

The extended zero-divisor graphs of the amalgamated duplication of a ring along an ideal

Brahim El Alaoui^{1,a}, and Raja L'hamri^{1,b}

¹ Faculty of Sciences, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Morocco.

^a brahim.elalaoui2@um5.ac.ma; brahimelalaoui0019@gmail.com;

^b raja.lhamri@um5r.ac.ma; rajaaalhamri@gmail.com

Abstract. Let R be a commutative ring and I be an ideal of R . The amalgamated duplication of R along I is the subring $R \bowtie I := \{(r, r + i) | r \in R, i \in I\}$ of $R \times R$. This paper investigates the extended zero-divisor graph of the amalgamated duplication of R along I . The purpose of this work is to study when $\overline{\Gamma}(R \bowtie I)$ and $\Gamma(R \bowtie I)$ coincide, to characterize when $\overline{\Gamma}(R \bowtie I)$ is complete, and to compute the diameter and the girth of $\overline{\Gamma}(R \bowtie I)$.

Keywords and phrases: Extended zero-divisor graphs, zero-divisor graphs, commutative rings, amalgamated duplication.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification : 13A70, 05C25.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper we will assume that R is a commutative ring with identity $1 \neq 0$ and $Z(R)$ is the set of zero-divisors of R . The idea of associating a graph with a commutative ring goes back to Beck [4], where he was mainly interested in colorings. In his work, the vertices of the graph were all elements of the ring. In [1], Anderson and Livingston introduced the zero-divisor graph, denoted $\Gamma(R)$, of R , which is a simple graph with vertices $Z(R)^* := Z(R) \setminus \{0\}$, the set of non-zero zero-divisors of R , and for distinct $x, y \in Z(R)^*$, the vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $xy = 0$. They began to study the relationship between ring-theoretic and graph-theoretic properties. In [5], Bennis et

al. gave an extension of the classical zero-divisor graph by introducing the extended zero-divisor graph, denoted by $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$, of R , which is a simple graph with the same vertex set as in the classical zero-divisor graph $\Gamma(R)$, and two different vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $x^n y^m = 0$ with $x^n \neq 0$ and $y^m \neq 0$ for some integer $n, m \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

For a better understanding of the concept of zero-divisor graphs, several authors have been interested in studying zero-divisor graphs of certain ring constructions (see for example [2, 3, 6, 9]). In this paper, we are interested in studying the extended zero-divisor graph of the amalgamated duplication of a ring along an ideal. Recall that the amalgamated duplication of R along I is the subring $R \bowtie I := \{(r, r + i) | r \in R, i \in I\}$ of $R \times R$. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we study when the extended zero-divisor graph and the classical zero-divisor graph of the amalgamated duplication of a ring R along an ideal I coincide. In Section 3, we characterize when the extended zero-divisor graph of $R \bowtie I$ is complete. We also study the diameter and the girth of $\bar{\Gamma}(R \bowtie I)$.

Let us fix some definitions used throughout this paper. Let x be an element of R , the annihilator of x is defined as $\text{Ann}(x) := \{y \in R | xy = 0\}$. For an ideal I of R , \sqrt{I} means the radical of I . An element x of R is called nilpotent if $x^n = 0$ for some positive integers n . The set of all nilpotent elements is denoted by $\text{Nil}(R) := \sqrt{0}$. A ring R is said to be reduced if $\text{Nil}(R) = \{0\}$. The ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ of residues modulo an integer n is denoted by \mathbb{Z}_n . For a subset X of R , we denote $X^* = X \setminus \{0\}$. The set of zero divisors of $R \bowtie I$ is defined as $Z(R \bowtie I) := T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \cup T_4$ where $T_1 = \{(0, i) | i \in I\}$, $T_2 = \{(i, 0) | i \in I\}$, $T_3 = \{(r, r + i) | r \in Z(R) \setminus \{0\}, i \in I\}$ and $T_4 = \{(r, r + i) | r \in R \setminus Z(R), j(r + i) = 0 \text{ for some } j \in I \setminus \{0\}\}$.

Now let us recall some basic notions of graph theory used in this paper. For a more general background on graph theory, we refer the reader to [7, 8]. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple (undirected) graph. The graph G is said to be connected if there is a path between any two distinct vertices. Namely, if for each pair of distinct vertices u and v there exists a finite sequence of distinct vertices $u = v_1, \dots, v_n = v$ such that each pair $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ is an edge. The length of such a path is $n - 1$ (i.e. the number of edges between u and v). For two different vertices u and v in G , the distance between u and v , denoted by $d(u, v)$, is the length of the shortest path connecting u and v , and if no such path exists, we set $d(u, v) = \infty$. The diameter of G is the supremum of the distance between vertices. Namely, the diameter of G is the quantity $\text{diam}(G) := \sup\{d(u, v) | u, v \in V\}$. A cycle is a path of length $n \geq 3$ that starts and ends at the same vertex. Namely, it is a path of the form $v_1 - v_2 - \dots - v_n - v_1$, where $v_i \neq v_j$ if $i \neq j$ for some $n \geq 3$. The girth of G , denoted by $\text{girth}(G)$, is the length of a shortest cycle in G if G contains a cycle. But if G does not contain a cycle, then the girth is infinite (i.e., $\text{girth}(G) = \infty$). The graph

G is said to be complete if for every two distinct vertices u and v in V , $u-v$ is an edge in E .

2 When $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) = \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$?

In this section we study when $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ and $\Gamma(R \rtimes I)$ coincide. In the general case, it was proved in [5] that $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$ if and only if every nonzero nilpotent element has index 2 (if $\text{Nil}(R) \neq \{0\}$) and $\text{Ann}(x) = \text{Ann}(x^2)$ for every $x \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$. We give the following lemma which allows us to prove the first main result of this section.

Lemma 2.1 *Let R be a ring and I be an ideal of R such that $I \subseteq Z(R)$ and $\Gamma(R) = \bar{\Gamma}(R)$. Then, $\forall r \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$, $\forall i \in I \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$; if $r+i \in \text{Nil}(R)$, then $\text{Ann}(r) \subseteq \text{Ann}(i)$.*

Proof. Let $r \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$ and $i \in I \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$ such that $r+i \in \text{Nil}(R)$. Let $\alpha \in \text{Ann}(r)$, then $\alpha r = 0$. Or, $(r+i)^2 = r^2 + 2ri + i^2 = 0$ (since $\Gamma(R) = \bar{\Gamma}(R)$). Thus, $\alpha i^2 = 0$ and so $\alpha \in \text{Ann}(i^2) = \text{Ann}(i)$. ■

The converse of Lemma 2.1 does not hold in general. So, to prove this we give the following counterexample.

Example 2.2 *Consider the ring $R \rtimes I = \mathbb{Z}_2[X, Y] / \langle X^3, X^2Y \rangle \rtimes \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y} \rangle$. Then, $I = Z(R) = \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y} \rangle$ and $\Gamma(R) \neq \bar{\Gamma}(R)$ since \bar{X} and \bar{Y} are adjacent in $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$ but not in $\Gamma(R)$. By a simple calculus we can easily prove that the necessary condition of Lemma 2.1 holds.*

Theorem 2.3 *Let R be a ring and I be an ideal of R such that $I \setminus \text{Nil}(R) \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) = \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$ if and only if the following assertions hold:*

1. $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$.
2. $I \subseteq \text{Ann}(\text{Nil}(R))$.

Proof. \Rightarrow Suppose that $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) = \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$. Let $r \in \text{Nil}(R)$, then $(r, r) \in \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$. Thus, $(r, r)^2 = 0$, by [5, Theorem 2.1]. Then, every nilpotent element in R has index 2. Now, let $r \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$ and $s \in \text{Ann}(r^2)$. Then, $sr^2 = 0$. Thus, $(s, s), (r, r) \in Z(R \rtimes I)$ and $(s, s)(r, r)^2 = 0$. Then, $(s, s) \in \text{Ann}((r, r)^2) = \text{Ann}((r, r))$, by [5, Theorem 2.1]. Then, $s \in \text{Ann}(r)$. Hence, (1) holds.

Next, let $i \in I$ and $r \in \text{Nil}(R)$. Let $j \in I \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$. Then, $(r, r+j) \in Z(R \rtimes I) \setminus \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$ (since $r+j \notin \text{Nil}(R)$). Since $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) = \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$, $\text{Ann}((r, r+j)^2) = \text{Ann}((r, r+j))$. Thus, $(i, 0) \in \text{Ann}((r, r+j)^2) = \text{Ann}((r, r+j))$ and so $ir = 0$.

\Leftarrow) To prove that $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) = \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$, it is sufficient to prove that every nonzero nilpotent element in $R \rtimes I$ has index 2 and for every $(r, r+i) \in Z(R \rtimes I) \setminus \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$, $\text{Ann}(r, r+i) = \text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2)$. Then, first, let $(r, r+i) \in \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I) = \text{Nil}(R) \rtimes (\text{Nil}(R) \cap I)$, then $(r, r+i)^2 = (r^2, (r+i)^2) = 0$ (Since $r, i \in \text{Nil}(R)$ and (1) holds). Now, let $(r, r+i) \in Z(R \rtimes I) \setminus \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$, we have the following cases:

Case 1. $(r, r+i) = (0, i) \in T_1$. If $i \in I \setminus Z(R)$, then it is clear that $\text{Ann}((0, i)) = \text{Ann}((0, i)^2)$. If $i \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$, then $\text{Ann}((0, i)^2) = \{(s, s+j) \in R \rtimes I \mid (s+j)i^2 = 0\} = \{(s, s+j) \in R \rtimes I \mid (s+j)i = 0\} = \text{Ann}((0, i))$ (since $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$).

Case 2. $(r, r+i) \in T_2$. Similar to *Case 1*.

Case 3. $(r, r+i) \in T_3 \setminus \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$. Then, we have following three sub-cases:

Sub-case 1. $r \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$ and $i \in I \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$. If $r+i \notin \text{Nil}(R)$, then $\text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2) = \{(s, s+j) \in R \rtimes I \mid sr^2 = 0 \text{ and } (s+j)(r+i)^2 = 0\} = \{(s, s+j) \in R \rtimes I \mid sr = 0 \text{ and } (s+j)(r+i) = 0\} = \text{Ann}((r, r+i))$ (since $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$). If $r+i \in \text{Nil}(R)$, then $(s, s+j) \in \text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2)$ implies that $sr^2 = 0$ and so $sr = 0$, by (1). Then, by (2) and Lemma 2.1, $(r+i)(s+j) = 0$ which implies that $(s, s+j) \in \text{Ann}((r, r+i))$.

Sub-case 2. $r \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$ and $i \in I \cap \text{Nil}(R)$. Then, $r+i \notin \text{Nil}(R)$ and so $\text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2) = \text{Ann}((r, r+i))$ (see *Sub-case 1*).

Sub-case 3. $r \in \text{Nil}(R)^*$ and $i \in I \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$. Let $(s, s+j) \in \text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2)$, then $(s+j)(r+i)^2 = 0$ and so $(s+j)(r+i) = 0$ (since $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$). If $r+i \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$, then $r+i+(-i) = r \in \text{Nil}(R)$ and so by (2) and Lemma 2.1, $rs = (r+i+(-i))(s+j+(-j)) = 0$. Hence, $(s, s+j) \in \text{Ann}((r, r+i))$. If $r+i \notin Z(R)$, then $\text{Ann}((r, r+i)) = \{(s, 0) \in R \rtimes I \mid sr = 0, s \in I\} = \{(s, 0) \in R \rtimes I \mid s \in I\} = \text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2)$, by the statements (2) and Lemma 2.1.

Case 4. $(r, r+i) \in T_4$. If $r+i \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$. Then, $\text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2) = \{(0, j) \in R \rtimes I \mid j(r+i)^2 = 0\} = \{(0, j) \in R \rtimes I \mid j(r+i) = 0\} = \text{Ann}((r, r+i))$, by (1). If $r+i \in \text{Nil}(R)$, then $\text{Ann}((r, r+i)^2) = \text{Ann}(r^2, 0) = \{(0, j) \in R \rtimes I \mid j \in I\} = \{(0, j) \in R \rtimes I \mid j(r+i) = 0\} = \text{Ann}((r, r+i))$, by the statements (2) and Lemma 2.1. \blacksquare

In the following, we give an example that verifies the statements of Theorem 3.2.

Example 2.4 Consider the ring $R \rtimes I = \mathbb{R}[X, Y] / \langle X^2, XY \rangle \rtimes \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y} \rangle$. We have $Z(R) = \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y} \rangle = I$ and $\text{Nil}(R) = \langle \bar{X} \rangle$. It is easy to see that the statement (2) of Theorem 2.3 holds. Also, the statements (1) of Theorem 2.3 holds. Indeed; Let

$r \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$ and $s \in \text{Ann}(r^2)$, then $sr^2 = 0$. Thus, $s \in \langle \bar{X} \rangle$ and so $rs = 0$. Then, $s \in \text{Ann}(r)$. Since every nilpotent element has index 2, $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$ by [5, Theorem 2.1].

To show that the two statements (1) and (2) of Theorem 2.3 are independent, we give the following examples.

Example 2.5 Consider the ring $R = \mathbb{R}[X, Y]/\langle X^2 \rangle$ and the ideal $I = \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y} \rangle$. Then, $I \setminus \text{Nil}(R) \neq \emptyset$, and the statement (1) holds since $Z(R) = \text{Nil}(R) = \langle \bar{X} \rangle$ and every non-zero nilpotent element has index 2. But, the statement (2) does not hold since $\bar{X}\bar{Y} \neq \bar{0}$. On the other hand, the vertices $(\bar{X}, \bar{X} + \bar{Y})$ and $(\bar{Y}, \bar{0})$ are not adjacent in $\Gamma(\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/\langle X^2 \rangle \rtimes \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y} \rangle)$, but they are adjacent in $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{R}[X, Y]/\langle X^2 \rangle \rtimes \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y} \rangle)$ (since $(\bar{X}, \bar{X} + \bar{Y})^2(\bar{Y}, \bar{0}) = (\bar{0}, \bar{0})$ and $(\bar{X}, \bar{X} + \bar{Y})(\bar{Y}, \bar{0}) \neq (\bar{0}, \bar{0})$). Thus, $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) \neq \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$.

Example 2.6 Consider the ring $R = \mathbb{Z}_{12}$ and the ideal $I = \langle \bar{2} \rangle$. Then, $Z(R) = \langle \bar{2}, \bar{3} \rangle$, $\text{Nil}(R) = \langle \bar{6} \rangle$ and $I = \text{Ann}(\text{Nil}(R))$. But, $\Gamma(R) \neq \bar{\Gamma}(R)$ since $\bar{2}$ is adjacent to $\bar{3}$ in $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$, but not in $\Gamma(R)$.

Note that the ring $R \rtimes I$ is isomorphic to the idealization $R \times I$ if and only if I is a nilpotent ideal of index 2 in R . Then, if $I^2 = 0$, $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) = \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$ if and only if $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$. Indeed, assuming that $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$, then by [5, Theorem 2.1], every non-zero nilpotent in R is of index 2, and for every $x \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$, $\text{Ann}(x) = \text{Ann}(x^2)$. Thus, we can easily deduce that the conditions (1) and (4) of [6, Theorem 2.1] hold. For the condition (3) of [6, Theorem 2.1], suppose by contrast that there exists $y \in \text{Ann}(a)$ for some $a \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$, but $yi \neq 0$ for some $i \in I$. Then, $a + i \in Z(R) \setminus \text{Nil}(R)$, since $yi(a + i) = 0$ and $I^2 = 0$. On the other hand, we have $y(a + i) = yi \neq 0$ and $y(a + i)^2 = 0$, so $\text{Ann}(a + i) \neq \text{Ann}((a + i)^2)$, a contradiction.

For the more general case. Namely, for the case when $I \subseteq \text{Nil}(R)$, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.7 Let R be a ring and $I \subseteq \text{Nil}(R)$ be an ideal of R . Then, $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I) = \Gamma(R \rtimes I)$ if and only if $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$.


Proof. \Rightarrow) Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.3.

\Leftarrow) Assume that $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$. Let $(r, r + i) \in \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$, then $r, r + i \in \text{Nil}(R)$. Then, $(r, r + i)^2 = (r^2, (r + i)^2) = (0, 0)$. Now, let $(r, r + i) \in Z(R \rtimes I) \setminus \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$. Let $(s, s + j) \in \text{Ann}((r, r + i)^2)$, then $r^2s = 0$ and $(r + i)^2(s + j) = 0$. Thus, $sr = 0$ and $(s + j)(r + i) = 0$ since $r, r + i \notin \text{Nil}(R)$ and $\bar{\Gamma}(R) = \Gamma(R)$. Then, $(s, s + j) \in \text{Ann}((r, r + i))$.

■

In the following we give an illustrated example of Theorem 2.7.

Example 2.8 Consider the ring $R \rtimes I = \mathbb{Z}_8 \rtimes \{\bar{0}, \bar{4}\}$. Then, the illustrated zero-divisor and extended zero-divisor graphs of $R \rtimes I$ are as follows.



We have $I \subseteq \text{Nil}(R)$, $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{Z}_8) \neq \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_8)$ (see the red induced subgraphs) and $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{Z}_8 \rtimes \{\bar{0}, \bar{4}\}) \neq \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_8 \rtimes \{\bar{0}, \bar{4}\})$.

3 The diameter and the girth of $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$

In this section, we study the diameter and the girth of the extended zero-divisor graph of the amalgamated duplication $R \rtimes I$. It was shown in [5, Theorem 3.1], that for any commutative ring R , the diameter of $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$ is at most 3. So, in the following we will study when $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 1$ (i.e, $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is complete), $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 2$ and $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 3$ (see Theorem 3.2, and Propositions 3.8 and 3.6). We start with the following lemma, which we will need to characterize when $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is complete.

Lemma 3.1 Let R be a ring and I be a non-zero ideal of R . Then, the following two statements are equivalent:

1. $Z(R \rtimes I) = \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$ and for every $a, b \in Z(R \rtimes I)$, $a^{n_a-1}b^{n_b-1} = 0$.
2. $Z(R) = \text{Nil}(R)$, $I \subseteq Z(R)$ and for every $x, y \in Z(R)$, $x^{n_x-1}y^{n_y-1} = 0$.

Proof. \Leftarrow $\text{Nil}(R \rtimes I) = \text{Nil}(R) \rtimes (\text{Nil}(R) \cap I) = Z(R) \rtimes (Z(R) \cap I) = Z(R) \rtimes I$ (since $I \subseteq Z(R)$). Since $I \subseteq \text{Nil}(R)$, $T_4 = \emptyset$. Thus, $\text{Nil}(R \rtimes I) = Z(R) \rtimes I = Z(R \rtimes I)$. Let $a = (r, r + i), b = (s, s + j) \in Z(R \rtimes I)$, we have $a^{n_a-1}b^{n_b-1} = (r, r + i)^{n_a-1}(s, s +$

$j)^{n_b-1} = (r^{n_a-1}s^{n_b-1}, (r+i)^{n_a-1}(s+j)^{n_b-1})$. Since $n_r \leq n_a$ and $n_s \leq n_b$, $r^{n_a-1}s^{n_b-1} = r^{n_a-n_r}s^{n_b-n_s}r^{n_r-1}s^{n_s-1} = 0$ (by (2)). Similarly, $(r+i)^{n_a-1}(s+j)^{n_b-1} = 0$.

\Rightarrow) Let $r \in Z(R)$, then $(r, r) \in Z(R \rtimes I) = \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$. Then, $r \in \text{Nil}(R)$. Thus, $Z(R) = \text{Nil}(R)$. Next, let $r \in I$, then $(i, 0) \in Z(R \rtimes I) = \text{Nil}(R \rtimes I)$. Thus, $i \in \text{Nil}(R) = Z(R)$. Then, $I \subseteq Z(R)$. Now, let $x, y \in Z(R)$, then $(x, x), (y, y) \in Z(R \rtimes I)$. Thus, $(x, x)^{n_x-1}(y, y)^{n_y-1} = 0$ ($n_{(x,x)} = n_x$ and $n_{(y,y)} = n_y$). Then, $x^{n_x-1}y^{n_y-1} = 0$. ■

Note that in the case where R is an integral domain, if $|I| = 2$, then the extended zero-divisor graph of $R \rtimes I$ is just an edge, but if $|I| \geq 3$, then $Z(R \rtimes I) = T_1 \cup T_2$ and so $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is a complete bipartite graph (and then $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 2$). In the following theorem, we treat the case where R is not an integral domain.

Theorem 3.2 *Let R be a ring that is not an integral domain and I be a non-zero ideal of R . The following two assertions are equivalent.*

1. $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is complete.
2. $Z(R) = \text{Nil}(R)$, $I \subseteq Z(R)$ and for every $x, y \in Z(R)$, $x^{n_x-1}y^{n_y-1} = 0$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). Assume that $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is complete. Then, $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$ is complete since $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$ is an induced subgraph of $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$. Thus, by [5, Theorem 3.3], $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ or $Z(R) = \text{Nil}(R)$ and for every $x, y \in Z(R)$, $x^{n_x-1}y^{n_y-1} = 0$. Suppose that $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then, $Z(R)^* = \{x := (0, 1), y := (1, 0)\}$. We have $1 = x + y$. Then, for every $0 \neq i \in I$, $i = ix + iy$ and so either $ix \neq 0$ or $iy \neq 0$. Let say $ix \neq 0$, then $(x, x), (0, ix) \in Z(R \rtimes I)^*$. Thus, (x, x) and $(0, ix)$ are adjacent in $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ (since $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is complete). Let $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be the smallest positive integer such that $(x, x)^t(0, ix)^s = 0$ with $(x, x)^t \neq 0$ and $(0, ix)^s \neq 0$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then, $i^s x^{t+s} = 0$. Since $i = ix + iy$, $i^s x^{s+t-1} = (ix + iy)i^{s-1}x^{s+t-1} = i^s x^{s+t} + i^s y x^{s+t-1} = i^s x^{s+t} = 0$. Thus, $(x, x)^{t-1}(0, ix)^s = 0$ with $(x, x)^{t-1} \neq 0$ and $(0, ix)^s \neq 0$, a contradiction with the fact that t is the smallest positive integer. Hence, $Z(R) = \text{Nil}(R)$ and for every $x, y \in R$, $x^{n_x-1}y^{n_y-1} = 0$. Next, let $0 \neq i \in I$. If $|I| \geq 3$, then for every $i \neq j \in I^*$, $(0, i), (0, j) \in Z(R \rtimes I)^*$. Then, $(0, i)$ and $(0, j)$ are adjacent in $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be the smallest positive integer such that $(0, i)^n(0, j)^m = 0$ with $(0, i)^n \neq 0$ and $(0, j)^m \neq 0$. Thus, $(j, i)(0, i^{n-1}j^m) = 0$ and so $(j, i) \in Z(R \rtimes I)^*$. Then, $(j, i)^\alpha(0, i)^\beta = 0$ with $(j, i)^\alpha \neq 0$ and $(0, i)^\beta \neq 0$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Thus, $i^{\alpha+\beta} = 0$ and so $i \in Z(R)$. Now, if $|I| = 2$, then $i^2 = 0$, otherwise $i^2 = i$ and so $i(i-1) = 0$. Then, $i-1 \in Z(R)^*$. Thus, $(1-i, 1) \in Z(R \rtimes I)^*$. Then, for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $(0, 0) = (1-i, 1)^\alpha(0, i) = (0, i)$, a contradiction. Hence, $i \in Z(R)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). It follows from Lemma 3.1. ■

For example, one can consider $\mathbb{Z}_8 \rtimes \langle \bar{4} \rangle$, $\mathbb{Z}_{p^n} \rtimes \langle p \rangle$, and $\mathbb{R}[X]/\langle X^n \rangle \rtimes \langle \bar{X} \rangle$ to get an example of a ring $R \rtimes I$ that satisfies the assertions of Theorem 3.2.

We have the following corollary as a simple consequence of Theorem 3.2.

Corollary 3.3 *Let R be a ring that is not an integral domain and I be a non-zero ideal of R such that $R \not\cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then, $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is complete if and only if $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$ is complete and $I \subseteq Z(R)$.*

The following example shows that the condition $I \subseteq Z(R)$ in Theorem 3.2 and in Corollary 3.3 can not be omitted (see also Example 2.5).

Example 3.4 *Let $n \geq 2$ be a positive integer and p be a prime number. Consider the ring $R \rtimes I := \mathbb{Z}_{p^n} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_{p^n}$. Then, $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n})$ is complete but $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_{p^n})$ is not complete since $(1, 0)$ is not adjacent to $(p, 0)$.*

Now, we give an example that shows that the condition $Z(R) = \text{Nil}(R)$ in Theorem 3.2 (in particular the condition $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$ is complete in Corollary 3.3) can not be omitted.

Example 3.5 *Let n be a positive integer and p be a prime number. Consider the ring $R \rtimes I := \mathbb{Z}_{p^n q} \rtimes \langle p \rangle$. We have $\langle p \rangle \subseteq Z(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n q})$ but $Z(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n q}) \neq \text{Nil}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n q})$ (in particular $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n q})$ is not complete). On the other hand, $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n q} \rtimes \langle p \rangle)$ is not complete (since, for example, $(pq, 0)$ and (q, q) are not adjacent in $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathbb{Z}_{p^n q} \rtimes \langle p \rangle)$).*

In [9, Proposition 4.11], it was shown that $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R \rtimes I)) = 3$ once $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R)) = 3$. In the following proposition, we give a similar result for the extended zero-divisor graph.

Proposition 3.6 *Let R be a ring and I be an ideal of R . If $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R)) = 3$ then, $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 3$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) < 3$. Then, $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 2$. Let $x, y \in Z(R) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $d(x, y) = 3$. Thus, $(x, x), (y, y) \in Z(R \rtimes I) \setminus \{0\}$ and (x, x) and (y, y) are not adjacent in $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$. Thus, $d((x, x), (y, y)) = 2$. Then, there exists $(r, r+i) \in Z(R \rtimes I) \setminus \{0\}$ that is adjacent to both (x, x) and (y, y) . Thus, $(r, r+i)^n (x, x)^\alpha = (r, r+i)^n (y, y)^\beta = 0$ with $(r, r+i)^n \neq 0$, $(x, x)^\alpha \neq 0$ and $(y, y)^\beta \neq 0$ for some positive integers $n, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^*$. If $r^n \neq 0$, then r is adjacent to both x and y in $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$ and so $d(x, y) = 2$, a contradiction. Otherwise, $(r+i)^n \neq 0$ and so $r+i$ is adjacent to both x and y in $\bar{\Gamma}(R)$, then $d(x, y) = 2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 3$. ■

The following example shows that the converse of Proposition 3.6 is not always true.

Example 3.7 *Consider the ring $R := \mathbb{Z}_2[X, Y, Z] / \langle X^3, XY \rangle$ with the ideal $I := \langle \bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{Z} \rangle$. Then, $d((\bar{Z}, \bar{Z} + (\bar{Y} + \bar{Z})), (\bar{0}, \bar{Z})) = 3$. This implies that $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 3$. But $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}(R)) = 2 \neq 3$.*

In the following result, we characterize when the diameter of $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is equal to 2 under some assumptions. Let us, first, say that a graph G has *Condition A* if every edge of G is a part of a triangle. Namely, for every $u, v \in V(G)$ such that $u - v \in E(G)$, there exists a vertex of G that is adjacent to both u and v .

Proposition 3.8 *Let R be a ring and I be an ideal of R such that $I \subseteq Z(R)$ and $Z(R)$ is an ideal of R . If $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$ and $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ has Condition A, then $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 2$.*

Proof. Since $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$ and $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ is an induced subgraph of $\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$, $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) \geq 2$. Then, let $(x, x+i) \neq (y, y+j) \in Z(R \rtimes I)^*$ be two non-adjacent vertices in $\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$. We have the following cases:

Case 1. $x = y = 0$. Then, for every $k \in I^*$, $(k, 0)$ is adjacent to both $(0, i)$ and $(0, j)$. Thus, $d((0, i), (0, j)) = 2$.

Case 2. $x \neq 0$ and $y = 0$. Then, $x \in Z(R)^*$ (since $Z(R)$ is an ideal and $I \subseteq Z(R)$). Thus, there exists $0 \neq z \in \text{Ann}(x)$. If there exists $k \in I$ such that $zk \neq 0$, then $(zk, 0)$ is adjacent to both $(x, x+i)$ and $(0, j)$. Otherwise (i.e, for every $k \in I$, $zk = 0$), (z, z) is adjacent to both $(x, x+i)$ and $(0, j)$. Thus, $d((x, x+i), (0, j)) = 2$.

Case 3. $x \neq 0$ and $y \neq 0$. Then, $x, y \in Z(R)^*$ (since $Z(R)$ is an ideal and $I \subseteq Z(R)$). If x and y are not adjacent in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$, then there exists $z \in Z(R)^*$ such that z is adjacent to both x and y (since $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$). Then, $z^\alpha x^n = z^\alpha y^m = 0$ with $z^\alpha \neq 0$, $x^n \neq 0$ and $y^m \neq 0$ for some positive integers $\alpha, n, m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. If $z^\alpha k \neq 0$ for some $k \in I$, then $(z^\alpha k, 0)$ is adjacent to both $(x, x+i)$ and $(y, y+j)$. Otherwise (i.e, $z^\alpha k = 0$ for every $k \in I$), (z, z) is adjacent to both $(x, x+i)$ and $(y, y+j)$. Thus, $d((x, x+i), (y, y+j)) = 2$. Now, if x and y are adjacent in $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$, then there exists $z \in Z(R)^*$ that is adjacent to both x and y (since $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ has Condition A). Thus, $z^\alpha x^n = z^\alpha y^m = 0$ with $z^\alpha \neq 0$, $x^n \neq 0$ and $y^m \neq 0$ for some $\alpha, n, m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then, by the same argument as above, we prove that $d((x, x+i), (y, y+i)) = 2$. Therefore, $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 2$. ■

The following example shows that the two conditions $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$ and $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ has Condition A, are independent.

Example 3.9 *Consider the rings $R := \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_q$ and $S := \mathbb{Z}_{p^n}$, where p and q are two prime numbers and $n \geq 2$ be a positive integer. Then, $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$, but $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ does not verify Condition A. And, $\overline{\Gamma}(S)$ has Condition A, but $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(S)) = 1$.*

As an example of a ring R such that $\text{diam}(\overline{\Gamma}(R)) = 2$ and $\overline{\Gamma}(R)$ has Condition A, we can consider the ring $R = \mathbb{R}[X, Y, Z] / \langle XY, XZ, YZ, X^3 \rangle$.

Now, we will characterize the girth of $\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$. In the case where R is an integral domain, if $|I| = 2$ then $\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is an edge, and so $\text{girth}(\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = \infty$. If $|I| \geq 3$, then $Z(R \rtimes I) = T_1 \cup T_2$. Thus, $\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$ is a complete bipartite graph and hence $\text{girth}(\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 4$. In the following theorem, we consider only the case where R is not an integral domain.

Theorem 3.10 *Let R be a ring and I be a non-zero ideal of R . If R is not an integral domain, then $\text{girth}(\overline{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 3$.*

Proof. Suppose that R is not an integral domain. Since the classical zero-divisor graph $\Gamma(R \rtimes I)$ is a subgraph of $\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)$, $girth(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) \leq girth(\Gamma(R \rtimes I))$. On the other hand, the girth of $\Gamma(R \rtimes I)$ is 3, by [9, Proposition 3.1]. Thus, $girth(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 3$.

■

Corollary 3.11 *Let R be a ring and I be a non-zero ideal of R . Then, we have the following equivalents:*

1. $girth(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 3$ if and only if R is not an integral domain.
2. $girth(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = 4$ if and only if R is an integral domain and $|I| \geq 3$.
3. $girth(\bar{\Gamma}(R \rtimes I)) = \infty$ if and only if R is an integral domain and $|I| = 2$.

References

- [1] Anderson D.F, Livingston P.S. The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring, J. Algebra **217** (1999) 434–447.
- [2] Axtell M, Coykendall J, Stickles J. Zero-divisor graphs of polynomial and power series over commutative rings. Comm. Algebra **33** (2005) 2043–2050.
- [3] Axtell M, Stickles J. Zero-divisor graphs of idealizations, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **204** (2006) 235–243.
- [4] Beck I. Coloring of commutative rings. J. Algebra **116** (1) (1988) 208–226.
- [5] Bennis D, Mikram J, Taraza F. On the extended zero divisor graph of commutative rings. Turk. J. Math. **40** (2016) 376–388
- [6] Bennis D, Mikram J, Taraza F. Extended zero-divisor graphs of idealizations. Commun. Korean Math. Soc. **32** (2017) 7–17.
- [7] Bollobas B. Modern Graph Theory. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [8] Chartrand G, Lesniak L. Graphs and Digraphs. 4th edn. (CRC), 2005.
- [9] Maimani H R, Yassemi S. Zero-divisor graphs of amalgamated duplication of a ring along an ideal. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **212** (2008) 168–174.