



Characterization of Prime Ideals in $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$

Sankar Sagi

College of Applied Sciences, Sohar, Ministry of Higher Education, Sultanate of Oman

Abstract. A convolution is a mapping \mathcal{C} of the set \mathcal{Z}^+ of positive integers into the set $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}^+)$ of all subsets of \mathcal{Z}^+ such that, for any $n \in \mathcal{Z}^+$, each member of $\mathcal{C}(n)$ is a divisor of n . If $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is the set of all divisors of n , for any n , then \mathcal{D} is called the Dirichlet's convolution. Corresponding to any general convolution \mathcal{C} , we can define a binary relation $\leq_{\mathcal{C}}$ on \mathcal{Z}^+ by " $m \leq_{\mathcal{C}} n$ if and only if $m \in \mathcal{C}(n)$ ". It is well known that \mathcal{Z}^+ has the structure of a distributive lattice with respect to the division order. The division ordering is precisely the partial ordering $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$ induced by the Dirichlet's convolution \mathcal{D} . In this paper, we present a characterization for the prime ideals in $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$, where \mathcal{D} is the Dirichlet's convolution.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classifications: 06B10, 11A99

Key Words and Phrases: Poset, Lattice, semi lattice, Convolution, ideal

1. Introduction

A Convolution is a mapping $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}^+)$ such that $\mathcal{C}(n)$ is a set of positive divisors on n , $n \in \mathcal{C}(n)$ and $\mathcal{C}(n) = \bigcup_{m \in \mathcal{C}(n)} \mathcal{C}(m)$, for any $n \in \mathcal{Z}^+$. Popular examples are the Dirichlet's convolution \mathcal{D} and the Unitary convolution \mathcal{U} defined respectively by

$$\mathcal{D}(n) = \text{The set of all positive divisors of } n$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}(n) = \text{The set of Unitary divisors of } n$$

for any $n \in \mathcal{Z}^+$. If \mathcal{C} is a convolution, then the binary relation $\leq_{\mathcal{C}}$ on \mathcal{Z}^+ , defined by,

$$m \leq_{\mathcal{C}} n \text{ if and only if } m \in \mathcal{C}(n),$$

is a partial order on \mathcal{Z}^+ and is called the partial order induced by \mathcal{C} [2]. It is well known that the Dirichlet's convolution induces the division order on \mathcal{Z}^+ with respect to which \mathcal{Z}^+ becomes a distributive lattice, where, for any $a, b \in \mathcal{Z}^+$, the greatest common divisor(GCD) and the

Email address: sagi_sankar@yahoo.co.in

least common multiple(LCM) of a and b are respectively the greatest lower bound(glb) and the least upper bound(lub) of a and b . In fact, with respect to the division order, the lattice \mathcal{Z}^+ satisfies the infinite join distributive law given by

$$\left(a \vee \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} b_i \right) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} (a \vee b_i) \right)$$

for any $a \in \mathcal{Z}^+$ and $\{b_i\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^+$. In this paper, we discuss various aspects of ideals and filters in (\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_C) and eventually present a characterization of prime ideals in $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ where \mathcal{D} is the Dirichlet's convolution. Actually a general convolution may not induce a lattice structure on \mathcal{Z}^+ . However, most of the convolutions we are considering induce a meet semi lattice structure on \mathcal{Z}^+ . For this reason, we first consider a general semi lattice and study its ideals and later extend these to (\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_D) .

2. Preliminaries

Let us recall that a partial order on a non-empty set X is defined as a binary relation \leq on X which is reflexive ($a \leq a$), transitive ($a \leq b, b \leq c \implies a \leq c$) and antisymmetric ($a \leq b, b \leq a \implies a = b$) and that a pair (X, \leq) is called a partially ordered set (poset) if X is a non-empty set and \leq is a partial order on X . For any $A \subseteq X$ and $x \in X$, x is called a lower (upper) bound of A if $x \leq a$ (respectively $a \leq x$) for all $a \in A$. We have the usual notations of the greatest lower bound (glb) and least upper bound (lub) of A in X . If A is a finite subset $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$, the glb of A (lub of A) is denoted by $a_1 \wedge a_2 \wedge \dots \wedge a_n$ or $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n a_i$ (respectively by $a_1 \vee a_2 \vee \dots \vee a_n$ or $\bigvee_{i=1}^n a_i$). A partially ordered set (X, \leq) is called a meet semi lattice if $a \wedge b (= \text{glb}\{a, b\})$ exists for all a and $b \in X$. (X, \leq) is called a join semi lattice if $a \vee b (= \text{lub}\{a, b\})$ exists for all a and $b \in X$. A poset (X, \leq) is called a lattice if it is both a meet and join semi lattice. Equivalently, lattice can also be defined as an algebraic system (X, \wedge, \vee) , where \wedge and \vee are binary operations which are associative, commutative and idempotent and satisfying the absorption laws, namely $a \wedge (a \vee b) = a = a \vee (a \wedge b)$ for all $a, b \in X$; in this case the partial order \leq on X is such that $a \wedge b$ and $a \vee b$ are respectively the glb and lub of $\{a, b\}$. The algebraic operations \wedge and \vee and the partial order \leq are related by

$$(a = a \wedge b \iff a \leq b \iff a \vee b = b).$$

Throughout the paper, \mathcal{Z}^+ and \mathcal{N} denote the set of positive integers and the set of non-negative integers respectively.

Definition 1. A mapping $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{Z}^+ \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}^+)$ is called a convolution if the following are satisfied for any $n \in \mathcal{Z}^+$.

- (1). $\mathcal{C}(n)$ is a set of positive divisors of n
- (2). $n \in \mathcal{C}(n)$

$$(3). \mathcal{C}(n) = \bigcup_{m \in \mathcal{C}(n)} \mathcal{C}(m).$$

Definition 2. For any convolution \mathcal{C} and m and $n \in \mathcal{Z}^+$, we define

$$(m \leq n \text{ if and only if } m \in \mathcal{C}(n))$$

Then $\leq_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a partial order on \mathcal{Z}^+ and is called the partial order induced by \mathcal{C} on \mathcal{Z}^+ .

In fact, for any mapping $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}^+)$ such that each member of $\mathcal{C}(n)$ is a divisor of n , $\leq_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a partial order on \mathcal{Z}^+ if and only if \mathcal{C} is a convolution, as defined above [1, 4].

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{C} be a convolution and p a prime number. Define a relation $\leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p$ on the set \mathcal{N} of non-negative integers by

$$(a \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p b \text{ if and only if } p^a \in \mathcal{C}(p^b))$$

for any a and $b \in \mathcal{N}$.

It can be easily verified that $\leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p$ is a partial order on \mathcal{N} , for each prime p . The following is a direct verification.

Theorem 1. Let \mathcal{C} be a convolution.

- (1). If $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a meet(join) semilattice, then so is $(\mathcal{N}, \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p)$ for each prime p .
- (2). If $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a lattice, then so is $(\mathcal{N}, \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p)$ for each prime p .

3. Ideals in (\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_D)

Recall that most of the convolutions like Dirichlet's convolution, Unitary convolution and k -free convolution induce meet semi lattice structure on \mathcal{Z}^+ [3]. For this reason we study ideals in a general meet semi lattice and later study ideals in the lattice structure \mathcal{Z}^+ induced by the division ordering $/$. The division ordering $/$ is precisely the partial ordering \leq_D induced by the Dirichlet's convolution D . Throughout this section, unless otherwise stated, by a semi lattice we mean a meet semi lattice only.

Definition 4. Let (X, \leq) be a poset. A non-empty subset I of X is called an **initial segment** if

$$a \in I, x \in X \text{ and } x \leq a \implies x \in I.$$

Definition 5. Let (S, \wedge) be a semi lattice. A non-empty subset I of S is called an **ideal** of S if the following are satisfied

- (1). $x \in S$ and $x \leq a \in I \implies x \in I$
- (2). For any a and $b \in I$, there exists $c \in I$ such that $a \leq c$ and $b \leq c$

Definition 6. Let (S, \wedge) be a semi lattice and $a \in S$. Then the set

$$(a] := \{x \in S \mid x \leq a\} = \{y \wedge a \mid y \in S\}$$

is an ideal of S and is called the **Principal ideal** generated by a in S . Note that $(a]$ is the smallest ideal of S containing a .

Now, we present the following

Theorem 2. Let a and b be elements of a meet semi lattice (S, \wedge) . Then the following are equivalent to each other:

- (1). There exists smallest ideal of S containing a and b .
- (2). The intersection of all ideals of S containing a and b is again an ideal of S .
- (3). a and b have least upper bound in S .

Proof. (1) \iff (2) : is trivial.

(1) \implies (3) : Let I be the smallest ideal of S containing a and b . Then, there exists $x \in I$ such that

$$a \leq x \text{ and } b \leq x$$

Therefore x is an upper bound of a and b . If y is any other upper bound of a and b , then $(y]$ is an ideal of S containing a and b and hence $I \subseteq (y]$. Since $x \in I$, we get that $x \in (y]$ and therefore $x \leq y$. Thus x is the least upper bound of a and b .

(3) \implies (1) : Let $a \vee b$ be the least upper bound of a and b . Then $a \leq a \vee b$ and $b \leq a \vee b$ and hence $(a \vee b]$ is an ideal containing a and b . If I is any ideal containing a and b , then there exists $x \in I$ such that

$$a \leq x \text{ and } b \leq x \text{ and hence } a \vee b \leq x$$

so that $a \vee b \in I$ and $(a \vee b] \subseteq I$. Thus $(a \vee b]$ is the smallest ideal of S containing a and b . \square

Although the intersection of an arbitrary class of ideals need not be an ideal, a finite intersection is always an ideal.

Theorem 3. Let (S, \wedge) be a semi lattice and $\mathcal{I}(S)$ the set of all ideals of S . Then $(\mathcal{I}(S), \cap)$ is a semilattice and $a \mapsto (a]$ is an embedding of (S, \wedge) onto $(\mathcal{I}(S), \cap)$.

Proof. By the above theorem, it follows that $(\mathcal{I}(S), \cap)$ is a semi lattice. Also, for any a and b in S , we have

$$(a] \cap (b] = (a \wedge b]$$

and

$$(a] \subseteq (b] \iff a \in (b] \iff a \leq b$$

Therefore $a \mapsto (a]$ is an embedding of S into $\mathcal{I}(S)$. \square

Theorem 4. A semi lattice (S, \wedge) is a lattice if and only if $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is a lattice and, in this case, $a \mapsto (a]$ is an embedding of the lattice S into the lattice $\mathcal{I}(S)$.

Proof. It is well known that the set $\mathcal{I}(S)$ of ideals of a lattice (S, \wedge, \vee) is again a lattice in which,

$$I \wedge J = I \cap J$$

and

$$I \vee J = \{x \in S \mid x \leq a \wedge b, \text{ for some } a \in I \text{ and } b \in J\}$$

for any ideals I and J , in this case,

$$[a] \vee [b] = [a \vee b]$$

for any a and b in S , so that $a \mapsto [a]$ is an embedding of lattices.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{I}(S)$ is a lattice. Let a and $b \in S$ and I be the least upper bound of $[a]$ and $[b]$ in $\mathcal{I}(S)$. Then I is the smallest ideal containing a and b and hence by Theorem 2, $a \vee b$ exists in S . Therefore S is a lattice. \square

For a lattice (L, \wedge, \vee) , any ideal of the semi lattice (L, \wedge) turns out to be the usual ideal of the lattice (L, \wedge, \vee) .

Definition 7. Let (S, \wedge) be a semi lattice. A non-empty subset F of S is called filter of S if, for any $a, b \in S$,

$$a \wedge b \in F \Leftrightarrow a \in F \text{ and } b \in F$$

Theorem 5. Let (S, \wedge) be a semi lattice and P a proper ideal of S . Then the following are equivalent to each other

- (1). For any elements a and b in S , $a \wedge b \in P \implies a \in P$ or $b \in P$
- (2). For any ideals I and J of S , $I \cap J \subseteq P \implies I \subseteq P$ or $J \subseteq P$
- (3). $S - P$ is a filter of S .

Proof. (1) \implies (2): Let I and J be ideals of S . Suppose that $I \not\subseteq P$ and $J \not\subseteq P$. Then there exist $a \in I$ and $b \in J$ such that $a \notin P$ and $b \notin P$. Then, by (1), $a \wedge b \notin P$. But $a \wedge b \leq a \in I$ and $a \wedge b \leq b \in J$ and hence $a \wedge b \in I \cap J$. Therefore $I \cap J \not\subseteq P$.

(2) \implies (3): If $a \leq b$ and $a \in S - P$, then clearly $b \in S - P$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} a \text{ and } b \in S - P &\implies a \notin P \text{ and } b \notin P \\ &\implies [a] \not\subseteq P \text{ and } [b] \not\subseteq P \\ &\implies [a \wedge b] = [a] \cap [b] \not\subseteq P \\ &\implies x \notin P \text{ for some } x \leq a \wedge b \\ &\implies x \leq a \wedge b \text{ and } x \in S - P \\ &\implies a \wedge b \in S - P \end{aligned}$$

Thus $S - P$ is a filter of S .

(3) \implies (1): For any a and $b \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 a \notin P \text{ and } b \notin P &\implies a \text{ and } b \in S - P \\
 &\implies a \wedge b \in S - P \\
 &\implies a \wedge b \notin P
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 8. Any proper ideal P of a semi lattice (S, \wedge) is said to be a **prime ideal** if any one (and hence all) of the conditions in Theorem 5 is satisfied.

4. Prime Ideals in (\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_D)

Now we shall turn our attention to the particular case of the lattice structure on \mathcal{Z}^+ induced by the division ordering $/$ and study the ideals and prime ideals of \mathcal{Z}^+ . The division ordering is precisely the partial ordering \leq_D induced by the Dirichlet's convolution D .

First we observe that $\left(\theta : (\mathcal{Z}^+, /) \longrightarrow \left(\sum_p \mathcal{N}, \leq\right)\right)$ is an order isomorphism where θ is defined by

$$(\theta(a))(p) = \text{The largest } n \in \mathcal{N} \text{ such that } p^n \text{ divides } a, \text{ for any } a \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \text{ and } p \in \mathcal{P}$$

and

$$\left(\sum_p \mathcal{N}\right) = \{f : \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N} \mid f(p) = 0 \text{ for all but finite } p\}.$$

Here \mathcal{P} stands for the set of primes and \mathcal{N} stands for the set of non-negative integers.

Definition 9. Adjoin an external element ∞ to \mathcal{N} and extend the usual ordering \leq on \mathcal{N} to $\mathcal{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ by defining $a < \infty$ for all $a \in \mathcal{N}$. We shall denote $\mathcal{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ together with this extended usual order by \mathcal{N}^∞ .

Theorem 6. Let $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ be a mapping and define

$$I_\alpha = \{n \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \mid \theta(n)(p) \leq \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P}\}$$

Then I_α is an ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, /)$ and every ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, /)$ is of the form I_α for some mapping $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$

Proof. Since no prime divides the integer 1, we get that $\theta(1)(p) = 0 \leq \alpha(p)$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and hence $1 \in I_\alpha$. Therefore I_α is a non-empty subset of \mathcal{Z}^+ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 m \text{ and } n \in I_\alpha &\implies \theta(m)(p) \leq \alpha(p) \text{ and } \theta(n)(p) \leq \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P} \\
 &\implies \theta(m \vee n)(p) = \text{Max}\{\theta(m)(p), \theta(n)(p)\} \leq \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies m \vee n \in I_\alpha$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m \leq_D n \in I_\alpha &\implies \theta(m)(p) \leq \theta(n)(p) \leq \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P} \\ &\implies \theta(m)(p) \leq \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P} \\ &\implies m \in I_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Thus I_α is an ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, /)$. Conversely suppose that I is any ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, /)$. Define $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ by

$$\alpha(p) = \text{Sup}\{\theta(n)(p) | n \in I\} \text{ for any } p \in \mathcal{P}$$

Note that $\alpha(p)$ is either a non-negative integer or ∞ , for any $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Therefore α is a mapping of \mathcal{P} into \mathcal{N}^∞ .

$$\begin{aligned} n \in I &\implies \theta(n)(p) \leq \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P} \\ &\implies n \in I_\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $I \subseteq I_\alpha$. On the other hand, suppose $n \in I_\alpha$. Then $\theta(n)(p) \leq \alpha(p)$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Since $\theta(n) \in \sum_p \mathcal{N}$, $|\theta(n)|$ is finite. If $|\theta(n)| = \emptyset$, then $n = 1 \in I$. Suppose $|\theta(n)|$ is non-empty. Let $|\theta(n)| = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r\}$. Then $\theta(n)(p) = 0$ for all $p \neq p_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ and $\theta(n)(p_i) \in \mathcal{N}$. Now, for each $1 \leq i \leq r$, $\theta(n)(p_i) \leq \alpha(p_i) = \text{Sup}\{\theta(m)(p_i) | m \in I\}$ and hence there exists $m_i \in I$ such that $\theta(n)(p_i) \leq \theta(m_i)(p_i)$. Now, put $m = m_1 \vee m_2 \vee \dots \vee m_r$, then $m \in I$ and

$$\theta(n)(p_i) \leq \text{Max}\{\theta(m_1)(p_i), \dots, \theta(m_i)(p_i)\} = \theta(m)(p_i)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq r$. Also, since $\theta(n)(p) = 0$ for all $p \neq p_i$, we get that $\theta(n)(p) \leq \theta(m)(p)$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$ so that $n \leq_D m \in I$ and therefore $n \in I$. Therefore $I_\alpha \subseteq I$. Thus $I = I_\alpha$. \square

Note that, if α is the constant map $\bar{0}$ defined by $\alpha(p) = 0$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$, then $I_\alpha = \{1\}$ and that, if α is the constant map $\bar{\infty}$, then $I_\alpha = \mathcal{Z}^+$.

Definition 10. For any mappings α and β from \mathcal{P} into \mathcal{N}^∞ , define

$$\alpha \leq \beta \text{ if and only if } \alpha(p) \leq \beta(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Thus \leq is a partial order on $(\mathcal{N}^\infty)^\mathcal{P}$.

Theorem 7. The map $\alpha \mapsto I_\alpha$ is an order isomorphism of the poset $((\mathcal{N}^\infty)^\mathcal{P}, \leq)$, onto the poset $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}^+), \subseteq)$ of all ideals of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, /)$.

Proof. Let α and $\beta : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \mathcal{N}^\infty$ be any mappings. Clearly, $\alpha \leq \beta \implies I_\alpha \subseteq I_\beta$. On the other hand, suppose that $I_\alpha \subseteq I_\beta$. We shall prove that $\alpha(p) \leq \beta(p)$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$ so that $\alpha \leq \beta$. To prove this, let us fix $p \in \mathcal{P}$. If $\beta(p) = \infty$ or $\alpha(p) = 0$, trivially $\alpha(p) \leq \beta(p)$. Therefore, we can assume that $\beta(p) < \infty$ and $\alpha(p) > 0$. Consider $n = p^{\beta(p)+1}$. Then

$$\theta(n)(p) = \beta(p) + 1 \not\leq \beta(p).$$

and hence $n \notin I_\beta$. Since $I_\alpha \subseteq I_\beta$, $n \notin I_\alpha$ and therefore $\theta(n)(q) \not\leq \alpha(q)$ for some $q \in \mathcal{P}$. But $\theta(n)(q) = 0$ for all $q \neq p$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(p) + 1 &= \theta(n)(p) \not\leq \alpha(p) \\ \alpha(p) &< \beta(p) + 1.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\alpha(p) \leq \beta(p)$. This is true for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Thus $\alpha \leq \beta$. Also $\alpha \mapsto I_\alpha$ is a surjection. Thus $\alpha \mapsto I_\alpha$ is an order isomorphism of $((\mathcal{N}^\infty)^\mathcal{P}, \leq)$, onto $(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Z}^+), \subseteq)$. \square

Corollary 1. For any α and $\beta : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$,

$$I_\alpha \cap I_\beta = I_{\alpha \wedge \beta}.$$

and

$$I_\alpha \cup I_\beta = I_{\alpha \vee \beta}.$$

where $\alpha \wedge \beta$ and $\alpha \vee \beta$ are point-wise g.l.b and l.u.b of α and β .

First we state the following two theorems from ‘‘Lattice Structures on \mathcal{Z}^+ induced by convolutions’’ [3].

Theorem 8. Let \mathcal{C} be a convolution which is closed under finite intersections and $\leq_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the partial order on \mathcal{Z}^+ induced by \mathcal{C} . Then $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a lattice if and only if it is directed above.

Theorem 9. Let \mathcal{C} be a convolution.

- (1). If $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a meet(join) semilattice, then so is $(\mathcal{N}, \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p)$ for each prime p
- (2). If $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a lattice, then so is $(\mathcal{N}, \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p)$ for each prime p .

Theorem 10. Let \mathcal{C} be a multiplicative convolution such that $(\mathcal{Z}^+, /)$ is a meet semi lattice. For any $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$, let

$$I_\alpha = \{n \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \mid \theta(n)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{P}} \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Then the following are equivalent to each other:

- (1). I_α is an ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ for any $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$.
- (2). $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is directed below
- (3). $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a lattice.

Proof. (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) follows from Theorem 8

(1) \Rightarrow (2) : Let $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ be defined by $\alpha(p) = \infty$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Then

$$I_\alpha = \{n \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \mid \theta(n)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathcal{P}} \alpha(p) = \infty \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{P}\}$$

and hence, by (1), \mathcal{Z}^+ is an ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ which implies that $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$ is directed above.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) : From (3) and Theorems 8 and 9, it follows that $(\mathcal{N}, \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p)$ is a lattice for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$

and $\theta(m \vee n)(p) = \theta(m)(p) \vee \theta(n)(p)$ in $(\mathcal{N}, \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p)$ for any m and $n \in \mathcal{X}^+$ and $p \in \mathcal{D}$. Let $\alpha : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ be any mapping. Then, for any m and $n \in \mathcal{X}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} m \leq_{\mathcal{C}} n \in I_\alpha &\implies \theta(m)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p \theta(n)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{D}. \\ &\implies \theta(m)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{D}. \\ &\implies m \in I_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m \text{ and } n \in I_\alpha &\implies \theta(m)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p \alpha(p) \text{ and } \theta(n)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{D}. \\ &\implies \theta(m)(p) \vee \theta(n)(p) \leq_{\mathcal{C}}^p \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{D}. \\ &\implies m \vee n \in I_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore I_α is an ideal of $(\mathcal{X}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{C}})$. □

Now, we have the following Theorems which characterize the prime ideals of the lattice $(\mathcal{X}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ where \mathcal{D} is the Dirichlet's convolution.

Theorem 11. Let $\alpha : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ be a mapping and I_α is an ideal of $(\mathcal{X}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ defined by $I_\alpha = \{n \in \mathcal{X}^+ | \theta(n)(p) \leq \alpha(p) \text{ for all } p \in \mathcal{D}\}$. Then the following are equivalent to each other.

- (1). I_α is a prime ideal of $(\mathcal{X}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$.
- (2). $\alpha(p) \neq \infty$ for some $p \in \mathcal{D}$ and for any β and $\gamma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$,

$$\beta \wedge \gamma \leq \alpha \implies \beta \leq \alpha \text{ or } \gamma \leq \alpha.$$

- (3). There exists unique $p \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\alpha(p) \neq \infty \text{ and } \alpha(q) = \infty \text{ for all } q \neq p \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Proof. (1) \implies (2) follows from Theorem 7, in which we have proved that $\beta \mapsto I_\beta$ is an isomorphism of the lattice $((\mathcal{N}^\infty)^{\mathcal{D}}, \leq)$ onto the lattice of ideals of $(\mathcal{X}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ from the fact that $I_\beta \cap I_\gamma = I_{\beta \wedge \gamma}$ for any β and $\gamma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$. If $\alpha(p) = \infty$ for all $p \in \mathcal{D}$, then, since $\theta(n)(p) \in \mathcal{N}$ for all $n \in \mathcal{X}^+$ and $p \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$I_\alpha = \{n \in \mathcal{X}^+ | \theta(n)(p) < \infty\} = \mathcal{X}^+$$

which is a contradiction to the fact that every prime ideal is a proper ideal. Thus $\alpha(p) \neq \infty$ for some $p \in \mathcal{D}$.

(2) \implies (3): Suppose that α satisfies (2). Fix $p \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\alpha(p) \neq \infty$. Then $\alpha(p) \in \mathcal{N}$. Now, define β and $\gamma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ by

$$\beta(q) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } q = p \\ \infty & \text{if } q \neq p \end{cases}$$

and

$$\gamma(q) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } q = p \\ 0 & \text{if } q \neq p \end{cases}$$

for any $q \in \mathcal{P}$. Then,

$$(\beta \wedge \gamma)(q) = \beta(q) \wedge \gamma(q) = 0 \leq \alpha(q)$$

for all $q \in \mathcal{P}$ and hence $\beta \wedge \gamma \leq \alpha$. Since $\alpha(p) \neq \infty$ and $\gamma(p) = \infty$, $(\gamma)(p) \not\leq \alpha(p)$ and hence $\gamma \not\leq \alpha$. Therefore, by (2), $\beta \leq \alpha$ and hence

$$\infty = \beta(q) \leq \alpha(q) \text{ for all } q \neq p.$$

Therefore $q(p) = \infty$ for all $q \neq p$ in \mathcal{P} . This also implies the uniqueness of p .

(3) \implies (1): Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\alpha(p) \neq \infty \text{ and } \alpha(q) = \infty \text{ for all } q \neq p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Then I_α is a proper ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$. Let J and K be any ideals of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ such that $J \cap K \subseteq I_\alpha$. Then there exists β and $\gamma : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ such that $J = I_\beta$ and $K = I_\gamma$. Now, $I_{\beta \wedge \gamma} = I_\beta \cap I_\gamma = J \cap K \subseteq I_\alpha$ and hence $\beta \wedge \gamma \leq \alpha$ so that

$$\text{Min}\{\beta(p), \gamma(p)\} = (\beta \wedge \gamma)(p) \leq \alpha(p).$$

Therefore $\beta(p) \leq \alpha(p)$ or $\gamma(p) \leq \alpha(p)$. Since $\alpha(q) = \infty$ for all $q \neq p$, it follows that $\beta \leq \alpha$ or $\gamma \leq \alpha$ and hence $I_\beta \subseteq I_\alpha$ or $I_\gamma \subseteq I_\alpha$. Therefore $J \subseteq I_\alpha$ or $K \subseteq I_\alpha$. Thus I_α is a prime ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$. \square

Definition 11. For any prime number p and $a \in \mathcal{N}$, define

$$I_{p,a} = \{n \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \mid \theta(n)(p) \leq a\}.$$

Then $I_{p,a}$ is an ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$. In fact $I_{p,a} = I_\alpha$, where $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$ is defined by

$$\alpha(q) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } q = p \\ \infty & \text{if } q \neq p \end{cases}$$

Note that $I_{p,a} = \{n \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \mid p^{a+1} \text{ does not divide } n\}$.

Theorem 12. An ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ is prime if and only if it is of the form $I_{p,a}$ for some $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and $a \in \mathcal{N}$.

Proof. Let I be an ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$. Then $I = I_\alpha$ for some mapping $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}^\infty$. Now, by Theorem 11, I is prime \iff there exists $p \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\alpha(p) \neq \infty$ and $\alpha(q) = \infty$ for all $q \neq p$ and $I = I_\alpha \iff I = I_{p,a}$, where $a = \alpha(p)$. \square

Theorem 13. For any p and $q \in \mathcal{P}$ and a and $b \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$I_{p,a} \subseteq I_{q,b} \iff p = q \text{ and } a \leq b$$

Proof. If $p = q$ and $a \leq b$, then

$$\begin{aligned} n \in I_{p,q} &\implies \theta(n)(p) \leq a \leq b \\ &\implies \theta(n)(q) \leq b \\ &\implies n \in I_{q,b} \end{aligned}$$

and hence $I_{p,a} \subseteq I_{q,b}$. Conversely suppose that $I_{p,a} \subseteq I_{q,b}$. If $p \neq q$, then

$$\theta(q^{b+1})(p) = 0 \leq a$$

and hence $q^{b+1} \in I_{p,a} \subseteq I_{q,b}$ so that $\theta(q^{b+1})(b) \leq b$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $p = q$. Now, since $\theta(p^a)(p) = a$, $p^a \in I_{p,a} \subseteq I_{q,b}$ and hence $a = \theta(p^a)(q) \leq b$. Thus $p = q$ and $a \leq b$. \square

The following are immediate consequences of Theorems 11,12 and 13.

Corollary 2. For each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\mathcal{P}_p = \{I_{p,a} \mid a \in \mathcal{N}\}$. Then the following hold.

- (1). \mathcal{P}_p is a chain of prime ideals of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$.
- (2). $\mathcal{P}_p \cap \mathcal{P}_q = \phi$ for all $p \neq q \in \mathcal{P}$.
- (3). $\bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{P}_p$ is the set of all prime ideals of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$.

Corollary 3. I is a minimal prime ideal of $(\mathcal{Z}^+, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ if and only if

$$I = I_{p,0} = \{n \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \mid p \text{ does not divide } n\}$$

for some $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

References

- [1] S. Sagi. *Lattice Theory of Convolutions*, Ph.D. Thesis, Andhra University, Waltair, Visakhapatnam, India, 2010.
- [2] U.M. Swamy, G.C. Rao, V. S. Ramaiah. On a conjecture in a ring of arithmetic functions. *Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 14(12), 1519-1530. 1983.
- [3] U.M. Swamy, S. Sagi. Lattice Structures on \mathcal{Z}^+ induced by convolutions. *European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 4(4), 424-434. 2011.
- [4] U.M. Swamy, S. Sagi. Partial Orders induced by Convolutions. *International Journal of Mathematics and Soft Computing*, 2(1), 2011, 25-33.