

MULTIPLICATIVE (GENERALIZED)-DERIVATIONS OF PRIME RINGS THAT ACT AS n -(ANTI)HOMOMORPHISMS

G. S. SANDHU

ABSTRACT. Let R be a prime ring. In this note, we describe the possible forms of multiplicative (generalized)-derivations of R that act as n -homomorphism or n -antihomomorphism on nonzero ideals of R . Consequently, from the given results one can easily deduce the results of Gusić [G05].

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, R will always denote an associative prime ring with center $Z(R)$ and C the extended centroid of R . It is well-known that in this case C is a field. For any $x, y \in R$, the symbol $[x, y]$ denotes the commutator $xy - yx$. Recall, a ring is said to be prime if $xRy = (0)$ (where $x, y \in R$) implies $x = 0$ or $y = 0$. An additive mapping $d : R \rightarrow R$ is said to be a derivation if $d(xy) = d(x)y + xd(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$. In 1991, Brešar [B91] introduced the notion of generalized derivation as follows: an additive mapping $F : R \rightarrow R$ is said to be a generalized derivation if $F(xy) = F(x)y + xd(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$, where d is a derivation of R . The concept of generalized derivation covers both the notions of derivation and left multiplier (i.e., an additive mapping $T : R \rightarrow R$ satisfying $T(xy) = T(x)y$ for all $x, y \in R$). Now if we relax the assumption of additivity in the notion of derivation, then it is called multiplicative derivation, i.e., a mapping $\delta : R \rightarrow R$ (not necessarily additive) satisfying $\delta(xy) = \delta(x)y + x\delta(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$. Recently, Dhara and Ali [D13] extended the notion of multiplicative derivation to multiplicative (generalized)-derivation. Accordingly, a mapping $F : R \rightarrow R$ (not necessarily additive) is said to be a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation of R if $F(xy) = F(x)y + x\delta(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$, where δ is a multiplicative derivation of R . Clearly, every generalized derivation is a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation, however the converse is not generally true (see [D13], Example 1.1). Recall that a mapping f of R is said to be acts as a homomorphism (resp. anti-homomorphism) on an appropriate subset K of R if $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$ (resp. $f(xy) = f(y)f(x)$) for all $x, y \in K$. Following Hezajian et al. [H05], a mapping f of R is said to be acts as an n -homomorphism (resp. n -antihomomorphism) of R if for any $x_i \in R$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$; $f(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n f(x_i)$ (resp. $f(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i) = f(x_n)f(x_{n-1}) \cdots f(x_1)$). Initially, the notion of n -homomorphism was introduced and studied for complex algebras by Hezajian et al. [H05], where some significant properties of n -homomorphisms are discussed on Banach algebras. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that every homomorphism of R is n -homomorphism (for $n > 2$), but the converse is not necessarily true (see [H05]).

Key words and phrases. Prime rings, multiplicative (generalized)-derivations, n -homomorphisms, n -antihomomorphisms.

2010 Mathematical subject classification: 16W25, 16N60, 16U80.

Till date, there exist many results in the literature showing that the global structure of R is often tightly connected to the behaviour of additive mappings defined on R . In 1989, a result due to Bell and Kappe [B89] states that if a prime ring R admits a derivation d that acts as homomorphism or anti-homomorphism on a nonzero right ideal U of R , then $d = 0$. Later Asma et al. [A03] proved that this result also holds on nonzero square-closed Lie ideals of prime rings. Moreover, Rehman [R04] established this result for generalized derivations of prime rings. In fact, he proved that if F is a nonzero generalized derivation of a 2-torsion free prime ring R that acts as homomorphism or anti-homomorphism on a nonzero ideal of R and $d \neq 0$, then R is commutative. Recently, Lukashenko [L15] provided a new direction to these studies by investigating derivations acting as homomorphisms or anti-homomorphisms in differentially semiprime rings. Now it seems interesting to extend the results of generalized derivations to multiplicative (generalized)-derivations. In this context, Gusić [G05] gave the complete form of Rehman's result as follows: *Let R be an associative prime ring, F be a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation of R associated with a multiplicative derivation δ and I be a nonzero ideal of R .*

- (a) *Assume that F acts as homomorphism on I . Then $\delta = 0$, and $F = 0$ or $F(x) = x$ for all $x \in R$.*
- (b) *Assume that F acts as anti-homomorphism on I . Then $\delta = 0$, and $F = 0$ or $F(x) = x$ for all $x \in R$ (in this case R should be commutative).*

In view of our above discussion, we find it reasonable to extend the results of derivations acting as homomorphisms (resp. anti-homomorphisms) to n -homomorphisms (resp. n -antihomomorphisms) with multiplicative derivations. More specifically, we study multiplicative (generalized)-derivations of prime rings that act as n -homomorphism or n -antihomomorphism.

2. THE RESULTS

We begin with the following observations in this subject, which we shall use frequently.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a prime ring and I be a nonzero ideal of R . Then for any $a, b \in R$, $aIb = (0)$ implies $a = 0$ or $b = 0$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let R be a prime ring and I be a nonzero ideal of R . If for any fixed positive integer n , $[x^n, y^n] \in Z(R)$ for all $x, y \in I$, then R is commutative.*

Proof. By hypothesis, we have $[[x^n, y^n], r] = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$ and $r \in R$. It is well-known that I and R satisfy same polynomial identities. Thus, we have $[[x^n, y^n], r] = 0$ for all $x, y, r \in R$. If possible suppose that R is not commutative. By a famous result of Lanski [L93], $R \subseteq M_n(F)$, where $M_n(F)$ be a ring of $n \times n$ matrices, with $n \geq 2$ over a field F . Moreover, R and $M_n(F)$ satisfy the same polynomial identities. Choose $x = e_{11}, y = e_{12} + e_{22}$ and $r = e_{21}$, where e_{ij} denotes matrix with 1 at ij -entry and 0 elsewhere. In this view, it follows that

$$0 = [[x^n, y^n], r] = e_{11},$$

a contradiction. Hence, R is commutative. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let R be a ring and δ be a multiplicative derivation of R . Then the followings are true:*

- (i) $\delta(0) = 0$.
 (ii) If $a \in Z(R)$, then $\delta(a) \in Z(R)$.

Proof. (i) $\delta(0) = \delta(0 \cdot 0) = \delta(0) \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot \delta(0) = 0$. (ii) Let $a \in Z(R)$ and δ be a multiplicative derivation of R . Then for each $x \in R$, we have

$$\delta(ax) = \delta(a)x + a\delta(x)$$

and

$$\delta(ax) = \delta(xa) = \delta(x)a + x\delta(a).$$

Together with above two equations, we get

$$[x, \delta(a)] = 0 \text{ for all } x \in R.$$

Hence $\delta(a) \in R$. □

Theorem 2.4. *Let R be a prime ring, I a nonzero ideal of R . Suppose that $F : R \rightarrow R$ is a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation associated with a multiplicative derivation δ of R such that F acts as n -homomorphism on I . Then $\delta = 0$, and $F = 0$ or there exists $\lambda \in C$ such that $F(x) = \lambda x$ for all $x \in R$ and $\lambda^{n-1} = 1$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, we have

$$F\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = \prod_{i=1}^n F(x_i) \quad (2.1)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. On the other hand, we find

$$F\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = F\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i\right)x_n + \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i\delta(x_n) \quad (2.2)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Combining (2.1) and (2.2), we obtain

$$\prod_{i=1}^n F(x_i) = F\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i\right)x_n + \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i\delta(x_n) \quad (2.3)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Replace x_n by x_nr in (2.3), where $r \in R$, we get

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} F(x_i)x_n\delta(r) = \prod_{i=1}^n x_i\delta(r).$$

That is

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} F(x_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i\right)x_n\delta(r) = 0.$$

In view of Lemma 2.1, we find that either $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} F(x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i$ or $\delta = 0$. Let us consider

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} F(x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i \quad (2.4)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Replace x_{n-1} by $x_{n-1}r$ in (2.4), we find

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} F(x_i)r + \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} F(x_i)x_{n-1}\delta(r) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i r \quad (2.5)$$

for all $x_i \in I$ and $r \in R$. Right multiply (2.4) by r and subtract from (2.5), we get

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-2} F(x_i)x_{n-1}\delta(r) = 0$$

for all $x_i \in I$ and $r \in R$. Again by invoking Lemma 2.1, we find that either $\prod_{i=1}^{n-2} F(x_i) = 0$ or $\delta = 0$. But $\delta \neq 0$, so we have $\prod_{i=1}^{n-2} F(x_i) = 0$ for all $x_i \in I$. Substitute $x_{n-2}r$ in place of x_{n-2} in above expression, where $r \in R$, we find that $\prod_{i=1}^{n-3} F(x_i)I\delta(r) = (0)$. By Lemma 2.1, it follows that either $\prod_{i=1}^{n-3} F(x_i) = 0$ for all $x_i \in I$ or $\delta = 0$. But $\delta \neq 0$, thus we have $\prod_{i=1}^{n-3} F(x_i) = 0$ for all $x_i \in I$. Continuing in this way, we arrive at $F(x) = 0$ for all $x \in I$. Replace x by xr , where $r \in R$, we get $x\delta(r) = 0$ for all $x \in I$ and $r \in R$. It implies that $\delta = 0$, which is a contradiction.

Let us now consider the latter case $\delta = 0$, we find that

$$F\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = F(x_1) \prod_{i=2}^n x_i \quad (2.6)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Combining (2.1) and (2.6), we obtain

$$F(x_1)\left(\prod_{i=2}^n F(x_i) - \prod_{i=2}^n x_i\right) = 0$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Replace x_1 by x_1r , where $r \in R$, we may infer that

$$F(x_1)R\left(\prod_{i=2}^n F(x_i) - \prod_{i=2}^n x_i\right) = (0)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Since R is prime, we find that either $F(x) = 0$ for all $x \in I$ or $\prod_{i=2}^n F(x_i) = \prod_{i=2}^n x_i$ for all $x_i \in I$. It is straight forward to see that the former case implies $F = 0$. On the other side, we have

$$\prod_{i=2}^n F(x_i) = \prod_{i=2}^n x_i \quad (2.7)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Take rx_2 instead of x_2 in (2.7), where $r \in R$, we get

$$F(r)x_2 \prod_{i=3}^n F(x_i) = rx_2 \prod_{i=3}^n x_i. \quad (2.8)$$

Left multiply (2.7) by r and then subtract from (2.8), we obtain

$$(F(r)x_2 - rF(x_2)) \prod_{i=3}^n F(x_i) = 0$$

for all $x_i \in I$ and $r \in R$. Substitute x_2s in place of x_2 in above equation, where $s \in R$, we obtain

$$(F(r)x_2 - rF(x_2))R \prod_{i=3}^n F(x_i) = (0)$$

for all $x_i \in I$ and $r \in R$. It implies that either $F(r)x - rF(x) = 0$ for all $x \in I$ and $r \in R$ or $\prod_{i=3}^n F(x_i) = 0$ for all $x_i \in I$. One may observe that in both of these cases we get the situation $F(r)x - rF(x) = 0$ for all $x \in I$ and $r \in R$. Replace x by sx , we get $(F(r)s - rF(s))x = 0$ for all $x \in I$ and $r, s \in R$. By Lemma 2.1, we get $F(r)s = rF(s)$ for

all $r, s \in R$. Replace r by rp , we get $F(r)p1_R(s) = 1_R(r)pF(s)$ for all $r, s, p \in R$, where 1_R is the identity mapping of R . With the aid of a result of Brešar [[B90], Lemma], it follows that there exists some $\lambda \in C$ such that $F = \lambda 1_R$ and hence $F(x) = \lambda x$ for all $x \in R$. In view of our hypothesis, we have $\lambda \prod_{i=1}^n x_i = \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda x_i$. It forces that $\lambda^{n-1} = 1$. It completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.5. [[G05], THEOREM 1(a)] *Let R be an associative prime ring, I a nonzero ideal of R . Suppose that $F : R \rightarrow R$ is a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation associated with a multiplicative derivation δ of R such that F acts a homomorphism on I . Then $\delta = 0$, and $F = 0$ or $F(x) = x$ for all $x \in R$.*

In spirit of a result of Gusić [[G05], Theorem 1(b)], it is natural to investigate multiplicative (generalized)-derivations that act as n -antihomomorphisms. However, we could not get this result in its complete form, but we obtain the following:

Theorem 2.6. *Let R be a prime ring, I a nonzero ideal of R . Suppose that $F : R \rightarrow R$ is a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation associated with a multiplicative derivation δ of R such that F acts as n -antihomomorphism on I . If $F = \delta$, then $\delta(x)^{n-1} \in Z(R)$ for all $x \in I$. Moreover, if δ is additive, then either $\delta = 0$ or R is commutative or R is an order in a 4-dimensional simple algebra.*

Proof. By hypothesis, we have

$$F\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = F(x_n)F(x_{n-1}) \cdots F(x_2)F(x_1) \quad (2.9)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. On the other hand, we may infer that

$$F\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = F(x_1) \prod_{i=2}^n x_i + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j \delta(x_i)\right) \prod_{k=i+1}^n x_k \quad (2.10)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Combining (2.9) and (2.10), we find that

$$F(x_n) \cdots F(x_1) = F(x_1) \prod_{i=2}^n x_i + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j \delta(x_i)\right) \prod_{k=i+1}^n x_k \quad (2.11)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Replace x_1 by $x_1 x_n$ in (2.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_n) \cdots F(x_2)F(x_1)x_n + F(x_n) \cdots F(x_2)x_1\delta(x_n) &= F(x_1)x_n \prod_{i=2}^n x_i \\ &+ x_1\delta(x_n) \prod_{i=2}^n x_i + x_1x_n\delta(x_2) \prod_{i=3}^n x_i + x_1x_n \sum_{i=3}^n \left(\prod_{j=2}^{i-1} x_j \delta(x_i)\right) \prod_{k=i+1}^n x_k \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Using (2.9) in (2.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} F\left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i\right)x_n + F(x_n) \cdots F(x_2)x_1\delta(x_n) &= F(x_1)x_n \prod_{i=2}^n x_i + x_1\delta(x_n) \prod_{i=2}^n x_i \\ &+ x_1x_n\delta(x_2) \prod_{i=3}^n x_i + x_1x_n \sum_{i=3}^n \left(\prod_{j=2}^{i-1} x_j \delta(x_i)\right) \prod_{k=i+1}^n x_k \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_i \in I$. It implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & (F(x_1) \prod_{i=2}^n x_i + \sum_{i=2}^n (\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j \delta(x_i) \prod_{k=i+1}^n x_k)) x_n + F(x_n) \cdots F(x_2) x_1 \delta(x_n) \\ &= F(x_1) x_n \prod_{i=2}^n x_i + x_1 \delta(x_n) \prod_{i=2}^n x_i + x_1 x_n \delta(x_2) \prod_{i=3}^n x_i + x_1 x_n \\ & \quad \sum_{i=3}^n (\prod_{j=2}^{i-1} x_j \delta(x_i) \prod_{k=i+1}^n x_k) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_i \in I$. In particular, for $x_1 = x$ and $x_2 = x_3 = \cdots = x_n = y$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} F(x)y^n + x \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-2} y^i \delta(y) y^{n-1-i} \right) + F(y)^{n-1} x \delta(y) &= F(x)y^n + x \delta(y) y^{n-1} \\ & \quad + xy \delta(y) y^{n-2} + x \left(\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} y^i \delta(y) y^{n-1-i} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in I$. It yields that

$$F(y)^{n-1} x \delta(y) = xy^{n-1} \delta(y) \quad (2.13)$$

for all $x, y \in I$. Replace x by rx , where $r \in R$ in (2.13), we get

$$F(y)^{n-1} rx \delta(y) = rxy^{n-1} \delta(y). \quad (2.14)$$

Left multiply (2.13) by r and combine with (2.14), we obtain $[F(y)^{n-1}, r]x\delta(y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$ and $r \in R$.

In particular, we take $F = \delta$. Thus we have $[\delta(y)^{n-1}, r]x\delta(y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$ and $r \in R$. Since R is a prime ring, it follows that for each $y \in I$, either $[\delta(y)^{n-1}, r] = 0$ for all $r \in R$ or $\delta(y) = 0$. In each case we have $[\delta(y)^{n-1}, r] = 0$ for all $y \in I$ and $r \in R$, i.e., $\delta(y)^{n-1} \in Z(R)$ for all $y \in I$. In case δ is additive, we are done by [[C09], Theorem B]. \square

Corollary 2.7. [[G05], THEOREM 1(b)] *Let R be an associative prime ring, I a nonzero ideal of R . Suppose that $F : R \rightarrow R$ is a multiplicative (generalized)-derivation associated with a multiplicative derivation δ of R such that F acts a homomorphism on I . Then $\delta = 0$, and $F = 0$ or $F(x) = x$ for all $x \in R$.*

Proof. For $n = 2$, in view of equation (2.13) and (2.14), we have $[F(y), t]x\delta(y) = 0$ for all $x, y, t \in I$. This same expression appeared in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1(b) in [G05], hence the conclusion follows in the same way. \square

Definition 2.8. Let $F : R \rightarrow R$ be a function. Then F is called right multiplicative (generalized)-derivation of R if it satisfies

$$F(xy) = F(x)y + x\delta(y)$$

for all $x, y \in R$ and δ is any mapping of R . And F is called left multiplicative (generalized)-derivation of R if it satisfies

$$F(xy) = \delta(x)y + xF(y)$$

for all $x, y \in R$ and δ is any mapping of R . Then it is not difficult to see that the associated mapping δ of right and left multiplicative (generalized)-derivation F is a multiplicative derivation. Now, F is said to be two-sided multiplicative (generalized)-derivation of R if it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} F(xy) &= F(x)y + x\delta(y) \\ &= \delta(x)y + xF(y) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in R$, where δ is a multiplicative derivation of R .

Theorem 2.9. *Let R be a prime ring, I a nonzero ideal of R . Suppose that $F : R \rightarrow R$ is a two-sided multiplicative (generalized)-derivation associated with a multiplicative derivation δ of R such that F acts as n -antihomomorphism on I . Then $\delta = 0$, and $F = 0$ or there exists $\lambda \in C$ such that $F(x) = \lambda x$ for all $x \in R$ and $\lambda^{n-1} = 1$ (in this case R should be commutative).*

Proof. From equation (2.13), we have $F(y)^{n-1}x\delta(y) = xy^{n-1}\delta(y)$ for all $x, y \in I$. Take $F(z)x$ in place of x in this equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(y)^{n-1}F(z)x\delta(y) &= F(z)xy^{n-1}\delta(y) \\ F(z)y^{n-1}x\delta(y) &= F(z)xy^{n-1}\delta(y) \\ F(z)y^{n-1}x\delta(y) + z\delta(y^{n-1})x\delta(y) &= F(z)xy^{n-1}\delta(y) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y, z \in I$. It implies that

$$F(z)[y^{n-1}, x]\delta(y) + z\delta(y^{n-1})x\delta(y) = 0 \quad (2.15)$$

for all $x, y, z \in I$. Replace z by rz in (2.15), where $r \in R$, we get

$$\delta(r)z[y^{n-1}, x]\delta(y) + rF(z)[y^{n-1}, x]\delta(y) + rz\delta(y^{n-1})x\delta(y) = 0.$$

Using (2.15), we find $\delta(r)z[y^{n-1}, x]\delta(y) = 0$ for all $x, y, z \in I$ and $r \in R$. In view of Lemma 2.1, it implies that either $\delta = 0$ or $[y^{n-1}, x]\delta(y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$. Assume that $[y^{n-1}, x]\delta(y) = 0$ for all $x, y \in I$. It implies that for each $y \in I$, either $y^{n-1} \in Z(R)$ or $\delta(y) = 0$. Together these both cases (using Lemma 2.3) imply that $\delta(y^{n-1}) \in Z(R)$ for all $y \in I$.

We now consider

$$\begin{aligned} F(xy^{n-1}) &= F(x)y^{n-1} + x\delta(y^{n-1}) \\ F(xy^{n-1}) &= F(y)^{n-1}F(x) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in I$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(y)^{n-1}F(x) &= F(x)y^{n-1} + x\delta(y^{n-1}) \\ &= F(x)y^{n-1} + \delta(y^{n-1})x. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Take xz in place of x in (2.16), we find

$$F(y)^{n-1}F(x)z + F(y)^{n-1}x\delta(z) = F(x)zy^{n-1} + x\delta(z)y^{n-1} + \delta(y^{n-1})xz \quad (2.17)$$

for all $x, y, z \in I$. Using (2.16), it implies that

$$F(y)^{n-1}x\delta(z) = F(x)[z, y^{n-1}] + x\delta(z)y^{n-1} \quad (2.18)$$

for all $x, y, z \in I$. Replace x by rx in (2.18), where $r \in R$, we get

$$F(y)^{n-1}rx\delta(z) = rF(x)[z, y^{n-1}] + \delta(r)x[z, y^{n-1}] + rx\delta(z)y^{n-1}.$$

Using (2.18), we have

$$[F(y)^{n-1}, r]x\delta(z) = \delta(r)x[z, y^{n-1}] \tag{2.19}$$

for all $x, y, z \in I$ and $r \in R$. Replace z by zw^{n-1} in (2.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} [F(y)^{n-1}, r]x\delta(z)w^{n-1} + [F(y)^{n-1}, r]xz\delta(w^{n-1}) &= \delta(r)x[z, y^{n-1}]w^{n-1} \\ &\quad + \delta(r)xz[y^{n-1}, w^{n-1}] \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y, z, w \in I$ and $r \in R$. Equation (2.19) reduces it to

$$\delta(w^{n-1})[F(y)^{n-1}, r]xz = \delta(r)xz[y^{n-1}, w^{n-1}] \tag{2.20}$$

for all $x, y, z, w \in I$ and $r \in R$. Take zs in place of z in (2.20), where $s \in R$, we find

$$\delta(w^{n-1})[F(y)^{n-1}, r]xzs = \delta(r)xzs[y^{n-1}, w^{n-1}]$$

for all $x, y, z, w \in I$ and $r, s \in R$. Using (2.20) in the above expression, we obtain $\delta(r)xz[[w^{n-1}, y^{n-1}], s] = 0$ for all $x, y, z, w \in I$ and $r, s \in R$. It forces that either $\delta = 0$ or $[w^{n-1}, y^{n-1}] \in Z(R)$ for all $y, w \in I$. But $\delta \neq 0$, thus we have $[w^{n-1}, y^{n-1}] \in Z(R)$ for all $y, w \in I$. In view of Lemma 2.2, R is commutative. Therefore, F is just n -homomorphism of R and hence by Theorem 2.4, we get $\delta = 0$, a contradiction.

On the other hand, we assume that $\delta = 0$. Relation (2.10) implies that

$$F(x_1x_2 \cdots x_n) = F(x_1)x_2 \cdots x_n$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Using this relation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_1)x_2x_3 \cdots x_{n-1}x_nx_{n+1} &= F(x_1x_2 \cdots x_{n-1}x_n)x_{n+1} \\ &= F(x_n)F(x_{n-1}) \cdots F(x_2)F(x_1)x_{n+1} \\ &= F(x_n)F(x_{n-1}) \cdots F(x_2)F(x_1x_{n+1}) \\ &= F(x_1x_{n+1}x_2 \cdots x_n) \\ &= F(x_1)x_{n+1}x_2 \cdots x_n \end{aligned}$$

for all $x_i \in I$. It gives

$$F(x_1)[x_2 \cdots x_n, x_{n+1}] = 0$$

for all $x_i \in I$. Thus we have either $F(x) = 0$ for all $x \in I$ or $[x_2 \cdots x_n, x_{n+1}] = 0$ for all $x_i \in I$. The first case implies $F = 0$. In the latter case we find that R is commutative and hence F acts as n -homomorphism on I . We are done by Theorem 2.4. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Prof. Neşet AYDIN for reading the earlier draft of the manuscript and suggesting Lemma 2.3.

REFERENCES

- [A03] A. ASMA, N. REHMAN AND S. ALI, *On Lie ideals with derivations as homomorphisms and anti-homomorphisms*, Acta Math. Hung., **101** (1-2), (2003), 79-82. doi: 10.1023/B:AMHU.0000003893.61349.98
- [B89] H. E. BELL AND L. C. KAPPE, *Rings in which derivations satisfy certain algebraic conditions*, Acta Math. Hung., **53** (3-4), (1989), 339-346. doi: 10.1007/BF01953371
- [B90] M. BREŠAR, *Semiderivations of prime rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **108** (4), (1990), 859-860. doi: 10.1090/S0002-9939-1990-1007488-X

- [B91] M. BREŠAR, *On the distance of the composition of two derivations to the generalized derivations*, Glasg. Math. J., **33**, (1991), 89-93. doi: 10.1017/S0017089500008077
- [C09] J.-C. CHANG, *Right generalized (α, β) -derivations having power central values*, Taiwanese J. Math., **13** (4), (2009), 1111-1120. doi: 10.11650/twjm/1500405495
- [D13] B. DHARA AND S. ALI, *On multiplicative (generalized)-derivations in prime and semiprime rings*, Aequ. Math., **86** (1-2), (2013), 65-79. doi: 10.1007/s00010-013-0205-y
- [G05] I. GUSIĆ, *A note on generalized derivations of prime rings*, Glasnik Mate., **40** (1), (2005), 47-49.
- [H05] S. HEJAZIAN, M. MIRZAVAZIRI AND M. MOSLEHIAN, *n -homomorphisms*, Bull. Iran. Math. Soc., **31** (1), (2005), 13-23.
- [L93] C. LANKSI, *An Engel condition with derivation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **118** (3), (1993), 731-734. doi: 10.1090/S0002-9939-1993-1132851-9
- [L15] M. P. LUKASHENKO, *Derivations as homomorphisms and anti-homomorphisms in differentially semiprime rings*, Math. Studii, **43** (1), (2015), 12-15. doi: 10.15330/ms.43.1.12-15
- [R04] N. REHMAN, *On generalized derivations as homomorphisms and anti-homomorphisms*, Glasnik Mate., **39** (1), (2004), 27-30.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PATEL MEMORIAL NATIONAL COLLEGE, RAJPURA 140401, PUNJAB, INDIA.

E-mail address: gurninder_rs@pbi.ac.in