

Spectral properties of Cayley graphs over finite commutative rings

Priya and Sanjay Kumar

Department of Mathematics

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Bhopal, India.

priya22@iiserb.ac.in

sanjayks@iiserb.ac.in

Abstract

Let R be a finite commutative ring with unity and x be a non-zero element of R . In this paper, we calculate the spectrum and energy of the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$, and also compute the energy of their compliment graph. It generalizes to Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 4.1 of [D. Kiani, M.M.H. Aghaei, Y. Meemark, and B. Suntornpoch. Energy of unitary Cayley graphs and gcd-graphs. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 435(6):1336–1343, 2011]. Further, we characterize the commutative ring R such that the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan. This generalizes to Theorem 12 of [X. Liu and S. Zhou. Spectral properties of unitary Cayley graphs of finite commutative rings. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 19(4):P13, 2012].

Keywords. Cayley graph, finite commutative ring, energy, Ramanujan Graph.

Mathematics Subject Classifications: 05C50, 20C25.

1 Introduction

A graph G is an ordered pair $(V(G), E(G))$ consisting of a non-empty vertex set $V(G)$ and an edge set $E(G)$ of unordered pairs of elements of $V(G)$. A graph is finite if $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ both are finite sets. In this paper, we consider only finite graphs. The $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of G , denoted by $\mathcal{A}(G)$, is the square matrix $[a_{uv}]$, where a_{uv} is given by

$$a_{uv} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (u, v) \in E(G) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if G has a loop at vertex v then the v^{th} diagonal entry of $\mathcal{A}(G)$ will be 1. The eigenvalues of $\mathcal{A}(G)$ are called the *eigenvalues* of G . If $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ are eigenvalues of a graph G with multiplicities m_1, \dots, m_k , respectively, then $\text{Spec}(G) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \dots & \lambda_k \\ m_1 & \dots & m_k \end{pmatrix}$ describe the spectrum of G . The *energy* of a graph G is the sum of absolute values of all the eigenvalues of G , *i.e.*, if $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ are eigenvalues of graph G with multiplicities m_1, \dots, m_k , respectively, then energy of G is

$$\mathcal{E}(G) = \sum_{i=1}^k m_i |\lambda_i|.$$

The energy of graph was first discussed by I. Gutman in [7] and it is widely studied in chemical graph theory. We refer to [8, 12] for a survey on energy of graphs.

A graph G is said to be *k-regular* if $\sum_{v \in V(G)} a_{uv} = k$ for all $u \in V(G)$, *i.e.*, sum of entries of each row of $\mathcal{A}(G)$ is k . Let G be a k -regular graph. We call G to be a Ramanujan graph if $|\lambda(G)| \leq 2\sqrt{k-1}$, for each eigenvalue $\lambda(G)$ of G whose absolute value less than k . For detailed survey on Ramanujan graphs we refer to [2, 13].

In general, the Cayley graph was defined on a group by taking connection set as any subset of a group. However, in this paper, we consider Cayley graphs only on finite commutative rings with a particular type of connection set. Let R be a finite commutative ring with unity and x be a non-zero element of R . Define R^* to be the set of all units of R and $xR^* := \{xr : r \in R^*\}$. The Cayley graph of R with connection set xR^* , denoted by $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$, is a graph with $V(\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)) = R$ and

$$E(\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)) = \{(u, v) : u, v \in R, u - v \in xR^*\}.$$

Note that if $x \in R^*$ then $xR^* = R^*$. The Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, R^*)$ is known as unitary Cayley graph. For a survey on eigenvalues of Cayley graphs, we refer to [12].

In 2009, A. Ilić [9] gave the energy of unitary Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_n, \mathbb{Z}_n^*)$ and its compliment. Later on, this result was extended to the unitary Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, R^*)$ by Kiani et al. [10] in 2011, for a finite commutative ring R with unity. In 2010, A. Droll [3] characterized the unitary Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}_n, \mathbb{Z}_n^*)$ to be a Ramanujan graph. Again, this characterization was extended to the unitary Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, R^*)$ by X. Liu and S. Zhou [11] in 2012, for a finite commutative ring R with unity. In this paper, we find the spectrum of the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. Using the spectrum, we calculate the energy of the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$.

and their complement graph. Finally, we characterize the commutative ring R for which the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is a Ramanujan graph.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some preliminary notions and results. In section 3, by calculating the spectrum of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$, we find the energy of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. In Section 5, we compute the energy of the complement graph of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. In the last section, we characterize the commutative ring for which the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan.

2 Preliminaries

A finite commutative ring with unity is called *local ring* if it has a unique maximal ideal. Let R be a local ring and M be the maximal ideal. Then, it is known that $R^* = R \setminus M$. It is also well known that every element of a finite commutative ring with unity is either a zero divisor or a unit element of R . Therefore, the maximal ideal M is the set of all zero-divisors of R . Note that $R^* \cup M$ is a disjoint union of R . Now, we have the following known result.

Lemma 2.1. *If R is a local ring with M as its maximal ideal, then $|R|, |M|$ and $\frac{|R|}{|M|}$ are all powers of p , for some prime p .*

By Theorem 8.7 of [1], every finite commutative ring can be written as a product of finite local rings and this decomposition is unique upto the permutation of local rings. Let R be a finite commutative ring with unity. Throughout the paper, we will use the following terminologies:

- We will use the notation $\mathbf{1}$ to denote the multiplicative identity (unity) of R and $\mathbf{0}$ to denote the additive identity of R .
- We consider $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_s$ such that

$$\frac{|R_1|}{m_1} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{|R_s|}{m_s},$$

where R_i is a local ring with maximal ideal M_i of order m_i for each $i = 1, \dots, s$. By Theorem 8.7 of [1], this decomposition is unique upto the permutation of local rings.

- We consider the element $x \in R$ as an element of the cartesian product $R_1 \times \cdots \times R_s$, that is $x := (x_1, \dots, x_s)$, where $x_i \in R_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$.

- Using $R^* = R_1^* \times \cdots \times R_s^*$, we observe that if $x \in R$ then $xR^* = x_1R_1^* \times \cdots \times x_sR_s^*$.
Moreover, $|xR^*| = \prod_{i=1}^s |x_iR_i^*|$.

Let R be a local ring and x be a nonzero element of R . We will use the notation I_x to denote an ideal of R generated by x and define

$$M_x := I_x \setminus xR^*.$$

Note that $xR^* \cup M_x$ is a disjoint union of I_x . Now we have the following result.

Lemma 2.2. *If M is a maximal ideal of R , then $M_x = xM$.*

Proof. By the definition of M_x and using the fact that $R^* \cup M$ is a disjoint union of R , we have $M_x \subseteq xM$. On the other hand, let xm is an element of xM with $m \in M$. Our claim is that $xm \notin xR^*$. If $xm \in xR^*$ then $xm = xu$ for some $u \in R^*$. We have $x(m - u) = \mathbf{0}$, and so $m - u$ is a zero divisor. Therefore $u \in M$, which is a contradiction. Hence $xm \notin xR^*$, equivalent to say $xm \in M_x$. \square

Define $A_x := \{r \in R : xr = \mathbf{0}\}$. The set A_x is known as the *annihilator* of x . We observe that A_x is an ideal of R . Define $C_p(0)$ as the ring with an additive group that is isomorphic to the cyclic group \mathbb{Z}_p and whose multiplication of any two elements is zero. The following result provides some fundamental properties of I_x and M_x that we are going to utilise in the next sections.

Lemma 2.3. *Let R be a local ring with maximal ideal M and x be a nonzero element of R . The following statements are true:*

- (i) *if $r \in R$ and $xr \in M_x$, then $r \in M$.*
- (ii) *M_x is a maximal ideal of I_x .*
- (iii) $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} = \frac{|R|}{|M|}$.
- (iv) *if x is unit and $|M_x| = 1$, then I_x is a field.*
- (v) *if x is non-unit and $|M_x| = 1$, then $I_x = C_p(0)$ for some prime p .*
- (vi) *if x is non-unit and $x^2 \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $|I_x| \leq |M_x|^2$.*

(vii) if $|M_x| > 1$, then $|I_x| \leq |M_x|^2$.

Proof. (i) If $r \notin M$ then $r \in R^*$. We get $xr \in xR^*$. By definition of M_x , $xr \notin M_x$. Which is a contradiction.

(ii) Clearly, $0 \in M_x$. Let $a, b \in M_x$. By Lemma 2.2, we have $a = xp$ and $b = xq$ for some $p, q \in M$. Using $p + q \in M$ and Lemma 2.2, $a + b = x(p + q) \in M_x$. Let $xr \in I_x$ and $a \in M_x$ with $r \in R$. By Lemma 2.2, we have $a = xp$ with some $p \in M$. Since M is an ideal of R , $rxp \in M$. Using Lemma 2.2, $(xr)a = x(rx p) \in M_x$. Thus M_x is an ideal of I_x . Now it remains to show that M_x is a maximal ideal of I_x . Let $xu \in xR^*$ with $u \in R^*$. It suffices to show that ideal of I_x generated by $M_x \cup \{xu\}$ is I_x itself. For this we will show that every element of I_x belongs to its ideal generated by $M_x \cup \{xu\}$. Let xr be a non zero element of I_x with $r \in R$. Using the fact that any ideal of R generated by $M \cup \{u\}$ is R itself, we get $r = a_1m_1 + \dots + a_tm_t + a_{t+1}u$, where $m_i \in M$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $a_i \in R$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t + 1\}$. We have

$$xr = xa_1m_1 + \dots + xa_tm_t + xa_{t+1}u = a_1xm_1 + \dots + a_txm_t + a_{t+1}xu.$$

Therefore xr belongs to the ideal of I_x generated by $M_x \cup \{xu\}$. Hence M_x is a maximal ideal of I_x .

(iii) If x is an unit element of R , then $I_x = R$ and $M_x = M$. And so the result holds. Assume that x is a non unit element of R . Define a map

$$\phi : \frac{R}{M} \rightarrow \frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} \quad \text{such that} \quad \phi(a + M) = ax + M_x.$$

If $a + M = b + M$ then $a - b \in M$. By Lemma 2.2, we get $(a - b)x \in M_x$. It implies that $ax + M_x = bx + M_x$. Thus ϕ is well-defined. If $\phi(a + M) = \phi(b + M)$ then $ax + M_x = bx + M_x$. This implies $ax - bx \in M_x$, and so $(a - b)x \in M_x$. By Part (i), we get $a - b \in M$, which means $a + M = b + M$. Thus ϕ is injective. Let $ax + M_x$ be a nonzero element of quotient ring $\frac{I_x}{M_x}$. Then $ax \notin M_x$, and so $ax \in xR^*$. By Part (i), we get $a \notin M$. Which means $a + M$ is a nonzero element of the ring $\frac{R}{M}$ and $\phi(a + M) = ax + M_x$. Thus ϕ is bijective. Hence $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} = \frac{|R|}{|M|}$.

(iv) If x is unit and $|M_x| = 1$, then $I_x = R$ and I_x has unique maximal trivial ideal. Now the proof follows.

(v) Assume that x is non-unit and $|M_x| = 1$. If $x^2 \neq \mathbf{0}$ then $x^2 \in M_x$. Therefore $|M_x| > 1$, which is not possible. Thus $x^2 = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, I_x has no proper, non-trivial ideal and product of any two elements of I_x is zero. By Lemma 2.1, we have $|I_x| = p^n$ for some prime p and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Cauchy's theorem of Abelian group, we get $n = 1$ because I_x has no proper, non-trivial ideal. Thus $|I_x| = p$, and so $I_x = C_p(0)$.

(vi) Assume that x is non-unit and $x^2 \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then $x \in M$ and $xr \in M$ for all $r \in R$. We observe that $A_x \cap M_x$ is an ideal of I_x . Define

$$\phi : \frac{I_x}{A_x \cap M_x} \rightarrow M_x \quad \text{such that} \quad \phi(xr + A_x \cap M_x) = x^2r,$$

where $r \in R$. Since $xr \in M$, $x^2r \in M_x$ by Lemma 2.2. If $xr + A_x \cap M_x = xr' + A_x \cap M_x$ then $xr - xr' \in A_x \cap M_x$. Therefore $x^2(r - r') = 0$, which means $x^2r = x^2r'$. Therefore $\phi(xr + A_x \cap M_x) = \phi(xr' + A_x \cap M_x)$. Thus ϕ is a well-defined. If $\phi(xr + A_x \cap M_x) = \phi(xr' + A_x \cap M_x)$ then $x^2r = x^2r'$. Therefore $x^2(r - r') = 0$, it means $r - r'$ is a zero-divisor of R . We have $r - r' \in M$, and so $x(r - r') \in M_x$. Using $x^2(r - r') = 0$, we obtain $x(r - r') \in A_x$. So $x(r - r') \in A_x \cap M_x$, it implies $xr + A_x \cap M_x = xr' + A_x \cap M_x$. Thus ϕ is injective map. It implies that $|I_x| \leq |M_x||A_x \cap M_x|$. Now the proof follows from $|A_x \cap M_x| \leq |M_x|$.

(vii) Assume that $|M_x| > 1$. If x is unit element of R then $I_x = R$ and $M_x = M$. Now the proof follows from [5]. Assume that x is non-unit element of R . We will split the proof into two cases.

Case 1: If $x^2 \neq 0$ then proof follows from Part (vi).

Case 2: If $x^2 = 0$ then the product of any two elements of I_x is zero. By Lemma 2.1, we have $|I_x| = p^n$ for some prime p and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the fact that every maximal subgroup of an abelian group of order p^n has order p^{n-1} and M_x is maximal subgroup of I_x , we get $|M_x| = p^{n-1}$. By $|M_x| > 1$, we have $n \geq 2$. Thus the proof follows from the inequality $p^n \leq p^{2(n-1)}$ whenever $n \geq 2$.

□

3 Energy of the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$

In this section, we first calculate the spectrum of the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. Using that, we find the energy of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$.

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ and $H = (V(H), E(H))$ be two graphs. Then tensor product $G \otimes H$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \times V(H)$, and $((u, v), (u', v')) \in E(G \otimes H)$ if and only if $(u, u') \in E(G)$ and $(v, v') \in E(H)$. In the next result, we express a Cayley graph in the tensor products of a Cayley graphs over local rings.

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a finite commutative ring and x be a nonzero element of R . Then the following statements are true:*

- (i) *The Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is $|xR^*|$ -regular.*
- (ii) *Both Cayley graphs $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ and $\text{Cay}(R_1, x_1R_1^*) \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{Cay}(R_s, x_sR_s^*)$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. (i) The proof follows from $\sum_{v \in R} a_{uv} = \sum_{s \in xR^*} a_{u-u-s} = |xR^*|$ for all $u \in V(G)$.

- (ii) Let $G = \text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ and $G_i = \text{Cay}(R_i, x_iR_i^*)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, s$. By our assumptions, we have $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_s$ and $xR^* = x_1R_1^* \times \cdots \times x_sR_s^*$. Therefore, the vertex set of both graphs G and $G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_s$ are equal. Let $a, b \in R$. Note that $a - b \in xR^*$ if and only if $a_i - b_i \in x_iR_i^*$ for each $i = 1, \dots, s$. Hence, both graphs G and $G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_s$ are isomorphic.

□

In the last theorem, we assume that x is a nonzero element of R , so the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ has no loops. But, there may be some $1 \leq j \leq s$ such that x_j is a zero element of the local ring R_j . In that case, the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R_j, x_jR_j^*)$ will have a loop on each vertex and there will be no edges between any two distinct vertices, and so the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of $\text{Cay}(R_j, x_jR_j^*)$ will be identity matrix. A *component* of a graph G is a connected subgraph of G such that it is not subgraph of any larger connected subgraph of G . The next result provides some combinatorial properties of components of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let R be a local ring and x be a non zero element of R . Then the following statements are true:*

- (i) $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ is a complete $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|}$ -partite graph whose partite sets are cosets of $\frac{I_x}{M_x}$.
- (ii) $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ is isomorphic to $G_{[z]}$ for each $z \in R$, where $V(G_{[z]}) = z + I_x$ and $E(G_{[z]}) = \{(z + a, z + b) : a - b \in xR^*\}$.
- (iii) If $a, b \in R$, there is a path between a and b in $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ if and only if a and b are lies in same coset of $\frac{R}{I_x}$.
- (iv) $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ has exactly $\frac{|R|}{|I_x|}$ components.
- (v) $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ is isomorphic to each component of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$.

Proof. (i) Observe that a and b are adjacent in $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ if and only if $a - b \in xR^*$, equivalent to say, $a - b \notin M_x$. Thus a and b are adjacent if and only if they are in different cosets of $\frac{I_x}{M_x}$. The vertex set of $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ can be partitioned into $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|}$ different independent sets and there is an edge between every pair of vertices from different independent sets. This implies $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ is a complete $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|}$ -partite graph.

- (ii) Define a bijective mapping $\theta: V(\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)) \rightarrow V(G_{[z]})$ such that $\theta(a) = z + a$ for all $a \in I_x$. It is clear from the definition of $G_{[z]}$ that a and b are adjacent in $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ if and only if $z + a$ and $z + b$ are adjacent in $G_{[z]}$. Thus θ is an isomorphism between $G_{[z]}$ and $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$.
- (iii) Let $a, b \in R$. Assume that there is a path P between a and b in $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. Then there exist a sequence of vertex a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} such that $P = a, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, b$. We get $b = a + s_1 + \dots + s_k$, for some $s_1, \dots, s_k \in xR^*$. Using $xR^* \subseteq I_x$, we get $b \in a + I_x$. Thus, a and b are lies in same coset of $\frac{R}{I_x}$. Conversely, assume that a and b are lies in same coset of $\frac{R}{I_x}$. We have $a, b \in z + I_x$ for some $z \in R$. Thus a and b are two vertex of the graph $G_{[z]}$, as defined in Part (ii). Using Part (i) and Part (ii), $G_{[z]}$ is a complete $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|}$ -partite graph, and so a and b are connected by a path in $G_{[z]}$. Hence, there is a path between a and b in $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$.
- (iv) Using Part (iii), a subgraph induced by the vertex set $z + I_x$ is a component. Hence, the number of components are equal to the size of $\frac{R}{I_x}$.

(v) Using Part (iii), a subgraph induced by the vertex set $z + I_x$ is a component, and that component is isomorphic to $G_{[z]}$. Now, the proof follows from Part (ii). □

Let G be a loopless graph. The *compliment* of G , denoted by \overline{G} , is a loopless graph with the same vertex set as of G and two distinct vertices are adjacent in \overline{G} if they are not adjacent in G .

Theorem 3.3. [14, 6] *If a graph G be a k -regular graph with n vertices, then G and \overline{G} have the same eigenvectors. k and $n - k - 1$ are the eigenvalues of G and \overline{G} , respectively, associated to eigenvector $J_{n \times 1}$ whose all entries are 1. And if λ is eigenvalue of G with eigenvector $\bar{x} \neq J_{n \times 1}$ then $-1 - \lambda$ is associated eigenvalue of \overline{G} .*

Lemma 3.4. *Let R be a local ring and x be a non zero element of R . Then the spectrum of $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ is*

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} |xR^*| & -|M_x| & 0 \\ 1 & \frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} - 1 & \frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} (|M_x| - 1) \end{array} \right).$$

Proof. Let $G = \text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$. By Lemma 3.2, G is a complete $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|}$ -partite graph. Therefore \overline{G} has $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|}$ components and each component is a complete graph with M_x vertices. Let J be the $|M_x| \times |M_x|$ matrix with each entry is 1. Note that the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of \overline{G} is a block diagonal matrix with $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|}$ blocks and each block matrix is equal to $J - I$, where I is $|M_x| \times |M_x|$ identity matrix. Since the spectrum of $J - I$ is $\left(\begin{array}{cc} |M_x| - 1 & -1 \\ 1 & |M_x| - 1 \end{array} \right)$, the spectrum of \overline{G} is

$\left(\begin{array}{cc} |M_x| - 1 & -1 \\ \frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} & \frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} (|M_x| - 1) \end{array} \right)$. Using Theorem 3.3, we observe the following things:

- (i) G has eigenvalue $|I_x| - (|M_x| - 1) - 1 = |I_x| - |M_x| = |xR^*|$ with multiplicity 1 corresponding to the eigenvector $J_{n \times 1}$.
- (ii) $-(|M_x| - 1) - 1 = -|M_x|$ is an eigenvalue with multiplicity $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} - 1$.
- (iii) $-(-1) - 1 = 0$ is an eigenvalue with multiplicity $\frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} (|M_x| - 1)$.

Therefore, the spectrum of $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$ is $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} |xR^*| & -|M_x| & 0 \\ 1 & \frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} - 1 & \frac{|I_x|}{|M_x|} (|M_x| - 1) \end{array} \right)$. □

Using Part (iv) and Part (v) of Lemma 3.2, $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ has exactly $\frac{|R|}{|I_x|}$ components and each component is isomorphic to $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$. Therefore the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is a block diagonal matrix with $\frac{|R|}{|I_x|}$ blocks and each block matrix is equal to the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of $\text{Cay}(I_x, xR^*)$. Now, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.5. *Let R be a local ring and x be a non-zero element of R . Then the spectrum of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is*

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} |xR^*| & -|M_x| & 0 \\ \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} & \frac{|R||xR^*|}{|I_x||M_x|} & \frac{|R|}{|M_x|}(|M_x| - 1) \end{array} \right).$$

Proof. The proof follows from Part (iv) and Part (v) of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.4 \square

Recall that the energy of a graph G is the sum of absolute values of all the eigenvalues of G . The next result is a consequence of Theorem 3.5 that provides a formula to calculate the energy of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$.

Corollary 3.5.1. *Let R be a local ring and x be a non-zero element of R . Then the energy of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is $2|xR^*|\frac{|R|}{|I_x|}$.*

Proof. The proof follows from $|xR^*|\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} + |M_x|\frac{|xR^*||R|}{|M_x||I_x|} = 2|xR^*|\frac{|R|}{|I_x|}$. \square

Theorem 3.6. [14] *Let G and H be two graphs. If $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues of G and μ_1, \dots, μ_m are the eigenvalues of H then $\lambda_i\mu_j$, where $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$ are the eigenvalues of $G \otimes H$.*

Let R be a finite commutative ring, x be a non-zero element of R , and $P = \{i: i \in \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ and } x_i \neq \mathbf{0}\}$. By Theorem 3.1, both graphs $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ and $\otimes_{i=1}^s \text{Cay}(R_i, x_iR_i^*)$ are isomorphic, and so they have same set of eigenvalues with same multiplicity. Note that if $i \notin P$ then the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of $\text{Cay}(R_i, x_iR_i^*)$ is square identity matrix of size $|R_i|$. Therefore, the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of $\otimes_{i \in P^c} \text{Cay}(R_i, x_iR_i^*)$ is square identity matrix of size $\prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i|$. By Theorem 3.6, both graphs $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ and $\otimes_{i \in P} \text{Cay}(R_i, x_iR_i^*)$ have same set of eigenvalues, but the multiplicity of each eigenvalue in $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is equal to $\prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i|$ times the multiplicity of corresponding eigenvalue in $\otimes_{i \in P} \text{Cay}(R_i, x_iR_i^*)$. Observe that $|I_{x_i}| = |M_{x_i}| + |x_iR_i^*|$ for each $x_i \neq \mathbf{0}$. Therefore,

$$|xR^*| = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_i \neq \mathbf{0}}}^s |x_iR_i^*| = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_i \neq \mathbf{0}}}^s (|I_{x_i}| - |M_{x_i}|) = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_i \neq \mathbf{0}}}^s |M_{x_i}| \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_i \neq \mathbf{0}}}^s \left(\frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} - 1 \right). \quad (1)$$

The result appears as follows.

Theorem 3.7. *Let R be a finite commutative ring, x be a non-zero element of R , and $P = \{i: i \in \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ and } x_i \neq 0\}$. Then eigenvalues of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ are*

$$(i) \quad (-1)^{|C|} \frac{|xR^*|}{\prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}} \text{ with multiplicity } \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \text{ for all subset } C \text{ of } P, \text{ where } P^c = \{1, 2, \dots, s\} \setminus P.$$

$$(ii) \quad 0 \text{ with multiplicity } |R| - \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 + \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}\right)$$

Proof. (i) Let C be a non-empty subset of P . By Theorem 3.6, $(-1)^{|C|} \prod_{i \in C} |M_{x_i}| \prod_{i \in P \setminus C} |x_i R_i^*|$ is a non-zero eigenvalue of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ with multiplicity $\prod_{i \in C} \frac{|R_i| |x_i R_i^*|}{|I_{x_i}| |M_{x_i}|} \prod_{i \in P \setminus C} \frac{|R_i|}{|I_{x_i}|} \prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i|$.

We have

$$(-1)^{|C|} \prod_{i \in C} |M_{x_i}| \prod_{i \in P \setminus C} |x_i R_i^*| = (-1)^{|C|} \frac{|xR^*|}{\prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|R_i| |x_i R_i^*|}{|I_{x_i}| |M_{x_i}|} \prod_{i \in P \setminus C} \frac{|R_i|}{|I_{x_i}|} \prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i| &= \prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i| \prod_{i \in P} \frac{|R_i|}{|I_{x_i}|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \\ &= \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $C = \phi$ then $\prod_{i \in P} |x_i R_i^*|$ is an eigenvalue with multiplicity $\prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i| \prod_{i \in P} \frac{|R_i|}{|I_{x_i}|}$.

Again, we have

$$\prod_{i \in P} |x_i R_i^*| = |xR^*| \text{ and } \prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i| \prod_{i \in P} \frac{|R_i|}{|I_{x_i}|} = \frac{|R|}{|I_x|}.$$

(ii) By Part (i), the number of non-zero eigenvalues of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is

$$\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} + \sum_{C \subset P, C \neq \phi} \left(\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right).$$

We have

$$\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \left(1 + \sum_{C \subset P, C \neq \phi} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) = \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 + \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right).$$

Therefore, 0 is an eigenvalue with multiplicity $|R| - \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 + \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right)$.

□

In Theorem 3.6, we have $\mathcal{E}(G \otimes H) = \mathcal{E}(G)\mathcal{E}(H)$. Now, we have the last result of this section.

Theorem 3.8. *Let R be a finite commutative ring, x be a non-zero element of R , and $P = \{i: i \in \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ and } x_i \neq \mathbf{0}\}$. Then the energy of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is $2^{|P|} \frac{|R||xR^*|}{|I_x|}$.*

Proof. We have

$$\mathcal{E}(\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)) = \prod_{i=1}^s \mathcal{E}(\text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)).$$

Since the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of $\otimes_{i \in P^c} \text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)$ is square identity matrix of size $\prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i|$, we have $\prod_{i \in P^c} \mathcal{E}(\text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)) = \prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i|$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)) &= \prod_{i \in P} \mathcal{E}(\text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)) \times \prod_{i \in P^c} \mathcal{E}(\text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)) \\ &= \prod_{i \in P} 2^{|x_i R_i^*|} \frac{|R_i|}{|I_{x_i}|} \times \prod_{i \in P^c} |R_i| \\ &= 2^{|P|} \frac{|R||xR^*|}{|I_x|}. \end{aligned}$$

In the third equality, we use $|R| = \prod_{i=1}^s |R_i|$, $|xR^*| = \prod_{i \in P} |x_i R_i^*|$, and $|I_x| = \prod_{i \in P} |I_{x_i}|$. □

4 Energy of the complement graph of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$

In this section we compute the energy of the complement graph of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let R be a finite commutative ring and x be a non-zero element of R . Then energy of $\overline{\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)}$ is*

$$2(|R| - |xR^*| - 1) + \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \left[2^{|P|} |xR^*| + \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 - \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) - \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 + \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) \right],$$

where $P = \{i: i \in \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ and } x_i \neq \mathbf{0}\}$.

Proof. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{|R|}$ be the eigenvalues of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ and $\lambda_1 = |xR^*|$. Theorem 3.3 implies that $|R| - |xR^*| - 1, -\lambda_2 - 1, \dots, -\lambda_{|R|} - 1$ are eigenvalues of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\overline{\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)}) &= |R| - |xR^*| - 1 + \sum_{i \neq 1} |-1 - \lambda_i| \\ &= |R| - |xR^*| - 1 + \sum_{i \neq 1} |\lambda_i + 1| \\ &= |R| - |xR^*| - 1 + \sum_{i \neq 1, \lambda_i \neq 0} |\lambda_i + 1| + \sum_{i \neq 1, \lambda_i = 0} |\lambda_i + 1|. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

By Theorem 3.7, we have

$$\sum_{i \neq 1, \lambda_i = 0} |\lambda_i + 1| = |R| - \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 + \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}\right). \quad (3)$$

Let C be a non-empty subset of P . Using Theorem 3.7, $(-1)^{|C|} \frac{|xR^*|}{\prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}}$ is a non-zero eigenvalue with multiplicity $\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}$. Similarly, if $C = \phi$ then $|xR^*|$ is also a non-zero eigenvalue of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ with multiplicity $\frac{|R|}{|I_x|}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq 1, \lambda_i \neq 0} |\lambda_i + 1| &= \sum_{C \subset P, C \neq \phi} \left| (-1)^{|C|} \frac{|xR^*|}{\prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|}} + 1 \right| \left(\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) + (|xR^*| + 1) \left(\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} - 1 \right) \\ &= \sum_{C \subset P, C \neq \phi} \left| (-1)^{|C|} \frac{|R||xR^*|}{|I_x|} + \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right| + (|xR^*| + 1) \left(\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} - 1 \right) \\ &= (2^{|P|} - 1) \frac{|R||xR^*|}{|I_x|} + \sum_{C \subset P, C \neq \phi} (-1)^{|C|} \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} + (|xR^*| + 1) \left(\frac{|R|}{|I_x|} - 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \left[2^{|P|} |xR^*| + \sum_{C \subset P, C \neq \phi} (-1)^{|C|} \prod_{i \in C} \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} + 1 \right] - (|xR^*| + 1) \\ &= \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \left[2^{|P|} |xR^*| + \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 - \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) \right] - (|xR^*| + 1). \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

Apply Equation (3) and Equation (4) in Equation (2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\overline{\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)}) &= (|R| - |xR^*| - 1) + \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \left[2^{|P|} |xR^*| + \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 - \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) \right] - (|xR^*| + 1) \\ &\quad + |R| - \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 + \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) \\ &= 2(|R| - |xR^*| - 1) + \frac{|R|}{|I_x|} \left[2^{|P|} |xR^*| + \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 - \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) - \prod_{i \in P} \left(1 + \frac{|x_i R_i^*|}{|M_{x_i}|} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Ramanujan Graphs

In this section, we give a characterization for the commutative ring R for which the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan. First, we will see known classification of finite rings of order p and p^2 .

Lemma 5.1. [4] \mathbb{Z}_p and $C_p(0)$ are the only rings of prime order p , upto isomorphism.

Theorem 5.2. [4] There are exactly 11 rings, upto isomorphism, of order p^2 , where p is a prime. These rings are given by the following presentations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{p^2} &= \langle a; p^2a = 0, a^2 = a \rangle = \mathbb{Z}_{p^2} \\
\mathcal{B}_{p^2} &= \langle a; p^2a = 0, a^2 = pa \rangle \\
\mathcal{C}_{p^2} &= \langle a; p^2 = 0, a^2 = 0 \rangle = C_{p^2}(0) \\
\mathcal{D}_{p^2} &= \langle a, b; pa = pb = 0, a^2 = a, b^2 = b, ab = ba = 0 \rangle = \mathbb{Z}_p + \mathbb{Z}_p \\
\mathcal{E}_{p^2} &= \langle a, b; pa = pb = 0, a^2 = a, b^2 = b, ab = a, ba = b \rangle \\
\mathcal{F}_{p^2} &= \langle a, b; pa = pb = 0, a^2 = a, b^2 = b, ab = b, ba = a \rangle \\
\mathcal{G}_{p^2} &= \langle a, b; pa = pb = 0, a^2 = 0, b^2 = b, ab = a, ba = a \rangle \\
\mathcal{H}_{p^2} &= \langle a, b; pa = pb = 0, a^2 = 0, b^2 = b, ab = ba = 0 \rangle = \mathbb{Z}_p + C_p(0) \\
\mathcal{I}_{p^2} &= \langle a, b; pa = pb = 0, a^2 = b, ab = 0 \rangle \\
\mathcal{J}_{p^2} &= \langle a, b; pa = pb = 0, a^2 = b^2 = 0 \rangle = C_p \times C_p(0) \\
\mathcal{K}_{p^2} &= GF(p^2) = \text{finite field of order } p^2
\end{aligned}$$

In the next result, we characterize the commutative ring R for which the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan by assuming x_i to be non-zero for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.

Theorem 5.3. Let R be a finite commutative ring and x be a non-zero element of R . If x_i is non-zero for all $i = 1, \dots, s$, then $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if one of the following holds

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) \quad \frac{I_{x_i}}{M_{x_i}} &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s. \\
(ii) \quad I_{x_i} &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s-3 \text{ and } I_{x_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_3 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_3(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for} \\
& \quad i = s-2, s-1, s. \\
(iii) \quad I_{x_i} &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s-3 \text{ and } I_{x_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_3 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_3(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for} \\
& \quad i = s-2, s-1 \text{ and } I_{x_s} = \mathbb{F}_4.
\end{aligned}$$

$$(iv) I_{x_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s-3 \text{ and } I_{x_i} = \mathbb{F}_4 \text{ for } i = s-2, s-1, s.$$

$$(v) I_{x_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s-2 \text{ and } I_{x_{s-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_3 & \text{if } x_{s-1} \in R_{s-1}^* \\ C_3(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $I_{x_s} = \mathcal{A}_9, \mathcal{B}_9, \mathcal{C}_9, \mathcal{D}_9, \mathcal{G}_9, \mathcal{H}_9, \mathcal{I}_9, \mathcal{J}_9$.

$$(vi) I_{x_1} = \mathcal{A}_4, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{C}_4, \mathcal{D}_4, \mathcal{G}_4, \mathcal{H}_4, \mathcal{I}_4, \mathcal{J}_4, \text{ and } I_{x_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, s-2,$$

and $I_{x_{s-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_1} & \text{if } x_{s-1} \in R_{s-1}^* \\ C_{p_1}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, I_{x_s} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_2} & \text{if } x_s \in R_s^* \\ C_{p_2}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$ where p_1 and p_2 are primes and q_1 and q_2 are prime powers such that

$$3 \leq |I_{x_{s-1}}| \leq |I_{x_s}| \leq |I_{x_{s-1}}| + \sqrt{|I_{x_{s-1}}| (|I_{x_{s-1}}| - 2)}.$$

$$(vii) I_{x_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s-2, \text{ and } I_{x_{s-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_1} & \text{if } x_{s-1} \in R_{s-1}^* \\ C_{p_1}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$I_{x_s} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_2} & \text{if } x_s \in R_s^* \\ C_{p_2}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \text{ where } p_1 \text{ and } p_2 \text{ are primes and } q_1 \text{ and } q_2 \text{ are prime powers}$$

such that

$$3 \leq |I_{x_{s-1}}| \leq |I_{x_s}| \leq 2 \left(|I_{x_{s-1}}| + \sqrt{|I_{x_{s-1}}| (|I_{x_{s-1}}| - 2)} \right) - 1.$$

$$(viii) \frac{I_{x_i}}{M_{x_i}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, s-1 \text{ and } \frac{I_{x_s}}{M_{x_s}} = S, \text{ where } S \text{ is a commutative}$$

ring such that $|S| = e \geq 3$ and

$$\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \leq 2 \left(e - 1 + \sqrt{(e-2)e} \right).$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.7, $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if $|\lambda_C| \leq 2\sqrt{|xR^*| - 1}$ for all λ_C other than $\pm|xR^*|$, where $C \subseteq \{1, \dots, s\}$ and

$$\lambda_C = (-1)^{|C|} \frac{|xR^*|}{\prod_{i \in C} \left(\frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} - 1 \right)}. \quad (5)$$

In general, we have $|I_{x_i}| \geq 2|M_{x_i}|$ for each $i = 1, \dots, s$. If $\frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} = 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ then $\pm|xR^*|$ are the only non-zero eigenvalue of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. Lemma 5.1 implies that $\frac{I_{x_i}}{M_{x_i}}$ is

isomorphic to either \mathbb{F}_2 (if $x_i \in R_i^*$) or $C_2(0)$ (if $x_i \notin R_i^*$) for each $i = 1, \dots, s$. Hence if $\frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} = 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ then $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if the condition (i) holds.

On the other hand, assume that $\frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} > 2$ for some i . Let $t + 1$ be the smallest integer such that $\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} > 2$ with $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$. We have

$$2 = \frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} = \dots = \frac{|I_{x_t}|}{|M_{x_t}|} < \frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} \leq \dots \leq \frac{|I_{x_s}|}{|M_{x_s}|}. \quad (6)$$

If $C \subseteq \{1, \dots, t\}$ then Equation (5) and Equation (6) implies $|\lambda_C| = |xR^*|$. Similarly, if $C \cap \{t + 1, \dots, s\} \neq \emptyset$ then Equation (5) and Equation (6) implies $|\lambda_C| = |\lambda_{C \cap \{t+1, \dots, s\}}| \leq |\lambda_{\{t+1\}}| < |xR^*|$. Thus $|\lambda_{\{t+1\}}|$ is the second largest absolute value of eigenvalue of $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$. Hence, $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if $|\lambda_{\{t+1\}}| \leq 2\sqrt{|xR^*| - 1}$, equivalent to say,

$$\frac{|xR^*|}{\left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1\right)} \leq 2\sqrt{|xR^*| - 1}. \quad (7)$$

Using $\sqrt{|xR^*| - 1} < \sqrt{|xR^*|}$, Equation (7) implies

$$|xR^*| < 4 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right)^2. \quad (8)$$

Using Equation (1), Equation (8) implies

$$\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \prod_{i=t+2}^s \left(\frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} - 1 \right) < 4 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right). \quad (9)$$

If $s \geq t + 4$ then using Equation (6) we get $\prod_{i=t+2}^s \left(\frac{|I_{x_i}|}{|M_{x_i}|} - 1 \right) \geq 4 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right)$. Thus Equation (9) does not hold. Therefore if $s \geq t + 4$, then there is no commutative ring R exist such that Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan. Now we have remaining three cases, $s = t + 3$, $s = t + 2$, and $s = t + 1$.

Case 1: $s = t + 3$

We rewrite the Equation (9)

$$\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+3}}|}{|M_{x_{t+3}}|} - 1 \right) < 4 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right). \quad (10)$$

Note that $\left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+3}}|}{|M_{x_{t+3}}|} - 1 \right) \geq 2 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right)$. If $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \geq 2$ then equation (10) does not hold. Therefore, if $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \geq 2$ then there is no commutative ring R exist such that $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan. Assume that $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 1$. Equation (10) implies

$$\left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+3}}|}{|M_{x_{t+3}}|} - 1 \right) < 4 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right). \quad (11)$$

We have the following two cases:

Case 1.1: $|I_{x_{t+1}}| = |I_{x_{t+2}}|$

Equation (11) implies $|I_{x_{t+3}}| \leq 4$. From equation (6), we have the following three cases:

- (a) $|I_{x_{t+1}}| = |I_{x_{t+2}}| = |I_{x_{t+3}}| = 3$
- (b) $|I_{x_{t+1}}| = |I_{x_{t+2}}| = 3, |I_{x_{t+3}}| = 4$
- (c) $|I_{x_{t+1}}| = |I_{x_{t+2}}| = |I_{x_{t+3}}| = 4$

The cases (a), (b), (c) satisfy to Equation (7). Hence, in this particular case, the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if R satisfies any one of the cases (a), (b), (c). Note that $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 1$, and so $|M_{x_i}| = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. By Equation 6, we have $|I_{x_i}| = 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$. Therefore, $I_{x_i} = \mathbb{F}_2$ (if $x_i \in R_i^*$) or $C_2(0)$ (if $x_i \notin R_i^*$) for all $i = 1, \dots, t$. Using Part (iv) and Part (v) of Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 5.1, we write the cases in the equivalent way:

- (a) $I_{x_i} = \mathbb{F}_3$ (if $x_i \in R_i^*$) or $C_3(0)$ (if $x_i \notin R_i^*$) for all $i = t+1, t+2, t+3$.
- (b) $I_{x_i} = \mathbb{F}_3$ (if $x_i \in R_i^*$) or $C_3(0)$ (if $x_i \notin R_i^*$) for all $i = t+1, t+2$, and $I_{x_{t+3}} = \mathbb{F}_4$.
- (c) $I_{x_i} = \mathbb{F}_4$ for all $i = t+1, t+2, t+3$.

Hence, in this particular case, the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if R satisfies any one of the condition (ii), (iii) and (iv).

Case 1.2: $|I_{x_{t+1}}| < |I_{x_{t+2}}|$

Equation (11) is equivalent to $|I_{x_{t+1}}| = 3, |I_{x_{t+2}}| = 4$ and $|I_{x_{t+3}}| = 4$. But it does not satisfy by Equation (7). Hence, in this particular case, there is no commutative ring R exist such that $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan.

Case 2: $s = t + 2$

In this case, Equation (9) reduce to

$$\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} - 1 \right) < 4 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right). \quad (12)$$

Observe that if $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \geq 4$ then Equation (12) does not hold. Hence, if $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \geq 4$ then there is no commutative ring R exist such that $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan. Therefore, we have either $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 3$, $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 2$, or $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 1$.

Case 2.1: $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 3$

In this case Equation (7) reduce to

$$3 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} - 1 \right) \leq 2 \sqrt{3 \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} - 1 \right)} - 1 \quad (13)$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 3$, there exist unique $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $|M_{x_j}| = 3$. By Part (vii) of Lemma 2.3, we get $|I_{x_j}| \leq 9$. Using the fact that M_{x_j} is a proper ideal of I_{x_j} , we get $|I_{x_j}| = 9$. And so $\frac{|I_{x_j}|}{|M_{x_j}|} = 3$ implies $j = t + 1$ or $j = t + 2$. Therefore we have two cases:

- (a) $|M_{x_i}| = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $|M_{x_{t+1}}| = 3$, and $|M_{x_{t+2}}| = 1$.
- (b) $|M_{x_i}| = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $|M_{x_{t+1}}| = 1$, and $|M_{x_{t+2}}| = 3$.

In the case (a), $\mathcal{A}_9, \mathcal{B}_9, \mathcal{C}_9, \mathcal{D}_9, \mathcal{G}_9, \mathcal{H}_9, \mathcal{I}_9, \mathcal{J}_9$ are the only possibilities for $I_{x_{t+1}}$ (follows from theorem 5.2) and $I_{x_{t+2}} = \mathbb{F}_q$ (if $x_{t+2} \in R_{t+2}^*$) or $C_p(0)$ (if $x_{t+2} \notin R_{t+2}^*$), where p is a prime and q is some power of prime (see Part (v) of Lemma 2.3). Rewrite the Equation (13) in another equivalent form

$$\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} \leq \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{|I_{x_{t+1}}|}{|M_{x_{t+1}}|} \right)} \right) + \frac{1}{3}. \quad (14)$$

In this case, we have $|M_{x_{t+2}}| = 1, |M_{x_{t+1}}| = 3$, and $|I_{x_{t+1}}| = 9$. Equation 14 implies that the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if $|I_{x_{t+2}}| = 3$, equivalent to say, R satisfies the condition (v). In the case (b), we have $\frac{|I_{x_{t+2}}|}{|M_{x_{t+2}}|} = 3$. Therefore, Equation (6) implies $|I_{x_{t+1}}| = 3$. Again, the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if R satisfies the condition (v).

Case 2.2 $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 2$

In this case the Equation (7) reduce to

$$2 \left(\frac{|I_{x_s}|}{|M_{x_s}|} - 1 \right) \leq 2 \sqrt{2 \left(\frac{|I_{x_s}|}{|M_{x_s}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{|I_{x_{s-1}}|}{|M_{x_{s-1}}|} - 1 \right)} - 1. \quad (15)$$

As $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 2$, therefore there exist unique $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $|M_{x_j}| = 2$. By Part (vii) of Lemma 2.3 we get $|I_{x_j}| \leq 4$. Using the fact that M_{x_j} is a proper ideal of I_{x_j} , therefore we get $|I_{x_j}| = 4$. And so $\frac{|I_{x_j}|}{|M_{x_j}|} = 2$ implies $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. Without loss of generality assume that $j = 1$, and so $|M_{x_1}| = 2$ and $|M_{x_i}| = 1$ for all $i \in \{2 \dots s\}$. In Theorem 5.2, $\mathcal{A}_4, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{C}_4, \mathcal{D}_4, \mathcal{G}_4, \mathcal{H}_4, \mathcal{I}_4, \mathcal{J}_4$ are the only commutative rings of order 4 such that the cardinality of maximal ideal is 2. Hence

we have $I_{x_1} = \mathcal{A}_4, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{C}_4, \mathcal{D}_4, \mathcal{G}_4, \mathcal{H}_4, \mathcal{I}_4, \mathcal{J}_4$, $I_{x_i} = \mathbb{F}_2$ (if $x_i \in R_i^*$) or $C_2(0)$ (if $x_i \notin R_i^*$) for each $i \in \{2 \dots t\}$, and $I_{x_{t+1}} = \mathbb{F}_{q_1}$ (if $x_{t+1} \in R_{t+1}^*$) or $C_{p_1}(0)$ (if $x_{t+1} \notin R_{t+1}^*$), and $I_{x_{t+2}} = \mathbb{F}_{q_2}$ (if $x_{t+2} \in R_{t+2}^*$) or $C_{p_2}(0)$ (if $x_{t+2} \notin R_{t+2}^*$), where p_1 and p_2 are primes and q_1 and q_2 are prime powers. By equation (15), $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if it satisfies the following equation

$$2(|I_{x_{t+2}}| - 1) \leq 2\sqrt{2(|I_{x_{t+1}}| - 1)(|I_{x_{t+2}}| - 1) - 1},$$

which is equivalent to

$$|I_{x_{t+2}}| \leq |I_{x_{t+1}}| + \sqrt{|I_{x_{t+1}}|(|I_{x_{t+1}}| - 2)}.$$

Hence this gives condition (vi).

Case 2.3 $\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| = 1$

In this case, $I_{x_i} = \mathbb{F}_2$ (if $x_i \in R_i^*$) or $C_2(0)$ (if $x_i \notin R_i^*$) for each $i \in \{1 \dots t\}$, $I_{x_{t+1}} = \mathbb{F}_{q_1}$ (if $x_{t+1} \in R_{t+1}^*$) or $C_{p_1}(0)$ (if $x_{t+1} \notin R_{t+1}^*$), and $I_{x_{t+2}} = \mathbb{F}_{q_2}$ (if $x_{t+2} \in R_{t+2}^*$) or $C_{p_2}(0)$ (if $x_{t+2} \notin R_{t+2}^*$), where p_1 and p_2 are primes and q_1 and q_2 are prime powers. In this case $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if it satisfies equation (7), that is,

$$|I_{x_{t+2}}| - 1 \leq 2\sqrt{(|I_{x_{t+1}}| - 1)(|I_{x_{t+2}}| - 1) - 1},$$

which is equivalent to

$$|I_{x_{t+2}}| \leq 2 \left(|I_{x_{t+1}}| + \sqrt{|I_{x_{t+1}}|(|I_{x_{t+1}}| - 2)} \right) - 1.$$

Hence this gives condition (vii).

Case 3: $s = t + 1$

In this case Equation (7) reduce to

$$\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \leq 2 \sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{t+1} |M_{x_i}| \left(\frac{|I_{x_s}|}{|M_{x_s}|} - 1 \right) - 1},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\prod_{i=1}^s |M_{x_i}| \leq 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{|I_{x_s}|}{|M_{x_s}|} \left(\frac{|I_{x_s}|}{|M_{x_s}|} - 2 \right)} + \frac{|I_{x_s}|}{|M_{x_s}|} - 1 \right).$$

Hence $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ will be Ramanujan as given in (viii).

□

Corollary 5.3.1. *Let R be a local ring and x be a non-zero element of R . Then $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if one of the following holds:*

$$(i) \frac{I_x}{M_x} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } x \in R^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \text{ equivalent to say, } |I_x| = 2|M_x|.$$

$$(ii) |I_x| \geq \left(\frac{|M_x|}{2} + 1\right)^2.$$

Proof. Take $s = 1$ in Theorem 5.3. Therefore, $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if either condition (i) or condition (viii) of Theorem 5.3 holds. The proof follows from the fact that condition (viii) of Theorem 5.3 is equivalent to $|I_x| \geq \left(\frac{|M_x|}{2} + 1\right)^2$. \square

Let R be a finite commutative ring, x be a non-zero element of R , and $P = \{i : i \in \{1, \dots, s\} \text{ and } x_i \neq \mathbf{0}\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $P = \{h_1, \dots, h_r\}$ with $h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_r$. Define $R' := R_{h_1} \times \dots \times R_{h_r}$ and $y := (x_{h_1}, \dots, x_{h_r})$. Since if $i \notin P$ then the $(0, 1)$ -adjacency matrix of $\text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)$ is the identity matrix, by Theorem 3.6 both graphs $\otimes_{i=1}^s \text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)$ and $\otimes_{i \in P} \text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)$ have same set of eigenvalues, but their multiplicities may be different. By Theorem 3.1, both graphs $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ and $\otimes_{i=1}^s \text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)$ are isomorphic. Again, using Theorem 3.1, both graphs $\text{Cay}(R', yR'^*)$ and $\otimes_{i \in P} \text{Cay}(R_i, x_i R_i^*)$ are isomorphic. Hence both graphs $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ and $\text{Cay}(R', yR'^*)$ have same set of eigenvalues, but their multiplicities may be different. Using the fact that $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if $\text{Cay}(R', yR'^*)$ is Ramanujan, we conclude the following result.

Theorem 5.4. *Let R be a finite commutative ring and x be a non-zero element of R . Then $\text{Cay}(R, xR^*)$ is Ramanujan if and only if one of the following holds;*

$$(i) \frac{I_{y_i}}{M_{y_i}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r.$$

$$(ii) I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r-3 \text{ and } I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_3 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_3(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = r-2, r-1, r.$$

$$(iii) I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r-3 \text{ and } I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_3 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_3(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = r-2, r-1 \text{ and } I_{y_r} = \mathbb{F}_4.$$

$$(iv) I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r-3 \text{ and } I_{y_i} = \mathbb{F}_4 \text{ for } i = r-2, r-1, r.$$

$$(v) I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r-2 \text{ and } I_{y_{r-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_3 & \text{if } y_{r-1} \in R_{r-1}^* \\ C_3(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \text{and } I_{y_r} = \mathcal{A}_9, \mathcal{B}_9, \mathcal{C}_9, \mathcal{D}_9, \mathcal{G}_9, \mathcal{H}_9, \mathcal{I}_9, \mathcal{J}_9.$$

$$(vi) I_{y_1} = \mathcal{A}_4, \mathcal{B}_4, \mathcal{C}_4, \mathcal{D}_4, \mathcal{G}_4, \mathcal{H}_4, \mathcal{I}_4, \mathcal{J}_4, \text{ and } I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 2, \dots, r-2, \\ \text{and } I_{y_{r-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_1} & \text{if } y_{r-1} \in R_{r-1}^* \\ C_{p_1}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, I_{y_r} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_2} & \text{if } y_r \in R_r^* \\ C_{p_2}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \text{ where } p_1 \text{ and } p_2 \\ \text{are primes and } q_1 \text{ and } q_2 \text{ are prime powers such that}$$

$$3 \leq |I_{y_{r-1}}| \leq |I_{y_r}| \leq |I_{y_{r-1}}| + \sqrt{|I_{y_{r-1}}| (|I_{y_{r-1}}| - 2)}.$$

$$(vii) I_{y_i} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r-2, \text{ and } I_{y_{r-1}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_1} & \text{if } y_{r-1} \in R_{r-1}^* \\ C_{p_1}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \\ I_{y_r} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q_2} & \text{if } y_r \in R_r^* \\ C_{p_2}(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \text{ where } p_1 \text{ and } p_2 \text{ are primes and } q_1 \text{ and } q_2 \text{ are prime powers} \\ \text{such that}$$

$$3 \leq |I_{y_{r-1}}| \leq |I_{y_r}| \leq 2 \left(|I_{y_{r-1}}| + \sqrt{|I_{y_{r-1}}| (|I_{y_{r-1}}| - 2)} \right) - 1.$$

$$(viii) \frac{I_{y_i}}{M_{y_i}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_2 & \text{if } y_i \in R_i^* \\ C_2(0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r-1 \text{ and } \frac{I_{y_r}}{M_{y_r}} = S, \text{ where } S \text{ is a commutative} \\ \text{ring such that } |S| = e \geq 3 \text{ and}$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^r |M_{y_i}| \leq 2 \left(e - 1 + \sqrt{(e-2)e} \right).$$

where y_i for $i = 1, \dots, r$ is defined as above.

Proof. Proof follows from previous theorem. □

References

- [1] M. Atiyah. *Introduction to commutative algebra*. CRC Press, 2018.

- [2] G. P. Davidoff, P. Sarnak, and A. Valette. *Elementary number theory, group theory, and Ramanujan graphs*, volume 55. Cambridge university press Cambridge, 2003.
- [3] A. Droll. A classification of ramanujan unitary cayley graphs. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, pages N29–N29, 2010.
- [4] B. Fine. Classification of finite rings of order p^2 . *Mathematics Magazine*, pages 248–252, 1993.
- [5] N. Ganesan. Properties of rings with a finite number of zero divisors. *Mathematische Annalen*, 157(3):215–218, 1964.
- [6] C. Godsil and G. Royle. *Algebraic graph theory*, volume 207. Springer Science & Business Media, 2001.
- [7] I. Gutman. The energy of a graph. In *Ber. Math.-Statist. Sect. Forsch. Graz, (100-105):Ber. No. 103, 22, 1978. 10. Steiermärkisches Mathematisches Symposium (Stift Rein, Graz, 1978)*.
- [8] I. Gutman. The energy of a graph: old and new results. In *Algebraic Combinatorics and Applications: Proceedings of the Euroconference, Algebraic Combinatorics and Applications (ALCOMA), held in Gößweinstein, Germany, September 12–19, 1999*, pages 196–211. Springer.
- [9] A. Ilić. The energy of unitary cayley graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 431(10):1881–1889, 2009.
- [10] D. Kiani, M. M. H. Aghaei, Y. Meemark, and B. Suntornpoch. Energy of unitary cayley graphs and gcd-graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 435(6):1336–1343, 2011.
- [11] X. Liu and S. Zhou. Spectral properties of unitary cayley graphs of finite commutative rings. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 19(4):P13, 2012.
- [12] X. Liu and S. Zhou. Eigenvalues of cayley graphs. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, pages P2–9, 2022.
- [13] M. R. Murty. Ramanujan graphs: An introduction. *Indian Journal Discret. Math*, 6:91–127, 2020.

- [14] D. B. West. *Introduction to graph theory*, Volume 2. Upper Saddle River, Prentice hal 2001.