-hereditary rings, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **13** (1961), 109–119.
7. C. FAITH, *Algebra I: Rings, Modules and Categories* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1973).
8. C. FAITH, *Algebra II: Ring Theory* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1976).
9. R. GILMER, *Multiplicative Ideal Theory* (Marcel-Dekker Inc., New York, 1971).
10. V. A. HIREMATH, Cofinitely generated and cofinitely related modules, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **39** (1982), 1–9.
11. V. A. HIREMATH, Copure submodules, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **44** (1984), 3–12.
12. V. A. HIREMATH, Cofinitely projective modules, *Houston J. Math.* **11** (1985), 183–190.
13. V. A. HIREMATH, Copure-injective modules, *Glasgow Math. J.*, submitted for publication.
14. J. P. JANS, On co-noetherian rings, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **1** (1969), 588–590.
15. B. MADDOX, Absolutely pure modules, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **18** (1967), 155–158.
16. N. H. MCCOY, *Theory of Rings* (Macmillan, New York, 1964).
17. C. MEGIBBEN, Absolutely pure modules, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **26** (1970), 561–566.
18. B. MITCHELL, *Theory of Categories* (Academic Press, New York, 1964).
19. B. L. OSOFOFSKY, Cyclic injective modules of full linear rings, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **17** (1966), 247–253.
20. J. J. ROTMAN, *Notes on Homological Algebra* (Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, 1968).

21. B. STESTRÖM, *Rings of Quotients* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1975).
22. P. VAMOS, On the dual of the notion of “finitely generated”, *L. London Math. Soc.* **43** (1968), 643–646.
23. P. VAMOS, Classical rings, *J. Algebra* **34** (1975), 114–129.
24. R. B. WARFIELD JR., Purity and algebraic compactness for modules, *Pacific J. Math.* **28** (1969), 699–719.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
MADURAI KAMARAJ UNIVERSITY
MADURAI-625 021, INDIA

Current address:
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF MYSORE
MYSORE-570 006, INDIA