

# ORE EXTENSIONS OF ABELIAN GROUPS WITH OPERATORS

PER BÄCK, PATRIK LUNDSTRÖM, JOHAN ÖINERT, AND JOHAN RICHTER

ABSTRACT. Given a set  $A$  and an abelian group  $B$  with operators in  $A$ , in the sense of Krull and Noether, we introduce the Ore group extension  $B[x; \delta_B, \sigma_B]$  as the additive group  $B[x]$ , with  $A[x]$  as a set of operators. Here, the action of  $A[x]$  on  $B[x]$  is defined by mimicking the multiplication used in the classical case where  $A$  and  $B$  are the same ring. We derive generalizations of Vandermonde’s and Leibniz’s identities for this construction, and they are then used to establish associativity criteria. Additionally, we prove a version of Hilbert’s basis theorem for this structure, under the assumption that the action of  $A$  on  $B$  is what we call weakly  $s$ -unital. Finally, we apply these results to the case where  $B$  is a left module over a ring  $A$ , and specifically to the case where  $A$  and  $B$  coincide with a non-associative ring which is left distributive but not necessarily right distributive.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the landmark article [25], Ore introduced a variant of skew polynomial rings over associative unital rings  $R$ , now known as *Ore extensions*, denoted by  $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ . Since then, Ore extensions have become a fundamental construction in ring theory.

Recall that the ring  $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$  is defined as the polynomial ring  $R[x]$  as a left  $R$ -module, but with a modified associative multiplication, defined by the equality

$$(1) \quad xr = \sigma(r)x + \delta(r)$$

for  $r \in R$ . Here,  $\sigma: R \rightarrow R$  is a ring endomorphism that preserves the identity, and  $\delta: R \rightarrow R$  is a  $\sigma$ -*derivation*, meaning that it is an additive map satisfying

$$(2) \quad \delta(rs) = \sigma(r)\delta(s) + \delta(r)s$$

for all  $r, s \in R$ . In the special case where  $\sigma = \text{id}_R$ , the ring  $R[x; \text{id}_R, \delta]$  is known as a *differential polynomial ring*, and  $\delta$  is called, simply, a *derivation*. If, additionally,  $\delta = 0$ , then  $R[x; \text{id}_R, 0]$  is just the standard polynomial ring  $R[x]$ .

Ore extensions appear in the study of cyclic algebras, enveloping rings of solvable Lie algebras, and various types of graded rings such as group rings and crossed products; see e.g. [6, 15, 21, 28]. They also provide many important examples and counterexamples in ring theory [3, 5]. Moreover, specific types of Ore extensions are used as tools in different analytical contexts, such as in rings of differential, pseudo-differential, and fractional differential operators [11], and in  $q$ -Heisenberg algebras [13].

Since Ore’s original article [25], many generalizations of Ore extensions have been introduced. These include modifications of the commutation rule (1) and versions with multiple variables; see e.g. [7, 8, 9, 20, 24, 29]. Other authors have explored hom-associative, non-associative, non-unital, as well as “flipped” versions of Ore extensions; see e.g. [1, 2, 19, 23].

---

*Date:* November 21, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16S36, 16W22, 16W70, 17A99, 17D99, 20K27.

*Key words and phrases.* Ore group extension, Ore module extension, Noetherian group, Noetherian module, Vandermonde’s identity, Leibniz’s identity, Hilbert’s basis theorem.

Additional variants include the skew Laurent polynomial ring  $R[x^\pm; \sigma]$ , the skew power series ring  $R[[x; \sigma]]$ , and the skew Laurent series ring  $R((x; \sigma))$ , as discussed in [12].

Various properties of these constructions, such as conditions under which they are integral domains, principal ideal domains, prime, or simple, have been extensively studied by numerous authors; see e.g. the surveys [10, 21] and the references therein. One of the most fundamental results in this direction, with many applications in ring theory and algebraic geometry, is the following:

**Theorem 1** (Hilbert’s basis theorem). *Suppose that  $R$  is an associative unital ring. Then  $R[x]$  is left Noetherian if and only if  $R$  is left Noetherian.*

The “if” direction of Hilbert’s basis theorem has been shown to hold for many Ore extensions as well:

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose that  $R$  is an associative, unital, left Noetherian ring with a ring automorphism  $\sigma$  and a  $\sigma$ -derivation  $\delta$ . Then  $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$  is also left Noetherian.*

Similar results hold for the rings  $R[x^\pm; \sigma]$ ,  $R[[x; \sigma]]$ , and  $R((x; \sigma))$ . For detailed proofs of these results, as well as of Theorem 2, see e.g. [12].

Another type of generalization of Hilbert’s basis theorem involves *polynomial modules* (see Theorem 3). More specifically, consider the left  $R[x]$ -module  $M[x]$ , where  $M$  is a left  $R$ -module, and the module structure is defined by the biadditive extension of the relation  $(rx^m)(ax^n) = (ra)x^{m+n}$  for  $r \in R$ ,  $a \in M$ , and non-negative integers  $m$  and  $n$ . For a submodule  $N$  of  $M$ , we define  $R^{-1}N := \{x \in M \mid Rx \subseteq N\}$ . The module  $M$  is said to have *property (F)* if, for any submodule  $N$  of  $M$ , we have  $R^{-1}N = N$ . It can easily be shown that an  $R$ -module  $M$  has property (F) if and only if it is *s-unital*, meaning that for each  $a \in M$  there exists  $r \in R$  with  $ra = a$ . In [30, Thm. A] Varadarajan proves the following:

**Theorem 3** (Varadarajan [30]). *Suppose that  $R$  is an associative, but not necessarily unital, ring and  $M$  is a left  $R$ -module. Then the left  $R[x]$ -module  $M[x]$  is Noetherian if and only if  $M$  is Noetherian and has property (F).*

After reflecting upon the constructions and results outlined above, the authors of the present article were prompted to explore the following:

**Question.** *Is it possible to define a class of “Ore module extensions” so that these simultaneously generalize polynomial modules and classical Ore extensions? If so, can algebraical structure results for Ore module extensions, such as associativity and a Hilbert’s basis theorem, be established?*

In this article, we provide affirmative answers to these questions. We show that not only is it possible to quite naturally define *Ore module extensions*  $M[x; \sigma_M, \delta_M]$  over *Ore ring extensions*  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$ , but one can also define, more generally, *Ore group extensions*  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  for any *abelian group  $B$  with operators* in a set  $A$ ; the latter concept first introduced by Krull [17] for finite abelian groups as *generalized finite abelian groups* and then extensively studied by Noether (see e.g. [22]) in the more general setting under its current name. Importantly, this broader approach of ours allows for applications in both *non-associative* and *non-unital* contexts, as well as in situations where a module or ring multiplication is *left distributive* but not necessarily right distributive.

Here is an outline of this article.

In Section 2, we begin by reviewing some concepts and results related to the actions of sets on groups. In particular, we establish a few folkloristic results on Noetherian groups

with operators (see Propositions 6-8). We also introduce two seemingly new concepts: stable homomorphisms for such groups (see Definition 9) and weakly  $s$ -unital actions (see Definition 14).

In Section 3, we introduce Ore group extensions of abelian groups with sets of operators (see Definition 20). Using general versions of the Vandermonde and Leibniz identities (see Proposition 21 and Proposition 24), we derive criteria for associativity of such structures (see Theorem 27).

In Section 4, we establish a version of Hilbert's basis theorem (see Theorems 33 and 35) for Ore extensions of abelian groups. In particular, we extend Theorem 3 by generalizing it to the context of groups with operators (see Theorem 35).

In Section 5, we introduce Ore module extensions (see Definition 41) and apply results from earlier sections to these new structures. In particular, we obtain a generalization of Theorem 1 for rings  $R$  which are left distributive and weakly  $s$ -unital, but not necessarily associative or right distributive (see Corollary 50). This allows us to address many previously unreachable cases for  $R$ , such as all unital and Noetherian rings which are alternative or Jordan, all Dickson's left near-fields [26], and all algebras generated by either of the Cayley–Dickson or Conway–Smith doubling procedures [18].

## 2. GROUPS WITH OPERATORS

Throughout this article, we put  $\mathbb{Z} := \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$ ,  $\mathbb{N} := \{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \geq 0\}$  and  $\mathbb{N}_+ := \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n > 0\}$ . We recall the following notions and results from [4] (see also [14, 16]). Let  $A$  and  $B$  be sets. Suppose that  $\alpha$  is an *action* of  $A$  on  $B$ . By this, we mean that  $\alpha$  is a function from  $A$  to the set  $B^B$  of functions from  $B$  into itself. By abuse of notation, we will often suppress  $\alpha$  and write  $ab := \alpha(a)(b)$ , for  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ , placing  $a$  to the *left* of  $b$ , and say that  $B$  is a *set with operators in  $A$* .

Let  $S$  be a subset of  $B$ . Then  $S$  is called *stable* if  $as \in S$ , for  $a \in A$  and  $s \in S$ . The intersection of the family of stable subsets of  $B$  containing  $S$  is called the *stable subset of  $B$  generated by  $S$* ; this set is denoted  $\overline{S}$ . We put  $A^0S := S$  and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  we let  $A^nS$  denote the set of all elements of the form  $a_1(a_2(\dots(a_{n-1}(a_ns)))\dots)$  for  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$  and  $s \in S$ . From [4, Ch. I, §3.2, Discussion after Def. 2] we extract the following:

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $S$  be a subset of  $B$ . Then  $\overline{S} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}(A^nS)$ .*

Suppose henceforth that  $(B, \cdot)$  is a *group with operators in  $A$* . By this, we mean that the elements of  $A$  act as group endomorphisms of  $B$ , that is  $a(b \cdot c) = (ab) \cdot (ac)$ , for  $a \in A$  and  $b, c \in B$ . A subgroup of  $B$  is called  *$A$ -stable* (or simply *stable*) if it is stable as a subset of  $B$ . Let  $e$  denote the identity element of  $B$ . Since  $ae = e$ , for  $a \in A$ , it follows that  $\{e\}$  is always a stable subgroup of  $B$ . Furthermore, trivially,  $B$  is a stable subgroup of itself. Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $B$ . The intersection of the family of stable subgroups of  $B$  that contain  $S$  is called the *stable subgroup of  $B$  generated by  $S$*  and is denoted by  $\langle S \rangle$ . If  $C$  is a stable subgroup of  $B$  such that  $C = \langle T \rangle$  for some finite subset  $T$  of  $B$ , then  $C$  is said to be *finitely generated by  $T$* . From [4, Ch. I, §4.3, Prop. 2] we recall the following:

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $B$ . Then  $\langle S \rangle$  equals the set of all products of the form  $b_1 \cdots b_n$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , where for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $b_k \in \overline{S}$  or  $b_k^{-1} \in \overline{S}$ .*

Consider the partially ordered set of stable subgroups of  $B$ , ordered by inclusion. We say that  $B$  is *stably Noetherian* if this partially ordered set satisfies the ascending chain condition.

The next result is folklore. Due to the lack of an appropriate reference, we include a proof (see [14, Thm. 11.4] for the abelian groups case).

**Proposition 6.** *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $B$  is stably Noetherian;
- (ii) any nonempty family of stable subgroups of  $B$  has a maximal element;
- (iii) every stable subgroup of  $B$  is finitely generated.

*Proof.* (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Suppose that (i) holds. Seeking a contradiction, suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a nonempty family of stable subgroups of  $B$  with no maximal element. Take  $B_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ . Since  $B_1$  is not maximal, there is  $B_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $B_1 \subsetneq B_2$ . Continuing in this way we can construct an infinite ascending chain of stable subgroups of  $B$  that does not stabilize, which is a contradiction.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): Suppose that (ii) holds. Let  $C$  be a stable subgroup of  $B$ . Define  $\mathcal{F}$  to be the set of all finitely generated stable subgroups of  $C$ . Note that  $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ , because  $\{e\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . By hypothesis,  $\mathcal{F}$  has a maximal element  $M$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{F}$  we have  $M \subseteq C$ . Seeking a contradiction, suppose that  $M \subsetneq C$ . Take  $c \in C \setminus M$ ,  $k \geq 1$  and  $m_1, \dots, m_k \in M$  such that  $M = \langle m_1, \dots, m_k \rangle$ . Put  $N := \langle m_1, \dots, m_k, c \rangle$ . Since  $N$  is finitely generated it follows that  $N \subseteq M$ , which contradicts  $c \in N$ .

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Suppose that (iii) holds. Let  $C_1 \subseteq C_2 \subseteq \dots$  be an ascending chain of stable subgroups of  $B$ . Then, clearly,  $C := \cup_{i \geq 1} C_i$  is a stable subgroup of  $B$ . By hypothesis, there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ,  $i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_n$  in  $\mathbb{N}_+$  and  $c_{i_k} \in C_{i_k}$ , for  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , with  $C = \langle c_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_n} \rangle$ . Let  $k \geq i_n$ . Then  $C_k \supseteq C_{i_n}$ . Since  $c_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_n} \in C_{i_n}$ , it follows that  $C = \langle c_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_n} \rangle \subseteq C_{i_n}$ . Thus,  $C_k \subseteq C \subseteq C_{i_n}$ , so that  $C_k = C_{i_n}$ . In particular,  $C_{i_n} = C_{i_n+1} = \dots$ , showing that the chain stabilizes.  $\square$

Let  $C$  be a normal stable subgroup of  $B$ . The quotient group  $B/C$  is then a group with operators in  $A$  if we put  $a(bC) := (ab)C$  for  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$  (see [4, Ch. I, §4.4, Thm. 2]). The next result is also folklore. Due to the lack of an appropriate reference, we include a proof.

**Proposition 7.** *Let  $C$  be a normal stable subgroup of  $B$ . Then  $B$  is stably Noetherian if and only if  $C$  and  $B/C$  are stably Noetherian.*

*Proof.* We generalize the proof for the abelian case given in [14, Thm. 11.6].

Suppose that  $B$  is stably Noetherian. Any stable subgroup  $D$  of  $C$  is also a stable subgroup of  $B$ . Hence, by assumption and Proposition 6,  $D$  is finitely generated. Thus,  $C$  is stably Noetherian. Now we show that  $B/C$  is stably Noetherian. By [4, Ch. I, §4.6, Cor. 1], the quotient map  $B \rightarrow B/C$  induces an inclusion preserving bijection between the family of stable subgroups of  $B$  containing  $C$  and the family of stable subgroups of  $B/C$ . From this bijection it follows that  $B/C$  is stably Noetherian, since  $B$  is stably Noetherian.

Suppose that  $C$  and  $B/C$  are stably Noetherian. Let  $D_1 \subseteq D_2 \subseteq \dots$  be an ascending chain of stable subgroups of  $B$ . Then  $D_1 \cap C \subseteq D_2 \cap C \subseteq \dots$  and  $D_1 C \subseteq D_2 C \subseteq \dots$  are ascending chains of stable subgroups of  $C$  and  $B/C$  respectively. By assumption there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that for any  $i \geq n$ , the equalities  $D_i \cap C = D_n \cap C$  and  $D_i C = D_n C$  hold. Take  $i \geq n$ . We wish to show that  $D_i = D_n$ . By assumption  $D_n \subseteq D_i$ . Now we show that  $D_i \subseteq D_n$ . Take  $d_i \in D_i$ . Then  $d_i \in D_i C = D_n C$  so that  $d_i = e_n c$  for some  $e_n \in D_n$  and  $c \in C$ . Then  $e_n^{-1} d_i \in D_n \subseteq D_i$  so that  $c = e_n^{-1} d_i \in C \cap D_i = C \cap D_n \subseteq D_n$ . Hence,  $d_i = e_n c \in D_n D_n \subseteq D_n$ .  $\square$

Let  $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a family of groups with operators in  $A$ , and let  $B$  be the direct product  $\prod_{i \in I} B_i$ . Consider the action of  $A$  on  $B$  defined by  $a(b_i)_{i \in I} := (ab_i)_{i \in I}$ , for  $a \in A$  and  $b_i \in B_i$ . With this structure,  $B$  is a group with operators in  $A$ .

**Proposition 8.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , and let  $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a family of groups with operators in  $A$ . Consider  $B := B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n$  as a group with operators in  $A$ , in the sense defined above. Then  $B$  is stably Noetherian if and only if  $B_i$  is stably Noetherian for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .*

*Proof.* The “only if” statement follows from Proposition 7 since each  $B_i$  is isomorphic to a normal stable subgroup of  $B$ . Now we show the “if” statement. Suppose that each  $B_i$  is stably Noetherian. We prove, by induction on  $n$ , that  $B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n$  is stably Noetherian. The claim trivially holds if  $n = 1$ . Suppose now that  $B_1 \times \cdots \times B_k$  is stably Noetherian for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . Put  $B := B_1 \times \cdots \times B_{k+1}$  and  $C := B_{k+1}$ . Then  $C$  is isomorphic to a stably Noetherian normal stable subgroup of  $B$  such that  $B/C \cong B_1 \times \cdots \times B_k$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $B/C$  is therefore also stably Noetherian. By Proposition 7,  $B$  is stably Noetherian.  $\square$

**Definition 9** ( $A$ -stable homomorphism). Let  $B$  and  $C$  be groups with operators in  $A$ . Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is a group homomorphism. Then we say that  $f$  is  $A$ -stable if for every  $b \in B$ , the inclusion  $f(Ab) \subseteq Af(b)$  holds.

**Proposition 10.** *Let  $B, C$ , and  $D$  be groups with operators in  $A$ . Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  and  $g : C \rightarrow D$  are  $A$ -stable group homomorphisms. Then  $g \circ f : B \rightarrow D$  is  $A$ -stable and  $\ker(f)$  is an  $A$ -stable subgroup of  $B$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $b \in B$ . Then  $g(f(Ab)) \subseteq g(Af(b)) \subseteq Ag(f(b))$ . Therefore,  $g \circ f$  is  $A$ -stable. Also  $f(A\ker(f)) \subseteq Af(\ker(f)) = Ae = e$ . Thus,  $\ker(f)$  is  $A$ -stable.  $\square$

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $B$  be a stably Noetherian group with operators in  $A$ . Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow B$  is a surjective  $A$ -stable group homomorphism. Then  $f$  is bijective.*

*Proof.* We want to show that  $\ker(f) = \{e\}$ , i.e.  $f$  is injective. By Proposition 10, all the function compositions  $f^k := f \circ \cdots \circ f$  ( $k$  functions), for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , are  $A$ -stable group homomorphisms. By Proposition 10 again,  $\ker(f^k)$  is an  $A$ -stable subgroup of  $B$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . Clearly,  $\ker(f) \subseteq \ker(f^2) \subseteq \cdots$ . Since  $B$  is stably Noetherian, there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $\ker(f^n) = \ker(f^{n+1}) = \cdots$ . We claim that  $\ker(f^n) \cap \text{im}(f^n) = \{e\}$ . Let us assume for a moment that this claim holds. Since  $f$  is surjective, it follows that  $\{e\} = \ker(f^n) \cap \text{im}(f^n) = \ker(f^n) \cap B = \ker(f^n)$ . Thus,  $\ker(f) \subseteq \ker(f^n) = \{e\}$  so that  $\ker(f) = \{e\}$ . Now we show the claim. Trivially,  $\ker(f^n) \cap \text{im}(f^n) \supseteq \{e\}$ . Now we show the reversed inclusion. To this end, take  $x \in \ker(f^n) \cap \text{im}(f^n)$ . Then  $f^n(x) = e$  and there is  $y \in B$  with  $f^n(y) = x$ . Thus,  $f^{2n}(y) = f^n(f^n(y)) = f^n(x) = e$ . Hence,  $y \in \ker(f^{2n}) = \ker(f^n)$  so that  $x = f^n(y) = e$ . Therefore,  $\ker(f^n) \cap \text{im}(f^n) \subseteq \{e\}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 12** ( $\tau$ -twist). Let  $B$  and  $C$  be groups with operators in  $A$ . Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is a group homomorphism. Let  $\tau$  be a map  $A \rightarrow A$ . We say that  $f$  is  $\tau$ -twisted if for all  $a \in A$  and all  $b \in B$ , the equality  $f(ab) = \tau(a)f(b)$  holds.

**Proposition 13.** *Let  $B$  and  $C$  be groups with operators in  $A$ . Suppose that  $f : B \rightarrow C$  is a  $\tau$ -twisted group homomorphism for some map  $\tau : A \rightarrow A$ . Then  $f$  is  $A$ -stable.*

*Proof.* Take  $b \in B$ . Then  $f(Ab) = \tau(A)f(b) \subseteq Af(b)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 14** (Weakly  $s$ -unital action). Suppose that  $B$  is a group with operators in  $A$ . Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $B$ . Put  $\tilde{S} := \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+} (A^n S)$ . Let  $[S]$  denote the set of all  $b_1 \cdots b_n$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , where for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $b_k \in \tilde{S}$  or  $b_k^{-1} \in \tilde{S}$ . Clearly,  $[S]$  is a stable subgroup of  $B$ . We say that the action of  $A$  on  $B$  is  $s$ -unital (resp. weakly  $s$ -unital) if for every  $b \in B$  the relation  $b \in Ab$  (resp.  $b \in [b]$ ) holds.

**Proposition 15.** *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) *the action of  $A$  on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital;*
- (ii) *for every nonempty subset  $S$  of  $B$ , the equality  $\langle S \rangle = [S]$  holds.*

*Proof.* (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Suppose that (i) holds. Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $B$ . By Proposition 4,  $\tilde{S} \subseteq \overline{S}$  and hence, by Proposition 5,  $[S] \subseteq \langle S \rangle$ . Now we show the reversed inclusion. Take  $s \in S$ . By (i),  $s \in [s] \subseteq [S]$ . Thus,  $[S]$  is a stable subgroup of  $B$  containing  $S$ . By the definition of  $\langle S \rangle$  we get that  $\langle S \rangle \subseteq [S]$ . This proves (ii).

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Suppose that (ii) holds. If  $b \in B$ , then  $b \in \langle b \rangle = [b]$ . This proves (i).  $\square$

**Example 16.** Suppose that  $B$  is an abelian group and  $A = \{a\}$  is a singleton set. Define the action of  $A$  on  $B$  by  $ab := b^{-1}$  for  $b \in B$ . Since  $a(ab) = (b^{-1})^{-1} = b$ , the action of  $A$  on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital. Note, however, that since  $ab \neq b$  for all  $b \in B$  with  $b^2 \neq e$ , the action is  $s$ -unital if and only if  $B$  is a Boolean group.

### 3. ORE GROUP EXTENSIONS

Throughout this section,  $B$  is an *abelian* group with operators in a nonempty set  $A$ ,  $+$  denotes the group operation in  $B$ , and  $0$  denotes the identity element of  $B$ .

**Definition 17** (Zero element). We always assume that  $A$  has a *zero element*. By this, we mean an element  $\epsilon \in A$  such that for any  $b \in B$ ,  $\epsilon b = 0$ . We will assume that  $\epsilon$  is fixed. By abuse of notation, we put  $0 := \epsilon$ , so that the convenient equality  $a0 = 0b = 0$  holds for all  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ .

**Definition 18** (Polynomial group). By a *polynomial* over  $A$  we mean a formal sum  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i x^i$ , where  $a_i \in A$ , for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $a_i = 0$  for all but finitely many  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . The set of polynomials over  $A$  is denoted by  $A[x]$ . We define  $B[x]$  similarly and equip it with an abelian group structure in the following way. If  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i x^i, \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} b'_j x^j \in B[x]$ , then we put

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i x^i + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} b'_j x^j := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (b_i + b'_i) x^i.$$

The zero polynomial is defined to be  $0 := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} 0x^i$ .

**Definition 19** ( $\pi$ -maps). From now on, let  $\sigma_B$  and  $\delta_B$  be group endomorphisms of  $B$ . Take  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . We define  $\pi_j^i: B \rightarrow B$  in the following way. If  $i \geq j$ , then we let  $\pi_j^i: B \rightarrow B$  denote the sum of all  $\binom{i}{j}$  compositions of  $j$  instances of  $\sigma_B$  and  $i - j$  instances of  $\delta_B$ . If  $i < j$ , then we put  $\pi_j^i := 0$ .

**Definition 20** (Ore group extension). The *Ore group extension*  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  is the abelian group  $B[x]$  with  $A[x]$  as a set of operators, the action being given by

$$\left( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i x^i \right) \left( \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} b_j x^j \right) := \sum_{i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}} (a_i \pi_k^i(b_j)) x^{k+j}$$

for  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i x^i \in A[x]$  and  $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} b_j x^j \in B[x]$ . By abuse of notation, we write  $B[x]$  for  $B[x; \text{id}_B, 0_B]$ .

**Proposition 21** (Vandermonde's identity).  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i^k \circ \pi_{j-i}^n = \pi_j^{k+n}$  for  $j, k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Take  $j, k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $X$  denote the set of words of length  $k+n$  having as letters exactly  $j$  copies of  $\sigma_B$  and  $k+n-j$  copies of  $\delta_B$ . The sum  $\pi_j^{k+n}$  equals the sum of all words from  $X$ , where we interpret each word as the function corresponding to the composition of its letters. For each  $i$ , let  $X_i$  denote the set of words of length  $k+n$  having exactly  $i$  copies of  $\sigma_B$  amongst its first  $k$  letters, and exactly  $j-i$  copies of  $\sigma_B$  amongst its remaining  $n$  letters. Fix  $i$ . Expanding the sums  $\pi_i^k$  and  $\pi_{j-i}^n$  it follows that the terms in the resulting sum  $\pi_i^k \circ \pi_{j-i}^n$  are in bijective correspondence with the words in  $X_i$ . Since, clearly,  $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a partition of  $X$ , the sought identity follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 22.**  $\pi_{j-1}^k \circ \sigma_B + \pi_j^k \circ \delta_B = \pi_j^{k+1}$  for  $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* This follows from Proposition 21 with  $n = 1$ .  $\square$

**Definition 23** ( $\sigma$ -derivation and  $\sigma$ -twist). Suppose from now on that  $\sigma_A$  and  $\delta_A$  are maps  $A \rightarrow A$ , and that  $\sigma_B$  and  $\delta_B$  are additive maps  $B \rightarrow B$ . We say that  $\delta_B$  is a  $\delta_A$ -twisted  $\sigma_A$ -derivation if  $\delta_B(ab) = \sigma_A(a)\delta_B(b) + \delta_A(a)b$  for all  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ . Additionally, we say that  $\sigma_B$  is  $\sigma_A$ -twisted if  $\sigma_B(ab) = \sigma_A(a)\sigma_B(b)$  for all  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ .

**Proposition 24** (Leibniz's identity). Suppose that  $\delta_B$  is a  $\delta_A$ -twisted  $\sigma_A$ -derivation and  $\sigma_B$  is  $\sigma_A$ -twisted. Take  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$  and  $i, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\pi_i^m(ab) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(a)\pi_i^k(b)$ .

*Proof.* We prove the sought identity by induction on  $m$ . It clearly holds for  $m = 0$ . Suppose that it holds for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using Corollary 22, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi_i^{m+1}(ab) &= \pi_{i-1}^m(\sigma_B(ab)) + \pi_i^m(\delta_B(ab)) \\
 &= \pi_{i-1}^m(\sigma_A(a)\sigma_B(b)) + \pi_i^m(\sigma_A(a)\delta_B(b)) + \pi_i^m(\delta_A(a)b) \\
 &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(\sigma_A(a))\pi_{i-1}^k(\sigma_B(b)) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(\sigma_A(a))\pi_i^k(\delta_B(b)) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(\delta_A(a))\pi_i^k(b) \\
 &= \pi_{i-1}^m(\sigma_A(a))\sigma_B^i(b) + \sum_{k=i}^m [\pi_k^m(\sigma_A(a))\pi_{i-1}^k(\sigma_B(b)) + \pi_k^m(\sigma_A(a))\pi_i^k(\delta_B(b))] \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(\delta_A(a))\pi_i^k(b) \\
 &= \pi_{i-1}^m(\sigma_A(a))\sigma_B^i(b) + \sum_{k=i}^m \pi_k^m(\sigma_A(a))\pi_i^{k+1}(b) + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(\delta_A(a))\pi_i^k(b) \\
 &= \sum_{k=i}^{m+1} \pi_{k-1}^m(\sigma_A(a))\pi_i^k(b) + \sum_{k=i}^{m+1} \pi_k^m(\delta_A(a))\pi_i^k(b) = \sum_{k=i}^{m+1} \pi_k^{m+1}(a)\pi_i^k(b).
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Proposition 25.** Suppose that  $\delta_B$  is a  $\delta_A$ -twisted  $\sigma_A$ -derivation and  $\sigma_B$  is  $\sigma_A$ -twisted. Take  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$  and  $j, m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i^m(a\pi_{j-i}^n(b)) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i^m(a)\pi_j^{i+n}(b)$ .

*Proof.* By Leibniz's and Vandermonde's identities, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i^m(a\pi_{j-i}^n(b)) &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(a)(\pi_i^k \circ \pi_{j-i}^n)(b) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(a)(\pi_i^k \circ \pi_{j-i}^n)(b) \\
 &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(a) \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\pi_i^k \circ \pi_{j-i}^n)(b) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_k^m(a)\pi_j^{k+n}(b).
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Definition 26** (Associativity). From now on  $C$  is an abelian group with operators in  $A$  and in  $B$ . We say that  $(A, B, C)$  is *associative* if  $(ab)c = a(bc)$  for all  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$  and  $c \in C$ .

Henceforth, let  $\sigma_C$  and  $\delta_C$  be additive maps  $C \rightarrow C$ . Note that the Ore group extension  $C[x; \sigma_C, \delta_C]$  is an abelian group with operators in  $A[x]$  and in  $B[x]$ , under our stated conventions on  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$ . Also note that  $C[x; \sigma_C, \delta_C]$  can be seen as an abelian group with operators in either of the sets  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  or  $B[x]$ .

**Theorem 27.** *Let  $(A, B, C)$  be associative. Suppose that  $\delta_C$  is a  $\delta_B$ -twisted  $\sigma_B$ -derivation and  $\sigma_C$  is  $\sigma_B$ -twisted. Then  $(A[x], B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B], C[x; \sigma_C, \delta_C])$  is associative.*

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i x^i \in A[x]$ ,  $\beta := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} b_j x^j \in B[x]$ , and  $\gamma := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k x^k \in C[x]$ . By Proposition 25, and the associativity of  $(A, B, C)$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha\beta)\gamma &= \sum_{i,j,p \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \pi_p^i(b_j) x^{p+j} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} c_k x^k = \sum_{i,j,k,p,q \in \mathbb{N}} (a_i \pi_p^i(b_j)) \pi_q^{p+j}(c_k) x^{q+k} \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k,p,q \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \left( \pi_p^i(b_j) \pi_q^{p+j}(c_k) \right) x^{q+k} = \sum_{i,j,k,q \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_p^i(b_j) \pi_q^{p+j}(c_k) \right) x^{q+k} \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k,q \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_p^i(b_j \pi_q^j(c_k)) \right) x^{q+k} \quad [\text{Put } r := q - p] \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k,r \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_p^i(b_j \pi_r^j(c_k)) x^{p+r+k} = \sum_{i,j,k,r,p \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \left( \pi_p^i(b_j \pi_r^j(c_k)) \right) x^{p+r+k} \\
&= \alpha \sum_{j,k,r \in \mathbb{N}} b_j \pi_r^j(c_k) x^{r+k} = \alpha(\beta\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

□

In analogy with the situation for modules, we define the *annihilator of  $A$  in  $C$*  to be the set  $\text{Ann}_C(A) := \{c \in C \mid Ac = \{0\}\}$ .

**Corollary 28.** *Let  $\sigma_C$  and  $\delta_C$  be group endomorphisms of  $C$ . Suppose that  $\text{Ann}_C(A) = \{0\}$ . The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $(A[x], B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B], C[x; \sigma_C, \delta_C])$  is associative;
- (ii)  $(A, B, C)$  is associative,  $\sigma_C$  is  $\sigma_B$ -twisted and  $\delta_C$  is a  $\delta_B$ -twisted  $\sigma_B$ -derivation.

*Proof.* The implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) follows from Theorem 27. Now we show that (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Suppose that  $(A[x], B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B], C[x; \sigma_C, \delta_C])$  is associative. Then, trivially,  $(A, B, C)$  is associative. Take  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$  and  $c \in C$ . From  $(ax)(bc) = ((ax)b)c$  we get that  $a\sigma_C(bc) = a\sigma_B(b)\sigma_C(c)$  and  $a\delta_C(bc) = a\sigma_B(b)\delta_C(c) + a\delta_B(b)c$ . Thus, both  $\sigma_C(bc) - \sigma_B(b)\sigma_C(c)$  and  $\delta_C(bc) - \sigma_B(b)\delta_C(c) - \delta_B(b)c$  belong to  $\text{Ann}_C(A) = \{0\}$ . Therefore,  $\sigma_C$  is  $\sigma_B$ -twisted and  $\delta_C$  is a  $\delta_B$ -twisted  $\sigma_B$ -derivation. □

**Example 29.** Suppose that  $F$  is a field and  $\sigma_F$  is a field endomorphism of  $F$ . Let  $V$  be an  $F$ -vector space with a fixed basis  $(v_i)_{i \in I}$ . Let  $\sigma_F$  act on  $V$  in the following way. Suppose that  $v = \sum_{i \in I} f_i v_i$ , for some  $f_i \in F$  with  $f_i = 0$  for all but finitely many  $i \in I$ . Put  $\sigma_F(v) := \sum_{i \in I} \sigma_F(f_i) v_i$ . Let  $\alpha$  be an  $F$ -vector space endomorphism of  $V$ . Put  $\sigma_V := \sigma_F \circ \alpha$ . Then  $\sigma_V$  is a  $\sigma_F$ -twisted endomorphism of  $V$ . Let  $\delta_F : F \rightarrow F$  be any  $\delta_F$ -twisted  $\sigma_F$ -derivation on  $F$ , for instance  $\delta_F := \text{id}_F - \sigma_F$ . Define  $\delta_V : V \rightarrow V$  by  $\delta_V(v) := \sum_{i \in I} \delta_F(f_i) v_i$ , for  $v \in V$ . Then  $\delta_V$  is a  $\delta_F$ -twisted  $\sigma_F$ -derivation on  $V$ . By Corollary 28, the triple  $(F[x], F[x; \sigma_F, \delta_F], V[x; \sigma_V, \delta_V])$  is associative.

#### 4. A HILBERT'S BASIS THEOREM

Throughout this section,  $B$  is an abelian group with operators in a nonempty set  $A$ ,  $+$  denotes the group operation in  $B$ , and  $0$  denotes the identity element of  $B$ . We also assume that  $A$  has a zero element (see Definition 17) and that  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  is an Ore group extension.



As is customary, given  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $b \in B$  we write

$$zb := \begin{cases} b + \cdots + b & (z \text{ terms}) & \text{if } z > 0, \\ 0 & & \text{if } z = 0, \\ (-b) + \cdots + (-b) & (-z \text{ terms}) & \text{if } z < 0. \end{cases}$$

Let  $S$  be a subset of  $B$ . We let  $\mathbb{Z}S$  denote the set of finite sums of elements of the form  $zs$  for  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $s \in S$ . Let  $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a family of subsets of  $B$ . We let  $\sum_{i \in I} S_i$  denote the set of finite sums of elements from  $\cup_{i \in I} S_i$ . From Proposition 5 and Proposition 15, we immediately get the following:

**Proposition 30.** *Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $B$ . Then  $\langle S \rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^n S)$  and  $[S] = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+} \mathbb{Z}(A^n S)$ . The action of  $A$  on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital if and only if for every nonempty subset  $S$  of  $B$  the equality  $\langle S \rangle = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+} \mathbb{Z}(A^n S)$  holds.*

**Definition 31** (Projection map). Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We define the *projection map*  $\beta_n: B[x] \rightarrow B[x]$  by  $\beta_n(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i x^i) := b_n x^n$ , for  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} b_i x^i \in B[x]$ .

**Lemma 32.** *Suppose that  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  is an Ore group extension,  $b \in B$  and  $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ . The following assertions hold:*

- (i)  $\beta_{i+j}(A^k((Ax^i)(bx^j))) = (A^{k+1}\sigma_B^i(b))x^{i+j}$ ;
- (ii) *if  $\sigma_B^i(b) \in [\sigma_B^i(b)]$ , then  $\sigma_B^i(b)x^{i+j} \in \beta_{i+j}(\langle (Ax^i)(bx^j) \rangle)$ .*

*Proof.* (i): It is clear that

$$\beta_{i+j}(A^k((Ax^i)(bx^j))) \subseteq \beta_{i+j}(A^k((A\sigma_B^i(b))x^{i+j})) \subseteq (A^{k+1}\sigma_B^i(b))x^{i+j}.$$

Now we show the reversed inclusion. Take  $a_1, \dots, a_{k+1} \in A$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(a_2(\cdots(a_{k+1}\sigma_B^i(b))\cdots))x^{i+j} &= \beta_{i+j}(a_1(a_2(\cdots(a_k((a_{k+1}x^i)bx^j))\cdots))) \\ &\in \beta_{i+j}(A^k((Ax^i)(bx^j))). \end{aligned}$$

(ii): Suppose that  $\sigma_B^i(b) \in [\sigma_B^i(b)] = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^{k+1}\sigma_B^i(b))$ . From (i) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_B^i(b)x^{i+j} &\in \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^{k+1}\sigma_B^i(b))x^{i+j} = \beta_{i+j}\left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^k((Ax^i)(bx^j)))\right) \\ &= \beta_{i+j}(\langle (Ax^i)(bx^j) \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Theorem 33.** *Suppose that  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  is an Ore group extension of a stably Noetherian group  $B$  on which the action is weakly  $s$ -unital. Let  $\sigma_B$  be an  $A$ -stable surjection. Then  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  is stably Noetherian, seen as a group with operators in  $A[x]$ .*

*Proof.* Put  $S := A[x]$  and  $T := B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$ . Let  $P$  be a nonzero  $S$ -stable subgroup of  $T$ . Set

$$Q := \{b \in B \mid \exists d \geq 0 \exists b_{d-1}, b_{d-2}, \dots, b_0 \in B \text{ with } \sigma_B^d(b)x^d + b_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + b_0 \in P\}.$$

We now show that  $Q$  is an  $A$ -stable subgroup of  $B$ . We first show that  $AQ \subseteq Q$ . Take  $a \in A$  and  $b \in Q$ . There are  $d \geq 0$  and  $b_{d-1}, b_{d-2}, \dots, b_0 \in B$  such that

$$p := \sigma_B^d(b)x^d + b_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + b_0 \in P.$$

Since  $\sigma_B$  is  $A$ -stable, there is  $a' \in A$  with  $\sigma_B^d(ab) = a'\sigma_B^d(b)$ . Thus

$$\sigma_B^d(ab)x^d + a'b_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + a'b_0 = a'\sigma_B^d(b)x^d + a'b_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + a'b_0 = a'p \in P,$$

so that  $ab \in Q$ . Now we show that  $Q + Q \subseteq Q$ . To this end, take  $b' \in Q$ ,  $e \geq 0$  and  $b'_{e-1}, b'_{e-2}, \dots, b'_0 \in B$  with  $p' := \sigma_B^e(b')x^e + b'_{e-1}x^{e-1} + \dots + b'_0 \in P$ . Suppose that  $d \geq e$ . Since the action on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital, it follows from Lemma 32 (with  $i = d - e$  and  $j = e$ ) that there is  $p'' \in \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^k((Ax^{d-e})p')) \subseteq P$  with leading term  $\sigma_B^d(b')x^d$ . Since  $p + p'' \in P$  and the leading term of  $p + p''$  is  $\sigma_B^d(b) + \sigma_B^d(b') = \sigma_B^d(b + b')$  it follows that  $b + b' \in Q$ . The case  $d < e$  is treated in a similar manner.

Since  $B$  is stably Noetherian, it follows from Proposition 7 that  $Q$  is stably Noetherian. Thus, by Proposition 6, there are  $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_k \in Q$  with  $Q = \langle b_1, \dots, b_k \rangle$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  there is  $p_i \in P$  with leading term  $\sigma^{n_i}(b_i)x^{n_i}$ . Let  $n := \max\{n_i\}_{i=1}^k$ . Fix  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Since the action on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital, it follows from Lemma 32 (with  $i = n - n_i$  and  $j = n_i$ ) that there is  $p'_i \in \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^k((Ax^{n-n_i})p_i)) \subseteq P$  with leading term  $\sigma_B^n(b_i)x^n$ . Put  $C := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} Bx^i$ . By Proposition 8,  $C$  is stably Noetherian. Therefore, by Proposition 7,  $C \cap P$  is stably Noetherian, which in turn, by Proposition 6, implies that  $C \cap P$  is finitely generated by some  $a_1, \dots, a_t \in C \cap P$ .

Put  $P_0 := \langle p'_1, \dots, p'_k, a_1, \dots, a_t \rangle$ . We claim that  $P_0 = P$ . Assuming that the claim holds,  $P$  is finitely generated, and hence, by Proposition 6,  $P$  is stably Noetherian. Now we show the claim. Trivially,  $P_0 \subseteq P$ . Now we show the reversed inclusion. To this end, take  $p \in P$  and let  $D$  denote the degree of  $p$ .

Case 1:  $D < n$ . Then  $p \in C \cap P = \langle a_1, \dots, a_t \rangle \subseteq P_0$ .

Case 2:  $D \geq n$ . Suppose that all elements of  $P$  of degree less than  $D$  belong to  $P_0$ . Since  $\sigma_B$  is surjective, there is  $b \in B$  such that the leading term of  $p$  is  $\sigma_B^D(b)x^D$ . From  $p \in P$  it follows that  $b \in Q$ . Since  $Q = \langle b_1, \dots, b_k \rangle$  and the action on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital, it follows from Proposition 30 that  $b \in \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^{j+1}b_i)$ . Thus, since  $\sigma_B$  is  $A$ -stable, we get

$$\sigma_B^D(b) \in \sigma_B^D \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^{j+1}b_i) \right) \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^{j+1}\sigma_B^D(b_i)).$$

By  $s$ -unitality of the action on  $B$ , for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  we have  $\sigma_B^D(b_i) \in [\sigma_B^D(b_i)]$ . Hence, by Lemma 32(ii), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_B^D(b)x^D &\in \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}(A^{j+1}\sigma_B^D(b_i))x^D \subseteq \beta_D \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{Z}(A^j((Ax^{D-n})(\sigma_B^n(b_i)x^n))) \right) \\ &= \beta_D \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{Z}(A^j((Ax^{D-n})p'_i)) \right) \subseteq \beta_D(P_0). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there is  $\bar{p} \in P_0$  with leading term  $\sigma_B^D(b)x^D$ . Hence,  $p - \bar{p} \in P$  and the leading term of  $p - \bar{p}$  has degree less than  $D$ . By the induction hypothesis it follows that  $p - \bar{p} \in P_0$ . Thus,  $p = \bar{p} + p - \bar{p} \in P_0 + P_0 \subseteq P_0$ .  $\square$

Note that under the assumptions of the previous theorem, the map  $\sigma_B$  is necessarily *bijective*, as established by Proposition 11.

**Theorem 34.** *Suppose that  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  is an Ore group extension of a stably Noetherian group  $B$  on which the action is  $s$ -unital. Let  $\tau$  be a map  $A \rightarrow A$  and suppose that  $\sigma_B$  is a  $\tau$ -twisted surjection. Then  $B[x; \sigma_B, \delta_B]$  is stably Noetherian, seen as a group with operators in  $A[x]$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from Proposition 13 and Theorem 33.  $\square$

The next result shows that the weakly  $s$ -unital condition in Theorem 33 cannot, in general, be removed.

**Theorem 35.** *Consider  $B[x]$  as an abelian group with operators in  $A[x]$ . Then  $B[x]$  is stably Noetherian if and only if  $B$  is stably Noetherian and the action on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital.*

*Proof.* The “if” statement follows immediately from Theorem 33. Now we show the “only if” statement. We use the argument from [30, p. 2201]. Suppose that  $B[x]$  is stably Noetherian. First we show that  $B$  is stably Noetherian. Seeking a contradiction, suppose that  $B_1 \subsetneq B_2 \subsetneq \dots$  is an infinite ascending chain of stable subgroups of  $B$ . Then, clearly,  $B_1[x] \subsetneq B_2[x] \subsetneq \dots$  is an infinite ascending chain of stable subgroups of  $B[x]$ , which is a contradiction. Now we show that the action of  $A$  on  $B$  is weakly  $s$ -unital. Seeking a contradiction, suppose that there is  $c \in B$  such that  $c \notin [c]$ . Since  $[c]$  is a stable subgroup of  $B$  we can consider the quotient group  $D := B/[c]$ . Then  $D$  is nonzero, because the class  $c + [c]$  in  $B/[c]$  is nonzero. Let  $E := \langle c + [c] \rangle$  be the  $A$ -stable subgroup in  $D$  generated by  $c + [c]$ . Consider  $E[x]$  as a group with operators in  $A[x]$ . Since  $Ac \in [c]$ , it follows that  $AE = \{0\}$ . Hence,  $A[x]E[x] = \{0\}$ . Thus, the  $A[x]$ -stable subgroups of  $E[x]$  are the same as the additive subgroups of  $E[x]$ . But  $E[x]$  is an infinite direct sum of the nonzero subgroups  $Ex^n$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so  $E[x]$  is not stably Noetherian. By Proposition 7,  $D[x]$  is not stably Noetherian. Therefore, by Proposition 7 again,  $B[x]$  is not stably Noetherian, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 36.** Theorem 35 extends Varadarajan’s theorem, see [30, Thm. A], generalizing the result from polynomial modules to the context of abelian groups with operators.

**Example 37.** Let  $I := \{1, 2, \dots\}$  be a nonempty countable set. For each  $n \in I$ , let  $p_n$  denote the  $n$ th odd prime number, so that  $p_1 = 3$ ,  $p_2 = 5$ ,  $p_3 = 7$ , and so on. For each  $n \in I$ , let  $C_n$  denote the cyclic group of order  $p_n$ . Suppose that  $B$  denotes the abelian group of all sequences  $(c_n)_{n \in I} \in \prod_{n \in I} C_n$  of  $c_n \in C_n$  with  $c_n = e$  for all but finitely many  $n \in I$ . Let  $A = \{a\}$  be a singleton set. Define the action of  $A$  on  $B$  by  $a(c_n)_{n \in I} = (c_n^{-1})_{n \in I}$ . By Example 16 and Theorem 35,  $B[x]$  is stably Noetherian as an abelian group with operators in  $A[x]$  if and only if  $I$  is finite.

## 5. ORE MODULE EXTENSIONS

Throughout this section,  $R$  is a *ring*. By this we mean that  $R$  is an additive group equipped with a map  $R \times R \ni (r, s) \mapsto rs \in R$ . We will refer to this map as the *ring multiplication*. From now on, let  $M$  be a left  $R$ -*module*. By this we mean that  $M$  is an additive group equipped with a map  $R \times M \ni (r, m) \mapsto rm \in M$ . We will refer to this map as the *module multiplication*. If  $N$  is an additive subgroup of  $M$  and the image of the restriction of the module multiplication to  $R \times N$  is contained in  $N$ , then  $N$  is called a *submodule* of  $M$ . For  $m \in M$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , we let  $R^n m$  denote the set of elements  $r_1(r_2(\dots(r_{n-1}(r_n m))\dots))$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$ .

**Definition 38.** With the above notation, the left  $R$ -module  $M$  is said to be:

- *associative* if  $(rs)m = r(sm)$  for  $r, s \in R$  and  $m \in M$ ;
- *left distributive* if  $r(m + n) = rm + rn$  for  $r \in R$  and  $m, n \in M$ ;
- *right distributive* if  $(r + s)m = rm + sm$  for  $r, s \in R$  and  $m \in M$ ;
- *weakly  $s$ -unital* if for each  $m \in M$ , the relation  $m \in \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+} \mathbb{Z}(R^n m)$  holds;
- *$s$ -unital* if for every  $m \in M$  there is  $r \in R$  such that  $m = rm$ ;
- *Noetherian* if any chain  $N_0 \subseteq N_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq N_i \subseteq \dots$  of  $R$ -submodules of  $M$  eventually stabilizes, i.e. if there is some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $N_i = N_k$  for every  $i \geq k$ .

The ring  $R$  is said to be *associative* (resp. *left distributive*, *right distributive*, *(weakly) left  $s$ -unital*) if  $R$  is associative (resp. left distributive, right distributive, (weakly)  $s$ -unital) as a left module over itself.

**Remark 39.** Let  $M$  be a left  $R$ -module. Consider  $R$  and  $M$  as sets equipped with an action of  $R$ , induced by the ring and module multiplication, respectively.

- (i) The  $R$ -module  $M$  is left distributive if and only if  $M$  is a group with operators in  $R$ , in the sense defined in Section 2.
- (ii) Suppose that  $M$  is left distributive. The  $R$ -module  $M$  is associative if and only if the triple  $(R, R, M)$  is associative in the sense of Definition 26.
- (iii) Suppose that  $R$  is left distributive. The ring  $R$  is associative if and only if the triple  $(R, R, R)$  is associative in the sense of Definition 26.
- (iv) Suppose that the  $R$ -module  $M$  is left distributive. Then  $M$  is weakly  $s$ -unital as an  $R$ -module if and only if the action of  $R$  on  $M$  is weakly  $s$ -unital in the sense of Definition 14.
- (v) Suppose that the  $R$ -module  $M$  is associative and left distributive. Then  $M$  is  $s$ -unital as an  $R$ -module if and only if the action of  $R$  on  $M$  is  $s$ -unital in the sense of Definition 14.
- (vi) Suppose that  $R$  is associative as a ring.
  - (a) The ring  $R$  is left (right) distributive as a left module over itself if and only if  $R$  is a left (right) *near-ring* in the sense of [26, Def. 1.1].
  - (b) The  $R$ -module  $M$  is right distributive and associative if and only if  $M$  is a *near module over  $R$* , in the sense of [27, Def. 1], or, equivalently, an  *$R$ -group*, in the sense of [26, Def. 1.17].
  - (c) The  $R$ -module  $M$  is left distributive and associative if and only if  $M$  is a *modified near module over  $R$* , in the sense of [27, Def. 2].

From now on,  $\sigma_R$  and  $\delta_R$  are maps  $R \rightarrow R$ , and  $\sigma_M$  and  $\delta_M$  are additive maps  $M \rightarrow M$ .

**Definition 40** (Ore ring extension). Suppose that the ring  $R$  is left distributive. By the *Ore ring extension*  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$  we mean the polynomial group  $R[x]$  with a left action on itself, the action being defined as in Definition 20, with  $A = B = R$ .

**Definition 41** (Ore module extension). Suppose that both the ring  $R$  and the left  $R$ -module  $M$  are left distributive. By the *Ore module extension*  $M[x; \sigma_M, \delta_M]$  we mean the polynomial group  $M[x]$  equipped with the ring  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$  as a set of operators, the action being defined as in Definition 20 with  $A = R$  and  $B = M$ .

**Proposition 42.** *Let  $R$  be a left distributive ring, and let  $M$  be a left distributive  $R$ -module. Suppose that  $M$  is associative as a left  $R$ -module. If  $\delta_M$  is a  $\sigma_R$ -derivation on  $M$  and  $\sigma_M$  is  $\sigma_R$ -twisted, then the Ore module extension  $M[x; \sigma_M, \delta_M]$  is left distributive and associative as a left  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$ -module.*

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 27 and Remark 39(ii). □

**Proposition 43.** *Let  $M$  be a modified near module over  $R$ . If  $\sigma_R$  is a ring endomorphism of  $R$ ,  $\delta_R$  is a  $\sigma_R$ -derivation on  $R$ ,  $\delta_M$  is a  $\sigma_R$ -derivation on  $M$  and  $\sigma_M$  is  $\sigma_R$ -twisted, then  $M[x; \sigma_M, \delta_M]$  is a modified near left module over  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 27 and Remark 39(iii), the ring  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$  is associative. The claim now follows from Remark 39(vi)(c) and Proposition 42. □

**Corollary 44.** *Let  $R$  be a left distributive ring, and  $M$  a left distributive  $R$ -module. Suppose that  $\text{Ann}_M(R) = \{0\}$ . The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) the left  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$ -module  $M[x; \sigma_M, \delta_M]$  is associative;
- (ii)  $M$  is associative,  $\delta_M$  is a  $\sigma_R$ -derivation, and  $\sigma_M$  is  $\sigma_R$ -twisted.

*Proof.* This follows from Corollary 28 and Remark 39(ii). □

**Theorem 45.** *Suppose that  $R$  is a left distributive ring, and that  $M$  is a left distributive,  $s$ -unital, and Noetherian  $R$ -module. Let  $\sigma_M$  be a  $\sigma_R$ -twisted surjection. Then  $M[x; \sigma_M, \delta_M]$  is Noetherian as a left  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$ -module.*

*Proof.* This follows from Proposition 13 and Theorem 33. □

**Corollary 46.** *Let the left  $R$ -module  $M$  be  $s$ -unital, left distributive and Noetherian. Suppose that  $\sigma_R$  is a ring automorphism of  $R$  and  $\alpha$  is an  $R$ -module automorphism of  $M$  with  $\sigma_M = \sigma_R \circ \alpha$ . Then  $M[x; \sigma_M, \delta_M]$  is Noetherian as a left  $R[x; \sigma_R, \delta_R]$ -module.*

*Proof.* Since, clearly,  $\sigma_M$  is  $\sigma_R$ -twisted, the claim follows from Theorem 45. □

**Example 47.** Suppose that  $D$  is a Dedekind domain. Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $D$  and let  $\sigma_D$  be a ring automorphism of  $D$ . If we put  $\sigma_I := \sigma_D|_I$ , then  $\sigma_I$  is  $\sigma_D$ -twisted. Let  $\delta_I : I \rightarrow I$  be any additive map. Since  $D$  is, in particular, Noetherian, it follows that  $I$  is Noetherian as a left  $D$ -module. By Corollary 46 it follows that  $I[x; \sigma_I, \delta_I]$  is Noetherian as a left  $D[x; \sigma_D, \delta_D]$ -module.

**Example 48.** Let  $F, V, \sigma_F, \alpha, \sigma_V, \delta_F$ , and  $\delta_V$  be defined as in Example 29. Suppose that  $V$  is finite-dimensional and that  $\sigma_F$  and  $\alpha$  are surjective (and hence also injective). By Corollary 46,  $V[x; \sigma_V, \delta_V]$  is Noetherian as a left  $F[x; \sigma_F, \delta_F]$ -module.

**Theorem 49.** *Suppose that the left  $R$ -module  $M$  is left distributive. Then the left  $R[x]$ -module  $M[x]$  is Noetherian if and only if  $M$  is Noetherian and weakly  $s$ -unital.*

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 35 and Theorem 45. □

**Corollary 50.** *Suppose that  $R$  is a left distributive ring. Then  $R[x]$  is left Noetherian if and only if  $R$  is left Noetherian and weakly left  $s$ -unital. In particular, if  $R$  is unital, then  $R[x]$  is left Noetherian if and only if  $R$  is left Noetherian.*

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 49. □

**Example 51.** There are many examples of classes of left distributive rings upon which we can apply our results above, for instance Corollary 50.

- (i) All unital and Noetherian rings which are alternative or Jordan.
- (ii) Dickson's *left near-fields* (see [26, p. 254]) are *finite* rings, hence Noetherian. Note that left near-fields are not always right distributive.
- (iii) Algebras generated by the so-called *Cayley–Dickson doubling procedure*. These algebras are finite-dimensional vector spaces, hence Noetherian. Note that these algebras are both left and right distributive for all dimensions.
- (iv) Algebras generated by the so-called *Conway–Smith doubling procedure* (see [18]). These algebras are finite-dimensional vector spaces, hence Noetherian. Note that these algebras are left distributive, but not right distributive from dimension 16 and onwards.

**Example 52.** Suppose that  $\mathbb{F}_2$  denotes the field with two elements 0 and 1. Let  $G = \{R, P, S\}$  denote the commutative non-associative *rock, paper, scissors* magma defined by the relations  $R^2 = R, P^2 = P, S^2 = S, RP = P, RS = R, PS = S$ . It is easily checked

that the magma algebra  $\mathbb{F}_2[G]$  is a Boolean ring. In particular,  $\mathbb{F}_2[G]$  is weakly left  $s$ -unital. Since  $\mathbb{F}_2[G]$  is finite, it is Noetherian. Therefore, by Corollary 50, the ring  $\mathbb{F}_2[G][x]$  is left Noetherian. However, note that  $\mathbb{F}_2[G]$  is not left unital. Indeed, seeking a contradiction. Let  $x := aR + bP + cS$  denote a left identity for some  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{F}_2$ . In particular,  $xR = R$  which implies that  $aR + bP + cR = R$  so that  $b = 0$  and  $a + c = 1$ . Thus,  $x = R$  or  $x = S$ . Case 1:  $x = R$ . From the equality  $xS = S$  we get  $RS = S$  which is a contradiction. Case 2:  $x = S$ . From the equality  $xP = P$  we get  $SP = P$  which is a contradiction.

**Example 53.** Sometimes Ore ring extensions produce rings which are left Noetherian but not right Noetherian. Indeed, suppose that  $R$  is a finite unital associative ring. Consider  $R \times R$  with its usual addition but with a new product defined by  $(r, s)(t, u) := (rt, ru)$ . It is easy to check that  $R \times R$  is an associative ring. Furthermore,  $R \times R$  is left unital having all elements of the form  $(1, s)$  as left units. However, since  $(0, 1)(t, u) = (0, 0)$ , the ring  $R \times R$  is not right unital. There are many derivations on  $R \times R$ . Indeed, fix  $(v, w) \in R \times R$ . The induced adjoint derivation  $\delta_{(v,w)}: R \times R \rightarrow R \times R$  is defined by

$$\delta_{(v,w)}(r, s) = (v, w)(r, s) - (r, s)(v, w) = (vr - rv, vs - rw) = \left( [v, r], \begin{vmatrix} v & w \\ r & s \end{vmatrix} \right)$$

for all  $(r, s) \in R \times R$ . Since  $R \times R$  is finite it follows that  $R \times R$  is both left and right Noetherian. From Theorem 45 it thus follows that the ring  $(R \times R)[x; \text{id}_{R \times R}, \delta_{(v,w)}]$  is left Noetherian. For every  $n \geq 0$  put  $I_n := \sum_{i=0}^n (\{0\} \times A)x^i$ . Then each  $I_n$  is a right ideal in the ring  $(R \times R)[x; \text{id}_{R \times R}, \delta_{(v,w)}]$ . But  $I_0 \subsetneq I_1 \subsetneq \dots$  showing that the ring  $(R \times R)[x; \text{id}_{R \times R}, \delta_{(v,w)}]$  is not right Noetherian.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aryapoor and P. Bäck, Flipped non-associative polynomial rings and the Cayley–Dickson construction, *J. Algebra* **662** (2025), 482–501.
- [2] P. Bäck, J. Richter, and S. Silvestrov, Hom-associative Ore extensions and weak unitalizations, *Int. Electron. J. Algebra* **24** (2018), 174–194.
- [3] G. M. Bergman, A ring primitive on the right but not on the left, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **15** (1964), 473–475.
- [4] N. Bourbaki, *Algebra I: chapters 1–3*, Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- [5] P. M. Cohn, Quadratic extensions of skew fields, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **11**(3) (1961), 531–556.
- [6] P. M. Cohn, *Skew field constructions*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, No. 27, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne, 1977.
- [7] E. P. Cojuhari, Monoid algebras over non-commutative rings, *Int. Electron. J. Algebra* **2**, (2007), 28–53.
- [8] E. P. Cojuhari and B. J. Gardner, Generalized higher derivations, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* **86**(2), (2012), 266–281.
- [9] E. P. Cojuhari and B. J. Gardner, Skew ring extensions and generalized monoid rings, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **154**(2) (2018), 343–361.
- [10] J. Cozzens and C. Faith, *Simple Noetherian rings*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, No. 69, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne, 1975.
- [11] K. R. Goodearl, Centralizers in differential, pseudodifferential, and fractional differential operator rings, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **13**(4) (1983), 573–618.
- [12] K. R. Goodearl and R. B. Warfield, *An introduction to noncommutative Noetherian rings*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge U.K., 2004.
- [13] L. Hellström and S. D. Silvestrov, *Commuting elements in  $q$ -deformed Heisenberg algebras*, World Scientific Publishing Co., River Edge, NJ, 2000.
- [14] I. M. Isaacs, *Algebra: a graduate course*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 2009.
- [15] N. Jacobson, *Finite-dimensional division algebras over fields*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [16] N. Jacobson, *Lectures in abstract algebra Vol. 1 Basic concepts*, Van Nostrand, New York, 1951.

- [17] W. Krull, Über verallgemeinerte endliche Abelsche Gruppen, *Math. Z.* **23** (1925), 161–196.
- [18] P. Lundström, Hilbert 90 for algebras with conjugation, *Algebr. Represent. Theor.* **15** (2012), 119–135.
- [19] P. Lundström, J. Öinert, and J. Richter, Non-unital Ore extensions, *Colloq. Math.*, **172**(2) (2023), 217–229.
- [20] D. R. Malm, Simplicity of partial and Schmidt differential operator rings, *Pacific J. Math.* **132**(1) (1988), 85–112.
- [21] J. C. McConnell and J. C. Robson, *Noncommutative Noetherian rings*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 30, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 2001.
- [22] E. Noether, Hyperkomplexe Größen und Darstellungstheorie, *Math. Z.* **30** (1929), 641–692.
- [23] P. Nystedt, J. Öinert, and J. Richter, Non-associative Ore extensions, *Isr. J. Math.* **224**(1) (2018), 263–292.
- [24] P. Nystedt, J. Öinert, and J. Richter, Simplicity of Ore monoid rings, *J. Algebra* **530** (2019), 69–85.
- [25] O. Ore, Theory of non-commutative polynomials, *Ann. of Math.* **34**(3) (1933), 480–508.
- [26] G. Pilz, *Near-rings: the theory and its applications*, (Rev. ed). North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.
- [27] A. V. Ramakrishna, T. V. N. Prasanna, and D. V. Lakshmi, Near ring multiplications on a modified near module over a near ring, *Eur. J. Pure Appl. Math.* **14**(1) (2021), 126–134.
- [28] L. H. Rowen, *Ring theory. Vol. I*, Academic, Boston, 1988.
- [29] T. H. M. Smits, Skew polynomial rings, *Indag. Math.* **30** (1968), 209–224.
- [30] K. Varadarajan, A generalization of Hilbert’s basis theorem, *Commun. Algebra* **10**(20) (1982), 2191–2204.

(Per Bäck) DIVISION OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, MÄLARDALEN UNIVERSITY, SE-721 23 VÄSTERÅS, SWEDEN

*Email address:* `per.back@mdu.se`

(Patrik Lundström) DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY WEST, SE-461 86 TROLLHÄTTAN, SWEDEN

*Email address, corresponding author:* `patrik.lundstrom@hv.se`

(Johan Öinert) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES, BLEKINGE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, SE-371 79 KARLSKRONA, SWEDEN

*Email address:* `johan.oinert@bth.se`

(Johan Richter) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES, BLEKINGE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, SE-371 79 KARLSKRONA, SWEDEN

*Email address:* `johan.richter@bth.se`