

Structure of the largest idempotent-product free sequences in semigroups

Guoqing Wang

Department of Mathematics, Tianjin Polytechnic University, Tianjin, 300387, P. R. China

Email: gqwang1979@aliyun.com

Abstract

Let S be a finite semigroup, and let $E(S)$ be the set of all idempotents of S . Gillam, Hall and Williams proved in 1972 that every S -valued sequence T of length at least $|S| - |E(S)| + 1$ is not (strongly) idempotent-product free, in the sense that it contains a nonempty subsequence the product of whose terms, in their natural order in T , is an idempotent, which affirmed a question of Erdős. They also showed that the value $|S| - |E(S)| + 1$ is best possible.

Here, motivated by Gillam, Hall and Williams' work, we determine the structure of the idempotent-product free sequences of length $|S \setminus E(S)|$ when the semigroup S (not necessarily finite) satisfies $|S \setminus E(S)|$ is finite, and we introduce a couple of structural constants for semigroups that reduce to the classical Davenport constant in the case of finite abelian groups.

Key Words: *Idempotent-product free sequences; Erdős-Burgess constant; Davenport constant; Zero-sum*

1 Introduction

Let S be a nonempty semigroup, endowed with a binary associative operation $*$ on S , and denote by $E(S)$ the set of idempotents of S , where $x \in S$ is said to be an idempotent (in S) if $x * x = x$. Our interest in semigroups and idempotents comes from the following question of P. Erdős to D.A. Burgess [2]:

If S is a finite nonempty semigroup of order n , does any S -valued sequence T of length n contain a nonempty subsequence the product of whose terms, in any order, is an idempotent?

In 1969, Burgess [2] gave an answer to this question in the case that \mathcal{S} is commutative or contains only one idempotent. Shortly after, this question was completely affirmed by D.W.H. Gillam, T.E. Hall and N.H. Williams, who actually proved the following stronger result:

Theorem A. ([8]) *Let \mathcal{S} be a finite nonempty semigroup. Any \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length $|\mathcal{S}| - |E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$ contains one or more terms whose product (in their natural order in this sequence) is an idempotent; In addition, the bound $|\mathcal{S}| - |E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$ is optimal.*

That better bounds can be obtained, at least in principle, for specific classes of semigroups is somewhat obvious and, in any case, will be explained later, in Section 4.

Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup and T a sequence of terms from \mathcal{S} . We call T (weakly) **idempotent-product free** if T contains no nonempty subsequence the product whose terms, in any order, is an idempotent, and we call T **strongly idempotent-product free** if T contains no nonempty subsequence the product whose terms, in their natural order in T , is an idempotent.

In fact, by using almost the same idea of arguments employed by Gillam, Hall and Williams [8], we can derive the following proposition for any semigroup \mathcal{S} such that $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite. For the readers' convenience, we shall give the arguments in Section 3.

Proposition 1.1. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup such that $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite. Then any \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$ is not strongly idempotent-product free.*

So, a natural question arises:

If \mathcal{S} is a nonempty semigroup such that $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite, and T is a weakly (respectively, strongly) idempotent-product free \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$, what can we say about T and the structure of \mathcal{S} ?

In this manuscript, we completely answered this question in case that T is a weakly idempotent-product free \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$. For the sake of exposition, we shall present the main theorem together with its proof in Section 3. Section 2 contains only some necessary preliminaries. In the final Section 4, further researches are proposed.

2 Some Preliminaries

We begin by recalling some notations extensively used in zero-sum theory, though mostly in the setting of commutative groups, see ([6], Chapter 5) for abelian groups and see [11] for nonabelian groups.

Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup. Finite \mathcal{S} -valued sequences can be regarded as words in the free monoid $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ with basis \mathcal{S} , we denote them multiplicatively, so as to write $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_\ell$ in

place of $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell)$, and call them simply sequences. We say the sequence $T = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_\ell \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ has length $|T| = \ell$. We say $T' = x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_t}$ is a subsequence of T provided that $t \in [0, \ell]$ and $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t \leq \ell$. Note that the operation (connecting two sequences) of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ is represented by \cdot , which is different from the operation of \mathcal{S} . Accordingly, we write x^n for the n -fold product of an element $x \in \mathcal{S}$, and $T^{[n]}$ for the n -fold product of the sequence $T \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$. By $TT'^{[-1]}$ we denote the remaining subsequence of T obtained by deleting the terms of T' from T . For any element $x \in \mathcal{S}$, by $v_x(T)$ we denote the multiplicity of x in the sequence T , i.e., the times which x appears to be terms in the sequence T . We set $\text{supp}(T) = \{x \in \mathcal{S} : v_x(T) > 0\}$. Let σ be any permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$. By $\pi_\sigma(T)$ we denote the product $x_{\sigma(1)} * x_{\sigma(2)} * \cdots * x_{\sigma(\ell)}$ of terms of T in the order under the permutation σ . If σ is the identity permutation, we just write $\pi(T)$ simply for $\pi_\sigma(T)$. Let

$$\prod(T) = \{\pi_\sigma(T') : T' \text{ takes every nonempty subsequence of } T \\ \text{and } \sigma \text{ takes every permutation of } [1, |T']\}.$$

We call T a (weakly) *idempotent-product free* \mathcal{S} -valued sequence by meaning that

$$\prod(T) \cap E(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset,$$

and T a *strongly idempotent-product free* \mathcal{S} -valued sequence by meaning that

$$\{\pi(T') : T' \text{ takes every nonempty subsequence of } T\} \cap E(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset.$$

For any element x of \mathcal{S} , we define

$$\lambda_T(x) = |\prod(T \cdot x) \setminus \prod(T)|.$$

The zero element of \mathcal{S} , denoted $0_{\mathcal{S}}$ (if it exists), is the unique element z of \mathcal{S} such that $z * x = x * z = z$ for every $x \in \mathcal{S}$.

Let X be a subset of \mathcal{S} . We say X generates \mathcal{S} , or the elements of X are generators of \mathcal{S} , provided that every element $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is the product of one or more elements in X , in which case we write $\mathcal{S} = \langle X \rangle$. In particular, we use $\langle x \rangle$ in place of $\langle X \rangle$ if $X = \{x\}$, and we say that \mathcal{S} is a cyclic semigroup if it is generated by a single element. For any element $x \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\langle x \rangle$ is finite, the least integer $r > 0$ such that $x^r = x^t$ for some positive integer $t \neq r$ is the **index** of x , denoted $\mathcal{I}(x)$, then the least integer $k > 0$ such that $x^{\mathcal{I}(x)+k} = x^{\mathcal{I}(x)}$ is the **period** of x , denoted $\mathcal{P}(x)$. Let I be an ideal of the semigroup \mathcal{S} , the relation defined by

$$a \mathcal{I} b \Leftrightarrow a = b \text{ or } a, b \in I$$

is a congruence on \mathcal{S} , the Rees Congruence of the ideal I . The quotient semigroup $\mathcal{S}/I = \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{I}$ is the Rees quotient of \mathcal{S} by I . Let Q be a semigroup with zero disjoint from \mathcal{S} . An **ideal extension** of \mathcal{S} by Q is a semigroup B such that \mathcal{S} is an ideal of B and the Rees quotient

$B/S = Q$. A **partial homomorphism** of $Q^* = Q \setminus \{0_Q\}$ into a semigroup \mathcal{D} is a mapping $f : Q^* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that $f(a * b) = f(a) * f(b)$ whenever $a * b \neq 0_Q$.

If \mathcal{S} is a commutative semigroup, it is then possible to define a fundamental congruence, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}$, on \mathcal{S} as follows: Let a, b be any two elements of \mathcal{S} . We write $a \leq_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}} b$ to mean that $a^m = b * c$ for some $c \in \mathcal{S}$ and some integer $m > 0$. If $a \leq_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}} b$ and $b \leq_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}} a$, we write $a \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}} b$. We call the commutative semigroup \mathcal{S} an archimedean semigroup provided that $a \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}} b$ for any two elements a, b of \mathcal{S} . By ([10], Chapter III, Theorem 1.2), the quotient semigroup $Y(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S}/\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a lower semilattice, called the **universal semilattice** of \mathcal{S} . Furthermore, there exists a partition $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{y \in Y(\mathcal{S})} \mathcal{S}_y$ into subsemigroups \mathcal{S}_y (one for every $y \in Y(\mathcal{S})$) with respect to the universal semilattice $Y(\mathcal{S})$, in particular, $\mathcal{S}_{y_1} * \mathcal{S}_{y_2} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{y_1 \wedge y_2}$ for all $y_1, y_2 \in Y(\mathcal{S})$, and each component \mathcal{S}_y is archimedean. The following lemma to characterize the structure of any finite commutative archimedean semigroup will be useful for the proof later.

Lemma 2.1. ([10], Chapter I, Proposition 3.6, Proposition 3.7, Proposition 3.8, and Chapter III, Proposition 3.1) *A finite commutative semigroup \mathcal{S} is archimedean if and only if it is an ideal extension of a finite abelian group G by a finite commutative nilsemigroup N . Moreover, the partial homomorphism $\varphi_G^N : N \setminus \{0_N\} \rightarrow G$ to construct the ideal extension of the group G by the nilsemigroup N is given by*

$$\varphi_G^N : a \mapsto a * e_G$$

where a denotes an arbitrary element $N \setminus \{0_N\} = \mathcal{S} \setminus G$ and e_G denotes the identity element of the subgroup G .

We say that the semigroup \mathcal{S} is a nilsemigroup if every element of \mathcal{S} is nilpotent, i.e., \mathcal{S} has a zero element $0_{\mathcal{S}}$ and for each element $x \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that $x^n = 0_{\mathcal{S}}$.

The following lemmas will be useful for our arguments.

Lemma 2.2. (see [9], Chapter IV, p. 127) *Let N be a finite commutative nilsemigroup, and let a, b be two elements of N . If $a * b \in \{a, b\}$, then $a = 0_N$ or $b = 0_N$.*

Lemma 2.3. ([10], Chapter I, Lemma 5.7, Proposition 5.8, Corollary 5.9) *Let $\mathcal{S} = \langle x \rangle$ be a finite cyclic semigroup. Then $\mathcal{S} = \{x, x^2, \dots, x^{I(x)}, x^{I(x)+1}, \dots, x^{I(x)+\mathcal{P}(x)-1}\}$ with*

$$x^i * x^j = \begin{cases} x^{i+j}, & \text{if } i + j \leq I(x) + \mathcal{P}(x) - 1; \\ x^k, & \text{if } i + j \geq I(x) + \mathcal{P}(x), \text{ where} \\ & I(x) \leq k \leq I(x) + \mathcal{P}(x) - 1 \text{ and } k \equiv i + j \pmod{\mathcal{P}(x)}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

(i) *there exists a unique idempotent, x^ℓ , in the cyclic semigroup $\langle x \rangle$, where*

$$\ell \in [I(x), I(x) + \mathcal{P}(x) - 1] \text{ and } \ell \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathcal{P}(x)};$$

(ii) *$\{x^{I(x)}, x^{I(x)+1}, \dots, x^{I(x)+\mathcal{P}(x)-1}\}$ is a cyclic subgroup of \mathcal{S} isomorphic to the additive group $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{P}(x)}$ of integers modulo $\mathcal{P}(x)$.*

3 The structure of the extremal sequence

In this section, we shall determine the structure of idempotent-product free \mathcal{S} -value sequences of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$. The following lemma will be useful.

Lemma 3.1. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup. Let T be an \mathcal{S} -valued sequence with $\prod(T) \cap E(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$, and let x be a term of T . Then $\lambda_{T, x^{[-1]}}(x) \geq 1$.*

Proof. Since $|\prod(T)|$ is finite, combined with Lemma 2.3 (i), we derive that $\langle x \rangle \not\subseteq \prod(T)$ no matter whether $\langle x \rangle$ is finite or infinite, and thus, $\langle x \rangle \not\subseteq \prod(Tx^{[-1]})$. Let k be the least positive integer such that $x^k \notin \prod(Tx^{[-1]})$. If $k = 1$, i.e., $x \notin \prod(Tx^{[-1]})$, then $x \in \prod(T) \setminus \prod(Tx^{[-1]})$ which implies $\lambda_{T, x^{[-1]}}(x) \geq 1$, done. Hence, we assume $k > 1$. Then $x^{k-1} \in \prod(Tx^{[-1]})$, and thus, $x^k = x^{k-1} * x \in \prod(Tx^{[-1]}) * x \subseteq \prod(T)$, which implies $\lambda_{T, x^{[-1]}}(x) \geq 1$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.1 Let $T = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_\ell \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ with length $\ell = |\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$, where $a_i \notin E(\mathcal{S})$. Suppose to the contrary that T is strongly idempotent-product free. Let

$$A_k = \{\pi(T_k) : T_k \text{ is a nonempty subsequence of } a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k\}$$

where $k \in [1, \ell]$. Clearly,

$$A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq A_\ell. \quad (1)$$

We shall prove that

$$|A_{t+1}| > |A_t| \text{ for each } t \in [1, \ell - 1]. \quad (2)$$

Since $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite, we have that the cyclic subsemigroup $\langle a_{t+1} \rangle$ is finite and contains an idempotent. Let m be the least positive integer such that $a_{t+1}^m \notin A_t$. If $m = 1$ then $a_{t+1} \in A_{t+1} \setminus A_t$, and if $m > 1$ then $a_{t+1}^m = a_{t+1}^{m-1} * a_{t+1} \in A_{t+1} \setminus A_t$, which implies (2).

By (1) and (2), we conclude that $|A_\ell| \geq |A_1| + \ell - 1 = \ell = |\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$, a contradiction with T being strongly idempotent-product free. \square

Now we are in a position to give the main theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup such that $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite, and let T be an \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$. Then $\prod(T) \cap E(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$ if, and only if, $\mathcal{R} = \langle \text{supp}(T) \rangle$ is a finite commutative semigroup with $\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{R} \subseteq E(\mathcal{S})$ and the universal semilattice $Y(\mathcal{R})$ is a chain such that $x_1 * x_2 = x_1$ for any elements $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ with $x_1 \preceq_{N_{\mathcal{R}}} x_2$, and moreover,*

(i) *each archimedean component of \mathcal{R} is, either a finite cyclic semigroup $\langle x \rangle$ with $x \in \text{supp}(T)$ and $I(x) \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathcal{P}(x)}$, or an ideal extension of a nontrivial finite cyclic group $\langle x_2 \rangle$ by a nontrivial finite cyclic nilsemigroup $\langle x_1 \rangle$ with $x_1, x_2 \in \text{supp}(T)$ and the partial homomorphism*

$\varphi_{\langle x_2 \rangle}^{\langle x_1 \rangle}$ being trivial, i.e., $\varphi_{\langle x_2 \rangle}^{\langle x_1 \rangle}(x_1) = e_{\langle x_2 \rangle}$ where $e_{\langle x_2 \rangle}$ denotes the identity element of the subgroup $\langle x_2 \rangle$;

(ii) $v_x(T) = I(x) + \mathcal{P}(x) - 2$ for each element $x \in \text{supp}(T)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The sufficiency is easy to verify. We need only to consider the necessity. Note first that the cyclic semigroup $\langle a \rangle$ is finite for every non-idempotent element $a \in \mathcal{S}$, since otherwise, $\langle a \rangle$ would be isomorphic to the additive semigroup \mathbb{N}^+ , which is a contradiction with $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ being finite. Let $\ell = |T| = |\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ and $T = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_\ell \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S})$ with $\prod(T) \cap E(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$. Let τ denote an arbitrary permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$, and let

$$T_k^\tau = a_{\tau(1)} a_{\tau(2)} \cdots a_{\tau(k)}$$

for each $k \in [1, m]$. Since $\prod(T_k^\tau) \cap E(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$ for all $k \in [1, \ell]$, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |T| &= |\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| \\ &\geq |\prod(T)| = |\prod(T_{\ell-1}^\tau)| + \lambda_{T_{\ell-1}^\tau}(a_{\tau(\ell)}) \\ &\geq |\prod(T_{\ell-1}^\tau)| + 1 = |\prod(T_{\ell-2}^\tau)| + \lambda_{T_{\ell-2}^\tau}(a_{\tau(\ell-1)}) + 1 \\ &\geq |\prod(T_{\ell-2}^\tau)| + 2 \\ &\vdots \\ &\geq |\prod(T_1^\tau)| + \ell - 1 = \ell = |T|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|\prod(T_k^\tau)| = k \tag{3}$$

for each $k \in [1, \ell]$, and that

$$\prod(T) = \mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S}). \tag{4}$$

Then we have the following.

Claim A. If a, b are two distinct elements of $\text{supp}(T)$, then $a * b = b * a \in \{a, b\}$.

Proof of Claim A. By (3) and the arbitrariness of τ , we have that $|\prod(a \cdot b)| = 2$, which implies $a * b, b * a \in \{a, b\}$. Suppose to the contrary without loss of generality that $a * b \neq b * a$ with $a * b = b$ and $b * a = a$. It follows that $a * a = a * (b * a) = (a * b) * a = b * a = a$, and so a is an idempotent, which is absurd. This proves Claim A. \square

By Claim A, then $\mathcal{R} = \langle \text{supp}(T) \rangle$ is **commutative**. Moreover, we have the following.

Claim B.

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{a \in \text{supp}(T)} \langle a \rangle.$$

In particular, for any $x \in \prod(T)$, there exists an element $a \in \text{supp}(T)$ such that $x = a^k$ with $k \in [1, v_a(T)]$.

Proof of Claim B. Take an arbitrary element x of \mathcal{R} . There exists some distinct elements of $\text{supp}(T)$, say x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m , such that $x = x_1^{n_1} * x_2^{n_2} * \dots * x_m^{n_m}$, where $m > 0$ and $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m > 0$. By applying Claim A, we conclude that $x = x_i^{n_i}$ for some $i \in [1, m]$. In particular, if $x \in \prod(T)$, we can take all the integers n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m above such that $n_i \in [1, v_{x_i}(T)]$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. This proves Claim B. \square

By Claim B, we see that \mathcal{R} is **finite** and we have the following.

Claim C. For any $a \in \text{supp}(T)$ and any integer $k \in [1, \mathcal{I}(a) + \mathcal{P}(a) - 1]$ such that $a^k \in \prod(T)$,

$$v_a(T) \geq k.$$

Proof of Claim C. By Claim B, we have that $a^k = b^t$ for some $b \in \text{supp}(T)$ with $t \in [1, v_b(T)]$. Suppose $b \neq a$. It follows from Claim A that $a^k * a^k = a^k * b^t = b^t = a^k$, and thus a^k is an idempotent, a contradiction. Hence, $b = a$ and $v_a(T) = v_b(T) \geq t \geq k$. This proves Claim C. \square

Let g and h be two arbitrary elements of \mathcal{R} which belong to two distinct archimedean components of \mathcal{R} . By Claim B, we have $g = a^k$ and $h = b^t$ where a, b are distinct elements of $\text{supp}(T)$ and $k, t > 0$. It follows from Claim A that

$$g * h = a^k * b^t = a^k = g$$

or

$$g * h = a^k * b^t = b^t = h$$

which implies

$$g \preceq_{N_{\mathcal{R}}} h$$

or

$$h \preceq_{N_{\mathcal{R}}} g.$$

Since $N_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a congruence on \mathcal{R} , by the arbitrariness of g and h , we conclude that the universal semilattice $Y(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}/N_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a chain and $g * h = g$ for any elements $g, h \in \mathcal{R}$ with $g \preceq_{N_{\mathcal{R}}} h$.

Let a be an arbitrary element of $\text{supp}(T)$. By (4), we have that all the elements except for the unique idempotent of $\langle a \rangle$ must belong to $\prod(T)$. Combined with Lemma 2.3 and Claim C, we conclude that

$$v_a(T) = \mathcal{I}(a) + \mathcal{P}(a) - 2, \tag{5}$$

and that the unique idempotent in the cyclic semigroup $\langle a \rangle$ is $a^{\mathcal{I}(a) + \mathcal{P}(a) - 1}$ which implies $\mathcal{I}(a) + \mathcal{P}(a) - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathcal{P}(a)}$, equivalently,

$$\mathcal{I}(a) \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathcal{P}(a)}. \tag{6}$$

By (5), we have Conclusion (ii) proved. Now it remains to show Conclusion (i).

Let A_y ($y \in Y(\mathcal{R})$) be an arbitrary archimedean component of \mathcal{R} . Since $x \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{R}} x^t$ for any element $x \in \mathcal{R}$ and any integer $t > 0$, we conclude by Claim B that A_y is a union of several cyclic subsemigroups generated by the elements of $\text{supp}(T)$, i.e.,

$$A_y = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_y} \langle x_i \rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $k_y \geq 1$ and x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k_y} are distinct elements of $\text{supp}(T)$. By Lemma 2.1, we may assume that A_y is an ideal extension of a group G_y by a nilsemigroup N_y (note that G_y or N_y may be trivial which shall be reduced to the case that A_y is a nilsemigroup or a group). Now we show that

$$|G_y \cap \text{supp}(T)| \leq 1 \quad (8)$$

and

$$|(A_y \setminus G_y) \cap \text{supp}(T)| \leq 1. \quad (9)$$

Suppose a, b are two distinct elements of $A_y \cap \text{supp}(T)$. Recalling Claim A, we see

$$a * b \in \{a, b\}.$$

If $a, b \in G_y$, then a or b is the identity element of the group G_y which is an idempotent, a contradiction. If $a, b \in A_y \setminus G_y = N_y \setminus \{0_{N_y}\}$, by Lemma 2.2, we derive a contradiction. This proves (8) and (9).

By (8) and (9), we have that

$$k_y \in \{1, 2\}$$

in (7).

Consider the case of $k_y = 1$, i.e., $A_y = \langle x \rangle$ for some $x \in \text{supp}(T)$. Combined with (6), we have Conclusion (i) proved.

Consider the case of $k_y = 2$, i.e., $A_y = \langle x_1 \rangle \cup \langle x_2 \rangle$ where x_1 and x_2 are distinct elements of $\text{supp}(T)$. By (8) and (9), we may assume without loss of generality that $x_2 \in G_y$ and $x_1 \in A_y \setminus G_y = N_y \setminus \{0_{N_y}\}$. Combined with Claim A, we see $x_1 * x_2 = x_2$. Then we conclude that the partial homomorphism $\varphi_{\langle x_2 \rangle}^{\langle x_1 \rangle}$ is trivial, and $G_y = \langle x_2 \rangle$ and $N_y = \langle x_1 \rangle$, and so Conclusion (i) holds.

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2. □

It is not hard to see that Theorem 3.2 can be also stated as the following equivalent form.

Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup such that $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite, and let T be an \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$. Then $\prod(T) \cap E(\mathcal{S}) = \emptyset$ if, and only if, $\mathcal{R} = \langle \text{supp}(T) \rangle$ is a finite commutative semigroup such that $\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{R} \subseteq E(\mathcal{S})$ and

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \langle x_i \rangle$$

where $\text{supp}(T) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$, $x_i * x_j = x_j$ and $\langle x_i \rangle^\circ \cap \langle x_j \rangle^\circ = \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, and $\langle x \rangle^\circ$ denotes the subset of all non-idempotent elements in the finite cyclic semigroup $\langle x \rangle^\circ$, and moreover, $I(x_i) \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathcal{P}(x_i)}$ and $v_{x_i}(T) = I(x_i) + \mathcal{P}(x_i) - 2$ for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

4 Concluding remarks

We remark that the value $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$ is best possible to ensure that any \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$ is not (strongly) idempotent-product free, in the sense that \mathcal{S} is a general semigroup. However, this value may be no longer best possible for a particular kind of semigroups. Hence, we introduce the following two combinatorial constants for any semigroup \mathcal{S} .

Definition 4.1. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup (not necessarily finite). We define $I(\mathcal{S})$, which is called the **Erdős-Burgess constant** of the semigroup \mathcal{S} , to be the least $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that every \mathcal{S} -valued sequence T of length ℓ is not (weakly) idempotent-product free, and we define $SI(\mathcal{S})$, which is called the **strong Erdős-Burgess constant** of the semigroup \mathcal{S} , to be the least $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that every \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length ℓ is not strongly idempotent-product free. Formally, we can also define*

$$I(\mathcal{S}) = \sup \{|T| + 1 : T \text{ takes every idempotent-product free } \mathcal{S}\text{-valued sequence}\}$$

and

$$SI(\mathcal{S}) = \sup \{|T| + 1 : T \text{ takes every strongly idempotent-product free } \mathcal{S}\text{-valued sequence}\}.$$

Then we have the following.

Proposition 4.2. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup.*

- (i). *If $I(\mathcal{S})$ or $SI(\mathcal{S})$ is finite then $\langle x \rangle$ is finite for every element $x \in \mathcal{S}$;*
- (ii). *$I(\mathcal{S}) \leq SI(\mathcal{S})$, and if \mathcal{S} is commutative then $I(\mathcal{S}) = SI(\mathcal{S})$; In particular, for the case $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite, $I(\mathcal{S}) = |\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$ holds if, and only if, the semigroup \mathcal{S} is given as in Theorem 3.2.*

Proof. Conclusion (ii) follows from the definition and Theorem 3.2 readily.

- (i). Suppose to the contrary there exists some element $x \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\langle x \rangle$ is infinite. Then the semigroup $\langle x \rangle$ is isomorphic to the additive semigroup \mathbb{N}^+ . The idempotent-product free sequence $x^{[\ell]}$ of arbitrarily great length $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ gives the contradiction. \square

The prerequisite that $\langle x \rangle$ is finite for every element $x \in \mathcal{S}$, is necessary for $I(\mathcal{S})$ ($SI(\mathcal{S})$) being finite but not sufficient. For example, take a semigroup

$$\mathcal{S} = \langle \{x_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \rangle \quad (10)$$

where $x_i * x_j = x_j * x_i = x_j$ for any $1 \leq i < j$, and where $\langle x_t \rangle$ is a finite cyclic group of order $t + 1$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. It is not hard to check that $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k$ is an idempotent-product free \mathcal{S} -valued sequence of length k for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which gives that the infinity of $I(\mathcal{S})$ ($SI(\mathcal{S})$).

Hence, the following problems would be interesting.

Problem 1. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup. Does there exist sufficient and necessary conditions to decide whether $I(\mathcal{S})$ ($SI(\mathcal{S})$) is finite or not?*

Problem 2. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup. Does there exist sufficient and necessary conditions to decide whether $I(\mathcal{S}) = SI(\mathcal{S})$ or not?*

One thing worth remarking is that $I(\mathcal{S})$ is finite does not imply that $SI(\mathcal{S})$ is finite. For example, take the semigroup $\mathcal{S} = \langle \{x_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \rangle \cup \{0_{\mathcal{S}}\}$ with zero element where $x_i * x_j = x_j$ and $x_j * x_i = 0_{\mathcal{S}}$ for any $1 \leq i < j$, and where $\langle x_t \rangle$ is a finite cyclic group of order some fixed integer $m > 2$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. It is easy to check that $I(\mathcal{S}) = m$ and $SI(\mathcal{S})$ is infinite.

Problem 3. *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty semigroup such that $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$ is finite. Find the sufficient and necessary conditions to decide whether $SI(\mathcal{S}) = |\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$. Moreover, in case that $SI(\mathcal{S}) = |\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})| + 1$, determine the structure of the strongly idempotent-product free \mathcal{S} -valued sequences of length $|\mathcal{S} \setminus E(\mathcal{S})|$.*

We remark that the above Problem 3 is in fact the inverse problem of Gillam, Hall and Williams (see Proposition 1.1).

Problem 4. *For some important kind of semigroup \mathcal{S} , determine the values of $I(\mathcal{S})$ and $SI(\mathcal{S})$.*

In the case that the semigroup \mathcal{S} is commutative, the (strong variant is the same as shown in Proposition 4.2) Erdős-Burgess constant seems to be closely related to a classical combinatorial constant, the **Davenport constant** originated from K. Rogers [13]. Davenport constant is the most important constant in Zero-sum Theory which has been extensively investigated for abelian groups since the 1960s (see [3–5, 7, 12]), and recently was also studied for commutative semigroups (see [1, 14–19], and P. 110 in [6]). For the readers' convenience, we state the definition of Davenport constant for commutative semigroups below.

Definition 4.3. ([14–16]) *Let \mathcal{S} be a commutative semigroup. Define $D(\mathcal{S})$ to be the least $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that every \mathcal{S} -valued sequence T of length at least ℓ contains a proper subsequence T' ($T' \neq T$) the product whose terms is equal to the product of all terms in T .*

It is easy to see that for the case that \mathcal{S} is an abelian group, both constants really mean the same thing, i.e., $I(\mathcal{S}) = D(\mathcal{S})$. While, for the case that the commutative semigroup \mathcal{S} is

not a group, both $I(S) < D(S)$ and $I(S) > D(S)$ could happen, which can be noticed from the following example.

Example. Take a commutative semigroup $S = \langle x_1 \rangle \cup \langle x_2 \rangle$ where $\langle x_1 \rangle$ is a finite cyclic group and $\langle x_2 \rangle$ is a finite cyclic nilsemigroup with $x_1 * x_2 = x_2 * x_1 = x_2$ and $|\langle x_1 \rangle| = n_1$ and $|\langle x_2 \rangle| = n_2$. Then we check that $I(S) = (n_1 - 1) + (n_2 - 1) + 1$ and $D(S) = \max(n_1, n_2 + 1)$. By taking proper n_1, n_2 , we have that both $I(S) < D(S)$ and $I(S) > D(S)$ could happen.

Therefore, we close this manuscript by proposing the following problem.

Problem 5. Let S be a commutative semigroup. Does there exist any relationship between the Erdős-Burgess constant $I(S)$ and the Davenport constant $D(S)$?

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by NSFC (11301381, 11271207), Science and Technology Development Fund of Tianjin Higher Institutions (20121003).

References

- [1] S.D. Adhikari, W. Gao and G. Wang, Erdős-Ginzburg-Ziv theorem for finite commutative semigroups, *Semigroup Forum*, **88** (2014) 555–568.
- [2] D.A. Burgess, A problem on semi-groups, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, **4** (1969) 9–11.
- [3] P. van Emde Boas and D. Kruyswijk, A combinatorial problem on finite abelian groups, 3, Report ZW 1969-008, Stichting Math. Centrum, Amsterdam.
- [4] W. Gao, On Davenport's constant of finite abelian groups with rank three, *Discrete Math.*, **222** (2000) 111–124.
- [5] A. Geroldinger, Additive Group Theory and Non-unique Factorizations, 1–86 in: A. Geroldinger and I. Ruzsa (Eds.), *Combinatorial Number Theory and Additive Group Theory (Advanced Courses in Mathematics-CRM Barcelona)*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2009.
- [6] A. Geroldinger and F. Halter-Koch, Non-Unique Factorizations. Algebraic, Combinatorial and Analytic Theory, *Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 278, Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2006.
- [7] A. Geroldinger and R. Schneider, On Davenport's constant, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **61** (1992) 147–152
- [8] D.W.H. Gillam, T.E. Hall and N.H. Williams, On finite semigroups and idempotents, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, **4** (1972) 143–144.

- [9] P.A. Grillet, *Semigroups: An introduction to the Structure Theory*, Dekker, New York, 1995.
- [10] P.A. Grillet, *Commutative Semigroups*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- [11] D.J. Gryniewicz, The large Davenport constant II: General upper bounds, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **217** (2013) 2221–2246.
- [12] J.E. Olson, A Combinatorial Problem on Finite Abelian Groups, I, *J. Number Theory*, **1** (1969) 8–10.
- [13] K. Rogers, A Combinatorial problem in Abelian groups, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, **59** (1963) 559–562.
- [14] G. Wang, Davenport constant for semigroups II, *J. Number Theory*, **153** (2015) 124–134.
- [15] G. Wang, Additively irreducible sequences in commutative semigroups, *arXiv:1504.06818*.
- [16] G. Wang and W. Gao, Davenport constant for semigroups, *Semigroup Forum*, **76** (2008) 234–238.
- [17] G. Wang and W. Gao, Davenport constant of the multiplicative semigroup of the ring $\mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}_{n_r}$, *arXiv:1603.06030*.
- [18] H.L. Wang, L.Z. Zhang, Q.H. Wang and Y.K. Qu, Davenport constant of the multiplicative semigroup of the quotient ring $\frac{\mathbb{F}_p[x]}{\langle f(x) \rangle}$, *International Journal of Number Theory*, in press, DOI: 10.1142/S1793042116500433.
- [19] L.Z. Zhang, H.L. Wang and Y.K. Qu, A problem of Wang on Davenport constant for the multiplicative semigroup of the quotient ring of $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$, *arXiv:1507.03182*.