Research Article

On Graphs Related to Comaximal Ideals of a Commutative Ring

Tongsuo Wu,¹ Meng Ye,¹ Dancheng Lu,² and Houyi Yu³

¹ Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

² Department of Mathematics, Soochow University, Suzhou, Jingsu 215006, China

³ School of Mathematics and Statistics, Southwest University, Chongqing 400715, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Tongsuo Wu; tswu@sjtu.edu.cn

Received 11 October 2012; Accepted 29 October 2012

Academic Editors: C. da Fonseca, R. Dondi, E. Kiliç, and S. Zhou

Copyright © 2013 Tongsuo Wu et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

We study the co maximal graph $\Omega(R)$, the induced subgraph $\Gamma(R)$ of $\Omega(R)$ whose vertex set is $R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$, and a retract $\Gamma_r(R)$ of $\Gamma(R)$, where R is a commutative ring. For a graph $\Gamma(R)$ which contains a cycle, we show that the core of $\Gamma(R)$ is a union of triangles and rectangles, while a vertex in $\Gamma(R)$ is either an end vertex or a vertex in the core. For a nonlocal ring R , we prove that both the chromatic number and clique number of $\Gamma(R)$ are identical with the number of maximal ideals of R . A graph $\Gamma_r(R)$ is also introduced on the vertex set $\{Rx \mid x \in R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))\}$, and graph properties of $\Gamma_r(R)$ are studied.

1. Introduction

In 1988, Beck [1] introduced the concept of zero-divisor graph for a commutative ring. Since then a lot of work was done in this area of research. Several other graph structures were also defined on rings and semigroups. In 1995, Sharma and Bhatwadekar [2] introduced a graph $\Omega(R)$ on a commutative ring R , whose vertices are elements of R where two distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $Rx + Ry = R$. Recently, Maimani et al. in [3] named this graph $\Omega(R)$ as the *comaximal graph* of R and they noted that the subgraph $\Gamma(R)$ induced on the subset $R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$ is the key to the co-maximal graph. Many interesting results about the subgraph were obtained in Maimani et al. [3] and Wang [4], and their works show that the properties of the graph $\Gamma(R)$ are quite similar to that of the modified zero-divisor graph by Anderson and Livingston [5]. For example, both graphs are simple, connected, and with diameter less than or equal to three, and each has girth less than or equal to four if they contain a cycle. Because of this reason, in this paper we use $\Gamma(R)$ to denote the graph $\Gamma_2(R) \setminus J(R)$ of [3]. In Section 2, we discover more properties shared by both zero-divisor graph and the subgraph $\Gamma(R)$ of $\Omega(R)$. In particular, It is shown that the core of $\Gamma(R)$ is a union of triangles and rectangles, while a vertex in $\Gamma(R)$ is either an end vertex or a vertex in the core. For any nonlocal ring R , it is shown that the chromatic

number of the graph $\Gamma(R)$ is identical with the number of maximal ideals of R . In Section 3, we introduce a new graph $\Gamma_r(R)$ on the vertex set

$$\{Rx \mid x \in R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))\}. \quad (1)$$

This graph is in fact a retract of the graph $\Gamma(R)$ and is thus simpler than the graph $\Gamma(R)$ in general, but we will show that they share many common properties and invariants.

Jinnah and Mathew in [6] studied the problem of when a co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$ is a split graph, and they determined all rings R with the property. In Section 4, we give an alternative proof to their main [6, Theorem 2.3]. In the co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$, each unit u of R is adjacent to all vertices of the graph while an element of $J(R)$ only connects to units of R . Temporally, we say u is in the center of the graph $\Gamma(R)$. Related to the co-maximal relation, there is the concept of *rings with stable range one*. Recall that a ring R (which needs not be commutative) has one in its stable range, if for any x, y with $Rx + Ry = R$, there is an element t such that $x + ty$ is invertible. For example, the following classes of rings have one in their stable range: zero-dimensional commutative rings, von Neumann unit-regular rings, and semilocal rings. The concept comaximal graph gives an interesting graph interpretation of such rings. In fact, a commutative ring R has one in its stable range if and only if for any pair of adjacent

vertices x, y in the co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$, the additive coset $x + Ry$ (and $y + Rx$) has at least one element in the center of the graph $\Omega(R)$.

Throughout this paper, all rings are assumed to be commutative with identity. For a ring R , let $U(R)$ be the set of invertible elements of R and $J(R)$ the Jacobson radical of R . Recall that a graph is called *complete* (resp., *discrete*) if every pair of vertices is adjacent (resp., no pair of vertices is adjacent). We denote a complete graph by K and a complete (resp., discrete) graph with n vertices by K_n (resp., D_n). A subset K of the vertex set of G is called a *clique* if any two distinct vertices of K are adjacent; the *clique number* $\omega(G)$ of G is the least upper bound of the size of the cliques. Similarly, we denote by $K_{m,n}$ the complete bipartite graph with two partitions of sizes m, n , respectively. Recall that H is called a *spanning subgraph* of a graph G if $V(G) = V(H)$ and $a \sim b$ in H implies $a \sim b$ in G for all distinct vertices of G , where $a \sim b$ means that $a \neq b$ and a is adjacent to b . Recall that a *cycle* in a graph is a path $v_1 \sim v_2 \sim \dots \sim v_n$ together with an additional edge $v_n \sim v_1$ ($n \geq 3$). For a simple graph G and a nonempty subset S of $V(G)$, there is the *subgraph induced on S*: the vertex set is S and the edge set is

$$\{x \sim y \mid x, y \in S, \text{ and there is an edge } x \sim y \text{ in the graph } G\}. \quad (2)$$

A discrete induced subgraph of a graph G is also called an *independent subset* of G . For other notations not mentioned in the paper, one can refer to [7, 8].

2. The Subgraph $\Gamma(R)$

As noted by Maimani et al. in [3], the main part of the co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$ is the subgraph $\Gamma(R)$ induced on the vertex subset $R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$. In fact, we have the following facts.

(O1) A vertex in $U(R)$ is adjacent to every vertex of $\Omega(R)$, while an element of $J(R)$ only connects to units of R . In fact, there is a sequential sum decomposition

$$\Omega(R) = J(R) + U(R) + \Gamma(R). \quad (3)$$

(O2) $\Gamma(R)$ is empty if and only if R is a local ring, that is, a commutative ring with a unique maximal ideal.

The authors of [3, 4] studied this subgraph and obtained many interesting results. In particular, it is proved that the graph is connected with diameter less than or equal to three [3, Theorem 3.1], that the girth of the graph is less than or equal to four [4, Corollary 3.8]. We include a detailed proof for the following fundamental property of graphs related to algebras.

Theorem 1 (see [3, Theorem 3.1]). *The graph $\Gamma(R)$ is connected with diameter less than or equal to three.*

Proof. For any $a \in R$, set $S_a = \{\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(R) \mid a \in \mathfrak{m}\}$. Then for each $a \notin J(R)$, $S_a \subset \text{Max}(R)$. For distinct $a, b \in R$, we claim

(1) $ab \in J(R)$ if and only if $\text{Max}(R) = S_a \cup S_b$,

(2) $Ra + Rb = R$ if and only if $S_a \cap S_b = \emptyset$.

Now for distinct $a, b \in R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$, if $ab \notin J(R)$, then there exists $x \in R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$ such that $Rab + Rx = R$. Then clearly there is a path $a \sim x \sim b$ in $\Gamma(R)$ and hence $d(a, b) \leq 2$. If $ab \in J(R)$, then take any $y \in R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$ such that $Ra + Ry = R$. We claim that $by \notin J(R)$ and it will follow that $d(a, b) \leq d(a, y) + d(y, b) \leq 3$. In fact, assume to the contrary that $by \in J(R)$. Then we have

$$S_b \cup (S_y \setminus S_b) = S_b \cup S_y = \text{Max}(R) = S_b \cup (S_a \setminus S_b). \quad (4)$$

It follows that $(S_y \setminus S_b) = S_a \setminus S_b = \emptyset$ since $S_a \cap S_y = \emptyset$. Then $b \in J(R)$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. $\square$

By [4, Theorem 3.9(1)], the clique number $\omega(\Gamma(R))$ is infinite whenever $J(R) = 0$ and the ring R is indecomposable. It could be used to sharpen [3, Theorem 2.2], as the following theorem shows.

Theorem 2. *For any non-local ring R , let $G = \Gamma(R)$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) G is a bipartite graph.
- (2) G is a complete bipartite graph.
- (3) R has exactly two maximal ideals.
- (4) $R/J(R) \cong \mathbb{K}_1 \times \mathbb{K}_2$, where each $\mathbb{K}_i$ is a field.

Proof. (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Assume that $\mathfrak{m}_1, \mathfrak{m}_2$ are the maximal ideals of R . Then $\Gamma(R)$ is a complete bipartite graph with two partitions $\mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_2$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_1$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Assume that G is a complete bipartite graph with vertex partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup V_2$. Then for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, $\mathfrak{m} \setminus J(R)$ is entirely contained in a single partition. Assume $\mathfrak{m}_i \setminus J(R) \subseteq V_i$. If R has a third maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n}$, then $\mathfrak{n} \setminus J(R) \subseteq V_i$ for some i . This is impossible since $\mathfrak{n} + \mathfrak{m}_i = R$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) and (4) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Clear.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Clearly, there is no loss to assume $J(R) = 0$.

If R has only a finite number of maximal ideals, say $\mathfrak{m}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, set $\mathfrak{n}_i = \mathfrak{m}_i \setminus (\cup_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{m}_j)$. Then $\mathfrak{n}_i \neq \emptyset$, and each vertex in $\mathfrak{n}_i$ is adjacent to all vertices in $\mathfrak{n}_j$. This implies $\omega(G) \geq |\text{Max}(R)|$ and hence $\omega(G) = |\text{Max}(R)|$, when R has only a finite number of maximal ideals. If further G is a bipartite graph, then $r = 2$; that is, R has exactly two maximal ideals.

In the following, assume that R has infinitely many maximal ideals, and we proceed to prove $\omega(G) = \infty$. Assume that R has a nontrivial idempotent e . Then $R = eR \times (1 - e)R$. If eR has no nontrivial idempotent element, then $\omega(\Gamma(eR)) = \infty$ and hence $\omega(G) = \infty$. Then assume that both e and $1 - e$ are nonprimitive idempotents. By induction, for any integer $s \geq 1$, there exist nontrivial corner rings $R_{s,i}$ of R such that $R = \prod_{j=1}^s R_{s,j}$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= (0, 1, \dots, 1), \dots, \\ f_2 &= (1, 0, 1, \dots, 1), \dots, \\ f_s &= (1, \dots, 1, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Clearly $\{f_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq s}$ is a clique in $\Gamma(R)$, and thus $\omega(G) = \infty$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4): This follows from the Chinese remainder theorem. $\square$

Note that the proof together with [4, Theorem 3.9(1)] actually gives an alternative proof to the fact that $\omega(\Gamma(R)) = |\text{Max}(R)|$ whenever R is not a local ring.

Recall that a ring R is called an *exchange ring* if the left module ${}_R R$ has the exchange property, see [9] and the included references for details. Recall that idempotents can be lifted modulo every ideal of an exchange ring R . The class of exchange rings include artinian rings, semiperfect rings, and clean rings, the rings in which each element is a sum of an idempotent and a unit. Recall that for a ring R with all idempotents central in R , R is clean if and only if R is an exchange ring. For commutative clean rings R , we have the following.

Corollary 3. *For any commutative non-local exchange ring R , let $G = \Gamma(R)$. Then G is a bipartite graph if and only if G is a complete bipartite graph, if and only if $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$, where each R_i is a local ring.*

A graph G is called *totally disconnected* if the edge set $E(G)$ is empty. By Theorem 1, we have the following observation and hence Theorem 4.

(O3) $\Gamma(R)$ is totally disconnected if and only if it is an empty graph, which is true if and only if R is a local ring.

Theorem 4 (see [3, 4]). *For a ring R , let $G = \Gamma(R)$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *A star graph is a spanning subgraph of G , that is; G has at least two vertices, and there exists a vertex in G which is adjacent to every other vertex.*
- (2) *G is a tree; that is, G is nonempty, connected and contains no cycles.*
- (3) *G is a star graph.*
- (4) *R is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{F}$ for some field $\mathbb{F}$.*

Proof. (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4): This is contained in [3, Corollary 2.4(2)].

(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4): This is contained in [4, Theorem 3.5, Corollary 3.6]. $\square$

Corollary 5. *For a finite simple graph G with $|G| \geq 2$, assume $G = \Gamma(R)$ for some ring R . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *A star graph is a spanning subgraph of G .*
- (2) *G is a tree; that is, G contains no cycle.*
- (3) *$G = K_{1, p^{n-1}}$ for some prime number p and some positive integer n .*

The works of [3, 4] show that the graph $\Gamma(R)$ has many properties which the zero-divisor graph of a ring (or a semigroup) already has. Recall from [10, 11] that *the core of a zero-divisor graph G is always a union of triangles and squares, and a vertex in G is either an end vertex or a vertex of the core.* Recall that the core of a graph G is by definition the

FIGURE 1: Lemma 6.

FIGURE 2: Lemma 7.

subgraph induced on all vertices of cycles of G . In the final part of this section, we will show that the graph $\Gamma(R)$ has the same property.

Lemma 6. *For any path $a \sim x \sim b$ in the graph $\Gamma(R)$, if $ab + x$ is not a unit of R , then the path is contained in a subgraph isomorphic to $K_1 + K_2 + K_1$.*

Proof. The given condition implies $Rx + Rab = R$. Hence $ab \notin J(R)$ and in particular, $ab + x \neq x$. Furthermore, we have

$$R(ab + x) + Ra = R = R(ab + x) + Rb. \quad (6)$$

Now assume $ab + x \notin U(R)$. Then $ab + x \notin U(R) \cup J(R)$. If $ab + x \notin \{a, b\}$, then there is a subgraph $K_1 + K_2 + K_1$ in $\Gamma(R)$ which contains the path $a \sim x \sim b$, see Figure 1. Since $R(ab + x) + Ra = R = R(ab + x) + Rb$, it follows that $ab + x \notin \{a, b\}$, and this completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 7. *If a vertex x of $\Gamma(R)$ is in a cycle of five vertices, then x is in either a triangle or a rectangle.*

Proof. Assume $a \sim x \sim b \sim c \sim d \sim a$ is a cycle in $\Gamma(R)$, and x is not in any triangle, see Figure 2. We proceed to verify that x is in a square.

In fact, if $xv \neq x$ for some $v \in U(R)$, then there is a square $a \sim x \sim b \sim vx \sim a$ in $\Gamma(R)$. Thus in the following, we assume $uy = y$, for all $u \in U(R)$ where $y \in \{a, x, b\}$. Then by Lemma 6, we can assume further

$$ab + x = 1, \quad xc + b = 1, \quad xd + a = 1. \quad (*)$$

Note that xd is adjacent to a , and xc is adjacent to b in $\Gamma(R)$. If $xd = x$, then by (*) we have $a = ab$. Then there is a rectangle $a \sim x \sim b \sim d \sim a$ in $\Gamma(R)$. Therefore we may assume $xd \notin \{x, d\}$, $xc \notin \{x, c\}$.

Since $d(xc, xd) \leq 3$, we can assume there is a path $xc \sim e \sim f \sim xd$. If $e \neq b$, then there is a rectangle $x \sim e \sim xc \sim b \sim x$. If $e = b$, then $f \notin \{x, a\}$ and hence by (*) there is a cycle $a \sim x \sim b \sim f \sim xd \sim a$. Then there is a rectangle $a \sim x \sim f \sim xd \sim a$ and a triangle $b \sim x \sim f \sim b$. This completes the verification. $\square$

Lemma 8. Let $G = \Gamma(R)$ and assume that G contains a cycle. Then for any path $a \sim x \sim b$ in the core of G , x is in a cycle C_n with $3 \leq n \leq 5$.

Proof. Assume

$$\dots \sim f \sim a \sim x \sim b \sim g \sim \dots \quad (7)$$

is a cycle in $\Gamma(R)$. We proceed to verify that x is in a cycle C_n with $3 \leq n \leq 5$. Since $Rab + Rfb = Rb$, we have

$$Rb = Rab + (Ra + Rx)fb = Rab + Rxfb. \quad (8)$$

Then $Rb + R(x - xfb) = Rab + Rx = R$. It follows that $x - xfb \notin U(R) \cup J(R)$. Consider xfb . If $xfb = 0$, then it follows that $Rb = Rab + Rxfb = Rab$. In this case, there is a rectangle $a \sim x \sim b \sim g \sim a$. In the following, assume $xfb \neq 0$, that is, $x - xfb \neq x$, and let $y = x - xfb$. Without loss of generality, assume $d(y, f) = 3$ and $y \sim d \sim e \sim f$ is a path from y to f . If further $d \neq b$, then there is a rectangle $b \sim x \sim d \sim y \sim b$. If $d = b$, then there is a cycle $C_5 : f \sim a \sim x \sim b \sim e \sim f$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 9. For a ring R , let $G = \Gamma(R)$ and assume that G contains a cycle. Then the following hold.

- (1) The core of G is a union of triangles and rectangles, and the girth of G is less than or equal to four.
- (2) Every vertex of G is either an end vertex or a vertex of the core.

Proof. (1) The first statement follows from Lemmas 7 and 8.

(2) For the second statement, let $a \sim x \sim b$ be a path and assume to the contrary that x is not in the core of $\Gamma(R)$. Since G contains a cycle, by Theorem 1, we can assume that $a \sim x \sim b \sim c$ is a path, where both b and c are in the core. Clearly, $1 - ac \in U(R)$. By Lemma 6, both $ab + x$ and $xc + b$ are units of R . By assumption on x , we can assume further

$$ab + x = 1, \quad xc + b = 1. \quad (9)$$

If $xc = x$, then we have $cx + ab = x + b = 1$, a contradiction. Then $xc \neq x$ and $b(1 - ac) = 1 - c$, where $1 - ac \in U(R)$. Thus we can replace b by $1 - c$. In a similar way, replace x by $1 - a$. Now in $\Gamma(R)$ there is a path $a \sim (1 - a) \sim (1 - c) \sim c$, where both c and $1 - c$ are in the core of G . Certainly, there is a vertex $d \notin \{c, 1 - c\}$ in the core such that $1 - c$ is adjacent to d . Then a similar argument shows $1 - c = v(1 - d)$ for some $v \in U(R)$. Since $1 - d \notin \{1 - c, c\}$, and the distance from a to $1 - d$ is at most three, we must have a triangle $(1 - c) \sim d \sim (1 - d) \sim (1 - c)$ in the graph G . Then $1 - c = v(1 - d)$ implies $(1 - d) \in U(R)$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. $\square$

3. A Retract $\Gamma_r(R)$ of $\Gamma(R)$

For simple graphs G and H , recall that $G \xrightarrow{\varphi} H$ if there exists a map $\varphi : G \rightarrow H$ such that for distinct $u, v \in V(G)$, $u \sim v$ in G implies $\varphi(u) \neq \varphi(v)$ and $\varphi(u) \sim \varphi(v)$ in H . Such a map φ is called a *graph homomorphism* from G to H . If H is a subgraph of G , and there is a graph homomorphism $G \xrightarrow{\varphi} H$, where the

FIGURE 3: Retract for ring $\mathbb{Z}_{12}$.

restriction of φ on H is an identity, then H is called a *retract* of G , see Figure 3 for an example. If G has no proper retract, then G is called a *core graph* (e.g., K_n is a core graph.). Note that the core of a graph needs not to be a core graph. Recall that the *chromatic number* $\chi(G)$ of G is the least positive integer r such that there exists a graph homomorphism $G \xrightarrow{\varphi} K_r$. It is the least number of colors needed for coloring the vertices of G in such a way that no two adjacent vertices have a same color. The *girth* of a graph G , denoted by $g(G)$, is the length of the minimal cycle in G .

In this section, we introduce a new graph which is a retract of $\Gamma(R)$ and we study this new graph.

Definition 10. For a ring R and any $x \in R$, let $\bar{x} = Rx$. Construct a simple graph in the following and denote it as $\Gamma_r(R) = G$:

$$\begin{aligned} V(G) &= \{\bar{x} \mid x \in R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))\}, \\ E(G) &= \{\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\} \mid \bar{x} \neq \bar{y} \in V(G), \text{ and } Rx + Ry = R\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Clearly, this graph has less vertices and less edges than that of the graph $\Gamma(R)$ in general, see Figure 3. More precisely, we have the following.

Proposition 11. (1) For a ring R , the graph $\Gamma_r(R)$ is a retract of $\Gamma(R)$.

(2) For any ideal I of R contained in $J(R)$, $\Gamma(R/I)$ is a retract of $\Gamma(R)$.

Furthermore, we have the following.

(3) If the girth of $\Gamma(R)$ is three, then so is the girth of $\Gamma_r(R)$.

(4) $\Gamma_r(R)$ is connected with diameter less than or equal to three.

(5) $\omega(\Gamma_r(R)) = \omega(\Gamma(R))$ and $\chi(\Gamma_r(R)) = \chi(\Gamma(R))$.

(6) $\Gamma_r(R)$ and $\Gamma(R)$ are homomorphically equivalent to the same unique core graph.

Proof. (1) Clearly, $\varphi : x \mapsto \bar{x}$ is a surjective graph homomorphism. For any $\bar{x} \in V(\Gamma_r(R))$, fix a vertex y_x in Rx to obtain a subgraph of $\Gamma(R)$. Then the graph $\Gamma_r(R)$ is isomorphic to the subgraph of $\Gamma(R)$. Thus $\Gamma_r(R)$ is a retract of the graph $\Gamma(R)$. In a similar way, one checks (2). All the remaining results follow from (1). We check (3) and (5) in the following.

(3) The result is clear by the definition of $\Gamma_r(R)$. In fact, if $G \rightarrow H$ and G has odd girth, then it is known that $g(G) = g(H)$, since any cycle with odd length is a core graph.

(5) Since a composition of graph homomorphisms is still a graph homomorphism, clearly $\chi(\Gamma_r(R)) \geq \chi(\Gamma(R))$. On the other hand, since $\Gamma_r(R)$ is isomorphic to a subgraph of

FIGURE 4: Sequential sum.

$\Gamma(R)$, for any graph homomorphism $\psi : \Gamma(R) \rightarrow K_s$, the restriction $\psi| : \Gamma_r(R) \rightarrow K_s$ is also a graph homomorphism. This shows the second assertion of (5). The first equality holds by the definition of a retract of a graph. Furthermore, it can be proved that the equalities hold for any graph retract and any graph blowup. See [12] for details. $\square$

By Theorem 2 and Proposition 11, we have the following.

Corollary 12. (1) For any non-local ring R , $\chi(\Gamma_r(R)) \geq |\text{Max}(R)|$.

(2) $\Gamma_r(R)$ is a complete bipartite graph if and only if R has exactly two maximal ideals, which is true if and only if $\Gamma_r(R)$ is a bipartite graph.

By [4, Corollary 3.8(1)], if $H = \Gamma(R)$ contains a cycle, then the girth $g(H) \leq 4$. Compared with Proposition 11(3), we have the following example for the $g(H) = 4$ case (see Figure 3).

Example 13. Consider the ring $R = \mathbb{Z}_{12}$. For this ring, $g(\Gamma(R)) = 4$, while $g(\Gamma_r(R)) = \infty$. We draw the two graphs in Figure 3.

Recall a convenient construction from graph theory, the sequential sum

$$G = G_1 + G_2 + \cdots + G_r \quad (11)$$

of a sequence of graphs $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_r$ with $V(G_i) \cap V(G_j) = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. The vertex set of G is $\bigcup_{i=1}^r V(G_i)$ and the edge set of G is $E \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^r E(G_i))$, where

$$E = \{v_i \sim v_{i+1} \mid v_i \in V(G_i), v_{i+1} \in V(G_{i+1}), 1 \leq i \leq r-1\}. \quad (12)$$

We illustrate the construction in Figure 4 for the sequence of graphs K_1, K_1, H , where H is a triangle K_3 together with three end vertices adjacent to distinct vertices.

Theorem 14. Let R be any commutative ring that is not a local ring, and let $G = \Gamma(R)$. Then the following numbers are identical:

- (1) the chromatic number $\chi(G)$,
- (2) the clique number $\omega(G)$,
- (3) the cardinal number of $\text{Max}(R)$,
- (4) $\chi(\Gamma_r(R))$,
- (5) $\omega(\Gamma_r(R))$.

Proof. First, recall from [2, Theorem 2.3] that

$$\chi(\Omega(R)) = |\text{Max}(R)| + |U(R)|. \quad (13)$$

Then consider the following decomposition of the co-maximal graph into sequential sums of three subgraphs:

$$\Omega(R) = J(R) + U(R) + \Gamma(R), \quad (14)$$

where $J(R)$ is a discrete subgraph while $U(R)$ is a complete subgraph. Since $|J(R)| \leq |U(R)|$, we have

$$\chi(\Omega(R)) = \chi(\Gamma(R)) + |U(R)|. \quad (15)$$

By [4, Theorem 3.9(2)], $\omega(\Gamma(R)) = |\text{Max}(R)|$. Then

$$\chi(\Gamma(R)) = |\text{Max}(R)| = \omega(\Gamma(R)). \quad (**)$$

By Proposition 11, we have $\chi(G) = \chi(\Gamma_r(R)) \geq \omega(\Gamma_r(R)) = \omega(G)$, and the result follows from (**). $\square$

Now we study the interplay between the graph structure of $\Gamma_r(R)$ and the algebraic property of R . First we have the following

Proposition 15. For a ring R , let $G = \Gamma_r(R)$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) A star graph is a spanning subgraph of G .
- (2) G is a star graph.
- (3) $R \cong \mathbb{F} \times T$, where $\mathbb{F}$ is a field and T is a local ring.

Proof. We only need to prove (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Assume $\bar{x}$ is adjacent to every other vertex in $\Gamma_r(R)$. Then $\bar{x} = \bar{x}^2$. Assume $x = rx^2$. Then $rx = (rx)^2$ and $\bar{x} = r\bar{x}$. So we can assume at the start that x is a nontrivial idempotent. Let $Rx = T, \mathbb{F} = R(1-x)$. Then T is a maximal ideal of R and $R = \mathbb{F} \times T$. Thus $\mathbb{F}$ is a field. Now $J(R) = J(T)$, and for any $y \in T \setminus J(T)$, we have $T = Ty$. Thus T is a local ring with the maximal ideal $J(R)$. $\square$

Note that for a finite local ring $(T, \mathfrak{m})$, if $\mathfrak{m} = Tx_1 \cup \cdots \cup Tx_r$ in which $Tx_i \not\subseteq Tx_j$, then $\Gamma_r(R) = K_{1,r}$.

Corollary 16. For any commutative ring R , $\text{diam}(\Gamma_r(R)) = 1$ if and only if $R \cong \mathbb{F}_1 \times \mathbb{F}_2$, where each $\mathbb{F}_i$ is a field.

Proof. If $R \cong \mathbb{F}_1 \times \mathbb{F}_2$, then clearly $\text{diam}(\Gamma_r(R)) = 1$. Conversely, assume $\text{diam}(\Gamma_r(R)) = 1$. Then $\Gamma_r(R)$ is a complete graph. By Proposition 15, we have $R \cong \mathbb{F} \times T$, where $\mathbb{F}$ is a field and T is a local ring. If T is not a field, then take any nonzero $x \in J(T)$. Then $(1, x) \in R \setminus U(R) \setminus J(R)$, and $(1, 0)$ is not adjacent to $(1, x)$ in $\Gamma_r(R)$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. $\square$

The following result follows from Corollary 12, Proposition 15, and the proof of [3, Lemma 3.2, Proposition 3.3],

Proposition 17. For any commutative non-local ring R , $\text{diam}(\Gamma_r(R)) = 2$ if and only if one of the following conditions holds.

- (1) $J(R)$ is a prime ideal of R .
- (2) R has exactly two maximal ideals, and $R \not\cong \mathbb{F}_1 \times \mathbb{F}_2$ for any fields $\mathbb{F}_i$.

Corollary 18. *For any commutative non-local ring R , the graphs $\Gamma(R)$ and $\Gamma_r(R)$ have the same diameter if and only if $R \not\cong \mathbb{F}_1 \times \mathbb{F}_2$ for any fields $\mathbb{F}_i$ but $\mathbb{F}_1 = \mathbb{F}_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

By [4, Theorem 3.9(2)], Theorem 14, and Corollary 16, if $\text{diam}(\Gamma_r(R)) = 2$ (resp., $\text{diam}(\Gamma(R)) = 2$), then either $\Gamma_r(R)$ (resp., $\Gamma(R)$) is a complete bipartite graph or its clique number is infinite.

At the end of this section, we pose the following problem.

Question 1. Which rings R have the property that $\Gamma(R)$ is a generalized split graph? Which rings R have the property that $\Gamma_r(R)$ is a (generalized) split graph?

Recall from [13] that a simple graph G is a *generalized split graph* if

$$V(G) = K \cup D, \quad K \cap D = \emptyset, \quad (16)$$

where the induced subgraph on K (resp., on D) is a core graph (resp., a discrete graph). Note that $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$ is not a generalized split graph, while $\Gamma_r(\mathbb{Z}_{12})$ is a split graph.

4. A Ring R Whose Comaximal Graph $\Omega(R)$ Is a Split Graph

Throughout this section, assume that G is a *split graph*, that is, G is simple and connected with $V(G) = K \cup D$, where $K \cap D = \emptyset$ and the induced subgraph on K (resp., on D) is a complete (resp., discrete) graph, see [13] and the included references there. For the split graph G , we always assume that D is a maximal such independent subset. Under this assumption, a complete graph K_n is a split graph with $|K| = n - 1, |D| = 1$.

Lemma 19. *For a commutative ring R , let G be the co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$. If G is a split graph with $V(G) = K \cup D$, then we have the following.*

- (1) For any proper ideal I of R , $|I \cap K| \leq 1$.
- (2) $\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n} \cap K = \{0\}$ holds for distinct maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}$ of R .
- (3) If R is isomorphic to neither $\mathbb{Z}_2$ nor $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, then $|K| \geq |\text{Max}(R)| + 1$. Also, $|K| = |\text{Max}(R)|$ if and only if $R = \mathbb{Z}_2$ or $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Proof. (1) Clear.

(2) Assume to the contrary that there exists some nonzero $u \in \mathfrak{m} \cap \mathfrak{n} \cap K$. Since $\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{n} = R$, we have $x \in \mathfrak{m}, y \in \mathfrak{n}$ such that $x + y = 1$. Clearly, $x \neq y$ and hence we can assume $x \in K$. Then it follows from Lemma 19(1) that $x = u \in \mathfrak{n}$, a contradiction.

(3) If R is a local ring, then either $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ or R has at least two units by assumption. The result holds in this case. In the following, we assume that R is non-local. If there is a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ with $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq D$, then by the proof of [6, Theorem 2.1],

$R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{F}$ for some field $\mathbb{F}$. In this case, $|K| \geq |\text{Max}(R)|$ and, $|K| = |\text{Max}(R)|$ if and only if $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_2$. If no maximal ideal is contained in K , then each maximal ideal has exactly one vertex in K by (1). By (2), we have $|K| \geq |\text{Max}(R)| + 1$. $\square$

We remark that Lemma 19(3) is the best possible. For instance, $|K| = |\text{Max}(R)| + 1$ holds for the local ring $\mathbb{Z}_4$ and $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. For $R = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, we draw its co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$ in Figure 4, in which $\Omega(R) = K_1 + K_1 + H$.

The following is a result of [6].

Lemma 20 (see [6, Theorem 2.1]). *For a commutative ring R which is non-local, if the co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$ is a split graph and $R \not\cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{F}$ for any field $\mathbb{F}$, then the characteristic of R is two, R has exactly three maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_i$, and $K \cap \mathfrak{m}_i = \{x_i\}$ for all i , where each x_i is idempotent and for every invertible element u of R , $ux_i = x_i$.*

We now give an alternative proof to the main result of [6].

Theorem 21 (see [6, Theorem 2.3]). *For a commutative ring R , the co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$ is a split graph if and only if R is one of the following: a local ring, $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{F}$ for some field $\mathbb{F}$.*

Proof. We only need to prove the necessary part. Assume that R is not a local ring and $R \not\cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{F}$ for any field $\mathbb{F}$. Let $G = \Omega(R)$. Assume further that the co-maximal graph G is a split graph with $V(G) = K \cup D$. By Lemma 20, R has exactly three maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) such that $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap K = \{x_i\}$, where $x_i^2 = x_i$ and $ux_i = x_i$ hold for every $u \in U(R)$. Also, R has characteristic 2. For any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$, assume $1 = rx_i + sx_j$ with $rx_i \in K$. By Lemma 19, we have $x_i = rx_i$ and hence $1 - x_i = sx_j$. It follows that $(1 - x_i)(1 - x_j) = 0$. Note that $1 + x_1x_2x_3 \in U(R)$ since $x_1x_2x_3 \in J(R)$, and it follows that $x_1x_2x_3 = 0$. Then $(1 - x_i)(1 - x_j) = 0$ implies $x_k + x_ix_k + x_jx_k = 0$ for any rearrangement i, j, k of 1, 2, 3. Therefore $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 2 \cdot f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0$. This shows that $1 - x_1, 1 - x_2, 1 - x_3$ is a complete set of orthogonal idempotent elements of R .

Let $R_i = R(1 - x_i)$. Then $R = \sum_{i=1}^3 R_i \cong R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$, where each R_i is a local ring with a unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n}_i$, since R has exactly three maximal ideals. For any $r(1 - x_1) \in \mathfrak{n}_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + r(1 - x_1) &= [(1 - x_1) + r(1 - x_1)] + (1 - x_2) + (1 - x_3) \in U(R). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Since $ux_2 = x_2$ for all $u \in U(R)$, it follows that $r(1 - x_1) \cdot x_2 = 0$. Now apply the fact $(1 - x_1)(1 - x_2) = 0$; one derives $r(1 - x_1) = 0$. Hence $\mathfrak{n}_1 = 0$ and each R_i is a field. Thus R is a direct product of three fields.

Since $x_1 = x_2 + x_3$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}_1 &= R_2 + R_3, & \mathfrak{m}_2 &= R_1 + R_3, \\ \mathfrak{m}_3 &= R_1 + R_2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Then in the decomposition $R = K \cup D$, we deduce from Lemma 19(1) that

$$\begin{aligned} K &= (U(R_1) + U(R_2) + U(R_3)) \cup \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}, \\ D &= R \setminus K. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Now we claim that each R_i is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and hence $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. In fact, assume $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} K &= (U(R_1) \times U(R_2) \times U(R_3)) \cup \{(0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

If $|R_1| > 2$, then there exists a nonzero element $1 \neq v_1 \in R_1$. Then both $z = (v_1, 0, 1)$ and $e = (0, 1, 0)$ are in the independent subset D , contradicting $Rz + Re = R$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 22. *A finite split graph is a co-maximal graph of a non-local commutative ring if and only if G is one of the following: (1) the sequential sum $K_1 + K_{p^n-1} + K_{1,p^n-1}$ for some prime number p and (2) the sequential sum $K_1 + K_1 + H$ in Figure 4, where H is a triangle K_3 together with three end vertices adjacent to distinct vertices.*

The co-maximal graph of a field is certainly a complete graph. For a finite local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ which is not a field, assume $|\mathfrak{m}| = p^m$. Then the co-maximal graph of R is $K_{p^n-p^m} + D_{p^m}$, where $p^n \geq 2p^m$ and D_{p^m} is a discrete graph with p^m vertices.

By Theorem 21 and the results of [3, 4], it is natural to ask the following question: for what rings R is $\Gamma(R)$ a split graph, where the vertex set of $\Gamma(R)$ is $R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$? Note that for distinct maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}$ (if exist) and $x \in \mathfrak{m}, y \in \mathfrak{n}$, $Rx + Ry = R$ implies $x, y \in R \setminus (U(R) \cup J(R))$. Then a careful check to the proofs of Lemma 19, Lemma 20, and Theorem 21 shows the following.

Theorem 23. *For any ring R , the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *The co-maximal graph $\Omega(R)$ of R is a split graph.*
- (2) *The subgraph $\Gamma(R)$ is either empty or a split graph.*
- (3) *R is one of the following: a local ring, $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{F}$ for some field $\mathbb{F}$.*

Note that a split graph G is isomorphic to $\Gamma(R)$ for some finite ring R if and only if either G is a star graph K_{1,p^n-1} for some prime number p or G is the triangle together with three end vertices adjacent to distinct vertices (see the graph H in Figure 4).

Acknowledgment

This research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant no. 11271250).

References

- [1] I. Beck, "Coloring of commutative rings," *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 116, no. 1, pp. 208–226, 1988.
- [2] P. K. Sharma and S. M. Bhatwadekar, "A note on graphical representation of rings," *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 176, no. 1, pp. 124–127, 1995.
- [3] H. R. Maimani, M. Salimi, A. Sattari, and S. Yassemi, "Comaximal graph of commutative rings," *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 319, no. 4, pp. 1801–1808, 2008.
- [4] H. J. Wang, "Graphs associated to co-maximal ideals of commutative rings," *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 320, no. 7, pp. 2917–2933, 2008.
- [5] D. F. Anderson and P. S. Livingston, "The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring," *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 217, no. 2, pp. 434–447, 1999.
- [6] M. I. Jinnah and S. C. Mathew, "When is the comaximal graph split?" *Communications in Algebra*, vol. 40, pp. 2400–2404, 2012.
- [7] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass, USA, 1969.
- [8] B. Bollobás, *Modern Graph Theory*, vol. 184 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer, New York, NY, USA, 1998.
- [9] T. Wu and Y. Xu, "On the stable range condition of exchange rings," *Communications in Algebra*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 2355–2363, 1997.
- [10] F. R. DeMeyer, T. McKenzie, and K. Schneider, "The zero-divisor graph of a commutative semigroup," *Semigroup Forum*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 206–214, 2002.
- [11] S. B. Mulay, "Cycles and symmetries of zero-divisors," *Communications in Algebra*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 3533–3558, 2002.
- [12] M. Ye, T. S. Wu, Q. Liu, and J. Guo, "Graph blow-up and its applications in comaximal ideal graphs," In press.
- [13] D. C. Lu and T. S. Wu, "Endomorphism monoids of general split graphs," *Ars Combinatoria*. In press.