P. Alirio J. Peña; Jorge E. Vielma
Isolated points and redundancy

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 52 (2011), No. 1, 145--152

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/141434

Comment.Math.Univ.Carolin. 52,1 (2011) 145–152

Isolated points and redundancy

Alirio J. Peña P., Jorge Vielma

Abstract. We describe the isolated points of an arbitrary topological space (X, τ). If the τ-specialization pre-order on X has enough maximal elements, then a point $x \in X$ is an isolated point in (X, τ) if and only if x is both an isolated point in the subspaces of τ-kerneled points of X and in the τ-closure of $\{x\}$ (a special case of this result is proved in Mehrvarz A.A., Samei K., *On commutative Gelfand rings*, J. Sci. Islam. Repub. Iran **10** (1999), no. 3, 193–196). This result is applied to an arbitrary subspace of the prime spectrum $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ of a (commutative with nonzero identity) ring R, and in particular, to the space $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ and the maximal and minimal spectrum of R. Dually, a prime ideal P of R is an isolated point in its Zariski-kernel if and only if P is a minimal prime ideal. Finally, some aspects about the redundancy of (maximal) prime ideals in the (Jacobson) prime radical of a ring are considered, and we characterize when $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is a scattered space.

Keywords: maximal (minimal) spectrum of a ring, scattered space, isolated point, prime radical, Jacobson radical

Classification: 54F65, 13C05

Introduction

In Section 1 we include some preliminaries. In Section 2 we describe the isolated points of an arbitrary topological space (Theorem 2.1). In particular, we describe the isolated points in a topological space (X, τ) such that the pre-ordered set $(X, \leq_\tau)$ has enough maximal elements, where $\leq_\tau$ is the τ-specialization pre-order on X (Theorem 2.2), and we apply this result to the prime spectrum of a ring (Corollary 2.1). In Section 3 we characterize the isolated points in an arbitrary subspace of the prime spectrum $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ of a ring R (Theorem 3.1) and we apply this to the maximal and minimal spectrum of R (Theorems 3.4–3.5). Also, using these results, we characterize when each of these subspaces is a discrete space (Corollaries 3.2–3.3). Further, we characterize the points which are isolated points in its kernel (Theorem 3.6), as well as when $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is a scattered space (Corollary 3.5).

1. Preliminaries

We denote by $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ the set of natural numbers, a set X with a topology τ will be denoted by (X, τ) and we assume no separation axioms, thus a point p is *isolated* if it is simply an open point. For every subset Y of X, we denote by $\tau|_Y$ the subspace topology on Y, by $\overline{Y}^{\tau}$ the τ-closure of Y, by $\widehat{Y}^{\tau}$ the

τ-*kernel* of Y (the intersection of the τ-open subsets of X containing Y), and Y is said to be τ-*kerneled* if $Y = \widehat{Y}^{\tau}$. Also, the τ-*saturation* of Y is the set $\bigcup_{y \in Y} \overline{y}^{\tau}$, and we say Y is τ-*saturated* if it coincides with its τ-saturation. In particular, $\overline{x}^{\tau} := \overline{\{x\}}^{\tau}$ and $\widehat{x}^{\tau} := \widehat{\{x\}}^{\tau}$ for every $x \in X$.

Let R be a ring. We set $I \leq R$ to indicate that I is an ideal of R and we denote by $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Max}(R)$, $\mathrm{Min}(R)$) the family of prime (resp. maximal, minimal prime) ideals of R. Recall that every proper ideal is contained in a maximal ideal and every prime ideal contains a minimal prime ideal ([2]). We set $J(R) := \bigcap \mathrm{Max}(R)$ the *Jacobson radical* of R, for every $I \leq R$, we denote by $\eta(I)$ the *prime radical* of I (the intersection of the prime ideals of R containing I) and we say I is a *radical ideal* if $I = \eta(I)$. In particular, $\eta(R) := \eta(0)$ is the *prime radical* of R, and R is called a *reduced ring* if $\eta(R) = \{0\}$. Note that $\eta(R) = \bigcap \mathrm{Min}(R)$ and we set $Ra := \{ra : r \in R\}$ and $(I : a) := \{r \in R : ra \in I\}$ for every $a \in R$.

Let I be an ideal of a ring R. We denote by $(I)_0$ the family of prime ideals of R containing I and by $D_0(I) := \mathrm{Spec}(R) \setminus (I)_0$. Also, $(a)_0 := (Ra)_0$ and $D_0(a) := D_0(Ra)$ for every $a \in R$. It is easy to see that the family $\{(I)_0 : I \leq R\}$ satisfies the axioms of closed sets for a topology t_Z on $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$, the *Zariski topology*, and the space $(\mathrm{Spec}(R), t_Z)$ is the *prime spectrum* of R. Note that $\overline{\{P\}}^{t_Z} = (P)_0$ and $\widehat{P}^{\tau} = \{Q \in \mathrm{Spec}(R) : Q \subseteq P\}$ for every $P \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)$, and in this work we consider the family $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ as a space with the Zariski topology.

2. Isolated points

Let (X, τ) be a space. A point $x \in X$ is called a *kerneled* (resp. *isolated*, *Alexandroff*) *point* of (X, τ) if $\{x\} = \widehat{x}^{\tau}$ (resp. $\{x\} \in \tau$, $\widehat{x}^{\tau} \in \tau$). The kerneled points of (X, τ) are the maximal elements in the pre-ordered set $(X, \leq_\tau)$, where $\leq_\tau$ is the τ-*specialization pre-order* on X, this is, $x \leq_\tau y$ in X if $x \in \overline{y}^{\tau}$, or equivalently, $y \in \widehat{x}^{\tau}$. Note that (X, τ) is a T_0-space if and only if $\leq_\tau$ is a partial order on X.

Let $(X, \leq)$ be a pre-ordered set. We denote by $\mathrm{Max}(X, \leq)$ the set of maximal elements in $(X, \leq)$, and we say $(X, \leq)$ *has enough maximal elements* if for every $x \in X$, there exists $y \in \mathrm{Max}(X, \leq)$ such that $x \leq y$. Dually, we define the set $\mathrm{Min}(X, \leq)$.

The following result is well known, but we present it here for further reference in this paper.

Theorem 2.1. *Let (X, τ) be a space and $x \in X$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *x is an isolated point of (X, τ).*
(b) *Whenever $A \subseteq X$ with $x \in \overline{A}^{\tau}$, we have $x \in A$.*
(c) *x is both an Alexandroff point of (X, τ) and a maximal element in $(X, \leq_\tau)$.*

Proof: It is clear that (a)$\Rightarrow$(b) and since $\mathrm{Max}(X, \leq_\tau)$ is the set of kerneled points of (X, τ), we have (c)$\Rightarrow$(a). To prove that (b)$\Rightarrow$(c), let $y \in \widehat{x}^{\tau}$. Then, $x \in \overline{y}^{\tau}$ and thus, $x = y$. Hence, $\widehat{x}^{\tau} = \{x\}$ and by hypothesis, the set $A = X \backslash \{x\}$ is τ-closed (otherwise, A is τ-dense and $x \in A$ which is a contradiction). Therefore, $\{x\} \in \tau$ and (c) holds. $\square$

Theorem 2.2. *Let (X, τ) be a space such that $(X, \leq_\tau)$ has enough maximal elements and $x \in X$. Then, x is an isolated point of (X, τ) if and only if x is both an isolated point in $\mathrm{Max}(X, \leq_\tau)$ and in $\overline{x}^{\tau}$.*

PROOF: The necessary condition is clear. Suppose the sufficiency condition and let $Y = \mathrm{Max}(X, \leq_\tau)$ and $Z = \overline{x}^{\tau}$. Then, $\{x\} = Y \cap U = Z \cap V$ for some pair $U, V \in \tau$. Note that $Y \cap Z = \{x\}$, since if $y \in Y \cap Z$ then $y \leq_\tau x$ and by maximality, we have $y = x$. Hence, $\{x\} = W \cap \{x\}$ where $W = U \cap V \in \tau$. We will show that $\{x\} = W$, for if $y \in W$ then, by hypothesis, there exists $z \in Y$ such that $y \leq_\tau z$ and thus, $y \in \overline{z}^{\tau}$ and since $y \in U$, we have $z \in U \cap Y = \{x\}$ and thus, $z = x$ and $y \leq_\tau x$. Hence, $y \in Z \cap V = \{x\}$ and $y = x$. $\square$

Corollary 2.1. *A prime ideal P of a ring R is an isolated point of the prime spectrum of R if and only if P is an isolated point in $\mathrm{Min}(R)$ and in the Zariski-closure of $\{P\}$.*

PROOF: Use Theorem 2.2, since $\mathrm{Min}(R) = \mathrm{Max}(\mathrm{Spec}(R), \leq_{tz})$ and $\leq_{tz} = \supseteq$. $\square$

Note that Corollary 2.1 is part (2) of Proposition 3 in [4], and in the next section we study each of the two sufficient conditions in Corollary 2.1.

3. Redundancy and scattered spectral spaces

Let Y be a nonempty family of prime ideals of a ring R and $P \in Y$. An ideal I of R is *absolutely Y-irreducible* if whenever $\mathcal{F} \subseteq Y$ with $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq I$, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $Q \subseteq I$. If $Y = \mathrm{Min}(R)$ then I is said to be *absolutely minimal-irreducible*, and if $Y = \mathrm{Max}(R)$ then I is said to be *absolutely maximal-irreducible* ([5]). Let $I(Y) := \bigcap Y$ be the radical ideal of Y and $I_P(Y) := \bigcap \{Q \in Y : Q \neq P\}$. Then, $\overline{Y}^{tz} = (I(Y))_0$ and we say P is *Y-redundant* if $I(Y) = I_P(Y)$. In particular, if $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ we have the *weak η-redundancy* studied in [5]. Also, if $Y = \mathrm{Min}(R)$ we speak of *η-redundancy* and if $Y = \mathrm{Max}(R)$ we speak of *J-redundancy*. We now give a description of the isolated points in an arbitrary subspace of $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ with at least two points. We denote by $\mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq)$ the set of minimal elements in the poset $(Y, \subseteq)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a ring, Y a non-empty subset of $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$, $I = \bigcap Y$ the radical ideal of Y and $P \in Y$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *P is an isolated point of Y (as subspace of $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$).*
(b) *P is an absolutely Y-irreducible ideal of R and $P \in \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq)$.*
(c) *Whenever $\mathcal{F} \subseteq Y$ with $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq P$, we have $P \in \mathcal{F}$.*
(d) *There exists $a \in I_P(Y) \backslash P$ such that $P = (I : a)$.*
(e) *P is not Y-redundant.*

Further, in such a case, $P = (I : a)$ for every $a \in I_P(Y) \backslash P$.

Proof: Let $t = t_Z|_Y$. To show that (a)$\Rightarrow$(b), let $Q \in Y$ with $Q \subseteq P$. Then, $Q \in \widehat{P}^{\,tz} \cap Y = \widehat{P}^{\,t} = \{P\}$ and thus, $Q = P$ and $P \in \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq)$. Now, let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq Y$ with $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq P$. Then, $P \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}^{tz} \bigcap Y = \overline{\mathcal{F}}^{t}$ and by hypothesis, $\{P\} \bigcap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $P \in \mathcal{F}$. The implication (b)$\Rightarrow$(c) is clear. Let us show that (c)$\Rightarrow$(e), and let $\mathcal{F} = Y \backslash \{P\}$. Then $I(Y) \neq I_P(Y)$ (otherwise, we will have $P \in \mathcal{F}$ which is a contradiction). Hence, P is not Y-redundant. Let us show that (e)$\Rightarrow$(a), and let $H = I_P(Y)$. Then $\{P\} = D_0(H) \bigcap Y \in t$. In fact, by hypothesis, $P \in D_0(H) \bigcap Y$ and if $Q \in D_0(H) \bigcap Y$ then $Q = P$ (otherwise, $H \subseteq Q$ which is a contradiction). Let us see (e)$\Rightarrow$(d), and let $a \in I_P(Y) \backslash P$. Let us show that $P = (I : a)$. In fact it is clear that $(I : a) \subseteq P$ and if $x \in P$ such that $ax \notin I$ then there exists $Q \in Y$ with $ax \notin Q$. But then, $Q \neq P$ (since $x \in P$) and thus, $a \in Q$ which is a contradiction. Finally, (d)$\Rightarrow$(a) since if $a \in I_P(Y) \backslash P$ with $P = (I : a)$ then $\{P\} = Y \bigcap D_0(a) \in t$. □

Corollary 3.1. *A prime ideal P of a ring R is an isolated point of the Zariski-closure of $\{P\}$ if and only if P is not the intersection of the prime ideals which strictly contain it.*

Corollary 3.1 is part (2) of Proposition 3 in [4] under the assumption that R is a reduced ring. Recall that a prime ideal P of a ring R is a minimal prime ideal if and only if $P = \bigcup_{a \in R \backslash P} (\eta(R) : a)$ ([2, Lemma 1.1]). Thus it is natural to ask when this last property holds for a non-empty family of prime ideals of R.

Theorem 3.2. *Let Y be a nonempty family of prime ideals of a ring R, $I = \bigcap Y$ and $P \in Y$. If $P = \bigcup_{a \in R \backslash P} (I : a)$ then $P \in \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq)$. Further, the converse holds in any one of the following cases:* (a) *if Y is a Zariski-kerneled set;* (b) *the Zariski-closure of Y coincides with its Zariski-saturation.*

Proof: Suppose $P = \bigcup_{a \in R \backslash P} (I : a)$ and that $P \notin \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq)$. Then, there exists $Q \in Y$ such that $Q \subsetneq P$. Let $x \in P \backslash Q$ and $a \in R \backslash P$ such that $x \in (I : a)$. Then, $ax \in I \subseteq Q$ which is a contradiction. Conversely, suppose $P \in \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq)$ and either (a) or (b) holds. It is clear that $\bigcup_{a \in R \backslash P} (I : a) \subseteq P$. Now, suppose $x \in P$ such that $ax \notin I$ for every $a \in R \backslash P$. Let $S = R \backslash P$ and $T = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S x^n$. Then, $S \subsetneq T$ and T is a multiplicatively closed subset of R such that $1 \in T$. Note that $0 \notin T$ (otherwise, $sx^n = 0 \in I$ for some $s \in S$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and since I is radical and $s \notin I$, we will have $x^m \in I$ for some integer $m \geq 2$ and thus, $x \in I$ which is a contradiction). Hence, $0 \notin T$ and $I \cap T = \emptyset$, and by Krull's Lemma (Theorem 2.2 in Chapter VIII of [3]), there exists a prime ideal Q of R such that $I \subseteq Q$ and $T \cap Q = \emptyset$. But then, $Q \in \overline{Y}^{tz}$ and $Q \subseteq P$. Now, if (a) holds then Y a lower segment of $(\mathrm{Spec}(R), \subseteq)$ and thus $Q \in Y$ and by minimality, $P = Q$ which is a contradiction (since $x \in P$ and $x \notin Q$). On the other hand, if (b) holds then $Q \in \overline{Y}^{tz} = \bigcup_{H \in Y} (H)_0$ and there exists $H \in Y$ such that $H \subseteq Q$ and as above, $P = H = Q$ obtaining a contradiction. □

Note that condition (b) in Theorem 3.2 is satisfied if Y is either Zariski-closed or dense with respect to the Alexandroff closure of the Zariski topology, denoted by $\overline{t_Z}$. Also, condition (b) is equivalent to the following: for every prime ideal P of R such that $\bigcap Y \subseteq P$, there exists $Q \in Y$ such that $Q \subseteq P$. In particular, any finite subset of $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ satisfies this property. Moreover, the conditions (a) and (b) are independent. In fact, if R is a zero-dimensional ring with infinite prime ideals then $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is not a discrete space and there exists a Zariski-open set Y which is not Zariski-closed (otherwise, the Zariski topology will be an Alexandroff T_1-topology which is discrete). On the other hand, if R is not a zero-dimensional ring then there exists a maximal nonminimal ideal P of R and thus, the set $Y = \{P\}$ satisfies trivially condition (b) but not condition (a).

Theorem 3.3. *Let Y be a nonempty family of prime ideals of a ring R, $P \in Y$ and $a \in R\backslash P$. If $P = (I(Y) : a)$ then $\{P\} = \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq) \bigcap D_0(a)$ and the converse holds if the poset $(Y, \subseteq)$ has enough minimal elements.*

Proof: If $Q \in Y$ with $Q \subseteq P$ then $Pa \subseteq I(Y) \subseteq Q$ and since $a \notin Q$, we have $P \subseteq Q$ and $P = Q$. Hence, $\{P\} \subseteq \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq) \bigcap D_0(a)$. Conversely, if $Q \in \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq) \bigcap D_0(a)$ then $Pa \subseteq I(Y) \subseteq Q$ and thus, $P \subseteq Q$ and $P = Q$. On the other hand, suppose that the poset $(Y, \subseteq)$ has enough minimal elements and $\{P\} = \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq) \bigcap D_0(a)$. It is clear that $(I(Y) : a) \subseteq P$ and if $x \in P$ with $ax \notin I(Y)$ then there exists $Q \in Y$ such that $ax \notin Q$. Now, if $Q_0 \in \mathrm{Min}(Y, \subseteq)$ such that $Q_0 \subseteq Q$ then $ax \notin Q_0$ and $P = Q_0$ which is a contradiction. Hence, $P = (I(Y) : a)$. □

We now prove some more consequences of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3.

Theorem 3.4. *Let R be a ring and P a prime ideal of R. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *P is an isolated point of* $\mathrm{Min}(R)$.
(b) *P is both an absolutely minimal-irreducible and minimal prime ideal of R.*
(c) *There exists $a \in R\backslash P$ such that $P \subseteq Q$ for every $Q \in D_0(a)$.*
(d) *There exists $a \in R\backslash P$ such that $P = (\eta(R) : a)$.*
(e) *P is not η-redundant.*
(f) *P is a minimal prime ideal of R and there exists $a \in R\backslash P$ such that $(\eta(R) : x) \subseteq (\eta(R) : a)$ for every $x \in R\backslash P$.*

Proof: By Theorems 3.1 and 3.3, we have (a)⇔(b)⇔(d)⇔(e). Let us show that (d)⇒(c). Suppose $a \in R\backslash P$ with $P = (\eta(R) : a)$ and let $Q \in D_0(a)$. Then $a \notin Q$ and if $x \in P$ then $ax \in \eta(R) \subseteq Q$ and thus, $x \in Q$ and $P \subseteq Q$. We see (c)⇒(b). Suppose $a \in R\backslash P$ such that $P \subseteq Q$ for every $Q \in D_0(a)$, and let $Q_0 \in \mathrm{Min}(R)$ with $Q_0 \subseteq P$. If $Q_0 \neq P$ then $a \in Q_0$ (otherwise $P \subseteq Q_0$ and thus $P = Q_0$ which is a contradiction). Hence, $P \in \mathrm{Min}(R)$. Now, let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathrm{Min}(R)$ with $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq P$. Then $a \notin \bigcap \mathcal{F}$ and there exists $Q \in \mathcal{F}$ with $a \notin Q$ and by hypothesis, $P \subseteq Q$ and by minimality, $P = Q$. Finally, for (f)⇔(d) use that $P = \bigcup_{a \in R\backslash P} (\eta(R) : a)$ ([2]). □

Corollary 3.2. *Let R be a ring. Then,* $\mathrm{Min}(R)$ *is a discrete space if and only if every minimal prime ideal of R is not η-redundant if and only if the prime radical of R is the irredundant intersection of the minimal prime ideals of R.*

Condition (d) in Theorem 3.4 is an extension of part (3) of Proposition 4 in [4]. Dually, we have the following two results.

Theorem 3.5. *Let R be a ring and P a maximal ideal of R. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *P is an isolated point of* $\mathrm{Max}(R)$.
(b) *P is an absolutely maximal-irreducible ideal of R.*
(c) *If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathrm{Max}(R)$ such that $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq P$ then $P \in \mathcal{F}$.*
(d) *There exists $a \in I_P(\mathrm{Max}(R)) \backslash P$ such that $P = (J(R) : a)$.*
(e) *There exists $a \in R \backslash P$ such that $P = (J(R) : a)$.*
(f) *P is not J-redundant.*

Corollary 3.3. *Let R be a ring. Then,* $\mathrm{Max}(R)$ *is a discrete space if and only if every maximal ideal of R is not J-redundant if and only if the Jacobson radical of R is the irredundant intersection of the maximal ideals of R.*

Every maximal ideal of a ring R generated by an idempotent element of R is an isolated point in $\mathrm{Max}(R)$ and the converse holds if R is a *semiprimitive ring*, this is, $J(R) = \{0\}$ (Lemma 2.1 in [4]). Note that if $J = J(R)$ then the quotient ring R/J is semiprimitive and the spaces $\mathrm{Max}(R)$ and $\mathrm{Max}(R/J)$ are homeomorphic. Hence, in general, the isolated points of the space $\mathrm{Max}(R)$ are the maximal ideals P of R for which P/J is an ideal of R/J generated by an idempotent element of R/J.

Theorem 3.6. *Let P be a prime ideal of a ring R and $Y = \widehat{P}^{tz}$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *P is an isolated point of Y.*
(b) *P is a minimal element in the poset $(Y, \subseteq)$.*
(c) *P is a minimal prime ideal of R.*
(d) *$P = (I(Y) : a)$ for some $a \in R \backslash P$.*

Proof: By Theorem 3.1, (a)⇔(b)⇔(c) and (a)⇒(d). To show that (d)⇒(c), let $Q \in \mathrm{Min}(R)$ such that $Q \subseteq P$. Since $Q \in Y$ and $a \notin Q$, we have $Pa \subseteq I(Y) \subseteq Q$ and thus, $P \subseteq Q$ and $P = Q$. □

By Corollary 3.1, the property (a) in Theorem 3.6 is not dual. Also, for every prime ideal P of a ring R, the family $Y = \widehat{P}^{tz}$ has enough minimal elements and the radical ideal $I(Y)$ is the intersection of the minimal prime ideals of R contained in P (see Theorem 3.3).

Theorem 3.7. *Let P and Q be prime ideals of a ring R. Then P is an isolated point of $\overline{Q}^{tz}$ if and only if $P = Q$ and P is not the intersection of the prime ideals which strictly contain it.*

Proof: The sufficiency condition is a consequence of Corollary 3.1. Conversely, suppose P is an isolated point of $\overline{Q}^{tz} = (Q)_0$. By Theorem 3.1, for every $\mathcal{F} \subseteq (Q)_0$ with $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq P$, we have $P \in \mathcal{F}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{F} = \{Q\}$ then $P = Q$. For the last part, use Corollary 3.1. □

Corollary 3.4. *Let P be a prime ideal of a ring R. If the (irreducible Zariski-closed) set $(P)_0$ has an isolated point then this point is P.*

Recall that (X, τ) is a *scattered space* if every nonempty subset of X contains a point that is isolated in the relative topology. By Corollary 3.4, if $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is a scattered space and $P \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ then P is the unique isolated point of $(P)_0$. By Theorem 2.8 in [1], if R is a zero-dimensional ring then $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is a scattered space if and only if every radical ideal of R is an irredundant intersection of (maximal) prime ideals of R. Compare this last result with Corollary 3.2. Further, by Theorem 3.1, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.5. *Let R be a ring. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ *is a scattered space.*
(b) *For every nonempty family Y of prime ideals of R, there is an absolutely Y-irreducible ideal of R which is a minimal element in $(Y, \subseteq)$.*
(c) *For every nonempty family Y of prime ideals of R, there exists $P \in Y$ such that if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq Y$ with $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subseteq P$, then $P \in \mathcal{F}$.*
(d) *For every nonempty family Y of prime ideals of R, there are $P \in Y$ and $a \in I_Y(P) \backslash P$ with $P = (I(Y) : a)$.*
(e) *For every nonempty family Y of prime ideals of R, there exists $P \in Y$ which is not Y-redundant.*

Acknowledgment. The authors would like to thank the referee for the careful reading of the manuscript and all the suggestions that improved the paper.

The first author would like to thank the second author for his guidance in the development of this paper which is part of his doctoral thesis.

References

[1] Heinzer W., Olberding B., *Unique irredundant intersections of completely irreducible ideals*, J. Algebra **287** (2005), 432–448.

[2] Henriksen M., Jerison M., *The space of minimal prime ideals of a commutative ring*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **115** (1965), 110–130.

[3] Hungerford T.W., *Algebra*, Reprint of the 1974 original, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 73, Springer, New York-Berlin, 1980.

[4] Mehrvarz A.A., Samei K., *On commutative Gelfand rings*, J. Sci. Islam. Repub. Iran **10** (1999), no. 3, 193–196.

[5] Peña A.J., Ruza L.M., Vielma J., *Separation axioms and the prime spectrum of commutative semirings*, Notas de Matemática, Vol. 5 (2), No. 284, 2009, pp. 66–82; http://www.saber.ula.ve/notasdematematica/.

Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia, Maracaibo, Venezuela

E-mail: aliriopp62@gmail.com

Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela

E-mail: vielma@ula.ve

(*Received* July 23, 2010)