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Abstract. Very recently, Breaz and Cîmpean introduced and examined in Bull. Korean Math. Soc. (2018) the class of so-called weakly tripotent rings as those rings $R$ whose elements satisfy at least one of the equations $x^3 = x$ or $(1 - x)^3 = 1 - x$. These rings are generally non-commutative. We here obtain a criterion when the commutative group ring $RG$ is weakly tripotent in terms only of a ring $R$ and of a group $G$ plus their sections.

Actually, we also show that these weakly tripotent rings are strongly invo-clean rings in the sense of Danchev in Commun. Korean Math. Soc. (2017). Thereby, our established criterion somewhat strengthens previous results on commutative strongly invo-clean group rings, proved by the present author in Univ. J. Math. & Math. Sci. (2018). Moreover, this criterion helps us to construct a commutative strongly invo-clean ring of characteristic 2 which is not weakly tripotent, thus showing that these two ring classes are different.
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1 Introduction and Background

Throughout the text of the current article all rings into consideration are assumed to be associative, possessing the identity element 1 which differs from the zero element 0. Our terminology and notation in both ring and group theories are mainly standard and some additional notions will be specified in the sequel. For instance, for a ring $R$, the symbol $U(R)$ denotes the set of all units in $R$, $Id(R)$ the set of all idempotents in $R$, $Nil(R)$ the set of all nilpotents in $R$ which, in the commutative case, coincides with the nil-radical $N(R)$, and $J(R)$ the Jacobson radical of $R$. Likewise, for an abelian group $G$, the letter $G^2$ stands for the subgroup of $G$ consisting of all elements of the type \{g^2 | g \in G\}. As usual, $RG$ designates the group ring of $G$ over $R$ with augmentation ideal $I(RG; G)$ generated by elements of the sort \{g - 1 | g \in G\}.

An element $t$ of a ring $R$ is called tripotent if the equality $t^3 = t$ holds. If each element of $R$ is with this property, $R$ is said to be tripotent as well. The complete description of such rings is well-known as a subdirect product (= a special subring of a direct product) of a family of copies of the fields $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\mathbb{Z}_3$.

On the other side, generalizing the aforementioned concept, in [1] were explored the so-called weakly tripotent rings that are rings in which at least one of the elements $t$ or $1 - t$ is a tripotent. It is immediate that weakly tripotent rings of characteristic
3 are themselves tripotent as \((1-t)^3 = 1-t^3 = 1-t\) yields that \(t^3 = t\). Interestingly, for any element \(y\) from the Jacobson radical \(J(R)\) of such a ring \(R\), it must be that \(y^2 = 2y\). To look at this, we have that \(y^3 = y\) or \((1-y)^3 = 1-y\). In the first version, \(y(1-y^2) = 0\) gives that \(y = 0\) as \(1-y^2 \in U(R)\), so that \(y^2 = 0 = 2y\). In the second one, we observe that \((1-y)^2 = 1\) as \(1-y \in U(R)\) and hence \(y^2 = 2y\), as promised. This substantiates that \(y^2 = 2y\) is always true. Replacing \(y \rightarrow -y\) allows us to get that \(4y = 0\).

These rings are, in general, non-commutative and there is no a complete description of their structure yet. However, a complete characterization theorem for a commutative ring \(R\) to be weakly tripotent is [1, Theorem 14]. However, since the direct product of an arbitrary family of Boolean rings is still a Boolean ring, we will state below this theorem in an equivalent form, but in a manner which is slightly more transparent and convenient for direct applications, as follows: A commutative ring \(R\) is weakly tripotent if, and only if, \(R \cong R_1 \times R_2\), where \(R_2 = \{0\}\) or \(x^3 = x\) holds \(\forall x \in R_2\) with \(3R_2 = \{0\}\), and \(R_1 = \{0\}\) or \(R_1\) is a subdirect product of \(R_{11} \times R_{12}\) with \(2kR_1 = \{0\}\) for some \(k = 1, 2, 3\) (or, in other words, \(3 \in U(R_1)\)), where \(R_{11}\) and \(R_{12}\) are rings such that either \(R_{11} = \{0\}\) or \(R_{11}/J(R_{11}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2\) with \(y^2 = 2y \forall y \in J(R_{11})\), and \(R_{12}\) is a Boolean ring. Resultantly, it readily follows that any commutative weakly tripotent ring of even characteristic (i.e., of characteristic \(2^k\) for \(k = 1, 2, 3\)) is nil-clean in the sense that the quotient-ring \(R/N(R)\) is Boolean or, equivalently, the factor-ring \(R/J(R)\) is Boolean with nil \(J(R)\). Besides, an pretty easy consequence is that (compare also with [1, Corollary 9]) a ring \(R\) is weakly tripotent such that \(3 \in U(R)\) and \(Id(R) = \{0, 1\}\) if, and only if, \(R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2\) with \(z^2 = 2z\) for any \(z \in J(R)\). A further characterization of arbitrary weakly tripotent rings (possibly non-commutative) is given in [5].

Our major motivation to write up this paper is to use the cited above theorem in order to deduce a full criterion for a commutative group ring to be weakly tripotent only in terms of the coefficient ring and the former group plus their divisions. This will be successfully done in the next section.

2 Main Results

Let us recall that a ring \(R\) is said to be strongly invo-clean in [2], provided for any element \(r \in R\) the existence of an idempotent \(e \in R\) and a unit \(v \in R\) of order at most 2 such that \(r = e + v\) with \(ev = ve\). These ring were completely classified in [2, Corollary 2.17] with the aid of structural results from [6].

The next relationship considerably strengthens [1, Corollary 4].

**Proposition 1.** Every weakly tripotent ring is strongly invo-clean.

*Proof.* For such a ring \(R\), we have \(r^3 = r\) or \((1-r)^3 = 1-r\) whenever \(r \in R\). In the first case, one writes that \(r = (1-r^2) + (r^2 + r - 1)\). A direct manipulation shows that \(1-r^2 \in Id(R)\) as \(r^2 \in Id(R)\) and that \((r^2 + r - 1)^2 = 1\) observing elementarily that these two elements commute, as required.
Dealing with the other equality \((1-r)^3 = 1-r\), the replacement \(r \rightarrow 1-r\) with the above trick at hand lead to this that \(1-r = f + w\) for some commuting idempotent \(f = 1 - (1-r)^2 = 2r - r^2\) and an involution \(w = 1 - 3r + r^2\). Therefore, \(r = (1-f) + (-w)\), where \((1-f)^2 = 1-f\) and \((-w)^2 = w^2 = 1\), as required. \(\square\)

We will demonstrate now that the converse implication is totally untrue. Before doing that, we need the following technicality.

**Lemma 1.** Let \(B\) be a boolean ring and let \(G\) be an abelian group. Then the group ring \(BG\) is weakly tripotent if, and only if, \(B \cong \mathbb{Z}_2\) and \(G^2 = \{1\} \).

**Proof.** "Necessity." Given \(g \in G\), it follows that \(g^3 = g\) or \((1-g)^3 = 1-g\). The first equality yields that \(g^3 = 1\). The second equality can be written as \(g^3 - g^2 + g = 0\) since \(2 = 0\) in both \(B\) and \(BG\). If we assume that \(g^2 \neq 1\), then one sees that \(g^3 \neq g^2\) and \(g^2 \neq g\). This assumption, however, leads to a contradiction since then \(g^3 - g^2 + g\) is an element in \(BG\) written in canonical form. Finally, it must be in the second case that \(g^2 = 1\) as well, as expected.

Next, for every \(b \in B\), we consider the element \(b + g \in BG\), where \(1 \neq g \in G\). Therefore, \((b + g)^3 = b + g\) or \([(1-b) - g]^3 = (1-b) - g\). In the first possibility, we derive that \(b + bg + b + g = b + g\), i.e., that \(b + bg = 0\). This forces at once that \(b = 0\). Since \(1-b\) is again an idempotent, the second possibility guarantees in a way of similarity that \(1-b = 0\), that is, \(b = 1\). Hence \(B = \{0, 1\} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2\), as asserted.

"Sufficiency." Each (possibly non-zero) element \(x\) of \(BG\) has take the form \(x = g_1 + \cdots + g_n\) for some \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). It is clear that \(x^2 = n\), whence \(x^2 = 1\) if \(n = 2k + 1\) or \(x^2 = 0\) if \(n = 2k\). In the first situation, one infers that \(x^3 = x\), as wanted. In the second situation, \((1-x)^2 = 1 + x^2 = 1\) so that \((1-x)^3 = 1-x\), as desired. \(\square\)

So, we are in a position to exhibit the concrete construction.

**Example 1.** There exists a commutative strongly invo-clean ring of characteristic 2 which is not weakly tripotent.

In fact, consider the group ring \(K = (\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)G\) with \(G^2 = \{1\} \). Utilizing Lemma 1 this group ring is manifestly non-weakly tripotent. Nevertheless, we claim that such a ring is strongly invo-clean. To show this, we apply the chief result from [9] to deduce that \(K\) is nil-clean in the sense that each element \(a \in K\) is writable as \(a = q + e\), where \(q \in Nil(K) = N(K)\) and \(e \in Id(K)\). On the other hand, in view of [8] or [7], one finds that \(N(K) = I(KG; G)\) because \(N(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2) = \{0\}\). It is obvious now that \(N(K)\) has an index of nilpotence not exceeding 2 as \(\text{char } (K) = 2\). And since \(a = (q + 1) + (1 + e)\) with \((q + 1)^2 = 1\) and \((1 + e)^2 = 1 + e\), we are set. This concludes our initial claim in the example.

We are now ready to proceed by proving with our necessary and sufficient condition for a commutative group ring to be weakly tripotent, thus generalizing Lemma 1 listed above.
Theorem 1. Suppose $R$ is a commutative ring and $G$ is an abelian group. Then the group ring $RG$ is weakly tripotent if, and only if, exactly one of the next two points holds:

(i) $G = \{1\}$ and $R$ is weakly tripotent.

(ii) $G \neq \{1\}$ with $G^2 = \{1\}$, $R$ is weakly tripotent such that $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$, where both $R_1$ and $R_2$ are weakly tripotent rings with $R_1 = \{0\}$ or $R_1$ a subdirect product of $L \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ for either $L = \{0\}$ or $L/J(L) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ having $y^2 = 2y$ for all $y \in J(L)$, and $R_2 = \{0\}$ or $\text{char}(R_2) = 3$ with $x^3 = x$ for all $x \in R_2$, and either

(ii.1) $|G| = 2$, $2d^2 = 2d$ for all $d \in L$ (and hence $4L = \{0\}$);

or

(ii.2) $|G| > 2$, $\text{char}(L) = 2$.

Proof. As $RG \cong R$ whenever $G$ is the trivial group, we shall hereafter assume that it is non-trivial.

"Necessity." Each element $x$ in $RG$ satisfies one of the equations $x^3 = x$ or $(1 - x)^3 = 1 - x$. Thus, for any $1 \neq g \in G$, one has that $g^3 = g$ or $(1 - g)^3 = 1 - g$. The first equality gives that $g^2 = 1$. The second one assures that $g^3 - 3g^2 + 2g = 0$. Assume in a way of contradiction that $g^2 \neq 1$. Since then $g \neq g^3 \neq g^2 \neq g$ and since the equation $g^3 - 3g^2 + 2g = 0$ is a canonical record, we will obtain a contrary to our assumption. Consequently, one extracts in both cases that $g^2 = 1$. Even something more: in the second equality we have that $3g - 3 = 0$ implying $3 = 0$. Thus the equation $(1 - x)^3 = 1 - x$ is tantamount to $x^3 = x$, as expected.

Furthermore, as $R \subseteq RG$, or even there is an epimorphism (= a surjective homomorphism) $RG \rightarrow R$ defined by the augmentation map, we employ [1, Lemma 1] to get that $R$ is weakly tripotent, too. We, therefore, may write in conjunction with the listed above theorem for commutative weakly tripotent rings that $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$, where both $R_1$ and $R_2$ are weakly tripotent rings with $R_1 = \{0\}$ or $R_1$ a subdirect product of $L \times B$ for some Boolean ring $B$ and either $L = \{0\}$ or $L/J(L) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ having $z^2 = 2z$ for all $z \in J(L)$, and $R_2 = \{0\}$ or $\text{char}(R_2) = 3$. It is then an easy technical matter to check that $RG \cong R_1G \times R_2G$, where $R_1G, R_2G$ both remain weakly tripotent. We will study these two direct factors separately:

About $R_1G$: Here $R_1G$ is a subdirect product of $LG \times BG$, where $LG$ and $BG$ are both weakly tripotent rings with $2 \in J(L)$ for the first ring. In the latter case, Lemma 1 enables us that $B \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, as stated. Concentrating now on $LG$, we shall consider two possibilities on the cardinality of the basis group $G$. In fact, firstly suppose that $|G| = 2$. Then, for every $r \in L$, we consider the element $r(1 - g) \in J(LG)$, where $1 \neq g \in G$ with $g^2 = 1$ (see, for instance,[7]). Since $[r(1 - g)]^2 = 2r(1 - g)$, one inspects by simple manipulations that $(2r^2 - 2r) - (2r^2 - 2r)g = 0$ implying immediately the desired equality $2r^2 = 2r$. Secondly, suppose that $|G| > 2$. Then there are two different elements $g, h \in G \setminus \{1\}$ with $g^2 = h^2 = 1$. Since both $g - 1 \in J(LG)$ and $1 - h \in J(LG)$, it follows directly that $g - h = (g - 1) + (1 - h) \in J(LG)$ and so $(g - h)^2 = 2(g - h)$ yielding that
2gh + 2g − 2h − 2 = 0. But as gh ≠ 1 because g ≠ h as well as gh ≠ g and gh ≠ h because h ≠ 1 and g ≠ 1, we conclude after all that 2 = 0 in L, as required.

About $R_2G$: As it was easily observed above, all weakly tripotent rings having characteristic 3 are obviously tripotent. Since then the non-zero ring $R_2$ of characteristic 3 has to be tripotent, we are done.

"Sufficiency." Writing $RG \cong R_1G \times R_2G$, we must explore both direct factors $R_1G$ and $R_2G$.

Dealing with the non-zero variant of the first direct factor $R_1G$, we detect that $R_1G$ is a subring of $LG \times \mathbb{Z}_2G$. The application of Lemma 1 is a guarantor that $\mathbb{Z}_2G$ is weakly tripotent bearing in mind that $G^2 = \{1\}$. We now assert that $J(LG) = J(L)G + I(LG; G)$. Indeed, seeing that $2 \in J(L)$, one verifies in virtue of [7] (see also [8]) that $J(LG) = J(L)G + \langle r(g-1) | r \in L, g \in G \rangle \subseteq J(L)G + I(LG; G)$. To derive the converse inclusion, we differ two possible cases for the cardinality of $G$: if $|G| = 2$, then $g(g-1) = -(g-1)$ as $g^2 = 1$. If now $|G| > 2$ with $G^2 = \{1\}$ and $2 = 0$ in $L$, we are observing that $I^2(LG; G) = \{0\}$ and so $I(LG; G) \subseteq J(LG)$ since $I(LG; G)$ is a nil ideal, giving the pursued equality, because $J(L)G \subseteq J(LG)$ holds always (cf.[7]). That is why, $LG/J(LG) = LG/[J(L) + I(LG; G)] \cong L/J(L) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, as needed. What suffices to prove in order to complete this point is that $z^2 = 2z$ for any $z \in J(LG)$. This, however, follows directly by the same token as in the proof of [3, Theorem 2.3]. Finally, we arrive at the fact that $LG$ is a weakly tripotent ring, whence so does $R_1G$ in accordance with [1, Lemma 1].

Further, concerning the second direct factor $R_2G$, since $R_2$ is either zero or a tripotent ring of characteristic 3, one plainly obtains that $R_2G$ is also a tripotent ring by taking into account that $G^2 = \{1\}$. We, finally, appeal to [1, Proposition 6] to conclude that $RG$ is weakly tripotent, as claimed.  

We close our work with the following challenging question.

**Proposition 2.** Find a criterion for a non-commutative group ring to be weakly tripotent.
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