

# TWO-SIDED EXPANSIONS OF MONOIDS

GANNA KUDRYAVTSEVA

**ABSTRACT.** We initiate the study of expansions of monoids in the class of *two-sided restriction monoids* and show that generalizations of the Birget-Rhodes prefix group expansion, despite the absence of involution, have rich structure close to that of respective relatively free *inverse* monoids.

For a monoid  $M$ , we define  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  to be the freest two-sided restriction monoid generated by a bijective copy,  $M'$ , of the underlying set of  $M$ , such that the inclusion map  $\iota: M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is determined by a set of relations,  $R$ , so that  $\iota$  is a premorphism which is weaker than a homomorphism. Our main result states that  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  can be constructed, by means of a partial action product construction, from  $M$  and the idempotent semilattice of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ , the free  $M'$ -generated inverse monoid subject to relations  $R$ . In particular, the semilattice of projections of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is isomorphic to the idempotent semilattice of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . The result by Fountain, Gomes and Gould on the structure of the free two-sided restriction monoid is recovered as a special case of our result.

We show that important properties of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  are well agreed with suitable properties of  $M$ , such as being cancellative or embeddable into a group. We observe that if  $M$  is an inverse monoid, then  $\mathcal{FI}_s(M)$ , the free inverse monoid with respect to strong premorphisms, is isomorphic to the Lawson-Margolis-Steinberg generalized prefix expansion  $M^{pr}$ . This gives a presentation of  $M^{pr}$  and leads to a model for  $\mathcal{FR}_s(M)$  in terms of the known model for  $M^{pr}$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The *Birget-Rhodes prefix expansion of a group* [2] is a construction that assigns to an arbitrary group  $G$  an  $E$ -unitary inverse monoid,  $\tilde{G}^R$ , which has a number of interesting properties and important applications.

There exists extensive literature on generalization of this construction from groups and inverse monoids [25] to monoids and their generalizations [10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19]. As an analogue of  $\tilde{G}^R$  all these generalizations (as well as generalizations [14, 15] of the Margolis-Meakin graph expansions [26]) output *one-sided restriction monoids*. Given that *two-sided restriction monoids* inherit more structure present in inverse monoids than one-sided ones, it looks somewhat surprising that two-sided expansions of monoids have not so far been considered. The aim of the present paper is to initiate their study by showing that they have rich structure close to that of the corresponding relatively free inverse monoids.

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20M10, 20M18, 20M05, 20M99, 20F05.

*Key words and phrases.* expansion, prefix group expansion, restriction monoid, inverse monoid, partial action, premorphism.

The author was partially supported by ARRS grant P1-0288.

Szendrei [30] proposed a model of  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$  where its elements are given by pairs  $(A, g)$  with  $A \subseteq G$  being a finite subset containing 1 and  $g$ . It is this model of  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$  that found generalizations to monoids. Applied to a monoid  $M$ , it produces a one-sided restriction monoid,  $Sz(M)$ , the *Szendrei expansion* of  $M$ . In the group case,  $(A, g)^{\oplus} = (A, g)(A, g)^{-1} = (A, 1)$  and  $(A, g)^{\otimes} = (A, g)^{-1}(A, g) = (g^{-1}A, 1)$ . In the monoid case, one similarly puts  $(A, m)^+ = (A, 1)$ , which makes  $Sz(M)$  a one-sided restriction monoid. However, since monoids do not have involution, it looks unclear how to extend  $(A, g)^{\otimes}$  to the monoid case thus making a quotient of  $Sz(M)$  generate a two-sided restriction monoid.

Szendrei's model of  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$  appears in Exel's work [9] as an inverse monoid being a quotient of a certain inverse monoid,  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ , given by generators and relations, determined by the property that any partial action of  $G$  can be lifted to an action of  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ . Kellendonk and Lawson [22] completed Exel's work by showing that  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  is in fact isomorphic to  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$ . Due to the correspondence between partial actions and premorphisms,  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$  is uniquely determined by its universal property: the map  $G \rightarrow \tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}, g \mapsto (\{1, g\}, g)$ , is a premorphism universal amongst all premorphisms from  $G$  to inverse monoids.

In this paper, we take the universal property of  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$ , extended to the setting where  $M$  is a monoid, as the definition of an analogue of  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$ . We thus define  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  to be the freest  $M'$ -generated two-sided restriction monoid, where  $M' = \{m' : m \in M\}$  is a bijective copy of the underlying set of  $M$ , subject to a set of relations,  $R$ , on the free  $M'$ -generated two-sided restriction monoid. We require that the map  $m \mapsto m', m \in M$ , is a premorphism which is weaker than a homomorphism, so that  $R$  can be any 'intermediate' set between the one determining a general premorphism and the one determining a homomorphism (cf. Section 3 for details). This includes (but is not limited to) general premorphisms, left strong premorphisms, right strong premorphisms, strong premorphisms and homomorphisms.

Our crucial observation is that the projection semilattice  $P(\mathcal{FR}_R(M))$  turns out to be isomorphic to the idempotent semilattice  $E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$  of the free *inverse* monoid  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  over  $M$  with respect to  $R$ . Composing the inclusion premorphism of  $M$  into  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  with the *Munn representation*, one obtains a premorphism from  $M$  to  $T_{E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))}$ , the *Munn inverse monoid* of the semilattice  $E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$ . This data, via a partial action product construction, gives rise to the two-sided restriction monoid  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  (for its precise definition, see Subsection 2.4). Theorem 5.6, our main result, states that  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$ , for any set  $R$  of admissible relations. As special cases this includes expansions with respect to all above-mentioned kinds of premorphisms. In the case where  $R$  defines a homomorphism and  $M = A^*$ , we recover the result by Fountain, Gomes and Gould [12] on the structure of the free  $A$ -generated two-sided restriction monoid. Therefore, our work upgrades the result of [12] from  $A^*$  to any monoid and from the expansion with respect to homomorphisms to expansions determined by arbitrary sets of admissible relations. Theorem 5.6 provides a precise sense of the main thesis of this paper that  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ , despite the absence of involution, has rich structure close to that of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ .

We show that properties of the monoid  $M$  are well agreed with suitable properties of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ . Thus  $M$  is left cancellative (resp. right cancellative or cancellative) if and only

if  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is left ample (resp. right ample or ample), cf. Theorem 7.1. Furthermore,  $M$  embeds into a group if and only if the canonical map from  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  to  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  is injective, cf. Theorem 7.4. We pay special attention to the case where  $M$  is an inverse monoid. We give a presentation for the *Lawson-Margolis-Steinberg generalized prefix expansion*  $M^{pr}$  of  $M$  [25] which shows that  $M^{pr}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{FI}_s(M)$ , cf. Theorem 7.10. In view of Theorem 5.6 and the known model for  $M^{pr}$  [25], this leads to a model of  $\mathcal{FR}_s(M)$ . In the case where  $G$  is a group,  $\mathcal{FR}_s(G)$  is isomorphic to each of  $\mathcal{FI}_s(G)$  and  $\tilde{G}^R$ , cf. Corollary 7.13.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall definitions and facts on two-sided restriction monoids, needed in this paper. In Section 3 we define the expansions  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  and study their first properties. Further, in Section 4 we state the  $F$ -restriction universal property of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  which generalizes a result by Szendrei [30]. In Section 5 we introduce the inverse monoids  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  and the partial action products  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  and then formulate Theorem 5.6. Section 6 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5.6. Finally, in Section 7 we consider special cases where  $M$  is left, right or two-sided cancellative, embeddable into a group or an inverse monoid.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Restriction monoids.** In this section we recall the definition and basic properties of restriction monoids. Our presentation follows recent works [31, 32] on the subject. For more details, we refer the reader to [16, 20, 6].

A *restriction semigroup* is an algebra  $(S; \cdot, *, ^+, ^+)$ , where  $(S; \cdot)$  is a semigroup and  $*$  and  $^+$  are unary operations satisfying the following identities:

$$(2.1) \quad xx^* = x, \quad x^*y^* = y^*x^*, \quad (xy^*)^* = x^*y^*, \quad x^*y = y(xy)^*;$$

$$(2.2) \quad x^+x = x, \quad x^+y^+ = y^+x^+, \quad (x^+y)^+ = x^+y^+, \quad xy^+ = (xy)^+x;$$

$$(2.3) \quad (x^+)^* = x^+, \quad (x^*)^+ = x^*.$$

The following useful identities are consequences of the axioms:

$$(2.4) \quad (xy)^* = (x^*y)^*, \quad (xy)^+ = (xy^+)^+.$$

A restriction semigroup possessing an identity element is called a *restriction monoid*. A restriction monoid is thus an algebra  $(S; \cdot, *, ^+, 1)$  of type  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ . Throughout the paper we always consider restriction monoids as  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -algebras. It is immediate from the definition that restriction monoids form a variety of type  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ . Note that the axioms imply that, in a restriction monoid,  $1^* = 1^+ = 1$ . We emphasize that by a restriction monoid we always mean a *two-sided restriction monoid*.

A *homomorphism of restriction monoids* is required to be a  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -homomorphism, that is, it preserves the multiplication, the unary operations  $*$  and  $^+$  and the identity element.

Let  $S$  be a restriction monoid. It follows from (2.3) that

$$\{x^*: x \in S\} = \{x^+: x \in S\}.$$

This set, denoted by  $P(S)$ , is closed with respect to the multiplication, is a semilattice with top element 1 and  $x^* = x^+ = x$  holds for all  $x \in P(S)$ . Therefore,  $P(S)$  is a  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -subalgebra of  $S$ . It is called the *semilattice of projections* of  $S$ . A projection is necessarily an idempotent, but a restriction monoid may contain idempotents which are not projections.

We will often use the following identities which say that a projection can be ‘moved’ to another side of an element which follow from the axioms:

$$(2.5) \quad ea = a(ea)^* \text{ and } ae = (ae)^+a \text{ for any } a \in S \text{ and } e \in P(S).$$

The following identities also follow from the axioms and will be frequently used in the sequel:

$$(2.6) \quad (ae)^* = (a^*e)^* = a^*e \text{ and } (ea)^+ = (ea^+)^+ = ea^+ \text{ for any } a \in S \text{ and } e \in P(S).$$

The *natural partial order*  $\leq$  on a restriction monoid  $S$  is defined, for  $a, b \in S$ , by  $a \leq b$  if and only if there is  $e \in P(S)$  such that  $a = eb$ . The following properties related to the natural partial order will be used throughout the paper without reference.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $S$  be a restriction monoid and  $a, b \in S$ . Then*

- (1)  $a \leq b$  if and only if  $a = bf$  for some  $f \in P(S)$ .
- (2)  $a \leq b$  if and only if  $a = ba^*$  if and only if  $a = a^+b$ .
- (3) If  $ea = a$  (respectively,  $ae = a$ ), where  $e \in P(S)$ , then  $e \geq a^+$  (respectively,  $e \geq a^*$ ).
- (4)  $a \geq ae, ea$  for any  $e \in P(S)$ .
- (5) The order  $\geq$  is compatible with the multiplication, that is,  $a \geq b$  implies  $ac \geq bc$  and  $ca \geq cb$  for any  $c \in S$ .
- (6) The order  $\geq$  is compatible with the unary operations, that is,  $a \geq b$  implies  $a^* \geq b^*$  and  $a^+ \geq b^+$ .

A *reduced restriction monoid* is a restriction monoid  $S$  that has precisely one projection. Then, necessarily,  $P(S) = \{1\}$ , so that  $a^* = a^+ = 1$  holds for any  $a \in S$ . On the other hand, any monoid  $S$  can be endowed with the structure of a restriction monoid by putting  $a^* = a^+ = 1$  for any  $a \in S$ . It follows that reduced restriction monoids can be identified with monoids (by removing from or adding the operations  $*$  and  $+$  to the signature). It also follows that restriction monoids generalize monoids: the category of monoids is (isomorphic to) a full subcategory of the category of restriction monoids. In what follows, when considering a monoid, we sometimes call it a reduced restriction monoid to emphasise that we are treating it as a restriction monoid.

Let  $\sigma$  be the least congruence on a restriction monoid  $S$ , which identifies all projections. Each of the following two statements is equivalent to  $a \sigma b$ :

- (1) there is  $e \in P(S)$  such that  $ea = eb$ ,
- (2) there is  $e \in P(S)$  such that  $ae = be$ .

The quotient  $S/\sigma$  is a reduced restriction monoid and is the greatest reduced restriction monoid quotient of  $S$ . The congruence  $\sigma$  is called the *least reduced restriction monoid congruence* on  $S$ , or simply *the least monoid congruence* on  $S$ .

A restriction monoid  $S$  is called *proper* if the following two conditions hold:

- (1) For any  $a, b \in S$  : if  $a^* = b^*$  and  $a \sigma b$  then  $a = b$ ,
- (2) For any  $a, b \in S$  : if  $a^+ = b^+$  and  $a \sigma b$  then  $a = b$ .

Proper restriction monoids generalize *E-unitary inverse monoids*.

A restriction monoid  $S$  is called *ample* if for all  $a, b, c \in S$ :

$$(2.7) \quad ac = bc \Rightarrow ac^+ = bc^+ \quad \text{and} \quad ca = cb \Rightarrow c^*a = c^*b.$$

If only the first (resp., the second) of these two implications is required to hold,  $S$  is called *right ample* (resp. *left ample*).

**2.2. Inverse monoids are a special case of restriction monoids.** *Inverse monoids* are monoids endowed with an inversion operation  $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ , which is an involution and satisfies the identities

$$xx^{-1}x = x, \quad xx^{-1}yy^{-1} = yy^{-1}xx^{-1}.$$

We consider an inverse monoid  $(S; \cdot, ^{-1}, 1)$  as a  $(2, 1, 0)$ -algebra. Inverse monoids form a variety of type  $(2, 1, 0)$ . In particular, homomorphisms of inverse monoids are required to commute with taking inverses. For information on inverse monoids we refer the reader to [24].

Let  $S$  be an inverse monoid and  $a \in S$ . We put  $a^\circledast = a^{-1}a$  and  $a^\oplus = aa^{-1}$  (that is,  $a^\circledast$  and  $a^\oplus$  are abbreviations for  $a^{-1}a$  and  $aa^{-1}$ , respectively). It can be easily verified (and is well known) that putting  $a^* = a^\circledast$  and  $a^+ = a^\oplus$  endows  $S$  with a structure of a restriction monoid. It follows that the category of inverse monoids is (isomorphic to) a full subcategory of the category of restriction monoids.

The *natural partial order* on an inverse monoid  $S$  coincides with the natural partial order on  $S$ , considered as a restriction monoid. In the symmetric inverse monoid  $\mathcal{I}(X)$  the inequality  $a \leq b$  means that  $a$  is a *restriction* of  $b$ . It is helpful to adopt this intuition to general restriction monoids. In particular,  $a \sigma b$  can be thought of as that  $a$  and  $b$  have a common restriction.

**2.3. Premorphisms from a monoid to a restriction monoid.** Let  $M$  be a monoid and  $T$  a restriction monoid.

**Definition 2.2.** A *premorphism* is a map  $\varphi: M \rightarrow T$  such that, for any  $m, n \in M$ ,

$$(PM1) \quad \varphi(1) = 1,$$

$$(PM2) \quad \varphi(m)\varphi(n) \leq \varphi(mn).$$

Clearly, the following are two equivalent forms of (PM2):

$$(PM2') \quad \varphi(m)\varphi(n) = \varphi(mn)(\varphi(m)\varphi(n))^*,$$

$$(PM2'') \quad \varphi(m)\varphi(n) = (\varphi(m)\varphi(n))^+\varphi(mn).$$

The discussion in Subsection 2.2 implies that a *premorphism from  $M$  to an inverse monoid* arises as a special case of this definition.

If the axiom (PM2) is replaced by a stronger axiom

$$(PM3) \quad \varphi(m)\varphi(n) = \varphi(mn),$$

the premorphism  $\varphi$  becomes a *homomorphism*.

**Definition 2.3.** A premorphism  $\varphi$  from a monoid  $M$  to a restriction monoid is called

- *left strong* if  $\varphi(m)\varphi(n) = (\varphi(m))^+\varphi(mn)$ , for any  $m, n \in M$ ,
- *right strong* if  $\varphi(m)\varphi(n) = \varphi(mn)(\varphi(n))^*$ , for any  $m, n \in M$ ,
- *strong* if it is both left and right strong.

**Remark 2.4.** Premorphisms from  $M$  to the symmetric inverse monoid  $\mathcal{I}(X)$  have counterparts in terms of *partial actions by partial bijections* of  $M$  on  $X$  (cf. [23]), but in the present paper we choose to adhere to the language of premorphisms. For a comprehensive survey on partial actions, we refer the reader to [8].

**2.4. Structure of proper restriction monoids.** In this subsection we recall the Cornock-Gould structure result on proper restriction monoids [7]. We remark that in [7] a pair of partial actions, called a *double action*, satisfying certain compatibility conditions, was considered, and in [23] we reformulated this using one partial action by partial bijections. Here we restate the construction of [23] in terms of premorphisms. Let  $T$  be a monoid,  $Y$  a semilattice with top element  $e$  and assume that we are given a premorphism  $\varphi: T \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(Y)$ . We assume that for every  $t \in T$  the map  $\varphi(t)$  satisfies the following axioms:

- (A)  $\text{dom}(\varphi(t))$  and  $\text{ran}(\varphi(t))$  are order ideals of  $Y$ .
- (B)  $\varphi(t): \text{dom}(\varphi(t)) \rightarrow \text{ran}(\varphi(t))$  is an order-isomorphism.
- (C)  $\text{dom}(\varphi(t)) \neq \emptyset$ .

We put

$$\mathcal{M}(T, Y) = \{(y, t) \in Y \times T : y \in \text{ran}(\varphi(t))\}$$

and define the multiplication, the unary operations  $*$  and  $^+$  and the identity element on  $\mathcal{M}(T, Y)$  by

$$(2.8) \quad (x, s)(y, t) = (\varphi(s)(\varphi(s)^{-1}(x) \wedge y), st),$$

$$(2.9) \quad (x, s)^* = (\varphi(s)^{-1}(x), 1), \quad (x, s)^+ = (x, 1), \quad (1, e).$$

With respect to these operations  $\mathcal{M}(T, Y)$  is a restriction monoid. It is proper and its semilattice of projections

$$P(\mathcal{M}(T, Y)) = \{(y, 1) : y \in Y\}$$

is isomorphic to  $Y$  via the map  $(y, 1) \mapsto y, y \in Y$ .

The minimum monoid congruence  $\sigma$  on  $\mathcal{M}(T, Y)$  is given by  $(x, s) \sigma (y, t)$  if and only if  $s = t$  so that  $\mathcal{M}(T, Y)/\sigma$  is isomorphic to  $M$ .

In the reverse direction, let  $S$  be a proper restriction monoid. Then there is a premorphism  $\varphi$ , called the *underlying premorphism of  $S$* , from  $T = S/\sigma$  to  $\mathcal{I}(P(S))$  given, for  $t \in S/\sigma$ , by

$$(2.10) \quad \text{dom}(\varphi(t)) = \{e \in P(S) : \text{there is } a \in t \text{ such that } a^* \geq e\}$$

and  $\varphi(t)(e) = (ae)^+$  for any  $e \in \text{dom}(\varphi(t))$  and  $a \in t$  such that  $a^* \geq e$ . The premorphism  $\varphi$  satisfies axioms (A), (B), (C). The following theorem is a specialization to monoids of the result due to Cornock and Gould [7].

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $S$  be a proper restriction monoid. Then  $S$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{M}(S/\sigma, P(S))$ .*

In view of the construction of  $\mathcal{M}(T, Y)$ , following the terminology of [29], it is natural to call  $\mathcal{M}(T, Y)$  the *semidirect type product* of  $T$  by  $Y$  *determined by the premorphism*  $\varphi$ , or just the *partial action product* of  $T$  by  $Y$  where the partial action is determined by the premorphism  $\varphi$ .

### 3. TWO-SIDED EXPANSIONS OF MONOIDS

**3.1. The expansions and the universal property.** Our definition is motivated by the Kellendonk's and Lawson's universal property [22] of the Birget-Rhodes prefix expansion of a group.

Let  $M$  be a monoid. We start from introducing the following two restriction monoids:

- $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$  - the *expansion* of  $M$  *with respect to premorphisms*, or the *free restriction monoid over  $M$  with respect to premorphisms*.
- $\mathcal{FR}(M)$  - the *expansion* of  $M$  *with respect to homomorphisms* or the *free restriction monoid over  $M$* .

We define  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{FR}(M)$  by generators and relations. The generator set for each of them is  $M' = \{[m] : m \in M\}$ . For each of them we include the defining relation

$$(3.1) \quad [1] = 1.$$

Further defining relations are as follows:

- For  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$  we add the relations

$$(3.2) \quad [m][n] = ([m][n])^+ [mn], \quad m, n \in M.$$

The defining relations say that the inclusion map  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$ ,  $m \mapsto [m]$ , is a premorphism. We do not add any more relations. By Lemma 2.1, (3.2) is equivalent to  $[m][n] = [mn]([m][n])^*$ ,  $m, n \in M$ .

- For  $\mathcal{FR}(M)$  we add the relations

$$(3.3) \quad [m][n] = [mn], \quad m, n \in M.$$

The defining relations say that the inclusion map  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}(M)$ ,  $m \mapsto [m]$ , is a homomorphism. We do not add any more relations.

Since relations (3.2) follow from relations (3.3),  $\mathcal{FR}(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$ .

**Example 3.1.** In the case where  $M = A^*$  is a free  $A$ -generated monoid,  $\mathcal{FR}(A^*)$  is obviously isomorphic to the *free restriction monoid*  $\mathcal{FR}(A)$ .<sup>1</sup>

We now make a general definition. Let  $R$  be a set of relations on  $\mathcal{FR}(M')$ . We require that:

- (1) relations  $R$  include relations (3.1) and (3.2);
- (2) relations (3.1) and (3.3) imply relations  $R$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>This should not cause a conflict of notation: it is always clear from the context whether  $X$  denotes a set or a monoid: if  $X$  is a set,  $\mathcal{FR}(X)$  is the free restriction monoid on the generator set  $X$ , whereas when  $X$  is a monoid,  $\mathcal{FR}(X)$  is the free restriction monoid over the monoid  $X$ .

We call  $R$  a set of *admissible relations*. We define  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  to be the  $M'$ -generated restriction monoid subject to relations  $R$ . We call  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  the *expansion* of  $M$  with respect to relations  $R$ , or the *free restriction monoid over  $M$  with respect to relations  $R$* .

A premorphism  $\varphi: M \rightarrow S$ , where  $S$  is a restriction monoid, *obeys* relations  $R$  if it satisfies conditions obtained from relations  $R$  by substituting each  $[m] \in M'$  by  $\varphi(m)$ .

We call the premorphism  $\iota: M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ ,  $m \mapsto [m]$ , the *inclusion premorphism* of  $M$  into  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ . By definition, it obeys relations  $R$ .

The following universal property is an immediate consequence of the definition.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $M$  be a monoid,  $R$  a set of admissible relations and  $S$  a restriction monoid. Let  $\varphi: M \rightarrow S$  be a premorphism obeying relations  $R$  and  $\iota: M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  the inclusion premorphism. Then there is a homomorphism  $\eta: \mathcal{FR}_R(M) \rightarrow S$  of restriction monoids such that  $\varphi = \eta\iota$ .*

The following statement justifies the use of the term ‘expansion’ [1].

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $R$  be a set of admissible relations.*

- (1) *Let  $M$  be a monoid. Then  $M$  is a surjective quotient of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ , under the projection map  $p_M$  which is a homomorphic extension of the map  $[m] \mapsto m$ ,  $m \in M$ .*
- (2) *Let  $\alpha: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  be a homomorphism of monoids. Then there is a homomorphism  $\tilde{\alpha}: \mathcal{FR}_R(M_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M_2)$  of restriction monoids such that the following diagram commutes (where  $p_{M_1}$  and  $p_{M_2}$  are projection maps).*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{FR}_R(M_1) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\alpha}} & \mathcal{FR}_R(M_2) \\ \downarrow p_{M_1} & & \downarrow p_{M_2} \\ M_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & M_2 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* (1) We consider  $M$  as a reduced restriction monoid. Since the identity map on  $M$  is a premorphism obeying relations  $R$ , Proposition 3.2 implies that  $M$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ . In particular, the map  $p_M$  is well defined and is clearly surjective.

(2) Let  $\iota: M_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M_2)$  be the inclusion premorphism and let  $\alpha' = \iota\alpha$ . Then  $\alpha': M_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M_2)$  is a premorphism obeying relations  $R$ . By Proposition 3.2 it extends to a homomorphism  $\tilde{\alpha}: \mathcal{FR}_R(M_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M_2)$ . That the diagram above commutes is immediate from the construction of  $\tilde{\alpha}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** Using the categorical language, for each set  $R$  of admissible relations, we have constructed is a functor,  $\mathcal{FR}_R$ , from the category of monoids to the category of restriction monoids, given on objects by  $M \mapsto \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  and on morphisms by  $\alpha \mapsto \tilde{\alpha}$ . Moreover, there is a natural transformation,  $p$ , from  $\mathcal{FR}_R$  to the identity functor on the category of monoids, whose component at a monoid  $M$ , given by the projection map  $p_M: \mathcal{FR}_R(M) \rightarrow M$ , is surjective.

The following is an immediate consequence of the proof of Proposition 3.3(1).

**Corollary 3.5.** *The inclusion premorphism  $\iota: M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is injective.*



The definitions imply that  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{FR}(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ . A general  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is therefore ‘intermediate’ between  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ . In the following example we present some important intermediate expansions.

**Example 3.6.**

- Let  $R$  be (3.1) and the set of relations

$$(3.4) \quad [m][n] = [m]^+[mn], \quad m, n \in M.$$

The defining relations say that the inclusion map  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is a left strong premorphism. We write  $\mathcal{FR}_{ls}(M)$  for  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  and call it the *expansion of  $M$  with respect to left strong premorphisms* or the *free restriction monoid over  $M$  with respect to left strong premorphisms*.


- Let  $R$  be (3.1) and the set of relations

$$(3.5) \quad [m][n] = [mn][n]^*, \quad m, n \in M.$$

The defining relations say that the inclusion map  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is a right strong premorphism. We write  $\mathcal{FR}_{rs}(M)$  for  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  and call it the *expansion of  $M$  with respect to right strong premorphisms* or the *free restriction monoid over  $M$  with respect to right strong premorphisms*.

- Let  $R$  be (3.1) and the union of (3.4) and (3.5). We write  $\mathcal{FR}_s(M)$  for  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  and call it the *expansion of  $M$  with respect to strong premorphisms* or the *free restriction monoid over  $M$  with respect to strong premorphisms*.

The following diagram illustrates the connection between the defined expansions. Arrows represent components at  $M$  (which are all surjective) of the canonical natural transformations between the expansions (looked at as functors).



**3.2. Structure of admissible relations.** Using (2.5), every element of  $\mathcal{FR}(M')$  can be written as  $ev$  where  $e \in P(\mathcal{FR}(M'))$  and  $v \in (M')^*$ , the free monoid over  $M'$ . Similarly, it can be also written as  $ve$ . Assume that relations (3.1) and (3.2) hold. Then  $v = [v]_M v^* = v^+[v]_M$ , where  $[v]_M$  is the value of  $v$  in  $M$ .

Therefore, under the assumption that relations (3.2) hold, any relation on  $\mathcal{FR}(M')$  can be rewritten in the form  $[v]_M v^* e = [w]_M w^* f$ . If this relation is admissible, the identity map on  $M$  should obey it, which implies  $[v]_M = [w]_M$ . It follows that, given that relations (3.1)

and (3.2) hold, any admissible relation which is not in (3.1) and (3.2), can be rewritten in the equivalent form

$$(3.6) \quad [m]e = [m]f \text{ and also in the forms } e[m] = f[m], e[m] = [m]f, [m]e = f[m],$$

where  $m \in M$  and  $e, f \in P(\mathcal{FR}(M'))$ .

For example, in the presence of (3.2), relations (3.5) are equivalent to

$$[mn]([m][n])^* = [mn][n]^*, m, n \in M.$$

#### 4. $F$ -RESTRICTION MONOIDS AND THEIR ASSOCIATED PREMORPHISMS

**4.1. The two premorphisms underlying an  $F$ -restriction monoid.** A restriction semigroup is called an  $F$ -restriction semigroup if every its  $\sigma$ -class has a maximum element. It is easy to check (or see [23, Lemma 5]) that an  $F$ -restriction semigroup is necessarily a monoid with the identity element being the maximum projection. An  $F$ -restriction monoid is necessarily proper.

Recall that the *Munn semigroup*  $T_Y$  of a semilattice  $Y$  is the semigroup of all order-isomorphisms between principal order ideals of  $Y$  under composition. This is an inverse semigroup contained in  $\mathcal{I}(Y)$ . In the case, where  $Y$  has a top element,  $T_Y$  is a monoid whose identity is the identity map on  $Y$ . If  $S$  an  $F$ -restriction monoid, the image of its underlying premorphism  $\varphi: S/\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(P(S))$  is contained in  $T_{P(S)}$ .

Let  $S$  be an  $F$ -restriction monoid. Denote  $T = S/\sigma$ . Inspired by similar considerations for  $F$ -inverse monoids [22], we introduce the map  $\tau: T \rightarrow S$  defined by  $\tau(t) = s_t$  where  $s_t$  is the maximum element of the  $\sigma$ -class  $t$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *The map  $\tau$  is a premorphism.*

*Proof.* Let  $t_1, t_2 \in T$ . Since  $s_{t_1}s_{t_2} \sigma s_{t_1t_2}$ , we have  $s_{t_1}s_{t_2} \leq s_{t_1t_2}$ . □

Let  $S$  be as above and let  $\alpha: S \rightarrow T_{P(S)}$  be the *Munn representation* of  $S$  given by  $\text{dom}(\alpha(s)) = (s^*)^\downarrow$  and  $\alpha(s)(e) = (se)^+$  for  $e \leq s^*$ . The map  $\alpha$  is a homomorphism and it is easy to see that  $\varphi = \alpha\tau$ . In particular, for any  $t \in S/\sigma$ ,

$$(4.1) \quad \text{dom}(\varphi(t)) = ((\tau(t))^*)^\downarrow \text{ and } \varphi(t)(e) = (\tau(t)e)^+ \text{ for any } e \leq (\tau(t))^*;$$

$$(4.2) \quad \text{dom}(\varphi(t))^{-1} = ((\tau(t))^+)^{\downarrow} \text{ and } \varphi(t)^{-1}(e) = (e\tau(t))^* \text{ for any } e \leq (\tau(t))^+.$$

From  $\varphi = \alpha\tau$  it follows that if  $\tau$  obeys an admissible relation then also  $\varphi$  obeys this relation. The next important statement shows that this connection is in fact two-way.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $S$  be an  $F$ -inverse monoid,  $T = S/\sigma$ ,  $\varphi$  the underlying premorphism and  $\tau$  the premorphism given above. Then  $\varphi$  obeys an admissible relation if and only if  $\tau$  obeys the same relation.*

*Proof.* Since both  $\tau$  and  $\varphi$  are premorphisms, they both obey relations (3.1) and (3.2). We thus need to consider only an admissible relation of the form (3.6). We fix such a relation

$$(4.3) \quad [t]f = [t]g,$$

where  $t \in T$  and  $f, g \in P(\mathcal{FR}(T'))$ .

Since  $\mathcal{I}(P(S))$  is a restriction monoid, there is a  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -homomorphism  $\varphi'$  such that the triangle below commutes, where  $\iota(t) = \lfloor t \rfloor$ ,  $t \in T$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{FR}(T') \\ & \nearrow \iota & \downarrow \varphi' \\ T & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \mathcal{I}(P(S)) \end{array}$$

Observe that  $\varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor f) = \varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor) \varphi'(f) = \varphi(t) \varphi'(f)$  and, likewise,  $\varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor g) = \varphi(t) \varphi'(g)$ . Since projections act as identity maps on their domains, the action of both  $\varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor f)$  and  $\varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor g)$  on their domains is given by  $e \mapsto (\tau(t)e)^+$ . Hence  $\varphi$  obeys (4.3) if and only if

$$(4.4) \quad \text{dom}(\varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor f)) = \text{dom}(\varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor g)).$$

Let  $\tau': \mathcal{FR}(T') \rightarrow S$  be a homomorphism which makes the left triangle below commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{FR}(T') & & \\ & \nearrow \iota & \downarrow \tau' & \searrow \varphi' & \\ T & \xrightarrow{\tau} & S & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathcal{I}(P(S)) \end{array}$$

The equality  $\tau'(\lfloor t \rfloor f) = \tau'(\lfloor t \rfloor g)$  simplifies to  $\tau(t)\tau'(f) = \tau(t)\tau'(g)$ . Since

$$\tau(t)\tau'(f), \tau(t)\tau'(g) \leq \tau(t),$$

the equality  $\tau(t)\tau'(f) = \tau(t)\tau'(g)$  holds if and only if  $(\tau(t)\tau'(f))^* = (\tau(t)\tau'(g))^*$  holds. Therefore,  $\tau$  obeys relation (4.3) if and only if

$$(4.5) \quad (\tau'(\lfloor t \rfloor f))^* = (\tau'(\lfloor t \rfloor g))^*.$$

We are left to show that (4.4) holds if and only if (4.5) holds. It suffices to prove that

$$(4.6) \quad \text{dom}(\varphi'(w)) = ((\tau'(w))^*)^\downarrow$$

for any  $w \in \mathcal{FR}(T')$ . We do this recursively. If  $w = 1$ , this is obvious. If  $w = \lfloor t \rfloor$ ,  $t \in T$ , then

$$\text{dom}(\varphi'(\lfloor t \rfloor)) = \text{dom}(\varphi(t)) = ((\tau(t))^*)^\downarrow = ((\tau'(\lfloor t \rfloor))^*)^\downarrow.$$

Assume that (4.6) holds and show that

$$(4.7) \quad \text{ran}(\varphi'(w)) = ((\tau'(w))^+)^{\downarrow}.$$

Since relations (3.2) hold, we can assume that  $w = f\lfloor t \rfloor$ , where  $t \in T$  and  $f \in P(\mathcal{FR}(T'))$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ran}(\varphi'(w)) &= \text{ran}(\varphi'(f)\varphi(t)) = ((\tau(t)(\text{dom}(\varphi'(f)\varphi(t))))^+)^{\downarrow} = \\ &= (\tau(t)(\tau'(f)\tau(t))^+)^{\downarrow} = (\tau'(f)\tau(t))^+)^{\downarrow} = ((\tau'(w))^+)^{\downarrow}, \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Assume that  $v = wu$  and that (4.6) holds for  $w$  and  $u$ . Then also (4.7) holds. Denote by  $[u]_T$  the value of  $u$  in  $T$ . Then  $\text{ran}(\varphi'(u)) \subseteq \text{ran}(\varphi([u]_T))$  and  $\varphi'(u)^{-1}(e) = \varphi([u]_T)^{-1}(e)$  for any  $e \in \text{ran}(\varphi'(u))$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dom}(\varphi'(wu)) &= \text{dom}((\varphi'(w))(\varphi'(u))) \\
&= \varphi'(u)^{-1}(\text{dom}(\varphi'(w)) \cap \text{ran}(\varphi'(u))) \\
&= \varphi([u]_T)^{-1}(((\tau'(w))^*)^\downarrow \cap ((\tau'(u))^+)^\downarrow) && \text{(by (4.6) and (4.7))} \\
&= \varphi([u]_T)^{-1}((\tau'(w))^*(\tau'(u))^+)^\downarrow \\
&= (((\tau'(w))^*(\tau'(u))^+)^\downarrow \tau([u]_T))^* && \text{(by (4.2))} \\
&= (((\tau'(w))^* \tau'(u))^*)^\downarrow && \text{(since } \tau([u]_T) = \tau'(u)) \\
&= ((\tau'(w)\tau'(u))^*)^\downarrow \\
&= ((\tau'(wu))^*)^\downarrow.
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that (4.6) holds. Then

$$\text{dom}(\varphi'(w^*)) = \text{dom}(\varphi'(w)^{-1}\varphi'(w)) = \text{dom}(\varphi'(w)) = ((\tau'(w))^*)^\downarrow = (\tau'(w^*))^\downarrow,$$

so that (4.6) holds also for  $w^*$ . Similarly one shows that (4.6) holds also for  $w^+$ .

It follows that (4.6) holds for all  $w \in \mathcal{FR}(T')$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $S$  be an  $F$ -restriction monoid. It is called *left extra  $F$ -restriction* (resp. *right extra  $F$ -restriction* or *extra  $F$ -restriction*) [23] provided that the underlying premorphism  $\varphi$  is left strong (resp. right strong or strong).  $S$  is called *ultra  $F$ -restriction* [23] (or *perfect* [21]) if  $\varphi$  is a homomorphism.

Proposition 4.2 tells us that all these classes can be equivalently defined by the respective properties of the premorphism  $\tau$ .

#### 4.2. Universal $F$ -restriction property.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $M$  be a monoid and  $R$  a set of admissible relations. Then:*

- (1) *Any element of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  can be written in the form  $e[m]$  where  $e \in P(\mathcal{FR}_R(M))$  and  $m \in M$ .*
- (2) *The minimum reduced restriction monoid congruence  $\sigma$  on  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is given by  $e[m] \sigma f[n]$  if and only if  $m = n$ . Consequently  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)/\sigma \simeq M$ .*

*Proof.* (1) By (2.5), any element of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  can be written as  $ev$  where  $v \in (M')^*$ . If  $|v| > 1$  (where  $|v|$  is the *length* of  $v$ ),  $|v|$  can be shortened applying (3.2) in the form  $[m][n] = [mn]([m][n])^*$  and (2.5). Part (1) now follows applying induction on  $|v|$ .

(2) It follows from the definition of  $\sigma$  that  $e[m] \sigma f[m]$  for any  $e, f \in P(\mathcal{FR}_R(M))$ . Therefore  $\sigma \supseteq \rho$ , where  $\rho$  is the congruence on  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ , the quotient over which is isomorphic to  $M$  (cf. Proposition 3.3(1)). Since  $\rho$  is a reduced restriction monoid congruence, this yields  $\sigma = \rho$ , by the minimality of  $\sigma$ .  $\square$

We now state the following universal  $F$ -restriction property which, in view of Corollary 7.13, generalizes Szendrei's result [30].

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $M$  be a monoid and  $R$  a set of admissible relations. Then*

- (1)  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is  $F$ -restriction, the inclusion premorphism  $\iota: M \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  obeys relations  $R$  and coincides with  $\tau: m \mapsto s_m$ .
- (2) Let  $S$  be an  $F$ -restriction monoid such that  $S/\sigma \simeq M$  and assume that the premorphisms  $\tau_S$ , given by  $m \mapsto s_m$ , obeys relations  $R$ . Then there is a homomorphism of restriction monoids  $\eta: \mathcal{FR}_R(M) \rightarrow S$  which preserves the maximum elements of  $\sigma$ -classes and is agreed with the projection map  $p_M: \mathcal{FR}_R(M) \rightarrow M$  and  $\beta: S \rightarrow M$  in that  $p_M = \beta\eta$ .

*Proof.* (1) The maximum element of the  $\sigma$ -class  $m$  in  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is obviously  $[m]$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is  $F$ -restriction. The remaining claims are now immediate.

(2) This can be easily derived from Proposition 3.2. We leave the details to the reader.  $\square$

## 5. THE MAIN RESULT

**5.1. Free inverse monoids over  $M$ .** Let  $M$  be a monoid,  $M'' = \{[m]: m \in M\}$  be a bijective copy of  $M^2$  and  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$  the free inverse monoid over the set  $M''$ .

We first introduce the following two inverse monoids:

- $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$ , the *free inverse monoid over  $M$  with respect to premorphisms*, is an inverse monoid generated by  $M''$  subject to defining relations

$$(5.1) \quad [1] = 1$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad [m][n] = ([m][n])^\oplus[mn] \text{ or, equivalently, } [mn] = [mn]([m][n])^\oplus, m, n \in M.$$

The relations say that the map  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$ ,  $m \mapsto [m]$ , is a premorphism.

- $\mathcal{FI}(M)$ , the *free inverse monoid over  $M$* , is an inverse monoid generated by  $M''$  subject to defining relations (5.1) and

$$(5.3) \quad [m][n] = [mn], m, n \in M.$$

The relations say that the map  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}(M)$ ,  $m \mapsto [m]$ , is a homomorphism.

**Example 5.1.**  $\mathcal{FI}(A^*)$  is obviously isomorphic to the *free inverse monoid*  $\mathcal{FI}(A)$  over  $A$ .

We now make a general definition. Let  $R$  be a set of admissible relations on  $\mathcal{FR}(M')$ . We define  $\overline{R}$  to be the set of inverse monoid relations, which are images of relations in  $R$  in  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$ . We define  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  to be the inverse monoid generated by  $M''$  subject to relations  $\overline{R}$  and call it the *free inverse monoid over  $M$  with respect to relations  $R$* .

Standard arguments imply that the premorphism  $\iota: M \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ , given by  $m \mapsto [m]$ , is universal amongst all premorphisms obeying relations  $\overline{R}$  from  $M$  to inverse monoids. In particular, an analogue of Proposition 3.2 holds true.

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume that  $M''$  is disjoint from  $M'$  thus different notation for its elements.

**Remark 5.2.** The premorphism  $\iota$  above is not injective in general. For example, an easy calculation shows that if  $M$  is a rectangular band with the identity element added then  $\mathcal{FI}(M)$  is always two-element.

**Remark 5.3.** It is immediate from the definition that if  $M$  is an inverse monoid,  $\mathcal{FI}(M)$  is isomorphic to  $M$ . In particular, one can not expect  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  to be in general  $F$ -inverse or  $E$ -unitary. There is no analogue of Proposition 3.3 either (because a monoid, being a special case of a restriction monoid, is not in general an inverse monoid). In particular, the functor  $\mathcal{FI}_R$  is not an expansion.

Similarly to as in the restriction setting, for any set  $R$  of admissible relations,  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{FI}(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . In the following example we present some important intermediate quotients, which are reminiscent of the restriction monoids from Example 3.6.

**Example 5.4.**

- Let  $R$  be the set of relations (3.1) and (3.4). We write  $\mathcal{FI}_{ls}(M)$  for  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  and call it the *free inverse monoid over  $M$  with respect to left strong premorphisms*.
- Let  $R$  be the set of relations (3.1) and (3.5). We write  $\mathcal{FI}_{rs}(M)$  for  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  and call it the *free inverse monoid over  $M$  with respect to right strong premorphisms*.
- Let  $R$  be the union of the sets of relations (3.1), (3.4) and (3.5). We write  $\mathcal{FI}_s(M)$  for  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  and call it the *free inverse monoid over  $M$  with respect to strong premorphisms*.

**5.2. The partial action products  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  and the main result.** Let  $R$  be a set of admissible relations. Because  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  can be endowed with the structure of a restriction monoid by putting  $a^* = a^\oplus$  and  $a^+ = a^\oplus$ , the universal property of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  implies that the  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -submonoid (where the unary operations are  $\oplus$  and  $\otimes$ ; taking inverses is prohibited) of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  generated by  $M''$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ . The quotient map is the map  $\psi_R$  defined on generators by

$$(5.4) \quad \psi_R([m]) = [m], \quad m \in M.$$

We wonder if there is a closer connection between  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  and  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ .

**Proposition 5.5.** *For each  $m \in M$  let  $\varphi_{[m]}$  be the partially defined map on  $E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$  with the domain*

$$\text{dom}(\varphi_{[m]}) = \{e \in E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)) : e \leq [m]^\oplus\} = ([m]^\oplus)^\downarrow$$

*given by*

$$\varphi_{[m]}(e) = [m]e[m]^{-1} = ([m]e)^\oplus, \quad e \in \text{dom}(\varphi_{[m]}).$$

*Then:*

- (1)  $\varphi_{[m]}$  is an order-isomorphism from  $([m]^\oplus)^\downarrow$  onto  $([m]^\oplus)^\downarrow$ .
- (2) The map  $m \mapsto \varphi_{[m]}$  is a premorphism which obeys relations  $R$  from  $M$  to the Munn monoid  $T_{E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))}$ .
- (3) The premorphism from part (2) satisfies Conditions (A), (B), (C) of Subsection 2.4 for forming the partial action product  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$ .

(4) The map  $\eta_R: M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  given by  $\eta_R(m) = ([m]^\oplus, m)$  is a premorphism obeying relations  $R$ .

*Proof.* (1) The homomorphism  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M) \rightarrow T_{E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))}$ , given on  $M''$  by  $[m] \mapsto \varphi_{[m]}$ , is the Munn representation of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . It is known that  $\varphi_{[m]}$  is an order-isomorphism from  $([m]^\otimes)^\downarrow$  onto  $([m]^\oplus)^\downarrow$ .

(2) It is enough to observe that the map  $M \rightarrow T_{E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))}$ ,  $m \mapsto \varphi_{[m]}$ , is the composition of  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ ,  $m \mapsto [m]$ , and the Munn representation,  $[m] \mapsto \varphi_{[m]}$ , of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . Since both of these maps are premorphisms obeying relations  $R$ , so is their composition.

(3) This is immediate.

(4) This follows from part (2) and Proposition 4.2.  $\square$

By Proposition 3.2 and part (4) of Proposition 5.5, the map  $\eta_R$  of part (4) of Proposition 5.5 gives rise to a  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -homomorphism

$$(5.5) \quad \tilde{\eta}_R: \mathcal{FR}_R(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))).$$

We are coming to our main result.

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let  $M$  be a monoid and  $R$  a set of admissible relations. Then  $\tilde{\eta}_R$  is an isomorphism of restriction monoids.*

It is enough to prove that  $\tilde{\eta}_R$  is surjective (i.e., that  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  is  $\eta_R(M)$ -generated) and that there is a homomorphism,  $\Psi_R$ , from  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  to  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  such that  $\Psi_R \tilde{\eta}_R$  is the identity map on  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$ .

## 6. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

**6.1. The map  $u \mapsto D_u$  from  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$  to  $P(\mathcal{FR}(M'))$ .** We aim to construct a map from  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$  to  $P(\mathcal{FR}(M'))$ . As a first step, we construct a map from the *free involutive monoid*  $\mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$  to  $P(\mathcal{FR}(M'))$ . Recall that elements of  $\mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$  are words over  $M'' \cup (M'')^{-1}$ . Let  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$ . We provide a recursive construction how to associate to it a projection  $D_u \in \mathcal{FR}(M')$ .

If  $u$  is the empty word, we put  $D_u = 1$ . Let now  $|u| = n \geq 1$  and assume that for words  $v$  with  $|v| < n$  the elements  $D_v$  are already defined. We then set

$$(6.1) \quad D_u = \begin{cases} (D_v[a])^*, & \text{if } u = v[a], a \in M, \\ ([a]D_v)^+, & \text{if } u = v[a]^{-1}, a \in M. \end{cases}$$

In particular, for  $a \in M$ ,  $D_{[a]} = [a]^*$  and  $D_{[a]^{-1}} = [a]^+$ .

**Remark 6.1.** The map  $u \mapsto D_u$  is inspired by the map  $\theta': FG(X) \rightarrow E$  from [12]. In fact, we use the same construction as in [12], but with different domain and range.

**Remark 6.2.** One can also define the element  $R_u$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$ , as follows. If  $u$  is the empty word,  $R_u = 1$ . Let  $|u| = n \geq 1$  and assume that if  $|v| < n$  the elements  $R_v$  are already defined. We then set

$$R_u = \begin{cases} ([a]R_v)^+, & \text{if } u = [a]v, a \in M, \\ (R_v[a])^*, & \text{if } u = [a]^{-1}v, a \in M. \end{cases}$$

Applying induction, it is easy to show that  $R_u = D_{u^{-1}}$  for any  $u \in \mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$ . In what follows we discuss and use only elements  $D_u$ . Of course, for elements  $R_u$  dual statements hold and these elements could have been equally used in our considerations, alone or in combination with elements  $D_u$ .

The following is immediate from the definition.

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $u, v, w \in \mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$ . If  $D_u = D_v$  then  $D_{uw} = D_{vw}$ .*

Observe that, by (2.4),  $D_{v[m_1][m_2]} = ((D_v[m_1])^*[m_2])^* = (D_v[m_1][m_2])^*$ . By induction, this and its dual equality, involving the operation  $^+$ , lead to the following equalities:

$$(6.2) \quad D_{v[m_1] \cdots [m_k]} = (D_v[m_1] \cdots [m_k])^* \text{ and } D_{v([m_1] \cdots [m_k])^{-1}} = ([m_1] \cdots [m_k] D_v)^+.$$

Recall [24] that the free inverse monoid  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$  can be realized as the quotient of  $\mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$  over the congruence  $\rho$  generated by  $aa^{-1}a \rho a$ , where  $a \in M'' \cup (M'')^{-1}$ , and  $aa^{-1}bb^{-1} \rho bb^{-1}aa^{-1}$ , where  $a, b \in M'' \cup (M'')^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $u, v \in \mathcal{F}_{inv}(M'')$ . If  $u \rho v$  then  $D_u = D_v$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to assume that  $u = psq$  and  $v = ptq$  where  $s$  and  $t$  are equivalent in one step, that is, when  $s \rho t$  is one of the relations generating  $\rho$ . Consider the following cases.

*Case 1.* Assume that  $s = [a][a]^{-1}[a]$  and  $t = [a]$  where  $a \in M$ . In view of Lemma 6.3 it is enough to prove that  $D_{p[a][a]^{-1}[a]} = D_{p[a]}$ . Using (2.5), we calculate

$$(6.3) \quad D_{p[a][a]^{-1}[a]} = (([a](D_p[a])^*)^+[a])^* = ((D_p[a])^+[a])^* = (D_p[a])^* = D_{p[a]}.$$

The case where  $s = [a]^{-1}[a][a]^{-1}$  and  $t = [a]^{-1}$  where  $a \in M$  is similar.

*Case 2.* Assume that  $s = [a][a]^{-1}[b][b]^{-1}$  and  $t = [b][b]^{-1}[a][a]^{-1}$  where  $a, b \in M$ . Again, it is enough to prove that  $D_{p[a][a]^{-1}[b][b]^{-1}} = D_{p[b][b]^{-1}[a][a]^{-1}}$ . From (6.3) we have  $D_{p[a][a]^{-1}} = (D_p[a])^+ = D_p[a]^+$ . Using this, (2.5) and (2.6), we have

$$D_{p[a][a]^{-1}[b][b]^{-1}} = ([b]((D_p[a])^+[b])^*)^+ = (D_p[a]^+[b])^+ = D_p[a]^+[b]^+.$$

By symmetry,  $D_{p[b][b]^{-1}[a][a]^{-1}} = D_p[a]^+[b]^+$ , too.

*Case 3.* Assume that  $s = [a][a]^{-1}[b]^{-1}[b]$  and  $t = [b]^{-1}[b][a][a]^{-1}$  where  $a, b \in M$ . It is enough to prove that  $D_{p[a][a]^{-1}[b]^{-1}[b]} = D_{p[b]^{-1}[b][a][a]^{-1}}$ . Similarly as in the previous case, we see that each of these elements equals  $D_p[a]^+[b]^*$ .

*Case 4.* Assume that  $s = [a]^{-1}[a][b]^{-1}[b]$  and  $t = [b]^{-1}[b][a]^{-1}[a]$  where  $a, b \in M$ . It is enough to prove that  $D_{p[a]^{-1}[a][b]^{-1}[b]} = D_{p[b]^{-1}[b][a]^{-1}[a]}$ . Similarly as in the previous two cases, we see that each of these elements equals  $D_p[a]^*[b]^*$ .  $\square$

Due to Lemma 6.4 there is a well-defined map  $\mathcal{FI}(M'') \rightarrow P(\mathcal{FR}(M'))$ ,  $[u]_\rho \mapsto D_{[u]_\rho}$ . Observe that, because  $\rho$  is a congruence, (6.1), (6.2) and the statement of Lemma 6.3 remain valid for elements of  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$ . We use this in the sequel without further mention, e.g., when we refer to Lemma 6.3 but are working in  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$ , we in fact refer to the statement of Lemma 6.3 applied to elements of  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$ .

Let  $u \in \mathcal{FI}(M'')$ . We set  $d_u$  to be the image of  $D_u$  under the projection map

$$\psi: \mathcal{FR}(M') \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}(M''),$$



given on generators by  $\lfloor m \rfloor \mapsto [m]$ .

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $u \in \mathcal{FI}(M'')$ . Then  $d_u = u^{\otimes}$ .*

*Proof.* We apply induction on the length of  $u$ . If  $u$  is the empty word, the statement is obvious. Assume that  $d_v = v^{\otimes}$  and let first  $u = v[a]$ . Then  $d_u = (d_v[a])^{\otimes} = [a]^{-1}v^{-1}v[a] = (v[a])^{\otimes}$ . Let now  $u = v[a]^{-1}$ . Then  $d_u = ([a]d_v)^{\oplus} = [a]v^{-1}v[a]^{-1} = (v[a]^{-1})^{\otimes}$ .  $\square$

**6.2. The induced map  $u \mapsto D_u$  from  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  to  $P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ .** The following is a crucial observation.

**Lemma 6.6.** *Let  $u \in \mathcal{FI}(M'')$ . Then  $D_u = D_{u^{-1}u}$ .*

*Proof.* We apply induction on  $|u|$ . The case  $u = 1$  is trivial. Assume that  $|u| = 1$ . If  $u = [a]$  where  $a \in M$ , we have  $D_{[a]^{-1}[a]} = ([a]^+[a])^* = [a]^+ = D_{[a]}$ , as required. If  $u = [a]^{-1}$  where  $a \in M$ , we have  $D_{[a][a]^{-1}} = ([a][a]^*)^+ = [a]^+ = D_{[a]^{-1}}$ .

Let  $n \geq 2$ . Assume that for the case where  $|u| < n$  the claim is proved. Let  $|u| = n$ . Assume that  $u = v[a]$ ,  $a \in M$ . We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{[a][a]^{-1}v^{-1}v} &= D_{v^{-1}v[a][a]^{-1}} && (\text{since } [a][a]^{-1}v^{-1}v = v^{-1}v[a][a]^{-1}) \\ &= ([a](D_{v^{-1}v}[a])^*)^+ && (\text{by (6.1)}) \\ &= (D_{v^{-1}v}[a])^+ && (\text{by (2.5)}) \\ &= D_{v^{-1}v}[a]^+ && (\text{by (2.6)}) \\ &= D_v[a]^+. && (\text{by the inductive hypothesis}) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $D_{[a]^{-1}} = D_{[a][a]^{-1}}$ , Lemma 6.3 and the calculation above yield

$$(6.4) \quad D_{[a]^{-1}v^{-1}v} = D_{[a][a]^{-1}v^{-1}v} = D_v[a]^+.$$

Hence, using (6.1), we obtain

$$D_{(v[a])^{-1}v[a]} = D_{[a]^{-1}v^{-1}v[a]} = (D_{[a]^{-1}v^{-1}v}[a])^* = (D_v[a]^+[a])^* = (D_v[a])^* = D_{v[a]},$$

as required. The case where  $u = v[a]^{-1}$ , where  $a \in M$ , is treated similarly.  $\square$

For further use, we record an analogue of (6.4):

$$(6.5) \quad D_{[a]v^{-1}v} = D_{[a]^{-1}[a]v^{-1}v} = D_v[a]^*.$$

**Lemma 6.7.** *Let  $e, f \in E(\mathcal{FI}(M''))$ . Then  $D_{ef} = D_e D_f$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $|e|$  denote the minimal length of a word  $u$  over  $M'' \cup (M'')^{-1}$  such that  $e = u^{-1}u$  in  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$ . We argue by induction on  $n = \min\{|e|, |f|\}$ . Equalities (6.4) and (6.5) show that the claim holds for  $n = 1$  (and for  $n = 0$  the claim holds trivially).

Let  $n \geq 2$  and assume that if  $\min\{|e|, |f|\} < n$ , the claim holds. We prove the claim for  $\min\{|e|, |f|\} = n$ . We can assume that  $n = |e| \leq |f|$ . Then  $e = u^{-1}u$  where  $|u| = n$  and  $f = v^{-1}v$  where  $|v| \geq n$ .

Suppose that  $u = w[a]$  where  $a \in M$ . We calculate:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{(w[a])^{-1}w[a]v^{-1}v} &= D_{w[a]v^{-1}v} = D_{w^{-1}w[a]v^{-1}v} && \text{(by Lemmas 6.6 and 6.3)} \\
&= D_{w^{-1}w[a]v^{-1}v[a]^{-1}[a]} && \text{(since } [a]v^{-1}v = [a]v^{-1}v[a]^{-1}[a] \text{)} \\
&= (D_{w^{-1}w[a]v^{-1}v[a]^{-1}[a]})^* && \text{(by (6.1))} \\
&= (D_{w^{-1}w}D_{[a]v^{-1}v[a]^{-1}[a]})^* && \text{(by the inductive hypothesis)} \\
&= (D_w D_{v[a]^{-1}[a]})^* = (D_w([a]D_v)^+[a])^* && \text{(by Lemma 6.6 and (6.1))} \\
&= (D_w[a]D_v)^* = (D_w[a])^*D_v && \text{(by (2.5) and (2.6))} \\
&= D_{w[a]}D_v, && \text{(by (6.1))}
\end{aligned}$$

so that  $D_{ef} = D_e D_f$ , as required.

The other case, where  $u = w[a]^{-1}$ ,  $a \in M$ , is treated similarly.  $\square$

Recall that  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FI}(M'')$  over the congruence generated by relations (5.1) and (5.2). We denote this congruence by  $\gamma_{pm}$ . Likewise,  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FR}(M')$  over the congruence generated by relations (3.1) and (3.2). We denote this congruence by  $\delta_{pm}$ .

**Proposition 6.8.** *Let  $u, v \in \mathcal{FI}(M'')$ . If  $u \gamma_{pm} v$  then  $D_u \delta_{pm} D_v$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $u = u_0 \gamma_{pm} u_1 \dots \gamma_{pm} u_n = v$  is a series of elements such that for each  $i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ , the elements  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$  are  $\gamma_{pm}$ -equivalent in one step, that is via the relation  $[m][n] = [mn]([m][n])^\oplus$  or its inverse  $([m][n])^{-1} = ([mn]([m][n])^\oplus)^{-1}$ , which is  $[n]^{-1}[m]^{-1} = ([m][n])^\oplus[mn]^{-1}$ . Let  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ . We show that

$$(6.6) \quad D_{u_i} \delta_{pm} D_{u_{i+1}} \text{ and } D_{u_i^{-1}} \delta_{pm} D_{u_{i+1}^{-1}}.$$

Consider two cases.

*Case 1.* Assume that  $u_i = p[m][n]q$  and  $u_{i+1} = p[mn]([m][n])^\oplus q$ . We first show that  $D_{u_i} \delta_{pm} D_{u_{i+1}}$ . Applying (2.6) we have:

$$D_{p[m][n]} = (D_p[m][n])^* \delta_{pm} (D_p[mn]([m][n])^\oplus)^* = (D_p[mn])^*([m][n])^*.$$

On the other hand, applying (6.2) and (2.6), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{p[mn]([m][n])^\oplus} &= D_{p[mn]([m][n])^{-1}([m][n])} = (([m][n](D_p[mn])^*)^+[m][n])^* = \\
&= ([m][n](D_p[mn])^*)^* = ([m][n])^*(D_p[mn])^* = (D_p[mn])^*([m][n])^*,
\end{aligned}$$

so that  $D_{p[m][n]} \delta_{pm} D_{p[mn]([m][n])^\oplus}$  and thus, by Lemma 6.3,  $D_{u_i} \delta_{pm} D_{u_{i+1}}$ . We now show that  $D_{u_i^{-1}} \delta_{pm} D_{u_{i+1}^{-1}}$ . We have  $u_i^{-1} = q^{-1}[n]^{-1}[m]^{-1}p^{-1}$  and  $u_{i+1}^{-1} = q^{-1}[mn]^{-1}([m][n])^\oplus p^{-1}$ . Similarly as above, one shows that each of the elements  $D_{q^{-1}[n]^{-1}[m]^{-1}}$  and  $D_{q^{-1}[mn]^{-1}([m][n])^\oplus}$  is  $\delta_{pm}$ -related to  $([m][n])^+([mn]D_{q^{-1}})^+$ , so that these elements are  $\delta_{pm}$ -related and thus, by Lemma 6.3,  $D_{u_i^{-1}} \delta_{pm} D_{u_{i+1}^{-1}}$ .

*Case 2.* Assume that  $u_i = p([m][n])^{-1}q$  and  $u_{i+1} = p([mn]([m][n])^\oplus)^{-1}q$ . But then  $u_i^{-1} = q^{-1}[m][n]p^{-1}$  and  $u_{i+1}^{-1} = q^{-1}[mn]([m][n])^\oplus p^{-1}$ . This reduces this case to the previous one.  $\square$

Hence there is a well-defined map  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ , given by  $[u]_{\gamma_{pm}} \mapsto [D_u]_{\delta_{pm}}$ . If  $u \in \mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$ , we define  $d_u = \psi_{pm}(D_u)$ . Because  $\gamma_{pm}$  and  $\delta_{pm}$  are congruences, (6.1), (6.2) and the statements of Lemmas 6.3, 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7 remain valid over  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$ . We use this in the sequel without further mention, e.g., when we refer to Lemma 6.3, but are working in  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$ , we in fact refer to the statement of Lemma 6.3 applied to elements  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  and  $\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M)$ .

**6.3. Proof of Theorem 5.6: the case of  $\tilde{\eta}_{pm}$ .** We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 5.6 in the special case where  $R$  consists of relations (3.2) and (3.1). This is the case where the set  $R$  is the least restrictive of all. That is, we prove that

$$\tilde{\eta}_{pm}: \mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)))$$

is an isomorphism.

**Proposition 6.9.**  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)))$  is generated by the elements  $\eta_{pm}(m) = ([m]^\oplus, m)$ , where  $m$  runs through  $M$ . Consequently, the homomorphism  $\tilde{\eta}_{pm}$  of (5.5) is surjective.

*Proof.* Let  $(e, m) \in \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)))$ . We need to show that  $(e, m)$  can be written as a  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -term in elements  $\eta_{pm}(m)$ ,  $m \in M$ . We do this by induction on the smallest length of a word  $u$  over  $M'' \cup (M'')^{-1}$  such that the value of  $u^{-1}u$  in  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  is  $e$ . First note that  $\eta_{pm}(1) = (1, 1)$  is the nullary operation. If  $e = [a]^{-1}[a]$ , where  $a \in M$ , then  $(e, 1) = ([a]^\oplus, a)^*$ , and if  $e = [a][a]^{-1}$  then  $(e, 1) = ([a]^\oplus, a)^+$  (cf. (2.9)). In both of these cases if  $e \leq [b]^\oplus$  then  $(e, b) = (e, 1)([b]^\oplus, b)$ , so the basis of the induction is proved.

Assume that the claim is proved for  $e$  which can be written as  $e = u^{-1}u$  where  $|u| \leq n$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $e = v^{-1}v$  where  $|v| = n + 1$ . Assume that  $v = u[a]$ ,  $a \in M$ . Then  $e = d_v = d_{u[a]} = (d_u[a])^\oplus$ . Hence  $(e, 1) = ((d_u[a])^\oplus, 1) = (d_u[a]^\oplus, a)^* \in \langle \eta_{pm}(M) \rangle$ . Assume now that  $v = u[a]^{-1}$ ,  $a \in M$ . Then  $e = d_v = d_{u[a]^{-1}} = ([a]d_u)^\oplus$ . By the inductive assumption  $(([a]d_u)^\oplus, a) = ([a]^\oplus, a)(d_u, 1) \in \langle \eta_{pm}(M) \rangle$ , so that  $(e, 1) = (([a]d_u)^\oplus, 1) = (([a]d_u)^\oplus, a)^+ \in \langle \eta_{pm}(M) \rangle$ . Furthermore,  $(e, m) = (e, 1)([m]^\oplus, m) \in \langle \eta_{pm}(M) \rangle$  for any  $m$  satisfying  $e \leq [m]^\oplus$ .  $\square$

Define a map

$$(6.7) \quad \Psi_{pm}: \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))) \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M), \quad \Psi_{pm}(e, m) = D_e[m].$$

We verify that  $\Psi_{pm}$  is a  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -morphism. Clearly, it respects the identity element. Verifications that  $\Psi_{pm}$  respects the unary operations  $*$  and  $+$  amount to showing the equalities  $D_{([e[m]])^\oplus} = (D_e[m])^*$  and  $D_e = (D_e[m])^+$ , respectively, for any  $m \in M$  and any  $e \in E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))$  satisfying  $e \leq [m]^\oplus$ . They follow applying (6.1) and Lemma 6.6:

$$(D_e[m])^* = D_{e[m]} = D_{([e[m]])^\oplus}, \quad (D_e[m])^+ = (D_e[m]^+)^+ = D_e[m]^+ = D_{e[m]^\oplus} = D_e.$$

It remains to verify that  $\Psi_{pm}$  preserves the multiplication.  $\Psi_{pm}((e, m)(f, n))$  equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{pm}(e([m]f)^\oplus, mn) &= D_{e([m]f)^\oplus} \lfloor mn \rfloor && \text{(by the definition of } \Psi_{pm} \text{)} \\
&= D_e D_{([m]f)^\oplus} \lfloor mn \rfloor && \text{(by Lemma 6.7)} \\
&= D_e D_{(f[m]^{-1})^\oplus} \lfloor mn \rfloor && \text{(since } ([m]f)^\oplus = (f[m]^{-1})^\oplus \text{)} \\
&= D_e D_{f[m]^{-1}} \lfloor mn \rfloor && \text{(by Lemma 6.6)} \\
&= D_e (\lfloor m \rfloor D_f)^+ \lfloor mn \rfloor. && \text{(by (6.1))}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\Psi_{pm}((e, m))\Psi_{pm}((f, n)) = D_e \lfloor m \rfloor D_f \lfloor n \rfloor = D_e (\lfloor m \rfloor D_f)^+ (\lfloor m \rfloor \lfloor n \rfloor)^+ \lfloor mn \rfloor.$$

Therefore, it is enough to show that  $(\lfloor m \rfloor D_f)^+ = (\lfloor m \rfloor D_f)^+ (\lfloor m \rfloor \lfloor n \rfloor)^+$ . We calculate:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\lfloor m \rfloor D_f)^+ (\lfloor m \rfloor \lfloor n \rfloor)^+ &= D_{f[m]^{-1}} D_{([m][n])^{-1}} && \text{(by (6.1))} \\
&= D_{[m]f[m]^{-1}} D_{([m][n])([m][n])^{-1}} && \text{(by Lemma 6.6)} \\
&= D_{[m]f[m]^{-1}[m][n][n]^{-1}[m]^{-1}} && \text{(by Lemma 6.7)} \\
&= D_{[m]f[n][n]^{-1}[m]^{-1}} && \text{(since } [m]^{-1}[m][n][n]^{-1}[m]^{-1} = [n][n]^{-1}[m]^{-1} \text{)} \\
&= D_{[m]f[m]^{-1}} = D_{f[m]^{-1}} && \text{(since } f \leq [n]^\oplus \text{ and by Lemma 6.6)} \\
&= (\lfloor m \rfloor D_f)^+, && \text{(by (6.1))}
\end{aligned}$$

as needed.

We show that  $\Psi_{pm}\tilde{\eta}_{pm}(\lfloor m \rfloor) = \lfloor m \rfloor$  for any  $m \in M$ . This is equivalent to  $\Psi_{pm}([m]^\oplus, m) = \lfloor m \rfloor$ , which rewrites to  $D_{[m]^\oplus} \lfloor m \rfloor = \lfloor m \rfloor$ . Because  $D_{[m]^\oplus} \lfloor m \rfloor \leq \lfloor m \rfloor$  and  $(D_{[m]^\oplus} \lfloor m \rfloor)^* = D_{[m]^\oplus} \lfloor m \rfloor = \lfloor m \rfloor$ , we are done.

Therefore, we have shown that  $\tilde{\eta}_{pm}$  is an isomorphism.

It follows in particular that the semilattices  $E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))$  and  $P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$  are isomorphic. The isomorphism is given by the composition of the isomorphism  $e \mapsto (e, 1)$  of  $E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))$  and  $P(\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))))$  (cf. Subsection 2.4) and the restriction of  $\Psi_{pm}$  to projections. That is,

$$e \mapsto (e, 1) \mapsto D_e$$

is an isomorphism from  $E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))$  to  $P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ . The inverse isomorphism is given by  $D_e \mapsto e = d_e$ , that is, it coincides with the restriction of  $\psi_{pm}$  of (5.4) to  $P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ . Hence,  $\psi_{pm}(D_e) = e$  for any  $e \in E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))$  and  $D_{\psi_{pm}(e)} = e$  for any  $e \in P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ .

**6.4. Proof of Theorem 5.6: the case of an arbitrary  $R$ .** We now proceed to the proof of Theorem 5.6 for the case where  $R$  is an arbitrary set of admissible relations.

**Lemma 6.10.** *The map  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ ,  $u \mapsto D_u$ , respects admissible relations of the form  $e \lfloor m \rfloor = f \lfloor m \rfloor$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $e \lfloor m \rfloor = f \lfloor m \rfloor$  be an admissible relation where  $e, f \in P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ . Its image in  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  under  $\psi_{pm}$  is  $\psi_{pm}(e) \lfloor m \rfloor = \psi_{pm}(f) \lfloor m \rfloor$ . It is enough to consider the following two cases.

Case 1. Let  $u = p\psi_{pm}(e)[m]q$  and  $v = p\psi_{pm}(f)[m]q$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{p\psi_{pm}(e)[m]} &= (D_{p\psi_{pm}(e)}[m])^* && \text{(by (6.1))} \\ &= (D_{p^{-1}p\psi_{pm}(e)}[m])^* && \text{(by Lemmas 6.6 and 6.3)} \\ &= (D_p D_{\psi_{pm}(e)}[m])^* && \text{(by Lemmas 6.7 and 6.6)} \\ &= (D_p e[m])^* && \text{(since } D_{\psi_{pm}(e)} = e) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $D_{p\psi_{pm}(f)[m]} = (D_p f[m])^*$ . Therefore,  $D_{p\psi_{pm}(e)[m]}$  is related with  $D_{p\psi_{pm}(f)[m]}$  via the relation  $e[m] = f[m]$ . By Lemma 6.3,  $D_u$  is so related with  $D_v$ .

Case 2. Let  $u = p(\psi_{pm}(e)[m])^{-1}q$  and  $v = p(\psi_{pm}(f)[m])^{-1}q$ . Then  $u = u^{-1} = q^{-1}\psi_{pm}(e)[m]p^{-1}$  and  $v = v^{-1} = q^{-1}\psi_{pm}(f)[m]p^{-1}$ . This reduces this case to the previous one.  $\square$

Therefore, for any set of admissible relations  $R$ , the map  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{FR}_{pm}(M))$ ,  $u \mapsto D_u$  gives rise to the induced map  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{FR}_R(M))$ , also denoted by  $u \mapsto D_u$ .

**Lemma 6.11.** *The quotient map  $\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  gives rise to a quotient map of restriction monoids  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M))) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $e, f \in \mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)$  be idempotents which are equal in the quotient  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . We show that identifying  $(e, m)$  with  $(f, m)$  defines a congruence on  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)))$ .

Let  $(e, m), (f, m) \in \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)))$  and assume that  $e$  and  $f$  are equal in  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . Let  $(g, l) \in \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_{pm}(M)))$ . Then  $(e, m)(g, l) = (e([m]g)^\oplus, ml)$  and  $(f, m)(g, l) = (f([m]g)^\oplus, ml)$ . Because a congruence is stable with respect to operations, the elements  $e([m]g)^\oplus$  and  $f([m]g)^\oplus$  are equal in  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . Further,  $(g, l)(e, m) = (g([l]e)^\oplus, lm)$  and  $(g, l)(f, m) = (g([l]f)^\oplus, lm)$ . Similarly,  $g([l]e)^\oplus$  and  $g([l]f)^\oplus$  are equal in  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ .

In addition,  $(e, m)^+ = (e, 1)$ ,  $(f, m)^+ = (f, 1)$  where  $e$  and  $f$  are equal in  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . Also,  $(e, m)^* = ((e[m])^\oplus, 1)$ ,  $(f, m)^* = ((f[m])^\oplus, 1)$  where  $(e[m])^\oplus$  and  $(f[m])^\oplus$  are equal in  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ .  $\square$

It follows that there is an analogue of Proposition 6.9 for any set  $R$  of admissible relations:  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  is generated by elements  $\eta_R(m) = ([m]^\oplus, m)$ , where  $m$  runs through  $M$ , and the map  $\tilde{\eta}_R$  of (5.5) is surjective.

Lemmas 6.10 and 6.11 show that the homomorphism  $\Psi_{pm}$  of (6.7) gives rise to the induced homomorphism

$$\Psi_R: \mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))) \rightarrow \mathcal{FR}_R(M), \quad \Psi_R(e, m) = D_e[m].$$

which satisfies  $\Psi_R \tilde{\eta}_R([m]) = [m]$  for any  $m \in M$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 5.6.

**Example 6.12.** Let  $M = \langle a \mid a^2 = a \rangle$  and  $R$  consist of relations (3.1) and (3.3) (then of course (3.2) also hold). In  $\mathcal{FI}(M)$  we have  $[a][a] = [a]$ , so that  $[a][a][a] = [a]$  which, in view of uniqueness of the inverse element, yields  $[a]^{-1} = [a]$ . It follows that  $[a]^\oplus = [a]^{-1}[a] = [a][a] = [a]$  and similarly  $[a]^\oplus = [a]$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{FI}(M) = E(\mathcal{FI}(M)) = \{1, [a]\}$ . Proof of Theorem 5.6 shows that the equality  $[a]^\oplus = [a]^\otimes$  can be deduced only from  $[a]^2 = [a]$

and  $(\cdot, \otimes, \oplus, 1)$ -axioms of restriction monoids. The deduction goes as follows. Note that  $[a]^2 = [a]$  is equivalent to

$$(6.8) \quad [a][a] = [a]([a][a])^\otimes \text{ and } [a] = [a]([a][a])^\otimes.$$

The first of these two relations says that  $[a]^2 \leq [a]$  and the second one is an admissible relation of the form (3.6). If

$$[a]^\oplus = v_0 \gamma v_1 \gamma \cdots \gamma v_n = [a]^\otimes$$

is a deduction of  $[a]^\oplus = [a]^\otimes$  from (6.8) and the defining relations of an inverse monoid, Lemma 6.4, Proposition 6.8 and Lemma 6.10 provide an algorithm how to pass from  $v_i^\otimes$  to  $v_{i+1}^\otimes$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ , using (6.8) and the defining relations of a restriction monoid. This leads to a required deduction of  $[a]^\oplus = [a]^\otimes$ .

We have  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}(M))) = \{(1, 1), ([a], 1), ([a], a)\}$ . By Theorem 5.6  $\mathcal{FR}(M) = \{[1], [a], [a]^*\}$  with  $[a]^+ = [a]^*$ , where  $\Psi(1, 1) = [1]$ ,  $\Psi([a], a) = [a]$  and  $\Psi([a], 1) = [a]^+ = [a]^*$ . Note that  $\mathcal{FR}(M)$  does not embed into  $\mathcal{FI}(M)$ . In particular,  $[a]^* \neq [a]$ , despite  $[a]^\otimes = [a]$  in  $\mathcal{FI}(M)$ .

We finally record an important consequence of our considerations.

**Corollary 6.13.** *Let  $\psi_R: \mathcal{FR}_R(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  be the  $(2, 1, 1, 0)$ -homomorphism defined on generators by  $[m] \mapsto [m]$ ,  $m \in M$ .*

- (1) *The restriction of  $\psi_R$  to  $P(\mathcal{FR}_R(M))$  is an isomorphism onto  $E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$ .*
- (2)  *$\psi_{pm}(D_e) = e$  for any  $e \in E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$  and  $D_{\psi_{pm}(e)} = e$  for any  $e \in P(\mathcal{FR}_R(M))$ .*

## 7. SPECIAL CASES

Let  $M$  be a monoid and  $R$  a set of admissible relations.

### 7.1. $M$ is left cancellative (resp. right cancellative, cancellative).

**Theorem 7.1.**  *$M$  is left cancellative (resp. right cancellative, cancellative) if and only if  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is left ample (reps. right ample, ample).*

*Proof.* Assume that  $M$  is left cancellative and show that  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  is left ample. Suppose that  $(h, p)(e, m) = (h, p)(f, n)$ . This is equivalent to  $(h([p]e)^\oplus, pm) = (h([p]f)^\oplus, pn)$ . The equality  $(h, p)^*(e, m) = (h, p)^*(f, n)$  is equivalent to  $((h[p])^\otimes e, m) = ((h[p])^\otimes f, n)$ . We thus need to show that  $h([p]e)^\oplus = h([p]f)^\oplus$  implies  $(h[p])^\otimes e = (h[p])^\otimes f$ . The first of the latter equalities rewrites to  $h[p]e[p]^{-1} = h[p]f[p]^{-1}$ . Multiplying this with  $[p]^{-1}$  on the left and with  $[p]$  on the right, commuting idempotents and using  $[p][p]^{-1}[p] = [p]$ , we obtain  $[p]^{-1}h[p]e = [p]^{-1}h[p]f$  which is  $(h[p])^\otimes e = (h[p])^\otimes f$ , as required.

Assume that  $\mathcal{M}(M, E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M)))$  is left ample and assume that  $pm = pn$  in  $M$ . Since

$$([p]^\oplus, p)([m]^\oplus[n]^\oplus, m) = (([p][m]^\oplus[n]^\oplus)^\oplus, pm) = ([p]^\oplus, p)([m]^\oplus[n]^\oplus, n),$$

it follows that

$$([p]^\oplus, p)^*([m]^\oplus[n]^\oplus, m) = ([p]^\oplus, p)^*([m]^\oplus[n]^\oplus, n),$$

which simplifies to  $([p]^\otimes[m]^\oplus[n]^\oplus, m) = ([p]^\otimes[m]^\oplus[n]^\oplus, n)$ . Hence  $m = n$ , so that  $M$  is left cancellative.

The claim where  $M$  is right cancellative is dual. The claim where  $M$  is (both left and right) cancellative follows.  $\square$

**7.2.  $M$  embeds into a group.** For our next statement, we recall that the *free group over  $M$*  [5] (called also the *fundamental group* of  $M$  [27]), denoted  $\mathcal{FG}(M)$ , is the quotient of the free  $M'''$ -generated group, where  $M''' = \{[m] : m \in M\}$ , under the defining relations saying that  $[1]$  is the identity element and that  $[m][n] = [mn]$  for any  $m, n \in M$ . So this is the free group over  $M$  with respect to homomorphisms, but note that, for any set  $R$  of admissible relations,  $\mathcal{FG}_R(M) \simeq \mathcal{FG}(M)$ , because in a group,  $g^\oplus = g^\ominus = 1$  for any  $g$ .

**Lemma 7.2.** *The maximum group quotient of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{FG}(M)$ .*

*Proof.* Because defining relations of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  follow from the defining relations of  $\mathcal{FG}(M)$ , it is clear that  $\mathcal{FG}(M)$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . Let  $\rho$  be the corresponding congruence on  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ . Assume that  $u, v \in \mathcal{FI}(M'')$  are such that  $[u]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} \rho [v]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ . Then  $[u]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)} = [v]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)}$ . It follows that there is a sequence  $u = u_0 \sim u_1 \sim \dots \sim u_n = v$  such that  $[u_i]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)} = [u_{i+1}]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ , follows by an application of a defining relation. We show that  $[u_i]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} \sigma [u_{i+1}]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ .

*Case 1.* Assume that we have applied a relation  $[m][m]^{-1} = 1$ . Then we can assume that  $u_i = p[m][m]^{-1}q$  and  $u_{i+1} = pq$ . Because, in  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ ,  $[m]^\oplus \leq 1$ , and  $\leq$  is compatible with the multiplication, it follows that  $[u_i]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} \leq [u_{i+1}]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ , so that  $[u_i]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} \sigma [u_{i+1}]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ . A relation  $[m]^{-1}[m] = 1$  is dual.

*Case 2.* Assume that we have applied a relation  $[m][n] = [mn]$ . Then we can assume that  $u_i = p[m][n]q$  and  $u_{i+1} = p[mn]q$ . Because, in  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$ ,  $[m][n] \leq [mn]$ , and  $\leq$  is compatible with the multiplication, it follows that  $[u_i]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} \leq [u_{i+1}]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ , so that  $[u_i]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} \sigma [u_{i+1}]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ .

*Case 3.* Assume that we have applied a relation  $([m][n])^{-1} = [mn]^{-1}$ . This case is treated similarly as the previous one, using in addition the fact that  $\leq$  is compatible with taking inverses.

We have proved that  $\rho \subseteq \sigma$ , so that  $\rho = \sigma$ , by the minimality of  $\sigma$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 7.3.** *Let  $M$  be a monoid and  $R$  a set of admissible relations. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $M$  embeds into a group.
- (2) The homomorphism  $\psi_R: \mathcal{FR}_R(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  of (5.4) is injective.

*Proof.* The definition of  $\mathcal{FG}(M)$  implies that  $M$  embeds into a group if and only if  $M$  embeds into  $\mathcal{FG}(M)$ .

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Assume that  $\psi_R(D_e[m]) = \psi_R(D_f[n])$  where  $e \leq [m]^\oplus$  and  $f \leq [n]^\oplus$ . That is,  $e[m] = f[n]$ . Passing to the quotient under  $\sigma$ , we get  $[m]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)} = [n]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)}$ . By assumption, this yields  $m = n$ . But then we get  $e[m] = f[m]$ . Since  $e[m], f[m] \leq [m]$ , the latter is equivalent to  $(e[m])^\oplus = (f[m])^\oplus$ , that is, to  $f = e$ . We have proved that  $D_e[m] = D_f[n]$ , so that  $\psi_R$  is injective.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Let  $u, v \in (M'')^*$  be such that their values in  $\mathcal{FG}(M)$  are equal, that is,  $[u]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)} = [v]_{\mathcal{FG}(M)}$ . Since  $[u]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} \sigma [v]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ , there is  $e \in E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$  such that

$e[u]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)} = e[v]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$  and we may assume that  $e \leq [u]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}^\oplus [v]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}^\oplus$ . Let  $[u]_M$  and  $[v]_M$  be the values of  $u$  and  $v$  in  $M$ . Observe that  $\psi_R \Psi_R(e, [u]_M) = \psi_R(D_e \lfloor [u]_M \rfloor) = e[u]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$  and, similarly,  $\psi_R \Psi_R(e, [v]_M) = e[v]_{\mathcal{FI}_R(M)}$ . Because  $\psi_R$  is injective (and  $\Psi_R$  is bijective), it follows that  $[u]_M = [v]_M$ , as needed.  $\square$

We obtain the following result.

**Theorem 7.4.** *If  $M$  embeds into a group then  $\mathcal{FR}_R(M)$  is isomorphic to the restriction submonoid of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  consisting of elements  $e[m]$  where  $e \in E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$  and  $m \in M$ . This is precisely the submonoid of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  that is  $(\cdot, \otimes, \oplus, 1)$ -generated by  $\{[m] : m \in M\}$ , or, equivalently, the submonoid of  $\mathcal{FI}_R(M)$  that is  $(\cdot, 1)$ -generated by  $E(\mathcal{FI}_R(M))$  and  $\{[m] : m \in M\}$ .*

**Example 7.5.** Let  $M = A^*$  and let the set  $R$  consist of relations (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3). As already noted,  $\mathcal{FR}(A^*)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{FR}(A)$ , the free restriction monoid over the set  $A$ . Likewise,  $\mathcal{FI}(A^*)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{FI}(A)$ , the free inverse monoid over the set  $A$ . Theorem 7.4 implies that  $\mathcal{FR}(A)$  is isomorphic to the submonoid of  $\mathcal{FI}(A)$  generated by  $E(\mathcal{FI}(A))$  and  $\{[a] : a \in A\}$ . We thus recover the result of Fountain, Gomes and Gould [12] on the structure of  $\mathcal{FR}(A)$ .

Therefore, Theorem 5.6 extends the result of [12] from  $A^*$  to any monoid  $M$  and from the set  $R$  determined by homomorphisms to any set of admissible relations.

**Remark 7.6.** It is well known that in the free inverse monoid, idempotents have rich structure: representing elements of the free inverse monoid by *birooted Munn trees* [28, 24], to describe idempotents, one needs *all* Munn trees (but with two roots coinciding). In this sense  $\mathcal{FR}(A)$ , which contains all idempotents of  $\mathcal{FI}(A)$ , is close to  $\mathcal{FI}(A)$ . We adopt this intuition also towards more general expansions.

**7.3.  $M$  is an inverse monoid.** Let  $S$  be an inverse monoid. In this section we provide models for  $\mathcal{FR}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{FR}_s(S)$ . Due to Theorem 5.6, it is enough to provide models for  $\mathcal{FI}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{FI}_s(S)$ . Since, obviously,  $\mathcal{FI}(S) \simeq S$ , we obtain the following statement.

**Proposition 7.7.** *Let  $S$  be an inverse monoid. Then  $\mathcal{FR}(S) \simeq \mathcal{M}(S, E(S))$ . In particular, if  $G$  is a group then  $\mathcal{FR}(G)$  is a group isomorphic  $G$ .*

**Remark 7.8.**  $\mathcal{M}(S, E(S))$  can be endowed with the structure of an inverse monoid, by putting  $(e, s)^{-1} = ((es)^\oplus, s^{-1})$ . However, unless  $S$  is a group, the image of  $S$  under the inclusion homomorphism  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(S, E(S))$  does not generate  $\mathcal{M}(S, E(S))$  as an inverse monoid. For example, because  $(e, s)^{-1}(e, s) = ((es)^\oplus, s^{-1}s)$ , the element  $(e, s)^* = ((es)^\oplus, 1)$  does not belong to this image.

We now turn to the inverse monoid  $\mathcal{FI}_s(S)$ . The following result characterizes strong premorphisms from  $S$  to inverse monoids.

**Proposition 7.9.** *Let  $S, T$  be inverse monoids and  $\varphi : S \rightarrow T$  a premorphism (cf. Definition 2.2). The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\varphi$  is strong;



(2)  $\varphi$  satisfies the following two conditions:

- (i) for all  $s \in S$ :  $\varphi(s^{-1}) = (\varphi(s))^{-1}$ ,
- (ii) for all  $s, t \in S$ : if  $s \leq t$  then  $\varphi(s) \leq \varphi(t)$ .

*Proof.* (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) Assume that  $\varphi$  satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of part (2). Then, for any  $s, t \in S$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(s)\varphi(t) &= \varphi(s)\varphi(t)(\varphi(t))^{\oplus} \leq \varphi(st)(\varphi(t))^{\oplus} = \varphi(st)\varphi(t^{-1})\varphi(t) \leq \\ &\quad \varphi(stt^{-1})\varphi(t) \leq \varphi(s)\varphi(t). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $\varphi(s)\varphi(t) = \varphi(st)(\varphi(t))^{\oplus}$ , so that  $\varphi$  is right strong. By symmetry, it is also left strong. Hence  $\varphi$  is strong.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) Assume that  $\varphi$  strong. If  $e \in E(S)$  then

$$\varphi(e)\varphi(e) = \varphi(e^2)(\varphi(e))^{\oplus} = \varphi(e)(\varphi(e))^{-1}\varphi(e) = \varphi(e),$$

so that  $\varphi(e) \in E(T)$ . Let  $s \in S$ . Then

$$(\varphi(s))^{\oplus}\varphi(s^{\oplus}) = (\varphi(s))^{-1}\varphi(s)\varphi(s^{-1}s) = (\varphi(s))^{-1}(\varphi(s))^{\oplus}\varphi(s) = (\varphi(s))^{-1}\varphi(s) = (\varphi(s))^{\oplus},$$

so that  $(\varphi(s))^{\oplus} \leq \varphi(s^{\oplus})$ . Putting  $s = t^{-1}$  we get  $(\varphi(t^{-1}))^{\oplus} \leq \varphi(t^{\oplus})$ . Using this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(s)\varphi(s^{-1})\varphi(s) &= \varphi(s)\varphi(s^{\oplus})(\varphi(s))^{\oplus} = \varphi(s)(\varphi(s))^{\oplus} = \varphi(s) \quad \text{and} \\ \varphi(s^{-1})\varphi(s)\varphi(s^{-1}) &= \varphi(s^{-1})\varphi(s^{\oplus})(\varphi(s^{-1}))^{\oplus} = \varphi(s^{-1})(\varphi(s^{-1}))^{\oplus} = \varphi(s^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $\varphi(s)$  and  $\varphi(s^{-1})$  are mutually inverse, so that  $\varphi(s^{-1}) = (\varphi(s))^{-1}$ , by the uniqueness of the inverse. We have shown that condition (i) holds.

To show that condition (ii) holds, we assume that  $s \leq t$ . Then  $s = ts^{\oplus}$ . It follows that

$$\varphi(t)\varphi(s^{\oplus}) = \varphi(ts^{\oplus})(\varphi(s^{\oplus}))^{\oplus} = \varphi(s)\varphi(s^{\oplus}) = \varphi(s)(\varphi(s))^{\oplus} = \varphi(s),$$

so that  $\varphi(s) \leq \varphi(t)$ , as needed.  $\square$

Proposition 7.9 combined with [25, Theorem 6.10, Theorem 6.17] leads to a presentation for  $S^{pr}$ , the Lawson-Margolis-Steinberg *generalized prefix expansion* of  $S$  [25]. Another presentation for  $S^{pr}$  was obtained by Buss and Exel in [4].

**Theorem 7.10.** *For any inverse monoid  $S$ ,  $S^{pr}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{FI}_s(S)$ . In particular,  $S^{pr}$  is an  $S''$ -generated inverse monoid, where  $S'' = \{[s] : s \in S\}$ , subject to the defining relations:*

- (1)  $[1] = 1$ ,
- (2)  $[s][t] = [st][t]^{\oplus}$ ,  $[s][t] = [s]^{\oplus}[st]$ ,  $s, t \in S$ .

**Remark 7.11.** It is clear that Proposition 7.9 and Theorem 7.10 remain valid in the semigroup setting, that is, in the absence of the identity element and the requirement that the identity element is preserved by a premorphism.

From Theorem 5.6 and Theorem 7.10 we obtain the following.

**Corollary 7.12.** *Let  $S$  be an inverse monoid. Then*

$$\mathcal{FR}_s(S) \simeq \mathcal{M}(S, E(S^{pr})).$$

Using this corollary and the known model for  $S^{pr}$  [25, Proposition 6.16] we get a model for  $\mathcal{FR}_s(S)$ .

There is an analogue of Remark 7.8 for  $\mathcal{FR}_s(S)$ . It can be similarly endowed with the structure of an inverse monoid, however, unless  $S$  is a group, the image of  $S$  under the inclusion premorphism  $S \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(S, E(\mathcal{FI}_s(S)))$  does not generate  $\mathcal{M}(S, E(\mathcal{FI}_s(S)))$  as an inverse monoid.

**Corollary 7.13.** *Let  $G$  be a group. Then  $\mathcal{FR}_s(G)$  is an inverse monoid isomorphic to each of  $\mathcal{FI}_s(G)$  and  $\tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$ .*

*Proof.* The isomorphism  $\mathcal{FR}_s(G) \simeq \mathcal{FI}_s(G)$  follows from Theorem 7.4. The isomorphism  $\mathcal{FI}_s(G) \simeq \tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$  follows from Theorem 7.10 and  $G^{pr} \simeq \tilde{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] J.-C. Birget, J. Rhodes, Almost finite expansions of arbitrary semigroups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **32** (1984) (3), 239–287.
- [2] J.-C. Birget, J. Rhodes, Group theory via global semigroup theory, *J. Algebra* **120** (1989), 284–300.
- [3] M. J. J. Branco, G. M. S. Gomes, The generalized Szendrei expansion of an  $\mathcal{R}$ -unipotent semigroup, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **123** (2009) (1-2), 11–26.
- [4] A. Buss, R. Exel, Inverse semigroup expansions and their actions on  $C^*$ -algebras, *Illinois J. Math.* **56** (2012) (4), 1185–1212.
- [5] A. H. Clifford, G. B. Preston, *The Algebraic Theory of Semigroups*, Mathematical Surveys 7, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, Vol. 1 (1961), Vol. 2 (1967).
- [6] C. Cornock, *Restriction Semigroups: Structure, Varieties and Presentations*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of York, 2011, available online at <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/1620/1/Thesis.Claire.Cornock.Final.pdf>
- [7] C. Cornock, V. Gould, Proper two-sided restriction semigroups and partial actions, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **216** (2012), 935–949.
- [8] M. Dokuchaev, Recent developments around partial actions, *São Paulo J. Math. Sci.* (2018), online first, DOI 10.1007/s40863-018-0087-y.
- [9] R. Exel, Partial actions of groups and actions of inverse semigroups, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **126** (1998), 3481–3494.
- [10] J. Fountain, G. M. S. Gomes, The Szendrei expansion of a semigroup, *Mathematika* **37** (1990) (2), 251–260.
- [11] J. Fountain, G. M. S. Gomes, V. Gould, Enlargements, semiabundancy and unipotent monoids, *Comm. Algebra* **27** (1999) (2), 595–614.
- [12] J. Fountain, G. M. S. Gomes, V. Gould, The free ample monoid, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **19** (2009), 527–554.
- [13] G. M. S. Gomes, The generalized prefix expansion of a weakly left ample semigroup, *Semigroup Forum* **72** (2006) (3), 387–403.
- [14] G. M. S. Gomes, V. Gould, Graph expansions of unipotent monoids, *Comm. Algebra* **28** (2000) (1), 447–463.
- [15] V. Gould, Graph expansions of right cancellative monoids, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **6** (1996) (6), 713–733.
- [16] V. Gould, Notes on restriction semigroups and related structures, available online at <http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~varg1/restriction.pdf>
- [17] V. Gould, C. Hollings, Partial actions of inverse and weakly left  $E$ -ample semigroups, *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* **86** (2009) (3), 355–377.

- [18] C. Hollings, Partial actions of monoids, *Semigroup Forum* **75** (2007) (2), 293–316.
- [19] C. Hollings, Conditions for the prefix expansion of a monoid to be (weakly) left ample. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **73** (2007) (3-4), 519–545.
- [20] C. Hollings, From right *PP* monoids to restriction semigroups: a survey, *European J. Pure Appl. Math.* **2** (2009), 21–57.
- [21] P. Jones, Almost perfect restriction semigroups, *J. Algebra* **445** (2016), 193–220.
- [22] J. Kellendonk, M. V. Lawson, Partial actions of groups, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **14** (1) (2004), 87–114.
- [23] G. Kudryavtseva, Partial monoid actions and a class of restriction semigroups, *J. Algebra*, **429** (2015), 342–370.
- [24] M. V. Lawson, *Inverse semigroups. The theory of partial symmetries*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1998.
- [25] M. V. Lawson, S. W. Margolis, B. Steinberg, Expansions of inverse semigroups, *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* **80** (2006) (2), 205–228.
- [26] S. W. Margolis, J. C. Meakin, *E*-unitary inverse monoids and the Cayley graph of a group presentation, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **58** (1989) (1), 45–76.
- [27] S. W. Margolis, J.-E. Pin, Inverse semigroups and extensions of groups by semilattices, *J. Algebra* **110** (1987) (2), 277–297.
- [28] W. D. Munn, Free inverse semigroups, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **29** (1974), 385–404.
- [29] M. Petrich, N. R. Reilly, A representation of *E*-unitary inverse semigroups, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)* **30** (1979) (119), 339–350.
- [30] M. B. Szendrei, A note on Birget-Rhodes expansion of groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **58** (1989), 93–99.
- [31] M. B. Szendrei, Embedding into almost left factorizable restriction semigroups, *Comm. Algebra* **41** (2013) (4), 1458–1483.
- [32] M. B. Szendrei, Embedding of a restriction semigroup into a *W*-product, *Semigroup Forum* **89** (2014) (1), 280–291.

G. KUDRYAVTSEVA: UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA, FACULTY OF CIVIL AND GEODETIC ENGINEERING, JAMOVA CESTA 2, SI-1000 LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA / INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, PHYSICS AND MECHANICS, JADRANSKA ULICA 19, SI-1000 LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA

*E-mail address:* ganna.kudryavtseva@fgg.uni-lj.si, ganna.kudryavtseva@imfm.si