

ON COMMUTATIVITY OF PRIME NEAR-RINGS WITH GENERALIZED DERIVATIONS

Dr.G. Gopala Krishnamoorthy, G.Shakila Chitra Selvi, Dr.V.Thiripura Sundari

Advisor, PSNL College of Education, Sattur

Assistant Professor of Mathematics, P.S.N.L. College of Education, Sattur

Assistant Professor of Mathematics, S.R.N.M College, Sattur

Abstract: Let R be a prime near-ring. The commutativity of R satisfying the conditions:

$$(i)D([x, y]) = \pm x^k[x^m, y]x^l$$

$$(ii)D(x \circ y) = \pm x^k(x^m \circ y)x^l$$

where $k \geq 0, l \geq 0, m \geq 1$, are fixed integers is studied. Further, some interesting relations between the prime graph and Zero-divisor graph of R are studied.

1.Introduction

Let R be a right near-ring. R is called zero-symmetric if $x \circ 0 = 0 \forall x \in R$ (Recall that in a right near-ring R , $0 \cdot x = 0$ is true for all $x \in R$). A near ring R is said to be prime if

$$xRy = 0 \text{ for } x, y \in R \text{ implies } x = 0 \text{ (or) } y = 0 \text{ [Here : } xRy = \{xry \mid r \in R\}]$$

An endomorphism d of R is called a derivation if

$$(i)d(x + y) = d(x) + d(y) \text{ and}$$

$$(ii)d(xy) = xd(y) + d(x)y \text{ for all } x, y \in R$$

Implies $x = 0$ (or) $y = 0$ [Here: $xRy = \{xry \mid r \in R\}]$

An endomorphism D of R is called a generalized endomorphism associated with a non-zero derivation d of R , if

$$(i)D(x + y) = D(x) + D(y) \text{ and } (ii)D(xy) = D(x)y + xd(y) \forall x, y \in R$$

Let $Z(R)$ denote the centre of R . For all $x, y \in R$, let $[x, y] = xy - yx$, called the commutator of x and y and $x \circ y = xy + yx$, called the anti-commutator of x and y . In [11] the authors showed that a prime ring R must be commutative if R admits a derivation d such that $d([x, y]) = [x, y]$ or $d([x, y]) = -[x, y]$ for all $x, y \in I$ where I is non-zero ideal of R . In [15] Yilun shang proved that a prime near-ring R which admits a generalized derivation D associated with a non-zero derivation d satisfying either

$$(i)D([x, y]) = x^k[x, y]x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R \text{ (or)}$$

$$(ii)D([x, y]) = -x^k[x, y]x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R$$

Then R is a commutative ring

He also proved that if R is a prime near-ring which admits a generalized derivation D associated with a non-zero derivation d satisfying either

$$(i) D(x \circ y) = x^k(x \circ y)x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R \\ \text{or } (ii) D(x \circ y) = -x^k(x \circ y)x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R$$

then R is a commutative ring.

In this paper we investigate the commutativity of a prime near ring R satisfying the following conditions.

$$(i) D([x, y]) = \pm x^k[x^m, y]x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R \\ (ii) D(x \circ y) = \pm x^k(x^m \circ y)x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R$$

Where $k \geq 0, l \geq 0, m \geq 1$ are fixed integers.

Lemma 1.1 [6]

Let R be a prime near-ring. If R admits a non-zero derivation d for which $d(R) \subset z(R)$, then R is a commutative ring.

2. Main results

Through out this paper R denote a prime near-ring(right). $Z(R)$ denote the centre of R . Let $R^m = \{x^m | x \in R\}$

Theorem 2.1

Let R be a prime near-ring. If there exists integers $k \geq 0, l \geq 0, m \geq 1$ such that R admits a generalized derivation D associated with a non-zero derivation d satisfying either

$$(i) D([x, y]) = x^k[x^m, y]x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R \text{ (or)} \\ (ii) D([x, y]) = -x^k[x^m, y]x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R$$

then R is a commutative ring.

Proof: We first assume that (i) holds

$$(ie) D([x, y]) = x^k[x^m, y]x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

Replace y by yx in (1)

$$D([x, yx]) = x^k[x^m, yx]x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

Since $[x, yx] = [x, y]x \forall x, y \in R$, (2) becomes

$$D([x, y]x) = x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

By definition we have:

$$\begin{aligned} D([x, y]x) &= D([x, y])x + [x, y]d(x) \\ (ie) x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} &= D([x, y])x + [x, y]d(x) \quad \text{(using (3))} \\ x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} &= (x^k[x^m, y]x^l)x + [x, y]d(x) \quad \text{(using (1))} \\ x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} &= x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} + [x, y]d(x) \\ \Rightarrow x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} - x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} &= [x, y]d(x) \\ \Rightarrow [x, y]d(x) &= 0 \dots \dots \dots (4) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing y by zy we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= [x, zy]d(x) = \{z[x, y] + [x, z]y\}d(x) \\ &= z[x, y]d(x) + [x, z]yd(x) \\ &= [x, z]yd(x) \text{ using (4)} \quad \forall x, y, z \in R \dots \dots \dots (5) \end{aligned}$$

This implies: $[x, z]Rd(x) = 0 \quad \forall x, z \in R \dots \dots \dots (6)$

Since R is prime (6) yields that for each $x \in R$

$$d(x) = 0 \quad \text{(or)} [x, z] = 0 \quad \forall z \in R$$

(ie) for each $x \in R, d(x) = 0$ (or) $x \in z(R) \dots \dots \dots (7)$

If $x \in z(R)$. then $xy = yx$ for all $y \in R$

Then $d(xy) = d(yx)$

$$\begin{aligned} d(x)y + xd(y) &= d(y)x + yd(x) \\ d(x)y + xd(y) &= xd(y) + yd(x) \because x \in z(R) \end{aligned}$$

$d(x)y = yd(x)$ for all $y \in R, (x) \in z(R)$

Thus: $x \in z(R) \Rightarrow d(x) \in z(R)$(8)

So, by (7) and(8) we get that

$$d(x) \in z(R), \forall x \in R \dots\dots\dots(9)$$

(ie) $d(R) \subset z(R)$

Then by Lemma 1.1., R is a commutative ring.

For (ii) we assumethat it holds:

$$D([x, y]) = -x^k[x^m, y]x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots\dots\dots(10)$$

Replace y by yx in (10)

$$D([x, yx]) = -x^k[x^m, yx]x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots\dots\dots(11)$$

Since $[x, yx] = [x, y]x \forall x, y \in R$ (11) becomes

$$D([x, y]x) = -x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} \forall x, y \in R \dots\dots\dots(12)$$

By definition, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} D([x, y]x) &= D([x, y])x + [x, y]d(x) \\ -x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} &= -x^k([x^m, y]x^l)x + [x, y]d(x) \quad (\text{using (10)}) \\ -x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} &= -x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} + [x, y]d(x) \\ -x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} + x^k[x^m, y]x^{l+1} &= [x, y]d(x) \\ \Rightarrow [x, y]d(x) &= 0 \quad \forall x, y \in R \dots\dots\dots(13) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing y by zy , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= [x, zy]d(x) = \{z[x, y] + [x, z]y\}d(x) \\ &= z[x, y]d(x) + [x, z]yd(x) \\ &= [x, z]yd(x) \text{ using (13)} \quad \forall x, y, z \in R \dots\dots\dots(14) \end{aligned}$$

This implies $[x, z]Rd(x) = 0$

$$\forall x, z \in R \dots\dots\dots(15)$$

Since R is prime (15) yields that for each $x \in Rd(x) = 0$ (or) $[x, z] = 0 \quad \forall z \in R$

(ie) for each $x \in Rd(x) = 0$ (or) $x \in z(R)$(16)

Now $x \in z(R)$ then $d(x) \in z(R)$(17)

So, by (16) and (17) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x) &\in z(R) \forall x \in R \\ (ie) d(R) &\subset z(R) \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 1.1. R is a commutative ring.

Note: If $m = 1$, we get Theorem 1[15]

Definition 2.2. [9]

The prime graph of a near-ring R denoted by $G(R)$ is a graph with vertices as the set of elements of R and edges as the set of vertex pair $\{x, y\}$ such that $xRy = 0$ or $yRx = 0$. It is easy to check that R is prime if and only if $G(R)$ is a star graph.

Definition 2.3 [9]

The Zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring R is a graph with the set of non-zero zero divisors of R as the vertices and any two vertices x, y are adjacent if and only if $x \neq y$ and $xy = 0$

Corollary 2.4

Let R be a prime near-ring. If the prime graph $G(R)$ is a star and there exist $k, l, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that R admits a generalized derivation d satisfying either (i) (or) (ii) of Theorem 2.1 then the zero divisor graph of R is a sub graph of $G(R)$

Remark 2.5 : The condition R is prime in Theorem 2.1 is necessary even in the case of arbitrary rings as seen in the following example.

Example 2.6.

Let R be a Commutative ring.

Let $R^* = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \mid x, y, z \in R \right\}$. Then R^* is a ring with respect to usual matrix addition and matrix multiplication.

Define $d: R^* \rightarrow R^*$ by

$$d\left(\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ clearly } d \text{ is an on-zero derivation on } R^*, \text{ If } A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $y \neq 0$,

then $AR^*A = 0$, which proves R^* is not Prime. Define $D: R^* \rightarrow R^*$ as $D\left(\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y+z \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

We shall show that D is a generalized derivation on R^* with an associated derivation d on R^* .

Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \in R^*$, $B = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \in R^*$. Then $AB = \begin{pmatrix} xa & xb+yc \\ 0 & zc \end{pmatrix}$ and

$$D(AB) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & xb+yc+zc \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Also, $D(A)B + Ad(B) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y+z \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y+z \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & yc+zc+xb \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Hence $D(AB) = D(A)B + Ad(B)$. Then $D([A, B]) = [A, B]$ for all $A, B \in R^*$. But R^* is a non-commutative ring.

Theorem 2.7

Let R be a prime near ring. If there exist integers $k \geq 0, l \geq 0, m \geq 1$, such that R admits a generalized derivation D associated with a non-zero derivation d satisfying either

$$(i) D(x \circ y) = x^k(x^m \circ y)x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R \text{ (or)}$$

$$(ii) D(x \circ y) = -x^k(x^m \circ y)x^l \text{ for all } x, y \in R,$$

Then R is a commutative ring.

Proof: We first assume that (i) holds.

$$D(x \circ y) = x^k(x^m \circ y)x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (18)$$

Replace y by yx in (18)

$$D(x \circ yx) = x^k(x^m \circ yx)x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (19)$$

Since $(x \circ yx) = (x \circ y)x, \forall x, y \in R$, (19) becomes

$$D(x \circ y)x = x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (20)$$

By definition we have:

$$\begin{aligned} D(x \circ y)x &= D(x \circ y)x + (x \circ y)d(x) \\ (ie) x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} &= D(x \circ y)x + (x \circ y)d(x) \quad (\text{using (20)}) \\ x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} &= x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} + (x \circ y)d(x) \quad \text{using (18)} \\ x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} &= x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} + (x \circ y)d(x) \\ \Rightarrow x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} - x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} &= (x \circ y)d(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow (x \circ y)d(x) = 0 \dots \dots \dots (21)$$

Replacing y by zy , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (x \circ zy) d(x) = \{z(x \circ y) + (x \circ z)y\} d(x) \\ &= z(x \circ y) d(x) + (x \circ z)yd(x) \end{aligned}$$

$$= (x \circ z)yd(x) \text{ using (21)} \quad \forall x, y, z \in R \dots \dots \dots (22)$$

This implies: $(x \circ z)Rd(x) = 0 \quad \forall x, z \in R \dots \dots \dots (23)$

Since R is prime (23) yields that for each $x \in R$ $d(x) = 0$ (or) $(x \circ z) = 0 \quad \forall z \in R$

(ie) for each $x \in d(x) = 0$ (or) $x \in z(R) \dots \dots \dots (24)$

Here $z(R)$ is the centre of R . If $x \in z(R)$ then $xy = yx$, then $d(xy) = d(yx)$,

$$d(x)y + xd(y) = d(y)x + yd(x)$$

$$(ie) d(x)y + xd(y) = xd(y) + yd(x) \quad \because x \in z(R)$$

$$d(x)y = yd(x) \text{ for all } y \in R$$

$$d(x) \in z(R)$$

$$\text{Thus: } x \in z(R) \Rightarrow d(x) \in z(R) \dots \dots \dots (25)$$

So, by (24) and (25) we get that:

$$d(x) \in z(R) \forall x \in R \dots \dots \dots (26)$$

$$(ie) d(R) \subset z(R)$$

Then by Lemma 1.1 R is a commutative ring

For (ii) we assume that it holds.

$$D(x \circ yx) = -x^k(x^m \circ y)x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (27)$$

Replace y by yx in (27)

$$D(x \circ yx) = -x^k(x^m \circ yx)x^l \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (28)$$

Since $(x \circ yx) = (x \circ y)x, \forall x, y \in R$, (28) becomes

$$D((x \circ y)x) = -x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (29)$$

By definition we have:

$$\begin{aligned} D((x \circ y)x) &= D(x \circ y)x + (x \circ y)d(x) \\ -x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} &= -x^k((x^m \circ y)x^l)x + (x \circ y)d(x) \text{ using (27)} \\ -x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} &= -x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} + (x \circ y)d(x) \\ -x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} + x^k(x^m \circ y)x^{l+1} &= (x \circ y)d(x) \\ \Rightarrow (x \circ y)d(x) &= 0 \quad \forall x, y \in R \dots \dots \dots (30) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing y by zy we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (x \circ zy)d(x) = \{z(x \circ y) + (x \circ y)y\}d(x) \\ &= z(x \circ y)d(x) + (x \circ z)yd(x) \\ &= (x \circ z)yd(x) \text{ using (30)} \quad \forall x, y, z \in R \dots \dots \dots (31) \end{aligned}$$

This implies $(x \circ z)Rd(x) = 0 \quad \forall x, z \in R \dots \dots \dots (32)$

Since R is prime (32) yields that for each:

$$\begin{aligned} x \in Rd(x) = 0 \text{ (or)} (x, z) = 0 \quad \forall z \in R \\ \text{(ie for each } x \in Rd(x) = 0 \text{ (or) } x \in z(R) \dots \dots \dots (33) \end{aligned}$$

Now $x \in z(R)$ then $d(x) \in z(R) \dots \dots \dots (34)$

So, by (33) and (34) we get:

$$d(x) \in z(R) \forall x \in R, \text{ (ie) } d(R) \subset z(R)$$

Then by Lemma 1.1. R is a commutative ring.

Remark 2.8 If $m = 1$, we get Theorem 2[15]

Corollary 2.9

Let R be a prime near-ring. If the prime graph $G(R)$ is a star and there exist $k, l, m \in N$ such that N admits a generalized derivation D associated with a non-zero derivation d satisfying either (i) (or) (ii) in Theorem 2.8, then the zero divisor graph of R is sub graph of $G(R)$.

Remark 2.10 The condition R is prime in Theorem 2.7 is necessary even in the case of arbitrary rings as seen in the following example.

Example 2.11.

Let S be a non-commutative ring in which the square of each elements is zero.

Let $R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \mid x, y, z \in S \right\}$. Defined: $R \rightarrow R$ as: $d \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

Then d is a derivation on R. Define $D \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y+z \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Then D is a generalized derivation with association derivation d. As already stated R is not prime. For any $x, y \in S$, we have

$$0 = (x + y)^2 = x^2 + xy + yx + y^2 = xy + yx$$

So, $\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ 0 & w \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & xv + yw + uy + vz \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for all $x, y, z, u, v, w \in S$

Consequently $D(A \circ B) = (A \circ B)$ for all $A, B \in R$. But R is non - commutative ring.

References

- [1] E-Albas, N.Argac, generalized derivations of prime rings, Algebra colloq.11(2004) 399-410
- [2] M.Ashraf, A.Ali, S.Ali, (σ, τ) Derivations on prime near rings, Arch, Math(Br no) 40(2004) 281-286

- [3] M.Ashraf, A.Shakir, on (σ, τ) -derivations of prime near-rings II, Sarajevo J.Math 4(2008) 23-30
- [4] D.Basudeb, Remarks on generalized derivations in prime and semi prime rings, Int. J.Math.Math.SCI 2010, Art ID 646587, 6PP
- [5] K.I.Beidar, Y.Fong, X.K wang, Posner and Herstein theorems for derivations of 3-prime near-rings, comm.Algebra 24(1996) 1581-1589
- [6] H.E.Bell, on derivations in near-ring II, Near-fields and K.Loops(Ham burg,1995) klumwer, Dordrecht, 1997, PP 31-35
- [7] H.E.Bell, G.Mason, on derivations in near-rings, in Near-Rings and Near-Fields (G.Betsch,ed) North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, PP 31-35
- [8] H.E.Bell, G.Mason, on derivations in near-rings and rings, Math J.O Kayama univ.34(1992) 135-144
- [9] S.Bhavanari, S.P.Kuncham, B.S.Kedukodi, Graph of a near ring with respect to an ideal, comm.Algebra 38(2010) 1957-1967
- [10] A.Boua, I.Oukhtite, Generalized derivations and commutativity of prime near – rings, J.Adv.Res.pure math.3(2011) (120-124)
- [11] M.N.Daif, H.E.Bell, Remarks on derivations on semi prime rings, Internat. J.Math, Math.Sci 15(1992)(205-206)
- [12] V.De Filippins, N.Rehman, commutativity and skew-commutativity conditions with generalized derivations, Algebra colloq.17(2010) 841-850
- [13] O.Golbasi, E.Koc, Notes on commutativity and skew-commutativity conditions with generalized derivations, FOC.Sci univ.Ank (ser A1) 58(2009)39-46
- [14] O.Gollbasi, E.Koc, some commutativity theorems of prime rings with generalized (σ, τ) -derivation, commun.korean Math.soc 26 (2011)(445-454)
- [15] Yilun shang, A note on the commutativity of prime Near-rings, Algebra colloquium 22(3)(2015) 301-306.