HAL open science

# Nonlinear *-Lie Higher Derivations of Standard Operator Algebras

Mohammad Ashraf, Shakir Ali, Bilal Ahmad Wani

▶ **To cite this version:**

Mohammad Ashraf, Shakir Ali, Bilal Ahmad Wani. Nonlinear *-Lie Higher Derivations of Standard Operator Algebras. Communications in Mathematics, 2018, Volume 26 (2018), Issue 1 (1), pp.15 - 29. 10.2478/cm-2018-0003 . hal-03664950

**HAL Id: hal-03664950**

**https://hal.science/hal-03664950v1**

Submitted on 11 May 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

sciendo

Communications in Mathematics 26 (2018) 15–29

Copyright © 2018 The University of Ostrava
DOI: 10.2478/cm-2018-0003

# Nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivations of standard operator algebras

*Mohammad Ashraf, Shakir Ali, Bilal Ahmad Wani*

**Abstract.** Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an infinite-dimensional complex Hilbert space and $\mathfrak{A}$ be a standard operator algebra on $\mathcal{H}$ which is closed under the adjoint operation. It is shown that every nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivation $\mathcal{D} = \{\delta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ is automatically an additive higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{D} = \{\delta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an inner $*$-higher derivation.

## 1 Introduction

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be an algebra over a commutative ring $R$. Recall that an $R$-linear mapping $d\colon \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ is called a derivation if $d(AB) = d(A)B + Ad(B)$ for all $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}$; in particular, $d$ is called an inner derivation if there exists some $X \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $d(A) = AX - XA$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$. An $R$-linear mapping $d\colon \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ is called a Lie derivation if $d([A, B]) = [d(A), B] + [A, d(B)]$ for all $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}$, where $[A, B] = AB - BA$ is the usual Lie product. Furthermore, without linearity/additivity assumption, if $d$ satisfies $d([A, B]) = [d(A), B] + [A, d(B)]$ for all $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}$, then $d$ is called a nonlinear Lie derivation. The question of characterizing Lie derivations and revealing the relationship between derivations and Lie derivations have been studied by many authors (see [1], [2], [5], [6], [7], [8], [11], [12], [15], [18]).

*2010 MSC:* 47B47, 16W25, 46K15.

*Key words:* Nonlinear $*$-Lie derivation, nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivation, additive $*$-higher derivation, standard operator algebra.

*Affiliation:*

Mohammad Ashraf – Department of Mathematics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002 India
*E-mail:* mashraf80@hotmail.com

Shakir Ali – Department of Mathematics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002 India
*E-mail:* shakir50@rediffmail.com

Bilal Ahmad Wani – Department of Mathematics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002 India
*E-mail:* bilalwanikmr@gmail.com

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be an associative $*$-algebra over the complex field $\mathbb{C}$. A mapping $d\colon \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ is said to be an additive $*$-derivation if it is an additive derivation and satisfies $d(A)^* = d(A^*)$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$. Further, if $d\colon \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ is a map (not necessarily linear) which satisfies $d([A,B]_*) = [d(A),B]_* + [A,d(B)]_*$ for all $A,B \in \mathfrak{A}$, where $[A,B]_* = AB - BA^*$, then $d$ is known as a nonlinear $*$-Lie derivation of $\mathfrak{A}$.

In [16] Yu and Zhang showed that every nonlinear $*$-Lie derivation from a factor von Neumann algebra on an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space into itself is an additive $*$-derivation. It is to be noted that a factor von Neumann algebra is a von Neumann algebra whose centre is trivial. In [4] Wu Jing proved that every nonlinear $*$-Lie derivation on standard operator algebra is automatically linear. Moreover, it is an inner $*$-derivation .

Let us recall some basic facts related to Lie higher derivations and $*$-Lie higher derivations of an associative algebra. Many different kinds of higher derivations, which consist of a family of some additive mappings, have been widely studied in commutative and noncommutative rings. Let $\mathbb{N}$ be the set of non-negative integers and $\mathcal{D} = \{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a family of linear mappings $d_n\colon \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{A}$ such that $d_0 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, the identity map on $\mathfrak{A}$. Then $\mathcal{D}$ is called

(i) a higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$ if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d_n(AB) = \sum_{i+j=n} d_i(A)d_j(B)$$

for all $A,B \in \mathfrak{A}$.

(ii) a Lie higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$ if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d_n([A,B]) = \sum_{i+j=n} \big[d_i(A), d_j(B)\big]$$

for all $A,B \in \mathfrak{A}$.

(iii) a $*$-Lie higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$ if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d_n([A,B]_*) = \sum_{i+j=n} \big[d_i(A), d_j(B)\big]_*$$

for all $A,B \in \mathfrak{A}$.

(iv) an inner higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$ if there exist two sequences $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{Y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfying the conditions

$$X_0 = Y_0 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n} X_i Y_{n-i} = \delta_{n0} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} Y_i X_{n-i}$$

such that $d_n(A) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} X_i A Y_{n-i}$, for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\delta_{n0}$ is the Kronecker sign.

If the linear assumption in the above definitions is dropped, then the corresponding higher derivation, Lie higher derivation and $*$-Lie higher derivation is said to be nonlinear higher derivation, nonlinear Lie higher derivation and nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivation respectively. Moreover, if $\mathcal{D} = \{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is assumed to be the family of additive mappings, then in the above definition higher derivation, Lie higher derivation and $*$-Lie higher derivation is said to be additive higher derivation, additive Lie higher derivation and additive $*$-Lie higher derivation respectively. Note that $d_1$ is always a derivation, Lie derivation and $*$-Lie derivation if $\mathcal{D} = \{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a higher derivation, Lie higher derivation and $*$-Lie higher derivation respectively.

The objective of this article is to investigate nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivations on standard operator algebras which are closed under adjoint operation in infinite-dimensional complex Hilbert spaces. Many researchers have made important contributions to the related topics (see [3], [9], [13]). Xiao [14] proved that every nonlinear Lie higher derivation of triangular algebras is the sum of an additive higher derivation and a nonlinear functional vanishing on all commutators. Qi and Hou [10] gave a characterization of Lie higher derivations on nest algebras. Zhang et al., [17] showed that every nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivation on factor von Neumann algebra is linear. Motivated by the above work in this article, we study nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivations on standard operator algebras .

## 2 Nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivations

Throughout this paper, $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ represents the set of real numbers and complex numbers respectively and $\mathcal{H}$ represents a complex Hilbert space. By $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ we mean the algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Denote by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ the subalgebra of bounded finite rank operators. It is to be noted that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ forms a $*$-closed ideal in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. An algebra $\mathfrak{A} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be standard operator algebra in case $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathfrak{A}$. An operator $P \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be a projection provided $P^* = P$ and $P^2 = P$. Note that, different from von Neumann algebras which are always weakly closed, a standard operator algebra is not necessarily closed. Recall that an algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is prime if $A\mathfrak{A}B = 0$ implies either $A = 0$ or $B = 0$. It is to be noted that any standard operator algebra is prime, which is a consequence of Hahn-Banach theorem. Motivated by the work of Jing [4], we have obtained the following main result.

**Theorem 1.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an infinite-dimensional complex Hilbert space and $\mathfrak{A}$ be a standard operator algebra on $\mathcal{H}$ containing identity operator $I$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is closed under the adjoint operation, then every nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivation $\mathcal{D} = \{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is an additive $*$-higher derivation.*

Now take a projection $P_1 \in \mathfrak{A}$ and let $P_2 = I - P_1$. We write $\mathfrak{A}_{jk} = P_j\mathfrak{A}P_k$ for $j, k = 1, 2$. Then by Peirce decomposition of $\mathfrak{A}$ we have $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_{11} \oplus \mathfrak{A}_{12} \oplus \mathfrak{A}_{21} \oplus \mathfrak{A}_{22}$. Note that any operator $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ can be expressed as $A = A_{11} + A_{12} + A_{21} + A_{22}$, and $A_{jk}^* \in \mathfrak{A}_{kj}$ for any $A_{jk} \in \mathfrak{A}_{jk}$.

We facilitate our discussion with the following known results.

**Lemma 1.** *[4, Lemma 2.1] Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a standard operator algebra containing identity operator $I$ in a complex Hilbert space which is closed under the adjoint operation. If $AB = BA^*$ holds true for all $B \in \mathfrak{A}$, then $A \in \mathbb{R}I$.*

**Lemma 2.** *[4, Proposition 2.7] Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a standard operator algebra containing identity operator $I$ in a complex Hilbert space which is closed under the adjoint operation. For any $A \in \mathfrak{A}$,*

*(i)* $[iP_1, A]_* = 0$ *implies* $A_{11} = A_{12} = A_{21} = 0$.

*(ii)* $[iP_2, A]_* = 0$ *implies* $A_{12} = A_{21} = A_{22} = 0$.

*(iii)* $[i(P_2 - P_1), A]_* = 0$ *implies* $A_{11} = A_{22} = 0$.

Now we shall use the hypothesis of Theorem 1 freely without any specific mention in proving the following lemmas.

**Lemma 3.** $d_n(0) = 0$ *for each* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 1$. If $n = 1$, by [4, Lemma 2.2], the result is true. Now assume that the result is true for $k < n$, i.e., $d_k(0) = 0$. Our aim is to show that $d_n$ satisfies the similar property. Observe that

$$d_n(0) = d_n([0,0]_*) = \sum_{i+j=n} [d_i(0), d_j(0)]_* = [d_n(0), 0]_* + [0, d_n(0)]_* = 0.$$

□

**Lemma 4.** $d_n$ *has the following properties:*

*(i) For any* $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $d_n(\lambda I) \in \mathbb{R}I$.

*(ii) For any* $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ *with* $A = A^*$, $d_n(A) = d_n(A^*) = d_n(A)^*$.

*(iii) For any* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $d_n(\lambda I) \in \mathbb{C}I$.

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 1$. By Lemmas 2.3, 2.4 & 2.5 of [4] the result is true for $n = 1$.

Assume that the result is true for $k < n$, i.e.,

$$d_k(\lambda I) \in \mathbb{R}I,\ d_k(A) = d_k(A^*) = d_k(A)^*,\ d_k(\lambda I) \in \mathbb{C}I.$$

Our aim is to show that $d_n$ satisfies the similar property. By the induction hypothesis;

(i) For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, since $d_k(\lambda I) \in \mathbb{R}I$, i.e., $d_k(\lambda I) = d_k(\lambda I)^* \in \mathbb{R}I$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = d_n([\lambda I, A]_*) &= [d_n(\lambda I), A]_* + [\lambda I, d_n(A)]_* + \sum_{\substack{i+j=n \\ 0<i,j\leq n-1}} [d_i(\lambda I), d_j(A)]_* \\ &= d_n(\lambda I)A - Ad_n(\lambda I)^*. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us that $d_n(\lambda I)A = Ad_n(\lambda I)^*$. By Lemma 1, we have $d_n(\lambda I) \in \mathbb{R}I$.

(ii) Using (i), we have for $A = A^*$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = d_n([A, I]_*) &= [d_n(A), I]_* + [A, d_n(I)]_* + \sum_{\substack{i+j=n \\ 0<i,j\leq n-1}} [d_i(A), d_j(I)]_* \\ &= d_n(A) - d_n(A)^* . \end{aligned}$$

(iii) For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ with $A = A^*$, applying (ii), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = d_n([A, \lambda I]_*) &= [d_n(A), \lambda I]_* + [A, d_n(\lambda I)]_* + \sum_{\substack{i+j=n \\ 0<i,j\leq n-1}} [d_i(A), d_j(\lambda I)]_* \\ &= A d_n(\lambda I) - d_n(\lambda I) A . \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $d_n(\lambda I)A = Ad_n(\lambda I)$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ with $A = A^*$, and hence $d_n(\lambda I) \in \mathbb{C}I$.

□

**Lemma 5.** *$d_n(\frac{1}{2}iI) = 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 1$ and $d_n(iA) = id_n(A)$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{A}$.*

*Proof.* The result is true for $n = 1$ by [4, Lemma 2.6]. Assume that the result is true for $k < n$, i.e., $d_k(\frac{1}{2}iI) = 0$. Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned} d_n\Big(-\frac{1}{2}I\Big) &= d_n\Big(\Big[\frac{1}{2}iI, \frac{1}{2}iI\Big]_*\Big) \\ &= \Big[d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big), \frac{1}{2}iI\Big]_* + \Big[\frac{1}{2}iI, d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big)\Big] + \sum_{\substack{p+q=n \\ 0<p,q\leq n-1}} \Big[d_p\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big), d_q\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big)\Big]_* \\ &= id_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big) + \frac{1}{2}i\Big\{d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big) - d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big)\Big\}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since both $d_n\big(-\frac{1}{2}I\big)$ and $\frac{1}{2}i\big\{d_n\big(\frac{1}{2}iI\big) - d_n\big(\frac{1}{2}iI\big)\big\}^*$ are self-adjoint, $id_n\big(\frac{1}{2}iI\big)$ is also self-adjoint, and hence it follows that

$$d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big) = -d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big)^*.$$

Thus, the above computation gives that

$$d_n\Big(-\frac{1}{2}I\Big) = 2id_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big). \tag{1}$$

Similarly, we can obtain from the fact $\big[-\frac{1}{2}iI, -\frac{1}{2}iI\big] = \frac{1}{2}I$ that $d_n\big(-\frac{1}{2}iI\big)^* = -d_n\big(-\frac{1}{2}iI\big)$ and $d_n\big(-\frac{1}{2}I\big) = -2id_n\big(-\frac{1}{2}iI\big)$. Thus $d_n\big(-\frac{1}{2}iI\big) = -d_n\big(\frac{1}{2}iI\big)$. Now we

compute

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big) &= d_n\Big(\Big[-\frac{1}{2}iI, -\frac{1}{2}I\Big]_*\Big) \\
&= \Big[d_n\Big(-\frac{1}{2}iI\Big), -\frac{1}{2}I\Big]_* + \Big[-\frac{1}{2}iI, d_n\Big(-\frac{1}{2}I\Big)\Big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{p+q=n \\ 0<p,q\leq n-1}} \Big[d_p\Big(-\frac{1}{2}iI\Big), d_q\Big(\frac{1}{2}I\Big)\Big]_* \\
&= -id_n\Big(-\frac{1}{2}iI\Big) - id_n\Big(-\frac{1}{2}I\Big) = d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big) - id_n\Big(-\frac{1}{2}I\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $d_n\big(-\frac{1}{2}I\big) = 0$, and so, by the equality (1), we have $d_n\big(\frac{1}{2}iI\big) = 0$. Now, for any $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, we have by induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n(iA) &= d_n\Big(\Big[\frac{1}{2}iI, A\Big]_*\Big) \\
&= \Big[d_n\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big), -A\Big]_* + \Big[\frac{1}{2}iI, d_n(A)\Big]_* + \sum_{\substack{p+q=n \\ 0<p,q\leq n-1}} \Big[d_p\Big(\frac{1}{2}iI\Big), d_q(A)\Big]_* \\
&= id_n(A).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 6.** *For any $A_{12} \in \mathfrak{A}_{12}$ and $B_{21} \in \mathfrak{A}_{21}$,*

$$d_n(A_{12} + B_{21}) = d_n(A_{12}) + d_n(B_{21}).$$

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 1$. By [4, Lemma 2.8] the result is true for $n = 1$.

Assume that the result is true for $k < n$, i.e., $d_k(A_{12}+B_{21}) = d_k(A_{12})+d_k(B_{21})$. Let $M = d_n(A_{12} + B_{21}) - d_n(A_{12}) - d_n(B_{21})$. We now show that $M = 0$.

By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= d_n\big([i(P_2 - P_1), A_{12} + B_{21}]_*\big) \\
&= \big[d_n\big(i(P_2 - P_1)\big), A_{12} + B_{21}\big]_* + \big[i(P_2 - P_1), d_n(A_{12} + B_{21})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r\big(i(P_2 - P_1)\big), d_s(A_{12} + B_{21})\big]_* \\
&= \big[d_n\big(i(P_2 - P_1)\big), A_{12} + B_{21}\big]_* + \big[i(P_2 - P_1), d_n(A_{12} + B_{21})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r\big(i(P_2 - P_1)\big), d_s(A_{12}) + d_s(B_{21})\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= d_n\big(\big[i(P_2-P_1), A_{12}\big]_*\big) + d_n\big(\big[i(P_2-P_1), B_{21}\big]_*\big)\\
&= \big[d_n\big(i(P_2-P_1)\big), A_{12}\big]_* + \big[i(P_2-P_1), d_n(A_{12})\big]_*\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r\big(i(P_2-P_1)\big), d_s(A_{12})\big]_* + \big[d_n\big(i(P_2-P_1)\big), B_{21}\big]_*\\
&\quad + \big[i(P_2-P_1), d_n(B_{21})\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r\big(i(P_2-P_1)\big), d_s(B_{21})\big]_*\\
&= \big[d_n\big(i(P_2-P_1)\big), A_{12}+B_{21}\big]_* + \big[i(P_2-P_1), d_n(A_{12})+d_n(B_{21})\big]_*\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r\big(i(P_2-P_1)\big), d_s(A_{12})+d_s(B_{21})\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above two equations, we arrive at $[i(P_2-P_1), M]_* = 0$. It follows from Lemma 2 that $M_{11} = M_{22} = 0$. Now we calculate $d_n(A_{12} - A_{12}^*)$ in two ways

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n(A_{12} - A_{12}^*) &= d_n\big([A_{12}+B_{21}, P_2]_*\big)\\
&= \big[d_n(A_{12}+B_{21}), P_2\big]_* + \big[A_{12}+B_{21}, d_n(P_2)\big]_*\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(A_{12}+B_{21}), d_s(P_2)\big]_*\\
&= \big[d_n(A_{12}+B_{21}), P_2\big]_* + \big[A_{12}+B_{21}, d_n(P_2)\big]_*\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(A_{12})+d_r(B_{21}), d_s(P_2)\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n(A_{12} - A_{12}^*) &= d_n\big([A_{12}, P_2]\big)_* + d_n\big([B_{21}, P_2]\big)_*\\
&= \big[d_n(A_{12}), P_2\big]_* + \big[A_{12}, d_n(P_2)\big]_*\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(A_{12}), d_s(P_2)\big]_*\\
&\quad + \big[d_n(B_{21}), P_2\big]_* + \big[B_{21}, d_n(P_2)\big]_*\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(B_{21}), d_s(P_2)\big]_*\\
&= \big[d_n(A_{12})+d_n(B_{21}), P_2\big]_* + \big[A_{12}+B_{21}, d_n(P_2)\big]_*\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(A_{12})+d_r(B_{21}), d_s(P_2)\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

The above two identities give us that $[M, P_2]_* = 0$. But

$$[M, P_2]_* = MP_2 - P_2M^* = (M_{12} + M_{21})P_2 - P_2(M_{12}^* + M_{21}^*) = M_{12} - M_{12}^*.$$

Hence it follows that $M_{12} = 0$.

Similarly, using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(B_{21} - B_{21}^*) &= d_n\big([A_{12} + B_{21}, P_1]_*\big) \\ &= d_n\big([A_{12}, P_1]\big)_* + d_n\big([B_{21}, P_1]\big)_*, \end{aligned}$$

one can show that $M_{21} = 0$. □

**Lemma 7.** *For any $A_{11} \in \mathfrak{A}_{11}$, $B_{12} \in \mathfrak{A}_{12}$, $C_{21} \in \mathfrak{A}_{21}$ and $D_{22} \in \mathfrak{A}_{22}$;*

*(i)* $d_n(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}) = d_n(A_{11}) + d_n(B_{12}) + d_n(C_{21})$.

*(ii)* $d_n(B_{12} + C_{21} + D_{22}) = d_n(B_{12}) + d_n(C_{21}) + d_n(D_{22})$.

*Proof.* (i) We proceed by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 1$. By [4, Lemma 2.9] the result is true for $n = 1$.

Assume that the result is true for $k < n$, that is,

$$d_k(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}) = d_k(A_{11}) + d_k(B_{12}) + d_k(C_{21}).$$

Let

$$M = d_n(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}) - d_n(A_{11}) - d_n(B_{12}) - d_n(C_{21}).$$

We now show that $M = 0$.

By the induction hypothesis, we have by Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(iB_{12}) + d_n(iC_{21}) &= d_n(iB_{12} + iC_{21}) \\ &= d_n\big([iP_2, A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}]_*\big) \\ &= \big[d_n(iP_2), A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}\big]_* \\ &\quad + \big[iP_2, d_n(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_2), d_s(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21})\big]_* \\ &= \big[d_n(iP_2), A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}\big]_* \\ &\quad + \big[iP_2, d_n(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_2), d_s(A_{11}) + d_s(B_{12}) + d_s(C_{21})\big]_*. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n(iB_{12}) + d_n(iC_{21}) &= d_n\big([iP_2, A_{11}]_*\big) + d_n\big([iP_2, B_{21}]_*\big) + d_n\big([iP_2, C_{21}]_*\big) \\
&= \big[d_n(iP_2), A_{11}\big]_* + \big[iP_2, d_n(A_{11})\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_2), d_s(A_{11})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \big[d_n(iP_2), B_{12}\big]_* + \big[iP_2, d_n(B_{12})\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_2), d_s(B_{12})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \big[d_n(iP_2), C_{21}\big]_* + \big[iP_2, d_n(C_{21})\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_2), d_s(C_{21})\big]_* \\
&= \big[d_n(iP_2), A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}\big]_* + \big[iP_2, d_n(A_{11}) + d_n(B_{12}) + d_n(C_{21})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_2), d_s(A_{11}) + d_s(B_{12}) + d_s(C_{21})\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above two equalities, we have $[iP_2, M]_* = 0$ and hence it follows from Lemma 2 (ii), that $M_{12} = M_{21} = M_{22} = 0$.

We now show that $M_{11} = 0$. Note that

$$\big[i(P_2 - P_1), B_{12}\big]_* = \big[i(P_2 - P_1), C_{21}\big]_* = 0.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n\big([i(P_2 - P_1), A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21}]_*\big) &= d_n\big([i(P_2 - P_1), A_{11}]_*\big) \\
&\quad + d_n\big([i(P_2 - P_1), B_{12}]_*\big) + d_n\big([i(P_2 - P_1), C_{21}]_*\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the similar arguments as used above, we get $[i(P_2 - P_1), M]_* = 0$. Therefore by Lemma 2, $M_{11} = 0$. Hence we are done.

(ii) Considering $d_n([iP_1, B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22}]_*)$ and $d_n([i(P_2-P_1), B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22}]_*)$, with the similar argument as in (i), one can obtain

$$d_n(B_{12} + C_{21} + D_{22}) = d_n(B_{12}) + d_n(C_{21}) + d_n(D_{22}).$$

□

**Lemma 8.** *For any $A_{11} \in \mathfrak{A}_{11}$, $B_{12} \in \mathfrak{A}_{12}$, $C_{21} \in \mathfrak{A}_{21}$ and $D_{22} \in \mathfrak{A}_{22}$;*

$$d_n(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21} + D_{22}) = d_n(A_{11}) + d_n(B_{12}) + d_n(C_{21}) + d_n(D_{22}).$$

*Proof.* By [4, Lemma 2.10], the result is true for $n = 1$. Assume that the result is true for $k < n$, i.e.,

$$d_k(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21} + D_{22}) = d_k(A_{11}) + d_k(B_{12}) + d_k(C_{21}) + d_k(D_{22}).$$

Our aim is to show that the result is true for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$M = d_n(A_{11} + B_{12} + C_{21} + D_{22}) - d_n(A_{11}) - d_n(B_{12}) - d_n(C_{21}) - d_n(D_{22}).$$

Note that $[iP_1, D_{22}]_* = 0$, by induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_n\big([iP_1, A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22}]_*\big) &= [d_n(iP_1), A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22}]_* \\ &\quad + \big[iP_1, d_n(A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_1), d_s(A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22})\big]_* \\ &= \big[d_n(iP_1), A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22}\big]_* \\ &\quad + \big[iP_1, d_n(A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_1), d_s(A_{11})+d_s(B_{12})+d_s(C_{21})+d_s(D_{22})\big]_*. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have by (i) of Lemma 7,

$$\begin{aligned} &d_n\big([iP_1, A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}+D_{22}]_*\big) \\ &\qquad = d_n\big([iP_1, A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}]_*\big) + d_n\big([iP_1, D_{22}]_*\big) \\ &\qquad = [d_n(iP_1), A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}]_* \\ &\qquad\quad + \big[iP_1, d_n(A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21})\big]_* \\ &\qquad\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_1), d_s(A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21})\big]_*. \\ &\qquad\quad + \big[d_n(iP_1), D_{22}\big]_* + \big[iP_1, d_n(D_{22})\big]_* \\ &\qquad\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_1), d_s(D_{22})\big]_* \\ &\qquad = \big[d_n(iP_1), A_{11}+B_{12}+C_{21}\big]_* \\ &\qquad\quad + \big[iP_1, d_n(A_{11})+d_n(B_{12})+d_n(C_{21})\big]_* \\ &\qquad\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_1), d_s(A_{11})+d_s(B_{12})+d_s(C_{21})\big]_* \\ &\qquad\quad + \big[d_n(iP_1), D_{22}\big]_* + \big[iP_1, d_n(D_{22})\big]_* \\ &\qquad\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_1), d_s(D_{22})\big]_*. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above two equalities, it follows that $[iP_1, M] = 0$, and hence by Lemma 2, $M_{11} = M_{12} = M_{21} = 0$. Using the fact that $[iP_2, A_{11}] = 0$ and the above similar arguments, we obtain $[iP_2, M]_* = 0$ which leads to $M_{22} = 0$. This completes the proof. □

**Lemma 9.** *For any $A_{jk}, B_{jk} \in \mathfrak{A}_{jk}$, where $j, k \in 1, 2$, we have*

$$d_n(A_{jk} + B_{jk}) = d_n(A_{jk}) + d_n(B_{jk})$$

*Proof.* We separate the proof in two distinct cases.

**Case I:** $j \neq k$

On one side, by Lemma 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(iA_{jk} + iB_{jk} + iA_{jk}^* + iB_{jk}A_{jk}^*) \\ = d_n(iA_{jk} + iB_{jk}) + d_n(iA_{jk}^*) + d_n(iB_{jk}A_{jk}^*)\,. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using Lemmas 6 and 8, by induction, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(iA_{jk} + iB_{jk} + iA_{jk}^* + iB_{jk}A_{jk}^*) &= d_n\big([iP_j + iA_{jk}, P_k + B_{jk}]_*\big) \\ &= \big[d_n(iP_j + iA_{jk}), P_k + B_{jk}\big]_* + \big[iP_j + iA_{jk}, d_(P_k + B_{jk})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_j + iA_{jk}), d_s(P_k + B_{jk})\big]_* \\ &= \big[d_n(iP_j) + d_n(iA_{jk}), P_k + B_{jk}\big]_* \\ &\quad + \big[iP_j + iA_{jk}, d_(P_k) + d_n(B_{jk})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_j) + d_r(iA_{jk}), d_s(P_k) + d_s(B_{jk})\big]_* \\ &= d_n\big([iP_j, P_k]_*\big) + d_n\big([iP_j, B_{jk}]_*\big) \\ &\quad + d_n\big([iA_{jk}, P_k]_*\big) + d_n\big([iA_{jk}, B_{jk}]_*\big) \\ &= d_n(iB_{jk}) + d_n(iA_{jk} + iA_{jk}^*) + d_n(iB_{jk}A_{jk}^*) \\ &= d_n(iB_{jk}) + d_n(iA_{jk}) + d_n(iA_{jk}^*) + d_n(iB_{jk}A_{jk}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above two equalities, we can conclude that

$$d_n(A_{jk} + B_{jk}) = d_n(A_{jk}) + d_n(A_{jk}^*)\,.$$

**Case II:** $j = k$.

Let $A_{jj}, B_{jj} \in \mathfrak{A}_{jj}$ and $n \in \{1, 2\}$ with $n \neq j$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= d_n\big([iP_n, A_{jj} + B_{jj}]_*\big) \\ &= \big[d_n(iP_n), A_{jj} + B_{jj}\big]_* + \big[iP_n, d_n(A_{jj} + B_{jj})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_n), d_s(A_{jj} + B_{jj})\big]_* \\ &= \big[d_n(iP_n), A_{jj} + B_{jj}\big]_* + \big[iP_n, d_n(A_{jj} + B_{jj})\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_n), d_s(A_{jj}) + d_s(B_{jj})\big]_*. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= d_n\big([iP_n, A_{jj}]_*\big) + d_n\big([iP_n, B_{jj}]_*\big) \\
&= \big[d_n(iP_n), A_{jj}\big]_* + \big[iP_n, d_n(A_{jj})\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_n), d_s(A_{jj})\big]_*. \\
&\quad + \big[d_n(iP_n), B_{jj}\big]_* + \big[iP_n, d_n(B_{jj})\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_n), d_s(B_{jj})\big]_* \\
&= \big[d_n(iP_n), A_{jj} + B_{jj}\big]_* + \big[iP_n, d_n(A_{jj}) + d_n(B_{jj})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(iP_n), d_s(A_{jj}) + d_s(B_{jj})\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

Take $M = d_n(A_{jj}+B_{jj}) - d_n(A_{jj}) - d_n(B_{jj})$. The above computation yields that $[iP_n, M]_* = 0$. By Lemma 2, we have $M_{nj} = M_{jn} = M_{nn} = 0$. We now show that $M_{jj} = 0$. For any $C_{jn} \in \mathfrak{A}_{jn}$, using Case I, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n\big([A_{jj} + B_{jj}, C_{jn}]_*\big) &= \big[d_n(A_{jj} + B_{jj}), C_{jn}\big]_* + \big[A_{jj} + B_{jj}, d_n(C_{jn})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(A_{jj} + B_{jj}), d_s(C_{jn})\big]_* \\
&= \big[d_n(A_{jj} + B_{jj}), C_{jn}\big]_* + \big[A_{jj} + B_{jj}, d_n(C_{jn})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(A_{jj}) + d_r(B_{jj}), d_s(C_{jn})\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n\big([A_{jj} + B_{jj}, C_{jn}]_*\big) &= d_n\big(A_{jj}C_{jn} + B_{jj}C_{jn}\big) \\
&= d_n(A_{jj}C_{jn}) + d_n(B_{jj}C_{jn}) \\
&= d_n\big([A_{jj}, C_{jn}]_*\big) + d_n\big([B_{jj}, C_{jn}]_*\big) \\
&= \big[d_n(A_{jj}), C_{jn}\big]_* + \big[A_{jj}, d_n(C_{jn})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(A_{jj}), d_s(C_{jn})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \big[d_n(B_{jj}), C_{jn}\big]_* + \big[B_{jj}, d_n(C_{jn})\big]_* \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big[d_r(B_{jj}), d_s(C_{jn})\big]_*.
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above two equalities, we obtain $[M, C_{jn}]_* = 0$ which leads to $M_{jj}C_{jn} = 0$. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ is prime, we see that $M_{jj} = 0$, which completes the proof.

□

**Lemma 10.** *$d_n$ is an additive $*$-higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$.*

*Proof.* We first show that $d_n$ is additive. For arbitrary $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}$, we write $A = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} A_{jk}$ and $B = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} B_{jk}$. It follows from Lemmas 8 and 9 that

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(A+B) &= d_n\Big\{\sum_{j,k=1}^{2}(A_{jk}+B_{jk})\Big\} \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} d_n(A_{jk}+B_{jk}) \\ &= \sum_{j,k=1}^{2}\big(d_n(A_{jk})+d_n(B_{jk})\big) \\ &= d_n\Big(\sum_{j,k=1}^{2} A_{jk}\Big)+d_n\Big(\sum_{j,k=1}^{2} B_{jk}\Big) \\ &= d_n(A)+d_n(B). \end{aligned}$$

We now show that $d_n(A^*) = d_n(A)^*$.

For any $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, it follows from Lemmas 4 and 5 that

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(A^*) &= d_n(\mathfrak{R}A - i\mathfrak{T}A) = d_n(\mathfrak{R}A) - d_n(i\mathfrak{T}A) \\ &= d_n(\mathfrak{R}A) - id_n(\mathfrak{T}A) = d_n(\mathfrak{R}A)^* - id_n(\mathfrak{T}A)^* \\ &= d_n(\mathfrak{R}A)^* + (id_n(\mathfrak{T}A))^* = d_n(\mathfrak{R}A)^* + d_n(i\mathfrak{T}A)^* \\ &= (d_n(\mathfrak{R}A + i\mathfrak{T}A))^* = d_n(A)^*. \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, we need to show that $d_n$ is a higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$.

Since $d_n$ is additive, it follows from Lemma 5, that $d_n(iI) = 0$. It is to be noted that $[iI + A, B]_* = 2iB + AB - BA^*$.

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(2iB) + d_n(AB) - d_n(BA^*) &= d_n\big([iI+A,B]_*\big) \\ &= \big[d_n(iI+A),B\big]_* + \big[iI+A,d_n(B)\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(iI+A),d_s(B)\big]_* \\ &= \big[d_n(iI)+d_n(A),B\big]_* + \big[iI+A,d_n(B)\big]_* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(iI)+d_r(A),d_s(B)\big]_* \\ &= \big[d_n(A),B\big]_* + \big[iI+A,d_n(B)\big]_* + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big[d_r(A),d_s(B)\big]_* \\ &= d_n(A)B - Bd_n(A)^* + 2id_n(B) + Ad_n(B) - d_n(B)A^* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n\\0<r,s\le n-1}} \big(d_r(A)d_s(B) - d_s(B)d_r(A)^*\big). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(AB) - d_n(BA^*) &= d_n(A)B - Bd_n(A)^* + Ad_n(B) - d_n(B)A^* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big(d_r(A)d_s(B) - d_s(B)d_r(A)^*\big). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $A$ by $iA$ in the above equality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(AB) + d_n(BA^*) &= d_n(A)B + Bd_n(A)^* + Ad_n(B) + d_n(B)A^* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} \big(d_r(A)d_s(B) + d_s(B)d_r(A)^*\big). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have,

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(AB) &= d_n(A)B + Ad_n(B) + \sum_{\substack{r+s=n \\ 0<r,s\leq n-1}} d_r(A)d_s(B) \\ &= \sum_{r+s=n} d_r(A)d_s(B). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $d_n$ is an additive higher derivation with $d_n(A^*) = d_n(A)^*$. Hence $d_n$ is an additive $*$-higher derivation on $\mathfrak{A}$, which completes the proof. □

Note that every additive derivation $d\colon \mathfrak{A} \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is an inner derivation (see [12]). Nowicki [9] proved that if every additive (linear) derivation of $\mathfrak{A}$ is inner, then every additive (linear) higher derivation of $\mathfrak{A}$ is inner (see also [13]). So by Theorem 1, the following corollary is immediate.

**Corollary 1.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an infinite-dimensional complex Hilbert space and $\mathfrak{A}$ be a standard operator algebra on $\mathcal{H}$ containing identity operator $I$. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is closed under the adjoint operation, then every nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivation $\mathcal{D} = \{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is inner with $d_n(A^*) = d_n(A)^*$ for each $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

## Acknowledgement

The authors are highly indebted to the referee for his/her valuable remarks which have improved the paper immensely.

## References

[1] M. Brešar: Commuting traces of biadditive mappings, commutativity preserving mappings and Lie mappings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 335 (2) (1993) 525–546.

[2] L. Chen, J. H. Zhang: Nonlinear Lie derivations on upper triangular matrices. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 56 (6) (2008) 725–730.

[3] M. Ferrero, C. Haetinger: Higher derivations of semiprime rings. *Comm. Algebra* 30 (2002) 2321–2333.

[4] Wu Jing: Nonlinear $*$-Lie derivations of standard operator algebras. *Quaestiones Mathematicae* 39 (8) (2016) 1037–1046.

[5] W. Jing, F. Lu: Lie derivable mappings on prime rings. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 60 (2012) 167–180.

[6] F. Y. Lu, W. Jing: Characterizations of Lie derivations of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 432 (1) (2010) 89–99.

[7] W. S. Martindale III: Lie derivations of primitive rings. *Michigan Math. J.* 11 (1964) 183–187.

[8] C. R. Mires: Lie derivations of von Neumann algebras. *Duke Math. J.* 40 (1973) 403–409.

[9] A. Nowicki: Inner derivations of higher orders. *Tsukuba J. Math.* 8 (2) (1984) 219–225.

[10] X. F. Qi, J. C. Hou: Lie higher derivations on nest algebras. *Commun. Math. Res.* 26 (2) (2010) 131–143.

[11] X. F. Qi, J. C. Hou: Characterization of Lie derivations on prime rings. *Comm. Algebra* 39 (10) (2011) 3824–3835.

[12] P. Šemrl: Additive derivations of some operator algebras. *Illinois J. Math.* 35 (1991) 234–240.

[13] F. Wei, Z. K. Xiao: Higher derivations of triangular algebras and its generalizations. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 435 (2011) 1034–1054.

[14] Z. K. Xiao, F. Wei: Nonlinear Lie higher derivations on triangular algebras. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 60 (8) (2012) 979–994.

[15] W. Yu, J. Zhang: Nonlinear Lie derivations of triangular algebras. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 432 (11) (2010) 2953–2960.

[16] W. Yu, J. Zhang: Nonlinear $*$-Lie derivations on factor von Neumann algebras. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 437 (2012) 1979–1991.

[17] F. Zhang, X. Qi, J. Zhang: Nonlinear $*$-Lie higher derivations on factor von Neumann algebras. *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.* 42 (3) (2016) 659–678.

[18] F. Zhang, J. Zhang: Nonlinear Lie derivations on factor von Neumann algebras. *Acta Mathematica Sinica. (Chin. Ser)* 54 (5) (2011) 791–802.

*Received:* 13 July, 2017
*Accepted for publication:* 2 February, 2018
*Communicated by:* Stephen Glasby