

k -COMMUTING MAPPINGS OF GENERALIZED MATRIX ALGEBRAS

YANBO LI, FENG WEI AND AJDA FOŠNER

ABSTRACT. In this paper we will study k -commuting mappings of generalized matrix algebras. The general form of arbitrary k -commuting mapping of a generalized matrix algebra is determined. It is shown that under mild assumptions, every k -commuting mapping of a generalized matrix algebra takes a certain form which is said to be proper. A number of applications related to k -commuting mappings are presented. These results extend the existing works of Cheung, Du and Wang [16, 18] to the case of generalized matrix algebras.

xxsec1

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative ring with identity element and \mathcal{A} a unital associative \mathcal{R} -algebra. For arbitrary elements $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we set $[a, b]_0 = a$, $[a, b]_1 = ab - ba$, and inductively $[a, b]_k = [[a, b]_{k-1}, b]$, where k is a fixed positive integer. Denote by $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})$ the center of \mathcal{A} and define

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})_k = \{ a \in \mathcal{A} \mid [a, x]_k = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{A} \}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})_1 = \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})$. An \mathcal{R} -linear mapping $\Theta: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is said to be k -commuting on \mathcal{A} if $[\Theta(a), a]_k = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. In particular, an \mathcal{R} -linear mapping $\Theta: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is called *commuting* on \mathcal{A} if $[\Theta(a), a] = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. When we investigate a k -commuting mapping Θ of an algebra \mathcal{A} , the principal task is to describe its form. Let Θ be a k -commuting mapping of an \mathcal{R} -algebra \mathcal{A} . Then Θ will be called *proper* if it has the form

$$\Theta(a) = \lambda a + \zeta(a) \tag{♣}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\lambda \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\zeta: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})$ is an \mathcal{R} -linear mapping. The concept of commuting mappings is closely related to that of biderivations. Recall that a bilinear mapping $\Upsilon: \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is called a *biderivation* if it is a derivation with respect to both components, meaning that $\Upsilon(ab, c) = a\Upsilon(b, c) + \Upsilon(a, c)b$ and $\Upsilon(a, bc) = b\Upsilon(a, c) + \Upsilon(a, b)c$ for all $a, b, c \in \mathcal{A}$. If \mathcal{A} is a noncommutative algebra, then the mapping $\Upsilon(a, b) = \lambda[a, b]$ (where $\lambda \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A}), \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}$) is a basic example of biderivation, which is usually called *inner biderivations*. Every commuting mapping $\Theta: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ gives rise to a biderivation of \mathcal{A} . Namely, linearizing the relation $[\Theta(a), a] = 0$ yields that $[\Theta(a), b] = [a, \Theta(b)]$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus the resulting mapping $(a, b) \mapsto [\Theta(a), b]$ is a biderivation.

Date: March 17, 2020.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16R60, 16W10, 15A78.

Key words and phrases. k -Commuting mapping, generalized matrix algebra.

This work is partially supported by the Training Program of International Exchange and Cooperation of the Beijing Institute of Technology. The work of the first author is supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province, China (A2017501003) and the Science and Technology support program of Northeastern University at Qinhuangdao (No. XNK201601).

Commuting mappings and biderivations are currently active branches in the theory of additive mappings of noncommutative algebras. Brešar [11] showed that an \mathcal{R} -linear mapping Θ of a prime algebra \mathcal{A} is commuting if and only if it has the form (\clubsuit) . This result gives rise to the study of various more general problems, and eventually comes into the theory of functional identities [13]. We also encourage the reader to read the elegant survey paper [12], in which the author presented a full and detailed account for the theory of commuting mappings. Furthermore, Brešar considered linear mappings with Engel condition on prime algebras, and especially studied 2-commuting and k -commuting mappings of prime algebras in [10, 11]. He observed that 2-commuting and k -commuting mappings of certain prime algebras are commuting. Zhang et al. [59] showed that every linear biderivation of nest algebras on a complex separable Hilbert space \mathbf{H} is an inner biderivation if and only if $\dim 0_+ \neq 1$ or $\dim \mathbf{H}_\perp^\perp \neq 1$. Zhao et al. [60] used the results in [59] to prove that every biderivation of an upper triangular matrix algebra is a sum of an inner biderivation and a special biderivation, which they call an extremal biderivation. Benkovič [5] defines the concept of an extremal biderivation, and proves that under certain conditions a biderivation of a triangular algebra \mathcal{A} is a sum of an extremal and an inner biderivation. The same statement still holds for the case of generalized matrix algebras [20].

Cheung initially started to study commuting mappings of matrix algebras in his powerful works [15, 16]. He determined the class of triangular algebras for which every commuting mapping is proper. In [6] Benkovič and Eremita studied commuting traces of bilinear mappings on triangular algebras. They gave mild conditions under which arbitrary commuting trace of a triangular algebra is proper. The authors applied the obtained results to the study of Lie isomorphisms and that of commutativity preserving mappings. Du and Wang [18] proved that under certain conditions, each k -commuting mapping on a triangular algebra \mathcal{A} is proper. More recently, Li, Liang, Wei and Xiao [23, 42–45, 54–56] jointly investigated linear mappings of generalized matrix algebras, such as derivations, Jordan derivations, Lie derivations, commuting mappings and semi-centralizing mappings. Our main purpose is to develop the theory of linear mappings of triangular algebras to the case of generalized matrix algebras, which has a much broader background. In [54], Xiao and Wei extended the main results of [16] to the case of generalized matrix algebras. They described the general form of arbitrary commuting mapping of a generalized matrix algebra and provided several sufficient conditions which enable the commuting mappings to be proper. Li and Wei [42, 43] considered semi-centralizing mappings of generalized matrix algebras and many ring-theoretic aspect results were extended to the case of generalized matrix algebras via complicated matrix computations. Franca [24–31] considered commuting mappings on certain subset of the full matrix algebra $M_n(\mathbb{K})$ over an arbitrary field \mathbb{K} . The involved subsets include the subset of all invertible matrices, the subset of all singular matrices and the subset of all rank- k matrices. He observed that every commuting mapping on these subsets usually has the so-called proper form. Motivating by Franca's work, Liu [46] characterized centralizing mappings on the above-mentioned subsets and got some analogous results. Xu and Yi gave the forms of commuting mappings of the aforementioned subsets got some analogous results [57].

This paper is devoted to the study of k -commuting mappings of generalized matrix algebras. We will describe the general form of arbitrary k -commuting mapping

of a 2-torsion free generalized matrix algebra and provide a sufficient condition which enables each commuting mapping to be proper. Our work extends the main results of [16, 18] to the case of generalized matrix algebras and also give the corresponding k -commuting version of [54, Theorem 3.6].

xxsec2

2. GENERALIZED MATRIX ALGEBRAS AND EXAMPLES

Let us begin with the definition of generalized matrix algebras given by a Morita context. Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative ring with identity. A *Morita context* consists of two unital \mathcal{R} -algebras A and B , two bimodules ${}_A M_B$ and ${}_B N_A$, and two bimodule homomorphisms called the pairings $\Phi_{MN} : M \otimes_B N \rightarrow A$ and $\Psi_{NM} : N \otimes_A M \rightarrow B$ satisfying the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \otimes_B N \otimes_A M & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{MN} \otimes I_M} & A \otimes_A M \\ \downarrow I_M \otimes \Psi_{NM} & & \downarrow \cong \\ M \otimes_B B & \xrightarrow{\cong} & M \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} N \otimes_A M \otimes_B N & \xrightarrow{\Psi_{NM} \otimes I_N} & B \otimes_B N \\ \downarrow I_N \otimes \Phi_{MN} & & \downarrow \cong \\ N \otimes_A A & \xrightarrow{\cong} & N. \end{array}$$

Let us write this Morita context as $(A, B, M, N, \Phi_{MN}, \Psi_{NM})$. We refer the reader to [48] for the basic properties of Morita contexts. If $(A, B, M, N, \Phi_{MN}, \Psi_{NM})$ is a Morita context, then the set

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} A & M \\ N & B \end{array} \right] = \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{cc} a & m \\ n & b \end{array} \right] \mid a \in A, m \in M, n \in N, b \in B \right\}$$

is an \mathcal{R} -algebra under matrix-like addition and matrix-like multiplication, where at least one of M and N is non-zero. Such an \mathcal{R} -algebra is usually called a *generalized matrix algebra* of order 2 and is denoted by

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(A, M, N, B) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} A & M \\ N & B \end{array} \right].$$

In a similar way, one can define a generalized matrix algebra of order $n > 2$. It was shown that up to isomorphism, arbitrary generalized matrix algebra of order n ($n \geq 2$) is a generalized matrix algebra of order 2 [43, Example 2.2]. If one of the modules M and N is zero, then \mathcal{G} exactly degenerates to an *upper triangular algebra* or a *lower triangular algebra*. In this case, we denote the resulted upper triangular algebra (resp. lower triangular algebra) by

$$\mathcal{T}^u = \mathcal{T}(A, M, B) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} A & M \\ O & B \end{array} \right] \quad \left(\text{resp. } \mathcal{T}^l = \mathcal{T}(A, N, B) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} A & O \\ N & B \end{array} \right] \right)$$

Note that our current generalized matrix algebras contain those generalized matrix algebras in the sense of Brown [14] as special cases. Let $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{R})$ be the full matrix algebra consisting of all $n \times n$ matrices over \mathcal{R} . It is worth to point out that the notion of generalized matrix algebras efficiently incorporates triangular algebras and full matrix algebras together. A distinctive feature of our systematic work is to deal with all questions related to (non-)linear mappings of triangular algebras and of full matrix algebras under a rigorous unified framework, which is the admired generalized matrix algebras frame, see [42–45, 54, 55].

Let us list some classical examples of generalized matrix algebras which will be revisited in the sequel (Section 4 and Section 5). Since these examples are ubiquitous in noncommutative background and operator theory, we just state their title without any details.

- (1) Unital algebras with nontrivial idempotents, such as (semi-)prime algebras with nontrivial idempotents;
- (2) Full matrix algebras;
- (3) Inflated algebras;
- (4) Triangular algebras;
- (5) Quasitilted algebras;
- (6) von Neumann algebra on Hilbert spaces;
- (7) Nest algebras on Hilbert spaces;
- (8) Standard operator algebras on Banach spaces.

Special attention is paid to the unital algebras with nontrivial idempotents. The following result demonstrates the equivalence between the class of generalized matrix algebras and the family of unital algebras with nontrivial idempotents.

xxsec2.1

Proposition 2.1. [54, Proposition 2.1] *A unital algebra \mathcal{A} is a generalized matrix algebra if and only if there exists an idempotent $e \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $e\mathcal{A}(1 - e) \neq 0$.*

These generalized matrix algebras regularly appear in the theory of associative algebras and noncommutative Noetherian algebras in the most diverse situations, which is due to its powerful persuasiveness and intuitive illustration effect. However, people pay less attention to the linear mappings of generalized matrix algebras. It was Krylov who initiated the study of linear mappings on generalized matrix algebras from the classifying point of view [35]. Since then many articles are devoted to this topic, and a number of interesting results are obtained (see [1–3, 5, 7–9, 19, 20, 42–45, 53–56]). Nevertheless, it leaves so much to be desired. It seems that the essential difference between triangular algebras and generalized matrix algebras lie in the right upper “corner” or left lower “corner”. Such a bit difference clearly increases the complexity of construction and computation, which is reflected in the maximal ring of quotients [49, 52] and the modules over generalized matrix algebras [38]. The representation theory, homological behavior, K -theory of generalized matrix algebras are intensively investigated by Krylov and his coauthors in [35–40]. We will propose some open questions concerning linear mappings and functional identities of generalized matrix algebras in Section 5 of this article. Therefore, generalized matrix algebras are indeed one class of great potential and inspiring associative algebras. We can never emphasize on the importance of generalized matrix algebras too much.

xxsec3

3. k -COMMUTING MAPPINGS OF GENERALIZED MATRIX ALGEBRAS

Throughout this section, we denote the generalized matrix algebra of order 2 originating from a Morita context $(A, B, M, N, \Phi_{MN}, \Psi_{NM})$ by

$$\mathcal{G} := \begin{bmatrix} A & M \\ N & B \end{bmatrix},$$

where at least one of the two bimodules M and N is distinct from zero. We always assume that M is faithful as a left A -module and also as a right B -module, but no any constraint conditions on N . By [43, Section 2.2] we know that every generalized

matrix algebra of order $n(n > 2)$ is isomorphic to a generalized matrix algebras of order 2. In view of this fact and technical considerations, only generalized matrix algebras of order 2 are considered in this section. Let k be a fixed positive integer with $k \geq 2$. An \mathcal{R} -linear mapping $\Theta : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ is called k -commuting if

$$\left[\Theta \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right), \begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right]_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

for all $\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}$.

The center of \mathcal{G} is

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix} \mid am = mb, na = bn, \forall m \in M, \forall n \in N \right\}.$$

Indeed, by [35, Lemma 1] it follows that the center $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ consists of all diagonal matrices $\begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$, where $a \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$, $b \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$ and $am = mb$, $na = bn$ for all $m \in M, n \in N$. However, in our situation where M is faithful as a left A -module and also as a right B -module, the conditions that $a \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ and $b \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$ become redundant and can be deleted. Indeed, if $am = mb$ for all $m \in M$, then for arbitrary element $a' \in A$ we get

$$(aa' - a'a)m = a(a'm) - a'(am) = (a'm)b - a'(mb) = 0.$$

The assumption that M is faithful as a left A -module leads to $aa' - a'a = 0$ and hence $a \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$. Likewise, we also have $b \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$.

Let us define two natural \mathcal{R} -linear projections $\pi_A : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow A$ and $\pi_B : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow B$ by

$$\pi_A : \begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \mapsto a \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_B : \begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \mapsto b.$$

By the above paragraph, it is not difficult to see that $\pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ and that $\pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{Z}(B)$. Given an element $a \in \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$, if $\begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b' \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$, then we have $am = mb = mb'$ for all $m \in M$. Since M is faithful as a right B -module, $b = b'$. That implies there exists a unique $b \in \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$, which is denoted by $\varphi(a)$, such that $\begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$. It is easy to verify that the map $\varphi : \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})) \rightarrow \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ is an algebraic isomorphism such that $am = m\varphi(a)$ and $na = \varphi(a)n$ for all $a \in \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})), m \in M, n \in N$.

The following result is a natural extension of [18, Lemma 2.1], which is indispensable for the proof of our main result.

xxsec3.1

Lemma 3.1. *Let n be a positive integer and A be a unital associative ring. For a left A -module M , if $\alpha : A \rightarrow M$ is a mapping such that $\alpha(a+1) = \alpha(a)$ and $a^n \alpha(a) = 0$ for all $a \in A$, then $\alpha = 0$. Similarly, for a right A -module M' , a mapping $\beta : A \rightarrow M'$ is zero if $\beta(a+1) = \beta(a)$ and $\beta(a)a^n = 0$ for all $a \in A$.*

Before proving our main theorem, we describe the general form of arbitrary k -commuting mapping on the generalized matrix algebra \mathcal{G} .

xxsec3.2

Proposition 3.2. *Let Θ be a k -commuting mapping of \mathcal{G} . Then Θ is of the form*

$$\Theta \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) + \delta_2(m) + \delta_3(n) + \delta_4(b) & \tau_2(m) \\ \nu_3(n) & \mu_1(a) + \mu_2(m) + \mu_3(n) + \mu_4(b) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\star)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1 : A &\longrightarrow A, & \delta_2 : M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(A)_k, & \delta_3 : N &\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(A)_k, & \delta_4 : B &\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(A)_k, \\ \mu_1 : A &\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(B)_k, & \mu_2 : M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(B)_k, & \mu_3 : N &\longrightarrow \mathcal{Z}(B)_k, & \mu_4 : B &\longrightarrow B \\ \tau_2 : M &\longrightarrow M, & \nu_3 : N &\longrightarrow N \end{aligned}$$

are all \mathcal{R} -linear mappings satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) δ_1 is a k -commuting mapping of A and $\delta_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)_k$;
- (2) μ_4 is a k -commuting mapping of B and $\mu_4(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)_k$;
- (3) $(\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_2(m))m = m(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_2(m))$;
- (4) $n(\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_3(n)) = (\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_3(n))n$;
- (5) $2\tau_2(m) = (\delta_1(1) - \delta_4(1))m - m(\mu_1(1) - \mu_4(1))$;
- (6) $2\nu_3(n) = n(\delta_1(1) - \delta_4(1)) - (\mu_1(1) - \mu_4(1))n$.

Proof. Suppose that the k -commuting mapping Θ is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} &\Theta \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) + \delta_2(m) + \delta_3(n) + \delta_4(b) & \tau_1(a) + \tau_2(m) + \tau_3(n) + \tau_4(b) \\ \nu_1(a) + \nu_2(m) + \nu_3(n) + \nu_4(b) & \mu_1(a) + \mu_2(m) + \mu_3(n) + \mu_4(b) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

for all $\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}$, where $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4$ are \mathcal{R} -linear mappings from A, M, N, B to A , respectively; $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4$ are \mathcal{R} -linear mappings from A, M, N, B to M , respectively; $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_4$ are \mathcal{R} -linear mappings from A, M, N, B to N , respectively; $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4$ are \mathcal{R} -linear mappings from A, M, N, B to B , respectively.

For any $G \in \mathcal{G}$, we will intensively employ the equation

$$[\Theta(G), G]_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Taking $G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ into (3.1) leads to

$$\Theta(G) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(1) & \tau_1(1) \\ \nu_1(1) & \mu_1(1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.3)$$

Combining (3.2) with (3.3) and a direct computation yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = [\Theta(G), G]_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (-1)^k \tau_1(1) \\ \nu_1(1) & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This implies that

$$\tau_1(1) = 0, \quad \nu_1(1) = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Likewise, we also have

$$\tau_4(1) = 0, \quad \nu_4(1) = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

by putting $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ in (3.2).

Let us take $G = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ into (3.2). An inductive approach gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = [\Theta(G), G]_k = \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_1(a), a]_k & (-1)^k a^k \tau_1(a) \\ \nu_1(a) a^k & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.6)$$

This shows that

$$[\delta_1(a), a]_k = 0 \quad (3.7)$$

for all $a \in A$. That is, δ_1 is a k -commuting mapping of A . Substituting $a + 1$ for a in (3.7) we get $[\delta_1(1), a]_k = 0$ for all $a \in A$. Therefore $\delta_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)_k$. By (3.6) we

know that $a^k \tau_1(a) = 0$. In view of (3.4) we obtain $\tau_1(a) = \tau_1(a + 1)$. By Lemma 3.1 it follows that

$$\tau_1(a) = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

for all $a \in A$. Revisiting the relations (3.6) and (3.4) and applying Lemma 3.1 again we have

$$\nu_1(a) = 0 \quad (3.9)$$

for all $a \in A$.

Let us choose $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$ in (3.2). Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = [\Theta(G), G]_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \tau_4(b)b^k \\ (-1)^k b^k \nu_4(b) & [\mu_4(b), b]_k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.10)$$

(3.10) implies that

$$[\mu_4(b), b]_k = 0 \quad (3.11)$$

for all $b \in B$. That is to say that μ_4 is a k -commuting mapping of B . Replacing b by $b + 1$ in (3.11) leads to $[\mu_4(1), b]_k = 0$ for all $b \in B$. And hence $\mu_4(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)_k$. Furthermore, it follows from (3.5), (3.10) and Lemma 3.1 that

$$\tau_4(b) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_4(b) = 0 \quad (3.12)$$

for all $b \in B$.

Let us choose $G = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$ in (3.1). In view of (3.8), (3.9) and (3.12) we obtain

$$\Theta(G) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) + \delta_4(b) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_1(a) + \mu_4(b) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.13)$$

Taking (3.13) into (3.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} &= [\Theta(G), G]_k \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_1(a) + \delta_4(b), a]_k & 0 \\ 0 & [\mu_1(a) + \mu_4(b), b]_k \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_1(a), a]_k + [\delta_4(b), a]_k & 0 \\ 0 & [\mu_1(a), b]_k + [\mu_4(b), b]_k \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Note that δ_1 and μ_4 are k -commuting mappings of A and B , respectively. Thus $[\delta_1(a), a]_k = 0$ for all $a \in A$ and $[\mu_4(b), b]_k = 0$ for all $b \in B$. Then (3.14) shows that $[\delta_4(b), a]_k = 0$ and $[\mu_1(a), b]_k = 0$ for all $a \in A, b \in B$. That is, $\delta_4(b) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)_k$ for all $b \in B$ and $\mu_1(a) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)_k$ for all $a \in A$.

Let us put $G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & m \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ in (3.2) and denote by

$$[\Theta(G), G]_i = X_i = \begin{bmatrix} X_i(11) & X_i(12) \\ X_i(21) & X_i(22) \end{bmatrix}$$

for each $0 \leq i < k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} X_{i+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} X_{i+1}(11) & X_{i+1}(12) \\ X_{i+1}(21) & X_{i+1}(22) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= [X_i, G] \\ &= \left[\begin{bmatrix} X_i(11) & X_i(12) \\ X_i(21) & X_i(22) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & m \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} -mX_i(11) & X_i(11)m - mX_i(22) - X_i(12) \\ X_i(21) & X_i(21)m \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives $X_{i+1}(21) = X_i(21)$ and hence

$$X_k(21) = X_0(21) = \nu_2(m). \quad (3.15)$$

Note that the fact $X_k = 0$. Then (3.15) implies that $\nu_2(m) = 0$ for all $m \in M$. Therefore

$$X_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(1) + \delta_2(m) & \tau_2(m) \\ 0 & \mu_1(1) + \mu_2(m) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= [X_0, G] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta_1(1)m + \delta_2(m)m - \tau_2(m) - m\mu_1(1) - m\mu_2(m) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Applying inductive computations we assert that for each $i > 0$, $X_i = (-1)^{i-1}X_1$ and hence $X_k = (-1)^{k-1}X_1$. This proves that $X_1 = 0$. By (3.16) we have

$$\tau_2(m) = \delta_1(1)m + \delta_2(m)m - m\mu_1(1) - m\mu_2(m). \quad (3.17)$$

Likewise, we put $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ in (3.2) and get

$$\tau_2(m) = m\mu_4(1) + m\mu_2(m) - \delta_4(1)m - \delta_2(m)m. \quad (3.18)$$

Combining (3.17) with (3.18) leads to

$$(\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_2(m))m = m(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_2(m))$$

and

$$2\tau_2(m) = (\delta_1(1) - \delta_4(1))m - m(\mu_1(1) - \mu_4(1)),$$

which are the required statements (3) and (5).

Let us choose $G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ n & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ (resp. $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ n & 1 \end{bmatrix}$) in (3.2) and repeat the previous computational process (3.15) – (3.18). Then $\tau_3(n) = 0$ will follow. We also get

$$\nu_3(n) = n\delta_1(1) + n\delta_3(n) - \mu_1(1)n - \mu_3(n)n \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$\nu_3(n) = \mu_3(n)n + \mu_4(1)n - n\delta_3(n) - n\delta_4(1). \quad (3.20)$$

Combining (3.19) with (3.20) gives

$$n(\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_3(n)) = (\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_3(n))n$$

and

$$2\nu_3(n) = n(\delta_1(1) - \delta_4(1)) - (\mu_1(1) - \mu_4(1))n,$$

which are the required statements (4) and (6).

Taking $G = \begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ into (3.2) yields

$$[\delta_1(a), a]_k + [\delta_2(m), a]_k = 0. \quad (3.21)$$

Since δ_1 is a k -commuting mapping of A , $\delta_2(m) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)_k$. Choosing $G = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ n & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ in (3.2) and using the same computational methods, we can obtain $\delta_3(n) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)_k$. Likewise, $\mu_2(m) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)_k$ and $\mu_3(n) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)_k$ will follow if we take $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$ and $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ n & b \end{bmatrix}$ into (3.2), respectively. This completes the proof of this proposition. \square

The current authors in [43] described the general form of arbitrary derivation on the generalized matrix algebra \mathcal{G} and showed that every semi-centralizing derivation on \mathcal{G} is zero. We next extend this result to the case of k -commuting derivations.

xxsec3.3

Proposition 3.3. [43, Proposition 4.2] *An \mathcal{R} -linear mapping Θ_d is a derivation of \mathcal{G} if and only if Θ_d has the form*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta_d \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) - mn_0 - m_0n & am_0 - m_0b + \tau_2(m) \\ n_0a - bn_0 + \nu_3(n) & n_0m + nm_0 + \mu_4(b) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\spadesuit) \\ & \forall \begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m_0 \in M, n_0 \in N$ and

$$\delta_1 : A \longrightarrow A, \quad \tau_2 : M \longrightarrow M, \quad \nu_3 : N \longrightarrow N, \quad \mu_4 : B \longrightarrow B$$

are all \mathcal{R} -linear mappings satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) δ_1 is a derivation of A with $\delta_1(mn) = \tau_2(m)n + m\nu_3(n)$;
- (2) μ_4 is a derivation of B with $\mu_4(nm) = n\tau_2(m) + \nu_3(n)m$;
- (3) $\tau_2(am) = a\tau_2(m) + \delta_1(a)m$ and $\tau_2(mb) = \tau_2(m)b + m\mu_4(b)$;
- (4) $\nu_3(na) = \nu_3(n)a + n\delta_1(a)$ and $\nu_3(bn) = b\nu_3(n) + \mu_4(b)n$

xxsec3.4

Proposition 3.4. *Let \mathcal{G} be a 2-torsion free generalized matrix algebra. Then every k -commuting derivation on \mathcal{G} is zero.*

Proof. Let Θ_d be a k -commuting derivation on \mathcal{G} . By Proposition 3.3 we know that Θ_d is of the form

$$\Theta_d \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) - mn_0 - m_0n & am_0 - m_0b + \tau_2(m) \\ n_0a - bn_0 + \nu_3(n) & n_0m + nm_0 + \mu_4(b) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.22)$$

for all $\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}$, where $m_0 = \tau_1(1), n_0 = \nu_1(1)$. Since Θ_d is k -commuting on \mathcal{G} , $\tau_1(1) = \nu_1(1) = 0$ by the relation (3.4). Therefore (3.22) becomes

$$\Theta_d \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) & \tau_2(m) \\ \nu_3(n) & \mu_4(b) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.23)$$

It should be remarked that δ_1 and μ_4 are derivations of A and B , respectively. Thus $\delta_1(1) = \mu_4(1) = 0$. In view of the conditions (5) and (6) in Proposition 3.2 we know that $\tau_2(m) = 0$ for all $m \in M$ and $\nu_3(n) = 0$ for all $n \in N$. Furthermore, applying the condition (3) in Proposition 3.3 gives that $\delta_1(a)m = 0$ for all $a \in A$ and $m \in M$. Since M is a faithful left A -module, $\delta_1(a) = 0$ for all $a \in A$. Similarly, by the condition (4) in Proposition 3.3 we can obtain $\mu_4(b) = 0$ for all $b \in B$. Hence, Θ_d has the form

$$\Theta_d \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

for all $\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}$, which is the desired result. \square

Now we are in a position to state the main theorem of this article. This result will provide a sufficient condition which enables arbitrary k -commuting mapping on the generalized matrix algebra \mathcal{G} to be proper.

xxsec3.5

Theorem 3.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a 2-torsion free generalized matrix algebra and Θ be a k -commuting mapping of \mathcal{G} . If the following three conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) $\mathcal{Z}(A)_k = \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$;
- (2) $\mathcal{Z}(B)_k = \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$;
- (3) *There exist $m_0 \in M$ and $n_0 \in N$ such that*

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) = \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{cc} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{array} \right] \mid a \in \mathcal{Z}(A), b \in \mathcal{Z}(B), am_0 = m_0b, n_0a = bn_0 \right\},$$

then Θ is proper. That is, Θ has the form

$$\Theta \left(\left[\begin{array}{cc} a & m \\ n & b \end{array} \right] \right) = \lambda \left[\begin{array}{cc} a & m \\ n & b \end{array} \right] + \zeta \left(\left[\begin{array}{cc} a & m \\ n & b \end{array} \right] \right), \forall \left[\begin{array}{cc} a & m \\ n & b \end{array} \right] \in \mathcal{G},$$

where $\lambda \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\zeta : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ is an \mathcal{R} -linear mapping.

Proof. By Proposition 3.2 we know that Θ has the form (\star) . We will complete the proof of this theorem via the following six steps.

Step 1. $\delta_2(m)m = m\mu_2(m)$ and $n\delta_3(n) = \mu_3(n)n$ for all $m \in M$ and $n \in N$.

We first claim that

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} \delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) \end{array} \right] \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}). \quad (3.24)$$

Actually, we have obtained $\delta_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)_k$ in the proof of Proposition 3.2. Applying the conditions (1) and (3) yields that $\delta_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$. Likewise, we also have $\delta_4(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ and hence $\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$. Similarly, we get $\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$. Moreover, it follows from the statement (3) of Proposition 3.2 that for arbitrary element $m \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_2(m_0 + m))(m_0 + m) \\ &= (\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_2(m_0))m_0 + 2\delta_2(m)m_0 \\ & \quad + 2\delta_2(m_0)m + (\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_2(m))m \\ &= m_0(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_2(m_0)) + 2\delta_2(m)m_0 \\ & \quad + 2\delta_2(m_0)m + m(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_2(m)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

On the other hand, the statement (3) of Proposition 3.2 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & (\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1) + 2\delta_2(m_0 + m))(m_0 + m) \\ &= (m_0 + m)(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_2(m_0 + m)) \\ &= m_0(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_2(m_0)) + 2m_0\mu_2(m) \\ & \quad + 2m\mu_2(m_0) + m(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1) + 2\mu_2(m)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

The above two equalities (3.25) and (3.26) imply that

$$2\delta_2(m)m_0 + 2\delta_2(m_0)m = 2m_0\mu_2(m) + 2m\mu_2(m_0). \quad (3.27)$$

Taking $m = m_0$ into (3.27) leads to $4\delta_2(m_0)m_0 = 4m_0\mu_2(m_0)$. Since \mathcal{G} is 2-torsion free,

$$\delta_2(m_0)m_0 = m_0\mu_2(m_0).$$

Thus the statement (3) of Proposition 3.2 becomes

$$(\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1))m_0 = m_0(\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1)). \quad (3.28)$$

Likewise, we by the statement (4) of Proposition 3.2 arrive at

$$2n_0\delta_3(n) + 2n\delta_3(n_0) = 2\mu_3(n)n_0 + 2\mu_3(n_0)n. \quad (3.29)$$

Thus $n_0\delta_3(n_0) = \mu_3(n_0)n_0$ will follow if we choose $n = n_0$ in (3.29) and consider the 2-torsion free property of \mathcal{G} . Now the statement (4) of Proposition 3.2 becomes

$$n_0(\delta_1(1) + \delta_4(1)) = (\mu_1(1) + \mu_4(1))n_0. \quad (3.30)$$

Combining (3.28), (3.30) with condition (3) completes the proof of (3.24). In view of the conditions (2), (3) and (3.24) we obtain

$$\delta_2(m)m = m\mu_2(m) \quad \text{and} \quad n\delta_3(n) = \mu_3(n)n. \quad (3.31)$$

By the relations (3.17), (3.18) and (3.31) we get

$$\tau_2(m) = \delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1) = m\mu_4(1) - \delta_4(1)m. \quad (3.32)$$

In view of the relations (3.20), (3.21) and (3.31) we have

$$\nu_3(n) = n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n = \mu_4(1)n - n\delta_4(1). \quad (3.33)$$

Step 2. $\delta_3(n)m = m\mu_3(n)$, $\mu_2(m)n = n\delta_2(m)$ for all $m \in M$ and $n \in N$.

We assert that

$$(\delta_3(n)m - m\mu_3(n))n = 0 \quad (3.34)$$

for all $m \in M, n \in N$. Proposition 3.2 shows that $\delta_3(n) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)_k$ for all $n \in N$. The conditions (1) and (3) force that $\delta_3(n) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ for all $n \in N$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_3(n)m - m\mu_3(n))n &= \delta_3(n)mn - m\mu_3(n)n \\ &= mn\delta_3(n) - m\mu_3(n)n = m(n\delta_3(n) - \mu_3(n)n) \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows from (3.31). Using the the same computational method we conclude

$$n(\delta_3(n)m - m\mu_3(n)) = 0, \quad (3.35)$$

$$m(\mu_2(m)n - n\delta_2(m)) = 0 \quad (3.36)$$

and

$$(\mu_2(m)n - n\delta_2(m))m = 0. \quad (3.37)$$

Let us choose $G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & m \\ n & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. It follows from (3.32), (3.33) and Proposition 3.2 that

$$\Theta(G) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(1) + \delta_2(m) + \delta_3(n) & \delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1) \\ n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n & \mu_1(1) + \mu_2(m) + \mu_3(n) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Applying the relation (3.31) yields

$$[\Theta(G), G] = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(1)mn - mn\delta_1(1) & \delta_3(n)m - m\mu_3(n) \\ \mu_2(m)n - n\delta_2(m) & nm\mu_1(1) - \mu_1(1)nm \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.38)$$

It should be remarked that $\delta_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$, $\mu_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$, $mn \in A$ and $nm \in B$. Thus (3.38) becomes

$$[\Theta(G), G] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta_3(n)m - m\mu_3(n) \\ \mu_2(m)n - n\delta_2(m) & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.39)$$

Consequently, for each $k \geq 2$, the relations (3.34)-(3.37) jointly give

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = [\Theta(G), G]_k = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (-1)^{k+1}(\delta_3(n)m - m\mu_3(n)) \\ \mu_2(m)n - n\delta_2(m) & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore

$$\delta_3(n)m = m\mu_3(n) \quad \mu_2(m)n = n\delta_2(m). \quad (3.40)$$

Step 3. $\begin{bmatrix} \delta_2(m) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2(m) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ for all $m \in M$ and $\begin{bmatrix} \delta_3(n) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_3(n) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ for all $n \in N$.

It is not difficult to verify that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_2(m_0) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2(m_0) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}). \quad (3.41)$$

Indeed, by Proposition 3.2 and the conditions (1), (2) and (3) we have

$$\delta_2(m) \in \mathcal{Z}(A) \text{ and } \mu_2(m) \in \mathcal{Z}(B) \quad (3.42)$$

for all $m \in M$. Furthermore, (3.31) and (3.40) imply that

$$\delta_2(m_0)m_0 = m_0\mu_2(m_0) \text{ and } n_0\delta_2(m_0) = \mu_2(m_0)n_0. \quad (3.43)$$

Then (3.41) follows from (3.42), (3.43) and the condition (3).

By the definition of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ and the relation (3.41) we know that $\delta_2(m_0)m = m\mu_2(m_0)$. This forces (3.27) to be

$$\delta_2(m)m_0 = m_0\mu_2(m). \quad (3.44)$$

Combining the relations (3.40), (3.44) and the condition (3) leads to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_2(m) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2(m) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) \quad (3.45)$$

for all $m \in M$. Similarly, it can be proved that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_3(n) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_3(n) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) \quad (3.46)$$

for all $n \in N$.

Step 4. For all $a \in A$, $m \in M$ and $n \in N$, we have

- (a) $\delta_1(a)m - m\mu_1(a) = a(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1)) = a(m\mu_4(1) - \delta_4(1)m)$,
- (b) $n\delta_1(a) - \mu_1(a)n = (n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n)a = (\mu_4(1)n - n\delta_4(1))a$.

Let us choose $G = \begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Then (3.31) and $\delta_2(m) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ imply that

$$[\Theta(G), G] = \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_1(a), a] & \alpha_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\alpha_1 = \delta_1(a)m - m\mu_1(a) - a(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1))$. It should be remarked that there exists a unique algebraic isomorphism $\varphi : \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})) \rightarrow \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ such that $am = m\varphi(a)$ and $na = \varphi(a)n$ for all $a \in \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$, $m \in M$ and $n \in N$. Therefore

$$\alpha_1 = \delta_1(a)m - \varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(a))m - a\delta_1(1)m + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1))m. \quad (3.47)$$

On the other hand, we by an inductive computation have

$$[\Theta(G), G]_i = \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_1(a), a]_i & \alpha_i \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ for each } i > 1,$$

where $\alpha_i = [\delta_1(a), a]_{i-1}m - a\alpha_{i-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \alpha_k \\ &= [\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1}m - a[\delta_1(a), a]_{k-2}m + \cdots + (-a)^{k-2}[\delta_1(a), a]m + (-a)^{k-1}\alpha_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

Combining (3.47) with (3.48) yields that

$$0 = ([\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} + \cdots + (-a)^{k-2}[\delta_1(a), a] \\ + (-a)^{k-1}(\delta_1(a) - \varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(a)) - a\delta_1(1) + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1))))m$$

for all $m \in M$. The fact that M is a faithful left A -module leads to

$$(-a)^{k-1}(\mu_1(a) + a\delta_1(1) - a\mu_1(1)) \\ = [\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} + \cdots + (-a)^{k-2}[\delta_1(a), a] + (-a)^{k-1}\delta_1(a).$$

Then Proposition 3.2 and the condition (1) show that $(-a)^{k-1}(\mu_1(a) + a\delta_1(1) - a\mu_1(1)) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$. That is,

$$[\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} + \cdots + (-a)^{k-2}[\delta_1(a), a] + (-a)^{k-1}\delta_1(a) \in \mathcal{Z}(A). \quad (3.49)$$

We assert that $[\delta_1(a), a] = 0$ for all $a \in A$. Indeed, it follows from (3.49) that

$$[[\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} + \cdots + (-a)^{k-2}[\delta_1(a), a] + (-a)^{k-1}\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} = 0 \quad (3.50)$$

for all $a \in A$. Since δ_1 is a k -commuting on A ,

$$a^{k-1}[\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} = 0$$

for all $a \in A$. Furthermore, the fact that $\delta_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ gives $[\delta_1(a+1), a+1]_{k-1} = [\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1}$ for all $a \in A$. By Lemma 3.1 we get $[\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} = 0$ for all $a \in A$. Repeating the same process we arrive at

$$0 = [\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1} = [\delta_1(a), a]_{k-2} = \cdots = [\delta_1(a), a]. \quad (3.51)$$

Taking the relation $[\delta_1(a), a] = 0$ into (3.48) we obtain $a^{k-1}\alpha_1 = 0$. Let us fix arbitrary element $m \in M$ and define $\alpha(a) = \delta_1(a)m - m\mu_1(a) - a(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1))$. Then

$$\alpha(a+1) = \delta_1(a+1)m - m\mu_1(a+1) - (a+1)(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1)) \\ = \delta_1(a)m - m\mu_1(a) + \delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1) \\ - a(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1)) - \delta_1(1)m + m\mu_1(1) \\ = \delta_1(a)m - m\mu_1(a) - a(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1)) = \alpha(a)$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 again we have $\alpha(a) = 0$. Thus

$$\delta_1(a)m - m\mu_1(a) = a(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1)). \quad (3.52)$$

Combining (3.32) with (3.52) yields

$$\delta_1(a)m - m\mu_1(a) = a(m\mu_4(1) - \delta_4(1)m). \quad (3.53)$$

This completes the proof of (a). Likewise, if we take $G = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ n & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, then (3.31) and $\delta_3(n) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ imply that

$$[\Theta(G), G] = \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_1(a), a] & 0 \\ \beta_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\beta_1 = (n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n)a + \mu_1(a)n - n\delta_1(a)$. We by an inductive computation conclude

$$[\Theta(G), G]_i = \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_1(a), a]_i & 0 \\ \beta_i & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ for each } i > 1,$$

where $\beta_i = \beta_{i-1}a - n[\delta_1(a), a]_{i-1}$. Then

$$0 = \beta_k = \beta_1 a^{k-1} - n[\delta_1(a), a] a^{k-2} - \cdots - n[\delta_1(a), a]_{k-1}. \quad (3.54)$$

Taking (3.51) into (3.54) we obtain $\beta_1 a^{k-1} = 0$. Let us fix arbitrary element $n \in N$ and define $\beta(a) = (n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n)a + \mu_1(a)n - n\delta_1(a)$. A direct computations gives $\beta(a) = \beta(a+1)$. In view of Lemma 3.1, we have $\beta = 0$. That is,

$$(n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n)a = n\delta_1(a) - \mu_1(a)n. \quad (3.55)$$

It follows from the relations (3.33) and (3.55) that

$$(\mu_4(1)n - n\delta_4(1))a = n\delta_1(a) - \mu_1(a)n, \quad (3.56)$$

which is the desired result (b).

Step 5. For all $b \in B$, $m \in M$ and $n \in N$, we have

- (c) $\delta_4(b)m - m\mu_4(b) = (m\mu_1(1) - \delta_1(1)m)b = (\delta_4(1)m - m\mu_4(1))b$,
- (d) $n\delta_4(b) - \mu_4(b)n = b(\mu_1(1)n - n\delta_1(1)) = b(n\delta_4(1) - \mu_4(1)n)$.

Let us choose $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix}$. Then (3.31) and $\mu_2(m) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ imply that

$$[\Theta(G), G] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \gamma_1 \\ 0 & [\mu_4(b), b] \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\gamma_1 = \delta_4(b)m - m\mu_4(b) - (m\mu_1(1) - \delta_1(1)m)b$. Note that there exists a unique algebraic isomorphism $\varphi : \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})) \rightarrow \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ such that $am = m\varphi(a)$ and $na = \varphi(a)n$ for all $a \in \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$, $m \in M$ and $n \in N$. Therefore

$$\gamma_1 = m\varphi(\delta_4(b)) - m\mu_4(b) - m\mu_1(1)b - m\varphi(\delta_1(1))b. \quad (3.57)$$

On the other hand, we by an inductive computation get

$$[\Theta(G), G]_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \gamma_i \\ 0 & [\mu_4(b), b]_i \end{bmatrix} \text{ for each } i > 1,$$

where $\gamma_i = \gamma_{i-1}b - m[\mu_4(b), b]_{i-1}$. Then

$$0 = \gamma_k = \gamma_1 b^{k-1} - m[\mu_4(b), b]b^{k-2} - \dots - m[\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1}. \quad (3.58)$$

Combining (3.57) with (3.58) yields that

$$0 = m((\varphi(\delta_4(b)) - \mu_4(b) - \mu_1(1)b - \varphi(\delta_1(1)b))b^{k-1} - [\mu_4(b), b]b^{k-2} - \dots - [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1})$$

for all $m \in M$. Since M is a faithful right B -module, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\varphi(\delta_4(b)) - \mu_1(1)b - \varphi(\delta_1(1)b))b^{k-1} \\ &= \mu_4(b)b^{k-1} + [\mu_4(b), b]b^{k-2} + \dots + [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then Proposition 3.2 and the conditions (1) and (2) jointly give $(\varphi(\delta_4(b)) - \mu_1(1)b - \varphi(\delta_1(1)b))b^{k-1} \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$. That is,

$$\mu_4(b)b^{k-1} + [\mu_4(b), b]b^{k-2} + \dots + [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1} \in \mathcal{Z}(B). \quad (3.59)$$

We conclude that $[\mu_4(b), b] = 0$ for all $b \in B$. Indeed, it follows from the relation (3.59) that

$$[\mu_4(b)b^{k-1} + [\mu_4(b), b]b^{k-2} + \dots + [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1}, b]_{k-1} = 0 \quad (3.60)$$

for all $b \in B$. Since μ_4 is k -commuting on B ,

$$[\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1}b^{k-1} = 0$$

for all $b \in B$. Furthermore, $\mu_4(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$ leads to $[\mu_4(b+1), b+1]_{k-1} = [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1}$ for all $b \in B$. Applying Lemma 3.1 we obtain $[\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1} = 0$. Repeating the same process as above we arrive at

$$0 = [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1} = [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-2} = \cdots = [\mu_4(b), b]. \quad (3.61)$$

Taking $[\mu_4(b), b] = 0$ into (3.58) we get $\gamma_1 b^{k-1} = 0$. Let us fix arbitrary element $m \in M$ and define $\gamma(b) = \delta_4(b)m - m\mu_4(b) - (m\mu_1(1) - \delta_1(1)m)b$. A direct computations gives $\gamma(b+1) = \gamma(b)$. And hence $\gamma(b) = 0$ by Lemma 3.1. That is,

$$\delta_4(b)m - m\mu_4(b) = (m\mu_1(1) - \delta_1(1)m)b. \quad (3.62)$$

It follows from the relations (3.32) and (3.62) that

$$\delta_4(b)m - m\mu_4(b) = (\delta_4(1)m - m\mu_4(1))b. \quad (3.63)$$

This completes the proof of (c).

In order to prove (d), let us take $G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ n & b \end{bmatrix}$. Then (3.31) and $\mu_3(n) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$ imply that

$$[\Theta(G), G] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \eta_1 & [\mu_4(b), b] \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\eta_1 = \mu_4(b)n - n\delta_4(b) - b(\mu_1(1)n - n\delta_1(1))$. It is easy to verify that for each $i > 1$,

$$[\Theta(G), G]_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \eta_i & [\mu_4(b), b]_i \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\eta_i = [\mu_4(b), b]_{i-1}n - b\eta_{i-1}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \eta_k \\ &= [\mu_4(b), b]_{k-1}n - b[\mu_4(b), b]_{k-2}n + \cdots + (-b)^{k-2}[\mu_4(b), b]n + (-b)^{k-1}\eta_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.64)$$

In view of the relations (3.61) and (3.64) we have $b^{k-1}\eta_1 = 0$. Let us fix arbitrary element $n \in N$ and define $\eta(b) = \mu_4(b)n - n\delta_4(b) - b(\mu_1(1)n - n\delta_1(1))$. Then a straightforward computations gives $\eta(b) = \eta(b+1)$. By Lemma 3.1 again it follows that $\eta = 0$. That is,

$$\mu_4(b)n - n\delta_4(b) = b(\mu_1(1)n - n\delta_1(1)). \quad (3.65)$$

Combining (3.33) with (3.65) leads to

$$n\delta_4(b) - \mu_4(b)n = b(n\delta_4(1) - \mu_4(1)n). \quad (3.66)$$

This completes the proof of this step.

Step 6. Θ is proper.

Suppose that

$$\Omega(X) := \Theta(X) - XC$$

for all $X \in \mathcal{G}$, where $C = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(1) - \varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & \varphi(\delta_1(1)) - \mu_1(1) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$. We assert that $\Omega(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$. Note that there exists a unique algebraic isomorphism $\varphi :$

$\pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})) \longrightarrow \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ such that $am = m\varphi(a)$ and $na = \varphi(a)n$ for all $a \in \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$, $m \in M$ and $n \in N$. Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) - a\delta_1(1) + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_1(a) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} \delta_4(b) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_4(b) - b\varphi(\delta_1(1)) + b\mu_1(1) \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} \delta_2(m) + \delta_3(n) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2(m) + \mu_3(n) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

for all $\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}$. By the relation (3.52) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\delta_1(a) - a\delta_1(1) + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1)))m - m\mu_1(a) \\ &= a(\delta_1(1)m - m\mu_1(1)) - a(\delta_1(1) - \varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1)))m \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in A, m \in M$. That is,

$$(\delta_1(a) - a\delta_1(1) + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1)))m = m\mu_1(a) \quad (3.68)$$

for all $a \in A, m \in M$. In view of the relation (3.55) and the fact $\delta_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(A)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &n(\delta_1(a) - a\delta_1(1) + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1))) - \mu_1(a)n \\ &= (n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n)a - na(\delta_1(1) - \varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1))) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in A, n \in N$. Therefore

$$n(\delta_1(a) - a\delta_1(1) + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1))) = \mu_1(a)n \quad (3.69)$$

for all $a \in A, n \in N$. In view of (3.68), (3.69) and the definition of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ we conclude

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) - a\delta_1(1) + a\varphi^{-1}(\mu_1(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_1(a) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) \quad (3.70)$$

for all $a \in A$. Likewise, the relation (3.62) and the fact $\mu_1(1) \in \mathcal{Z}(B)$ jointly lead to

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_4(b)m - m(\mu_4(b) - b\varphi(\delta_1(1)) + b\mu_1(1)) \\ &= (m\mu_1(1) - \delta_1(1)m)b + mb(\varphi(\delta_1(1)) - \mu_1(1)) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $b \in B, m \in M$. This implies that

$$\delta_4(b)m = m(\mu_4(b) - b\varphi(\delta_1(1)) + b\mu_1(1)) \quad (3.71)$$

for all $b \in B, m \in M$. It follows from (3.65) that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mu_4(b) - b\varphi(\delta_1(1)) + b\mu_1(1))n - n\delta_4(b) \\ &= b(n\delta_1(1) - \mu_1(1)n) - b(\varphi(\delta_1(1)) - \mu_1(1))n \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $b \in B, n \in N$. This shows

$$n\delta_4(b) = (\mu_4(b) - b\varphi(\delta_1(1)) + b\mu_1(1))n \quad (3.72)$$

for all $b \in B, n \in N$. Taking into account (3.71), (3.72) and the definition of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$ yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_4(b) & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_4(b) - b\varphi(\delta_1(1)) + b\mu_1(1) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) \quad (3.73)$$

for all $b \in B$. Then (3.45), (3.46), (3.70) and (3.73) prove that

$$\Omega \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})$$

for all $\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}$, which is the desired assertion. \square

The following result will be used in the sequel.

xxsec3.6

Corollary 3.6. *If $\mathcal{Z}(A)_k = \mathcal{R}1 = \mathcal{Z}(B)_k$, then every k -commuting mapping of \mathcal{G} is proper.*

Indeed, since $\mathcal{R}1 \subseteq \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(A)_k = \mathcal{R}1$, we have $\mathcal{R}1 = \mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{Z}(A)_k = \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$. Likewise, we get $\mathcal{R}1 = \mathcal{Z}(B) = \mathcal{Z}(B)_k = \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$. It is easy to check that the condition (3) of Theorem 3.5 is satisfied. This corollary follows from Theorem 3.5.

In particular, if the generalized matrix algebra \mathcal{G} degenerates one general triangular algebra (that is, $\mathcal{G} = \begin{bmatrix} A & M \\ O & B \end{bmatrix}$), then our main result Theorem 3.5 contains the main theorem of [18] as a special case.

xxsec3.7

Corollary 3.7. [18, Theorem 1.1] *Let \mathcal{T} be a 2-torsion free triangular algebra and Θ be a k -commuting mapping of \mathcal{T} . If the following three conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) $\mathcal{Z}(A)_k = \pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$;
- (2) $\mathcal{Z}(B)_k = \pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$;
- (3) *There exists $m_0 \in M$ such that*

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix} \middle| a \in \mathcal{Z}(A), b \in \mathcal{Z}(B), am_0 = m_0b \right\},$$

then Θ is proper.

4. APPLICATIONS

xxsec4

In this section, we will present some applications of k -commuting mappings to full matrix algebras, inflated algebras, upper and lower triangular matrix algebras, nest algebras and block upper and lower triangular matrix algebras.

xxsec4.1

4.1. Full matrix algebras. Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative ring with identity, A be a 2-torsion free unital algebra over \mathcal{R} and $M_n(A)$ be the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices with $n \geq 2$. Then the *full matrix algebra* $M_n(A)$ ($n \geq 2$) can be represented as a generalized matrix algebra of the form

$$M_n(A) = \begin{bmatrix} A & M_{1 \times (n-1)}(A) \\ M_{(n-1) \times 1}(A) & M_{n-1}(A) \end{bmatrix}.$$

xxsec4.1

Corollary 4.1. *Every k -commuting mapping on the full matrix algebra $M_n(A)$ or $M_n(\mathcal{R})$ is proper.*

One can directly check that $M_n(A)$ or $M_n(\mathcal{R})$ satisfies all conditions (1)-(3) of Theorem 3.5. Therefore, every commuting mapping on $M_n(A)$ or $M_n(\mathcal{R})$ is proper. We would like to point out that this corollary can also be obtained by applying the notion of FI-degree of functional identities and related results in [13].

xxsec4.2

4.2. Inflated algebras. Let A be a unital \mathcal{R} -algebra and V be an \mathcal{R} -linear space. Given an \mathcal{R} -bilinear form $\gamma : V \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} V \rightarrow A$, we define an associative algebra (not necessarily with identity) $B = B(A, V, \gamma)$ as follows: As an \mathcal{R} -linear space, B equals to $V \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} V \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} A$. The multiplication is defined as follows

$$(a \otimes b \otimes x) \cdot (c \otimes d \otimes y) := a \otimes d \otimes x\gamma(b, c)y$$

for all $a, b, c, d \in V$ and any $x, y \in A$. This definition makes B become an associative \mathcal{R} -algebra and B is called an *inflated algebra* of A along V . The inflated algebras are closely connected with the cellular algebras which are extensively studied in representation theory. We refer the reader to [34] and the references therein for these algebras.

Let us assume that V is a non-zero linear space with a basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. Then the bilinear form γ can be characterized by an $n \times n$ matrix Γ over A , that is, $\Gamma = (\gamma(v_i, v_j))$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Now we could define a new multiplication “ \circ ” on the full matrix algebra $M_n(A)$ by

$$X \circ Y := X\Gamma Y \quad \text{for all } X, Y \in M_n(A).$$

Under the usual matrix addition and the new multiplication “ \circ ”, $M_n(A)$ becomes a new associative algebra which is a generalized matrix algebra in the sense of Brown [14]. We denote this new algebra by $(M_n(A), \Gamma)$. It should be remarked that our current generalized matrix algebras contain all generalized matrix algebras defined by Brown [14] as special cases. By [34, Lemma 4.1], the inflated algebra $B(A, V, \gamma)$ is isomorphic to $(M_n(A), \Gamma)$ and hence is a generalized matrix algebra in the sense of ours.

xxsec4.2

Corollary 4.2. *Let A be a unital \mathcal{R} -algebra, V be an \mathcal{R} -linear space and $B(A, V, \gamma)$ be the inflated algebra of A along V . If $B(A, V, \gamma)$ has an identity element, then each k -commuting mapping of $B(A, V, \gamma)$ is proper.*

Proof. If $B(A, V, \gamma)$ has an identity element, then the matrix Γ defined by the bilinear form γ is invertible in the full matrix algebra $M_n(A)$ by [34, Proposition 4.2]. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma : M_n(A) &\longrightarrow (M_n(A), \Gamma) \\ X &\longmapsto X\Gamma^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sigma(X) \circ \sigma(Y) = \sigma(X)\Gamma\sigma(Y) = XY\Gamma^{-1} = \sigma(XY)$ for all $X, Y \in M_n(A)$ and hence σ is an algebraic isomorphism. Now the result follows from Corollary 4.1 and the fact $B(A, V, \gamma) \cong (M_n(A), \Gamma)$. \square

xxsec4.3

4.3. Prime algebras. Let \mathcal{A} be a 2-torsionfree prime algebra over a commutative ring \mathcal{R} . Assume that \mathcal{A} has unit 1 and a nontrivial idempotent e . Then $\mathcal{A} = e\mathcal{A}e + e\mathcal{A}(1-e) + (1-e)\mathcal{A}e + (1-e)\mathcal{A}(1-e)$. Since \mathcal{A} is prime, it is straightforward to verify that both $e\mathcal{A}e$ and $(1-e)\mathcal{A}(1-e)$ are also prime. By [41, Theorem 2] it follows that $\mathcal{Z}(e\mathcal{A}e)_k = \pi_{e\mathcal{A}e}\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{Z}((1-e)\mathcal{A}(1-e))_k = \pi_{(1-e)\mathcal{A}(1-e)}\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A})$.

xxsec4.3

Corollary 4.3. *Let \mathcal{A} be a 2-torsionfree prime algebra over a commutative ring \mathcal{R} . Suppose that \mathcal{A} has the identity 1 and a nontrivial idempotent e . Then every k -commuting mapping of \mathcal{A} is proper.*

xxsec4.4

4.4. Upper and lower matrix triangular algebras. Let \mathcal{R} be a 2-torsion free commutative ring with identity. We denote the set of all $p \times q$ matrices over \mathcal{R} by $M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{R})$. Let us denote the set of all $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over \mathcal{R} and the set of all $n \times n$ lower triangular matrices over \mathcal{R} by $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{R})$ and $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{R})$, respectively. For $n \geq 2$ and each $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, the *upper triangular matrix algebra* $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{R})$ and *lower triangular matrix algebra* $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{R})$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{R}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{T}_k(\mathcal{R}) & M_{k \times (n-k)}(\mathcal{R}) \\ & \mathcal{T}_{n-k}(\mathcal{R}) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{R}) = \begin{bmatrix} & \mathcal{T}'_k(\mathcal{R}) \\ M_{(n-k) \times k}(\mathcal{R}) & \mathcal{T}'_{n-k}(\mathcal{R}) \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively.

xxsec4.4

Corollary 4.4. *Every k -commuting mapping of the upper triangular matrix algebra $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{R})$ (resp. the lower triangular matrix algebra $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{R})$) is proper.*

We will give a unification proof for the cases of the upper and lower triangular matrix algebras and nest algebras in below.

xxsec4.5

4.5. Nest algebras. Let \mathbf{H} be a complex Hilbert space and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$ be the algebra of all bounded linear operators on \mathbf{H} . Let I be a index set. A *nest* is a set \mathcal{N} of closed subspaces of \mathbf{H} satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $0, \mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{N}$;
- (2) If $N_1, N_2 \in \mathcal{N}$, then either $N_1 \subseteq N_2$ or $N_2 \subseteq N_1$;
- (3) If $\{N_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, then $\bigcap_{i \in I} N_i \in \mathcal{N}$;
- (4) If $\{N_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, then the norm closure of the linear span of $\bigcup_{i \in I} N_i$ also lies in \mathcal{N} .

If $\mathcal{N} = \{0, \mathbf{H}\}$, then \mathcal{N} is called a trivial nest, otherwise it is called a non-trivial nest.

The *nest algebra* associated with \mathcal{N} is the set

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}) = \{ T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}) \mid T(N) \subseteq N \text{ for all } N \in \mathcal{N} \}.$$

A nontrivial nest algebra is a triangular algebra. Indeed, if $N \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{0, \mathbf{H}\}$ and E is the orthogonal projection onto N , then $\mathcal{N}_1 = E(\mathcal{N})$ and $\mathcal{N}_2 = (1 - E)(\mathcal{N})$ are nests of N and N^\perp , respectively. Moreover, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}_1) = E\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})E, \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}_2) = (1 - E)\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})(1 - E)$ are nest algebras and

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}_1) & E\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})(1 - E) \\ O & \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}_2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that any finite dimensional nest algebra is isomorphic to a complex block upper triangular matrix algebra. We refer the reader to [17] for the theory of nest algebras.

xxsec4.5

Corollary 4.5. *Every k -commuting mapping of the nest algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ is proper.*

We now give a unification proof for Corollary 4.3 and Corollary 4.4 by an induction on k . For convenience, let us set $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{R})$ or $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$. The case of $k = 1$ is clearly trivial, since $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{W})_1 = \mathcal{R}1$. Let us choose an arbitrary element $W \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{W})_k$. Then $[[W, X], X]_{k-1} = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{W}$. If \mathcal{W} is a trivial nest algebra, then $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$ is a centrally closed prime algebra. By [41, Theorem 1] it follows

that $[W, X] = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{W}$. This implies that $W \in \mathcal{R}1$ and that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{W})_k = \mathcal{R}1$. If \mathcal{W} is a nontrivial nest algebra or an upper triangular matrix algebra. Then \mathcal{W} can be written as the triangular algebra

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & M \\ O & B \end{bmatrix}.$$

In view of the induction hypothesis we have $\mathcal{Z}(A)_{k-1} = \mathcal{R}1 = \mathcal{Z}(B)_{k-1}$. By Corollary 3.6 we know that there exist $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\zeta : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}1$ such that

$$[W, X] = \lambda X + \zeta(X)$$

for all $X \in \mathcal{W}$. Therefore

$$(W - \lambda I)X + X(-W) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{R}1$$

for all $X \in \mathcal{W}$. A straightforward computation leads to $(W - \lambda I) = -(-W) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{W})$. This shows that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{W})_k = \mathcal{R}1$. Thus $\mathcal{Z}(A)_k = \mathcal{R}1 = \mathcal{Z}(B)_k$. It follows from Corollary 3.6 that every k -commuting mapping on the upper (resp. lower) triangular matrix algebra $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{R})$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{R})$) is proper. Likewise, every k -commuting mapping on the nest algebra $\tau(\mathcal{N})$ is also proper.

xxsec4.6

4.6. von Neumann Algebras. Recall that a von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} is a subalgebra of some $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H})$, the algebra of all bounded linear operators acting on a complex Hilbert space \mathbf{H} , which satisfies the double commutant property: $\mathcal{M}'' = \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{M}' = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}) \mid TA = AT, \forall A \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and $\mathcal{M}'' = \{\mathcal{M}'\}'$. For $A \in \mathcal{M}$, the central carrier of A , denoted by \overline{A} , is the intersection of all central projections P such that $PA = 0$. If A is self-adjoint, then the core of A , denoted by \underline{A} , is $\sup\{S \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}) \mid S = S^*, S \leq A\}$. In case of $A = P$ is a projection, then \underline{P} is the largest central projection $\leq P$. A projection P is core-free if $\underline{P} = 0$. It is easy to see that $\underline{P} = 0$ if and only if $\overline{I - P} = I$. If \mathcal{M} has no central summands of type I_1 , then each nonzero central projection in \mathcal{M} is the carrier of a core-free projection in \mathcal{M} . In particular, there exists a nonzero core-free projection $P \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\overline{P} = I$. For such P , note that $\overline{P} = \overline{I - P} = I$. It follows from the definition of the central carrier that both $\text{span}\{TP(x) \mid T \in \mathcal{M}, x \in \mathbf{H}\}$ and $\text{span}\{T(I - P)(x) \mid T \in \mathcal{M}, x \in \mathbf{H}\}$ are dense in \mathbf{H} . So $AMP = 0$ implies $A = 0$ and $AM(I - P) = 0$ implies $A = 0$. Thus, if \mathcal{M} has no central summands of type I_1 , then $\mathcal{M} = PMP + PMQ + QMP + QMQ$ satisfies the corresponding conditions (1)-(3) in Theorem 3.5. This is due to the fact \mathcal{M} is a semiprime algebra and PMP and QMQ are both semiprime. Applying [41, Theorem 2] yields that $\mathcal{Z}(PMP)_k = \pi_{PMP}(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}))$ and $\mathcal{Z}(QMQ)_k = \pi_{QMQ}(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{M}))$. Therefore, Theorem 3.5 is true for additive maps on von Neumann algebras without central summands of type I_1 .

xxsec4.6

Corollary 4.6. *Let \mathcal{M} be a von Neumann algebra without central summands of type I_1 . Then every k -commuting mapping of \mathcal{M} is proper.*

xxsec4.7

4.7. Block upper and lower triangular matrix algebras. Let \mathbb{C} be the complex field. Let \mathbb{N} be the set of all positive integers and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any positive integer m with $m \leq n$, we denote by $\vec{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_i, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ an ordered m -vector of positive integers such that $n = d_1 + \dots + d_i + \dots + d_m$. The *block upper*

triangular matrix algebra $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C})$ is a subalgebra of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with form

$$B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C}) = \begin{bmatrix} M_{d_1}(\mathbb{C}) & \cdots & M_{d_1 \times d_i}(\mathbb{C}) & \cdots & M_{d_1 \times d_m}(\mathbb{C}) \\ & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & & M_{d_i}(\mathbb{C}) & \cdots & M_{d_i \times d_m}(\mathbb{C}) \\ & O & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & M_{d_m}(\mathbb{C}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Likewise, the block lower triangular matrix algebra $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C})$ is a subalgebra of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ with form

$$B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C}) = \begin{bmatrix} M_{d_1}(\mathbb{C}) & & & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & & & O \\ M_{d_i \times d_1}(\mathbb{C}) & \cdots & M_{d_i}(\mathbb{C}) & & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \\ M_{d_m \times d_1}(\mathbb{C}) & \cdots & M_{d_m \times d_i}(\mathbb{C}) & \cdots & M_{d_m}(\mathbb{C}) \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that the full matrix algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ of all $n \times n$ matrices over \mathbb{C} and the upper(resp. lower) triangular matrix algebra $T_n(\mathbb{C})$ of all $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over \mathbb{C} are two special cases of block upper(resp. lower) triangular matrix algebras. If $n \geq 2$ and $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C}) \neq M_n(\mathbb{C})$, then $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C})$ is an upper triangular algebra and can be written as

$$B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C}) = \begin{bmatrix} B_j^{\bar{d}_1}(\mathbb{C}) & M_{j \times (n-j)}(\mathbb{C}) \\ O_{(n-j) \times j} & B_{n-j}^{\bar{d}_2}(\mathbb{C}) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $1 \leq j < m$ and $\bar{d}_1 \in \mathbb{N}^j, \bar{d}_2 \in \mathbb{N}^{m-j}$. Similarly, if $n \geq 2$ and $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C}) \neq M_n(\mathbb{C})$, then $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C})$ is a lower triangular algebra and can be represented as

$$B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C}) = \begin{bmatrix} B_j^{\bar{d}_1}(\mathbb{C}) & O_{j \times (n-j)} \\ M_{(n-j) \times j}(\mathbb{C}) & B_{n-j}^{\bar{d}_2}(\mathbb{C}) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $1 \leq j < m$ and $\bar{d}_1 \in \mathbb{N}^j, \bar{d}_2 \in \mathbb{N}^{m-j}$.

xxsec4.7

Corollary 4.7. *Every k -commuting mapping of the block upper triangular matrix algebra $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C})$ (resp. the block lower triangular matrix algebra $B_n^{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{C})$) is proper.*

xxsec5

5. TOPICS FOR FUTURE POTENTIAL RESEARCH

Although the main aim of this paper is to describe the form of k -commuting mappings of generalized matrix algebras, the investigation of various additive mappings (associative-type, Jordan-type or Lie-type) on generalized matrix algebras also have a great interest and should be further paid much attention. The study of additive mappings on generalized matrix algebras is shedding light on the investigation of functional identities in the background of such kind of algebras. In the light of the motivation and contents of this article, we will propose several topics with high potential and with merit for future research in this field.

The theory of functional identities was initiated by Brešar at the beginning of 90's in last century and it was greatly developed by Beidar, Brešar, Chebotar, and Martindale. A functional identity (FI) of an algebra can be roughly described as an identical relation involving arbitrary elements of the algebra together with

functions. The scope of the theory is to determine these functions or, in case this is not possible, to determine the structure of the algebra admitting the given FI. The first functional identities were introduced in the early 90's by Brešar as an attempt to unify several results on centralizing mappings. Then the theory quickly developed through a decade until reaching an ultimate stage that covers and unifies a number of existing results. The main motivation for constructing a general theory relies on the applications, and FI-theory has shown its strength in various areas. In particular, it turned out to be the right tool in proving several conjectures formulated by Herstein in 1961 concerning the description of Lie-type mappings in associative rings [33]. For a full and nice account of the development of the theory of functional identities and their applications, we refer the reader to the technical literature [13] for details.

Let \mathcal{A} be an associative algebra. Let F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 be mappings from \mathcal{A} into itself such that

$$F_1(x)y + F_2(y)x + xG_2(y) + yG_1(x) = 0 \quad (5.1)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$. This is a basic functional identity, which was one of the first functional identities studied in prime algebras. The mappings F_1, F_2, G_1 and G_2 are looked on as unknowns and the main purpose is to describe the form of these mappings. The functional identity (5.1) is also closely related to commuting mappings, which is due to the fact each commuting additive mapping F of \mathcal{A} gives rise to the identity

$$F(x)y + F(y)x - xF(y) - yF(x) = 0$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$. This identity is just one special case of (5.1). Centralizing mappings and commuting mappings can be considered as the most basic and important examples of functional identities. However, the general theory of functional identities, which was developed in [13], can not be applied to the context of triangular rings, since these rings are not d -free. Nevertheless, Beidar, Brešar and Chebotar investigated certain functional identities on upper triangular matrix algebras [4]. Moreover, Cheung described the form of commuting linear maps for a certain class of triangular algebras [15, 16]. Later, several problems on certain types of mappings on triangular rings and algebras have been studied, where some special examples of functional identities appear. Zhang and his students [59] studied the functional identity of type (5.1) in the context of nest algebras. Han [32] considered the functional identity of type (5.1) on CSL algebras and characterized the form of linear mappings $F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2: \text{Alg}\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying (5.1), where \mathcal{L} is a commutative subspace lattice generated by finite many commuting independent nests on a complex separable Hilbert space \mathbf{H} with $\dim \mathbf{H} \geq 3$, $\text{Alg}\mathcal{L}$ is the CSL algebra associated with \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{M} be a σ -weakly closed algebra containing $\text{Alg}\mathcal{L}$. In two recent articles [21, 22], Eremita studied functional identity (5.1) in triangular algebras. He succeeded in describing the form of additive mappings $F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ satisfying (5.1) if a triangular ring \mathcal{T} satisfies certain conditions. Moreover, the notion of the maximal left ring of quotients, which plays an important role in the study of functional identities on (semi-)prime rings, is used to characterize those additive mappings F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 [22]. It is predictable that Eremita's approach, which is based on the notion of the maximal left ring of quotients, enable us to generalize and unify a number of known results regarding mappings of triangular algebras and generalized matrix algebras.

The functional identities in triangular algebras and full matrix algebras were already studied in [4, 21, 22]. One would expect that the next step is to investigate functional identities of generalized matrix algebras. The notion of generalized matrix algebras efficiently unifies triangular algebras and full matrix algebras together. The eventual goal of our systematic work is to deal with all questions related to additive (or multiplicative) mappings of triangular algebras and full matrix algebras under a unified frame, which is the desirable generalized matrix algebras frame.

xxsec5.1

Question 5.1. Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(A, M, N, B)$ be a generalized matrix algebra over a commutative ring \mathcal{R} and let F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 be mappings from \mathcal{G} into itself such that

$$F_1(x)y + F_2(y)x + xG_2(y) + yG_1(x) = 0$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{G}$. Describe the forms of F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 satisfying the above condition.

Although people embark on studying functional identities in triangular algebras and full matrix algebras, the functional identities with additional structure has not been treated yet. For instance, the functional identities with automorphisms and derivations in generalized matrix algebras are worthy to be considered further.

xxsec5.2

Proposition 5.2. ([43, Proposition 4.2]) Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(A, M, N, B)$ be a generalized matrix algebra over a commutative ring \mathcal{R} . An \mathcal{R} -linear mapping Θ is a derivation of \mathcal{G} if and only if Θ has the form

$$\Theta \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1(a) - mn_0 - m_0n & am_0 - m_0b + \tau_2(m) \\ n_0a - bn_0 + \nu_3(n) & n_0m + nm_0 + \mu_4(b) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $m_0 \in M, n_0 \in N$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1 : A &\longrightarrow A, & \tau_2 : M &\longrightarrow M, & \tau_3 : N &\longrightarrow M, \\ \nu_2 : M &\longrightarrow N, & \nu_3 : N &\longrightarrow N, & \mu_4 : B &\longrightarrow B \end{aligned}$$

are all \mathcal{R} -linear mappings satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) δ_1 is a derivation of A with $\delta_1(mn) = \tau_2(m)n + m\nu_3(n)$;
- (2) μ_4 is a derivation of B with $\mu_4(nm) = n\tau_2(m) + \nu_3(n)m$;
- (3) $\tau_2(am) = a\tau_2(m) + \delta_1(a)m$ and $\tau_2(mb) = \tau_2(m)b + m\mu_4(b)$;
- (4) $\nu_3(na) = \nu_3(n)a + n\delta_1(a)$ and $\nu_3(bn) = b\nu_3(n) + \mu_4(b)n$.

In view of Proposition 5.2 we have

xxsec5.3

Question 5.3. Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(A, M, N, B)$ be a generalized matrix algebra over a commutative ring \mathcal{R} . Let F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 be mappings from \mathcal{G} into itself and $\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ be derivations from \mathcal{G} into itself such that

$$F_1(x)\Theta_2(y) + F_2(y)\Theta_1(x) + \Delta_1(x)G_2(y) + \Delta_2(y)G_1(x) = 0$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{G}$. What can we say about the forms of F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 and those of $\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ satisfying the above condition ?

Let us next concentrate on the functional identities with automorphisms in generalized matrix algebras. Automorphisms of generalized matrix algebras have been intensively considered in Ánh and van Wyk [9]. Now we summarize some important facts which are essential for our purposes.

xxsec5.4

Proposition 5.4. ([9, Theorem 3.6]) Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(A, M, N, B)$ and $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G}'(A', M', N', B')$ be two generalized matrix algebra over a commutative ring \mathcal{R} . Suppose that A' and B' have only trivial idempotents, and at least one of M' and N' is nonzero.

Let $\Omega: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$ be an \mathcal{R} -linear mapping. Then Ω is an isomorphism if and only if Ω has one of the following forms:

$$(1) \quad \Omega \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma(a) & \gamma(a)m'_0 - m'_0\delta(b) + \mu(m) \\ n'_0\gamma(a) - \delta(b)n'_0 + \nu(n) & \delta(b) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\gamma: A \rightarrow A'$ and $\delta: B \rightarrow B'$ are two algebraic isomorphisms, $\mu: M \rightarrow M'$ is a (γ, δ) -bimodule isomorphism, $\nu: N \rightarrow N'$ is a (δ, γ) -bimodule isomorphism, $m'_0 \in M'$ and $n'_0 \in N'$ are two fixed elements.

$$(2) \quad \Omega \left(\begin{bmatrix} a & m \\ n & b \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(b) & m'_*\rho(a) - \sigma(b)m'_* + \tau(n) \\ \rho(a)n'_* - n'_*\sigma(b) + \zeta(m) & \rho(a) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\rho: A \rightarrow B'$ and $\sigma: B \rightarrow A'$ are two algebraic isomorphisms, $\zeta: M \rightarrow N'$ is a (ρ, σ) -bimodule isomorphism, $\tau: N \rightarrow M'$ is a (σ, ρ) -bimodule isomorphism, $m'_* \in M'$ and $n'_* \in N'$ are two fixed elements.

A class of automorphisms established in the background of generalized matrix algebras permit us to avoid the strong assumption—the diagonal algebras A and B in a generalized matrix algebra $\mathcal{G} = \begin{bmatrix} A & M \\ N & B \end{bmatrix}$ have only trivial idempotents—when we deal with those additive mappings with such kind of automorphisms on \mathcal{G} . Moreover, their expression forms will be more simpler than the form of Ω in the above theorem.

Let 1 (resp. $1'$) be the identity of the algebra A (resp. B), and let I be the identity of the generalized matrix algebra \mathcal{G} . We will use the following notations:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q = I - P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1' \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{11} = P\mathcal{G}P, \quad \mathcal{G}_{12} = P\mathcal{G}Q, \quad \mathcal{G}_{21} = Q\mathcal{G}P, \quad \mathcal{G}_{22} = Q\mathcal{G}Q.$$

Thus the generalized matrix algebra \mathcal{G} can be written as

$$\mathcal{G} = P\mathcal{G}P + P\mathcal{G}Q + Q\mathcal{G}P + Q\mathcal{G}Q = \mathcal{G}_{11} + \mathcal{G}_{12} + \mathcal{G}_{21} + \mathcal{G}_{22}.$$

Here, \mathcal{G}_{11} and \mathcal{G}_{22} are subalgebras of \mathcal{G} which are isomorphic to A and B , respectively. \mathcal{G}_{12} is a $(\mathcal{G}_{11}, \mathcal{G}_{22})$ -bimodule which is isomorphic to the (A, B) -bimodule M . \mathcal{G}_{21} is a $(\mathcal{G}_{22}, \mathcal{G}_{11})$ -bimodule which is isomorphic to the (B, A) -bimodule N . It should be remarked that $\pi_A(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ and $\pi_B(\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}))$ are isomorphic to $P\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})P$ and $Q\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})Q$, respectively. Then there is an algebraic isomorphism $\chi: P\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})P \rightarrow Q\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})Q$ such that $am = m\chi(a)$ for all $m \in P\mathcal{G}Q$. There is also an algebraic isomorphism $\varpi: Q\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})Q \rightarrow P\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G})P$ such that $bn = n\varpi(b)$ for all $n \in Q\mathcal{G}P$.

xxsec5.5

Definition 5.5. [15, Definition 5.1.6] An automorphism ξ of a generalized matrix algebra $\mathcal{G} = \begin{bmatrix} A & M \\ N & B \end{bmatrix}$ is said to be *partible* with respect to A, B, M, N , if it can be written as $\xi = \phi_r \bar{\xi}$, where $r \in \mathcal{G}$, ϕ_r is an inner automorphism $\phi_r(x) = r^{-1}xr$, which is induced by the element r , and $\bar{\xi}$ is an automorphism of \mathcal{G} satisfying the conditions $\bar{\xi}(P\mathcal{G}P) = P\mathcal{G}P$, $\bar{\xi}(P\mathcal{G}Q) = P\mathcal{G}Q$, $\bar{\xi}(Q\mathcal{G}P) = Q\mathcal{G}P$ and $\bar{\xi}(Q\mathcal{G}Q) = Q\mathcal{G}Q$.

A generalized matrix algebra $\mathcal{G} = \begin{bmatrix} A & M \\ N & B \end{bmatrix}$ is said to be *partible* if every automorphism of \mathcal{G} is partible.

Indeed, there are a number of generalized matrix algebras which are partible, see [23]. Those triangular algebras what Martín González, Repka and Sánchez-Ortega considered in [47, 50, 51] are exactly partible triangular algebras. Of course, those algebras are also partible generalized matrix algebras. They take advantage of structural features of partible triangular algebras to describe commuting mapping

with automorphisms on these algebras. Comparing the old version [50] and the new version [47], we observe that partible triangular algebras not only cover upper triangular matrix algebras and Hilbert space nest algebras, but also simplify the complicated computational process. Yu and Zhang [58] investigated commuting mappings with automorphisms on Hilbert space nest algebras. It should be remarked that nest algebras on Hilbert spaces are partible, see [23]. In view of these works and Proposition 5.4 we ask

xxsec5.6

Question 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(A, M, N, B)$ be a partible generalized matrix algebra over a commutative ring \mathcal{R} . Let F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 be mappings from \mathcal{G} into itself and $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ be automorphisms from \mathcal{G} into itself such that*

$$F_1(x)\Omega_2(y) + F_2(y)\Omega_1(x) + \Gamma_1(x)G_2(y) + \Gamma_2(y)G_1(x) = 0$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{G}$. How about are the forms of F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 and those of $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ satisfying the above condition ?

Acknowledgements

Part of this research work was done when the third author visited the School of Mathematics and Statistics at Beijing Institute of Technology in the winter of 2016. She takes this opportunity to express his sincere thanks to the School of Mathematics and Statistics and the Office of International Affairs at Beijing Institute of Technology for the hospitality extended to them during his visit. We are deeply grateful to a special Training Program of International Exchange and Cooperation of the Beijing Institute of Technology. We would like to thank the tremendous job of the anonymous referee, who, apart from a very thorough report which helped to correct a number of minor errors, lacunae, and other inaccuracies (both mathematical and pedagogical), also taught me some theory of generalized matrix algebras. And last but not least, we are sincerely grateful to Professor Pham Ngoc nh for his kind consideration and his advices on modifying our manuscript.

REFERENCES

AnhWyk1

[1] P. N. Ánh and L. van Wyk, *Automorphism groups of generalized triangular matrix rings*, Linear Algebra Appl., **434** (2011), 1018-1026.

AnhWyk2

[2] P. N. Ánh and L. van Wyk, *Isomorphisms between strongly triangular matrix rings*, Linear Algebra Appl., **438** (2013), 4374-4381.

AnhBirkenmeierWyk

[3] P. N. Ánh, G. F. Birkenmeier and L. van Wyk, *Idempotents and structures of rings*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, **64** (2016), 2002-2029.

BeidarBresarChebotar

[4] K. I. Beidar, M. Brešar and M. A. Chebotar, *Functional identities on upper triangular matrix algebras*, J. Math. Sci., **102** (2000) 4557-4565.

Benkovic1

[5] D. Benkovič, *Biderivations of triangular algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **431** (2009), 1587-1602.

BenkovicEremita

[6] D. Benkovič and D. Eremita, *Commuting traces and commutativity preserving maps on triangular algebras*, J. Algebra, **280** (2004), 797-824.

BenkovicGrasic

[7] D. Benkovič and M. Grašič, *Generalized derivations on unital algebras determined by action on zero products*, Linear Algebra Appl., **445** (2014), 347-368.

BenkovicSirovnik

[8] D. Benkovič and N. Širovnik, *Jordan derivations of unital algebras with idempotents*. Linear Algebra Appl., **437** (2012), 2271-2284.

- [9] C. Boboc, S. Dăscălescu and L. van Wyk, *Isomorphisms between Morita context rings*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, **60** (2012), 545-563.
- [10] M. Brešar, *On a generalization of the notion of centralizing mappings*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **114** (1992), 641-649.
- [11] M. Brešar, *Centralizing mappings and derivations in prime rings*, J. Algebra, **156** (1993), 385-394.
- [12] M. Brešar, *Commuting maps: a survey*, Taiwanese J. Math., **8** (2004), 361-397.
- [13] M. Brešar, M. A. Chebotar and W. S. Martindale, 3rd, *Functional Identities*, Frontiers in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007. xii+272 pp.
- [14] W. P. Brown, *Generalized matrix algebras*, Canad. J. Math., **7** (1955), 188-190.
- [15] W.-S. Cheung, *Maps on triangular algebras*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Victoria, 2000. 172pp.
- [16] W.-S. Cheung, *Commuting maps of triangular algebras*, J. London Math. Soc., **63** (2001), 117-127.
- [17] K. R. Davidson, *Nest Algebras*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, **191**, Longman. London/New York, 1988.
- [18] Y.-Q. Du and Y. Wang, *k-commuting maps on triangular algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **436** (2012), 1367-1375.
- [19] Y.-Q. Du and Y. Wang, *Lie derivations of generalized matrix algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **437** (2012) 2719-2726.
- [20] Y.-Q. Du and Y. Wang, *Biderivations of generalized matrix algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **438** (2013), 4483-4499.
- [21] D. Eremita, *Functional identities of degree 2 in triangular rings*, Linear Algebra Appl., **438** (2013), 584-597.
- [22] D. Eremita, *Functional identities of degree 2 in triangular rings revisited*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, **63** (2015), 534-553.
- [23] A. Fosner, X.-F. Liang and F. Wei, *Centralizing traces with automorphisms on triangular algebras*, Acta Math. Hungar., **154** (2018), 315-342.
- [24] W. Franca, *Commuting maps on some subsets of matrices that are not closed under addition*, Linear Algebra Appl., **437** (2012), 388-391.
- [25] W. Franca, *Commuting maps on rank-k matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl., **438** (2013), 2813-2815.
- [26] W. Franca, *Commuting traces of multiadditive maps on invertible and singular matrices*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, **61** (2013), 1528-1535.
- [27] W. Franca, *Commuting traces on invertible and singular operators*, Oper. Matrices, **9** (2015), 305-310.
- [28] W. Franca, *Commuting traces of biadditive maps on invertible elements*. Comm. Algebra, **44** (2016), 2621-2634.
- [29] W. Franca, *Weakly commuting maps on the set of rank-1 matrices*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, **65** (2017), 475-495.
- [30] W. Franca, *Commuting traces of multilinear maps on invertible elements*, Comm. Algebra, in press, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2017.1404087> (2018)
- [31] W. Franca and N. Louza, *Commuting maps on rank-1 matrices over noncommutative division rings*, Comm. Algebra, **45** (2017), 4696-4706.
- [32] D. Han, *Functional identities of degree 2 in CSL algebras*, to appear in Bull. Iranian Math. Soc., 2018.

- Herstein** [33] I. N. Herstein, *Lie and Jordan structures in simple, associative rings*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **67** (1961), 517-531.
- KonigXi** [34] S. König and C.-C. Xi, *A characteristic free approach to Brauer algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **353** (2000), 1489-1505.
- Krylov1** [35] P. A. Krylov, *Isomorphism of generalized matrix rings*, (Russian) Algebra Logika, **47** (2008), 456-463; translation in Algebra Logic, **47** (2008), 258-262.
- Krylov2** [36] P. A. Krylov, *The group K_0 of a generalized matrix ring*, (Russian) Algebra Logika, **52** (2013), 370-385; translation in Algebra Logic, **52** (2013), 250-261.
- Krylov3** [37] P. A. Krylov, *Calculation of the group K_1 of a generalized matrix ring*, (Russian) Sibirsk. Mat. Zh., **55** (2014), no. 4, 783-789; translation in Sib. Math. J., **55** (2014), 639-644.
- KrylovTuganbaev1** [38] P. A. Krylov and A. A. Tuganbaev, *Modules over formal matrix rings*, (Russian) Fundam. Prikl. Mat., **15** (2009), 145-211; Engl. Transl.: J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.), **171** (2010), 248-295.
- KrylovTuganbaev2** [39] P. A. Krylov and A. A. Tuganbaev, *Grothendieck and Whitehead groups of formal matrix rings*, (Russian) Fundam. Prikl. Mat., **20** (2015), 173-203; Engl. Transl.: J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.), **223** (2017), 606-628.
- KrylovTuganbaev3** [40] P. A. Krylov and A. A. Tuganbaev, *Formal Matrices*, Algebra and Applications, **23**, Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2017. viii+156 pp.
- Lanski** [41] C. Lanski, *An Engel condition with derivation for left ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **125** (1997), 339-345.
- LivanWykWei** [42] Y.-B. Li, L. van Wyk and F. Wei, *Jordan derivations and antiderivations of generalized matrix algebras*, Oper. Matrices, **7** (2013), 399-415.
- LiWei** [43] Y.-B. Li and F. Wei, *Semi-centralizing maps of generalized matrix algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **436** (2012), 1122-1153.
- LiXiao** [44] Y.-B. Li and Z.-K. Xiao, *Additivity of maps on generalized matrix algebras*, Elect. J. Linear Algebra, **22** (2011), 743-757.
- LiangWeiXiaoFosner** [45] X.-F. Liang, F. Wei, Z.-K. Xiao and A. Fošner, *Centralizing traces and Lie triple isomorphisms on generalized matrix algebras*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, **63** (2015), 1786-1816.
- Liu** [46] C.-K. Liu, *Centralizing maps on invertible or singular matrices over division rings*, Linear Algebra Appl., **440** (2014), 318-324.
- MartinRepkaSanchez** [47] C. Martín González, J. Repka and J. Sánchez-Ortega, *Automorphisms, σ -biderivations and σ -commuting maps of triangular algebras*, Mediterr. J. Math., **14** (2017), 14:68.
- Morita** [48] K. Morita, *Duality for modules and its applications to the theory of rings with minimum condition*, Sci. Rep. Tokyo Kyoiku Diagaku Sect. A, **6** (1958), 83-142.
- Muller** [49] M. Müller, *Rings of quotients of generalized matrix rings*, Comm. Algebra, **15** (1987), 1991-2015.
- RepkaSanchez** [50] J. Repka and J. Sánchez-Ortega, *σ -Biderivations and σ -commuting maps of triangular algebras*, <http://arXiv:1312.3980v1> [math.RA].
- Sanchez** [51] J. Sánchez-Ortega, *σ -mappings of triangular algebras*, <http://arXiv:1312.4635v1> [math.RA].
- Stenstrom** [52] B. Stenström, *The maximal ring of quotients of a triangular matrix ring*, Math. Scand., **34** (1974), 162-166.
- WangWang** [53] Y. Wang and Y. Wang, *Multiplicative Lie n -derivations of generalized matrix algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **438** (2013), 2599-2616.

- XiaoWei1 [54] Z.-K. Xiao and F. Wei, *Commuting mappings of generalized matrix algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **433** (2010), 2178-2197.
- XiaoWei2 [55] Z.-K. Xiao and F. Wei, *Commuting traces and Lie isomorphisms on generalized matrix algebras*, Oper. Matrices, **8** (2014), 821-847.
- XiaoWeiFosner [56] Z.-K. Xiao, F. Wei and A. Fošner, *Centralizing traces and Lie triple isomorphisms on triangular algebras*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, **63** (2015), 1309-1331.
- XuYi [57] X.-W. Xu and X.-F. Yi, *Commuting maps on rank- k matrices*, Electron. J. Linear Algebra, **27** (2014), 735-741.
- YuZhang [58] W.-Y. Yu and J.-H. Zhang, *σ -biderivations and σ -commuting maps on nest algebras*, Acta Math. Sinica (Chinese Series), **50** (2007), 1391-1396.
- ZhangFengLiWu [59] J.-H. Zhang, S. Feng, H.-X. Li and R.-H. Wu *Generalized biderivations of nest algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl., **418** (2006), 225-233.
- ZhaoWangYao [60] Y.-X. Zhao, D.-Y. Wang and R.-P. Yao *Biderivations of upper triangular matrix algebras over commutative rings*, Int. J. Math. Game Theory Algebra, **18** (2009), 473-478.

LI: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY AT QINHUANGDAO, QINHUANGDAO, 066004, P. R. CHINA.

E-mail address: liyanbo707@163.com

WEI: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING, 100081, P. R. CHINA

E-mail address: daoshuo@hotmail.com

E-mail address: daoshuwei@gmail.com

FOŠNER: FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT, UNIVERSITY OF PRIMORSKA, CANKARJEVA 5, SI-6104 KOPER, SLOVENIA

E-mail address: ajda.fosner@fm-kp.si