Miskolc Mathematical Notes
Vol. 16 (2015), No 1, pp. 17-24

HU e-ISSN 1787-2413
DOI: 10.18514/MMN.2015.1297

On strong commutativity preserving like maps in rings with involution

Shakir Ali, Nadeem Dar, and Abdul Nadim Khan

Miskolc Mathematical Notes
Vol. 16 (2015), No. 1, pp. 17–24
HU e-ISSN 1787-2413

ON STRONG COMMUTATIVITY PRESERVING LIKE MAPS IN RINGS WITH INVOLUTION

SHAKIR ALI, NADEEM AHMAD DAR, AND ABDUL NADIM KHAN

Received 25 June, 2014

Abstract. The main purpose of this paper is to prove the following result: Let R be a prime ring with involution of the second kind and with $char(R) \neq 2$. If R admits a nonzero derivation $d : R \to R$ such that $[d(x), d(x^*)] = [x, x^*]$ for all $x \in R$, then R is commutative. We also provide an example which shows that the above result does not holds in case the involution is of the first kind. Moreover, a related result has also been obtained.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 16N60; 16W10; 16W25.

Keywords: prime ring, involution, derivation, strong commutativity preserving

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this article, R will represent an associative ring with centre $Z(R)$. We denote $[x, y] = xy - yx$, the commutator of x and y and $x \circ y = xy + yx$, the anti-commutator of x and y. However, given two subsets A and B of R, $[A, B]$ will denote the additive subgroup of R generated by all elements of the form $[x, y]$ where $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ and $A \circ B$ is defined similarly. Further, $\overline{A}$ will be the subring of R generated by A. A ring R is said to be 2-torsion free if $2a = 0$ (where $a \in R$) implies $a = 0$. A ring R is called a prime ring if $aRb = (0)$ (where $a, b \in R$) implies $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, and is called a semiprime ring in case $aRa = (0)$ implies $a = 0$. An additive map $x \mapsto x^*$ of R into itself is called an involution if (i) $(xy)^* = y^*x^*$ and (ii) $(x^*)^* = x$ hold for all $x, y \in R$. An element x in a ring with involution $*$ is said to be hermitian if $x^* = x$ and skew-hermitian if $x^* = -x$. The sets of all hermitian and skew-hermitian elements of R will be denoted by $H(R)$ and $S(R)$, respectively. A ring equipped with an involution is known as ring with involution or $*$-ring. The involution is said to be of the first kind if $Z(R) \subseteq H(R)$, otherwise it is said to be of the second kind. In the later case $S(R) \cap Z(R) \neq (0)$. If R is 2-torsion free then every $x \in R$ can be uniquely represented in the form $2x = h + k$, where $h \in H(R)$ and $k \in S(R)$. Note that in this case x is normal i.e., $xx^* = x^*x$, if and only if h and k commute. If all elements in R are normal, then R is called a normal ring. An example is the ring of quaternions. A description of such rings can be found in [13], where further references can be found.

An additive mapping $d : R \to R$ is said to be a derivation of R if $d(xy) = d(x)y + xd(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$. A derivation d is said to be inner if there exists $a \in R$ such that $d(x) = ax - xa$ for all $x \in R$. Over the last 30 years, several authors have investigated the relationship between the commutativity of the ring R and certain special types of maps on R. The first result in this direction is due to Divinsky[12], who proved that a simple artinian ring is commutative if it has a commuting non-trivial automorphim. Two years later, Posner [21] proved that the existence of a nonzero centralizing derivation on a prime ring forces the ring to be commutative. Over the last few decades, several authors have subsequently refined and extended these results in various directions (viz., [3, 5, 6], where further references can be found).

We say that a map $f : R \to R$ preserves commutativity if $[f(x), f(y)] = 0$ whenever $[x, y] = 0$ for all $x, y \in R$. The study of commutativity preserving mappings has been an active research area in matrix theory, operator theory and ring theory (see [8, 10] for references). Following [7], let S be a subset of R, a map $f : R \to R$ is said to be strong commutativity preserving (SCP) on S if $[f(x), f(y)] = [x, y]$ for all $x, y \in S$. In [4], Bell and Daif investigated the commutativity in rings admitting a derivation which is SCP on a nonzero right ideal. Precisely, they proved that if a semiprime ring R admits a derivation d satisfying $[d(x), d(y)] = [x, y]$ for all x, y in a right ideal I of R, then $I \subseteq Z(R)$. In particular, R is commutative if $I = R$. Later, Deng and Ashraf [11] proved that if there exist a derivation d of a semiprime ring R and a map $f : I \to R$ defined on a nonzero ideal I of R such that $[f(x), d(y)] = [x, y]$ for all $x, y \in I$, then R contains a nonzero central ideal. In particular, they showed that R is commutative if $I = R$. Further, Ali and Huang [2], showed that if R is a 2-torsion free semiprime ring and d is a derivation of R satisfying $[d(x), d(y)] + [x, y] = 0$ for all x, y in a nonzero ideal I of R, then R contains a nonzero central ideal. Many related generalizations of these results can be found in the literature (see for instance [9, 15–20, 22, 23]).

The main purpose of the present paper is to initiate the study of a more general concept than SCP mappings. More precisely, we consider an additive mapping $f : R \to R$ satisfying $[f(x), f(x^*)] = [x, x^*]$ for all $x \in R$. In fact, we investigate the commutativity of a prime ring with involution, when the mapping f is assumed to be a derivation of R. Moreover, a related result is obtained by replacing the commutator by anti-commutator.

2. Results

We begin with the following lemma, which is essentially proved in [1, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 1. *Let R be a prime ring with involution $*$ such that $char(R) \neq 2$. If $S(R) \cap Z(R) \neq (0)$ and R is normal, then R is commutative.*

Theorem 1. *Let R be a prime ring with involution $*$ of the second kind and with $char(R) \neq 2$. Let d be a nonzero derivation of R such that $[d(x), d(x^*)] = [x, x^*]$ for all $x \in R$. Then R is commutative.*

Proof. By the assumption, we have

$$[d(x), d(x^*)] = [x, x^*] \tag{2.1}$$

for all $x \in R$. A lineralization of (2.1) yields that

$$[d(x), d(y^*)] + [d(y), d(x^*)] = [x, y^*] + [y, x^*] \tag{2.2}$$

for all $x, y \in R$. Replacing y by xx^* in (2.2) and making use of (2.1), we arrive at

$$d(x)[d(x), x^*] + [d(x), x]d(x^*) + d(x)[x^*, d(x^*)] + [x, d(x^*)]d(x^*) = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

for all $x \in R$. Replacing x by $x + h^{'}$, where $h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$, we obtain

$$d(h^{'})[d(x), x^*] + [d(x), x]d(h^{'}) + d(h^{'})[x^*, d(x^*)] + [x, d(x^*)]d(h^{'}) = 0.$$

This can be further written as

$$d(h^{'})([d(x), x^*] + [d(x), x] + [x^*, d(x^*)] + [x, d(x^*)]) = 0$$

for all $h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$ and $x \in R$. Since the centre of a prime ring is free from zero divisors we get either $d(h^{'}) = 0$ for all $h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$ or $[d(x), x^*] + [d(x), x] + [x^*, d(x^*)] + [x, d(x^*)] = 0$ for all $x \in R$. Suppose

$$d(h^{'}) = 0 \text{ for all } h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R). \tag{2.4}$$

Replacing $h^{'}$ by $(k^{'})^2$ in (2.4), where $k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R)$, we get

$$0 = d(h^{'}) = d((k^{'})^2) = d(k^{'})k^{'} + k^{'}d(k^{'}) = 2d(k^{'})k^{'}.$$

Since $char(R) \neq 2$, we arrive at

$$d(k^{'})k^{'} = 0 \text{ for all } k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R).$$

For each $k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R)$, the last expression yields that either $d(k^{'}) = 0$ or $k^{'} = 0$. Since $k^{'} = 0$ implies $d(k^{'}) = 0$, we may write

$$d(k^{'}) = 0 \text{ for all } k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R). \tag{2.5}$$

Let $x \in Z(R)$. Since $char(R) \neq 2$, every $x \in Z(R)$ can be represented as $2x = h + k$, where $h \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$ and $k \in S(R) \cap Z(R)$. This implies that $2d(x) = d(2x) = d(h + k) = d(h) + d(k) = 0$. Since $char(R) \neq 2$, we get

$$d(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in Z(R). \tag{2.6}$$

Replacing y by $k^{'}y$ in (2.2), where $k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R)$ and using (2.6), we arrive at

$$k^{'}(-[d(x), d(y^*)] + [d(y), d(x^*)] + [x, y^*] - [y, x^*]) = 0$$

for all $k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R)$ and $x, y \in R$. Using the primeness of R and the fact that $S(R) \cap Z(R) \neq (0)$, we get

$$-[d(x), d(y^*)] + [d(y), d(x^*)] = -[x, y^*] + [y, x^*] \tag{2.7}$$

for all $x, y \in R$. On comparing (2.2) and (2.7), we obtain $2[d(x), d(y^*)] = 2[x, y^*]$ for all $x, y \in R$. Replacing y by y^* and using the fact that $char(R) \neq 2$, we conclude that $[d(x), d(y)] = [x, y]$ for all $x, y \in R$. Therefore in view of [4, Theorem 1], R is commutative. Now we consider the case

$$[d(x), x^*] + [d(x), x] + [x^*, d(x^*)] + [x, d(x^*)] = 0$$

for all $x \in R$. Replacing x by $h + k$, where $h \in H(R)$ and $k \in S(R)$, we obtain $4[d(k), h)] = 0$. Since $char(R) \neq 2$, we are force to conclude that

$$[d(k), h] = 0 \text{ for all } h \in H(R) \; and \; k \in S(R). \tag{2.8}$$

Replacing h by $k_0 k^{'}$, where $k_0 \in S(R)$ and $k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R)$, we arrive at $([d(k), k_0])k^{'} = 0$. Since R is prime and $S(R) \cap Z(R) \neq (0)$, we get

$$[d(k), k_0] = 0 \; for \; all \; k, k_0 \in S(R). \tag{2.9}$$

Now since $char(R) \neq 2$, every $x \in R$ can be represented as $2x = h + k$, where $h \in H(R), k \in S(R)$, so in view of equations (2.8) and (2.9), we are force to conclude that

$$[d(k), x] = 0 \; for \; all \; k \in S(R) \; and \; x \in R. \tag{2.10}$$

for all $k \in S(R)$ and $x \in R$. That is, $d(k) \in Z(R)$ for all $k \in S(R)$. First we assume that $d(S(R)) = (0)$. Then, we have $d(x - x^*) = 0$ for all $x \in R$. That is, $d(x) = d(x^*)$ for all $x \in R$. Thus, we have $0 = [d(x), d(x^*)] = [x, x^*]$ for all $x \in R$. Hence R is normal and we are done by Lemma 1. Now suppose that $d(S(R)) \neq (0)$. For $k_o \in S(R)$ with $d(k_o) \neq 0$ and $k \in [S(R), S(R)]$, we have $d(k_o k k_o) \in Z(R)$. The last expression can be written as $d(k_o) k k_o + k_o k d(k_o) \in Z(R)$, since $d([S(R), S(R)]) = (0)$. Thus $d(k_o)(k_o k + k k_o) \in Z(R)$ and hence $k_o k + k k_o \in Z(R)$ for all $k \in [S(R), S(R)]$. This implies that $d(k_o k + k k_o) \in Z(R)$ and hence $2d(k_o)k \in Z(R)$. Since $char(R) \neq 2$ and R is prime, the above relation yields that $k \in Z(R)$. That is, $[S(R), S(R)] \subseteq Z(R)$. Suppose $[S(R), S(R)] \neq (0)$ and $k, k_o \in S(R)$ such that $[k, k_o] \neq 0$. Since $k k_o k \in S(R)$, we have $[k, k k_o k] = k[k, k_o]k = k^2[k, k_o] \in Z(R)$. This implies that $k^2 \in Z(R)$ and hence $k \in Z(R)$ for all $k \in S(R)$ as proved earlier. Therefore, R is commutative in view of Lemma 1. Now suppose $[S(R), S(R)] = (0)$. Since $\overline{S(R)^2}$ is both a Lie ideal and a commutative subring of R, by [13, Theorem 2.1.2], $k^2 \in Z(R)$ for all $k \in S(R)$ and hence $k \in Z(R)$ for all $k \in S(R)$. Thus, R is normal and hence R is commutative by Lemma 1. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

If we replace commutator by anti-commutator in Theorem 1, the corresponding result also holds.

Theorem 2. *Let R be a prime ring with involution $*$ of the second kind and with $char(R) \neq 2$. Let d be a nonzero derivation of R such that $d(x) \circ d(x^*) = x \circ x^*$ for all $x \in R$. Then R is commutative.*

Proof. By the given hypothesis, we have $d(x) \circ d(x^*) = x \circ x^*$ for all $x \in R$. This can be further written as

$$d(x)d(x^*) + d(x^*)d(x) = xx^* + x^*x \tag{2.11}$$

for all $x \in R$. A lineralization of (2.11) yields that

$$d(x)d(y^*) + d(y)d(x^*) + d(x^*)d(y) + d(y^*)d(x) = xy^* + yx^* + x^*y + y^*x \tag{2.12}$$

for all $x, y \in R$. Replacing y by $h^{'}x$, ($h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$) in (2.12) and using (2.11), we get

$$d(h^{'})d(x)x^* + d(h^{'})xd(x^*) + d(h^{'})d(x^*)x + d(h^{'})x^*d(x) = 0.$$

That is, $d(h^{'})d(x \circ x^*) = 0$ for all $h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$ and $x \in R$. Since the centre of a prime ring is free from zero divisors, we have either $d(h^{'}) = 0$ for all $h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$ or $d(x \circ x^*) = 0$ for all $x \in R$. Suppose $d(h^{'}) = 0$ for all $h^{'} \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$. This further implies that $d(x) = 0$ for all $x \in Z(R)$. Replacing y by $k^{'}y$, ($k^{'} \in S(R) \cap Z(R)$) in (2.12) and using the fact $d(x) = 0$ for all $x \in Z(R)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} k^{'}(-d(x)d(y^*) + d(y)d(x^*) + d(x^*)d(y) - d(y^*)d(x)) = \\ = k^{'}(-xy^* + yx^* + x^*y - y^*x). \end{aligned}$$

Again using the primeness of R and since $S(R) \cap Z(R) \neq (0)$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} -d(x)d(y^*) + d(y)d(x^*) + d(x^*)d(y) - d(y^*)d(x) \\ = -xy^* + yx^* + x^*y - y^*x \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

for all $x, y \in R$. Comparing (2.12) and (2), we get $2(d(x)d(y^*) + d(y^*)d(x)) = 2(xy^* + y^*x)$ for all $x, y \in R$. Since $char(R) \neq 2$ and replace y by y^* to get $d(x) \circ d(y) = x \circ y$ for all $x, y \in R$. Hence, R is commutative in view of [3, Theorem 4.4]. On the other hand, suppose $d(x \circ x^*) = 0$ for all $x \in R$. The above equation can be further written as

$$d(x)x^* + xd(x^*) + d(x^*)x + x^*d(x) = 0 \tag{2.14}$$

for all $x \in R$. Replacing x by $h \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$ in (2.14), and using the fact that $char(R) \neq 2$, we obtain

$$d(h)h = 0 \text{ for all } h \in H(R) \cap Z(R).$$

Now since the centre of a prime ring is free from zero divisors, we get for each $h \in H(R) \cap Z(R)$ either $d(h) = 0$ or $h = 0$. Since $h = 0$ implies $d(h) = 0$, we may write $d(h)=0$ for all $h\in H(R)\cap Z(R)$ and hence $d(x)=0$ for all $x\in Z(R)$. Linearizing (2.14), we obtain

$$d(x)y^*+d(y)x^*+xd(y^*)+yd(x^*)+d(x^*)y+d(y^*)x+x^*d(y)+y^*d(x)=0 \tag{2.15}$$

for all $x,y\in R$. Replacing y by $y_o\in Z(R)$ in (2.15) and using the fact that $d(x)=0$ for all $x\in Z(R)$, we get

$$d(x)y_o^*+y_od(x^*)+d(x^*)y_o+y_o^*d(x)=0 \tag{2.16}$$

for all $y_o\in Z(R)$ and $x\in R$. In particular, taking $y_o=h_o\in H(R)\cap Z(R)$ in (2.16), we get $2(d(x)h_o+d(x^*)h_o)=0$. Since $char(R)\neq 2$, we obtain $d(x)h_o+d(x^*)h_o=0$. This can be further written as

$$d(x+x^*)h_o=0 \tag{2.17}$$

for all $h_o\in H(R)\cap Z(R)$ and $x\in R$. Using the primeness of R, we get either $d(x+x^*)=0$ or $H(R)\cap Z(R)=(0)$. But $H(R)\cap Z(R)=(0)$ implies that $S(R)\cap Z(R)=(0)$, which gives a contradiction since we have assumed $S(R)\cap Z(R)\neq(0)$. Therefore, we are left with the case $d(x+x^*)=0$ for all $x\in R$. Replacing x by $h+k$ in the above equation, we get $2d(h)=0$. This implies that $d(h)=0$ for all $h\in H(R)$. Further $d(x+x^*)=0$ implies that $d(x)=-d(x^*)$ for all $x\in R$. Replacing x by xh, where $h\in H(R)$ in the last expression we get $d(x)h=-hd(x^*)$, since $d(h)=0$. This further implies that $d(x)h=hd(x)$ for all $x\in R$. Therefore in view of the theorem of [14], we conclude that $h\in Z(R)$ for all $h\in H(R)$. Hence R is commutative in view of Lemma 1. Thereby completing the proof of the theorem. □

At the end, let us write an example which shows that the restriction of second kind involution in Theorem 1 is not superfluous.

Example 1. Let $R=\left\{\begin{pmatrix} a & b\\ c & d\end{pmatrix}\,\middle|\, a,b,c,d\in Z\right\}$. Of course R with matrix addition and matrix multiplication is a prime ring. Define mappings $d:R\longrightarrow R$, and $*:R\longrightarrow R$ such that $d\begin{pmatrix} a & b\\ c & d\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -b\\ c & 0\end{pmatrix}$, $\begin{pmatrix} a & b\\ c & d\end{pmatrix}^*=\begin{pmatrix} d & -b\\ -c & a\end{pmatrix}$. Obviously, $Z(R)=\left\{\begin{pmatrix} a & 0\\ 0 & a\end{pmatrix}\,\middle|\, a\in Z\right\}$. Then $x^*=x$ for all $x\in Z(R)$, and hence $Z(R)\subseteq H(R)$, which shows that the involution $*$ is of the first kind. Moreover, d is nonzero and the following condition $[d(x),d(x^*)]=[x,x^*]$ for all $x\in R$, is satisfied. However, R is not commutative. Hence, in Theorem 1, the hypothesis of second kind involution is crucial.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to the learned referee's for carefully reading the manuscript. The valuable suggestions have simplified and clarified the paper greatly.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Ali and N. A. Dar, "On $*$-centralizing mappings in rings with involution," *Georgian Math. J.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 25–28, 2014.

[2] S. Ali and S. Huang, "On derivations in semiprime rings," *Algebr. Represent. Theor.*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1023–1033, 2012.

[3] M. Ashraf and N. Rehman, "On commutativity of rings with derivations," *Results Math.*, vol. 42, no. 1-2, pp. 3–8, 2002.

[4] H. E. Bell and M. N. Daif, "On commutativity and strong commutativity preserving maps," *Canad. Math. Bull.*, vol. 37, pp. 443–447, 1994.

[5] H. E. Bell and M. N. Daif, "On derivations and commutativity in prime rings," *Acta Math. Hungar.*, vol. 66, pp. 337–343, 1995.

[6] H. E. Bell and W. S. Martindale III, "Centralizing mappings of semiprime rings," *Canad. Math. Bull.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 92–101, 1987.

[7] H. E. Bell and G. Mason, "On derivations in near rings and rings," *Math. J. Okayama Univ.*, vol. 34, pp. 135–144, 1992.

[8] M. Brešar, "Commuting traces of biadditive mappings, commutativity preserving mappings and Lie mappings," *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 335, no. 2, pp. 525–546, 1993.

[9] M. Brešar and C. R. Miers, "Strong commutativity preserving mappings of semiprime rings," *Canad. Math. Bull.*, vol. 37, pp. 457–460, 1994.

[10] P. Šemrl, "Commutativity preserving maps," *Linear Algebra Appl.*, vol. 429, pp. 1051–1070, 2008.

[11] Q. Deng and M. Ashraf, "On strong commutativity preserving maps," *Results Math.*, vol. 30, pp. 259–263, 1996.

[12] N. Divinsky, "On commuting automorphisms of rings," *Trans. Roy. Soc. Canada. Sect. III.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 19–22, 1995.

[13] I. N. Herstein, *Derivations cocentralizing Lie ideals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

[14] I. N. Herstein, "A note on derivations II," *Canad. Math. Bull.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 509–511, 1979.

[15] T. K. Lee and T. L. Wong, "Nonadditive strong commutativity preserving maps," *Comm. Algebra*, vol. 40, pp. 2213–2218, 2012.

[16] P. K. Liau and C. K. Liu, "Strong commutativity preserving generalized derivations on Lie ideals," *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, vol. 59, pp. 905–915, 2011.

[17] J. S. Lin and C. K. Liu, "Strong commutativity preserving maps on Lie ideals," *Linear Algebra Appl.*, vol. 428, pp. 1601–1609, 2008.

[18] J. S. Lin and C. K. Liu, "Strong commutativity preserving maps in prime rings with involution," *Linear Algebra Appl.*, vol. 432, pp. 14–23, 2010.

[19] C. K. Liu, "Strong commutativity preserving generalized derivations on right ideals," *Monatsh. Math.*, vol. 166, pp. 453–465, 2012.

[20] J. Ma, X. W. Xu, and F. W. Niu, "Strong commutativity preserving generalized derivations on semiprime rings," *Acta Math. Sin.(Engl. Ser.)*, vol. 24, pp. 1835–1842, 2008.

[21] E. C. Posner, "Derivations in prime rings," *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 8, pp. 1093–1100, 1957.

[22] X. Qi and J. Hou, "Strong commutativity presrving maps on triangular rings," *Oper. Matrices*, vol. 6, pp. 147–158, 2012.

[23] M. S. Samman, "On strong commutativity-preserving maps," *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, vol. 6, pp. 917–923, 2005.

Authors' addresses

Shakir Ali
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Rabigh, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah-21589, Saudi Arabia, KSA
E-mail address: shakir.ali.mm@amu.ac.in

Nadeem Ahmad Dar
Department of Mathematics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002, INDIA
E-mail address: ndmdarlajurah@gmail.com

Abdul Nadim Khan
Department of Mathematics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002, INDIA
E-mail address: abdulnadimkhan@gmail.com