Journal of Algebraic Systems, Vol. 13(No. 2): (2025), pp 95-107.
https://doi.org/10.22044/JAS.2023.13177.1725

WEAK IDEMPOTENT NIL-CLEAN RINGS

B. Asmare, T. Abebaw and K. Venkateswarlu*

Abstract. We introduce the concept of a weak idempotent nil-clean ring as a generalization of a weakly nil-clean ring. We give certain characterizations for weak idempotent nil-clean rings in terms of Jacobson radical and nil-radical. Further, we obtain any weak idempotent nil-clean ring $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$ where R_1 and R_2 are weak idempotent nil-clean rings such that $2 \in J(R_1)$ and $3 \in J(R_2)$.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, R stands for associative ring with unity unless and otherwise stated. We denote the set of all idempotents, nilpotents, units, the Jacobson radical, and the prime radicals (nil-radicals) of a ring R by $Id(R)$, $Nil(R)$, $U(R)$, $J(R)$ and $N(R)$ respectively.
We recall the following definitions from [3]. A ring R is called

1. strongly nil-clean if for each $r \in R$, there exists a nilpotent n and an idempotent e such that $r = n + e$ and $ne = en$.
2. nil-clean if every element can be expressed as a sum of a nilpotent and an idempotent.
3. strongly weakly nil-clean if each element $r \in R$ can be represented as either $r = n + e$ or $r = n - e$, $ne = en$ where n is nilpotent and e is idempotent.
4. weakly nil-clean ring if every element can be written as either a sum or a difference of a nilpotent and an idempotent.
5. clean if every element can be written as a sum of a unit and an idempotent.

The following hold: Strongly nil-clean $\Rightarrow$ nil-clean $\Rightarrow$ weakly nil-clean $\Rightarrow$ clean.

It is observed that every element can be represented as a sum of a certain element and an idempotent element in all the above-said rings. It is quite natural to ask whether the representation can be generalized or not. In any

Published online: 1 April 2024
MSC(2020): Primary: 16N40; Secondary: 16N20, 16N99.
Keywords: Weakly nil-clean rings; Weak idempotent nil-clean rings; Clean rings.
Received: 27 May 2023, Accepted: 13 September 2023.
*Corresponding author.

ring R, if $a^4 = a^2$ then such a is called weak idempotent element. Clearly, every idempotent is weak idempotent but not conversely. For instance, consider the ring of integers modulo 4. Clearly, every element is a weak idempotent element but 2 is not idempotent. In view of these observations, is it possible to replace the idempotent element with a weak idempotent element in the above-said classes of rings? To some extent the answer is affirmative. In this context, we introduce the notion of weak idempotent nil-clean rings which is a subclass of the class of clean rings and a wider class to the class of weakly nil-clean rings.

In this paper, we introduce the notion of weak idempotent nil-clean rings (for short, win-clean rings) and furnish certain examples. Further, we obtain some basic results concerning weak idempotent nil-clean rings. In the next section, we prove $R/Nil(R)$ is a reduced win-clean ring if and only if R is a commutative win-clean ring. Also, we characterize the win-clean ring in Proposition 2.23. The main result of this paper is that every win-clean ring R is isomorphic to a direct product of win-clean rings R_1 and R_2 where $2 \in J(R_1)$ and $3 \in J(R_2)$.

2. Main results

Definition 2.1. Let R be a ring. An element $a \in R$ is called weak idempotent nil-clean if $a = n + w$ for some nilpotent n and some weak idempotent w. R is said to be weak idempotent nil-clean if every element of R is weak idempotent nil-clean.

Remark 2.2. We denote the set of all weak idempotent elements by $wi(R)$ and weak idempotent nil-clean ring by win-clean ring.

Example 2.3. Let $R = M_2(\mathbb{Z}_3)$. Then R is win-clean ring.

Example 2.4. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$. Then R is win-clean ring.

Remark 2.5. If R is a ring and w is a weak idempotent element, then

(1) $w^{2n} = w^2$, and $w^{2n+1} = w^3$.
(2) $Id(R) \cup -Id(R) \subseteq wi(R)$.

We can easily verify that every weakly nil-clean ring is a win-clean ring using remark 2.5 (2) but the converse is not true. For instance, $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ is win-clean ring but not weakly nil-clean, since $(2, 1)$ cannot be expressed as a sum or a difference of any nilpotent and any idempotent element in $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let R be a ring. If $w \in R$ is weak idempotent, then*

(1) w^k *is a weak idempotent element, i.e,* $w^{2k} = w^{4k}$ *where* $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
(2) w^2 *and* $1 - w^2$ *are idempotent elements.*
(3) $2w^2 - 1$ *and* $w - 1 + w^2$ *are units.*
(4) $w^n - w^{n+2}$ *is nilpotent for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(5) $(1 - w^2)w^2 = 0$
(6) w *is clean.*

Proof. It is straightforward. □

Definition 2.7. Let R be a ring and I be an ideal of R. Then the weak idempotents can be lifted modulo I if there exists $w \in wi(R)$ for a given $a \in R$ with $a^4 - a^2 \in I$ such that $w - a \in I$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let* I *be a nil ideal of a ring* R. *If* $\bar{w}$ *is a weak idempotent element in* R/I, *then* $\bar{w}$ *can be lifted to a weak idempotent in* R.

Proof. Let $\bar{w} \in R/I$ be a weak idempotent and w be any pre-image for $\bar{w}$. Then $\bar{w}^2 = \bar{w}^4$ implies that $w^2 - w^4 \in I$ or $w^2 \equiv w^4 (modI)$ where w^2 and w^4 are pre-images of $\bar{w}^2$ and $\bar{w}^4$, in R/I respectively. Let $z = 1 - w^2$. Then (a) $w^2 z = z w^2$ and (b) $w^2 + z \equiv 1(modI)$.

Now $w^2 z = w^2 - w^4 \in I$. Then $0 = (w^2 z)^k = w^{2k} z^k$ for some positive integer k. Also, w^{2k} is a pre-image of $\bar{w}$, since $w^{2k} \equiv w^2 (modI)$. Conditions (a) and (b) are preserved when w and z are replaced by w^{2k} and z^k. Moreover, condition (c) $w^2 z = z w^2 = 0$ is also preserved.

From condition (b), we have $x = 1 - w^2 - z \in I$. Then $(1 - w^2 - z)^m = 0$ for some positive integer m. Thus $1 = 1 - x^m = (1 - x)(1 + x + \cdots + x^{m-1})$ and it follows that $1 - x$ has an inverse $u = 1 + x + \cdots + x^{m-1}$. u commutes with w and z as x commutes with w and z.

Since $x \in I$, $u \equiv 1(modI)$. We can replace w and z with uw^2 and uz, in this case w is again a pre-image for $\bar{w}$ and also conditions (a), (b), and (c) hold true. Further, it is true that (d) $w^2 + z = 1$. By condition (c), we have $w^2 z = 0$, so it gives that $w^2 = w^2(w^2 + z) = w^4 + w^2 z = w^4$. Therefore, $\bar{w}$ lifted to the weak idempotent w in R. □

Proposition 2.9. *The homomorphic image of any win-clean ring is win-clean.*

Proof. It is straightforward. □

Remark 2.10. The converse of Theorem 2.9 is not true. For instance, consider the canonical epimorphism $\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/(3)$ given by $\alpha(n) = n + (3)$. Then $\mathbb{Z}_3 \cong \mathbb{Z}/(3)$ is a win-clean ring, but $\alpha^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}/(3)) = \mathbb{Z}$ is not a win-clean ring.

Let R be a ring and M a left R-module. Consider the idealization of R and M given by $R(M) = R \oplus M$. For $(r, m), (s, t) \in R(M)$, product and sum defined as follows:

$$(r, m)(s, t) = (rs, rt + sm); (r, m) + (s, t) = (r + s, m + t).$$

Then $R(M)$ is the ring.

Theorem 2.11. *Let R be a ring and M be a left R-module. Then R is win-clean if and only if $R(M)$ is win-clean.*

Proof. Assume that R is win-clean ring and $(r, m) \in R(M)$ where $r \in R$ and $m \in M$. Then $r = n + w$ for $n \in Nil(R)$ and $w \in wi(R)$. Thus $n^k = 0$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. So $(n, m)^{k+1} = (n^{k+1}, (k + 1)n^k m) = (0, 0)$ which implies that $(r, m) = (n + w, m) = (n, m) + (w, 0)$ is win-clean expression of (r, m). Hence, $R(M)$ is win-clean. Conversely, $R \cong R(M)/(0 \oplus M)$ is homomorphic image of $R(M)$. So by Theorem 2.9, R is win-clean ring. □

Proposition 2.12. *Let R be a ring. Then weak idempotent elements in $J(R)$ are nilpotents.*

Proof. Let $w \in J(R)$ be a weak idempotent element. Then $w^2 \in J(R)$ and also $1 - w^2$ is an idempotent element. Again, $w^2 \in J(R)$ implies that $1 - w^2 \in U(R)$. So $1 - w^2$ is both idempotent and unit. Thus $1 - w^2 = 1$, since 1 is the only unit and idempotent element. This implies that $w^2 = 0$. Hence w is nilpotent element. □

Proposition 2.13 ([8])**.** *Let R be a ring and $a, b \in R$ such that $ab \neq ba$. Then*

$$(a + b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} a^k b^{n-k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n} D_k b^{n-k}$$

where $d_a(x) = ax - xa$ and $D_k = D_k(b, a) = (a + d_b)^n 1 - a^n$, $D_0(b, a) = 0$, $D_{n+1}(b, a) = d_b a^n + (A + d_b)D_n(b, a)$.

Proposition 2.14. *Let R be a win-clean ring, then $J(R) \subseteq Nil(R)$.*

Proof. Let $a \in J(R)$. Then $a = n + w$, where $n \in Nil(R)$ and $w \in wi(R)$. Then $(a - w)^k = 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. So $(w - a)^k \in J(R)$. Now

$$(w - a)^k = \textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} w^k a^{n-k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n} D_k a^{n-k}$$

implies that $(w-a)^k - [\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} w^k a^{n-k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n} D_k a^{n-k}] = w^k \in J(R) \cap wi(R)$. Since $J(R)$ does not contain units and non-zero idempotents, w must be nilpotent. Now $a - w, w \in Nil(R)$ which in turn implies that $a \in Nil(R)$. Hence $J(R) \subseteq Nil(R)$. □

Corollary 2.15. *If R is a win-clean ring, then $J(R)$ is nil.*

Remark 2.16. A reduced win-clean ring is a ring in which all the elements are weak idempotents.

Proposition 2.17. *Let R be a commutative ring. Then R is win-clean if and only if $R/Nil(R)$ is a reduced win-clean ring.*

Proof. Assume that R is win-clean ring. Let $\bar{x} = x + Nil(R) \in R/Nil(R)$ for some $x \in R$. Now write

$$\bar{x} = (n + w) + Nil(R) = (n + Nil(R)) + (w + Nil(R)) = w + Nil(R)$$

and $w + Nil(R) \in wi(R/Nil(R))$. This implies that $\bar{x}$ is weak idempotent element in $R/Nil(R)$. Since $\bar{x}$ is arbitrary, $R/Nil(R)$ is reduced win-clean ring. Conversely, assume that $R/Nil(R)$ is win-clean ring and let $r \in R$. Since $R/Nil(R)$ is reduced, $Nil(R/Nil(R)) = \{0\}$ and $r + Nil(R) = w + Nil(R)$ for some $w + Nil(R) \in wi(R/Nil(R))$. Then $w^4 - w^2 \in Nil(R)$. By Proposition 2.12, the weak idempotent $w + Nil(R)$ can be lifted to a weak idempotent $w \in wi(R)$ such that $r - w = n$ for some $n \in Nil(R)$, i.e., $r = n + w$. This shows that r is win-clean. Hence R is win-clean ring. □

Corollary 2.18. *Let R be a commutative ring. Then R is win-clean if and only if $R/N(R)$ is win-clean ring.*

Proof. It is obvious. □

Proposition 2.19. *Let I be a nil ideal of a ring R. R is win-clean if and only if R/I is win-clean.*

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) It is obvious.

($\Longleftarrow$) Let $r \in R$. Then $\bar{r} = r + I \in R/I$. We can write $\bar{r} = \bar{n} + \bar{w}$ where $\bar{n} \in Nil(R/I)$ and $\bar{w} \in wi(R/I)$ implies that $r + I = (n + w) + I$. The nilpotent $\bar{n}$ in R/I lift to a nilpotent n in R. To see this, $\bar{n}^k = 0$ for $k \geq 1$ in R/I implies that $n^k \in I$. Since I is nil, $(n^k)^m = 0$. So $n^{km} = 0$ for $m \geq 1$. We know that weak idempotents lift modulo any nil ideal, this allows us to assume that w is a weak idempotent in R. Moreover, $r - n - w \in I$. It follows that $r - w = n + d$ where $d \in I$. Since $n^m = 0$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(n + d)^k \in I$ because I is ideal of R. Thus $(n + d)^{mk} = 0$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ as I is nil ideal. So $n + d$ is nilpotent. Therefore, R is win-clean, as desired. □

Corollary 2.20. *A ring R is win-clean if and only if $R/J(R)$ is win-clean and $J(R)$ is nil.*

Proof. Since $J(R)$ is nil, the proof follows from Proposition 2.19. □

The converse of Proposition 2.14 is not true. Consider example 1.2 in [7]. If we take a simple domain $F = \mathbb{Z}_5$, then $A = M_2(\mathbb{Z}_5)$ is a ring of 2×2 matrices over integer modulo 5, and $B = D_2(\mathbb{Z}_5)$ is a ring of 2×2 diagonal matrices over integer modulo 5 such that $Nil(B) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_5 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Define $R = B + A[[x]]_x$, where $A[[x]]$ denotes the formal power series ring with an indeterminate x over a ring R. Then $Nil(R) \subsetneq J(R) = Nil(B) + A[[x]]$ and $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_5$. But $\mathbb{Z}_5$ is not win-clean and hence $R/J(R)$ is not win-clean. Therefore, By Corollary 2.20, R is not win-clean ring.

Remark 2.21. It is clear that if $x \in R$ a non-zero central nilpotent, then $1 - xr \in U(R)$ for all $r \in R$. Hence $x \in J(R)$, i.e, the non-zero central nilpotents are contained in Jacobson radical, $J(R)$.

Corollary 2.22. *Let R be a win-clean ring such that the weak idempotents are central. Then $C(R)$, the center of R, is a win-clean ring.*

Proposition 2.23. *The following are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *R is win-clean.*
(2) *12 is nilpotent and $R/12R$ is win-clean.*
(3) *$R/J(R)$ is win-clean and $J(R)$ is nil.*

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2). If $12 = 0$, then we are done. Assume that $12 \neq 0$. As R is a ring with 1, $1 + 1 = 2 \in R$ is the least non-unit central element of R. Then there exist a weak idempotent w and a nilpotent n such that $2 = n + w$. Thus $(2 - n)^2 = (2 - n)^4 \implies 2^2 - 4n + n^2 = 2^4 - 32n + 24n^2 - 8n^3 + n^4$. So $n(-n^3 + 8n^2 - 23n + 28) = 12$. Hence, 12 is nilpotent. Since R is win-clean, $R/12R$ is win-clean by Proposition 2.19.

(2) $\implies$ (1) follows from Proposition 2.19 and (1) $\iff$ (3) obtained immediately from Corollary 2.20. □

Proposition 2.24 ([5])**.** *Let R be a ring, and let I be any nil-ideal of R. Then R is nil-clean if and only if R/I is nil-clean.*

Proposition 2.25. *A ring R is nil-clean if and only if R is win-clean and $2 \in J(R)$.*

Proof. ($\implies$) Suppose R is nil-clean and $r \in R$. Then $r = n + e$ where $n \in Nil(R)$ and $e \in Id(R)$. Thus $e \in wi(R)$. So r is win-clean and hence R is win-clean. Also, $2 = n + e$ implies that $n = 2$. Thus 2 is central nilpotent. This implies that $2 \in J(R)$.

($\Longleftarrow$) Assume R is win-clean. Then $J(R)$ is nil. As $2 \in J(R)$,

$$2 + J(R) = 0 + J(R).$$

We know that a nilpotent modulo nil ideal lifted to nilpotent in R. So we have $2 = 0$, i.e., $char(R/J(R)) = 2$. Thus for all $r \in R$ we have $2\bar{r} = \bar{0}$ and $1 - 2\bar{r} = \bar{1}$. So $R/J(R)$ is Boolean. Hence $R/J(R)$ is nil-clean. By Proposition 2.24, R is nil-clean. □

Proposition 2.26. *A ring R is weakly nil-clean if and only if R is win-clean and $2 \in J(R)$ or $3 \in J(R)$.*

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) Obviously R is win-clean. Assume that $2 \notin J(R)$. Then $2 \in U(R)$ and $6^n = 0$ for some positive integer n as 6 is nilpotent element in R ([3], Theorem 2). Thus $2^n 3^n = 0$ implies that $3^n = 0$. Hence $3 \in J(R)$.

($\Longleftarrow$) Assume that R is win-clean. Then $R/J(R)$ is win-clean and $J(R)$ is nil by Corollary 2.20. If $2 \in J(R)$, then by Proposition 2.25, R is nil-clean. So R is weakly nil-clean. Again, if $3 \in J(R)$, then $3 + J(R) = 0 + J(R)$ and also 2 is invertible in R. we can assume $3 = 0$, so that $char(R/J(R)) = 3$. So $\bar{2}$ is unit in $R/J(R)$. Moreover, $3\bar{r} = \bar{0}$, $\bar{1} - 3\bar{r} = \bar{1}$ and $\bar{2} - 3\bar{r} = \bar{2}$ for all $r \in R$. Thus $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ and hence $R/J(R)$ is weakly nil-clean. Therefore, R is weakly nil-clean. □

Proposition 2.27. *A finite direct product $R = \prod R_\alpha$ of rings is win-clean ring if and only if each R_α is win-clean ring.*

Proof. It is straightforward. □

Proposition 2.28. *Let R be a ring. Then R is win-clean ring if and only if $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$ where R_1 is win-clean with $2 \in J(R_1)$ and R_2 is 0 or a win-clean ring with $3 \in J(R_2)$.*

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) Suppose R is win-clean ring. Then 12 is nilpotent element in R, so that $(12)^n = 0$ for some positive integer n. Then $4^n R \cap 3^n R = 0$ and $4^n R + 3^n R = R$. Thus $R \cong (R/2^{2n}R) \times (R/3^n R)$ by Chinese remainder theorem. By Proposition 2.27, $R_1 = R/2^{2n}R$ and $R_2 = R/3^n R$ are win-clean rings. Thus 2 is central nilpotent in R_1. So $2 \in J(R_1)$. We can assume $R_2 \neq 0$. Then 3 is central nilpotent in R_2 and hence $3 \in J(R_2)$.

($\Longleftarrow$) It is obvious. □

Corollary 2.29. *The following are equivalent for a ring R.*

(1) *R is a win-clean ring with central weak idempotent elements.*

(2) *$R \cong R_1 \times R_2$, where R_1 is win-clean with weak idempotents are central and $J(R_1)$ nil such that $R_1/J(R_1)$ is Boolean, and R_2 is 0 or $R_2/J(R_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ with $J(R_2)$ nil.*
(3) *R is win-clean ring with central weak idempotent elements, $J(R)$ is nil, and $R/J(R)$ is isomorphic to either a Boolean ring, or to $\mathbb{Z}_3$, or to the direct product of two such rings.*

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2) Using Proposition 2.28, we can write $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$, where R_1 is win-clean ring with central weak idempotents and $2 \in J(R_1)$; and R_2 is 0 or win-clean ring with central weak idempotents and $3 \in J(R_2)$. Thus $char(R_1/J(R_1)) = 2$ which in turn implies that $\bar{x} = -\bar{x}$ for all $\bar{x} \in R_1/J(R_1)$. Hence, $R_1/J(R_1)$ is Boolean. Assume $R_2 \neq 0$. As R_2 is win-clean and $3 \in J(R_2)$, $R_2/J(R_2)$ is win-clean and $char(R_2/J(R_2)) = 3$. Also, 2 is unit in R_2, since $2 \notin J(R_2)$. From this, we conclude that

$$R_2/J(R_2) = \{3R_2, 1 - 3R_2, 2 - 3R_2\},$$

so that every element of $R_2/J(R_2)$ is nilpotent or invertible. Therefore, $R_2/J(R_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$. Furthermore, by Corollary 2.20, $J(R_1)$ and $J(R_2)$ are nil ideals.

(2) $\implies$ (3) and (3) $\implies$ (1) are straightforward. □

Theorem 2.30. *Let R be a reduced commutative ring. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *$R = wi(R)$.*
(2) *R is isomorphic to either a Boolean ring B or $\mathbb{Z}_3$, or $B \times \mathbb{Z}_3$.*
(3) *For all $x \in R$, $x^4 = x^2$.*
(4) *R is win-clean.*

Proof. For a reduced ring R, (1) $\iff$ (3) $\iff$ (4). Thus, it remains to show the equivalence of (1) and (2).

(1) $\implies$ (2) Suppose $R = wi(R)$. If $y \in R$, y^2 is an idempotent. If R is indecomposable, then either $y^2 = 0$ or $y^2 = 1$ for any $y \in R$. This implies that $y = 0$ or $y^2 = 1$ for all $y \in R$. Thus, each nonzero element of R is a unit and hence R is a field. Hence, R is isomorphic to either $\mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{Z}_3$.

Next, assume R is not indecomposable. Let $R = S \times T$ and $s \in S$, where S and T are coprime ideals of R, that is, $S + T = R$. Then, $(s, 0)$ is not a unit implies that either $(s, 0) = (0, 0)$, or $(s, 0)^2 = (0, 0)$, or $(s, 0)^2 = (s, 0)$, or $(s, 0)^2 = (s, 0)^4$ and $(s, 0)^2 \neq (1, 0)$. If $(s, 0) = (0, 0)$ or $(s, 0)^2 = (0, 0)$, then $(s, 0) = (0, 0)$ since S is reduced. In this case, S is a field. So, S is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{Z}_3$. If $(s, 0)^2 = (s, 0)$, then $s \in Id(S) \cup [-Id(S)]$ and

hence $S = Id(S) \cup [-Id(S)]$. By [4, Theorem 1.13], S is isomorphic to either a Boolean ring, or $\mathbb{Z}_3$, or $B \times \mathbb{Z}_3$, where B is a Boolean ring. The same holds for T. As a direct product of two Boolean rings is a Boolean ring we get R is isomorphic to a Boolean ring B, $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$, $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times B$, or $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 \times B$. If $(s,0)^2 = (s,0)^4$ and $(s,0)^2 \neq (1,0)$, then let $y = (s,0)$. Now $R = R(y^2) \oplus R(1-y^2)$ is the decomposition of R.
Assume $R(y^2)$ is not a Boolean ring. Then, we show that $R(1-y^2)$ is Boolean. Suppose ry^2 is not idempotent. Then, for any $s \in R$, $ry^2 + (-s)(1-y^2)$ is not idempotent. Thus, $-(ry^2 + (-s)(1-y^2)) = -ry^2 + s(1-y^2)$ is idempotent. So, each $s(1-y^2)$ is idempotent. Thus, $R(1-y^2)$ is Boolean and also $2R(1-y^2) = 0$. Hence, for each $y \in R$, either $2y^2 = 0$ or $2(1-y^2) = 0$.

If $(0:2) = \{y \in R \mid 2y^2 = 0\} = R$, then $char(R) = 2$. Hence, $R = wi(R) = Id(R)$ and so R is Boolean. Now assume $(0:2) \neq R$. Then, we claim that $(0:2)$ is a maximal ideal of R. Suppose there is a maximal ideal M such that $(0:2) \subsetneq M$. Let $y^2 \in M - (0:2)$. Then, $y^2 \in wi(R) = R$ and $y^2 \notin (0:2)$. Thus, $2y^2 \neq 0$ and hence $2(1-y^2) = 0$. So, $1-y^2 \in (0:2) \subseteq M$, a contradiction. Hence, $(0:2)$ is a maximal ideal. So, $\bar{R} = R/(0:2)$ is an indecomposable ring with $\bar{R} = wi(\bar{R})$. By the idea in the first part of this proof, we have that $\bar{R}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{Z}_3$.

Next we show that $2R \cap (0:2) = 0$. Assume that $y \in 2R \cap (0:2)$. Then, $y = 2s$ and $2y^2 = 0$. But then $y^2 = y^4 = (2s)^4 = 2(2s)^2(2s)^2 = 2y^2 = 0$. If $2R = 0$, then R is Boolean.

Now assume that $2R \neq 0$. If $2R = R$, then $(0:2) = 0$ is a maximal ideal of R. Thus, R is a field and hence by the first paragraph of this proof, it is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_3$. If $2R \neq R$, then $R = 2R \oplus (0:2)$, where $(0:2)$ is a Boolean ring and $2R \cong R/(0:2)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_3$ since $2R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{Z}_3$ by the first paragraph of this proof and $2R \nsubseteq (0:2)$. Therefore, R is isomorphic to either a Boolean ring, or $\mathbb{Z}_3$, or $B \times \mathbb{Z}_3$, or $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$, or $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 \times B$, where B is a Boolean ring.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) It is obvious. □

Recall that a ring is said to be zero dimensional if every prime ideal is maximal ideal.

Corollary 2.31. *Let R be a commutative ring. The following statements hold.*

(1) *A reduced indecomposable ring is win-clean if and only if it is isomorphic to either $\mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{Z}_3$. In particular, any win-clean domain is isomorphic to either $\mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{Z}_3$.*

(2) *A win-clean ring is zero-dimensional.*

Proof. (1) Suppose R is a reduced indecomposable win-clean. Then 0 is the only nilpotent, and its idempotents are only 0 and 1. Let $w \in wi(R)$. Then $w^2 \in Id(R)$ implies that $w^2 = 0$ or $w^2 = 1$. If $w^2 = 0$, then w is both weak idempotent and nilpotent. So $w = 0$. If $w^2 = 1$, then w is a unit and weak idempotent. Now we have $R = \{0, 1, w\}$. Since R is closed under $+$, $w + 1 \in R$ which implies that $w + 1 = 0$ or $w + 1 = 1$, or $w + 1 = w$. If $w + 1 = 0$, then $w = -1$. In this case, $R = \{0, 1, -1\}$ which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_3$. If $w + 1 = 1$ or $w + 1 = w$, then $w = 0$ as $0 \neq 1$. Hence $R = \{0, 1\}$ which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2$. The converse is straightforward.

(2) Let R be a win-clean and P a prime ideal of R. Then R/P is an integral domain. By (1), the quotient R/P is isomorphic to either $\mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{Z}_3$ and hence P is maximal ideal.

□

Proposition 2.32. *Let R be a win-clean ring with central weak idempotent elements and let $a \in R$. If aR contains no non-zero idempotent. Then a is the sum of two nilpotent elements.*

Proof. Suppose aR contains no non-zero idempotent. Choose $w \in wi(R)$ and $n \in Nil(R)$ such that $a = n + w$. Then

$$aw^3 = nw^3 + w^4 = nw^3 + w^2 = (nw + 1)w^2.$$

So $aw^3(nw+1)^{-1} = (nw+1)w^2(nw+1)^{-1}$ in aR. As nw is nilpotent, $nw+1$ is unit and w^2 is idempotent. Thus $(nw + 1)w^2(nw + 1)^{-1}$ is idempotent. Since aR does not contain non-zero idempotent element, we have

$$(nw + 1)w^2(nw + 1)^{-1} = 0$$

which implies $w^2 = 0$ and hence w is nilpotent. Therefore, a is a sum of two nilpotent elements. □

Definition 2.33. Let R be a ring. Then an element x in R is called the square root of idempotent element if there exists an idempotent element e in R such that $x^2 = e$.

Proposition 2.34. *Let R be a win-clean ring with central weak idempotent elements in which, $2 \in U(R)$. Then every element of R can be written as a sum of nilpotent and a square root of idempotent element.*

Proof. Let $a \in R$. Then $a = n + w$ for some $n \in Nil(R)$ and $w \in wi(R)$. Let $v = 2w^2 - 1$. Then $v^2 = (2w^2-1)^2 = 4w^4 - 4w^2 + 1 = 4w^2 - 4w^2 + 1 = 1$. Thus $vv^{-1} = (2w^2-1)(2w^2-1)^{-1} = 1$. Now $v = 2w^2 - 1$ implies $w^2 = (v+1)/2$ and $[(v+1)/2]^2 = (v+1)/2$. Therefore, w is a square root of idempotent. □

Next, we see that a win-clean ring is a subclass of clean rings.

Theorem 2.35. *Every win-clean ring is clean.*

Proof. Let R be a win-clean ring and $a \in R$. Then $a = n + w$ for some nilpotent n and weak idempotent w. So $a = n + w = (n + w - 1 + w^2) + (1 - w^2)$. By Theorem 2.6, $w - 1 + w^2$ is unit and $1 - w^2 \in Id(R)$. To see $n + w - 1 + w^2$ is unit. Let $u = w - 1 + w^2$. Then $n + w - 1 + w^2 = n + u$. Since n and $(u^{-1}n)$ are nilpotents, we have $n^m = 0$ and $(u^{-1}n)^m = 0$ for some positive integer m. Now

$$\begin{aligned}(n+u)^{-1} =& [u(1+\frac{n}{u})]^{-1} = [1 - \frac{n}{u} + (\frac{n}{u})^2 - (\frac{n}{u})^3 + \cdots + (-\frac{n}{u})^{m-1}]u^{-1}\\ =& [1 - u^{-1}n + (u^{-1}n)^2 - \cdots + (-1)^{m-1}(u^{-1}n)^{m-1}]u^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}(n+u)(n+u)^{-1} =& (n+u)[1 - u^{-1}n + \cdots + (-1)^{m-1}(u^{-1}n)^{m-1}]u^{-1}\\ =& n[1 - u^{-1}n + \cdots + (-1)^{m-1}(u^{-1}n)^{m-1}]u^{-1}\\ &+ u[1 - u^{-1}n + (u^{-1}n)^2 - \cdots + (-1)^{m-1}(u^{-1}n)^{m-1}]u^{-1}\\ =& nu^{-1} - (nu^{-1})^2 + (nu^{-1})^3 - \cdots + (-1)^{m-1}(nu^{-1})^m\\ &+ 1 - nu^{-1} + (nu^{-1})^2 - \cdots + (-1)^{m-1}(nu^{-1})^{m-1}\\ =& 1.\end{aligned}$$

Thus a is clean. Therefore, R is clean. □

In general, the converse of Theorem 2.35 does not hold true. For example, integer modulo 5, $\mathbb{Z}_5$, is clean but not win-clean.

Lemma 2.36. *If w is a weak idempotent element in a win-clean ring R and $2 \in J(R)$, then $w \pm w^2$ is nilpotent.*

Proof. Since $2 \in J(R)$, we have $(w \pm w^2)^2 = 2(w^2 \pm w^3) \in J(R)$. As $J(R)$ is nil, there exists some positive integer m such that $2^m = 0$ and also $(w \pm w^2)^{2m} = 0$. Hence, $w \pm w^2$ is nilpotent. □

The following proposition sets a condition for which a clean element becomes win-clean.

Proposition 2.37. *Let R be a commutative ring, $2 \in J(R)$ and x be clean in R with clean decomposition $x = u + e$. Then x is win-clean if and only if there exists $w \in wi(R) \cap Nil(R)$ such that $2e - 1 + u$ is nilpotent.*

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$) Suppose x is win-clean. Then $x = n + f$ for some $n \in Nil(R)$ and $f \in wi(R)$. Now $x = n + f = (n - 1 + f + f^2) + (1 - f^2)$. Since $2 \in J(R)$, $f + f^2$ is nilpotent by Lemma 2.36. Then take $u = n - 1 + f + f^2$ and $e = 1 - f^2$. So

$$2e - 1 + u = 2(1 - f^2) - 1 + (n - 1 + f + f^2) + f^2 = n + f.$$

($\Longleftarrow$) We can rewrite $x = u + e$ as $x = (u + 2e - 1 + w^2) + (1 - e - w^2)$. Since $1 - e - w^2$ is weak idempotent, x is win-clean. □

Acknowledgments

We thank the unknown reviewers for their invaluable suggestions and comments for the improvement of this paper.

References

1. S. Ali, A note on commutative weakly nil clean rings, *J. Algebra Appl.*, **15**(10) (2016), Article ID: 1620001.
2. D. K. Basnet and J. Bhattacharyya, Weak nil-clean rings, (2015), https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1510.07440.
3. S. Breaz, P. Danchev and Y. Zhou, Rings in which every element is either a sum or a difference of a nilpotent and an idempotent, *J. Algebra Appl.*, **15**(08) (2016), Article ID: 1650148.
4. P. V. Danchev and W. W. McGovern, Commutative weakly nil clean unital rings, *J. Algebra*, **425** (2015), 410–422.
5. A. J. Diesl, Nil clean rings, *J. Algebra*, **383** (2013), 197–211.
6. T. Koşan, Z. Wang, and Y. Zhou, Nil-clean and strongly nil-clean rings, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **220**(2) (2016), 633–646.
7. C. I. Lee and S. Y. Park, When nilpotents are contained in Jacobson radicals, *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, **55**(5)(2018), 1193–1205.
8. W. Wyss, Two non-commutative binomial theorems, (2017), https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1707.03861
9. M. I. Zubayda and N. F. Norihan, On weak nil-clean rings, *Open Access Library Journal*, **9**(e8812) (2022), 2333–9721.

Biadiglign Asmare
Department of Mathematics, College of Natural and Computational Science, Addis Ababa University, P.O. Box 1176, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
Email: biadiglign.asmare@aau.edu.et

Tilahun Abebaw
Department of Mathematics, College of Natural and Computational Science, Addis Ababa University, P.O. Box 1176, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
Email: tilahun.abebaw@aau.edu.et

Kolluru Venkateswarlu
Department of Computer Science and System Engineering, College of Engineering, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.
Email: drkvenkateswarlu@gmail.com

Journal of Algebraic Systems

WEAK IDEMPOTENT NIL-CLEAN RINGS

B. ASMARE, T. ABEBAW AND K. VENKATESWARLU

حلقه‌های پوچ–تمیز خودتوان ضعیف

بی. اسماره[1]، تی. آبباو[2] و کی. ونکتسوارلو[3]

[1,2]گروه ریاضیات، کالج علوم طبیعی و محاسباتی، دانشگاه آدیس آبابا، آدیس آبابا، اتیوپی

[3]گروه علوم کامپیوتر و مهندسی سیستم، کالج مهندسی، دانشگاه آندرا، ویساخاپاتنام، آندرا پرادش، هند

در این مقاله، مفهوم حلقه پوچ–تمیز خودتوان ضعیف را که تعمیمی از حلقه‌های پوچ–تمیز ضعیف است، تعریف می‌کنیم. با توجه به جیکوبسون رادیکال و پوچ–رادیکال، یک مشخصه سازی خاص برای حلقه‌های پوچ–تمیز خودتوان‌های ضعیف ارائه می‌دهیم. به علاوه، نشان می‌دهیم که برای هر حلقه پوچ–تمیز خودتوان ضعیف R داریم $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$ که R_1 و R_2 حلقه‌های پوچ–تمیز خودتوان ضعیف هستند به طوری که $2 \in J(R_1)$ و $3 \in J(R_2)$.

کلمات کلیدی: حلقه‌های پوچ–تمیز ضعیف، حلقه‌های پوچ–تمیز خودتوان ضعیف، حلقه‌های تمیز.