

Congruence Extensions in Congruence–modular Varieties

George GEORGESCU¹, Leonard KWUIDA² and Claudia MUREȘAN^{3*}

^{1,3}University of Bucharest, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science

²Bern University of Applied Sciences, School of Business

¹georgescu.capreni@yahoo.com;

²leonard.kwuida@bfh.ch;

³cmuresan@fmi.unibuc.ro, claudia.muresan@unibuc.ro

September 4, 2024

Abstract

We investigate from an algebraic and topological point of view the minimal prime spectrum of a universal algebra, considering the prime congruences w.r.t. the term condition commutator. Then we use the topological structure of the minimal prime spectrum to study extensions of universal algebras that generalize certain types of ring extensions. Our results hold for semiprime members of semi–degenerate congruence–modular varieties, as well as semiprime algebras whose term condition commutators are commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins and satisfy certain conditions on compact congruences, even if those algebras do not generate congruence–modular varieties.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classifications: 08A30, 08B10, 06B10, 13B99, 06F35, 03G25.

Keywords: (modular) commutator, (minimal) prime congruence, (Stone, Zariski, flat) topology, (ring) extension.

1 Introduction

Inspired by group theory and initially developed in [10] for congruence–modular varieties, commutator theory has led to the solving of many deep universal algebra problems; it has been later extended by adopting various definitions for the commutator, all of which collapse to the modular commutator in this congruence–modular case.

The congruence lattices of members of congruence–modular varieties, endowed with the modular commutator, form commutator lattices, in which we can introduce the prime elements w.r.t. the commutator operation. For the purpose of not restricting to this congruence–modular setting, we have introduced the notion of a prime congruence through the term condition commutator. Under certain conditions for this commutator operation which do not have to be satisfied throughout a whole variety, the thus defined set of the prime congruences of an algebra becomes a topological space when endowed to a generalization of the Zariski topology from commutative rings [20, 23]. For members of semi–degenerate congruence–modular varieties, this topological space has strong properties [1], some of which extend to more general cases.

The first goal of this paper is to study the topology this generalization induces on the antichain of the minimal prime congruences of an algebra whose term condition commutator satisfies certain conditions, all of which hold in any member of a semi–degenerate congruence–modular variety.

The second goal of our present work is the study of certain types of extensions of algebras with ”well–behaved” commutators, meaning term condition commutators that behave like the modular commutator, generalizing results on ring extensions from [4, 28].

In Section 2 we recall some results on congruence lattices and the term condition commutator, as well as the particular case of the modular commutator, along with the prime and minimal prime spectra of congruences of an algebra with ”well–behaved” commutators, where the prime congruences are defined w.r.t. the commutator

*Corresponding author.

operation, as well as the prime and minimal spectra of ideals of a bounded distributive lattice. The following sections are dedicated to our new results.

Section 3 contains arithmetical properties of commutator lattices of congruences and annihilators w.r.t. the commutator in such lattices, derived from the residuation operation and its associated negation introduced through these annihilators.

In Section 4 we obtain several algebraic properties of the minimal prime spectrum of congruences, including a characterization of minimal prime congruences through their behavior w.r.t. the negations of congruences, obtained in two different cases from a corresponding characterization of minimal prime ideals of bounded distributive lattices.

In Section 5 we study the Stone (also called spectral) and the flat (also called inverse) topology on the minimal prime spectrum of congruences of an algebra, establish homeomorphisms between these and the corresponding topologies on the minimal prime spectrum of ideals of the reticulation of that algebra (see [13] for the construction of the reticulation in the universal algebra setting) and obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for these two topologies to coincide.

In Section 6, starting from the study of ring extensions in [4, 28], we define certain classes of extensions of universal algebras that generalize corresponding classes of ring extensions: m -extensions, rigid, quasirigid and weak rigid extensions, r -extensions and quasi/weak r -extensions, r^* -extensions and quasi/weak r^* -extensions, and, generalizing results from [4, 28], we obtain relations between these types of extensions, characterizations for these kinds of extensions and topological properties of the minimal prime spectra of the universal algebras that form such extensions.

2 Preliminaries

We refer the reader to [1, 6, 16, 22] for a further study of the following notions from universal algebra, to [2, 5, 7, 15] for the lattice-theoretical ones, to [1, 10, 22, 27] for the results on commutators and to [1, 8, 9, 12, 26, 18] for the Stone topologies.

All algebras will be nonempty and they will be designated by their underlying sets; by *trivial algebra* we mean one-element algebra. For brevity, we denote by $A \cong B$ the fact that two algebras A and B of the same type are isomorphic.

\mathbb{N} denotes the set of the natural numbers, $\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, and, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\overline{a, b} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid a \leq n \leq b\}$ the interval in the lattice (\mathbb{N}, \leq) bounded by a and b , where \leq is the natural order¹. Let M, N be sets and $S \subseteq M$. Then $\mathcal{P}(M)$ denotes the set of the subsets of M and $(\text{Eq}(M), \vee, \cap, \Delta_M = \{(x, x) \mid x \in M\}, \nabla_M = M^2)$ is the bounded lattice of the equivalences on M . We denote by $i_{S, M} : S \rightarrow M$ the inclusion map and by $id_M = i_{M, M}$ the identity map of M . For any function $f : M \rightarrow N$, we denote by $\text{Ker}(f)$ the kernel of f , by f the direct image of $f^2 = f \times f$ and by f^* the inverse image of f^2 .

For any poset P , $\text{Max}(P)$ and $\text{Min}(P)$ will denote the set of the maximal elements and that of the minimal elements of P , respectively. Whenever we refer to posets of congruences of an algebra or ideals of a lattice, the order will be the set inclusion.

Let L be a lattice. Then $\text{Cp}(L)$ and $\text{Mi}(L)$ denote the set of the compact elements and that of the meet-irreducible elements of L , respectively. $\text{Id}(L)$, $\text{PId}(L)$ and $\text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(L)$ denote the sets of the ideals, principal ideals and prime ideals of L , respectively. We denote by $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L) = \text{Min}(\text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(L))$: the set of the minimal prime ideals of L . Let $U \subseteq L$ and $u \in L$. Then $[U]_L$ and $[u]_L$ denote the filters of L generated by U and by u , respectively, while $(U)_L$ and $(u)_L$ denote the ideals of L generated by U and by u , respectively. If L has a 0, then $\text{Ann}_L(U) = \{a \in L \mid (\forall x \in U)(a \wedge x = 0)\}$ is the annihilator of U and we denote by $\text{Ann}_L(u) = \text{Ann}_L(\{u\})$ the annihilator of u . The subscript L will be eliminated from these notations when the lattice L is clear from the context. Note that, if L has a 0 and it is distributive, then all annihilators in L are ideals of L .

Recall that a *frame* is a complete lattice with the meet distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins.

Throughout this paper, by *functor* we mean covariant functor. \mathcal{B} denotes the functor from the variety of bounded distributive lattices to the variety of Boolean algebras which takes each bounded distributive lattice to its Boolean center and every morphism in the former variety to its restriction to the Boolean centers. If L is a bounded lattice, then we denote by $\mathcal{B}(L)$ the set of the complemented elements of L even if L is not distributive.

\textcircled{H} Throughout the rest of this paper: τ will be a universal algebras signature, \mathcal{V} a variety of τ -algebras and A

¹This is to differentiate from the notation for commutators

an arbitrary member of \mathcal{V} .

Everywhere in this paper, we will mark global assumptions as above, for better visibility.

Unless mentioned otherwise, by *morphism* we mean τ -morphism.

$\text{Con}(A)$, $\text{Max}(A)$, $\text{PCon}(A)$ and $\mathcal{K}(A)$ denote the sets of the congruences, maximal (proper) congruences, principal congruences and finitely generated congruences of A , respectively; note that $\mathcal{K}(A) = \text{Cp}(\text{Con}(A))$. $\text{Max}(A)$ is called the *maximal spectrum* of A . For any $X \subseteq A^2$ and any $a, b \in A$, $Cg_A(X)$ will be the congruence of A generated by X and we shall denote by $Cg_A(a, b) = Cg_A(\{(a, b)\})$.

For any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, $p_\theta : A \rightarrow A/\theta$ will be the canonical surjective morphism; given any $X \in A \cup A^2 \cup \mathcal{P}(A) \cup \mathcal{P}(A^2)$, we denote by $X/\theta = p_\theta(X)$. Note that $\text{Ker}(p_\theta) = \theta$ for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, and that $Cg_A(Cg_S(X)) = Cg_A(X)$ for any subalgebra S of A and any $X \subseteq S^2$.

If L is a distributive lattice, so that we have the canonical lattice embedding $\iota_L : \text{Id}(L) \rightarrow \text{Con}(L)$, then we will denote, for every $I \in \text{Id}(L)$, by $\pi_I = p_{\iota_L(I)} : L \rightarrow L/I$.

\textcircled{H} Throughout the rest of this paper, B will be a member of \mathcal{V} and $f : A \rightarrow B$ a morphism.

Recall that, for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ and any $\beta \in \text{Con}(B)$, we have $f^*(\beta) \in [\text{Ker}(f)] \subseteq \text{Con}(A)$, $f(f^*(\beta)) = \beta \cap f(A^2) \subseteq \beta$ and $\alpha \subseteq f^*(f(\alpha))$; if $\alpha \in [\text{Ker}(f)]$, then $f(\alpha) \in \text{Con}(f(A))$ and $f^*(f(\alpha)) = \alpha$. Hence $\theta \mapsto f(\theta)$ is a lattice isomorphism from $[\text{Ker}(f)]$ to $\text{Con}(f(A))$, having f^* as inverse, and thus it sets an order isomorphism from $\text{Max}(A) \cap [\text{Ker}(f)]$ to $\text{Max}(f(A))$. In particular, for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, the map $\alpha \mapsto \alpha/\theta$ is an order isomorphism from $[\theta]$ to $\text{Con}(A/\theta)$.

Lemma 2.1. [3, Lemma 1.11], [31, Proposition 1.2] *For any $X \subseteq A^2$ and any $\alpha, \theta \in \text{Con}(A)$:*

- $f(Cg_A(X) \vee \text{Ker}(f)) = Cg_{f(A)}(f(X))$, so $Cg_B(f(Cg_A(X))) = Cg_B(f(X))$ and $(Cg_A(X) \vee \theta)/\theta = Cg_{A/\theta}(X/\theta)$;
- in particular, $f(\alpha \vee \text{Ker}(f)) = Cg_{f(A)}(f(\alpha))$, so $(\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta = Cg_{A/\theta}(\alpha/\theta)$.

For any nonempty family $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I} \subseteq [\text{Ker}(f)]$, we have, in $\text{Con}(f(A))$: $f(\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = \bigvee_{i \in I} f(\alpha_i)$. Indeed, by Lemma

$$2.1, f(\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = f(Cg_A(\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i)) = Cg_{f(A)}(f(\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i)) = Cg_{f(A)}(\bigcup_{i \in I} f(\alpha_i)) = \bigvee_{i \in I} f(\alpha_i).$$

We denote by $f^\bullet : \text{Con}(A) \rightarrow \text{Con}(B)$ the map defined by $f^\bullet(\alpha) = Cg_B(f(\alpha))$ for all $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$. By the above, if f is surjective, then $f^\bullet|_{[\text{Ker}(f)]} : [\text{Ker}(f)] \rightarrow \text{Con}(B)$ is the inverse of the lattice isomorphism $f^*|_{\text{Con}(B)} : \text{Con}(B) \rightarrow [\text{Ker}(f)]$.

We use the following definition from [24] for the *term condition commutator*: let $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$. For any $\mu \in \text{Con}(A)$, by $C(\alpha, \beta; \mu)$ we denote the fact that the following condition holds: for all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any term t over τ of arity $n+k$, if $(a_i, b_i) \in \alpha$ for all $i \in \overline{1, n}$ and $(c_j, d_j) \in \beta$ for all $j \in \overline{1, k}$, then $(t^A(a_1, \dots, a_n, c_1, \dots, c_k), t^A(a_1, \dots, a_n, d_1, \dots, d_k)) \in \mu$ iff $(t^A(b_1, \dots, b_n, c_1, \dots, c_k), t^A(b_1, \dots, b_n, d_1, \dots, d_k)) \in \mu$. We denote by $[\alpha, \beta]_A = \bigcap \{\mu \in \text{Con}(A) \mid C(\alpha, \beta; \mu)\}$; we call $[\alpha, \beta]_A$ the *commutator of α and β in A* . The operation $[\cdot, \cdot]_A : \text{Con}(A) \times \text{Con}(A) \rightarrow \text{Con}(A)$ is called the *commutator of A* .

By [10], if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then, for each member M of \mathcal{V} , $[\cdot, \cdot]_M$ is the unique binary operation on $\text{Con}(M)$ such that, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(M)$, $[\alpha, \beta]_M = \min\{\mu \in \text{Con}(M) \mid \mu \subseteq \alpha \cap \beta \text{ and, for any member } N \text{ of } \mathcal{V} \text{ and any surjective morphism } h : M \rightarrow N \text{ in } \mathcal{V}, \mu \vee \text{Ker}(h) = h^*([h(\alpha \vee \text{Ker}(h)), h(\beta \vee \text{Ker}(h))]_N)\}$. Therefore, if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, $\alpha, \beta, \theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ and f is surjective, then $[f(\alpha \vee \text{Ker}(f)), f(\beta \vee \text{Ker}(f))]_B = f([\alpha, \beta]_A \vee \text{Ker}(f))$, in particular $[(\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta, (\beta \vee \theta)/\theta]_{A/\theta} = ([\alpha, \beta]_A \vee \theta)/\theta$, hence, if $\theta \subseteq \alpha \cap \beta$, then $[\alpha/\theta, \beta/\theta]_{A/\theta} = ([\alpha, \beta]_A \vee \theta)/\theta$, and, if, moreover, $\theta \subseteq [\alpha, \beta]_A$, then $[\alpha/\theta, \beta/\theta]_{A/\theta} = [\alpha, \beta]_A/\theta$.

By [24, Lemma 4.6, Lemma 4.7, Theorem 8.3], the commutator is smaller than the intersection and increasing in both arguments; if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then the commutator is also commutative and distributive in both arguments w.r.t. arbitrary joins.

Hence, if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and the commutator of A coincides to the intersection of congruences, then $\text{Con}(A)$ is a frame, in particular it is distributive.

Therefore, if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and the commutator coincides to the intersection in each member of \mathcal{V} , then \mathcal{V} is congruence-distributive. By [19], the converse holds, as well: if \mathcal{V} is congruence-distributive, then, in each member of \mathcal{V} , the commutator coincides to the intersection of congruences.

For any $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we denote by $[\alpha, \beta]_A^1 = [\alpha, \beta]_A$ and, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, by $[\alpha, \beta]_A^{n+1} = [[\alpha, \beta]_A^n, [\alpha, \beta]_A^n]_A$. Recall that A is called an *Abelian algebra* iff $[\nabla_A, \nabla_A]_A = \Delta_A$.

Recall that, for any nonempty family $(M_i)_{i \in I}$ of members of \mathcal{V} , the *skew congruences* of the direct product $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$ are the elements of $\text{Con}(\prod_{i \in I} M_i) \setminus \prod_{i \in I} \text{Con}(M_i)$, where $\prod_{i \in I} \text{Con}(M_i) = \{\prod_{i \in I} \alpha_i \mid (\forall i \in I) (\alpha_i \in \text{Con}(M_i))\}$, with the direct product of binary relations having the usual definition.

By [10, Theorem 8.5, p. 85], if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then the following are equivalent:

- \mathcal{V} contains no nontrivial Abelian algebras, that is, for any nontrivial algebra M from \mathcal{V} , $[\nabla_M, \nabla_M]_M \neq \Delta_M$;
- for any algebra M from \mathcal{V} , $[\nabla_M, \nabla_M]_M = \nabla_M$;
- for any algebra M from \mathcal{V} and any $\theta \in \text{Con}(M)$, $[\theta, \nabla_M]_M = \theta$;
- \mathcal{V} has no skew congruences, that is, for any algebras M and N from \mathcal{V} , $\text{Con}(M \times N) = \{\theta \times \zeta \mid \theta \in \text{Con}(M), \zeta \in \text{Con}(N)\}$.

Recall that \mathcal{V} is said to be *semi-degenerate* iff no nontrivial algebra in \mathcal{V} has one-element subalgebras. Recall from [22] that, if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then the following are equivalent:

- \mathcal{V} is semi-degenerate;
- for all members M of \mathcal{V} , $\nabla_M \in \mathcal{K}(M)$.

By [1, Lemma 5.2], the equivalences in [10, Theorem 8.5, p. 85] recalled above and the fact that, in congruence-distributive varieties, the commutator coincides to the intersection, we have: if \mathcal{V} is either congruence-distributive or both congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then \mathcal{V} has no skew congruences.

If $[\cdot, \cdot]_A$ is distributive w.r.t. the join, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then, if A has *principal commutators*, that is its set $\text{PCon}(A)$ of principal congruences is closed w.r.t. the commutator, then A has *compact commutators*, that is its set $\mathcal{K}(A)$ of compact congruences is closed w.r.t. the commutator. Consequently, if the commutator of A equals the intersection of congruences, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-distributive, then, if A has the *principal intersection property (PIP)*, that is $\text{PCon}(A)$ is closed w.r.t. the intersection, then A has the *compact intersection property (CIP)*, that is $\mathcal{K}(A)$ is closed w.r.t. the intersection.

Recall that a *prime congruence* of A is a proper congruence ϕ of A such that, for any $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$, if $[\alpha, \beta]_A \subseteq \phi$, then $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ or $\beta \subseteq \phi$ [10]. It actually suffices that we enforce this condition for principal congruences α, β of A :

Lemma 2.2. [12, 13] *A proper congruence ϕ of A is prime iff for any $\alpha, \beta \in \text{PCon}(A)$, if $[\alpha, \beta]_A \subseteq \phi$, then $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ or $\beta \subseteq \phi$.*

We denote by $\text{Spec}(A)$ the (*prime*) *spectrum* of A , that is the set of the prime congruences of A . Recall that $\text{Spec}(A)$ is not necessarily nonempty. However, by [1, Theorem 5.3], if the commutator of A is distributive w.r.t. the join of congruences, $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $[\nabla_A, \nabla_A]_A = \nabla_A$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then:

- $\text{Max}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$;
- any proper congruence of A is included in a maximal and thus a prime congruence of A ;
- hence $\text{Max}(A)$ and thus $\text{Spec}(A)$ is nonempty whenever A is nontrivial.

For each $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we denote by $V_A(\theta) = \text{Spec}(A) \cap [\theta]$ and by $D_A(\theta) = \text{Spec}(A) \setminus V_A(\theta) = \text{Spec}(A) \setminus [\theta]$. For each $X \subseteq A^2$ and all $a, b \in A$, we denote by $V_A(X) = V_A(\text{Cg}_A(X))$, $D_A(X) = D_A(\text{Cg}_A(X))$, $V_A(a, b) = V_A(\text{Cg}_A(a, b))$ and $D_A(a, b) = D_A(\text{Cg}_A(a, b))$.

For any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we denote by $\rho_A(\theta) = \bigcap V_A(\theta)$ and call this congruence the *radical* of θ . We denote by $\text{RCon}(A) = \{\rho_A(\theta) \mid \theta \in \text{Con}(A)\} = \{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \rho_A(\theta) = \theta\}$. We call the elements of $\text{RCon}(A)$ the *radical congruences* of A . Obviously, any prime congruence of A is radical.

By [1, Lemma 1.6, Proposition 1.2], if the commutator of A is commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then:

- (i) a congruence θ of A is radical iff it is *semiprime*, that is, for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, if $[\alpha, \alpha]_A \subseteq \theta$, then $\alpha \subseteq \theta$;
- (ii) hence $\text{Spec}(A) = \text{Mi}(\text{Con}(A)) \cap \text{RCon}(A)$.

A is called a *semiprime algebra* iff $\rho_A(\Delta_A) = \Delta_A$. By statement (i) above, if the commutator of A equals the intersection, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-distributive, then $\text{RCon}(A) = \text{Con}(A)$, thus A is semiprime.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Spec}}(A) = \{D_A(\theta) \mid \theta \in \text{Con}(A)\}$. If the commutator of A is commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then, by [1, 12, 13], $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Spec}}(A)$ is a topology on $\text{Spec}(A)$, called the *Stone topology* or the *spectral topology*, which satisfies, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$ and any family $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I} \subseteq \text{Con}(A)$:

- $D_A(\alpha) \subseteq D_A(\beta)$ iff $V_A(\alpha) \supseteq V_A(\beta)$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) \subseteq \rho_A(\beta)$;
- thus $D_A(\alpha) = D_A(\beta)$ iff $V_A(\alpha) = V_A(\beta)$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) = \rho_A(\beta)$;
- clearly, $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ implies $\rho_A(\alpha) \subseteq \rho_A(\beta)$;
- clearly, $\alpha \subseteq \rho_A(\alpha)$, thus $\rho_A(\alpha) = \Delta_A$ implies $\alpha = \Delta_A$;
- $D_A(\nabla_A) = \text{Spec}(A) = V_A(\Delta_A)$ and $D_A(\Delta_A) = \emptyset = V_A(\nabla_A)$;
- if A is semiprime, then: $D_A(\alpha) = \emptyset$ iff $V_A(\alpha) = \text{Spec}(A)$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) = \Delta_A$ iff $\alpha = \Delta_A$;
- if $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $[\nabla_A, \nabla_A]_A = \nabla_A$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then: $D_A(\alpha) = \text{Spec}(A)$ iff $V_A(\alpha) = \emptyset$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) = \nabla_A$ iff $\alpha = \nabla_A$;
- $D_A([\alpha, \beta]_A) = D_A(\alpha \cap \beta) = D_A(\alpha) \cap D_A(\beta)$ and $D_A(\alpha \vee \beta) = D_A(\alpha) \cup D_A(\beta)$, thus $V_A([\alpha, \beta]_A) = V_A(\alpha \cap \beta) = V_A(\alpha) \cup V_A(\beta)$, $V_A(\alpha \vee \beta) = V_A(\alpha) \cap V_A(\beta)$, $\rho_A([\alpha, \beta]_A) = \rho_A(\alpha \cap \beta) = \rho_A(\alpha) \cap \rho_A(\beta)$ and $\rho_A(\alpha \vee \beta) = \rho_A(\alpha) \vee \rho_A(\beta)$;
- $D_A(\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = D_A(\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} D_A(\alpha_i)$, thus $V_A(\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = V_A(\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = \bigcap_{i \in I} V_A(\alpha_i)$ and $\rho_A(\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = \rho_A(\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i) = \bigcap_{i \in I} \rho_A(\alpha_i)$;
 $\rho_A(\bigcup_{i \in I} \rho_A(\alpha_i)) = \bigvee_{i \in I} \rho_A(\alpha_i)$;
- hence, for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, $V_A(\theta) = \bigcap_{(a,b) \in \theta} V_A(a, b)$ and $D_A(\theta) = \bigcup_{(a,b) \in \theta} D_A(a, b)$, therefore the Stone topology $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Spec}}(A)$ has $\{D_A(a, b) \mid a, b \in A\}$ as a basis.

Assume that $[\cdot, \cdot]_A$ is commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins. Assume, moreover, that $\text{Max}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$, which holds if $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $[\nabla_A, \nabla_A]_A = \nabla_A$. All of this holds in the particular case when \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate. Then the Stone topology $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Spec}}(A)$ on $\text{Spec}(A)$ induces *Stone* or *spectral topology* on $\text{Max}(A)$: $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Max}}(A) = \{D_A(\theta) \cap \text{Max}(A) \mid \theta \in \text{Con}(A)\}$, having $\{D_A(a, b) \cap \text{Max}(A) \mid a, b \in A\}$ as a basis.

In the same way, but replacing congruences with ideals, one defines the Stone topology on the set of prime ideals and that of maximal ideals of a bounded distributive lattice.

In [12, 26], we have called f an *admissible morphism* iff $f^*(\text{Spec}(B)) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$. Recall from [1] that, if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then the map $\alpha \mapsto f(\alpha)$ is an order isomorphism from $\text{Spec}(A) \cap [\text{Ker}(f)]$ to $\text{Spec}(f(A))$, thus to $\text{Spec}(B)$ if f is surjective, case in which this map coincides with f^\bullet and f^* is its inverse, hence f is admissible.

Remark 2.3. By the above, if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and f is surjective, then:

- for all $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, $f(V_A(\alpha)) = V_B(f(\alpha))$ and $f(D_A(\alpha)) = D_B(f(\alpha))$;
- in particular, for all $a, b \in A$, $f(V_A(a, b)) = V_B(f(a), f(b))$ and $f(D_A(a, b)) = D_B(f(a), f(b))$,

thus, since $f = f^\bullet = (f^*)^{-1}$, the map $f^*|_{\text{Spec}(B)}: \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ is continuous w.r.t. the Stone topologies.

A subset S of A^2 is called an *m-system* for A iff, for all $a, b, c, d \in A$, if $(a, b), (c, d) \in S$, then $[Cg_A(a, b), Cg_A(c, d)]_A \cap S \neq \emptyset$. For instance, any congruence of A is an *m-system*. Also:

Remark 2.4. [12, 13] If $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A)$, then $\nabla_A \setminus \phi$ is an m -system in A .

Lemma 2.5. [1] Let S be an m -system in A and $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\alpha \cap S = \emptyset$. If the commutator of A is distributive w.r.t. the join, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, then:

- $\text{Max}\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \alpha \subseteq \theta, \theta \cap S = \emptyset\} \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$, in particular, for the case $\alpha = \Delta_A$, $\text{Max}\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \theta \cap S = \emptyset\} \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$;
- if $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, in particular in \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then the set $\text{Max}\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \alpha \subseteq \theta, \theta \cap S = \emptyset\}$ is nonempty, in particular $\text{Max}\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \theta \cap S = \emptyset\}$ is nonempty.

Remark 2.6. If \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular, S is an m -system in A and f is surjective, then $f(S)$ is an m -system in B .

We denote by $\text{Min}(A) = \text{Min}(\text{Spec}(A), \subseteq)$. Recall that $\text{Min}(A)$ is called the *minimal prime spectrum* of A and its elements are called *minimal prime congruences* of A .

Now assume that the commutator of A is commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins, which holds if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular. Then, by [25, Proposition 5.9], if we define a binary relation \equiv_A on $\text{Con}(A)$ by: for any $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\alpha \equiv_A \beta$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) = \rho_A(\beta)$, then \equiv_A is a lattice congruence of $\text{Con}(A)$ that preserves arbitrary joins such that $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$ is a frame; see also [13].

Following the notations from [25], if $(L, [\cdot, \cdot])$ is a *commutator lattice*, that is a complete lattice L endowed with a binary operation $[\cdot, \cdot]$ which is commutative, smaller than the meet and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins [9, 11], then we denote by Spec_L the set of the prime elements of L w.r.t. the commutator $[\cdot, \cdot]$, by $\text{Min}_L = \text{Min}(\text{Spec}_L)$ the set of the minimal prime elements of L and by $R(L)$ the set of the radical elements of L , that is the meets of subsets of Spec_L .

If $(L, [\cdot, \cdot])$ is a commutator lattice, $u \in L$ and $U \subseteq L$, then, in order to differentiate between annihilators w.r.t. to the meet and those w.r.t. the commutator, we will use the following notations: the annihilator of U in $(L, [\cdot, \cdot])$ is $\text{Ann}_{(L, [\cdot, \cdot])}(U) = \{a \in L \mid (\forall x \in U) ([a, x] = 0)\}$ and the annihilator of u in $(L, [\cdot, \cdot])$ is $\text{Ann}_{(L, [\cdot, \cdot])}(u) = \text{Ann}_{(L, [\cdot, \cdot])}(\{u\})$.

Recall from [25] that L is a frame iff its commutator $[\cdot, \cdot]$ equals the meet, case in which the annihilators in $(L, [\cdot, \cdot])$ coincide with those w.r.t. the meet and Spec_L is exactly the set of the meet-prime elements of L , thus $\text{Spec}_L = \text{Mi}(L)$ since L is distributive.

3 On the Residuated Structure of the Lattice of Congruences

\textcircled{H} Throughout this section, we will assume that the commutator of A is commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins, which holds if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular.

See [13] for the next results. Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, arbitrary.

An induction argument shows that:

- $[\alpha, \beta]_A^{n+1} = [[\alpha, \beta]_A^n, [\alpha, \beta]_A^n]_A$;
- $\rho_A([\alpha, \beta]_A^n) = \rho_A([\alpha, \beta]_A) = \rho_A(\alpha \cap \beta) = \rho_A(\alpha) \cap \rho_A(\beta)$.

If A is semiprime, then $\rho_A(\theta) = \Delta_A$ iff $\theta = \Delta_A$, therefore:

- since $\rho_A([\alpha, \alpha]_A^n) = \rho_A([\alpha, \alpha]_A) = \rho_A(\alpha)$, it follows that: $\rho_A([\alpha, \alpha]_A^n) = \Delta_A$ iff $\alpha = \Delta_A$;
- since $\rho_A([\alpha, [\beta, \gamma]_A]_A) = \rho_A(\alpha \cap \beta \cap \gamma) = \rho_A([\alpha, \beta]_A, \gamma)_A$, it follows that: $[\alpha, [\beta, \gamma]_A]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $\alpha \cap \beta \cap \gamma = \Delta_A$ iff $[[\alpha, \beta]_A, \gamma]_A = \Delta_A$.

If \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and f is surjective, then, for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}(A^2)$ and any $a, b, c, d \in A$:

- $[f(\alpha \vee \text{Ker}(f)), f(\beta \vee \text{Ker}(f))]_B^n = f([\alpha, \beta]_A^n \vee \text{Ker}(f))$, in particular $[(\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta, (\beta \vee \theta)/\theta]_{A/\theta}^n = ([\alpha, \beta]_A^n \vee \theta)/\theta$;
- hence $[Cg_{A/\theta}(X/\theta), Cg_{A/\theta}(Y/\theta)]_{A/\theta}^n = ([Cg_A(X), Cg_A(Y)]_A^n \vee \theta)/\theta$, in particular $[Cg_{A/\theta}(a/\theta, b/\theta), Cg_{c/\theta, d/\theta}(Y/\theta)]_{A/\theta}^n = ([Cg_A(a, b), Cg_A(c, d)]_A^n \vee \theta)/\theta$;

- $\text{Spec}(B) = \{\phi/\text{Ker}(f) \mid \phi \in V_A(\text{Ker}(f))\}$, in particular $\text{Spec}(A/\theta) = \{\phi/\theta \mid \phi \in V_A(\theta)\}$.

We denote by $\beta \rightarrow \gamma = \bigvee\{\delta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma\}$ and $\beta^\perp = \beta \rightarrow \Delta_A$.

Clearly, $\beta \rightarrow \gamma = \bigvee\{\delta \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma\} = \bigvee\{\delta \in \text{PCon}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma\}$, so $\beta^\perp = \bigvee\{\delta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A\} = \bigvee\{\delta \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A\} = \bigvee\{\delta \in \text{PCon}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A\}$.

Note that these operations can be defined for any commutator lattice $(L, [\cdot, \cdot])$ by: $b \rightarrow c = \bigvee\{a \in L \mid [a, b] \leq c\}$ and $b^\perp = b \rightarrow 0 = \bigvee\{a \in L \mid [a, b] = 0\}$ for any $b, c \in L$ and, if L is algebraic, that is compactly generated, then we also have equalities similar to the above.

Since $[\Delta_A, \beta]_A = \Delta_A \subseteq \gamma$ and, for any non-empty family $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}$, $[\alpha_i, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma$ for all $i \in I$ implies $\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i, \beta]_A =$

$\bigvee_{i \in I} [\alpha_i, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma$, it follows that:

$$\beta \rightarrow \gamma = \max\{\delta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma\},$$

$$\text{in particular } \beta^\perp = \max\{\delta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\delta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A\},$$

hence, in the particular case in which A is semiprime, $\beta^\perp = \max(\text{Ann}_{(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)}(\beta))$ and thus $\text{Ann}_{(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)}(\beta) = (\beta^\perp) \in \text{PId}(\text{Con}(A))$.

The definitions above also show that:

$$[\beta, \beta \rightarrow \gamma]_A \subseteq \gamma, \text{ in particular } [\beta, \beta^\perp]_A = \Delta_A;$$

moreover, for all $\delta \in \text{Con}(A)$:

$$[\delta, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma \text{ iff } \delta \subseteq \beta \rightarrow \gamma, \text{ in particular: } [\delta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A \text{ iff } \delta \subseteq \beta^\perp.$$

Hence, in the particular case when the commutator of A is associative, $(\text{Con}(A), \vee, \cap, \rightarrow, \Delta_A, \nabla_A)$ is a (bounded commutative integral) residuated lattice, in which \cdot^\perp is the negation.

Lemma 3.1. *If the algebra A is semiprime, then $\theta^\perp \in \text{RCon}(A)$ for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha, \theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $[\alpha, \alpha]_A \subseteq \theta^\perp$. Then, by the above and the fact that A is semiprime, $[[\alpha, \alpha]_A, \theta]_A = \Delta_A$, which is equivalent to $\rho_A([\alpha, \alpha]_A, \theta]_A) = \Delta_A$, that is $\rho_A(\alpha \cap \theta) = \Delta_A$, that is $\rho_A([\alpha, \theta]_A) = \Delta_A$, which means that $[\alpha, \theta]_A = \Delta_A$, which in turn is equivalent to $\alpha \subseteq \theta^\perp$. Hence θ^\perp is a semiprime and thus a radical congruence of A . \square

Since $\theta = \bigvee_{(a,b) \in \theta} Cg_A(a, b) = \bigvee\{\zeta \in \text{PCon}(A) \mid \zeta \subseteq \theta\} = \bigvee\{\zeta \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \zeta \subseteq \theta\}$, it follows that:

$$\beta \rightarrow \gamma = \bigvee\{\zeta \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid [\zeta, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma\} = \bigvee\{\zeta \in \text{PCon}(A) \mid [\zeta, \beta]_A \subseteq \gamma\},$$

$$\text{in particular } \beta^\perp = \bigvee\{\zeta \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid [\zeta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A\} = \bigvee\{\zeta \in \text{PCon}(A) \mid [\zeta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A\}.$$

Let us note that, for all $a, b \in A$, we have $(a, b) \in \beta^\perp$ iff $Cg_A(a, b) \subseteq \beta^\perp$ iff $[Cg_A(a, b), \beta]_A = \Delta_A$, hence $\beta^\perp = \{(a, b) \in A^2 \mid [Cg_A(a, b), \beta]_A = \Delta_A\}$.

For any $X \subseteq A^2$, we denote by $X^\perp = \{(a, b) \in A^2 \mid (\forall (x, y) \in X) ([Cg_A(a, b), Cg_A(x, y)]_A = \Delta_A)\}$, so that:

$$X^\perp = \{(a, b) \in A^2 \mid [Cg_A(a, b), \bigvee_{(x,y) \in X} Cg_A(x, y)]_A = \Delta_A\} = \{(a, b) \in A^2 \mid [Cg_A(a, b), Cg_A(X)]_A = \Delta_A\} =$$

$$\bigvee\{Cg_A(a, b) \mid (a, b) \in A^2, [Cg_A(a, b), Cg_A(X)]_A = \Delta_A\} = \bigvee\{\alpha \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\alpha, Cg_A(X)]_A = \Delta_A\} = \max\{\alpha \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\alpha, Cg_A(X)]_A = \Delta_A\} = Cg_A(X)^\perp,$$

so this more general notation is consistent with the notation above for the particular case when $X \in \text{Con}(A)$.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\alpha, \beta, \theta \in \text{Con}(A)$:*

$$(i) \beta \subseteq \alpha \rightarrow \beta;$$

(ii) $(\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta) = \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)$.

Proof. (i) $[\beta, \alpha]_A \subseteq \beta \cap \alpha \subseteq \beta$, thus $\beta \subseteq \max\{\zeta \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid [\zeta, \alpha]_A \subseteq \beta\} = \alpha \rightarrow \beta$.

(ii) For all $\gamma \in \text{Con}(A)$, we have, since $[\gamma, \theta]_A \subseteq \theta \subseteq \beta \vee \theta$: $\gamma \subseteq (\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)$ iff $[\gamma, \alpha \vee \theta]_A \subseteq \beta \vee \theta$ iff $[\gamma, \alpha]_A \vee [\gamma, \theta]_A \subseteq \beta \vee \theta$ iff $[\gamma, \alpha]_A \subseteq \beta \vee \theta$ iff $\gamma \subseteq \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)$. By taking $\gamma = (\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)$ and then $\gamma = \alpha \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)$ in the previous equivalences, we get: $\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta) = (\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)$. \square

Proposition 3.3. For any $\alpha, \beta, \theta \in \text{Con}(A)$:

(i) $(\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)/\theta = ((\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta))/\theta = (\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta))/\theta$;

(ii) $((\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta)^\perp = (\alpha \rightarrow \theta)/\theta$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, (i), $\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta) \supseteq \beta \vee \theta \supseteq \theta$ and $(\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta) \supseteq \beta \vee \theta \supseteq \theta$.

(i) For any $\gamma \in [\theta]$, we have: $\gamma/\theta \subseteq (\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)/\theta$ iff $[\gamma/\theta, (\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta]_{A/\theta} \subseteq (\beta \vee \theta)/\theta$ iff $([\gamma, \alpha \vee \theta]_A \vee \theta)/\theta \subseteq (\beta \vee \theta)/\theta$ iff $[\gamma, \alpha \vee \theta]_A \vee \theta \subseteq \beta \vee \theta$ iff $[\gamma, \alpha \vee \theta]_A \subseteq \beta \vee \theta$ iff $\gamma \subseteq (\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)$ iff $\gamma/\theta \subseteq ((\alpha \vee \theta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta))/\theta$. Since $\text{Con}(A/\theta) = \{\zeta/\theta \mid \zeta \in [\theta]\}$, by taking $\gamma/\theta = (\alpha \vee \theta)/\theta \rightarrow (\beta \vee \theta)/\theta$ and then $\gamma/\theta = (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)/\theta$ in the equivalences above we obtain the first equality in the enunciation; the second follows from Lemma 3.2, (ii).

(ii) Take $\beta = \Delta_A$ in (i). \square

Lemma 3.4. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$. Then:

(i) $\Delta_A^\perp = \nabla_A$ and, if $[\theta, \nabla_A]_A = \theta$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then $\nabla_A^\perp = \Delta_A$;

(ii) $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ implies $\beta^\perp \subseteq \alpha^\perp$, and: $\beta^\perp \subseteq \alpha^\perp$ iff $\alpha^{\perp\perp} \subseteq \beta^{\perp\perp}$, in particular $\alpha^\perp = \beta^\perp$ iff $\alpha^{\perp\perp} = \beta^{\perp\perp}$;

(iii) $\alpha \subseteq \alpha^{\perp\perp}$ and $\alpha^{\perp\perp\perp} = \alpha^\perp$;

(iv) $(\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp = \alpha^\perp \cap \beta^\perp = (\alpha^\perp \cap \beta^\perp)^{\perp\perp}$;

(v) if A is semiprime, then $[\alpha, \beta]_A^\perp = (\alpha \cap \beta)^\perp$ and $(\alpha \cap \beta)^{\perp\perp} = \alpha^{\perp\perp} \cap \beta^{\perp\perp}$;

(vi) if A is semiprime, then: $\alpha^\perp \subseteq \beta^\perp$ iff $[\alpha, \beta]_A^\perp = \beta^\perp$;

(vii) if A is semiprime, then: $\alpha \subseteq \alpha^\perp$ iff $\alpha = \Delta_A$.

Proof. (i) $\Delta_A^\perp = \max\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\theta, \Delta_A] = \Delta_A\} = \max(\text{Con}(A)) = \nabla_A$. If $[\theta, \nabla_A]_A = \theta$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, then $\nabla_A^\perp = \max\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\theta, \nabla_A] = \Delta_A\} = \max\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \theta = \Delta_A\} = \max\{\Delta_A\} = \Delta_A$.

(ii),(iii) If $\alpha \subseteq \beta$, then $\{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\alpha, \theta]_A = \Delta_A\} \supseteq \{\theta \in \text{Con}(A) \mid [\beta, \theta]_A = \Delta_A\}$, hence $\beta^\perp \subseteq \alpha^\perp$, which thus, in turn, implies $\alpha^{\perp\perp} \subseteq \beta^{\perp\perp}$.

Since $[\alpha, \alpha^\perp]_A = \Delta_A$, it follows that $\alpha \subseteq \alpha^{\perp\perp}$, hence $\alpha^\perp \subseteq \alpha^{\perp\perp\perp}$ if we replace α by α^\perp in this inclusion, but also $\alpha^{\perp\perp\perp} \subseteq \alpha^\perp$ by the above, therefore $\alpha^\perp = \alpha^{\perp\perp\perp}$.

Hence $\alpha^{\perp\perp} \subseteq \beta^{\perp\perp}$ implies $\beta^\perp = \beta^{\perp\perp\perp} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp\perp\perp} = \alpha^\perp$.

(iv) For any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we have: $[\theta, \alpha]_A = [\theta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $[\theta, \alpha \vee \beta]_A = \Delta_A$, hence: $\theta \subseteq \alpha^\perp \cap \beta^\perp$ iff $\theta \subseteq (\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp$, thus: $\alpha^\perp \cap \beta^\perp = (\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp$. By (iii), $(\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp = (\alpha \vee \beta)^{\perp\perp\perp} = (\alpha^\perp \cap \beta^\perp)^{\perp\perp}$.

(v) If A is semiprime, then, for any $\theta, \zeta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we have: $\theta \subseteq \zeta^\perp$ iff $[\theta, \zeta]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $\theta \cap \zeta = \Delta_A$.

Hence, for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$: $\theta \subseteq [\alpha, \beta]_A^\perp$ iff $[\theta, [\alpha, \beta]_A]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $\theta \cap \alpha \cap \beta = \Delta_A$ iff $[\theta, \alpha \cap \beta]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $\theta \subseteq (\alpha \cap \beta)^\perp$.

By taking $\theta = [\alpha, \beta]_A^\perp$ and then $\theta = (\alpha \cap \beta)^\perp$ in the previous equivalences, we obtain: $[\alpha, \beta]_A^\perp = (\alpha \cap \beta)^\perp$.

If we denote by $\gamma = \alpha^{\perp\perp} \cap \beta^{\perp\perp}$ and by $\delta = (\alpha \cap \beta)^\perp = [\alpha, \beta]_A^\perp$ by the above, then:

$\gamma \subseteq \alpha^{\perp\perp}$ and $\gamma \subseteq \beta^{\perp\perp}$, thus $[\gamma, \alpha^\perp]_A = \Delta_A$ and $[\gamma, \beta^\perp]_A = \Delta_A$;

$[\delta, \alpha \cap \beta]_A = \Delta_A$, so $\delta \cap \alpha \cap \beta = \Delta_A$, thus $[\alpha \cap \delta, \beta]_A = \Delta_A$, hence $\alpha \cap \delta \subseteq \beta^\perp$;

therefore $[\gamma, \alpha \cap \delta]_A = \Delta_A$, so $\gamma \cap \alpha \cap \delta = \Delta_A$, thus $[\gamma \cap \delta, \alpha]_A = \Delta_A$, so $\gamma \cap \delta \subseteq \alpha^\perp$;

hence $[\gamma, \gamma \cap \delta]_A = \Delta_A$, so $\gamma \cap \delta = \gamma \cap \gamma \cap \delta = \Delta_A$, thus $[\gamma, \delta]_A = \Delta_A$, hence $\alpha^{\perp\perp} \cap \beta^{\perp\perp} = \gamma \subseteq \delta^\perp = [\alpha, \beta]_A^{\perp\perp} = (\alpha \cap \beta)^{\perp\perp}$ by the above.

But $(\alpha \cap \beta)^{\perp\perp} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp\perp} \cap \beta^{\perp\perp}$ by (ii). Therefore $(\alpha \cap \beta)^{\perp\perp} = \alpha^{\perp\perp} \cap \beta^{\perp\perp}$.

(vi) By (v), $[\alpha, \beta]_A^{\perp\perp} = (\alpha \cap \beta)^{\perp\perp} = \alpha^{\perp\perp} \cap \beta^{\perp\perp}$, thus, according to (ii) and (iii): $\alpha^\perp \subseteq \beta^\perp$ iff $\beta^{\perp\perp} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp\perp}$ iff $\alpha^{\perp\perp} \cap \beta^{\perp\perp} = \beta^{\perp\perp}$ iff $[\alpha, \beta]_A^{\perp\perp} = \beta^{\perp\perp}$ iff $[\alpha, \beta]_A^\perp = \beta^\perp$.

(vii) If A is semiprime, then: $\alpha \subseteq \alpha^\perp$ iff $[\alpha, \alpha]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $\alpha \cap \alpha = \Delta_A$ iff $\alpha = \Delta_A$. \square

Lemma 3.5. [1, Proposition 4, (1)], [13, Proposition 18, Corollary 2] *For any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$:*

- $\rho_A(\theta) = \max\{\alpha \in \text{Con}(A) \mid (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}^*)([\alpha, \alpha]_A^n \subseteq \theta)\} = \bigvee\{\alpha \in \text{Con}(A) \mid (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}^*)([\alpha, \alpha]_A^n \subseteq \theta)\} = \bigvee\{\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}^*)([\alpha, \alpha]_A^n \subseteq \theta)\} = \bigvee\{\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A) \mid (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}^*)([\alpha, \alpha]_A^n \subseteq \theta)\} = \{(a, b) \in A^2 \mid (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}^*)([Cg_A(a, b), Cg_A(a, b)]_A^n \subseteq \theta)\};$
- *for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\alpha \subseteq \rho_A(\theta)$ iff there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $[\alpha, \alpha]_A^n \subseteq \theta$;*
- *A is semiprime iff, for any $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $[\alpha, \alpha]_A^n = \Delta_A$ implies $\alpha = \Delta_A$.*

Proposition 3.6. *If $[\theta, \nabla_A]_A = \theta$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is either congruence–distributive or both congruence–modular and semi–degenerate, then: A/θ^\perp is semiprime for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ iff A is semiprime.*

Proof. By [14, Proposition 5.22] and Lemma 3.1, if A is semiprime, then A/ζ is semiprime for all $\zeta \in \text{RCon}(A)$, in particular A/θ^\perp is semiprime for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$.

Conversely, if A/θ^\perp is semiprime for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, then A/∇_A^\perp is semiprime; but $\nabla_A^\perp = \Delta_A$ by Lemma 3.4, (i), and $A/\nabla_A^\perp = A/\Delta_A \cong A$, thus A is semiprime. \square

See also [13] for the following properties. By [25, Proposition 6.7], if $[\theta, \nabla_A]_A = \theta$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is either congruence–distributive or both congruence–modular and semi–degenerate, then:

- for any $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$ and any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, $[\varepsilon, \alpha]_A = \varepsilon \cap \alpha$;
- $\mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$ is a Boolean sublattice of $\text{Con}(A)$ whose complementation is \cdot^\perp and in which, by the above, the commutator equals the intersection.

By [25, Proposition 6.11], if $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $[\theta, \nabla_A]_A = \theta$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence–modular and semi–degenerate, then $\mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A)) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(A)$.

Let us also note that, if the commutator of A equals the intersection, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence–distributive, then $\text{Con}(A)$ is a frame, hence $\mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$ is a complete Boolean sublattice of $\text{Con}(A)$.

Following [6], we say that an algebra A is *hyperarchimedean* iff, for all $\theta \in \text{PCon}(A)$, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $[\theta, \theta]_A^n \in \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$.

By the above, if the commutator of A equals the intersection, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence–distributive, then A is hyperarchimedean iff $\text{PCon}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$ iff $\text{Con}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$ iff $\mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A)) = \text{Con}(A)$; furthermore, if the commutator of A equals the intersection and $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence–distributive and semi–degenerate, then A is hyperarchimedean iff $\mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A)) = \mathcal{K}(A) = \text{Con}(A)$. Thus the hyperarchimedean members of a congruence–distributive variety are those with Boolean lattices of congruences and, if the variety is also semi–degenerate, then all congruences of its hyperarchimedean members are compact.

Extending the terminology used for rings in [25], we call A a *strongly Baer*, respectively *Baer algebra* iff, for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, respectively all $\theta \in \text{PCon}(A)$, we have $\theta^\perp \in \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$, iff the commutator lattice $(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)$ is strongly Stone, respectively Stone.

Lemma 3.7. *If $[\theta, \nabla_A]_A = \theta$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is either congruence–distributive or both congruence–modular and semi–degenerate, then: A is Baer iff, for all $\theta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, we have $\theta^\perp \in \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$.*

Proof. The converse implication is trivial.

If A is Baer and $\theta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, so that $\theta = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \theta_i$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n \in \text{PCon}(A)$, then $\theta_1^\perp, \dots, \theta_n^\perp \in \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$, so that, according to Lemma 3.4, (iv), $\theta^\perp = (\theta_1 \vee \dots \vee \theta_n)^\perp = \theta_1^\perp \cap \dots \cap \theta_n^\perp \in \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$. \square

Proposition 3.8. *If $[\theta, \nabla_A]_A = \theta$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is either congruence–distributive or both congruence–modular and semi–degenerate, then:*

- (i) *if A is hyperarchimedean, then A is strongly Baer;*
- (ii) *if A is strongly Baer, then A is semiprime;*
- (iii) *if A is Baer and has principal commutators, then A is semiprime.*

Proof. (i) By the above, if A is hyperarchimedean, then $\mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A)) = \text{Con}(A)$, thus A is strongly Baer.

(ii) Assume that A is strongly Baer and let $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $[\theta, \theta]_A^n = \Delta_A$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. By the basic properties of the implication above and the fact that, if $n \geq 2$, then $[\theta, \theta]_A^n = [[\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1}, [\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1}]_A$, this implies that $[\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1} \subseteq ([\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1})^\perp$. But, since A is strongly Baer, $([\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1})^\perp \in \mathcal{B}(\text{Con}(A))$ thus its commutator with any congruence of A equals the intersection, hence $[\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1} = [\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1} \cap ([\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1})^\perp = [[\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1}, ([\theta, \theta]_A^{n-1})^\perp]_A = \Delta_A$. By turning the above into a recursive argument we get that $[\theta, \theta]_A = \Delta_A$ and then that $\theta = \Delta_A$. By Lemma 3.5, it follows that A is semiprime.

(iii) By an analogous argument to that of (ii), taking $\theta \in \text{PCon}(A)$, so that $[\theta, \theta]_A^n \in \text{PCon}(A)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ since A has principal commutators. \square

4 The Minimal Prime Spectrum

\textcircled{H} Throughout this section, we will assume that the commutator of A is commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins, which holds if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular.

By an argument based on Zorn's Lemma, it follows that:

- any prime congruence of A includes a minimal prime congruence, hence $\rho_A(\Delta_A) = \bigcap \text{Spec}(A) = \bigcap \text{Min}(A)$;
- moreover, for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ and any $\psi \in V_A(\theta) = [\theta] \cap \text{Spec}(A)$, there exists a $\phi \in \text{Min}(V_A(\theta)) = \text{Min}([\theta] \cap \text{Spec}(A))$ such that $\phi \subseteq \psi$, hence:

Remark 4.1. For any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we have:

- $\rho_A(\theta) = \bigcap \text{Min}(V_A(\theta)) = \bigcap \text{Min}([\theta] \cap \text{Spec}(A))$;
- $D_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset$ iff $V_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \text{Min}(A)$ iff $[\theta] \cap \text{Min}(A) = \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\text{Min}(A) \subseteq [\theta]$ iff $\theta \subseteq \bigcap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\theta \subseteq \rho_A(\Delta_A)$ iff $\rho_A(\theta) = \rho_A(\Delta_A)$.
- $D_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \text{Min}(A)$ iff $V_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset$;
 $V_A(\theta) = \emptyset$ iff $\rho_A(\theta) = \nabla_A$, which holds if $\theta = \nabla_A$; recall from [13] that, if $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $[\nabla_A, \nabla_A]_A = \nabla_A$, then $\nabla_A / \equiv_A = \{\nabla_A\}$, so: $\rho_A(\theta) = \nabla_A$ iff $\theta = \nabla_A$;
clearly, $V_A(\theta) = \emptyset$ implies $V_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset$; the converse implication holds iff $\text{Min}(A) = \text{Spec}(A)$ iff $\text{Spec}(A)$ is an antichain.

Indeed, $\text{Spec}(A)$ is an antichain iff $\text{Min}(A) = \text{Spec}(A)$, case in which $V_A(\theta) = V_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

Now, if $V_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset$ implies $V_A(\theta) = \emptyset$, then let us assume by absurdum that $\text{Min}(A) \neq \text{Spec}(A)$, that is $\text{Spec}(A) \not\subseteq \text{Min}(A)$, so that there exists $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A) \setminus \text{Min}(A)$. But then $V_A(\phi) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset$, while $V_A(\phi) \neq \emptyset$ since $\phi \in V_A(\phi)$; a contradiction.

Proposition 4.2. *If $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then, for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ and any $\phi \in V_A(\theta)$, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\phi \in \text{Min}(V_A(\theta))$;
- (ii) $\nabla_A \setminus \phi$ is a maximal element of the set of m -systems of A which are disjoint from θ .

Proof. By Remark 2.4, $\nabla_A \setminus \phi$ is an m -system, which is, of course, disjoint from θ since $(\nabla_A \setminus \phi) \cap \theta \subseteq (\nabla_A \setminus \phi) \cap \phi = \emptyset$. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): By an application of Zorn's Lemma, it follows that there exists a maximal element M of the set of m -systems of A which include $\nabla_A \setminus \phi$ and are disjoint from θ , so that $\nabla_A \setminus \phi \subseteq M \subseteq \nabla_A \setminus \theta$ and, furthermore, M is a maximal element of the set of m -systems of A which are disjoint from θ .

According to Lemma 2.5, there exists a $\psi \in \text{Max}\{\alpha \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \theta \subseteq \alpha, M \cap \alpha = \emptyset\} \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$, so that $\psi \in V_A(\theta)$ and $(\nabla_A \setminus \phi) \cap \psi \subseteq M \cap \psi = \emptyset$, thus $\nabla_A \setminus \phi \subseteq M \subseteq \nabla_A \setminus \psi$, hence $\psi \subseteq \phi$.

Since $\phi \in \text{Min}(V_A(\theta))$, it follows that $\phi = \psi$, thus $\nabla_A \setminus \phi = M$, which is a maximal element of the set of m -systems of A which are disjoint from θ .

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let μ be a minimal element of $V_A(\theta)$ with $\mu \subseteq \phi$.

By Remark 2.4, $\nabla_A \setminus \mu$ is an m -system, which is disjoint from θ since $(\nabla_A \setminus \mu) \cap \theta \subseteq (\nabla_A \setminus \mu) \cap \mu = \emptyset$, and $\nabla_A \setminus \phi \subseteq \nabla_A \setminus \mu$.

Since $\nabla_A \setminus \phi$ is a maximal element of the set of m -systems of A which are disjoint from θ , it follows that $\nabla_A \setminus \phi = \nabla_A \setminus \mu$, thus $\phi = \mu$, which is a minimal element of $V_A(\theta)$. \square

Corollary 4.3. *If $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, in particular if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then, for any $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A)$, the following are equivalent:*

- $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$;
- $\nabla_A \setminus \phi$ is a maximal element of the set of m -systems of A which are disjoint from Δ_A .

Proof. By Proposition 4.2 for $\theta = \Delta_A$. \square

Lemma 4.4. [29] *If L is a bounded distributive lattice and $P \in \text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(L)$, then the following are equivalent:*

- $P \in \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L)$;
- for any $x \in P$, $\text{Ann}_L(x) \not\subseteq P$.

Recall from Section 2 that $\text{Spec}(A) = \text{Mi}(\text{Con}(A)) \cap \text{RCon}(A)$. By [25, Proposition 4.4], if A is semiprime, then all annihilators in $(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)$ are lattice ideals of $\text{Con}(A)$.

Remember that, in the commutator lattice $(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)$, $R(\text{Con}(A)) = \text{RCon}(A)$ and $\text{Spec}_{\text{Con}(A)} = \text{Spec}(A)$, and that, since $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$ is a frame, the elements of $\text{Spec}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}$ are exactly the meet-prime elements of $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$, thus, by the distributivity of $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$, $\text{Spec}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A} = \text{Mi}(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$.

Lemma 4.5. *If A is semiprime, then:*

- (i) for any $U \subseteq \text{Con}(A)$, $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}(U/\equiv_A) = \text{Ann}_{(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)}(U)/\equiv_A$;
- (ii) $\text{Spec}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A} = \{\phi/\equiv_A \mid \phi \in \text{Spec}(A)\}$;
- (iii) for all $\theta \in \text{RCon}(A)$, $\theta/\equiv_A \cap \text{RCon}(A) = \{\theta\}$ and $\theta = \max(\theta/\equiv_A)$;
- (iv) $\phi \mapsto \phi/\equiv_A$ is an order isomorphism from $\text{Spec}(A)$ to $\text{Spec}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}$;
- (v) $R(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A) = \{\phi/\equiv_A \mid \phi \in \text{RCon}(A)\}$; moreover, for any $\phi \in \text{Con}(A)$, we have: $\phi \in \text{RCon}(A)$ iff $\phi/\equiv_A \in R(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$; thus $\phi \mapsto \phi/\equiv_A$ is an order isomorphism from $\text{RCon}(A)$ to $R(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$.

Proof. (i) By [25, Lemma 4.2].

(ii) By [25, Proposition 6.2].

(iii) By [25, Remark 5.11].

(iv) By (ii), (iii) and the fact that $\text{Spec}(A) \subseteq \text{RCon}(A)$ and $\text{Spec}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A} \subseteq R(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$.

(v) The equality follows from (ii) and the definition of radical elements; by (iii), we also obtain the equivalence and the order isomorphism. \square

Remark 4.6. For any $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we have: $\alpha/\equiv_A \leq \beta/\equiv_A$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) \subseteq \rho_A(\beta)$, because: $\alpha/\equiv_A \leq \beta/\equiv_A$ iff $\alpha/\equiv_A \wedge \beta/\equiv_A = \alpha/\equiv_A$ iff $(\alpha \cap \beta)/\equiv_A = \alpha/\equiv_A$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha \cap \beta) = \rho_A(\alpha)$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) \cap \rho_A(\beta) = \rho_A(\alpha)$ iff $\rho_A(\alpha) \subseteq \rho_A(\beta)$.

In many of the following results, we will refer to these hypotheses:

$(\lambda)_A$ $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $\mathcal{K}(A)$ is closed w.r.t. the commutator of A ;

$(\mu)_A$ all principal ideals of $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$ generated by minimal prime elements are minimal prime ideals, that is: for any $p \in \text{Min}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}$, we have $\langle p \rangle \in \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$.

Since an element of a lattice is prime iff the principal ideal it generates is prime, we have that, whenever a principal ideal of a lattice is a minimal prime ideal, it follows that its generator is a minimal prime element of that lattice. Hence condition $(\mu)_A$ is equivalent to:

- for any $p \in \text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$, we have: $p \in \text{Min}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}$ iff $\langle p \rangle \in \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$.

Recall that $\mathcal{K}(A) = \text{Cp}(\text{Con}(A))$. Note that $\widehat{\mu}_A$ holds if all prime ideals of $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$ are principal, in particular if all ideals of $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$ are principal, that is if $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$ is compact, in particular if $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A = \mathcal{K}(A)/\equiv_A$, that is if $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A = \mathcal{L}(A)$ in the case when $\mathcal{K}(A)$ is closed w.r.t. the commutator, in particular if $\text{Con}(A)$ is compact, that is if $\text{Con}(A) = \mathcal{K}(A)$.

If $\text{Con}(A) = \mathcal{K}(A)$, then $\widehat{\lambda}_A$ is trivially satisfied.

Recall from [13], that, if $\widehat{\lambda}_A$ is satisfied, then the *reticulation* $\mathcal{L}(A)$ of A can be constructed as the lattice $\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{K}(A)/\equiv_A$, which is a bounded sublattice of the frame $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$ and thus $\mathcal{L}(A)$ is a bounded distributive lattice.

Recall, also, that, if \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular and semi-degenerate, then $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$.

Proposition 4.7. *Assume that A is semiprime and let $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A)$. Let us consider the following statements:*

- (i) $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$;
- (ii) for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ implies $\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$;
- (iii) for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ iff $\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$;
- (iv) for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ implies $\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$;
- (v) for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ iff $\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$.

If $\widehat{\lambda}_A$ holds, then statements (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.

If $\widehat{\mu}_A$ holds, then statements (i), (iv) and (v) are equivalent.

Proof. Case 1: Assume that A satisfies $\widehat{\lambda}_A$.

(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii): Recall from [13] that we have the following maps, which are clearly order-preserving [13, Lemma 11.(i)]: $\theta \mapsto \theta^*$ from $\text{Con}(A)$ to $\text{Id}(\mathcal{L}(A))$, defined by: $\theta^* = ((\theta) \cap \mathcal{K}(A))/\equiv_A$ for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$;

$I \mapsto I_*$ from $\text{Id}(\mathcal{L}(A))$ to $\text{Con}(A)$, defined by: $I_* = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \gamma/\equiv_A \in I\}$ for all $I \in \text{Id}(\mathcal{L}(A))$.

By [13, Proposition 11], these maps restrict to order isomorphisms between $\text{Spec}(A)$ and $\text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$, inverses of each other, thus they further restrict to mutually inverse order isomorphisms between $\text{Min}(A)$ and $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$.

Let $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and all $\psi \in \text{Spec}(A)$, arbitrary. By the above, $(\psi^*)_* = \psi$. Since $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $(\beta/\equiv_A)_{\mathcal{L}(A)} = (\beta/\equiv_A)_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A} \cap \mathcal{L}(A) = (\beta)_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A} \cap \mathcal{K}(A)/\equiv_A = ((\beta)_{\text{Con}(A)} \cap \mathcal{K}(A))/\equiv_A = \beta^*$, hence $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\beta/\equiv_A) = \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}((\beta/\equiv_A)_{\mathcal{L}(A)}) = \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\beta^*)$. By [13, Lemma 27], since A is semiprime, we have: $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\beta^*) \subseteq \psi^*$ iff $\beta^\perp \subseteq (\psi^*)_*$, that is $\beta^\perp \subseteq \psi$.

Hence: $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\phi^* \in \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$. By Lemma 4.4, the latter is equivalent to: $(\forall x \in \phi^*) (\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(x) \not\subseteq \phi^*)$, that is: $(\forall \alpha \in (\phi) \cap \mathcal{K}(A)) (\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\alpha/\equiv_A) \not\subseteq \phi^*)$, which means that: $(\forall \alpha \in (\phi) \cap \mathcal{K}(A)) (\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\alpha^*) \not\subseteq \phi^*)$, which is equivalent to: $(\forall \alpha \in (\phi) \cap \mathcal{K}(A)) (\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi)$, that is: $(\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)) (\alpha \subseteq \phi \Rightarrow \alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi)$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii): Trivial.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): If $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ is such that $\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$, then, since $[\alpha, \alpha^\perp]_A = \Delta_A \subseteq \phi \in \text{Spec}(A)$, it follows that $\alpha \subseteq \phi$.

Case 2: Now assume that A satisfies $\widehat{\mu}_A$.

(v) \Rightarrow (iv): Trivial.

(iv) \Rightarrow (v): Analogous to the proof of (ii) \Rightarrow (iii).

(i) \Leftrightarrow (iv): By Lemma 4.5.(iv), the condition that $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A)$ is equivalent to $\phi/\equiv_A \in \text{Spec}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}$, which is equivalent to $(\phi/\equiv_A) \in \text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$.

Again by Lemma 4.5.(iv), $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\phi/\equiv_A \in \text{Min}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}$, which is equivalent to $(\phi/\equiv_A) \in \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A)$. By Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5.(i), the latter is equivalent to the fact that, for any $\alpha \in (\phi)$, $(\alpha^\perp/\equiv_A) = (\alpha^\perp)_{\equiv_A} = \text{Ann}_{(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)}(\alpha)/\equiv_A = \text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}(\alpha/\equiv_A) \not\subseteq (\phi/\equiv_A) = (\phi)_{\equiv_A}$, that is $\alpha^\perp/\equiv_A \not\subseteq (\phi/\equiv_A) = (\phi)_{\equiv_A}$. Since $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A) \subseteq \text{RCon}(A)$ and thus $\phi = \max(\phi/\equiv_A)$ by Lemma 4.5.(iii), this condition is equivalent to $\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq (\phi)$, that is $\alpha^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$. \square

Example 4.8. Note that the equivalence in Proposition 4.7 for the case when A satisfies $\widehat{\lambda}_A$ does not hold for $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, arbitrary. Indeed, if we let A be the Boolean subalgebra of the power set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ of the set \mathbb{N} of natural numbers formed of the finite and the cofinite subsets of \mathbb{N} : $A = \{S \mid S \subseteq \mathbb{N}, |S| < \aleph_0 \text{ or } |\mathbb{N} \setminus S| < \aleph_0\}$, then, since A is a Boolean algebra, its lattice of congruences is isomorphic to its lattice of filters, and obviously this lattice isomorphism $\varphi : \text{Filt}(A) \rightarrow \text{Con}(A)$ takes the set $\text{Spec}_{\text{Filt}(A)}$ of the prime elements of the lattice

$\text{Filt}(A)$ of the filters of A , which equals the set $\text{Spec}_{\text{Filt}}(A) = \text{Max}_{\text{Filt}}(A)$ of the prime and thus maximal filters of A by a routine proof, to $\text{Spec}_{\text{Con}}(A) = \text{Spec}(A) = \text{Max}(A) = \text{Min}(A)$ since A is a Boolean algebra, therefore $\text{Min}_{\text{Filt}}(A) := \text{Min}(\text{Spec}_{\text{Filt}}(A)) = \text{Spec}_{\text{Filt}}(A) = \text{Max}_{\text{Filt}}(A) = \text{Max}(\text{Filt}(A) \setminus \{\{\mathbb{N}\}\})$. Now let us consider the filter P of A formed of the cofinite subsets of \mathbb{N} : $P = \{S \mid S \subseteq \mathbb{N}, |\mathbb{N} \setminus S| < \aleph_0\}$. It is well known that $\text{Spec}_{\text{Filt}}(A) = \text{Max}(\text{Filt}(A) \setminus \{\{\mathbb{N}\}\}) = \{M \cap A \mid M \in \text{Max}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \setminus \{\{\mathbb{N}\}\})\} \cup \{P\} = \{[\{a\}]_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})} \cap A \mid a \in M\} \cup \{P\}$, in particular P is a prime and thus a minimal prime filter of A . P is clearly not a principal, thus not a compact filter of A . Since Boolean algebras are congruence-distributive, the commutator $[\cdot, \cdot]_A$ of A equals the intersection, thus the commutator lattice $(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A = \cap)$ is isomorphic to the commutator lattice $(\text{Filt}(A), \cap)$, also endowed the commutator operation equalling the intersection, in which $P^\perp = \max\{F \in \text{Filt}(A) \mid P \cap F = \{\mathbb{N}\}\} = \max\{\{\mathbb{N}\}\} = \{\mathbb{N}\}$, since any nontrivial filter F of A contains a proper subset S of \mathbb{N} , which must thus be such that an $a \in \mathbb{N}$ does not belong to S , hence S is included in the proper cofinite subset $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{a\}$ of \mathbb{N} , so $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{a\} \in P \cap F$, which means that no nontrivial filter of A satisfies $P \cap F = \{\mathbb{N}\}$. So $P^\perp = \{\mathbb{N}\} \subset P$, of course, $P \subseteq P$. Therefore $\varphi(P) \in \text{Spec}(A) = \text{Min}(A)$ and $\varphi(P) \in \text{Con}(A) \setminus \text{Cp}(\text{Con}(A)) = \text{Con}(A) \setminus \mathcal{K}(A)$, $\varphi(P)^\perp = \varphi(P^\perp) = \varphi(\{\mathbb{N}\}) = \Delta_A \subset \varphi(P)$ and $\varphi(P) \subseteq \varphi(P)$, hence $\varphi(P) \subseteq \varphi(P)$ does not imply $\varphi(P)^\perp \not\subseteq \varphi(P)$.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and let us consider the following statements:*

- (i) $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$;
- (ii) for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ implies $\alpha \rightarrow \rho_A(\Delta_A) \not\subseteq \phi$;
- (iii) for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ implies $\alpha \rightarrow \rho_A(\Delta_A) \not\subseteq \phi$.

If \mathcal{A}_A holds, then (i) is equivalent to (ii).

If \mathcal{B}_A holds, then (i) is equivalent to (iii).

Proof. Case 1: Assume that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A . Then we have the following equivalences.

$\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\phi/\rho_A(\Delta_A) \in \text{Min}(A)$, which, by Proposition 4.7, since $A/\rho_A(\Delta_A)$ is semiprime, is equivalent to the fact that, for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $(\alpha \vee \rho_A(\Delta_A))/\rho_A(\Delta_A) \subseteq \phi/\rho_A(\Delta_A)$ implies $((\alpha \vee \rho_A(\Delta_A))/\rho_A(\Delta_A))^\perp \not\subseteq \phi/\rho_A(\Delta_A)$, that is $\alpha \vee \rho_A(\Delta_A) \subseteq \phi$ implies $(\alpha \rightarrow \rho_A(\Delta_A))/\rho_A(\Delta_A) \not\subseteq \phi/\rho_A(\Delta_A)$ according to Proposition 3.3, (ii), that is $\alpha \subseteq \phi$ implies $\alpha \rightarrow \rho_A(\Delta_A) \not\subseteq \phi$ since ϕ is prime and thus $\rho_A(\Delta_A) \subseteq \phi$.

Case 2: Assume that A satisfies \mathcal{B}_A . Then the proof goes the same as above, but for all $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$. \square

5 Two Topologies on the Minimal Prime Spectrum

\mathcal{H} Throughout this section, we will assume that the commutator of A is commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins, which holds in the particular case when \mathcal{V} is congruence-modular.

Clearly, the Stone topology $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Spec}}(A)$ of $\text{Spec}(A)$ induces the topology $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}}(A) = \{D_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \theta \in \text{Con}(A)\}$ on $\text{Min}(A)$, which has $\{D_A(a, b) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid a, b \in A\}$ as a basis and $\{V_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \theta \in \text{Con}(A)\}$ as the family of closed sets. $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}}(A)$ is called the *Stone* or *spectral topology* on $\text{Min}(A)$.

\mathcal{H} Throughout the rest of this section, we will also assume that A is semiprime.

Lemma 5.1. $\theta^\perp = \bigcap (V_A(\theta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A))$ for every $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$.

Proof. Let $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$. Clearly, $\theta^\perp \subseteq \bigcap (V_A(\theta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A))$.

Let us denote by $\alpha = \bigcap (V_A(\theta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A))$, so that $\alpha \subseteq \mu$ for any $\mu \in V_A(\theta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

Assume by absurdum that $\alpha \not\subseteq \theta^\perp$, so that $[\alpha, \theta]_A \neq \Delta_A = \rho_A(\Delta_A) = \bigcap \text{Min}(A)$ since A is semiprime, therefore $[\alpha, \theta]_A \not\subseteq \phi$ for some $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$, which implies that $\theta \not\subseteq \phi$ and $\alpha \not\subseteq \phi$, hence $\phi \notin V_A(\theta^\perp)$, that is $\theta^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$. So $\theta \not\subseteq \phi$ and $\theta^\perp \not\subseteq \phi$, while $[\theta, \theta^\perp]_A = \Delta_A \subseteq \phi$, which contradicts the fact that $\phi \in \text{Min}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$.

Therefore $\bigcap (V_A(\theta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = \alpha \subseteq \theta^\perp$, hence the equality. \square

Remark 5.2. By Lemma 5.1, for any $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(A)$, we have: $\alpha^\perp = \beta^\perp$ iff $V_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\beta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $D_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\beta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

Proposition 5.3. *For any $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \text{Con}(A)$, we consider the following statements:*

- (i) $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha^{\perp\perp}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ and $D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\alpha^{\perp\perp}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$;
- (ii) $\alpha^\perp \cap \beta^\perp = \gamma^\perp$ iff $V_A(\alpha) \cap V_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\gamma) \cap \text{Min}(A)$;
- (iii) $\alpha^{\perp\perp} = \beta^\perp$ iff $\alpha^\perp = \beta^{\perp\perp}$ iff $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\beta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $D_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

If A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A , then the statements above hold for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A)$.

If A satisfies \mathcal{B}_A , then the statements above hold for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \text{Con}(A)$.

Proof. Let $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$.

Case 1: Assume that \mathcal{A}_A holds and let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A)$.

(i) By Proposition 4.7, $\phi \in V_A(\alpha)$ iff $\phi \in D_A(\alpha^\perp)$, hence also $\phi \notin V_A(\alpha)$ iff $\phi \notin D_A(\alpha^\perp)$, that is $\phi \in D_A(\alpha)$ iff $\phi \in V_A(\alpha^\perp)$. Therefore $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ and $D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$, hence also $V_A(\alpha^{\perp\perp}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\alpha^{\perp\perp\perp}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ and $D_A(\alpha^{\perp\perp}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha^{\perp\perp\perp}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ by Lemma 3.4, (iii).

(ii) By (i), along with Proposition 3.4, (iv), and Remark 5.2, $\alpha^\perp \cap \beta^\perp = \gamma^\perp$ iff $(\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp = \gamma^\perp$ iff $V_A((\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\gamma^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $(D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) \cup (D_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = (D_A(\alpha) \cup D_A(\beta)) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\alpha \vee \beta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\gamma) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\text{Min}(A) \setminus ((D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) \cup (D_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A))) = \text{Min}(A) \setminus (D_A(\gamma) \cap \text{Min}(A))$ iff $V_A(\alpha) \cap V_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = (V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) \cap (V_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = V_A(\gamma) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

(iii) By (i) and Remark 5.2, $\alpha^{\perp\perp} = \beta^\perp$ iff $V_A(\alpha^{\perp\perp}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\beta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $D_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\beta^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

By Lemma 3.4, (iii), $\alpha^{\perp\perp} = \beta^\perp$ implies $\alpha^\perp = \alpha^{\perp\perp\perp} = \beta^{\perp\perp}$, which also proves the converse.

Case 2: The proof goes similarly in the case when \mathcal{B}_A holds, but for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \text{Con}(A)$. \square

Let us denote by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}}(A)$ the topology on $\text{Min}(A)$ generated by $\{V_A(a, b) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid a, b \in A\}$, called the *flat topology* or the *inverse topology* on $\text{Min}(A)$. Also, we denote by $\mathcal{M}in(A)$, respectively $\mathcal{M}in(A)^{-1}$ the minimal prime spectrum of A endowed with the Stone, respectively the flat topology: $\mathcal{M}in(A) = (\text{Min}(A), \mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}}(A))$ and $\mathcal{M}in(A)^{-1} = (\text{Min}(A), \mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}}(A))$.

Remark 5.4. $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}}(A)$ has $\{V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)\}$ as a basis, since $V_A(\Delta_A) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \text{Min}(A)$ and, for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, we have $\alpha \vee \beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) \cap V_A(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha \vee \beta) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

Recall that, for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, α^\perp generates the annihilator of α in the commutator lattice $(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)$ as a principal ideal.

Let us consider the following condition:

\mathcal{K}_A $\alpha^\perp \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$.

Condition \mathcal{K}_A obviously holds if the lattice $\text{Con}(A)$ is compact: $\text{Con}(A) = \mathcal{K}(A)$.

Proposition 5.5. (i) *The flat topology on $\text{Min}(A)$ is coarser than the Stone topology: $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}}(A)$.*

(ii) *If \mathcal{K}_A is satisfied, then the two topologies coincide: $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}}(A) = \mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}}(A)$, that is $\mathcal{M}in(A) = \mathcal{M}in(A)^{-1}$.*

Proof. (i) By Proposition 5.3.(i), for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}}(A)$.

(ii) Again by Proposition 5.3.(i), for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$, which belongs to $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}}(A)$ if $\alpha^\perp \in \mathcal{K}(A)$. \square

Now let L be a bounded distributive lattice. Following [13], we denote, for any $I \in \text{Id}(L)$ and $a \in L$, by $V_{\text{Id},L}(I) = \text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(L) \cap [I]_{\text{Id}(L)}$, $D_{\text{Id},L}(I) = \text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(L) \setminus V_{\text{Id},L}(I)$, $V_{\text{Id},L}(a) = V_{\text{Id},L}([a]_L)$ and $D_{\text{Id},L}(a) = D_{\text{Id},L}([a]_L)$.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Spec},\text{Id}}(L)$ the Stone topology on $\text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(L)$ and by $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Min},\text{Id}}(L)$ the Stone topology on $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L)$: $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Spec},\text{Id}}(L) = \{D_{\text{Id},L}(I) \mid I \in \text{Id}(L)\}$, having $\{D_{\text{Id},L}(a) \mid a \in L\}$ as a basis, and $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Min},\text{Id}}(L) = \{D_{\text{Id},L}(I) \cap \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L) \mid I \in \text{Id}(L)\}$, having $\{D_{\text{Id},L}(a) \cap \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L) \mid a \in L\}$ as a basis.

Also, let us denote by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min},\text{Id}}(L)$ the flat topology on $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L)$, which has $\{V_{\text{Id},L}(a) \cap \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L) \mid a \in L\}$ as a basis. And let $\mathcal{M}in_{\text{Id}}(L)$, respectively $\mathcal{M}in_{\text{Id}}(L)^{-1}$ be the minimal prime spectrum of ideals of L endowed with the Stone, respectively the flat topology: $\mathcal{M}in_{\text{Id}}(L) = (\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L), \mathcal{S}_{\text{Min},\text{Id}}(L))$ and $\mathcal{M}in_{\text{Id}}(L)^{-1} = (\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(L), \mathcal{F}_{\text{Min},\text{Id}}(L))$.

Lemma 5.6. *If \mathcal{A}_A holds and $\mathcal{L}(A)$ is the reticulation of A , then:*

- (i) $\text{Min}(A)$ is homeomorphic to $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$;
- (ii) $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ is homeomorphic to $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))^{-1}$.

Proof. Assume that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A , so that its reticulation can be constructed as: $\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{K}(A)/\equiv_A$. As in [13], let us denote by $u : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$ and $v : \text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A)) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ the mutually inverse homeomorphisms w.r.t. the Stone topologies mentioned in the proof of Proposition 4.7: $u(\phi) = \phi^*$ for all $\phi \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and $v(P) = P_*$ for all $P \in \text{Spec}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$.

- (i) u and v obviously restrict to homeomorphisms between $\text{Min}(A)$ and $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$.
- (ii) Let us recall the flat topology $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}(A)}$ has $\{V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)\}$ as a basis, while the flat topology on $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min,Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$ has $\{V_{\text{Id},\mathcal{L}(A)}((\alpha]_{\mathcal{L}(A)}) \cap \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A)) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)\}$ as a basis.

In the proof of [13, Proposition 11] we have obtained that, for all $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, $u(V_A(\alpha)) = V_{\text{Id},\mathcal{L}(A)}(\alpha^*)$. Note that, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, then $\alpha^* = (\alpha/\equiv_A]_{\mathcal{L}(A)}$, thus $u(V_A(\alpha)) = V_{\text{Id},\mathcal{L}(A)}((\alpha/\equiv_A]_{\mathcal{L}(A)})$, hence u is open w.r.t. the flat topologies on the minimal prime spectra.

Consequently, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, $v(V_{\text{Id},\mathcal{L}(A)}((\alpha/\equiv_A]_{\mathcal{L}(A)})) = v(u(V_A(\alpha))) = V_A(\alpha)$, hence v is open w.r.t. the flat topologies on the minimal prime spectra.

Therefore u and v are mutually inverse homeomorphisms between $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ and $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))^{-1}$. \square

Proposition 5.7. *If \mathcal{A}_A holds, then $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ is a compact T_1 topological space.*

Proof. Assume that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A , and let us consider the reticulation of A : $\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{K}(A)/\equiv_A$.

By Hochster's theorem [18, Proposition 3.13], there exists a commutative unitary ring R such that the reticulation $\mathcal{L}(R)$ of R is lattice isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}(A)$. Recall that the commutator lattice of the ideals of R endowed with the multiplication of ideals as commutator operation is isomorphic to the commutator lattice of its congruences, $(\text{Con}(R), [\cdot, \cdot]_R)$.

By Lemma 5.6.(ii), the minimal prime spectrum of R endowed with the flat topology, $\text{Min}(R)^{-1}$, is homeomorphic to $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(R))^{-1}$ and thus to $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))^{-1}$, which in turn is homeomorphic to $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$, thus $\text{Min}(R)^{-1}$ is homeomorphic to $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$.

By [21, Theorem 3.1], $\text{Min}(R)^{-1}$ is compact and T_1 . Therefore $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ is compact and T_1 . \square

Following [13], under \mathcal{A}_A , we will denote the lattice bounds of $\mathcal{L}(A)$ by $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$, so $\mathbf{0} = \nabla_A/\equiv_A$ and $\mathbf{1} = \Delta_A/\equiv_A$.

Theorem 5.8. *If \mathcal{A}_A is satisfied, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\text{Min}(A) = \text{Min}(A)^{-1}$;
- (ii) $\text{Min}(A)$ is compact;
- (iii) for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $\beta \subseteq \alpha^\perp$ and $(\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp = \Delta_A$.

Proof. Assume that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A . Then the reticulation $\mathcal{L}(A)$ of A is a bounded distributive lattice and thus a distributive lattice with zero, hence, according to [30, Proposition 5.1], the following are equivalent:

- (a) $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A)) = \text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))^{-1}$;
- (b) $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(A))$ is compact;
- (c) for any $x \in \mathcal{L}(A)$, there exists $y \in \mathcal{L}(A)$ such that $x \wedge y = \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(x \vee y) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

By Lemma 5.6, (i) is equivalent to (a). By Lemma 5.6.(i), (ii) is equivalent to (b).

To prove that (iii) is equivalent to (c), let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, arbitrary, so that α/\equiv_A , and β/\equiv_A are arbitrary elements of $\mathcal{L}(A)$.

A is semiprime, that is $\rho_A(\Delta_A) = \Delta_A$, which is equivalent to $\Delta_A/\equiv_A = \{\Delta_A\}$ according to [25, Remark 5.10], hence, for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\theta = \Delta_A$ iff $\theta \in \Delta_A/\equiv_A$ iff $\theta/\equiv_A = \Delta_A/\equiv_A$, that is $\theta/\equiv_A = \mathbf{0}$.

Recall that $\beta \subseteq \alpha^\perp$ is equivalent to $[\alpha, \beta]_A = \Delta_A$ and thus to $[\alpha, \beta]_A/\equiv_A = \mathbf{0}$ by the above, that is $\alpha/\equiv_A \wedge \beta/\equiv_A = \mathbf{0}$.

Furthermore, since A is semiprime, we have, for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$: by [25, Lemma 5.18.(ii)], $\text{Ann}_{(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)}(\theta) = \text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)}(\theta)$, and, by Lemma 4.5.(i), $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)}(\theta) = \{\Delta_A\}$ iff $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}(\theta/\equiv_A) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

$(\alpha \vee \beta)^\perp = \Delta_A$ means that $\text{Ann}_{(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)}(\alpha \vee \beta) = \{\Delta_A\}$, that is $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)}(\alpha \vee \beta) = \{\Delta_A\}$, which is equivalent to $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}(\alpha/\equiv_A \vee \beta/\equiv_A) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, which in turn is equivalent to $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\alpha/\equiv_A \vee \beta/\equiv_A) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, because, if we denote by $\theta = [\alpha, \beta]_A$, so that $\theta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $\theta/\equiv_A = \alpha/\equiv_A \vee \beta/\equiv_A \in \mathcal{L}(A)$, we have:

since $\mathcal{L}(A)$ is a bounded sublattice of $\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A$, $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}(\theta/\equiv_A) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ implies $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\theta/\equiv_A) = \text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}(\theta/\equiv_A) \cap \mathcal{L}(A) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$;

for the converse, recall that $\max \text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)}(\theta) = \max \text{Ann}_{(\text{Con}(A), [\cdot, \cdot]_A)}(\theta) = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid [\theta, \gamma]_A = \Delta_A\} = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid [\theta, \gamma]_A/\equiv_A = \mathbf{0}\} = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \theta/\equiv_A \wedge \gamma/\equiv_A = \mathbf{0}\}$, thus, if $\theta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, so that $\theta/\equiv_A \in \mathcal{L}(A)$, then $\max \text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)}(\theta) = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \gamma/\equiv_A \in \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\theta/\equiv_A)\}$; hence, if $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{L}(A)}(\theta/\equiv_A) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, then $\max \text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)}(\theta) = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \gamma/\equiv_A \in \{\mathbf{0}\}\} = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \gamma/\equiv_A = \mathbf{0}\} = \bigvee \{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \gamma = \Delta_A\} = \Delta_A$, thus $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)}(\theta) = \{\Delta_A\}$, which is equivalent to $\text{Ann}_{\text{Con}(A)/\equiv_A}(\theta/\equiv_A) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. \square

Proposition 5.9. *If $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $\text{Spec}(A)$ is unordered, then $\text{Min}(A)$ is compact.*

Proof. Assume that $\nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $\text{Spec}(A)$ is unordered, that is $\text{Spec}(A) = \text{Min}(A)$, and let $\text{Min}(A) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (D_A(\alpha_i) \cap \text{Min}(A))$ for some nonempty family $\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$ of congruences of A .

Then $\text{Min}(A) = (\bigcup_{i \in I} D_A(\alpha_i)) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i) \cap \text{Min}(A)$, so $V_A(\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset$. By Remark 4.1, this implies that $\bigvee_{i \in I} \alpha_i = \nabla_A \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, so that $\nabla_A = \bigvee_{i \in F} \alpha_i$ for some finite subset F of I , hence $\text{Min}(A) = D_A(\bigvee_{i \in F} \alpha_i) \cap \text{Min}(A) = (\bigcup_{i \in F} D_A(\alpha_i)) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \bigcup_{i \in F} (D_A(\alpha_i) \cap \text{Min}(A))$, therefore $\text{Min}(A)$ is compact. \square

Theorem 5.10. *If A satisfies $\textcircled{\Delta}_A$ and $\textcircled{\kappa}_A$, in particular if $\text{Con}(A) = \mathcal{K}(A)$, then $\text{Min}(A)$ is a Hausdorff topological space consisting solely of clopen sets, thus the Stone topology $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}(A)}$ is a complete Boolean sublattice of $\mathcal{P}(\text{Min}(A))$. If, moreover, $\text{Spec}(A)$ is unordered, then $\text{Min}(A)$ is also compact.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.3, (i), the Stone topology $\mathcal{S}_{\text{Min}(A)}$ on $\text{Min}(A)$ consists entirely of clopen sets.

Let μ, ν be distinct minimal prime congruences of A . Then there exist $a, b \in A$ such that $(a, b) \in \mu \setminus \nu$, so that $Cg_A(a, b) \subseteq \mu$ and $Cg_A(a, b) \not\subseteq \nu$, so that $Cg_A(a, b)^\perp \not\subseteq \mu$ by Proposition 4.7, so $\mu \in D_A(Cg_A(a, b)^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ and $\nu \in D_A(Cg_A(a, b)) \cap \text{Min}(A)$. $D_A(Cg_A(a, b)) \cap \text{Min}(A) \cap D_A(Cg_A(a, b)^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(Cg_A(a, b)) \cap D_A(Cg_A(a, b)^\perp) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A([Cg_A(a, b), Cg_A(a, b)^\perp]_A) \cap \text{Min}(A) = D_A(\Delta_A) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset \cap \text{Min}(A) = \emptyset$, therefore the topological space $(\text{Min}(A), \{D_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \theta \in \text{Con}(A)\})$ is Hausdorff.

By Proposition 5.9, if $\text{Spec}(A)$ is an antichain, then $\text{Min}(A)$ is also compact. \square

6 m -extensions

\textcircled{H} Throughout this section, we will assume that A is a subalgebra of B , the algebras A and B are semiprime and the commutators of A and B are commutative and distributive w.r.t. arbitrary joins.

In particular, the following results hold for extensions of semiprime algebras in congruence-modular varieties.

To avoid any danger of confusion, we will denote by $\alpha^{\perp A} = \alpha \rightarrow \Delta_A$ and $X^{\perp A} = Cg_A(X)^{\perp A}$ for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ and any $X \subseteq A^2$ and by $\beta^{\perp B} = \beta \rightarrow \Delta_B$ and $Y^{\perp B} = Cg_B(Y)^{\perp B}$ for any $\beta \in \text{Con}(B)$ and any $Y \subseteq B^2$. See this notation for arbitrary subsets in Section 3.

We call the extension $A \subseteq B$:

- *admissible* iff the map $i_{A,B} : A \rightarrow B$ is admissible, that is iff $i_{A,B}^*(\phi) = \phi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Spec}(A)$ for all $\phi \in \text{Spec}(B)$;
- *Min-admissible* or an *m -extension* iff $i_{A,B}^*(\mu) = \mu \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$ for all $\phi \in \text{Min}(B)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that the extension $A \subseteq B$ is admissible and let us consider the following statements:*

- (i) $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension;

- (ii) for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and any $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$, if $\alpha \subseteq \mu$, then $\alpha^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \mu$;
- (iii) for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and any $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$, $\alpha \subseteq \mu$ iff $\alpha^{\perp A} \subseteq \mu$;
- (iv) for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ and any $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$, if $\alpha \subseteq \mu$, then $\alpha^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \mu$;
- (v) for any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ and any $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$, $\alpha \subseteq \mu$ iff $\alpha^{\perp A} \subseteq \mu$.

If A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A , then (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.
If A satisfies \mathcal{B}_A , then (i), (iv) and (v) are equivalent.

Proof. For any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ and $\mu \in \text{Con}(B)$, we obviously have: $\alpha \subseteq \mu$ iff $\alpha \subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A$, and $\alpha^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \mu$ iff $\alpha^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A$.

Now assume that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A or \mathcal{B}_A , and let $M = \mathcal{K}(A)$ if \mathcal{A}_A holds, and $M = \text{Con}(A)$ if \mathcal{B}_A holds.

Since the extension $A \subseteq B$ is admissible, we have $\mu \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Spec}(A)$ for any $\mu \in \text{Spec}(B)$. $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension iff $\mu \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$ for any $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$, hence, by Proposition 4.7: $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension iff, for all $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ and all $\alpha \in M$, the following equivalence holds: $\alpha \subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A$ iff $\alpha^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A$; by the above, this is equivalent to: $\alpha \subseteq \mu$ iff $\alpha^{\perp A} \subseteq \mu$. \square

If $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension, then the function $\Gamma = i_{A,B}^* |_{\text{Min}(B)}: \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$, $\Gamma(\mu) = \mu \cap \nabla_A$ for all $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$, is well defined.

Proposition 6.2. *If the extension $A \subseteq B$ is admissible, then, for every $\psi \in \text{Spec}(A)$, there exists a $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\mu \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \psi$.*

Proof. Since $\psi \in \text{Spec}(A)$, $\nabla_A \setminus \psi$ is an m -system in A , thus also in B , according to [12, Lemma 4.18]. Hence there exists a $\nu \in \text{Max}\{\gamma \in \text{Con}(B) \mid \gamma \cap (\nabla_A \setminus \psi) = \emptyset\}$, so that $\nu \in \text{Spec}(B)$ by Lemma 2.5, and thus there exists a $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ with $\mu \subseteq \nu$, so that $\mu \cap (\nabla_A \setminus \psi) \subseteq \nu \cap (\nabla_A \setminus \psi) = \emptyset$ and thus $(\mu \cap \nabla_A) \setminus \psi = \emptyset$, so $\mu \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \psi$. \square

Corollary 6.3. \bullet *If the extension $A \subseteq B$ is admissible, then, for every $\psi \in \text{Min}(A)$, there exists a $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\mu \cap \nabla_A = \psi$.*

\bullet *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible m -extension, then $\Gamma: \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ is surjective.*

Lemma 6.4. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible m -extension, then, for any $\theta, \zeta \in \text{Con}(A)$: $[\theta, \zeta]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $[Cg_B(\theta), Cg_B(\zeta)]_B = \Delta_B$.*

Proof. Since A and B are semiprime, that is $\Delta_A = \rho_A(\Delta_A) = \bigcap \text{Min}(A)$ and $\Delta_B = \rho_B(\Delta_B) = \bigcap \text{Min}(B)$, we have: $[Cg_B(\theta), Cg_B(\zeta)]_B = \Delta_B$ iff $[Cg_B(\theta), Cg_B(\zeta)]_B \subseteq \nu$ for all $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$ iff, for all $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$, $Cg_B(\theta) \subseteq \nu$ or $Cg_B(\zeta) \subseteq \nu$ iff, for all $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$, $\theta \subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$ or $\zeta \subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$; by Corollary 6.3, the latter is equivalent to: for all $\mu \in \text{Min}(A)$, $\theta \subseteq \mu$ or $\zeta \subseteq \mu$, which in turn is equivalent to the fact that $[\theta, \zeta]_A \subseteq \mu$ for all $\mu \in \text{Min}(A)$, that is $[\theta, \zeta]_A = \Delta_A$. \square

Proposition 6.5. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible m -extension, then, for any $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$: $\theta^{\perp A} = \theta^{\perp B} \cap \nabla_A$ and $\theta^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\theta^{\perp A})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.4 we have, for any $u, v \in A$: $(u, v) \in \theta^{\perp A}$ iff $[Cg_A(u, v), \theta]_A = \Delta_A$ iff $[Cg_B(Cg_A(u, v)), Cg_B(\theta)]_B = \Delta_B$ iff $[Cg_B(u, v), Cg_B(\theta)]_B = \Delta_B$ iff $(u, v) \in \theta^{\perp B}$ iff $(u, v) \in \theta^{\perp B} \cap \nabla_A$.

Again by Lemma 6.4, we have, for any $\beta \in \text{Con}(B)$: $\theta^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\theta^{\perp B}) = \max\{\beta \in \text{Con}(B) \mid [\beta, Cg_B(\theta)]_B = \Delta_B\} \subseteq \max\{Cg_B(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \text{Con}(A), [Cg_B(\alpha), Cg_B(\theta)]_B = \Delta_B\} = \max\{Cg_B(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \text{Con}(A), \alpha, \theta]_A = \Delta_A\} = Cg_B(\max\{\alpha \in \text{Con}(A) \mid \alpha, \theta]_A = \Delta_A\}) = Cg_B(\theta^{\perp A})$; on the other hand: $[\theta, \theta^{\perp A}]_A = \Delta_A$, thus $[Cg_B(\theta), Cg_B(\theta^{\perp A})]_B = \Delta_B$, so $Cg_B(\theta^{\perp A}) \subseteq Cg_B(\theta^{\perp B}) = \theta^{\perp B}$. Therefore $Cg_B(\theta^{\perp A}) = \theta^{\perp B}$. \square

Corollary 6.6. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible m -extension, then, for any $\theta, \zeta \in \text{Con}(A)$: $\theta^{\perp A} = \zeta^{\perp A}$ iff $\theta^{\perp B} = \zeta^{\perp B}$.*

Corollary 6.7. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible m -extension such that A satisfies \mathcal{B}_A and B satisfies \mathcal{A}_B or \mathcal{B}_B , then, for any $\psi \in \text{Spec}(B)$, we have: $\psi \in \text{Min}(B)$ iff $\psi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$.*

Proof. We have the direct implication by the definition of an m -extension.

Now assume that $\psi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$ and let $\beta \in \text{Con}(B)$, arbitrary. Then, by Propositions 4.7 and 6.5: $\beta \subseteq \psi$ implies $\beta \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$, which is equivalent to $(\beta \cap \nabla_A)^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$, hence $(\beta \cap \nabla_A)^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \psi$, thus $Cg_B(\beta \cap \nabla_A)^{\perp B} = (\beta \cap \nabla_A)^{\perp B} = Cg_B((\beta \cap \nabla_A)^{\perp A}) \not\subseteq \psi$, hence $[\beta, \psi]_B \supseteq [Cg_B(\beta \cap \nabla_A), \psi]_B \supsetneq \Delta_B$ since $\beta \supseteq Cg_B(\beta \cap \nabla_A)$, thus $\beta^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \psi$. Therefore, again by Proposition 4.7, $\psi \in \text{Min}(B)$. \square

Remark 6.8. Note from the proof of Corollary 6.7 that, if $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible m -extension such that A satisfies $\textcircled{\mu}_A$ and B satisfies $\textcircled{\lambda}_B$ or $\textcircled{\mu}_B$, then B satisfies the equivalence of all statements (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) in Proposition 4.7.

By extending the terminology for ring extensions from [4], we call $A \subseteq B$:

- a *rigid*, respectively *quasirigid*, respectively *weak rigid extension* iff, for any $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, there exists an $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$, respectively an $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, respectively an $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\alpha^{\perp B} = \beta^{\perp B}$;
- an *r-extension*, respectively a *quasi r-extension*, respectively *weak r-extension* iff, for any $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ and any $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$ such that $\beta \not\subseteq \mu$, there exists an $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$, respectively an $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, respectively an $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$ and $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}$;
- an *r*-extension*, respectively a *quasi r*-extension*, respectively a *weak r*-extension* iff, for any $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ and any $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$ such that $\beta \subseteq \mu$, there exists an $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$, respectively an $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, respectively an $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\alpha \subseteq \mu$ and $\alpha^{\perp B} \subseteq \beta^{\perp B}$.

Remark 6.9. If $A \subseteq B$ is admissible or an m -extension, then, since any $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ and $\mu \in \text{Con}(B)$ satisfy the equivalence $\alpha \subseteq \mu$ iff $\alpha \subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A$, thus also the equivalence $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$ iff $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A$, it follows that $A \subseteq B$ is:

- an *r-extension*, respectively a *quasi r-extension*, respectively *weak r-extension* iff, for any $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, $\{\mu \cap \nabla_A \mid \mu \in D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)\} \subseteq \bigcup \{D_A(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in M, \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\} = D_A(\bigvee \{\alpha \in M \mid \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\})$, where M is equal to $\text{PCon}(A)$, respectively $\mathcal{K}(A)$, respectively $\text{Con}(A)$;
- an *r*-extension*, respectively a *quasi r*-extension*, respectively a *weak r*-extension* iff, for any $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, $\{\mu \cap \nabla_A \mid \mu \in V_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)\} \subseteq \bigcup \{V_A(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in M, \alpha^{\perp B} \subseteq \beta^{\perp B}\}$, where M is equal to $\text{PCon}(A)$, respectively $\mathcal{K}(A)$, respectively $\text{Con}(A)$;

thus, if $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension, then $A \subseteq B$ is:

- an *r-extension*, respectively a *quasi r-extension*, respectively *weak r-extension* iff, for any $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, $\Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) \subseteq \bigcup \{D_A(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in M, \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\} = D_A(\bigvee \{\alpha \in M \mid \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\})$, where M is equal to $\text{PCon}(A)$, respectively $\mathcal{K}(A)$, respectively $\text{Con}(A)$;
- an *r*-extension*, respectively a *quasi r*-extension*, respectively a *weak r*-extension* iff, for any $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, $\Gamma(V_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) \subseteq \bigcup \{V_A(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in M, \alpha^{\perp B} \subseteq \beta^{\perp B}\}$, where M is equal to $\text{PCon}(A)$, respectively $\mathcal{K}(A)$, respectively $\text{Con}(A)$.

Remark 6.10. Note from Lemma 2.1 that, for any set I and any $\{a_i, b_i \mid i \in I\} \subseteq A$, $Cg_B(Cg_A(\{(a_i, b_i) \mid i \in I\})) = Cg_B(\{(a_i, b_i) \mid i \in I\})$, hence, for any $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$, $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ and $\gamma \in \text{Con}(A)$, it follows that $Cg_B(\alpha) \in \text{PCon}(B)$, $Cg_B(\beta) \in \mathcal{K}(B)$ and $Cg_B(\gamma) \in \text{Con}(B)$.

Proposition 6.11. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension, then:*

- (i) *if B satisfies $\textcircled{\mu}_B$ and $A \subseteq B$ is a weak rigid extension, then it is both a weak r-extension and a weak r*-extension;*
- (ii) *if B satisfies $\textcircled{\lambda}_B$ or $\textcircled{\mu}_B$ and $A \subseteq B$ is a quasirigid extension, then it is both a quasi r-extension and a quasi r*-extension;*
- (iii) *if B satisfies $\textcircled{\lambda}_B$ or $\textcircled{\mu}_B$ and $A \subseteq B$ is a rigid extension, then it is both an r-extension and an r*-extension.*

Proof. (ii) Assume that $A \subseteq B$ is a quasirigid extension and let $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ and $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, so that $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = \beta^{\perp B}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, hence, according to Proposition 4.7 and Remark 6.10:

- $\beta \not\subseteq \mu$ implies $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \mu$, thus $Cg_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \mu$, hence $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$;
- $\beta \subseteq \mu$ implies $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = \beta^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \mu$, thus $\alpha \subseteq Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \mu$.

(i) and (iii) Analogously. □

Proposition 6.12. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension, then:*

- (i) Γ is continuous w.r.t. the Stone topologies and the inverse topologies;
- (ii) if $(\mathcal{X}_A, \mathcal{U}_A, \mathcal{X}_B)$ or (\mathcal{U}_B) is satisfied, then $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ is continuous.
- (iii) if A satisfies (\mathcal{K}_A) , along with one of (\mathcal{X}_A) or (\mathcal{U}_A) , or B satisfies (\mathcal{K}_B) , along with one of (\mathcal{X}_B) or (\mathcal{U}_B) , then $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B)^{-1} \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ is continuous.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$, so that $D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ is an arbitrary open set in $\text{Min}(A)$, $D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$ is an open set in $\text{Min}(B)$ and, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$, so that $Cg_B(\alpha) \in \mathcal{K}(B)$, then $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ is an arbitrary basic open set in $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ and $V_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$ is a basic open set in $\text{Min}(B)^{-1}$.

Since $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension, we have, for all $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$: $\nu \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$, thus:

$\nu \in \Gamma^{-1}(V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A))$ iff $\nu \cap \nabla_A \in V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = [\alpha] \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\nu \cap \nabla_A \in [\alpha]$ iff $\alpha \subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$ iff $\alpha \subseteq \nu$ iff $Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \nu$ iff $\nu \in V_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$; hence $\Gamma^{-1}(V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = V_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$;

similarly, $\nu \in \Gamma^{-1}(D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A))$ iff $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$ iff $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $Cg_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\nu \in D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$; hence $\Gamma^{-1}(D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$.

(i) Hence $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ and $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B)^{-1} \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ are continuous.

(ii) Assume that $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$.

If (\mathcal{X}_A) or (\mathcal{U}_A) hold, then, by Proposition 4.7: $\alpha \subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$ iff $\alpha^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$ iff $\alpha^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $Cg_B(\alpha^{\perp A}) \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\nu \in D_B(Cg_B(\alpha^{\perp A})) \cap \text{Min}(B)$; hence $\Gamma^{-1}(V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = D_B(Cg_B(\alpha^{\perp A})) \cap \text{Min}(B)$.

If (\mathcal{X}_B) or (\mathcal{U}_B) hold, then, by Proposition 4.7: $Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \nu$ iff $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\nu \in D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B)$; hence $\Gamma^{-1}(V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B)$.

Hence, in either of these cases, $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)^{-1}$ is continuous.

(iii) Analogous to the proof of (ii) or simply by applying (i), (ii) and Proposition 5.5.(ii). □

Proposition 6.13. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible quasi r -extension and B satisfies (\mathcal{X}_B) or (\mathcal{U}_B) , then:*

- $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension;
- if, furthermore, A satisfies (\mathcal{X}_A) or (\mathcal{U}_A) , then Γ is a bijection.

Proof. Assume that $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible quasi r -extension and B satisfies (\mathcal{X}_B) or (\mathcal{U}_B) .

Assume by absurdum that there exists a $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$ with $\nu \cap \nabla_A \notin \text{Min}(A)$, so that $\nu \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Spec}(A) \setminus \text{Min}(A)$ since $\text{Min}(B) \subseteq \text{Spec}(B)$ and $A \subseteq B$ is admissible, hence there exists $\mu \in \text{Min}(A)$ such that $\mu \subsetneq \nu \cap \nabla_A$.

Since $A \subseteq B$ is admissible, by Corollary 6.3 it follows that $\mu = \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A$ for some $\varepsilon \in \text{Min}(B)$. Thus $\varepsilon \cap \nabla_A = \mu \subsetneq \nu \cap \nabla_A$, therefore ε and ν are distinct minimal prime congruences of B , hence they are incomparable, thus $\varepsilon \setminus \nu \neq \emptyset$, so that $(x, y) \in \varepsilon \setminus \nu$ for some $x, y \in B$.

Then $Cg_B(x, y) \not\subseteq \nu$, so that, since $A \subseteq B$ is a quasi r -extension, there exists an $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu$ and $Cg_B(x, y)^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}$. Then $Cg_B(\alpha) \in \mathcal{K}(B)$ and $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu$, thus $Cg_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \mu$, hence $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \subseteq \nu$ by Proposition 4.7 and the fact that B satisfies (\mathcal{X}_B) or (\mathcal{U}_B) .

Also, $Cg_B(x, y) \subseteq \varepsilon$, thus, again by Proposition 4.7 and the fact that B satisfies (\mathcal{X}_B) or (\mathcal{U}_B) , $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \supseteq Cg_B(x, y)^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \varepsilon$, hence $\alpha \subseteq Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \varepsilon$, thus $\alpha \subseteq \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A = \mu \subset \nu \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \nu$, hence $Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \nu$, so that $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \nu$, which contradicts the above.

Therefore $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension, hence Γ is surjective by Corollary 6.3 and the admissibility of $A \subseteq B$.

Now let $\phi, \psi \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\Gamma(\phi) = \Gamma(\psi)$, that is $\phi \cap \nabla_A = \psi \cap \nabla_A$, and assume by absurdum that $\phi \neq \psi$, so that $\phi \setminus \psi \neq \emptyset$, that is $(u, v) \in \phi \setminus \psi$ for some $u, v \in B$, which thus satisfy $Cg_B(u, v) \subseteq \phi$ and $Cg_B(u, v) \not\subseteq \psi$.

As above, it follows that there exists a $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $\gamma \not\subseteq \psi$ and $Cg_B(u, v)^{\perp B} \subseteq \gamma^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\gamma^{\perp A})$ by Proposition 6.5, while $Cg_B(u, v)^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \phi$, hence $Cg_B(\gamma^{\perp A}) \not\subseteq \phi$, thus $\gamma^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \phi$. But then $\gamma \not\subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$ and $\gamma^{\perp A} \not\subseteq \phi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$. If A satisfies \mathfrak{A}_A or \mathfrak{U}_A , then this implies $\gamma \subseteq \phi \cap \nabla_A$ by Proposition 4.7.

Hence $\gamma \subseteq \phi \cap \nabla_A = \psi \cap \nabla_A \not\subseteq \gamma$; a contradiction. Therefore Γ is injective. \square

Proposition 6.14. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible quasi r^* -extension and B satisfies \mathfrak{A}_B or \mathfrak{U}_B , then:*

- $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension;
- if, furthermore, A satisfies \mathfrak{A}_A or \mathfrak{U}_A , then Γ is a bijection.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 6.13. \square

Theorem 6.15. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible extension such that A satisfies \mathfrak{A}_A or \mathfrak{U}_A and B satisfies \mathfrak{A}_B or \mathfrak{U}_B , then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \subseteq B$ is an r -extension;
- (ii) $A \subseteq B$ is a quasi r -extension;
- (iii) $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ is a homeomorphism.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Trivial.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible quasi r -extension such that A satisfies \mathfrak{A}_A or \mathfrak{U}_A and B satisfies \mathfrak{A}_B or \mathfrak{U}_B , then, by Propositions 6.13 and 6.12, it follows that $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension and $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ is a continuous bijection.

Let $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, arbitrary, so that $\Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = \{\psi \cap \nabla_A \mid \psi \in D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)\} = \{\psi \cap \nabla_A \mid \psi \in \text{Min}(B), \beta \not\subseteq \psi\}$.

By Remark 6.9 and the fact that $A \subseteq B$ is a quasi r -extension and an m -extension, $\Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) \subseteq D_A(\bigvee\{\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\}) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

Now let $\phi \in D_A(\bigvee\{\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = (\bigcup\{D_A(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A), \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\}) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \bigcup\{D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A), \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\}$, so that $\phi \in D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B} = (Cg_B(\alpha))^{\perp B}$ by Proposition 6.5.

By Corollary 6.3, there exists $\psi \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\Gamma(\psi) = \psi \cap \nabla_A = \phi \not\subseteq \alpha$, thus $\psi \not\subseteq Cg_B(\alpha)$, hence $\psi \supseteq Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = \beta^{\perp B}$ and thus $\psi \not\subseteq \beta$ by Proposition 4.7 and the fact that B satisfies \mathfrak{A}_B or \mathfrak{U}_B , so that $\psi \in D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)$, thus $\phi \in \Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B))$.

Hence we also have the converse inclusion: $D_A(\bigvee\{\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\}) \cap \text{Min}(A) \subseteq \Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B))$, hence $\Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = D_A(\bigvee\{\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(A) \mid \beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}\}) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

Therefore $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ is also open, thus it is a homeomorphism.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Assume that Γ is a homeomorphism w.r.t. the Stone topologies, so that $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension and Γ maps basic open sets of $\text{Min}(B)$ to basic open sets of $\text{Min}(A)$.

Let $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, so that $D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)$ is a basic open set of $\text{Min}(B)$. By the above, there exists $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$ such that $\{\mu \cap \nabla_A \mid \mu \in D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)\} = \Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

Hence, for all $\mu \in D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)$, that is $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\beta \not\subseteq \mu$, we have $\mu \cap \nabla_A \in D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$, so $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A$, that is $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$. Since, A satisfies \mathfrak{A}_A or \mathfrak{U}_A and B satisfies \mathfrak{A}_B or \mathfrak{U}_B , we have, by Proposition 4.7: $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \mu$ and $\alpha^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \subseteq \mu$.

Now let $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(B)$ such that $\gamma \subseteq \beta^{\perp B}$, arbitrary. Any $\varepsilon \in \text{Min}(B)$ satisfies the following:

- if $Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \varepsilon$, then $[\gamma, Cg_B(\alpha)]_B \subseteq \varepsilon$;
- if $Cg_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \varepsilon$, then $\alpha \not\subseteq \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A$, that is $\Gamma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A \in D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) = \Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B))$, hence $\varepsilon \in D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)$ since Γ is a bijection, thus $\beta \not\subseteq \varepsilon$, so $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \varepsilon$, again by Proposition 4.7, thus $\gamma \subseteq \varepsilon$ by the above, hence $[\gamma, Cg_B(\alpha)]_B \subseteq \varepsilon$.

Hence $[\gamma, Cg_B(\alpha)]_B \subseteq \bigcap \text{Min}(B) = \Delta_B$ since B is semiprime, thus $[\gamma, Cg_B(\alpha)]_B = \Delta_B$, that is $\gamma \subseteq Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = \alpha^{\perp B}$. Therefore $\beta^{\perp B} = \bigvee\{\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(B) \mid \gamma \subseteq \beta^{\perp B}\} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B}$. Hence $A \subseteq B$ is an r -extension. \square

Proposition 6.16. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible r -extension such that A satisfies \mathfrak{A}_A or \mathfrak{U}_A and B satisfies \mathfrak{A}_B or \mathfrak{U}_B , then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $A \subseteq B$ is a rigid extension;

(ii) Γ maps basic open sets of $\text{Min}(B)$ to basic open sets of $\text{Min}(A)$.

Proof. By Proposition 6.13, $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension and Γ is bijective.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$, so that there exists $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$ with $\beta^{\perp B} = \alpha^{\perp B} = \text{Cg}_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}$ since $A \subseteq B$ is rigid.

By Proposition 4.7, for any $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$, the following equivalences hold: $\beta \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \nu$ iff $(\text{Cg}_B(\alpha))^{\perp B} \subseteq \nu$ iff $\text{Cg}_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$, therefore, since Γ is bijective, we have $\Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = \{\nu \cap \nabla_A \mid \nu \in \text{Min}(B), \beta \not\subseteq \nu\} = \{\mu \in \text{Min}(A) \mid \alpha \not\subseteq \mu\} = D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$. By to the hypothesis of this implication, $\Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ for some $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$, thus $\{\nu \cap \nabla_A \mid \nu \in \text{Min}(B), \beta \not\subseteq \nu\} = \{\mu \in \text{Min}(A), \alpha \not\subseteq \mu\}$.

By Proposition 4.7, it follows that any $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$ satisfies: $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \nu$ iff $\beta \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A$ iff $\alpha \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $\text{Cg}_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \nu$ iff $(\text{Cg}_B(\alpha))^{\perp B} \subseteq \nu$. As in the proof of the implication (iii) \Rightarrow (i) from Theorem 6.15, it follows that $\beta^{\perp B} = \bigcap V_B(\beta^{\perp B}) = \bigcap V_B(\text{Cg}_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}) = \text{Cg}_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = \alpha^{\perp B}$. Hence the extension $A \subseteq B$ is rigid. \square

Proposition 6.17. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible r^* -extension such that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A or \mathcal{U}_A and B satisfies \mathcal{A}_B or \mathcal{U}_B , then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $A \subseteq B$ is a quasirigid extension;

(ii) Γ maps basic open sets of $\text{Min}(B)^{-1}$ to basic open sets of $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$.

Proof. By Proposition 6.14, $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension and Γ is bijective.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(B)$, so that $\beta = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and some $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \text{PCon}(B)$. By the hypothesis of this implication, for each $i \in \overline{1, n}$, there exists $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $\beta_i^{\perp B} = \alpha_i^{\perp B} = (\text{Cg}_B(\alpha_i))^{\perp B}$.

Analogously to the proof of (i) \Rightarrow (ii) from Proposition 6.16, it follows that $\Gamma(V_B(\beta_i) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = V_A(\alpha_i) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ for all $i \in \overline{1, n}$, hence $\Gamma(V_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = \Gamma(\bigcap_{i=1}^n V_B(\beta_i) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \Gamma(V_B(\beta_i) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n V_A(\alpha_i) \cap \text{Min}(A) = V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$, where $\alpha = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \in \mathcal{K}(A)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Similar to the proof of (ii) \Rightarrow (i) in Proposition 6.16. \square

Corollary 6.18. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible r -extension and r^* -extension such that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A or \mathcal{U}_A and B satisfies \mathcal{A}_B or \mathcal{U}_B , then the following are equivalent:*

- $A \subseteq B$ is a quasirigid extension;

- $A \subseteq B$ is a rigid extension.

Proof. By Proposition 6.14, $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension and Γ is bijective.

Clearly, if the extension $A \subseteq B$ is rigid, then it is quasirigid.

Now assume that $A \subseteq B$ is quasirigid. Then, by Proposition 6.17, Γ maps basic open sets of $\text{Min}(B)^{-1}$ to basic open sets of $\text{Min}(A)^{-1}$. Since Γ is bijective, it follows that Γ maps basic open sets of $\text{Min}(B)$ to basic open sets of $\text{Min}(A)$, hence $A \subseteq B$ is rigid according to Proposition 6.16. \square

Theorem 6.19. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible extension such that A satisfies \mathcal{A}_A or \mathcal{U}_A and B satisfies \mathcal{A}_B or \mathcal{U}_B , then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $A \subseteq B$ is a quasi r^* -extension;

(ii) $\Gamma : \text{Min}(A)^{-1} \rightarrow \text{Min}(B)^{-1}$ is a homeomorphism.

Proof. By adapting the proof of Theorem 6.15. \square

We say that A satisfies the *annihilator condition* (AC for short) if for all $\alpha, \beta \in \text{PCon}(A)$ there exists $\gamma \in \text{PCon}(A)$ such that $\gamma^{\perp A} = \alpha^{\perp A} \cap \beta^{\perp A}$.

Remark 6.20. By Proposition 5.3.(ii), A satisfies AC if and only if the family $\{V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)\}$ is closed under finite intersections. Thus, for any semiprime algebra A that satisfies AC, the family $\{V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A) \mid \alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)\}$ is a basis for the inverse topology $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Min}(A)}$ of $\text{Min}(A)$.

Proposition 6.21. *Let $A \subseteq B$ be an admissible extension such that A satisfies \mathcal{O}_A or \mathcal{U}_A and B satisfies \mathcal{O}_B or \mathcal{U}_B .*

(i) *If A satisfies AC, then: $A \subseteq B$ is a quasi r^* -extension iff $A \subseteq B$ is an r^* -extension.*

(ii) *If $A \subseteq B$ is an r -extension and both A and B satisfy AC, then: $A \subseteq B$ is a quasirigid extension iff $A \subseteq B$ is a rigid extension.*

Proof. (i) Assume that $A \subseteq B$ is a quasi r^* -extension. Then, by Theorem 6.19, $\Gamma : \text{Min}(A)^{-1} \rightarrow \text{Min}(B)^{-1}$ is a homeomorphism.

Let $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$ and $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$ such that $\beta \subseteq \nu$, so that $\nu \in V_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)$, thus, by the above, $\nu \cap \nabla_A = \Gamma(\nu) \in \Gamma(V_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B))$, which, according to Remark 6.20, equals $V_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ for some $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$. As in the proof of (ii) \Rightarrow (i) from Proposition 6.16, it follows that $\alpha^{\perp B} \subseteq \beta^{\perp B}$. Therefore $A \subseteq B$ is an r^* -extension.

The converse implication is trivial.

(ii) By Propositions 6.16 and 6.17 and the clear fact that, in this case, condition (ii) from Proposition 6.16 is equivalent to (ii) from Proposition 6.17. \square

Let us denote, for any subset $X \subseteq A^2$, by $S(X) = \{\psi \in \text{Min}(B) \mid X \not\subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A\}$, thus $S(X) = \{\psi \in \text{Min}(B) \mid \psi \cap \nabla_A \in D_A(\text{Cg}_A(X))\}$.

Proposition 6.22. *Let $A \subseteq B$ be an admissible extension with the property that, for any $\theta, \zeta \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\theta^{\perp A} = \zeta^{\perp A}$ implies $\theta^{\perp B} = \zeta^{\perp B}$. Assume that A satisfies \mathcal{O}_A or \mathcal{U}_A and that B is hyperarchimedean and satisfies \mathcal{O}_B or \mathcal{U}_B . Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *$\text{Min}(A)$ is a compact space;*

(ii) *$A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension;*

(iii) *For any $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$ there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $S(\beta) = \text{Spec}(B) \setminus S(\alpha)$;*

(iv) *For any $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$ there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $\beta \subseteq \alpha^{\perp A}$ and $(\alpha \vee \beta)^{\perp A} = \Delta_A$.*

Proof. (i) \Leftrightarrow (iv) By Theorem 5.8.

(iv) \Rightarrow (iii): Assume that $\alpha \in \text{PCon}(A)$. By the hypothesis (iv), there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{K}(A)$ such that $\beta \subseteq \alpha^{\perp A}$ and $(\alpha \vee \beta)^{\perp A} = \Delta_A$.

In order to show that $\text{Spec}(B) \setminus S(\alpha) = S(\beta)$, let $\psi \in \text{Spec}(B) \setminus S(\alpha)$, hence $\alpha \subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$. Since $A \subseteq B$ satisfies the implication in the enunciation, by Proposition 4.7 it follows that these implications hold: if $(\alpha \vee \beta)^{\perp A} = \Delta_A$, that is $(\text{Cg}_B(\alpha \vee \beta))^{\perp A} = \Delta_A$, then $(\text{Cg}_B(\alpha \vee \beta))^{\perp B} \subseteq \psi$, thus $\text{Cg}_B(\alpha \vee \beta) \not\subseteq \psi$, so $\alpha \vee \beta \not\subseteq \psi$, thus $\beta \not\subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$, so $\psi \in S(\beta)$, which proves the inclusion $\text{Spec}(B) \setminus S(\alpha) \subseteq S(\beta)$.

Conversely, let $\psi \in S(\beta)$, so that $\beta \not\subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$. But $[\alpha, \beta]_A = \Delta_A \subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Spec}(A)$, hence $\alpha \subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$, so $\psi \in \text{Spec}(B) \setminus S(\alpha)$. Therefore $S(\beta) \subseteq \text{Spec}(B) \setminus S(\alpha)$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii): We have to prove that $\psi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Min}(A)$ for any $\psi \in \text{Min}(B)$. Assume by absurdum that there exists $\psi \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\psi \cap \nabla_A \notin \text{Min}(A)$. But $\psi \cap \nabla_A \in \text{Spec}(A)$ since $A \subseteq B$ is admissible, thus $\phi \subsetneq \psi \cap \nabla_A$ for some $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$. By Corollary 6.3, there exists $\varepsilon \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\phi = \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A$. So $\varepsilon \cap \nabla_A \subsetneq \psi \cap \nabla_A$, hence there exists $(a, b) \in (\psi \cap \nabla_A) \setminus (\varepsilon \cap \nabla_A)$, so that, if we denote by $\alpha = \text{Cg}_A(a, b) \in \text{PCon}(A)$, then $\alpha \not\subseteq \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A$ and $\alpha \subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$, therefore $\varepsilon \in S(\alpha)$ and $\psi \notin S(\alpha)$. Since $S(\beta) = \text{Spec}(B) \setminus S(\alpha)$, it follows that $\varepsilon \notin S(\beta)$ and $\psi \in S(\beta)$, hence $\beta \subseteq \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$ and $\beta \not\subseteq \psi \cap \nabla_A$. We have obtained a contradiction, thus $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Assume that $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension, so the map Γ is surjective and continuous w.r.t. the Stone topologies by Corollary 6.3 and Proposition 6.12.(i).

By [13, Theorem 8], it follows that the reticulation $\mathcal{L}(B)$ of the hyperarchimedean algebra B is a Boolean algebra. Since $\text{Min}(B)$ and $\text{Min}_{\text{Id}}(\mathcal{L}(B))$ are homeomorphic, it follows that $\text{Min}(B)$ is a Boolean space, hence $\text{Min}(B)$ is a compact space, therefore $\text{Min}(A)$ is also a compact space. \square

Remark 6.23. Let A be a reduced (that is semiprime) commutative ring and $Q(A)$ the complete ring of A (see [23]). In this case, $Q(A)$ is a regular ring [23], i.e. a hyperarchimedean ring. In accordance with [28, Proposition 7.2.(2)], $A \subseteq Q(A)$ is a Baer extension of rings, so one can apply our Proposition 6.18. Then we obtain [17, Theorem 4.3] as a particular case. It also results that, if A is a reduced ring, then: $\text{Min}(A)$ is compact iff $A \subseteq Q(A)$ is an m -extension.

Theorem 6.24. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible m -extension such that $\mathfrak{U}_A, \mathfrak{K}_A, \mathfrak{U}_B$ and \mathfrak{K}_B are satisfied and Γ is injective, then $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ is a homeomorphism and $A \subseteq B$ is a weak rigid extension.*

Proof. We will be using Propositions 4.7 and 6.5 and Lemma 3.4.(ii).

Let $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ and $\mu \in \text{Min}(A)$, so that $\mu = \nu \cap \nabla_A$ for some $\nu \in \text{Min}(B)$ by Corollary 6.3. Then:

$\mu \in D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$, that is $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$, is equivalent to $\alpha^{\perp A} \subseteq \mu$, which implies $\alpha^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\alpha^{\perp A}) \subseteq Cg_B(\mu) \subseteq \nu$, thus $Cg_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \nu$, that is $\nu \in D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$;

on the other hand, $\nu \in D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$ means that $Cg_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \nu$, so that $\alpha^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \subseteq \nu$, hence $\alpha^{\perp A} = \alpha^{\perp B} \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \nu \cap \nabla_A = \mu$, thus $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$, that is $\mu \in D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$;

hence $\nu \in D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$ iff $\Gamma(\nu) = \mu \in D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$ iff $\nu \in \Gamma^{-1}(D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A))$, therefore $\Gamma^{-1}(D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = D_B(Cg_B(\alpha)) \cap \text{Min}(B)$.

Thus Γ is continuous and, by Proposition 5.3, (i), for all $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$, $\Gamma^{-1}(V_A(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = \Gamma^{-1}(D_A(\theta^{\perp A}) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = D_B(Cg_B(\theta^{\perp A})) \cap \text{Min}(B) = V_B(Cg_B(\theta^{\perp A})^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B) = V_B(\theta^{\perp B \perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B) = V_B(Cg_B(\theta)^{\perp B \perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B) = V_B(Cg_B(\theta) \cap \text{Min}(B))$.

Hence, if Γ is injective and thus bijective according to Corollary 6.3, then Γ is a homeomorphism, in particular Γ is open, thus, for every $\beta \in \text{Con}(B)$, there exists an $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\Gamma(D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)$, hence, by the above, along with Proposition 5.3, (i), and Proposition 6.5, $V_B(\beta^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B) = D_B(\beta) \cap \text{Min}(B) = \Gamma^{-1}(D_A(\alpha) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = \Gamma^{-1}(D_A(\alpha^{\perp A \perp A}) \cap \text{Min}(A)) = D_B(Cg_B(\alpha^{\perp A \perp A})) \cap \text{Min}(B) = D_B(Cg_B(\alpha^{\perp A})^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B) = V_B(Cg_B(\alpha^{\perp A})) \cap \text{Min}(B) = V_B(Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B)$, hence, according to Lemma 5.1, $\beta^{\perp B} = \bigcap (V_B(\beta^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = \bigcap (V_B(Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}) \cap \text{Min}(B)) = Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} = \alpha^{\perp B}$, thus $A \subseteq B$ is weak rigid. \square

Theorem 6.25. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible weak r -extension such that $\mathfrak{U}_A, \mathfrak{K}_A, \mathfrak{U}_B$ and \mathfrak{K}_B are satisfied, then $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension and an r -extension and $\Gamma : \text{Min}(B) \rightarrow \text{Min}(A)$ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. Assume that $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible weak r -extension, so that Γ is surjective by Corollary 6.3. We will apply Proposition 4.7.

Assume by absurdum that there exists a $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\mu \cap \nabla_A \notin \text{Min}(A)$, so that $\phi \subsetneq \mu \cap \nabla_A$ for some $\phi \in \text{Min}(A)$. By the above, $\phi = \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A$ for some $\varepsilon \in \text{Min}(B)$, so that $\varepsilon \cap \nabla_A \subsetneq \mu \cap \nabla_A$, thus $\varepsilon \neq \mu$, hence $\varepsilon \setminus \mu \neq \emptyset$, that is $(x, y) \in \varepsilon \setminus \mu$ for some $x, y \in B$.

We have $Cg_B(x, y) \not\subseteq \mu$, hence there exists an $\alpha \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$ and $Cg_B(x, y)^{\perp B} \subseteq \alpha^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B}$ since $A \subseteq B$ is a weak r -extension. But $\alpha \not\subseteq \mu$ implies $Cg_B(\alpha) \not\subseteq \mu$, hence $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \subseteq \mu$.

Since $Cg_B(x, y) \subseteq \varepsilon$, we have $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \supseteq Cg_B(x, y)^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \varepsilon$, thus $\alpha \subseteq Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \varepsilon$, hence $\alpha \subseteq \varepsilon \cap \nabla_A = \phi \subset \mu \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \mu$, hence $Cg_B(\alpha) \subseteq \mu$, thus $Cg_B(\alpha)^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \mu$, contradicting the above.

Therefore $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension.

Now let $\mu, \nu \in \text{Min}(B)$ such that $\mu \cap \nabla_A = \nu \cap \nabla_A$. Assume by absurdum that $\mu \neq \nu$, so that $\mu \setminus \nu \neq \emptyset$, that is $(u, v) \in \mu \setminus \nu$ for some $u, v \in B$.

Then $Cg_B(u, v) \not\subseteq \nu$, thus, since $A \subseteq B$ is a weak r -extension, there exists a $\xi \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\xi \not\subseteq \nu$ and $Cg_B(u, v)^{\perp B} \subseteq \xi^{\perp B}$.

Since $Cg_B(u, v) \subseteq \mu$, $Cg_B(u, v)^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \mu$, hence, by Proposition 6.5, $Cg_B(\xi^{\perp A}) = Cg_B(\xi)^{\perp B} = \xi^{\perp B} \not\subseteq \mu$, thus $\xi \subseteq \xi^{\perp A \perp A} \subseteq Cg_B(\xi^{\perp A \perp A}) = Cg_B(\xi^{\perp A})^{\perp B} \subseteq \mu$, hence $\xi \subseteq \mu \cap \nabla_A = \nu \cap \nabla_A \subseteq \nu$, contradicting the above.

Therefore Γ is injective and thus a homeomorphism by Theorem 6.24.

Finally, let $\mu \in \text{Min}(B)$ and $\beta \in \text{PCon}(B)$ such that $\beta \not\subseteq \mu$, so that, since $A \subseteq B$ is a weak r -extension, there exists a $\gamma \in \text{Con}(A)$ such that $\gamma \not\subseteq \mu$ and $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \gamma^{\perp B}$.

Then $(w, z) \in \gamma \setminus \mu$ for some $w, z \in A$, so that $Cg_A(w, z) \not\subseteq \mu$ and $Cg_A(w, z) \subseteq \gamma$, so that $Cg_B(Cg_A(w, z)) \subseteq Cg_B(\gamma)$ and thus $\beta^{\perp B} \subseteq \gamma^{\perp B} = Cg_B(\gamma)^{\perp B} \subseteq Cg_B(Cg_A(w, z))^{\perp B} = Cg_A(w, z)^{\perp B}$.

Therefore $A \subseteq B$ is an r -extension. \square

Theorem 6.26. *If $A \subseteq B$ is an admissible weak r^* -extension such that $\mathfrak{U}_A, \mathfrak{K}_A, \mathfrak{U}_B$ and \mathfrak{K}_B are satisfied, then $A \subseteq B$ is an m -extension and an r^* -extension and Γ is a homeomorphism w.r.t. the Stone topologies.*

Proof. By adapting the proof of Theorem 6.25. □

Corollary 6.27. *If μ_A, κ_A, μ_B and κ_B are satisfied and $A \subseteq B$ is admissible and either a weak r -extension or a weak r^* -extension, then $A \subseteq B$ is a weak rigid extension.*

Corollary 6.28. *If $A \subseteq B$ is admissible and μ_A, κ_A, μ_B and κ_B are satisfied, then the following are equivalent:*

- $A \subseteq B$ is a weak rigid extension;
- $A \subseteq B$ is a weak r -extension;
- $A \subseteq B$ is a weak r^* -extension;
- $A \subseteq B$ is an r -extension;
- $A \subseteq B$ is an r^* -extension.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the research grant number IZSEZO_186586/1, awarded to the project *Reticulations of Concept Algebras* by the Swiss National Science Foundation, within the programme Scientific Exchanges.

References

- [1] P. Agliano, Prime Spectra in Modular Varieties, *Algebra Universalis* **30** (1993), 581–597.
- [2] R. Balbes, P. Dwinger, *Distributive Lattices*, University of Missouri Press, Columbia, Missouri, 1974.
- [3] K. A. Baker, Primitive Satisfaction and Equational Problems for Lattices and Other Algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **190** (1974), 125–150.
- [4] P. Bhattacharjee, K. M. Dress, W. Wm. McGovern, Extensions of Commutative Rings, *Topology and Its Applications* **158** (2011), 1802–1814.
- [5] T. S. Blyth, *Lattices and Ordered Algebraic Structures*, Springer–Verlag London Limited, 2005.
- [6] S. Burris, H. P. Sankappanavar, *A Course in Universal Algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **78**, Springer–Verlag, New York–Berlin (1981).
- [7] P. Crawley, R. P. Dilworth, *Algebraic Theory of Lattices*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs (1973).
- [8] J. Czelakowski, *The Equationally–defined Commutator. A Study in Equational Logic and Algebra*, Birkhäuser Mathematics, 2015.
- [9] J. Czelakowski, Additivity of the Commutator and Residuation, *Reports on Mathematical Logic* **43** (2008), 109–132.
- [10] R. Freese, R. McKenzie, *Commutator Theory for Congruence–modular Varieties*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **125**, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [11] N. Galatos, P. Jipsen, T. Kowalski, H. Ono, *Residuated Lattices: An Algebraic Glimpse at Substructural Logics*, *Studies in Logic and The Foundations of Mathematics* **151**, Elsevier, Amsterdam / Boston / Heidelberg / London / New York / Oxford / Paris / San Diego / San Francisco / Singapore / Sydney / Tokyo, 2007.
- [12] G. Georgescu, C. Mureşan, Going Up and Lying Over in Congruence–modular Algebras, *Mathematica Slovaca* **69**, Issue 2 (2019), 275–296.
- [13] G. Georgescu, C. Mureşan, The Reticulation of a Universal Algebra, *Scientific Annals of Computer Science* **28**, Issue 1 (2018), 67–113.

- [14] G. Georgescu, L. Kwuida, C. Mureşan, Functorial Properties of the Reticulation of a Universal Algebra, *Journal of Applied Logics. Special Issue on Multiple Valued Logic and Applications* **8** (5) (June 2021), 1123–1168.
- [15] G. Grätzer, *General Lattice Theory*, Birkhäuser Akademie–Verlag, Basel–Boston–Berlin (1978).
- [16] G. Grätzer, *Universal Algebra*, Second Edition, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, New York, 2008.
- [17] J. A. Huckaba, *Commutative Rings with Zero Divisors*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics **117**, M. Dekker, New York, 1988.
- [18] P. T. Johnstone, *Stone Spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **3**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/London/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney, 1982.
- [19] B. Jónsson, Congruence–distributive Varieties, *Math. Japonica* **42**, Issue 2 (1995), 353–401.
- [20] J. Kaplansky, *Commutative Rings*, First Edition: University of Chicago Press, 1974; Second Edition: Polygonal Publishing House, 2006.
- [21] M. L. Knox, R. Levy, W. W. McGovern, J. Shapiro, Generalizations of Complemented Rings with Applications to Rings of Functions, *Journal of Algebra and Its Applications*, **8** (01) (2009), 17–40.
- [22] J. Kollár, Congruences and One–element Subalgebras, *Algebra Universalis* **9**, Issue 1 (December 1979), 266–267.
- [23] J. Lambek, *Lectures on Rings and Modules*, Second Edition, Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, 1976.
- [24] R. McKenzie and J. Snow, *Congruence Modular Varieties: Commutator Theory and Its Uses, in Structural Theory of Automata, Semigroups, and Universal Algebra*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2005.
- [25] C. Mureşan, Stone Commutator Lattices and Baer Rings, *Discussiones Mathematicae – General Algebra and Applications* **42**(1) (2022), 51–96.
- [26] C. Mureşan, Taking Prime, Maximal and Two–class Congruences Through Morphisms, arXiv:1607.06901 [math.RA] (2016).
- [27] P. Ouwehand, *Commutator Theory and Abelian Algebras*, arXiv:1309.0662 [math.RA] (2013).
- [28] G. Picavet, Ultrafiltres sur un Espace Spectral – Anneaux de Baer – Anneaux à Spectre Minimal Compact, *Mathematica Scandinavica* **46**(1) (1980), 23–53.
- [29] H. Simmons, Reticulated Rings. *Journal of Algebra* **66**, Issue 1 (September 1980), 169–192.
- [30] T. P. Speed, Spaces of Ideals of Distributive Lattices II. Minimal Prime Ideals, *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society* **18**(1) (1974), 54–72.
- [31] A. Ursini, On Subtractive Varieties, V: Congruence Modularity and the Commutator, *Algebra Universalis* **43** (2000), 51–78.