

Involutions of the second kind on finitary incidence algebras

Érica Z. Fornaroli*

*Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Estadual de Maringá,
Avenida Colombo, 5790, Maringá, PR, 87020-900, Brazil.*

Abstract

Let K be a field and X a connected partially ordered set. In the first part of this paper, we show that the finitary incidence algebra $FI(X, K)$ of X over K has an involution of the second kind if and only if X has an involution and K has an automorphism of order 2. We also give a characterization of the involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$. In the second part, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for two involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ to be equivalent in the case where $\text{char } K \neq 2$ and every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner.

Keywords: Finitary incidence algebra; involution; automorphism.

2020 MSC: 16W10

1 Introduction

Let X be a partially ordered set and let K be a field. Involutions of the first kind on the finitary incidence algebra $FI(X, K)$ were studied in [1–5, 10–12]. In [2] was proved that $FI(X, K)$ has a K -linear involution if and only if X has an involution. The description of such involutions was given in [3]. When $\text{char } K \neq 2$ and X has an all-comparable element, the classification of the K -linear involutions on $FI(X, K)$ was obtained firstly for the case where X is finite [1], and later, locally finite [2]. After, in [3], the classification was generalized for the case where X is connected (not necessarily locally finite) and every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. If X is connected, then $FI(X, K)$ is a central algebra, therefore the classification of all involutions of the first kind was given in [3].

If X is a finite chain of cardinality $n \geq 1$, then $FI(X, K)$ is isomorphic to the algebra $UT_n(K)$ of the $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over K . When $\text{char } K \neq 2$, the involutions of the first kind on $UT_n(K)$ were classified [5] and those of the second kind, in [9].

*ezancanella@uem.br

By [9, Lemma 2.1], if two involutions on an algebra are equivalent, they are of the same kind. Thus, the classification of involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ in the case where $\text{char } K \neq 2$, X is connected and every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner completes the classification of involutions on $FI(X, K)$ under these assumptions.

In Section 2 we fix the notations, recall some results about involutions and finitary incidence algebras, and we also prove some general results. If X is connected, we prove in Section 3 that $FI(X, K)$ has an involution of the second kind if and only if X has an involution and K has an involution of the second kind (Theorem 3.4). We also give a description of the involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ (Theorem 3.7). Finally, in Section 4, we consider a field K of characteristic different from 2 and a connected partially ordered set X such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner and we give necessary and sufficient conditions for two involutions on $FI(X, K)$ to be equivalent via inner automorphisms (Theorems 4.3, 4.8, 4.13 and 4.14). Then we use such a classification to obtain the general classification (Theorem 4.1, Corollary 4.16, Theorems 4.18 and 4.20). The results obtained in this section generalize the classification of involutions of the second kind on $UT_n(K)$ given in [9] (that is, in the case where X is a finite chain).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Involutions on a arbitrary algebra

Let K be a field and $K^\times = K \setminus \{0\}$. Throughout the paper K -algebras are associative with unity. The center of a K -algebra A is denoted by $Z(A)$ and the set of invertible elements of A is denoted by $U(A)$. For each $a \in U(A)$, Ψ_a denotes the inner automorphism defined by a , i.e., $\Psi_a : A \rightarrow A$ is such that $\Psi_a(x) = axa^{-1}$ for all $x \in A$.

An *involution* on a K -algebra A is an additive map $\rho : A \rightarrow A$ such that $\rho(ab) = \rho(b)\rho(a)$ and $\rho^2(a) = a$ for all $a, b \in A$. Note that $\rho(a) \in Z(A)$ for all $a \in Z(A)$. If ρ is the identity map on $Z(A)$, then it is an involution of the *first kind*, otherwise, it is of the *second kind*. It is easy to see that $\rho(1) = 1$ and $\rho(a^{-1}) = \rho(a)^{-1}$ for all $a \in U(A)$. An element $a \in A$ is ρ -*symmetric* if $\rho(a) = a$, and ρ -*unitary* if $a\rho(a) = \rho(a)a = 1$.

Two involutions ρ_1 and ρ_2 on a K -algebra A are *equivalent* if there is an automorphism Φ of A such that $\Phi \circ \rho_1 = \rho_2 \circ \Phi$. In this case, ρ_1 and ρ_2 are of the same kind, by [9, Lemma 2.1]. Moreover, if A is central, then $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K$ by the same lemma.

We present below some results that holds for involutions of the first or second kind on an arbitrary K -algebra A .

Proposition 2.1. *Let ρ be an involution on a K -algebra A . If $e \in A$ is an idempotent, then $\rho(e)$ is an idempotent. Moreover, if the idempotent e is primitive, then so is $\rho(e)$.*

Proof. It is clear that if $e \in A$ is an idempotent, then so is $\rho(e)$. If e is a primitive idempotent, let $s \in A$ be an idempotent such that $s\rho(e) = \rho(e)s = s$. Then $e\rho(s) = \rho(s)e = \rho(s)$ and $\rho(s)$ is an idempotent. Since e is primitive, it follows that $\rho(s) = 0$ or $\rho(s) = e$, therefore $s = 0$ or $s = \rho(e)$. Thus, $\rho(e)$ is a primitive idempotent. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let ρ be an involution on a K -algebra A and $u \in U(A)$. Then $\rho \circ \Psi_u = \Psi_{\rho(u^{-1})} \circ \rho$.*

Proof. It is the same as for [1, Lemma 4]. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be involutions on a K -algebra A . There is an inner automorphism Ψ of A such that $\Psi \circ \rho_1 = \rho_2 \circ \Psi$ if and only if $\rho_1 = \Psi_{v\rho_2(v)} \circ \rho_2$ for some $v \in U(A)$.*

Proof. It is the same as for [1, Lemma 5] just by replacing [1, Lemma 4] by Lemma 2.2. \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let ρ be an involution on a K -algebra A and $u \in U(A)$.*

- (i) $\Psi_u \circ \rho$ is an involution on A if and only if $\rho(u) = cu$ for some $c \in Z(A)$.
- (ii) If $\rho(u) = ku$ for some $k \in K$, then $\Psi_u \circ \rho$ is an involution on A and k is ρ -unitary. On the other hand, if A is a central algebra and $\Psi_u \circ \rho$ is an involution, then $\rho(u) = ku$ for some ρ -unitary $k \in K$.

Proof. (i) Clearly, $\Psi_u \circ \rho$ is additive and satisfies $(\Psi_u \circ \rho)(ab) = (\Psi_u \circ \rho)(b)(\Psi_u \circ \rho)(a)$. Moreover, for any $x \in A$,

$$(\Psi_u \circ \rho)^2(x) = (\Psi_u \circ \rho)(u\rho(x)u^{-1}) = \Psi_u(\rho(u)^{-1}x\rho(u)) = u\rho(u)^{-1}x\rho(u)u^{-1}.$$

Thus, $(\Psi_u \circ \rho)^2(x) = x$ if and only if $\rho(u)u^{-1}x = x\rho(u)u^{-1}$. Therefore, $\Psi_u \circ \rho$ is an involution if and only if $\rho(u)u^{-1} \in Z(A)$.

- (ii) If $\rho(u) = ku$ for some $k \in K$, then $\Psi_u \circ \rho$ is an involution, by (i), and

$$u = \rho^2(u) = \rho(ku) = \rho(uk) = \rho(k)\rho(u) = \rho(k)ku.$$

Thus $\rho(k)k = 1$.

If A is a central algebra and $\Psi_u \circ \rho$ is an involution, then there is $k \in K$ such that $\rho(u) = ku$, by (i), and $\rho(k)k = 1$ as proved in the previous paragraph. \square

2.2 Involutions of the second kind on a field of characteristic different from 2

Now, let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and consider K as a K -algebra. Suppose there is an involution $*$: $K \rightarrow K$ of the second kind. We will denote $*(a)$ by a^* for each $a \in K$. Let

$$K_0 = \{a \in K : a^* = a\}.$$

Then K_0 is a proper subfield of K such that $[K : K_0] = 2$ and there is a linear basis $\{1, i\}$ of K over K_0 such that $i^2 \in K_0$ and $i^* = -i$, by [9, Lemma 2.5], since $*$ is an automorphism of order 2.

Proposition 2.5. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 with an involution $*$ of the second kind. For each $*$ -unitary $k \in K^\times$ there is $a \in K^\times$ such that $k = a^*a^{-1}$.*

Proof. Let $k \in K^\times$ be a $*$ -unitary element. Let $\{1, i\}$ be a linear basis of K over K_0 such that $i^2 \in K_0$ and $i^* = -i$. Then there are $a, b \in K_0$ such that $k = a + bi$.

If $b = 0$, then $k^* = a = k$, that is, $k^{-1} = k$. Thus $k = \pm 1$ and therefore

$$k = 1 = 1^*1^{-1} \text{ or } k = -1 = i^*i^{-1}.$$

Suppose $b \neq 0$. We have $1 = kk^* = (a + bi)(a - bi) = a^2 - b^2i^2$ which implies

$$b^2i^2 = a^2 - 1. \quad (1)$$

Consider $l = (1 + a) - bi \in K^\times$. Applying (1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} l^*l^{-1} &= [(1 + a) + bi] \cdot \frac{(1 + a) + bi}{(1 + a)^2 - b^2i^2} = \frac{[(1 + a) + bi]^2}{(1 + a)^2 - b^2i^2} \\ &= \frac{(1 + a)^2 + 2(1 + a)bi + b^2i^2}{1 + 2a + a^2 - b^2i^2} \\ &= \frac{1 + 2a + a^2 + 2bi + 2abi + a^2 - 1}{1 + 2a + a^2 - a^2 + 1} \\ &= \frac{2a(1 + a) + 2bi(1 + a)}{2(1 + a)} = a + bi = k. \end{aligned}$$

□

We will also consider the set

$$K_1 = \{aa^* : a \in K^\times\}.$$

It is easy to see that K_1 is a subgroup of the multiplicative group $K_0^\times = K_0 \setminus \{0\}$.

2.3 Posets and finitary incidence algebras

Let (X, \leq) be a partially ordered set (poset, for short). Given $x, y \in X$, the *interval* from x to y is the set $[x, y] = \{z \in X : x \leq z \leq y\}$. If all intervals of X are finite, then X is said to be *locally finite*. The poset X is *connected* if for any $x, y \in X$ there exist a positive integer n and $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ in X such that $x_i \leq x_{i+1}$ or $x_{i+1} \leq x_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$.

A map $\lambda : X \rightarrow X$ is an *involution* on X if $\lambda^2(x) = x$ for all $x \in X$, and for any $x, y \in X$, the following property is satisfied:

$$x \leq y \Leftrightarrow \lambda(y) \leq \lambda(x).$$

If the poset X has an involution λ , then, by [3, Theorem 4.7], there is a triple of disjoint subsets (X_1, X_2, X_3) of X with $X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3$ satisfying:

- (i) $X_3 = \{x \in X : \lambda(x) = x\}$;

- (ii) if $x \in X_1 (X_2)$, then $\lambda(x) \in X_2 (X_1)$;
- (iii) if $x \in X_1 (X_2)$ and $y \leq x (x \leq y)$, then $y \in X_1 (X_2)$.

In this case, (X_1, X_2, X_3) is called a λ -decomposition of X .

Let X be a poset and K a field. The *incidence space* of X over K is the K -space of functions $I(X, K) = \{f : X \times X \rightarrow K : f(x, y) = 0 \text{ if } x \not\leq y\}$. Let $FI(X, K)$ be the subspace of $I(X, K)$ formed by the functions f such that for any $x \leq y$ in X , there is only a finite number of subintervals $[u, v] \subseteq [x, y]$ such that $u \neq v$ and $f(u, v) \neq 0$. Then $FI(X, K)$ is a K -algebra with the (convolution) product

$$(fg)(x, y) = \sum_{x \leq z \leq y} f(x, z)g(z, y),$$

for any $f, g \in FI(X, K)$, called the *finitary incidence algebra* of X over K . Furthermore, if $f \in FI(X, K)$ and $g \in I(X, K)$, then $fg, gf \in I(X, K)$, and with this action of $FI(X, K)$ on $I(X, K)$ on the left and on the right, $I(X, K)$ is an $FI(X, K)$ -bimodule [8].

The unity of $FI(X, K)$ is the function δ defined by $\delta(x, y) = 1$ if $x = y$, and $\delta(x, y) = 0$ otherwise. An element $f \in FI(X, K)$ is invertible if and only if $f(x, x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in X$, by [8, Theorem 2]. Given $x, y \in X$ with $x \leq y$, we denote by e_{xy} the element of $FI(X, K)$ defined by $e_{xy}(x, y) = 1$ and $e_{xy}(u, v) = 0$ if $(u, v) \neq (x, y)$, and we write e_x for e_{xx} . Then for any $f \in FI(X, K)$,

$$e_x f e_y = \begin{cases} f(x, y) e_{xy} & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (2)$$

Proposition 2.6. *Let X be a poset and K a field. The finitary incidence algebra $FI(X, K)$ is central if and only if X is connected.*

Proof. The proof is the same as for the case where X is locally finite. (See Theorem 1.3.13 and Corollary 1.3.14 of [13]). \square

We recall that if α is an automorphism X , then α induces an automorphism $\hat{\alpha}$ of $FI(X, K)$ by $\hat{\alpha}(f)(x, y) = f(\alpha^{-1}(x), \alpha^{-1}(y))$, for all $f \in FI(X, K)$ and $x, y \in X$. An element $\sigma \in I(X, K)$ such that $\sigma(x, y) \neq 0$ for all $x \leq y$, and $\sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z) = \sigma(x, z)$ whenever $x \leq y \leq z$, determines an automorphism M_σ of $FI(X, K)$ by $M_\sigma(f)(x, y) = \sigma(x, y)f(x, y)$, for all $f \in FI(X, K)$ and $x, y \in X$ (see [3, Proposition 2.2]). Such an automorphism M_σ is called *multiplicative*. The next theorem follows from [7, Lemma 3].

Theorem 2.7. *Let X be a poset and let K be a field. If Φ is an automorphism of $FI(X, K)$, then $\Phi = \Psi \circ M \circ \hat{\alpha}$, where Ψ is an inner automorphism, M is a multiplicative automorphism, and $\hat{\alpha}$ is the automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ induced by an automorphism α of X .*

3 Involutions on $FI(X, K)$

From now on, K is a field and X is a poset. In this section, we show that in the case where X is connected, $FI(X, K)$ has an involution of the second kind if and only if X has an involution and K has an involution of the second kind (Theorem 3.4). In this case, we also give a characterization of the involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ (Theorem 3.7).

Note that if $*$: $K \rightarrow K$ is an involution, then $*$ = id_K or $*$ is an automorphism of order 2, depending on whether $*$ is of the first or second kind. We will denote $*(a)$ by a^* for each $a \in K$.

Lemma 3.1. *If $*$ is an involution on K and λ is an involution on X , then $\rho_\lambda^* : FI(X, K) \rightarrow FI(X, K)$ given by*

$$\rho_\lambda^*(f)(x, y) = [f(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^*,$$

for all $f \in FI(X, K)$ and $x, y \in X$, is an involution.

Proof. Firstly note that $\rho_\lambda^*(f) \in FI(X, K)$ for all $f \in FI(X, K)$; indeed, if $x \not\leq y$, then $\lambda(y) \not\leq \lambda(x)$ and so $\rho_\lambda^*(f)(x, y) = 0$. Moreover, if $[u, v] \subseteq [x, y]$ is such that $u \neq v$ and $\rho_\lambda^*(f)(u, v) \neq 0$, then $[\lambda(v), \lambda(u)] \subseteq [\lambda(y), \lambda(x)]$, $\lambda(v) \neq \lambda(u)$ and $f(\lambda(v), \lambda(u)) \neq 0$. Thus, since $f \in FI(X, K)$, then $\rho_\lambda^*(f) \in FI(X, K)$.

Since $*$ is additive, then so is ρ_λ^* . Let $f, g \in FI(X, K)$ and $x \leq y$ in X . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\lambda^*(fg)(x, y) &= [(fg)(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* \\ &= \left[\sum_{\lambda(y) \leq \lambda(z) \leq \lambda(x)} f(\lambda(y), \lambda(z))g(\lambda(z), \lambda(x)) \right]^* \\ &= \sum_{x \leq z \leq y} [g(\lambda(z), \lambda(x))]^* [f(\lambda(y), \lambda(z))]^* \\ &= \sum_{x \leq z \leq y} \rho_\lambda^*(g)(x, z) \rho_\lambda^*(f)(z, y) \\ &= (\rho_\lambda^*(g) \rho_\lambda^*(f))(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\rho_\lambda^*(\rho_\lambda^*(f))(x, y) = [\rho_\lambda^*(f)(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* = \{[f(\lambda(\lambda(x)), \lambda(\lambda(y)))]^*\}^* = f(x, y).$$

Thus, $\rho_\lambda^*(fg) = \rho_\lambda^*(g) \rho_\lambda^*(f)$ and $\rho_\lambda^*(\rho_\lambda^*(f)) = f$ and so ρ_λ^* is an involution. \square

Remark 3.2. Note that if $*$ is an involution on K and λ is an involution on X , then

$$\rho_\lambda^*(a) = a^*, \forall a \in K \tag{3}$$

and

$$\rho_\lambda^*(e_x) = e_{\lambda(x)}, \forall x \in X. \tag{4}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let X be a connected poset with an involution λ and let $*$ be an involution on K . Then ρ_λ^* is of the second kind if and only if $*$ is of the second kind.*

Proof. Since X is connected, then $FI(X, K)$ is central by Proposition 2.6. Thus, by (3), ρ_λ^* is of the second kind if and only if $*$ is of the second kind. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let K be a field and X a connected poset. Then $FI(X, K)$ has an involution of the second kind if and only if K has an involution of the second kind and X has an involution.*

Proof. If K has an involution $*$ of the second kind and X has an involution λ , then ρ_λ^* is an involution of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$, by Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3.

Conversely, suppose ρ is an involution of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$. Given $x \in X$, by [8, Lemma 1], e_x is a primitive idempotent of $FI(X, K)$, and therefore $\rho(e_x)$ is also a primitive idempotent, by Proposition 2.1. Again by [8, Lemma 1], there is a unique $y \in X$ such that $\rho(e_x)$ is conjugate to e_y . Thus, ρ induces a map $\lambda : X \rightarrow X$ such that, given $x \in X$, $\rho(e_x)$ is conjugate to $e_{\lambda(x)}$. We will show that λ is an involution.

For each $x \in X$, let $f_x \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho(e_x) = f_x e_{\lambda(x)} f_x^{-1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} e_x &= \rho^2(e_x) = \rho(f_x e_{\lambda(x)} f_x^{-1}) = \rho(f_x)^{-1} \rho(e_{\lambda(x)}) \rho(f_x) \\ &= \rho(f_x)^{-1} f_{\lambda(x)} e_{\lambda^2(x)} f_{\lambda(x)}^{-1} \rho(f_x) \\ &= [\rho(f_x)^{-1} f_{\lambda(x)}] e_{\lambda^2(x)} [\rho(f_x)^{-1} f_{\lambda(x)}]^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\lambda^2(x) = x$. Let $x, y \in X$. By (2),

$$\begin{aligned} x \leq y &\Leftrightarrow e_x FI(X, K) e_y \neq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \rho(e_y) FI(X, K) \rho(e_x) \neq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow f_y e_{\lambda(y)} f_y^{-1} FI(X, K) f_x e_{\lambda(x)} f_x^{-1} \neq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow f_y e_{\lambda(y)} FI(X, K) e_{\lambda(x)} f_x^{-1} \neq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow e_{\lambda(y)} FI(X, K) e_{\lambda(x)} \neq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \lambda(y) \leq \lambda(x). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that λ is an involution.

Finally, since $FI(X, K)$ is a central algebra, by Proposition 2.6, then $\rho|_K$ is an involution on K , which is of the second kind because ρ is of the second kind. \square

To give a characterization of the involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ we need some lemmas.

Lemma 3.5. *Let K be a field and X a connected poset. Let ρ be an involution of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ that induces the involution λ on X . Let $x, y \in X$ with $x \leq y$. Then we have:*

$$(i) \quad \rho(e_y)(\lambda(y), \lambda(x)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho(e_{\lambda(x)})(x, y) = 0;$$

$$(i) \rho(e_x)(\lambda(y), \lambda(x)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho(e_{\lambda(y)})(x, y) = 0.$$

Proof. It is the same as for [3, Lemma 3.3]. \square

Let $Y \subseteq X$ be an arbitrary subset and consider $e_Y \in FI(X, K)$ defined by $e_Y(u, v) = 1$ if $u = v \in Y$ and $e_Y(u, v) = 0$ otherwise. Note that if $Y = \{x\}$, then $e_{\{x\}} = e_x$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let K be a field and X a connected poset. Let ρ be an involution of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ that induces the involution λ on X . Let $x, y \in X$ with $x \leq y$. Then, for any $Y \subseteq X$, $\rho(e_Y)(\lambda(y), \lambda(x)) = \rho(e_{Y'}) (\lambda(y), \lambda(x))$, where $Y' = \{z \in Y : \rho(e_z)(\lambda(z), \lambda(x)) \neq 0 \text{ and } \rho(e_z)(\lambda(y), \lambda(z)) \neq 0\}$.*

Proof. The proof is the same as for [3, Lemma 3.4]. \square

Theorem 3.7. *Let K be a field and X a connected poset. If ρ is an involution of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$, then $\rho = \Psi \circ M \circ \rho_\lambda^*$, where Ψ is an inner automorphism and M is a multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$, λ is the involution on X induced by ρ , and $*$ = $\rho|_K$.*

Proof. Let λ be the involution on X induced by ρ and $*$ = $\rho|_K$. Consider the involution ρ_λ^* on $FI(X, K)$. Define $f \in I(X, K)$ by

$$f(u, v) = (\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_u)(u, v) = \rho(e_{\lambda(u)})(u, v), \quad (5)$$

where the last equality follows from (4). We can show that $f \in FI(X, K)$ as was done in the proof of Theorem 3.5 of [3], replacing Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 of [3] by Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, respectively.

Let $y \in X$. For any $u \leq v$ in X we have

$$\begin{aligned} [f(\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y)](u, v) &= \sum_{u \leq t \leq v} f(u, t)(\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y)(t, v) \\ &= \sum_{u \leq t \leq v} (\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_u)(u, t)(\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y)(t, v) \\ &= [(\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_u) \cdot (\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y)](u, v) \\ &= [(\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_u e_y)](u, v) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \neq y \\ (\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y)(y, v) & \text{if } u = y \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \neq y \\ f(y, v) & \text{if } u = y \end{cases} \\ &= \sum_{u \leq t \leq v} e_y(u, t)f(t, v) \\ &= (e_y f)(u, v). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $f(\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y) = e_y f$, for all $y \in X$.

For each $x \in X$, let $g_x \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho(e_x) = g_x e_{\lambda(x)} g_x^{-1}$. Then $f(x, x) = \rho(e_{\lambda(x)})(x, x) = (g_{\lambda(x)} e_x g_{\lambda(x)}^{-1})(x, x) = 1$, and so $f \in U(FI(X, K))$. Thus, for all $y \in X$, $(\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y) = f^{-1} e_y f = \Psi_{f^{-1}}(e_y)$ and therefore

$$(\Psi_f \circ \rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*)(e_y) = e_y. \quad (6)$$

Now, $\rho|_K = * = \rho_\lambda^*|_K$, by (3). Thus, $\rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*$ is an automorphism of $FI(X, K)$, by [9, Lemma 2.2]. Therefore, it follows from (6) and [3, Proposition 2.3], that $\Psi_f \circ \rho \circ \rho_\lambda^*$ is a multiplicative automorphism, that is, there exists a multiplicative $\sigma \in I(X, K)$ such that $\Psi_f \circ \rho \circ \rho_\lambda^* = M_\sigma$ and then $\rho = \Psi_{f^{-1}} \circ M_\sigma \circ \rho_\lambda^*$. \square

4 Classification of involutions

From now on, the field K has characteristic different from 2 and X is a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Thus, by Proposition 2.6, $FI(X, K)$ is a central algebra. By [7, Remark 4], every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner if and only if the first cohomology group $H^1(X, K^\times)$ of X with values in the multiplicative group K^\times is trivial.

In this section, we present necessary and sufficient conditions for two involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ to be equivalent.

Theorem 4.1. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$. Then ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent if and only if there exist an automorphism α of X and an inner automorphism Ψ of $FI(X, K)$ such that $\rho_1 = \Psi \circ \hat{\alpha} \circ \rho_2 \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1} \circ \Psi^{-1}$.*

Proof. The involutions ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent if and only if there exists an automorphism Φ of $FI(X, K)$ such that $\Phi \circ \rho_2 = \rho_1 \circ \Phi$. By Theorem 2.7, $\Phi = \Psi \circ \hat{\alpha}$ where Ψ is an inner automorphism and α is an automorphism of X . Thus, ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent if and only if $\rho_1 = \Psi \circ \hat{\alpha} \circ \rho_2 \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1} \circ \Psi^{-1}$. \square

Note that in the theorem above, $\hat{\alpha} \circ \rho_2 \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1}$ is an involution on $FI(X, K)$ and it is equivalent to ρ_1 , via inner automorphism. Because of that, we start by looking for necessary and sufficient conditions for two involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ to be equivalent via inner automorphisms.

4.1 Classification via inner automorphisms

Proposition 4.2. *Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be involutions (of the first or second kind) on $FI(X, K)$. There exists $u \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\Psi_u \circ \rho_2 = \rho_1$ if and only if ρ_1 and ρ_2 induce the same involution on X and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K$.*

Proof. Suppose there exists $u \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\Psi_u \circ \rho_2 = \rho_1$. Let λ_1 and λ_2 be the involutions on X induced by ρ_1 and ρ_2 , respectively. For each $x \in X$, let $f_x \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_2(e_x) = f_x e_{\lambda_2(x)} f_x^{-1}$. Then

$$\rho_1(e_x) = (\Psi_u \circ \rho_2)(e_x) = u f_x e_{\lambda_2(x)} f_x^{-1} u^{-1} = (u f_x) e_{\lambda_2(x)} (u f_x)^{-1}.$$

Thus $\lambda_1(x) = \lambda_2(x)$ for all $x \in X$ and so $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 =: \lambda$. Denote $\rho_1|_K = *_{1}$ and $\rho_2|_K = *_{2}$. By Theorem 3.7 and [3, Theorem 3.5], there exist $v, w \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_1 = \Psi_v \circ \rho_{\lambda}^{*1}$ and $\rho_2 = \Psi_w \circ \rho_{\lambda}^{*2}$. Thus, for all $k \in K$, it follows from (3) that

$$\begin{aligned} k^{*1} &= \Psi_v(k^{*1}) = (\Psi_v \circ \rho_{\lambda}^{*1})(k) = \rho_1(k) = (\Psi_u \circ \rho_2)(k) = (\Psi_u \circ \Psi_w \circ \rho_{\lambda}^{*2})(k) \\ &= \Psi_{uw}(k^{*2}) = k^{*2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\rho_1|_K = *_{1} = *_{2} = \rho_2|_K$.

Conversely, suppose both involutions ρ_1 and ρ_2 induce the involution λ on X and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K =: *$. By Theorem 3.7 and [3, Theorem 3.5], there exist $v, w \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_1 = \Psi_v \circ \rho_{\lambda}^*$ and $\rho_2 = \Psi_w \circ \rho_{\lambda}^*$. So

$$\rho_1 = \Psi_v \circ \rho_{\lambda}^* = \Psi_v \circ \Psi_{w^{-1}} \circ \rho_2 = \Psi_{vw^{-1}} \circ \rho_2.$$

□

Theorem 4.3. *Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be involutions (of the first or second kind) on $FI(X, K)$. If there exists $u \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\Psi_u \circ \rho_2 = \rho_1 \circ \Psi_u$, then ρ_1 and ρ_2 induce the same involution on X and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K$.*

Proof. It follows directly from Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 4.2. □

It follows from Theorem 4.3 that two involutions on $FI(X, K)$ that induce different involutions on X or different involutions on K are not equivalent via inner automorphisms. For this reason, we fix an involution λ on X and an involution $*$ of the second kind on K and we are going to investigate when two involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ that induce λ on X and $*$ on K are equivalent via inner automorphisms.

Firstly, we obtain an important characterization of the involutions on $FI(X, K)$ that induce λ on X and $*$ on K , under the assumptions of this section.

Proposition 4.4. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let λ be an involution on X and $*$ an involution of the second kind on K . If ρ is an involution on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $*$ on K , then there is a ρ_{λ}^* -symmetric $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho = \Psi_v \circ \rho_{\lambda}^*$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.7, $\rho = \Psi_u \circ \rho_{\lambda}^*$ for some $u \in U(FI(X, K))$. Since $FI(X, K)$ is a central algebra, then, by Proposition 2.4 (ii), there is $k \in K^{\times}$ such that $\rho_{\lambda}^*(u) = ku$ and $\rho_{\lambda}^*(k) = k^* = k^{-1}$. By Proposition 2.5, there is $a \in K^{\times}$ such that $k = a^*a^{-1}$. Let $v = a^{-1}u \in U(FI(X, K))$. Then

$$\rho_{\lambda}^*(v) = \rho_{\lambda}^*(u)\rho_{\lambda}^*(a)^{-1} = ku(a^*)^{-1} = kuk^{-1}a^{-1} = v.$$

Moreover, since $uv^{-1} = a \in K$, then $\Psi_u = \Psi_v$, by [6, Proposition 2.2 (i)]. Therefore, $\rho = \Psi_v \circ \rho_{\lambda}^*$. □

Let (X_1, X_2, X_3) be a λ -decomposition of X . Let $\epsilon : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ be a map and consider $u_\epsilon \in U(FI(X, K))$ defined by

$$u_\epsilon(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 1 & \text{if } x = y \in X \setminus X_3 \\ \epsilon(x) & \text{if } x = y \in X_3 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Note that if $X_3 = \emptyset$ or $\epsilon(x) = 1$ for all $x \in X_3$, then $u_\epsilon = \delta$. For any $x, y \in X_3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\lambda^*(u_\epsilon)(x, y) &= [u_\epsilon(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 1 & \text{if } x = y \in X \setminus X_3 \\ [\epsilon(x)]^* & \text{if } x = y \in X_3 \end{cases} \\ &= u_\epsilon(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\rho_\lambda^*(u_\epsilon) = u_\epsilon$. By Proposition 2.4, $\rho_\epsilon := \Psi_{u_\epsilon} \circ \rho_\lambda^*$ is an involution on $FI(X, K)$ such that $\rho_\epsilon = \rho_\lambda^*$ when $X_3 = \emptyset$ or $\epsilon(x) = 1$ for all $x \in X_3$. Moreover, for any $x \in X$, $\rho_\epsilon(e_x) = u_\epsilon e_{\lambda(x)} u_\epsilon^{-1}$ by (4), therefore ρ_ϵ induces the involution λ on X . And, for $a \in K$, $\rho_\epsilon(a) = \Psi_{u_\epsilon}(a^*) = a^*$, by (3). Thus, $\rho_\epsilon|_K = *$. In particular, ρ_ϵ is of the second kind, since $*$ is of the second kind. Hence we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.5. *Let (X_1, X_2, X_3) be a λ -decomposition of X . Let $\epsilon : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ be a map and $u_\epsilon \in U(FI(X, K))$ as in (7). Then*

$$\rho_\epsilon = \Psi_{u_\epsilon} \circ \rho_\lambda^* \quad (8)$$

is an involution of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $$ on K . Moreover, $\rho_\epsilon = \rho_\lambda^*$ when $X_3 = \emptyset$ or $\epsilon(x) = 1$ for all $x \in X_3$.*

Lemma 4.6. *Let $u \in U(FI(X, K))$ be ρ_ϵ -symmetric. Then $u = v\rho_\epsilon(v)$ for some $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ if and only if $u(x, x) \in K_1$, for all $x \in X_3$.*

Proof. If there exists $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $u = v\rho_\epsilon(v)$, then for all $x \in X_3$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x, x) &= v(x, x)\rho_\epsilon(v)(x, x) = v(x, x)(u_\epsilon\rho_\lambda^*(v)u_\epsilon^{-1})(x, x) \\ &= v(x, x)u_\epsilon(x, x)[v(\lambda(x), \lambda(x))]^*u_\epsilon^{-1}(x, x) \\ &= v(x, x)[v(x, x)]^*u_\epsilon(x, x)[u_\epsilon(x, x)]^{-1} \\ &= v(x, x)[v(x, x)]^* \in K_1. \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose that for each $x \in X_3$ there exists $a_x \in K^\times$ such that $u(x, x) = a_x a_x^*$. For $x \leq y$ in X there are six possibilities:

- (1) $x, y \in X_1$;
- (2) $x, y \in X_2$;

- (3) $x \in X_1$ and $y \in X_2$;
- (4) $x \in X_1$ and $y \in X_3$;
- (5) $x \in X_3$ and $y \in X_2$;
- (6) $x = y \in X_3$.

So we define $v \in I(X, K)$ as follows, for each pair $x \leq y$ in X :

$$v(x, y) = \begin{cases} \delta_{xy} & \text{if } x, y \in X_1 \\ u(x, y) & \text{if } x, y \in X_2 \\ u(x, y)/2 & \text{if } x \in X_1 \text{ and } y \in X_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in X_1 \text{ and } y \in X_3 \\ u(x, y) & \text{if } x \in X_3 \text{ and } y \in X_2 \\ a_x & \text{if } x = y \in X_3 \end{cases}.$$

If $[r, s] \subseteq [x, y]$ is such that $r \neq s$ and $v(r, s) \neq 0$, then $r, s \in X_2$, or $r \in X_1$ and $s \in X_2$, or $r \in X_3$ and $s \in X_2$. In any of these cases, we get $u(r, s) \neq 0$. Since $u \in FI(X, K)$, the number of such intervals $[r, s]$ must be finite, hence $v \in FI(X, K)$. Moreover, clearly v is invertible.

Let $x \leq y$ in X . We are going to prove that $u(x, y) = (v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, y)$ for each of the six possibilities listed above.

(1. $x, y \in X_1$) In this case, $\lambda(x), \lambda(y) \in X_2$ and if $t \in X$ is such that $x \leq t \leq y$, then $t \in X_1$. Thus, $v(x, t) = 0$ for all $x < t \leq y$, so

$$\begin{aligned} (v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, y) &= \sum_{x \leq t \leq y} v(x, t)\rho_\epsilon(v)(t, y) = v(x, x)\rho_\epsilon(v)(x, y) \\ &= u_\epsilon(x, x)\rho_\lambda^*(v)(x, y)u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) = [v(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* = [u(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* \\ &= \rho_\lambda^*(u)(x, y) = u_\epsilon(x, x)\rho_\lambda^*(u)(x, y)u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) = \rho_\epsilon(u)(x, y) \\ &= u(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

(2. $x, y \in X_2$) We have $\lambda(x), \lambda(y) \in X_1$ and if $t \in X$ is such that $x \leq t \leq y$, then $t \in X_2$. So if $x \leq t < y$, then $v(\lambda(y), \lambda(t)) = 0$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, y) &= \sum_{x \leq t \leq y} v(x, t)(u_\epsilon\rho_\lambda^*(v)u_\epsilon^{-1})(t, y) \\ &= \sum_{x \leq t \leq y} v(x, t)u_\epsilon(t, t)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(t))]^*u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) \\ &= v(x, y)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(y))]^* \\ &= u(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

(3. $x \in X_1, y \in X_2$) In this case, if $x \leq t \leq y$, then $t \in X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3$. If $x < t < y$ and $t \in X_1 \cup X_3$, then $v(x, t) = 0$. And if $x < t < y$ and $t \in X_2$, then $\lambda(t) \in X_1$, therefore,

$$\rho_\epsilon(v)(t, y) = u_\epsilon(t, t)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(t))]^*u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) = [v(\lambda(y), \lambda(t))]^* = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
(v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, y) &= \sum_{x \leq t \leq y} v(x, t)\rho_\epsilon(v)(t, y) \\
&= v(x, x)\rho_\epsilon(v)(x, y) + v(x, y)\rho_\epsilon(v)(y, y) \\
&= u_\epsilon(x, x)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) \\
&\quad + \frac{u(x, y)}{2} u_\epsilon(y, y)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(y))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) \\
&= \left[\frac{u(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))}{2} \right]^* + \frac{u(x, y)}{2} \\
&= \frac{\rho_\lambda^*(u)(x, y)}{2} + \frac{u(x, y)}{2} \\
&= \frac{u_\epsilon(x, x)\rho_\lambda^*(u)(x, y)u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y)}{2} + \frac{u(x, y)}{2} \\
&= \frac{\rho_\epsilon(u)(x, y)}{2} + \frac{u(x, y)}{2} = \frac{u(x, y)}{2} + \frac{u(x, y)}{2} \\
&= u(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

(4. $x \in X_1, y \in X_3$) If $x \leq t \leq y$, then $t \in X_1 \cup X_3$, and $t \in X_3$ implies $t = y$.
Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, y) &= \sum_{x \leq t \leq y} v(x, t)\rho_\epsilon(v)(t, y) \\
&= v(x, x)\rho_\epsilon(v)(x, y) + v(x, y)\rho_\epsilon(v)(y, y) \\
&= u_\epsilon(x, x)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) + 0 \\
&= [v(y, \lambda(x))]^* [\epsilon(y)]^{-1} = [u(y, \lambda(x))]^* [\epsilon(y)]^{-1} \\
&= u_\epsilon(x, x)[u(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y)u_\epsilon(y, y)[\epsilon(y)]^{-1} \\
&= \rho_\epsilon(u)(x, y)\epsilon(y)[\epsilon(y)]^{-1} \\
&= u(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

(5. $x \in X_3, y \in X_2$) If $x \leq t \leq y$, then $t \in X_2 \cup X_3$, and $t \in X_3$ implies $t = x$.
Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, y) &= \sum_{x \leq t \leq y} v(x, t)\rho_\epsilon(v)(t, y) \\
&= v(x, x)u_\epsilon(x, x)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(x))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) \\
&\quad + \sum_{x < t \leq y} v(x, t)u_\epsilon(t, t)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(t))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) \\
&= 0 + v(x, y)u_\epsilon(y, y)[v(\lambda(y), \lambda(y))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(y, y) \\
&= u(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

(6. $x, y \in X_3$) In this case, $x = y$ and so

$$\begin{aligned}
(v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, y) &= (v\rho_\epsilon(v))(x, x) = v(x, x)\rho_\epsilon(v)(x, x) \\
&= a_x u_\epsilon(x, x)[v(\lambda(x), \lambda(x))]^* u_\epsilon^{-1}(x, x) \\
&= a_x [v(\lambda(x), \lambda(x))]^* = a_x [v(x, x)]^* \\
&= a_x a_x^* = u(x, x) \\
&= u(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

We thus conclude that $u = v\rho_\epsilon(v)$. \square

Since $\rho_\epsilon = \rho_\lambda^*$ when $X_3 = \emptyset$, the following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 4.7. *Let $u \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_\lambda^*(u) = u$. If $X_3 = \emptyset$, then $u = v\rho_\lambda^*(v)$ for some $v \in U(FI(X, K))$.*

In the case where $X_3 = \emptyset$ we have the following result.

Theorem 4.8. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let $*$ be an involution of the second kind on K and λ an involution on X such that $\lambda(x) \neq x$ for all $x \in X$. Then every involution on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $*$ on K is equivalent to ρ_λ^* (via inner automorphisms).*

Proof. Let ρ be an involution on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $*$ on K . By Proposition 4.4, there is $u \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_\lambda^*(u) = u$ and $\rho = \Psi_u \circ \rho_\lambda^*$. By Corollary 4.7, there is $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $u = v\rho_\lambda^*(v)$. Thus, by Lemma 2.3, ρ is equivalent to ρ_λ^* via inner automorphisms. \square

From now on we will analyze the case where $X_3 \neq \emptyset$.

Note that if $u \in FI(X, K)$ is ρ_λ^* -symmetric, then for each $x \in X_3$, $u(x, x) = \rho_\lambda^*(u)(x, x) = [u(\lambda(x), \lambda(x))]^* = [u(x, x)]^*$. Thus, for each $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_\lambda^*(v) = v$ we can define a map $\epsilon_v : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ by $\epsilon_v(x) = v(x, x)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let ρ be an involution on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $*$ on K . Then there is a ρ_λ^* -symmetric $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that ρ is equivalent to ρ_{ϵ_v} , via inner automorphisms.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.4, there is $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_\lambda^*(v) = v$ and $\rho = \Psi_v \circ \rho_\lambda^*$. Since $\rho_{\epsilon_v} = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_v}} \circ \rho_\lambda^*$, by (8), then $\rho = \Psi_v \circ \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_v}^{-1}} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_v} = \Psi_{vu_{\epsilon_v}^{-1}} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_v}$. Now

$$\rho_{\epsilon_v}(vu_{\epsilon_v}^{-1}) = \rho_{\epsilon_v}(u_{\epsilon_v})^{-1} \rho_{\epsilon_v}(v) = u_{\epsilon_v}^{-1} \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_v}}(\rho_\lambda^*(v)) = u_{\epsilon_v}^{-1} \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_v}}(v) = vu_{\epsilon_v}^{-1}.$$

Moreover, for each $x \in X_3$,

$$(vu_{\epsilon_v}^{-1})(x, x) = v(x, x)[u_{\epsilon_v}(x, x)]^{-1} = \epsilon_v(x)[\epsilon_v(x)]^{-1} = 1 \in K_1.$$

Thus, by Lemma 4.6, there exists $w \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $vu_{\epsilon_v}^{-1} = w\rho_{\epsilon_v}(w)$. It follows that $\rho = \Psi_{w\rho_{\epsilon_v}(w)} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_v}$ and hence ρ is equivalent to ρ_{ϵ_v} , via inner automorphisms, by Lemma 2.3. \square

It follows from lemma above that every involution ρ on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $*$ on K is equivalent, via inner automorphisms, to ρ_ϵ for some map $\epsilon : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$. Thus, to get a classification of involutions via inner automorphisms it is enough to find out what conditions $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ must satisfy for ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} to be equivalent via inner automorphisms.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ be maps. The involutions ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent via inner automorphisms if and only if there is $k \in K_0^\times$ such that, for each $x \in X_3$, $\epsilon_1(x) = ka_x\epsilon_2(x)$ for some $a_x \in K_1$.*

Proof. If ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent via inner automorphisms, then, by Lemma 2.3, there exists $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho_{\epsilon_1} = \Psi_{v\rho_{\epsilon_2}(v)} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2}$. On the other hand,

$$\rho_{\epsilon_1} = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_1}} \circ \rho_\lambda^* = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_1}} \circ \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1}} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1}} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2}, \quad (9)$$

by (8). Thus $\Psi_{v\rho_{\epsilon_2}(v)} = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1}}$, so by [6, Proposition 2.2 (i)] and Proposition 2.6, there is $k \in K^\times$ such that $v\rho_{\epsilon_2}(v) = ku_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1}$. By Lemma 4.6, for each $x \in X_3$, there is $a_x \in K_1$ such that $(v\rho_{\epsilon_2}(v))(x, x) = a_x$. Therefore, by (7),

$$a_x = ku_{\epsilon_1}(x, x)[u_{\epsilon_2}(x, x)]^{-1} = k\epsilon_1(x)[\epsilon_2(x)]^{-1}. \quad (10)$$

Since $a_x \in K_1 \subseteq K_0^\times$ and $\epsilon_1(x), \epsilon_2(x) \in K_0^\times$, then $k \in K_0^\times$. Thus, by (10), $\epsilon_1(x) = k^{-1}a_x\epsilon_2(x)$ with $k^{-1} \in K_0^\times$ and $a_x \in K_1$, for each $x \in X_3$.

Conversely, suppose there is $k \in K_0^\times$ such that, for each $x \in X_3$, $\epsilon_1(x) = ka_x\epsilon_2(x)$ for some $a_x \in K_1$. By (9) and [6, Proposition 2.2 (i)],

$$\rho_{\epsilon_1} = \Psi_{k^{-1}u_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1}} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2}. \quad (11)$$

Since $u_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1}$ and k are ρ_{ϵ_2} -symmetric, then so is $k^{-1}u_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1}$. Moreover, for any $x \in X_3$,

$$\begin{aligned} (k^{-1}u_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1})(x, x) &= k^{-1}u_{\epsilon_1}(x, x)[u_{\epsilon_2}(x, x)]^{-1} \\ &= k^{-1}\epsilon_1(x)[\epsilon_2(x)]^{-1} = a_x \in K_1. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.6, there is $v \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $k^{-1}u_{\epsilon_1}u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1} = v\rho_{\epsilon_2}(v)$. Thus, by (11), $\rho_{\epsilon_1} = \Psi_{v\rho_{\epsilon_2}(v)} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2}$, therefore ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent via inner automorphisms, by Lemma 2.3. \square

Let $\pi : K_0^\times \rightarrow K_0^\times/K_1$ be the canonical homomorphism. For any map $\epsilon : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$, let $\theta_\epsilon = \pi \circ \epsilon$. We define on the set $(K_0^\times/K_1)^{X_3}$ of all maps from X_3 to K_0^\times/K_1 the following equivalence relation: $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in (K_0^\times/K_1)^{X_3}$ are equivalent if there exists $g \in K_0^\times/K_1$ such that $\theta_1 = L_g \circ \theta_2$, where $L_g : K_0^\times/K_1 \rightarrow K_0^\times/K_1$ is the left multiplication by g .

Remark 4.11. For each $\theta \in (K_0^\times/K_1)^{X_3}$ there is $\epsilon : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ such that $\theta = \theta_\epsilon$. Indeed, for each $x \in X_3$ take an $a_x \in K_0^\times$ such that $\theta(x) = a_xK_1$ and define $\epsilon : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ by $\epsilon(x) = a_x$.

Corollary 4.12. *Let $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ be maps. The involutions ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent via inner automorphisms if and only if θ_{ϵ_1} and θ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent.*

Proof. If ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent via inner automorphisms, then there is $k \in K_0^\times$ such that, for each $x \in X_3$, $\epsilon_1(x) = ka_x\epsilon_2(x)$ for some $a_x \in K_1$, by Lemma 4.10. Thus, for any $x \in X_3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{\epsilon_1}(x) &= \pi(\epsilon_1(x)) = \epsilon_1(x)K_1 = (ka_x\epsilon_2(x))K_1 = (kK_1)(\epsilon_2(x)K_1) \\ &= (kK_1)\pi(\epsilon_2(x)) = (kK_1)\theta_{\epsilon_2}(x) = (L_{kK_1} \circ \theta_{\epsilon_2})(x).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\theta_{\epsilon_1} = L_{kK_1} \circ \theta_{\epsilon_2}$.

Conversely, if there is $g = kK_1 \in K_0^\times/K_1$ such that $\theta_{\epsilon_1} = L_g \circ \theta_{\epsilon_2}$, then for all $x \in X_3$,

$$\epsilon_1(x)K_1 = \theta_{\epsilon_1}(x) = (L_g \circ \pi \circ \epsilon_2)(x) = (kK_1)(\epsilon_2(x)K_1) = (k\epsilon_2(x))K_1.$$

So for each $x \in X_3$ there is $a_x \in K_1$ such that $\epsilon_1(x) = ka_x\epsilon_2(x)$. By Lemma 4.10, ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent via inner automorphisms. \square

If ρ is an involution on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $*$ on K , then there exists a map $\epsilon : X_3 \rightarrow K_0^\times$ such that ρ is equivalent to ρ_ϵ , via inner automorphisms, by Lemma 4.9. Thus, by Corollary 4.12, ρ induces on $(K_0^\times/K_1)^{X_3}$ only one equivalence class, namely, the equivalence class that contains θ_ϵ . Therefore, by Remark 4.11, the number of equivalence classes of involutions on $FI(X, K)$ that induce λ on X and $*$ on K , via inner automorphisms, is equal to the number of equivalence classes on the set $(K_0^\times/K_1)^{X_3}$. So we have the following result.

Theorem 4.13. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let $*$ be an involution of the second kind on K and λ an involution on X such that $\lambda(x) = x$ for some $x \in X$. Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be involutions on $FI(X, K)$ that induce λ on X and $*$ on K . Then ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent via inner automorphisms if and only if they induce the same equivalence class on $(K_0^\times/K_1)^{X_3}$.*

Since the cardinality of any equivalence class on $(K_0^\times/K_1)^{X_3}$ is equal to $|K_0^\times/K_1|$, there are $|K_0^\times/K_1|^{|X_3|-1}$ classes of involutions on $FI(X, K)$ that induce λ on X and $*$ on K , via inner automorphisms. Thus, in the particular case when $|X_3| = 1$, we have the following result.

Theorem 4.14. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let $*$ be an involution of the second kind on K and λ an involution on X such that $\lambda(x) = x$ for exactly one $x \in X$. Then every involution on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ on X and $*$ on K is equivalent to ρ_λ^* (via inner automorphisms).*

4.2 General classification

Finally, we will use Theorem 4.1 to obtain the classification of involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ from the classification via inner automorphisms.

Proposition 4.15. *Let ρ be an involution of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ that induces the involutions λ on X and $*$ on K , and let α be an automorphism of X . Then the involution $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$ induces the involution $\alpha \circ \lambda \circ \alpha^{-1}$ on X and the involution $*$ on K .*

Proof. For each $x \in X$, let $f_x \in U(FI(X, K))$ such that $\rho(e_x) = f_x e_{\lambda(x)} f_x^{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1})(e_x) &= (\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho)(e_{\alpha^{-1}(x)}) \\ &= \widehat{\alpha}(f_{\alpha^{-1}(x)} e_{\lambda(\alpha^{-1}(x))} f_{\alpha^{-1}(x)}^{-1}) \\ &= \widehat{\alpha}(f_{\alpha^{-1}(x)}) e_{(\alpha \circ \lambda \circ \alpha^{-1})(x)} [\widehat{\alpha}(f_{\alpha^{-1}(x)})]^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

whence $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$ induces $\alpha \circ \lambda \circ \alpha^{-1}$ on X . Now, since $FI(X, K)$ is central and $\widehat{\alpha}$ is K -linear, then, for all $a \in K$,

$$(\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1})(a) = (\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho)(a) = \widehat{\alpha}(a^*) = a^*.$$

□

As in [1, p.1953], we consider the following equivalence relation \sim on the set of all involutions on X : λ and μ are equivalent if there exists an automorphism α of X such that $\alpha \circ \lambda = \mu \circ \alpha$.

Corollary 4.16. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner.*

- (i) *If the involutions ρ_1 and ρ_2 of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ are equivalent, then they induce equivalent involutions on X and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K$.*
- (ii) *Let λ_1 and λ_2 be equivalent involutions on X , α an automorphism of X such that $\alpha \circ \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \circ \alpha$, and $*$ an involution of the second kind on K . If ρ is an involution on $FI(X, K)$ that induces λ_2 on X and $*$ on K , then ρ is equivalent to the involution $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$ which induces λ_1 on X and $*$ on K .*

Proof. (i) Let λ_1 and λ_2 be the involutions on X induced by the involutions ρ_1 and ρ_2 , respectively. If ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent, then there exists an automorphism α of X such that ρ_1 and $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho_2 \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$ are equivalent via inner automorphism, by Theorem 4.1. Thus, by Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 4.15, $\lambda_1 = \alpha \circ \lambda_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}$ and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K$.

(ii) It is clear that $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$ is an involution on $FI(X, K)$ which is equivalent to ρ . Moreover, $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$ induces λ_1 on X and $*$ on K , by Proposition 4.15. □

Remark 4.17. Let λ_1, λ_2 be equivalent involutions on X , and $X_3^{\lambda_i} = \{x \in X : \lambda_i(x) = x\}$, $i = 1, 2$. Let α be an automorphism of X such that $\alpha \circ \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \circ \alpha$. We have

$$\lambda_2(x) = x \Leftrightarrow \alpha(\lambda_2(x)) = \alpha(x) \Leftrightarrow \lambda_1(\alpha(x)) = \alpha(x).$$

Thus, $|X_3^{\lambda_1}| = |X_3^{\lambda_2}|$, and given $\epsilon : X_3^{\lambda_2} \rightarrow K_0^\times$ we have a well-defined map $\epsilon \circ \alpha^{-1} : X_3^{\lambda_1} \rightarrow K_0^\times$.

Theorem 4.18. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let λ_1, λ_2 be involutions on X such that $|X_3^{\lambda_1}| = |X_3^{\lambda_2}| \leq 1$. Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ that induce λ_1 and λ_2 on X , respectively. Then ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent if and only if λ_1 and λ_2 are equivalent and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K$.*

Proof. If ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent, then λ_1 and λ_2 are equivalent and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K$, by Corollary 4.16 (i).

Conversely, suppose λ_1 and λ_2 are equivalent and $\rho_1|_K = \rho_2|_K =: *$. By Theorems 4.8 and 4.14, ρ_i is equivalent (via inner automorphism) to $\rho_{\lambda_i}^*$, $i = 1, 2$. Let α be an automorphism of X such that $\alpha \circ \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \circ \alpha$. By Corollary 4.16 (ii), $\rho_{\lambda_2}^*$ is equivalent to the involution $\hat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\lambda_2}^* \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1}$. However, for any $f \in FI(X, K)$ and $x \leq y$ in X , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\lambda_2}^* \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1})(f)(x, y) &= (\rho_{\lambda_2}^* \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1})(f)(\hat{\alpha}^{-1}(x), \hat{\alpha}^{-1}(y)) \\ &= [\hat{\alpha}^{-1}(f)(\lambda_2(\alpha^{-1}(y)), \lambda_2(\alpha^{-1}(x)))]^* \\ &= [f((\alpha \circ \lambda_2 \circ \alpha^{-1})(y), (\alpha \circ \lambda_2 \circ \alpha^{-1})(x))]^* \\ &= [f(\lambda_1(y), \lambda_1(x))]^* = \rho_{\lambda_1}^*(f)(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\hat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\lambda_2}^* \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1} = \rho_{\lambda_1}^*$. Therefore, $\rho_{\lambda_1}^*$ and $\rho_{\lambda_2}^*$ are equivalent and hence ρ_1 and ρ_2 are equivalent. \square

The next theorem completes the classification of involutions of the second kind on $FI(X, K)$ (see Lemma 4.9, Corollary 4.12, Theorem 4.13, Corollary 4.16 and Theorem 4.18). To prove it, we need a lemma.

Lemma 4.19. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let $*$ be an involution of the second kind on K , λ_1, λ_2 equivalent involutions on X , and $X_3^{\lambda_i} = \{x \in X : \lambda_i(x) = x\}$, $i = 1, 2$. Let α be an automorphism of X such that $\alpha \circ \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \circ \alpha$. If $\rho_{\epsilon_2} = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_2}} \circ \rho_{\lambda_2}^*$, then $\hat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \hat{\alpha}^{-1} = \rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}$.*

Proof. By (7) and Remark 4.17, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\epsilon_2}(\alpha^{-1}(x), \alpha^{-1}(x)) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha^{-1}(x) \in X \setminus X_3^{\lambda_2} \\ \epsilon_2(\alpha^{-1}(x)) & \text{if } \alpha^{-1}(x) \in X_3^{\lambda_2} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in X \setminus X_3^{\lambda_1} \\ (\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1})(x) & \text{if } x \in X_3^{\lambda_1} \end{cases} \\ &= u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}(x, x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $f \in FI(X, K)$ and $x \leq y$ in X , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1})(f)(x, y) &= (\rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1})(f)(\alpha^{-1}(x), \alpha^{-1}(y)) \\
&= (\Psi_{u_{\epsilon_2}} \circ \rho_{\lambda_2}^* \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1})(f)(\alpha^{-1}(x), \alpha^{-1}(y)) \\
&= (u_{\epsilon_2}(\rho_{\lambda_2}^* \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1})(f)u_{\epsilon_2}^{-1})(\alpha^{-1}(x), \alpha^{-1}(y)) \\
&= u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}(x, x)\rho_{\lambda_2}^*(\widehat{\alpha}^{-1}(f))(\alpha^{-1}(x), \alpha^{-1}(y))u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}^{-1}(y, y) \\
&= u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}(x, x)[\widehat{\alpha}^{-1}(f)(\lambda_2(\alpha^{-1}(y)), \lambda_2(\alpha^{-1}(x)))]^*u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}^{-1}(y, y) \\
&= u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}(x, x)[f(\lambda_1(y), \lambda_1(x))]^*u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}^{-1}(y, y) \\
&= (\Psi_{u_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}} \circ \rho_{\lambda_1}^*)(f)(x, y) \\
&= \rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}(f)(x, y)
\end{aligned}$$

and hence $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1} = \rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}$. \square

Theorem 4.20. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2 and X a connected poset such that every multiplicative automorphism of $FI(X, K)$ is inner. Let λ_1, λ_2 be involutions on X such that $|X_3^{\lambda_1}| = |X_3^{\lambda_2}| > 1$. Let $*_i$ be an involution of the second on K , and $\epsilon_i : X_3^{\lambda_i} \rightarrow K_0^\times$ a map, $i = 1, 2$, such that the involutions $\rho_{\epsilon_1} = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_1}} \circ \rho_{\lambda_1}^{*1}$ and $\rho_{\epsilon_2} = \Psi_{u_{\epsilon_2}} \circ \rho_{\lambda_2}^{*2}$ are not equivalent via inner automorphisms. Then ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent if and only if $*_1 = *_2$ and there exists an automorphism α of X such that $\alpha \circ \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \circ \alpha$ (i.e., λ_1 and λ_2 are equivalent) and ρ_{ϵ_1} and $\rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}$ are equivalent, via inner automorphisms.*

Proof. If ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent, then by the proof of Corollary 4.16 (i), there exists an automorphism α of X such that ρ_{ϵ_1} and $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$ are equivalent via inner automorphisms, $\alpha \circ \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \circ \alpha$ and $*_1 = \rho_{\epsilon_1}|_K = \rho_{\epsilon_2}|_K = *_2$. By Lemma 4.19, $\widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1} = \rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}$. Therefore, ρ_{ϵ_1} and $\rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}$ are equivalent, via inner automorphisms.

Conversely, suppose that $*_1 = *_2 =: *$ and there exists an automorphism α of X such that $\alpha \circ \lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \circ \alpha$, and ρ_{ϵ_1} and $\rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}}$ are equivalent, via inner automorphisms. By Lemma 4.19, $\rho_{\epsilon_2 \circ \alpha^{-1}} = \widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1}$. It follows that there is an inner automorphism Ψ of $FI(X, K)$ such that $\Psi \circ \rho_{\epsilon_1} = \widehat{\alpha} \circ \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ \widehat{\alpha}^{-1} \circ \Psi$, that is, $(\widehat{\alpha}^{-1} \circ \Psi) \circ \rho_{\epsilon_1} = \rho_{\epsilon_2} \circ (\widehat{\alpha}^{-1} \circ \Psi)$ and hence ρ_{ϵ_1} and ρ_{ϵ_2} are equivalent. \square

References

- [1] Brusamarello, R., Fornaroli, E. Z., Santulo Jr., E. A., Classification of involutions on incidence algebras, *Comm. Algebra* **39** (2011) 1941–1955. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2010.480958>
- [2] Brusamarello, R., Fornaroli, E. Z., Santulo Jr., E. A., Anti-automorphisms and involutions on (finitary) incidence algebras, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **60** (2012) 181–188. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081087.2011.576393>

- [3] Brusamarello, R., Fornaroli, E. Z., Santulo Jr., E. A., Classification of involutions on finitary incidence algebras, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **24**(8) (2014), 1085–1098. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218196714500477>
- [4] Brusamarello, R., Lewis, D. W., Automorphisms and involutions on incidence algebras, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* **59**(11) (2011), 1247–1267. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03081087.2010.496113>
- [5] Di Vincenzo, O. M., Koshlukov, P., La Scala, R., Involutions for upper triangular matrix algebras, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **37**(4) (2006), 541–568. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aam.2005.07.004>
- [6] Fornaroli, E. Z., Pezzott, R. E. M., Anti-isomorphisms and involutions on the idealization of the incidence space over the finitary incidence algebra, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **637** (2022), 82–109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2021.12.005>
- [7] Khripchenko, N. S., Automorphisms of finitary incidence rings, *Algebra Discrete Math.* **9**(2) (2010), 78–97.
- [8] Khripchenko, N. S., Novikov, B. V., Finitary incidence algebras, *Comm. Algebra* **37**(5) (2009), 1670–1676. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927870802210019>
- [9] Quispe Urure, R. I., Silva, D. C., Involutions of the second kind for upper triangular matrix algebras, *Comm. Algebra* **51**(6) (2023), 2326–2333. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2022.2158193>
- [10] Scharlau, W., Automorphisms and involutions of incidence algebras, *Lectures Notes in Mathematics* **488** (1975), 340–350. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0081233>
- [11] Spiegel, E., Involutions in incidence algebras, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **405** (2005), 155–162. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2005.03.003>
- [12] Spiegel, E., Upper-triangular embeddings of incidence algebras with involution, *Comm. Algebra* **36**(5) (2008), 1675–1681. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927870801937224>
- [13] Spiegel, E., O’Donnell, C. J., *Incidence Algebras*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 206, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1997.