

ZERO-DIVISOR GRAPHS OF \mathbb{Z}_n , THEIR PRODUCTS AND D_n

AMRITA ACHARYYA AND ROBINSON CZAJKOWSKI

ABSTRACT. This paper is an endeavor to discuss some properties of zero-divisor graphs of the ring \mathbb{Z}_n , the ring of integers modulo n . The zero divisor graph of a commutative ring R , is an undirected graph whose vertices are the nonzero zero-divisors of R , where two distinct vertices are adjacent if their product is zero. The zero divisor graph of R is denoted by $\Gamma(R)$. We discussed $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$'s by the attributes of completeness, k -partite structure, complete k -partite structure, regularity, chordality, γ - β perfectness, simplicial vertices. The clique number for arbitrary $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ was also found. This work also explores related attributes of finite products $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$, seeking to extend certain results to the product rings. We find all $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ that are perfect. Likewise, a lower bound of clique number of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n)$ was found. Later, in this paper we discuss some properties of the zero divisor graph of the poset D_n , the set of positive divisors of a positive integer n partially ordered by divisibility.

1. INTRODUCTION

Zero-divisor graphs were first discussed by Beck [1] as a way to color commutative rings. They were further discussed by Livingston and Anderson in [4] and [5]. A zero-divisor graph of a ring R , denoted by $\Gamma(R)$, is a graph whose vertices are all the zero divisors of R . Two distinct vertices u and v are adjacent if $uv = 0$. Beck [1] considered every element of R a vertex, with 0 sharing an edge with all other vertices. Since then, others have chosen to omit 0 from zero-divisor graphs [2, 3, 4, 5]. For our purposes, we omit 0 so that the vertex set of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ denoted by $ZD(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ will only be the non-zero zero-divisors. In the first section, we explore a concept explored by Smith [3] called type graphs. In [3], type graphs were used to find all perfect $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. We extended the notion of type graphs for $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ to find all perfect zero-divisor graphs of such products, where n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k are

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 68R10, 68R01, 03G10, 13A99.

Key words and phrases. zero-divisor graph, commutative ring, finite products, poset, type graph.

positive integers and $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ is the direct product of \mathbb{Z}_{n_i} s, $1 \leq i \leq k$. We then move on to various properties of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ and $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. AbdAlJawad and Al-Ezeh [2] discussed the domination number of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. We extend this result to find an upper bound and lower bound for the domination number of finite product $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ and discussed coefficient of smallest degree of domination polynomial of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. In the last section, we explore zero divisor graphs of the poset D_n , the set of positive divisors of a positive integer n partially ordered by divisibility and we catalog them in a similar way. Zero divisor graph of poset is studied in [8], [9], [10].

2. TYPE GRAPHS

When we consider zero-divisor graphs of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$, it is useful to consider the type graphs of these rings. A type graph has vertices of T_a where a is a factor of n that is neither 1 nor 0. The set of all T_i forms a partition of the zero divisor graph by $T_a = \{x \in ZD(\mathbb{Z}_n) | \gcd(x, n) = a\}$. This concept was shown by Smith [3], where the type graph was used to find all perfect $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. Smith used the notation $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ to denote the type graph. In that paper, four key observations were shown to be true regarding the type graphs on \mathbb{Z}_n . In this section, we modify the definition of type graph to fit the graph of $\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k}$. Additionally, we show these observations to be true over this type graph as well. We then use analogues of some theorems from [3] to characterize the perfectness of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$.

The following are two important theorems from [3].

Theorem 2.1 (Smith's Main Theorem). [3] *A graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is perfect iff n is of one of the following forms:*

1. $n = p^a$ for prime p and positive integer a .
2. $n = p^a q^b$ for distinct primes p, q and positive integers a, b .
3. $n = p^a q r$ for distinct primes p, q, r and positive integer a .
4. $n = p q r s$ for distinct primes p, q, r, s .

Theorem 2.2 (Smith's Theorem 4.1). [3] *$\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is perfect iff its type graph $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is perfect.*

Definition 2.3 (Type graph of $\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k}$). *The type graph of $\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k}$ denoted by $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ has a vertex set of the type classes $T(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_k)$ where $(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_k) \neq (0, 0, \cdots, 0)$ nor $(1, 1, \cdots, 1)$, and x_i is a divisor of n_i , 1, or 0.*

$T(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_k) = \{(a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_k) \mid |a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}/0 \text{ and } \gcd(a_i, n_i) = x_i$

or $a_i = 0$ if $x_i = 0$ }. Arbitrary $T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ shares an edge with arbitrary $T(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$ iff $x_i y_i = 0$ for all i .

Smith [3] gave the following four observations for the type graph of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$.

Theorem 2.4. *Each vertex of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is in exactly one type class.*

Theorem 2.5. *Arbitrary distinct vertices T_x and T_y share an edge in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ iff each $a \in T_x$ shares an edge with each $b \in T_y$ in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$.*

Theorem 2.6. *Arbitrary distinct vertices T_x and T_y don't share an edge in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ iff each $a \in T_x$ doesn't share an edge with each $b \in T_y$ in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$.*

Theorem 2.7. *In $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ consider arbitrary a and b in the same type class. An arbitrary vertex c in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ shares an edge with b iff it shares an edge with a also.*

Following are the four analogues to the above results for $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$.

Theorem 2.8. *Each vertex of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ is in exactly one type class.*

Proof. Assume otherwise. Then there is a vertex v that is not in any type class, or v is in multiple type classes.

Case 1: v is not in any type class.

Then v must have an element a_i that is not 0 and whose gcd with n_i is not a number x_i which is clearly not true.

Case 2: v is in multiple type classes.

Let $v = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \cap T(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$. Then for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ if $a_i = 0$, then $x_i = y_i = 0$ and if $a_i \neq 0$, then $\gcd(a_i, n_i) = x_i = y_i$ giving $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$ which is a contradiction.

□

Theorem 2.9. *Arbitrary distinct vertices $T_x = T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ and $T_y = T(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$ share an edge in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ iff each $a \in T_x$ shares an edge with each $b \in T_y$ in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$.*

Proof. Let T_x shares an edge with T_y . By the definition, $x_i y_i = 0$ for every i . Consider arbitrary $(a_1, \dots, a_i) \in T_x$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_i) \in T_y$. Since each a_i is a multiple of x_i and each b_i is a multiple of y_i , $a_i b_i$ is a multiple of $x_i y_i$ and therefore equal to 0. Then (a_1, \dots, a_i) and (b_1, \dots, b_i) share an edge.

Conversely, let every $a \in T_x$ and $b \in T_y$ share an edge. Since $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ is an element of T_x , and $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$ is an element of T_y , x and y share an edge. Then T_x must share an edge with T_y . \square

Theorem 2.10. *Arbitrary distinct vertices $T_x = T(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ and $T_y = T(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$ don't share an edge in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ iff each $a \in T_x$ doesn't share an edge with each $b \in T_y$ in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$.*

Proof. Let T_x does not share an edge with T_y . By the definition, $x_i y_i \neq 0$ for some i , which means $x_i y_i$ lacks some factor f of n_i . Consider arbitrary $(a_1, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_k) \in T_x$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_i, \dots, b_k) \in T_y$. Now, a_i is a multiple of x_i and b_i is a multiple of y_i , and thus, $a_i b_i$ is a multiple of $x_i y_i$. Since $\text{gcf}(a_i, n_i) = x_i$ and $\text{gcf}(b_i, n_i) = y_i$, $a_i b_i$ also lacks the factor f from n_i and is therefore non-zero. So (a_1, \dots, a_k) and (b_1, \dots, b_k) do not share an edge.

Conversely, let each $a \in T_x$ and $b \in T_y$ do not share an edge. Since $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ is an element of T_x , and $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k)$ is an element of T_y , x and y don't share an edge. Then T_x must not share an edge with T_y . \square

Theorem 2.11. *In $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ consider arbitrary $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ and $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)$ in the same type class $T(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k)$. An arbitrary vertex $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k)$ shares an edge with b iff it shares an edge with a also.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 2.5 and 2.6. \square

Next, we want have the following theorem:

Theorem 2.12. *$\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ is perfect iff its type graph $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ is perfect.*

To show this, we will use the following three theorems, whose proofs are analogous to the corresponding proofs in [3].

Theorem 2.13. *Given arbitrary hole or antihole H of length greater than 4 in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$, every vertex in H belongs to a different type class.*

Theorem 2.14. *Let there be a hole or antihole H length $l > 4$ in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. Then the type graph $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ must also contain a hole or antihole length l .*

Theorem 2.15. *Let there be a hole or antihole H length $l > 4$ in the type class $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. Then the graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ must also contain a hole or antihole length l .*

Using these theorems, now we can establish the following proof of Theorem 2.12.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof in [3]. □

Now that we know perfectness in the type graph implies perfectness in the zero-divisor graph, it is possible to find all such perfect $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. As it turns out, for both $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ and $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$, we can exchange the primes of each n_i , and as long as the form of the primes (the amount of primes and the power of each prime) stays the same, the type graph will be isomorphic. To illustrate this, consider $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{p^2q} \times \mathbb{Z}_p)$ where p, q are prime. This type graph is isomorphic to $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{r^2s} \times \mathbb{Z}_t)$ where r, s, t are prime, even if the value of the primes change. We will use this to find all perfect $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$.

Theorem 2.16. *Consider some $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ and $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ such that $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ and $m = q_1^{\alpha_1} q_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots q_k^{\alpha_k}$. Then $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n) \cong \Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_m)$.*

Proof. Consider arbitrary vertex u in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. u is a factor of n , so we can write $u = p_1^{x_1} p_2^{x_2} \cdots p_k^{x_k}$. Note that $0 \leq x_i \leq \alpha_i, \forall i$. Define a function $f : \Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n) \rightarrow \Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ as $f(u) = f(p_1^{x_1} p_2^{x_2} \cdots p_k^{x_k}) = q_1^{x_1} q_2^{x_2} \cdots q_k^{x_k}$. Since n and m both have the same amount of prime factors, and each corresponding prime has the same power α_i , the result follows. □

Theorem 2.17. *Consider $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ and $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_k})$ where the prime factorization of n_i has the same form as m_i for each i . That is, n_i and m_i have the same amount of prime factors and the same power for each prime. Then $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k}) \cong \Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_k})$.*

Proof. Take arbitrary n_i .

Denote the prime factorization of $n_i = p_{i,1}^{\alpha_{i,1}} \cdots p_{i,j_i}^{\alpha_{i,j_i}}$ where j_i is the amount of prime of n_i . Likewise, $m_i = q_{i,1}^{\alpha_{i,1}} \cdots q_{i,j_i}^{\alpha_{i,j_i}}$. Note that the only difference between these factorizations are the value of the primes being used. The powers and amount of primes are the same. Consider arbitrary $(u_1, \cdots, u_k) \in \Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. Each u_i is a factor of n_i

or 0. We can write $u_i = p_{i,1}^{x_{i,1}} \cdots p_{i,j_i}^{x_{i,j_i}}$ where $0 \leq x_{i,l} \leq \alpha_{i,l}$. Note that if u_i is 1, each $x_{i,l}$ is 0 and if u_i is 0, $x_{i,l} = \alpha_{i,l}$ for every l .

Define a function $f : \Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k}) \rightarrow \Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_k})$ as $f(u_1, \dots, u_k) = f(p_{1,1}^{x_{1,1}} \cdots p_{1,j_1}^{x_{1,j_1}}, \dots, p_{k,1}^{x_{k,1}} \cdots p_{k,j_k}^{x_{k,j_k}})$
 $= (q_{1,1}^{x_{1,1}} \cdots q_{1,j_1}^{x_{1,j_1}}, \dots, q_{k,1}^{x_{k,1}} \cdots q_{k,j_k}^{x_{k,j_k}}) = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$. Note that all we did was only replaced the primes. Hence the result follows as the previous one. \square

Theorem 2.18. $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ is isomorphic to $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1 \cdots n_k})$ if all n_i 's are mutually co-prime.

Proof. The proof follows by Chinese Remainder theorem. \square

The next theorem will show how we can characterize perfectness of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. Because now by the above three theorem without loss of generality we can simply choose primes that will make each n_i co-prime. Then we know the type graph will be isomorphic to $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ where n is the product of all such co-prime n_i . So n will have a prime factorization with the total amount of primes in all n_i and they will have corresponding powers. So, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.19. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \cdots \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ is perfect iff it is possible to find mutually co prime positive integers $m_1, m_2 \cdots m_k$, so that each m_i has same amount of prime factors with same exponent in it's prime factorization as that in n_i and $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{m_1 m_2 \cdots m_k})$ is perfect.

Example 2.20. For example, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^2 q} \times \mathbb{Z}_p)$ is perfect because $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{a^2 bc})$ is perfect as shown by [3]. Also note, no product with a dimension greater than four can be perfect. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_5})$ is not perfect since no $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1 \cdots p_5})$ is perfect as shown by [3].

3. SOME PROPERTIES OF $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$

In this section we characterize $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ by various qualities such as completeness, cordiality and clique number. A helpful construction used is the strong type graph. We define the strong type graph as the type graph with self loops. We normally do not consider self-loops, in zero-divisor graphs and type graphs, but in the strong type graph, a vertex has a loop at it if it annihilates itself. We denote the strong type graph of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ as $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$.

Another construction used commonly in this section is n^* . Consider some $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. Let $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_m^{\alpha_m}$, then $n^* = p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\beta_2} \cdots p_m^{\beta_m}$ where β_i is half of α_i rounded up. This construction is very useful, as some properties of vertices can be associated with whether or not the vertex is a multiple of n^* .

Lemma 3.1. *Two arbitrary vertices u and v in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ that are both in the same type class T_i share an edge iff T_i has a self-loop in the strong type graph.*

Proof. Let T_i have a self-loop. Then $i^2 = 0$. Since every $u, v \in T_i$ are multiples of i , u and v will share an edge.

Conversely, let T_i does not have a self-loop. Take arbitrary u and v in T_i . According to the definition of type class, u and v are some multiple of i where $gcf(u, n) = i$ and likewise for v . We can write $u = ai$ and $v = bi$ where $gcf(a, n/i) = 1$ and $gcf(b, n/i) = 1$. Assume u and v share an edge. Then $uv = cn$, $abi^2 = cn$ where c is a natural number. So $\frac{abi^2}{n} = c$. Since T_i does not have a self-loop, $i^2 \neq 0$ which means n contains a factor not contained by i^2 . Let this factor be called d . Let $\frac{q}{d}$ represent the simplified form of the fraction $\frac{i^2}{n}$ where d is guaranteed to not be 1. By substitution, $\frac{abq}{d} = c$. But this is a contradiction since a , b and q do not share a factor with n/i , so cannot cancel the d out of the denominator. Therefore, the expression cannot be equal to c , a natural number. u and v do not share an edge. □

Theorem 3.2. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^2})$ is complete where p is prime.

Proof. Take arbitrary zero divisors of \mathbb{Z}_n , u and v . u and v must both share a common factor with n , and the only possible factor is p since p^2 is zero. So both u and v have a factor of p . Then u and v share an edge. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^2})$ is complete. □

Theorem 3.3. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$ where p is prime and $x \geq 3$ is not complete.

Proof. Let $x \geq 3$.

Case 1: $p = 2$: p and $3p$ are distinct non-zero zero-divisors that are not connected.

Case 2: $p \neq 2$: p and $2p$ are distinct non-zero zero-divisors that are not connected. □

Theorem 3.4. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$, where $n \geq 2$ is complete iff $n = p^2$.

Proof. Let $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ be complete. Assume two or more distinct prime factors of n exist. Label the smallest such factor by p . Now choose another distinct prime factor of n as q . p is a zero divisor and shares an edge with n/p . Since p and q are both prime factors of n , $pq \leq n$. Also, since $p < q$, $p^2 < pq$. So $p^2 < pq \leq n$ which means p^2 is non-zero and distinct from p . p^2 shares an edge with n/p so p^2 is a distinct zero-divisor that does not share an edge with p , making $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ not complete. So n must only have one prime factor. Then, by Theorem 2.2, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$

is not complete if $x \geq 3$. So $x = 2$. So when $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is complete, $n = p^2$. The converse follows by Theorem 3.2. \square

Theorem 3.5. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite if $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite.

Proof. Let $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ be k -partite. Then $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ can be partitioned into k disjoint subsets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k such that no vertex in the same set share an edge. Partition $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ into a similar grouping Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k where $u \in Q_i$ iff $u \in T_u \in S_i$. Consider arbitrary u and v , vertices of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ that are in the same partitioned set Q_i .

Case 1: u and v are in different type classes.

Call such classes T_u and T_v . Then since u and v are both in Q_i , T_u and T_v are both in S_i which means T_u does not share an edge with T_v . So, by [3] u and v do not share an edge.

Case 2: u and v are in the same type class.

Call this class T_u . Then since $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite, T_u does not form a loop with itself. Hence, by Lemma 3.1, u and v do not share an edge. \square

Theorem 3.6. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is complete k -partite if $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is complete k -partite.

Proof. Let $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ be complete k -partite. Then by Theorem 2.4, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite. Using the partition used in Theorem 3.5, if we let $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ be partitioned into k disjoint subsets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k , then $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ can be partitioned into k disjoint subsets Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k , where arbitrary vertex of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is in Q_i if its type class is in S_i . Consider arbitrary vertices in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$, u and v , that are not in the same Q_i . Then u and v must be in different type classes in two different S_i 's. Call these classes T_u and T_v . Since $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is complete k -partite, T_u and T_v share an edge. Then u and v share an edge by [3]. \square

Remark 3.7. *The converse of Theorem 3.5 and 3.6 is not always true. If the zero-divisor graph is k -partite, but has a self-annihilating vertex, the strong type graph will have a self-loop, which prevents it from being k -partite.*

Theorem 3.8. *If n is square free, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite, where k is the number of distinct prime factors of n .*

Proof. Consider the strong type graph $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. Let, $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_k$. Partition the graph into k sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k . A vertex T_a in the strong

type graph is in S_i if $gcf(a, p_i) = 1$ and $gcf(a, p_h) > 1$ for all $h < i$.

We now claim that S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k covers all the vertices of $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$.

Assume there is a T_a that is not in any S_i . Since T_a is a vertex, a must be a factor of n that is also less than n . So a must omit at least one p_i . So $gcf(a, p_i) = 1$. Since T_a is not in any S_i , there must exist some $h < i$ such that $gcf(a, p_h) = 1$. Choose the smallest index h of such p_h . Then T_a must be in S_h which is a contradiction.

Our next claim is any two vertices u and v in the same partition do not share an edge.

Consider arbitrary u and v in S_i . Both u and v do not contain p_i so they do not share an edge. So the strong type graph is k -partite.

By Theorem 3.5, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1 p_2 \dots p_k})$ is k -partite. □

Lemma 3.9. *Arbitrary type class T_a in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ contains only one element iff $a = \frac{n}{2}$.*

Proof. Let $T_a \in \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ have a type class that has only one element. Assume $a \neq \frac{n}{2}$. Since a is a factor of n , $\frac{n}{a} = f$ is also a factor of n . Note that $f \geq 3$.

Consider the vertex $a(f-1)$. The quantity $(f-1)$ does not share any factors with f . Since $af = n$, $gcf(a(f-1), n) = a$. So $a(f-1) \in T_a$. Also note that $a < a(f-1) < n$. So $a(f-1)$ is a distinct vertex in T_a which is a contradiction. So $a = \frac{n}{2}$

Let $a = \frac{n}{2}$. Then a is the only element in T_a since $2a = n$. □

Corollary 3.10. *Analogous to above, $T_{n/p}$ in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ contains exactly $p-1$ elements if p is the smallest prime factor of n .*

Lemma 3.11. *There is at most one type class with only one element.*

Proof. Assume there are two or more distinct type classes that have only one element. Call two of these classes T_u and T_v . By Lemma 3.9, $u = v = \frac{n}{2}$ which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 3.12. *$\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite if $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite or $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite and the only self-connected vertex of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is $T_{\frac{n}{2}}$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ be k -partite. By Theorem 3.5, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is k -partite. Let $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ be k -partite and let $\Gamma^S(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ have only one self-connected vertex, $T_{\frac{n}{2}}$. Consider arbitrary distinct u and v , zero divisors of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$, that are in the same partition.

Case 1: u and v are in the same type class.

By Lemma 2.17, $T_{\frac{n}{2}}$ has only one element, so if u and v are

distinct, they cannot be in $T_{\frac{n}{2}}$. Then the type class they are in are not self-connected so u and v do not share an edge.

Case 2: u and v are in different type classes.

Since u and v are in the same partition, their type classes are in the same partition and do not share an edge. Thus, u and v do not share an edge.

□

Lemma 3.13. *A vertex in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ annihilates itself iff it is a multiple of n^* .*

Lemma 3.14. *Consider two arbitrary vertices in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ u and v such that u is a factor of v . The largest clique containing v , M_v has a magnitude greater than or equal to the M_u , the largest clique containing u .*

Proof. Take arbitrary vertices u and v in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. Let u be a factor of v . Assume the opposite, that M_u has a larger magnitude than that of M_v . Every element e in $M_u \setminus u$ has the property $eu = 0$. Then $\forall e \in M_u$, $ev = 0$. So a clique C exists with v and each e in $M_u \setminus u$. C has a magnitude equal to the magnitude of M_u which is a contradiction since M_v is the largest clique containing v . □

Theorem 3.15. *$cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)) \geq \frac{n}{n^*} + k - 1$ where k is the number of odd-power primes in the prime factorization of n .*

Proof. We claim that any two multiples of n^* share an edge. Take two arbitrary multiples of n^* , an^* and bn^* . Since $(n^*)^2 \geq n$ these two vertices will share an edge. So the multiples of n^* form a clique. Call it C . An arbitrary vertex of C will be of the form an^* for $1 < a < \frac{n}{n^*}$. The amount of elements in this clique is $\frac{n}{n^*} - 1$, so the clique number of the graph is at least $\frac{n}{n^*} - 1$. Now consider all vertices of the form n^*/q where q is an arbitrary odd-power prime in the prime factorization of n . Because n^* has a factor of q with power of half rounded up, and n^*/q has a power of half rounded down, arbitrary n^*/q shares an edge with each an^* in C . Also, each n^*/q_1 shares an edge to each other n^*/q_2 . This is because the power of q_1 in n^*/q_1 is half rounded down and in n^*/q_2 it is half rounded up, and likewise for q_2 . Since k is the number of distinct odd powered primes in the prime factorization of n , $cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)) \geq \frac{n}{n^*} + k - 1$. □

Theorem 3.16. *$cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)) \leq \frac{n}{n^*} + k - 1$ where k is the number of odd-power primes in the prime factorization of n .*

Proof. Consider arbitrary clique C . Partition C into sets L and N where L is the set of vertices of C that are not multiples of n^* and N is the set of vertices of C that are multiples of n^* . Consider arbitrary vertex l_1 in L . Since l_1 is not a multiple of n^* , there must be some prime factor p_1 of n whose power in l_1 is less than half of its power in n (since if every prime factor was greater than or equal to half, l_1 would be a multiple of n^*). Every other l_i in L must have its p_1 factor with a power greater than or equal to half its power in n for it to share an edge with l_1 . Consider another vertex l_2 in L . l_2 must also have a prime factor whose power is less than half its power in n , but it cannot be p_1 . Call it p_2 . So each l_i in L must have a distinct prime factor p_i that has a power less than or equal to half its power in n . Let m be the number of distinct prime factors of n . Then there can be a maximum of m many l_i in L . N has a maximum size of $\frac{n}{n^*} - 1$, so the clique number is at most $\frac{n}{n^*} + m - 1$.

Consider some e_1 , a vertex in L whose corresponding p_1 , has an even power in n . e_1 does not share an edge with n^* . This means the clique number is one less if n has an even-powered prime. Consider another e_2 that has an even p_2 whose power is less than half. Then e_2 does not share an edge with $p_1 n^*$. In general, a vertex e_i whose corresponding p_i has an even power does not share an edge with distinct vertices $p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{i-1} n^*$. So the size of C is reduced by the number of even powered-primes of n . This value can be represented by $m - k$ where k is the number of odd-powered primes of n . Hence, since C is arbitrary, $cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)) \leq \frac{n}{n^*} + m - (m - k) - 1$. $cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)) \leq \frac{n}{n^*} + k - 1$. \square

Theorem 3.17. $cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)) = \frac{n}{n^*} + k - 1$.

Proof. The proof follows by Theorem 3.15 and Theorem 3.16. \square

Theorem 3.18. *There are no non-empty, non-complete, regular $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$.*

Proof. Consider all $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ that are non-empty and not complete. Assume \exists some regular graph among these graphs.

Case 1: $n = p^x$ where p is prime

If $x = 1$, the graph is empty, and if $x = 2$, the graph is complete, so $x \geq 3$. Then p is a vertex that shares an edge with $p - 1$ many other vertices, and p^2 is a vertex that shares an edge with $p^2 - 1$ many other vertices. Since the graph is regular, $p - 1 = p^2 - 1$, thus $p = p^2$, which means $p = 1$, a contradiction.

Case 2: $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_m^{\alpha_m}$, $m \geq 2$ and p_i are all prime

Vertex p_1 shares an edge with $p_1 - 1$ many other vertices, and

the vertex p_2 shares an edge with $p_2 - 1$ many other vertices. Since the graph is regular, $p_1 - 1 = p_2 - 1$, thus $p_1 = p_2$ which is a contradiction since p_1 and p_2 are distinct.

So the only non-empty regular graphs are complete. □

Theorem 3.19. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is chordal iff $n = p^x, 2p$ or $2p^2$, where p is prime and x is a positive integer.

Proof. Let $n = p^x$. Assume that $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$ is not chordal. Then \exists a cycle C of length > 3 , that has no chord. Let y be a vertex of C that is not a multiple of n^* . Then, since the power of p in y has a power strictly less than $\frac{x}{2}$, each neighbor must be a multiple of n^* . Then the two neighbors of y in C share an edge which is a chord. So all vertices in C must be a multiple of n^* which also causes a chord. So $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$ is chordal.

Let $n = 2p$. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{2p})$ is a star because it is a line segment only. Then, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{2p})$ is chordal.

Let $n = 2p^2$. Assume $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{2p^2})$ is non-chordal. Then \exists a cycle C of length > 3 that has no chord.

Let a be a vertex of C in the type class T_p . Each neighbor of a must be a multiple of $2p$, and therefore, is in the type class T_{2p} . Each multiple of $2p$ shares an edge, so there exists a chord in C . So there can be no vertices in the type class T_p in C .

Let b be a vertex of C that is in the type class T_2 . Every neighbor of b must be in the type class T_{p^2} . But there is only one element in T_{p^2} so b cannot have two distinct neighbors. So b is not a vertex of C .

So each vertex of C must be in either T_{p^2} or T_{2p} . Then since there is only one element of T_{p^2} , and the magnitude of C is at least 4, there are at least 3 elements of T_{2p} in C . Those 3 elements form a triangle since each multiple of $2p$ annihilates each other multiple of $2p$. But C can't have a triangle since it is chord-less. This is a contradiction.

Let n not be $p^x, 2p$ or $2p^2$.

Case 1: $n = 2^x p^y$ where $y \geq 3, x \geq 1$ and p is an odd prime.
Then $2^x p - p^y - 2^{x+1} p - p^{y-1}$ is a chord-less cycle.

Case 2: $n = 2^x p^y$ where $x \geq 2, y \geq 1$ and p is an odd prime.
Then $2p^y - 2^x - p^y - 2^{x+1}$ is a chord-less cycle.

Case 3: $n = p^x q^y$ where $p, q \geq 3$ where $p \neq q$ are primes and x, y are non-zero.

Then $p^x - q^y - 2p^x - 2q^y$ is a chord-less cycle.

Case 4: $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ where $k \geq 3$ and α_i is non-zero.

Since $k \geq 3$, n has an odd prime factor p_1 . Then $p_1^{\alpha_1} - n/p_1^{\alpha_1} - 2p_1^{\alpha_1} - 2n/p_1^{\alpha_1}$ is a chord-less cycle.

So $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is non-chordal if n is not p^x , $2p$ or $2p^2$. □

Lemma 3.20. *If $n^* \neq n$, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ has a simplicial vertex.*

Proof. Let $n^* \neq n$. Then n/n^* is a vertex since n/n^* shares an edge with n^* which is not a multiple of n . Since every neighbor of n/n^* is a multiple of n^* and every multiple of n^* shares an edge, n/n^* is a simplicial vertex. So $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ has a simplicial vertex. □

Another construction n_* can be useful. It is similar to n^* , but for the odd powered primes, round down instead of up. Consider $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ where $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$. Define n_* as $n_* = p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\beta_2} \cdots p_k^{\beta_k}$ and $\beta_i = \alpha_i/2$ if α_i is even and $\beta_i = (\alpha_i - 1)/2$ if α_i is odd.

Note that $n_* n^* = 0$ and if n is square-free, $n_* = 1$.

Lemma 3.21. *Arbitrary vertex v in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is a simplicial vertex iff $v \in T_2$ or $v \in T_g$ where g is a factor of n_* .*

Proof. Take arbitrary v in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. Let $v \in T_2$. Then v only shares an edge with vertices in $T_{n/2}$. By Lemma 3.9, $T_{n/2}$ has only one element, which makes a clique. So v is simplicial.

Let $v \in T_g$ where g is a factor of n_* . So $n_* = ag$ where a is a positive integer. Consider some vertex h in T_j that shares an edge with v . Then $j * g = bn$ for positive integer b . $\frac{jn_*}{a} = bn_* n^*$. $\frac{j}{a} = bn^*$. Then $j = abn^*$. So j is a multiple of n^* and therefore, h is a multiple of n^* . Since every multiple of n^* shares an edge with every other such multiple, v is a simplicial vertex.

Conversely, let v be neither in T_2 nor in any T_g where g is a factor of n_* . Then, since v is not in any T_g , v has some prime with a power greater than half of that in n . Call that prime p_x and its power in v , α_x . Let the type class of v be called T_w . Consider the type class $T_{n/w}$. Each vertex in $T_{n/w}$ shares an edge with v . Since $v \notin T_2$, $T_{n/w} \neq T_{n/2}$. So by Lemma 3.9, $T_{n/w}$ has more than one element. Since n/w has a power of p_x less than that of half in n , none of the vertices in $T_{n/w}$ share an edge with each other. So the neighbors of v do not form a clique. Hence, v is not simplicial. □

Theorem 3.22. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ has a simplicial vertex iff the prime factorization of n is not square free or n is even.

Proof. Let n not be square free. Then, $n^* \neq n$. So by Lemma 3.20, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ has a simplicial vertex.

Let n be even. Then, 2 is a zero divisor. Every neighbor of 2 must be a multiple of $n/2$ which there is only one of, so 2 is a simplicial vertex.

Let n be square free and odd. 2 is therefore not a factor of n . Then consider arbitrary vertex x . x shares an edge with both n/x and $2n/x$. $2n/x$ is non-zero since x is necessarily odd, and n/x and $2n/x$ do not share an edge since n is odd. For if $\frac{n}{x}\frac{2n}{x} = ny$, $2n = yx^2$ and $n = \frac{yx^2}{2}$ which is a contradiction. So there are no simplicial vertices of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. \square

Note: It follows by [3], (observation 3.2), if in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ a vertex u is simplicial then T_u is simplicial in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_n)$. But, not conversely. For example, in $\Gamma^T(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$, T_3 is simplicial, where as 3 is not so in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$.

Lemma 3.23. If $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ has three or more prime factors of n , $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is not $\gamma - \beta$ perfect.

Proof. Let $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ where $k \geq 3$. By [2], the domination number is k . Construct some vertex map V whose size is k .

We claim that V must contain the vertex n/p_x for every p_x prime factor of n .


Consider the vertex n/p_x for some p_x prime factor of n . Let n/p_x not be in V . Construct set $C = \{p_x p_i | 1 \leq i \leq k\}$. n/p_x shares an edge with every vertex in C . Since $n/p_x \notin V$, every element of C is in V . C has k many vertices, so V has at least k many vertices. Consider vertex p_x . p_x shares an edge with n/p_x which is not covered by V , so V has at least $k + 1$ vertices. That is a contradiction since the size of V is k . So each n/p_x is in V .

Consider the type classes T_{n/p_1} , T_{n/p_2} and T_{n/p_3} . By Lemma 3.11, there can be at most one type class with only one element. At least two of these type classes have more than one element. Without loss of generality, let them be T_{n/p_1} and T_{n/p_2} . Since n/p_1 and n/p_2 are both in V , choose different vertices in the type classes u and v . u and v share an edge since they are multiples of n/p_1 and n/p_2 respectively, so they share an edge, but are not in V . Then V must contain at least one


other element making the size of V at least $k + 1$. This is a contradiction. We cannot construct a vertex map size k . So $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is not $\gamma - \beta$ perfect. \square

Theorem 3.24. *The only $\gamma - \beta$ perfect $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ are $n = 2^3, 3^2, p, 2p$ and $3p$.*

Proof. Let $n = 2^3$. The domination number clearly equals the smallest vertex map.



Let $n = 3^2$. The domination number clearly equals the smallest vertex map.



Let $n = 2p$. Then the graph is a star, so the domination number and the smallest vertex map are both 1.

Let $n = 3p$. Then $V = \{p, 2p\}$ is both a minimal dominating set and a minimal vertex map.

Let $n = p$. Then both the domination number and the smallest vertex map is 0 since the graph is empty.

Now, we will show that all other $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ are not $\gamma - \beta$ perfect.

Let $n = 2^2$. The empty set is a vertex map since there are no edges in this map, so smallest vertex map and the domination number are not the same.

Let $n = 2^x, x \geq 4$. Then $2^{x-1} - 2^{x-2} - 3 \cdot 2^{x-2}$ is a triangle. Triangles prevent vertex maps of size 1, and by [2] the domination number is 1, so the values do not match.

Let $n = 3^x, x \geq 3$. Then $3^{x-1} - 2 \cdot 3^{x-1} - 3^{x-2}$ is a triangle that prevents vertex maps of size 1.

Let $n = p^x, p \geq 5, x \geq 2$. Then $p^{x-1} - 2 \cdot p^{x-1} - 3 \cdot p^{x-1}$ is a triangle.

Let $n = pq, q > p \geq 5$. The domination number is 2 by [2]. $p - q - 2p - 2q - 3p - 2q$ is a hole size 6. There cannot be a vertex map that covers a hole of that size, so the smallest vertex map is not 2.

Let $n = p^x q, x \geq 2$. The domination number is 2.

Case 1: $p = 2$.

Then $p^{x-1}q - p^x - q - p^{x+1} - pq$ is a non-induced sub-graph that cannot be covered by a vertex map size 2.

Case 2: $p \neq 2$.

Then $p^x - p^{x-1}q - p - 2p^{x-1}q - 2p$ is a non-induced sub-graph that cannot be covered by a vertex map size 2. The smallest vertex map is larger than 2 making the graph not $\gamma - \beta$ perfect. Let $n = p^x q^y$, $x, y \geq 2$. The domination number is 2 by [2]. Assume there is a vertex map V size 2. Consider the edges $p - p^{x-1}q^y$ and $q - p^x q^{y-1}$. V must contain at least vertex one of each edge. By Lemma 3.11 only one type class can have only one vertex. Consider the type classes $T_{p^x q^{y-1}}$ and $T_{p^{x-1} q^y}$. At least one of them must contain more than one vertex. Without loss of generality let that be $T_{p^{x-1} q^y}$. Then there exists some $u \in T_{p^{x-1} q^y}$ that is not in V . The edge $p - u$ is not covered by V , so the size of V is at least one more than 2 which is a contradiction.

Let $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$, $k \geq 3$. Then by Lemma 3.23, the graph is not $\gamma - \beta$ perfect.

So the only $\gamma - \beta$ graphs $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ are $2^3, 3^2, p, 2p$ and $3p$.

□

4. SOME PROPERTIES OF $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$

In this section, we discuss some facts about $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. It is often possible to relate some properties of the individual $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$ to the graph of the product. One example is that the domination number of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ has an upper and lower bound corresponding to the domination number of each $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$.

Theorem 4.1. *Consider two arbitrary commutative rings with unity, R and S . $\Gamma(R \times S)$ is complete iff $|R| = |S| = 2$.*

Proof. Consider some R and S such that $|R| = |S| = 2$. Since both R and S have 1, the only elements of R and S are 0 and 1, where by 1 we denote the unity of the respective ring. Then the zero divisor graph is $(0, 1) - (1, 0)$ which is complete.

Conversely, let R or S have more than 2 elements. Without loss of generality, let R have more than 2 elements. Then R has some element a that is neither 1 nor 0. The graph $\Gamma(R \times S)$ has vertices $(1, 0)$ and $(a, 0)$. These vertices do not share an edge because $1 \cdot a = a$ which is not zero. So $\Gamma(R \times S)$ is not complete.

□

Theorem 4.2. $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ where $k \geq 2$ and each R_i is a commutative ring with 1. This graph is complete iff $k = 2$ and $|R_i| = 2$ for all i .

Proof. Consider some $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ where $k = 2$ and all $|R_i| = 2$. Then by Theorem 3.0, $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ is complete.

Consider some $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ that does not meet this criteria. If $k \geq 3$, then $(1, 0, 1)$ and $(1, 1, 0)$ are two vertices that do not share an edge. If any $|R_i| \geq 2$, then R_i has an element a that is not 0 or 1. Then (\cdots, a, \cdots) does not share an edge with $(\cdots, 1, \cdots)$, where a and 1 are placed in the i -th entry of the respective elements. So $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ is not complete. \square

Theorem 4.3. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ where $n, m \geq 2$ is complete-bipartite iff n and m are prime.

Proof. Let m and n be prime. Then partition $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ into sets S_n and S_m such that $S_n = \{(x, 0) | 0 < x < n\}$ and $S_m = \{(0, y) | 0 < y < m\}$.

We claim that $S_n \cup S_m = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$.

Assume, \exists a zero divisor $a = (a_1, a_2)$ that is not in $S_n \cup S_m$. Both a_1 and a_2 are non-zero as m and n are prime. Since a is a zero-divisor, there must be some $b = (b_1, b_2)$ that shares an edge with a . So $a_1 b_1 = 0$. Since \mathbb{Z}_n has no non-zero divisors, and a_1 is not zero, $b_1 = 0$. In the same way we find that b_2 is zero. This means a is not a zero-divisor because it only shares an edge with 0. So $S_n \cup S_m = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$.

Take arbitrary $u, v \in S_n$. Then $u = (u_1, 0)$ and $v = (v_1, 0)$. Since $u_1 v_1 \neq 0$, $uv \neq (0, 0)$ which means u and v do not share an edge. In the same way u and v do not share an edge if they are both in S_m . So u and v do not share an edge if they are in the same partition which is the definition of bipartite.

Thus, it follows from the construction of S_n and S_m , that $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ is complete bipartite.

Conversely, let $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ be complete bipartite. Assume one or both n and m are not prime. Let the non-prime be n . Then, there is a non-zero zero divisor of \mathbb{Z}_n . Call it k . Since $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ is complete-bipartite, the vertices of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ can be partitioned into 2 disjoint subsets such that no edges exist between two vertices in the same partition, and every pair of vertices in different partitions share an edge. $(1, 0)$ is a zero divisor since it shares an edge with $(0, 1)$. $(k, 0)$ is also a zero divisor since it also shares an edge with $(0, 1)$. Since $(k, 0)$ does not share an edge with $(1, 0)$, they must be in the same partition. Call it S_1 and let the other partition be S_2 . Since k is a zero-divisor

of \mathbb{Z}_n , $\exists k'$ not necessarily distinct such that $k \cdot k' = 0$. Then $(k', 1)$ shares an edge with $(k, 0)$ which means $(k', 1) \in S_2$. Since $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ is complete-bipartite, $(1, 0)$ must share an edge with $(k', 1)$ since they are in opposite partitions, but their product is not 0, which is a contradiction. So both n and m must be prime. \square

Corollary 4.4. *From this theorem it follows that $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ has a complete bipartite sub-graph.*

This is formed by $S_n \cup S_m$. If one of them is not a prime, we can delete all vertices that has at least one an entry dividing either n or m respectively, to get a complete bipartite subgraph.

Theorem 4.5. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ where $\forall n_i \geq 2$ and $k \geq 2$ is bipartite iff $k = 2$ and both n_i are prime, or one n_x is prime and the other is 4.

Proof. Let $k = 2$ and both n_1 and n_2 be prime. By Theorem 4.3, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2})$ is bipartite.

Let $k = 2$ and let one of n_i be 4 and the other be prime. Without loss of generality, let $n_1 = 4$. Then n_2 is prime. Partition the vertices into set A and B where A is the set of all vertices of the form $(a, 0)$ where $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_1}/0$ and B is everything else. Consider arbitrary, distinct elements of A , $(a_1, 0)$ and $(a_2, 0)$. They do not share an edge, since there are no two distinct a_1 and a_2 that share an edge in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1})$. Consider all vertices in B . Assume $\exists u, v \in B$ such that u shares an edge with v . Then, $u = (u_1, u_2)$ and $v = (v_1, v_2)$. Note that $u_2 v_2 \neq 0$. $u_2 v_2 = 0$ which means u_2 and v_2 are zero divisors in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_2})$. This is impossible since there are no zero divisors in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_2})$. So $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ is bipartite.

Conversely, let $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ be bipartite.

We first claim that $k = 2$.

Assume $k \geq 3$. Then, $(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) - (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) - (0, 0, 1, \dots, 0)$ is a triangle which cannot exist in a bipartite graph. So $k < 3$. By our definition, $k \geq 2$, so $k = 2$

We now claim no $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$ can have two or more distinct zero divisors.

Assume otherwise. Call two such divisors u and v that share an edge in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$. Without loss of generality, let u and v be in the first slot (so $i = 1$). Then $(u, 0) - (v, 0) - (0, 1)$ is a triangle which cannot exist in a bipartite graph. The only $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$ that has one element is $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_4)$. So all n_i must be either 4 or prime.

Our final claim is it is not possible for both n_i to be 4.

Assume otherwise. Then $(2, 0) - (2, 2) - (0, 2)$ is a triangle which cannot exist in a bipartite graph. So, because $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$

is bipartite, $k = 2$ and either both n_i are prime, or one is 4 and the other is prime. \square

Theorem 4.6. $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ where each R_i is a commutative ring with 1 is not perfect if some $\Gamma(R_i)$ is not perfect.

Proof. Let some $\Gamma(R_i)$ be non-perfect. Then by the Strong Perfect Graph theorem, there exists an odd hole or anti-hole H of length 5 or greater. Let H have a length l . Then we write it as, $v_1 - v_2 - \cdots - v_{l-1} - v_l - v_1$. Then a hole exists in $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$. Fill in the i th position with the vertices of H , and fill the rest in with zeros. The hole is $(0, \cdots, 0, v_1, 0, \cdots, 0) - (0, \cdots, 0, v_2, 0, \cdots, 0) - \cdots - (0, \cdots, 0, v_{l-1}, 0, \cdots, 0) - (0, \cdots, 0, v_l, 0, \cdots, 0) - (0, \cdots, 0, v_1, 0, \cdots, 0)$. The same proof can be used for an anti-hole. So if any $\Gamma(R_i)$ are non-perfect, $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ will also be non-perfect. \square

Note 4.7. The converse of Theorem 3.4 is not true. In the graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$, every $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ is perfect, but we find the hole $(1, 1, 0, 0, 0) - (0, 0, 1, 1, 0) - (1, 0, 0, 0, 1) - (0, 1, 1, 0, 0) - (0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$.

Theorem 4.8. $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_x)$ where each R_i is a commutative ring with 1 is not regular if any $\Gamma(R_i)$ is not empty.

Proof. Take $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_x)$. Let some $\Gamma(R_i)$ be non-empty. Consider the vertex $g = (0, \cdots, 0, 1, 0, \cdots, 0)$ that has a 1 at the i^{th} index and 0 filled in all other indices. All neighbors of g must be of the form $(a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_{i-1}, 0, a_{i+1}, \cdots, a_{x-1}, a_x)$, with a zero at the i^{th} index and any value in the other indices, not all zero. Let there are f many such vertices. Since $\Gamma(R_i)$ is non-empty, $\exists k \in \Gamma(R_i)$. Since k is a zero divisor, there must be some $k' \in \Gamma(R_i)$, not necessarily distinct, such that $k \cdot k' = 0$. Consider the vertex $h = (0, \cdots, 0, k, 0, \cdots, 0)$ with k in the i^{th} index and the rest filled in with 0. This vertex shares an edge with all vertices that share an edge with g . So h shares an edge with at least f vertices. But it also shares an edge with $(1, \cdots, 1, k', 1, \cdots, 1)$ which means h shares an edge with at least $f + 1$ vertices. This means g and h have a different number of neighbors, so $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_x)$ is not regular. \square

Theorem 4.9. For arbitrary rings R and S , $cl(\Gamma(R \times S)) \geq cl(\Gamma(R)) + cl(\Gamma(S)) + |R'| |S'|$ where R' and S' are any set of self-annihilating vertices in a maximal clique of $\Gamma(R)$ and $\Gamma(S)$.

Proof. Let C be a maximal clique in $\Gamma(R)$ and D be a maximal clique in $\Gamma(S)$. Construct an induced sub graph $X = \{(c, 0) \text{ or } (0, d) | c \in C, d \in D\}$. Take two arbitrary, distinct vertices in X , call them u and v .

Case 1: $u = (c_1, 0), v = (c_2, 0)$

Since c_1 shares an edge with c_2 , u and v share an edge.

Case 2: $u = (0, d_1), v = (0, d_2)$

since d_1 shares an edge with d_2 , u and v share an edge.

Case 3: u and v are not of the same form.

Then, without loss of generality, let $u = (c, 0)$ and $v = (0, d)$. u shares an edge with v .

So X is a clique in $\Gamma(R \times S)$ with size $cl(\Gamma(R)) + cl(\Gamma(S))$.

Now consider R' , the set of all self-annihilating vertices in C . Each vertex in R' shares an edge with each other vertex in R' because it is an induced sub-graph of a clique. It also shares an edge with every vertex in C . Likewise, every vertex in S' , the set of all self-annihilating vertices in D , shares an edge with every other vertex in S' and every vertex in D . Define the induced sub-graph $Y = \{(r, s) | r \in R', s \in S'\}$. Every vertex $(r, s) \in Y$ shares an edge with every other vertex in Y and every vertex in X , so $X \cup Y$ forms a clique size $cl(\Gamma(R)) + cl(\Gamma(S)) + |R'| |S'|$.

□

Corollary 4.10. *Consider n many arbitrary rings R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n . Then, $cl(\Gamma(R_1 \times R_2 \times \dots \times R_n)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n cl(\Gamma(R_i)) + \sum_{i \neq j, i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} |R'_i| |R'_j| + \sum_{i \neq j \neq k; i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} |R'_i| |R'_j| |R'_k| + \dots + |R'_1| |R'_2| \dots |R'_n|$, where each R'_i is any set of self-annihilating vertices in a maximal clique in $\Gamma(R_i)$.*

Proof. Extending a similar type of construction in the proof of the above theorem, we can consider C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n , a collection of maximal cliques in $\Gamma(R_1), \Gamma(R_2), \dots, \Gamma(R_n)$ respectively. Construct an induced sub graph $X_i = \{(0, 0, \dots, c_i, \dots, 0) | c_i \in C_i\}$, $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$, where we place the c_i in the i -th coordinate. Then X forms a click of cardinality $\sum_{i=1}^n cl(\Gamma(R_i))$. Then consider, $X_{ij} = \{(0, 0, \dots, c_i, \dots, c_j, \dots, 0) | c_i \in R'_i, c_j \in R'_j\}$, where R'_i, R'_j are any set of self annihilating vertices in maximal clique in $\Gamma(R_i)$ and $\Gamma(R_j)$, where we place the c_i and c_j in the i -th and j -th entries respectively. Set $Y = \bigcup_{i \neq j; i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} X_{ij}$. Then Y forms a click of cardinality $\sum_{i \neq j; i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} |R'_i| |R'_j|$, that is disjoint from X . In a similar fashion we can construct X_{ijk} for each distinct triplets $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and call their union Z and Z gives a click of cardinality $\sum_{i \neq j \neq k; i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}} |R'_i| |R'_j| |R'_k|$. Proceeding in this way the result follows. □

Lemma 4.11. *Consider $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ for arbitrary n . There is a maximal clique M that contains all self-annihilating vertices.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 3.15 and Lemma 3.13. \square

Theorem 4.12. *The clique number of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_m)$ has a lower bound of $cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)) + cl(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_m)) + (\frac{n}{n^*} - 1)(\frac{m}{m^*} - 1)$.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 4.9 and the proof of Theorem 3.15 and Lemma 3.13. \square

Theorem 4.13. *$\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ where $k \geq 2$ and R_i is a commutative ring with 1 has a simplicial vertex iff some $\Gamma(R_i)$ has a simplicial vertex or some $|R_i| = 2$.*

Proof. Take arbitrary $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$. Let some $\Gamma(R_i)$ have a simplicial vertex c . Then consider the vertex $(1, \cdots, 1, c, 1, \cdots, 1)$ where c is in the i th slot. Each neighbor of $(1, \cdots, 1, c, 1, \cdots, 1)$ must have 0 in every slot except the i th slot, and the value of the i th slot must be a neighbor of c in $\Gamma(R_i)$. Since each neighbor of c shares an edge and each other slot is 0, all such neighbors of $(1, \cdots, 1, c, 1, \cdots, 1)$ form a clique. So $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ has a simplicial vertex.

Let some $|R_i| = 2$. Then $(1, \cdots, 1, 0, 1, \cdots, 1)$ only shares an edge with $(0, \cdots, 0, 1, 0, \cdots, 0)$ making $(1, \cdots, 1, 0, 1, \cdots, 1)$ simplicial.

Let $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ have a simplicial vertex v . Also, assume all $|R_i| > 2$ and no $\Gamma(R_i)$ have any simplicial vertices. Consider arbitrary v in $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$. Let v have 0 at some index, $v = (\cdots, 0, \cdots)$. Then since no $|R_i| = 2$, there exists some vertex $a \in R_i$ that is not 0 or 1. v then shares an edge with $(0, \cdots, 0, 1, 0, \cdots, 0)$ and $(0, \cdots, 0, a, 0, \cdots, 0)$ which do not share an edge. So for v to be simplicial, it cannot contain any 0. Let v have a at some index, where a is a zero divisor in its respective $\Gamma(R_i)$. $v = (\cdots, a, \cdots)$. Then v shares an edge with every $(0, \cdots, 0, a', 0, \cdots, 0)$ where $a \cdot a' = 0$ in $\Gamma(R_i)$. a is not simplicial since no $\Gamma(R_i)$ have any simplicial vertex, so some neighbor $(0, \cdots, 0, a', 0, \cdots, 0)$ will not share an edge with another neighbor of the same form. So v is not simplicial if it has any zero-divisors in its slots. For v to be simplicial, every slot must be a non-zero, non-zero-divisor. However, elements of that form are not vertices. So $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ has no simplicial vertices, which is a contradiction. The assumption that all $|R_i| > 2$ and no $\Gamma(R_i)$ have any simplicial vertices is false. So some $|R_i| > 2$ or some $\Gamma(R_i)$ has a simplicial vertex. \square

Theorem 4.14. *$\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ where R_i is a commutative ring with 1 is non-chordal if any $\Gamma(R_i)$ is non-chordal.*

Proof. Consider arbitrary $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$. Then let some $\Gamma(R_i)$ be non-chordal. So there exists a cycle $a_1 - a_2 - \cdots - a_k - a_1$ greater than 3 with no chords. Then in $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$, there is a cycle $(0, \dots, a_1, \dots, 0) - (0, \dots, a_2, \dots, 0) - \cdots - (0, \dots, a_k, \dots, 0) - (0, \dots, a_1, \dots, 0)$, which makes it non-chordal. \square

Lemma 4.15. $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ where R_i is a commutative ring with 1 and $k \geq 2$ is non-chordal if more than one $|R_i| \geq 3$.

Proof. In $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$, let two or more $|R_i| \geq 3$. Without loss of generality, let the first two slots be the R_i with a magnitude greater than or equal to 3. Then $(1, 0, \dots, 0) - (0, 1, \dots, 0) - (a, 0, \dots, 0) - (0, b, \dots, 0)$ where a is a non-trivial element of R_1 and b is a non-trivial element of R_2 , is a cycle with no chord. So $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ is non-chordal. \square

Lemma 4.16. $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ where R_i is a commutative ring with 1 is non-chordal if $k \geq 4$.

Proof. Let $k > 4$. Then $(1, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) - (0, 0, 1, 1, \dots, 0) - (1, 0, 0, 0, \dots, 0) - (0, 0, 0, 1, \dots, 0)$ is a chord-less cycle. So $\Gamma(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_k)$ is non-chordal. \square

Lemma 4.17. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_3})$ where at least one $n_i > 2$ is non-chordal.

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $n_3 > 2$. Then, $(1, 0, 0) - (0, 0, 2) - (1, 1, 0) - (0, 0, 1)$ is a chord-less cycle. \square

Theorem 4.18. The only chordal $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ where $n_i \geq 2$ and $k \geq 2$ are $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_p)$, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^2})$ and $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$.


Proof. Consider $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_p)$. Since $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ has no vertices, the only vertices of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_p)$ are $(1, 0)$ or of the form $(0, x)$ where $0 < x < p$. So the graph is a star making it chordal.

Consider $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^2})$. Assume that $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^2})$ is non-chordal. Then there exists a cycle C length greater than 3 that has no chord. Let v be an arbitrary vertex in C .

Let v have a multiple of p as its second element, $v = (a, bp)$. Then every vertex that is not a neighbor of v in C must have a non-zero non-multiple of p as its second element. Therefore, both neighbors of v must have 0 as their second element so that they share an edge with their other neighbor. So both neighbors of v are $(1, 0)$. We cannot repeat vertices so v cannot have a multiple of p as its second element. That means the only possible vertices in C are $(1, 0)$ and $(0, b)$ where

b is a non-zero non-multiple of p . A cycle of size 4 or greater cannot be constructed out of these vertices since we cannot write $(1, 0)$ twice and $(0, b)$ does not share an edge with itself. C cannot be constructed, so $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^2})$ is chordal.

Consider $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$. The graph of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is shown below and is chordal.



To prove the converse, let's assume the opposite. Let there be a chordal $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ not listed. By Lemma 4.15, only one n_i can be greater than 2. By Lemma 4.16, $k \leq 3$. By Theorem 4.14, if any n_i are non-chordal, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ will be non-chordal. So every n_i must be p^x , $2p$, or $2p^2$ which was shown by Theorem 4.17.

So the only possible $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$ are $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p})$, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p^2})$, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p})$ and $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p^2})$.

In $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$ where $x \geq 3$ and p is prime, $(1, p^{x-1}) - (0, (p-1)p) - (1, 0) - (0, p)$ is a chord-less cycle.

In $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p})$ where $p \geq 3$ is a prime, $(1, 0) - (0, 4) - (1, p) - (0, 2)$ is a chord-less cycle.

In $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p^2})$ where $p \geq 3$ is a prime, $(1, 2p) - (0, p) - (1, 4p) - (0, p^2)$ is a chord-less cycle.

By Lemma 3.15, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^x})$, $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p})$ and $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{2p^2})$ are all non-chordal where $p \geq 3$.

So there are no other chordal $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. □

Lemma 4.19. $D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k}))$ has an upper bound of $2[D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1})) + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_2})) + \cdots + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_k}))]$.

Proof. Let d_i be the domination number of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$. Then each $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$ has a dominating set D_i size d_i . Then consider the sets

$A_i = \{(0, \dots, 0, v, 0, \dots, 0) \mid v \in D_i\}$ where the i -th slot is filled with arbitrary vertex in D_i and the rest are 0. Also consider B_i , the set of neighbors of each vertex in A_i , with only one neighbor for each vertex. Now consider $\cup_{i=1}^k (A_i \cup B_i)$ and arbitrary vertex $v \in \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$.

Case 1: v has an element e in some i th slot that is a vertex of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$.

If $e \in D_i$, then v shares an edge with the corresponding vertex in B_i , and if $e \notin D_i$, then v shares an edge with some vertex in D_i .

Case 2: v has 0 in some i th slot.

Then v shares an edge with some vertex in A_i .

So if neither of these cases is true, none of the elements of v can be zero or a vertex in its corresponding $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$, so the only neighbor of v is $(0, \dots, 0)$ which means v is not a vertex. Then $\cup_{i=1}^k (A_i \cup B_i)$ is a dominating set. A_i and B_i both have size $D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i}))$ since it only has one vertex for each vertex in its corresponding D_i . So the size of $\cup_{i=1}^k (A_i \cup B_i)$ is $2(D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1})) + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_2})) + \dots + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_k})))$ which is an upper bound of the domination number.

□

Lemma 4.20. $D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k}))$ has a lower bound of $D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1})) + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_2})) + \dots + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_k}))$.

Proof. Let D be an arbitrary dominating set of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})$. Consider the vertex $v = (1, \dots, 1, a, 1, \dots, 1)$ where a in the i th slot is a vertex of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$. The only possible neighbors of v are of the form $(0, \dots, 0, b, 0, \dots, 0)$ where b is a neighbor of a in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$. Construct a subset A_i that is all vertices in D of the form $(0, \dots, 0, b, 0, \dots, 0)$ or $(1, \dots, 1, b, 1, \dots, 1)$ where b is a vertex in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$.

We claim that arbitrary A_i has a size of at least d_i , where d_i is the domination number of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$.

Assume otherwise. Then there are less than d_i vertices of the form $(0, \dots, 0, b, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $(1, \dots, 1, b, 1, \dots, 1)$. Take some a in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$. Since some vertex in D shares an edge with every vertex not in D , arbitrary $v = (1, \dots, 1, a, 1, \dots, 1)$ either shares an edge with some $(0, \dots, 0, b, 0, \dots, 0)$ or is itself in D and therefore in A_i . If v is not

in D , then v shares an edge with some $(0, \dots, 0, b, 0, \dots, 0)$ which means a shares an edge with some b in $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$. If v is in D , then $(1, \dots, 1, a, 1, \dots, 1)$ is in A_i . Construct a set H that contains all a in the i th slot of all such v . H forms a dominating set of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$ size less than d_i which is a contradiction since $D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})) = d_i$. So A_i has a size of at least d_i .

Next, each A_i is disjoint from each other since b in the i th slot can never be 0 or 1, which means there will be no duplicate vertices. So the sum of the sizes of each $A_i \subseteq D$ will be greater than or equal to the sum of the domination number of each $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_i})$. This is a lower bound of the domination number. \square

Combining Lemma 4.19 and 4.20 we get the following.

Theorem 4.21. $D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1})) + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_2})) + \dots + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_k})) \leq D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_k})) \leq 2[D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_1})) + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_2})) + \dots + D(\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{n_k}))]$.

The next theorem talks about the coefficients of a Domination Polynomial.

Theorem 4.22. *In arbitrary $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}})$, $k \geq 3$, and each p_i is a distinct prime number, the coefficient c of the smallest degree of the domination polynomial is $(p_1 - 1)(p_2 - 1) \dots (p_k - 1)$.*

Proof. Consider $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}})$, $k \geq 3$. Let $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}$. Construct set D that has exactly one element from each type class T_{n/p_i} . Since every vertex of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}})$ must be a multiple of some p_i , every vertex shares an edge with some vertex in some T_{n/p_i} and therefore, D . So D is a dominating set.

We claim that for arbitrary minimal dominating set D , exactly one vertex must be present from each type class T_{n/p_i} .

Assume the opposite. Then there exists a dominating set D that either doesn't have a vertex from some type class T_{n/p_x} or has an extra vertex not in any type class T_{n/p_x} . Let D not have any vertices from T_{n/p_x} . Since the only neighbors of vertices in T_{p_x} are in T_{n/p_x} , every vertex in T_{p_x} must be in D . $p_x \neq n/2$ because otherwise $2p_x = n$, $2p_x = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ and $2 = \frac{p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}}{p_x}$ which is not possible. So by Lemma 1.10, T_{p_x} has more than one element. If D contains at least one vertex from all T_{n/p_x} except T_{p_x} , then the size of D is larger than A above. So D is not a minimal dominating set. If D lacks any vertices from other T_{n/p_i} , then for each vertex missing, two or more must be added from T_{p_x} . In which case D would also not be minimal. So D

must contain at least one vertex from each T_{n/p_i} . There also cannot be any additional vertices, either from type classes not of the form T_{n/p_x} , nor multiple from the same type class. Otherwise D would not be minimal.

Since there are $p_i - 1$ vertices in T_{n/p_i} , the total amount of possible minimal dominating sets D is $(p_1 - 1)(p_2 - 1) \cdots (p_k - 1)$. \square

Theorem 4.23. $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_k})$ is k -partite where every p_i is prime.

Proof. Consider some graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_k})$. Construct a collection of subsets S_i which is the set of all vertices with a non-zero term in the i th slot and zero in any slot less than i .

$$S_1 = \{(a, \cdots) | a \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_1}, a \neq 0\}$$

$$S_2 = \{(0, a, \cdots) | a \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_2}, a \neq 0\}$$

...

$$S_k = \{(0, 0, \cdots, 0, a) | a \in \mathbb{Z}_{p_k}, a \neq 0\}$$

We claim that no two vertices u, v from the same subset S_x share an edge.

Consider arbitrary vertices u and v in some S_x . By the definition, the x th slot of u and v has a non-zero term from \mathbb{Z}_{p_x} . Since \mathbb{Z}_{p_x} has no non-zero, zero divisors, the terms in the x th slot will not multiply to get 0, so u and v do not share an edge.

No we claim that all the S_i form a partition of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_k})$. Assume there is a vertex v not in any S_i . Let v have a non-zero element a in the x th slot. The by definition it is in S_x , or in some S_i , $i < x$ if some i th slot also has a non-zero element. So v cannot have any non-zero elements and thus, $v = 0$ which is not a vertex. $\cup S_i$ is the vertex set of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_k})$.

Assume there is a v in multiple S_i , say S_x and S_y . Without loss of generality, let $x < y$. Then the x th slot of v has a non-zero term a because it is in S_x . But the x th slot must be zero because v is in S_y . That is a contradiction, so there are no overlaps in the partition.

S_i is a k -partite partition, so $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_k})$ is k -partite. \square

5. ZERO DIVISOR GRAPH OF THE POSET D_n

Zero divisor graph of a poset has been studied in [8], [9], [10]. We always have Clique number of the zero divisor graph of a ring does not exceed the Chromatic number of that. Beck conjectured that that for an arbitrary ring R , they are same. But Anderson and Naseer [6] have

shown that this is not the case in general, namely they presented an example of a commutative local ring R with 32 elements for which Chromatic number is strictly bigger than the clique number. In [6] Nimbhorkar, Wasadikar and DeMeyer have shown that Beck's conjecture holds for meet-semilattices with 0, i.e., commutative semigroups with 0 in which each element is idempotent. Infact, it is valid for a much wider class of relational structures, namely for partially ordered sets (posets, briefly) with 0. Now, to any poset (P, \leq) , with a least element 0 we can assign the graph G as follows: its vertices are the nonzero zero divisors of P , where a nonzero $x \in P$ is called a zero divisor if there exists a non zero $y \in P$, so that $L(x, y) = 0$, $L(x, y) = \{z \in P | z \leq x, y\}$. And x, y are connected by an edge if $L(x, y) = 0$. We discuss here some properties of the zero divisor graph of a specific poset D_n . Very often we used the prime factorization of the positive integer n . By abuse of notation, let us call D_n as the zero divisor graph of the poset D_n . Note that, the vertex set of D_n is the set of all factors of n that are not divisible by some prime factor of n . Also, note that, two vertices in D_n are connected by an edge if and only if they are mutually co-prime.

Remark 5.1 (Properties of D_n).

- i. *If $n = p^m$ for some prime p and positive integer m , then D_n is trivial.*

So from now on consider D_n where $n \neq p^m$ where p and m are as mentioned.

- ii. *The diameter of D_n is 3 iff n has three distinct prime factors namely p, q, r . This is shown by the path $pq - r - p - qr$. Otherwise, the diameter is 1 or 2, as $D_{p^m q^n}$ is complete bipartite which has diameter 2 or in the case of $m = n = 1$ has diameter 1. [7] shows zero divisors of a poset have diameter of 1, 2, or 3.*
- iii. *D_n is complete only when $n = pq$, where p and q are two distinct primes. D_n is complete bipartite iff $n = p^m q^s$ where m and s are two positive integers.*
- iv. *We have the clique number of D_n and a few coefficients of the clique polynomial. The clique number of D_n is the number of distinct prime factors of n . If $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} p_3^{\alpha_3} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$ where p_i 's are distinct primes $\forall i$, any set of vertices $\{p_1^{\beta_1}, p_2^{\beta_2}, p_3^{\beta_3} \cdots p_r^{\beta_r}\}$,*

where $1 \leq \beta_i \leq \alpha_i \forall i$ forms a maximal clique. This is a clique because no two vertices in a clique can have a common prime factor. Also, if any vertex of a clique has more than one prime factor, the clique will not be maximal. Hence the clique number is r , the number of distinct primes of n . And the leading coefficient in the clique polynomial is $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_r$. The coefficient of x^{r-1} is $\sum_{i=1}^r (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{i-1} \alpha_{i+1} \cdots \alpha_r) + \binom{r}{2} \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_r$. Reason: Consider a clique of size $r-1$. If all the vertices has single prime factors then, there are $\sum_{i=1}^r (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{i-1} \alpha_{i+1} \cdots \alpha_r)$ many of this type, as a typical clique of this type is a set of the form $\{p_1^{\beta_1}, p_2^{\beta_2}, \dots, p_{i-1}^{\beta_{i-1}}, p_{i+1}^{\beta_{i+1}}, \dots, p_r^{\beta_r}\}$, where $1 \leq \beta_j \leq \alpha_j \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. Otherwise, exactly one vertex will contain two primes. And in that case we will obtain $\binom{r}{2} \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_r$ many such clique sets with cardinality $r-1$. No element in a clique set can have three distinct primes in it's prime factorization. Hence the result follows.

- v. The domination number of D_n is the number of distinct prime factors of n , same as the clique number, as any dominating set must not omit a prime factor of n . If some p_i is missing from a set of vertices V , then the vertex $p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{i-1} p_{i+1} \cdots p_r$ is not adjacent to any vertex in V . Furthermore, if we let V be the set of all distinct primes of n , each vertex in D_n must share an edge with at least one vertex in V because each vertex in D_n must omit at least one prime of n from its prime factorization.
- vi. D_n is regular iff $n = (pq)^m$ for some positive integer m . If $n = p^m q^r, m \neq r$, then $D_n = K_{m,n}$ which is not regular. Then, if n has more than two distinct primes in it's prime factorization, p and pq are vertices with a different degrees. Every vertex that shares an edge with pq shares an edge with p , but p shares an edge with q while pq does not, making the graph non-regular.
- vii. In [9], it is discussed that the girth of the zero divisor graph of any poset is 3, 4, or ∞ . The girth of D_n is ∞ iff $n = p^m q$, where p and q are two distinct primes and m is a positive integers bigger than 1. The girth of D_n is 4, if and only if $n = p^m q^r$, where p and q are two distinct primes and m and r are both positive integers bigger than 1. Otherwise, the girth of D_n is 3, because if n has at least 3 different prime factors p, q and r ,

then $p - q - r - p$ is a triangle in D_n .

- viii. D_n is not perfect if n is the product of least five different primes p, q, r, s, t in its prime factorization, then $ps - qt - pr - qs - tr - ps$ is a cycle of length five in D_n . Hence by Strong perfect graph theorem D_n is not perfect.

Suppose n has 4 distinct prime factors p, q, r and s . Assume there is an odd cycle of length 5 or greater that contains a vertex v that is the product of two such primes. Let $v = p^x q^y$. Then the two neighbors of v cannot be a multiple of p or q . Suppose the neighbors both consists of r^a for some positive integer a . Then, we get part of the cycle as $r^a - p^x q^y - r^b$ for another positive integer b . Then, r^a will necessarily share an edge with the other neighbors of r^b making the cycle length 4. So the neighbors of v must have both r and s . Additionally, these part of the cycle must be of the form $r^a - p^x q^y - r^w s^z$, otherwise we get a cycle of length 4 again. But any vertex that shares an edge with $r^w s^z$ must also share an edge with r^a making such a cycle impossible. This means any odd cycle length greater than 5 cannot contain a vertex with two or more prime factors, making an odd cycle length greater than 4 impossible. The other two situations when v consists of only one prime, or three primes also gives contradiction. Thus D is perfect iff n has 4 or fewer prime factors (the $n < 4$ case follows).

- ix. D_n is chordal iff $n = p^m q$ or $n = pqr$ where p, q and r are distinct primes and $m \geq 1$. For if n is not of that form, $p - q - p^2 - q^2 - p$ or $p - q - p^2 - qr - p$ or $p - r - pq - rs - p$ will give holes of length greater than 3 in respective D_n 's.
- x. Let, n be a square free positive integer. Then, its simplicial vertices are precisely those factors of n which misses exactly one prime in its prime factorization. Now, suppose n is not square free. Then, if all primes in its prime factorization are not square free, it has no simplicial vertex. Otherwise, the simplicial vertices are precisely those which misses exactly one square free prime factor. For example, if $n = p^2 q^2 r$, $pq, p^2 q, pq^2$ and $p^2 q^2$ are the only simplicial vertices because r is the only square free prime factor.

- xi. *The only planar D_n has n of the form $n = p^m q$, $p^m q^2$, pqr or $p^2 qr$. First, let n have only 2 prime factors. We will first examine this case. If $n = p^m q^l$ where $l \geq 3$ and $m \geq 3$, then $K_{3,3}$ is a subgraph of D_n and therefore a minor of D_n . Then by Wagner's theorem, D_n is non planar. But in the case of $p^m q$, D_n is a star, so it is planar. And in the case of $p^m q^2$, the graph can be drawn without any crossing edges. Next, let's examine n with 3 prime factors. If $n = pqr$ or $n = p^2 qr$ the graph is clearly planar if drawn. But, if $n = p^m qr$ where $m \geq 3$, The subgraph consisting of p , p^2 , p^3 , q , r and qr form $K_{3,3}$ if we delete the edge between q and r . Then by Wagner's theorem the graph is non-planar since $K_{3,3}$ is a minor. Next, if $n = p^m q^l r$, where $m \geq 2$ and $l \geq 2$ the set of vertices q , q^2 , p , p^2 , r , pr and qr is a subdivision of K_5 . Then, by Kuratowski's theorem, the graph is non-planar. So the only planar D_n with only 3 primes in n are pqr and $p^2 qr$. Lastly, consider the case where n has 4 primes in its prime factorization, $n = pqrs$. Then, the vertex set of p , q , r , s , pq and rs can be made isomorphic to K_5 by contracting the edge between pq and rs to make a single vertex. Therefore, K_5 is a minor of D_n for this case, and by Wagner's theorem the graph is non-planar.*
- xii. *D_n is Eulerian iff the power of each prime in the prime factorization of n is even. For, if n has a prime p^α that appears in its prime factorization where α is odd, then the vertex $\frac{n}{p^\alpha}$ has odd degree, otherwise every vertex has even degree.*
- xiii. *If n is square free, then we have the edge cardinality of D_n as $\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} 2^{r-i-1} \binom{r}{i} - 2^{r-1} - 1$, where r is the number of distinct primes of n . For, if we consider $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r$, where p_i 's are distinct primes, then the degree of each vertex p_i is $\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \binom{r-1}{i} = 2^{r-1} - 1$ giving $r(2^{r-1} - 1)$ to the degree sum of the vertices. Similarly each vertex $p_i p_j$ is adjacent to $\sum_{i=1}^{r-2} \binom{r-2}{i} = 2^{r-2} - 1$ many vertices, giving $\binom{r}{2}(2^{r-1} - 2)$ in the degree sum. Proceeding in this way, we obtain the sum of the vertex degrees are $\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \binom{r}{i}(2^{r-i} - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \binom{r}{i} 2^{r-i} - 2^r - 2$. Then, as the sum of vertex degrees is twice the edge cardinalities the result follows.*
- xiv. *We have a lower bound for Independence number of D_n . Let, $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$, where p_i 's are distinct primes. Then if I is the independence number of D_n ,*

$I \geq \text{Max}_{1 \leq i \leq r} [\alpha_i \{1 + \sum \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{i_2} \cdots \alpha_{i_l} | \alpha_i \neq \alpha_{i_j} \neq \alpha_{i_k}, j, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}\}], \{\alpha_{i_1}, \alpha_{i_2} \cdots \alpha_{i_l}\}$ varies over all non empty proper subset of $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1} \cdots \alpha_r\}$

Proof. Consider any independent set containing p_i from the list of primes in the prime factorization of n . Then, the largest possible independent set containing p_i , will have p_i as a factor in all it's vertices. So, that must contain $p_i, p_i^2, \dots, p_i^{\alpha_i}$ giving α_i many vertices in the independent set. In order to maximize the cardinality of the set, we need to consider all possible factors of n that has a factor p_i and that misses atleast one prime in the prime factorization of n . Thus we get

$p_i p_1, p_i p_1^2, \dots, p_i p_1^{\alpha_1}, p_i p_2, p_i p_2^2, \dots, p_i p_2^{\alpha_2}, \dots, p_i p_r, p_i p_r^2, \dots, p_i p_r^{\alpha_r}$ are inside the independent set giving $\alpha_i(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_{i-1} + \alpha_{i+1} + \dots + \alpha_r) = \alpha_i \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^r \alpha_j$ many vertices. Similarly, we get more $\alpha_i \sum_{j=1, i \neq j \neq k}^r \alpha_j \alpha_k$ many vertices from the factors of n that contains p_i and that are product of three primes. Proceeding in this way get the necessary result. \square

- xv. *Let, n be square free. Then, a lower bound of the Independence number of D_n is $2^{r-1} - r$, where r is the number of prime factors of n . If, $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r$, where p_i 's are distinct primes, then whenever I is the independence number of D_n , $I \geq 2^{r-1} - r$.*

Proof. Consider any independent set in D_n . If we pick up any element from that set, that is divisible by some p_i , then, all possible proper divisors of n , that has p_i as a factor forms an Independent set of D_n and cardinality of that set is $2^{r-1} - r$. Hence the result follows. \square

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge Dr. Lisa DeMeyer for introducing this topic to us by an excellent presentation, which motivated us to work in this area.

REFERENCES

1. I. Beck, *Coloring of commutative rings*, J. Algebra, 116 no. 1 (1988), 208-226.
2. E. E. AbdAlJawad, H. Al-Ezeh, *Domination and Independence Numbers of $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$* , International Mathematical Forum, 3, 2008, no. 11, 503 - 511.
3. Smith, Bennett, *"Perfect Zero-Divisor Graphs of \mathbb{Z}_n "*, Rose-Hulman Undergraduate Mathematics Journal: Vol. 17 : Iss. 2 , Article 6, 2016.
4. D. F. Anderson, P. S. Livingston, *The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring*, J. Algebra, 217 no. 2 (1999), 434-447.

5. Livingston, Philip S., *Structure in Zero-Divisor Graphs of Commutative Rings*, Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1997. <https://trace.tennessee.edu/utkgradthes/1803>.
6. D. D. Anderson, M. Naseer, *Beck's coloring of a commutative ring*, Journal of Algebra, Vol. 159, 500 - 514, 1993.
7. S. K. Nimbhorkar, M. P. Wasadikar, L. Demeyer, *Coloring of Meet-Semilattices*, Ars Combinatoria, Vol. 84, 97 - 104, 2007.
8. Z Xue, S. Liu, *Zero divisors of partially ordered sets*, Applied Mathematics Letters, Volume 23, Issue 4, April 2010, Pages 449-452.
9. M. Ali, A. K. Das, H. R. Maimani, M. R. Pournaki, S. Yassemi *On the diameter and girth of zero divisor graphs of posets*, Discrete Applied Mathematics, Volume 160, Issue 9, June 2012, Pages 1319-1324.
10. R. Halaš, M. Jukl, *On Beck's coloring of posets*, Discrete Mathematics, Volume 309, Issue 13, 6 July 2009, Pages 4584-4589.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO,
MAIN CAMPUS, TOLEDO, OH 43606-3390
E-mail address: Amrita.Acharyya@utoledo.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO,
MAIN CAMPUS, TOLEDO, OH 43606-3390
E-mail address: Robinson.Czajkowski@rockets.utoledo.edu