

LIE ALGEBRAS OF SKEW-SYMMETRIC ELEMENTS IN SIMPLE LEAVITT PATH ALGEBRAS

NGUYEN HUYNH THAO NHI AND HUYNH VIET KHANH

ABSTRACT. Let K be a field and E be a graph. Let $L_K(E)$ be the Leavitt path algebra of E over K with the standard involution $*$. We investigate the set of skew-symmetric elements, $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)} = \{x \in L_K(E) : x^* = -x\}$, and show that for any simple $L_K(E)$ containing a cycle, $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}] \neq \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$. This provides a negative answer to a question posed by Herstein raised in [Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 67 (1961), 517–531].

1. INTRODUCTION

Every associative algebra \mathcal{A} over a field K gives rise to a Lie algebra by considering the same vector space structure and defining the Lie bracket as $[a, b] = ab - ba$ for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. The Lie algebra obtained in this way is called the Lie algebra associated with \mathcal{A} and is often denoted by \mathcal{A}^- . Suppose further that \mathcal{A} is equipped with an involution $*$, that is, a map $*$: $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ satisfying the following conditions:

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

for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $Z(\mathcal{A})$ denote the center of \mathcal{A} . If $a^* = a$ for all $a \in Z(\mathcal{A})$, the involution $*$ is said to be of the *first kind*. Otherwise, if there exists a nonzero $a \in Z(\mathcal{A})$ such that $a^* \neq a$, then $*$ is said to be of the *second kind*. Define $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{x \in \mathcal{A} : x^* = -x\}$ as the set of *skew-symmetric elements* of \mathcal{A} with respect to $*$. It is clear that if $*$ is an involution of the first kind, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a Lie subalgebra of \mathcal{A}^- . For any K -subspace I of \mathcal{A} , let $[I, I]$ denote $\text{span}_K\{ab - ba \mid a, b \in I\}$, the K -subspace of \mathcal{A} generated by all commutators $ab - ba$. The following question was raised by Herstein (see [7, p. 529] in [3]):

Question 1. If \mathcal{A} is a simple ring with an involution of the first kind, is it true that $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}} = [\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}]$?

Several counterexamples to Question 1 have been identified. For instance, P. H. Lee provided an example of a division ring D with an involution such that $\mathbf{K}_D \neq [\mathbf{K}_D, \mathbf{K}_D]$ in [5]. Additionally, J. Hennig constructed a simple, locally-finite-dimensional algebra with the same property in [2].

Let E be a graph and K a field, and let $L_K(E)$ denote the Leavitt path algebra of E over K . The mapping $*$: $L_K(E) \rightarrow L_K(E)$, defined by sending v to v , e to e^* , and e^* to e for all $v \in E^0$ and $e \in E^1$, and fixing all elements in K , induces an involution of $L_K(E)$. This is called the *standard involution* on $L_K(E)$ (see [1, page 36]). One can verify that this involution $*$ is of the first kind.

Key words and phrases. leavitt path algebra; Lie algebra.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16S88; 17B65; 17B20; 17B30.

In this note, we address Question 1 in the context where \mathcal{A} is the Leavitt path algebra $L_K(E)$. Numerous papers have investigated the structure of $L_K(E)^-$, the Lie algebra associated with $L_K(E)$ (see, e.g., [4], [6], [7]). It is known from [1, Theorem 2.9.1] that $L_K(E)$ is a simple ring if and only if the following conditions hold:

- (1) The only hereditary and saturated subsets of E^0 are \emptyset and E^0 ;
- (2) Every cycle in E has an exit.

The primary aim of this note is to study $\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$, the set of skew-symmetric elements of $L_K(E)$ with respect to $*$. Additionally, we demonstrate that for any simple $L_K(E)$ containing a cycle, $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}] \neq \mathbf{K}_{L_K(E)}$, thereby providing negative answers to Question 1.

A *directed graph* is a graph, denoted by $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$, consisting of two sets E^0 and E^1 together with maps $r, s : E^1 \rightarrow E^0$. The elements of E^0 and E^1 are called *vertices* and *edges* of E respectively. For $e \in E^1$, we say that $s(e)$ is a *source* and $r(e)$ is a *range* of e . In this paper, the word “graph” will always mean “directed graph”. Moreover, concerning a graph as above, we often write E instead of $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$.

Let E be a graph, $v \in E^0$ and $e \in E^1$. We say that v *emits* e if $s(e) = v$. A vertex v is a *sink* if it emits no edges, while it is an *infinite emitter* if it emits infinitely many edges. A vertex v is said to be *regular* if it is neither a sink nor an infinite emitter. The set of all regular vertices in a graph E is denoted by $\text{Reg}(E)$. A *finite path* μ of length $\ell(\mu) := n \geq 1$ is a finite sequence of edges $\mu = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ 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 $\text{Path}(E)$. Let $\text{ClPath}(E)$ denote the set of all closed paths in $\text{Path}(E)$.

If $\mu = e_1 \cdots e_n \in \text{Path}(E)$, then we denote the element $e_n^* \cdots e_2^* e_1^*$ by μ^* . If $\ell(\mu) \geq 1$ and $v = s(\mu) = r(\mu)$, then we say that μ is a *closed path based at* v . If, moreover, $s(e_j) \neq v$ for every $j > 1$, then we call μ a *closed simple path based at* v . If $\mu = e_1 \cdots e_n$ is a closed path based at v and $s(e_i) \neq s(e_j)$ for every $i \neq j$, then μ is called a *cycle based at* v . If $\mu = e_1 \cdots e_n$ is a cycle based at v , then for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, the path $\mu_i = e_i e_{i+1} \cdots e_n e_1 \cdots e_{i-1}$ is a cycle based at $s(e_i)$. We call the collection of cycles $\{\mu_i\}$ based at $s(e_i)$ the *cycle of* μ . A *cycle* c is a set of paths consisting of the cycle of μ for some cycle μ based at a vertex v . An *exit* for a path $\mu = e_1 \cdots e_n$ is an edge e such that $s(e) = s(e_i)$ for some i and $e \neq e_i$.

Let H be a subset of E^0 . We say that H is *hereditary* if whenever $u \in H$ and $u \geq v$ for some vertex v , then $v \in H$; and H is *saturated* if, for any regular vertex v , $r(s^{-1}(v)) \subseteq H$ implies $v \in H$.

Definition 1.1 (Leavitt path algebra). Let E be an arbitrary graph and K a field. The *Leavitt path algebra of* E *over* 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 $v \in \text{Reg}(E)$.

Definition 1.2 (Cohn path algebra). Let E be an arbitrary graph and K any field. The *Cohn path algebra of E over K* , denoted by $C_K(E)$, is the free associative K -algebra generated by the set $E^0 \cup E^1 \cup (E^1)^*$, subject to the relations given in (V), (E1), (E2), and (CK1) in Definition 1.1.

Remark 1. Let E be a graph and K a field. Let I be the ideal of the $C_K(E)$ generated by the set

$$\left\{ v - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v)} ee^* \mid v \in \text{Reg}(E) \right\}.$$

Then

$$L_K(E) \cong C_K(E)/I$$

as K -algebras.

Let E be a graph and K a field. For simplicity reason, throughout this note, we always let \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{C} denote $L_K(E)$ and $C_K(E)$ respectively. The set of all integers and positive integers will be denoted by \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{Z}_+ , respectively.

2. A DISCRIPTION OF $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$

Although various bases for \mathcal{L} can be identified (see e.g., [1]), consider the set

$$\mathcal{B} = \{ \alpha\beta^* \mid \alpha, \beta \in \text{Path}(E), r(\alpha) = r(\beta) \}.$$

While \mathcal{L} is generated as a K -vector space by \mathcal{B} , this set is not necessarily a basis for \mathcal{L} . However, according to [1, Proposition 1.5.6], \mathcal{B} is indeed a K -basis for \mathcal{C} . Consequently, computations involving the elements of \mathcal{C} are simplified when using this basis. Every element $x \in \mathcal{C}$ can be uniquely expressed as $x = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \alpha_i \beta_i^*$, where $k_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$ (the nonzero elements of K), and $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \text{Path}(E)$ with $r(\alpha_i) = r(\beta_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Upon rearrangement, x can be written in the form

$$(1) \quad x = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(a_i \gamma_i \lambda_i^* + b_i \lambda_i \gamma_i^* \right) + \sum_{j=1}^k c_j p_j p_j^*,$$

where $a_i, b_i, c_j \in K$, $\gamma_i, \lambda_i, p_j \in \text{Path}(E)$, with $\gamma_i \neq \lambda_i$ and $\gamma_i \lambda_i^* \neq \lambda_{i'} \gamma_{i'}^*$ for all $1 \leq i \neq i' \leq n$. (Note that some of the a_i , b_i , and c_j may be zero.)

Proposition 2.1. *Let E be a graph and K a field. The following assertions hold:*

(i) *If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is equal to*

$$\text{span}_K \{ \gamma \lambda^* - \lambda \gamma^* \mid \gamma, \lambda \in \text{Path}(E), \gamma \neq \lambda, r(\gamma) = r(\lambda) \}.$$

(ii) *If $\text{char}(K) = 2$, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is equal to*

$$\text{span}_K \{ pp^*, \gamma \lambda^* + \lambda \gamma^* \mid p, \gamma, \lambda \in \text{Path}(E), \gamma \neq \lambda, r(\gamma) = r(\lambda) \}.$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Write

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i \gamma_i \lambda_i^* + b_i \lambda_i \gamma_i^*) + \sum_{j=1}^k c_j p_j p_j^*,$$

where $a_i, b_i, c_j \in K$, $\gamma_i \neq \lambda_i$, and $\gamma_i \lambda_i^* \neq \lambda_{i'} \gamma_{i'}^*$ for all $1 \leq i \neq i' \leq n$. It follows that

$$x^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(a_i \lambda_i \gamma_i^* + b_i \gamma_i \lambda_i^* \right) + \sum_{j=1}^k c_j p_j p_j^*.$$

As $x^* + x = 0$, we get

$$(2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i) \gamma_i \lambda_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i) \lambda_i \gamma_i^* + \sum_{j=1}^k 2c_j p_j p_j^* = 0.$$

Because the elements $\gamma_1 \lambda_1^*, \dots, \gamma_n \lambda_n^*, \lambda_1 \gamma_1^*, \dots, \lambda_n \gamma_n^*, p_1 p_1^*, \dots, p_k p_k^*$ are pairwise distinct, we obtain that $a_i + b_i = 0$ and $2c_j = 0$ for all i, j . We divide our situation into two possible cases:

Case 1. $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$. In this case, we have $a_i = -b_i$ and $c_j = 0$ for all i, j . This means that

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (\gamma_i \lambda_i^* - \lambda_i \gamma_i^*).$$

Case 2. $\text{char}(K) = 2$. It follows that $a_i = b_i$ for all i . Consequently, we get

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (\gamma_i \lambda_i^* + \lambda_i \gamma_i^*) + \sum_{j=1}^k c_j p_j p_j^*.$$

Conversely, such elements x with presentations in *Case 1* and *Case 2* clearly belong to $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Thus, the proposition is now proved. \square

Lemma 2.2 ([7, Lemma 9]). *Let K be a field and E a graph. Let $v \in E^0$ be a regular vertex, and let y denote the element $v - \sum_{\{e \in E^1 \mid s(e)=v\}} ee^*$ of the ideal I of \mathcal{C} described in Remark 1.*

- (i) *If $p \in \text{Path}(E) \setminus E^0$, then $yp = 0$.*
- (ii) *If $q \in \text{Path}(E) \setminus E^0$, then $q^*y = 0$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let E be a graph and K a field. Let I be the ideal of \mathcal{C} as defined in Remark 1. The following assertions hold:*

- (i) *$I \cap \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is equal to*

$$\text{span}_K \left\{ \gamma \gamma^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v)} \gamma ee^* \gamma^* \mid \gamma \in \text{Path}(E), r(\gamma) = v \in \text{Reg}(E) \right\}.$$

- (ii) *If $\text{char}(K) = 2$, then $I \cap \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}} = I \cap \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$. If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, then $I \cap \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $0 \neq x \in I$. In view of Lemma 2.2, we get

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \gamma_i \left(v_i - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} ee^* \right) \rho_i^*,$$

where $k_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$, $\gamma_i, \rho_i \in \text{Path}(E)$ with $r(\gamma_i) = r(\rho_i) = v_i \in \text{Reg}(E)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Or, equivalently,

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \left(\gamma_i \rho_i^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} \gamma_i ee^* \rho_i^* \right).$$

- (i) Assume that $x \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Then, we have $x - x^* = 0$; that is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n k_i \left(\gamma_i \rho_i^* - \rho_i \gamma_i^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} (\gamma_i ee^* \rho_i^* - \rho_i ee^* \gamma_i^*) \right) = 0.$$

As $v_i \neq v_j$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ and all the k_i 's are non-zero, the above equation implies that $\rho_i = \gamma_i$ for all i . In other words, we have

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \left(\gamma_i \gamma_i^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} \gamma_i e e^* \gamma_i^* \right).$$

Conversely, it is clear that such an element belongs to $I \cap \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$.

(ii) If $\text{char}(K) = 2$, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}} = \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$, from which it follows that $I \cap \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}} = I \cap \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Now we only need to consider the case $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$. Deny the conclusion. Assume that $0 \neq x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$. It follows that $x + x^* = 0$, which implies that

$$(3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \left(\gamma_i \rho_i^* + \rho_i \gamma_i^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} (\gamma_i e e^* \rho_i^* + \rho_i e e^* \gamma_i^*) \right) = 0.$$

As $v_i \neq v_j$ for $i \neq j$, if there exists $i_0 \in \{1 \leq i \leq n\}$ such that $\gamma_{i_0} \neq \rho_{i_0}$, then the summand $k_{i_0} \gamma_{i_0} \rho_{i_0}^*$ in the equation (3) is not eliminated, which implies that $k_{i_0} = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, we get that $\rho_i = \gamma_i$ for all i . Then, the equation (3) becomes:

$$(4) \quad 2 \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \left(\gamma_i \gamma_i^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} \gamma_i e e^* \gamma_i^* \right) = 0.$$

As $v_i \neq v_j$ for $i \neq j$, the equation (4) implies that $2k_i = 0$, and hence $k_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{1 \leq i \leq n\}$. It follows that $x = 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we get that $I \cap \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$. \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let E be a graph and K a field.*

(i) *If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is equal to*

$$\text{span}_K \{ \gamma \lambda^* - \lambda \gamma^* \mid \gamma, \lambda \in \text{Path}(E), r(\gamma) = r(\lambda), \gamma \neq \lambda \}.$$

(ii) *If $\text{char}(K) = 2$, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is equal to*

$$\text{span}_K \{ p p^*, \gamma \lambda^* + \lambda \gamma^* \mid p, \gamma, \lambda \in \text{Path}(E), r(\gamma) = r(\lambda), \gamma \neq \lambda \}.$$

Proof. Viewing \mathcal{L} as \mathcal{C}/I , a non-zero element $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{L}$ can be written in the form

$$\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(a_i \gamma_i \lambda_i^* + b_i \lambda_i \gamma_i^* \right) + \sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j p_j^* + I,$$

where $a_i, b_i, c_j \in K$, $\gamma_i \neq \lambda_i$, and $\gamma_i \lambda_i^* \neq \lambda_i \gamma_i^*$ for all $1 \leq i \neq i' \leq n$. Assume that $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$. It follows that $\bar{x} + \bar{x}^* = \bar{0}$, which implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i) \left(\gamma_i \lambda_i^* + \lambda_i \gamma_i^* \right) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j p_j^* + I = \bar{0}.$$

Let y denote the element $\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i) \left(\gamma_i \lambda_i^* + \lambda_i \gamma_i^* \right) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j p_j^* \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, we have $y \in I$ in \mathcal{C} . Moreover, it is easy to check that $y \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}}$. In other words, we have $y \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}} \cap I$. By Lemma 2.3, we obtain that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i) \left(\gamma_i \lambda_i^* + \lambda_i \gamma_i^* \right) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j p_j^* = \sum_{k=1}^s d_k \left(\rho_k \rho_k^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_k)} \rho_k e e^* \rho_k^* \right),$$

where $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_s \in K$ and $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s \in \text{Reg}(E)$. Since $\gamma_i \neq \lambda_i$, and $\gamma_i \lambda_i^* \neq \lambda_{i'} \gamma_{i'}^*$ for all $1 \leq i \neq i' \leq n$, the previous equation implies that $a_i = -b_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and so

$$(5) \quad 2 \sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j p_j^* = \sum_{k=1}^s d_k \left(\rho_k \rho_k^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_k)} \rho_k e e^* \rho_k^* \right) \in I,$$

and

$$\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\gamma_i \lambda_i^* - \lambda_i \gamma_i^* \right) + \sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j p_j^* + I.$$

If $\text{char}(K) = 2$, then such an element \bar{x} with the form as above clearly belongs to $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$. This proves (ii). If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, then the equation (5) implies that $\sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j p_j^* \in I$. It follows that $\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \left(\gamma_i \lambda_i^* - \lambda_i \gamma_i^* \right) + I$. Again, such an element also belongs to $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$, proving (i). \square

3. NEGATIVE ANSWERS TO HERSTEIN'S QUESTION

A comprehensive description of the elements of $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$ was provided by Mesyan in [6]. Using this description, along with our results from the previous section, we present in this section a characterization of $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \cap [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$. This characterization enables us to provide negative answers to Question 1. First, we begin by recalling the following definitions:

Definition 3.1 ([6, Definition 1]). Let E be a graph, and for each $v \in E^0$ let $\epsilon_v \in \mathbb{Z}^{(E^0)}$ denote the element with 1 in the v -th coordinate and zeros elsewhere. If $v \in E^0$ is a regular vertex, for all a_{vu} denote the number of edges $e \in E^1$ such that $s(e) = v$ and $r(e) = u$. Define

$$B_v = (a_{vu})_{u \in E^0} - \epsilon_v \in \mathbb{Z}^{(E^0)}.$$

On the other hand, let

$$B_v = (0)_{u \in E^0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{(E^0)},$$

if v is not a regular vertex.

Definition 3.2 ([6, Definition 11]). Let E be a graph and $p, q \in \text{ClPath}(E)$. We write $p \sim q$ if there exist paths $x, y \in \text{Path}(E)$ such that $p = xy$ and $q = yx$.

Also, it was proved in [6, Lemma 12] that \sim is an equivalence relation on the elements of $\text{ClPath}(E)$. We also recall here the description of $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$ given by Mesyan:

Theorem 3.3 ([6, Theorem 15]). *Let E be a graph and K a field. Let $x \in \mathcal{L}$ be an arbitrary element. Write*

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i q_i t_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^*,$$

for some $k, l, m, m_i, n, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $a_i, b_i, c_{ij}, d_{ij} \in K$ and $p_i, q_i, t_i, x_{ij}, z_{ij} \in \text{Path}(E)$, and $y_{ij}, w_{ij} \in \text{ClPath}(E) \setminus E^0$, where for each i and $u \in \text{ClPath}(E)$, $q_i \neq t_i u$ and $t_i \neq q_i u$, and where $y_{ij} \sim y_{i'j'}$ if and only if $i = i'$ if and only if $w_{ij} \sim w_{i'j'}$. Also, for each $v \in E^0$, let B_v and ϵ_v be as in Definition 3.1.

Then $x \in [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \epsilon_{r(p_i)} \in \text{span}_K \{B_v | v \in E^0\}$,
- (2) $\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} = 0$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,
- (3) $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} = 0$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let E be a graph and K a field. Let x be an element of \mathcal{C} which is uniquely written as $x = \sum_{i=1}^l b_i t_i q_i^*$, where $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $b_i \in K \setminus \{0\}$ and $q_i, t_i \in \text{Path}(E)$ with $r(q_i) = r(t_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$. If $x \in \mathbf{K}_\mathcal{C}$, then $l = 2l'$ for some $l' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and there exist $b_{i_1}, \dots, b_{i_{l'}} \in \{b_1, \dots, b_l\}$ and $t_{i_1} q_{i_1}^*, \dots, t_{i_{l'}} q_{i_{l'}}^* \in \{t_1 q_1^*, \dots, t_l q_l^*\}$ such that $x = \sum_{j=1}^{l'} b_{i_j} (t_{i_j} q_{i_j}^* - q_{i_j} t_{i_j}^*)$.*

Proof. As $x + x^* = 0$, we get

$$(6) \quad \sum_{i=1}^l b_i t_i q_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i q_i t_i^* = 0.$$

As the element $t_i q_i^*$'s are pairwise distinct and all the b_i 's are non-zero, the equation (6) implies that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, there exists $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ such that $b_i t_i q_i^* + b_j q_j t_j^* = 0$. It follows $l = 2l'$ for some $l' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and that $b_i = -b_j$, $t_i = q_j$ and $q_i = t_j$. Thus, the conclusion of the lemma follows immediately. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let E be a graph and K a field. Let x be an element of \mathcal{C} which is uniquely written as*

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^*,$$

where $m, n, m_i, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $c_{ij}, d_{ij} \in K \setminus \{0\}$ and $x_{ij}, z_{ij} \in \text{Path}(E)$, $y_{ij}, w_{ij} \in \text{ClPath}(E) \setminus E^0$, and where $y_{ij} \sim y_{i'j'}$ if and only if $i = i'$ if and only if $w_{ij} \sim w_{i'j'}$. If $x \in \mathbf{K}_\mathcal{C}$, then $m = n$ and after a suitable re-indexing, we have that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $m_i = n_i$ and $d_{ij} = -c_{ij}$, $z_{ij} = x_{ij}$ and $w_{ij} = y_{ij}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. In other words, we have

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* - x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*).$$

Proof. As $x + x^* = 0$, we get

$$(7) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} (z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* + z_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij}^*) = 0.$$

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m_i\}$, and for each $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$ we have

$$c_{ij} x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + d_{kl} z_{kl} w_{kl} z_{kl}^* = 0 \iff \begin{cases} c_{ij} = -d_{kl} \\ x_{ij} = z_{kl} \\ y_{ij} = w_{kl} \end{cases} \iff c_{ij} x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^* + d_{kl} z_{kl} w_{kl}^* z_{kl}^* = 0.$$

Therefore, the conclusion follows immediately. \square

Theorem 3.6. *Let E be a graph and K a field. Let $x \in \mathcal{L}$.*

- (i) If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, then $x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$ if and only if there exist $l, m, m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $b_i, c_{ij} \in K$, $q_i, t_i, x_{ij} \in \text{Path}(E)$, $y_{ij} \in \text{ClPath}(E) \setminus E^0$ such that

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^l b_i(t_i q_i^* - q_i t_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^* - x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^*),$$

where for each i and $u \in \text{ClPath}(E)$, $q_i \neq t_i u$ and $t_i \neq q_i u$, and where $y_{ij} \sim y_{i'j'}$ if and only if $i = i'$.

- (ii) If $\text{char}(K) = 2$, then $x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$ if and only if there exist $k, l, m, m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $p_i, b_i, c_{ij} \in K$, $q_i, t_i, x_{ij} \in \text{Path}(E)$, and $y_{ij} \in \text{ClPath}(E) \setminus E^0$ such that

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i(t_i q_i^* - q_i t_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^* - x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^*),$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \epsilon_{r(p_i)} \in \text{span}_K \{B_v | v \in E^0\}$, and for each i and $u \in \text{ClPath}(E)$, $q_i \neq t_i u$ and $t_i \neq q_i u$, and where $y_{ij} \sim y_{i'j'}$ if and only if $i = i'$.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{L}$. Viewing x as an element of \mathcal{C}/I , we can write

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i q_i t_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* + I,$$

which satisfies condition (1), (2) and (3) of Theorem 3.3. As $x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$, we get $x^* + x + I = I$, which means the element

$$\begin{aligned} y := \sum_{i=1}^k 2a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i (t_i q_i^* + q_i t_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) \\ + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} d_{ij} (z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* + z_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij}^*) \in I \text{ in } \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it is clear that $y \in \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{C}} \cap I$. We have two possible cases:

Case 1. $y = 0$. In other words, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k 2a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i (t_i q_i^* + q_i t_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) \\ + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} (z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* + z_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij}^*) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &= \{p_i p_i^* \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} \\ \mathbf{B} &= \{t_i q_i^*, q_i t_i^* \mid 1 \leq i \leq l\} \\ \mathbf{C} &= \cup_{i=1}^m (\cup_{j=1}^{m_i} \{x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^*\}) \cup \cup_{i=1}^n (\cup_{j=1}^{n_i} \{z_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij}^*\}). \end{aligned}$$

Because these subsets are pairwise disjoint and contained in the basic \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{C} , the previous equation implies that

$$(8) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k 2a_i p_i p_i^* = 0,$$

$$(9) \quad \sum_{i=1}^l b_i (t_i q_i^* + q_i t_i^*) = 0,$$

$$(10) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} (z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* + z_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij}^*) = 0.$$

Because the elements of \mathbf{A} are pairwise distinct, the equation 8 implies that $2a_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Consider the equation (9). In view of Lemma 3.4, $t = 2t'$ for some $t' \in \mathbb{N}$ and there exist $b_{i_1}, \dots, b_{i_{l'}}$ and $t_{i_1} q_{i_1}^*, \dots, t_{i_{l'}} q_{i_{l'}}^* \in \{t_1 q_1^*, \dots, t_l q_l^*\}$

such that $\sum_{i=1}^l b_i q_i t_i^* = \sum_{j=1}^{l'} b'_j (t_{i_j} q_{i_j}^* - q_{i_j} t_{i_j}^*)$.

Now, consider the equation (10). By Lemma 3.5, we get that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* - x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*).$$

Therefore,

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{j=1}^{l'} b'_j (t_{i_j} q_{i_j}^* - q_{i_j} t_{i_j}^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* - x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) + I.$$

If $\text{char}(K) = 2$ then we have $(p_i p_i^*)^* = p_i p_i^* = -p_i p_i^*$, which means $p_i p_i^*$ is in $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$. If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, then $a_i = 0$ for all i , and again we have $x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \cap [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$.

Case 2. $y \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^k 2a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i (t_i q_i^* + q_i t_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} (z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* + z_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^t k_i (\rho_i \rho_i^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} \rho_i e e^* \rho_i^*), \end{aligned}$$

for some $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m \in K \setminus \{0\}$ and $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m \in \text{Reg}(E)$. By the same arguments as in Case 1, we get

$$(11) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k 2a_i p_i p_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^t k_i (\rho_i \rho_i^* - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v_i)} \rho_i e e^* \rho_i^*).$$

$$(12) \quad \sum_{i=1}^l b_i (t_i q_i^* + q_i t_i^*) = 0,$$

$$(13) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* + x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} d_{ij} (z_{ij} w_{ij}^* z_{ij}^* + z_{ij} w_{ij} z_{ij}^*) = 0.$$

Again, repeat arguments used in Case 1, we obtain

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{j=1}^{l'} b'_j (t_{i_j} q_{i_j}^* - q_{i_j} t_{i_j}^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^* - x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^*) + I.$$

If $\text{char}(K) = 2$ then we have $p_i p_i^*$ is in $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$. It follows that $x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \cap [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$. If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$, since the element on the right side of equation (11) belongs to I of \mathcal{C} , we get that $\sum_{i=1}^k 2a_i p_i p_i^* \in I$ or $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i p_i p_i^*$ is also in I . It follows that $x = \sum_{j=1}^{l'} b'_i (t_{i_j} q_{i_j}^* - q_{i_j} t_{i_j}^*) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} c_{ij} (x_{ij} y_{ij}^* x_{ij}^* - x_{ij} y_{ij} x_{ij}^*) + I$. The converse is clear. \square

The following corollary follows immediately from Theorem 3.6 and Lemma 2.4.

Corollary 3.7. *Let E be a graph and K a field. If E does not contain a cycle, then the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *If $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \cap [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}] = \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$.*
- (2) *If $\text{char}(K) = 2$ then $x \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \cap [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$ if and only there exist $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $a_i, b_i \in K$, and $p_i, q_i, t_i \in \text{Path}(E)$ such that*

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i p_i p_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^l b_i (t_i q_i^* - q_i t_i^*),$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \epsilon_{r(p_i)} \in \text{span}_K \{B_v | v \in E^0\}$ and $t_i \neq q_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$.


Corollary 3.8. *Let E be a graph and K a field. If E contains a cycle, then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \neq [\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}]$.*

Proof. View \mathcal{L} as \mathcal{C}/I . Let c be a cycle in E , and let $x = c - c^* \in \mathcal{C}$. It is clear that $x \notin I$. Let \bar{x} denote $x + I$ in \mathcal{L} . Then, we get that $\bar{x} \neq \bar{0}$ in \mathcal{L} . Moreover, according to Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 2.4, we conclude that $\bar{x} \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$ but $\bar{x} \notin [\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$. This implies that $[\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}] \neq \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}$. \square

The following two propositions illustrate that we can construct Leavitt path algebras \mathcal{L} for which $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \neq [\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}]$, thereby providing counterexamples that resolve Question 1 in the negative.

Proposition 3.9. *Let \mathcal{L} be a simple Leavitt path algebra over a graph containing a cycle. Then $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \neq [\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}]$.*

Example 1. Let R_n be the rose with n petals graph:




Then $L_K(R_n)$ is a simple ring and $[\mathbf{K}_{L_K(R_n)}, \mathbf{K}_{L_K(R_n)}] \neq \mathbf{K}_{L_K(R_n)}$.

In [2], J. Hennig provided an example of a simple, locally finite-dimensional associative algebra \mathcal{A} over an algebraically closed field, equipped with an involution, such that $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}} \neq [\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{A}}]$. In the following proposition, we utilize Leavitt path algebras to construct similar algebras with the same property:

Proposition 3.10. *There exist a simple, locally finite Leavitt path algebra \mathcal{L} such that $\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \neq [\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}]$.*

Proof. Let K be a field with $\text{char}(K) = 2$. Let $A_{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the following graph where $(A_{\mathbb{Z}})^0$ indexed by \mathbb{Z} :



Let $\mathcal{L} = L_K(A_{\mathbb{Z}})$. Then, for any $v_i \in (A_{\mathbb{Z}})^0$, we have

$$B_{v_i} = (\dots, 0, \underset{i\text{-th}}{1}, 1, 0 \dots) \in \mathbb{Z}^{(\mathbb{Z})}.$$

Let $\mathbb{V} = \text{span}_K\{B_v \mid v \in (A_{\mathbb{Z}})^0\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{(\mathbb{Z})}$. Then, for any $0 \neq B \in \mathbb{V}$, there exist integers $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} B &= a_{i_1} B_{v_{i_1}} + a_{i_2} B_{v_{i_2}} + \dots + a_{i_n} B_{v_{i_n}} \\ &= (\dots, 0, a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n+1}, 0, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, any $0 \neq B \in \mathbb{V}$ has at least two non-zero coordinates. Thus, for any $v \in E^0$, by (2) of Corollary 3.7, we get $v \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}} \setminus [\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{L}}]$. Because the only hereditary and saturated subsets of $A_{\mathbb{Z}}$ are \emptyset and $(A_{\mathbb{Z}})^0$, we conclude that \mathcal{L} is simple. Moreover, according to [4, Proposition 4.4], we also get that \mathcal{L} is a locally finite K -algebra.

4. DECLARATIONS

Data Availability. The authors declare that no data has been used for this research.

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. □

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] J. Hennig, *Simple, locally finite dimensional Lie algebras in positive characteristic*, J. Algebra 413 (2014), 270–288.
- [3] I. N. Herstein, *Lie and Jordan structures in simple, associative rings*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 67 (1961) 517–531.
- [4] H. V. Khanh, *Leavitt path algebras in which every Lie ideal is an ideal and applications*, Transformation Groups (2024). DOI: 10.1007/s00031-024-09848-1.
- [5] P. H. Lee, *An example of division rings with involution*, J. Algebra 74 (1982) 282–283.
- [6] Z. Mesyan, *Commutator Leavitt path algebras*, Algebr. Represent. Theory 16(5) (2013), 1207–1232.
- [7] G. Abrams, Gene, Z. Mesyan, *Simple Lie algebras arising from Leavitt path algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 216(10) (2012), 2302–2313.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, HCMC UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, 280 AN DUONG VUONG STR., DIST. 5, HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM

Email address: `nhinh.t.dais034@pg.hcmue.edu.vn`; `thaonhi01012001@gmail.com`

Email address: `khanhhv@hcmue.edu.vn`