

Characterization of Lie multiplicative derivation on alternative rings

Bruno Leonardo Macedo Ferreira

*Technological Federal University of Paraná,
Professora Laura Pacheco Bastos Avenue, 800,
85053-510, Guarapuava, Brazil.*

e-mail: brunoferreira@utfpr.edu.br

and

Henrique Guzzo Jr.

*Institute of Mathematics and Statistics
University of São Paulo,
Matão Street, 1010,
05508-090, São Paulo, Brazil.*

e-mail: guzzo@ime.usp.br

Abstract

In this paper we generalize the result valid for associative rings due [6, Martindale III] and [1, Brešar] to alternative rings. Let \mathfrak{R} be an unital alternative ring, and $\mathfrak{D} : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ is a Lie multiplicative derivation. Then \mathfrak{D} is the form $\delta + \tau$ where δ is an additive derivation of \mathfrak{R} and τ is a map from \mathfrak{R} into its center \mathfrak{Z} , which maps commutators into the zero.

AMS 2010 Subject Classification: 17A36, 17D05

Keywords: Lie multiplicative derivation; Prime alternative rings

Running Head: Lie multiplicative derivation

1 Alternative rings and Lie multiplicative derivation

Let \mathfrak{R} be a unital ring not necessarily associative or commutative and consider the following convention for its multiplication operation: $xy \cdot z = (xy)z$ and $x \cdot yz = x(yz)$ for $x, y, z \in \mathfrak{R}$, to reduce the number of parentheses. We denote the *associator* of \mathfrak{R} by $(x, y, z) = xy \cdot z - x \cdot yz$ for $x, y, z \in \mathfrak{R}$. And $[x, y] = xy - yx$ is the usual Lie product of x and y , with $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$.

Let \mathfrak{R} be a ring and $\mathfrak{D} : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ a mapping of \mathfrak{R} into itself. We call \mathfrak{D} a *Lie multiplicative derivation* of \mathfrak{R} into itself if for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$

$$\mathfrak{D}([x, y]) = [\mathfrak{D}(x), y] + [x, \mathfrak{D}(y)].$$

A ring \mathfrak{R} is said to be *alternative* if $(x, x, y) = 0 = (y, x, x)$ for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$. One easily sees that any associative ring is an alternative ring. An alternative ring \mathfrak{R} is called *k-torsion free* if $kx = 0$ implies $x = 0$, for any $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k > 0$, and *prime* if $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{B} \neq 0$ for any two nonzero ideals $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{R}$. The *nucleus* of an alternative ring \mathfrak{R} is defined by

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{R}) = \{r \in \mathfrak{R} \mid (x, y, r) = 0 = (x, r, y) = (r, x, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathfrak{R}\}.$$

And the *centre* of an alternative ring \mathfrak{R} is defined by

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}) = \{r \in \mathcal{N} \mid [r, x] = 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathfrak{R}\}.$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathfrak{R} be a 3-torsion free alternative ring. So \mathfrak{R} is a prime ring if and only if $a\mathfrak{R} \cdot b = 0$ (or $a \cdot \mathfrak{R}b = 0$) implies $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ for $a, b \in \mathfrak{R}$.*

Proof. Clearly all alternative rings satisfying the properties $a\mathfrak{R} \cdot b = 0$ (or $a \cdot \mathfrak{R}b = 0$) are prime rings. Suppose \mathfrak{R} is a prime ring by [8, Lemma 2.4, Theorem A and Proposition 3.5] we have $\mathfrak{R} = \mathcal{A}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{A}_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{A} \neq (0)$ is a chain of subrings of \mathfrak{R} . If $a\mathfrak{R} \cdot b = 0$ (or $a \cdot \mathfrak{R}b = 0$) hence $a\mathcal{A} \cdot b = 0$ (or $a \cdot \mathcal{A}b = 0$) follows [8, Proposition 3.5 (e)] that $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. \square

Definition 1.1. *A ring \mathfrak{R} is said to be flexible if satisfies*

$$(x, y, x) = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathfrak{R}.$$

It is known that alternative rings are flexible.

Proposition 1.1. *Let \mathfrak{R} be a alternative ring then \mathfrak{R} satisfies*

$$(x, y, z) + (z, y, x) = 0 \text{ for all } x, y, z \in \mathfrak{R}.$$

Proof. Just linearize the identity $(x, y, x) = 0$. \square

A nonzero element $e_1 \in \mathfrak{R}$ is called an *idempotent* if $e_1 e_1 = e_1$ and a *nontrivial idempotent* if it is an idempotent different from the multiplicative identity element of \mathfrak{R} . Let us consider \mathfrak{R} an alternative ring and fix a nontrivial idempotent $e_1 \in \mathfrak{R}$. Let $e_2: \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ and $e'_2: \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ be linear operators given by $e_2(a) = a - e_1 a$ and $e'_2(a) = a - a e_1$. Clearly $e_2^2 = e_2$, $(e'_2)^2 = e'_2$ and we note that if \mathfrak{R} has a unity, then we can consider $e_2 = 1 - e_1 \in \mathfrak{R}$. Let us denote $e_2(a)$ by $e_2 a$ and $e'_2(a)$ by $a e_2$. It is easy to see that $e_i a \cdot e_j = e_i \cdot a e_j$ ($i, j = 1, 2$) for all $a \in \mathfrak{R}$. Then \mathfrak{R} has a Peirce decomposition $\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}_{11} \oplus \mathfrak{R}_{12} \oplus \mathfrak{R}_{21} \oplus \mathfrak{R}_{22}$, where $\mathfrak{R}_{ij} = e_i \mathfrak{R} e_j$ ($i, j = 1, 2$) [4], satisfying the following multiplicative relations:

- (i) $\mathfrak{R}_{ij}\mathfrak{R}_{jl} \subseteq \mathfrak{R}_{il}$ ($i, j, l = 1, 2$);
- (ii) $\mathfrak{R}_{ij}\mathfrak{R}_{ij} \subseteq \mathfrak{R}_{ji}$ ($i, j = 1, 2$);
- (iii) $\mathfrak{R}_{ij}\mathfrak{R}_{kl} = 0$, if $j \neq k$ and $(i, j) \neq (k, l)$, ($i, j, k, l = 1, 2$);
- (iv) $x_{ij}^2 = 0$, for all $x_{ij} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ij}$ ($i, j = 1, 2$; $i \neq j$).

In this paper we consider that \mathfrak{R} is 2,3-torsion free alternative ring with satisfying:

- (1) If $x_{ij}\mathfrak{R}_{ji} = 0$ then $x_{ij} = 0$ ($i \neq j$);
- (2) If $x_{11}\mathfrak{R}_{12} = 0$ or $\mathfrak{R}_{21}x_{11} = 0$ then $x_{11} = 0$;
- (3) If $\mathfrak{R}_{12}x_{22} = 0$ or $x_{22}\mathfrak{R}_{21} = 0$ then $x_{22} = 0$;
- (4) If $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with $z \neq 0$ then $z\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}$.

Remark 1.1. Note that prime alternative rings satisfy (1), (2), (3). In deed, we firstly show (1).

Let be $x_{ij}\mathfrak{R}_{ji} = 0$ so $x_{ij}(\mathfrak{R}e_i) = 0$. As \mathfrak{R} is 3-torsion free alternative ring and e_i is a nontrivial idempotent we have $x_{ij} = 0$, by Theorem 1.1.

(2) If $x_{11}\mathfrak{R}_{12} = 0$ or $\mathfrak{R}_{21}x_{11} = 0$ so $x_{11}(\mathfrak{R}e_2) = 0$ or $(e_2\mathfrak{R})x_{11} = 0$. Thus $x_{11} = 0$ because e_2 is a nontrivial idempotent.

(3) It is similar to (2).

Proposition 1.2. Let \mathfrak{R} be a 2,3-torsion free alternative ring satisfying (1), (2), (3).

- (♠) If $[a_{11} + a_{22}, \mathfrak{R}_{12}] = 0$, then $a_{11} + a_{22} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$,
- (♣) If $[a_{11} + a_{22}, \mathfrak{R}_{21}] = 0$, then $a_{11} + a_{22} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Proof. We will prove only (♠) because (♣) it is similar to (♠). For any $x_{11} \in \mathfrak{R}_{11}$ and $y_{12} \in \mathfrak{R}_{12}$, by Proposition 1.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} (a_{11}x_{11})y_{12} &= a_{11}(x_{11}y_{12}) = (x_{11}y_{12})a_{22} = x_{11}(y_{12}a_{22}) = x_{11}(a_{11}y_{12}) \\ &= (x_{11}a_{11})y_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2) that $a_{11}x_{11} = x_{11}a_{11}$. Now for any $x_{12} \in \mathfrak{R}_{12}$ and $y_{22} \in \mathfrak{R}_{22}$, by Proposition 1.1

$$\begin{aligned} x_{12}(y_{22}a_{22}) &= (x_{12}y_{22})a_{22} = a_{11}(x_{12}y_{22}) = (a_{11}x_{12})y_{22} = (x_{12}a_{22})y_{22} \\ &= x_{12}(a_{22}y_{22}). \end{aligned}$$

By (3), we see that $a_{22}y_{22} = y_{22}a_{22}$. Let $x_{21} \in \mathfrak{R}_{21}$ and $y_{12} \in \mathfrak{R}_{12}$ be arbitrary. Applying identity above and Proposition 1.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}(a_{22}x_{21})y_{12} &= a_{22}(x_{21}y_{12}) = (x_{21}y_{12})a_{22} = x_{21}(y_{12}a_{22}) = x_{21}(a_{11}y_{12}) \\ &= (x_{21}a_{11})y_{12},\end{aligned}$$

which, by (1), implies that $a_{22}x_{21} = x_{21}a_{11}$. Now, for any $x \in \mathfrak{R}$, using identities above we get

$$\begin{aligned}(a_{11} + a_{22})x &= (a_{11} + a_{22})(x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{22}) \\ &= a_{11}x_{11} + a_{11}x_{12} + a_{22}x_{21} + a_{22}x_{22} \\ &= x_{11}a_{11} + x_{12}a_{22} + x_{21}a_{11} + x_{22}a_{22} \\ &= (x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{21} + x_{22})(a_{11} + a_{22}) \\ &= x(a_{11} + a_{22}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus $a_{11} + a_{22} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$. □

Proposition 1.3. *We have $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}_{ij}) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}_{ij} + \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$ with $i \neq j$.*

Proof. We will make just the case $i = 1, j = 2$ because the other case it is similar. For any $a \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}_{12})$ with $a = a_{11} + a_{12} + a_{21} + a_{22}$ we have $[a, r_{12}] = 0$ which implies $[a_{11} + a_{22}, r_{12}] = 0$ and $a_{21}r_{12} = 0$ for all $r_{12} \in \mathfrak{R}_{12}$. By item (♠) of the Proposition 1.2 and item (1) follows that $a_{11} + a_{22} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $a_{21} = 0$. Therefore $a = a_{11} + a_{12} + a_{21} + a_{22} = a_{12} + a_{11} + a_{22} \in \mathfrak{R}_{12} + \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$ □

There are several results on the characterizations of Lie derivations on associative rings. The first characterization on Lie derivations is due to Martindale III, see [6], who proved the following result in 1964.

Theorem 1.2. *(Martindale III) Let L be a Lie derivation of a primitive ring R into itself, where R contains a nontrivial idempotent and the characteristic of R is not 2 then every Lie derivation L of R is of the form $L = D + T$, where D is an ordinary derivation of R into a primitive ring \bar{R} containing R and T is an additive mapping of R into the center of \bar{R} that maps commutators into zero.*

In 1993, Brešar generalized the above characterization of Lie derivations on primitive rings to those on prime rings, see [1]. He obtained the following theorem for associative rings.

Theorem 1.3. (Brešar) *Let R be a prime ring of characteristic not 2. Let d be a Lie derivation of R . If R does not satisfy S_4 , then d is of the form $\delta + \tau$, where δ is a derivation of R into its central closure and τ is an additive mapping of R into its extended centroid sending commutators to zero.*

As for characterizations on Lie derivable mappings on operator algebras, the following result is proved in [5].

Theorem 1.4. *Let X be a Banach space of dimension greater than 1 and δ be a Lie derivable mapping of $B(X)$ into itself. Then $\delta = D + \tau$, where D is an additive derivation and τ is a map from $B(X)$ into $\mathbb{F}I$ vanishing at commutators.*

In view of the above, this motivated us to study the characterization of Lie multiplicative derivation on alternative rings.

2 Main theorem

We shall prove as follows the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.1. *Let \mathfrak{A} be an unital alternative ring with nontrivial idempotent and $\mathfrak{D} : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ is a Lie multiplicative derivation. Then \mathfrak{D} is the form $\delta + \tau$, where δ is an additive derivation of \mathfrak{A} and τ is a map from \mathfrak{A} into its center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{A})$, which maps commutators into the zero if and only if*

$$a) \quad e_2 \mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{A}_{11}) e_2 \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{A}) e_2,$$

$$b) \quad e_1 \mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{A}_{22}) e_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{A}) e_1.$$

Firstly let us assume that Lie multiplicative derivation $\mathfrak{D} : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ satisfies a) and b). The following Lemmas has the same hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 and we need these Lemmas for the proof of the first part this Theorem. Thus, let us consider e_1 a nontrivial idempotent of \mathfrak{A} . We started with the following

Lemma 2.1. $\mathfrak{D}(0) = 0$.

Proof. In deed, $\mathfrak{D}(0) = \mathfrak{D}([0, 0]) = [\mathfrak{D}(0), 0] + [0, \mathfrak{D}(0)] = 0$. □

Lemma 2.2. $\mathfrak{D}(e_1) - f_{y,z}(e_1) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{A})$, with $y = \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{12} + \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{21}$, $z = -e_1$ where $f_{y,z} := [L_y, L_z] + [L_y, R_z] + [R_y, R_z]$ and L, R are left and right multiplication operators respectively.

Proof. Firstly observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{D}(a_{12}) &= \mathfrak{D}([e_1, a_{12}]) = [\mathfrak{D}(e_1), a_{12}] + [e_1, \mathfrak{D}(a_{12})] \\ &= \mathfrak{D}(e_1)a_{12} - a_{12}\mathfrak{D}(e_1) + e_1\mathfrak{D}(a_{12}) - \mathfrak{D}(a_{12})e_1\end{aligned}$$

In the above equation the left and right sides are, respectively, multiplied by e_1 and e_2 , and we have $[\mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{11} + \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{22}, a_{12}] = 0$ for all $a_{12} \in \mathfrak{R}_{12}$ so by (\spadesuit) of Proposition 1.2 we get $\mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{11} + \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{22} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$. Taking $y = \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{12} + \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{21}$ and $z = -e_1$ we obtain $\mathfrak{D}(e_1) - f_{y,z}(e_1) = \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{11} + \mathfrak{D}(e_1)_{22} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$. \square

Before we continue it is worth noting that $f_{y,z} := [L_y, L_z] + [L_y, R_z] + [R_y, R_z]$ is a derivation, by [77 page of [7]], so without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathfrak{D}(e_1) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$

Remark 2.1. *If $\mathfrak{D}(e_1) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$ then $\mathfrak{D}(e_2) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$. Indeed, note that $[e_1, a] = [a, e_2]$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{R}$. Thus*

$$\begin{aligned}[\mathfrak{D}(e_2), a] &= \mathfrak{D}([e_2, a]) - [e_2, \mathfrak{D}(a)] = \mathfrak{D}([a, e_1]) - [e_2, \mathfrak{D}(a)] \\ &= [\mathfrak{D}(a), e_1] + [a, \mathfrak{D}(e_1)] - [e_2, \mathfrak{D}(a)] \\ &= [\mathfrak{D}(a), e_1] - [e_2, \mathfrak{D}(a)] \\ &= [\mathfrak{D}(a), e_1] + [e_1, \mathfrak{D}(a)] = 0\end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in \mathfrak{R}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{D}(e_2) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}) \in \mathfrak{R}_{ij}$ with $i \neq j$, because $\mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}) = \mathfrak{D}([e_i, a_{ij}]) = [e_i, \mathfrak{D}(a_{ij})]$.

Lemma 2.3. $\mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{R}_{ii}) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}_{ii} + \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$ ($i = 1, 2$)

Proof. We show just the case $i = 1$ because the other case can be treated similarly. For every $a_{11} \in \mathfrak{R}_{11}$, with $\mathfrak{D}(a_{11}) = b_{11} + b_{12} + b_{21} + b_{22}$ we get

$$0 = \mathfrak{D}([a_{11}, e_1]) = [\mathfrak{D}(a_{11}), e_1] + [a_{11}, \mathfrak{D}(e_1)] = [\mathfrak{D}(a_{11}), e_1].$$

From this $b_{12} = b_{21} = 0$. By Theorem 2.1 item a), we have

$$\mathfrak{D}(a_{11}) = b_{11} + e_2\mathfrak{D}(a_{11})e_2 = b_{11} + ze_2 = b_{11} - e_1z + z \in \mathfrak{R}_{11} + \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}).$$

\square

Lemma 2.4. \mathfrak{D} is almost additive map, that is, for every $a, b \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\mathfrak{D}(a + b) - \mathfrak{D}(a) - \mathfrak{D}(b) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Proof. For proof to see Theorem 4.1 in [3]. \square

Now let us define the mappings δ and τ . By Remark 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 we have that

- (A) if $a_{ij} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ij}$, $i \neq j$, then $\mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}) = b_{ij} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ij}$,
- (B) if $a_{ii} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ii}$, then $\mathfrak{D}(a_{ii}) = b_{ii} + z$, $b_{ii} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ii}$, z is a central element.

We note that in (B), b_{ii} and z are uniquely determined. Indeed, if $\mathfrak{D}(a_{ii}) = b'_{ii} + z'$, $b'_{ii} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ii}$, $z' \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$. Then $b_{ii}b'_{ii} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$. Hence by conditions (2) and (3), $b_{ii} = b'_{ii}$ and $z = z'$. Now we define a map δ of \mathfrak{R} according to the rule $\delta(a_{ij}) = b_{ij}$, $a_{ij} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ij}$. For every $a = a_{11} + a_{12} + a_{21} + a_{22} \in \mathfrak{R}$, define $\delta(a) = \sum \delta(a_{ij})$. And a map τ of \mathfrak{R} into $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$ is then defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(a) &= \mathfrak{D}(a) - \delta(a) \\
&= \mathfrak{D}(a) - (\delta(a_{11}) + \delta(a_{12}) + \delta(a_{21}) + \delta(a_{22})) \\
&= \mathfrak{D}(a) - (b_{11} + b_{12} + b_{21} + b_{22}) \\
&= \mathfrak{D}(a) - (\mathfrak{D}(a_{11}) - z_{a_{11}} + \mathfrak{D}(a_{12}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{21}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{22}) - z_{a_{22}}) \\
&= \mathfrak{D}(a) - (\mathfrak{D}(a_{11}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{12}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{21}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{22}) - (z_{a_{11}} + z_{a_{22}})) \\
&= \mathfrak{D}(a) - (\mathfrak{D}(a_{11}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{12}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{21}) + \mathfrak{D}(a_{22})).
\end{aligned}$$

We need to prove that δ and τ are desired maps.

Lemma 2.5. δ is an additive map.

Proof. We only need to show that δ is an additive on \mathfrak{R}_{ii} . Let $a_{ii}, b_{ii} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ii}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(a_{ii} + b_{ii}) - \delta(a_{ii}) - \delta(b_{ii}) &= \mathfrak{D}(a_{ii} + b_{ii}) - \tau(a_{ii} + b_{ii}) - \mathfrak{D}(a_{ii}) \\
&\quad + \tau(a_{ii}) - \mathfrak{D}(b_{ii}) + \tau(b_{ii}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\delta(a_{ii} + b_{ii}) - \delta(a_{ii}) - \delta(b_{ii}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap \mathfrak{R}_{ii} = \{0\}$. □

Now we show that $\delta(ab) = \delta(a)b + a\delta(b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{R}$.

Lemma 2.6. For every $a_{ii}, b_{ii} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ii}$, $a_{ij}, b_{ij} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ij}$, $b_{ji} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ji}$ and $b_{jj} \in \mathfrak{R}_{jj}$ with $i \neq j$ we have

- (I) $\delta(a_{ii}b_{ij}) = \delta(a_{ii})b_{ij} + a_{ii}\delta(b_{ij})$,
- (II) $\delta(a_{ij}b_{jj}) = \delta(a_{ij})b_{jj} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{jj})$,
- (III) $\delta(a_{ii}b_{ii}) = \delta(a_{ii})b_{ii} + a_{ii}\delta(b_{ii})$,
- (IV) $\delta(a_{ij}b_{ij}) = \delta(a_{ij})b_{ij} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ij})$,

$$(V) \quad \delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}) = \delta(a_{ij})b_{ji} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji}).$$

Proof. Let us start with (I)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(a_{ii}b_{ij}) &= \mathfrak{D}(a_{ii}b_{ij}) = \mathfrak{D}([a_{ii}, b_{ij}]) \\ &= [\mathfrak{D}(a_{ii}), b_{ij}] + [a_{ii}, \mathfrak{D}(b_{ij})] \\ &= [\delta(a_{ii}), b_{ij}] + [a_{ii}, \delta(b_{ij})] \\ &= \delta(a_{ii})b_{ij} + a_{ii}\delta(b_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Next (II)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(a_{ij}b_{jj}) &= \mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}b_{jj}) = \mathfrak{D}([a_{ij}, b_{jj}]) \\ &= [\mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}), b_{jj}] + [a_{ij}, \mathfrak{D}(b_{jj})] \\ &= [\delta(a_{ij}), b_{jj}] + [a_{ij}, \delta(b_{jj})] \\ &= \delta(a_{ij})b_{jj} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{jj}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we show (III). By Proposition 1.1 and (I) we get

$$\delta((a_{ii}b_{ii})r_{ij}) = \delta(a_{ii}b_{ii})r_{ij} + (a_{ii}b_{ii})\delta(r_{ij}).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(a_{ii}(b_{ii}r_{ij})) &= \delta(a_{ii})b_{ii}r_{ij} + a_{ii}\delta(b_{ii}r_{ij}) \\ &= \delta(a_{ii})b_{ii}r_{ij} + a_{ii}(\delta(b_{ii})r_{ij} + b_{ii}\delta(r_{ij})). \end{aligned}$$

As $(a_{ii}b_{ii})r_{ij} = a_{ii}(b_{ii}r_{ij})$ and $(a_{ii}b_{ii})\delta(r_{ij}) = a_{ii}(b_{ii}\delta(r_{ij}))$ we obtain

$$(\delta(a_{ii}b_{ii}) - \delta(a_{ii})b_{ii} - a_{ii}\delta(b_{ii}))r_{ij} = 0$$

for all $r_{ij} \in \mathfrak{R}_{ij}$. So $\delta(a_{ii}b_{ii}) = \delta(a_{ii})b_{ii} + a_{ii}\delta(b_{ii})$.

Next (IV).

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta(a_{ij}b_{ij}) &= \delta(2a_{ij}b_{ij}) = \mathfrak{D}(2a_{ij}b_{ij}) \\ &= \mathfrak{D}([a_{ij}, b_{ij}]) = [\mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}), b_{ij}] + [a_{ij}, \mathfrak{D}(b_{ij})] \\ &= [\delta(a_{ij}), b_{ij}] + [a_{ij}, \delta(b_{ij})] \\ &= \delta(a_{ij})b_{ij} - b_{ij}\delta(a_{ij}) + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ij}) - \delta(b_{ij})a_{ij} \\ &= 2(\delta(a_{ij})b_{ij} + b_{ij}\delta(a_{ij})) \end{aligned}$$

As \mathfrak{R} is 2-torsion free it's follow that $\delta(a_{ij}b_{ij}) = \delta(a_{ij})b_{ij} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ij})$. And finally we show (V). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau([a_{ij}, b_{ji}]) &= \mathfrak{D}([a_{ij}, b_{ji}]) - \delta([a_{ij}, b_{ji}]) \\
&= [\mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}), b_{ji}] + [a_{ij}, \mathfrak{D}(b_{ji})] - \delta(a_{ij}b_{ji} - b_{ji}a_{ij}) \\
&= [\delta(a_{ij}), b_{ji}] + [a_{ij}, \delta(b_{ji})] - \delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}) + \delta(b_{ji}a_{ij}) \\
&= \delta(a_{ij})b_{ji} - b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij}) + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji}) - \delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} - \delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}) \\
&\quad + \delta(b_{ji}a_{ij}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$[\delta(a_{ij})b_{ji} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji}) - \delta(a_{ij}b_{ji})] + [\delta(b_{ji}a_{ij}) - \delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} - b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij})] = z \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}).$$

If $z = 0$ then $\delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}) = \delta(a_{ij})b_{ji} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})$. If $z \neq 0$ we multiply by a_{ij} we get

$$a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji}a_{ij}) - a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} - a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij})) = a_{ij}z.$$

By (II) we have

$$\delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}a_{ij}) - \delta(a_{ij})(b_{ji}a_{ij}) - a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} - a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij})) = a_{ij}z. \quad (1)$$

Now we observe that $\delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}a_{ij}) = \delta(a_{ij})(b_{ji}a_{ij}) + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} + a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij}))$. In deed, observe that $[[a_{ij}, b_{ji}], a_{ij}] = 2a_{ij}b_{ji}a_{ij}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
2\delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}a_{ij}) &= \delta(2a_{ij}b_{ji}a_{ij}) \\
&= \mathfrak{D}([a_{ij}, b_{ji}], a_{ij}) \\
&= [[\mathfrak{D}(a_{ij}), b_{ji}], a_{ij}] + [[a_{ij}, \mathfrak{D}(b_{ji})], a_{ij}] + [[a_{ij}, b_{ji}], \mathfrak{D}(a_{ij})] \\
&= [[\delta(a_{ij}), b_{ji}], a_{ij}] + [[a_{ij}, \delta(b_{ji})], a_{ij}] + [[a_{ij}, b_{ji}], \delta(a_{ij})] \\
&= (\delta(a_{ij})b_{ji})a_{ij} + a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij})) + 2a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} \\
&\quad + (a_{ij}b_{ji})\delta(a_{ij}) + \delta(a_{ij})(b_{ji}a_{ij}) \\
&= \delta(a_{ij})(b_{ji}a_{ij}) - (a_{ij}b_{ji})\delta(a_{ij}) + a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij})) \\
&\quad + a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij})) + 2a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} + (a_{ij}b_{ji})\delta(a_{ij}) + \delta(a_{ij})(b_{ji}a_{ij}) \\
&= 2(\delta(a_{ij})(b_{ji}a_{ij}) + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} + a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij}))).
\end{aligned}$$

Since \mathfrak{R} is 2-torsion free we get $\delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}a_{ij}) = \delta(a_{ij})(b_{ji}a_{ij}) + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})a_{ij} + a_{ij}(b_{ji}\delta(a_{ij}))$. So $a_{ij}z = 0$ but by (4) we have $zh = e_1 + e_2$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ which is a contradiction. Therefore $\delta(a_{ij}b_{ji}) = \delta(a_{ij})b_{ji} + a_{ij}\delta(b_{ji})$. \square

Lemma 2.7. δ is a derivation.

Proof. Let be $a, b \in \mathfrak{R}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(ab) &= \delta((a_{11} + a_{12} + a_{21} + a_{22})(b_{11} + b_{12} + b_{21} + b_{22})) \\
&= \delta(a_{11}b_{11}) + \delta(a_{11}b_{12}) + \delta(a_{12}b_{12}) + \delta(a_{12}b_{21}) + \delta(a_{12}b_{22}) \\
&\quad + \delta(a_{21}b_{11}) + \delta(a_{21}b_{12}) + \delta(a_{21}b_{21}) + \delta(a_{22}b_{21}) + \delta(a_{22}b_{22}) \\
&= \delta(a)b + a\delta(b)
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6. \square

Lemma 2.8. τ sends the commutators into zero.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau([a, b]) &= \mathfrak{D}([a, b]) - \delta([a, b]) \\
&= [\mathfrak{D}(a), b] + [a, \mathfrak{D}(b)] - \delta([a, b]) \\
&= [\delta(a), b] + [a, \delta(b)] - \delta([a, b]) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Let us assume that $\mathfrak{D} : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ is a Lie multiplicative derivation of the form $\mathfrak{D} = \delta + \tau$ where δ is an additive derivation of \mathfrak{R} and τ is a map from \mathfrak{R} into its center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$, which maps commutators into the zero. So

$$\begin{aligned}
e_2 \mathfrak{D}(a_{11}) e_2 &= e_2 \delta(a_{11}) e_2 + e_2 \tau(a_{11}) e_2 \\
&= e_2 \delta(e_1 a_{11}) e_2 + e_2 \tau(a_{11}) e_2 \\
&= e_2 (\delta(e_1) a_{11} + e_1 \delta(a_{11})) e_2 + e_2 \tau(a_{11}) e_2 \\
&= e_2 (\delta(e_1) a_{11}) e_2 + e_2 (e_1 \delta(a_{11})) e_2 + e_2 \tau(a_{11}) e_2 \\
&= (e_2 \delta(e_1)) (a_{11} e_2) + (e_2 e_1) (\delta(a_{11}) e_2) + e_2 \tau(a_{11}) e_2 \\
&= e_2 \tau(a_{11}) e_2 \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}) e_2.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
e_1 \mathfrak{D}(a_{22}) e_1 &= e_1 \delta(a_{22}) e_1 + e_1 \tau(a_{22}) e_1 \\
&= e_1 \delta(e_2 a_{22}) e_1 + e_1 \tau(a_{22}) e_1 \\
&= e_1 (\delta(e_2) a_{22} + e_2 \delta(a_{22})) e_1 + e_1 \tau(a_{22}) e_1 \\
&= e_1 (\delta(e_2) a_{22}) e_1 + e_1 (e_2 \delta(a_{22})) e_1 + e_1 \tau(a_{22}) e_1 \\
&= (e_1 \delta(e_2)) (a_{22} e_1) + (e_1 e_2) (\delta(a_{22}) e_1) + e_1 \tau(a_{22}) e_1 \\
&= e_1 \tau(a_{22}) e_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R}) e_1,
\end{aligned}$$

for every $a_{11} \in \mathfrak{R}_{11}$ and $a_{22} \in \mathfrak{R}_{22}$. This demonstrates the letters a) and b) and the proof of the Theorem 2.1 is complete.

3 Applications

Corollary 3.1. *Let \mathfrak{R} be an unital prime alternative ring with nontrivial idempotent satisfying (4) and $\mathfrak{D} : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ is a Lie multiplicative derivation. Then \mathfrak{D} is the form $\delta + \tau$, where δ is an additive derivation of \mathfrak{R} and τ is a map from \mathfrak{R} into its center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$, which maps commutators into the zero if and only if*

$$a) \ e_2 \mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{R}_{11})e_2 \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})e_2,$$

$$b) \ e_1 \mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{R}_{22})e_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})e_1.$$

And we finished the article with an application on simple alternative rings.

Corollary 3.2. *Let \mathfrak{R} be an unital simple alternative ring with nontrivial idempotent and $\mathfrak{D} : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ is a Lie multiplicative derivation. Then \mathfrak{D} is the form $\delta + \tau$, where δ is an additive derivation of \mathfrak{R} and τ is a map from \mathfrak{R} into its center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$, which maps commutators into the zero if and only if*

$$a) \ e_2 \mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{R}_{11})e_2 \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})e_2,$$

$$b) \ e_1 \mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{R}_{22})e_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})e_1.$$

Proof. It is enough to observe that every single ring is prime and $\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{R})$ is a field. \square

References

- [1] Brešar M., Commuting traces of biadditive mappings, commutativity-preserving mappings and Lie mappings, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 335 (1993), 525-546.
- [2] Ferreira J.C.M. and Ferreira B.L.M., Additivity of n -Multiplicative Maps on Alternative Rings, *Comm. in Algebra* 44 (2016), 1557-1568.
- [3] Ferreira B.L.M. and Guzzo H., Lie Maps on Alternative Rings, *submitted* (2017).

- [4] Hentzel I. R., Kleinfeld E. Smith H. F., Alternative Rings with Idempotent. *J. Algebra* 64 (1980), 325-335.
- [5] Lu F. and Liu B., Lie derivable maps on $B(X)$, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 372 (2010), 369-376.
- [6] Martindale III W. S., Lie derivations of primitive rings, *Michigan Math. J.* 11 (1964) 183-187.
- [7] Schafer R.D., An introduction to nonassociative algebras *Pure and Applied Mathematics* 22 Academic Press, New York-London (1966).
- [8] Slater M., Prime alternative rings, I *J. Algebra* 15 (1970), 229-243.