

# BOUNDING THE FREE SPECTRUM OF NILPOTENT ALGEBRAS OF PRIME POWER ORDER

ERHARD AICHINGER

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a finite nilpotent algebra in a congruence modular variety with finitely many fundamental operations. If  $\mathbf{A}$  is of prime power order, then it is known that there is a polynomial  $p$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $n$ -generated algebra in the variety generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  has at most  $2^{p(n)}$  elements. We present a bound on the degree of this polynomial.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The binary commutator operation defined by [Smi76] and studied in [FM87, MMT87] has allowed to generalize concepts from group theory, such as solvability or nilpotency, from groups to arbitrary universal algebras. For an algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  in a congruence modular variety, its *lower central series* is a series of its congruence relations, and it is defined by  $\lambda_1 := 1_A$  and  $\lambda_{k+1} := [1_A, \lambda_k]$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  denotes the *term condition commutator* defined in [FM87, MMT87]. If  $\lambda_{k+1} = 0_A$ , then  $\mathbf{A}$  is called *k-nilpotent*. From [Hig67], we know that for a  $k$ -nilpotent group  $\mathbf{G}$ , there is a polynomial  $p$  of degree  $k$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , all  $n$ -generated groups in the variety generated by  $\mathbf{G}$  are of size at most  $2^{p(n)}$ . This property can be investigated for arbitrary algebraic structures, and we say that a finite algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  has *small free spectrum* if there is a polynomial  $p$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , every  $n$ -generated algebra in the variety generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  is of size at most  $2^{p(n)}$ . Straightforward generalizations of the group theoretic results fail: In [VL83, p. 308, Example 2] Vaughan-Lee constructed a nilpotent loop of size 12, and [AM07, p. 283] exhibits a nilpotent expansion of the six element abelian group with one unary operation, which both fail to have small free spectrum. However, in a congruence modular variety, the following result is known:

**Theorem 1.1** ([BB87, Theorem 2]). *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a finite nilpotent algebra of finite type in a congruence modular variety. We assume that  $\mathbf{A}$  is a direct product of algebras of prime power order. Then  $\mathbf{A}$  has small free spectrum.*

---

*Date:* January 24, 2019.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 08A40 (08B20,20N05).

*Key words and phrases.* nilpotent algebra, free spectrum, supernilpotent algebra, congruence modular variety.

Supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF):P29931.

If  $\mathbf{A}$  is a group, this is known from [Hig67]. The proof of the above theorem relies on a generalization of Higman’s combinatorial argument given in [BB87] and on bounding the rank of the commutator terms of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Such a bound was derived in [VL83] and Chapter 14 of [FM87] in the course of proving that an algebra satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 has a finite basis for its equational laws. In other words, the above theorem by Berman and Blok tells that for each algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, there is a polynomial  $p$  such that every  $n$ -generated algebra in the variety generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  has at most  $p(n)$  elements. The contribution of the present work is an upper bound on the degree of  $p$ . In deriving this upper bound, we obtain an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1. We observe that for a finite algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ , every  $n$ -generated algebra in the variety generated by  $\mathbf{A}$  is a homomorphic image of the free algebra in this variety, and this free algebra is isomorphic to the algebra  $\text{Clo}_n(\mathbf{A})$  of  $n$ -ary term functions on  $\mathbf{A}$ , and the *free spectrum*  $f_{\mathbf{A}}$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  is defined by  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) := |\text{Clo}_n(\mathbf{A})|$ . We also mention that Theorem 3.14 from [Kea99] provides some kind of a converse: a finite algebra in a congruence modular variety with small free spectrum is a direct product of algebras of prime power order.

The property of having small free spectrum is closely related to *supernilpotency*, a notion introduced in [AE06, AM10]. We say that an algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  is *k-supernilpotent* if the higher commutator operation defined in [Bul01] and studied, e.g., in [AM10, Moo18] satisfies  $[1_A, \dots, 1_A]_{\mathbf{A}} = 0_A$  ( $k + 1$  repetitions of  $1_A$ ); this condition is formulated without using higher commutators in Definition 2.1 below. The algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  is called *supernilpotent* if there is  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $k$ -supernilpotent. For those classes of algebra that we will study here, supernilpotency implies nilpotency: this implication holds in congruence permutable varieties by [AM10], and more generally in congruence modular varieties by [Wir19]. The connection between *supernilpotency* and *small free spectrum* is stated in Lemma 2.4 below. From this Lemma, we see that a finite algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  in a congruence modular variety is  $k$ -supernilpotent if and only if there is a polynomial  $p$  of degree  $k$  such that for its free spectrum, we have  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) \leq 2^{p(n)}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ; hence  $\mathbf{A}$  is supernilpotent if and only if  $\mathbf{A}$  has small free spectrum. Using the concept of supernilpotency, the theorem by Berman and Blok can be rephrased as “every nilpotent algebra of finite type and prime power order in a congruence modular variety is supernilpotent”. However, although [BB87] yields the existence of a  $k$  such that the algebra is  $k$ -supernilpotent, no explicit upper bound for  $k$  has been computed. For groups and rings,  $k$  can be chosen to be the nilpotency degree, but this does not hold in general: for every  $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \geq 2$ , [AM13] exhibits a  $k$ -nilpotent algebra of size  $2^k$  with fundamental operations of arity at most  $m$  that is  $m^{k-1}$ -supernilpotent, but not  $(m^{k-1} - 1)$ -supernilpotent. These examples show that a bound on the supernilpotency degree cannot be a function of  $k$  alone, but must contain more information on the algebra. For certain algebras (groups expanded with multilinear operations), an explicit bound

was given in [AM13]. Our main theorem provides such a bound for all algebras covered by the Berman-Blok-Theorem; in particular, it applies to nilpotent loops of prime power order. One ingredient used in this bound is the *height* of the congruence lattice of  $\mathbf{A}$ , which we define as the maximal size of a linearly ordered subset of the lattice minus one; hence the height of the 1-element lattice is 0 and the height of a linearly ordered set with  $n$  elements is  $n - 1$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $q > 1$  be a prime power, let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a nilpotent algebra in a congruence modular variety with  $|A| = q$  such that all fundamental operations of  $\mathbf{A}$  are of arity at most  $m$ . Let  $h$  be the height of the congruence lattice of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and let*

$$s := (m(q - 1))^{h-1}.$$

*Then  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent, and there is a polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  of degree at most  $s$  such that the free spectrum satisfies  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) = 2^{p(n)}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

From this result, we obtain the following improvement of Theorem 1.1.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a finite nilpotent algebra in a congruence modular variety that is a direct product of algebras of prime power order, and let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that all fundamental operations of  $\mathbf{A}$  are of arity at most  $m$ . We assume  $|A| > 1$ . Let*

$$s := (m(|A| - 1))^{(\log_2(|A|) - 1)}.$$

*Then  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent and there is a polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  of degree  $\leq s$  such that the free spectrum satisfies  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) = 2^{p(n)}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

Combining this with [Kea99], we obtain:

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a finite algebra in a congruence modular variety with  $|A| > 1$ , and let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that all fundamental operations of  $\mathbf{A}$  are of arity at most  $m$ . Then we have:*

- (1) *If  $\mathbf{A}$  has small free spectrum, then there is a polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  of degree at most  $(m(|A| - 1))^{(\log_2(|A|) - 1)}$  such that  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) = 2^{p(n)}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*
- (2) *If  $\mathbf{A}$  is supernilpotent, then it is  $((m(|A| - 1))^{(\log_2(|A|) - 1)})$ -supernilpotent.*

The proofs of these results will be given in Section 7. Our proof of Theorem 1.2 will proceed as follows: We define a binary operation  $+$  on  $\mathbf{A} = (A, F)$  such that  $(A, +)$  is an elementary abelian group and  $\mathbf{A}' = (A, F \cup \{+\})$  is still nilpotent. Since  $(A, +)$  is elementary abelian, we can expand it to a finite field  $(A, +, \cdot)$  and represent all fundamental operations from  $\mathbf{A}$  by polynomials over this field. Using this representation, we show that  $\mathbf{A}'$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent, which implies that its reduct  $\mathbf{A}$  is also  $s$ -supernilpotent.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES ABOUT SUPERNILPOTENCY

We use the definition of supernilpotency in [AM10, Definition 7.1]. This definition can be stated as follows:

**Definition 2.1** (Term condition for supernilpotency). Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an algebra and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\mathbf{A}$  is *k-supernilpotent* if for all  $n_1, \dots, n_{k+1} \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and for all  $\langle (a_1^{(i)}, a_2^{(i)}) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\} \rangle \in \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} (A^{n_i} \times A^{n_i})$  and for all  $\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} n_i$ -ary term functions  $t$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  the following holds: if for all  $f : \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$  such that  $f$  is not constantly 2, we have

$$t(a_{f(1)}^{(1)}, \dots, a_{f(k)}^{(k)}, a_1^{(k+1)}) = t(a_{f(1)}^{(1)}, \dots, a_{f(k)}^{(k)}, a_2^{(k+1)}),$$

then

$$t(a_2^{(1)}, \dots, a_2^{(k)}, a_1^{(k+1)}) = t(a_2^{(1)}, \dots, a_2^{(k)}, a_2^{(k+1)}).$$

From this definition, we see immediately that reducts of supernilpotent algebras are supernilpotent:

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  be universal algebras with the same universe. If  $\mathbf{B}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent and the clones of term operations of these algebras satisfy  $\text{Clo}(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq \text{Clo}(\mathbf{B})$ , then  $\mathbf{A}$  is also  $s$ -supernilpotent.*

We also see that  $s$ -supernilpotency is defined by an infinite set of quasi-identities, and is therefore preserved under taking subalgebras and direct products.

If  $\mathbf{A} = (A, +, -, 0, (f_i)_{i \in I})$  is an expanded group, we can describe supernilpotency more easily. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we call a function  $f : A^n \rightarrow A$  *absorbing* if for all  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$  with  $0 \in \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ , we have  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$ . The prototypes of absorbing functions are the commutator  $(a_1, a_2) \mapsto -a_1 - a_2 + a_1 + a_2$  in any group,  $(a_1, a_2) \mapsto a_1 a_2$  in any ring, and, also on every ring, every function that can be written as  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n \cdot g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . The *essential arity* of  $f : A^n \rightarrow A$  is the number of arguments on which  $f$  depends. We note that the essential arity of an absorbing function  $f : A^n \rightarrow A$  is either  $n$  or 0.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A, +, -, 0, (f_i)_{i \in I})$  be an expanded group, and let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent.
- (2) All absorbing polynomial functions of  $\mathbf{A}$  are of essential arity at most  $s$ .

If  $\mathbf{A}$  is finite, then (1) and (2) are furthermore equivalent to

- (3) There is a polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  of degree  $\leq s$  such that  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) = |\text{Clo}_n(\mathbf{A})| = 2^{p(n)}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof:* The equivalence of (1) and (2) follows from Corollary 6.12 of [AM10] by observing that  $s$ -supernilpotency is equivalent to the higher commutator property

$[1_A, \dots, 1_A] = 0_A$  ( $(s+1)$  times  $1_A$ ). The equivalence of (3) and (1) follows from Corollary 4.3 of [Aic14]; there it was proved using a modification of an argument that goes back to [Hig67].  $\square$

The equivalence of (1) and (3) is actually true for all finite algebras in congruence modular varieties. Following [FM87], we say that a term  $w(x_1, \dots, x_{r+1})$  in the language of  $\mathbf{A}$  is a *commutator term* of rank  $r$  for  $\mathbf{A}$  if  $\mathbf{A} \models w(z, x_2, \dots, x_r, z) \approx w(x_1, z, \dots, x_r, z) \approx \dots \approx w(x_1, x_2, \dots, z, z) \approx z$ . A commutator term  $w(x_1, \dots, x_{r+1})$  is called *trivial* if  $\mathbf{A} \models w(x_1, \dots, x_r, z) \approx z$ . A part of the next lemma has also been stated in [AMO18].

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a finite algebra in a congruence modular variety, and let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent.
- (2)  $\mathbf{A}$  is nilpotent, and all nontrivial commutator terms of  $\mathbf{A}$  are of rank at most  $s$ .
- (3) There is a polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  of degree at most  $s$  such that  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) = 2^{p(n)}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (4)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\log_2(f_{\mathbf{A}}(n))/n^{s+1}) = 0$ .

*Proof:* (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): By [Wir19, Theorem 4.11],  $\mathbf{A}$  has an  $(s+1)$ -difference term  $d$ . Since  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent,  $d$  is a Mal'cev term. From [AM10, Lemma 7.5], we obtain that  $\mathbf{A}$  is nilpotent and all commutator terms have rank at most  $s$ . This bound on the rank can also be seen directly from the term condition that defines supernilpotency: to this end, let  $w(x_1, \dots, x_{r+1})$  be a commutator term of  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $r > s$ . We want to show that  $w$  satisfies  $\mathbf{A} \models w(x_1, \dots, x_r, z) \approx z$ . To this end, let  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r, \zeta \in A$ . We apply the term condition from Definition 2.1 with the following settings:  $t := w^{\mathbf{A}}$ ,  $a_1^{(i)} := \zeta$  and  $a_2^{(i)} := \xi_i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ ,  $a_1^{(s+1)} := (\zeta, \dots, \zeta)$  ( $r-s+1$  times  $\zeta$ ),  $a_2^{(s)} := (\xi_{s+1}, \dots, \xi_r, \zeta)$ . Then the term condition implies  $t(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_s, \zeta, \dots, \zeta) = t(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_s, \dots, \xi_r, \zeta)$ . Since  $w$  is a commutator term,  $\zeta = t(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_s, \zeta, \dots, \zeta)$ . Thus  $\mathbf{A} \models w(x_1, \dots, x_r, z) \approx z$ , and hence  $w$  is trivial.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Under the additional assumption that  $\mathbf{A}$  is a direct product of algebras of prime power order, this is shown in the proof of Theorem 2 of [BB87]. However, this additional assumption is only used to obtain a bound on the rank of nontrivial commutator terms, which is claimed by (2).

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4): Obvious.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1): The proof for this implication comes from [AMO18]; it is included for easier reference.

Theorem 9.18 of [HM88] implies that the variety  $V(\mathbf{A})$  omits types **1** and **5**. From [HM88, Lemma 12.4], we obtain that  $\mathbf{A}$  is right nilpotent, and since the commutator operation in a congruence modular variety is commutative,  $\mathbf{A}$  is

therefore nilpotent. Now [FM87, Theorem 6.2] yields that  $\mathbf{A}$  has a Mal'cev term. Let  $\mathbf{A}^*$  be the expansion of  $\mathbf{A}$  with all its constants. Then  $\mathbf{A}^*$  is nilpotent and generates a congruence permutable variety. The variety  $V(\mathbf{A}^*)$  is nilpotent by [FM87, Theorem 14.2], and hence congruence uniform by [FM87, Corollary 7.5]. Since for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f_{\mathbf{A}^*}(n) \leq f_{\mathbf{A}}(n + |A|) \leq 2^{p(n+|A|)}$ , we obtain from the proof of [BB87, Theorem 1] that all commutator terms of  $\mathbf{A}^*$  are of rank at most  $s$ . Hence all commutator polynomials (in the sense of [AM10, Definition 7.2]) of  $\mathbf{A}$  are of rank at most  $s$ , and then [AM10, Lemma 7.5] yields that  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent.  $\square$

It is worth noting that in proving Lemma 2.4, we needed to employ substantial results from each of the sources [BB87, FM87, HM88, AM10, Wir19].

### 3. PRELIMINARIES ON COMMUTATORS AND NILPOTENCY

In this section, we compile some well known facts on the relation between the commutator operation and the Mal'cev term of an algebra. This is an extension of [Aic06, p. 14]. Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an algebra with a Mal'cev term  $d$ . We fix an element  $o \in A$  and define two binary operations  $+_o$  and  $-_o$  by

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} x +_o y &:= d(x, o, y) \text{ and} \\ x -_o y &:= d(x, y, o) \text{ for } x, y \in A. \end{aligned}$$

Sometimes, we also use  $-_o$  as a unary operation: then  $-_o y$  stands for  $o -_o y = d(o, y, o)$ . In the following proposition, we compile those relations of  $+_o$  and  $-_o$  with the commutator that we will need in the sequel. Such properties have been established from the very beginning of modular commutator theory (cf. [Her79, Gum83]), and the proofs of several of these properties are taken from [Aic06]. The proofs given below rely only on the following fact that follows rather directly from the definition of the term condition defining the binary commutator operation (see Lemma 2.2 of [Aic06] or Exercise 4.156(2) from [MMT87]): if  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are congruences of any algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $(a, b) \in \alpha$ ,  $(c, d) \in \beta$ ,  $p \in \text{Pol}_2(\mathbf{A})$ , and  $p(a, c) = p(a, d)$ , then  $p(b, c) \equiv p(b, d) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ .

**Lemma 3.1** (cf. [Aic06, Proposition 2.7]). *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an algebra with a Mal'cev term  $d$ , let  $a, b, c, o$  be elements of  $A$ , let  $+_o$  and  $-_o$  be defined as in (3.1), and let  $\alpha, \beta$  be congruences of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then we have:*

- (1)  $a +_o o = o +_o a = a -_o o = a$ .
- (2)  $a -_o a = o$ .
- (3) If  $a \equiv_\alpha b \equiv_\beta o$ , then  $(a -_o b) +_o b \equiv a \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ .
- (4) If  $a \equiv_\alpha o \equiv_\beta b$ , then  $(a +_o b) -_o b \equiv a \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ .
- (5) If  $a \equiv_\alpha o \equiv_\beta b$ , then  $a +_o b \equiv b +_o a \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ .
- (6) If  $a \equiv_\alpha o \equiv_\beta b$ , then  $(a +_o b) +_o c \equiv a +_o (b +_o c) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ .
- (7) If  $a \equiv_\alpha o \equiv_\beta b$ , then  $d(a +_o b, b, c) \equiv a +_o c \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ .

(8) If  $a \equiv_\alpha o$ , then  $(-{}_o a) +_o a \equiv o \pmod{[\alpha, \alpha]}$ .

*Proof:* Properties (1) and (2) follow from the properties of the Mal'cev term  $d$ . For proving (3), we define a polynomial function  $t \in \text{Pol}_2(\mathbf{A})$  by  $t(x, y) := d(d(a, x, y), y, b)$ . We have  $t(a, o) = t(a, b) = b$ . Thus we obtain  $t(b, o) \equiv t(b, b) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ , which means  $(a -_o b) +_o b \equiv a \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ . For proving (4), we define a polynomial function  $t \in \text{Pol}_2(\mathbf{A})$  by  $t(x, y) := d(d(x, y, b), d(b, y, o), o)$ . We have  $t(o, o) = t(o, b) = o$ . Thus we obtain  $t(a, o) \equiv t(a, b) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ , which means  $(a +_o b) -_o b \equiv a \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ . For proving (5), we define  $t(x, y) := d(y +_o x, x +_o y, a +_o b)$  for  $x, y \in A$ . Then we have  $t(o, o) = t(o, b) = a +_o b$ , and therefore  $t(a, o) \equiv t(a, b) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ , which implies  $a +_o b \equiv b +_o a \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ . For proving (6), we define  $t(x, y) := d(x +_o (y +_o c), (x +_o y) +_o c, (a +_o b) +_o c)$  and have  $t(o, o) = t(o, b) = (a +_o b) +_o c$ , and therefore  $t(a, o) \equiv t(a, b) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ , which implies  $(a +_o b) +_o c \equiv a +_o (b +_o c) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ . For proving (7), we consider the polynomial function of  $\mathbf{A}$  defined by  $t(x, y) := d(x +_o y, y, c)$  for  $x, y \in A$ . Then  $t(o, o) = d(o, o, c) = c$  and  $t(o, b) = d(b, b, c) = c$ . Therefore,  $(t(a, o), t(a, b)) \in [\alpha, \beta]$ , and thus  $d(a, o, c) \equiv d(a +_o b, b, c) \pmod{[\alpha, \beta]}$ . Since  $d(a, o, c) = a +_o c$ , the result follows. For property (8), we observe that  $(-{}_o a) +_o a = (o -_o a) +_o a$ . By property (3), the last expression is congruent modulo  $[\alpha, \alpha]$  to  $o$ .  $\square$

The following well known Lemma goes back to [Her79, Fre83].

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an algebra with Mal'cev term  $d$ , and let  $\alpha$  be a congruence of  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $[\alpha, \alpha] = 0_A$ . Let  $Q := o/\alpha$ . Then  $\mathbf{Q} := (Q, +_o, -_o, o)$  is an abelian group. If  $\alpha$  is furthermore a minimal congruence of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $Q$  is finite, then  $\mathbf{Q}$  is of prime exponent.*

*Proof:* The first part follows from items (6),(1), and (8) of Lemma 3.1. For the second part, we sketch an argument taken from [Fre83, p. 151]: From Proposition 2.8(2) of [Aic06], it is not hard to infer that the group  $\mathbf{Q}$  can be seen as a module over the finite ring  $(\{p|_Q : p \in \text{Pol}_1(\mathbf{A}), p(o) = o\}, +_o, \circ)$ . Since  $\alpha$  is a minimal congruence, this module has no submodules, and thus  $\mathbf{Q}$  is the additive group of a finite simple module, and has therefore prime exponent.  $\square$

We will also use the following relational description of centrality that goes back to [Kis92]. We call a congruence relation  $\zeta$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  *central* in  $\mathbf{A}$  if  $[\zeta, 1_A] = 0_A$  (cf. [BS81, Definition 13.1]).

**Lemma 3.3** (Relational description of centrality, cf. Theorem 3.2(iii) of [Kis92]). *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an algebra with a Mal'cev term  $d$ , and let  $\zeta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{A})$ . Then  $\zeta$  is central in  $\mathbf{A}$  if and only if all fundamental operations of  $\mathbf{A}$  preserve the relation  $\rho = \{(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \in A^4 \mid (a_1, a_2) \in \zeta, d(a_1, a_2, a_3) = a_4\}$ .*

*Proof:* The result is a special case of [AM07, Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.4].  $\square$

In expanded groups, the commutator of two congruences can be calculated from the associated 0-classes (ideals) and binary polynomial functions [AM07, Lemma 2.9]. We will only use the following assertion:

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A, +, -, 0, (f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$  be an expanded group, let  $\xi, \eta$  be congruences of  $\mathbf{A}$ , let  $X := 0/\xi$  and  $Y := 0/\eta$  be the ideals of  $\mathbf{A}$  associated with these congruences, and let  $p \in \text{Pol}_2(\mathbf{A})$  such that  $p(a, 0) = p(0, a) = 0$  for all  $a \in A$ . Then for all  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ ,  $p(x, y) \equiv 0 \pmod{[\xi, \eta]}$ , and therefore  $p(x, y)$  lies in the ideal  $[X, Y] := 0/[\xi, \eta]$  associated with  $[\xi, \eta]$ .*

*Proof:* Since  $p(0, 0) = p(0, y)$ , the term condition yields  $p(x, 0) \equiv p(x, y) \pmod{[\xi, \eta]}$ .  $\square$

#### 4. EXPANDING AN ALGEBRA WITH A GROUP OPERATION

Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be an algebra in a congruence modular variety, let  $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , and let  $0_A = \alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_m = 1_A$  be a linearly ordered sequence of equivalence relations on  $A$ .  $L = \langle \alpha_i \mid i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\} \rangle$  is a *central series* of  $\mathbf{A}$  if for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\alpha_i$  is a congruence relation of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\alpha_i/\alpha_{i-1}$  is central in  $\mathbf{A}/\alpha_{i-1}$ ; using the homomorphism property of the modular commutator, this centrality can be expressed by  $[1_A, \alpha_i] \leq \alpha_{i-1}$ . An algebra is nilpotent if and only if it has a finite central series. We fix an element  $o \in A$  and a Mal'cev term  $d$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we let  $G_i \subseteq \mathbf{A}/\alpha_{i-1}$  be defined by

$$G_i := \{x/\alpha_{i-1} \mid x \in A, (x, o) \in \alpha_i\}.$$

In other words,  $G_i$  is the image of  $o/\alpha_i$  under the canonical projection from  $\mathbf{A}$  to  $\mathbf{A}/\alpha_{i-1}$ . Let  $\bar{o} := o/\alpha_{i-1}$ . Since  $[\alpha_i, \alpha_i] \leq [1, \alpha_i] \leq \alpha_{i-1}$ , Lemma 3.2 and the homomorphism property of the modular commutator tell that the operations  $g +^i h := d(g, \bar{o}, h)$  and  $-^i g := d(\bar{o}, g, \bar{o})$  turn  $G_i$  into an abelian group. We call

$$\mathbf{G} := \prod_{i=1}^m (G_i, +^i, -^i, \bar{o})$$

the abelian group associated with the algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ , its central series  $L$ , and zero  $o$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a finite nilpotent algebra in a congruence modular variety, let  $0_A = \alpha_0 \prec \alpha_1 \prec \dots \prec \alpha_m = 1_A$  be a maximal chain in the congruence lattice of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and let  $o \in A$ . Let  $\mathbf{G} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{G}_i$  be the abelian group associated with  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $L := \langle \alpha_i \mid i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\} \rangle$ , and zero  $o$ . Then  $|G|$  is a direct product of groups of prime order, and  $|\mathbf{G}| = |\mathbf{A}|$ . If  $|\mathbf{A}|$  is furthermore of prime power order, then  $\mathbf{G}$  is elementary abelian.*

*Proof:* Since  $\mathbf{A}$  is nilpotent,  $L$  is a central series of  $\mathbf{A}$ . By Lemma 3.2, each of the groups  $\mathbf{G}_i$  is an abelian group of prime exponent. Furthermore,  $\mathbf{A}$  is congruence uniform [FM87, Corollary 7.5]. For proving  $|\mathbf{G}| = |\mathbf{A}|$ , we proceed



by induction on  $m$  and have  $|\mathbf{A}| = |o/\alpha_1| \cdot |\mathbf{A}/\alpha_1| = |\mathbf{G}_1| \cdot |\mathbf{A}/\alpha_1|$ , which is equal to  $|\mathbf{G}_1| \cdot \prod_{i=2}^m |\mathbf{G}_i| = |\mathbf{G}|$  by the induction hypothesis. Now assume that  $\mathbf{A}$  is of prime power order. Then  $\mathbf{G}$  is of prime power order and squarefree exponent, and therefore elementary abelian.  $\square$

The following theorem allows to expand a nilpotent algebra with a Mal'cev term with group operations such that nilpotency is preserved.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A, F)$  be a nilpotent algebra with a Mal'cev term  $d$ , let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $o \in A$ , and let  $L = \langle \alpha_i \mid i \in \{0, \dots, m\} \rangle$  be a central series of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then there exist a binary function  $+$  :  $A \times A \rightarrow A$  and a unary function  $-$  :  $A \rightarrow A$  such that*

- (1)  $(A, +, -, o)$  is isomorphic to the abelian group  $\mathbf{G}$  associated with  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $L$ , and  $o$ .
- (2)  $L = \langle \alpha_i \mid i \in \{0, \dots, m\} \rangle$  is a central series also of the expansion  $\mathbf{A}' = (A, F \cup \{+, -, o\})$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and therefore  $\mathbf{A}'$  is nilpotent of class at most  $m$ .

*Proof:* As in (3.1), we define  $x +_o y := d(x, o, y)$ ,  $x -_o y := d(x, y, o)$ , and  $-_o y := d(o, y, o)$  for  $x, y \in A$ . We proceed by induction on  $m$ . We show that there exist  $+$ ,  $-$  such that

- (i) for each  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ , both  $+$  and  $-$  preserve the congruence  $\alpha_i$ ,
- (ii) the algebra  $(A, +, -, o)$  is isomorphic to the abelian group  $\mathbf{G}$  associated with  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $L$  and zero  $o$ ,
- (iii) for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , both  $+$  and  $-$  preserve the relation  $\gamma_i$  given by
 
$$\gamma_i = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in A^4 \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \alpha_i, (d(x_1, x_2, x_3), x_4) \in \alpha_{i-1}\}.$$

If  $m = 0$ , then  $|A| = 1$ . Defining  $+$  as the only binary and  $-$  as the only unary operation of this set, we see that  $(A, +, -, o)$  is a one element group, and hence isomorphic to the one element group  $\mathbf{G}$ .

Now we assume  $m \geq 1$ . Let  $\alpha := \alpha_1$ . Then  $\mathbf{A}/\alpha$  has a central series  $L_1 = \langle 0_{A/\alpha} = \alpha_1/\alpha, \alpha_2/\alpha, \dots, \alpha_m/\alpha = 1_{A/\alpha} \rangle$  which is shorter than  $L$ , and so we may apply the induction hypothesis on  $\mathbf{A}/\alpha$  to obtain  $\oplus : \mathbf{A}/\alpha \times \mathbf{A}/\alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{A}/\alpha$  and  $\ominus : \mathbf{A}/\alpha \rightarrow \mathbf{A}/\alpha$  such that  $(A/\alpha, \oplus, \ominus, o/\alpha)$  is isomorphic to the abelian group associated to  $\mathbf{A}/\alpha$ ,  $L_1$ , and zero  $o/\alpha$ . Furthermore,  $\oplus$  and  $\ominus$  preserve all congruences in  $L_1$  and, for each  $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, m\}$ , the relation

$$(4.1) \quad \delta_i := \{(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) \in (A/\alpha)^4 \mid (y_1, y_2) \in \alpha_i/\alpha, (d(y_1, y_2, y_3), y_4) \in \alpha_{i-1}/\alpha\}.$$

Now let  $Q := o/\alpha$ . We choose  $R$  to be a set of representatives of  $A$  modulo  $\alpha$  with  $o \in R$ , and we let  $r : A \rightarrow R$  be the function that assigns to each  $a$  the element  $r(a) \in R$  with  $(a, r(a)) \in \alpha$ . We define the mapping

$$\psi : A \rightarrow A/\alpha \times Q$$

by

$$\psi(a) = (\psi_1(a), \psi_2(a)) := (a/\alpha, a -_o r(a))$$

for  $a \in A$ . Searching for its inverse, we define

$$\varphi : A/\alpha \times Q \rightarrow A$$

by  $\varphi(a/\alpha, q) := q +_o r(a)$ . We will now prove that  $\psi$  is bijective and that  $\varphi = \psi^{-1}$ . To this end, we first compute  $\varphi(\psi(a)) = \varphi(a/\alpha, a -_o r(a)) = (a -_o r(a)) +_o r(a)$ . Since  $L$  is a central series, we have  $[\alpha, 1_A] = 0_A$ , and therefore Lemma 3.1(3) yields  $(a -_o r(a)) +_o r(a) = a$ . Second, we let  $a \in A$  and  $q \in Q$  and compute

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\varphi(a/\alpha, q)) &= \psi(q +_o r(a)) \\ &= ((q +_o r(a))/\alpha, (q +_o r(a)) -_o r(q +_o r(a))). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $q +_o r(a) \equiv_\alpha o +_o r(a) = r(a)$ , we have

$$((q +_o r(a))/\alpha, (q +_o r(a)) - r(q +_o r(a))) = (r(a)/\alpha, (q +_o r(a)) -_o r(a)).$$

Now applying Lemma 3.1(4), we obtain that the last expression is equal to  $(a/\alpha, q)$ . Thus  $\psi$  and  $\varphi$  are mutually inverse to each other, and hence bijective. Now we define the functions  $+ : A \times A \rightarrow A$  and  $- : A \rightarrow A$  by

$$\begin{aligned} a + b &:= \varphi((a/\alpha) \oplus (b/\alpha), \psi_2(a) +_o \psi_2(b)) \text{ and} \\ -b &:= \varphi(\ominus (b/\alpha), -_o \psi_2(b)). \end{aligned}$$

for  $a, b \in A$ . We now prove that  $+$  and  $-$  satisfy the required properties and start with property (i). We consider the algebra

$$(B, \boxplus, \boxminus, \sigma') := (A/\alpha, \oplus, \ominus, o/\alpha) \times (Q, +_o, -_o, o).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(a + b) &= ((a/\alpha) \oplus (b/\alpha), \psi_2(a) +_o \psi_2(b)) \\ &= (\psi_1(a) \oplus \psi_1(b), \psi_2(a) +_o \psi_2(b)) \\ &= (\psi_1(a), \psi_2(a)) \boxplus (\psi_2(b), \psi_2(b)) \\ &= \psi(a) \boxplus \psi(b) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $a, b \in A$ , and since, similarly,  $\psi(-b) = \boxminus(\psi(b))$  and  $\psi(o) = \sigma'$ , the mapping  $\psi$  is an isomorphism from  $(A, +, -, o)$  to  $(B, \boxplus, \boxminus, \sigma')$  and  $\psi_1$  is an epimorphism from  $(A, +, -, o)$  to  $(A/\alpha, \oplus, \ominus, o/\alpha)$ . Since the kernel of  $\psi_1$  is  $\alpha$ , we see that  $\alpha$  is a congruence relation of  $(A, +, -, o)$ , and therefore  $+$  and  $-$  preserve  $\alpha_1$ . In order to show that  $+$  and  $-$  preserve  $\alpha_i$  for  $i \geq 2$ , we let  $i \in \{2, \dots, m\}$  and observe that by the construction of  $\oplus$  and  $\ominus$  through the induction hypothesis,  $\alpha_i/\alpha$  is a congruence relation of  $(A/\alpha, \oplus, \ominus, o/\alpha)$ , and therefore its pre-image  $\beta$  under the homomorphism  $\psi_1$ , given by

$$\beta := \{(a, b) \in A \mid (\psi_1(a), \psi_1(b)) \in \alpha_i/\alpha\},$$

is a congruence of  $(A, +, -, o)$ . By its definition,  $\beta = \{(a, b) \in A \mid (a/\alpha, b/\alpha) \in \alpha_i/\alpha\} = \alpha_i$ . Hence,  $+$  and  $-$  preserve  $\alpha_i$ . This completes the proof of item (i).

Next, we prove item (ii). The group  $(Q, +_o, -_o, o)$  is isomorphic to the component  $\mathbf{G}_1$  of the abelian group  $\mathbf{G} := \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbf{G}_i$  associated with  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $L$ , and  $o$ . The group associated with  $\mathbf{A}/\alpha$ ,  $L_1$  and  $o/\alpha$  is isomorphic to  $\prod_{i=2}^m \mathbf{G}_i$ . Hence  $(B, \boxplus, \boxminus, o') = (A/\alpha, \oplus, \ominus, o/\alpha) \times (Q, +_o, -_o, o)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{G}$ , and therefore  $(A, +, -, o)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{G}$ . This completes the proof of (ii), and thus item (1) of the statement of the theorem is proved.

For (iii), we first consider the case  $i \geq 2$ . Let  $\mathbf{A}'$  be the expansion  $(A, F \cup \{+, -, o\})$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Its homomorphic image  $\mathbf{A}'/\alpha$  is equal to  $(A/\alpha, F \cup \{\oplus, \ominus, o/\alpha\})$ . By the construction of  $\oplus$  and  $\ominus$  as functions preserving the relations in (4.1) and the relational description of centrality (Lemma 3.3), we have  $[1_{A/\alpha}, \alpha_i/\alpha]_{\mathbf{A}'/\alpha} \leq \alpha_{i-1}/\alpha$ . Hence  $[1_A, \alpha_i]_{\mathbf{A}'} \leq \alpha_{i-1}$ , and thus the relational description of commutators implies that  $+$  and  $-$  preserve  $\gamma_i$ . Before proving that  $+$  and  $-$  also preserve  $\gamma_1$ , which encodes the centrality of  $\alpha_1 = \alpha$  in  $\mathbf{A}'$ , we prove some connections between  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $+_o$ ,  $-_o$  and the Mal'cev term  $d$ . First, we check that for all  $a \in A$  and  $q \in Q$ , we have

$$(4.2) \quad q + a = q +_o a = a +_o q.$$

For proving the first equality, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} q + a &= \varphi((q/\alpha) \oplus (a/\alpha), \psi_2(q) +_o \psi_2(a)) \\ &= \varphi((o/\alpha) \oplus (a/\alpha), (q -_o r(q)) +_o (a -_o r(a))) \\ &= \varphi(a/\alpha, (q -_o o) +_o (a -_o r(a))) \\ &= \varphi(a/\alpha, q +_o (a -_o r(a))) \\ &= (q +_o (a -_o r(a))) +_o r(a) \\ &= q +_o ((a -_o r(a)) +_o r(a)) \text{ (by Lemma 3.1(6))} \\ &= q +_o a \text{ (by Lemma 3.1(3)).} \end{aligned}$$

The second equality of (4.2) now follows from Lemma 3.1(5). We will also need that for all  $q \in Q$  and  $a, b \in A$ , we have

$$(4.3) \quad d(q +_o a, a, b) = q +_o b.$$

This follows from Lemma 3.1(7). Next, we observe that if  $(v, w) \in \alpha$ , then  $w -_o v \in Q$  and then  $v = (w -_o v) +_o v$  by Lemma 3.1(3).

With these preparations, we are ready to prove that  $+$  preserves  $\gamma_1$ . To this end, let  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \gamma_1$  and  $(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) \in \gamma_1$ . We have to prove

$$(4.4) \quad (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2, x_3 + y_3, x_4 + y_4) \in \gamma_1.$$

By the fact that  $+$  preserves  $\alpha_1$ , we obtain  $(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \in \alpha_1$ . Hence for completing the proof of (4.4), we have to show

$$d(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2, x_3 + y_3) = x_4 + y_4.$$

We set

$$v := x_2, y := x_1 -_o x_2, w := y_2, z := y_1 -_o y_2.$$

and compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& d(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2, x_3 + y_3) \\
&= d((y +_o v) + (z +_o w), v + w, x_3 + y_3) \\
&= d((y + v) + (z + w), v + w, x_3 + y_3) \text{ (by (4.2))} \\
&= d((y + z) + (v + w), v + w, x_3 + y_3) \text{ (because } (A, +) \text{ is abelian)} \\
&= d((y +_o z) +_o (v + w), v + w, x_3 + y_3) \text{ (by (4.2))} \\
&= (y +_o z) +_o (x_3 + y_3) \text{ (by (4.3))} \\
&= (y + z) + (x_3 + y_3) \text{ (by (4.2))} \\
&= (y + x_3) + (z + y_3) \text{ (because } (A, +) \text{ is abelian)} \\
&= (y +_o x_3) + (z +_o y_3) \text{ (by (4.2))} \\
&= d(y +_o v, v, x_3) + d(z +_o w, w, y_3) \text{ (by (4.3))} \\
&= d(x_1, x_2, x_3) + d(y_1, y_2, y_3) \\
&= x_4 + y_4 \text{ (because } (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \gamma_1 \text{ and } (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) \in \gamma_1).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (4.4), and therefore  $+$  preserves  $\gamma_1$ . We now show that  $-$  preserves  $\gamma_1$ . As a first step, we show that for all  $a, b, c \in A$  with  $(a, b) \in \alpha$ , we have

$$(4.5) \quad a -_o b = a + (-b) \text{ and } d(a, b, c) = a + (-b) + c.$$

From Lemma 3.1(3), we obtain  $a = (a -_o b) +_o b$ , which is equal to  $(a -_o b) + b$  by (4.2). Since  $(A, +, -, o)$  is a group, we therefore have  $a + (-b) = a -_o b$ , establishing the first part of (4.5). For the second part, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
d(a, b, c) &= d(a -_o b +_o b, b, c) \\
&= (a -_o b) +_o c \text{ (by (4.3))} \\
&= (a -_o b) + c \text{ (by (4.2))} \\
&= (a + (-b)) + c \text{ (by the first part of (4.5)).}
\end{aligned}$$

We now take  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \gamma_1$ , and prove that  $(-x_1, -x_2, -x_3, -x_4) \in \gamma_1$ . Since  $-$  preserves  $\alpha$ ,  $(-x_1, -x_2) \in \alpha$ , and thus it remains to show that

$$(4.6) \quad d(-x_1, -x_2, -x_3) = -x_4.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(-x_1, -x_2, -x_3) &= (-x_1) + x_2 + (-x_3) \text{ (by (4.5))} \\
&= -(x_1 + (-x_2) + x_3) \text{ (because } (A, +, -, o) \text{ is an abelian group)} \\
&= -d(x_1, x_2, x_3) \text{ (by (4.5))} \\
&= -x_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $(-x_1, -x_2, -x_3, -x_4) \in \gamma_1$ , and therefore  $-$  preserves  $\gamma_1$ , which completes the proof of (ii).

Now to establish (2), we observe that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , the nilpotency of  $\mathbf{A}$  implies  $[1, \alpha_i]_{\mathbf{A}} \leq \alpha_{i-1}$ . Thus (by Lemma 3.3) each fundamental operation of  $\mathbf{A}$  preserves  $\gamma_i$ . Since also  $+$  and  $-$  preserve  $\gamma_i$  by item (iii), all fundamental operations of  $\mathbf{A}'$  preserve  $\gamma_i$ , which implies  $[1, \alpha_i]_{\mathbf{A}'} \leq \alpha_{i-1}$ . Hence  $\mathbf{A}'$  is nilpotent of class at most  $m$ .  $\square$

## 5. CLONES OF POLYNOMIALS

All finitary functions on a finite field are induced by polynomials. When considering polynomials instead of functions, we can use notions such as *degree* or *monomial*. Such an approach has been used, e.g., in [Kre18]. In this section, we will study polynomials in the polynomial ring  $K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}] = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  over countably many variables over some (not necessarily finite) field  $\mathbf{K}$ . Adapting [CF09], we define the product of  $A, B \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$  by

$$AB = \{p(q_1, \dots, q_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, p \in A \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n], q_1, \dots, q_n \in B\}.$$

Here  $p(q_1, \dots, q_n)$  denotes the polynomial obtained from  $p$  by substituting simultaneously each variable  $x_i$  with  $q_i$ . We say that a subset  $C$  of  $K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$  is a *clone of polynomials* if for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x_i \in C$  and  $CC \subseteq C$ . Given a subset  $F$  of  $K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ , we use  $\text{Clon}(F)$  to denote the clone of polynomials that is generated by  $F$ . By  $L$ , we denote the set

$$L := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : a_i \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

Hence  $L = \text{Clon}(\{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ , and if  $F$  is a nonempty subset of  $K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ , then  $LF$  is exactly the subgroup of  $(K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}], +, -, 0)$  generated by  $F$ .

We notice that a clone of polynomials is not a clone in the usual sense, since its elements are polynomials, and not finitary functions on some set. A bridge between these concepts is provided in the following lemma. For a field  $\mathbf{K}$ ,  $f \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  and  $m \geq n$ , we let  $f^{\mathbf{K}, m}$  be the  $m$ -ary function that  $f$  induces on  $K$ . For example  $x_3^{\mathbf{K}, 5}$  induces the projection  $(a_1, \dots, a_5) \mapsto a_3$  on  $K$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a field, and let  $C \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$  be a clone of polynomials. Let*

$$C' := \{f^{\mathbf{K}, m} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, f \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n], m \geq n\}.$$

*Then  $C'$  is a clone on the set  $K$ .*

Given this close connection, it is not surprising that we may transfer some results from clone theory to clones of polynomials.

**Lemma 5.2** (Associativity Lemma, cf. [CF09]). *Let  $A, B, C \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ , let  $L := \text{Clop}(\{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ , and let  $P := \text{Clop}(\emptyset) = \{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then we have:*

- (1)  $(AB)C \subseteq A(BC) \subseteq (A(BP))C$ . In particular if  $BP \subseteq B$ , then  $(AB)C = A(BC)$ .
- (2)  $L(AL)$  is closed under composition with polynomials in  $L$  from both sides; in other words,  $L(L(AL)) \subseteq L(AL)$  and  $(L(AL))L \subseteq L(AL)$ .

*Proof:* The proof of item (1) is straightforward and can be developed along the lines of [CF09]. Item (2) then follows by observing  $L(L(AL)) \subseteq (L(LP))(AL) = (LL)(AL) = L(AL)$  and  $(L(AL))L \subseteq L((AL)L) \subseteq L(A(LL)) = L(AL)$ .  $\square$

For a set  $C \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ , let  $C^{(0)} := \{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $C^{(n+1)} = C^{(n)} \cup (CC^{(n)})$ . For  $f \in K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ , the *depth of  $f$  with respect to  $C$* , denoted by  $\delta_C(f)$ , is the smallest  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $f \in C^{(n)}$ , and undefined if no such  $n$  exists.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a field, and let  $C \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ . Then the clone generated by  $C$ ,  $\text{Clop}(C)$ , is equal to  $\bigcup\{C^{(n)} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ . If  $M \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$  is such that  $\{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq M$  and  $CM \subseteq M$ , then  $\text{Clop}(C) \subseteq M$ .*

*Proof:* Let  $U := \bigcup\{C^{(n)} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ . Then  $C \subseteq C^{(1)} \subseteq U \subseteq \text{Clop}(C)$ , and hence it is sufficient to prove  $UU \subseteq U$ . To this end, we prove by induction on  $n$  that  $C^{(n)}U \subseteq U$ . This is obvious for  $n = 0$ . For the induction step, we let  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u \in (C^{(n+1)} \setminus C^{(n)}) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ , and  $v_1, \dots, v_m \in U$ . Since  $u \in CC^{(n)}$ , there are  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $r \in C$  and  $s_1, \dots, s_l \in C^n$  with  $u = r(s_1, \dots, s_l)$ . Now  $u(v_1, \dots, v_m) = r(s_1(v_1, \dots, v_m), \dots, s_l(v_1, \dots, v_m))$ . Then each  $s_i(v_1, \dots, v_m)$  is an element of  $U$  by the induction hypothesis. Thus there is  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\{s_i(v_1, \dots, v_m) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, l\}\} \subseteq C^{(k)}$ , and therefore  $u(v_1, \dots, v_m) \in C^{(k+1)} \subseteq U$ . This completes the induction step; therefore  $UU \subseteq U$  and  $U = \text{Clop}(C)$ . We show the second part by proving that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $C^{(n)} \subseteq M$ . The induction basis  $n = 0$  follows from the condition  $\{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq M$ . For the induction step, let  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then  $C^{(n+1)} = C^{(n)} \cup (CC^{(n)}) \subseteq M \cup CM$  by the induction hypothesis. Applying the assumption  $CM \subseteq M$ , we obtain  $C^{(n+1)} \subseteq M$ . Thus  $\text{Clop}(C) \subseteq M$ .  $\square$

The *total degree of a monomial* is defined by

$$\deg(a \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha_i}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $a \in K \setminus \{0\}$  and the *total degree of a polynomial* is the maximum of the total degrees of its monomials. A polynomial is called *homovariate* if all of its monomials contain exactly the same variables. For example, over  $K = \mathbb{Z}_7$ , each of the polynomials  $5x_1x_2^3x_4 - 2x_1^{17}x_2x_4^3 + x_1^6x_2^3x_4^{20}$ ,  $x_2 + 6x_2^4$  and  $2$  is homovariate, but none of the polynomials  $x_1 + x_2$ ,  $1 + 3x_1^3 + x_1^5$  is homovariate. For a finite

subset  $I$  of  $\mathbb{N}$ , the *homovariate component*  $H_I(p)$  of the polynomial  $p$  with respect to  $I$  is defined as the sum those monomials whose set of variables is  $I$ . As an example, we compute

$$H_{\{2,3,4\}}(5x_2^2x_3 + 7x_2^2x_3x_4^5 + x_1x_2x_3x_4 + 4x_4^3x_5 + 13x_2^6x_3^8x_4^7) = 7x_2^2x_3x_4^5 + 13x_2^6x_3^8x_4^7$$

and  $H_{\{2,3\}}(x_2^2+x_3) = 0$ . Hence each polynomial is the sum of all of its homovariate components. For a set of polynomials  $F \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ ,

$$\text{Hoc}(F) := \{H_I(f) \mid I \subseteq \mathbb{N}, f \in F\}$$

is the set of the homovariate components of elements of  $F$ . We note that by this definition, for every polynomial  $f$ ,  $0 \in \text{Hoc}(\{f\})$ : let  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $x_j$  does not occur in  $f$ . Then  $H_{\{j\}}(f) = 0$ . We also see that for every  $f \neq 0$ , the set  $\text{Hoc}(\{f\})$  has at least two elements.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $F \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ , and let  $L := \text{Clop}(\{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ . Then we have:*

- (1)  $F \subseteq L\text{Hoc}(F)$ .
- (2)  $\text{Hoc}(F) \subseteq L(FL)$ .

*Proof:* For every  $f \in F$ , we have  $f = \sum_{h \in \text{Hoc}(f)} h$ , and therefore  $F \subseteq L\text{Hoc}(F)$ . For proving the second assertion, we show that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $f \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , every  $h \in \text{Hoc}(\{f\})$  satisfies  $h \in L(\{f\}L)$ . We proceed by induction on the number of homogeneous components of  $f$ , i.e., on  $|\text{Hoc}(\{f\})|$ . If  $|\text{Hoc}(\{f\})| = 1$ , then  $f = 0$ , therefore  $\text{Hoc}(\{f\}) = \{0\}$  and thus  $\text{Hoc}(\{f\}) \subseteq L(\{f\}L)$ . For the induction step, we assume that  $|\text{Hoc}(\{f\})| \geq 2$ . We list all subsets of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  as  $(I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{2^n})$  in such a way that for all  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we have  $I_i \subseteq I_j \Rightarrow i \leq j$ . Now

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} H_{I_j}(f).$$

Let  $k$  be minimal with  $H_{I_k}(f) \neq 0$ . Then, for all  $j$  with  $j > k$ ,  $I_j \not\subseteq I_k$ , and hence there is  $m \in I_j$  such that  $m \notin I_k$ . We produce  $f'$  from  $f$  by setting all variables whose indices are not in  $I_k$  to 0. Clearly  $f' \in \{f\}L$ . Since all summands of  $f$  for  $j > k$  become 0 by this setting, we have  $f' = H_{I_k}(f)$ . By the induction hypothesis, every homogeneous component of  $f - f' = \sum_{j=k+1}^{2^n} H_{I_j}(f)$  lies in  $L(\{f - f'\}L)$ . Since  $f' \in \{f\}L$ , we have  $f - f' \in L(\{f\}L)$ , and therefore  $L(\{f - f'\}L) \subseteq L((L(\{f\}L))L) = L(\{f\}L)$  and so we obtain that  $\{H_{I_{k+1}}, \dots, H_{I_{2^n}}\} \subseteq L(\{f\}L)$ .  $\square$

The following theorem will help us to represent term functions of the algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  as sums of absorbing functions. Informally, the idea is the following: Suppose that we have a universal algebra  $\mathbf{A} = (A, +, -, 0, (f_i)_{i \in I})$ , and let  $F := \{f_i \mid i \in I\}$ . To simplify the discussion, we assume that all  $f_i$  have positive arity. Every term

function of  $\mathbf{A}$  can be represented as by a tree whose leaves are variables or 0, and whose other nodes are elements of  $F \cup \{+, -\}$ . Our goal is to move  $+$  and  $-$  to the top of the tree. To this end, we transform the tree into a tree whose nodes are labelled by a new set of functions,  $H$ , and by  $+$  and  $-$ . All functions in  $H$  will be absorbing, and in the new tree, no node labelled by  $+$  or  $-$  will appear inside a subtree rooted by an element of  $H$ . Deviating from this explanation, we will not work with the operations of the algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  directly, but rather with polynomials over a field whose universe is  $A$ . Given a set  $F$  of polynomials, we will obtain a set  $H$  of homovariate polynomials such that each polynomial in  $\text{Clop}(F \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$  is a sum of compositions of polynomials in  $H$ ; this set of sums of compositions is the just the product  $LC$ , where  $C = \text{Clop}(H)$ .

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a field, let  $F \subseteq K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ ,  $L := \text{Clop}(\{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ , and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that the total degree of each  $f \in F$  is at most  $n$ . Then there exists a set  $H \subseteq K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  of homovariate polynomials such that*

$$(5.1) \quad L \text{Clop}(H) = \text{Clop}(F \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$$

and the total degree of each  $h \in H$  is at most  $n$ .

*Proof:* In the case  $F = \emptyset$ , we choose  $H := F$  obtain that both sides are equal to the subgroup of  $(K[x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}], +, -, 0)$  generated by  $\{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Let us now assume  $F \neq \emptyset$ . We consider the subgroup  $S = (L(FL)) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  of  $(K[x_1, \dots, x_n], +, -, 0)$ . Let

$$H := \text{Hoc}(S) = \text{Hoc}\left((L(FL)) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n]\right).$$

Now each  $h \in H$  is a homovariate component of a polynomial in  $L(FL)$ , and has therefore total degree at most  $n$ . We now start to establish (5.1). By Lemma 5.4, we have  $H = \text{Hoc}(S) \subseteq L(SL)$ . Since  $S \subseteq L(FL)$ , and since by Lemma 5.2(2),  $L(FL)$  is closed under composition with polynomials from  $L$  from both sides, we obtain  $L(SL) \subseteq L(FL)$ , and therefore  $H \subseteq L(FL)$ , and then also

$$(5.2) \quad HL \subseteq L(FL).$$

We will now prove

$$(5.3) \quad \text{Clop}(H \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\}) = L \text{Clop}(H).$$

$\supseteq$ : Both sets  $L$  and  $\text{Clop}(H)$  are subsets of  $\text{Clop}(H \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ . Since  $\text{Clop}(H)$  is a clone, their product  $L \text{Clop}(H)$  is also a subset of  $\text{Clop}(H)$ .

$\subseteq$ : We use Lemma 5.3 with  $C := H \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\}$  and  $M = L \text{Clop}(H)$ , and observe that  $\{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq M$ . For proving  $CM \subseteq M$ , we observe that using the Associativity Lemma (Lemma 5.2), we obtain  $CM = HM \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\}M \subseteq HM \cup L(L \text{Clop}(H)) = HM \cup L \text{Clop}(H) = HM \cup M$ . Hence what remains to



prove is  $HM \subseteq M$ . To this end, we will show that for all  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in L \text{Clop}(H)$  and for all  $g \in H$ , we have

$$(5.4) \quad g(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in L \text{Clop}(H).$$

We fix  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in L \text{Clop}(H)$  and  $g \in H$ . Each  $t_i$  is a sum of elements in  $\text{Clop}(H) \cup \{-p \mid p \in \text{Clop}(H)\}$ . We collect these summands and thereby find  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $s_1, \dots, s_N \in \text{Clop}(H)$ ,  $\sigma : \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , and  $(m_i)_{i=1}^n$  with  $0 = m_0 \leq m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \dots \leq m_n = N$  such that for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$t_i = \sum_{j=m_{i-1}+1}^{m_i} (-1)^{\sigma(j)} s_j.$$

We define  $e \in K[x_1, \dots, x_N]$  by

$$e(x_1, \dots, x_N) := g\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_1} (-1)^{\sigma(j)} x_j, \dots, \sum_{j=m_{n-1}+1}^N (-1)^{\sigma(j)} x_j\right),$$

which implies

$$e(s_1, \dots, s_N) = g(t_1, \dots, t_n).$$

Then  $e \in HL$ , and thus by (5.2),  $e \in L(FL)$ . We decompose  $e$  into its homovariate components and obtain

$$(5.5) \quad e = \sum_{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}} H_I(e).$$

Let  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ . We first observe that  $H_I(e) \in \text{Hoc}(L(FL))$ , which by Lemma 5.4 is a subset of  $L((L(FL))L)$ . Hence by Lemma 5.2(2), we obtain

$$(5.6) \quad H_I(e) \in L(FL).$$

We will now show that for each  $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , we have

$$(5.7) \quad H_I(e) \in \{0\} \cup \text{Clop}(H) \subseteq L \text{Clop}(H).$$

We first consider the case  $|I| > n$ . Since  $e \in L(FL)$  is obtained by adding and substituting linear polynomials into polynomials from  $F$ ,  $e$  has total degree at most  $n$ . Hence  $H_I(e) = 0$ . In the case  $|I| \leq n$ , we let  $\pi : \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  be a bijection such that  $I \subseteq \pi[\{1, 2, \dots, n\}]$ . Then clearly  $\pi^{-1}[I] \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We define

$$p_I(x_1, \dots, x_N) := H_I(e)(x_{\pi^{-1}(1)}, x_{\pi^{-1}(2)}, \dots, x_{\pi^{-1}(N)}).$$

Then by (5.6),  $p_I \in (L(FL))L \subseteq L(FL)$ . Since  $H_I(e)(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  contains only variables  $x_i$  with  $i \in I$ ,  $H_I(e)(x_{\pi^{-1}(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi^{-1}(N)})$  contains only  $x_{\pi^{-1}(i)}$  with  $i \in I$ . Thus  $p_I \in K[x_{\pi^{-1}(i)} \mid i \in I]$ , which implies  $p_I \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Therefore,  $p_I$

is a homovariate polynomial in  $(L(FL)) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , and thus  $p_I \in H$ . Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned} p_I(s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, s_{\pi(N)}) &= H_I(e)(s_{\pi(\pi^{-1}(1))}, \dots, s_{\pi(\pi^{-1}(N))}) \\ &= H_I(e)(s_1, \dots, s_N). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $p_I \in H$ , we have  $p_I(s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, s_{\pi(N)}) \in \text{Clop}(H)$ . Therefore,  $H_I(e)(s_1, \dots, s_N) \in \text{Clop}(H)$ , which completes the proof of (5.7). Using (5.5), we obtain that  $e(s_1, \dots, s_N) \in L\text{Clop}(H)$ . This completes the proof of (5.4). Now applying Lemma 5.3 we obtain the “ $\subseteq$ ”-inclusion of (5.3).

We finish the proof by establishing that

$$(5.8) \quad \text{Clop}(F \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\}) = \text{Clop}(H \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\}).$$

For  $\subseteq$ , we first observe that  $F \subseteq L\text{Hoc}(F)$ . Each  $g \in \text{Hoc}(F)$  contains at most  $n$  variables. Replacing these  $n$  variables by  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and undoing this replacement afterwards, we obtain

$$(5.9) \quad \text{Hoc}(F) \subseteq ((\text{Hoc}(F)L) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n])L.$$

The next goal is to prove

$$(5.10) \quad (\text{Hoc}(F)L) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n] \subseteq LH.$$

By Lemma 5.4,  $\text{Hoc}(F) \subseteq L(FL)$ , thus  $\text{Hoc}(F)L \subseteq L(FL)$ . Therefore

$$(\text{Hoc}(F)L) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n] \subseteq (L(FL)) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n].$$

Now by Lemma 5.4,

$$(L(FL)) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n] \subseteq L\text{Hoc}(L(FL) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n]) = LH,$$

which completes the proof of (5.10). Combining (5.9) and (5.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} F &\subseteq L\text{Hoc}(F) \\ &\subseteq L\left(\left((\text{Hoc}(F)L) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_n]\right)L\right) \text{ (by (5.9))} \\ &\subseteq L((LH)L) \text{ (by (5.10)).} \end{aligned}$$

Since both  $L$  and  $H$  are subsets of  $\text{Clop}(H \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ , we obtain  $F \subseteq \text{Clop}(H \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ . From this, the inclusion  $\subseteq$  of (5.8) immediately follows. For the other inclusion in (5.8), we use (5.2) to obtain  $H \subseteq L(FL)$ . Hence  $H \subseteq \text{Clop}(F \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$ . This proves (5.8); together with (5.3), this establishes the claim in (5.1).  $\square$

## 6. CLONES OF FINITARY FUNCTIONS

We call a finite algebra  $\mathbf{A} = (A, +, -, 0, (f_i)_{i \in I})$  an *expanded elementary abelian group* if  $(A, +, -, 0)$  is a finite abelian group of prime exponent. We call  $*$  a *field multiplication* on  $\mathbf{A}$  if  $\mathbf{K} := (A, +, -, 0, *)$  is a field;  $\mathbf{K}$  is then a *field associated*

with  $\mathbf{A}$ . We do not claim that such a multiplication has any further connection to the algebra  $\mathbf{A}$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a field, let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $p \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be such that  $p^{\mathbf{K},n}$  is an absorbing function from  $K^n$  to  $K$ . Then  $p^{\mathbf{K},n} = (H_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}(p))^{\mathbf{K},n}$ .*

*Proof:* We proceed by induction on the number  $k := \#\{I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \mid H_I(p) \neq 0\}$  of non-zero homovariate components of  $p$ . If  $k = 0$ , then  $p = 0$  and  $H_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}} = 0$ . If  $k \geq 1$ , we let  $I$  be minimal with respect to  $\subseteq$  such that  $H_I(p) \neq 0$ . If  $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , then  $p = H_I(p)$ . If  $I \neq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we write  $p$  as the sum of its homovariate components, which means

$$p = \sum_{J \subseteq \{1,2,\dots,n\}} H_J(p).$$

We set all  $x_i$  with  $i \notin I$  to 0 and obtain  $0 = H_I(p)^{\mathbf{K},n}$ . Therefore,  $q := p - H_I(p)$  satisfies  $p^{\mathbf{K},n} = q^{\mathbf{K},n}$ . By the induction hypothesis  $q^{\mathbf{K},n} = H_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}(q)^{\mathbf{K},n}$ . Now since  $H_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}(q) = H_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}(p)$ , we obtain  $(H_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}(q))^{\mathbf{K},n} = (H_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}(p))^{\mathbf{K},n}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} = (A, +, -, 0, (f_i)_{i \in I})$  an expanded elementary abelian group, and let  $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We assume that for each  $i \in I$ , the arity of  $f_i$  is at most  $m$ , and that  $\mathbf{A}$  is nilpotent of class at most  $k$ . Then all absorbing polynomial functions of  $\mathbf{A}$  are of essential arity at most  $(m(|A| - 1))^{k-1}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $|A| = 1$ , then all polynomial functions are of essential arity 0, and hence the claim holds. We will now assume  $|A| > 1$ . We let  $(\alpha_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  be the lower central series of  $\mathbf{A}$  defined by  $\alpha_0 := 1_A$  and  $\alpha_i = [1_A, \alpha_{i-1}]$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and for  $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we define  $A_i := 0/\alpha_i$  to be the ideal of  $\mathbf{A}$  associated with  $\alpha_i$ ; hence  $A_0 = A$ . Then by  $k$ -nilpotency,  $A_k = 0$ . Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a field associated with  $\mathbf{A}$ . For each  $i \in I$ , we let  $m_i$  be the arity of  $f_i$ , and we choose  $f'_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_m]$  such that

$$(f'_i)^{\mathbf{K},n}(a_1, \dots, a_m) = f_i(a_1, \dots, a_{m_i})$$

for all  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A$  and  $\deg_{x_j}(f'_i) < |A|$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ .

Then the total degree of  $f'_i$  is at most  $n := m(|A| - 1)$ . Let

$$F := \{f'_i \mid i \in I\}.$$

Then  $F \subseteq K[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . We use Theorem 5.5 to obtain a set  $H \subseteq K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  of homovariate polynomials such that

$$(6.1) \quad L \text{ Clop}(H) = \text{Clop}(F \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\})$$

and the total degree of each  $h \in H$  is at most  $n$ .

We will show next that for all  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and for all  $p \in \text{Clop}(H) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ , the following property holds:

$$(6.2) \quad \text{if } p \text{ contains at least } n^{l-1} + 1 \text{ variables, then } p^{\mathbf{K},N}(A^N) \subseteq A_l.$$

Seeking a contradiction, we let  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  be minimal such that there is an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and a  $p \in \text{Clop}(H) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_N]$  that contains at least  $n^{l-1} + 1$  variables and  $p^{\mathbf{K},N}(A^N) \not\subseteq A_l$ . Among those  $p$ , we choose one of minimal depth  $\delta_H(p)$  (as defined before Lemma 5.3) with respect to  $H$ . Since  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $p$  contains at least two variables, and thus  $p$  is not a variable and not a constant polynomial. Therefore,

$$p = h(t_1, \dots, t_n)$$

with  $h \in H$  nonconstant and  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \text{Clop}(H)$ .

In the case that  $h$  contains only one variable, we let  $x_j$  be this variable. The polynomial  $t_j$  must then also contain at least  $n^{l-1} + 1$  variables. By the minimality of  $\delta_H(p)$ ,  $t_j^{\mathbf{K},n}(A^n) \subseteq A_l$ . Since  $h$  is homovariate, the function  $g_1 : a_j \mapsto h^{\mathbf{K},n}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , which is formally defined by

$$g_1 = \{(a_j, h^{\mathbf{K},n}(a_1, \dots, a_n)) \mid a_1, \dots, a_n \in A\},$$

satisfies  $g_1(0) = 0$ . Since  $h^{\mathbf{K},n}$  is a term operation of  $\mathbf{A}$ , we have  $g_1(A_l) \subseteq A_l$ , and therefore  $p^{\mathbf{K},N}(A^N) \subseteq A_l$ , contradicting the choice of  $p$ .

In the case that  $h$  contains exactly  $r$  variables with  $2 \leq r \leq n$ , we let  $x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_r}$  be these variables, and define  $g_2 : A^r \rightarrow A$  by

$$g_2 : (a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, \dots, a_{j_r}) \mapsto h^{\mathbf{K},n}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$$

We first show that for all  $i_1, \dots, i_r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,

$$(6.3) \quad g_2(A_{i_1} \times \dots \times A_{i_r}) \subseteq A_{\max(\{i_1, \dots, i_r\})+1}.$$

To this end, we fix  $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \prod_{s=1}^r A_{i_s}$ . The function  $g_2$  is a term function of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Let  $u$  be such that  $i_u = \max(\{i_1, \dots, i_r\})$ , and let  $v \in \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{u\}$ . We define

$$g_3(x, y) := g_2(a_1, \dots, a_{u-1}, x, a_{u+1}, \dots, a_{v-1}, y, a_{v+1}, \dots, a_r).$$

Then  $g_3$  is a polynomial function of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Since  $h$  is homovariate,  $g_3(a, 0) = g_3(0, a) = 0$  for all  $a \in A$ . Denoting  $0/[\alpha_d, \alpha_e]$  simply by  $[A_d, A_e]$ , Lemma 3.4 implies  $g_3(a_u, a_v) \in [A_{i_u}, A_{i_v}] \subseteq [A_{i_u}, A] \subseteq A_{i_u+1}$ . This completes the proof of (6.3).

Continuing with the proof of (6.2), we first consider the case  $l = 1$ . Then by (6.3),  $g_2(A^r) = g_2(A_0^r) \subseteq A_1$ , and therefore  $h^{\mathbf{K},n}(A^n) \subseteq A_1$ . Hence  $p^{\mathbf{K},N}(A^N) \subseteq A_1$ , contradicting the choice of  $p$ .

In the case  $l \geq 2$ , one of the polynomials  $t_{j_1}, \dots, t_{j_r}$  contains at least  $n^{l-2} + 1$  variables: if all contained at most  $n^{l-2}$  variables, also  $p = h(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  would contain at most  $rn^{l-2} \leq n^{l-1}$  variables, contradicting the choice of  $p$ . Let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $t_{j_s}$  contains at least  $n^{l-2} + 1$  variables. By the minimality of  $l$ , we see that  $t_{j_s}(A^n) \subseteq A_{l-1}$ . By (6.3),  $g_2(A \times \dots \times A \times A_{l-1} \times A \times \dots \times A) \subseteq A_l$ , where  $A_{l-1}$  occurs at place  $s$ . Thus  $p^{\mathbf{K},N}(A^N) \subseteq A_l$ , contradicting again the choice of  $p$ . This completes the proof of (6.2).

Setting  $l := k$ , we see that every  $p \in \text{Clop}(H)$  that contains at least  $n^{k-1} + 1$  variables induces the constant 0 function on  $\mathbf{K}$ .

We will now show that all absorbing polynomial functions of  $\mathbf{A}$  depend on at most  $n^{k-1}$  variables. To this end, let  $N > n^{k-1}$ , and let  $q$  be an  $N$ -ary absorbing polynomial function of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then there is  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  and there are  $t \in \text{Clo}_{M+N}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_M \in A$  such that

$$q(a_1, \dots, a_N) = t(a_1, \dots, a_N, b_1, \dots, b_M)$$

for all  $a_1, \dots, a_N \in A$ . Since  $t \in \text{Clo}_{N+M}(\mathbf{A})$ , there is a polynomial  $p \in \text{Clop}(F \cup \{x_1 + x_2, -x_1, 0\}) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_{N+M}]$  such that  $t = p^{\mathbf{K}, N+M}$ . Then by (6.1),  $p \in L \text{Clop}(H)$ , and therefore, there is  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $p = \sum_{i=1}^l p_i$  with  $p_i \in \text{Clop}(H)$ . We let

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= \{i \in \{1, \dots, l\} : p_i \text{ contains all the variables } x_1, \dots, x_N\}, \\ J &:= \{1, \dots, l\} \setminus I. \end{aligned}$$

For  $i \in I$ ,  $p_i$  contains at least  $n^{k-1} + 1$  variables, and therefore  $p_i$  induces the 0-function on  $\mathbf{A}$ . Thus

$$p^{\mathbf{K}, N+M} = \sum_{i \in J} p_i^{\mathbf{K}, N+M}.$$

For  $i \in J$ , let

$$r_i(x_1, \dots, x_N) := p_i(x_1, \dots, x_N, b_1, \dots, b_M) \in K[x_1, \dots, x_N].$$

Then we have

$$q(a_1, \dots, a_N) = \sum_{i \in J} r_i^{\mathbf{K}, N}(a_1, \dots, a_N)$$

for all  $a_1, \dots, a_N \in A$ . Since  $q$  is absorbing,  $\sum_{i \in J} r_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  induces an absorbing function on  $K$ . By Lemma 6.1,  $\sum_{i \in J} r_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  induces the same function as  $H_{\{1, \dots, N\}}(\sum_{i \in J} r_i(x_1, \dots, x_N))$ . For each  $i \in J$ ,  $p_i$  does not contain all the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_N$ . Thus  $r_i$  has no monomial that contains all the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_N$ , and therefore the sum  $\sum_{i \in J} r_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  does not contain such a monomial, either. Hence  $H_{\{1, \dots, N\}}(\sum_{i \in J} r_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)) = 0$ . Therefore  $\sum_{i \in J} r_i(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  induces the 0-function on  $K$ , which implies  $q = 0$ .  $\square$

## 7. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

*Proof of Theorem 1.2:* As a nilpotent algebra in a congruence modular variety,  $\mathbf{A}$  has a Mal'cev term (see Theorem 6.2 of [FM87] and the remarks after the proof of Corollary 7.2, cf. [Kea99, Theorem 2.7]). We choose an element  $o \in A$  and let  $L = \langle 0_A = \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_h = 1_A \rangle$  be a maximal chain in the congruence lattice of  $\mathbf{A}$ . By Lemma 4.1, the abelian group associated with  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $L$  and  $o$  is elementary abelian, and therefore we can use Theorem 4.2 to expand  $\mathbf{A} = (A, (f_i)_{i \in I})$  with operations  $+$  and  $-$  and thereby obtain an  $h$ -nilpotent expanded group  $\mathbf{V} := (A, +, -, 0, (f_i)_{i \in I})$  with elementary abelian group reduct. Then by

Theorem 6.2, all nonzero absorbing polynomial functions of  $\mathbf{V}$  are of arity at most  $s = (m(q-1))^{h-1}$ . Hence by Lemma 2.3,  $\mathbf{V}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent, and then by Lemma 2.2, its reduct  $\mathbf{A}$  is also  $s$ -supernilpotent. The claim on the free spectrum now follows from Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.3:* As a nilpotent algebra in a congruence modular variety,  $\mathbf{A}$  has a Mal'cev term. We write  $\mathbf{A} = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{B}_i$  with each  $\mathbf{B}_i$  of prime power order. By Theorem 1.2, each  $\mathbf{B}_i$  is  $s_i$ -supernilpotent with  $s_i = (m(|B_i| - 1))^{h_i-1}$ , where  $h_i$  is the height of the congruence lattice of  $\mathbf{B}_i$ . As a nilpotent algebra in a congruence modular variety,  $\mathbf{B}_i$  is congruence uniform [FM87, Corollary 7.5], which implies  $h_i \leq \log_2(|B_i|)$ . Since  $|B_i| \leq |A|$ , we have  $s_i \leq s$ , and therefore each factor  $\mathbf{B}_i$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent. Hence  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $s$ -supernilpotent. The claim on the free spectrum again follows from Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.4:* For proving (1), we assume that  $\mathbf{A}$  has small free spectrum. Then from Lemma 2.4(4) $\Rightarrow$ (2), we obtain that  $\mathbf{A}$  is nilpotent. By [Kea99, Theorem 3.14],  $\mathbf{A}$  is isomorphic to a direct product of algebras of prime power order. Now Corollary 1.3 yields that  $\mathbf{A}$  is  $((m(|A| - 1))^{\log_2(|A|)-1})$ -supernilpotent and that the free spectrum  $f_{\mathbf{A}}$  is of the form  $f_{\mathbf{A}}(n) = 2^{p(n)}$  with  $\deg(p) \leq (m(|A| - 1))^{\log_2(|A|)-1}$ . For proving (2), we assume that  $\mathbf{A}$  is supernilpotent. Then from Lemma 2.4(1) $\Rightarrow$ (4), we obtain that  $\mathbf{A}$  has small free spectrum. Now we proceed as in (1).  $\square$

## 8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Sebastian Kreinecker for numerous discussions on clones of polynomials and Nebojša Mudrinski and Jakub Opršal for discussions on Section 2.

## REFERENCES

- [AE06] E. Aichinger and J. Ecker, *Every  $(k+1)$ -affine complete nilpotent group of class  $k$  is affine complete*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **16** (2006), no. 2, 259–274.
- [Aic06] E. Aichinger, *The polynomial functions of certain algebras that are simple modulo their center*, Contributions to general algebra. 17, Heyn, Klagenfurt, 2006, pp. 9–24.
- [Aic14] ———, *On the direct decomposition of nilpotent expanded groups*, Comm. Algebra **42** (2014), no. 6, 2651–2662.
- [AM07] E. Aichinger and P. Mayr, *Polynomial clones on groups of order  $pq$* , Acta Math. Hungar. **114** (2007), no. 3, 267–285.
- [AM10] E. Aichinger and N. Mudrinski, *Some applications of higher commutators in Mal'cev algebras*, Algebra Universalis **63** (2010), no. 4, 367–403.
- [AM13] ———, *On various concepts of nilpotence for expansions of groups*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **83** (2013), no. 4, 583–604.
- [AMO18] E. Aichinger, N. Mudrinski, and J. Opršal, *Complexity of term representations of finitary functions*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **28** (2018), 1101–1118.

- [BB87] J. Berman and W. J. Blok, *Free spectra of nilpotent varieties*, Algebra Universalis **24** (1987), no. 3, 279–282.
- [BS81] S. Burris and H. P. Sankappanavar, *A course in universal algebra*, Springer New York Heidelberg Berlin, 1981.
- [Bul01] A. Bulatov, *On the number of finite Mal'tsev algebras*, Contributions to general algebra, 13 (Velké Karlovice, 1999/Dresden, 2000), Heyn, Klagenfurt, 2001, pp. 41–54.
- [CF09] M. Couceiro and S. Foldes, *Function classes and relational constraints stable under compositions with clones*, Discuss. Math. Gen. Algebra Appl. **29** (2009), no. 2, 109–121.
- [FM87] R. Freese and R. N. McKenzie, *Commutator theory for congruence modular varieties*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 125, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [Fre83] R. Freese, *Subdirectly irreducible algebras in modular varieties*, Universal algebra and lattice theory (Puebla, 1982), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1004, Springer, Berlin, 1983, pp. 142–152.
- [Gum83] H. P. Gumm, *Geometrical methods in congruence modular algebras*, vol. 45, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., no. 286, American Mathematical Society, 1983.
- [Her79] C. Herrmann, *Affine algebras in congruence modular varieties*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **41** (1979), no. 1-2, 119–125.
- [Hig67] G. Higman, *The orders of relatively free groups*, Proc. Internat. Conf. Theory of Groups (Canberra, 1965), Gordon and Breach, New York, 1967, pp. 153–165.
- [HM88] D. Hobby and R. McKenzie, *The structure of finite algebras*, Contemporary mathematics, vol. 76, American Mathematical Society, 1988.
- [Kea99] K. A. Kearnes, *Congruence modular varieties with small free spectra*, Algebra Universalis **42** (1999), no. 3, 165–181.
- [Kis92] E. W. Kiss, *Three remarks on the modular commutator*, Algebra Universalis **29** (1992), no. 4, 455–476.
- [Kre18] S. Kreinecker, *Closed function sets on groups of prime order*, ArXiv e-prints (2018), 1810.09175.
- [MMT87] R. N. McKenzie, G. F. McNulty, and W. F. Taylor, *Algebras, lattices, varieties, volume I*, Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole Advanced Books & Software, Monterey, California, 1987.
- [Moo18] A. Moorhead, *Higher commutator theory for congruence modular varieties*, J. Algebra **513** (2018), 133–158.
- [Smi76] J. D. H. Smith, *Mal'cev varieties*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 554, Springer Verlag Berlin, 1976.
- [VL83] M. R. Vaughan-Lee, *Nilpotence in permutable varieties*, Universal algebra and lattice theory (Puebla, 1982), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1004, Springer, Berlin, 1983, pp. 293–308.
- [Wir19] A. Wires, *On Supernilpotent Algebras*, Algebra Universalis **80**:1 (2019).

ERHARD AICHINGER, INSTITUT FÜR ALGEBRA, JOHANNES KEPLER UNIVERSITÄT LINZ, 4040 LINZ, AUSTRIA

*E-mail address:* erhard@algebra.uni-linz.ac.at

*URL:* <http://www.jku.at/algebra>