

ON \mathbb{Z}_p -INVOLUTION

Ameer Jaber^{1 §}, Hamed M. Obiedat², Ibrahim Abu Falahah³

^{1,2,3}Department of Mathematics

The Hashemite University

Zarqa, 13115, JORDAN

Abstract: Our main purpose is to study the existence of \mathbb{Z}_p -involution on central simple \mathbb{Z}_p -algebras. Then we define a \mathbb{Z}_3 -involution on a central simple \mathbb{Z}_3 -algebra.

AMS Subject Classification: 16W10

Key Words: central simple \mathbb{Z}_p -algebras, \mathbb{Z}_p -involutions, division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebras

1. Introduction

The existence of superinvolution on associative superalgebras was studied by many authors, for example Michel Racine in [5] and A. Elduque and O. Villa in [1] studied superalgebras, which are \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded algebras, and existence of superinvolutions on finite dimensional central simple superalgebras, and they found that non-trivial central division superalgebras are never endowed with superinvolution of the first kind, but they prove the graded version of the classical Albert and Albert-Riehm Theorem of existence of superinvolution of the second kind.

Continuing on the studying of superalgebras, in [2] we developed the theory of existence of pseudo-superinvolutions of the first kind on finite dimensional central simple associative superalgebras over a field K of characteristic not 2. We proved that a central division superalgebra \mathcal{D} , over a field K of characteristic

Received: October 28, 2016

Revised: December 19, 2016

Published: February 16, 2017

© 2017 Academic Publications, Ltd.

url: www.acadpubl.eu

[§]Correspondence author

not 2, of even type has a pseudo-superinvolution of the first kind if and only if \mathcal{D} is of order 2 in the Brauer-Wall group $BW(K)$.

Moreover we proved that if \mathcal{D} is of type then \mathcal{D} has a pseudo-superinvolution of the first kind if and only if $\sqrt{-1} \in K$ and \mathcal{D} is of order 2 in the Brauer-Wall group $BW(K)$.

Let p be any prime number. An associative \mathbb{Z}_p -ring $R = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} R_i$ is nothing but a $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ -graded associative ring. A $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ -graded ideal $I = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} I_i$ of an associative \mathbb{Z}_p -ring R is called a \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal of R . An associative \mathbb{Z}_p -ring R is simple if it has no non-trivial \mathbb{Z}_p -ideals. An associative \mathbb{Z}_p -ring R is a commutative \mathbb{Z}_p -ring if

$$a_\alpha b_\beta = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} b_\beta a_\alpha \quad \forall a_\alpha \in R_\alpha, b_\beta \in R_\beta,$$

where the product $\alpha\beta$ is taken modulo p . We will say that such elements \mathbb{Z}_p -commute.

Let R be an associative \mathbb{Z}_p -ring with $1 \in R_0$, then R is said to be a division \mathbb{Z}_p -ring if all nonzero homogeneous elements are invertible, i.e., every $0 \neq r_\alpha \in R_\alpha$ has an inverse r_α^{-1} , necessarily in $R_{p-\alpha}$, where the subscript $p - \alpha$ is taken modulo p .

Let K be a field of characteristic 0. An associative $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ -graded K -algebra $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{A}_i$ is a finite dimensional central simple \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra over a field K , if $Z(\mathcal{A}) \cap \mathcal{A}_0 = K$, where $Z(\mathcal{A}) = \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid ab = ba \ \forall b \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is the center of \mathcal{A} , and the only \mathbb{Z}_p -ideals of \mathcal{A} are (0) and \mathcal{A} itself.

In Section 2 we prove the structure theory of \mathbb{Z}_p -division algebra, where p is a prime number, which is a restate of Division Superalgebra Theorem, see [6, P. 438].

In Section 3 we define the \mathbb{Z}_p -involution on \mathbb{Z}_p -algebras, then we prove that a central simple \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra $\mathcal{A} = M_n(\mathcal{D})$ over a field K , where \mathcal{D} is a division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra with $\mathcal{D}_1 \neq \{0\}$, has a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution if and only if \mathcal{D} has. Also we prove that if a central simple \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra $\mathcal{A} = M_n(\mathcal{D})$ over a field K , where \mathcal{D} is a division algebra with $\mathcal{D}_j = \{0\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p - 1$ has a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution then \mathcal{D} has.

2. Division \mathbb{Z}_p -Algebra

We start this work by proving a structure theorem on \mathbb{Z}_p -division algebras which is a restate of Division Superalgebra Theorem, see [6, P. 438], but first we need

the following lemma. The proof of this lemma is exactly the same as the proof of [4, Lemmata 3,5].

Lemma 2.1. *Let p be a prime number. If $\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{A}_i$ is a central simple unital \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra over K then either \mathcal{A} is simple as an algebra or \mathcal{A}_0 is simple and $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_0 u^i$, with $u \in Z(\mathcal{A}) \cap \mathcal{A}_1$ and $u^p = 1$. \square*

Theorem 2.2 (Division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra Theorem). *If $\mathcal{D} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{D}_i$ is a finite dimensional central division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra over the field K of characteristic 0, then exactly one of the following holds where throughout \mathcal{C} denotes a central division algebra over K and $\omega \in K$ denotes a primitive p th root of unity.*

- (i) $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{C}$, i.e., $\mathcal{D}_i = \{0\}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K K[u]$, $u^p = \lambda \in K^\times$, $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K K$, $\mathcal{D}_i = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K Ku^i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$.
- (iii) $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{D}_0 = C_{\mathcal{D}}(u)$, the centralizer of u in \mathcal{C} ,

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \{c \in \mathcal{D} : cu = \sigma^i(u)c\} \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq p - 1,$$

for some Galois extension $K[u] \subset \mathcal{C}$ of order p with Galois automorphism σ .

- (iv) $\mathcal{D} = M_p(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K M_p(K)$,
 $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K K[u]$, $\mathcal{D}_i = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K K[u]W^i$, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq p - 1$, where

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 1 \\ \lambda & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ & \omega & & & \\ & & \omega^2 & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \ddots \\ & & & & & \omega^{p-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\lambda \notin K^p$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{D} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{D}_i$ be a central division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra over K , and let $\mathcal{D}_1 \neq \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{D}_i \neq \{0\} \quad \forall 2 \leq i \leq p - 1$. If $0 \neq v \in \mathcal{D}_1$, then $\mathcal{D}_0 v^i \subseteq \mathcal{D}_i =$

$\mathcal{D}_i v^{-i} v^i \subseteq \mathcal{D}_0 v^i$. Therefore, for any $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$ and for any $0 \neq v \in \mathcal{D}_1$ we have that $\mathcal{D}_i = \mathcal{D}_0 v^i$.

For any $a \in \mathcal{D}_0$, $va = a^{\psi_v} v$, where $a^{\psi_v} = vav^{-1}$, and $\psi_v|_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is an automorphism of \mathcal{D}_0 as an algebra over $K = Z(\mathcal{D}) \cap \mathcal{D}_0$. Since any element of \mathcal{D}_1 is of the form $c_0 v$, $c_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0$, the restriction of ψ_v to $Z(\mathcal{D}_0)$ does not depend on the particular choice of $v \in \mathcal{D}_1$. Assume first that $\psi_v|_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is an inner automorphism of \mathcal{D}_0 , say $\psi_v|_{\mathcal{D}_0} = \psi_c$, where $c \in \mathcal{D}_0$ (up to multiplication by an element of $Z(\mathcal{D}_0)$). Therefore $vav^{-1} = cac^{-1}$ implies that $c^{-1}vav^{-1}c = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_0$. Letting $u = c^{-1}v \in \mathcal{D}_1$ then $u^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}_{p-1}$ and $uau^{-1} = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_0$, so u centralizes \mathcal{D}_0 . Since $\mathcal{D}_i = \mathcal{D}_0 u^i \forall 1 \leq i \leq p - 1$, u centralizes $\mathcal{D}_i \forall 1 \leq i \leq p - 1$. Thus $u \in Z(\mathcal{D})$ and $u^p \in Z(\mathcal{D}) \cap \mathcal{D}_0$, say $u^p = \lambda \in K^\times$. Letting $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D}_0$, $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K K[u]$. Note that \mathcal{D} is simple as an algebra if and only if $\lambda \notin K^p$. If $\lambda \in K^p$, we may assume that $\lambda = 1$. This is the only case where \mathcal{D} is not simple as an algebra.

Assume next that $\sigma = \psi_v|_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is not an inner automorphism of \mathcal{D}_0 over K . If σ is not the identity then K is the fixed subfield of $Z(\mathcal{D}_0)$, which implies that $Z(\mathcal{D}_0)$ is a Galois extension of K of order p with Galois automorphism σ . We may choose $u \in Z(\mathcal{D}_0)$ such that $Z(\mathcal{D}_0) = K[u]$, $u^p = \lambda \notin K^p$ with $\sigma(u) \neq u \in K[u]$. Now, $(av)u = a\sigma(u)v = \sigma(u)(av)$ implies that $\sigma(vu) = v\sigma(u) = \sigma(\sigma(u)v) = \sigma^2(u)v$ and hence $av^2u = av\sigma(u)v = a(v\sigma(u))v = a(\sigma^2(u)v)v = \sigma^2(u)(av^2)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_0$. We prove that $av^i u = a\sigma^i(u)v^i$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_0$ and for all $2 \leq i \leq p - 1$ by induction on i . Note that it is true for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose that $av^{i-1}u = \sigma^{i-1}(u)(av^{i-1})$ for all $a \in \mathcal{D}_0$. Then $av^i u = av(v^{i-1}u) = av(\sigma^{i-1}(u)v^{i-1}) = av\sigma^{i-1}(u)v^{i-1}v = a\sigma^{i-1}(u)v^i$. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_0 = C_{\mathcal{D}}(u)$, the centralizer of u in \mathcal{D} and for $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$ we have $\mathcal{D}_i = \{c \in \mathcal{D} : cu = \sigma^i(u)c\} = \mathcal{D}_0 v^i$. If \mathcal{D} is a division algebra then $\mathcal{D} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{p-1} \mathcal{D}_i$ as above.

If \mathcal{D} is not a division algebra then since \mathcal{D}_0 is not central simple over $K = Z(\mathcal{D}) \cap \mathcal{D}_0$ then, by Lemma 2.1, \mathcal{D} is a central simple algebra over K . Let $J \neq \{0\}$ be a right ideal of \mathcal{D} . If $0 \neq \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} a_i \in J$ then at least one of $a_i \neq 0$ and multiplying by a_i^{-1} on the right, $1 + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} b_i \in J$ for some $b_i \in \mathcal{D}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$. Hence $(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} b_i)\mathcal{D} \subseteq J$. If J contains an element $0 \neq \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} a'_i \notin (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} b_i)\mathcal{D}$ then arguing as above, we obtain an element $1 + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} b'_i \in J$, $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} b'_i \neq \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} b_i$. In that case $0 \neq \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (b_i - b'_i) \in J$, where $b_i - b'_i \in \mathcal{D}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$. If $b_j - b'_j \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq j \leq p - 1$, then multiplying $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (b_i - b'_i)$ by $(b_j - b'_j)^{-1}$, we get that $1 + c \in J$ and we may assume that $c = \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} c_i$. If $c = 0$ then $J = \mathcal{D}$. If $c \neq 0$ and J contains an element $0 \neq \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} a''_i \notin (1 + c)\mathcal{D}$, then arguing as above, we obtain an element $1 + c' \in J$, $c' \neq c$. Thus $0 \neq \sum_{i=1}^{p-2} (c_i - c'_i) \in J$ and

so there exists $1 \leq j \leq p - 2$ such that $c_j - c'_j \neq 0$. Multiplying $\sum_{i=1}^{p-2}(c_i - c'_i)$ by $(c_j - c'_j)^{-1}$, we get that $1 + d \in J$, and we may assume that $d = \sum_{i=1}^{p-3} d_i$. Continuing as above to obtain $1 + f_1 \in J$, where $f_1 \in \mathcal{D}_1$. If $f_1 = 0$ then $J = \mathcal{D}$. If $f_1 \neq 0$ and J contains an element $0 \neq \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} a''_i \notin (1 + f_1)\mathcal{D}$, then arguing as above, we obtain an element $1 + f'_1 \in J$, where $f'_1 \in \mathcal{D}_1$ and $f'_1 \neq f_1$. In that case $0 \neq f_1 - f'_1 \in J$ and hence $1 \in J$ which must be the whole of \mathcal{D} . Therefore a descending chain of nonzero right ideals in \mathcal{D} has length at most p and \mathcal{D} is isomorphic to $M_p(\mathcal{C})$, where \mathcal{C} is a central division algebra over K . If $K[u]$ were to embed in \mathcal{C} then $\mathcal{D}_0 = C_{\mathcal{D}}(u) \supseteq M_p(\mathcal{C})$ which is not a division algebra. Therefore $K[u]$ does not embed in \mathcal{C} but rather the algebraic extension $K[u]$ of order p embeds in $M_p(K)$ and u, W can be chosen

$$\text{as } u = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 1 \\ \lambda & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, W = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & \\ & \omega & & & \\ & & \omega^2 & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & \omega^{p-1} \end{bmatrix}, \lambda \notin K^p \text{ where}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K K[u], \mathcal{D}_i = \mathcal{C} \otimes_K K[u]W^i \forall 1 \leq i \leq p - 1. \quad \square$$

3. \mathbb{Z}_p -Involution on \mathbb{Z}_p -Algebra

Definition 1. A \mathbb{Z}_p -involution of an associative \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra \mathcal{A} is a graded additive map $*$: $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$a^{**} = a \quad \text{and} \quad (a_\alpha b_\beta)^* = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} b_\beta^* a_\alpha^*.$$

Let $V = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_p} V_i$ be a (left) \mathbb{Z}_p -space over a division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra \mathcal{C} and $W = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_p} W_i$ a right \mathbb{Z}_p -space over \mathcal{C} . A bilinear pairing $(,)_\nu$ is a biadditive map $(,)_\nu : V \times W \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ satisfying

$$(v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha+\beta+(p-1)\nu}, \quad (c_\gamma v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu = c_\gamma (v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu,$$

$$(v_\alpha, w_\beta c_\gamma)_\nu = (v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu c_\gamma,$$

for all $v_\alpha \in V_\alpha, w_\beta \in W_\beta$ and $c_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma$. The bilinear pairing $(,)_\nu$ is *nondegenerate* if

$$(v_\alpha, W)_\nu = \{0\} \Rightarrow v_\alpha = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (V, w_\beta)_\nu = \{0\} \Rightarrow w_\beta = 0.$$

If $(\ , \)_\nu$ is nondegenerate we say that the \mathbb{Z}_p -paces V and W are *dual*.

The right \mathbb{Z}_p -space W over \mathcal{C} may be viewed as a (left) \mathbb{Z}_p -space over \mathcal{C}^{op} via

$$c_\gamma w_\beta := (-1)^{\beta\gamma} w_\beta c_\gamma.$$

An element $a_\alpha \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(V)_\alpha$ (acting from the right) is said to have an *adjoint* $a_\alpha^* \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}^o}(W)_\alpha$ (acting from the right) if

$$(v_\beta a_\alpha, w_\delta)_\nu = (-1)^{\alpha\delta} (v_\beta, w_\delta a_\alpha^*)_\nu, \quad \forall v_\beta \in V_\beta, w_\delta \in W_\delta.$$

Therefore if \mathcal{D} is a division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra and σ is an antiautomorphism of \mathcal{D} , then it is an isomorphism of \mathcal{D} onto \mathcal{D}^{op} and a right \mathbb{Z}_p -space W over \mathcal{D}^{op} is a left \mathbb{Z}_p -space over \mathcal{D} under the action

$$d_\delta w_\beta := (-1)^{\delta\beta} w_\beta d_\delta^\sigma, \quad d_\delta \in \mathcal{D}_\delta, w_\beta \in W_\beta.$$

Thus, $(\ , \)_\nu : V \times W \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a *sesquilinear pairing* of (left) \mathbb{Z}_p -spaces over \mathcal{D} , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} (d_\delta v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu &= d_\delta (v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu, \\ (v_\alpha, d_\delta w_\beta)_\nu &= (-1)^{\beta\delta} (v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu d_\delta^\sigma \end{aligned}$$

for all $v_\alpha \in V_\alpha, w_\beta \in W_\beta, d_\delta \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$. If $\bar{\ \ }$ is a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution of \mathcal{D} then \mathcal{D} is isomorphic to \mathcal{D}^{op} and we may consider sesquilinear pairings of $V \times V$. If $\epsilon \in Z(\mathcal{D})$ with $\epsilon\bar{\epsilon} = 1$, an ϵ -*hermitian* \mathbb{Z}_p -form is a sesquilinear pairing satisfying

$$(v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \overline{\epsilon(w_\beta, v_\alpha)_\nu}, \quad \forall v_\alpha \in V_\alpha, w_\beta \in V_\beta.$$

If $\epsilon = 1$ (respectively, -1), $(\ , \)_\nu$ is said to be *hermitian* (respectively, *skewhermitian*).

Theorem 3.1. A nondegenerate symmetric \mathbb{Z}_p -form $(\ , \)$ ($\nu = 0$) on a finite dimensional \mathbb{Z}_p -space V over a field K , induces a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution $*$ on $\text{End}_K V$ via

$$(v_i a_k, v_j) = (-1)^{kj} (v_i, v_j a_k^*) \quad \forall v_i, v_j \in V.$$

proof. Let a_α, b_β be homogeneous elements in $\text{End}_K V$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (v_i a_\alpha b_\beta, v_j) &= (-1)^{(\alpha+\beta)j} (v_i, v_j (a_\alpha b_\beta)^*) \\ &= (-1)^{\beta j} (v_i a_\alpha, v_j b_\beta^*) \\ &= (-1)^{\alpha(\beta+j)} (-1)^{\beta j} (v_i, v_j b_\beta^* a_\alpha^*), \end{aligned}$$

and hence $(-1)^{(\alpha+\beta)j}(v_i, v_j(a_\alpha b_\beta)^*) = (-1)^{\alpha(\beta+j)}(-1)^{\beta j}(v_i, v_j b_\beta^* a_\alpha^*)$. Since \mathbb{Z}_p is a field, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\beta + j)(\text{ mod } p) + \beta j(\text{ mod } p) &= \alpha(\beta + j) + \beta j(\text{ mod } p) \\ &= (\alpha + \beta)j + \alpha\beta(\text{ mod } p). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(a_\alpha b_\beta)^* = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} b_\beta^* a_\alpha^*$ which implies that $*$ is a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution on $\text{End}_K V$. □

Now we are able to prove the main result in this work.

Theorem 3.2. *A primitive \mathbb{Z}_p -ring \mathcal{A} with a minimal right \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal has a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution $*$ if and only if \mathcal{A} has a selfdual right \mathbb{Z}_p -module I , the commuting \mathbb{Z}_p -ring \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{A} on I has a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution, and $*$ is the adjoint with respect to a non-degenerate hermitian or skewhermitian \mathbb{Z}_p -form on I .*

Proof. Assume that there is a minimal right \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal I and an homogeneous element $a_i \in I_i$ such that $a_i a_i^* I \neq \{0\}$. Then take $x = a_i a_i^* \in I$ and note that $x^* = (-1)^{i^2} x$. By [3, Theorem 3.9] there is a primitive idempotent $e \in I_0$ with $I = e\mathcal{A}$ and $xe = ex = x$. Therefore, $xee^* = xe^* = (-1)^{i^2} x^* e^* = (-1)^{i^2} (ex)^* = (-1)^{i^2} x^* = x$. Then, as in the proof of [3, Theorem 3.9], $f = ee^*$ is an idempotent, with $f^* = f$ and $I = f\mathcal{A}$. So $\mathcal{D} = f\mathcal{A}f$ is a division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra with \mathbb{Z}_p -involution $\bar{} = *|_{\mathcal{D}}$ and the right \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal $V = f\mathcal{A}$ is a left \mathbb{Z}_p -space over \mathcal{D} . For $v_i = fa_i \in V_i, w_j = fb_j \in V_j$, define

$$(v_i, w_j)_0 := fa_i(fb_j)^* = fa_i b_j^* f \in \mathcal{D}_{i+j},$$

one checks that for all $d_k \in \mathcal{D}_k, v_i \in V_i, w_j \in V_j$,

$$(d_k v_i, w_j)_0 = d_k(v_i, w_j)_0, \quad (v_i, d_k w_j)_0 = (-1)^{kj}(v_i, w_j)_0 \bar{d}_k,$$

$$\overline{(v_i, w_j)_0} = (-1)^{ij}(w_j, v_i)_0,$$

that V is self dual with respect to $(,)_0$, and that $*$ is the adjoint with respect to the hermitian \mathbb{Z}_p -form $(,)_0$.

Otherwise, for any minimal right \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal I of \mathcal{A} , and any homogeneous element $a \in I, aa^* I = \{0\}$ holds. Take a minimal right \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal I of \mathcal{A} and assume that there exists an homogeneous element $a \in I$ such that $aa^* \neq 0$. By minimality, $I = aa^* \mathcal{A} = a\mathcal{A}$, and $I^* I = \mathcal{A}aa^*aa^* \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(aa^* I) = \{0\}$. By [3, Theorem 3.9(iv)], $\mathcal{A}a$ is a minimal left \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal, and hence $a^* \mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}a)^*$ is a minimal right \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal. Take $J = a^* \mathcal{A}$. If there was an homogeneous element x in J with $xx^* \neq 0$, as before we would have $\{0\} = J^* J = \mathcal{A}aa^* \mathcal{A}$, but this is impossible since \mathcal{A} is prime. So for any homogeneous element x in $J, xx^* = 0$.

Hence, from now on let I be a minimal right \mathbb{Z}_p -ideal of \mathcal{A} such that $xx^* = 0$ for any homogeneous element x in I . By [3, Theorem 3.9], $I = e\mathcal{A}$ for a primitive idempotent $e \in I_0$, we have $e\mathcal{A}e^* \neq \{0\}$ by primeness. Therefore $e\mathcal{A}_\nu e^* \neq \{0\}$ for some $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. We choose ν to be 0 if possible. We will show that this will always be the case, let $\mathcal{D} = e\mathcal{A}e$, if $\mathcal{D}_j = e\mathcal{A}_j e \neq \{0\}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq p-1$, then $\mathcal{D}_{p-j} = e\mathcal{A}_{p-j} e \neq \{0\}$ (since \mathcal{D} is a division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra). If $e\mathcal{A}_{p-j} e^* \neq \{0\}$, since $e^*\mathcal{A}_j e^* = (e\mathcal{A}_j e)^* \neq \{0\}$,

$$e\mathcal{A}_0 e^* \supseteq (e\mathcal{A}_{p-j} e^*)(e^*\mathcal{A}_j e^*) \neq \{0\}.$$

Similarly if $e\mathcal{A}_j e^* \neq \{0\}$, since $e^*\mathcal{A}_{p-j} e^* = (e\mathcal{A}_{p-j} e)^* \neq \{0\}$,

$$e\mathcal{A}_0 e^* \supseteq (e\mathcal{A}_j e^*)(e^*\mathcal{A}_{p-j} e^*) \neq \{0\}.$$

We may therefore assume that if $\nu \neq 0$ then $\mathcal{D}_j = \{0\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p-1$.

Assume $e\mathcal{A}_\nu e^* \neq \{0\}$. If $e(r_\nu + r_\nu^*)e^* \neq 0$, for some $r_\nu \in \mathcal{A}_\nu$, letting $t_\nu = r_\nu + r_\nu^*$ we may assume that $(et_\nu e^*)^* = et_\nu e^*$. Otherwise $(er_\nu e^*)^* = -er_\nu e^*$, for all $r_\nu \in \mathcal{A}_\nu$ and one chooses $t_\nu \in \mathcal{A}_\nu$ such that $(et_\nu e^*)^* = -et_\nu e^* \neq 0$. Thus

$$(et_\nu e^*)^* = \epsilon et_\nu e^*, \quad \epsilon = \pm 1.$$

Since $e^*\mathcal{A}et_\nu e^* \neq \{0\}$, by primeness, and since $e^*\mathcal{A}_0 e^*$ is a division algebra, one can choose $s_{(p-1)\nu} \in \mathcal{A}_{(p-1)\nu}$ such that

$$e^*s_{(p-1)\nu}et_\nu e^* = e^*.$$

Applying $*$,

$$\begin{aligned} e &= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} et_\nu^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu}^* e \\ &= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} et_\nu^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu}^* e. \\ &= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon et_\nu e^* s_{(p-1)\nu}^* e. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} e^*s_{(p-1)\nu}e &= e^*s_{(p-1)\nu}((-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon et_\nu e^* s_{(p-1)\nu}^* e) \\ &= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon (e^*s_{(p-1)\nu}et_\nu e^*)s_{(p-1)\nu}^* e \\ &= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon e^* s_{(p-1)\nu}^* e. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(e^*s_{(p-1)\nu}e)^* = (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e.$$

We therefore have

$$e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} et_\nu e^* = e^*, \quad et_\nu e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e = e,$$

$$(et_\nu e^*)^* = \epsilon et_\nu e^*, \quad (e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e)^* = (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e.$$

For $v_\alpha = ea_\alpha \in I_\alpha$, $w_\beta = eb_\beta \in I_\beta$,

$$v_\alpha w_\beta^* = ea_\alpha b_\beta^* e^*$$

$$= ea_\alpha b_\beta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} et_\nu e^*.$$

Define

$$(v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu := ea_\alpha b_\beta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \in e\mathcal{A}_{\alpha+\beta+(p-1)\nu} e = \mathcal{D}_{\alpha+\beta+(p-1)\nu}.$$

By the last claim $(v_\alpha, v_\alpha)_\nu := ea_\alpha a_\alpha^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e = 0$, for all $v_\alpha \in I_\alpha$. If $(v_\alpha, I)_\nu = \{0\}$,

$$ea_\alpha \mathcal{A} e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e = \{0\},$$

and, since $e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \neq 0$,

$$ea_\alpha = 0, \quad \text{by primeness.}$$

Similarly, $(I, w_\beta)_\nu = \{0\}$ implies $w_\beta = 0$ and $(,)_\nu$ is nondegenerate. If $d_\delta \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$, $(d_\delta v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu = d_\delta (v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu$. Moreover

$$(v_\alpha, d_\delta w_\beta)_\nu = (ea_\alpha, d_\delta eb_\beta)_\nu$$

$$= (-1)^{\delta\beta} ea_\alpha b_\beta^* e^* d_\delta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e$$

$$= (-1)^{\delta\beta} ea_\alpha b_\beta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} et_\nu e^* d_\delta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e$$

$$= (-1)^{\delta\beta} (v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu et_\nu e^* d_\delta^* e^* s_{2\nu} e$$

$$= (-1)^{\delta\beta} (v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu \overline{d_\delta},$$

where

$$\overline{d_\delta} := et_\nu e^* d_\delta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e.$$

For $d_\delta \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$,

$$\overline{\overline{d_\delta}} = et_\nu e^* (et_\nu e^* d_\delta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e)^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e$$

$$= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu(\nu+\delta)} (-1)^{\delta\nu} et_\nu e^* s_{(p-1)\nu}^* e d_\delta et_\nu e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e$$

$$= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu(\nu+\delta)} (-1)^{\delta\nu} (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon e d_\delta \epsilon e$$

$$= (-1)^{(p-1)\nu(\nu+\delta)} (-1)^{\delta\nu} (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} d_\delta,$$

$$= d_\delta,$$

since if $\nu \neq 0$, then δ must be 0. For $c_\gamma \in \mathcal{D}_\gamma$ and $d_\delta \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{c_\gamma d_\delta} &= et_\nu e^*(c_\gamma d_\delta)^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \\ &= (-1)^{\gamma\delta} et_\nu e^* d_\delta^* c_\gamma^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \\ &= (-1)^{\gamma\delta} et_\nu e^* d_\delta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} et_\nu e^* c_\gamma^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \\ &= (-1)^{\gamma\delta} \overline{d_\delta c_\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\overline{}$ is a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution of \mathcal{D} and $(,)_\nu$ is a nondegenerate sesquilinear \mathbb{Z}_p -form on I whose adjoint is $*$. Finally

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{(v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu} &= et_\nu e^*(ea_\alpha b_\beta^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e)^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \\ &= (-1)^{\alpha\beta} (-1)^{(p-1)\nu(\alpha+\beta)} et_\nu e^* s_{(p-1)\nu}^* eb_\beta a_\alpha^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \\ &= (-1)^{\alpha\beta} (-1)^{(p-1)\nu(\alpha+\beta)} (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon eb_\beta a_\alpha^* e^* s_{(p-1)\nu} e \\ &= (-1)^{\alpha\beta} (-1)^{(p-1)\nu(\alpha+\beta)} (-1)^{(p-1)\nu^2} \epsilon(w_\beta, v_\alpha)_\nu. \end{aligned}$$

If $\nu = 0$, then $\overline{(v_\alpha, w_\beta)_0} = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon(w_\beta, v_\alpha)_0$. Thus $(,)_0$ is ϵ -hermitian \mathbb{Z}_p -form. If $\nu \neq 0$, then we have assumed that $\mathcal{D}_j = \{0\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p - 1$ and so $(v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu = 0$, if $\alpha + \beta + (p - 1)\nu = j \pmod p$, where $j \neq 0$, which implies that $\alpha + \beta = \nu + j \pmod p$. Thus the right hand side is 0 unless $\alpha + \beta = \nu \pmod p$, and therefore

$$\overline{(v_\alpha, w_\beta)_\nu} = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon(w_\beta, v_\alpha)_\nu.$$

Thus $(,)_\nu$ is ϵ -hermitian \mathbb{Z}_p -form. □

Now we have the following results for a prime number p .

Corollary 3.3. *A central simple \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra $\mathcal{A} = M_n(\mathcal{D})$ over a field K , where \mathcal{D} is a division \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra with $\mathcal{D}_1 \neq \{0\}$, has a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution if and only if \mathcal{D} has.*

Corollary 3.4. *If a central simple \mathbb{Z}_p -algebra $\mathcal{A} = M_n(\mathcal{D})$ over a field K , where \mathcal{D} is a division algebra with $\mathcal{D}_j = \{0\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p - 1$ has a \mathbb{Z}_p -involution then \mathcal{D} has.*

In the next example we define a \mathbb{Z}_3 -involution on a central simple \mathbb{Z}_3 -algebra $\mathcal{A} = M_{1+1+1}(K)$, where K is a given field.

Example 1. Let $\mathcal{A} = M_{1+1+1}(K)$ be a \mathbb{Z}_3 -algebra then the \mathbb{Z}_3 -additive map

$$\sigma : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$$

defined by

$$\sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -c \\ b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \\ c & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a \\ -c & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a \mathbb{Z}_3 -involution on \mathcal{A} .

Let $\mathcal{A} = M_{p+q+p}(\mathcal{D})$ be a central simple \mathbb{Z}_3 -algebra, where \mathcal{D} is a division algebra. In the last result we define a \mathbb{Z}_3 -involution on \mathcal{A} induced by an involution $\bar{}$ defined on \mathcal{D} .

Theorem 3.5. *Let \mathcal{D} be a division algebra, and let $\mathcal{A} = M_{p+q+p}(\mathcal{D})$, $p, q > 0$ be a \mathbb{Z}_3 -algebra with $\mathcal{A}_0 = M_p(\mathcal{D}) \oplus M_q(\mathcal{D}) \oplus M_p(\mathcal{D})$ and*

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{A}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & y \\ z & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $a, y \in M_{q \times p}(\mathcal{D})$, $b, x \in M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{D})$, $c, z \in M_{p \times p}(\mathcal{D})$. If \mathcal{D} has an involution $\bar{}$, then $*$ defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} f & x & c \\ a & g & y \\ z & b & h \end{pmatrix}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{h} & \tilde{y} & -\tilde{c} \\ \tilde{b} & \tilde{g} & \tilde{x} \\ -\tilde{z} & \tilde{a} & \tilde{f} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a \mathbb{Z}_3 -involution on \mathcal{A} , where for any matrix a over \mathcal{D} , $\tilde{a} = \bar{a}^t$, t the transpose.

proof. If \mathcal{D} has an involution $\bar{}$, then for any $a \in M_p(\mathcal{D})$ or $a \in M_q(\mathcal{D})$, $\tilde{a} = \bar{a}^t$, t the transpose, defines involutions on $M_p(\mathcal{D})$ and on $M_q(\mathcal{D})$. Moreover if $a \in M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{D})$ ($M_{q \times p}(\mathcal{D})$), then $\tilde{a} \in M_{q \times p}(\mathcal{D})$ ($M_{p \times q}(\mathcal{D})$).

Let $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ be two matrices in \mathcal{A}_1 , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right]^* &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & cy & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & az \\ bx & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \widetilde{az} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \widetilde{cy} \\ -\widetilde{bx} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{z}\tilde{a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{y}\tilde{c} \\ -\tilde{x}\tilde{b} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$-\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \end{pmatrix}^* \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix}^* = -\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\tilde{z} \\ \tilde{y} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{x} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\tilde{c} \\ \tilde{b} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{a} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\tilde{z}\tilde{a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\tilde{y}\tilde{c} \\ \tilde{x}\tilde{b} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{z}\tilde{a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{y}\tilde{c} \\ -\tilde{x}\tilde{b} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Which implies that $(XY)^* = -Y^*X^*$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}_1$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \\ c & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right]^* &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & az \\ bx & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & cy & 0 \end{pmatrix}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\tilde{a}\tilde{z} \\ \tilde{c}\tilde{y} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{b}\tilde{x} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\tilde{z}\tilde{a} \\ \tilde{y}\tilde{c} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{x}\tilde{b} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^* \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b \\ c & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^* &= - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{z} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{y} \\ -\tilde{x} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{b} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{a} \\ -\tilde{c} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\tilde{z}\tilde{a} \\ \tilde{y}\tilde{c} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{x}\tilde{b} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Which implies that $(XY)^* = -Y^*X^*$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}_2$.

Finally, let $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & c \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ be a general matrix in \mathcal{A}_1 and $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & z \\ x & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ a general matrix in \mathcal{A}_2 , then

$$\begin{aligned} (XY)^* &= \begin{pmatrix} cx & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & ay & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & bz \end{pmatrix}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{b}\tilde{z} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{a}\tilde{y} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{c}\tilde{x} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{z}\tilde{b} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{y}\tilde{a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{x}\tilde{c} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } Y^*X^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{z} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{y} \\ -\tilde{x} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\tilde{c} \\ \tilde{b} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{a} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{z}\tilde{b} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{y}\tilde{a} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{x}\tilde{c} \end{pmatrix} = (XY)^*.$$

Similarly, $(YX)^* = X^*Y^*$. □

References

- [1] A. Elduque, O. Villa, The existence of superinvolutions, *Journal of Algebra*, **319** (2008), 4338-4359.
- [2] A. Jaber, Existence of Pseudo-Superinvolutions of The First Kind, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, Volume 2008 (2008), Article ID 386468, 13 pages, **doi:** 10.1155/2008/386468.
- [3] A. Jaber, On Primitive \mathbb{Z}_p -Algebra, *Submitted*.
- [4] C.T.C. Wall, Graded Brauer groups, *Reine Angew. Math.*, **213** (1963), 187-199.
- [5] M.L. Racine, Primitive superalgebras with superinvolution, *Journal of Algebra*, **206** (1998), 588-614.
- [6] M.L. Racine, E.I. Zelmanov, Simple Jordan superalgebras with semisimple even part, *Journal of Algebra*, **270** (2003), 374-444.

