

EDN: UNTTNT

УДК 512.6

Identities Related to Homo-derivation on Ideal in Prime Rings

Nadeem ur Rehman*

Hafedh Alnoghashi[†]

Department of Mathematics

Aligarh Muslim University

Aligarh, India

Received 20.11.2022, received in revised form 25.12.2022, accepted 20.02.2023

Abstract. This study aims to investigate the commutativity of a prime ring \mathcal{R} with a non-zero ideal \mathcal{I} and a homo-derivation ϑ that satisfies certain algebraic identities. We also provided some examples of why our results hypothesis is essential.

Keywords: prime ring, homo-derivation.

Citation: N. ur Rehman, H. Alnoghashi, Identities Related to Homo-derivation on Ideal in Prime Rings, J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Math. Phys., 2023, 16(3), 370–384. EDN: UNTTNT.



1. Introduction

Throughout this article, \mathcal{R} denotes a ring with centre Z . A ring \mathcal{R} is said to be a prime ring if $\forall a, b \in \mathcal{R}$, $a\mathcal{R}b = \{0\}$ implies $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. For $a, b \in \mathcal{R}$, the symbol $[a, b]$ (resp. $a \circ b$) denotes the (resp. anti-) commutator $ab - ba$ (resp. $ab + ba$). An additive mapping $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is said to be a homo-derivation if $\vartheta(ab) = \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + \vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) \forall a, b \in \mathcal{R}$, [14]. The only additive map which is both derivation and homo-derivation on prime ring is the zero map. If $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, then a mapping $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ preserves \mathcal{D} if $\vartheta(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. A map $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is called zero-power valued on \mathcal{D} if ϑ preserves \mathcal{D} and if for all $a \in \mathcal{D}$, there is a positive integer $m(a) > 1$ such that $\vartheta^{m(a)} = 0$, El Sofy [14].

In 2001, Ashraf and Rehman [13] showed that if \mathcal{R} is a prime ring, \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} and $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is a derivation of \mathcal{R} , then \mathcal{R} is commutative if \mathcal{R} satisfies any one of the following: $\vartheta(ab) \pm ab \in Z$, $\vartheta(ab) \pm ba \in Z$, $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \pm ab \in Z$, $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \pm ba \in Z$, for all $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$.

In 2016, Asmaa Melaibari et. al. [2] showed that if \mathcal{R} is a prime ring, \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} , and $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is a non-zero homo-derivation of \mathcal{R} , then \mathcal{R} is commutative if $\vartheta([a, b]) = 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$. Moreover, if $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$, ϑ is zero-power valued on \mathcal{R} , and $\vartheta([a, b]) \in Z$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{R}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.

In 2018, Alharfie and Muthana [7] showed that if \mathcal{R} is a prime ring of characteristic $\neq 2$, \mathcal{I} a non-zero left ideal of \mathcal{R} , and ϑ a homo-derivation of \mathcal{R} , which is a zero-power valued on \mathcal{I} , then \mathcal{R} is commutative if \mathcal{R} satisfies any one of the following: $a\vartheta(b) \pm ab \in Z$, $a\vartheta(b) \pm ba \in Z$, $a\vartheta(b) \pm [a, b] \in Z$, $\vartheta(b)a \pm [a, b] \in Z$, $[\vartheta(a), b] \pm ab \in Z$, $[\vartheta(a), b] \pm ba \in Z$, for all $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$.

*rehman100@gmail.com, nu.rehman.mm@amu.ac.in <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3955-7941>

[†]halnoghashi@gmail.com <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0253-6573>

© Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

In 2019, they showed that if \mathcal{R} is a prime ring, \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} and $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is a zero-power valued homo-derivation on \mathcal{I} , then \mathcal{R} is commutative if $\vartheta(ab) - ab \in Z$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$ [6, Theorem 3.1], or $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$ [6, Theorem 3.2]. In fact, we will prove the same result in [6, Theorem 3.1] by replacing the condition " ϑ is zero-power valued" by " $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$," as in Theorem 1.2(ii). For ([6, Theorem 3.2]), they made a mistake in the proof because they replaced ϑ by $-\vartheta$, given that $-\vartheta$ is homo-derivation, but this is not true in general, take $\vartheta(a) = -a$ of any ring of characteristic $\neq 2$. So, we will prove the previous result as in Theorem 1.2(i) again. Additional references may be found at [1, 3–5, 9, 10, 12, 15–19].

Motivated by these results, we will investigate the commutativity of prime ring \mathcal{R} with homo-derivation ϑ and a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{I} that fulfills specific algebraic identities. We also provided some examples of why our results hypothesis is essential.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathcal{R} be a prime ring, \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} and ϑ a homo-derivation of \mathcal{R} preserves \mathcal{I} . If any one of the following holds, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

- (i) $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (i) $\vartheta(a) \neq -a$ and $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) - ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (ii) $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (iii) $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) - ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{R} be a prime ring, \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} and ϑ a homo-derivation of \mathcal{R} preserves \mathcal{I} . If any one of the following holds, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

- (i) ϑ is zero-power valued on \mathcal{I} and $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (ii) $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) - ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (iii) $\vartheta(ab) + ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (iv) $\vartheta(ab) - ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$.

The next example demonstrates that the hypothesis ϑ is zero-power valued on \mathcal{I} in Theorem 1.2(i) is essential.

Example 1.1. *Let \mathbb{Z} be the ring of all integers, $\mathcal{R} = M_2(\mathbb{Z})$, $\mathcal{I} = 2\mathcal{R}$, and define $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ by $\vartheta(a) = -a$. Then it is easy to see that ϑ is a homo-derivation such that $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, but ϑ is not zero-power valued on \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{R} is not commutative.*

The next example shows that $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ cannot be omitted in the hypothesis of Theorem 1.2(ii).

Example 1.2. *Let $\mathcal{R} = M_2(\mathbb{Z}_2)$, $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{R}$, and define $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ by $\vartheta(a) = -a$. Moreover, ϑ is a homo-derivation such that $\vartheta(ab) - ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, but $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) = 2$ and \mathcal{R} is not commutative.*

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathcal{R} be a prime ring, \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} and ϑ a non-zero homo-derivation of \mathcal{R} preserves \mathcal{I} . If any one of the following holds, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

- (i) $\vartheta(a) \neq -a$ and $\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (ii) $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;
- (iii) $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$;

(iv) $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$.

The next example demonstrates that Theorem 1.3(ii) cannot be satisfied without $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$.

Example 1.3. As in Example 1.2, we see that $\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z$, \mathcal{R} is prime and $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) = 2$, but \mathcal{R} is not commutative.

The next example demonstrates how essential primeness is to our results.

Example 1.4. Let $\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix} : r, s, t \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$, $\mathcal{I} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & s \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : s \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$, and let us define $\vartheta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ by $\vartheta(a) = -a$. Then it is easy to see that ϑ is a homo-derivation on \mathcal{R} , which satisfies the next conditions $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ab \in Z$, $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ba \in Z$, $\vartheta(ab) - ab \in Z$, $\vartheta(ab) + ba \in Z$, $\vartheta(ab) - ba \in Z$, $\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z$, $\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z$, and $\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z$, $\forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, but \mathcal{R} is not commutative.

2. Preliminaries

The following fundamental identities that satisfy $\forall a, b, c \in \mathcal{R}$:

$$[ab, c] = a[b, c] + [a, c]b;$$

$$[a, bc] = b[a, c] + [a, b]c;$$

$$a \circ bc = (a \circ b)c - b[a, c] = b(a \circ c) + [a, b]c;$$

$$ab \circ c = a(b \circ c) - [a, c]b = (a \circ c)b + a[b, c],$$

will be applied without being mentioned.

To achieve our aim, we will use the next lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 ([8], Lemma 4). Let \mathcal{R} a prime ring and $\{b, ab\} \subseteq Z$. Then $a \in Z$ or $b = 0$.

Lemma 2.2 ([13], Lemma 2.2). Let \mathcal{R} be a prime ring. If \mathcal{R} contains a non-zero commutative right ideal, then \mathcal{R} is a commutative ring.

Lemma 2.3 ([11], Lemma 2.5). Let \mathcal{R} be a prime ring and \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} . If

$$(i) [a, b] \in Z;$$

$$(ii) a \circ b \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Then \mathcal{R} is commutative.

Lemma 2.4. Let \mathcal{R} be a prime ring and \mathcal{I} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{R} . For $a, b \in \mathcal{R}$, if $a\mathcal{I}b = \{0\}$, then $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.

Proof. Let $a, b \in \mathcal{R}$ and $a\mathcal{I}b = \{0\}$. Then $a\mathcal{I}\mathcal{R}b = \{0\}$, and so $b = 0$ or $a\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$. Now, if $a\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$, then $a\mathcal{R}\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$. Hence, $a = 0$ or $\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$. Since $\mathcal{I} \neq \{0\}$, we get $a = 0$. \square

Remark 2.1. Let \mathcal{R} be a prime ring, \mathcal{I} an ideal of \mathcal{R} and ϑ a homo-derivation of \mathcal{R} . If $\vartheta(a) = a \forall a \in \mathcal{I}$, then $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) = 2$ or $\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$. From definition of ϑ , we infer that $\vartheta(ab) = \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + \vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$ and so $ab = ab + ab + ab$ and hence $2ab = 0$ thus $ab = 0$, that is, $\mathcal{I}^2 = \{0\}$ and since \mathcal{R} is prime, we see that $\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$. \square

3. The main result

Lemma 3.1. *If $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ab \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (1)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z = \{0\}$.

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ab = 0. \quad (2)$$

Replacing b by bt in (2) and using it, where $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we have

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(t) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(t) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)bt$ in (3) and applying (2), we get $\vartheta(a)b(\vartheta(t) - t) = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{I}(\vartheta(t) - t) = \{0\}$ and by Lemma 2.4, we infer that $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $\vartheta(t) - t = 0$. If $\vartheta(t) - t = 0$, then $\vartheta(t) = t$ and by Remark 2.1 a contradiction. Now, in case $\vartheta(a) = 0$. Using the last expression in (2), we infer that $ab = 0$, and so $\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$, a contradiction.

So $\mathcal{I} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. Substituting bz for b in (1) and applying it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we obtain

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (4)$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)bz$ in (4), we conclude that $\vartheta(a)(\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + bz) + \vartheta(a)b(\vartheta(z) - z) \in Z$ and by using (1) in the last relation, we see that $[\vartheta(a)b(\vartheta(z) - z), \vartheta(a)] = 0$. That is,

$$[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(a)]b(\vartheta(z) - z) + \vartheta(a)[b(\vartheta(z) - z), \vartheta(a)] = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\vartheta(a)[b(\vartheta(z) - z), \vartheta(a)] = 0. \quad (5)$$

Writing z instead of a and b by z' in (1), respectively, where $z, z' \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we obtain

$$\vartheta(z)\vartheta(z') \in Z. \quad (6)$$

Taking z by z^2 in (6) and applying it, we get $\vartheta(z)\vartheta(z)\vartheta(z') \in Z$ and by using (6) in the previous expression, we conclude $\vartheta(z)\vartheta(z') = 0$ or $\vartheta(z) \in Z$. If $\vartheta(z) \in Z$, then from (5), we see that $(\vartheta(z) - z)\vartheta(a)[b, \vartheta(a)] = 0$, that is, $(\vartheta(z) - z)\mathcal{I}\vartheta(a)[b, \vartheta(a)] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(z) - z = 0$ or $\vartheta(a)[b, \vartheta(a)] = 0$. If $\vartheta(z) - z = 0$, then

$$\vartheta(z) = z \neq 0. \quad (7)$$

Now, from definition of ϑ , we have $\vartheta(za) = \vartheta(z)\vartheta(a) + \vartheta(z)a + z\vartheta(a)$. Using (7) in the last relation, we get $\vartheta(za) = 2z\vartheta(a) + za$. Taking a by za in (1) and using the previous relation, we infer that $2z\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + za\vartheta(b) + zab \in Z$. Applying (1) in the last expression, we find that $z\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + za\vartheta(b) \in Z$. Thus,

$$(\vartheta(a) + a)\vartheta(b) \in Z. \quad (8)$$

Taking $b = z$ in (8) and using (7), we see that $\vartheta(a) + a \in Z$. Using the previous relation and Lemma 2.1 in (8), we arrive at $\vartheta(a) + a = 0$ or $\vartheta(b) \in Z$. In case $\vartheta(b) \in Z$. Applying the previous relation in (1), we obtain $ab \in Z$. Putting $b = z$ in the last relation, we have $a \in Z$. Hence, $\mathcal{I} \subseteq Z$, and by Lemma 2.2, \mathcal{R} is commutative. Now, if $\vartheta(a) + a = 0$, then $\vartheta(a) = -a$. Taking $a = z$ in the last relation and by (7), we get a contradiction.

Suppose that

$$\vartheta(a)[b, \vartheta(a)] = 0. \quad (9)$$

Replacing b by sb in (9) and applying it, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we get $\vartheta(a)s[b, \vartheta(a)] = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{S}[b, \vartheta(a)] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $[b, \vartheta(a)] = 0$. Suppose that $[b, \vartheta(a)] = 0$. Substituting at for a in the last expression and using it, where $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we conclude $\vartheta(a)[b, t] + [b, a]\vartheta(t) = 0$. Taking $b = a$ in the previous expression, we see that $\vartheta(a)[a, t] = 0$. Writing ba instead of t in the last relation and applying it, where $b \in \mathcal{S}$, we find that $\vartheta(a)b[a, t] = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{S}[a, t] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $[a, t] = 0$. If $[a, t] = 0$, then $\mathcal{S} \subseteq Z$, and by Lemma 2.2, we get \mathcal{R} is commutative. Now, suppose that

$$\vartheta(a) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Applying (10) in (1), we infer that $ab \in Z$. Putting $0 \neq b = z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$ and by Lemma 2.1, we get $a \in Z$, and by Lemma 2.2, we obtain \mathcal{R} is commutative. Now, suppose that $\vartheta(z)\vartheta(z') = 0$. Replacing z' by z in the last expression, we get

$$\vartheta(z)\vartheta(z) = 0. \quad (11)$$

Substituting $b\vartheta(z)$ for b in (5) and using (11), we conclude $\vartheta(a)[-b\vartheta(z)z, \vartheta(a)] = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)[b\vartheta(z), \vartheta(a)] = 0$ by applying the last relation in (5), we obtain $\vartheta(a)[-bz, \vartheta(a)] = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)[b, \vartheta(a)] = 0$. As in (9), we have \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.2. *If $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) - ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative or any homo-derivation ϑ is of the form $\vartheta(a) = -a$.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) - ab \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (12)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{S} \cap Z = \{0\}$.

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) - ab = 0. \quad (13)$$

Writing bt instead of b in (13) and using it, where $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we see that $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(t) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(t) = 0$. Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)bt$ in the previous expression and applying (13), we get $\vartheta(a)b(\vartheta(t) + t) = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{S}(\vartheta(t) + t) = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $\vartheta(t) + t = 0$. In case $\vartheta(a) = 0$ and using it in (13), we obtain $ab = 0$ and so $\mathcal{S} = \{0\}$, a contradiction. If $\vartheta(t) + t = 0$, then $\vartheta(t) = -t$.

Now, in case $\mathcal{S} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. Replacing b by bz in (12) and applying it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$, we have

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (14)$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)bz$ in (14), we conclude $\vartheta(a)(\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) - bz) + \vartheta(a)b(\vartheta(z) + z) \in Z$. Using (12) in the last relation, we obtain

$$\vartheta(a)[b(\vartheta(z) + z), \vartheta(a)] = 0. \quad (15)$$

Now as Lemma 3.1 in Eq. (5), we have \mathcal{R} is commutative or $\vartheta(z) + z = 0$. If $\vartheta(z) + z = 0$, then $\vartheta(z) = -z \neq 0$ and by applying the previous expression in (14), we get

$$\vartheta(a)(\vartheta(b) + b) \in Z. \quad (16)$$

Putting $0 \neq a = z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$ in (16), this gives $\vartheta(z)(\vartheta(b) + b) \in Z$, that is, $-z(\vartheta(b) + b) \in Z$, and hence $\vartheta(b) + b \in Z$ by Lemma 2.1. Using the previous relation in (16) and by Lemma 2.1, we see that $\vartheta(a) \in Z$ or $\vartheta(b) + b = 0$. If $\vartheta(b) + b = 0$, then $\vartheta(b) = -b$. In case $\vartheta(a) \in Z$ and by (12), we infer that $ab \in Z$. Putting $0 \neq b = z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$ and by Lemma 2.1, we conclude that $a \in Z$, and by Lemma 2.2, we get \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.3. *If $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ba \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (17)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z = \{0\}$.

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) + ba = 0. \quad (18)$$

Substituting bt for b in (18) and applying it, where $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we conclude

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(t) + \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)t + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(t) + bta = 0.$$

Adding $\pm bat$ in the last expression and using (18), we get

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(t) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(t) + b[t, a] = 0.$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)tb$ in the above relation and applying (18), we obtain

$$\vartheta(a)b\vartheta(t) - \vartheta(a)tb + b[t, a] = 0. \quad (19)$$

Writing $\vartheta(a)b$ instead of b in (19), this gives

$$\vartheta(a)^2b\vartheta(t) - \vartheta(a)t\vartheta(a)b + \vartheta(a)b[t, a] = 0. \quad (20)$$

Left multiplying (19) by $\vartheta(a)$, we see that

$$\vartheta(a)^2b\vartheta(t) - \vartheta(a)^2tb + \vartheta(a)b[t, a] = 0. \quad (21)$$

Comparing (20) and (21), this gives $\vartheta(a)[\vartheta(a), t]b = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)[\vartheta(a), t]\mathcal{I} = 0$ and since $\mathcal{I} \neq 0$, we infer that $\vartheta(a)[\vartheta(a), t] = 0$. Now as in Lemma 3.1 in (9), we have $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or \mathcal{R} is commutative. If \mathcal{R} is commutative, then $\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{R} = \{0\}$, and so $\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$, a contradiction. In case $\vartheta(a) = 0$ and from (18), we get $ba = 0$ and so $\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$, contradiction.

So, $\mathcal{I} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. Replacing b by bz in (17) and using it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we conclude

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(z) \in Z.$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)zb$ in the previous expression, we get

$$\vartheta(a)(\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + zb) + \vartheta(a)(b\vartheta(z) - zb) \in Z.$$

Using (17) in the last relation, we see that $\vartheta(a)[b(\vartheta(z) - z), \vartheta(a)] = 0$. Now, as in Lemma 3.1 in Eq. (5), we have \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.4. *If $\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) - ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) - ba \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (22)$$

In case $\mathcal{I} \cap Z = \{0\}$ as Lemma 3.3, we have a contradiction. So, $\mathcal{I} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. Substituting bz for b in (22) and applying it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we conclude

$$\vartheta(a)\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (23)$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)zb$ in (23), we get

$$\vartheta(a)(\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) - zb) + \vartheta(a)b(\vartheta(z) + z) \in Z.$$

Using (22) in the above expression, we obtain $\vartheta(a)[b(\vartheta(z) + z), \vartheta(a)] = 0$. Now, as in Lemma 3.2 in Eq. (15), we have \mathcal{R} is commutative or $\vartheta(a) = -a$. Now, in case $\vartheta(a) = -a$. Applying the previous relation in (22), we get $[a, b] \in Z$ and by using Lemma 2.3, we obtain \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.5. *If ϑ is zero-power valued on \mathcal{S} and $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (24)$$

Writing bt instead of b in (24), where $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we see that $(\vartheta(ab) + ab)(\vartheta(t) + t) \in Z$ and by applying (24) in the last relation and by Lemma 2.1, we get $\vartheta(ab) + ab = 0$ or $\vartheta(t) + t \in Z$. If $\vartheta(ab) + ab = 0$, then

$$(\vartheta(a) + a)(\vartheta(b) + b) = 0. \quad (25)$$

Replacing b by $\vartheta^{n-1}(b)$ in (25), where $\vartheta^n(b) = 0$, we conclude

$$(\vartheta(a) + a)\vartheta^{n-1}(b) = 0. \quad (26)$$

Substituting $\vartheta^{n-2}(b)$ for b in (25) and using (26), we see that

$$(\vartheta(a) + a)\vartheta^{n-2}(b) = 0$$

and by repeating the previous steps, we conclude that $(\vartheta(a) + a)b = 0$. Now as in Eq. (25), we have $ab = 0$ and so $\mathcal{S} = \{0\}$, contradiction. So $\vartheta(t) + t \in Z$. As in Eq. (25), we get $t \in Z$ and by Lemma 2.2, \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.6. *If $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) - ab \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(ab) - ab \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (27)$$

Writing bt instead of b in (27), where $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we conclude

$$(\vartheta(ab) - ab)(\vartheta(t) + t) + 2ab\vartheta(t) \in Z. \quad (28)$$

Thus $2[ab\vartheta(t), \vartheta(t) + t] = 0$, that is, $[ab\vartheta(t), \vartheta(t) + t] = 0$. Replacing a by sa in the previous expression and applying it, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we get $[s, \vartheta(t) + t]ab\vartheta(t) = 0$, that is, $[s, \vartheta(t) + t]\mathcal{S}b\vartheta(t) = \{0\}$ and so $[s, \vartheta(t) + t] = 0$ or $b\vartheta(t) = 0$. If $b\vartheta(t) = 0$, then $\mathcal{S}\vartheta(t) = \{0\}$ and hence $\vartheta(t) = 0$. Using the last relation in (27), we obtain

$$ab \in Z. \quad (29)$$

Replacing a by b and b by a in (29), we see that $ba \in Z$. From the last expression and (29), we have $[a, b] \in Z$ and by Lemma 2.3(i), \mathcal{R} is commutative. Suppose that $[s, \vartheta(t) + t] = 0$. Substituting sr for s in the previous relation and applying it, where $r \in \mathcal{R}$, we get $[s, \vartheta(t) + t] = 0$, that is, $\mathcal{S}[r, \vartheta(t) + t] = \{0\}$ and so $[r, \vartheta(t) + t] = 0$ thus $\vartheta(t) + t \in Z$. Again writing ab instead of t in the last expression, we see that $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z$. Comparing the last relation and (27), we conclude $a \circ b \in Z$, and by Lemma 2.3(ii), \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.7. *If $\vartheta(ab) + ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(ab) + ba \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (30)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z = \{0\}$.

$$\vartheta(ab) + ba = 0. \quad (31)$$

Replacing b by bt in (31), where $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we conclude $(\vartheta(ab) + ab)\vartheta(t) + b[t, a] = 0$. Adding $\pm ba\vartheta(t)$ in the previous expression and using (31), we get $b([t, a] - a\vartheta(t)) = 0$ and since $\mathcal{I} \neq \{0\}$, we infer that

$$[t, a] - a\vartheta(t) = 0. \quad (32)$$

Substituting sa for a in (32), where $s \in \mathcal{I}$, we obtain

$$s[t, a] + [t, s]a - sa\vartheta(t) = 0. \quad (33)$$

Left multiplying (32) by s , we see that

$$s[t, a] - sa\vartheta(t) = 0. \quad (34)$$

Comparing (33) and (34), this gives $[t, s]a = 0$, that is, $[t, s]\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$ and since $\mathcal{I} \neq \{0\}$, we infer that $[t, s] = 0$ and so $\mathcal{I} \subseteq Z$ and by Lemma 2.2, \mathcal{R} is commutative.

Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. Writing bz instead of b in (30) and applying it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we conclude

$$(\vartheta(ab) + ab)\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (35)$$

Putting $a = b = z$ in (30), where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we get

$$\vartheta(z^2) \in Z. \quad (36)$$

Taking z by z^2 in (35), we have $(\vartheta(ab) + ab)\vartheta(z^2) \in Z$ and by using (36) in the last relation, we see that $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z$ or $\vartheta(z^2) = 0$. If $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z$ and by applying (30), then $[a, b] \in Z$ and so \mathcal{R} is commutative. Suppose that

$$\vartheta(z^2) = 0. \quad (37)$$

Replacing b by bt in (30), we conclude $\vartheta(ab)\vartheta(t) + \vartheta(ab)t + ab\vartheta(t) + bta \in Z$, where $t \in \mathcal{I}$. Putting $a = b = z$ in the last expression and using (37), where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, this gives $\vartheta(t) + t \in Z$. Taking t by ab in the previous relation where $a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, we get $\vartheta(ab) + ab \in Z$. Using the last expression in (30), we conclude $[a, b] \in Z$ and so \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.8. *If $\vartheta(ab) - ba \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} \cap Z = \{0\}$. As in Lemma 3.7. Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. As in Lemma 3.7 and applying Lemma 2.3(ii). \square

Lemma 3.9. *If $\vartheta \neq 0$ and $\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative or any homo-derivation ϑ is of the form $\vartheta(a) = -a$.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (38)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z = \{0\}$.

$$\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) = 0. \quad (39)$$

Substituting bt for b in (39) and using it, where $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we see that $(\vartheta(a) + a)b\vartheta(t) = 0$, that is, $(\vartheta(a) + a)\mathcal{I}\vartheta(t) = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) + a = 0$ or $\vartheta(t) = 0$. In case

$$\vartheta(t) = 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (40)$$

Writing rt instead of t in the last relation and applying it, where $r \in \mathcal{R}$, we get $\vartheta(r)t = 0$, that is $\vartheta(r)\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(r) = 0 \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}$, a contradiction. In case $\vartheta(a) + a = 0$, we infer that $\vartheta(a) = -a$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. Replacing b by bz in (38) and using it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we conclude

$$(\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b))\vartheta(z) + (a + \vartheta(a))b\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (41)$$

Using (38) in (41), we obtain

$$[(a + \vartheta(a))b, \vartheta(z)]\vartheta(z) = 0. \quad (42)$$

Substituting $(z + \vartheta(z))b$ for b in (42) and applying it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we conclude $[a + \vartheta(a), \vartheta(z)]z b \vartheta(z) = 0$ implies that $[a + \vartheta(a), \vartheta(z)]b \vartheta(z) = 0$, that is, $[a + \vartheta(a), \vartheta(z)]\mathcal{I}\vartheta(z) = \{0\}$ and so $[a + \vartheta(a), \vartheta(z)] = 0$ or $\vartheta(z) = 0$. In case

$$\vartheta(z) = 0. \quad (43)$$

Putting $b = z$ in (38) and using (43), where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{I} \cap Z$, we see that $\vartheta(a)z \in Z$ and hence

$$\vartheta(a) \in Z. \quad (44)$$

Writing ab instead of a in (44) and applying it, where $b \in \mathcal{I}$, we get $\vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) \in Z$ and by using (44) in the previous expression, we have $\vartheta(a)[b, a] = 0$. Replacing b by sb in the last relation and applying it, where $s \in \mathcal{I}$, we obtain $\vartheta(a)s[b, a] = 0$, that is $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{I}[b, a] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $[b, a] = 0$. If $[b, a] = 0$, then $\mathcal{I} \subseteq Z$ and so \mathcal{R} is commutative. In case $\vartheta(a) = 0$ the same as in (40), we infer that $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. Now, suppose that $\vartheta(z) \neq 0$ and $[a + \vartheta(a), \vartheta(z)] = 0$. By using the last expression in (42), this gives $(a + \vartheta(a))[b, \vartheta(z)]\vartheta(z) = 0$. Substituting bs for b in the previous relation and applying it, where $s \in \mathcal{I}$, we conclude $(a + \vartheta(a))[b, \vartheta(z)]s\vartheta(z) = 0$, that is, $(a + \vartheta(a))[b, \vartheta(z)]\mathcal{I}\vartheta(z) = \{0\}$ and so $(a + \vartheta(a))[b, \vartheta(z)] = 0$ or $\vartheta(z) = 0$. But $\vartheta(z) \neq 0$ and hence $(a + \vartheta(a))[b, \vartheta(z)] = 0$. Writing sb instead of b in the last expression and using it, where $s \in \mathcal{I}$, we get $(a + \vartheta(a))s[b, \vartheta(z)] = 0$, that is, $(a + \vartheta(a))\mathcal{I}[b, \vartheta(z)] = \{0\}$ and so $a + \vartheta(a) = 0$ or $[b, \vartheta(z)] = 0$. If $a + \vartheta(a) = 0$, then $\vartheta(a) = -a$. Now, suppose that $[b, \vartheta(z)] = 0$. Replacing b by br in the last relation and applying it, where $r \in \mathcal{R}$, we have $b[r, \vartheta(z)] = 0$, that is, $\mathcal{I}[r, \vartheta(z)] = \{0\}$ and so $[r, \vartheta(z)] = 0$ this implies that

$$\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (45)$$

Using (45) and (38) in (41), we see that $(a + \vartheta(a))b\vartheta(z) \in Z$ and by applying (45) in the previous expression, we get $(a + \vartheta(a))b \in Z$ or $\vartheta(z) = 0$. In case $\vartheta(z) = 0$ as (43). Now, suppose that $(a + \vartheta(a))b \in Z$. Substituting br for b in the last relation and using it, where $r \in \mathcal{R}$, we obtain $(a + \vartheta(a))b = 0$ or $r \in Z$. If $r \in Z$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative. If $(a + \vartheta(a))b = 0$, then $(a + \vartheta(a))\mathcal{I} = \{0\}$ and so $a + \vartheta(a) = 0$, and hence $\vartheta(a) = -a$. \square

Lemma 3.10. *If $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (46)$$

$$\vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) \in Z. \quad (47)$$

Writing bt instead of b in (47), where $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we conclude

$$(\vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b))t + a(\vartheta(b) + b)\vartheta(t) \in Z$$

and by applying (47) in the last expression, we get $[a(\vartheta(b) + b)\vartheta(t), t] = 0$. Replacing a by sa in the previous relation and using it, where $s \in \mathcal{I}$, we obtain $[s, t]a(\vartheta(b) + b)\vartheta(t) = 0$, that is, $[s, t]\mathcal{I}(\vartheta(b) + b)\vartheta(t) = \{0\}$ and so $[s, t] = 0$ or $(\vartheta(b) + b)\vartheta(t) = 0$. If $[s, t] = 0$, then $\mathcal{I} \subseteq Z$ and hence \mathcal{R} is commutative. Suppose that $(\vartheta(b) + b)\vartheta(t) = 0$. Substituting at for t in the last expression and applying it, where $a \in \mathcal{I}$, we see that $(\vartheta(b) + b)a\vartheta(t) = 0$, that is, $(\vartheta(b) + b)\mathcal{I}\vartheta(t) = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(b) + b = 0$ or $\vartheta(t) = 0$. In case $\vartheta(t) = 0$, the same as in (40), we infer that $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. If $\vartheta(b) + b = 0$, then $\vartheta(b) = -b$ and by using the last relation in (46), we conclude $2ab \in Z$ and so $ab \in Z$. Now as Lemma 3.6 in Eq.(29) we get \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

Lemma 3.11. *If $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (48)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{I} \cap Z = \{0\}$. Then

$$\vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0, \quad (49)$$

that is,

$$\vartheta(a) \circ \vartheta(b) + \vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) = 0. \quad (50)$$

Writing ab instead of b in (50), we conclude $\vartheta(a) \circ \vartheta(ab) + \vartheta(a)ab + a\vartheta(ab) = 0$. Using (49) in the previous expression, we get

$$-(\vartheta(a) \circ \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a)) + \vartheta(a)ab - a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0.$$

That is,

$$-(\vartheta(a) \circ \vartheta(b))\vartheta(a) + \vartheta(a)ab - a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0. \quad (51)$$

Right multiplying (50) by $\vartheta(a)$, this gives

$$(\vartheta(a) \circ \vartheta(b))\vartheta(a) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(a) + a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0. \quad (52)$$

Comparing (51) and (52), we obtain

$$\vartheta(a)b\vartheta(a) + \vartheta(a)ab = 0. \quad (53)$$

Replacing b by bt in (51), where $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we see that

$$\vartheta(a)bt\vartheta(a) + \vartheta(a)abt = 0. \quad (54)$$

Right multiplying (53) by t , where $t \in \mathcal{I}$, we conclude

$$\vartheta(a)b\vartheta(a)t + \vartheta(a)abt = 0. \quad (55)$$

Comparing (54) and (55), we get

$$\vartheta(a)b[\vartheta(a), t] = 0, \quad (56)$$

that is, $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{S}[\vartheta(a), t] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $[\vartheta(a), t] = 0$. Assume that $\vartheta(a) = 0$, the same as in (40), we infer that $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. In case $[\vartheta(a), t] = 0$. Substituting ab for a in the last relation and using it, where $b \in \mathcal{S}$, we obtain $\vartheta(a)[b, t] + [a, t]\vartheta(b) = 0$. Putting $t = b$ in the last expression, this gives $[a, b]\vartheta(b) = 0$. Writing as instead of a in the previous relation and applying it, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we see that $[a, b]s\vartheta(b) = 0$, that is, $[a, b]\mathcal{S}\vartheta(b) = \{0\}$ and so $[a, b] = 0$ or $\vartheta(b) = 0$. If $\vartheta(b) = 0$, then $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. In case $[a, b] = 0$, we infer that \mathcal{R} is commutative.

Now, suppose that $\mathcal{S} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. We can write Eq. (48) as

$$(\vartheta(a) \circ \vartheta(b)) + \vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) \in Z. \quad (57)$$

Replacing b by bz in (57) and using it, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$, we get

$$(\vartheta(a) \circ \vartheta(b)\vartheta(z)) + (\vartheta(a) \circ b\vartheta(z)) + a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + ab\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (58)$$

Putting $a = z$ and adding $\pm\vartheta(z)b\vartheta(z)$ in (58), we have

$$\{(\vartheta(z) \circ \vartheta(b)) + z\vartheta(b) + \vartheta(z)b\}\vartheta(z) + b\{\vartheta(z)^2 + z\vartheta(z)\} \in Z. \quad (59)$$

Taking $a = b = z$ in (57) and since $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$, we infer that

$$\vartheta(z)^2 + z\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (60)$$

Using (57) and (60) in (59), we obtain $\{(\vartheta(z) \circ \vartheta(b)) + z\vartheta(b) + \vartheta(z)b\}[\vartheta(z), b] = 0$. Applying (57) in the last expression, we get $\{(\vartheta(z) \circ \vartheta(b)) + z\vartheta(b) + \vartheta(z)b\}\mathcal{S}[\vartheta(z), b] = \{0\}$ and so $(\vartheta(z) \circ \vartheta(b)) + z\vartheta(b) + \vartheta(z)b = 0$ or $[\vartheta(z), b] = 0$.

Suppose that

$$[\vartheta(z), b] = 0. \quad (61)$$

Substituting rb for b in (61) and using it, where $r \in R$, we conclude $[\vartheta(z), r]b = 0$, that is, $[\vartheta(z), r]\mathcal{S} = \{0\}$ and so $[\vartheta(z), r] = 0$ and hence

$$\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (62)$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)b\vartheta(z)$ in (58) and applying (57) and (62), we see that $(b\vartheta(a) + ab)\vartheta(z) \in Z$ and by using (62) in the last relation, we get $b\vartheta(a) + ab \in Z$ or $\vartheta(z) = 0$. In case

$$\vartheta(z) = 0. \quad (63)$$

Putting $b = z$ in (57), where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$ and applying the previous expression, we conclude $z\vartheta(a) \in Z$ and so

$$\vartheta(a) \in Z. \quad (64)$$

Writing ab instead of a in (64) and using it, where $b \in \mathcal{S}$, we obtain $\vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) \in Z$ and by applying (64) in the last relation, we get $[\vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b), r] = 0$, where $r \in R$, by using (64) in the last expression, we see that $\vartheta(a)[b, r] + [a, r]\vartheta(b) = 0$. Taking $r = b$ in the previous relation, this gives $[a, b]\vartheta(b) = 0$. Replacing a by as in the last expression, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we conclude $[a, b]s\vartheta(b) = 0$, that is, $[a, b]\mathcal{S}\vartheta(b) = \{0\}$ and so $[a, b] = 0$ or $\vartheta(b) = 0$. If $[a, b] = 0$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative. If $\vartheta(b) = 0$, then $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. Now, suppose that

$$b\vartheta(a) + ab \in Z. \quad (65)$$

Putting $0 \neq b = z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$ in (65), we get

$$\vartheta(a) + a \in Z. \quad (66)$$

Adding $\pm ba$ in (65), this gives $b(\vartheta(a) + a) + [a, b] \in Z$. Using 66) in the last relation, we obtain $[[a, b], b] = 0$. Substituting ta for a in the previous expression and applying it, where $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $2[t, b][a, b] = 0$ and hence $[t, b][a, b] = 0$. Writing sa instead of a in the last relation and using it, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we see that $[t, b]s[a, b] = 0$, that is, $[t, b]\mathcal{S}[a, b] = \{0\}$ and so $[t, b] = 0$ or $[a, b] = 0$. In two cases \mathcal{R} is commutative.

Now, in case $(\vartheta(z) \circ \vartheta(b)) + z\vartheta(b) + \vartheta(z)b = 0$ as in Eq.(50), we conclude as Eq.(56), $\vartheta(z)b[\vartheta(z), t] = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(z)\mathcal{S}[\vartheta(z), t] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(z) = 0$ or $[\vartheta(z), t] = 0$. In case $[\vartheta(z), t] = 0$, as in (61). In case $\vartheta(z) = 0$ as in (63). \square

Lemma 3.12. *If $\text{char}(\mathcal{R}) \neq 2$ and $\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative.*

Proof. Assume that

$$\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) \in Z \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (67)$$

Suppose that $\mathcal{S} \cap Z = \{0\}$. Then

$$\vartheta(ab) - \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0. \quad (68)$$

That is,

$$[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(b)] + \vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) = 0. \quad (69)$$

Replacing b by ab in (69), we have $[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(ab)] + \vartheta(a)ab + a\vartheta(ab) = 0$. Using (68) in the last relation, we get $[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(b)\vartheta(a)] + \vartheta(a)ab + a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0$. Thus,

$$[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(b)]\vartheta(a) + \vartheta(a)ab + a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0. \quad (70)$$

Right multiplying (69) by $\vartheta(a)$ this gives

$$[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(b)]\vartheta(a) + \vartheta(a)b\vartheta(a) + a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(a) = 0. \quad (71)$$

Comparing (70) and (71), we obtain

$$\vartheta(a)b\vartheta(a) - \vartheta(a)ab = 0. \quad (72)$$

Substituting bt for b in (72), where $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we see that

$$\vartheta(a)bt\vartheta(a) - \vartheta(a)abt = 0. \quad (73)$$

Right multiplying (72) by t , where $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we conclude

$$\vartheta(a)b\vartheta(a)t - \vartheta(a)abt = 0. \quad (74)$$

Comparing (73) and (74), we get $\vartheta(a)b[\vartheta(a), t] = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{S}[\vartheta(a), t] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $[\vartheta(a), t] = 0$. If $\vartheta(a) = 0$, then $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. In case $[\vartheta(a), t] = 0$. Writing ab instead of a in the previous relation and using it, where $b \in \mathcal{S}$, we obtain $\vartheta(a)[b, t] + [a, t]\vartheta(b) = 0$. Putting $t = b$ in the last expression, this gives $[a, b]\vartheta(b) = 0$. Replacing a by as in the last relation and applying it, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we see that $[a, b]s\vartheta(b) = 0$, that is, $[a, b]\mathcal{S}\vartheta(b) = \{0\}$ and so $[a, b] = 0$ or $\vartheta(b) = 0$. If $\vartheta(b) = 0$, then $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. In case $[a, b] = 0$, we infer that \mathcal{R} is commutative.

Now, suppose that $\mathcal{S} \cap Z \neq \{0\}$. Putting $a = b = z$ in (67), where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$, we conclude

$$\vartheta(z) \in Z. \quad (75)$$

Substituting bz for b in (67) and using it and (75), where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$, we get

$$[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(b)]\vartheta(z) + [\vartheta(a), b]\vartheta(z) + a\vartheta(b)\vartheta(z) + ab\vartheta(z) \in Z.$$

Adding $\pm\vartheta(a)b\vartheta(z)$ in the previous expression and using (67) and (75), we obtain

$$([\vartheta(a), b] + ab - \vartheta(a)b)\vartheta(z) \in Z$$

and so $[\vartheta(a), b] + ab - \vartheta(a)b \in Z$ or $\vartheta(z) = 0$. In case

$$\vartheta(z) = 0. \quad (76)$$

Taking $b = z$ in (67) and applying the above relation, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$, we see that $\vartheta(a)z \in Z$ and so

$$\vartheta(a) \in Z. \quad (77)$$

By using (77) in (67), we have $\vartheta(a)b + a\vartheta(b) \in Z$ and so $\vartheta(a)[b, a] = 0$. Writing sb instead of b in the last expression, where $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we get $\vartheta(a)s[b, a] = 0$, that is, $\vartheta(a)\mathcal{S}[b, a] = \{0\}$ and so $\vartheta(a) = 0$ or $[b, a] = 0$. If $[b, a] = 0$, then \mathcal{R} is commutative. If $\vartheta(a) = 0$, then $\vartheta = 0$, a contradiction. Now, suppose that

$$[\vartheta(a), b] + ab - \vartheta(a)b \in Z. \quad (78)$$

Putting $b = z$ in (78), where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$, we see that

$$a - \vartheta(a) \in Z. \quad (79)$$

Replacing b by $\vartheta(b)$ in (78), this gives

$$[\vartheta(a), \vartheta(b)] + a\vartheta(b) - \vartheta(a)\vartheta(b) \in Z. \quad (80)$$

Comparing (80) and (67), we conclude $\vartheta(a)(\vartheta(b) + b) \in Z$. Taking $a = z$ in the previous relation, where $0 \neq z \in \mathcal{S} \cap Z$, we get $\vartheta(z)(\vartheta(b) + b) \in Z$ and so $\vartheta(z) = 0$ or $\vartheta(b) + b \in Z$. In case $\vartheta(z) = 0$ as Eq. (76). In case $\vartheta(b) + b \in Z$. Putting $b = a$ in the last expression, where $a \in \mathcal{S}$, we obtain

$$\vartheta(a) + a \in Z. \quad (81)$$

Comparing (80) and (79), we see that $2a \in Z$ and so $a \in Z$, and hence \mathcal{R} is commutative. \square

By using Lemmas 3.1–3.12, we get the proof of Theorems 1.1–1.3.

The authors are greatly indebted to the referee for his/her valuable suggestions, which have immensely improved the paper.

References

- [1] A.Melaibari, N.Muthana, A.Al-Kenani, Centrally-extended homoderivations on rings, *Gulf j. math*, 4(2)(2016), 62–70.

-
- [2] A.Melaibari, N.Muthana, A.Al-Kenani, Homoderivations on rings, *Gen. Math. Notes*, **35**(1)(2016), 1–8.
- [3] A.Al-Kenani, A.Melaibari, N.Muthana, Homoderivations and commutativity of $*$ -prime rings, *East West Math*, **17**(2)(2015), 117–126.
- [4] E.Gselmann, G.Kiss, Remarks on the notion of homo-derivations, 2020.
DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2001.03439
- [5] E.Alharfie, N.Muthana, Homoderivation of prime rings with involution, *Bull. Inter. Math. Virtual Inst*, **9**(2019), 305–318. DOI: 10.7251/BIMVI1902305A
- [6] E.Alharfie, N.Muthana, On homoderivations and commutativity of rings, *Bull. Inter. Math. Virtual Inst*, **9**(2019), 301–304. DOI: 10.7251/BIMVI1902301A
- [7] E.Alharfie, N.Muthana, The commutativity of prime rings with homoderivations, *Int. J. of Ad. and Appl. Sci.*, **5**(5)(2018), 79–81.
- [8] J.Mayne, Centralizing mappings of prime rings, *Can. Math. Bull*, **27**(1)(1984), 122–126.
- [9] M.El-Sayiad, A.Ageeb, A.Ghareeb, Centralizing n -homoderivations of semiprime rings, *J. Math*, **2022**(2022), 1–8. DOI: 10.1155/2022/1112183
- [10] M.Yettou, A.Amroune, Homoderivations on a lattice, *Jordan J. of Math. and Sta.*, **15**(2)(2022), 325–338.
- [11] M.Abu-Nawas, R.Al-Omary, On ideals and comutativity of prime rings with generalized derivations, *Eur. J. Appl. Math*, **11**(1)(2018), 79–89. DOI: 10.29020/nybg.ejpam.v11i1.3142
- [12] M.M. Ebrahimi, H.Pajooesh, Inner derivations and homo-derivations on ℓ -rings, *Acta Math. Hungar.*, **100**(1-2)(2003), 157–165. DOI: 10.1023/A:1024616503681
- [13] M.Ashraf, N.Rehman, On derivation and commutativity in prime rings, *East-West J. Math*, **3**(1)(2001), 87–91.
- [14] M.El-Sofy, *Rings with some kinds of mappings*, M.Sc. Thesis, Cairo University, Branch of Fayoum, Cairo, Egypt, 2000.
- [15] N.Rehman, H.Alnoghshi, On jordan homo-derivation of triangular algebras, *Miskolc Math. Notes*, *Accepted*.
- [16] N.Rehman, H.Alnoghshi, Jordan homo-derivations on triangular matrix rings, *An. Stiint. Univ. Al. I. Cuza Iasi. Mat.*, **68**(2)(2022), 203–216. DOI: 10.47743/anstim.2022.00016
- [17] N.Rehman, M.R. Mozumder, A.Abbasi, Homoderivations on ideals of prime and semi prime rings, *The Aligarh Bull. of Math.*, **38**(1-2)(2019), 77–87.
- [18] S.Mouhssine, A.Boua, Homoderivations and semigroup ideals in 3-prime near-rings, *Algebr. Struct. their Appl.*, **8**(2)(2021), 177–194.
- [19] S.S.Husain, K.Dey, Homoderivations of σ -prime γ -rings, *Adv. Math.: Sci. J*, **10**(1)(2021), 83–91.

Тождества, связанные с гомообразованием на идеале в первичных кольцах

Надим Рехман
Хафед Альногаши

Кафедра математики
Алигархский мусульманский университет
Алигарх, Индия

Аннотация. Целью данной работы является исследование коммутативности первичного кольца \mathcal{R} с ненулевым идеалом \mathcal{I} и гомодифференцированием ϑ , удовлетворяющим некоторым алгебраическим тождествам. Мы также привели несколько примеров того, почему наша гипотеза о результатах важна.

Ключевые слова: первичное кольцо, гомоприсхождение.