IJMMS 31:6 (2002) 321–327
PII. S0161171202107149
http://ijmms.hindawi.com

SUBMODULES OF SECONDARY MODULES

SHAHABADDIN EBRAHIMI ATANI

Received 31 July 2001 and in revised form 25 January 2002

Let R be a commutative ring with nonzero identity. Our objective is to investigate representable modules and to examine in particular when submodules of such modules are representable. Moreover, we establish a connection between the secondary modules and the pure-injective, the Σ-pure-injective, and the prime modules.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 13F05.

1. Introduction. In this paper, all rings are commutative rings with identity and all modules are unital. The notion of associated prime ideals and the related one of primary decomposition are classical. In a dual way, we define the attached prime ideals and the secondary representation. This theory is developed in the appendix to Section 6 in Matsumura [6] and in Macdonald [5]. Now we define the concepts that we will need.

Let R be a ring and let $0 \neq M$ be an R-module. Then M is called a secondary module (second module) provided that for every element r of R the homothety $M \xrightarrow{r\cdot} M$ is either surjective or nilpotent (either surjective or zero). This implies that $\operatorname{nilrad}(M) = P$ $(\operatorname{Ann}(M) = P')$ is a prime ideal of R, and M is said to be P-secondary (P'-second), so every second module is secondary (the concept of second module is introduced by Yassemi [14]). A secondary representation for an R-module M is an expression for M as a finite sum of secondary modules (see [5]). If such a representation exists, we will say that M is representable.

If R is a ring and N is a submodule of an R-module M, the ideal $\{r \in R : rM \subseteq N\}$ will be denoted by $(N : M)$. Then $(0 : M)$ is the annihilator of M, $\operatorname{Ann}(M)$. A proper submodule N of a module M over a ring R is said to be prime submodule (primary submodule) if for each $r \in R$ the homothety $M/N \xrightarrow{r\cdot} M/N$ is either injective or zero (either injective or nilpotent), so $(0 : M/N) = P$ $(\operatorname{nilrad}(M/N) = P')$ is a prime ideal of R, and N is said to be P-prime submodule (P'-primary submodule). So N is prime in M if and only if whenever $rm \in N$, for some $r \in R$, $m \in M$, then $m \in N$ or $rM \subseteq N$. We say that M is a prime module (primary module) if zero submodule of M is prime (primary) submodule of M, so N is a prime submodule of M if and only if M/N is a prime module. Moreover, every prime module is primary.

Let R be a ring, and let N be an R-submodule of M. Then N is pure in M if for any finite system of equations over N which is solvable in M, the system is also solvable in N. A module is said to be absolutely pure if every embedding of it into any other modules is pure embedding. A submodule N of an R-module M is called relatively divisible (or an RD-submodule) if $rN = N \cap rM$ for all $r \in R$. Every RD-submodule of a P-secondary module over a commutative ring R is P-secondary (see [2, Lemma 2.1]).

A module M is pure-injective if and only if any system of equations in M which is finitely solvable in M, has a global solution in M [7, Theorem 2.8]. The module N is a pure-essential extension of M if M is pure in N and for all nonzero submodules L of N, if $M\cap L=0$, then $(M\oplus L)/L$ is not pure in N/L. A pure-injective hull $H(M)$ of a module M is a pure essential extension of M which is pure-injective. Every module M has a pure-injective hull which is unique to isomorphism over M [12].

Given an R-module M and index set I, the direct sum of the family $\{M_i : i\in I\}$ where $M_i=M$ for each $i\in I$ will be denoted by $M^{(I)}$. Given a module property $\mathcal{P}$, we will say that a module M is $\sum$-$\mathcal{P}$ if $M^{(I)}$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}$ for every index set I.

Let R be a commutative ring. An element $a\in R$ is said to be regular if there exists $b\in R$ such that $a=a^2b$, and R is said to be regular if each of its elements is regular. An important property of regular rings is that every module is absolutely pure (see [13, Theorem 37.6]).

Let R be a ring and M an R-module. A prime ideal P of R is called an associated prime ideal of M if P is the annihilator $\operatorname{Ann}(x)$ of some $x\in M$. The set of associated primes of M is written $\operatorname{Ass}(M)$. For undefined terms, we refer to [6, 7].

2. Secondary submodules. In general, a nonzero submodule of a representable (even secondary) R-module is not representable (secondary), but we have the following results.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a commutative ring and let $0\neq N$ be an* RD*-submodule of R-module M. Then M is P-secondary if and only if N and M/N are P-secondary.*

Proof. If M is P-secondary, then N and M/N are P-secondary by [2, Lemma 2.1] and [5, Theorem 2.4], respectively. Conversely, suppose that $r\in R$. If $r\in P$, then $r^n(M/N)=0$ and $r^nN=0$ for some n, hence $r^nM\subseteq N$ and $0=r^nN=r^nM\cap N=r^nM$. If $r\notin P$, then $rM+N=M$, $rN=N$, and $N=rN=rM\cap N$, so we have $rM=M$, as required. □

Corollary 2.2. *Let R be a commutative regular ring, and let $0\neq N$ be a submodule of R-module M. Then M is P-secondary if and only if N and M/N are P-secondary.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.1. □

Theorem 2.3. *Let R be a commutative regular ring. Then every nonzero submodule of a representable R-module is representable.*

Proof. Let M be a representable R-module and let $M=\sum_{i=1}^n M_i$ be a minimal secondary representation with $\operatorname{nilrad}(M_i)=P_i$. There is an element $r_1\in P_1$ such that $r_1\notin\cup_{i=2}^nP_i$. Otherwise $P_1\subseteq\cup_{i=2}^nP_i$, so by [10, Theorem 3.61], $P_1\subseteq P_j$ for some j, and hence $P_1=P_j$, a contradiction. Thus there exists a positive integer m_1 such that $r_1^{m_1}\in\operatorname{Ann}(M_1)$ and the module $r_1^{m_1}M=\sum_{i=2}^n r_1^{m_1}M_i$ is representable. By using this process for the ideals $P_2,\dots,P_{n-1}$, there are integers $m_2,\dots,m_{n-1}$ and elements $r_2\in P_2,\dots,r_{n-1}\in P_{n-1}$ such that $s_nM=M_n$, where $0\neq s_n=r_1^{m_1}r_2^{m_2}\cdots r_{n-1}^{m_{n-1}}$, $s_n\in\cap_{i=1}^{n-1}P_i$ and $s_n\notin P_n$. Therefore by a similar argument, there are elements $s_1,\dots,s_{n-1}$

such that $M = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i M$, where for each i, where $i = 1,\dots,n$, $s_i \notin P_i$, $s_i M = M_i$, and $s_i \in \cap_{i=1_{i\neq j}}^{n} \operatorname{Ann}(M_j)$.

Let N be a nonzero submodule of M and $0 \neq a \in N$. Then $a = s_1 b_1 + \cdots + s_n b_n$ for some $b_i \in M$, $i = 1,\dots,n$. By assumption, there exists $t_1,\dots,t_n \in R$ such that for each i, $s_i = s_i^2 t_i$. As $0 \neq a$, $s_i b_i \neq 0$ for some i and $s_i t_i a = s_i^2 t_i b_i = s_i b_i$, so $s_i N \neq 0$. We can assume that $s_{i_1} N \neq 0,\dots,s_{i_k} N \neq 0$, where $\{i_1,\dots,i_k\} \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}$. By a similar argument as above, if $a \in N$, then $a = \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{i_j} t_{i_j} a \in \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{i_j} N$, and hence $N = \sum_{j=1}^{k} s_{i_j} N$. Since for each j, where $j = 1,\dots,k$, $s_{i_j} N$ is pure in the P_{i_j}-secondary module M_{i_j}, it is P_{i_j}-secondary by [2, Lemma 2.1], as required. □

Theorem 2.4. *Let R be a commutative ring and let N be a prime submodule of secondary R-module of M. Then N is $(N:M)$-secondary.*

Proof. Suppose that M is a P-secondary module over R. Let $r \in R$. If $r \in P$, then $r^n N \subseteq r^n M = 0$ for some n. If $r \notin P$, then $rM = M$. Suppose that $n \in N$, so there is an element $m \in M$ such that $n = rm$. As N is a prime submodule of M and $N \neq rM = M$, $m \in N$, so $rN = N$, hence N is P-secondary.

By [4, Lemma 1], the ideal $P' = (N:M) = \{r \in R : rM \subseteq N\}$ is prime. Clearly, $P' \subseteq P$. Let $s \in P$. Then $s^n N = s^n M = 0$ for some n. There is an element $m \in M$ such that $m \notin N$ and $s^n m = 0 \in N$, so $s^n \in P'$, hence $s \in P'$. Thus $P = P'$, as required. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let R be a commutative ring and let N be a prime submodule of P-second R-module of M. Then N is an* RD*-submodule of M.*

Proof. Let $r \in R$. If $r \in P$, then $rN \subseteq rM = 0$, so $rN = N \cap rM = 0$. If $r \notin P$, then $rM = M$, so the homothety $M/N \xrightarrow{r\cdot} M/N$ is not zero since N is prime. It follows that the above homothety is injective. If $a \in N \cap rM$, then there is $b \in M$ such that $a = rb$. Since $r(b+N) = 0$, so $b \in N$, hence $rN = N \cap rM$, as required. □

Theorem 2.6. *Let M be a P-second module over a commutative ring R, and let N be a prime submodule of M. Then every submodule of M properly containing N is an* RD*-submodule. In particular, it is P-second.*

Proof. Let K be a submodule of M properly containing N. Then K/N is a prime submodule of prime and P-second module M/N, so by Proposition 2.5, K/N is an RD-submodule of M/N. Now the assertion follows from [3, Consequences 18-2.2(c)] and Proposition 2.5. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let M be a nonzero module over a commutative domain R. Then M is (0)-second if and only if M is (0)-secondary.*

Proof. The proof is completely straightforward. □

By [3, Proposition 11-3.11] and [11, Proposition 12, page 506] (see also [14]), and the definitions of secondary and primary modules, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.8. *Let R be a commutative ring.*

(i) *Every Artinian primary module over R is secondary.*
(ii) *Every Noetherian secondary module over R is primary.*
(iii) *Every finitely generated secondary module is primary.*

Lemma 2.9. *Let R be a commutative ring. Let K and N be submodules of an R-module M such that N is prime and K is P-secondary. Then $N\cap K$ is P-secondary.*

Proof. Let $r\in R$. If $r\in P$, then $r^n(N\cap K)\subseteq r^nK=0$ for some n. Suppose $r\notin P$ and $t\in N\cap K$. Then $t=rs$ for some $s\in K$ since K P-secondary. As N is prime, we have $s\in N$, and hence $t\in r(N\cap K)$. This gives, $N\cap K=r(N\cap K)$. □

Theorem 2.10. *Let M be a representable module over a commutative ring R, and let N be a prime submodule of M with $(N:M)=P$. Then the following hold:*
(i) *N is representable;*
(ii) *M/N is P-secondary.*

Proof. (i) Let M be a representable R-module and let $M=\sum_{i=1}^m M_i$ be a minimal secondary representation with $\operatorname{nilrad}(M_i)=P_i$. For each i, $i=1,2,\dots,m$, let $m_i\in M_i$ and $r_i\in P_i$. Then $r_i^{n_i}m_i=0$ for some n_i, and we have $(r_i^{n_i}+P)(m_i+M_i)=0$ and hence either $P_i\subseteq P$ or $M_i\subseteq N$ $(i=1,2,\dots,m)$. It follows that $M_i\not\subseteq N$ for some i (otherwise $M=N$). If $M_i\not\subseteq N$ and $M_j\not\subseteq N$ for $i\neq j$, then $P=P_i=P_j$, a contradiction (for if $t\in P-P_i$ then $M_i=tM_i\subseteq tM\subseteq N$). Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that $M_1\not\subseteq N$ and $M_i\subseteq N$, so $P_1=P$ and $P_i\not\subseteq P$ $(i=2,3,\dots,m)$. Then $M_2+M_3+\cdots+M_m\subseteq N$ and

$$N=N\cap M=N\cap(M_1+\cdots+M_m)=M_2+\cdots+M_m+(N\cap M_1). \tag{2.1}$$

Now the assertion follows from Lemma 2.9.

(ii) Since $M=M_1+N$, we have $M/N=(M_1+N)/N\cong M_1/(M_1\cap N)$, as required. □

Proposition 2.11. *Let R be a Dedekind domain, and let M be a $0\neq P$-secondary R-module. Then M is a P-primary module.*

Proof. Let $r\in R$. If $r\in P$, then the homothety $M\xrightarrow{r\cdot}M$ is nilpotent since M is secondary. Suppose that $r\notin P$. If $ra=0$ for some $0\neq a\in M$, then by [6, Theorem 6.1], there exists $0\neq b\in M$ and $Q\in\operatorname{Ass}(M)$ such that $r\in Q$ and $Q=(0:_R b)$. As $(0:M)\subseteq(0:b)=Q$, we have $P=Q$, a contradiction. So the homothety $M\xrightarrow{r\cdot}M$ is injective, as required. □

Remarks. (i) Let R be a domain which is not a field. Then R is a prime R-module (since R is torsion-free) but it is not secondary (even it is not pure-injective).

(ii) Let R be a local Dedekind domain with maximal ideal $P=Rp$. We show that the module $E(R/P)$ is not prime (but it is (0)-secondary). Set $E=E(R/P)$ and $A_n=(0:_E P^n)$ $(n\geq 1)$. Then by [2, Lemma 2.6], $PA_{n+1}=A_n$, $A_n\subseteq E$ is a cyclic R-module with $A_n=Ra_n$ such that $pa_{n+1}=a_n$, every nonzero proper submodule L of E is of the form $L=A_m$ for some m and E is Artinian module with a strictly increasing sequence of submodules

$$A_1\subset A_2\subset\cdots\subset A_n\subset A_{n+1}\subset\cdots. \tag{2.2}$$

We claim that $(A_n:_R E)=0$ for every n. Suppose that $r\in(A_n:_R E)$ with $r\neq 0$. Then $rE\subseteq A_n$ and for all $a\in M$, we have $a=rb$ for some $b\in M$ since E is injective (= divisible). Thus $a=rb\in A_n$, so $E=A_n$, a contradiction. Therefore $(A_n:_R E)=0$ for every integer $n \geq 1$. However no A_n is a prime submodule of E, for if m is any positive integer, then $p^m \notin (A_n :_R E) = 0$ and $a_{n+m} \notin A_n$, but $p^m a_{m+n} = a_n \in A_n$.

Theorem 2.12. *Let R be a Dedekind domain, and let M be an R-module. Then M is $0 \neq P$-second if and only if M is P-prime.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.11, it is enough to show that if M is P-prime, then M is P-second. Since $(0 : M) = P$ is a maximal ideal in R, so M is a vector space over R/P, hence M is P-second. □

Proposition 2.13. *Let R be a Dedekind domain. Then any $0 \neq P$-prime R-module is a direct sum of copies of $R_P/PR_P \cong R/P$.*

Proof. By the proof of Proposition 2.11, every element of $R - P$ acts invertibly on M, so the R-module structure of M extends naturally to a structure of M as a module over the localisation R_P of R at P. Therefore, we can assume that R is a commutative local Dedekind domain with maximal ideal $P = Rp$. Let M_j denote the indecomposable summand of M, so M_j is P-prime. Let m_j be a nonzero element of M_j, hence $(0 : m_j) = (0 : M) = P$. Then $Rm_j \cong R/P$ is pure in M_j since m_j is not divisible by p in M_j, but by [1, Proposition 1.3], the module R/P is itself pure-injective, so Rm_j is a direct summand of M_j, and hence $M_j \cong Rm_j$, as required. □

3. Pure-injective modules

Proposition 3.1. *Let M be a P-secondary module over a commutative ring R. Then $H = H(M)$, the pure-injective hull, is P-secondary.*

Proof. Let $r \in R$. If $r \notin P$, then $rM = M$, so M satisfies the sentence for all x there exists y $(x = ry)$, and hence so does H (because any module and its pure-injective hull satisfy the same sentences [7, Chapter 4]). If $r \in R$, then $r^n M = 0$, so M satisfies the sentence for all x $(r^n x = 0)$, hence so does in H, as required. □

Theorem 3.2. *The following conditions are equivalent for a Prufer domain R:*
(i) *the ring R is a Dedekind domain;*
(ii) *every secondary R-module is pure-injective.*

Proof. Let R be a Dedekind domain and M a secondary R-module. If $\operatorname{Ann}(M) = 0$, then M is divisible, hence injective. If $\operatorname{Ann}(M) \neq 0$, then M is a torsion R-module of bounded order, so that M is Σ-pure-injective (see [15]). In both cases, M is Σ-pure-injective (so pure-injective).

Conversely, let R be a Prufer domain with the property that every secondary module is pure-injective. In order to prove that R is Dedekind domain, it suffices to show that every divisible R-module is injective. Let M be a divisible R-module. Then M is secondary, Hence pure-injective. Since R is Prufer, pure-injective modules are RD-injective (see [7]). The embedding of M in its injective envelope $E(M)$ is an RD-pure monomorphism, because for every nonzero $r \in R$ we have that $M = rM$, so that $rE(M) \cap M \subseteq M \subseteq rM$. Since M is the RD-injective, M is a direct summand of $E(M)$. Thus M is injective. This shows that R is a Dedekind domain. □

Remarks. (i) There is a module over a commutative regular ring which is injective but not secondary (see [9, Theorem 2.3]). The commutative regular ring $R = F \times F$, F a field, is an Artinian Gorenstein, that is, R is injective (so pure-injective) as an R-module. But R is not secondary, because multiplication by $(1,0)$ is neither nilpotent nor surjective.

(ii) The above consideration thus leads us to the following question: are secondary modules pure-injective? The answer is yes because of the following reason. Every non-Noetherian Prufer domain has secondary modules that are not pure-injective. For instance, every non-Noetherian valuation domain has secondary modules that are not pure-injective.

Proposition 3.3. *Let M be an R-module.*

(i) *M is $\sum$-secondary if and only if M is secondary.*

(ii) *Let M be a direct sum of modules M_i $(i \in I)$ where for each i, M_i is secondary and $\operatorname{Ann}(M_i) = \operatorname{Ann}(M_j)$ for all $i, j \in I$. Then M is secondary.*

Proof. (i) The necessity is immediate by the definition. Conversely, suppose that M is P-secondary. Given an index set J, and let $r \in R$. If $r \in P$, then $r^n M = 0$ for some n, so $r^n M^{(J)} = 0$. If $r \notin P$ then $rM = M$, so $rM^{(J)} = M^{(J)}$, as required.

(ii) Since the annihilators of all direct summands coincide, we can assume that M_i is P-secondary (say) for all $i \in I$. Now the proof of (ii) is similar to that (i) and we omit it. □

Corollary 3.4. *Let M be an indecomposable Σ-pure-injective module over a commutative Prufer ring R. Then M is secondary.*

Proof. Set $P = \{r \in R : \operatorname{Ann}_M r \neq 0\}$ and $P' = \cap_n P^n$. Then P and P' are prime ideals in R by [8, Fact 3.1 and Lemma 2.1]. By [8, Fact 3.2], M is either P-secondary or P'-secondary, as required. □

Corollary 3.5. *Every Σ-pure-injective module over a Prufer ring is representable.*

Proof. Suppose M is a Σ-pure-injective module over a commutative Prufer ring R. By [8, page 967], we can write $M = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_m$ where M_i is secondary for all i by Proposition 3.3 and Corollary 3.4, as required. □

Acknowledgment. The author thanks the referee for useful comments.

References

[1] S. E. Atani, *On pure-injective modules over pullback rings*, Comm. Algebra **28** (2000), no. 9, 4037–4069.

[2] ———, *On secondary modules over Dedekind domains*, Southeast Asian Bull. Math. **25** (2001), no. 1, 1–6.

[3] J. Dauns, *Modules and Rings*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[4] S. M. George, R. L. McCasland, and P. F. Smith, *A principal ideal theorem analogue for modules over commutative rings*, Comm. Algebra **22** (1994), no. 6, 2083–2099.

[5] I. G. Macdonald, *Secondary representation of modules over a commutative ring*, Symposia Mathematica, Vol. 11 (Convegno di Algebra Commutativa, INDAM, Rome, 1971), Academic Press, London, 1973, pp. 23–43.

[6] H. Matsumura, *Commutative Ring Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 8, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.

[7] M. Prest, *Model Theory and Modules*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 130, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.

[8] M. Prest and G. Puninski, *Σ-pure-injective modules over a commutative Prüfer ring*, Comm. Algebra **27** (1999), no. 2, 961–971.

[9] R. Y. Sharp, *Secondary representations for injective modules over commutative Noetherian rings*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2) **20** (1976), no. 2, 143–151.

[10] ______, *Steps in Commutative Algebra*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 19, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[11] W. V. Vasconcelos, *On finitely generated flat modules*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (1969), 505–512.

[12] R. B. Warfield Jr., *Purity and algebraic compactness for modules*, Pacific J. Math. **28** (1969), 699–719.

[13] R. Wisbauer, *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*, Algebra, Logic and Applications, vol. 3, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Pennsylvania, 1991.

[14] S. Yassemi, *The dual notion of prime submodules*, to appear in Arch. Math.

[15] W. Zimmermann, *Rein injektive direkte Summen von Moduln*, Comm. Algebra **5** (1977), no. 10, 1083–1117 (German).

Shahabaddin Ebrahimi Atani: Department of Mathematics, University of Guilan, P.O. Box 1914, Rasht, Iran

E-mail address: ebrahimi@cd.gu.ac.ir

Journal of Applied Mathematics and Decision Sciences

Special Issue on Decision Support for Intermodal Transport

Call for Papers

Intermodal transport refers to the movement of goods in a single loading unit which uses successive various modes of transport (road, rail, water) without handling the goods during mode transfers. Intermodal transport has become an important policy issue, mainly because it is considered to be one of the means to lower the congestion caused by single-mode road transport and to be more environmentally friendly than the single-mode road transport. Both considerations have been followed by an increase in attention toward intermodal freight transportation research.

Various intermodal freight transport decision problems are in demand of mathematical models of supporting them. As the intermodal transport system is more complex than a single-mode system, this fact offers interesting and challenging opportunities to modelers in applied mathematics. This special issue aims to fill in some gaps in the research agenda of decision-making in intermodal transport.

The mathematical models may be of the optimization type or of the evaluation type to gain an insight in intermodal operations. The mathematical models aim to support decisions on the strategic, tactical, and operational levels. The decision-makers belong to the various players in the intermodal transport world, namely, drayage operators, terminal operators, network operators, or intermodal operators.

Topics of relevance to this type of decision-making both in time horizon as in terms of operators are:

- Intermodal terminal design
- Infrastructure network configuration
- Location of terminals
- Cooperation between drayage companies
- Allocation of shippers/receivers to a terminal
- Pricing strategies
- Capacity levels of equipment and labour
- Operational routines and lay-out structure
- Redistribution of load units, railcars, barges, and so forth
- Scheduling of trips or jobs
- Allocation of capacity to jobs
- Loading orders
- Selection of routing and service

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jamds/guidelines.html. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	June 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	September 1, 2009
Publication Date	December 1, 2009

Lead Guest Editor

Gerrit K. Janssens, Transportation Research Institute (IMOB), Hasselt University, Agoralaan, Building D, 3590 Diepenbeek (Hasselt), Belgium; Gerrit.Janssens@uhasselt.be

Guest Editor

Cathy Macharis, Department of Mathematics, Operational Research, Statistics and Information for Systems (MOSI), Transport and Logistics Research Group, Management School, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium; Cathy.Macharis@vub.ac.be