

# The images of some simple derivations

Dan Yan \*

MOE-LCSM,

School of Mathematics and Statistics,

Hunan Normal University, Changsha 410081, China

*E-mail:* yan-dan-hi@163.com

## Abstract

In the paper, we study the relation between the images of polynomial derivations and their simplicity. We prove that the images of simple Shamsuddin derivations are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces. In addition, we also show that the images of some simple derivations in dimension three are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces. Thus, we conjecture that the images of simple derivations in dimension greater than one are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces. We also prove that locally nilpotent derivations are not simple in dimension greater than one.

**Keywords.** Simple Shamsuddin Derivations, Mathieu-Zhao spaces, Locally Nilpotent Derivations

**MSC(2020).** 13N15; 13C99.

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we will write  $\mathbb{N}$  for the non-negative integers,  $K$  for any field with characteristic zero and  $R := K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$  for the polynomial algebra over  $K$  in  $n + 1$  indeterminates  $x, y_1, \dots, y_n$ .  $\partial_x, \partial_i$  will denote the derivations  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}$  of  $R$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , respectively. More generally, if  $s, r_1, \dots, r_s \geq 1$  are integers and  $\{x\} \cup \{y_{i,j} : i = 1, \dots, s, j = 1, \dots, r_i\}$  are indeterminates over  $K$ ,  $\partial_{i,j}$  will denote the derivation  $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{i,j}}$  of  $K[x, \bigcup_{i=1}^s \{y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}\}]$ . We abbreviate  $\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial y_j}$  as  $g_{tyj}$ . For element  $f$  of  $K[x]$ , we shall often use  $f'$  instead of  $f_x$ .

---

\*The author is supported by Scientific Research Fund of Hunan Provincial Education Department (Grant No. 21A0056), the NSF of China (Grant No. 11871241; 11601146) and the Construct Program of the Key Discipline in Hunan Province.

A  $K$ -derivation  $D : R \rightarrow R$  of  $R$  is a  $K$ -linear map such that

$$D(ab) = D(a)b + aD(b)$$

for any  $a, b \in R$  and  $D(c) = 0$  for any  $c \in K$ . The set of all  $K$ -derivations of  $R$  is denoted by  $\text{Der}_K(R)$ . An ideal  $I$  of  $R$  is called  $D$ -stable if  $D(I) \subset I$ .  $R$  is called  $D$ -simple if it has no proper nonzero  $D$ -stable ideal. The  $K$ -derivation  $D$  is called simple if  $R$  has no  $D$ -stable ideals other than 0 and  $R$ . For some examples of simple derivations, see [1], [2], [3], [8].

A derivation  $D$  of  $R$  is said to be a Shamsuddin derivation if  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i y_i + b_i) \partial_i$  with  $a_i, b_i \in K[x]$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Observe that if  $D$  is such a Shamsuddin derivation of  $R$ , then grouping the terms that have the same  $a_i$  and renaming the indeterminates  $y_i$  and the polynomials  $a_i, b_i$  if necessary, we can write  $D$  in the following form:

$$D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$$

with  $a_i, b_{i,j} \in K[x]$  for every  $i$  and every  $(i, j)$ ,  $a_i \neq a_l$  for  $i \neq l$ . A derivation  $D$  of  $R$  is said to be locally nilpotent if, for each  $a \in R$ , there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $D^m(a) = 0$ .

The Mathieu-Zhao space was introduced by Zhao in [10] and [11], which is a natural generalization of ideals. We give the definition here for the polynomial rings. A  $K$ -subspace  $M$  of  $R$  is said to be a Mathieu-Zhao space if for any  $a, b \in R$  with  $a^m \in M$  for all  $m \geq 1$ , we have  $ba^m \in M$  when  $m \gg 0$ .

In our paper, we prove that the images of simple Shamsuddin derivations are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces in section 2. In addition, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for  $D$  to be a Mathieu-Zhao spaces, where  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s (a(x)y_i + b_i(x)) \partial_i + \sum_{j=s+1}^n b_j(x) \partial_j$ . In section 3, we prove that the images of some simple derivations in dimension three are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces and locally nilpotent derivations are not simple in dimension greater than one. According to our conclusions, we make the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.1.** *If  $D$  is a simple derivation of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  and  $n \geq 2$ , then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space.*

## 2 The images of simple Shamsuddin derivations

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$  be a derivation of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$  with  $a_i, b_{i,j} \in K[x]$ . If  $D$  is simple, then  $\deg a_i \geq 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 3.1 in [4] that  $D_i = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$  is simple for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . If  $a_i \in K$ , then it's easy to see that the equation

$z' = a_i z + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} k_j b_{i,j}$  has solution in  $K[x]$  for any  $(k_1, \dots, k_{r_i}) \in K^{r_i}$ . It follows from Theorem 3.2 in [4] that  $D_i$  is not simple, a contradiction. Hence  $\deg a_i \geq 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$  be a derivation of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$  with  $a_i, b_{i,j} \in K[x]$ . If  $D$  is simple, then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $1 \in \text{Im } D$ . If  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ , then we have  $\text{Im } D = K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ . We claim that  $y_{1,1} \notin \text{Im } D$ . Suppose that  $y_{1,1} \in \text{Im } D$ . Then there exists  $f \in K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad y_{1,1} = D(f).$$

Let  $f = f^{(d)} + f^{(d-1)} + \dots + f^{(1)} + f^{(0)}$ , where  $f^{(j)}$  is a polynomial of degree  $j$  with respect to  $y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq d$ . Suppose that

$$f^{(d)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_s = d} c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_s^{l_s}$$

with  $c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} \in K[x]$ ,  $y_i = (y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i})$ ,  $l_i = l_{i,1} + \dots + l_{i,r_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . If the equation  $a_1(x)\gamma_1 + \dots + a_s(x)\gamma_s = 0$  has no positive integral solution, then the conclusion follows from Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 3.2 in [9]. Otherwise, we can assume that  $\sum_{i=1}^s |m_i^{(u)}| a_i(x) = 0$  with  $(m_1^{(u)}, \dots, m_s^{(u)}) = 1$  and  $m_i^{(u)} = (m_{i,1}^{(u)}, \dots, m_{i,r_i}^{(u)})$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ ,  $1 \leq u \leq t$  for some  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ ,  $|m_i^{(u)}| = m_{i,1}^{(u)} + \dots + m_{i,r_i}^{(u)}$  and the vectors  $m^{(1)} := (m_1^{(1)}, \dots, m_s^{(1)}), \dots, m^{(t)} := (m_1^{(t)}, \dots, m_s^{(t)})$  are linearly independent. We view the polynomials as in  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$  with coefficients in  $K[x]$  when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on  $y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}$ .

(1) If  $d \geq 2$ , then we have

$$(2.2) \quad c'_{l_1, \dots, l_s} + (l_1 a_1(x) + \dots + l_s a_s(x)) c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_s^{l_s}$  with  $l_1 + \dots + l_s = d$  of equation (2.1). If  $l_1 a_1(x) + \dots + l_s a_s(x) \neq 0$ , then it follows from equation (2.2) that  $c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} = 0$ . If  $l_1 a_1(x) + \dots + l_s a_s(x) = 0$ , then  $c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} \in K$ . Thus, we have

$$f^{(d)} = c_{k_1} (y_1^{m_1^{(1)}} \cdots y_s^{m_s^{(1)}})^{k_1} + \dots + c_{k_t} (y_1^{m_1^{(t)}} \cdots y_s^{m_s^{(t)}})^{k_t}$$

with  $c_{k_1} \neq 0$ , where  $\sum_{i=1}^s k_u |m_i^{(u)}| = d$  for all  $1 \leq u \leq t$ . Suppose that  $f^{(d-1)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_s = d-1} \tilde{c}_{l_1, \dots, l_s} y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_s^{l_s}$  with  $\tilde{c}_{l_1, \dots, l_s} \in K[x]$ ,  $y_i = (y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i})$ ,  $l_i = l_{i,1} + \dots + l_{i,r_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Note that  $(k_u m_{1,1}^{(u)}, \dots, k_u m_{i,j}^{(u)} - 1, \dots, k_u m_{s,r_s}^{(u)}) \neq (k_v m_{1,1}^{(v)}, \dots, k_v m_{\tilde{i},j}^{(v)} - 1, \dots, k_v m_{s,r_s}^{(v)})$  for  $i \neq \tilde{i}$ ,  $1 \leq u, v \leq t$ . Otherwise,  $a_i(x) = a_{\tilde{i}}(x)$ , a contradiction.

If  $d \geq 3$ , then comparing the coefficients of  $y_{1,1}^{k_1 m_{1,1}^{(1)} - 1} \cdots y_{1,r_1}^{k_1 m_{1,r_1}^{(1)}} \cdots y_{s,1}^{k_1 m_{s,1}^{(1)}} \cdots y_{s,r_s}^{k_1 m_{s,r_s}^{(1)}}$ ,  $y_{1,1}^{k_1 m_{1,1}^{(1)}} y_{1,2}^{k_1 m_{1,2}^{(1)} - 1} \cdots y_{s,r_s}^{k_1 m_{s,r_s}^{(1)}}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $y_{1,1}^{k_1 m_{1,1}^{(1)}} y_{1,2}^{k_1 m_{1,2}^{(1)}} \cdots y_{s,r_s}^{k_1 m_{s,r_s}^{(1)} - 1}$  of equation

(2.1), at least one of  $\tilde{c}_{l_1, \dots, l_s}$  satisfies the equation  $z' = a_{i_0}z + \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i_0}} \hat{k}_j b_{i_0, j}$  for some  $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ ,  $(\hat{k}_1, \dots, \hat{k}_{r_{i_0}}) \in K^{r_{i_0}} / \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ ;  $l_1 + \dots + l_s = d - 1$ . Since  $D$  is simple, it follows from Theorem 3.1 in [4] that  $D_i = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i, j} + b_{i, j}) \partial_{i, j}$  is simple for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . It follows from Theorem 3.2 in [4] that the equation  $z' = a_{i_0}z + \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i_0}} \tilde{k}_j b_{i_0, j}$  does not have any solution in  $K[x]$  for any  $(\tilde{k}_1, \dots, \tilde{k}_{r_{i_0}}) \in K^{r_{i_0}} / \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ , a contradiction.

If  $d = 2$ , then  $f^{(2)} = c_{k_1} y_{i_1, j_1} y_{\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{j}_1} + \dots + c_{k_t} y_{i_t, j_t} y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}$  with  $c_{k_1} \neq 0$ ,  $i_u \neq \tilde{i}_u$ ,  $1 \leq u \leq t$ . Let  $f^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} C_{i, j} y_{i, j}$  with  $C_{i, j} \in K[x]$  for  $1 \leq j \leq r_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . If  $y_{1,1} \notin \{y_{i_1, j_1}, \dots, y_{i_t, j_t}, y_{\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{j}_1}, \dots, y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}\}$ , then we have

$$(2.3) \quad C'_{1,1} + a_1(x)C_{1,1} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $y_{1,1}$  of equation (2.1). It follows from Lemma 2.1 that  $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$ . Then we have  $C_{1,1} = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x$  of equation (2.3), which contradicts equation (2.3). If  $y_{1,1} \in \{y_{i_1, j_1}, \dots, y_{i_t, j_t}, y_{\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{j}_1}, \dots, y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}\}$ , then we can assume that

$$f^{(2)} = c_{k_1} y_{1,1} y_{i_1, j_1} + \dots + c_{k_t} y_{i_t, j_t} y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}.$$

Hence

$$(2.4) \quad C'_{i_1, j_1} - a_1(x)C_{i_1, j_1} + c_{k_1} b_{1,1} + c_{k_2} b_{1,2} + \dots + c_{k_{\tilde{t}_1}} b_{1, \tilde{t}_1} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $y_{i_1, j_1}$  of equation (2.1), where  $1 \leq \tilde{t}_1 \leq \min\{t, r_1\}$ . Since  $D$  is simple, it follows from the arguments of  $d = 3$  that  $C'_{i_1, j_1} - a_1(x)C_{i_1, j_1} + c_{k_1} b_{1,1} + c_{k_2} b_{1,2} + \dots + c_{k_{\tilde{t}_1}} b_{1, \tilde{t}_1} \neq 0$ , a contradiction.

(2) If  $d = 1$ , then we can assume that  $f^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} C_{i, j} y_{i, j}$  with  $C_{i, j} \in K[x]$  for  $1 \leq j \leq r_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Thus, we have

$$(2.5) \quad C'_{1,1} + a_1(x)C_{1,1} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $y_{1,1}$  of equation (2.1). Since  $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$ , we have  $C_{1,1} = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x$  of equation (2.5), which contradicts equation (2.5).

(3) If  $d = 0$ , then  $D(f) \in K[x]$ . Clearly,  $y_{1,1} \notin \text{Im } D$ . Thus, the conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i, j} + b_{i, j}) \partial_{i, j}$  be a derivation of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s, r_s}]$  with  $a_i, b_{i, j} \in K[x]$ . If  $\deg a_i > \deg b_{i, j}$  and  $b_{i,1}, \dots, b_{i, r_i}$  are linearly independent over  $K$  for every  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$  and every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r_i\}$ , then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s, r_s}]$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Corollary 3.3 in [4] that  $D$  is simple. Then the conclusion follows from Theorem 2.2.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^k (a(x)y_i + b_i(x))\partial_i + \sum_{j=k+1}^n b_j(x)\partial_j$  be a derivation of  $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$  with  $a(x), b_i(x) \in K[x]$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $k \geq 1$ . Then  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$  iff  $a(x) \in K$ .*

*Proof.* “ $\Leftarrow$ ” If  $a(x) \in K$ , then it follows from Example 9.3.2 in [7] that  $D$  is locally finite. Since  $1 \in \text{Im } D$ , it follows from Proposition 1.4 in [12] that  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ .

“ $\Rightarrow$ ” Since  $1 \in \text{Im } D$  and  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ , we have  $\text{Im } D = K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ . Suppose that  $\deg a(x) \geq 1$ . We claim  $y_1 \notin \text{Im } D$ . If  $y_1 \in \text{Im } D$ , then there exists  $f \in K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$  such that

$$(2.6) \quad y_1 = D(f).$$

Let  $f = f^{(d)} + \dots + f^{(1)} + f^{(0)}$ , where  $f^{(\tilde{k})}$  is a polynomial of degree  $k$  with respect to  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  for  $0 \leq \tilde{k} \leq d$ . Suppose that  $f^{(d)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d} c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n}$  with  $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} \in K[x]$ .

If  $d \geq 2$ , then we have

$$(2.7) \quad c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)'} + (l_1 + \dots + l_k)a(x)c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n}$  with  $l_1 + \dots + l_n = d$  of equation (2.6). If  $l_1 + \dots + l_k \neq 0$ , then  $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} = 0$  for all  $l_1 + \dots + l_n = d$  by comparing the degree of  $x$  of equation (2.7). Thus,

$$f^{(d)} = \sum_{l_{k+1} + \dots + l_n = d} c_{l_{k+1}, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \dots y_n^{l_n}.$$

Let  $f^{(d-1)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d-1} c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n}$  with  $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} \in K[x]$ . If  $d-1 \geq 2$ , then we have

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d-1} [c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)'} + (l_1 + \dots + l_k)a(x)c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)}] y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n} + \sum_{l_{k+1} + \dots + l_n = d} \sum_{j=k+1}^n l_j b_j c_{l_{k+1}, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \dots y_j^{l_j-1} \dots y_n^{l_n} = 0$$

by considering the part of degree  $d-1$  of equation (2.6) with respect to  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ . If  $l_1 + \dots + l_k \neq 0$ , then we have

$$(2.9) \quad c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)'} + (l_1 + \dots + l_k)a(x)c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n}$  with  $l_1 + \dots + l_n = d-1$  of equation (2.8). Thus, we have  $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} = 0$  for all  $l_1 + \dots + l_k \neq 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x$  of equation (2.9). That is,

$$f^{(d-1)} = \sum_{l_{k+1} + \dots + l_n = d-1} c_{l_{k+1}, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \dots y_n^{l_n}.$$

Hence we have  $f^{(t)} = \sum_{l_{k+1}+\dots+l_n=t} c_{l_{k+1},\dots,l_n}^{(d-t)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$  by considering the part of degree  $t$  of equation (2.6) with respect to  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  for all  $2 \leq t \leq d$ . Suppose that  $f^{(1)} = c_1(x)y_1 + \cdots + c_n(x)y_n$ . Then we have

$$(2.10) \quad c_1'(x) + a(x)c_1(x) = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $y_1$  of equation (2.6). Since  $\deg a(x) \geq 1$ , we have  $c_1(x) = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x$  of equation (2.10), which contradicts equation (2.10).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j} + \sum_{l \neq i, l=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_l} (a_l(x)y_{l,j})\partial_{l,j}$  be a derivation of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$  and  $D_i = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j}$  a derivation of  $K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$  with  $a_i(x), a_l(x), b_{i,j}(x) \in K[x]$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . If  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ , then  $\text{Im } D_i$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $1 \in \text{Im } D$  and  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ , we have  $\text{Im } D = K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ . Thus, for any  $x^{q_0} y_{i,1}^{q_1} \cdots y_{i,r_i}^{q_i} \in K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$ , there exists  $g_{q_0, \dots, q_i} \in K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$  such that

$$(2.11) \quad x^{q_0} y_{i,1}^{q_1} \cdots y_{i,r_i}^{q_i} = D(g_{q_0, \dots, q_i}).$$

Let  $y_{l,j} = 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq r_l$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq s$ ,  $l \neq i$ . Then equation (2.11) has the following form:

$$x^{q_0} y_{i,1}^{q_1} \cdots y_{i,r_i}^{q_i} = D_i(g_{q_0, \dots, q_i}(x, 0, \dots, 0, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}, 0, \dots, 0)).$$

Hence we have  $\text{Im } D_i = K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$ . That is,  $\text{Im } D_i$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j} + \sum_{l \neq i, l=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_l} (a_l(x)y_{l,j})\partial_{l,j}$  be a derivation of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$  with  $a_i(x), a_l(x), b_{i,j}(x) \in K[x]$ . If  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ , then  $a_i(x) \in K$ .*

*Proof.* The conclusion follows from Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 3.5 in [9].  $\square$

### 3 Images of some simple derivations

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^n (a_i x_i + b_i)\partial_{x_i}$  be a derivation of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  with  $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ . Then we have the following statements:*

- (1) *If  $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n \geq 1$ , then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .*
- (2) *If  $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n = 0$  and  $\deg_{x_{n-2}} (n_1 a_{n-1} + n_2 a_n) \geq 1$  for any  $(n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ , then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $1 \in \text{Im } D$ . If  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , then we have  $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . We claim  $x_n \notin \text{Im } D$ . If  $x_n \in \text{Im } D$ , then there exists  $f \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad x_n = D(f).$$

We view the polynomials as in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$  with coefficients in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$  when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on  $x_i$  in the following arguments for  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $f = f_d x_n^d + \dots + f_1 x_n + f_0$  with  $f_d \neq 0$ ,  $f_j \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq d$ . If  $d \geq 1$ , then we have

$$(3.2) \quad f_{dx_1} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} (a_i x_i + b_i) f_{dx_i} + da_n f_d = c$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_n^d$  of equation (3.1), where  $c = 0$  or  $1$ .

(1) If  $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n \geq 1$ , then we have  $f_d = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x_{n-1}$  of equation (3.2), which is a contradiction. Thus, we have  $d = 0$ . Since  $D(f) \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ , we have  $x_n \notin \text{Im } D$ . Thus,  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .

(2) If  $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n = 0$ , then we assume that  $f_d = f_d^{(m)} x_{n-1}^m + \dots + f_d^{(1)} x_{n-1} + f_d^{(0)}$  with  $f_d^{(m)} \neq 0$ ,  $f_d^{(l)} \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}]$  for  $0 \leq l \leq m$ , we have

$$(3.3) \quad f_{dx_1}^{(m)} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} (a_i x_i + b_i) f_{dx_i}^{(m)} + ma_{n-1} f_d^{(m)} + da_n f_d^{(m)} = c$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_{n-1}^m$  of equation (3.2), where  $c = 0$  or  $1$ . Since  $d \geq 1$  and  $\deg_{x_{n-2}} (ma_{n-1} + da_n) \geq 1$ , we have  $f_d^{(m)} = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x_{n-1}$  of equation (3.3), which is a contradiction. Hence we have  $x_n \notin \text{Im } D$ . Then the conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^n (a_i x_i + b_i) \partial_{x_i}$  be a derivation of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  with  $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ . If  $D$  is simple, then  $\deg a_2 \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{D} = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) \partial_{x_2}$ . Then  $\tilde{D}$  is simple. Hence the conclusion follows from Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^3 (a_i x_i + b_i) \partial_{x_i}$  be a derivation of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  with  $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$  and  $a_3 = 0$ . If  $D$  is simple, then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $1 \in \text{Im } D$ . If  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ , then  $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ . Suppose that  $\deg_{x_2} b_3 = u$ . We claim  $x_2^{u+1} \notin \text{Im } D$  if  $D$  is simple. Suppose that  $x_2^{u+1} \in \text{Im } D$ . Then there exists  $f \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  such that

$$(3.4) \quad x_2^{u+1} = D(f)$$

We view the polynomials as in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$  with coefficients in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$  for  $i \in \{2, 3\}$  when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on  $x_i$  in the following arguments. Let  $f = f_d x_3^d + \dots + f_1 x_3 + f_0$  with  $f_d \neq 0$ ,  $f_j \in K[x_1, x_2]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq d$ . If  $d \geq 1$ , then we have

$$f_{dx_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{dx_2} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_3^d$  of equation (3.4). That is,  $D(f_d) = 0$ . Since  $D$  is simple, we have  $f_d \in K^*$ . If  $d \geq 2$ , then we have

$$f_{(d-1)x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{(d-1)x_2} + b_3 \cdot df_d = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_3^{d-1}$  of equation (3.4). Then  $-(df_d)^{-1} f_{d-1}$  is a solution of  $\tilde{D}(z) = b_3$ , where  $\tilde{D} = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) \partial_{x_2}$ , which contradicts that  $D$  is simple. Hence we have  $d \leq 1$ .

(1) If  $d = 1$ , then we have  $f = f_1 x_3 + f_0$  with  $f_1 \in K^*$  and equation (3.4) has the following form

$$(3.5) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{0x_2} + f_1 \cdot b_3 = x_2^{u+1}$$

Since  $\deg_{x_2} b_3 = u$ , we have  $\deg_{x_2} f_0 \geq u + 1$ . Let  $f_0 = f_0^{(t)} x_2^t + \dots + f_0^{(1)} x_2 + f_0^{(0)}$  with  $f_0^{(t)} \neq 0$ ,  $f_0^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq t$ . If  $t > u + 1 \geq 1$ , then we have

$$(3.6) \quad f_0^{(t)'} + t a_2 f_0^{(t)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_2^t$  of equation (3.5). It follows from Corollary 3.2 that  $\deg a_2 \geq 1$ . Then we have  $f_0^{(t)} = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of equation (3.6), which is a contradiction. Hence we have  $t = u + 1$ . Then we have

$$(3.7) \quad f_0^{(u+1)'} + t a_2 f_0^{(u+1)} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_2^{u+1}$  of equation (3.5). We have a contradiction by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of equation (3.7).

(2) If  $d = 0$ , then we have  $f = f_0$  and equation (3.4) has the following form:

$$(3.8) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{0x_2} = x_2^{u+1}$$

We have a contradiction by following the arguments of case (1). Thus, we have  $x_2^{u+1} \notin \text{Im } D$ . Hence  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^3 (a_i x_i + b_i) \partial_{x_i}$  be a derivation of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  with  $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ . If  $D$  is simple, then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ .*

*Proof.* If  $a_3 = 0$ , then it follows from Proposition 3.3 that  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ . If  $\deg_{x_2} a_3 \geq 1$ , then it follows from Proposition 3.1



that  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ . Hence we can assume that  $a_3 \neq 0$  and  $\deg_{x_2} a_3 = 0$ . Note that  $1 \in \text{Im } D$ . If  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ , then we have  $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ . We claim  $x_2 \notin \text{Im } D$  if  $D$  is simple. If  $x_2 \in \text{Im } D$ , then there exists  $f \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  such that

$$(3.9) \quad x_2 = D(f).$$

We view the polynomials as in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$  with coefficients in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$  for  $i \in \{2, 3\}$  when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on  $x_i$  in the following arguments. Let  $f = f_d x_3^d + \dots + f_1 x_3 + f_0$  with  $f_d \neq 0$ ,  $f_j \in K[x_1, x_2]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq d$ .

If  $d \geq 1$ , then we have

$$(3.10) \quad f_{dx_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{dx_2} + df_d \cdot a_3 = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_3^d$  of equation (3.9). Let  $f_d = f_d^{(m)} x_2^m + \dots + f_d^{(1)} x_2 + f_d^{(0)}$  with  $f_d^{(m)} \neq 0$ ,  $f_d^{(k)} \in K[x_1]$  for  $0 \leq k \leq d$ . Then we have

$$(3.11) \quad f_{dx_1}^{(m)} + (ma_2 + da_3) f_d^{(m)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_2^m$  of equation (3.10). Then we have  $f_d^{(m)} \in K^*$  and  $da_3 = -ma_2$  by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of equation (3.11).

If  $m \geq 1$ , then we have

$$f_{dx_1}^{(m-1)} + m f_d^{(m)} b_2 + (m-1) f_d^{(m-1)} a_2 + da_3 \cdot f_d^{(m-1)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_2^{m-1}$  of equation (3.10). That is,

$$f_d^{(m-1)'} = a_2 f_d^{(m-1)} - m f_d^{(m)} b_2.$$

Thus,  $-(m f_d^{(m)})^{-1} f_d^{(m-1)}$  is a solution of the equation  $z' = a_2 z + b_2$ . Let  $\tilde{D} = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) \partial_{x_2}$ . Then it follows from Theorem 13.2.1 in [7] that  $\tilde{D}$  is not simple. Hence  $D$  is not simple, which is a contradiction. Whence we have  $m = 0$ . That is,  $f_d = f_d^{(0)}$ . Then equation (3.11) has the following form:

$$f_d^{(0)'} + da_3 f_d^{(0)} = 0.$$

Since  $a_3 \neq 0$ , we have  $f_d^{(0)} = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of the above equation, which is a contradiction. Hence we have  $d = 0$ . Then equation (3.9) has the following form:

$$(3.12) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{0x_2} = x_2.$$

Let  $f_0 = f_0^{(t)} x_2^t + \dots + f_0^{(1)} x_2 + f_0^{(0)}$  with  $f_0^{(k)} \in K[x_1]$  for  $0 \leq k \leq t$ . Then we have  $t = 1$  and

$$(3.13) \quad f_0^{(1)'} + a_2 f_0^{(1)} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_2$  of equation (3.12). Since  $\deg a_2 \geq 1$ , we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of equation (3.13). Hence we have  $x_2 \notin \text{Im } D$ , Whence  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $D = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)\partial_{x_2} + b_3\partial_{x_3}$  be a derivation of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  with  $a_2, b_2 \in K[x_1]$  and  $b_3 = b_3^{(v)}x_2^v + \cdots + b_3^{(1)}x_2 + b_3^{(0)}$  with  $b_3^{(v)} \neq 0$ ,  $b_3^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq v$ . If  $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$ , then  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $1 \in \text{Im } D$ . If  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ , then we have  $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ . We claim  $x_2^{v+1} \notin \text{Im } D$  if  $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$ . Suppose that  $x_2^{v+1} \in \text{Im } D$ . Then there exists  $f \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  such that

$$(3.14) \quad x_2^{v+1} = D(f).$$

We view the polynomials as in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$  with coefficients in  $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$  when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on  $x_i$  for  $i \in \{2, 3\}$  in the following arguments. Let  $f = f_dx_3^d + \cdots + f_1x_3 + f_0$  with  $f_d \neq 0$ ,  $f_j \in K[x_1, x_2]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq d$ . If  $d \geq 1$ , then we have the following equations:

$$(3.15) \quad f_{dx_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)f_{dx_2} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_3^d$  of equation (3.14). Let  $f_d = f_d^{(t)}x_2^t + \cdots + f_d^{(1)}x_2 + f_d^{(0)}$  with  $f_d^{(t)} \neq 0$ ,  $f_d^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq t$ . If  $t \geq 1$ , then we have

$$(3.16) \quad f_d^{(t)'} + ta_2f_d^{(t)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_2^t$  of equation (3.15). Since  $\deg a_2 \geq 1$ , we have  $f_d^{(t)} = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of equation (3.16), which is a contradiction. Hence we have  $t = 0$ . It follows from equation (3.15) that  $f_d^{(0)'} = 0$ . That is,  $f_d = f_d^{(0)} \in K^*$ .

If  $d \geq 2$ , then we have

$$(3.17) \quad f_{(d-1)x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)f_{(d-1)x_2} + df_d \cdot b_3 = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_3^{d-1}$  of equation (3.14). If  $v = 0$ , then it follows from Proposition 2.4 that  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ . We can assume that  $v \geq 1$ . Let  $f_{d-1} = f_{d-1}^{(s)}x_2^s + \cdots + f_{d-1}^{(1)}x_2 + f_{d-1}^{(0)}$  with  $f_{d-1}^{(s)} \neq 0$ ,  $f_{d-1}^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq s$ . It follows from equation (3.17) that  $s \geq v$ . If  $s > v$ , then we have

$$(3.18) \quad f_{d-1}^{(s)'} + sa_2f_{d-1}^{(s)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_3^{d-1}$  of equation (3.17). Since  $\deg a_2 \geq 1$ , we have  $f_{d-1}^{(s)} = 0$  by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of equation (3.18), which is a contradiction. Hence we have  $s = v$ . Then we have

$$(3.19) \quad f_{d-1}^{(v)'} + sa_2f_{d-1}^{(v)} + df_d \cdot b_3^{(v)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of  $x_2^v$  of equation (3.17). Since  $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$ , we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of  $x_1$  of equation (3.19). Thus, we

have  $d \leq 1$ . That is,  $f = f_1x_3 + f_0$  with  $f_1 \in K$ ,  $f_0 \in K[x_1, x_2]$ . Then equation (3.14) has the following form:

$$(3.20) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)f_{0x_2} + f_1 \cdot b_3 = x_2^{v+1}.$$

We have a contradiction by following the arguments of case (1) of Proposition 3.3. Hence we have  $x_2^{v+1} \notin \text{Im } D$ . That is,  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $D = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)\partial_{x_2} + b_3\partial_{x_3}$  be a derivation of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  with  $a_2, b_2 \in K[x_1]$  and  $b_3 = b_3^{(v)}x_2^v + \cdots + b_3^{(1)}x_2 + b_3^{(0)}$  with  $b_3^{(v)} \in K^*$ ,  $b_3^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$  for  $0 \leq j \leq v$ . Then  $\text{Im } D$  is a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$  iff  $a_2 \in K$ .*

*Proof.* “ $\Leftarrow$ ” If  $a_2 \in K$ , then  $D$  is locally finite. Since  $1 \in \text{Im } D$ , the conclusion follows from Proposition 1.4 in [12].

“ $\Rightarrow$ ” If  $\deg a_2 \geq 1$ , then  $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$ . It follows from Proposition 3.5 that  $\text{Im } D$  is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of  $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ . Then the conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $D$  be a derivation of  $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  for  $n \geq 2$ . If  $D$  is locally nilpotent, then  $D$  is not simple.*

*Proof.* If  $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D \neq K$ , then  $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D$  is a  $D$ -stable ideal. If  $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D = (1)$ , then  $D = 0$ . Clearly,  $D$  is not simple. If  $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D \neq (1)$ , then  $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D$  is a proper  $D$ -stable ideal. Thus,  $D$  is not simple. We can assume that  $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D = K$ . It follows from Lemma 8 in [5] or Theorem 2.1 in [6] that  $D(f) = c \cdot J(f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}, f)$  for some  $c \in K^*$ , where  $J(f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}, f)$  is the Jacobian of  $f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}, f$ . Note that  $\deg f_i \geq 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ . Otherwise,  $D = 0$ . Clearly,  $D$  is not simple. Then we have  $D(f_1) = 0$ . That is, the ideal  $(f_1)$  is a proper  $D$ -stable ideal. Hence  $D$  is not simple.  $\square$

## References

- [1] P. Brumatti, Y. Lequain and D. Levcovitz, *Differential simplicity in Polynomial Rings and Algebraic Independence of Power Series*, J. London Math. Soc. 68(2)(2003), 615-630.
- [2] D. A. Jordan, *Differentially simple rings with no invertible derivations*, the Quart. Jour. of Math. 32(1981) 417-424.
- [3] S. Kour, A.K. Maloo, *Simplicity of Some Derivations of  $k[x, y]$* , Comm. in Algebra 41(4)(2013) 1417-1431.

- [4] Y. Lequain, *Simple Shamsuddin derivations of  $K[X, Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ : An algorithmic characterization*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 212(212)(2008) 801-807.
- [5] L. Makar-Limanov, *Locally nilpotent derivations, a new ring invariant and applications*, Lecture notes, Bar-Han Univesity, 1998. Avail. <http://www.math.wayne.edu/~lml/>.
- [6] L. Makar-Limanov, *Locally nilpotent derivations of affine domains*, MPIM Preprint Series 2004-92. Avail. at [www.math.mpim-bonn.mpg.de](http://www.math.mpim-bonn.mpg.de).
- [7] A. Nowicki, *Polynomial derivations and their rings of constants*, Toruń: N. Copernicus Univ. Press, 1994.
- [8] D. Yan, *Simple derivations in two variables*, Comm. in Algebra 47(9)(2019) 3881–3888.
- [9] D. Yan, *On Shamsuddin derivations and the isotropy groups*, arXiv:2002.00330v3.
- [10] W. Zhao, *Generalizations of the image conjecture and Mathieu conjecture*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 214(7)(2010) 1200-1216.
- [11] W. Zhao, *Mathieu subspaces of associative algebras*, J. Algebra 350(2)(2012) 245-272.
- [12] W. Zhao, *Idempotents in intersection of the kernel and the image of locally fnite derivations and  $\varepsilon$ -derivations*, Eur. J. Math. 4 (2018) 1491-1504.