

TOTALLY COMPATIBLE STRUCTURES ON THE RADICAL OF AN INCIDENCE ALGEBRA

MYKOLA KHRYPCHENKO

ABSTRACT. We describe totally compatible structures on the Jacobson radical of the incidence algebra of a finite poset over a field. We show that such structures are in general non-proper.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Definitions and preliminaries	3
1.1. Matching compatibilities and interchangeability	3
1.2. Isomorphic and antiisomorphic structures	4
1.3. Posets	4
1.4. Incidence algebras	5
2. Some general properties of totally compatible structures	5
3. Proper totally compatible structures	6
4. Proper totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$	8
4.1. The centroid of $J(I(X, K))$	8
4.2. The description of proper totally compatible structures	10
5. Totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$	11
5.1. A class of totally compatible structures	11
5.2. The description of totally compatible structures	12
6. Open problem	17
References	18

INTRODUCTION

Two algebraic structures from a variety \mathcal{A} defined on a same vector space are said to be *compatible* if their sum (equivalently, any linear combination) belongs to \mathcal{A} . Originated in the 70's [14], compatibility of Lie [8, 9] associative [4, 17] and Poisson [18, 2, 3] algebras has been actively studied in the context of mathematical physics. Recently, it has attracted the interest of scientists from other areas of mathematics who expanded the investigation of compatibility to the varieties of L_∞ -algebras [5], Leibniz algebras [15], pre-Lie algebras [1], anti-pre-Lie algebras [16], left-symmetric algebras [23], Hom-Lie algebras [6], Hom-Lie triple systems [22] and

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W99; 16S50; 16N20.

Key words and phrases. totally compatible structures; proper totally compatible structures; annihilator-valued structures; incidence algebra; Jacobson radical.

so on. In particular, [15, 1, 13] provide algebraic classifications of low-dimensional compatible algebras.

Given a structure μ from \mathcal{A} , it is natural to ask: can one explicitly describe all the structures from \mathcal{A} (on the same vector space) that are compatible with μ ? This question has been previously studied [4, 17] for the variety of associative algebras. Recall that the compatibility of two *associative* bilinear products \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 on a vector space V is equivalent to the following identity on V :

$$(a \cdot_1 b) \cdot_2 c + (a \cdot_2 b) \cdot_1 c = a \cdot_1 (b \cdot_2 c) + a \cdot_2 (b \cdot_1 c). \quad (1)$$

In general, fixing \cdot_1 , it is technically difficult to give a complete description of \cdot_2 satisfying (1), although there are some natural classes of such products associated to \cdot_1 .

In this context, it seems to be more reasonable to study particular cases of (1) that are based on equalities of pairs of monomials. More precisely, let σ be a permutation of $\{1, 2\}$. If the i -th monomial of the left-hand side of (1) equals the $\sigma(i)$ -th monomial of the right-hand side of (1) for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 are said to be σ -*matching* [24] (in the case $\sigma = \text{id}$ the triple (V, \cdot_1, \cdot_2) is called a *matching dialgebra* [26], also known as *As⁽²⁾-algebra* [28]). If all the 4 monomials in (1) are equal, then \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 are *totally compatible* (see [27, 25]). In [11], inspired by [21], we introduced another similar notion, called *interchangeability*, which means that the operations \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 can be permuted in each of the monomials in (1) without changing the brackets. If A is *unital* (or in certain sense close to being unital), then it is easy to see that σ -matching, interchangeable and totally compatible structures on A are simple modifications of the original associative product on A (see [11]).

The situation becomes more interesting in the context of *nilpotent* associative algebras, where new classes of compatible structures arise. In [12] we characterized σ -matching, interchangeable and totally compatible structures on the strictly upper triangular matrix algebra $UT_n(K)$, $n \geq 3$, which is a classical example of a nilpotent associative algebra. Notice that $UT_n(K)$ is the *Jacobson radical* of the algebra $T_n(K)$ of *all* upper triangular $n \times n$ matrices over K , which is in turn a particular case of the *incidence algebra* $I(X, K)$ of a *finite* poset X over K . So, our next goal was to generalize the results of [12] to the Jacobson radical $J(I(X, K))$ of $I(X, K)$. However, having classified the id-matching structures on $J(I(X, K))$ in the first draft of this manuscript, we gave up on the idea to proceed to (12)-matching and interchangeable structures, since the classification turned out to be too complex. We thus focused only on *totally compatible* structures that are the main object of study in this article.

In Section 1 we collect all the needed definitions and preliminary results about totally compatible structures and incidence algebras to make the paper self-contained.

In Section 2 we prove a couple of short general results whose particular cases will be used below.

In Section 3 we introduce *annihilator-valued* structures and study their relationship with structures $*_\varphi$ determined by centroid elements (known from [11]). As a result, we arrive at the definition of a *proper* totally compatible structure $*$, which essentially means that, up to an annihilator-valued component, $*$ is determined by a centroid element. The motivation comes from [11, 12], where most of the algebras had only totally compatible structures of this type. In Proposition 3.14, we prove that the class of proper totally compatible structures is closed under isomorphisms and antiisomorphisms.

Having prepared all the necessary general background, in Section 4 we focus on the algebra $J(I(X, K))$ and first describe in Proposition 4.7 its centroid, which is itself an interesting object of study. It is then used in Corollary 4.8 to give a description of proper totally compatible structures on $J(I(X, K))$.

Finally, in Section 5 we prove our main result Theorem 5.12, which gives a complete description of totally compatible structures on $J(I(X, K))$. Annihilator-valued structures again play an important role in this case, but, instead of $*_\varphi$, we obtain a more general class of structures that behave locally as $*_\varphi$. In Corollary 5.13, we find a sufficient condition on X under which all the totally compatible structures on $J(I(X, K))$ are proper. Example 5.15 shows that non-proper totally compatible structures on $J(I(X, K))$ may indeed exist, and Example 5.15 demonstrates that the condition from Corollary 5.13 is not necessary. We then give Example 5.17 that illustrates the situation when all the totally compatible structures on $J(I(X, K))$ are annihilator-valued. In fact, this happens if and only if X has length at most 2, as proved in Proposition 5.19. We leave as an open problem to describe finite posets X such that all the totally compatible structures on $J(I(X, K))$ are proper.

1. DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper K will be an arbitrary field. All the algebras and vector spaces will be over K and all the products will be K -bilinear. The dot product will be sometimes omitted, i.e. ab will mean $a \cdot b$. As usual, the symbol \circ will be reserved for the composition of two maps.

Let (A, \cdot) be a (not necessarily associative) algebra. The *annihilator* of A is the ideal

$$\text{Ann}(A, \cdot) = \{a \in A : a \cdot b = b \cdot a = 0 \text{ for all } b \in A\}.$$

We will often write simply $\text{Ann}(A)$, when it is clear what product is meant. Given subsets $B, C \subseteq A$, we denote

$$B \cdot C = \text{span}_K\{b \cdot c : b \in B, c \in C\}.$$

We may write B^2 for $B \cdot B$, when the product on A is clear from the context. The *centroid* of A , denoted $\Gamma(A)$, is the space of linear maps $\varphi : A \rightarrow A$ such that

$$\varphi(a \cdot b) = a \cdot \varphi(b) = \varphi(a) \cdot b \quad (2)$$

for all $a, b \in A$.

1.1. Matching compatibilities and interchangeability. Generalizing [11, Definition 1.1] (inspired by [24]) we say that two (not necessarily associative!) products \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 on a same vector space V are

(i) *σ -matching* (where $\sigma \in S_2 = \{\text{id}, (12)\}$), if

$$(a \cdot_1 b) \cdot_2 c = a \cdot_{\sigma(1)} (b \cdot_{\sigma(2)} c) \text{ and } (a \cdot_2 b) \cdot_1 c = a \cdot_{\sigma(2)} (b \cdot_{\sigma(1)} c); \quad (3)$$

(ii) *interchangeable* if

$$(a \cdot_1 b) \cdot_2 c = (a \cdot_2 b) \cdot_1 c \text{ and } a \cdot_1 (b \cdot_2 c) = a \cdot_2 (b \cdot_1 c);$$

(iii) *totally compatible*, if

$$(a \cdot_1 b) \cdot_2 c = (a \cdot_2 b) \cdot_1 c = a \cdot_1 (b \cdot_2 c) = a \cdot_2 (b \cdot_1 c), \quad (4)$$

for all $a, b, c \in V$. Observe that σ -matching *associative* products are compatible in the sense of (1), while interchangeable ones need not be compatible in general. Furthermore, notice that \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 are totally compatible if and only if \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 are σ -matching for all $\sigma \in S_2$ if and only if \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 are interchangeable and σ -matching for some $\sigma \in S_2$.

Given an *associative* algebra (A, \cdot) , by a σ -matching (resp. *interchangeable* or *totally compatible*) *structure* on (A, \cdot) we mean an *associative* product $*$ on A such that \cdot and $*$ are σ -matching (resp. interchangeable or totally compatible). It is obvious that \cdot is a totally compatible structure on (A, \cdot) . It is known that any *mutation* [7] \cdot_x of \cdot by $x \in A$, i.e. $a \cdot_x b = a \cdot x \cdot b$, is an id-matching structure on (A, \cdot) . If, moreover, x is central, then \cdot_x is a totally compatible structure on (A, \cdot) .

As we saw in [11, Propositions 2.2 and 2.6], for a *unital* algebra A , any id-matching (resp. (12)-matching or interchangeable) structure on (A, \cdot) is a mutation of \cdot by $x \in A$ (resp. by a central $x \in A$). Consequently, any (12)-matching or interchangeable structure on a unital algebra (A, \cdot) is totally compatible. If A is non-unital (in particular, if A is *nilpotent*), all these compatibilities may be different (see [11, Examples 1.4 and 1.5]).

1.2. Isomorphic and antiisomorphic structures. Let $*_1$ and $*_2$ be two σ -matching, interchangeable or totally compatible structures on an associative algebra (A, \cdot) . Following [11, 12], we say that an automorphism (resp. antiautomorphism) ϕ of (A, \cdot) is an *isomorphism* (resp. *antiisomorphism*) between $*_1$ and $*_2$, if

$$\phi(a *_1 b) = \phi(a) *_2 \phi(b) \text{ (resp. } \phi(a *_1 b) = \phi(b) *_2 \phi(a))$$

for all $a, b \in A$. The structures $*_1$ and $*_2$ are *isomorphic* (resp. *antiisomorphic*), if there is an isomorphism (resp. antiisomorphism) between them. This means that $(A, \cdot, *_1)$ and $(A, \cdot, *_2)$ are isomorphic (resp. antiisomorphic) as algebras with two multiplications. Given a σ -matching, interchangeable or totally compatible structure $*$ on (A, \cdot) and an automorphism (resp. antiautomorphism) ϕ of (A, \cdot) , the product \star on A defined by

$$a \star b = \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) * \phi^{-1}(b)) \text{ (resp. } a \star b = \phi(\phi^{-1}(b) * \phi^{-1}(a))) \quad (5)$$

for all $a, b \in A$, is a structure on (A, \cdot) of the same kind as $*$, and it is isomorphic (resp. antiisomorphic) to $*$ (see [12, Lemma 1.2]).

1.3. Posets. Let (X, \leq) be a finite poset. As usual, we write $x < y$ to mean $x \leq y$ and $x \neq y$. The binary relations \geq and $>$ are inverse to \leq and $<$, respectively. Two elements $x, y \in X$ are said to be *comparable*, if $x \leq y$ or $x \geq y$. A nonempty subset $C \subseteq X$ is a *chain*, if any two elements $x, y \in C$ are comparable. A chain $C \subseteq X$ is *maximal*, if there is no chain properly containing C . The *length* of a chain $C \subseteq X$ is $l(C) := |C| - 1$. The *length* of X is

$$l(X) := \max\{l(C) : C \text{ is a chain in } X\}.$$

Given $x \leq y$, define

$$l(x, y) := l(\{z \in X : x \leq z \leq y\}).$$

Denote by $\text{Min}(X)$ and $\text{Max}(X)$ the subsets of minimal and maximal elements of X , respectively. Finally, write

$$X_{<}^n = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X^n : x_1 < \dots < x_n\}.$$

1.4. Incidence algebras. Let (X, \leq) be a finite poset and K a field. The *incidence algebra* $I(X, K)$ of X over K (see [19, 20]) is the associative K -algebra with basis $\{e_{xy} : x, y \in X, x \leq y\}$ (called *natural basis*) and bilinear multiplication

$$e_{xy} \cdot e_{uv} = \delta_{yu} e_{xv}$$

for all $x \leq y$ and $u \leq v$ in X . Here and below δ means the Kronecker delta. Given $f \in I(X, K)$, denote by $f(x, y)$ the coefficient of e_{xy} in the linear combination

$$f = \sum_{x \leq y} f(x, y) e_{xy}.$$

The following formulas will be useful:

$$e_{xy} \cdot f = \sum_{v \geq y} f(y, v) e_{xv} \text{ and } f \cdot e_{xy} = \sum_{u \leq x} f(u, x) e_{uy}.$$

Recall from [20, Theorem 4.2.5] that the *Jacobson radical* of $I(X, K)$ is

$$J(I(X, K)) = \{f \in I(X, K) : f(x, x) = 0, \forall x \in X\} = \text{span}_K \{e_{xy} : x < y\}.$$

The following facts are well-known and easy to prove:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ann}(J(I(X, K))) &= \text{span}_K \{e_{xy} : \text{Min}(X) \ni x < y \in \text{Max}(X)\}, \\ J(I(X, K)) \cdot J(I(X, K)) &= \text{span}_K \{e_{xy} : l(x, y) > 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

To shorten some formulas, we will sometimes write \mathcal{J} for $J(I(X, K))$ below.

2. SOME GENERAL PROPERTIES OF TOTALLY COMPATIBLE STRUCTURES

The following is clear.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\{\cdot_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of bilinear products on a same vector space V . If $\{\cdot_i\}_{i \in I}$ are pairwise σ -matching (resp., interchangeable or totally compatible), then any two finite linear combinations of $\{\cdot_i\}_{i \in I}$ are σ -matching (resp., interchangeable or totally compatible).*

The next result permits us to avoid unnecessary proofs of associativity in some cases.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (A, \cdot) be an associative algebra and $*_1, *_2$ two bilinear products on A , where $*_1$ is associative. Assume that $\cdot, *_1$ and $*_2$ are pairwise σ -matching (resp. totally compatible). Then $*_1 + *_2$ is a σ -matching (resp. totally compatible) structure on (A, \cdot) if and only if $*_2$ is associative.*

Proof. It is enough to prove the result for σ -matching structures.

The “only if” part. Assume that $*_1 + *_2$ is a σ -matching structure on (A, \cdot) . In particular, $*_1 + *_2$ is associative. By Lemma 2.1 the products $*_1 + *_2$ and $*_1$ are σ -matching, whence they are compatible. It follows that $*_2 = (*_1 + *_2) - *_1$ is associative.

The “if” part. Assume that $*_2$ is associative. Since $*_1$ and $*_2$ are σ -matching and associative, their sum $*_1 + *_2$ is also associative. By Lemma 2.1 the products $*_1 + *_2$ and \cdot are σ -matching. Thus, $*_1 + *_2$ is a σ -matching structure on (A, \cdot) . \square

The following property is a particular case of total compatibility that will occur below.

Definition 2.3. Let \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 be two (not necessarily associative) products on a same vector space V . We say that \cdot_1 and \cdot_2 are *mutually annihilating* if

$$(V \cdot_1 V) \cdot_2 V = (V \cdot_2 V) \cdot_1 V = V \cdot_1 (V \cdot_2 V) = V \cdot_2 (V \cdot_1 V) = \{0\}. \quad (6)$$

3. PROPER TOTALLY COMPATIBLE STRUCTURES

Recall from [11, Definition 2.4] the following.

Definition 3.1. Let (A, \cdot) be a (not necessarily associative) algebra and $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$. The product $*_\varphi$ on A given by

$$a *_\varphi b := \varphi(a \cdot b) \quad (7)$$

is said to be *determined* by φ .

Remark 3.2. In particular, \cdot is determined by id .

The next fact was proved as a part of [11, Lemma 2.3].

Lemma 3.3. Let (A, \cdot) be an associative algebra and $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$. Then $*_\varphi$ is a totally compatible structure on (A, \cdot) .

Let us introduce one more class of structures, which plays a particularly important role in the case of nilpotent algebras.

Definition 3.4. Let (A, \cdot) be a (not necessarily associative) algebra. A bilinear product \bullet on A is said to be *annihilator-valued* (with respect to \cdot), if \cdot and \bullet are mutually annihilating. An *annihilator-valued structure* on an associative algebra (A, \cdot) is an associative annihilator-valued bilinear product on A .

Remark 3.5. A bilinear product \bullet on A is annihilator-valued if and only if

- (i) $A \bullet A \subseteq \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$;
- (ii) $A \cdot A \subseteq \text{Ann}(A, \bullet)$.

Remark 3.6. Any annihilator-valued product \bullet on A is totally compatible with \cdot .

Remark 3.7. An annihilator-valued product \bullet on A may be non-associative even if (A, \cdot) is associative. For example, consider A to be a null algebra, i.e. $A \cdot A = \{0\}$, so that $\text{Ann}(A, \cdot) = A$. Then any bilinear product \bullet on A is annihilator-valued.

Remark 3.8. If $\text{Ann}(A, \cdot) \subseteq A \cdot A$, then $A \bullet A \subseteq \text{Ann}(A, \bullet)$, so any annihilator-valued product on A is associative, regardless of whether (A, \cdot) is associative.

Annihilator-valued products on (A, \cdot) admit the following constructive description.

Lemma 3.9. Let (A, \cdot) be a (not necessarily associative) algebra and V a vector space complement of $A \cdot A$ in A . Then a bilinear product \bullet on A is annihilator-valued if and only if there exists a bilinear map $\mu : V \times V \rightarrow \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$ such that

$$(a_1 + a_2) \bullet (b_1 + b_2) = \mu(a_2, b_2), \quad (8)$$

where $a_1, b_1 \in A \cdot A$ and $a_2, b_2 \in V$.

Proof. The “if” part. Let $\mu : V \times V \rightarrow \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$ be a bilinear map and define \bullet by (8). It is clear that \bullet is bilinear and $A \bullet A \subseteq \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$. Now, if $a \in A \cdot A$, then $a = a_1 + a_2$, where $a_1 = a \in A \cdot A$ and $a_2 = 0 \in V$. Hence, $a \bullet b = \mu(0, b_2) = 0$ for

any $b = b_1 + b_2 \in A$ with $b_1 \in A \cdot A$ and $b_2 \in V$. Thus, $(A \cdot A) \bullet A = \{0\}$. The proof that $A \bullet (A \cdot A) = \{0\}$ is similar.

The “only if” part. Let \bullet be an annihilator-valued product on A . Given $a = a_1 + a_2$ and $b = b_1 + b_2$ with $a_1, b_1 \in A \cdot A$ and $a_2, b_2 \in V$, by Remark 3.5 (ii) we have

$$(a_1 + a_2) \bullet (b_1 + b_2) = a_2 \bullet b_2.$$

So, we may define $\mu : V \times V \rightarrow \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$ by $\mu(u, v) = u \bullet v$ for all $u, v \in V$. Then μ is bilinear and (8) holds. \square

Lemma 3.10. *Let (A, \cdot) be a (not necessarily associative) algebra, $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$ and \bullet an annihilator-valued product on A . Then $*_\varphi$ and \bullet are mutually annihilating, in particular, totally compatible.*

Proof. For all $a, b, c \in A$ we have

$$(a *_\varphi b) \bullet c = \varphi(a \cdot b) \bullet c = (a \cdot \varphi(b)) \bullet c = 0$$

by Remark 3.5 (ii) and

$$(a \bullet b) *_\varphi c = \varphi((a \bullet b) \cdot c) = \varphi(0) = 0$$

by Remark 3.5 (i). Symmetrically, $a *_\varphi (b \bullet c) = a \bullet (b *_\varphi c) = 0$. \square

Hence, as a consequence of Lemmas 2.2, 3.3 and 3.10 and Remark 3.6 we get.

Corollary 3.11. *Let (A, \cdot) be an associative algebra, $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$ and \bullet an annihilator-valued product on A . Then $*_\varphi + \bullet$ is a totally compatible structure on (A, \cdot) if and only if \bullet is associative, i.e. \bullet is an annihilator-valued structure on (A, \cdot) .*

Definition 3.12. Let (A, \cdot) be an associative algebra. A totally compatible structure on (A, \cdot) is said to be *proper*, if it is of the form $*_\varphi + \bullet$, where $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$ and \bullet is an annihilator-valued structure on (A, \cdot) .

In most cases studied before in [11, 12] all the totally compatible structures turned out to be proper.

Example 3.13. Let (A, \cdot) be an associative algebra and $*$ a totally compatible structure on (A, \cdot) .

- (i) If A is unital, then $*$ is determined by $\varphi \in \Gamma(A) \cong C(A)$, whence $*$ is proper (see [11, Proposition 2.6]).
- (ii) If A is null, then $*$ is annihilator-valued, whence $*$ is proper (see Remark 3.7).
- (iii) If A is the semigroup algebra of a rectangular band, then $*$ is determined by $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$, whence $*$ is proper (see [11, Proposition 3.11]).
- (iv) If A has enough idempotents, then $*$ is determined by $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$, whence $*$ is proper (see [11, Proposition 3.23]).
- (v) If A is the free non-unital algebra over a set X with $|X| > 1$, then $*$ is determined by $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$, whence $*$ is proper (see [11, Proposition 4.6]).
- (vi) If A is the free non-unital commutative algebra over a set X with $|X| > 1$, then $*$ is determined by $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$, whence $*$ is proper (see [11, Proposition 4.12]).

- (vii) If A is the strictly upper triangular matrix algebra, then $*$ is proper (see [12, Theorem 5.1], where any linear combination of the structures $\mathbf{T}_{i,j}^1$ is annihilator-valued and any scalar multiple of the structure \mathbf{T}^2 is determined by $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$).
- (viii) If A is the free non-unital algebra over a set X with $|X| = 1$ (i.e., the non-unital polynomial algebra in one variable), then $*$ is not always proper (see [11, Remark 4.10]).

Proposition 3.14. *The class of proper totally compatible structures on an associative algebra (A, \cdot) is closed under isomorphisms and antiisomorphisms.*

Proof. Let $* = *_{\varphi} + \bullet$, where $\varphi \in \Gamma(A)$ and \bullet is an annihilator-valued structure on (A, \cdot) .

Any structure \star isomorphic to $*$ is of the form $a \star b = \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) * \phi^{-1}(b))$ for some $\phi \in \text{Aut}(A, \cdot)$. Then for all $a, b \in A$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} a \star b &= \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) * \phi^{-1}(b)) = \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) *_{\varphi} \phi^{-1}(b) + \phi^{-1}(a) \bullet \phi^{-1}(b)) \\ &= \phi(\varphi(\phi^{-1}(a) \cdot \phi^{-1}(b))) + \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) \bullet \phi^{-1}(b)) \\ &= (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a \cdot b) + \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) \bullet \phi^{-1}(b)). \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that $\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1} \in \Gamma(A)$, because

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a \cdot b) &= \phi(\varphi(\phi^{-1}(a) \cdot \phi^{-1}(b))) = \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) \cdot \varphi(\phi^{-1}(b))) \\ &= a \cdot \phi(\varphi(\phi^{-1}(b))) = a \cdot (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(b) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $(\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a \cdot b) = (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a) \cdot b$. Furthermore, the bilinear product $a \blacklozenge b = \phi(\phi^{-1}(a) \bullet \phi^{-1}(b))$ on A is clearly associative, because \bullet is, and satisfies $A \blacklozenge A \subseteq \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$ thanks to Remark 3.5 (i) and $\phi(\text{Ann}(A, \cdot)) = \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$. One also has $(A \cdot A) \blacklozenge A = A \blacklozenge (A \cdot A) = \{0\}$ due to Remark 3.5 (ii), $\phi^{-1}(A) = A$ and $\phi^{-1}(A \cdot A) = A \cdot A$. Thus, \blacklozenge is annihilator-valued, so that \star is proper as being equal to $*_{\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1}} + \blacklozenge$.

If \star is antiisomorphic to $*$, then it is given by $a \star b = \phi(\phi^{-1}(b) * \phi^{-1}(a))$ for some antiisomorphism ϕ of (A, \cdot) . Similarly to the isomorphic structure, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a \star b &= \phi(\varphi(\phi^{-1}(b) \cdot \phi^{-1}(a))) + \phi(\phi^{-1}(b) \bullet \phi^{-1}(a)) \\ &= (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a \cdot b) + \phi(\phi^{-1}(b) \bullet \phi^{-1}(a)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a \cdot b) &= \phi(\varphi(\phi^{-1}(b) \cdot \phi^{-1}(a))) = \phi(\varphi(\phi^{-1}(b)) \cdot \phi^{-1}(a)) \\ &= a \cdot \phi(\varphi(\phi^{-1}(b))) = a \cdot (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(b) \end{aligned}$$

and $(\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a \cdot b) = (\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1})(a) \cdot b$, so that $\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1} \in \Gamma(A)$. It is easily seen as above that $a \blacklozenge b = \phi(\phi^{-1}(b) \bullet \phi^{-1}(a))$ is an annihilator-valued structure on (A, \cdot) . Thus, $* = *_{\phi \circ \varphi \circ \phi^{-1}} + \blacklozenge$ is proper. \square

4. PROPER TOTALLY COMPATIBLE STRUCTURES ON $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$

4.1. The centroid of $J(I(X, K))$. In order to characterize proper totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$, we need a description of the centroid of $J(I(X, K))$. Let us introduce a class of centroid elements that will be one of the ingredients of the future description.

Definition 4.1. Let (A, \cdot) be a (not necessarily associative) algebra. A linear map $\varphi : A \rightarrow A$ is said to be *annihilator-valued*, if it satisfies

- (i) $\varphi(A) \subseteq \text{Ann}(A)$;
- (ii) $\varphi(A \cdot A) = \{0\}$.

Remark 4.2. Any annihilator-valued linear map $\varphi : A \rightarrow A$ belongs to $\Gamma(A)$, since all the products in (2) are zero.

Another class of centroid elements has its origin in [10]. Recall from [10] that a map $\sigma : X_{\leq}^2 \rightarrow K$ is said to be *constant on chains* if

$$\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(u, v), \text{ whenever } x < y \text{ and } u < v \text{ belong to a same chain in } X.$$

Definition 4.3. Let $\sigma : X_{\leq}^2 \rightarrow K$ be constant on chains. Define the linear map $\varphi_\sigma : J(I(X, K)) \rightarrow J(I(X, K))$ by

$$\varphi_\sigma(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)e_{xy},$$

for all $x < y$.

Lemma 4.4. Let $\sigma : X_{\leq}^2 \rightarrow K$ be constant on chains. Then $\varphi_\sigma \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$.

Proof. Let $x < y$ and $u < v$. If $v \neq x$, then

$$e_{uv}\varphi_\sigma(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)e_{uv}e_{xy} = 0 = \varphi_\sigma(0) = \varphi_\sigma(e_{uv}e_{xy}).$$

If $v = x$, then $x < y$ and $u < y$ belong to the same chain $u < x < y$. Hence, $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(u, y)$, so

$$e_{uv}\varphi_\sigma(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)e_{uv}e_{xy} = \sigma(x, y)e_{uy} = \sigma(u, y)e_{uy} = \varphi_\sigma(e_{uy}) = \varphi_\sigma(e_{uv}e_{xy}).$$

Similarly one proves that $\varphi_\sigma(e_{xy})e_{uv} = \varphi_\sigma(e_{xy}e_{uv})$. Thus, $\varphi_\sigma \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$. \square

Lemma 4.5. Let $\varphi \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$ and $x < y$.

- (i) If $l(x, y) > 1$, then $\varphi(e_{xy}) \in \text{span}_K\{e_{xy}\}$.
- (ii) If $l(x, y) = 1$, then $\varphi(e_{xy}) \in \text{span}_K\{e_{xy}\} + \text{Ann}(J(I(X, K)))$.

Proof. (i). If $l(x, y) > 1$, then there is $x < z < y$, so

$$\varphi(e_{xy}) = \varphi(e_{xz}e_{zy}) = e_{xz}\varphi(e_{zy}) \in \text{span}_K\{e_{xz} : z < y\}.$$

Similarly,

$$\varphi(e_{xy}) = \varphi(e_{xz})e_{zy} \in \text{span}_K\{e_{zy} : z < y\}.$$

Since

$$\text{span}_K\{e_{xz} : z < y\} \cap \text{span}_K\{e_{zy} : z < y\} = \text{span}_K\{e_{xy}\},$$

the proof of (i) is complete.

(ii). Let $u < v$ with $(u, v) \neq (x, y)$. Assume first that $u \notin \text{Min}(X)$ and choose $a < u$. Then

$$\varphi(e_{xy})(u, v) = (e_{au}\varphi(e_{xy}))(a, v) = \varphi(e_{au}e_{xy})(a, v). \quad (9)$$

We have two cases.

Case 1: $u \neq x$. Then $e_{au}e_{xy} = 0$, so $\varphi(e_{xy})(u, v) = 0$ by (9).

Case 2: $u = x$ and $v \neq y$. Then $e_{au}e_{xy} = e_{ay}$, where $l(a, y) > 1$. By (i) we have $\varphi(e_{ay}) \in \text{span}_K\{e_{ay}\}$. Since $v \neq y$, then $\varphi(e_{ay})(a, v) = 0$, so $\varphi(e_{xy})(u, v) = 0$ in view of (9). One similarly shows that $\varphi(e_{xy})(u, v) = 0$, whenever $v \notin \text{Max}(X)$. This completes the proof of (ii). \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\varphi \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$. Then the associated map $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$, given by*

$$\sigma(x, y) = \varphi(e_{xy})(x, y),$$

for all $x < y$, is constant on chains.

Proof. Let $x < y$ and C be a chain containing x and y . Denote $a = \text{Min}(C)$ and $b = \text{Max}(C)$. We first show that $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(a, y)$. It suffices to consider the case $a \neq x$. Then $a < x$, so

$$\varphi(e_{xy})(x, y) = (e_{ax}\varphi(e_{xy}))(a, y) = \varphi(e_{ax}e_{xy})(a, y) = \varphi(e_{ay})(a, y),$$

whence $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(a, y)$. Similarly, one proves that $\sigma(a, y) = \sigma(a, b)$. Thus, $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(a, b)$. \square

Proposition 4.7. *The elements of $\Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$ are exactly the maps of the form $\varphi_\sigma + \eta$, where $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$ is constant on chains and η is annihilator-valued.*

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$. Then there is $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$ from Lemma 4.6 which is constant on chains. Define $\eta = \varphi - \varphi_\sigma$. In view of Lemma 4.5 we have $\eta(e_{xy}) \in \text{Ann}(J(I(X, K)))$ and $\eta(e_{xy}) = 0$, whenever $l(x, y) > 1$. The latter means that $\eta(\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}) = \{0\}$. Thus, η is annihilator-valued.

Conversely, $\varphi_\sigma \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$ by Lemma 4.4 and $\eta \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$ by Remark 4.2. Therefore, $\varphi_\sigma + \eta \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$. \square

4.2. The description of proper totally compatible structures.

Corollary 4.8. *Proper totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ are exactly bilinear products $*$ of the form*

$$e_{xy} * e_{uv} = \sigma(x, v)\delta_{yu}e_{xv} + e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv}, \quad (10)$$

where $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$ is constant on chains and \bullet is an annihilator-valued structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$.

Proof. This follows from Definition 3.12 and Proposition 4.7, because for $\varphi = \varphi_\sigma + \eta \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$ as in Proposition 4.7 we have

$$e_{xy} *_\varphi e_{uv} = \varphi_\sigma(e_{xy} \cdot e_{uv}) + \eta(e_{xy} \cdot e_{uv}) = \varphi_\sigma(\delta_{yu}e_{xv}) = \sigma(x, v)\delta_{yu}e_{xv}.$$

\square

Remark 4.9. Let \sim be the equivalence relation on $X_{<}^2$ generated by the pairs $((x, y), (u, v)) \in X_{<}^2 \times X_{<}^2$ such that there exists a chain in X containing both $x < y$ and $u < v$. Then a map $X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$ is constant on chains if and only if it is constant on \sim -classes of $X_{<}^2$.

Taking a \sim -class \mathcal{C} of $X_{<}^2$, one can define $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}} : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$ by

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & (x, y) \in \mathcal{C}, \\ 0, & (x, y) \notin \mathcal{C}. \end{cases}$$

Then $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ is constant on chains, and the corresponding totally compatible structure $*_{\mathcal{C}}$ on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ determined by $\varphi_{\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}} \in \Gamma(J(I(X, K)))$ is given by

$$e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{uv} = \begin{cases} e_{xv}, & y = u \text{ and } (x, v) \in \mathcal{C}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is therefore easily seen by Corollary 4.8 that the totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ are exactly bilinear products $*$ that are sums of an annihilator-valued structure \bullet on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ and a linear combination of the structures $*_{\mathcal{C}}$, where \mathcal{C} runs through the set X_{\leq}^2 / \sim of \sim -classes of X_{\leq}^2 .

5. TOTALLY COMPATIBLE STRUCTURES ON $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$

5.1. A class of totally compatible structures. We first define a combinatorial notion that will play a role in the main result.

Definition 5.1. Let $(x, y, z), (u, v, w) \in X_{\leq}^3$. The triples (x, y, z) and (u, v, w) are said to be *chained* if there is a chain in X containing both $x < y < z$ and $u < v < w$. Let \approx be the equivalence relation generated by all the pairs of chained triples in X_{\leq}^3 and denote by X_{\leq}^3 / \approx the set of \approx -equivalence classes of X_{\leq}^3 .

Remark 5.2. If (x, y, z) and (u, v, w) are chained, then $(x, z) \sim (u, w)$. Consequently, for any $(x, y, z), (u, v, w) \in X_{\leq}^3$ we have

$$(x, y, z) \approx (u, v, w) \Rightarrow (x, z) \sim (u, w). \quad (11)$$

The converse of (11) is not true in general (see Examples 5.15–5.17 below).

Lemma 5.3. Let $\mathcal{C} \in X_{\leq}^3 / \approx$. Then the bilinear product $*_{\mathcal{C}}$ given by

$$e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{uv} = \begin{cases} e_{xv}, & y = u \text{ and } (x, y, v) \in \mathcal{C}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

is a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$.

Proof. Let $x < y, z < u$ and $v < w$. We are going to show that

$$(e_{xy} \cdot e_{zu}) *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = (e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zu}) \cdot e_{vw} = e_{xy} \cdot (e_{zu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw}) = e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} (e_{zu} \cdot e_{vw}). \quad (13)$$

Case 1: $y \neq z$. Then $e_{xy} \cdot e_{zu} = e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zu} = 0$, so the first two products of (13) are zero. By (12) the product $e_{zu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw}$ is either e_{zw} or 0. In any case, $e_{xy} \cdot (e_{zu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw}) = 0$. Similarly, $e_{zu} \cdot e_{vw}$ is either e_{zw} or 0. In any case, $e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} (e_{zu} \cdot e_{vw}) = 0$ by (12).

Case 2: $y = z$. Then $(e_{xy} \cdot e_{zu}) *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = e_{xu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw}$. We have the following two subcases.

Case 2.1: $u \neq v$. Then $e_{xu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = e_{zu} \cdot e_{vw} = e_{zu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = 0$, so all the products of (13), except possibly for the second one, are zero. Since $e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zu}$ is either e_{xu} or 0, we have $(e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zu}) \cdot e_{vw} = 0$ as well.

Case 2.2: $u = v$. Observe that

$$(x, y, u) \approx (x, u, w) \approx (y, u, w) \approx (x, y, w). \quad (14)$$

because $x < y < u < w$. We have the following two subcases.

Case 2.2.1: $(x, u, w) \notin \mathcal{C}$. Then $(x, y, u), (y, u, w), (x, y, w) \notin \mathcal{C}$. By (12) we have $e_{xu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = 0$, so that $(e_{xy} \cdot e_{zu}) *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = 0$. Since $e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zu} = e_{zu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = 0$, then $(e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zu}) \cdot e_{vw} = e_{xy} \cdot (e_{zu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw}) = 0$. Furthermore, $e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} (e_{zu} \cdot e_{vw}) = e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zw}$, which is also zero by (12).

Case 2.2.2: $(x, u, w) \in \mathcal{C}$. Then $(x, y, u), (y, u, w), (x, y, w) \in \mathcal{C}$. In this case, $e_{xu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = e_{xw}$, so that $(e_{xy} \cdot e_{zu}) *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw} = e_{xw}$ by (12). Now, $(e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zu}) \cdot e_{vw} = e_{xu} \cdot e_{vw} = e_{xw}$, $e_{xy} \cdot (e_{zu} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{vw}) = e_{xy} \cdot e_{zw} = e_{xw}$ and $e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} (e_{zu} \cdot e_{vw}) = e_{xy} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{zw} = e_{xw}$ by (12).

Thus, the proof of (13) is complete.

For the associativity of $*$ let us show that

$$(e_{xy} *_C e_{zu}) *_C e_{vw} = e_{xy} *_C (e_{zu} *_C e_{vw}). \quad (15)$$

The proof of (15) is similar to that of (13). As above, one sees that both of the monomials of (15) are zero, whenever $y \neq z$ or $u \neq v$. If $y = z$ and $u = v$, then $x < y < u < w$, so that (14) holds. Hence, both of the monomials of (15) are either zero (if $(x, y, u) \notin \mathcal{C}$) or are equal to e_{xw} (if $(x, y, u) \in \mathcal{C}$). \square

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a \approx -class and \bullet an annihilator-valued product on $J(I(X, K))$. Then $*_{\mathcal{C}}$ and \bullet are mutually annihilating, in particular, totally compatible.*

Proof. It follows from $\mathcal{J} \bullet \mathcal{J} \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot)$ and (12) that $(\mathcal{J} \bullet \mathcal{J}) *_C \mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J} *_C (\mathcal{J} \bullet \mathcal{J}) = \{0\}$. Now, since $\mathcal{J} *_C \mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J} \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \bullet)$, then $\mathcal{J} *_C \mathcal{J} \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \bullet)$. \square

Lemma 5.5. *For any pair of distinct \approx -classes \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} , the structures $*_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $*_{\mathcal{D}}$ are mutually annihilating, in particular, totally compatible.*

Proof. Let $x < y$, $z < u$ and $v < w$.

Case 1: $y \neq z$ or $u \neq v$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (e_{xy} *_C e_{zu}) *_D e_{vw} &= (e_{xy} *_D e_{zu}) *_C e_{vw} = e_{xy} *_C (e_{zu} *_D e_{vw}) \\ &= e_{xy} *_D (e_{zu} *_C e_{vw}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

by (12).

Case 2: $y = z$ and $u = v$. Then $x < y < u < w$, so we have (14).

Case 2.1: $(x, y, u) \in \mathcal{C}$. Then $(x, y, u), (x, u, w), (y, u, w), (x, y, w) \notin \mathcal{D}$ by (14), whence (16).

Case 2.2: $(x, y, u) \in \mathcal{D}$. Then $(x, y, u), (x, u, w), (x, y, w), (y, u, w) \notin \mathcal{C}$ by (14), whence (16).

Case 2.3: $(x, y, u) \notin \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{D}$. Then (16) is immediate in view of (14). \square

Proposition 5.6. *The sum of an annihilator-valued structure \bullet on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ and a linear combination of the structures $*_{\mathcal{C}}$, where \mathcal{C} runs through the set of \approx -equivalence classes of X_{\leq}^3 , is a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 2.1 and 5.3–5.5 and Remark 3.6 any product of the form $\bullet + \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in X_{\leq}^3 / \approx} \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} *_C$ is totally compatible with \cdot . Since \bullet and all the structures $*_{\mathcal{C}}$ are associative and pairwise totally compatible, then $\bullet + \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in X_{\leq}^3 / \approx} \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} *_C$ is also associative. \square

5.2. The description of totally compatible structures. Recall the following fact.

Lemma 5.7 (Lemma 4.1 from [12]). *Let (A, \cdot) be a (not necessarily associative) algebra and $*$ a bilinear product on A such that $*$ and \cdot are interchangeable. For all $a, b \in A$ if $a \cdot b = 0$, then $a * b \in \text{Ann}(A, \cdot)$.*

Lemma 5.8. *Let $*$ be a bilinear product on $J(I(X, K))$ such that $*$ and \cdot are (12)-matching. Given $x < y$ and $u < v$ with $y \neq u$, if $l(x, y) > 1$ or $l(u, v) > 1$, then $e_{xy} * e_{uv} = 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $l(x, y) > 1$ and choose $x < z < y$. Then

$$e_{xy} * e_{uv} = (e_{xz} \cdot e_{zy}) * e_{uv} = e_{xz} * (e_{zy} \cdot e_{uv}) = 0.$$

The case $l(u, v) > 1$ is similar. \square

Lemma 5.9. *Assume that $*$ is a bilinear product on $J(I(X, K))$ such that $*$ and \cdot are totally compatible. Let $x < y < z$.*

- (i) *If $l(x, y) > 1$ or $l(y, z) > 1$, then $e_{xy} * e_{yz} \in \text{span}_K\{e_{xz}\}$.*
- (ii) *If $l(x, y) = l(y, z) = 1$, then $e_{xy} * e_{yz} \in \text{span}_K\{e_{xz}\} + \text{Ann}(J(I(X, K)))$.*

Proof. (i). Assume that $l(x, y) > 1$ and choose $x < u < y$. Then

$$e_{xy} * e_{yz} = (e_{xu} \cdot e_{uy}) * e_{yz} = e_{xu} \cdot (e_{uy} * e_{yz}) \in \text{span}_K\{e_{xv} : u < v\}.$$

On the other hand,

$$e_{xy} * e_{yz} = (e_{xu} \cdot e_{uy}) * e_{yz} = (e_{xu} * e_{uy}) \cdot e_{yz} \in \text{span}_K\{e_{wz} : w < y\}.$$

Consequently,

$$e_{xy} * e_{yz} \in \text{span}_K\{e_{xv} : u < v\} \cap \text{span}_K\{e_{wz} : w < y\} = \text{span}_K\{e_{xz}\}.$$

The case $l(y, z) > 1$ is similar.

(ii). Now let $l(x, y) = l(y, z) = 1$. Take $u < v$ such that $(u, v) \neq (x, z)$. Assume first that $u \notin \text{Min}(X)$ and choose $a < u$. Then

$$(e_{xy} * e_{yz})(u, v) = (e_{au} \cdot (e_{xy} * e_{yz}))(a, v).$$

We have two cases.

Case 1: $u \neq x$. Then $e_{au} \cdot (e_{xy} * e_{yz}) = (e_{au} \cdot e_{xy}) * e_{yz} = 0$.

Case 2: $u = x$ and $v \neq z$. By (i) we have

$$e_{au} \cdot (e_{xy} * e_{yz}) = e_{ax} \cdot (e_{xy} * e_{yz}) = e_{ax} * (e_{xy} \cdot e_{yz}) = e_{ax} * e_{xz} \in \text{span}_K\{e_{az}\},$$

because $l(x, z) > 1$. Since $v \neq z$, we conclude that $(e_{au} \cdot (e_{xy} * e_{yz}))(a, v) = 0$.

Thus, $(e_{xy} * e_{yz})(u, v) = 0$, whenever $(u, v) \neq (x, z)$ and $u \notin \text{Min}(X)$. One similarly proves that $(e_{xy} * e_{yz})(u, v) = 0$, whenever $(u, v) \neq (x, z)$ and $v \notin \text{Max}(X)$. \square

Lemma 5.10. *Assume that $*$ is a bilinear product on $J(I(X, K))$ such that $*$ and \cdot are totally compatible. Given $x < y < z$ and $u < v < w$, if $(x, y, z) \approx (u, v, w)$, then $(e_{xy} * e_{yz})(x, z) = (e_{uv} * e_{vw})(u, w)$.*

Proof. It is enough to consider the case where $x < y < z$ and $u < v < w$ are chained, so let C be a chain containing $x < y < z$ and $u < v < w$. Denote $a = \text{Min}(C)$ and $b = \text{Max}(C)$. If $x \neq a$, then $a < x$ and

$$\begin{aligned} (e_{xy} * e_{yz})(x, z) &= (e_{ax} \cdot (e_{xy} * e_{yz}))(a, z) = ((e_{ax} \cdot e_{xy}) * e_{yz})(a, z) \\ &= (e_{ay} * e_{yz})(a, z). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

If $x = a$, then (17) trivially holds. Similarly,

$$(e_{ay} * e_{yz})(a, z) = (e_{ay} * e_{yb})(a, b). \tag{18}$$

Combining (17) and (18), we get $(e_{xy} * e_{yz})(x, z) = (e_{ay} * e_{yb})(a, b)$. By the same reason $(e_{uv} * e_{vw})(u, w) = (e_{av} * e_{vb})(a, b)$. If $y = v$, we are done. If $y < v$, then

$$e_{av} * e_{vb} = (e_{ay} \cdot e_{yv}) * e_{vb} = e_{ay} * (e_{yv} \cdot e_{vb}) = e_{ay} * e_{yb}.$$

The case $v < y$ is symmetric. \square

Proposition 5.11. *Assume that $*$ is a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. Then $*$ is the sum of an annihilator-valued structure \bullet on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ and a linear combination of the structures $*_{\mathcal{C}}$, where \mathcal{C} runs through the set of \approx -equivalence classes of $X_{<}^3$.*

Proof. For all $x < y < z$ denote $\alpha_{xyz} = (e_{xy} * e_{yz})(x, z) \in K$. Furthermore, for all $x < y$ and $u < v$ with $l(x, y) = l(u, v) = 1$ denote $a_{xy}^{uv} = e_{xy} * e_{uv} - \alpha_{xyv} \delta_{yu} e_{xv}$. By Lemmas 5.7–5.9 we have $a_{xy}^{uv} \in \text{Ann}(J(I(X, K)))$ and

$$e_{xy} * e_{uv} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{xyv} \delta_{yu} e_{xv} + a_{xy}^{uv}, & l(x, y) + l(u, v) = 2, \\ \alpha_{xyv} \delta_{yu} e_{xv}, & l(x, y) + l(u, v) > 2. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Moreover, by Lemma 5.10 we have $\alpha_{xyz} = \alpha_{uvw}$, whenever $(x, y, z) \approx (u, v, w)$.

Given a \approx -class \mathcal{C} , denote by $\alpha_{\mathcal{C}}$ the common α_{xyz} for all $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, denote by \bullet the following bilinear product on $J(I(X, K))$:

$$e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv} = \begin{cases} a_{xy}^{uv}, & l(x, y) + l(u, v) = 2, \\ 0, & l(x, y) + l(u, v) > 2. \end{cases}$$

Then \bullet is annihilator-valued, and by (19) we have $*$ = \bullet + $\sum_{\mathcal{C} \in X_{<}^3 / \approx} \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} *_{\mathcal{C}}$. By Lemmas 5.3 and 5.5 the linear combination $\sum_{\mathcal{C} \in X_{<}^3 / \approx} \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} *_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. Furthermore, by Lemmas 2.1, 5.4 and 5.5 the products \bullet and $\sum_{\mathcal{C} \in X_{<}^3 / \approx} \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} *_{\mathcal{C}}$ are totally compatible. Finally, \bullet and \cdot are totally compatible by Remark 3.6. Then it follows from Lemma 2.2 that \bullet is associative, so that it is an annihilator-valued structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. \square

Theorem 5.12. *Let X be a finite poset and K a field. Then totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ are exactly sums of annihilator-valued structures \bullet on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ and linear combinations of the structures $*_{\mathcal{C}}$, where \mathcal{C} runs through the set of \approx -equivalence classes of $X_{<}^3$.*

Proof. It follows from Propositions 5.6 and 5.11. \square

As a consequence, we obtain the following sufficient condition for all the totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ to be proper.

Corollary 5.13. *Assume that for all $(x, y, z), (u, v, w) \in X_{<}^3$ one has*

$$(x, z) \sim (u, w) \Rightarrow (x, y, z) \approx (u, v, w). \quad (20)$$

Then all the totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ are proper.


Proof. Let $*$ be a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. Then $*$ = \bullet + $\sum_{\mathcal{C} \in X_{<}^3 / \approx} \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} *_{\mathcal{C}}$ as in Theorem 5.12. Given $x < y$ with $l(x, y) > 1$, choose an arbitrary $x < z < y$ and define $\sigma(x, y) = \alpha_{\mathcal{C}}$, where \mathcal{C} is the \approx -class of (x, z, y) . By (20) the definition does not depend on the choice of z . Moreover, $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(u, v)$, whenever $l(x, y) > 1$, $l(u, v) > 1$ and $(x, y) \sim (u, v)$ by (20). Now if $l(x, y) = 1$ and there is $(u, v) \sim (x, y)$ with $l(u, v) > 1$, then set $\sigma(x, y) := \sigma(u, v)$. This is again well-defined by (20). Finally, if $l(x, y) = 1$ and there is no $(u, v) \sim (x, y)$ with $l(u, v) > 1$, then the \sim -class of (x, y) is a singleton¹, so we can define $\sigma(x, y)$ arbitrarily. By construction, $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$ is constant on chains and (10) holds. Thus, $*$ is proper by Remark 4.9. \square

¹This happens exactly when $\{x, y\}$ is a maximal chain in X .

Remark 5.14. The condition (20) is not necessary for all the totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ to be proper as will be seen in Examples 5.16 and 5.17.

We first give an example showing that there may exist non-proper totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$.

Example 5.15. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ with the partial order whose Hasse diagram is given below.



Observe that

$$X_{<}^3 = \{(1, 2, 3), (1, 2, 4), (1, 2, 5), (1, 2, 6), (2, 3, 5), (2, 4, 6)\}.$$

There set $X_{<}^3$ decomposes into two \approx -classes:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(1, 2, 3), (1, 2, 5), (2, 3, 5)\} \text{ and } \mathcal{D} = \{(1, 2, 4), (1, 2, 6), (2, 4, 6)\},$$

because all the elements constituting the triples from \mathcal{C} belong to the chain $1 < 2 < 3 < 5$, all the elements constituting the triples from \mathcal{D} belong to the chain $1 < 2 < 4 < 6$ and no triple from \mathcal{C} is chained with a triple from \mathcal{D} . Thus, by Theorem 5.12 we obtain a totally compatible structure $*_{\mathcal{C}}$ on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$, which is given by

$$e_{12} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{23} = e_{13}, \quad e_{12} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{25} = e_{15}, \quad e_{23} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{35} = e_{25}, \quad (21)$$

where the remaining products of basis elements are zero. However, $*_{\mathcal{C}}$ is not proper. For, if it were proper, by Corollary 4.8 there would exist a map $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$, constant on chains, and an annihilator-valued structure \bullet on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ such that (10) holds. Then we would have

$$e_{12} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{23} = \sigma(1, 3)e_{13} + e_{12} \bullet e_{23} \text{ and } e_{12} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{24} = \sigma(1, 4)e_{14} + e_{12} \bullet e_{24}. \quad (22)$$

Since

$$\text{Ann}(J(I(X, K)), \cdot) = \text{span}_K\{e_{15}, e_{16}\},$$


then comparing $e_{12} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{23}$ in (21) and (22), we would conclude that $\sigma(1, 3) = 1$. Similarly, from $e_{12} *_{\mathcal{C}} e_{24} = 0$ and (22) we would get $\sigma(1, 4) = 0$. But σ is constant on chains, so taking the chains $1 < 2 < 3$ and $1 < 2 < 4$, we would have

$$\sigma(1, 3) = \sigma(1, 2) = \sigma(1, 4),$$

a contradiction.

A slight modification of Example 5.15 results in only proper totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$.

Example 5.16. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ with the partial order whose Hasse diagram is given below.



Similarly to Example 5.15, we have

$$X_{<}^3 = \{(1, 2, 3), (1, 2, 4), (1, 2, 5), (2, 3, 5)\}$$

with two \approx -classes

$$\mathcal{C} = \{(1, 2, 3), (1, 2, 5), (2, 3, 5)\} \text{ and } \mathcal{D} = \{(1, 2, 4)\}.$$

Let $*$ be a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. By Theorem 5.12 there are $\alpha, \beta \in K$ and an annihilator-valued structure \bullet on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e_{12} * e_{23} &= \alpha e_{13} + e_{12} \bullet e_{23}, \quad e_{12} * e_{25} = \alpha e_{15}, \\ e_{23} * e_{35} &= \alpha e_{25} + e_{23} \bullet e_{35}, \quad e_{12} * e_{24} = \beta e_{14} + e_{12} \bullet e_{24}, \\ e_{xy} * e_{uv} &= e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv}, \quad \text{if } y \neq u \text{ and } (x, y), (u, v) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (2, 4), (3, 5)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the remaining products of basis elements are zero. Define $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K$ by $\sigma(x, y) = \alpha$ for all $(x, y) \in X_{<}^2$. Obviously, σ is constant on chains. Furthermore, define a bilinear product \blacklozenge on $J(I(X, K))$ by setting, for all $x < y$ and $u < v$,

$$e_{xy} \blacklozenge e_{uv} = \begin{cases} e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv} + (\beta - \alpha)e_{14}, & (x, y) = (1, 2) \text{ and } (u, v) = (2, 4), \\ e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Since

$$\text{Ann}(J(I(X, K)), \cdot) = \text{span}_K\{e_{15}, e_{14}\},$$

then by (23) and Remark 3.5 (i) we have

$$\mathcal{J} \blacklozenge \mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{J} \bullet \mathcal{J} + \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot) \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot).$$

Moreover, as

$$\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J} = \text{span}_K\{e_{13}, e_{14}, e_{15}, e_{25}\},$$


by (23) and Remark 3.5 (ii) we have

$$(\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}) \blacklozenge \mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}) \bullet \mathcal{J} = \{0\} \text{ and } \mathcal{J} \blacklozenge (\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{J} \bullet (\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}) = \{0\}.$$

Finally, $\text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot) \subseteq \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}$ guarantees that \blacklozenge is associative by Remark 3.8. So, \blacklozenge is an annihilator-valued structure on (\mathcal{J}, \cdot) . Thus, $*$ is proper by Corollary 4.8 (where \bullet should be replaced by \blacklozenge).

An easier example, where all the totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ are proper (in fact, annihilator-valued), is as follows.

Example 5.17. Let $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with the partial order whose Hasse diagram is given below.



Then $X_{\leq}^3 = \{(1, 2, 3), (1, 2, 4)\}$ having two \approx -classes $\mathcal{C} = \{(1, 2, 3)\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{(1, 2, 4)\}$. Let $*$ be a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. By Theorem 5.12 there are $\alpha, \beta \in K$ and an annihilator-valued structure \bullet on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} e_{12} * e_{23} &= \alpha e_{13} + e_{12} \bullet e_{23}, \quad e_{12} * e_{24} = \beta e_{14} + e_{12} \bullet e_{24}, \\ e_{xy} * e_{uv} &= e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv}, \text{ if } y \neq u \text{ and } (x, y), (u, v) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (2, 4)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the remaining products of basis elements are zero. But

$$\text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot) = \text{span}_K\{e_{13}, e_{14}\} = \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J},$$

so that $*$ is itself an annihilator-valued structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. In particular, $*$ is proper.

Remark 5.18. Observe that in Examples 5.16 and 5.17 all the pairs $(x, y) \in X_{\leq}^2$ are \sim -equivalent, but not all the triples $(x, y, z) \in X_{\leq}^3$ are \approx -equivalent. So, (20) does not hold.

In fact, the result of Example 5.17 can be generalized.

Proposition 5.19. *Let X be a finite poset. Then all the totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ are annihilator-valued if and only if $l(X) \leq 2$.*

Proof. The “if” part. Assume that $l(X) \leq 2$ and let $*$ be a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. By Theorem 5.12 we have $*$ = $\bullet + \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in X_{\leq}^3 / \approx} \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} * \mathcal{C}$, where \bullet is an annihilator-valued structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$.

We first prove that $\mathcal{J} * \mathcal{J} \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot)$. Let $x < y$ and $u < v$. If $y \neq u$, then $e_{xy} * e_{uv} = e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv} \in \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot)$. Otherwise, $e_{xy} * e_{uv} = \alpha_{\mathcal{C}} e_{xv} + e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv}$, where \mathcal{C} is the \approx -class containing (x, y, v) . Observe that $x < y < v$ is a maximal chain (otherwise there would exist a maximal chain in X properly containing $x < y < v$, i.e. having length > 2). Therefore, $x \in \text{Min}(X)$ and $v \in \text{Max}(X)$. This means that $e_{xv} \in \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot)$, so that $e_{xy} * e_{uv} \in \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot)$. Thus, $\mathcal{J} * \mathcal{J} \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, \cdot)$.

Now let us show that $\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J} \subseteq \text{Ann}(\mathcal{J}, *)$. Let $x < y$ and $u < v$. Assume first that $l(x, y) > 1$, i.e. $e_{xy} \in \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}$. Then $y \neq u$, since otherwise $l(x, v) > 2$ contradicting $l(X) = 2$. Hence, $e_{xy} * e_{uv} = e_{xy} \bullet e_{uv}$, which is 0 by Remark 3.5 (ii). This proves $(\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}) * \mathcal{J} = \{0\}$. The proof of $\mathcal{J} * (\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{J}) = \{0\}$ is similar (it corresponds to the case $l(u, v) > 1$). Thus, $*$ is annihilator-valued.

The “only if” part. Assume that $l(X) > 2$. Then there are $x < y < z$ in X such that $x \notin \text{Min}(X)$ or $z \notin \text{Max}(X)$. The product \cdot is itself a totally compatible structure on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$, and it is not annihilator-valued, because $e_{xy} \cdot e_{yz} = e_{xz} \notin \text{Ann}(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$. \square

6. OPEN PROBLEM

Problem 6.1. *Let K be a field. Characterize finite posets X such that all the totally compatible structures on $(J(I(X, K)), \cdot)$ are proper.*

REFERENCES

- [1] ABDELWAHAB, H., KAYGORODOV, I., AND MAKHLOUF, A. The algebraic and geometric classification of compatible pre-Lie algebras. *SIGMA, Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* 20 (2024), paper 107, 20.
- [2] BOLSINOV, A. V. Compatible Poisson brackets on Lie algebras and completeness of families of functions in involution. *Math. USSR, Izv.* 38, 1 (1991), 69–90.
- [3] BOLSINOV, A. V., AND BORISOV, A. V. Compatible Poisson brackets on Lie algebras. *Math. Notes* 72, 1 (2002), 10–30.
- [4] CARIÑENA, J. F., GRABOWSKI, J., AND MARMO, G. Quantum bi-Hamiltonian systems. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 15, 30 (2000), 4797–4810.
- [5] DAS, A. Compatible L_∞ -algebras. *J. Algebra* 610 (2022), 241–269.
- [6] DAS, A. Cohomology and deformations of compatible Hom-Lie algebras. *J. Geom. Phys.* 192 (2023), 14. Id/No 104951.
- [7] ELDUQUE, A., AND MYUNG, H. C. *Mutations of alternative algebras*, vol. 278 of *Math. Appl., Dordr.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.
- [8] GOLUBCHIK, I. Z., AND SOKOLOV, V. V. Compatible Lie brackets and integrable equations of the principal chiral model type. *Funct. Anal. Appl.* 36, 3 (2002), 172–181.
- [9] GOLUBCHIK, I. Z., AND SOKOLOV, V. V. Factorization of the loop algebras and compatible Lie brackets. *J. Nonlinear Math. Phys.* 12 (2005), 343–350.
- [10] KAYGORODOV, I., AND KHRYPCHENKO, M. Transposed Poisson structures on Lie incidence algebras. *J. Algebra* 647 (2024), 458–491.
- [11] KHRYPCHENKO, M. σ -matching and interchangeable structures on certain associative algebras. *Commun. Math.* 33, 3 (2025), Paper no. 6.
- [12] KHRYPCHENKO, M. σ -matching and interchangeable structures on the strictly upper triangular matrix algebra. *Mediterr. J. Math.* 22 (2025), article number 103.
- [13] LADRA, M., LEITE DA CUNHA, B., AND LOPES, S. A. A classification of nilpotent compatible Lie algebras. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2)* 74, 1 (2025), 29. Id/No 70.
- [14] MAGRI, F. A simple model of the integrable Hamiltonian equation. *J. Math. Phys.* 19 (1978), 1156–1162.
- [15] MAKHLOUF, A., AND SAHA, R. On compatible Leibniz algebras. *J. Algebra Appl.* 24, 4 (2025), 25. Id/No 2550105.
- [16] NORMATOV, Z. Compatible anti-pre-Lie algebras. *To appear in J. Algebra Appl.* [arXiv:2412.16273](https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16273) (2024). 10.1142/S0219498826502208.
- [17] ODESSKII, A., AND SOKOLOV, V. Algebraic structures connected with pairs of compatible associative algebras. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2006, 19 (2006), 35. Id/No 43743.
- [18] REYMAN, A. G., AND SEMENOV-TIAN-SHANSKY, M. A. Compatible Poisson brackets for Lax equations and classical r -matrices. *J. Sov. Math.* 47, 2 (1989), 2493–2502.
- [19] ROTA, G.-C. On the foundations of combinatorial theory. I. Theory of Möbius functions. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* 2, 4 (1964), 340–368.
- [20] SPIEGEL, E., AND O'DONNELL, C. J. *Incidence Algebras*. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker, 1997.
- [21] STROHMAYER, H. Operads of compatible structures and weighted partitions. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 212, 11 (2008), 2522–2534.
- [22] TENG, W., LONG, F., ZHANG, H., AND JIN, J. On compatible Hom-Lie triple systems. *J. Math. Res. Appl.* 44, 5 (2024), 633–647.
- [23] WU, M. Compatible left-symmetric bialgebras. *Algebra Colloq.* 32, 4 (2025), 541–560.
- [24] ZHANG, H., GAO, X., AND GUO, L. Compatible structures of operads by polarization, their Koszul duality and Manin products. *Appl. Categ. Struct.* 33, 6 (2025), 40. Id/No 38.
- [25] ZHANG, Y. Homotopy transfer theorem for linearly compatible di-algebras. *J. Homotopy Relat. Struct.* 8, 1 (2013), 141–150.
- [26] ZHANG, Y., BAI, C., AND GUO, L. The category and operad of matching dialgebras. *Appl. Categ. Struct.* 21, 6 (2013), 851–865.
- [27] ZHANG, Y., BAI, C., AND GUO, L. Totally compatible associative and Lie dialgebras, tri-dendriform algebras and PostLie algebras. *Sci. China, Math.* 57, 2 (2014), 259–273.
- [28] ZINBIEL, G. W. Encyclopedia of types of algebras 2010. In *Operads and universal algebra. Proceedings of the summer school and international conference, Tianjin, China, July 5–9, 2010*. Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific, 2012, pp. 217–297.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA, CAMPUS
TRINDADE, FLORIANÓPOLIS, SC, CEP: 88040–900, BRAZIL
Email address, Corresponding author: `nskhripchenko@gmail.com`