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#### Abstract

We shall prove that if $M$ is a finitely generated multiplication module and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ is a finitely generated ideal of $R$, then there exists a distributive lattice $\bar{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ with Zariski topology is homeomorphic to $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ to Stone topology. Finally we shall give a characterization of finitely generated multiplication $R$-modules $M$ such that $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ is a finitely generated ideal of $R$.
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## 1. Introduction

Throughout this note all rings are commutative with identity and all modules are unital.

For any submodule $N$ of an $R$-module $M$, we define $(N: M)=\{r \in R: r M \subseteq N\}$ and denote $(0: M)$ by $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$. A submodule $P$ of $M$ is called prime if $P \neq M$ and whenever $r \in R, m \in M$ and $r m \in P$, then $m \in P$ or $r \in(P: M)$. It is easy to show that if $P$ is a prime submodule of an $R$-module $M$, then $(P: M)$ is a prime ideal of $R$. The set of all prime submodules of $M$ is denoted by $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$. As defined in [4] the radical of a submodule $N$ of an $R$-module $M$ is given by $\operatorname{rad}(N)=\bigcap P$, where the intersection is over all prime submodules of $M$ containing $N$. If there is no prime submodule containing $N$, then we define $\operatorname{rad}(N)=M$. The radical of an ideal $I$ of $R$ is denoted by $\sqrt{I}$.

An $R$-module $M$ is called a multiplication module provided for any submodule $N$ of $M$ there exists an ideal $I$ of $R$ such that $N=I M$. It is easy to check that $M$ is a multiplication module if and only if $N=(N: M) M$ for every submodule $N$ of $M$ (see [8]).

In this paper at first we shall construct a distributive lattice $\bar{M}$ and discuss some properties of $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$, where $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ is the set of all prime ideals in the lattice $\bar{M}$. We shall then prove that if $M$ is a finitely generated multiplication module and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ is a finitely generated ideal of $R$, then $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ and $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ are homeomorphic. Finally we shall generalize the notion of reticulated and semi-reticulated rings for modules and characterize some classes of semi-reticulated modules.

## 2. On the lattice $\bar{M}$ and its prime spectrum

Let $R$ be a ring and let $\mathrm{FI}(R)$ be the set of all finitely generated ideals of $R$. Now let $M$ be an $R$-module and $\mathrm{su}(M)$ the $\mathrm{FI}(R)$-semimodule generated by the principal $R$-submodules of $M$ and $M$ under the operations $N+K, I N$, where $N, K \in \operatorname{su}(M)$ and $I \in \mathrm{FI}(R)$. Hence

$$
\operatorname{su}(M)=\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{k} I_{i} R m_{i}+J_{i} M: I_{i}, J_{i} \in \mathrm{FI}(R), \quad m_{i} \in M, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}\right\}
$$

It is clear that if $M$ is a finitely generated $R$-module then $\operatorname{su}(M)$ is the set of all finitely generated submodules of $M$.

Define the equivalence relation on $\operatorname{su}(M), " \sim$ " by $N \sim L$ if and only if $\operatorname{rad}(N)=$ $\operatorname{rad}(L)[6$, p. 1470], and denote the resulting set of equivalence classes by $\bar{M}$; i.e., $\bar{M}=$ $\{[K]: K \in \operatorname{su}(M)\}$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $N, N^{\prime}, K, K^{\prime} \in \operatorname{su}(M)$ and $I, I^{\prime} \in \operatorname{FI}(R)$. If $N \sim N^{\prime}$ and $K \sim K^{\prime}$, then we have
(i) $(N+K) \sim\left(N^{\prime}+K^{\prime}\right)$;
(ii) if $\sqrt{I}=\sqrt{I^{\prime}}$ then $I N \sim I^{\prime} N^{\prime}$.

Proof. (i) By [6, Lemma 1.5].
(ii) Let $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$ and $I N \subseteq P$. Hence $N \subseteq P$ or $I \subseteq(P: M)$. If $N \subseteq P$ then $I^{\prime} N^{\prime} \subseteq N^{\prime} \subseteq \operatorname{rad}\left(N^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{rad}(N) \subseteq P$. Suppose that $I \subseteq(P: M) \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)$. Hence $I^{\prime} \subseteq \sqrt{I^{\prime}}=\sqrt{I} \subseteq(P: M)$. Thus $I^{\prime} N^{\prime} \subseteq I^{\prime} M \subseteq P$. Therefore $\operatorname{rad}\left(I^{\prime} N^{\prime}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{rad}(I N)$. Similarly $\operatorname{rad}(I N) \subseteq \operatorname{rad}\left(I^{\prime} N^{\prime}\right)$ and hence $I N \sim I^{\prime} N^{\prime}$.

Let $[N],[K]$ belong to $\bar{M}$ and $I \in \mathrm{FI}(R)$.
We define $[N]+[K]:=[N+K]$ and $I[N]:=[I N]$. Then by Lemma 2.1, $\bar{M}$ becomes an $\mathrm{FI}(R)$-semimodule. Furthermore we define $[N] \leqslant[K]$ if for each $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$, $K \subseteq P$ implies that $N \subseteq P$. Therefore $(\bar{M}, \leqslant)$ is a partially ordered set.

Let $N$ be a subset of $M$.

We define $\bar{M}(N)=\{[L] \in \bar{M}: L \sim K$, for some $K \subseteq N\}$. If $0 \in N$ then $[0] \in \bar{M}(N)$ and hence $\bar{M}(N) \neq \emptyset$.

Now let $N$ be a subset of $\bar{M}$. We define $M[N]=\{x \in M:[R x] \in N\}$. If $[0] \in N$ then $0 \in M[N]$ and hence $M[N] \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 2.2. Let $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$. Then $M[\bar{M}(P)]=P$.
Proof. Let $x \in P$. Then $R x \subseteq P$ and hence $[R x] \in \bar{M}(P)$. Therefore $x \in M[\bar{M}(P)]$. Now let $x \in M[\bar{M}(P)]$. Then $[R x] \in \bar{M}(P)$ and so $R x \sim L$ for some $L \subseteq P$. Thus $R x \subseteq \operatorname{rad}(R x)=\operatorname{rad}(L) \subseteq P$. Hence $x \in P$

For the remainder of this section we let $M$ be a finitely generated multiplication $R$-module and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ a finitely generated ideal of $R$.

Proposition 2.3. Suppose that $M$ is an $R$-module. Then $(\bar{M}, \leqslant)$ is a distributive lattice.

Proof. Put $0:=\left[0_{M}\right]$ and $1:=[M]$.
Define for any $N, K \in \operatorname{su}(M) ;[N] \vee[K]:=[N+K]$ and $[N] \wedge[K]=[(N: M) K]$. Since $M, N$ and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ are finitely generated, by [8, Proposition 13], $(N: M)$ is finitely generated. Therefore $(N: M) \in \mathrm{FI}(R)$ and so $(N: M) K \in \operatorname{su}(M)$. Since $M$ is a multiplication module, the infimum of $[N]$ and $[K]$ is well-defined.

We now show that $\bar{M}$ is a distributive lattice. It is enough to show that

$$
[(N: M) K+L]=[(N+L: M)(K+L)] .
$$

Let $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$ be such that $(N: M) K+L \subseteq P$. Then $(N: M) K \subseteq P$ and $L \subseteq P$. Hence $K \subseteq P$ or $(N: M) \subseteq(P: M)$. If $K \subseteq P$ then $(N+L: M) K \subseteq P$ and since $(N+L: M) L \subseteq P$, we get $(N+L: M)(K+L) \subseteq P$. If $(N: M) \subseteq(P: M)$, then since $M$ is a multiplication module, $N=(N: M) M \subseteq P$. Hence $(N+L) \subseteq P$ and so $(N+L: M) K \subseteq P$. Therefore

$$
[(N: M) K+L] \leqslant[(N+L: M)(K+L)] .
$$

Similarly $[(N+L: M)(K+L)] \leqslant[(N: M) K+L]$.
Let $N$ be an ideal of $\bar{M}$. Since $R(x+y) \subseteq R x+R y$ and $R(r x) \subseteq R x$, where $x, y \in M$ and $r \in R$, we see that $M(N)$ is an $R$-submodule of $M$.

Lemma 2.4. If $M$ is a finitely generated $R$-module, then $\bar{M}(M[N])=N$, for all ideals $N$ of $\bar{M}$.

Proof. It is clear that $N \subseteq \bar{M}(M[N])$. Let $[L] \in \bar{M}(M[N])$. Then for some finitely generated $K \in \operatorname{su}(M), K \in[L]$ and $K \subseteq M[N]$. Suppose that $K=\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_{i} R$. Therefore we have $[L]=[K]=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[m_{i} R\right] \in N$. We conclude that $\bar{M}(M[N])=N$ and the proof is complete.

Lemma 2.5. Let $M$ be an $R$-module and $N \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$. Then $M[N] \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$.
Proof. If $M[N]=M$ then by Lemma 2.4, $N=\bar{M}(M[N])=\bar{M}(M)=\bar{M}$, which is a contradiction. Suppose that $N \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ and $r m \in M[N], r \in R$, $m \in M$. Then $[R r m] \in \bar{M}(M[N])=N$. Since $M$ is a multiplication module, so $(R m: M) M=R m$. Hence $[(R m: M) r M]=[R m] \wedge[r M]=[R r m] \in N$, and so $[R m] \in N$ or $[r M] \in N$. If $[R m] \in N$ then $m \in M[N]$. Now if $[r M] \in N$, then $r M \subseteq M[N]$.

## Proposition 2.6.

(i) If $N \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ then $\bar{M}(M[N])=N$.
(ii) For every ideal $N$ of $\bar{M}$,

$$
N \subseteq \bar{M}(M[N]) \subseteq \operatorname{rad}(N)=\bigcap\{P \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M}): N \subseteq P\}
$$

Proof. (i) Clearly $N \subseteq \bar{M}(M[N])$. Let $[K] \in \bar{M}(M[N])$. Hence there exists $L \subseteq M[N]$ such that $L \sim K$. By Lemma $2.5, M[N] \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$ and so $K \subseteq M[N]$. Since $K \in \operatorname{su}(M)$, we have $K=\sum_{i=1}^{t} I_{i} m_{i} R+J_{i} M$, where $I_{i}, J_{i} \in \mathrm{FI}(R)$ and $m_{i} \in$ $M$. Therefore $I_{i} m_{i} R \subseteq M[N]$ and $J_{i} M \subseteq M[N]$, for all $i$. Thus $m_{i} \in M[N]$ or $I_{i} \subseteq(M[N]: M)$. If $m_{i} \in M[N]$ then $\left[m_{i} R\right] \in N$. Since $\left[I_{i} m_{i} R\right] \leqslant\left[m_{i} R\right]$, we get $\left[I_{i} m_{i} R\right] \in N$. Now if $I_{i} \subseteq(M[N]: M)$ then $\left[I_{i} m_{i} R\right] \in N$. Therefore $\left[I_{i} m_{i} R\right] \in N$, for all $i$. By a similar proof $\left[J_{i} M\right] \in N$. We conclude that $[K] \in N$.
(ii) Let $N$ be any ideal of $\bar{M}$. If $N=\bar{M}$ then clearly $N=\bar{M}(M[N])$. Therefore assume that $N \neq \bar{M}$. Let $[K] \in \bar{M}(M[N])$. Hence $K \sim L$, for some $L \subseteq M[N]$. Choose a $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$, with $N \subseteq P$, then $M[N] \subseteq M[P]$. By Lemma 2.5, $M[P] \in$ $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ and hence $K \subseteq \operatorname{rad}(L) \subseteq \operatorname{rad}(M[N]) \subseteq M[P]$. Thus $[K] \in \bar{M}(M[P])=P$ (by (i)). So $[K] \in \operatorname{rad}(N)$. Therefore $\bar{M}(M[N]) \subseteq \operatorname{rad}(N)$. The proof is complete.

Lemma 2.7. Let $M$ be an $R$-module and $N$ a submodule of $M$. Then $\bar{M}(N)$ is an ideal in the lattice $\bar{M}$.

Proof. Let $\left[L_{1}\right],\left[L_{2}\right] \in \bar{M}(N)$. Then there exist $K_{1} \subseteq N$ and $K_{2} \subseteq N$ such that $K_{1} \sim L_{1}$ and $K_{2} \sim L_{2}$. By Lemma 2.1, $\left(K_{1}+K_{2}\right) \sim\left(L_{1}+L_{2}\right)$ and so $\left[L_{1}\right] \vee\left[L_{2}\right]=\left[L_{1}+L_{2}\right] \in \bar{M}(N)$. Now assume that $[L] \in \bar{M}(N),[K] \in \bar{M}$ and $[K] \leqslant[L]$. We must show that $[K] \in \bar{M}(N)$. There exists $L^{\prime} \subseteq N, L^{\prime} \sim L$. Put $L_{1}=(K: M) L^{\prime}$. It is clear that $L_{1} \subseteq N$. Let $Q \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$ and $L_{1} \subseteq Q$. Then $L^{\prime} \subseteq Q$ or $(K: M) \subseteq(Q: M)$. If $L^{\prime} \subseteq Q$ then $L \subseteq \operatorname{rad}(L)=\operatorname{rad}\left(L^{\prime}\right) \subseteq Q$ and hence $K \subseteq Q$, because $[K] \leqslant[L]$. Now if $(K: M) \subseteq(Q: M)$ then $K \subseteq Q$. Clearly $(K: M) L^{\prime} \subseteq K \subseteq Q$. Thus $K \sim L_{1}$ and so $[K] \in \bar{M}(N)$.

Let $N$ be a submodule of $\bar{M}$.
Put $(N: \bar{M})=\{J \in \mathrm{FI}(R)$ : for all $[K] \in \bar{M}$, there exists $[L] \in N ; J[K] \leqslant[L]\}$. It is easy to show that $(N: \bar{M})$ is an ideal of $\operatorname{FI}(R)$, i.e. $J_{1}+J_{2} \in(N: \bar{M})$, $I J \in(N: \bar{M})$, where $J_{1}, J_{2}, J \in(N: \bar{M})$ and $I \in \mathrm{FI}(R)$.

Proposition 2.8. Let $M$ be an $R$-module. Then $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ if and only if $(P: \bar{M}) \in \operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{FI}(R))$.

Proof. Let $(P: \bar{M})=\mathrm{FI}(R)$. By assumption $P \neq \bar{M}$, so there exists $[K] \in$ $\bar{M} \backslash P$. Since $R \in(P: \bar{M})$, we have $R[K]=[K] \leqslant[L]$, for some $[L] \in P$. So $[K] \in P$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $(P: \bar{M}) \neq \mathrm{FI}(R)$. Assume that $I, J \in \mathrm{FI}(R)$ are such that $I J \in(P: \bar{M})$. Let $[K] \in \bar{M}$. Then there exists $[L] \in P$ such that $I J[K] \leqslant[L]$ and so $[I J K] \in P$. Clearly $[(I K: M) J M] \leqslant[I J K]$. Hence $[I K] \wedge[J M]=[(I K: M) J K]=[I J K] \in P$, and so $[I K] \in P$ or $[J M] \in P$. We conclude that $I \in(P: \bar{M})$ or $J \in(P: \bar{M})$ and $(P: \bar{M}) \in \operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{FI}(R))$. Conversely, let $[K] \wedge[L]=[(K: M) L] \in P$ and $[T] \in \bar{M}$. Since $[(K: M)(L: M) T] \leqslant[(K: M) L]$, we have $(K: M) \in(P: \bar{M})$ or $(L: M) \in(P: \bar{M})$. If $(K: M) \in(P: \bar{M})$ then $[(K: M) M] \in P$. Since $M$ is a multiplication module, $[K]=[(K: M) M] \in P$. Similarly $[L] \in P$ and hence $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$.

Lemma 2.9. Let $M$ be an $R$-module. If $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$ then $\bar{M}(P) \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$.
Proof. Assume that $\bar{M}(P)=\bar{M}$. By Lemma $2.2, P=M[\bar{M}]=M$, which is a contradiction. Now let $[K] \wedge[L]=[(K: M) L] \in \bar{M}(P)$. Then there exists $L^{\prime} \subseteq P$ such that $(K: M) L \sim L^{\prime}$. Therefore $(K: M) L \subseteq \operatorname{rad}\left(L^{\prime}\right) \subseteq P$. So $L \subseteq P$ or $K=(K: M) M \subseteq P$. Thus $[K] \in \bar{M}(P)$ or $[L] \in \bar{M}(P)$.

## 3. Topologies on $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ and $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$

We begin this section by introducing a topology called the Zariski topology on $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ for any $R$-module $M$, in which closed sets are varieties

$$
V(N)=\{P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M):(N: M) \subseteq(P: M)\}
$$

of all submodules $N$ of $M$ [2, Proposition 1.1]. Similarly, for any ideal $L$ of $\bar{M}$, put

$$
\bar{V}(L)=\{Q \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M}): L \subseteq Q\}
$$

For the remainder of this section we let $M$ be a finitely generated multiplication $R$-module and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ a finitely generated ideal of $R$.

Lemma 3.1. Let $M$ be an $R$-module. Put $\bar{T}=\{\bar{V}(L) \mid L$ is an ideal of $\bar{M}\}$. Then $\bar{T}$ is the collection of closed sets of the Stone topology on $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$.

Proof. It is easy to show that $\bar{V}([0])=\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ and $\bar{V}(\bar{M})=\emptyset$. Let $L$ and $N$ be ideals of $\bar{M}$. We show that $\bar{V}(L) \cup \bar{V}(N)=\bar{V}(L \cap N)$. Suppose that $Q \in \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ is such that $L \cap N \subseteq Q$ and $L \nsubseteq Q$. Then there exists $[K] \in L \backslash Q$. Let $\left[K_{1}\right] \in N$. Clearly $[K] \wedge\left[K_{1}\right] \in L \cap N$. Therefore $\left[K_{1}\right] \in Q$. Hence $\bar{V}(L \cap N) \subseteq$ $\bar{V}(L) \cup \bar{V}(N)$. It is clear that $\bar{V}(L) \cup \bar{V}(N) \subseteq \bar{V}(L \cap N)$. Let $\left\{N_{i} \mid i \in I\right\}$ be a family of ideals of $\bar{M}$. Then $\bigcap_{i \in I} \bar{V}\left(N_{i}\right)=\bar{V}\left(\sum_{i \in I} N_{i}\right)$.

For any subset $X \subseteq \operatorname{Spec}(M)$, let $\bar{X}=\{\bar{M}(P): P \in X\}$. Since $M$ is a finitely generated multiplication $R$-module and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ is a finitely generated ideal of $R$, by Lemma $2.9 \bar{X} \subseteq \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$.

Lemma 3.2. Let $M$ be an $R$-module. Then for each submodule $N$ of $M, \overline{V(N)}=$ $\bar{V}(\bar{M}(N))$.

Proof. Let $\bar{M}(P) \in \overline{V(N)}$, so $P \in V(N)$. Thus $(N: M) \subseteq(P: M)$. Let $[L] \in \bar{M}(N)$. Then $L \sim L^{\prime}$, for some $L^{\prime} \subseteq N$. But $(N: M) M=N$ and hence $L^{\prime} \subseteq P$. Therefore $[L] \in \bar{M}(P)$. We conclude that $\bar{M}(N) \subseteq \bar{M}(P)$ and so $\overline{V(N)} \subseteq \bar{V}(\bar{M}(N))$. Now let $Q \in \bar{V}(\bar{M}(N))$, then $\bar{M}(N) \subseteq Q$. By Lemma $2.5, M[Q]=P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$. Hence by Lemma 2.4, $\bar{M}(P)=\bar{M}(M[Q])=Q$. We claim that $(N: M) \subseteq(P: M)$. If $r M \subseteq N$ then $[r M] \in \bar{M}(N) \subseteq Q$ and so $r R[M] \in Q$. Hence $r M \subseteq M[Q]=P$. We conclude that $Q \in \overline{V(N)}$.

Put $T=\{V(N) \mid N$ is a submodule of $M\}$.

Theorem 3.3. Let $M$ be a finitely generated multiplication $R$-module and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ a finitely generated ideal of $R$. Then the topological spaces $(\operatorname{Spec}(M), T)$ and $(\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M}), \bar{T})$ are homeomorphic.

Proof. Define

$$
\varphi: \operatorname{Spec}(M) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M}) ; \quad \varphi(P)=\bar{M}(P)
$$

and

$$
\psi: \operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M}) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Spec}(M) ; \quad \psi(L)=M[L] .
$$

By Lemmas 2.9 and 2.5, $\varphi$ and $\psi$ are well-defined. By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4, we have

$$
\psi \circ \varphi(P)=\psi(\bar{M}(P))=M[\bar{M}(P)]=P
$$

and

$$
\varphi \circ \psi(L)=\varphi(M[L])=\bar{M}(M[L])=L
$$

Hence the two mappings $\varphi$ and $\psi$ are inverses of each other. The bijection $\varphi$ induces a $\operatorname{map} \bar{\varphi}: T \longrightarrow \bar{T}$ by $\bar{\varphi}(V(N))=\overline{V(N)}$. By Lemma 3.2, $\overline{V(N)}=\bar{V}(\bar{M}(N))$ and so $\bar{\varphi}$ is well-defined. We claim that this induced map is also a bijection. Suppose $\overline{V(N)}=\overline{V(L)}$. By Lemma 3.2, we have $\bar{V}(\bar{M}(N))=\bar{V}(\bar{M}(L))$. We must show that $V(N)=V(L)$. Let $P \in \operatorname{Spec}(M)$ and $(N: M) \subseteq(P: M)$. Suppose that $r M \subseteq L$. Hence $[r M] \in \bar{M}(L)$. Since $\bar{M}(P) \in \bar{V}(\bar{M}(N))=\bar{V}(\bar{M}(L))$, we get $[r M] \in \bar{M}(P)$. Therefore $r M \subseteq P$. We conclude that $P \in V(L)$ and so $V(N) \subseteq V(L)$. By symmetry we infer that $V(L)=V(N)$. Hence $\bar{\varphi}$ is one-to-one. Now let $\bar{V}(L) \in \bar{T}$. Since $L$ is an ideal of $\bar{M}$, we have $\bar{\varphi}(V(M[L]))=\bar{V}(\bar{M}(M[L]))=\bar{V}(L)$ and so $\bar{\varphi}$ is onto.

Following M. Hochster [3], we say that a topological space $W$ is a spectral space if $W$ is homeomorphic to $\operatorname{Spec}(S)$ with the Zariski topology, for some ring $S$.

Definition. A semi-reticulation for an $R$-module $M$ is a pair $(\bar{M}, \lambda)$ where $\bar{M}$ is a distributive lattice with 0,1 and $\lambda: M \longrightarrow \bar{M}$ is a mapping such that
(I) $\lambda(x+y) \leqslant \lambda(x) \vee \lambda(y)$;
(II) $\lambda(r x) \leqslant \lambda(x) \wedge \lambda(y)$, for some $y \in r M$;
(III) $\lambda(0)=0$;
(IV) the inverse image map induced by $\lambda$ is a homeomorphism between $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ and $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ (with the Stone and the Zariski topologies respectively).
Moreover, if $\lambda(m)=1$, for some $m \in M$, then we say that $M$ has a reticulation (this generalizes [7]).

Theorem 3.5. Let $M$ be a finitely generated $R$-module and $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$ be a finitely generated ideal of $R$. Then the following are equivalent.
(i) $M$ is a multiplication module;
(ii) there exists a semi-reticulation for $M$;
(iii) $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ is spectral.

Proof. (i) $\rightarrow$ (ii) Define $\lambda: M \longrightarrow \bar{M}$ by $\lambda(x)=[R x]$, where $x \in M$. Clearly (I), (II) and (III) are satisfied. By Theorem 3.3, we have $\lambda^{-1}(Q)=\psi(Q)$. Hence the inverse image map induced by $\lambda$ is a homeomorphism between $\operatorname{Spec}(\bar{M})$ and $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$.
(ii) $\rightarrow$ (iii) It is well known that the prime ideal space of a distributive lattice with 0,1 , is spectral under the Stone topology (see [1]). By Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 3.3, $\operatorname{Spec}(M)$ is spectral.
(iii) $\rightarrow$ (i) By [5, Corollary 6.6].

Corollary 3.6. Let $M$ be a finitely generated $R$-module. Suppose that $R$ is a Noetherian ring or $M$ is a faithful module (i.e. $\operatorname{Ann}(M)=0$ ). Then $M$ is multiplication if and only if $M$ has a semi-reticulation.

Corollary 3.7. Let $M$ be a cyclic $R$-module. Suppose that $R$ is a Noetherian ring or $M$ is a faithful module, then $M$ has a reticulation.

Proof. By Corollary 3.6, $M$ has a semi-reticulation. Since $M$ is a cyclic $R$-module, there exists $m \in M$ such that $R m=M$. Therefore $\lambda(m)=[R m]=$ $[M]=1$. We conclude that $M$ has a reticulation.
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