Discussiones Mathematicae
General Algebra and Applications 38 (2018) 207–219
doi:10.7151/dmgaa.1294

CONRAD'S PARTIAL ORDER ON P.Q.-BAER $*$-RINGS

Anil Khairnar

Department of Mathematics
Abasaheb Garware College, Pune-411004, India

e-mail: anil.khairnar@mesagc.org
anil_maths2004@yahoo.com

and

B.N. Waphare

Center for Advanced Studies in Mathematics
Department of Mathematics
Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune-411007, India

e-mail: bnwaph@math.unipune.ac.in
waphare@yahoo.com

Abstract

We prove that a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring forms a pseudo lattice with Conrad's partial order and also characterize p.q.-Baer $*$-rings which are lattices. The initial segments of a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring with the Conrad's partial order are shown to be an orthomodular posets.

Keywords: Conrad's partial order, p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, central cover, orthomodular set.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 16W10; Secondary 06A06, 47L30.

1. Introduction

A $*$-*ring* R is a ring equipped with an involution $x \to x^*$, that is an additive anti-automorphism of a period at most two. An element e of a $*$-ring R is a *projection* if $e = e^2$ (idempotent) and $e = e^*$ (self-adjoint). For a nonempty subset B of R, we write $r_R(B) = \{x \in R \mid bx = 0,$ for every $b \in B\}$, and call the *right annihilator* of B in R. Similarly, we define the *left annihilator* of B in R (denoted by $l_R(B)$). A ring is said to be *abelian* if its every idempotent is central. A ring without nonzero nilpotent elements is called a *reduced* ring. Let P be a poset and $a, b \in P$, then the *join* of a and b, denoted by $a \vee b$ is defined as $a \vee b = \sup\{a, b\}$ and the *meet* of a and b, denoted by $a \wedge b$ is defined as $a \wedge b = \inf\{a, b\}$. A poset P is said to be a pseudo lattice, if for $a, b \in P$, whenever a, b have a common upper bound, then $a \wedge b$ and $a \vee b$ both exist.

Kaplansky [16] introduced Baer rings and Baer $*$-rings to abstract various properties of AW^* algebras, von Neumann algebras and complete $*$-regular rings. The subject of Baer $*$-rings is essentially pure algebra, with historic roots in operator algebras and lattice theory.

The set of projections in a Rickart $*$-ring forms an orthomodular lattice under the partial order '$e \leq_p f$ if and only if $e = fe = ef$'. This lattice is extensively studied in [3, 16, 24]. In [2, 9, 10, 12, 25] the authors studied partial orders on complex matrices or $\mathscr{B}(H)$ (the algebra of all bounded linear operators on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space H). In [11, 15, 22] the authors studied partial orders on Rickart $*$-rings. In [26], authors introduced multiplicatively finite elements in a ring. By restricting multiplicatively finite elements, Khairnar and Waphare [18] introduced generalized projections, a partial order on them and studied this poset in a Rickart $*$-ring. In [19], authors studied Generalized Projections in $\mathbb{Z}_n$. Hartwig [12] defined the plus partial order on the set of regular elements in a semigroup. For $m \times n$ matrices over a division ring D (that is $D_{m\times n}$) Hartwig [12] use the concept of rank $\rho(.)$ and obtained the following result, which characterize the plus order for the ring $D_{m\times n}$.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 2, [12]). *Let $A, B \in D_{m\times n}$. Then $A \leq B$ if and only if $\rho(B - A) = \rho(B) - \rho(A)$. In particular, rank-subtractivity is a partial-ordering relation on $D_{m\times n}$.*

Also in the same paper [12], Hartwig posed the following open problems for regular rings.

Problem 1. Can one induce a partial ordering on a ring R, by a subtractive rank-like function $\rho : R \to G$, where G is a well-ordered abelian group and $\rho(b - a) = \rho(b) - \rho(a)$?

Problem 2. Does $a \leq c$, $b \leq c$, $aR \cap bR = \{0\} = Ra \cap Rb \Rightarrow a + b \leq c$? (here $\leq$ denote the plus partial order on regular elements of a ring R).

Conrad [8] extended the work of Abian [1] by showing that a ring R is partially ordered by the relation $a \leq_c b$ if and only if $arb = ara$ for all $r \in R$ (this is called Conrad's relation) precisely when it is semiprime. Burgess and Raphael [6] proved that this relation, when defined on a semigroup S, is a partial order whenever S is weakly separative.

Birkenmeier *et al.* [5] introduced principally quasi-Baer (p.q.-Baer) $*$-rings. A $*$-ring R is said to be *a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring* if, for every principal right ideal aR

of R, $r_R(aR) = eR$, where e is a projection in R. From the above definition, it follows that $l_R(aR) = Rf$ for a suitable projection f. In [20], authors studied a sheaf representation of p.q.-Baer $*$-Rings. There is an abelian p.q.-Baer $*$-ring which is not a Rickart $*$-ring. Also, reduced Rickart $*$-rings are p.q.-Baer $*$-rings. In [5], Birkenmeier *et al.* have given examples of p.q.-Baer $*$-rings those are neither Rickart $*$-rings nor quasi-Baer $*$-rings.

Example 1.2 [5, Exercise 10.2.24.4]**.** Let A be a domain, $A_n = A$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$, and B be the ring of $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ such that a_n is eventually constant, which is a subring of $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$. Take $R = M_n(B)$, where n is an integer such that $n > 1$. Let $*$ be the transpose involution of R. Then R is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring which is not quasi-Baer (hence not a quasi-Baer $*$-ring). Also, if A is commutative which is not Prüfer, then R is not a Rickart $*$-ring.

Example 1.3 [5, Exercise 10.2.24.5]**.** Let R be a $*$-ring. If R is a right (or left) p.q.-Baer ring and $*$ is semiproper, then R is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Hence, if R is biregular and $*$ is semiproper, then R is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.

Example 1.4 [20, Example 2.3]**.** Let T be a commutative regular ring with unity such that $|T| > 1$, and $S = \prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda} T_\lambda$, where $T_\lambda = T$ and Λ is an infinite indexing set. If R is a subring of S generated by $\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Lambda} T_\lambda$ and either $1 \in S$ or $\{f : \Lambda \to T \mid f \text{ is a constant function}\}$, then by [4, Example 1.5], R is a p.q.-Baer ring that is not quasi-Baer. Since R is commutative, R is a $*$-ring with an identity involution. Therefore R is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring but not a quasi-Baer $*$-ring.

Example 1.5 [20, Example 2.6]**.** Let

$$R = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in M_2(\mathbb{Z}) \mid a \equiv d,\ b \equiv 0, \text{ and } c \equiv 0 \pmod 2 \right\}.$$

Consider involution $*$ on R as the transpose of the matrix. In [14, Example 2(1)], it is shown that R is neither right p.p. nor left p.p. (hence not a Rickart $*$-ring) but $r_R(uR) = \{0\} = 0R$ for any nonzero element $u \in R$. Therefore R is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.

Recall the following remark from [20].

Remark 1.6 [20, Remark 2.2]**.** Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Then,

(1) R is semiprime.

(2) R is reflexive (see [21, Proposition 4]).

(3) Involution $*$ is semiproper.

(4) For any central projection $e \in R$, $C(e) = e$. Moreover, for any $x \in R$ and any central projection $e \in R$, $C(ex) = eC(x)$.

(5) Let $a \in R$, then $C(a^*) = C(a)$.
(6) For any central projection $e \in R$, eR is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.

As p.q.-Baer $*$-rings are semiprime, therefore Conrad's relation is a partial order on a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Analogous to Problem 1 and Problem 2, we raise the following problems for a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.

Problem 3. Can one induce a partial ordering on a ring R, by a subtractive rank-like function $\rho : R \to G$, where G is a partially-ordered abelian group and $\rho(b - a) = \rho(b) - \rho(a)$?

Problem 4. Does $a \leq_c d$, $b \leq_c d$, $aR \cap bR = \{0\} = Ra \cap Rb \Rightarrow a + b \leq_c d$?

Let R be a $*$-ring and $x \in R$, we say that x possesses a *central cover* if there exists a smallest central projection h such that $hx = x$. If such a projection h exists, then it is unique and is called the central cover of x, denoted by $h = C(x)$ (see [3]). In [17] the authors proved the existence of central cover of every element of a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. In the second section of this paper, we characterize Conrad's partial order on p.q.-Baer $*$-rings in terms of central covers. This essentially gives a solution of Problem 3. In the third section, we answer Problem 4 positively.

Janowitz [15] proved that the initial segments of an arbitrary Rickart $*$-ring with the $*$-order are orthomodular posets. The same result is proved by Krēmere [22] for the left-star order. In the last section, we prove that the initial segments of a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring with Conrad's partial order are orthomodular posets.

2. Conrad's relation on p.q.-Baer $*$-rings

Hence fourth, $\leq$ denotes Conrad's partial order relation. In the following remark we list some basic observations.

Remark 2.1. Let R be a $*$-ring and $P(Z(R))$ denotes the set of central projections of R.
(1) For $e, f \in P(Z(R))$, $e \leq f$ if and only if $e = ef$.
(2) For any $e \in P(Z(R))$ the central cover of e, $C(e)$ exists and $C(e) = e$. Moreover, whenever $C(x)$ exists for some $x \in R$, then for any $e \in P(Z(R))$, $C(ex)$ exists and $C(ex) = eC(x)$.
(3) Let $a \in R$. If $C(a)$ exists in R, then $C(a^*)$ exists in R and $C(a^*) = C(a)$ (see [17]).

Lemma 2.2. *Let R be a $*$-ring and $x \in R$. Let $e \in R$ be a central projection in R such that* (1) $xe = x$ *and* (2) $xRy = 0$ *implies* $ey = 0$. *Then* $e = C(x)$.

Proof. To prove that $e = C(x)$, it is sufficient to prove that e is the smallest central projection with $xe = x$. Let $e' \in R$ be a central projection such that

$xe' = x$. Then $x(1-e') = 0$. Since $1-e'$ is central, $xR(1-e') = 0$. By condition (2), we have $e(1-e') = 0$ and hence $e = ee'$. Therefore $e \leq e'$. Thus $e = C(x)$. ■

The existence of a central cover of every element in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring is guaranteed by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3 (Theorem 2.3, [17]). *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $x \in R$. Then x has a central cover $e \in R$. Further, $xRy = 0$ if and only if $yRx = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$. That is $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR) = l_R(Rx) = l_R(Re) = (1-e)R = R(1-e)$.*

In the following lemma, we characterize Conrad's relation in terms of central cover.

Theorem 2.4. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $a, b \in R$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *$a^*rb = a^*ra$ for all $r \in R$.*

(2) *$a = C(a)b$.*

(3) *$arb = ara$ for all $r \in R$ (that is $a \leq b$).*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose $a^*rb = a^*ra$ for all $r \in R$. Hence $a^*r(b-a) = 0$ for all $r \in R$. This gives $a^*R(b-a) = 0$. By Theorem 2.3, we get $C(a^*)(b-a) = 0$. By Remark 2.1, we have $C(a)(b-a) = 0$. Thus $a = C(a)b$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Suppose $a = C(a)b$. For $r \in R$, we have $ara = arC(a)b = C(a)arb = arb$. Therefore $arb = ara$ for all $r \in R$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): By the similar arguments as in the proof of (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), we get $a = C(a)b$. Further, for $r \in R$, $a^*ra = a^*rC(a)b = C(a)a^*rb = C(a^*)a^*rb = a^*rb$. Thus $a^*rb = a^*ra$ for all $r \in R$. ■

The above theorem essentially says that, in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring R, for $a, b \in R$, $a \leq b$ if and only if $a = C(a)b$. Therefore, we use the relation $a = C(a)b$ as Conrad's relation (partial order) on a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. The following lemma leads to the result which constructs a subtractive function on a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.

Lemma 2.5. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $a, b \in R$ be such that $a \leq b$. Then,*

(1) *$C(a) \leq C(b)$ and $a = aC(b) = bC(a)$*

(2) *$C(b-a) = C(b) - C(a)$.*

Proof. (1) Since $a \leq b$, we have $a = C(a)b$. By Remark 2.1, $C(a) = C(C(a)b) = C(a)C(b)$. This yields $C(a) \leq C(b)$. Also, $aC(a) = aC(a)C(b)$ implies that $a = aC(b)$. Therefore $a = aC(b) = bC(a)$.

(2) Since $C(a) \leq C(b)$, $C(b) - C(a)$ is a central projection. Also by part (1), we have $(b-a)(C(b)-C(a)) = bC(b)-bC(a)-aC(b)+aC(a) = b-a-a+a = b-a$. Further, for $y \in R$, $(b-a)Ry = 0$ if and only if $bry = ary$ for all $r \in R$ if and only

if $bC(b)ry = bC(a)ry$ for all $r \in R$ if and only if $bR(C(b)-C(a))y = 0$ if and only if $C(b)(C(b) - C(a))y = 0$ (by Theorem 2.3) if and only if $(C(b) - C(a))y = 0$. Thus, by Lemma 2.2, we get $C(b - a) = C(b) - C(a)$, as required. ■

In the above lemma we have proved that in a p.q.-Bear $*$-ring R, for $a, b \in R$, if $a \leq b$ then $C(b - a) = C(b) - C(a)$. The following lemma gives a sufficient condition so that the converse of this statement is true.

Lemma 2.6. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring in which 2 is invertible. Let $a, b \in R$ be such that $C(b - a) = C(b) - C(a)$. Then $a \leq b$.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in R$ be such that $C(b-a) = C(b)-C(a)$. Then $(C(b)-C(a))^2 = C(b) - C(a)$, which yields $2C(b)C(a) = 2C(a)$. Since 2 is invertible element in R, we have $C(b)C(a) = C(a)$. Further, $C(b - a)C(a) = (C(b) - C(a))C(a) = 0$. By Theorem 2.3, $(b - a)RC(a) = 0$. Consequently, $(b - a)C(a) = 0$ and hence $bC(a) = a$. Therefore $a \leq b$. ■

The following theorem characterizes Conrad's partial order in terms of central covers, which gives a result similar to Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.7. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring in which 2 is invertible and let $a, b \in R$. Then $a \leq b$ if and only if $C(b - a) = C(b) - C(a)$.*

Proof. The proof follows from Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6. ■

In the following corollary, we give a solution of Problem 3. Let $B(R)$ denote the algebra of central projections in a $*$-ring R. Note that $B(R)$ is a partial ordered abelian group.

Corollary 2.8. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring in which 2 is invertible. Then there exists a function $\rho : R \to B(R)$ such that $\rho(b - a) = \rho(b) - \rho(a)$ and ρ induces the Conrad's partial order on R.*

Proof. Let $\rho : R \to B(R)$ defined as $\rho(x) = C(x)$. Then the proof follows from Theorem 2.7. ■

A *$*$-regular ring* is a regular ring with proper involution (i.e., for any element a, $a^*a = 0$ implies that $a = 0$). Note that the $*$-regular rings whose lattice of principal right ideals is complete are Baer $*$-rings and hence are p.q.-Baer $*$-rings (see [3]). In connection to Problem 1 we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.9. *Let R be a $*$-regular and p.q.-Baer $*$-ring in which 2 is invertible. Then there exists a subtractive rank like function $\rho : R \to B(R)$ such that $\rho(b - a) = \rho(b) - \rho(a)$ and ρ induces Conrad's partial order on R.*

An abelian group admits an order if and only if it is torsion free (see [23]). Since $B(R)$ is a Boolean algebra, it is well-ordered with respect to Conrad's partial order if and only if the cardinality of $B(R)$ is two.

3. When does a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring become a lattice?

Hartwig [13] showed that a $*$-regular ring R forms a pseudo upper semilattice under the $*$-orthogonal partial ordering. That is, $a, b \in R$ have a common upper bound if and only if $a \vee b$ exists in R. In this section, we prove that a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring R forms a pseudo lattice under Conrad's partial order. Also, we characterize p.q.-Bear $*$-rings those form lattices. As a consequence, we answer Problem 4 positively.

In [8], a concept of orthogonality is introduced as follows.

Definition 3.1. Let R be a semiprime ring and $a, b \in R$. Then a is said be *orthogonal* to b if $aRb = 0$. In a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring this condition is equivalent to $C(a)C(b) = 0$ (see [17]). We write $a \perp b$, whenever a is orthogonal to b.

Recall the following definition and theorem from [6].

Definition 3.2. Let R be a semiprime ring. For an ideal I of R, *Ann* $I = \{r \in R \mid rI = 0\}$. If for each ideal I, *Ann* I contains a nonzero central idempotent then R is called *weakly i-dense*. R is *orthogonally complete* if every orthogonal set has a supremum.

Theorem 3.3 (Theorem 9, [6])**.** *An orthogonally complete semiprime ring which is weakly i-dense is complete.*

We give an example of a commutative, reduced, weakly i-dense p.q.-Baer $*$-ring which is not orthogonally complete.

Example 3.4. Let $R = \{x \in \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{Q} \mid \text{for almost all } i,\ x_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then R is a commutative $*$-ring with an identity involution. For $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots) \in R$, $r_R(a) = bR$ where $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots)$ with $b_i = 1$ if $a_i = 0$; and $b_i = 0$ if $a_i \neq 0$. Note that $b^2 = b = b^*$. Therefore R is a Rickart $*$-ring. Since an abelian Rickart $*$-ring is a reduced p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, R becomes a commutative reduced p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Since every ideal of R is a principal ideal and R is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, therefore by Theorem 2.3, R is weakly i-dense. Let $c_1 = (\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \dots), c_2 = (0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \dots), \dots,$ and $S = \{c_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then S is an orthogonal subset of R which does not have the supremum in R. Thus R is not orthogonally complete.

In the following theorem, we prove that a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring forms a pseudo lattice with respect to Conrad's partial order.

Theorem 3.5. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $a, b \in R$ have a common upper bound. Then,*

(1) $aC(b) = bC(a)$;

(2) $a^*rb = C(a)b^*rb = C(b)a^*ra$ *for all* $r \in R$. *Hence,* a^*b *is self adjoint;*

(3) $arb^* = C(a)brb^* = C(b)ara^*$ *for all* $r \in R$. *Hence,* ab^* *is self adjoint;*

(4) $a \wedge b = aC(b) = bC(a)$; *and*

(5) $a \vee b = a + b - a \wedge b$.

Proof. Let $a, b, c \in R$ and c be a common upper bound of a and b. Then $a = C(a)c$ and $b = C(b)c$. By Theorem 2.4, $a^*ra = a^*rc$, $b^*rb = b^*rc$ for all $r \in R$. Also, $b^*rb = c^*rb$ for all $r \in R$.

(1) Since $a = C(a)c$ and $b = C(b)c$, we have $aC(b) = C(a)cC(b) = bC(a)$.

(2) Let $r \in R$. Then $a^*rb = a^*rC(b)c = C(b)a^*rc = C(b)a^*ra$. Also, $a^*rb = (C(a)c)^*rb = C(a)c^*rb = C(a)b^*rb$. Consequently, $a^*rb = C(a)b^*rb = C(b)a^*ra$ for all $r \in R$. In particular for $r = 1$, we have $a^*b = C(b)a^*a$. Therefore $(a^*b)^* = C(b)a^*a = a^*b$. Thus a^*b is self adjoint.

(3) The proof is similar to the proof of part (2).

(4) To prove $a \wedge b = aC(b)$, first we prove that $aC(b)$ is a common lower bound of a and b. By Remark 2.1, $C(aC(b))a = C(a)C(b)a = aC(b)$. This implies that $aC(b) \leq a$. Similarly, $bC(a) \leq b$. By part (1), we get $aC(b) \leq b$. Let $d \in R$ be such that $d \leq a$ and $d \leq b$. Then $d = C(d)a = C(d)b$ and hence $dC(b) = C(d)b$. Further, $C(d)aC(b) = dC(b) = C(d)b = d$. Therefore $d \leq aC(b)$. Thus $a \wedge b = aC(b) = bC(a)$.

(5) By parts (1) and (4), $C(a)(a + b - a \wedge b) = C(a)(a + b - aC(b)) = aC(a) + bC(a) - aC(a)C(b) = a + bC(a) - aC(b) = a$. This yields $a \leq (a + b - a \wedge b)$. Similarly, $b \leq (a + b - a \wedge b)$. Let $d \in R$ be such that $a \leq d$ and $b \leq d$. Then $a = C(a)d$ and $b = C(b)d$. Let $r \in R$. By part (2), we have $(a + b - a \wedge b)^*r(a + b - a \wedge b) = (a^* + b^* - a^*C(b))r(a + b - aC(b)) = a^*ra + a^*rb - a^*raC(b) + b^*ra + b^*rb - b^*raC(b) - a^*raC(b) - a^*rbC(b) + a^*raC(b) = a^*ra + a^*rb - a^*rb + b^*ra + b^*rb - C(b)b^*ra - a^*rb - a^*raC(b) + a^*raC(b) = a^*ra + b^*ra + b^*rb - b^*ra - a^*rb = a^*rdC(a) + b^*rdC(b) - a^*rdC(b) = a^*rd + b^*rd - a^*rdC(b) = (a^* + b^* - a^*C(b))rd = (a + b - aC(b))^*rd = (a + b - a \wedge b)^*rd$. By Theorem 2.4, we get $(a + b - a \wedge b) \leq d$. Therefore $a \vee b = a + b - a \wedge b$. ∎

As an immediate consequence of above theorem we have the following corollaries.

Corollary 3.6. *Let* R *be a p.q.-Baer* $*$*-ring. Then* R *is a pseudo lattice with respect to Conrad's partial order.*

Corollary 3.7. *Let* R *be a p.q.-Baer* $*$*-ring and* $a, b \in R$. *If* $a \vee b$ *exists in* R *then* $a \vee b = a + b(1 - C(a)) = b + a(1 - C(b))$.

By Theorem 3.5(1), in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring R, if $a, b \in R$ have a common upper bound then $aC(b) = bC(a)$. In the following lemma, we prove that the converse of this statement is also true.

Lemma 3.8. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $a, b \in R$. If $aC(b) = bC(a)$ then a, b have a common upper bound.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in R$ be such that $aC(b) = bC(a)$. We prove that $a + b - aC(b)$ is a common upper bound of a and b. Clearly $C(a)(a + b - aC(b)) = a + C(a)b - aC(b) = a$. Also, $C(b)(a + b - aC(b)) = aC(b) + b - aC(b) = b$. Therefore $a \leq a + b - aC(b)$ and $b \leq a + b - aC(b)$, as required. ∎

The following theorem, characterizes p.q.-Baer $*$-rings which form lattices with Conrad's partial order.

Theorem 3.9. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Then R is a lattice with respect to Conrad's partial order if and only if $aC(b) = bC(a)$ for all $a, b \in R$.*

Proof. The proof follows from Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.8. ∎

We conclude this section with a positive answer to Problem 4.

Theorem 3.10. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $a, b, c \in R$. If $a \leq c$, $b \leq c$, $aR \cap bR = \{0\}$ then $a + b \leq c$.*

Proof. Let $a, b, c \in R, a \leq c$, $b \leq c$ and $aR \cap bR = \{0\}$. Then, by Theorem 3.5, $aC(b) = bC(a)$. This implies that $aC(b) \in aR \cap bR$ and hence $aC(b) = 0$. Again, by using Theorem 3.5, we have $a \vee b = a + b$. Thus $a + b \leq c$. ∎

4. Orthogonality relation on p.q.-Baer $*$-rings

In this section, we prove that the initial segments of an arbitrary p.q.-Baer $*$-ring with Conrad's partial order are orthomodular posets.

We recall the following definitions from [7].

A binary relation $\perp$ on a poset $(P, \leq, 0)$, where 0 is the least element of the poset, is called an *orthogonality relation* (for the order $\leq$) if for all $x, y, z \in P$,

(1) if $x \perp y$, then $y \perp x$;

(2) if $x \leq y$ and $y \perp z$, then $x \perp z$; and

(3) $0 \perp x$.

A poset with orthogonality $(P, \leq, \perp, 0)$ is called *quasi-orthomodular* if for all $x, y \in P$,

(4) if $x \perp y$, then $x \vee y$ exists;

(5) if $x \leq y$, then $y = x \vee z$ for some $z \in P$ with $x \perp z$;

(6) if $x \perp y$, $x \perp z$ and $y \leq x \vee z$, then $y \leq z$.

A poset $(P, \leq, 0, 1)$ (where 0 is the least and 1 is the greatest element) is called an *orthocomplemented poset* if there is an operation $^{\perp} : P \to P$ such that for all $a, b \in P$,

(1) $a \wedge a^{\perp}$ and $a \vee a^{\perp}$ exist, and $a \wedge a^{\perp} = 0$ and $a \vee a^{\perp} = 1$;

(2) $(a^{\perp})^{\perp} = a$;

(3) if $a \leq b$, then $b^{\perp} \leq a^{\perp}$.

The operation $^{\perp}$ is called an *orthocomplementation.* In an orthocomplemented poset, we define the relation $\perp$ by $a \perp b$ if and only if $a \leq b^{\perp}$. This is an orthogonality relation. An orthocomplemented poset $(P, \leq, {}^{\perp}, 0, 1)$ is called *orthomodular* if for all $a, b \in P$,

(1) if $a \perp b$, then $a \vee b$ exist;

(2) if $a \leq b$, then there exists an element $c \in P$ such that $c \leq a^{\perp}$ and $b = a \vee c$.

Between orthomodularity and quasi-orthomodularity, the following connection holds.

Theorem 4.1 [7]**.** *In a quasi-orthomodular poset $(P, \leq, {}^{\perp})$, all initial segments $[0, p] = \{a \in P \mid a \leq p\}$ are orthomodular for some orthogonality $\perp_p$ on $([0, p], \leq)$. Furthermore, if $\perp_p$ is the orthogonality of the initial segment $[0, p]$, then for all $a, b \in [0, p]$, $a \perp_p b$ if and only if $a \perp b$. Moreover, if $x \perp_p y$ and $x, y \leq q$, then $x \perp_q y$.*

By using above theorem, we prove that the initial segments of p.q.-Baer $*$-rings with Conrad's partial order are orthomodular posets, for that we prove the following sequence of theorems and lemmas.

Lemma 4.2. *The relation $\perp$ is an orthogonality relation on a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.*

Proof. Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. By definition of orthogonal elements, it is clear that for any $x, y \in R$, if $x \perp y$ then $y \perp x$. Suppose $a \leq b$ and $b \perp c$. Then $a = C(a)b$ and $C(b)C(c) = 0$. By Lemma 2.5, $C(a)C(c) = C(a)C(b)C(c) = 0$ and hence $a \perp c$. Further, $C(0) = 0$, therefore $C(0)C(x) = 0$ for any $x \in R$. Consequently, $0 \perp x$ for any $x \in R$. Thus the relation $\perp$ is an orthogonality relation. ■

Lemma 4.3. *Let R be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $a, b \in R$ be orthogonal elements. Then $a \wedge b = 0$ and $a \vee b = a + b$.*

Proof. Let $a, b \in R$ be such that $a \perp b$. Then $C(a)C(b) = 0$. This implies $aC(b) = C(a)b = 0$. Therefore by Lemma 3.8, a and b have a common upper bound. By Theorem 3.5, we have $a \wedge b = 0$ and $a \vee b = a + b$. ■

The following lemma leads to the orthomodularity condition in a poset.

Theorem 4.4. *A p.q.-Baer $*$-ring R with the order $\leq$ and the orthogonality $\perp$ is a quasi-orthomodular poset.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, the relation $\perp$ is an orthogonality relation on R. Let $a, b \in R$ and $a \leq b$. Then $a = C(a)b$ and hence $C(a) = C(a)C(b)$. Let $c = b - a$. By Lemma 2.5, $C(a)C(c) = C(a)C(b - a) = C(a)(C(b) - C(a)) = C(a)C(b) - C(a) = 0$. Therefore $a \perp c$. Let $e, f, d \in R$ be such that $e \perp f$, $e \perp d$ and $f \leq e \vee d$. Then $C(e)C(f) = C(e)C(d) = 0$ and $f = C(b)(e \vee d)$. By Lemma 4.3, $f = C(f)(e + d) = C(f)e + C(f)d = C(f)d$. Hence $f \leq d$. Thus R is a quasi-orthomodular poset. ■

Theorem 4.5. *In a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring R, the initial segments $[0, m] = \{a \in R \mid a \leq m\}$ are orthomodular posets. Furthermore, if $\perp_m$ is the local orthogonality of the initial segment $[0, m]$, then for all $a, b \in [0, m]$, $a \perp_m b$ if and only if $a \perp b$. Moreover, if $a \perp_m b$ and $a, b \leq n$, then $a \perp_n b$.*

Proof. The proof follows from Theorems 4.1 and 4.4. ■

Acknowledgment

The first author gratefully acknowledges the University Grant Commission, New Delhi, India for the award of Teachers Fellowship under the faculty development program, during the XIIth plan period (2012–2017).

Also, the first author acknowledges the Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), India,for an International Travel Support to present the above work in an International Congress of Mathematicians held at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1–9 August 2018.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Abian, *Direct product decomposition of commutative semisimple rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **24** (1970) 502–507.
doi:10.2307/2037396

[2] J.K. Baksalary and S.K. Mitra, *Left-star and right-star partial ordering*, Linear Algebra Appl. **149** (1991) 73–89.
doi:10.1016/0024-3795(91)90326-R

[3] S.K. Berberian, *Baer $*$-Rings*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. Band 195. Vol. **296** (Berlin, Springer, 1972).
doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15071-5

[4] G.F. Birkenmeier, J.K. Park and S.T. Rizvi, *Principally quasi-Baer rings hulls*, Advances in Ring Theory Trends in Mathematics, 47–61 (Birkhäuser Basel, 2010).
doi:10.1007/978-3-0346-0286-0_4

[5] G.F. Birkenmeier, J.K. Park and S.R. Tariq, Extensions of Rings and Modules (New York, Birkhäuser, 2013).
doi:10.1007/978-0-387-92716-9

[6] W.D. Burgess and R. Raphael, *On Conrad's partial order relation on semiprime rings and on semigroups*, Semigroup Forum **16** (1978) 133–140.
http://eudml.org/doc/134282

[7] J. Cīrulis, *Quasi-orthomodular posets and weak BCK-algebras*, Order **31** (2014) 403–419.
doi:10.1007/s11083-013-9309-1

[8] P.F. Conrad, *The hulls of semiprime rings*, Austral. Math. Soc. **12** (1975) 311–314.
doi:10.1017/S0004972700023911

[9] G. Dolinar and J. Marovt, *Star partial order on $B(H)$*, Linear Algebra Appl. **434** (2011) 319–326.
doi:10.1016/j.laa.2010.08.023

[10] G. Dolinar, B. Kuzma and J. Marovt, *A note on partial orders of Hartwig, Mitsch, and Šemrl*, Appl. Math. and Comp. **270** (2015) 711–713.
doi:10.1016/j.amc.2015.08.066

[11] M.P. Drazin, *Natural structure on semigroup with involution*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **84** (1978) 139–141.
https://projecteuclid.org/euclid.bams/1183540393

[12] R.E. Hartwig, *How to partially order regular elements*, Math. Japon. **25** (1980) 1–13.

[13] R.E. Hartwig, *Pseudo lattice properties of the star-orthogonal partial ordering for star-regular rings.*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **77** (1979) 299–303.
doi:10.2307/2042174

[14] C.Y. Hong, N.K. Kim, T.K. Kwak, *Ore extension of Baer and PP rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **151** (2000) 215–226.
doi:10.1016/S0022-4049(99)00020-1

[15] M.F. Janowitz, *On the $*$-order for Rickart $*$-rings*, Algebra Universalis **16** (1983) 360–369.
doi:10.1007/BF01191791

[16] I. Kaplansky, Rings of Operators (W.A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1968).

[17] A. Khairnar and B.N. Waphare, *Unitification of weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings*, Southeast Asian Bull. Math. (to appear).
arXiv:1612.01681

[18] A. Khairnar and B.N. Waphare, *Order properties of generalized projections*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **65** (2017) 1446–1461.
doi:10.1080/03081087.2016.1242554

[19] A. Khairnar and B.N. Waphare, *Generalized Projections in $\mathbb{Z}_n$*, AKCE Int. J. Graphs Comb.
doi:10.1016/j.akcej.2018.01.010

[20] A. Khairnar and B.N. Waphare, *A Sheaf Representation of Principally Quasi-Baer ∗-Rings*, Algebr. Represent. Theory.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10468-017-9758-0

[21] J.Y. Kim, *On reflexive principally quasi-Baer rings*, Korean J. Math. **17** (2009) 233–236.

[22] I. Krēmere, *Left-star order structure of Rickart ∗-ring*, Linear Multilinear Algebra **64** (2016) 341–352.
doi:10.1080/03081087.2015.1040369

[23] F.W. Levi, *Ordered groups*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. A **16** (1942) 256–263.

[24] S. Maeda, *On the lattice of projections of a Baer ∗-ring*, J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A **22** (1958) 75–88.

[25] P. Šemrl, *Automorphisms of $B(H)$ with respect to minus partial order*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **369** (2010) 205–213.
doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2010.02.059

[26] B.N. Waphare and Anil Khairnar, *Semi-Baer modules*, J. Algebra Appl. **14** (2015) 1550145 (12 pages).
doi:10.1142/S0219498815501455

Received 8 February 2017
Revised 25 July 2018
Accepted 31 July 2018