On $r$-noncommuting graph of finite rings

Monalisha Sharma, Parama Dutta and Rajat Kanti Nath

Abstract

Let $R$ be a finite ring and $r \in R$. The $r$-noncommuting graph of $R$, denoted by $\Gamma_r^R$, is a simple undirected graph whose vertex set is $R$ and two vertices $x$ and $y$ are adjacent if and only if $[x, y] \neq r$ and $-r$. In this paper, we study several properties of $\Gamma_r^R$. We show that $\Gamma_r^R$ is not a regular graph, a lollipop graph and complete bipartite graph. Further, we consider an induced subgraph of $\Gamma_r^R$ (induced by the non-central elements of $R$) and obtained some characterizations of $R$.
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1 Introduction

Throughout the paper $R$ denotes a finite ring and $r \in R$. Let $Z(R) := \{ z \in R : zr = rz \text{ for all } r \in R \}$ be the center of $R$. For any element $x \in R$, the centralizer of $x$ in $R$ is a subring given by $C_R(x) := \{ y \in R : xy = yx \}$. Clearly, $Z(R) = \bigcap_{x \in R} C_R(x)$. For any two elements $x$ and $y$ of $R$, $[x, y] := xy - yx$ is called the additive commutator of $x$ and $y$. Let $K(R) = \{ [x, y] : x, y \in R \}$ and $[R, R]$ and $[x, R]$ for $x \in R$ denote the additive subgroups of $(R, +)$ generated by the sets $K(R)$ and $\{ [x, y] : y \in R \}$ respectively.

The study of graphs defined on algebraic structures have been an active topic of research in the last few decades. Recently, Erfanian, Khashyarmanesh and Nafar [4] considered noncommuting graphs of finite rings. Recall that the noncommuting graph of a finite noncommutative ring $R$ is a simple undirected graph whose vertex set is $R \setminus Z(R)$ and two vertices $x$ and $y$ are adjacent if and only if $xy \neq yx$. A generalization of this graph can be found in [2]. The complement of noncommuting graph, called commuting graph, of a finite noncommutative ring is considered in [3] and [10].

*Corresponding author
In this paper, we introduce and study \( r \)-noncommuting graph of a finite ring \( R \) for any given element \( r \in R \). The \( r \)-noncommuting graph of \( R \), denoted by \( \Gamma^r_R \), is a simple undirected graph whose vertex set is \( R \) and two vertices \( x \) and \( y \) are adjacent if and only if \( [x,y] \neq r \) and \(-r\). Clearly, \( \Gamma^r_R = \Gamma^{-r}_R \). If \( r = 0 \) then the induced subgraph of \( \Gamma^r_R \) with vertex set \( R \setminus Z(R) \), denoted by \( \Delta^r_R \), is nothing but the noncommuting graph of \( R \). Note that \( \Gamma^r_R \) is 0-regular graph if \( r = 0 \) and \( R \) is commutative. Also, \( \Gamma^r_R \) is complete if \( r \notin K(R) \). Thus for \( r \notin K(R) \), \( \Gamma^r_R \) is \( n \)-regular if and only if \( R \) is of order \( n+1 \). Therefore throughout the paper we shall consider \( r \in K(R) \). The motivation of this paper lies in \([7, 8, 9, 11]\) where analogous notion of this graph is studied in case of finite groups.

In Section 2, we first compute the degree of any vertex of \( \Gamma^r_R \) in terms of its centralizers. Then we characterize \( R \) if \( \Gamma^r_R \) is a tree or a star graph. We further show that \( \Gamma^r_R \) is not a regular graph (if \( r \in K(R) \)), a lollipop graph and complete bipartite graph for any noncommutative ring \( R \). In Section 3, we show that \( \Gamma^r_{R_1} \) is isomorphic to \( \Gamma^{\psi(r)}_{R_2} \) if \( (\phi, \psi) \) is an isoclinism between two finite rings \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) such that \( |Z(R_1)| = |Z(R_2)| \). In Section 4, we consider \( \Delta^r_R \) and obtain some characterization of \( R \) along with other results. As a consequence of our results we determine some positive integers \( n \) such that the noncommuting graph of \( R \) is \( n \)-regular and give some characterizations of such rings.

It was shown in \([3]\) that there are only two noncommutative rings (up to isomorphism) having order \( p^2 \), where \( p \) is a prime, and the rings are given by

\[
E(p^2) = \langle a, b : pa = pb = 0, a^2 = a, b^2 = b, ab = a, ba = b \rangle
\]

and

\[
F(p^2) = \langle x, y : px = py = 0, x^2 = x, y^2 = y, xy = y, yx = x \rangle.
\]

Following figures show the graphs \( \Gamma^r_{E(p^2)} \) for \( p = 2, 3 \).

Figure 1: \( \Gamma^0_{E(4)} \)

Figure 2: \( \Gamma^{a+b}_{E(4)} \)

Figure 3: \( \Gamma^0_{E(9)} \)

Figure 4: \( \Gamma^{a+2b}_{E(9)} = \Gamma^{2a+b}_{E(9)} \)
It may be noted here that the graphs $\Gamma^0_{E(4)}$, $\Gamma^{x+y}_{E(4)}$, $\Gamma^0_{F(9)}$ and $\Gamma^{x+2y}_{F(9)}$ are isomorphic to $\Gamma^0_{E(4)}$, $\Gamma^{x+b}_{E(4)}$, $\Gamma^0_{E(9)}$ and $\Gamma^{x+2b}_{E(9)}$ respectively.

2 Some properties

In this section, we characterize $R$ if $\Gamma^*_R$ is a tree or a star graph. We also show the non-existence of finite noncommutative rings $R$ whose $r$-noncommuting graph is a regular graph (if $r \in K(\Gamma)$), a lollipop graph or a complete bipartite graph. However, we first compute degree of any vertices in the graph $\Gamma^*_R$. For any two given elements $x$ and $r$ of $R$, we write $T_{x,r}$ to denote the generalized centralizer $\{y \in R : [x,y] = r\}$ of $x$. The following proposition gives degree of any vertices of $\Gamma^*_R$ in terms of its generalized centralizers.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $x$ be any vertex in $\Gamma^*_R$. Then

(a) $\deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)|$ if $r = 0$.

(b) if $r \neq 0$ then $\deg(x) = \begin{cases} |R| - |T_{x,r}| - 1, & \text{if } 2r = 0 \\ |R| - 2|T_{x,r}| - 1, & \text{if } 2r \neq 0. \end{cases}$

**Proof.** (a) If $r = 0$ then $\deg(x)$ is the number of $y \in R$ such that $xy \neq yx$. Note that $|C_R(x)|$ gives the number of elements that commute with $x$. Hence, $\deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)|$.

(b) Consider the case when $r \neq 0$. If $2r = 0$ then $r = -r$. Note that $y \in R$ is not adjacent to $x$ if and only if $y = x$ or $y \in T_{x,r}$. Therefore, $\deg(x) = |R| - |T_{x,r}| - 1$. If $2r \neq 0$ then $r \neq -r$. It is easy to see that $T_{x,r} \cap T_{x,-r} = \emptyset$ and $y \in T_{x,r}$ if and only if $-y \in T_{x,-r}$. Therefore, $|T_{x,r}| = |T_{x,-r}|$. Note that $y \in R$ is not adjacent to $x$ if and only if $y = x$ or $y \in T_{x,r}$ or $y \in T_{x,-r}$. Therefore, $\deg(x) = |R| - |T_{x,r}| - |T_{x,-r}| - 1$. Hence the result follows.

The following corollary gives degree of any vertices of $\Gamma^*_R$ in terms of its centralizers.

**Corollary 2.2.** Let $x$ be any vertex in $\Gamma^*_R$.

(a) If $r \neq 0$ and $2r = 0$ then $\deg(x) = \begin{cases} |R| - 1, & \text{if } T_{x,r} = \emptyset \\ |R| - |C_R(x)| - 1, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$

(b) If $r \neq 0$ and $2r \neq 0$ then $\deg(x) = \begin{cases} |R| - 1, & \text{if } T_{x,r} = \emptyset \\ |R| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$

**Proof.** Notice that $T_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $r \in [x,R]$. Suppose that $T_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$. Let $t \in T_{x,r}$ and $p \in t + C_R(x)$. Then $[x,p] = r$ and so $p \in T_{x,r}$. Therefore, $t + C_R(x) \subseteq T_{x,r}$. Again, if $y \in T_{x,r}$ then $(y-t) \in C_R(x)$ and so $y \in t + C_R(x)$. Therefore, $T_{x,r} \subseteq t + C_R(x)$. Thus $|T_{x,r}| = |C_R(x)|$ if $T_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$. Hence the result follows from Proposition 2.1.
Proposition 2.3. Let R be a ring with unity. The r-noncommuting graph $\Gamma^r_R$ is a tree if and only if $|R| = 2$ and $r \neq 0$.

Proof. If $r = 0$ then, by Proposition 2.1(a), we have $\deg(r) = 0$. Hence, $\Gamma^r_R$ is not a tree. Suppose that $r \neq 0$. If $R$ is commutative then $r \notin K(R)$. Hence, $\Gamma^r_R$ is complete graph. Therefore $\Gamma^r_R$ is a tree if and only if $|R| = 2$. If $R$ is noncommutative then $|x,0| \neq r,-r$ and $|x,1| \neq r,-r$ for any $x \in R$. Therefore $\deg(x) \geq 2$ for all $x \in R$. Hence, $\Gamma^r_R$ is not a tree.

Proposition 2.4. If $R$ is non-commutative then $\Gamma^r_R$ is not a lollipop graph.

Proof. Let $\Gamma^r_R$ be a lollipop graph. Then there exists an element $x \in R$ such that $\deg(x) = 1$. If $r = 0$ then $x \notin Z(R)$ and so $|C_R(x)| \leq \frac{|R|}{2}$. Also, by Proposition 2.1(a), we have $\deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)|$. These give $|R| - |C_R(x)| = 1$. Hence, $|R| \leq 2$, a contradiction.

If $r \neq 0$ then, by Corollary 2.2, we have $\deg(x) = |R| - 1, |R| - |C_R(x)| - 1$ or $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1$. These give $|R| - |C_R(x)| = 2$ or $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 2$. Clearly $x \notin Z(G)$ and so $|C_R(x)| \leq \frac{|R|}{2}$. Therefore, if $|R| - |C_R(x)| = 2$ then $|R| \leq 4$. If $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 2$ then $|R|$ is even and $|C_R(x)| \leq \frac{|R|}{2}$. Therefore, $|R| \leq 6$. Since $R$ is noncommutative we have $|R| = 4$. Therefore, if $r \neq 0$ then $\Gamma^r_R$ is isomorphic to a star graph on 4 vertices. Hence, $\Gamma^r_R$ is not a lollipop graph.

The proof of Proposition 2.4 also ensures the following result.

Proposition 2.5. Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring. Then $\Gamma^r_R$ is a star graph if and only if $R$ is isomorphic to $E(4) = \langle a,b : 2a = 2b = 0, a^2 = a, b^2 = b, ab = a, ba = b \rangle$ or $F(4) = \langle a,b : 2a = 2b = 0, a^2 = a, b^2 = b, ab = b, ba = a \rangle$.

In fact, if $R$ is noncommutative having more than four elements then there is no vertex of degree one in $\Gamma^r_R$.

It is observed that $\Gamma^r_R$ is $(|R| - 1)$-regular if $r \notin K(R)$. Also, if $r = 0$ and $R$ is commutative then $\Gamma^r_R$ is 0-regular. In the following proposition, we show that $\Gamma^r_R$ is not regular if $r \in K(R)$.

Proposition 2.6. Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring and $r \in K(R)$. Then $\Gamma^r_R$ is not regular.

Proof. If $r = 0$ then, by Proposition 2.1(a), we have $\deg(r) = 0$. Let $x \in R$ be a non-central element. Then $|C_R(x)| \neq |R|$. Therefore, by Proposition 2.1(a), $\deg(x) \neq 0 = \deg(r)$. This shows that $\Gamma^r_R$ is not regular. If $r \neq 0$ then $T_{0,r} = 0$. Therefore, by Corollary 2.2, we have $\deg(0) = |R| - 1$. Since $r \in K(R)$, there exists $0 \neq x \in R$ such that $T_{x,r} \neq 0$. Therefore, by Corollary 2.2, we have $\deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)| - 1$ or $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1$. If $\Gamma^r_R$ is regular then $\deg(x) = \deg(0)$. Therefore $|R| - |C_R(x)| - 1 = |R| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 = |R| - 1$ which gives $|C_R(x)| = 0$, a contradiction. Hence, $\Gamma^r_R$ is not regular. This completes the proof.
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We conclude this section with the following result.

**Proposition 2.7.** Let $R$ be a finite ring.

(a) If $r = 0$ then $\Gamma^r_R$ is not complete bipartite.

(b) If $r \neq 0$ then $\Gamma^r_R$ is not complete bipartite for $|R| \geq 3$ with $|Z(R)| \geq 2$.

*Proof.* Let $\Gamma^r_R$ be complete bipartite. Then there exist subsets $V_1$ and $V_2$ of $R$ such that $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset, V_1 \cup V_2 = R$ and if $x \in V_1$ and $y \in V_2$ then $x$ and $y$ are adjacent.

(a) If $r = 0$ then for $x \in V_1$ and $y \in V_2$ we have $[x, y] \neq 0$. Therefore, $[x, x + y] \neq 0$ which implies $x + y \in V_2$. Again $[y, x + y] \neq 0$ which implies $x + y \in V_1$. Thus $x + y \in V_1 \cap V_2$, a contradiction. Hence $\Gamma^r_R$ is not complete bipartite.

(b) If $r \neq 0, |R| \geq 3$ and $|Z(R)| \geq 2$ then for any $z_1, z_2 \in Z(R)$, $z_1$ and $z_2$ are adjacent. Let us take $z_1 \in V_1$ and $z_2 \in V_2$. Since $|R| \geq 3$ we have $x \in R$ such that $x \neq z_1$ and $x \neq z_2$. Also $[x, z_1] = 0 = [x, z_2]$. Therefore $x$ is adjacent to both $z_1$ and $z_2$. Therefore $x \notin V_1 \cup V_2 = R$, a contradiction. Hence $\Gamma^r_R$ is not complete bipartite. \hfill $\square$

3 Isoclinism between rings and $\Gamma^r_R$

In 1940, Hall [1] introduced isoclinism between two groups. Recently, Buckley et al. [2] have introduced isoclinism between two rings. Let $R_1$ and $R_2$ be two rings. A pair of additive group isomorphisms $(\phi, \psi)$ where $\phi : \frac{R}{Z(R_1)} \to \frac{R}{Z(R_2)}$ and $\psi : [R_1, R_1] \to [R_2, R_2]$ is called an isoclinism between $R_1$ to $R_2$ if $\psi([u, v]) = [u', v']$ whenever $\phi(u + Z(R_1)) = u' + Z(R_2)$ and $\phi(v + Z(R_1)) = v' + Z(R_2)$. Two rings are called isoclinic if there exists an isoclinism between them. If $R_1$ and $R_2$ are two isomorphic rings and $\alpha : R_1 \to R_2$ is an isomorphism then it is easy to see that $\Gamma^r_{R_1} \cong \Gamma^\alpha_{R_2}$. In the following proposition we show that $\Gamma^r_{R_1} \cong \Gamma^\psi_{R_2}$ if $R_1$ and $R_2$ are two isoclinic rings with isoclinism $(\phi, \psi)$.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $R_1$ and $R_2$ be two finite rings such that $|Z(R_1)| = |Z(R_2)|$. If $(\phi, \psi)$ is an isoclinism between $R_1$ and $R_2$ then

$$\Gamma^r_{R_1} \cong \Gamma^\psi_{R_2}.\tag{1}$$

*Proof.* Since $\phi : \frac{R}{Z(R_1)} \to \frac{R}{Z(R_2)}$ is an isomorphism, $\frac{R}{Z(R_1)}$ and $\frac{R}{Z(R_2)}$ have same number of elements. Let $\frac{R}{Z(R_1)} = \frac{R}{Z(R_2)} = n$. Again since $|Z(R_1)| = |Z(R_2)|$, there exists a bijection $\theta : Z(R_1) \to Z(R_2)$. Let $\{r_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\{s_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ be two transversals of $\frac{R}{Z(R_1)}$ and $\frac{R}{Z(R_2)}$ respectively. Let $\phi : \frac{R}{Z(R_1)} \to \frac{R}{Z(R_2)}$ and $\psi : [R_1, R_1] \to [R_2, R_2]$ be defined as $\phi(r_i + Z(R_1)) = s_i + Z(R_2)$ and $\psi([r_i + z_1, r_j + z_2]) = [s_i + z'_1, s_j + z'_2]$ for some $z_1, z_2 \in Z(R_1)$, $z'_1, z'_2 \in Z(R_2)$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.\hfill $\square$
Let us define a map $\alpha : R_1 \to R_2$ such that $\alpha(r_i + z) = s_i + \theta(z)$ for $z \in Z(R)$. Clearly $\alpha$ is a bijection. We claim that $\alpha$ preserves adjacency. Let $x$ and $y$ be two elements of $R_1$ such that $x$ and $y$ are adjacent. Then $[x, y] \neq r, -r$. We have $x = r_i + z_i$ and $y = r_j + z_j$ where $z_i, z_j \in Z(R_1)$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Therefore

$$[r_i + z_i, r_j + z_j] \neq r, -r$$
$$\Rightarrow \psi([r_i + z_i, r_j + z_j]) \neq \psi(r), -\psi(r)$$
$$\Rightarrow [s_i + \theta(z_i), s_j + \theta(z_j)] \neq \psi(r), -\psi(r)$$
$$\Rightarrow [\alpha(r_i + z_i), \alpha(r_j + z_j)] \neq \psi(r), -\psi(r)$$
$$\Rightarrow [\alpha(x), \alpha(y)] \neq \psi(r), -\psi(r).$$

This shows that $\alpha(x)$ and $\alpha(y)$ are adjacent. Hence the result follows. $\square$

4 An induced subgraph

We write $\Delta^r_R$ to denote the induced subgraph of $\Gamma^r_R$ with vertex set $R \setminus Z(R)$. It is worth mentioning that $\Delta^0_R$ is the noncommuting graph of $R$. If $r \neq 0$ then it is easy to see that the commuting graph of $R$ is a spanning subgraph of $\Delta^r_R$. The following result gives a condition such that $\Delta^r_R$ is the commuting graph of $R$.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring and $r \neq 0$. If $K(R) = \{0, r, -r\}$ then $\Delta^r_R$ is the commuting graph of $R$.

**Proof.** The result follows from the fact that two vertices $x, y$ in $\Delta^r_R$ are adjacent if and only if $xy = yx$. $\square$

Let $\omega(\Delta^r_R)$ be the clique number of $\Delta^r_R$. The following result gives a lower bound for $\omega(\Delta^r_R)$.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring and $r \neq 0$. If $S$ is a commutative subring of $R$ having maximal order then $\omega(\Delta^r_R) \geq |S| - |S \cap Z(R)|$.

**Proof.** The result follows from the fact that the subset $S \setminus S \cap Z(R)$ of $R \setminus Z(R)$ is a clique of $\Delta^r_R$. $\square$

By [4, Theorem 2.1], it follows that the diameter of $\Delta^0_R$ is less than or equal to 2. The next result gives some information regarding diameter of $\Delta^r_R$ when $r \neq 0$. We write $\text{diam}(\Delta^r_R)$ and $d(x, y)$ to denote the diameter of $\Delta^r_R$ and the distance between $x$ and $y$, for any two vertices $x$ and $y$, respectively. For any two vertices $x$ and $y$, we write $x \sim y$ to denote $x$ and $y$ are adjacent, otherwise $x \not\sim y$.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring and $r \in R \setminus Z(R)$ such that $2r \neq 0$.

(a) If $3r \neq 0$ then $\text{diam}(\Delta^r_R) \leq 3$.

(b) If $|Z(R)| = 1$, $|C_R(r)| \neq 3$ and $3r = 0$ then $\text{diam}(\Delta^r_R) \leq 3$. 
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Proof. (a) If \( x \sim r \) for all \( x \in R \setminus Z(R) \) such that \( x \neq r \) then, it is easy to see that \( \text{diam}(\Delta^x_R) \leq 2 \). Suppose there exists a vertex \( x \in R \setminus Z(R) \) such that \( x \sim r \). Then \([x, r] = r \) or \(-r\). We have

\[
[x, 2r] = 2[x, r] = \begin{cases} 
2r, & \text{if } [x, r] = r \\
-2r, & \text{if } [x, r] = -r.
\end{cases}
\]

Since \( 2r \neq 0 \) we have \([x, 2r] \neq 0 \) and hence \( 2r \in R \setminus Z(R) \). Also, \( 2r \neq r, -r \). Therefore, \([x, 2r] \neq r, -r \) and so \( x \sim 2r \). Let \( y \in R \setminus Z(R) \) such that \( y \neq x \). If \( y \sim r \) then \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \) noting that \( r \sim 2r \). If \( y \sim r \) then \( y \sim 2r \) (as shown above). In this case \( d(x, y) \leq 2 \). Hence, \( \text{diam}(\Delta^r_R) \leq 3 \).

(b) If \( x \sim r \) for all \( x \in R \setminus Z(R) \) such that \( x \neq r \) then, it is easy to see that \( \text{diam}(\Delta^x_R) \leq 2 \). Suppose there exists a vertex \( x \in R \setminus Z(R) \) such that \( x \sim r \). Let \( y \in R \setminus Z(R) \) such that \( y \neq x \). We consider the following two cases.

**Case 1:** \( x \sim r \) and \( x \sim 2r \).

If \( y \sim r \) then \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \) noting that \( r \sim 2r \). Therefore, \( \text{diam}(\Delta^y_R) \leq 3 \). If \( y \sim r \) but \( y \sim 2r \) then \( d(x, y) \leq 2 \). Consider the case when \( y \sim r \) as well as \( y \sim 2r \). Therefore \([y, r] = r \) or \(-r\). If \([y, r] = r \) then \([y, 2r] = 2[y, r] = 2r = -r\); otherwise \( y \sim 2r \), a contradiction. Let \( a \in C_R(r) \) such that \( a \neq 0, r, -r \) (such element exists, since \(|C_R(r)| \geq 3 \)). Clearly \( a \in R \setminus Z(R) \). Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \( x \sim 2r \sim a \sim y \) and so \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \([y, a] = r \) or \(-r\). If \([y, a] = r \) then

\[
[y, r - a] = [y, r] - [y, a] = r - r = 0.
\]

Note that \( r - a \in R \setminus Z(R) \); otherwise \( a = r \), a contradiction. Therefore, \( y \sim r - a \). Also,

\[
[r - a, 2r] = 2[r, a] = 0.
\]

That is, \( r - a \sim 2r \). Thus \( x \sim 2r \sim r - a \sim y \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). If \([y, a] = -r \) then

\[
[y, 2r - a] = [y, 2r] - [y, a] = -r - (-r) = 0.
\]

Note that \( 2r - a \in R \setminus Z(R) \); otherwise \( a = 2r = -r \), a contradiction. Therefore, \( y \sim 2r - a \). Also,

\[
[2r - a, 2r] = 2[r, a] = 0.
\]

That is, \( 2r - a \sim 2r \). Thus \( x \sim 2r \sim 2r - a \sim y \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \).

If \([y, r] = -r \) then \([y, 2r] = 2[y, r] = -2r = r\); otherwise \( y \sim 2r \), a contradiction. Let \( a \in C_R(r) \) such that \( a \neq 0, r, -r \). Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \( x \sim 2r \sim a \sim y \) and so \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \([y, a] = r \) or \(-r\). If \([y, a] = r \) then

\[
[y, r + a] = [y, r] + [y, a] = -r + r = 0.
\]

Note that \( r + a \in R \setminus Z(R) \); otherwise \( a = -r \), a contradiction. Therefore, \( y \sim r + a \). Also,

\[
[r + a, 2r] = 2[a, r] = 0.
\]
Therefore, \( y + a \sim 2r \). Thus \( x \sim 2r \sim r + a \sim y \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). If \( [y, a] = -r \) then

\[
[y, 2r + a] = [y, 2r] + [y, a] = r + (-r) = 0.
\]

Note that \( 2r + a \in R \setminus Z(R) \); otherwise \( a = -2r = r \), a contradiction. Therefore, \( y \sim 2r + a \). Also,

\[
[2r + a, 2r] = 2[a, r] = 0.
\]

That is, \( 2r + a \sim 2r \). Thus \( x \sim 2r \sim 2r + a \sim y \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \) and hence \( \text{diam}(\Delta_R) \leq 3 \).

**Case 2:** \( x \sim r \) and \( x \sim 2r \).

Let \( a \in C_R(r) \) such that \( a \neq 0, r, -r \).

**Subcase 2.1:** \( x \sim a \)

If \( y \sim r \) then \( y \sim r \sim a \sim x \). Therefore \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). If \( y \sim r \) but \( y \sim 2r \) then \( y \sim 2r \sim a \sim x \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). Consider the case when \( y \sim r \) as well as \( y \sim 2r \). Therefore \([y, r] = r \) or \(-r \). If \([y, r] = r \) then \([y, 2r] = 2[y, r] = 2r = -r \); otherwise \( y \sim 2r \), a contradiction. Suppose \( y \sim a \).

Then \( y \sim a \sim x \) and so \( d(x, y) \leq 2 \). Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \( y \sim 2r \). Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \( [y, a] = r \) or \(-r \). If \([y, a] = r \) then \([y, r - a] = 0 \). Therefore, \( y \sim r - a \sim a \sim x \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). If \([y, a] = -r \) then \([y, 2r - a] = 0 \). Therefore, \( y \sim 2r - a \sim a \sim x \) and so \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \).

If \([y, r] = -r \) then \([y, 2r] = 2[y, r] = -2r = r \); otherwise \( y \sim 2r \), a contradiction. Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \( y \sim a \sim x \) and so \( d(x, y) \leq 2 \). Suppose \( y \sim a \). Then \([y, a] = r \) or \(-r \). If \([y, a] = r \) then \([y, r + a] = 0 \). Therefore, \( y \sim r + a \sim a \sim x \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). If \([y, a] = -r \) then \([y, 2r + a] = 0 \). Therefore, \( y \sim 2r + a \sim a \sim x \) and so \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \). Hence, \( \text{diam}(\Delta_R) \leq 3 \).

**Subcase 2.2:** \( x \sim a \)

In this case we have \( x \sim r \) and \( x \sim 2r \). It can be seen that \([x, r] = r \) implies \([x, 2r] = -r \) and \([x, r] = -r \) implies \([x, 2r] = r \).

Suppose \([x, r] = r \) and \([x, a] = r \). Then \([x, r - a] = [x, r] - [x, a] = 0 \). Hence, \( x \sim r - a \). Now, we have the following cases.

(i) \( x \sim r - a \sim r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \).

(ii) \( x \sim r - a \sim 2r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) but \( y \sim 2r \).

Suppose \( y \sim r \) as well as \( y \sim 2r \). Then, proceeding as in Subcase 2.1, we get the following cases:

(iii) \( x \sim r - a \sim a \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) and \( 2r \) but \( y \sim a \).

(iv) \( y \sim r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = r \) and \([y, a] = r \).

(v) \( y \sim 2r - a \sim r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = r \) and \([y, a] = -r \).

(vi) \( y \sim r + a \sim r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = -r \) and \([y, a] = r \).

(vii) \( y \sim 2r + a \sim r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = -r \) and \([y, a] = -r \).
Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \).
Suppose \([x, r] = r\) and \([x, a] = -r\). Then
\[
[x, 2r - a] = [x, 2r] - [x, a] = -r - (-r) = 0.
\]
Hence, \( x \sim 2r - a \). Now, proceeding as above we get the following cases:

(i) \( x \sim 2r - a \sim r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \).
(ii) \( x \sim 2r - a \sim 2r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) but \( y \sim 2r \).
(iii) \( x \sim 2r - a \sim a \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) and \( 2r \) but \( y \sim a \).
(iv) \( y \sim r - a \sim 2r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = r\) and \([y, a] = r\).
(v) \( y \sim 2r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = r\) and \([y, a] = -r\).
(vi) \( y \sim r + a \sim 2r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = -r\) and \([y, a] = r\).
(vii) \( y \sim 2r + a \sim 2r - a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = -r\) and \([y, a] = -r\).
Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \).
Suppose \([x, r] = -r\) and \([x, a] = r\). Then
\[
[x, r + a] = [x, r] + [x, a] = -r + r = 0.
\]
Hence, \( x \sim r + a \). Proceeding as above we get the following similar cases:

(i) \( x \sim r + a \sim r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \).
(ii) \( x \sim r + a \sim 2r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) but \( y \sim 2r \).
(iii) \( x \sim r + a \sim a \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) and \( 2r \) but \( y \sim a \).
(iv) \( y \sim r - a \sim r + a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = r\) and \([y, a] = r\).
(v) \( y \sim 2r - a \sim r + a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = r\) and \([y, a] = -r\).
(vi) \( y \sim r + a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = -r\) and \([y, a] = r\).
(vii) \( y \sim 2r + a \sim r + a \sim x \) if \([y, r] = -r\) and \([y, a] = -r\).
Therefore, \( d(x, y) \leq 3 \).
Suppose \([x, r] = -r\) and \([x, a] = -r\). Then
\[
[x, 2r + a] = [x, 2r] + [x, a] = r + (-r) = 0.
\]
Hence, \( x \sim 2r + a \) and so we get the following similar cases:

(i) \( x \sim 2r + a \sim r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \).
(ii) \( x \sim 2r + a \sim 2r \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) but \( y \sim 2r \).
(iii) \( x \sim 2r + a \sim a \sim y \) if \( y \sim r \) and \( 2r \) but \( y \sim a \).
Theorem 4.5. Let \( R \) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 8\). Then \( \Delta^*_R \) is not a tree.

Proof. Suppose that \( \Delta^*_R \) is a tree. Therefore there exist \( x \in R \setminus Z(R) \) such that \( \deg(x) = 1 \).

**Case 1:** \( r = 0 \).

By Proposition 4.4(a), we have \( \deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)| \). Therefore, \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 1\) and hence \(|C_R(x)| = 1\), a contradiction.

**Case 2:** \( r \neq 0 \) and \( 2r = 0 \).

By Proposition 4.4(b), we have \( \deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1 \) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1\). Hence \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 1\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1 = 1\).

**Subcase 2.1:** \(|R| - |Z(R)| = 2\).

In this case we have \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or \(2\). If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| = 3\), a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 2\) then \(|R| = 4\). Therefore, the additive quotient group \( R_{Z(R)} \) is cyclic. Hence, \( R \) is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2:** \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| = 2\).

In this case, \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or \(2\). If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 3\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 3\) and hence \(|R| = 6\). Therefore, \( R \) is commutative; a contradiction.

As a consequence of Proposition 2.1(a) and Corollary 2.2, we get the following result.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let \( x \) be any vertex in \( \Delta^*_R \).

(a) If \( r = 0 \) then \( \deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)| \).

(b) If \( r \neq 0 \) and \( 2r = 0 \) then

\[
\deg(x) = \begin{cases} 
|R| - |Z(R)| - 1, & \text{if } T_{x,r} = \emptyset \\
|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

(c) If \( r \neq 0 \) and \( 2r \neq 0 \) then

\[
\deg(x) = \begin{cases} 
|R| - |Z(R)| - 1, & \text{if } T_{x,r} = \emptyset \\
|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Some applications of Proposition 4.4 are given below.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let \( R \) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 8\). Then \( \Delta^*_R \) is not a tree.
If $|Z(R)| = 2$ then $|R| - |C_R(x)| = 4$. Therefore, $|C_R(x)| = 4$ and so $|R| = 8$, a contradiction.

**Case 3:** $r \neq 0$ and $2r \neq 0$.

By Proposition \[4.4\](c), we have $\deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1$ or $|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1$. Hence, $|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 1$ or $|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 = 1$. If $|R| - |Z(R)| = 2$ then as shown in subcase 2.1 we get a contradiction. If $|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| = 2$ then $|Z(R)| = 1$ or 2.

**Subcase 3.1:** $|Z(R)| = 1$.

In this case, $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 3$. Therefore, $|C_R(x)| = 3$ and hence $|R| = 9$.

It follows from Fig. 4 that $\Delta_R^x = 4K_2$ which is a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.2:** $|Z(R)| = 2$.

In this case, $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 4$. Therefore, $|C_R(x)| = 4$ and so $|R| = 12$. It follows that the additive quotient group $\frac{R}{Z(R)}$ is cyclic. Hence, $R$ is commutative; a contradiction. This completes the proof. \[
\square
\]

The proof of the above theorem also gives the following results.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring such that $|R| \neq 8$. Then $\Delta_R^x$ has end vertices if and only if $r \neq 0$ and $R$ is isomorphic to $E(9)$ or $F(9)$.

**Theorem 4.7.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring such that $|R| \neq 8$. Then $\Delta_R^x$ is 1-regular if and only if $r \neq 0$ and $R$ is isomorphic to $E(9)$ or $F(9)$.

We also have the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.8.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring such that $|R| \neq 8$. Then the noncommuting graph of $R$ is not a tree. Further, noncommuting graph of such rings do not have any end vertices.

**Theorem 4.9.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring such that $|R| \neq 8, 12$. Then $\Delta_R^x$ has a vertex of degree 2 if and only if $r = 0$ and $R$ is isomorphic to $E(4)$ or $F(4)$.

**Proof.** Suppose $\Delta_R^x$ has a vertex $x$ of degree 2.

**Case 1:** $r = 0$.

By Proposition \[4.4\](a), we have $\deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)|$. Therefore, $|R| - |C_R(x)| = 2$ and hence $|C_R(x)| = 2$. Therefore, $|R| = 4$ and $\Delta_R^x$ is a triangle (as shown in Figure 1).

**Case 2:** $r \neq 0$ and $2r = 0$.

By Proposition \[4.4\](b), we have $\deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1$ or $\deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1$. Therefore, $|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 2$ or $|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1 = 2$.

**Subcase 2.1:** $|R| - |Z(R)| = 3$.

In this case we have $|Z(R)| = 1$ or 3. If $|Z(R)| = 1$ then $|R| = 4$. As shown in Figure 2, $\Delta_R^x$ is a 0-regular graph on three vertices. Therefore, it has no vertex of degree 2, which is a contradiction. If $|Z(R)| = 3$ then $|R| = 6$. Therefore, $R$ is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2:** $|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| = 3$. 

\[
11
\]
In this case, \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 3. If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 4\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 2\) or 4 and hence \(|R| = 6\) or 8; a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 3\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 6\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 6\) and so \(|R| = 12\), which contradicts our assumption.

**Case 3:** \(r \neq 0\) and \(2r \neq 0\).

By Proposition 4.11(c), we have \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1\). Hence, \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 2\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 = 2\).

If \(|R| - |Z(R)| = 3\) then as shown in Subcase 2.1 we get a contradiction. If \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| = 3\) then \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 3.

**Subcase 3.1:** \(|Z(R)| = 1\).

In this case, \(|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 4\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 2\) or 4 and hence \(|R| = 8\) or 12 which is a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.2:** \(|Z(R)| = 3\).

In this case, \(|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 6\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 6\) and so \(|R| = 18\). It follows that the additive quotient group \(\frac{R}{Z(R)}\) is cyclic. Hence, \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. This completes the proof. \(\blacksquare\)

The proof of the above result also suggest the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.10.** Let \(R\) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 8, 12\). Then \(\Delta'_R\) is 2-regular if and only if \(r = 0\) and \(R\) is isomorphic to \(E(4)\) or \(F(4)\).

**Corollary 4.11.** Let \(R\) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 8, 12\). Then the noncommuting graph of \(R\) is 2-regular if and only if \(R\) is isomorphic to \(E(4)\) or \(F(4)\).

**Theorem 4.12.** Let \(R\) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 16, 18\). Then \(\Delta'_R\) has no vertex of degree 3.

**Proof.** Suppose \(\Delta'_R\) has a vertex \(x\) of degree 3.

**Case 1:** \(r = 0\).

By Proposition 4.11(a), we have \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)|\). Therefore, \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 3\) and hence \(|C_R(x)| = 3\). Therefore, \(|R| = 6\) and hence \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction.

**Case 2:** \(r \neq 0\) and \(2r = 0\).

By Proposition 4.11(b), we have \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1\) or \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1\). Therefore \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 3\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1 = 3\).

**Subcase 2.1:** \(|R| - |Z(R)| = 4\).

In this case we have \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 2 or 4. If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| = 5\) or 6 and hence \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 4\) then \(|R| = 8\). Therefore, the additive quotient group \(\frac{R}{Z(R)}\) is cyclic. Hence, \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2:** \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| = 4\).

In this case, \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 2 or 4. If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 5\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 5\) and hence \(|R| = 10\). Therefore \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 2\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 6\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 6\).
and so\( |R| = 12 \). It follows that the additive quotient group \( \frac{R}{Z(R)} \) is cyclic. Hence, \( R \) is commutative; a contradiction. If \( |Z(R)| = 4 \) then \( |R| - |C_R(x)| = 8 \). Therefore, \( |C_R(x)| = 8 \) and so \( |R| = 16 \); a contradiction.

**Case 3:** \( r \neq 0 \) and \( 2r \neq 0 \).

By Proposition 4.4(c), we have \( \deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1 \) or \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 \). Hence, \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 3 \) or \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 = 3 \).

If \( |R| - |Z(R)| = 4 \) then as shown in Subcase 2.1 we get a contradiction. If \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| = 4 \) then \( |Z(R)| = 1 \) or \( 2 \) or \( 4 \).

**Subcase 3.1:** \( |Z(R)| = 1 \).

In this case, \( |R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 5 \). Therefore, \( |C_R(x)| = 5 \) then \( |R| = 15 \). Therefore \( R \) is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.2:** \( |Z(R)| = 2 \).

In this case, \( |R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 6 \). Therefore, \( |C_R(x)| = 6 \) and so \( |R| = 18 \); a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.3:** \( |Z(R)| = 4 \).

In this case, \( |R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 8 \). Therefore, \( |C_R(x)| = 8 \) and so \( |R| = 24 \). It follows that the additive quotient group \( \frac{R}{Z(R)} \) is cyclic. Hence, \( R \) is commutative; a contradiction. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.13.** Let \( R \) be a noncommutative ring such that \( |R| \neq 16, 18 \). Then \( \Delta^r_R \) is not 3-regular. In particular, the noncommuting graph of such \( R \) is not 3-regular.

**Theorem 4.14.** Let \( R \) be a noncommutative ring such that \( |R| \neq 8, 12, 18, 20 \). Then \( \Delta^r_R \) has no vertex of degree 4.

**Proof.** Suppose \( \Delta^r_R \) has a vertex \( x \) of degree 4.

**Case 1:** \( r = 0 \).

By Proposition 4.4(a), we have \( \deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)| \). Therefore, \( |R| - |C_R(x)| = 4 \) and hence \( |C_R(x)| = 2 \) or \( 4 \). If \( |C_R(x)| = 2 \) then \( |R| = 6 \) and hence \( R \) is commutative; a contradiction. If \( |C_R(x)| = 4 \) then \( |R| = 8 \); a contradiction.

**Case 2:** \( r \neq 0 \) and \( 2r = 0 \).

By Proposition 4.4(b), we have \( \deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1 \) or \( \deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1 \). Therefore \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 4 \) or \( |R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1 = 4 \).

**Subcase 2.1:** \( |R| - |Z(R)| = 5 \).

In this case we have \( |Z(R)| = 1 \) or \( 5 \). Then \( |R| = 6 \) or \( 10 \) and hence \( R \) is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2:** \( |R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| = 5 \).

In this case, \( |Z(R)| = 1 \) or \( 5 \). If \( |Z(R)| = 1 \) then \( |R| - |C_R(x)| = 6 \). Therefore, \( |C_R(x)| = 2 \) or \( 3 \) or \( 6 \). If \( |C_R(x)| = 2 \) then \( |R| = 8 \); a contradiction. If \( |C_R(x)| = 3 \) then \( |R| = 9 \). It follows from Figure 4 that \( \Delta^r_R = 4K_2 \) which is a contradiction. If \( |C_R(x)| = 6 \) then \( |R| = 12 \); a contradiction. If \( |Z(R)| = 5 \) then \( |R| - |C_R(x)| = 10 \). Therefore, \( |C_R(x)| = 10 \) and so \( |R| = 20 \); a contradiction.

**Case 3:** \( r \neq 0 \) and \( 2r \neq 0 \).

By Proposition 4.4(c), we have \( \deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1 \) or \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 \). Hence, \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 4 \) or \( |R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 = 4 \).
If \(|R| - |Z(R)| = 5\) then as shown in Subcase 2.1 we get a contradiction. If \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| = 5\) then \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 5.

**Subcase 3.1:** \(|Z(R)| = 1\).

In this case, \(|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 6\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 2\) or 3 or 6. If \(|C_R(x)| = 2\) then \(|R| = 10\). Therefore \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|C_R(x)| = 3\) or 6 then \(|R| = 12\) or 18; a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.2:** \(|Z(R)| = 5\).

In this case, \(|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 10\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 10\) and so \(|R| = 30\). It follows that the additive quotient group \(\frac{R}{Z(R)}\) is cyclic. Hence, \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. This completes the proof.

**Corollary 4.15.** Let \(R\) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 8, 12, 18, 20\). Then \(\Delta'_R\) is not 4-regular. In particular, the noncommuting graph of such \(R\) is not 4-regular.

**Theorem 4.16.** Let \(R\) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 8, 16, 24, 27\). Then \(\Delta'_R\) has no vertex of degree 5.

**Proof.** Suppose \(\Delta'_R\) has a vertex \(x\) of degree 5.

**Case 1:** \(r = 0\).

By Proposition 4.3(a), we have \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)|\). Therefore, \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 5\) and hence \(|C_R(x)| = 5\). Then \(|R| = 10\) and hence \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction.

**Case 2:** \(r \neq 0\) and \(2r = 0\).

By Proposition 4.4(b), we have \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1\) or \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1\). Therefore \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 5\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1 = 5\).

**Subcase 2.1:** \(|R| - |Z(R)| = 6\).

In this case we have \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 2 or 3 or 6. If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| = 7\) and hence \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 2\) then \(|R| = 8\); a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 3\) then \(|R| = 9\). It follows from Figure 4 that \(\Delta'_R = 4K_2\) which is a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 6\) then \(|R| = 12\). Therefore, the additive quotient group \(\frac{R}{Z(R)}\) is cyclic. Hence, \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2:** \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| = 6\).

In this case, \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 2 or 3 or 6. If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 7\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 7\) then \(|R| = 14\) and hence \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 2\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 8\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 4\) or 8. If \(|C_R(x)| = 4\) then \(|R| = 12\). Therefore, the additive quotient group \(\frac{R}{Z(R)}\) is cyclic. Hence, \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|C_R(x)| = 8\) then \(|R| = 16\); a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 3\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 9\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 9\). and so \(|R| = 18\). It follows that the additive quotient group \(\frac{R}{Z(R)}\) is cyclic. Hence, \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 6\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 12\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 12\) and so \(|R| = 24\); a contradiction.

**Case 3:** \(r \neq 0\) and \(2r \neq 0\).

By Proposition 4.4(c), we have \(\text{deg}(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1\). Hence, \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 5\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 = 5\).
If $|R| - |Z(R)| = 6$ then as shown in Subcase 2.1 we get a contradiction. If $|R| - |Z(R)| = 2|C_R(x)| = 6$ then $|Z(R)| = 1$ or 2 or 3 or 6.

**Subcase 3.1: $|Z(R)| = 1$.**
Here we have, $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 7$. Therefore, $|C_R(x)| = 7$ then $|R| = 21$ and hence $R$ is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.2: $|Z(R)| = 2$.**
In this case, $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 8$. Therefore, $|C_R(x)| = 4$ or 8. If $|C_R(x)| = 4$ or 8 then $|R| = 16$ or 24; a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.3: $|Z(R)| = 3$.**
In this case, $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 9$. Therefore, $|C_R(x)| = 9$ and so $|R| = 27$; a contradiction.

**Subcase 3.4: $|Z(R)| = 6$.**
In this case, $|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 12$. Therefore, $|C_R(x)| = 12$ and so $|R| = 36$. It follows that the additive quotient group $\frac{R}{Z(R)}$ is cyclic. Hence, $R$ is commutative; a contradiction. This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

**Corollary 4.17.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring such that $|R| \neq 8, 16, 24, 27$. Then $\Delta^*_R$ is not 5-regular. In particular, the noncommuting graph of such $R$ is not 5-regular.

We conclude this section with the following characterization of $R$.

**Theorem 4.18.** Let $R$ be a noncommutative ring such that $|R| \neq 8, 12, 16, 24, 28$. Then $\Delta^*_R$ has a vertex of degree 6 if and only if $r = 0$ and $R$ is isomorphic to $E(9)$ or $F(9)$.

**Proof.** Suppose $\Delta^*_R$ has a vertex $x$ of degree 6.

**Case 1: $r = 0$.**
By Proposition 4.3(a), we have \(\deg(x) = |R| - |C_R(x)|\). Therefore, \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 6\) and hence \(|C_R(x)| = 2\ or 3 or 6\). If \(|C_R(x)| = 2\) then \(|R| = 8\); a contradiction. If \(|C_R(x)| = 3\) then \(|R| = 9\). Therefore, $\Delta^*_R$ is a 6-regular graph (as shown in Figure 3). If \(|C_R(x)| = 6\) then \(|R| = 12\); a contradiction.

**Case 2: $r \neq 0$ and $2r = 0$.**
By Proposition 4.3(b), we have \(\deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1\ or \(\deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1\). Therefore \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 6\ or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| - 1 = 6\).

**Subcase 2.1: $|R| - |Z(R)| = 7$.**
In this case we have \(|Z(R)| = 1\ or 7\). If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| = 8\); a contradiction. If \(|Z(R)| = 7\) then \(|R| = 14\) and hence $R$ is commutative; a contradiction.

**Subcase 2.2: $|R| - |Z(R)| - |C_R(x)| = 7$.**
In this case, \(|Z(R)| = 1\ or 7\). If \(|Z(R)| = 1\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 8\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 2\ or 4 or 8\). If \(|C_R(x)| = 2\) then \(|R| = 10\). Thus $R$ is commutative; a contradiction. If \(|C_R(x)| = 4\ or 8\) then \(|R| = 12\ or 16\); which are contradictions. If \(|Z(R)| = 7\) then \(|R| - |C_R(x)| = 14\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 14\) and so \(|R| = 28\); a contradiction.

**Case 3: $r \neq 0$ and $2r \neq 0$.**
By Proposition 4.4(c), we have \(\deg(x) = |R| - |Z(R)| - 1\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1\). Hence, \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 1 = 6\) or \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| - 1 = 6\).

If \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| = 7\) then as shown in Subcase 2.1 we get a contradiction. If \(|R| - |Z(R)| - 2|C_R(x)| = 7\) then \(|Z(R)| = 1\) or 7.

**Subcase 3.1:** \(|Z(R)| = 1\).

In this case, \(|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 8\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 2\) or 4 or 8 then \(|R| = 12\) or 16 or 24; all are contradictions to the order of \(R\).

**Subcase 3.2:** \(|Z(R)| = 7\).

In this case, \(|R| - 2|C_R(x)| = 14\). Therefore, \(|C_R(x)| = 14\) and so \(|R| = 42\). It follows that the additive quotient group \(\frac{R}{Z(R)}\) is cyclic. Hence, \(R\) is commutative; a contradiction. This completes the proof.

**Corollary 4.19.** Let \(R\) be a noncommutative ring such that \(|R| \neq 8, 12, 16, 24, 28\). Then \(\Delta^R_r\) is 6-regular if and only if \(r = 0\) and \(R\) is isomorphic to \(E(9)\) or \(F(9)\). In particular, the noncommuting graph of such \(R\) is 6-regular if and only if \(R\) is isomorphic to \(E(9)\) or \(F(9)\).
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