

On weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals of commutative rings^{*†}

M. J. NIKMEHR^a, R. NIKANDISH^b AND A. YASSINE^a

^a*Faculty of Mathematics, K.N. Toosi University of Technology,
P.O. BOX 16315-1618, Tehran, Iran*

nikmehr@kntu.ac.ir yassine_ali@email.kntu.ac.ir

^b*Department of Mathematics, Jundi-Shapur University of Technology,
P.O. BOX 64615-334, Dezful, Iran*

r.nikandish@ipm.ir

Abstract

Let R be a commutative ring with identity. In this paper, we introduce the concept of weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals which is a generalization of weakly prime ideals. A proper ideal I of R is called weakly 1-absorbing prime if for all nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$ such that $0 \neq abc \in I$, then either $ab \in I$ or $c \in I$. A number of results concerning weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals and examples of weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals are given. It is proved that if I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R and $0 \neq I_1 I_2 I_3 \subseteq I$ for some ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of R such that I is free triple-zero with respect to $I_1 I_2 I_3$, then $I_1 I_2 \subseteq I$ or $I_3 \subseteq I$. Among other things, it is shown that if I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R that is not 1-absorbing prime, then $I^3 = 0$. Moreover, weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals of PID's and Dedekind domains are characterized. Finally, we investigate commutative rings with the property that all proper ideals are weakly 1-absorbing primes.

1 Introduction

We assume throughout this paper that all rings are commutative with identity. Let R be a ring and I be an ideal of R . The set of nilpotent elements of R , the set of zero-divisors of R , the set of integers, and integers modulo n are denoted by $\sqrt{0}$, $Z(R)$, \mathbb{Z} and

^{*}*Key Words:* 1-absorbing prime ideal, Weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal, Prime ideal, Weakly prime ideal.

[†] 2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 13A15, 13C05.

\mathbb{Z}_n , respectively. By a proper ideal I of R we mean an ideal with $I \neq R$. A ring R is called *local* if it has a unique maximal ideal. A ring R is called a *reduced* ring if it has no non-zero nilpotent elements; i.e., $\sqrt{0} = 0$. For any undefined notation or terminology in commutative ring theory, we refer the reader to [10].

In recent years, various generalizations of prime ideals have been studied by several authors. For instance, in 1978, Hedstrom and Houston [7] defined the strongly prime ideal, that is a proper ideal P of R such that for $a, b \in K$ with $ab \in P$, either $a \in P$ or $b \in P$ where K is the quotient field of R . In 2003, Anderson and Smith [1] introduced the notion of a weakly prime ideal, i.e., a proper ideal P of R with the property that for $a, b \in R$, $0 \neq ab \in P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$. So a prime ideal is weakly prime. In 2005, Bhatwadekar and Sharma [6] introduced the notion of almost prime ideal which is also a generalization of prime ideal. A proper ideal I of an integral domain R is said to be almost prime if for $a, b \in R$ with $ab \in I \setminus I^2$, then either $a \in I$ or $b \in I$, and it is clear that every weakly prime ideal is an almost prime ideal. Another generalization of prime ideal is 2-prime; Indeed, a nonzero proper ideal I of R is called 2-prime if whenever $a, b \in R$ and $ab \in I$, then $a^2 \in I$ or $b^2 \in I$ (See [5] and [9] for more details). The notion of 2-absorbing ideals was introduced and investigated in 2007 by Badawi [2]. A nonzero proper ideal I of R is called 2-absorbing if whenever $a, b, c \in R$ and $abc \in I$, then $ab \in I$ or $ac \in I$ or $bc \in I$. In [3], Badawi and Darani extended the concept of weakly prime ideal to weakly 2-absorbing ideal. A proper ideal I of R is said to be a weakly 2-absorbing ideal of R if whenever $a, b, c \in R$ with $0 \neq abc \in I$ implies $ab \in I$ or $ac \in I$ or $bc \in I$. In [4], 1-absorbing primary ideal was introduced and studied. A proper ideal I of R is called 1-absorbing primary if for all nonunit $a, b, c \in R$ such that $abc \in I$, then either $ab \in I$ or $c \in \sqrt{I}$. Recall that 1-absorbing prime ideals, as a generalization of prime ideals, were introduced and investigated in [11]. In this paper, we extend the concepts of weakly prime ideal and 1-absorbing primary ideal to weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal.

A proper ideal I of R is called (*weakly*) 1-absorbing prime if for all nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$ such that $(0 \neq)abc \in I$, then either $ab \in I$ or $c \in I$. Clearly, every weakly prime ideal is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal. However, the converse is not true.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, first we give the definition of weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals (Definition 2.1). For nontrivial weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals see Example 2.3. Also, it is proved (Theorem 2.6) that if I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R that is not 1-absorbing prime, then $I^3 = 0$. In Theorem 2.10 we give a condition under which every weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R is 1-absorbing prime. Among other things, it is shown (Theorem 2.12) that the radical of a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R need not be a prime ideal of R . Finally, it is proved (Theorem 2.23) that if I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R and $0 \neq I_1 I_2 I_3 \subseteq I$ for some ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of

R such that I is free triple-zero with respect to $I_1I_2I_3$, then $I_1I_2 \subseteq I$ or $I_3 \subseteq I$. In Section 3, we characterize rings with the property that all proper ideals are weakly 1-absorbing prime.

2 Weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals

In this section, the concept of weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals is introduced and investigated. We start with the following definitions.

Definition 2.1 *Let R be a ring. A proper ideal I of R is called weakly 1-absorbing prime if for all nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$ such that $0 \neq abc \in I$, then $ab \in I$ or $c \in I$.*

Definition 2.2 *Suppose that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R and $a, b, c \in R$ are nonunit elements.*

(1) *We say (a, b, c) is a triple-zero of I if $abc = 0$, $ab \notin I$ and $c \notin I$.*

(2) *Suppose that $I_1I_2I_3 \subseteq I$, for some ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of R . We say I is free triple-zero with respect to $I_1I_2I_3$, if (a, b, c) is not a triple-zero of I , for every $a \in I_1, b \in I_2$, and $c \in I_3$.*

It is easy to see that if I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal that is not 1-absorbing prime, then there exists a triple-zero of I . Note that every weakly prime ideal is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal, and every weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal is a weakly 2-absorbing prime ideal. The following example provides a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal that is not 1-absorbing prime, a weakly 2-absorbing ideal that is not weakly 1-absorbing prime and a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal that is not weakly prime.

Example 2.3 (1) Consider the ideal $J = \{0, 4\}$ of \mathbb{Z}_8 . Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_8(+)J$ and $I = \{(0, 0), (0, 4)\}$. It is easy to see that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal, since $abc \in I$ for some $a, b, c \in R \setminus I$ if and only if $abc = (0, 0)$. But, $(2, 0)(2, 0)(2, 0) \in I$ and both $(4, 0) \notin I$ and $(2, 0) \notin I$, thus I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal that is not 1-absorbing prime.

(2) Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$, where R_1, R_2, R_3 are fields and $I = R_1 \times \{0\} \times \{0\}$. One can easily see that the ideal I is not weakly 1-absorbing prime, since

$(0, 0, 0) \neq (1, 0, 1)(1, 0, 1)(1, 1, 0) = (1, 0, 0) \in I$ and neither $(1, 0, 1)(1, 0, 1) = (1, 0, 1) \in I$ nor $(1, 1, 0) \in I$. But I is a weakly 2-absorbing ideal of R , by [3, Theorem 3.5]. Hence every weakly 2-absorbing ideal need not be weakly 1-absorbing prime.

(3) Consider the ideal $J = \{0, 4, 8\}$ of the ring \mathbb{Z}_{12} . Clearly, J is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of \mathbb{Z}_{12} that is not weakly prime.

Proposition 2.4 *Let R be a ring, I a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and c be a nonunit element of $R \setminus I$. Then $(I : c)$ is a weakly prime ideal of R .*

Proof. Assume that $0 \neq ab \in (I : c)$ for some nonunit element $c \in R \setminus I$ such that $a \notin (I : c)$. We may assume that a, b are nonunit elements of R . As $0 \neq abc = acb \in I$ and $ac \notin I$ and I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , we have $b \in I \subseteq (I : c)$. Hence $(I : c)$ is a weakly prime ideal of R . \square

Let R be a local ring and I be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R which is not 1-absorbing prime. To prove $I^3 = 0$, the following lemma is needed.

Lemma 2.5 *Let I be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a local ring R and let (a, b, c) be a triple-zero of I for some nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$. Then the following statements hold.*

$$(1) \quad abI = acI = bcI = 0.$$

$$(2) \quad aI^2 = bI^2 = cI^2 = 0.$$

Proof. (1) Assume that $abI \neq 0$. Then there exists $x \in I$ such that $abx \neq 0$. Therefore $ab(c+x) \neq 0$. Since $ab \notin I$ and I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal, $(c+x) \in I$, and hence $c \in I$, a contradiction. Thus $abI = 0$. Now suppose that $acI \neq 0$. Then there exists $x \in I$ such that $acx \neq 0$. Therefore $a(b+x)c \neq 0$. Since $c \notin I$ and I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal, $a(b+x) \in I$, and so $ab \in I$, a contradiction. Thus $acI = 0$. Similarly, one can easily see that $bcI = 0$.

(2) Assume that $axy \neq 0$ for some $x, y \in I$. By part (1), $a(b+x)(c+y) = axy \neq 0$. Since R is local, the set of nonunit elements of R is an ideal of R . Therefore $(b+x), (c+y)$ are nonunit elements of R . This means that either $a(b+x) \in I$ or $c+y \in I$. Hence either $ab \in I$ or $c \in I$, a contradiction. Thus $aI^2 = 0$. Similarly, one can easily show that $bI^2 = cI^2 = 0$. \square

Theorem 2.6 *Let I be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a local ring R that is not 1-absorbing prime. Then $I^3 = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R that is not 1-absorbing prime. Then there exists a triple-zero (a, b, c) of I for some nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$. Suppose that $I^3 \neq 0$. Hence $xyz \neq 0$ for some $x, y, z \in I$. By Lemma 2.5, $(a+x)(b+y)(c+z) = xyz \neq 0$. Since R is local, the set of nonunit elements of R is an ideal of R . Therefore $(a+x), (b+y)$ and $(c+z)$ are nonunit elements. Hence either $(a+x)(b+y) \in I$ or $(c+z) \in I$, and so either $ab \in I$ or $c \in I$, a contradiction. Thus $I^3 = 0$. \square

It is worth mentioning that if I is an ideal of a ring R such that $I^3 = 0$, then I need not be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal. For example, let $R = \mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z}$ and $I = 8\mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z}$. Then $I^3 = 0$, but $\bar{0} \neq \bar{2} \cdot \bar{2} \cdot \bar{2} = \bar{8} \in I$ and $\bar{2}, \bar{4} \notin I$.

Now, we state the following corollary.

Corollary 2.7 (1) *Let I be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a local ring R that is not 1-absorbing prime. Then $\sqrt{I} = \sqrt{0}$.*

(2) *If R is a reduced local ring and $I \neq 0$ is a proper ideal of R , then I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R if and only if I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .*

Theorem 2.8 *Let I be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a local ring R that is not 1-absorbing prime. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *If $w \in \sqrt{0}$, then either $w^2 \in I$ or $w^2I = wI^2 = \{0\}$.*
- (2) *$\sqrt{0}^2I^2 = \{0\}$.*

Proof. (1) Suppose that $w \in \sqrt{0}$ such that $w^2I \neq \{0\}$. Suppose also that n is the least positive integer such that $w^n = 0$. Then $n \geq 3$ and $w^2(x + w^{n-2}) = w^2x \neq 0$ for some $x \in I$. Therefore, either $w^2 \in I$ or $(x + w^{n-2}) \in I$, since R is local (which means that $(x + w^{n-2})$ is nonunit) and I is weakly 1-absorbing prime. If $(x + w^{n-2}) \in I$, then $w^{n-2} \in I$, and so $w^2 \in I$, as $w^{n-4} \notin I$. Hence $w^2 \in I$. Thus either $w^2 \in I$ or $w^2I = \{0\}$, for every $w \in \sqrt{0}$. Next, we show that $wI^2 = \{0\}$. Suppose that $wI^2 \neq \{0\}$ and $w^2 \notin I$. Then $w^2I = \{0\}$ and $wxy \neq 0$ for some $x, y \in I$. Let m be the least positive integer such that $w^m = 0$. This means that $m \geq 3$ and $w^2I = 0$. Therefore $w(w+x)(w^{m-2} + y) = wxy \neq 0$. But R is local (which means that $(y + w^{n-2})$ is non unit) and I is weakly 1-absorbing prime, hence either $w^2 \in I$ or $w^{m-2} \in I$, a contradiction. Thus $wI^2 = \{0\}$.

(2) Suppose that $a, b \in \sqrt{0}$. It follows from part (1) that if either $a^2 \notin I$ or $b^2 \notin I$, then $abI^2 = \{0\}$. Hence assume that $a^2 \in I$ and $b^2 \in I$, which means that $ab(a+b) \in I$. We distinguish two cases, according as $(a, b, a+b)$ is a triple-zero of I or not. If $(a, b, a+b)$ is

a triple-zero of I , then $abI = \{0\}$, by Lemma 2.5 (1), and thus $\sqrt{0}^2 I^2 = \{0\}$. If $(a, b, a+b)$ is not a triple-zero of I , then it is easily seen that $ab \in I$, and so $\sqrt{0}^2 I^2 = \{0\}$, by Theorem 2.6. \square

Corollary 2.7 and Theorem 2.8 lead to the following corollary.

Corollary 2.9 *Let I, J, K be weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals of a local ring R such that none of them is 1-absorbing prime. Then $I^2 JK = IJ^2 K = IJK^2 = I^2 J^2 = I^2 K^2 = J^2 K^2 = \{0\}$.*

If I is a proper ideal of R , it is well known that \sqrt{I} is a prime ideal of R if and only if \sqrt{I} is a primary ideal of R . In the following result, we give a condition under which every weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R is 1-absorbing prime.

Theorem 2.10 *Suppose that I is a proper ideal of R such that $\sqrt{0} \subseteq I$ and $\sqrt{0}$ is a prime (primary) ideal of R . Then I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R if and only if I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .*

Proof. Suppose that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of the ring R and $xyz \in I$ for some nonunit elements $x, y, z \in R$. If $xyz \neq 0$, then either $xy \in I$ or $z \in I$. Therefore assume that $xyz = 0$ and $z \notin I$. Since $xyz = 0 \in \sqrt{0}$ which is a prime ideal of R , we conclude that $xy \in \sqrt{0} \subseteq I$. Thus I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R if and only if I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . \square

In the following result, we give a condition under which a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R is not 1-absorbing prime.

Theorem 2.11 *Suppose that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a local ring R and $\{0\}$ has a triple-zero (a, b, c) for some nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$ such that $ab \notin \sqrt{0}$. Then I is not a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R if and only if $I \subseteq \sqrt{0}$.*

Proof. Suppose that I is not a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Hence, by part (1) of Corollary 2.7, $I \subseteq \sqrt{0}$. Conversely, suppose that $I \subseteq \sqrt{0}$ and $\{0\}$ has a triple-zero (a, b, c) for some nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$ such that $ab \notin \sqrt{0}$. Then $ab \notin I$ and $c \notin I$. Hence (a, b, c) is a triple-zero of I , and thus I is not a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . \square

One can easily see that if I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R , then there exists just one prime ideal of R that is minimal over I . In the following result, we show that for

every positive integer $n \geq 2$, there exist a ring R and a nonzero weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal I of R such that there are exactly n prime ideals of R that are minimal over I .

Theorem 2.12 *Suppose that $n \geq 2$ is a positive integer. Then there exist a ring R and a nonzero weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal I of R such that I has exactly n minimal prime ideals of R .*

Proof. Suppose that $n \geq 2$ is a positive integer and $D = \mathbb{Z}_8 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_8$ (n times). Clearly, $M = \{\bar{0}, \bar{4}\}$ is an ideal of \mathbb{Z}_8 . Define the D -module M such that $xM = a_1M$ for every $x = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in D$ and consider the idealization ring $R = D(+)M$ and the ideal $I = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}(+)M$ of R . It follows from [8, Theorem 25.1 (3)] that every prime ideal of R is of the form $P(+)M$ for some prime ideal P of D and since for every $a, b, c \in R \setminus I$ and $abc \in I$, we deduce that $abc = ((0, \dots, 0), 0)$. Hence I is a nonzero weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , and thus there are exactly n prime ideals of R that are minimal over I . \square

In the next result, one can see that in a reduced ring, the radical of a nonzero weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal is a prime ideal.

Theorem 2.13 *Let R be a reduced ring and I a nonzero weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Then \sqrt{I} is a prime ideal of R .*

Proof. Let $0 \neq ab \in \sqrt{I}$ for some $a, b \in R$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that a, b are nonunit. Then $(ab)^n \in I$ for some positive integer n , and so $(ab)^n \neq 0$, because R is reduced. Therefore $0 \neq a^m a^{(n-m)} b^n \in I$ for some positive integer m , and hence either $a^m a^{(n-m)} = a^n \in I$ or $b^n \in I$. Thus \sqrt{I} is a weakly prime ideal of R . But R is reduced and $I \neq \{0\}$, hence \sqrt{I} is a prime ideal of R , by [1, Corollary 2]. \square

It was shown in [11, Theorem 2.4] that if R is a non-local ring, then every 1-absorbing prime ideal is prime. In the following theorem, we show that if R is a non-local ring and I is a proper ideal of R having the property that $\text{ann}(x)$ is not a maximal ideal of R for every element $x \in I$, then I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal if and only if I is a weakly prime ideal.

Theorem 2.14 *Let R be a non-local ring and I a proper ideal of R having the property that $\text{ann}(x)$ is not a maximal ideal of R for every element $x \in I$. Then I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal if and only if I is a weakly prime ideal.*

Proof. It is easy to see that every weakly prime ideal of R is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Then assume that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and let $0 \neq ab \in I$ for some $a, b \in R$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that a, b are nonunit. Since $ab \neq 0$, $\text{ann}(ab)$ is a proper ideal of R , and so $\text{ann}(ab) \subset L$, for some maximal ideal L of R . But R is a non-local ring, hence there exists a maximal ideal M of R such that $M \neq L$. Suppose that $m \in M \setminus L$. Then $m \notin \text{ann}(ab)$, which means that $0 \neq mab \in I$. Since I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , either $ma \in I$ or $b \in I$. If $b \in I$, then the proof is complete. So suppose that $b \notin I$. Therefore $ma \in I$. But $m \notin L$ and L is a maximal ideal of R , hence $m \notin J(R)$. This means that there exists an $r \in R$ such that $1+rm$ is a nonunit element of R . We take the following two cases: **Case one:** if $1+rm \notin \text{ann}(ab)$, then $0 \neq (1+rm)ab \notin I$. Since I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and $b \notin I$, we conclude that $(1+rm)a = a+rma \in I$. But $rma \in I$, so $a \in I$ and I is a weakly prime ideal of R . **Case two:** Suppose that $1+rm \in \text{ann}(ab)$. Since $\text{ann}(ab)$ is not a maximal ideal of R and $\text{ann}(ab) \subset L$, there exists an element $w \in L \setminus \text{ann}(ab)$. Therefore $0 \neq wab \in I$. But I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and $b \notin I$, thus $wa \in I$. We have $1+rm+w$ is a nonzero nonunit element of L , because $1+rm \in \text{ann}(ab) \subset L$ and $w \in L \setminus \text{ann}(ab)$. Thus $0 \neq (1+rm+w)ab \in I$. Now, since I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and $b \notin I$, we have $(1+rm+w)a = a+rma+wa \in I$. Hence $a \in I$, and thus I is a weakly prime ideal of R . \square

Let R be an integral domain with the quotient field K . Recall that a proper ideal I of R is called invertible if $II^{-1} = R$, where $I^{-1} = \{r \in K : rI \subseteq R\}$. An integral domain is called a Dedekind domain if every nonzero proper ideal of R is invertible. In the following results, weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals of Dedekind domains and principal ideal domains are completely described.

Theorem 2.15 *Let R be a Noetherian integral domain that is not a field and I an ideal of R . Then (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3).*

(1) R is a Dedekind domain;

(2) If I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , then $I = M$ or $I = M^2$ where M is a maximal ideal of R ;

(3) If I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , then $I = P$ or $I = P^2$ where $P = \sqrt{I}$ is a prime ideal of R .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose that R is a Noetherian integral domain that is not a field and I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R such that $P = \sqrt{I}$. Since R is a Dedekind domain, we conclude that every nonzero prime ideal of R is a maximal ideal of

R . Therefore P is a maximal ideal of R , by Theorem 2.13. This means that I is a primary ideal of R such that $P^2 \subseteq I$. Hence, by [11, Theorem 2.10], $I = M$ or $I = M^2$ where M is a maximal ideal of R .

(2) \Rightarrow (3) This is obvious. □

In view of Theorem 2.15, we have the following result.

Corollary 2.16 *Let R be a principal ideal domain that is not a field and I be a nonzero proper ideal of R . If I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , then $I = pR$ or $I = p^2R$ for some nonzero prime element p of R .*

In the following theorems we show that weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals are really of interest in indecomposable rings.

Theorem 2.17 *Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2$ is a decomposable ring, where R_1 and R_2 are rings and I is a proper ideal of R_1 . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) $I \times R_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .
- (2) $I \times R_2$ is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .
- (3) I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_1 .

Proof. (3) \Rightarrow (2) and (2) \Rightarrow (1) These are clear.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose that $I \times R_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and $abc \in I$ for some nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R_1$. Suppose also that $0 \neq x \in R_2$. Then $(0, 0) \neq (a, 1)(b, 1)(c, x) = (abc, x) \in I \times R_2$, and so either $(a, 1)(b, 1) = (ab, 1) \in I \times R_2$ or $(c, x) \in I \times R_2$. Hence, either $ab \in I$ or $c \in I$. Thus I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_1 . □

Theorem 2.18 *Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2$ is a decomposable ring, where R_1 and R_2 are rings and I_1, I_2 are nonzero ideals of R_1 and R_2 , respectively. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .
- (2) $I_1 = R_1$ and I_2 is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_1 or $I_2 = R_2$ and I_1 is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_1 or I_1, I_2 are prime ideals of R_1, R_2 , respectively.
- (3) $I_1 \times I_2$ is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .
- (4) $I_1 \times I_2$ is a prime ideal of R .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let $I_1 \times I_2$ be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . If $I_1 = R_1$ ($I_2 = R_2$), then by Theorem 2.17, I_2 (I_1) is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_2 (R_1). Therefore assume that I_1 and I_2 are proper ideals. Suppose that $a, b \in R_2$ such that $ab \in I_2$ and $0 \neq x \in I_1$. Then $(0, 0) \neq (x, 1)(1, a)(1, b) = (x, ab) \in I_1 \times I_2$. But I_1 is proper, hence $(1, a) \notin I_1 \times I_2$ and $(1, b) \notin I_1 \times I_2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that x, a, b are nonunit. Since $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , we conclude that $(x, 1)(1, a) = (x, a) \in I_1 \times I_2$. Thus I_2 is a prime ideal of R_2 . Similarly, it can be easily shown that I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 .

(2) \Rightarrow (3) If $I_1 = R_1$ and I_2 is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_2 or $I_2 = R_2$ and I_1 is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_1 , then the result follows from Theorem 2.17. Assume that I_1, I_2 are prime ideals of R_1, R_2 , respectively. Since I_1, I_2 are nonzero ideals of R_1 and R_2 , assume that $(0, 0) \neq (a, b) \in I_1 \times I_2$. Then $(0, 0) \neq (a, 1)(a, 1)(1, b) = (a^2, b) \in I_1 \times I_2$. This means that either $(a, 1)(a, 1) \in I_1 \times I_2$ or $(1, b) \in I_1 \times I_2$, since $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Hence either $(a, 1) \in I_1 \times I_2$ or $(1, b) \in I_1 \times I_2$, as I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 , a contradiction. Thus $I_1 \times I_2 = R_1 \times I_2$ or $I_1 \times I_2 = I_1 \times R_2$ and in both cases $I_1 \times I_2$ is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .

(3) \Rightarrow (4) Since R is not a local ring, the proof follows from [11, Theorem 2.4].

(4) \Rightarrow (1) This is straightforward. □

Theorem 2.19 *Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2$ is a decomposable ring, where R_1 and R_2 are rings and I_1 is a nonzero proper ideal of R_1 and I_2 is a proper ideal of R_2 . Then (1) \Rightarrow (2). In fact, (2) \Rightarrow (1) need not be true.*

(1) $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R that is not a 1-absorbing prime ideal.

(2) I_1 is a weakly prime ideal of R_1 that is not a prime ideal and $I_2 = \{0\}$ is a prime ideal of R_2 .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose that $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R that is not a 1-absorbing prime ideal and $I_2 \neq \{0\}$. Hence, by Theorem 2.18, $I_1 \times I_2$ is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , a contradiction, and thus $I_2 = \{0\}$. Now, we show that I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 . Suppose that $a, b \in R_1$ such that $ab \in I_1$ and $0 \neq x \in I_1$. Then $(0, 0) \neq (x, 1)(1, a)(1, b) = (x, ab) \in I_1 \times I_2$. But I_1 is proper, hence $(1, a) \notin I_1 \times I_2$ and $(1, b) \notin I_1 \times I_2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that x, a, b are nonunit. Since $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , $(x, 1)(1, a) = (x, a) \in I_1 \times I_2$. Thus $I_2 = \{0\}$ is a prime ideal of R_2 . We show that I_1 is a weakly prime ideal of R_1 . Let $a, b \in R_1$ such that $0 \neq ab \in I_1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that a, b are nonunit. Since

$(0, 0) \neq (b, 1)(1, 0)(ab, 1) = (ab^2, 0) \in I_1 \times I_2$ and $(ab, 1) \notin I_1 \times \{0\}$ and $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , we conclude that $(b, 0) \in I_1 \times \{0\}$, and hence $b \in I_1$. Thus I_1 is a weakly prime ideal of R_1 . Assume that I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 . Since I_1 is a nonzero ideal of R_1 , assume that $0 \neq a \in I_1$. Then $(0, 0) \neq (a, 1)(a, 1)(1, 0) = (a^2, 0) \in I_1 \times I_2$. This means that either $(a, 1)(a, 1) \in I_1 \times I_2$ or $(1, 0) \in I_1 \times I_2$, as $I_1 \times I_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Hence either $(a, 1) \in I_1 \times I_2$ or $(1, 0) \in I_1 \times I_2$, as I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 , a contradiction. Thus I_1 is a weakly prime ideal of R_1 that is not a prime ideal and $I_2 = \{0\}$ is a prime ideal of R_2 .

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Assume that I_1 is a weakly prime ideal of R_1 that is not a prime ideal and $I_2 = \{0\}$ is a prime ideal of R_2 . We show that $I_1 \times I_2$ need not be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Since $I_1 \neq 0$, there exists $0 \neq x \in I_1$, and so $(0, 0) \neq (a, 1)(a, 1)(1, 0) = (a^2, 0) \in I_1 \times \{0\}$. Since neither $(a, 1)(a, 1) = (a^2, 1) \in I_1 \times \{0\}$ nor $(1, 0) \notin I_1 \times \{0\}$ and I_1 is proper, we conclude that $I_1 \times I_2$ is not a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . \square

In the following, we show that in a decomposable ring $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$ every nonzero weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R is 1-absorbing prime.

Theorem 2.20 *Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$ is a decomposable ring, where R_1, R_2 and R_3 are rings and $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ is a nonzero proper ideal of R . Then I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal if and only if I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal.*

Proof. Let $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ be a nonzero weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Then there exists an element $(0, 0, 0) \neq (a, b, c) \in I$. Since $(a, 1, 1)(1, b, 1)(1, 1, c) = (a, b, c)$, either $(a, b, 1) \in I$ or $(1, 1, c) \in I$. Hence either $I_3 = R_3$ or $I_1 = R_1$ and $I_2 = R_2$, and so $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times R_3$ or $I = R_1 \times R_2 \times I_3$. Thus, by Theorem 2.17, I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . The converse is clear. \square

Corollary 2.21 *Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$ is a decomposable ring, where R_1, R_2 and R_3 are rings and $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ is a nonzero ideal of R . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .

(2) $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .

(3) Either $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ such that for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, I_k is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_k , and $I_j = R_j$ for every $j \in \{1, 2, 3\} - \{k\}$, or $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ such that for some $k, m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, I_k is a prime ideal of R_k , I_m is a prime ideal of R_m , and $I_j = R_j$ for every $j \in \{1, 2, 3\} - \{k, m\}$.

(4) $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ is a prime ideal of R .

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) It follows from Theorem 2.20.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Since $I = I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3$ is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , we have either $I_3 \neq R_3$ or $I_2 \neq R_2$ or $I_1 \neq R_1$. If $I_3 \neq R_3$, then by the proof of Theorem 2.20, $I_2 = R_2$ and $I_1 = R_1$, and so we are done. If $I_2 \neq R_2$, then by the proof of Theorem 2.20, either $I_3 = R_3$ and $I_1 = R_1$ or $I_3 = R_3$ and $I_1 \neq R_1$. The first case is clear, so assume that $I_3 = R_3$ and $I_1 \neq R_1$. We show that I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 and I_2 is a prime of R_2 . Suppose that $a, b \in R_1$ such that $ab \in I_1$, and $c, d \in R_2$ such that $cd \in I_2$. Then $(0, 0, 0) \neq (a, 1, 1)(1, c, 1)(b, d, 1) = (ab, cd, 1) \in I$. Hence either $a \in I_1$ or $b \in I_1$, and thus I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 . Similarly, since $(0, 0, 0) \neq (a, 1, 1)(b, c, 1)(1, d, 1) = (ab, cd, 1) \in I$, we conclude that either $c \in I_2$ or $d \in I_2$. Hence I_2 is a prime ideal of R_2 . Finally, assume that $I_1 \neq R_1$ and $I_3 = R_3$. By an argument similar to that we applied above, we conclude that I_1 is a prime ideal of R_1 and I_2 is a prime ideal of R_2 .

(3) \Rightarrow (2) This is clear.

(2) \Leftrightarrow (4) It follows from [11, Theorem 2.4]. □

The next theorem states that if I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R and $0 \neq I_1 I_2 I_3 \subseteq I$ for some ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of R such that I is free triple-zero with respect to $I_1 I_2 I_3$, then $I_1 I_2 \subseteq I$ or $I_3 \subseteq I$. First, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.22 *Let I be a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of a ring R . If $abJ \subseteq I$ for some nonunit elements $a, b \in R$ and a proper ideal J of R such that (a, b, c) is not a triple-zero of I for every $c \in J$, then $ab \in I$ or $J \subseteq I$.*

Proof. Suppose that $abJ \subseteq I$, but $ab \notin I$ and $J \not\subseteq I$. Then there exists an element $j \in J \setminus I$. But (a, b, j) is not a triple-zero of I and $abj \in I$ and $ab \notin I$ and $j \notin I$, a contradiction. □

Theorem 2.23 *Suppose that I is a proper ideal of a ring R . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .

(2) For any proper ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of R such that $0 \neq I_1 I_2 I_3 \subseteq I$ and I is free triple-zero with respect to $I_1 I_2 I_3$, we have either $I_1 I_2 \subseteq I$ or $I_3 \subseteq I$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and $0 \neq I_1 I_2 I_3 \subseteq I$ for some proper ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of R such that $I_1 I_2 \not\subseteq I$ and I is free

triple-zero with respect to $I_1I_2I_3$. Then there are nonunit elements $a \in I_1$ and $b \in I_2$ such that $ab \notin I$. Since $abI_3 \subseteq I$, $ab \notin I$ and (a, b, c) is not a triple-zero of I for every $c \in J$, it follows from Lemma 2.22 that $J \subseteq I$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that $0 \neq abc \in I$ for some nonunit elements $a, b, c \in R$ and $ab \notin I$. Suppose also that $I_1 = aR, I_2 = bR$, and $I_3 = cR$. Then $0 \neq I_1I_2I_3 \subseteq I$ and $I_1I_2 \not\subseteq I$. Hence $I_3 = cR \subseteq I$, and thus $c \in I$. \square

Suppose that I is an ideal of a ring R . It was shown in [11, Theorem 2.7], if I is 1-absorbing prime and $I_1I_2I_3 \subseteq I$ for some proper ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of R , then $I_1I_2 \subseteq I$ or $I_3 \subseteq I$. We end this section with the following question: if I is weakly 1-absorbing prime and $0 \neq I_1I_2I_3 \subseteq I$ for some proper ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 of R , does it imply that $I_1I_2 \subseteq I$ or $I_3 \subseteq I$?

3 Rings in which every proper ideal is weakly 1-absorbing prime

In this section we study rings in which every proper ideal is weakly 1-absorbing prime. To prove Theorem 3.2, the following lemma is needed.

Lemma 3.1 *Let R be a ring. Then for every $a, b, c \in J(R)$, the ideal $I = Rabc$ is weakly 1-absorbing prime if and only if $abc = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that R is a ring, $a, b, c \in J(R)$ and $I = Rabc$ is an ideal of R . One can easily see that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , if $abc = 0$. So assume that I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and $abc \neq 0$. Hence a, b, c are nonunit, and so either $ab \in I$ or $c \in I$. If $ab \in I$, then $ab = abcx$ for some $x \in R$, and thus $ab(1 - cx) = 0$. This follows that $ab = 0$, since $cx \in J(R)$ which means that $1 - cx$ is unit. Therefore $abc = 0$, a contradiction. If $c \in I$, by a similar argument, we can see that $c(1 - abk) = 0$ for some $x \in R$. This implies that $c = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $abc = 0$. \square

Theorem 3.2 *Let R be a local ring with a unique maximal ideal M . Then every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime if and only if $M^3 = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that R is local with a maximal ideal M and every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $abc = 0$ for every $a, b, c \in M$, since $abcR$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal. Therefore $M^3 = \{0\}$. Conversely, suppose that $M^3 = \{0\}$ and I is a nonzero proper ideal of R . Suppose also that $0 \neq abc \in I$ for

some nonunit elements a, b, c of R . Then $a, b, c \in M$. But $M^3 = \{0\}$ and $0 \neq abc$, hence either a is a unit of R or b is a unit of R or c is a unit of R , a contradiction. Thus I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal. \square

Corollary 3.3 *Suppose that R is a local ring with a unique maximal ideal M such that $M^2 = \{0\}$. Then every proper ideal of R is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R .*

Proof. Suppose that R is local with a maximal ideal M and I is a proper ideal of R . It follows from Theorem 3.2 that I is weakly 1-absorbing prime, because $M^3 = \{0\}$. Therefore assume that $0 = abc \in I$ for some nonunit elements a, b, c of R . This means that $a, b, c \in M$. Since $M^2 = \{0\}$, $abc = 0$ and M^2 is primary, we conclude that either $c \in M^2 \subseteq I$ or $ab \in M$. In the second case, it easy to see that $ab = 0 \in I$. Thus I is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . \square

Theorem 3.4 *Suppose that R_1 and R_2 are rings and $R = R_1 \times R_2$. If R_1 and R_2 are local with maximal ideals M_1 and M_2 , respectively, and every proper ideal of R is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , then M_1^2, M_2^2 are zero ideals and either R_1 or R_2 is a field.*

Proof. Suppose that R_1 and R_2 are local rings with maximal ideals M_1 and M_2 , respectively, and $R = R_1 \times R_2$. First, suppose that every proper ideal of R is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R and $a, b \in M_1$ such that $ab \neq 0$. Then the ideal $I = abR_1 \times \{0\}$ of R is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Without loss of generality, we may assume that a, b are nonunit. But $(0, 0) \neq (a, 1)(b, 1)(1, 0) = (ab, 0) \in I$ and I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R , hence $(1, 0) \in I$, since $(a, 1)(b, 1) \notin I$, and so $1 = abx$ for some $x \in R_1$. This means that $1 - abx = 0$, a contradiction, as $1 - abx$ is a unit element of R_1 . Therefore $M_1^2 = \{0\}$. By a similar argument as above and taking the ideal $I = \{0\} \times abR_1$, one can see that $M_2^2 = \{0\}$. Now, assume that R_1 and R_2 are not fields and look for a contradiction. It follows that $M_1 \neq \{0\}$, and so the ideal $J = M_1 \times \{0\}$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . But $M_2^2 = \{0\}$ and R_2 is not a field, hence there exists $c \in M_2$ such that $c \neq 0$. Suppose that $0 \neq m_1 \in M_1$. Then $(0, 0) \neq (m_1, 1)(1, c)(1, c) = (m_1, c^2) = (m_1, 0) \in J = M_1 \times \{0\}$ which is a contradiction, since both $(m_1, 1)(1, c) = (m_1, c) \notin J$ and $(1, c) \notin J$. Thus either R_1 or R_2 is a field. \square

Finally, we characterize rings in which every ideal is weakly 1-absorbing prime. To this end, the following lemma is needed.

Lemma 3.5 (1) *Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$, where R_1, R_2 and R_3 are rings. If every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime, then R_1, R_2, R_3 are fields.*

(2) Let R be a ring and every proper ideal of R be weakly 1-absorbing prime. Then R has at most three maximal ideals.

Proof. (1) Let $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$ be a decomposable ring, where R_1, R_2 and R_3 are rings such that every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime. Without loss of generality, assume that R_1 is not a field. Let J be a non-zero proper ideal of R_1 and m be a non-zero element of J . Suppose that $I = J \times \{0\} \times \{0\}$. Then I is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Since $(0, 0, 0) \neq (m, 1, 1)(1, 0, 1)(1, 1, 0) = (m, 0, 0) \in I$ and both $(m, 1, 1)(1, 0, 1) = (m, 0, 1) \notin I$ and $(1, 1, 0) \notin I$, we have a contradiction. Hence R_1, R_2, R_3 are fields.

(2) Let M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4 be distinct maximal ideals of R and $I = M_1 \cap M_2 \cap M_3$. Since every weakly 1-absorbing prime is weakly 2-absorbing, and by [2, Theorem 2.5], I is not a 2-absorbing ideal of R , we conclude that I is a weakly 2-absorbing ideal of R that is not a 2-absorbing ideal of R . Therefore, by [3, Theorem 2.4], $I^3 = \{0\}$, a contradiction. Thus R has at most three distinct maximal ideals. \square

We end this paper with the following result.

Theorem 3.6 *Let R be a ring. If (1) every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime, then either (2) R is a local ring with a unique maximal ideal M such that $M^3 = 0$ or (3) $R = R_1 \times R_2$, where R_1 is a local ring with a unique maximal ideal M_1 such that $M_1^2 = 0$ and R_2 is a field or (4) $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$, where R_1, R_2, R_3 are fields. Furthermore, (2) \Rightarrow (1) but (3) \Rightarrow (1) and (4) \Rightarrow (1) need not necessarily be true.*

Proof. If R satisfies condition (2), then the condition (1) follows from Theorem 3.2. Suppose R satisfies condition (3), i.e., $R = R_1 \times R_2$, where R_1 is local with a unique maximal ideal M_1 such that $M_1^2 = 0$ and R_2 is a field. Since R_2 is a field and every proper ideal of R_1 is a 1-absorbing prime, we conclude that the ideals $\{0\} \times R_2$ and $R_1 \times \{0\}$ are weakly 1-absorbing prime ideals of R . Suppose that J is a non-zero proper ideal of R_1 . It follows from Theorem 2.17 that $J \times R_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal, since J is a 1-absorbing prime ideal of R_1 , by Corollary 3.3. Hence, it is enough to prove that $J \times \{0\}$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Let $0 \neq a \in J$. Then $(0, 0, 0) \neq (a, 1)(a, 1)(1, 0) = (a^2, 0, 0) \in J \times \{0\}$ and both $(a^2, 1) \notin J \times \{0\}$ and $(1, 0) \notin J \times \{0\}$. Thus the condition (3) \Rightarrow (1) need not necessarily be true. Suppose that R satisfies condition (4), i.e., $R = R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3$, where R_1, R_2, R_3 are fields. By taking $I = R_1 \times \{0\} \times \{0\}$, where R_1 is a field, one can easily see that the ideal I is not weakly 1-absorbing prime, because $(0, 0, 0) \neq (1, 0, 1)(1, 0, 1)(1, 1, 0) = (1, 0, 0) \in I$ and neither $(1, 0, 1)(1, 0, 1) = (1, 0, 1) \in I$ nor $(1, 1, 0) \in I$, showing that the condition (4) \Rightarrow (1) need not necessarily be true. To

complete the proof, assume that every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime. It follows from Lemma 3.5 part (2) that R has at most three maximal ideals, and so if R is local with a unique maximal M , then by Theorem 3.2, $M^3 = \{0\}$. Thus R satisfies (2). If R has two maximal ideals M_1 and M_2 , then $J(R) = M_1 \cap M_2$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R . Since every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime, $Rabc$ is weakly 1-absorbing prime, for every $a, b, c \in J(R)$. Hence $abc = 0$, by Lemma 3.1, and this means that $J(R)^3 = M_1^3 \cap M_2^3 = \{0\}$. Thus, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem $R \cong R/M_1^3 \times R/M_2^3$. But R/M_1^3 and R/M_2^3 are local rings and every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime. Hence, by Theorem 3.4, either R/M_1^3 or R/M_2^3 is a field and $N^2 = J^2 = 0$, where N and J are the maximal ideals of R/M_1^3 and R/M_2^3 , respectively. Thus R satisfies (3). If R has three maximal ideals M_1, M_2 and M_3 , then $J(R) = M_1 \cap M_2 \cap M_3$ is a weakly 1-absorbing prime ideal of R (weakly 2-absorbing ideal). But $J(R)$ is not a 2-absorbing, hence, by [3, Theorem 2.4], $J(R)^3 = M_1^3 \cap M_2^3 \cap M_3^3 = \{0\}$. Thus, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem, $R \cong R/M_1^3 \times R/M_2^3 \times R/M_3^3$. Since every proper ideal of R is weakly 1-absorbing prime, Lemma 3.5 implies that $R/M_1^3, R/M_2^3$ and R/M_3^3 are fields. Thus R satisfies (4). \square

References

- [1] D. D. Anderson, E. Smith, Weakly prime ideals, *Houston J. Math.* 29 (2003) 831–840.
- [2] A. Badawi, On 2-absorbing ideals of commutative rings, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* 75 (2007) 417–429.
- [3] A. Badawi, A. Y. Darani, On weakly 2-absorbing ideals of commutative rings, *Houston J. Math.* 39 (2013) 441–452.
- [4] A. Badawi, E. Yetkin, On 1-absorbing primary ideals of commutative rings, *J. Algebra Appl.* (2020), 2050111.
- [5] C. Beddani, W. Messirdi, 2-prime ideals and their applications, *J. Algebra Appl.* 15 (2016) 1650051.
- [6] S. M. Bhatwadekar, P. K. Sharma, Unique factorization and birth of almost primes, *Comm. Algebra* 33 (2005) 43–49.
- [7] J. R. Hedstrom, E.G. Houston, Pseudo-valuation domains, *Pacific J. Math.* 75 (1978) 137–147.
- [8] J. A. Huckaba, *Commutative Rings with Zero-Divisors*, Marcel Dekker, New York/Basil, 1988.
- [9] R. Nikandish, M. J. Nikmehr, A. Yassine, More on the 2-prime ideals of commutative rings, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* 57 (2020) 117–126.

- [10] R. Y. Sharp, *Steps in Commutative Algebra*, 2nd ed. London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 51. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [11] A. Yassine, M. J. Nikmehr, R. Nikandish, On 1-absorbing prime ideals of commutative rings, to appear in *J. Algebra Appl.*