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In this note, a ring will mean (not necessarily commutative) ring with unity 1. A ring $R$ is said to be reduced, if $R$ has no nonzero nilpotent element. A group $G(\neq 1)$ is called ordered, if it admits strict linear ordering $<$ such that $g<h$ implies $g k<h k, k g<k h$ for all $k \in G$ (cf. Passman [1]). Our aim is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem. Let $R$ be a reduced ring and $G$ an ordered group. Let $\alpha, \beta$ be elements of the group ring $R G: \alpha=\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} g_{i}, \beta=\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_{j} h_{j}$, where $a_{i}, b_{j} \in R\left(a_{i} \neq 0, b_{j} \neq 0\right)$, and $g_{1}, \cdots, g_{n}$ and $h_{1}, \cdots, h_{m}$ are respectively mutually distinct elements of $G$. Then we have $\alpha \beta=0$ if and only if $a_{i} b_{j}=0$ for all $i=1, \cdots, n, j=1, \cdots, m$.

For the proof we use the following simple lemma on a reduced ring $R$.

Lemma. If $a, b$ are elements of $a$ reduced ring $R, a b a=0$ implies $b a=0$. (In particular, $a b=0$ implies $b a=0$.)

Proof. If $a b a=0$, we have $(b a)^{2}=b a b a=0$. As $R$ has no nonzero nilpotent element, this implies $b a=0$.

Proof of the Theorem. The if-part being obvious, we have only to prove the only-if-part: $\alpha \beta=0$ implies $a_{i} b_{j}=0$. We have nothing to prove, if $n=m=1$. So suppose $n \geq 2, m \geq 2$. As $G$ is ordered and $g_{1}, \cdots, g_{n}$ and $h_{1}, \cdots, h_{m}$ are respectively mutually distinct, we may assume $g_{1}<\cdots<g_{n}, h_{1}<\cdots<h_{m}$. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha \beta=\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m} a_{i} b_{j} g_{i} h_{j}=0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $g_{1} h_{1}$ is the "smallest among $g_{i} h_{j}$ " i.e. we have $g_{1} h_{1}<g_{i} h_{j}$ for any $i, j$ with $1<i, 1<j$. Thus we should have $a_{1} b_{1}=0$.

To simplify the further description of our proof, we shall use the following expressions on pairs of indices $(i, j),\left(i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}\right), \cdots$ where $i, i^{\prime}$, $\cdots \in\{1,2, \cdots, n\}, j, j^{\prime}, \cdots \in\{1,2, \cdots, m\}$. These $m n$ pairs are ordered according to the "magnitudes" of $g_{i} h_{j}, g_{i}, h_{j}$, $\cdots$; we shall say namely ( $i, j$ ) is smaller than ( $i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}$ ) and write $(i, j)<\left(i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}\right)$ when $g_{i} h_{j}<g_{i^{\prime}}, h_{j^{\prime}}$; ( $i, j$ ) is called equivalent to ( $i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}$ ), written $(i, j) \sim\left(i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}\right)$, when $g_{i} h_{j}=$ $g_{i^{\prime}, h_{j^{\prime}} .}^{\prime}$ From $i<i^{\prime}$ follows obviously ( $\left.i, j\right)<\left(i^{\prime}, j\right.$ ), and from $(i, j)<\left(i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}\right)$, $\left(i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}\right) \sim\left(i^{\prime \prime}, j^{\prime \prime}\right)$ follows $(i, j)<\left(i^{\prime \prime}, j^{\prime \prime}\right)$. We shall prove $a_{i} b_{j}=0$ following the "magnitudes" of $(i, j)$ beginning from the smallest pair $(1,1)$. A pair ( $i, j$ ) will be called settled, if $a_{i} b_{j}=0$ has been proved. Thus ( 1,1 )
is settled, and in proving $a_{i_{0}} b_{j_{0}}=0$ for a fixed pair $\left(i_{0}, j_{0}\right)$, we can obviously assume that all ( $i, j$ ) are settled for $(i, j)<\left(i_{0}, j_{0}\right)$. Let $\left\{\left(i_{1}, j_{1}\right), \cdots,\left(i_{p}, j_{p}\right)\right\}$ be the set of all unsettled pairs which are equivalent to ( $i_{0}, j_{0}$ ). From (1) follows
(2)

$$
a_{i_{1}} b_{j_{1}}+\cdots+a_{i_{p}} b_{j_{p}}=0
$$

We have nothing more to prove if $p=1$. So let $p \geq 2$ and $i_{1}<i_{2}<\ldots$ $<i_{p}$. Then we have for $k \geq 2\left(i_{1}, j_{k}\right)<\left(i_{k}, j_{k}\right) \sim\left(i_{0}, j_{0}\right)$ so that $\left(i_{1}, j_{k}\right)$ is settled by our assumption and $a_{i_{1}} b_{j_{k}}=0$ whence follows $b_{k_{j}} a_{i_{1}}=0$ by Lemma. Multiplying (2) by $a_{i_{1}}$ from right, we obtain $a_{i_{1}} b_{j_{1}}=0$, i.e. ( $i_{1}, j_{1}$ ) is settled and we can proceed further.

In the following Corollaries, the notations $R, G, \alpha=\sum a_{i} g_{i}, \beta=$ $\sum b_{j} h_{j}$ will have the same meanings as in the Theorem.

Corollary 1. If $\alpha$ is a zero-divisor of $R G$, then $a_{i}$ are zero-divisors of $R$.

Corollary 2. $a_{i}=b_{j}(\neq 0)$ can not take place for any $i=1, \cdots, n$, $j=1, \cdots, m$.

Proof. If $a_{i}=b_{j}$, then $a_{i} b_{j}=a_{i}^{2}=0$ and $a_{i}=0$.
Corollary 3. $R G$ has no non-trivial idempotent.
Proof. Let $e$ be an idempotent of $R G$. Then $e^{2}=e, e(e-1)=0$, which implies $e=0$ or $e=1$ by virtue of Corollary 2.

Remark. If $G$ is not torsion free, then $R G$ containselements $\alpha, \beta$ with $\alpha \beta=0$, such that coefficients of $g_{i}, h_{j}$ in $\alpha, \beta$ are not zero-divisors; e.g. $\alpha=g-1, \beta=1+g+\cdots+g^{n-1}$ where $g^{n}=1$.
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