

# A NOTE ON LIE AND JORDAN STRUCTURES OF LEAVITT PATH ALGEBRAS

HUYNH VIET KHANH<sup>†</sup> AND LE QUI DANH

ABSTRACT. Let  $L_K(E)$  be the Leavitt path algebra of a directed graph  $E$  over a field  $K$ . In this paper, we determine  $E$  and  $K$  for the Lie algebra  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  and the Jordan algebra  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  arising from  $L_K(E)$  with respect to the standard involution to be solvable.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Every associative algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  over a field  $K$  can give rise to two new structures: the *Lie algebra*, denoted by  $\mathcal{A}^-$ , and the *Jordan algebra*, denoted by  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$  over  $K$ . These structures can be obtained by defining new products within  $\mathcal{A}$ , namely the Lie bracket  $[x, y] = xy - yx$  for Lie algebras and the Jordan product  $x \circ y = xy + yx$  for Jordan algebras respectively, for every  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$ . A reasonable question arises: Are the properties of  $\mathcal{A}$  as a ring mirrored in its Lie or Jordan algebra counterparts? Specifically, does the simplicity of  $\mathcal{A}$  as a ring guarantee its simplicity as a Lie or Jordan algebra? In a seminal paper [9] by Herstein, this question was answered affirmatively. Assume further that  $\mathcal{A}$  is equipped with an involution  $\star$ ; that is, a map  $\star : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  satisfying all below conditions:

- (1)  $(a + b)^\star = a^\star + b^\star$ ,
- (2)  $(ab)^\star = b^\star a^\star$ ,
- (3)  $(a^\star)^\star = a$ ,

for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ . Let

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{x \in \mathcal{A} : x^\star = x\} \text{ and } \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{x \in \mathcal{A} : x^\star = -x\}$$

be the sets of *symmetric elements* and *skew-symmetric elements* of  $\mathcal{A}$  with respect to  $\star$ , respectively. It is obvious that  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{A}}$  are Lie subalgebra and Jordan subalgebra of  $\mathcal{A}^-$  and  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$  respectively. These are the most important structures of Lie or Jordan algebras arising from an associative algebra. In particular, when  $\mathcal{A}$  is the full matrix ring  $\mathbb{M}_n(K)$  and  $\star$  is the transpose operation, then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}$  is identified with the Lie algebra of *skew-symmetric matrices* which corresponds to the *Lie group of orthogonal matrices*. Under some certain assumptions on  $\mathcal{A}$ , Lie and Jordan structures of  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{A}}$  respectively were intensively investigated by Herstein in a series of papers ([5]-[9]) and by other authors in the references therein.

In this paper, we consider the case when  $\mathcal{A}$  is the Leavitt path algebra  $L_K(E)$  of a directed graph  $E$  over a field  $K$ . Within the past few years, the Lie subalgebras of

---

*Key words and phrases.* leavitt path algebra; cohn path algebra; Lie algebra; Jordan algebra  
2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16S88; 16W10.

<sup>†</sup> Corresponding author.

$L_K(E)^-$  arising from  $L_K(E)$  have been investigated by many authors. Motivated by the groundbreaking work of Herstein [9], necessary and sufficient conditions for the Lie algebra  $[L_K(E), L_K(E)]$  of  $L_K(E)^-$  to be simple were given in [2] and [3], under the assumption that  $E$  is row-finite. In another direction, the paper [12] completely identified the graph  $E$  and the field  $K$  for the Lie algebra  $L_K(E)^-$  to be solvable.

Let  $E$  be a graph and  $K$  a field. Then, the mapping  $*$  :  $L_K(E) \rightarrow L_K(E)$  which sends  $v$  to  $v$ ,  $e$  to  $e^*$  and  $e^*$  to  $e$  for all  $v \in E^0$  and  $e \in E^1$ , and leaves all elements in  $K$  fixed, extends to an involution of  $L_K(E)$ . We call this the *standard involution* on  $L_K(E)$  (see also [1, page 36]). Let  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  be the Lie subalgebra of  $L_K(E)^-$  and the Jordan subalgebra of  $L_K(E)^\circ$  with respect to this involution, respectively. In [4] the simplicity of the Lie algebra  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  was also studied. The current paper is devoted to a study of the Lie algebra  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  and the Jordan algebra  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$ . To be more specific, we identify the graph  $E$  and the field  $K$  for the Lie algebra  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  and the Jordan algebra  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  to be solvable.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Directed graphs and Leavitt path algebras.** Throughout this paper, the basic notations and conventions are taken from [1]. In particular, a (directed) graph  $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$  consists of two sets  $E^0$  and  $E^1$  together with maps  $r, s : E^1 \rightarrow E^0$ . The elements of  $E^0$  are called *vertices* and the elements of  $E^1$  *edges*. For the convenience of readers, in the following, we outline some concepts and notations that we use substantially in this paper.

Let  $E$  be a graph. A vertex  $v$  in  $E$  is a *sink* if it emits no edges, while it is an *infinite emitter* if it emits infinitely many edges. A graph  $E$  is said to be *row-finite* if  $E$  contains no infinite emitter. A vertex  $v$  is said to be *regular* if it is neither a sink nor an infinite emitter. A *path*  $\mu$  in a graph  $E$  is a finite sequence of edges  $\mu = e_1 e_2 \dots e_n$  with  $r(e_i) = s(e_{i+1})$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . We set  $s(\mu) := s(e_1)$  and  $r(\mu) := r(e_n)$ . The set of all finite paths in  $E$  is denoted by  $\text{Path}(E)$ . An *exit* for a path  $\mu = e_1 \dots e_n$  is an edge  $e$  such that  $s(e) = s(e_i)$  for some  $i$  and  $e \neq e_i$ .

**Definition 2.1** (Leavitt path algebra). Let  $E$  be a graph and  $K$  a field. We define a set  $(E^1)^*$  consisting of symbols of the form  $\{e^* | e \in E^1\}$ . The *Leavitt path algebra of  $E$  with coefficients in  $K$* , denoted by  $L_K(E)$ , is the free associative  $K$ -algebra generated by  $E^0 \cup E^1 \cup (E^1)^*$ , subject to the following relations:

- (V)  $vv' = \delta_{v,v'}v$  for all  $v, v' \in E^0$ ,
- (E1)  $s(e)e = er(e) = e$  for all  $e \in E^1$ ,
- (E2)  $r(e)e^* = e^*s(e) = e^*$  for all  $e \in E^1$ ,
- (CK1)  $e^*f = \delta_{e,f}r(e)$  for all  $e, f \in E^1$ , and
- (CK2)  $v = \sum_{\{e \in E^1 | s(e)=v\}} ee^*$  for every  $v \in \text{Reg}(E)$ .

Let  $E$  be a graph. For each  $e \in E^1$ , we call  $e^*$  the *ghost edge*. Also, the notation  $\mu^* = e_n^* \dots e_2^* e_1^*$  stands for the corresponding ghost path of the path  $\mu = e_1 \dots e_n$ .

**2.2. Lie and Jordan structures of associative algebras.** Every associative algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  over a field  $K$  is endowed with a Lie algebra structure for the *Lie bracket*  $[a, b] = ab - ba$  for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ . We denote this Lie algebra by  $\mathcal{A}^-$ . For  $K$ -subspaces  $S$  and  $T$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , we defined  $[S, T] = \text{span}_K\{ab - ba : a \in S, b \in T\}$ . A  $K$ -subspace  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is called a *Lie subalgebra* of  $\mathcal{A}^-$  if  $[a, b] \in \mathcal{L}$  for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$ . For the Lie

subalgebra  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\mathcal{A}^-$ , we define inductively the two series

$$\mathcal{L}^{(0)} = \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}^{(1)} = [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}], \dots, \mathcal{L}^{(n)} = [\mathcal{L}^{(n-1)}, \mathcal{L}^{(n-1)}], \dots$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}^0 = \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}^1 = [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}], \dots, \mathcal{L}^n = [\mathcal{L}^{n-1}, L], \dots$$

The Lie subalgebra  $\mathcal{L}$  is called *Lie solvable* (resp., *Lie nilpotent*) if there exists  $n \geq 0$  (resp.,  $m \geq 0$ ) such that  $\mathcal{L}^{(n)} = 0$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{L}^m = 0$ ). If such the smallest  $n$  (resp.,  $m$ ) exists, we will say that  $\mathcal{L}$  is *Lie solvable of index  $n$*  (resp., *Lie nilpotent of index  $m$* ).

Similarly, a *Jordan product* can be defined on  $\mathcal{A}$  by  $a \circ b = ab + ba$ , for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  is viewed as a Jordan algebra for the product  $\circ$ , we denote it by  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$ . Note that in the case  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , the two structures  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$  and  $\mathcal{A}^-$  coincides. A  $K$ -subspace  $\mathcal{J}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is called a *Jordan subalgebra* of  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$  if  $a \circ b \in \mathcal{J}$  for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{J}$ . For two  $K$ -subspaces  $S$  and  $T$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ , we defined

$$S \circ T = \text{span}_K \{ab + ba : a \in S, b \in T\}.$$

For the Jordan subalgebra  $\mathcal{J}$  of  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$ , we define the analogous series for  $\mathcal{J}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{J}_{(0)} = \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}_{(1)} = \mathcal{J} \circ \mathcal{J}, \dots, \mathcal{J}_{(n)} = \mathcal{J}_{(n-1)} \circ \mathcal{J}_{(n-1)}, \dots$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_0 = \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}_1 = \mathcal{J} \circ \mathcal{J}, \dots, \mathcal{J}_n = \mathcal{J}_{n-1} \circ \mathcal{J}, \dots$$

The Jordan subalgebra  $\mathcal{J}$  is called *Jordan solvable* (resp., *Jordan nilpotent*) if there exists  $n \geq 0$  (resp.,  $m \geq 0$ ) such that  $\mathcal{J}_{(n)} = 0$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{J}_m = 0$ ). The *index of a solvable Jordan algebra* is defined similarly.

In this paper, we particularly consider the special case where  $\mathcal{A} = L_K(E)$ ,  $\mathcal{L} = \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  and  $\mathcal{J} = \mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  with respect to the standard involution on  $L_K(E)$ .

**2.3. Homomorphisms of algebras with involutions.** Let  $K$  be a field, and  $(\mathcal{A}, \star)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}, \natural)$  be  $K$ -algebras with involutions. A *homomorphism of  $K$ -algebras with involution*  $\varphi : (\mathcal{A}, \star) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}, \natural)$  is a  $K$ -algebra homomorphism  $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  such that  $(\varphi(ab))^\natural = \varphi(b^\star)\varphi(a^\star)$ .

It is obvious that if  $(\mathcal{A}, \star)$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathcal{B}, \natural)$  as  $K$ -algebras with involution, then the Lie subalgebras  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$ , with the respect involutions  $\star$  and  $\natural$  respectively, are also isomorphic as Lie algebras over  $K$ . Similarly, the Jordan subalgebras  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{B}}$  of  $\mathcal{A}^\circ$  and  $\mathcal{B}^\circ$ , with the respect involutions  $\star$  and  $\natural$  respectively, are also isomorphic as Jordan algebras over  $K$ .

### 3. LIE SOLVABILITY AND JORDAN SOLVABILITY OF $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$

Let  $K$  be a field, and  $\mathcal{A}$  a unital  $K$ -algebra with involution  $\natural$ . Let  $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$  be the matrix ring of degree  $n \geq 1$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then, it is easy to check that  $\natural$  is extended to an involution, which is again denoted by  $\natural$ , on  $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$  by letting

$$(3.1) \quad (a_{ij})_{n \times n}^\natural = (a_{ji}^\natural)_{n \times n}$$

for every matrix  $(a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$ . Let  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}$  be the Lie subalgebra of  $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})^-$  with respect to the involution  $\natural$  on  $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$  as defined in (3.1). In this section, we gives conditions on  $n$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  for  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}$  to be Lie solvable. First, we fix the following notation: In  $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$ , we denote by  $E_{ij}$  the matrix whose  $(i, j)$ -entry is 1 and the other entries are 0. The following proposition is the main result of this section:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $K$  be a field, and  $\mathcal{A}$  be a unital  $K$ -algebra with an involution  $\natural$ . Assume further that  $\mathcal{A}$  is an integral domain. Let  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}$  be as defined above. Then, the following assertions holds:*

- (a)  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}$  is not Lie solvable when  $n \geq 3$ .
- (b) If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  is not Lie nilpotent.
- (c) If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  is Lie solvable, with index at most 3. If moreover, the involution on  $\mathcal{A}$  is trivial, then the index is 2.
- (d) Assume that  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ . If the involution on  $\mathcal{A}$  is trivial, then  $[\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}] = 0$ ; while if the involution on  $\mathcal{A}$  is non-trivial, then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  is not Lie solvable.

*Proof.* (a): Assume first that  $n \geq 3$ . Let  $a, b, c \in K$  be such that  $c \neq 0$  and  $a^2 + b^2 \neq 0$ . We construct inductively a family of matrices  $\{A_m, B_m, X_m \mid m = 1, 2, \dots\}$  in  $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})$  as follows: Put

$$A_1 = a(E_{12} - E_{21}) + b(E_{13} - E_{31}), \quad B_1 = c(E_{23} - E_{32}), \quad X_1 = [A_1, B_1];$$

and for each  $m \geq 2$ , we put

$$A_m = [X_{m-1}, B_{m-1}], \quad B_m = [X_{m-1}, A_{m-1}], \quad \text{and } X_m = [A_m, B_m].$$

Since  $A_1, B_1 \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}$ , we get that  $X_1 \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}^{(1)}$ . Inductively, it can be checked that  $A_m, B_m \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}^{(m-1)}$ , from which it follows that  $X_m \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}^{(m)}$ . For each  $m \geq 1$ , we claim that there exist  $a_m, b_m, c_m \in K$  such that  $c_m \neq 0$ ,  $a_m^2 + b_m^2 \neq 0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} A_m &= a_m(E_{12} - E_{21}) + b_m(E_{13} - E_{31}), \\ B_m &= c_m(E_{23} - E_{32}), \\ X_m &\neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The argument proceeds by induction on  $m$ . For  $m = 1$ , then we set  $a_1 = a$ ,  $b_1 = b$  and  $c_1 = c$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= a_1(E_{12} - E_{21}) + b_1(E_{13} - E_{31}), \\ B_1 &= c_1(E_{23} - E_{32}), \\ X_1 &= -b_1c_1(E_{12} - E_{21}) + a_1c_1(E_{13} - E_{31}) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the claim is true for  $m = 1$ . Now, assume that the claim is true for all  $m \geq i$  for some  $i \geq 2$ . We will prove the claim is also true for  $m = i+1$ . Now, the inductive assumption shows that there exist  $a_i, b_i, c_i \in K$  such that  $c_i \neq 0$ ,  $a_i^2 + b_i^2 \neq 0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= a_i(E_{12} - E_{21}) + b_i(E_{13} - E_{31}), \\ B_i &= c_i(E_{23} - E_{32}), \\ X_i &= [A_i, B_i] = -b_i c_i (E_{12} - E_{21}) + a_i c_i (E_{13} - E_{31}) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

From this, a direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{i+1} &= [X_i, B_i] = -a_i c_i^2 (E_{12} - E_{21}) - b_i c_i^2 (E_{13} - E_{31}), \\ B_{i+1} &= [X_i, A_i] = (a_i^2 + b_i^2) c_i (E_{23} - E_{32}), \\ X_{i+1} &= [A_{i+1}, B_{i+1}] = b_i (a_i^2 + b_i^2) c_i^3 (E_{12} - E_{21}) - a_i (a_i^2 + b_i^2) c_i^3 (E_{13} - E_{31}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $a_i^2 + b_i^2 \neq 0$ , we have  $X_{i+1} \neq 0$ . The claim is proved. It follows that  $X_m \neq 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$ , and so  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(\mathcal{A})}^{(m)} \neq 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)}$  is not Lie solvable, proving (a).

To prove the remaining assertions, we assume from now on that  $n = 2$ . Let us calculate  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  more explicitly. It is obvious that

$$\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b^{\natural} & c \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } a = -a^{\natural}, c = -c^{\natural} \right\}.$$

Let  $A_i, B_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq 4$ ) be arbitrary matrices in  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$ . Then, these matrices can be written as

$$A_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ -b_i^{\natural} & c_i \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } B_i = \begin{pmatrix} u_i & v_i \\ -v_i^{\natural} & w_i \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $a_i, b_i, c_i, u_i, v_i, w_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $a_i = -a_i^{\natural}, c_i = -c_i^{\natural}, u_i = -u_i^{\natural}, w_i = -w_i^{\natural}$ .

For each  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , put  $X_i = [A_i, B_i]$ . Because  $a_i = -a_i^{\natural}, c_i = -c_i^{\natural}, u_i = -u_i^{\natural}$ , and  $w_i = -w_i^{\natural}$ , we get

$$(3.2) \quad X_i = \begin{pmatrix} r_i & s_i \\ -s_i^{\natural} & -r_i \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where}$$

$$(3.3) \quad r_i = b_i^{\natural}v_i - b_iv_i^{\natural} \text{ and } s_i = v_i(a_i - c_i) + b_i(w_i - u_i).$$

It follows that

$$(3.4) \quad [X_1, X_2] = \begin{pmatrix} s_2s_1^{\natural} - s_1s_2^{\natural} & 0 \\ 2(r_1s_2^{\natural} - s_1^{\natural}r) & s_2^{\natural}s_1 - s_1^{\natural}s_2 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where}$$

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} s_2s_1^{\natural} - s_1s_2^{\natural} &= (v_2v_1^{\natural} - v_1v_2^{\natural})(a_1 - c_1)(c_2 - a_2) \\ &\quad + (v_2b_1^{\natural} - b_1v_2^{\natural})(a_2 - c_2)(u_1 - w_1) \\ &\quad + (v_1b_2^{\natural} - b_2v_1^{\natural})(w_2 - u_2)(a_1 - c_1) \\ &\quad + (b_1b_2^{\natural} - b_2b_1^{\natural})(u_1 - w_1)(u_2 - w_2). \end{aligned}$$

(b) and (c): Assume that  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . As  $2(r_1s_2^{\natural} - s_1^{\natural}r) = 0$ , it follows from (3.4) that  $[X_1, X_2]$  is a diagonal matrix. Similarly, we also obtain that  $[X_3, X_4]$  is also a diagonal matrix. Thus  $[[X_1, X_2], [X_3, X_4]] = 0$ , which means that  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^{(3)} = 0$ . We divide our situation into two possible cases:

**Case 1.**  $\text{char}(K) = 2$  and the involution  $^{\natural}$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  is trivial. As  $b_i^{\natural} = b_i$  and  $v_i^{\natural} = v_i$ , we get from (3.3) that  $r_i = 0$ . It follows from (3.2) that  $X_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & s_i \\ -s_i^{\natural} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , and so  $[X_1, X_2] = 0$ ; or equivalently, we have  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^{(2)} = 0$ . In other words,  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  is Lie solvable of index 2. This completes the proof of the second assertion of (c).

**Case 2.**  $\text{char}(K) = 2$  and the involution  $^{\natural}$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  is non-trivial. In this case, suitable choices of the matrices  $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2$  yield that  $[X_1, X_2] \neq 0$ . For example, if we choose  $a_1 = c_1, a_2 = c_2, b_1 = 1, u_1 \neq w_1, w_1 = w_2 = 0, 0 \neq u_1 = u_2 \in K, b_2 \neq b_2^{\natural}$ , then it follows from (3.5) that  $s_2s_1^{\natural} - s_1s_2^{\natural} = (b_2^{\natural} - b_2)u_1^2 \neq 0$ . Therefore, we get from (3.4) that  $[X_1, X_2] \neq 0$ . It follows that  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  is Lie solvable of index 3. This completes the proof of (c).

Now, we give the proof of (b). Let  $A = E_{12} + E_{21}$  and  $B = E_{11}$ , which belong to  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$ . Define

$$[A, {}_m B] = [\dots[A, B], \underbrace{\dots, B}_{m \text{ times}}],$$

for some  $m \geq 1$ . Then, it is clear that  $[A, {}_m B] \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^m$  for all  $m \geq 1$ . Moreover, it is straightforward to show that  $[A, {}_m B] = E_{12} + E_{21} \neq 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$ . This implies that  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^m \neq 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$ , yielding that  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  is not Lie nilpotent. The proof of (b) is complete.

(d): Recall that

$$\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ -b^\natural & c \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } a = -a^\natural, c = -c^\natural \right\}.$$

We consider the following two possible cases:

**Case 3.**  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$  and the involution  $^\natural$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  is trivial. Because  $a^\natural = a$ , the equation  $a = -a^\natural$  is equivalent to  $2a = 0$ , and hence  $a = 0$ . Similarly, we also obtain that  $c = 0$ . Moreover, as  $b^\natural = b$ , we finally get that

$$\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ -b & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid b \in \mathcal{A} \right\}.$$

It follows that  $[\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}] = 0$ .

**Case 4.**  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$  and the involution  $^\natural$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  is non-trivial. Fix  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $a \neq a^\natural$ . Put  $u = a - a^\natural$ . Then, we have  $u = -u^\natural$ . We construct inductively a family of matrices  $A_m, B_m$ , and  $X_m$  as follows. For  $m = 1$ , we put

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u \\ u & 0 \end{pmatrix}, B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & -u \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } X_1 = [A_1, B_1],$$

For  $m \geq 2$ , we put

$$A_m = [X_{m-1}, B_{m-1}], B_m = [X_{m-1}, A_{m-1}] \text{ and } X_m = [A_m, B_m].$$

Since  $A_1, B_1 \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$ , we get that  $X_1 \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^{(1)}$ . Inductively, it can be checked that  $A_m, B_m \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^{(m-1)}$ , from which it follows that  $X_m \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^{(m)}$ . We claim that for each positive integer  $m$ , there exists  $v_m \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $0 \neq v_m = -v_m^\natural$  and

$$\begin{aligned} A_m &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_m \\ v_m & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_m &= \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^{m+1}v_m & 0 \\ 0 & (-1)^m v_m \end{pmatrix}, \\ X_m &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (-1)^m 2v_m^2 \\ (-1)^{m+1} 2v_m^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by induction on  $m$ . For  $m = 1$ , we set  $v_1 = u$ . Then, we have  $0 \neq v_1 = v_1^\natural$  and  $X_1 = [A_1, B_1] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2u^2 \\ 2u^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0$ . Thus, the claim is true for the case  $m = 1$ . Now, assume that the claim is true for  $m = i \geq 2$ . That means

there exist  $v_i \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $0 \neq v_i = -v_i^{\natural}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_i \\ v_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_i &= \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^{i+1}v_i & 0 \\ 0 & (-1)^i v_i \end{pmatrix}, \\ X_i &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (-1)^i 2v_i^2 \\ (-1)^{i+1} 2v_i^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we prove the claim for the case  $m = i + 1$ . A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{i+1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4v_i^3 \\ 4v_i^3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_{i+1} &= \begin{pmatrix} (-1)^i 4v_i^3 & 0 \\ 0 & (-1)^{i+1} 4v_i^3 \end{pmatrix}, \\ X_{i+1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (-1)^{i+1} 32v_i^6 \\ (-1)^{i+2} 32v_i^6 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now, put  $v_{i+1} = 4v_i^3$ . Then, we have

$$v_{i+1}^{\natural} = (4v_i^3)^{\natural} = 4(v_i^{\natural})^3 = -4v_i^3 = -v_{i+1} \neq 0.$$

Therefore, the claim is true for  $m = i + 1$ . The claim is proved. It follows that  $X_m \neq 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$ . In other words, we have  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}^{(m)}$  for all  $m \geq 1$ , which means that  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{A})}$  is not Lie solvable.  $\square$

In the remainder of this section, we record two corollaries of Proposition 3.1 for further use. In the proposition, let  $A = K$  and  $\natural$  be the trivial involution on  $K$ . Then, the extended involution  $\natural$  on  $\mathbb{M}_n(K)$  given by (3.1) is just the transpose operation on  $\mathbb{M}_n(K)$ ; that is, for every matrix  $(a_{ij})_{n \times n} \in \mathbb{M}_n(K)$ , we have

$$(3.6) \quad ((a_{ij})_{n \times n})^{\natural} = (a_{ji})_{n \times n}.$$

With respect to this involution, the Lie algebra  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)}$  consists precisely of skew-symmetric matrices in  $\mathbb{M}_n(K)$ :

$$\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)} = \{(a_{ij}) : a_{ji} = -a_{ij} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}.$$

As a consequence of Proposition 3.1, we easily obtain the following:

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $K$  be a field, and  $n \geq 2$  an integer. Let  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)}$  be the Lie subalgebra of skew-symmetric matrices of  $\mathbb{M}_n(K)^-$ . The following assertions hold:*

- (1) *Suppose that  $n = 2$ . If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $[\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)}] = 0$ ; and, if  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)}$  is Lie solvable of index 2 but not Lie nilpotent.*
- (2) *If  $n \geq 3$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K)}$  is not Lie solvable.*

For any field  $K$ , let  $K[x, x^{-1}]$  be the Laurent polynomial  $K$ -algebra in  $x$ ; that is,

$$K[x, x^{-1}] = \left\{ \sum_{i=k}^n a_i x^i \mid a_i \in K \text{ and } k \geq n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Then, the map  $\natural : K[x, x^{-1}] \rightarrow K[x, x^{-1}]$  defined by  $(\sum_i a_i x^i)^\natural = \sum_i a_i x^{-i}$  is a non-trivial involution on  $K[x, x^{-1}]$ . Now, in Proposition 3.1, we consider the case where  $\mathcal{A} = K[x, x^{-1}]$  and extend the involution  $\natural$  on  $K[x, x^{-1}]$  to the matrix ring  $\mathbb{M}_n(K[x, x^{-1}])$  as defined in (3.1). This extended involution  $\natural : \mathbb{M}_n(K[x, x^{-1}]) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_n(K[x, x^{-1}])$  is precisely given by the following rule:

$$(3.7) \quad ((f_{ij}(x))_{n \times n})^\natural = (f_{ji}(x^{-1}))_{n \times n}$$

for each matrix  $(f_{ij}(x)) \in \mathbb{M}_n(K[x, x^{-1}])$ . With respect to this involution, we easily get the following corollary to Proposition 3.1:

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $K[x, x^{-1}]$  be the Laurent polynomial  $K$ -algebra. Let  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_n(K[x, x^{-1}])}$  be the Lie subalgebra of skew-symmetric elements of  $\mathbb{M}_n(K[x, x^{-1}])^-$  with respect to the involution defined by (3.7). Then, the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}])}$  is Lie solvable of index 3 but not Lie nilpotent.*
- (2) *If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}])}$  is not Lie solvable.*

#### 4. LIE SOLVABILITY AND JORDAN SOLVABILITY OF $L_K(E)$

Throughout of this section, we will denote by  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  the Lie subalgebra of  $L_K(E)^-$  and the Jordan subalgebra of  $L_K(E)^\circ$  with respect to standard involution  $*$  on  $L_K(E)$  as defined before, respectively. The main aim of this section is to provide a necessary and sufficient condition on the graph  $E$  and the field  $K$  for  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  to be Lie and Jordan solvable, respectively. We start this section a lemma which determines a  $K$ -basis of  $L_K(E)$ :


**Lemma 4.1** ([1, Corollary 1.5.12]). *Let  $E$  be a graph and  $K$  a field. Put  $\mathcal{A} = \{\lambda\nu^* \mid \lambda, \nu \in \text{Path}(E) \text{ and } r(\lambda) = r(\nu)\}$ . For each  $v \in \text{Reg}(E)$ , let  $\{e_1^v, \dots, e_{n_v}^v\}$  be an enumeration of the elements of  $s^{-1}(v)$ . Then, a  $K$ -basis of  $L_K(E)$  is given by the family*

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\lambda e_{n_v}^v (e_{n_v}^v)^* \nu^* : r(\lambda) = r(\nu) = v \in \text{Reg}(E)\}.$$

The next lemma provides a necessary condition for  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  to be Lie solvable. The ideas used to prove of this lemma come from the proof of [12, Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.3]. It can be said that, in  $L_K(E)$ , we can easily choose a suitable subalgebra which is isomorphic to the matrix ring  $\mathbb{M}_3(K)$ . Then, Corollary 3.2 is applied to get all possible cases for  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  to be Lie solvable. For convenience of the readers, we still include the proof here.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $L_K(E)$  be the Leavitt path algebra of a graph  $E$  with coefficients in a field  $K$ . Then,  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is not Lie solvable if one of the following cases occurs:*

- (1)  *$E$  contains a cycle with an exit.*
- (2)  *$E$  contains one of following subgraphs:*





*Proof.* (1) Assume that  $E$  contains a cycle  $c$  with an exit  $f$ . Then, according to Lemma 4.1, the set  $\{c^m f f^*(c^*)^n : 1 \leq m, n \leq 3\}$  is linearly independent over  $K$  satisfying the rule

$$(c^m f f^*(c^*)^i)(c^j f f^*(c^*)^n) = \delta_{ij} c^m f f^*(c^*)^n,$$


where  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta. It follows that the  $K$ -subalgebra of  $L_K(E)$ , say  $A$ , generated by  $\{c^m f f^*(c^*)^n : 1 \leq m, n \leq 3\}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{M}_3(K)$ . The restriction of the standard involution  $*$  on  $L_K(E)$  to  $A$  is still an involution on  $A$  which satisfies  $\mathbf{K}_A \subseteq \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$ . Let  $\natural$  be the involution on  $\mathbb{M}_3(K)$  as defined in (3.6). Then, it can be checked that  $(A, *)$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{M}_3(K), \natural)$  as  $K$ -algebras with involution. Thus, we have that  $\mathbf{K}_A$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_3(K)}$  as Lie algebras over  $K$ . Because  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_3(K)}$  is not Lie solvable (see Corollary 3.2), it follows that  $\mathbf{K}_A$ , and hence  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is not Lie solvable.

(2) For the proof of this assertion, we assume first that  $E$  contains  $F_1$ . Then,  $v, f, ef$  are all paths ending at  $v$ . It is straightforward to check the subalgebra  $B$  of  $L_K(E)$  generated by  $v, f, ef, f^*, f^*e^*, ff^*, eff^*, ff^*e^*, eff^*e^*$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{M}_3(K)$  via map:  $eff^*e^* \mapsto E_{11}, ff^* \mapsto E_{22}, v \mapsto E_{33}, eff^* \mapsto E_{12}, ff^*e^* \mapsto E_{21}, f \mapsto E_{23}, f^* \mapsto E_{32}, ef \mapsto E_{13}$ , and  $f^*e^* \mapsto E_{31}$  (see also a similar techniques used in the proof of [1, Lemma 2.6.4]). The restriction of the involution  $*$  to  $B$  is also an involution on  $B$  for which  $\mathbf{K}_B \subseteq \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{K}_B$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbb{M}_3(K)}$  as Lie algebras over  $K$ . Therefore, by Corollary 3.2, we conclude that  $\mathbf{K}_B$ , and so  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is not Lie solvable.

Finally, assume that  $E$  contains  $F_2$  or  $F_3$ . Then, the subalgebra  $C$  generated by  $v, e, f, e^*, f^*, ee^*, ff^*, ef^*, fe^*$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{M}_3(K)$  via map  $ee^* \mapsto E_{11}, ff^* \mapsto E_{22}, v \mapsto E_{33}, ef^* \mapsto E_{12}, fe^* \mapsto E_{21}, e \mapsto E_{13}, e^* \mapsto E_{31}, f \mapsto E_{23}, f^* \mapsto E_{32}$ . A similar argument as in previous paragraph shows that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is not Lie solvable too. The proof is now completed.  $\square$

As a consequence of Lemma 4.2, we have the following remark.

**Remark 1.** Let  $L_K(E)$  be the Leavitt path algebra of a graph  $E$  with coefficients in a field  $K$ . If  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable then  $E$  is a disjoint union of following graphs:



in which  $\{u_i | i \in I\}$  and  $\{v_j | j \in J\}$ , where  $I$  and  $J$  are indexing non-empty sets of arbitrary cardinality.

**Remark 2.** Let  $E_4, E_5, E_6$  be graphs as defined above. If  $m := |I|$  and  $n := |J|$  are finite, then by [1, Corollary 2.7.5], we get that

$$\begin{aligned} L_K(E_1) &\cong K, \quad L_K(E_2) \cong K[x, x^{-1}], \quad L_K(E_3) \cong \mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}]), \\ L_K(E_4) &\cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{M}_2(K), \quad L_K(E_5) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}]), \\ L_K(E_6) &\cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{M}_2(K) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}]). \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we give a sufficient condition for  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  to be Lie solvable. We proceed by proving several auxiliary lemmas.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $K$ -algebra with an involution  $*$ , and  $\mathbf{J}$  be an indexing set of arbitrary cardinality. Let  $I_j, j \in \mathbf{J}$ , be ideals of  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying the property that for each  $j$ , if  $a \in I_j$  then  $a^* \in I_j$ . Put  $M = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{J}} I_j$ . If  $M = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbf{J}} I_j$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_M = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbf{J}} \mathbf{K}_{I_j}$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{K}_M$  is Lie solvable (nilpotent) if and only if  $\mathbf{K}_{I_j}$  is Lie solvable (nilpotent) of a common index for all  $j \in \mathbf{J}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathbf{K}_M$ . Then, we may write  $x = a_{j_1} + a_{j_2} + \cdots + a_{j_n}$ , where  $a_{j_k} \in I_{j_k}$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . The equation  $x^* = -x$  implies that

$$a_{j_1} + a_{j_1}^* = -(a_{j_2} + a_{j_2}^* + \cdots + a_{j_n} + a_{j_n}^*).$$

Because  $a_{j_k} \in I_{j_k}$  for all  $i$ , the above equation shows that  $a_{j_1} + a_{j_1}^* \in I_{j_1} \cap (I_{j_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus I_{j_n}) = 0$ . It follows that  $a_1 + a_1^* = 0$ , and so  $a_{j_1} \in \mathbf{K}_{I_{j_1}}$ . Similarly, we also obtain that  $a_i \in \mathbf{K}_{I_{j_k}}$  for  $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ . In other words, we have  $\mathbf{K}_M \subseteq \sum_{j \in \mathbf{J}} \mathbf{K}_{I_j} = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbf{J}} \mathbf{K}_{I_j}$ . The inverse inclusion is clear. The final assertion follows from the fact that  $\mathbf{K}_M^{(n)} = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbf{J}} \mathbf{K}_{I_j}^{(n)}$  and  $\mathbf{K}_M^n = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbf{J}} \mathbf{K}_{I_j}^n$  for all integer  $n \geq 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $K$  be a field, and  $E_1, E_2, E_3$  be graphs as defined in Remark 1. Then, the following assertions hold:*

- (1)  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_1)}$  and  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_2)}$  are Lie solvable of index 1.
- (2)  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_3)}$  is Lie solvable (of index 3) if and only if  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . Additionally,  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_3)}$  is not Lie nilpotent.

*Proof.* The assertion (i) follows immediately from the fact that  $L_K(E_1)$  and  $L_K(E_2)$  are commutative. Moreover, because  $L_K(E_3) \cong \mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}])$ , we get that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_3)}$  is not Lie nilpotent.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $K$  be a field, and  $E_4, E_5, E_6$  be graphs as defined in Remark 1. Then, the following assertions hold:*

- (1) If  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  is Lie solvable, then it is Lie solvable of index  $l \leq 3$ . More precisely, if  $|I|$  is finite and  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$  (resp.,  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ ), then  $l = 1$  (resp.,  $l = 2$ ). If  $|I|$  is infinite and  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$  (resp.,  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ ), then  $l = 2$  (resp.,  $l = 3$ ). Additionally,  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  is Lie nilpotent if and only if  $|I|$  is finite and  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , if and only if  $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}] = 1$ .
- (2)  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_5)}$  is Lie solvable (of index  $l \leq 4$ ) if and only if  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . More precisely, if  $|J|$  is finite (resp., infinite), then  $l = 3$  (resp.,  $l = 4$ ). Additionally,  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_5)}$  is not Lie nilpotent.

- (3)  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)}$  is Lie solvable (of index  $l \leq 4$ ) if and only if  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . More precisely, if both  $|I|$  and  $|J|$  are finite (resp., either  $|I|$  or  $|J|$  is infinite), then  $l = 3$  (resp.,  $l = 4$ ). Additionally,  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)}$  is not Lie nilpotent.

*Proof.* (1) Consider the graph  $E_4$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $I_i$  be the ideal of  $L_K(E_4)$  generated by  $u_i$ . Then, it is clear that, for each  $i$ ,

$$I_i = \text{span}_K\{u_i, e_i, e_i^*, e_i e_i^*\}.$$

Moreover, according to Lemma 4.1, the set  $\{u_i, e_i, e_i^*, e_i e_i^*\}$  is linearly independent over  $K$ . Thus, it can be checked that  $I_i \cong \mathbb{M}_2(K)$  via the mapping  $u_i \mapsto E_{11}$ ,  $e_i e_i^* \mapsto E_{22}$ ,  $e_i \mapsto E_{12}$  and  $e_i^* \mapsto E_{21}$ . Moreover, we have  $\sum_{i=1}^n I_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n I_i$ . Put  $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n I_i$ . Then, according to Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 3.2, we conclude that  $\mathbf{K}_M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{K}_{I_i}$ , and that  $\mathbf{K}_M$  is Lie solvable. Moreover, in view of Corollary 3.2, if  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $[\mathbf{K}_M, \mathbf{K}_M] = 0$ ; and, if  $\text{char}(K) = 2$  then  $\mathbf{K}_M$  is Lie solvable of index 2 but not Lie nilpotent. Now, we consider two possible cases:

**Case 1.**  $n$  is finite. In this case, as  $u \in M$ , we get that  $L_K(E_4) = M$ , from which it follows that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)} = \mathbf{K}_M$ . Thus, all conclusions follow immediately in this case.

**Case 2.**  $n$  is infinite. In this case,  $u$  is an infinite emitter and  $u \notin M$ . This implies that  $L_K(E_4) = Ku \oplus M$  as  $K$ -vector spaces. It follows that

$$[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}] \subseteq [L_K(E_4), L_K(E_4)] = [M, M] \subseteq M.$$

As  $M$  is Lie solvable, we conclude that  $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}]$ , and hence  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$ , is Lie solvable. To determine the solvable index of  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$ , we consider the following subcases:

*Subcase 2.1.*  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ . Because  $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}] \subseteq M$ , we conclude that  $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}] \subseteq \mathbf{K}_M$  which is Lie solvable of index 1. This means that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  is Lie solvable of index at most 2. Moreover, as  $u, e_1 - e_1^* \in \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  satisfying  $u(e_1 - e_1^*) = e_1 \neq -e_1^* = (e_1 - e_1^*)u$ . That means  $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}] \neq 0$ ; and so, it is Lie solvable of index 2. On the other hand, for any  $m \geq 1$ , the element  $[e_1 - e_1^*, m v] \in \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}^m$  and  $[e_1 - e_1^*, m u] = (-1)^m e_1 - e_1^* \neq 0$ . It follows that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}^m \neq 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  is not Lie nilpotent in this case.

*Subcase 2.2.*  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . As  $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}] \subseteq \mathbf{K}_M$  which is Lie solvable of index 2, it follows that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  is Lie solvable of index at most 3. Because  $v \in \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)} \setminus \mathbf{K}_M$ , we conclude that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)} \neq [\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}]$ . It follows that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  is Lie solvable of index 3. On the other hand, as  $\mathbf{K}_{I_i}$  is not Lie nilpotent and  $\mathbf{K}_{I_i} \subseteq \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  for all  $i$ , we obtain that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_4)}$  is not Lie nilpotent. The proof of assertion (1) is complete.

(2) Consider the graph  $E_5$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , let  $J_i$  be the ideal of  $L_K(E_5)$  generated by the  $v_j$ 's. Then, we have  $J_j \cong \mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}])$  for all  $j$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^n J_j = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n J_j$ . Therefore, one can repeat the arguments of the proof of assertion(1), together with using Corollary 3.3 instead of Corollary 3.2, to get (2).

(3) Consider the graph  $E_6$ . Let  $I_i$  and  $J_j$  be respectively the ideals of  $L_K(E_6)$  generated by  $v_i$  and  $u_j$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . Then, for each  $i$  and each  $j$ , we have  $I_i \cong \mathbb{M}_2(K)$  and  $J_j \cong \mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}])$ . It can be checked that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n I_i + \sum_{j=1}^m J_j = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n I_i \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^m J_j.$$

Put  $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n I_i$  and  $N = \bigoplus_{j=1}^m J_j$ . Then, as before,  $\mathbf{K}_M$  is Lie solvable of index at most 3; and,  $\mathbf{K}_N$  is Lie solvable (of index at most 4) if and only if  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . Moreover, it is clear that  $L_K(E_6) = Kw + (M \oplus N)$ . As  $N$  is not Lie nilpotent, we get that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)}$  is not Lie nilpotent. Moreover, we have that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)}$  is Lie solvable if and only if both  $\mathbf{K}_M$  and  $\mathbf{K}_N$  are Lie solvable, if and only if  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . Now, assume that  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . To determine the Lie solvability index of  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)}$ , we consider the following cases. If both  $|I|$  and  $|J|$  are finite, then  $w \in M \oplus N$ ; and so,  $L_K(E_6) = M \oplus N$ . Again, by Lemma 4.3, we obtain that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)} = \mathbf{K}_M \oplus \mathbf{K}_N$ . According to Corollary 3.2,  $\mathbf{K}_M$  is Lie solvable of index 2, while by Corollary 3.3,  $\mathbf{K}_N$  is Lie solvable of index 3. It follows that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)}$  is Lie solvable of index 3. If either  $|I|$  or  $|J|$  is infinite, then  $w \notin M \oplus N$ . Thus, a similar argument as used in *Case 2* above shows that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E_6)}$  is Lie solvable of index 4.  $\square$

We now present the main result of this section: a sufficient and necessary condition for  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  to be Lie solvable.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $K$  be a field and  $E$  a graph. Then, the followings hold:*

- (1) *If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable (of index  $\leq 4$ ) if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union of graphs  $E_1, \dots, E_6$ . Specially, the index is 4 precisely when  $E$  contains either  $E_5$  or  $E_6$  with infinite  $|I|$  or  $|J|$ .*
- (2) *If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable (of index  $\leq 2$ ) if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union of graphs  $E_1, E_2$  and  $E_4$ . Specially, the index is 2 precisely when  $E$  contains  $E_4$  with infinite  $|I|$ .*

*Proof.* To prove (1), we assume first that  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . For a proof of the ‘‘only if’’ part, we assume that  $L_K(E)$  is Lie solvable. Then by Remark 1, the graph  $E$  is a disjoint union of graphs  $E_1, \dots, E_6$ . Conversely, we assume that  $E$  is a disjoint union of graphs  $E_1, \dots, E_6$ . Then,  $L_K(E)$  is a direct summand of ideals each of which is isomorphic to  $L_K(E_1), \dots, L_K(E_6)$ . In view of Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, we get that  $L_K(E_1), \dots, L_K(E_6)$  are Lie solvable, and so the assertion (1) follows. Finally, the proof of (2) is similar to that of (1).  $\square$

If  $E$  is row-finite, then by Remark 2, we can obtain more detailed descriptions as follows:

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $K$  be a field and  $E$  a row-finite graph.*

- (1) *If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable (of index  $\leq 3$ ) if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union graphs  $E_1, \dots, E_6$  with finite  $|I|$  and  $|J|$ . In this case,*

$$L_K(E) \cong \bigoplus_{I_1} K \oplus \bigoplus_{I_2} K[x, x^{-1}] \oplus \bigoplus_{I_3} \mathbb{M}_2(K) \oplus \bigoplus_{I_4} \mathbb{M}_2(K[x, x^{-1}]),$$

*for suitable (possibly infinite) indexing sets  $I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4$ . Moreover, the index is 3 precisely when  $E$  contains  $E_3, E_5$  or  $E_6$ .*

- (2) *If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable (of index  $\leq 2$ ) if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union of graphs  $E_1, E_2$  and  $E_4$  with finite  $|I|$ . In this case, we have*

$$L_K(E) \cong \bigoplus_{J_1} K \oplus \bigoplus_{J_2} K[x, x^{-1}] \oplus \bigoplus_{J_3} \mathbb{M}_2(K),$$

*for suitable (possibly infinite) indexing sets  $J_1, J_2, J_3$ . Moreover, the index is 2 precisely when  $E$  contains  $E_3$ .*

The following theorem provides a necessary and sufficient condition for  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  to be Lie nilpotent. The proof of this theorem is similar to that of Theorem 4.6, so it should be omitted.

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $K$  be a field and  $E$  a graph.*

- (1) *If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie nilpotent if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union graphs  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ .*
- (2) *If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie nilpotent if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union graphs  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$ , and  $E_4$  with finite  $n$ .*

*In particular,  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie nilpotent if and only if  $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}] = 0$ .*

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $K$  be a field and  $E$  a graph. If  $E$  contains an infinite emitter, then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is not Lie nilpotent.*

The following corollary addresses a situation where being Lie solvable and being Lie nilpotent are equivalent.

**Corollary 4.10.** *Let  $K$  be a field and  $E$  a row-finite graph. If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable if and only if it is Lie nilpotent, if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union of graphs  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$  and  $E_4$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $L_K(E)$  is Lie solvable. In view of Corollary 4.7,  $E$  is a disjoint union of a finite number of graphs  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$  or  $E_4$  with finite  $|I|$ . Therefore,  $L_K(E)$  is Lie nilpotent by Theorem 4.8.  $\square$

In the remainder of this section, we investigate the solvability of the Jordan algebra  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$ .

**Theorem 4.11.** *Let  $K$  be a field and  $E$  a graph. Then, the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  is Jordan solvable (resp., nilpotent) if and only if  $E$  is a disjoint union of graphs  $E_1, \dots, E_6$  (resp.,  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ ).*
- (2) *If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  is not Jordan nilpotent.*

*Proof.* (1) Assume that  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ . Then,

$$a \circ b = ab + ba = ab - ba = [a, b] \text{ for any } a, b \in L_K(E).$$

It follows that  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)} = \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  is Jordan solvable (resp., nilpotent) if and only if  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable (resp., nilpotent). By Theorems 4.6 and 4.8, all conclusions of (1) are asserted.

(2) Assume that  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ . Let  $v$  be an arbitrary vertex of  $E$ . Then, it is clear that  $v \in \mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$ . Put  $X_0 = v$  and  $X_{m+1} = X_m \circ v$ , for all  $m \geq 0$ . Then, it can be checked that  $X_m = 2^m v$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . Since  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , it follows that  $X_m \neq 0$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  is not Jordan nilpotent.  $\square$

To conclude this paper, we relate the solvability of the four structures  $L_K(E)^\circ$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$ ,  $L_K(E)^-$  and  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$ .

**Remark 3.** Theorem 4.11 is also true if we replace  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  by the whole  $L_K(E)^\circ$ . This means  $L_K(E)^\circ$  is Jordan solvable or Jordan nilpotent if and only if  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  is. At the other extreme, in view of Theorem 4.6(2), if  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$  then  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable but  $L_K(E)^-$  is not Lie solvable. These facts show that  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  is Lie solvable for a wider class of graph  $E$  than  $L_K(E)^-$ . Also, in some senses, the Lie algebra  $\mathbf{S}_{L_K(E)}$  is bigger than the Jordan algebra  $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$  in  $L_K(E)$ .

**Funding.** This research is funded by the Vietnam Ministry of Education and Training under grant number B2024-CTT-02.

**Conflict of Interest.** The authors have no conflict of interest to declare that are relevant to this article.

**Data availability.** The authors declare that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the paper.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. Abrams, P. Ara, and M. Siles Molina, *Leavitt path algebras*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics series, Vol. 2191, Springer-Verlag Inc., 2017.
- [2] G. Abrams, Z. Mesyan, *Simple Lie algebras arising from Leavitt path algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 216(10) (2012) 2302–2313.
- [3] A. Alahmedi, H. Alsulami, *On the simplicity of the Lie algebra of a Leavitt path algebra*. Comm. Algebra 44(9) (2016) 4114–4120.
- [4] A. Alahmadi and H. Alsulami, *Simplicity of the Lie algebra of skew symmetric elements of a Leavitt path algebra*, Comm. Algebra 44 (2016) 3182–3190.
- [5] I. N. Herstein, *On the Lie and Jordan rings of a simple, associative ring*, Amer. J. Math. 77 (1955) 279–285.
- [6] I. N. Herstein, *The Lie ring of a simple, associative ring*, Duke Math. J. 22 (1955) 471–476.
- [7] I. N. Herstein, *Lie and Jordan systems in simple rings with involution*, Amer. J. Math. 78 (1956) 629–649.
- [8] I. N. Herstein, *Jordan homomorphisms*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 81 (1956) 331–341.
- [9] I. N. Herstein, *Lie and Jordan structures in simple, associative rings*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 67 (1961) 517–531.
- [10] I. N. Herstein, *Topics in Ring Theory*, Mathematics Lecture Notes, University of Chicago, 1965.
- [11] J. E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, Grad. Texts in Math., Vol. 9, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1978.
- [12] T. G. Nam, Z. Zhang, *Lie solvable Leavitt path algebras*. J. Algebra Appl. 21(10) (2022), Paper No. 2250203

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, HCMC UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, 280 AN DUONG VUONG STR., DIST. 5, HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM  
*Email address:* `khanhhv@hcmue.edu.vn`

FACULTY OF FUNDAMENTAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ARCHITECTURE HO CHI MINH CITY, 196 PASTEUR STR., DIST. 3, HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM  
*Email address:* `danh.lequi@uah.edu.vn`