

**THE IMAGES OF MULTILINEAR POLYNOMIALS EVALUATED
ON 3×3 MATRICES.**

ALEXEY KANEL-BELOV, SERGEY MALEV, LOUIS ROWEN

ABSTRACT. Let p be a multilinear polynomial in several noncommuting variables, with coefficients in a algebraically closed field K of arbitrary characteristic. In this paper we classify the possible images of p evaluated on 3×3 matrices. The image is one of the following:

- $\{0\}$,
- the set of scalar matrices,
- a (Zariski) dense subset of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(K)$, the matrices of trace 0,
- a dense subset of $M_3(K)$,
- the set of 3–scalar matrices (i.e., matrices having eigenvalues $(\beta, \beta\varepsilon, \beta\varepsilon^2)$ where ε is a cube root of 1), or
- the set of scalars plus 3–scalar matrices.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is the continuation of [BeMR1], in which we considered the question, reputedly raised by Kaplansky, of the possible image set $\text{Im } p$ of a polynomial p on matrices.

Conjecture 1. *If p is a multilinear polynomial evaluated on the matrix ring $M_n(K)$, then $\text{Im } p$ is either $\{0\}$, K (viewed as K the set of scalar matrices), $\mathfrak{sl}_n(K)$, or $M_n(K)$.*

Here $\mathfrak{sl}_n(K)$ is the set of matrices of trace zero.

This subject was investigated by many authors (see [AIM], [BrK], [Ch], [Ku1], [Ku2], [LeZh]). For review and basic terminology we refer to our previous paper [BeMR1]. (Connections between images of polynomials on algebras and word equations are discussed in [BKP]; also see [La], [LaS], [S].)

Recall that a polynomial p (written as a sum of monomials) is called *semi-homogeneous of weighted degree d* with (integer) *weights* (w_1, \dots, w_n) if for each monomial h of p , taking $d_{j,h}$ to be the degree of x_j in h , we have

$$d_{1,h}w_1 + \dots + d_{n,h}w_n = d.$$

A semi-homogeneous polynomial with weights $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ is called *homogeneous* of degree d .

In [BeMR1] we settled Conjecture 1 for $n = 2$ and classified the possible images for semi-homogeneous polynomials:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16R99, 15A24, 17B60; Secondary 16R30.

Key words and phrases. Noncommutative polynomial, image, multilinear, matrices.

This work was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 1207/12).

The second named author was supported by an Israeli Ministry of Immigrant Absorption scholarship.

Theorem 1. *Let $p(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ be a semi-homogeneous polynomial evaluated on the algebra $M_2(K)$ of 2×2 matrices over a quadratically closed field. Then $\text{Im } p$ is either $\{0\}$, K , $\text{sl}_2(K)$, the set of all non-nilpotent matrices in $\text{sl}_2(K)$, or a dense subset of $M_2(K)$ (with respect to Zariski topology).*

A homogeneous polynomial p is called *multilinear* if $d_{j,h} = 1$ for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ and each monomial h of p (and thus $d = n$).

Examples were given in [BeMR1] of homogeneous (but not multilinear) polynomials whose images do not belong to the classification of Theorem 1.

Our research in this paper continues for the 3×3 case, yielding the following:

Theorem 2. *If p is a multilinear polynomial evaluated on 3×3 matrices then $\text{Im } p$ is one of the following:*

- $\{0\}$,
- the set of scalar matrices,
- $\text{sl}_3(K)$, (perhaps lacking the diagonalizable matrices of discriminant 0), cf. Remark 7.
- a dense subset of $M_3(K)$,
- the set of 3-scalar matrices, or
- the set of scalars plus 3-scalar matrices.

2. IMAGES OF POLYNOMIALS

For any polynomial $p \in K\langle x_1, \dots, x_m \rangle$, the *image* of p (in R) is defined as

$$\text{Im } p = \{r \in R : \text{there exist } a_1, \dots, a_m \in R \text{ such that } p(a_1, \dots, a_m) = r\}.$$

Remark 1. $\text{Im } p$ is invariant under conjugation, since

$$ap(x_1, \dots, x_m)a^{-1} = p(ax_1a^{-1}, ax_2a^{-1}, \dots, ax_ma^{-1}) \in \text{Im } p,$$

for any nonsingular $a \in M_n(K)$.

We recall the following lemmas (for arbitrary n) proved in [BeMR1]:

Lemma 1 ([BeMR1, Lemma 4]). *If a_i are matrix units, then $p(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ is either 0, or $c \cdot e_{ij}$ for some $i \neq j$, or a diagonal matrix.*

Lemma 2 ([BeMR1, Lemma 5]). *The linear span of $\text{Im } p$ is either $\{0\}$, K , sl_n , or $M_n(K)$. If $\text{Im } p$ is not $\{0\}$ or the set of scalar matrices, then for any $i \neq j$ the matrix unit e_{ij} belongs to $\text{Im } p$.*

Another major tool is Amitsur's Theorem [Row3, Theorem 3.2.6, p. 176], that the algebra of generic $n \times n$ matrices (generated by matrices $Y_k = (\xi_{i,j}^{(k)})$ whose entries $\{\xi_{i,j}^{(k)}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$ are commuting indeterminates) is a non-commutative domain UD whose ring of fractions with respect to the center is a division algebra which we denote as $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ of dimension n^2 over its center $F_1 := \text{Cent}(\widetilde{\text{UD}})$.

Remark 2. Suppose t is a commuting indeterminate, and $f(x_1, \dots, x_m; t)$ is a polynomial taking values under matrix substitutions for the x_i and scalars for t . Suppose that there exists unique t_0 such that $f(x_1, \dots, x_m; t_0) = 0$.

In case $\text{Char}(K) = 0$, t_0 is a rational function with respect to the entries of x_i . If this t_0 is fixed under simultaneous conjugation of generic matrices $\overline{x_1, \dots, x_m}$, then t_0 is in the center of Amitsur's division algebra $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$, implying $f \in \widetilde{\text{UD}}$.

In case $\text{Char}(K) = q \neq 0$, then $t_0^{q^l}$ is a rational function for some $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Remark 3. In Remark 2 we could take a system of polynomial equations and polynomial inequalities. If t_0 is unique, then it is a rational function (or $t_0^{q^l}$ if $\text{Char}(K) = q > 0$).

In fact, we need a slight modification of Amitsur's theorem, which is well known. Viewing

$$\widetilde{\text{UD}} \subseteq M_n \left(F(\xi_{i,j}^{(k)}) : 1 \leq i, j \leq n, k \geq 1 \right)$$

we can define the reduced characteristic coefficients of elements of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$, which by [Row2, Remark 24.67] lie in F_1 .

Lemma 3. *Suppose that an element a of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ has a unique eigenvalue α (i.e., of multiplicity n). If $\text{Char}(K) = 0$, then a is scalar. If $\text{Char}(K) = q > 0$, then $q|n$ and a is q^l -scalar for some l .*

Proof. If $\text{Char}(K) = 0$, then α is the element of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ and $a - \alpha I$ is nilpotent, and thus 0.

If $\text{Char}(K) = q$ then α^{q^l} is an element of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$; therefore $a^{q^l} - \alpha^{q^l} I$ is nilpotent, and thus 0, implying a is q^l -scalar. This is impossible if q does not divide the size of the matrices n . \square

Lemma 4. *The multiplicity of any eigenvalue of an element a of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ must divide n . In particular, when n is odd, a cannot have an eigenvalue of multiplicity 2.*

Proof. Recall [Row1, Remark 4.106] that for any element a in a division algebra, represented as a matrix, the eigenvalues of a occur with the same multiplicity, which thus must divide n . \square

Proposition 1. *Suppose we have a homomorphism $\varphi : \widetilde{\text{UD}} \rightarrow A$ given by the specialization $\varphi(Y_k) = a_k$. Then any characteristic coefficient of Y_k in $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ specializes to the corresponding characteristic coefficient of a_k .*

Proof. Let $t := n^2$. Any characteristic coefficient of an element of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ can be expressed as the ratio of two central polynomials, in view of [Row3, Theorem 1.4.12]; also see [BeR, Theorem J, p. 27] which says that for any t -alternating polynomial nonidentity f , and for any characteristic coefficient ω_ℓ of the characteristic polynomial $\lambda^t + \sum_{\ell=1}^t (-1)^\ell \omega_\ell \lambda^{t-\ell}$ of a linear transformation T of the t -dimensional vector space corresponding to $n \times n$ matrices, we have

$$\omega_\ell(T) f(a_1, \dots, a_t, r_1, \dots, r_m) = \sum f(T^{\ell_1} a_1, \dots, T^{\ell_t} a_t, r_1, \dots, r_m), \quad (1)$$

summed over all vectors (ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_t) where each $\ell_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\sum \ell_i = \ell$. Hence, taking $f(a_1, \dots, a_t, r_1, \dots, r_m) \neq 0$, the characteristic coefficient of a polynomial evaluated on A is obtained according to the specialization from $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ induced from φ . \square

We recall Donkin's theorem:

Theorem 3 (Donkin [D]). *For any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, the algebra of polynomial invariants $K[M_n(K)^m]^{\text{GL}_n(K)}$ under $\text{GL}_n(K)$ is generated by the trace functions*

$$T_{i,j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = \text{Trace}(x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_r}, \bigwedge^j K^n), \quad (2)$$

where $i = (i_1, \dots, i_r)$, all $i_l \leq m$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $j > 0$, and $x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_r}$ act as linear transformations on the exterior algebra $\bigwedge^j K^n$.

Proposition 1 yields the following observation:

Proposition 2. *All of Donkin's invariants of Theorem 3 can be embedded in $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$.*

For $n > 2$, we also have an easy consequence of the theory of division algebras.

Lemma 5. *Suppose for some polynomial p and some number $q < n$, that p^q takes on only scalar values in $M_n(K)$, over an infinite field K , for n prime. Then p takes on only scalar values in $M_n(K)$.*

Proof. We can view p as an element of the generic division algebra $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ of degree n , and we adjoin a q -root of 1 to K if necessary. Then p generates a subfield of dimension 1 or n of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$. The latter is impossible, so the dimension is 1; i.e., p is already central. \square

2.1. The case $M_3(K)$.

Now we turn specifically to the case $n = 3$. Let K be an algebraically closed field. We say that a polynomial p is **trace-vanishing** if each of its evaluations have trace 0; i.e., $\text{tr}(p)$ is a trace identity of p . Also, for $\text{char}(K) \neq 3$ we fix a primitive cube root $\varepsilon \neq 1$ of 1; when $\text{char}(K) = 3$ we take $\varepsilon = 1$.

Lemma 6. *We define functions $\omega_k : M_3(K) \rightarrow K$ as follows: Given a matrix a , let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ be the eigenvalues of a , and denote*

$$\omega_k := \omega_k(a) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq 3} \lambda_{i_1} \dots \lambda_{i_k}.$$

Let $p(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ be a semi-homogeneous, trace-vanishing polynomial.

Consider the rational function $H(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \frac{\omega_2(p(x_1, \dots, x_m))^3}{\omega_3(p(x_1, \dots, x_m))^2}$ (taking values in $K \cup \{\infty\}$). If $\text{Im } H$ is dense in K , then $\text{Im } p$ is dense in sl_3 .

Proof. Note that $\omega_2(p)^3$ and $\omega_3(p)^2$ are semi-homogeneous. Thus, $\text{Im } H$ is dense in K iff the image of the pair $(\omega_2(p)^3, \omega_3(p)^2)$ is dense in K^2 . But since ω_2 and ω_3 are algebraically independent, so are $\omega_2(p)^3$ and $\omega_3(p)^2$, so we conclude that the image of the pair $(\omega_2(p)^3, \omega_3(p)^2)$ is dense in K^2 . Thus, the set of characteristic polynomials of evaluations of p is dense in the space of all possible characteristic polynomials of trace zero matrices. Therefore, the set of all triples $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)$ of eigenvalues of matrices from $\text{Im } p$ is dense in the plane $x + y + z = 0$ defined in K^3 , implying that $\text{Im } p$ is dense in sl_3 . \square

Theorem 4. *Let $p(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ be a semi-homogeneous polynomial which is trace-vanishing on 3×3 matrices. Then $\text{Im } p$ is one of the following:*

- $\{0\}$,
- the set of scalar matrices (which can occur only if $\text{Char } K = 3$),
- a dense subset of $\text{sl}_3(K)$, or
- the set of 3-scalar matrices, i.e., the set of matrices with eigenvalues $(\gamma, \gamma\varepsilon, \gamma\varepsilon^2)$, where ε is our cube root of 1.

Proof of Theorem 4. We define the functions $\omega_k : M_n(K) \rightarrow K$ as in Lemma 6, and consider the rational function $H = \frac{\omega_2(p(x_1, \dots, x_m))^3}{\omega_3(p(x_1, \dots, x_m))^2}$ (taking values in $K \cup \{\infty\}$).

If $\omega_2(p) = \omega_3(p) = 0$, then each evaluation of p is a nilpotent matrix, contradicting Amitsur's Theorem. Thus, either $\text{Im } H$ is dense in K , or H must be constant.

If $\text{Im } H$ is dense in K , then $\text{Im } p$ is dense in sl_3 by Lemma 6.

So we may assume that H is a constant, i.e., $\alpha\omega_2^3(p) + \beta\omega_3^2(p) = 0$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in K$ not both 0. Fix generic matrices Y_1, \dots, Y_m . We claim that the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, -\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ of $q := p(Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$ are pairwise distinct. Otherwise either they are all equal, or two of them are equal and the third is not, each of which is impossible by Lemmas 3 and 4 since $q \in \widetilde{\text{UD}}$.

Let $\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, -\lambda'_1 - \lambda'_2$ be the eigenvalues of another matrix $r \in \text{Im } p$. Thus we have the following:

$$\alpha\omega_2^3(r) + \beta\omega_3^2(r) = \alpha\omega_2^3(q) + \beta\omega_3^2(q) = 0.$$

Therefore we have homogeneous equations on the eigenvalues. Dividing by λ_2^6 and $\lambda_2'^6$ respectively, we have the same two polynomial equations of degree 6 on $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}$ and $\frac{\lambda'_1}{\lambda'_2}$, yielding six possibilities for $\frac{\lambda'_1}{\lambda'_2}$. The six permutations of λ_1, λ_2 , and $\lambda_3 = -\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ define six pairwise different $\frac{\lambda'_1}{\lambda'_2}$ unless $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ is a permutation (multiplied by a scalar) of one of the following triples: $(1, 1, -2)$, $(1, -1, 0)$, $(1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon^2)$. The first case is impossible since the eigenvalues must be pairwise distinct. The second case give us an element of Amitsur's algebra $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ with eigenvalue 0 and thus determinant 0, contradicting Amitsur's Theorem. In the third case the polynomial p is 3-scalar. Thus, either p is 3-scalar polynomial, or each matrix from $\text{Im } p$ will have the same eigenvalues up to permutation and scalar multiple. Note for p being 3-scalar this is true also.

Assume that for some $i \in \{2, 3\}$ that $\text{tr}(p^i)$ is not identically zero. Then λ_1^i, λ_2^i , and λ_3^i are three linear functions on $\text{tr}(p^i)$. Hence we have the PI (polynomial identity) $(p^i - \lambda_1^i)(p^i - \lambda_2^i)(p^i - \lambda_3^i)$. Thus by Amitsur's Theorem, one of the factors is a PI. Hence p^i is a scalar matrix. However $i \neq 2$ by Lemma 4. Hence $i = 3$. In this case the image of p is the set of matrices with eigenvalues $\{(\gamma, \gamma\varepsilon, \gamma\varepsilon^2) : \gamma \in K\}$.

Thus, we may assume that p satisfies $\text{tr}(p^i) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and 3. Now $\omega_1(p) = \text{tr}(p) = 0$ and $2\omega_2(p) = (\text{tr}(p))^2 - \text{tr}(p^2) = 0$.

Hence $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 0$ if $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$; in this case ω_3 is either 0 (and hence p is PI) or not 0 (and hence p is 3-scalar).

So assume that $\text{char}(K) = 2$. Recall that

$$0 = \text{tr}(p^3) = \lambda_1^3 + \lambda_2^3 + \lambda_3^3 = \lambda_1^3 + \lambda_2^3 + \lambda_3^3 - 3\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 + 3\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3.$$

But $\lambda_1^3 + \lambda_2^3 + \lambda_3^3 - 3\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3$ is a multiple of $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ (seen by substituting $-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$ for λ_3) and thus equals 0. Thus, $0 = 3\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 = \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 = \omega_3(p)$, and the Hamilton-Cayley equation yields $p^3 + \omega_2 p = 0$. Therefore, $p(p^2 + \omega_2) = 0$ and by Amitsur's Theorem either p is PI, or $p^2 = -\omega_2$ (which is central), implying by Lemma 5 that p is central. \square

Example 1. The element $[x, [y, x]x[y, x]^{-1}]$ of $\widetilde{\text{UD}}$ takes on only 3-scalar values (see [Row3, Theorem 3.2.21, p. 180]) and thus gives rise to a homogeneous polynomial taking on only 3-scalar values.

Now we consider the possible image sets of multilinear trace-vanishing polynomials.

Lemma 7. *If p is a multilinear polynomial, not PI nor central, then there exist a collection of matrix units (E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m) such that $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m)$ is a diagonal but not scalar matrix.*

Proof. By Lemmas 1 and 2, the linear span of all $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m)$ for any matrix units E_i such that $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m)$ is diagonal includes all $\text{Diag}\{x, y, -x - y\}$. In particular there exist a collection of matrix units (E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m) such that $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m)$ is a diagonal but not scalar matrix. \square

Theorem 5. *Let p be a multilinear polynomial which is trace-vanishing on 3×3 matrices over a field K of arbitrary characteristic. Then $\text{Im } p$ is one of the following:*

- $\{0\}$,
- the set of scalar matrices,
- the set of 3-scalar matrices, or
- for each triple $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$ there exist a matrix $M \in \text{Im } p$ with eigenvalues λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 .

Proof. If the polynomial $\omega_2(p)$ (defined in the proof of Theorem 4) is identically zero, then the characteristic polynomial is $p^3 - \omega_3(p) = 0$, implying p is either scalar (which can happen only if $\text{Char}(K) = 3$) or 3-scalar. Therefore we may assume that the polynomial $\omega_2(p)$ is not identically zero. Let

$$f_{\alpha, \beta}(M) = \alpha \omega_2(M)^3 + \beta \omega_3(M)^2.$$

It is enough to show that for any $\alpha, \beta \in K$ there exists a non-nilpotent matrix $M = p(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ such that $f_{\alpha, \beta}(p(a_1, \dots, a_m)) = 0$, since this will imply that the image of H (defined in Lemma 6) contains all $-\frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ and thus $K \cup \{\infty\}$. (For example, if $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$, then $\omega_3(M) = 0$, implying $\omega_2(M) \neq 0$ since $\omega_1(M) = 0$ and M is non-nilpotent, and thus $H = \infty$.) Therefore, for any trace-vanishing polynomial (i.e., a polynomial $x^3 + \gamma_1 x + \gamma_0$) there is a matrix in $\text{Im } p$ for which this is the characteristic polynomial. Hence whenever $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$ there is a matrix with eigenvalues λ_i .

Without loss of generality we may assume that $a = p(Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$ and $b = p(\tilde{Y}_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m)$ are not proportional for generic matrices $\tilde{Y}_1, Y_1, \dots, Y_m$, cf. [BeMR2, Lemma 2]. Consider the polynomial $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta}(t) = f_{\alpha, \beta}(a + tb)$. There are three cases to consider:

CASE I. $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta} = 0$ identically. Then $f_{\alpha, \beta}(a) = 0$, and a is not nilpotent by Proposition 2.

CASE II. $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta}$ is a constant $\tilde{\beta} \neq 0$. Then $f_{\alpha, \beta}(b + ta) = t^6 \varphi_{\alpha, \beta}(t^{-1}) = \tilde{\beta} t^6$; thus $f_{\alpha, \beta}(b) = 0$, and b is not nilpotent by Proposition 2.

CASE III. $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta}$ is not constant. Then it has finitely many roots. Assume that for each substitution t the matrix $a + tb$ is nilpotent; in particular, $\omega_2(a + tb) = 0$. Note that $\omega_2(a + tb)$ equals the sum of principal 2×2 minors and thus is a quadratic polynomial (for otherwise $\omega_2(b) = 0$ which means that $\omega_2(p)$ is identically zero, a contradiction). Hence $\omega_2(a + tb)$ has two roots, which we denote as t_1 and t_2 . If $t_1 = t_2$, then t_1 is uniquely defined and thus, in view of Remark 2, is a rational function in the entries of a and b , and $a + t_1 b$ is a nilpotent rational function (because we assumed that one of $a + t_1 b$ and $a + t_2 b$ is nilpotent, but here they are equal.) At least one of t_1 and t_2 is a root of $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta}$.

If only t_1 is a root, then t_1 is uniquely defined and thus, by Remark 2, is a rational function; hence, $a + t_1 b$ is a nilpotent polynomial, contradicting Proposition 2. Thus, we may assume that both t_1 and t_2 are roots of $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta}$. But $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta}(t_i)$ is nilpotent, and in particular $\omega_3(a + t_i b) = 0$. Thus there exists exactly one more root t_3 of

$\omega_3(a + tb)$, which is uniquely defined and thus, by Remark 2, is rational. Hence we may consider the polynomial $q(x_1, \dots, x_m, \tilde{x}_1) = a + t_3b$, which must satisfy the condition $\text{tr}(q) = \det(q) = 0$. This is impossible for homogeneous q by Theorem 4, and also impossible for nonhomogeneous q since the leading homogenous component q_d would satisfy $\text{tr}(q_d) = \det(q_d) = 0$, a contradiction. \square

Remark 4. Assume that $\text{char}(K) = 3$ and p is a multilinear polynomial, which is neither PI nor central. Then, according to Lemma 7 there exists a collection of matrix units E_i such that

$$p(E_1, \dots, E_m) = \text{Diag}\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$$

is diagonal but not scalar. Without loss of generality, $\alpha \neq \beta$. Hence $p^3(E_1, \dots, E_m) = \text{Diag}\{\alpha^3, \beta^3, \gamma^3\}$ and $\alpha^3 \neq \beta^3$ because $\text{char}(K) = 3$. Therefore p is not 3–scalar.

Theorem 6. *If there exist α, β , and γ in K such that $\alpha + \beta + \gamma, \alpha + \beta\varepsilon + \gamma\varepsilon^2$ and $\alpha + \beta\varepsilon^2 + \gamma\varepsilon$ are nonzero, together with matrix units E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m such that $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m)$ has eigenvalues α, β and γ , then $\text{Im } p$ is dense in M_3 .*

Proof. Define χ to be the permutation of the set of matrix units, sending the indices $1 \rightarrow 2, 2 \rightarrow 3$, and $3 \rightarrow 1$. For example, $\chi(e_{12}) = e_{23}$. For triples T_1, \dots, T_m (each $T_i = (t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}, t_{i,3})$) consider the function

$$f(T_1, \dots, T_m) = p(t_{1,1}x_1 + t_{1,2}\chi(x_1) + t_{1,3}\chi^{-1}(x_1), t_{2,1}x_2 + t_{2,2}\chi(x_2) + t_{2,3}\chi^{-1}(x_2), \dots, t_{m,1}x_m + t_{m,2}\chi(x_m) + t_{m,3}\chi^{-1}(x_m)). \quad (3)$$

Opening the brackets, we have 3^m terms, each of which we claim is a diagonal matrix. Each term is a monomial with coefficient of the type

$$\chi^{k_{\pi(1)}} \chi^{k_{\pi(2)}} \dots \chi^{k_{\pi(m)}} x_{\pi(1)} x_{\pi(2)} \dots x_{\pi(m)},$$

where k_i is $-1, 0$ or 1 , and π is a permutation. Since we substitute only matrix units in p , by Lemma 1 the image is either diagonal or a matrix unit with some coefficient. For each of the three vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 in our graph define the index ι_ℓ , for $1 \leq \ell \leq 3$ to be the number of incoming edges to v_ℓ minus the number of outgoing edges from v_ℓ . Thus, at the outset, when the image is diagonal, we have $\iota_1 = \iota_2 = \iota_3 = 0$.

We claim that after applying χ to any matrix unit the new ι'_ℓ will all still be congruent modulo 3. Indeed, if the edge $\vec{12}$ is changed to $\vec{23}$, then $\iota'_1 = \iota + 1$ and $\iota'_3 = \iota_3 + 1$, whereas $\iota'_2 = \iota_2 - 2 \equiv \iota_2 + 1$. The same with changing $\vec{23}$ to $\vec{31}$ and $\vec{31}$ to $\vec{12}$. If we make the opposite change $\vec{21}$ to $\vec{13}$, then (modulo 3) we subtract 1 throughout. If we make a change of the type $\vec{ii} \mapsto \vec{jj}$, then $\iota'_\ell = \iota_\ell$ for each ℓ .

If $p(\chi^{k_1}x_1, \chi^{k_2}x_2, \dots, \chi^{k_m}x_m) = e_{ij}$, this means that the number of incoming edges minus the number of outgoing edges of the vertex i is $-1 \pmod{3}$ and the number of incoming edges minus the number of outgoing edges of j is $1 \pmod{3}$, which are not congruent modulo 3. Thus the values of the mapping f defined in (3) are diagonal matrices. Now fix $3m$ algebraically independent triples $T_1, \dots, T_m, \Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m, \Upsilon_1, \dots, \Upsilon_m$. Assume that $\text{Im } f$ is 2–dimensional. Then $\text{Im } df$ must also be 2–dimensional at any point. Consider the differential df at the point $(\Theta_1, T_2, \dots, T_m)$. Thus,

$$f(\Theta_1, T_2, \dots, T_m), f(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m), f(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \dots, T_m)$$

belong to $\text{Im } df$. Thus these three matrices must span a linear space of dimension not more than 2. Hence they lie in some plane P . Now take

$$f(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, T_3, \dots, T_m), f(\Theta_1, T_2, T_3, \dots, T_m), f(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, T_4, \dots, T_m).$$

For the same reason they lie in a plane, which is the plane P because it has two vectors from P . By the same argument, we conclude that all the matrices of the type $f(\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_k, T_{k+1}, \dots, T_m)$ lie in P . Now we see that

$$f(\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_{m-1}, T_m), f(\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m), f(\Upsilon_1, \Theta_2, \dots, \Theta_m)$$

also lie in P . Analogously we obtain that also

$$f(\Upsilon_1, \dots, \Upsilon_k, \Theta_{k+1}, \dots, \Theta_m) \in P$$

for any k .

Hence for $3m$ algebraically independent triples

$$T_1, \dots, T_m; \Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m; \Upsilon_1, \dots, \Upsilon_m,$$

we have obtained that $f(T_1, \dots, T_m)$, $f(\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m)$ and $f(\Upsilon_1, \dots, \Upsilon_m)$ lie in one plane. Thus any three values of f , in particular $\text{Diag}\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$, $\text{Diag}\{\beta, \gamma, \alpha\}$ and $\text{Diag}\{\gamma, \alpha, \beta\}$, must lie in one plane. We claim that this can happen only if

$$\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 0, \quad \alpha + \beta\varepsilon + \gamma\varepsilon^2 = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha + \beta\varepsilon^2 + \gamma\varepsilon = 0.$$

Indeed, $\text{Diag}\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$, $\text{Diag}\{\beta, \gamma, \alpha\}$ and $\text{Diag}\{\gamma, \alpha, \beta\}$, are dependent if and only if the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta & \gamma \\ \beta & \gamma & \alpha \\ \gamma & \alpha & \beta \end{pmatrix}$$

is singular, i.e., its determinant $3\alpha\beta\gamma - (\alpha^3 + \beta^3 + \gamma^3) = 0$. But this has the desired three roots when viewed as a cubic equation in γ .

We have a contradiction to our hypothesis. \square

Remark 5. If there exist α , β , and γ such that $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 0$ but (α, β, γ) is not proportional to $(1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon^2)$ or $(1, \varepsilon^2, \varepsilon)$, with matrices E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m such that $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m)$ has eigenvalues α , β and γ , then either all diagonalizable trace zero matrices lie in $\text{Im } p$, or $\text{Im } p$ is dense in $M_3(K)$. If $\alpha + \beta\varepsilon + \gamma\varepsilon^2 = 0$ but (α, β, γ) is not proportional to $(1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon^2)$ or $(1, 1, 1)$, then all diagonalizable matrices with eigenvalues $\alpha + \beta$, $\alpha + \beta\varepsilon$ and $\alpha + \beta\varepsilon^2$ lie in $\text{Im } p$ or $\text{Im } p$ is dense in $M_3(K)$.

Remark 6. The proof of Theorem 6 works also for any field K of characteristic 3. In this case $\varepsilon = 1$. Hence, if there are α , β , and γ in K such that

$$\alpha + \beta + \gamma \neq 0,$$

together with matrix units E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m such that $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m)$ has eigenvalues α , β and γ , then $\text{Im } p$ is dense in M_3 . Therefore, for $\text{Char } K = 3$, any multilinear polynomial p is either trace-vanishing or $\text{Im } p$ is dense in $M_3(K)$.

Theorem 7. *If p is a multilinear polynomial such that $\text{Im } p$ does not satisfy the equation $\gamma\omega_1(p)^2 = \omega_2(p)$ for $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = \frac{1}{4}$, then $\text{Im } p$ contains a matrix with two equal eigenvalues that is not diagonalizable and of determinant not zero. If $\text{Im } p$ does not satisfy any equation of the form $\gamma\omega_1(p)^2 = \omega_2(p)$ for any γ , then the set of non-diagonalizable matrices of $\text{Im } p$ is Zariski dense in the set of all non-diagonalizable matrices, and $\text{Im } p$ is dense.*

Proof. If not, then by [BeMR2, Lemma 2] there is at least one variable (say, x_1) such that $a = p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ does not commute with $b = p(\tilde{x}_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$. Consider the matrix $a + tb = p(x_1 + t\tilde{x}_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, viewed as a polynomial in t .

Recall that the discriminant of a 3×3 matrix with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ is defined as $\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2$. Thus, the discriminant of $a + tb$ is a polynomial $f(t)$ of degree 6. If $f(t)$ has only one root t_0 , then this root is defined in terms of the entries of $\tilde{x}_1, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$, and invariant under the action of the symmetric group, and thus is in Amitsur's division algebra \widetilde{UD} . By Lemma 3, $a + t_0b$ is scalar, and the uniqueness of t_0 implies that a and b are scalar, contrary to assumption.

Thus, $f(t)$ has at least two roots - say, $t_1 \neq t_2$, and the matrices $a + t_1b$ and $a + t_2b$ each must have multiple eigenvalues. If both of these matrices are diagonalizable, then each of $a + t_i b$ have a 2-dimensional plane of eigenvectors. Therefore we have two 2-dimensional planes in 3-dimensional linear space, which must intersect. Hence there is a common eigenvector of both $a + t_i b$ and this is a common eigenvector of a and b . If a and b have a common eigenspace of dimension 1 or 2, then there is at least one eigenvector (and thus eigenvalue) of a that is uniquely defined, implying $a \in \widetilde{UD}$ by Remark 2, contradicting Lemma 3. If a and b have a common eigenspace of dimension 3, then a and b commute, a contradiction.

We claim that there cannot be a diagonalizable matrix with equal eigenvalues on the line $a + tb$. Indeed, if there were such a matrix, then either it would be unique (and thus an element of \widetilde{UD} , which cannot happen), or there would be at least two such diagonalizable matrices, which also cannot happen, as shown above.

Assume that all matrices on the line $a + tb$ of discriminant zero have determinant zero. Then either all of them are of the type $\text{Diag}\{\lambda, \lambda, 0\} + e_{12}$ or all of them are of the type $\text{Diag}\{0, 0, \mu\} + e_{12}$. (Indeed, there are three roots of the determinant equation $\det(a + tb) = 0$, which are pairwise distinct, and all of them give a matrix with two equal eigenvalues, all belonging to one of these types, since otherwise one eigenvalue is uniquely defined and thus yields an element of \widetilde{UD} , which cannot happen.)

In the first case, all three roots of the determinant equation $\det(a + tb) = 0$ satisfy the equation $(\omega_1(a + tb))^2 = 4\omega_2(a + tb)$. Hence, we have three pairwise distinct roots of the polynomial of maximal degree 2, which can occur only if the polynomial is identically zero. It follows that also $(\omega_1(a))^2 - 4\omega_2(a) = 0$, so $(\omega_1(p))^2 - 4\omega_2(p) = 0$ is identically zero, which by hypothesis cannot happen.

In the second case we have the analogous situation, but $\omega_2(p)$ will be identically zero, a contradiction.

Thus on the line $a + tb$ we have at least one matrix of the type $\text{Diag}\{\lambda, \lambda, \mu\} + e_{12}$ and $\lambda\mu \neq 0$. Consider the algebraic expression $\mu\lambda^{-1}$. If not constant, then it takes on almost all values, so assume that it is a constant δ . Then $\delta \neq -2$, since otherwise this matrix will be the unique matrix of trace 0 on the line $a + tb$ and thus an element of \widetilde{UD} , contrary to Lemmas 3 and 4. Consider the polynomial $q = p - \frac{\text{tr} p}{\delta + 2}$. At the same point t it takes on the value $\text{Diag}\{0, 0, (\delta - 1)\lambda\} + e_{12}$. Hence all three pairwise distinct roots of the equation $\det q(x_1 + t\tilde{x}_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) = 0$ will give us a matrix of the form $\text{Diag}\{0, 0, *\} + e_{12}$ (otherwise we have uniqueness and thus an element of \widetilde{UD}), contradicting Lemma 4. Therefore q satisfies an equation $\omega_2(q) = 0$. Hence, p satisfies an equation $\omega_1(p)^2 - c\omega_2(p) = 0$, for some constant c , a contradiction. Hence almost all non-diagonalizable matrices belong to the image of p , and they are almost all matrices of discriminant 0 (a subvariety of $M_3(K)$ of codimension 1).

By Amitsur's Theorem, $\text{Im } p$ cannot be a subset of the discriminant surface. Thus, $\text{Im } p$ is dense in $M_3(K)$. \square

Remark 7. Note that if $\omega_1(p)$ is identically zero, and $\omega_2(p)$ is not identically zero, then $\text{Im } p$ contains a matrix similar to $\text{Diag}\{1, 1, -2\} + e_{12}$. Hence $\text{Im } p$ contains all diagonalizable trace zero matrices (perhaps with the exception of the diagonalizable matrices of discriminant 0, i.e. matrices similar to $\text{Diag}\{c, c, -2c\}$), all non-diagonalizable non-nilpotent trace zero matrices, and all matrices N for which $N^2 = 0$. Nilpotent matrices of order 3 also belong to the image of p , as we shall see in Lemma 9.

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Lemma 8. *A matrix is 3-scalar iff its eigenvalues are in $\{\gamma, \gamma\varepsilon, \gamma\varepsilon^2 : \gamma \in K\}$, where $\gamma^3 \in K$ is its determinant. The variety V_3 of 3-scalar matrices has dimension 7.*

Proof. The first assertion is immediate since the characteristic polynomial is $x^3 - \gamma^3$. Hence V_3 is a variety. The second assertion follows since the invertible elements of V_3 are defined by two equations: $\text{tr}(x) = 0$ and $\text{tr}(x^{-1}) = 0$ and thus a V_3 is a variety of codimension 2. \square

Lemma 9. *Assume $\text{Char } K \neq 3$. If p is neither PI nor central, then the variety V_3 is contained in $\text{Im } p$.*

Proof. According to Lemma 2 there exist matrix units E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m such that $p(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_m) = e_{1,2}$. Consider the mapping χ described in the proof of Theorem 6. For any triples $T_i = (t_{1,i}, t_{2,i}, t_{3,i})$, let

$$f(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m) = p(\dots, t_{1,i}E_i + t_{2,i}\chi(E_i) + t_{3,i}\chi^2(E_i), \dots).$$

$\text{Im } f$ (a subset of $\text{Im } p$) is a subset of the 3-dimensional linear space

$$L = \{\alpha e_{12} + \beta e_{23} + \gamma e_{31}, \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in K\}.$$

Since e_{12} , e_{23} and e_{31} belong to $\text{Im } f$, we see that $\text{Im } f$ is dense in L , and hence at least one matrix $a = \alpha e_{12} + \beta e_{23} + \gamma e_{31}$ for $\alpha\beta\gamma \neq 0$ belongs to $\text{Im } p$. Note that this matrix is 3-central. Thus the variety V_3 , excluding the nilpotent matrices, is contained in $\text{Im } p$. The nilpotent matrices of order 2 also belong to the image of p since they are similar to e_{12} .

Let us show that all nilpotent matrices of order 3 (i.e., matrices similar to $e_{12} + e_{23}$), also belong to $\text{Im } p$. We have the multilinear polynomial

$$f(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m) = q(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m)e_{12} + r(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m)e_{23} + s(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m)e_{31},$$

therefore q, r and s are three scalar multilinear polynomials. Assume there is no nilpotent matrix of order 3 in $\text{Im } p$. Then we have the following: if $q = 0$ then either $rs = 0$, if $r = 0$ then $sq = 0$, and if $s = 0$ then $qr = 0$. Assume q_1 is the greatest common divisor of q and r and $q_2 = \frac{q}{q_1}$. Note both q_i are multilinear polynomials defined on disjoint sets of variables. If $q_1 = 0$ then $r = 0$ and if $q_2 = 0$ then $s = 0$. Note there are no double efficient, and thus $r = q_1 r'$ is a multiple of q_1 and $s = q_2 s'$ is a multiple of q_2 . The polynomial r' cannot have common divisors with q_2 , therefore if we consider any generic point (T_1, \dots, T_m) on the surface $r' = 0$ then $r(T_1, \dots, T_m) = 0$ and $q(T_1, \dots, T_m) \neq 0$. Hence $s(T_1, \dots, T_m) = 0$ for any generic (T_1, \dots, T_m) from the surface $r' = 0$. Therefore r' is the divisor of s . Remind both q_1 and q_2 are multilinear polynomials defined on

disjoint subsets of $\{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m\}$. Without loss of generality $q_1 = q_1(T_1, \dots, T_k)$, and $q_2 = q_2(T_{k+1}, \dots, T_m)$. Therefore $r' = r'(T_{k+1}, \dots, T_m)$ and it is divisor of s . Also remind $s = s'q_2$ so $q_2(T_{k+1}, \dots, T_m)$ is also divisor of s . Hence $r' = cq_2$ where c is constant. Thus $r = q_1r' = cq_1q_2 = cq$. However there exist (T_{k+1}, \dots, T_m) such that $q = 0$ and $r = 1$ (i.e. such that $f(T_{k+1}, \dots, T_m) = e_{23}$). A contradiction. \square

Remark 8. When $\text{Char } K = 3$, then V_3 is the space of the matrices with equal eigenvalues (including also scalar matrices). The same proof shows that all nilpotent matrices belong to the image of p , as well as all matrices similar to $cI + e_{12} + e_{23}$. But we do not know how to show that scalar matrices and matrices similar to $cI + e_{12}$ belong to the image of p .

Proof of Theorem 2. First assume that $\text{Char } K \neq 3$. According to Lemma 9 the variety V_3 is contained in $\text{Im } p$. Therefore $\text{Im } p$ is either the set of 3-scalar matrices, or some 8-dimensional variety (with 3-scalar subvariety), or is 9-dimensional (and thus dense).

It remains to classify the possible 8-dimensional images. Let us consider all matrices $p(E_1, \dots, E_m)$ where E_i are matrix units. If all such matrices have trace 0, then $\text{Im } p$ is dense in $\text{sl}_3(K)$, by Theorem 5. Therefore we may assume that at least one such matrix a has eigenvalues α, β and γ such that $\alpha + \beta + \gamma \neq 0$. By Theorem 6 we cannot have $\alpha + \beta + \gamma, \alpha + \beta\varepsilon + \gamma\varepsilon^2$ and $\alpha + \beta\varepsilon^2 + \gamma\varepsilon$ all nonzero. Hence a either is scalar, or a linear combination (with nonzero coefficients) of a scalar matrix and $\text{Diag}\{1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon^2\}$ (or with $\text{Diag}\{1, \varepsilon^2, \varepsilon\}$, without loss of generality - with $\text{Diag}\{1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon^2\}$). By Theorem 7, if $\text{Im } p$ is not dense, then p satisfies an equation of the type $(\text{tr}(p))^2 = \gamma \text{tr}(p^2)$ for some $\gamma \in K$. Therefore, if a scalar matrix belongs to $\text{Im } p$, then $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ and $\text{Im } p$ is the set of 3-scalar plus scalar matrices. If the matrix a is not scalar, then it is a linear combination of a scalar matrix and $\text{Diag}\{1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon^2\}$. Hence, by Remark 5, $\text{Im } p$ is also the set of 3-scalar plus scalar matrices. In any case, we have shown that $\text{Im } p$ is either $\{0\}, K$, the set of 3-scalar matrices, the set of 3-scalar plus scalar matrices (matrices with eigenvalues $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta\varepsilon, \alpha + \beta\varepsilon^2)$), $\text{sl}_3(K)$ (perhaps lacking nilpotent matrices of order 3), or is dense in $M_3(K)$.

If $\text{Char } K = 3$, then by Remark 6 the multilinear polynomial p is either trace-vanishing or $\text{Im } p$ is dense in $M_3(K)$. If p is trace-vanishing, then by Theorem 5, $\text{Im } p$ is one of the following: $\{0\}$, the set of scalar matrices, the set of 3-scalar matrices, or for each triple $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$ there exists a matrix $M \in \text{Im } p$ with eigenvalues λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 . \square

4. OPEN PROBLEMS

Problem 1. *Does there actually exist a multilinear polynomial whose image evaluated on 3×3 matrices consists of 3-scalar matrices?*

Problem 2. *Does there actually exist a multilinear polynomial whose image evaluated on 3×3 matrices is the set of scalars plus 3-scalar matrices?*

Remark 9. Problems 1 and 2 both have the same answer. If they both have affirmative answers, such a polynomial would a counter-example to Kaplansky's problem.

Problem 3. *Is it possible that the image of a multilinear polynomial evaluated on 3×3 matrices is dense but not all of $M_3(K)$?*

Problem 4. *Is it possible that the image of a multilinear polynomial evaluated on 3×3 matrices is the set of all trace-vanishing matrices without discriminant vanishing diagonalizable matrices?*

REFERENCES

- [AIM] Albert, A.A.; Muckenhoupt. *On matrices of trace 0*, Michigan Math. J. **1** (1957), 1–3.
- [BKP] Belov, A.; Kunavskii, B; Plotkin,E; *Word equations in simple groups and polynomial equations in simple algebras*, Vestnik St. Petersburg University, **46** (2013), 3–13
- [BeMR1] Belov, A.; Malev, S.; Rowen, L. *The images of non-commutative polynomials evaluated on 2×2 matrices*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc **140** (2012), 465–478.
- [BeMR2] Belov, A.; Malev, S.; Rowen, L. *Power-central polynomials on matrices*, preprint, (2013).
- [BeR] Belov, A.; Rowen, L.H. *Computational Aspects of Polynomial Identities*, A. K. Peters Ltd., Wellesley, MA. (2005).
- [BrK] Bresar, M. and Klep, I., *Values of Noncommutative Polynomials, Lie Skew-Ideals and the Tracial Nullstellensatz*, arXiv:0810.1774
- [Ch] Chuang, C.-L. *On ranges of polynomials in finite matrix rings*, Proceeding of the American Mathematical Society **110** (1990), no. 2, 293–302.
- [D] Donkin, S. *Invariants of several matrices*, Invent. Math. **110** (1992), no. 2, 389–401.
- [Ku1] Kulyamin, V.V. *Images of graded polynomials in matrix rings over finite group algebras* Russ. Math. Surv.**55** (2000), 345–346.
- [Ku2] Kulyamin, V.V. *On images of polynomials in finite matrix rings*, Thesis Cand. Phys.-Math. Sci., Moscow Lomonosov state University Moscow (2000).
- [La] Larsen M. *Word maps have large image*, Israel J. Math. **139** (2004) 149–156.
- [LaS] Larsen M.; Shalev, A. *Word maps and Waring type problems*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **22** (2009), 437-466.
- [LeZh] Lee, Ts.-Kw.; Zhou, Y. *Right Ideals generated by an idempotent of finite rank*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **431** (2009), 2118–2126.
- [Row1] Rowen, L.H., *Graduate algebra: Commutative view*, AMS Graduate Studies in Mathematics **73** (2006).
- [Row2] Rowen, L.H., *Graduate algebra: Noncommutative view*, AMS Graduate Studies in Mathematics **91** (2008).
- [Row3] Rowen, L. *Polynomial identities in ring theory*, Academic press, New York (1980).
- [S] Shalev, A. *Word maps, conjugacy classes, and a non-commutative Waring-type theorem*, Annals of Math., to appear.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT GAN, ISRAEL

E-mail address: `beloval@math.biu.ac.il`

E-mail address: `malevs@math.biu.ac.il`

E-mail address: `rowen@math.biu.ac.il`