

# PROPER LIE AUTOMORPHISMS OF INCIDENCE ALGEBRAS

ÉRICA Z. FORNAROLI, MYKOLA KHRYPCHENKO, AND EDNEI A. SANTULO JR.

ABSTRACT. Let  $X$  be a finite connected poset and  $K$  a field. We study the question, when all Lie automorphisms of the incidence algebra  $I(X, K)$  are proper. Without any restriction on the length of  $X$  we find only a sufficient condition involving certain equivalence relation on the set of maximal chains of  $X$ . For some classes of posets of length one, such as finite connected crownless posets (i.e., without weak crown subposets), crowns and ordinal sums of two antichains we give a complete answer.

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Preliminaries	2
1.1. Automorphisms and anti-automorphisms	2
1.2. Posets	3
1.3. Incidence algebras	3
1.4. Decomposition of $\phi \in \text{Aut}^\pm(I(X, K))$	4
1.5. Lie automorphisms of incidence algebras	4
2. Proper Lie automorphisms of $I(X, K)$ and proper bijections of $B$	5
3. Admissible bijections of $B$ and maximal chains in $X$	8
4. Sets of length one	12
4.1. Admissible bijections of $B$ and crowns in $X$	12
4.2. The crownless case	13
4.3. The crown case	13
4.4. The case of the ordinal sum of two anti-chains	15
Acknowledgements	16
References	16

## INTRODUCTION

A *Lie isomorphism* of associative rings  $(R, \cdot)$  and  $(S, \cdot)$  is an isomorphism of the corresponding Lie rings  $(R, [\ , \ ])$  and  $(S, [\ , \ ])$ , where  $[a, b] = a \cdot b - b \cdot a$ . If  $R = S$ , a Lie isomorphism  $R \rightarrow S$  is called a *Lie automorphism* of  $R$ . If, moreover,  $R$  and  $S$  are algebras, it is natural to require Lie isomorphisms  $R \rightarrow S$  to be linear. Any bijective map of the form  $\phi + \nu$ , where  $\phi$  is either an isomorphism  $R \rightarrow S$  or the negative of an anti-isomorphism  $R \rightarrow S$ , and  $\nu$  is an additive map

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 16S50, 17B60, 17B40, 06A07; secondary: 16W10, 05C38.

*Key words and phrases*. Lie automorphism, proper Lie automorphism, incidence algebra, maximal chain, crown.

on  $R$  with values in the center of  $S$  whose kernel contains  $[R, R]$ , is always a Lie isomorphism. Such Lie isomorphisms are called *proper*. In most of the cases studied in the literature, these are the only examples of Lie isomorphisms. Indeed, this is true for Lie automorphisms of full matrix rings  $M_n(R)$  over division rings  $R$  with  $\text{char}(R) \notin \{2, 3\}$  as proved in [14], for Lie isomorphisms of primitive [16], simple [18] and prime rings [17], for Lie automorphisms of upper triangular matrix algebras  $T_n(R)$  over commutative rings [9, 7] and for Lie isomorphisms of block-triangular matrix algebras over a UFD [8].

In [13] we described Lie automorphisms of the incidence algebra  $I(X, K)$  of a finite connected poset  $X$  over a field  $K$ . In general, they are not proper as shown in [13, Example 5.20], but, for some classes of posets, every Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$  is proper. For instance, if  $X$  is a chain of cardinality  $n$ , then  $I(X, K) \cong T_n(K)$ , and thus every Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$  is proper in view of [13, Corollary 5.19] (see also [9, Theorem 6]). So the following question arises.

**Question.** *What are the necessary and sufficient conditions on a finite connected poset  $X$  such that all Lie automorphisms of  $I(X, K)$  are proper?*

In this paper we give a partial answer to this question. Namely, for a general  $X$  we find only a sufficient condition (see Corollary 3.12), and for some particular classes of posets of length one  $X$  we give a complete answer (see Corollaries 4.7 and 4.12 and Proposition 4.14).

More precisely, our work is organized as follows. Section 1 serves as a background on posets, incidence algebras and maps on them. In particular, we recall all the necessary definitions from [13] and introduce some new notations. In Section 2 we reduce the question of when all Lie automorphisms of  $I(X, K)$  are proper to a purely combinatorial property of  $X$  dealing with a certain group  $\mathcal{AM}(X)$  of bijections on maximal chains of  $X$  (see Theorem 2.10). In our terminology, we prove that every Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$  is proper if and only if every bijection  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  is *proper*. In Section 3 we introduce an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on maximal chains of  $X$  and show that any  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  induces isomorphisms or anti-isomorphisms between certain subsets of  $X$  (the so-called *supports* of  $\sim$ -classes), as proved in Theorem 3.10. Consequently, if all the maximal chains of  $X$  are equivalent, then all Lie automorphisms of  $I(X, K)$  are proper (see Corollary 3.12). The equivalence  $\sim$  is just the equality relation whenever  $X$  is of length one, hence this situation is treated separately. This is done in Section 4. We first consider the case when  $X$  has no crown subset and give a full description of those  $X$  for which any  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  is proper (see Corollary 4.7). We then pass to two specific classes of  $X$ :  $n$ -crowns  $\text{Cr}_n$  and ordinal sums of two anti-chains  $\text{K}_{m,n}$ . If  $X = \text{Cr}_n$ , then we explicitly describe the group  $\mathcal{AM}(X)$  (see Proposition 4.10) and its subgroup of proper bijections (see Proposition 4.11). It follows that all  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)$  are proper exactly when  $n = 2$  (see Corollary 4.12). If  $X = \text{K}_{m,n}$ , then there are only proper  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  as proved in Proposition 4.14.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

**1.1. Automorphisms and anti-automorphisms.** Let  $A$  be an algebra. We denote by  $\text{Aut}(A)$  the group of (linear) automorphisms of  $A$ , by  $\text{Aut}^-(A)$  the set of (linear) anti-automorphisms of  $A$  and by  $\text{Aut}^\pm(A)$  the union  $\text{Aut}(A) \cup \text{Aut}^-(A)$ . Observe that the union is non-disjoint if and only if  $A$  is commutative, in which

case  $\text{Aut}(A) = \text{Aut}^-(A)$ . The set  $\text{Aut}^\pm(A)$  is a group under the composition, and moreover, if  $A$  is non-commutative and  $\text{Aut}^-(A) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{Aut}(A)$  is a (normal) subgroup of  $\text{Aut}^\pm(A)$  of index 2. In particular,  $|\text{Aut}(A)| = |\text{Aut}^-(A)|$ , whenever  $A$  is non-commutative and  $\text{Aut}^-(A) \neq \emptyset$ . We use the analogous notations  $\text{Aut}(X)$ ,  $\text{Aut}^-(X)$  and  $\text{Aut}^\pm(X)$  for the group of automorphisms of a poset  $X$ , the set of anti-automorphisms of  $X$  and the group  $\text{Aut}(X) \cup \text{Aut}^-(X)$ , respectively. As above,  $\text{Aut}(X)$  either coincides with  $\text{Aut}^\pm(X)$  or is a subgroup of index 2 in  $\text{Aut}^\pm(X)$  (if  $X$  is not an anti-chain and  $\text{Aut}^-(X) \neq \emptyset$ ).

**1.2. Posets.** Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set (which we usually shorten to “poset”) and  $x, y \in X$ . The *interval* from  $x$  to  $y$  is the set  $[x, y] = \{z \in X : x \leq z \leq y\}$ . The poset  $X$  is said to be *locally finite* if all the intervals of  $X$  are finite. A *chain* in  $X$  is a linearly ordered (under the induced order) subset of  $X$ . The *length* of a finite chain  $C \subseteq X$  is defined to be  $|C| - 1$ . The *length*<sup>1</sup> of a finite poset  $X$ , denoted by  $l(X)$ , is the maximum length of chains  $C \subseteq X$ . A *walk* in  $X$  is a sequence  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m \in X$ , such that  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$  are comparable and  $l([x_i, x_{i+1}]) = 1$  (if  $x_i \leq x_{i+1}$ ) or  $l([x_{i+1}, x_i]) = 1$  (if  $x_{i+1} \leq x_i$ ) for all  $i = 0, \dots, m - 1$ . A walk  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m$  is *closed* if  $x_0 = x_m$ . A *path* is a walk satisfying  $x_i \neq x_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . A *cycle* is a closed walk  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m = x_0$  in which  $m \geq 4$  and  $x_i = x_j \Rightarrow \{i, j\} = \{0, m\}$  for  $i \neq j$ . We say that  $X$  is *connected* if for any pair of  $x, y \in X$  there is a path  $x = x_0, \dots, x_m = y$ . We will denote by  $\text{Min}(X)$  (resp.  $\text{Max}(X)$ ) the set of minimal (resp. maximal) elements of  $X$ . If  $X$  is connected and  $|X| > 1$ , then  $\text{Min}(X) \cap \text{Max}(X) = \emptyset$ .

**1.3. Incidence algebras.** Let  $X$  be a locally finite poset and  $K$  a field. The *incidence algebra* [20]  $I(X, K)$  of  $X$  over  $K$  is the  $K$ -space of functions  $f : X \times X \rightarrow K$  such that  $f(x, y) = 0$  if  $x \not\leq y$ . This is a unital  $K$ -algebra under the convolution product

$$(fg)(x, y) = \sum_{x \leq z \leq y} f(x, z)g(z, y),$$

for any  $f, g \in I(X, K)$ . Its identity element  $\delta$  is given by

$$\delta(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & x = y, \\ 0, & x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

Throughout the rest of the paper  $X$  will stand for a connected finite poset. Then  $I(X, K)$  admits the standard basis  $\{e_{xy} : x \leq y\}$ , where

$$e_{xy}(u, v) = \begin{cases} 1, & (u, v) = (x, y), \\ 0, & (u, v) \neq (x, y). \end{cases}$$

We will write  $e_x = e_{xx}$ . Denote also  $B = \{e_{xy} : x < y\}$ . It is a well-known fact (see [22, Theorem 4.2.5]) that the Jacobson radical of  $I(X, K)$  is

$$J(I(X, K)) = \{f \in I(X, K) : f(x, x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in X\} = \text{Span}_K B.$$

*Diagonal elements* of  $I(X, K)$  are those  $f \in I(X, K)$  satisfying  $f(x, y) = 0$  for  $x \neq y$ . They form a commutative subalgebra  $D(X, K)$  of  $I(X, K)$  spanned by  $\{e_x : x \in X\}$ . Clearly, each  $f \in I(X, K)$  can be uniquely written as  $f = f_D + f_J$  with  $f_D \in D(X, K)$  and  $f_J \in J(I(X, K))$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>often also called the height

**1.4. Decomposition of  $\phi \in \text{Aut}^\pm(I(X, K))$ .** Now, we recall the descriptions of automorphisms and anti-automorphisms of  $I(X, K)$ . Firstly, if  $X$  and  $Y$  are finite posets and  $\lambda : X \rightarrow Y$  is an isomorphism (resp. anti-isomorphism), then  $\lambda$  induces an isomorphism (resp. anti-isomorphism)  $\hat{\lambda} : I(X, K) \rightarrow I(Y, K)$  defined by  $\hat{\lambda}(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)}$  (resp.  $\hat{\lambda}(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(y)\lambda(x)}$ ), for all  $x \leq y$  in  $X$ . An element  $\sigma \in I(X, K)$  such that  $\sigma(x, y) \neq 0$ , for all  $x \leq y$ , and  $\sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z) = \sigma(x, z)$  whenever  $x \leq y \leq z$ , determines an automorphism  $M_\sigma$  of  $I(X, K)$  by  $M_\sigma(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)e_{xy}$ , for all  $x \leq y$ . Such automorphisms are called *multiplicative*. Any automorphism (anti-automorphism) of  $I(X, K)$  decomposes as

$$\phi = \hat{\lambda} \circ \xi \circ M_\sigma, \quad (1)$$

where  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}(X)$  (resp.  $\text{Aut}^-(X)$ ),  $\xi$  is an inner automorphism and  $M_\sigma$  is a multiplicative automorphism of  $I(X, K)$ . For automorphisms this was proved in [1, Theorem 5] and for anti-automorphisms in [3, Theorem 5] (for more results on automorphisms and anti-automorphisms of incidence algebras see [4, 6, 3, 5, 23, 21, 12, 15]).

**1.5. Lie automorphisms of incidence algebras.** In this section we introduce several new notations and recall some definitions and results from [13].

We denote by  $\mathcal{C}(X)$  the set of maximal chains in  $X$ . Let  $C : u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_m$  in  $\mathcal{C}(X)$ . A bijection  $\theta : B \rightarrow B$  is *increasing* (resp. *decreasing*) on  $C$  if there exists  $D : v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_m$  in  $\mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\theta(e_{u_i u_j}) = e_{v_i v_j}$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$  (resp.  $\theta(e_{u_i u_j}) = e_{v_{m-j+1} v_{m-i+1}}$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ ). In this case we write  $\theta(C) = D$ . Moreover, we say that  $\theta$  is *monotone on maximal chains in  $X$*  if, for any  $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ ,  $\theta$  is increasing or decreasing on  $C$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  the set of bijections  $B \rightarrow B$  which are monotone on maximal chains in  $X$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  is a subgroup of the symmetric group  $S(B)$ . Each  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  induces a bijection on  $\mathcal{C}(X)$  which maps  $C$  to  $\theta(C)$ .

Let  $\theta : B \rightarrow B$  be a bijection and  $X^2_{<} = \{(x, y) \in X^2 : x < y\}$ . A map  $\sigma : X^2_{<} \rightarrow K^*$  is *compatible* with  $\theta$  if  $\sigma(x, z) = \sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z)$  whenever  $\theta(e_{xz}) = \theta(e_{xy})\theta(e_{yz})$ , and  $\sigma(x, z) = -\sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z)$  whenever  $\theta(e_{xz}) = \theta(e_{yz})\theta(e_{xy})$ .

Let  $\theta : B \rightarrow B$  be a bijection and  $\Gamma : u_0, u_1, \dots, u_m = u_0$  a closed walk in  $X$ . In [13] we introduced the following 4 functions  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) &= |\{i : u_i < u_{i+1} \text{ and } \exists w > z \text{ such that } \theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_i u_{i+1}}\}|, \\ s_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) &= |\{i : u_i > u_{i+1} \text{ and } \exists w > z \text{ such that } \theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_{i+1} u_i}\}|, \\ t_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) &= |\{i : u_i < u_{i+1} \text{ and } \exists w < z \text{ such that } \theta(e_{wz}) = e_{u_i u_{i+1}}\}|, \\ t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) &= |\{i : u_i > u_{i+1} \text{ and } \exists w < z \text{ such that } \theta(e_{wz}) = e_{u_{i+1} u_i}\}|. \end{aligned}$$

We call the bijection  $\theta : B \rightarrow B$  *admissible* if

$$s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) - s_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) = t_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) - t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) \quad (2)$$

for any closed walk  $\Gamma : u_0, u_1, \dots, u_m = u_0$  in  $X$  and for all  $z \in X$ . In particular, if  $X$  is a tree, then any bijection  $\theta : B \rightarrow B$  is admissible. We denote by  $\mathcal{AM}(X)$  the set of those  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  which are admissible.

Let  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . Given  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$ , a map  $\sigma : X^2_{<} \rightarrow K^*$  compatible with  $\theta$  and a sequence  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in K^n$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \in K^*$ , we define in [13, Definition 5.17] the following *elementary Lie automorphism*  $\tau = \tau_{\theta, \sigma, c}$  of

$I(X, K)$  where, for any  $e_{xy} \in B$ ,

$$\tau(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)\theta(e_{xy})$$

and  $\tau|_{D(X, K)}$  is determined by

$$\tau(e_{x_i})(x_1, x_1) = c_i,$$

$i = 1, \dots, n$ , as in Lemmas 5.8 and 5.16 from [13]. As in [13, Definition 5.15] we say that  $\tau$  *induces* the pair  $(\theta, \sigma)$  and in some situations we write  $\theta = \theta_\tau$ .

As in [13], we denote by  $\text{LAut}(I(X, K))$  the group of Lie automorphisms of  $I(X, K)$  and by  $\widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K))$  its subgroup of elementary Lie automorphisms. We will also use the notation  $\text{Inn}_1(I(X, K))$  for the subgroup of inner automorphisms consisting of conjugations by  $\beta \in I(X, K)$  with  $\beta_D = \delta$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** [13, Theorem 4.15] *The group  $\text{LAut}(I(X, K))$  is isomorphic to the semidirect product  $\text{Inn}_1(I(X, K)) \rtimes \widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K))$ .*

## 2. PROPER LIE AUTOMORPHISMS OF $I(X, K)$ AND PROPER BIJECTIONS OF $B$

Let  $\varphi \in \text{LAut}(I(X, K))$ . Then  $\varphi = \psi \circ \tau_{\theta, \sigma, c}$ , where  $\psi \in \text{Inn}_1(I(X, K))$  and  $\tau_{\theta, \sigma, c}$  is an elementary Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$ , by Theorem 1.1. Note that  $\varphi$  is proper if and only if  $\tau_{\theta, \sigma, c}$  is proper. Therefore, all Lie automorphisms of  $I(X, K)$  are proper if and only if all elementary Lie automorphisms of  $I(X, K)$  are proper.

Let  $\varphi = \tau_{\theta, \sigma, c}$  be an elementary Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$ . Suppose that  $\varphi$  is proper,  $\varphi = \phi + \nu$ , where  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(I(X, K))$  or  $-\phi \in \text{Aut}^-(I(X, K))$  and  $\nu$  is a linear central-valued map on  $I(X, K)$  such that  $\nu([I(X, K), I(X, K)]) = \{0\}$ . If  $x < y$ , then  $e_{xy} \in J(I(X, K)) = [I(X, K), I(X, K)]$ , by [13, Proposition 2.3]. Thus

$$\varphi(e_{xy}) = \phi(e_{xy}), \forall x < y. \quad (3)$$

By [22, Corollary 1.3.15], for each  $x \in X$  there is  $\alpha_x \in K$  such that

$$\varphi(e_x) = \phi(e_x) + \alpha_x \delta. \quad (4)$$

Suppose firstly that  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(I(X, K))$ . Then, by (1),  $\phi = \hat{\lambda} \circ \xi_f \circ M_\tau$ , where  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}(X)$ ,  $\xi_f$  is an inner automorphism and  $M_\tau$  is a multiplicative automorphism of  $I(X, K)$ . Thus, by (3),

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(e_{xy}) &= \sigma(x, y)^{-1}(\hat{\lambda} \circ \xi_f \circ M_\tau)(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)^{-1}(\hat{\lambda} \circ \xi_f)(\tau(x, y)e_{xy}) \\ &= \sigma(x, y)^{-1}\hat{\lambda}(\tau(x, y)f e_{xy} f^{-1}) = \sigma(x, y)^{-1}\tau(x, y)\hat{\lambda}(f)e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)}\hat{\lambda}(f)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Analogously, if  $-\phi \in \text{Aut}^-(I(X, K))$ , then, by (1),  $\phi = \hat{\lambda} \circ \xi_f \circ M_\tau$ , where  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}^-(X)$ ,  $\xi_f$  is an inner automorphism and  $M_\tau$  is a multiplicative automorphism of  $I(X, K)$ . Thus, by (3),

$$\theta(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)^{-1}(\hat{\lambda} \circ \xi_f \circ M_\tau)(e_{xy}) = \sigma(x, y)^{-1}\tau(x, y)\hat{\lambda}(f)^{-1}e_{\lambda(y)\lambda(x)}\hat{\lambda}(f). \quad (6)$$

**Remark 2.1.** Let  $x \leq y, u \leq v$  in  $X$ ,  $\alpha \in K^*$  and  $h \in I(X, K)$  an invertible element. Note that if  $he_{xy}h^{-1} = \alpha e_{uv}$ , then  $(x, y) = (u, v)$ .

**Definition 2.2.** A bijection  $\theta : B \rightarrow B$  is said to be *proper* if there exists  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}^\pm(X)$  such that  $\theta(e_{xy}) = \hat{\lambda}(e_{xy})$  for all  $e_{xy} \in B$ . The proper bijections of  $B$  form a group, which we denote by  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ .

**Proposition 2.3.** *If  $|X| > 2$ , then the group  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is isomorphic to  $\text{Aut}^\pm(X)$ .*

*Proof.* The map sending  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}(X)$  (resp.  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}^-(X)$ ) to  $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , such that  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)}$  (resp.  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(y)\lambda(x)}$ ), is an epimorphism from  $\text{Aut}^\pm(X)$  to  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . We only need to prove that it is injective.

It is injective on  $\text{Aut}(X)$ . Indeed, take  $\lambda, \mu \in \text{Aut}(X)$  such that  $(\lambda(x), \lambda(y)) = (\mu(x), \mu(y))$  for all  $x < y$  in  $X$ . Let  $x$  be an arbitrary element of  $X$ . Since  $X$  is connected and  $|X| > 1$ , there is  $y \in X$  such that either  $y < x$  or  $y > x$ . In both cases we get  $\lambda(x) = \mu(x)$ . Thus,  $\lambda = \mu$ . Similarly, one proves injectivity on  $\text{Aut}^-(X)$ .

Assume now that there are  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}(X)$  and  $\mu \in \text{Aut}^-(X)$  such that  $(\lambda(x), \lambda(y)) = (\mu(y), \mu(x))$  for all  $x < y$  in  $X$ . We first show that  $X$  must have length at most 1. Indeed, if there were  $x < y < z$  in  $X$ , then we would have  $(\lambda(x), \lambda(y)) = (\mu(y), \mu(x))$  and  $(\lambda(y), \lambda(z)) = (\mu(z), \mu(y))$ , whence  $\lambda(x) = \lambda(z)$ , a contradiction. Now, consider a triple  $x, y, z \in X$  with  $x > z < y$ . It follows from  $(\lambda(z), \lambda(x)) = (\mu(x), \mu(z))$  and  $(\lambda(z), \lambda(y)) = (\mu(y), \mu(z))$  that  $\mu(x) = \mu(y)$ , a contradiction. Similarly, the existence of a triple  $x, y, z \in X$  with  $x < z > y$  leads to  $\lambda(x) = \lambda(y)$ . If there are two incomparable elements  $x, y \in X$ , then there exists a sequence  $x = x_1, \dots, x_m = y$ , where  $m \geq 3$  and either  $x_1 < x_2 > x_3$  or  $x_1 > x_2 < x_3$ . In both cases we come to a contradiction. Thus,  $X$  is of length at most 1 and any two elements of  $X$  are comparable, which means that  $X$  is either a singleton, or a chain of length 1.  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** If  $X$  is a chain of length 1, then  $|\mathcal{P}(X)| = 1$ , while  $|\text{Aut}^\pm(X)| = 2$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** *We have  $\mathcal{P}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{AM}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then there exists  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}^\pm(X)$  as in Definition 2.2. In both cases  $\theta$  is the restriction of  $\hat{\lambda}$  to  $B$  and, since  $\hat{\lambda}$  or  $-\hat{\lambda}$  is an elementary Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$  by [13, Remark 4.8], then  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  by [13, Remark 5.10].  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $\varphi \in \widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K))$  inducing a pair  $(\theta, \sigma)$ . Then  $\theta$  is proper if, and only if,  $\varphi$  is proper.*

*Proof.* Assume first that  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)}$  for some  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}(X)$ . Then  $\theta$  is increasing on any maximal chain in  $X$  and thus  $\sigma(x, z) = \sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z)$  for all  $x < y < z$ . Extending  $\sigma$  to  $X_{\leq}^2 = \{(x, y) : x \leq y\}$  by means of  $\sigma(x, x) = 1$  for all  $x \in X$ , we obtain the multiplicative automorphism  $M_\sigma \in \text{Aut}(I(X, K))$ . Consider  $\psi = \varphi \circ M_\sigma^{-1}$ . Notice that  $\psi(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)}$  for all  $x < y$  and  $\psi(e_x) = \varphi(e_x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . It suffices to prove that  $\psi$  is proper. Indeed, if  $\psi = \phi + \nu$ , then  $\varphi = \psi \circ M_\sigma = \phi \circ M_\sigma + \nu$  since  $M_\sigma$  is identity on  $D(X, R)$ .

Clearly,  $\psi(e_{xy}) = \hat{\lambda}(e_{xy})$  for all  $x < y$ , so  $\hat{\lambda}$  is a candidate for  $\phi$ . It remains to prove (4) for  $\psi$ , i.e., to show that  $\psi(e_x) = e_{\lambda(x)} + \alpha_x \delta$  for some  $\alpha_x \in K$ . The latter is equivalent to

$$\psi(e_x)(y, y) = \psi(e_x)(\lambda(x), \lambda(x)) - 1 \quad (7)$$

for all  $y \neq \lambda(x)$ . Given  $x, y \in X$  with  $y \neq \lambda(x)$ , we choose a path  $\lambda(x) = u_0, \dots, u_m = y$  from  $\lambda(x)$  to  $y$ . Let  $v_i \in X$  such that  $\lambda(v_i) = u_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq m$ . In particular,  $v_0 = x$ . Then

$$\psi(e_x)(y, y) = \psi(e_x)(\lambda(x), \lambda(x)) + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (\psi(e_x)(u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) - \psi(e_x)(u_i, u_i)). \quad (8)$$

If  $u_0 < u_1$ , then  $\theta(e_{xv_1}) = e_{u_0u_1}$ , so  $\psi(e_x)(u_1, u_1) - \psi(e_x)(u_0, u_0) = -1$  by [13, Lemma 5.7]. Similarly, if  $u_0 > u_1$ , then  $\theta(e_{v_1x}) = e_{u_1u_0}$ , so  $\psi(e_x)(u_0, u_0) -$

$\psi(e_x)(u_1, u_1) = 1$ . In any case  $\psi(e_x)(u_1, u_1) - \psi(e_x)(u_0, u_0) = -1$ . Observe that  $v_i \neq x$  for all  $i > 0$ . Hence  $\psi(e_x)(u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) - \psi(e_x)(u_i, u_i) = 0$  for all such  $i$  by [13, Lemma 5.7]. It follows that the sum on the right-hand side of (8) has only one non-zero term which equals  $-1$ , proving (7).

The case  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(y)\lambda(x)}$ , where  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}^-(X)$ , is similar.

Conversely, suppose that  $\varphi = \phi + \nu$ , where  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(I(X, K))$  (resp.  $-\phi \in \text{Aut}^-(I(X, K))$ ) and  $\nu$  is a linear central-valued map on  $I(X, K)$  annihilating  $[I(X, K), I(X, K)]$ . It follows from (5) (resp. (6)) and Remark 2.1 that  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)}$  ( $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(y)\lambda(x)}$ ) for all  $e_{xy} \in B$ , where  $\lambda \in \text{Aut}(X)$  ( $\lambda \in \text{Aut}^-(X)$ ). Therefore,  $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ . Let  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\theta$  is increasing on  $C_1$  and decreasing on  $C_2$ . If there exist  $x, y \in C_1 \cap C_2$  and  $x < y$ , then  $x$  is the minimum of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  and  $y$  is the maximum of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ .*

*Proof.* We first notice that there is  $z \in C_1$  such that  $z < x$  ( $y < z$ ) if, and only if, there is  $z' \in C_2$  such that  $z' < x$  ( $y < z'$ ), by the maximality of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . Suppose that are  $z \in C_1$  and  $z' \in C_2$  such that  $z, z' < x$ . Then  $\theta(e_{zx})\theta(e_{xy}) = \theta(e_{zy})$  and  $\theta(e_{xy})\theta(e_{z'x}) = \theta(e_{z'y})$ . Thus, there are  $s < u < v < t$  such that  $\theta(e_{zx}) = e_{su}$ ,  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{uv}$ ,  $\theta(e_{z'x}) = e_{vt}$  and  $\theta(e_{zy}) = e_{sv}$ ,  $\theta(e_{z'y}) = e_{ut}$ . If  $\theta^{-1}$  is increasing on a maximal chain containing  $s < u < v < t$ , then  $\theta^{-1}(e_{st}) = \theta^{-1}(e_{su})\theta^{-1}(e_{ut}) = e_{zx}e_{z'y}$  which implies  $z' = x$ , a contradiction. If  $\theta^{-1}$  is decreasing on a maximal chain containing  $s < u < v < t$ , then  $\theta^{-1}(e_{st}) = \theta^{-1}(e_{vt})\theta^{-1}(e_{sv}) = e_{z'x}e_{zy}$  which implies  $z = x$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $x$  is the minimum of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . Analogously,  $y$  is the maximum of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.8.** *For any  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ , there is  $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K^*$  compatible with  $\theta$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_i$  ( $\mathcal{C}_d$ ) be the set of all maximal chains in  $X$  on which  $\theta$  is increasing (decreasing). Let  $(x, y) \in X_{<}^2$ . If  $x \in \text{Min}(X)$ , we set  $\sigma(x, y) = 1$ . Otherwise, by Lemma 2.7, both  $x$  and  $y$  belong only to maximal chains from  $\mathcal{C}_i$  or only to maximal chains from  $\mathcal{C}_d$ . In the former case we set  $\sigma(x, y) = 1$  and, in the latter one, we set  $\sigma(x, y) = -1$ .

Let  $x < y < z$  in  $X$ . Again, by Lemma 2.7, those three elements can be simultaneously only in maximal chains from  $\mathcal{C}_i$  or only in maximal chains from  $\mathcal{C}_d$ . If they belong to maximal chains from  $\mathcal{C}_i$ , then  $\sigma(x, z) = 1 = \sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z)$ . Otherwise, there are two situations to be considered:  $x \in \text{Min}(X)$  or  $x \notin \text{Min}(X)$ . In the former case,  $\sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z) = 1 \cdot (-1) = -1 = -\sigma(x, z)$ . In the latter case,  $\sigma(x, y)\sigma(y, z) = (-1)^2 = 1 = -\sigma(x, z)$ . Thus,  $\sigma$  is compatible with  $\theta$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.9.** *The image of the group homomorphism  $\widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K)) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$ ,  $\varphi \mapsto \theta_\varphi$ , coincides with  $\mathcal{AM}(X)$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{AM}(X)$  is a group.*

*Proof.* If  $\varphi \in \widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K))$ , then  $\theta_\varphi \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  by Lemma 5.4 and Remark 5.10 from [13]. Let now  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$ . By Lemma 2.8 there is  $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K^*$  compatible with  $\theta$ . Choose an arbitrary  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in K^n$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \in K^*$ , where  $n = |X|$ . Then  $\tau = \tau_{\theta, \sigma, c} \in \widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K))$  such that  $\theta_\tau = \theta$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.10.** *Every Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$  is proper if and only if  $\mathcal{P}(X) = \mathcal{AM}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that every Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$  is proper. Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$ . By Lemma 2.8, there is  $\sigma : X_{<}^2 \rightarrow K^*$  compatible with  $\theta$  and, by [13, Lemma 5.16], there is  $\varphi \in \widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K))$  inducing  $(\theta, \sigma)$ . By hypothesis,  $\varphi$  is proper. Therefore,  $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  by Lemma 2.6.

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathcal{P}(X) = \mathcal{AM}(X)$ . Let  $\varphi \in \widetilde{\text{LAut}}(I(X, K))$  inducing the pair  $(\theta, \sigma)$ . By hypothesis,  $\theta$  is proper. Therefore,  $\varphi$  is proper, by Lemma 2.6. Thus, every Lie automorphism of  $I(X, K)$  is proper.  $\square$

### 3. ADMISSIBLE BIJECTIONS OF $B$ AND MAXIMAL CHAINS IN $X$

Observe that the definitions of the functions  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}$  make sense for any sequence  $\Gamma : u_0, \dots, u_m$  such that either  $u_i < u_{i+1}$  or  $u_{i+1} < u_i$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq m-1$ . We will call such sequences  $\Gamma$  *semiwalks*. If moreover  $u_0 = u_m$ , then  $\Gamma$  will be called a *closed semiwalk*.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ ,  $z \in X$  and  $\Gamma : u_0, u_1, \dots, u_m = u_0$  a closed semiwalk in  $X$ . Let  $0 \leq k < k+l \leq m$  such that  $u_k < u_{k+1} < \dots < u_{k+l}$  or  $u_k > u_{k+1} > \dots > u_{k+l}$  and set  $\Gamma' : u_0, \dots, u_k, u_{k+l}, \dots, u_m = u_0$ . Then*

$$s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) - t_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma'}^+(z) - t_{\theta, \Gamma'}^+(z), \quad s_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) - t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma'}^-(z) - t_{\theta, \Gamma'}^-(z). \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $u_k < u_{k+1} < \dots < u_{k+l}$ . There are two cases.

*Case 1.*  $\theta^{-1}$  is increasing on a maximal chain containing  $u_k < u_{k+1} < \dots < u_{k+l}$ . Then there are  $v_k < v_{k+1} < \dots < v_{k+l}$  such that  $\theta^{-1}(e_{u_i u_j}) = e_{v_i v_j}$  for all  $k \leq i < j \leq k+l$ .

*Case 1.1.*  $z = v_i$  for some  $k < i < k+l$ . If  $\theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_j u_{j+1}}$  for  $w > z$  and  $k \leq j < k+l$ , then  $(z, w) = (v_j, v_{j+1})$ , which implies that  $j = i$  and  $w = v_{i+1}$ . Similarly  $\theta(e_{wz}) = e_{u_j u_{j+1}}$  for  $w < z$  and  $k \leq j < k+l$  yields  $w = v_{i-1}$ . Since, moreover,  $\theta(e_{v_k v_{k+l}}) = e_{u_k u_{k+l}}$  and  $z \neq v_k$ , there is no  $w > z$  such that  $\theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_k u_{k+l}}$ . Similarly there is no  $w < z$  such that  $\theta(e_{wz}) = e_{u_k u_{k+l}}$ . Therefore,  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) - 1$ ,  $t_{\theta, \Gamma'}^+(z) = t_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) - 1$ ,  $s_{\theta, \Gamma'}^-(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z)$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma'}^-(z) = t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z)$ .

*Case 1.2.*  $z = v_k$ . Again, if  $\theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_j u_{j+1}}$  for  $w > z$  and  $k \leq j < k+l$ , then  $w = v_{k+1}$ . However, there is no  $w < z$  such that  $\theta(e_{wz}) = e_{u_j u_{j+1}}$  for some  $k \leq j < k+l$ , but there is a unique  $w > z$  (namely,  $w = v_{k+1}$ ) such that  $\theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_k u_{k+l}}$ . This means that  $s_{\theta, \Gamma'}^{\pm}(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z)$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma'}^{\pm}(z) = t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z)$ .

*Case 1.3.*  $z = v_{k+l}$ . This case is similar to Case 1.2. We have  $s_{\theta, \Gamma'}^{\pm}(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z)$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma'}^{\pm}(z) = t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z)$ .

*Case 1.4.*  $z \notin \{v_k, \dots, v_{k+l}\}$ . Then there is neither  $w < z$  such that  $\theta(e_{wz}) = e_{u_j u_{j+1}}$  nor  $w > z$  such that  $\theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_j u_{j+1}}$  for some  $k \leq j < k+l$ . Moreover, there is neither  $w < z$  such that  $\theta(e_{wz}) = e_{u_k u_{k+l}}$  nor  $w > z$  such that  $\theta(e_{zw}) = e_{u_k u_{k+l}}$ . Thus,  $s_{\theta, \Gamma'}^{\pm}(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z)$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma'}^{\pm}(z) = t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z)$ .

*Case 2.*  $\theta^{-1}$  is decreasing on a maximal chain containing  $u_k < u_{k+1} < \dots < u_{k+l}$ . Then everything from Case 1 remains valid with the replacement of the “+”-functions by their “-”-analogs and vice versa.

In any case  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) - t_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z)$  and  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) - t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z)$  are invariant under the change of  $\Gamma$  for  $\Gamma'$ . When  $u_k > u_{k+1} > \dots > u_{k+l}$ , the proof is analogous.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ . Then  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  if and only if (2) holds for any  $z \in X$  and any closed semiwalk  $\Gamma : u_0, \dots, u_m = u_0$ ,  $m \geq 2$ .*



*Proof.* The “if” part is trivial. Let us prove the “only if” part. Indeed, the case  $m = 2$  is explained in the proof of [13, Lemma 5.13], and if  $m \geq 3$ , then  $\Gamma$  can be extended to a closed walk  $\Delta$  by inserting increasing (if  $u_i < u_{i+1}$ ) or decreasing (if  $u_i > u_{i+1}$ ) sequences of elements between  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ . Since (2) holds for  $\Delta$ , then by Lemma 3.1 it holds for  $\Gamma$  too.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  and  $\Gamma : u_0, \dots, u_m = u_0$ ,  $m \geq 2$ , a closed semiwalk. Let also  $x_i < y_i$ , such that  $\theta(e_{u_i u_{i+1}}) = e_{x_i y_i}$  for  $u_i < u_{i+1}$  and  $\theta(e_{u_{i+1} u_i}) = e_{x_i y_i}$  for  $u_i > u_{i+1}$ .*

- (i) *If  $x_i \in \text{Min}(X)$  for some  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ , then there is  $j \neq i$  such that  $x_i = x_j$ .*
- (ii) *If  $y_i \in \text{Max}(X)$  for some  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ , then there is  $j \neq i$  such that  $y_i = y_j$ .*

*Proof.* We will prove (i), the proof of (ii) is analogous. Assume that  $x_i \neq x_j$  for all  $j \neq i$ . If  $u_i < u_{i+1}$ , then  $s_{\theta^{-1}, \Gamma}^+(x_i) = 1$  and  $s_{\theta^{-1}, \Gamma}^-(x_i) = 0$ , since  $\theta^{-1}(e_{x_i y_i}) = e_{u_i u_{i+1}}$  and  $\theta^{-1}(e_{x_i w}) \neq e_{u_j u_{j+1}}$  for any  $w \neq y_i$  and  $j \neq i$  (otherwise  $x_i$  would coincide with some  $x_j$  for  $j \neq i$ ). Similarly, if  $u_i > u_{i+1}$ , then  $s_{\theta^{-1}, \Gamma}^+(x_i) = 0$  and  $s_{\theta^{-1}, \Gamma}^-(x_i) = 1$ . Obviously,  $t_{\theta^{-1}, \Gamma}^\pm(x_i) = 0$ , because  $x_i \in \text{Min}(X)$ . Thus, (2) fails for the triple  $(\theta^{-1}, \Gamma, x_i)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ . Assume that there exist  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\theta$  is increasing on  $C$  and decreasing on  $D$ . If  $x \in C \cap D$ , then either  $x \in \text{Min}(X)$  or  $x \in \text{Max}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C : x_1 < \dots < x_n$ ,  $D : y_1 < \dots < y_m$  and  $x = x_i = y_j$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . Suppose that  $1 < i < n$ . Then  $1 < j < m$ , since otherwise  $D$  would not be maximal. There exist maximal chains  $C' : u_1 < \dots < u_n$  and  $D' : v_1 < \dots < v_m$  such that  $\theta(e_{x_k x_l}) = e_{u_k u_l}$  for all  $1 \leq k < l \leq n$  and  $\theta(e_{y_p y_q}) = e_{v_{m-q+1} v_{m-p+1}}$  for all  $1 \leq p < q \leq m$ . In particular,  $\theta(e_{x_{i-1} x_i}) = e_{u_{i-1} u_i}$ ,  $\theta(e_{x_i x_{i+1}}) = e_{u_i u_{i+1}}$ ,  $\theta(e_{y_{j-1} y_j}) = e_{v_{m-j+1} v_{m-j+2}}$ ,  $\theta(e_{y_j y_{j+1}}) = e_{v_{m-j} v_{m-j+1}}$ . Observe that  $x_{i-1} < x_i = y_j < y_{j+1}$ . Then either  $u_i = v_{m-j}$ , or  $u_{i-1} = v_{m-j+1}$ , depending on whether  $\theta$  is increasing or decreasing on a maximal chain containing  $x_{i-1} < x_i < y_{j+1}$ . Similarly, considering  $y_{j-1} < y_j = x_i < x_{i+1}$  we obtain  $v_{m-j+1} = u_{i+1}$  or  $v_{m-j+2} = u_i$ . If  $u_i = v_{m-j}$ , then  $v_{m-j+1} = u_{i+1}$ , so that  $\{u_i, u_{i+1}\} \subseteq C' \cap D'$ . However,  $\theta^{-1}$  is increasing on  $C'$  and decreasing on  $D'$ , so  $u_i$  is the common minimum of  $C'$  and  $D'$  and  $u_{i+1}$  is the common maximum of  $C'$  and  $D'$  by Lemma 2.7. This contradicts the assumption  $1 < i < n$ . Similarly,  $u_{i-1} = v_{m-j+1}$  implies  $v_{m-j+2} = u_i$ , whence  $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\} \subseteq C' \cap D'$  leading to a contradiction.

Thus,  $i \in \{1, n\}$ . If  $i = 1$ , then necessarily  $j = 1$ , as otherwise  $C$  would not be maximal. Similarly, if  $i = n$ , then  $j = m$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  and  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ ,  $C : x_1 < \dots < x_n$ ,  $D : y_1 < \dots < y_m$ . Assume that  $x_i = y_j$  for some  $1 < i < n$  and  $1 < j < m$ . If  $\theta$  is increasing (resp. decreasing) on  $C$ , then it is increasing (resp. decreasing) on  $D$ . Moreover, if  $\theta(C) : u_1 < \dots < u_n$  and  $\theta(D) : v_1 < \dots < v_m$ , then  $u_i = v_j$  (resp.  $u_{n-i+1} = v_{m-j+1}$ ).*

*Proof.* Let  $\theta$  be increasing on  $C$ . Then it is increasing on  $D$  by Lemma 3.4. Using the same idea as in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we have  $\theta(e_{x_{i-1} x_i}) = e_{u_{i-1} u_i}$ ,

$\theta(e_{x_i x_{i+1}}) = e_{u_i u_{i+1}}$ ,  $\theta(e_{y_{j-1} y_j}) = e_{v_{j-1} v_j}$ ,  $\theta(e_{y_j y_{j+1}}) = e_{v_j v_{j+1}}$ . Considering  $x_{i-1} < x_i = y_j < y_{j+1}$  we conclude that  $u_i = v_j$  or  $u_{i-1} = v_{j+1}$ . Similarly it follows from  $y_{j-1} < y_j = x_i < x_{i+1}$  that  $u_i = v_j$  or  $v_{j-1} = u_{i+1}$ . If  $u_i \neq v_j$ , then  $u_{i-1} = v_{j+1}$  and  $v_{j-1} = u_{i+1}$ . But this is impossible, since  $u_{i-1} < u_{i+1}$  and  $v_{j+1} > v_{j-1}$ .

The proof for the decreasing case is analogous.  $\square$

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ . We say that  $C$  and  $D$  are *linked* if there exists  $x \in C \cap D$  such that  $x \notin \text{Min}(X) \sqcup \text{Max}(X)$ . Denote by  $\sim$  the equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{C}(X)$  generated by  $\{(C, D) \in \mathcal{C}(X)^2 : C, D \text{ are linked}\}$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Each  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  induces a bijection  $\tilde{\theta}$  on  $\mathcal{C}(X)/\sim$ . Moreover, if  $\theta$  is increasing (resp. decreasing) on  $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ , then it is increasing (resp. decreasing) on any  $D \sim C$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  be linked. Then  $\theta(C)$  and  $\theta(D)$  are linked by Lemma 3.5. It follows that  $C \sim D$  implies  $\theta(C) \sim \theta(D)$ , which induces a map  $\tilde{\theta} : \mathcal{C}(X)/\sim \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(X)/\sim$ . It is a bijection whose inverse is  $\tilde{\theta}^{-1}$ .

Assume that  $\theta$  is increasing on  $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ . Then by Lemma 3.5 it is increasing on any  $D \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  which is linked to  $C$ . By the obvious induction this extends to any  $D \sim C$ . The decreasing case is similar.  $\square$

**Definition 3.8.** Given  $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{C}(X)/\sim$ , we define the *support* of  $\mathfrak{C}$ , denoted  $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{C})$ , as the set  $\{x \in C : C \in \mathfrak{C}\}$ .

**Remark 3.9.** Let  $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D} \in \mathcal{C}(X)/\sim$ . If  $\mathfrak{C} \neq \mathfrak{D}$ , then  $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{C}) \cap \text{supp}(\mathfrak{D}) \subseteq \text{Min}(X) \sqcup \text{Max}(X)$ .

Indeed, assume that  $x \in \text{supp}(\mathfrak{C}) \cap \text{supp}(\mathfrak{D})$ , where  $x \notin \text{Min}(X)$  and  $x \notin \text{Max}(X)$ . There are  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$  and  $D \in \mathfrak{D}$  such that  $x \in C \cap D$ . But then  $C$  and  $D$  are linked, so  $C \sim D$ , whence  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{D}$ .

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  and  $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{C}(X)/\sim$ . Then there exists an isomorphism or an anti-isomorphism of posets  $\lambda : \text{supp}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\tilde{\theta}(\mathfrak{C}))$  such that for all  $x < y$  from  $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{C})$  one has*

$$\theta(e_{xy}) = \hat{\lambda}(e_{xy}). \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* In view of Lemma 3.7 we may assume that  $\theta$  is increasing on all  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$  or decreasing on all  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ . Consider the case of an increasing  $\theta$ . We are going to construct the corresponding  $\lambda : \text{supp}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\tilde{\theta}(\mathfrak{C}))$ . Let  $x \in \text{supp}(\mathfrak{C})$  and  $C : x_1 < \dots < x_n$  a maximal chain from  $\mathfrak{C}$  containing  $x$ . Denote by  $C' : u_1 < \dots < u_n$  the image of  $C$  under  $\theta$ . If  $x = x_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , then we put  $\lambda(x_i) = u_i$ . We still need to show that the definition does not depend on the choice of  $C$ .

If  $1 < i < n$ , then this is true by Lemma 3.5.

If  $i = 1$ , then  $x \in \text{Min}(X)$ . If there exists another maximal chain  $D : y_1 < \dots < y_m$  from  $\mathfrak{C}$  containing  $x$ , then  $x = y_1$ . We thus need to show that  $u_1 = v_1$ , where  $D' : v_1 < \dots < v_m$  is the image of  $D$  under  $\theta$ . Since  $C \sim D$ , there are  $C = C_1, \dots, C_k = D$  such that  $C_j$  and  $C_{j+1}$  are linked for all  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ . Denote by  $z_j$  an element of  $C_j \cap C_{j+1}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , which is neither minimal, nor maximal in  $X$ . Set also  $z_0 = z_k = x$ . Observe that  $z_j, z_{j+1} \in C_{j+1}$  for all  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ , so that either  $z_j \leq z_{j+1}$  or  $z_j \geq z_{j+1}$ . Let  $\Gamma : z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k = z_0$ . Clearly,  $z_0 \neq z_j$  and  $z_j \neq z_k$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , as  $z_0 = z_k \in \text{Min}(X)$ , while  $z_j \notin \text{Min}(X)$ . Moreover, we will assume that  $z_j \neq z_{j+1}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k-2$ , since

otherwise we may just remove the repetitions (and at least 2 elements will remain). Let also  $a_j < b_j$  such that  $\theta(e_{z_j z_{j+1}}) = e_{a_j b_j}$  if  $z_j < z_{j+1}$ , and  $\theta(e_{z_{j+1} z_j}) = e_{a_j b_j}$  if  $z_j > z_{j+1}$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ . Observe that  $a_0 = u_1$ , since  $x = z_0 < z_1 \in C$ , and  $a_{k-1} = v_1$ , since  $x = z_k < z_{k-1} \in D$ . In particular,  $a_0, a_{k-1} \in \text{Min}(X)$ . Since  $z_j$  is not minimal for all  $1 \leq j \leq k-2$ , then neither is  $a_j$ , so that  $a_j \notin \{a_0, a_{k-1}\}$  for such  $j$ . But then we must have  $a_0 = a_{k-1}$ , i.e.,  $u_1 = v_1$ , by Lemma 3.3 (i).

The case  $i = n$  is similar. The map  $\lambda : \text{supp}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\tilde{\theta}(\mathfrak{C}))$  is thus constructed.


We now prove that  $\lambda(x) < \lambda(y)$  and (10) holds for all  $x < y$  from  $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{C})$ . By construction, this is true for  $x$  and  $y$  belonging to the same  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ . Let now  $x < y$  be arbitrary elements of  $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{C})$ . Choose  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$  containing  $x$  and  $D \in \mathfrak{C}$  containing  $y$ . If  $x \notin \text{Min}(X)$ , then any  $C' \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  containing  $x$  and  $y$  is linked to  $C$ , so that  $C' \in \mathfrak{C}$ . The case when  $y \notin \text{Max}(X)$  is similar. Let now  $x \in \text{Min}(X)$  and  $y \in \text{Max}(X)$ . As above, we choose  $C = C_1, \dots, C_k = D$ , such that  $C_j, C_{j+1} \in \mathfrak{C}$  are linked for all  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , and  $z_j \in C_j \cap C_{j+1}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , which is neither minimal, nor maximal in  $X$ . We set  $z_0 = x$ ,  $z_k = y$  and  $\Gamma : z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k, z_{k+1} = z_0$ . We also assume that  $z_j \neq z_{j+1}$  for all  $0 \leq j \leq k$  and denote by  $a_j < b_j$  the elements satisfying  $\theta(e_{z_j z_{j+1}}) = e_{a_j b_j}$  if  $z_j < z_{j+1}$  and  $\theta(e_{z_{j+1} z_j}) = e_{a_j b_j}$  if  $z_j > z_{j+1}$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq k$ . As above, observe that  $a_0, a_k \in \text{Min}(X)$ , while  $a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} \notin \text{Min}(X)$ . Then  $a_0 = a_k$  by Lemma 3.3 (i). Similarly it follows from Lemma 3.3 (ii) that  $b_{k-1} = b_k$ . But  $a_0 = \lambda(x)$  and  $b_{k-1} = \lambda(y)$ , since  $e_{a_0 b_0} = \theta(e_{z_0 z_1}) = e_{\lambda(z_0)\lambda(z_1)} = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(z_1)}$  and  $e_{a_{k-1} b_{k-1}} = \theta(e_{z_{k-1} z_k}) = e_{\lambda(z_{k-1})\lambda(z_k)} = e_{\lambda(z_{k-1})\lambda(y)}$ . Hence,  $\lambda(x) = a_k < b_k = \lambda(y)$  and  $\theta(e_{xy}) = \theta(e_{z_{k+1} z_k}) = e_{a_k b_k} = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)} = \tilde{\lambda}(e_{xy})$ .

It is clear that  $\lambda$  is a bijection whose inverse is the map  $\mu : \text{supp}(\tilde{\theta}(\mathfrak{C})) \rightarrow \text{supp}(\mathfrak{C})$  corresponding to  $\theta^{-1}$ . Thus,  $\lambda$  is an isomorphism between  $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{C})$  and  $\text{supp}(\tilde{\theta}(\mathfrak{C}))$ .

The case of a decreasing  $\theta$  is analogous.  $\square$

The following example shows that the admissibility of  $\theta$  in Theorem 3.10 cannot be dropped.

**Example 3.11.** Let  $X = \{1, \dots, 10, 1', \dots, 9', 7''\}$  with the following Hasse diagram.



Then  $\mathcal{C}(X)/\sim$  consists of 2 classes whose supports are  $Y = \{1, \dots, 10\}$  and  $Z = \{1', \dots, 9', 10, 7''\}$ . Observe that there exists  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  mapping one  $\sim$ -class to another. It is defined as follows:  $\theta(e_{ij}) = e_{i'j'}$  for all  $i \leq j$  in  $X$  with  $(i, j) \neq (5, 7)$ ,  $\theta(e_{i'j'}) = e_{ij}$  for all  $i' \leq j'$  in  $X$  with  $(i', j') \neq (5', 7'')$ ,  $\theta(e_{57}) = e_{5'7''}$  and  $\theta(e_{5'7''}) = e_{57}$  (to make the definition shorter, we set  $10' := 10$ ). However,  $Y$  and  $Z$  are not isomorphic or anti-isomorphic because  $|Y| \neq |Z|$ . The reason is that


$\theta \notin \mathcal{AM}(X)$ . Indeed, for  $\Gamma : 5 < 7 > 6 < 8 > 5$  we have  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(7') = 0$ ,  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(7') = 0$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(7') = 1$ .

As a consequence of Theorems 2.10 and 3.10 we have the following result which generalizes [13, Corollary 5.19], where  $X$  was a chain.

**Corollary 3.12.** *If  $|\mathcal{C}(X)/\sim| = 1$ , then each  $\varphi \in \text{LAut}(I(X, K))$  is proper.*

Observe, however, that the condition  $|\mathcal{C}(X)/\sim| = 1$  is not necessary for all  $\varphi \in \text{LAut}(I(X, K))$  to be proper, as the following example shows.

**Example 3.13.** Let  $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  with the following Hasse diagram.



Note that  $\mathcal{C}(X)/\sim$  consists of 2 classes whose supports are  $Y = \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$  and  $Z = \{1, 3, 5, 6\}$ . For any  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  there are 2 possibilities for the corresponding isomorphisms  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  between the supports: either  $\lambda_1 : Y \rightarrow Y$  and  $\lambda_2 : Z \rightarrow Z$ , or  $\lambda_1 : Y \rightarrow Z$  and  $\lambda_2 : Z \rightarrow Y$ . In the former case  $\lambda_1 = \text{id}_Y$  and  $\lambda_2 = \text{id}_Z$ , and in the latter case  $\lambda_2 = \lambda_1^{-1}$ , where  $\lambda_1$  maps an element  $y \in Y$  to the element  $z \in Z$  which is symmetric to  $y$  with respect to the vertical line passing through the vertices 1 and 5. In both cases  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are the restrictions of an automorphism of  $X$  to  $Y$  and  $Z$ , respectively.

#### 4. SETS OF LENGTH ONE

**4.1. Admissible bijections of  $B$  and crowns in  $X$ .** Before proceeding to the case  $l(X) = 1$  we will prove a useful fact which holds for  $X$  of an arbitrary length.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $n$  be an integer greater than 1. By a *weak  $n$ -crown* we mean a poset  $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$  where

$$x_i < y_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad x_{i+1} < y_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \text{ and } x_1 < y_n. \quad (11)$$

An  *$n$ -crown* is a weak  $n$ -crown which has no other pairs of distinct comparable elements except (11). It is thus fully determined by  $n$  up to an isomorphism and will be denoted by  $\text{Cr}_n$ . A poset  $P$  is called a *weak crown (resp. crown)*, if it is a weak  $n$ -crown (resp.  $n$ -crown) for some  $n \geq 2$ . We say that a poset  $X$  *has a weak crown (resp. crown)* if there is a subset  $Y \subseteq X$  which is a weak crown (resp. crown) under the induced partial order.

Posets without crowns are known to satisfy some “good” properties [19, 11, 10].

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ . Then  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(X)$  if and only if (2) holds for any  $z \in X$  and any weak crown  $\Gamma : u_0, \dots, u_m = u_0$  in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* The “only if” part is obvious. For the “if” part take any closed semiwalk  $\Gamma : u_0, u_1, \dots, u_m = u_0$  and  $z \in X$ . Let  $0 \leq k < k+l \leq m$  such that  $u_k < u_{k+1} < \dots < u_{k+l}$ . We define  $\Gamma' : u_0, \dots, u_k, u_{k+l}, \dots, u_m = u_0$ . By Corollary 3.2 equality (2) holds for  $\Gamma$  if and only if it holds for  $\Gamma'$ . The same is true for any  $\Gamma'$  obtained from  $\Gamma$  by removing intermediate terms in a decreasing sequence of

consecutive vertices. Thus, doing so for all maximal sequences in  $\Gamma$  we finally get  $\Gamma'$  whose vertices form either a sequence  $x < y > x$ , or a weak crown. However, the case  $\Gamma' : x < y > x$  can be ignored, because (2) always holds for such  $\Gamma'$  as shown in the proof of [13, Lemma 5.13].  $\square$

**4.2. The crownless case.** Let now  $l(X) = 1$ . Observe that  $\mathcal{M}(X) = S(B)$ . Moreover, any  $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  is linked only to itself, so  $|\mathcal{C}(X)/\sim| = |\mathcal{C}(X)|$  and Theorem 3.10 becomes useless.

**Definition 4.3.** We say that  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  is *separating* if there exists a pair of non-disjoint  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(X)$  such that  $\theta(C)$  and  $\theta(D)$  are disjoint.

**Remark 4.4.** Any separating  $\theta$  is not proper.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $l(X) = 1$ . If  $|\text{Min}(X)| > 1$  and  $|\text{Max}(X)| > 1$ , then there are disjoint  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Choose arbitrary  $x < y$  in  $X$ . Obviously,  $x \in \text{Min}(X)$  and  $y \in \text{Max}(X)$ . Let  $U = \{u \in \text{Min}(X) \mid u \not\leq y\}$  and  $V = \{v \in \text{Max}(X) \mid x \not\leq v\}$ . If  $U \neq \emptyset$ , then take  $u \in U$ . Clearly,  $u \neq x$ . Since  $X$  is connected, there exists  $v > u$ , and  $v \neq y$  by the definition of  $U$ . Then  $C : x < y$  and  $D : u < v$  are disjoint. The case  $V \neq \emptyset$  is similar. Suppose now that  $U = V = \emptyset$ . This means that  $x \leq v$  for any  $v \in \text{Max}(X)$  and  $y \geq u$  for any  $u \in \text{Min}(X)$ . Choose  $u \in \text{Min}(X) \setminus \{x\}$  and  $v \in \text{Max}(X) \setminus \{y\}$ . Then  $C_1 : x < v$  and  $D_1 : u < y$  are disjoint.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $l(X) = 1$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{P}(X)$  if and only if  $|\text{Min}(X)| = 1$  or  $|\text{Max}(X)| = 1$ .*

*Proof.* If  $|\text{Min}(X)| = 1$ , say  $\text{Min}(X) = \{x\}$ , then any  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  can be identified with a bijection  $\lambda$  of  $\text{Max}(X)$  such that  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{x\lambda(y)}$  for all  $y > x$ . But  $\lambda$  extends to an automorphism of  $X$  by means of  $\lambda(x) = x$ , so that  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{\lambda(x)\lambda(y)}$ . A symmetric argument works in the case  $|\text{Max}(X)| = 1$ .

Suppose now that  $|\text{Min}(X)| > 1$  and  $|\text{Max}(X)| > 1$ . By Lemma 4.5 there are disjoint  $C : x < y$  and  $D : u < v$ . Choose a path  $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m = u$ . Since  $x, u \in \text{Min}(X)$ , then  $m \geq 2$  and  $x_0 < x_1 > x_2$ . We define  $\theta(e_{x_0x_1}) = e_{xy}$ ,  $\theta(e_{xy}) = e_{x_0x_1}$ ,  $\theta(e_{x_2x_1}) = e_{uv}$ ,  $\theta(e_{uv}) = e_{x_2x_1}$  and  $\theta(e_{ab}) = e_{ab}$  for any other  $e_{ab} \in B$ . Clearly,  $\theta \in S(B) = \mathcal{M}(X)$  and it is separating, in particular, not proper.  $\square$

If  $X$  does not contain a weak crown, then  $\mathcal{AM}(X) = \mathcal{M}(X)$  by Lemma 4.2. Hence, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $l(X) = 1$  and assume that  $X$  does not contain a weak crown. Then  $\mathcal{AM}(X) = \mathcal{P}(X)$  if and only if  $|\text{Min}(X)| = 1$  or  $|\text{Max}(X)| = 1$ .*

**4.3. The crown case.** We will now consider two classes of posets of length one which have crowns. We begin with the case of  $X$  being a crown and are going to calculate the groups  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{AM}(X)$  explicitly. Thus, in this subsection  $X = \text{Cr}_n = \{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ .

**Definition 4.8.** The chains  $x_i < y_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , will be called *odd*, and  $x_{i+1} < y_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , and  $x_1 < y_n$  will be called *even*. Thus, each element of  $\text{Cr}_n$  belongs to exactly one odd chain and to exactly one even chain.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Cr}_n)$ . Then  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)$  if and only if for any pair of distinct non-disjoint chains  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(\text{Cr}_n)$  the images  $\theta(C)$  and  $\theta(D)$  have opposite parities.*

*Proof.* Observe that (2) is invariant under cyclic shifts of  $\Gamma$  (any such shift does not change the functions  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}$ ). Thus, for admissibility it is enough to consider  $\Gamma : x_1 < y_1 > x_2 < \dots < y_n > x_1$ , since any other cycle in  $\text{Cr}_n$  is a cyclic shift of  $\Gamma$ .

The “only if” case. Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)$  and  $C, D \in \mathcal{C}(\text{Cr}_n)$ , such that  $C \cap D = \{z\}$ , where  $z \in \text{Min}(\text{Cr}_n) \sqcup \text{Max}(\text{Cr}_n)$ . Suppose that  $z \in \text{Min}(\text{Cr}_n)$ . Then there are only two elements  $w, w' \in \text{Max}(\text{Cr}_n)$  such that  $z < w, w'$ . Thus,  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z) = 0$  and  $\theta$  is admissible if and only if  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(z) = s_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(z) = 1$ , which only occur if  $\theta(C)$  and  $\theta(D)$  have opposite parities. The case when  $z \in \text{Max}(\text{Cr}_n)$  is similar.

The “if” case. Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Cr}_n)$  and  $z \in \text{Cr}_n$  be arbitrary. Again, we consider the case  $z \in \text{Min}(\text{Cr}_n)$ , so that  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z) = 0$ . Choose  $w, w' \in \text{Max}(\text{Cr}_n)$  with  $z < w, w'$  and put  $C : z < w$  and  $D : z < w'$ . Since  $\theta(C)$  and  $\theta(D)$  have opposite parities, then  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(z) = 1$  and (2) is satisfied. Similarly, one handles the case  $z \in \text{Max}(\text{Cr}_n)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.10.** *The group  $\mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)$  is isomorphic to  $(S_n \times S_n) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ .*

*Proof.* Denote by  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  the subsets of  $\mathcal{C}(\text{Cr}_n)$  formed by the odd and even chains, respectively, and let  $\mathcal{G} = \{\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Cr}_n) : \theta(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O} \text{ or } \theta(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{E}\}$ . We will first prove that  $\mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n) = \mathcal{G}$ . For any  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)$ , if  $\theta(e_{x_1 y_1}) \in \mathcal{O}$ , then  $\theta(e_{x_2 y_1}) \in \mathcal{E}$  by Lemma 4.9. It follows that  $\theta(e_{x_2 y_2}) \in \mathcal{O}$  by the same reason. Applying this argument consecutively to  $e_{x_3 y_2}, e_{x_3 y_3}, \dots, e_{x_k y_k}, e_{x_1 y_k}$ , we obtain  $\theta(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}$ . Similarly, if  $\theta(e_{x_1 y_1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ , then  $\theta(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{E}$ . Thus,  $\theta \in \mathcal{G}$ . On the other hand, let  $\theta \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\text{Cr}_n)$ ,  $C_1 \neq C_2$ , such that  $C_1 \cap C_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  have opposite parities, say,  $C_1 \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $C_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ . If  $\theta(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}$ , then  $\theta(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{E}$  due to the bijectivity of  $\theta$ . Analogously, if  $\theta(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{E}$ , then  $\theta(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{O}$ . So, in either case,  $\theta(C_1)$  and  $\theta(C_2)$  have opposite parities. Therefore,  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)$ , by Lemma 4.9.

We now prove that  $\mathcal{G} \cong (S_n \times S_n) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Consider  $\mathcal{H} = \{\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Cr}_n) : \theta(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}\}$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{H}$  is a (normal) subgroup of  $\mathcal{G}$  of index 2. Since  $|\mathcal{O}| = |\mathcal{E}| = n$ , we have  $\mathcal{H} \cong S_n \times S_n$ . Define  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Cr}_n)$  as follows:  $\theta(e_{x_i y_i}) = e_{x_{i+1} y_i}$  and  $\theta(e_{x_{i+1} y_i}) = e_{x_i y_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ,  $\theta(e_{x_n y_n}) = e_{x_1 y_n}$  and  $\theta(e_{x_1 y_n}) = e_{x_n y_n}$ . By definition  $\theta \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{H}$  and  $\theta$  has order 2. Therefore,  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H} \cdot \langle \theta \rangle \cong (S_n \times S_n) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.11.** *The group  $\mathcal{P}(\text{Cr}_n)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_{2n} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ .*

*Proof.* In view of Proposition 2.3 it suffices to prove that  $\text{Aut}^{\pm}(\text{Cr}_n) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2n} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ . To this end, we will show that  $\text{Aut}^{\pm}(\text{Cr}_n) \cong D_{2n}$ , where  $D_{2n}$  is the group of symmetries of a regular  $2n$ -gon which is known to be isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_{2n} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Denote  $x_i$  by  $u_{2i-1}$  and  $y_i$  by  $u_{2i}$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , identifying  $u_j$  with the  $j$ -th vertex of a regular  $2n$ -gon, whose vertices are indexed consecutively according to the counterclockwise orientation. For the sake of simplicity, we shall consider the indices modulo  $2n$  in the rest of the proof.

Given  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}^{\pm}(\text{Cr}_n)$ , set  $i_{\varphi}$  to be the integer modulo  $2n$  such that  $\varphi(u_{2n}) = u_{i_{\varphi}}$ . Notice that if  $i_{\varphi}$  is even then  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\text{Cr}_n)$ , otherwise  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}^{-}(\text{Cr}_n)$ . In any case, since the only elements of  $\text{Cr}_n$  comparable with  $u_{2n}$ , besides itself, are  $u_{2n-1}$  and  $u_1$ , then  $\varphi(u_1) = u_{i_{\varphi} \pm 1}$ . If  $\varphi(u_1) = u_{i_{\varphi} + 1}$ , then it can be easily shown inductively that  $\varphi(u_j) = u_{i_{\varphi} + j}$  for any  $j = 1, \dots, 2n$ . This corresponds to the counterclockwise rotation by an angle of  $i_{\varphi} \pi / n$  in  $D_{2n}$ . If  $\varphi(u_1) = u_{i_{\varphi} - 1}$ , again by an easy inductive

argument,  $\varphi(u_j) = u_{i_\varphi - j}$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, 2n$ . If  $i_\varphi$  is even,  $\varphi$  corresponds to the reflection across the diagonal containing  $u_j$  and  $u_{j+n}$ , where  $2j = i_\varphi$ . Otherwise  $\varphi$  corresponds to the reflection across the line which contains the midpoints of the sides  $u_j u_{j+1}$  and  $u_{j+n} u_{j+n+1}$ , where  $i_\varphi = 2j + 1$ . Since  $i_\varphi$  can be any of the  $2n$  indices of the vertices considered, all the  $4n$  elements of  $D_{2n}$  ( $2n$  rotations and  $2n$  reflections) can occur as elements of  $\text{Aut}^\pm(\text{Cr}_n)$  and we obtain the claimed isomorphism.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.12.** *We have  $\mathcal{P}(\text{Cr}_2) = \mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_2)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\text{Cr}_n) \neq \mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)$  for all  $n > 2$ .*

*Proof.* Indeed,  $|\mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_2)| = |\mathcal{P}(\text{Cr}_2)|$  and  $|\mathcal{AM}(\text{Cr}_n)| = 2(n!)^2 > 4n! > 4n = |\mathcal{P}(\text{Cr}_2)|$  for  $n > 2$ .  $\square$

**4.4. The case of the ordinal sum of two anti-chains.** We will now proceed to the case of sets of length one which have as many crowns as possible.

**Definition 4.13.** Given positive integers  $m$  and  $n$ , denote by  $\text{K}_{m,n}$  the poset  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ , where  $x_i < y_j$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , and there is no other pair of distinct comparable elements.

Observe that  $\text{K}_{m,n}$  is the ordinal sum [24] of two anti-chains of cardinalities  $m$  and  $n$ . The Hasse diagram of  $\text{K}_{m,n}$  is a *complete bipartite graph* [2], so that  $\text{Aut}(\text{K}_{m,n}) \cong S_m \times S_n$ . It is also clear that  $\text{K}_{m,n}$  is anti-isomorphic to  $\text{K}_{n,m}$ , so we may assume that  $m \leq n$ . The cases  $m = 1$  and  $m = n = 2$  (a 2-crown) were considered in Proposition 4.6 and Corollary 4.12.

**Proposition 4.14.** *Let  $2 \leq m \leq n$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}(\text{K}_{m,n}) = \mathcal{AM}(\text{K}_{m,n})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{AM}(\text{K}_{m,n})$ . Fix  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and write  $\theta(e_{x_i y_j}) = e_{u_i v_i}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Denote by  $U_j$  and  $V_j$  the sets of all  $u_i$  and  $v_k$ , respectively. We first prove that for any pair of  $u_i \in U_j$  and  $v_k \in V_j$  there is  $l$  such that  $\theta(e_{x_l y_j}) = e_{u_i v_k}$ . This is trivial if  $u_i = u_k$  or  $v_i = v_k$ , so let  $u_i \neq u_k$  and  $v_i \neq v_k$ . Consider the cycle  $\Gamma : u_i < v_i > u_k < v_k > u_i$ . We have  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^\pm(y_j) = 0$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^\pm(y_j) = 2$ . Since  $\theta$  is admissible, we must have  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(y_j) = 2$ . But this means that  $\theta(e_{x_l y_j}) = e_{u_i v_k}$  for some  $1 \leq l \leq m$  (and  $\theta(e_{x_p y_j}) = e_{u_k v_i}$  for some  $1 \leq p \leq m$ ), as desired. As a consequence, we obtain  $|U_j| \cdot |V_j| = m$ .

We now prove that  $|U_j| = 1$  or  $|V_j| = 1$ . Assume that  $|U_j| \geq 2$  and  $|V_j| \geq 2$ . Since  $|U_j| \cdot |V_j| = m$ , we conclude that  $|U_j| \leq \frac{m}{2}$  and  $|V_j| \leq \frac{m}{2} \leq \frac{n}{2}$ . It follows that there exist  $z < w$  such that  $z \notin U_j$  and  $w \notin V_j$ . Consider the cycle  $\Gamma : u_1 < v_1 > z < w > u_1$ . Clearly,  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^\pm(y_j) = 0$ ,  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(y_j) = 1$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(y_j) = 0$ , a contradiction.

*Case 1.*  $|V_j| = 1$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Then there exists a bijection  $\lambda$  of  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$  such that  $\{\theta(e_{x_1 y_j}), \dots, \theta(e_{x_m y_j})\} = \{e_{x_1 \lambda(y_j)}, \dots, e_{x_m \lambda(y_j)}\}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . We will prove that  $\theta(e_{x_i y_j}) = e_{u_i \lambda(y_j)}$  and  $\theta(e_{x_i y_k}) = e_{z_i \lambda(y_k)}$  imply  $u_i = z_i$  for  $j \neq k$ . Suppose that  $u_i \neq z_i$  and consider the cycle  $\Gamma : u_i < \lambda(y_j) > z_i < \lambda(y_k) > u_i$ . We have  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^\pm(x_i) = 0$ ,  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^+(x_i) = 2$  and  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^-(x_i) = 0$ , a contradiction. Thus, there exists a bijection  $\mu$  of  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  such that  $\theta(e_{x_i y_j}) = e_{\mu(x_i) \lambda(y_j)}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . But this means that  $\theta$  corresponds to the automorphism of  $\text{K}_{m,n}$  acting as  $\lambda$  on  $\text{Max}(\text{K}_{m,n})$  and as  $\mu$  on  $\text{Min}(\text{K}_{m,n})$ . So,  $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\text{K}_{m,n})$ .

*Case 2.*  $|U_j| = 1$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Then  $|V_j| = m$ . We will prove that this is possible only if  $m = n$ . Assume that  $m < n$  and let  $U_j = \{p_j\}$ . Since  $\theta(e_{x_i y_j}) = e_{p_j v_i}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $|V_j| < n$ , there exist  $z < w$  such that  $z \neq p_j$

and  $w \notin V_j$ . Taking the cycle  $\Gamma : p_j < v_1 > z < w > p_j$ , we obtain  $s_{\theta, \Gamma}^{\pm}(y_j) = 0$ ,  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{+}(y_j) = 1$  and  $t_{\theta, \Gamma}^{-}(y_j) = 0$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $m = n$ . We now prove that  $|U_k| = 1$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . If  $|U_k| \neq 1$ , then  $k \neq j$  and  $|V_k| = 1$ , say  $V_k = \{q_k\}$ . We have  $\{\theta(e_{x_1 y_j}), \dots, \theta(e_{x_n y_j})\} = \{e_{p_j y_1}, \dots, e_{p_j y_n}\}$  and  $\{\theta(e_{x_1 y_k}), \dots, \theta(e_{x_n y_k})\} = \{e_{x_1 q_k}, \dots, e_{x_n q_k}\}$ . Since  $j \neq k$ , these sets must be disjoint. But  $e_{p_j q_k}$  belongs to their intersection, a contradiction. Thus,  $|U_k| = 1$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Replacing  $\theta$  by  $\theta' \circ \theta$ , where  $\theta'(e_{xy}) = e_{\mu(y)\mu(x)}$  and  $\mu$  is the anti-automorphism of  $X$  which interchanges  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we get the situation of Case 1, so that  $\theta' \circ \theta \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Since  $\theta' \in \mathcal{P}(K_{m,n})$ , we conclude that  $\theta \in \mathcal{P}(K_{m,n})$ .  $\square$

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The second author was partially supported by CNPq 404649/2018-1.

## REFERENCES

- [1] BACLAWSKI, K. Automorphisms and derivations of incidence algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 36, 2 (1972), 351–356.
- [2] BOLLOBÁS, B. *Modern graph theory*, vol. 184 of *Grad. Texts Math.* New York, NY: Springer, 1998.
- [3] BRUSAMARELLO, R., FORNAROLI, É. Z., AND SANTULO JR, E. A. Anti-automorphisms and involutions on (finitary) incidence algebras. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 60, 2 (2012), 181–188.
- [4] BRUSAMARELLO, R., FORNAROLI, É. Z., AND SANTULO JR, E. A. Classification of involutions on finitary incidence algebras. *Int. J. Algebra Comput.* 24, 8 (2014), 1085–1098.
- [5] BRUSAMARELLO, R., FORNAROLI, É. Z., AND SANTULO JR, E. A. Multiplicative automorphisms of incidence algebras. *Commun. Algebra* 43, 2 (2015), 726–736.
- [6] BRUSAMARELLO, R., AND LEWIS, D. W. Automorphisms and involutions on incidence algebras. *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 59, 11 (2011), 1247–1267.
- [7] CAO, Y. Automorphisms of certain Lie algebras of upper triangular matrices over a commutative ring. *J. Algebra* 189, 2 (1997), 506–513.
- [8] CECIL, A. J. Lie isomorphisms of triangular and block-triangular matrix algebras over commutative rings. Master’s thesis, University of Victoria, 2016.
- [9] ĐOKOVIĆ, D. Ž. Automorphisms of the Lie algebra of upper triangular matrices over a connected commutative ring. *J. Algebra* 170, 1 (1994), 101–110.
- [10] DOKUCHAEV, M., AND NOVIKOV, B. On colimits over arbitrary posets. *Glasg. Math. J.* 58, 1 (2016), 219–228.
- [11] DRÄXLER, P. Completely separating algebras. *J. Algebra* 165, 3 (1994), 550–565.
- [12] DROZD, Y., AND KOLESNIK, P. Automorphisms of incidence algebras. *Comm. Algebra* 35, 12 (2007), 3851–3854.
- [13] FORNAROLI, É. Z., KHRYPCHENKO, M., AND SANTULO JR, E. A. Lie automorphisms of incidence algebras. *To appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* ([arXiv:2012.06661v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.06661v3)) (2020).
- [14] HUA, L. K. A theorem on matrices over a sfield and its applications. *J. Chinese Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 1 (1951), 110–163.
- [15] KHRYPCHENKO, N. S. Automorphisms of finitary incidence rings. *Algebra and Discrete Math.* 9, 2 (2010), 78–97.
- [16] MARTINDALE 3RD, W. S. Lie isomorphisms of primitive rings. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 14 (1963), 909–916.
- [17] MARTINDALE 3RD, W. S. Lie isomorphisms of prime rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 142 (1969), 437–455.
- [18] MARTINDALE 3RD, W. S. Lie isomorphisms of simple rings. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* 44 (1969), 213–221.
- [19] RIVAL, I. A fixed point theorem for finite partially ordered sets. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* 21 (1976), 309–318.
- [20] ROTA, G.-C. On the foundations of combinatorial theory. I. Theory of Möbius functions. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* 2, 4 (1964), 340–368.
- [21] SPIEGEL, E. On the automorphisms of incidence algebras. *J. Algebra* 239, 2 (2001), 615–623.



- [22] SPIEGEL, E., AND O'DONNELL, C. J. *Incidence Algebras*. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker, 1997.
- [23] STANLEY, R. Structure of incidence algebras and their automorphism groups. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.* 76 (1970), 1236–1239.
- [24] STANLEY, R. P. *Enumerative combinatorics. Vol. 1*, vol. 49 of *Camb. Stud. Adv. Math.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE MARINGÁ, MARINGÁ, PR,  
CEP: 87020–900, BRAZIL

*Email address:* ezancanella@uem.br

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA, CAMPUS  
REITOR JOÃO DAVID FERREIRA LIMA, FLORIANÓPOLIS, SC, CEP: 88040–900, BRAZIL

*Email address:* nskhripchenko@gmail.com

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE MARINGÁ, MARINGÁ, PR,  
CEP: 87020–900, BRAZIL

*Email address:* easjunior@uem.br