## SEMIPRIME RINGS WITH NILPOTENT DERIVATIVES

BY<br>L. O. CHUNG AND JIANG LUH

There has been a great deal of work recently concerning the relationship between the commutativity of a ring $R$ and the existence of certain specified derivations of R. Bell, Herstein, Procesei, Schacher, Ligh, Martindale, Putcha, Wilson, and Yaqub [1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14] have studied conditions on commutators which imply the commutativity of rings. By noting that a commutator is simply the image of an element under an inner derivation, the present authors and A. N. Richoux [3, 4, 5] have generalized several earlier results by replacing inner derivations by certain (not necessarily inner) derivations. Recently in [8], Herstein claims that, for a prime ring $R$, if $x \in R$ and if there is a positive integer $n$ such that $[x, y]^{n}=0$ for all $y \in R$ then $x$ is central in $R$. The purpose of this paper is to extend this result to semi-prime rings and, at the same time, to relax the hypothesis by replacing the commutator $[x, y]$ by $\partial x$ for an arbitrary derivation $\partial$ of $R$.
Theorem. Let $R$ be a semi-prime ring with a derivation $\partial$. Suppose there exists a positive integer $n$ such that $(\partial x)^{n}=0$ for all $x \in R$ and suppose $R$ is $(n-1)$ !torsion free. Then $\partial=0$.

Let us first establish the following:
Lemma 1. Let $R$ be an $m$ !-torsion free ring. Suppose $y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{m} \in R$ satisfy $\alpha y_{1}+\alpha^{2} y_{2}+\cdots+\alpha^{m} y_{m}=0$ for $\alpha=1,2, \ldots, m$. Then $y_{i}=0$ for all $i$.

Proof. Let A be the matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
2 & 2^{2} & \cdots & 2^{m} \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots
\end{array}\right] \cdot .
$$

Then, by our assumption,

$$
A\left(\begin{array}{c}
y_{1} \\
y_{2} \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
y_{m}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
0 \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
0
\end{array}\right)
$$
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Premultiplying by the adjoint of $A$ yields

$$
(\operatorname{det} A)\left(\begin{array}{c}
y_{1} \\
y_{2} \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
y_{m}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
0 \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
\cdot \\
0
\end{array}\right)
$$

Since the determinant of $A$, $\operatorname{det} A$, known as a Vandermonde determinant, is equal to a product of positive integers, each of which is less than $m$, and since $R$ is $m$ !-torsion free, it follows immediately that $y_{i}=0$ for all $i$.
Throughout the balance of this paper we assume $R$ is a semi-prime ring with a derivation $\partial$. Assume $n$ is a positive integer, $R$ is $(n-1)$ !-torsion free and $(\partial x)^{n}=0$ for all $x \in R$. Moreover, $Z$ denotes the ring of integers, $\partial R$ denotes the set of all $\partial x$ where $x \in R$.

Lemma 2. For all $x, y \in R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial y(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial y=0 . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $\alpha \in Z$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1$.
By expanding $(\partial(x+\alpha y))^{n}=0$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (\alpha x)^{n}+\alpha\left(\partial y(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial y\right)+\alpha^{2}\left((\partial y)^{2}(\partial x)^{n-2}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\partial y \partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-3}+\partial x(\partial y)^{2}(\partial x)^{n-3}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-2}(\partial y)^{2}\right)+\cdots+\alpha^{n}(\partial y)^{n}=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $(\partial x)^{n}=0$ and $(\partial y)^{n}=0$, it can be written abbreviately as

$$
\alpha y_{1}+\alpha^{2} y_{2}+\cdots+\alpha^{n-1} y_{n-1}=0 .
$$

By Lemma 1, all $y_{i}=0$ and, particularly,

$$
y_{1}=\partial y(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial y=0 .
$$

Lemma 3. For all $x, y \in R$, and $k=2,3,4, \ldots$,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\partial^{k} x y(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial x \partial^{k} x y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial^{k} x y=0  \tag{2}\\
(\partial x)^{n-1} y \partial^{k} x+(\partial x)^{n-2} y \partial^{k} x \partial x+\cdots+y \partial^{k} x(\partial x)^{n-1}=0 \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on $k$. In (1) we replace $y$ by $\partial x y$. We obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[\partial^{2} x y(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial x \partial^{2} x y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial^{2} x y\right] } \\
&+\left[\partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-1}+(\partial x)^{2} \partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n} \partial y\right]=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

The second bracket is zero by (1) and hence (2) holds for $k=2$.

Now, we assume (2) holds for $k=m-1$. In (1), replacing y by $\partial^{m-1} x y$ yields $\begin{aligned} {\left[\partial^{m} x y(\partial x)^{n-1}\right.} & \left.+\partial x \partial^{m} x y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial^{m} x y\right] \\ & +\left[\partial^{m-1} x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial x \partial^{m-1} x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial^{m-1} x \partial y\right]=0 .\end{aligned}$

The second bracket again is zero by the induction hypothesis and thus (2) holds for $k=m$.

Similarly, in (1) replacing $y$ by $y \partial x$ and $y \partial^{k-1} x$ respectively yield (2).
Lemma 4. For all $x \in R$ and $k=2,3,4, \ldots$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial^{k} x=0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\partial^{k} x(\partial x)^{n-1}=0
$$

Proof. (3) can be obtained from (2) by premultiplying by ( $\partial x)^{n-1}$ and by the semi-primeness of $R$, (3)' can be obtained from (2)' similarly.

Lemma 5. For all $x, y \in R$ and positive integer $k$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{k} y(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial^{k} x\left(\partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-3}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial y\right)=0 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
(4) $\quad(\partial x)^{n-1} \partial^{k} y+\left(\partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-3}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial y\right) \partial^{k} x=0$.

Proof. From Lemma 2, (4) and (4)' both hold for $k=1$. Now we assume $k \geq 2$. We replace $x$ by $x+\alpha y$ in (3)', where $\alpha \in Z$ and $1 \leq \alpha \leq n-1$ and then expand it. The identity (4) follows immediately from Lemma 1. Likewise (4)' can be obtained from the identity (3).

Lemma 6. For all $x \in R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial^{2} x=\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-2}=0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. In the identity (4) for $k=2$, replacing $y$ by $y \partial x$ yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\partial^{2} y \partial x+\partial y \partial^{2} x+y\right. & \left.\partial^{3} x\right)(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial^{2} x\left[\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right)(\partial x)^{n-2}\right. \\
& \left.+\partial x\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right)(\partial x)^{n-3}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-2}\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right)\right]=0
\end{aligned}
$$

or

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\left[\partial^{2} y\right)(\partial x)^{n-1}+\partial^{2} x\left(\partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\partial x \partial y(\partial x)^{n-3}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial y\right)\right] \partial x \\
& \quad+\left[\partial y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-1}+y \partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{n-1}\right]+\partial^{2} x\left[y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-2}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\partial x y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-3}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{n-2} y \partial^{2} x\right]=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

This first bracket is zero by Lemma 5 while the second bracket is zero by Lemma 4. Hence we have $\partial^{2} x\left[y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-2}+\partial x y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-3}+\cdots+\right.$ $\left.(\partial x)^{n-2} y \partial^{2} x\right]=0$. Now we postmultiply by $(\partial x)^{n-2}$ and use Lemma 4. We arrive
that $(\partial x)^{n-2} y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-2}=0$. Since $y$ is arbitrary and $R$ is semi-prime, $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-2}=0$ as we desired. Similarly $(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial^{2} x=0$.

Lemma 7. For all $x \in R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{n-2}=(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial^{3} x=0 . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. In $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-2}=0$, by replacing $x$ by $x+\alpha y$, by expanding and by using Lemma 1, we obtain

$$
\partial^{2} y(\partial x)^{n-2}+\partial^{2} x\left[(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial y+(\partial x)^{n-3} \partial y \partial x+\cdots+\partial y(\partial x)^{n-2}\right]=0 .
$$

Replacing $y$ by $y \partial x$ and applying (5) yield
(7) $y \partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{n-2}+\partial^{2} x\left[(\partial x)^{n-2} y \partial^{2} x+(\partial x)^{n-3} y \partial^{2} x \partial x+\cdots+y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-2}\right]=0$.

Now, we premultiply by $(\partial x)^{n-2}$ and use (5). It follows that $(\partial x)^{n-2} y \partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{n-2}=0$. The semi-primeness of $R$ implies $\partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{n-2}=0$. Likewise, $(\partial x)^{n-2} \partial^{3} x=0$.

Lemma 8. For all $x \in R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\partial x)^{2} \partial^{2} x=\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{2}=0 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. For $n<4$, it is trivial by Lemma 6. Now we assume that $n \geq 4$. From (7), using (6) and (5) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} x\left[(\partial x)^{n-3} y \partial^{2} x \partial x+(\partial x)^{n-4} y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{2}+\cdots+\partial x y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-3}\right]=0 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Postmultiplying by $(\partial x)^{n-4}$ yields $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-3} y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-4}=0$ which, by the semi-primeness of $R$, implies $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-3}=0$. Likewise, $(\partial x)^{n-3} \partial^{2} x=0$. So we are done if $n=4$ or 5. Suppose $n>5$. The identity (9) becomes $\partial^{2} x\left[(\partial x)^{n-4} y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{2}+\cdots+(\partial x)^{2} y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-4}\right]=0$. Postmultiplying by $(\partial x)^{n-6}$ yields $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-4} y \partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-4}=0$. Again by the semi-primeness of $R$, $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{n-4}=0$. Continuing this process if necessary, we obtain $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{2}=0$ and, likewise, $(\partial x)^{2} \partial^{2} x=0$.

Lemma 9. For all $x \in R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial x \partial^{2} x=\partial^{2} x \partial x=0 \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. From $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{2}=0$, we replace $x$ by $x+y$. After expansion we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} y(\partial x)^{2}+\partial^{2} x(\partial x \partial y+\partial y \partial x)=0 \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Replacing $y$ by $y \partial x$ yields
$\left(\partial^{2} y \partial x+\partial y \partial^{2} x+y \partial^{3} x\right)(\partial x)^{2}+\partial^{2} x\left(\partial x\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right)+\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right) \partial x\right)=0$.
By noting that $\partial^{2} x(\partial x)^{2}=0$, we get $\left[\partial^{2} y(\partial x)^{3}+\partial^{2} x \partial x \partial y \partial x+\partial^{2} x \partial y(\partial x)^{2}\right]+y \partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{2}+\partial^{2} x\left(\partial x y \partial^{2} x+y \partial^{2} x \partial x\right)=0$.

The first bracket is zero according to (11). So

$$
\begin{equation*}
y \partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{2}+\partial^{2} x\left(\partial x y \partial^{2} x+y \partial^{2} x \partial x\right)=0 \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now premultiplying by $(\partial x)^{2}$ yields $(\partial x)^{2} y \partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{2}=0$ which, by semiprimeness of $R$, implies $\partial^{3} x(\partial x)^{2}=0$. Thus the identity (12) becomes $\partial^{2} x\left(\partial x y \partial^{2} x+y \partial^{2} x \partial x\right)=0$. Postmultiplying by $\partial x$ yields $\partial^{2} x \partial x y \partial^{2} x \partial x=0$, and hence by the semi-primeness of $R, \partial^{2} x \partial x=0$. That $\partial x \partial^{2} x=0$ can be obtained analogously.

Lemma 10. For all $x \in R, \partial^{3} x=0$.
Proof. By Lemma 9, for all $x, y \in R, \partial(x+y) \partial^{2}(x+y)=0$ which implies $\partial y \partial^{2} x+\partial x \partial^{2} y=0$. Premultiplying by $\partial^{2} x$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} x \partial y \partial^{2} x=0 \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we replace $y$ by $y \partial^{2} x z$.
It follows $\partial^{2} x\left(\partial y \partial^{2} x z+y \partial^{3} x z+y \partial^{2} x \partial z\right) \partial^{2} x=0$ or, by (13), $\partial^{2} x y \partial^{3} x z \partial^{2} x=$ 0 . By the semi-primenesss of $R, \partial^{2} x y \partial^{3} x=0$. Replacing $x$ by $x+z$ yields $\partial^{2} z y \partial^{3} x+\partial^{2} x y \partial^{3} z=0$. Now by premultiplying by $\partial^{3} z$ and by noting that $\partial^{3} z \partial^{2} z=0$ (Lemma 9), we obtain $\partial^{3} z \partial^{2} x y \partial^{3} z=0$. Consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{3} z \partial^{2} x=0 \text { for all } x, z \in R . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Replacing $x$ by $\partial x y$ yields.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{3} z \partial x \partial^{2} y=0 \quad \text { for all } x, y, z \in R \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

by using (14). On the other hand, in (14), replacing $x$ by $x \partial y$ yields $\partial^{3} x\left(\partial^{2} x \partial y+\partial x \partial^{2} y+x \partial^{3} y\right)=0$ which, by (14) and (15), implies $\partial^{3} z x \partial^{3} y=0$ for all $x, y, z \in R$. The semi-primeness of $R$ gives $\partial^{3} y=0$ for all $y \in R$.

It is perhaps worth noting that for an arbitrary ring $A \partial^{3} x=0$ for all $x \in A$ does not imply $\partial=0$ or the commutativity of $A$.

Example. Let $A$ be the 3 by 3 matrix ring over a division ring and $\partial$ be the inner derivation of $A$ defined by
$\partial\left(\begin{array}{lll}x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} \\ x_{31} & x_{32} & x_{33}\end{array}\right)=\left[\left(\begin{array}{lll}0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\right),\left(\begin{array}{lll}x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} \\ x_{31} & x_{32} & x_{33}\end{array}\right)\right]=\left(\begin{array}{lll}x_{31} & x_{32} & x_{33}-x_{11} \\ 0 & 0 & -x_{21} \\ 0 & 0 & -x_{31}\end{array}\right)$.
It can be seen easily that $\partial^{3} x=0$ for all $x \in A$. However, $A$ is not commutative. Now we are in a position to prove our main theorem.

Proof of the Theorem. By Lemma 9, $\partial(x+y) \partial^{2}(x+y)=0$ which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial y \partial^{2} x+\partial x \partial^{2} y=0 \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, by Lemma $10, \partial^{3}(x y)=0$ which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} x \partial y+\partial x \partial^{2} y=0 \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, from (16) and (17),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} x \partial y=\partial y \partial^{2} x, \quad \text { for all } x, y \in R . \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

In (18), replacing $y$ by $y \partial x$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} x\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right)=\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right) \partial^{2} x, \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

while in (17), replacing $x$ by $\partial x$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} x \partial^{2} y=0, \quad \text { for all } x, y \in R \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (19), using (20) and (10), we obtain $\partial^{2} x\left(\partial y \partial x+y \partial^{2} x\right)=0$.
But $\partial^{2} x \partial y \partial x=\partial y \partial^{2} x \partial x=0$ by (18) and (10). So we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\partial^{2} x=0 \quad \text { for all } x \in R \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here to prove $\partial=0$ we might use a result of Posner [13] which says that a product of two non-trivial derivations is not a derivation in a prime ring if the characteristic of the ring is not 2 . However, for the sake of self containment we provide a direct and elementary proof. Indeed, from (21), for all $x, y \in R$, $\partial^{2}(x y)=0$. This implies $\partial x \partial y=0$. Now by replacing $y$ by $y x$ we obtain $\partial x y \partial x=0$ for all $x, y \in R$. Therefore, $\partial=0$ by the semi-primeness of $R$.

As an immediate consequence of the theorem we have
Corollary. Let $R$ be a semi-prime ring and $x \in R$. If there exists a positive integer $n$ such that $[x, y]^{n}=0$ for all $y \in R$ and $R$ is $(n-1)!$-torsion free, then $x$ lies in the center of $R$.

We conclude with some open problems:

1. It can be shown that for some small n, e.g. 2, 3, the theorem is true without assuming that $R$ is $(n-1)$ !-torsion free. Is it true for general $n$ ?
2. Does the theorem remain true if one weakens the assumption by assuming that $n$ depends upon $x$ ?
3. Let $R$ be a semi-prime ring with derivation $\partial$. If there exist positive integers $n$ and $k$ such that $\left(\partial^{k} x\right)^{n}$ is central for all $x \in R$, what kind of conclusion can be drawn on $R$ and $\partial$ ? (cf. [10]).
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Added in proof.
The detailed proof of the results in reference [8] has appeared in J. Algebra 60 (1979), 567-574.
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