

On semicommutativity of rings relative to hypercenter

Nazeer Ansari¹

Department of Mathematics
Madanapalle Institute of Technology & Science
Madanapalle, Andhra pradesh, 517325
email:drnazeeransari@mits.ac.in

Kh. Herachandra singh
Department of Mathematics
Manipur University, Canchipur
Imphal, Manipur, 795003
email: heramath@manipuruniv.ac.in

Abstract

Armendariz and semicommutative rings are generalizations of reduced rings. In [4], I.N. Herstein introduced the notion of a hypercenter of a ring to generalize the center subclass. For a ring R , an element $a \in R$ is called hypercentral if $ax^n = x^na$ for all $x \in R$ and for some $n = n(x, a) \in \mathbb{N}$. Motivated by this definition, we introduce \mathcal{H} -Semicommutative rings as a generalization of semicommutative rings and investigate their relations with other classes of rings. We have proven that the class of \mathcal{H} -Semicommutative rings lies strictly between Zero-Insertive rings (ZI) and Abelian rings. Additionally, we have demonstrated that if R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the matrix subring $S'_n(R)$ is also \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Among other significant results, we have established that if R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative and left SF , then R is strongly regular. We have also shown that \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings are 2-primal, providing sufficient conditions for a ring R to be nil-singular. Additionally, we have proven that if every simple singular module over R is $wnil$ -injective and R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then R is reduced. Furthermore, we have studied the relationship of \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings with the classes of Baer, Quasi-Baer, p.p. rings, and p.q. rings in this article, and we have provided some more relevant results.

2020 MSC: 16D80, 16U80.

keywords: Hypercenter; semicommutative ring; \mathcal{H} -Semicommutative ring.

1 Introduction

In this article, R represents an associative ring with unity (unless R is a nil ring). We write $rad(R)$, $Nil(R)$, $Nil_*(R)$, $Nil^*(R)$, $Z(R)$, and $T(R)$ to represent the Jacobson

¹Corresponding author

radical, the set of all nilpotent elements, the lower nilradical, the upper nilradical, the set of all central elements, and the set of all hypercentral elements of R , respectively. For a non-empty set $X \subseteq R$, an element $a \in R$ is called left(right)-annihilator if $aX = 0(Xa = 0)$. We also write $l_R(X)(R_R(X))$ to denote the set of all left(right)-annihilators for a non-empty set $X \subseteq R$. A ring R is called *reduced* if $Nil(R) = (0)$. A ring R is reversible if, for any $u, v \in R$, the condition $uv = 0$ implies $vu = 0$. A ring R is called *semicommutative* if, whenever $u, v \in R$ satisfy $uv = 0$, the condition $uRv = 0$ holds. *semicommutative* rings are a generalization of *reduced* rings. R is called *directly finite* if for any $u, v \in R$, $uv = 1$ implies $vu = 1$. R is called an *NI-ring* if $Nil(R)$ forms an ideal of R . Many authors have extensively studied *semicommutative* rings for the past few decades and developed many new generalizations. Hwang, in [5], introduced the notion of an *R-IFP* (*insertion of factor property*) ring. R is called *R-IFP* if, for any $u, v \in R$ with $v \neq 0$, $uv = 0$ implies $uRw = 0$ for some $0 \neq w \in R$. Chen, in [12], introduced *weakly semicommutative* rings as a generalization of *semicommutative* rings. R is called *weakly semicommutative* if the condition $uRv \in Nil(R)$ holds true whenever $u, v \in R$ satisfy $uv = 0$. In [9], R is called *nil-semicommutative* if whenever $uv \in Nil(R)$ for some $u, v \in R$, then $uRv \subseteq Nil(R)$. We denote these rings as *nil-semicommutative-II* to avoid nomenclature clashes with other generalizations. In [6], R is called *nil-semicommutative* if any elements u and v in $Nil(R)$ that satisfy $uv = 0$ also satisfy $uRv = 0$. We denote these rings by *nil-semicommutative-I*. In [8], R is called *central semicommutative* ring if the condition $uRv \subseteq Z(R)$ holds whenever $u, v \in R$ satisfy $uv = 0$. In [13], R is called *J-semicommutative* ring if the condition $uRv \subseteq rad(R)$ holds whenever $u, v \in R$ satisfy $uv = 0$. In [4], I.N. Herstein introduced the notion of the hypercenter of a ring. For a ring R , an element $a \in R$ is called hypercentral if $ax^n = x^n a$ for every $x \in R$ and for some $n = n(x, a) \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, the hypercenter of ring R is defined as:

$$T(R) = \{a \in R \mid ax^n = x^n a \forall x \in R, n = n(x, a) \geq 1\}$$

From the definition, it is easy to see that the hypercenter forms a subring of R and that $Z(R) \subseteq T(R)$. For a ring R , we note that $T(R)$ does not necessarily equal $Z(R)$. For instance, if R is a noncommutative nil ring, then $T(R) = R$ but $Z(R) \neq R$. Thus, we can see the hypercenter as a generalization of the center of a ring. However, I.N. Herstein in [4] showed that if R is either semiprime or has no non-zero nil ideals, then the hypercenter and the centre of R coincide. Given these generalizations of $Z(R)$, a natural question arises: what happens if we replace $Z(R)$ with $T(R)$ in the class of generalized semicommutative rings?

The purpose of this article is to introduce \mathcal{H} -*semicommutative* rings as a generalization of *semicommutative* rings and investigate their relations with other classes of rings. We say a ring R is \mathcal{H} -*semicommutative* if whenever $ab = 0$ for some $a, b \in R$, then arb is hypercentral for each $r \in R$. We have proven that the class of \mathcal{H} -Semicommutative rings lies strictly between Zero-Insertive rings (ZI) and Abelian rings. Additionally, we have shown that if R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the matrix subring

$S'_n(R)$ is also \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Among other important results, we have demonstrated that if R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative and left SF , then R is strongly regular. We show that \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings are 2-primal and provide sufficient conditions for a ring R to be nil-singular. Furthermore, we prove that if every simple singular module over R is w nil-injective and R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then R is reduced. Additionally, we study the relationship of \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings with the classes of Baer, Quasi-Baer, p.p. rings, and p.q. rings and present more relevant results.

2 \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings

Here, we introduce \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings, which contain the class of *semicommutative* rings. On the other hand, every reduced ring is Armendariz and *semicommutative*. We demonstrate that there exists a large class of \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings that are not reduced. Thus, \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings constitute an independent category within the class of *semicommutative* rings.

Definition 2.1. A ring R is called \mathcal{H} -semicommutative if $uv = 0$ implies that $uRv \subseteq T(R)$ for any $u, v \in R$.

From the above definition, we can easily say that the class of \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings is closed under subrings. Furthermore, all reduced and central semicommutative rings are \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings. Next, we have noted a result that generates a large class of rings which are \mathcal{H} -semicommutative but neither reduced nor central-semicommutative.

Proposition 2.2. *Every nil rings are \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.*

Proof. The proof follows easily since $T(R) = R$. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let R be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Then R is central semicommutative if any of the following conditions is true.*

- (1) R is division ring.
- (2) R is semisimple ring.
- (3) R be a ring with no nonzero nil ideal.

Proof. The proof is follows easily from [4]. □

Proposition 2.4. *Every \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring is nil-semicommutative-II.*

Proof. Let $u \in N(R)$ such that $u^n = 0$. Thus by Lemma 2.2 in [10], it is enough to show that $ru \in N(R)$ for all $r \in R$. We have $u^n = u^{n-1}.u = 0 \Rightarrow u^{n-1}ru \in T(R)$ for all $r \in R$. This implies $(u^{n-1}ru)(ru)^m = (ru)^m(u^{n-1}ru) = (ru)^{m-1}ru(u^{n-1}ru) = 0$. Thus we get $u^{n-1}(ru)^{m+1} = 0$. Hence $u^{n-2}ru(ru)^{m+1} \in T(R)$. This implies

$u^{n-2}ru(ru)^{m+1}(ru)^p = (ru)^p(u^{n-2}ru(ru)^{m+1}) = (ru)^{p-1}.r(u^{n-1}ru(ru)^{m+1}) = 0$. Thus we get $u^{n-2}ru(ru)^{m+1}(ru)^p = u^{n-3}u(ru)^{m+p+2} = 0$. Hence $u^{n-3}ru(ru)^{m+p+2} \in T(R)$. Proceeding in similar way we get $u^{n-3}(ru)(ru)^{m+p+2}(ru)^q = (ru)^q\{u^{n-3}ru(ru)^{m+p+2}\} = (ru)^{q-1}r\{u^{n-2}ru(ru)^{m+1}(ru)^p\} = 0$. Hence we get $u^{n-3}(ru)^{m+p+q+3} = 0$. Proceeding similarly we get $(ru)^t = 0$ for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies $ru \in N(R)$. \square

Proposition 2.5. *If a ring R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then R is abelian and for any idempotent $e = e^2 \in R$ the rings eR and $(1 - e)R$ are \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.*

Proof. Since eR and $(1 - e)R$ are subring of R recall that \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings are closed under subring. Thus now it is left to show that R is abelian. We have $e(1 - e) = 0$ which implies $er(1 - e) \in T(R)$. This implies for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $er(1 - e)(1 - e)^n = (1 - e)^n er(1 - e) = (1 - e)er(1 - e) = 0$. Thus we have $er(1 - e)^{n+1} = er(1 - e) = 0 \Rightarrow er = ere$. Again $(1 - e)e = 0$ implies $(1 - e)re \in T(R)$ for all $r \in R$. Processing similarly we have for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(1 - e)^n(1 - e)re = (1 - e)re(1 - e)^n = 0$. This implies $(1 - e)^{n+1}re = (1 - e)re = 0 \Rightarrow re = ere$. Thus we get $er = re$. Hence R is abelian. \square

Proposition 2.6. *If a ring R is abelian and for some idempotent $e = e^2 \in R$ the rings eR and $(1 - e)R$ are \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.*

Proof. let us assume that $ab = 0$ for some $a, b \in R$. This implies $eaeb = 0 \Rightarrow eaeb = 0$. This implies $(ea)er(eb) \in T(eR)$ for all $r \in R$. Thus $eaereb(es)^n = (es)^n eaereb \Rightarrow earbs^n = s^n earb$ for all $s \in R$. Thus we have $earb \in T(R)$. Again by applying similar procedure we get $(1 - e)arb \in T(R)$. Thus $earb + (1 - e)arb = arb \in T(R)$. \square

Upon examining Proposition 2.6, it may seem that the requirement for eR and $(1 - e)R$ to be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative is superfluous. However, the example provided below will demonstrate that this is not the case.

Example 2.7. There exist a ring R which is abelian but not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.

Proof. Let us consider a ring R as follows:

$$R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ w & x \end{pmatrix} \mid u, v, w, x \in \mathbb{Z}, u \equiv x \pmod{2}, w \equiv v \pmod{2} \right\}$$

. Then the only idempotent elements are $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Hence it is abelian.

Now let $P = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus $PQ = 0$, let us take any arbitrary

$C = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ in R , then $PCQ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -8 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. We can see that $PCQ \notin T(R)$ as for

$K = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in R$ $PCQK^n = 0$ but $K^n PCQ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -8.4^n \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Hence $PCQK^n \neq K^n PCQ$. \square

Next, we investigate some triangular matrix subrings, which provide a good supply of rings that are \mathcal{H} -semicommutative but not semicommutative, as well as rings that are nil-semicommutative but not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. For a ring R , let $T_n(R)$ denote the set of all $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices, and let $V_n(R) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} E_{i,i+1}$. For $T_n(R)$, consider the following subsets:

$$A_n(R) = \sum_{i=1}^n N(R)E_{ii} + \sum_{l=2}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} RV_n^{l-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor+i}^n RE_{ij}$$

$$B_n(R) = \sum_{i=1}^n N(R)E_{ii} + \sum_{l=3}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} RV_n^{l-2} + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor+1} \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor+i-1}^n RE_{ij}$$

$$U_n(R) = \sum_{i=1}^n N(R)E_{ii} + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor+1} RE_{ij} + \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor+2}^n RE_{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor+1,j}$$

$$S'_n(R) = \sum_{i=1}^n N(R)E_{ii} + \sum_{i<j} RE_{ij}$$

$$S_n(R) = RI_n + \sum_{i<j} RE_{ij}$$

$$T(R, n) = RI_n + \sum_{l=2}^n RV_n^{l-1}$$

$$T'(R, n) = \sum_{i=1}^n N(R)E_{ii} + \sum_{l=2}^n RV_n^{l-1}$$

Proposition 2.8. *For a ring R , the following statements are true.*

- (1) *If R is reduced, then $T(R, n)$, $A_n(R)$, $U_n(R)$ is central semicommutative.*
- (2) *If R is nil simicommutative-II, then $T_n(R)$ is nil-semicommutative-II.*
- (3) *For any ring R , $T_n(R)$ is not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.*

- (4) If R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then $S'_n(R)$, $U_n(R)$, $A_n(R)$, $T'_n(R, n)$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative but not central semicommutative.
- (5) If R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, then $B_n(R)$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ but not central semicommutative for $n = 2, 3$.

Proof. (1) The proof follows from Lemma 2.9 in [8] and Theorem 2.1 in [3].

(2) The proof follows from Corollary 2.12 in [9].

(3) If possible, assume that for $n \geq 2$, $T_n(R)$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Then by 2.6, $T_n(R)$ is an abelian ring. Consider E_{22} , which is clearly idempotent. Since $T_n(R)$ is abelian, this implies $E_{22} \in Z(T_n(R))$. However, we see that $E_{22}E_{12} = 0_{n \times n} \neq E_{12} = E_{12}E_{22}$. Hence, we get a contradiction, implying that $T_n(R)$ is not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.

(4) Since $A_n(R)$, $U_n(R)$, $T'_n(R, n)$ are subsets of $S'_n(R)$. Thus it is sufficient to show that $S'_n(R)$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Again since R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, implies $nil(R)$ is an ideal of R which makes $S'_n(R)$ as a nil ring. Thus by Proposition 2.2, $S'_n(R)$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Now we proceed to show that they are not central semicommutative ring. For $U_n(R)$, Let $a, c \in Nil(R)$ such that $a^p = 0$ and $c^q = 0$ for some $1 < p, q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then consider $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & c^{q-1} \\ 0 & c^{q-1} \end{pmatrix}$ and $B = \begin{pmatrix} a^{p-1} & a^{p-1} \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ be any elements of $U_2(R)$. Then we see that $AB = \begin{pmatrix} a & c^{q-1} \\ 0 & c^{q-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a^{p-1} & a^{p-1} \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Now consider $C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have $ACB = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ac \\ 0 & o \end{pmatrix}$. On the other hand we see that $\begin{pmatrix} o & ac \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ but however $\begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ac \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & tac \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ may not be a zero matrix. Thus $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & ac \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin C(U_2(R))$. Hence $U_2(R)$ is not central semicommutative. Since $U_2(R)$ is embedded as subring in $U_n(R)$ for $n \geq 2$. Thus we can say that $U_n(R)$ is not central semicommutative. Similarly we can show that $S'_n(R)$, $A_n(R)$, $T'_n(R, n)$ are not central semicommutative.

(5). Since R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative, implies $nil(R)$ is an ideal of R which makes $B_n(R)$ as a nil ring. Thus by Proposition 2.2, $B_n(R)$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand $B_2(R)$ is not central semicommutative by similar counter example given in (4). □

Recall that if $uv = 1$ implies $vu = 1$ for any $u, v \in R$, then R is called directly finite.

Proposition 2.9. *Every \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring is directly finite.*

Proof. Let us consider $uv = 1$ for some $u, v \in R$. This implies $u(vu - 1) = 0 \Rightarrow ur(vu - 1) \in T(R)$ for all $r \in R$. This implies for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $v^n ur(vu - 1) = ur(vu - 1)v^n = vr(vuv^n - v^n) = 0$. Thus $v^n ur(vu - 1) = 0$. By taking $r = v$, we have $v^n uv(vu - 1) = v^{n-1}(uv - 1) = 0$. Multiplying by u from the left side we get $v^{n-2}(uv - 1) = 0$. Repeating the same left multiplication by u , after finite steps we get $vu = 1$. \square

Recall that for a ring R , the intersection of all prime ideals is known as the prime radical, denoted by $P(R)$. Obviously, $P(R) \subseteq Nil(R)$. R is called 2-primal if $P(R) = Nil(R)$.

Proposition 2.10. *Every \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring is 2-primal ring.*

Proof. We use induction on nilpotency of elements. Let $u \in R$ is such that $u^2 = 0$. Then by hypothesis we get $uru \in T(R)$ for every $r \in R$. Thus for any $r, s \in R$, we have $(us)^n uru = uru(us)^n = uru^2 s(us)^{n-1} = 0$, where $n = n(r, s) \in \mathbb{N}$. let P be any prime ideal, then we have $us(us)^{n-1}uru \in P$ implies $u \in P$. Thus $u \in P(R)$. Again let us consider $u^3 = 0$, then this implies $uru^2 \in T(R)$ for all $r \in R$. Then for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $u^t uru^2 = uruu^t = 0$. Thus $usu^{t-1}uru^2 \in T(R)$. Again by similar procedure its easy to see that $u \in P(R)$. Thus by induction we conclude that $N(R) \subseteq P(R)$. \square

Corollary 2.11. *Every \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings is J -semicommutative.*

We recall that for any $u \in Nil(R)$ and a module ${}_R M$, if the left R -homomorphism $f : Ru \rightarrow {}_R M$ can be extended to $R \rightarrow {}_R M$, then ${}_R M$ is called *left nil-injective*. On the other hand ${}_R M$ is called *left wnil-injective* if for any $u \in nil(R)$, there exists a $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $u^n \neq 0$ and any left R -homomorphism $f : Ru^n \rightarrow {}_R M$ can be extended to $R \rightarrow {}_R M$. It is obvious that *left nil-injective* implies *left wnil-injective*. Similarly R is called *left(right) nil-injective* if ${}_R R(R_R)$ is *left(right) nil-injective* and R is called *left(right) wnil-injective* if ${}_R R(R_R)$ is *left(right) wnil-injective*.

Proposition 2.12. *Let R be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring. If every simple singular left R -module is wnil-injective then R is reduced.*

Proof. Let us consider $u \in R$ such that $u^2 = 0$. If possible assume that $u \neq 0$. Then $l(u) \neq R$. Thus by hypothesis \exists a maximal left ideal K such that $u \in l(u) \subseteq K$. Again if K is not essential in ${}_R R$ then \exists some idempotent $e \in R$ such that $K = Re = R(1-e)$. This will imply that $u(1-e) = 0$. Since R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative implies $(1-e)u = 0$. Thus $(1-e) \in l(u) \subseteq l(1-e)$. Thus $(1-e)^2 = 0$ which is a contradiction. Thus K is essential in ${}_R R$ and hence R/K is *wnil-injective*. Now consider a module homomorphism $f : Ru \rightarrow R/K$ given by $f(ru) = r + K$. Then by hypothesis $\exists g : R \rightarrow R/K$ given as $g(u) = f(u)$. Now we have $1+K = f(u) = g(u) = ug(1) = uv+K$ where $g(1) = v+K$. Thus $1-uv \in K$. Also since $u^2 = 0$ and R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative,

there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(ru)^t(uru) = uru(ru)^t = 0$. Thus we get $uv \in \text{Nil}(R)$ which implies $1 - uv$ is unit in R . This gives a contradiction that K is maximal. Hence we get $u = 0$ and thus R is reduced. \square

A ring R is referred to as a left (or right) $GP - V'$ -ring if every simple singular left (or right) R -module is GP-injective. A left ideal L of R is termed a GW -ideal if, for any $a \in L$, there exists a positive integer $n \geq 1$ such that $a^n R \subseteq L$. The concept of a GW -ideal for right ideals K of R is defined in a similar manner.

Corollary 2.13. *Let R be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring. Then R is strongly regular if and only if every maximal left ideal of R are GW -ideals and R is left $GP-V'$ ring.*

Proof. Let us consider every maximal left ideal of R are GW -ideals and R is left $GP-V'$ ring. Then by 2.12, R is reduced. Thus by Theorem 2.3, R is central semicommutative and Hence by Theorem 2.13 in [10], R is strongly regular. The converse part is a well known result. \square

Corollary 2.14. *Let R be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring. Then R is strongly regular if and only if every maximal right ideal of R are GW -ideals and R is right $GP-V'$ ring.*

Recall that R is called left SF-ring if every simple left R -module is flat.

Proposition 2.15. *Let R be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. If R is left SF, then R is strongly regular*

Proof. Let us consider $u \in R$ satisfies $uRu = 0$. If possible assume that $u \neq 0$. Then there exists a maximal left ideal K such that $u \in r(uR) \subseteq K$. Again by hypothesis that R is left SF, there exists a $t \in K$ such that $u = ut$. Thus $u(1 - t) = 0$ and since R is \mathcal{H} , we have $uR(1 - t) \subseteq T(R)$. Again if possible let us assume that $uR(1 - t) \neq 0$. Then again by similar process we have a $g \in R$ such that $ug(1 - t) \neq 0$. This implies $l(ug(1 - t)) \neq R$. Then again \exists a maximal left ideal L such that $l(ug(1 - t)) \subseteq L$. Also $uRu = 0$ implies $ug(1 - t)ug(1 - t) = 0$. This implies $ug(1 - t) \in l(ug(1 - t)) \subseteq L$. Thus there exists $l \in L$ such that $ug(1 - t) = lug(1 - t) \Rightarrow (1 - l)(ug(1 - t)) = 0 \Rightarrow 1 - l \in l(ug(1 - t)) \subseteq L$. Thus $1 \in L$ which gives us a contradiction. Thus $uR(1 - t) = 0 \Rightarrow 1 - t \in r(uR) \subseteq K \Rightarrow 1 \in K$ which is again a contradiction. This shows that $u = 0$. Thus R is semiprime. Hence by Proposition 2.3 R is central semicommutative. Thus by Theorem 2.17 in [10], R is strongly regular. \square

Recall that a right ideal I of R is called right essential if $I \cap J \neq 0$ for every non-zero right ideal J . Left essential ideals are defined similarly. The right singular ideal $\mathcal{Z}_r(R)$ is defined as the set of all $r \in R$ such that $R_R(r)$ is essential right ideal. left singular ideal $\mathcal{Z}_l(R)$ is defined similarly. It is well known that $\mathcal{Z}_r(R)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_l(R)$ are two sided ideals. In [2], R is called *nil singular* if both $\mathcal{Z}_r(R)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_l(R)$ are nil ideals. It is well known that if the *A.C.C* condition is satisfy on every left and right annihilator of $r \in R$, then R is *nil singular*. Here we record some other conditions for R to be *nil singular*.

Proposition 2.16. *Let R be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Then R is nil singular if any one of the following condition holds.*

- (1). $R/Nil(R)$ is left SF-ring.
- (2). $R/Nil(R)$ is left GP- V' ring with every maximal left ideals are GW-ideals.
- (3). $R/Nil(R)$ is right GP- V' ring with every maximal right ideals are GW-ideals.

Proof. R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Thus by proposition 2.6 R is abelian and by Proposition 2.10, R is 2-primal. This implies $Nil(R)$ is ideal and obviously $R/Nil(R)$ is reduced and hence $R/Nil(R)$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. By Proposition 2.15 $R/Nil(R)$ is strongly regular. Hence $R/Nil(R)$ is regular. Thus R is π -regular. Since every π -regular ring is nil-singular (see Proposition 2.2 in [2]). Thus result (1) follows. The proof for (2) and (3) follows similarly. \square

Next, we study the localization of rings. Let S denote a multiplicatively closed subset of R consisting of centrally regular elements. Then $S^{-1}R$ is the localization of R at S

Proposition 2.17. *Let R be a ring. Then R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative if and only if $S^{-1}R$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.*

Proof. Let us suppose that R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. let $p_1 = a^{-1}p$ and $q_1 = b^{-1}q$ are any elements of $S^{-1}R$ are such that $p_1q_1 = 0$. Since $a, b \in S$ and S is central regular subset implies $p_1q_1 = a^{-1}pb^{-1}q = a^{-1}b^{-1}pq = 0$. This implies $pq = 0$. So by hypothesis $prq \in T(R)$ for every $r \in R$. Let $u \in S$ and $t \in R$. Then we have $a^{-1}b^{-1}u^{-1} \in C(R) \subseteq T(R)$ and $ptq \in T(R)$. So $a^{-1}b^{-1}u^{-1}ptq = (a^{-1}p)(u^{-1}t)(b^{-1}q) = p_1t_1q_1 \in T(R)$. Thus $S^{-1}R$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Conversely let us suppose that $S^{-1}R$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Since R is embedded as a subring in $S^{-1}R$ and \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings are closed under subring. Thus R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. \square

Corollary 2.18. *let R be a ring. Then $R[x]$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative if and only if $R[x, x^{-1}]$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.*

Proof. Consider $S = \{1, x, x^2, \dots\}$. Then clearly S is multiplicative closed subset of $R[x]$ consisting of central regular elements. Thus the proof follows from Proposition 2.17. \square

Next we record an example of ring R and an ideal I of R such that both R and I are \mathcal{H} -semicommutative but the quotient ring R/I is not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.

Example 2.19. Consider $R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F & F \\ 0 & F & F \\ 0 & 0 & F \end{pmatrix}$ and $I = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & F & F \\ 0 & 0 & F \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, where F represent a field. Then $R/I \cong F \oplus F \oplus F$. Then its clear that R/I is not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative

and since $I \subseteq Nil(R)$ implies I is also \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. However R is not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. For this let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have $A.B = 0$. Let $C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$. Then $ACB = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Let us choose $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ any arbitrary element of R where $c \neq 0$. Then we can see that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ $X^n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c^n \end{pmatrix}$. Thus $X^n ACB = 0$ and $ACBX^n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c^n \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus $X^n ACB \neq ACBX^n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence R is not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.

Here, we provide an example of a ring R that is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative; however, R/I is not \mathcal{H} -semicommutative for some ideal I of R .

Example 2.20. Let $R = D[x, y]$ be a ring of polynomial over two variables where D is a division ring. Let us consider $I = \langle x^2 \rangle$ be an ideal of R such that $xy^n \neq y^n x$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since R is semicommutative implies R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative but, $(x + I)^2 = I$ and $(x + I)(y^n + I)(x + I)$ is not in $T(R/I)$.

Proposition 2.21. Let R/I is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative for some ideal I of R . If I is reduced then R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.

Proof. let $p, q \in R$ are such that $pq = 0$. we have $qIa \subseteq I$ and $(qIa)^2 = 0$ and $qIa = 0$ as I is reduced. Therefore $((pRq)I)^2 = 0$ and so $(pRq)I = 0$. Now $(p + I)(q + I) = pq + I = I$ and since R/I is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative implies $(p + I)(R + I)(q + I) = pRq + I \in T(R/I)$. By hypothesis $(paq + I)(r^n + I) = (r^n + I)(paq + I)$. This implies $paqr^n - r^n paq \in I$ for every $a, r \in R$. So we get $(paqr^n - r^n paq)^2 \in (paqr^n - r^n paq)I = 0$ since $(pRq)I = 0$. Thus $paqr^n = r^n paq$ for each $r, a \in R$. Hence R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. \square

Proposition 2.22. let R be a Armendariz ring. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.
- (2) $R[x]$ is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative.

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (1) The proof is straightforward since subring of \mathbb{H} -semicommutative ring are closed.(1) \Rightarrow (2) Let us consider $f(x) = \sum_{l=0}^n u_l x^l$ and $g(x) = \sum_{k=0}^m v_k x^k$ are any two elements of $R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$. Since R is Armendariz implies $u_l v_k = 0$. Thus by hypothesis, $u_l R v_k \in T(R)$. Since $T(R)$ is closed under addition, this implies $f(x)R[x]g(x) \in T(R[x])$. Hence R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. \square

Here next we have shown that the hypothesis of R is Armendariz ring is not a superfluous.

Example 2.23. Let $L = \mathbb{Z}_2 \langle d_0, d_1, d_2, d_3, e_0, e_1 \rangle$ be the free algebra(with 1) over \mathbb{Z}_2 generated by six indeterminates(as labeled above). Let I be a ideal generated by the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} & d_0e_0, d_0e_1 + d_1e_0, d_1e_1 + d_2e_0, \\ & d_2e_1 + d_3e_0, d_3e_1, d_0a_k(0 \leq k \leq 3), d_3d_k(0 \leq k \leq 3), \\ & d_1d_k + d_2d_k(0 \leq k \leq 3), e_l e_k(0 \leq l, k \leq 1), e_l d_k(0 \leq l \leq 1, 0 \leq k \leq 3) \end{aligned}$$

Let $R = L/I$. Neilsen in [7], proved that A is *semicommutative* but not McCoy. Further, R is not \mathcal{H} -*semicommutative* as consider $p(x) = d_0 + d_1x + d_2x^2 + d_3x^3$ and $m(x) = e_0 + e_1x$. The above relations suggest that $p(x)m(x) = 0$ in $R[x]$, but however we can see that $p(x)d_0m(x) \neq 0$ since $d_1d_0e_1 + d_0d_1e_2 \notin T(R[x])$.

Recall that an element $a \in R$ is said to be multiplicatively finite if the set $S = \{a^t \mid t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$ is finite, and k is said to be the multiplicative order of a if k is the least positive integer such that $a^k = a^m$ for some $0 \leq m < k$. Thus, idempotent elements are multiplicatively finite with a multiplicative order $k \leq 2$. We say a multiplicative element $a \in R$ satisfies property (P) if $a^n = a$ for some $n \geq 2$.

Recall from [11], R is called left semi-Baer (right semi-quasi-Baer) if for any subset $X \subseteq R$ (left ideal $I \subseteq R$), we have $l_R(X) = Rb$ ($l_R(I) = Rb$) for some $b \in S$. A ring R is called left semi-P.P ring (left semi p.q ring) if $l_R(a) = Rb$ ($l_R(Ra) = Rb$) for some $b \in S$. All these definitions have left-right symmetry. Thus, a ring R is called semi-Baer (semi quasi-Baer) if it is both left and right semi-Baer (semi quasi-Baer). A ring R is called semi P.P ring (semi p.q ring) if it is both left and right semi P.P ring (semi p.q ring).

Proposition 2.24. *Let R be an \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring. If every multiplicative element satisfies property (P) and R is a left (or right) semi-p.p ring, then R is reduced.*

Proof. Let $a \in R$ is such that $a^2 = 0$. Thus $a \in l_R(a)$. Also R is semi-p.p ring so \exists an idempotent $b \in S$ such that $l_R(a) = Rb$. By hypothesis $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b^n = b$. Thus we have $(b^{(n-1)})^2 = b^{n-1}$ and since \mathcal{H} -semicommutative rings are abelian implies $b^{(n-1)}$ is idempotent. Since $a = rb$ for some $r \in R$ and $b^{(2n-1)} = b^n \cdot b^{(n-1)} = b \cdot b^{(n-1)} = b^n = b$. Multiplying $a = rb$ by $b^{(2n-2)}$ from right side we get $0 = ab^{(2n-2)} = rb^{(2n-1)} = rb = a$. Thus R is reduced. Similar argument also follows for right semi-p.p ring. \square

Proposition 2.25. *Let R be an \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring. If every multiplicative element satisfies property (P) and R is a left (or right) semi-p.q ring, then R is reduced."*

Proof. Proof follows similar to that of Proposition 2.24 \square

Corollary 2.26. *Let R be \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. Then R is reduced if any one of the following conditions holds.*

- (1) R is semiprime.
- (2) R is left(right) p.p ring.
- (3) R is left(right) p.q-Baer ring.

Proof. The proof follows straightforwardly, as every idempotent element is a multiplicative finite element. \square

Corollary 2.27. *For a \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring R , the following assertions are equivalent.*

- (1) R is semi-left p.p ring.
- (2) R is semi-right p.p ring.
- (3) R is semi-left p.q-Baer ring.
- (4) R is semi-right p.q-Baer ring.

Proof. The proof follows easily as in each of the cases R is reduced. \square

Corollary 2.28. *For a \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring R , the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is left p.p ring.
- (2) R is right p.p ring.
- (3) R is left p.q-Baer ring.
- (4) R is right p.q-Baer ring.

Proof. The proof follows easily as in each of the case R is reduced. \square

Corollary 2.29. *For a \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring R , the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is semi-Baer ring.
- (2) R is semi quasi-Baer ring.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) is obvious. (2) \Rightarrow (1) Since If R is quasi-Baer ring which implies R is semi p.p ring. Thus by Proposition 2.26, R is reduced and hence *semicommutative*. Thus by Theorem 2.7 in [1] implies R is Baer-ring. \square

Proposition 2.30. *For a \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring R , then the following assertions are equivalent;*

- (1) R is a right(left) p.p ring if and only if $R[x]$ is right(left) p.p ring.

(2) R is a Baer ring if and only if $R[x]$ is a Baer ring.

(3) R is right(left) $p.q$ -Baer ring if and only if $R[x]$ is right(left) $p.q$ -Baer ring.

(4) R is a quasi-Baer ring if and only if $R[x]$ is a quasi-Baer ring.

Proposition 2.31. *Let R be a semi- $p.p$ ring. If every multiplicative finite element satisfy the property (P), then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(1) R is semicommutative ring.

(2) R is Armendariz ring.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Since R is *semicommutative* implies R is reduced and thus R is Armendariz. (2) \Rightarrow (1) let us assume that $ab = 0$ for some $a, b \in R$. This implies $b \in r_R(a) = cR$, where $c^n = c$. Then this implies $b = cr$. Again $c^{(n-1)^2} = c^{(n-1)}$. Thus c^{n-1} is idempotent. Since R is *semicommutative* implies R is abelian, multiplying $b = cr$ by $c^{(2n-2)}$ from the left side we get $c^{(2n-2)}b = bc^{(2n-2)} = c^{(2n-1)}r = cr = b$. Now let $f(x) = ak + ax$ and $g(x) = kb - bx \in R[x]$. We get $f(x)g(x) = (ak + ax)(kb - bx) = ak^2b = ak^2bc^{(2n-2)} = ak^2c^{(2n-2)}b = ac^{(2n-2)}k^2b = 0$. By hypothesis R is Armendariz, thus $akb = 0$ for all $k \in R$. Hence R is *semicommutative*. \square

Corollary 2.32. *For a $p.p$ ring R , the following assertions are equivalent:*

(1) R is semicommutative ring.

(2) R is Armendariz ring.

Corollary 2.33. *Let R be a semi- $p.p$ ring. If every multiplicative finite element satisfy the property (P), then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(1) R is \mathcal{H} -semicommutative ring.

(2) R is Armendariz ring.

Proposition 2.34. *Let R be a \mathcal{H} -semicommutative. If every multiplicative finite element satisfy the property (P), then the following assertion holds.*

(1) If R is semi-Baer ring then $R[x]$ is semi-Baer ring.

(2) If R is semi-quasi Baer ring then $R[x]$ is semi quasi Baer ring.

(3) If R is semi $p.p$ ring then $R[x]$ is semi- $p.p$ ring.

(4) If R is semi- $p.q$ ring then $R[x]$ is semi- $p.q$ ring.

Proof. Let R be semi-Baer ring, this implies R is semi- $p.p$ ring. Hence by Proposition 2.26, R is reduced and this implies $R[x]$ is reduced and hence $R[x]$ is semi-Baer ring. The other parts are direct implication of Corollary 2.26 \square

3 Conflict of Interest

On behalf of the authors the corresponding author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] N. Agayev and A. Harmancı, *On semicommutative modules and rings*, Kyungpook Mathematical Journal, **47(2)** (2007), 21–30.
- [2] M. Ahmadi and A. Moussavi, *Rings whose singular ideals are nil*, Communications in Algebra, **48(11)** (2020), 4796–4808.
- [3] Y. Gang, *Semicommutative and reduced rings*, Vietnam Journal of Mathematics, **35(3)** (2007), 309–315.
- [4] I. Herstein, *On the hypercenter of a ring*, Journal of Algebra, **36(1)** (1975), 151–157.
- [5] S. U. Hwang, *A generalization of insertion-of-factors-property*, Bulletin of Korean Mathematical Society, **44(1)** (2007), 87–94.
- [6] R. Mohammadi, A. Moussavi and M. Zahiri, *On nil-semicommutative rings*, International Electronic Journal of Algebra, **11(11)** (2012), 20–37.
- [7] P. P. Nielsen, *Semi-commutativity and the McCoy condition*, Journal of Algebra, **298(1)** (2006), 134–141.
- [8] T. Özen, N. Agayev and A. Harmancı, *On a class of semicommutative rings*, Kyungpook Mathematical Journal, **51(2)** (2011), 283–291.
- [9] Y. Qu and J. Wei, *Some notes on nil-semicommutative rings*, Turkish Journal of Mathematics, **38(2)** (2014), 212–224.
- [10] L. Wang and J. Wei, *Central semicommutative rings*, Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, **45** (2014), 13–26.
- [11] B. Waphare and A. Khairnar, *Semi-baer modules*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications, **14(10)** (2015), 155–145.
- [12] C. Wei-xing and C. Shu-ying, *On weakly semicommutative rings*, Comm. Math. Res, **27(2)** (2011), 179–192.
- [13] X. Xie, *Some results on j -semicommutative rings*, Mathematical Theory and Applications, **32(2)** (2012), 26–32.