



Paper Type: Research Paper



New Characterization Theorems of the mp-Quantales

George Georgescu *

Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania; georgescu.capreni@yahoo.com

Citation:



Georgescu, G. (2021). New characterization theorems of the mp-Quantales. Journal of fuzzy extension and applications, 2(2), 106-119.

Received: 07/03/2021

Reviewed: 30/03/2021

Revised: 15/04/2021

Accept: 29/04/2021

Abstract

The mp-quantales were introduced in a previous paper as an abstraction of the lattices of ideals in mp-rings and the lattices of ideals in conormal lattices. Several properties of m-rings and conormal lattices were generalized to mp-quantales. In this paper we shall prove new characterization theorems for mp-quantales and for semiprime mp-quantales (these last structures coincide with the P F - quantales). Some proofs reflect the way in which the reticulation functor (from coherent quantales to bounded distributive lattices) allows us to export some properties from conormal lattices to mp-quantales.

Keywords: Coherent quantale. reticulation of a quantale, mp-quantales, PF-quantales, transfer properties.

1 | Introduction

Licensee Journal of Fuzzy Extension and Applications. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).

The mp-quantales were introduced in [13] as an abstraction of the lattice of ideals of an mp - ring [1] and the lattice of ideals of a conormal lattice (see [7], [17], [23]). In [13] we proved some characterization theorems for mp - quantales that extend some results of [1] and [7] that describe the mp - rings, respectively the conormal lattices. The P F - quantales constitute an important class of mp - quantales (cf. [13]). They generalize the lattices of ideals in P F - rings. In fact, the P F - quantales are the semiprime P F - quantales. The paper [13] also contains several characterizations of a P F - quantale.

An important tool in proving the mentioned results was the reticulation of a coherent quantale [6] and [12] (the reticulation of a coherent quantale A is a bounded distributive lattice L(A) whose

Stone prime spectrum $\text{SpecId}, Z(L(A))$ is homeomorphic with the Zariski prime spectrum $\text{Spec}Z(A)$ of A).

The reticulation construction provides a covariant functor from the category of coherent quantales to the category of bounded distributive lattices [6].

In this paper we shall obtain new characterization theorem for mp - quantales and P F - quantales. Some of these theorems contain properties expressed in terms of equations or pure and w-pure elements (see *Theorems 5 and 6*), while others (see *Theorems 7 and 8*) extend some conditions existing in some results of [27].

Now we give a short description of the content of this paper. Section 2 contains some notions and basic results in quantale theory [22] and [10]: residuation and negation operation, m - prime and minimal m - prime elements, Zariski and flat topologies on the spectra of a quantale, radical elements, etc. In Section 3 we recall from [6] and [12] the construction of the reticulation $L(A)$ of a coherent quantale A and we present some results that describe how the reticulation functor preserves the m - prime elements, the annihilators, the pure and the w - pure elements, etc. In Section 4 we discuss the way in which the mp - quantales (defined in [13]) generalize the mp - rings [1] and the conormal lattices [7] and [23]. Some properties that characterize the mp - quantale are recalled from [13]. The main results of the paper are placed in Section 5. We prove three theorems with new algebraic and topological characterizations of the mp-quantales. Some characterization results of the P F-quantales (= the semiprime mp-quantales) are obtained as corollaries. Some of proofs reflect the way in which the reticulation functor transfer some properties of conormal lattices to mp-quantales.

2 | Preliminaries on Quantales

This section contains some basic notions and results in quantale theory [22] and [10]. Let $(A, W, \wedge, \cdot, 0, 1)$ be a quantale and $K(A)$ the set of its compact elements. A is said to be integral if $(A, \cdot, 1)$ is a monoid and commutative, if the multiplication is commutative. A frame is a quantale in which the multiplication coincides with the meet [17]. The quantale A is algebraic if any $a \in A$ has the form $a = W X$ for some subset X of $K(A)$. An algebraic quantale A is coherent if $1 \in K(A)$ and $K(A)$ is closed under the multiplication. The set $\text{Id}(R)$ of ideals of a (unital) commutative ring R is a coherent quantale and the set $\text{Id}(L)$ of ideals of a bounded distributive lattice L is a coherent frame.

Throughout this paper, the quantales are assumed to be integral and commutative. We shall write ab instead of $a \cdot b$. We fix a quantale A .

On each quantale A one can consider a residuation operation (= implication) $a \rightarrow b = W \{x | ax \leq b\}$ and a negation operation $a \perp = a \perp A$, defined by $a \perp = a \rightarrow 0 = W \{x \in A | ax = 0\}$ (extending the terminology from ring theory [2], $a \perp$ is also called the annihilator of a). Then for all $a, b, c \in A$ the following residuation rule holds: $a \leq b \rightarrow c$ if and only if $ab \leq c$, so $(A, \vee, \wedge, \cdot, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$ becomes a (commutative) residuated lattice. Particularly, we have $a \leq b \perp$ if and only if $ab = 0$. In this paper we shall use without mention the basic arithmetical 2 properties of a residuated lattice [11].

An element $p < 1$ of A is m-prime if for all $a, b \in A$, $ab \leq p$ implies $a \leq p$ or $b \leq p$. If A is an algebraic quantale, then $p < 1$ is m-prime if and only if for all $c, d \in K(A)$, $cd \leq p$ implies $c \leq p$ or $d \leq p$. Let us introduce the following notations: $\text{Spec}(A)$ is the set of m-prime elements and $M_{ax}(A)$ is the set of maximal elements of A . If $1 \in K(A)$ then for any $a < 1$ there exists $m \in M_{ax}(A)$ such that $a \leq m$. The same hypothesis $1 \in K(A)$ implies that $M_{ax}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}(A)$. We remark that the set $\text{Spec}(R)$ of prime ideals in R is the prime spectrum of the quantale $\text{Id}(R)$ and the set of prime ideals in L is the prime spectrum of the frame $\text{Id}(L)$.

Recall from [22] that the radical $\varrho(a)$ of an element a of A is defined by $\varrho(a) = \bigvee \{p \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid a \leq p\}$. If $a = \varrho(a)$ then a is said to be a radical element of A . The set $R(A)$ of the radical elements of A is a frame [22] and [23]. In [6] it is proven that $\text{Spec}(A) = \text{Spec}(R(A))$ and $M_{ax}(A) = M_{ax}(R(A))$.

Lemma 1. [19]. Let A be a coherent quantale and $a \in A$. Then

$$\varrho(a) = \bigvee \{c \in K(A) \mid c^k \leq a \text{ for some integer } k \geq 1\}.$$

For any $c \in K(A)$, $c \leq \varrho(a)$ iff $c^k \leq a$ for some $k \geq 1$.

A is semiprime if and only if for any integer $k \geq 1$, $c^k = 0$ implies $c = 0$.

Let A be a quantale such that $1 \in K(A)$. For any $a \in A$, denote $D_A(a) = D(a) = \{p \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid a \leq p\}$ and $\bigvee A(a) = \bigvee (a) = \{p \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid a \leq p\}$. Then $\text{Spec}(A)$ is endowed with a topology whose closed sets are $(\bigvee (a))_{a \in A}$. If the quantale A is algebraic then the family $(D(c))_{c \in K(A)}$ is a basis of open sets for this topology. The topology introduced here generalizes the Zariski topology (defined on the prime spectrum $\text{Spec}(R)$ of a commutative ring R [2]) and the Stone topology (defined on the prime spectrum $\text{SpecId}(L)$ of a bounded distributive lattice L [3]). Then this topology will be also called the Zariski topology of $\text{Spec}(A)$ and the corresponding topological space will be denoted by $\text{SpecZ}(A)$. According to [13], $\text{SpecZ}(A)$ is a spectral space in the sense of [15]. The flat topology associated with this spectral space has as basis the family of the complements of compact open subsets of $\text{SpecZ}(A)$ (cf. [8] and [17]). Recall from [13] that the family $\{\bigvee (c) \mid c \in K(A)\}$ is a basis of open sets for the flat topology on $\text{Spec}(A)$. We shall denote by $\text{SpecF}(A)$ this topological space. For any $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$, let us denote $\Lambda(p) = \{q \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid q \leq p\}$. According to Proposition 5.6 of [13], the flat closure $\text{cl}_F(\{p\})$ of the set $\{p\}$ is equal to $\Lambda(p)$.

Let L be a bounded distributive lattice. For any $x \in L$, denote $D_{\text{Id}}(x) = \{P \in \text{SpecId}(L) \mid x \in P\}$ and $V_{\text{Id}}(x) = \{P \in \text{SpecId}, Z(L) \mid x \in P\}$. The family $(D_{\text{Id}}(x))_{x \in L}$ is a basis of open sets for the Stone topology on $\text{SpecId}(L)$; this topological space will be denoted by $\text{SpecId}, Z(L)$. We will denote by $\text{SpecId}, F(L)$ the prime spectrum $\text{SpecId}(L)$ endowed with the flat topology; the family $(V_{\text{Id}}(x))_{x \in L}$ is a basis of open sets for the flat topology.

If A is a quantale then we denote by $M_{in}(A)$ the set of minimal m -prime elements of A ; $M_{in}(A)$ is called the minimal prime spectrum of A . If $1 \in K(A)$ then for any $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ there exists $q \in M_{in}(A)$ such that $q \leq p$.

Proposition 1. If A is a coherent quantale and $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $p \in M_{in}(A)$ if and only if for all $c \in K(A)$, the following equivalence holds: $c \leq p$ iff $c \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq p$.

Corollary 1. [18]. If A is a semiprime coherent quantale and $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $p \in M_{in}(A)$ if and only if for all $c \in K(A)$, the following equivalence holds: $c \leq p$ iff $c \perp \leq p$.

An element e of the quantale A is a complemented element if there exists $f \in A$ such that $e \vee f = 1$ and $e \wedge f = 0$. The set $B(A)$ of complemented elements of A is a Boolean algebra (cf. [5] and [16]). $B(A)$ will be called the Boolean center of the quantale A .

Proposition 2. If $a \in A$ then $a \perp = \bigvee (\bigvee (a \perp) \cap M_{in}(A))$.

3 | Reticulation of a Coherent Quantale

Let A be a coherent quantale and $K(A)$ the set of its compact elements. We define the following equivalence relation on the set $K(A)$: for all $c, d \in K(A)$, $c \equiv d$ iff $\varrho(c) = \varrho(d)$. The quotient set $L(A) = K(A)/\equiv$ is a bounded distributive lattice. For any $c \in K(A)$ denote by c/\equiv its equivalence class. Consider the canonical surjection $\lambda_A : K(A) \rightarrow L(A)$ defined by $\lambda_A(c) = c/\equiv$, for any $c \in K(A)$. The pair $(L(A), \lambda_A : K(A) \rightarrow L(A))$ (or shortly $L(A)$) will be called the reticulation of A . In [6] and [12] an axiomatic definition of the reticulation of a coherent quantale was given. We remark that the reticulation $L(R)$ of a commutative ring R (defined in [17] and [23]) is isomorphic with the reticulation $L(\text{Id}(R))$ of the quantale $\text{Id}(R)$.

For any $a \in A$ and $I \in \text{Id}(L(A))$ let us denote $a * = \{\lambda_A(c) \mid c \in K(A), c \leq a\}$ and $I * = \bigvee \{c \in K(A) \mid \lambda_A(c) \in I\}$. The assignments $a \mapsto a *$ and $I \mapsto I *$ define two order - preserving maps $(\cdot) * : A \rightarrow \text{Id}(L(A))$ and $(\cdot) * : \text{Id}(L(A)) \rightarrow A$. The following lemma collects the main properties of the maps $(\cdot) *$ and $(\cdot) *$.

Lemma 2. [6]. The following assertions hold

If $a \in A$ then $a *$ is an ideal of $L(A)$ and $a \leq (a *) *$.

If $I \in \text{Id}(L(A))$ then $(I *) * = I$.

If $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $(p *) * = p$ and $p * \in \text{SpecId}(L(A))$.

If $P \in \text{SpecId}(L(A))$ then $P * \in \text{Spec}(A)$.

If $p \in K(A)$ then $c * = (\lambda_A(c))$.

If $c \in K(A)$ and $I \in \text{Id}(L(A))$ then $c \leq I *$ iff $\lambda_A(c) \in I$.

If $a \in A$ and $I \in \text{Id}(L(A))$ then $\varrho(a) = (a *) *$, $a * = (\varrho(a)) *$ and $\varrho(I *) = I *$.

If $c \in K(A)$ and $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $c \leq p$ iff $\lambda_A(c) \in p *$.

By the previous lemma one can consider the maps $\delta_A : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \text{SpecId}(L(A))$ and $\Lambda : \text{SpecId}(L(A)) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$, defined by $\delta_A(p) = p *$ and $\Lambda(I) = I *$, for all $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and $I \in \text{SpecId}(L(A))$.

Lemma 3. [6] and [13]. The functions δ_A and Λ are homeomorphisms w.r.t. the Zariski and the flat topologies, inverse to one another.

We also observe that δ_A and Λ are order - isomorphisms. In particular, for any m - prime element p of A , we have $p \in M \text{ in}(A)$ if and only in $p * \in M \text{ inId}(L(A))$.

We denote by $M \text{ in}^Z(A)$ (resp. $M \text{ in}^F(A)$) the topological space obtained by restricting the topology of $\text{Spec}^Z(A)$ (resp. $\text{Spec}^F(A)$) to $M \text{ in}(A)$. Then $M \text{ in}^Z(A)$ is homeomorphic to the space $M \text{ inId,Z}(L(A))$ of minimal prime ideals in $L(A)$ with the Stone topology and $M \text{ in}^F(A)$ is homeomorphic to the space $M \text{ inId,F}(L(A))$ of minimal prime ideals in $L(A)$ with the flat topology (cf. Lemma 3). By [13], $M \text{ in}^Z(A)$ is a zero - dimensional Hausdorff space and $M \text{ in}^F(A)$ is a compact T_1 space.

For a bounded distributive lattice L we shall denote by $B(L)$ the Boolean algebra of the complemented elements of L . It is well-known that $B(L)$ is isomorphic to the Boolean center $B(\text{Id}(L))$ of the frame $\text{Id}(L)$ (see [5] and [17]). By [6], the function $\lambda_A | B(A) : B(A) \rightarrow B(L(A))$ is a Boolean isomorphism.

If L is a bounded distributive lattice and $I \in \text{Id}(L)$ then the annihilator of I is the following ideal of $L(A)$: $\text{Ann}_L(I) = \text{Ann}(I) = \{x \in I \mid x \wedge y = 0, \text{ for all } y \in L\}$.

Let us fix a coherent quantale A .

Lemma 4. [13]. If $c \in K(A)$ and $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $\text{Ann}(\lambda A(c)) \subseteq p^*$ if and only if $c \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq p$.

Proposition 3. [13]. If a is an element of a coherent quantale then $\text{Ann}(a^*) = (a \rightarrow \varrho(0))^*$; if A is semiprime then $\text{Ann}(a^*) = (a \perp)^*$.

Particularly, for any $c \in K(A)$, we have $\text{Ann}(\lambda A(c)) = (c \rightarrow \varrho(0))^*$.

Proposition 4. [13]. Assume that A is a coherent quantale. If I is an ideal of $L(A)$ then $(\text{Ann}(I))^* = I^* \rightarrow \varrho(0)$; if A is semiprime then $(\text{Ann}(I))^* = (I^*) \perp$.

An ideal I of a commutative ring R is said to be pure if for any $x \in I$ we have $I \vee \text{Ann}(x) = R$. An ideal I of a bounded distributive lattice L is said to be a σ -ideal if for any $x \in I$ we have $I \vee \text{Ann}(x) = L$. These two notions can be generalized to quantale theory: an element a of an algebraic quantale A is said to be pure if for any $c \in K(A)$ we have $a \vee c \perp = 1$. We note that the σ -ideals of a bounded distributive lattice L coincide with the pure elements of the frame $\text{Id}(L)$.

An element a of an algebraic quantale A is said to be w -pure [14] if for any $c \in K(A)$ we have $a \vee (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$. It is easy to see that any pure element of A is w -pure.

Lemma 5. [14]. If an element a of a coherent quantale A is w -pure then a^* is a σ -ideal of the lattice $L(A)$. Particularly, if a is pure then a^* is a σ -ideal.

Lemma 6. [14]. Let A be a coherent quantale and J a σ -ideal of $L(A)$. Then J^* is a w -pure element of A .

For any $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ let us denote $O(p) = \bigvee \{c \in K(A) \mid c \perp \leq p\}$.

Lemma 7. [14]. Let A be a coherent quantale. If $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and $c \in K(A)$ then $c \leq O(p)$ if and only if $c \perp \leq p$.

4 | From mp-Rings and Conormal Lattices to the mp-Quantales

Recall from [1] that a commutative ring R is an mp-ring if each prime ideal of R contains a unique minimal prime ideal. The following theorem of [1], that collects several characterizations of mp-rings, emphasizes some of their algebraic and topological properties.

Theorem 1. [1]. If R is a commutative ring then the following assertions are equivalent R is an mp-ring.

If P and Q are distinct minimal prime ideals of the ring R then $P + Q = R$.

$R/\mathfrak{n}(R)$ is an mp-ring, whenever $\mathfrak{n}(A)$ is the nil-ideal of R .

$\text{Spec}^f(R)$ is a normal space.

The inclusion $M \text{ in } F(R) \subseteq \text{Spec}^f(R)$ has a flat continuous retraction.

If P is a minimal prime ideal of R then $VR(P)$ is a flat closed subset of $\text{Spec}^f(R)$.

For all $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0$ implies $\text{Ann}(a^n) + \text{Ann}(b^n) = R$, for some integer $n \geq 1$.

Any minimal prime ideal of A is the radical of a unique pure ideal of A .

The conormal lattices were introduced by Cornish in [7] under the name of normal lattices (a discussion of the terminology can be found in [23] and [17]). According to [23], a bounded distributive lattice L is conormal if for all $a, b \in L$ such that $a \wedge b = 0$ there exist $x, y \in L$ such that $a \wedge x = b \wedge y = 0$ and $x \vee y = 1$.

Theorem 2. [7]. If A is a conormal lattice then the following assertions are equivalent

A is a conormal lattice.

If P and Q are distinct minimal prime ideals of the lattice L then $P \vee Q = L$.

Any minimal prime ideal of L is a σ -ideal.

If $x, y \in L$ and $x \wedge y = 0$ then $\text{Ann}(x) \vee \text{Ann}(y) = L$.

If $x, y \in L$ then $\text{Ann}(x \wedge y) = \text{Ann}(x) \vee \text{Ann}(y) = L$.

Any prime ideal of L contains a unique minimal prime ideal.

For each $x \in L$, $\text{Ann}(x)$ is a σ -ideal.

From the previous two theorems we observe that the mp -rings and the conormal lattices have similar characterizations. This remark allows us to extend these notions to quantale theory. A quantale A is said to be an mp -quantale if for any m -prime element p of A there exists a unique minimal m -prime element q such that $q \leq p$. The mp -frames are defined in a similar manner.

The following theorem establishes a strong connection between mp -quantales, mp -frames and conormal lattices.

Theorem 3. [13]. For any coherent quantale A the following assertions are equivalent

A is an mp -quantale.

$R(A)$ is an mp -frame.

$L(A)$ is a conormal lattice.

Proof. We know that $\text{Spec}(A) = \text{Spec}(R(A))$ and $M \text{ in}(A) = M \text{ in}(R(A))$, so the equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) is clear. The equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (3) was established in [13].

The following theorem is a generalization of some parts of *Theorems 1* and *2*.

Theorem 4. [13]. For any coherent quantale A the following are equivalent

A is an mp -quantale.

For any distinct $p, q \in M \text{ in}(A)$ we have $p \vee q = 1$.

The inclusion $M \text{ in}^F(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}^F(A)$ has a flat continuous retraction.

$\text{Spec}^F(A)$ is a normal space.

If $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $V(p)$ is a closed subset of $\text{Spec}^F(A)$.

Recall from [13] that a quantale A is a P F - quantale if for each $c \in K(A)$, $c \perp$ is a pure element. From [13] we know that a quantale A is a P F - quantale if and only if it is a semiprime mp-quantale.

5 | New Characterization Theorems

This section concerns the new characterization theorems for mp-quantales and P F - quantales. Our results extend some characterization theorems of mp -rings and P F - rings proven in [1], [26], [27]. Let us fix a coherent quantale A .

Recall from Section 3 that the maps $\delta_A : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \text{SpecId}(L(A))$ and $A : \text{SpecId}(L(A)) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ are order - isomorphisms and homeomorphisms w.r.t. the Zariski and the flat topologies, inverse to one another. Then the following lemma is immediate.

Lemma 8. [13]. The functions $\delta_A | M \text{ in}(A) : M \text{ in}(A) \rightarrow M \text{ inId}(L(A))$ and $A | M \text{ inId}(L(A)) : M \text{ inId}(L(A)) \rightarrow M \text{ in}(A)$ are homeomorphisms w.r.t. the Zariski and the flat topologies, inverse to one another.

The previous lemma allows us to transfer some topological results from $M \text{ inId}(L(A))$ to $M \text{ in}(A)$. Often we shall apply this lemma and its direct consequences without mention.

Theorem 5. The following assertions are equivalent:

A is an mp-quantale.

Any minimal m-prime element of A is w - pure.

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Let p be a minimal m - prime element of A , hence $p^* \in M \text{ inId}(L(A))$ (cf. *Lemma 8*). According to Theorem 3, $L(A)$ is a conormal lattice, hence, by using Theorem 2, it follows that p^* is a σ - ideal of the lattice $L(A)$. By *Lemmas 2* and *6*, $p = (p^*)^*$ is a w - pure element of A .

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let P be a minimal prime ideal of $L(A)$, so $P = p^*$, for some minimal m - prime element p of A (cf. *Lemma 8*). By hypothesis (2), p is a w-pure element of A . According to *Lemma 5*, $P = p^*$ is a σ - ideal of $L(A)$. Applying the implication (3) \Rightarrow (1) of Theorem 2, it follows that $L(A)$ is a conormal lattice, so A is an mp - quantale (cf. *Theorem 3*).

Corollary 2. If A is semiprime then the following assertions are equivalent

A is a P F - quantale.

Any minimal m-prime element of A is pure.

Proof.

We know from [13] that A is a P F - quantale if and only if it is a semiprime mp - quantale. In a semiprime quantale the pure and the w - pure elements coincide, so the corollary follows from *Theorem 5*.

Theorem 6. The following are equivalent

A is an mp-quantale.

For all $c, d \in K(A)$, $cd \leq \varrho(0)$ implies $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$.

For all $c, d \in K(A)$, $cd \rightarrow \varrho(0) = (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))$.

For any $c \in K(A)$, $c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ is a w - pure element of A .

For all $c, d \in K(A)$, $cd = 0$ implies $(c \perp) \perp \vee (d \perp) \perp = 1$.

For any minimal m - prime element p of A there exists a unique pure element q such that $p = \varrho(q)$.

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume by absurdum that there exist $c, d \in K(A)$, such that $cd \leq \varrho(0)$ and $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) < 1$, so $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \leq m$, for some maximal element m of A . Consider a minimal m - prime element p of A such that $p \leq m$. By *Theorem 5*, p is a w - pure element of A . From $cd \leq \varrho(0) \leq p$ we get $c \leq p$ or $d \leq p$ (because p is m - prime). Assuming that $c \leq p$ we get $p \vee (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$ (because p is a w - pure element), contradicting that $p \leq m$ and $c \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq m$. Thus the implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) is verified.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let p, q be two distinct minimal m - prime elements of A , hence there exists $d \in K(A)$ such that $d \leq p$ and $d \not\leq q$. By Proposition 1, from $d \leq p$ it follows that $d \rightarrow \varrho(0) \not\leq p$, so there exists $c \in K(A)$ such that $c \leq d \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $c \not\leq p$. Then $cd \leq \varrho(0)$, hence $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$ (by hypothesis (2)). The last equality implies that there exist $e, f \in K(A)$ such that $e \leq (c \rightarrow \varrho(0))$, $f \leq (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))$ and $e \vee f = 1$. From $ce \leq \varrho(0) \leq p$ and $c \not\leq p$ we obtain $e \leq p$. Similarly, we can prove that $f \leq q$, so $p \vee q = 1$. By applying the implication (2) \rightarrow (1) of *Theorem 4*, it results that A is an mp-quantale.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Firstly we shall establish the inequality $cd \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))$. Let e be a compact element of A such that $e \leq cd \rightarrow \varrho(0)$, hence we get $cde \leq \varrho(0)$. In accordance with the hypothesis (2), it follows that $(ce \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$, so there exist $x, y \in K(A)$ such that $x \leq ce \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $y \leq d \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $x \vee y = 1$. From $x \leq ce \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ we obtain $ex \leq c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$.

Then $e = e(x \vee y) = ex \vee ey \leq ex \vee y \leq (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))$, so we have proven that $cd \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))$.

From $cd \leq c$ and $cd \leq d$ it results that $c \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq cd \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $d \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq cd \rightarrow \varrho(0)$, hence the converse inequality $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \leq cd \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ follows.

(3) \Rightarrow (2) If $cd \leq \varrho(0)$ then, by using the property (3), it follows that $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = cd \rightarrow \varrho(0) = 1$.

(2) \Rightarrow (4) Let c be a compact element of A . Assume that d is a compact element of A such that $d \leq c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$, so $cd \leq \varrho(0)$, hence $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$ (by the condition (2)). It results that $c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ is a

w-pure element of A .

(4) \Rightarrow (2) Assume that $c, d \in K(A)$ and $cd \leq \varrho(0)$, so $d \leq c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$. Since $c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ is a w - pure element of A , the equality $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$ follows.

(1) \Rightarrow (5) By *Theorem 3*, the reticulation $L(A)$ is a conormal lattice. Assume that $c, d \in K(A)$ and $cd = 0$, hence $\lambda_A(c)\lambda_A(d) = \lambda_A(cd) = \lambda_A(0) = 0$ (by Definition 3(ii) of [6]). In accordance with Lemma 4.4 of [14], we know that the function $(\cdot)^* : A \rightarrow \text{Id}(L(A))$ preserves the joins. According to *Theorem 2*, we have $\text{Ann}(\lambda_A(c)) \vee \text{Ann}(\lambda_A(d)) = L(A)$, hence, by using *Proposition 3*, it follows that $((c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)))^* = ((c \rightarrow \varrho(0))^* \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))^*) = (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \perp \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \perp = \text{Ann}(\lambda_A(c)) \vee \text{Ann}(\lambda_A(d)) = L(A)$.

By applying *Lemma 2*, it follows that $\varrho((c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))) = (((c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)))^*)^* = 1$, so $(c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$ (cf. Lemma 5(3) of [6]). Since $1 \in K(A)$, there exist $x, y \in K(A)$ such that $x \leq c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$, $y \leq d \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $x \vee y = 1$. From $xc \leq \varrho(0)$, $yd \leq \varrho(0)$ we get $x \wedge n c = 0$, $y \wedge n d = 0$, for some integer $n \geq 1$ (cf. Lemma 1), hence $x \wedge n \leq (c \wedge n) \perp$ and $y \wedge n \leq (d \wedge n) \perp$. By Lemma 2(4) of [6], from $x \vee y = 1$ it results that $x \wedge n \vee y \wedge n = 1$, therefore $(c \wedge n) \perp \vee (d \wedge n) \perp = 1$.

(5) \Rightarrow (1) According to *Theorem 3*, it suffices to show that $L(A)$ is a conormal lattice. Let $x, y \in L(A)$ such that $x \wedge y = 0$, so $x = \lambda_A(c)$, $y = \lambda_A(d)$, for some $c, d \in K(A)$, hence $\lambda_A(cd) = x \wedge y = 0$. By Lemma 1, there exists an integer $n \geq 1$ such that $c \wedge n d = 0$, so $(c \wedge n k) \perp \vee (d \wedge n k) \perp = 1$, for some integer $k \geq 1$ (according to hypothesis (5)). Since $(c \wedge n k) \perp \leq c \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $(d \wedge n k) \perp \leq d \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0)$, it follows that $(c \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$. We know from Lemma 9(6) of [6] that $\lambda_A(c \wedge n k) = \lambda_A(c)$ and $\lambda_A(d \wedge n k) = \lambda_A(d)$. We recall that the map $(\cdot)^*$ preserves the joins.

In accordance with *Proposition 3*, the following equalities hold: $\text{Ann}(x) \vee \text{Ann}(y) = \text{Ann}(\lambda_A(c)) \vee \text{Ann}(\lambda_A(d)) = \text{Ann}(\lambda_A(c \wedge n k)) \vee \text{Ann}(\lambda_A(d \wedge n k)) = (c \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0))^* \vee (d \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0))^* = ((c \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \wedge n k \rightarrow \varrho(0)))^* = 1^* = L(A)$. By applying the implication (4) \Rightarrow (1) of *Theorem 2*, it follows that $L(A)$ is a conormal lattice.

(1) \Rightarrow (6) Let us denote by $\text{Vir}(A)$ the set of pure elements of the quantale A . Recall that the pure elements of the frame $\text{Id}(L(A))$ are exactly the σ - ideals of the lattice $L(A)$, so $\text{Vir}(\text{Id}(L(A)))$ will be the frame of σ - ideals the lattice $L(A)$. We recall from [12] that the map $w: \text{Vir}(A) \rightarrow \text{Vir}(\text{Id}(L(A)))$, defined by $w(a) = a^*$ for any $a \in \text{Vir}(A)$, is a frame isomorphism.

Let p be a minimal m - prime element of A , so p^* is a minimal prime ideal of the lattice $L(A)$. Since $L(A)$ is a conormal lattice, p^* is a σ -ideal of $L(A)$ (cf. *Theorem 2*. But w is a frame isomorphism, so there exists a unique pure element q of A such that $p^* = w(q) = q^*$. By using *Lemma 2*, it follows that $p = (p^*)^* = (q^*)^* = \varrho(q)$.

Assume that q_1, q_2 are pure elements of A such that $p = \varrho(q_1) = \varrho(q_2)$. By *Lemma 2*, it follows that $p^* = (\varrho(q_i))^* = q_i^*$, for $i = 1, 2$. Thus $w(q_1) = w(q_2)$, hence $q_1 = q_2$ (because w is a bijection).

(6) \Rightarrow (1) Let p, q be two distinct minimal m - prime elements of A , so there exists $c \in K(A)$ such that $c \leq p$ and $c \not\leq q$. By the hypothesis (6), there exists a unique pure element r such that $p = \varrho(r)$. From $c \leq \varrho(r)$ we get $c \wedge n \leq r$, for some integer $n \geq 1$ (cf. *Lemma 1*). But r is pure, so we get $r \vee (c \wedge n) \perp = 1$, therefore we obtain $p \vee (c \wedge n) \perp = 1$ (because $r \leq p$). Since q is m - prime, $c \not\leq q$ implies $c \wedge n \not\leq q$, hence $(c \wedge n) \perp \leq q$. It follows that $p \vee q = 1$. According to *Theorem 4*, it results that A is an mp-quantale.

The *properties* (5) and (6) of the previous theorem are the quantale versions of the conditions (5) and (6) of *Theorem 1*.

Corollary 3. [13]. The following are equivalent

A is a P F – quantale.

A is a semiprime mp – quantale.

For all $c, d \in K(A)$, $cd = 0$ implies $c \perp \vee d \perp = 1$.

For all $c, d \in K(A)$, $(cd) \perp = c \perp \vee d \perp$.

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) By Lemma 8.17 of [13], A is semiprime, so for any $c \in K(A)$, $c \rightarrow \varrho(0) = c \perp$ is a pure element, so $c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ is w - pure. By implication (4) \Leftrightarrow (1) of *Theorem 6*, A is an mp-quantale.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Let c be a compact element of A. Since A is a semiprime mp - quantale, $c \perp = c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ is a w - pure element (cf. implication (1) \Rightarrow (4) of *Theorem 6*). But in a semiprime quantale the pure and w - pure elements coincide, so $c \perp$ is a pure element of A. Thus A is a P F - quantale.

(1) \Leftrightarrow (3) The condition (3) says that for any $c \in K(A)$, $c \perp$ is a pure element of A.

(2) \Rightarrow (4) Since A is semiprime we have $\varrho(0) = 0$, so (4) follows by using the implication (1) \Rightarrow (3) of *Theorem 6*.

(4) \Rightarrow (2) Assume that $c^n = 0$, where $c \in K(A)$ and $n \geq 1$ is a natural number. By the hypothesis (3), from $c^n = 0$ we obtain $c \perp = (c^n) \perp = 1$, so $c \leq c \perp \perp = 0$. It result that $c = 0$, so the quantale A is semiprime (by *Lemma 1*). In this case we have $cd \rightarrow \varrho(0) = (cd) \perp = c \perp \vee d \perp = (c \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (d \rightarrow \varrho(0))$.

By using the implication (3) \rightarrow (1) of *Theorem 6*, we conclude that A is an mp - quantale.

Lemma 9. If $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $\varrho(O(p)) \leq p$.

If $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $p \in M \text{ in}(A)$ if and only if $\varrho(O(p)) = p$.

Proof.

(1) If $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then $\varrho(O(p)) \leq \varrho(p) \leq p$.

(2) Let p be an m - prime element of A. Assume that $p \in M \text{ in}(A)$. Firstly, from (1) we know that $\varrho(O(p)) \leq p$. In order to show the converse inequality $p \leq \varrho(O(p))$, suppose that $c \in K(A)$ and $c \leq p$. According to *Proposition 1*, $c \leq p$ implies $c \rightarrow \varrho(0) \leq p$, so there exists $d \in K(A)$ such that $d \leq c \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $d \leq p$. Applying *Lemma 1*, from $cd \leq \varrho(0)$ we get $c^n d^n = 0$, for some integer $n \geq 1$, hence $d^n \leq (c^n) \perp$. Since $d \leq p$ and $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ we have $d^n \leq p$, so $(c^n) \perp \leq p$. By using *Lemma 7*, it follows that $c^n \leq O(p)$, therefore $c \leq \varrho(O(p))$ (cf. *Lemma 1*). Conclude that $p \leq \varrho(O(p))$.

Now assume that $\varrho(O(p)) = p$. Let us consider a minimal m - prime element q of A such that $q \leq p$. We want to prove that $O(p) \leq q$. For any $c \in K(A)$, by using *Lemma 7*, the following implications hold: $c \leq O(p) \Rightarrow c \perp \leq p \Rightarrow c \leq q$. It follows that $O(p) \leq q$, so $p = \varrho(O(p)) \leq O(q) \leq q$. Thus $p = q$, therefore p is a minimal m - prime element of A.

The following result generalizes Theorem 3.2 of [27] to the framework of quantale theory.

Theorem 7. The following are equivalent

A is an mp-quantale.

If p and q are distinct minimal m -prime elements of A then we have $O(p) \vee O(q) = 1$.

For any $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$, $\varrho(O(p))$ is m -prime.

For any $m \in \text{Max}(A)$, $\varrho(O(p))$ is m -prime.

If $p, q \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and $p \leq q$ then $\varrho(O(p)) = \varrho(O(q))$.

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume that $p, q \in \text{Min}(A)$ and $p \neq q$, so $p \vee q = 1$ (cf. Theorem 4). By using Lemma 9, we have $p = \varrho(O(p))$ and $q = \varrho(O(q))$, hence $\varrho(O(p)) \vee \varrho(O(q)) = 1$. In accordance with Lemma 2.2 of [13], it follows that $O(p) \vee O(q) = 1$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Assume that $p, q \in \text{Min}(A)$ and $p \neq q$, so $O(p) \vee O(q) = 1$. Since $O(p) \leq p$ and $O(q) \leq q$ we get $p \vee q = 1$. By the implication (2) \Rightarrow (1) of Theorem 4 it follows that A is an mp-quantale.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose that $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$. In order to show that $\varrho(O(p))$ is m -prime, let c, d be two compact elements of A such that $cd \leq \varrho(O(p))$, so there exists an integer $n \geq 1$ such that $cnd^n \leq O(p)$ (cf. Lemma 1). By Lemma 7 we have $(cnd^n) \perp \leq p$, so there exists $e \in K(A)$ such that $e \leq (cnd^n) \perp$ and $e \leq p$. Thus $ecnd^n = 0$, hence $(ecn \rightarrow \varrho(0)) \vee (edn \rightarrow \varrho(0)) = 1$ (by Theorem 6). Since $1 \in K(A)$ there exist two compact elements c and d such that $x \leq ecn \rightarrow \varrho(0)$, $y \leq edn \rightarrow \varrho(0)$ and $x \vee y = 1$.

Then $xecn \leq \varrho(0)$ and $yedn \leq \varrho(0)$, so there exists an integer $k \geq 1$ such that $x^k e^k c^k n^k = 0$ and $y^k e^k d^k n^k = 0$. By Lemma 2.1 of [13], we have $x^k \vee y^k = 1$, so $x^k \leq p$ or $y^k \leq p$. Let us assume that $x^k \leq p$, hence $x^k e^k c^k \leq p$ (because $e \leq p$ and $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ implies $e^k \leq p$). From $x^k e^k c^k n^k = 0$ we get $x^k e^k c^k \leq (c^k n^k) \perp$, hence $(c^k n^k) \perp \leq p$. In virtue of Lemma 7, it follows that $c^k n^k \leq O(p)$, so $c \leq \varrho(O(p))$ (by Lemma 1). Similarly, $y^k \leq p$ implies $d \leq \varrho(O(p))$. Conclude that $\varrho(O(p))$ is m -prime.

(3) \Rightarrow (4) Obviously.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and fix a maximal element m such that $p \leq m$. Let q be a minimal m -prime element such that $q \leq p \leq m$. For any $c \in K(A)$ such that $c \leq O(m)$ we have $c \perp \leq m$ (by Lemma 7), hence $c \perp \leq q$. Since q is m -prime it follows that $c \leq q$, so we conclude that $O(m) \leq q$, so $\varrho(O(m)) \leq \varrho(q) = q$. According to the hypothesis (4), $\varrho(O(m))$ is m -prime, therefore $q = \varrho(O(m))$. We have proven that there exists a unique minimal m -prime element q such that $q \leq p$, so A is an mp-quantale.

(1) \Rightarrow (5) Assume that $p, q \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and $p \leq q$. Let us consider $m \in \text{Max}(A)$ and $r \in \text{Min}(A)$ such that $r \leq p \leq q \leq m$, hence, by using Lemma 9, we get $r = \varrho(O(r)) \leq \varrho(O(p)) \leq \varrho(O(q)) \leq \varrho(O(m))$. According to the proof of the implication (4) \Rightarrow (1) we have $r = \varrho(O(m))$, so $\varrho(O(p)) = \varrho(O(q))$.

(5) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ and $q_1, q_2 \in \text{Min}(A)$ such that $q_1 \leq p$ and $q_2 \leq p$. Let m be a maximal element of A such that $p \leq m$. Applying the hypothesis (5) and Lemma 9 we get $q_1 = \varrho(O(q_1)) = \varrho(O(q_2)) = q_2$, hence there exists a unique minimal m -prime element q of A such that $q \leq p$.

Now we shall present some consequences of Theorem 7 that extend Corollaries 3.3 of 3.5 of [27].

Lemma 10. $\bigvee \{O(m) \mid m \in M_{ax}(A)\} = 0$.

Proof. Assume that $c \in K(A)$ and $c \leq \bigvee \{O(m) \mid m \in M_{ax}(A)\}$. If $c \perp < 1$ then $c \perp \leq n$, for some $n \in M_{ax}(A)$. By Lemma 7 we have $c \leq O(n)$, contradicting the assumption that $c \leq \bigvee \{O(m) \mid m \in M_{ax}(A)\}$. Then $c \perp = 1$, hence $c \leq c \perp \perp = 0$. Thus $c = 0$, so we conclude that $\bigvee \{O(m) \mid m \in M_{ax}(A)\} = 0$.

Theorem 8. The following are equivalent

A is a P F – quantale.

For any $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$, $O(p)$ is m – prime.

For any $m \in M_{ax}(A)$, $O(p)$ is m – prime.

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume that $p \in K(A)$ and $c, d \in K(A)$ such that $cd \leq O(p)$, so $(cd) \perp \leq p$ (cf. Lemma 10). By Corollary 3 we have $(cd) \perp = c \perp \vee d \perp$, so $c \perp \leq p$ or $d \perp \leq p$. By applying again Lemma 10 it follows that $c \leq O(p)$ or $d \leq O(p)$, so $O(p)$ is m-prime.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Obviously.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) By the hypothesis (3), we have $\varrho(O(m)) = O(m)$, for any $m \in M_{ax}(A)$. By using Theorem 7 it results that A is an mp - quantale.

We shall prove that A is semiprime. Assume $c \in K(A)$ and $c \leq \varrho(0)$, hence $c \perp = 0$ for some integer $n \geq 1$ (cf. Lemma 1). Then for each $m \in M_{ax}(A)$ we have $c \perp \leq O(m)$, hence $c \leq O(m)$ (because $O(m)$ is m - prime). Thus $c \leq \bigvee \{O(m) \mid m \in M_{ax}(A)\} = 0$ (by Lemma 10), so $c = 0$. Thus A is a semiprime mp-quantale, so A is a P F - quantale.

By Theorem 4, we know that for any mp - quantale A, the inclusion $M_{inF}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}^F(A)$ has a flat continuous retraction. The following result establishes the form of a continuous retraction $\gamma: \text{Spec}^F(A) \rightarrow M_{inF}(A)$ of the inclusion $M_{inF}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}^F(A)$ (whenever such retraction exists).

Proposition 6. If the inclusion $M_{inF}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}^F(A)$ has a continuous retraction $\gamma: \text{Spec}^F(A) \rightarrow M_{inF}(A)$ then $\gamma(p) = \varrho(O(p))$, for all $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$.

Proof. Let p be an m-prime element of A. Recall from Proposition 5.6 of [13] that the flat closure of the set $\{p\}$ is given by $\text{cl}^F(\{p\}) = \Lambda(p)$, where $\Lambda(p) = \{s \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid s \leq p\}$. Assume that $q \in M_{inF}(A)$ and $q \leq p$, so $q \in \Lambda(p) = \text{cl}^F(\{p\})$ (cf. Proposition 5.6 of [13]). Since the map γ is a continuous retraction of the inclusion $M_{inF}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}^F(A)$ we have $q = \gamma(q) \in \text{cl}^F(\{\gamma(p)\}) = \Lambda(\gamma(p)) = \{\gamma(p)\}$, so $q = \gamma(p)$. Thus $\gamma(p)$ is the unique minimal m - prime element q such that $q \leq p$. In particular, we have proven that A is an mp - quantale. According to Lemma 9 and Theorem 7, from $\gamma(p) \leq q$ it follows that $\gamma(p) = \varrho(O(\gamma(p))) = \varrho(O(p))$.

From the previous proposition we get the uniqueness of the continuous retraction γ of the inclusion $M_{inF}(A) \subseteq \text{Spec}^F(A)$ (whenever the retraction γ exists).

Reference

- [1] Aghajani, M., & Tarizadeh, A. (2020). Characterizations of Gelfand rings specially clean rings and their dual rings. *Results in mathematics*, 75(3), 1-24.
- [2] Atiyah, M. F., & Macdonald, I. G. (2018). *Introduction to commutative algebra*. CRC Press.
- [3] Balbes, R., & Dwinger, Ph. (2011). *Distributive lattices*. Abstract Space Publishing
- [4] Bhattacharjee, P. (2009). *Minimal prime element space of an algebraic frame* (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University). Available at http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=bgsu1243364652
- [5] Birkhoff, G. (1940). *Lattice theory* (Vol. 25). American mathematical Soc.
- [6] Cheptea, D., & Georgescu, G. (2020). Boolean lifting properties in quantales. *Soft computing*, 24, 6119-6181.
- [7] Cornish, W. H. (1972). Normal lattices. *Journal of the Australian mathematical society*, 14(2), 200-215.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1446788700010041>
- [8] Dickmann, M., Schwartz, N., & Tressl, M. (2019). *Spectral spaces* (Vol. 35). Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Dobbs, D. E., Fontana, M., & Papick, I. J. (1981). On certain distinguished spectral sets. *Annali di matematica pura ed applicata*, 128(1), 227-240. (In Italian). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01789475>
- [10] Eklund, P., García, J. G., Höhle, U., & Kortelainen, J. (2018). Semigroups in complete lattices. In *Developments in mathematics* (Vol. 54). Cham: Springer.
- [11] Galatos, N., Jipsen, P., Kowalski, T., & Ono, H. (2007). *Residuated lattices: an algebraic glimpse at substructural logics*, volum 151. Elsevier.
- [12] Georgescu, G. (1995). The reticulation of a quantale. *Revue roumaine de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, 40(7), 619-632.
- [13] Georgescu, G. (2021). Flat topology on the spectra of quantales. *Fuzzy sets and systems*, 406, 22-41.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2020.08.009>
- [14] Georgescu, G. (2020). Reticulation of a quantale, pure elements and new transfer properties. *Fuzzy sets and systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2021.06.005>
- [15] Hochster, M. (1969). Prime ideal structure in commutative rings. *Transactions of the American mathematical society*, 142, 43-60.
- [16] Jipsen, P. (2009). Generalizations of Boolean products for lattice-ordered algebras. *Annals of pure and applied logic*, 161(2), 228-234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2009.05.005>
- [17] Johnstone, P. T. (1982). *Stone spaces* (Vol. 3). Cambridge university press.
- [18] Keimel, K. (1972). A unified theory of minimal prime ideals. *Acta mathematica academiae scientiarum hungarica*, 23(1-2), 51-69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01889903>
- [19] Powell, W. B. (1985). *Ordered algebraic structures* (Vol. 99). CRC Press.
- [20] Matlis, E. (1983). The minimal prime spectrum of a reduced ring. *Illinois journal of mathematics*, 27(3), 353-391.
- [21] Paseka, J., & Rosický, J. (2000). Quantales. In *Current research in operational quantum logic* (pp. 245-262). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1201-9_10
- [22] Rosenthal, K. I., & Niefield, S. B. (1989). Connections between ideal theory and the theory of locales a. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 552(1), 138-151.
- [23] Simmons, H. (1980). Reticulated rings. *Journal of algebra*, 66(1), 169-192.
- [24] Speed, T. P. (1974). Spaces of ideals of distributive lattices II. Minimal prime ideals. *Journal of the Australian mathematical society*, 18(1), 54-72.
- [25] Tarizadeh, A. (2019). Flat topology and its dual aspects. *Communications in algebra*, 47(1), 195-205.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2018.1469637>
- [26] Tarizadeh, A. (2019). Zariski compactness of minimal spectrum and flat compactness of maximal spectrum. *Journal of algebra and its applications*, 18(11). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219498819502025>
- [27] Tarizadeh, A., & Aghajani, M. (2021). Structural results on harmonic rings and lessened rings. *Beiträge zur algebra und geometrie/contributions to algebra and geometry*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13366-020-00556-x>