

# INJECTIVELY AND ABSOLUTELY $T_1S$ -CLOSED SEMIGROUPS

TARAS BANAKH

ABSTRACT. A semigroup  $X$  is *absolutely* (resp. *injectively*)  $T_1S$ -closed if for any (injective) homomorphism  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  to a  $T_1$  topological semigroup  $Y$ , the image  $h[X]$  is closed in  $Y$ . We prove that a commutative semigroup  $X$  is injectively  $T_1S$ -closed if and only if  $X$  is bounded, nonsingular and Clifford-finite. Using this characterization, we prove that (1) every injectively  $T_1S$ -closed semigroup has injectively  $T_1S$ -closed center, and (2) every absolutely  $T_1S$ -closed semigroup has finite center. As a by-product of the proof we elaborate the technique of topologization of semigroups by remote bases.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

In many cases, completeness properties of various objects of General Topology or Topological Algebra can be characterized externally as closedness in ambient objects. For example, a metric space  $X$  is complete if and only if  $X$  is closed in any metric space containing  $X$  as a subspace. A uniform space  $X$  is complete if and only if  $X$  is closed in any uniform space containing  $X$  as a uniform subspace. A topological group  $G$  is Raïkov complete if and only if it is closed in any topological group containing  $G$  as a subgroup.

On the other hand, for topological semigroups there are no reasonable notions of (inner) completeness. Nonetheless we can define many completeness properties of semigroups via their closedness in ambient topological semigroups.

A *topological semigroup* is a topological space  $X$  endowed with a continuous associative binary operation  $X \times X \rightarrow X$ ,  $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ .

**Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of topological semigroups. A topological semigroup  $X$  is called

- *$\mathcal{C}$ -closed* if for any isomorphic topological embedding  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  to a topological semigroup  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$  the image  $h[X]$  is closed in  $Y$ ;
- *injectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed* if for any injective continuous homomorphism  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  to a topological semigroup  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$  the image  $h[X]$  is closed in  $Y$ ;
- *absolutely  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed* if for any continuous homomorphism  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  to a topological semigroup  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$  the image  $h[X]$  is closed in  $Y$ .

For any topological semigroup we have the implications:

$$\text{absolutely } \mathcal{C}\text{-closed} \Rightarrow \text{injectively } \mathcal{C}\text{-closed} \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}\text{-closed.}$$

**Definition.** A semigroup  $X$  is defined to be (*injectively, absolutely*)  *$\mathcal{C}$ -closed* if so is  $X$  endowed with the discrete topology.

We will be interested in the (absolute, injective)  $\mathcal{C}$ -closedness for the classes:

- $T_1S$  of topological semigroups satisfying the separation axiom  $T_1$ ;
- $T_2S$  of Hausdorff topological semigroups;
- $T_2S$  of Tychonoff zero-dimensional topological semigroups.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22A15, 20M18, 54B30, 54D35, 54H11, 54H12.

*Key words and phrases.* commutative semigroup, semilattice, group,  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed semigroup, injectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed semigroup, absolutely  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed semigroup.

A topological space satisfies the separation axiom  $T_1$  if all its finite subsets are closed. A topological space is *zero-dimensional* if it has a base of the topology consisting of *clopen* (= closed-and-open) sets.

Since  $T_2S \subseteq T_2S \subseteq T_1S$ , for every semigroup we have the implications:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{absolutely } T_1S\text{-closed} & \implies & \text{absolutely } T_2S\text{-closed} & \implies & \text{absolutely } T_zS\text{-closed} \\
 \Downarrow & & \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\
 \text{injectively } T_1S\text{-closed} & \implies & \text{injectively } T_2S\text{-closed} & \implies & \text{injectively } T_zS\text{-closed} \\
 \Downarrow & & \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\
 T_1S\text{-closed} & \implies & T_2S\text{-closed} & \implies & T_zS\text{-closed}.
 \end{array}$$

$\mathcal{C}$ -Closed topological groups for various classes  $\mathcal{C}$  were investigated by many authors [1, 2, 3, 18, 22, 31]. In particular, the closedness of commutative topological groups in the class of Hausdorff topological semigroups was investigated in [28, 38];  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed topological semilattices were investigated in [5, 6, 12, 24, 25, 35, 36]. For more information about complete topological semilattices and pospaces, see the survey [11]. This paper is a continuation of the papers [16], [7], [8], [9], [10], providing inner characterizations of various closedness properties of (discrete topological) semigroups. In order to formulate such inner characterizations, let us recall some properties of semigroups.

A semigroup  $X$  is called

- *unipotent* if  $X$  has a unique idempotent;
- *chain-finite* if any infinite set  $I \subseteq X$  contains elements  $x, y \in I$  such that  $xy \notin \{x, y\}$ ;
- *singular* if there exists an infinite set  $A \subseteq X$  such that  $AA$  is a singleton;
- *periodic* if for every  $x \in X$  there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x^n$  is an idempotent;
- *bounded* if there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $x \in X$  the  $n$ -th power  $x^n$  is an idempotent;
- *group-finite* if every subgroup of  $X$  is finite;
- *group-bounded* if every subgroup of  $X$  is bounded.

We recall that an element  $x$  of a semigroup is an *idempotent* if  $xx = x$ .

The following theorem (proved in [7]) characterizes  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed commutative semigroups.

**Theorem 1.1** (Banakh–Bardyla). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of topological semigroups such that  $T_2S \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq T_1S$ . A commutative semigroup  $X$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed if and only if  $X$  is chain-finite, nonsingular, periodic, and group-bounded.*

For unipotent semigroups, Theorem 1.1 was simplified in [16] as follows.

**Theorem 1.2** (Banakh–Vovk). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of topological semigroups such that  $T_2S \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq T_1S$ . A unipotent commutative semigroup  $X$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed if and only if  $X$  is bounded and nonsingular.*

Theorem 1.1 implies that each subsemigroup of a  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed commutative semigroup is  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed. On the other hand, quotient semigroups of  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed commutative semigroups are not necessarily  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed, see Example 1.8 in [7]. This motivated the authors of [7] to introduce the notions of ideally and projectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed semigroups.

Let us recall that a *congruence* on a semigroup  $X$  is an equivalence relation  $\approx$  on  $X$  such that for any elements  $x \approx y$  of  $X$  and any  $a \in X$  we have  $ax \approx ay$  and  $xa \approx ya$ . For any congruence  $\approx$  on a semigroup  $X$ , the quotient set  $X/\approx$  has a unique semigroup structure such that the quotient map  $X \rightarrow X/\approx$  is a semigroup homomorphism. The semigroup  $X/\approx$  is called the *quotient semigroup* of  $X$  by the congruence  $\approx$ . A subset  $I$  of a semigroup  $X$  is called an *ideal* in  $X$  if  $IX \cup XI \subseteq I$ . Every ideal  $I \subseteq X$  determines the congruence  $(I \times I) \cup \{(x, y) \in X \times X : x = y\}$  on  $X \times X$ . The quotient semigroup of  $X$  by this congruence is denoted by  $X/I$  and called the *quotient semigroup* of  $X$  by the ideal  $I$ . If  $I = \emptyset$ , then the quotient semigroup  $X/\emptyset$  can be identified with the semigroup  $X$ .

**Definition.** A semigroup  $X$  is called

- *projectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed* if for any congruence  $\approx$  on  $X$  the quotient semigroup  $X/\approx$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed;
- *ideally  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed* if for any ideal  $I \subseteq X$  the quotient semigroup  $X/I$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed.

It is easy to see that for every semigroup the following implications hold:

$$\text{absolutely } \mathcal{C}\text{-closed} \Rightarrow \text{projectively } \mathcal{C}\text{-closed} \Rightarrow \text{ideally } \mathcal{C}\text{-closed} \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}\text{-closed}.$$

It is easy to check that a semigroup  $X$  is absolutely  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed if and only if for any congruence  $\approx$  on  $X$  the semigroup  $X/\approx$  is injectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed.

For a semigroup  $X$ , let  $E(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : xx = x\}$  be the set of idempotents of  $X$ . For an idempotent  $e$  of a semigroup  $X$ , let  $H_e$  be the maximal subgroup of  $X$  that contains  $e$ . The union  $H(X) = \bigcup_{e \in E(X)} H_e$  of all subgroups of  $X$  is called the *Clifford part* of  $S$ . A semigroup  $X$  is called

- *Clifford* if  $X = H(X)$ ;
- *Clifford+finite* if  $X \setminus H(X)$  is finite;
- *Clifford-finite* if the Clifford part  $H(X)$  is finite.
- *Clifford-singular* if there exists an infinite set  $A \subseteq X \setminus H(X)$  such that  $AA \subseteq H(X)$ .

Ideally and projectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed commutative semigroups were characterized in [7] as follows.

**Theorem 1.3** (Banakh–Bardyla). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of topological semigroups such that  $T_2S \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq T_1S$ . For a commutative semigroup  $X$  the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $X$  is projectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed;
- (2)  $X$  is ideally  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed;
- (3) the semigroup  $X$  is chain-finite, group-bounded and Clifford+finite.

**Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of topological semigroups. A semigroup  $X$  is called

- *$\mathcal{C}$ -discrete* (or else  *$\mathcal{C}$ -nontopologizable*) if for any injective homomorphism  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  to a topological semigroup  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$  the image  $h[X]$  is a discrete subspace of  $Y$ ;
- *$\mathcal{C}$ -topologizable* if  $X$  is not  $\mathcal{C}$ -discrete;
- *projectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -discrete* if for every homomorphism  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  to a topological semigroup  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$  the image  $h[X]$  is a discrete subspace of  $Y$ .

The study of topologizable and nontopologizable semigroups is a classical topic in Topological Algebra that traces its history back to Markov's problem [32] of topologizability of infinite groups, which was resolved in [34], [26] and [33] by constructing examples of nontopologizable infinite groups. For some other results on topologizability of semigroups, see [13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 29, 30, 37].

For a semigroup  $X$  let

$$Z(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{z \in X : \forall x \in X (xz = zx)\}$$

be the *center* of  $X$ . The first statement of following theorem is proved in Lemmas 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 of [7] and the second and third statements are taken from Theorem 1.7 in [9].

**Theorem 1.4** (Banakh–Bardyla). *Let  $X$  be a semigroup.*

- (1) *If  $X$  is  $T_2S$ -closed, then the semigroup  $Z(X)$  is chain-finite, periodic and nonsingular.*
- (2) *If  $X$  is injectively  $T_2S$ -closed or  $T_2S$ -discrete, then  $Z(X)$  is group-finite.*
- (3) *If  $X$  is ideally  $T_2S$ -closed, then  $Z(X)$  is group-bounded.*

Injectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed commutative unipotent semigroups were characterized in [16] as follows.

**Theorem 1.5** (Banakh–Vovk). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of topological semigroups such that  $T_2S \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq T_1S$ . For a commutative unipotent semigroup  $X$  the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $X$  is injectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed;
- (2)  $X$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed and group-finite;

(3)  $X$  is bounded, nonsingular and group-finite.

The principal results of this paper are the following two theorems describing the center of an injectively (and absolutely)  $T_1S$ -closed semigroup and also characterizing injectively (and absolutely)  $T_1S$ -closed commutative semigroups.

**Theorem 1.6.** *For a semigroup  $X$  consider the following conditions:*

- (1)  $X$  is commutative, bounded, nonsingular and Clifford-finite;
- (2)  $X$  is injectively  $T_1S$ -closed;
- (3)  $X$  is  $T_1S$ -closed and  $T_1S$ -discrete;
- (4)  $X$  is  $T_2S$ -closed and  $T_2S$ -discrete;
- (5)  $X$  is  $T_2S$ -closed and  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite;
- (6)  $Z(X)$  is bounded, nonsingular and Clifford-finite;
- (7)  $Z(X)$  is injectively  $T_1S$ -closed.

Then (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (7).

If  $X$  is commutative, then the conditions (1)–(7) are equivalent.

**Theorem 1.7.** *For a semigroup  $X$ , consider the following conditions:*

- (1)  $X$  is finite;
- (2)  $X$  is absolutely  $T_1S$ -closed;
- (3)  $X$  is projectively  $T_1S$ -closed and projectively  $T_1S$ -discrete;
- (4)  $X$  is projectively  $T_1S$ -closed and injectively  $T_1S$ -closed;
- (5)  $X$  is projectively  $T_1S$ -closed and  $T_1S$ -discrete;
- (6)  $X$  is ideally  $T_2S$ -closed and  $T_2S$ -discrete;
- (7)  $X$  is ideally  $T_2S$ -closed and the semigroup  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite;
- (8)  $Z(X)$  is finite;
- (9)  $Z(X)$  is absolutely  $T_1S$ -closed.

Then (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6)  $\Rightarrow$  (7)  $\Rightarrow$  (8)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (9).

If  $X$  is commutative, then the conditions (1)–(9) are equivalent.

**Remark 1.8.** The equivalences (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) in Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 were proved in Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 of [8]. For viable semigroups the implication (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (8) of Theorem 1.7 was proved in Theorem 1.14 of [10].

Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 imply that the injective (and absolute)  $T_1S$ -closedness is preserved by subsemigroups of commutative semigroups.

**Corollary 1.9.** *Any subsemigroup of an injectively (and absolutely)  $T_1S$ -closed commutative semigroup is injectively (and absolutely)  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed.*

**Remark 1.10.** Corollary 1.9 is specific for commutative semigroups and does not generalize to noncommutative groups: by Theorem 1.10 in [8], every countable bounded group  $G$  without elements of order 2 is a subgroup of an absolutely  $T_1S$ -closed countable simple bounded group  $X$ . If the group  $G$  has infinite center, then  $G$  is not injectively  $T_1S$ -closed by Theorem 1.6. On the other hand,  $G$  is a subgroup of the absolutely  $T_1S$ -closed group  $X$ . This example also shows that the equivalences (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2) in Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 do not hold for non-commutative groups.

Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 will be proved in Sections 6 and 7. The main instrument in the proof of Theorem 1.6 is Theorem 5.5 on  $T_2S$ -topologizability of semigroups  $X$  whose central semilattice  $EZ(X) = E(X) \cap Z(X)$  is chain-finite and infinite. This topologizability theorem is proved using semigroup topologies, generated by remote bases. The corresponding technique is elaborated in Sections 3–5. The obtained topologizability results have an independent value and are essentially used in the paper [4], containing the following characterization of injectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed commutative semigroups.

**Theorem 1.11** (Banakh). *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of topological semigroups such that  $T_2S \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq T_1S$ . A commutative semigroup  $X$  is injectively  $\mathcal{C}$ -closed if and only if  $X$  is chain-finite, group-finite, bounded, nonsingular and not Clifford-singular.*

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We denote by  $\omega$  the set of finite ordinals, by  $\mathbb{N} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \omega \setminus \{0\}$  the set of positive integer numbers. For a set  $X$  we denote by  $[X]^{<\omega}$  the family of all finite subsets of  $X$ .

A *poset* is a set  $X$  endowed with a partial order  $\leq$ . For an element  $a$  of a poset  $X$ , let

$$\downarrow a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : x \leq a\} \quad \text{and} \quad \uparrow a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : a \leq x\}$$

be the *lower* and *upper sets* of  $a$  in  $X$ , respectively.

For a subset  $A$  of a poset  $X$ , let

$$\downarrow A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{a \in A} \downarrow a \quad \text{and} \quad \uparrow A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{a \in A} \uparrow a$$

be the *lower* and *upper sets* of  $A$  in the poset  $X$ .

For two elements  $x, y$  of a poset  $X$  we write  $x < y$  if  $x \leq y$  and  $x \neq y$ .

A subset  $A$  of a poset  $X$  is called a *chain* if for any  $x, y \in A$  either  $x \leq y$  or  $y \leq x$ .

A poset  $X$  is called

- *chain-finite* if each chain in  $X$  is finite;
- *well-founded* if every nonempty set  $A \subseteq X$  contains an element  $a \in A$  such that  $A \cap \downarrow a = \{a\}$ .

It is easy to see that each chain-finite poset is well-founded.

Let  $X$  be a semigroup and  $E(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : xx = x\}$  be the set of idempotents of  $X$ . We shall consider  $E(X)$  as a poset endowed with the *natural partial order*  $\leq$  defined by  $x \leq y$  iff  $xy = yx = x$ . Observe that for a (commutative) semigroup  $X$  the poset  $E(X)$  is chain-finite if (and only if) the semigroup  $X$  is chain-finite.

For any infinite set  $X$  endowed with the left zero multiplication  $xy = x$ , the poset  $E(X) = X$  is chain-finite but the semigroup  $X$  is not chain-finite.

An element  $z$  of a semigroup  $X$  is called *central* if  $z \in Z(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{z \in X : \forall x \in X (zx = xz)\}$ . The intersection

$$EZ(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E(X) \cap Z(X) = E(Z(X))$$

is called the *central semilattice* of  $X$ .

For an element  $a$  of a semigroup  $X$ , the set

$$H_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : (xX^1 = aX^1) \wedge (X^1x = X^1a)\}$$

is called the  *$\mathcal{H}$ -class* of  $a$ . Here  $X^1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \cup \{1\}$  where  $1$  is an element such that  $1x = x = x1$  for all  $x \in X^1$ . By Corollary 2.2.6 [27], for every idempotent  $e \in E(X)$  its  $\mathcal{H}$ -class  $H_e$  coincides with the maximal subgroup of  $X$ , containing the idempotent  $e$ . The union

$$H(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{e \in E(X)} H_e$$

is called the *Clifford part* of  $X$ . The Clifford part is not necessarily a subsemigroup of  $X$ .

On the other hand, the *central Clifford part*

$$H_Z(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{e \in EZ(X)} H_e$$

is a subsemigroup of  $X$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *For every semigroup  $X$  the central Clifford part  $H_Z(X)$  is a subsemigroup of  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Given any  $x, y \in H_Z(X)$ , find central idempotents  $e, f \in EZ(X)$  such that  $x \in H_e$  and  $y \in H_f$ . Since the idempotents  $e, f$  are central, the product  $fe$  is a central idempotent in  $X$ . Observe that

$$xyX^1 = xfX^1 = fxX^1 = feX^1 \quad \text{and} \quad X^1xy = X^1ey = X^1ye = X^1fe,$$

which means that  $xy \in H_{fe} \subseteq H_Z(X)$ .  $\square$

For any element  $x \in H(X)$ , there exists a unique element  $x^{-1} \in H(X)$  such that

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

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $X$  be a semigroup. If for some  $e \in E(X)$  the intersection  $H_e \cap Z(X)$  is not empty, then  $Z(X) \cap H_e$  is a subgroup of  $H_e$  and  $e \in Z(X)$ .*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $Z(X) \cap H_e$  is a subsemigroup of  $H_e$ . It remains to prove that  $z^{-1} \in Z(X) \cap H_e$  for any  $z \in Z(X) \cap H_e$ . Given any  $z \in Z(X) \cap H_e$  and  $x \in X$ , we have  $zx = xz$  and hence  $exz = ezx = zx = xz$  and  $zx = xz = xze = zxe$ . Multiplying the equalities  $zx = zxe$  and  $exz = xz$  by  $z^{-1}$ , we obtain  $ex = z^{-1}zx = z^{-1}zxe = exe = exzz^{-1} = xzz^{-1} = xe$  and hence  $e \in Z(X)$ .

Multiplying the equality  $xz = zx$  by  $z^{-1}$  from the left, we obtain  $z^{-1}xz = z^{-1}zx = ex = xe = xz^{-1}z$ . The equality  $z^{-1}xz = xz^{-1}z$  implies

$$z^{-1}x = z^{-1}ex = z^{-1}xe = z^{-1}xzz^{-1} = xz^{-1}zz^{-1} = xz^{-1},$$

which means that  $z^{-1} \in Z(X)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $X$  be a semigroup and  $x, y \in H(X)$ . If  $xy = yx$ , then  $xy \in H(X)$  and  $(xy)^{-1} = x^{-1}y^{-1} = y^{-1}x^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the idempotents  $e = xx^{-1} = x^{-1}x$  and  $f = yy^{-1} = y^{-1}y$  and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} ey &= x^{-1}xy = x^{-1}yx = x^{-1}yxx^{-1}x = x^{-1}yxe = x^{-1}xye = eye \\ &= eyx^{-1} = exy^{-1} = xyx^{-1} = yx^{-1} = ye. \end{aligned}$$

By analogy we can prove that  $xf = fx$ . Next, observe that

$$ef = eyy^{-1} = yey^{-1} = fyy^{-1} = fey^{-1} = fef = y^{-1}yef = y^{-1}eyf = y^{-1}ey = y^{-1}ye = fe.$$

Then for the idempotent  $u = ef = fe$  we have  $xyX^1 = xfX^1 = fxX^1 = feX^1 = uX^1$  and  $X^1xy = X^1ey = X^1ye = X^1fe = X^1u$ , which means that  $xy \in H_u \subseteq H(X)$ . Observe that

$$x^{-1}f = x^{-1}ef = x^{-1}fe = x^{-1}fxx^{-1} = x^{-1}xfx^{-1} = efx^{-1} = fex^{-1} = fx^{-1}.$$

By analogy we can prove that  $y^{-1}e = ey^{-1}$ . Then  $x^{-1}y^{-1}X^1 = x^{-1}fX^1 = fx^{-1}X^1 = feX^1 = uX^1$  and  $X^1x^{-1}y^{-1} = X^1ey^{-1} = X^1y^{-1}e = X^1fe = X^1u$ , which means that  $x^{-1}y^{-1} \in H_u$ . By analogy we can prove that  $y^{-1}x^{-1} \in H_u$ . It follows from  $xyy^{-1}x^{-1} = xfx^{-1} = fxx^{-1} = fe = u$  that  $y^{-1}x^{-1} = (xy)^{-1}$ . Also  $xyx^{-1}y^{-1} = yxx^{-1}y^{-1} = yey^{-1} = eyy^{-1} = ef = u$  implies that  $x^{-1}y^{-1} = (xy)^{-1} = y^{-1}x^{-1}$ .  $\square$

For a subset  $A$  of a semigroup  $X$  and a positive integer number  $n$ , let

$$\sqrt[n]{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : x^n \in A\} \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt[\infty]{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt[n]{A} = \{x \in X : A \cap x^{\mathbb{N}} \neq \emptyset\},$$

where

$$x^{\mathbb{N}} = \{x^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is the *monogenic semigroup* generated by  $x$ .

For a point  $a \in X$ , the set  $\sqrt[\infty]{\{a\}}$  will be denoted by  $\sqrt[\infty]{a}$ . The sets  $\sqrt[\infty]{E(X)}$  and  $\sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$  are called the *periodic part* and *eventually Clifford part* of  $X$ , respectively.

A semigroup  $X$  is called *eventually Clifford* if  $X = \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$ . It is clear that each periodic semigroup is eventually Clifford (but not vice versa).

The following lemma is proved in [7, 3.1].

**Lemma 2.4.** *For any idempotent  $e$  of a semigroup we have  $(\sqrt[\infty]{H_e} \cdot H_e) \cup (H_e \cdot \sqrt[\infty]{H_e}) \subseteq H_e$ .*

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $x$  be an element of a semigroup  $X$  such that  $x^n \in H_e$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $e \in E(X)$ . Then  $x^m \in H_e$  for all  $m \geq n$ .*

*Proof.* To derive a contradiction, assume that  $x^m \notin H_e$  for some  $m \geq n$ . We can assume that  $m$  is the smallest number such that  $m \geq n$  and  $x^m \notin H_e$ . It follows from  $x^n \in H_e$  and  $x^m \notin H_e$  that  $m > n > 1$  and hence  $m - 2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . The minimality of  $m$  ensures that  $x^{m-1} \in H_e$ . Observe that  $x^m X^1 \subseteq x^{m-1} X^1 = e x^{m-1} X^1 \subseteq e X^1$  and

$$e X^1 = x^{2(m-1)} (x^{2(m-1)})^{-1} X^1 \subseteq x^{2(m-1)} X^1 = x^m x^{m-2} X^1 \subseteq x^m X^1.$$

Therefore,  $x^m X^1 = e X^1$ . By analogy one can prove that  $X^1 x^m = X^1 e$ . Therefore,  $x^m \in H_e$ , which contradicts the choice of  $m$ .  $\square$

For a semigroup  $X$ , let  $\pi : \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)} \rightarrow E(X)$  be the map assigning to each  $x \in X$  a unique idempotent  $\pi(x)$  such that  $x^{\mathbb{N}} \cap H_{\pi(x)} \neq \emptyset$ . Lemma 2.5 ensures that the map  $\pi$  is well-defined.

**Lemma 2.6.** *If  $X$  is a commutative semigroup, then  $\sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$  is a subsemigroup of  $X$  and  $\pi : \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)} \rightarrow E(X)$  is a homomorphism.*

*Proof.* Given any  $x, y \in \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$ , find  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x^n \in H_{\pi(x)}$  and  $y^n \in H_{\pi(y)}$ . By (the proof of) Lemma 2.3,  $(xy)^n = x^n y^n \in H_{\pi(x)\pi(y)} \subseteq H(X)$  and hence  $xy \in \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$ , and  $\pi(xy) = \pi(x)\pi(y)$ , which means that  $\sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$  is a subsemigroup of  $X$  and  $\pi$  is a homomorphism.  $\square$

### 3. SHIFTING SETS IN SEMIGROUPS

In this section we describe the operation of shifting subsets in a semigroup, which allows to transport subsets of a semigroup from one place to another.

Let  $X$  be a semigroup. Given two elements  $e, b \in X$ , consider the set

$$\frac{b}{e} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in X : xe = b\}$$

which can be thought as the set of all left shifts that move  $e$  to  $b$ . If the set  $\frac{b}{e}$  is not empty, then  $\frac{b}{e} \cdot e = \{b\}$  and for any subset  $U \subseteq X$  containing  $e$ , the set  $\frac{b}{e} \cdot U$  contains  $b$ .

The assignment

$$U \mapsto \Lambda^e(b; U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{b\} \cup \left(\frac{b}{e} \cdot U\right)$$

will be referred to as the  *$e$ -to- $b$  shift* of  $U$ .

Let us describe some properties of the  $e$ -to- $b$  shifts.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $e$  be an idempotent of a semigroup  $X$ . For any elements  $a, b \in X$  and subsets  $U, V, W \subseteq X$  the following statements hold:*

- (1) *If  $V \subseteq W$ , then  $\Lambda^e(b; V) \subseteq \Lambda^e(b; W)$ .*
- (2)  *$\Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) \subseteq \frac{be}{e}$ .*
- (3) *If  $b \neq be$ , then  $\Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) = \{b\}$ .*
- (4) *If  $a \in \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) \setminus \{b\}$ , then  $\Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e}) = \{a\}$ .*
- (5) *If  $a \neq b$  and  $\Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e}) \cap \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) \neq \emptyset$ , then either  $\Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e}) = \{a\}$  or  $\Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) = \{b\}$ .*
- (6) *If  $V \subseteq W$ , then  $a \cdot \Lambda^e(b; V) \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$ .*
- (7) *If  $Ub \subseteq bW$  and  $be = eb$ , then  $\Lambda^e(a; U) \cdot b \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$ ;*
- (8) *If  $e \in Z(X)$ ,  $V \subseteq W$ ,  $Ub \subseteq bW$  and  $\forall y \in \frac{b}{e}$  ( $UyV \subseteq yW$ ), then  $\Lambda^e(a; U) \cdot \Lambda^e(b; V) \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$ .*

*Proof.* 1. If  $V \subseteq W$ , then  $\Lambda^e(b; V) = \{b\} \cup (\frac{b}{e} \cdot V) \subseteq \{b\} \cup (\frac{b}{e} \cdot W) = \Lambda^e(b; W)$ .

2. Fix any  $x \in \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e})$ . If  $x = b$ , then  $xe = be$  and hence  $x \in \frac{be}{e}$ . If  $x \neq b$ , then  $x = us$  for some  $u \in \frac{b}{e}$  and  $s \in \frac{e}{e}$ . Then  $xe = use = ue = uee = be$  and again  $x \in \frac{be}{e}$ .

3. If  $b \neq be$ , then  $\frac{b}{e} = \emptyset$  and hence  $\Lambda^e(b; V) = \{b\}$ .

4. If  $a \in \Lambda(b, \frac{e}{e}) \setminus \{b\} \subseteq \frac{b}{e} \cdot \frac{e}{e}$ , then  $a = b'v$  for some  $b' \in \frac{b}{e}$  and  $v \in \frac{e}{e}$ . Then  $ae = b've = b'e = b \neq a$  and  $\Lambda(a; \frac{e}{e}) = \{a\}$  by Lemma 3.1(3).

5. Assume that  $a \neq b$  and  $\Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e}) \cap \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $a \neq ae$  or  $b \neq be$ , then  $\Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e}) = \{a\}$  or  $\Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) = \{b\}$  by Lemma 3.1(3). So, we assume that  $a = ae$  and  $b = be$ . Take any element  $x \in \Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e}) \cap \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e})$  and observe that  $x \in \frac{ae}{e} \cap \frac{be}{e}$ , by Lemma 3.1(2). Then  $a = ae = xe = be = b$ , which contradicts the choice of  $a, b$ .

6–8. Take any elements  $x \in \Lambda^e(a; U)$  and  $y \in \Lambda^e(b; V)$ .

If  $x = a$  and  $y = b$ , then  $xy = ab \in \Lambda^e(ab; W)$ .

If  $V \subseteq W$ ,  $x = a$  and  $y \neq b$ , then  $y = b'v$  for some  $b' \in \frac{b}{e}$  and  $v \in V \subseteq W$ . It follows from  $b' \in \frac{b}{e}$  that  $b'e = b$  and  $ab'e = ab$  and finally  $ab' \in \frac{ab}{e}$ . Now we see that  $xy = ab'v \in \frac{ab}{e} \cdot V \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab, V) \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$  and hence  $a \cdot \Lambda^e(b; V) \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$ .

If  $Ub \subseteq bW$ ,  $x \neq a$  and  $y = b$ , then  $x = a'u$  for some  $a' \in \frac{a}{e}$  and  $u \in U$ . It follows from  $ub \subseteq Ub \subseteq bW$  that  $ub = bw$  for some  $w \in W$ . If  $be = eb$ , then  $a'be = a'eb = ab$  and hence  $a'b \in \frac{ab}{e}$ . Then  $xy = a'ub = a'bw \in \frac{ab}{e} \cdot W \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$  and hence  $\Lambda^e(a; U) \cdot b \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$ .

Finally assume that  $x \neq a$ ,  $y \neq b$ , and  $UcV \subseteq cW$  for every  $c \in \frac{b}{e}$ . In this case  $x = a'u$  and  $y = b'v$  for some  $a' \in \frac{a}{e}$ ,  $b' \in \frac{b}{e}$ ,  $u \in U$  and  $v \in V$ . If  $e \in Z(X)$ , then  $a'b'e = (a'e)(b'e) = ab$ , which implies  $a'b' \in \frac{ab}{e}$  and finally  $xy = a'ub'v \in a'b'W \subseteq \frac{ab}{e} \cdot W \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W)$ .  $\square$

#### 4. TOPOLOGIES GENERATED BY REMOTE BASES ON SEMIGROUPS

In this section we introduce the notion of a remote base on a semigroup  $X$  and prove that it generates a  $T_0$  semigroup topology on  $X$ . Also we provide a condition ensuring that this topology is zero-dimensional. We recall that a topological space  $X$  satisfies the separation axiom  $T_0$  (or else  $X$  is a  $T_0$ -space) if for any distinct points  $x, y \in X$  there exists an open set  $U \subseteq X$  such that  $U \cap \{x, y\}$  is a singleton.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $X$  be a semigroup and  $e$  be a central idempotent in  $X$ . An  $e$ -remote base on  $X$  is a function  $\Phi = (\Phi_x)_{x \in X}$  assigning to each  $x \in X$  a family  $\Phi_x$  of subsets of  $X$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (1)  $\forall x \in X \forall A, B \in \Phi_x \exists C \in \Phi_x (C \subseteq A \cap B \subseteq \frac{e}{e})$ ;
- (2)  $\forall x, y \in X \forall W \in \Phi_{xy} \exists U \in \Phi_x \exists V \in \Phi_y (V \subseteq W \wedge Uy \subseteq yW \wedge \forall b \in \frac{y}{e} (UbV \subseteq bW))$ .

Given an  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi = (\Phi_x)_{x \in X}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  be the topology on  $X$ , consisting of all sets  $W \subseteq X$  such that for every  $x \in W$  there exist a set  $U \in \Phi_x$  such that  $x \in \Lambda^e(x; U) \subseteq W$ . The topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  will be referred to as *the topology generated by the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$* .

Lemma 3.1(1,4) implies the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $e$  be a central idempotent in a semigroup  $X$  and  $\Phi$  be an  $e$ -remote base. For every  $x \in X$  the family*

$$\mathcal{B}_x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\Lambda^e(x; V) : V \in \Phi_x\}$$

*is a neighborhood base of the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  at  $x$ .*

Now we define a condition on an  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  implying the zero-dimensionality of the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$ .



**Definition 4.3.** Let  $X$  be a semigroup and  $e$  be a central idempotent in  $X$ . An  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  is defined to be *regular* if for any element  $b \in X$  with  $b \neq be$ , there exists a set  $V \in \Phi_{be}$  such that  $b \notin \frac{be}{e} \cdot V$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $X$  be a semigroup,  $e$  be a central idempotent in  $X$  and  $\Phi = (\Phi_x)_{x \in X}$  be an  $e$ -remote base. Then

- (1)  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is a topological semigroup;
- (2)  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is a  $T_0$  topological space with discrete subspace of non-isolated points.
- (3) If the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  is regular, then for every point  $b \in X$ , any subset  $B \subseteq \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e})$  containing  $b$  is closed in the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$ .
- (4) If the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  is regular, then every topology  $\tau$  on  $X$  with  $\tau_\Phi \subseteq \tau$  is Hausdorff and zero-dimensional.

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.2, the family

$$\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\Lambda^e(x; V) : x \in X, V \in \Phi_x\}$$

is a base of the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$ .

1. To see that  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is a topological semigroup, take any elements  $a, b \in X$  and a neighborhood  $O_{ab} \in \mathcal{T}_\Phi$  of  $ab$ . Find a set  $W \in \Phi_{ab}$  such that  $\Lambda^e(ab; W) \subseteq O_{ab}$ . By Definition 5.1, there exist sets  $U \in \Phi_a$  and  $V \in \Phi_b$  such that  $V \subseteq W$ ,  $Ub \subseteq bW$  and  $\forall y \in \frac{b}{e} (UyV \subseteq yW)$ . By Lemmas 4.2 and 3.1(8),  $\Lambda^e(a; U)$  and  $\Lambda^e(b; V)$  are  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$ -open sets such that  $a \in \Lambda^e(a; U)$ ,  $b \in \Lambda^e(b; V)$  and

$$\Lambda^e(a; U) \cdot \Lambda^e(b; V) \subseteq \Lambda^e(ab; W) \subseteq O_{ab}.$$

So,  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is a topological semigroup.

2. Lemma 3.1(5) ensures that the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  satisfies the separation axiom  $T_0$ . To see that the subspace  $X'$  of non-isolated points of  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is discrete, take any point  $x' \in X'$  and consider the neighborhood  $\Lambda^e(x'; \frac{e}{e})$  of  $x'$  in  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$ . By Lemma 3.1(4), every point  $x \in \Lambda^e(x'; \frac{e}{e}) \setminus \{x'\}$  is isolated in  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$ , which implies that  $\{x'\} = X' \cap \Lambda^e(x'; \frac{e}{e})$  and hence  $x'$  is an isolated point of the set  $X'$ , so the subspace  $X'$  of  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is discrete.

3. Assume that the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  is regular. Take any  $b \in X$  and any set  $B \subseteq \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e})$  such that  $b \in B$ . Assuming that  $B$  is not closed in the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$ , we can find an element  $a \notin B$  such that for any set  $U \in \Phi_a$  we have

$$\emptyset \neq \Lambda^e(a; U) \cap B \subseteq \Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e}) \cap \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e})$$

and hence  $\{a\} \neq \Lambda^e(a; U) \subseteq \Lambda^e(a; \frac{e}{e})$ . Applying Lemma 3.1(4), we conclude that  $b \in B \subseteq \Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e}) = \{b\}$ . Then  $b \in \Lambda^e(a; U)$  and hence  $b = a'u$  for some  $a' \in \frac{a}{e}$  and  $u \in U \subseteq \frac{e}{e}$ . It follows that  $be = (a'u)e = a'(ue) = a'e = a \neq b$ . Since the remote base  $\Phi$  is regular, there exists a set  $U \in \Phi_{be} = \Phi_a$  such that  $b \notin \frac{be}{e} \cdot U$  and hence  $b \notin \Lambda^e(be; U) = \Lambda^e(a; U)$ , which contradicts  $a \in \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{\Lambda^e(b; \frac{e}{e})} = \{b\}$ .

4. Assume that the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  is regular and take any topology  $\tau$  on  $X$  with  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi \subseteq \tau$ . Since  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is a  $T_0$ -space, the topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is a  $T_0$ -space, too. To see that  $(X, \tau)$  is zero-dimensional, take any open set  $U \in \tau$  and any point  $x \in U$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi \subseteq \tau$ , the set  $O_x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U \cap \Lambda^e(x; \frac{e}{e})$  is a neighborhood of  $x$  in the topology  $\tau$ . By Theorem 4.4(3), the set  $O_x$  is closed in the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  and hence is closed in the topology  $\tau$ . Therefore, the topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is zero-dimensional and being a  $T_0$ -space, is Hausdorff.  $\square$

Now we present two easy-to-apply conditions of regularity of a remote base. We recall that  $EZ(X) = E(Z(X)) = E(X) \cap Z(X)$  is the *central semilattice* of a semigroup  $X$  and  $H_Z(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{e \in EZ(X)} H_e$  is the *central Clifford part* of  $X$ . By  $\pi : \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)} \rightarrow E(X)$  we denote the map assigning to each  $x \in \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$  the unique idempotent  $\pi(x)$  such that  $x^n \in H_{\pi(x)}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $X$  be a semigroup and  $\Phi$  be an  $e$ -remote base at a central idempotent  $e$  of  $X$ . Assume that the semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is well-founded, and for every element  $b \neq be$  in  $X$  and every finite set  $F \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ , there exists a set  $V \in \Phi_{be}$  such that  $V \subseteq H_Z(X) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$ . Then the remote base  $\Phi$  is regular and the topological semigroup  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is zero-dimensional.*

*Proof.* To prove that the remote base  $\Phi$  is regular, take any element  $b \neq be$  in  $X$ . Observe that  $L = \{x \in EZ(X) : bx = b\}$  is a subsemigroup of  $EZ(X)$ . If  $L$  is empty, then put  $F = \emptyset$ . If  $L \neq \emptyset$ , then let  $F = \{s\}$  where  $s$  is the smallest element of the poset  $L$ , which exists by the well-foundedness of the semilattice  $EZ(X)$ .

We claim that  $F \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ . In the opposite case  $F \neq \emptyset$ ,  $L \neq \emptyset$  and  $se = es = s$  and  $b = bs = bse = be$ , which contradicts our assumption. So,  $F \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ . By the assumption of the proposition, there exists a set  $V \in \Phi_{be}$  such that  $V \subseteq H_Z(X) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$ . We claim that  $b \notin \frac{be}{e} \cdot V$ . In the opposite case we can find elements  $b' \in \frac{be}{e}$  and  $v \in V \subseteq H_Z(X)$  such that  $b = b'v$ . Since  $v \in H_Z(X)$ , there exists an idempotent  $c \in EZ(X)$  such that  $v \in H_c$ . Then  $b = b'v = b'vc = bc$  and hence  $c \in L \neq \emptyset$  and  $\pi(v) = c \in \uparrow s = \uparrow F$ . But  $\pi(v) \in \uparrow F$  contradicts the choice of  $v \in V \subseteq H_Z(X) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$ . This contradiction shows that  $b \notin \frac{be}{e} \cdot V$ , which completes the proof of the regularity of the remote base  $\Phi$ . By Theorem 4.4, the topological semigroup  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is zero-dimensional.  $\square$

A less trivial criterion of regularity of a remote base is supplied by the following proposition. We recall that a semigroup  $X$  is *eventually Clifford* if  $X = \sqrt[\infty]{H(X)}$ .

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $X$  be a nonsingular eventually Clifford semigroup such that the poset  $E(X)$  is well-founded. Let  $\Phi$  be an  $e$ -remote base for  $X$  at a central idempotent  $e \in E(X)$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , finite set  $F \subseteq E(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ , and every  $b \in X$  with  $b \neq be$ , there exists a set  $V \in \Phi_{be}$  such that  $V \subseteq \{z^m : z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F], m \geq n\}$ . Then the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  is regular and the topological semigroup  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is Hausdorff and zero-dimensional.*

*Proof.* To prove that the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi$  is regular, take any element  $b \in X$  such that  $b \neq be$ . We need to find a set  $V \in \Phi_{be}$  such that  $b \notin \frac{be}{e} \cdot V$ . By Lemma 4.7 below, there exist  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite set  $F \subseteq E(X) \setminus \downarrow e$  such that  $b \notin \{az^m : a \in X, z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi[\uparrow F], m \geq n\}$ . By our assumption, there exists a set  $V \in \Phi_{be}$  such that  $V \subseteq \{z^m : z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi[\uparrow F], m \geq n\}$ .

We claim that  $b \notin \frac{be}{e} \cdot V$ . Indeed, assuming that  $b \in \frac{be}{e} \cdot V$ , we can find elements  $a \in \frac{be}{e}$  and  $v \in V$  such that  $b = av$ . By the choice of  $V$ , there exists  $z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi[\uparrow F]$  such that  $v = z^m$  for some  $m \geq n$ . Then  $b = az^m$ , which contradicts the choice of  $n$  and  $u$ . To complete the proof of Proposition 4.6, it remains to prove the following lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $X$  be a nonsingular eventually Clifford semigroup such that the poset  $E(X)$  is well-founded. For any  $e \in EZ(X)$  and  $b \in X$  with  $b \neq be$ , there exist  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $F \in [E(X) \setminus \downarrow e]^{<\omega}$  such that  $ue \neq u$  and  $b \notin \{az^m : a \in X, z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F], m \geq n\}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $e \in EZ(X)$  and  $b \in X$  with  $b \neq be$ . If  $\pi(b)e \neq \pi(b)$ , then the number  $n = 1$  and the set  $F = \{\pi(b)\}$  have the required properties. Indeed, assume that  $b = az^m$  for some  $a \in X$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$ . Since  $X$  is eventually Clifford, there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $b^k \in H_{\pi(b)}$ ,  $a^k \in H_{\pi(a)}$  and  $z^{mk} \in H_{\pi(z)}$ . Let  $(b^k)^{-1}$ ,  $(a^k)^{-1}$  and  $(z^{mk})^{-1}$  be the inverse elements to  $b^k$ ,  $a^k$ ,  $z^{mk}$  in the groups  $H_{\pi(b)}$ ,  $H_{\pi(a)}$  and  $H_{\pi(z)}$ , respectively. By Lemma 2.3, the equality  $b^k = (az^m)^k = a^k z^{mk}$  implies  $(b^k)^{-1} = (a^k)^{-1} (z^{mk})^{-1}$ . Multiplying the last equality by  $b^k = a^k z^{mk}$ , we obtain

$$\pi(b) = b^k (b^k)^{-1} = a^k z^{mk} (a^k)^{-1} (z^{mk})^{-1} = a^k (a^k)^{-1} z^{mk} (z^{mk})^{-1} = \pi(a) \pi(z) = \pi(z) \pi(a),$$

which contradicts the choice of  $z \notin \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$ .

So, we assume that  $\pi(b)e = \pi(b)$ . Since  $X$  is eventually Clifford, there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $b^n \in H_{\pi(b)}$ . Then  $b^n = b^n \pi(b) = b^n (\pi(b)e) = (b^n \pi(b))e = b^n e$ . Let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  be the unique number  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $b^q \neq b^q e$  and  $b^{q+1} = b^{q+1} e$ .

Let  $X^1 = X \cup \{1\}$  where  $1 \notin X$  be an element such that  $1x = x = x1$  for all  $x \in X^1$ . In the set  $E(X^1)$  consider the subset

$$L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{u \in E(X^1) : \exists \zeta \in Z(X^1) \quad (b^q \zeta u = b^q \zeta \neq b^q \zeta e)\}.$$

The set  $L$  contains  $1$  and hence is not empty. Since the poset  $E(X)$  is well-founded, there exists  $u \in L$  such that  $L \cap \downarrow u = \{u\}$ . Let  $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \cap \{u\}$ .

It remains to prove that there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$b \notin \{az^m : a \in X, z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F], m \geq n\}.$$

To derive a contradiction, assume that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist  $a \in X$  and  $z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  such that  $b = az^m$  for some  $m \geq n$ .

By the definition of the set  $L \ni u$ , there exists  $\zeta \in Z(X^1)$  such that  $b^q \zeta u = b^q \zeta \neq b^q \zeta e$  and hence  $eu \neq u$ . Let

$$c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b^q \zeta$$

and observe that

$$cu = c \neq ce.$$

**Claim 4.8.**  $c^2 e = c^2$ .

*Proof.* If  $q = 1$ , then  $b^{2q} e = b^{q+1} e = b^{q+1} = b^{2q}$  by the choice of  $q$ . If  $q > 1$ , then  $b^{2q} e = b^{q-1} b^{q+1} e = b^{q-1} b^{q+1} = b^{2q}$ . In both cases we have  $b^{2q} e = b^{2q}$  which implies

$$c^2 e = (b^q \zeta)^2 e = b^{2q} \zeta^2 e = b^{2q} e \zeta^2 = b^{2q} \zeta^2 = (b^q \zeta)^2 = c^2.$$

□

**Claim 4.9.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $a \in X$  and  $z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  such that  $c = az^m$  for some  $m > n$ .

*Proof.* By our assumption, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $\alpha \in X$  and  $z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  such that  $b = \alpha z^k$  for some  $k > n$ . Then

$$c = b^q \zeta = (\alpha z^k)^q \zeta = (\alpha^q \zeta) z^{kq} = az^m$$

where  $a = \alpha^q \zeta$  and  $m = kq \geq k > n$ . □

**Claim 4.10.** Let  $a \in X$ ,  $z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $c = az^n$ . Then there exists  $m \geq n$  such that  $az^m e \neq az^m$  and  $az^{m+1} e = az^{m+1}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is eventually Clifford, there exists a number  $l > n$  such that  $z^l \in H_{\pi(z)}$  and hence  $z^l = z^l \pi(z)$ . By Lemma 2.2,  $\pi(z) = \pi(z^l) \in EZ(X)$  and hence  $\pi(z)u \in E(X)$ . We claim that  $az^l e = az^l$ . Indeed, assuming that  $az^l e \neq az^l$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} b^q \zeta z^{l-n} \pi(z) u &= cz^{l-n} \pi(z) u = cu z^{l-n} \pi(z) = cz^{l-n} \pi(z) = \\ &az^n z^{l-n} \pi(z) = az^l \pi(z) = az^l = az^n z^{l-n} = cz^{l-n} = b^q \zeta z^{l-n} = \\ &cz^{l-n} = az^n z^{l-n} = az^l \neq az^l e = az^n z^{l-n} e = cz^{l-n} e = b^q \zeta z^{l-n} e \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $\pi(z)u = u\pi(z) \in L$  and  $\pi(z)u = u$  by the minimality of  $u$ . Then  $z \in \pi^{-1}[\uparrow u] = \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$ , which contradicts the choice of  $z$ . This contradiction shows that  $az^l e = az^l$ .

On the other hand  $az^n e = ce \neq c = az^n$ . Then there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n \leq m < l$  and  $az^m e \neq az^m$  but  $az^{m+1} e = az^{m+1}$ . □

Using Claims 4.9 and 4.10, we shall inductively construct sequences  $\{a_k\}_{k \in \omega} \subseteq X$ ,  $\{z_k\}_{k \in \omega} \subseteq Z(X) \cap \frac{\varepsilon}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  and  $(n_k)_{k \in \omega}, (l_k)_{k \in \omega}, (m_k)_{k \in \omega} \in \mathbb{N}^\omega$  such that for every  $k \in \omega$  the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i)  $a_k z_k^{n_k} = c$ ;
- (ii)  $a_k z_k^{l_k} e \neq a_k z_k^{l_k}$  and  $a_k z_k^{l_k+1} e = a_k z_k^{l_k+1}$ ;
- (iii)  $a_k z_k^{m_k} \notin \{a_i z_i^{m_i} : i < k\}$ ;
- (iv)  $2k + 1 < n_k \leq l_k$  and  $l_k - k \leq m_k \leq l_k$ ;
- (v)  $a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{m_k} = c^2$  for any  $i \leq k$ .

To start the inductive construction, apply Claim 4.9 and find  $a_0 \in X$ ,  $z_0 \in Z(X) \cap \frac{\varepsilon}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  and  $n_0 > 1$  such that  $c = a_0 z_0^{n_0}$ . By Claim 4.10, there exists a number  $l_0 \geq n_0$  such that  $a_0 z_0^{l_0} e \neq a_0 z_0^{l_0}$  and  $a_0 z_0^{l_0+1} e = a_0 z_0^{l_0+1}$ . Put  $m_0 = l_0$ . It is clear that  $a_0, z_0, n_0, l_0, m_0$  satisfy the inductive conditions (i)–(iv). Let us show that (v) is satisfied, too. If  $m_0 = n_0$ , then

$$(a_0 z_0^{m_0})^2 = (a_0 z_0^{n_0})^2 = c^2.$$

If  $n_0 < m_0$ , then

$$(a_0 z_0^{m_0})^2 = (a_0 z_0^{n_0})^2 z_0^{2(m_0-n_0)} = c^2 z_0^{2(m_0-n_0)} = c^2 e z_0^{2(m_0-n_0)} = c^2 e = c^2,$$

because  $z_0 \in \frac{\varepsilon}{e}$ .

Assume that for some  $k \in \omega$  sequences  $(a_i)_{i < k}, (z_i)_{i < k}, (n_i)_{i < k}, (l_i)_{i < k}$  and  $(m_i)_{i < k}$  satisfying the inductive conditions (i)–(v) have been constructed.

**Claim 4.11.** *For every  $i < k$  the set  $A_i = \{a_i z_i^{m_i} z : z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{\varepsilon}{e}\}$  is finite.*

*Proof.* The inductive condition (iv) implies that  $m_i \geq l_i - i > i + 1$  and hence  $l_i \geq 2i + 2$  and  $2m_i \geq (2l_i - 2i) \geq l_i + 2$ . The inductive conditions (ii), (iv) and  $z_i \in Z(X) \cap \frac{\varepsilon}{e}$  ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} (a_i z_i^{m_i})^2 &= (a_i z_i^{l_i+1}) a_i z_i^{2m_i-l_i-1} = (a_i z_i^{l_i+1} e) a_i z_i^{2m_i-l_i-1} = (a_i z_i^{m_i})^2 e = (a_i z_i^{m_i})^2 z_i^{2l_i} e = \\ &= (a_i z_i^{n_i})^2 z_i^{2l_i+2m_i-2n_i} e = c^2 z_i^{2l_i+2m_i-2n_i} e = c^2 e. \end{aligned}$$

Then for every  $z, z' \in Z(X) \cap \frac{\varepsilon}{e}$  we have

$$(a_i z_i^{m_i} z)(a_i z_i^{m_i} z') = (a_i z_i^{m_i})^2 z z' = c^2 e z z' = c^2 z z' e = c^2 e = c^2,$$

which means that  $A_i A_i \subseteq \{c^2\}$  and hence  $A_i$  is finite by the nonsingularity of the semigroup  $X$ .  $\square$

By Claim 4.9, there exist  $a_k \in X$ ,  $z_k \in Z(X) \cap \frac{\varepsilon}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  and  $n_k > 2k + 1 + \max_{i < k} |A_i|$  such that  $a_k z_k^{n_k} = c$ . By Claim 4.10, there exists a number  $l_k \geq n_k$  such that  $a_k z_k^{l_k} e \neq a_k z_k^{l_k}$  but  $a_k z_k^{l_k+1} e = a_k z_k^{l_k+1}$ .

**Claim 4.12.** *For every positive numbers  $i < j \leq l_k$  we have  $a_k z_k^i \neq a_k z_k^j$ .*

*Proof.* To derive a contradiction, assume that  $a_k z_k^i = a_k z_k^j$  and hence

$$a_k z_k^{i+2(j-i)} = a_k z_k^j z_k^{j-i} = a_k z_k^i z_k^{j-i} = a_k z_k^j = z_k z_k^i.$$

Proceeding by induction, we obtain that  $a_k z_k^{i+s(j-i)} = a_k z_k^i$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Find  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $i + s(j-i) > l_k + 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_k z_k^{l_k} &= a_k z_k^i z_k^{l_k-i} = a_k z_k^{i+s(j-i)} z_k^{l_k-i} = a_k z_k^{l_k+1} z_k^{i+s(j-i)-l_k-1+l_k-i} = \\ &= a_k z_k^{l_k+1} e z_k^{s(j-i)-1} = a_k z_k^{l_k} e z_k^{s(j-i)} = a_k z_k^{l_k} e, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the choice of  $l_k$ .  $\square$

For every  $i < k$ , let

$$\lambda_i = \max(\{0\} \cup \{\lambda \in \{1, \dots, l_k\} : a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^\lambda e \neq a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^\lambda\}).$$

**Claim 4.13.**  $a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1} e = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1}$ .

*Proof.* If  $a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1} e \neq a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1}$ , then the definition of the number  $\lambda_i$  ensures that  $\lambda_i = l_k$ . Then

$$a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1} = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{l_k+1} = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{l_k+1} e = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1} e,$$

which contradicts our assumption.  $\square$

**Claim 4.14.**  $\lambda_i \leq |A_i|$ .

*Proof.* Assuming that  $\lambda_i > |A_i|$ , we conclude that  $\lambda_i > 0$  and hence  $a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i} e \neq a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i}$ . Then also  $a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{\lambda_i} e \neq a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{\lambda_i}$  and  $a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^j e \neq a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^j$  for every  $j \leq \lambda_i$ . The definition of the set  $A_i$  ensures that  $\{a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^j : j \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq A_i$ . Since  $\lambda_i > |A_i|$ , there exist positive numbers  $j < j' \leq \lambda_i$  such that  $a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^j = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{j'} = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{j+(j'-j)}$ . Then

$$a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{j+2(j'-j)} = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{j'} z_k^{j'-j} = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^j z_k^{j'-j} = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{j'} = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^j.$$

Proceeding by induction, we can prove that

$$a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^{j+s(j'-j)} = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_k^j$$

for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Choose  $s \geq 2$  such that  $j + s(j' - j) > \lambda_i + 1$ . By Claim 4.13,

$$\begin{aligned} a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i} &= a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^j z_k^{\lambda_i-j} = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{j+s(j'-j)} z_k^{\lambda_i-j} = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1} z_k^{s(j'-j)-1} = \\ &= a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i+1} e z_k^{s(j'-j)-1} = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{j+s(j'-j)} z_k^{\lambda_i-j} e = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^j z_k^{\lambda_i-j} e = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{\lambda_i} e, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the definition of  $\lambda_i$ .  $\square$

Using Claim 4.12, choose a number  $m_k$  such that  $a_k z_k^{m_k} \notin \{a_i z_i^{m_i} : i < k\}$  and  $l_k - k \leq m_k \leq l_k$ . Observe that for every  $i < k$  we have  $m_k \geq l_k - k \geq n_k - k > |A_i| \geq \lambda_i$  and hence  $a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{m_k} e = a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{m_k}$ , see Claim 4.13. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{m_k} &= a_i z_i^{m_i} a_k z_k^{m_k} e = a_i z_i^{m_i} e a_k z_k^{m_k} e = a_i z_i^{m_i} z_i^{l_i} e a_k z_k^{m_k} z_k^{l_k} e = \\ &= a_i z_i^{n_i} z_i^{l_i+m_i-n_i} e a_k z_k^{n_k} z_k^{l_k+m_k-n_k} e = c e c e = c^2 e = c^2. \end{aligned}$$

Also  $2m_k \geq 2l_k - 2k \geq l_k + n_k - 2k \geq l_k + 2$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (a_k z_k^{m_k})^2 &= a_k^2 z_k^{2m_k} = a_k^2 z_k^{l_k+1} z_k^{2m_k-l_k-1} = a_k^2 z_k^{l_k+1} e z_k^{2m_k-l_k-1} = (a_k z_k^{m_k})^2 e = (a_k z_k^{m_k})^2 z_k^{2l_k} e = \\ &= (a_k z_k^{n_k})^2 z_k^{2(l_k+m_k-n_k)} e = c^2 e = c^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $a_k, z_k, n_k, l_k, m_k$  satisfy the inductive conditions (i)–(v).

After completing the inductive construction, consider the set  $A = \{a_k z_k^{m_k}\}_{k \in \omega}$ . The inductive conditions (iii) and (v) ensure that the set  $A$  is infinite and  $AA = \{c^2\}$  is a singleton. But this contradicts the nonsingularity of  $X$ .  $\square$

5. SEMIGROUP TOPOLOGIES GENERATED BY  $e$ -BASES ON SEMIGROUPS

In this section we introduce the notion of an  $e$ -base, which is a suitable simplification of the (more general) notion of an  $e$ -remote base.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $X$  be a semigroup and  $e$  be a central idempotent in  $X$ . An  $e$ -base on  $X$  is a nonempty family  $\Phi$  of subsemigroups of  $X$  such that for every  $U, W \in \Phi$  there exists  $V \in \Phi$  such that  $V \subseteq U \cap W \subseteq Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e}$ .

Given an  $e$ -base  $\Phi$  on  $X$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  be the topology on  $X$ , consisting of all sets  $W \subseteq X$  such that for every  $x \in W$  there exist a set  $U \in \Phi$  such that  $x \in \Lambda^e(x; U) \subseteq W$ . The topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  will be referred to as *the topology generated by the  $e$ -base  $\Phi$* .

The  $e$ -base  $\Phi$  is *regular* if for every  $b \in X$  with  $b \neq be$  there exists a set  $V \in \Phi$  such that  $b \notin \frac{be}{e} \cdot V$ .

Observe that for an  $e$ -base  $\Phi$  on a semigroup  $X$ , the constant function  $\Phi_*$  assigning to each  $x \in X$  the family  $\Phi$  is an  $e$ -remote base on  $X$  and the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$  is equal to the topology  $\mathcal{T}_{\Phi_*}$ . The  $e$ -base  $\Phi$  is regular if and only if the  $e$ -remote base  $\Phi_*$  is regular.

The following theorem can be easily derived from Lemma 4.2, Theorem 4.4, and Propositions 4.5, 4.6.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $X$  be a semigroup,  $e$  be a central idempotent in  $X$  and  $\Phi$  be an  $e$ -base on  $X$ . Then*

- (1)  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is a  $T_0$  topological semigroup;
- (2) for every  $x \in X$  the family  $\{\Lambda^e(x; U) : U \in \Phi\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\Phi$  is a neighborhood base at  $x$ .
- (3) If the  $e$ -base  $\Phi$  is regular, then the topological semigroup  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$  is zero-dimensional and for every  $x \in X$  and  $U \in \Phi$  the set  $\Lambda^e(x; U)$  is clopen in  $(X, \mathcal{T}_\Phi)$ .
- (4) The  $e$ -base  $\Phi$  is regular if one of the following conditions is satisfied:
  - (a) the poset  $EZ(X)$  is well-founded and for every finite set  $F \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ , there exists a set  $V \in \Phi$  such that  $V \subseteq H(X) \cap Z(X) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$ ;
  - (b) the semigroup  $X$  is nonsingular and eventually Clifford, the poset  $E(X)$  is well-founded, and for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $F \in [E(X) \setminus \downarrow e]^{<\omega}$ , there exists a set  $V \in \Phi$  such that  $V \subseteq \{z^m : z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F], m \geq n\}$ .

Given a central idempotent  $e$  in a semigroup  $X$ , consider the following families:

$$\mathcal{E}[e] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \frac{e}{e} \cap E(X) \cap Z(X) \setminus \uparrow F : F \in [EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e]^{<\omega} \right\};$$

$$\mathcal{H}[e] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \frac{e}{e} \cap H(X) \cap Z(X) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F] : F \in [EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e]^{<\omega} \right\};$$

$$\mathcal{Z}[e] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \{z^n : z \in \frac{e}{e} \cap Z(X) \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F]\} : n \in \mathbb{N}, F \in [E(X) \setminus \downarrow e]^{<\omega} \right\}.$$

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $X$  be a semigroup and  $e$  be a central idempotent in  $X$ .*

- (1) The families  $\mathcal{E}[e]$ ,  $\mathcal{H}[e]$  and  $\mathcal{Z}[e]$  are  $e$ -bases for  $X$  and hence  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]})$ ,  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}[e]})$ , and  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Z}[e]})$  are  $T_0$  topological semigroups.
- (2) If the semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is well-founded, then the families  $\mathcal{E}[e]$  and  $\mathcal{H}[e]$  are regular  $e$ -bases for  $X$  and hence  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]})$  and  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}[e]})$  are zero-dimensional topological semigroups.
- (3) If the poset  $E(X)$  is well-founded and the semigroup  $X$  is nonsingular and eventually Clifford, then the family  $\mathcal{Z}[e]$  is a regular  $e$ -base for  $X$  and  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Z}[e]})$  is a zero-dimensional topological semigroup.

*Proof.* 1E. To see that the family  $\mathcal{E}[e]$  is an  $e$ -base, take any sets  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{E}[e]$  and find finite sets  $F_1, F_2 \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$  such that  $A_i = \frac{e}{e} \cap EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F_i$  for every  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Observe that for the finite set  $F = F_1 \cup F_2 \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ , the set  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{e}{e} \cap EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F$  belongs to  $\mathcal{E}[e]$  and is a subset of  $A_1 \cap A_2$ . Since  $EZ(X)$  is a semilattice, the set  $A$  is a subsemigroup of  $EZ(X)$ . Then  $AA \subseteq A \subseteq A_1 \cap A_2 \subseteq Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e}$ , witnessing that the family  $\mathcal{E}[e]$  is an  $e$ -base.

1H. To see that the family  $\mathcal{H}[e]$  is an  $e$ -base, take any sets  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{H}[e]$  and find finite sets  $F_1, F_2 \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$  such that  $A_i = \frac{e}{e} \cap H(X) \cap Z(X) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F_i]$  for every  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Observe that for the finite set  $F = F_1 \cup F_2 \subseteq EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ , the set  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{e}{e} \cap H(X) \cap Z(X) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  belongs to  $\mathcal{H}[e]$  and is a subset of  $A_1 \cap A_2$ . We claim that  $A$  is a subsemigroup of  $X$ . By Lemma 2.2,  $H(X) \cap Z(X) = H(Z(X))$ , by Lemma 2.3,  $H(Z(X))$  is a subsemigroup of  $Z(X)$ , and by Lemma 2.6, the restriction  $\pi|_{H(Z(X))} : H(Z(X)) \rightarrow EZ(X)$  is a homomorphism. Since the set  $EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F$  is a subsemigroup of  $EZ(X)$  and  $\pi|_{H(Z(X))}$  is a homomorphism, the set  $H(Z(X)) \cap \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  is a subsemigroup of  $H(Z(X))$ . It is easy to see that  $\frac{e}{e}$  is a subsemigroup of  $X$ . Then  $A = \frac{e}{e} \cap H(Z(X)) \setminus \pi^{-1}[\uparrow F]$  is a subsemigroup of  $H(Z(X)) \subseteq Z(X)$  and hence  $AA \subseteq A \subseteq A_1 \cap A_2 \subseteq Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e}$ , witnessing that the family  $\mathcal{H}[e]$  is an  $e$ -base.

1Z. To see that the family  $\mathcal{Z}[e]$  is an  $e$ -base, take any sets  $A_0, A_1 \in \mathcal{Z}[e]$  and find numbers  $n_0, n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  and finite sets  $F_0, F_1 \subseteq E(X) \setminus \downarrow e$  such that  $A_i = \{z^{n_i} : z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F_i]\}$  for every  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Observe that for the number  $n = n_0 n_1$  and the finite set  $F = F_0 \cup F_1 \subseteq E(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ , the set  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{z^n : z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F]\}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{Z}[e]$ . We claim that  $A \subseteq A_0 \cap A_1$ . Take any  $a \in A$  and find  $z \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F]$  such that  $a = z^n$ . It follows from  $z \in \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F] \subseteq \sqrt[n]{H(X)}$  that for every  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  we have  $z^{n_i} \in \sqrt[n_i]{H(X)}$  and  $\pi(z^{n_i}) = \pi(z) \in EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F$ . Since the set  $Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e}$  is a subsemigroup of  $X$ , we obtain  $z^{n_i} \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F] \subseteq Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F_i]$ . Taking into account that  $a = z^n = z^{n_0 n_1} = (z^{n_1})^{n_0}$ , we conclude that  $a \in A_{1-i}$  for every  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ .

It remains to show that  $A$  is a subsemigroup of  $Z(X)$ . Given any elements  $a, b \in A$ , find elements  $x, y \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F]$  such that  $a = x^n$  and  $b = y^n$ . Then  $ab = x^n y^n = (xy)^n$  as  $x, y \in Z(X)$ . It remains to prove that  $xy \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F]$ . It follows from  $x, y \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e}$  that  $xy \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e}$ . By Lemma 2.2, we have  $H(X) \cap Z(X) = H(Z(X))$  and hence  $x, y \in Z(X) \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \downarrow F] \subseteq Z(X) \cap \sqrt[n]{H(X)} = Z(X) \cap \sqrt[n]{H(Z(X))}$ . By Lemma 2.6, the set  $Z(X) \cap \sqrt[n]{H(Z(X))}$  is a subsemigroup of  $Z(X)$  and the restriction  $\pi|_{\sqrt[n]{H(Z(X))}}$  is a homomorphism. Then  $xy \in Z(X) \cap \sqrt[n]{H(Z(X))}$  and  $\pi(xy) = \pi(x)\pi(y) \in EZ(X)$ . Assuming that  $\pi(xy) \in \uparrow F$ , we can find an idempotent  $f \in F$  such that  $\pi(xy)f = f\pi(xy) = f$  and then

$$f = \pi(xy)f = \pi(x)\pi(y)f = \pi(x)\pi(x)\pi(y)f = \pi(x)f = f\pi(x)$$

as  $\pi(x) \in EZ(X)$ . Then  $\pi(x) \in EZ(X) \cap \uparrow f$ , which contradicts the choice of  $x \in \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F] \subseteq \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow f]$ . This contradiction shows that  $\pi(xy) \notin \uparrow F$  and hence  $xy \in Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \cap \pi^{-1}[EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F]$  and  $ab = (xy)^n \in A$ .

Then  $AA \subseteq A \subseteq A_1 \cap A_2 \subseteq Z(X) \cap \frac{e}{e}$ , witnessing that  $\mathcal{Z}[e]$  is an  $e$ -base.

By Theorem 5.2,  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]})$ ,  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}[e]})$  and  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Z}[e]})$  are  $T_0$  topological semigroups.

2. If the poset  $EZ(X)$  is well-founded, then by Theorem 5.2(4a), the  $e$ -bases  $\mathcal{E}[e]$  and  $\mathcal{H}[e]$  are regular and by Theorem 5.2(3), the  $T_0$  semigroup topologies  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}[e]}$  are zero-dimensional.

3. If the poset  $E(X)$  is well-founded and the semigroup  $X$  is nonsingular and eventually Clifford, then by Theorem 5.2(4b), the  $e$ -base  $\mathcal{Z}[e]$  is regular and by Theorem 5.2(3), the  $T_0$  semigroup topology  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Z}[e]}$  is zero-dimensional.  $\square$

Now we find a condition ensuring that the topologies  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}[e]}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Z}[e]}$  are not discrete.

**Proposition 5.4.** *If the central semilattice  $EZ(X)$  of a semigroup  $X$  is chain-finite and infinite, then some idempotent  $e \in EZ(X)$  is a non-isolated point in the topologies  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}[e]}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Z}[e]}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that the semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is chain-finite and infinite. Observe that the set

$$I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e \in EZ(X) : EZ(X) \cap \uparrow e \text{ is infinite}\}$$

contains the smallest element of the chain-finite semilattice  $EZ(X)$  and hence  $I$  is not empty. Since  $EZ(X)$  is chain-finite, there exists an idempotent  $e \in I$  such that  $I \cap \uparrow e = \{e\}$ . We claim that  $e$  is non-isolated in the topologies  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{H}[e]}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{Z}[e]}$ . Indeed, given any neighborhood  $O_e$  of  $e$  in one of these topologies, we can find a finite set  $F \subseteq E(X) \setminus \downarrow e$  such that  $\frac{e}{e} \cap EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F \subseteq O_e$ . It remains to prove that the set  $\frac{e}{e} \cap EZ(X) \setminus \uparrow F \subseteq O_e$  is infinite. First we show that for every  $f \in F$ , the set  $S_f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} EZ(X) \cap \uparrow e \cap \uparrow f$  is finite. This is clear if  $S_f$  is empty. So, assume that  $S_f \neq \emptyset$ . Being a subsemilattice of the chain-finite semilattice  $EZ(X)$ , the semilattice  $S_f$  has the smallest element  $s \in S_f \subseteq \uparrow e \cap \uparrow f$ . Assuming that  $s = e$ , we conclude that  $f \in \downarrow s = \downarrow e$ , which contradicts the choice of  $f \in F \subseteq E(X) \setminus \downarrow e$ . Therefore,  $s \in \uparrow e \setminus \{e\}$ . The maximality of  $e$  ensures that the set  $EZ(X) \cap \uparrow s \supseteq S_f$  is finite. Then the set  $EZ(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \uparrow F = EZ(X) \cap \uparrow e \setminus \uparrow F = EZ(X) \cap \uparrow e \setminus \bigcup_{f \in F} S_f$  is infinite and so is the set  $O_e \supseteq EZ(X) \cap \frac{e}{e} \setminus \uparrow F$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** *A semigroup  $X$  is  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -topologizable if its central semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is chain-finite and infinite.*

*Proof.* Assume that the semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is chain-finite and infinite. Since the semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is chain-finite, the poset  $EZ(X)$  is well-founded. By Proposition 5.4, some idempotent  $e$  is non-isolated in the topology  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]}$ . By Theorem 5.3(2),  $(X, \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{E}[e]})$  is a Hausdorff zero-dimensional topological semigroup, witnessing that the semigroup  $X$  is  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -topologizable.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Given a semigroup  $X$ , we need to prove the implications (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (7) of the conditions:

- (1)  $X$  is commutative, bounded, nonsingular and Clifford-finite;
- (2)  $X$  is injectively  $\mathsf{T}_1\mathsf{S}$ -closed;
- (3)  $X$  is  $\mathsf{T}_1\mathsf{S}$ -closed and  $\mathsf{T}_1\mathsf{S}$ -discrete;
- (4)  $X$  is  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -closed and  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -discrete;
- (5)  $X$  is  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -closed and  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite;
- (6)  $Z(X)$  is bounded, nonsingular and Clifford-finite;
- (7)  $Z(X)$  is injectively  $\mathsf{T}_1\mathsf{S}$ -closed.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): Assume that  $X$  is commutative, bounded, nonsingular and Clifford-finite. To prove that  $X$  is injectively  $\mathsf{T}_1\mathsf{S}$ -closed, it suffices to show that  $X$  is closed in any  $T_1$  topological semigroup  $Y$  that contains  $X$  as a subsemigroup. Let  $\pi : X \rightarrow E(X)$  be the map assigning to each  $x \in X$  the unique idempotent  $\pi(x) \in E(X)$  such that  $x \in H_{\pi(x)}$ . By Lemma 2.6,  $\pi$  is a homomorphism and hence for every  $e \in E(X)$  the preimage  $\pi^{-1}(e)$  is a unipotent semigroup. By Theorem 1.5, the bounded, nonsingular, group-finite commutative unipotent semigroup  $\pi^{-1}(e)$  is closed in  $Y$ . Since the set  $E(X) \subseteq H(X)$  is finite, the set  $X = \bigcup_{e \in E(X)} \pi^{-1}(e)$  is closed in  $Y$ , being the union of finitely many closed sets.

The equivalence (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) is proved in Proposition 3.2 of [8].

The implication (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) is trivial and follows immediately from the inclusion  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S} \subseteq \mathsf{T}_1\mathsf{S}$ .

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (5): Assume that  $X$  is  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -closed and  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -discrete. By Theorem 1.4, the central semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is chain-finite and by Theorem 5.5,  $EZ(X)$  is finite. By Theorem 1.4, the semigroup  $Z(X)$  is group-finite. By Lemma 2.2, for every idempotent  $e \in EZ(X)$  the intersection  $H_e \cap Z(X)$  is a subgroup of  $Z(X)$ . Since  $Z(X)$  is group-finite, the subgroup  $H_e \cap Z(X)$  is finite. Then  $H(Z(X)) = \bigcup_{e \in EZ(X)} (H_e \cap Z(X))$  is finite, which means that the semigroup  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite.

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6): Assume that  $X$  is  $\mathsf{T}_2\mathsf{S}$ -closed and  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite. By Theorem 1.4, the semigroup  $Z(X)$  is periodic and nonsingular. Let  $\pi_Z : Z(X) \rightarrow EZ(X)$  be the map assigning to each  $x \in X$



the unique idempotent  $\pi_Z(x) \in x^{\mathbb{N}}$ . By Lemma 2.6, the map  $\pi_Z$  is a homomorphism. Then for every  $e \in EZ(X)$  the preimage  $\pi_Z^{-1}(e) \subseteq Z(X)$  is a unipotent commutative semigroup. Since  $Z(X)$  is periodic, nonsingular and Clifford-finite, for every  $e \in EZ(X)$ , the unipotent commutative semigroup  $\pi_Z^{-1}(e)$  is chain-finite, periodic, nonsingular and group-finite. By Theorem 1.1,  $\pi^{-1}(e)$  is  $T_1S$ -closed and by Theorem 1.2,  $\pi_Z^{-1}(e)$  is bounded. Since  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite, the semilattice  $EZ(X)$  is finite and then the semigroup  $Z(X) = \bigcup_{e \in EZ(X)} \pi_Z^{-1}(e)$  is bounded, being a finite union of bounded subsemigroups.

The equivalence (6)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (7) follows from the implications (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (6) and the obvious equality  $Z(Z(X)) = Z(X)$ .

## 7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.7

Given a semigroup  $X$ , we need to prove the implications (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6)  $\Rightarrow$  (7)  $\Rightarrow$  (8)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (9) of the conditions:

- (1)  $X$  is finite;
- (2)  $X$  is absolutely  $T_1S$ -closed;
- (3)  $X$  is projectively  $T_1S$ -closed and projectively  $T_1S$ -discrete;
- (4)  $X$  is projectively  $T_1S$ -closed and injectively  $T_1S$ -closed;
- (5)  $X$  is projectively  $T_1S$ -closed and  $T_1S$ -discrete;
- (6)  $X$  is ideally  $T_2S$ -closed and  $T_2S$ -discrete;
- (7)  $X$  is ideally  $T_2S$ -closed and the semigroup  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite;
- (8)  $Z(X)$  is finite;
- (9)  $Z(X)$  is absolutely  $T_1S$ -closed.

The implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) is trivial, the equivalence (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) is proved in Proposition 3.3 of [8], the implication (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) is trivial, the equivalence (4)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (5) follows from the equivalence (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) in Theorem 1.6; the implication (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (6) is trivial, and (6)  $\Rightarrow$  (7) follows from the implication (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (5) of Theorem 1.6.

(7)  $\Rightarrow$  (8): Assume that  $X$  is ideally  $T_2S$ -closed and  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite. By Theorem 1.4, the semigroup  $Z(X)$  is periodic. Let  $\pi_Z : Z(X) \rightarrow EZ(X)$  be the map assigning to each  $x \in Z(X)$  the unique idempotent in the monogenic semigroup  $x^{\mathbb{N}}$ . By Lemma 2.6,  $\pi_Z$  is a homomorphism and hence for every  $e \in EZ(X)$  the preimage  $\pi_Z^{-1}(e) = \sqrt[\infty]{e}$  is a unipotent subsemigroup of  $Z(X)$ . By Lemma 2.2, the intersection  $H_e \cap Z(X)$  is a subgroup of  $Z(X)$ . Since  $Z(X)$  is Clifford-finite, the subgroup  $H_e \cap Z(X)$  is finite. Since  $X$  is ideally  $T_2S$ -closed, we can apply Lemma 7.5 of [7] and conclude that the set  $\pi_Z^{-1}(e) \setminus H_e$  is finite and so is the semigroup  $\pi^{-1}(e) = (\pi_Z^{-1}(e) \setminus H_e) \cap (H_e \cap Z(X))$ . Then the set  $Z(X) = \bigcup_{e \in EZ(X)} \pi_Z^{-1}(e)$  is finite.

The equivalence (8)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (9) follows from the implications (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (8) and the trivial equality  $Z(Z(X)) = Z(X)$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Arhangel'skii, M. Choban, *Semitopological groups and the theorems of Montgomery and Ellis*, C. R. Acad. Bulg. Sci. **62**(8) (2009), 917–922.
- [2] A. Arhangel'skii, M. Choban, *Completeness type properties of semitopological groups, and the theorems of Montgomery and Ellis*, Topology Proceedings **37** (2011), 33–60.
- [3] T. Banakh, *Categorically closed topological groups*, Axioms **6**:3 (2017), 23.
- [4] T. Banakh, *Injectively closed commutative semigroups*, preprint.
- [5] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, *Characterizing chain-finite and chain-compact topological semilattices*, Semigroup Forum **98** (2019), no. 2, 234–250.
- [6] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, *Completeness and absolute  $H$ -closedness of topological semilattices*, Topology Appl. **260** (2019), 189–202.

- [7] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, *Characterizing categorically closed commutative semigroups*, Journal of Algebra **591** (2022), 84–110.
- [8] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, *Categorically closed countable semigroups*, preprint, ([arxiv.org/abs/2111.14154](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.14154)).
- [9] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, *Subgroups of categorically closed semigroups*, preprint.
- [10] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, *Absolutely closed semigroups and their subsemigroups*, preprint ([arxiv.org/abs/2207.12778](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12778)).
- [11] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, *Complete topologized posets and semilattices*, Topology Proc. **57** (2021), 177–196.
- [12] T. Banakh, S. Bardyla, A. Ravsky, *The closedness of complete subsemilattices in functionally Hausdorff semitopological semilattices*, Topology Appl. **267** (2019), 106874.
- [13] T. Banakh, I. Guran, I. Protasov, *Algebraically determined topologies on permutation groups*, Topology Appl. **159**:9 (2012) 2258–2268.
- [14] T. Banakh, H. Mildenerger, *Cardinal invariants distinguishing permutation groups*, Europ. J. Math. **2**:2 (2016) 493–507.
- [15] T. Banakh, I. Protasov, O. Sipacheva, *Topologization of sets endowed with an action of a monoid*, Topology Appl. **169** (2014) 161–174.
- [16] T. Banakh, V. Vovk, *Categorically closed unipotent semigroups*, preprint (<https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.00072>).
- [17] D. Dikranjan, D. Shakhmatov, *The Markov–Zariski topology of an abelian group*, Journal of Algebra **324** (2010), 1125–1158.
- [18] D. Dikranjan, V. Uspenskij, *Categorically compact topological groups*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **126** (1998), 149–168.
- [19] E.K. van Douwen, *The maximal totally bounded group topology on  $G$  and the biggest minimal  $G$ -space, for abelian groups  $G$* , Topology Appl. **34**:1 (1990), 69–91.
- [20] J. Dutka, A. Ivanov, *Topologizable structures and Zariski topology*, Algebra Univers. **79** (2018), Paper No.72.
- [21] G. Gierz, J. Lawson and A. Stralka, *Intrinsic topologies on semilattices of finite breadth*, Semigroup Forum **31** (1985), 1–17.
- [22] M. Goto, *Absolutely closed Lie groups*, Math. Ann. **204** (1973), 337–341.
- [23] O. Gutik, *Topological properties of Taimanov semigroups*, Math. Bull. Shevchenko Sci. Soc. **13** (2016) 29–34.
- [24] O. Gutik, D. Pagon, D. Repovš, *On chains in  $H$ -closed topological pospaces*, Order **27**:1 (2010), 69–81.
- [25] O. Gutik, D. Repovš, *On linearly ordered  $H$ -closed topological semilattices*, Semigroup Forum **77**:3 (2008), 474–481.
- [26] G. Hesse, *Zur Topologisierbarkeit von Gruppen*, Dissertation, Univ. Hannover, Hannover, 1979.
- [27] J. Howie, *Fundamentals of Semigroup Theory*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
- [28] V. Keyantuo, Y. Zelenyuk, *Semigroup completions of locally compact Abelian groups*, Topology Appl. **263** (2019), 199–208.
- [29] A. Klyachko, A. Olshanskii, D. Osin, *On topologizable and non-topologizable groups*, Topology Appl. **160** (2013), 2104–2120.
- [30] M. Kotov, *Topologizability of countable equationally Noetherian algebras*, Algebra Logika, **52**:2 (2013), 155–171.
- [31] A. Lukács, *Compact-Like Topological Groups*, Heldermann Verlag: Lemgo, Germany, 2009.
- [32] A.A. Markov, *Three papers on topological groups: I. On the existence of periodic connected topological groups. II. On free topological groups. III. On unconditionally closed sets*, Amer. Math. Soc. Translation **30** (1950), 120 pp.
- [33] A.Yu. Olshanski, *A remark on a countable non-topologizable group*, Vestnik Mosk. Gos. Univ. Mat. Mekh., No.3 (1980), 103.
- [34] S. Shelah, *On a problem of Kurosh, Jonsson groups, and applications. Word problems, II*, (Conf. on Decision Problems in Algebra, Oxford, 1976), 373–394; Stud. Logic Foundations Math., **95**, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1980.
- [35] J.W. Stepp, *A note on maximal locally compact semigroups*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **20** (1969), 251–253.
- [36] J.W. Stepp, *Algebraic maximal semilattices*. Pacific J. Math. **58**:1 (1975), 243–248.
- [37] A.D. Taimanov, *An example of a semigroup which admits only the discrete topology*, Algebra i Logika, **12**:1 (1973) 114–116 (in Russian).
- [38] Y. Zelenyuk, *Semigroup extensions of Abelian topological groups*, Semigroup Forum **98** (2019), 9–21.

T.BANAKH: IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV (UKRAINE) AND JAN KOCHANOWSKI UNIVERSITY IN KIELCE (POLAND)

*Email address:* [t.o.banakh@gmail.com](mailto:t.o.banakh@gmail.com)