

# SQUARE-DIFFERENCE FACTOR ABSORBING IDEALS OF A COMMUTATIVE RING

DAVID F. ANDERSON, AYMAN BADAWI, AND JIM COYKENDALL

ABSTRACT. Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with  $1 \neq 0$ . A proper ideal  $I$  of  $R$  is a *square-difference factor absorbing ideal* (sdf-absorbing ideal) of  $R$  if whenever  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ , then  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ . In this paper, we introduce and investigate sdf-absorbing ideals.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we introduce and study square-difference factor absorbing ideals of a commutative ring  $R$  with nonzero identity, where a proper ideal  $I$  of  $R$  is a *square-difference factor absorbing ideal* (sdf-absorbing ideal) of  $R$  if whenever  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ , then  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ . A prime ideal is an sdf-absorbing ideal (but not conversely). In particular,  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal in any integral domain. For other generalizations of prime ideals, see [1, 5, 7]. We also introduce and briefly study weakly square-difference factor absorbing ideals, where a proper ideal  $I$  of  $R$  is a *weakly square-difference factor absorbing ideal* (weakly sdf-absorbing ideal) of  $R$  if whenever  $0 \neq a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ , then  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ .

In Section 2, we give some basic properties of sdf-absorbing ideals. We show that a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal is a radical ideal (Theorem 2.2), and the converse holds when  $\text{char}(R) = 2$  (Theorem 2.4). Moreover, a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal is a prime ideal when  $2 \in U(R)$  (Theorem 2.6). Throughout this paper, properties of  $2 \in R$  will play an important role. In Section 3, we study when all proper ideals or nonzero proper ideals of a commutative ring are sdf-absorbing ideals. In particular, every nonzero proper ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $R/\text{nil}(R)$  is a von Neumann regular ring (Theorem 3.1). In addition, we determine when every proper ideal or nonzero proper ideal of a commutative von Neumann regular ring is an sdf-absorbing ideal (Theorems 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7). In Section 4, we give several additional results about sdf-absorbing ideals. For example, we determine the sdf-absorbing ideals in a PID (Corollary 4.3) and the direct product of two commutative rings (Theorem 4.12). We also study sdf-absorbing ideals in polynomial rings (Theorems 4.5 and 4.8), idealizations (Theorem 4.16), amalgamation rings (Theorem 4.19), and  $D + M$  constructions (Theorem 4.21). In Section 5, the final section, we briefly study weakly sdf-absorbing ideals. Several

---

*Date:* March 1, 2024.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13A15; Secondary 13F05, 13G05.

*Key words and phrases.* Square-difference factor absorbing ideal, weakly square-difference factor absorbing ideal, prime ideal, weakly prime ideal, radical ideal, 2-absorbing ideal,  $n$ -absorbing ideal.

results for sdf-absorbing ideals have analogs for weakly sdf-absorbing ideals. Many examples are given throughout to illustrate the results.

We assume throughout that all rings are commutative with nonzero identity and that  $f(1) = 1$  for all ring homomorphisms  $f : R \rightarrow T$ . Let  $R$  be a commutative ring. Then  $\dim(R)$  denotes the Krull dimension of  $R$ ,  $\text{char}(R)$  the characteristic of  $R$ ,  $J(R)$  the Jacobson radical of  $R$ ,  $\text{nil}(R)$  the ideal of nilpotent elements of  $R$ ,  $Z(R)$  the set of zero-divisors of  $R$ , and  $U(R)$  the group of units of  $R$ . The ring  $R$  is *reduced* if  $\text{nil}(R) = \{0\}$ . Recall that a commutative ring  $R$  is *von Neumann regular* if for every  $x \in R$ , there is a  $y \in R$  such that  $x^2y = x$ . Equivalently,  $R$  is von Neumann regular if and only if  $R$  is reduced and  $\dim(R) = 0$  ([11, Theorem 3.1]).

As usual,  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ , and  $\mathbb{F}_q$  will denote the integers, rationals, integers modulo  $n$ , and the finite field with  $q$  elements, respectively. For any undefined concepts or terminology, see [10, 11, 12].

## 2. PROPERTIES OF SDF-ABSORBING IDEALS

In this section, we give some basic properties of square-difference factor absorbing ideals. We begin with the definition.

**Definition 2.1.** A proper ideal  $I$  of a commutative ring  $R$  is a *square-difference factor absorbing ideal* (sdf-absorbing ideal) of  $R$  if whenever  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ , then  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ .

Clearly a prime ideal is an sdf-absorbing ideal. Although the converse may fail (see Example 2.8(a)), we next show that nonzero sdf-absorbing ideals are always radical ideals.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $I$  be a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$ . Then  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that for  $0 \neq a \in R$ , we have  $a \in I$  whenever  $a^2 \in I$ . Since  $I$  is a nonzero ideal of  $R$ , there is a  $0 \neq i \in I$ . Thus  $a^2 - i^2 \in I$ ; so  $a + i \in I$  or  $a - i \in I$  since  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Hence  $a \in I$ , and thus  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.3.** (a) The “nonzero” hypothesis is needed in Theorem 2.2. It is easily verified that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  (cf. Theorem 4.11), but not a radical ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ .

(b) Theorem 2.2 also shows that the “ $a, b \neq 0$ ” hypothesis is not needed in the definition of sdf-absorbing ideal when the ideal is nonzero.

A radical ideal need not be an sdf-absorbing ideal, see Example 2.8(a). However, the converse of Theorem 2.2 does hold when  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ , and the “nonzero ideal” hypothesis is not needed.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $I$  be a radical ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  with  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ . Then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be a radical ideal of  $R$  and  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ . Since  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ , we have  $(a + b)^2 = a^2 + b^2 = a^2 - b^2 \in I$ , and thus  $a + b \in I$  since  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$ . Hence  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

If  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ , then  $a - b = a + b$ . The next result determines when  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $I$  an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  implies both  $a + b, a - b \in I$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $I$  be an sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) *If  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ , then  $a + b, a - b \in I$ .*
- (b)  $2 \in I$ .
- (c)  $\text{char}(R/I) = 2$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $a = b = 1$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 = 0 \in I$ , and thus  $2 = 1 + 1 = a + b \in I$  by hypothesis.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Assume that  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ . Then  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$  since  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , and  $2b \in I$  since  $2 \in I$ . Thus  $a - b = (a + b) - 2b \in I$  if  $a + b \in I$ , and  $a + b = (a - b) + 2b \in I$  if  $a - b \in I$ .

(b)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (c) This is clear.  $\square$

The next result gives a case where sdf-absorbing ideals are prime ideals. It is easily verified that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_9$  (cf. Theorem 4.11); so the “nonzero” hypothesis is needed in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $I$  be a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  with  $2 \in U(R)$ . Then  $I$  is a prime ideal of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  and  $xy \in I$  for  $x, y \in R$ . We may assume that  $x, y \neq 0$ . First, assume that  $y \neq x$  and  $y \neq -x$ . Let  $a = (x + y)/2, b = (x - y)/2 \in R$ . Since  $y \neq x$  and  $y \neq -x$ , we have  $a^2 - b^2 = xy \in I$  and  $a, b \neq 0$ . Thus  $x = a + b \in I$  or  $y = a - b \in I$  since  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Next, assume that  $y = x$  or  $y = -x$ . Then  $x^2 \in I$ , and hence  $x \in I$  since  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.2. Thus  $I$  is a prime ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

The following criterion for an ideal to be an sdf-absorbing ideal will often prove useful.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $I$  be a proper ideal of a commutative ring  $R$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  *$I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*
- (b) *If  $ab \in I$  for  $a, b \in R \setminus I$ , then the system of linear equations  $X + Y = a, X - Y = b$  has no nonzero solution in  $R$  (i.e., there are no  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  that satisfy both equations).*

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Suppose that  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R, ab \in I$  for  $a, b \in R \setminus I$ , and the system of linear equations  $X + Y = a, X - Y = b$  has a solution in  $R$  for some  $0 \neq x, y \in R$ . Then  $x^2 - y^2 = ab \in I$ , but  $x + y = a \notin I$  and  $x - y = b \notin I$ , a contradiction.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Assume that  $x^2 - y^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq x, y \in R$ . Let  $a = x + y$  and  $b = x - y$ . Then  $ab = x^2 - y^2 \in I$ , and the system of linear equations  $X + Y = a, X - Y = b$  has a solution in  $R$  for  $0 \neq x, y \in R$ . Thus  $x + y = a \in I$  or  $x - y = b \in I$ , and hence  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

We next give several examples of sdf-absorbing ideals.

**Example 2.8.** (a) Using Theorem 2.7, one can easily verify that a proper ideal  $I$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  if and only if  $I$  is a prime ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  or  $I = 2q\mathbb{Z}$  for some odd prime integer  $q$ . Note that if  $p, q$  are nonassociate odd prime integers,

then  $pq\mathbb{Z}$  is a radical ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  which is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Thus the converse of Theorem 2.2 may fail. See Corollary 4.3 for the general PID case.

(b) Let  $R$  be a boolean ring. Then every proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  since  $x^2 = x$  for every  $x \in R$ .

(c) Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}[W, T]$ . Since  $(2W)(2T) \in WTR$  and the system of linear equations  $x + y = 2W$ ,  $x - y = 2T$  has a nonzero solution in  $R$ , we have that  $WTR$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.7. However, note that  $WTR$  is a radical ideal of  $R$ .

(d) Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}$  and  $I = I_1 \times \cdots \times I_n \times J$  be an ideal of  $R$ . Using Theorem 2.7 again, one can easily verify that  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $J$  is a prime ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  or  $J = 2q\mathbb{Z}$  for some odd prime integer  $q$ .

(e) Let  $R = K[X]$ , where  $K$  is a field, and  $I = (X + 1)(X - 1)R$ . Then  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ . Thus  $I$  is never an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.6.

(f) Let  $R = K[X]$ , where  $K$  is a field, and  $I = f_1^{n_1} \cdots f_k^{n_k} R$  for nonassociate irreducible  $f_1, \dots, f_k \in R$  and positive integers  $n_1, \dots, n_k$ . Then  $I$  is a radical (resp., prime) ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $n_1 = \cdots = n_k = 1$  (resp.,  $k = n_k = 1$ ). If  $\text{char}(K) = 2$ , then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.4. If  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$ , then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is a prime ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.6.

(g) Let  $R$  be a valuation domain. Then every radical ideal of  $R$  is a prime ideal ([10, Theorem 17.1(2)]); so the prime ideals are the only sdf-absorbing ideals of  $R$  by Theorem 2.2.

The next two theorems and corollary follow directly from the definitions and Remark 2.3(b); so their proofs are omitted.

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let  $I$  be an sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$ , and let  $S$  be a multiplicatively closed subset of  $R$  with  $I \cap S = \emptyset$ . Then  $I_S$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_S$ .*

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $f : R \rightarrow T$  be a homomorphism of commutative rings.*

(a) *If  $J$  is a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ , then  $f^{-1}(J)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

(b) *If  $f$  is injective and  $J$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ , then  $f^{-1}(J)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

(c) *If  $f$  is surjective and  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  containing  $\ker(f)$ , then  $f(I)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ .*

**Corollary 2.11.** (a) *Let  $R \subseteq T$  be an extension of commutative rings and  $J$  an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ . Then  $J \cap R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

(b) *Let  $J \subseteq I$  be ideals of a commutative ring  $R$ . If  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , then  $I/J$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R/J$ .*

(c) *If  $J \subsetneq I$ , then  $I/J$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R/J$  if and only if  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

The following examples show that the “nonzero” hypothesis is needed in Theorem 2.10(a) and the “ $\ker(f) \subseteq I$ ” hypothesis is needed in Theorem 2.10(c).

**Example 2.12.** (a) Let  $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}_4$  be the natural epimorphism. By Remark 2.3(a),  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ , but  $f^{-1}(\{0\}) = 4\mathbb{Z}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  by Example 2.8(a). Thus the “nonzero” hypothesis is needed in Theorem 2.10(a).

(b) Let  $f : \mathbb{Z}[X] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the epimorphism given by  $f(g(X)) = g(0)$ . Then  $I = (X + 4)$  is a prime ideal, and thus an sdf-absorbing ideal, of  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ , but  $f((X + 4)) = 4\mathbb{Z}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  by Example 2.8(a). Note that  $\ker(f) = (X) \not\subseteq (X + 4) = I$ ; so the “ $\ker(f) \subseteq I$ ” hypothesis is needed in Theorem 2.10(c).

### 3. WHEN EVERY IDEAL IS AN SDF-ABSORBING IDEAL

In this section, we consider when every proper ideal or nonzero proper ideal of a commutative ring is an sdf-absorbing ideal. Recall that every proper ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  is a radical ideal if and only if  $R$  is von Neumann regular (cf. [4, Proposition 1.1]). We use this fact to show that if every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , then  $R/\text{nil}(R)$  is von Neumann regular. In particular, if in addition  $R$  is reduced, then  $R$  is von Neumann regular.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $R$  be commutative ring such that every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Then  $R/\text{nil}(R)$  is von Neumann regular. In particular,  $\dim(R) = 0$ . Moreover, if  $R$  is not reduced, then  $\text{nil}(R)$  is the unique minimal nonzero ideal of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* Every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is a radical ideal by Theorem 2.2. Thus every proper ideal of  $R/\text{nil}(R)$  is a radical ideal, and hence  $R/\text{nil}(R)$  is von Neumann regular. The “in particular” and “moreover” statements are clear.  $\square$

**Example 3.2.** (a) All proper ideals of  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  are sdf-absorbing ideals, and all nonzero proper ideals (but not the zero ideal) of  $\mathbb{Z}_{25}$  are sdf-absorbing ideals (cf. Theorem 4.11). Neither ring is reduced (i.e., von Neumann regular).

(b) All proper ideals of  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  are sdf-absorbing ideals, and all nonzero proper ideals (but not the zero ideal) of  $\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$  are sdf-absorbing ideals (cf. Example 3.8). Both of these rings are von Neumann regular.

(c) However, not all nonzero proper ideals in a von Neumann regular ring need be sdf-absorbing ideals (cf. Example 3.8). For example, let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ . Then the ideal  $I = \{0\} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  (to see this, let  $a = (2, 1, 0), b = (1, 1, 0) \in R$ ).

The quasilocal case is easily handled.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $R$  be a quasilocal commutative ring with maximal ideal  $M$ . Then every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $M$  is the unique prime ideal of  $R$ ,  $M$  is principal, and  $M^2 = \{0\}$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $R$  is not a field. Suppose that every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Then  $M$  is the unique prime ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 3.1. Moreover,  $M$  is the only nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  since every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is a radical ideal by Theorem 2.2. Thus  $M$  is principal and  $M^2 = \{0\}$ .

Conversely, if  $M$  is the unique prime ideal of  $R$ ,  $M$  is principal, and  $M^2 = \{0\}$ , then  $M$  is the only nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  and is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

The next example shows that in the above theorem,  $\{0\}$  may or may not be an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .

**Example 3.4.** (a) Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_{p^2}$  for  $p$  prime. Then  $R$  satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.3; so every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .

However,  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $p = 2$  or  $p = 3$  by Theorem 4.11.

(b) Let  $R = K[X]/(X^2)$ , where  $K$  is a field. Then  $R$  satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.3, so every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . However, it is easily verified that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $K = \mathbb{Z}_3$ .

The next several results consider the case where every proper ideal or nonzero proper ideal of a commutative von Neumann regular ring is an sdf-absorbing ideal. They depend on whether 2 is zero, a unit, or a nonzero zero-divisor in  $R$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $R$  be a reduced commutative ring with  $2 \in U(R)$ .*

(a) *Every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $R$  is a field or  $R$  is isomorphic to  $F_1 \times F_2$  for fields  $F_1, F_2$ .*

(b) *Every proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $R$  is a field.*

*Proof.* (a) If  $R$  is a field, then the claim is clear. So assume that  $R$  is isomorphic to  $F_1 \times F_2$  for fields  $F_1, F_2$ . Then  $R$  has exactly two nonzero proper ideals and each is a maximal ideal of  $R$ . Thus every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .

Conversely, assume that  $R$  is not a field and every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Suppose that  $R$  has at least three distinct maximal ideals, say  $M_1, M_2, M_3$ . Then  $M_1 \cap M_2 \neq \{0\}$  (if  $M_1 \cap M_2 = \{0\}$ , then  $M_1 \subseteq M_3$  or  $M_2 \subseteq M_3$ ). Thus  $M_1 \cap M_2$  is a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  and  $2 \in U(R)$ ; so  $M_1 \cap M_2$  is a prime ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.6, a contradiction since  $\dim(R) = 0$  by Theorem 3.1. Hence  $R$  has exactly two maximal ideals, say  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . Then, arguing as above,  $J(R) = M_1 \cap M_2 = \{0\}$ ; so  $R$  is isomorphic to  $F_1 \times F_2$  for fields  $F_1 \cong R/M_1, F_2 \cong R/M_2$  by the Chinese Remainder Theorem.

(b) By part (a) above, we need only show that  $I = \{(0, 0)\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R = F_1 \times F_2$  when  $2 \in U(R)$ . Let  $a = (2, -2), b = (2, 2) \in F_1 \times F_2$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 = (0, 0) \in I$ , but  $a + b = (4, 0) \notin I$  and  $a - b = (0, -4) \notin I$  since  $\text{char}(F_1) = 2$ ,  $\text{char}(F_2) \neq 2$  as  $2 \in U(R)$ . Thus  $I = \{(0, 0)\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $F_1 \times F_2$ .  $\square$

Since every proper ideal of a commutative von Neumann regular ring is a radical ideal, Theorem 2.4 yields the following result which generalizes the fact that every ideal of a boolean ring is an sdf-absorbing ideal (Example 2.8(b)). Note that  $R = \mathbb{F}_4 \times \mathbb{F}_4$  is a von Neumann regular ring with  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ , but  $R$  is not a boolean ring.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative von Neumann regular ring with  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ . Then every proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

We next handle the case when 2 is a nonzero zero-divisor of  $R$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative von Neumann regular ring with  $0 \neq 2 \in Z(R)$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) *Every proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*
- (b) *Every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*
- (c) *Exactly one maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$  has  $\text{char}(R/M) \neq 2$ .*

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) This is clear.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) First, assume that  $\text{char}(R/M) = 2$  for every maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$ . Then  $R$  is isomorphic to a subring of the direct product of fields of characteristic 2; so  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ , a contradiction. Next, assume that  $R$  has at least two maximal ideals  $M_1, M_2$  with  $\text{char}(R/M_1), \text{char}(R/M_2) \neq 2$ . Let  $I = M_1 \cap M_2$ . Then  $I \neq \{0\}$  since otherwise  $R$  is isomorphic to the direct product of two fields, each with characteristic  $\neq 2$ , by the Chinese Remainder Theorem. Thus  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , and hence  $I/I = \{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R/I$  by Corollary 2.11(b). However,  $R/I$  is isomorphic to  $F_1 \times F_2$  for fields  $F_1 \cong R/M_1, F_2 \cong R/M_2$ , where  $\text{char}(F_1), \text{char}(F_2) \neq 2$ , by the Chinese Remainder Theorem, and thus  $2 \in U(R/I)$ . Hence  $\{(0, 0)\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $F_1 \times F_2$  by the proof of Theorem 3.5(b), a contradiction. Thus exactly one maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$  has  $\text{char}(R/M) \neq 2$ .

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Suppose that exactly one maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$  has  $\text{char}(R/M) \neq 2$ . We need to show that every proper ideal  $I$  of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Note that  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$  since  $R$  is von Neumann regular. Thus it suffices to show that if  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$ , then either  $a + b$  is in every prime (maximal) ideal of  $R$  containing  $I$  or  $a - b$  is in every prime (maximal) ideal of  $R$  containing  $I$ . Let  $N$  be a maximal ideal of  $R$  containing  $I$ ; we consider two cases.

First, let  $N = M$  be the unique maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$  with  $\text{char}(R/M) \neq 2$ . If  $I$  is contained in  $M$ , then as  $a^2 - b^2 \in M$ , we have  $a + b \in M$  or  $a - b \in M$ . Next, let  $N \neq M$ ; so  $\text{char}(R/N) = 2$ . As  $a^2 - b^2 \in N$ , both  $a + b$  and  $a - b$  are in  $N$  by Theorem 2.5, and we select the sign convention to conform with the outcome of the previous case, if necessary. So given the (radical) ideal  $I$  of  $R$ , if  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$ , then either  $a + b$  is in every prime (maximal) ideal of  $R$  containing  $I$  or  $a - b$  is in every prime (maximal) ideal of  $R$  containing  $I$ . Thus  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ , and hence  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing factor ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

Together, Theorem 3.5, Theorem 3.6, and Theorem 3.7 completely determine when every nonzero proper ideal or proper ideal of a commutative von Neumann regular ring is an sdf-absorbing ideal since every element in a commutative von Neumann regular ring is either a unit or a zero-divisor ([11, Corollary 2.4]). We next apply these criteria to a commutative von Neumann regular ring which is the direct product of finitely many fields.

**Example 3.8.** Let  $R$  be the direct product of finitely many fields (so  $R$  is von Neumann regular).

(a) Every proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if at most one of the fields has characteristic  $\neq 2$ .

(b) Every nonzero proper ideal of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if at most one of the fields has characteristic  $\neq 2$  or  $R$  is the direct product of two fields.

#### 4. ADDITIONAL RESULTS

In this section, we give several more results about sdf-absorbing ideals in special classes of commutative rings. In particular, we determine the sdf-absorbing ideals in a PID and the direct product of two commutative rings, and study sdf-absorbing ideals in polynomial rings, idealizations, amalgamation rings, and  $D + M$  constructions.

A nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  is always a radical ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.2; the following theorem gives a case where the converse holds.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $I$  be a proper ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  such that  $I = P_1 \cap \cdots \cap P_n$  for distinct comaximal prime ideals  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  of  $R$ . Then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if at most one of the  $P_i$ 's has  $\text{char}(R/P_i) \neq 2$ .*

*Proof.* By way of contradiction, assume that  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , and  $\text{char}(R/P_1), \text{char}(R/P_2) \neq 2$ . Then  $I/I = \{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R/I$  by Corollary 2.11(b), and  $R/I$  is isomorphic to  $T = R/P_1 \times \cdots \times R/P_n$  by the Chinese Remainder Theorem. Let  $a = (1, 1, \dots, 1), b = (-1, 1, \dots, 1) \in T$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 = (0, \dots, 0)$ , but  $a + b = (0, 2, \dots, 2) \notin \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$  and  $a - b = (2, 0, \dots, 0) \notin \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ . Thus  $\{(0, \dots, 0)\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ , a contradiction. Hence at most one of the  $P_i$ 's has  $\text{char}(R/P_i) \neq 2$ .

The converse follows easily using a slight modification to the proof of (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) in Theorem 3.7. The details are left to the reader.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** (a) Theorem 4.1 gives criteria for  $\text{nil}(R)$  to be an sdf-absorbing ideal in a zero-dimensional semilocal commutative ring.

(b) In the proof of Theorem 4.1, note that if  $I = I_1 \cap \cdots \cap I_n$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  for distinct comaximal proper ideals  $I_1, \dots, I_n$  of  $R$ , then at most one of the  $I_i$ 's has  $\text{char}(R/I_i) \neq 2$ .

Using Theorem 4.1, we have the following characterization of sdf-absorbing ideals in a PID which extends Example 2.8(a) (also, cf. Example 2.8(f), Theorem 2.4, and Theorem 2.6).

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let  $R$  be a PID and  $I$  a nonzero proper ideal of  $R$ .*

(a) *If 2 is a nonzero nonunit of  $R$ , then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is a prime (maximal) ideal of  $R$ , i.e.,  $I = aR$  for  $a \in R$  prime, or  $I = aR$ , where  $a = a_1 \cdots a_n a_{n+1}$  for nonassociate primes  $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1} \in R$  such that  $a_i \mid 2$  in  $R$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . In particular, if  $2 \in R$  is prime, then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is a prime (maximal) ideal of  $R$  or  $I = 2pR$  for  $p \in R$  prime not associate to 2.*

(b) *If  $2 \in U(R)$ , then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is a prime (maximal) ideal of  $R$ , i.e.,  $I = aR$  for  $a \in R$  prime.*

(c) *If  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ , then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$ , i.e.,  $I = a_1 \cdots a_n R$  for nonassociate primes  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in R$ .*

*Proof.* (a) Assume that  $I$  is a nonprime (and thus nonzero) sdf-absorbing ideal of the PID  $R$ . Then  $I$  is a radical ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.2, and hence  $I$  is the intersection (product) of a finite number of distinct nonzero principal prime (maximal) ideals of  $R$ . Applying Theorem 4.1, we have  $I = aR$ , where  $a = a_1 \cdots a_n a_{n+1}$  for nonassociate prime elements  $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1} \in R$  such that  $a_i \mid 2$  (in  $R$ ) for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

The converse is clear by Theorem 4.1. The ‘‘in particular’’ statement is also clear.

(b) This follows from Theorem 2.6.

(c) This follows from Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.4.  $\square$

We have the following example of a PID  $R$  such that  $2pR$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  for any prime  $p \in R$ .



**Example 4.4.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}[i]$ . Then  $R$  is a PID and  $2 = -i(1+i)^2$ , where  $1+i$  is prime and  $i$  is a unit of  $R$ . Thus 2 is not a prime element of  $R$  and  $2pR$  is not a radical ideal of  $R$  for any prime  $p \in R$ ; so  $I = 2pR$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  for any prime  $p \in R$  by Theorem 2.2. However, by Corollary 4.3(a), a nonprime ideal  $I$  of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I = (1+i)pR$  for some prime  $p \in R$  not associate to  $1+i$ .

We next consider when the two ideals  $I[X]$  and  $(I, X)$  are sdf-absorbing ideals of  $R[X]$ . The following partial result for  $I[X]$  is a consequence of Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $I$  be a proper ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  such that  $I = P_1 \cap \cdots \cap P_n$  for distinct comaximal prime ideals  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  of  $R$ . Then  $I[X]$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$  if and only if  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* If  $I[X]$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$ , then it is easily verified that  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .

Conversely, assume that  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Then  $I[X] = P_1[X] \cap \cdots \cap P_n[X]$ , where  $P_1[X], \dots, P_n[X]$  are distinct comaximal prime ideals of  $R[X]$  since  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  are distinct comaximal prime ideals of  $R$ . Moreover, at most one of the  $P_i$ 's has  $\text{char}(R/P_i) \neq 2$  by Theorem 4.1. Since  $R[X]/P_i[X]$  is isomorphic to  $R/P_i[X]$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , at most one of the  $P_i[X]$ 's has  $\text{char}(R[X]/P_i[X]) \neq 2$ . Thus  $I[X]$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$  by Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

Combining Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.5, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let  $I$  be a proper ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  such that  $I = P_1 \cap \cdots \cap P_n$  for distinct comaximal prime ideals  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  of  $R$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .
- (b)  $I[X]$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$ .
- (c) At most one of the  $P_i$ 's has  $\text{char}(R/P_i) \neq 2$ .

**Remark 4.7.** Note that  $\{0\}$  may be an sdf-absorbing ideal in  $R$ , but not an sdf-absorbing ideal in  $R[X]$  (so, in this case,  $\{0\}$  is not the intersection of finitely many distinct comaximal prime ideals of  $R$ ). For example, let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_4$ .

The sdf-absorbing ideals  $(I, X)$  in  $R[X]$  are easily classified

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring.*

- (a) *Let  $I$  be a nonzero proper ideal of  $R$ . Then  $(I, X)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$  if and only if  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*
- (b)  *$(X)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$  if and only if  $R$  is reduced and  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* (a) If  $(I, X)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$ , then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.10(c).

Conversely, assume that  $I$  is a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Let  $f = a + Xm(X), g = b + Xn(X) \in R[X]$  with  $f^2 - g^2 \in (I, X)$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$ ; so  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$  by Remark 2.3(b). Thus  $f + g \in (I, X)$  or  $f - g \in (I, X)$ ; so  $(I, X)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$ .

(b) If  $(X)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$ , then  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.10(c). Moreover,  $(X)$  is a radical ideal of  $R[X]$  by Theorem 2.2; so  $R$  is also reduced.

Conversely, assume that  $R$  is reduced and  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Let  $f = a + Xm(X), g = b + Xn(X) \in R[X]$  with  $f^2 - g^2 \in (X)$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 = 0$ . If  $a, b \neq 0$ , then  $a + b = 0$  or  $a - b = 0$  since  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . If  $a = 0$  or  $b = 0$ , then  $a = b = 0$  since  $R$  is reduced. So in either case,  $f + g \in (X)$  or  $f - g \in (X)$ . Thus  $(X)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R[X]$ .  $\square$

The next theorem is similar to Theorem 4.1. Note that Corollary 4.3 is also a consequence of Theorem 4.9 since in Corollary 4.3, we have  $P_1 \cap \cdots \cap P_n = P_1 \cdots P_n$ .

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $I$  be a proper ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  such that  $I = P_1 \cap \cdots \cap P_n$  for prime ideals  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  of  $R$  and the intersection of any  $n - 1$  of the ideals  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  is not equal to  $I$ . Then  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if at most one of the  $P_i$ 's has  $\text{char}(R/P_i) \neq 2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . By way of contradiction, assume that  $n \geq 2$  and  $\text{char}(R/P_1), \text{char}(R/P_2) \neq 2$ . Then  $I \subsetneq J = P_2 \cap \cdots \cap P_n$  by hypothesis; so there is a  $j \in J \setminus P_1$  and  $q \in P_1 \setminus J$  (otherwise  $I = P_1$ ). Let  $x = j + q$  and  $y = j - q$ . Then  $x \neq 0, y \neq 0$ , and  $x^2 - y^2 = 4jq \in I$ . Moreover,  $x + y = 2j \notin P_1$  since  $2 \notin P_1$ , and  $x - y = 2q \notin J$  since  $2 \notin P_2$ . Thus  $x + y \notin I$  and  $x - y \notin I$ ; so  $I$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , a contradiction. Hence at most one of the  $P_i$ 's has  $\text{char}(R/P_i) \neq 2$ .

The converse follows easily using a slight modification to the proof of (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) in Theorem 3.7. The details are left to the reader.  $\square$

In view of Theorem 4.9, we have the following example.

**Example 4.10.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  for  $n \geq 2$ . Then  $I = (6, 2X_1, \dots, 2X_n, X_1 \cdots X_n) = (X_1, 3) \cap (X_2, 2) \cap \cdots \cap (X_n, 2)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 4.9.

The next result completely determines when  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ .

**Theorem 4.11.**  *$\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  if and only if  $n = 4, n = 9, n = p$  is prime, or  $n = 2p$  for some odd prime  $p$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R = \mathbb{Z}_n$ . First, suppose that  $n \neq 2, 4$  is an even positive integer and  $n \neq 2p$  for any odd prime  $p$ . We consider two cases. For the first case, assume that  $4 \mid n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Then the system of linear equations  $X + Y = n/2$  and  $X - Y = 2$  has a solution  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  and  $x^2 - y^2 = 0$ , but  $x + y \neq 0$  and  $x - y \neq 0$ . Thus  $\{0\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.7. For the second case, assume that  $4 \nmid n$ ; so  $n$  has an odd prime factor  $q$ . Then the system of linear equations  $X + Y = 2n/q$  and  $X - Y = 2q$  has a solution  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  (note that  $n \neq 2p$  by assumption) and  $x^2 - y^2 = 0$ , but  $x + y \neq 0$  and  $x - y \neq 0$ . Hence  $\{0\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.7. Next, suppose that  $n$  is odd, not prime,  $n \neq 3, 9$ , and let  $q$  be a prime factor of  $n$ . Then the system of linear equations  $X + Y = 4n/q$  and  $X - Y = 2q$  has a solution  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  and  $x^2 - y^2 = 0$ , but  $x + y \neq 0$  and  $x - y \neq 0$ . Thus  $\{0\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.7 again. Hence, if  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ , then  $n = 4, n = 9, n = p$  is prime, or  $n = 2p$  for some odd prime  $p$ .

Conversely, if  $n = p$  is prime, then  $\{0\}$  is a maximal ideal, and thus an sdf-absorbing ideal, of the field  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . If  $n = 4$  or  $n = 9$ , then one can easily verify that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . Finally, assume that  $n = 2p$  for some odd prime  $p$ . Since  $I = 2p\mathbb{Z}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  by Example 2.8(a), we have that  $I/I = \{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}/2p\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}_{2p}$  by Corollary 2.11(b).  $\square$

We next investigate when the direct product of two ideals is an sdf-absorbing ideal. First, we consider the case when both ideals are nonzero proper ideals.

**Theorem 4.12.** *Let  $I_1, I_2$  be nonzero proper ideals of the commutative rings  $R_1, R_2$ , respectively. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a)  $I_1 \times I_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$ .
- (b)  $I_1, I_2$  are sdf-absorbing ideals of  $R_1, R_2$ , respectively, and  $2 \in I_1$  or  $2 \in I_2$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $I = I_1 \times I_2$  be an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R = R_1 \times R_2$ . Then it is easily shown that  $I_1, I_2$  are sdf-absorbing ideals of  $R_1, R_2$ , respectively. Next, let  $a = (1, 1), b = (1, -1) \in R$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 = (0, 0) \in I$ ; so  $(2, 0) = a + b \in I$  or  $(0, 2) = a - b \in I$ . Thus  $2 \in I_1$  or  $2 \in I_2$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) We may assume that  $2 \in I_1$ . Let  $(0, 0) \neq a = (a_1, a_2), b = (b_1, b_2) \in R$  with  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$ . Then  $a_1^2 - b_1^2 \in I_1$ , and thus  $a_1 + b_1 \in I_1$  or  $a_1 - b_1 \in I_1$  by Remark 2.3(b) since  $I_1$  is a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . Since  $2 \in I_1$ , we have  $a_1 + b_1, a_1 - b_1 \in I_1$  by Theorem 2.5. Also,  $a_2^2 - b_2^2 \in I_2$ ; so  $a_2 + b_2 \in I_2$  or  $a_2 - b_2 \in I_2$  by Remark 2.3(b) again since  $I_2$  is a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_2$ . If  $a_2 + b_2 \in I_2$ , then  $a + b \in I$ . If  $a_2 - b_2 \in I_2$ , then  $a - b \in I$ . Thus  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

Now we consider the case when one of the ideals in the product is either zero or the whole ring.

**Theorem 4.13.** *Let  $I_1, I_2$  be nonzero proper ideals of the commutative rings  $R_1, R_2$ , respectively.*

- (a)  $\{0\} \times R_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$  if and only if  $R_1$  is reduced and  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . A similar result holds for  $R_1 \times \{0\}$ .
- (b)  $I_1 \times R_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$  if and only if  $I_1$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . A similar result holds for  $R_1 \times I_2$ .
- (c)  $\{0\} \times I_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$  if and only if  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ ,  $R_1$  is reduced,  $I_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_2$ , and  $\text{char}(R_1) = 2$  or  $2 \in I_2$ . A similar result holds for  $I_1 \times \{0\}$ .
- (d)  $\{0\} \times \{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$  if and only if  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ ,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are reduced, and  $\text{char}(R_1) = 2$  or  $\text{char}(R_2) = 2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $R = R_1 \times R_2$ .

(a) Assume that  $\{0\} \times R_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Then it is clear that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . We show that  $R_1$  is reduced. Let  $c \in R_1$  with  $c^2 = 0$ , and  $a = (c, 1), b = (0, 1) \in R$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 = (0, 0) \in \{0\} \times R_2$ ; so  $(c, 2) = a + b \in \{0\} \times R_2$  or  $(c, 0) = a - b \in \{0\} \times R_2$ . Thus  $c = 0$ ; so  $R_1$  is reduced.

Conversely, assume that  $R_1$  is reduced and  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . Let  $(0, 0) \neq a = (a_1, a_2), b = (b_1, b_2) \in R$  with  $a^2 - b^2 \in \{0\} \times R_2$ . Since  $R_1$  is reduced, we have  $a_1 = b_1 = 0$  or  $0 \neq a_1, b_1 \in R_1$ . Hence  $a_1 + b_1 = 0$  or  $a_1 - b_1 = 0$ ; so  $a + b \in \{0\} \times R_2$  or  $a - b \in \{0\} \times R_2$ . Thus  $\{0\} \times R_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .

(b) The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.12.

(c) The proof is similar to part (a) above.

(d) Let  $I = \{0\} \times \{0\}$  be an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Then it is easily shown that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ . By an argument similar to that in part (a) above, we have that  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are reduced. Let  $a = (1, 1), b = (1, -1) \in R$ .

Then  $a^2 - b^2 = (0, 0) \in I$ ; so  $(2, 0) = a + b \in I$  or  $(0, 2) = a - b \in I$ . Thus  $\text{char}(R_1) = 2$  or  $\text{char}(R_2) = 2$ .

Conversely, assume that  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ ,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are reduced, and  $\text{char}(R_1) = 2$  or  $\text{char}(R_2) = 2$ . We may assume that  $\text{char}(R_2) = 2$ . Let  $(0, 0) \neq a = (a_1, a_2), b = (b_1, b_2) \in R$  with  $a^2 - b^2 = (0, 0)$ . Since  $R_1$  is reduced, we have  $a_1 = b_1 = 0$  or  $0 \neq a_1, b_1 \in R_1$ . Since  $a_1^2 - b_1^2 = 0$ , we have  $a_1 + b_1 = 0$  or  $a_1 - b_1 = 0$ . Similarly,  $a_2 + b_2 = a_2 - b_2 = 0$  since  $\text{char}(R_2) = 2$ . If  $a_1 + b_1 = 0$ , then  $a + b = (0, 0)$ . If  $a_1 - b_1 = 0$ , then  $a - b = (0, 0)$ . Thus  $I = \{(0, 0)\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.14.** (a) The previous two theorems may be combined by an abuse of definition (consider the whole ring to be an sdf-absorbing radical ideal, and note that  $2 \in \{0\}$  if and only if the ring has characteristic 2). Let  $I_1, I_2$  be ideals of  $R_1, R_2$ , respectively, not both the whole ring. Then  $I_1 \times I_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$  if and only if  $I_1, I_2$  are sdf-absorbing radical ideals of  $R_1, R_2$ , respectively, and  $\text{char}(R_1) = 2$  or  $\text{char}(R_2) = 2$ .

(b)  $\{0\}$  and  $\{0, 2\}$  are sdf-absorbing ideals of  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ , but  $\{0\} \times \{0\}$ ,  $\{0\} \times \{0, 2\}$ , and  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  are not sdf-absorbing ideals of  $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  by Theorem 4.13 (or choose  $a = (2, 1), b = (0, 1)$ ). Also, see Example 4.15.

In view of Example 2.8(a), Theorem 4.12, and Theorem 4.13, we have the following example.

**Example 4.15.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$  and  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  a positive prime. Then a nonzero ideal  $I$  of  $R$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is a prime ideal of  $R$  (i.e.,  $I = \{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $I = p\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $I = \mathbb{Z} \times \{0\}$ , or  $I = \mathbb{Z} \times p\mathbb{Z}$ ),  $I = 2\mathbb{Z} \times p\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $I = p\mathbb{Z} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $I = 2p\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ),  $I = \mathbb{Z} \times 2p\mathbb{Z}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ),  $I = 2\mathbb{Z} \times 2p\mathbb{Z}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ),  $I = 2p\mathbb{Z} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ),  $I = \{0\} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$ , or  $I = 2\mathbb{Z} \times \{0\}$ .

The ideals  $\{0\} \times \{0\}$ ,  $\{0\} \times p\mathbb{Z}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ),  $p\mathbb{Z} \times \{0\}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ),  $\{0\} \times 2p\mathbb{Z}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ), and  $2p\mathbb{Z} \times \{0\}$  ( $p \neq 2$ ) are not sdf-absorbing ideals of  $R$  (or choose  $a = (1, 1), b = (1, -1)$ ).

In the following result, we determine the sdf-absorbing ideals in idealization rings. Recall that for a commutative ring  $R$  and  $R$ -module  $M$ , the *idealization of  $R$  and  $M$*  is the commutative ring  $R(+M) = R \times M$  with identity  $(1, 0)$  under addition defined by  $(r, m) + (s, n) = (r + s, m + n)$  and multiplication defined by  $(r, m)(s, n) = (rs, rn + sm)$ . For more on idealizations, see [3, 11]. Every ideal of  $R(+M)$  has the form  $I(+N)$  for  $I$  an ideal of  $R$  and  $N$  a submodule of  $M$  ([11, Theorem 25.1(1)]); so Theorem 4.16 completely determines the nonzero sdf-absorbing ideals of  $R(+M)$ .

**Theorem 4.16.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring,  $I$  a nonzero proper ideal of  $R$ ,  $M$  an  $R$ -module, and  $N$  a submodule of  $M$ . Then  $I(+N)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R(+M)$  if and only if  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  and  $N = M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A = R(+M)$  and  $J = I(+N)$ .

Assume that  $J$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A$ . It is easily verified that  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . By way of contradiction, assume that  $N \subsetneq M$ ; so there is an  $m \in M \setminus N$ . Let  $0 \neq i \in I$ , and  $a = (i, 0), b = (0, m) \in R(+M) = A$ . Then  $a^2 - b^2 = (i^2, 0) \in I(+N) = J$ , but  $a + b = (i, m) \notin J$  and  $a - b = (i, -m) \notin J$ , a contradiction. Thus  $N = M$ .

Conversely, assume that  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  and  $N = M$ . Let  $a^2 - b^2 \in J$  for  $(0, 0) \neq a, b \in A$ , where  $a = (a_1, m_1)$  and  $b = (b_1, m_2)$ . Since  $I$  is a

nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  and  $a_1^2 - b_1^2 \in I$ , we have  $a_1 + b_1 \in I$  or  $a_1 - b_1 \in I$  by Remark 2.3(b). If  $a_1 + b_1 \in I$ , then  $a + b \in I(+M) = J$ . If  $a_1 - b_1 \in I$ , then  $a - b \in I(+M) = J$ . Thus  $J = I(+M)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A$ .  $\square$

The following example shows that it is crucial that  $I$  be a nonzero ideal in Theorem 4.16.

**Example 4.17.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $M = N = \mathbb{Z}_4$ , and  $I = \{0\}$ . Then  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ , but  $\{0\}(+)\mathbb{Z}_4$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4(+)\mathbb{Z}_4$  by Theorem 2.2 since  $\{0\}(+)\mathbb{Z}_4$  is not a radical ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4(+)\mathbb{Z}_4$  (or consider  $x = (2, 0), y = (0, 2)$ ).

Next, we consider when  $\{0\}(+)N$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R(+M)$ .

**Remark 4.18.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring and  $M$  a nonzero  $R$ -module.

(a) If  $\{0\}(+)N$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R(+M)$  for  $N$  a proper submodule of  $M$ , then  $N = \{0\}$  by Theorem 2.2.

(b) It is easily shown that  $\{0\}(+)M$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R(+M)$  if and only if  $R$  is reduced and  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  (cf. Example 4.17).

(c) It is easily shown that  $\{(0, 0)\}$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R(+M)$  when  $|M| \neq 3$ . However,  $\{(0, 0)\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_3(+)\mathbb{Z}_3$ , but not of  $\mathbb{Z}(+)\mathbb{Z}_3$ .

In the next result, we study sdf-absorbing ideals in amalgamation rings. Let  $A, B$  be commutative rings,  $f : A \rightarrow B$  a homomorphism, and  $J$  an ideal of  $B$ . Recall that the *amalgamation of  $A$  and  $B$  with respect to  $f$  along  $J$*  is the subring  $A \bowtie_J B = \{(a, f(a) + j) \mid a \in A, j \in J\}$  of  $A \times B$ .

**Theorem 4.19.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be commutative rings,  $f : A \rightarrow B$  a homomorphism,  $J$  an ideal of  $B$ , and  $I$  a nonzero proper ideal of  $A$ . Then  $I \bowtie_J B$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A \bowtie_J B$  if and only if  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A$ .*

*Proof.* If  $I \bowtie_J B$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A \bowtie_J B$ , then it is easily verified  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A$ .

Conversely, assume that  $I$  is a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A$ . Let  $x = (a, f(a) + j_1), y = (b, f(b) + j_2) \in A \bowtie_J B$  such that  $x^2 - y^2 \in I \bowtie_J B$ . Since  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  and  $I$  is a nonzero sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A$ , we have  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$  by Remark 2.3(b). If  $a + b \in I$ , then  $x + y = (a + b, f(a) + j_1 + f(b) + j_2) = (a + b, f(a + b) + j_1 + j_2) \in I \bowtie_J B$ . Similarly, if  $a - b \in I$ , then  $x - y = (a - b, f(a - b) + j_1 - j_2) \in I \bowtie_J B$ . Thus  $I \bowtie_J B$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $A \bowtie_J B$ .  $\square$

The following example shows that it is again crucial that  $I$  be a nonzero ideal in Theorem 4.19.

**Example 4.20.** Let  $A = B = J = \mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $f = 1_A : A \rightarrow A$ , and  $I = \{0\}$ . Then  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ , but  $\{0\} \bowtie_{\mathbb{Z}_4} \mathbb{Z}_4$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4 \bowtie_{\mathbb{Z}_4} \mathbb{Z}_4$  by Theorem 2.2 since  $\{0\} \bowtie_{\mathbb{Z}_4} \mathbb{Z}_4 \neq \{(0, 0)\}$  is not a radical ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4 \bowtie_{\mathbb{Z}_4} \mathbb{Z}_4$  (or consider  $x = (2, 0), y = (0, 2)$ ).

Let  $T$  be an integral domain of the form  $K + M$ , where the field  $K$  is a subring of  $T$  and  $M$  is a nonzero maximal ideal of  $T$ , and let  $D$  be a subring of  $K$ . Then  $R = D + M$  is a subring of  $T$  with the same quotient field as  $T$ . This “ $D + M$ ” construction has proved very useful for constructing examples since ring-theoretic properties of  $R$  are often determined by those of  $T$  and  $D$ . The “classical” case,

when  $T$  is a valuation domain, was first studied systemically in [9, Appendix II], and the “generalized”  $D + M$  construction as above was introduced and studied in [8]. The next several results concern the sdf-absorbing ideals in  $D + M$ . (The relevant facts concerning ideals in  $D + M$  used in the proof of Theorem 4.21 may be found in [9, Theorem A, p. 560] or [10, Exercise 11, p. 202].)

**Theorem 4.21.** *Let  $T = K + M$  be an integral domain, where the field  $K$  is a subring of  $T$  and  $M$  is a nonzero maximal ideal of  $T$ , and let  $D$  be a subring of  $K$  and  $R = D + M$ .*

(a) *Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $D$ . Then  $I + M$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $D$ .*

(b) *Let  $T$  be a valuation domain. Then  $J$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $J = I + M$ , where  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $D$ , or  $J$  is a prime ideal of  $T$ .*

*Proof.* (a) This follows directly from Theorem 2.10(a)(c).

(b) Let  $J$  be an ideal of  $R$ ; so  $J$  is comparable to  $M$ . If  $M \subseteq J$ , then  $J = I + M$  for an ideal  $I$  of  $D$ . Thus  $J$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $D$  by part (a) above. So we may assume that  $J \subseteq M$ . Note that the prime ideals of  $R$  contained in  $M$  are just the prime ideals of  $T$ . Hence the radical ideals of  $R$  contained in  $M$  are precisely the prime ideals of  $T$  (since radical ideals in a valuation domain are prime). Thus  $J$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  if and only if  $J$  is a prime ideal of  $T$ .  $\square$

**Example 4.22.** Let  $T = \mathbb{Q}[[X]] = \mathbb{Q} + X\mathbb{Q}[[X]]$ ,  $R = \mathbb{Z} + X\mathbb{Q}[[X]]$ , and  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  a positive prime. Then  $T$  is a valuation domain (DVR) with maximal ideal  $M = X\mathbb{Q}[[X]]$ . Thus the sdf-absorbing ideals of  $R$  are the prime ideals  $\{0\}$ ,  $X\mathbb{Q}[[X]]$ , and  $p\mathbb{Z} + X\mathbb{Q}[[X]]$ , and the ideals  $2p\mathbb{Z} + X\mathbb{Q}[[X]]$  ( $p \neq 2$ ) by Theorem 4.21(b) and Example 2.8(a). Note that  $R$  is a Bézout domain by [8, Theorem 7], but not a PID since  $M$  is not a principal (or even finitely generated) ideal of  $R$ .

## 5. WEAKLY SQUARE-DIFFERENCE FACTOR ABSORBING IDEALS

Recall from [2] (also see [6]) that a proper ideal  $I$  of a commutative ring  $R$  is a *weakly prime ideal* of  $R$  if whenever  $0 \neq ab \in I$  for  $a, b \in R$ , then  $a \in I$  or  $b \in I$ . In this section, we introduce and study the “weakly” analog of sdf-absorbing ideals. First we give the definition.

**Definition 5.1.** A proper ideal  $I$  of a commutative ring  $R$  is a *weakly square-difference factor absorbing ideal* (weakly sdf-absorbing ideal) of  $R$  if whenever  $0 \neq a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ , then  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ .

A weakly prime ideal or sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  is clearly also a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . If  $R$  is an integral domain, then  $I$  is a weakly prime (resp., weakly sdf-absorbing) ideal of  $R$  if and only if it is a prime (resp., sdf-absorbing) ideal of  $R$ . Also,  $\{0\}$  is vacuously a weakly prime and weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , but need not be a prime or sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . The following is an example of a nonzero weakly sdf-absorbing ideal that is neither an sdf-absorbing ideal nor a weakly prime ideal.

**Example 5.2.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ , and  $I = \{0\} \times \{0, 2\}$ . Then  $I$  is not a radical ideal of  $R$ ; so  $I$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  by Theorem 2.2. Also,  $(0, 0) \neq$

$(2, 2)(0, 1) \in I$ , but  $(2, 2) \notin I$  and  $(0, 1) \notin I$ ; so  $I$  is not a weakly prime ideal of  $R$ . Note that if  $x^2 - y^2 \in I$  for  $x, y \in R$ , then  $x^2 - y^2 = (0, 0)$ . Thus  $I$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .

The next theorem is the “weakly” version of Theorem 2.6.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $I$  be a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  with  $2 \in U(R)$ . Then  $I$  is a weakly prime ideal of  $R$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.6. The details are left to the reader.  $\square$

The next two theorems and corollary are the “weakly” analogs of Theorem 2.9, Theorem 2.10(b)(c), and Corollary 2.11(a)(b), respectively. They follow directly from the definitions; so their proofs are omitted.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $I$  be a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$ , and let  $S$  be a multiplicatively closed subset of  $R$  with  $I \cap S = \emptyset$ . Then  $I_S$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_S$ .*

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $f : R \rightarrow T$  be a homomorphism of commutative rings.*

(a) *If  $f$  is injective and  $J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ , then  $f^{-1}(J)$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

(b) *If  $f$  is surjective and  $I$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  containing  $\ker(f)$ , then  $f(I)$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ .*

**Corollary 5.6.** (a) *Let  $R \subseteq T$  be an extension of commutative rings and  $J$  a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $T$ . Then  $J \cap R$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

(b) *Let  $J \subseteq I$  be ideals of a commutative ring  $R$ . If  $I$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , then  $I/J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R/J$ .*

The following examples (cf. Example 2.12) show that the “weakly” analog of Theorem 2.10(a) and Corollary 2.11(c) may fail and the “ $\ker(f) \subseteq I$ ” hypothesis is needed in Theorem 5.5(b).

**Example 5.7.** (a) Let  $f : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  be the natural epimorphism. By Example 5.2,  $\{0\} \times \{0, 2\}$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ , but  $f^{-1}(\{0\} \times \{0, 2\}) = 4\mathbb{Z} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$  is not a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$  (let  $a = (2, 2)$  and  $b = (0, 2)$ ). Thus the “weakly” analog of Theorem 2.10(a) and Corollary 2.11(c) may fail.

(b) Let  $f : \mathbb{Z}[X] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the epimorphism given by  $f(g(X)) = g(0)$ . Then  $I = (X + 4)$  is a prime ideal, and thus a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal, of  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ , but  $f((X + 4)) = 4\mathbb{Z}$  is not a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  (let  $a = 4$  and  $b = 2$ ). Note that  $\ker(f) = (X) \not\subseteq (X + 4) = I$ ; so the “ $\ker(f) \subseteq I$ ” hypothesis is needed in Theorem 5.5(b).

If  $I$  is a weakly prime ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  that is not a prime ideal, then  $I \subseteq \text{nil}(R)$  by [2, Theorem 1]. A similar result holds for weakly sdf-absorbing ideals.

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $I$  be a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$ . If  $I$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , then  $I \subseteq \text{nil}(R)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $I$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , we have  $a^2 - b^2 = 0$  for some  $0 \neq a, b \in R$ , but  $a + b \notin I$  and  $a - b \notin I$ . Note that if  $a, b \in I$ , then  $a + b \in I$  and  $a - b \in I$ ,

a contradiction. So without loss of generality, we may assume that  $b \notin I$ . Let  $i \in I$ . Then  $b+i, b-i \neq 0$ . We first show that  $a^2 - (b+i)^2 = 0$  and  $a^2 - (b-i)^2 = 0$ . Since  $i \in I$  and  $a^2 - b^2 = 0$ , we have  $a^2 - (b+i)^2 = a^2 - b^2 - 2bi - i^2 = -2bi - i^2 \in I$ . Suppose that  $a^2 - (b+i)^2 \neq 0$ . Since  $I$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , either  $a + (b+i) \in I$  or  $a - (b+i) \in I$ . Thus  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ , a contradiction. Similarly,  $a^2 - (b-i)^2 = 0$ . Hence  $-2bi - i^2 = a^2 - b^2 - 2bi - i^2 = a^2 - (b+i)^2 = 0$  and  $2bi - i^2 = a^2 - b^2 + 2bi - i^2 = a^2 - (b-i)^2 = 0$ ; so  $2i^2 = 0$ . Thus  $2i \in \text{nil}(R)$ . Since  $2bi - i^2 = 0$  and  $2i \in \text{nil}(R)$ , we have  $i^2 = 2bi \in \text{nil}(R)$ . Hence  $i \in \text{nil}(R)$ , and thus  $I \subseteq \text{nil}(R)$ .  $\square$

In light of the proof of Theorem 5.8, we have the following result.

**Corollary 5.9.** *Let  $I$  be a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of a commutative ring  $R$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .*

(a)  $2i^2 = 0$ , and hence  $2i \in \text{nil}(R)$ , for every  $i \in I$ . Moreover, if  $2 \notin Z(R)$  or  $\text{char}(R) = 2$ , then  $i^2 = 0$  for every  $i \in I$ .

(b) If  $R$  is reduced, then  $I = \{0\}$ .

We next investigate when  $I \times J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$ .

**Theorem 5.10.** *Let  $R_1, R_2$  be commutative rings and  $I$  a nonzero weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(a)  $I \times R_2$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$ .

(b)  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ .

(c)  $I \times R_2$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) Let  $R = R_1 \times R_2$  and  $J = I \times R_2$ . Assume by way of contradiction that  $I$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . Since  $I$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ , there are  $0 \neq a, b \in R_1$  such that  $a^2 - b^2 = 0$ , but  $a + b \notin I$  and  $a - b \notin I$ . Let  $x = (a, 1), y = (b, 0) \in R$ . Then  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  and  $(0, 0) \neq x^2 - y^2 \in J$ . Since  $J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , we have  $x + y = (a + b, 1) \in J$  or  $x - y = (a - b, 1) \in J$ . Thus  $a + b \in I$  or  $a - b \in I$ , a contradiction. Hence  $I$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) This follows from Remark 4.14(b).

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) This is clear.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.11.** *Let  $R_1, R_2$  be commutative rings,  $I$  a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal, and  $J$  a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_2$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal. Then the following statements are equivalent*

(a)  $I \times J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal.

(b)  $I \times J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$ .

(c) If  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $a, b \in R_1$ , then  $a^2 - b^2 = 0$ , and if  $c^2 - d^2 \in J$  for  $c, d \in R_2$ , then  $c^2 - d^2 = 0$ .

(d) If  $x^2 - y^2 \in I \times J$  for  $0 \neq x, y \in R_1 \times R_2$ , then  $x^2 - y^2 = (0, 0)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $R = R_1 \times R_2$  and  $K = I \times J$ .

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) This is clear.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) Assume  $0 \neq a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $a, b \in R_1$ . Since  $J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_2$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal, we have  $e^2 - f^2 = 0$  for some  $0 \neq e, f \in R_2$ , but  $e + f \notin J$  and  $e - f \notin J$ . Let  $x = (a, e)$  and  $y = (b, f)$ . Then  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  and  $0 \neq x^2 - y^2 = (a^2 - b^2, e^2 - f^2) \in K$ . Since  $K$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ , we have  $x + y = (a + b, e + f) \in K$  or  $x - y = (a - b, e - f) \in K$ .



Thus  $e + f \in J$  or  $e - f \in J$ , a contradiction. Hence if  $a^2 - b^2 \in I$  for  $a, b \in R_1$ , then  $a^2 - b^2 = 0$ . A similar argument shows that if  $c^2 - d^2 \in J$  for  $c, d \in R_2$ , then  $c^2 - d^2 = 0$ .

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (d) This is clear.

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) Clearly  $K$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . We show that  $K$  is not a 1-absorbing ideal of  $R$ . Since  $I$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal, we have  $a^2 - b^2 = 0$  for some  $0 \neq a, b \in R_1$ , but  $a + b \notin I$  and  $a - b \notin I$ . Let  $x = (a, 0), y = (0, b)$ . Then  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  and  $x^2 - y^2 = (0, 0) \in K$ , but  $x + y = (a + b, 0) \notin K$  and  $x - y = (a - b, 0) \notin K$ . Hence  $K$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$ .  $\square$

Note that in the proof of (d)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) of Theorem 5.11 above, we only need one of  $I, J$  to not be an sdf-absorbing ideal. In view of Theorem 5.11, the following example shows that  $I \times J$  may be a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1 \times R_2$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal, but neither  $I$  nor  $J$  need be a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal.

**Example 5.12.** Let  $R_1 = R_2 = \mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $R = R_1 \times R_2$ , and  $K = \{0\} \times \{0, 2\}$ . Then  $K$  is a nonzero weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal by Example 5.2. However,  $I = \{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$  and  $J = \{0, 2\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_2$ .

The following example satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 5.11.

**Example 5.13.** Let  $R_1 = \mathbb{Z}_2[X]/(X^2)$ ,  $R_2 = \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ , and  $R = R_1 \times R_2$ . Then  $I = \{0\}$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . Since  $(X + 1)^2 - 1^2 = 0$  in  $R_1$ , but  $X \notin I$ , we have that  $I$  is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_1$ . Let  $J = \{0\} \times \{0, 2\}$ . Then  $J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R_2$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal by Example 5.2. Since  $x^2 - y^2 \in K = I \times J$  for  $0 \neq x, y \in R$  implies  $x^2 - y^2 = (0, 0, 0) \in R$ , we have that  $K = I \times J$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $R$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal by Theorem 5.11.

In Theorem 4.11, we determined when  $\{0\}$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . We next consider  $nil(\mathbb{Z}_n)$  ( $= J(\mathbb{Z}_n)$ ).

**Theorem 5.14.** (a)  $nil(\mathbb{Z}_n)$  is an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  if and only if  $n = q^m$  for some integer  $m \geq 1$  and positive prime  $q$  or  $n = 2^i p^k$  for some integers  $i, k \geq 1$  and positive prime  $p \neq 2$ .

(b)  $nil(\mathbb{Z}_n) = \{0\}$  is a weakly sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  that is not an sdf-absorbing ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  if and only if  $n = pq$  for distinct odd positive primes  $p, q$  or  $n = p_1 \cdots p_m$  for distinct positive primes  $p_1, \dots, p_m$ , where  $m \geq 3$ .

*Proof.* (a) This follows from Theorem 4.9.

(b) Note that  $nil(\mathbb{Z}_n) = \{0\}$  if and only if  $n$  is a product of distinct positive primes. The result then follows from Theorem 4.9 and Theorem 4.11.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. D. Anderson and M. Bataineh, Generalizations of prime ideals, *Comm. Algebra*, 36(2008), 686–696.
- [2] D. D. Anderson and E. Smith, Weakly prime ideals, *Houston J. Math.*, 29(2003), 831–840.
- [3] D. D. Anderson and M. Winders, Idealization of a module, *J. Commut. Algebra*, 1(2009), 3–56.

- [4] D. F. Anderson and A. Badawi, Divisibility conditions in commutative rings with zerodivisors, *Comm. Algebra*, 30(2002), 4031–4047.
- [5] D. F. Anderson and A. Badawi, On  $n$ -absorbing ideals in commutative rings, *Comm. Algebra*, 39(2011), 1646–1672.
- [6] A. Badawi, On weakly semiprime ideals of commutative rings, *Beitr. Algebra Geom.*, 57(2016), 589–597.
- [7] A. Badawi, On 2-absorbing ideals of commutative rings, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.*, 75(2007), 417–429.
- [8] J. Brewer and E. Rutter,  $D + M$  constructions with general overrings, *Michigan Math. J.*, 23(1976), 109–129.
- [9] R. W. Gilmer, *Multiplicative Ideal Theory*, Queen’s Papers in Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 12, Queen’s Univ. Press, Kingston, Ontario, 12(1968).
- [10] R. Gilmer, *Multiplicative Ideal Theory*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1972.
- [11] J. Huckaba, *Rings with Zero Divisors*, Marcel Dekker, New York/Basel, 1988.
- [12] I. Kaplansky, *Commutative Rings, revised ed.*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1974.