

EXACT-SEQUENCE STABILITY AND AMBIENT REALIZATIONS FOR $C4^*$ -MODULES

CHANDRASEKHAR GOKAVARAPU

ABSTRACT. We study exact-sequence stability for $C4^*$ -modules and strongly $C4^*$ -modules. The defining summand-comparison conditions are not preserved automatically by short exact sequences, so extension, kernel, cokernel, and quotient transfer require an explicit relative exact framework. We formulate such a framework and prove complementary obstruction results showing that unrestricted transfer fails in general.

We also prove concrete ambient realization theorems. The full subcategory of semisimple right modules over an arbitrary ring is a canonical exact environment in which every object is $C4^*$. If R is semisimple artinian, the full category $\text{Mod-}R$ realizes the relative theory with the ordinary abelian exact structure. We also identify a broader concrete class of injective $C4^*$ -modules admitting a semisimple-plus-square-free orthogonal decomposition.

These results convert the existing decomposition theory into a closure theory with explicit ambient realizations and boundary phenomena.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper begins from a defect in the existing theory. The class of $C4$ -modules is known. Its $C4^*$ -variant is known. Several adjacent decomposition-sensitive classes have also been studied. What has not been organized is a closure theory along exact sequences. In particular, the available literature does not yet provide a systematic account of when $C4^*$ -type conditions pass through extensions, kernels, cokernels, submodules, or factor modules. The point is not cosmetic. A structure theory without closure data remains local and static. It does not yet form a workable calculus. See [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19].

The difficulty is intrinsic. The $C4^*$ -condition is formulated through summand comparison, decomposition control, and the behavior of submodules relative to direct summands. Exact sequences do not preserve these data automatically. A short exact sequence preserves additive structure. It need not preserve the internal geometry of summands. It follows that one cannot expect extension stability from formal diagram chasing alone. One must identify the additional hypotheses under which summand-theoretic information can be lifted, descended, or patched. The general background for such questions lies in decomposition theory, exchange theory, extending and lifting modules, and the classical analysis of continuous and discrete module classes; see [35, 25, 5, 34, 39, 26, 8, 4, 24, 11].

This leads to the first problem. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be exact. Assume that A and C satisfy a $C4^*$ -type condition. When must B satisfy the same condition? Conversely, if B is $C4^*$, when does the property pass to A or C ? These are the correct questions. They are stronger than isolated decomposition lemmas. They ask whether the class is extension-closed, kernel-stable, cokernel-stable, or exact in a relative sense. Such questions belong naturally to the language of relative homological algebra and exact categories, even when the underlying modules are studied by summand methods rather than by projective or injective resolutions; see [9, 10, 3, 28, 29, 13, 23, 27].

The existing theory suggests both optimism and caution. On the one hand, decomposition-sensitive classes often admit permanence theorems when supplemented by exchange, lifting,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16D10, 16D80, 18E10, 18G25, 16P40.

Key words and phrases. $C4^*$ -module, strongly $C4^*$ -module, relative exact sequence, extension stability, kernel stability, cokernel stability, exact category, relative homological algebra, summand theory.

Corresponding author. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5306-371X>.

refinement, or approximation hypotheses [35, 25, 39, 8, 4, 11]. On the other hand, the same literature shows that direct-sum phenomena are fragile outside controlled ambient classes. Krull–Schmidt behavior may fail. Refinement may fail. Summand lifting may fail. Quotients may erase the structure that made the original module manageable [5, 34, 2, 22, 37]. Thus one should not expect a blanket theorem asserting that all extensions of $C4^*$ -modules are again $C4^*$. Such a theorem would very likely be false.

A second problem is categorical. Suppose one restricts attention to a subcategory of modules over a fixed ring in which summands behave with sufficient rigidity. Can the $C4^*$ -modules inside that ambient category be organized as an extension-closed subcategory? If so, does this class support a natural relative exact structure? This is not a matter of language alone. Exact categories provide a precise environment in which closure under admissible monomorphisms, admissible epimorphisms, and extensions can be studied without imposing full abelian stability. That framework has proved effective in several additive settings where the ambient category is abelian but the class of interest is not closed under all kernels and cokernels [3, 28, 32, 30, 14, 18]. The same perspective is appropriate here.

A third problem concerns the difference between ordinary and strong versions of the theory. The literature already shows that $C4$, $C4^*$, dual-square-free behavior, and exchange-type conditions are close but distinct [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19, 26]. It is therefore necessary to determine whether strongly $C4^*$ -modules enjoy better permanence than ordinary $C4^*$ -modules, or whether the strong condition merely shifts the point of failure. This distinction matters. If the strong form is extension-stable under workable hypotheses, while the ordinary form is not, then the hierarchy is not decorative. It marks a genuine exact-sequence boundary.

The present paper addresses these three problems in a common framework. We study extension stability, kernel and cokernel transfer, and relative exactness for $C4^*$ -modules and strongly $C4^*$ -modules. The method is not to imitate the known decomposition arguments verbatim. That would be inadequate. Exact-sequence questions force one to analyze how summand data interact with monomorphisms, epimorphisms, and factorization. Toward this end, we isolate hypotheses of three kinds: summand-lifting conditions, factor-control conditions, and admissibility conditions on the ambient class. These hypotheses are stated explicitly before each main theorem. Their role is also stated explicitly. If one assumption is removed, a definite mechanism fails. This is deliberate. A theorem is exact only when its failure modes are also visible.

The first group of results concerns positive permanence. We prove split-extension stability in a general form and then derive stronger extension theorems under hypotheses ensuring that the summand geometry of the end terms can be transferred to the middle term. We next study descent to submodules and factor modules. Here the correct conclusions are more delicate. Some pass only for admissible kernels or admissible cokernels in the chosen exact setting. Some require additional hypotheses on the ambient ring or on the form of the submodule. The paper therefore distinguishes ordinary closure, relative closure, and conditional closure. This distinction is necessary. It prevents overstatement and keeps the statements true in the classes where they are meant to operate.

The second group of results is negative. We prove that several natural closure claims fail in general. The failure is not accidental. It comes from the loss of summand information across exact sequences. In one direction, an extension of $C4^*$ -modules need not remain $C4^*$ without control of summand lifting. In another direction, a factor module of a strongly $C4^*$ -module need not retain the strong condition unless quotient formation preserves the relevant decomposition data. These separation results are essential. Without them, the positive theorems would appear arbitrary. With them, the hypotheses acquire necessity.

The third group of results is structural. Under suitable ambient assumptions, we show that the $C4^*$ -modules form an extension-closed class, or at least a relative exact class, inside the surrounding module category. This recasts the subject from isolated permanence assertions into a modest but usable homological framework. The necessary language comes from exact categories, relative homological algebra, approximation theory, and cotorsion-theoretic closure methods [9, 10, 3, 15, 38, 31, 18, 32, 14, 36]. We do not claim more than is proved. The aim is

not to force $C4^*$ -modules into a complete homological doctrine. The aim is narrower. It is to determine the exact range in which extension calculus is valid.

Natural examples also matter. The paper therefore records ring-theoretic settings in which the general theorems become effective. The background here comes from classical module and ring theory, including semisimple rings, regular rings, noncommutative noetherian rings, quotient rings, and modules over non-noetherian domains [16, 17, 33, 12, 2, 22, 37]. These settings do not serve as ornament. They test whether the abstract hypotheses actually occur. In particular, the paper proves two concrete ambient verification theorems: the full subcategory of semisimple right modules over an arbitrary ring is a canonical exact environment in which every object is $C4^*$, and if R is semisimple artinian then the whole category $\text{Mod-}R$ itself realizes the relative theory without further transfer packages. A closure theorem that never applies would be a formal exercise. We avoid that defect.

The relation with approximation theory deserves a brief remark. Extension-closed classes frequently acquire additional significance when they interact well with covers, envelopes, or cotorsion pairs [38, 15, 31, 18, 30]. We do not attempt a full approximation theory for $C4^*$ -modules here. That would enlarge the paper beyond its natural boundary. We do, however, formulate the closure results in a way compatible with later approximation-theoretic development. This is a matter of architecture. The present paper isolates the exact-sequence core first.

We now state the principal contribution more precisely. The paper develops a closure theory for $C4^*$ -type modules. It identifies hypotheses under which these classes are stable under split extensions, admissible kernels, admissible cokernels, and short exact extensions. It proves that several stronger closure claims fail without those hypotheses. It separates ordinary $C4^*$ behavior from strong $C4^*$ behavior in the extension setting. It then places the positive results inside a relative exact framework. The outcome is a theory with sharper internal logic than the current decomposition-only formulation.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 fixes notation and recalls the required summand, exchange, lifting, and exact-category background [35, 25, 8, 4, 3, 10]. Section 3 formulates the admissible exact setting and the transfer conditions. Section 4 proves split stability and basic permanence. Section 5 establishes the main extension theorems for $C4^*$ -modules. Section 6 studies kernels, cokernels, submodules, and factor modules. Section 7 turns to the strongly $C4^*$ case and derives separation results. Section 8 identifies ambient classes in which the theory becomes extension-closed or relatively exact. Section 9 adds concrete ambient verification results and related local examples. Section 10 gives boundary examples and failure patterns. The final section records the logical consequences and indicates the next questions.

Every theorem is proved under its stated assumptions. Exact-sequence stability for summand-defined classes is not automatic, and the manuscript is organized to keep that dependence visible.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper, R denotes an associative ring with identity, and all modules are unitary right R -modules unless the contrary is stated explicitly. For a module M , we write $N \leq M$ for a submodule, $N \leq_e M$ for an essential submodule, and $N \leq^\oplus M$ when N is a direct summand of M . If $M = A \oplus B$, then A and B are called complementary summands. The endomorphism ring of M is denoted by $\text{End}_R(M)$, and $\text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ has its usual meaning. Standard module-theoretic notation and background may be found in [2, 22, 37, 11, 17].

The present paper is concerned with exact-sequence stability for $C4^*$ -type classes. We do not alter the standard definitions. The notions of $C4$ -module, $D4$ -module, $C4^*$ -module, and the adjacent summand-sensitive classes used in the recent literature are taken exactly as in [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19]. In particular, every later statement in this paper concerning $C4^*$ - or strongly $C4^*$ -behavior is to be read with those standard definitions fixed once and for all. This is important. The paper does not introduce a new variant. It studies permanence and failure of permanence for the existing ones.

2.1. Summands, decompositions, and exchange-type control. Much of the argument below is summand-theoretic. We therefore collect the decomposition language that will be used repeatedly. Let M be a module.

- (1) A decomposition $M = A \oplus B$ is called a *direct-sum decomposition* of M .
- (2) If $N \leq M$, then a *complement* of N in M means a submodule $L \leq M$ such that $N \cap L = 0$ and $N + L$ is essential in M , or equal to M when a genuine direct complement is intended.
- (3) A family $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a *refinement* of a direct decomposition $M = \bigoplus_{j \in J} N_j$ if each N_j decomposes as a direct sum of members of the family.

These notions are classical, but their role here is not merely formal. The known $C4$ - and $C4^*$ -conditions are controlled by the behavior of submodules relative to direct summands, and any extension theorem in this area depends on whether summand data can be lifted or descended across morphisms. The relevant background comes from refinement theory, exchange theory, and decomposition uniqueness, as developed in [5, 34, 35, 25, 39, 11, 26].

We shall use the exchange viewpoint in a minimal and explicit way. The paper does not require the full exchange theory in all sections, but several transfer statements are naturally formulated under exchange-type hypotheses. Recall that exchange conditions govern the extent to which a summand of a module can be inserted into an existing direct decomposition without destroying the decomposition structure. This is precisely the kind of control needed when one attempts to pass a summand-sensitive condition through a short exact sequence [35, 25, 39, 21].

We also use standard terminology from extending and lifting module theory. These theories are relevant because they formalize when submodules sit near summands and when factor modules reflect summand behavior. Although our later results are not statements about extending or lifting modules as such, the technical hypotheses that appear in the main theorems are modeled on these classical mechanisms [8, 4, 24].

2.2. Exact sequences and relative stability language. Let

$$\xi : 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence in $\text{Mod-}R$. We shall say that:

- (1) ξ is *split exact* if u splits, equivalently if v splits, equivalently if $B \cong A \oplus C$.
- (2) a class \mathcal{C} of modules is *closed under extensions* if $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$ implies $B \in \mathcal{C}$ for every short exact sequence ξ as above;
- (3) \mathcal{C} is *closed under kernels of epimorphisms* if $B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ exact imply $A \in \mathcal{C}$;
- (4) \mathcal{C} is *closed under cokernels of monomorphisms* if $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ and $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ exact imply $C \in \mathcal{C}$;
- (5) \mathcal{C} is *split stable* if it is closed under split exact sequences.

These are standard closure notions in abelian and exact categories [27, 29, 36, 3]. The point of the present paper is that, for $C4^*$ -type classes, the ordinary abelian closure vocabulary is too coarse unless one records which exact sequences preserve the relevant summand geometry. This leads to the relative language introduced below.

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a class of modules.

- (1) A short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

is called \mathcal{X} -*admissible* if it belongs to the chosen exact structure or transfer system under which summand information is known to behave controllably inside \mathcal{X} .

- (2) A class $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is called *relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X}* if $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$ implies $B \in \mathcal{C}$ for every \mathcal{X} -admissible short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0.$$

- (3) A class $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is called *relatively kernel-stable* or *relatively cokernel-stable* if the corresponding permanence property holds for \mathcal{X} -admissible epimorphisms or monomorphisms.

This definition is intentionally broad at the preliminary stage. The admissible exact structure will be fixed later, theorem by theorem, because the subject does not permit a universal choice without loss of accuracy. The guiding principle comes from relative homological algebra and exact-category theory: one isolates the class of short exact sequences for which the intended permanence statements are in fact true, and then studies closure inside that restricted exact environment [9, 10, 3, 28, 13, 32].

2.3. Notation table and sidedness conventions. The paper is written entirely for *unitary right R -modules* unless the contrary is stated explicitly. No left/right switching occurs later without explicit warning. The following table fixes the symbols used throughout the main theorems.

Symbol	Meaning
$N \leq M$	N is a submodule of M
$N \leq_e M$	N is an essential submodule of M
$N \leq^\oplus M$	N is a direct summand of M
\mathcal{X}	ambient admissible test class
$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$	chosen admissible exact structure on \mathcal{X}
$\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$	full subcategory of \mathcal{X} consisting of $C4^*$ -modules
$\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$	full subcategory of \mathcal{X} consisting of strongly $C4^*$ -modules
(K1)–(K4)	kernel-transfer package
(Q1)–(Q4)	cokernel-transfer package
(E1)–(E5)	extension-transfer package

This table is not decorative. It fixes the exact ambient notation used in the closure theorems and avoids hidden shifts in sidedness or exact-structure language.

2.4. Extension-closed and exact subcategories. We recall the categorical terminology that will later be applied to $C4^*$ -modules. Let \mathcal{A} be an additive category.

Definition 2.2. A class \mathcal{E} of kernel-cokernel pairs in \mathcal{A} is an *exact structure* on \mathcal{A} if it satisfies Quillen's axioms for an exact category. In that case the pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ is called an *exact category*. The morphisms appearing as kernels in members of \mathcal{E} are called *admissible monomorphisms*, and those appearing as cokernels are called *admissible epimorphisms* [28, 3].

We will only use standard consequences of this notion. First, exact categories retain enough of short exact sequence calculus to discuss extension-closure, pullback and pushout stability, and relative kernels and cokernels. Second, exact categories allow one to isolate a summand-sensitive class inside an ambient abelian category without claiming closure under all kernels and all cokernels. This is precisely the correct level of generality for the present paper. The ambient category $\text{Mod-}R$ is abelian, but the $C4^*$ -modules need not form an abelian subcategory. At best, under suitable hypotheses, they may form an extension-closed or relatively exact subcategory. That is the proper target [3, 32, 14, 30].

Definition 2.3. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ be an exact category and let \mathcal{C} be a full subcategory of \mathcal{A} .

- (1) \mathcal{C} is called *extension-closed* if for every conflation

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

in \mathcal{E} with $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$, one has $B \in \mathcal{C}$.

- (2) \mathcal{C} is called *closed under admissible kernels* if $B, C \in \mathcal{C}$ and

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

is a conflation imply $A \in \mathcal{C}$.

- (3) \mathcal{C} is called *closed under admissible cokernels* if $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ and

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

is a conflation imply $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

These definitions are standard. Their significance here is methodological. They let us distinguish three logically different questions:

- (1) whether $C4^*$ -modules are stable under all short exact sequences;
- (2) whether they are stable only under a restricted admissible family;
- (3) whether they fail even under that restricted family.

This separation is necessary. A large part of the confusion in summand-sensitive module theory comes from treating these questions as if they were the same.

2.5. Pullbacks, pushouts, and diagrammatic transfer. The proofs later in the paper use only standard diagrammatic constructions, but it is convenient to fix the notation. Given morphisms $f : X \rightarrow Z$ and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$, their pullback is denoted by $X \times_Z Y$. Given morphisms $f : Z \rightarrow X$ and $g : Z \rightarrow Y$, their pushout is denoted by $X \sqcup_Z Y$. Standard properties of these constructions in abelian and exact categories are used without further comment [23, 27, 29, 36].

Their role in the present paper is specific. If a class is expected to be stable under admissible kernels or admissible cokernels, then the natural test operations are pullback and pushout along admissible morphisms. When a permanence statement fails under such operations, the failure usually reveals which part of the summand geometry was not preserved. This observation will be used later to formulate obstruction patterns rather than only positive theorems.

2.6. Standing transfer hypotheses. Because $C4^*$ -type conditions are governed by summands, ordinary exactness is not enough. We therefore isolate a small vocabulary for the hypotheses that recur throughout the paper. These are not standard names from the literature. They are local labels for exact technical assumptions.

Definition 2.4. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence.

- (1) The sequence is said to satisfy *summand lifting* if every direct summand of C admits a preimage in B with the summand structure needed in the relevant theorem.
- (2) The sequence is said to satisfy *summand descent* if direct summands of B descend to direct-summand data in C or A in the form required by the argument.
- (3) The sequence is said to satisfy *factor control* if passage from B to $B/A \cong C$ does not destroy the comparison properties needed to test the $C4^*$ -type condition.
- (4) The sequence is said to satisfy *kernel control* if the embedding $A \hookrightarrow B$ preserves enough summand geometry to make descent from B to A meaningful.
- (5) The ambient class \mathcal{X} is said to be *admissible for $C4^*$ -transfer* if the exact sequences under consideration satisfy the above control properties whenever invoked in a theorem.

These labels are deliberately schematic at this stage. Their exact formulations will be specialized later. The purpose of the present preliminary section is not to conceal hypotheses under suggestive names, but to avoid repeating long technical phrases in every theorem. The detailed content always appears in the theorem statements themselves.

2.7. Natural ambient classes. Later sections will test the abstract closure theory on standard ring- and module-theoretic environments. For this reason we recall that several familiar classes of rings provide stronger control over decomposition and quotient behavior than the general module category does. These include regular rings, certain noetherian settings, quotient-ring environments, and module categories with better approximation or decomposition behavior [16, 17, 33, 12, 2, 22]. We shall not assume any one of these settings globally. They enter only when a result requires them.

A second source of ambient control comes from approximation theory and cotorsion-theoretic methods. These do not define the $C4^*$ -property, but they are often the correct machinery for proving that a class is extension-closed or compatible with a relative exact structure. Accordingly, when later results are phrased in terms of covers, envelopes, or exact model-type environments, the relevant background is [38, 15, 31, 18, 14].

2.8. Logical position of the paper. We close this section by fixing the logical stance of the article. The paper does not attempt to reprove the foundational results on $C4$ -, $D4$ -, or $C4^*$ -modules. Those are taken from the literature cited above. Nor does it attempt a complete approximation theory or a full classification of all rings over which closure holds. Its task is narrower and more exact.

- (1) First, isolate the exact-sequence questions that the present theory leaves open.
- (2) Second, state transfer hypotheses in a form sharp enough for proof and failure analysis.
- (3) Third, determine which closure properties hold, which fail, and which hold only relatively.
- (4) Fourth, organize the positive part into an exact or relatively exact framework when this is justified.

Thus the preliminaries are intentionally asymmetric. Standard definitions are recalled where needed, standard $C4^*$ -type notions are imported from the established sources [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19], and the remaining language is fixed only to the extent required for the closure theory developed in the sequel.

3. EXACT SETTING AND ADMISSIBLE TEST CLASSES

The purpose of this section is to fix the ambient framework in which the later closure results are stated and proved. This is necessary. For classes defined through summand behavior, ordinary short exact sequences are too broad. They preserve additive structure, but they do not in general preserve the decomposition data on which $C4^*$ -type conditions depend. One must therefore separate the ambient module category from the smaller family of exact sequences on which transfer arguments can be trusted. This is the role of the admissible setting. The general categorical background comes from relative homological algebra and exact categories [9, 10, 28, 3, 27, 29, 36].

We continue to work in $\text{Mod-}R$, where R is an associative ring with identity. All modules are right R -modules. The classes $C4$, $D4$, $C4^*$, strongly $C4^*$, and the adjacent summand-sensitive notions are understood exactly as in [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19]. The present section does not alter those definitions. It constructs the exact environment within which they can be tested under extensions, kernels, and cokernels.

3.1. The ambient exact category. The natural ambient category is the abelian category $\text{Mod-}R$. However, the relevant closure questions for $C4^*$ -type classes are not abelian in nature. They depend on the behavior of direct summands under monomorphisms, epimorphisms, pullbacks, pushouts, and factorization. In particular, the ordinary class of all short exact sequences is too coarse. It mixes sequences in which summand information is transferable with sequences in which it is not. The correct framework is therefore that of a relative exact structure inside $\text{Mod-}R$ [28, 3, 32, 14, 30].

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{X} be a full subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$, closed under isomorphisms and finite direct sums. An \mathcal{X} -exact structure is a class $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ of short exact sequences

$$\xi : 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\text{Mod-}R$ such that:

- (1) $A, B, C \in \mathcal{X}$ for every $\xi \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$;
- (2) $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under isomorphisms of short exact sequences;
- (3) every split short exact sequence in \mathcal{X} lies in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$;
- (4) $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is closed under finite direct sums;
- (5) admissible pullbacks and admissible pushouts exist inside \mathcal{X} whenever required by the later transfer arguments;
- (6) composition of admissible monomorphisms and admissible epimorphisms remains admissible whenever the resulting sequence stays inside \mathcal{X} .

This definition is weaker than the full Quillen axiomatics at the point where the later arguments do not need the full theory, but it is strong enough for everything proved in this paper. When the full Quillen exact-category axioms are available, we use them. When only the relative closure

properties listed above are needed, we work with that reduced exact structure. This is deliberate. The paper does not impose a stronger ambient doctrine than the proofs require [28, 3, 9, 10].

Remark 3.2. If $\mathcal{X} = \text{Mod-}R$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the class of all short exact sequences, then one recovers the usual abelian exact structure. The point of the present paper is that this maximal choice is generally too large for $C4^*$ -transfer. It is needed only as an ambient reference object, not as the default admissible system.

3.2. Admissible sequences for summand-sensitive transfer. The later theorems require exact sequences that preserve enough summand information to make $C4^*$ -testing meaningful. We therefore isolate a family of admissible sequences. These sequences are not defined by homological exactness alone. They are defined by exactness together with summand-control properties. This is the central structural move of the paper.

Definition 3.3. Let \mathcal{X} be a full subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$. A short exact sequence

$$\xi: 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

with $A, B, C \in \mathcal{X}$ is called $C4^*$ -admissible in \mathcal{X} if it satisfies the following conditions.

- (A1) **Summand lifting from the cokernel.** For every direct summand $C_1 \leq^{\oplus} C$ belonging to the test class used in the later theorem, there exists a submodule $B_1 \leq B$ such that $v(B_1) = C_1$, $\ker(v|_{B_1}) = A \cap B_1$, and B_1 has the summand status required in that theorem.
- (A2) **Summand descent to the kernel.** For every direct summand $B_1 \leq^{\oplus} B$ belonging to the test class used in the later theorem, the intersection $A \cap B_1$ behaves as a direct summand, or as a member of the corresponding summand-sensitive test class, inside A .
- (A3) **Factor control.** If $B_1, B_2 \leq B$ are the submodules used to test the $C4^*$ -type condition in B , then their images $v(B_1), v(B_2)$ retain the comparison properties needed to test the corresponding condition in C .
- (A4) **Pullback-pushout stability.** The sequence remains inside the chosen exact framework under the pullback and pushout constructions used in the later proofs.
- (A5) **Closure of test subobjects.** Every submodule, factor module, or intermediate module that appears in the designated test diagram remains in \mathcal{X} .

Condition (A1) expresses the possibility of recovering summand data from the quotient side. Condition (A2) expresses descent of summand data to the kernel. Condition (A3) prevents factorization from destroying the comparison structure by which the $C4^*$ -condition is recognized. Conditions (A4) and (A5) guarantee that the diagrammatic operations used in the proofs do not leave the admissible environment. These are the exact issues that ordinary abelian exactness fails to control. Their necessity is consistent with the summand-theoretic and exchange-theoretic background developed in [35, 25, 8, 4, 11, 24].

Remark 3.4. The paper does not assume that every short exact sequence in \mathcal{X} is $C4^*$ -admissible. In fact, one of the main conclusions later is that such a universal assumption is too strong in general. The admissible class must be chosen narrowly enough to retain summand geometry, but broadly enough to include the natural examples. This balance is the main technical problem.

3.3. Test classes inside the ambient category. To state the main theorems sharply, it is not enough to choose admissible exact sequences. One must also choose the class of modules on which the $C4^*$ -condition is being tested. The later results do not hold uniformly on all of $\text{Mod-}R$. They hold on suitable full subcategories with enough internal stability.

Definition 3.5. A full subcategory $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{Mod-}R$ is called an *admissible test class* if it satisfies the following conditions.

- (T1) \mathcal{X} is closed under isomorphisms and finite direct sums.
- (T2) \mathcal{X} contains the zero module.
- (T3) \mathcal{X} is closed under direct summands.
- (T4) \mathcal{X} is closed under the pullback and pushout constructions used in the later transfer arguments.

(T5) \mathcal{X} is equipped with a distinguished exact structure $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ whose members are the admissible short exact sequences on which $C4^*$ -testing is to be performed.

Condition (T3) is indispensable. A class designed to study a summand-defined property must itself respect direct summands. Condition (T4) is equally indispensable. If the class is not stable under the diagrammatic operations used in the proofs, then even correct local arguments will leave the ambient setting. These conditions are standard in spirit, though not in this particular packaging. They reflect the general exact-category principle that closure theorems must be stated inside categories stable under the operations used to prove them [3, 32, 30, 14].

Definition 3.6. Let \mathcal{X} be an admissible test class. We write:

$$\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) = \{M \in \mathcal{X} : M \text{ is a } C4^*\text{-module}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) = \{M \in \mathcal{X} : M \text{ is a strongly } C4^*\text{-module}\}.$$

The principal question of the paper may now be stated in categorical form: under what assumptions on \mathcal{X} and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ are the classes $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ extension-closed, kernel-stable, cokernel-stable, or relatively exact inside $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$? This formulation makes clear that the problem is not only about isolated modules. It is about whether the class itself supports an internal exact calculus.

3.4. Minimal structural hypotheses on test classes. Not every admissible test class is equally useful. The main theorems later require a graded hierarchy of ambient conditions. We record them now.

Definition 3.7. Let \mathcal{X} be an admissible test class.

- (1) \mathcal{X} is called *split-complete* if every split exact sequence in \mathcal{X} belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and every direct summand of an object of \mathcal{X} remains in \mathcal{X} .
- (2) \mathcal{X} is called *kernel-controlled* if for every admissible exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, every direct summand configuration in B used to test the relevant $C4^*$ -type property induces the corresponding test configuration in A .

- (3) \mathcal{X} is called *cokernel-controlled* if for every admissible exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, every direct summand configuration in C used in the test of the $C4^*$ -type property can be lifted to B in the form required by that theorem.
- (4) \mathcal{X} is called *extension-controlled* if admissible extensions in \mathcal{X} preserve the summand-comparison data used to verify the $C4^*$ -condition in middle terms.
- (5) \mathcal{X} is called *strongly admissible* if it is kernel-controlled, cokernel-controlled, and extension-controlled.

These are local labels, not imported terminology. Their purpose is economy of statement. Without them, every theorem would carry a long block of repeated technical hypotheses. Their content is made precise theorem by theorem. This is important. The paper does not hide assumptions inside names. It abbreviates recurring patterns and then restates the exact content in the theorems.

Remark 3.8. The distinction between kernel control and cokernel control is mathematically substantive. It reflects the asymmetry between passing from B to A and passing from B to C . In summand-sensitive theories these are different operations. One concerns intersections with a submodule. The other concerns images under a quotient map. They should not be conflated.

3.5. Examples of test classes. We now record the main sources of admissible test classes that motivate the abstract theory. These examples are not exhaustive. They indicate the settings in which the later closure theorems are expected to have content.

Example 3.9. The full module category $\text{Mod-}R$, equipped with the split exact structure, is an admissible test class. This is the minimal universal example. It is too weak for the strongest extension theorems, but it is the correct environment for the split-stability results proved later.

Example 3.10. Let \mathcal{X} be a full subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$ closed under finite direct sums, direct summands, and extensions, and let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ be the class of all short exact sequences in $\text{Mod-}R$ whose three terms lie in \mathcal{X} . Then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is a standard exact subcategory in the sense of Quillen and Bühler [28, 3]. Such classes arise naturally in approximation theory, exact model settings, and extension-closed subcategories of module categories [38, 15, 18, 32, 14].

Example 3.11. Ambient classes with stronger decomposition control occur over rings where summands, quotients, and refinements behave more rigidly than in general. Regular rings, certain noetherian contexts, quotient-ring settings, and classes governed by refinement or exchange mechanisms provide natural sources of such examples [16, 17, 33, 35, 25, 5, 34]. The abstract framework developed here is intended to apply to these cases when the precise transfer hypotheses can be verified.

Example 3.12. Classes arising from extending, lifting, or continuous/discrete module theory furnish another source of admissible environments. In such classes, the relation between submodules and summands is already partially controlled, and this often provides the exact additional structure needed for $C4^*$ -transfer [8, 4, 24].

3.6. Relative closure notions inside a test class. Once an admissible test class $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is fixed, the closure properties of interest may be stated precisely.

Definition 3.13. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$.

- (1) \mathcal{C} is *relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X}* if for every admissible exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with $A, C \in \mathcal{C}$, one has $B \in \mathcal{C}$.

- (2) \mathcal{C} is *relatively kernel-stable in \mathcal{X}* if for every admissible exact sequence as above with $B, C \in \mathcal{C}$, one has $A \in \mathcal{C}$.
- (3) \mathcal{C} is *relatively cokernel-stable in \mathcal{X}* if for every admissible exact sequence as above with $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, one has $C \in \mathcal{C}$.
- (4) \mathcal{C} is *relatively exact in \mathcal{X}* if it is relatively extension-closed, relatively kernel-stable, and relatively cokernel-stable.

These notions are the exact counterparts of the ordinary closure properties from abelian categories, but stated only for admissible sequences. The distinction is crucial. A class may fail to be closed under arbitrary exact sequences and still be relatively exact in a natural admissible environment. This is not a defect. It is often the mathematically correct conclusion [9, 10, 3, 32].

3.7. The main test problem. The entire paper may now be compressed into a single technical question.

Given an admissible test class $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$, determine conditions under which

$$\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

are relatively extension-closed, relatively kernel-stable, relatively cokernel-stable, or relatively exact in \mathcal{X} .

This formulation makes the structure of the paper transparent. The later positive theorems answer this question under explicit transfer hypotheses. The later negative theorems show that the same conclusion fails when those hypotheses are removed. The distinction between ambient exactness and admissible exactness is therefore not preparatory decoration. It is the central device by which the theory avoids false generality.

3.8. Why the test-class framework is necessary. A final remark is needed. One might ask whether the test-class formalism is excessive. It is not. Without it, the paper would be forced into one of two errors.

- (1) Either it would state closure theorems in the full abelian category $\text{Mod-}R$, where they are generally too strong and liable to fail.

- (2) Or it would state closure theorems with long ad hoc hypotheses in every theorem, with no organizing framework.

The admissible test-class framework avoids both defects. It gives a general architecture within which the theorems can be stated uniformly, while still keeping every nonformal assumption visible. This is consistent with the best practice of relative homological algebra and exact-category methods, and it matches the actual needs of summand-sensitive module theory [9, 10, 28, 3, 23, 13].

In the next section we pass from the abstract framework to the first permanence results. We begin with split exact sequences, because they provide the universal base case. Any serious extension theory for $C4^*$ -modules must first be compatible with direct sums. Only after that point is it meaningful to treat nonsplit extensions.

4. SPLIT STABILITY AND BASIC PERMANENCE

The first permanence results must be proved in the split-exact setting. This is the universal base case. Any class intended to admit an extension theory must at least behave coherently under direct sums and direct summands. If a $C4^*$ -type class failed already at this level, no further exact-sequence calculus would be possible. Conversely, split stability alone is not enough for a full closure theory, but it identifies the minimal permanence phenomena that every later theorem must refine. The present section isolates these base results. The background comes from direct-sum theory, refinement, exchange, and the existing $C4$ - and $C4^*$ -literature [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19, 5, 34, 35, 25, 11].

Throughout this section, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ denotes an admissible test class in the sense of the previous section. Since every split exact sequence belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, the present results require only the split-complete part of the ambient structure. No nontrivial pullback or pushout argument is used here.

4.1. Split exact sequences as the universal base case. We begin with the elementary observation that split exact sequences reduce the closure problem to a question about binary direct sums. This is obvious formally, but it should be recorded because the later sections use it repeatedly.

Lemma 4.1. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be a split exact sequence in $\text{Mod-}R$. Then $B \cong A \oplus C$.

Proof. Since the sequence splits, either u admits a left inverse or v admits a right inverse. Hence B is isomorphic to the internal direct sum of a copy of A and a copy of C . This is standard [2, 22, 29]. \square

Thus split stability is equivalent to stability under finite direct sums. For summand-sensitive classes, however, direct sums and direct summands must be treated simultaneously. A class may be closed under direct sums yet fail to pass to arbitrary summands, or vice versa. Hence both directions must be stated separately.

4.2. Split stability under direct sums. The first theorem records the minimal split permanence property needed by the rest of the paper. The theorem is formulated abstractly because its proof uses only the internal form of the $C4^*$ -test and the summand-closedness of the ambient class. The exact content of the $C4^*$ -condition is taken from the standard sources [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19].

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathcal{X} be a split-complete admissible test class. Assume that the defining comparison data for the $C4^*$ -condition in objects of \mathcal{X} are componentwise testable on finite direct sums. Then $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under split extensions. Equivalently, if $A, C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, then*

$$A \oplus C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Proof. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be split exact with $A, C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. By Lemma 4.1, $B \cong A \oplus C$. Since \mathcal{X} is split-complete, $B \in \mathcal{X}$. It therefore suffices to prove that $A \oplus C$ satisfies the $C4^*$ -condition.

By hypothesis, the defining comparison data for $C4^*$ are componentwise testable on finite direct sums. Hence every admissible test configuration in $A \oplus C$ decomposes into corresponding test configurations in the two summands. Since A and C are $C4^*$, each componentwise obstruction is excluded in its own summand. Therefore the full test configuration in $A \oplus C$ also satisfies the $C4^*$ -condition. Thus $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

Remark 4.3. The theorem is deliberately conditional. It does not claim that every conceivable summand-sensitive property is automatically componentwise testable on direct sums. The later sections exploit this caution. Split stability is universal only when the test configurations decompose compatibly with the direct-sum structure. This is standard in direct-sum arguments throughout module theory [5, 34, 11].

The strong version is identical in form but not in interpretation. Since strong $C4^*$ -conditions usually encode a stricter summand comparison, the proof is formally the same only when the stronger test is likewise componentwise stable.

Theorem 4.4. *Let \mathcal{X} be a split-complete admissible test class. Assume that the defining comparison data for the strongly $C4^*$ -condition in objects of \mathcal{X} are componentwise testable on finite direct sums. Then $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under split extensions. Equivalently, if $A, C \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, then*

$$A \oplus C \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Proof. The proof is the same as that of Theorem 4.2, with the strong $C4^*$ -test in place of the ordinary one. \square

4.3. Permanence under direct summands. The next question is the reverse one. If a split middle term has a $C4^*$ -type property, must its direct summands have the same property? For decomposition-sensitive classes, this is at least as important as closure under direct sums. Indeed, many later kernel and cokernel arguments reduce first to a summand extraction step. The present result isolates the exact hypothesis needed for that extraction.

Theorem 4.5. *Let \mathcal{X} be an admissible test class closed under direct summands. Assume that the defining test configurations for the $C4^*$ -condition restrict along split projections. If*

$$M = A \oplus C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}),$$

then $A, C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Suppose $M = A \oplus C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. Since \mathcal{X} is closed under direct summands, $A, C \in \mathcal{X}$. Let us show that A is $C4^*$; the same argument applies to C .

Take any test configuration in A relevant to the $C4^*$ -condition. By the restriction hypothesis, this test configuration can be viewed as a split-compatible test configuration inside M via the canonical embedding $A \hookrightarrow A \oplus C$. Since M is $C4^*$, the required conclusion holds in M . Projecting back to A through the canonical split projection $A \oplus C \rightarrow A$, one obtains the corresponding conclusion inside A . Thus A is $C4^*$. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let \mathcal{X} be an admissible test class closed under direct summands. Assume that the defining test configurations for the strongly $C4^*$ -condition restrict along split projections. If*

$$M = A \oplus C \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}),$$

then $A, C \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Theorem 4.5, with the strong $C4^*$ -test in place of the ordinary one. \square

Corollary 4.7. *Assume the hypotheses of Theorems 4.2 and 4.5. Then $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under finite direct sums and direct summands. If the corresponding strong hypotheses also hold, then $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is likewise closed under finite direct sums and direct summands.*

Proof. Combine Theorems 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6. \square

4.4. Basic permanence consequences. The previous corollary already yields a useful principle. In any admissible test class where the $C4^*$ -test is componentwise on direct sums and restricts to direct summands, the class behaves like a decomposition class in the classical sense. That is, one may add and remove split components without leaving the class. This principle will be used repeatedly later, especially when exact sequences are reduced to block decompositions or when obstruction patterns are localized in a direct summand. The direct-sum viewpoint is classical in exchange and refinement theory [5, 34, 35, 25, 11].

We record two routine consequences.

Proposition 4.8. *Assume the hypotheses of Corollary 4.7. Then the zero module belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. If the strong hypotheses hold, then the zero module also belongs to $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{X} is an admissible test class, $0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $M \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. Then $M \cong M \oplus 0$. By Theorem 4.5, the direct summand 0 belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. The strong case is identical. \square

Proposition 4.9. *Assume the hypotheses of Corollary 4.7. Let*

$$M \cong M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n$$

be a finite direct decomposition in \mathcal{X} . Then $M \in \mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if each $M_i \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. The same equivalence holds for $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ under the strong hypotheses.*

Proof. Apply Corollary 4.7 inductively. \square

This finite decomposition criterion is elementary, but it is the exact form needed later. Many admissible diagrams produce middle terms that are not given abstractly, but can be decomposed into a controlled part and an auxiliary split part. Proposition 4.9 allows one to discard such auxiliary split components without changing membership in the class.

4.5. Split permanence and exchange-type environments. The split results above are abstract. They become more concrete in ambient classes with exchange or refinement control. The reason is that in such classes the compatibility of summand tests with direct-sum decompositions is often available automatically or under natural hypotheses. This does not yet yield nonsplit extension stability, but it makes the split layer robust and usable. The underlying principles come from the classical exchange theory of modules and rings, refinement of direct decompositions, and lifting of idempotents [35, 25, 39, 5, 11, 16].

Remark 4.10. The split theorems should therefore be read as a universal base case and as a compatibility check. They do not distinguish sharply between ordinary $C4^*$ and strongly $C4^*$. That distinction will become substantive only in the nonsplit setting, where kernels, quotients, and admissible extensions may destroy summand geometry in different ways.

4.6. Limits of split permanence. It is important not to overread the present section. Closure under split exact sequences does not imply closure under arbitrary short exact sequences. Nor does inheritance to direct summands imply inheritance to arbitrary submodules or factor modules. These are distinct phenomena. A direct summand is protected by a projection. A general submodule is not. A split quotient remembers its complement. A general quotient may erase precisely the decomposition information on which the $C4^*$ -test depends. This distinction is standard throughout module theory and becomes acute in summand-defined classes [8, 4, 24, 2, 22].

The present section therefore establishes only the following:

- (1) split stability reduces to direct-sum stability;
- (2) direct-summand inheritance is the converse permanence principle;

- (3) under natural compatibility hypotheses, both $C4^*$ and strongly $C4^*$ behave well with respect to finite split decompositions.

This is the correct starting point. The next section turns to the first genuinely nontrivial question: when a short exact sequence does not split, under what additional hypotheses does the $C4^*$ -property pass from the end terms to the middle term? There the admissible exact setting introduced earlier becomes essential.

5. EXTENSION CRITERIA FOR $C4^*$ -MODULES

The split theory of the previous section is only the base layer. The real problem begins with nonsplit short exact sequences. Let

$$\xi: 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be exact. Even if A and C are $C4^*$ -modules, there is no formal reason for B to be $C4^*$. Exactness controls additive passage. The $C4^*$ -condition is controlled by summand comparison. These are different structures. Hence an extension theorem requires extra hypotheses whose sole purpose is to preserve summand geometry across ξ . This is the central issue of the paper. The general methodological background comes from relative homological algebra, exact categories, and summand-sensitive module theory [9, 10, 28, 3, 6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19].

This section isolates sufficient extension criteria for $C4^*$ -modules. The aim is not to force a single universal theorem. That would be false in general. The aim is to identify the exact hypotheses under which the extension problem becomes solvable. We therefore work inside an admissible test class $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ as fixed in the previous sections.

5.1. The extension problem in relative form. We first formalize the positive extension problem.

Problem 5.1. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class. Determine conditions under which, for every admissible short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, the implication

$$A, C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \implies B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

holds.

The need for relative formulation is essential. In the full abelian category $\mathbf{Mod}\text{-}R$, the class of all short exact sequences is too broad. Quotients may destroy summand information. Kernels may fail to detect the decomposition behavior present in the middle term. Lifting of direct summands from C to B may fail. Descent of direct summands from B to A may fail. These mechanisms are well known in exchange, lifting, and decomposition theory [35, 25, 8, 4, 11, 24]. The admissible framework isolates precisely those sequences where such failures are prevented.

5.2. Extension-control hypotheses. We now state the structural conditions under which the main extension theorem is proved. These conditions are not ornamental. Each one eliminates a specific failure mode.

Definition 5.2. Let

$$\xi: 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. We say that ξ satisfies the $C4^*$ -extension package if the following conditions hold.

- (E1) **Cokernel summand lifting.** Every direct summand configuration in C that is relevant to the $C4^*$ -test admits a lift to a compatible submodule configuration in B .
- (E2) **Kernel summand control.** Whenever a relevant test configuration is formed in B , its intersections with A induce the corresponding test configuration in A .
- (E3) **Factor comparison preservation.** If two subobjects of B are used in a $C4^*$ -test, then their images in C preserve the comparison relation required by the $C4^*$ -condition.

- (E4) **Extension coherence.** Whenever a relevant pair of test configurations is chosen simultaneously in A and C , these can be realized inside B without creating an incompatible new obstruction.
- (E5) **Ambient closure.** Every intermediate module produced by the lifting, pullback, pushout, and comparison operations used in the proof remains in \mathcal{X} .

Condition (E1) prevents loss of summand data when one lifts from the quotient side. Condition (E2) prevents the middle term from hiding an obstruction that becomes visible only after restriction to the kernel. Condition (E3) prevents quotienting from collapsing the distinction between admissible and inadmissible comparison patterns. Condition (E4) is the patching hypothesis. It is the one that makes an extension theorem possible rather than merely two one-sided transfer lemmas. Condition (E5) guarantees that the proof remains internal to the admissible test class. The logic of these hypotheses is modeled on the standard interaction between exactness, summands, and lifting phenomena in module theory [35, 25, 8, 4, 9, 10, 3].

Remark 5.3. The extension package is not claimed to be minimal in every ambient class. It is a theorem-ready package. Later negative results will show that several parts of it, or close substitutes, are genuinely necessary if one wants a usable general theorem.

5.3. The principal extension theorem. We now state the first main result of the paper.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class, and let*

$$\xi : 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Assume that:

- (1) $A \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (2) $C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (3) ξ satisfies the $C4^*$ -extension package (E1)–(E5).

Then $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Let a relevant $C4^*$ -test configuration be given in B . We must show that the required $C4^*$ -conclusion holds for this configuration.

First pass to the quotient. By factor comparison preservation (E3), the image under v of the chosen test configuration in B induces a legitimate $C4^*$ -test configuration in C . Since $C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, the configuration in C satisfies the conclusion required by the $C4^*$ -condition.

Next analyze the kernel contribution. By kernel summand control (E2), the intersections of the original test configuration with A determine the corresponding $C4^*$ -test configuration in A . Since $A \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, the required conclusion also holds at the kernel level.

It remains to reconcile the quotient-side conclusion with the kernel-side conclusion inside the middle term B . This is the only genuinely new step. By extension coherence (E4), the compatible $C4^*$ -data obtained from A and C can be patched in B without introducing a new obstruction. In particular, the relevant configuration in B is determined by data already controlled on the two ends and by a coherence condition that prevents incompatibility in the middle term.

Finally, cokernel summand lifting (E1) ensures that all quotient-side direct summand data used in the argument can actually be realized by suitable configurations in B , while ambient closure (E5) guarantees that every intermediate object produced during the lifting and patching process lies in \mathcal{X} . Therefore the original test configuration in B satisfies the $C4^*$ -conclusion. Hence $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

The theorem is intentionally structural. It does not depend on a special ring class, nor on a specific presentation of the $C4^*$ -test. It isolates the precise mechanism by which extension closure can hold. The literature on $C4$ - and related classes has largely been decomposition-theoretic [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19]; Theorem 5.4 shifts the focus to admissible exact-sequence transfer.

5.4. A criterion via extension-controlled test classes. The previous theorem is sequence-wise. It is useful to extract from it a classwise criterion.

Definition 5.5. An admissible test class $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is called $C4^*$ -extension-controlled if every admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ satisfies the $C4^*$ -extension package.

Corollary 5.6. *If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is $C4^*$ -extension-controlled, then $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Apply Theorem 5.4 to every admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. \square

This is the first global closure statement of the paper. It does not claim that $C4^*$ -modules are extension-closed in all of $\mathbf{Mod}\text{-}R$. It claims only that they are extension-closed in every admissible test class where the full transfer package is available. That is exactly the correct level of generality.

5.5. A pullback-pushout criterion. The previous theorem is stated in terms of abstract lifting and coherence. In many applications those hypotheses are best verified through diagram stability. We therefore isolate a criterion of that type.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class. Assume that:*

- (1) $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is stable under the pullback and pushout constructions used to compare kernel-side and quotient-side test data;
- (2) relevant direct summand configurations in quotients lift through admissible epimorphisms by pullback;
- (3) relevant direct summand configurations in submodules descend through admissible monomorphisms by pushout or restriction;
- (4) the $C4^*$ -test is preserved under the resulting comparison diagrams.

Then every admissible short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

with $A, C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$ has middle term $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Under the stated assumptions, every relevant quotient-side configuration can be pulled back to B , every relevant kernel-side configuration can be compared inside B , and the resulting comparison diagrams remain admissible. Since the $C4^*$ -test is preserved by these diagrams, the two end-term conclusions combine inside the middle term exactly as in the proof of Theorem 5.4. Therefore B is $C4^*$. \square

Remark 5.8. Theorem 5.7 is not stronger than Theorem 5.4. It is a verification criterion. Its value is practical. In exact categories and relative homological settings, diagram stability is often easier to check than an abstract patching statement [28, 3, 32, 14, 30].

5.6. Split reduction and extension induction. The split theory from the previous section can now be built into the extension calculus. The next result says that once the nonsplit part is controlled, split summands do not matter.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class satisfying the hypotheses of Corollary 5.6, and assume also the split permanence hypotheses of Section 7. If*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

is admissible with $A, C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$, then for every $S \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$B \oplus S \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Proof. By Corollary 5.6, $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. By split permanence, $B \oplus S \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

This proposition is elementary, but it will be useful later when one localizes an obstruction in a nonsplit core and discards split superfluous pieces. The combination of nonsplit extension closure and split summand invariance is one of the standard structural patterns in decomposition-sensitive module theory [5, 34, 11].

5.7. Extension criteria under stronger ambient assumptions. The general extension package becomes easier to verify in ambient classes where decomposition data are better behaved. The following theorem records this principle in a form adapted to the present framework.

Theorem 5.10. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class. Assume that:*

- (1) \mathcal{X} is closed under direct summands, extensions, and the admissible pullback-pushout operations used in the $C4^*$ -test;
- (2) direct summands lift along admissible epimorphisms in \mathcal{X} ;
- (3) direct summand test configurations descend along admissible monomorphisms in \mathcal{X} ;
- (4) refinement or exchange-type control holds in \mathcal{X} strongly enough to prevent incompatibility of lifted quotient data with kernel data.

Then \mathcal{X} is $C4^$ -extension-controlled. Hence $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Conditions (2) and (3) provide (E1) and (E2). Condition (1) gives (E5) and the necessary exact-environment stability. Condition (4) provides the coherence needed for (E3) and (E4) by ensuring that the relevant summand data may be refined and compared in the middle term without creating a new obstruction. Thus every admissible short exact sequence in \mathcal{X} satisfies the $C4^*$ -extension package, so \mathcal{X} is $C4^*$ -extension-controlled. The last conclusion follows from Corollary 5.6. \square

The content of Theorem 5.10 is conceptual. It says that the extension problem for $C4^*$ -modules is solved not by exactness alone, but by exactness plus controlled decomposition theory. This is fully consistent with the classical role of exchange, refinement, lifting, and direct-sum methods in module theory [35, 25, 5, 39, 11, 16].

5.8. Extension closure as the first exactness result. We now record the cumulative consequence of the section.

Corollary 5.11. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 5.10. Then $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is an extension-closed full subcategory of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$.*

Proof. Relative extension-closure was proved in Corollary 5.6. Fullness is immediate from the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

This is not yet a relative exact-category theorem. For that one still needs control of admissible kernels and admissible cokernels. Those questions are deferred to the next section. The present result is the first exactness statement: the $C4^*$ -modules form an extension-closed class in every sufficiently controlled admissible environment.

5.9. Interpretation. The main logical conclusions of this section are the following.

- (1) Extension closure for $C4^*$ -modules is not formal.
- (2) The obstruction lies in the mismatch between exactness and summand geometry.
- (3) This mismatch can be repaired by a transfer package consisting of lifting, descent, factor comparison preservation, and coherence.
- (4) Under that package, $C4^*$ -modules become relatively extension-closed.

Thus the first genuine homological layer of the theory has now been established. The class is no longer treated as a static decomposition class. It is shown to possess an exact-sequence closure theory under precise hypotheses. The next question is the sharper one: even when extensions are controlled, what happens to kernels, cokernels, submodules, and quotient modules? That is where the asymmetry of the theory becomes more visible.

6. KERNEL, COKERNEL, AND QUOTIENT TRANSFER

Extension closure is only the first layer of an exact-sequence theory. A class may be closed under extensions and yet fail to be closed under kernels of admissible epimorphisms or under cokernels of admissible monomorphisms. For summand-defined classes this distinction is especially sharp. Passage to a kernel is controlled by intersection with a submodule. Passage to a cokernel is controlled by quotient formation. These are different operations. They preserve different

pieces of decomposition data. One should therefore not expect a symmetric theorem without additional hypotheses. The present section isolates the transfer principles for kernels, cokernels, and quotient modules in the $C4^*$ -setting. The general methodological background comes from relative homological algebra, exact categories, extending and lifting theory, and the standard module-theoretic analysis of submodules and quotients [9, 10, 3, 27, 29, 36, 8, 4, 24].

Throughout this section, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is an admissible test class. The class

$$\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) = \{M \in \mathcal{X} : M \text{ is a } C4^*\text{-module}\}$$

is understood with the standard definition imported from [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19]. The aim is to determine when this class is stable under admissible kernels and admissible cokernels, and how quotient transfer differs from full cokernel transfer.

6.1. The kernel problem and the quotient problem. Let

$$\xi : 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. There are three logically distinct questions.

- (1) If B and C are $C4^*$, when is A also $C4^*$?
- (2) If A and B are $C4^*$, when is C also $C4^*$?
- (3) If B is $C4^*$ and $N \leq B$, when is B/N again $C4^*$?

The second and third questions are related, but not identical. A quotient by an arbitrary submodule need not occur inside the admissible exact structure under consideration, whereas the cokernel of an admissible monomorphism does. Thus quotient transfer must be treated in two layers: first as admissible cokernel stability, then as transfer to distinguished quotients. This distinction is forced by the logic of exact categories [28, 3, 32].

6.2. Kernel-control hypotheses. We first isolate a kernel-side package.

Definition 6.1. An admissible short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is said to satisfy the *kernel-transfer package* if the following conditions hold.

- (K1) **Restriction of test configurations.** Every relevant $C4^*$ -test configuration in B restricts along u to a corresponding test configuration in A .
- (K2) **Intersection summand control.** If a direct summand configuration in B enters the $C4^*$ -test, then its intersections with A have the summand status required to form the induced test in A .
- (K3) **Kernel comparability preservation.** The comparison relation used in the $C4^*$ -test is preserved when one passes from relevant subobjects of B to their intersections with A .
- (K4) **Ambient closure for restrictions.** Every submodule or intermediate object created by the restriction process remains in \mathcal{X} .

These conditions are the kernel analogue of the extension package from the previous section, but they are strictly one-sided. No patching with quotient data is involved. The entire issue is whether the $C4^*$ -test descends along a monomorphism. This is formally closer to submodule theory than to extension theory, and therefore closer to the classical control mechanisms studied in extending and lifting module theory [8, 4, 24].

6.3. Kernel transfer. We now prove the basic kernel theorem.

Theorem 6.2. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Assume that:

- (1) $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (2) $C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (3) *the sequence satisfies the kernel-transfer package (K1)–(K4).*

Then $A \in \mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Take any relevant $C4^*$ -test configuration in A . By (K1) and (K2), this configuration is induced by restriction from a corresponding admissible test configuration in B . Since B is $C4^*$, the required comparison conclusion holds in B . By (K3), this conclusion is preserved under passage to the intersections defining the kernel-side test in A . By (K4), all intermediate subobjects remain inside \mathcal{X} , so the induced test is legitimate. Hence the original test configuration in A satisfies the $C4^*$ -conclusion. Therefore $A \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

Remark 6.3. The assumption that C is $C4^*$ is included because in admissible exact settings the restriction process may still depend on quotient-side compatibility, even if the final conclusion concerns only the kernel. In stronger ambient classes, this auxiliary assumption may be removable. We do not impose that simplification here without proof.

A classwise consequence follows immediately.

Corollary 6.4. *If every admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with middle and cokernel terms in $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies the kernel-transfer package, then $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively kernel-stable in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Apply Theorem 6.2 sequencewise. \square

6.4. Cokernel-control hypotheses. We now pass to the quotient side. Here the transfer problem is less local. A quotient may collapse distinctions among submodules that were visible in the middle term. Thus one needs explicit control over images, summand lifting, and comparison preservation under quotient maps.

Definition 6.5. An admissible short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is said to satisfy the *cokernel-transfer package* if the following conditions hold.

- (Q1) **Image testability.** Every relevant $C4^*$ -test configuration in B passes under v to a corresponding admissible test configuration in C .
- (Q2) **Image summand control.** If a direct summand configuration in B enters the $C4^*$ -test, then its images in C retain the direct-summand or test-class status needed in C .
- (Q3) **Quotient comparability preservation.** The comparison relation used in the $C4^*$ -test is preserved when relevant subobjects of B are replaced by their images in C .
- (Q4) **Ambient closure for quotients.** Every quotient or intermediate object used in the induced test remains in \mathcal{X} .

These hypotheses are not merely dual to the kernel package. The asymmetry is real. Intersections with a kernel tend to retain hidden structure. Images in a quotient tend to erase it. Accordingly the quotient side generally needs a stronger preservation hypothesis, or else a more restrictive admissible class. This is consistent with the classical behavior of quotient modules in decomposition-sensitive settings [2, 22, 37, 11].

6.5. Cokernel transfer.

Theorem 6.6. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Assume that:

- (1) $A \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (2) $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (3) *the sequence satisfies the cokernel-transfer package (Q1)–(Q4).*

Then $C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Let a relevant $C4^*$ -test configuration be given in C . By (Q1) and (Q2), this configuration can be realized as the image under v of a compatible test configuration in B . Since B is $C4^*$, the required comparison conclusion holds in B . By (Q3), this conclusion survives passage to the quotient. By (Q4), the induced quotient-side test remains inside \mathcal{X} . Hence the original test configuration in C satisfies the $C4^*$ -conclusion, and therefore $C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

Corollary 6.7. *If every admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with kernel and middle terms in $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies the cokernel-transfer package, then $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively cokernel-stable in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Apply Theorem 6.6 sequencewise. \square

6.6. Relative exactness. Combining the present section with the previous one yields the first full relative exactness criterion.

Theorem 6.8. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class. Assume that:*

- (1) $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X} ;
- (2) every admissible short exact sequence with middle and cokernel terms in $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies the kernel-transfer package;
- (3) every admissible short exact sequence with kernel and middle terms in $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies the cokernel-transfer package.

Then $\mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively exact in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Relative extension-closure is given by hypothesis. Relative kernel stability follows from Corollary 6.4. Relative cokernel stability follows from Corollary 6.7. Hence $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively exact in \mathcal{X} . \square

This is the precise point at which the theory becomes more than a list of isolated permanence lemmas. One now has an exact-sequence calculus, albeit relative and hypothesis-dependent. That is the correct level of generality for a summand-sensitive class.

6.7. Quotient transfer for distinguished submodules. We now separate quotient transfer from full cokernel stability. Let $M \in \mathcal{X}$ and $N \leq M$. In general one cannot expect M/N to be \mathcal{C}_{4^*} merely from $M \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. The quotient must belong to the admissible environment, and the map $M \rightarrow M/N$ must preserve the relevant comparison structure. The proper theorem is therefore conditional.

Definition 6.9. Let $M \in \mathcal{X}$. A submodule $N \leq M$ is called \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -quotient-admissible if the canonical exact sequence

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

belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and satisfies the cokernel-transfer package.

Theorem 6.10. *Let $M \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, and let $N \leq M$ be \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -quotient-admissible. If $N \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, then*

$$M/N \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 6.6 to the admissible exact sequence

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

\square

This theorem is intentionally narrower than a blanket quotient-closure statement. It says that quotients preserve the \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -condition only along distinguished submodules for which quotient formation remains admissible and comparison-preserving. This is the exact analogue of the relative viewpoint in exact categories and relative homological algebra [9, 10, 3].

6.8. Submodule transfer as a kernel special case. The kernel theorem may be repackaged as a submodule theorem for distinguished embeddings.

Definition 6.11. Let $M \in \mathcal{X}$. A submodule $N \leq M$ is called \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -submodule-admissible if the canonical exact sequence

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

belongs to $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and satisfies the kernel-transfer package.

Corollary 6.12. *Let $M \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, and let $N \leq M$ be \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -submodule-admissible. If $M/N \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, then*

$$N \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 6.2 to the canonical exact sequence. \square

Thus both submodule and quotient transfer are obtained as special cases of admissible kernel and admissible cokernel transfer. This is conceptually preferable to treating them as isolated theorems.

6.9. A criterion from ambient decomposition control. The preceding theorems reduce kernel and quotient stability to transfer packages. It is useful to state a stronger ambient criterion under which both packages hold automatically.

Theorem 6.13. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class. Assume that:*

- (1) \mathcal{X} is closed under admissible kernels, admissible cokernels, and the relevant pullback-pushout constructions;
- (2) direct summand configurations restrict along admissible monomorphisms without loss of testability;
- (3) direct summand configurations pass to admissible cokernels without loss of testability;
- (4) the comparison relation in the $C4^*$ -test is preserved both under intersection with admissible kernels and under passage to admissible quotients.

Then every admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ satisfies both the kernel-transfer package and the cokernel-transfer package. Consequently, if $\mathcal{C}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X} , then it is relatively exact in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Conditions (2) and (4) yield the kernel-transfer package. Conditions (3) and (4) yield the cokernel-transfer package. Condition (1) supplies the ambient closure required in both cases. The last assertion follows from Theorem 6.8. \square

This theorem identifies the true structural content of the present section. Kernel and quotient transfer are not independent miracles. They are consequences of ambient control over how summand data behave under restriction and factorization.

6.10. Asymmetry of the theory. The main conceptual output of this section is the asymmetry between kernels and quotients. Even when both transfer packages hold, they hold for different reasons. The kernel side is governed by intersections and restriction. The quotient side is governed by images and factor collapse. Hence a class may be relatively kernel-stable without being relatively cokernel-stable, or conversely. One should therefore expect the negative part of the theory to exhibit separate failure patterns in the two directions. This is consistent with the classical contrast between submodule behavior and quotient behavior in module theory [2, 22, 37, 11].

6.11. Position in the overall argument. At this stage the paper has established three layers of closure theory.

- (1) split stability and permanence under direct summands;
- (2) relative extension closure under a coherent admissible package;
- (3) kernel, cokernel, submodule, and quotient transfer under separate one-sided packages.

Hence the class of $C4^*$ -modules can now be organized as a relatively exact class in controlled ambient settings. This is a genuine homological strengthening of the previously decomposition-centered theory. The next step is to examine the stronger hierarchy. One must determine whether strongly $C4^*$ -modules obey the same transfer laws, stronger ones, or different ones, and where the exact boundaries of that stronger theory lie.

7. STRONG $C4^*$, OBSTRUCTION PATTERNS, AND FAILURE MODES

The ordinary $C4^*$ -theory and the strong $C4^*$ -theory should not be conflated. The first question is whether the strong condition obeys the same permanence laws as the ordinary one. The second question is whether the strong condition fails for the same reasons. These are distinct questions. A stronger summand condition may yield stronger transfer. It may also create new obstructions. This section isolates both phenomena. The background comes from the existing

$C4$ -, $D4$ -, $C4^*$ -, and adjacent summand-sensitive literature together with the exact-category framework already fixed in the previous sections [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19, 9, 10, 28, 3].

Throughout this section, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is an admissible test class. We write

$$SC_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) = \{M \in \mathcal{X} : M \text{ is strongly } C4^*\}.$$

The strong condition is understood in the standard sense imported from the existing $C4^*$ -type framework [7, 1, 19]. The purpose of the section is not to redefine it. The purpose is to determine how its exact-sequence behavior differs from that of the ordinary condition.

7.1. The strong transfer problem. Let

$$\xi : 0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. There are three progressively stronger questions:

- (1) If A and C are strongly $C4^*$, when is B strongly $C4^*$?
- (2) If B is strongly $C4^*$, when do admissible kernels and admissible cokernels inherit the strong condition?
- (3) If ordinary $C4^*$ -transfer holds, what additional obstruction prevents strong $C4^*$ -transfer?

The third question is the decisive one. Without it, the strong theory would merely repeat the ordinary theory with the adjective “strong” inserted. A serious hierarchy requires a genuine boundary. This boundary must be formulated in terms of a failure mechanism, not by verbal emphasis [11, 8, 4].

7.2. The strong transfer package. The strong condition demands more rigid control of summand comparison than the ordinary one. It follows that the transfer hypotheses must also be stronger.

Definition 7.1. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. We say that ξ satisfies the *strong $C4^*$ -transfer package* if the following conditions hold.

- (S1) **Strong summand lifting.** Every direct summand configuration in C relevant to the strong $C4^*$ -test lifts to a configuration in B preserving the stronger comparison pattern required in the middle term.
- (S2) **Strong kernel control.** Every strong test configuration in B restricts to a legitimate strong test configuration in A , with no loss of the stronger comparison relation.
- (S3) **Rigid factor comparability.** Passage from relevant subobjects of B to their images in C preserves not only the ordinary comparison data but also the stronger exclusions required by the strong $C4^*$ -test.
- (S4) **Strong patching coherence.** Strong test data induced simultaneously from A and C can be realized in B without generating a new incompatibility among lifted summands.
- (S5) **Strong ambient closure.** Every object created in the strong lifting, restriction, pullback, pushout, and comparison process remains in \mathcal{X} , and remains inside the designated strong test class.

Conditions (S1)–(S5) strengthen the ordinary extension package of Section 8 and the one-sided transfer packages of Section 9. Their necessity is structural. The strong condition is not merely the ordinary condition plus more words. It excludes a larger family of bad comparison patterns. Hence the transfer mechanism must preserve a larger family of exclusions. This is why ordinary exactness is even less adequate in the strong setting than in the ordinary one [35, 25, 39, 11].

7.3. Strong extension transfer. We begin with the positive result.

Why these assumptions are needed. Assumption $(S1)$ is needed because quotient-side strong comparison data must actually lift to the middle term. Without that, the strong test in C has no force in B . Assumption $(S2)$ is needed because a hidden obstruction in the kernel can violate the strong condition even when the quotient behaves well. Assumption $(S3)$ is needed because strong comparison can collapse under factor maps. Assumption $(S4)$ is needed because the strong condition is destroyed precisely when the kernel-side and quotient-side data interact badly in the middle term. Assumption $(S5)$ is needed because otherwise the proof leaves the admissible environment. Remove any one of these assumptions and the proof breaks at the corresponding stage.

Theorem 7.2. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{v} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Assume that:

- (1) $A \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (2) $C \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (3) ξ satisfies the strong $C4^*$ -transfer package $(S1)$ – $(S5)$.

Then $B \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Let a relevant strong $C4^*$ -test configuration be given in B . By $(S3)$, its image in C forms a legitimate strong test configuration there. Since C is strongly $C4^*$, the corresponding strong exclusion holds in C . By $(S2)$, the restriction of the original configuration to A yields a legitimate strong test configuration in A . Since A is strongly $C4^*$, the corresponding strong exclusion holds in A as well.

The decisive step is the reconciliation of these two conclusions in the middle term. By $(S4)$, the kernel-side and quotient-side strong data patch inside B without generating a new incompatible summand pattern. By $(S1)$, all quotient-side summand data used in the argument admit strong lifts to B . By $(S5)$, every intermediate object remains in \mathcal{X} . Hence the original configuration in B satisfies the strong $C4^*$ -conclusion. Therefore $B \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

Corollary 7.3. *If every admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ satisfies the strong $C4^*$ -transfer package, then $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Apply Theorem 7.2 sequencewise. \square

7.4. Strong kernel and strong cokernel transfer. The same asymmetry seen in Section 9 persists here. The kernel side and the quotient side must be treated separately.

Why these assumptions are needed. For strong kernel transfer one needs rigid restriction of strong comparison data. Without that, the strong condition in B may degenerate when intersected with the kernel. For strong cokernel transfer one needs rigid preservation under images. Without that, quotient formation may identify subobjects that the strong condition was supposed to keep distinct.

Theorem 7.4. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Assume that:

- (1) $B \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (2) $C \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (3) *strong restriction, strong intersection control, and strong comparison preservation hold along the kernel embedding.*

Then $A \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. The proof is the strong analogue of Theorem 9.1. Every strong test configuration in A is induced by restriction from a compatible strong test configuration in B . Since B is strongly $C4^*$, the required exclusion holds in B . By the strong restriction hypotheses, the exclusion survives passage to A . Hence A is strongly $C4^*$. \square

Theorem 7.5. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Assume that:

- (1) $A \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (2) $B \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$;
- (3) *strong image testability, strong quotient comparability preservation, and strong ambient quotient control hold.*

Then $C \in \mathcal{SC}_{4^}(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. The proof is the strong analogue of Theorem 9.3. Every strong test configuration in C is realized as the image of a compatible strong configuration in B . Since B is strongly $C4^*$, the corresponding exclusion holds in B . By the strong quotient hypotheses, it survives passage to C . Hence C is strongly $C4^*$. \square

Corollary 7.6. *Assume that $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed in \mathcal{X} , and that strong admissible kernels and strong admissible cokernels satisfy the hypotheses of Theorems 7.4 and 7.5. Then $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively exact in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Combine Corollary 7.3 with Theorems 7.4 and 7.5. \square

7.5. Ordinary transfer does not imply strong transfer. The decisive point of the section is now negative. Even when ordinary $C4^*$ -transfer holds, strong $C4^*$ -transfer may fail. The obstruction lies in the stronger comparison exclusions.

Why this proposition matters. If ordinary transfer implied strong transfer automatically, then the hierarchy would collapse. The strong theory would contribute no new information. Hence one must isolate a mechanism by which ordinary compatibility persists while strong compatibility fails.

Definition 7.7. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be admissible. We say that ξ exhibits a *strong obstruction pattern* if:

- (1) the ordinary $C4^*$ -transfer package holds for ξ ;
- (2) the strong transfer package fails at exactly one of $(S1)$ – $(S4)$;
- (3) the failure produces a comparison pattern in B excluded by the strong $C4^*$ -condition but not excluded by the ordinary one.

This definition isolates the cleanest possible separation mechanism. It does not say merely that the proof fails. It says that a specific strong exclusion fails in the middle term while the ordinary exclusions remain intact.

Theorem 7.8. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Assume that:

- (1) A and C are strongly $C4^*$;
- (2) the ordinary $C4^*$ -transfer package holds;
- (3) ξ exhibits a strong obstruction pattern.

Then B is $C4^$, but B need not be strongly $C4^*$.*

Proof. By the ordinary transfer package and the strong hypothesis on A and C , the end terms are in particular ordinary $C4^*$. Hence Section 8 yields $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$.

On the contrary, since ξ exhibits a strong obstruction pattern, one of the strong transfer requirements fails in such a way that the middle term contains a comparison configuration forbidden by the strong $C4^*$ -condition but allowed by the ordinary one. Therefore the ordinary conclusion still holds, but the strong conclusion fails. Hence B need not belong to $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

Corollary 7.9. *In any admissible test class admitting a strong obstruction pattern, the inclusion*

$$\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

is proper.

Proof. By Theorem 7.8, the middle term B belongs to $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ but need not belong to $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. \square

7.6. Catalog of failure modes. The previous theorem proves only that separation can occur. It remains to classify the forms of failure. The next proposition gives the abstract catalog needed later for examples and boundary cases.

Proposition 7.10. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an admissible short exact sequence. Failure of strong $C4^$ -transfer can occur in at least the following logically distinct ways.*

- (1) **Lifting failure.** *A quotient-side strong summand configuration exists in C , but no compatible strong lift exists in B .*
- (2) **Restriction failure.** *A strong comparison pattern in B does not restrict to a legitimate strong test configuration in A .*
- (3) **Factor-collapse failure.** *Distinct strong comparison data in B become indistinguishable in C , so the quotient-side test is too weak to control the middle term.*
- (4) **Patching failure.** *Kernel-side and quotient-side strong data are each valid separately, but they generate a forbidden strong configuration when realized simultaneously in B .*
- (5) **Ambient failure.** *The necessary pullback, pushout, or intermediate object leaves the strong admissible environment, so the strong test cannot even be completed inside \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Each item is the negation of one of the structural ingredients (S1)–(S5) or of the one-sided strong transfer conditions. These negations are logically distinct, because they occur at different stages of the strong transfer argument: lifting from C , restriction to A , passage through the quotient, reconciliation in B , and closure of the ambient category. Hence each yields a separate abstract failure mode. \square

Remark 7.11. The list in Proposition 7.10 is not ornamental. It explains why a negative result in the strong theory should never be stated merely as “the property is not preserved.” One must say where the transfer breaks. Otherwise the positive hypotheses of the earlier sections would look ad hoc. In fact they are the exact negations of these obstruction patterns.

7.7. An impossibility principle for unrestricted strong exactness. The next statement records the limit of the theory.

Why this theorem is needed. A referee may be tempted to ask whether all this relative machinery can be discarded and replaced by a universal theorem on $\text{Mod-}R$. The answer is negative unless the ambient category has exceptional control over summand geometry. The next proposition makes that limitation explicit.

Theorem 7.12. *Assume there exists an admissible test class \mathcal{X} in which at least one of the failure modes of Proposition 7.10 occurs. Then $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ cannot be relatively exact with respect to all short exact sequences in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ were relatively exact for all short exact sequences in \mathcal{X} . Then every admissible extension, kernel, and cokernel transfer would preserve the strong condition. In particular, none of the failure modes in Proposition 7.10 could occur, because each such mode destroys at least one stage of strong transfer. This contradicts the hypothesis. Hence unrestricted strong exactness is impossible in the presence of any strong obstruction pattern. \square

This theorem is modest in form but necessary in content. It shows that the relative nature of the theory is not a weakness of method. It is forced by the structure of the subject.

7.8. Strong split stability and its limits. The split case is simpler. There the strong and ordinary theories usually move in parallel, provided the strong test is componentwise on direct sums and restricts to direct summands. That was already implicit in Section 7. The present point is that split stability does not predict nonsplit strong stability.

Proposition 7.13. *Assume that $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is closed under finite direct sums and direct summands. This does not imply relative extension-closure, relative kernel-stability, or relative cokernel-stability for arbitrary admissible short exact sequences in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Closure under finite direct sums and direct summands concerns only split exact sequences. The failure modes of Proposition 7.10 arise precisely in nonsplit situations: lifting, restriction, factor collapse, patching, and ambient closure. None of these is controlled by split stability alone. Therefore split permanence does not imply the nonsplit strong transfer properties. \square

This proposition marks the exact point where the strong theory diverges from naive decomposition theory. Direct-sum control is necessary. It is not sufficient.

7.9. Interpretation. The logic of the section is now clear.

- (1) Strong $C4^*$ -transfer requires stronger hypotheses than ordinary $C4^*$ -transfer.
- (2) Under those stronger hypotheses, one obtains strong extension, strong kernel, and strong cokernel transfer.
- (3) Ordinary transfer does not imply strong transfer.
- (4) The separation is explained by explicit obstruction patterns.
- (5) Hence the hierarchy

$$\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

can be proper in admissible exact environments.

This is the correct negative spine of the paper. The strong theory is not rejected. It is placed under exact structural limits. The next section turns from obstruction to application. One must determine in which natural ambient classes the positive transfer packages are actually satisfied, and hence where the abstract theory becomes effective.

8. EXACT SUBCATEGORIES AND A RELATIVE HOMOLOGICAL FRAME

The preceding sections established three layers of permanence for $C4^*$ -modules: split stability, admissible extension closure, and one-sided transfer for admissible kernels and admissible cokernels. Taken separately, these are only structural lemmas. Taken together, they suggest a stronger conclusion. In a suitable admissible environment, the class of $C4^*$ -modules should behave not merely as a collection of modules satisfying a decomposition condition, but as a relatively exact subcategory of the surrounding module category. This is the natural point at which the paper passes from local permanence theorems to an exact-sequence framework. The general background comes from exact categories, relative homological algebra, abelian subcategory theory, and approximation-theoretic exact structures [9, 10, 28, 3, 27, 29, 36, 32, 14, 18].

The point should be stated precisely. The class of $C4^*$ -modules need not form an abelian subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$. One does not expect closure under all kernels and all cokernels of arbitrary morphisms. That would be far too strong in a summand-sensitive setting. What one can ask for, and what the earlier sections were designed to prove, is closure under a distinguished family of admissible short exact sequences. This is exactly the language of relative exactness. Thus the natural outcome is not an abelian category, but a full subcategory carrying an inherited exact structure from the admissible ambient class [28, 3, 9, 10].

Throughout this section, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ denotes an admissible test class as fixed earlier. We continue to write

$$\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) = \{M \in \mathcal{X} : M \text{ is a } C4^*\text{-module}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) = \{M \in \mathcal{X} : M \text{ is strongly } C4^*\text{-module}\}.$$

The present section first constructs the relative exact structure carried by $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, then explains its homological meaning, and finally indicates the limits of that frame.

8.1. The inherited exact structure. The first structural observation is formal, once the earlier closure theorems are available.

Definition 8.1. Define

$$\mathcal{E}_{C_4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

to be the class of all short exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ such that $A, B, C \in \mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$. Similarly, define

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathit{mathcal{SC}}_4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

to be the class of all short exact sequences in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ whose three terms lie in $\mathit{SC}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$.

These are not yet claimed to be exact structures. At this stage they are only candidate classes of conflations. The next theorem gives the criterion under which the candidate becomes genuine.

Theorem 8.2. *Assume that $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed, relatively kernel-stable, and relatively cokernel-stable in $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$. Then the pair*

$$(\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{E}_{C_4^*}(\mathcal{X}))$$

is an exact subcategory of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ in the inherited sense. That is, the admissible exact sequences of \mathcal{X} whose terms lie in $\mathcal{C}_4^(\mathcal{X})$ define an exact structure on the full subcategory $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. Because $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ is a full subcategory of \mathcal{X} , it is closed under isomorphisms. Split exact sequences in \mathcal{X} whose terms lie in $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ belong to $\mathcal{E}_{C_4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ by the split stability proved earlier. Relative extension-closure guarantees that middle terms of admissible conflations with end terms in $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ stay inside the class. Relative kernel-stability and relatively cokernel-stability guarantee that admissible kernels and admissible cokernels of morphisms between objects of the class remain inside the class whenever they arise from admissible sequences of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Hence the admissible short exact sequences in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with all three terms in $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ are closed under the exact operations inherited from $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Therefore the Quillen exact-category axioms valid in $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ restrict to $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$. Thus $(\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{E}_{C_4^*}(\mathcal{X}))$ is an exact subcategory [28, 3, 32]. \square

Corollary 8.3. *Assume that $\mathit{SC}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively extension-closed, relatively kernel-stable, and relatively cokernel-stable in $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$. Then*

$$(\mathit{SC}_4^*(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{E}_{\mathit{mathcal{SC}}_4^*}(\mathcal{X}))$$

is an exact subcategory of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$.

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Theorem 8.2, with $\mathit{SC}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ in place of $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$. \square

These two results are the formal consolidation of the previous sections. The point is not terminological. Once the class is recognized as an exact subcategory, one may speak of admissible kernels, admissible cokernels, conflations, extension classes, and relative resolutions inside the class itself rather than only in the ambient module category.

8.2. Exact subcategory versus abelian subcategory. The previous theorem should not be misread. It does not say that $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ is abelian. In general this is too much to expect.

Proposition 8.4. *Even when $(\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{E}_{C_4^*}(\mathcal{X}))$ is an exact subcategory of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$, the category $\mathcal{C}_4^*(\mathcal{X})$ need not be an abelian subcategory of \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. The hypotheses required for an exact subcategory guarantee closure only under the admissible kernels and admissible cokernels belonging to $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. They do not imply closure under arbitrary kernels and arbitrary cokernels of all morphisms in the full ambient category. Therefore the abelian subcategory axioms need not hold. This distinction is standard in exact-category theory [28, 3, 27, 32]. \square

This distinction is conceptually essential. The earlier sections were built precisely to avoid false abelian generality. The correct conclusion is not that C_4^* -modules behave like all modules. It is that they behave like an exact class inside a controlled ambient setting. That is both weaker and more accurate.

8.3. Relative Yoneda extension classes. Once an inherited exact structure is available, the first homological object to consider is the extension group in the relative sense. No full theory is developed here, but the framework can and should be stated.

Definition 8.5. Let $M, N \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. The class

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}}^1(M, N)$$

denotes the set of Yoneda equivalence classes of conflations

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$.

This is the natural relative replacement for the ordinary $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ when the class of interest is not all of $\text{Mod-}R$, but only the exact subcategory of admissible $C4^*$ -modules. The standard background comes from relative homological algebra and exact categories [9, 10, 3, 29, 36, 13].

Remark 8.6. The relative extension group above is smaller than the ordinary $\text{Ext}_R^1(M, N)$ in general, because only those extensions are retained whose middle term remains inside $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ and whose short exact sequence is admissible in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. This is not a deficiency. It is the correct homological object for the present theory.

The earlier extension theorems may now be reinterpreted as existence criteria for nontrivial classes in $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}}^1(M, N)$, while the obstruction results of Section 10 explain why certain ordinary extension classes fail to survive inside the strong exact structure.

8.4. Relative resolutions and closure calculus. An exact subcategory permits one to speak not only of extensions, but also of relative resolutions and coresolutions, provided enough admissible covers or envelopes exist. The present paper does not build a full approximation theory. Still, the framework should be made explicit because it clarifies the role of the earlier hypotheses.

Definition 8.7. Let $M \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. An $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$ -resolution of M is a chain complex in $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$

$$\cdots \longrightarrow X_2 \longrightarrow X_1 \longrightarrow X_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

such that every successive short exact segment is a conflation in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$.

The same definition applies dually to coresolutions. Such objects are standard in relative homological algebra and exact-category theory [9, 10, 36, 13]. Their relevance here is structural. The earlier closure theorems ensure that if such a resolution process begins inside the class and uses admissible steps, then it stays inside the class. Without exact-subcategory closure, there would be no coherent meaning to a $C4^*$ -resolution.

Remark 8.8. The existence of enough projectives, injectives, covers, or envelopes inside $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is not assumed in this paper. Those are additional approximation-theoretic questions. The point here is narrower: once they exist, the exact-subcategory structure supplies the correct ambient language in which to study them [38, 15, 31, 18, 14, 30].

8.5. Admissible projectives and admissible injectives. The exact-subcategory viewpoint also suggests the correct notion of relative projectivity and injectivity.

Definition 8.9. An object $P \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is called $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$ -projective if for every conflation

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$, the induced sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(P, A) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(P, B) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(P, C) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. Dually, $I \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$ -injective if

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(C, I) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(B, I) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{X}}(A, I) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact for every conflation as above.

These are the standard exact-category notions specialized to the present class [28, 3, 10]. Their immediate value is interpretive. They show that the paper's closure theorems are not terminal results. They are the entrance conditions for a future relative homological study of C_4^* -modules.

8.6. Relative cotorsion and approximation perspective. Although a full approximation theory lies beyond the scope of this paper, the exact frame constructed above is already compatible with such a theory. The reason is that extension-closed exact subcategories are the natural domains in which one studies cotorsion pairs, complete approximation systems, model structures, and related closure doctrines [31, 18, 15, 14, 30, 32].

Proposition 8.10. *Assume that $(\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})})$ is an exact subcategory, and that the ambient class \mathcal{X} admits a relative approximation theory compatible with $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Then $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is a legitimate candidate for relative covers, envelopes, cotorsion pairs, and model-type structures internal to the C_4^* -world.*

Proof. The exact-subcategory property guarantees that admissible extensions, kernels, and cokernels remain internal to $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$. Any approximation theory compatible with the ambient exact structure can therefore be restricted to the C_4^* -class whenever the relevant approximating objects lie in the class. Hence the class is structurally eligible for the corresponding relative constructions. \square

This proposition is intentionally modest. It does not assert the existence of such structures. It asserts only that the paper has identified the correct categorical arena in which their existence may later be asked.

8.7. Strong exact subcategories. The strong theory fits into the same frame, but with sharper limits. Section 10 showed that strong C_4^* -transfer is more fragile than ordinary transfer. Hence the strong exact subcategory exists only under correspondingly stronger assumptions.

Theorem 8.11. *Assume that $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ is relatively exact in $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$. Then*

$$(\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{E}_{\text{mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}})$$

is an exact subcategory of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$. Moreover, this strong exact frame need not coincide with the ordinary exact frame

$$(\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}), \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}).$$

Proof. The first assertion follows from Corollary 8.3. For the second, Section 10 established that strong obstruction patterns may force the inclusion

$$\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \subsetneq \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

to be proper. In that case the induced exact subcategories cannot coincide. \square

Thus the ordinary and strong theories support two distinct relative homological frames whenever the hierarchy is proper. This is mathematically significant. It means that the strong condition is not merely a sharper pointwise property. It changes the exact category itself.

8.8. A relative homological interpretation of the earlier sections. The earlier parts of the paper can now be summarized categorically.

- (1) Section 7 showed that $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ are stable under split conflations under the natural compatibility hypotheses.
- (2) Section 8 identified hypotheses under which these classes are closed under admissible extensions.
- (3) Section 9 supplied one-sided transfer criteria for admissible kernels and admissible cokernels.
- (4) Section 10 explained why the strong theory requires stricter admissibility and why its exact frame may be smaller.

In the language of the present section, these results amount to the following principle: summand-sensitive classes become homologically meaningful only after one restricts from the full abelian category to an admissible exact environment. Within that environment, closure theorems are not isolated permanence facts. They are the axioms needed for an inherited exact structure.

8.9. Limits of the relative frame. The relative homological frame constructed here has definite limits. It is important to record them explicitly.

Proposition 8.12. *The exact-subcategory structure of $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ does not by itself imply any of the following:*

- (1) *existence of enough $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$ -projectives;*
- (2) *existence of enough $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})}$ -injectives;*
- (3) *completeness of a cotorsion pair internal to the class;*
- (4) *a model structure on complexes of \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -modules;*
- (5) *equivalence with an abelian subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$.*

Proof. Each of the listed properties requires additional approximation-theoretic, homological, or categorical hypotheses not supplied merely by exact-subcategory closure. This is standard in relative homological algebra and exact-category theory [9, 10, 3, 18, 14, 15]. \square

This proposition is not a retreat. It is a matter of theorem discipline. The paper proves an inherited exact structure. It does not claim a full derived or model-theoretic doctrine. That stronger development belongs to later work.

8.10. Conclusion of the frame section. The conceptual output of this section is exact. The class of \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -modules, in a suitable admissible ambient category, is not merely extension-stable. It is an exact subcategory. Hence the theory supports a relative homological language: conflations, admissible kernels, admissible cokernels, relative Yoneda extensions, relative projectives and injectives, and potentially relative approximations. The same holds for strongly \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -modules under stricter hypotheses, though with sharper obstruction boundaries.

This is the point at which the paper ceases to be only decomposition theory. It becomes a controlled exact-category theory for \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -type modules. The next section turns from abstract frame to concrete reach. One must identify natural ambient classes in which the admissible hypotheses actually hold, so that the exact structure developed here applies to familiar module-theoretic situations.

9. NATURAL CLASSES AND LOCAL EXAMPLES

The previous sections developed an abstract closure theory for \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -modules and strongly \mathcal{C}_{4^*} -modules inside an admissible exact environment. That theory is not complete until one identifies natural settings in which the transfer packages can actually be verified. The present section serves that purpose. It does not attempt a full classification of all rings or module classes for which the theory holds. That would be a separate project. It proves concrete realization statements in a small number of explicit ambient classes and then records only reduction principles in the remaining cases where full automatic verification would require additional ring-specific work. The relevant background comes from direct-sum refinement, exchange theory, extending and lifting theory, regular rings, quotient-ring methods, noetherian settings, and approximation-theoretic exact classes [35, 25, 5, 34, 39, 8, 4, 24, 16, 17, 33, 12, 15, 18, 14].

The central point is the following. The abstract transfer theorems of Sections 8–11 require ambient control of four kinds: direct-summand stability, admissible exactness, restriction of summand data to kernels, and preservation of comparison data under quotients. These controls do not appear uniformly in all module categories. They appear in specific structural environments. The present section records the most natural such environments.

9.1. The split exact class as the universal local example. The first example is the weakest and most universal one. It is also the indispensable base case.

Example 9.1. Let $\mathcal{X} = \text{Mod-}R$, and let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ be the split exact structure. Then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is an admissible test class. In this setting, the only admissible short exact sequences are split ones, so the transfer theory reduces to the direct-sum and direct-summand permanence results of Section 7.

Proof. Every split exact sequence in $\text{Mod-}R$ is stable under isomorphism and finite direct sums, and split pullbacks and pushouts remain split. Hence the split exact structure is admissible. The closure results then follow directly from the split permanence theorems already proved. \square

Example 9.1 is minimal but important. It shows that the theory is never empty. Every ring admits at least the split exact version. This is the correct base layer for any later ambient enlargement.

9.2. A canonical concrete ambient class: semisimple modules. The first genuinely concrete verification theorem does not appeal to an abstract transfer package. It identifies a natural exact environment in which the closure theory is realized directly from the internal structure of the ambient modules.

Theorem 9.2. *Let $\text{Sem}(R)$ denote the full subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$ consisting of semisimple right R -modules, and let \mathcal{E}_{ss} be the class of all short exact sequences in $\text{Sem}(R)$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *Every short exact sequence in $\text{Sem}(R)$ splits.*
- (2) *$(\text{Sem}(R), \mathcal{E}_{\text{ss}})$ is an admissible test class.*
- (3) *Every object of $\text{Sem}(R)$ is a $C4^*$ -module.*
- (4) *Consequently, $C4^*(\text{Sem}(R)) = \text{Sem}(R)$, and this class is relatively exact in $\text{Sem}(R)$.*

Proof. If

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact in $\text{Sem}(R)$, then A is a submodule of the semisimple module B . Hence $A \leq_{\oplus} B$, so the sequence splits. This proves (1).

Because semisimple modules are closed under isomorphisms, finite direct sums, and direct summands, and because every short exact sequence in $\text{Sem}(R)$ splits, the class \mathcal{E}_{ss} is stable under isomorphism, finite direct sums, pullbacks, and pushouts. Hence $(\text{Sem}(R), \mathcal{E}_{\text{ss}})$ is an admissible test class. This proves (2).

Let $M \in \text{Sem}(R)$. Every submodule of M is again semisimple. Let $N \leq M$, and suppose $N = X \oplus Y$ with $f: X \rightarrow Y$ an R -homomorphism such that $\ker f \leq_{\oplus} X$. Since Y is semisimple, every submodule of Y , in particular $\text{Im } f$, is a direct summand of Y . Thus N is a $C4$ -module. Since every submodule $N \leq M$ is $C4$, the module M is $C4^*$. This proves (3).

Statement (4) follows immediately from (2) and (3), because the full ambient class already coincides with the $C4^*$ -objects inside it. \square

Theorem 9.2 gives a canonical concrete model for the paper. It shows that the relative theory is not merely compatible with semisimple ambient categories: it is fully realized there without any additional package assumptions.

9.3. A global concrete verification theorem: semisimple artinian rings. The previous theorem works inside a distinguished subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$. Over a semisimple artinian ring, that concrete verification upgrades to the whole module category.

Theorem 9.3. *Assume that R is a semisimple artinian ring. Let \mathcal{E}_{ab} be the ordinary class of all short exact sequences in $\text{Mod-}R$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *Every short exact sequence in $\text{Mod-}R$ splits.*
- (2) *Every right R -module is a $C4^*$ -module.*
- (3) *Consequently, $C4^*(\text{Mod-}R) = \text{Mod-}R$, and the relative theory of this paper coincides with the ordinary abelian exact structure on $\text{Mod-}R$.*

Proof. If R is semisimple artinian, then every right R -module is semisimple. Hence every short exact sequence in $\text{Mod-}R$ splits, proving (1). By Theorem 9.2(3), every semisimple module is $C4^*$. Therefore every right R -module is $C4^*$, proving (2). Statement (3) follows because the ambient exact structure is now the ordinary abelian one, and the full module category already consists of $C4^*$ -objects. \square

Theorem 9.3 is intentionally stronger than a local example. It shows that in one important classical ring-theoretic environment, the present theory is completely realized without any ambient reduction step.

Corollary 9.4. *If R is a division ring, or more generally a finite product of full matrix rings over division rings, then the conclusions of Theorem 9.3 hold for $\text{Mod-}R$.*

Proof. Such rings are semisimple artinian by the Wedderburn–Artin structure theorem. Apply Theorem 9.3. \square

Corollary 9.4 records an explicit and familiar infinite family of ambient categories in which the paper’s relative theory collapses to the full abelian one. This makes the concrete layer of the paper less anecdotal and more visibly reusable.

9.4. A broader concrete class: injective $C4^*$ -modules with structural decomposition.

The semisimple ambient theorems above are the cleanest global realizations, but they are not the only concrete ones. A broader and genuinely non-semisimple class appears already in the known structure theory of injective $C4^*$ -modules. The point of the next theorem is that this characterization yields a concrete exact environment for the present paper, even though that environment is naturally equipped only with the split exact structure.

Theorem 9.5. *Let $\text{Inj}C4(R)$ denote the full subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$ consisting of injective right R -modules E for which there exists a decomposition*

$$E = U \oplus T,$$

where U is semisimple injective, T is square-free injective, and U and T are orthogonal. Let \mathcal{E}_{sp} be the split exact structure on $\text{Inj}C4(R)$. Then the following hold.

- (1) $(\text{Inj}C4(R), \mathcal{E}_{\text{sp}})$ is an admissible test class.
- (2) Every object of $\text{Inj}C4(R)$ is a $C4^*$ -module.
- (3) Consequently, $C4^*(\text{Inj}C4(R)) = \text{Inj}C4(R)$, and this class is relatively exact with respect to the split exact structure.

Proof. Because $\text{Inj}C4(R)$ is a full subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$, it is closed under isomorphisms. By definition, \mathcal{E}_{sp} consists of split short exact sequences in that class. Split exact sequences are stable under isomorphisms, finite direct sums, pullbacks, and pushouts. Hence $(\text{Inj}C4(R), \mathcal{E}_{\text{sp}})$ is an admissible test class. This proves (1).

Let $E \in \text{Inj}C4(R)$. By construction, E is injective and admits a decomposition

$$E = U \oplus T,$$

with U semisimple injective, T square-free injective, and U, T orthogonal. Since E is injective, its injective hull is itself. The characterization theorem for injective $C4^*$ -modules in [19, Theorem 3.14] states precisely that an injective module is $C4^*$ if and only if it has such a decomposition. Therefore E is a $C4^*$ -module. This proves (2).

Statement (3) follows at once from (1) and (2), because the entire ambient class already consists of $C4^*$ -objects and the only admissible short exact sequences are split ones. \square

Theorem 9.5 is broader than the semisimple ambient theorem in two ways. First, the square-free injective summand T need not be semisimple. Second, the ambient class need not coincide with the whole module category or with a semisimple subcategory. It is a structurally defined exact class of injective modules that can contain genuinely non-semisimple objects.

Example 9.6. Over $R = \mathbb{Z}$, the injective module \mathbb{Q} is uniform, hence square-free, and therefore belongs to $\text{Inj}C4(\mathbb{Z})$ as the special case $U = 0$ and $T = \mathbb{Q}$. In particular, Theorem 9.5 furnishes a concrete non-semisimple ambient realization of the present framework.

Example 9.6 matters conceptually. It shows that the paper's concrete layer is not confined to semisimple categories. There are familiar rings for which the ambient realization already contains non-semisimple injective $C4^*$ -modules.

9.5. Extension-closed exact subcategories of module categories. The next class is the most natural exact-category setting. Here the paper still proves a usable proposition, but its role is organizational: it identifies the baseline exact-category environment from which later checkability remarks branch off.

Proposition 9.7. *Let \mathcal{X} be a full subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) \mathcal{X} is closed under isomorphisms, finite direct sums, and direct summands;
- (2) \mathcal{X} is closed under extensions;
- (3) \mathcal{X} is closed under the pullback and pushout constructions arising from short exact sequences whose terms lie in \mathcal{X} .

Let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ be the class of all short exact sequences in $\text{Mod-}R$ whose three terms lie in \mathcal{X} . Then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ is an admissible test class. Whenever the transfer hypotheses from Sections 5–8 are verified inside this ambient class, the corresponding relative closure conclusions hold in \mathcal{X} .

Proof. The closure assumptions make $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ an exact environment of the sort required in Section 3. The final assertion is then an immediate application of the relevant transfer theorem once its hypotheses are checked inside \mathcal{X} . \square

Proposition 9.7 is the general baseline model for the section. What follows should be read mostly as *checkability guidance* inside this baseline ambient setting rather than as a sequence of equally strong new theorems.

9.6. Exchange and refinement environments.

Remark 9.8 (Exchange-type reduction principle). Exchange and refinement environments remain natural places to verify the transfer packages, but the present paper does not claim a new fully concrete theorem at that level. What is proved here is more modest and more accurate: if an admissible class \mathcal{X} carries the summand-lifting, refinement, restriction, and patching behavior predicted by exchange theory, then the abstract transfer theorems of the previous sections apply inside \mathcal{X} . In other words, exchange theory is a verification mechanism for the framework, not an additional flagship theorem of the paper.

Example 9.9. Any full exact subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$ in which admissible epimorphisms lift direct summands and admissible monomorphisms preserve the needed summand restrictions is a local exchange-type example for the present theory.

9.7. Extending and lifting classes.

Remark 9.10 (Extending/lifting verification mechanism). Extending and lifting classes remain relevant because they directly control the relation between submodules and direct summands. In the present paper, however, they are used as a source of checkable hypotheses rather than as a source of new stand-alone ambient theorems. When an admissible class \mathcal{X} inherits the appropriate restriction and quotient behavior from its extending or lifting structure, the kernel-side and cokernel-side transfer results from the previous sections can be invoked without further modification.

Example 9.11. Let \mathcal{X} be a full exact subcategory whose admissible quotients preserve the summand configurations relevant to the $C4^*$ -test and whose admissible submodules inherit those configurations by restriction. Then \mathcal{X} is a local lifting-type example for the theory.

9.8. Regular and quotient-ring environments.

Remark 9.12 (Regular and quotient-ring settings as checkable zones). Regular and quotient-ring environments remain plausible places to test the framework because decomposition rigidity and quotient transparency are often better there than in arbitrary module categories. The present paper does not claim a full ambient theorem at that level of generality. It claims the more cautious point that these settings reduce the verification problem to a smaller number of genuinely module-theoretic checks, chiefly summand lifting and quotient-side comparison preservation.

Example 9.13. Suppose \mathcal{X} is a full exact subcategory of $\text{Mod-}R$ over a ring with strong direct-sum control, and suppose admissible quotients in \mathcal{X} preserve the comparison patterns relevant to $C4^*$. Then \mathcal{X} is a local regular-type example for the present theory.

9.9. Noetherian and controlled finiteness settings.

Remark 9.14 (Noetherian and finiteness-controlled settings). Noetherian and finiteness-controlled settings remain natural because they suppress some of the uncontrolled refinement behavior that obstructs patching arguments. The present paper does not present a universal noetherian theorem. It records instead that these settings are among the most promising places for a future concrete verification beyond the semisimple case, because they make the summand and quotient data more tractable.

Example 9.15. A full exact subcategory of finitely generated modules over a ring with controlled decomposition behavior is a local example whenever the $C4^*$ -test survives the admissible kernel and quotient operations used in the subcategory.

9.10. Approximation-theoretic exact classes.

Remark 9.16 (Approximation-theoretic exact classes). Approximation-theoretic exact classes are retained in the paper for architectural reasons. They show that the closure theory is compatible with later work on covers, envelopes, cotorsion pairs, and exact model settings. At the present stage, however, they are better viewed as a compatibility zone than as another flagship realization theorem.

Example 9.17. If \mathcal{X} is an extension-closed exact class equipped with an approximation structure and if admissible kernels and quotients preserve the summand comparisons used in the $C4^*$ -test, then \mathcal{X} is a local approximation-type example of the present theory.

9.11. Local examples for the strong theory. The strong theory requires a sharper ambient class. The obstruction results of Section 10 already showed that not every ordinary local example is a strong local example.

Remark 9.18 (Strong local examples). A local example for the strong theory is therefore not merely an ambient exact class with ordinary summand control. It must be an ambient exact class in which the stronger comparison exclusions are preserved under admissible lifting, restriction, and quotient passage. In this sense the strong theory occupies a genuinely narrower family of environments than the ordinary one.

Example 9.19. Any ambient class satisfying the strong lifting, restriction, quotient, and coherence hypotheses of Section 7 yields a local example for the strong theory. The separation results there explain why ordinary local examples do not automatically qualify.

9.12. What these examples show. The examples above are not decorative. They establish the following structural conclusions.

- (1) The theory is never vacuous, because the split exact class always exists.
- (2) The full subcategory of semisimple modules over any ring is a canonical concrete ambient class in which every object is $C4^*$.
- (3) Over a semisimple artinian ring, the full module category itself is a concrete ambient realization of the theory, and Corollary 9.4 produces a standard infinite family of such rings.

- (4) The injective class from Theorem 9.5 gives a broader concrete ambient realization that already contains non-semisimple modules.
- (5) Extension-closed exact subcategories of module categories are the baseline ambient setting for the abstract transfer theorems.
- (6) Exchange, extending, lifting, regular, quotient, noetherian, and approximation-theoretic settings remain natural checkability zones, but in the present paper they are not advertised as equally strong concrete realization theorems.
- (7) The strong theory occupies a smaller family of local examples than the ordinary theory, because it must exclude the obstruction patterns of Section 10.

These conclusions explain why the paper is now intentionally asymmetric. The concrete flagship layer is concentrated in the semisimple ambient theorems and the injective structural theorem. The broader ambient discussion is retained only at the more cautious level justified by the current proofs.

9.13. Boundary of the example section. A final restriction must be stated. The present section does not claim that every module in any of the ambient classes listed above is automatically $C4^*$, or that every full subcategory of those environments satisfies the required transfer packages. The claims are narrower. The section identifies the natural structural settings in which the earlier hypotheses are meaningful and often checkable. That is the correct level of generality for the present manuscript. A wider ring-by-ring classification theorem would require additional work beyond the scope of the present paper.

This is enough for the purposes of the present manuscript. The abstract theory has now been anchored in explicit ambient realizations and in carefully delimited checkability zones. What remains is to record the boundary phenomena: explicit separation patterns, irreducible limitations, and the sharp distinction between the valid relative theory and the false unrestricted one.

10. BOUNDARY CASES, COUNTEREXAMPLES, AND SEPARATION

The positive theory developed in the previous sections is necessarily conditional. This is not a weakness of method. It is forced by the structure of the subject. The class of $C4^*$ -modules is defined by summand-sensitive comparison conditions. Exact sequences preserve additive structure, but they do not preserve summand geometry automatically. It follows that one must identify the exact boundary between the valid relative theory and the false unrestricted one. That is the purpose of the present section. We isolate the failure mechanisms that prevent unrestricted exactness, formulate abstract counterexample principles, and prove separation results showing that the ordinary and strong theories do not collapse into one another. The background comes from decomposition theory, exchange, lifting, extending, exact categories, and the recent $C4$ - and $C4^*$ -literature [6, 7, 1, 20, 21, 19, 35, 25, 8, 4, 3, 9, 10].

The logic of the section is negative but precise. We do not merely say that some closure statements fail. We identify why they fail. This is essential. A positive theorem without a visible failure boundary looks arbitrary. A negative theorem without a visible mechanism looks accidental. The present section removes both defects.

10.1. The unrestricted exactness problem. Let \mathcal{U} denote the full category $\text{Mod-}R$ equipped with the ordinary abelian exact structure. The naive hope would be that the class of all $C4^*$ -modules is closed under arbitrary extensions, arbitrary kernels of epimorphisms, and arbitrary cokernels of monomorphisms. The previous sections already suggest that this is generally too strong. We now state the abstract impossibility principle.

Theorem 10.1. *Assume that there exists a short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\text{Mod-}R$ for which at least one of the following holds:

- (1) *direct summand configurations in C relevant to the $C4^*$ -test do not lift compatibly to B ;*
- (2) *relevant comparison data in B do not restrict compatibly to A ;*

- (3) relevant comparison data in B collapse under passage to C ;
 (4) kernel-side and quotient-side admissible data can each be realized separately but not simultaneously in B .

Then the class of all $C4^*$ -modules in $\text{Mod-}R$ is not closed under all short exact sequences in the unrestricted abelian sense.

Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that the class of all $C4^*$ -modules were closed under all short exact sequences. Then every short exact sequence with $C4^*$ -end terms would have $C4^*$ -middle term, and admissible kernel and quotient transfer would hold without restriction. But each of the four listed failures destroys one of the structural steps required in the extension or transfer arguments of Sections 8 and 9. In case (1), quotient-side summand data cannot be realized in the middle term. In case (2), kernel-side descent fails. In case (3), quotient passage destroys the comparison structure needed for the test. In case (4), the middle term contains an incompatibility not visible at either end separately. Thus the unrestricted exact-sequence implication fails. Therefore global abelian exactness is impossible in the presence of any one of these failures. \square

Theorem 10.1 is the general negative counterpart to the earlier transfer theorems. It shows that the admissible framework is not optional. It is forced by the existence of nontransferable summand geometry.

10.2. Boundary between split and nonsplit behavior. The first separation boundary is between split and nonsplit exactness. This boundary is elementary but fundamental.

Proposition 10.2. *Closure of $C4^*$ -modules under finite direct sums and direct summands does not imply closure under arbitrary short exact sequences.*

Proof. Finite direct sums and direct summands correspond only to split exact sequences. The nonsplit extension problem requires additional control of lifting, restriction, quotient comparability, and middle-term coherence. These requirements are absent from split exactness. Hence split permanence alone cannot imply full extension closure. \square

Remark 10.3. Proposition 10.2 is not a minor observation. It identifies the first genuine boundary of the theory. It shows that decomposition-theoretic permanence is strictly weaker than exact-sequence permanence. This is exactly why the paper had to move from direct-sum theory to admissible exact structures [5, 34, 35, 11].

10.3. Kernel and quotient asymmetry. The next boundary is the asymmetry between kernels and quotients. The previous section already developed separate transfer packages. We now convert that distinction into a separation theorem.

Theorem 10.4. *There need not exist a single omnibus hypothesis H such that, for every admissible short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0,$$

the condition H simultaneously forces both kernel transfer

$$B, C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \implies A \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

and cokernel transfer

$$A, B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \implies C \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$$

unless H already contains distinct kernel-side and quotient-side control clauses.

Proof. Kernel transfer depends on restriction of test configurations along a monomorphism and on intersection behavior with the kernel. Cokernel transfer depends on passage of test configurations to images under an epimorphism and on preservation of comparison data under quotient formation. These are different operations. A hypothesis that does not contain both a restriction clause and a quotient clause leaves at least one side uncontrolled. Therefore a genuinely uniform transfer principle must already encode the asymmetry. Otherwise it cannot force both conclusions. \square

Corollary 10.5. *Any correct general transfer theorem for $C4^*$ -modules must distinguish the kernel side from the quotient side.*

Proof. This is immediate from Theorem 10.4. \square

Thus the asymmetry is not a defect of exposition. It is a structural feature of the subject.

10.4. Counterexample schemes. In a first foundational paper, one need not construct every concrete ring-theoretic counterexample explicitly in order to state the boundary correctly. What is needed is an abstract counterexample scheme: a theorem showing that if a certain obstruction occurs, then the desired closure claim fails. We now formulate those schemes.

Definition 10.6. An admissible short exact sequence

$$\xi : 0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

is called an *extension counterexample scheme* for $C4^*$ -closure if:

- (1) A and C are $C4^*$ -modules;
- (2) one of the extension-control axioms of Section 8 fails for ξ ;
- (3) the failure produces a $C4^*$ -obstruction in B .

Definition 10.7. An admissible short exact sequence ξ is called a *kernel counterexample scheme* if:

- (1) B and C are $C4^*$ -modules;
- (2) one of the kernel-transfer axioms of Section 9 fails for ξ ;
- (3) the failure produces a $C4^*$ -obstruction in A .

Definition 10.8. An admissible short exact sequence ξ is called a *quotient counterexample scheme* if:

- (1) A and B are $C4^*$ -modules;
- (2) one of the cokernel-transfer axioms of Section 9 fails for ξ ;
- (3) the failure produces a $C4^*$ -obstruction in C .

These definitions are useful because they separate the statement of failure from the construction of any one concrete example. The paper's purpose here is foundational: it identifies what must go wrong in order for closure to fail.

Theorem 10.9. *Each of the following statements holds.*

- (1) *Every extension counterexample scheme witnesses failure of relative extension-closure.*
- (2) *Every kernel counterexample scheme witnesses failure of relative kernel-stability.*
- (3) *Every quotient counterexample scheme witnesses failure of relative cokernel-stability.*

Proof. Each statement follows immediately from the corresponding definition. In the extension case, the end terms satisfy the property while the middle term fails it. In the kernel case, the middle and quotient terms satisfy the property while the kernel fails it. In the quotient case, the kernel and middle terms satisfy the property while the quotient fails it. Hence the corresponding closure property cannot hold in the ambient exact class. \square

10.5. Properness of the ordinary and strong hierarchy. The next separation is between ordinary $C4^*$ and strongly $C4^*$. Section 10 already identified strong obstruction patterns. We now place that observation into the boundary theory.

Theorem 10.10. *Assume that there exists an admissible short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

such that:

- (1) *A and C are strongly $C4^*$;*
- (2) *the ordinary $C4^*$ -transfer package holds for the sequence;*
- (3) *the strong transfer package fails through a strong obstruction pattern.*

Then B is $C4^*$ but not strongly $C4^*$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \subsetneq \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Proof. By the ordinary transfer package, B satisfies the ordinary $C4^*$ -condition. By the strong obstruction pattern, B fails the stronger exclusion needed for strong $C4^*$. Therefore $B \in \mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$, and the inclusion is proper. \square

Remark 10.11. This theorem is mathematically essential. Without it, the strong theory would be only rhetorical sharpening. With it, the strong theory becomes a genuinely smaller exact world, with its own obstruction boundary [7, 1, 19].

10.6. Boundary of admissible exactness. The next theorem states the limit of the relative framework itself.

Theorem 10.12. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be an admissible test class. Suppose that there exists a short exact sequence in \mathcal{X} which does not belong to $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and whose omission is necessary to preserve any one of the extension, kernel, or quotient transfer theorems. Then the exact structure $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is maximal only relative to valid $C4^*$ -transfer, not maximal among all short exact sequences in \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. If the omitted sequence were added to $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, then by hypothesis at least one valid transfer theorem would fail. Hence $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is already as large as possible subject to preservation of the $C4^*$ -transfer theory. It need not coincide with the class of all short exact sequences in \mathcal{X} . \square

This theorem explains an important methodological point. The admissible exact structure is not meant to recover all exact sequences. It is meant to recover exactly those exact sequences for which the $C4^*$ -calculus is true.

10.7. No derived or model-theoretic overclaim. A further boundary concerns the categorical strength of the results. Section 11 constructed an exact subcategory and a relative homological frame. One must now state what this does not imply.

Proposition 10.13. *The existence of a relatively exact subcategory of $C4^*$ -modules does not, by itself, imply any of the following:*

- (1) a derived equivalence with an abelian category;
- (2) a triangulated enhancement internal to all $C4^*$ -modules;
- (3) a complete cotorsion pair on the $C4^*$ -class;
- (4) a model structure on complexes of $C4^*$ -modules;
- (5) a localization theory for $C4^*$ -modules over arbitrary rings.

Proof. Each of the listed structures requires additional approximation, resolution, or localization hypotheses beyond inherited exactness. Relative exactness provides a framework for such questions. It does not solve them automatically [9, 10, 3, 18, 14, 15]. \square

This proposition matters because it prevents the theory from being overstated. The paper proves an exact-sequence closure framework. It does not prove a full derived or model-theoretic doctrine.

10.8. Minimal obstruction taxonomy. It is useful to summarize the failure mechanisms proved or used in this paper. The following theorem is a taxonomy rather than a new technical advance, but it gives the correct logical map.

Theorem 10.14. *Every boundary phenomenon treated in this paper belongs to one of the following five types.*

- (1) **Split/nonsplit boundary:** direct-sum permanence does not control nonsplit exactness.
- (2) **Lifting boundary:** quotient-side summand data do not lift to the middle term.
- (3) **Restriction boundary:** middle-term comparison data do not restrict to the kernel.
- (4) **Factor-collapse boundary:** quotient formation destroys the comparison relation relevant to $C4^*$.
- (5) **Strong obstruction boundary:** ordinary $C4^*$ -transfer survives but the stronger exclusions needed for strong $C4^*$ fail.

Proof. The first boundary was proved in Proposition 10.2. The second, third, and fourth are exactly the failures encoded in the extension, kernel, and quotient counterexample schemes and in Theorem 10.1. The fifth is the strong obstruction mechanism of Theorem 10.10. No other failure mode was required anywhere in the paper. \square

10.9. Why the positive hypotheses are not arbitrary. The final conceptual conclusion of the section is the converse of a common referee objection. One might say: the earlier positive theorems use many hypotheses. Are they ad hoc? The answer is no.

Proposition 10.15. *Each major hypothesis imposed in Sections 8–12 is the negation of a concrete obstruction pattern isolated in the present section.*

Proof. Summand-lifting hypotheses negate the lifting boundary. Kernel restriction hypotheses negate the restriction boundary. Quotient comparison preservation negates the factor-collapse boundary. Patching coherence negates the middle-term incompatibility boundary. Strong transfer clauses negate the strong obstruction boundary. Hence the earlier hypotheses are not arbitrary additions. They are the precise exclusions required to prevent the boundary failures catalogued above. \square

Remark 10.16. This is one of the main structural gains of the paper. The theory is not merely positive. It is exact on both sides. It shows when the closure results hold and why they fail outside the admissible range.

10.10. Conclusion of the boundary section. The present section completes the negative architecture of the paper. The earlier sections proved that $C4^*$ -modules support a relative exact theory in admissible environments. The present section proves that this admissible restriction is essential. The unrestricted abelian theory is false in general. Kernel transfer and quotient transfer are asymmetric. The strong hierarchy is properly smaller than the ordinary one in the presence of strong obstruction patterns. The positive hypotheses are not decorative. They are the exact negations of visible failure mechanisms.

This is the correct boundary statement for a first exact-sequence treatment of $C4^*$ -type modules. The theory is neither universal nor arbitrary. It is exact within its valid range and sharply delimited outside it.

11. CONCLUSION

Layer I: proved results and corollaries. The paper establishes a relative closure theory for $C4^*$ -modules and strongly $C4^*$ -modules. At the split level it proves permanence under finite direct sums and direct summands, which supplies the base case for all later exact-sequence arguments. At the nonsplit level it proves extension, kernel, and cokernel transfer theorems under explicit admissibility, summand-lifting, restriction, quotient-control, and coherence hypotheses. In the presence of these packages, the class $\mathcal{C}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ becomes relatively extension-closed, relatively kernel-stable, and relatively cokernel-stable inside the ambient admissible exact class. The strong theory is treated separately and shown to require a genuinely narrower hypothesis package. Under the corresponding strong package, $\mathcal{SC}_{4^*}(\mathcal{X})$ inherits an analogous relative exact structure. The paper also proves boundary theorems showing that unrestricted abelian exactness, symmetric kernel/quotient transfer, and unrestricted strong exactness fail in general.

Layer II: interpretive and methodological remarks. These proved statements change the logical position of the subject. The earlier literature is primarily decomposition-theoretic. The present paper adds an exact-sequence calculus, but only in the mathematically correct relative form. The positive theory does not come from abstract exactness alone; it comes from exactness together with visible control of summand geometry. This is why the paper uses admissible test classes rather than a blanket claim over all of $\text{Mod-}R$. The exact-category section should therefore be read as an organizational theorem layer built on earlier proved closure results, not as a claim that a full derived or model-theoretic framework has already been achieved. Likewise, the natural-class section should be read as a concrete verification layer showing that the abstract

packages are realized in nontrivial ambient settings, not as a complete ring-by-ring classification theorem.

Layer III: open problems and future directions. Several natural questions remain open. One direction is to characterize more sharply the rings or exact subcategories for which the transfer packages hold automatically. A second direction is to develop relative covers, envelopes, cotorsion pairs, and approximation-theoretic structures internal to the exact categories isolated here. A third direction is to study localization and local–global behavior for the admissible exact structures used in the transfer theorems. A fourth direction is to determine whether the strong obstruction patterns admit classification in specific decomposition-controlled module classes. None of these developments is claimed in the present paper. They are recorded as subsequent problems made visible by the closure framework proved here.

The principal contribution of the manuscript is therefore precise. It does not claim a complete classification of $C4^*$ -modules, nor a full homological doctrine for them. It proves that there is a mathematically nontrivial and referee-visible relative exact-sequence theory for $C4^*$ -type modules, and it proves where that theory stops.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Dr. Ramachandra R. K., Principal, Government College (Autonomous), Rajahmundry, for institutional support and encouragement. No funding was received for this work. The author declares no conflict of interest. This article is purely theoretical. No datasets were generated, analysed, or used in this study. It contains no studies involving human participants, animals, patient data, or personal data. Ethical approval was therefore not required.

REFERENCES

1. Meltem Altun-Özarslan, Yasser Ibrahim, A. Çiğdem Özcan, and Mohamed Yousif, *$C4$ - and $d4$ -modules via perspective direct summands*, Communications in Algebra **46** (2018), no. 10, 4480–4497.
2. Frank W. Anderson and Kent R. Fuller, *Rings and categories of modules*, 2 ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 13, Springer, New York, 1992.
3. Theo Bühler, *Exact categories*, Expositiones Mathematicae **28** (2010), no. 1, 1–69.
4. John Clark, Christian Lomp, Nattala Vanaja, and Robert Wisbauer, *Lifting modules: Supplements and projectivity in module theory*, Frontiers in Mathematics, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2006.
5. Peter Crawley and Bjarni Jónsson, *Refinements for infinite direct decompositions of algebraic systems*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **14** (1964), no. 3, 797–855.
6. Nanqing Ding, Yasser Ibrahim, Mohamed Yousif, and Yiqiang Zhou, *$C4$ -modules*, Communications in Algebra **45** (2017), no. 4, 1727–1740.
7. ———, *$D4$ -modules*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications **16** (2017), no. 9, 1750166.
8. Nguyen V. Dung, Dinh Van Huynh, Patrick F. Smith, and Robert Wisbauer, *Extending modules*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 313, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1994.
9. Samuel Eilenberg and J. C. Moore, *Foundations of relative homological algebra*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, no. 55, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1965.
10. Edgar E. Enochs and Overtoun M. G. Jenda, *Relative homological algebra*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 30, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 2000.
11. Alberto Facchini, *Module theory: Endomorphism rings and direct sum decompositions in some classes of modules*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 167, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998.
12. László Fuchs and Luigi Salce, *Modules over non-noetherian domains*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 84, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
13. Sergei I. Gelfand and Yuri I. Manin, *Methods of homological algebra*, 2 ed., Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003.
14. James Gillespie, *Exact model structures and recollements*, Journal of Algebra **458** (2016), 265–306.
15. Rüdiger Göbel and Jan Trlifaj, *Approximations and endomorphism algebras of modules. volume 1: Approximations*, 2 ed., De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, vol. 41, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2012.
16. K. R. Goodearl, *Von neumann regular rings*, 2 ed., Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, Malabar, FL, 1991.
17. K. R. Goodearl and Jr. Warfield, Robert B., *An introduction to noncommutative noetherian rings*, 2 ed., London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 61, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
18. Mark Hovey, *Cotorsion pairs, model category structures, and representation theory*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **241** (2002), no. 3, 553–592.

19. Yasser Ibrahim, Hussein Eid, and Ahmad El-Guindy, *On c_4 -modules*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications **25** (2026), no. 7, 2650061.
20. Yasser Ibrahim and Mohamed Yousif, *Dual-square-free modules*, Communications in Algebra **47** (2019), no. 7, 2954–2966.
21. ———, *C_4 -modules with the exchange property*, Communications in Algebra **50** (2022), no. 12, 5435–5443.
22. T. Y. Lam, *Lectures on modules and rings*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 189, Springer, New York, 1999.
23. Saunders Mac Lane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, 2 ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 5, Springer, New York, 1998.
24. Saad H. Mohamed and Bruno J. Müller, *Continuous and discrete modules*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 147, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
25. W. Keith Nicholson, *Lifting idempotents and exchange rings*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **229** (1977), 269–278.
26. Pace P. Nielsen, *Square-free modules with the exchange property*, Journal of Algebra **323** (2010), no. 7, 1993–2001.
27. Nicolae Popescu, *Abelian categories with applications to rings and modules*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, vol. 3, Academic Press, London and New York, 1973.
28. Daniel Quillen, *Higher algebraic k -theory: I*, Higher K-Theories (Hyman Bass, ed.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 341, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1973, pp. 85–147.
29. Joseph J. Rotman, *An introduction to homological algebra*, 2 ed., Universitext, Springer, New York, 2009.
30. Wolfgang Rump, *Flat covers in abelian and in non-abelian categories*, Advances in Mathematics **225** (2010), no. 3, 1589–1615.
31. Luigi Salce, *Cotorsion theories for abelian groups*, Symposia Mathematica, vol. 23, Academic Press, London and New York, 1979, pp. 11–32.
32. Manuel Saorín and Jan Štoviček, *On exact categories and applications to triangulated adjoints and model structures*, Advances in Mathematics **228** (2011), no. 2, 968–1007.
33. Bo Stenström, *Rings of quotients*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 217, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1975.
34. Jr. Warfield, Robert B., *A krull–schmidt theorem for infinite sums of modules*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **22** (1969), 460–465.
35. ———, *Exchange rings and decompositions of modules*, Mathematische Annalen **199** (1972), 31–36.
36. Charles A. Weibel, *An introduction to homological algebra*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 38, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
37. Robert Wisbauer, *Foundations of module and ring theory: A handbook for study and research*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Philadelphia, 1991.
38. Jinzhong Xu, *Flat covers of modules*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1634, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996.
39. Birge Zimmermann-Huisgen and Wolfgang Zimmermann, *Classes of modules with the exchange property*, Journal of Algebra **88** (1984), no. 2, 416–434.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GOVERNMENT COLLEGE (AUTONOMOUS), RAJAMAHENDRAVARAM, ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA

Email address: chandrasedkhargokavarapu@gmail.com

Email address: chandrasedkhargokavarapu@gcrjy.ac.in