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#### Abstract

Suppose that $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(\mathrm{R}))$ and $\Omega(\psi(R))$ have been the sub-graphs of complete graph $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$ generated as the sets of all regularity components and nil in $R$. We find out when every one of the graphs $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R)), \operatorname{Reg}(\psi(\mathrm{R}))$ and $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is linked and homogenous. Whenever $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(\mathrm{R}))$ and $\Omega(\psi(R))$ are both Eulerian and regularity.
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## 1. Introduction

The concept of graph theory was introduced via (Harary, F. 1972) ${ }^{[11]}$. Also, in 1981 Vince introduced the concept of locally homogeneous graphs in the groups (Vince, A. 1981). $R$ shall be employed during this whole study to signify ring having unity $1 \neq 0$. Have $\Omega(R)$ denote the sets of all $R$ is nil and $R$ entire graphs are a simple graph having vertices subset R in which two different vertices $\zeta$ and $\eta$ are contiguous if $\zeta+\eta \in \Omega(R)$. Anderson and Badawi presented these graphs, designated as $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$ in (Anderson, D. F. and Badawi, A. 2008) ${ }^{[1]}$, where the researchers provided a detailed discussion of the situation whenever $\Omega(R)$ is indeed an ideal. They did, however, calculate several graphic symmetries including the radius and circumference of $C(\psi(R))$. In 2009 (Akbari, S. et al. 2009) ${ }^{[5]}$ demonstrated that only if $R$ is a ring, a connecting complete graph is Hamilton. After that (Maimani, H. R. et al. 2012) ${ }^{[12]}$ explored the species $C(\psi(R))$. Pucanovi and Petrov, (Pucanovi, Z. and Petrovi, Z. 2011; Anderson, D. F., \& Badawi, A. 2012) ${ }^{[15,2]}$ estimated the circumference of $C(\psi(R))$. In 2012 (Shekarriza, M. H. et al. 2012) provides the properties of Eulerian $C(\psi(R))$. The concept of $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$ predominance number is calculated separately in (Chelvam, T. T., \& Asir, T. 2013; Chelvam, T. T., \& Selvakumar, K. 2014) ${ }^{[8-9]}$. Ramin discusses the vertices connectivity of $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$ wherein $R$ is a ring (Ramin, A. 2013) ${ }^{[16]}$ and (Asir, T., \& Chelvam, T. T. 2013) ${ }^{[8]}$ investigates the complements of $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$. for a finite ring $R$ (Sander, T., \& Nazzal, K. 2014) ${ }^{[17]}{ }^{[17]}$ considers minimal nil k-flows for $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$. Akbari and Heydari (Akbari, S., \& Heydari, F. 2013) ${ }^{[6]}$ investigates several characteristics of a regular graphs $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$. Erić and Pucanović (Erić, A. L., \& Pucanović, Z. S. 2013) ${ }^{[10]}$ investigates the graphic of $C(\psi(R))$. Additionally, (Anderson, D. F., \& Badawi, A. 2013) ${ }^{[3]}$ defines $R$ 's generalized complete graphs. The readers can consult (Müller, H. et al. 2014; Nazzal, K. 2016; Singh, P. and Bhat, V. K. 2020; Anderson, D. F. et al. 2012; Tamizh Chelvam, T. 2022) ${ }^{[13,14,19,2,20]}$ for just a review on the complete graphs of a ring.
The result that follows fully describes the graphs $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$. whenever $\mathrm{C}(R)$ is an ideal of R .
1.1. Remark (Anderson, D. F., \& Badawi, A. 2008) ${ }^{[1]}$ : Assume $R$ is a ring, and $\Omega(R)$ is an ideal of $R$. Suppose that $|\Omega(R)|=\omega,|R / \Omega(R)|=\varphi$.
a) $\quad \Omega(\psi(R))$ is the complete graph $K_{\omega}$.
b) If $2 \in \Omega(R)$, then $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is indeed the unions of $\varphi-1 \cap K_{\omega} s$.
c) $R / \Omega(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2}$ or $R / \Omega(R) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{3}$ iff $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is linked.
d) If $2 \in \operatorname{Reg}(R)$, then $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is indeed the unions of $(\varphi-1) / 2 \cap K_{\omega^{\prime} \omega} s$.

We discuss whether every of those graphs $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R)), \operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$, and $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is locally linked in this work. Likewise, we studied regularity of the graphs $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ and $\Omega(\psi(R))$. Finally, the Eulerian graphs $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ and $\Omega(\psi(R))$ are investigated.

## 2. Some Properties of $C(\Psi(R)), \operatorname{Reg}(\Psi(R))$, and $\Omega(\Psi(R))$

First, we will start with the following definition

### 2.1 Definition

Consider $G$ to be a graph having vertices and edges collections $\mathrm{M}(G)$ and $\mathrm{N}(G)$, correspondingly. Take $m \in$ $\mathrm{M}(G)$ be the open neighbor of $m$, which is given as $\Lambda(m)=$ $\{s \in \mathrm{M}(G): \varsigma m \in \Lambda(G)\}$.If for all $m \in \mathrm{M}(G) \Lambda(m)$ the graph $G$ is considered to be local linked. Therefore, when $G$ is a union of whole graph, $G$ is local linked; otherwise, if $G$ has such vertices and edges part besides the $K_{1,1} G$ isn't really local linked.

### 2.2 Proposition

Suppose $\Omega(R)$ be an ideal of $R$.

1. $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is a locally linked graph.
2. $\quad R$ is an integral domain iff $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ and $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$ are locally connected graphs.

### 2.3 Proposition

Suppose $R$ be the sum of two rings $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$. If neither $R_{1}$ nor $R_{2}$ is an integral domain, so $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is locally linked. Proof. There is no pathway linking $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ in $\Lambda((0,0))$ when $R$ is a combination of two integral domain. As a result, $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is not locally linked. Suppose that neither $R_{1}$ nor $R_{2}$ are integral domains. Because $(0,0)$ in $\Lambda((\varsigma, \sigma))$ is a pathway combining $(\zeta, \eta)$ and $(\lambda, \xi)$ in $\Lambda((\varsigma, \sigma))$, we have $(\zeta, \eta)-(0,0)-(\lambda, \xi)$. As a result, $\Lambda((\varsigma, \sigma))$ is locally linked for all $(\varsigma, \sigma)$ in $\Omega(R)-0$. Therefore, the connectedness of a graphs created by $\Lambda((0,0))$ must still be investigated. If $(\zeta, \eta)$ and $(\lambda, \xi)$ are two non-neighboring vertex in $\Lambda((0,0))$, then $\zeta \in \Omega\left(R_{1}\right) \backslash\{0\}$ means that $(\zeta, \eta)-(-\zeta,-\xi)-$ $(\lambda, \xi)$ is a pathway in $\Lambda((0,0))$ and $\eta$ is a pathway in $\Omega(R)$ 0 . Then $\eta \in \Omega\left(R_{1}\right) \backslash\{0\}$ denotes a pathway in $\Lambda((0,0))$ as $(\zeta, \eta)-(-\lambda, \eta)-(\lambda, \xi)$.

Suppose $R$ be a ring product and. If neither $R_{1}$ nor $R_{2}$ is an integral domain. Consequently, $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is locally linked.
Proof. Assuming that $(\varsigma, \sigma) \in \operatorname{Reg}(R)$ and $(\zeta, \eta),(\lambda, \xi)$ are two non-contiguous vertexes in $\Lambda((\varsigma, \sigma))$. Thus, $\zeta \in \Lambda(\varsigma)$ offers the pathway $(\zeta, \eta)-(\varsigma,-\sigma)-(-\varsigma,-\xi)-(\lambda, \xi)$ in $\Lambda((\zeta, \eta))$ and $\eta \in \Lambda(\sigma)$ offers the pathway $(\zeta, \eta)-(-\varsigma, \sigma)-$ $(-\lambda,-\sigma)-(\lambda, \xi)$ in $\Lambda((\zeta, \eta))$.Now, since $R$ be a ring product it becomes obvious that if $\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{1}\right)\right|=\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{2}\right)\right|=2$, so neither $R_{1}$ nor $R_{2}$ is an integral domain (According to the Proposition. 2.3) and $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is a full graph. Thus, locally linked.

### 2.5 Proposition

If $R=\prod_{j=2}^{n+1} R_{i}, n \geq 2$, so $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is locally linked.
Proof. Let $\varsigma=\left(\varsigma_{i}\right) \in \operatorname{Reg}(R)$ and $\varphi=\left(\varphi_{j}\right)$ and $\phi=\left(\phi_{j}\right)$ represent two non-neighboring vertexes in $\Lambda(\varsigma)$. Because $\varphi \in$ $\Lambda(\varsigma), \varsigma_{i}+\varphi_{i} \in \Omega\left(R_{j}\right)$, for some $j=2$. If take $\varrho=\left(\varrho_{j}\right)$ so $\varrho_{1}=\varphi_{1}, \varrho_{2}=-\varphi_{2}, \varrho_{3}=-\phi_{3}, \varrho_{4}=-\phi_{4}$ and $\varrho_{i}=2 \forall j+$ $1 \geq 5$, therefore $\varphi-\varrho-\phi-1$ is a pathway in $\Lambda(\varsigma)$.

### 2.6 Definition

Consider $G$ to be a graph having vertices and edges collections $\mathrm{M}(G)$ and $\mathrm{N}(G)$, correspondingly. Then

1. $C\left(\Psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is not locally linked iff $k=v^{p+1}$, with $v$ is a prime and $p \geq 3$ or $k=v_{1} v_{2} v_{3}$, and $v_{1}, v_{2}$ and $v_{3}$ are separate primes.
2. $\Omega\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is not locally linked iff $k=v_{1} v_{2} v_{3}$ where $v_{1}, v_{2}$ and $v_{3}$ are distinct primes.
3. $\operatorname{Reg}\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is not locally linked iff $k=v^{p+1}$, where $v$ is prime and $p \geq 3$.

### 2.7 Proposition

Assume $R$ is the product of two rings $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$ are two rings for which $\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{1}\right)\right|=k_{1}$ and $\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{2}\right)\right|=k_{2}$. Set $\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right) \in \operatorname{Reg}(R)$ and $\operatorname{deg}_{1}\left(\varphi_{1}\right)=\varepsilon_{1}$ and $\operatorname{deg}_{2}\left(\varphi_{2}\right)=\varepsilon_{2}$ with $\operatorname{deg}_{j}\left(\varphi_{j}\right)$ is indeed the grade of $\varphi_{j}$ in $\operatorname{Reg}\left(\psi\left(R_{j}\right)\right)$.The vertices grade $\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)$ in $\operatorname{Reg}\left(\Psi\left(R_{j}\right)\right)$ is therefore provided as,

### 2.4 Proposition

$$
\operatorname{deg}\left(\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right)= \begin{cases}k_{2} \varepsilon_{1}+k_{1} \varepsilon_{2}-\varepsilon_{1} \varepsilon_{2}-1, & \text { if } 2 \in \operatorname{Reg}(R) ; \\ k_{1} \varepsilon_{2}+k_{2} \varepsilon_{1}+\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right)-\left(\varepsilon_{1}+\varepsilon_{2}\right)-\varepsilon_{1} \varepsilon_{2}-3, & \text { if } 2 \in Z\left(R_{1}\right) \text { and } Z\left(R_{2}\right) \\ k_{1} \varepsilon_{2}+k_{2} \varepsilon_{1}-\varepsilon_{2}+k_{2}-\varepsilon_{1} \varepsilon_{2}-2, & \text { if } 2 \in Z\left(R_{1}\right) \text { and } 2 \in \operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{2}\right)\end{cases}
$$

Proof. Suppose that $2 \in \operatorname{Reg}(R)$ so $\Lambda\left(\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right)=$ $\left\{(\varsigma, \sigma) \in \operatorname{Reg}(R): \varsigma \in \Lambda\left(\varphi_{1}\right) \quad\right.$ or $\left.\in \quad \Lambda\left(\varphi_{2}\right)\right\}$. So, $\left|\Lambda\left(\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right)\right|=k_{2} \varepsilon_{1}+k_{1} \varepsilon_{2}-\varepsilon_{1} \varepsilon_{2}-1$. Now, If $2 \in Z\left(R_{1}\right)$ and $\quad Z\left(R_{2}\right)$, thus $\quad \Lambda\left(\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right)=\{(\varsigma, \sigma) \in \operatorname{Reg}(R) \backslash$ $\left\{\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right\}: \varsigma \in \Lambda\left(\varphi_{1}\right) \cup\left\{\varphi_{1}\right\}$ or $\left.\sigma \in \Lambda\left(\varphi_{2}\right) \cup\left\{\varphi_{2}\right\}\right\}$. Hence, $\left|\Lambda\left(\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right)\right|=\left(\varepsilon_{2}+1\right) k_{1}+\left(\varepsilon_{1}+1\right) k_{2}-\left(\varepsilon_{1}+1\right)\left(\varepsilon_{2}+\right.$ 1) - 3. If $2 \in Z\left(R_{1}\right)$ and $2 \in \operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{2}\right)$, then $\Lambda\left(\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right)=$ $\left\{(\varsigma, p) \in \operatorname{Reg}(R) \backslash\left\{\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right\}: \varsigma \in \Lambda\left(\varphi_{1}\right) \cup\left\{\varphi_{1}\right\} \quad\right.$ or $\quad \sigma \in$ $\left.\Lambda\left(\varphi_{2}\right)\right\}$. Therefore, $\quad\left|\Lambda\left(\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)\right)\right|=\left(\varepsilon_{1}+1\right) k_{2}+k_{1} \varepsilon_{2}-$ $\left(\varepsilon_{1}+1\right) \varepsilon_{2}-2$.
2.8 Remark Assume $R$ is a ring. Consequently

1. If $|R|$ is an even number, so $|\Omega(R)|$ and $|\operatorname{Reg}(R)|$ are indeed odd if $R$ is a field with even order,
2. When $|R|$ is an odd number, then $|\operatorname{Reg}(R)|$ is an even number, while $|\Omega(R)|$ is an odd number.
2.9 Definition Assume $R$ is a ring, so
3. if $R$ is a ring then $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph,
4. $\quad R$ is a field iff $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph of even grade.

### 2.10 Remark

Suppose $R$ be a product of two rings $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right) \in$ $\operatorname{Reg}(R)$. The grade of vertices $\left(\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}\right)$ in $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ then is even iff $\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{1}\right)\right|: \quad\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{2}\right)\right| \quad$ are even and $\operatorname{deg}$ $\operatorname{deg}_{1}\left(\varphi_{1}\right), \operatorname{deg}_{2}\left(\varphi_{2}\right)$ are odd.

### 2.11 Proposition

Suppose $R$ be a ring. Consequently $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph of odd grade iff $R$ is a field.
Proof. Assume that $R=\prod_{j=2}^{n+1} R_{i}, n \geq 3$, and $R_{j}$ is a finite ring $\forall i$. By using Definition 2.9. and Remark 2.10. we obtain $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph of odd grade. Next consider the situation if $R$ is a product of fields of odd orders then $R \cong$
$H \times L$, with $H$ is the product including all fields $R_{j}^{\prime} h$ and $R_{j}^{\prime} l$ is the product of all rings which are not field of odd orders. Therefore $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph of odd order. Lastly, if $|R|=2^{k+1} p^{k}$, with $p>1$, we can construct $R \cong H \times L$, where $|H|=2^{k+1}$, and $|L|=p^{k}$. $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is thus a regular graph of odd order. Therefore, $R$ is a field.

## 3. Some Properties of Eulerian Graphs

First, we will start with the following definition:

### 3.1 Definition

If a graph seems to have a complete path that contains each of its edges, it is classified as Eulerian. Alternatively, a linked graph $G$ is Eulerian iff every vertices in $\mathrm{M}(G)$ has an even grade.
$\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is obviously Eulerian iff $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2}$, whereas $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian iff $|R|$ is even, but
$C(\psi(R))$ not Eulerian if $R$ is a finite ring.

### 3.2 Proposition

If $R$ is a finite ring, thus $\mathrm{C}(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph iff $R$ is a product of odd-ordered fields.
Proof: Allow $R$ to be the straight product of two rings. Thus $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is linked, because for every two non-adjacent vertex $(\varsigma, \sigma)$ and $(\zeta, \eta)$ in $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R)),(\varsigma, \sigma)-(-\varsigma,-\eta)-$ $(\zeta, \eta)$ is a pathway. As a result, for every finite ring $R$, $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is linked.

### 3.3 Proposition

If $R$ is a finite ring, thus $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph iff $R$ is a product of even-ordered fields.
Proof: obvious.

### 3.4 Proposition

Assume $R$ is a finite ring. Then $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph iff $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2}$ or $R$ is a product of odd order fields.
Proof: By applying Proposition. 2.11, we get the result.

### 3.5 Proposition

Assume $R$ is a ring. If $|R|$ is odd, then $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph.
Proof. If $R$ is a ring, so $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is obviously Eulerian graph iff $R$ is a field or $|R|$ is even. Assume $R=\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} R_{j+1}$, with $R_{j+1}$ being a finite ring for every i. Thus, there are two possibilities.
Situation 1: $|R|$ is an odd number. If $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph, $\operatorname{deg}((0,0, \ldots, 0))=|\Omega(R)|-2$ is an odd number. Since $R$ is a product of field of odd orders, according to Remark 2.8. So $\operatorname{deg}((1,1,0, \ldots, 0)=|\Omega(R)|-2-$ $\prod_{j=3}^{k}\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|$ is strange, even contradictory.
Situation 2: Assume that $|R|$ is even. Then $\left|R_{j+1}\right|$ is odd for all $j+1$. Consider $\varrho=\left(\varrho_{j+1}\right) \in \Omega(R)$.Now, $L=$ $\left\{l \in\{1,2, ., k+1\}: \varrho_{l} \in \Omega\left(R_{l+1}\right)\right\}$ and $H=\{1,2, ., k+1\} \backslash$ $(L+1)$ are defined. About any finite ring of even order P , the summation of every two components are a zero-divisor iff all elements are zero-divisors. Thus, whenever $\varsigma=\left(\varsigma_{j+1}\right) \in$ $\Omega(R) \backslash\left\{\varrho_{j+1}\right\}$ including all $j+1 \in L$, and left, the vertices $\left.\varsigma_{j+1} \in R_{j+1} \backslash-\varrho_{j+1}+\Omega\left(R_{j+1_{-}}\right)\right) \forall j+1 \in \Phi$ and $\varsigma_{j+1} \in$ $\Omega\left(R_{j+1}\right)$ for some $j+1 \in \Phi$ is non-adjacent to $\varrho$. Because $\left|-\varrho_{j+1}+\Omega\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|=\left|\Omega\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right| \forall j+1$ we have $\operatorname{deg}\left(\varrho_{j+1}\right)=\left(\left|\Omega\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|-1\right)-$
$\left(\prod_{(j+1) \in L}\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|\left(\prod_{(j+1) \in L}\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|-\right.\right.$
$\left.\prod_{(j+1) \in L}\left(\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|-\left|\Omega\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|\right)\right)$. Because $\left|\Omega\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|$ is even and $\left|\operatorname{Reg}\left(R_{j+1}\right)\right|$ is odd $\forall j+1 \in \Phi$ we may conclude that $\operatorname{deg}\left(\varrho_{j+1}\right)$ is odd. Furthermore, $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is a linked graph because there are 0 neighboring vertex to every other vertex in $\Omega(\psi(R))$. As a result, $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph.

### 3.6 Corollary

Assume $R$ is a finite ring. Then $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph iff $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2}$ or $R$ is a product of odd order fields.
Proof: By applying Proposition. 2.11, we get the result.

## 4. Conclusion

In this study we obtained the following results:

1. $C\left(\Psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is not locally linked iff $k=v^{p+1}$, with $v$ is a prime and $p \geq 3$ or $k=v_{1} v_{2} v_{3}$, and $v_{1}, v_{2}$ and $v_{3}$ are separate primes.
2. $\Omega\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is not locally linked iff $k=v_{1} v_{2} v_{3}$ where $v_{1}, v_{2}$ and $v_{3}$ are distinct primes.
3. $\operatorname{Reg}\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is not locally linked iff $k=v^{p+1}$, where $v$ is prime and $p \geq 3$.
4. $\quad \Omega(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph, if $R$ is a ring.
5. $\quad R$ is a field iff $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph of even grade.
6. $\quad R$ is a field iff $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is a regular graph of odd grade.
7. $\operatorname{Reg}\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is Eulerian iff $k=3$.
8. $\Omega\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is Eulerian iff $k=3$ or $k$ is an even number.
9. $C\left(\psi\left(\mathbb{Z}_{k}\right)\right)$ is never Eulerian.
10. $\operatorname{Reg}(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph iff $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2}$.
11. $\Omega(\psi(R))$ is Eulerian graph iff $R \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2}$.
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