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\begin{aligned}
& \text { AbStract. Let } f: A \rightarrow B \text { and } g: A \rightarrow C \text { be two ring homomor- } \\
& \text { phisms and let } J \text { and } J^{\prime} \text { be two ideals of } B \text { and } C \text {, respectively, such that } \\
& f^{-1}(J)=g^{-1}\left(J^{\prime}\right) \text {. The bi-amalgamation of } A \text { with }(B, C) \text { along }\left(J, J^{\prime}\right) \\
& \text { with respect of }(f, g) \text { is the subring of } B \times C \text { given by } \\
& \qquad A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)=\left\{\left(f(a)+j, g(a)+j^{\prime}\right) / a \in A,\left(j, j^{\prime}\right) \in J \times J^{\prime}\right\} \text {. } \\
& \text { In this paper, we study the transference of } p m^{+}, p m \text { and finite character } \\
& \text { ring-properties in the bi-amalgamation. } \\
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& \text { finite character. } \\
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\end{aligned}
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## 1. Introduction

Throughout, all rings considered are commutative with unity. A ring $R$ is called a pm ring (also called Gefland ring) if each prime ideal is contained in exactly one maximal ideal. This class of rings has been introduced in [10] by G. De Marco and A.Orsatti, and studied in [4, 5, 17]. It contains the class of Von Neumann regular rings, local rings, zero-dimensional rings, rings of functions, etc... . In particular, any ring of the form $C(X)$, the ring of continuous real valued functions on a (completely regular) topological space $X$ is $p m([11,7.15])$. However, this last class of rings have a stronger property than $p m$; in fact in a ring $C(X)$ where $X$ is a topological space, the prime ideals containing a given prime ideal form a chain. In [2], W.D. Burgess and R. Raphael introduced a $p m^{+}$rings as a rings with this last stronger property. Any local domain is a $p m$ ring but would be $p m^{+}$only if all its prime ideals formed a chain, as, for example, in a valuation domain. It is also proved that a ring $R$ is $p m^{+}$if and only if, for each multiplicative subset set $S$ of $R, S^{-1} R$ a $p m$ ring (see [2] for more details).

[^0]A ring $R$ has finite character if each non-zero ideal of $R$ is contained in at most finitely many maximal ideals of $R$. The notion of the finite character domain has been introduced by Griffin [12]. While the concept of finite character ring was been extended to the rings with zero-divisors in 1971 by Larsen [14], where he characterized the prüfer finite character rings. A ring $R$ is called $h$-local if it is a $p m$ ring and has finite character. Thus, $R$ is $h$-local if and only if modulo any non-zero prime ideal it is a local ring and modulo any non-zero ideal it is a semi-local ring. In $[15,16]$, Matlis studied the $h$-local domains and gave some further characterizations. In [19], Olberding shows how diverse examples of $h$-local Prüfer domains arise as overrings of Noetherian domains and polynomial rings in finitely many variables.

Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: A \rightarrow C$ be two commutative ring homomorphisms and let $J$ and $J^{\prime}$ be two ideals of $B$ and $C$, respectively, such that $f^{-1}(J)=g^{-1}\left(J^{\prime}\right)$. The bi-amalgamation of $A$ with $(B, C)$ along $\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ with respect to $(f, g)$ is the subring of $B \times C$ given by

$$
A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)=\left\{\left(f(a)+j, g(a)+j^{\prime}\right) \mid a \in A,\left(j, j^{\prime}\right) \in J \times J^{\prime}\right\}
$$

This construction was introduced in [13] as a natural generalization of duplications $[8,9]$ and amalgamations $[6,7]$. Given a ring homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ and an ideal $J$ of $B$, the bi-amalgamation $A \bowtie^{\mathrm{id}_{A}, f}\left(f^{-1}(J), J\right)$ coincides with the amalgamated algebra introduced in 2009 by D'Anna, Finocchiaro, and Fontana [6, 7] as the following subring of $A \times B$ :

$$
A \bowtie^{f} J=\{(a, f(a)+j) \mid a \in A, j \in J\} .
$$

When $A=B$ and $f=\operatorname{id}_{A}$, the amalgamated $A \bowtie^{\mathrm{id}_{A}} I$ is called amalgamated duplication of a ring $A$ along the ideal $I$, and denoted $A \bowtie I$ (introduced in 2007 by D'Anna and Fontana, [9]). This construction can be presented as a bi-amalgamation algebra as follows:

$$
A \bowtie I=A \bowtie \bowtie^{\operatorname{id}_{A}, \mathrm{id}_{A}}(I, I) .
$$

In this paper, we investigate the transfer of $p m, \mathrm{pm}^{+}$, finite character and $h$ local properties to bi-amalgamation algebras. Our main goal is to provide new classes of rings which satisfied these properties.

## 2. Results

Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ and $g: A \rightarrow C$ be two ring homomorphisms and let $J$ and $J^{\prime}$ be two ideals of $B$ and $C$, respectively, such that $I:=f^{-1}(J)=g^{-1}\left(J^{\prime}\right)$. Throughout this paper, $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ will denote the bi-amalgamation of $A$ with $(B, C)$ along $\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ with respect to $(f, g)$.

In our study of the transfer of properties defined in the introduction, we need the description of the prime and maximal spectrums of the bi-amalgamation
construction. For thus, let's adopt the following notations:
For $L \in \operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J)$ and $L^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Spec}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)$, consider the prime ideals of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{L} & :=\left(L \times\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)\right) \cap\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& =\left\{\left(f(a)+j, g(a)+j^{\prime}\right) \mid a \in A,\left(j, j^{\prime}\right) \in J \times J^{\prime}, f(a)+j \in L\right\} \\
\overline{L^{\prime}} & :=\left((f(A)+J) \times L^{\prime}\right) \cap\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& =\left\{\left(f(a)+j, g(a)+j^{\prime}\right) \mid a \in A,\left(j, j^{\prime}\right) \in J \times J^{\prime}, g(a)+j^{\prime} \in L^{\prime}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Using [13, Lemmas 5.1, 5.2 and Propositions 5.3, 5.7], we deduce the following lemma.
Lemma 2.1. Under the above notation, let $P$ be a prime (resp. maximal) ideal of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$. Then
(1) $J \times J^{\prime} \subseteq P \Leftrightarrow \exists!\mathfrak{p} \supseteq I$ in $\operatorname{Spec}(A)($ resp. $\operatorname{Max}(A))$ such that $P=$ $\mathfrak{p} \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$.
In this case, $\exists L \supseteq J$ in $\operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J)(r e s p . \operatorname{Max}(f(A)+J))$ and $\exists L^{\prime} \supseteq J^{\prime}$ in $\operatorname{Spec}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\operatorname{Max}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)\right)$ such that $P=$ $\bar{L}=\overline{L^{\prime}}$.
(2) $J \times J^{\prime} \nsubseteq P \Leftrightarrow \exists$ ! $L$ in $\operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J)$ or in $\operatorname{Spec}(g(A)+J)$ (resp. in $\operatorname{Max}(f(A)+J)$ or in $\operatorname{Max}(f(A)+J))$ such that $J \nsubseteq L$ or $J^{\prime} \nsubseteq L$ and $P=\bar{L}$.

Consequently, we have
$\operatorname{Spec}\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right)=\left\{\bar{L} \mid L \in \operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J) \cup \operatorname{Spec}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)\right\}$,
$\quad$ and
$\operatorname{Max}\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right)=\left\{\bar{L} \mid L \in \operatorname{Max}(f(A)+J) \cup \operatorname{Max}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)\right\}$.
The notations and the facts of the previous lemma will be used in the sequel without explicit reference.

Our first result investigate the transfer of the $p m^{+}$property to the biamalgamation construction.
Proposition 2.2. $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is $p m^{+}$ring if and only if $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are pm ${ }^{+}$rings.
Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ Using [13, Proposition 4.1], we have the following isomorphisms of rings

$$
\frac{A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)}{0 \times J^{\prime}} \cong f(A)+J \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)}{J \times 0} \cong g(A)+J^{\prime}
$$

Thus, following [2, Lemma 3.7], $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are $p m^{+}$rings. $(\Leftarrow)$ Let $P$ be a prime ideal of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$. We have to show that any two
ideals of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ which contains $P$ are comparable. So, let $P_{1}, P_{2} \in$ $\operatorname{Spec}\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right)$ containing $P$.
If $J \times J^{\prime} \subseteq P$, then $J \times J^{\prime} \subseteq P_{1}$ and $J \times J^{\prime} \subseteq P_{2}$, and hence there exist $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2} \in \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ containing $I$ such that $P=\mathfrak{p} \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right), P_{1}=\mathfrak{p}_{1} \bowtie^{f, g}$ $\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ and $P_{2}=\mathfrak{p}_{2} \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$. Following [13, Proposition 4.1], we have the following isomorphism of rings:

$$
\varphi: \begin{aligned}
& \frac{A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)}{J \times J^{\prime}} \longrightarrow \frac{A}{I} \\
&\left(f(a)+j, g(a)+j^{\prime}\right) \longmapsto \\
& \bar{a}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, since $P \subseteq P_{1}$ and $P \subseteq P_{2}$, we have $\frac{\mathfrak{p}}{I} \subseteq \frac{\mathfrak{p}_{1}}{I}$ and $\frac{\mathfrak{p}}{I} \subseteq \frac{\mathfrak{p}_{2}}{I}$. On the other hand, by [13, Proposition 4.1], $\frac{A}{I} \cong \frac{f(A)+J}{J}$. Hence, since $f(A)+J$ is a $p m^{+}$ ring and by using [2, Lemma 3.7], $\frac{A}{I}$ is a $p m^{+}$ring. Thus, $\frac{\mathfrak{p}_{1}}{I}$ and $\frac{\mathfrak{p}_{2}}{I}$ are comparable, and so are $\mathfrak{p}_{1}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{2}$. Consequently, $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ are comparable. Now, suppose that $J \times J^{\prime} \nsubseteq P$. Then, there exist $L$ in $\operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J)$ or in $\operatorname{Spec}(g(A)+J)$ such that $J \nsubseteq L$ or $J^{\prime} \nsubseteq L$ and $P=\bar{L}$. In the first case, we have

$$
0 \times J^{\prime} \subseteq\left(L \times\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)\right) \cap\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right)=\bar{L}=P
$$

Thus, $\frac{P_{1}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$ and $\frac{P_{2}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$ are prime ideals of the $p m^{+} \operatorname{ring} \frac{A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)}{\{0\} \times J^{\prime}} \cong f(A)+J$ containing the prime ideal $\frac{P}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$. Thus, $\frac{P_{1}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$ and $\frac{P_{1}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$ are comparable, and so are $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$. Similarly, in the second case, we conclude that $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ are comparable. Accordingly, the ring $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is $p m^{+}$.
Corollary 2.3. (1) $A \bowtie^{f} J$ is $p m^{+}$if and only if $A$ and $f(A)+J$ are $p m^{+}$.
(2) $A \bowtie I$ is $\mathrm{pm}^{+}$if and only if $A$ is $\mathrm{pm}^{+}$.

Example 2.4. For a given prime positive integer $p$, let $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ be ring of $p$-adic integers. Clearly, $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ is a $p m^{+}$ring since it is a valuation domain. Thus, using the previous corollary, for any non zero positive integer $n$, the ring $\mathbb{Z}_{p} \bowtie\left(p^{n} \mathbb{Z}_{p}\right)$ is a $p m^{+}$ring.

The next result study the transfer of the $p m$ property to the bi-amalgamation construction.

Proposition 2.5. $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is pm ring if and only if $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are pm rings.

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$. Clearly, any homomorphic image of a $p m$ ring is also $p m$. Thus, using [13, Proposition 4.1], $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are $p m$ rings.
$(\Leftarrow)$. Let $P$ be a prime ideal of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ contained in $M_{1}, M_{2} \in \operatorname{Max}\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\right.$ $\left.\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right)$. If $J \times J^{\prime} \subseteq P$, then $J \times J^{\prime} \subseteq M_{1}$ and $J \times J^{\prime} \subseteq M_{1}$, and hence there exist $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ and $\mathfrak{m}_{1}, \mathfrak{m}_{2} \in \operatorname{Max}(A)$ containing $I$ such that $P=\mathfrak{p} \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$, $M_{1}=\mathfrak{m}_{1} \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ and $M_{2}=\mathfrak{m}_{2} \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$. As in the proof of Proposition
2.2, we deduce that $\frac{\mathfrak{m}_{1}}{I}$ and $\frac{\mathfrak{m}_{2}}{I}$ are maximal ideals of $\frac{A}{I}$ (which is isomorphic to a homomorphic image of $f(A)+J$, by [13, Proposition 4.1], and so it is a $p m$ ring), and they contain the prime ideal $\frac{\mathfrak{p}}{I}$. Thus, $\frac{\mathfrak{m}_{1}}{I}=\frac{\mathfrak{m}_{2}}{I}$, and so $\mathfrak{m}_{1}=\mathfrak{m}_{2}$. Consequently, $M_{1}=M_{2}$.

Now, suppose that $J \times J^{\prime} \nsubseteq P$. Then, there exist $L$ in $\operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J)$ or in $\operatorname{Spec}(g(A)+J)$ such that $J \nsubseteq L$ or $J^{\prime} \nsubseteq L$ and $P=\bar{L}$. In the first case, as in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we have $0 \times J^{\prime} \subseteq P$. Thus, $\frac{M_{1}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$ and $\frac{M_{2}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$ are maximal ideals of the $p m$ ring $\frac{A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)}{\{0\} \times J^{\prime}} \cong f(A)+J$ containing the prime ideal $\frac{P}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$. Thus, $\frac{M_{1}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}=\frac{M_{2}}{0 \times J^{\prime}}$, and so $M_{1}=M_{2}$. Similarly, in the second case, we conclude that $M_{1}=M_{2}$. Accordingly, the ring $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is $p m$.

Corollary 2.6. (1) $A \bowtie^{f} J$ is pm if and only if $A$ and $f(A)+J$ are $p m$. (2) $A \bowtie I$ is pm if and only if $A$ is pm.

Recall that the ring $R$ is called clean if each element in $R$ can be expressed as the sum of a unit and an idempotent. The concept of clean rings was introduced by Nicholson [18]. Examples of clean rings include all commutative Von Neumann regular rings and local rings. A basic property of clean rings is that any homomorphic image of a clean ring is again clean. In [1], D.D. Anderson and V.P. Camillo proved that any clean ring is $p m$, and the equivalence holds when the ring has only finite number of minimal prime ideals. The notion of cleanness of bi-amalgamations is not yet performed. However, using the pm property, we can deduce the following result.

Corollary 2.7. (1) If $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is clean, then so are $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$.
(2) If $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ have a finite number of minimal prime ideals, then $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is clean if and only if $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are clean.
In particular, $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is Noetherian and clean if and only if $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are Noetherian and clean.

Proof. (1). Follows from [13, Proposition 4.1] since every homomorphic image of a clean ring is clean (by [1, Proposition 2]).
(2). From [1, Theroem 5] and Proposition 2.5, it suffices to show that $A \bowtie^{f, g}$ $\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ has only a finite number of minimal ideals. Using [13, Proposition 4.1], when $J=0$ (resp. $J^{\prime}=0$ ), we have $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right) \cong g(A)+J^{\prime}$ (resp. $\left.A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right) \cong g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)$, and so $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is satisfied the desired property. So, we may assume that $J \neq 0$ and $J^{\prime} \neq 0$.

Let $P$ be a minimal prime ideal of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$. From Lemma 2.1, there exists $L$ in $\operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J)$ or in $\operatorname{Spec}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)$ such that $P=\bar{L}$. Take, for example, the first case and let $K \in \operatorname{Spec}(f(A)+J)$ such that $K \subseteq L$. Then, $0 \times J^{\prime} \subseteq \bar{K} \subseteq \bar{L}=P$. Hence, $\bar{K}=\bar{L}$, and so $K=L$. Thus, $L$ is a minimal
prime ideal of $f(A)+J$. Consequently, since $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ have only finite number of minimal prime ideals, $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ has also only finite number of minimal prime ideals.

The last statement follows from [13, Proposition 4.2] and the fact that Noetherian rings have only finite number of minimal prime ideals.

Example 2.8. For each integer $n>1$, the Krull dimension of the Noetherian ring $\mathbb{Z} / n \mathbb{Z}$ is 0 . Thus, by [1, Corollary 11$], \mathbb{Z} / n \mathbb{Z}$ is a clean ring. By using Corollary 2.7, for each integer $1<m<n$, the ring $\mathbb{Z} / n \mathbb{Z} \bowtie(\bar{m})$ is clean.

Recall that a ring $R$ is semi-local if it has a finite number of maximal ideals. Clearly, every semi-local ring has finite character. The converse is not true (take the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ for example). Our next result proves that the finite character property and the semi-local property coincide over the bi-amalgamation construction. This is due to the form of maximal ideals of bi-amalgamation.

Proposition 2.9. Suppose that $J$ and $J^{\prime}$ are non-zero ideals of $B$ and $C$, respectively. The following assertions are equivalent:
(1) $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is semi-local.
(2) $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ has finite character.
(3) $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are semi-local.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow(2)$. Clear, since every semi-local ring has finite character.
$(2) \Rightarrow(3)$. Since $J \times\{0\}$ and $\{0\} \times J^{\prime}$ are non zero ideals of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$, there exist a finite number of maximal ideals of $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ containing $J \times\{0\}$ and $\{0\} \times J^{\prime}$, respectively. Therefore, $\frac{A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)}{\{0\} \times J^{\prime}} \cong f(A)+J$ and $\frac{A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)}{J \times\{0\}} \cong g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are semi-local rings.
$(3) \Rightarrow(1)$. Following Lemma 2.1,

$$
\operatorname{Max}\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right)=\left\{\bar{L} \mid L \in \operatorname{Max}(f(A)+J) \cup \operatorname{Max}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)\right\}
$$

Thus, $\operatorname{Max}\left(A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is finite since $\operatorname{Max}(f(A)+J)$ and $\operatorname{Max}\left(g(A)+J^{\prime}\right)$ are finite, and so $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is semi-local.

Corollary 2.10. Suppose that $J$ and $I:=f^{-1}(J)$ are a non-zero ideals of $B$ and $A$, respectively. Then, $A \bowtie^{f} J$ has finite character if and only if $A$ and $f(A)+J$ are semi-local.

The transfer of $h$-local property to the bi-amalgamation algebras is easily deduced from Propositions 2.5 and 2.9 as follows:

Corollary 2.11. Suppose that $J$ and $J^{\prime}$ are non zero ideals of $B$ and $C$ respectively. Then, $A \bowtie^{f, g}\left(J, J^{\prime}\right)$ is h-local if and only if $f(A)+J$ and $g(A)+J^{\prime}$ are pm and semi-local.

Corollary 2.12. Suppose that $J$ and $I:=f^{-1}(J)$ are a non-zero ideals of $B$ and $A$, respectively. Then, $A \bowtie^{f} J$ is $h$-local if and only if $A$ and $f(A)+J$ are $p m$ and semi-local.

Example 2.13. Let $R$ be an Artinian ring (e.g., $\mathbb{Z} / n \mathbb{Z}$ ) and $I$ a non-zero ideal of $R$. Then, since $R$ is zero-dimensional (and so $p m$ ) ring and semi-local and by using the above corollary, $R \bowtie I$ is $h$-local.
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