

Compatible ideals and radicals of Ore extensions

E. Hashemi

ABSTRACT. For a ring endomorphism α and an α -derivation δ , we introduce α -compatible ideals which are a generalization of α -rigid ideals and study the connections of the prime radical and the upper nil radical of R with the prime radical and the upper nil radical of the Ore extension $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$ and the skew power series $R[[x; \alpha]]$. As a consequence we obtain a generalization of Hong, Kwak and Rizvi, 2005.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	349
2. The prime and upper nil radicals of Ore extensions	351
References	355

1. Introduction

Throughout the paper R always denotes an associative ring with unity. $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$ will stand for the Ore extension of R , where α is an endomorphism and δ an α -derivation of R , that is, δ is an additive map such that $\delta(ab) = \delta(a)b + \alpha(a)\delta(b)$, for all $a, b \in R$. We use $P(R)$, $N_r(R)$ and $N(R)$ to denote the prime radical, the upper nil radical and the set of all nilpotent elements of R , respectively.

According to Krempa [15], an endomorphism α of a ring R is called *rigid* if $a\alpha(a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$ for $a \in R$. R is called an α -rigid ring [9] if there exists a rigid endomorphism α of R . Note that any rigid endomorphism of a ring is a monomorphism and α -rigid rings are reduced by Hong et al. [9]. Properties of α -rigid rings have been studied in Krempa [15], Hirano [7] and Hong et al. [11] and [9].

On the other hand, a ring R is called *2-primal* if $P(R) = N(R)$ (see [2]). Every reduced ring is obviously a 2-primal ring. Moreover, 2-primal rings have been extended to the class of rings which satisfy $N_r(R) = N(R)$, but the converse does not hold ([3], Example 3.3). Observe that R is a 2-primal ring if and only if $P(R) = N_r(R) = N(R)$, if and only if $P(R)$ is a completely semiprime ideal (i.e., $a^2 \in P(R)$ implies $a \in P(R)$ for $a \in R$) of R . We refer to [2, 3, 7, 10, 14, 18, 19]

Received May 29, 2006.

Mathematics Subject Classification. primary 16W20, 16N40, 16S36, secondary 16W60.

Key words and phrases. α -compatible rings, Ore extensions, skew power series, α -rigid rings, prime and upper nil radicals.

for more detail on 2-primal rings. Recall that a ring R is called *strongly prime* if R is prime with no nonzero nil ideals. An ideal P of R is *strongly prime* if R/P is a strongly prime ring. All (strongly) prime ideals are taken to be proper. We say an ideal P of a ring R is *minimal (strongly) prime* if P is minimal among (strongly) prime ideals of R . Note that (see [17])

$$N_r(R) = \cap\{P \mid P \text{ is a minimal strongly prime ideal of } R\}.$$

Recall that an ideal P of R is *completely prime* if $ab \in P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$ for $a, b \in R$. Every completely prime ideal of R is strongly prime and every strongly prime ideal is prime.

According to Hong et al. [11], for an endomorphism α of a ring R , an α -ideal I is called an α -*rigid ideal* if $a\alpha(a) \in I$ implies $a \in I$ for $a \in R$. Hong et al. [11] studied connections between the α -rigid ideals of R and the related ideals of some ring extensions. They also studied the relationship of $P(R)$ and $N_r(R)$ of R with the prime radical and the upper nil radical of the Ore extension $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$ of R in the cases when either $P(R)$ or $N_r(R)$ is an α -rigid ideal of R , obtaining the following result: Let $P(R)$ (resp. $N_r(R)$) be an α -rigid δ -ideal of R . Then

$$P(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq P(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$$

(resp. $N_r(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq N_r(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$). Hong et al. [11] provided an example to show that the condition “ $P(R)$ is α -rigid” is not superfluous.

In [6], the authors defined α -compatible rings, which are a generalization of α -rigid rings. A ring R is called α -*compatible* if for each $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0 \Leftrightarrow a\alpha(b) = 0$. Moreover, R is said to be δ -*compatible* if for each $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0 \Rightarrow a\delta(b) = 0$. If R is both α -compatible and δ -compatible, we say that R is (α, δ) -*compatible*. In this case, clearly the endomorphism α is injective. In ([6], Lemma 2.2), the authors showed that R is α -rigid if and only if R is α -compatible and reduced. Thus the α -compatible ring is a generalization of an α -rigid ring to the more general case where R is not assumed to be reduced.

Motivated by the above facts, for an endomorphism α of a ring R , we define α -compatible ideals in R which are a generalization of α -rigid ideals. For an ideal I , we say that I is an α -*compatible ideal* of R if for each $a, b \in R$, $ab \in I \Leftrightarrow a\alpha(b) \in I$. Moreover, I is said to be a δ -*compatible ideal* if for each $a, b \in R$, $ab \in I \Rightarrow a\delta(b) \in I$. If I is both α -compatible and δ -compatible, we say that I is an (α, δ) -*compatible ideal*. The definition is quite natural, in the light of its similarity with the notion of α -rigid ideals. Here, in Proposition 2.4, we will show that I is an α -rigid ideal if and only if I is an α -compatible ideal and completely semiprime.

In this paper we first give some examples of (α, δ) -compatible ideals which are not α -rigid. Then, we study connections between (α, δ) -compatible ideals of R and related ideals of some ring extensions. Also we investigate the relationship of $P(R)$ and $N_r(R)$ of R with the prime radical and the upper nil radical of the Ore extension $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$ and the skew power series $R[[x; \alpha]]$.

Recall that an ideal I of R is called an α -*ideal* if $\alpha(I) \subseteq I$; I is called α -*invariant* if $\alpha^{-1}(I) = I$; I is called a δ -*ideal* if $\delta(I) \subseteq I$; I is called an (α, δ) -*ideal* if it is both an α - and a δ -ideal. If I is an (α, δ) -ideal, then $\bar{\alpha} : R/I \rightarrow R/I$ defined by $\bar{\alpha}(a + I) = \alpha(a) + I$ is an endomorphism and $\bar{\delta} : R/I \rightarrow R/I$ defined by $\bar{\delta}(a + I) = \delta(a) + I$ is an $\bar{\alpha}$ -derivation.

2. The prime and upper nil radicals of Ore extensions

In this section, our focus of study will be on the prime and the upper nil radicals of a ring R and those of the Ore extension $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$ and the skew power series ring $R[[x; \alpha]]$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let I be an ideal of a ring R . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) I is an (α, δ) -compatible ideal.
- (2) R/I is $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta})$ -compatible.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Clearly I is an (α, δ) -ideal. Let $(a + I)(b + I) = 0$ in R/I . Then $ab \in I$. Hence $a\alpha(b) \in I$. Thus $(a + I)\bar{\alpha}(b + I) = 0$. Similarly, $(a + I)\bar{\alpha}(b + I) = 0$ implies $(a + I)(b + I) = 0$. If $(a + I)(b + I) = 0$, then $ab \in I$, so that $a\delta(b) \in I$. Hence $(a + I)\bar{\delta}(b + I) = 0$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) This is similar to the proof of (1) \Rightarrow (2). □

Lemma 2.2. *Let I be an α -compatible ideal of a ring R . Then I is α -invariant.*

Proof. Let $\alpha(a) \in I$. Then $1\alpha(a) \in I$ and so $a \in I$, since I is α -compatible. Thus I is an α -invariant ideal. □

Recall from [16] that a one-sided ideal I of a ring R has the *insertion of factors property* (or simply, IFP) if $ab \in I$ implies $aRb \subseteq I$ for $a, b \in R$ (H.E. Bell in 1970 introduced this notion for $I = 0$).

The following proposition extends ([6], Lemma 2.1).

Proposition 2.3. *Let I be an (α, δ) -compatible ideal of R and $a, b \in R$.*

- (1) *If $ab \in I$, then $a\alpha^n(b) \in I$ and $\alpha^n(a)b \in I$ for every positive integer n . Conversely, if $a\alpha^k(b)$ or $\alpha^k(a)b \in I$ for some positive integer k , then $ab \in I$.*
- (2) *If $ab \in I$, then $\alpha^m(a)\delta^n(b), \delta^n(a)\alpha^m(b) \in I$ for any nonnegative integers m, n .*

Proof. (1) If $ab \in I$, then $\alpha^n(a)\alpha^n(b) \in I$, since I is an α -ideal. Hence $\alpha^n(a)b \in I$, since I is α -compatible. If $\alpha^k(a)b \in I$, then $\alpha^k(a)\alpha^k(b) \in I$, since I is α -compatible. Hence $\alpha^k(ab) \in I$ and $ab \in I$, since I is α -invariant, by Lemma 2.2.

(2) It is enough to show that $\delta(a)\alpha(b) \in I$. If $ab \in I$, then by (1) and δ -compatibility of I , $\alpha(a)\delta(b) \in I$. Hence $\delta(a)b = \delta(ab) - \alpha(a)\delta(b) \in I$. Thus $\delta(a)b \in I$ and $\delta(a)\alpha(b) \in I$, since I is α -compatible. □

Proposition 2.4. *Let R be a ring, I be an ideal of R and $\alpha : R \rightarrow R$ be an endomorphism of R . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) I is an α -rigid ideal of R .
- (2) I is α -compatible, semiprime and satisfies the IFP property.
- (3) I is α -compatible and completely semiprime.

If δ is an α -derivation of R , then the following are equivalent:

- (4) I is an α -rigid δ -ideal of R .
- (5) I is (α, δ) -compatible, semiprime and satisfies the IFP property.
- (6) I is (α, δ) -compatible and completely semiprime.

Proof. (1)⇒(2) This follows from ([11], Propositions 2.2 and 2.4).

(2)⇒(1) Let $a\alpha(a) \in I$. Then $a^2 \in I$, since I is α -compatible. Hence $aRa \subseteq I$, since I satisfies the IFP property. Thus $a \in I$, since I is semiprime.

(4)⇒(6) By (1)⇒(3), I is α -compatible and completely semiprime. We show that $a\delta(b) \in I$, when $ab \in I$. If $ab \in I$, then $\delta(ab) = \alpha(a)\delta(b) + \delta(a)b \in \delta(I) \subseteq I$. Thus $(\alpha(a)\delta(b))^2 = \delta(ab)\alpha(a)\delta(b) - \delta(a)b\alpha(a)\delta(b) \in I$, because $\delta(ab), b\alpha(a) \in I$. Since I is completely semiprime, we have $\alpha(a)\delta(b) \in I$ and so $a\delta(b) \in I$, by Proposition 2.3. □

In [6], the authors give some examples of (α, δ) -compatible rings which are not α -rigid. Note that there exists a ring R for which every nonzero proper ideal is α -compatible but R is not α -compatible. For example, consider the ring

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix},$$

where F is a field, and the endomorphism α of R is defined by $\alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ for $a, b, c \in F$.

The following examples show that there exist α -compatible ideals that are not α -rigid.

Example 2.5. Let F be a field. Let $R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} f & f_1 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix} \mid f, f_1 \in F[x] \right\}$, where $F[x]$ is the ring of polynomials over F . Then R is a subring of the 2×2 matrix ring over the ring $F[x]$. Let $\alpha : R \rightarrow R$ be an automorphism defined by $\alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} f & f_1 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} f & uf_1 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix}$, where u is a fixed nonzero element of F . Let $p(x)$ be an irreducible polynomial in $F[x]$. Let $I = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & f_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid f_1 \in \langle p(x) \rangle \right\}$, where $\langle p(x) \rangle$ is the principal ideal of $F[x]$ generated by $p(x)$. Then I is an α -compatible ideal of R but it is not α -rigid. Indeed, since $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & g(x) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & g(x) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in I$, but $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & g(x) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin I$ for $g(x) \notin \langle p(x) \rangle$. Thus I is not α -rigid.

Example 2.6 ([12], Example 2). Let \mathbb{Z}_2 be the field of integers modulo 2 and $A = \mathbb{Z}_2[a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2, c]$ be the free algebra of polynomials with zero constant term in noncommuting indeterminates $a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1, b_2, c$ over \mathbb{Z}_2 . Note that A is a ring without identity. Consider an ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_2 + A$, say I , generated by $a_0b_0, a_1b_2 + a_2b_1, a_0b_1 + a_1b_0, a_0b_2 + a_1b_1 + a_2b_0, a_2b_2, a_0rb_0, a_2rb_2, (a_0 + a_1 + a_2)r(b_0 + b_1 + b_2)$ with $r \in A$ and $r_1r_2r_3r_4$ with $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 \in A$. Then I satisfies the IFP property. Let $\alpha : R \rightarrow R$ be an inner automorphism (i.e., there exists an invertible element $u \in R$ such that $\alpha(r) = u^{-1}ru$ for each $r \in R$). Then I is α -compatible, since I satisfies the IFP property. But I is not α -rigid, since I is not completely semiprime.

Definition 2.7. Given α and δ as above and integers $j \geq i \geq 0$, let us write f_i^j for the sum of all “words” in α and δ in which there are i factors of α and $j - i$ factors of δ . For instance, $f_j^j = \alpha^j, f_0^j = \delta^j$ and $f_{j-1}^j = \alpha^{j-1}\delta + \alpha^{j-2}\delta\alpha + \dots + \delta\alpha^{j-1}$.

Note that if I is an (α, δ) -ideal of R , then $I[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is an ideal of the Ore extension $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$.

Theorem 2.8. *Let I be an (α, δ) -compatible semiprime ideal of R . Assume $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$ and $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m b_j x^j \in R[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $f(x)R[x; \alpha, \delta]g(x) \subseteq I[x; \alpha, \delta]$.
- (2) $a_i R b_j \subseteq I$ for each i, j .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume $f(x)R[x; \alpha, \delta]g(x) \subseteq I[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Then

$$(\dagger) \quad (a_0 + \cdots + a_n x^n)c(b_0 + \cdots + b_m x^m) \in I[x; \alpha, \delta] \text{ for each } c \in R.$$

Hence $a_n \alpha^n (cb_m) \in I$. Thus $a_n cb_m \in I$, since I is α -compatible. Therefore $a_n f_i^j (cb_m) \in I$, by Proposition 2.3. Next, replace c by $cb_{m-1} da_n e$, where $c, d, e \in R$. Then $(a_0 + \cdots + a_n x^n)cb_{m-1} da_n e(b_0 + \cdots + b_{m-1} x^{m-1}) \in I[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Hence $a_n \alpha^n (cb_{m-1} da_n e b_{m-1}) \in I$ and $a_n cb_{m-1} da_n e b_{m-1} \in I$, since I is α -compatible. Thus $(Ra_n R b_{m-1})^2 \subseteq I$. Hence $Ra_n R b_{m-1} \subseteq I$, since I is semiprime. Continuing this process, we obtain $a_n R b_k \subseteq I$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Hence by (α, δ) -compatibility of I , we get $(a_0 + \cdots + a_n x^n)R[x; \alpha, \delta](b_0 + \cdots + b_{m-1} x^{m-1}) \subseteq I[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Using induction on $n + m$, we obtain $a_i R b_j \subseteq I$ for each i, j .

(2) \Rightarrow (1) This follows from Proposition 2.3. □

Corollary 2.9. *If I is a (semi)prime (α, δ) -compatible ideal of R , then $I[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is a (semi)prime ideal of $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$.*

Proof. Assume that I is a prime (α, δ) -compatible ideal of R . Let $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$ and $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m b_j x^j \in R[x; \alpha, \delta]$ such that $f(x)R[x; \alpha, \delta]g(x) \subseteq I[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Then $a_i R b_j \subseteq I$ for each i, j , by Theorem 2.8. Assume $g(x) \notin I[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Hence $b_j \notin I$ for some j . Thus $a_i \in I$ for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, since I is prime. Therefore $f(x) \in I[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Consequently, $I[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is a prime ideal of $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$. □

Theorem 2.10. *If each minimal prime ideal of R is (α, δ) -compatible, then $P(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq P(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 2.9. □

The following example shows that there exists a ring R such that all minimal prime ideals are α -compatible, but are not α -rigid.

Example 2.11. Let $R = Mat_2(\mathbb{Z}_4)$ be the 2×2 matrix ring over the ring \mathbb{Z}_4 . Then $P(R) = \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cc} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{array} \right) \mid a_{ij} \in \bar{2}\mathbb{Z} \right\}$ is the only prime ideal of R . Let $\alpha : R \rightarrow R$

be the endomorphism defined by $\alpha \left(\left(\begin{array}{cc} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{array} \right) \right) = \left(\begin{array}{cc} a_{11} & -a_{12} \\ -a_{21} & a_{22} \end{array} \right)$. Then α is an automorphism of R and $P(R)$ is α -compatible. However, $P(R)$ is not α -rigid, since $\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \alpha \left(\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \right) \in P(R)$, but $\left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \notin P(R)$.

Theorem 2.12. *If P is a completely (semi)prime (α, δ) -compatible ideal of R , then $P[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is a completely (semi)prime ideal of $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$.*

Proof. Let P be a completely prime ideal of R . R/P is a domain, hence it is a reduced ring. R/P is a $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta})$ -compatible ring, hence R/P is $\bar{\alpha}$ -rigid, by ([6], Lemma 2.2). Let $\overline{f(x)}, \overline{g(x)} \in R/P[x; \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta}]$ such that $\overline{f(x)} \overline{g(x)} = 0$. Then $\overline{f(x)} = 0$ or $\overline{g(x)} = 0$, by ([9], Proposition 6). Thus $R[x; \alpha, \delta]/P[x; \alpha, \delta] \cong R/P[x; \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta}]$ is a domain and $P[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is a completely prime ideal of $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$. □

Corollary 2.13 ([11], Proposition 3.8). *If $P(R)$ is an α -rigid δ -ideal of R , then $P(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq P(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$.*

Proof. $P(R)$ is an α -rigid δ -ideal, hence $P(R)$ is a completely semiprime (α, δ) -compatible ideal of R , by Proposition 2.4. Therefore $P(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq P(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$, by Theorem 2.12. \square

Theorem 2.14. *If P is a strongly (semi)prime (α, δ) -compatible ideal of R , then $P[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is a strongly (semi)prime ideal of $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.9, $P[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is a prime ideal of $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$. Hence

$$R[x; \alpha, \delta]/P[x; \alpha, \delta] \cong R/P[x; \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta}]$$

is a prime ring. We claim that zero is the only nil ideal of $R/P[x; \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta}]$. Let J be a nil ideal of $R/P[x; \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta}]$. Assume I be the set of all leading coefficients of elements of J . First we show that I is an ideal of R/P . Clearly I is a left ideal of R/P . Let $\bar{a} \in I$ and $\bar{r} \in R/P$. Then there exists $\bar{f}(x) = \bar{a}_0 + \dots + \bar{a}_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \bar{a}x^n \in J$. Hence $(\bar{f}(x)\bar{r})^m = 0$ for some nonnegative integer m . Thus $\bar{a} \bar{\alpha}^n (\bar{r}\bar{\alpha}) \dots \bar{\alpha}^{(m-1)n} (\bar{r}\bar{\alpha}) \bar{\alpha}^{mn} (\bar{r})^m = 0$, since it is the leading coefficient of $(\bar{f}(x)\bar{r})^m$. Therefore $(\bar{a}\bar{r})^m = 0$, since R/P is $\bar{\alpha}$ -compatible. Consequently, I is an ideal of R/P . Clearly I is a nil ideal of R/P . Hence $I = 0$ and so $J = 0$. Therefore $P[x; \alpha, \delta]$ is a strongly prime ideal of $R[x; \alpha, \delta]$. \square

Theorem 2.15. *If each minimal strongly prime ideal of R is (α, δ) -compatible, then $N_r(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq N_r(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$.*

Corollary 2.16 ([11], Proposition 3.8). *If $N_r(R)$ is an α -rigid δ -ideal of R , then $N_r(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq N_r(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$.*

Proof. $N_r(R)$ is an α -rigid δ -ideal, hence $N_r(R)$ is a completely semiprime (α, δ) -compatible ideal of R , by Proposition 2.4, and $N_r(R)$ is a strongly semiprime ideal of R . Therefore $N_r(R[x; \alpha, \delta]) \subseteq N_r(R)[x; \alpha, \delta]$, by Theorem 2.15. \square

As a parallel result to Theorems 2.8, 2.10, 2.12, 2.14 and 2.15, we have the following results for the skew power series ring $R[[x; \alpha]]$.

Proposition 2.17. *Let I be an α -compatible semiprime ideal of R . Assume $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i x^i$ and $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j x^j \in R[[x; \alpha]]$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $f(x)R[[x; \alpha]]g(x) \subseteq I[[x; \alpha]]$.
- (2) $a_i R b_j \subseteq I$ for each i, j .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume $f(x)R[[x; \alpha]]g(x) \subseteq I[[x; \alpha]]$. Let c be an arbitrary element of R . Then we have the following:

$$(\S) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i+j=k} a_i x^i c b_j x^j \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i+j=k} a_i \alpha^i (c b_j) \right) x^k \in I[[x; \alpha]].$$

By induction on $i + j$, we show that $a_i R b_j \subseteq I$ for all i, j . From Equation (\S), we obtain $a_0 R b_0 \subseteq I$. This prove for $i + j = 0$. Now suppose that $a_i R b_j \subseteq I$ for

$i + j \leq n - 1$. From Equation (§), we have

$$(\S\S) \quad \sum_{i+j=k} a_i \alpha^i (cb_j) \in I \text{ for all } k \geq 0.$$

Let c, d, e be arbitrary elements of R . For $k = n$ replace c by $cb_n da_0 e$. Then we obtain $a_0 cb_n da_0 eb_n \in I$, since $a_0 Rb_j \subseteq I$ for each $j \leq n - 1$. Hence $(Ra_0 Rb_n)^2 \subseteq I$ and so $Ra_0 Rb_n \subseteq I$, since I is semiprime. Continuing this process (replacing c by $cb_j da_{n-j} e$ in Equation (§§) for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ and using α -compatibility of I), we obtain $a_i Rb_j \subseteq I$ for $i + j = n$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) This follows from Proposition 2.3. \square

Corollary 2.18. *If I is a (semi)prime α -compatible ideal of R , then $I[[x; \alpha]]$ is a (semi)prime ideal of $R[[x; \alpha]]$.*

Theorem 2.19. *If each minimal prime ideal of R is α -compatible, then $P(R[[x; \alpha]]) \subseteq P(R)[[x; \alpha]]$.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 2.18. \square

Theorem 2.20. *If P is a completely (semi)prime α -compatible ideal of R , then $P[[x; \alpha]]$ is a completely (semi)prime ideal of $R[[x; \alpha]]$.*

Proof. Let P be a completely prime ideal of R . R/P is a domain, hence it is a reduced ring. $\overline{R/P}$ is an $\bar{\alpha}$ -compatible ring, hence $\overline{R/P}$ is $\bar{\alpha}$ -rigid, by ([6], Lemma 2.2). Let $\overline{f(x)}, \overline{g(x)} \in \overline{R/P}[[x; \bar{\alpha}]]$ such that $\overline{f(x)} \overline{g(x)} = 0$. Then $\overline{f(x)} = 0$ or $\overline{g(x)} = 0$, by ([9], Proposition 17). Thus $R[[x; \alpha]]/P[[x; \alpha]] \cong \overline{R/P}[[x; \bar{\alpha}]$ is a domain and $P[[x; \alpha]]$ is a completely prime ideal of $R[[x; \alpha]]$. \square

Corollary 2.21 ([11], Proposition 3.12). *If $P(R)$ is an α -rigid ideal of R , then $P(R[[x; \alpha]]) \subseteq P(R)[[x; \alpha]]$.*

Theorem 2.22. *If P is a strongly prime α -compatible ideal of R , then $P[[x; \alpha]]$ is a strongly prime ideal of $R[[x; \alpha]]$.*

Theorem 2.23. *If each minimal strongly prime ideal of R is α -compatible, then $N_r(R[[x; \alpha]]) \subseteq N_r(R)[[x; \alpha]]$.*

Corollary 2.24 ([11], Proposition 3.12). *If $N_r(R)$ is an α -rigid ideal of R , then $N_r(R[[x; \alpha]]) \subseteq N_r(R)[[x; \alpha]]$.*

References

- [1] Annin, Scott. Associated primes over skew polynomials rings. *Comm. Algebra* **30** (2002), no. 5, 2511–2528. MR1904650 (2003c:16039). Erratum. *Comm. Algebra* **30** (2002), no. 10, 5109–5110. MR1940490 (2003k:16037).
- [2] Birkenmeier, Gary F.; Heatherly, Henry E.; Lee, Enoch K. Completely prime ideals and associated radicals. *Ring theory* (Granville, OH, 1992), 102–129, *World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ*, 1993. MR1344225 (96e:16025), Zbl 0853.16022.
- [3] Birkenmeier, Gary F.; Kim, Jin Yong; Park, Jae Keol. Regularity conditions and the simplicity of prime factor rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **115** (1997), no. 3, 213–230. MR1431833 (97k:16006), Zbl 0870.16006. Corrigendum. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **149** (2000), no. 1, 105. MR1760908 (2001d:16019).
- [4] Ferrero, Miguel. Radicals of skew polynomial rings and skew Laurent polynomial rings. *Math. J. Okayama Univ.* **29** (1987), 119–126 (1988). MR0936735 (89d:16001), Zbl 0647.16004.
- [5] Hashemi, E. Radicals of skew Laurent polynomial rings. To appear.

- [6] Hashemi, E.; Moussavi, A. Polynomial extensions of quasi-Baer rings. *Acta Math. Hungar.* **107** (2005), no. 3, 207–224. MR2148584 (2006c:16048), Zbl 1081.16032.
- [7] Hirano, Yasuyuki. Some studies on strongly π -regular rings. *Math. J. Okayama Univ.* **20** (1978), no. 2, 141–149. MR0519561 (80i:16020), Zbl 0394.16011.
- [8] Hirano, Yasuyuki. On the uniqueness of rings of coefficients in skew polynomial rings. *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **54** (1999), no. 3-4, 489–495. MR1694531 (2000b:16055), Zbl 0930.16018.
- [9] Hong, Chan Yong; Kim, Nam Kyun; Kwak, Tai Keun. Ore extensions of Baer and p.p.-rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **151** (2000), no. 3, 215–226. MR1776431 (2001f:16054), Zbl 0982.16021.
- [10] Hong, Chan Yong; Kwak, Tai Keun. On minimal strongly prime ideals. *Comm. Algebra* **28** (2000), no. 10, 4867–4878. MR1779879 (2001g:16005), Zbl 0981.16001.
- [11] Hong, Chan Yong; Kwak, Tai Keun; Rizvi, S. Tariq. Rigid ideals and radicals of Ore extensions. *Algebra Colloq.* **12** (2005), no. 3, 399–412. MR2144995 (2006g:16063).
- [12] Huh, Chan; Lee, Yang; Smoktunowicz, Agata. Armendariz rings and semicommutative rings. *Comm. Algebra* **30** (2002), no. 2, 751–761. MR1883022 (2002j:16037), Zbl 1023.16005.
- [13] Jordan, D. A. Bijective extensions of injective ring endomorphisms. *J. London Math. Soc.* **35** (1982), no. 3, 435–448. MR0657500 (83j:16002), Zbl 0486.16002.
- [14] Kim, Nam Kyun; Kwak, Tai Keun. Minimal prime ideals in 2-primal rings. *Math. Japonica* **50** (1999), no. 3, 415–420. MR1727666 (2000h:16002), Zbl 0943.16002.
- [15] Krempa, Jan. Some examples of reduced rings. *Algebra Colloq.* **3** (1996), no. 4, 289–300. MR1422968 (98e:16027), Zbl 0859.16019.
- [16] Mason, Gordon. Reflexive ideals. *Comm. Algebra* **9** (1981), no. 17, 1709–1724. MR0631884 (83b:16017), Zbl 0468.16024.
- [17] Rowen, Louis H. Ring Theory. Vol. I. Pure and Applied Math., 127. *Academic Press, Boston*, 1988. MR0940245 (89h:16001), Zbl 0651.16001.
- [18] Shin, Gooyong. Prime ideals and sheaf representation of a pseudo symmetric ring. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **184** (1973), 43–60 (1974). MR0338058 (49 #2825), Zbl 0283.16021.
- [19] Sun, Shu Hao. Noncommutative rings in which every prime ideal is contained in a unique maximal ideal. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **76** (1991), no. 2, 179–192. MR1145866 (93b:16058), Zbl 0747.16001.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHAHROOD UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SHAHROOD, IRAN,
P.O.Box: 316-3619995161
eb_hashemi@yahoo.com or eb_hashemi@shahrood.ac.ir

This paper is available via <http://nyjm.albany.edu/j/2006/12-20.html>.