

THE ZARISKI TOPOLOGY-GRAPH OF MODULES OVER COMMUTATIVE RINGS II

H. ANSARI-TOROGHY¹ AND S. HABIBI²

¹ *Department of pure Mathematics,
Faculty of mathematical Sciences,
University of Guilan, P. O. Box 41335-19141, Rasht, Iran.
e-mail: ansari@guilan.ac.ir*

² *School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box:
19395-5746, Tehran, Iran.
Department of pure Mathematics, Faculty of mathematical Sciences, University of Guilan, P.
O. Box 41335-19141, Rasht, Iran.
e-mail: habibishk@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT. Let M be a module over a commutative ring R . In this paper, we continue our study about the Zariski topology-graph $G(\tau_T)$ which was introduced in (The Zariski topology-graph of modules over commutative rings, Comm. Algebra., 42 (2014), 3283–3296). For a non-empty subset T of $\text{Spec}(M)$, we obtain useful characterizations for those modules M for which $G(\tau_T)$ is a bipartite graph. Also, we prove that if $G(\tau_T)$ is a tree, then $G(\tau_T)$ is a star graph. Moreover, we study coloring of Zariski topology-graphs and investigate the interplay between $\chi(G(\tau_T))$ and $\omega(G(\tau_T))$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper R is a commutative ring with a non-zero identity and M is a unital R -module. By $N \leq M$ (resp. $N < M$) we mean that N is a submodule (resp. proper submodule) of M .

Define $(N :_R M)$ or simply $(N : M) = \{r \in R \mid rM \subseteq N\}$ for any $N \leq M$. We denote $((0) : M)$ by $\text{Ann}_R(M)$ or simply $\text{Ann}(M)$. M is said to be faithful if $\text{Ann}(M) = (0)$.

Let $N, K \leq M$. Then the product of N and K , denoted by NK , is defined by $(N : M)(K : M)M$ (see [3]).

A prime submodule of M is a submodule $P \neq M$ such that whenever $re \in P$ for some $r \in R$ and $e \in M$, we have $r \in (P : M)$ or $e \in P$ [13].

The prime spectrum of M is the set of all prime submodules of M and denoted by $\text{Spec}(M)$.

There are many papers on assigning graphs to rings or modules (see, for example, [1, 5, 6, 9]). In [4], the present authors introduced and studied the graph $G(\tau_T)$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13C13, 13C99, 05C75.

Key words and phrases. Rings and modules; Zariski topology; graph; chromatic and clique number.

This research was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No. 96130028).

(resp. $AG(M)$), called the *Zariski topology-graph* (resp. *the annihilating-submodule graph*), where T is a non-empty subset of $Spec(M)$.

$AG(M)$ is an undirected graph with vertices $V(AG(M)) = \{N \leq M \mid \text{there exists } (0) \neq K < M \text{ with } NK = (0)\}$. In this graph, distinct vertices $N, L \in V(AG(M))$ are adjacent if and only if $NL = (0)$. Let $AG(M)^*$ be the subgraph of $AG(M)$ with vertices $V(AG(M)^*) = \{N < M \text{ with } (N : M) \neq Ann(M) \mid \text{there exists a submodule } K < M \text{ with } (K : M) \neq Ann(M) \text{ and } NK = (0)\}$. By [4, Theorem 3.4], one conclude that $AG(M)^*$ is a connected subgraph.

$G(\tau_T)$ is an undirected graph with vertices $V(G(\tau_T)) = \{N < M \mid \text{there exists } K < M \text{ such that } V(N) \cup V(K) = T \text{ and } V(N), V(K) \neq T\}$ and distinct vertices N and L are adjacent if and only if $V(N) \cup V(L) = T$ (see [4, Definition 2.3]).

The *Zariski topology* on $X = Spec(M)$ is the topology τ_M described by taking the set $Z(M) = \{V(N) \mid N \text{ is a submodule of } M\}$ as the set of closed sets of $Spec_R(M)$, where $V(N) = \{P \in X \mid (P : M) \supseteq (N : M)\}$ [14].

If $Spec(M) \neq \emptyset$, the mapping $\psi : Spec(M) \rightarrow Spec(R/Ann(M))$ such that $\psi(P) = (P : M)/Ann(M)$ for every $P \in Spec(M)$, is called the *natural map* of $Spec(M)$ [14].

A topological space X is irreducible if for any decomposition $X = X_1 \cup X_2$ with closed subsets X_i of X with $i = 1, 2$, we have $X = X_1$ or $X = X_2$.

The prime radical \sqrt{N} is defined to be the intersection of all prime submodules of M containing N , and in case N is not contained in any prime submodule, \sqrt{N} is defined to be M [13].

We recall that $N < M$ is said to be a semiprime submodule of M if for every ideal I of R and every submodule K of M with $I^2K \subseteq N$ implies that $IK \subseteq N$. Further M is called a semiprime module if $(0) \subseteq M$ is a semiprime submodule. Every intersection of prime submodules is a semiprime submodule (see [18]).

The notations $Nil(R)$, $Min(M)$, and $Min(T)$ will denote the set of all nilpotent elements of R and the set of all minimal prime submodules of M , and the set of minimal members of T , respectively.

A clique of a graph is a complete subgraph and the supremum of the sizes of cliques in G , denoted by $\omega(G)$, is called the clique number of G . Let $\chi(G)$ denote the chromatic number of the graph G , that is, the minimal number of colors needed to color the vertices of G so that no two adjacent vertices have the same color. Obviously $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G)$.

In this article, we continue our studying about $G(\tau_T)$ and $AG(M)$ and we try to relate the combinatorial properties of the above mentioned graphs to the algebraic properties of M .

In section 2 of this paper, we state some properties related to the Zariski topology-graph that are basic or needed in the later sections. In section 3, we study the bipartite Zariski topology-graphs of modules over commutative rings (see Proposition 3.1). Also, we prove that if $G(\tau_T)$ is a tree, then $G(\tau_T)$ is a star graph (see Theorem 3.5). In section 4, we study coloring of the Zariski topology-graph of modules and investigate the interplay between $\chi(G(\tau_T))$ and $\omega(G(\tau_T))$. We show that under condition over minimal submodules of $M/(\cap_{P \in T} P : M)M$, we have $\omega(G(\tau_T)) = \chi(G(\tau_T))$ (see Theorem 4.1). Moreover, we investigate some relations between the existence of cycles in the Zariski topology-graph of a cyclic module and the number of its minimal members of T (see Proposition 4.10).

Let us introduce some graphical notions and denotations that are used in what follows: A graph G is an ordered triple $(V(G), E(G), \psi_G)$ consisting of a nonempty set of vertices, $V(G)$, a set $E(G)$ of edges, and an incident function ψ_G that associates an unordered pair of distinct vertices with each edge. The edge e joins x and y if $\psi_G(e) = \{x, y\}$, and we say x and y are adjacent. A path in graph G is a finite sequence of vertices $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, where x_{i-1} and x_i are adjacent for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and we denote $x_{i-1} - x_i$ for existing an edge between x_{i-1} and x_i .

A graph H is a subgraph of G , if $V(H) \subseteq V(G)$, $E(H) \subseteq E(G)$, and ψ_H is the restriction of ψ_G to $E(H)$. A bipartite graph is a graph whose vertices can be divided into two disjoint sets U and V such that every edge connects a vertex in U to one in V ; that is, U and V are each independent sets and complete bipartite graph on n and m vertices, denoted by $K_{n,m}$, where V and U are of size n and m , respectively, and $E(G)$ connects every vertex in V with all vertices in U . Note that a graph $K_{1,m}$ is called a star graph and the vertex in the singleton partition is called the center of the graph. For some $U \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $N(U)$, the set of all vertices of $G \setminus U$ adjacent to at least one vertex of U . For every vertex $v \in V(G)$, the size of $N(v)$ is denoted by $\deg(v)$. If all the vertices of G have the same degree k , then G is called k -regular, or simply regular. We denote by C_n a cycle of order n . Let G and G' be two graphs. A graph homomorphism from G to G' is a mapping $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow V(G')$ such that for every edge $\{u, v\}$ of G , $\{\phi(u), \phi(v)\}$ is an edge of G' . A retract of G is a subgraph H of G such that there exists a homomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow H$ such that $\phi(x) = x$, for every vertex x of H . The homomorphism ϕ is called the retract (graph) homomorphism (see [10]).

Throughout the rest of this paper, we denote: T is a non-empty subset of $\text{Spec}(M)$, $Q := (\cap_{P \in T} P : M)M$, $\bar{M} := M/Q$, $\bar{N} := N/Q$, $\bar{m} := m + Q$, and $\bar{I} := I/(Q : M)$, where N is a submodule of M containing Q , $m \in M$, and I is an ideal of R containing $(Q : M)$.

2. AUXILIARY RESULTS

In this section, we provide some properties related to the Zariski topology-graph that are basic or needed in the sequel.

Remark 2.1. Let N be a submodule of M . Set $V^*(N) := \{P \in \text{Spec}(M) \mid P \supseteq N\}$. By [4, Remark 2.2], For submodules N and K of M , we have

$$V(N) \cup V(K) = V(N \cap K) = V(NK) = V^*(NK).$$

By [4, Remark 2.5], we have T is a closed subset of $\text{Spec}(M)$ if and only if $T = V(\cap_{P \in T} P)$ and $G(\tau_T) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $T = V(\cap_{P \in T} P)$ and T is not irreducible. So if N and K are adjacent in $G(\tau_T)$, then $V^*(NK) = V^*((\cap_{P \in T} P : M)M)$ and hence $\sqrt{NK} = \cap_{P \in T} P$. Therefore $\cap_{P \in T} P \subseteq \sqrt{(N : M)M}, \sqrt{(K : M)M}$.

Lemma 2.2. (See [2, Proposition 7.6].) Let R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n be non-zero ideals of R . Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (a) $R = R_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R_n$;
- (b) As an abelian group R is the direct sum of R_1, \dots, R_n ;
- (c) There exist pairwise orthogonal idempotents e_1, \dots, e_n with $1 = e_1 + \dots + e_n$, and $R_i = Re_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proposition 2.3. Suppose that e is an idempotent element of R . We have the following statements.

- (a) $R = R_1 \oplus R_2$, where $R_1 = eR$ and $R_2 = (1 - e)R$.
- (b) $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$, where $M_1 = eM$ and $M_2 = (1 - e)M$.
- (c) For every submodule N of M , $N = N_1 \oplus N_2$ such that N_1 is an R_1 -submodule M_1 , N_2 is an R_2 -submodule M_2 , and $(N :_R M) = (N_1 :_{R_1} M_1) \oplus (N_2 :_{R_2} M_2)$.
- (d) For submodules N and K of M , $NK = N_1K_1 \oplus N_2K_2$, $N \cap K = N_1 \cap K_1 \oplus N_2 \cap K_2$ such that $N = N_1 \oplus N_2$ and $K = K_1 \oplus K_2$.
- (e) Prime submodules of M are $P \oplus M_2$ and $M_1 \oplus Q$, where P and Q are prime submodules of M_1 and M_2 , respectively.
- (f) For submodule N of M , we have $\sqrt{N} = \sqrt{N_1 \oplus N_2} = \sqrt{N_1} \oplus \sqrt{N_2}$, where $N = N_1 \oplus N_2$.

Proof. This is clear. \square

An ideal $I < R$ is said to be nil if I consist of nilpotent elements.

Lemma 2.4. (See [12, Theorem 21.28].) Let I be a nil ideal in R and $u \in R$ be such that $u + I$ is an idempotent in R/I . Then there exists an idempotent e in uR such that $e - u \in I$.

Lemma 2.5. (See [5, Lemma 2.4].) Let N be a minimal submodule of M and let $\text{Ann}(M)$ be a nil ideal. Then we have $N^2 = (0)$ or $N = eM$ for some idempotent $e \in R$.

We note that M is said to be *primeful* if either $M = (0)$ or $M \neq (0)$ and the natural map of $\text{Spec}(M)$ is surjective (see [15]).

Proposition 2.6. We have the following statements.

- (a) If N, L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T)$, then $\sqrt{(N : M)M} / \cap_{P \in T} P$ and $\sqrt{(L : M)M} / \cap_{P \in T} P$ are adjacent in $AG(M / \cap_{P \in T} P)$.
- (b) If M is a primeful module and N, L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T)$, then $\sqrt{N} / \cap_{P \in T} P$ and $\sqrt{L} / \cap_{P \in T} P$ are adjacent in $AG(M / \cap_{P \in T} P)$.

Proof. (a) First we see easily that for any submodule N of M , $V(N) = V(\sqrt{(N : M)M})$. Suppose that N and L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T)$ so that $V(N) \cup V(L) = T$. Then we have $V^*(\sqrt{(N : M)M} \sqrt{(L : M)M}) = T$. It follows that $\sqrt{(N : M)M} \sqrt{(L : M)M} \subseteq \cap_{P \in T} P$ (see Remark 2.1). Now the claim follow by Remark 2.1.

(b) This is clear by [4, Corollary 4.5]. \square

Remark 2.7. The Proposition 2.6 (a) extends [4, Theorem 4.4].

Lemma 2.8. Assume that T is a closed subset of $\text{Spec}(M)$. Then $AG(\bar{M})^*$ is isomorphic with a subgraph of $G(\tau_T)$. In particular, $AG(M / \cap_{P \in T} P)^*$ is isomorphic with an induced subgraph of $G(\tau_T)$.

Proof. Let $\bar{N} \in V(AG(\bar{M})^*)$. Then there exists a nonzero submodule \bar{K} of \bar{M} such that it is adjacent to \bar{N} (if $N = K$, then $(N : M) = (Q : M)$, a contradiction). So we have $NK \subseteq Q$. Hence $V(NK) = T$. If $V(N) = T$, then $(N : M) = (Q : M)$, a contradiction. Hence N is a vertex in $G(\tau_T)$ which is adjacent to L . To see the last assertion, let $N / \cap_{P \in T} P$ and $K / \cap_{P \in T} P$ be two vertices of $AG(M / \cap_{P \in T} P)^*$. If N and K are adjacent in $G(\tau_T)$, then by Proposition 2.6, $\sqrt{(N : M)M} / \cap_{P \in T} P$ and $\sqrt{(K : M)M} / \cap_{P \in T} P$ are adjacent in $AG(M / \cap_{P \in T} P)^*$. So

$$\sqrt{(N : M)M} \sqrt{(L : M)M} \subseteq \cap_{P \in T} P.$$

Since

$$NK = ((N : M)M : M)((K : M)M : M)M \subseteq \sqrt{(N : M)M} \sqrt{(L : M)M},$$

we have $N/\cap_{P \in T} P$ and $K/\cap_{P \in T} P$ are adjacent in $AG(M/\cap_{P \in T} P)^*$, as desired. \square

Lemma 2.9. If \bar{M} is a faithful module, then $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ and $AG(M)^*$ are the same.

Proof. \bar{M} is a faithful module so that $T = Spec(M)$. If $G(\tau_{Spec(M)}) \neq \emptyset$, then there exist non-trivial submodules N and K of M which is adjacent in $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$. Hence $V(NK) = Spec(M)$ which implies that $NK = (0)$ so that $AG(M)^* \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.8, $AG(M)^*$ is isomorphic with a subgraph of $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$. One can see that the vertex map $\phi : V(G(\tau_{Spec(M)})) \rightarrow V(AG(M)^*)$, defined by $N \rightarrow N$ is an isomorphism. \square

Recall that $\Delta(G(\tau_T))$ is the maximum degree of $G(\tau_T)$ and the length of an R -module M , is denoted by $l_R(M)$.

Lemma 2.10. Let every nontrivial submodule of M be a vertex in $G(\tau_T)$. If $\Delta(G(\tau_T)) < \infty$, then $l_R(M) \leq \Delta(G(\tau_T)) + 1$. Also, every non-trivial submodule of M has finitely many submodules.

Proof. First we show that the descending chain of non-trivial submodules $K_1 \supsetneq K_2 \supsetneq K_3 \supsetneq \dots$ terminates. Since $G(\tau_T)$ is connected, there exists a submodule N such that $V(N) \cup V(K_1) = T$. Hence for each i , $i \geq 1$, $V(N) \cup V(K_i) = T$ and so $deg(N) = \infty$, a contradiction. Next, let $N_1 \subsetneq N_2 \subsetneq N_3 \subsetneq \dots$ be an ascending chain of non-trivial submodules of M . Since $G(\tau_T)$ is connected, there exists a submodule K such that $V(K) \cup V(N_{\Delta+1}) = T$, where $\Delta = \Delta(G(\tau_T))$. Hence $V(K) \cup V(N_i) = T$ for each $1 \leq i \leq \Delta + 1$. Thus $deg(K) \geq \Delta + 1$, a contradiction. It follows that $l_R(M) \leq \Delta + 1$. For the proof of the last assertion, let N be a non-trivial submodule of M . Since $G(\tau_T)$ is connected, there exists a submodule K such that $V(N) \cup V(K) = T$. Hence for every submodule N' of N , $V(N') \cup V(K) = T$. As $\Delta < \infty$, the number of submodules of N should be finite. \square

Theorem 2.11. Let \bar{M} be a multiplication module and $G(\tau_T) \neq \emptyset$. Then $G(\tau_T)$ has acc (resp. dcc) on vertices if and only if \bar{M} is a Noetherian (resp. an Artinian) module.

Proof. Suppose that $G(\tau_T)$ has acc (resp. dcc) on vertices. By [4, Remark 2.6], \bar{M} is not a prime module and hence there exists $r \in R$ and $\bar{m} \in \bar{M}$ such that $r\bar{m} = \bar{0}$ but $\bar{m} \neq \bar{0}$ and $r \notin Ann(\bar{M})$. Now $r\bar{M} \cong \bar{M}/(\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r)$. Further, $r\bar{M}$ and $(\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r)$ are vertices because $(\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r)(r\bar{M}) = ((\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r) : \bar{M})(r\bar{M} : \bar{M})\bar{M} \subseteq r\bar{M}((\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r) : \bar{M}) \subseteq r(\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r) = \bar{0}$. Then $\{\bar{N} \mid \bar{N} \leq \bar{M}, \bar{N} \subseteq r\bar{M}\} \cup \{\bar{N} \mid \bar{N} \leq \bar{M}, \bar{N} \subseteq (\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r)\} \subseteq V(G(\tau_T))$. It follows that the R -modules $r\bar{M}$ and $(\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r)$ have acc (resp. dcc) on submodules. Since $r\bar{M} \cong \bar{M}/(\bar{0} :_{\bar{M}} r)$, \bar{M} has acc on submodules and the proof is completed. \square

3. ZARISKI TOPOLOGY-GRAPH OF MODULES

First, in this section we give the more notation to be used throughout the remainder of this article. Suppose that e ($e \neq 0, 1$) is an idempotent element of R . Let $M_1 := eM$, $M_2 := (1 - e)M$, $T_1 := \{P_1 \in Spec(M_1) \mid P_1 \oplus M_2 \in T\}$, $T_2 := \{P_2 \in Spec(M_2) \mid M_1 \oplus P_2 \in T\}$, $Q_1 := (\cap_{P_1 \in T_1} P_1 : M_1)M_1$, $Q_2 := (\cap_{P_2 \in T_2} P_2 : M_2)M_2$,

$\bar{M}_1 = \overline{eM} = eM/Q_1$, and $\bar{M}_2 = \overline{(e-1)M} = (e-1)M/Q_2$. Consequently we have, $Q = Q_1 \oplus Q_2$, where $Q = (\cap_{P \in T} P : M)M$ and $\bar{M} \cong \bar{M}_1 \oplus \bar{M}_2$.

We recall that a submodule N of M is a prime R -module if and only if it is a prime $R/Ann(M)$ -module (see [4, Result 1.2]).

Proposition 3.1. Suppose that \bar{M} does not have a non-zero submodule $\overline{\cap_{P \in T} P} \neq \bar{N}$ with $V(N) = T$. Then the following statements hold.

- (a) If there exists a vertex of $G(\tau_T)$ which is adjacent to every other vertex, then \bar{M}_1 is a simple module and \bar{M}_2 is a prime module for some idempotent element $e \in R$.
- (b) If \bar{M}_1 and \bar{M}_2 are prime modules for some idempotent element $e \in R$, then $G(\tau_T)$ is a complete bipartite graph.

Proof. (a) Suppose that N is adjacent to every other vertex of $G(\tau_T)$. Since $V(N) = V((N : M)M)$, we have $N = (N : M)M$ and hence $V(N) = V^*(N)$. Thus $N = \sqrt{N}$ because $V(N) = V(\sqrt{N})$. We claim that \bar{N} is a minimal submodule of \bar{M} . Let $Q \subsetneq K \subsetneq N$. If $V(K) \neq T$, then K is adjacent to N and hence $V(K) = T$, a contradiction. So \bar{N} is a minimal submodule of \bar{M} . We have $(\bar{N})^2 \neq (0)$ because $V(N) \neq T$. Then Lemma 2.5, implies that $\bar{M} \cong \overline{eM} \oplus \overline{(e-1)M}$ for some idempotent element e of R . Without loss of generality we may assume that $M_1 \oplus Q_2$ is adjacent to every other vertex. We claim that \bar{M}_1 is a simple module and \bar{M}_2 is a prime module. Let $Q_1 \subsetneq K < M_1$. We have $V(K \oplus Q_2) \neq T$ because $Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \subsetneq K \oplus Q_2$. Since $V(K \oplus Q_2) \cup V(Q_1 \oplus M_2) = T$, we have $K \oplus Q_2$ is a vertex and hence is adjacent to $M_1 \oplus Q_2$. Therefore $V(K \oplus Q_2) \cup V(M_1 \oplus Q_2) = V(K \oplus Q_2) = T$, a contradiction. It implies that \bar{M}_1 is a simple module. Now, we show that \bar{M}_2 is a prime module. It is enough to show that is a prime $R/(Q_2 : M_2)$ -module. Otherwise, $\bar{I}\bar{K} = (\bar{0})$, where $(Q_2 : M_2) \subsetneq I < R$ and $Q_2 \subsetneq K < M$. It follows that $V(M_1 \oplus K) \cup V(Q_1 \oplus IM_2) = V(Q_1 \oplus K(IM_2)) = T$ because $K(IM_2) \subseteq IK \subseteq Q_2$ and $(Q_2 : M_2)^2 M_2 \subseteq K(IM_2)$ (note that $(Q_2 : M_2) \subseteq (K : M)$ and $(Q_2 : M_2) \subseteq I$). Therefore $V(M_1 \oplus K) \cup V(M_1 \oplus Q_2) = T = V(M_1 \oplus Q_2)$, a contradiction (note that $M_1 \oplus K$ is properly containing $Q_1 \oplus Q_2$).

(b) Assume that $N_1 \oplus N_2$ is adjacent to $K_1 \oplus K_2$. One can see that $\sqrt{N_1 K_1} \oplus \sqrt{N_2 K_2} = \sqrt{Q_1 \oplus Q_2}$. It implies that $(\sqrt{(K_1 : M_1)M_1} : M_1) \sqrt{(N_1 : M_1)M_1} = (\bar{0})$ and $(\sqrt{(K_2 : M_2)M_2} : M_2) \sqrt{(N_2 : M_2)M_2} = (\bar{0})$. Since \bar{M}_1 and \bar{M}_2 are prime modules, $(\sqrt{(K_1 : M_1)M_1} : M_1) = (Q_1 : M_1)$ or $\sqrt{(N_1 : M_1)M_1} = Q_1$ and $(\sqrt{(K_2 : M_2)M_2} : M_2) = (Q_2 : M_2)$ or $\sqrt{(N_2 : M_2)M_2} = Q_2$. Therefore $G(\tau_T)$ is a complete bipartite graph with two parts U and V such that $N \in U$ if and only if $V(N) = V(M_1 \oplus Q_2)$ and $K \in V$ if and only if $V(K) = V(Q_1 \oplus M_2)$. \square

Corollary 3.2. Let \bar{M} be a faithful module and does not have a non-zero submodule $\overline{\cap_{P \in T} P} \neq \bar{N}$ with $V(N) = T$. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (a) There is a vertex of $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ which is adjacent to every other vertex of $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$.
- (b) $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ is a star graph.
- (c) $M = F \oplus D$, where F is a simple module and D is a prime module.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) Let \bar{M} be a faithful module. Then $Q = (0)$ and we have $T = Spec(M)$. By Proposition 3.1, $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$, where M_1 is a simple module and M_2 is a prime module. Then every non-zero submodule of M is of the form $M_1 \oplus N_2$

and $(0) \oplus N_2$, where N_2 is a non-zero submodule of M_2 . By our hypothesis, we can not have any vertex of the form $M_1 \oplus N_2$, where N_2 is a non-zero proper submodule of M_2 . Also $M_1 \oplus (0)$ is adjacent to every other vertex, and non of the submodules of the form $(0) \oplus N_2$ can be adjacent to each other. So $G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})$ is a star graph.

(b) \Rightarrow (c) This follows by Proposition 3.1 (a).

(c) \Rightarrow (a) Assume that $M = F \oplus D$, where F is a simple module and D is a prime module. It is easy to see that for some minimal submodule N of M , we have $N^2 \neq (0)$. Since M is a faithful module, Lemma 2.5 implies that $F \cong eM$, where e is an idempotent element of R . Finally Proposition 3.1 (a) completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.3. Let $e \in R$ be an idempotent element of R and \bar{M} does not have a non-zero submodule $\overline{\cap_{P \in T} P} \neq \bar{N}$ with $V(N) = T$. If $G(\tau_T)$ is a triangle-free graph, then both \bar{M}_1 and \bar{M}_2 are prime R -modules. Moreover, if $G(\tau_T)$ has no cycle, then \bar{M}_1 is a simple module and \bar{M}_2 is a prime module.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that \bar{M}_1 is a prime module. Then $\bar{I}\bar{K} = (\bar{0})$, where $(Q_2 : M_2) \subsetneq I < R$ and $Q_2 \subsetneq K < M$. It follows that $V(M_1 \oplus K) \cup V(Q_1 \oplus IM_2) = V(Q_1 \oplus K(IM_2)) = T$ (if $IM_2 = K$, then $V(Q_1 \oplus K) = V(Q_1 \oplus K^2) = V(Q_1 \oplus K(IM_2)) = T$, a contradiction). So both \bar{M}_1 and \bar{M}_2 are prime R -modules. Now suppose that $G(\tau_T)$ has no cycle. If none of \bar{M}_1 and \bar{M}_2 is a simple module, then we choose non-trivial submodules N_i in M_i for some $i = 1, 2$. So $N_1 \oplus Q_2$, $Q_1 \oplus N_2$, $M_1 \oplus Q_2$, and $Q_1 \oplus M_2$ form a cycle, a contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.4. Assume that M is a multiplication module or a primeful module and \bar{M} does not have a non-zero submodule $\overline{\cap_{P \in T} P} \neq \bar{N}$ with $V(N) = T$. Then $G(\tau_T)$ is a star graph if and only if \bar{M}_1 is a simple module and \bar{M}_2 is a prime module for some idempotent $e \in R$.

Proof. First we note that if \bar{M} is a multiplication module, then for any non-zero submodule \bar{N} of \bar{M} , we have $V(N) \neq T$. The necessity is clear by Proposition 3.1 (a). For the converse, assume that $\bar{M} = \bar{M}_1 \oplus \bar{M}_2$, where \bar{M}_1 is a simple module and \bar{M}_2 is a prime for some idempotent $e \in R$. Using the Proposition 3.1 (b), $G(\tau_T)$ is a complete bipartite graph with two parts U and V such that $N \in U$ if and only if $V(N) = V(M_1 \oplus Q_2)$ and $K \in V$ if and only if $V(K) = V(Q_1 \oplus M_2)$. We claim that $|U| = 1$. Otherwise, $V(M_1 \oplus Q_2) = V(N_1 \oplus Q_2)$, where $Q_1 \neq N_1 < M_1$. It follows that $\sqrt{(N_1 : M_1)\bar{M}_1} = M_1$, a contradiction (note that if M is a multiplication module or a primeful module, then $\sqrt{(N : M)\bar{M}} \neq M$, where $N < M$). So $G(\tau_T)$ is a star graph. \square

Theorem 3.5. If $G(\tau_T)$ is a tree, then $G(\tau_T)$ is a star graph.

Proof. Suppose that $G(\tau_T)$ is not a star graph. Then $G(\tau_T)$ has at least four vertices. Obviously, there are two adjacent vertices L and K of $G(\tau_T)$ such that $|N(L) \setminus \{K\}| \geq 1$ and $|N(K) \setminus \{L\}| \geq 1$. Let $N(L) \setminus \{K\} = \{L_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ and $N(K) \setminus \{L\} = \{K_j\}_{j \in \Gamma}$. Since $G(\tau_T)$ is a tree, we have $N(L) \cap N(K) = \emptyset$. By [4, Theorem 3.4], $\text{diam}(G(\tau_T)) \leq 3$. So every edge of $G(\tau_T)$ is of the form $\{L, K\}$, $\{L, L_i\}$ or $\{K, K_j\}$, for some $i \in \Lambda$ and $j \in \Gamma$. Now, Pick $p \in \Lambda$ and $q \in \Gamma$. Since $G(\tau_T)$ is a tree, $L_p K_q$ is a vertex of $G(\tau_T)$. If $L_p K_q = L_u$ for some $u \in \Lambda$, then $V(KL_u) = T$, a contradiction. If $L_p K_q = K_v$, for some $v \in \Gamma$, then $V(LK_v) = T$, a contradiction. If $L_p K_q = L$ or $L_p K_q = K$, then $V(L^2) = T$ or $V(K^2) = T$, respectively and hence $V(L) = T$ or $V(K) = T$, a contradiction. So the claim is proved. \square

Theorem 3.6. *Let R be an Artinian ring and let M be a multiplication or a primeful module. If $G(\tau_T)$ is a bipartite graph, then $|T| = 2$ and $G(\tau_T) \cong K_2$.*

Proof. First we may assume that $G(\tau_T)$ is not empty. Then R can not be a local ring. Otherwise, $T = V(mM)$, where m is the unique maximal ideal of R . Therefore [4, Remark 2.6] implies that $mM = M$ and hence T is empty, a contradiction. Hence by [8, Theorem 8.9], $R = R_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R_n$, where R_i is an Artinian local ring for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $n \geq 2$. By Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.3, since $G(\tau_T)$ is a bipartite graph, we have $n = 2$ and hence $\bar{M} \cong \bar{M}_1 \oplus \bar{M}_2$ for some idempotent $e \in R$. If \bar{M}_1 is a prime module, then it is easy to see that \bar{M}_1 is a vector space over $R/Ann(\bar{M}_1)$ and so is a semisimple R -module. A similar argument as we did in proof of Corollary 3.4 implies that $|T| = 2$ and $G(\tau_T) \cong K_2$. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that M is a multiplication module and $Ann(\bar{M})$ is a nil ideal of R .*

- (a) *If $G(\tau_T)$ is a finite bipartite graph, then $|T| = 2$ and $G(\tau_T) \cong K_2$.*
- (b) *If $G(\tau_T)$ is a regular graph of finite degree, then $|T| = 2$ and $G(\tau_T) \cong K_2$.*

Proof. (a) By Theorem 2.11, \bar{M} is an Artinian and Noetherian module so that $R/Ann(\bar{M})$ is an Artinian ring. A similar arguments in Theorem 3.6 says that, $R/Ann(\bar{M})$ is a non-local ring. So by [8, Theorem 8.9] and Lemma 2.2, there exist pairwise orthogonal idempotents modulo $Ann(\bar{M})$. By lemma 2.4, $\bar{M} \cong \bar{M}_1 \oplus \bar{M}_2$, for some idempotent e of R . Now, the proof that $G(\tau_T) \cong K_2$ is similar to the proof of Corollary 3.4.

(b) We may assume that $G(\tau_T)$ is not empty. So \bar{M} is not a prime module by [4, Remark 2.6] and a similar manner in proof of Theorem 2.11, shows that \bar{M} has a finite length so that $R/Ann(\bar{M})$ is an Artinian ring. As in the proof of part (a), $\bar{M} \cong \bar{M}_1 \oplus \bar{M}_2$ for some idempotent $e \in R$. If \bar{M}_1 has one non-trivial submodule N , then $deg(Q_1 \oplus M_2) > deg(N \oplus M_2)$ (we note that by [6, Proposition 2.5], $\bar{N}\bar{K} = (\bar{0})$ for some $(\bar{0}) \neq \bar{K} < \bar{M}_1$) and this contradicts the regularity of $G(\tau_T)$. Hence \bar{M}_1 is a simple module. Finally a similar argument as we have seen in Corollary 3.4 gives $G(\tau_T) \cong K_2$. \square

Theorem 3.8. *Assume that \bar{M} does not have a non-zero submodule $\overline{\cap_{P \in T} P} \neq \bar{N}$ with $V(N) = T$, $Ann(\bar{M})$ is a nil ideal, and $|Min(\bar{M})| \geq 3$. Then $G(\tau_T)$ contains a cycle.*

Proof. If $G(\tau_T)$ is a tree, then by Theorem 3.5, $G(\tau_T)$ is a star graph. Suppose that $G(\tau_T)$ is a star graph and N is the center of star. Clearly, one can assume that $\overline{\sqrt{(N : M)\bar{M}}}$ is a minimal submodule of \bar{M} . If $(\overline{\sqrt{(N : M)\bar{M}}})^2 \neq (\bar{0})$, then by Lemma 2.4, there exists an idempotent $e \in R$ such that $(\overline{\sqrt{(N : M)\bar{M}}}) = e\bar{M}$. Now by Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 3.3, we conclude that $|Min(\bar{M})| = 2$, a contradiction. Hence $(\overline{\sqrt{(N : M)\bar{M}}})^2 = (\bar{0})$ and hence $V(N) = T$, a contradiction. Therefore $G(\tau_T)$ contains a cycle. \square

4. COLORING OF THE ZARISKI-TOPOLOGY GRAPH OF MODULES

The purpose of this section is to study of coloring of the Zariski topology-graph of modules and investigate the interplay between $\chi(G(\tau_T))$ and $\omega(G(\tau_T))$. We note that since $E(G(\tau_T)) \geq 1$ when $G(\tau_T) \neq \emptyset$, then $\chi(G(\tau_T)) \geq 2$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let \bar{M} be an Artinian module such that for every minimal submodule \bar{N} of \bar{M} , N is a vertex in $G(\tau_T)$. Then $\omega(G(\tau_T)) = \chi(G(\tau_T))$.*

Proof. \bar{M} is Artinian, so it contains a minimal submodule. Since for every minimal submodule \bar{N} of \bar{M} , N is a vertex in $G(\tau_T)$, we have $V(N) \neq T$. Also, $N \cap L = Q$, where \bar{N} and \bar{L} are minimal submodules of \bar{M} . It follows that N and L are adjacent in $G(\tau_T)$, where \bar{N} and \bar{L} are minimal submodules of \bar{M} . First, suppose that \bar{M} has infinitely many minimal submodules. Then $\omega(G(\tau_T)) = \infty$ and there is nothing to prove. Next, assume that \bar{M} has k minimal submodules, where k is finite. We conclude that $\chi(G(\tau_T)) = k = \omega(G(\tau_T))$. Obviously, $\omega(G(\tau_T)) \geq k$. If possible, assume that $\omega(G(\tau_T)) > k$. Let $\Sigma = \{N_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in I}$, where $|I| = \omega(G(\tau_T))$ be a maximum clique in $G(\tau_T)$. As every $N_\lambda \in \omega$, $\sqrt{(N_\lambda : M)\bar{M}}$ contains a minimal submodule, there exists a minimal submodule \bar{K} and submodules N_i and N_j in ω , such that $\bar{K} \subset \sqrt{(N_i : M)\bar{M}} \cap \sqrt{(N_j : M)\bar{M}}$, and hence $V(K) = T$, a contradiction. Hence $\omega(G(\tau_T)) = k$. Next, we claim that $G(\tau_T)$ is k -colorable. In order to prove, put $A = \{\bar{K}_1, \dots, \bar{K}_k\}$ be the set of all minimal submodules of \bar{M} . Now, we define a coloring f on $G(\tau_T)$ by setting $f(N) = \min\{i \mid K_i \subseteq \sqrt{(N : M)\bar{M}}\}$ for every vertex N of $G(\tau_T)$. Let N and L be adjacent in $G(\tau_T)$ and $f(N) = f(L) = j$. Thus $K_j \subseteq \sqrt{(N : M)\bar{M}} \cap \sqrt{(L : M)\bar{M}}$, a contradiction. It implies that f is a proper k coloring of $G(\tau_T)$ and hence $\chi(G(\tau_T)) \leq k = \omega(G(\tau_T))$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that \bar{M} is a faithful module. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) $\chi(G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})) = 2$.
- (b) $G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})$ is a bipartite graph with two non-empty parts.
- (c) $G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})$ is a complete bipartite graph with two non-empty parts.
- (d) Either R is a reduced ring with exactly two minimal prime ideals or $G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})$ is a star graph with more than one vertex.

Proof. By using Lemma 2.9, $G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})$ and $AG(M)^*$ are the same and so [5, Theorem 3.2] completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that T is a finite set. Then $\chi(G(\tau_T))$ is finite. In particular, $\omega(G(\tau_T))$ is finite.*

Proof. Suppose that $T = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\}$ is a finite set of distinct prime submodules of M . Define a coloring $f(N) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid P_n \notin V(N)\}$, where N is a vertex of $G(\tau_T)$. We can see that $\chi(G(\tau_T)) \leq k$. \square

Theorem 4.4. *For every module M , $\omega(G(\tau_T)) = 2$ if and only if $\chi(G(\tau_T)) = 2$. In particular, $G(\tau_T)$ is bipartite if and only if $G(\tau_T)$ is triangle-free.*

Proof. Let $\omega(G(\tau_T)) = 2$. On the contrary assume that $G(\tau_T)$ is not bipartite. So $G(\tau_T)$ contains an odd cycle. Suppose that $C := N_1 - N_2 - \dots - N_{2k+1} - N_1$ be a shortest odd cycle in $G(\tau_T)$ for some natural number k . Clearly, $k \geq 2$. Since C is a shortest odd cycle in $G(\tau_T)$, N_3N_{2k+1} is a vertex. Now consider the vertices N_1, N_2 , and N_3N_{2k+1} . If $N_1 = N_3N_{2k+1}$, then $V(N_4N_1) = T$. This implies that $N_1 - N_4 - \dots - N_{2k+1} - N_1$ is an odd cycle, a contradiction. Thus $N_1 \neq N_3N_{2k+1}$. If $N_2 = N_3N_{2k+1}$, then we have $C_3 = N_2 - N_3 - N_4 - N_2$, again a contradiction. Hence $N_2 \neq N_3N_{2k+1}$. It is easy to check N_1, N_2 , and N_3N_{2k+1} form a triangle in $G(\tau_T)$, a contradiction. The converse is clear. In particular, we note that empty graphs are bipartite graphs. \square

Corollary 4.5. Assume that $e \in R$ is an idempotent element and \bar{M} does not have a non-zero submodule $\overline{\cap_{P \in T} P} \neq \bar{N}$ with $V(N) = T$. Then $G(\tau_T)$ is a complete bipartite graph if and only if \bar{M}_1 and \bar{M}_2 are prime modules.

Proof. Assume that $G(\tau_T)$ is a complete bipartite graph. Therefore Theorem 4.4 states that $G(\tau_T)$ is a triangle-free graph. So Lemma 3.3 follows that \bar{M}_1 and \bar{M}_2 are prime modules. The conversely holds by Proposition 3.1 (b). \square

Remark 4.6. Assume that S is a multiplicatively closed subset of R such that $S \cap (\cup_{P \in T} (P : M)) = \emptyset$. Let $T_S = \{S^{-1}P : P \in T\}$. One can see that $V(N) = T$ if and only if $V(S^{-1}N) = T_S$, where M is a finitely generated module.

Theorem 4.7. Let S be a multiplicatively closed subset of R defined in Remark 4.6 and M is a finitely generated module. Then $G(\tau_{T_S})$ is a retract of $G(\tau_T)$ and $\omega(G(\tau_{T_S})) = \omega(G(\tau_T))$.

Proof. Consider a vertex map $\phi : V(G(\tau_T)) \rightarrow V(G(\tau_{T_S})), N \rightarrow N_S$. Clearly, $N_S \neq K_S$ implies that $N \neq K$ and $V(N) \cup V(K) = T$ if and only if $V(N_S) \cup V(K_S) = T_S$. Thus ϕ is surjective and hence $\omega(G(\tau_{T_S})) \leq \omega(G(\tau_T))$. If $N \neq K$ and $V(N) \cup V(K) = T$, then we show that $N_S \neq K_S$. On the contrary suppose that $N_S = K_S$. Then $V(N_S^2) = V(N_S K_S) = V(N_S) \cup V(K_S) = T_S$ and so $V(N^2) = T$, a contradiction. This shows that the map ϕ is a graph homomorphism. Now, for any vertex N_S of $G(\tau_{T_S})$, we can choose a fixed vertex N of $G(\tau_T)$. Then ϕ is a retract (graph) homomorphism which clearly implies that $\omega(G(\tau_{T_S})) = \omega(G(\tau_T))$ under the assumption. \square

Corollary 4.8. Let S be a multiplicatively closed subset of R defined in Remark 4.6 and let M be a finitely generated module. Then $\chi(AG(M_S)) = \chi(AG(M))$.

Corollary 4.9. Assume that M is a semiprime module and $AG(M)^*$ does not have an infinite clique. Then M is a faithful module and $0 = (P_1 \cap \dots \cap P_k : M)$, where P_i is a prime submodule of M for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof. By [5, Theorem 3.7 (b)], M is a faithful module and the last assertion follows directly from the proof of [5, Theorem 3.7 (b)]. \square

Proposition 4.10. Let \bar{M} be a cyclic module and let T be a closed subset of $\text{Spec}(M)$. We have the following statements.

- (a) If $\{P_1, \dots, P_n\} \subseteq \text{Min}(T)$, then there exists a clique of size n in $G(\tau_T)$.
- (b) We have $\omega(G(\tau_T)) \geq |\text{Min}(T)|$ and if $|\text{Min}(T)| \geq 3$, then $gr(G(\tau_T)) = 3$.
- (c) If $\sqrt{(0)} = (\bar{0})$, then $\chi(G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})) = \omega(G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})) = |\text{Min}(T)|$.

Proof. (a) The proof is straightforward by the facts that $AG(\bar{M}) = AG(\bar{M})^*$ has a clique of size n by [6, Theorem 2.18] and $AG(\bar{M})$ is isomorphic with a subgraph of $G(\tau_T)$ by Lemma 2.8.

(b) This is clear by item (a).

(c) If $|\text{Min}(T)| = \infty$, then by Proposition 4.10 (b), there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, [6, Theorem 2.20] implies that $AG(\bar{M})$ does not have an infinite clique. So \bar{M} is a faithful module by Corollary 4.9. Next, Lemma 2.9 says that $G(\tau_{\text{Spec}(M)})$ and $AG(M)^*$ are the same. Now the result follows by [6, Theorem 2.20]. \square

Lemma 4.11. Assume that \bar{M} is a semiprime module. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (a) $\chi(G(\tau_{Spec(M)}))$ is finite.
- (b) $\omega(G(\tau_{Spec(M)}))$ is finite.
- (c) $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ does not have an infinite clique.

Proof. (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) is clear.

(c) \implies (d) Suppose that $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ does not have an infinite clique. By Lemma 2.8, $AG(\bar{M})^*$ does not have an infinite clique and so by Corollary 4.9, there exists a finite number of prime submodules P_1, \dots, P_k of M such that $(\cap_{P \in T} P : M) = (P_1 \cap \dots \cap P_k : M)$. Define a coloring $f(N) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid P_n \notin V(N)\}$, where N is a vertex of $G(\tau_T)$. Then we have $\chi(G(\tau_{Spec(M)})) \leq k$. \square

Corollary 4.12. Assume that $AG(M/\cap_{P \in T} P)^*$ does not have an infinite clique. Then $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ and $AG(M)^*$ are the same. Also, $\chi(G(\tau_{Spec(M)}))$ is finite.

Proof. Since $M/\cap_{P \in T} P$ is a semiprime module, by Corollary 4.9, $M/\cap_{P \in T} P$ is a faithful module and there exists a finite number of prime submodules P_1, \dots, P_k of M such that $(\cap_{P \in T} P : M) = (P_1 \cap \dots \cap P_k : M)$. So the result follows by Lemma 2.9 and from the proof of (c) \implies (d) of Lemma 4.11. \square

We recall that M is said to be *X-injective* if either $X = \emptyset$ or the natural map of $X = Spec(M)$ is injective (see [7]).

Proposition 4.13. Suppose that $\sqrt{(\bar{0})} = (\bar{0})$, for every minimal member P of T , $(P : M)$ is a minimal ideal of R , and \bar{M} is an X -injective module. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (a) $\chi(G(\tau_{Spec(M)}))$ is finite.
- (b) $\omega(G(\tau_{Spec(M)}))$ is finite.
- (c) $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ does not have an infinite clique.
- (d) $Min(T)$ is a finite set.

Proof. (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) is clear.

(c) \implies (d) Suppose $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ does not have an infinite clique. By Lemma 2.8, $AG(\bar{M})^*$ does not have an infinite clique and hence by Corollary 4.9, there exists a finite number of prime submodules P_1, \dots, P_k of M such that $(\cap_{P \in T} P : M) = (P_1 \cap P_2 \cap \dots \cap P_k : M)$. By assumptions, one can see that $Min(T)$ is a finite set.

(d) \implies (a) Assume that $Min(T)$ is a finite set (equivalently, \bar{M} has a finite number of minimal prime submodules) so that $(\cap_{P \in T} P : M) = (P_1 \cap P_2 \cap \dots \cap P_k : M)$, where $Min(T) = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$. Define a coloring $f(N) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid P_n \notin V(N)\}$, where N is a vertex of $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$. Then we have $\chi(G(\tau_{Spec(M)})) \leq k$. \square

Example 4.14. If M is a faithfully flat R -module (for example, free modules), then pM is a p -prime submodule of M , where p is a prime ideal of R by [13, Theorem 3]. So for every minimal prime submodule P of M , $(P : M)$ is a minimal ideal of R .

Proposition 4.15. Assume that $\sqrt{(\bar{0})} = (\bar{0})$ and \bar{M} is a faithful module. Then the following statements are equivalent.

- (a) $\chi(G(\tau_{Spec(M)}))$ is finite.
- (b) $\omega(G(\tau_{Spec(M)}))$ is finite.
- (c) $G(\tau_{Spec(M)})$ does not have an infinite clique.
- (d) R has a finite number of minimal prime ideals.
- (e) $\chi(G(\tau_{Spec(M)})) = \omega(G(\tau_{Spec(M)})) = |Min(R)| = k$, where k is finite.

Proof. This is clear by Lemma 2.9, [5, Proposition 3.11], and [5, Corollary 3.12]. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. F. Anderson and P. S. Livingston, *The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring*, J. Algebra, **217** (1999) 434–447.
- [2] W. Anderson and K. R. Fuller, *Rings and Categories of Modules*, (New York-Heidelberg-Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1974).
- [3] H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *Product and dual product of submodules*, Far East J. Math. Sci **25** (3) (2008) 447–455.
- [4] H. Ansari-Toroghy and S. Habibi, *The Zariski topology-graph of modules over commutative rings*, Comm. Algebra **42** (2014) 3283–3296.
- [5] ———, *The annihilating-submodule graph of modules over commutative rings*, to appear in Math. Reports.
- [6] ———, *The annihilating-submodule graph of modules over commutative rings II*, Arab. J. Math, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40065-016-0154-0>.
- [7] H. Ansari-Toroghy and R. Ovyae-Sarmazdeh, *On the prime spectrum of X -injective modules*, Comm. Algebra **38** (2010) 2606–2621.
- [8] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*, (Addison-Wesley, 1969).
- [9] I. Beck, *Coloring of commutative rings*, J. Algebra **116** (1988) 208–226.
- [10] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, (Grad. Texts in Math, Springer, NJ, 2005).
- [11] Z. A. Elbast and P. F. Smith, *Multiplication modules*, Comm. in Algebra **16** (1988) 755–779.
- [12] T. Y. Lam, *A First Course in Non-Commutative Rings*, (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991).
- [13] Chin-Pi, Lu, *Prime submodules of modules*, Comment. Math. Univ. St. Pauli **33**, no. 1 (1984) 61–69.
- [14] ———, *The Zariski topology on the prime spectrum of a module*, Houston J. Math **25** no. 3 (1999) 417–432.
- [15] ———, *A module whose prime spectrum has the surjective natural map*, Houston J. Math **33** no. 1 (2007) 125–143.
- [16] ———, *Modules with Noetherian spectrum*, Comm. in Algebra **38** (2010) 807–828.
- [17] R. L. McCasland and M. E. Moor, *Prime submodules*, Comm. Algebra **20**(6)(1992), 1803–1817.
- [18] H. A. Tavallae and R. Varmazyar, *Semi-radicals of submodules in modules*, IUST International Journal of Engineering Science **19** (2008) 21–27.