

RINGS IN WHICH ALL ELEMENTS ARE THE SUM OF A CENTRAL ELEMENT AND AN ELEMENT FROM $\Delta(R)$

PETER DANCHEV, ARASH JAVAN, OMID HASANZADEH, AND AHMAD MOUSSAVI

ABSTRACT. We define and consider in-depth the so-called " $C\Delta$ rings" as those rings R whose elements are a sum of an element in $C(R)$ and of an element in $\Delta(R)$. Our achieved results somewhat strengthen these recently obtained by Ma-Wang-Leroy in Czechoslovak Math. J. (2024) as well as these due to Kurtulmaz-Halicioglu-HarmanCI-Chen in Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin (2019).

Specifically, we succeeded to establish that exchange $C\Delta$ rings are always clean as well as that exchange CN rings are strongly clean. Likewise, we prove that, for any ring R , the ring of formal power series $R[[x]]$ over R is $C\Delta$ if, and only if, so is R . And, furthermore, we show that, for any ring R , if the polynomial ring $R[x]$ is a $C\Delta$ ring, then R satisfies the Köthe conjecture. Some other closely related things concerning certain extensions of $C\Delta$ rings are also presented.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BASIC CONCEPTS

In the current paper, let throughout R denote an associative ring with identity element, which ring is *not* necessarily commutative. Typically, for such a ring R , the sets $U(R)$, $Nil(R)$ and $C(R)$ represent the set of invertible elements (i.e., the unit group of R), the set of nilpotent elements and the set of central elements in R , respectively. Additionally, $J(R)$ denotes the Jacobson radical of R . Likewise, the whole ring of $n \times n$ matrices over R and the ring of $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over R are, respectively, designed by $M_n(R)$ and $T_n(R)$.

The key instrument of the present article unambiguously plays the set $\Delta(R)$, which was introduced by Lam in [10, Exercise 4.24] and was recently examined by Leroy-Matzuk in [11]. As pointed out by the authors in [11, Theorem 3 and 6], $\Delta(R)$ is the largest Jacobson radical's subring of R that is closed with respect to multiplication by all units (as well as by quasi-invertible elements) of R . Also, the containment $J(R) \subseteq \Delta(R)$ is fulfilled always. Moreover, $\Delta(R) = J(T)$, where T is the subring of R generated by all units of R , and the equality $\Delta(R) = J(R)$ holds if, and only if, $\Delta(R)$ is an ideal of R . Explicitly, an element a in a ring R is from $\Delta(R)$ if $1 - ua$ is a unit for all $u \in U(R)$.

Furthermore, a ring R is said to be CU if each element $a \in R$ has a decomposition $a = c + u$, where c is a central element and u is a unit – to be exact, this notion was introduced by Kurtulmaz et al. in [7]. They showed that, if \mathbb{F} is a field which is *not* isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2 , then $M_2(\mathbb{F})$ is a CU ring.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16S34, 16U60.

Key words and phrases. central element, $C\Delta$ ring, $\Delta(R)$, matrix ring.

In the other vein, a ring R is called CN if each element a of R has a decomposition $a = c + n$, where c is a central element and n is a nilpotent element. This concept was introduced in [8]. They showed that every CN ring is CU , but the converse is definitely *not* true in general. They also characterized all elements in $M_n(R)$ having a CN decomposition. They, moreover, proved for a division ring R that, if $M_n(R)$ is a CN ring, then the cardinality of $C(R)$ is strictly greater than n .

Similarly, an element $a \in R$ has a CJ decomposition if $a = c + j$ for some $c \in C(R)$ and $j \in J(R)$ and a ring R is called CJ if every element of R has a CJ decomposition. This notion was introduced by Ma et al. in [13]. They study the behavior of this class of rings under various ring extensions. In particular, they proved that, for any ring R , the subring $C(R) + J(R)$ is always a CJ ring, and that if $R[x]$ is a CJ ring, then R satisfies the Köthe conjecture.

So, as a non-trivial extension of CJ rings, we are motivated to introduce and investigate the new and more expanded concept of a $C\Delta$ ring, which will be the leitmotif of our study, like this: a ring R is called $C\Delta$ if each element $a \in R$ has a decomposition $a = c + r$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $r \in \Delta(R)$. Apparently, all CJ rings are $C\Delta$, but the opposite implication does *not* hold in all generality as we will illustrate below.

In the following, we give definitions of some other subrings of $T_n(R)$ in order to discuss in the sequel whether they satisfy the $C\Delta$ property:

$$D_n(R) = \{(a_{ij}) \in M_n(R) \mid \text{all diagonal entries of } (a_{ij}) \text{ are equal}\};$$

$$V_n(R) = \left\{ \sum_{i=j}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_j e_{(i-j+1)i} \mid a_j \in R \right\};$$

$$V_n^k(R) = \left\{ \sum_{i=j}^n \sum_{j=1}^k x_j e_{(i-j+1)i} + \sum_{i=j}^{n-k} \sum_{j=1}^{n-k} a_{ij} e_{j(i+k+1)} \mid x_j, a_{ij} \in R \right\},$$

where $x_{ij} \in R, a_{js} \in R, 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq n - k$ and $k + 1 \leq s \leq n$;

$$D_n^k(R) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=k+1}^n a_{ij} e_{ij} + \sum_{j=k+2}^n b_{(k+1)j} e_{(k+1)j} + cI_n \mid a_{ij}, b_{ij}, c \in R \right\},$$

where $k = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, i.e., satisfies $n = 2k$ when n is an even integer and $n = 2k + 1$ when n is an odd integer.

Our principal work in what follows is planned thus: In the next section, we are concerned with the exploration of some crucial structural properties of $C\Delta$ rings arising under various constructions, as well as we will discuss certain connections between the aforementioned classes of rings (see, e.g., Corollaries 2.9 and 2.26). In the subsequent third section, we are focussed on the possible extensions of $C\Delta$ rings and again some transversal between the existing classes of rings is obtained (see, e.g., Theorems 3.8, 3.10 and 3.19). In the final fourth section, we pose two queries of some interest and importance which, hopefully, could stimulate a further research on this subject (see Problems 4.1 and 4.2).

2. BASIC PROPERTIES OF CΔ RINGS

In this section, we introduce the concept of a CΔ ring and investigate its elementary properties. We also give relations between CΔ rings and some other related rings. For this purpose, we need a series of preliminary technicalities.

Lemma 2.1. *For any ring R , the following equality is true:*

$$U(R) + \Delta(R) = U(R).$$

Proof. We know that $U(R) \subseteq U(R) + J(R) \subseteq U(R) + \Delta(R)$. To treat the reciprocal, given $x \in U(R) + \Delta(R)$, we may write $x = u + r$, where $u \in U(R)$ and $r \in \Delta(R)$. One easily checks that $x = u + r = u(1 + u^{-1}r) \in U(R)$, as required. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let R be a ring. For $n \geq 2$,*

$$\Delta(M_n(R)) = J(M_n(R)) = M_n(J(R)).$$

Proof. Knowing that, for all $n \geq 2$, $M_n(R)$ is generated by its units, we apply [11, Corollary 4] to get that $\Delta(M_n(R)) = J(M_n(R))$, as stated. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let R be a ring. If $I \subseteq J(R)$ and $\Delta(R/I) = 0$, then $\Delta(R) = I = J(R)$.*

Proof. Since $J(R) \subseteq \Delta(R)$, it suffices to show that $\Delta(R) \subseteq I$. Choose $x \in \Delta(R)$ and $x \notin I$. So, $x + I$ is a non-zero element of R/I and hence $x + I \notin \Delta(R/I)$. Therefore, by definition of Δ , there exists $y \in R$ such that $(1 + xy) + I$ is not unit in R/I , but this is a contradiction. Then, $\Delta(R) \subseteq I$ whence $\Delta(R) = I = J(R)$, as asserted. \square

Two automatic consequences hold:

Corollary 2.4. *For any ring R , $\Delta(R) = J(R)$ if, and only if, $\Delta(R/J(R)) = (0)$.*

Corollary 2.5. *Let R be a ring and $I \subseteq J(R)$. Then, $\frac{I + \Delta(R)}{I} = \Delta(R/I)$.*

Let us recollect once again our key machinery explicitly in a more expanded form.

Definition 2.6. Let R be a ring. An element $a \in R$ is called CΔ or just it has a CΔ-decomposition if $a = c + r$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $r \in \Delta(R)$. If every element of R has such a CΔ-decomposition, then R is called a CΔ ring.

The following appeared to be obviously true:

Example 2.7. The following are fulfilled:

- (i) Every commutative ring is CΔ.
- (ii) Every radical ring R , i.e., $R = J(R)$, is CΔ.
- (iii) Every Δ -ring R , i.e., $R = \Delta(R)$, is CΔ.
- (iv) Every CJ ring is CΔ.

Recall that a ring R is said to be *Dedekind-finite* if $ab = 1$ implies $ba = 1$ for any $a, b \in R$. In other words, all one-sided inverses in the ring are two-sided. Also, a ring R is called *reduced* if it contains no non-zero nilpotent elements.

We now proceed by proving the following statement.

Proposition 2.8. *Let R be a CΔ ring. Then, the following are valid:*

- (i) For any ideal $I \subseteq J(R)$, R/I is $C\Delta$ (in particular, $R/J(R)$ is $C\Delta$).
- (ii) For any $a, b \in R$, $ab - ba \in \Delta(R)$.
- (iii) R is Dedekind-finite.
- (iv) If $a^2 \in \Delta(R)$, then $a \in \Delta(R)$.
- (v) R is a CU ring.
- (vi) Always $\text{Nil}(R) \subseteq J(R)$ and $\text{Nil}(R) \subseteq \Delta(R)$.
- (vii) If $a^2 \in J(R)$, then $a \in J(R)$ (in particular, $R/J(R)$ is reduced).
- (viii) For any $e \in \text{Id}(R)$, the corner subring eRe is a $C\Delta$ ring.

Proof. (i) It is straightforward and, therefore, we omit the details.

- (ii) Suppose $a = c + d$ and $b = c' + d'$, where $c, c' \in C(R)$ and $d, d' \in \Delta(R)$. Thus, we have $ab - ba = dd' - d'd \in \Delta(R)$.
- (iii) Let $a, b \in R$. So, $ab - ba \in \Delta(R)$ by (ii). If $ab = 1$, then $1 - ba \in \Delta(R)$. Hence, $ba \in 1 - \Delta(R) \subseteq U(R)$.
- (iv) Suppose $a = c + d$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $d \in \Delta(R)$. Thus, $a^2 = c^2 + 2cd + d^2$. On the other side, since $a^2 \in \Delta(R)$, it must be that $(1 - a)(1 + a) = 1 - a^2 \in U(R)$ and hence $1 + a \in U(R)$. So,

$$(1 + a) - d = c + 1 \in U(R) + \Delta(R) \subseteq U(R).$$

Therefore, $(c + 1)d \in \Delta(R)$ whence $cd + d \in \Delta(R)$. But, since $\Delta(R)$ is a subring of R , we derive $cd \in \Delta(R)$ and so $c^2 = a^2 - 2cd - d^2 \in \Delta(R)$. Now, we show that $c \in \Delta(R)$. Given $u \in U(R)$, we may write $(1 - uc)(1 + uc) = 1 - u^2c^2 \in U(R)$ yielding $1 - uc \in U(R)$ and $c \in \Delta(R)$. Consequently, $a = c + d \in \Delta(R)$.

- (v) Choose $a \in R$. Then, $a - 1 = c + d$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $d \in \Delta(R)$. So, $a = c + (1 + d)$, where $1 + d \in 1 + \Delta(R) \subseteq U(R)$. Hence, R is CU .
- (vi) It is pretty clear, so we leave the arguments.
- (vii) Using (iv), we have $a \in \Delta(R)$. Take $r \in R$ and write $r = c + d$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $d \in \Delta(R)$. So, we obtain $(1 - ra) = 1 - (c + d)a = 1 - ca - da$. Now, we show that $1 - ca \in U(R)$. In fact, $(1 - ca)(1 + ca) = 1 - c^2a^2 \in U(R)$ (note that $a^2 \in J(R)$) and hence $1 - ca \in U(R)$. Therefore,

$$1 - ra = (1 - ca) - da \in U(R) + \Delta(R) \subseteq U(R).$$

This shows that $a \in J(R)$.

- (viii) Choosing $a \in eRe$, we write $a = c + d$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $d \in \Delta(R)$. Since $a \in eRe$, we deduce $a = ec + ed = ce + de$ forcing that $ed = de$. Evidently, $ec \in C(eRe)$. Now, we prove that $ed = de \in \Delta(eRe)$. For this purpose, assume that $u \in U(eRe)$, so $u' = u + (1 - e) \in U(R)$ and, moreover, $v = 1 - u'd \in U(R)$. But, $eve = ev = ve = e - ued$ and, also, $(eve)(ev^{-1}e) = e$. Therefore, $ev = e - ued \in U(R)$ and hence $ed = de \in \Delta(eRe)$. □

Recall that a ring R is *exchange* if, for each $a \in R$, there exists $e^2 = e \in aR$ such that $(1 - e) \in (1 - a)R$ (see [15]).

Corollary 2.9. *Let R be an exchange $C\Delta$ ring. Then, R is clean.*

Proof. Since R is exchange, $R/J(R)$ is exchange and all idempotents lift modulo $J(R)$ in view of [15, Proposition 1.5]. Likewise, $R/J(R)$ is reduced utilizing Proposition 2.8 (vii), whence it is abelian. Therefore, $R/J(R)$ is abelian exchange, and

hence it is clean. Finally, taking into account [15], one concludes that R is clean, as required. \square

Proposition 2.10. *Let R be a ring. Then, a $C\Delta$ ring R is uniquely $C\Delta$ (that is, each element has a unique $C\Delta$ -decomposition) if, and only if, $\Delta(R) \cap C(R) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that R is uniquely $C\Delta$ and that $c \in C \cap \Delta$. Let $0 \neq r \in \Delta(R)$. We have $1 + r = (1 - c) + (c + r)$, where $1 - c \in C(R)$ and $c + r \in \Delta(R)$, because $\Delta(R)$ is a subring of R . The uniqueness of the $C\Delta$ -decomposition gives that $c = 0$.

Conversely, if $C \cap \Delta = 0$ and $c + r = c' + r'$ are two $C\Delta$ decompositions, we infer $c - c' = r' - r \in C \cap \Delta = 0$ and hence $c = c', r = r'$, as required. \square

Proposition 2.11. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following statements hold:*

- (i) $U(R) \cap (C + \Delta) \subseteq U(C + \Delta)$.
- (ii) $\Delta(R) \subseteq \Delta(C + \Delta)$.
- (iii) $C(R) \subseteq C(C + \Delta)$.

Proof. (i) Choose $a \in U(R) \cap (C + \Delta)$. Then, $a = c + r$ for $c \in C(R)$, $r \in \Delta(R)$, and there exists $b \in U(R)$ such that $ab = ba = 1$. We deduce that $c = a - r \in U(R) + \Delta(R) \subseteq U(R)$ whence $c \in C(R) \cap U(R) \subseteq U(C(R))$. Therefore, $ab = (c + r)b = cb + rb = 1$. Thus,

$$b = c^{-1}(1 - rb) = c^{-1} - c^{-1}rb \in C + \Delta,$$

because $\Delta(R)$ is a subring of R . This manifestly shows that the inverse of a is, indeed, in $C + \Delta$.

(ii) Choose $x \in \Delta(R)$. So, $x \in C + \Delta$ and $1 + xy \in U(R)$ for every $y \in U(R)$. Thus, $1 + xy \in U(R)$ for every $y \in U(C + \Delta)$, and there exists $v \in U(R)$ such that $(1 + xy)v = v(1 + xy) = 1$. Therefore, we have $v = 1 - xyv \in C + \Delta$, and hence $1 + xy \in U(C + \Delta)$ for every $y \in U(C + \Delta)$. This demonstrates that $x \in \Delta(C + \Delta)$.

(iii) Choose $x \in C(R)$. Then, $x \in C + \Delta$ and $xy = yx$ for every $y \in R$. So, $xy = yx$ for every $y \in C + \Delta$. This gives that $x \in C(C + \Delta)$. \square

The next appears immediately.

Corollary 2.12. *Let R be a ring. Then, $C(R) + \Delta(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.*

Recall that a ring R is called *division* if every non-zero element of R is invertible. Also, a ring R is called *local* if $R/J(R)$ is a division ring.

Example 2.13. (i) It is well known that any division ring is a local ring, and hence it is a CU ring in virtue of [7, Example 2.2]. But, one plainly verifies that division rings are not $C\Delta$.

(ii) Letting K be a division ring, we consider the ring $D_2(K)$. We know that $D_2(K)$ is a local ring, and so it is a CU ring, but a simple check guarantees that it is not a $C\Delta$ ring.

A ring R is called ΔU , provided $1 + \Delta(R) = U(R)$ (see [4]).

Remark 2.14. One readily verifies that, if R is a ΔU ring, then R is $C\Delta$ precisely when it is CU .

Proposition 2.15. *Let R be a ring and $a \in R$. Then, a has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition if, and only if, for each $p \in U(R)$, pap^{-1} has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition.*

Proof. Assume that a has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition. So, $a = c + r$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $r \in \Delta(R)$ such that, for an invertible $p \in R$, $pap^{-1} = pcp^{-1} + prp^{-1}$, where $pcp^{-1} = c$ is central and $prp^{-1} \in \Delta(R)$.

Conversely, supposing that $pap^{-1} \in R$ has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition, we receive $pap^{-1} = t + x$, where $t \in C(R)$ and $x \in \Delta(R)$. Hence, $a = p^{-1}tp + p^{-1}xp$ is a $C\Delta$ -decomposition of a . \square

A ring R is said to be UJ , provided $U(R) = 1 + J(R)$ (for more details, see [5]). Recall that a ring R is called UU , provided $U(R) = 1 + Nil(R)$ (see, for a more account, [3]).

Lemma 2.16. *The following items hold:*

- (i) *If R is a UJ ring, then $Nil(R) \subseteq J(R)$.*
- (ii) *If R is a UU ring, then $J(R), \Delta(R) \subseteq Nil(R)$.*
- (iii) *If R is a ΔU ring, then $Nil(R) \subseteq \Delta(R)$.*

Proof. (i) Choosing $a \in Nil(R)$, we get $1 + a \in 1 + Nil(R) \subseteq U(R) = 1 + J(R)$. Hence, $a \in J(R)$.

(ii) Choosing $a \in J(R)$, we get $1 + a \in 1 + J(R) \subseteq U(R) = 1 + Nil(R)$. Hence, $a \in Nil(R)$.

Since, $1 + \Delta(R) \subseteq U(R)$, we are done.

(iii) It can be argued in the same way as above, so the details are dropped off. \square

Corollary 2.17. *Let R be a ring. The following points hold:*

- (i) *If R is UU and $C\Delta$, then it is CN .*
- (ii) *If R is ΔU and CN , then it is $C\Delta$.*
- (iii) *If R is UJ and CN , then it is CJ .*
- (iv) *If R is UU and CJ , then it is CN .*

Lemma 2.18. *Let R be a commutative ring. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *R is a CN ring.*
- (ii) *R is a CJ ring.*
- (iii) *R is a $C\Delta$ ring.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). This is obvious, because, in commutative rings, we always have $Nil(R) \subseteq J(R)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). It is simple, because we always have $J(R) \subseteq \Delta(R)$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i). It is immediate by referring to [8, Example 2.2]. \square

A ring R is said to be *semi-local* if $R/J(R)$ is a left Artinian ring or, equivalently, $R/J(R)$ is a semi-simple ring.

Lemma 2.19. *Let R be an Artinian ring. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *R is a CN ring.*
- (ii) *R is a CJ ring.*
- (iii) *R is a $C\Delta$ ring.*

Proof. Since every Artinian ring is known to be semi-local, we have $J(R) = \Delta(R)$ by virtue of [11, Theorem 11], whence (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii). It suffices to show that $Nil(R) \subseteq J(R)$. Since R is Artinian, one readily writes that $R/J(R) \cong \prod M_{n_i}(D_i)$ for some matrix rings $M_{n_i}(D_i)$ over division rings D_i . Also, $R/J(R)$ is CN invoking [8, Lemma 2.15], and hence each $M_{n_i}(D_i)$ is CN consulting with [8, Proposition 2.16]. Since we know that the matrix rings are not CN , we arrive at $n_i = 1$ for every i . Finally, $R/J(R) \cong \prod D_i$ and this insures that $R/J(R)$ is reduced. Thus, $Nil(R) \subseteq J(R)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). This is straightforward, because in Artinian rings we have always $J(R) \subseteq Nil(R)$. \square

As finite rings are always Artinian, we directly extract the following consequence.

Corollary 2.20. *Let R be a finite ring. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a CN ring.
- (ii) R is a CJ ring.
- (iii) R is a $C\Delta$ ring.

Let $Nil_*(R)$ denote the *prime radical* (or, in other terms, the *lower nil-radical*) of a ring R , i.e., the intersection of all *prime ideals* of R . We know that $Nil_*(R)$ is a nil-ideal of R . It is also long known that a ring R is called *2-primal* if its lower nil-radical $Nil_*(R)$ consists precisely of all the nilpotent elements of R , that is, $Nil_*(R) = Nil(R)$. For instance, it is well known that reduced rings and commutative rings are both 2-primal.

For an endomorphism α of a ring R , R is called α -*compatible* if, for any $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0 \iff a\alpha(b) = 0$, and in this case α is clearly injective.

Let R be a ring and suppose $\alpha : R \rightarrow R$ is a ring endomorphism. Then, $R[x; \alpha]$ denotes the *ring of skew polynomial* over R with multiplication defined by $xr = \alpha(r)x$ for all $r \in R$. In particular, $R[x] = R[x; 1_R]$ is the *ring of polynomials* over R .

Proposition 2.21. *Let R be a 2-primal and α -compatible ring. Then,*

$$\Delta(R[x, \alpha]) = \Delta(R) + Nil_*(R[x, \alpha])x.$$

Proof. Writing that $f = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \Delta(R[x, \alpha])$, then, for every $u \in U(R)$, we have that $1 - uf \in U(R[x, \alpha])$. Thus, an appeal to [1, Corollary 2.14] ensures that $1 - ua_0 \in U(R)$ and, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, $ua_i \in Nil_*(R)$. Since $Nil_*(R)$ is an ideal, we have $a_0 \in \Delta(R)$ and, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, $a_i \in Nil_*(R)$. But, as R is 2-primal, [1, Lemma 2.2] is applicable to get that $Nil_*(R)[x, \alpha] = Nil_*(R[x, \alpha])$.

Conversely, assume $f \in \Delta(R) + Nil_*(R[x, \alpha])x$ and $u \in U(R[x, \alpha])$. Then, a consultation with [1, Corollary 2.14] assures that $u \in U(R) + Nil_*(R[x, \alpha])x$. Since R is a 2-primal ring, we have

$$1 - uf \in U(R) + Nil_*(R[x, \alpha])x \subseteq U(R[x, \alpha]),$$

and thus $f \in \Delta(R[x, \alpha])$, as required. \square

Lemma 2.22. *Let R be a CN ring. Then, for every $e \in Id(R)$, eRe is too a CN ring.*

Proof. Letting $a \in eRe$, we then write $a = c + n$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $n \in Nil(R)$. Since $a \in eRe$, we have $a = ec + en = ce + ne$ and this, in turn, forces that $en = ne$. But, $ec \in C(eRe)$ and we easily conclude that $en = ne \in Nil(eRe)$. Finally, eRe is a CN ring, as claimed. \square

A ring R is called *semi-potent* if every one-sided ideal not contained in $J(R)$ contains a non-zero idempotent.

Lemma 2.23. *Let R be a semi-potent ring. Then, every CN ring is CJ .*

Proof. It suffices to show that $Nil(R) \subseteq J(R)$. For this target, we establish that $\overline{R} = R/J(R)$ is reduced. Since R is a semi-potent ring, we know that \overline{R} is also a semi-potent (and even a potent) ring.

Assume now that $0 \neq x \in \overline{R}$ with $x^2 = 0$. Thus, [12, Theorem 2.1] applies to get that there exists $e \in \overline{R}$ such that $e\overline{R}e \cong M_2(S)$, where S is a non-zero ring. However, since \overline{R} is a CN ring in accordance with Lemma 2.22, $e\overline{R}e$ is also CN. However, on the other hand, it is known that $M_2(S)$ is not a CN ring, which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, \overline{R} is a reduced ring, as promised. \square

Corollary 2.24. *Let R be a semi-potent CN ring. Then, $R/J(R)$ is commutative.*

Proof. With Lemma 2.23 at hand, we conclude that $\overline{R} = R/J(R)$ is reduced and hence $Nil(\overline{R}) = (0)$. Since R is CN, it follows that \overline{R} is CN as well, and hence it is commutative. \square

Lemma 2.25. *Let R be a CN ring. Then, R is abelian.*

Proof. Suppose $e \in Id(R)$. So, $e = c + n$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $n \in Nil(R)$. Therefore, we write $c - c^2 = n - n^2 - 2cn \in Nil(R)$. Thus, owing to [18, Lemma 3.5], there exists a monic polynomial $f(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$, where $f(a)^2 = f(a)$ and $m = c - f \in Nil(R)$. Since $c \in C(R)$, we have $f, m \in C(R)$. So, $e - f = m + n \in Nil(R)$. On the other side, $(e - f)^3 = e - f$. This means that $e = f \in C(R)$, whence R is abelian, as stated. \square

As a final consequence, we detect:

Corollary 2.26. *Let R be an exchange CN ring. Then, R is strongly clean.*

3. SOME EXTENSIONS OF $C\Delta$ RINGS

We are here concentrated on certain non-trivial extensions of $C\Delta$ rings of matrix type. Before stating and proving the main results, we deal with a few preliminaries.

Lemma 3.1. *Let R be a commutative ring. For any $n \geq 2$, $A \in M_n(R)$ has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition if, and only if, $A - cI_n \in M_n(J(R))$ for some $c \in R$.*

Proof. Assume that $A \in M_n(R)$ has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition. By assumption, there exists $c \in R$ such that $A - cI_n \in M_n(J(R))$. Note that, for any $B \in M_n(R)$, B is central in $M_n(R)$ precisely when there exists $c \in R$ such that $B = cI_n$, as required.

Conversely, suppose that, for any $A \in M_n(R)$, there exists $c \in R$ such that $A - cI_n \in M_n(J(R))$. As cI_n is central in $M_n(R)$, it follows that $A \in M_n(R)$ has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition, as needed. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let R be a ring and n a positive integer. Then, $A \in M_n(R)$ has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition if, and only if, for each $p \in GL_n(R)$, $pAp^{-1} \in M_n(R)$ has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition.*

Remark 3.3. Since $\Delta(M_n(R)) = J(M_n(R))$ for any $n \geq 2$ and $M_n(R)/J(M_n(R)) \cong M_n(R/J(R))$, we notice that $M_n(R)$ is never a $C\Delta$ ring for any $n \geq 2$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let R be a commutative ring. Then, $T_2(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring if, and only if, for any $a, b \in R$, there exists $c \in R$ such that $a - c, b - c \in \Delta(R)$.*

Proof. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} \in T_2(R)$. So, A has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition if, and only if, there exist $C = \begin{pmatrix} c & 0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \in C(T_2(R))$ and $D = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(T_2(R))$ such that $A = C + D$. Thus, $D \in \Delta(T_2(R))$ if, and only if, $x, z \in \Delta(R)$. Also, $A = C + D$ is a $C\Delta$ -decomposition if, and only if, there exists $c \in R$ such that $A - cI_2 \in T_2(R)$ if, and only if, $a - c, b - c \in \Delta(R)$, as asked for. \square

Example 3.5. Consider the ring $R = \mathbb{Z}$. So, R is $C\Delta$, but $T_2(R)$ is not $C\Delta$. Consider the ring $A = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 \end{pmatrix} \in T_2(R)$. Then, one inspects that there is no $c \in R$ such that both $4 - c$ and $5 - c$ belong to $\Delta(R)$. So, we deduce that $T_2(R)$ is not $C\Delta$, as pursued.

Let R be a ring and suppose $\alpha : R \rightarrow R$ is a ring endomorphism. Standardly, $R[[x; \alpha]]$ denotes the ring of *skew formal power series* over R ; that is, all formal power series in x with coefficients from R and with multiplication defined by $xr = \alpha(r)x$ for all $r \in R$. In particular, $R[[x]] = R[[x; 1_R]]$ is the *ring of formal power series* over R .

We now come to the following criterion.

Proposition 3.6. *Let R be a ring. The ring $R[[x; \alpha]]$ is $C\Delta$ if, and only if, R is $C\Delta$.*

Proof. Let $R[[x; \alpha]]$ be $C\Delta$. Consider $I := R[[x; \alpha]]x$. Then, one verifies that I is an ideal of $R[[x; \alpha]]$. Note also that a routine calculation leads to $J(R[[x; \alpha]]) = J(R) + I$, so $I \subseteq J(R[[x; \alpha]])$. Since $R[[x; \alpha]]/I \cong R$, we derive with the aid of Proposition 2.8(i) that R is $C\Delta$.

Conversely, let R be $C\Delta$ and write $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots \in R[[x; \alpha]]$. Then, $a_i = c_i + r_i$, where $c_i \in C(R)$ and $r_i \in \Delta(R)$ for every i . Thus, we have $f(x) = g(x) + k(x)$, where

$$g(x) = c_0 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + \dots \in C(R)[[x; \alpha]] \subseteq C(R[[x; \alpha]])$$

and

$$k(x) = r_0 + r_1x + r_2x^2 + \dots \in \Delta(R)[[x; \alpha]] = \Delta(R[[x; \alpha]]).$$

This enables us that $R[[x; \alpha]]$ is $C\Delta$, as expected. \square

Our next automatic consequence sounds like this.

Corollary 3.7. *A ring $R[[x]]$ is $C\Delta$ if, and only if, so is R .*

We now have all the ingredients necessary to attack the truthfulness of the following main statement.

Theorem 3.8. *Let R be a 2-primal ring and let α be an endomorphism of R such that R is α -compatible. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a CN ring.
- (ii) $R[x; \alpha]$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.

- (iii) $R[x; \alpha]$ is a *CJ ring*.
- (iv) $R[x; \alpha]$ is a *CN ring*.

Proof. As R is 2-primal, $R/Nil_*(R)$ is reduced, and so we have

$$J(R[x; \alpha]) = Nil_*(R[x; \alpha]) = Nil_*(R)[x; \alpha].$$

Hence, points (iii) and (iv) are equivalent.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii). Supposing that $f = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in R[x; \alpha]$, we have $a_i = c_i + n_i$, where $c_i \in C(R)$ and $n_i \in Nil(R) = Nil_*(R)$ for every i . Moreover, we know that $n_0 \in Nil(R) \subseteq Nil_*(R) \subseteq J(R) \subseteq \Delta(R)$. Therefore, taking into account Proposition 2.21, we write

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{i=0}^n c_i x^i + n_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n n_i x^i \in C(R) + \Delta(R) + Nil_*(R)[x; \alpha]x \subseteq C(R) + \Delta(R[x; \alpha]) \subseteq \\ &C(R[x; \alpha]) + \Delta(R[x; \alpha]), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). For every $a \in R$, we have that $ax = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i x^i + \sum_{i=0}^n d_i x^i$. Thus, $a = c_0 + d_0$, where $d_0 \in Nil_*(R)$ owing to Proposition 2.21. Now, it suffices to demonstrate that $c_0 \in C(R)$. For this aim, we set $f := \sum_{i=0}^n c_i x^i$. Since we know $rf = fr$ for every $r \in R$, it gives that $rc_0 = c_0r$. So, $c_0 \in C(R)$ and hence R is a *CN ring*, as required.

(i) \iff (iv). With a proof very close to the previous implication, the desired result can easily be obtained. \square

As a direct consequence, we yield:

Corollary 3.9. *Let R be a 2-primal ring. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a *CN ring*.
- (ii) $R[x]$ is a *C Δ ring*.
- (iii) $R[x]$ is a *CJ ring*.
- (iv) $R[x]$ is a *CN ring*.

Let $Nil^*(R)$ be the sum of all nil-ideals in R . We call $Nil^*(R)$ the *upper nil-radical* of R . This is the largest nil-ideal of R . In order to remember the famous Kötheconjecture to the non-expert reader, we refer to [9, 10.28] for a more detailed information.

So, we are in a position to show validity of the following major assertion.

Theorem 3.10. *If $R[x]$ is a *C Δ ring*, then R satisfies the Köthe conjecture.*

Proof. Assume that $R[x]$ is *C Δ* . It suffices to establish that $J(R[x]) = Nil^*(R)[x]$. Indeed, since $J(R[x]) = N[x]$, where $N = J(R[x]) \cap R$, we show that $Nil^*(R) = N$. To that goal, given $a \in Nil^*(R)$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a^k = 0$; thus, $a^k \in J(R[x])$. Since $R[x]$ is *C Δ* , the quotient $R[x]/J(R[x])$ is reduced, which fact is enabled from Proposition 2.8(vii). So, we conclude that $a \in J(R[x])$ and this insures that $a \in N$. On the other hand, since N is a nil-ideal and $Nil^*(R)$ is the largest nil-ideal of R , we infer $N \subseteq Nil^*(R)$. Therefore, $N = Nil^*(R)$, as required. \square

The next two necessary and sufficient conditions are worthy of documentation.

Proposition 3.11. *For any ring R and an integer $n \geq 1$, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) R is $C\Delta$.
- (ii) $D_n(R)$ is $C\Delta$.
- (iii) $V_n(R)$ is $C\Delta$.
- (iv) $D_n^k(R)$ is $C\Delta$.
- (v) $V_n^k(R)$ is $C\Delta$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & & & * \\ & a & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & a \end{pmatrix} \in D_n(R).$$

Thanks to (i), there exist $c \in C(R)$ and $b \in \Delta(R)$ such that $a = c + b$. Let

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c & & & 0 \\ & c & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} b & & & * \\ & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, we verify at once that $C \in C(D_n(R))$ and $B \in \Delta(D_n(R))$. Also, we have $A = C + B$. Therefore, $D_n(R)$ is $C\Delta$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). Let $a \in R$. Consider the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & & & 0 \\ & a & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & a \end{pmatrix} \in D_n(R).$$

So, A has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition $A = C + B$ in $D_n(R)$, where a readily verification gives that

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c & & & 0 \\ & c & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & c \end{pmatrix} \in C(P_n(R)), \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} b & & & * \\ & b & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & b \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(R_n).$$

Then, we may write $a = c + b$ with $c \in C(R)$ and $b \in \Delta(R)$. Hence, a has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition in R , and so R is $C\Delta$. The equivalencies (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii), (i) \Leftrightarrow (iv) and (i) \Leftrightarrow (v) can be proved similarly, so we eliminate their evidences. \square

Proposition 3.12. *Let $R = \prod_{i \in I} R_i$ be a direct product of rings. Then, R is $C\Delta$ if, and only if, R_i is $C\Delta$ for each index i .*

Proof. We know that $C(R) = \prod_{i \in I} C(R_i)$ and, thanks to [11], that $\Delta(R) = \prod_{i \in I} \Delta(R_i)$. So, our further arguments are routine and thus omitted. \square

We noticed earlier that, if $n \geq 2$, then $M_n(R)$ is *not* $C\Delta$. We now exhibit certain subrings of $M_3(R)$ that are $C\Delta$ whenever R is $C\Delta$.

And so, let R be a ring, and assume $s, t \in C(R)$. Write

$$L_{(s,t)} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ sc & d & te \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in M_3(R) : a, c, d, e, f \in R \right\},$$

where the operations are defined as those in $M_3(R)$. Then, a simple inspection is a guarantor that $L_{(s,t)}(R)$ is a subring of $M_3(R)$.

We, thereby, arrive at the following technicality.

Lemma 3.13. *Let R be a ring, and $s, t \in C(R)$. Then,*

$$\Delta(L_{(s,t)}(R)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ sc & d & te \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in L_{(s,t)}(R) : a, d, f \in \Delta(R), c, e \in R \right\}.$$

Proof. Assume that $a, d, f \in \Delta(R)$. Put

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ sc & d & te \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in L_{(s,t)}(R).$$

For any element

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ sy & z & tu \\ 0 & 0 & v \end{pmatrix} \in U(L_{(s,t)}(R)),$$

we have

$$I_3 + AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + ax & 0 & 0 \\ s(cx + by) & 1 + dz & t(du + ev) \\ 0 & 0 & 1 + fv \end{pmatrix}.$$

Under our hypothesis, it must be that $1 + ax, 1 + dz, 1 + fv \in U(R)$. Hence, $I_3 + AB \in U(L_{(s,t)}(R))$ and $A \in \Delta(L_{(s,t)}(R))$, as needed.

Conversely, suppose that $a, d, f \in R$ and put

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ sc & d & te \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(L_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

For any $x, z, v \in U(R)$ and $y, u \in R$, letting

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ sy & z & tu \\ 0 & 0 & v \end{pmatrix} \in U(L_{(s,t)}(R)),$$

we have $I_3 + AB \in U(L_{(s,t)}(R))$, i.e.,

$$I_3 + AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + ax & 0 & 0 \\ s(cx + dy) & 1 + dz & t(dx + tev) \\ 0 & 0 & 1 + fv \end{pmatrix} \in U(L_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

Thus, we have $1 + ax, 1 + dz, 1 + fv \in U(R)$. This unambiguously shows that $a, d, f \in \Delta(R)$, as required. \square

Consider the following subring of $L_{(s,t)}(R)$:

$$V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & te \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in L_{(s,t)}(R) : a, e \in R \right\}.$$

We are now ready to establish the following.

Proposition 3.14. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following statements hold:*

- (i) *R is a $C\Delta$ ring if, and only if, $V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R))$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.*
- (ii) *Assume that R is a $C\Delta$ ring. Suppose also that any $\{a, d, f\} \subseteq R$ having a $C\Delta$ -decomposition $a = x + p$, $d = y + q$ and $f = z + r$ with $\{x, y, z\} \subseteq C(R)$ and $\{p, q, r\} \subseteq \Delta(R)$ satisfy $sx = sy$ and $ty = tz$. Then, $L_{(s,t)}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.*

Proof. (i) Assume that R is a $C\Delta$ ring. Set

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & te \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

Then, there exist $c \in C(R)$ and $r \in \Delta(R)$ such that $a = c + r$. Hence, for the next two matrices

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} r & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & r & te \\ 0 & 0 & r \end{pmatrix},$$

we detect that $C \in C(V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R)))$ and $B \in \Delta(V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R)))$. Therefore, $A = C + B$ is the wanted $C\Delta$ -decomposition of A in $V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R))$.

For the converse, choose $x \in R$ and consider

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{pmatrix} \in V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

Then, there exist

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \in C(V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R))), \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} r & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(V_2(L_{(s,t)}(R))).$$

So, $c \in C(R)$ and $r \in \Delta(R)$, and $x = c + r$ is the $C\Delta$ -decomposition of x . Consequently, R is a $C\Delta$ ring, as asserted.

(ii) Suppose that

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ sc & d & te \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in L_{(s,t)}(R).$$

Let $a = x + p$, $d = y + q$ and $f = z + r$ denote the $C\Delta$ -decompositions of a , d , and f , respectively. By our hypothesis, $sx = sy$ and $ty = tz$. Thus, we deduce that A has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition in $L_{(s,t)}(R)$ as $A = C + B$, where

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \in C(L_{(s,t)}(R)), \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 & 0 \\ sc & q & te \\ 0 & 0 & r \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(L_{(s,t)}(R)),$$

as claimed. \square

As an automatic consequence, we derive:

Corollary 3.15. *Let R be a ring. If $L_{(s,t)}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring, then R is a $C\Delta$ ring.*

Proof. Assume that $L_{(s,t)}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring, and let $a \in R$ and

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in L_{(s,t)}(R).$$

Bearing in mind the hypothesis, A has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition in $L_{(s,t)}(R)$. This easily leads to the fact that a admits a $C\Delta$ -decomposition in R , as necessary. \square

The next example shows that there are $C\Delta$ rings such that $L_{(s,t)}(R)$ need *not* be a $C\Delta$ ring.

Example 3.16. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $A := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in L_{(1,1)}(R)$. Since R is a commu-

tative ring, it is too a $C\Delta$ ring. Assume that $A = C + B$ is a $C\Delta$ -decomposition of A . Since A is neither a central element nor an element in the Δ , we can assume with no harm in generality that A has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition as $A = C + B$, where

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in C(L_{(1,1)}(R)) \quad \text{and} \quad B := \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ c & y & c \\ 0 & 0 & z \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(L_{(1,1)}(R)),$$

where $\{x, y, z\} \subseteq \Delta(\mathbb{Z})$. This, however, forces a contradiction with the arithmetic in \mathbb{Z} , as expected.

The next two affirmations are also worthy of recording.

Proposition 3.17. *A ring R is $C\Delta$ if, and only if, so is $L_{(0,0)}(R)$.*

Proof. Firstly, observe that $L_{(0,0)}(R)$ is isomorphic to the ring $R \times R \times R$. Thus, employing Proposition 3.12, $\prod_{i \in I} R_i$ is a $C\Delta$ ring for each $i \in I$ with all $R_i \cong R$ whenever R is a $C\Delta$ ring. \square

Furthermore, suppose now that R is a ring and that $s, t \in C(R)$. Let $H_{(s,t)}(R)$ be the subring of $M_3(R)$ defined by

$$H_{(s,t)}(R) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ sc & d & e \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in M_3(R) : a, c, d, e, f \in R, a - d = sc, d - f = te \right\}.$$

Thus, an easy inspection gives that any element A of $H_{(s,t)}(R)$ has the form

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} sc + te + f & 0 & 0 \\ c & te + f & e \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 3.18. *Let R be a ring and $s, t \in C(R)$. Then,*

$$\Delta(H_{(s,t)}(R)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ c & d & e \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in H_{(s,t)}(R) : a, d, f \in \Delta(R), c, e \in R \right\}.$$

Proof. Assume that $a, d, f \in \Delta(R)$, and set

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ c & d & e \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in H_{(s,t)}(R)$$

as well as, for any $x, z, v \in U(R)$; $y, u \in R$, set

$$B := \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ y & z & u \\ 0 & 0 & v \end{pmatrix} \in U(H_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

Then, it follows that

$$I_3 + AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + ax & 0 & 0 \\ y & 1 + dz & u \\ 0 & 0 & 1 + fv \end{pmatrix}.$$

But, since $1 + ax, 1 + dz, 1 + fv \in U(R)$, we can get $I_3 + AB \in U(H_{(s,t)}(R))$ and this yields that $A \in \Delta(H_{(s,t)}(R))$.

Conversely, suppose that

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ c & d & e \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(H_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

and, for any $x, z, v \in U(R)$; $y, u \in R$, set

$$B := \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ y & z & u \\ 0 & 0 & v \end{pmatrix} \in U(H_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

Then, it follows that

$$I_3 + AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + ax & 0 & 0 \\ y & 1 + dz & u \\ 0 & 0 & 1 + fv \end{pmatrix} \in U(H_{(s,t)}(R)).$$

Therefore, we obtain $1 + ax, 1 + dz, 1 + fv \in U(R)$, and hence $a, d, f \in \Delta(R)$, as wanted. \square

Our next chief affirmation is the following one.

Theorem 3.19. *A ring R is $C\Delta$ if, and only if, $H_{(s,t)}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.*

Proof. Assume that R is a $C\Delta$ ring. Put

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ c & d & e \\ 0 & 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \in H_{(s,t)}(R).$$

Thus, one follows that $a = c_1 + r_1, d = c_2 + r_2, f = c_3 + r_3, c = c_4 + r_4, e = c_5 + r_5$ with $\{c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5\} \subseteq C(R)$ and $\{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5\} \subseteq \Delta(R)$. Letting $c_1 - c_2 = sc_4, c_2 - c_3 = tc_5, r_1 - r_2 = sr_4$ and $r_2 - r_3 = tr_5$, we then construct

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & 0 & 0 \\ c_4 & c_2 & c_5 \\ 0 & 0 & c_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & 0 & 0 \\ r_4 & r_2 & r_5 \\ 0 & 0 & r_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So, we receive $C \in C(H_{(s,t)}(R))$ and $B \in \Delta(H_{(s,t)}(R))$. Hence, $A = C + B$ is the desired $C\Delta$ -decomposition of A .

Conversely, suppose that $H_{(s,t)}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring and choose $a \in R$. Then,

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in H_{(s,t)}(R),$$

and it has the $C\Delta$ -decomposition $A = C + B$, where

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & 0 \\ y & z & u \\ 0 & 0 & v \end{pmatrix} \in C(H_{(s,t)}(R)) \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & 0 & 0 \\ r_2 & r_3 & r_4 \\ 0 & 0 & r_5 \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(H_{(s,t)}(R)),$$

with $\{y, u, v\} \subseteq C(R)$ and $\{r_1, r_2, r_3\} \subseteq \Delta(R)$. Consequently, $a = v + r_5$ is the asked $C\Delta$ -decomposition of the element a . \square

Given a ring R and a central elements s of R , the 4-tuple $\begin{pmatrix} R & R \\ R & R \end{pmatrix}$ becomes a ring denoted by $K_s(R)$ with addition component-wise and with multiplication defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & x_1 \\ y_1 & b_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_2 & x_2 \\ y_2 & b_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 a_2 + s x_1 y_2 & a_1 x_2 + x_1 b_2 \\ y_1 a_2 + b_1 y_2 & s y_1 x_2 + b_1 b_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, $K_s(R)$ is called a *generalized matrix ring* over R .

We now proceed by proving the following claim.

Proposition 3.20. *Let R be a commutative ring. Then, the following hold:*

- (i) $C(K_0(R))$ consists of all scalar matrices.
- (ii) $U(K_0(R)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in K_0(R) : a, d \in U(R) \right\}$.
- (iii) $\Delta(K_0(R)) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in K_0(R) : a, d \in \Delta(R) \right\}$.

Proof. (i) It follows at once from [6, Lemma 1.1].

(ii) It follows at once from [16, Lemma 3.1].

(iii) Assume that $a, d \in \Delta(R)$, and let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in K_0(R).$$

For any element

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} a' & b' \\ c' & d' \end{pmatrix} \in U(K_0(R)),$$

we compute

$$I_2 + AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + aa' & ab' + bd' \\ ca' + dc' & 1 + dd' \end{pmatrix}.$$

By hypothesis, $1 + aa'$, $1 + dd' \in U(R)$. Thus, $I_2 + AB \in U(K_0(R))$ implying that $A \in \Delta(K_0(R))$.

Conversely, suppose that $a, d \in R$ and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(K_0(R)).$$

For any $a', d' \in U(R)$ and $c', b' \in R$, we set

$$B := \begin{pmatrix} a' & b' \\ c' & d' \end{pmatrix} \in U(K_0(R)).$$

We, furthermore, calculate that

$$I_2 + AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + aa' & ab' + bd' \\ ca' + dc' & 1 + dd' \end{pmatrix} \in U(K_0(R)).$$

So, we have $1 + aa', 1 + dd' \in U(R)$ showing that $a, d \in \Delta(R)$, as required. \square

Proposition 3.21. *A ring R is $C\Delta$ if, and only if, $D_n(K_0(R))$ is a $C\Delta$ ring for any $n \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let R be a $C\Delta$ ring. We assume for a moment that $n = 2$. Suppose

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in D_2(K_0(R)).$$

By assumption, $a = c_1 + r_1$, where $c_1 \in C(R)$ and $r_1 \in \Delta(R)$. Suppose also that

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & c_1 \end{pmatrix} \in C(D_2(K_0(R))) \quad \text{and} \quad B := \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & b \\ 0 & r_1 \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(D_2(K_0(R))).$$

Hence, $A = C + B$ is the required $C\Delta$ -decomposition of the matrix A .

Conversely, let $D_2(K_0(R))$ be a $C\Delta$ ring and $a \in R$. Then,

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in D_2(K_0(R))$$

has the $C\Delta$ -decomposition $A = C + B$ with

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & c_1 \end{pmatrix} \in C(D_2(K_0(R))) \quad \text{and} \quad B := \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & b_1 \\ 0 & r_1 \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(D_2(K_0(R))),$$

where $c_1 \in C(R)$ and $r_1 \in \Delta(R)$. By comparing components of matrices, we get $a = c_1 + r_1$, and obviously it is the required $C\Delta$ -decomposition of the element a .

The general case for any $n > 2$ follows by induction, which we leave to the interested reader for a direct check. \square

Example 3.22. Note that $K_0(R)$ need *not* be a $C\Delta$ ring. In fact, assume the contrary that

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in K_0(\mathbb{Z})$$

has a $C\Delta$ -decomposition as $A = C + B$, where $c \in C(K_0(\mathbb{Z}))$ and $B \in \Delta(K_0(\mathbb{Z}))$.

Then, we infer

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 1-x & 0 \\ 0 & -x \end{pmatrix},$$

and these, in turn, imply $x = 1$ or $x \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}) = \{0\}$, that is, the expected contradiction, thus substantiating our claim.

Let R be a ring and M a bi-module over R . The *trivial extension* of R and M is stated as

$$T(R, M) = \{(r, m) : r \in R \text{ and } m \in M\},$$

with addition defined component-wise and multiplication defined by

$$(r, m)(s, n) = (rs, rn + ms).$$

The trivial extension $T(R, M)$ is isomorphic to the subring

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} r & m \\ 0 & r \end{pmatrix} : r \in R \text{ and } m \in M \right\}$$

of the formal 2×2 matrix ring $\begin{pmatrix} R & M \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix}$, and also $T(R, R) \cong R[x]/\langle x^2 \rangle$. We, likewise, note that the set of units of the trivial extension $T(R, M)$ is

$$U(T(R, M)) = T(U(R), M).$$

Moreover, according to [4], we have

$$\Delta(T(R, M)) = T(\Delta(R), M).$$

So, the following is valid.

Proposition 3.23. *If $T(R, M)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring, then R is a $C\Delta$ ring. The converse holds if, for any $c \in C(R)$ and $m \in M$, we have $cm = mc$.*

Proof. Assuming that $T(R, M)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring, it easily follows that R is $C\Delta$ too.

Conversely, let R be a $C\Delta$ ring and let $X = (a, m) \in T(R, M)$ be an arbitrary element. Then, $a \in R$ and, by hypothesis, we write $a = c + r$, where $c \in C(R)$ and $r \in \Delta(R)$. Thus,

$$X = (a, m) = (c + r, m) = (c, 0) + (r, m),$$

where $(c, 0) \in C(T(R, M))$ and $T(\Delta(R), M) = \Delta(T(R, M))$. Putting $C = (c, 0)$ and $D = (r, m)$, we conclude that $X = C + D$ is a $C\Delta$ -decomposition of X , as we need. \square

As an immediate consequence, we receive:

Corollary 3.24. *The trivial extension $T(R, R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring if, and only if, R is a $C\Delta$ ring.*

Let α be an endomorphism of R and n a positive integer. It was defined by Nasr-Isfahani in [14] the *skew triangular matrix ring* like this:

$$T_n(R, \alpha) = \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cccccc} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a_0 & \cdots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_0 \end{array} \right) \middle| a_i \in R \right\}$$

with addition point-wise and multiplication given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a_0 & \cdots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_0 & b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_{n-1} \\ 0 & b_0 & b_1 & \cdots & b_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & b_0 & \cdots & b_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & b_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_1 & c_2 & \cdots & c_{n-1} \\ 0 & c_0 & c_1 & \cdots & c_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & c_0 & \cdots & c_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$c_i = a_0\alpha^0(b_i) + a_1\alpha^1(b_{i-1}) + \cdots + a_i\alpha^i(b_0), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1.$$

We denote the elements of $T_n(R, \alpha)$ by $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$. If α is the identity endomorphism, then $T_n(R, \alpha)$ is a subring of upper triangular matrix ring $T_n(R)$.

The following criterion is true:

Proposition 3.25. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a CΔ ring.
- (ii) $T_n(R, \alpha)$ is a CΔ ring.

Proof. (ii) \Rightarrow (i). Choose

$$I := \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{array} \right) \middle| a_{ij} \in R \quad (i \leq j) \right\}.$$

Therefore, one easily finds that $I^n = (0)$, $I \subseteq J(T_n(R, \alpha))$, and $\frac{T_n(R, \alpha)}{I} \cong R$. Resultantly, the implication follows from Proposition 2.8(i).

(i) \Rightarrow (ii). Consider $A := \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a_0 & \cdots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_0 \end{pmatrix} \in T_n(R, \alpha)$, where $a_i \in R$.

Then, by hypothesis, $a_0 = c_0 + r_0$, where $c_0 \in C(R)$ and $r_0 \in \Delta(R)$. Therefore,

we write $A = C + B$, where $C := \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & c_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_0 \end{pmatrix} \in C(T_n(R, \alpha))$, and

$$B := \begin{pmatrix} r_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ 0 & r_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & r_0 & \cdots & a_{n-3} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & r_0 \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta(\mathbb{T}_n(R, \alpha)) \text{ looking at [11, Corollary 9(1)].}$$

Hence, $T_n(R, \alpha)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring, as claimed. \square

Besides, notice that there is a ring isomorphism

$$\varphi : \frac{R[x; \alpha]}{\langle x^n \rangle} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n(R, \alpha),$$

defined as

$$\varphi(a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \langle x^n \rangle) = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$$

with $a_i \in R$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Thus, one finds that $\mathbb{T}_n(R, \alpha) \cong \frac{R[x; \alpha]}{\langle x^n \rangle}$, where $\langle x^n \rangle$ is the ideal generated by x^n .

We arrive in the sequel at a series of consequences.

Corollary 3.26. *Let R be a ring with an endomorphism α such that $\alpha(1) = 1$. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (ii) $\frac{R[x; \alpha]}{\langle x^n \rangle}$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (iii) $\frac{R[[x; \alpha]]}{\langle x^n \rangle}$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.

Corollary 3.27. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (ii) $\frac{R[x]}{\langle x^n \rangle}$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (iii) $\frac{R[[x]]}{\langle x^n \rangle}$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.

Consider R to be a ring and M to be a bi-module over R . Let

$$\text{DT}(R, M) := \{(a, m, b, n) \mid a, b \in R, m, n \in M\}$$

with addition defined componentwise and multiplication defined by

$$(a_1, m_1, b_1, n_1)(a_2, m_2, b_2, n_2) = (a_1a_2, a_1m_2 + m_1a_2, a_1b_2 + b_1a_2, a_1n_2 + m_1b_2 + b_1m_2 + n_1a_2).$$

Then, $\text{DT}(R, M)$ is a ring which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{T}(\mathbb{T}(R, M), \mathbb{T}(R, M))$. Likewise, with this at hand, we deduce

$$\text{DT}(R, M) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & m & b & n \\ 0 & a & 0 & b \\ 0 & 0 & a & m \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b \in R, m, n \in M \right\}.$$

We now have the following isomorphism of rings: $\frac{R[x, y]}{\langle x^2, y^2 \rangle} \rightarrow \text{DT}(R, R)$ given as

$$a + bx + cy + dxy \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & b & c & d \\ 0 & a & 0 & c \\ 0 & 0 & a & b \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

Corollary 3.28. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (ii) $\text{DT}(R, R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (iii) $\frac{R[x, y]}{\langle x^2, y^2 \rangle}$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.

Corollary 3.29. *Let R be a ring, and let*

$$S_n(R) := \{(a_{ij}) \in T_n(R) \mid a_{11} = a_{22} = \cdots = a_{nn}\}.$$

Then, the following are equivalent:

- (i) R is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (ii) $S_n(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.

Further, Wang introduced in [17] the matrix ring $S_{n,m}(R)$. Supposing R is a ring, then the matrix ring $S_{n,m}(R)$ can be represented as

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b_1 & \cdots & b_{n-1} & c_{1n} & \cdots & c_{1n+m-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & a & b_1 & c_{n-1,n} & \cdots & c_{n-1,n+m-1} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & a & d_1 & \cdots & d_{m-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a & d_1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & a \end{pmatrix} \in T_{n+m-1}(R) : a, b_i, d_j, c_{i,j} \in R \right\}.$$

In this vein, let $T_{n,m}(R)$ be

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|cccc} a & b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_{n-1} \\ 0 & a & b_1 & \cdots & b_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a & \cdots & b_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a \end{array} \right. \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{0} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right. \\ \left. \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \\ \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{cccc} a & c_1 & c_2 & \cdots & c_{m-1} \\ 0 & a & c_1 & \cdots & c_{m-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a & \cdots & c_{m-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a \end{array} \right) \in T_{n+m}(R) : a, b_i, c_j \in R \right\},$$

and

$$U_n(R) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b_1 & b_2 & b_3 & b_4 & \cdots & b_{n-1} \\ 0 & a & c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & \cdots & c_{n-2} \\ 0 & 0 & a & b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_{n-3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a & c_1 & \cdots & c_{n-4} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & a \end{pmatrix} \in T_n(R) : a, b_i, c_j \in R \right\}.$$

Corollary 3.30. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following issues are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (ii) $S_{n,m}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (iii) $T_{n,m}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (iv) $U_n(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.

Letting now R be an arbitrary ring, Danchev et al. introduced in [2] the aforementioned rings as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n,m}(R) &= R[x, y | x^n = xy = y^m = 0], \\ B_{n,m}(R) &= R \langle x, y | x^n = xy = y^m = 0 \rangle, \\ C_n(R) &= R \langle x, y | x^2 = \underbrace{xyxyx \dots}_{n-1 \text{ words}} = y^2 = 0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.31. ([2, Lemma 5.1]) *Let R be a ring and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the next three isomorphisms of rings are fulfilled:*

- (i) $A_{n,m}(R) \cong T_{n,m}(R)$.
- (ii) $B_{n,m}(R) \cong S_{n,m}(R)$.
- (iii) $C_n(R) \cong U_n(R)$.

Corollary 3.32. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following claims are equivalent:*

- (i) R is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (ii) $B_{n,m}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (iii) $A_{n,m}(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.
- (iv) $C_n(R)$ is a $C\Delta$ ring.

4. OPEN QUESTIONS

We finish our considerations with two left problems as follows:

Problem 4.1. Let R be a ring and G a multiplicative group. Find a necessary and sufficient condition when the group ring RG is $C\Delta$ only in terms of R , G and their sections.

Problem 4.2. Characterize those rings R , naming them *feebly Δ -clean* for which, for any $r \in R$, there exist $d \in \Delta(R)$ and $e, f \in Id(R)$ with $ef = fe = 0$ such that $r = d + e - f$. In addition, if d commutes with (either) e or f , the feebly Δ -clean ring R having this property is said to be *strongly feebly Δ -clean*.

Funding: The work of the first-named author, P.V. Danchev, is partially supported by the Junta de Andalucía under Grant FQM 264. All other three authors are supported by Bonyad-Meli-Nokhbegan and receive funds from this foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Chen, *On constant products of elements in skew polynomial rings*, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. **41**(2) (2015), 453–462.
- [2] P. Danchev, A. Javan, O. Hasanzadeh and A. Moussavi, *Rings with $u - 1$ quasiniipotent for each unit u* , J. Algebra Appl. **24**(10) (2025).
- [3] P. V. Danchev and T. Y. Lam, *Rings with unipotent units*, Publ. Math. (Debrecen) **88**(3-4) (2016), 449–466.
- [4] F. Karabacak, M. Kosan, T. Quynh and D. Yai, *A generalization of UJ-rings*, J. Algebra Appl. **20**(12) (2021).
- [5] M. T. Kosan, A. Leroy and J. Matczuk, *On UJ-rings*, Commun. Algebra **46**(5) (2018), 2297–2303.
- [6] P. A. Krylov and A. A. Tuganbaev, *Modules over formal matrix rings*, J. Math.Sci. **171**(2) (2010), 248–295.
- [7] Y. Kurtulmaz, S. Halicioglu, A. Harmanci and H. Chen, *Rings in which elements are a sum of a central and a unit element*, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin **42**(4) (2019), 619–631.
- [8] Y. Kurtulmaz and A. Harmanci, *Rings in which elements are a sum of a central and a nilpotent element*, arXiv:2005.12575 (2020).
- [9] T. Y. Lam, *A First Course in Noncommutative Rings*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **131**, Springer-Verlag, New York (1991).
- [10] T. Y. Lam, *Exercises in Classical Ring Theory*, Second Edition, Springer Verlag, New York (2003).
- [11] A. Leroy and J. Matczuk, *Remarks on the Jacobson radical*, in "Rings, Modules and Codes", 269–276; Contemp. Math. **727**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2019).
- [12] J. Levitzki, *On the structure of algebraic algebras and related rings*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **74** (1953), 384–409.
- [13] G. Ma, Y. Wang and A. Leroy, *Rings in which elements are sum of a central element and an element in the Jacobson radical*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal. **74**(2) (2024), 515–533.
- [14] A. R. Nasr-Isfahani, *On skew triangular matrix rings*, Commun. Algebra. **39**(11) (2011), 4461–4469.
- [15] W. K. Nicholson, *Lifting idempotents and exchange rings*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **229** (1977) 269–278.
- [16] G. Tang, C. Li and Y. Zhou, *Study of Morita contexts*, Commun. Algebra. **42**(4) (2014), 1668–1681.
- [17] W. Wang, E. R. Puczyłowski and L. Li, *On Armendariz rings and matrix rings with simple θ -multiplication*, Commun. Algebra **36**(4) (2008), 1514–1519.
- [18] Z. L. Ying, T. Kosan and Y. Zhou, *Rings in which every element is a sum of two tripotents*, Canad. Math. Bull. **59** (2016) 661–672.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 1113 SOFIA, BULGARIA

Email address: danchev@math.bas.bg; pvdanchev@yahoo.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY, 14115-111 TEHRAN JALAL ALEAHMAD NASR, IRAN

Email address: a.darajavan@modares.ac.ir; a.darajavan@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY, 14115-111 TEHRAN JALAL ALEAHMAD NASR, IRAN

Email address: o.hasanzade@modares.ac.ir; hasanzadeomiid@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TARBIAT MODARES UNIVERSITY, 14115-111 TEHRAN JALAL ALEAHMAD NASR, IRAN

Email address: moussavi.a@modares.ac.ir; moussavi.a@gmail.com