

Regarding Corners of Invo-Clean Unital Rings

Sushila

Assistant Professor (Mathematics)

Shri Parshu Ram College, Dungrana, Bhadra, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan, India

Email ID: sushilagill16@gmail.com

Abstract

We prove that if R is an invo-clean ring and e is an idempotent, then the corner subring eRe is also invo-clean. In particular, if for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the full matrix $n \times n$ ring $M_n(R)$ is invo-clean, then so is R .

Keywords: Rings, Idempotent.

Introduction

Everywhere in the text of the current paper, all our rings R are assumed to be associative, containing the identity element 1, which in general differs from the zero element 0. Our standard terminology and notations are mainly in agreement with [11]. For instance, for such a ring R , the letter $J(R)$ stands for the Jacobson radical of R , $\text{Nil}(R)$ for the set of nilpotents in R , and $\text{Id}(R)$ for the set of idempotent in R . For some arbitrary but a fixed $e \in \text{Id}(R)$, the subrings eRe and $(1 - e)R(1 - e)$ of R are named corner subrings of R . As usual, $M_n(R)$ will denote the full $n \times n$ matrix ring, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Imitating [13], a ring is called clean if each its element is the sum of a unit and an idempotent, whereas if this unit is 2-torsion, i.e., it is an involution, the clean ring is called invo-clean in [2] and [3]. On the other vein, a ring is said to be nil-clean in [9] if every its element the sum of a nilpotent and an idempotent, while in [7] and [1] a ring is termed weakly nil-clean if every its element is either the sum or the difference of a nilpotent and an idempotent.

Our motivation in writing up this short article is to show the somewhat surprising property that invo-cleanness is closed for taking corners, although the same property is not longer true for the cleanness as it has been demonstrated in [14]. Our statements are very close to these from [4], [5] and [6].

After that, we will comment some idempotent properties as defined in [6] and we will finish with a characterization of the structure of special sorts of weakly nil-clean rings by extending the corresponding results from [12, Corollary 2.6] and [15, Proposition 4.3], respectively.

2. Main Results and Problems

We start here with the following technicality.

Lemma 2.1. Suppose that R is a ring. Then R is an invo-clean ring if, and only if, $R = A \times B$, where A is a nil-clean ring such that the quotient $\bar{A} = A/J(A)$ is nil-clean of nilpotency index ≤ 2 , $J(R)$ is nil, the elements of $\text{Nil}(R)$ satisfy the equation $a^2 + 2a = 0$, and B is a ring which is either zero or a sub direct product of the fields Z_3 .

Proof. It follows by a direct combination of [2] and [12, Theorem 3.3] (compare also with Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 from [12]).

The next assertion is our critical tool. As aforementioned it, however, contrasts the counterexample in [14], where a clean ring R was constructed for which eRe is not clean.

Theorem 2.2. If R is an invo-clean ring, then eRe is also an invo-clean ring for any idempotent e of R . In addition, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $M_n(R)$ is invo-clean, then so is R .

Proof. In virtue of Lemma 2.1, we decompose $R = A \times B$, where A , $\bar{A}$ and B have the same meaning as above. Furthermore, letting $e = (e_1, e_2)$ be an idempotent in R , we detect that e_1 is an idempotent in A and e_2 is an idempotent in B . Therefore, a plain check shows that $eRe = (e_1Ae_1) \times (e_2Be_2)$. It is obvious that the second direct factor e_2Be_2 is either zero or a subdirect product of the Z_3 's. This is true, because B being commutative of characteristic 3 ensures that all its elements satisfy the equation $x^3 = x$ and so the elements of the corner ring $e_2Be_2 = e_2B$ satisfy that equation too.

Now, setting $S = e_1Ae_1$, we deduce with the aid of [11] that $J(S) = e_1J(A)e_1 = S \cap J(A) \subseteq J(A)$, whence $J(S)$ is nil as well, and that $\text{Nil}(S) \subseteq \text{Nil}(A)$. However, $S/J(S) = e_1Ae_1/[(e_1Ae_1) \cap J(A)] \cong (e_1Ae_1 + J(A))/J(A) = \bar{e}_1 \bar{A} \bar{e}_1$, where $\bar{e}_1 = e_1 + J(A)$ and the last equality is fulfilled because of the formula $(e + J(A))(a + J(A))(e + J(A)) = eae + J(A)$, which holds for any $a \in A$. Exploiting furthermore [12, Corollary 2.5], we obtain that $\bar{e}_1 \bar{A} \bar{e}_1$ is nil-clean of index of nilpotence at most 2. Hence again Lemma 2.1 is in use to conclude that eRe is an invo-clean ring, as expected.

As for the second part-half, it is well known that $R \cong fM_n(R)f$ for some idempotent $f \in M_n(R)$. Thus the first part-half directly applies to get the desired implication.

We will now comments some idempotent properties in arbitrary rings.

Proposition 2.3. Suppose R is a ring and $e \in \text{Id}(R)$. Then the following are equivalent:

(1) e is central, that is, $er = re$ for all $r \in R$.

(2) $ef = fe$ for all $f \in \text{Id}(R)$.

(3) $efe = fef$ for all $f \in \text{Id}(R)$, that is, e is symmetric.

(4) $ef = fef$ (resp., $fe = fef$) for all $f \in \text{id}(R)$, that is, e is left (resp., right) regular.

Proof. Given the truthfulness of (3), for any $r \in R$ we consider the element $e + er(1 - e)$. A routine check shows that it is an idempotent of R , say f .

We observe also that $fe = e$ as well as that $ef = f$. Therefore, $efe = fef$ yields that $fe = ef$, i.e., $e = f$. Consequently, $f = e + er(1 - e)$ implies that $er(1 - e) = 0$ and so that $er = ere$. Similarly, $(1 - e)re = 0$ and thus $re = ere$. Finally, $er = re$, as required. This proves the equivalence $(1) \leftrightarrow (3)$. The other points (2) and (4) can be handled by analogy. In view of the last claim, we may state:

Remark 2.4. In [6, Definitions 1.1 and 1.2] the concepts of symmetric and left-right regular idempotents were introduced. In accordance with Proposition 2.3, the word "differ", which is stated on line 4 after Definition 1.2 referred to above, surely should be replaced by the phrase "eventually differ".

Let us recall now that an idempotent e of a ring R is said to be left-central if, for each $r \in R$, the equality $re = ere$ holds, and it is said to be right-central provided $er = ere$ holds. Somewhere in the existing literature this idempotent is called semicentral, left or right respectively. It is clear that if e is simultaneously left-central and right-central, then it is central, i.e., $er = re$ for every $r \in R$.

If in a way of similarity we consider the left equality $re = rer$ and its right analogue $er = rer$, it must be that $(re)^2 = re$ and $(er)^2 = ere$ as well as that $(er)^2 = er$ and $(re)^2 = ere$.

What is of some interest is to know what these conditions on the idempotent e will imply. In particular, what we can discover when $(er)^2 = (re)^2$ in the general case not provided the validity of the previous equalities for e ?

We now will be involved with the structure of weakly nil-clean rings of bounded nilpotency index. Consulting with [15, Definition 2.3], we shall say that a weakly nil-clean ring R has a finite nil index if it exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ which is the least integer such that $(r - e)^k = 0$ or $(r + e)^k = 0$ for every $r \in R$ and some $e \in \text{Id}(R)$ which depends on r .

Let us recall that a ring R is called strongly π -regular, provided for each $a \in R$ there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with the property that $a^n \in a^{n+1}R \cap Ra^{n+1}$.

Specifically, the following strengthening of [15, Proposition 4.3] and [12, Corollary 2.6] holds:

Proposition 2.5. If R is a weakly nil-clean ring of nil index not exceeding 2, then R is strongly π -regular.

Proof. Our first assertion is that R has a bounded by 2 index of nilpotence. In fact, if t is an arbitrary nilpotent in R , then we can write that $t = e + q$ or $t = -e + q$, where $q^2 = 0$. Consequently, one writes that $e = t - q$ or $e = q - t$ and thus it follows from [10, Proposition 2] that $e = 0$, so that $t = q$ sustaining our claim.

On the other side, it was proved in [1] that weakly nil-clean rings are clean and thus exchange. Moreover, it was also shown there that every homomorphic image of R has nil Jacobson radical. Henceforth, we are now in a position to employ [8, Lemma 3.9] inferring that R is strongly π -regular, indeed.

We end our work with the following two questions of interest.

Problem 2.6. Let R be a ring in which 2 is nilpotent, and let $e \in R$ be an idempotent. If both eRe and $(1 - e)R(1 - e)$ are invo-clean rings, does it follow that R is also invo-clean?

In this aspect, let us comment that the matrix ring $M_n(Z_3)$ over the invo-clean ring Z_3 is not invo-clean as well since, in conjunction with [2] or [3], all invo-clean rings of characteristic 3 must be commutative (compare also with [6]). Moreover, although all units in Z_3 are involutions, this is not the case in the matrix ring $M_2(Z_3)$ over Z_3 even in the case $n = 2$. As an illustration of this, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ has the property that its square $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^2$ is equal to $\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} = -\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. That is why, a ring R is said to be almost invo-clean if, for every element r in R , we have that $r = v + e$, where $e^2 = e$ and $v^2 = 1$ or $v^2 = -1$, calling such an element v an almost involution. Note that our matrix illustrated above is, actually, an almost involution. So, one may ask of whether or not $M_n(R)$ is an almost invo-clean ring, provided that R is an invo-clean ring. As a starting point of view, this could be firstly checked for $M_n(Z_3)$.

Problem 2.7. If R is a ring of index of nilpotence at most 2 and eRe and $(1-e)R(1-e)$ are both nil-clean rings of index of nilpotence not exceeding 2, is R also nil-clean?

In case that is true, it will improve on [4, Lemma 2.3], where both corners are assumed to be boolean rings.

REFERENCES

1. S. Breaz, P. Danchev and Y. Zhou, Rings in which every element is either a sum or a difference of a nilpotent and an idempotent, *J. Algebra Appl.*, 15 (2016), 1650148. <https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219498816501486>

2. P. V. Danchev, Invo-clean unital rings, *Commun. Korean Math. Soc.*, 32 (2017), 19{27. <https://doi.org/10.4134/ckms.c160054>
3. P. V. Danchev, Weakly invo-clean unital rings, *Afrika Matematika*, 28 (2017), 1285-1295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13370-017-0515-7>
4. P. V. Danchev, Strongly nil-clean corner rings, *Bull. Iran. Math. Soc.*, 43 (2017), 1333-1339.
5. P. V. Danchev, Semi-boolean corner rings, *International Mathematical Forum*, 12 (2017), 795{802. <https://doi.org/10.12988/imf.2017.7655>
6. P. V. Danchev, On corner subrings of unital rings, *Internat. J. Contemp. Math. Sci.*, 13 (2018), 59{62. <https://doi.org/10.12988/ijcms.2018.812>
7. P. V. Danchev and W. Wm. McGovern, Commutative weakly nil clean unital rings, *Journal of Algebra*, 425 (2015), 410-422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2014.12.003>
8. P. V. Danchev and J. Ster, Generalizing π -regular rings, *Taiwanese J. Math.*, 19 (2015), 1577-1592. <https://doi.org/10.11650/tjm.19.2015.6236>
9. A. J. Diesl, Nil clean rings, *Journal of Algebra*, 383 (2013), 197-211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2013.02.020>
10. M. Ferrero, E. Puczyłowski and S. Sidki, On the representation of an idempotent as a sum of nilpotent elements, *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 39 (1996), 178-185. <https://doi.org/10.4153/cmb-1996-022-0>
11. T. Y. Lam, *A First Course in Noncommutative Rings*, Second Edition, Graduate Texts in Math., Vol. 131, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8616-0>
12. Y. Li, X. Quan and G. Xia, Nil-clean rings of nilpotency index at most two with application to involution-clean rings, *Commun. Korean Math. Soc.*, 33 (2018), 751-757. <https://doi.org/10.4134/CKMS.c170308>
13. W. K. Nicholson, Lifting idempotents and exchange rings, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 229 (1977), 269-278. <https://doi.org/10.1090/s0002-9947-1977-0439876-2>
14. J. Ster, Corner rings of a clean ring need not be clean, *Commun. Algebra*, 40 (2012), 1595-1604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2011.551901>
15. J. Ster, On expressing matrices over Z_2 as the sum of an idempotent and a nilpotent, *Lin. Algebra Appl.*, 544 (2018), 339{349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2018.01.015>