

PRIME AND PRIMITIVE IDEALS OF ULTRAGRAPH LEAVITT PATH ALGEBRAS

A. POURABBAS, M. IMANFAR AND H. LARKI

ABSTRACT. Let \mathcal{G} be an ultragraph and let K be a field. We describe prime and primitive ideals in the ultragraph Leavitt path algebra $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. We identify the graded prime ideals in terms of downward directed sets and then we characterize the non-graded prime ideals. We show that the non-graded prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ are always primitive.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let E be a (directed) graph. The Leavitt path algebra $L_K(E)$, which is a purely algebraic analogue of graph Cuntz-Krieger C^* -algebra $C^*(E)$ [17, 10], was introduced in [1, 2]. The algebras $L_K(E)$ are generalizations of the Leavitt algebras $L(1, n)$ [21]. The study of the structure of prime and primitive Leavitt path algebras have been the subject of a series of papers in recent years (see [5, 6, 3]). For a unital commutative ring R , the graded prime (primitive) ideals of $L_R(E)$ are characterized in [19] via special subsets of the vertex (called maximal tails). Furthermore, the structure of non-graded prime and primitive ideals of $L_K(E)$ have been identified in [16]. It was shown in [16] that there is a one-to-one correspondence between non-graded prime (primitive) ideals of $L_K(E)$ and maximal tails containing a loop without exits and the prime spectrum of $K[x, x^{-1}]$.

Ultragraph Leavitt path algebras have been widely studied, see [11, 8, 7, 12, 13, 22, 14]. Ultragraph Leavitt path algebra $L_R(\mathcal{G})$ was introduced in [15] as the algebraic version of ultragraph C^* -algebra $C^*(\mathcal{G})$ [24]. The algebras $L_R(\mathcal{G})$ are generalizations of the Leavitt path algebras $L_R(E)$. The structure of ultragraph Leavitt path algebras are more complicated, because in ultragraphs the range of each edge is allowed to be a nonempty set of vertices rather than a single vertex. The class of ultragraph Leavitt path algebras is strictly larger than the class of Leavitt path algebras of directed graphs. Also, every Leavitt path algebra of a directed graph can be embedded as a subalgebra in a unital ultragraph Leavitt path algebra.

The aim of this paper is to give a complete description of the prime ideals as well as the primitive ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. We start in Section 2 by recalling the definition of the quotient ultragraph $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ and its Leavitt path algebra $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. In Section 3, we characterize the graded prime

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W10, 16D25.

Key words and phrases. Ultragraph, Leavitt path algebra, prime ideal, primitive ideal.

ideals in terms of the downward directed sets. To describe the structure of non-graded prime ideals, we investigate the structure of the closed ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ which contain no nonzero set idempotents. In Section 4, we give a complete description of primitive ideals. We show that a graded prime ideal $I_{(H, B_H)}$ is primitive if and only if the quotient ultragraph $\mathcal{G}/(H, B_H)$ satisfies Condition (L). Finally, we prove that every non-graded prime ideal in $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ is primitive.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we briefly review the basic definitions and properties of ultragraphs [24], quotient ultragraphs [20] and ultragraph Leavitt path algebras [15].

An *ultragraph* $\mathcal{G} = (G^0, \mathcal{G}^1, r_{\mathcal{G}}, s_{\mathcal{G}})$ consists of a countable set of vertices G^0 , a countable set of edges \mathcal{G}^1 , the source map $s_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G}^1 \rightarrow G^0$ and the range map $r_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G^0) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, where $\mathcal{P}(G^0)$ denotes the collection of all subsets of G^0 . By an *algebra* in $\mathcal{P}(X)$, we mean a collection of subsets of X which is closed under the set operations \cup , \cap and \setminus . We write \mathcal{G}^0 for the smallest algebra in $\mathcal{P}(G^0)$ containing $\{\{v\}, r_{\mathcal{G}}(e) : v \in G^0 \text{ and } e \in \mathcal{G}^1\}$.

Definition 2.1. A subcollection $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}^0$ is *hereditary* if

- (1) $\{s_{\mathcal{G}}(e)\} \in H$ implies $r_{\mathcal{G}}(e) \in H$ for all $e \in \mathcal{G}^1$.
- (2) $A \cup B \in H$ for all $A, B \in H$.
- (3) $A \in H$, $B \in \mathcal{G}^0$ and $B \subseteq A$, imply $B \in H$.

The subcollection $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}^0$ is *saturated* if, whenever $0 < |s_{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(v)| < \infty$ satisfies $r_{\mathcal{G}}(e) \in H$ for all $e \in s_{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(v)$, we have $\{v\} \in H$. Let $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}^0$ be a saturated hereditary subcollection. We define the *breaking vertices* of H to be the set

$$B_H := \left\{ v \in G^0 : |s_{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(v)| = \infty \text{ and } 0 < |s_{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}(v) \cap \{e : r_{\mathcal{G}}(e) \notin H\}| < \infty \right\}.$$

If $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}^0$ is a saturated hereditary subcollection and $S \subseteq B_H$, then (H, S) is called an *admissible pair* in \mathcal{G} .

2.1. Quotient ultragraph. In order to define the quotient of ultragraphs we need to recall and introduce some notations. Let (H, S) be an admissible pair in ultragraph $\mathcal{G} = (G^0, \mathcal{G}^1, r_{\mathcal{G}}, s_{\mathcal{G}})$. Given $A \in \mathcal{P}(G^0)$, set $\overline{A} := A \cup \{w' : w \in A \cap (B_H \setminus S)\}$. The smallest algebra in $\mathcal{P}(\overline{G^0})$ containing

$$\{\{v\}, \{w'\}, \overline{r_{\mathcal{G}}(e)} : v \in G^0, w \in B_H \setminus S \text{ and } e \in \mathcal{G}^1\}$$

is denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{G}^0}$. Let \sim be a relation on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^0}$ defined by $A \sim B$ if and only if there exists $V \in H$ such that $A \cup V = B \cup V$. Then, by [20, Lemma 3.5], \sim is an equivalent relation on $\overline{\mathcal{G}^0}$ and the operations

$$[A] \cup [B] := [A \cup B], [A] \cap [B] := [A \cap B] \text{ and } [A] \setminus [B] := [A \setminus B]$$

are well-defined on the equivalent classes $\{[A] : A \in \overline{\mathcal{G}^0}\}$. It can be shown that $[A] = [B]$ if and only if both $A \setminus B$ and $B \setminus A$ belong to H .

Definition 2.2. Let (H, S) be an admissible pair in \mathcal{G} . The *quotient ultragraph of \mathcal{G} by (H, S)* is the quadruple $\mathcal{G}/(H, S) := (\Phi(G^0), \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1), r, s)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(G^0) &:= \{[\{v\}], [\{w'\}]: v \in G^0, \{v\} \notin H \text{ and } w \in B_H \setminus S\}, \\ \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1) &:= \{e \in \mathcal{G}^1 : r_{\mathcal{G}}(e) \notin H\},\end{aligned}$$

and $s : \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1) \rightarrow \Phi(G^0)$ and $r : \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1) \rightarrow \{[A] : A \in \overline{\mathcal{G}^0}\}$ are the maps defined by $s(e) := [\{s_{\mathcal{G}}(e)\}]$ and $r(e) := [\overline{r_{\mathcal{G}}(e)}]$ for every $e \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)$, respectively.

We denote by $\Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$ the smallest algebra in $\{[A] : A \in \overline{\mathcal{G}^0}\}$ containing

$$\Phi(G^0) \cup \{r(e) : e \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)\}.$$

One can see that $\Phi(\mathcal{G}^0) = \{[A] : A \in \overline{\mathcal{G}^0}\}$. If $A, B \in \overline{\mathcal{G}^0}$ and $[A] \cap [B] = [A]$, then we write $[A] \subseteq [B]$. Also, we write $[v]$ instead of $[\{v\}]$ for every vertex $v \in G^0 \setminus H$.

A *path* in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ is a finite sequence $\alpha = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ of edges with $s(e_{i+1}) \subseteq r(e_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. We consider the elements of $\Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$ as the paths of length zero. We let $\text{Path}(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ denotes the set of all paths in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$. We define $[A]^* := [A]$ and $\alpha^* := e_n^* e_{n-1}^* \cdots e_1^*$, for every $[A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$ and $\alpha = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n \in \text{Path}(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. The maps r, s extend to $\text{Path}(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ in an obvious way.

2.2. Leavitt path algebra. A vertex $[v] \in \Phi(G^0)$ is called an *infinite emitter* if $|s^{-1}([v])| = \infty$ and a *sink* if $|s^{-1}([v])| = \emptyset$. A *singular vertex* is a vertex that is either a sink or an infinite emitter and we denote the set of singular vertices by $\Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0)$.

Definition 2.3. Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph and let K be a field. A *Leavitt $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ -family* in a K -algebra X is a set $\{q_{[A]}, t_e, t_{e^*} : [A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0) \text{ and } e \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)\}$ of elements in X such that

- (1) $q_{[\emptyset]} = 0$, $q_{[A]}q_{[B]} = q_{[A] \cap [B]}$ and $q_{[A] \cup [B]} = q_{[A]} + q_{[B]} - q_{[A] \cap [B]}$;
- (2) $q_{s(e)}t_e = t_e q_{r(e)} = t_e$ and $q_{r(e)}t_{e^*} = t_{e^*} q_{s(e)} = t_{e^*}$;
- (3) $t_{e^*}t_f = \delta_{e,f} q_{r(e)}$;
- (4) $q_{[v]} = \sum_{s(e)=[v]} t_e t_{e^*}$ whenever $[v] \in \Phi(G^0) \setminus \Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0)$.

The *Leavitt path algebra of $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$* , denoted by $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$, is defined to be the K -algebra generated by a universal Leavitt $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ -family.

Let \mathcal{G} be an ultragraph. If we consider the quotient ultragraph $\mathcal{G}/(\emptyset, \emptyset)$, then $[A] = \{A\}$. For every $A \in \mathcal{G}^0$. Thus we can consider the ultragraph \mathcal{G} as the quotient ultragraph $\mathcal{G}/(\emptyset, \emptyset)$. So it makes sense to talk about the *ultragraph Leavitt path algebra $L_K(\mathcal{G})$* and define it as $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(\emptyset, \emptyset))$. In fact, the definition of ultragraph Leavitt path algebras ([15, Defintion 2.1]) is an special case of the Definition 2.3.

By [15, Theorem 2.15], $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is of the form

$$\text{span}_K \{t_{\alpha} q_{[A]} t_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \text{Path}(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \text{ and } r(\alpha) \cap [A] \cap r(\beta) \neq [\emptyset]\},$$

where $t_\alpha := t_{e_1}t_{e_2}\cdots t_{e_n}$ if $\alpha = e_1e_2\cdots e_n$ and $t_\alpha := q_{[A]}$ if $\alpha = [A]$. Also, $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is a \mathbb{Z} -graded ring by the grading

$$L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))_n = \text{span}_K\{t_\alpha q_{[A]} t_{\beta^*} : |\alpha| - |\beta| = n\} \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

Throughout the article we denote the universal Leavitt \mathcal{G} -family and $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ -family by $\{s, p\}$ and $\{t, q\}$, respectively. Also, we suppose that $L_K(\mathcal{G}) = L_K(s, p)$ and $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) = L_K(t, q)$.

3. PRIME IDEALS

In this section, we give a complete description of the prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. We first characterize the primeness of a graded ideal in terms of the downward directed sets and then we characterize the non-graded prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$.

3.1. Graded prime ideals. We recall the definition of downward directed sets from [20, Definition 5.3]. Let \mathcal{G} be an ultragraph and $A, B \in \mathcal{G}^0$. We write $A \geq B$ if either $B \subseteq A$ or there is a path α of positive length such that $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) \in A$ and $B \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)$. For the sake of simplicity, we will write $v \geq w$ instead of $\{v\} \geq \{w\}$. A nonempty subset M of \mathcal{G}^0 is said to be *downward directed* if for every $A, B \in M$ there exists $\emptyset \neq C \in M$ such that $A, B \geq C$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph. Then every nonzero graded ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ contains idempotent $q_{[A]}$ for some $[\emptyset] \neq [A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$.*

Proof. Let I be a nonzero graded ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. Then the quotient map $\pi : L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \rightarrow L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))/I$ is a graded homomorphism. Suppose that $q_{[A]} \notin I$ for every $[\emptyset] \neq [A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$. Then, by [15, Theorem 3.2], π is injective, which is impossible. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let I be an ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. Consider $H_I := \{A \in \mathcal{G}^0 : p_A \in I\}$. If I is prime, then $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H_I$ is downward directed.*

Proof. Let $X := L_K(\mathcal{G})/I$ and denote by \tilde{x} the image of $x \in C^*(\mathcal{G})$ in X . For every $A, B \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H_I$, both $X\tilde{p}_A X$ and $X\tilde{p}_B X$ are nonzero ideals of X . Suppose that I is a prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. It follows that X is a prime ring. Thus $X\tilde{p}_A X\tilde{p}_B X$ is a nonzero ideal of X and consequently $\tilde{p}_A X\tilde{p}_B \neq \{0\}$. Since X is of the form

$$\text{span}_K\{\tilde{s}_\alpha \tilde{p}_C \tilde{s}_{\beta^*} : C \in \mathcal{G}^0, \alpha, \beta \in \text{Path}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ and } r_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) \cap C \cap r_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta) \neq \emptyset\},$$

there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Path}(\mathcal{G})$ and $C \in \mathcal{G}^0$ such that $p_A(s_\alpha p_C s_{\beta^*})p_B \neq 0$, which would mean that $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) \in A$ and $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta) \in B$. Thus if we set $D := r_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) \cap C \cap r_{\mathcal{G}}(\beta)$, then we can deduce that $A, B \geq D$. Therefore $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H_I$ is downward directed. \square

Let (H, S) be an admissible pair in \mathcal{G} . For any $w \in B_H$, set

$$p_w^H := p_w - \sum_{s_{\mathcal{G}}(e)=w, r_{\mathcal{G}}(e) \notin H} s_e s_e^*,$$

and we define $I_{(H,S)}$ as the (two-sided) ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ generated by the idempotents $\{p_A : A \in H\} \cup \{p_w^H : w \in S\}$. By [15, Theorem 4.4], $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \cong L_K(\mathcal{G})/I_{(H,S)}$ and the correspondence $(H, S) \mapsto I_{(H,S)}$ is a bijection from the set of all admissible pairs of \mathcal{G} to the set of all graded ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$.

Proposition 3.3. *If $I_{(H,S)}$ is a prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$, then $|B_H \setminus S| \leq 1$*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $w, z \in B_H \setminus S$. Let I and J be two ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ generated by $q_{[w']}$ and $q_{[z']}$, respectively. Since $[w'], [z']$ are two sinks in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ and $q_{[w']}q_{[z']} = 0$, we have that $q_{[w']}L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))q_{[z']} = 0$. Thus $IJ = 0$, contradicting the primeness of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let \mathcal{G} be an ultragraph. Set*

$$X_1 = \{I_{(H, B_H)} : \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H \text{ is downward directed}\}$$

and

$$X_2 = \{I_{(H, B_H \setminus \{w\})} : w \in B_H \text{ and } A \geq w \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H\}.$$

Then $X_1 \cup X_2$ is the set of all graded prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$.

Proof. Let X be the set of all graded prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. We prove that $X = X_1 \cup X_2$.

Assume $I_{(H, B_H)} \in X_1$. We show that the zero ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, B_H))$ is prime. Since $\{0\}$ is a graded ideal, it suffices to prove that for every nonzero graded ideals I, J of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, B_H))$, $IJ \neq \{0\}$ (see [23, Proposition II.1.4]). If I and J are such ideals, then by Lemma 3.1, there exist nonzero idempotents $q_{[A]} \in I$ and $q_{[B]} \in J$. Since $A, B \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ and $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed, there exists $C \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ such that $A, B \geq C$. Thus $q_{[C]} \in I \cap J$ and therefore $\{0\}$ is a prime ideal. Since $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, B_H)) \cong L_K(\mathcal{G})/I_{(H, B_H)}$, we deduce that $I_{(H, B_H)}$ is prime. Hence $X_1 \subseteq X$.

Let $I_{(H, B_H \setminus \{w\})} \in X_2$. Then $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed, because $A \geq w$ for all $A \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$. Now, in a similar way as before we obtain that $I_{(H, B_H \setminus \{w\})}$ is prime. Thus $X_2 \subseteq X$.

To establish the reverse inclusion, let $I_{(H,S)} \in X$. From Proposition 3.3 we have that either $S = B_H$ or $S = B_H \setminus \{w\}$ for some $w \in B_H$. If $S = B_H$, then, by Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed. Hence $I_{(H,S)} \in X_1$.

Let $S = B_H \setminus \{w\}$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$. We show that $A \geq w$. Clearly the result holds for $w \in A$, so let $w \notin A$. By the primeness of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$, we must have $IJ \neq \{0\}$ for every nonzero ideals I and J of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. Thus

$$L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))q_{[\bar{A}]}L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))q_{[w']}L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \neq \{0\},$$

and hence $q_{[\overline{A}]}L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))q_{[w']} \neq \{0\}$. Since $[w']$ is a sink and $[\overline{A}] \cap [w'] = [\emptyset]$, there exists a path α of positive length such that $q_{[\overline{A}]}t_\alpha q_{[w']} \neq 0$. Therefore $s(\alpha) \subseteq [A]$ and $[w'] \subseteq r(\alpha)$, which implies that $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) \in A$ and $w \in r_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)$. Thus $A \geq w$ and consequently $I_{(H, S)} \in X_2$. This proves that $X \subseteq X_1 \cup X_2$. \square

From [15, Theorem 5.4], we know that the ultragraph \mathcal{G} satisfies Condition (K) if and only if every ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ is graded. The following corollary now follows from [15, Theorem 5.4] and Theorem 3.4.

Corollary 3.5. *If the ultragraph \mathcal{G} satisfies Condition (K), then Theorem 3.4 gives a complete description of the prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$.*

3.2. Non-graded prime ideals. Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph and let $\gamma = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ be a path of positive length. If $s(\gamma) \subseteq r(\gamma)$, then γ is called a *loop*. Denote $\gamma^1 := \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$. We say that γ has an *exit* if either $r(e_i) \neq s(e_{i+1})$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ or there exist an edge $f \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)$ and an index i such that $s(f) \subseteq r(e_i)$ but $f \neq e_{i+1}$. The quotient ultragraph $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ satisfies *Condition (L)* if every loop in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ has an exit.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph. If $\gamma = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ is a loop in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ without exits, then I_{γ^0} and $K[x, x^{-1}]$ are Morita equivalent as rings, where I_{γ^0} is an ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ generated by $\{q_{s(e_i)} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ be a loop with no exits in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ and $[v] = s(\gamma)$. Consider

$$(I_{\gamma^0}, q_{[v]}I_{\gamma^0}q_{[v]}, I_{\gamma^0}q_{[v]}, q_{[v]}I_{\gamma^0}, \psi, \phi),$$

where $\psi(m \otimes n) = mn$ and $\phi(n \otimes m) = nm$. It can be shown that this is a (surjective) Morita context. Thus I_{γ^0} and $q_{[v]}I_{\gamma^0}q_{[v]}$ are Morita equivalent.

Now we show that $q_{[v]}I_{\gamma^0}q_{[v]} \cong K[x, x^{-1}]$. Since γ is a loop without exits, we deduce that

$$I_{\gamma^0} = \text{span}_K \{t_\mu q_{s(e_i)} t_{\nu^*} : s(e_i) \subseteq r(\mu) \cap r(\nu) \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

and $q_{s(e_i)} = (t_{e_i} \cdots t_{e_n})q_{[v]}(t_{e_n}^* \cdots t_{e_i}^*)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. This implies that

$$q_{[v]}I_{\gamma^0}q_{[v]} = \text{span}_K \{(t_\gamma)^m (t_{\gamma^*})^n : m, n \geq 1\}.$$

Let E be the graph with one vertex w and one loop f . Then $\{p_w := q_{[v]}, s_f := t_\gamma, s_{f^*} := t_{\gamma^*}\}$ is a Leavitt E -family in $q_{[v]}I_{\gamma^0}q_{[v]}$. It follows from the universality of $L_K(E)$ and the graded uniqueness theorem that $L_K(E) \cong q_{[v]}I_{\gamma^0}q_{[v]}$. Since $L_K(E) \cong K[x, x^{-1}]$, we conclude that I_{γ^0} and $K[x, x^{-1}]$ are Morita equivalent. \square

To prove the next lemma, we use the fact that $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ can be estimated by the Leavitt path algebras of finite graphs. So, we recall this approximation from [15, Section 3] and then we prove Lemma 3.8.

Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph and F be a finite subset of $\Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0) \cup \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)$. We construct a finite graph G_F as follows. Let $F^0 := F \cap \Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0)$ and

$F^1 := F \cap \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1) = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. For every $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{0^n\}$, we define $r(\omega) := \bigcap_{\omega_i=1} r(e_i) \setminus \bigcup_{\omega_j=0} r(e_j)$ and $R(\omega) := r(\omega) \setminus \bigcup_{[v] \in F^0} [v]$ which belong to $\Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$. Set

$$\Gamma_0 := \{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{0^n\} : \text{where vertices } [v_1], \dots, [v_m] \text{ exist} \\ \text{such that } R(\omega) = \bigcup_{i=1}^m [v_i] \text{ and } \emptyset \neq s^{-1}([v_i]) \subseteq F^1 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m\},$$

and

$$\Gamma_F := \{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \{0^n\} : R(\omega) \neq [\emptyset] \text{ and } \omega \notin \Gamma_0\}.$$

Define the finite graph $G_F = (G_F^0, G_F^1, r_F, s_F)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} G_F^0 &:= F^0 \cup F^1 \cup \Gamma_F, \\ G_F^1 &:= \{(e, f) \in F^1 \times F^1 : s(f) \subseteq r(e)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(e, [v]) \in F^1 \times F^0 : [v] \subseteq r(e)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(e, \omega) \in F^1 \times \Gamma_F : \omega_i = 1 \text{ whenever } e = e_i\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $s_F(e, f) = s_F(e, [v]) = s_F(e, \omega) = e$ and $r_F(e, f) = f$, $r_F(e, [v]) = [v]$, $r_F(e, \omega) = \omega$. By [15, Lemma 3.1], the elements

$$\begin{aligned} P_e &:= t_e t_{e^*}, & P_{[v]} &:= q_{[v]}(1 - \sum_{e \in F^1} t_e t_{e^*}), & P_\omega &:= q_{R(\omega)}(1 - \sum_{e \in F^1} t_e t_{e^*}), \\ S_{(e,f)} &:= t_e P_f, & S_{(e,[v])} &:= t_e P_{[v]}, & S_{(e,\omega)} &:= t_e P_\omega, \\ S_{(e,f)^*} &:= P_f t_{e^*}, & S_{(e,[v])^*} &:= P_{[v]} t_{e^*}, & S_{(e,\omega)^*} &:= P_\omega t_{e^*}, \end{aligned}$$

form a Leavitt G_F -family in $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ such that

$$L_K(G_F) \cong L_K(S, P) = \langle q_{[v]}, t_e, t_{e^*} : [v] \in F^0, e \in F^1 \rangle.$$

Remark 3.7. Let $\gamma := e_1 e_2 \dots e_n$ be a loop in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ and F be a finite subset of $\Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0) \cup \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)$ containing $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$. Then $\tilde{\gamma} := (e_1, e_2) \dots (e_n, e_1)$ is a loop in G_F . Since the elements of $F^0 \cup \Gamma_F$ are sinks in G_F , every loop in G_F is of the form $\tilde{\beta}$ where β is a loop in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$. By using the argument of [20, Lemma 4.8], we can show that γ is a loop without exits in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ if and only if $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a loop without exits in G_F .

The set of vertices in the loops without exits of $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ is denoted by $P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. Also, we denote by $I_{P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))}$ the ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ generated by the idempotents associated to the vertices in $P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph. If $z \in L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \setminus I_{P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))}$, then there exist $x, y \in L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ and $[\emptyset] \neq [A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$ such that $xzy = q_{[A]}$.*

Proof. Let $\{F_n\}$ be an increasing sequence of finite subsets of $(G_S^H)^0_{\text{sg}} \cup \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)$ such that $\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty F_n = \Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0) \cup \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1)$. Then

$$\bigcup_n L_K(G_{F_n}) = \langle q_{[v]}, t_e, t_{e^*} : [v] \in \Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0), e \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1) \rangle = L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)).$$

Now, let $z \in L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \setminus I_{P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))}$. There exists F_n such that $z \in L_K(G_{F_n})$. We show that $z \notin I_{P_c(G_{F_n})}$. By Remark 3.7, we have

$$P_c(G_{F_n}) = \{\tilde{\alpha} : \alpha \in P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \text{ and } \gamma^1 \subseteq G_{F_n}^1\}.$$

Suppose that $\gamma := e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n \in P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. For every $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $P_{e_i} = t_{e_i} t_{e_i}^* \in I_{P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))}$. Thus $I_{P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))}$ contains generators of $I_{P_c(G_{F_n})}$. This implies that $I_{P_c(G_{F_n})} \subseteq L_K(G_{F_n}) \cap I_{P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))}$ and consequently $z \in L_K(G_{F_n}) \setminus I_{P_c(G_{F_n})}$.

By [4, Proposition 5.2], there exist $x', y' \in L_K(G_{F_n})$ and $w \in G_{F_n}^0$ such that $x'zy' = P_w$. We distinguish three cases.

- (1) Let $w = [v] \in F_n^0$. Since $[v] \in \Phi_{\text{sg}}(G^0)$, there exists $f \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1) \setminus F_n^1$ such that $[v] = s(f)$. Set $x = t_{f^*}x'$ and $y = y't_f$. Then $xyz = q_{r(f)}$.
- (2) If $w = e \in F_n^1$, then $t_{e^*}x'zy't_e = q_{r(e)}$.
- (3) Let $w = \omega \in \Gamma_{F_n}$. Thus there exists a vertex $[v] \subseteq R(\omega)$ such that either $[v]$ is a sink or there is an edge $f \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1) \setminus F_n^1$ with $s(f) = [v]$. In the former case, we deduce that $q_{[v]}x'zy' = q_{[v]}Q_\omega = q_{[v]}$ and in the later case $t_{f^*}x'zy't_f = t_{f^*}Q_\omega t_f = q_{r(f)}$.

□

Proposition 3.9 is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.8.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph. If I is an ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ with $\{[A] \neq [\emptyset] : q_{[A]} \in I\} = \emptyset$, then $I \subseteq I_{P_c(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))}$.*

Remark 3.10. Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph, $x \in L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ and let the ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ generated by $I_{(H, S)} \cup \{x\}$ is denoted by $I_{(H, S, x)}$. Suppose that γ is a loop in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ without exits and $f(x)$ is a polynomial in $K[x, x^{-1}]$. It can be shown that $I_{\langle f(t_\gamma) \rangle} = I_{\langle f(t_{\gamma'}) \rangle}$, where γ' is a permutation of γ .

Let H be a saturated hereditary subset of \mathcal{G}^0 and $\gamma = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ be a loop in \mathcal{G} . We say that $\gamma = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ is a loop in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ if $r_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$. Also, γ has an exit in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ if either $r_{\mathcal{G}}(e_i) \setminus s_{\mathcal{G}}(e_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ or there exists an edge $f \in \mathcal{G}^1$ and an index i such that $r_{\mathcal{G}}(f) \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ and $s_{\mathcal{G}}(f) \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(e_i)$ but $f \neq e_{i+1}$. One can see that the quotient ultragraph $\mathcal{G}/(H, B_H)$ satisfies Condition (L) if and only if every loop in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ has an exit in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$.

Theorem 3.11. *Let \mathcal{G} be an ultragraph and let I be an ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. Denote $H := H_I$. Then I is a non-graded prime ideal if and only if*

- (1) $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed,
- (2) $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ contains a loop γ without exits in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ and
- (3) $I = I_{\langle H, B_H, f(s_\gamma) \rangle}$, where $f(x)$ is an irreducible polynomial in $K[x, x^{-1}]$.

Proof. Let I be a non-graded prime ideal and $S := \{w \in B_H : p_w^H \in I\}$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed. Consider the

quotient $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \cong L_K(\mathcal{G})/I_{(H, S)}$ and let \tilde{I} be the image of I under the quotient map. Since I is a non-graded ideal, we have that $\tilde{I} \neq \{0\}$. The argument in the proof of [15, Theorem 4.4] implies that

$$\{[A] \neq [\emptyset] : [A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0) \text{ and } q_{[A]} \in \tilde{I}\} = \emptyset.$$

In view of Lemma 3.1, this means that \tilde{I} is a non-graded ideal. Thus by the Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem [15, Theorem 3.6], $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ contains a loop γ without exits. Let $w \in B_H \setminus S$ and $X := L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))/\tilde{I}$. Since γ has no exits and $[w']$ is a sink, we get that $(q_{[w']} + \tilde{I})X(q_{s(\gamma)} + \tilde{I}) = \{0\}$, in contradiction with the primeness of X . Hence $S = B_H$.

Since $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed, we get that γ is unique (up to permutation). Thus, by Proposition 3.9, we have $\tilde{I} \subset I_{\gamma^0}$. From Lemma 3.6, we know that I_{γ^0} is Morita equivalent to $K[x, x^{-1}]$ by the Morita correspondence $J \mapsto q_{s(\gamma)}Jq_{s(\gamma)}$. Since the primeness is preserved by the Morita correspondence, we deduce that $q_{s(\gamma)}\tilde{I}q_{s(\gamma)}$ is a prime ideal of $K[x, x^{-1}]$. Thus there exists an irreducible polynomial $f(x)$ in $K[x, x^{-1}]$ such that $q_{s(\gamma)}\tilde{I}q_{s(\gamma)}$ is generated by $f(x)$. Hence $\tilde{I} = I_{\langle f(t_\gamma) \rangle}$. Since $\tilde{I} \subset L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, B_H)) \cong L_K(\mathcal{G})/I_{(H, B_H)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} q_{[A]} &= p_A + I_{(H, B_H)} & \text{for } A \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0), \\ t_e &= s_e + I_{(H, B_H)} & \text{for } e \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1), \\ t_{e^*} &= s_{e^*} + I_{(H, B_H)} & \text{for } e \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^1), \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that $I = I_{\langle H, B_H, f(s_\gamma) \rangle}$.

Conversely, assume that the above three conditions hold. Denote by \tilde{I} the image of I in the quotient $L_K(\mathcal{G})/I_{(H, B_H)}$. Hence $\tilde{I} = I_{\langle f(t_\gamma) \rangle}$. Since $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed, γ is unique (up to permutation). It follows from Proposition 3.9 that $\tilde{I} \subset I_{\gamma^0}$. Thus $q_{s(\gamma)}\tilde{I}q_{s(\gamma)}$ is an ideal of $K[x, x^{-1}]$ generated by $f(x)$. As $f(x)$ is an irreducible polynomial in $K[x, x^{-1}]$, the ideal $q_{s(\gamma)}\tilde{I}q_{s(\gamma)}$ is prime and therefore, by Lemma 3.6, \tilde{I} is a prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})/I_{(H, B_H)}$. Since $\{0\} \neq \tilde{I} \subset I_{\gamma^0}$, we get that \tilde{I} is a non-graded ideal. Consequently, I is a non-graded prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. \square

4. PRIMITIVE IDEALS

In this section, we characterize primitive ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. We determine primitive quotient ultragraph Leavitt path algebras and then we characterize graded primitive ideals. Finally, We see that the non-graded prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ are always primitive.

4.1. Graded primitive ideals. A ring R is said to be left (right) *primitive*, if it has a faithful simple left (right) R -module. Since $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S)) \cong L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))^{op}$, we deduce that $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is left primitive if and only if it is right primitive. So we simply say it is primitive.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, B_H)$ be a quotient ultragraph and*

$$X := \{[A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0) \setminus \{[\emptyset]\} : [A] \cap [v] = [\emptyset] \text{ for every vertex } [v] \in \Phi(G^0)\}.$$

If $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed, then X is closed under finite intersections.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed. We show that if $[A] \in X$ and $A \geq C$ for some $C \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$, then $C \subseteq A$. If $C \not\subseteq A$, then there is a path α of positive length such that $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) \in A$ and $C \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)$. So $\{s_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)\} \in H$. Thus, by the hereditary property of H , $C \in H$, which is impossible.

Now, let $[A_1], \dots, [A_n] \in X$ and $A := A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n$. Set $C_1 = A_1$. Since $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed, there exists $C_2 \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ such that $C_1, A_2 \geq C_2$. Therefore $C_2 \subseteq C_1 \cap A_2$. Similarly, there exists $C_3 \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ such that $C_3 \subseteq C_2 \cap A_2$. Repeating this process we find $C_n \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ such that $C_n \subseteq A$. Hence $A \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ and thus $[A] \neq [\emptyset]$. Since $[A] \cap [v] = [\emptyset]$ for all $[v] \in \Phi(G^0)$, we conclude that $[A] \in X$. \square

Let A be a unital ring. By [9, Theorem 1], A is left primitive if and only if there is a left ideal $M \neq A$ of A such that for every nonzero two-sided ideal I of A , $M + I = A$. We use this to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ be a quotient ultragraph. Then $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is primitive if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (i) $S = B_H$, $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ satisfies Condition (L) and $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed.
- (ii) $S = B_H \setminus \{w\}$ for some $w \in B_H$ and $A \geq w$ for all $A \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$.

Proof. First, suppose that $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is primitive. Then $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is prime and thus $I_{(H, S)}$ is a prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. From Proposition 3.3 we deduce that $|B_H \setminus S| \leq 1$. So either $|B_H \setminus S| = 1$ or $S = B_H$. Thus (ii) follows by Theorem 3.4 or (i) holds by Theorem 3.4 and appalling Lemma 3.6, respectively.

Conversely, suppose that (i) holds. Applying Theorem 3.4, the graded ideal $I_{(H, S)}$ is prime which implies that $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is a prime ring. By [18, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2], there exists a prime unital K -algebra R such that $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ embeds in R as a two-sided ideal and primitivity of R gives the primitivity of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ and vice versa. So it is enough to show that R is primitive. Suppose that X is the set defined in Lemma 4.1. We distinguish two cases depending on X .

Case 1. Let $X = \emptyset$ and let $[v]$ be a vertex in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$. Define $H = \{[u] \in \Phi(G^0) : v \geq u\}$. Since $\Phi(G^0)$ is countable we can write $H = \{[v_1], [v_2], \dots\}$. We claim that there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ in $\text{Path}(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ such that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_{i+1} = \lambda_i \mu_i$ for some path $\mu_i \in \text{Path}(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ and also $v_i \geq s_{\mathcal{G}}(\mu_i)$. Note that for every $[A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$ we define $s_{\mathcal{G}}([A]) = r_{\mathcal{G}}([A]) = A$.

Set $\lambda_1 = [v_1]$, since $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ is downward directed, there exists $A_2 \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ such that $v_2 \geq A_2$ and $r_{\mathcal{G}}(\lambda_1) \geq A_2$. If $A_2 \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\lambda_1)$, then $A_2 = \{v_1\}$

and take $\mu_1 = [A_2]$. If $A_2 \not\subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\lambda_1)$, then there is a path μ_1 of positive length such that $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\mu_1) \in r_{\mathcal{G}}(\lambda_1)$ and $A_2 \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\mu_1)$. Now define $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1\mu_1$. Also $v_1 \geq s_{\mathcal{G}}(\mu_1)$, $v_2 \geq A_2$ and $A_2 \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\lambda_2)$. Now by induction we assume that there exist $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ with the previous properties. Corresponding there exist $A_k \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $v_k \geq A_k$ and $A_k \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\lambda_k)$. Since $[A_n] \neq [\emptyset]$ and $X = \emptyset$, there is a vertex $[u_n] \in \Phi(G^0)$ such that $u_n \subseteq A_n$. Hence $v_n \geq u_n$ and $[u_n] \subseteq r(\lambda_n)$, one can show that there is a path $\mu_n \in \text{Path}(\mathcal{G})$ such that $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\mu_n) = u_n$. Now define $\lambda_{n+1} = \lambda_n\mu_n$ and corresponding $A_{n+1} \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ with the same property as before.

Now set

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R(1 - t_{\lambda_i} t_{\lambda_i}^*),$$

which is a left ideal of R . If $1 \in M$, then $1 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(1 - t_{\lambda_i} t_{\lambda_i}^*)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$. Since $t_{\lambda_j} t_{\lambda_j}^* t_{\lambda_k} t_{\lambda_k}^* = t_{\lambda_k} t_{\lambda_k}^*$ ($k \geq j$), we have

$$t_{\lambda_n} t_{\lambda_n}^* = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(1 - t_{\lambda_i} t_{\lambda_i}^*) t_{\lambda_n} t_{\lambda_n}^* = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $1 \notin M$ and M is a proper left ideal of R .

By [9, Theorem 1], to prove that R is primitive, It is enough to show that $M + I = R$ for every nonzero two-sided ideal I of R . Take $I_1 = I \cap L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. But R is prime, so I_1 is a nonzero two sided ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$. Since $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ satisfies Condition (L), by the Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem [15, Theorem 3.6], there exists $[\emptyset] \neq [A] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$ such that $q_{[A]} \in I_1$. By downward directedness, there exists $C \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ for which $v \geq C$ and $A \geq C$. As $X = \emptyset$, there is a vertex $[z] \in \Phi(G^0)$ such that $z \in C$. Hence $v \geq z$ and thus $z = v_n$ for some $n \geq 1$. We know that $v_n \geq s_{\mathcal{G}}(\mu_n)$, where $\lambda_{n+1} = \lambda_n\mu_n$. Consequently, $A \geq C \geq v_n \geq s_{\mathcal{G}}(\mu_n) \geq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\lambda_{n+1})$. Since $q_{[A]} \in I_1$, we deduce that $q_{r(\lambda_{n+1})} \in I_1$ and $t_{\lambda_{n+1}} t_{\lambda_{n+1}}^* \in I_1$. Thus

$$1 = (1 - t_{\lambda_{n+1}} t_{\lambda_{n+1}}^*) + t_{\lambda_{n+1}} t_{\lambda_{n+1}}^* \in M + I,$$

which implies that $M + I = R$.

Case 2. Let $X \neq \emptyset$. Define $M = \sum_{[A] \in X} R(1 - q_{[A]})$, which is a left ideal of R .

We claim that M is proper, otherwise let $1 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(1 - q_{[A_i]}) \in M$, where $[A_1], \dots, [A_n] \in X$ and $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$. Then $q_{[A]} = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(1 - q_{[A_i]})q_{[A]} = 0$, where $A := A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n$. By Lemma 4.1 $[A] \neq [\emptyset]$, so $q_{[A]} \neq 0$, a contradiction.

Consider I and I_1 as before. Choose $[A] \in X$, $C \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ and $[\emptyset] \neq [B] \in \Phi(\mathcal{G}^0)$ such that $q_{[B]} \in I_1$, $B \geq C$ and $A \geq C$. As we have seen in the proof of Lemma 4.1, $[C] \in X$. Since $B \geq C$, we have $q_{[C]} \in I_1$. Therefore $1 = (1 - q_{[C]}) + q_{[C]} \in M + I$. Hence $M + I = R$ and consequently R is primitive.

Finally, suppose that (ii) holds. Then $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed. By Theorem 3.4, $L_K(\mathcal{G}/(H, S))$ is a prime ring. We claim that $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$ satisfies Condition (L), now with a similar argument as in the previous part if we

take $M = R(1 - q_{[w]})$, one can show that $M + I = R$ for every nonzero two-sided ideal I of R and consequently R is primitive.

To prove the claim, let $\gamma = e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ be a loop in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$. By (ii) we have $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) \geq w$, so either $w = s_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma)$ or $w \neq s_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma)$. Thus $r(e_n) \neq s(e_1)$ or there is a path α such that $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha) = s_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma)$ and $\{w\} \subseteq r_{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha)$, respectively. Therefore γ has an exit in $\mathcal{G}/(H, S)$. \square

A two-sided ideal I of a ring R is called a left (right) *primitive ideal* if R/I is a left (right) primitive ring. We note that a graded ideal $I_{(H,S)}$ of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ is left primitive if and only if it is right primitive.

Theorem 4.2 immediately yields the following.

Corollary 4.3. *Let \mathcal{G} be an ultragraph. A graded ideal $I_{(H,S)}$ of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ is primitive if and only if one of the following holds:*

- (i) $S = B_H$, $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed and every loop in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ has an exit in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$.
- (ii) $S = B_H \setminus \{w\}$ for some $w \in B_H$ and $A \geq w$ for all $A \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$.

4.2. Non-graded primitive ideals. It is well known that every primitive ideal of a ring is prime. The next theorem shows that every non-graded prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ is primitive.


Theorem 4.4. *Let \mathcal{G} be an ultragraph. A non-graded prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$ is prime if and only if it is primitive.*

Proof. Let I be a non-graded prime ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. By Theorem 3.11, $I = I_{\langle H, B_H, f(s_{\gamma}) \rangle}$, where $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is a downward directed set containing a loop γ without exits in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ and $f(x)$ is an irreducible polynomial in $K[x, x^{-1}]$. Let $\tilde{I} = I/I_{(H, B_H)}$ and $s_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) = v$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.11, the ideal $q_{[v]} \tilde{I} q_{[v]}$ of $K[x, x^{-1}]$ generated by $f(x)$ is a maximal ideal. Hence $K[x, x^{-1}]/q_{[v]} \tilde{I} q_{[v]} \cong K$. On the other hand, we have

$$\overline{P}_v \left(\frac{L_K(\mathcal{G})}{I} \right) \overline{P}_v \cong \frac{q_{[v]} \left(\frac{L_K(\mathcal{G})}{I_{(H, B_H)}} \right) q_{[v]}}{q_{[v]} \left(\frac{I}{I_{(H, B_H)}} \right) q_{[v]}} \cong \frac{q_{[v]} L_K \left(\frac{\mathcal{G}}{(H, B_H)} \right) q_{[v]}}{q_{[v]} \tilde{I} q_{[v]}} \cong \frac{K[x, x^{-1}]}{q_{[v]} \tilde{I} q_{[v]}},$$

where $\overline{P}_v = p_v + I$ and $q_{[v]} = p_v + I_{(H, B_H)}$. Since every field is primitive, we see that $L_K(\mathcal{G})/I$ has a primitive corner and so, I is a primitive ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. \square

Example 4.5. Consider the ultragraph \mathcal{G} given below.



Set $H_1 = \overline{\{v\}}$ and $H_2 = \overline{\{r_{\mathcal{G}}(e) \setminus \{v, v_1\}\}}$ (for $X \subseteq \mathcal{G}^0$, \overline{X} denotes the smallest saturated hereditary subset of \mathcal{G}^0 containing X). We have that $B_{H_1} = \{w\}$ and $B_{H_2} = \emptyset$. Let H be a saturated hereditary subcollection of \mathcal{G} . It can be shown that $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H$ is downward directed if and only if $H = H_1$ or $H = H_2$. It follows from Theorem 3.4 that $I_{(H_1, \{w\})}$ and $I_{(H_2, \emptyset)}$ are (graded) prime ideals of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. Since $A \geq w$ for every $A \in \mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H_1$, by Corollary 4.3 (ii), $I_{(H_1, \emptyset)}$ is a primitive ideal of $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. $I_{(H_1, \{w\})}$ is not primitive because f is a loop without exits in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H_1$. If $g(x)$ is an irreducible polynomial in $K[x, x^{-1}]$, then, by Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 4.4, $I_{(H_1, \{w\}, g(s_f))}$ is a non-graded prime (primitive) ideal in $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. Since every loop in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H_2$ has an exit in $\mathcal{G}^0 \setminus H_2$, by Corollary 4.3 (i), $I_{(H_2, \emptyset)}$ is primitive. Finally, Let X be the set of prime ideals and Y be the set of primitive ideals in $L_K(\mathcal{G})$. Then we have

$$X = \{I_{(H_1, \{w\})}, I_{(H_1, \emptyset)}, I_{(H_2, \emptyset)}, I_{(H_1, \{w\}, g(s_f))}\}$$

and $Y = X \setminus \{I_{(H_1, \{w\})}\}$, where $g(x)$ is an irreducible polynomial in $K[x, x^{-1}]$.

REFERENCES

- [1] *G. Abrams and G. Aranda Pino*, The Leavitt path algebra of a graph, *J. Algebra*, **293**(2005), 319-334.
- [2] *G. Abrams and G. Aranda Pino*, The Leavitt path algebras of arbitrary graphs, *Houston J. Math.*, **34**(2008), 423-442.
- [3] *G. Abrams, J. P. Bell and K. M. Rangaswamy*, On prime nonprimitive von Neumann regular algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **366**(5) (2014), 2375-2392.
- [4] *G. Aranda Pino, J. Brox and M. Siles Molina*, Cycles in Leavitt path algebras by means of idempotents, *Forum Math.*, **27**(2015), 601-633.
- [5] *G. Aranda Pino, E. Pardo and M. Siles Molina*, Exchange Leavitt path algebras and stable rank, *J. Algebra*, **305**(2006), 912-936.
- [6] *G. Aranda Pino, E. Pardo and M. Siles Molina*, Prime spectrum and primitive Leavitt path algebras, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **58**(2)(2009), 869-890.
- [7] *G. G. de Castro, D. Gonçalves, and D. W. van Wyk*, Ultragraph algebras via labelled graph groupoids, with applications to generalized uniqueness theorems, *J. Algebra*, **579**(2021), 456-495.
- [8] *M. M. Firrisa*, Morita equivalence of graph and ultragraph Leavitt path algebras, *arXiv:2006.06521*, (2020).
- [9] *E. Formanek*, Group rings of free products are primitive, *J. Algebra*, **56**(1979), 395-398.
- [10] *N. Fowler, M. Laca and I. Raeburn*, The C^* -algebras of infinite graphs, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **128**(3)(2000), 2319-2327.
- [11] *D. Gonçalves and D. Royer*, Simplicity and chain conditions for ultragraph Leavitt path algebras via partial skew group ring theory, *Aust. Math. Soc.*, **109**(3)(2020), 299-319.
- [12] *D. Gonçalves and D. Royer*, Irreducible and permutative representations of ultragraph Leavitt path algebras, *Forum Math.*, **32**(2020), 41-431.
- [13] *D. Gonçalves and D. Royer*, Representations and the reduction theorem for ultragraph Leavitt path algebras, *J. Algebraic Combin.*, **53**(2021), 505-526.
- [14] *R. Hazrat, T. G. Nam*, Realizing ultragraph Leavitt path algebras as Steinberg algebras, *arXiv:2008.04668*, (2020).

- [15] *M. Imanfar, A. Pourabbas and H. Larki*, The leavitt path algebras of ultragraphs, Kyungpook Math. J., **60**(1)(2020), 21-43.
- [16] *K. M. Rangaswamy*, The theory of prime ideals of Leavitt path algebras over arbitrary graphs, J. Algebra, **375**(2013), 73-96.
- [17] *A. Kumjian, D. Pask and I. Raeburn*, Cuntz-Krieger algebras of directed graphs, Pacific J. Math., **184**(1998), 161-174.
- [18] *C. Lanski, R. Resco and L. Small*, On the primitivity of prime rings, J. Algebra, **59**(2)(1979), 395-398.
- [19] *H. Larki*, Ideal structure of Leavitt path algebras with coefficients in a commutative ring with unit, Comm. Algebra, **43**(2015), 5031-5058.
- [20] *H. Larki*, Primitive ideals and pure infiniteness of ultragraph C^* -algebras, J. Korean Math. Soc., **56**(2019) 1-23.
- [21] *W.G. Leavitt*, Modules without invariant basis number, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **8**(1957), 322-328.
- [22] *T. G. Nam and N. D. Nam*, Purely infinite simple ultragraph Leavitt path algebras, arXiv:2007.08144, (2020).
- [23] *C. Năstăsescu and F. van Oystaeyen*, Graded Ring Theory, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [24] *M. Tomforde*, A unified approach to Exel-Laca algebras and C^* -algebras associated to graphs, J. Operator Theory, **50**(2003), 345-368.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, AMIRKABIR UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, 424 HAFEZ AVENUE, 15914 TEHRAN, IRAN.

Email address: `arpabbas@aut.ac.ir`, `m.imanfar@aut.ac.ir`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND COMPUTER, SHAHID CHAMRAN UNIVERSITY, AHVAZ, IRAN

Email address: `h.larki@scu.ac.ir`