

## COMAXIMAL GRAPH OF COMMUTATIVE RINGS

HAMID REZA MAIMANI, MARYAM SALIMI, ASIYEH SATTARI, AND SIAMAK YASSEMI

*Dedicated to Jürgen Herzog on the occasion of his 65th birthday*

ABSTRACT. Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with identity. Let  $\Gamma(R)$  be a graph with vertices as elements of  $R$ , where two distinct vertices  $a$  and  $b$  are adjacent if and only if  $Ra + Rb = R$ . In this paper we consider a subgraph  $\Gamma_2(R)$  of  $\Gamma(R)$  which consists of non-unit elements. We look at the connectedness and the diameter of this graph. We completely characterize the diameter of the graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ . In addition, it is shown that for two finite semi-local rings  $R$  and  $S$ , if  $R$  is reduced, then  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$  if and only if  $R \cong S$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For the sake of completeness, first we state some definitions and notions used throughout to keep this paper as self contained as possible. We define a *coloring* of a graph  $G$  to be an assignment of colors (elements of some set) to the vertices of  $G$ , one color to each vertex, so that adjacent vertices are assigned distinct colors. If  $n$  colors are used, then the coloring is referred to as an *n-coloring*. If there exists an *n-coloring* of a graph  $G$ , then  $G$  is called *n-colorable*. The minimum  $n$  for which a graph  $G$  is *n-colorable* is called the *chromatic number* of  $G$ , and is denoted by  $\chi(G)$ . For a graph  $G$ , the *degree* of a vertex  $v$  in  $G$  is the number of edges of  $G$  incident with  $v$ . Recall that a graph is said to be *connected* if for each pair of distinct vertices  $v$  and  $w$ , there is a finite sequence of distinct vertices  $v = v_1, \dots, v_n = w$  such that each pair  $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$  is an edge. Such a sequence is said to be a path and the distance,  $(v, w)$ , between connected vertices  $v$  and  $w$  is the length of the shortest path connecting them. The *diameter* of a connected graph is the supremum of the distances between vertices. The diameter is 0 if the graph consists of a single vertex and a connected graph with more than one vertex has diameter 1 if and only if it is complete; i.e., each pair of distinct vertices forms an edge. An *r-partite* graph is one whose vertex set can be partitioned into  $r$  subsets so that no edge has both ends in any one subset. A *complete r-partite* graph is one in which each vertex is joined to every vertex that is not in the same subset. The *complete bipartite* (i.e., 2-partite) graph with part sizes  $m$  and  $n$  is denoted by  $K_{m,n}$ . A graph in which each pair of distinct vertices is joined by an edge is called a *complete* graph. We use  $K_n$  for the complete graph with  $n$  vertices. A *clique* of a graph is its maximal complete subgraph and the number of vertices in

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C75, 13A15.

*Key words and phrases.* connected graph, diameter, complete graph, clean rings.

\* Corresponding author. Department of Mathematics, University of Tehran, P.O. Box 13145-448 Tehran, Iran.

H. R. Maimani was supported in part by a grant from IPM No. 85050117.

S. Yassemi was supported was supported by a grant from IPM No. 85130214.

the largest clique of graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{clique}(G)$ , is called the *clique number* of  $G$ . Obviously  $\chi(G) \geq \text{clique}(G)$  for general graph  $G$  (see [4, page 289]). Let  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$  and  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$  be two graphs with disjoint vertices set  $V_i$  and edges set  $E_i$ . The join of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  is denoted by  $G = G_1 \vee G_2$  with vertices set  $V_1 \cup V_2$  and the set of edges is  $E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \{xy | x \in V_1 \text{ and } y \in V_2\}$ .

From now on let  $R$  be a commutative ring with identity. In [3], Beck considered  $\Gamma(R)$  as a graph with vertices as elements of  $R$ , where two different vertices  $a$  and  $b$  are adjacent if and only if  $ab = 0$ . He studied finitely colorable rings with this graph structure and showed that  $\chi(\Gamma(R)) = \text{clique}(\Gamma(R))$  for certain classes of rings. In [2], Anderson and Naseer have made further study of finitely colorable rings and have given an example of a finite local ring with  $5 = \text{clique}(\Gamma(R)) < \chi(\Gamma(R)) = 6$ .

In [7], Sharma and Bhatwadekar define another graph on  $R$ ,  $\Gamma(R)$ , with vertices as elements of  $R$ , where two distinct vertices  $a$  and  $b$  are adjacent if and only if  $Ra + Rb = R$ . They showed that  $\chi(\Gamma(R)) < \infty$  if and only if  $R$  is a finite ring. In this case  $\chi(\Gamma(R)) = \text{clique}(\Gamma(R)) = t + \ell$ , where  $t$  and  $\ell$ , respectively, denote the number of maximal ideals of  $R$  and the number of units of  $R$ .

In this paper, we study further the graph structure defined by Sharma and Bhatwadekar.

Let  $\Gamma_1(R)$  be the subgraph of  $\Gamma(R)$ , generated by the units of  $R$ , and  $\Gamma_2(R)$  be the subgraph of  $\Gamma(R)$  generated by non-unit elements. In section 2, it is shown that the graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is a complete bipartite if and only if the cardinal number of the set  $\text{Max}(R)$  is equal 2 (see Theorem 2.2). Also we show that  $R$  is a finite product of quasi-local rings if and only if  $R$  is clean and  $\text{clique}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) < \infty$  (see Theorem 2.5).

In section 3, the main result says that  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is connected and  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) \leq 3$  (see Theorem 3.1). In addition, we completely characterize the diameter of the graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ .

In the final section, it is shown that for two finite semi-local rings  $R$  and  $S$ , if  $R$  is reduced, then  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$  if and only if  $R \cong S$  (see Corollary 4.6).

## 2. BIPARTITE GRAPHS

Throughout this paper  $R$  will be a commutative ring with identity,  $U(R)$  its group of units,  $J(R)$  its Jacobson radical, and  $I(R)$  its set of idempotents. A ring  $R$  is said to be quasi-local if it has a unique maximal ideal; if  $\mathfrak{m}$  is the unique maximal ideal of  $R$ , we will often write  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ .

Let  $\Gamma(R)$  be the graph represented by  $R$  with definition of Sharma-Behatwadekar. Let  $\Gamma_1(R) = \langle U(R) \rangle$  and  $\Gamma_2(R) = \langle R \setminus U(R) \rangle$  be the subgraphs of  $\Gamma(R)$ . Then it is easy to see that  $\Gamma(R) = \Gamma_1(R) \vee \Gamma_2(R)$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *The following hold:*

- (a)  $\Gamma_1(R)$  is a complete graph.
- (b)  $a \in J(R)$  if and only if  $\deg_{\Gamma_2(R)} a = 0$ .

*Proof.* Since (a) is clear we just prove (b). Suppose  $a \in J(R)$ . Then for any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$ ,  $a \in \mathfrak{m}$ . If  $\deg_{\Gamma_2(R)} a \neq 0$ , then there exists  $b \in \Gamma_2(R)$  such that  $Ra + Rb = R$ . On the other hand there exists  $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Max}(R)$  with  $b \in \mathfrak{n}$  and so  $1 \in \mathfrak{n}$  that is a contradiction.

Conversely, assume that  $\deg_{\Gamma_2(R)} a = 0$ . Assume contrary  $a \notin J(R)$ . Then there exists  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R)$  such that  $a \notin \mathfrak{m}$ . Thus  $Ra + \mathfrak{m} = R$ . Therefore there exists

$b \in \mathfrak{m}$  such that  $Ra + Rb = R$ . This contradicts our assumption. In the following we study the cases where  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is complete bipartite graph and where this graph is  $n$ -partite. □

We know that each  $x \in U(R)$  is adjacent to every vertex of  $\Gamma(R)$  and it is shown that each  $x \in J(R)$  is an isolated vertex of  $\Gamma_2(R)$ . Thus the main part of the graph  $\Gamma(R)$  is the subgraph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ . For this reason the main aim of this paper is to study the structure of this subgraph.

**Theorem 2.2.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is a complete bipartite graph.
- (ii) The cardinal number of the set  $\text{Max}(R)$  is equal 2.

*Proof.* (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Let  $\text{Max}(R) = \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \mathfrak{m}_2\}$ . Thus the vertices set of  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is equal to the set  $(\mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_2) \cup (\mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_1)$ . Let  $a \in \mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_2$  and  $b \in \mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_1$ . Thus  $Ra + Rb \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}_1 \cup \mathfrak{m}_2$  and so  $Ra + Rb = R$ .

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Suppose  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is a complete bipartite graph with two part  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . Set  $M_1 = V_1 \cup J(R)$  and  $M_2 = V_2 \cup J(R)$ . We show that  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are two maximal ideals of  $R$  and  $\text{Max}(R) = \{M_1, M_2\}$ . Let  $x, y \in M_1 = V_1 \cup J(R)$ . Consider the following three cases:

*Case 1.* Assume that  $x, y \in J(R)$ . Then  $x - y \in J(R)$  and so  $x - y \in M_1$ .

*Case 2.* Assume that  $x \in J(R)$  and  $y \in V_1$ . Then  $x - y \notin J(R)$ . If  $x - y \in U(R)$ , then  $Rx + Ry = R$  and so we obtain a contradiction. If  $x - y \in M_2$ , then  $x - y \in V_2$  and so  $R(x - y) + Ry = R$ . Thus  $Rx + Ry = R$  which is a contradiction. Therefore  $x - y \in V_1 \subseteq M_1$ .

*Case 3.* Assume that  $x, y \in V_1$ . If  $x - y \in J(R)$  then there is nothing to prove. Therefore we assume  $x - y \notin J(R)$ . With the same proof as case 2, the assertion holds.

Now suppose that  $r \in R$  and  $x \in M_1$ . If  $x \in J(R)$ , then clearly  $rx \in M_1$ . Therefore suppose that  $x \notin J(R)$ . Also  $rx$  is not unit. Suppose that  $rx \in M_2$ . Then  $rx \in V_2$  and so  $R(rx) + Rx = R$ . Thus  $x$  is a unit element of  $R$  which is a contradiction. So  $rx \in M_1$ .

To now we showed that  $M_1$  is an ideal of  $R$ . By the structure of  $\Gamma(R)$ , for any  $x \in R \setminus M_1$ , we have  $M_1 + Rx = R$ . This implies that  $M_1$  is a maximal ideal.

With the same argument  $M_2$  is a maximal ideal of  $R$ . Now if  $N \in \text{Max}(R)$  then  $N \subseteq M_1 \cup M_2$  and so  $N = M_1$  or  $N = M_2$ .

This finishes the proof. □

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $n > 1$ . Then the following hold:*

- (a) If  $|\text{Max}(R)| = n < \infty$ , then the graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is  $n$ -partite.
- (b) If the graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is  $n$ -partite, then  $|\text{Max}(R)| \leq n$ . In this case if the graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is not  $(n - 1)$ -partite, then  $|\text{Max}(R)| = n$ .

*Proof.* (a). Let  $\text{Max}(R) = \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n\}$  and set  $V_1 = \mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus J(R)$  and for each  $i \geq 2$ ,  $V_i = \mathfrak{m}_i \setminus \cup_{t=1}^{i-1} \mathfrak{m}_t$ . Using Prime Avoidance Theorem,  $V_i \neq \emptyset$  for each  $i$ . It is easy to see that any two vertices belong to  $V_i$  are not adjacent.

(b). Let  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  be the  $n$  parts of vertices of  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ . Assume contrary  $|\text{Max}(R)| > n$  and let  $\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_{n+1} \in \text{Max}(R)$ . For any  $i$ , choose  $x_i \in \mathfrak{m}_i \setminus \cup_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{m}_j$ . Then it is easy to see that  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$  is a clique in  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ . By the Pigeon

Hole Principal, two of  $x_i$ 's should belong to one of  $V_i$ 's, that is a contradiction. Therefore  $|\text{Max}(R)| \leq n$ . Now suppose that  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is not  $(n-1)$ -partite and  $|\text{Max}(R)| = m < n$ . By (a) the graph will be  $m$ -partite and this is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $R$  be a ring with  $|\text{Max}(R)| \geq 2$ . Then the following hold:*

- (a) *If  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is a complete  $n$ -partite graph, then  $n = 2$ .*
- (b) *If there exists a vertex of  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  which is adjacent to every other vertex then  $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times F$ , where  $F$  is a field.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{m}_1, \mathfrak{m}_2$  be two maximal ideals of  $R$ . Since the elements of  $\mathfrak{m}_i \setminus J(R)$  are not adjacent, and at least one element of  $\mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus J(R)$  is adjacent to one element of  $\mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus J(R)$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus J(R)$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus J(R)$  are subsets of two distinct parts of  $\Gamma_2(R)$ . That means  $(\mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus J(R)) \cap (\mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus J(R)) = \emptyset$ . We claim that  $J(R) = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \mathfrak{m}_2$ . In other case,  $J(R) \subsetneq (\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \mathfrak{m}_2)$  and so there exists  $x \in (\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \mathfrak{m}_2) \setminus J(R)$ . This element belongs to  $\mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus J(R)$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus J(R)$ , that is a contradiction. Therefore we obtain  $J(R) = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \mathfrak{m}_2$  and so  $|\text{Max}(R)| = 2$ . Now by theorem 2.2 we have  $n = 2$ .

(b). Let  $x$  be a non-unit element of  $R$  which is adjacent to every other vertex of  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ . Since  $x$  is comaximal with each nonunit outside the Jacobson radical,  $x$  is idempotent,  $J(R) = (0)$  and  $\mathfrak{m} = \{0, x\}$  is a maximal ideal. Thus for each nonunit  $s \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ , having  $xR + sR = R$  implies  $(1-x)sR = (1-x)R$  and this implies  $(1-x)R = F$  is a field. Hence  $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times F$ .  $\square$

A ring is said to be *clean* if each of its elements can be written as the sum of a unit and an idempotent cf. [6] (see also [1]). For example, a quasi-local ring is clean. The following result gives an application of Sharma-Bhatwadegar graph to characterize clean rings.

**Theorem 2.5.** *For the ring  $R$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a)  *$R$  is a finite product of quasi-local rings.*
- (b)  *$R$  is clean and clique  $(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R))$  is finite.*

*Proof.* (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b). Let  $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n$  where each  $R_i$  is quasi-local with unique maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}_i$ . Set  $N_i = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_{i-1} \times \mathfrak{m}_i \times R_{i+1} \times \cdots \times R_n$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then each  $N_i$  belongs to  $\text{Max}(R)$ . For any  $i$  choose  $x_i \in N_i \setminus \cup_{\ell \neq i} N_\ell$ . Then it is easy to see that  $Rx_i + Rx_j = R$  for all  $i \neq j$ . In addition by using the Pigeon Hole Principal, there is no any  $n+1$  family elements of  $\cup_{i=1}^n N_i$  which pairwise adjacent. Thus clique  $(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = n < \infty$ .

On the other hand, each  $R_i$  is clean and so by [1, Proposition 2(3)],  $R$  is clean.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a). Suppose that clique  $(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R))$  is finite. Assume contrary that  $I(R)$  has infinitely many idempotent elements then by [7, Lemma 2.1] there exists an infinite sequence  $e_1, e_2, \dots$  of non-trivial idempotents in  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  such that the set  $S$  consisting of elements  $e_i$  ( $i \geq 1$ ) is an infinite clique. This is a contradiction.  $\square$

### 3. DIAMETER OF THE GRAPH

In this section we completely characterize the diameter of  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ . The following result shows that  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is a connected graph and its diameter is not greater than 3.

**Theorem 3.1.** *The graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is connected, and  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) \leq 3$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $a, b \in (R \setminus U(R)) \setminus J(R)$ . We consider two cases:

*Case 1* Assume that  $ab \notin J(R)$ . There exists  $x \in (R \setminus U(R)) \setminus J(R)$  such that  $Rab + Rx = R$ . Thus  $Ra + Rx = Rb + Rx = R$ . So we have the path  $a-x-b$ , and so  $(a, b) \leq 2$ .

*Case 2* Assume that  $ab \in J(R)$ . Set  $S_a = \{\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R), a \in \mathfrak{m}\}$  and  $S_b = \{\mathfrak{m} \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R), b \in \mathfrak{m}\}$ . Clearly,  $\text{Max}(R) = S_a \cup S_b$ . Now suppose that  $x$  is adjacent to  $a$  in  $\Gamma_2(R)$ . Then  $x \notin J(R)$ . If  $a \in \mathfrak{m}$ , then  $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$  and so  $x \in \mathfrak{n} \in \text{Max}(R)$ , where  $\mathfrak{n} \in S_b \setminus S_a$ . Thus  $bx \notin J(R)$ . Therefore by Case 1,  $(b, x) \leq 2$  and so  $(a, b) \leq 3$ . □

**Lemma 3.2.**  *$\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 1$  if and only if  $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 1$ , then  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is complete graph. Thus there exists a vertex of  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  which is adjacent to every other vertex. Therefore  $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times F$ , where  $F$  is a field by Proposition 2.4(b). Since  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is complete, we have that  $F \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Thus  $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ .

It is easy to see that for  $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ ,  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 1$ . □

Our next result characterizes the graphs where  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 2$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Assume that  $R$  is not local. The diameter of the graph  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is equal 2 if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (a)  $J(R)$  is a prime ideal.
- (b)  $|\text{Max}(R)| = 2$  and  $R \not\cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ .

*Proof.* Note that if  $J(R)$  is prime and  $R$  is semi-local (i.e. has finite number of maximal ideals), then  $R$  will be local. Let  $J(R)$  be a prime ideal and  $a, b \notin J(R)$ . Then  $ab \notin J(R)$ , and so by the same argument as Theorem 3.1, there exists  $x \in (R \setminus U(R)) \setminus J(R)$ , such that  $a-x-b$  is a path. Thus  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) \leq 2$ . If  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 1$ , then by previous result  $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ . But  $J(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$  is not a prime ideal. That is a contradiction.

Now let  $|\text{Max}(R)| = 2$  and  $R \not\cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ , then by Theorem 2.2,  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$  is a complete bipartite graph where at least one of the parts has at least two elements. Therefore  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 2$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 2$  and  $J(R)$  is not prime. let  $a, b \notin J(R)$  but  $ab \in J(R)$ . We claim that  $a$  and  $b$  are adjacent. Otherwise, there exists  $t$  in  $\Gamma_2(R)$  such that  $Ra + Rt = Rb + Rt = R$ . Thus  $Rab + Rt = R$  and so  $ab \notin J(R)$  which is a contradiction. Therefore  $Ra + Rb = R$  and so for some  $p, q \in R$ ,  $pa + qb = 1$ . Set  $S = R/J(R)$  and  $a_1 = pa + J(R)$  and  $b_1 = qb + J(R)$ . Then  $a_1 b_1 = 0$  and  $a_1 + b_1 = 1_S$ . Therefore  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are idempotent elements in  $S$ , and so  $S = Sa_1 \oplus Sb_1$ . We will show that  $Sa_1$  is a field. Let  $0 \neq x \in Sa_1$  and  $0 \neq y \in Sb_1$ . Then there exists  $\alpha, \beta$  such that  $\alpha x + \beta y = 1_S$  and so  $\alpha(a_1 + b_1)x + \beta(a_1 + b_1)y = 1_S$ . Thus  $(\alpha a_1)x + (\beta b_1)y = 1_S$ . On the other hand  $a_1 + b_1 = 1_S$  and so  $(\alpha a_1)x = a_1$  and  $(\beta b_1)y = b_1$ . Therefore  $x$  is a unit in  $Sa_1$ . Therefore  $Sa_1$  and  $Sb_1$  are fields and so  $|\text{Max}(S)| = 2$ . therefore  $|\text{Max}(R)| = 2$ . □

**Example 3.4.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_n$  where  $n = p_1^{\ell_1} \cdots p_r^{\ell_r}$ .

Assume  $r \geq 3$ . Let  $x = p_1^{\ell_1} \cdots p_{r-1}^{\ell_{r-1}}$  and  $y = p_2^{\ell_2} \cdots p_r^{\ell_r}$ . Then  $x$  and  $y$  are not adjacent. Also if  $x, y$  are adjacent  $z$ , then  $(z, x) = (z, y) = 1$ , which is impossible. We have  $Rx + Rp_r^{\ell_r} = R = Rp_r^{\ell_r} + Rp_1^{\ell_1} = Rp_1^{\ell_1} + Ry$ . Hence there is path  $x - p_r^{\ell_r} - p_1^{\ell_1} - y$ . So  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(\mathbb{Z}_n) \setminus J(\mathbb{Z}_n)) = 3$ .

Assume that  $r = 2$ . In this case we have two maximal ideals  $M_1 = \langle p_1 \rangle$  and  $M_2 = \langle p_2 \rangle$ . Then  $\Gamma(R)$  is a complete bipartite graph and so  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(\mathbb{Z}_n) \setminus J(\mathbb{Z}_n)) = 2$ .

Assume that  $r = 1$ . Then  $R$  is local and so  $\Gamma_2(\mathbb{Z}_n) \setminus J(\mathbb{Z}_n)$  is empty graph.

**Example 3.5.** Let  $R$  be an infinite PID. Then for any two non-unit elements  $a, b$ , there exists a prime element  $p$  such that  $p$  does not divide  $a$  and  $b$ . Therefore  $Ra + Rp = Rb + Rp = 1$ . So  $(a, b) \leq 2$  and hence  $\text{diam}(\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)) = 2$ .

#### 4. ISOMORPHISMS

Recall that two graphs  $G$  and  $H$  are isomorphic, denoted by  $G \cong H$ , if there is a bijection  $\varphi : G \rightarrow H$  of vertices such that the vertices  $x$  and  $y$  are adjacent in  $G$  if and only if  $\varphi(x)$  and  $\varphi(y)$  are adjacent in  $H$ .

In this section, we consider the following question:

If  $R$  and  $S$  are two rings with  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$ , then do we have  $R \cong S$ ?

The following examples show that the above question is not valid in general.

**Example 4.1.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_4$  and  $S = \mathbb{Z}_2[x]/(x^2)$ . Then by simple computation we can see that  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S) (\cong K_2 \vee \bar{K}_2)$ . But  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_2[x]/(x^2)$  are not isomorphic.

**Example 4.2.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_8$  and  $S = \mathbb{Z}_2[x]/(x^3)$ . Then  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S) (\cong K_4 \vee \bar{K}_4)$ . But  $R$  and  $S$  are not isomorphic.

**Example 4.3.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_2[x]/(x^3)$  and  $S = \mathbb{Z}_2[x, y]/(x^2, y^2, xy)$ . Then  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S) (\cong K_4 \vee \bar{K}_4)$ . But  $R$  and  $S$  are not isomorphic.

In the following theorem we give a partial answer to the above question.

**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $\{(R_i, \mathfrak{m}_i)\}_{i=1}^m$  and  $\{(S_j, \mathfrak{n}_j)\}_{j=1}^n$  be two finite families of finite quasi-local rings, and let  $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_m$  and  $S = S_1 \times \cdots \times S_n$ . If  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$  then  $m = n$  and there is a permutation  $\sigma$  on the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  such that  $|R_i/\mathfrak{m}_i| = |S_{\sigma(i)}/\mathfrak{n}_{\sigma(i)}|$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and hence  $R_i/\mathfrak{m}_i \cong S_{\sigma(i)}/\mathfrak{n}_{\sigma(i)}$ . In particular, if  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$  and each  $R_i$  is a finite field, then each  $S_j$  is also a finite field and  $R_i \cong S_{\sigma(i)}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and thus  $R \cong S$ .

*Proof.* First note that since  $|\text{Max}(R)| = n$  and  $|\text{Max}(S)| = m$ , and  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$ , we have that  $m = n$ . Set  $M_i = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_{i-1} \times \mathfrak{m}_i \times R_{i+1} \times \cdots \times R_m$  and  $N_i = S_1 \times \cdots \times S_{i-1} \times \mathfrak{n}_i \times S_{i+1} \times \cdots \times S_m$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . For any  $i = 1, \dots, m$  let  $x_i \in M_i \setminus \cup_{j \neq i} M_j$ . Clearly  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  is a clique in  $\Gamma_2(R)$ . Suppose that  $\nu(x_i)$  is equal to the number of vertices of  $\Gamma(R)$  which are not adjacent to  $x_i$ . Then

$$\nu(x_i) = |R - \{y | y = x_i \text{ or } y \text{ adjacent to } x_i\}| = |M_i|.$$

For each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , let  $y_{\sigma(i)} \in N_{\sigma(i)}$  be the image of  $x_i$  under the graph isomorphism. Then  $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$  is a clique in  $\Gamma_2(S)$  and  $y_{\sigma(i)} \in N_{\sigma(i)} \setminus \cup_{j \neq \sigma(i)} N_j$ . It is easy to see that  $\nu(y_{\sigma(i)}) = |N_{\sigma(i)}|$ . Thus  $|M_i| = |N_{\sigma(i)}|$  and so  $|R_i/\mathfrak{m}_i| = |S_{\sigma(i)}/\mathfrak{n}_{\sigma(i)}|$ . Therefore  $R/\mathfrak{m}_i \cong S_{\sigma(i)}/\mathfrak{n}_{\sigma(i)}$ .

In particular, if  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$  and each  $R_i$  is a finite field. Thus  $J(R) = (0)$  and so  $J(S) = (0)$  and hence  $\mathfrak{n}_i = (0)$  for each  $i$ . Therefore each  $S_j$  is also a finite field and  $R_i \cong S_{\sigma(i)}$  for each  $i \in I$ , and thus  $R \cong S$ .  $\square$

The following example shows that the condition “ $R_i$  is a field” is necessary in Theorem 4.4.

**Example 4.5.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_8$ , and  $S = \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ . Then  $J(R) \cong \{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  and  $J(S) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Also  $U(R) = \{1\} \times \{1, 3, 5, 7\}$  and  $U(S) = \{1, 3\} \times \{1, 3\}$ . Since  $|Max(R)| = |Max(S)| = 2$ , then  $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R) \cong \Gamma_2(S) \setminus J(S) \cong K_{4,4}$ . Therefore  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S) \cong (K_{4,4} \cup \bar{K}_4) \vee K_4$ . But it is clear that  $R \not\cong S$ .

**Corollary 4.6.** Let  $R$  and  $S$  be two finite semi-local rings and let  $R$  be reduced. Then  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$  if and only if  $R \cong S$ .

*Proof.* It is clear that  $R = F_1 \times \cdots \times F_n$ , where  $F_i$  is a field for any  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Now the assertion holds from Theorem 4.4.  $\square$

The following result shows that there exists a copy of  $\Gamma(R/J(R))$  in the structure of  $\Gamma(R)$ . This result obtains that for two rings  $R$  and  $S$  if  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$ , then  $R/J(R) \cong S/J(S)$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** The following hold:

- (a) If  $a$  is adjacent to  $b$  in  $\Gamma(R)$ , then every element of  $a + J(R)$  is adjacent to  $b + J(R)$ .
- (b) The elements of  $a + J(R)$  are adjacent if and only if  $a$  is an unit. In this case, each element of  $a + J(R)$  is unit too.
- (c) There exists a copy of  $\Gamma(R/J(R))$  in the structure of  $\Gamma(R)$ . In particular, if  $\Gamma(R) \cong \Gamma(S)$ , then  $R/J(R) \cong S/J(S)$ .

*Proof.* (a). Suppose that  $Ra + Rb = R$ . Let  $x = a + r_1$  and  $y = b + r_2$  for  $r_1, r_2 \in J(R)$ . Then there exists elements  $s, t \in R$  such that  $sa + tb = 1$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} sx + ty &= sa + tb + sr_1 + tr_2 \\ &= 1 - (-sr_1 - tr_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $-sr_1 - tr_2 \in J(R)$ , so  $sx + ty$  is a unit and hence  $Rx + Ry = R$ .

(b). Let  $(a + r_1)$  be adjacent to  $a + r_2$ . Then  $R(a + r_1) + R(a + r_2) = R$  and so there exist  $s, t \in R$  such that  $s(a + r_1) + t(a + r_2) = 1$ . This implies that  $(s + t)a = 1 - (r_1s + r_2t)$  and so  $(s + t)a$  is invertible. Therefore  $a$  is invertible.

(c). Choose a distinct representation  $\{a_i\}$  from the cosets of  $R/J(R)$ . By parts (a) and (b), we have  $\langle \{a_i\} \rangle \cong \Gamma(R/J(R))$ . Let  $\varphi : \Gamma(R) \rightarrow \Gamma(S)$  be an isomorphism. Then  $\varphi(\langle \{a_i\} \rangle) = \langle \{b_i\} \rangle = S/J(S)$  and hence the assertion is easily obtained.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was finalized when H.R. Maimani and S. Yassemi were visiting the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (TIFR) under TWAS-UNESCO Associateship Scheme. It is a pleasure to thank both TWAS and TIFR for financial support and hospitality. The authors would like to thank S.M. Bhatwadekar for the stimulating discussions. The authors wish to thank an anonymous referee, whose comments have improved this paper.

REFERENCES

1. D. D. Anderson and V. P. Camillo, *Commutative rings whose elements are a sum of a unit and idempotent*, *Comm. Algebra* **30** (2002), 3327–3336.
2. D. D. Anderson and M. Naseer, *Beck's coloring of a commutative ring*, *J. Algebra* **159** (1993), 500–514.
3. I. Beck, *Coloring of Commutative Rings*, *J. Algebra* **116** (1988), no. 1, 208–226.
4. G. Chartrand, O. R. Oellermann, *Applied and Algorithmic Graph Theory*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1993.
5. G. De Marco and A. Orsatti, *Commutative Rings in Which Every Prime Ideal is Contained in a Unique Maximal Ideal*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **30** (1971), 459–466.
6. W. K. Nicholson, *Lifting Idempotents and Exchange Rings*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **229** (1977), 269–278.
7. P. K. Sharma and S. M. Bhatwadekar, *A note on Graphical representation of rings*, *J. Algebra* **176** (1995), 124–127.

HAMID REZA MAIMANI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEHRAN, TEHRAN, IRAN, AND INSTITUTE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS (IPM).

*E-mail address:* maimani@ipm.ir

MARYAM SALIMI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEHRAN, TEHRAN, IRAN.

ASIYEH SATTARI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEHRAN, TEHRAN, IRAN.

SIAMAK YASSEMI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEHRAN, TEHRAN, IRAN, AND INSTITUTE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS (IPM).

*E-mail address:* yassemi@ipm.ir