

(Short Note)

ON THE DIAMETER OF ZERO-DIVISOR GRAPHS OF IDEALIZATIONS WITH RESPECT TO INTEGRAL DOMAIN

MANAL AL-LABADI

ABSTRACT. Let R be a ring with unity and let M be an R - module. Let $R(+)M$ be the idealization of the ring R by the R - module M . In this paper, we give new results on the diameter of $\Gamma(R(+)M)$ when R is an integral domain.

1. Introduction

The zero divisor graph of a ring is the (simple) graph whose vertex set is the set of non-zero zero divisors, and an edge is drawn between two distinct vertices if their product is zero. The zero divisor graph of a commutative ring has been studied extensively by several authors, see [1, 2, 3 and 4]. Let R be a commutative ring with unity. We use the notation A^* to refer to the nonzero elements of A . For two distinct vertices a and b in a graph $\Gamma(R)$, the distance between a and b , denoted by $d(a, b)$, is the length of the shortest path connecting a and b , if such a path exists, otherwise, $d(a, b) = \infty$. The diameter of a graph $\Gamma(R)$ is $\text{diam}(\Gamma) = \sup \{d(a, b) : a \text{ and } b \text{ are distinct vertices of } \Gamma\}$. We will use the notation $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R))$ to denote the diameter of the nonzero zero divisors of R . Let

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 13A99, Secondary: 13A15.

Key words and phrases. : Zero - divisor graphs, Idealization rings.

Copyright © Deanship of Research and Graduate Studies, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

Received: Nov. 16, 2009.

Accepted : Feb. 8, 2010.

M be an R - module. Consider $R(+)M = \{(a, m) : a \in R, m \in M\}$ and let (a, m) and (b, n) be two elements of $R(+)M$. Define $(a, m) + (b, n) = (a + b, m + n)$ and $(a, m)(b, n) = (ab, an + bm)$. Under this definition $R(+)M$ becomes a commutative ring with unity. Call this ring the idealization ring of M in R . For more details, we refer the reader to [5]. The set of all nonzero zero divisors of a ring R is denoted by $Z^*(R)$.

$Diam(\Gamma(R(+)M))$ when R is an Integral Domain

Lemma 1.1. *Let R be an integral domain such that \mathbb{Z}_2 is an R -module with $ann(\mathbb{Z}_2) = \{0\}$. Then $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

Proof. Now $1_R \cdot 1 = 1$ since \mathbb{Z}_2 is unitary R -module. So,
 $(1_R + 1_R) \cdot 1 = 1_R \cdot 1 + 1_R \cdot 1 = 1 + 1 = 0$. Hence $2 \cdot 1_R = 1_R + 1_R \in ann(\mathbb{Z}_2) = \{0\}$.
Hence $ch(R) = 2$. Moreover, $r \cdot 1 = 1$ for all $r \in R^*$ because $ann(\mathbb{Z}_2) = \{0\}$. Assume that $r \in R - \{0_R, 1_R\}$. Then $(r + 1_R) \cdot 1 = 1 + 1 = 0$, hence $r = -1_R = 1_R$, a contradiction. Then $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. \square

Lemma 1.2. *Let R be an integral domain such that \mathbb{Z}_3 is an R -module with $ann(\mathbb{Z}_3) = \{0\}$. Then $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$.*

Proof. $0, 1_R \in R$ and $1_R \neq 0_R$. Then $2 \cdot 1_R \in R$. If $2 \cdot 1_R = 0_R$, then $3 \cdot 1_R \cdot 1 = 0$ because $3 \cdot 1_R \cdot 1 = (1_R + 1_R + 1_R) \cdot 1 = 1 + 1 + 1 = 0$. So, $0 = 3 \cdot 1_R \cdot 1 = (2 \cdot 1_R + 1_R) \cdot 1 = 2 \cdot 1_R \cdot 1 + 1_R \cdot 1 = 0 + 1 = 1$, contradiction. So, $2 \cdot 1_R \neq 0_R$. If $2 \cdot 1_R = 1_R$, then $1_R = 0_R$ since $(R, +)$ is abelian group. So, R has at least 3 element $0_R, 1_R$ and $2 \cdot 1_R$. Assume that there exist, $r \in R - \{0_R, 1_R, 2 \cdot 1_R\}$, $r \in R$. If $r \cdot 1 = 0$, then $r \in ann(\mathbb{Z}_3)$. Hence $r = 0_R$, contradiction. If $r \cdot 1 = 1$, then

$(r + 21_R).1 = r.1 + 21_R.1 = r.1 + 1 + 1 = 1 + 1 + 1 = 0$. So, $r + 21_R = 0_R$ since $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_3) = \{0\}$. Then $r = -21_R = 1_R$, contradiction. If $r.1 = 2$, then $(r + 1_R).1 = 0$. So, $r + 1_R = 0_R$ i.e $r = -1_R = 21_R$, contradiction. Thus $R = \{0_R, 1_R, 21_R\}$ and

$$\begin{array}{cccc} & & 0_R & 1_R & 21_R \\ & & \cdot & & \\ 31_R = 0_R. & \text{Then } (R, +) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3, +). & (R, \cdot) = & \begin{array}{cccc} 0_R & 0_R & 0_R & 0_R \\ 1_R & 0_R & 1_R & 21_R \\ 21_R & 0_R & 21_R & 1_R \end{array} & \cdot \end{array}$$

Then $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ (as a ring). □

Theorem 1.3. *Let R be an integral domain and $M \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ be an R -module.*

(i): *If $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_2) = \{0\}$, then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_2)) = 0$.*

(ii): *If $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_2) \neq \{0\}$, then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_2)) = 2$.*

Proof. (i) $M \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_2) = \{0\}$. Then, by Lemma 1.1, $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then $Z^*(\mathbb{Z}_2(+) \mathbb{Z}_2) = \{(0, 1)\}$, so $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_2)) = 0$.

(ii) $M \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_2) \neq \{0\}$. Then there exists at least one element in R^* such that $r.1 = 0$. $Z^*(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_2) = \{(0, 1)\} \cup \{(r, 0), (r, 1), \dots\}$. Any two elements in $\{(r, 0), (r, 1), \dots\}$ are non adjacent, but $(r, 0).(0, 1) = (0, 0)$ and $(0, 1).(r, 1) = (0, 0)$. $(r, 0) \text{---} (0, 1) \text{---} (r, 1)$ so, $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_2)) = 2$. □

Theorem 1.4. *Let R be an integral domain and $M \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ be an R -module.*

(i): *If $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_3) = \{0\}$, then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_3)) = 1$.*

(ii): *If $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_3) \neq \{0\}$, then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_3)) = 2$.*

Proof. (i) $M \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$, $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_3) = \{0\}$. Then, by Lemma 1.2, $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$. So, $Z^*(\mathbb{Z}_3(+) \mathbb{Z}_3) = \{(0, 1), (0, 2)\}$.

Thus, $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_3)) = 1$. $\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_3)$ is $(0, 1) — (0, 2)$.

(ii) $M \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ and $\text{ann}(\mathbb{Z}_3) \neq \{0\}$. Then there exists at least one element in R^* such that $r \cdot \mathbb{Z}_3 = 0$. So, $Z^*(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_3) = \{(0, 1), (0, 2)\} \cup \{(r, 0), (r, 1), (r, 2), \dots\}$. Any two elements in $\{(r, 0), (r, 1), (r, 2), \dots\}$ are non adjacent since $r \cdot s \neq 0$ for any $r, s \in R^*$. But $(r, 0) — (0, 1) — (r, 2)$. Hence, $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+) \mathbb{Z}_2)) = 2$. \square

Theorem 1.5. *Let R be an integral domain and $|M| \geq 4$, be an R -module.*

- (i): *If $r \cdot m \neq 0$, for any $r \in R^*$ and $m \in M^*$, then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 1$.*
- (ii): *If there exists at least one element $m \in M^*$ such that $r \cdot m = 0$, for any $r \in R$, then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 2$.*
- (iii): *If there exists at least two elements in R^* such that $r_1 \cdot m = 0$, $r_2 \cdot n = 0$, $r_1 \cdot n \neq 0$, $r_2 \cdot m \neq 0$, $m \neq n$, for $m, n \in M^*$, then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 3$.*

Proof. (i) If there is no element $r \in R^*$ such that $r \cdot m = 0$, for any $m \in M^*$, then $Z^*(R(+)M) = \{(0, m) : m \in M^*\}$. Then any two elements in $\{(0, m) : m \in M^*\}$ are at distance 1.

(ii) If there exists at least one element $m \in M^*$ such that $r \cdot m = 0$, for any $r \in R$, then $Z^*(R(+)M) = \{(0, m) : m \in M^*\} \cup \{(r, m), \dots : m \in M\}$. Then any two elements in $\{(r, m), \dots : m \in M\}$ are non adjacent. But $(r, n) \cdot (0, m) = (0, 0)$, and $(0, m) \cdot (0, n) = (0, 0)$. Then $(r, n) — (0, m) — (0, n)$, $m \neq n$, and $m, n \in M^*$. Then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 2$.

(iii) If there exists two elements $r_1, r_2 \in R^*$ such that $r_1 \cdot m = 0$, $r_2 \cdot n = 0$, $m \neq n$, and $m, n \in M^*$, then $Z^*(R(+)M) = \{(0, m) : m \in M^*\} \cup \{(r_1, m), (r_2, n), \dots : m \neq n, m, n \in M^*\}$. Any two elements in $\{(r_1, n), (r_2, m), \dots : m \neq n, m, n \in M^*\}$ are non adjacent. But $(r_1, 0) — (0, m) — (0, n) — (r_2, 0)$. Then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 3$. \square

Example 1.6. Consider the ring $\mathbb{Z}_5(+)\mathbb{Z}_5$. Then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 1$. Since \mathbb{Z}_5 is an integral domain and \mathbb{Z}_5 is an \mathbb{Z}_5 -module, and there is no element in \mathbb{Z}_5^* such that $r.m = 0$, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_5^*$.

Example 1.7. Consider the ring $\mathbb{Z}(+)\mathbb{Z}_{18}$. Then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 3$. Since \mathbb{Z} is an integral domain and \mathbb{Z}_{18} is an \mathbb{Z} -module, and there exists two elements $(r_1 = 2, r_2 = 9)$ in \mathbb{Z}^* such that $2.9 = 0$, $9.2 = 0$, $2.2 \neq 0$, $9.9 \neq 0$, $9, 2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{18}^*$, then $(2, 0) - (0, 9) - (0, 2) - (9, 0)$.

Example 1.8. Consider the ring $\mathbb{Z}(+)\mathbb{Z}_5$. Then $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R(+)M)) = 2$. Since \mathbb{Z} is an integral domain and \mathbb{Z}_5 is an \mathbb{Z} -module, and there exists $5 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $5.3 = 0$, $3 \in \mathbb{Z}_5$. And for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, $r.3 = 0$.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. F. Anderson and P. S. Livingston, The zero-divisor graph of a commutative rings, J. Algebra, 217 (1999), 434 - 447.
- [2] M. Axtell and J. Stickles, Zero-divisor graphs of idealizations, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra, 204 (2006), 235 - 243.
- [3] I. Beck, Coloring of a commutative ring, J. Algebra, 116 (1988), 208 - 226.
- [4] S. Ebrahimi Atani and Z. Ebrahimi Sarvandi, Zero-divisor graphs of idealizations with respect to prime modules, Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences, 2 (26) (2007), 1279 - 1283.
- [5] J. Huckaba (1988), Commutative rings with zero divisors, in Monographs Pure Applied Mathematics, Marcel Dekker, Basel, New York.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSITY, AMMAN, JORDAN

E-mail address: mlabadi@philadelphia.edu.jo