

## TRACES OF PERMUTING $n$ -ADDITIVE MAPPINGS IN $*$ -PRIME RINGS

A. ALI AND K. KUMAR \*

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove that a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal  $U$  of a  $*$ -prime ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  of Char  $\mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  is central, if one of the following holds: (i)  $\delta(x)\delta(y) \mp x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (ii)  $[x, y] - \delta(xy)\delta(yx) \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (iii)  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp [x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (iv)  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (v)  $\delta(x)\delta(y) \mp yx \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , where  $\delta$  is the trace of  $n$ -additive map  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ , for all  $x, y \in U$ .

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper,  $\mathfrak{R}$  will denote an associative ring with centre  $Z(\mathfrak{R})$ . A ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  is said to be  $*$ -prime if  $a\mathfrak{R}b = a\mathfrak{R}b^* = \{0\}$  implies that either  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$ . For each pair of elements  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$  we shall write  $[x, y]$  the commutator  $xy - yx$ ; while the symbol  $x \circ y$  will stand for the anti-commutator  $xy + yx$ . An additive map  $x \rightarrow x^*$  of  $\mathfrak{R}$  into itself is called an involution on  $\mathfrak{R}$  if it satisfies the conditions: (i)  $(x^*)^* = x$ , (ii)  $(xy)^* = y^*x^*$  for all  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$ . A ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  equipped with an involution  $*$  is called a  $*$ -ring or ring with involution. An additive subgroup  $U$  of a ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  is said to be a Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$  if  $[U, \mathfrak{R}] \subseteq U$ . A Lie ideal  $U$  of a  $*$ -ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  is said to be a  $*$ -Lie ideal, if  $U^* = U$ . A Lie ideal  $U$  is said to be square closed, if for all  $u \in U$ , then  $u^2 \in U$ . An element  $x$  in a  $*$ -ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  is said to be hermitian element if  $x^* = x$  and skew-hermitian if  $x^* = -x$ . The set of hermitian and skew-hermitian elements of  $\mathfrak{R}$

---

MSC(2010): 16W25; 16N60; 16U80

Keywords: Prime rings,  $*$ -prime rings,  $*$ -Lie ideals,  $n$ -additive maps, Trace of  $n$ -additive maps.

Received: 18 April 2020, Accepted: 4 September 2020.

\*Corresponding author .

will be denoted by  $H(\mathfrak{R})$  and  $S(\mathfrak{R})$ , respectively. The involution  $*$  is said to be of the first kind if  $Z(\mathfrak{R}) \subseteq H(\mathfrak{R})$ , otherwise it is said to be of the second kind. In the later case  $S(\mathfrak{R}) \cap Z(\mathfrak{R}) \neq \{0\}$ .

An additive map  $f : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  is said to be a derivation, if  $f(xy) = f(x)y + xf(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$ . An additive map  $g : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  is said to be a generalized derivation, if there exists a derivation  $f : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  such that  $g(xy) = g(x)y + xf(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $n \geq 2$  be a fixed positive integer. A map  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  is said to be symmetric

(permuting), if  $F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = F(x_{\pi(1)}, x_{\pi(2)}, \dots, x_{\pi(n)})$  for all  $x_i \in \mathfrak{R}$  for every permutation  $(\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(n))$ .

A map  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  is said to be  $n$ -additive, if  $F$  is addi-

tive in each variable  $x_i$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  i.e.,  $F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i + y_i, \dots, x_n) = F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n) + F(x_1, x_2, \dots, y_i, \dots, x_n)$  for all  $x_i, y_i \in \mathfrak{R}$  and

$i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . On the other hand, let  $\mathfrak{R} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ a & b \end{bmatrix} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$ ,

where  $\mathbb{C}$  is a complex field. It is clear that,  $\mathfrak{R}$  is a noncommutative ring under matrix addition and matrix multiplication.

Define map  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  by

$$F \left[ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & b_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ a_2 & b_2 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ a_n & b_n \end{bmatrix} \right] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ a_1 a_2 a_3 \dots a_n & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then it is easy to see that  $F$  is a symmetric  $n$ -additive map.

Let  $n \geq 2$  be a fixed positive integer and let a map  $\delta : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  defined by  $\delta(x) = F(x, x, \dots, x)$  is called the trace of  $F$ . It is obvious that in case, when  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  is a symmetric  $n$ -additive

mapping, the trace  $\delta$  of  $F$  satisfies the relation

$$\delta(x+y) = \delta(x) + \delta(y) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(x, y).$$

Since we have  $F(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) = F(0 + 0, x_2, \dots, x_n) = F(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) + F(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$ ,

we obtain  $F(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 0$  for all  $x_i \in \mathfrak{R}$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Hence

we get  $0 = F(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , i.e.  $0 = F(x_1 - x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . This

implies that  $0 = F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) + F(-x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . It gives that

$F(-x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = -F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  for all  $x_i \in \mathfrak{R}$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

This tells us that  $\delta$  is an odd function, if  $n$  is odd and  $\delta$  is an even

function, if  $n$  is even.

In 1992, Daif and Bell [7, Theorem 1] proved that if a semiprime ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  admits a derivation  $f$  such that  $f([x, y]) - [x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$ ,

then  $\mathfrak{R}$  is commutative. Further, Ashraf et. al. in [6] obtained the commutativity of a prime ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  admitting a generalized derivation  $g$  on  $\mathfrak{R}$  satisfying one of the following : (i)  $g(xy) \mp xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (ii)  $g(xy) \mp yx \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (iii)  $g(x)g(y) \mp xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y$  in some appropriate subset of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . In 2007, Oukhtite and Salhi [5] proved that let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring such that  $\text{char } \mathfrak{R} \neq 2, 3$ . Let  $L$  be a nonzero Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$  and  $d$  a nonzero derivation of  $\mathfrak{R}$  commuting with  $*$ . If  $d^2(L) \subset Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , then  $L \subset Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .

Motivated by the aforementioned results, we prove that a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal  $U$  of a  $*$ -prime ring  $\mathfrak{R}$  of  $\text{Char } \mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  is central, if it satisfies one of the following: (i)  $\delta(x)\delta(y) \mp x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (ii)  $[x, y] - \delta(xy)\delta(yx) \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (iii)  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp [x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (iv)  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , (v)  $\delta(x)\delta(y) \mp yx \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ , where  $\delta$  is the trace of an  $n$ -additive map  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ .

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

We should do a great deal of calculation with commutators and anti-commutator routinely using the following basic identities:

$$\begin{aligned} x \circ (yz) &= (x \circ y)z - y[x, z] = y(x \circ z) + [x, y]z \\ (xy) \circ z &= x(y \circ z) - [x, z]y = (x \circ z)y + x[y, z] \\ [x, yz] &= (x \circ y)z - y(x \circ z) = y[x, z] + [x, y]z \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 2.1.** [5, Lemma 1] *Let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring and  $U$  be a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . If  $[U, U] = 0$ , then  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .*

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring of  $\text{Char } \mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  and  $U$  be a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$*

*be a symmetric  $n$ -additive map and  $\delta$  be the trace of  $F$ . If  $\delta(x)\delta(y) \mp x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ , then  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that

$$\delta(x)\delta(y) - x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.1)$$

Replacing  $y$  by  $y + z$  in (2.1), we get

$$\delta(x)(\delta(y) + \delta(z) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z)) - x \circ y - x \circ z \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.2)$$

Comparing (2.1) and (2.2), we have

$$\delta(x) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

That is

$$\delta(x) \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, z) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, z) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.3)$$

Substituting  $y$  for  $z$  in (2.3), we get

$$\delta(x) \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, y) + \binom{n}{2} h_2(y, y) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, y) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x) \left( \binom{n}{1} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}) + \binom{n}{2} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-2)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y}_{2\text{-times}}) + \dots \right. \\ \left. + \binom{n}{n-1} F(\underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\delta(x) \left( \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} \right) F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

That is

$$(2^n - 2)\delta(x)F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{R}$  is  $(2^n - 2)$  torsion free, we have

$$\delta(x)F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

This implies that

$$\delta(x)\delta(y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.4)$$

Using (2.1) and (2.4), we obtain

$$x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.5)$$

Thus  $[r, (x \circ y)] = 0$  for all  $x, y \in U$ ,  $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Replacing  $y$  by  $2yx$  and again using the fact that  $\text{Char } \mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$ , we get

$$(y \circ x)[r, x] = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in U, r \in \mathfrak{R}. \quad (2.6)$$

Substituting  $sr$  for  $r$ , we have

$$(y \circ x)\mathfrak{R}[r, x] = \{0\} \text{ for all } x, y \in U, r \in \mathfrak{R}. \quad (2.7)$$

For all  $x \in U \cap S_*(\mathfrak{R})$ , relation (2.7), yields that  $(y \circ x)\mathfrak{R}[r, x] = \{0\} = (y \circ x)\mathfrak{R}([r, x])^*$ . Since  $\mathfrak{R}$  is  $*$ -prime ring, we obtain either  $(y \circ x) = 0$  or  $[r, x] = 0$ . Now for any  $x \in U$ , using the fact  $x - x^* \in U \cap S_*(\mathfrak{R})$ , we get  $y \circ (x - x^*) = 0$  or  $[r, x - x^*] = 0$ . If  $y \circ (x - x^*) = 0$ , then  $(y \circ x - y \circ x^*) = 0$ , as  $y \circ x = 0$ ;  $y \circ x^* = 0$ , so we have either  $y \circ x = 0$  or  $[r, x] = 0$ . On the other hand, if  $[r, x - x^*] = 0$ , then  $[r, x] = [r, x^*]$ . This implies that,  $[r, x^*] = 0$ . In conclusion, for all  $x, y \in U$ ,  $r \in R$ , we have either  $(y \circ x) = 0$  or  $[r, x] = 0$ . Let  $A = \{x \in U \mid (y \circ x) = 0\}$ ,  $B = \{x \in U \mid [r, x] = 0\}$ , for all  $x, y \in U$ ,  $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Then  $A$  and  $B$  both are additive subgroups of  $U$  and  $A \cup B = U$ . But a group cannot be union of two its proper subgroups and therefore  $A = U$  or  $B = U$ . If  $A = U$ , then  $(y \circ x) = 0$  for all  $x, y \in U$ . Replacing  $x$  by  $[x, rx]$  in the last expression, we get  $[x, r][y, x] = 0$  for all  $x, y \in U$ ,  $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Again replacing  $r$  by  $sr$ , we get

$$[x, s]\mathfrak{R}[y, x] = \{0\} \text{ for all } x, y \in U; \text{ for all } s \in \mathfrak{R}. \quad (2.8)$$

If  $x \in U \cap S_*(\mathfrak{R})$ , then  $[x, s]\mathfrak{R}[y, x] = ([x, s])^*\mathfrak{R}[y, x] = \{0\}$ . Thus  $*$ -primeness of  $\mathfrak{R}$  yields that, either  $[x, s] = 0$  or  $[y, x] = 0$ , but for any  $x \in U$ ,  $x - x^*, x + x^* \in U \cap S_*(\mathfrak{R})$ . Then either  $[x - x^*, s] = 0$  or  $[y, x - x^*] = 0$ . If  $[x - x^*, s] = 0$ , then from (2.8)  $[x, s]\mathfrak{R}[y, x] = ([x, s])^*\mathfrak{R}[y, x] = \{0\}$  for all  $x, y \in U$  for all  $s \in U$ . Hence either  $[x, s] = 0$  or  $[y, x] = 0$ . Let  $A_1 = \{x \in U \mid [x, s] = 0\}$  and  $B_1 = \{x \in U \mid [y, x] = 0\}$ . Again  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  are additive subgroups of  $U$  such that  $A_1 \cup B_1 = U$ . But a group can not be union of two its proper subgroups and therefore  $A_1 = U$  or  $B_1 = U$ . If  $A_1 = U$ , then  $[x, s] = 0$  for all  $x \in U$  this implies that  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$  on the other hand, if  $B_1 = U$ , then we have  $[y, x] = 0$  for all  $x, y \in U$  and hence  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$  by Lemma 2.1. Thus, in both the cases we find that  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ . Now if  $B = U$  then  $[x, s] = 0$  for all  $x \in U$  for all  $s \in \mathfrak{R}$  and again  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$  and hence in both the cases we find that  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .

Similarly, we can prove the result in case  $\delta(x)\delta(y) + x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ .

□

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring of Char  $\mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  and  $U$  be a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$*

*be a symmetric  $n$ -additive map and  $\delta$  be the trace of  $F$ . If  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ , then  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose

$$\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) - x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.9)$$

Replacing  $y$  by  $y + z$  in (2.9), we get

$$\delta(x) \circ (\delta(y) + \delta(z) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z)) - x \circ y - x \circ z \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.10)$$

Comparing (2.9) and (2.10), we have

$$\delta(x) \circ \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

This gives

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, z) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, z) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.11)$$

Substituting  $y$  for  $z$  in (2.11), we get

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, y) + \binom{n}{2} h_2(y, y) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, y) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x) \circ & \left( \binom{n}{1} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}) + \binom{n}{2} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-2)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y, y}_{2\text{-times}}) + \dots \right. \\ & \left. + \binom{n}{n-1} F(\underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}) \right) \in Z(F) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} \right) F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Therefore, we have

$$(2^n - 2)\delta(x) \circ F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{R}$  is  $(2^n - 2)$  torsion free. Then

$$\delta(x) \circ F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

This implies that

$$\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.12)$$

Using (2.9) and (2.12), we obtain

$$x \circ y \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Using the same arguments, as we have done in the proof of the Theorem 2.2, we get the result.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring of Char  $\mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  and  $U$  be a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$*

*be a symmetric  $n$ -additive map and  $\delta$  be the trace of  $F$ . If  $[x, y] - \delta(xy) + \delta(yx) \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ , then  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that

$$[x, y] - \delta(xy) + \delta(yx) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.13)$$

Replacing  $y$  by  $y + z$  in (2.13), we get

$$\begin{aligned} [x, y] + [x, z] - \delta(xy) - \delta(xz) - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(xy, xz) \\ + \delta(yx) + \delta(zx) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(yx, zx) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Comparing (2.13) and (2.14), we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(yx, zx) - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(yx, zx) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.15)$$

Substituting  $z$  for  $y$  in (2.15), we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(yx, yx) - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(xy, xy) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{1} h_1(yx, yx) + \binom{n}{2} h_2(yx, yx) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(yx, yx) \\ - \binom{n}{1} h_1(xy, xy) - \binom{n}{2} h_2(xy, xy) - \dots - \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(xy, xy) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \binom{n}{1} F(\underbrace{yx, yx, \dots, yx}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{yx}_{1\text{-times}}) + \binom{n}{2} F(\underbrace{yx, yx, \dots, yx}_{(n-2)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{yx}_{2\text{-times}}) + \dots \right. \\
& \quad + \binom{n}{n-1} F(\underbrace{yx}_{1\text{-times}}, \underbrace{yx, yx, \dots, yx}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}) - \binom{n}{1} F(\underbrace{xy, xy, \dots, xy}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{xy}_{1\text{-times}}) \\
& \quad - \binom{n}{2} F(\underbrace{xy, xy, \dots, xy}_{(n-2)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{xy}_{2\text{-times}}) - \dots \\
& \quad \left. - \binom{n}{n-1} F(\underbrace{xy}_{1\text{-times}}, \underbrace{xy, xy, \dots, xy}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} \right) F(yx, yx, \dots, yx) \\
& \quad - \left( \binom{n}{1} + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} \right) F(xy, xy, \dots, xy) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).
\end{aligned}$$

That is

$$(2^n - 2)\delta(yx) - (2^n - 2)\delta(xy) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Therefore, we have

$$(2^n - 2) \left( \delta(yx) - \delta(xy) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{R}$  is  $(2^n - 2)$  torsion free, then

$$\delta(yx) - \delta(xy) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.16)$$

Comparing (2.13) and (2.16), we get  $[x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$ . Thus  $[r, [x, y]] = 0$  for all  $x, y \in U$ ,  $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Replacing  $y$  by  $2yx$  and using the fact that  $\mathfrak{R}$  is not of characteristic  $(2^n - 2)$ , we get  $[r, [x, yx]] = [r, [x, y]x] = [x, y][r, x]$ . Again, replacing  $r$  by  $ry$ , we have  $[y, x]\mathfrak{R}[y, x] = \{0\}$  for all  $x, y \in U$ . Therefore,  $[y, x]\mathfrak{R}[y, x] = [y, x]\mathfrak{R}([y, x])^* = \{0\}$  and hence  $*$ -primeness of  $\mathfrak{R}$  yields that  $[y, x] = 0$  for all  $x, y \in U$ , by Lemma 2.1,  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring of Char  $\mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  and  $U$  be a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$*



be a symmetric  $n$ -additive map and  $\delta$  be the trace of  $F$ . If  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp [x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ , then  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that

$$\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) - [x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.17)$$

Replacing  $y$  by  $y + z$  in (2.17), we get

$$\delta(x) \circ (\delta(y) + \delta(z) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z)) - [x, y] - [x, z] \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.18)$$

Comparing (2.17) and (2.18), we have

$$\delta(x) \circ \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

This implies that

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, z) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, z) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.19)$$

Substituting  $z$  for  $y$  in (2.19), we get

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, y) + \binom{n}{2} h_2(y, y) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, y) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x) \circ & \left( \binom{n}{1} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}) + \binom{n}{2} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-2)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y, y}_{2\text{-times}}) + \dots \right. \\ & \left. + \binom{n}{n-1} F(\underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} \right) F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U,$$

and we have

$$(2^n - 2)\delta(x) \circ F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{R}$  is  $(2^n - 2)$  torsion free, we get

$$\delta(x) \circ F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

This implies that

$$\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.20)$$

Using (2.17) and (2.20), we obtain  $[x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ . Arguing in the similar manner as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we get the result.

Similarly, we can prove the case if,  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) + [x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ . □

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring of Char  $\mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  and  $U$  be a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be a symmetric  $n$ -additive map and  $\delta$  be the trace of  $F$ . If  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ , then  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that

$$\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) - xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.21)$$

Replacing  $y$  by  $y + z$  in (2.21), we get

$$\delta(x) \circ (\delta(y) + \delta(z) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z)) - xy - xz \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.22)$$

Comparing (2.21) and (2.22), we have

$$\delta(x) \circ \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h_k(y, z) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, z) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, z) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.23)$$

Substituting  $y$  for  $z$  in (2.23), we get

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} h_1(y, y) + \binom{n}{2} h_2(y, y) + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} h_{n-1}(y, y) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(x) \circ & \left( \binom{n}{1} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}) + \binom{n}{2} F(\underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-2)\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y, y}_{2\text{-times}}) + \dots \right. \\ & \left. + \binom{n}{n-1} F(\underbrace{y}_{1\text{-times}}, \underbrace{y, y, \dots, y}_{(n-1)\text{-times}}) \right) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\delta(x) \circ \left( \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{n-1} \right) F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}).$$

This implies that

$$(2^n - 2)\delta(x) \circ F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{R}$  is  $(2^n - 2)$  torsion free, we get

$$\delta(x) \circ F(y, y, \dots, y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

This implies that

$$\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \in Z(\mathfrak{R}). \quad (2.24)$$

Using (2.21) and (2.24), we obtain

$$xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U. \quad (2.25)$$

Interchanging the role of  $x$  and  $y$  in (2.25) and subtracting from (2.25), we find

$$[x, y] \in Z(\mathfrak{R}) \text{ for all } x, y \in U.$$

Arguing in the similar manner as in the Theorem 2.5, we get the result.

The prove is same for the case  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) + xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $\mathfrak{R}$  be a  $*$ -prime ring of Char  $\mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  and  $U$  be a nonzero square closed  $*$ -Lie ideal of  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$*

*be a symmetric  $n$ -additive map and  $\delta$  be the trace of  $F$ . If  $\delta(x) \circ \delta(y) \mp xy \in Z(\mathfrak{R})$  for all  $x, y \in U$ , then  $U \subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .*

*Proof.* The proof runs on the same parallel lines as of the Theorem 2.6.  $\square$

The following examples illustrates that  $\mathfrak{R}$  to be  $*$ -prime ring and Char  $\mathfrak{R} \neq (2^n - 2)$  for  $n > 1$  are essential in the hypothesis of the above theorems.

**Example 2.8.** Let  $\mathfrak{R} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix} \mid a, b, c \in \mathbb{S}, \text{ ring of integers} \right\}$  and  $U = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mid b \in \mathbb{S} \right\}$ . Then  $Z(\mathfrak{R}) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & a \end{bmatrix} \mid a \in \mathbb{S} \right\}$ . Define

map  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  by

$$F \left[ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a_1 & b_1 \\ 0 & c_1 \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a_2 & b_2 \\ 0 & c_2 \end{array} \right], \dots, \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a_n & b_n \\ 0 & c_n \end{array} \right] \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a_1 a_2 a_3 \dots a_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right].$$

It can be verified that  $F$  is  $n$ -additive with trace  $\delta$  defined by

$$\delta : \mathfrak{R} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R} \text{ as } \delta \left[ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{array} \right] \right] = F \left[ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{array} \right], \dots, \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{array} \right] \right]$$

satisfying hypothesis of the above Theorems. However  $U \not\subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .

**Example 2.9.** Let  $\mathfrak{R} = \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x & 0 \\ y & z \end{array} \right] \mid x, y, z \in \mathbb{S}, \text{ ring of integers} \right\}$  and  $U = \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ y & 0 \end{array} \right] \mid y \in \mathbb{S} \right\}$ , here  $Z(\mathfrak{R}) = \left\{ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{array} \right] \mid x \in \mathbb{S} \right\}$ . Define a map  $F : \underbrace{\mathfrak{R} \times \mathfrak{R} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{R}}_{n\text{-times}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  by

$$F \left[ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x_1 & 0 \\ y_1 & z_1 \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x_2 & 0 \\ y_2 & z_2 \end{array} \right], \dots, \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x_n & 0 \\ y_n & z_n \end{array} \right] \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & z_1 z_2 z_3 \dots z_n \end{array} \right].$$

It can be verified that  $F$  is  $n$ -additive with trace  $\delta$  defined by

$$\delta : \mathfrak{R} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{R} \text{ as } \delta \left[ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x & 0 \\ y & z \end{array} \right] \right] = F \left[ \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x & 0 \\ y & z \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x & 0 \\ y & z \end{array} \right], \dots, \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x & 0 \\ y & z \end{array} \right] \right]$$

satisfying hypothesis of the above Theorems. However  $U \not\subseteq Z(\mathfrak{R})$ .

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the referee for careful reading.

## REFERENCES

1. A. Ali, F. Shujat and K. Kumar, *Some functional identities with generalized skew derivation on  $\ast$ -prime rings*, Palestine Journal of Mathematics, **07** (2018), 88–98.
2. I.N. Herstein, *Rings with involution*, Chicago lectures in mathematics, University of Chicago press, Chicago, III, USA, (1976).
3. K.H. Park, *On prime and semiprime rings with symmetric  $n$ -derivations*, J. Chungcheong Math. Soc., **22** (2009), 451–458.
4. K.H. Park and Y.S. Jung, *On permuting 3-derivations and commutativity in prime near rings*, Commun. Korean Math. Soc., **25** (2010), 1–9, DOI 10.4134/CKMS.2010.25.1001.

5. L. Oukhtite and S. Salhi, *Lie ideals and derivations of  $\sigma$  prime rings*, International Journal of Algebra, **17** (2007), 25–30.
6. M. Ashraf, A. Ali and S. Ali, *Some commutativity theorems for rings with generalized derivations*, Southeast Asian Bull. Math., **31** (2007), 415–421.
7. M.N. Daif and H.E. Bell, *Remarks on derivations on semiprime rings*, Int. J. Math. and Math. Sci., **15** (1992), 205–206.

**A. Ali**

Department of Mathematics  
 Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002, Aligarh, India.  
 Email: asma.ali2@rediffmail.com

**K. Kumar**

Department of Mathematics  
 Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002, Aligarh, India.  
 Email: 01kapilmathsamu@gmail.com