

SECOND IDEAL INTERSECTION GRAPH OF A COMMUTATIVE RING

F. FARSHADIFAR

ABSTRACT. Let R be a commutative ring with identity. In this paper, we introduce and investigate the second ideal intersection graph $SII(R)$ of R with vertices are non-zero proper ideals of R and two distinct vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I \cap J$ is a second ideal of R .

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, R will denote a commutative ring with identity and \mathbb{Z} will denote the ring of integers. Also, " \subset " will denote the strict inclusion.

An ideal I of R is said to be a *second ideal* if $I \neq 0$ and for every element r of R we have either $rI = 0$ or $rI = I$ [8].

A *graph* G is defined as the pair $(V(G), E(G))$, where $V(G)$ is the set of vertices of G and $E(G)$ is the set of edges of G . For two distinct vertices a and b of $V(G)$, the notation $a - b$ means that a and b are adjacent. A graph G is said to be *complete* if $a - b$ for all distinct $a, b \in V(G)$, and G is said to be *empty* if $E(G) = \emptyset$. Note by this definition that a graph may be empty even if $V(G) \neq \emptyset$. An empty graph could also be described as totally disconnected. If $|V(G)| \geq 2$, a *path* from a to b is a series of adjacent vertices $a - v_1 - v_2 - \dots - v_n - b$. The *length of a path* is the number of edges it contains. A *cycle* is a path that begins and ends at the same vertex in which no edge is repeated, and all vertices other than the starting and ending vertex are distinct. If a graph G has a cycle, the *girth* of G (notated $g(G)$) is defined as the length of the shortest cycle of G ; otherwise, $g(G) = \infty$. A graph G is *connected* if for every pair of distinct vertices $a, b \in V(G)$, there exists a path from a to b . If there is a path from a to b with $a, b \in V(G)$, then the *distance from a to b* is the length of the shortest path from a to b and is denoted by $d(a, b)$. If there is not a path between a and b , $d(a, b) = \infty$. The *diameter* of G is $\text{diam}(G) = \text{Sup}\{d(a, b) | a, b \in V(G)\}$. A graph without any cycles is an *acyclic graph*. A vertex that is adjacent to every other vertices is said to be a *universal vertex* whereas a vertex with degree zero is called an *isolated vertex*.

In [7], the authors introduced and investigate the definition of the *prime ideal sum graph* of R , denoted by $PIS(R)$, which is a graph whose vertices are non-zero proper ideals of R and two distinct vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I + J$ is a prime ideal of R . In this paper, we introduce and study the second ideal intersection graph $SII(R)$ of R with vertices are non-zero proper ideals of R and two distinct vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I \cap J$ is a second ideal of R . This can be regarded as a dual notion of the prime ideal sum graph introduced

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C25; 05C69; 13A15, 13A99.

Key words and phrases. Graph, prime ideal, second ideal, intersection, minimal ideal.


in [7]. Some of the results in this article are dual of the results for the prime ideal sum graph introduced in [7].

2. MAIN RESULTS


Definition 2.1. The *second ideal intersection graph* of R , denoted by $SII(R)$, is an undirected simple graph whose vertices are non-zero proper ideals of R and two distinct vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I \cap J$ is a second ideal of R . This can be regarded as a dual notion of the prime ideal sum graph introduced in [7].

Let n be a positive integer. Consider the ring \mathbb{Z}_n of integers modulo n . We know that \mathbb{Z}_n is a principal ideal ring and each of these ideals is generated by $\bar{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, where m is a factor of n . In this paper, we denote this ideal by $\langle m \rangle$.

Example 2.2. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{p^3q}$, where p, q are primes. Then the non-zero proper ideals of R are $\langle p \rangle, \langle q \rangle, \langle p^2 \rangle, \langle pq \rangle, \langle p^3 \rangle$, and $\langle p^2q \rangle$. In the following figures, we can see the graphs $PIS(\mathbb{Z}_{p^3q})$ and $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{p^3q})$.



Example 2.3. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{p^2q^2}$, where p, q are primes. Then the non-zero proper ideals of R are $\langle p^2 \rangle, \langle qp^2 \rangle, \langle p \rangle, \langle pq \rangle, \langle q \rangle, \langle pq^2 \rangle$, and $\langle q^2 \rangle$. In the following figures, we can see the graphs $PIS(\mathbb{Z}_{p^2q^2})$ and $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{p^2q^2})$.




Example 2.4. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{p^k}$, where p, q are primes and k is a positive integer. Then $\langle p^{k-1} \rangle$ is the only second ideal of R . One can see that $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{p^k})$ is a star graph with center vertex $\langle p^{k-1} \rangle$.


Proposition 2.5. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_n$, where n is a positive integer. Then we have the following.

- (a) If $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_k$ ($k \geq 3$), where p_i 's are distinct prime numbers, then $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ contains a cycle of length 3.
- (b) If $n = p_1^3 p_2 \dots p_k$ ($k \geq 2$), where p_i 's are distinct prime numbers, then $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ contains a cycle of length 3.

Proof. (a) Clearly, $\langle p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k-1} \rangle$ is a second ideal of R . Set $I = \langle p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k-1} \rangle$, $J = \langle p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k-2} \rangle$, and $K = \langle p_{k-1} \rangle$. Then the graph $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ contains the following cycle.



(b) Clearly, $\langle p_1^2 p_2 \dots p_k \rangle$ is a second ideal of R . Set $I = \langle p_1^2 p_2 \dots p_k \rangle$, $J = \langle p_2 \dots p_k \rangle$, and $K = \langle p^2 \rangle$. Then the graph $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ contains the following cycle.



□

The *intersection graph* of R , denoted by $\Gamma(R)$, is a graph whose vertices are non-zero proper ideals of R and two distinct vertices I and J are adjacent if and only if $I \cap J \neq 0$ [6].

Remark 2.6. Since the second ideals of R are non-zero, $SII(R)$ is a subgraph of $\Gamma(R)$. This subgraph is not necessarily induced subgraph. For example, as we can see in the Figure B in the Example 2.2, $\langle q \rangle$ is not adjacent to $\langle pq \rangle$ in the graph $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{p^3 q})$. But $\langle q \rangle$ is adjacent to $\langle pq \rangle$ in the graph $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{p^3 q})$.

An *Eulerian graph* is a graph which has a path that visits each edge exactly once which starts and ends on the same vertex. A connected non-empty graph is Eulerian if and only if the valency of each vertex is even [4, Theorem 4.1].

Remark 2.7. In [6, Theorem 5.1], it is shown that $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is Eulerian if and only if $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_m$ or $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \dots p_m^{n_m}$, where each n_i is even ($n_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$) and p_i 's are distinct primes. But as we can see in Figure D, $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is not Eulerian when $n = p^2 q^2$. One can see that if $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_m$, where p_i 's are distinct primes, then $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is an Eulerian graph.

Theorem 2.8. *Let R be a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal (e.g., when R is an Artinian ring). Then $SII(R)$ has a universal vertex if and only if one of the two statements hold:*

- (a) R has exactly one minimal ideal.
- (b) R has exactly two minimal ideals M_1 and M_2 such that $M_1 + M_2$ is a non-trivial maximal ideal and that there is no non-second ideal that properly contained in $M_1 + M_2$.

Proof. Let (a) hold and M be the minimal ideal of R . Then for each ideal I of R , we have $I \cap M = M$, which is a second ideal and hence I is adjacent to M . Thus, M is a universal vertex.

Let (b) hold and set $I := M_1 + M_2$. Assume that J is a non-trivial ideal other than I and without loss of generality, let $M_1 \subseteq J$. Since by assumption, I is a maximal ideal, we have $M_1 \subseteq I \cap J \subset I$. Now, by assumption, $I \cap J$ is a second ideal of R and so I is a universal vertex.

Conversely, let $SII(R)$ have a universal vertex, say I . If R has a unique minimal ideal, the proof is done. Now, assume that R has at least three minimal ideals, say M_1, M_2 and M_3 . Note that I cannot be a minimal ideal as two distinct minimal ideals are not adjacent. Since I is not a minimal ideal, then it contains a minimal ideal, say M_1 . If possible, let $M_2 \not\subseteq I$. Then by minimality of M_2 , we have $I \cap M_2 = 0$. Thus I is not adjacent to M_2 , a contradiction. Hence, $M_1 + M_2 + M_3 \subseteq I$. Now, one of the following two cases holds.

Case 1. Let $I \neq M_1 + M_2 + M_3$. Since $I \cap (M_1 + M_2 + M_3) = M_1 + M_2 + M_3$ and I is a universal vertex in $SII(R)$, we get that $M_1 + M_2 + M_3$ is a second ideal of R . Thus $M_1 + M_2 + M_3 \subseteq (0 :_M \text{Ann}_R(M_1)\text{Ann}_R(M_2)\text{Ann}_R(M_3))$ implies that $M_1 = M_2 = M_3$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. Let $I = M_1 + M_2 + M_3$. Set $T = M_1 + M_2$. Since sum of two minimal ideals cannot be a second ideal, $I \cap T = T$ is not a second ideal, i.e. I is not adjacent to T , which contradicts with our assumption that I is a universal vertex. Therefore, R has exactly two minimal ideals, say M_1 and M_2 . By the same argument as above, we conclude that $I = M_1 + M_2$. Now, we show that I is a maximal ideal. If possible, let there exists a non-trivial ideal J of R such that $M_1 + M_2 = I \subset J$. Then, as I is a universal vertex, $J \cap I = I = M_1 + M_2$ is a second ideal of R , which is a contradiction. Thus, I is a maximal ideal. If possible, let J be a non-second ideal such that $M_i \subset J \subset I = M_1 + M_2$, where $i = 1$ or 2 . But, it follows that $I \cap J = J$, a non-second ideal and hence I is not adjacent to J , a contradiction. Thus, there does not exist such ideal J and the proof is completed. \square

Recall that R is said to be *coreduced ring* if $rR = r^2R$ for each $r \in R$ [2].

For an ideal I of R the *second radical* (or *second socle*) of I is defined as the sum of all second ideals of R contained in I and it is denoted by $sec(I)$. In case I does not contain any second ideal, the second radical of I is defined to be (0) (see [5] and [1]). If $sec(R) = R$, then R is coreduced [2, Proposition 2.22].

Remark 2.9. Let R be a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal and R is not a coreduced ring. Then $sec(R)$ is adjacent to each element of $Spec^s(R)$, where $Spec^s(R)$ is the set of all second ideals of R .

Proof. As R is a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal and R is not a coreduced ring, $sec(R)$ is a non-zero proper ideal of R . For each second ideal I of R , we have $I \cap sec(R) = I$ is a second ideal of R . Thus $sec(R)$ is adjacent to each element of $Spec^s(R)$. \square

Corollary 2.10. Let R be a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal and R is not a coreduced ring. Then $sec(R)$ is the only minimal ideal of R if and only if $sec(R)$ is a universal vertex of $SII(R)$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 2.8. \square

Theorem 2.11. *Let R be a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal. An ideal I of R is an isolated vertex in $SII(R)$ if and only if I is a minimal as well as maximal ideal of R .*

Proof. Let I be an isolated vertex in $SII(R)$. If I is not a minimal ideal, then it properly contains a minimal ideal, say M and $I \cap M = M$. Thus I is adjacent to M in $SII(R)$, a contradiction, and so I is a minimal ideal. If I is not a maximal ideal, then there exists an ideal J of R such that $I \subset J \subset R$ and $I \cap J = I$, which is a second ideal. Hence I is adjacent to J , a contradiction, and so I is a maximal ideal of R .

Conversely, let I be a minimal as well as maximal ideal of R . If possible, assume that I is not isolated in $SII(R)$. Then there exists a non-zero proper ideal J of R other than I such that $I \cap J$ is a second ideal. If $I \not\subseteq J$, then as I is minimal ideal of R , we have $I \cap J = 0$, which is not a second ideal. On the other hand if $I \subseteq J$, then by maximality of I , we have $J = R$ or $I = J$, a contradiction. Thus such an ideal J does not exist and hence I is an isolated vertex in $SII(R)$. \square

Theorem 2.12. *Let R be a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal. Then $SII(R)$ is complete if and only if R has exactly one minimal ideal and every non-zero non-second ideal is a maximal ideal.*

Proof. Let $SII(R)$ be a complete graph. Then by Theorem 2.8, $SII(R)$ has a universal vertex and hence either one of the two conditions holds. Since two distinct minimal ideals cannot be adjacent, R cannot have two minimal ideals. Hence part (a) of Theorem 2.8 holds. Let I be a non-zero proper ideal of R which is not second. If possible, there exists an ideal J of R such that $I \subset J \subset R$, then $I \cap J = I$. Since I is not a second ideal, I is not adjacent to J , a contradiction to the completeness of $SII(R)$. Thus every non-zero non-second ideal is a maximal ideal.

Conversely, let R has exactly one minimal ideal, say M , and every non-zero non-second ideal be a maximal ideal. Let I_1 and I_2 be two distinct non-zero proper ideals of R . Then $M \subseteq I_1$ and $M \subseteq I_2$. Suppose $M \subseteq I_1 \cap I_2 = I_3$ is not a second ideal of R . Then by given condition, I_3 is a maximal ideal. But $I_3 \subseteq I_1, I_2$ and I_1, I_2 are proper ideals of R . Therefore, $I_1 = I_2 = I_3$, which is a contradiction. Thus $I_1 \cap I_2$ is second and so I_1 is adjacent to I_2 . Hence, $SII(R)$ is complete. \square

Example 2.13. Let $k \geq 4$ be a positive integer. Consider the ring \mathbb{Z}_{p^k} , where p is prime. Since $p^2\mathbb{Z}_{p^k}$ is a non-second and non-maximal ideal of \mathbb{Z}_{p^k} , we have $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{p^k})$ is not a complete graph by Theorem 2.12.

Corollary 2.14. Let n be a positive integer. Then $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is a complete graph if and only if $n = p^k$, where p is prime and $k = 2$ or $k = 3$.

Proof. This follows from [6, Theorem 2.9] and Example 2.13. \square

Theorem 2.15. *Let n be a positive integer. Then the graph $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is disconnected if and only if $n = pq$, where p and q are distinct primes.*

Proof. Clearly, the graph $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{pq})$, where p and q are distinct primes is disconnected. Now, let $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_k$, where p_i 's are primes but may not be all distinct. First assume that $k \geq 3$. Set $m = p_2 \dots p_k$. One can see that $\langle m \rangle$ is a second ideal of R and $\langle m \rangle$ is adjacent to $\langle p_2 \rangle$. Therefore, for $k \geq 3$, the graph $SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is connected. If $k = 2$ and $p_1 = p_2$, then $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^2})$ contains only a single point and hence connected. Therefore n is of the form pq , where p and q are distinct primes. \square

Theorem 2.16. *Let R be a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal. Then $SII(R)$ is connected if and only if R is not a direct sum of two of its minimal ideals. If $SII(R)$ is connected, then $\text{diam}(SII(R)) \leq 2$.*

Proof. Let I_1, I_2 be two proper ideals of R . If $I_1 \cap I_2$ is a second ideal, then $I_1 - I_2$ in $SII(R)$. Otherwise, assume that $I_1 \cap I_2$ is not a second ideal. By assumption, both ideals I_1 and I_2 are contain a minimal ideals of R . If they are contain the same minimal ideal, say M , then we have $I_1 - M - I_2$, as minimal ideals are second and hence $d(I_1, I_2) = 2$. Thus, we assume that they are not contain the same minimal ideals, $M_1 \subset I_1, M_2 \subset I_2$ and $M_1 \neq M_2$ are two minimal ideals of R . First assume that $M_1 + M_2 \neq R$. By the minimality of M_2 , we have $M_2 \cap I_1 = 0$. Then $I_1 \cap (M_1 + M_2) = I_1 \cap M_1 + I_1 \cap M_2 = M_1$ and so $I_1 - M_1 + M_2$. Similarly, $M_1 + M_2 - I_2$. Thus we have a path of length 2 given by $I_1 - M_1 + M_2 - I_2$ and so $d(I_1, I_2) \leq 2$. Hence, $\text{diam}(SII(R)) \leq 2$. If $M_1 + M_2 = R$, then since M_1 and M_2 are minimal ideals, the sum is directed.

Conversely, if R is direct sum of two minimal ideals M_1 and M_2 , the only non-trivial ideals of R are $0 + M_2$ and $M_1 + 0$. In this case, $SII(R)$ consists of two isolated vertices and hence it is not connected. \square

Recall that R is said to be a *comultiplication ring* if for each ideal I of R , we have $I = \text{Ann}_R(\text{Ann}_R(I))$ [3].

Corollary 2.17. *Let R be a comultiplication ring in which R is not a direct sum of two of its minimal ideals. Then $\text{diam}(SII(R)) \leq 2$.*

Proof. Every ideal in a comultiplication ring contains a minimal ideal by [3, Theorem 7]. Now the result follows from Theorem 2.16. \square

In [7, Theorem 2.6], it is shown that the graph $PIS(R)$ is connected if and only if R is not a direct sum of two fields. If $PIS(R)$ is connected, then $\text{diam}(PIS(R)) \leq 4$. Moreover, if R is a principal ideal ring, then $\text{diam}(PIS(R)) \leq 2$. But as we see in the following theorem (the most of its proof is the proof of [7, Theorem 2.6]) it is not necessary for R to be a principal ideal ring.

Theorem 2.18. *The graph $PIS(R)$ is connected if and only if R is not a direct sum of two fields. If $PIS(R)$ is connected, then $\text{diam}(PIS(R)) \leq 2$.*

Proof. Let I_1, I_2 be two non-zero ideals of R . If $I_1 + I_2$ is a prime ideal, then $I_1 - I_2$ in $PIS(R)$. Otherwise, assume that $I_1 + I_2$ is not a prime ideal. Both ideals I_1 and I_2 are contained in some maximal ideals of R . If they are contained in the same maximal ideal, say M , then we have $I_1 - M - I_2$, as maximal ideals are prime ideals and hence $d(I_1, I_2) = 2$. Thus, we assume that they are not contained in the same maximal ideals, $I_1 \subset M_1, I_2 \subset M_2$ and $M_1 \neq M_2$ are two maximal ideals of R . First assume that $M_1 \cap M_2 \neq 0$. By the maximality of M_2 , we have $M_2 + I_1 = R$. Then

$$M_1 = M_1 \cap R = M_1 \cap (M_2 + I_1) = (I_1 \cap M_1) + (M_1 \cap M_2) = I_1 + (M_1 \cap M_2)$$

and so $I_1 - M_1 \cap M_2$. Similarly, $M_1 \cap M_2 - I_2$. Thus we have a path of length 2 given by $I_1 - M_1 \cap M_2 - I_2$ and so $d(I_1, I_2) \leq 2$. Hence, $\text{diam}(PIS(R)) \leq 2$. If $M_1 \cap M_2 = 0$, then since M_1 and M_2 are maximal ideals, R is a direct sum of two fields.

Conversely, if R is direct sum of two two fields F_1 and F_2 , the only non-trivial ideals of R are $0 + F_2$ and $F_1 + 0$. In this case, $PIS(R)$ consists of two isolated vertices and hence it is not connected. \square

Theorem 2.19. *If any two non-comparable ideals are adjacent in $SII(R)$, then $\text{girth}(SII(R)) = 3$.*

Proof. Let I_1 and I_2 be two non-comparable ideals which are adjacent in $SII(R)$. Then $I_1 \cap I_2$ is a second ideal of R . Since I_1 and I_2 are non-comparable, then I_1 , I_2 , and $I_1 \cap I_2$ forms a triangle in $SII(R)$, i.e. $\text{girth}(SII(R)) = 3$. \square

Corollary 2.20. *If $SII(R)$ is acyclic or $\text{girth}(SII(R)) > 3$, then no two non-comparable ideals of R are adjacent in $SII(R)$ and adjacency occurs only in case of comparable ideals, i.e. for any edge in $SII(R)$, one of the terminal vertices is a second ideal of R .*

Theorem 2.21. *If $\text{girth}(SII(R)) = n$, then there exist at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ distinct second ideals in R .*

Proof. By Theorem 2.19, if two non-comparable ideals are adjacent in $SII(R)$, then $\text{girth}(SII(R)) = 3$ and the intersection of those two non-comparable ideals forms a second ideal, and hence R contains at least $\lfloor 3/2 \rfloor = 1$ second ideal. Thus, we assume that $\text{girth}(SII(R)) > 3$, i.e. by Corollary 2.20, adjacency occurs only in case of comparable ideals. Let $I_1 - I_2 - I_3 - \dots - I_n - I_1$ be a cycle of length n . First, we observe that neither $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq I_3 \subseteq \dots \subseteq I_n \subseteq I_1$ nor $I_1 \supseteq I_2 \supseteq I_3 \supseteq \dots \supseteq I_n \supseteq I_1$ can hold, as in both the cases all the ideals will be equal. Thus, without loss of generality, we have $I_2 \subseteq I_1$, $I_2 \subseteq I_3$ and I_2 is a second ideal of R . Hence, we have the following two cases:

Case I. Let $I_2 \subseteq I_1, I_3$ and $I_4 \subseteq I_3$. Then, we have I_2, I_4 to be second ideals.

Case II. Let $I_2 \subseteq I_1, I_3$ and $I_3 \subseteq I_4$. Then, we have I_2, I_3 to be second ideals. In any case, we get at least 2 ideals to be second in R among I_1, I_2, I_3 and I_4 . Continuing in this manner till I_n , we get at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ ideals which are second in R . \square

Corollary 2.22. *Let R has k second ideals. Then $SII(R)$ is either acyclic or $\text{girth}(SII(R)) \leq 2k$.*


Let G be a graph. A non-empty subset D of the vertex set $V(G)$ is called a *dominating set* if every vertex $V(G \setminus D)$ is adjacent to at least one vertex of D . The *domination number* $\gamma(G)$ is the minimum cardinality among the dominating sets of G .

Theorem 2.23. *Let R be a commutative ring in which every ideal contains a minimal ideal and let \mathcal{M} be the set of all minimal ideals of R . Then \mathcal{M} is a minimal dominating set of $SII(R)$ and $\gamma(SII(R)) \leq |\mathcal{M}|$. Moreover, $\gamma(SII(R)) = 1$ if and only if R has exactly one minimal ideal or R has exactly two minimal ideals M_1 and M_2 such that $M_1 + M_2$ is a non-trivial maximal ideal such that there is no non-second ideal properly contained $M_1 + M_2$. Also, if R has exactly two minimal ideals which does not satisfy the above condition, then $\gamma(SII(R)) = 2$.*

Proof. Since any ideal I of R is contains some element M of \mathcal{M} and $I \cap M = M$, which is a second ideal, \mathcal{M} dominates $SII(R)$. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$. It is to be observed that $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{M\}$ does not dominate M and so fails to dominate $SII(R)$. Thus \mathcal{M} is

a minimal dominating set of $SII(R)$ and $\gamma(SII(R)) \leq |\mathcal{M}|$. The second and third parts follow from Theorem 2.8. \square

Example 2.24. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{pqr}$, where p, q , and r are primes. Then the non-zero proper ideals of R are $\langle p \rangle, \langle q \rangle, \langle r \rangle, \langle pq \rangle, \langle pr \rangle$, and $\langle qr \rangle$. In the following figures, we can see the graphs $PIS(\mathbb{Z}_{pqr})$ and $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{pqr})$.




Remark 2.25. The inequality in the Theorem 2.23 may be strict. For example, in the graph $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{pqr})$, we have $\{\langle p \rangle, \langle qr \rangle\}$ or $\{\langle r \rangle, \langle pq \rangle\}$ or $\{\langle q \rangle, \langle pr \rangle\}$ forms a dominating set of $SII(\mathbb{Z}_{pqr})$. But \mathbb{Z}_{pqr} have three minimal ideals $\langle pq \rangle, \langle pr \rangle$, and $\langle qr \rangle$.

Proposition 2.26. If R and S are two isomorphic commutative rings with unity, then $SII(R)$ and $SII(S)$ are isomorphic as graphs.

Proof. This is straightforward. \square

Example 2.27. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{12}$ and $S = \mathbb{Z}_{18}$. Then the non-zero proper ideals of R are $\langle 2 \rangle, \langle 3 \rangle, \langle 4 \rangle$, and $\langle 6 \rangle$. Also, the non-zero proper ideals of S are $\langle 2 \rangle, \langle 3 \rangle, \langle 6 \rangle$, and $\langle 9 \rangle$. Clearly, the rings R and S are not isomorphic as rings. However, both of their corresponding second ideal intersection graphs are isomorphic as we can see in the following figures.



Proposition 2.28. Let R be a comultiplication ring and I, J be ideals of R . Then we have the following.

- (a) If $\text{Ann}_R(I \cap J) = I + J$, then I and J are adjacent in $SII(R)$ if and only if they are adjacent in $PIS(R)$.
- (b) If $\text{Ann}_R(I) = J$ and $\text{Ann}_R(J) = I$, then I and J are adjacent in $SII(R)$ if and only if they are adjacent in $PIS(R)$.

- (c) I and $\text{Ann}_R(I)$ are adjacent in $SII(R)$ if and only if they are adjacent in $PIS(R)$.

Proof. (a) This follows from the fact that in the comultiplication ring R an ideal I is second if and only if $\text{Ann}_R(I)$ is a prime ideal of R [3, Theorem 196 (a)].

(b) We have $I + J = \text{Ann}_R(J) + \text{Ann}_R(I) = \text{Ann}_R(I \cap J)$ by [3, Proposition 12 (b)]. Now the result follows from part (a)

(c) Since R is a comultiplication ring, $I = \text{Ann}_R(\text{Ann}_R(I))$. Now the result follows from part (b). \square

Theorem 2.29. *Let R be a comultiplication ring. Then we have $PIS(R) \cong SII(R)$.*

Proof. Let be \mathfrak{A} the set of all non-zero proper ideals of R . Define the map $\phi : V(PIS(R)) = \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow V(SII(R)) = \mathfrak{A}$ by $\phi(I) = \text{Ann}_R(I)$ for each $I \in \mathfrak{A}$. Then as R is a comultiplication ring, one can see that ϕ is an isomorphism. Now let I and J be two non-zero proper ideal of R such that I is adjacent to J in $PIS(R)$. Then $I + J$ is a prime ideal of R . But by [3, Proposition 12 (a)], we have

$$I + J = \text{Ann}_R(\text{Ann}_R(I)) + \text{Ann}_R(\text{Ann}_R(J)) = \text{Ann}_R(\text{Ann}_R(I) \cap \text{Ann}_R(J)).$$

This implies that $\text{Ann}_R(I) \cap \text{Ann}_R(J)$ is a second ideal of R [3, Theorem 196 (a)]. Therefore $\text{Ann}_R(I)$ and $\text{Ann}_R(J)$ are adjacent in $SII(R)$, as needed. \square

Corollary 2.30. *Let n be a positive integer. Then for the ring \mathbb{Z}_n we have $PIS(\mathbb{Z}_n) \cong SII(\mathbb{Z}_n)$.*

Proof. By [3, Example 11 (b)], \mathbb{Z}_n is a comultiplication ring. Thus the result follows from Theorem 2.29 \square

The following example shows that the condition R is a comultiplication ring is required in the Theorem 2.29.

Example 2.31. Consider $R = \mathbb{Z}$. Then \mathbb{Z} is not a comultiplication ring, $E(SII(\mathbb{Z})) = \emptyset$, and the ideal $2\mathbb{Z}$ is adjacent to the ideals $2k\mathbb{Z}$ in $PIS(\mathbb{Z})$ for each positive integer $k > 1$.

Author Contribution. All the authors have an equal contribution.

Ethics approval. This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by the author.

Conflict Of Interest. The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Funding. The author has not disclosed any funding.

REFERENCES

1. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *On the dual notion of prime submodules*, Algebra Colloq., 19(spec 1) (2012), 1109-1116.
2. H. Ansari-Toroghy, F. Farshadifar, and F. Mahboobi-Abkenar. *On the ideal- based zero-divisor graphs*. Int. Electron. J. Algebra, 23:115–130, 2018.
3. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar. *Survey on comultiplication modules*. Surv. Math. Appl., 14:61–108, 2019.
4. J.A Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, American Elsevier, New York, 1976.

5. S. Çeken, M. Alkan, and F.P. Smith, *The dual notion of the prime radical of a module*, J. Algebra, 392 (2013), 265-275.
6. I. Chakrabarty, S. Ghosh, T.K. Mukherjee and M.K. Sen, *Intersection graphs of ideals of rings*, Discrete Mathematics, 309 (2009), 5381–5392.
7. M. Saha, A. Das, E.Y. Celikel, and C. Abdioglu, *Prime ideal sum graph of a commutative ring*, Journal of Algebra and its Applications, 22 (06) (2023): 2350121.
8. S. Yassemi, *The dual notion of prime submodules*, Arch. Math (Brno), 37 (2001), 273–278.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, FARHANGIAN UNIVERSITY, P.O. BOX 14665-889,
TEHRAN, IRAN.

Email address: `f.farshadifar@cfu.ac.ir`