

## 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  $I = M_1 + M_2 \subset J \subset M_i$ , 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  $I_1, I_3 \subseteq I_2$  and  $I_2$  is a second ideal of  $R$ . Hence, we have the following two cases:

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

**Case II.** Let  $I_1, I_3 \subseteq I_2$  and  $I_4 \subseteq I_3$ . 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 is 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  $\phi$  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  $k > 1$ .

## 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