

POINTWISE SEMICOMMUTATIVE RINGS

SANJIV SUBBA [†], TIKARAM SUBEDI ^{†*}, AND A. M. BUHPHANG ^{††}

ABSTRACT. We call a ring R pointwise semicommutative if for any element $a \in R$ either $l(a)$ or $r(a)$ is an ideal of R . A class of pointwise semicommutative rings is a strict generalization of semicommutative rings. Since reduced rings are pointwise semicommutative, this paper studies sufficient conditions for pointwise semicommutative rings to be reduced. For a pointwise semicommutative ring R , R is strongly regular if and only if R is left SF; R is exchange if and only if R is clean; if R is semiperiodic then $R/J(R)$ is commutative.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise mentioned, all rings considered are associative with identity, R represents a ring, and all modules are unital. For any $w \in R$, the notations $r(w)$ ($l(w)$) represents the right (left) annihilator of w . We write $C(R)$, $P(R)$, $J(R)$, $N(R)$, $E(R)$, $Z(R)$ and $U(R)$ respectively, for the set of all central elements, the prime radical, the Jacobson radical, the set of all nilpotent elements, the set of all idempotent elements, the left singular ideal of R and the group of units of R . Recall that R is said to be:

- (1) *reduced* if $N(R) = 0$.
- (2) *reversible* ([4]) if $wh = 0$ implies $hw = 0$ for any $w, h \in R$.
- (3) *semicommutative* ([4]) if for each $w \in R$, $r(w)$ is an ideal of R .
- (4) *strongly regular* ([5]) if for each $w \in R$, $w \in w^2R$.
- (5) *left (right) weakly regular* ([2]) if $w \in R w R w$ ($w \in w R w R$) for any $w \in R$.
- (6) *left (right) quasi duo* ([5]) if every maximal left (right) ideal of R is an ideal of R .

Let $ME_l(R) = \{e \in E(R) \mid Re \text{ is a minimal left ideal of } R\}$. R is called *left min-abel* if for any $e \in ME_l(R)$ $re = ere$ for all $r \in R$. R is called *left MC2* if $aRe = 0$ implies $eRa = 0$ for any $a \in R$, $e \in ME_l(R)$. According to [3], R is said to be *NCI* if $N(R) = 0$ or $N(R)$ contains a non-zero ideal of R . R is said to be *NI* if $N(R)$ is an ideal of R , and R is *2-primal* if $N(R) = P(R)$. Obviously, NI rings are NCI; nevertheless, the converse is not true (by [3, Example 2.5]). R is *directly finite* if $wh = 1$ implies $hw = 1$ for any $h, w \in R$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 16U80; Secondary 16S34, 16S36.
Key words and phrases. Pointwise semicommutative rings, semicommutative rings.

Let $\Psi : R \rightarrow R$ be an automorphism of R . $R[x; \Psi]$ is the ring of polynomials over R with respect to usual polynomial addition and multiplication which is defined by the rule: $xa = \Psi(a)x$. $R[x; \Psi]$ is called skew polynomial ring of R .

Over the past several years, semicommutative rings and their generalizations have been studied extensively by many authors. In a semicommutative ring R , both the left and the right annihilator of every element of R are ideals of R . This motivates us to investigate a ring R in which either the left or the right annihilator (not necessarily both) of any element of R is an ideal of R . This paper studies such a class of rings.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Definition 2.1. We call a ring R *pointwise semicommutative* if for any $w \in R$, either $l(w)$ or $r(w)$ is an ideal of R .

It is evident that semicommutative rings are pointwise semicommutative. However, the following example shows that the converse need not be true.

Example 2.2. Let $R = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $a_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $a_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $a_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $a_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $a_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $a_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $a_6 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $a_7 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. Observe that $l(a_0) = R$, $l(a_1) = l(a_2) = 0$, $l(a_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $l(a_4) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $r(a_5) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $l(a_6) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $r(a_7) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ are ideals. Thus, R is pointwise semicommutative. Clearly, R is not semicommutative.

Proposition 2.3. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative ring. Then:*

- (1) R is directly finite.
- (2) R is left min-abel.

Proof. (1) Suppose $w, h \in R$ with $wh = 1$. Take $k = h - h^2w$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative and $k^2 = 0$, $0 = k(w - h^2w)k = (h - h^2w)(w - h^2w)(h - h^2w)$. This implies that $hw = 1$.

- (2) Let $e \in ME_l(R)$ and $w \in R$. Take $h = we - ewe$. If possible, assume that $h \neq 0$. Clearly, $he = h$ and $h^2 = 0$. Observe that $0 \neq Rh \subseteq Re$. Since $e \in ME_l(R)$, $Rh = Re$. As R is pointwise semicommutative and $h^2 = 0$, $hRh = 0$. Thus, $0 = RhRh = ReRe = Re$, a contradiction. Thus, $h = 0$.

□

Proposition 2.4. *Let R be a ring. Then R is a domain if and only if R is prime and pointwise semicommutative.*

Proof. The necessary part is obvious. Conversely, assume that R is a prime and pointwise semicommutative ring and $w, h \in R$ be such that $wh = 0$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative and $(hw)^2 = 0$, $hwRhw = 0$. By hypothesis, $hw = 0$. So for any $r \in R$, $(wrh)^2 = 0$ which further implies that $wrhRwrh = 0$, that is, $wrh = 0$. As R is prime, $w = 0$ or $h = 0$. \square

It is well known that the ring

$$R_n = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1(n-1)} & a_{1n} \\ 0 & a & \cdots & a_{2(n-1)} & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a & a_{(n-1)n} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & a \end{bmatrix} \mid a, a_{ij} \in R, i < j \right\}$$

is semicommutative whenever R is reduced and $n = 3$. However, R_n is not semicommutative for $n \geq 4$ even if R is reduced (see [4, Example 1.3]). So one might suspect whether R_n is pointwise semicommutative for $n \geq 4$ whenever R is reduced. Nevertheless, the following example obliterates the possibility.

Example 2.5. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_6$, $R_4 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b & c & d \\ 0 & a & e & f \\ 0 & 0 & a & g \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a \end{bmatrix} \mid a, b, c, d, e, f, g \in R \right\}$,

where \mathbb{Z}_6 is the ring of integers modulo 6. Take $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \in R_4$.

Note that $B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in r(A)$. Let $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 5 & 5 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in R_4$.

Then $ACB = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \neq 0$. Now, observe that $E = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in$

$l(A)$. Take $F = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\ 0 & 5 & 3 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 & 5 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \in R_4$. Then $EFA = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \neq 0$.

Thus, neither $r(A)$ nor $l(A)$ is an ideal of R_4 , that is, R_4 is not a pointwise semicommutative ring.

Proposition 2.6. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative ring. Then R is NCI.*

Proof. Let R be a pointwise semicommutative ring. Suppose $N(R) \neq 0$. Then there exists $w (\neq 0) \in N(R)$ such that $w^n = 0$ for some integer $n \geq 2$

and $w^{n-1} \neq 0$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative, either $w^{n-1}Rw = 0$ or $wRw^{n-1} = 0$. So $w^{n-1}Rw^{n-1} = 0$. Hence $Rw^{n-1}R$ is a non-zero nilpotent ideal of R . Thus, R is *NCI*. \square

Observe that R_4 (in Example 2.5) is *NCI*. Hence the converse is not true.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\{R_i\}_{i \in \Delta}$ be a class of rings and Δ an index set. If $R = \prod_{i \in \Delta} R_i$ is pointwise semicommutative, then R_i is pointwise semicommutative for each $i \in \Delta$.*

Proof. Let $a_j \in R_j$, $j \in \Delta$. Suppose $l((0, \dots, 0, a_j, 0, \dots))$ is an ideal of $R = \prod_{i \in \Delta} R_i$ and $x_j \in l(a_j)$. Note that $(0, 0, \dots, 0, x_j, 0, \dots) \in l((0, \dots, 0, a_j, 0, \dots))$. So $(0, 0, \dots, 0, x_j, 0, \dots)(r_i)_{i \in \Delta}(0, \dots, a_j, 0, \dots) = 0$ for any $(r_i)_{i \in \Delta} \in \prod_{i \in \Delta} R_i$. So $x_j r_j \in l(a_j)$ for all $r_j \in R_j$. Thus, $l(a_j)$ is an ideal of R_j . Similarly, $r(a_j)$ is an ideal of R_j whenever $r((0, \dots, 0, a_j, 0, \dots))$ is an ideal of R . Therefore, for each $j \in \Delta$, R_j is pointwise semicommutative. \square

However, the converse is not true (see the following example).

Example 2.8. Let $R_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then R_i is pointwise semi-

commutative (see Example 2.2). Take $A = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \in R_1 \times$

R_2 . Then $l(A) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{bmatrix}$. Note that $X = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \in$

$l(A)$ and take $Y = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \in R_1 \times R_2$. Then

$XY = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \notin l(A)$. Thus, $l(A)$ is not an ideal of $R_1 \times R_2$.

Observe that

$r(A) = \left\{ \left(\begin{bmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & z \\ 0 & z \end{bmatrix} \right) \mid x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \right\}$. So, $P = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \in$

$r(A)$. Then, $YP = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \notin r(A)$. So $r(A)$ is not an ideal of $R_1 \times R_2$. Therefore, $R_1 \times R_2$ is not pointwise semicommutative.

Proposition 2.9. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative, and every nilpotent element is of index ≤ 2 . Then R is 2-primal.*

Proof. It is obvious that $P(R) \subseteq N(R)$. Let $w \in N(R)$. Then $w^2 = 0$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative, $wRw = 0 \subseteq P(R)$ and so $w \in P(R)$. Therefore $P(R) = N(R)$. \square

Following [6], an element w of a ring R is said to be *clean* if w is a sum of a unit, and an idempotent of R , w is said to be *exchange* if there exist $e \in E(R)$ such that $e \in wR$ and $1 - e \in (1 - w)R$. R is said to be *clean* if every element of R is clean, and R is said to be *exchange* if every element of R is exchange. It is well known that clean rings are exchange.

Proposition 2.10. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative exchange ring, then R is clean.*

Proof. Let $w \in R$. Then there exists $e \in E(R)$ satisfying $e \in wR$ and $1-e \in (1-w)R$. So $e = wh$ and $1-e = (1-w)k$ for some $h, k \in R$ such that $h = he, k = k(1-e)$. Then $(w-(1-e))(h-k) = wh-wk-(1-e)h+(1-e)k = wh + (1-w)k - (1-e)h - ek = 1 - (1-e)h - ek$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative, either $r(e)$ or $l(e)$ is an ideal of R . If $r(e)$ is an ideal of R , then $0 = hes(1-e) = hs(1-e)$, that is, $(1-e)hs \in N(R)$ for all $s \in R$ and $0 = ek(1-e) = ek$. So $(1-e)h, ek \in J(R)$. If $l(e)$ is an ideal of R , then $(1-e)h = 0$ and $ek \in J(R)$. Therefore, $1 - (1-e)h - ek$ is unit and by Proposition 2.3 (1), $w - (1-e)$ is unit. Thus, w is clean. \square

A ring R is said to be semiperiodic ([1]) if for each $w \in R \setminus (J(R) \cup C(R))$, $w^q - w^p \in N(R)$ for some integers p and q of opposite parity.

Lemma 2.11. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative ring. If R is semiperiodic then $N(R) \subseteq J(R)$.*

Proof. Suppose $w (\neq 0)$, $x \in R$ and $w^k = 0$ for some positive integer k . If $wx \in J(R)$, then wx is right quasi-regular. If $wx \in C(R)$, then wx is nilpotent, and so wx is right quasi-regular. Assume that $wx \notin J(R) \cup C(R)$. Then by [1, Lemma 2.3(iii)], there exist a positive integer p and $e \in E(R)$ such that $(wx)^p = (wx)^pe$ and $e = wy$ for some $y \in R$. Observe that

$$e = wy = ewy = ew(1-e)y + ewey = ew(1-e)y + ew^2y^2 = \dots = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} ew^i(1-e)y^i + ew^k y^k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} ew^i(1-e)y^i.$$

Since R is pointwise semicommutative, $r(e)$ or $l(e)$ is an ideal of R . If $r(e)$ is an ideal of the R , then $ew^i(1-e)y^i = 0$ for all i and hence $e = 0$. If $l(e)$ is an ideal of R then $(1-e)re = 0$ for any $r \in R$ and hence $ew^i(1-e)s \in N(R)$ for all i and $s \in R$, that is, $ew^i(1-e) \in J(R)$.

Hence $e = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} ew^i(1-e)y^i \in J(R)$, that is, $e = 0$. Consequently, we obtain $(wx)^p = 0$ and so wx is right quasi-regular. Thus, $w \in J(R)$. \square

Proposition 2.12. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative ring. If R is semiperiodic, then:*

- (1) $R/J(R)$ is commutative.
- (2) R is NI.
- (3) R is commutative whenever $J(R) \neq N(R)$.

Proof. (1) By Lemma 2.11, $N(R) \subseteq J(R)$. Write $\bar{R} = R/J(R)$ and let $\bar{w} \in \bar{R}$ with $\bar{w}^2 = 0$. Then by [1, Lemma 2.6], $w^2 \in J(R) \subseteq N(R) \cup C(R)$. If $w^2 \in N(R)$, then $w \in N(R) \subseteq J(R)$ (see Lemma 2.11), that is, $\bar{w} = 0$. Suppose $w^2 \notin N(R)$, then $w^2 \in C(R)$. If $w \in Z(R)$, then $\bar{w}\bar{R}\bar{w} = 0$. Since \bar{R} is semiprime, $\bar{w} = 0$. Assume, if possible, that $\bar{w} \notin C(\bar{R})$ then $w \notin J(R) \cup C(R)$. By [1, Lemma 2.3(iii)], there

exist a positive integer p and $e \in E(R)$ such that $w^p = w^p e$ and $e = wy$ for some $y \in R$. Hence $e = ewy = ew(1-e)y + ewey = ew(1-e)y + ew^2y^2$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative, $e \in J(R)$, that is, $e = 0$. This yields that $w^p = 0$ and so $w \in N(R) \subseteq J(R)$, a contradiction. Therefore $\bar{w} \in C(\bar{R})$ and so $\bar{w} = 0$. Thus, \bar{R} is reduced. Since R is semiperiodic, \bar{R} is commutative (by [1, Theorem 4.4]).

- (2) Let $w, h \in N(R)$ and $x \in R$. By Lemma 2.11, $w - h, wx \in J(R)$. By [1, Lemma 2.6], $w - h, wx \in N(R) \cup C(R)$. If $w - h, wx \in N(R)$, then nothing to prove. Suppose $w - h, wx \in C(R)$. Now, observe that $(w - h)w = w(w - h)$ and $(wx)^m = w^m x^m$ for all integer $m \geq 1$. This implies that $wh = hw$ and hence $w - h, wx \in N(R)$. Hence $N(R)$ is an ideal.
- (3) By [1, Lemma 2.6], $J(R) = (J(R) \cap N(R)) \cup (J(R) \cap C(R))$. Note that R is NI (by 2), and $J(R) \cap N(R)$ and $J(R) \cap C(R)$ are additive subgroups of R , so $J(R) = J(R) \cap N(R)$ or $J(R) \cap C(R)$. This yields that $J(R) \subseteq N(R)$ or $J(R) \subseteq C(R)$. By hypothesis and Lemma 2.11, $J(R) \subseteq C(R)$. Let $w \in R$. Suppose $w \notin C(R)$. Then $w \notin J(R) \cup C(R)$. Then there exist positive integers p, q ($p \geq q$) of opposite parity such that $w^p - w^q \in N(R)$. So $(w^p - w^q)^k = 0$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then $((w - w^{p-q+1}))^k = 0$, this gives $w - w^{p-q+1} \in N(R) \subseteq J(R) \subseteq C(R)$. By Herstein's Theorem [1], R is commutative. \square

The following examples show that the skew polynomial ring and the polynomial ring over a pointwise semicommutative ring need not be pointwise semicommutative.

- Example 2.13.** (1) Let D be a division ring and $R = D \oplus D$ with componentwise multiplication. Clearly, R is reduced, so R is pointwise semicommutative. Define $\sigma(h, w) = (w, h)$. Then σ is an automorphism of R . Let $f(x) = (1, 0)x \in R[x; \sigma]$. Observe that $f(x)^2 = 0$ but $f(x)xf(x) \neq 0$. Hence $R[x; \sigma]$ is not pointwise commutative.
- (2) Take \mathbb{Z}_2 as the field of integers modulo 2 and let $A = \mathbb{Z}_2[a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2, c]$ be the free algebra of polynomials with zero constant terms in noncommuting indeterminates $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2$ and c over \mathbb{Z}_2 . Take an ideal I of the ring $\mathbb{Z}_2 + A$ generated by $a_0b_0, a_0b_1 + a_1b_0, a_0b_2 + a_1b_1 + a_2b_0, a_1b_2 + a_2b_1, a_1b_1, a_0rb_0, a_2rb_2, b_0a_0, b_0a_1 + b_1a_0, b_0a_2 + b_1a_1 + b_2a_0, b_1a_2 + b_2a_1, b_2a_2, b_0ra_0, b_2ra_2, (a_0 + a_1 + a_2)r(b_0 + b_1 + b_2), (b_0 + b_1 + b_2)r(a_0 + a_1 + a_2)$ and $r_1r_2r_3r_4$ where $r, r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 \in A$. Take $R = (\mathbb{Z}_2 + A)/I$. Then we have $R[x] \cong (\mathbb{Z}_2 + A)[x]/I[x]$. By [4, Example 2.1], R is reversible and hence pointwise semicommutative. Observe that $(b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2)(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2) \in I[x]$. But $(b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2)c(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2) \notin I[x]$, since $b_0ca_1 + b_1ca_0 \notin I$. Hence $l((a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2))$ is not an ideal of $R[x]$. Again, $(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2)(b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2) \in I[x]$. But $(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2)c(b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2) \notin$

$I[x]$, since $a_0cb_1 + a_1cb_0 \notin I$. Thus, $r(\overline{(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2)})$ is also not an ideal of $R[x]$. Therefore, $R[x]$ is not pointwise semicommutative.

Lemma 2.14. *Let R be a ring and Δ be a multiplicatively closed subset of R consisting of central non-zero divisors. For any $u^{-1}a \in \Delta^{-1}R$, $l(u^{-1}a)$ is an ideal of $\Delta^{-1}R$ if and only if $l(a)$ is an ideal of R and $r(u^{-1}a)$ is an ideal of $\Delta^{-1}R$ if and only if $r(a)$ is an ideal of R .*

Proof. Easy to prove. \square

Proposition 2.15. *Let R be a ring and Δ be a multiplicatively closed subset of R consisting of central non-zero divisors. Then R is pointwise semicommutative if and only if $\Delta^{-1}R$ is pointwise semicommutative.*

Proof. Suppose R is pointwise semicommutative. Let $u^{-1}a \in \Delta^{-1}R$. Then, either $l(a)$ or $r(a)$ is an ideal of R . By the Lemma 2.14, either $l(u^{-1}a)$ or $r(u^{-1}a)$ is an ideal of $\Delta^{-1}R$. Thus, $\Delta^{-1}R$ is pointwise semicommutative. Observe that the converse is trivial. \square

Corollary 2.16. *$R[x]$ is pointwise semicommutative if and only if $R[x, x^{-1}]$ is so.*

Proof. Note that $R[x, x^{-1}] = \Delta^{-1}R[x]$, where $\Delta = \{1, x, x^2, \dots\}$. Hence the result follows. \square

A left R -module M is said to be *Wnil-injective* if for any $w (\neq 0) \in N(R)$, there exists a positive integer m such that $w^m \neq 0$ and any R -homomorphism $\Psi : Rw^m \rightarrow M$ extends to one from R to M . In order to probe some properties of pointwise semicommutative rings, we investigate Wnil-injective modules over a pointwise semicommutative ring in the following.

Proposition 2.17. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative ring, and every simple singular left R -module is Wnil-injective then:*

- (1) R is left non-singular.
- (2) R is left weakly regular whenever R is left MC2.
- (3) R is reduced if any $e \in E(R)$, $er = ere$ for all $r \in R$.

Proof. (1) Assume that $Z({}_R R) \neq 0$. Then there exists $w (\neq 0) \in Z({}_R R)$ such that $w^2 = 0$. So, $l(w) \subseteq M$ for some maximal left ideal M of R . Since $w \in Z({}_R R)$, M is essential. Now, define an R -homomorphism $\Psi : Rw \rightarrow R/M$ via. $\Psi(rw) = r + M$. By hypothesis, R/M is Wnil-injective and so there exists $h \in R$ with $1 - wh \in M$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative and $w^2 = 0$, $whw = 0$, that is, $wh \in l(w)$, which further implies that $1 \in M$, a contradiction. Therefore $Z({}_R R) = 0$.

- (2) Suppose there is an element $w \in R$ such that $RwR + l(w) \neq R$. So, $RwR + l(w) \subseteq M$ for some maximal left ideal M of R . If M is not essential in ${}_R R$, then $M = Re = l(1 - e)$ for some $e \in E(R)$. As

$R(1-e) \cong R/l(1-e) = R/M$ is a simple left R -module, $R(1-e)$ is a minimal left ideal of R . By Proposition 2.3 (2), R is a left min-abel ring. Since R is a left MC2 ring, $1-e \in Z(R)$ by [8, Theorem 1.8]. As $w \in RwR + l(w) \subseteq M = l(1-e)$, $w(1-e) = 0 = (1-e)w$. So $1-e \in l(w) \subseteq M = l(1-e)$, a contradiction. Therefore, M is essential left ideal of R . Thus, R/M is Wnil-injective. As in the proof of (1,) $1-wh \in M$ for some $h \in R$. Since $wh \in RwR \subseteq M$, $1 \in M$, a contradiction. Therefore, $RwR + l(w) = R$ for any $w \in R$, that is, $RwRw = R$. Hence R is a left weakly regular ring.

- (3) Suppose there exists $w (\neq 0) \in R$ satisfying $w^2 = 0$. Then $l(w) \subseteq M$ for some maximal left ideal M of R . If M is not essential, then $M = l(e)$ for some $0 \neq e \in E(R)$. So $we = 0$ and by hypothesis, $ew = ewe = 0$. This implies that $e \in l(w) \subseteq M = l(e)$, a contradiction. Hence M is essential, and R/M is simple singular left R -module. As in the proof of (1), $1-wh \in M$ for some $h \in R$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative and $w^2 = 0$, $wh \in l(w) \subseteq M$. This implies that $1 \in M$, a contradiction. Therefore, $w = 0$. □

R is called a *left (right) SF* if all simple left (right) R -modules are flat. [7, Remark 3.13] shows that R is strongly regular whenever R is a reduced left SF ring. We extend this result as follows.

Proposition 2.18. *Let R be a pointwise semicommutative ring. If R is left SF, then R is strongly regular.*

Proof. By [7, Proposition 3.2], $R/J(R)$ is left SF. Let $w^2 \in J(R)$ such that $w \notin J(R)$. Assume, if possible, $Rr(w) + J(R) = R$, then

$1 = x + \sum^{finite} r_i s_i$, $x \in J(R)$, $r_i \in R$, $s_i \in r(w)$. Then $w = xw + \sum^{finite} r_i s_i w$. Take $t_i = s_i w$. So $t_i^2 = 0$. Since R is pointwise semicommutative, $t_i R t_i = 0$. Suppose $t_i \notin J(R)$. Then $M + R t_i = R$ for some maximal left ideal M of R with $t_i \notin M$. So $m + p t_i = 1$, $m \in M$, $p \in R$. This yields that $(1-m)^2 = 0$, that is, $1 \in R$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $t_i \in J(R)$. This further yields that $w \in J(R)$, a contradiction. Hence $Rr(w) + J(R) \neq R$. There exist some maximal left ideal H satisfying $Rr(w) + J(R) \subseteq H$. Note that $w^2 \in H$. By [7, Lemma 3.14], $w^2 = w^2 x$ for some $x \in H$, that is, $w - wx \in r(w) \subseteq H$. So $w \in H$. Hence there exists $y \in H$ satisfying $w = wy$, that is, $1 - y \in r(w) \subseteq H$. This implies that $1 \in H$, a contradiction. Therefore $R/J(R)$ is reduced. Therefore by [7, Remark 3.13], $R/J(R)$ is strongly regular. This implies that R is left quasi-duo, and hence by [7, Theorem 4.10], R is strongly regular. □

REFERENCES

- [1] H. E. Bell and A. Yaqub, *On commutativity of semiperiodic rings*, Results Math., **53** (1-2) (2009) 19-26.

- [2] G. F. Birkenmeier, J. Y. Kim and J. K. Park, *A connection between weak regularity and the simplicity of prime factor rings*, **122 (1)** (1994) 53-58.
- [3] S. U. Hwang, Y. C. Jeon and K. S. Park, *On NCI rings*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc., **44 (2)** (2007) 215-223.
- [4] N. K. Kim and Y. Lee, *Extensions of reversible rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **185 (1-3)** (2003) 207-223.
- [5] T. Y. Lam and A. S. Dugas, *Quasi-duo rings and stable range descent*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **195 (3)** (2005) 243-259.
- [6] W. K. Nicholson, *Lifting idempotents and exchange rings*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., **229** (1977) 269-278.
- [7] M. B. Rege, *On von Neumann regular rings and SF-rings*, Math. Japonica, **31 (6)** (1986) 927-936.
- [8] J. Wei., *Certain rings whose simple singular modules are nil-injective*, Turk. J. Math, **32 (4)** (2008) 393-408.

[†]DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA, SHILLONG 793003, INDIA

Email address: sanjivsubba59@gmail.com

^{†*}DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY MEGHALAYA, SHILLONG 793003, INDIA

Email address: tikaram.subedi@nitm.ac.in

^{††}DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTH-EASTERN HILL UNIVERSITY, SHILLONG 793022, INDIA

Email address: ardeline@nehu.ac.in