

# 2-Local derivations on the W-algebra $W(2, 2)$

Xiaomin Tang<sup>1,2, \*</sup>

1. School of Mathematical Science, Heilongjiang University, Harbin, 150080, P. R. China,
2. School of Mathematical Science, Harbin Engineering University, Harbin, 150001, P. R. China

## Abstract

The present paper is devoted to study 2-local derivations on W-algebra  $W(2, 2)$  which is an infinite-dimensional Lie algebras with some out derivations. We prove that all 2-local derivations on the W-algebra  $W(2, 2)$  are derivation. We also give a complete classification of the 2-local derivation on the so called thin Lie algebra and prove that it admits a lots of 2-local derivations which are not derivations.

**Key words:** W-algebra  $W(2, 2)$ , thin Lie algebra, derivation, 2-local derivation.

**Mathematics Subject Classification:** 17A32, 17B30, 17B10.

## 1 Introduction

In 1997, Šemrl [10] introduced the notion of 2-local derivations on algebras. Namely, for an associative algebra  $\mathcal{L}$ , a map  $\Delta : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  (not necessarily linear) is called a *2-local derivation* if, for every pair of elements  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ , there exists a derivation  $\Delta_{x,y} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  (depending on  $x, y$ ) such that  $\Delta_{x,y}(x) = \Delta(x)$  and  $\Delta_{x,y}(y) = \Delta(y)$ .

The concept of 2-local derivation is actually an important and interesting property for an algebra. For a given algebra  $\mathcal{L}$ , the main problem concerning these notions is to prove that they automatically become a derivation or to give examples of 2-local derivations of  $\mathcal{L}$ , which are not derivations. Recently, several papers have been devoted to similar notions and corresponding problems for Lie algebras  $\mathcal{L}$ . In [3, 4] the authors prove that every 2-local derivation on a semi-simple Lie algebra  $\mathcal{L}$  is a derivation and that each finite-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebra, with dimension larger than two admits 2-local derivation which is not a derivation. In [2] the authors study 2-local derivations on some infinite-dimensional Lie algebras, i.e., they that all 2-local derivations on the Witt algebra as well as on the positive Witt algebra are (global) derivations, and give an example of infinite-dimensional Lie algebra with a 2-local derivation which is not a derivation. In [1, 13] the authors prove that every 2-local derivation on some class of generalized Witt algebras (or their Borel subalgebras) is a derivation.

---

\*Corresponding author, E-mail: tangxm@hlju.edu.cn

As we see that the Lie algebras whose every 2-local derivation is a derivation almost all have a common quality, that is any derivation of these Lie algebras is inner. We naturally want to know what form of the 2-local derivation has if the Lie algebra has some out derivations? In the present paper we study 2-local derivations on the infinite-dimensional Lie algebra  $W(2,2)$  and so called thin Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{T}$ . Note that both  $W(2,2)$  and  $\mathfrak{T}$  all have some out derivations. We prove that every 2-local derivation on  $W$ -algebra  $W(2,2)$  is a derivation and the thin Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{T}$  admits many 2-local derivations which are not derivations.

In Section 2 we give some preliminaries concerning  $W$ -algebra  $W(2,2)$ . In Section 3 we prove that every 2-local derivations on  $W$ -algebra  $W(2,2)$  are automatically derivations. In Section 4 we complete describe the 2-local derivation on the so-called thin Lie algebra and show that it admits 2-local derivations which are not derivations.

Throughout this paper, we denote by  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}^*$  and  $\mathbb{C}$  the sets of all integers, positive integers, nonzero integers and complex numbers respectively. All algebras are over  $\mathbb{C}$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we give some necessary definitions and preliminary results.

A derivation on a Lie algebra  $\mathcal{L}$  is a linear map  $D : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  which satisfies the Leibniz law, that is,

$$D([x, y]) = [D(x), y] + [x, D(y)]$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ . The set of all derivations of  $\mathcal{L}$  with respect to the commutation operation is a Lie algebra and it is denoted by  $Der(\mathcal{L})$ . For all  $a \in \mathcal{L}$ , the map  $\text{ad}(a)$  on  $\mathcal{L}$  defined as  $\text{ad}(a)x = [a, x]$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{L}$  is a derivation and derivations of this form are called *inner derivation*.

Recall that a map  $\Delta : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  (not liner in general) is called a *2-local derivation* if for every  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ , there exists a derivation  $\Delta_{x,y} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  (depending on  $x, y$ ) such that  $\Delta(x) = \Delta_{x,y}(x)$  and  $\Delta(y) = \Delta_{x,y}(y)$ . For a 2-local derivation on  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{L}$ , we have

$$\Delta(kx) = \Delta_{x,kx}(kx) = k\Delta_{x,kx}(x) = k\Delta(x). \quad (2.1)$$

The  $W$ -algebra  $W(2,2)$  is an infinite-dimensional Lie algebra with the  $\mathbb{C}$ -basis

$$\{L_m, I_m | m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

and the Lie brackets are given by

$$\begin{aligned} [L_m, L_n] &= (m - n)L_{m+n}, \\ [L_m, I_n] &= (m - n)I_{m+n}, \\ [I_m, I_n] &= 0, \forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

A class of central extensions of  $W(2,2)$  first introduced by [14] in their recent work on the classification of some simple vertex operator algebras, and then some scholars studied the theory on structures and representations of  $W(2,2)$  or its central extensions, see [5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12] and so forth. We now recall and establish several auxiliary results.

**Lemma 2.1.** (see [6]) Denote by  $\text{Der}(W(2, 2))$  and by  $\text{Inn}(W(2, 2))$  the space of derivations and the space of inner derivations of  $W(2, 2)$  respectively. Then

$$\text{Der}(W(2, 2)) = \text{Inn}(W(2, 2)) \oplus \mathbb{C}D,$$

where  $D$  is an outer derivation defined by  $D(L_m) = 0$ ,  $D(I_m) = I_m$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $\Delta$  be a 2-local derivation on the  $W$ -algebra  $W(2, 2)$ . Then for every  $x, y \in W(2, 2)$ , there exists a derivation  $\Delta_{x,y}$  of  $W(2, 2)$  such that  $\Delta(x) = \Delta_{x,y}(x)$ ,  $\Delta(y) = \Delta_{x,y}(y)$  and it can be written as

$$\Delta_{x,y} = \text{ad}\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (a_k(x, y)L_k + b_k(x, y)I_k)\right) + \lambda(x, y)D \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\lambda, a_k, b_k (k \in \mathbb{Z})$  are complex-valued functions on  $W(2, 2) \times W(2, 2)$  and  $D$  is given by Lemma 2.1.

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1, obviously the derivation  $\Delta_{x,y}$  can be written as the form of (2.2).  $\square$

### 3 2-Local derivations on $W(2, 2)$

Now we shall give the main result concerning 2-local derivations on  $W(2, 2)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** Every 2-local derivation on the  $W$ -algebra  $W(2, 2)$  is a derivation.

For the proof of this Theorem we need several Lemmas. For a 2-local derivation  $\Delta : W(2, 2) \rightarrow W(2, 2)$  and  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ , below we always use the symbol  $\Delta_{x,y}$  for the derivation of  $W(2, 2)$  satisfying  $\Delta(x) = \Delta_{x,y}(x)$  and  $\Delta(y) = \Delta_{x,y}(y)$ ; and  $D$  for the out derivation of  $W(2, 2)$  given by Lemma 2.1.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $\Delta$  be a 2-local derivation on  $W(2, 2)$ . Take any but fixed  $y \in W(2, 2)$ .

(i) For a given  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , if  $\Delta(L_i) = 0$  then

$$\Delta_{L_i,y} = \text{ad}(a_i(L_i, y)L_i + b_i(L_i, y)I_i) + \lambda(L_i, y)D; \quad (3.3)$$

(ii) If  $\Delta(I_0) = 0$  then for any  $y \in W(2, 2)$  we have

$$\Delta_{I_0,y} = \text{ad}(a_0(I_0, y)L_0 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k(I_0, y)I_k) \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\lambda, a_k, b_k (k \in \mathbb{Z})$  are complex-valued functions on  $W(2, 2) \times W(2, 2)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.2, we can assume that

$$\Delta_{L_i,y} = \text{ad}\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (a_k(L_i, y)L_k + b_k(L_i, y)I_k)\right) + \lambda(L_i, y)D, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\Delta_{I_0,y} = \text{ad}\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (a_k(I_0, y)L_k + b_k(I_0, y)I_k)\right) + \lambda(I_0, y)D \quad (3.6)$$

for some complex-valued functions  $\lambda, a_k, b_k (k \in \mathbb{Z})$  on  $W(2, 2) \times W(2, 2)$ .

(i) When  $\Delta(L_i) = 0$ , in view of (3.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(L_i) &= \Delta_{L_i, y}(L_i) \\ &= \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (a_k(L_i, y)L_k + b_k(L_i, y)I_k), L_i \right] + \lambda(L_i, y)D(L_i) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} ((k-i)a_k(L_i, y)L_{k+i} + (k-i)b_k(L_i, y)I_{k+i}) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

From the above equation, one has  $(k-i)a_k(L_i, y) = (k-i)b_k(L_i, y) = 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , which deduces  $a_k(L_i, y) = b_k(L_i, y) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $k \neq i$ . Then Equation (3.5) becomes (3.3), as deserved.

(ii) When  $\Delta(I_0) = 0$ , then it follows from (3.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(I_0) &= \Delta_{I_0, y}(I_0) \\ &= \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (a_k(I_0, y)L_k + b_k(I_0, y)I_k), I_0 \right] + \lambda(I_0, y)D(I_0) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} ka_k(I_0, y)L_k + \lambda(I_0, y)I_0 = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Then we have  $\lambda(I_0, y) = 0$  and  $ka_k(I_0, y) = 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , i.e.,  $a_k(I_0, y) = 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^*$ . This with (3.6) implies that (3.4) holds. The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a 2-local derivation on  $W(2, 2)$  such that  $\Delta(L_0) = \Delta(L_1) = 0$ . Then*

$$\Delta(L_i) = 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.7)$$

*Proof.* In view of  $\Delta(L_0) = \Delta(L_1) = 0$ , by using Lemma 3.2 we can assume that

$$\Delta_{L_0, y} = \text{ad}(a_0(L_0, y)L_0 + b_0(L_0, y)I_0) + \lambda(L_0, y)D, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\Delta_{L_1, y} = \text{ad}(a_1(L_1, y)L_0 + b_1(L_1, y)I_1) + \lambda(L_1, y)D \quad (3.9)$$

for all  $y \in W(2, 2)$ , where  $\lambda, a_k, b_k (k \in \mathbb{Z})$  are complex-valued functions on  $W(2, 2) \times W(2, 2)$ . Let  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  be a fixed index. Then by taking  $y = L_i$  in (3.8) and (3.9) respectively we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(L_i) &= \Delta_{L_0, L_i}(L_i) = [a_0(L_0, L_i)L_0 + b_0(L_0, L_i)I_0, L_i] + \lambda(L_0, L_i)D(L_i), \\ &= -ia_0(L_0, L_i)L_i - ib_0(L_0, L_i)I_i\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(L_i) &= \Delta_{L_1, L_i}(L_i) = [a_1(L_1, L_i)L_1 + b_1(L_1, L_i)I_1, L_i] + \lambda(L_1, L_i)D(L_i), \\ &= (1-i)a_0(L_0, L_i)L_{i+1} + (1-i)b_0(L_0, L_i)I_{i+1}.\end{aligned}$$

By the above two equations, it follows that

$$ia_0(L_0, L_i)L_i + ib_0(L_0, L_i)I_i + (1-i)a_0(L_0, L_i)L_{i+1} + (1-i)b_0(L_0, L_i)I_{i+1} = 0,$$

which implies  $a_0(L_0, L_i) = b_0(L_0, L_i) = 0$ . It concludes that  $\Delta(L_i) = 0$ . We finish the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** Let  $\Delta$  be a 2-local derivation on  $W(2, 2)$  such that  $\Delta(L_i) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then for any  $x = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_t L_t + \beta_t I_t) \in W(2, 2)$ , we have

$$\Delta(x) = \Delta\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_k L_k + \beta_k I_k)\right) = \mu_x \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_t I_t \quad (3.10)$$

where  $\mu_x$  is a complex number depending on  $x$ .

*Proof.* For  $x = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_t L_t + \beta_t I_t) \in W(2, 2)$ , since  $\Delta(L_i) = 0$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , from Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(x) &= \Delta_{L_i, x}(x) \\ &= [a_i(L_i, x)L_i + b_i(L_i, x)I_i, x] + \lambda(L_i, x)D(x) \\ &= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (i - t)(\alpha_t a_i(L_i, x)L_{i+t} + (\beta_t a_i(L_i, x) + \alpha_t b_i(L_i, x))I_{i+t}) + \lambda(L_i, x) \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_t I_t. \end{aligned}$$

By taking enough diffident  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  in the above equation and, if necessary, let these  $i$ 's to be large enough, we obtain that  $\Delta(x) = \lambda(L_i, x) \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_t I_t$ . Note that  $\mu_x \doteq \lambda(L_i, x)$  is a constant since it is independent on  $i$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** Let  $\Delta$  be a 2-local derivation on  $W(2, 2)$  such that  $\Delta(I_0) = 0$  and  $\Delta(L_i) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then for any  $p \in \mathbb{Z}^*$  and  $y \in W(2, 2)$ , there are  $\xi_p^y, \eta_p^y \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\Delta_{L_p + I_{2p}, y} = \text{ad}(\xi_p^y L_p + \eta_p^y I_p + \xi_p^y I_{2p}). \quad (3.11)$$

*Proof.* For  $p \in \mathbb{Z}^*$ , by  $\Delta(L_i) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\Delta(L_p + I_{2p}) = \mu_{L_p + I_{2p}} I_{2p}, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $\mu_{L_p + I_{2p}} \in \mathbb{C}$  is given by (3.10). In view of  $\Delta(I_0) = 0$  and Lemma 3.3 we know that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta(L_p + I_{2p}) \\ &= \Delta_{I_0, L_p + I_{2p}}(L_p + I_{2p}) \\ &= [a_0(I_0, L_p + I_{2p})L_0 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} b_k(I_0, L_p + I_{2p})I_k, L_p + I_{2p}] \\ &= -pa_0(I_0, L_p + I_{2p})(L_p + 2I_{2p}) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (k - p)b_k(I_0, L_p + I_{2p})I_{k+p}. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (3.12), gives that  $-pa_0(I_0, L_p + I_{2p}) = 0$  and  $-2pa_0(I_0, L_p + I_{2p}) = \mu_{L_p + I_{2p}}$ , i.e., we get  $\mu_{L_p + I_{2p}} = 0$ . It follows by (3.12) that

$$\Delta(L_p + I_{2p}) = 0. \quad (3.13)$$

Next, for every  $y \in W(2, 2)$ , by Lemma 2.2 we can assume that

$$\Delta_{L_p + I_{2p}, y} = \text{ad}\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (a_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y)L_k + b_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y)I_k)\right) + \lambda(L_p + I_{2p}, y)D. \quad (3.14)$$

From (3.13) and (3.14), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta(L_p + I_{2p}) \\
&= \Delta_{L_p + I_{2p}, y}(L_p + I_{2p}) \\
&= \left[ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (a_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y)L_k + b_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y)I_k), L_p + I_{2p} \right] + \lambda(L_p + I_{2p}, y)I_{2p} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y)((k-p)L_{k+p} + (k-2p)I_{k+2p}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (k-p)b_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y)I_{k+p} + \lambda(L_p + I_{2p}, y)I_{2p} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

From this, it is easy to see that  $(k-p)a_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y)L_{k+p} = 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and so that  $a_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y) = 0$  for all  $k \neq p$ . Using this conclusion we observe the coefficient of  $I_{3p}$  in the above equation, then one has

$$(p-2p)a_p(L_p + I_{2p}, y) + (2p-p)b_{2p}(L_p + I_{2p}, y) = 0,$$

which implies  $a_p(L_p + I_{2p}, y) = b_{2p}(L_p + I_{2p}, y)$ . Furthermore, by observing the coefficient of  $I_k, k \neq 3p$  in the above equation we get  $\lambda(L_p + I_{2p}, y) = 0$  and  $(k-p)b_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y) = 0$  for all  $k \neq p, 2p$ , i.e.,  $b_k(L_p + I_{2p}, y) = 0$  for all  $k \neq p, 2p$ . Finally, by denoting  $\xi_p^y = a_p(L_p + I_{2p}, y)$  and  $\eta_p^y = b_p(L_p + I_{2p}, y)$  we finish the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a 2-local derivation on  $W(2, 2)$  such that  $\Delta(L_0) = \Delta(L_1) = \Delta(I_0) = 0$ . Then  $\Delta(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in W(2, 2)$ .*

*Proof.* Take any but fixed  $x = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_t L_t + \beta_t I_t) \in W(2, 2)$ , where  $(\alpha_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\beta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are both sequences which contain only finitely many nonzero entries.

Since  $\Delta(L_0) = \Delta(L_1) = 0$ , it follows by Lemma 3.3 that

$$\Delta(L_i) = 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.15}$$

This, together with Lemma 3.4, gives

$$\Delta(x) = \Delta\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_k L_k + \beta_k I_k)\right) = \mu_x \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_t I_t \tag{3.16}$$

for some  $\mu_x \in \mathbb{C}$ . Now, for any  $p \in \mathbb{Z}^*$ , by (3.15) and  $\Delta(I_0) = 0$ , we obtain by Lemma 3.5 that

$$\Delta_{L_p + I_{2p}, x} = \text{ad}(\xi_p^x L_p + \eta_p^x I_p + \zeta_p^x I_{2p}) \tag{3.17}$$

for some  $\xi_p^x, \eta_p^x \in \mathbb{C}$ . Therefore, from (3.17) one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(x) &= \Delta_{L_p + I_{2p}, x}(x) \\
&= [\xi_p^x L_p + \eta_p^x I_p + \zeta_p^x I_{2p}, \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_t L_t + \beta_t I_t)]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} ((p-t)\zeta_p^x \alpha_t L_{p+t} + (p-t)\zeta_p^x \beta_t I_{p+t}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} ((p-t)\eta_p^x \alpha_t I_{p+t} + (2p-t)\zeta_p^x \alpha_t I_{2p+t}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Next the proof is divided into three cases according to the situations of  $(\alpha_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ ,  $(\beta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ .

**Case i.**  $(\beta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a zero sequence, i.e.,  $x = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha_t L_t$ . Then by (3.16), it is easy to see that  $\Delta(x) = 0$ .

**Case ii.**  $(\alpha_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a zero sequence, i.e.,  $x = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_t I_t$ . Then by (3.16) and (3.18) we have

$$\Delta(x) = \mu_x \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_t I_t = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (p-t)\zeta_p^x \beta_t I_{p+t}$$

for all  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ . By taking enough different  $p$  in the above equation and, if necessary, let these  $p$ 's to be large enough, we obtain that  $\Delta(x) = 0$ .

**Case iii.** Both  $(\alpha_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  and  $(\beta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are not zero sequences. Hence there is a nonzero term  $\alpha_{t_0} L_{t_0}$  in  $x = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (\alpha_t L_t + \beta_t I_t)$  for some  $t_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Take two integers  $p = p_1$  and  $p = p_2$  in (3.18) such that  $p_i - t_0 \neq 0, i = 1, 2$ , then by  $(p_i - t_0)\zeta_{p_i}^x \alpha_{t_0} L_{p_i+t_0} = 0$  in (3.18) we have  $\zeta_{p_i}^x = 0$ . Then by (3.16) and (3.18) we have

$$\Delta(x) = \mu_x \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_t I_t = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} (p_i - t)\eta_{p_i}^x \alpha_t I_{p_i+t}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

By taking  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  in the above equation such that  $p_1, p_2, p_1 - p_2$  are large enough, we see that  $\Delta(x) = 0$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

Now we are in position to prove Theorem 3.1.

**Proof of Theorem 3.1 :** Let  $\Delta$  be a 2-local derivation on  $W(2, 2)$ . Take a derivation  $\Delta_{L_0, L_1}$  such that

$$\Delta(L_0) = \Delta_{L_0, L_1}(L_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(L_1) = \Delta_{L_0, L_1}(L_1).$$

Set  $\Delta_1 = \Delta - \Delta_{L_0, L_1}$ . Then  $\Delta_1$  is a 2-local derivation such that  $\Delta_1(L_0) = \Delta_1(L_1) = 0$ . By lemma 3.3,  $\Delta_1(L_i) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . From this with Lemma 3.4, we have  $\Delta_1(I_0) = \mu_{I_0} I_0$  for some  $\mu_{I_0} \in \mathbb{C}$ . Now we set  $\Delta_2 = \Delta_1 - \mu_{I_0} D$ . Then  $\Delta_2$  is a 2-local derivation such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_2(L_0) &= \Delta_1(L_0) - \mu_{I_0} D(L_0) = 0 - 0 = 0, \\
\Delta_2(L_1) &= \Delta_1(L_1) - \mu_{I_0} D(L_1) = 0 - 0 = 0, \\
\Delta_2(I_0) &= \Delta_1(I_0) - \mu_{I_0} D(I_0) = \mu_{I_0} I_0 - \mu_{I_0} I_0 = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By lemma 3.6, it follows that  $\Delta_2 = \Delta - \Delta_{L_0, L_1} - \mu_{I_0} D \equiv 0$ . Thus  $\Delta = \Delta_{L_0, L_1} + \mu_{I_0} D$  is a derivation. The proof is completed.  $\square$

## 4 2-local derivation on the thin Lie algebra

Let us consider the following (see [8]) so-called *thin Lie algebra*  $\mathfrak{T}$  with a basis  $\{e_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , which is defined by the following table of multiplications of the basis elements:

$$[e_1, e_n] = e_{n+1}, \quad n \geq 2,$$

and other products of the basis elements being zero. In this section, we study the 2-local derivation on the thin Lie algebra and prove that it admits a lots of 2-local derivations which are not derivations. Recall that the authors in [2] give a special example of 2-local derivations on  $\mathfrak{T}$ . The following lemma is given by [2] with a slight difference.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Any derivation  $\delta$  on the algebra thin Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{T}$  if of the form  $\delta \doteq \delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(n,m)}$  which satisfies*

$$\delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(n,m)}(e_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e_i, \quad (4.19)$$

$$\delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(n,m)}(e_j) = (j-2)\alpha_1 e_j + \sum_{i=2}^m \beta_i e_{i+j-2}, \quad j \geq 2, \quad (4.20)$$

where  $n, m-1 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n, \beta = (\beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\delta$  be a derivation on  $\mathcal{L}$ . We set  $\delta(e_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e_i, \delta(e_2) = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i e_i$ , where  $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \mathbb{C}, i = 2, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then we have  $\delta(e_3) = \delta([e_1, e_2]) = [\delta(e_1), e_2] + [e_1, \delta(e_2)] = \alpha_1 e_3 + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i e_{i+1}$ . From this, one has  $0 = \delta([e_2, e_3]) = [\delta(e_2), e_3] + [e_2, \delta(e_3)] = \beta_1 e_4$ , and so that  $\beta_1 = 0$ . This means that (4.20) replacing  $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(n,m)}$  by  $\delta$  holds for  $j = 2$ . We assume that (4.20) holds for  $j(\geq 2)$ . Further, We have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(e_{j+1}) &= \delta([e_1, e_j]) = [\delta(e_1), e_j] + [e_1, \delta(e_j)] \\ &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e_i, e_j \right] + [e_1, (j-2)\alpha_1 e_j + \sum_{i=2}^m \beta_i e_{i+j-2}] \\ &= (j-1)\alpha_1 e_{j+1} + \sum_{i=2}^m \beta_i e_{i+j-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves that (4.20) holds For  $j+1$ . By induction on  $j$  we know that (4.20) holds. Conversely, it is easy to check that a linear map  $\delta$  on  $\mathfrak{T}$  satisfying (4.19) and (4.20) is a derivation. Denote this derivation  $\delta$  by  $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(n,m)}$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

Now we give a complete classification of the 2-local derivation on  $\mathfrak{T}$  as follow.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Every 2-local derivation  $\Delta$  on the thin Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{T}$  is of the form*

$$\Delta = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(s,t)} + \Omega_{\theta,\lambda}^{(q,m)}$$

for some  $s, t-1, m-1 \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ , and  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s) \in \mathbb{C}^s, \beta = (\beta_2, \dots, \beta_t) \in \mathbb{C}^{t-1}, \theta = (\theta_2, \dots, \theta_m) \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$  and  $q \in \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : t > 2\}$ , where  $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(s,t)}$  is given by Lemma 4.1 and



$\Omega_{\theta,\lambda}^{(q,m)} : \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}$  is a map that satisfies for any  $x = \sum_{i=1}^p k_i e_i \in \mathfrak{T}$ ,

$$\Omega_{\theta,\lambda}^{(q,m)}(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=2}^p \sum_{j=2}^m k_i \theta_j e_{i+j-2}, & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0, \\ \lambda k_q e_q, & \text{if } x = k_q e_q \text{ for some } q \text{ with } 2 < q \leq p, \\ 0, & \text{others} \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\Delta$  is a 2-local derivation on the thin Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{T}$ . Let  $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta - \Delta_{e_1, e_2}$ . Then  $\tilde{\Delta}$  is also a 2-local derivation on the thin Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{T}$  satisfying  $\tilde{\Delta}(e_1) = \tilde{\Delta}(e_2) = 0$ .

Take any but fixed  $x = \sum_{i=1}^p k_i e_i \in \mathfrak{T}$ . If  $x = 0$ , then by (2.1) we know  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = 0$ . Hence below we always assume that  $x \neq 0$ , i.e.,  $k_p \neq 0$  for some  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For the derivation  $\tilde{\Delta}_{e_1, x}$ , as  $\tilde{\Delta}_{e_1, x}(e_1) = \tilde{\Delta}(e_1) = 0$ , it follows by Lemma 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}_{e_1, x}(e_1) &= 0, \\ \tilde{\Delta}_{e_1, x}(e_j) &= \sum_{i=2}^m \beta_i^x e_{i+j-2}, \quad \forall j \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq 2$  and  $\beta_i^x \in \mathbb{C}, i = 2, \dots, m$  with  $\beta_m^x \neq 0$ . Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}(x) &= \tilde{\Delta}_{e_1, x}(x) = k_1 \tilde{\Delta}_{e_1, x}(e_1) + \dots + k_p \tilde{\Delta}_{e_1, x}(e_p) \\ &= k_2 \beta_2^x e_2 + (k_2 \beta_3^x + k_3 \beta_2^x) e_3 + \dots \\ &\quad + (k_{p-1} \beta_m^x + k_p \beta_{m-1}^x) e_{p+m-3} + k_p \beta_m^x e_{p+m-2} \\ &= \beta_2^x \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_i + \beta_3^x \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_{i+1} + \dots + \beta_m^x \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_{i+m-2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

For the derivation  $\tilde{\Delta}_{e_2, x}$ , by  $\tilde{\Delta}_{e_2, x}(e_2) = \tilde{\Delta}(e_2) = 0$  and Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}_{e_2, x}(e_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^x e_i, \\ \tilde{\Delta}_{e_2, x}(e_j) &= (j-2) \alpha_1^x e_j, \quad \forall j \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha_i^x \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, n$  with  $\alpha_n^x \neq 0$ . From this, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}(x) &= \tilde{\Delta}_{e_2, x}(x) \\ &= k_1 (\alpha_1^x e_1 + \dots + \alpha_n^x e_n) \\ &\quad + k_3 \alpha_1^x e_3 + 2k_4 \alpha_1^x e_4 + \dots + (p-2) k_p \alpha_1^x e_p. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Next, according to the situations of coefficients  $k_1, \dots, k_p$  in  $x = \sum_{i=1}^p k_i e_i$ , the proof is divided into the following cases.

**Case 1.** When  $k_1 \neq 0$ . By comparing (4.22) with (4.23), we have  $k_1 \alpha_1^x e_1 = 0$  and so that  $\alpha_1^x = 0$ . Therefore, (4.23) becomes

$$\tilde{\Delta}(x) = k_1(\alpha_2^x e_2 + \cdots + \alpha_n^x e_n).$$

This, together with (4.22), gives that  $n = p + m - 2$  and

$$\begin{cases} k_1 \alpha_2^x = k_2 \beta_2^x, \\ k_1 \alpha_3^x = k_2 \beta_3^x + k_3 \beta_2^x, \\ k_1 \alpha_4^x = k_2 \beta_4^x + k_3 \beta_3^x + k_4 \beta_2^x, \\ \vdots \\ k_1 \alpha_n^x = k_p \beta_m^x. \end{cases} \quad (4.24)$$

Note that  $k_1 \neq 0$ , if we given a sequence of numbers  $\beta_2^x, \cdots, \beta_m^x$  then we can get a sequence of numbers  $\alpha_2^x, \cdots, \alpha_n^x$  satisfying (4.24). Hence in this case we let  $\Delta(x)$  be of the form (4.22), namely, by denoting  $\theta_j = \beta_j^x, j = 2, \cdots, m$  we have

$$\tilde{\Delta}(x) = \theta_2 \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_i + \theta_3 \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_{i+1} + \cdots + \theta_m \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_{i+m-2} = \sum_{i=2}^p \sum_{j=2}^m k_i \theta_j e_{i+j-2}.$$

**Case 2.** When  $k_1 = 0$ . By (4.23) we have

$$\tilde{\Delta}(x) = \alpha_1^x (k_3 e_3 + 2k_4 e_4 + \cdots + (p-2)k_p e_p). \quad (4.25)$$

From this we see that if  $p = 2$  or  $\alpha_1^x = 0$  then  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = 0$ . Assume that  $p \geq 3$  and  $\alpha_1^x \neq 0$ . On the other hand, by (4.25) and (4.22) we see that  $\alpha_1^x (p-2)k_p e_p = k_p \beta_m^x e_{p+m-2}$  and so that  $p = p + m - 2$ . In other words,  $m = 2$ . Therefore, (4.22) becomes

$$\tilde{\Delta}(x) = \beta_2^x (k_2 e_2 + \cdots + k_p e_p). \quad (4.26)$$

**Subcase 2.1** When  $k_2 \neq 0$ . Then by (4.25) and (4.26) one has  $\beta_2^x k_2 e_2 = 0$  which deduces  $\beta_2^x = 0$ . Hence by (4.26) we have  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = 0$ .

**Subcase 2.2** When  $k_2 = 0$ . In view of (4.25) and (4.26), we get

$$\tilde{\Delta}(x) = \alpha_1^x (k_3 e_3 + 2k_4 e_4 + \cdots + (p-2)k_p e_p) = \beta_2^x (k_3 e_3 + k_4 e_4 + \cdots + k_p e_p). \quad (4.27)$$

If there are two coefficients  $k_s, k_t, 3 \leq s < t \leq p$  in (4.27) such that  $k_s k_t \neq 0$ , then we have  $\alpha_1^x (s-2) = \beta_2^x$  and  $\alpha_1^x (t-2) = \beta_2^x$ . This yields  $\alpha_1^x = 0$  and then  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = 0$ . If there exist only one  $k_q \neq 0$  for some  $3 \leq q \leq p$ , i.e.,  $x = k_q e_q$ , then we have by (4.27) that  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = \lambda k_q e_q$  by denoting  $\lambda \doteq \beta_2^x$ . If all  $k'_s$  are equal to 0, then  $\tilde{\Delta}(x) = 0$ .

Now, by summarizing the above processes we get  $\tilde{\Delta} = \Omega_{\theta, \lambda}^{(q, m)}$  for some appropriate  $\theta, \lambda, q, m$ . Note that  $\tilde{\Delta} = \Delta - \Delta_{e_1, e_2}$ . Let the derivation  $\Delta_{e_1, e_2}$  be of the form  $\delta_{\alpha, \beta}^{(n, s)}$  for some appropriate  $\alpha, \beta, n, s$  in Lemma 4.1, then we complete the proof.  $\square$

By Theorem 4.2, we know the thin Lie algebra admits a lots of 2-local derivations which are not derivations. We give two examples as follows.

**Example 4.3.** Let  $\Delta = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(s,t)} + \Omega_{\theta,\lambda}^{(q,m)} : \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}$  with  $m = 2$  and  $\alpha = 0, \beta = 0, \theta = 1, \lambda = 0$ , that is

$$\Delta\left(\sum_{i=1}^p k_i e_i\right) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_i, & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } k_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

The authors in [2] have shown that such  $\Delta$  is a 2-local derivation on  $\mathfrak{T}$  but it is not a derivation.

**Example 4.4.** Let  $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(s,t)} = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(s,t)} + \Omega_{\theta,\lambda}^{(q,m)} : \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}$  with  $\delta_{\alpha,\beta}^{(s,t)} = 0, m = q = 3$  and  $\theta = (1,1), \lambda = 2$ , that is  $\Delta = \Omega_{(1,1),2}^{(3,3)}$ . Exactly we have

$$\Delta\left(\sum_{i=1}^p k_i e_i\right) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_i + \sum_{i=2}^p k_i e_{i+1}, & \text{if } k_1 \neq 0, \\ 2k_3 e_3, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^p k_i e_i = k_3 e_3, \\ 0, & \text{if } k_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then by theorem 4.2 it is easy to see that  $\Delta$  is a 2-local derivation. We will see that  $\Delta$  is not a derivation. In fact, let  $x = e_1 + e_2$  and  $y = -e_1 - e_2 + 2e_3$ . Then we have  $\Delta(x) = e_2 + e_3, \Delta(y) = -e_2 + e_3 + 2e_4$  and  $\Delta(x + y) = \Delta(2e_3) = 4e_3 \neq \Delta(x) + \Delta(y) = 2e_3 + 2e_4$ . So,  $\Delta$  is not additive, and therefore is not a derivation.

## Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11771069) and the fund of Heilongjiang Provincial Laboratory of the Theory and Computation of Complex Systems.

## References

- [1] Sh.A Ayupov, K.K. Kudaybergenov, B. Yusupov, 2-Local derivations on generalized Witt algebras. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, inpress, doi: 10.1080/03081087.2019.1708846.
- [2] Sh.A Ayupov, B. Yusupov, 2-Local derivations of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras. *J. Algebra Appl.*, ID: 2050100 (2020).
- [3] Sh.A Ayupov, K.K. Kudaybergenov, I.S. Rakhimov, 2-Local derivations on finite-dimensional Lie algebras, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **474** (2015), 1-11.
- [4] Z. Chen, D. Wang, 2-Local automorphisms of finite-dimensional simple Lie algebras, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **486**, 335-344 (2015).

- [5] H. Chen, J. Li, *Left-symmetric algebra structures on the W-algebra  $W(2, 2)$* , Linear Algebra Appl. **437** (2012), 1821-1834.
- [6] S. Gao, C. Jiang, Y. Pei, *Derivations, central extensions and automorphisms of a Lie algebra*, Acta Math. Sin. **52** (2009), 281-288.
- [7] W. Jiang, W. Zhang. *Verma modules over the  $W(2, 2)$  algebras*, J. Geom. Phys. **98**(2015), 118-127.
- [8] K. Khakimdjanova, Yu. Khakimdjano, *Sur une classe d'algebres de Lie de dimension infinie*, Commun. Algebra, Vol.**29**(1) (2001), 177-191.
- [9] G. Radobolja. *Subsingular vectors in Verma modules, and tensor product of weight modules over the twisted Heisenberg-Virasoro algebra and  $W(2, 2)$  algebra*, J. Math. Phys. **54** (2013), 071701.
- [10] P. Šemrl, *Local automorphisms and derivations on  $B(H)$* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **125** (1997), 2677-2680.
- [11] X. Tang, *Biderivations, linear commuting maps and commutative post-Lie algebra structures on W-algebras*, Commun. Algebra **45** (2017), 5252-5261.
- [12] Y. Wang, Q. Geng, Z. Chen, *The superalgebra of  $W(2, 2)$  and its modules of the intermediate series*, Commun. Algebra **45** (2017), 749-763.
- [13] Y. Zhao, Y. Chen, K. Zhao, *2-local Derivations on Witt Algebras*, J. Algebra Appl., inpress, doi: 10.1142/S0219498821500687 (2020).
- [14] W. Zhang, C. Dong, *W-algebra  $W(2, 2)$  and the vertex operator algebra  $L(\frac{1}{2}, 0) \otimes L(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$* , Commun. Math. Phys. **285** (2009), 991-1004.