

1-1-2022

On the extended zero-divisor graph of strictly partial transformation semigroup

EMRAH KORKMAZ

Follow this and additional works at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

KORKMAZ, EMRAH (2022) "On the extended zero-divisor graph of strictly partial transformation semigroup," *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*: Vol. 46: No. 6, Article 15. <https://doi.org/10.55730/1300-0098.3267>

Available at: <https://journals.tubitak.gov.tr/math/vol46/iss6/15>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. It has been accepted for inclusion in Turkish Journal of Mathematics by an authorized editor of TÜBİTAK Academic Journals. For more information, please contact academic.publications@tubitak.gov.tr.

On the extended zero-divisor graph of strictly partial transformation semigroup

Emrah KORKMAZ* 

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences and Arts, Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey

Received: 02.02.2022

Accepted/Published Online: 28.04.2022

Final Version: 04.07.2022

Abstract: Given a commutative ring R , the zero-divisor graph of R is an undirected simple graph with vertices the nonzero zero-divisors of R , and two distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $xy = 0$. In [8], Redmond presented different versions of zero-divisor graphs of noncommutative rings. The main aim of this paper is to analyse these graphs for the semigroup \mathcal{SP}_n of all strictly partial transformations on the set $X_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Key words: Strictly partial transformation, zero-divisor graph, clique number, chromatic number

1. Introduction

The concept of zero-divisor graphs was introduced by Beck in 1988 [2]. In this pioneering work, the author predominantly focused on the coloring of rings and let all elements of R be vertices of the graphs. Several decades later in [1], Anderson and Livingston presented the standard definition of zero-divisor graphs on commutative rings with identity. In this study, the authors let R be a commutative ring and let $Z(R)$ be its set of zero-divisors and considered the zero-divisor of R as a simple undirected graph having vertex set $Z(R) \setminus \{0\}$ in which two distinct vertices x, y are adjacent if and only if $xy = 0$. DeMeyer et al. utilized this standard definition on commutative semigroups with zero in [6, 7]. Further, several other studies (e.g., [4, 5, 7]) have extensively explored the zero-divisor graph of commutative semigroups.

For any set X contained in a ring R , let $X^* = X \setminus \{0\}$. For a ring R , let $Z(R) = \{x \in R : xy = 0 \text{ or } zx = 0 \text{ for some } y, z \in R^*\}$ is the set of zero-divisors of R and $T(R) = \{x \in R : xy = 0 = zx \text{ for some } y, z \in R^*\}$ is the set of two-sided zero-divisors of R . Afterwards, Redmond generalized the zero-divisor graph to noncommutative rings in numerous ways in [8] and presented the following:

- Let R be a noncommutative ring. We define a directed graph $G(R)$ with vertices $Z(R)^* = Z(R) \setminus \{0\}$, where $x \rightarrow y$ is an edge between distinct vertices x and y if and only if $xy = 0$.
- Let R be a noncommutative ring. We define an undirected graph $\overline{G}(R)$ with vertices $Z(R)^* = Z(R) \setminus \{0\}$, where distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if either $xy = 0$ or $yx = 0$.
- Let R be a noncommutative ring. We define an undirected graph $\overline{G}(R)$ with vertices $T(R)^* = T(R) \setminus \{0\}$, where distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $xy = yx = 0$.

*Correspondence: emrahkorkmaz90@gmail.com

2010 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 20M20, 97K30

- Let R be a noncommutative ring. We define an undirected graph $\overline{G}(R)$ with vertices $Z(R)^* = Z(R) \setminus \{0\}$, where distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $xy = yx = 0$.

The third definition coincides with the usual definition of the zero-divisor graph when R is a commutative ring. These concepts carry over to noncommutative semigroups by taking the semigroup S with zero instead of R . There are several papers (e.g., [12–14]) presenting the study of these definitions for noncommutative semigroups.

Notation 1.1 For $\alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n$ we denote the domain of α by $\text{dom}(\alpha)$, the image of α by $\text{im}(\alpha)$ and the codomain of α by $\text{codom}(\alpha)$. A partial transformation $\alpha : \text{dom}(\alpha) \subseteq X_n \rightarrow \text{im}(\alpha) \subseteq X_n$ is called strictly partial provided that $\text{dom}(\alpha) \neq X_n$, that is, $\text{codom}(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n$ and $i \in X_n$, we will write $i\alpha = -$ if and only if $i \in \text{codom}(\alpha)$. The strictly partial transformation on X_n will be denoted by 0 if $\text{codom}(\alpha) = X_n$. For any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we shall use the notation $x\alpha$ instead of $\alpha(x)$, so that the composition $(x\alpha)\beta$ is written as $x(\alpha\beta)$.

Let $\mathcal{SP}_n^* = \mathcal{SP}_n \setminus \{0\}$. For $n \geq 2$, we define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} L &= L(\mathcal{SP}_n) = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n : \alpha\beta = 0 \text{ for some } \beta \in \mathcal{SP}_n^*\}, \\ R &= R(\mathcal{SP}_n) = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n : \gamma\alpha = 0 \text{ for some } \gamma \in \mathcal{SP}_n^*\}, \\ T &= T(\mathcal{SP}_n) = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n : \alpha\beta = 0 = \gamma\alpha \text{ for some } \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{SP}_n^*\}, \\ Z &= Z(\mathcal{SP}_n) = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n : \alpha\beta = 0 \text{ or } \gamma\alpha = 0 \text{ for some } \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{SP}_n^*\} \end{aligned}$$

which are called the set of left zero-divisors, right zero-divisors, two-sided zero-divisors, and the set of zero-divisors of \mathcal{SP}_n . Let \mathcal{S}_n , \mathcal{T}_n , \mathcal{P}_n , and $\mathcal{SP}_n = \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \mathcal{T}_n$ be the symmetric group, (full) transformations semigroup, partial transformations semigroup and strictly partial transformations semigroup on the set $X_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$, respectively. It is known that $|\mathcal{P}_n| = (n+1)^n$, $|\mathcal{T}_n| = (n)^n$ and $|\mathcal{SP}_n| = (n+1)^n - n^n$. The reader is referred to [9, 10] and [11] for more details in semigroup theory and graph theory, respectively.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 1, we summarize relevant definitions and notations. In Section 2, we show that $L = R = T = Z = \mathcal{SP}_n$. Therefore, if we consider Redmond’s generalizations for \mathcal{SP}_n , then the last two definitions of Redmond’s coincide. In [14], Toker showed that \mathcal{SP}_n is the set of two-sided zero-divisors of \mathcal{P}_n . He has also analysed the zero-divisor graph of \mathcal{P}_n . For this reason, we consider the simple directed graph, denoted by $\Gamma(\mathcal{SP}_n)$, (that is, with no multiple edges or loops) with vertices $\mathcal{SP}_n^* = \mathcal{SP}_n \setminus \{0\}$, where $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is an edge between distinct vertices α and β if and only if $\alpha\beta = 0$. Then, we analyse of this graph in terms of its properties. In Section 3, we consider the simple undirected graph, denoted by $\overline{\Gamma}(\mathcal{SP}_n)$, (that is with no multiple edges or loops) with vertices $\mathcal{SP}_n^* = \mathcal{SP}_n \setminus \{0\}$, where $\alpha - \beta$ is an edge between distinct vertices α and β if and only if either $\alpha\beta = 0$ or $\beta\alpha = 0$. Then, we analyse of this graph in terms of its properties.

2. A directed zero-divisor graph of \mathcal{SP}_n

In this section, we consider the simple directed graph $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{SP}_n) = (V(\Gamma), E(\Gamma))$ with vertices \mathcal{SP}_n^* , where $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is an edge between distinct vertices α and β if and only if $\alpha\beta = 0$. For $\alpha, \beta \in V(\Gamma)$, we will write $\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta$ to mean that $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is an edge and $\beta \rightarrow \alpha$ is an edge. We begin with some results about (left/right) zero-divisors of \mathcal{SP}_n that will be needed to analyse Γ . The following simple lemma is stated without proof.

Lemma 2.1 Given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{SP}_n$, the following statements are satisfied:

(i) $\alpha\beta = 0$ if and only if $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\beta)$.

(ii) $\alpha^2 = 0$ if and only if $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\alpha)$.

Lemma 2.2 For $n \geq 2$,

$$L = R = T = Z = \mathcal{SP}_n.$$

Proof It is clear that $0 \in L, R, \mathcal{SP}_n$. For any $0 \neq \alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n$, let

$$\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & \cdots & A_r & A_{r+1} \\ a_1 & \cdots & a_r & - \end{pmatrix},$$

where $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, if we take

$$i\beta = \begin{cases} i & i \in codom(\alpha) \\ - & i \in X_n \setminus codom(\alpha) \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad i\gamma = \begin{cases} - & i \in im(\alpha) \\ i & i \in X_n \setminus im(\alpha) \end{cases}$$

then it is clear that $\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{SP}_n^*$. Since $im(\beta) \subseteq codom(\alpha)$, it follows quickly from Lemma 2.1 that $\beta\alpha = 0$, and so $\mathcal{SP}_n \subseteq R$. Similarly, since $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\gamma)$, it follows quickly from Lemma 2.1 that $\alpha\gamma = 0$, and so $\mathcal{SP}_n \subseteq L$. The proof of the lemma follows since $T = L \cap R$ and $Z = L \cup R$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ is a *directed graph*, where V is a finite nonempty set of vertices and $E \subseteq \{\{u, v\} : u, v \in V, u \neq v\}$ is the set of edges. We will write $u \rightarrow v$ to mean that $\{u, v\} \in E$. For $u, v \in V$ if there exist distinct vertices $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n \in V(G)$ such that $v_0 = u, v_n = v$ and $v_{i-1} \rightarrow v_i$ is an edge in E for each in $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $u \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_{n-1} \rightarrow v$ is called a *path* from u to v of length n in G . If there is a path between any two vertices in G , then G is called *strongly connected graph*. The length of the shortest path between u and v in G denoted by $d_G(u, v)$. The *diameter* of the graph G is defined by $diam(G) = \max\{d_G(u, v) : u, v \in V\}$.

Lemma 2.3 Γ is strongly connected and $diam(\Gamma) = 2$ for $n \geq 2$.

Proof We define $\theta_{ij} \in \mathcal{SP}_n$ such that $dom(\theta_{ij}) = \{i\}$ and $i\theta_{ij} = j$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. It is clear that $\theta_{ij} \in V(\Gamma)$. Now let $\Omega = \{\theta_{ij} \in \mathcal{SP}_n : 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ and $\lambda \in V(\Gamma) \setminus \Omega$. Since there exist $i, j \in X_n$ such that $i \notin im(\lambda)$ and $j \in codom(\lambda)$, then it follows quickly from Lemma 2.1 that $\lambda \leftrightarrow \theta_{ij}$ is a path. Moreover, for any $i, j, k, l \in X_n$ such that $i \neq k \neq j$, if we consider the transformations $\theta_{ij}, \theta_{kl} \in \Omega$, then $\theta_{ij} \leftrightarrow \theta_{kl}$ is a path. Hence, we prove that Γ is strongly connected and $diam(\Gamma) \leq 2$. Now let α and β be distinct nonadjacent vertices of Γ . Then, it is clear that there are $i, j \in X_n$ such that $i \notin im(\alpha)$ and $j \in codom(\beta)$. Therefore, $\alpha \rightarrow \theta_{ij} \rightarrow \beta$ is path, and so $diam(\Gamma) = 2$, as required.

The *girth* of the G , denoted by $gr(G)$, is the length of the shortest cycle in G . The girth is infinite if G does not contain any cycles.

Lemma 2.4 $gr(\Gamma) = 2$ for $n \geq 2$.

Proof For any two distinct $i, j \in X_n$, if we take $\theta_{ii}, \theta_{jj} \in \Omega$ which is defined as in Lemma 2.3, then it is clear that $\theta_{ii} \rightarrow \theta_{jj} \rightarrow \theta_{ii}$ is a cycle of length 2 in Γ , and so $gr(\Gamma) = 2$.

Let v be a vertex of G . The *open out-neighbourhood* of v is $\mathcal{N}^+(v) = \{u \in V : \{v, u\} \in E\}$ and the *open in-neighbourhood* of v is $\mathcal{N}^-(v) = \{u \in V : \{u, v\} \in E\}$. The *closed out-neighbourhood* of v is $\mathcal{N}^+[v] = \mathcal{N}^+(v) \cup \{v\}$ and the *closed in-neighbourhood* of v is $\mathcal{N}^-[v] = \mathcal{N}^-(v) \cup \{v\}$. The *indegree* $\deg_G(v^+)$ of a vertex v is $\deg_G(v^+) = |\mathcal{N}^+(v)|$ and the *outdegree* $\deg_G(v^-)$ of a vertex v is $\deg_G(v^-) = |\mathcal{N}^-(v)|$. Furthermore, the *maximum indegree* and the *maximum outdegree* are denoted by $\Delta^-(G)$ and $\Delta^+(G)$, respectively. $\delta^-(G)$ is the *minimum indegree* and $\delta^+(G)$ is the *minimum outdegree*.

Lemma 2.5 For $n \geq 2$, let $\alpha \in V(\Gamma)$ with $|im(\alpha)| = r$ and $|codom(\alpha)| = k$. Then,

$$\deg_{\Gamma}(\alpha^+) = \begin{cases} (n+1)^{n-r} - 1 & im(\alpha) \not\subseteq codom(\alpha) \\ (n+1)^{n-r} - 2 & im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\alpha) \end{cases} \text{ and}$$

$$\deg_{\Gamma}(\alpha^-) = \begin{cases} (k+1)^n - k^n - 1 & im(\alpha) \not\subseteq codom(\alpha) \\ (k+1)^n - k^n - 2 & im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\alpha). \end{cases}$$

Proof Let $\alpha \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $|im(\alpha)| = r$ and $|codom(\alpha)| = k$ (for $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$ and $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$).

Case 1: Let $im(\alpha) \not\subseteq codom(\alpha)$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{N}^+(\alpha)$, then $\alpha\beta = 0$, and so $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\beta)$. This means that if $i \in im(\alpha)$, then $i\beta = -$ and if $i \in X_n \setminus im(\alpha)$ then $i\beta \in X_n$ or $i\beta = -$. However, there are $(n+1)^{n-r}$ elements in this way including 0, and so $\deg_{\Gamma}(\alpha^+) = (n+1)^{n+r} - 1$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{N}^-(\alpha)$, then $\beta\alpha = 0$, and so $im(\beta) \subseteq codom(\alpha)$. This means that for $j \in X_n$, we have $j\beta \in codom(\alpha)$ or $j\beta = -$. It is clear that there are $(k+1)^n$ elements in this way including 0. But, we must exclude those elements which are chosen from $codom(\alpha)$ such that $codom(\beta) = \emptyset$, as those elements do not belong to $V(\Gamma)$. Since there are k^n elements in this way, we have $\deg_{\Gamma}(\alpha^-) = (k+1)^n - k^n - 1$.

Case 2: Let $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\alpha)$. By considering $\alpha^2 = 0$, the proof is similar to above case.

Lemma 2.5 gives us immediately the proof of the next corollary.

Corollary 2.6 $\Delta^+(\Gamma) = (n+1)^{n-1} - 1$, $\Delta^-(\Gamma) = n^n - 1$, $\delta^+(\Gamma) = n$, and $\delta^-(\Gamma) = 2^n - 1$ for $n \geq 2$.

A nonempty subset D of $V(G)$ is called a *dominating set* of G if $\bigcup_{v \in D} \mathcal{N}^+[v] = V(G)$. The *domination number* $\gamma(G)$ is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G .

Theorem 2.7 $\gamma(\Gamma) = n$ for $n \geq 2$.

Proof For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\mathcal{D} = \{\alpha_{ii} \in V(\Gamma) : dom(\alpha_{ii}) = im(\alpha_{ii}) = i\}$ and $\gamma \in V(\Gamma) \setminus \mathcal{D}$. Since there exists $j \in codom(\gamma)$, it follows quickly that $\alpha_{jj}\gamma = 0$. Furthermore, for any two distinct $i, j \in X_n$, it is clear that $\alpha_{ii}\alpha_{jj} = 0$. This yields, $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}^+[\lambda] = V(\Gamma)$, that is, \mathcal{D} is a dominating set of Γ . For $1 \leq i \leq n$,

let $\beta_{ii} \in V(\Gamma)$ such that $codom(\beta_{ii}) = i$ and $j\beta_{ii} = j$ for all $i \neq j \in X_n$. Then, we consider the set $\mathcal{A} = \{\beta_{ii} \in V(\Gamma) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Now suppose that $\alpha \in V(\Gamma)$ is an adjacent β_{ii} and β_{jj} for any two distinct $i, j \in X_n$. This yields, $\alpha\beta_{ii} = 0$ and $\alpha\beta_{jj} = 0$ if and only if $\alpha = 0$. Similarly, $\beta_{ii}\alpha = 0$ and $\beta_{jj}\alpha = 0$ if and only if $\alpha = 0$. That is contradiction. Moreover, for any two distinct $i, j \in X_n$, it is clear that β_{ii} and β_{jj} are nonadjacent vertices. Thus, we show that if \mathcal{B} is a minimum dominating set of Γ , then $|\mathcal{B}| \geq |\mathcal{A}| = n$. Since \mathcal{D} is a dominating set of Γ and $|\mathcal{D}| = n$, this proves the assertion.

The *chromatic number* of G is the minimum number of colours required to colour all vertices in G so that no two adjacent vertices receive the same colour and it is denoted by $\chi(G)$.

A *complete graph* G is a simple graph such that every vertex is adjacent to every other vertex. A complete graph on n vertices is denoted by K^n . A subset C of V is called a *clique* in G if $u \rightarrow v$ for all distinct $u, v \in C$. The *clique number* of G , denoted by $\omega(G)$, is the greatest integer r such that G has a clique K^r . For $n \geq 2$, we give a lower bound for the clique number of Γ in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.8 *If $n \geq 2$, then $\omega(\Gamma) \geq (r + 1)^{n-r} - 1$ for $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$.*

Proof The proof is the same in the given [14, Theorem 3.7].

For any graph G , it is proved in [3, Corollary, 6.2] that $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G)$. Thus, we have the next corollary.

Corollary 2.9 *If $n \geq 2$, then $\chi(\Gamma) \geq (r + 1)^{n-r} - 1$ for $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$.*

3. Undirected zero-divisor graph of \mathcal{SP}_n

In this section, we define the simple undirected graph $\bar{\Gamma} = \bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{SP}_n) = (V(\bar{\Gamma}), E(\bar{\Gamma}))$ with vertices \mathcal{SP}_n^* , where $\alpha - \beta$ is an edge between distinct vertices α and β if and only if either $\alpha\beta = 0$ or $\beta\alpha = 0$.

Let $\bar{G} = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ is an *undirected graph*, where \bar{V} is a finite nonempty set of vertices and $\bar{E} \subseteq \{(u, v) : u, v \in \bar{V}, u \neq v\}$ is the set of edges. We will write $u - v$ to mean that $(u, v) \in \bar{E}$. For $u, v \in \bar{V}$ if there exist distinct vertices $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n \in \bar{V}$ such that $v_0 = u, v_n = v$ and $v_{i-1} - v_i$ is an edge in \bar{E} for each in $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $u - v_1 - \dots - v_{n-1} - v$ is called a *path* from u to v of length n in \bar{G} . If there is a path between any two vertices in \bar{G} , then \bar{G} is called *connected graph*. The length of the shortest path between u and v in \bar{G} is denoted by $d_{\bar{G}}(u, v)$. The *diameter* of the graph \bar{G} is defined by $\text{diam}(\bar{G}) = \max\{d_{\bar{G}}(u, v) : u, v \in \bar{V}\}$.

Lemma 3.1 $\bar{\Gamma}$ is connected and $\text{diam}(\bar{\Gamma}) = 2$ for $n \geq 2$.

Proof As defined in Lemma 2.3, let $\theta_{ij} \in \mathcal{SP}_n$ such that $\text{dom}(\theta_{ij}) = \{i\}$ and $i\theta_{ij} = j$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then, we consider the set $\Omega = \{\theta_{ij} \in \mathcal{SP}_n : 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq n\}$. It is clear that $\Omega \subsetneq V(\bar{\Gamma})$.

Now assume that α and β be distinct vertices of $\bar{\Gamma}$.

Case 1: $\alpha\beta = 0$ or $\beta\alpha = 0$. Then, $\alpha - \beta$ is a path.

Now suppose that $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ and $\beta\alpha \neq 0$.

Case 2: Let $\text{im}(\alpha) \leq n - 1$ and $\text{im}(\beta) \leq n - 2$. Then, it is clear that there exist $i, j \in X_n$ such that $i \notin \text{im}(\alpha)$ and $j \in \text{codom}(\beta)$. Now if we consider the transformation $\theta_{ij} \in \Omega$, then $\alpha\theta_{ij} = 0$ and $\theta_{ij}\beta = 0$. This yields, $\alpha - \theta_{ij} - \beta$ is a path.

Case 3: Let $\text{im}(\alpha) \leq n - 2$ and $\text{im}(\beta) \leq n - 1$. The result follows by using an argument similar to the aforementioned case.

Case 4: Let $\text{im}(\alpha) = n - 1$ and $\text{im}(\beta) = n - 1$.

Subcase 1: For, $i, j \in X_n$, let $i \notin \text{im}(\alpha)$ and $j \notin \text{im}(\beta)$ such that $i \neq j$. It is clear that there exists $k \in X_n$ such that $k \in \text{codom}(\beta)$. Now if we consider the transformation $\theta_{ik} \in \Omega$, then $\alpha\theta_{ik} = 0$ and $\theta_{ik}\beta = 0$. This yields, $\alpha - \theta_{ik} - \beta$ is a path.

Subcase 2: For $i \in X_n$, let $i \notin im(\alpha)$ and $i \notin im(\beta)$. If we consider the transformation $\theta_{ii} \in \Omega$, then $\alpha\theta_{ii} = 0$ and $\beta\theta_{ii} = 0$. This yields, $\alpha - \theta_{ii} - \beta$ is a path.

Thus, we prove that $\bar{\Gamma}$ is connected and $diam(\bar{\Gamma}) \leq 2$. If we take θ_{ij} and θ_{ji} in Ω , then it is clear that θ_{ij} and θ_{ji} are nonadjacent vertices in $\bar{\Gamma}$, and so $diam(\bar{\Gamma}) = 2$.

The *girth* of the \bar{G} , denoted by $gr(\bar{G})$, is the length of the shortest cycle in \bar{G} . The girth is infinite if \bar{G} does not contain any cycles.

Lemma 3.2 $gr(\bar{\Gamma}) = 3$ for $n \geq 2$.

Proof Since $\bar{\Gamma}$ is a simple undirected graph, it is clear that $gr(\bar{\Gamma}) \geq 3$. Let i, j , and k be three distinct elements of X_n . If we consider the set $\Omega \subsetneq V(\bar{\Gamma})$ as defined in Lemma 3.1, then we have a cycle $\theta_{ii} - \theta_{jj} - \theta_{kk} - \theta_{ii}$, and so $gr(\bar{\Gamma}) = 3$.

The *degree* of a vertex v of \bar{V} , denoted $deg_{\bar{G}}(v)$, is the number of adjacent vertices to v in \bar{G} . The *maximum vertex degree* and *minimum vertex degree* in \bar{G} are denoted by $\Delta(\bar{G})$ and $\delta(\bar{G})$, respectively.

Lemma 3.3 For $n \geq 2$, let $\alpha \in V(\bar{\Gamma})$ with $|im(\alpha)| = r$ and $|codom(\alpha)| = k$. Then,

$$deg_{\bar{\Gamma}}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} (n+1)^{n-r} + (k+1)^n - k^n - (k+1)^{n-r} - 1 & im(\alpha) \not\subseteq codom(\alpha) \\ (n+1)^{n-r} + (k+1)^n - k^n - (k+1)^{n-r} - 2 & im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\alpha). \end{cases}$$

Proof Let $\alpha \in V(\bar{\Gamma})$ such that $|im(\alpha)| = r$ and $|codom(\alpha)| = k$ (for $1 \leq r \leq n-1$ and $1 \leq k \leq n-1$).

Case 1: Let $im(\alpha) \not\subseteq codom(\alpha)$. For $\beta \in \mathcal{SP}_n$, if $\alpha\beta = 0$, then $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\beta)$. For $\gamma \in \mathcal{SP}_n$, if $\gamma\alpha = 0$, then $im(\gamma) \subseteq codom(\alpha)$. Using a similar method as in the proof of Lemma 2.5, it can be easily obtained that there are $(n+1)^{n-r} - (k+1)^n - k^n$ adjacent vertices of α in $V(\bar{\Gamma})$. Now we must exclude those elements which are counted twice. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{SP}_n$, if $\alpha\lambda = 0 = \lambda\alpha$, then $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\lambda)$ and $im(\lambda) \subseteq codom(\alpha)$. This means that if $i \in im(\alpha)$, then $i\lambda = -$ and if $i \in X_n \setminus im(\alpha)$, then $i\lambda \in codom(\alpha)$ or $i\lambda = -$. However, there are $(k+1)^{n-r}$ elements in this way including 0. Thus, $deg_{\bar{\Gamma}}(\alpha) = (n+1)^{n-r} + (k+1)^n - k^n - (k+1)^{n-r} - 1$, as required.

Case 2: Let $im(\alpha) \subseteq codom(\alpha)$.

The proof can be obtained by using an argument similar to the aforementioned case in view of the fact that we consider α is adjacent itself.

Lemma 3.3 gives us immediately the proof of the next corollary.

Corollary 3.4 $\Delta(\bar{\Gamma}) = (n+1)^{n-1} + n^n - (n-1)^n - n^{n-1} - 1$ and $\delta(\bar{\Gamma}) = n + 2^n - 3$ for $n \geq 2$.

A nonempty subset D of \bar{V} is called a *dominating set* of \bar{G} if every vertex $v \in \bar{V}$ is either in D or is adjacent to a vertex in D . The *dominating number* $\gamma(\bar{G})$ of a graph \bar{G} is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set in \bar{G} .

Theorem 3.5 $\gamma(\bar{\Gamma}) = n$ for $n \geq 2$.

Proof For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\mathcal{D} = \{\alpha_{ii} \in V(\overline{\Gamma}) : \text{dom}(\alpha_{ii}) = \text{im}(\alpha_{ii}) = i\}$ and $\lambda \in V(\overline{\Gamma}) \setminus \mathcal{D}$. Since there exists $j \in X_n$ such that $j \in \text{codom}(\lambda)$, it follows quickly that $\alpha_{jj}\lambda = 0$. Furthermore, for any two distinct $i, j \in X_n$, it is clear that $\alpha_{ii}\alpha_{jj} = 0$. This yields, \mathcal{D} is a dominating set of $\overline{\Gamma}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\beta_{ii} \in V(\overline{\Gamma})$ such that $\text{codom}(\beta_{ii}) = i$ and $j\beta_{ii} = j$ for all $i \neq j \in X_n$. Then, we consider the set $\mathcal{A} = \{\beta_{ii} \in V(\overline{\Gamma}) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Now suppose that $\alpha \in V(\overline{\Gamma})$ is an adjacent β_{ii} and β_{jj} for any two distinct $i, j \in X_n$. This yields, $\alpha\beta_{ii} = 0$ and $\alpha\beta_{jj} = 0$ if and only if $\alpha = 0$. Similarly, $\beta_{ii}\alpha = 0$ and $\beta_{jj}\alpha = 0$ if and only if $\alpha = 0$. That is a contradiction. Moreover, for any two distinct $i, j \in X_n$, it is clear that β_{ii} and β_{jj} are nonadjacent. Thus, we show that if \mathcal{B} is a minimum dominating set of $\overline{\Gamma}$, then $|\mathcal{B}| \geq |\mathcal{A}| = n$. Since \mathcal{D} is a dominating set of $\overline{\Gamma}$ and $|\mathcal{D}| = n$, this proves the assertion.

Recall that we use $u - v$ to mean that $(u, v) \in E(\overline{G})$. By taking into account of this, the *chromatic number*, *clique*, and *clique number* for \overline{G} are defined as in Section 2.

For $n \geq 2$, we give a better lower bound for the clique number of $\overline{\Gamma}$ in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6 *If $n \geq 2$, then $\omega(\overline{\Gamma}) \geq (r + 1)^{n-r} + \frac{r(r+1)}{2} - 1$ for $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$.*

Proof Let $A = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r\} \subseteq X_n$ for $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$. Let $\beta_{ji} \in \mathcal{SP}_n$ such that $\text{dom}(\beta_{ji}) = j$ and $j\beta_{ji} = i$ for all $i, j \in A$ with $i \leq j$. Now we consider the sets:

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \{\alpha \in \mathcal{SP}_n : A \subseteq \text{codom}(\alpha) \text{ and } \emptyset \neq \text{im}(\alpha) \subseteq A\}, \\ C &= \{\beta_{ji} \in \mathcal{SP}_n : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $B \neq \emptyset \neq C$ and if $\alpha \in B \cup C$, then $\alpha \in V(\overline{\Gamma})$. For any two distinct $\beta, \lambda \in B \cup C$, it is easy to see that $\text{im}(\beta) \subseteq \text{codom}(\lambda)$ and $\text{im}(\lambda) \subseteq \text{codom}(\beta)$. This yields, β and λ are adjacent vertices in $V(\overline{\Gamma})$ from Lemma 2.1. Thus, $\overline{\Gamma}$ has a clique $K^{|B \cup C|}$. Since $|B \cup C| = |B| \cup |C| = (r + 1)^{n-r} - 1 + \frac{r(r+1)}{2}$, it follows quickly that $\omega(\overline{\Gamma}) \geq (r + 1)^{n-r} + \frac{r(r+1)}{2} - 1$ for $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$, as required.

For any graph G , it is proved in [3, Corollary, 6.2] that $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G)$. Hence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.7 *If $n \geq 2$, then $\chi(\overline{\Gamma}) \geq (r + 1)^{n-r} + \frac{r(r+1)}{2} - 1$ for $1 \leq r \leq n - 1$.*

Together, our study contributes to the research conducted on zero divisor graphs by revealing the properties of the extended zero-divisor graphs of \mathcal{SP}_n .

References

- [1] Anderson DF, Livingston PS. The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring. Journal of Algebra 1999; 217 (2): 434-447. doi: 10.1006/jabr.1998.7840
- [2] Beck I. Coloring of commutative rings. Journal of Algebra 1988; 116 (1): 208-226. doi: 10.1016/0021-8693(88)90202-5
- [3] Chartrand G, Zhang P. Chromatic Graph Theory. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2009.
- [4] Das KC, Akgüneş N, Çevik AS. On a graph of monogenic semigroup. Journal of Inequalities and Applications 2013; 44: 1-13. doi: 10.1186/1029-242X-2013-44 noncommutative

- [5] Lu DC, Wu TS. The zero-divisor graphs of posets and an application to semigroups. *Graphs Comb.* 2010; 26 (6): 793-804. doi: 10.1007/s00373-010-0955-4
- [6] DeMeyer F, DeMeyer L. Zero divisor graphs of semigroups. *Journal of Algebra* 2005; 283 (1): 190-198. doi: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2004.08.028
- [7] DeMeyer F, McKenzie T, Schneider K. The zero-divisor graph of a commutative semigroup. *Semigroup Forum* 2002; 65 (2): 206-214. doi: 10.1007/s002330010128
- [8] Redmond SP. The zero-divisor graph of a noncommutative ring. *International Journal of Commutative Rings* 2002; 1 (4): 203-211.
- [9] Ganyushkin O, Mazorchuk V. *Classical Finite Transformation Semigroups*. London, UK: Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [10] Howie JM. *Fundamentals of Semigroup Theory*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [11] Thulasiraman K, Arumugan S, Brandstädt A, Nishizeki T. *Handbook of Graph Theory, Combinatorial Optimization, and Algorithms*. Boca Raton, CRC Press, 2015.
- [12] Wright SE, Lengths of paths and cycles in zero-divisor graphs and digraphs of semigroups. *Commun. Algebra* 2007; 35 (6): 1987-1991. doi: 10.1080/00927870701247146
- [13] Toker K. Zero-divisor graphs of Catalan monoid. *Hacettepe Journal of Mathematics and Statistics* 2021 50 (2): 387-396. doi: 10.15672/hujms.702478
- [14] Toker K. Zero-divisor graphs of partial transformation semigroups. *Turkish Journal of Mathematics* 2021 45 (5): 2331-2340. doi: 10.3906/mat-2012-94