

# CHARACTERIZATION OF LIE DERIVATIONS ON VON NEUMANN ALGEBRAS

XIAOFEI QI AND JINCHUAN HOU

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$  a scalar. It is shown that an additive map  $L$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $L(AB - \xi BA) = L(A)B - \xi BL(A) + L(B)A - \xi AL(B)$  whenever  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if one of the following statements holds: (1)  $\xi = 1$ ,  $L = \varphi + f$ , where  $\varphi$  is an additive derivation on  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $f$  is an additive map from  $\mathcal{M}$  into its center vanishing on  $[A, B]$  with  $AB = 0$ ; (2)  $\xi = 0$ ,  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A$ ; (3)  $\xi = -1$ ,  $L$  is a Jordan derivation; (4)  $\xi$  is rational and  $\xi \neq 0, \pm 1$ ,  $L$  is an additive derivation; (5)  $\xi$  is not rational, there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  satisfying  $\varphi(\xi I) = \xi L(I)$  such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . A linear map  $L$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $L(AB - \xi BA) = L(A)B - \xi BL(A) + L(B)A - \xi AL(B)$  whenever  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if there exists a  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  and a linear map  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  vanishing on  $[A, B]$  with  $AB = 0$  such that (i)  $\xi = 1$ ,  $L(A) = AT - TA + f(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; (ii)  $\xi = 0$ ,  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $L(A) = AT - (T - L(I))A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; (iii)  $\xi \neq 0, 1$ ,  $L(A) = AT - TA$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be an associative ring (or an algebra over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ ). Recall that an additive (a linear) map  $\delta$  from  $\mathcal{R}$  into itself is called an additive (a linear) derivation if  $\delta(AB) = \delta(A)B + A\delta(B)$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$ . More generally, an additive (a linear) map  $L$  from  $\mathcal{R}$  into itself is called an additive (a linear) Jordan derivation if  $L(AB + BA) = L(A)B + AL(B) + L(B)A + BL(A)$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$  (equivalently,  $L(A^2) = L(A)A + AL(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  if the characteristic of  $\mathcal{R}$  is not 2); is called a Lie derivation if  $L([A, B]) = [L(A), B] + [A, L(B)]$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$ , where  $[A, B] = AB - BA$  is the Lie product of  $A$  and  $B$ . The problem of how to characterize the linear (additive) Jordan (Lie) derivations of rings and algebras has received many mathematicians' attention for many years. Brešar in [1] proved that every additive Lie derivation on a prime ring  $\mathcal{R}$  with characteristic not 2 can be decomposed as  $\tau + \zeta$ , where  $\tau$  is a derivation from  $\mathcal{R}$  into its central closure and  $\zeta$  is an additive map of  $\mathcal{R}$  into the extended centroid  $\mathcal{C}$  sending

---

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B47, 46L10.

*Key words and phrases.* Von Neumann algebras, Lie derivations, Derivations,  $\xi$ -Lie derivations.

This work is partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11171249, 11101250) and Young Talents Plan for Shanxi Univeristy.

commutators to zero. Johnson [8] proved that every continuous linear Lie derivation from a  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  into a Banach  $\mathcal{A}$ -bimodule  $M$  is standard, that is, can be decomposed as the form  $\tau + h$ , where  $\tau : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow M$  is a derivation and  $h$  is a linear map from  $\mathcal{A}$  into the center of  $M$  vanishing at each commutator. Mathieu and Villena [14] showed that every linear Lie derivation on a  $C^*$ -algebra is standard. In [17] Qi and Hou proved that the same is true for additive Lie derivations of nest algebras on Banach spaces. For other results, see [2, 6] and the references therein.

Recently, there have been a number of papers on the study of conditions under which derivations of rings or operator algebras can be completely determined by the action on some elements concerning products (see [3, 7, 10, 12, 16] and the references therein). For Lie derivations, some works were also done. A linear (an additive) map  $L : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is said to be Lie derivable at a point  $Z$  if  $L([A, B]) = [L(A), B] + [A, L(B)]$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$  with  $[A, B] = Z$ . Clearly, this definition is not valid for some  $Z$ , for instance, for  $Z = I$ , as the unit  $I$  can not be a commutator  $[A, B]$  in general. It is also obvious that the condition of maps Lie derivable at some point is much weaker than the condition of being a Lie derivation. Qi and Hou [18] discussed such linear maps on  $\mathcal{J}$ -subspace lattice algebras. Lu and Jing in [13] gave another kind of characterization for Lie derivations as follows. Let  $X$  be a Banach space with  $\dim X \geq 3$  and  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  the algebra of all bounded linear operators acting on  $X$ . It is proved in [13] that if  $\delta : \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X)$  is a linear map satisfying  $\delta([A, B]) = [\delta(A), B] + [A, \delta(B)]$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  with  $AB = 0$  (resp.  $AB = P$ , where  $P$  is a fixed nontrivial idempotent), then  $\delta = d + \tau$ , where  $d$  is a derivation of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  and  $\tau : \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}I$  is a linear map vanishing at commutators  $[A, B]$  with  $AB = 0$  (resp.  $AB = P$ ). Later, this result was generalized to the maps on triangular algebras and prime rings in [9] and [19] respectively. Since factor von Neumann algebras are prime, as a consequence of the result for prime rings, all additive maps  $\delta$  on factor von Neumann algebras satisfying  $\delta([A, B]) = [\delta(A), B] + [A, \delta(B)]$  for any  $A, B$  with  $AB = 0$  are characterized. However the proof for factor von Neumann algebras is not valid anymore for general von Neumann algebras. So, it is natural to ask what happens when the concerned von Neumann algebras are not factor.

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ . For a scalar  $\xi \in \mathbb{F}$  and for  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ , if  $AB = \xi BA$ , we say that  $A$  commutes with  $B$  up to a factor  $\xi$ . The notion of commutativity up to a factor for pairs of operators is an important concept and has been studied in the context of operator algebras and quantum groups (ref. [4, 11]). Motivated by this, a binary operation  $[A, B]_\xi = AB - \xi BA$ , called  $\xi$ -Lie product of  $A$  and  $B$ , was introduced in [17]. An additive (a linear) map  $L : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is called an additive (a linear)  $\xi$ -Lie derivation if  $L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$  for all

$A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ . This conception unifies several well known notions. It is clear that a  $\xi$ -Lie derivation is a derivation if  $\xi = 0$ ; is a Lie derivation if  $\xi = 1$ ; is a Jordan derivation if  $\xi = -1$ . The structure of  $\xi$ -Lie derivations was characterized in triangular algebras and prime algebras in [17, 20] respectively. Particularly, we got a characterization of  $\xi$ -Lie derivations on Banach space nest algebras and standard operator algebras.

Thus, more generally, one may ask what is the structure of additive (linear) maps  $L$  that satisfy  $L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$  for any  $A, B$  with  $AB = 0$ ? The purpose of the present paper is to study this question for maps on von Neumann algebras and characterize all such maps on general von Neumann algebras. Note that every map on a commutative von Neumann algebra is a Lie derivation. So it is reasonable to confine our attention to the von Neumann algebras that have no central summands of type  $I_1$ .

This paper is organized as follows. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . In Section 2, we deal with the case  $\xi = 1$ , that is, the case of Lie product, and show that every additive map  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $L([A, B]) = [L(A), B] + [A, L(B)]$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if it has the form  $L = \varphi + f$ , where  $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is an additive derivation and  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ , the center of  $\mathcal{M}$ , is an additive map vanishing on each commutator  $[A, B]$  whenever  $AB = 0$  (Theorem 2.1). Section 3 is devoted to discussing the case of  $\xi \neq 1$ . We show that every additive map  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  satisfies that  $L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and, (1)  $\xi = 0$ , there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; (2)  $\xi = -1$ ,  $L$  is a Jordan derivation, that is,  $L(A^2) = L(A)A + AL(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; (3)  $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$  is rational and  $\xi \neq 0, -1$ ,  $L$  is an additive derivation; (4)  $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$  is not rational, there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  satisfying  $\varphi(\xi I) = \xi L(I)$  such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  (Theorem 3.1). Moreover, in the last case (4), if (i)  $L$  is continuous when restricted on  $\mathbb{C}I$  or (ii) there exists a positive number  $c$  and a subsequence of integers  $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $|k_n| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $\|L(\xi^{k_n} I)\| \leq c|\xi|^{k_n}$ , then  $L$  is an additive derivation (Corollary 3.3). Here we say that a complex number is rational if it has rational real and imaginary parts. Particularly, we get a structure theorem for additive  $\xi$ -Lie derivations on von Neumann algebras without central summands of type  $I_1$  (Corollary 2.5 and Corollary 3.4).

For the linear case, we show that, a linear map  $L$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $L(AB - \xi BA) = L(A)B - \xi BL(A) + L(B)A - \xi AL(B)$  whenever  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if there exists a  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  and a linear map  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  vanishing on  $[A, B]$  with  $AB = 0$  such that (1) in the case  $\xi = 1$ ,  $L(A) = AT - TA + f(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; (2) in the case  $\xi = 0$ ,  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$

and  $L(A) = AT - (T - L(I))A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; (3) in the case  $\xi \neq 0, 1$ ,  $L(A) = AT - TA$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  (See Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 3.2).

## 2. CHARACTERIZATION OF LIE DERIVATIONS

In this section, we consider the question of characterizing Lie derivations by action at zero product on general von Neumann algebras having no central summands of type  $I_1$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . Suppose that  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is an additive map. Then  $L$  satisfies that  $L([A, B]) = [L(A), B] + [A, L(B)]$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  and an additive map  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  that vanishes each commutator  $[A, B]$  whenever  $AB = 0$ , such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + f(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  denotes the center of  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

*Particularly,  $L$  is linear and satisfies that  $L([A, B]) = [L(A), B] + [A, L(B)]$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if there exists some  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  and a linear map  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  that vanishes each commutator  $[A, B]$  whenever  $AB = 0$ , such that  $L(A) = AT - TA + f(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

Before proving this theorem, we need some notations. We introduce the concept of core-free projections, which had been defined in [15]. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be any von Neumann algebra and  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . Recall that the central carrier of  $A$ , denoted by  $\overline{A}$ , is the intersection of all central projections  $P$  such that  $PA = 0$ . If  $A$  is self-adjoint, then the core of  $A$ , denoted by  $\underline{A}$ , is  $\sup\{S \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}) : S = S^*, S \leq A\}$ . Particularly, if  $A = P$  is a projection, it is clear that  $\underline{P}$  is the largest central projection  $\leq P$ . A projection  $P$  is core-free if  $\underline{P} = 0$ . It is easy to see that  $\underline{P} = 0$  if and only if  $\overline{I - P} = I$ .

We first give two lemmas, which are needed in this paper.

**Lemma 2.2.** ([15]) *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . Then each nonzero central projection  $C \in \mathcal{M}$  is the carrier of a core-free projection in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Particularly, there exists a nonzero core-free projection  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\overline{P} = I$ .*

We remark here that a little more can be said about the above lemma. We in fact have that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$  if and only if it has a projection  $P$  with  $\underline{P} = 0$  and  $\overline{P} = I$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** ([15]) *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra. For projections  $P, Q \in \mathcal{M}$ , if  $\overline{P} = \overline{Q} \neq 0$  and  $P + Q = I$ , then  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  commutes with  $PXQ$  and  $QXP$  for all  $X \in \mathcal{M}$  implies  $T \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ .*

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra. Assume that  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  is a projection with  $\underline{P} = 0$  and  $\overline{P} = I$ . Then  $PMP \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}) = (I - P)\mathcal{M}(I - P) \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}) = \{0\}$ .*

**Proof.** If  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  is a projection such that  $\underline{P} = 0$  and  $\overline{P} = I$ , then it is clear that  $\underline{I - P} = 0$  and  $\overline{I - P} = I$ . So we need only to show that  $PMP \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}) = \{0\}$ . Assume on the contrary that there is a nonzero element  $A \in PMP \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ . Then there is a nonzero projection  $Q \in PMP \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ . It is clear that  $0 < Q \leq \underline{P}$ , contradicting to the assumption  $\underline{P} = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** By Lemma 2.2, we can find a non-central core-free projection  $P$  with central carrier  $I$ . In the sequel we fix such a projection  $P$ . By the definitions of core and central carrier,  $I - P$  is core-free and  $\overline{I - P} = I$ . For the convenience, denote  $\mathcal{M}_{ij} = P_i \mathcal{M} P_j$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ , where  $P_1 = P$  and  $P_2 = I - P$ . Then  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{11} + \mathcal{M}_{12} + \mathcal{M}_{21} + \mathcal{M}_{22}$ . In all that follows, when writing  $S_{ij}$ , it always indicates  $S_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ .

The “if” part is obvious. We will prove the “only if” part by checking several claims.

**Claim 1.**  $PL(P)P + (I - P)L(P)(I - P) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ .

For any  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ , since  $A_{12}P = 0$ , we have  $L([A_{12}, P]) = [L(A_{12}), P] + [A_{12}, L(P)]$ . It follows that

$$L(A_{12}) + L(A_{12})P - PL(A_{12}) + A_{12}L(P) - L(P)A_{12} = 0.$$

Writing  $L(A_{12}) = S_{11} + S_{12} + S_{21} + S_{22}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{11} + A_{12}L(P)P + A_{12}(I - P)L(P)(I - P) \\ & - PL(P)PA_{12} + 2S_{21} + S_{22} - (I - P)L(P)PA_{12} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $A_{12}(I - P)L(P)(I - P) - PL(P)PA_{12} = 0$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} & PA(I - P)[(I - P)L(P)(I - P) + PL(P)P] \\ & = [(I - P)L(P)(I - P) + PL(P)P]PA(I - P) \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Similarly, for any  $(I - P)AP \in \mathcal{M}_{21}$ , by using the equation  $(I - P)AP(I - P) = 0$ , one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & (I - P)AP[(I - P)L(P)(I - P) + PL(P)P] \\ & = [(I - P)L(P)(I - P) + PL(P)P](I - P)AP \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

holds for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

By Lemma 2.3, Eq.(2.1) and Eq.(2.2) ensure that  $PL(P)P + (I - P)L(P)(I - P) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ , as desired.

Denote  $S = PL(P)(I - P) - (I - P)L(P)P$  and define a map  $\delta : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  by

$$\delta(A) = L(A) + SA - AS$$

for every  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . It is easily checked that, for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$AB = 0 \Rightarrow \delta([A, B]) = [\delta(A), B] + [A, \delta(B)].$$

Moreover, by Claim 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(P) &= L(P) - (I - P)L(P)P - PL(P)(I - P) \\ &= PL(P)P + (I - P)L(P)(I - P) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

**Claim 2.**  $P\delta(I)(I - P) = (I - P)\delta(I)P = 0$ .

Since  $(I - P)P = 0$ , we have

$$0 = \delta([I - P, P]) = [\delta(I - P), P] + [I - P, \delta(P)] = [\delta(I), P],$$

which implies that  $P\delta(I)(I - P) = (I - P)\delta(I)P = 0$ .

**Claim 3.**  $\delta(\mathcal{M}_{ij}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ .

We only need to check that  $\delta(\mathcal{M}_{12}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{12}$ , and the proof of another inclusion relation is similar.

For any  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ , write  $\delta(A_{12}) = S_{11} + S_{12} + S_{21} + S_{22}$ . By the equation  $A_{12}P = 0$ , we have  $-\delta(A_{12}) = \delta([A_{12}, P]) = [\delta(A_{12}), P] + [A_{12}, \delta(P)] = [\delta(A_{12}), P]$ . It follows from Eq.(2.3) that  $S_{11} + 2S_{21} + S_{22} = 0$ . This implies that  $S_{11} = S_{12} = S_{22} = 0$ , and so  $\delta(A_{12}) = S_{21} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ .

**Claim 4.** There exists a map  $f_i : \mathcal{M}_{ii} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  such that  $\delta(A_{ii}) \in \mathcal{M}_{ii} + f_i(A_{ii})$  holds for any  $A_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

Take any  $A_{11} \in \mathcal{M}_{11}$  and  $B_{22} \in \mathcal{M}_{22}$ . Since  $A_{11}B_{22} = 0$ , we have

$$0 = \delta([A_{11}, B_{22}]) = [\delta(A_{11}), B_{22}] + [A_{11}, \delta(B_{22})].$$

Let  $\delta(A_{11}) = S_{11} + S_{12} + S_{21} + S_{22}$  and  $\delta(B_{22}) = T_{11} + T_{12} + T_{21} + T_{22}$ . Then we get

$$(A_{11}T_{11} - T_{11}A_{11}) + (S_{12}B_{22} + A_{11}T_{12}) - (B_{22}S_{21} + T_{21}A_{11}) + (S_{22}B_{22} - B_{22}S_{22}) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$A_{11}T_{11} = T_{11}A_{11}, \quad S_{22}B_{22} = B_{22}S_{22} \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$S_{12}B_{22} + A_{11}T_{12} = 0, \quad B_{22}S_{21} + T_{21}A_{11} = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Fixing  $A_{11}$  and letting  $B_{22}$  run over all  $\mathcal{M}_{22}$ , and in turn, fixing  $B_{22}$  and letting  $A_{11}$  run over all  $\mathcal{M}_{11}$ , by Eq.(2.4), we get

$$T_{11} = f_2(B_{22})P \text{ and } S_{22} = f_1(A_{11})(I - P) \text{ hold for some } f_1(A_{11}), f_2(B_{22}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}). \quad (2.6)$$

Taking  $B_{22} = I - P$  in Eq.(2.5), then for any  $A_{11}$ , by Eq.(2.3) and Claim 2, we have

$$S_{12} = -A_{11}P\delta(I - P)(I - P) = -A_{11}P\delta(I)(I - P) + A_{11}P\delta(P)(I - P) = 0 \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$S_{21} = -(I - P)\delta(I - P)PA_{11} = -(I - P)\delta(I)PA_{11} + (I - P)\delta(P)PA_{11} = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

Similarly, taking  $A_{11} = P$  in Eq.(2.5), one can easily check that  $T_{12} = T_{21} = 0$ . Combining this and Eqs.(2.6)-(2.8), we obtain

$$\delta(A_{11}) = S_{11} + S_{22} = S_{11} - f_1(A_{11})P + f_1(A_{11})I \in \mathcal{M}_{11} + f_1(A_{11})$$

and

$$\delta(B_{22}) = T_{11} + T_{22} = f_2(B_{22})I - f_2(B_{22})(I - P) + T_{22} \in \mathcal{M}_{22} + f_2(B_{22}).$$

Hence the Claim 4 is true.

Now let us define two maps  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $d : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  respectively by

$$f(A) = f_1(A_{11}) + f_2(A_{22}) \text{ and } d(A) = \delta(A) - f(A)$$

for all  $A = A_{11} + A_{12} + A_{21} + A_{22} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Then by Claims 3-4 we have

$$d(\mathcal{M}_{ij}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{ij}, \quad d(\mathcal{M}_{ii}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{ii}, \quad d(\mathcal{M}_{ij}) = \delta(\mathcal{M}_{ij}), \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2. \quad (2.9)$$

**Claim 5.**  $d$  and  $f$  are additive.

By the definition of  $d$ ,  $d$  is additive on  $\mathcal{M}_{12}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{21}$ . So we only need to verify that  $d$  is additive on  $\mathcal{M}_{ii}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). In fact, for any  $A_{11}, B_{11} \in \mathcal{M}_{11}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(A_{11} + B_{11}) + f(A_{11} + B_{11}) &= \delta(A_{11} + B_{11}) = \delta(A_{11}) + \delta(B_{11}) \\ &= d(A_{11}) + f(A_{11}) + d(B_{11}) + f(B_{11}) = d(A_{11}) + d(B_{11}) + (f(A_{11}) + f(B_{11})), \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$d(A_{11} + B_{11}) - (d(A_{11}) + d(B_{11})) = (f(A_{11}) + f(B_{11}) - f(A_{11} + B_{11})) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}).$$

Since  $\mathcal{M}_{11} \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}) = \{0\}$  by Lemma 2.4, we see that  $d(A_{11} + B_{11}) = d(A_{11}) + d(B_{11})$ , and consequently,  $f(A_{11}) + f(B_{11}) = f(A_{11} + B_{11})$ .

Similarly, one can prove that  $d$  is also additive on  $\mathcal{M}_{22}$ .

**Claim 6.**  $d$  is a derivation, that is,  $d(AB) = d(A)B + Ad(B)$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ .

We will complete the proof of the claim by three steps.

**Step 1.**  $d(A_{ii}B_{ij}) = d(A_{ii})B_{ij} + A_{ii}d(B_{ij})$  for all  $A_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$ ,  $B_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $d(A_{ij}B_{jj}) = d(A_{ij})B_{jj} + A_{ij}d(B_{jj})$  for all  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ ,  $B_{jj} \in \mathcal{M}_{jj}$ ,  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ .

We only give the proof for the case  $A_{11} \in \mathcal{M}_{11}$  and  $B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ . The other cases can be dealt with similarly.

In fact, for any  $A_{11} \in \mathcal{M}_{11}$  and  $B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ , since  $B_{12}A_{11} = 0$ , by Eq.(2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -d(A_{11}B_{12}) &= -\delta(A_{11}B_{12}) = \delta([B_{12}, A_{11}]) \\ &= \delta(B_{12})A_{11} - A_{11}\delta(B_{12}) + B_{12}\delta(A_{11}) - \delta(A_{11})B_{12} \\ &= -A_{11}d(B_{12}) - d(A_{11})B_{12}, \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $d(A_{11}B_{12}) = d(A_{11})B_{12} + A_{11}d(B_{12})$  for all  $A_{11} \in \mathcal{M}_{11}$  and  $B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ .

**Step 2.**  $d(A_{ii}B_{ii}) = d(A_{ii})B_{ii} + A_{ii}d(B_{ii})$  for all  $A_{ii}, B_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

Let  $i \neq j$ . For any  $A_{ii}, B_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$  and any  $S_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ , by Step 1, on the one hand, we have

$$d(A_{ii}B_{ii}S_{ij}) = d(A_{ii}B_{ii})S_{ij} + A_{ii}B_{ii}d(S_{ij});$$

on the other hand,

$$d(A_{ii}B_{ii}S_{ij}) = d(A_{ii})B_{ii}S_{ij} + A_{ii}d(B_{ii}S_{ij}) = d(A_{ii})B_{ii}S_{ij} + A_{ii}d(B_{ij})S_{ij} + A_{ii}B_{ii}d(S_{ij}).$$

Comparing the above two equations, we see that

$$(d(A_{ii}B_{ii}) - d(A_{ii})B_{ii} - A_{ii}d(B_{ii}))S_{ij} = 0 \quad (2.10)$$

holds for all  $S_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ .

Similarly, one can verify that

$$S_{ji}(d(A_{ii}B_{ii}) - d(A_{ii})B_{ii} - A_{ii}d(B_{ii})) = 0 \quad (2.11)$$

holds for all  $S_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}_{ji}$ . Also note that, by Eq.(2.9), it is obvious that

$$S_{ij}(d(A_{ii}B_{ii}) - d(A_{ii})B_{ii} - A_{ii}d(B_{ii})) = (d(A_{ii}B_{ii}) - d(A_{ii})B_{ii} - A_{ii}d(B_{ii}))S_{ji} = 0.$$

So it follows from Eqs.(2.10)-(2.11) and Lemma 2.3 that  $d(A_{ii}B_{ii}) - d(A_{ii})B_{ii} - A_{ii}d(B_{ii}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ , which implies that  $d(A_{ii}B_{ii}) - d(A_{ii})B_{ii} - A_{ii}d(B_{ii}) = 0$  by Lemma 2.4.

Note that, by using Step 2 and the fact  $d(\mathcal{M}_{ii}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{ii}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), one can get

$$d(P) = d(I - P) = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

**Step 3.**  $d(A_{ij}B_{ji}) = d(A_{ij})B_{ji} + A_{ij}d(B_{ji})$  for all  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $B_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}_{ji}$ ,  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ .



Take any  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$  and  $B_{21} \in \mathcal{M}_{21}$ . Since  $(A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} - B_{21} + (I - P))(P + B_{21}) = 0$ , by the definition of  $d$ , Claim 5 (additivity of  $d$ ), Eq.(2.9) and Eq.(2.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -d(A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} + B_{21}A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) - f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) \\
&= -\delta(A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} + B_{21}A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) \\
&= \delta([A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} - B_{21} + (I - P), P + B_{21}]) \\
&= [\delta(A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} - B_{21} + I - P), P + B_{21}] + [A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} - B_{21} + I - P, \delta(P + B_{21})] \\
&= [d(A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} - B_{21} + I - P), P + B_{21}] + [A_{12}B_{21} - A_{12} - B_{21} + I - P, d(P + B_{21})] \\
&= -d(A_{12})B_{21} + d(A_{12}) - B_{21}d(A_{12}B_{21}) \\
&\quad + B_{21}d(A_{12}) - A_{12}d(B_{21}) - d(B_{21})A_{12}B_{21} + d(B_{21})A_{12}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Step 1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& d(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) + f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) \\
&= d(A_{12})B_{21} - B_{21}d(A_{12}) + A_{12}d(B_{21}) - d(B_{21})A_{12}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Multiplying by  $A_{12}$  from the left side and the right side respectively in Eq.(2.13), and applying Eq.(2.9), we get

$$A_{12}d(B_{21}A_{12}) - f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})A_{12} = A_{12}B_{21}d(A_{12}) + A_{12}d(B_{21})A_{12}$$

and

$$d(A_{12}B_{21})A_{12} + f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})A_{12} = d(A_{12})B_{21}A_{12} + A_{12}d(B_{21})A_{12}.$$

These two equations, together with Step 1, yield

$$-d(A_{12})B_{21}A_{12} - f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})A_{12} = -d(A_{12}B_{21})A_{12} + A_{12}d(B_{21})A_{12}$$

and

$$-A_{12}B_{21}d(A_{12}) + f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})A_{12} = -A_{12}d(B_{21}A_{12}) + A_{12}d(B_{21})A_{12}.$$

Comparing the above two equations, one achieves

$$f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})A_{12} = 0. \tag{2.14}$$

Similarly, multiplying by  $B_{21}$  from the left side and the right side respectively in Eq.(2.13), one can verify

$$f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})B_{21} = 0. \tag{2.15}$$

Next we will prove  $f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) = 0$ . To do this, for any  $A_{12}$ , let  $A_{12} = V|A_{12}|$  be its polar decomposition. Then Eq.(2.14) implies that  $f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})|A_{12}| = 0$ . So  $|A_{12}|f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* = 0$ . It follows that

$$A_{12}f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* = V|A_{12}|f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* = 0. \tag{2.16}$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$B_{21}f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* = 0. \quad (2.17)$$

Multiplying by  $f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^*$  in Eq.(2.13), by using Eqs.(2.16)-(2.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & d(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* \\ & + f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Note that, by Eq.(2.9), Step 2 and Eqs.(2.16)-(2.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d(A_{12}B_{21})f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* \\ & = d(A_{12}B_{21}Pf(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^*P) - A_{12}B_{21}d(Pf(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^*P) \\ & = -A_{12}B_{21}d(Pf(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^*P) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & d(B_{21}A_{12})f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* \\ & = d(B_{21}A_{12}(I - P)f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^*(I - P)) \\ & \quad - B_{21}A_{12}d((I - P)f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^*(I - P)) \\ & = -B_{21}A_{12}d((I - P)f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^*(I - P)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence Eq.(2.18) implies

$$f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12})^* = 0,$$

and so  $f(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) = 0$ . Thus Eq.(2.13) reduces to

$$d(A_{12}B_{21} - B_{21}A_{12}) = d(A_{12})B_{21} - B_{21}d(A_{12}) + A_{12}d(B_{21}) - d(B_{21})A_{12},$$

which implies that  $d(A_{12}B_{21}) = d(A_{12})B_{21} + A_{12}d(B_{21})$  and  $d(B_{21}A_{12}) = B_{21}d(A_{12}) + d(B_{21})A_{12}$  hold for all  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$  and  $B_{21} \in \mathcal{M}_{21}$ , as desired.

Now by Steps 1-3, it is easily checked that  $d$  is an additive derivation.

**Claim 7.**  $f([A, B]) = 0$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$ .

In fact, for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f([A, B]) &= \delta([A, B]) - d([A, B]) \\ &= [\delta(A), B] + [A, \delta(B)] - d(AB - BA) \\ &= [d(A) - h(A), B] + [A, d(B) - h(B)] - d(AB - BA) \\ &= [d(A), B] + [A, d(B)] - d(AB - BA) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 8.** The theorem holds.

Indeed, let  $\varphi(A) = d(A) - (SA - AS)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; then, by the definitions of  $\delta$  and  $d$ , we have  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + f(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . It is easy to check that  $\varphi$  is an additive derivation on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Furthermore, if  $L$  is linear, then  $\varphi$  and  $f$  are linear, too. As linear derivations on von Neumann algebras are inner, we see that, there exists an element  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\varphi(A) = AT - TA$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . The proof is finished.  $\square$

By Theorem 2.1, we get a characterization of additive Lie derivations immediately.

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . Suppose that  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is an additive map. Then  $L$  is a Lie derivation if and only if there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  and an additive map  $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  vanishing on each commutator  $[A, B]$  for any  $A, B$  such that  $L = \varphi + f$ .*

### 3. CHARACTERIZATION OF $\xi$ -LIE DERIVATIONS

In this section, we consider the question of characterizing  $\xi$ -Lie derivations for  $\xi \neq 1$  by action at zero product on von Neumann algebras.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . Suppose that  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is an additive map and  $\xi$  is a scalar with  $\xi \neq 1$ . Then  $L$  satisfies that  $L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and one of the following statements holds:*

(1)  $\xi \neq 0, -1$ , there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  with  $\varphi(\xi I) = \xi L(I)$  such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ; in particular,  $L$  is an additive derivation whenever  $\xi$  is a rational complex number.

(2)  $\xi = 0$ , there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

(3)  $\xi = -1$ ,  $L$  is an additive Jordan derivation, that is,  $L$  satisfies  $L(A^2) = L(A)A + AL(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

For the linear maps, we have

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . Suppose that  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is a linear map and  $\xi$  is a scalar with  $\xi \neq 1$ . Then  $L$  satisfies that  $L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$  if and only if one of the following statements holds:*

(1)  $\xi \neq 0$ , there is some  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $L(A) = AT - TA$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ;

(2)  $\xi = 0$ ,  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and there exists some  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $L(A) = AT - (T - L(I))A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

**Proof.** Obviously, we need only check the “only if” part. Note that every linear derivation on a von Neumann algebra is inner. If  $\xi \neq 0, -1$ , by Theorem 3.1,  $L(I) = 0$  and  $L$  is a linear derivation. Hence, there is an element  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $L(A) = AT - TA$  for

all  $A$ ; if  $\xi = -1$ , by (3) of Theorem 3.1,  $L$  is a linear Jordan derivation. However every linear Jordan derivation of a  $C^*$ -algebra is a derivation (ref. [5, Teorem 2.4]). Hence  $L$  is a derivation and has the form  $A \mapsto AT - TA$  for some  $T$ . So the statement (1) of the corollary is valid. If  $\xi = 0$ , by Theorem 3.1,  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and there exists a  $T \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $L(A) = AT - TA + L(I)A = AT - (T - L(I))A$  for all  $A$ , that is, the statement (2) holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** It is obvious that each of statements (1), (2) and (3) implies that  $AB = 0 \Rightarrow L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$ . For instance, assume that (1) is valid. Then, for any  $A, B$  with  $AB = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} L([A, B]_\xi) &= -L(\xi BA) = -(\varphi(\xi BA) + \xi L(I)BA) \\ &= -(\varphi(\xi I)BA + \xi\varphi(BA) + \xi L(I)BA) = -(\xi\varphi(B)A + \xi B\varphi(A) + 2\xi L(I)BA) \\ &= \varphi(A)B + A\varphi(B) + 2L(I)AB - (\xi\varphi(B)A + \xi B\varphi(A) + 2\xi L(I)BA) \\ &= [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi. \end{aligned}$$

The following give a proof of the “only if” part. We use the same symbols to that in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Particularly,  $P$  is a fixed projection in  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $\underline{P} = 0$  and  $\overline{P} = I$ . In the sequel, we always assume that  $\xi \neq 1$  and  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is an additive map satisfying  $L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$  for  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$ . We will prove the “only if” part by several claims.

**Claim 1.**  $PL(I)(I - P) = (I - P)L(I)P = 0$  and  $(I - P)L(P)(I - P) = PL(I - P)P = 0$ .

Since  $P(I - P) = 0$ , we have  $[L(P), I - P]_\xi + [P, L(I - P)]_\xi = 0$ , that is,

$$L(P)(I - P) - \xi(I - P)L(P) + PL(I - P) - \xi L(I - P)P = 0; \quad (3.1)$$

since  $(I - P)P = 0$ , we have  $[L(I - P), P]_\xi + [I - P, L(P)]_\xi = 0$ , that is,

$$L(I - P)P - \xi PL(I - P) + (I - P)L(P) - \xi L(P)(I - P) = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Multiplying by  $P$  and  $I - P$  from the left and the right respectively in Eq.(3.1), one gets  $PL(P)(I - P) + PL(I - P)(I - P) = 0$ , and so

$$PL(I)(I - P) = 0;$$

multiplying by  $I - P$  and  $P$  from the left and the right respectively in Eq.(3.2), one gets  $(I - P)L(I - P)P + (I - P)L(P)P = 0$ , and so

$$(I - P)L(I)P = 0;$$

multiplying by  $I - P$  from both sides in Eq.(3.1), one gets  $(I - P)L(P)(I - P) - \xi(I - P)L(P)(I - P) = 0$ , and so

$$(I - P)L(P)(I - P) = 0;$$

multiplying by  $P$  from both sides in Eq.(3.2), one gets  $PL(I - P)P - \xi PL(I - P)P = 0$ , and so

$$PL(I - P)P = 0.$$

Hence the claim is true.

Now define a map  $\delta : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  by  $\delta(A) = L(A) + SA - AS$  for each  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $S = PL(P)(I - P) - (I - P)L(P)P$ . It is easy to verify that  $\delta$  is an additive map satisfying  $[\delta(A), B]_\xi + [A, \delta(B)]_\xi = \delta([A, B]_\xi)$  for  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$ . Moreover, by Claim 1, we also have

$$P\delta(I)(I - P) = (I - P)\delta(I)P = (I - P)\delta(P)(I - P) = P\delta(I - P)P = 0.$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(P) &= L(P) + TP - PT = PL(P)P \\ &= P\delta(P)P - P(TP - PT)P = P\delta(P)P \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(I - P) &= L(I - P) + T(I - P) - (I - P)T = (I - P)L(I - P)(I - P) \\ &= (I - P)\delta(I - P)(I - P) - (I - P)(T(I - P) - (I - P)T)(I - P) \\ &= (I - P)\delta(I - P)(I - P). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

In the following, for the convenience, we write  $P_1 = P$ ,  $P_2 = I - P$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{ij} = P_i\mathcal{M}P_j$ .

**Claim 2.**  $\delta(\mathcal{M}_{ii}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{ii}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

For any  $A_{11} \in \mathcal{M}_{11}$ , since  $A_{11}(I - P) = 0$ , we have  $[\delta(A_{11}), I - P]_\xi + [A_{11}, \delta(I - P)]_\xi = 0$ .

This and Eq.(3.4) yield

$$\delta(A_{11})(I - P) - \xi(I - P)\delta(A_{11}) = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Multiplying by  $P$  from the left side in Eq.(3.5), one gets

$$P\delta(A_{11})(I - P) = 0; \quad (3.6)$$

multiplying by  $I - P$  from both sides in Eq.(3.5), one gets  $(1 - \xi)(I - P)\delta(A_{11})(I - P) = 0$ , which implies

$$(I - P)\delta(A_{11})(I - P) = 0 \quad (3.7)$$

as  $\xi \neq 1$ . On the other hand, since  $(I - P)A_{11} = 0$ , we have  $[\delta(I - P), A_{11}]_\xi + [I - P, \delta(A_{11})]_\xi = 0$ , that is,  $(I - P)\delta(A_{11}) - \xi\delta(A_{11})(I - P) = 0$ . Multiplying  $P$  from the right side in the equation, one gets

$$(I - P)\delta(A_{11})P = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Combining Eqs.(3.6)-(3.8), we obtain  $\delta(A_{11}) \in \mathcal{M}_{11}$ . So  $\delta(\mathcal{M}_{11}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{11}$ .

The proof of  $\delta(\mathcal{M}_{22}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{22}$  is similar and we omit it here.

**Claim 3.**  $\delta(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and  $\delta(P_i)A_{ij} = A_{ij}\delta(P_j)$  holds for any  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ ,  $i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$ .

Firstly, take any  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ . Since  $A_{12}P_1 = 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(-\xi A_{12}) &= [\delta(A_{12}), P_1]_\xi + [A_{12}, \delta(P_1)]_\xi \\ &= \delta(A_{12})P_1 - \xi P_1 \delta(A_{12}) + A_{12} \delta(P_1) - \xi \delta(P_1) A_{12};\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

since  $P_2 A_{12} = 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(-\xi A_{12}) &= [\delta(P_2), A_{12}]_\xi + [P_2, \delta(A_{12})]_\xi \\ &= \delta(P_2)A_{12} - \xi A_{12} \delta(P_2) + P_2 \delta(A_{12}) - \xi \delta(A_{12})P_2.\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

Eqs.(3.9) and (3.10) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(A_{12})P_1 - \xi P_1 \delta(A_{12}) + A_{12} \delta(P_1) - \xi \delta(P_1) A_{12} \\ = \delta(P_2)A_{12} - \xi A_{12} \delta(P_2) + P_2 \delta(A_{12}) - \xi \delta(A_{12})P_2.\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

If  $\xi \neq 0$ , multiplying by  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  from the left and the right respectively in Eq.(3.11), by Eqs.(3.3)-(3.4), one obtains

$$\delta(P_1)A_{12} = P_1 \delta(P_1)P_1 A_{12} = A_{12}P_2 \delta(P_2)P_2 = A_{12} \delta(P_2).$$

If  $\xi = 0$ , by using of the relation  $(P_1 + A_{12})(A_{12} - P_2) = (A_{12} - P_2)(P_1 + A_{12}) = 0$ , we have

$$(\delta(P_1) + \delta(A_{12}))(A_{12} - P_2) + (P_1 + A_{12})(\delta(A_{12}) - \delta(P_2)) = 0$$

and

$$(\delta(A_{12}) - \delta(P_2))(P_1 + A_{12}) + (A_{12} - P_2)(\delta(P_1) + \delta(A_{12})) = 0,$$

which mean that

$$\delta(P_1)A_{12} + \delta(A_{12})A_{12} - \delta(A_{12})P_2 + P_1 \delta(A_{12}) + A_{12} \delta(A_{12}) - A_{12} \delta(P_2) = 0$$

and

$$\delta(A_{12})P_1 + \delta(A_{12})A_{12} + A_{12} \delta(A_{12}) - P_2 \delta(A_{12}) = 0.$$

Combining the above two equations, one obtains  $\delta(P_1)A_{12} = A_{12} \delta(P_2)$ , which, together with Eqs.(3.3)-(3.4), implies that  $P_1 \delta(P_1)P_1 A_{12} = A_{12} P_2 \delta(P_2)P_2$ .

Thus we have proved that

$$\delta(P_1)A_{12} = P_1 \delta(P_1)P_1 A_{12} = A_{12} P_2 \delta(P_2)P_2 = A_{12} \delta(P_2) \quad \text{for all } A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}.$$

Note that  $P_1 \delta(P_2)P_1 = P_2 \delta(P_1)P_2 = 0$ . The above equation implies

$$P_1 \delta(I)P_1 A_{12} = A_{12} P_2 \delta(I)P_2,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(I)A_{12} &= (P_1\delta(I)P_1 + P_2\delta(I)P_2)A_{12} \\
&= A_{12}(P_2\delta(I)P_2 + P_1\delta(I)P_1) \\
&= A_{12}\delta(I)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

holds for all  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ .

Similarly, one can show that

$$\delta(P_2)A_{21} = A_{21}\delta(P_1) \text{ and } \delta(I)A_{21} = A_{21}\delta(I) \text{ for all } A_{21} \in \mathcal{M}_{21}. \tag{3.13}$$

Now by Lemma 2.3, Eqs.(3.12) and (3.13), we get  $\delta(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ .

**Claim 4.** For any  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  ( $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ ), the following statements hold.

(1) If  $\xi \neq -1$ , then  $\delta(A_{ij}) \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ .

(2) If  $\xi = -1$ , then  $P_1\delta(A_{ij})P_1 = P_2\delta(A_{ij})P_2 = 0$  and  $\delta(A_{ij})A_{ij} + A_{ij}\delta(A_{ij}) = 0$ .

To prove (1) we only need to check that  $\delta(A_{12}) \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$  for all  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ , and the proof for  $A_{21}$  is similar.

For any  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ , Eq.(3.11) is true. Then, multiplying by  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  from both sides respectively in Eq.(3.11), and noting that  $\xi \neq 1$  and Eqs.(3.3)-(3.4), one can easily check that

$$P_1\delta(A_{12})P_1 = P_2\delta(A_{12})P_2 = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

To complete the proof of the statement (1), we have to check that  $P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1 = 0$ . We will prove this by considering two cases.

**Case 1.**  $\xi = 0$ .

For any  $A_{12}$ , since  $A_{12}P_1 = 0$ , we obtain

$$\delta(A_{12})P_1 + A_{12}\delta(P_1) = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Multiplying by  $P_2$  from the left side in Eq.(3.15), one gets  $P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1 = 0$ . This and Eq.(3.14) yield  $\delta(A_{12}) = P_1\delta(A_{12})P_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ .

**Case 2.**  $\xi \neq 0, -1$ .

In this case, take any  $A_{12}, B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ . Since  $(B_{12} - P_2)(P_1 + A_{12}) = 0$ , by Eqs.(3.3)-(3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta(-\xi B_{12} + \xi A_{12}) = \delta([B_{12} - P_2, P_1 + A_{12}]_\xi) \\
&= [\delta(B_{12} - P_2), P_1 + A_{12}]_\xi + [B_{12} - P_2, \delta(P_1 + A_{12})]_\xi \\
&= \delta(B_{12})P_1 + \delta(B_{12})A_{12} - \xi P_1\delta(B_{12}) - \xi A_{12}\delta(B_{12}) + \xi A_{12}\delta(P_2) \\
&\quad + B_{12}\delta(A_{12}) - P_2\delta(A_{12}) - \xi\delta(P_1)B_{12} - \xi\delta(A_{12})B_{12} + \xi\delta(A_{12})P_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Multiplying by  $P_2$  from both sides in Eq.(3.16) and applying Eq.(3.14), we get

$$P_2\delta(B_{12})P_1A_{12} = \xi P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1B_{12} \text{ for all } A_{12}, B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}. \tag{3.17}$$

Note that, multiplying by  $P_2$  and  $P_1$  from the left and the right respectively in Eq.(3.9), one sees that

$$P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1 = P_2\delta(-\xi A_{12})P_1 \quad \text{for all } A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}. \quad (3.18)$$

It follows from Eqs.(3.17) and (3.18) that

$$\begin{aligned} -P_2\delta(B_{12})P_1A_{12} &= P_2\delta(\xi B_{12})P_1A_{12} \\ &= \xi P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1(\xi B_{12}) = \xi^2 P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1B_{12} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $A_{12}, B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ . This and Eq.(3.17) imply that

$$P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1B_{12} = 0 \quad \text{for all } A_{12}, B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}. \quad (3.19)$$

Similarly, multiplying by  $P_1$  from both sides in Eq.(3.16), by using Eqs.(3.14) and (3.18), one can show that

$$B_{12}P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1 = 0 \quad \text{for all } A_{12}, B_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}. \quad (3.20)$$

Also note that  $P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1B_{21} = B_{21}P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1 = 0$  for all  $B_{21} \in \mathcal{M}_{21}$ . Then it follows from Lemma 2.3 and Eqs.(3.19)-(3.20) that  $P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ , and hence  $P_2\delta(A_{12})P_1 = 0$ . So the statement (1) holds.

To prove the statement (2), note that, as  $\xi = -1$ ,  $\delta$  in fact satisfies

$$AB = 0 \Rightarrow \delta(AB + BA) = \delta(A)B + A\delta(B) + \delta(B)A + B\delta(A).$$

Then, for any  $A_{12} \in \mathcal{M}_{12}$ , since  $(P_1 + A_{12})(A_{12} - P_2) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta(P_1 + A_{12})(A_{12} - P_2) + (A_{12} - P_2)\delta(P_1 + A_{12}) \\ &+ \delta(A_{12} - P_2)(P_1 + A_{12}) + (P_1 + A_{12})\delta(A_{12} - P_2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Claims 2-3 and Eq.(3.11) that  $\delta(A_{12})A_{12} + A_{12}\delta(A_{12}) = 0$ , which, together with Eq.(3.14), imply that the statement (2) is true.

**Claim 5.** The following statements hold.

- (1) If  $\xi \neq 0, -1$ , then  $\delta(\xi AB) = \xi\delta(A)B + \xi A\delta(B)$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ .
- (2) If  $\xi = 0$ , then there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  such that  $\delta(A) = \varphi(A) + \delta(I)A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .
- (3) If  $\xi = -1$ , then  $\delta(A^2) = \delta(A)A + A\delta(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , that is,  $\delta$  is an additive Jordan derivation.

We will prove the claim by considering three cases.

**Case 1.**  $\xi \neq 0, -1$ .

In this case, we will show that  $\delta(\xi AB) = \xi\delta(A)B + \xi A\delta(B)$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  by three steps.

**Step 1.**  $\delta(\xi A_{ii}B_{ij}) = \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ij} + \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ij})$  for all  $A_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}, B_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ .



In fact, for any  $A_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$  and  $B_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ , since  $B_{ij}A_{ii} = 0$ , by Claims 2 and (1) of Claim 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ij}) &= \delta([B_{ij}, A_{ii}]_{\xi}) \\ &= \delta(B_{ij})A_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ij}) + B_{ij}\delta(A_{ii}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ij} \\ &= -\xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ij}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ij}) = \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ij} + \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ij})$  for all  $A_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$  and  $B_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ .

Similarly, one can check the following.

**Step 2.**  $\delta(\xi A_{ij} B_{jj}) = \xi\delta(A_{ij})B_{jj} + \xi A_{ij}\delta(B_{jj})$  for all  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ ,  $B_{jj} \in \mathcal{M}_{jj}$ ,  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ .

**Step 3.**  $\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii}) = \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} + \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii})$  for all  $A_{ii}, B_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

Let  $i \neq j$ . For any  $A_{ii}, B_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$  and any  $S_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ , by Step 1, on the one hand, we have

$$\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii} S_{ij}) = \xi\delta(A_{ii} B_{ii})S_{ij} + \xi A_{ii} B_{ii}\delta(S_{ij});$$

on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii} S_{ij}) &= \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii}S_{ij} + \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii}S_{ij}) \\ &= \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii}S_{ij} + \xi^2 A_{ii}\delta(\xi^{-1}B_{ii})S_{ij} + \xi A_{ii}B_{ii}\delta(S_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above two equations, we see that

$$(\delta(A_{ii}B_{ii}) - \delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(\xi^{-1}B_{ii}))S_{ij} = 0,$$

which implies that

$$(\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii}))S_{ij} = 0 \quad (3.21)$$

holds for all  $S_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ .

Similarly, one can verify that

$$S_{ji}(\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii})) = 0 \quad (3.22)$$

holds for all  $S_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}_{ji}$ . Also note that, by Claim 2, it is obvious that

$$S_{ij}(\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii})) = (\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii}))S_{ji} = 0.$$

So it follows from Lemma 2.3 and Eqs.(3.21)-(3.22) that  $\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii}) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ , which implies, by Lemma 2.4, that  $\delta(\xi A_{ii} B_{ii}) - \xi\delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} - \xi A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii}) = 0$ .

**Step 4.**  $\delta(\xi A_{ij} B_{ji}) = \xi\delta(A_{ij})B_{ji} + \xi A_{ij}\delta(B_{ji})$  for all  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $B_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}_{ji}$ ,  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ .

For any  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $B_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}_{ji}$  with  $i \neq j$ , since  $(A_{ij}B_{ji} - A_{ij} - B_{ji} + P_j)(P_i + B_{ji}) = 0$ , by the definition of  $\delta$ , we have

$$-\delta(\xi A_{ij} B_{ji} - \xi A_{ij} + \xi B_{ji} A_{ij} B_{ji} - \xi B_{ji} A_{ij}) = \delta([A_{ij} B_{ji} - A_{ij} - B_{ji} + P_j, P_i + B_{ji}]_{\xi}).$$

Thus by Claim 2 and (1) of Claim 4, the above equation reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta(\xi A_{ij} B_{ji}) - \delta(\xi A_{ij}) - \delta(\xi B_{ji} A_{ij}) \\
= & \delta(A_{ij}) B_{ji} + \delta(B_{ji}) P_i - \delta(P_j) B_{ji} - \xi \delta(A_{ij}) \\
& - \xi B_{ji} \delta(A_{ij}) - A_{ij} B_{ji} \delta(P_i) + A_{ij} \delta(B_{ji}) \\
& + B_{ji} \delta(P_i) - P_j \delta(B_{ji}) - \xi \delta(P_i) A_{ij} - \xi \delta(B_{ji}) A_{ij}.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by  $P_j$  from both sides in the above equation, by Claims 2 and 4 again, one obtains  $\delta(\xi B_{ji} A_{ij}) = \xi \delta(B_{ji}) A_{ij} + \xi B_{ji} \delta(A_{ij})$ , as desired.

Now, for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ , by Steps 1-4 and the additivity of  $\delta$ , it is easily checked that  $\delta(\xi AB) = \xi \delta(A) B + \xi A \delta(B)$  holds for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ . So the statement (1) of Claim 5 is true.

**Case 2.**  $\xi = 0$ .

In this case,  $\delta$  satisfies  $AB = 0 \Rightarrow \delta(A)B + A\delta(B) = 0$ . We first show that

$$\delta(AB) = \delta(A)B + A\delta(B) - \delta(I)AB$$

for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Let  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ . By Claim 2 and (1) in Claim 4, the relation  $(A_{ii} + A_{ii} B_{ij})(P_j - B_{ij}) = 0$  entails that

$$\delta(A_{ii} B_{ij}) = \delta(A_{ii}) B_{ij} + A_{ii} \delta(B_{ij}) - A_{ii} B_{ij} \delta(P_j) \quad (3.23)$$

holds for any  $A_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$  and  $B_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ ; the relation  $(P_i - A_{ij})(B_{jj} + A_{ij} B_{jj}) = 0$  implies that

$$\delta(A_{ij} B_{jj}) = \delta(A_{ij}) B_{jj} + A_{ij} \delta(B_{jj}) - \delta(P_i) A_{ij} B_{jj} \quad (3.24)$$

holds for any  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $B_{jj} \in \mathcal{M}_{jj}$ . Then, by Claim 3, Eq.(3.23) and using a similar argument to that of Step 3 in Case 1, one can show that

$$\delta(A_{ii} B_{ii}) = \delta(A_{ii}) B_{ii} + A_{ii} \delta(B_{ii}) - A_{ii} B_{ii} \delta(P_i) \quad (3.25)$$

holds for any  $A_{ii}, B_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$ . Next, by the equation  $(A_{ij} + A_{ij} B_{ji})(P_i - B_{ji}) = 0$  and Claim 2 and (1) in Claim 4, one can obtain that

$$\delta(A_{ij} B_{ji}) = \delta(A_{ij}) B_{ji} + A_{ij} \delta(B_{ji}) - A_{ij} B_{ji} \delta(P_i) \quad (3.26)$$

holds for any  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $B_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}_{ji}$ . Finally, the additivity of  $\delta$ , together with Eqs.(3.23)-(3.26), ensures that  $\delta(AB) = \delta(A)B + A\delta(B) - \delta(I)AB$  holds for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Now let  $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  be the map defined by  $\varphi(A) = \delta(A) - \delta(I)A$ . Note that  $\delta(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$ . Thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(AB) &= \delta(AB) - \delta(I)AB = \delta(A)B + A\delta(B) - 2\delta(I)AB \\
&= (\varphi(A) + \delta(I)A)B + A(\varphi(B) + \delta(I)B) - 2\delta(I)AB = \varphi(A)B + A\varphi(B)
\end{aligned}$$

holds for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ . So  $\varphi$  is an additive derivation, and  $\delta(A) = \varphi(A) + \delta(I)A$  for all  $A$ . particularly,  $\delta$  is a generalized derivation.

**Case 3.**  $\xi = -1$ .

In this case,  $\delta$  satisfies

$$AB = 0 \Rightarrow \delta(BA) = \delta(A)B + A\delta(B) + \delta(B)A + B\delta(A).$$

We will show that  $\delta$  is a Jordan derivation, and therefore the statement (3) holds.

Let  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$ . For any  $A_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$  and  $B_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$ , since  $B_{ij}A_{ii} = 0$ , by Claim 2 and (2) in Claim 4, one can verify

$$\delta(A_{ii}B_{ij}) = \delta(A_{ii})B_{ij} + A_{ii}\delta(B_{ij}) + \delta(B_{ij})A_{ii}; \quad (3.27)$$

for any  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $B_{jj} \in \mathcal{M}_{jj}$ , by using of the relation  $B_{jj}A_{ij} = 0$ , Claim 2 and (2) in Claim 4, one can verify

$$\delta(A_{ij}B_{jj}) = \delta(A_{ij})B_{jj} + A_{ij}\delta(B_{jj}) + B_{jj}\delta(A_{ij}). \quad (3.28)$$

For any  $A_{ii}, B_{ii} \in \mathcal{M}_{ii}$ , by Claim 3, Eq.(3.27) and using a similar argument to that of Step 3 in Case 1, one can show that

$$\delta(A_{ii}B_{ii}) = \delta(A_{ii})B_{ii} + A_{ii}\delta(B_{ii}). \quad (3.29)$$

For any  $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$  and  $A_{ji} \in \mathcal{M}_{ji}$ , since  $(A_{ij}A_{ji} + A_{ij} + A_{ji} + P_j)(P_i - A_{ij} - A_{ji} + A_{ji}A_{ij}) = 0$ , by Claim 2 and (2) of Claim 4, it is easily checked that

$$\delta(A_{ij}A_{ji}) = \delta(A_{ij})A_{ji} + A_{ij}\delta(A_{ji}) \text{ and } \delta(A_{ji}A_{ij}) = \delta(A_{ji})A_{ij} + A_{ji}\delta(A_{ij}) \quad (3.30)$$

Now, combining Eqs.(3.27)-(3.30), it is easy to verify that  $\delta(A^2) = \delta(A)A + A\delta(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , that is,  $\delta$  is a Jordan derivation.

**Claim 6.** If  $\xi \neq 0, -1$ , then there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  satisfying  $\varphi(\xi I) = \xi\delta(I)$  such that  $\delta(A) = \varphi(A) + \delta(I)A$  holds for any  $A$ ; in particular, in the case that  $\xi$  is a rational complex number,  $\delta$  is an additive derivation.

By (1) of Claim 5,  $\delta(\xi AB) = \xi(\delta(A)B + A\delta(B))$  holds for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ . Particularly, for any  $A, B$  with  $AB = 0$ , we have  $\xi(\delta(A)B + A\delta(B)) = \delta(\xi AB) = \delta(0) = 0$ . Thus  $\delta(A)B + A\delta(B) = 0$  holds for any  $A, B$  with  $AB = 0$ , that is,  $\delta$  meets the condition for  $\xi = 0$ . Then, by (2) of Claim 5, there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  such that  $\delta(A) = \varphi(A) + \delta(I)A$  for all  $A$ . Furthermore, as  $\delta(\xi I) = \xi\delta(I)I + \xi I\delta(I) = 2\xi\delta(I)$ , we see that  $\delta(\xi I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  by Claim 3 and  $\varphi(\xi I) = \xi\delta(I)$ . Since  $\delta$  is additive, for any rational real number  $r$  and any  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  we have  $\delta(rA) = r\delta(A)$ . As  $0 = -\varphi(I) = \varphi(i^2 I) = \varphi(iI)iI + iI\varphi(iI) = 2i\varphi(iI)$ , we

see that  $\varphi(iI) = 0$ , which implies that  $\delta(iI) = i\delta(I)$  and hence  $\delta(rI) = r\delta(I)$  holds for any rational complex number  $r$ .

Thus, if  $\xi$  is a rational complex number, then  $\xi\delta(I) = \delta(\xi I) = 2\xi\delta(I)$ , which forces  $\delta(I) = 0$ . Hence  $\delta = \varphi$  is an additive derivation.

**Claim 7.** The statements (1), (2), (3) of the theorem hold.

Note that  $L(A) = \delta(A) + AS - SA$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $L(I) = \delta(I)$ . Hence, by Claims 5 and 6,  $L$  has the forms stated in the theorem. The proof of the theorem is finished.  $\square$

By checking the proof of Theorem 3.1, for nonrational complex number  $\xi$ ,  $L$  is an additive derivation under some conditions.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . Suppose that  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is an additive map and  $\xi$  is a nonrational complex number. If  $L$  satisfies that  $L([A, B]_\xi) = [L(A), B]_\xi + [A, L(B)]_\xi$  for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $AB = 0$ , and if  $L$  satisfies one of the following additional conditions, then  $L$  is an additive derivation with  $L(\xi I) = 0$ .*

(i)  $L$  is continuous when restricted on  $\mathbb{C}I$ .

(ii) There exists a positive number  $c$  and a subsequence of integers  $k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $|k_n| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $\|L(\xi^{k_n} I)\| \leq c|\xi|^{k_n}$ .

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.1 there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  such that  $\varphi(\xi I) = \xi L(I)$  and  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A$ . Since  $0 = \varphi(i^2 I) = 2i\varphi(iI)$ , we have  $\varphi(iI) = 0$  and  $L(iI) = iL(I)$ . Thus  $L(iA) = \varphi(iA) + iL(I)A = \varphi(iI)A + i\varphi(A) + iL(I)A = iL(A)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . It follows from the additivity of  $L$  that

$$L(rA) = rL(A) \tag{3.31}$$

holds for any rational complex number  $r$  and any  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . Note that  $L(\xi I) = 2\xi L(I)$ .

Assume that  $L$  meets the condition (i). Take rational complex numbers  $r_n$  so that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \xi$ . Then

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L((r_n - \xi)I) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n - 2\xi)L(I) = -\xi L(I),$$

which implies that  $L(I) = 0$ . So,  $L = \varphi$  is an additive derivation and  $L(\xi I) = 0$ .

Assume that  $L$  satisfies the condition (ii). By induction, it is easily checked that, for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$L(\xi^k I) = (k + 1)\xi^k L(I).$$

Thus, by the condition (ii), we have

$$\|L(I)\| = \frac{1}{|k_n + 1||\xi|^{k_n}} \|L(\xi^{k_n} I)\| \leq \frac{c}{|k_n| - 1}$$

holds for any integer  $k_n$ , which implies that  $L(I) = 0$  as  $|k_n| \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence  $L$  is an additive derivation. Moreover,  $L(\xi I) = 2\xi L(I) = 0$ .  $\square$

Finally, let us consider the question of characterizing  $\xi$ -Lie derivations for  $\xi \neq 1$ . Obviously, if  $\xi = 0$ , then an additive  $\xi$ -Lie derivation is an additive derivation; if  $\xi = -1$ , then an additive  $\xi$ -Lie derivation is an additive Jordan derivation. For the case that  $\xi \neq 0, 1$ , by Theorem 3.1, we have

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type  $I_1$ . Suppose that  $L : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$  is an additive map and  $\xi$  is a scalar with  $\xi \neq 0, \pm 1$ . Then  $L$  is a  $\xi$ -Lie derivation if and only if  $L$  is an additive derivation.*

**Proof.** The “if” part is obvious. For the “only if” part, by Theorem 3.1,  $L(I) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M})$  and there exists an additive derivation  $\varphi$  with  $\varphi(\xi I) = \xi L(I)$  such that  $L(A) = \varphi(A) + L(I)A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . Since  $L$  is a  $\xi$ -Lie derivation, we have

$$L(I) - L(\xi I) = L([I, I]_\xi) = [L(I), I]_\xi + [I, L(I)]_\xi = 2L(I) - 2\xi L(I). \quad (3.32)$$

Note that  $L(\xi I) = \varphi(\xi I) + \xi L(I) = 2\xi L(I)$ . So, by Eq.(3.32), we see that  $L(I) = 0$  and  $L$  is a derivation.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Brešar, Commuting traces of biadditive mappings, commutativity-preserving mappings and Lie mappings, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 335 (1993), 525-546.
- [2] M. Brešar, Jordan derivations revisited, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc., 139 (2005), 411-425.
- [3] M. Bresar, Characterizing homomorphisms, derivations and multipliers in rings with idempotents, Proc. R. Soc. Edinb., Sect. A 137 (2007), 9-21.
- [4] J. A. Brooke, P. Busch, B. Pearson, Commutativity up to a factor of bounded operators in complex Hilbert spaces, R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math Phys. Eng. Sci., A 458 (2002), 109-118.
- [5] U. Haagerup, N. Laustsen, Weak amenability of  $C^*$ -algebras and a theorem of Goldstein, Banach algebras 97 (Blaubeuren), 223-243, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1998.
- [6] I. N. Herstein, Jordan derivations of prime rings, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 8 (1957), 1104-1110.
- [7] J. C. Hou, X. F. Qi, Additive maps derivable at some points on  $\mathcal{J}$ -subspace lattice algebras, Lin. Alg. Appl., 429 (2008), 1851-1863.
- [8] B. E. Johnson, Symmetric amenability and the nonexistence of Lie and Jordan derivations, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 120 (1996), 455-473.
- [9] P. S. Ji, W. Q. Qi, Characterizations of Lie derivations of triangular algebras, Linear Algebra and its Applications, 435(5) 2011, 1137-1146.
- [10] W. Jing, S. Lu, P. Li, Characterisations of derivations on some operator algebras, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc., 66 (2002), 227-232.
- [11] C. Kassel, Quantum groups, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

- [12] T.-K. Lee, Generalized skew derivations characterized by acting on zero products, *Pacific J. Math.*, 216 (2004), 293-301.
- [13] F. Lu, W. J, Characterizations of Lie derivations of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ , *Lin. Alg. Appl.* 432 (2009), 89-99.
- [14] M. Mathieu, A. R. Villena, The structure of Lie derivations on  $C^*$ -algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.*, 202 (2003), 504-525.
- [15] C. R. Miers, Lie isomorphisms of operator algebras, *Pacific J. Math.*, 38 (1971), 717-735.
- [16] Z. D. Pan, Derivable maps and derivational points, *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 436(11) (2012), 4251-4260.
- [17] X. F. Qi, J. C. Hou, Additive Lie ( $\xi$ -Lie) Derivations and Generalized Lie ( $\xi$ -Lie) Derivations on Nest Algebras, *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 431 (2009), 843-854.
- [18] X. F. Qi, J. C. Hou, Linear maps Lie derivable at zero on  $\mathcal{J}$ -subspace lattice algebras, *Studia Math*, 197 (2010), 157-169.
- [19] X. F. Qi, J. C. Hou, Characterization of Lie derivations on prime rings, *Communication in Algebras*, 39(10) (2011), 3824-3835.
- [20] X. F. Qi, J. C. Hou, Additive Lie ( $\xi$ -Lie) Derivations and Generalized Lie ( $\xi$ -Lie) Derivations on Prime Algebras, *Acta Math. Sin. (English Series)*, in press.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANXI UNIVERSITY, TAIYUAN 030006, P. R. OF CHINA

*E-mail address:* qixf1980@126.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TAIYUAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, TAIYUAN 030024, P. R. OF CHINA; DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANXI UNIVERSITY, TAIYUAN 030006, P. R. OF CHINA

*E-mail address:* jinchuanhou@yahoo.com.cn