



### REMARKS ON MULTIPLICATIVE GENERALIZED DERIVATIONS IN PRIME AND SEMIPRIME RINGS

**Moharram A. Khan\*, Muhammad Minkail and Hamisu Musa**

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Faculty of Natural and Applied Sciences,  
Umaru Musa Yarádua University, Katsina- Nigeria.

Article Received on 06/07/2020

Article Revised on 27/07/2020

Article Accepted on 17/08/2020

**\*Corresponding Author**

**Moharram A. Khan**

Department of Mathematics  
and Computer Science,  
Faculty of Natural and  
Applied Sciences, Umaru  
Musa Yarádua University,  
Katsina- Nigeria.

**ABSTRACT**

Let  $R$  be a semiprime ring with center  $Z(R)$  and  $L$  a nonzero left ideal of  $R$ . A map  $F: R \rightarrow R$  (not necessarily additive) is called multiplicative generalized derivation if it satisfies  $F(xy) = F(x)y + xg(y)$  for all  $x, y \in R$ , where  $g: R \rightarrow R$  a derivation. The main aim in this paper is to study the following

situations:  $(P_1) F(xy) - F(x)g(y) \in Z(R)$  and  $(P_2) F(xy) + g(y)F(x) \in Z(R)$  for all  $x, y \in R$  in some appropriate subset of  $R$ .

**KEYWORDS:** Left ideal, multiplicative generalized derivation, semiprime ring.

MSC 2010, Classifications: 16N60, 16W25, 16Y30.

**INTRODUCTION**

Throughout the present paper;  $R$  will denote an associative ring with centre  $Z(R)$ .

For given  $x, y \in R$ , the symbol  $[x, y]$  and  $xoy$  denote the commutator  $xy - yx$  and anticommutator  $xy + yx$ , respectively. Posner<sup>[12]</sup> enumerated two outstanding results on derivation in prime ring, these results stated that: (i) In a 2-torsion-free prime ring, if the iterate of two derivations is a derivation, then one of them must be zero; (ii). A prime ring  $R$  admitting a nonzero centralizing derivation  $d$  must be commutative. Since then, derivation in ring have been generalized in different direction such as Jordan derivation, left derivation,

$(\theta, \varphi)$ -derivation, generalized derivation, generalized Jordan derivation, generalized Jordan  $(\theta, \varphi)$ -derivation, higher derivations, generalized higher derivations and others.

Moreover, generalized derivations got its motivation from Bresar,<sup>[2]</sup> who acknowledged the distance of composition of two derivations. Bresar,<sup>[2]</sup> estimated the distance of the composition of two derivations to the generalized derivations. Over last few decades a lot of works has been done on generalized derivation (see for references [1, 3, 5, 6]). The concept of generalized derivation covers both concept of derivation and that of a left multiplier that is an additive mapping  $f: R \rightarrow R$  satisfying  $f(xy) = f(x)y$  for all  $x, y \in R$ .

Throughout this paper, a ring  $R$  represents an associative ring (not necessarily unity) with  $Z(R)$ , centre of  $R$ . In this sequel, we need the basic definitions as given below.

- An additive mapping  $d: R \rightarrow R$  is a derivation if  $d(xy) = d(x)y + xd(y)$  holds for all  $x, y \in R$ .
- An additive mapping  $F: R \rightarrow R$  is called a generalized derivation of  $R$ , if there exist a derivation  $g: R \rightarrow R$  such that  $F(xy) = F(x)y + xg(y)$  holds for all  $x, y \in R$ .

**Remarks 1.1.** Hvala,<sup>[8]</sup> initiated generalized derivations from the algebraic viewpoint and defined that an additive map  $f$  of a ring  $R$  into itself will be called a generalized derivation if there exist a derivation  $d$  of  $R$  such  $f(xy) = f(x)y + xd(y)$  for all  $x, y \in R$ .

Next, Lee and Shieu<sup>[10]</sup> extended the definition of generalized derivations as follows:

By a generalized derivation we mean an additive mapping  $g: I \rightarrow U$  such that  $g(xy) = g(x)y + xd(y)$  for all  $x, y \in I$ , where  $I$  is a dense right ideal of  $R$  and  $d$  is a derivation from  $I$  into  $U$ .

- A mapping  $D: R \rightarrow R$  (not necessarily additive) which satisfies  $D(xy) = D(x)y + xD(y)$  for all  $x, y \in R$  is called multiplicative derivation of  $R$ .
- A mapping  $F: R \rightarrow R$  is called a multiplicative (generalized)- derivation if  $F(xy) = F(x)y + xg(y)$  is fulfilled for all  $x, y \in R$ , where  $g: R \rightarrow R$  is a derivation.

Multiplicative generalized derivations precisely have been studied by different authors in different directions in the past few years (see for references.<sup>[5,6,8]</sup>). In this line of investigation, Martindale<sup>[11]</sup> posed a well-known problem: "When are multiplicative mappings additive?" This question was motivated by the work of Rickart<sup>[13]</sup> and Johnson.<sup>[9]</sup>

Furthermore, Rickart.<sup>[13]</sup> raised the question of “when a multiplicative isomorphism additive”? In both of these papers, Martindale.<sup>[4]</sup> noted some kind of minimality conditions imposed on the ring  $R$ , generalized the hypothesis of Rickart at the same time omit the minimality conditions and surveyed this result of Rickart in the presence of family of idempotent elements as: Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of a ring  $R$ . The mapping  $f : S \rightarrow R$  is a centralizing (or commuting) map on  $S$  if  $[f(x), x] \in Z(R)$  (or  $[f(x), x] = 0$ )  $\forall x \in S$ . Martindale,<sup>[11]</sup> answered the question of when a multiplicative mapping additive and stated that: Suppose  $R$  is a ring containing a family  $\{e_a \in A\}$  of idempotent that satisfies:

- I)  $xR = 0$  implies  $x = 0$ ;
- II)  $e_a R x = 0$  for each  $a \in A$ , then  $x = 0$  (and hence  $Rx = 0$  implies  $x = 0$ );
- III) For each  $a \in A$ ,  $e_a x e_a R (1 - e_a) = 0$  implies  $e_a x e_a = 0$ .

Then any multiplicative isomorphism  $\emptyset$  of  $R$  onto an arbitrary ring  $S$  is additive.

In his paper,<sup>[4]</sup> Daif introduced the idea of multiplicative derivation and gave the precise definition of the term ‘multiplicative derivation’. Daif and Tamman El-Sayyid<sup>[3]</sup> generalized the definition of multiplicative derivation to multiplicative generalized derivations.

A natural question of “when a multiplicative derivation additive” was answered by Daif,<sup>[4]</sup> was motivated by the work of Martindale<sup>[11]</sup> and introduced the notion of multiplicative derivation as: The mapping  $D: R \rightarrow R$  is said to be a multiplicative derivation if it satisfies  $D(xy) = D(x)y + xD(y)$  for all  $x, y \in R$ . in the case of multiplicative derivations, the mappings assumed not to be an additive mapping. Further, Goldmann and Semrl<sup>[7]</sup> gave the complete description of these mappings.

Daif and Tammam El-sayiad<sup>[3]</sup> extend multiplicative derivations to multiplicative generalized derivations as follows: a mapping  $F$  on  $R$  is said to be a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation if there exists a derivations  $d$  on  $R$  such that  $F(xy) = F(x)y + xd(y)$  for all  $x, y \in R$ .

The concepts of multiplicative generalized derivation cover the concepts of multiplicative derivation and multiplicative generalized derivation.

In this definition, if we take  $d$  to be a mapping that is not necessarily additive and not necessarily derivation then  $F$  is called a multiplicative (generalized)- derivation which was introduced by Dhara and Ali.<sup>[6]</sup>

Recently, Dhara and Ali.<sup>[6]</sup> gave a precise definition of multiplicative generalized derivation as follows: a mapping  $F : R \rightarrow R$  is said to be a multiplicative (generalized)- derivation if there exist a map  $g$  on  $R$  such that  $F(xy) = F(x) + xg(y)$  for all  $x, y \in R$  where  $g$  is any mapping on  $R$  (not necessarily additive).

A multiplicative (generalized)- derivation associated with mapping  $g = 0$  covers the concepts of multiplicative centralizers (not necessarily additive).

The example of multiplicative generalized derivations are multiplicative derivation and multiplicative centralizers (see Dhara and Ali.<sup>[7]</sup> for further reference).

On the other hand, Daif studied this situation of Martindale and proved a similar result by replacing the mapping  $\delta$  with multiplicative derivations.

In 2018, Dhara and Mozumder<sup>[5]</sup> investigated the commutativity of semiprime ring admitting a multiplicative (generalized)- derivation satisfying the following differential properties:

- (i)  $F(xy) + F(x)F(y) \in Z(R)$
- (ii)  $F(xy) - F(x)F(y) \in Z(R)$
- (iii)  $F(xy) + F(y)F(x) \in Z(R)$
- (iv)  $F(xy) - F(y)F(x) \in Z(R)$
- (v)  $F(xy) - g(y)F(x) \in Z(R)$ . for all  $x, y \in Z(R)$

In this line of investigation, it is natural to ask the question of related identities (i) - (v) to establish commutativity of prime and semi prime rings involving multiplicative generalized derivations. Motivated by these works, the aim of this article is to establish commutativity of semiprime rings admitting a multiplicative (generalized)- derivation associated with a nonzero derivation  $g$  satisfying the following identities  $(P_1)$  and  $(P_2)$  for all  $x, y$  in some suitable subset of  $R$ .

### 1. Preliminaries results

We shall make use of the following basic identities frequently in the prove of our results

- (i)  $[xy, z] = x[y, z] + [x, z]y$

(ii)  $[x, yz] = y[x, z] + [x, y]z$  for all  $x, y, z \in R$ .

In order to prove our results, we need the following results.

**Lemma 1.1.** ([5, Lemma 2])

(a) If  $R$  is a semiprime ring, the centre of a nonzero one-sided ideal is contained in the centre of  $R$ ; in particular, any commutative one-sided ideal is contained in the centre of  $R$ .

(b) If  $R$  is a prime ring with a nonzero central ideal, then  $R$  must be commutative.

**Lemma 1.2.** ([4, Theorem 3]) Let  $R$  be a semiprime ring and  $U$  a nonzero left ideal of  $R$ . If  $R$  admits a derivation  $d$  which is nonzero on  $U$  and centralizing on  $U$ , then  $R$  contains a nonzero central ideal.

**Lemma 1.3.** ([6, Lemma 2]) If  $R$  is prime with a nonzero ideal, then  $R$  is commutative.

**Lemma 1.4.** ([3, Theorem 4]) Let  $R$  be a central prime ring and  $I$  be a nonzero left ideal of  $R$ . If  $R$  admits a nonzero derivation  $d$  which is centralizing on  $I$ , then  $R$  is commutative.

**Lemma 1.5.** ([10, Theorem 2 (ii)]) Let  $R$  be a noncommutative prime ring with extended centroid  $C$ ,  $\lambda$  a nonzero left ideal of  $R$  and  $p, q, r, k$  are fixed positive integers. If  $d$  is a derivation of  $R$  such that  $x^p[d(x^q), x^r]^k = 0$  for all  $x \in \lambda$ , then either  $d = \text{ad}(b)$  and  $\lambda b = (0)$  for some  $b \in Q$  or  $\lambda[\lambda, \lambda] = (0)$  and  $d(\lambda) \subseteq \lambda C$ .

**Lemma 1.6.** ([4, Fact-4]) Let  $R$  be a semiprime ring,  $d$  a nonzero derivation of  $R$  such that  $x[[d(x), x], x] = 0$  for all  $x \in R$ . Then  $d$  maps  $R$  into its centre.

**Lemma 1.7.** ([5, Lemma 2.4]) If  $R$  is a prime ring,  $d: R \rightarrow R$  a derivation of  $R$ ,  $I$  a nonzero left ideal of  $R$  and  $0 \neq a \in R$  such that  $[\text{ad}(x), x] = 0$  for all  $x \in I$ , then one of the following holds: (1)  $a \in Z(R)$ ; (2)  $Ia = (0)$ ; (3)  $\text{Id}(I) = (0)$ .

## 2. Main results

We are now in a position to prove our main theorems.

**Theorem 2.1** Let  $R$  be a semi prime ring with centre  $Z(R)$  and  $A$  a nonzero left ideal of  $R$ . Let  $F: R \rightarrow R$  be a multiplicative (generalized)- derivation associated with the derivation  $\delta: R \rightarrow R$ . If  $F(xy) - F(x)\delta(y) \in Z(R)$  for all  $x, y \in A$ , then  $A[\delta(x), x] = (0)$ . For all  $x \in A$ . In particular, when  $A = R$ , then either  $\delta = 0$  or  $R$  contains a nonzero central ideal.

**Proof.** By hypothesis, we have

$$F(xy) - F(x)\delta(y) \in Z(R). \quad \forall x, y \in A \quad (2.1)$$

Replacing  $y$  with  $yz$  in (2.1), we obtain.

$$F(xyz) - F(x)\delta(yz) \in Z(R). \quad y, z \in A. \quad (2.2)$$

Or,

$$F(xyz) - F(x)[\delta(y)z + y\delta(z)] \in Z(R) \quad (2.3)$$

This gives

$$F(xyz) - F(x)\delta(y)z - F(x)y\delta(z) \in Z(R). \quad (2.4)$$

This can be re-written as

$$F(xyz) - F(xy)z + [F(xy) - F(x)\delta(y)]z - F(x)y\delta(z) \in Z(R) \quad (2.5)$$

$$[F(xyz), z] - [F(xy), z]z + [F(xy) - F(x)\delta(y), z]z - F(x)y\delta(z) = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Since  $F(xy) - F(x)\delta(y) \in Z(R)$ , then the above equation reduces to

$$[F(xyz), z] - [F(xy), z]z - F(x)y\delta(z) = 0. \quad \forall x, y \in A \quad (2.7)$$

Replacing  $x = xz$  in (2.7), we have

$$[F(xzyz), z] - [F(xzy), z]z - [F(xz)y\delta(z), z] = 0.. \quad (2.8)$$

$$[F(xzyz), z] - [F(xzy), z]z - [F(x)z + x\delta(z)]y\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Putting  $y = zy$  in (2.9) we have

$$[F(xzyz), z] - [F(xzy), z]z - [F(x)zy\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Subtracting (2.9) from (2.10) we have

$$[F(xzyz), z] - [F(xzy), z]z - [F(x)z + x\delta(z)]y\delta(z), z] - [F(xzyz), z] - [F(xzy), z]z - [F(x)zy\delta(z), z] = 0 \quad (2.11)$$

This reduces to

$$[x\delta(z)y\delta(z), z] = 0.. \quad \forall x, y \in A \quad (2.12)$$

Putting  $x = \delta(z)x$  in (2.12) we have

$$[\delta(z)x\delta(z)y\delta(z), z] = 0 \quad (2.13)$$

$$\delta(z)[x\delta(z)y\delta(z), z] + [\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)y\delta(z) \quad (2.14)$$

By application (2.12), (2.14) reduces to

$$[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)y\delta(z) = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

Right multiplication of (2.15) by  $u$  for some  $u \in A$  we have

$$u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)y\delta(z) = 0 \quad (2.16)$$

Replacing  $y = yt$  for some  $t \in A$ , we obtain

$$u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)yt\delta(z) = 0 \quad (2.17)$$

Replacing  $t = tz$  in (2.17), gives

$$u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)ytz\delta(z) = 0 \quad (2.18)$$

Right multiplication of (2.17) by  $z$  we have

$$u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)yt\delta(z)z = 0 \quad (2.19)$$

Subtracting (2.18) from (2.19) we have

$$u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)yt\delta(z)z - u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)ytz\delta(z) = 0.$$

This yields

$$u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)yt[\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad (2.20)$$

Replacing  $x = xz$  in (2.20), we get

$$u[\delta(z), z]xz\delta(z)yt[\delta(z), z] = 0 \quad (2.21)$$

Replacing  $y = zy$  in (2.21), we obtain

$$u[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z)zyt[\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

Subtracting (2.21) from (2.22), we get

$$u[\delta(z), z]x[\delta(z), z]yt[\delta(z), z] = 0 \quad (2.23)$$

Putting  $v = yt$ , we get

$$u[\delta(z), z]x[\delta(z), z]v[\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad \forall u, x, z, v \in A \quad (2.24)$$

$$\Rightarrow A[\delta(z), z]A[\delta(z), z]A[\delta(z), z] = 0, \text{ this implies } 0 = (A[\delta(z), z])^3$$

since  $R$  is semiprime, it contains no nonzero nilpotent right ideal, implying  $(A[\delta(z), z])=0$ .

For all  $z \in A$ . In particular when  $A = R$ , then  $[\delta(x), x] = 0 \quad \forall x \in R$ .

**Theorem 2.2:** Let  $R$  be a semi prime ring with centre  $Z(R)$  and  $A$  a nonzero left ideal of  $R$ .

let  $F : R \rightarrow R$  be a multiplicative (generalized)- derivation associated with derivation  $\delta : R \rightarrow R$ . If

$$F(xy) + \delta(y)F(x) \in Z(R) \quad \forall x, y \in A, \text{ then } A[\delta(x), x] = (0).$$

For all  $x \in A$ , in particular, when  $A = R$ , then either  $\delta = 0$  or  $R$  contains a nonzero central ideal.

**Proof.**

$$\text{Given } F(xy) + \delta(y)F(x) \in Z(R). \quad \forall x, y \in A \quad (2.25)$$

Replacing  $x$  with  $xz$  where  $z \in A$ , we have

$$F(xzy) + \delta(y)F(xz) \in Z(R) \quad \forall x, y, z \in A. \quad (2.26)$$

This implies that

$$F(xzy) + \delta(y)[F(x)z + x\delta(z)] \in Z(R). \quad (2.27)$$

Or

$$F(xzy) + \delta(y)F(x)z + \delta(y)x\delta(z) \in Z(R). \quad \forall x, y, z \in A \quad (2.28)$$

One can write (2.28), as

$$F(xzy) - F(xy)z + [F(xy) + \delta(y)F(x)]z + \delta(y)x\delta(z) \in Z(R) \quad (2.29)$$

Commuting both sides with  $z$  we have

$$[F(xzy) - F(xy)z + [F(xy) + \delta(y)F(x)]z + \delta(y)x\delta(z), z] = 0 \quad (2.30)$$

By the given condition, (2.30), becomes

$$[F(xzy) - F(xy)z + \delta(y)x\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad \forall x, y, z \in A \quad (2.31)$$

Replacing  $y$  by  $z$ , we get

$$[F(xz^2) - F(xz)z + \delta(z)x\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad \forall x, z \in A \quad (2.32)$$

Or

$$[F(x)z^2 + x\delta(z^2) - [(F(x)z + x\delta(z))z + \delta(z)x\delta(z)], z] = 0 \quad (2.33)$$

We have that

$$[xz\delta(z) + \delta(z)x\delta(z), z] = 0 \quad (3.34)$$

Replacing  $x$  by  $zx$  in (4.34), we have

$$[zxz\delta(z) + \delta(z)zx\delta(z), z] = 0. \quad (3.35)$$

Left multiplication of (4.34) by  $z$  and then, subtracting from (4.35), we obtain

$$[[\delta(z), z]x\delta(z), z] = 0 \quad (3.36)$$

By application of (Dhara and Mozumder [5], Theorem 3.6), we find that

$$[\delta(z), z]^2 x[\delta(z), z]^2 u[\delta(z), z]^2 = 0 \text{ for all } x, u, z \in A.$$

This implies that

$$(A[\delta(z), z]^2)^3 = (0) \text{ for all } z \in A.$$

Since  $R$  is semiprime, we conclude that

$$A[\delta(z), z]^2 = (0) \text{ for all } z \in A.$$

In particular, when  $A = R$ , then

$$A[\delta(z), z]^2 = (0) \text{ for all } x \in R, \text{ either } \delta = 0 \text{ or } R \text{ contains a nonzero central ideal.}$$

### 3. Counter example

In this section, we construct an example of a derivation and multiplicative generalized derivation that illustrate our theorems.



$$\text{Let } R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ \beta & \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid a, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}, \text{ where } \mathbb{Z} \text{ is the set of all integers.}$$

Since  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} R \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = (0)$ , so  $R$  is not prime ring. Define the mapping  $d$  and  $F: R \rightarrow R$

$$\text{As follows: } d \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ \beta & \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \beta & \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } F \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ \beta & \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -a & 0 & 0 \\ \beta & \gamma & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \text{ It suffices to verify that}$$

$d$  and  $F$  are derivation and multiplicative generalized derivation in  $R$  such that

$$F(xy) = F(x)y + xd(y) \text{ Holds for all } x, y \in R.$$

## REFERENCES

1. E. Albas, Generalized derivations on ideals of prime rings, Miskolc Mathematical Notes, 2003; 14: 3-9.
2. M. Braser, On the distance of composition of two derivations to the generalized derivations, Glasgow Math: J, 1991; 33: 89-93.
3. M. N. Daif and M. S. Tammam El-Sayyid, Multiplicative generalized derivations which are additive, East-West J. Math, 1997; 9: 31-37.
4. M. N. Daif, When is a multiplicative derivation additive, internet. J. Math. & Math. Sci, 1991; 14: 615-618.
5. B. Dhara and M. R. Mozumder, Some Identities Involving Multiplicative Generalized Derivations in Prime and Semiprime Rings, Bol. Soc. Paran. Mat, 2018; 36(1): 25-36.
6. B. Dhara and S. Ali, On  $n$ -centralizing generalized derivations in semiprime rings with application to  $C^*$ -algebra, J. Algebra and its Applications, 2012; 11: 112-131.
7. H. Goldman and P. Šemrl, Multiplicative derivations on  $C(X)$ , Monatsh. fur Math, 1996; 121: 189-197. (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf01298949>).
8. B. Hvala, Generalized derivations in rings, Comm. Algebra, 1998; 26: 1147-1166. (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00927879808826190>).
9. R. E. Johnson, The extended centralizer of a ring over a module, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc, 1951; 2: 891-895.

10. T. K. Lee and W. K. Shiue, A result on derivations with Engel conditions in prime rings, Southeast Asian Bull. Math, 1999; 23: 437-446.
11. W. S. Martindale III, When are multiplicative mappings additive, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc, 1969; 21: 695-698.
12. E. Posner, Derivations in prime rings, proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 1957; 8: 1093-1100.
13. C. E. Rickart, One-to-one mappings of rings and lattices, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc, 1948; 54: 758-764.