

## Derivation on $\beta_1$ Near-Ring

<sup>1</sup>Rakeshwar Purohit, <sup>2</sup>Bhumika Shrimali, <sup>3</sup>Khemraj Meena, and <sup>4</sup>Hrishikesh Paliwal

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, University College of Science, MLSU, Udaipur

<sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, University College of Science, MLSU, Udaipur

<sup>3</sup>Research Scholar, University College of Science, MLSU, Udaipur

<sup>4</sup>Research Scholar, University College of Science, MLSU, Udaipur

Email: <sup>1</sup>rakeshwarpurohit@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>bhumi658@gmail.com, <sup>3</sup>khemrajmeena21@yahoo.com,  
<sup>4</sup>hrishikeshramji@gmail.com

Contact: <sup>1</sup>9799297052, <sup>2</sup>9571221344, <sup>3</sup>9782062996, <sup>4</sup>7891122210

### Article Info

**Page Number:** 4665 - 4672

**Publication Issue:**

**Vol 71 No. 4 (2022)**

### Abstract

In this paper, A particular type of Near-Ring called  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring is taken and existence of derivation on it, is described. Moreover, some results regarding derivation on  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring are discussed.

### Article History

**Article Received:** 25 March 2022

**Revised:** 30 April 2022

**Accepted:** 15 June 2022

**Publication:** 19 August 2022

**Indexterms:**  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring, Derivation, commutative, Zero-symmetric.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This present paper is inspired by work of G.Sugantha and R.Balakrishna who have introduced the notion of  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring. A non-void set  $N_r$  together with additive and multiplicative operation is called a Near-Ring if  $N_r$  is additive group, multiplicative semi group and possesses one sided distributive law [4]. A Right Near-Ring  $N_r$  is known as  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring if any  $a, b$  in  $N_r$  it satisfies  $aN_r b = N_r ab$  [1]. A Near-Ring is zero-symmetric if  $\forall x_1 \in N_r, 0x_1 = 0$ . An additive mapping  $d$  from  $N_r$  to  $N_r$  is a derivation if  $\forall \alpha, \beta \in N_r$

$$d(\alpha\beta) = \alpha d(\beta) + \beta d(\alpha)$$

$$\text{or } d(\alpha\beta) = d(\alpha)\beta + \alpha d(\beta)$$

For any  $a, b$  in Near-Ring  $N_r$ , the symbol  $[p, q]$  represents the commutator  $pq - qp$ , and the symbol  $p \circ q$  represents the skew commutator  $pq + qp$ .

A Derivation  $d$  is known as commuting if

$[d(x), x] = 0, \forall x \in N_r$ . A Derivation  $d$  is called skew commuting if  $d(x) \circ x = 0, \forall x \in N_r$  [5]. This paper moves in direction of extending some results on  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring admitting derivation.

Throughout this paper  $N_r$  represents a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring with identity,  $d$  is derivation and  $Z$  represents centre of  $N_r$ .

## II. PRELIMINARIES

**Definition 2.1** → A Near-Ring  $N_r$  is known as pseudo commutative Near-Ring if  $\forall x_1, y_1, z_1 \in N_r$ ,  $x_1 y_1 z_1 = z_1 y_1 x_1$  [Definition 2.1 of (2)].

**Proposition 2.2** → Every  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring which has identity is always zero-symmetric Near-Ring. [Prop. 5.1 of (1)]

**Proposition 2.3** → Every Near-Ring possesses derivation iff it is zero-symmetric Near-Ring. [Theorem 2.7 of (3)]

**Proposition 2.4** → Every pseudo commutative Near-Ring which has identity is a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring. [Prop. 5.5 of (1)]

**Lemma 2.5** → For a Near-Ring  $N_r$  and its ideal  $X$ , if  $x_1 x_2 \in X \implies x_1 \circ x_2 \in I \forall x_1 x_2 \in N_r$  then  $N_r$  has strong I.F.P. [Prop. 9.2 of (4)]

**Lemma 2.6** → For a Near-Ring  $N_r$  which admits derivation  $d$ ,  $(a_1, a_2)$  is constant where  $a_1$  in  $A$  is commuting or skew commuting elements and  $a_2 \in N_r$ . Here  $A$  is additive non-zero  $N_r$ -subgroup of  $N_r$  [Lemma 2.5 of (5)]

## III. Examples on $\beta_1$ Near-Ring

**3.1**  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring which admits derivation:

**Example 1**  $\rightarrow(N_r = \{0,2,4,6,8\}, +10)$  is a  $\beta_1$ Near-Ring which is defined on cyclic group of order 5, where second composition is defined according to Pilz [4], Scheme ‘F’, p.410 and example 10.

.	0	2	4	6	8
0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	2	4	6	8
4	0	4	8	2	6
6	0	6	2	8	4
8	0	8	6	4	2

**Example 2**  $\rightarrow(N_r = \{0,2,4,6,8,10,12\},+14)$  is a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring which is defined on cyclic group of order 7,where second operation is defined according to Pilz [4], Scheme ‘I’, p.411 and example 23.

.	0	2	4	6	8	10	12
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	2	4	6	8	10	12
4	0	4	8	12	2	6	10
6	0	6	12	4	10	2	8
8	0	8	2	10	4	12	6
10	0	10	6	2	12	8	4
12	0	12	10	8	6	4	2

**3.2** Near-Ring which are not  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring

**Example 1**  $\rightarrow(N_r = \{0,2,4,6,8,10,12\},+14)$  is a Near-Ring defined on cyclic group of order 7,where second operation is defined according to Pilz [4] Scheme ‘I’, p.412 and example 19.

.	0	2	4	6	8	10	12
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

**Example 2** →  $(N_r = \{0,2,4,6,8,10,12,14\}, +_{16})$  is a Near-Ring defined on cyclic group of order 8, where second operation is defined according to Pilz [4], Scheme ‘J’, p.414 and example 118.

.	0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14

IV. MAIN

RESULTS

**Proposition 4.1** → Every  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring  $N_r$  with identity element ‘1’ always admits derivation.

**Proof:** Let  $N_r$  be a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring which has identity element one then by proposition 2.2, it will be zero-symmetric also. Again, using proposition 2.3 it can be easily proven that it must admit derivation. Hence  $N_r$  always admits a derivation.

**Theorem 4.2** → For any pseudo commutative Near-Ring  $N_r$  with identity one, the following results are true:

- (i)  $N_r$  is a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring.
- (ii)  $N_r$  admits derivation.
- (iii)  $N_r$  satisfies partial distributive law which is:  $x(d(yz)) = x(d(y)z + yd(z)) = xd(y)z + xyd(z), \forall x, y, z \in N_r$ .

(iv)  $N_r$  has strong I.F.P.

**V. Proof:** Let  $N_r$  be a pseudo commutative Near-Ring with identity one then,

(i) Proof is straight forward (by Prop.2.4)

(ii) Since every pseudo commutative Near-Ring is  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring and every  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring admits derivation (by Proposition 4.1). Combining both yield to the result that every pseudo commutative Near-Ring with identity one also admits derivation.

(iii) Take  $x, y, z \in N_r$ , then we have

$$d((xy)z) = xyd(z) + (xd(y) + d(x)y)z \quad (1)$$

$$\text{and also } d(x(yz)) = xd(yz) + d(x)yz = x(yd(z) + d(y)z) + d(x)yz = xyd(z) + xd(y)z + d(x)yz \quad (2)$$

by (1) and (2), we will get the required result.

(vi) By (i), every pseudo commutative Near-Ring with identity '1' is a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring  $\Rightarrow \forall p, q \in N_r$ ,

$$\text{VI. } pN_r q = pN_r q \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Now since } N_r \text{ is zero-symmetric, so for any ideal } X \text{ of } N_r, \quad N_r X \subseteq X \quad (2)$$

Let  $x_1, x_2 \in N_r$  and any  $r \in N_r$

$$\text{VII. } x_1 r x_2 \in x_1 N_r x_2 = N_r x_1 x_2 \quad (\text{by } 1)$$

$$\subseteq N_r \quad x$$

$$\subseteq I \quad (\text{by } 2)$$

Now if we use Lemma 2.5, it is clear that  $N_r$  has strong I.F.P.

**Corollary 4.3:** Let  $N_r$  be a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring which has derivation  $d$  then  $N_r$  has strong I.F.P.

**Proof:** Since  $N_r$  has derivation  $\Rightarrow N_r$  zero-symmetric then by above it is obvious that  $N_r$  has strong I.F.P.

**Lemma 4.4:** Let  $N_r$  be a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring with  $1 \in N_r$  then  $d(0) = 0$  where  $d$  is derivation on  $N_r$ .

**Proof:** Since every  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring is zero-symmetric. Hence,  $d(0) = d(00) = d(0)0 + 0d(0) \Rightarrow d(0) = 0$

**Proposition 4.5** → The necessary and sufficient conditions for a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring  $N_r$  with non-zero derivation 'd' to be an abelian Near-Ring are-  
 (i)  $d(x_1 x_2) = d(x_2 x_1) \quad x_1, x_2 \in N_r$   
 (ii) For multiplicative commutators in  $N_r \exists \alpha \in N_r$  s.t.  $d(\alpha)$  is not a left zero divisor.

**Proof:** Let  $N_r$  be a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring and suppose the following condition holds.  
 Now  $d(x_1 x_2) = d(x_2 x_1)$  (given)

put  $x_1 = x_2 x_1 \Rightarrow d(x_2 x_1 x_2) = d(x_2 x_2 x_1)$

Hence  $d(x_2 x_1 x_2) - d(x_2 x_2 x_1) = 0$   
 $\Rightarrow d(x_2(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1)) = 0$

$\Rightarrow x_2 d(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1) + d(x_2)(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1) = 0$

$\Rightarrow d(x_2)(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1) = 0 \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in N_r$

[As  $d(x_1 x_2) = d(x_2 x_1)$ ]

Also  $d(\alpha)$  is not a left zero divisor  $\forall [x_1 x_2]$

$\Rightarrow d(\alpha)(x_1 \alpha - \alpha x_1) = 0 \Rightarrow (x_1 \alpha - \alpha x_1) = 0, \quad \forall x_1 \in N_r$

Hence  $\alpha \in Z(N_r)$ .

Again  $d(\alpha(x_1 x_2)) = d((\alpha x_1) x_2) = d(x_2)(\alpha x_1) = d((x_2 d(x_2 \alpha)) x_1) = d((\alpha x_2) x_1) = d(\alpha (x_2 x_1))$

[As  $d(x_1 x_2) = d(x_2 x_1)$ ]

$\Rightarrow d(\alpha(x_1 x_2)) - d(\alpha(x_2 x_1)) = d(\alpha(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1)) = 0$

$\Rightarrow \alpha d(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1) + d(\alpha)(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1) = d(\alpha)(x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1) = 0$

Hence  $x_1 x_2 - x_2 x_1 = 0, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in N_r$

$N_r$  is commutative.

Conversely if  $N_r$  is commutative then clearly

$d(x_1 x_2) = d(x_2 x_1)$  and  $[x_1, x_2] = 0 \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in N_r$

which leads to the result.

**Corollary 4.6:** For any  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring  $N_r$  which admits derivation s.t.  $d(N_r) \subseteq Z(N_r)$ , then  $N_r$  will be a commutative ring if  $\exists \alpha \in N_r$  s.t.  $d(\alpha)$  is not a left zero divisor in  $N_r$ .

**Theorem 4.7:** For a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring  $N_r$  admitting a derivation  $d$  s.t.  $d(d(r)s) = d(s d(r)), \forall r, s \in N_r$ , and if  $d^2(\alpha)$  is not a left zero divisor in  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring  $N_r$  for some  $\alpha \in N_r$  then  $N_r$  is an abelian Ring.

**Proof:**  $d(d(r)s) = d(sd(r))$

Replace  $s = d(r)s$  then

$$d(d(r)) (d(r)s) - s d(r) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow d^2(r)(d(r)s - s d(r)) = 0 \quad \forall r, s \in N_r \quad (1)$$

$\Rightarrow d(\alpha)s = s d(\alpha) \quad \forall s \in N_r$  [  $d^2(\alpha)$  is not a left zero divisor ].

Now  $\forall r, s \in N_r$

$$d(d(\alpha)(r d(s))) = d((d(\alpha)r)d(s)) = d(d(s) (d(\alpha) r))$$

$$= d((ds)d(\alpha)r) = d((d(\alpha)d(s))r) = d(d(\alpha) (d(s)r))$$

$$\Rightarrow d(\alpha) d(r d(s)) - d(s)r + d^2(\alpha)(rds) - d(s)r = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow d^2(\alpha)(r d(s)) - d(s)r = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow r d(s) - d(s)r = 0 \quad \forall r, s \in N_r$$

$$\Rightarrow d(N_r) \subseteq Z(N_r).$$

Replacing  $b = d(\alpha) \Rightarrow d(b) \neq 0$  is not a left zero divisor in  $N_r \Rightarrow$  by Corollary 4.6  $N_r$  is an abelian Ring.

**Theorem 4.8**  $\rightarrow$  For a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring  $N_r$  which has zero element is the only divisor of zero and also has a non-trivial commuting or skew commuting derivation  $d$  then  $N_r$  is a commutative Near-Ring.

**Proof:** Let  $N_r$  be a  $\beta_1$  Near-Ring and  $c_1$  be any additive commutator in  $N_r$ .

$\Rightarrow c_1$  is constant (by Lemma 2.6 and Prop. 4.1) also  $c_1 x_1$  will also be an additive commutator  $\forall x_1 \in N_r$

$\Rightarrow c_1 x_1$  is also constant.

$$\text{Hence } d(c_1 x_1) = d(c_1)x_1 + c_1 d(x_1) = 0$$

$$\text{and } c_1 d(x_1) = 0.$$

Now  $\exists y_1 \in N_r$  s.t.  $d(y_1) \neq 0$  ( $d$  is non-zero)

$$\text{and by above } c_1 d(x_1) = 0.$$

$\therefore N_r$  has no non-zero divisors of zero  $\Rightarrow c_1 = 0$

Hence  $N_r$  is abelian.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Sungantha, R. Balakrishna, " $\beta_1$  Near-Ring," *International Journal of Algebra*, vol. 8, 1–7, 2014.
- [2] S. Uma, "Pseudo commutative Near-Rings," *Scientia Magna An International Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 75-85, 2010.

- [3] Ahmad A.M. Kamal, Khalid H. Al-Shaalan, "Commutativity of Near-Rings with derivations," *Algebra Colloquium*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 215–230, 2014.
- [4] G. Pilz, "Near-Rings the theory and its applications," *Elsevier*, 2011.
- [5] Yong-UK CHO, "A Study of derivation in Near-Rings," *Pusan Kyongnam Math. J.*, vol. 12, no.2, pp. 63–69.