

# POWER MONOIDS: A BRIDGE BETWEEN FACTORIZATION THEORY AND ARITHMETIC COMBINATORICS

YUSHUANG FAN AND SALVATORE TRINGALI

**ABSTRACT.** We extend a few fundamental aspects of the classical theory of non-unique factorization, as presented in Geroldinger and Halter-Koch's 2006 monograph on the subject, to a non-commutative and non-cancellative setting, in the same spirit of Baeth and Smertnig's work on the factorization theory of non-commutative, but cancellative monoids [J. Algebra **441** (2015), 475–551].

More in detail, we introduce notions of factorization, distance, and catenary degree, along with a generalization of weak transfer homomorphisms we call equimorphisms, and we prove a number of basic results related to them. Most notably, we establish that equimorphisms preserve (factorization) lengths and do not increase the catenary degree, and we provide sufficient conditions for a unit-cancellative monoid to be atomic (respectively, BF).

Then, we bring in power monoids and, applying the abstract machinery developed in the first part, we undertake the study of their arithmetic. More specifically, let  $H$  be a multiplicatively written monoid. The set  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  of all non-empty finite subsets of  $H$  is naturally made into a monoid, which we refer to as the power monoid of  $H$  and is non-cancellative unless  $H$  is trivial, by endowing it with the operation  $(X, Y) \mapsto \{xy : (x, y) \in X \times Y\}$ . Power monoids are, in disguise, one of the primary objects of interest in arithmetic combinatorics, and here we tackle them from the perspective of factorization theory.

In particular, we show that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is a BF-monoid when  $H$  is linearly orderable and BF. Moreover, we obtain that, if  $H$  is a Dedekind-finite, non-torsion monoid, then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is not transfer Krull (more generally, is not equimorphic to a cancellative monoid), the union of the sets of lengths of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  containing  $k$  is  $\mathbf{N}_{\geq 2}$  for every  $k \geq 2$ , the set of distances (or delta set) is  $\mathbf{N}^+$ , and the set of catenary degrees is either  $\mathbf{N}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$  or  $\mathbf{N}^+$ , the latter being the case if  $H$  is a linearly orderable BF-monoid.

Proofs lead to examine various properties of finite subsets of  $\mathbf{N}$  that can or cannot be written as a sumset in a non-trivial way, which gives rise to an intriguing interplay with additive number theory.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

From the classical point of view, factorization theory is all about various phenomena arising from non-uniqueness of factorization in atomic monoids (and rings), and their classification by algebraic, arithmetic, or combinatorial invariants. So far, the theory has been centered on rings (noetherian domains, Krull domains, maximal orders, etc.) and monoids (Krull monoids, monoids of modules, C-monoids, monoids of invertible ideals, etc.), where the structures in play, both in the commutative and in the non-commutative setting, are cancellative, see [15] for a survey and [3] for trends and perspectives. The field has become

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11B13, 11B30, 11R27, 13A05, 13F15, 16U30, 20M13, 20M25. Secondary 11B13, 11P70.

*Key words and phrases.* Atomic; catenary degree; Dedekind-finite; equimorphisms; primitive (or irreducible) sets; linearly orderable; monoids; non-unique factorization; permutable distance; power monoids; product sets; sets of lengths; set of distances; sumsets; transfer techniques; unit-cancellative; weak transfer homomorphisms.

Y.F. was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC), Project No. 11401542, and the China Scholarship Council (CSC). S.T. was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), Project No. M 1900-N39.

more and more popular since the publication of Geroldinger and Halter-Koch's 2006 monograph [18], which is entirely devoted to the commutative and cancellative case.

It is, indeed, the main objective of the present work to extend fundamental aspects of factorization theory to *arbitrary* monoids (in a more systematic way than done in the past) and to inquire into the arithmetic properties of a new class of (not necessarily cancellative or commutative) monoids we refer to as *power monoids* (notations and terminology will be explained later, see, in particular, §§ 2 and 3).

Our motivation is twofold. On the one hand, there has been recently a mounting interest for possible generalizations of factorization theory to monoid-like structures that need no longer be commutative or cancellative, or where the operation is only partially defined [2, 6, 10, 15, 16, 20, 41], which raises a demand for non-trivial examples to use as a test bed for further developments. On the other hand, power monoids are, in disguise, one of the primary objects of study in arithmetic combinatorics, a highly active area of research, which has seen tremendous developments in recent years, expanding from the classical bases of additive number theory [32, 33], where the focus is on the integers, to more abstract settings such as non-commutative groups or semigroups [23, 38, 42]: So, the idea is, on the whole, that arithmetic combinatorics may benefit, in the long run, from the interaction with factorization theory through power monoids, much in the same way as the latter has, in its own right, drawn enormous benefits from the former [17].

For one concrete example of the kind of connections we are alluding to, assume  $(G, +)$  is an additively written finite group. A set  $X \subseteq G$  is called *primitive* (or irreducible) if there do not exist  $A, B \subseteq G$  with  $X = \{a + b : (a, b) \in A \times B\}$  and  $|A|, |B| \geq 2$ . This notion is related to deep questions in arithmetic combinatorics, see [1, 24, 39] and references therein, and it turns out (see points (ii) and (iv) of Proposition 3.2) that  $X$  being primitive is the same as  $X$  being an atom in the power monoid of  $G$ .

**Plan of the paper and background.** With these ideas in mind, we organize the paper as follows. In § 2, we first extend a few fundamental aspects of the classical theory of non-unique factorization to a non-commutative and non-cancellative setting, in the same spirit of Baeth and Smertnig's work on the factorization theory of non-commutative, but cancellative monoids [2] (see Remarks 2.2–2.6 and 2.10–2.16 for a critical comparison). More specifically, we introduce notions of factorization, distance, and catenary degree, along with a generalization of weak transfer homomorphisms we refer to as equimorphisms, and we prove a number of basic properties related to them. In particular, we establish that equimorphisms preserve (factorization) lengths and do not increase the catenary degree (Proposition 2.18). Moreover, we give sufficient conditions for a unit-cancellative monoid to be atomic or BF (Theorem 2.22), thus improving on analogous results of Smertnig in the cancellative setting [41, Proposition 3.1], and Geroldinger, Kainrath, and the authors in the commutative setting [10, Lemma 3.1(1)].

Then, we bring in power monoids and, applying the abstract machinery developed in the former part, undertake the study of their arithmetic (§§ 3 and 4). More in detail, let  $H$  be a monoid. We denote the power monoid of  $H$  by  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , and show that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is a BF-monoid if  $H$  is linearly orderable and BF (Proposition 3.3). In addition, we obtain that, if  $H$  is a Dedekind-finite, non-torsion monoid, then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is not equimorphic to a cancellative monoid (in particular, is not a transfer Krull monoid), and that the union of the sets of lengths of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  containing  $k$  is  $\mathbf{N}_{\geq 2}$  for every integer  $k \geq 2$ , the set of distances (or delta set) is  $\mathbf{N}^+$ , and the set of catenary degrees is either  $\mathbf{N}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$  or  $\mathbf{N}^+$ , the latter being the case if  $H$  is a linearly orderable BF-monoid (Proposition 4.11 and Theorem 4.10, respectively).

It is perhaps worth stressing that we are talking here of several *different* results, insofar as unions of sets of lengths, sets of distances, and sets of catenary degrees are, in principle, “independent objects”, in the sense that, at least in general, none of them can be determined from the knowledge of the other two.

Proofs use a variety of ideas. Most notably, we rely on transfer principles (see Remark 2.16, Proposition 2.18, and Theorem 4.1) to reduce the kind of arithmetic properties we are considering to corresponding properties of finite subsets of  $\mathbf{N}$  than can or cannot be written as a sumset in a non-trivial way, which leads to some intriguing interplay with additive number theory.

Analogous contributions have been made by many authors in the cancellative setting. In particular, it follows by work of Kainrath [28, Theorem 1] that the delta set of a commutative transfer Krull monoid over an infinite abelian group is equal to  $\mathbf{N}^+$ , see also [15, Theorem 17]. The same is true, by [13, Theorem 9], for the monoid (under multiplication) of non-zero integer-valued polynomials with rational coefficients, which in turn is not a transfer Krull monoid by [13, Remark 12]. In a similar vein, Hassler has established that the set of distances of certain commutative Krull monoids with infinite class group (where every class is a sum of a bounded number of classes containing prime divisors) is infinite, see [26, Theorem 1], while Smertnig has proved in [41, Theorem 1.2] that, if  $H$  is the monoid (under multiplication) of the non-zero elements of certain maximal orders in a simple central algebra over a number field, then  $H$  is not necessarily a transfer Krull monoid, but the delta set of  $H$  is still equal to  $\mathbf{N}^+$  and the union of sets of lengths of  $H$  containing  $k$  is either  $\mathbf{N}_{\geq 2}$  or  $\mathbf{N}_{\geq 3}$  for every  $k \geq 3$  (note that  $H$  need not be commutative).

On a related note, Geroldinger and Schmid have recently obtained [19] that for every non-empty finite set  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbf{N}^+$  with  $\min \Delta = \gcd \Delta$  there is a finitely generated, commutative Krull monoid whose set of distances is equal to  $\Delta$ , while Geroldinger and Yuan had previously shown [21, Theorem 1.1] that the delta set of a commutative Krull monoid is either empty or a (discrete) interval whose minimum is equal to 1. The latter result has been subsequently generalized by Geroldinger and Zhong to certain commutative, seminormal, weakly Krull monoids [22, Theorem 1.1], while a non-commutative analogue was established by Smertnig in [41, Theorem 1.1]. Further contributions to this line of research have been made, among others, by Chapman, Gotti, and Pelayo [5], García-García, Moreno-Frías, and Vigneron-Tenorio [14], and Chapman, García-Sánchez, Llena, Ponomarenko, and Rosales [4].

As for the set of catenary degrees, this was also considered in a couple of recent papers by Fan and Geroldinger [9] and O’Neill, Ponomarenko, Tate, and Webb [35], with the former focused on commutative Krull monoids and the latter on finitely generated, cancellative, commutative monoids.

We close the paper with a conjecture on systems of sets of lengths that looks quite challenging (§ 5).

**Basic notations and terminology.** Unless noted otherwise, we reserve the letters  $\ell$ ,  $m$ , and  $n$  (with or without subscripts) for positive integers, and the letters  $i$ ,  $j$ , and  $k$  for non-negative integers. We use  $\mathbf{R}$  for the reals,  $\mathbf{Z}$  for the integers, and  $\mathbf{N}$  for the non-negative integers.

A *monoid* is a pair  $(H, \otimes)$  consisting of a set  $H$  (called the *ground set* of the monoid and systematically identified with it if there is no risk of ambiguity) and an associative (binary) operation  $\otimes : H \times H \rightarrow H$  for which there exists a (provably unique) element  $e \in H$  (the *identity* of the monoid) such that  $e \otimes x = x \otimes e = x$  for all  $x \in H$  (as usual, we assume the identity is preserved under monoid homomorphisms). If  $(H, \otimes)$  is a monoid and  $X, Y \subseteq H$ , we set  $X \otimes Y := \{x \otimes y : (x, y) \in X \times Y\}$ .

If  $a, b \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ , we let  $\llbracket a, b \rrbracket := \{x \in \mathbf{Z} : a \leq x \leq b\}$  stand for the (discrete) interval between  $a$  and  $b$ . If  $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $X, Y \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ , we denote by  $X^+$  the positive part of  $X$  (so,  $\mathbf{N}^+$  is the set of positive

integers), and we define the sumset of  $X$  and  $Y$  by  $X + Y := \{x + y : (x, y) \in X \times Y\}$ , the  $n$ -fold sumset of  $X$  by  $nX := \{x_1 + \cdots + x_n : x_1, \dots, x_n \in X\}$ , and the  $\lambda$ -dilation of  $X$  by  $\lambda \cdot X := \{\lambda x : x \in X\}$ .

If  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $Z$  are sets and  $\mathcal{C}$  is an equivalence (relation) on  $X$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  the power set of  $X$  and by  $\llbracket x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$  the (equivalence) class of a fixed element  $x \in X$  in the quotient  $X/\mathcal{C}$ , and we write  $X = Y \uplus Z$  to mean that  $Y \cap Z = \emptyset$  and  $X = Y \cup Z$ . Lastly, we assume  $\sup(\emptyset) := 0$  and  $\inf(\emptyset) := \infty$ , and we let  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  be the group of permutations of the interval  $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ .

Further notations and terminology, if not explained, are standard or should be clear from the context.

## 2. MONOIDS AND FACTORIZATIONS

In this section, we fix or recall some definitions that are at the center of our interest, and we prove a few fundamental results we use later in §§ 3 and 4 to draw some conclusions about the algebraic and arithmetic properties of power monoids.

To begin, let  $H$  be a (multiplicatively written) monoid with identity  $1_H$ : This will be fixed all through the section, and need not be commutative or whatever, unless a statement to the contrary is made.

We denote by  $H^\times$  the *set of units* (or *invertible elements*) of  $H$ . We say that  $H$  is *reduced* if  $H^\times = \{1_H\}$ , *cancellative* if  $xz = yz$  or  $zx = zy$ , for some  $x, y, z \in H$ , implies  $x = y$ , *Dedekind-finite* if  $xy = 1_H$  yields  $yx = 1_H$ , and *unit-cancellative* (respectively, *strongly unit-cancellative*) provided that  $xy = x$  or  $yx = x$  only if  $y \in H^\times$  (respectively,  $y = 1_H$ ).

Unit-cancellative monoids are the subject of recent work by Geroldinger, Kainrath, and the authors in the commutative and finitely generated case [10], and by Geroldinger and Schwab in the finitely presented case [20]. In turn, Dedekind-finite monoids, sometimes also referred to as directly finite, weakly 1-finite, inverse symmetric, or von Neumann-finite monoids, form a fairly large class, which includes, among many others, the multiplicative monoid of Artinian or Noetherian (in particular, finite or semisimple) rings [7, Proposition 4.6.6 and Theorem 4.6.7(iii)], algebraic algebras over a field [29, Exercise 1.13], right and left self-injective rings [8, Corollary 1.1], and the group ring of a (possibly non-abelian or infinite) group over a field of characteristic zero [8, Theorem 2.3], not to mention trivial examples such as commutative or cancellative monoids, and submonoids, direct products, and direct limits of Dedekind-finite monoids.

In point of fact, both unit-cancellative and Dedekind-finite monoids play a central role in the present paper, though most of the basic definitions and results are worked out in greater generality at no additional cost. Of course, all cancellative monoids are strongly unit-cancellative, and the latter are unit-cancellative: What is less obvious is that unit-cancellative monoids are Dedekind-finite (Lemma 2.25).

Given  $x, y \in H$ , we write  $x \mid_H y$  if  $uxv = y$  for some  $u, v \in H$ , cf. [2, Definition 5.2(1)]. In particular, we use  $x \simeq_H y$ , and we say that  $x$  is *associate* to  $y$ , if  $y \in H^\times x H^\times$ . Also, we denote by  $\text{ord}_H(x)$  the *order* of  $x$  (in  $H$ ), viz., the cardinality of the set  $\{x^n : n \in \mathbf{N}^+\}$ . We call  $H$  *non-torsion* if  $\text{ord}_H(u) = \infty$  for some  $u \in H$ , and *divisible* if, for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  and  $x \in H$ , there exists  $y \in H$  with  $x = y^n$ . Lastly, we take a submonoid  $M$  of  $H$  to be *divisor-closed* if  $x \in M$  whenever  $x \mid_H y$  and  $y \in M$ .

We let  $\mathcal{A}(H)$  stand for the *set of atoms* (or *irreducible elements*) of  $H$ , where  $a \in H$  is an atom if  $a \notin H^\times$  and there do not exist  $x, y \in H \setminus H^\times$  such that  $a = xy$  (in general, the product of two non-units can be a unit, so the first condition does not follow from the second, cf. Lemmas 2.21(i) and 2.25).

We set, for every  $x \in H$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_H(x) := \{k \in \mathbf{N}^+ : x = a_1 \cdots a_k \text{ for some } a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{A}(H)\}$  if  $x \neq 1_H$  and  $\mathbf{L}_H(x) := \{0\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  otherwise; we call an element of  $\mathbf{L}_H(x)$  a (*factorization*) *length* of  $x$ , and  $\mathbf{L}_H(x)$

the set of lengths of  $x$ . Consequently, we say that  $H$  is *atomic* (respectively, a *BF-monoid*) if  $\mathsf{L}_H(x)$  is non-empty (respectively, non-empty and finite) for all  $x \in H \setminus H^\times$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $H$  be a monoid, and let  $x, y \in H$  and  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ . The following hold:*

- (i) *If  $x, y \in H^\times$ , then  $xy \in H^\times$ . Moreover, the converse is true if  $H = H^\times$  or  $\mathcal{A}(H) \neq \emptyset$ .*
- (ii) *If  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  and  $u \in H^\times$ , then  $ua, au \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ .*
- (iii)  *$\mathsf{L}_H(x) = \emptyset$  for every  $x \in H^\times \setminus \{1_H\}$ .*

*Proof.* (i) The first part is trivial and well known; in particular, if  $u, v \in H^\times$ , then  $uv$  is invertible and  $(uv)^{-1} = v^{-1}u^{-1}$ . As for the converse, the claim is obvious if  $H = H^\times$ . Otherwise, pick  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  and suppose for a contradiction that there are  $x, y \in H$  such that  $xy \in H^\times$ , but  $x \notin H^\times$  or  $y \notin H^\times$ . We can assume (by symmetry) that  $x$  is not a unit. Then  $xyz = 1_H$  for some  $z \in H$ , which yields  $a = x(yza)$ . So  $yzza$  must be a unit, since  $x$  is not and  $a$  is an atom. In particular,  $yzav = 1_H$  for some  $v \in H$ . This shows in turn that  $yz$  is both left- and right-invertible, hence is invertible. It follows that  $x = (yz)^{-1}$  is a unit, a contradiction.

(ii) Let  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  and  $u \in H^\times$ . We want to prove that  $au$  is an atom (the other case is similar). To start with,  $au$  cannot be a unit; otherwise,  $a = vu^{-1}$  for some  $v \in H^\times$ , which would imply (say, by point (i)) that  $a \in H^\times$ , a contradiction. Moreover, if  $au = xy$  for some  $x, y \in H$ , then  $a = x(yu^{-1})$ . So, using that  $a$  is an atom, we find that either  $x \in H^\times$ , or  $yu^{-1} = v$  for some  $v \in H^\times$ , from which  $y = vu \in H^\times$ . Therefore, we can conclude that  $au \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ .

(iii) It is evident that, if  $\mathcal{A}(H)$  is empty, then so is  $\mathsf{L}_H(x)$  for every  $x \in H \setminus \{1_H\}$ , and we are done. Otherwise, we get from point (i) that the units of  $H$  cannot be factored into a non-empty product of atoms of  $H$ , and consequently  $\mathsf{L}_H(u) = \emptyset$  for every  $u \in H^\times \setminus \{1_H\}$ . ■

**Remark 2.2.** Note that  $0 \in \mathsf{L}_H(x)$  for some  $x \in H$  only if  $x = 1_H$ , in contrast to the standard convention of taking the set of lengths of *any* unit of  $H$  equal to  $\{0\}$ . In point of fact, we beg to disagree with this convention, and all the more in the light of Lemma 2.1(iii), since it looks no longer fit for the present work (cf. Remark 2.4) and future developments we have in mind.

**Remark 2.3.** By Lemma 2.1(iii),  $1_H$  cannot be expressed as a non-empty product of atoms of  $H$ . This has as a consequence that, for all  $x, y \in H$ ,

$$\mathsf{L}_H(x) + \mathsf{L}_H(y) \subseteq \mathsf{L}_H(xy) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup \mathsf{L}_H(x) + \sup \mathsf{L}_H(y) \leq \sup \mathsf{L}_H(xy),$$

which is one of the main reasons for assuming  $\mathsf{L}_H(1_H) := \{0\}$ , besides the fact that an empty product in  $H$  is, by convention, equal to  $1_H$ .

We let  $\mathcal{L}(H) := \{\mathsf{L}_H(x) : x \in H\} \setminus \{\emptyset\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N})$ . We refer to  $\mathcal{L}(H)$  as the *system of sets of lengths* of  $H$ , and to an integer  $k \in \bigcup \mathcal{L}(H)$  as a length of  $H$ . Then, for each  $k \in \mathbf{N}$  we denote by  $\mathcal{U}_k(H)$  the union of all  $L \in \mathcal{L}(H)$  with  $k \in L$ . Clearly  $\mathcal{U}_0(H) = \{0\}$ , and if  $\mathcal{A}(H)$  is non-empty, then  $\mathcal{U}_1(H) = \{1\}$  and  $k \in \mathcal{U}_k(H)$  for all  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ ; otherwise,  $\mathcal{U}_1(H) = \mathcal{U}_2(H) = \dots = \emptyset$ .

We take  $\Delta(H) := \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}(H)} \Delta(L)$ , where for  $L \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$  we let  $\Delta(L)$  be the set of all  $d \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $L \cap \llbracket l, l+d \rrbracket = \{l, l+d\}$  for some  $l \in L$ . We call  $\Delta(H)$  the *set of distances* (or *delta set*) of  $H$ . Sets of lengths, along with a number of invariants derived from them (e.g., sets of distances, elasticities, and unions of sets of lengths), are by and large the best tools so far available to describe the arithmetic of BF-monoids, see [15] for further discussion on this point.

On the other hand, we denote by  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})$ , for a fixed set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the free monoid with basis  $\mathcal{U}$  (as usual, we assume  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})$  contains  $\mathcal{U}$  as a set). We use the symbol  $*$  for the operation of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})$  and always write  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})$  multiplicatively. We refer to the elements of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})$  as  $\mathcal{U}$ -words and to the identity,  $1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})}$ , of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})$  as the empty  $\mathcal{U}$ -word. Given  $\mathfrak{z} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})$ , we set  $\|\mathfrak{z}\|_{\mathcal{U}} := 0$  if  $\mathfrak{z} = 1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})}$ . Otherwise, there are uniquely determined  $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\mathfrak{z} = z_1 * \dots * z_n$ ; accordingly, we take  $\|\mathfrak{z}\|_{\mathcal{U}} := n$ , and we let  $\mathfrak{z}z_n^{-1} := z_1^{-1}\mathfrak{z} := 1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{U})}$  if  $n = 1$ , and  $\mathfrak{z}z_n^{-1} := z_1 * \dots * z_{n-1}$  and  $z_1^{-1}\mathfrak{z} := z_2 * \dots * z_n$  if  $n \geq 2$ . In any case,  $\|\mathfrak{z}\|_{\mathcal{U}}$  is termed the *length* (or *norm*) of  $\mathfrak{z}$ .

With this said, let  $\pi_H$  be the unique monoid homomorphism  $\mathcal{F}^*(H) \rightarrow H$  such that  $\pi_H(x) = x$  for all  $x \in H$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_H$  the smallest monoid congruence on  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  determined by the following condition:

- If  $\mathfrak{a} = a_1 * \dots * a_m$  and  $\mathfrak{b} = b_1 * \dots * b_n$  are, respectively, non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words of length  $m$  and  $n$ , then  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$  if and only if  $\pi_H(\mathfrak{a}) = \pi_H(\mathfrak{b})$ ,  $m = n$ , and  $a_1 \simeq_H b_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_n \simeq_H b_{\sigma(n)}$  for some permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ .

We call  $\pi_H$  the *factorization homomorphism* of  $H$ , and the quotient  $Z(H) := \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))/\mathcal{C}_H$  the *factorization monoid* of  $H$ . We continue denoting the operation of  $Z(H)$  by the same symbol as the operation of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ , and we observe that, if  $H$  is a reduced commutative monoid and  $\mathfrak{a} = a_1 * \dots * a_n$  is a non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -word of length  $n$ , then

$$\llbracket \mathfrak{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H} = \{a_{\sigma(1)} * \dots * a_{\sigma(n)} : \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}.$$

Accordingly, we abuse notation and identify  $\llbracket \mathfrak{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H}$  with  $\mathfrak{a}$  whenever  $H$  is commutative and  $H^\times = \{1_H\}$ .

Also, we notice that  $\pi_H(\mathcal{A}) = \{\pi_H(\mathfrak{a})\}$  for all  $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ , and we define, for every  $x \in H$ ,

$$Z_H(x) := \{\llbracket \mathfrak{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H} : \mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)) \text{ and } \pi_H(\mathfrak{a}) = x\} \subseteq Z(H)$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_H(x) := \pi_H^{-1}(x) \cap \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)) = \bigcup Z_H(x) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)),$$

from which it is easily seen that

$$\mathsf{L}_H(x) = \{\|\mathfrak{a}\|_H : \mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{Z}_H(x)\}. \quad (1)$$

We refer to the elements of  $Z_H(x)$  as the *factorization classes* of  $x$  and to the  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words in  $\mathcal{Z}_H(x)$  as the *factorizations* of  $x$ . Then, we take a break for some highlights.

**Remark 2.4.** The above definition of the factorization monoid  $Z(H)$  is, in general, inconsistent with analogous definitions from the literature on factorization theory, and it is probably useful to explain why this inconsistency is not necessarily bad.

More precisely, our terms for comparison will be the classical definition of the factorization monoid (for the case when  $H$  is commutative and cancellative) and Smertnig's definition of the monoid of rigid factorizations (for cancellative monoids), for which we use, respectively, the notation  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  and  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$ , and we refer, respectively, to [18, Definition 1.2.6] and [41, § 3] (see also Remarks 2.5 and 2.6).

To start with, it is worth stressing that a "full comparison" between  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  and  $Z(H)$ , whatever it may mean, is just impossible. Not only because  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  is not defined for non-commutative monoids (cancellativity does not play an active role in this regard, see [10, § 3]), but also, and more importantly, because there seems to be no meaningful way to carry over the definition of  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  to a non-commutative setting:  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  is the free *abelian* monoid with basis  $\mathcal{A}(H_{\text{red}})$ , where  $H_{\text{red}}$  is the quotient  $H/H^\times$ .

Therefore, a naive attempt to generalize the classical definition to the case when  $H$  may not be commutative would be to take the quotient of  $H$  by the monoid congruence  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{red}}$  generated by the relation  $\simeq_H$  and to let the factorization monoid of  $H$  equal to  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)/\mathcal{C}_{\text{red}})$ . But this approach has a major drawback: If  $H$  is commutative, then  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{red}}$  and  $\simeq_H$  coincide. Otherwise,  $\simeq_H$  need not be a congruence and  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{red}}$  can be “much larger” than  $\simeq_H$ , with the result that  $H/\mathcal{C}_{\text{red}}$  is “too small” for carrying any interesting information about the arithmetic of  $H$  (cf. [41, Remarks 3.3.1]).

In a similar vein, a full comparison between  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  and  $Z(H)$  is also unfeasible, since the definition of  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  is phrased in the language of categories, while the present paper is entirely focused on monoids (though a large part of this section can be abstracted to the level of categories without much trouble).

So, we have no choice but to restrict the comparison between  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  and  $Z(H)$  to the commutative setting, and the comparison between  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  and  $Z(H)$  to the case when the former is specialized to monoids (no further comment will be made on this point in the sequel).

ROUND 1:  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  vs  $Z(H)$ . Assume that  $H$  is commutative, and denote by  $\mathcal{C}'_H$  the smallest monoid congruence on  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  for which the following holds:

- If  $\mathbf{a} = a_1 * \cdots * a_m$  and  $\mathbf{b} = b_1 * \cdots * b_n$  are, respectively, non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words of length  $m$  and  $n$ , then  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{C}'_H$  if and only if  $m = n$  and  $a_1 \simeq_H b_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_n \simeq_H b_{\sigma(n)}$  for some  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ .

It is readily checked that  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  is isomorphic (as a monoid) to  $Z'_{\text{GeH}}(H) := \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))/\mathcal{C}'_H$ . Thus, rather than comparing  $Z(H)$  with  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$ , we may compare the former with  $Z'_{\text{GeH}}(H)$ , which has practical advantages.

In particular, there is a unique homomorphism  $\pi_{\text{GeH}} : Z'_{\text{GeH}}(H) \rightarrow H_{\text{red}}$  such that  $\pi_{\text{GeH}}(\llbracket a \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}'_H}) = aH^\times$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ , and for every  $x \in H$  we can identify the elements of the set

$$Z'_{\text{GeH}}(x) := \pi_{\text{GeH}}^{-1}(xH^\times) \subseteq Z'_{\text{GeH}}(H)$$

with the factorizations of  $x$  in the sense of [18, Definition 1.2.6]. So, taking

$$\mathcal{Z}'_{\text{GeH}}(x) := \bigcup Z'_{\text{GeH}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$$

and calling the  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words in  $\mathcal{Z}'_{\text{GeH}}(x)$  the *classical factorizations* of  $x$ , we end up with the conclusion that, in the multiplicative monoid of the ring of integers, the  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{P})$ -words  $2 * (-3)$  and  $2 * 3$ , where  $\mathbf{P}$  is the set of rational primes, are both classical factorizations of 6. Of course, there is nothing wrong or paradoxical with this inference (it is just the consequence of some definitions), though we do not find it very natural and nothing similar happens with our definitions.

Indeed,  $\mathcal{Z}_H(1_H) = \mathcal{Z}'_{\text{GeH}}(x) = \{1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))}\}$  for  $x \in H^\times$ , and  $\mathcal{Z}_H(x) = \emptyset$  for  $x \in H^\times \setminus \{1_H\}$ . Also, if  $\mathbf{a} = a_1 * \cdots * a_n$  is a non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -word of length  $n$  and  $x = \pi_H(\mathbf{a})$ , then

$$\llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H} = \{(a_{\sigma(1)}u_1) * \cdots * (a_{\sigma(n)}u_n) : \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n, u_1, \dots, u_n \in H^\times, \text{ and } u_1 \cdots u_n x = x\} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}'_H} = \{(a_{\sigma(1)}u_1) * \cdots * (a_{\sigma(n)}u_n) : \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \text{ and } u_1, \dots, u_n \in H^\times\}.$$

It follows that  $\llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H} \subseteq \llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}'_H}$ , and the inclusion is strict if, for instance,  $H$  is strongly unit-cancellative, but not reduced. The point is simply that  $\mathcal{C}_H \subseteq \mathcal{C}'_H$ , and in general we do not have equality.

In other terms,  $Z'_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  is “coarser” than  $Z(H)$ , in the sense that the former embeds (as a monoid) into the latter, but the embedding is an isomorphism if and only if  $H$  is reduced.

ROUND 2:  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  vs  $Z(H)$ . In the case of monoids, Smertnig's definition of  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  comes down to the following: Denote by  $\circ$  the binary operation on the set  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Sm}}(H) := H^\times \times \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  given by

$$((u, \mathbf{a}), (v, \mathbf{b})) \mapsto \begin{cases} (u, \mathbf{a}a_n^{-1} * (a_n v) * \mathbf{b}) & \text{if } n := \|\mathbf{a}\|_H \geq 1 \text{ and } \mathbf{a} = a_1 * \cdots * a_n, \\ (uv, \mathbf{b}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

which is well defined by Lemma 2.1(ii) (note that Smertnig's original definition is restricted to the cancellative setting, where it is trivial that  $\circ$  is well defined). It is seen that the pair  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{Sm}}(H), \circ)$  is a monoid. Accordingly, let  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Sm}}$  be the smallest monoid congruence on  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{Sm}}(H), \circ)$  determined by the following:

- If  $u, v \in H^\times$ , and  $\mathbf{a} = a_1 * \cdots * a_m$  and  $\mathbf{b} = b_1 * \cdots * b_n$  are, respectively, non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words of length  $m$  and  $n$ , then  $((u, \mathbf{a}), (v, \mathbf{b})) \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{Sm}}$  if and only if  $u\pi_H(\mathbf{a}) = v\pi_H(\mathbf{b})$ ,  $m = n$ , and there exist  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \in H^\times$  with  $\varepsilon_n = 1_H$ ,  $ua_1 = vb_1\varepsilon_1^{-1}$ , and  $a_i = \varepsilon_{i-1}b_i\varepsilon_i^{-1}$  for  $i \in \llbracket 2, n \rrbracket$ .

In fact,  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  is the quotient of  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{Sm}}(H), \circ)$  by the congruence  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Sm}}$ . In particular, if  $H$  is reduced, then  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H) \cong \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ . So, contrary to what happens with  $Z(H)$ ,  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  is not even isomorphic to  $Z_{\text{GeH}}(H)$  when  $H$  is reduced and commutative, cf. [2, p. 492]. Nevertheless, there are strong similarities between the constructions of  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  and  $Z(H)$ , which will be further clarified by Remark 2.5.

First, both constructions involve, through the definition of the congruences  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Sm}}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_H$ , a condition (in terms of the homomorphism  $\pi_H$ ) that rules out the ‘‘issues’’ pointed out in the above in reference to the classical factorizations in the commutative setting.

Secondly, both agree on the role of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  and the idea that factorizations, whatever they may be, are related to the quotient of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ , or something as close to  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  as  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Sm}}(H)$ , by a suitable congruence. But while  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  brings in ‘‘the  $H^\times$  factor (...) to represent trivial factorizations of units’’ (to quote Smertnig's own words from [41, Remark 3.3.1]), we brush off the trivial factorizations of a unit  $u \neq 1_H$  from our approach, which leads to a simplification of the theory without causing any significant loss (cf. Remarks 2.2 and 2.3).

**Remark 2.5.** The factorization monoid  $Z(H)$  is *essentially* the same as Baeth and Smertnig's monoid,  $Z_p(H)$ , of permutable factorizations: This may not be immediately apparent, but it follows from Lemma 2.1(ii) and a careful reading of [2, Construction 3.3(2), Definitions 3.4(2) and 3.8(2), and Remark 3.9(2)]. In the notations and terminology of Remark 2.4,  $Z_p(H)$  is, in fact, the quotient of  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  by the smallest monoid congruence  $\sim_p$  on  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  for which the following holds:

- If  $u, v \in H^\times$ , and  $\mathbf{a} = a_1 * \cdots * a_m$  and  $\mathbf{b} = b_1 * \cdots * b_n$  are non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words of length  $m$  and  $n$ , respectively, then  $\llbracket (u, \mathbf{a}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{Sm}}} \sim_p \llbracket (v, \mathbf{b}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{Sm}}}$  if and only if  $u\pi_H(\mathbf{a}) = v\pi_H(\mathbf{b})$ ,  $m = n$ , and there exists  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $a_i \simeq_H b_{\sigma(i)}$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ .

Consequently,  $Z(H)$  is monoid isomorphic to  $Z_p(H) \setminus \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of all congruence classes in  $Z_p(H)$  corresponding to a rigid factorization of the form  $\llbracket (u, 1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{Sm}}}$  with  $u \in H^\times \setminus \{1_H\}$ . In particular, we have a monoid isomorphism between  $Z(H)$  and  $Z_p(H)$  if and only if  $H$  is reduced.

With the above in mind, we proceed to introduce the distance function,  $\mathbf{d}_H$ , we are going to use in our definition of the catenary degree (see Remarks 2.6 and 2.10 for a comparison with other distances).

To begin, set  $\mathcal{A}^*(H) := \{\llbracket a \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H} : a \in \mathcal{A}(H)\}$ . Given  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)$  and  $\mathfrak{z} \in \mathcal{F}^*(H)$ , we let

$$\nu_H(\mathfrak{z}; \mathfrak{A}) := \begin{cases} |\{i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket : z_i \in \mathfrak{A}\}| & \text{if } n := \|\mathfrak{z}\|_H \geq 1 \text{ and } \mathfrak{z} = z_1 * \cdots * z_n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$



cf. [18, Definition 1.1.9.1]. It is not difficult to see that

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_H = \sum_{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)} \mathbf{v}_H(\mathbf{a}; \mathfrak{A}), \quad \text{for every } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)). \quad (3)$$

Then, for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  we take

$$\delta_H(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \pi_H(\mathbf{a}) = \pi_H(\mathbf{b}) \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathbf{a} \wedge_H \mathbf{b} := \max(\|\mathbf{a}\|_H, \|\mathbf{b}\|_H) - \sum_{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)} \min(\mathbf{v}_H(\mathbf{a}; \mathfrak{A}), \mathbf{v}_H(\mathbf{b}; \mathfrak{A})).$$

Lastly, we let the *matching distance* of  $H$  be the function

$$d_H : \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)) \times \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)) \rightarrow \mathbf{R} : (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \mapsto \max(\delta_H(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \mathbf{a} \wedge_H \mathbf{b}).$$

Roughly speaking,  $d_H$  measures how different two factorizations are from each other. Of course, there is no unique way to do that, but the matching distance looks quite natural, especially when related to our definition of the factorization monoid. An alternative, and much more abstract, approach is outlined in the next remark.

**Remark 2.6.** Let  $d$  be a function  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)) \times \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ . We say that  $d$  is a (*global*) *distance* (on  $H$ ) if, for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ , the following four conditions are satisfied:

- (D1)  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$  whenever  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ .
- (D2)  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = d(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a})$ .
- (D3)  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}) + d(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b})$ .
- (D4)  $|\|\mathbf{a}\|_H - \|\mathbf{b}\|_H| \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq \max(\|\mathbf{a}\|_H, \|\mathbf{b}\|_H)$ .

It is immediate that, if  $d$  is a distance, then it is non-negative, since for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  we have

$$0 \stackrel{(D1)}{=} d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}) \stackrel{(D3)}{\leq} d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + d(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a}) \stackrel{(D2)}{=} 2d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}).$$

We refer to  $d$  as a  $\mathcal{C}_H$ -*metric* if it is a distance and, in addition,  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$  for some  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  implies  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ . Moreover, we call  $d$  *subinvariant* (on  $H$ ) if we have:

- (D5)  $d(\mathbf{c} * \mathbf{a} * \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} * \mathbf{b} * \mathbf{d}) \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ .

In a similar vein, we say that  $d$  is *invariant* (on  $H$ ) if (D5) holds with equality, namely:

- (D6)  $d(\mathbf{c} * \mathbf{a} * \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} * \mathbf{b} * \mathbf{d}) = d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ .

Lastly, we take  $d$  to be *locally invariant* (on  $H$ ) if it is subinvariant and

- (D7)  $d(\mathbf{c} * \mathbf{a} * \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{c} * \mathbf{b} * \mathbf{d}) = d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$  for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  with  $\pi_H(\mathbf{a}) = \pi_H(\mathbf{b})$ .

These definitions are all modeled after [2, Definition 3.2], where  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  is replaced by the category of rigid factorizations  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$ , distances are all  $\mathbf{N}$ -valued and invariant (in particular, subinvariant distances are never mentioned), and the right-most inequality in (D4) has a slightly different form, for the fact that  $Z_{\text{Sm}}(H)$  is designed to include the trivial factorizations of the units of  $H$  (see Remark 2.4 for notations and further details).

The interest for subinvariant distances stems in part from the next lemma, which the reader may want to compare with points (1) and (2) of [2, Lemma 3.7].

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $H$  be a monoid and  $d$  a subinvariant distance on  $H$ . Then:*

- (i)  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = d(\mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d})$  for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  with  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}), (\mathbf{b}, \mathfrak{d}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ .
- (ii)  $d(\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} * \mathfrak{d}) \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + d(\mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d})$  for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ .
- (iii) The binary relation  $\sim_d$  on  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ , defined by taking  $\mathbf{a} \sim_d \mathbf{b}$ , for some  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ , if and only if  $\pi_H(\mathbf{a}) = \pi_H(\mathbf{b})$  and  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$ , is a monoid congruence.
- (iv)  $\llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H} \subseteq \llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket_{\sim_d}$  for every  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ .

*Proof.* (i) Let  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  with  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ . By (D2), it is sufficient to show that  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq d(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b})$ , which is straightforward, because  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}) + d(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b})$  by (D3) and  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}) = 0$  by (D1).

(ii) Recall from the above that  $d$  is non-negative. Then, consider that, for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ ,

$$d(\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} * \mathfrak{d}) \stackrel{(D3)}{\leq} d(\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} * \mathbf{c}) + d(\mathbf{b} * \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} * \mathfrak{d}) \stackrel{(D5)}{\leq} d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + d(\mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d}),$$

(iii) Let  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ . If  $\mathbf{a} \sim_d \mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \sim_d \mathbf{c}$ , then  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}) \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + d(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) = 0$  by (D3), whence it is easy to check that  $\sim_d$  is an equivalence relation. To show that  $\sim_d$  is actually a congruence, assume  $\mathbf{a} \sim_d \mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c} \sim_d \mathfrak{d}$ , i.e.,  $\pi_H(\mathbf{a}) = \pi_H(\mathbf{b})$ ,  $\pi_H(\mathbf{c}) = \pi_H(\mathfrak{d})$ , and  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = d(\mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d}) = 0$ . We need to prove that  $\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{c} \sim_d \mathbf{b} * \mathfrak{d}$ , which is immediate, since, on the one hand,  $\pi_H$  being a homomorphism  $\mathcal{F}^*(H) \rightarrow H$  yields

$$\pi_H(\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{c}) = \pi_H(\mathbf{a}) * \pi_H(\mathbf{c}) = \pi_H(\mathbf{b}) * \pi_H(\mathfrak{d}) = \pi_H(\mathbf{b} * \mathfrak{d}),$$

and on the other hand, we obtain from point (ii) that  $d(\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} * \mathfrak{d}) \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + d(\mathbf{c}, \mathfrak{d}) = 0$ .

(iv) This is a trivial consequence of points (i) and (iii).  $\blacksquare$

Notably, we get from Lemma 2.7(iii) that every subinvariant distance  $d$  on  $H$  gives rise to a corresponding notion of factorization, by looking at the quotient  $Z_d(H)$  of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  by the congruence  $\sim_d$ , i.e., by identifying two words  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  if and only if  $d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 0$ , cf. [2, Definition 3.8(1)]. However, we will not pursue this direction here, as it would take us too far from our main goals. Instead, we observe that, by Lemma 2.7(iv),  $Z_d(H) = Z(H)$  whenever  $d$  is a  $\mathcal{C}_H$ -metric, and we proceed to prove that  $d_H$  is a locally invariant  $\mathcal{C}_H$ -metric, cf. [18, Proposition 1.2.5].

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $H$  be a monoid, pick  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ , and set  $\mathcal{A}^*(H) := \{\llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_H} : \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}(H)\}$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{a} \wedge_H \mathbf{b} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)} |\nu_H(\mathbf{a}; \mathfrak{A}) - \nu_H(\mathbf{b}; \mathfrak{A})| + \frac{1}{2} \left| \|\mathbf{a}\|_H - \|\mathbf{b}\|_H \right|. \quad (4)$$

*In particular, if  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}), (\mathbf{b}, \mathfrak{d}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ , then  $\mathbf{a} \wedge_H \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c} \wedge_H \mathfrak{d}$ .*

*Proof.* By (3), the claim is trivial if  $\mathbf{a}$  or  $\mathbf{b}$  is the empty word. Otherwise, write  $\mathbf{a} = a_1 * \dots * a_m$  and  $\mathbf{b} = b_1 * \dots * b_n$ , where  $a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ . Because

$$\mathbf{a} \wedge_H \mathbf{b} = (a_{\sigma(1)} * \dots * a_{\sigma(m)}) \wedge_H (b_{\tau(1)} * \dots * b_{\tau(n)}),$$

for all  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m$  and  $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , there is no loss of generality in assuming that there exists  $k \in \llbracket 0, \min(m, n) \rrbracket$  with  $a_i \simeq_H b_i$  for  $i \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$ , but  $a_i \not\simeq_H b_j$  for every  $i \in \llbracket k+1, m \rrbracket$  and  $j \in \llbracket k+1, n \rrbracket$ .

Accordingly, set  $\mathbf{a}_0 := \mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_0 := \mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{c}_0 := 1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))}$ , and for each  $i \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$  define  $\mathbf{a}_i := a_i^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{i-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_i := b_i^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{i-1}$ , and  $\mathbf{c}_i := \mathbf{c}_{i-1} * a_i$ . It is then straightforward that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a} \wedge_H \mathbf{b} &= \max(\|\mathbf{a}_k\|_H, \|\mathbf{b}_k\|_H) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \|\mathbf{a}_k\|_H + \|\mathbf{b}_k\|_H + \left| \|\mathbf{a}_k\|_H - \|\mathbf{b}_k\|_H \right| \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)} (\nu_H(\mathbf{a}_k; \mathfrak{A}) + \nu_H(\mathbf{b}_k; \mathfrak{A})) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)} |\nu_H(\mathbf{a}_k; \mathfrak{A}) - \nu_H(\mathbf{b}_k; \mathfrak{A})|, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where, in particular, we used (3) for the second equality on the first row. On the other hand, it is easily checked that, for each  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)$ , we have  $v_H(\mathfrak{a}_k; \mathfrak{A}) - v_H(\mathfrak{b}_k; \mathfrak{A}) = v_H(\mathfrak{a}; \mathfrak{A}) - v_H(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{A})$  and

$$\begin{aligned} v_H(\mathfrak{a}_k; \mathfrak{A}) + v_H(\mathfrak{b}_k; \mathfrak{A}) &= v_H(\mathfrak{a}; \mathfrak{A}) + v_H(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{A}) - 2 \min(v_H(\mathfrak{a}; \mathfrak{A}), v_H(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{A})) \\ &= \max(v_H(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{A}) - v_H(\mathfrak{a}; \mathfrak{A}), v_H(\mathfrak{a}; \mathfrak{A}) - v_H(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{A})) = |v_H(\mathfrak{a}; \mathfrak{A}) - v_H(\mathfrak{b}; \mathfrak{A})|, \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5), leads to (4). The ‘‘In particular’’ part of the statement is now immediate, since  $v_H(\mathfrak{x}; \mathfrak{A}) = v_H(\mathfrak{y}; \mathfrak{A})$  for all  $(\mathfrak{x}, \mathfrak{y}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$  and  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{A}^*(H)$ . ■

**Proposition 2.9.**  $d_H$  is a locally invariant  $\mathcal{C}_H$ -metric and has the additional property that:

- (i)  $d_H(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  is a non-negative integer for every  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ ;
- (ii)  $d_H(\mathfrak{a}^k, \mathfrak{b}^k) = kd_H(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  for all  $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$  and  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ .

Moreover,  $d_H(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \frac{1}{2}$  for some non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words  $\mathfrak{a} = a_1 * \cdots * a_m$  and  $\mathfrak{b} = b_1 * \cdots * b_n$  of length  $m$  and  $n$ , respectively, if and only if  $\pi_H(\mathfrak{a}) \neq \pi_H(\mathfrak{b})$ ,  $m = n$ , and there exists a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $a_i \simeq_H b_{\sigma(i)}$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$ .

*Proof.* (D1) and (D2) are trivial, while the rest is a consequence of (3), Lemma 2.8, the triangle inequality for the absolute value, and the fact that  $\delta_H(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \leq \delta_H(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{c}) + \delta_H(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{b})$  for all  $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \in \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))$ , with equality if and only if  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{c}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$  or  $(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{b}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$  (we encourage the reader to fill in the details). ■

**Remark 2.10.** Up to the technical details highlighted in Remarks 2.5 and 2.6,  $d_H$  is no different from the *permutable distance* introduced by Baeth and Smertnig in the cancellative setting, cf. [2, Definition 3.4(2) and Construction 3.3(2)]. So, in particular,  $d_H$  is essentially the same, on the level of cancellative, commutative monoids, as the distance of [18, Definition 1.2.4 and p. 14], cf. [2, Remark 3.5(1)].

With the above in mind, we let the *catenary degree* of an element  $x \in H$ , which we denote by  $c_H(x)$ , be the infimum of the set of integers  $d \in \mathbf{N}$  for which the following condition is verified:

- For all  $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{Z}_H(x)$  there are factorizations  $\mathfrak{c}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_H(x)$  with  $\mathfrak{c}_0 = \mathfrak{a}$  and  $\mathfrak{c}_n = \mathfrak{b}$  such that  $d_H(\mathfrak{c}_{i-1}, \mathfrak{c}_i) \leq d$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ .

It is seen that  $c_H(x) = 0$ , for a given  $x \in H$ , if and only if  $|Z_H(x)| \leq 1$ . Thus, we find it natural to define

$$\text{Ca}(H) := \{c_H(x) : x \in H\} \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}^+ \cup \{\infty\}.$$

We call  $\text{Ca}(H)$  the *set of catenary degrees* (or *catenary set*) of  $H$ . It is clear that  $\text{Ca}(H) \subseteq \mathbf{N}^+$  if  $H$  is a BF-monoid, but this is not true in general.

**Remark 2.11.** Let  $x \in H \setminus H^\times$ . It follows by Remark 2.10 that, if  $H$  is atomic and cancellative,  $c_H(x)$  coincides with the catenary degree of  $x$  associated, according to [2, Definition 4.1(3)], to the permutable distance of Baeth and Smertnig. In particular, if  $H$  is atomic, cancellative, and commutative,  $c_H(x)$  has the same value as the catenary degree of  $x$  in the classical theory, cf. [18, Definition 1.6.1.2].

**Remark 2.12.** In the same spirit of [2, § 4], every subinvariant distance  $d$  on  $H$  gives rise to a corresponding notion of catenary degree, but this is something beyond the scope of the present work.

We will systematically drop the subscript ‘ $H$ ’ from the above notations whenever the monoid  $H$  is implied from the context and there is no risk of ambiguity.

The kind of arithmetic properties in which we are interested in this paper, are often proved by reduction to suitable families of atomic monoids that are, in a way, less problematic than others. This is achieved by means of transfer techniques (cf. Remark 2.16), as per Halter-Koch's notion of transfer homomorphism in the commutative and cancellative setting, see [25, Lemma 5.4], or Baeth and Smertnig's notion of weak transfer homomorphism, see [2, Definition 2.1] and [15, § 4].

More specifically, let  $H$  and  $K$  be multiplicatively written monoids, and let  $\varphi$  a homomorphism  $H \rightarrow K$ . We denote by  $\varphi^*$  the unique (monoid) homomorphism  $\mathcal{F}^*(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^*(K)$  such that  $\varphi^*(x) = \varphi(x)$  for all  $x \in H$  (cf. [2, Lemma 3.1] for an analogous definition), and we refer to  $\varphi$  as a (*monoid*) *equimorphism* (from  $H$  to  $K$ ) if the following conditions hold:

- (E1)  $\varphi(x) = 1_K$  for some  $x \in H$  only if  $x \in H^\times$ , that is,  $\varphi^{-1}(1_K) \subseteq H^\times$ .
- (E2)  $\varphi$  is *atom-preserving*, i.e.,  $\varphi(a) \in \mathcal{A}(K)$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ .
- (E3) If  $x \in H \setminus \{1_H\}$  and  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathcal{L}_K(\varphi(x)) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\varphi^*(\mathfrak{a}) \in \llbracket \mathfrak{b} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_K}$  for some  $\mathfrak{a} \in \mathcal{L}_H(x)$ .

We call  $\varphi$  a *weak transfer homomorphism* if (a) it satisfies (E2) and (E3) and (b)  $K = K^\times \varphi(H) K^\times$  and  $\varphi^{-1}(K^\times) = H^\times$ . Of course, every weak transfer homomorphism is an equimorphism, but the converse is not true in general, not even in the cancellative, commutative setting.

Then, we say that  $H$  is *equimorphic* to  $K$  if there exists an equimorphism from  $H$  to  $K$ , and that  $H$  is a *transfer Krull monoid* if there is a weak transfer homomorphism from  $H$  to a monoid of zero-sum sequences over an abelian group  $G$  with support in a subset  $G_0 \subseteq G$ , see [18, Definition 2.5.5] for further details and terminology.

**Remark 2.13.** The  $K$ -word  $\varphi^*(\mathfrak{a})$  in (E3) is actually an  $\mathcal{A}(K)$ -word by condition (E2). Moreover, the  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -word  $\mathfrak{a}$  in (E3) is non-empty (since  $x \neq 1_H$ ), and so is the  $\mathcal{A}(K)$ -word  $\mathfrak{b}$ ; otherwise,  $\varphi(x) = 1_K$ , and hence  $x = 1_H$  (by (E1) and the fact that  $\mathcal{L}_H(x) \neq \emptyset$ , but  $\mathcal{L}_H(u) = \emptyset$  for every  $u \in H^\times \setminus \{1_H\}$ ), which is a contradiction. Accordingly, write  $\mathfrak{a} = a_1 * \dots * a_m$  and  $\mathfrak{b} = b_1 * \dots * b_n$ , where  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathcal{A}(K)$ . Then  $\varphi^*(\mathfrak{a}) \in \llbracket \mathfrak{b} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_K}$  means, by the definition itself of  $\mathcal{C}_K$ , that  $\pi_K(\mathfrak{b}) = \pi_K(\varphi^*(\mathfrak{a}))$ ,  $m = n$ , and there exists a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $b_{\sigma(i)} \simeq_K \varphi(a_i)$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ .

**Remark 2.14.** Condition (E2) cannot be proved from (E1) and (E3). Indeed, let  $H$  (respectively,  $K$ ) be the monoid of non-negative integers (respectively, non-negative real numbers) under addition, and let  $\varphi$  be the canonical embedding. Clearly,  $\varphi$  satisfies (E1) and (E3), because  $H^\times = K^\times = \{0\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}(K) = \emptyset$ . But  $1 \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ , so  $\varphi$  cannot satisfy (E2).

**Remark 2.15.** In Baeth and Smertnig's original definition of a weak transfer homomorphism  $\varphi : H \rightarrow K$ , it is assumed that  $H$  is cancellative and  $K$  is atomic, which implies that  $\varphi$  is atom-preserving. By Remark 2.14, this need not hold for an arbitrary equimorphism, which is the reason for having included condition (E2) in the above definitions. In particular, it follows from here and Remark 2.13 that every weak transfer homomorphism in the sense of Baeth and Smertnig is also a weak transfer homomorphism in our sense, and hence an equimorphism.

**Remark 2.16.** The *use* of transfer techniques in the present work is a bit unconventional, which could result into confusion. So it is perhaps worth trying to put things in perspective.

Roughly, the idea behind the introduction of transfer techniques in factorization theory can be outlined as follows: We have some kind of special monoid homomorphism  $\varphi : H \rightarrow K$ , and we want to investigate

certain properties of one of  $H$  or  $K$  by looking at corresponding properties of the other. To this end, we use  $\varphi$  to shift information from  $H$  to  $K$ , which is what we do here with equimorphisms (see Proposition 2.18 and Theorem 4.1), if  $H$  is, in a sense, easier to understand than  $K$ , or to pull it back from  $K$  to  $H$ , as is normally the case with transfer and weak transfer homomorphisms, if it is the other way around.

Now that we have introduced most of the basic notions we need and clarified, we hope, some subtle aspects, we are ready to prove a couple of results extending some pieces of [18, Proposition 1.2.11.1] and [15, Lemma 11], respectively, to the abstract setting of this work: As is true for all other results from the present section, they will be applied later to the study of the arithmetic of power monoids, though the second of them is perhaps of independent interest.

**Proposition 2.17.** *Let  $H$  be a monoid, and assume that  $M$  is a divisor-closed submonoid of  $H$ . Then  $M^\times = H^\times$  and  $\mathcal{A}(M) = \mathcal{A}(H) \cap M$ . In addition,  $\mathsf{L}_M(x) = \mathsf{L}_H(x)$ ,  $\mathsf{Z}_M(x) = \mathsf{Z}_H(x)$ , and  $\mathsf{c}_M(x) = \mathsf{c}_H(x)$  for all  $x \in M$ , and consequently  $\mathcal{L}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(H)$ ,  $\Delta(M) \subseteq \Delta(H)$ , and  $\mathsf{Ca}(M) \subseteq \mathsf{Ca}(H)$ .*

*Proof.* Of course,  $M^\times \subseteq H^\times$ . On the other hand,  $u \in H^\times$  only if  $u \mid_H 1_H$ , and since  $1_H = 1_M$  and  $M$  is a divisor-closed submonoid of  $H$ , this yields  $H^\times \subseteq M^\times$ , and hence  $M^\times = H^\times$ . Similarly, it is clear that  $\mathcal{A}(H) \cap M \subseteq \mathcal{A}(M)$ . To prove the opposite inclusion, let  $a \in \mathcal{A}(M)$ , and write  $a = xy$  for some  $x, y \in H$ . Then  $x, y \in M$ , using again that  $M$  a divisor-closed submonoid of  $H$ . Thus  $x \in M^\times$  or  $y \in M^\times$ , and so  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ , because  $M^\times = H^\times$ . Therefore, given  $x, y \in M$ , it is immediate that  $\mathcal{L}_M(x) = \mathcal{L}_H(x)$ , and  $x \simeq_M y$  if and only if  $x \simeq_H y$ . Hence,  $\mathsf{Z}_M(x) = \mathsf{Z}_H(x)$  for every  $x \in M$ , and the rest is obvious. ■

**Proposition 2.18.** *Let  $H$  and  $K$  be monoids, and  $\varphi : H \rightarrow K$  an equimorphism. The following hold:*

- (i)  $\mathsf{L}_H(x) = \mathsf{L}_K(\varphi(x))$  for every  $x \in H \setminus H^\times$ .
- (ii)  $(\varphi^*(\mathbf{a}), \varphi^*(\mathbf{b})) \in \mathcal{C}_K$  for every  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ .
- (iii) For each  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{Z}(H)$  there exists a unique  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{Z}(K)$  with  $\varphi^*(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ .
- (iv)  $\mathsf{c}_K(\varphi(x)) \leq \mathsf{c}_H(x)$  for all  $x \in H$ .
- (v)  $\varphi(H)$  is a divisor-closed submonoid of  $K$  only if  $\varphi(H^\times) = K^\times$ . Conversely, if  $\varphi(H^\times) = K^\times$  and  $K$  is atomic, then  $\varphi(H)$  is a divisor-closed submonoid of  $K$ .

In particular,  $\mathcal{L}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(K)$  and  $\Delta(H) \subseteq \Delta(K)$ .

*Proof.* (i) Pick  $x \in H \setminus H^\times$ , and set  $L := \mathsf{L}_H(x)$  and  $L' := \mathsf{L}_K(\varphi(x))$ . Since  $x$  is not a unit, it is clear from condition (E1) that  $\varphi(x) \neq 1_K$ , which yields  $L, L' \subseteq \mathbb{N}^+$  (see Remark 2.2).

Accordingly, assume  $L \neq \emptyset$  and let  $k \in L$ . Then  $x = a_1 \cdots a_k$  for some  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ . Therefore  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(a_1) \cdots \varphi(a_k)$ , and hence  $k \in L'$ , because  $\varphi$  is an atom-preserving homomorphism.

Conversely, assume  $L' \neq \emptyset$  and pick  $k \in L'$ . Then  $\varphi(x) = b_1 \cdots b_k$  for some  $b_1, \dots, b_k \in \mathcal{A}(K)$ , and by Remark 2.13 there exist  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  such that  $x = a_1 \cdots a_k$ , with the result that  $k \in L$ .

So, putting it all together, we can conclude that  $L = L'$ . The ‘‘In particular’’ statement (on systems of sets of lengths and delta sets) is then an obvious consequence.

(ii) Let  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{C}_H$ . If  $\pi_H(\mathbf{a}) = 1_H$ , then  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} = 1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))}$ , and hence  $\varphi^*(\mathbf{a}) = \varphi^*(\mathbf{b}) = 1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(K))}$ . Otherwise, there are  $a_1, b_1, \dots, a_n, b_n \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ ,  $u_1, v_1, \dots, u_n, v_n \in H^\times$ , and  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = (a_1 * \cdots * a_n, b_1 * \cdots * b_n)$ ,  $b_{\sigma(i)} = u_i a_i v_i$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ , and  $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$ . Because  $\varphi$  is a homomorphism, it follows that  $\varphi(u_i), \varphi(v_i) \in K^\times$  and  $\varphi(b_{\sigma(i)}) = \varphi(u_i)\varphi(a_i)\varphi(v_i)$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . But  $\varphi^*(\mathbf{a})$  and  $\varphi^*(\mathbf{b})$  are  $\mathcal{A}(K)$ -words by Remark 2.13. Thus  $(\varphi^*(\mathbf{a}), \varphi^*(\mathbf{b})) \in \mathcal{C}_K$ , and we are done.

(iii) Let  $\mathcal{A} \in Z(H)$ , and pick  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ . By Remark 2.13,  $\varphi^*(\mathbf{a})$  is an  $\mathcal{A}(K)$ -word. Consequently, we can set  $\mathcal{B} := \llbracket \varphi^*(\mathbf{a}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{E}_K} \in Z(K)$ . Then, it is immediate from point (ii) that  $\varphi^*(\mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{B}$  for every  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{A}$ , viz.,  $\varphi^*(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . The rest (i.e., the statement of uniqueness) is trivial, since each class in  $Z(H)$  is non-empty, and pairwise distinct classes in  $Z(K)$  are disjoint (by the general properties of congruences).

(iv) Let  $x \in H$ . The inequality is obvious if  $\mathbf{c}_K(\varphi(x)) = 0$ . Otherwise,  $\mathcal{Z}_K(\varphi(x)) \neq \emptyset$  and  $x \neq 1_H$ . So, pick  $\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}' \in \mathcal{Z}_K(\varphi(x))$ . By condition (E3),  $\varphi^*(\mathbf{a}) \in \llbracket \mathbf{a}' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{E}_K}$  and  $\varphi^*(\mathbf{b}) \in \llbracket \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{E}_K}$  for some  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{Z}_H(x)$ . Consequently, there are factorizations  $\mathbf{c}_0, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n \in \mathcal{Z}_H(x)$  with  $\mathbf{c}_0 = \mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_n = \mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{d}_H(\mathbf{c}_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}_i) \leq \mathbf{c}_H(x)$  for each  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . Set  $\mathbf{c}'_0 := \mathbf{a}'$ ,  $\mathbf{c}'_n := \mathbf{b}'$ , and  $\mathbf{c}'_i := \varphi^*(\mathbf{c}_i)$  for  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ . Then, using that  $\varphi(x) \simeq_K \varphi(y)$  whenever  $x \simeq_H y$  (since  $\varphi$  is a homomorphism), we obtain, for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ ,

$$\mathbf{d}_K(\mathbf{c}'_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}'_i) = \mathbf{c}'_{i-1} \wedge_H \mathbf{c}'_i = \varphi^*(\mathbf{c}_{i-1}) \wedge_H \varphi^*(\mathbf{c}_i) \leq \mathbf{c}_{i-1} \wedge_H \mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{d}_H(\mathbf{c}_{i-1}, \mathbf{c}_i) \leq \mathbf{c}_H(x),$$

which implies that the catenary degree of  $\varphi(x)$  in  $K$  is bounded above by  $\mathbf{c}_H(x)$ .

(v) The first part is straightforward from Proposition 2.17, after noting that  $\varphi(H^\times) = \varphi(H)^\times$  by the fact that  $\varphi$  is a homomorphism. As for the rest, assume  $K$  is atomic and  $\varphi(H^\times) = K^\times$ , and pick  $y \in K$  and  $z \in \varphi(H)$  such that  $y \mid_K z$ . It is enough to show that  $y \in \varphi(H)$ , as  $\varphi(H)$  is a submonoid of  $K$ .

This is obvious if  $y \in K^\times$ . Otherwise, it follows from the atomicity of  $K$  that  $y = b_1 \cdots b_n$  for some  $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathcal{A}(K)$ , and since  $\varphi$  is an equimorphism, we get from Remark 2.13 and the above that there are  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ ,  $u_1, v_1, \dots, u_n, v_n \in H^\times$ , and  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $b_{\sigma(i)} = \varphi(u_i)\varphi(a_i)\varphi(v_i)$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . So  $y \in K$ , because  $\varphi(H)$  is closed under the operation of  $K$ . ■

**Remark 2.19.** The second part of Proposition 2.18(v) need not be true if  $K$  is not atomic. To see this, let  $K$  be the monoid of non-negative real numbers under addition, and  $H$  the submonoid of  $K$  consisting of the rational numbers. Both  $H$  and  $K$  are reduced, divisible, cancellative, commutative monoids, which implies that  $\mathcal{A}(H) = \mathcal{A}(K) = \emptyset$ , because every non-unit of  $H$  (respectively, of  $K$ ) is, say, the square of a non-unit. It follows that the canonical embedding  $H \rightarrow K$  is an injective equimorphism, but of course  $H$  is not a divisor-closed submonoid of  $K$ .

**Remark 2.20.** It follows from [2, p. 506] and Remark 2.10 that, if  $\varphi : H \rightarrow K$  be a (monoid) transfer homomorphism in the sense of in the sense of [2, Definition 2.1(1)] with  $K$  atomic, then  $\mathbf{c}_K(\varphi(x)) \leq \mathbf{c}_H(x)$  for all  $x \in H \setminus H^\times$ , which is a special case of Proposition 2.18(iv), because  $\varphi$  is a weak transfer homomorphism by [2, p. 483], and hence an equimorphism by Remark 2.15.

However, nothing similar to Proposition 2.18(iv) was known before for weak transfer homomorphisms (not even in the atomic, cancellative, commutative case). A sharper result is actually proved by Baeth and Smertnig in [2, Proposition 4.8], though under the (very strong) assumption that  $\varphi : H \rightarrow K$  is an *isoatomic* weak transfer homomorphism from an atomic cancellative monoid to another ( $\varphi$  is isoatomic provided that  $\varphi(a) \simeq_K \varphi(b)$  for some  $a, b \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  only if  $a \simeq_H b$ ).

Our next step is to seek a convenient criterion for a unit-cancellative monoid to be atomic or BF.

**Lemma 2.21.** *Let  $H$  be a unit-cancellative monoid, and let  $x, y \in H$ . We have that:*

- (i)  $xy \in H^\times$  if and only if  $x, y \in H^\times$ .
- (ii) If  $xy = xu$  (respectively,  $yx = ux$ ) for some  $u \in H^\times$ , then  $y \in H^\times$ .
- (iii) If  $x \in H \setminus \mathcal{A}(H)$  and  $x \neq 1_H$ , then  $\mathcal{Z}_H(x) = \bigcup_{y, z \in H \setminus H^\times : x=yz} \{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b} : (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{Z}_H(y) \times \mathcal{Z}_H(z)\}$ .
- (iv)  $xH = yH$  (respectively,  $Hx = Hy$ ) if and only if  $x \in yH^\times$  (respectively,  $x \in H^\times y$ ).

- (v) If  $H$  satisfies the ACC on principal right (respectively, principal left) ideals and  $x \in H \setminus H^\times$ , then  $x \in \mathcal{A}(H) \cdot H$  (respectively,  $x \in H \cdot \mathcal{A}(H)$ ).

*Proof.* (i) The “if” part is trivial, see also Lemma 2.1(i). As for the other direction, assume that  $xy$  is a unit, and let  $u \in H$  such that  $xyu = uxy = 1_H$ . This means that  $x$  is right-invertible and  $y$  is left-invertible (a right inverse of  $x$  being given by  $yu$ , and a left inverse of  $y$  by  $ux$ ). Moreover, we have  $xyux = x$ , which implies, by the unit-cancellativity of  $H$ , that  $v = yux$  is a unit, and hence  $(v^{-1}yu)x = y(uxv^{-1}) = 1_H$ . So, in conclusion, we see that both  $x$  and  $y$  are right- and left-invertible, hence are invertible.

(ii) Suppose that  $xy = xu$  for some  $u \in H^\times$  (the other case is similar). Then  $x = xyu^{-1}$ , so we get by the unit-cancellativity of  $H$  and point (i) that  $y \in H^\times$ .

(iii) Let  $x \in H \setminus \mathcal{A}(H)$  such that  $x \neq 1_H$ , and set  $\mathcal{Z}'_H(x) := \bigcup_{y,z \in H \setminus H^\times : x=yz} \{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b} : (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{Z}_H(y) \times \mathcal{Z}_H(z)\}$  for brevity's sake. It is evident that  $\mathcal{Z}'_H(x) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_H(x)$ , so we are left with the opposite inclusion. This is obvious if  $\mathcal{Z}_H(x) = \emptyset$ . Otherwise,  $\mathcal{Z}_H(x)$  is a non-empty subset of  $\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H)) \setminus \{1_{\mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(H))}\}$ . Accordingly, let  $\mathbf{a} := a_1 * \cdots * a_n \in \mathcal{Z}_H(x)$ . Then  $n \geq 2$ , because  $x \notin \mathcal{A}(H)$ , and hence  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} * \mathbf{c}$ , where  $\mathbf{b} := a_1 * \cdots * a_{n-1}$  and  $\mathbf{c} := a_n$  are non-empty  $\mathcal{A}(H)$ -words. But this implies  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{Z}'_H(x)$ , since  $y := \pi_H(\mathbf{b})$  and  $z := \pi_H(\mathbf{c})$  are both non-unit of  $H$  by point (i), and we are done.

(iv) It is obvious that, if  $x \in yH^\times$ , then  $xH = yH$ . So assume  $xH = yH$ . Then  $x = ya$  and  $y = xb$  for some  $a, b \in H$ , with the result that  $y = yab$ . Since  $H$  is unit-cancellative, it follows that  $ab \in H^\times$ , and hence  $a, b \in H^\times$  by point (i) above, which implies that  $x \in yH^\times$ . This concludes the proof, as the analogous statement for principal left ideals can be established in a similar way (we omit details).

(v) We prove the statement only for principal right ideals, as the other case is similar. To this end, assume for a contradiction that the claim is false. Then the set

$$\Omega := \{xH : x \in H \setminus H^\times \text{ and } x \notin \mathcal{A}(H) \cdot H\}$$

is non-empty. So, using that  $H$  satisfies the ACC on principal right ideals,  $\Omega$  has a  $\subseteq$ -maximal element, say  $\tilde{x}H$ . Clearly,  $\tilde{x}$  is neither a unit nor an atom (of  $H$ ), because  $\tilde{x}H \in \Omega$ . Therefore,  $\tilde{x} = xy$  for some  $x, y \in H \setminus H^\times$ . On the other hand,  $x \notin \mathcal{A}(H) \cdot H$ , otherwise we would have  $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{A}(H) \cdot H$ . Thus,  $xH \in \Omega$  and  $\tilde{x}H \subseteq xH$ . But  $\tilde{x}H$  is a  $\subseteq$ -maximal element of  $\Omega$ , so necessarily  $\tilde{x}H = xH$ .

It then follows from point (iv) and the above that  $xy = \tilde{x} = xu$  for some  $u \in H^\times$ , which is, however, a contradiction, as it yields  $y \in H^\times$  by point (ii).  $\blacksquare$

We let a function  $\lambda : H \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$  be a *length function* on  $H$  if  $\lambda(x) < \lambda(y)$  for all  $x, y \in H$  such that  $y = uxv$  for some  $u, v \in H$  with  $u \notin H^\times$  or  $v \notin H^\times$ : This generalizes [18, Definition 1.1.3.2] from the case when  $H$  is cancellative and commutative, and Smertnig's definition of a right length function [40, p. 364] from the case when  $H$  is cancellative.

We are actually interested in unit-cancellative monoids that have a length function, but need not be cancellative or commutative. This leads to our first theorem, which is a generalization of [18, Proposition 1.1.4 and Corollary 1.3.3] and [10, Lemma 3.1(1)]. For the sake of exposition, we will say that  $H$  *satisfies the ACCP* if it satisfies the ACC on both principal right and principal left ideals.

**Theorem 2.22.** *Let  $H$  be a monoid and  $M$  a submonoid of  $H$  with  $M^\times = M \cap H^\times$ . The following hold:*

- (i) *Suppose that  $H$  is unit-cancellative and satisfies the ACCP. Then  $H$  is atomic.*
- (ii) *If  $H$  is unit-cancellative, then so is  $M$ .*

- (iii) Assume that  $H$  has a length function. Then  $H$  satisfies the ACCP.
- (iv) If  $H$  has a length function and is unit-cancellative, then  $M$  is a BF-monoid.

*Proof.* (i) The proof is along the same lines of that of [41, Proposition 3.1]. To start with, suppose for a contradiction that the set

$$\Omega := \{Hx : x \in H \setminus H^\times \text{ and } x \text{ is not a (finite) product of atoms of } H\}$$

is non-empty. Then, using that  $H$  satisfies the ACC on principal *left* ideals,  $\Omega$  must have a maximal element, say  $H\tilde{x}$ . Of course,  $\tilde{x}$  is neither a unit nor an atom (of  $H$ ), so we get from Lemma 2.21(v) that  $\tilde{x} = ax$  for some  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  and  $x \in H$ , where we have used that  $H$  also satisfies the ACC on principal *right* ideals. This shows that  $H\tilde{x} \subseteq Hx$ , and we claim that  $H\tilde{x} \subsetneq Hx$ .

Indeed, since  $\tilde{x} \notin \mathcal{A}(H)$ , we infer from Lemma 2.1(ii) that  $x \notin H^\times$ . Therefore,  $H\tilde{x} = Hx$  would imply by Lemma 2.21(iv) and the above that  $ax = \tilde{x} = ux$  for some  $u \in H^\times$ , which is a contradiction, because it yields by Lemma 2.21(ii) that  $a \in H^\times$ . Thus, we see that  $H\tilde{x} \subsetneq Hx$ , as was claimed.

However, this is possible only if  $x = a_1 \cdots a_n$  for some  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ , since  $\tilde{x}$  is a  $\subseteq$ -maximal element of  $\Omega$ . It follows that  $\tilde{x} = ax$  is a product of atoms of  $H$ , which is still a contradiction.

(ii) Assume  $H$  is unit-cancellative, and let  $x, y \in M$  such that  $xy = x$  or  $yx = x$  in  $M$ . Then  $xy = x$  or  $yx = x$  in  $H$  (since  $M$  is a submonoid of  $H$ ), and hence  $x \in H^\times$ . So, using that  $M^\times = M \cap H^\times$ , it follows that  $x \in M^\times$ , and we can conclude that  $M$  is unit-cancellative.

(iii) Let  $\lambda : H \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$  be a length function on  $H$ , and suppose for a contradiction that there exists an  $H$ -valued sequence  $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$  such that  $a_n H \subsetneq a_{n+1} H$  (respectively,  $H a_n \subsetneq H a_{n+1}$ ) for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$ . Then, for each  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  we have that  $a_n = a_{n+1} v_n$  (respectively,  $a_n = v_n a_{n+1}$ ) for some  $v_n \in H \setminus H^\times$ , with the result that  $\lambda(a_{n+1}) < \lambda(a_n)$ . But this is impossible.

(iv) Let  $\lambda : H \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$  be a length function on  $H$ . It is then clear that the restriction of  $\lambda$  to  $M$  is a length function on  $M$ . So we have by point (iii) that  $M$  satisfies the ACCP. On the other hand, it follows from point (ii) that  $M$  is also unit-cancellative. Therefore, point (i) entails that  $M$  is an atomic monoid. We are left to show that  $M$  is, in fact, a BF-monoid.

For this, let  $x \in H \setminus H^\times$ , and pick  $k \in \mathbf{N}^+$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{A}(H)$  such that  $x = a_1 \cdots a_k$ . Since it is straightforward from the definition of a length function that  $\lambda(a) \geq 1$  for every  $a \in H \setminus H^\times$ , it is seen by induction that  $\lambda(x) \geq k$ . Thus  $\max \mathbf{L}(x) \leq \lambda(x)$ , and we are done.  $\blacksquare$

We conclude this section with a corollary generalizing [18, Proposition 1.3.2] from cancellative, commutative monoids to unit-cancellative monoids (cf. [40, Lemma 3.6] for a much weaker result along the same lines), and with an elementary lemma showing that unit-cancellative monoids are Dedekind-finite.

**Corollary 2.23.** *Let  $H$  be a unit-cancellative monoid. The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $H$  is a BF-monoid.
- (b)  $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} (H \setminus H^\times)^n = \emptyset$ .
- (c)  $H$  has a length function.

*Proof.* To ease notation, set  $\mathfrak{m} := H \setminus H^\times$  and  $\mathfrak{j} := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{m}^n$ . It is sufficient to prove that (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) and (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c), since (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) is a consequence of Theorem 2.22(iv).

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): Let  $x \in H$ . If  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  and  $x \in \mathfrak{m}^n$ , then  $x = x_1 \cdots x_n$  for some  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in H \setminus H^\times$ , which implies  $\sup \mathbf{L}_H(x) \geq n$ , because  $H$  is BF, and hence  $x_i$  is a non-empty product of atoms of  $H$  for



each  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . But  $H$  being a BF-monoid also implies that  $\mathsf{L}_H(x)$  is finite. So, there must exist  $n \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $x \notin \mathfrak{m}^n$ , and it follows that  $\mathfrak{j} = \emptyset$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c): Pick  $\bar{x} \in H$ . Since  $\mathfrak{j} = \emptyset$ , there exists  $v \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $\bar{x} \notin \mathfrak{m}^v$ : We claim that  $\bar{x} \notin \mathfrak{m}^n$  for every  $n \geq v$ . Indeed, suppose that  $\bar{x} = x_1 \cdots x_n$  for some  $n \geq v$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in H \setminus H^\times$ , and set  $y_i := x_i$  for  $i \in \llbracket 1, v-1 \rrbracket$  and  $y_v := x_v \cdots x_n$ . Then, using that  $H$  is unit-cancellative, we obtain from Lemma 2.21(i) that  $y_1, \dots, y_v \in H \setminus H^\times$ , and hence  $\bar{x} \in \mathfrak{m}^v$ , a contradiction.

It follows that the function  $\lambda : H \rightarrow \mathbf{N} : x \mapsto \sup\{n \in \mathbf{N}^+ : x \in \mathfrak{m}^n\}$  is well defined, because the set  $\{n \in \mathbf{N}^+ : x \in \mathfrak{m}^n\}$  is finite for all  $x \in H$ . We want to show that  $\lambda$  is a length function (on  $H$ ).

In fact, let  $u, v, x, y \in H$  with  $y = u xv$ . It is straightforward that  $y \in \mathfrak{m}^{\lambda(u)+\lambda(x)+\lambda(v)}$ . Therefore, we have  $\lambda(u) + \lambda(x) + \lambda(v) \leq \lambda(y)$ , and  $\lambda(x) = \lambda(y)$  only if  $\lambda(u) = \lambda(v) = 0$ , which is, in turn, equivalent to  $u, v \in H^\times$ . This yields that  $\lambda$  is a length function.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2.24.** As a complement to Corollary 2.23, note that a monoid is BF only if it is unit-cancellative. Indeed, let  $H$  be an atomic monoid, and assume that  $xy = x$  (respectively,  $yx = x$ ) for some  $x \in H$  and  $y \in H \setminus H^\times$ . Then  $x$  is not a unit, and  $xy^k = x$  (respectively,  $y^k x = x$ ) for all  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ . Therefore, we get from Remark 2.3 that

$$\mathsf{L}_H(x) + k\mathsf{L}_H(y) \subseteq \mathsf{L}_H(x) + \mathsf{L}_H(y^k) \subseteq \mathsf{L}_H(x), \text{ for all } k \in \mathbf{N}.$$

But since  $H$  is atomic,  $\mathsf{L}_H(x)$  and  $\mathsf{L}_H(y)$  are non-empty subsets of  $\mathbf{N}^+$ , with the result that  $\sup \mathsf{L}_H(x) = \infty$ , and hence  $H$  is not a BF-monoid: Incidentally, this generalizes to the non-commutative setting an observation from the introduction of [10, § 3].

**Lemma 2.25.** *Let  $H$  be a monoid. Then  $H$  is Dedekind-finite if and only if  $x, y \in H^\times$  for all  $x, y \in H$  with  $xy \in H^\times$ . In particular,  $H$  is Dedekind-finite if  $\mathcal{A}(H) \neq \emptyset$  or  $H$  is unit-cancellative.*

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $H$  is Dedekind-finite, and let  $x, y \in H$  such that  $xy \in H^\times$ . Then there exists  $z \in H$  for which  $xyz = zxy = 1_H$ . It follows that  $yzx = 1_H$ , which shows that  $x$  and  $y$  are units.

Conversely, assume that  $x, y \in H^\times$  whenever  $x, y \in H$  and  $xy \in H^\times$ . Then  $xy = 1_H$  for some  $x, y \in H$  yields  $x, y \in H^\times$ , and hence  $y = x^{-1}xy = x^{-1} \cdot 1_H = x^{-1}$ , which implies in turn that  $yx = 1_H$ .

The ‘‘In particular’’ part is now straightforward by the above and Lemmas 2.1(i) and 2.21(i).  $\blacksquare$

### 3. POWER MONOIDS

Let  $H$  be a (multiplicatively written) monoid, as in § 2. We use  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  for the set of all *non-empty* finite subsets of  $H$ , and we denote by  $\cdot$  the binary operation

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H) \times \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H) : (X, Y) \mapsto XY,$$

where  $XY := X \cdot Y := \{xy : (x, y) \in X \times Y\}$ . Moreover, we define

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H) := \{X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H) : X \cap H^\times \neq \emptyset\}.$$

It is trivial that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , endowed with the above operation, forms a monoid, with the identity given by the singleton  $\{1_H\}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is a submonoid of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ . Accordingly, we call  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ , respectively, the *power monoid* and *restricted power monoid* of  $H$ .

**Remark 3.1.** When  $H$  is an additively written monoid (as is the case in § 4), we will rather denote the operation of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  by  $+$  and the restricted power monoid of  $H$  by  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(H)$ .

It is the main goal of the present section to investigate some of the algebraic and arithmetic properties of these two structures, and to link them to corresponding properties of the restricted power monoid of  $(\mathbf{N}, +)$ , which we discuss in more detail in § 4. We start with a few basic results.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $H$  be a monoid. The following hold:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  are cancellative if and only if  $H = \{1_H\}$ .
- (ii)  $\{\{u\} : u \in H^\times\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times$ , and the inclusion is an equality if  $H$  is Dedekind-finite.
- (iii) Let  $H$  be Dedekind-finite. Then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is a divisor-closed submonoid of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times = \{\{u\} : u \in H^\times\}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H))$ , and  $\text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)) \subseteq \text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H))$ .
- (iv) Assume that  $H$  is Dedekind-finite (respectively, strongly unit-cancellative) and fix  $a \in H$ . Then  $\{a\} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H))$  only if (respectively, if and only if)  $a \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ .
- (v) Let  $H$  be cancellative. Then  $\{\{a\} : a \in \mathcal{A}(H)\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H))$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is atomic (respectively, a BF-monoid) only if so is  $H$ .

*Proof.* (i) The “if” part is obvious, and of course  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is cancellative only if so is  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ . Therefore, suppose for a contradiction that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is cancellative, but  $H \neq \{1_H\}$ . Accordingly, let  $x \in H \setminus \{1_H\}$ . We have that  $x^2 \neq x$  and  $x^2 \neq 1_H$ ; otherwise,  $\{1_H, x\} \cdot \{1_H\} = \{1_H, x\} \cdot \{1_H, x\}$ , yet  $\{1_H, x\} \neq \{1_H\}$ , which is impossible by the cancellativity of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ . But this still leads to a contradiction, as it implies that  $\{1_H, x^2\} \neq \{1_H, x, x^2\}$ , though  $\{1_H, x^2\} \cdot \{1_H, x\} = \{1_H, x, x^2\} \cdot \{1_H, x\}$ .

(ii) The inclusion  $\{\{u\} : u \in H^\times\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times$  is trivial. As for the rest, let  $H$  be Dedekind-finite, and pick  $U \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times$ . Then, there is a set  $V \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  such that  $UV = \{1_H\}$ . Accordingly,  $uv = 1_H$  for all  $u \in U$  and  $v \in V$ , and this, together with Lemma 2.25, yields  $U, V \subseteq H^\times$ . So  $1 = |UV| \geq |U|$ , and consequently  $U = \{u\}$  for some  $u \in H^\times$ .

(iii) Let  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  such that  $UYV = X$  for some  $U, V \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  (namely,  $Y \mid X$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ ), and using that  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ , pick  $x \in X \cap H^\times$ . Then,  $x = uyv$  for some  $u \in U$ ,  $y \in Y$ , and  $v \in V$ . So, by Lemma 2.25,  $y$  is a unit of  $H$ , because  $H$  is Dedekind-finite. It follows that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is a divisor-closed submonoid of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , and the rest is a consequence of point (ii) and Proposition 2.17.

(iv) Let  $a = xy$  for some  $x, y \in H \setminus H^\times$ . Then  $\{a\} = \{x\} \cdot \{y\}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ . Since  $H$  is Dedekind-finite, we have by point (ii) that neither  $\{x\}$  nor  $\{y\}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times$ , which shows that  $\{a\}$  is not an atom of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , and proves the “only if” part of the claim.

Now, assume that  $H$  is strongly unit-cancellative and  $\{a\} = XY$  for some non-unit  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ . Accordingly, suppose for a contradiction that  $Y$  is contained in  $H^\times$  (the case when  $X \subseteq H^\times$  is symmetric). Then  $|Y| \geq 2$ , because every one-element subset of  $H^\times$  is a unit of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  by point (ii). In particular, there exist  $x \in H$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in H^\times$  such that  $y_1 \neq y_2$  and  $a = xy_1 = xy_2$ , i.e.,  $xy_1y_2^{-1} = x$ . This, however, is not possible, by the fact that  $H$  is strongly unit-cancellative.

So, putting it all together, neither  $X$  nor  $Y$  is a subset of  $H^\times$ , whence  $a = xy$  for some  $x \in X \setminus H^\times$  and  $y \in Y \setminus H^\times$ . To wit,  $a$  is not an atom of  $H$ .

(v) This is straightforward from point (ii) and the fact that, if  $H$  is cancellative and  $|XY| = 1$  for some  $X, Y \subseteq H$ , then  $|X| = |Y| = 1$  (we omit further details). ■

In particular, point (i) of Proposition 3.2 suggests that the kind of study we are undertaking in this paper is, except for trivial cases, entirely beyond the scope of the factorization theory of *cancellative*

monoids, while points (ii)–(iii) indicate that the arithmetic of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  should be “smoother” when  $H$  is Dedekind-finite or unit-cancellative.

Keeping the above in mind, we look for (natural) sufficient conditions to guarantee that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  are BF-monoids. To this end, we say that  $H$  is *linearly orderable* (as a monoid) if there exists a total order  $\preceq$  on (the set)  $H$  such that  $xz \prec yz$  and  $zx \prec zy$  for all  $x, y, z \in H$  with  $x \prec y$ , in which case the pair  $(H, \preceq)$  is called a *linearly ordered monoid*.

Linearly orderable monoids are cancellative. The additive group of the real field is a linearly orderable group. Every submonoid of a linearly orderable monoid is still a linearly orderable monoid, and the same is true of any direct product (either finite or infinite) of linearly orderable monoids.

A variety of linearly orderable groups is provided by abelian torsion-free groups, as first proved by Levi in [30]. In a similar vein, Iwasawa [27], Mal’tsev [31], and Neumann [34] established, independently from each other, that torsion-free nilpotent groups are linearly orderable. Moreover, pure braid groups [37] and free groups [27] are linearly orderable, and so are some Baumslag-Solitar groups, which has led to interesting developments in connection to the study of sums of dilates in additive number theory, see [12, 11] and references therein. Further examples are discussed in [43, Appendix A] and [36, §1], see, in particular, [36, Examples A.4 and A.5] for two of them involving triangular matrices and monoid rings.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $H$  be a linearly orderable monoid. The following hold:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  are strongly unit-cancellative monoids.
- (ii)  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times = \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times = \{\{u\} : u \in H^\times\}$ .
- (iii)  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is a BF-monoid.
- (iv)  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is a BF-monoid if and only if so is  $H$ .

*Proof.* To begin, let  $\preceq$  be a total order such that  $(H, \cdot, \preceq)$  is a linearly ordered monoid. We claim that

$$|AB| \geq |A| + |B| - 1, \quad \text{for all } A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H). \quad (6)$$

This is immediate if  $A$  or  $B$  is a singleton, as we have already noted that linearly orderable monoids are cancellative. Otherwise, let  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  be the unique numbering of  $A$  with  $a_1 \prec \dots \prec a_m$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  the unique numbering of  $B$  with  $b_1 \prec \dots \prec b_n$ . Then  $a_1b_1 \prec \dots \prec a_mb_1 \prec \dots \prec a_mb_n$ , with the result that  $|AB| \geq m + n - 1 = |A| + |B| - 1$ , as was desired.

(i) With the above in hand, let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  such that  $XY = X$  (the symmetric case when  $YX = X$  is analogous and will be omitted). Since  $\preceq$  is a total relation, every non-empty finite subset  $S$  of  $H$  has a minimum  $S_\#$  and a maximum  $S^\#$  (relative to the order  $\preceq$ ). Accordingly, we get  $X_\# = (XY)_\# = X_\# \cdot Y_\#$  and  $X^\# = X^\# \cdot Y^\#$ , which is possible if and only if  $Y_\# = Y^\# = 1_H$ , because  $(H, \preceq)$  is a linearly ordered, and hence cancellative, monoid. In other terms,  $XY = X$  only if  $Y = \{1_H\}$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is strongly unit-cancellative, and then so is  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ , since it is trivial that submonoids of strongly unit-cancellative monoids are strongly unit-cancellative too (cf. Theorem 2.22(ii)).

(ii) This is straightforward from the cancellativity of  $H$  and points (ii) and (iii) of Proposition 3.2.

(iii) Let  $\lambda_0$  be the map  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H) \rightarrow \mathbf{N} : X \mapsto |X| - 1$ , and let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  such that  $Y = UXV$  for some  $U, V \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  with  $U \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times$  or  $V \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times$ . Then, it follows from (6) that

$$\lambda_0(Y) = |Y| - 1 \geq |U| + |X| + |V| - 3 = \lambda_0(U) + \lambda_0(X) + \lambda_0(V) \geq \lambda_0(X),$$

and the last inequality is strict unless  $\lambda_0(U) = \lambda_0(V) = 0$ , namely,  $|U| = |V| = 1$ . So, knowing from point (ii) that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times = \{\{u\} : u \in H^\times\}$ , we find that  $\lambda_0(Y) > \lambda_0(X)$ .

In other terms, we have shown that  $\lambda_0$  is a length function on  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ . Therefore, we conclude from point (i) and Corollary ?? that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is a BF-monoid.

(iv) The ‘‘only if’’ part is a consequence of Proposition 3.2(v), in combination with the cancellativity of  $H$ . As for the other direction, assume  $H$  is a BF-monoid and let  $\lambda$  be the function

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H) \rightarrow \mathbf{N} : X \mapsto |X| + \sup \mathbf{L}_H(X^\sharp) - 1,$$

where we write  $X^\sharp$  for the maximum of the set  $X$  relative to the total order  $\preceq$  (cf. the proof of point (i)). Note that  $\lambda$  is well defined, because  $\mathbf{L}_H(x)$  is a finite subset of  $\mathbf{N}$  for every  $x \in H$  (by the assumption that  $H$  is a BF-monoid). We want to prove that  $\lambda$  is a length function on  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , which, as in the proof of point (iii), will imply that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  is a BF-monoid.

Indeed, let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , and suppose that  $Y = UXV$  for some  $U, V \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  with  $U \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times$  or  $V \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times$ . In particular, we assume that  $U \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)^\times$ , as the other occurrence is similar. By point (ii), this means that either  $|U| \geq 2$  or  $U = \{x\}$  for some  $x \notin H^\times$ , and in both cases  $|U| + \sup \mathbf{L}_H(U^\sharp) \geq 2$ . Moreover, it is clear that  $|V| + \sup \mathbf{L}_H(V^\sharp) \geq 1$ . Therefore, we get from Remark 2.3 and (6) that

$$\lambda(Y) \geq |U| + |X| + |V| + \sup \mathbf{L}_H(U^\sharp) + \sup \mathbf{L}_H(X^\sharp) + \sup \mathbf{L}_H(V^\sharp) - 3 > \lambda(X).$$

It follows that  $\lambda$  is a length function on  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , and this finishes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 3.4.** As a complement to points (iii) and (iv) of Proposition 3.3, we note that the power monoid of a linearly orderable monoid, no matter whether commutative or not, need not be atomic.

In fact, let  $H$  be a linearly orderable, divisible monoid such that  $H^\times \neq H$ . Then,  $\mathcal{A}(H)$  is empty (cf. Remark 2.19), and since  $H \setminus H^\times$  is non-empty, we see that  $H$  is not atomic.

Our last result for this section provides, along with Proposition 3.2(iii), a complete characterization of the atoms of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  of size  $\leq 3$  under the assumption that  $H$  is linearly orderable.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Assume  $H$  is a linearly orderable monoid, and let  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  such that  $2 \leq |X| \leq 3$ . Then  $X \notin \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H))$  if and only if there exist  $x, z \in H^\times$  and  $y \in H \setminus \{1_H\}$  with  $xy = yx$  such that  $z^{-1}X = \{x, xy, xy^2\}$  or  $Xz^{-1} = \{x, xy, xy^2\}$ . In particular, if  $|X| = 2$ , then  $X \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H))$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $X = AB$  for some  $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  such that neither  $A$  nor  $B$  is a unit.

Given  $u, v \in H^\times$ , it is clear that  $uXv = (uA) \cdot (Bv)$  and  $|uXv| = |X|$  (recall once more that linearly orderable monoids are cancellative), and  $uXv$  is an atom if and only if so is  $X$ . Since  $X \cap H^\times \neq \emptyset$ , we can thus ‘‘normalize’’  $X$  (by multiplying it, either on the left or on the right, by the inverse of an element of  $X \cap H^\times$ ), in such a way that  $1_H \in X$ . Moreover, we can also assume (by symmetry) that  $|A| \leq |B|$ .

We claim that  $|A| \geq 2$ . Indeed, suppose to the contrary that  $A = \{a\}$ . Then,  $ab = 1_H$  for some  $b \in B$ , which implies by Lemma 2.21(i) that  $a \in H^\times$ . By points (ii) and (iii) of Proposition 3.2, this is, however, in contradiction to the fact that  $A \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times$ .

Since  $2 \leq |X| \leq 3$  and  $|A| \leq |B|$ , it follows that  $|A| = |B| = 2$  and  $|X| = 3$ , as we get from the proof of Proposition 3.3 that  $|X| \geq |A| + |B| - 1$ . So we are done with the ‘‘In particular’’ part of the statement.

As for the rest, let  $\preceq$  be a total order on  $H$  making the pair  $(H, \preceq)$  into a linearly ordered monoid. Then, we can write  $A = \{a, b\}$  and  $B = \{u, v\}$ , with  $a \prec b$  and  $u \prec v$ . Thus, we get  $X = \{au, av, bu, bv\}$ ,

where  $au \prec av \prec bv$  and  $au \prec bu \prec bv$ . Because  $|X| = 3$ , this yields  $av = bu$  and  $X = \{au, av, bv\}$ , and we can distinguish two cases (recall that  $1_H \in X$ ):

CASE 1:  $1_H = au$  (the case when  $1_H = bv$  is symmetric, and we omit it). Then  $a, u \in H^\times$  by Lemma 2.21(i), and hence  $a = u^{-1}$  and  $v = ubu$ , which shows that  $X = \{x, xy, xy^2\}$  with  $x := 1_H$  and  $y := bu$ .

CASE 2:  $1_H = av = bu$ . Then we have, again by Lemma 2.21(i), that  $a, b, u, v \in H^\times$ , with the result that  $(a, b) = (v^{-1}, u^{-1})$ , and hence  $X = \{v^{-1}u, 1_H, u^{-1}v\} = \{x, xy, xy^2\}$ , with  $x := v^{-1}u$  and  $y := u^{-1}v$ .

This concludes the proof of the “only if” part, as in both of the two cases considered in the above we have  $xy = yx$  and  $y \neq 1_H$ , so that “denormalizing”  $X$  (by multiplying it, either on the left or on the right, by a unit of  $H$ ) still returns a 3-element set of the desired form.

As for the “if” direction, assume there exist  $x, z \in H^\times$  and  $y \in H \setminus \{1_H\}$  with  $xy = yx$  and  $z^{-1}X = \{x, xy, xy^2\}$  (the other case is similar). Then  $X = \{z, zy\} \cdot \{x, xy\}$ , and it is clear from the above that  $\{z, zy\}$  and  $\{x, xy\}$  are not unit of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ . Consequently,  $X \notin \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H))$ . ■

#### 4. THE RESTRICTED POWER MONOID OF $(\mathbf{N}, +)$

Throughout, we let  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  denote the restricted power monoid of  $(\mathbf{N}, +)$ . In contrast to § 3, where power monoids were always written multiplicatively, we will use the additive notation for  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ .

Because  $(\mathbf{N}, +)$  is a linearly orderable, reduced, commutative monoid, we have by Proposition 3.3(i)–(iii) that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is a strongly unit-cancellative, reduced, commutative BF-monoid, where the identity is the one-element set  $\{0\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  (below, we will often use these facts without comment).

With this in mind, we come to our next theorem, which shows, in the end, that it is possible to investigate some arithmetic properties of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ , under suitable assumptions on the monoid  $H$ , through the study of the arithmetic of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ , with the advantage that the latter is, in a sense, easier to understand, cf. Remark 2.16.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume  $H$  is a Dedekind-finite, non-torsion monoid. Then there exists a (monoid) monomorphism  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  for which the following condition holds:*

- (c) *Given  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  with  $\Phi(X) = Y_1 \cdots Y_n$ , there are  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  such that  $X = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$  and  $\Phi(X_i) \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)} Y_i$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ .*

*In particular,  $\Phi$  is an equimorphism, and hence  $\mathsf{L}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})}(X) = \mathsf{L}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)}(\Phi(X))$  and  $\mathsf{c}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)}(\Phi(X)) \leq \mathsf{c}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})}(X)$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ .*

*Proof.* Using that  $H$  is non-torsion, fix  $x_0 \in H$  with  $\text{ord}(x_0) = \infty$ , and denote by  $\phi$  the unique homomorphism  $(\mathbf{N}, +) \rightarrow H$  for which  $\phi(1) = x_0$ . Of course,  $\phi$  is a monomorphism, because  $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$  for some  $x, y \in \mathbf{N}$  with  $x < y$  would imply  $\{x_0^k : k \in \mathbf{N}^+\} \subseteq \{x_0^k : k \in \llbracket 0, y-1 \rrbracket\}$  (the inclusion is actually an equality, but proving it would be useless here), in contradiction to the fact that  $\text{ord}_H(x_0) = \infty$ . Furthermore, we can clearly lift  $\phi$  to a monomorphism  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  by taking  $\Phi(X) := \{\phi(x) : x \in X\}$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ . So we proceed to demonstrate that  $\Phi$  satisfies condition (c).

Indeed, let  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  such that  $\Phi(X) = Y_1 \cdots Y_n$ . Since  $0 \in X$  and  $\phi$  is a homomorphism, there exist  $u_1 \in Y_1, \dots, u_n \in Y_n$  with  $u_1 \cdots u_n = \phi(0) = 1_H$ , and we get from Lemma 2.25 that  $u_1, \dots, u_n \in H^\times$ , as we are assuming that  $H$  is Dedekind-finite. So, for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$  set

$$Y'_i := u_0 \cdots u_{i-1} Y_i u_i^{-1} \cdots u_1^{-1},$$

where  $u_0 := 1_H$ . It is straightforward that  $\Phi(X) = Y'_1 \cdots Y'_n$ , and of course  $Y'_i \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)} Y_i$  for each  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . Moreover, it is plain that  $1_H \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n Y'_i$ , with the result that  $Y'_1, \dots, Y'_n \subseteq \Phi(X)$ . But this implies, by the injectivity of  $\Phi$ , that there exist  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  with  $0 \in X_i$  and  $\Phi(X_i) = Y'_i \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)} Y_i$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . It follows that  $\Phi(X) = \Phi(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)$ , and hence  $X = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$  (since  $\Phi$  is a monomorphism), which finishes the proof of condition (c).

We are left to show that  $\Phi$  is an equimorphism, as all the rest will follow from points (i) and (iv) of Proposition 2.18. Actually, it is clear from the above that  $\Phi$  satisfies conditions (E1) and (E3) from the definition of equimorphisms in § 2 (see also Remark 2.13). Therefore, it will be enough to prove that  $\Phi$  is atom-preserving. To this end, let  $A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$ .

Assume first that  $\Phi(A) = X'Y'$  for some  $X', Y' \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ . Then, we derive from condition (c) that there are  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  such that  $\Phi(X) \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)} X'$ ,  $\Phi(Y) \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)} Y'$ , and  $A = X + Y$ , which can happen only if one (and only one) of  $X$  and  $Y$  is  $\{0\}$ , since  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is a reduced BF-monoid and  $A$  is an atom of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ . Accordingly,  $X' \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)} \{1_H\}$  or  $Y' \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)} \{1_H\}$ , and hence one of  $X'$  and  $Y'$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times$ .

On the other hand, suppose for a contradiction that  $\Phi(A) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)^\times$ . Then, we have by Proposition 3.2(iii) and the Dedekind-finiteness of  $H$  that  $|\Phi(A)| = 1$ . So we get  $|A| = 1$  (recall that  $\Phi$  is injective), and hence  $A = \{0\}$ . This, however, is not possible, because  $A$  is an atom of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ . ■

With this said, we go on showing how to construct some “non-trivial” families of atoms of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ . We start with an elementary lemma, whose simple proof we leave as an exercise for the reader.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $X, Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  such that  $X = Y_1 + \cdots + Y_n$ . The following hold:*

- (i)  $Y_i \subseteq X$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In particular, if  $X \subseteq q \cdot \mathbf{N}$  for some  $q \in \mathbf{N}$ , then  $Y_i \subseteq q \cdot \mathbf{N}$ .
- (ii)  $\mathsf{L}(q \cdot X) = \mathsf{L}(X)$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  for every  $q \in \mathbf{N}^+$ .
- (iii) If  $X^+ \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\min X^+ \in Y_i$  for some  $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $d, \ell, q \in \mathbf{N}^+$  with  $d \geq \ell q + 1$ , and let  $A$  be a non-empty finite set of integers  $\geq \ell q + 1$  such that  $a \equiv b \pmod d$  for all  $a, b \in A$ . Then  $(q \cdot \llbracket 0, \ell \rrbracket) \cup A$  is not an atom of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  if and only if  $A = \{(\ell + k)q\}$  for some  $k \in \llbracket 1, \lceil \ell/2 \rceil \rrbracket$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $B := (q \cdot \llbracket 0, \ell \rrbracket) \cup A$ , and suppose first that  $A = \{(\ell + k)q\}$  for some integer  $k \in \llbracket 1, \lceil \ell/2 \rceil \rrbracket$ . Then  $B = \{0, qk\} + (q \cdot \llbracket 0, \ell - k \rrbracket \cup \{\ell q\})$ , since  $k \leq \ell - k + 1$ . Therefore,  $B$  is not an atom of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ , because it is the sum of two elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  both different from  $\{0\}$  (here we use that  $\ell, q \in \mathbf{N}^+$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is a reduced monoid). So the “if” part of the statement is proved.

As for the other direction, let  $B = X + Y$  for some  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}) \setminus \{\{0\}\}$  (in particular,  $X^+$  and  $Y^+$  are both non-empty). Set  $x_M := \max X$  and  $y_M := \max Y$ . By symmetry, we can assume  $1 \leq x_M \leq y_M$ . Let  $x_m := \min X^+$ , and suppose for a contradiction that  $y_M \geq \ell q + 1$ .

Then  $y_M, x_m + y_M \in A$ , which is possible only if  $x_m \geq d \geq \ell q + 1$ , as  $x_m = (x_m + y_M) - y_M \geq 1$  and, by hypothesis,  $a \equiv b \pmod d$  for all  $a, b \in A$ . Because  $q = \min B^+$  and  $X \cup Y \subseteq B$  by Lemma 4.2(i), we thus get from Lemma 4.2(iii) that  $q \in Y$ , and hence  $x_m, x_m + q \in A$ , which is a contradiction, because  $1 \leq q = (x_m + q) - x_m < d$ .

It follows that  $B \subseteq \llbracket 0, x_M + y_M \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket 0, 2\ell q \rrbracket$ , hence  $A \subseteq \llbracket \ell q + 1, 2\ell q \rrbracket$ . Since  $A$  is a non-empty set and  $1 \leq 2\ell q - (\ell q + 1) < d$ , we thus conclude that  $|A| = 1$  (again, we use that  $a \equiv b \pmod d$  for all  $a, b \in A$ ).

On the other hand,  $y_M \leq \ell q$  yields, along with Lemma 4.2(i), that  $X, Y \subseteq q \cdot \llbracket 0, \ell \rrbracket$ , with the result that  $A \subseteq X + Y \subseteq q \cdot \mathbf{N}$ .

So, putting it all together, we see that  $A = \{(\ell + k)q\}$  for some  $k \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $\lceil \ell/2 \rceil < k \leq \ell$ . Then  $k \geq 2$ , and of course  $x_M \geq kq$ , otherwise we would obtain that

$$(\ell + k)q = \max B = x_M + y_M < kq + \ell q,$$

a contradiction. Moreover, we claim that

$$X \cap \llbracket x_M - kq + 1, x_M - 1 \rrbracket = Y \cap \llbracket y_M - kq + 1, y_M - 1 \rrbracket = \emptyset. \quad (7)$$

In fact, if  $x \in X \cap \llbracket x_M - kq + 1, x_M - 1 \rrbracket \neq \emptyset$  (the other case is similar), then  $x + y_M, (\ell + k)q \in B$  (as was already noted, we have  $(\ell + k)q = x_M + y_M$ ), and actually

$$(\ell + k)q > x + y_M \geq (\ell + k)q - kq + 1 = \ell q + 1.$$

We thus get  $x + y_M, (\ell + k)q \in A$ , but this is impossible (because  $A$  is a singleton) and leads to (7).

Accordingly, we find that  $X \subseteq \llbracket 0, x_M - kq \rrbracket \cup \{x_M\}$  and  $Y \subseteq \llbracket 0, y_M - kq \rrbracket \cup \{y_M\}$ , whence

$$q \cdot \llbracket 0, \ell \rrbracket = B \setminus \{(\ell + k)q\} = (X + Y) \setminus \{(\ell + k)q\} \subseteq (\llbracket 0, (\ell - k)q \rrbracket \cup \llbracket x_M, \ell q \rrbracket) \cap (q \cdot \mathbf{N}). \quad (8)$$

However, this is still a contradiction, because  $x_M - (\ell - k)q \geq kq - (\ell - k)q = (2k - \ell)q \geq 2q$ , with the result that at least one multiple of  $q$  in the interval  $\llbracket 0, \ell q \rrbracket$  is missing from the right-most side of (8). ■

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  and  $b, q \in \mathbf{N}^+$  be such that  $A \subseteq q \cdot \mathbf{N}$ , but  $q \nmid b$ . Then  $A \cup \{b\} \notin \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$  if and only if  $A = \{0, 2b\}$ .*

*Proof.* The ‘‘if’’ part is trivial. As for the other direction, suppose that  $B := A \cup \{b\}$  is not an atom of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ , namely, there exist  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  such that  $B = X + Y$  and  $|X|, |Y| \geq 2$ .

We get from Lemma 4.2(i) that  $X, Y \subseteq B$ . It follows that  $b \in X \cup Y$ , since  $b \in X + Y$  and  $q \nmid b$ , but  $q \mid x + y$  for all  $x, y \in B \setminus \{b\}$ . In particular, we can assume (by symmetry) that  $b \in X$ . Then, we have  $Y = \{0, b\}$ ; otherwise,  $b + y \in B$  for some  $y \in A$ , which is, however, impossible, because  $q \mid y$ , and hence  $q \nmid b + y$ , yet  $b + y \neq b$  and  $b$  is the unique element in  $B$  which is not divisible by  $q$ . So we can apply the same argument to  $X$  and conclude that  $X = \{0, b\}$ . Thus  $B = \{0, b, 2b\}$ , and we are done. ■

In particular, we can immediately use Proposition 4.3 to determine the set of lengths of an interval of the form  $\llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ , which is one of the main ingredients in the proof of Theorem 4.10.

**Proposition 4.5.**  $L(\llbracket 0, n \rrbracket) = \llbracket 2, n \rrbracket$  for every  $n \geq 2$ .

*Proof.* As was noted before,  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is a reduced BF-monoid. So the claim is trivial if  $n = 2$ , since if  $\llbracket 0, 2 \rrbracket = X + Y$  for some  $X, Y \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}) \setminus \{\{0\}\}$ , then it is clear that  $X = Y = \llbracket 0, 1 \rrbracket$ .

Accordingly, suppose the claim is true for a fixed  $n \geq 2$ , and observe that  $\llbracket 0, n + 1 \rrbracket = \llbracket 0, 1 \rrbracket + \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ . Since  $L(X) + L(Y) \subseteq L(X + Y)$  for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ , it follows that

$$L(\llbracket 0, n + 1 \rrbracket) \supseteq 1 + L(\llbracket 0, n \rrbracket) = \llbracket 3, n + 1 \rrbracket. \quad (9)$$

On the other hand, let  $A := \{k \in \llbracket 2, n \rrbracket : k \equiv n \pmod{2}\}$ , and set  $B := \{0, 2\}$  if  $n = 2$  and  $B := \{0, 1\} \cup A$  otherwise. Then  $B$  is an atom by Propositions 3.5 and 4.3 (apply the latter with  $d = 2$  and  $\ell = q = 1$ ), and we have  $\llbracket 0, n + 1 \rrbracket = \{0, 1\} + B$ , which implies, together with (9), that  $\llbracket 2, n + 1 \rrbracket \subseteq L(\llbracket 0, n + 1 \rrbracket)$ .

We are left to show that  $\max L(\llbracket 0, n+1 \rrbracket) \leq n+1$ , which is simple, since if  $\llbracket 0, n+1 \rrbracket = X_1 + \cdots + X_k$  for some  $X_1, \dots, X_k \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}) \setminus \{\{0\}\}$ , then  $n+1 = \max X_1 + \cdots + \max X_k \geq k$ .  $\blacksquare$

As for the rest, we will need a series of lemmas, the second of which (Lemma 4.7) is actually the key result of the paper.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell, \beta_\ell \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $u_1, \dots, u_\ell \in \mathbf{N}^+$  be such that  $\alpha_i, \beta_i \leq 1$  and  $u_1 + \cdots + u_i < u_{i+1}$  for  $i \in \llbracket 1, \ell-1 \rrbracket$ . Then  $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \alpha_i u_i = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \beta_i u_i$  if and only if  $\alpha_i = \beta_i$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$ .*

*Proof.* The ‘‘if’’ part is obvious. As for the other, assume  $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \alpha_i u_i = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \beta_i u_i$ , set  $E := \{i \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket : \alpha_i \neq \beta_i\}$ , and suppose for a contradiction that  $E \neq \emptyset$ . Accordingly, let  $i_0 := \max E$ . By symmetry, we can admit that  $\alpha_{i_0} < \beta_{i_0}$ . Then  $\alpha_i = \beta_i$  for  $i \in \llbracket i_0+1, \ell \rrbracket$ , and we have  $\sum_{i=1}^{i_0} \alpha_i u_i = \sum_{i=1}^{i_0} \beta_i u_i$ . This is, however, impossible, since our assumptions imply that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i_0} \alpha_i u_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} u_i + (\beta_{i_0} - 1)u_{i_0} < \beta_{i_0} u_{i_0} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{i_0} \beta_i u_i. \quad \blacksquare$$

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $u_1, \dots, u_{n+1} \in \mathbf{N}^+$  be given so that (a)  $u_1 + \cdots + u_n \leq u_{n+1} - u_n$ , (b)  $2u_n \neq u_{n+1}$ , and (c)  $u_1 + \cdots + u_i < \frac{1}{2}u_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ . Next, let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  such that*

$$\{0, u_1\} + \cdots + \{0, u_{n+1}\} = X + Y, \quad (10)$$

and set  $I_X := \{i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket : u_i \in X\}$  and  $I_Y := \{i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket : u_i \in Y\}$ . The following hold:

- (i)  $\llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket = I_X \uplus I_Y$ .
- (ii)  $X \setminus \sum_{i \in I_X} \{0, u_i\} \subseteq \{u_1 + \cdots + u_n\}$  and  $Y \setminus \sum_{i \in I_Y} \{0, u_i\} \subseteq \{u_1 + \cdots + u_n\}$ .
- (iii) if  $X \neq \sum_{i \in I_X} \{0, u_i\}$  or  $Y \neq \sum_{i \in I_Y} \{0, u_i\}$ , then  $n \geq 2$ ,  $u_1 + \cdots + u_n = u_{n+1} - u_n$ , and one of  $X$  and  $Y$  is equal to  $\{0, u_n\}$ .

*Proof.* To start with, we note for future reference that conditions (a)–(c) yield

$$u_1 + \cdots + u_i < 2u_i < u_{i+1} \quad \text{for all } i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \quad (11)$$

and for the sake of notation we set

$$U := \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \{0, u_i\}, \quad U^* := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \{0, u_i\}, \quad U' := U^* + \{0, u_n\}, \quad \text{and} \quad U'' := U^* + \{0, u_{n+1}\}.$$

In particular, it follows from (11) that

$$U \cap \llbracket u_1 + \cdots + u_i + 1, u_{i+1} - 1 \rrbracket = \emptyset, \quad \text{for all } i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket. \quad (12)$$

To ease the exposition, we break up the remainder of the proof into a series of claims. We will often use without comment later on that  $X, Y \subseteq U$ , as is implied by Lemma 4.2(i).

**CLAIM A.** *If  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  and  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} u_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} u_j + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k$ , then one of the following holds:*

- (A1)  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{J} \uplus \mathcal{K}$ .
- (A2)  $n \in (\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{K}) \setminus \mathcal{I}$ ,  $n+1 \in \mathcal{I} \setminus (\mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{K})$ , and  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} u_j + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k \geq u_{n+1}$ .

*In particular, if  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} u_j \in X$  and  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k \in Y$ , then either of the following occurs:*

- (A3)  $\mathcal{J}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  are disjoint.
- (A4)  $n \in \mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{K}$ ,  $n+1 \notin \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{K}$ , and  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} u_j + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k \geq u_{n+1}$ .



*Proof of Claim A.* Let  $\delta_S$  denote, for a fixed  $S \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ , the map  $\llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$  defined by  $\delta_S(i) := 1$  if  $i \in S$  and  $\delta_S(i) := 0$  otherwise.

Given  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ , set  $x := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} u_j$ ,  $y := \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k$ , and  $z := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} u_i$ , and let  $\alpha_i := \delta_{\mathcal{J}}(i)$ ,  $\beta_i := \delta_{\mathcal{K}}(i)$ , and  $\gamma_i := \delta_{\mathcal{I}}(i)$  for each  $i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ . Then put  $E := \{i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket : \alpha_i + \beta_i \neq \gamma_i\}$ , and assume  $z = x + y$ . We distinguish two cases:

CASE 1:  $E = \emptyset$ . Then  $\delta_{\mathcal{J}}(i) + \delta_{\mathcal{K}}(i) = \delta_{\mathcal{I}}(i)$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ , which is possible if and only if  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{J} \uplus \mathcal{K}$ , as is straightforward to check (in particular, note that  $\alpha_i + \beta_i \geq 2$  for every  $i \in \mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{K}$ ).

CASE 2:  $E \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $i_0 := \max E$ . Since  $\alpha_i + \beta_i = \gamma_i$  for  $i \in \llbracket i_0 + 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i_0} \gamma_i u_i = \sum_{i=1}^{i_0} (\alpha_i + \beta_i) u_i.$$

It is clear that  $\alpha_{i_0} + \beta_{i_0} < \gamma_{i_0}$ ; otherwise, we would get from (11) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i_0} (\alpha_i + \beta_i) u_i \geq (\gamma_{i_0} + 1) u_{i_0} > \gamma_{i_0} u_{i_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} u_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{i_0} \gamma_i u_i$$

a contradiction. So we see that  $i_0 = n+1$ ; otherwise, we would infer from (c) and the above that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i_0} (\alpha_i + \beta_i) u_i \leq (\gamma_{i_0} - 1) u_{i_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} (\alpha_i + \beta_i) u_i \leq (\gamma_{i_0} - 1) u_{i_0} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} u_i < \gamma_{i_0} u_{i_0} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{i_0} \gamma_i u_i,$$

which is still impossible. It follows that  $\gamma_{n+1} = 1$  and  $\alpha_{n+1} = \beta_{n+1} = 0$ , as we have from the above that  $\alpha_{n+1} + \beta_{n+1} < \gamma_{n+1}$ ; in particular,  $x + y \geq u_{n+1}$ . Consequently,  $\gamma_n = 0$  and  $\alpha_n = \beta_n = 1$ , since we get by (11) that  $2u_n < u_{n+1}$  and

$$\gamma_n u_n + u_{n+1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \gamma_i u_i = x + y \leq (\alpha_n + \beta_n) u_n + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i < (\alpha_n + \beta_n + 1) u_n.$$

In other terms, we have that  $n \in (\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{K}) \setminus \mathcal{I}$ ,  $n+1 \in \mathcal{I} \setminus (\mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{K})$ , and  $x + y \geq u_{n+1}$ .

The rest is now obvious, because if  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ , then  $X + Y = U$  implies that  $x + y = \sum_{i \in I} u_i$  for some  $I \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ , so we apply the above with  $\mathcal{I} = I$ .  $\blacksquare$

**CLAIM B.**  $X \cap (U' + u_{n+1}) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $Y \cap (U' + u_{n+1}) = \emptyset$ .

*Proof of Claim B.* At least one of the sets  $X \cap (U' + u_{n+1})$  and  $Y \cap (U' + u_{n+1})$  is empty; otherwise, there would exist  $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  with  $n+1 \in \mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{K}$  such that  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} u_j \in X$  and  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} u_k \in Y$ , in contradiction to Claim A. On the other hand,  $X \cap (U' + u_{n+1}) = Y \cap (U' + u_{n+1}) = \emptyset$  would imply

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} u_i = \max U = \max X + \max Y \leq 2 \max U' = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} u_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i < \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} u_i,$$

which is impossible and completes the proof of the claim.  $\blacksquare$

**CLAIM C.**  $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \subseteq I_X \cup I_Y$  and  $I_X \cap I_Y = \emptyset$ .

*Proof of Claim C.* First,  $2u_1, \dots, 2u_n \notin U$  by (11) and (12), and  $2u_{n+1} \notin U$  by Claim B. So  $I_X \cap I_Y$  is empty; otherwise,  $u_i \in X \cap Y$  for some  $i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ , and hence  $2u_i \in X + Y = U$ , a contradiction.

As for the rest, let  $i_0 \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . Because  $u_{i_0} \in U$ , there are  $J, K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  such that  $x := \sum_{j \in J} u_j \in X$ ,  $y := \sum_{k \in K} u_k \in Y$ , and  $x + y = u_{i_0}$ . But  $u_{i_0} < u_{n+1}$ , so we get by Claim A (applied with  $\mathcal{J} = J$  and

$\mathcal{K} = K$ ) that  $J \uplus K = \{i_0\}$ . Of course, this is possible only if  $J = \{i_0\}$  or  $K = \{i_0\}$ , i.e.,  $u_{i_0} \in X \cup Y$ . So we conclude that  $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \subseteq I_X \cup I_Y$ .  $\blacksquare$

Based on Claim C, we assume from now on that  $u_n \in X$ , which, thanks to the symmetry of (10) and conditions (i)–(iii), does not affect the generality of the subsequent arguments.

**CLAIM D.**  $\llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket = I_X \uplus I_Y$ .

*Proof of Claim D.* In the light of Claims B and C, it is enough to prove that  $n+1 \in I_X \cup I_Y$ . To this end, suppose for a contradiction that  $u_{n+1} \notin X \cup Y$ . We distinguish two cases:

CASE 1:  $Y \cap (U'' + u_n) = \emptyset$ . Since  $u_{n+1} \in X + Y$ , there are  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$  with  $x, y < u_{n+1}$  such that  $x + y = u_{n+1}$ . But the assumption we are making on  $Y$  yields  $Y \subseteq U^* \cup (U^* + u_{n+1})$ . Thus

$$x + y \stackrel{(12)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i + \max U^* = u_n + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i \stackrel{(c)}{<} 2u_n \stackrel{(11)}{<} u_{n+1},$$

which is impossible and completes the analysis of this case.

CASE 2:  $Y \cap (U'' + u_n) \neq \emptyset$ . Because  $u_n + u_{n+1} \in X + Y = U$ , there exist  $J, K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  such that  $x := \sum_{j \in J} u_j \in X$ ,  $y := \sum_{k \in K} u_k \in Y$ , and  $x + y = u_n + u_{n+1}$ , yet  $J, K \neq \{n+1\}$ . In particular, we see that  $n+1 \in J \cup K$ ; otherwise, we would have

$$x + y \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} u_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i \stackrel{(11)}{<} u_n + u_{n+1},$$

a contradiction. So we apply Claim A (with  $I = \{n, n+1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{J} = J$ , and  $\mathcal{K} = K$ ) and have  $\{n, n+1\} = J \uplus K$ .

On the other hand, recalling that  $u_n \in X$  and  $Y \cap (U'' + u_n) \neq \emptyset$ , and taking  $K_0$  to be any subset of  $\llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  with  $n \in K_0$ , we infer from Claim A (now applied once with  $\mathcal{J} = J$  and  $\mathcal{K} = K_0$ , then with  $\mathcal{J} = \{n\}$  and  $\mathcal{K} = K$ ) that neither  $J$  nor  $K$  can be equal to  $\{n, n+1\}$ .

So, to sum it up, we have that  $\{n, n+1\} = J \uplus K$ , but  $J, K \neq \{n, n+1\}$ . This means, in the end, that  $J = \{n+1\}$  or  $K = \{n+1\}$ , and hence  $u_{n+1} \in X \cup Y$ .  $\blacksquare$

**CLAIM E.** Assume that  $Y \cap (U'' + u_n) \neq \emptyset$ . Then the following conditions hold:

- (E1)  $n \geq 2$  and  $Y \cap (U'' + u_n) = \{u_1 + \cdots + u_n\} = \{u_{n+1} - u_n\}$ .
- (E2)  $X = \{0, u_n\}$  and  $I_Y = \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket \setminus \{n\}$ .

*Proof of Claim E.* (E1) Let  $K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  such that  $n \in K$  and  $y := \sum_{k \in K} u_k \in Y$ . We get from Claim A (applied with  $\mathcal{J} = \{n\}$  and  $\mathcal{K} = K$ ) that  $K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$  and  $u_n + y \geq u_{n+1}$  (recall that we are assuming  $u_n \in X$ ). So it follows from condition (a) that  $u_n + y = u_{n+1}$ , which is possible only if  $n \geq 2$  (recall that  $2u_n \neq u_{n+1}$  by (11)) and  $K = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ , i.e.  $y = u_1 + \cdots + u_n$ .

(E2) Assume  $x := \sum_{j \in J} u_j \in X$  for some non-empty  $J \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ . Then we get from Claim A (now applied with  $\mathcal{J} = J$  and  $\mathcal{K} = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ ) that either  $J \cap \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket = \emptyset$ , or  $J \subseteq \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$  and  $n \in J$ . In particular,  $\max X \leq u_{n+1}$ , and hence  $X \setminus \{u_{n+1}\} \subseteq U'$ , because  $J \cap \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket = \emptyset$  if and only if  $J = \{n+1\}$ .

Suppose for a contradiction that  $u_{n+1} \in X$ . Then  $Y \cap (U' + u_{n+1}) = \emptyset$  by Claim B, and we conclude from point (E1) that  $Y \setminus \{u_1 + \dots + u_n\} \subseteq U^*$ . On the other hand, it is seen that

$$\max(U' + Y) = 2(u_1 + \dots + u_n) \stackrel{\text{(E1)}}{=} u_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i = \max(X + U^*) \stackrel{\text{(11)}}{<} u_{n+1} + u_n < u_1 + \dots + u_{n+1},$$

where for the last inequality we have used that  $n \geq 2$  (again by point (E1)). Thus  $u_n + u_{n+1} \notin X + Y$ , which is, however, impossible, because  $u_n + u_{n+1} \in U = X + Y$ .

So, putting it all together, we have proved that  $J$  cannot be equal to  $\{n+1\}$ , which implies, by the above considerations, that  $J \subseteq \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$  and  $n \in J$ . In particular, taking  $J$  to be a one-element subset of  $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$  and recalling that  $u_n \in X$  show that  $I_X = \{n\}$ , and hence  $I_Y = \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket \setminus \{n\}$  by Claim D. ■

**CLAIM F.** *Let  $J, K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  such that  $\sum_{j \in J} u_j \in X$  and  $\sum_{k \in K} u_k \in Y$ . Then one (and only one) of the following two cases occurs:*

$$\text{(F1)} \quad J \cap K = \emptyset, J \subseteq I_X, \text{ and } K \subseteq I_Y.$$

$$\text{(F2)} \quad J \subseteq I_X = \{n\}, K = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \text{ and conditions (E1) and (E2) of Claim E are satisfied.}$$

*Proof of Claim F.* Set  $x := \sum_{j \in J} u_j$  and  $y := \sum_{k \in K} u_k$ . We distinguish two cases:

CASE 1:  $K \subseteq I_Y$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $J \cap K \neq \emptyset$ . Then we have by Claim A (applied with  $\mathcal{J} = J$  and  $\mathcal{K} = K$ ) that  $n \in J \cap K$ . It follows that  $Y \cap (U^* + u_n) \neq \emptyset$ . So we obtain from Claim E that  $X = \{0, u_n\}$ ,  $I_Y = \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket \setminus \{n\}$ , and  $y = u_1 + \dots + u_n$ . This is, however, impossible, because it implies by Lemma 4.6 that  $K = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \not\subseteq I_Y$ .

We want to prove that  $J \cap I_Y = \emptyset$ ; this will give that  $J \subseteq I_X$  (and finish the analysis of the present case), since  $J \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket \setminus I_Y$  by the above and  $I_X \uplus I_Y = \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  by Claim D. Indeed, assume that  $J \cap I_Y \neq \emptyset$ . Accordingly, let  $i_0 \in J \cap I_Y$ . Then we infer from Claim A (now applied with  $\mathcal{J} = J$  and  $\mathcal{K} = \{i_0\}$ ) that  $i_0 = n$ , and hence  $u_n \in Y$ , in contradiction to Claim E.

CASE 2:  $K \not\subseteq I_Y$ . Because  $K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  and  $I_X \uplus I_Y = \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  by Claim D, we have  $I_X \cap K \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $i_0 \in I_X \cap K$ . Then Claim A (applied with  $\mathcal{J} = \{i_0\}$  and  $\mathcal{K} = K$ ) yields  $i_0 = n$ , and this implies by Claim E that  $X = \{0, u_n\}$  and  $Y \cap (U^* + u_n) = \{u_1 + \dots + u_n\}$ . So  $J \subseteq I_X = \{n\}$  and  $y = u_1 + \dots + u_n$ , and by (11) and Lemma 4.6 this is possible only if  $K = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . ■

**CLAIM G.** *Given  $I \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$ , there exist  $J, K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  for which  $\sum_{j \in J} u_j \in X$ ,  $\sum_{k \in K} u_k \in Y$ , and  $\sum_{i \in I} u_i = \sum_{j \in J} u_j + \sum_{k \in K} u_k$ . Moreover, one (and only one) of the following holds:*

$$\text{(G1)} \quad J \uplus K = I, J \subseteq I_X, \text{ and } K \subseteq I_Y.$$

$$\text{(G2)} \quad J \subseteq I_X = \{n\} \text{ and } K = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket.$$

*Proof of Claim G.* Set  $z := \sum_{i \in I} u_i$ . Then  $z \in X + Y = U$ , and hence there exist  $J, K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  such that  $x := \sum_{j \in J} u_j \in X$ ,  $y := \sum_{k \in K} u_k \in Y$ , and  $z = x + y$ . If  $K \subseteq I_Y$ , then  $J \cap K = \emptyset$  and  $J \subseteq I_X$  by point (F1) of Claim F, and hence  $J \uplus K = I$  by point (A1) of Claim A (applied with  $\mathcal{I} = I$ ,  $\mathcal{J} = J$ , and  $\mathcal{K} = K$ ). Otherwise, Claim F yields  $J \subseteq I_X = \{n\}$  and  $K = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . ■

**CLAIM H.**  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_X} u_i \in X$  for every  $\mathcal{I}_X \subseteq I_X$ , and  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_Y} u_i \in Y$  for every  $\mathcal{I}_Y \subseteq I_Y$ .

*Proof of Claim H.* We just prove the statement relative to  $X$ , as the other is similar. For this, let  $I \subseteq I_X$ , and set  $z := \sum_{i \in I} u_i$ . The claim is obvious if  $|I| \leq 1$  (by the very definition of  $I_X$ ), so assume  $|I| \geq 2$ .

Since  $z \in U = X + Y$ , there exist  $J, K \subseteq \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket$  such that  $x := \sum_{j \in J} u_j \in X$ ,  $y := \sum_{k \in K} u_k \in Y$ , and  $z = x + y$ . Because  $|I_X| \geq |I| \geq 2$ , we thus obtain from Claim **G** that  $J \uplus K = I$  and  $K \subseteq I_Y$ . But this is possible only if  $K = \emptyset$ , because  $I_X \cap I_Y = \emptyset$  by Claim **D** and  $K \subseteq I \subseteq I_X$ . So  $I = J$ , and hence  $z = x \in X$ .  $\blacksquare$

At long last, we are ready to finish the proof of the lemma. In fact, we get from Claim **G** that

$$X \subseteq \sum_{i \in I_X} \{0, u_i\} \quad \text{and} \quad Y \setminus \{u_1 + \cdots + u_n\} \subseteq \sum_{i \in I_Y} \{0, u_i\},$$

and from Claim **H** that

$$\sum_{i \in I_X} \{0, u_i\} \subseteq X \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in I_Y} \{0, u_i\} \subseteq Y \setminus \{u_1 + \cdots + u_n\}.$$

This proves point **(ii)**, while points **(i)** and **(iii)** follow from Claims **D** and **E** (recall that we are assuming without loss of generality that  $u_n \in X$ ).  $\blacksquare$

For the next lemma (and the subsequent proposition), we say that a finite sequence  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n$  is the *natural enumeration* of a non-empty set  $L \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$  if  $L = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n\}$  and  $\ell_i < \ell_{i+1}$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $u_1, \dots, u_\ell \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that  $u_1 + \cdots + u_i < \frac{1}{2}u_{i+1}$  for  $i \in \llbracket 1, \ell-2 \rrbracket$  and  $u_1 + \cdots + u_{\ell-1} < u_\ell - u_{\ell-1}$  if  $\ell \geq 2$ . Then  $\mathbf{Z}(\{0, u_1\} + \cdots + \{0, u_\ell\}) = \{\{0, u_1\} * \cdots * \{0, u_\ell\}\}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\ell = 1$ , the conclusion is trivial by Proposition 3.5. So let  $\ell \geq 2$  and assume that the following condition (herein used as an inductive hypothesis) is satisfied:

- If  $t \in \llbracket 1, \ell-1 \rrbracket$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in \mathbf{N}^+$  are such that  $v_1 + \cdots + v_i < \frac{1}{2}v_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, t-2 \rrbracket$  and  $v_1 + \cdots + v_{t-1} < v_t - v_{t-1}$  if  $t \geq 2$ , then  $\mathbf{Z}(\{0, v_1\} + \cdots + \{0, v_t\}) = \{\{0, v_1\} * \cdots * \{0, v_t\}\}$ .

Next, suppose that  $U := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \{0, u_i\} = X + Y$  for some non-unit  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ , and set

$$I_X := \{i \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket : u_i \in X\} \quad \text{and} \quad I_Y := \{i \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket : u_i \in Y\}.$$

By Lemma 4.7 (applied with  $n = \ell - 1$ ), we see that

$$X = \sum_{i \in I_X} \{0, u_i\}, \quad Y = \sum_{i \in I_Y} \{0, u_i\}, \quad \text{and} \quad I_X \uplus I_Y = \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket.$$

So, in particular,  $\emptyset \neq I_X, I_Y \subsetneq \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$ , because  $X$  and  $Y$  are both different from  $\{0\}$ .

Put  $m := |I_X|$ , and let  $i_1, \dots, i_m$  be the natural enumeration of  $I_X$ . Since  $u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_m}$  is a subsequence of  $u_1, \dots, u_\ell$ , we have  $u_{i_1} + \cdots + u_{i_k} < \frac{1}{2}u_{i_{k+1}}$  for all  $k \in \llbracket 1, m-2 \rrbracket$  and  $u_{i_1} + \cdots + u_{i_{m-1}} < u_{i_m} - u_{i_{m-1}}$  for  $m \geq 2$ . Hence, we get from the inductive hypothesis that  $\mathbf{Z}(X) = \{\{0, u_{i_1}\} * \cdots * \{0, u_{i_m}\}\}$ .

In a similar way, if  $n := |I_Y|$  and  $j_1, \dots, j_n$  is the natural enumeration of  $I_Y$ , then  $\mathbf{Z}(Y) = \{\{0, u_{j_1}\} * \cdots * \{0, u_{j_n}\}\}$ , and putting it all together, we conclude by Lemma 2.21(iii) that  $\mathbf{Z}(U) = \{\{0, u_1\} * \cdots * \{0, u_\ell\}\}$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $r \in \mathbf{N}_{\geq 2}$ , and let  $v_1, \dots, v_{r+1} \in \mathbf{N}^+$  such that (a)  $v_1 \equiv \cdots \equiv v_{r-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  and  $v_r \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , (b)  $v_1 + \cdots + v_r = v_{r+1} - v_r$ , and (c)  $v_1 + \cdots + v_i < \frac{1}{2}v_{i+1}$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, r-1 \rrbracket$ . Set*

$$V := \{0, v_1\} + \cdots + \{0, v_{r+1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad A' := \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} v_i : I \subseteq \llbracket 1, r+1 \rrbracket \setminus \{r\} \right\}.$$

*Then the following hold:*

- (i)  $A'' := \{v_1 + \cdots + v_r\} \cup A' \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$  and  $A'' \neq \{0, v_i\}$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, r+1 \rrbracket$ .
- (ii)  $Z(V) = \{\{0, v_r\} * A'', \{0, v_1\} * \cdots * \{0, v_{r+1}\}\}$ .

In particular,  $L(V) = \{2, r+1\}$ ,  $\Delta(V) = \{r-1\}$ , and  $c(V) = \{r\}$ .

*Proof.* Set  $v := v_1 + \cdots + v_r$  for ease of notation. The ‘‘In particular’’ part of the statement is a straightforward consequence of point (ii), so we will just focus on the latter and point (i).

(i) By conditions (a) and (b),  $A'$  is a subset of  $2 \cdot \mathbf{N}$  and  $v$  is an odd integer (in particular, note that  $v_{r+1}$  is even). Since  $0 \in A'$  and  $|A'| \geq r+1 \geq 3$ , it follows by Proposition 4.4 (applied with  $A = A'$ ,  $q = 2$ , and  $b = v$ ) that  $A''$  is an atom of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ . The rest is trivial, because  $|A''| \geq |A'| \geq 3$ .

(ii) Observe that  $V \notin \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$  and recall that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is a reduced BF-monoid. Accordingly, let  $V = X + Y$  for some non-unit  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ , and set  $\mathcal{Z}(X, Y) := \{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b} : (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{Z}(X) \times \mathcal{Z}(Y)\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})))$ ,  $I_X := \{i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket : v_i \in X\}$ , and  $I_Y := \{i \in \llbracket 1, n+1 \rrbracket : v_i \in Y\}$ . By Lemma 4.7 (applied with  $n = r$  and  $u_1 = v_1, \dots, u_{n+1} = v_{r+1}$ ), we have  $I_X \uplus I_Y = \llbracket 1, r+1 \rrbracket$ , and there are two cases:

CASE 1:  $X = \sum_{i \in I_X} \{0, v_i\}$  and  $Y = \sum_{i \in I_Y} \{0, v_i\}$ . Let  $i_1, \dots, i_h$  be the natural enumeration of  $I_X$  and  $j_1, \dots, j_k$  the natural enumeration of  $I_Y$ , where  $h := |I_X|$  and  $k := |I_Y|$  (it is clear that  $h, k \in \mathbf{N}^+$ , because  $X, Y \neq \{0\}$ ). Since  $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_h}$  is a *proper* subsequence of  $v_1, \dots, v_{r+1}$ , it holds  $v_{i_1} + \cdots + v_{i_s} < \frac{1}{2}v_{i_{s+1}}$  for all  $s \in \llbracket 1, h-2 \rrbracket$  and  $v_{i_1} + \cdots + v_{i_{h-1}} < v_{i_h} - v_{i_{h-1}}$  for  $h \geq 2$ . Hence, we get from Lemma 4.8 (applied with  $\ell = h$  and  $u_1 = v_{i_1}, \dots, u_\ell = v_{i_h}$ ) that  $\mathcal{Z}(X) = \{\{0, v_{i_1}\} * \cdots * \{0, v_{i_h}\}\}$ . On the other hand, the very same argument also shows that  $\mathcal{Z}(Y) = \{\{0, v_{j_1}\} * \cdots * \{0, v_{j_k}\}\}$ . So using that  $\{i_1, \dots, i_h\}$  and  $\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$  form a partition of  $\llbracket 1, r+1 \rrbracket$ , we conclude that  $\mathcal{Z}(X, Y) = \{\{0, v_1\} * \cdots * \{0, v_{r+1}\}\}$ .

CASE 2:  $X = \{0, v_r\}$  and  $Y = A''$  (up to swapping  $X$  and  $Y$ ). By Proposition 3.5 and point (i), both  $X$  and  $Y$  are atoms, hence  $\mathcal{Z}(X, Y) = \{\{0, v_r\} * A''\}$ .

Now, in view of Lemma 2.21(iii), we infer from the above analysis that  $Z(V) = \{\{0, v_r\} * A'', \{0, v_1\} * \cdots * \{0, v_{r+1}\}\}$ . So the proof of point (ii) (and of the whole proposition) is complete.  $\blacksquare$

At long last, we have all the ingredients we need to furnish a proof of the following:

**Theorem 4.10.** *Let  $H$  be a Dedekind-finite, non-torsion monoid. We have that:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)) = \mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)) = \mathcal{U}_k(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})) = \mathbf{N}_{\geq 2}$  for every  $k \geq 2$ .
- (iii)  $\Delta(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)) = \Delta(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)) = \Delta(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})) = \mathbf{N}^+$ .
- (iv)  $\text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)) \supseteq \text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)) \supseteq \text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})) = \mathbf{N}^+$ .

In particular, if  $H$  is a linearly orderable BF-monoid, then the inclusions of point (iv) are equalities.

*Proof.* (i) follows by Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 3.2(iii), while (ii) is implied by point (i) and Proposition 4.5, and (iii) by point (i) and Proposition 4.9. As for (iv), we need some more work.

To start with, we get from Proposition 4.9 that  $\mathbf{N}_{\geq 2} \subseteq \text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$ , and clearly  $\text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})) \subseteq \mathbf{N}^+$ , since  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is a BF-monoid. This yields  $\text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})) = \mathbf{N}^+$ , as it is easy to check that

$$Z(\llbracket 0, 6 \rrbracket \setminus \{4\}) = \{\{0, 1\} + \{0, 2, 5\}, \{0, 1\} + \{0, 1, 2, 5\}\}. \quad (13)$$

On the other hand, Proposition 3.2(iii) implies that  $\text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)) \subseteq \text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H))$ . So we are left to show that  $\text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})) \subseteq \text{Ca}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H))$ , as the ‘‘In particular’’ part of the statement is just a consequence of point (iv) and Proposition 3.3.

Indeed, pick  $r \in \mathbf{N}^+$  and let  $\Phi$  be the same monomorphism of Theorem 4.1. We set  $V_r := \llbracket 0, 6 \rrbracket \setminus \{4\}$  if  $r = 1$ , and  $V_r := \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \{0, v_i\}$  otherwise, where  $v_1, \dots, v_{r+1}$  are positive integers satisfying conditions (a)-(c) of Proposition 4.9. Moreover, we put  $c_r := c_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})}(V_r)$  and  $c'_r := c_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})}(\Phi(V_r))$ .

We have by (13) and Proposition 4.9 that there are  $A_0, \dots, A_{r+1} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$  such that  $|A_i| \neq |A_0|$  for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, r+1 \rrbracket$  and  $Z_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})}(V_r) = \{A_0 * A_1, A_1 * \dots * A_{r+1}\}$ . (Recall that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is a reduced, commutative BF-monoid). So it is evident that  $c_r = r$ .

On the other hand, we know from Theorem 4.1 that  $\Phi$  is actually an equimorphism. Therefore, we get from Proposition 2.18(iv) that  $c'_r \leq r$ . In addition,  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})}(\Phi(V_r)) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_r \cup \mathcal{L}'_r$ , where

$$\mathcal{L}_r := \{B * C : B \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})} \Phi(A_0) \text{ and } C \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})} \Phi(A_1)\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})))$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}'_r := \{B_1 * \dots * B_{r+1} : B_1 \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})} \Phi(A_1), \dots, B_{r+1} \simeq_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})} \Phi(A_{r+1})\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H}))).$$

Now observe that, if  $\mathbf{a} = B * C \in \mathcal{L}_r$  and  $\mathbf{b} = B_1 * \dots * B_{r+1} \in \mathcal{L}'_r$ , then  $\mathbf{a} \wedge_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})} \mathbf{b} \geq r$ , since we infer from the injectivity of  $\Phi$  and Proposition 3.2(ii) that  $|B_i| = |\Phi(A_i)| = |A_i| \neq |B|$  for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, r+1 \rrbracket$ ; in particular,  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \notin \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})}$ . It follows that  $Z_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})}(\Phi(V_r)) = \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}\}$ , where

$$\mathcal{A} := \llbracket \Phi(A_0) * \Phi(A_1) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_r \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B} := \llbracket \Phi(A_1) * \dots * \Phi(A_{r+1}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}'_r.$$

So, putting it all together, we obtain from Lemma 2.8 that

$$c'_r = (\Phi(A_0) * \Phi(A_1)) \wedge_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})} (\Phi(A_1) * \dots * \Phi(A_{r+1})) \geq \inf_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{L}_r, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}'_r} (\mathbf{a} \wedge_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(\mathbf{H})} \mathbf{b}) \geq r,$$

and hence  $c'_r = c_r = r$ , which is enough to conclude.  $\blacksquare$

We close the section by proving that there is no chance that the kind of arithmetic results summarized in Theorem 4.10 can be also obtained by appealing to “standard transfer techniques”.

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $H$  be a Dedekind-finite, non-torsion monoid. Then neither  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  nor  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is equimorphic to a cancellative monoid (in particular, neither is a transfer Krull monoid).*

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.9 (applied with  $r = 2$ ), there are  $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N}))$  such that  $A + B = A + C + D$ . If  $\Phi$  is the equimorphism of Theorem 4.1, then the sets  $A' := \Phi(A)$ ,  $B' := \Phi(B)$ ,  $C' := \Phi(C)$ , and  $D' := \Phi(D)$  are atoms of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$ , and in addition  $A'B' = A'C'D'$ .

Now, suppose for a contradiction that there exists an equimorphism  $\varphi : \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H) \rightarrow K$  (respectively,  $\varphi : \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H) \rightarrow K$ ) for which  $K$  is a cancellative monoid. It follows that  $\varphi(A')\varphi(B') = \varphi(A')\varphi(C')\varphi(D')$ , which yields  $\varphi(B') = \varphi(C')\varphi(D')$  by the cancellativity of  $K$ . But we know from Proposition 3.2(iii) that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  is a divisor-closed submonoid of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$ , and this implies, by Proposition 2.17, that  $B', C', D' \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H))$ . So, using that  $\varphi$  is atom-preserving, we conclude that  $\varphi(B'), \varphi(C'), \varphi(D') \in \mathcal{A}(K)$ , which is in contradiction to the fact that  $\varphi(B') = \varphi(C')\varphi(D')$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5. PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

We conjecture that, if  $H$  is a Dedekind-finite, non-torsion monoid, then the systems of sets of lengths of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},1}(H)$  contain  $\{\{0\}, \{1\}\} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbf{N}_{\geq 2})$ .

By Theorem 4.1 and points (iii) and (iv) of Proposition 3.3, it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})) = \{\{0\}, \{1\}\} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbf{N}_{\geq 2})$ , which, however, looks quite challenging, when considering what it took to demonstrate that every interval of the form  $\llbracket 2, n \rrbracket$  with  $n \geq 2$  (Proposition 4.5), every one-element subset of  $\mathbf{N}$  (Lemma 4.8), and every two-element set  $L \subseteq \mathbf{N}_{\geq 2}$  with  $2 \in L$  (Proposition 4.9) can be realized as the set of lengths of some  $X \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$ .

Analogous conclusions are known for cancellative, commutative monoids. In particular, it was proved by Kainrath, see [28, Theorem 1], that  $\{\{0\}, \{1\}\} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbf{N}_{\geq 2})$  is the system of sets of lengths of any commutative transfer Krull monoid over an infinite abelian group, and Frisch established, see [13, Theorem 9], that the same is true for the monoid (under multiplication) of non-zero integer-valued polynomials with rational coefficients (we have already mentioned Kainrath's and Frisch's work in the introduction, though in a different context). Yet, it is unlikely that a combination of these results and transfer techniques can be used to settle the above conjecture, since we have by Proposition 4.11 that  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin},0}(\mathbf{N})$  is not equimorphic to a cancellative monoid.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are indebted to Alfred Geroldinger for invaluable comments and enlightening conversations, to Daniel Smertnig for useful discussions and his help with a campaign of numerical experiments that have eventually led to the formulation of Lemma 4.7, and to Benjamin Steinberg for answering a question related to Lemma 2.1(i) on MathOverflow (see <http://mathoverflow.net/questions/261850/>).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] N. Alon, A. Granville, and A. Ubis, *The number of sumsets in a finite field*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **42** (2010), No. 5, 784–794.
- [2] N.R. Baeth and D. Smertnig, *Factorization theory: From commutative to noncommutative settings*, J. Algebra **441** (2015), 475–551.
- [3] S. Chapman, M. Fontana, A. Geroldinger, and B. Olberding (eds.), *Multiplicative Ideal Theory and Factorization Theory: Commutative and Non-Commutative Perspectives*, Springer Proc. Math. Stat. **170**, Springer, 2016.
- [4] S.T. Chapman, P.A. García-Sánchez, D. Llena, V. Ponomarenko, and J.C. Rosales, *The catenary and tame degree in finitely generated commutative cancellative monoids*, Manuscripta Math. **120** (2006), No. 3, 253–264.
- [5] S.T. Chapman, F. Gotti, and R. Pelayo, *On delta sets and their realizable subsets in Krull monoids with cyclic class groups*, Colloq. Math. **137** (2014), No. 1, 137–146.
- [6] S. Chun and D.D. Anderson, *Irreducible elements in commutative rings with zero-divisors, II*, Houston J. Math. **39** (2013), No. 3, 741–752.
- [7] P.M. Cohn, *Basic Algebra: Groups, Rings and Fields*, Springer, 2005 (2nd printing).
- [8] C. Faith, *Dedekind Finite Rings and a Theorem of Kaplansky*, Comm. Algebra **31** (2003), No. 9, 4175–4178.
- [9] Y. Fan and A. Geroldinger, *Minimal relations and catenary degrees in Krull monoids*, to appear in J. Commut. Algebra ([arXiv:1603.06356](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.06356)).
- [10] Y. Fan, A. Geroldinger, F. Kainrath, and S. Tringali, *Arithmetic of commutative semigroups with a focus on semigroups of ideals and modules*, J. Algebra Appl. **16** (2017), No. 11, 42 pages.
- [11] G.A. Freiman, M. Herzog, P. Longobardi, M. Maj, A. Plagne, D.J.S. Robinson, and Y.V. Stanchescu, *On the structure of subsets of an orderable group with some small doubling properties*, J. Algebra **445** (2016), 307–326.
- [12] G.A. Freiman, M. Herzog, P. Longobardi, M. Maj, and Y.V. Stanchescu, *A small doubling structure theorem in a Baumslag–Solitar group*, European J. Combin. **44**, Part A (2015), 106–124.
- [13] S. Frisch, *A construction of integer-valued polynomials with prescribed sets of lengths of factorizations*, Monatsh. Math. **171** (2013), Nos. 3–4, 341–350.

- 
- [14] J.I. García-García, M.A. Moreno-Frías, and A. Vigneron-Tenorio, *Computation of delta sets of numerical monoids*, *Monatsh. Math.* **178** (2015), No. 3, 457–472.
- [15] A. Geroldinger, *Sets of lengths*, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **123** (2016), No. 10, 960–988.
- [16] ———, *Non-commutative Krull monoids: A divisor theoretic approach and their arithmetic*, *Osaka J. Math.* **50** (2013), No. 2, 503–539.
- [17] ———, “Additive Group Theory and Non-unique Factorizations”, pp. 1–86 in: A. Geroldinger and I.Z. Ruzsa (eds.), *Combinatorial Number Theory and Additive Group Theory*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2009.
- [18] A. Geroldinger and F. Halter-Koch, *Non-Unique Factorizations. Algebraic, Combinatorial and Analytic Theory*, *Pure Appl. Math.* **278**, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (FL), 2006.
- [19] A. Geroldinger and W. Schmid, *A realization theorem for sets of distances*, *J. Algebra* **481** (2017), 188–198.
- [20] A. Geroldinger and E.D. Schwab, *Sets of lengths in atomic unit-cancellative finitely presented monoids*, preprint.
- [21] A. Geroldinger and P. Yuan, *The set of distances in Krull monoids*, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **44** (2012), No. 6, 1203–1208.
- [22] A. Geroldinger and Q. Zhong, *The set of distances in seminormal weakly Krull monoids*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **220** (2016), No. 11, 3713–3732.
- [23] D.J. Gryniewicz, *Structural Additive Theory*, *Dev. Math.* **30**, Springer, 2013.
- [24] K. Gyarmati and A. Sárközy, *On Reducible and Primitive Subsets of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , II*, *Q. J. Math.* (2015), hav032.
- [25] F. Halter-Koch, “Finitely Generated Monoids, Finitely Primary Monoids, and Factorization Properties of Integral Domains”, pp. 31–72 in D.D. Anderson (ed.), *Factorization in Integral Domains*, *Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math.* **189**, Dekker, New York, 1997.
- [26] W. Hassler, *Factorization properties of Krull monoids with infinite class group*, *Colloq. Math.* **92** (2002), No. 2, 229–242.
- [27] K. Iwasawa, *On linearly ordered groups*, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **1** (1948), No. 1, 1–9.
- [28] F. Kainrath, *Factorization in Krull monoids with infinite class group*, *Colloq. Math.* **80** (1999), No. 1, 23–30.
- [29] T.Y. Lam, *Exercises in Classical Ring Theory*, *Problem Books in Math.*, Springer, New York, 2003 (2nd edition).
- [30] F.W. Levi, *Arithmetische Gesetze im Gebiete diskreter Gruppen*, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* **35** (1913), 225–236.
- [31] A.I. Mal’tsev, *On ordered groups*, *Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR Ser. Mat.* **13** (1949), No. 6, 473–482.
- [32] M.B. Nathanson, *Additive Number Theory: The Classical Bases*, *Grad. Texts in Math.* **164**, Springer, New York, 1996.
- [33] ———, *Additive Number Theory: Inverse Problems and the Geometry of Sumsets*, *Grad. Texts in Math.* **165**, Springer, New York, 1996.
- [34] B.H. Neumann, *On ordered groups*, *Amer. J. Math.* **71** (1949), 1–18.
- [35] C. O’Neill, V. Ponomarenko, R. Tate, and G. Webb, *On the set of catenary degrees of finitely generated cancellative commutative monoids*, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **26** (2016), No. 3, 565–576.
- [36] A. Plagne and S. Tringali, *Sums of dilates in ordered groups*, *Comm. Algebra* **44** (2016), No. 12, 5223–5236.
- [37] D. Rolfsen and J. Zhu, *Braids, orderings and zero divisors*, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* **7** (1998), No. 6, 837–841.
- [38] I.Z. Ruzsa, “Sumsets and Structure”, pp. 88–210 in: A. Geroldinger and I.Z. Ruzsa (eds.), *Combinatorial Number Theory and Additive Group Theory*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2009.
- [39] A. Sárközy, *On additive decompositions of the set of quadratic residues modulo  $p$* , *Acta Arith.* **155** (2012), No. 1, 41–51.
- [40] D. Smertnig, “Factorizations of Elements in Noncommutative Rings: A survey”, pp. 353–402 in [3].
- [41] ———, *Sets of lengths in maximal orders in central simple algebras*, *J. Algebra* **390** (2013), 1–43.
- [42] T. Tao and V.H. Vu, *Additive Combinatorics*, *Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math.* **105**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [43] S. Tringali, *Small doubling in ordered semigroups*, *Semigroup Forum* **90** (2015), No. 1, 135–148.



MATHEMATICAL COLLEGE, CHINA UNIVERSITY OF GEOSCIENCES | HAIKIAN DISTRICT, BEIJING, CHINA

*E-mail address:* `fys@cugb.edu.cn`

*URL:* `http://yushuang-fan.weebly.com/`

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, UNIVERSITY OF GRAZ, NAWI GRAZ | HEINRICHSTR. 36,  
8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA

*E-mail address:* `salvatore.tringali@uni-graz.at`

*URL:* `http://imsc.uni-graz.at/tringali`