

# ON $f$ -DERIVATIONS OF BCI-ALGEBRAS

JIANMING ZHAN AND YONG LIN LIU

Received 14 December 2004 and in revised form 16 May 2005

The notion of left-right (resp., right-left)  $f$ -derivation of a BCI-algebra is introduced, and some related properties are investigated. Using the idea of regular  $f$ -derivation, we give characterizations of a  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra.

## 1. Introduction and preliminaries

In the theory of rings and near-rings, the properties of derivations are an important topic to study, see [2, 3, 7, 10]. In [6], Jun and Xin applied the notions in rings and near-rings theory to BCI-algebras, and obtained some related properties. In this paper, the notion of left-right (resp., right-left)  $f$ -derivation of a BCI-algebra is introduced, and some related properties are investigated. Using the idea of regular  $f$ -derivation, we give characterizations of a  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra.

By a BCI-algebra we mean an algebra  $(X; *, 0)$  of type  $(2,0)$  satisfying the following conditions:

$$(I) ((x * y) * (x * z)) * (z * y) = 0;$$

$$(II) (x * (x * y)) * y = 0;$$

$$(III) x * x = 0;$$

$$(IV) x * y = 0 \text{ and } y * x = 0 \text{ imply that } x = y;$$

for all  $x, y, z \in X$ .

In any BCI-algebra  $X$ , one can define a partial order “ $\leq$ ” by putting  $x \leq y$  if and only if  $x * y = 0$ .

A subset  $S$  of a BCI-algebra  $X$  is called *subalgebra* of  $X$  if  $x * y \in S$  for all  $x, y \in S$ . A subset  $I$  of a BCI-algebra  $X$  is called an *ideal* of  $X$  if it satisfies (i)  $0 \in I$ ; (ii)  $x * y \in I$  and  $y \in I$  imply that  $x \in I$  for all  $x, y \in X$ .

A mapping  $f$  of a BCI-algebra  $X$  into itself is called an *endomorphism* of  $X$  if  $f(x * y) = f(x) * f(y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . Note that  $f(0) = 0$ . Especially,  $f$  is *monic* if for any  $x, y \in X$ ,  $f(x) = f(y)$  implies that  $x = y$ .

A BCI-algebra  $X$  has the following properties:

$$(1) x * 0 = x;$$

$$(2) (x * y) * z = (x * z) * y;$$

- (3)  $x \leq y$  implies that  $x * z \leq y * z$  and  $z * y \leq z * x$ ;
- (4)  $x * (x * (x * y)) = x * y$ ;
- (5)  $(x * z) * (y * z) \leq x * y$ ;
- (6)  $0 * (x * y) = (0 * x) * (0 * y)$ ;
- (7)  $x * 0 = 0$  implies that  $x = 0$ .

For a BCI-algebra  $X$ , denote by  $X_+$  (resp.,  $G(X)$ ) the BCK-part (resp., the BCI-G part) of  $X$ , that is,  $X_+ = \{x \in X \mid 0 \leq x\}$  (resp.,  $G(X) = \{x \in X \mid 0 * x = x\}$ ). Note that  $G(X) \cap X_+ = \{0\}$ . If  $X_+ = \{0\}$ , then  $X$  is called a  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra.

In a  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra  $X$ , the following hold:

- (8)  $(x * z) * (y * z) = x * y$ ;
- (9)  $0 * (0 * x) = x$ ;
- (10)  $x * (0 * y) = y * (0 * x)$ ;
- (11)  $x * y = 0$  implies that  $x = y$ ;
- (12)  $x * a = x * b$  implies that  $a = b$ ;
- (13)  $a * x = b * x$  implies that  $a = b$ ;
- (14)  $a * (a * x) = x$ .

Let  $X$  be a  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra. We define addition “+” as  $x + y = x * (0 * y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . Then  $(X, +)$  is an abelian group with identity 0 and  $x - y = x * y$ . Conversely, let  $(X, +)$  be an abelian group with identity 0 and let  $x * y = x - y$ . Then  $X$  is a  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra and  $x + y = x * (0 * y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$  (see [5]).

For a BCI-algebra  $X$ , we denote  $x \wedge y = y * (y * x)$ , in particular,  $0 * (0 * x) = a_x$ , and  $L_p(X) = \{a \in X \mid x * a = 0 \Rightarrow x = a \text{ for all } x \in X\}$ . We call the elements of  $L_p(X)$  the  $p$ -atoms of  $X$ . For any  $a \in X$ , let  $V(a) = \{x \in X \mid a * x = 0\}$ , which is called the branch of  $X$  with respect to  $a$ . It follows that  $x * y \in V(a * b)$  whenever  $x \in V(a)$  and  $y \in V(b)$  for all  $x, y \in X$  and  $a, b \in L_p(X)$ . Note that  $L_p(X) = \{x \in X \mid a_x = x\}$ , which is the  $p$ -semisimple part of  $X$ , and  $X$  is a  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra if and only if  $L_p(X) = X$  (see [6]). Note also that  $a_x \in L_p(X)$ , that is,  $0 * (0 * a_x) = a_x$ , which implies that  $a_x * y \in L_p(X)$  for all  $y \in X$ . It is clear that  $G(X) \subseteq L_p(X)$ ,  $x * (x * a) = a$ , and  $a * x \in L_p(X)$  for all  $a \in L_p(X)$  and  $x \in X$ . For more details, refer to [1, 8, 11].

**Definition 1.1** [9]. A BCI-algebra  $X$  is said to be *commutative* if  $x = x \wedge y$  whenever  $x \leq y$  for all  $x, y \in X$ .

**Definition 1.2** [4]. A BCI-algebra  $X$  is said to be *branchwise commutative* if  $x \wedge y = y \wedge x$  for all  $x, y \in V(a)$  and all  $a \in L_p(X)$ .

**LEMMA 1.3** [6]. A BCI-algebra  $X$  is commutative if and only if it is branchwise commutative.

**Definition 1.4** [6]. Let  $X$  be a BCI-algebra. By a *left-right derivation* (briefly,  $(l, r)$ -derivation) of  $X$ , a self-map  $d$  of  $X$  satisfying the identity  $d(x * y) = (d(x) * y) \wedge (x * d(y))$  for all  $x, y \in X$  is meant. If  $d$  satisfies the identity  $d(x * y) = (x * d(y)) \wedge (d(x) * y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ , then it is said that  $d$  is a *right-left derivation* (briefly,  $(r, l)$ -derivation) of  $X$ . Moreover, if  $d$  is both an  $(r, l)$ - and an  $(l, r)$ -derivation, it is said that  $d$  is a *derivation*.

## 2. $f$ -derivations

In what follows, let  $f$  be an endomorphism of  $X$  unless otherwise specified.

*Definition 2.1.* Let  $X$  be a BCI-algebra. By a *left-right  $f$ -derivation (briefly,  $(l,r)$ - $f$ -derivation)* of  $X$ , a self-map  $d_f$  of  $X$  satisfying the identity  $d_f(x * y) = (d_f(x) * f(y)) \wedge (f(x) * d_f(y))$  for all  $x, y \in X$  is meant, where  $f$  is an endomorphism of  $X$ . If  $d_f$  satisfies the identity  $d_f(x * y) = (f(x) * d_f(y)) \wedge (d_f(x) * f(y))$  for all  $x, y \in X$ , then it is said that  $d_f$  is a *right-left  $f$ -derivation (briefly,  $(r,l)$ - $f$ -derivation)* of  $X$ . Moreover, if  $d_f$  is both an  $(r,l)$ - and an  $(l,r)$ - $f$ -derivation, it is said that  $d_f$  is an  *$f$ -derivation*.

*Example 2.2.* Let  $X = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  be a BCI-algebra with the following Cayley table:

$*$	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	2	2	2	2
1	1	0	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	0	0	0	0
3	3	2	1	0	0	0
4	4	2	1	1	0	1
5	5	2	1	1	1	0

Define a map  $d_f : X \rightarrow X$  by

$$d_f(x) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } x = 0, 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

and define an endomorphism  $f$  of  $X$  by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, 1, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Then it is easily checked that  $d_f$  is both derivation and  $f$ -derivation of  $X$ .

*Example 2.3.* Let  $X$  be a BCI-algebra as in Example 2.2. Define a map  $d_f : X \rightarrow X$  by

$$d_f(x) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } x = 0, 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Then it is easily checked that  $d_f$  is a derivation of  $X$ .

Define an endomorphism  $f$  of  $X$  by

$$f(x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in X. \tag{2.4}$$

Then  $d_f$  is not an  $f$ -derivation of  $X$  since

$$d_f(2 * 3) = d_f(0) = 2, \tag{2.5}$$

but

$$(d_f(2) * f(3)) \wedge (f(2) * d_f(3)) = (0 * 0) \wedge (0 * 0) = 0 \wedge 0 = 0, \tag{2.6}$$

and thus  $d_f(2 * 3) \neq (d_f(2) * f(3)) \wedge (f(2) * d_f(3))$ .

*Remark 2.4.* From Example 2.3, we know that there is a derivation of  $X$  which is not an  $f$ -derivation of  $X$ .

*Example 2.5.* Let  $X = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  be a BCI-algebra with the following Cayley table:

$*$	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	3	2	3	2
1	1	0	5	4	3	2
2	2	2	0	3	0	3
3	3	3	2	0	2	0
4	4	2	1	5	0	3
5	5	3	4	1	2	0

Define a map  $d_f : X \rightarrow X$  by

$$d_f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, 1, \\ 2 & \text{if } x = 2, 4, \\ 3 & \text{if } x = 3, 5, \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

and define an endomorphism  $f$  of  $X$  by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, 1, \\ 2 & \text{if } x = 2, 4, \\ 3 & \text{if } x = 3, 5. \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

Then it is easily checked that  $d_f$  is both derivation and  $f$ -derivation of  $X$ .

*Example 2.6.* Let  $X$  be a BCI-algebra as in Example 2.5. Define a map  $d_f : X \rightarrow X$  by

$$d_f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0, 1, \\ 2 & \text{if } x = 2, 4, \\ 3 & \text{if } x = 3, 5. \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

Then it is easily checked that  $d_f$  is a derivation of  $X$ .

Define an endomorphism  $f$  of  $X$  by

$$f(0) = 0, \quad f(1) = 1, \quad f(2) = 3, \quad f(3) = 2, \quad f(4) = 5, \quad f(5) = 4. \tag{2.10}$$

Then  $d_f$  is not an  $f$ -derivation of  $X$  since

$$d_f(2 * 3) = d_f(3) = 3, \tag{2.11}$$

but

$$(d_f(2) * f(3)) \wedge (f(2) * d_f(3)) = (2 * 2) \wedge (3 * 3) = 0 \wedge 0 = 0, \tag{2.12}$$

and thus  $d_f(2 * 3) \neq (d_f(2) * f(3)) \wedge (f(2) * d_f(3))$ .

*Example 2.7.* Let  $X$  be a BCI-algebra as in Example 2.5. Define a map  $d_f : X \rightarrow X$  by

$$d_f(0) = 0, \quad d_f(1) = 1, \quad d_f(2) = 3, \quad d_f(3) = 2, \quad d_f(4) = 5, \quad d_f(5) = 4. \quad (2.13)$$

Then  $d_f$  is not a derivation of  $X$  since

$$d_f(2 * 3) = d_f(3) = 2, \quad (2.14)$$

but

$$(d_f(2) * 3) \wedge (2 * d_f(3)) = (3 * 3) \wedge (2 * 2) = 0 \wedge 0 = 0, \quad (2.15)$$

and thus  $d_f(2 * 3) \neq (d_f(2) * 3) \wedge (2 * d_f(3))$ .

Define an endomorphism  $f$  of  $X$  by

$$f(0) = 0, \quad f(1) = 1, \quad f(2) = 3, \quad f(3) = 2, \quad f(4) = 5, \quad f(5) = 4. \quad (2.16)$$

Then it is easily checked that  $d_f$  is an  $f$ -derivation of  $X$ .

*Remark 2.8.* From Example 2.7, we know that there is an  $f$ -derivation of  $X$  which is not a derivation of  $X$ .

For convenience, we denote  $f_x = 0 * (0 * f(x))$  for all  $x \in X$ . Note that  $f_x \in L_p(X)$ .

**THEOREM 2.9.** *Let  $d_f$  be a self-map of a BCI-algebra  $X$  defined by  $d_f(x) = f_x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then  $d_f$  is an  $(l, r)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . Moreover, if  $X$  is commutative, then  $d_f$  is an  $(r, l)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in X$ .

Since

$$\begin{aligned} 0 * (0 * (f_x * f(y))) &= 0 * (0 * ((0 * (0 * f(x))) * f(y))) \\ &= 0 * (0 * ((0 * f(y)) * (0 * f(x)))) \\ &= 0 * (0 * (0 * f(y * x))) = 0 * f(y * x) \\ &= 0 * (f(y) * f(x)) = (0 * f(y)) * (0 * f(x)) \\ &= (0 * (0 * f(x))) * f(y) = f_x * f(y), \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

we have  $f_x * f(y) \in L_p(X)$ , and thus

$$f_x * f(y) = (f(x) * f_y) * ((f(x) * f_y) * (f_x * f(y))). \quad (2.18)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_f(x * y) &= f_{x*y} = 0 * (0 * f(x * y)) = 0 * (0 * (f(x) * f(y))) \\ &= (0 * (0 * f(x))) * (0 * (0 * f(y))) = f_x * f_y \\ &= (0 * (0 * f_x)) * (0 * (0 * f(y))) = 0 * (0 * (f_x * f(y))) \\ &= f_x * f(y) = (f(x) * f_y) * ((f(x) * f_y) * (f_x * f(y))) \\ &= (f_x * f(y)) \wedge (f(x) * f_y) = (d_f(x) * f(y)) \wedge (f(x) * d_f(y)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

and so  $d_f$  is an  $(l,r)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . Now, assume that  $X$  is commutative. Using Lemma 1.3, it is sufficient to show that  $d_f(x) * f(y)$  and  $f(x) * d_f(y)$  belong to the same branch for all  $x, y \in X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_f(x) * f(y) &= f_x * f(y) = 0 * (0 * (f_x * f(y))) \\ &= (0 * (0 * f_x)) * (0 * (0 * f(y))) \\ &= f_x * f_y \in V(f_x * f_y), \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

and so  $f_x * f_y = (0 * (0 * f(x))) * (0 * (0 * f(y))) = 0 * (0 * (f(x) * f(y))) = 0 * (0 * (f(x) * d_f(y))) \leq f(x) * d_f(y)$ , which implies that  $f(x) * d_f(y) \in V(f_x * f_y)$ . Hence,  $d_f(x) * f(y)$  and  $f(x) * d_f(y)$  belong to the same branch, and so

$$\begin{aligned} d_f(x * y) &= (d_f(x) * f(y)) \wedge (f(x) * d_f(y)) \\ &= (f(x) * d_f(y)) \wedge (d_f(x) * f(y)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

This completes the proof. □

**PROPOSITION 2.10.** *Let  $d_f$  be a self-map of a BCI-algebra  $X$ . Then the following hold.*

- (i) *If  $d_f$  is an  $(l,r)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ , then  $d_f(x) = d_f(x) \wedge f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ .*
- (ii) *If  $d_f$  is an  $(r,l)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ , then  $d_f(x) = f(x) \wedge d_f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$  if and only if  $d_f(0) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Let  $d_f$  be an  $(l,r)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d_f(x) &= d_f(x * 0) = (d_f(x) * f(0)) \wedge (f(x) * d_f(0)) \\ &= (d_f(x) * 0) \wedge (f(x) * d_f(0)) = d_f(x) \wedge (f(x) * d_f(0)) \\ &= (f(x) * d_f(0)) * ((f(x) * d_f(0)) * d_f(x)) \\ &= (f(x) * d_f(0)) * ((f(x) * d_f(x)) * d_f(0)) \\ &\leq f(x) * (f(x) * d_f(x)) = d_f(x) \wedge f(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

But  $d_f(x) \wedge f(x) \leq d_f(x)$  is trivial and so (i) holds.

(ii) Let  $d_f$  be an  $(r,l)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . If  $d_f(x) = f(x) \wedge d_f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ , then for  $x = 0$ ,  $d_f(0) = f(0) \wedge d_f(0) = 0 \wedge d_f(0) = d_f(0) * (d_f(0) * 0) = 0$ .

Conversely, if  $d_f(0) = 0$ , then  $d_f(x) = d_f(x * 0) = (f(x) * d_f(0)) \wedge (d_f(x) * f(0)) = (f(x) * 0) \wedge (d_f(x) * 0) = f(x) \wedge d_f(x)$ , ending the proof. □

**PROPOSITION 2.11.** *Let  $d_f$  be an  $(l,r)$ - $f$ -derivation of a BCI-algebra  $X$ . Then,*

- (i)  $d_f(0) \in L_p(X)$ , that is,  $d_f(0) = 0 * (0 * d_f(0))$ ;
- (ii)  $d_f(a) = d_f(0) * (0 * f(a)) = d_f(0) + f(a)$  for all  $a \in L_p(X)$ ;
- (iii)  $d_f(a) \in L_p(X)$  for all  $a \in L_p(X)$ ;
- (iv)  $d_f(a + b) = d_f(a) + d_f(b) - d_f(0)$  for all  $a, b \in L_p(X)$ .

*Proof.* (i) The proof follows from Proposition 2.10(i).

(ii) Let  $a \in L_p(X)$ , then  $a = 0 * (0 * a)$ , and so  $f(a) = 0 * (0 * f(a))$ , that is,  $f(a) \in L_p(X)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_f(a) &= d_f(0 * (0 * a)) \\
 &= (d_f(0) * f(0 * a)) \wedge (f(0) * d_f(0 * a)) \\
 &= (d_f(0) * f(0 * a)) \wedge (0 * d_f(0 * a)) \\
 &= (0 * d_f(0 * a)) * ((0 * d_f(0 * a)) * (d_f(0) * f(0 * a))) \\
 &= (0 * d_f(0 * a)) * ((0 * (d_f(0) * f(0 * a))) * d_f(0 * a)) \\
 &= 0 * (0 * (d_f(0) * (f(0) * f(a)))) \\
 &= 0 * (0 * (d_f(0) * (0 * f(a)))) \\
 &= d_f(0) * (0 * f(a)) = d_f(0) + f(a).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.23}$$

(iii) The proof follows directly from (ii).

(iv) Let  $a, b \in L_p(X)$ . Note that  $a + b \in L_p(X)$ , so from (ii), we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_f(a + b) &= d_f(0) + f(a + b) \\
 &= d_f(0) + f(a) + d_f(0) + f(b) - d_f(0) = d_f(a) + d_f(b) - d_f(0).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.24}$$

□

**PROPOSITION 2.12.** *Let  $d_f$  be a  $(r, l)$ - $f$ -derivation of a BCI-algebra  $X$ . Then,*

- (i)  $d_f(a) \in G(X)$  for all  $a \in G(X)$ ;
- (ii)  $d_f(a) \in L_p(X)$  for all  $a \in G(X)$ ;
- (iii)  $d_f(a) = f(a) * d_f(0) = f(a) + d_f(0)$  for all  $a \in L_p(X)$ ;
- (iv)  $d_f(a + b) = d_f(a) + d_f(b) - d_f(0)$  for all  $a, b \in L_p(X)$ .

*Proof.* (i) For any  $a \in G(X)$ , we have  $d_f(a) = d_f(0 * a) = (f(0) * d_f(a)) \wedge (d_f(0) * f(a)) = (d_f(0) * f(a)) * ((d_f(0) * f(a)) * (0 * d_f(a))) = 0 * d_f(a)$ , and so  $d_f(a) \in G(X)$ .

(ii) For any  $a \in L_p(X)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_f(a) &= d_f(0 * (0 * a)) = (0 * d_f(0 * a)) \wedge (d_f(0) * f(0 * a)) \\
 &= (d_f(0) * f(0 * a)) * ((d_f(0) * f(0 * a)) * (0 * d_f(0 * a))) \\
 &= 0 * d_f(0 * a) \in L_p(X).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.25}$$

(iii) For any  $a \in L_p(X)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_f(a) &= d_f(a * 0) = (f(a) * d_f(0)) \wedge (d_f(a) * f(0)) \\
 &= d_f(a) * (d_f(a) * (f(a) * d_f(0))) = f(a) * d_f(0) \\
 &= f(a) * (0 * d_f(0)) = f(a) + d_f(0).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.26}$$

(iv) The proof follows from (iii). This completes the proof.

□

Using Proposition 2.12, we know there is an  $(l, r)$ - $f$ -derivation which is not an  $(r, l)$ - $f$ -derivation as shown in the following example.

*Example 2.13.* Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  be the set of all integers and “ $-$ ” the minus operation on  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $(\mathbb{Z}, -, 0)$  is a BCI-algebra. Let  $d_f : X \rightarrow X$  be defined by  $d_f(x) = f(x) - 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (d_f(x) - f(y)) \wedge (f(x) - d_f(y)) &= (f(x) - 1 - f(y)) \wedge (f(x) - (f(y) - 1)) \\ &= (f(x - y) - 1) \wedge (f(x - y) + 1) \\ &= (f(x - y) + 1) - 2 = f(x - y) - 1 \\ &= d_f(x - y). \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

Hence,  $d_f$  is an  $(l, r)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . But  $d_f(0) = f(0) - 1 = -1 \neq 1 = f(0) - d_f(0) = 0 - d_f(0)$ , that is,  $d_f(0) \notin G(X)$ . Therefore,  $d_f$  is not an  $(r, l)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$  by Proposition 2.12(i).

### 3. Regular $f$ -derivations

*Definition 3.1.* An  $f$ -derivation  $d_f$  of a BCI-algebra  $X$  is said to be *regular* if  $d_f(0) = 0$ .

*Remark 3.2.* We know that the  $f$ -derivations  $d_f$  in Examples 2.5 and 2.7 are regular.

**PROPOSITION 3.3.** *Let  $X$  be a commutative BCI-algebra and let  $d_f$  be a regular  $(r, l)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . Then the following hold.*

- (i) Both  $f(x)$  and  $d_f(x)$  belong to the same branch for all  $x \in X$ .
- (ii)  $d_f$  is an  $(l, r)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ .

*Proof.* (i) Let  $x \in X$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= d_f(0) = d_f(a_x * x) \\ &= (f(a_x) * d_f(x)) \wedge (d(a_x) * f(x)) \\ &= (d(a_x) * f(x)) * ((d(a_x) * f(x)) * (f(a_x) * d_f(x))) \\ &= (d(a_x) * f(x)) * ((d(a_x) * f(x)) * (f_x * d_f(x))) \\ &= f_x * d_f(x) \quad \text{since } f_x * d_f(x) \in L_p(X), \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

and so  $f_x \leq d_f(x)$ . This shows that  $d_f(x) \in V(f_x)$ . Clearly,  $f(x) \in V(f_x)$ .

(ii) By (i), we have  $f(x) * d_f(y) \in V(f_x * f_y)$  and  $d_f(x) * f(y) \in V(f_x * f_y)$ . Thus  $d_f(x * y) = (f(x) * d_f(y)) \wedge (d_f(x) * f(y)) = (d_f(x) * f(y)) \wedge (f(x) * d_f(y))$ , which implies that  $d_f$  is an  $(l, r)$ - $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . □

*Remark 3.4.* The  $f$ -derivations  $d_f$  in Examples 2.5 and 2.7 are regular  $f$ -derivations but we know that the  $(l, r)$ - $f$ -derivation  $d_f$  in Example 2.2 is not regular. In the following, we give some properties of regular  $f$ -derivations.

*Definition 3.5.* Let  $X$  be a BCI-algebra. Then define  $\ker d_f = \{x \in X \mid d_f(x) = 0 \text{ for all } f\text{-derivations } d_f\}$ .



PROPOSITION 3.6. Let  $d_f$  be an  $f$ -derivation of a BCI-algebra  $X$ . Then the following hold:

- (i)  $d_f(x) \leq f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ ;
- (ii)  $d_f(x) * f(y) \leq f(x) * d_f(y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ ;
- (iii)  $d_f(x * y) = d_f(x) * f(y) \leq d_f(x) * d_f(y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ ;
- (iv)  $\ker d_f$  is a subalgebra of  $X$ . Especially, if  $f$  is monic, then  $\ker d_f \subseteq X_+$ .

Proof. (i) The proof follows by Proposition 2.10(ii).

(ii) Since  $d_f(x) \leq f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ , then  $d_f(x) * f(y) \leq f(x) * f(y) \leq f(x) * d_f(y)$ .

(iii) For any  $x, y \in X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_f(x * y) &= (f(x) * d_f(y)) \wedge (d_f(x) * f(y)) \\ &= (d_f(x) * f(y)) * ((d_f(x) * f(y)) * (f(x) * d_f(y))) \\ &= (d_f(x) * f(y)) * 0 = d_f(x) * f(y) \leq d_f(x) * d_f(y), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

which proves (iii).

(iv) Let  $x, y \in \ker d_f$ , then  $d_f(x) = 0 = d_f(y)$ , and so  $d_f(x * y) \leq d_f(x) * d_f(y) = 0 * 0 = 0$  by (iii), and thus  $d_f(x * y) = 0$ , that is,  $x * y \in \ker d_f$ . Hence,  $\ker d_f$  is a subalgebra of  $X$ . Especially, if  $f$  is monic, and letting  $x \in \ker d_f$ , then  $0 = d_f(x) \leq f(x)$  by (i), and so  $f(x) \in X_+$ , that is,  $0 * f(x) = 0$ , and thus  $f(0 * x) = f(x)$ , which implies that  $0 * x = x$ , and so  $x \in X_+$ , that is,  $\ker d_f \subseteq X_+$ .  $\square$

THEOREM 3.7. Let  $f$  be monic of a commutative BCI-algebra  $X$ . Then  $X$  is  $p$ -semisimple if and only if  $\ker d_f = \{0\}$  for every regular  $f$ -derivation  $d_f$  of  $X$ .

Proof. Assume that  $X$  is  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebra and let  $d_f$  be a regular  $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . Then  $X_+ = \{0\}$ , and so  $\ker d_f = \{0\}$  by using Proposition 3.6(iv). Conversely, let  $\ker d_f = \{0\}$  for every regular  $f$ -derivation  $d_f$  of  $X$ . Define a self-map  $d_f^*$  of  $X$  by  $d_f^*(x) = f_x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Using Theorem 2.9,  $d_f^*$  is an  $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . Clearly,  $d_f^*(0) = f_0 = 0 * (0 * f(0)) = 0$ , and so  $d_f^*$  is a regular  $f$ -derivation of  $X$ . It follows from the hypothesis that  $\ker d_f^* = \{0\}$ . In addition,  $d_f^*(x) = f_x = 0 * (0 * f(x)) = f(0 * (0 * x)) = f(0) = 0$  for all  $x \in X_+$ , and thus  $x \in \ker d_f^*$ , which shows that  $X_+ \subseteq \ker d_f^*$ . Hence, by Proposition 3.6(iv),  $X_+ = \ker d_f^* = \{0\}$ . Therefore  $X$  is  $p$ -semisimple.  $\square$

Definition 3.8. An ideal  $A$  of a BCI-algebra  $X$  is said to be an  $f$ -ideal if  $f(A) \subseteq A$ .

Definition 3.9. Let  $d_f$  be a self-map of a BCI-algebra  $X$ . An  $f$ -ideal  $A$  of  $X$  is said to be  $d_f$ -invariant if  $d_f(A) \subseteq A$ .

THEOREM 3.10. Let  $d_f$  be a regular  $(r, l)$ - $f$ -derivation of a BCI-algebra  $X$ , then every  $f$ -ideal  $A$  of  $X$  is  $d_f$ -invariant.

Proof. By Proposition 2.10(ii), we have  $d_f(x) = f(x) \wedge d_f(x) \leq f(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . Let  $y \in d_f(A)$ . Then  $y = d_f(x)$  for some  $x \in A$ . It follows that  $y * f(x) = d_f(x) * f(x) = 0 \in A$ . Since  $x \in A$ , then  $f(x) \in f(A) \subseteq A$  as  $A$  is an  $f$ -ideal. It follows that  $y \in A$  since  $A$  is an ideal of  $X$ . Hence  $d_f(A) \subseteq A$ , and thus  $A$  is  $d_f$ -invariant.  $\square$

THEOREM 3.11. Let  $d_f$  be an  $f$ -derivation of a BCI-algebra  $X$ . Then  $d_f$  is regular if and only if every  $f$ -ideal of  $X$  is  $d_f$ -invariant.

*Proof.* Let  $d_f$  be a derivation of a BCI-algebra  $X$  and assume that every  $f$ -ideal of  $X$  is  $d_f$ -invariant. Then since the zero ideal  $\{0\}$  is  $f$ -ideal and  $d_f$ -invariant, we have  $d_f(\{0\}) \subseteq \{0\}$ , which implies that  $d_f(0) = 0$ . Thus  $d_f$  is regular. Combining this and Theorem 3.10, we complete the proof.  $\square$

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Education Committee of Hubei Province (2004Z002, D200529001). The authors would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief and referees for the valuable suggestions and corrections for the improvement of this paper.

### References

- [1] M. Aslam and A. B. Thaheem, *A note on  $p$ -semisimple BCI-algebras*, Math. Japon. **36** (1991), no. 1, 39–45.
- [2] H. E. Bell and L.-C. Kappe, *Rings in which derivations satisfy certain algebraic conditions*, Acta Math. Hungar. **53** (1989), no. 3-4, 339–346.
- [3] H. E. Bell and G. Mason, *On derivations in near-rings*, Near-Rings and Near-Fields (Tübingen, 1985), North-Holland Math. Stud., vol. 137, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, pp. 31–35.
- [4] M. A. Chaudhry, *Branchwise commutative BCI-algebras*, Math. Japon. **37** (1992), no. 1, 163–170.
- [5] M. Daoji, *BCI-algebras and abelian groups*, Math. Japon. **32** (1987), no. 5, 693–696.
- [6] Y. B. Jun and X. L. Xin, *On derivations of BCI-algebras*, Inform. Sci. **159** (2004), no. 3-4, 167–176.
- [7] K. Kaya, *Prime rings with  $\alpha$ -derivations Hacettepe*, Bull. Mater. Sci. Eng. **16-17** (1987-1988), 63–71.
- [8] Y. L. Liu, J. Meng, and X. L. Xin, *Quotient rings induced via fuzzy ideals*, Korean J. Comput. Appl. Math. **8** (2001), no. 3, 631–643.
- [9] J. Meng and X. L. Xin, *Commutative BCI-algebras*, Math. Japon. **37** (1992), no. 3, 569–572.
- [10] E. C. Posner, *Derivations in prime rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (1957), 1093–1100.
- [11] L. Tiande and X. Changchang,  *$p$ -radical in BCI-algebras*, Math. Japon. **30** (1985), no. 4, 511–517.

Jianming Zhan: Department of Mathematics, Hubei Institute for Nationalities, Enshi 445000, Hubei Province, China

*E-mail address:* zhanjianming@hotmail.com

Yong Lin Liu: Department of Applied Mathematics, School of Science, Xidian University, Xi'an 710071, Shaanxi, China; Department of Mathematics, Nanping Teachers College, Nanping 353000, Fujian, China

*E-mail address:* ylliun@tom.com