

Some properties of Higman-Thompson monoids and digital circuits

J.C. Birget

19 iii 2024

Abstract

We define various monoid versions of the Thompson group V , and prove connections with monoids of acyclic digital circuits. We show that the monoid $M_{2,1}$ (based on partial functions) is not embeddable into Thompson’s monoid $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$, but that $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ has a submonoid that maps homomorphically onto $M_{2,1}$. This leads to an efficient completion algorithm for partial functions and partial circuits. We show that the union of partial circuits with disjoint domains is an element of $M_{2,1}$, and conversely, every element of $M_{2,1}$ can be decomposed efficiently into a union of partial circuits with disjoint domains.

1 Introduction

We consider various monoids that generalize Richard Thompson’s group V . The group V (which is also called $G_{2,1}$ or V_2) was introduced by Thompson [26, 27] (see also [18]), and he proved that V is an infinite finitely presented simple group. In fact, as Matt Brin pointed out [15, 16, 17], Thompson initially derived V as the group of units of a monoid (in the mid 1960s); he did not publish anything about this monoid, but talked about it in lectures (notes by Brin [28, 29]). Thompson’s monoid, was rediscovered in [7, 6], where Thompson’s monoid is called $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$. A partial-function version of the monoid was also introduced in [7, 6], called $M_{2,1}$ (it had apparently not been considered by Thompson). In [7, 6] it was proved that $M_{2,1}$ is finitely generated and congruence-simple, that its group of units is V , and that its word problem over a finite generating set is in P .

In his lectures [28, 29] Thompson outlined a proof (recently reconstructed by Brin [15]) that $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ is finitely presented. By using similar ideas Brin also proved that $M_{2,1}$ is finitely presented (but Brin’s proofs of finite presentation remain unpublished). More recently a proof of finite presentation of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ (and more generally of the n -dimensional version $n\text{-tot}M_{2,1}$), was posted by de Witt and Elliott [20].

Most of the time we will actually work with the Higman-Thompson monoids $M_{k,1}$ and $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$, and the Higman-Thompson group $G_{k,1}$ [21], although we often just say “Thompson monoids” and “Thompson group”.

Remark about the name “Thompson monoid”: The Thompson group F contains a submonoid F^+ such that F is the group of fractions is F^+ . In the literature F^+ is usually called the “Thompson monoid” or the “positive submonoid” of F . The present paper does not explicitly use F^+ , and “Thompson monoids” will refer to various monoids that generalize V , replacing bijections by various functions.

Acknowledgement: Section 8 was motivated by discussions with Matt Brin [15].

Summary of results

We prove new connections between $M_{k,1}$, $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$, other Thompson monoids, and acyclic digital circuits:

- Sections 2, 3, and 4: We define various pre-Thompson and Thompson monoids, and circuits (partial circuits and boolean circuits). The Thompson monoids are obtained from pre-Thompson monoids by applying congruences. All these monoids (including the monoids of input-output functions of circuits) have a generating set of the form $\Gamma \cup \tau$, where Γ is finite, and τ is the infinite set of bit transpositions; for circuits, Γ is the set of gates. We show that circuits are closely related to Thompson monoids, and that important concepts from circuits (input-length, size, depth) can be defined in all Thompson monoids.
- Section 5: The pre-Thompson monoid $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ (which maps onto $M_{2,1}$) is finitely generated.
- Section 6: Certain pre-Thompson and Thompson monoids, including the monoid of input-output functions of circuits, are *not* finitely generated.
- Section 7: Most Thompson monoids are congruence-simple. An exception is the monoid of input-output functions of boolean circuits.
- Section 8: The Thompson monoid $M_{2,1}$ (based on partial functions) is not embeddable homomorphically into Thompson's monoid $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ (based on total functions). Similarly, the monoid of input-output functions of partial circuits is not embeddable homomorphically into the monoid of input-output functions of boolean circuits; in other words, partial circuits cannot be completed to boolean circuits in a homomorphic way (where the completion of the composite would be the composite of the completions).
- Section 9: Although $M_{2,1}$ is not embeddable into $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ and not a homomorphic image of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ (by congruence-simplicity), there is a submonoid of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ that maps homomorphically onto $M_{2,1}$. This is an inverse completion, which can be used to give efficient completion algorithms (for $M_{2,1}$ and for partial circuits).
- Section 10: Any element of $M_{2,1}$ can be computed by (a finite set of) partial circuits with disjoint domains. Conversely, the union of a finite set of partial circuits with disjoint domains is an element of $M_{2,1}$.

In conclusion, the Thompson monoids and circuits are, in essence, the same thing.

2 Preliminary monoids

Before defining various Thompson monoids we need some definitions, that are fairly standard (see also [1, 2, 5, 7, 9]). We first introduce monoids of right-ideal morphisms; the Thompson and Higman-Thompson monoids are then obtained from these “*pre-Thompson*” monoids by applying a congruence.

Definition 2.1 (function).

A function is a triple $f = (X, r, Y)$, where $r \subseteq X \times Y$ is a relation that has the function property: $(\forall (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in r)[x_1 = x_2 \Rightarrow y_1 = y_2]$.

The domain of f is $\text{Dom}(f) = \text{Dom}(r) = \{x : (\exists y \in Y)[(x, y) \in r]\} \subseteq X$, and the image (a.k.a. range) is $\text{Im}(f) = \text{Im}(r) = \{y : (\exists x \in X)[(x, y) \in r]\} \subseteq Y$. Thus, $r \subseteq \text{Dom}(f) \times \text{Im}(f) \subseteq X \times Y$.

The sets X and Y are called the source, respectively the target, of $f = (X, r, Y)$.

Here we usually take $X = Y = A^*$, or $X = Y = A^\omega$, or $X = Y = A^*0^\omega$, where A is a finite alphabet such that $\{0, 1\} \subseteq A$, and ω is the set of natural integers (as an ordinal).

The composition of two functions $f_1 = (X_1, r_1, Y_1)$, $f_2 = (X_2, r_2, Y_2)$, is defined by $(.)f_1 \circ f_2 = (X_1, (.)r_1 \circ r_2, Y_2)$, where $(.)r_1 \circ r_2 = \{(x, y) \in X_1 \times Y_2 : (\exists z \in Y_1 \cap X_2)[(x, z) \in r_1 \ \& \ (z, y) \in r_2]\}$.

Then $\text{Dom}((.)f_1 \circ f_2) = \text{Dom}(f_1) \cap f_1^{-1}(\text{Dom}(f_2))$, and $\text{Im}((.)f_1 \circ f_2) = \text{Im}(f_2) \cap f_2(\text{Im}(f_1))$. We often write $(.)f$ for f to indicate that the function is applied to the right, and we write $f(.)$ when the function is applied to the left.

We follow the set-theoretic view of functions, not the category-theoretic one. (In category theory, most commonly, functions are treated as total, and composition is undefined if $Y_1 \neq X_2$.) We will deviate from the set-theoretic view of functions in one way: We will usually make functions act on the *left* of the argument, and we write $f(.)$ to indicate this; we sometimes let functions act on the right, and then we write $(.)f$.

A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is *total* iff $\text{Dom}(f) = X$ and $X \neq \emptyset$.

The *empty function* (X, \emptyset, Y) is denoted by θ when X and Y are clear from the context.

We use finite alphabets, typically of the form $A = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ with $k \geq 1$, and the free monoid A^* , consisting of all strings (i.e., finite sequences of elements of A), including the *empty string* ε . We also consider the set A^ω of ω -sequences over A . For a string $x \in A^*$ the length is denoted by $|x|$. Concatenation of $x, y \in A^*$ is denoted by xy (juxtaposition) or by $x \cdot y$. Sets $X, Y \subseteq A^*$ are concatenated as $XY = \{xy : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. For $x, y \in A^*$, x is a *prefix* of y iff $y = xu$ for some $u \in A^*$; this is denoted by $x \leq_{\text{pref}} y$. We write $x <_{\text{pref}} y$ iff $x \leq_{\text{pref}} y$ and $x \neq y$. The relation \leq_{pref} is a partial order. Strings $x, y \in A^*$ are *prefix-comparable* iff $x \leq_{\text{pref}} y$ or $y \leq_{\text{pref}} x$; this is denoted by $x \parallel_{\text{pref}} y$. A set $P \subseteq A^*$ is a *prefix code* iff no element of P is a prefix of another element of P , i.e., different elements of P are prefix-incomparable [1]. A *maximal prefix code* of A^* is a prefix code that is \subseteq -maximal among the prefix codes of A^* . A set $R \subseteq A^*$ is a *right-ideal* of A^* iff $R = RA^*$; this is equivalent to $(\forall x \in R)(\forall u \in A^*)[x \leq_{\text{pref}} u \Rightarrow u \in R]$. The intersection (or union) of any set of right ideals is a right ideal. We say that two sets X, Y intersect iff $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. An *essential right ideal* of A^* is a right ideal that intersects every right ideal of A^* . The following is easy to prove: R is a right-ideal of A^* iff there exists a (unique) prefix code P of A^* such that $R = PA^*$; P is called the *prefix code of R* . Moreover, R is essential iff the prefix code of R is maximal.

A *finitely generated right ideal* is defined to be a right ideal whose prefix code is finite. The intersection (or union) of any two finitely generated right ideals is a finitely generated right ideal (see [2]).

As we saw already, in this paper, “function” always means *partial function*.

A *right-ideal morphism* of A^* is a function $f : A^* \rightarrow A^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(f)$ is a right ideal, and $(\forall x \in \text{Dom}(f))(\forall u \in A^*)[f(xu) = f(x)u]$. The prefix code of the right ideal $\text{Dom}(f)$ is called the *domain code* of f , and denoted by $\text{domC}(f)$. One easily proves that if f is a right-ideal morphism then $\text{Im}(f)$ is a right ideal; the prefix code of $\text{Im}(f)$ is called the *image code* of f , and denoted by $\text{imC}(f)$. The right-ideal morphism f is uniquely determined by the restriction $f|_{\text{domC}(f)}$; this restriction is called the *table of f* . In general, $\text{imC}(f) \subseteq f(\text{domC}(f))$, but that this inclusion can be strict (as will be discussed later).

It is easy to prove that if R is a right ideal and f is a right-ideal morphism then $f(R)$ and $f^{-1}(R)$ are right ideals. Moreover, can prove (see [2, 7]) that for any two functions $f_2, f_1 : \text{Dom}(f_2 \circ f_1(.)) = f_1^{-1}(\text{Im}(f_1) \cap \text{Dom}(f_2))$, and $\text{Im}(f_2 \circ f_1(.)) = f_2(\text{Im}(f_1) \cap \text{Dom}(f_2))$. It follows that the composite $f_2 \circ f_1(.)$ of two right-ideal morphisms f_2, f_1 of A^* is a right-ideal morphism.

Definition 2.2 *The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (also called $\mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}}$) consists of all right-ideal morphisms of A^* with finite domain code, with function composition as the monoid operation.*

When $A = \{0, 1\}$, the above monoid is called $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$.

Equivalently, $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ iff f is a right-ideal morphism whose table $f|_{\text{domC}(f)}$ is finite.

It follows from [7, Thm. 4.5] that if f_2, f_1 are right-ideal morphisms with finite domain codes then $f_2 \circ f_1(.)$ also has a finite domain code. Hence $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is closed under composition, so $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is indeed a monoid.

Let us introduce a few more monoids.

Definition 2.3.

A right-ideal morphism $f : A^* \rightarrow A^*$ is called total iff $\text{dom}f(f)$ is a maximal prefix code of A^* ; equivalently, $\text{Dom}(f)$ is an essential right ideal.

A right-ideal morphism f is called surjective iff $\text{im}f(f)$ is a maximal prefix code of A^* , i.e., $\text{Im}(f)$ is an essential right ideal.

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} &= \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is total } \}; \\ \text{sur}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} &= \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is surjective } \}; \\ \text{inj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} &= \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is injective } \}. \end{aligned}$$

One proves easily that these are indeed monoids under composition.

Since the above monoids are submonoids of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ we can consider intersections of any of these monoids, e.g., $\text{totinj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, or $\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. The latter maps homomorphically onto the Thompson group V and was studied in [9] under the name $\text{riAut}(k)$.

Remark on the words “total” and “surjective”: Here, total or surjective right-ideal morphisms of A^* are usually not total, respectively surjective, as functions on A^* . However we will see later, when $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ and $\text{sur}M_{k,1}$ are introduced, that they are total, respectively surjective, as functions on A^ω .

The following monoids have close connections with acyclic boolean circuits.

Definition 2.4 (plep, tlep, pfl, and tfl).

Let $f : A^* \rightarrow A^*$ be a right-ideal morphism.

- f is called partial length-equality preserving, or plep, iff for all $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Dom}(f)$:
 $|x_1| = |x_2| \Rightarrow |f(x_1)| = |f(x_2)|$.
- f is called total length-equality preserving, or tlep, iff f is total and plep.
- f is called partial fixed-length input, or pfl, iff f is plep and $\text{dom}C(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ for some $m \geq 0$.
- f is called total fixed-length input, or tfl, iff f is tlep and $\text{dom}C(f) = \{0, 1\}^m$ for some $m \geq 0$.
- We define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{plep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} &= \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is plep } \}; \\ \text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} &= \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is tlep } \}; \\ \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} &= \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is pfl } \}; \\ \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} &= \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is tfl } \}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that these are monoids under composition, and that if f is pfl then

$$f(\text{dom}C(f)) = \text{im}C(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n \quad \text{for some } n \geq 0.$$

Since the monoids $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ are strongly related to acyclic circuits, we usually consider $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, i.e., we use the alphabet $A = \{0, 1\}$.

Summary of pre-Thompson monoids

We introduced the following monoids of right-ideal morphisms of A^* , with $|A| = k \geq 2$:

$\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ — the monoid of all right-ideal morphisms with finite domain-code; also called $\mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}}$.

$\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ — the monoid of right-ideal morphisms whose domain-code is a maximal finite prefix code; also called $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}}$.

$\text{sur}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ — the monoid of right-ideal morphisms whose domain-code is finite, and whose image-code is a maximal prefix code.

$\text{inj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ — the monoid of injective right-ideal morphisms whose domain-code is finite.

Intersections of the above, in particular $\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

$\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ — the monoid of right-ideal morphisms whose domain-code is $\{0,1\}^m$ for some m (depending on the morphism), and whose image-code is a subset of $\{0,1\}^n$ for some n (depending on the morphism).

$\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ — the monoid of right-ideal morphisms whose domain-code is a subset of $\{0,1\}^m$ for some m (depending on the morphism), and whose image-code is a subset of $\{0,1\}^n$ for some n (depending on the morphism).

3 Circuits and monoids

The main motivation for the monoids $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is their connection to classical acyclic boolean circuits and partial circuits. Acyclic circuits are combinational, so they have no synchronization issues.

Connections between Thompson monoids (and groups), and acyclic circuits were previously studied in [3, 5, 4, 11].

3.1 Circuits

An *acyclic boolean circuit* is a directed acyclic graph (DAG), together with a vertex labeling that associates an input variable x_i with each source vertex, an output variable y_j with each sink vertex, and a gate with each interior vertex. The classical **not**, **and**, **or**, and **fork** gates are used; **not** has fan-in 1 and fan-out 1, **and** and **or** have fan-in 2 and fan-out 1, **fork** has fan-in 1 and fan-out 2; a source vertex has fan-in 0 and fan-out 1, and a sink vertex has fan-in 1 and fan-out 0. Every vertex has in-degree and out-degree that matches the fan-in, respectively fan-out, of its gate.

A *partial acyclic circuit* (more briefly, a *partial circuit*) is defined in the same way as an acyclic boolean circuit, except that now the set of gates is enlarged by a finite set of additional *partial gates* in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. In a partial circuit, if one or more gates produce an undefined output for a given input, then the whole output of the circuit is undefined for that input; so partial circuits do not use a kind of multi-valued logic. (Physically, an “undefined” input or output value of a circuit is any physical signal that does not correspond unambiguously to a boolean value 0 or 1; this could e.g. be some “intermediate” signal, an undecodable signal, or fluctuating signals.) Subsection 3.2 gives more information on partial circuits; the present subsection focuses on boolean circuits.

It was proved by Hoover, Klawe, and Pippenger [23] (see also [19, Theorem 1.9.1]) that if **and**, **or**, **not** are allowed to have unbounded fan-out (let \mathcal{G} be this infinite set of gates), then every circuit C made from gates in \mathcal{G} is equivalent (regarding its input-output function) to a circuit C' with gates from a fixed finite set of gates \mathcal{G}' (equivalently, a set of gates of bounded fan-in and bounded fan-out), such that $\text{size}(C') \leq c \text{size}(C)$, and $\text{depth}(C') \leq c \text{depth}(C)$ (for some constant $c \geq 1$).

Two circuits C_1, C_2 are called *isomorphic* iff the DAGs of C_1 and C_2 are isomorphic, and the vertices of C_1 and C_2 that correspond to each other by the DAG isomorphism are labeled by the same gate, or the same input variable, or the same output variable. This is denoted by $C_1 \cong C_2$. Two isomorphic circuits can be different in their geometric “layouts”. E.g., wire permutations, braiding and knotting of wires, could be different, but in such a way that the connection relation between vertices are the same.

As input-output functions of the *gates*, applied at position j in an input bit-string, are defined as follows (where $u, v \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $j = |u| + 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{not}_j &: u x_j v \mapsto u \bar{x}_j v; \\ \text{and}_{j,j+1} &: u x_j x_{j+1} v \mapsto u (x_j \wedge x_{j+1}) v; \\ \text{or}_{j,j+1} &: u x_j x_{j+1} v \mapsto u (x_j \vee x_{j+1}) v; \\ \text{fork}_j &: u x_j v \mapsto u x_j x_j v. \end{aligned}$$

An acyclic circuit also uses *bit-position transpositions* $\tau_{i,j}$ for $i < j$ (where $u, v, w \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $i = |u| + 1$, $j = |uv| + 2$):

$$\tau_{i,j}: u x_i v x_j w \mapsto u x_j v x_i w.$$

The transpositions are not viewed as gates (in actual circuits they are usually implemented as wire-permutations or wire-crossings).

Since the gates can be applied at any input positions, there are infinitely many gates of each kind (viewed as input-output functions).

Let $\kappa_{1,n}: x_1 x_2 x_3 \dots x_n \mapsto x_2 x_3 \dots x_n x_1$ be the *cyclic permutation* of the first n variables; then we have $\kappa_{1,n}(\cdot) = \tau_{n-1,n} \tau_{n-2,n-1} \dots \tau_{2,3} \tau_{1,2}(\cdot)$. It is well known that the set of finite permutations of ω (the natural integers) is generated by the set of transpositions $\{\tau_{j,j+1} : j \in \omega\}$; it is also generated by the set of transpositions $\{\tau_{1,j} : j \in \omega\}$.

Thanks to $\tau = \{\tau_{i,j} : i, j \geq 1\}$ we only need the gates not_1 (= not), $\text{and}_{1,2}$ (= and), $\text{or}_{1,2}$ (= or), and fork_1 (= fork). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{not}_j &= \tau_{1,j} \circ \text{not}_1 \circ \tau_{1,j}(\cdot), \\ \text{and}_{j,j+1} &= \kappa_{1,j} \circ \text{and}_{1,2} \circ \tau_{2,j+1} \circ \tau_{1,j}(\cdot), \\ \text{fork}_j &= (\kappa_{1,j+1})^2 \circ \text{fork}_1 \circ \tau_{1,j}(\cdot). \end{aligned}$$

Extension to a right-ideal morphism

For every circuit (and gate) we extend the input-output function $f : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ to a right-ideal morphism by defining

$$f(xu) = f(x)u, \quad \text{for all } x \in \{0, 1\}^m, u \in \{0, 1\}^*.$$

Thus $\text{domC}(f) = \{0, 1\}^m$, $\text{Dom}(f) = \{0, 1\}^m \{0, 1\}^*$, $\text{imC}(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, and $\text{Im}(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n \{0, 1\}^*$; here, m is the number of input bits of the circuit, and n is the number of output bits. The definition of the gates, given above, carries out this extension already with $\text{domC}(\text{not}_j) = \{0, 1\}^j = \text{domC}(\text{fork}_j)$, $\text{domC}(\text{and}_j) = \{0, 1\}^{j+1} = \text{domC}(\text{or}_j)$, $\text{imC}(\text{not}_j) = \{0, 1\}^j = \text{imC}(\text{and}_j) = \text{imC}(\text{or}_j)$, and $\text{imC}(\text{fork}_j) = \{0, 1\}^{j+1}$.

This extension makes f an element of the pre-Thompson monoid $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. The extension to right-ideal morphisms enables us to always compose input-output functions of circuits, and the composite is never the empty function.

The input-output function of the circuit is obtained by composing a sequence of copies of the four gates **not**, **and**, **or**, **fork**, and elements of τ .

Conversely, every total function $\{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ (for any given $m, n \geq 1$) can be realized by an acyclic boolean circuit (see e.g. [19, 25, 30]).

Later we will also consider the extension of the input-output function f of any acyclic circuit to a function $\{0, 1\}^\omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\omega$, by defining $f(xu) = f(x)u$ for all $x \in \text{domC}(f)$, $u \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$. This makes f an element of the Thompson monoid $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$.

After extending the input-output function f_C of an acyclic circuit C to a right-ideal morphism of $\{0, 1\}^*$, or to a function $\{0, 1\}^\omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\omega$, we need to redefine the input- and output-length, since

now C has an unbounded sequence of input variables, and an unbounded sequence of output variables. But f_C only modifies a finite prefix $x_1 \dots x_m \in \text{dom}C(f_C)$ of the total input into a finite output prefix $y_1 \dots y_n \in f_C(\text{dom}C(f_C))$. I.e., $f_C(x_1 \dots x_m x_{m+1} \dots x_{m+k} \dots) = f_C(x_1 \dots x_m) x_{m+1} \dots x_{m+k} \dots = y_1 \dots y_n y_{n+1} \dots y_{n+k} \dots$, such that for all $k \geq 1$: $y_{n+k} = x_{m+k}$ (i.e., y_{n+k} and x_{m+k} have the same value in $\{0, 1\}$). The connection from the input variable x_{m+k} to the output variable y_{n+k} is just a wire (with no gate or wire permutation operation); we call the link (x_{m+k}, y_{n+k}) an *identity wire*.

Definition 3.1 (input- and output-length of a boolean circuit).

Let $(x_i : i \in \omega)$ be the input variables of an acyclic circuit C with input-output function extended to a right-ideal morphism of $\{0, 1\}^*$, and let $(y_j : j \in \omega)$ be the output variables. The input-length $\ell_{\text{in}}(C)$ and the output-length $\ell_{\text{out}}(C)$ of C are defined by

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(C) = \max\{i > 0 : \text{a gate or a wire permutation in } C \text{ is connected to the input variable } x_i\}.$$

$$\ell_{\text{out}}(C) = \max\{j > 0 : \text{a gate or a wire permutation in } C \text{ uses the output variable } y_j\}.$$

Definition 3.2 (size and depth of a circuit).

- The size of an acyclic circuit C , denoted by $|C|$, is the maximum of $\ell_{\text{in}}(C)$, $\ell_{\text{out}}(C)$, and the number of gates of C (the latter is the number $|V_i|$ of internal vertices of the DAG of C , i.e., the non-input and non-output vertices). I.e., $|C| = \max\{\ell_{\text{in}}(C), \ell_{\text{out}}(C), |V_i|\}$.

Wire permutations are not explicitly counted in the size, but they influence $\ell_{\text{in}}(C)$ and $\ell_{\text{out}}(C)$.

- The depth of an acyclic circuit C , denoted by $\text{depth}(C)$, is the depth of the underlying DAG, i.e., the maximum length of all directed paths.

For a function in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (or $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, etc.), given by a sequence of generators, the input- and output-length can also be defined.

Note that for the composition of functions we have: $u_k \circ \dots \circ u_1(x)$ is defined iff for all $i \in [1, k]$, $u_i \circ \dots \circ u_1(x)$ is defined.

Definition 3.3 (input- and output-length in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$).

(1) Let Γ be a finite set such that $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. For any $u = u_k \dots u_1 \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ with $u_i \in \Gamma \cup \tau$ (for $i \in [1, k]$), we define:

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(u) = \min\{m \in \mathbb{N} : (\forall x \in \{0, 1\}^m) [u_k \circ \dots \circ u_1(x) \text{ is defined}]\};$$

$$\ell_{\text{out}}(u) \text{ is the unique } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } u_k \circ \dots \circ u_1(\{0, 1\}^m) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n, \text{ where } m = \ell_{\text{in}}(u).$$

The same definition of $\ell_{\text{in}}(u)$ (but not of $\ell_{\text{out}}(u)$) can be applied for $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

(2) Let Γ be a finite set such that $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. For any $u = u_k \dots u_1 \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ with $u_i \in \Gamma \cup \tau$ (for $1 \leq i \leq k$), we define:

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(u) = \min\{m \in \mathbb{N} : (\forall x \in \{0, 1\}^m) [x \{0, 1\}^\omega \subseteq \text{Dom}(E_u) \{0, 1\}^\omega \Rightarrow u_k \circ \dots \circ u_1(x) \text{ is defined}]\};$$

$$\ell_{\text{out}}(u) \text{ is the unique } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } u_k \circ \dots \circ u_1(\{0, 1\}^m) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n, \text{ where } m = \ell_{\text{in}}(u).$$

The same definition of $\ell_{\text{in}}(u)$ (but not of $\ell_{\text{out}}(u)$) can be applied for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

(3) For the Thompson monoids $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$, $\text{tfl}M_{2,1}$, $M_{2,1}$, $\text{pfl}M_{2,1}$, acting on $\{0, 1\}^\omega$, we define the input-length (and an output-length in the plep case) by using words in $(\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$, where Γ is finite such that $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, respectively. I.e., we use the generating sets of the corresponding pre-Thompson monoids.

The following is straightforward.

Lemma 3.4 (equivalent definition of input-length).

Let Γ be a finite set such that $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (or $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), and let $u = u_k \dots u_1 \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ with $u_i \in \Gamma \cup \tau$ for $i \in [1, k]$. Then

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(u) = \min \{ m \in \mathbb{N} : \{0, 1\}^m \cap \text{Dom}(u_k \circ \dots \circ u_1(\cdot)) \equiv_{\text{fin}} \text{domC}(u_k \circ \dots \circ u_1(\cdot)) \}.$$

□

Definition 3.5 (lengths and sizes of words).

Let Γ be a finite set such that $\Gamma \cap \tau = \emptyset$, and let $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$. Then

- $\text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w) = \max\{i : \tau_{i-1,i} \text{ occurs in } w\}$; and
 $\text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w) = 0$ if no element of τ occurs in w .
- For a finite set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$, $\text{maxlen}(S) = \max\{|s| : s \in S\}$.
For a finite set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{maxlen}(\mathcal{F}) = \max\{|s| : s \in \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\text{domC}(f) \cup f(\text{domC}(f)))\}$.
- $|w|_{\Gamma}$ is the number of occurrences of letters of Γ in w ;
- $|w|_{\Gamma \cup \tau}$ is the number of occurrences of elements in $\Gamma \cup \tau$ in w ;
this is the length of w where every element of $\Gamma \cup \tau$ is assigned length 1;
- $|w| = |w|_{\Gamma \cup \tau} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w)$; this is called the **total word-length** of w .

The total word-length of w could have been defined to be $\max\{|w|_{\Gamma \cup \tau}, \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w)\}$. But this does not make much difference (since for positive real numbers a, b we have $\max\{a, b\} < a + b < 2 \max\{a, b\}$).

Definition 3.6 (evaluation function). For a generating set $\Gamma \cup \tau$ of one of the above monoids (e.g., $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), the generator evaluation function $E : w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^* \mapsto E_w \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is defined for any $x \in A^*$ by

$$E_w(x) = w_k \circ \dots \circ w_1(x),$$

where $w = w_k \dots w_1$ with $w_i \in \Gamma \cup \tau$ for $i \in [1, k]$. For a given $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$, the right-ideal morphism E_w is called the input-output function of w .

For partial circuits, the circuit evaluation function $E : C \mapsto E_C$ is such that for any partial circuit C , E_C is the input-output function of C (extended to a right-ideal morphism of $\{0, 1\}^*$).

Encoding of a circuit by a bitstring:

As a preliminary step, we encode the alphabet $\{0, 1, \#\}$ over $\{0, 1\}$. This can be done, e.g., by the injective function $\text{code}_0(\cdot) : \{0, 1, \#\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ defined by $\text{code}_0(0) = 00$, $\text{code}_0(1) = 01$, $\text{code}_0(\#) = 1$, and $\text{code}_0(xy) = \text{code}_0(x) \text{code}_0(y)$ for all $x, y \in \{0, 1, \#\}^*$. The set $\{00, 01, 1\}$ is a maximal prefix code.

Let (V, E) be the set of vertices, respectively edges, of an acyclic circuit (boolean or partial). We assume that every vertex v is a bitstring of length $\lceil \log_2 |V| \rceil$, and different vertices are different bitstrings. Moreover, the bitstrings used here represent the numbers 0 through $|V| - 1$ in binary representation of length $\lceil \log_2 |V| \rceil$ (with leading 0s when needed).

For every input vertex v we consider the string $\#v\#b\#\ell\#r\#$ over the alphabet $\{0, 1, \#\}$. Here b is the gate-type of v , namely 000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, for respectively Input, Output, and, or, not, fork; in a partial circuit, we also allow the partial gate ζ_1 (see Subsection 3.2), encoded by 110. The bitstrings ℓ, r are the predecessor vertices (a.k.a. the parents) of v ; they provide the inputs for v . If v is a source (a.k.a. an input vertex) then ℓ, r are each a copy of v ; if v has in-degree 1 then r is a copy of ℓ .

In addition, we require that the vertex labels $v \in V$ are chosen so that $\#v\#b\#\ell\#r\#$ satisfies $v <_{\text{lex}} \ell$ and $v <_{\text{lex}} r$ (unless v is a source, and then $v = \ell = r$). So, the names of the vertices and their lexicographic order are compatible with the *precedence* order (dependence order, a.k.a. topological sort).

To represent the circuit by a string we concatenate all the strings that describe the vertices; let $s \in \{0, 1, \#\}^*$ be the resulting string. We do this in *sorted order of the vertices* $v \in \{0, 1\}^*$, according to the dictionary order in $\{0, 1\}^*$. This, together with the fact that $v <_{\text{lex}} \ell$ and $v <_{\text{lex}} r$, implies that in an encoding of an acyclic circuit, the vertices are *topologically sorted* (i.e., the partial order defined by the acyclic digraph, as a Hasse diagram, is compatible with the lexicographic order of the vertex strings).

Finally, we consider $\text{code}_0(s\#\#)$ to obtain the encoding of a circuit C , denoted by $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$. We call $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$ the *precedence encoding* of the acyclic circuit C . The set of all strings $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$ that represent acyclic circuits is called the *precedence connection language*. In our formulation, the precedence connection language is an infinite prefix code.

Decoding: From a precedence encoding $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$ of a boolean or partial circuit C , a circuit isomorphic to C can be reconstructed, up to circuit isomorphism; C itself is not uniquely determined by $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$ (see the remarks about isomorphic circuits at the beginning of this subsection).

Let us show that the precedence connection language belongs to $\text{DSpace}(\log)$.

1. A finite-state machine can decode a string from $\{0, 1\}^*$ to a string in $\{0, 1, \#\}^*$; i.e., apply the function $\text{code}_0^{-1}(\cdot)$, and reject if this is not decodable. A finite-state machine can also check whether the decoded string belongs to $(\#\{0, 1\}^+ \#\{000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, 110\} \#\{0, 1\}^+ \#\{0, 1\}^+ \#)^+$.
2. We can check in log-space whether in a string

$$\#v_1\#b_1\#\ell_1\#r_1\# \#v_2\#b_2\#\ell_2\#r_2\# \dots \#v_i\#b_i\#\ell_i\#r_i\# \dots \#v_{|V|}\#b_{|V|}\#\ell_{|V|}\#r_{|V|}\#,$$

all the vertex strings v_i , ℓ_i , and r_i (over all i) have the same length, whether $v_i <_{\text{lex}} \ell_i$ and $v_i <_{\text{lex}} r_i$ (unless $v_i = \ell_i = r_i$), and whether the vertices v_i occur in strict sorted lexicographic order (with increments of 1 at each step, starting with $v_1 = 0^{\lceil \log_2 |V| \rceil} 1$ and ending at the binary representation of $|V| - 1$).

3. For each vertex v we check its in-degree. If v is an **and**, **or**, or a ζ_1 gate, we check whether ℓ , r , and v , are all different. If v is a **not** or a **fork** gate or an output vertex, we check whether $\ell = r <_{\text{lex}} v$. If v is an input vertex, we check whether $\ell = r = v$. This is easily done in log-space.
4. For each vertex v_i we check its out-degree: If v_i is an output vertex, v_i must not be equal to ℓ_j or r_j of any other vertex v_j . If v_i has out-degree 1 (i.e., it is of type **Input**, **and**, **or**, **not** or ζ_1) then v_i must be equal to exactly one parent vertex ℓ_j or r_j of another vertex v_j , with $i < j$ (because of topological sorting). If v_i is of type **fork**, then there must be two vertices v_j and v_k , with i, j, k all different and $i < j, k$ (by topological sorting), such that v_i is equal to ℓ_j or r_j , and to ℓ_k or r_k .

Computing properties of a circuit: We would like to compute the input-length, output-length, size, and depth of a boolean or partial circuit C in log-space, from its precedence encoding $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$.

Given $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$, a finite-state automaton can output the number of input vertices in unary notation (by recognizing the gate-type **Input**, i.e., 000); similarly, the number of output vertices, or the total number of vertices can be computed in unary. To compute the depth $d(C)$ of C in binary notation, we give an algorithm with space complexity $O(d(C) + \log |V|)$. The algorithm uses depth-first search, as follows:

We use every source vertex, one after another. We remember the currently chosen source vertex s_i (in space $\log |V|$), and do depth-first search from s_i , remembering the sequence of left or right steps in the DAG, remembering left as 0, and right as 1; the search goes left when possible; this yields a bitstring of length $\leq d(C)$; when this depth-first phase ends, the length of the search string is computed in

binary, and remembered (in space $\leq \log d(C)$). Now the search backtracks, using the search string in reverse, reading 0s until a 1 is found, or the start vertex is found. Now the search follows the 1 found, and then goes left again. The new depth eventually found is compared with the stored one, and the larger one (in lexicographic order) is kept. If the vertex is found in the backtrack, and a 0 was read just before the start vertex, this 0 is replaced by 1, and the search resumes. If a 1 was read just before the start vertex, the search resumes with the next source vertex (unless there is no next source vertex, in which case the search is over).

In a similar way, $\ell_{\text{in}}(C)$ and $\ell_{\text{out}}(C)$ (Def. 3.1) can be computed in log-space, by doing reverse depth-first search (in the reverse DAG) or depth-first search.

In summary we proved the following.

Lemma 3.7 *There is an injective function $\text{Code}_{<}(\cdot)$ (the precedence encoding) that maps every acyclic boolean or partial circuit to a bitstring with the following properties: The image set of $\text{Code}_{<}(\cdot)$ (i.e., the set of all encodings of acyclic circuits, also called the precedence connection language) is a prefix code that belongs to $\text{DSpace}(\log)$. Moreover, there is an algorithm that on input $\text{Code}_{<}(C)$, for any acyclic circuit C , computes the depth $\text{depth}(C)$ with space complexity $O(\text{depth}(C) + \log |V|)$ (where $|V|$ is the number of vertices in the circuit). And there are log-space algorithms that compute $\ell_{\text{in}}(C)$, $\ell_{\text{out}}(C)$, and $|C|$. \square*

In this paper, whenever a circuit C is an input or an output of an algorithm, we actually use the encoding of C by a bitstring as the input or output of the algorithm.

Theorem 3.8 describes a close relation between acyclic circuits and words over a generating set $\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cup \tau$ of $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. This relation was already studied in [5, Prop. 2.4], but Theorem 3.8 is more detailed in its parts (2) and (3).

Theorem 3.8 (boolean circuits versus words in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$).

Let Γ_{ff} be a finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, and $\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cap \tau = \emptyset$. For $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cup \tau)^*$, let $|w| = |w|_{\Gamma \cup \tau} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w)$.

(1) (From circuit to word): *Let C be any acyclic boolean circuit, with gates of type and, or, not, fork. Then a word $W(C) \in (\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cup \tau)^*$ can be constructed such that C and $W(C)$ have the same input-output function. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} |W(C)| &= \Theta(|C|); \\ \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(W(C)) &\leq |C|; \\ \ell_{\text{in}}(W(C)) &= \ell_{\text{in}}(C), \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\text{out}}(W(C)) = \ell_{\text{out}}(C). \end{aligned}$$

And $W(C)$ can be computed from C in log-space in terms of $|C|$.

(2) (From word to circuit): *From any word $u \in (\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cup \tau)^*$, an acyclic boolean circuit $C(u)$, over the gate set {and, or, not, fork}, can be constructed such that $C(u)$ and u have the same input-output function. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} |C(u)| &= \Theta(|u|); \\ \ell_{\text{in}}(C(u)) &= \ell_{\text{in}}(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\text{out}}(C(u)) = \ell_{\text{out}}(u). \end{aligned}$$

And $C(u)$ can be computed from u in log-space in terms of $|u|$.

(3) *If boolean circuits use Γ_{ff} as the set of gates, then $W(\cdot)$ and $C(\cdot)$ can be chosen so that*

$$C(W(C)) \cong C$$

(i.e., the boolean circuits C and $CW(C)$ are isomorphic).

PROOF. (1) Let us assume at first that $\{\text{and, or, not, fork}\} \subseteq \Gamma_{\text{tff}}$. We adapt the proof of [5, Prop. 2.4], but some changes are needed because here we use $\text{tff}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ instead of $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$.

We construct $W(C)$ by simulating the gates in the left-to-right order in each depth-layer of C . The wires that leave a layer are numbered from left to right, and similarly the wires that enter a layer are numbered from left to right. Each gate of the boolean circuit C is simulated by a word over $\Gamma_{\text{tff}} \cup \tau$. The reasoning is the same for every gate, so let us just focus on a gate $g = \text{or}_{i_1, i_2, j}$ with in-wire numbers i_1 and i_2 , and out-wire number j . Here we assume that all gates that precede g (i.e., to the left of g in the layer, or at the right end of the previous layer if g is at the left end) have already been applied, in order to produce a suffix of $W(C)$; and we assume that the input sequence, after all the gates that precede g have been applied, is $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{m_1})$. By using bit-transpositions we have: $\text{or}_{i_1, i_2}(\cdot) = \text{or} \circ \tau_{2, i_2} \circ \tau_{1, i_1}(\cdot)$. Then the complete output so far is $(y_1, x_3, \dots, x_{i_1-1}, x_1, \dots, x_2, x_{i_2+1}, \dots, x_{m_1})$. The output of $\text{or}_{i_1, i_2, j}(\cdot)$ is expected to go to position j , whereas $\text{or} \circ \tau_{2, i_2} \circ \tau_{1, i_1}(\cdot)$ sends its output bit y_1 to position 1. But instead of permuting all the wires 1 through j in order to get the output of $\text{or} \circ \tau_{2, i_2} \circ \tau_{1, i_1}(\cdot)$ to wire j , we just leave y_1 on wire 1 for now. The simulation of the next gate of c will then use the appropriate bit-transpositions $\tau_{2, \ell} \circ \tau_{1, k}$ for moving the correct input wires to the next gate. Thus, each gate of C is simulated by one generator in Γ_{tff} and two wire-swaps in τ .

Finally, when all the output variables of the boolean circuit have been computed, a permutation of the n output wires is used in order to send the outputs to the correct final output wires. This will also take care of wire-swaps of wires that are not connected to any gate. Any permutation of n elements can be realized with $< n$ ($\leq |C|$) bit-transpositions.

We have $\ell_{\text{in}}(W(C)) = \ell_{\text{in}}(C)$ and $\ell_{\text{out}}(W(C)) = \ell_{\text{out}}(C)$ because C and $W(C)$ use the same input wires, and the same output wires.

The word $W(C)$ can be computed by a log-space Turing machine, since the only thing to be remembered in the computation is a few numbers that are $\leq |C|$ (the lengths of the intermediary input and output strings, and up to three positions in the intermediary input and output strings).

If $\{\text{and, or, not, fork}\} \not\subseteq \Gamma$, any $g \in \{\text{and, or, not, fork}\} \setminus \Gamma$ can be replaced by a word $w_g \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$. The gate g and the word w_g represent the same function; therefore the reasoning with $\{\text{and, or, not, fork}\} \subseteq \Gamma$ still works for the words w_g , except that $|W(C)|_{\Gamma} \leq s|C|$, where $s = \max\{|w_g|_{\Gamma} : g \in \Gamma_{\text{tff}}\}$.

(2) Since $\{\text{and, or, not, fork}\} \cup \tau$ is a generating set of $\text{tff}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ we consider first the case where $\Gamma_{\text{tff}} = \{\text{and, or, not, fork}\}$. Then the construction of a boolean circuit $C(u)$ from $u \in (\Gamma_{\text{tff}} \cup \tau)^*$ will be an inversion of the construction in the proof of (1).

Notation: For $g \in \Gamma_{\text{tff}}$ (finite) we let

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(g) = \text{maxlen}(\text{dom}C(g)), \text{ and } \ell_{\text{out}}(g) = \text{maxlen}(g(\text{dom}C(g))) = \text{maxlen}(\text{im}C(g)).$$

Every $u \in (\Gamma_{\text{tff}} \cup \tau)^*$ has the form

$$u = t_r g_r \dots t_{j+1} g_{j+1} t_j g_j \dots t_2 g_2 t_1 g_1 t_0,$$

where $r \geq 0$, $g_j \in \Gamma_{\text{tff}}$ (for $1 \leq j \leq r$), and $t_j \in \tau^+$ (for $0 \leq j \leq r$); i.e., every t_j is a non-empty sequence of bit-transpositions, representing a finite permutation of $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$. The boolean circuit $C(u)$ is constructed in two steps (described in detail below): (a) For every t_j we define a bipartite DAG that represents the wire permutation t_j , and then we connect g_j to the DAGs of t_{j-1} and t_j . (b) We eliminate all intermediary vertices and just keep the gates g_j , as well as the input variables and the output variables. Wire-swaps are automatically kept (they are implemented by the adjacency relation of the DAG of the circuit; they do not correspond to vertices). In more detail:

(a) For every j with $0 \leq j \leq r$, let $\ell_j = \max\{i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} : t_j(i) \neq i\}$; note that $t_j(i) \neq i$ is equivalent to $t_j^{-1}(i) \neq i$. So for all $i > \ell_j$: $t_j(i) = i$. Hence t_j , which is a finitary permutation of $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$, can be viewed as a permutation of $\{i : 1 \leq i \leq \ell_j\}$.

The bipartite DAG of t_j has input vertex set $\{x_i^{(j,\text{in})} : i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}\}$, output vertex set $\{x_i^{(j,\text{out})} : i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}\}$, and edge set $\{(x_i^{(j,\text{in})}, x_{t_j(i)}^{(j,\text{out})}) : i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}\}$.

For every j with $1 \leq j \leq r$, we connect g_j to the DAG of t_{j-1} and to the DAG of t_j as follows: We connect $x_i^{(j-1,\text{out})}$ to the i th input variable of g_j , for $1 \leq i \leq \ell_{\text{in}}(g_j)$; we connect the i th output variable of g_j to $x_i^{(j,\text{in})}$, for $1 \leq i \leq \ell_{\text{out}}(g_j)$; moreover, we connect $x_i^{(j-1,\text{out})}$ to $x_{i-\ell_{\text{in}}(g_j)+\ell_{\text{out}}(g_j)}^{(j,\text{in})}$, for all $i > \ell_{\text{in}}(g_j)$. This connects the DAGs of all the wire permutations t_j ($0 \leq j \leq r$) and all the gates g_j ($1 \leq j \leq r$) into one DAG; the vertex set of this DAG is

$$\{x_i^{(j,\text{in})} : 0 \leq j \leq r, i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}\} \cup \{g_j : 1 \leq j \leq r\} \cup \{x_i^{(j,\text{out})} : 1 \leq j \leq r, i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}\}.$$

The vertices $x_i^{(j,\text{in})}$ (for $1 \leq j \leq r$), and $x_i^{(j,\text{out})}$ (for $0 \leq j < r$), are called ‘‘intermediary vertices’’.

The acyclic digraph constructed in (a) can be computed in log-space. Indeed, the only things to remember during the computation are numbers $\leq |u|$.

(b) For all $j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ with $j \neq k$, we add an edge (g_j, g_k) , from the α th output of g_j ($1 \leq \alpha \leq \ell_{\text{out}}(g_j)$) to the β th input of g_k ($1 \leq \beta \leq \ell_{\text{in}}(g_k)$), iff in the DAG constructed in (a) there exists a path from g_j to g_k , from the α th output of g_j to the β th input of g_k , such that this path does not contain any other gate $g \in \Gamma_{\text{tff}}$. And we add an edge $(x_i^{(0,\text{in})}, g_j)$, from the input variable $x_i^{(0,\text{in})}$ to the α th input of g_j , iff in the DAG constructed in (a) there exists a path from $x_i^{(0,\text{in})}$ to the α th input of g_j , such that this path does not contain any other gate $g \in \Gamma_{\text{tff}}$. And we add an edge $(g_j, x_i^{(r,\text{out})})$, from the α th output of g_j to the output variable $x_i^{(r,\text{out})}$, iff in the DAG constructed in (a) there exists a path from the α th output of g_j to the output variable $x_i^{(r,\text{out})}$, such that this path does not contain any other gate $g \in \Gamma_{\text{tff}}$. And we add an edge $(x_i^{(0,\text{in})}, x_m^{(r,\text{out})})$ iff in the DAG constructed in (a) there exists a path from $x_i^{(0,\text{in})}$ to $x_m^{(r,\text{out})}$, such that this path does not contain any gate $g \in \Gamma_{\text{tff}}$. Now we drop all intermediary vertices, and the edges incident to one or more intermediary vertices.

The resulting DAG is a boolean circuit $C(u)$ with input variables $x_i^{(0,\text{in})}$ (for $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$), output variables $x_i^{(r,\text{out})}$ (for $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$), and gate vertices labeled by g_1, \dots, g_r . These input (or output) variables are the same as those of u . Wire-swaps are automatically kept, via the adjacency relation in the DAG. The input-output function of the circuit $C(u)$ is the same as the one of the DAG constructed in (a), which is obtained by composing the letters of u ; hence u and $C(u)$ have the same input-output function.

The number of gates of $C(u)$ is $|u|_{\Gamma_{\text{tff}}}$. [End of (b).]

The acyclic digraph constructed in (b) can be computed in log-space. Indeed, the only things to remember during the computation are numbers $\leq |u|$.

The order of the gates in u yields a precedence order for $C(u)$ which is the same as the gate order in u .

In case $\Gamma_{\text{tff}} \neq \{\text{and, or, not, fork}\}$, we use the above method to build an acyclic boolean circuit over the gate set Γ_{tff} . After this we can replace each gate γ in the finite set Γ_{tff} by an acyclic boolean circuit $C(\gamma)$ over $\{\text{and, or, not, fork}\}$. The inputs and outputs of $C(\gamma)$ are the same as the ones of γ . Since Γ_{tff} is finite, this increases the size of $C(u)$ by a constant factor.

Since steps (a) and (b) use log-space, the final result $C(u)$ is constructed in log-space (since log-space is closed under composition).

We have $\ell_{\text{in}}(C(u)) = \ell_{\text{in}}(u)$ and $\ell_{\text{out}}(C(u)) = \ell_{\text{out}}(u)$ because u and $C(u)$ use the same input wires and the same output wires.

(3) Let us prove that $\text{CW}(C) \hat{=} C$. By the construction in (1), $\text{W}(C)$ contains the same gates as C , in the same order (where in C we order the gates by layers, starting at the top, and from left to right in each layer). And $\text{W}(C)$ describes the same connection between gates (and between input or output

variables and gates) as C . By the construction in (2), $\text{CW}(C)$ contains the same gates as $W(C)$, in the same order. Hence, $\text{CW}(C)$ contains the same gates as C , in the same order. The connections in C and in $\text{CW}(C)$ are the same, since both $C(\cdot)$ and $W(\cdot)$ preserve the connections between generators g_j . Hence, $W(C)$ and C are isomorphic boolean circuits.

However, usually the wire permutations that implement the connections between gates are different in $\text{CW}(C)$ and C . \square

Remark: In Theorem 3.8(3) we mainly care about the fact that the boolean circuit C is isomorphic to $\text{CW}(C)$. Depending on the details of the encoding we could also have $\text{WC}(u) = u$.

As a consequence of the Theorem we have:

Proposition 3.9 (generators of $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$).

The monoid $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is the set of input-output functions of acyclic boolean circuits, extended to right-ideal morphisms of $\{0, 1\}^$.*

And $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ has a generating set $\Gamma \cup \tau$, where Γ is finite. The finite set Γ can be chosen to be $\{\text{not, and, or, fork}\}$. \square

We will prove later that $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is not finitely generated (Theorem 6.3), but that $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated (Theorem 5.6).

Remark about change of generators in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$:

Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be two finite sets such that $\Gamma_1 \cup \tau$ and $\Gamma_2 \cup \tau$ generate $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. For every $\gamma \in \Gamma_2$ we can choose $k(\gamma) \in (\Gamma_1 \cup \tau)^*$ be such that γ and $k(\gamma)$ represent the same element of $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$; and for every $\tau_{i,j} \in \tau$ we let $k(\tau_{i,j}) = \tau_{i,j}$. Since $\gamma \in \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and $\Gamma_2 \cup \tau$ is a generating set, $k(\gamma)$ exists. For all $w = w_k \dots w_1 \in (\Gamma_1 \cup \tau)^*$ (with $w_i \in \Gamma_1 \cup \tau$) we define $k(w) = k(w_k) \dots k(w_1)$.

Then w and $k(w)$ represent the same right-ideal morphism in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$.

3.2 Partial circuits

We saw already that a *partial acyclic circuit* (more shortly, a *partial circuit*) is defined in the same way as an acyclic boolean circuit, except that now elements from a finite set of additional *partial gates* in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ can be included in the circuit (see the beginning of Subsection 3.1).

In a partial circuit, if one or more gates produce an undefined output for a given input, then the whole output of the circuit is undefined for that input.

Here only one new partial gate, called ζ_1 , is introduced. It turns out that $\{\zeta_1, \text{not, and, or, fork}\}$ is a complete set of gates for partial circuits. The gate ζ_1 is defined as the right-ideal morphism of $\{0, 1\}^*$ with $\text{domC}(\zeta_1) = \{00, 01\}$, $\text{imC}(\zeta_1) = \{0, 1\}$, and

$$\zeta_1(00) = 0;$$

$$\zeta_1(01) = 1;$$

$$\zeta_1(1u) \text{ is undefined for all } u \in \{0, 1\}^*.$$

As a gate, ζ_1 has two input wires and one output wire, which outputs the second input bit if the first input bit is 0; there is no output if the first input bit is 1.

More generally, for all $m \geq 1$ we define $\zeta_m \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ to be the right-ideal morphism with $\text{domC}(\zeta_m) = \{00, 01\}^m$ and $\text{imC}(\zeta_m) = \{0, 1\}^m$, such that

$$z_1 \dots z_m u \in \{00, 01\}^m \{0, 1\}^* \quad (\text{with } z_i \in \{00, 01\} \text{ for } i \in [1, m], \text{ and } u \in \{0, 1\}^*),$$

$$\mapsto \zeta_m(z_1 \dots z_m u) = \zeta_1(z_1) \dots \zeta_1(z_m) u.$$

And $\zeta_m(x)$ is undefined if $x \notin \{00, 01\}^m \{0, 1\}^*$.

Then ζ_m is a composition of m instances of ζ_1 alternating with bit-transpositions in τ . Inductively:

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_m(z_1 \dots z_{m-1} z_m u) &= \zeta_{m-1}(z_1 \dots z_{m-1}) \zeta_1(z_m) u, \text{ so} \\ \zeta_m(\cdot) &= \kappa_{1,m} \circ \zeta_1 \circ \tau_{2,m+1} \circ \tau_{1,m} \circ \zeta_{m-1}(\cdot),\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_{1,m}(\cdot)$ is the cyclic permutation seen before.

Proposition 3.10 (generators for $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$).

The monoid $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ has a generating set of the form $\Gamma \cup \tau$, where Γ is a finite subset of $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. One can choose $\Gamma = \{\zeta_1, \text{not}, \text{and}, \text{or}, \text{fork}\}$; so this is a complete set of gates for acyclic partial circuits.

PROOF. Consider $f \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ with $\text{dom}C(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$, and $f(\text{dom}C(f)) = \text{im}C(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$.

Let $\text{code}_0(\cdot)$ be the encoding of the 3-letter alphabet $\{0, 1, \perp\}$ into $\{0, 1\}^*$, defined as follows:

$$\text{code}_0(0) = 00, \quad \text{code}_0(1) = 01, \quad \text{code}_0(\perp) = 11;$$

and for any string $s = s_1 \dots s_k \in \{0, 1\}^*$ with $s_i \in \{0, 1\}$ (for $i = 1, \dots, k$):

$$\text{code}_0(s) = \text{code}_0(s_1) \dots \text{code}_0(s_k) \quad (\text{concatenation}).$$

So, $\text{code}_0(\cdot)$ is a monoid morphism of $\{0, 1\}^*$, not a right-ideal morphism.

We define the following *completion* F of f (where m and n are as above): For all $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$,

$$\begin{aligned}F(x) &= \text{code}_0(f(x)) \quad \text{if } x \in \text{dom}C(f) \ (\subseteq \{0, 1\}^m); \\ F(x) &= (11)^n (= \text{code}_0(\perp)^n) \quad \text{if } x \in \{0, 1\}^m \setminus \text{dom}C(f); \text{ and} \\ F(xu) &= F(x) u, \quad \text{for all } x \in \{0, 1\}^m, \ u \in \{0, 1\}^*.\end{aligned}$$

So $\text{dom}C(F) = \{0, 1\}^m$, and $\text{im}C(F) \subseteq \{00, 01, 11\}^n$.

Then F is total, so $F \in \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. Therefore by Prop. 3.9, F is generated by $\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau$ where $\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} = \{\text{not}, \text{and}, \text{or}, \text{fork}\}$, and $\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. Moreover,

$$(*) \quad f(\cdot) = \zeta_n \circ F(\cdot),$$

where $\zeta_n \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is the right-ideal morphism defined above. Since ζ_n is a composition of instances of ζ_1 and bit-transpositions in τ , we conclude that $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is generated by $\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \{\zeta_1\} \cup \tau$. \square

Remark. For $\text{plep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, it is not known whether they have a generating sets of the form $\Gamma \cup \tau$ with Γ finite.

We will prove later that $\text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ are not finitely generated.

We now generalize Theorem 3.8 from $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ to $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ by using partial circuits. We saw in Prop. 3.10 that $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is generated by a finite set Γ_{pfl} of partial gates, together with τ . In the Theorem below the *total length* of $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ is defined as in Theorem 3.8:

$$|w| = |w|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w).$$

We for an acyclic partial circuit C we define $\ell_{\text{in}}(C)$, $\ell_{\text{out}}(C)$, $|C|$ and $\text{depth}(C)$ in the same way as for boolean circuits (Definitions 3.1 and 3.2).

Theorem 3.11 (partial circuits and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$).

Let $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \subseteq \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ be a finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, and $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cap \tau = \emptyset$. Then we have:

- (1) For every every $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ there exists a partial circuit $C(w)$ of partial gates such that w and $C(w)$ have same input-output function. Moreover, the total length of w and the size of $C(w)$ are linearly related, i.e., $|C(w)| = \Theta(|w|)$.

(2) For every partial circuit c there exists a word $W(c) \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that c and $W(c)$ have same input-output function. moreover,

The size of c and the total length of $W(c)$ are linearly related: $|W(c)| = \Theta(|c|)$.

$\max \text{index}_\tau(W(c)) \leq |c|$.

$\ell_{\text{in}}(W(c)) = \ell_{\text{in}}(c)$, and $\ell_{\text{out}}(W(c)) = \ell_{\text{out}}(c)$.

(3) The functions $W(\cdot)$ and $C(\cdot)$ can be chosen so that for every partial circuit c : $C(W(c)) \hat{=} c$.

PROOF. This can be proved in the same way as Theorem 3.8. Indeed, using a set Γ_{pfl} of partial gates and generators instead of a set Γ_{tfl} of total ones, does not change the proof. \square

Remark. Most of the time we use the alphabet $A = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, for some fixed $k \geq 2$, and the Higman-Thompson monoids and groups. However for $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ we only consider the alphabet $\{0, 1\}$, i.e., $k = 2$. This is because of the connection between these two monoids and circuits.

Theorems 3.8 and 3.11 are used for the following definition.

Definition 3.12 (depth in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$). Let Γ_{tfl} and Γ_{pfl} be finite sets such that $\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. Then for $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ or $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ we define the depth of w by

$$\text{depth}(w) = \text{depth}(C(w)).$$

4 Various definitions of various Thompson monoids

The Thompson monoids will be defined as quotient monoids of the monoids of right-ideal morphisms seen above. For this we define several congruence relations, that are themselves based on equivalence relations between prefix codes. For finite prefix codes, these equivalence relations turn out to be the same.

4.1 Equivalence relations between prefix codes

We will use the following equivalence relations between prefix codes $P, Q \subset A^*$. The equivalences \equiv_{end} , \equiv_{bd} , and \equiv_{poly} were studied in [10]; \equiv_{fin} was introduced in [12, Def. 2.12]; \equiv_{0^ω} is new.

• $[\equiv_{\text{end}}]$ $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$ iff for every right ideal $R \subseteq A^*$: $[R \cap PA^* = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow R \cap QA^* = \emptyset]$. This is called the *end-equivalence*.

By [10, Prop. 2.5], $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$ is equivalent to

$$\text{cl}(PA^\omega) = \text{cl}(QA^\omega),$$

where $\text{cl}(\cdot)$ denotes *closure* in the Cantor space topology of A^ω .

The relation \equiv_{end} can be extended to a preorder on the set of prefix codes of A^* by defining $P \leq_{\text{end}} Q$ iff for every right ideal $R \subseteq A^*$: $[R \cap QA^* = \emptyset \Rightarrow R \cap PA^* = \emptyset]$. Equivalently, $\text{cl}(PA^\omega) \subseteq \text{cl}(QA^\omega)$. Then $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$ iff $P \leq_{\text{end}} Q$ and $Q \leq_{\text{end}} P$.

Lemma 4.1 Let $P, Q \subset A^*$ be prefix codes. If P is a maximal prefix code and $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$, then Q is maximal.

PROOF. P is maximal iff $\text{cl}(PA^\omega) = A^\omega$. And since $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$, $\text{cl}(QA^\omega) = \text{cl}(PA^\omega)$, so $\text{cl}(QA^\omega) = A^\omega$.
 \square

- $[\equiv_{\text{bd}}]$ $P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q$ iff $PA^\omega = QA^\omega$. This is called *bounded end-equivalence*.

By [10, Prop. 3.2], $PA^\omega = QA^\omega$ is equivalent to the following: (1) $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$, and (2) there exists a total function $r: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x_1 \in P$ and $x_2 \in Q$:

$$\text{if } x_1 \parallel_{\text{pref}} x_2 \text{ then } |x_1| \leq r(|x_2|) \text{ and } |x_2| \leq r(|x_1|).$$

Here, \parallel_{pref} denotes comparability in the prefix order \leq_{pref} of A^* .

It follows that $P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q$ implies $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$. The converse does not hold; e.g., $0^*1 \equiv_{\text{end}} \{\varepsilon\}$, but $0^*1 \not\equiv_{\text{bd}} \{\varepsilon\}$.

$P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q$ does not imply $PA^* = QA^*$. E.g., $0\{0,1\} \equiv_{\text{bd}} \{0\}$, but $0\{0,1\}\{0,1\}^* = 0\{0,1\}^+ \neq 0\{0,1\}^*$.

The relation \equiv_{bd} can be extended to a preorder on the set of prefix codes of A^* by defining $P \leq_{\text{bd}} Q$ iff $PA^\omega \subseteq QA^\omega$. Then $P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q$ iff $P \leq_{\text{bd}} Q$ and $Q \leq_{\text{bd}} P$.

- $[\equiv_{\text{poly}}]$ $P \equiv_{\text{poly}} Q$ iff $P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q$, and there exists a polynomial π such that for all $x_1 \in P$ and $x_2 \in Q$: if $x_1 \parallel_{\text{pref}} x_2$ then $|x_1| \leq \pi(|x_2|)$ and $|x_2| \leq \pi(|x_1|)$.

The relation \equiv_{poly} can be extended to a preorder on the set of prefix codes of A^* by defining $P \leq_{\text{poly}} Q$ iff $PA^\omega \subseteq QA^\omega$, and there exists a polynomial p such that for all $x_1 \in P$ and $x_2 \in Q$:

$$\text{if } x_1 \parallel_{\text{pref}} x_2 \text{ then } |x_1| \leq \pi(|x_2|) \text{ and } |x_2| \leq \pi(|x_1|).$$

- $[\equiv_{\text{fin}}]$ $P \equiv_{\text{fin}} Q$ iff the symmetric difference $PA^* \Delta QA^*$ is finite.

The relation \equiv_{fin} can be extended to a preorder on the set of prefix codes of A^* by defining $P \leq_{\text{fin}} Q$ iff $PA^\omega \subseteq QA^\omega$, and the set difference $PA^* \setminus QA^*$ is finite. Then $P \equiv_{\text{fin}} Q$ iff $P \leq_{\text{fin}} Q$ and $Q \leq_{\text{fin}} P$.

We give another characterization of \equiv_{fin} .

Definition 4.2 Let \rightarrow_1 be the relation between prefix codes $P, Q \subset A^*$ defined as follows:

$$P \rightarrow_1 Q \text{ iff there exists } p \in P \text{ such that } Q = (P \setminus \{p\}) \cup pA.$$

This is called a one-step restriction of P (see [12, Lemma 2.22]).

Let \equiv_1^* be the reflexive-symmetric-transitive closure of \rightarrow_1 .

Proposition 4.3 The equivalence relations \equiv_{fin} and \equiv_1^* are the same.

PROOF. This is a special case of [12, Lemma 2.25] for $n = 1$. \square

- $[\equiv_{0^\omega}]$ $P \equiv_{0^\omega} Q$ iff $PA^*0^\omega = QA^*0^\omega$. (Here we assume that $0 \in A$.)

Remark. Let $A = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, and consider the base- k representation of rational numbers in the semi-open interval $[0, 1[$. Then the set $\{0.x_1 \dots x_n 0^\omega : x_1, \dots, x_n \in A, n \geq 1\}$ represents all the k -ary rational numbers in $[0, 1[$ in a unique way. (By definition, a k -ary rational number is a rational number of the form m/k^n for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{N}$.) So we have:

$$P \equiv_{0^\omega} Q \text{ iff } \{0.pu : p \in P, u \in A^*\} = \{0.qv : q \in Q, v \in A^*\} \quad (\subset \mathbb{Q}).$$

We now start studying the relationship between the above equivalence relations.

Lemma 4.4 For finite prefix codes $P, Q \subset A^*$: $P \equiv_{\text{fin}} Q$ iff $P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q$ iff $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$.

PROOF. The first equivalence is a special case of [12, Lemma 2.13], for $n = 1$. The second equivalence holds since for every finite prefix code P , $PA^\omega = \text{cl}(PA^\omega)$ in Cantor space. \square

Lemma 4.5 ($\equiv_{\text{bd}} \Rightarrow \equiv_{0^\omega} \Rightarrow \equiv_{\text{end}}$).

(1) For all prefix codes $P, Q \subseteq A^*$: $P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q \Rightarrow P \equiv_{0^\omega} Q \Rightarrow P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$.

(2) If P and Q are finite, these implications are equivalences (\Leftrightarrow).

But for prefix codes in general (even for finite-state ones), the implications are not equivalences.

PROOF. (1) [First \Rightarrow] Suppose $PA^\omega = QA^\omega$. Then $PA^\omega \cap A^*0^\omega = QA^\omega \cap A^*0^\omega$. And it is easy to prove that $PA^\omega \cap A^*0^\omega = PA^*0^\omega$, and similarly for Q .

[Second \Rightarrow] Suppose $PA^*0^\omega = QA^*0^\omega$, and consider any right-ideal $R \subseteq A^*$. If $PA^* \cap R \neq \emptyset$ then there exist $p \in P$ and $u \in A^*$ such that $pu \in R$. Since $PA^*0^\omega = QA^*0^\omega$, there are $q \in Q$ and $v \in A^*$ such that $pu0^\omega = qv0^\omega$, hence $pu0^i = qv0^j$ for some $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since R is a right ideal, $pu0^i \in R$, hence $qv0^j \in R$. So, $QA^* \cap R \neq \emptyset$. In a similar way one proves that if $QA^* \cap R \neq \emptyset$ then $PA^* \cap R \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$.

(2) We saw in Lemma 4.4 that if P and Q are finite then \equiv_{bd} and \equiv_{end} are the same. Hence, since \equiv_{0^ω} is between \equiv_{bd} and \equiv_{end} , \equiv_{0^ω} is also equal to them.

In general, \equiv_{0^ω} is different from \equiv_{end} . Example: For $A = \{0, 1\}$, Consider 0^*1 and $\{\varepsilon\}$. We have $0^*1 \equiv_{\text{end}} \{\varepsilon\}$; but $0^\omega \in \{0, 1\}^*0^\omega \setminus 0^*1\{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$, so $0^*1 \not\equiv_{0^\omega} \{\varepsilon\}$.

In general, \equiv_{0^ω} is different from \equiv_{bd} . Example: For $A = \{0, 1\}$, Consider 1^*0 and $\{\varepsilon\}$. We have $1^*0 \not\equiv_{\text{bd}} \{\varepsilon\}$, since $1^\omega \notin 1^*0\{0, 1\}^\omega$. However we can prove that $1^*0\{0, 1\}^*0^\omega = \{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$, so $1^*0 \equiv_{0^\omega} \{\varepsilon\}$.

Proof that $1^*0\{0, 1\}^*0^\omega = \{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$:

We obviously have " \subseteq ". Let us prove " \supseteq ". For any element $u0^\omega \in \{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$ we have the following cases:

(a) $u \in 0^*$: Then $u0^\omega = 0^\omega \in 1^*0\{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$.

(b) $u \in 1^*$: Then $u0^\omega = 1^n0^\omega \in 1^*0\{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$.

(c.1) u contains both 0 and 1, and starts with 1: Then $u0^\omega = 1^n0v0^\omega \in 1^*0\{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$.

(c.2) u contains both 0 and 1, and starts with 0: Then $u0^\omega = 0v0^\omega = \varepsilon0v0^\omega \in 1^*0\{0, 1\}^*0^\omega$. \square

Remark. Since \equiv_{0^ω} implies \equiv_{end} , we could have used \equiv_{0^ω} instead of \equiv_{end} in the definitions of \equiv_{bd} and \equiv_{poly} (given above).

Proposition 4.6 (preservation of finiteness). Let $P, Q \subseteq A^*$ be prefix codes.

If P is finite and $P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q$, then Q is finite.

This does not hold in general for \equiv_{0^ω} (and hence not for \equiv_{end}).

PROOF. The first claim is proved in [10, Lemma 3.15].

An example where this does not hold for \equiv_{0^ω} is $1^*0 \equiv_{0^\omega} \{\varepsilon\}$ (used in the proof of Lemma 4.5(2)). This implies $1^*0 \equiv_{\text{end}} \{\varepsilon\}$. \square

Proposition 4.7 For finite prefix codes $P, Q \subseteq A^*$ the following are equivalent:

$$P \equiv_{\text{fin}} Q, \quad P \equiv_{\text{poly}} Q, \quad P \equiv_{\text{bd}} Q, \quad P \equiv_{0^\omega} Q, \quad P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q.$$

PROOF. The left-to-right implications hold for all prefix codes: The first two are obvious, and the last three hold by Lemma 4.5(1). In the other direction: For finite prefix codes, $P \equiv_{\text{end}} Q$ implies $P \equiv_{\text{fin}} Q$ by Lemma 4.4. \square

4.2 Congruence relations on $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$

In [10] we extended the equivalence relations \equiv_{end} , \equiv_{bd} and \equiv_{poly} from prefix codes to right-ideal morphisms. We do this more generally:

Definition 4.8 *Let \equiv_X is any one of \equiv_{end} , \equiv_{0^ω} , \equiv_{bd} , \equiv_{poly} , or \equiv_{fin} . For right-ideal morphisms f, g of A^* we define $f \equiv_X g$ by*

$$f \equiv_X g \text{ iff } \text{domC}(f) \equiv_X \text{domC}(g), \text{ and } f(x) = g(x) \text{ for all } x \in \text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g).$$

In [10] we proved that \equiv_{end} , \equiv_{bd} and \equiv_{poly} are congruences on the \mathcal{RM}^{P} . In the rest of this subsection we prove now that \equiv_{0^ω} and \equiv_{fin} are also congruences.

In the next Proposition the following is used: By definition, a function $f : A^* \rightarrow A^*$ is **balanced** iff there exists a total function $\pi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x \in \text{Dom}(f)$: $|f(x)| \leq \pi(|x|)$ and $|x| \leq \pi(|f(x)|)$.

One can show that f is balanced iff for all $y \in \text{Im}(f)$: $f^{-1}(y)$ is finite.

Proposition 4.9 *The relation \equiv_{fin} is a congruence on the monoid of all balanced right-ideal morphisms of A^* .*

PROOF. We want to show that if f, g, h are balanced right-ideal morphisms, and $f \equiv_{\text{fin}} g$, then $fh \equiv_{\text{fin}} gh$ and $hf \equiv_{\text{fin}} hg$. It follows from $f \equiv_{\text{fin}} g$ that $f \equiv_{\text{bd}} g$ and that $\text{Dom}(f) \Delta \text{Dom}(g)$ is finite. Since \equiv_{bd} is a congruence (as was proved in [10]), it follows that $fh \equiv_{\text{bd}} gh$ and $hf \equiv_{\text{bd}} hg$. Hence it will suffice to show that $\text{Dom}(fh) \Delta \text{Dom}(gh)$ and $\text{Dom}(hf) \Delta \text{Dom}(hg)$ are finite.

For hf and hg , consider any $x \in \text{Dom}(hf) \setminus \text{Dom}(hg)$, i.e., $hf(x)$ is defined but $hg(x)$ is not defined. It is not possible for both $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ to be defined (otherwise, $f(x) = g(x)$ since $f \equiv_{\text{fin}} g$, and then both $hf(x)$ and $hg(x)$ would be defined). Hence, $f(x)$ is defined but $g(x)$ is not defined. Since $\text{Dom}(f) \Delta \text{Dom}(g)$ is finite, there are only finitely many such x , so $\text{Dom}(hf) \setminus \text{Dom}(hg)$ is finite. In a similar way one proves that $\text{Dom}(hg) \setminus \text{Dom}(hf)$ is finite.

For fh and gh , consider any $x \in \text{Dom}(fh) \setminus \text{Dom}(gh)$, i.e., $fh(x)$ (hence $h(x)$) is defined but $gh(x)$ is not defined. Hence, $h(x) \in \text{Dom}(f) \setminus \text{Dom}(g)$, which is finite. Thus, there are only finitely many choices for $h(x)$. Since h is balanced it follows that there are only finitely many choices for $x \in h^{-1}h(x)$, so $\text{Dom}(fh) \setminus \text{Dom}(gh)$ is finite. In a similar way one proves that $\text{Dom}(gh) \setminus \text{Dom}(fh)$ is finite. \square

In order to prove that \equiv_{0^ω} is a congruence we use two lemmas.

Lemma 4.10 *For any prefix codes $P, Q \subseteq A^*$: $(PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega = PA^*0^\omega \cap QA^*0^\omega$.*

PROOF. [\subseteq] Since $PA^* \cap QA^* \subseteq PA^*$, we have $(PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega \subseteq PA^*0^\omega$; similarly $(PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega \subseteq QA^*0^\omega$. Hence, $(PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega \subseteq PA^*0^\omega \cap QA^*0^\omega$.

[\supseteq] If $x \in PA^*0^\omega \cap QA^*0^\omega$ then $x = pu0^\omega = qv0^\omega$, for some $p \in P$, $q \in Q$ and $u, v \in A^*$. Hence $pu0^i = qv0^j$ for some $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. So $x = pu0^i0^\omega = qv0^j0^\omega$ for some $pu0^i = qv0^j \in PA^* \cap QA^*$; hence $x \in (PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega$. \square

Lemma 4.11 *For any prefix codes $P, Q \subseteq A^*$ and any right-ideal morphism h of A^* :*

$$PA^*0^\omega = QA^*0^\omega \text{ implies } h^{-1}(PA^*)0^\omega = h^{-1}(QA^*)0^\omega.$$

PROOF. By Lemma 4.10, $PA^*0^\omega = QA^*0^\omega = (PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega$. Our result will follow if we prove

$$h^{-1}(PA^*)0^\omega = h^{-1}(PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega,$$

and similarly for Q ; then indeed, $h^{-1}(PA^*)0^\omega = h^{-1}(PA^* \cap QA^*)0^\omega = h^{-1}(QA^*)0^\omega$.

It is obvious that $h^{-1}(PA^* \cap QA^*) 0^\omega \subseteq h^{-1}(PA^*) 0^\omega$.

Let us prove that $h^{-1}(PA^*) 0^\omega \subseteq h^{-1}(PA^* \cap QA^*) 0^\omega$. Any $x \in h^{-1}(PA^*) 0^\omega$ is of the form $x = z0^\omega$ where $h(z) = pu$ for some $p \in P$ and $u \in A^*$. Then, since $PA^* 0^\omega = QA^* 0^\omega$ we have: $h(z)0^\omega = pu0^\omega = qv0^\omega$, for some $q \in Q$ and $v \in A^*$. Hence, $pu0^i = qv0^j$ for some $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, $h(z0^i) = pu0^i = qv0^j \in PA^* \cap QA^*$, so $z0^i \in h^{-1}(PA^* \cap QA^*)$. Therefore, $x = z0^i 0^\omega \in h^{-1}(PA^* \cap QA^*) 0^\omega$. \square

Proposition 4.12 *The relation \equiv_{0^ω} is a congruence on the monoid of all right-ideal morphisms of A^* (and in particular on the monoids $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and \mathcal{RM}^{P}).*

PROOF. Let f, g, h be right-ideal morphisms of A^* such that $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$. We want to show that $fh(\cdot) \equiv_{0^\omega} gh(\cdot)$ and $hf(\cdot) \equiv_{0^\omega} hg(\cdot)$. Since $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$ implies $f \equiv_{\text{end}} g$ by Lemma 4.5, and \equiv_{end} is a congruence by [10, Prop. 2.17], we conclude: $fh(\cdot) \equiv_{\text{end}} gh(\cdot)$ and $hf(\cdot) \equiv_{\text{end}} hg(\cdot)$. The Proposition then follows from the Claims below.

Claim 1. $\text{Dom}(fh(\cdot)) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(gh(\cdot)) 0^\omega$.

Proof of Claim 1: By [12, Prop. 3.5], $\text{Dom}(fh(\cdot)) = \text{Dom}(h) \cap h^{-1}(\text{Dom}(f))$. By Lemma 4.10, this implies that $\text{Dom}(fh(\cdot)) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(h) 0^\omega \cap h^{-1}(\text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega)$. By Lemma 4.11, and since $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$, this is equal to $\text{Dom}(h) 0^\omega \cap h^{-1}(\text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega)$; and this is $\text{Dom}(gh(\cdot))$. [End, proof of Claim 1]

Claim 2. $fh(\cdot)$ and $gh(\cdot)$ agree on $\text{Dom}(fh(\cdot)) \cap \text{Dom}(gh(\cdot))$.

Proof of Claim 2: By Lemma 4.5, \equiv_{0^ω} implies \equiv_{end} on all prefix codes; and the requirement of agreement on the intersection of the domains is the same for \equiv_{0^ω} and \equiv_{end} . And \equiv_{end} is a congruence (by [10, Prop. 2. 17]); now, since $fh(\cdot) \equiv_{\text{end}} gh(\cdot)$, $fh(\cdot)$ and $gh(\cdot)$ agree on $\text{Dom}(fh(\cdot)) \cap \text{Dom}(gh(\cdot))$. [End, proof of Claim 2]

Claims 1 and 2 imply that if $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$ then $fh(\cdot) \equiv_{0^\omega} gh(\cdot)$.

Claim 3. $\text{Dom}(hf(\cdot)) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(hg(\cdot)) 0^\omega$.

Proof of Claim 3: By [12, Prop. 3.5], $\text{Dom}(hf(\cdot)) = \text{Dom}(f) \cap f^{-1}(\text{Dom}(h))$, so $\text{Dom}(hf(\cdot)) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega \cap f^{-1}(\text{Dom}(h)) 0^\omega$. Hence for every $x \in \text{Dom}(hf(\cdot))$ we have $x \in \text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega$, and $x = z0^\omega$ for some $z \in A^*$ such that $f(z) \in \text{Dom}(h)$. Since $\text{Dom}(h)$ is a right ideal, $f(z0^i) = f(z)0^i \in \text{Dom}(h)$, for all $i \geq 0$. Since $\text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega$ and $\text{Dom}(f)$ and $\text{Dom}(g)$ are right ideals, we have $z0^i \in \text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)$ for all i large enough. Now, $x = z0^i 0^\omega$, where $z0^i \in \text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)$; moreover, $f(z0^i) = g(z0^i)$, since f and g agree on $\text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)$. Hence, $f(z) 0^\omega \in \text{Dom}(h)$ is equivalent to $g(z) 0^\omega \in \text{Dom}(h)$. Therefore, $x \in \text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega \cap g^{-1}(\text{Dom}(h)) 0^\omega$. Thus, $\text{Dom}(hf(\cdot)) \subseteq \text{Dom}(hg(\cdot))$. In the same way one proves that $\text{Dom}(hg(\cdot)) \subseteq \text{Dom}(hf(\cdot))$. [End, proof of Claim 3]

Claim 4. $hf(\cdot)$ and $hg(\cdot)$ agree on $\text{Dom}(hf(\cdot)) \cap \text{Dom}(hg(\cdot))$.

Claim 4 is proved in the same way as Claim 2.

Claims 3 and 4 imply that if $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$ then $hf(\cdot) \equiv_{0^\omega} hg(\cdot)$. \square

4.3 Defining Thompson monoids

The monoid $M_{k,1}$ is defined (see [7]) as the quotient monoid

$$M_{k,1} = \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} / \equiv_{\text{fin}}.$$

On $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ the congruence \equiv_{fin} is equal to various other congruences, as seen in Prop. 4.7. Therefore,

$$M_{k,1} = \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} / \equiv_{\text{fin}} = \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} / \equiv_{\text{poly}} = \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} / \equiv_{\text{bd}} = \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} / \equiv_{0^\omega} = \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} / \equiv_{\text{end}}.$$

Thompson's original monoid can be defined by

$$\text{tot}M_{k,1} = \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} / \equiv_{\text{fin}},$$

where the same monoid is obtained if \equiv_{fin} is replaced by the other congruences. (Thompson originally defined this monoid as the monoid generated by a certain finite set of generators acting on the Cantor space $\{0, 1\}^\omega$, and on other sets.)

The Thompson group V can be defined by

$$V = \text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}},$$

where the same monoid is obtained if \equiv_{fin} is replaced by the other congruences. The Thompson group V is the *group of units* of each one of the monoids $M_{k,1}$, $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$, $\text{sur}M_{k,1}$, $\text{inj}M_{k,1}$, and their intersections.

We also define

$$\text{tfl}M_{2,1} = \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\text{pfl}M_{2,1} = \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}},$$

where the same monoid is obtained if \equiv_{fin} is replaced by the other congruences. These are called the Thompson monoids of total, or partial, **fixed-length input** functions.

These Thompson monoids have another characterization:

Lemma 4.13 *The monoids $\text{plep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}}$ are isomorphic.*

The monoids $\text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}}$ are isomorphic.

PROOF. For every $f \in \text{plep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ let $m = \text{maxlen}(\text{dom}C(f))$. Then $f|_{\{0,1\}^m} \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, and $f \equiv_{\text{fin}} f|_{\{0,1\}^m}$. So, $\text{plep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}}$ is isomorphic to $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}}$ by the isomorphism $[f]_{\text{fin}} \mapsto [f|_{\{0,1\}^m}]_{\text{fin}}$, with f ranging over $\text{plep}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$; here $[f]_{\text{fin}}$ denotes the \equiv_{fin} -class of f .

A similar reasoning applies for tlep and tfl . \square

As a consequence of Lemma 4.13, we use the notations $\text{tfl}M_{2,1}$ and $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ interchangeably, and similarly for $\text{pfl}M_{2,1}$ and $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$.

We also consider the subgroup

$$\text{lp}M_{k,1} = \text{lp}\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}/\equiv_{\text{fin}},$$

where

$$\text{lp}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} = \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : |f(x)| = |x| \text{ for all } x \in \text{Dom}(f)\}.$$

The latter is called the monoid of *length-preserving* right-ideal morphisms.

The group $\text{lp}V$ is the subgroup of length-preserving elements of V (see [4]), and it is the *group of units* of the monoids $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$ and $\text{tlep}M_{k,1}$.

We next study faithful actions of $M_{k,1}$ and its submonoids and subgroups. It is well known that $G_{k,1}$ acts faithfully on A^ω , and $M_{k,1}$ acts similarly on A^ω (see [8, Subections 1.2-1.3]).

Here we will show that $M_{k,1}$ and $G_{k,1}$ also act faithfully on A^*0^ω . As opposed to A^ω , the set A^*0^ω is countable.

We extend right-ideal morphisms of A^* to functions on A^ω , as follows. For any right-ideal morphism f , any $x \in \text{Dom}(f)$, and any $z \in A^\omega$, we define

$$(a) \quad f(x) = f(x)z.$$

In particular, we can let $z = 0^\omega$, and in that case f is just extended to A^*0^ω . The extension of f to A^ω or to A^*0^ω will also be called f ; and usually we will view right-ideal morphisms of A^* as functions on $A^* \cup A^\omega$.

Lemma 4.14 *If $y_1, y_2 \in A^*$ are such that $(\forall z \in A^*)[y_1 z 0^\omega = y_2 z 0^\omega]$, then $y_1 = y_2$.*

PROOF. Since $y_1 z 0^\omega = y_2 z 0^\omega$, the strings y_1 and y_2 are prefix-comparable. Let us assume $y_1 \leq_{\text{pref}} y_2$ (the case $y_2 \leq_{\text{pref}} y_1$ is similar). Then $y_2 = y_1 v$ for some $v \in A^*$, so $y_1 z 0^\omega = y_1 v z 0^\omega$, which implies $z 0^\omega = v z 0^\omega$, for all $z \in A^*$. Suppose (for a contradiction) that $v \neq \varepsilon$. Let $a \in A$ denote the left-most letter in v . Since z is arbitrary, we can pick $z \in A \setminus \{a\}$. Then $z 0^\omega \neq v z 0^\omega$ (since they start with different letters), so we have a contradiction. Hence $v = \varepsilon$, so $y_1 = y_2$. \square

Proposition 4.15.

(1) *For any two right-ideal morphisms f, g of A^* (and their extensions to A^ω and to $A^* 0^\omega$):*

$$f \equiv_{0^\omega} g \quad \text{iff} \quad f|_{A^* 0^\omega} = g|_{A^* 0^\omega} \quad (\text{i.e., } f \text{ and } g \text{ have the same action on } A^* 0^\omega).$$

(2) *The monoid $M_{k,1}$ and the Higman-Thompson group $G_{k,1}$ act faithfully on $A^* 0^\omega$ by the action (a).*

PROOF. (1) follows from the next two Claims.

Claim 1. If two right-ideal morphisms f, g act the same on $A^* 0^\omega$ then $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$.

Proof of Claim 1: Since f and g act the same on $A^* 0^\omega$, they have the same domain in $A^* 0^\omega$; i.e., $\text{domC}(f) A^* 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega = \text{domC}(g) A^* 0^\omega$. Hence, $\text{domC}(f) \equiv_{0^\omega} \text{domC}(g)$.

Moreover, since f and g act the same on $A^* 0^\omega$ they agree on $\text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega \cap \text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega = (\text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)) 0^\omega$; the latter equality holds by Lemma 4.10. Hence, for all $x \in \text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)$ and all $z \in A^*$: $f(x) z 0^\omega = g(x) z 0^\omega$. Since this holds for all z , we conclude (by Lemma 4.14) that for all $x \in \text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)$: $f(x) = g(x)$. So f and g agree on $\text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)$. Thus, $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$. [This proves Claim 1.]

Claim 2. If $f, g \in \mathcal{RM}^P$ satisfy $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$ then f and g act the same on $A^* 0^\omega$.

Proof of Claim 2: Since $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$ we have $\text{domC}(f) A^* 0^\omega = \text{domC}(g) A^* 0^\omega$, hence f and g have the same domain in $A^* 0^\omega$. Moreover, $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$ implies that f and g agree on $\text{Dom}(f) \cap \text{Dom}(g)$, by the definition of $f \equiv_{0^\omega} g$. This implies that f acts the same as g on $\text{Dom}(f) 0^\omega = \text{Dom}(g) 0^\omega$. [This proves Claim 2.]

(2) Since for finite prefix codes, \equiv_{0^ω} coincides with \equiv_{fin} , it follows that $M_{k,1}$ acts faithfully on $A^* 0^\omega$ by the action (a). Hence, any submonoid of $M_{k,1}$, in particular $G_{k,1}$, also acts faithfully on $A^* 0^\omega$ by the action (a). \square

Remark. We saw already (in the Remark after the definition of $\equiv_{A^* 0^\omega}$) that $A^* 0^\omega$ is in 1-to-1 correspondence with the set \mathbb{Q}_k of k -ary rationals in $[0, 1[$, via the map $x 0^\omega \in A^* 0^\omega \mapsto 0.x \in \mathbb{Q}_k \cap [0, 1[$. So the action of $M_{2,1}$ on $A^* 0^\omega$ is also an action on the set $\mathbb{Q}_k \cap [0, 1[$.

Summary of Thompson monoids

We have defined the following Thompson monoids:

- $M_{k,1}$, the action monoid of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ on A^ω (and on $A^* 0^\omega$), with $|A| = k$.
- $\text{tot}M_{k,1} = \{f \in M_{k,1} : \text{Dom}(f) \text{ is an essential right ideal of } A^*\}$.
Equivalently, f acting on A^ω (or on $A^* 0^\omega$) is a total function.
(For $k = 2$, this is Thompson's original monoid.)
- $\text{sur}M_{k,1} = \{f \in M_{k,1} : \text{Im}(f) \text{ is an essential right ideal of } A^*\}$.
Equivalently, f acting on A^ω (or on $A^* 0^\omega$) is a surjective function.
- $\text{inj}M_{k,1} = \{f \in M_{k,1} : f \text{ is injective on } A^\omega\}$.
- $\text{plep}M_{k,1} = \{f \in M_{k,1} : (\forall x_1, x_2 \in \text{Dom}(f) \subseteq A^*)[|x_1| = |x_2| \Rightarrow |f(x_1)| = |f(x_2)|]\}$.

These functions are called *(partial) length-equality preserving*.

- $\text{tlep}M_{k,1} = \{f \in \text{tot}M_{k,1} : (\forall x_1, x_2 \in \text{Dom}(f) \subseteq A^*)[|x_1| = |x_2| \Rightarrow |f(x_1)| = |f(x_2)|]\}$.

These functions are called *total and length-equality preserving*.

5 Finite generation of $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$

The proof that the monoid $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated is carried out in several steps, and is based in part on earlier results. In [6] it was shown that $M_{2,1}$ is finitely generated. Recall that $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ uses the alphabet $\{0, 1\}$.

In [9] it was shown that the following submonoid of $\mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated:

$$\text{totsurinj}RM^{\text{fin}} = \{f \in \mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is injective, and both } \text{domC}(f) \text{ and } \text{imC}(f) \text{ are finite maximal prefix codes}\}.$$

In [9] this monoid was called $\text{riAut}(k)$ (for “right-ideal automorphisms”).

5.1 Normal functions

One of the difficulties in the study of right-ideal morphisms of A^* comes from the existence of non-normal right-ideal morphisms, as defined next.

Definition 5.1 *A right-ideal morphism f of A^* is called **normal** iff $f(\text{domC}(f)) = \text{imC}(f)$.*

It is easy to prove [10, Lemma 5.7] that this is equivalent to $f^{-1}(\text{imC}(f)) = \text{domC}(f)$.

For any right-ideal morphism f of A^* :

$$\text{imC}(f) \subseteq f(\text{domC}(f)), \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-1}(\text{imC}(f)) \subseteq \text{domC}(f),$$

by [10, Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2]. These inclusions could be strict, as illustrated by the following example. Let f be the right-ideal morphism defined by $\text{domC}(f) = \{00, 01\}$, $\text{imC}(f) = \{0\}$, and for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$: $f(00x) = 0x$, $f(01x) = 00x$. So, $f(\{00, 01\}) = \{0, 00\}$, hence f is non-normal.

All injective right-ideal morphisms are normal [10, Lemma 5.2]). So non-normal right-ideal morphisms are not encountered in the study of the Thompson group $G_{2,1}$ and its subgroups.

In [7, Theorem 4.5B] it was shown that every right-ideal morphism in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is \equiv_{fin} -equivalent to a normal right-ideal morphism in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. So in the study of $M_{2,1}$, non-normal morphisms can ultimately avoided (although they show up as intermediate products in calculations).

Every function in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is normal (as is easily proved). However, there exist non-normal functions in $\text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. E.g., for f given by the table $\{(0, 0), (10, 00)\}$ we have $f(\text{domC}(f)) = \{0, 00\} \neq \{0\} = \text{imC}(f)$.

For the finite generation of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ the following is crucial.

Theorem 5.2 (injective-normal factorization).

For every non-normal right-ideal morphism $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ there is an injective right-ideal morphism $j \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and a normal right-ideal morphism $\nu \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ such that

$$f(\cdot) = \nu \circ j(\cdot).$$

Moreover, if f is total then j and ν are total.

PROOF. Let $P = \text{dom}C(f)$ and $Q = \text{im}C(f)$. For every $p \in P$ there exists a unique $q_p \in Q$ and a unique $u_p \in A^*$ such that $f(p) = q_p u_p$. We define the right-ideal morphisms j and ν as follows:

$$\text{dom}C(j) = \text{dom}C(\nu) = P;$$

and for every $p \in P$:

$$\begin{aligned} j(p) &= p u_p, \quad \text{and} \\ \nu(p) &= q_p. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\nu \circ j = f$. Indeed, for any $p \in P$ we have $\nu(j(p)) = \nu(p u_p) = \nu(p) u_p = q_p u_p = f(p)$.

The morphism j is injective, since p is the unique prefix of $p u_p$ that belongs to the prefix code P . We have $\text{im}C(j) = \{p u_p : p \in P\}$. This is a prefix code, since if $p_1 u_{p_1}$ is a prefix of $p_2 u_{p_2}$ for $p_1, p_2 \in P$, then p_1 and p_2 are prefix-comparable; hence $p_1 = p_2$ (since P is a prefix code); and then $u_{p_1} = u_{p_2}$ (since p uniquely determines u_p).

For the right-ideal morphism ν we have $\nu(P) = Q = \text{im}C(\nu)$, hence ν is normal.

We saw that $\text{dom}C(j) = \text{dom}C(\nu) = P$. So, if P is a maximal prefix code then j and ν , as constructed above, are total. \square

Since injective right-ideal morphisms are normal (by Lemma 5.2 in [10]), Theorem 5.2 implies:

Proposition 5.3 *Every non-normal right-ideal morphism in $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, or in $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, is the composite of two normal right-ideal morphisms in $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, respectively in $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. \square*

5.2 Proof that $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated

The proof has the following outline (and has some overlap with the proof of finite generation of $M_{k,1}$ in [7]): (1) We saw that $\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ (a.k.a. $\text{riAut}(k)$) is finitely generated (see [9]). (2) We prove that the submonoid of injective elements of $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated. (3) We show that the set of all normal elements of $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated. (4) By Prop. 5.3 it follows that $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated.

Proposition 5.4 *The submonoid $\text{inj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}} = \{f \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}} : f \text{ is injective}\}$ is finitely generated.*

PROOF. Consider any $f \in \text{inj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, and let $P = \text{dom}C(f)$ and $Q = \text{im}C(f)$. Since injective right-ideal morphisms are normal, $f(P) = Q$ and $f^{-1}(Q) = P$. By injectiveness, $|P| = |Q|$.

- Case 1: P and Q are both maximal prefix codes.

Then $f \in \text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, so f is generated by any finite generating set of $\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$.

- Case 2: P and Q are both non-maximal prefix codes.

Then by [6, Lemma 3.1] there exist maximal prefix codes $P_M, Q_M \subset \{0,1\}^*$ such that $P \subset P_M$, $Q \subset Q_M$, and $|P_M| = |Q_M|$. Consider the following ‘‘standard’’ maximal prefix code $C \subset 0^*1$ of cardinality $|P_M|$:

$$C = 0^{|P_M|-2}\{0,1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : 0 \leq r \leq |P_M| - 3\}.$$

Since P is not empty and is a non-maximal prefix code, we have $|P_M| \geq 2$. The second set in the above union is empty when $|P_M| = 2$. It is easy to see that C is a maximal prefix code, and $|C| = |P_M|$.

Since $|C| = |P_M| = |Q_M|$, and these are maximal prefix codes, there exist right-ideal morphisms $g_1 : C\{0,1\}^* \rightarrow P_M\{0,1\}^*$, $g_2 : Q_M\{0,1\}^* \rightarrow C\{0,1\}^*$, with g_2, g_1 chosen in $\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ in such a way that $g_2 f g_1 = \text{id}_D$. Here, $D \subset C$ is chosen to consist of the first $|P|$ elements of C in dictionary order. More precisely,

$$D = 0^{|P_M|-2}\{0,1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : |P_M| - |P| \leq r \leq |P_M| - 3\}.$$

Since g_1 and g_2 are injective, it follows from $g_2 f g_1(\cdot) = \text{id}_D$ that $f = g_2^{-1} \text{id}_D g_1^{-1}(\cdot)$.

It is straightforward to prove that $D \equiv_{\text{fin}} 0^{|P_M|-|P|}\{0,1\}$, so $\text{id}_D \equiv_{\text{fin}} \text{id}_{0^{|P_M|-|P|}\{0,1\}}$ (the latter is the identity restricted to the right-ideal $0^{|P_M|-|P|}\{0,1\}\{0,1\}^*$). It was proved in [6, Lemma 3.3] that for all $j > 0$: $\text{id}_{0^j\{0,1\}}$ is generated by $\{(0 \rightarrow 00), (00 \rightarrow 0), \text{id}_{0^j\{0,1\}}\}$. (In [6, Lemma 3.3], this was proved in $M_{2,1}$, but the proof does not use \equiv_{fin} , just composition, and the restrictions implied by composition.)

Finally, $0^{|P_M|-|P|}\{0,1\} \equiv_{\text{fin}} D \subset C = \text{im}C(g_1^{-1}) = \text{dom}C(g_2^{-1})$. Since we have $D\{0,1\}^* \subseteq 0^{|P_M|-|P|}\{0,1\}\{0,1\}^*$, id_D is obtained from $\text{id}_{0^{|P_M|-|P|}\{0,1\}}$ by restriction. So can just use composition (with g_1^{-1} on the right and g_2^{-1} on the left) to implement this \equiv_{fin} -equivalence; hence

$$g_2^{-1} \text{id}_{0^{|P_M|-|P|}\{0,1\}} g_1^{-1} = g_2^{-1} \text{id}_D g_1^{-1} (= f).$$

Since $g_2, g_1 \in \text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, it follows that f is generated by a finite generating set of $\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ together with the finite set $\{(0 \rightarrow 00), (00 \rightarrow 0), \text{id}_{0\{0,1\}}, \text{id}_{\{0,1\}}\} \subset \text{inj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

- Case 3: P is a maximal prefix code, and Q is non-maximal.

Then by [6, Lemma 3.1] there exists a maximal prefix code $Q_M \subset \{0,1\}^*$ such that $Q \subset Q_M$ and $|P| = |Q| < |Q_M|$. Consider the following “standard” maximal prefix code $C' \subset 0^*1$ of cardinality $|Q_M|$:

$$C' = 0^{|Q_M|-2}\{0,1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : 0 \leq r \leq |Q_M| - 3\}.$$

As in Case 2, we have $|Q_M| \geq 2$, and C' is a maximal prefix code with $|C'| = |Q_M|$, where C is the “standard” maximal prefix code of cardinality $|P|$:

$$C = 0^{|P|-2}\{0,1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : |P| - 3 \geq r \geq 0\}.$$

If $|P| = 2$ then $P = \{0,1\}$ and this formula yields $C = P$. If $|P| = 1$ then $P = \{\varepsilon\}$, and we choose $C = P$.

As in Case 2, there exist $g_2, g_1 \in \text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ with $g_1 : C\{0,1\}^* \rightarrow P\{0,1\}^*$, and $g_2 : Q_M\{0,1\}^* \rightarrow C'\{0,1\}^*$, where g_2, g_1 are chosen so that $g_2 f g_1 : C\{0,1\}^* \rightarrow C'\{0,1\}^*$ preserves the dictionary order, and maps C bijectively onto the first $|P|$ elements of C' in the dictionary order. Let S be this set of the first $|P|$ elements of C' , so

$$S = 0^{|Q_M|-2}\{0,1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : |Q_M| - |P| \leq r \leq |Q_M| - 3\}.$$

Then $P \equiv_{\text{fin}} \{\varepsilon\}$, $S \equiv_{\text{fin}} 0^{|Q_M|-|P|-1}\{0,1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : |Q_M| - |P| - 2 \geq r \geq 0\}$, both P and S are final segments of 0^*1 in the dictionary order, and $g_2 f g_1(\cdot)$ preserves the dictionary order. Hence, $g_2 f g_1(\cdot) \equiv_{\text{fin}} (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{|Q_M|-|P|})$. Moreover,

$$S\{0,1\}^* \subseteq (0^{|Q_M|-|P|-1}\{0,1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : |Q_M| - |P| - 2 \geq r \geq 0\})\{0,1\}^*,$$

so \equiv_{fin} can be implemented by composition (with g_1^{-1} on the right and g_2^{-1} on the left). Hence $(f =) g_2^{-1} g_2 f g_1 g_1^{-1} = g_2^{-1} (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^{|Q_M|-|P|}) g_1^{-1}$.

By [6, Lemma 3.3], for any $j \geq 1$, $(\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^j)$ is generated by $\{(\varepsilon \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 00), (00 \rightarrow 0)\}$. So f is generated by a finite generating set of $\text{totsurinj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and the finite set $\{(\varepsilon \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 00), (00 \rightarrow 0)\} \subset \text{inj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$.

- Case 4: P is a non-maximal prefix code, and Q is maximal.

This is proved by applying Case 3 to f^{-1} , and by using the inverses of the generators of Case 3. \square

Prop. 5.4 was proved for the binary alphabet $A = \{0,1\}$, but the same proof could be adapted to $A = \{0,1,\dots,k-1\}$ for any $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 5.5 *The normal elements of $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ are generated by a finite set of normal elements.*

PROOF. Let $f \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ be a normal element with $P = \text{domC}(f)$, $Q = \text{imC}(f)$; by normality, $Q = f(P)$ and $P = f^{-1}(Q)$. The proof is similar in outline to the proof of finite generation of $M_{k,1}$ [6, Theorem 3.5].

If $|P| = |Q|$ then f is injective; and for $\text{inj}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ we already have a finite generating set, by Prop. 5.4). For the remainder of the proof we have $|P| > |Q|$.

Claim. *Let $f \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ be a normal right-ideal morphism, with $P = \text{domC}(f)$, $Q = \text{imC}(f) = f(Q)$, such that $|P| > |Q|$. Then f is equal to a composite of $\leq |P| - |Q|$ normal right-ideal morphisms $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ with $P_i = \text{domC}(\varphi_i)$ and $Q_i = \text{imC}(\varphi_i) = \varphi_i(P_i)$, such that $|P_i| - |Q_i| \leq 1$.*

Proof of the Claim: We use induction on $|P| - |Q|$. In the base case, $|P| - |Q| = 1$, there is nothing to prove. Assume now $|P| - |Q| \geq 2$; then one, or both, of the next two cases apply.

Case 1: There exist $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in P$ with $f(x_1) = f(x_2) = f(x_3) (= y_1 \in Q)$, with x_1, x_2, x_3 all different.

Then $f(\cdot) = \psi_2\psi_1(\cdot)$, where ψ_2, ψ_1 are defined as follows: $\text{domC}(\psi_1) = P$, $\text{imC}(\psi_1) = P \setminus \{x_1\}$, and $\psi_1(x_1) = \psi_1(x_2) = x_2$; $\psi_1(x) = x$ for all $x \in P \setminus \{x_1\}$. And $\text{domC}(\psi_2) = P \setminus \{x_1\}$ and $\text{imC}(\psi_2) = Q$, and $\psi_2(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in P \setminus \{x_1\}$; in particular, $\psi_2(x_2) = \psi_2(x_3) = y_1$. Then ψ_2, ψ_1 are normal. For the sizes of their domain code and image code we have: $|P| - |P \setminus \{x_1\}| = 1$ for ψ_1 . And $|P \setminus \{x_1\}| - |Q| = |P| - |Q| - 1 < |P| - |Q|$, so the inductive step applies to ψ_2 .

Case 2: There exist $x_1, x_2 \in P$ with $f(x_1) = f(x_2) (= y_1 \in Q)$, and there exist $x_3, x_4 \in P$ with $f(x_3) = f(x_4) (= y_2 \in Q)$, with $y_1 \neq y_2$, and x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 all different.

Then $f(\cdot) = \psi_2\psi_1(\cdot)$, where ψ_2, ψ_1 are the same as in Case 1.

In either case, f is factored into one normal function with difference 1, and one with difference $|P| - |Q| - 1 < |P| - |Q|$. So, by induction, f is factored into $\leq |P| - |Q|$ normal functions with difference 1. [This proves the Claim.]

By the Claim it suffices to show that every normal $f \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ with $|P| - |Q| = 1$ is generated by a finite set of normal elements. Let us denote $|P| = n$, $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$, $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}\}$, such that $f(p_i) = q_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, and $f(p_n) = q_{n-1}$. Except for $f(p_{n-1}) = f(p_n) = q_{n-1}$, the indexing is arbitrary. We define a ‘‘standard’’ prefix code $C \subset 0^*1$ of size $|C| = |P|$:

$$C = 0^{|P|-2}\{0, 1\} \cup \{0^r 1 : 0 \leq r \leq |P| - 3\}.$$

This is the same code C as in Prop. 5.4. When $|P| = 2$ the formula yields $C = \{0, 1\}$. Since $|P| = |Q| + 1$, we have $|P| \geq 2$. We enumerate C in increasing dictionary order as (c_1, \dots, c_n) ; so $c_1 = 0^{n-1}$, and $c_i = 0^{n-i}1$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$; in particular, $c_n = 1$.

We factor f as $f(\cdot) = \psi_3\psi_2\psi_1(\cdot)$, where ψ_3, ψ_2, ψ_1 are defined as follows on their domain and image codes:

$\psi_1 : P \rightarrow C$ is the bijection $p_i \mapsto c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

$\psi_2 : C \rightarrow C \setminus \{c_n\}$ is given by $c_i \mapsto c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $c_n \mapsto c_{n-1}$.

$\psi_3 : C \setminus \{c_n\} \rightarrow Q$ is the bijection $c_i \mapsto q_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

Clearly, $f(\cdot) = \psi_3\psi_2\psi_1(\cdot)$. Since ψ_1 and ψ_3 are injective they are finitely generated, by Prop. 5.4.

We still want to factor $\psi_2 : C \rightarrow C \setminus \{c_n\}$ over a fixed finite generating set.

If $n = 2$ then $c_n = 1$, and $c_1 = c_{n-1} = 0$. Then $\psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

If $n > 2$ then $\psi_2(c_i) = c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $\psi_2(c_n) = c_{n-1}$. And $c_1 = 0^{n-1}$, and $c_i = 0^{n-i}1$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$. Therefore,

$$\psi_2 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c} 0^{n-1} & 0^{n-2}1 & 0^{n-3}1 & \dots & 0^{n-i}1 & \dots & 001 & 01 & 1 \\ 0^{n-1} & 0^{n-2}1 & 0^{n-3}1 & \dots & 0^{n-i}1 & \dots & 001 & 01 & 01 \end{array} \right).$$

Since ψ_2 is the identity function for its first $n-1$ elements in the dictionary order, we have

$$\psi_2 \equiv_{\text{fin}} \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} 00 & 01 & 1 \\ 00 & 01 & 01 \end{array} \right) \equiv_{\text{fin}} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 01 \end{array} \right) = \{(0,0), (1,01)\}.$$

Hence, since $\psi_2 \subseteq \{(0,0), (1,01)\}$,

$$(f =) \psi_3 \circ \psi_2 \circ \psi_1 = \psi_3 \circ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 01 \end{array} \right) \circ \psi_1.$$

The middle function is not normal, but it can be factored into two normal functions:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 01 \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \circ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 11 \end{array} \right).$$

Hence, f is generated by a finite set of generator of $\text{inj}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, together with the two new generators

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \text{ and } \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 11 \end{array} \right). \quad \square$$

From Lemma 5.5 and Prop. 5.3 we now conclude:

Theorem 5.6.

The monoid $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ is finitely generated.

Moreover, $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ has a finite generating set consisting of normal elements. \square

6 $\text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$, $\text{plep}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, and $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$, are not finitely generated

The question whether $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ is finitely generated was raised in [5, Section 2], and here we answer it negatively. First, we need a special version of a well-known fact.

Lemma 6.1 *For all $g, f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$: If $g \circ f(\cdot)$ is total and injective, then f is total and injective, and g is defined on all of $\text{imC}(f)A^\omega$.*

PROOF. 1. f is total: By contraposition, suppose f is not total, i.e., there exists $x \in A^*$ such that $xA^* \cap \text{Dom}(f) = \emptyset$. Then $g(f(xA^*)) = \emptyset$, so $xA^* \cap \text{Dom}(gf(\cdot)) = \emptyset$, hence $gf(\cdot)$ is not total.

2. g is defined on $\text{imC}(f)A^\omega$: If $g \circ f(\cdot)$ is total, then g is defined on every $z \in \text{imC}(f)A^\omega$. Indeed, if that were not the case then there would exist $f(x) \in \text{imC}(f)$ (for some $x \in A^*$) such that $g(f(x)A^*) = \emptyset$. Then $gf(xA^*) = \emptyset$, hence $gf(\cdot)$ would not be total.

3. f is injective: By contraposition, suppose f is not injective, i.e., there exist $a, b \in \text{Dom}(f)$ with $a \neq b$ and $f(a) = f(b)$. Then $az \neq bz$ and $f(a)z = f(b)z$ for all $z \in A^*$. Hence $g \circ f(az) = g \circ f(bz)$, and this is defined for long enough z , since g is defined on all of $\text{imC}(f)A^\omega$. Hence $g \circ f(\cdot)$ is not injective. \square

Theorem 6.2.

*The monoids $\text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, and $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ ($= \text{tfl}M_{2,1}$), as well as $\text{plep}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, and $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ ($= \text{pfl}M_{2,1}$), are **not finitely generated**.*

PROOF. (1) Case of tfl monoids:

Since $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ ($= \text{tfl}M_{2,1}$) is a homomorphic image of $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and of $\text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, it is enough to prove that $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ is not finitely generated. Recall that $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ acts faithfully on $\{0,1\}^\omega$. For any $N > 0$ let

$$\Gamma_N = \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : (\exists n, m \leq N)[\text{domC}(f) = \{0,1\}^m \text{ and } \text{imC}(f) \subseteq \{0,1\}^n]\}.$$

If $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ were finitely generated, then $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ would be generated by Γ_N for some N . Let us show that not_{N+1} is not generated by Γ_N . For all $x_1 \dots x_N x_{N+1} \in \{0, 1\}^{N+1}$ and $u \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$,

$$\text{not}_{N+1}(x_1 \dots x_N x_{N+1} u) = x_1 \dots x_N \bar{x}_{N+1} u,$$

where \bar{x}_{N+1} is the negation of the bit x_{N+1} .

Suppose, for a contradiction, that $\text{not}_{N+1}(\cdot) = \gamma_T \dots \gamma_1(\cdot)$ for some $T \geq 1$, and $\gamma_i \in \Gamma_N$ for $i \in [1, T]$. For every $i \in [1, T]$ let $\text{domC}(\gamma_i) = \{0, 1\}^{m_i}$ and $\text{imC}(\gamma_i) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{n_i}$; since $\gamma_i \in \Gamma_N$ we have $m_i, n_i \leq N$.

Since not_{N+1} is total and injective it follows from Lemma 6.1 that $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(\cdot)$ is total and injective for all $t \in [1, T]$. Totalness and injectiveness imply that for every t there exists $s \in \{0, 1\}^{N+1}$ such that $|\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(s)| \geq N+1$. And since $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(\cdot)$ is tfl, we have $|\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(s)| = |\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)|$ for all x such that $|x| = |s|$. Hence for all $t \in [1, T]$ and all $x \in \{0, 1\}^{N+1}$:

$$(\star) \quad |\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)| \geq N+1.$$

Since $N+1 > N \geq m_i$ for all $i \in [1, T]$, every $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)$ is defined (for all $t \in [1, T]$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^{N+1}$). And the application of γ_{t+1} to $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)$ changes only a prefix of length $\leq N$ (since $m_{t+1}, n_{t+1} \leq N$).

Consider now any $z = p^{(0)} z_{N+1} v \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$, with $p^{(0)} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ and $v \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$. Then for all $t \in [1, T]$: $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(p^{(0)} z_{N+1} v)$ is defined, and $\gamma_T \dots \gamma_1(p^{(0)} z_{N+1} v) = p^{(0)} \bar{z}_{N+1} v$. Moreover there are strings $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(t)}, \dots, p^{(T)} \in \{0, 1\}^*$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(p^{(0)} z_{N+1} v) &= p^{(1)} z_{N+1} v \quad \text{with } |p^{(1)}| \geq N \\ \gamma_2 \gamma_1(p^{(1)} z_{N+1} v) &= p^{(2)} z_{N+1} v \quad \text{with } |p^{(2)}| \geq N, \\ &\vdots \\ \gamma_t \gamma_{t-1} \dots \gamma_2 \gamma_1(p^{(t-1)} z_{N+1} v) &= p^{(t)} z_{N+1} v \quad \text{with } |p^{(t)}| \geq N. \\ &\vdots \\ \gamma_T \dots \gamma_2 \gamma_1(p^{(T-1)} z_{N+1} v) &= p^{(T)} z_{N+1} v \quad \text{with } |p^{(T)}| \geq N. \end{aligned}$$

The relations $|p^{(t)}| \geq N$ hold by relation (\star) . And the suffix $z_{N+1} v$ is not modified because every γ_t only changes a prefix of length $\leq N$ of $p^{(t-1)}$, while $p^{(t-1)}$ itself has length $\geq N$.

So $\gamma_T \dots \gamma_1(\cdot) = \text{not}_{N+1}$ does not change z_{N+1} , which contradicts the definition of not_{N+1} .

(2) Case of pfl monoids:

As in (1) it is sufficient to prove the result for $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$. For any $N > 0$ let

$$\Gamma_N = \{f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} : (\exists n, m \leq N)[\text{domC}(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m \text{ and } \text{imC}(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n]\}.$$

If $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ were finitely generated, then it would be generated by Γ_N for some N . Let us show that not_{N+1} is not generated by Γ_N . (The difference with part (1) is that “ $\text{domC}(f) =$ ” is replaced by “ $\text{domC}(f) \subseteq$ ”.)

Suppose, for a contradiction, that $\text{not}_{N+1}(\cdot) = \gamma_T \dots \gamma_1(\cdot)$ for some $T \geq 1$, and $\gamma_i \in \Gamma_N$ for $i \in [1, T]$. For every $i \in [1, T]$, let $\text{domC}(\gamma_i) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{m_i}$ and $\text{imC}(\gamma_i) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{n_i}$; since $\gamma_i \in \Gamma_N$ we have $m_i, n_i \leq N$.

Since not_{N+1} is total and injective it follows from Lemma 6.1 that $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(\cdot)$ is total and injective for all $t \in [1, T]$, and that γ_{t+1} is defined on all of $\text{imC}(\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1) \{0, 1\}^\omega$. Totalness and injectiveness imply that for every t there exists $s \in \{0, 1\}^{N+1}$ such that $|\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(s)| \geq N+1$. And since $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(\cdot)$ is pfl, we have $|\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(s)| = |\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)|$ for all $x \in \text{Dom}(\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1)$ such that $|x| = |s|$. Hence, since $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1$ is total we have for all $t \in [1, T]$ and all $x \in \{0, 1\}^{N+1}$:

$$(\star) \quad |\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)| \geq N+1.$$

Since $N+1 > N \geq m_i$ for all $i \in [1, T]$, every $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)$ is defined (for all $t \in [1, T]$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^{N+1}$). And the application of γ_{t+1} to $\gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(x)$ changes only a prefix of length $\leq N$ (since $m_{t+1}, n_{t+1} \leq N$).

Consider now any $z = p^{(0)}z_{N+1}v \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$, with $p^{(0)} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ and $v \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$. Then all $t \in [1, T] : \gamma_t \dots \gamma_1(p^{(0)}z_{N+1}v)$ is defined, and $\gamma_T \dots \gamma_1(p^{(0)}z_{N+1}v) = p^{(0)}\bar{z}_{N+1}v$. Moreover there are strings $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(t)}, \dots, p^{(T)} \in \{0, 1\}^*$ such that the relations of part (1) hold. The rest of the proof is exactly as in part (1). \square

Consequences for circuits

We saw in Theorem 3.8 that the set of input-output functions of acyclic boolean circuits, extended to right-ideal morphisms, is precisely the monoid $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, and in Theorem 3.11 that the set of input-output functions of acyclic partial circuits, extended to right-ideal morphisms, is precisely the monoid $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. Then Theorem 6.2 implies:

Theorem 6.3 *The monoids of input-output functions of acyclic boolean circuits, or partial circuits, extended to right-ideal morphisms of $\{0, 1\}^*$, are not finitely generated under function-composition.*
 \square

However, $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ are generated under composition by a set of the form $\Gamma \cup \tau$, where Γ is finite, and τ is the set of bit-position transpositions (or just the set of transpositions $\tau_{i,i+1}$ of adjacent positions).

7 Some algebraic properties of the monoids

$M_{2,1}$, $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$, $\text{sur}M_{2,1}$, and $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$

Here we give a few algebraic properties of Higman-Thompson monoids.

7.1 Regularity

Proposition 7.1 *The monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is regular, i.e., for every $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ there exists $f' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ such that $ff'f = f$. Moreover, f' can be chosen to be injective with, in addition, $\text{domC}(f') = \text{imC}(f)$.*

PROOF. For any $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and any $y \in \text{imC}(f)$, let us choose an element $x'_y \in f^{-1}(y)$. It is a fact that $f^{-1}(\text{imC}(f)) \subseteq \text{domC}(f)$ (see [10, Lemma 5.5]), hence $x'_y \in \text{domC}(f)$. We define $f' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ by $f'(yu) = x'_y u$ for every $y \in \text{imC}(f)$ and $u \in \{0, 1\}^*$; so, $\text{domC}(f') = \text{imC}(f)$. Hence $f' \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, since it is a right-ideal morphism, and $\text{imC}(f)$ is finite. Since for different elements y the sets $f^{-1}(y)$ are disjoint, f' is injective. (Note also that $f^{-1}(y)$ is also finite for every $y \in \text{imC}(f)$.)

Then for any $xv \in \text{Dom}(f)$ with $x \in \text{domC}(f)$: $ff'f(xv) = ff'(yuv)$, where $f(x) = yu$ for some $y \in \text{imC}(f)$, $u \in \{0, 1\}^*$. Hence, $ff'(yuv) = f(x'_y uv)$, where $x'_y = f'(y) \in \text{domC}(f)$; then, $f(x'_y uv) = yuv = f(x)v$. Thus, $ff'f(xv) = f(xv)$, so f' is an inverse of f . \square

A similar argument show that all the pre-Thompson and Thompson monoids are regular.

For a generating set $\Gamma \cup \tau$ of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, with Γ finite, the problem of finding an inverse is coNP-hard. Moreover, on input $w, w' \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$, deciding whether w' represents an inverse of w (i.e., $E_w E_{w'} E_w = E_w$) is coNP-complete (see [3, 11]).

7.2 Congruence-simplicity

We know that $M_{k,1}$ and $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$ are congruence-simple [7, 6]. We show here that Thompson's original monoid $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ is also congruence-simple, but that $\text{tlep}M_{k,1}$ is not congruence-simple.

The proofs below use elements of $M_{k,1}$ denoted by $(u \rightarrow v)$, where $u, v \in A^*$. The function $(u \rightarrow v)$ has a singleton table $\{(u, v)\}$; so $\text{Dom}((u \rightarrow v)) = uA^\omega$, $\text{Im}((u \rightarrow v)) = vA^\omega$; and for all $uz \in uA^\omega$: $(u \rightarrow v)(uz) = vz$. Since $\{\varepsilon\}$ is a maximal prefix code, $(\varepsilon \rightarrow u) \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$.

More generally, for any $v \in A^*$ and any finite prefix code $C \subseteq A^*$ we define the function $(C \rightarrow v)$ by $\text{dom}C((C \rightarrow v)) = C$, $\text{im}C((C \rightarrow v)) = \{v\}$, and for all $c \in C$ and $z \in A^\omega$: $(C \rightarrow v)(cz) = vz$. If C is a maximal prefix code then $(C \rightarrow v) \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$.

Theorem 7.2 *For all $k \geq 2$, the monoids $M_{k,1}$ and $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$ are 0- \mathcal{J} -simple and congruence-simple.*

PROOF. For $M_{k,1}$ this was proved in [7, Prop. 2.2 and Thm. 2.3], and in [6].

For $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$, the proofs of [7, Prop. 2.2, Thm. 2.3] work without any change, since $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$ has a $\mathbf{0}$, and all the multipliers used in the proofs are of the form $(u \rightarrow v)$ for various $u, v \in A^*$. And $(u \rightarrow v)$ obviously belongs to $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$. \square

Theorem 7.3 *For all $k \geq 2$, the monoid $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ is congruence-simple.*

PROOF. Let \equiv be any congruence on $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ that is not the equality relation. We will prove that \equiv has just one congruence class.

Claim 1. There exist strings $y_0, y_1 \in A^*$ that are not prefix-comparable, such that $(\varepsilon \rightarrow y_0) \equiv (\varepsilon \rightarrow y_1)$.

Proof of Claim 1: Since \equiv is not equality, there exist $\psi, \varphi \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$ such that $\psi \equiv \varphi$ and $\psi \neq \varphi$. By restriction we can represent ψ and φ by right-ideal morphisms that are normal (Def. 5.1), with $\text{im}C(\psi) \cup \text{im}C(\varphi) \subseteq A^n$ for some $n > 0$. Hence there are $x_0 \in A^*$ and $y_0, y_1 \in A^n$ such that $\psi(x_0) = y_0 \neq y_1 = \varphi(x_0)$. Since $|y_0| = |y_1|$, $y_0 \neq y_1$ implies that y_0, y_1 are not prefix-comparable. Then $\psi \equiv \varphi$ implies

$$(\varepsilon \rightarrow y_0) = \psi \circ (\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0)(\cdot) \equiv \varphi \circ (\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0)(\cdot) = (\varepsilon \rightarrow y_1).$$

[This proves Claim 1.]

Claim 2. For all $x, y \in A^*$: $(\varepsilon \rightarrow x) \equiv (\varepsilon \rightarrow y)$.

Proof of Claim 2: By Claim 1 there are $u, v \in A^*$ that are not prefix-comparable, such that $(\varepsilon \rightarrow v) \equiv (\varepsilon \rightarrow v)$. Since u and v are not prefix-comparable, there exists a maximal finite prefix code $C \subseteq A^*$ such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq C$; in fact, in the proof of Claim 1 we have $u, v \subseteq A^n$. For any $x, y \in A^*$, let $f \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$ be the function defined by $\text{dom}C(f) = C$, $f(C) = \{x, y\}$, with $f(u) = x$, $f(v) = y$, and $f(z) = x$ for all $z \in C \setminus \{u, v\}$. (The set $\{x, y\}$ need not be a prefix code.) Then $(\varepsilon \rightarrow u) \equiv (\varepsilon \rightarrow v)$ implies

$$(\varepsilon \rightarrow x) = f \circ (\varepsilon \rightarrow u)(\cdot) \equiv f \circ (\varepsilon \rightarrow v)(\cdot) = (\varepsilon \rightarrow y).$$

[This proves Claim 2.]

Claim 3. For all $x \in A^*$: $(\varepsilon \rightarrow x) \equiv \mathbf{1}$.

Proof of Claim 3: This follows from Claim 2 by letting $y = \varepsilon$.

[This proves Claim 3.]

Claim 4. For every finite maximal prefix code $P \subset A^*$: $(P \rightarrow \varepsilon) \equiv \mathbf{1}$.

Proof of Claim 4: Here $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the identity function on $A^* \cup A^\omega$. By Claim 3, $(\varepsilon \rightarrow p) \equiv \mathbf{1}$ for every $p \in P$. This implies (for any particular $p \in P$):

$$\mathbf{1} = (\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon) = (P \rightarrow \varepsilon) \circ (\varepsilon \rightarrow p)(\cdot) \equiv (P \rightarrow \varepsilon) \circ \mathbf{1}(\cdot) = (P \rightarrow \varepsilon).$$

[This proves Claim 4.]

Claim 5. For all $f \in \text{tot}M_{2,1}$: $\mathbb{1} \equiv f$.

Proof of Claim 5: By restriction, any $f \in \text{tot}M_{2,1}$ can be represented by a normal right-ideal morphism in $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (that we also call f). Let $P = \text{domC}(f)$, and let Q be a finite maximal prefix code such that $f(P) = \text{imC}(f) \subseteq Q$. Since P and Q are finite maximal prefix codes, Claim 4 implies that $\mathbb{1} \equiv (P \rightarrow \varepsilon) \equiv (Q \rightarrow \varepsilon)$.

Then $(Q \rightarrow \varepsilon) \equiv \mathbb{1}$ implies $(P \rightarrow \varepsilon) = (Q \rightarrow \varepsilon) \circ f(\cdot) \equiv \mathbb{1} \circ f(\cdot) = f$. Now $\mathbb{1} \equiv (P \rightarrow \varepsilon)$ implies $\mathbb{1} \equiv f$.

[This proves Claim 5 and the Theorem]. \square

Combined with the results of de Witt and Elliott [20] and Brin [15], Theorem 7.3 yields (for all $k \geq 2$):

Corollary 7.4.

The monoid $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ is an infinite, finitely presented, congruence-simple monoid that has the Higman-Thompson group $G_{k,1}$ as its group of units. \square

We will now prove that $\text{tlep}M_{k,1}$ is not congruence-simple.

Definition 7.5 (the input-output length difference function δ).

The input-output length difference function δ is defined by

$$\delta : f \in \text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} \longmapsto \delta(f) = |f(x)| - |x| \in \mathbb{Z},$$

for any $x \in \text{domC}(f)$.

Proposition 7.6.

(0) *For all $f \in \text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\delta(f)$ is well-defined (i.e., it just depends on f , not on x).*

Moreover, $\delta(f) = |f(x)| - |x|$ for all $x \in \text{Dom}(f)$ (not just for $x \in \text{domC}(f)$).

(1) *For all $f_1, f_2 \in \text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$: If $f_1 \equiv_{\text{fin}} f_2$ then $\delta(f_1) = \delta(f_2)$.*

So $\delta(f)$ is well-defined for all $f \in \text{tlep}M_{2,1}$.

If $\text{domC}(f) = \{0, 1\}^m$ for some $m \geq 0$, then $f(\text{domC}(f)) = \text{imC}(f) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, where $n = m + \delta(f)$. Hence δ is surjective.

(2) *For all $f_1, f_2 \in \text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$: $\delta(f_2 \circ f_1) = \delta(f_2) + \delta(f_1)$.*

Hence, $\delta : \text{tlep}M_{2,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and $\delta : \text{tlep}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ are surjective monoid homomorphisms.

(3) *Let Γ be a finite set such that $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ or $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$. Let $E : (\Gamma \cup \tau)^* \rightarrow \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ be the generator evaluation function, i.e., for every $w = w_k \dots w_1 \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ such that $w_i \in \Gamma \cup \tau$ we have $E_w(\cdot) = w_k \circ \dots \circ w_1(\cdot)$. Then*

$$\delta(E_w) = \sum (\delta(w_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k, w_i \in \Gamma).$$

PROOF. (0) This follows from the fact that f is lep (length-equality preserving). (1) If f and g differ by a one-step restriction (i.e., $\text{domC}(g) = (\text{domC}(f) - \{x\}) \cup xA$, for some $x \in \text{domC}(f)$), then $\delta(f) = \delta(g)$. Then we use the fact that \equiv_{fin} is the same as \equiv_1^* (by Prop. 4.3). (2) is straightforward, and (3) follows from (2), using the fact that $\delta(\tau_{i,j}) = 0$. \square

For any $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$, the integer $\delta(E_w)$ (in sign-magnitude binary representation) is easily computed (by using (3) above)

The existence of the homomorphism $\delta(\cdot)$ (by (2) above) implies the following:

Corollary 7.7.

For all $k \geq 2$, the monoids $\text{tlep}M_{k,1}$, $\text{tlep}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}}$, and $\text{tfl}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}}$ are not congruence-simple.

The “kernel” of $\delta : \text{tlep}M_{2,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is the monoid

$$\delta^{-1}(0) = \text{tlp}M_{k,1} = \{f \in \text{tlep}M_{k,1} : (\forall x \in \text{Dom}(f)) [|f(x)| = |x|]\},$$

where lp stands for *length-preserving*.

As a (partial) function, δ can also be defined for $\text{plep}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}}$, $\text{pfl}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}}$, and $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$. However, $\delta(\theta)$ is undefined (where θ is the empty function), so on these monoids δ is not a total function. The following is proved in the same way as Prop. 7.6.

Proposition 7.8.

(0) For all $f \in \text{plep}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}} \setminus \{\theta\}$, $\delta(f)$ is well-defined (i.e., it just depends on f , not on x).

(1) For all $f_1, f_2 \in \text{plep}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}} \setminus \{\theta\}$: If $f_1 \equiv_{\text{fin}} f_2$ then $\delta(f_1) = \delta(f_2)$.

So $\delta(f)$ is well-defined for all $f \in \text{plep}M_{2,1} \setminus \{\theta\}$.

(2) For all $f_1, f_2 \in \text{plep}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}} \setminus \{\theta\}$ such that $f_2 \circ f_1(\cdot) \neq \theta$, $\delta(f_2 \circ f_1) = \delta(f_2) + \delta(f_1)$.

(3) Let Γ be a finite set such that $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\text{pfl}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}}$ or $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$. Let $E : (\Gamma \cup \tau)^* \rightarrow \text{pfl}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}}$ be the generator evaluation function, i.e., for every $w = w_k \dots w_1 \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ such that $w_i \in \Gamma \cup \tau$ we have $E_w(\cdot) = w_k \circ \dots \circ w_1(\cdot)$. Then we have, if $E_w \neq \theta$:

$$\delta(E_w) = \sum (\delta(w_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k, w_i \in \Gamma).$$

□

But $\delta : \text{plep}M_{k,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ cannot be extended to a semigroup homomorphism, since $\text{plep}M_{k,1}$ is congruence-simple (by 7.2).

7.3 The monoid $\text{sur}M_{k,1}$

Lemma 7.9 *The monoid $\text{sur}M_{k,1}$ has only one idempotent, namely the identity element.*

PROOF. If $f = f^2$ then for all $x \in \text{Dom}(f) \subseteq A^\omega$: $y = f(x) = f f(x) = f(y)$. Since f is surjective, y ranges over all of A^ω . Hence, $y = f(y)$ for all $y \in A^\omega$. □

Proposition 7.10 *For all $h, k \geq 2$, the monoids $\text{tot}M_{h,1}$ and $M_{h,1}$ are not embeddable in $\text{sur}M_{k,1}$.*

PROOF. By Lemma 7.9, the only idempotent is the identity function. But $\text{tot}M_{h,1}$ and $M_{h,1}$ contain infinitely many idempotents, and an embedding preserves idempotents and distinctness. □

It follows that $\text{sur}M_{k,1}$ is not isomorphic to $\text{tot}M_{h,1}$ nor to $M_{h,1}$.

8 Non-embeddability of $M_{h,1}$ into $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$, and of $\text{plep}M_{h,1}$ into $\text{tlep}M_{k,1}$

Theorem 8.1 *For all $h, k \geq 2$, the monoids $M_{h,1}$ and $\text{plep}M_{h,1}$ are not embeddable into $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$.*

I.e., there is no injective monoid homomorphism $M_{h,1} \hookrightarrow \text{tot}M_{k,1}$.

As a consequence, the monoid $\text{plep}M_{h,1}$ is *not* embeddable into $\text{tlep}M_{k,1}$ ($\subseteq \text{tot}M_{k,1}$).

The Theorem follows from a series of Lemmas that distinguish $M_{h,1}$ from the submonoids of $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$.

Lemma 8.2.

(1) For every $f \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$ and for every infinite set $X \subseteq \{0,1\}^\omega$, $f(X)$ is infinite.

(2) For every $f \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$ and for every finite set $H \subseteq A^\omega$ such that $|H| > |\text{dom}C(f)|$:

$$|f(H)| > |H|/|\text{dom}C(f)|.$$

PROOF. (1) Since $P = \text{dom}C(f)$ is a finite maximal prefix code, we have: $PA^\omega = A^\omega$. Hence, $X \cap PA^\omega = X$ is infinite. Therefore (since P is finite), there exists $p \in P$ such that $X \cap pA^\omega$ is infinite, hence $X \cap pA^\omega = pS$, where S is an infinite subset of A^ω . Then $f(X)$ contains the infinite set $f(pS) = f(p)S$.

(2) Let $P = \text{dom}C(f)$; this is a finite maximal prefix code, so $PA^\omega = A^\omega$. There exists $p \in P$ such that $|H \cap pA^\omega| \geq |H|/|P|$. Indeed, otherwise we would have $|H \cap pA^\omega| < |H|/|P|$ for all $p \in P$; this would imply $(|H| =) |H \cap PA^\omega| \leq \sum_{p \in P} |H \cap pA^\omega| < \sum_{p \in P} |H|/|P| = |P|(|H|/|P|) = |H|$; this would imply $|H| < |H|$.

For $p \in P$ such that $|H \cap pA^\omega| \geq |H|/|P|$, let

$$H \cap pA^\omega = p \{s_i : i = 1, \dots, |H|/|P|, |H|/|P| + 1, \dots\},$$

where all s_i ($\in A^\omega$) are different. Then $f(H)$ has the subset

$$f(p) \{s_i : i = 1, \dots, |H|/|P|, |H|/|P| + 1, \dots\},$$

so $|f(H)| > |H|/|P|$. \square

Lemma 8.3 *Let g be any non-torsion element of $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ (i.e., $\{g^i : i \in \omega\}$ is infinite). Then for all $N > 0$ there exists $u \in A^\omega$ such that $|\{g^i(u) : i \geq 0\}| > N$.*

PROOF. By contraposition we assume that there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $u \in A^\omega$: $|\{g^i(u) : i \geq 0\}| \leq N$. Since $|\{g^i(u) : i \geq 0\}|$ is finite, there exist n, m (depending on u) such that $g^n(u) = g^{n+m}(u)$, and $0 \leq n < n+m \leq N$. Hence, letting $M = N!$ we have for all u : $g^M(u) = g^{2M}(u)$. So, g is a torsion element. \square

Lemma 8.4 *If S is a subsemigroup of $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ that contains a non-torsion element, then S has no left-zero.*

PROOF. Let $g \in S$ be a non-torsion element. Let us assume, for a contradiction, that S has a left-zero z (i.e., $zs(\cdot) = z(\cdot)$ for all $s \in S$). Then $zg^i(\cdot) = z(\cdot)$ for all $i \geq 0$. Let $P = \text{dom}C(z)$, and let $N > 2|P|$. By Lemma 8.3, there exists $u \in A^\omega$, such that $|\{g^i(u) : i \geq 0\}| > N$. By Lemma 8.2, $|z(\{g^i(u) : i \geq 0\})| > N/|P|$; and N can be chosen so that $N/|P| \geq 2$. On the other hand, $zg^i(\cdot) = z(\cdot)$, so $|z(\{g^i(u) : i \geq 0\})| = |\{z(u)\}| = 1$. This leads to the false statement $1 \geq 2$. \square

As a consequence, $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ itself has no left-zero (and hence no zero). However, some subsemigroups have left-zeros.

Proof of Theorem 8.1:

The monoids $\text{plep}M_{h,1}$ and $M_{h,1}$ contain a zero (namely the empty map), and non-torsion elements (e.g., the element represented by the right-ideal morphism $(\varepsilon \rightarrow 0)$).

Assume, for a contradiction, that $M_{h,1}$ (or $\text{plep}M_{h,1}$) is embeddable in $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$. An embedding preserves non-torsion elements, and the zero in the image submonoid. So the embedded copy of $M_{h,1}$ (or $\text{plep}M_{h,1}$) in $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ is a subsemigroup with a left zero and a non-torsion element. But this contradicts Lemma 8.4. \square

Theorem 8.1 for $k \geq 3$ and $h = 2$ can also be derived in an interesting way from Theorem 8.1 for $k = 2$. First, a Lemma and a Proposition that are of independent interest are proved:

Lemma 8.5 .

For any finite maximal prefix code $C \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ such that $|C| \geq 2$ we have: $\{0, 1\}^\omega = C^\omega$.

PROOF. Obviously, $C^\omega \subseteq \{0, 1\}^\omega$. Conversely, let us show that any $z = (z_i : i \in \omega)$ (with $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$) is factored in a unique way over C . Let $\ell = \text{maxlen}(C)$. Since C is maximal, z has a unique prefix $c_1 \in C$, of length $|c_1| = l_1$ with $1 \leq l_1 \leq \ell$; so $z = c_1 z_{l_1} \dots$. Suppose now, by induction, that a prefix of length $\geq n$ of z has been factored over C ; i.e., $z = c_1 \dots c_n z_{l_n} \dots$, where $c_1, \dots, c_n \in C$ with $|c_1 \dots c_n| = l_n \geq n$. Then $z_{l_n} \dots z_{l_n+\ell}$ has a prefix in C ; let us denote this element of C by c_{n+1} , with $|c_1 \dots c_n c_{n+1}| = l_{n+1}$. Then $z = c_1 \dots c_n c_{n+1} z_{l_{n+1}} \dots$.

Moreover, every finite prefix of z can be factored in at most one way over C , since C is a prefix code. \square

However, $C^* \neq \{0, 1\}^*$ unless $C = \{0, 1\}$.

Proposition 8.6 For every $k \geq 3$, $M_{k,1}$ is embeddable into $M_{2,1}$, and $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ is embeddable into $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$.

PROOF. This is proved in the same way as $G_{k,1}$ is embedded into $G_{2,1}$, using Higman's coding method. Let $A = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, let $C \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ be any maximal prefix code of cardinality $|C| = k$, and let $\eta : i \in A \mapsto \eta(i) \in C$ be any bijection. For any $x = x_1 \dots x_n \in A^*$ with $x_i \in A$, consider the coding $\eta(x) = \eta(x_1) \dots \eta(x_n) \in C^* \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$; then $\eta : A^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ is an injective monoid morphism. For $x = x_1 \dots x_n \dots \in A^\omega$ with $x_i \in A$ we define $\eta(x) = \eta(x_1) \dots \eta(x_n) \dots \in C^\omega$; since C is a maximal prefix code of $\{0, 1\}^*$ we have $C^\omega = \{0, 1\}^\omega$ (by Lemma 8.5).

For any $f \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$ let $P = \text{dom}C(f)$. This is a finite prefix code of A^* , which is maximal if $f \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$. Then $\eta(P)$ is a finite prefix code of $\{0, 1\}^*$, which is maximal if P is maximal. We encode f by $f^\eta \in \text{tot}M_{2,1}$, defined by

$$f^\eta(\eta(x)) = \eta(f(x))$$

for every $x \in A^* \cup A^\omega$. Equivalently, for every $z \in C^* \cup C^\omega$, $f^\eta(z) = \eta \circ f \circ \eta^{-1}(z)$; recall that $\eta : A^* \cup A^\omega \rightarrow C^* \cup C^\omega$ is total and injective.

Then $f^\eta \in M_{2,1}$ (and $f^\eta \in \text{tot}M_{2,1}$ if $f \in \text{tot}M_{k,1}$), with $\text{dom}C(f^\eta) = \eta(P)$. And $f \mapsto f^\eta$ is a monoid morphism $M_{k,1} \rightarrow M_{2,1}$ and $\text{tot}M_{k,1} \rightarrow \text{tot}M_{2,1}$, since $(gf)^\eta = \eta g f \eta^{-1} = \eta g \eta^{-1} \eta f \eta^{-1} = g^\eta f^\eta$. And $f \mapsto f^\eta$ is injective since η and η^{-1} are injective \square

PROOF of Theorem 8.1 for $k \geq 3$ and $h = 2$, derived from Theorem 8.1 for $k = 2$:

Assume for a contradiction that $M_{2,1}$ is embeddable in $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$. By Prop. 8.6, $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ is embeddable into $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$. Now, $M_{2,1} \hookrightarrow \text{tot}M_{k,1} \hookrightarrow \text{tot}M_{2,1}$, so $M_{2,1} \hookrightarrow \text{tot}M_{2,1}$. This contradicts the Theorem for $k = 2$. \square

9 Completion operations for $M_{2,1}$, $\text{pfl}M_{2,1}$, $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$

The goal of a completion operation of a partial function f is to find a *total* function \bar{f} , such that f can be recovered from \bar{f} and $\text{Dom}(f)$. A completion operation $(\bar{\cdot}) : f \rightarrow \bar{f}$ may be a function (i.e., only one \bar{f} is found for each f); we call this a *deterministic* completion. A completion operation could also be a relation (if f is completed in several ways); we call this a *nondeterministic* completion.

Theorem 8.1 is a non-completability result. This section gives several forms of completability.

We work with the monoids of right-ideal morphisms $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$; the corresponding results for $M_{2,1}$ and $\text{pfl}M_{2,1}$ then hold too. Below, for any $h \geq 2$, $\mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}}$ denotes the monoid $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ of right-ideal morphisms $A^* \rightarrow A^*$ for an alphabet A of size $|A| = h$.

The following concept is used in all of our completion constructions.

Definition 9.1 (complementary prefix code). For a prefix code $P \subseteq A^*$, a complementary prefix code of P is a prefix code $Q \subseteq A^*$ such that (1) $P \cup Q$ is a maximal prefix code, and (2) $PA^* \cap QA^* = \emptyset$.

Every finite prefix code has finite complementary prefix codes. See [3, Def. 5.2], [8, Def. 3.29, Lemma 3.30], and also [14, Prop. 5.2].

9.1 Deterministic completion

Definition 9.2 A deterministic completion operation of $\mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}}$ in $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}}$ (and similarly of $M_{h,1}$ in $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$) is a total function

$$\overline{(\cdot)} : f \in \mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}} \mapsto \overline{f} \in \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}},$$

together with a function

$$\varrho : \{\overline{f} : f \in \mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}}\} \subseteq \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_k^{\text{fin}} \mapsto \mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}},$$

such that for all $f \in \mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}}$:

$$f \subseteq \varrho(\overline{f}).$$

In other words, for all $x \in \text{Dom}(f)$: $f(x) = [\varrho(\overline{f})](x)$.

A completion is called *homomorphic* iff for all $f_2, f_1 \in \mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}}$: $\overline{f_2 \cdot f_1}(\cdot) = \overline{f_2} \cdot \overline{f_1}(\cdot)$. By Theorem 8.1, there exists no injective homomorphic completion of $M_{h,1}$.

We give two examples of deterministic completions.

1. A classical completion operation for $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ and $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$

For $f \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ with $\text{domC}(f) \subseteq \{0,1\}^m$ and $\text{imC}(f) \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$, we can define a completion $\tilde{f} \in \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ as follows:

$$\text{domC}(\tilde{f}) = \{0,1\}^m, \quad \text{imC}(\tilde{f}) = \text{imC}(f) \cup \{0^n\} \subseteq \{0,1\}^n,$$

and for all $x \in \{0,1\}^m$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &= f(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{domC}(f), \\ \tilde{f}(x) &= 0^n & \text{if } x \in \{0,1\}^m \setminus \text{domC}(f). \end{aligned}$$

More generally, for $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ we can define a completion $\tilde{f} \in \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ as follows:

$$\text{domC}(\tilde{f}) = \text{domC}(f) \cup Q,$$

where Q is a finite complementary prefix code of $\text{domC}(f)$ in A^* . For all $x \in P \cup Q$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(x) &= f(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{domC}(f) = P, \\ \tilde{f}(x) &= 0 & \text{if } x \in Q. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $f \subseteq \tilde{f}$; so for the function ϱ we can just pick the identity function, i.e., $\varrho(\tilde{f}) = \tilde{f}$. Then we have: $f = \tilde{f}$ iff f is total (i.e., $\text{domC}(f)$ is a maximal prefix code); hence $\tilde{\tilde{f}} = \tilde{f}$.

The completion operation $\tilde{(\cdot)}$ is *not injective*. In particular, $\tilde{f}_1 = \tilde{f}_2$ if the following two conditions hold: (1) $f_1 \subseteq f_2$; (2) if $f_1(x)$ is undefined then $f_2(x)$ is undefined or $f_2(x) \in 0A^*$.

The operation $\tilde{(\cdot)}$ is *not homomorphic*. For example, if $f = (1 \rightarrow 0)$ and $g = (0 \rightarrow 1)$ with $A = \{0,1\}$, then $gf(\cdot) = (1 \rightarrow 1)$, so $\tilde{gf}(\cdot) = \mathbb{1}_{\{0,1\}}$. And \tilde{f} has the table $\{(1,0), (0,0)\}$ and \tilde{g} has the table $\{(0,1), (1,0)\}$, so $\tilde{g}\tilde{f}(\cdot)$ has the table $\{(0,1), (1,1)\}$. Hence $\tilde{gf}(\cdot) \neq \tilde{g}\tilde{f}(\cdot)$.

Before describing another completion we give a preliminary construction. For any prefix code $P \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$, $\text{spref}(P)$ denotes the set of *strict prefixes* of the elements of P (i.e., the prefixes not in P).

Lemma 9.3 (expanding a maximal prefix code to a larger alphabet).

Let $\{0, 1, 2\}$ be a 3-letter alphabet. If P is a finite prefix code in $\{0, 1\}^*$ then

$$P \cup (\text{spref}(P))2$$

is a finite prefix code in $\{0, 1, 2\}^*$, which is maximal in $\{0, 1, 2\}^*$ iff P is maximal in $\{0, 1\}^*$.

PROOF. See [3, Lemma 9.1] and [13, Lemma 1.5]. \square

2. An injective non-homomorphic completion of $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ or of $M_{2,1}$

Every element $f \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ (or of $M_{2,1}$) is completed to an element $\bar{f} \in \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ (or in $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$) as follows. We first choose a finite complementary prefix code $Q \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ of $\text{dom}C(f)$. Then $P = \text{dom}C(f) \cup Q$, ($\subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$) is a finite maximal prefix code of $\{0, 1\}^*$, and $P \cup (\text{spref}(P))\perp$ is a finite maximal prefix code of $\{0, 1, \perp\}^*$ (by Lemma 9.3). Now \bar{f} is the right-ideal morphism of $\{0, 1, \perp\}^*$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}C(\bar{f}) &= \text{dom}C(f) \cup Q \cup (\text{spref}(\text{dom}C(f) \cup Q)) \cdot \perp; \\ \bar{f}(x) &= f(x) \quad \text{if } x \in \text{dom}C(f); \\ \bar{f}(x) &= \perp \quad \text{if } x \in Q \cup (\text{spref}(\text{dom}C(f) \cup Q)) \cdot \perp. \end{aligned}$$

The function $f \in \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}} \mapsto \bar{f} \in \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_3^{\text{fin}}$ is total and injective; it is not a monoid morphism, since $M_{2,1}$ is not embeddable into $\text{tot}M_{3,1}$ (by Theorem 8.1). Taking ϱ to be the identity function, we obtain a completion $\bar{(\cdot)} : \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}} \rightarrow \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_3^{\text{fin}}$ (and $M_{2,1} \rightarrow \text{tot}M_{3,1}$).

By encoding the elements of $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_3^{\text{fin}}$ as in Prop. 8.6, $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_3^{\text{fin}}$ is embedded into $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. This yields a (non-homomorphic) completion of $\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$ in $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$. Taking ϱ to be the inverse of the embedding function $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_3^{\text{fin}} \rightarrow \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$, we obtain a completion $\bar{(\cdot)} : \mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}} \rightarrow \text{tot}\mathcal{RM}_2^{\text{fin}}$.

Although deterministic completions are simple and fairly natural, they have some drawbacks: They cannot be made homomorphic (if they are injective). It is difficult to compute \bar{f} or \tilde{f} if f is given by a sequence of generators (in Γ or in $\Gamma \cup \tau$); even when f is given by a table, it is difficult to find \bar{f} or \tilde{f} because we do not have an efficient method for finding a complementary prefix code.

9.2 Inverse homomorphic completion

We construct a general completion operation that has (inverse) homomorphic properties, and that provides an efficient computation of \bar{f} as a word of generators, if f is given by a word of generators. Here we will work with $M_{h,1}$, not with $\mathcal{RM}_h^{\text{fin}}$.

Definition 9.4 (completion defined by an inverse homomorphism).

(1) An inverse homomorphic completion of $M_{h,1}$ in $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ is a surjective semigroup homomorphism

$$\varrho : \text{Dom}(\varrho) \subseteq \text{tot}M_{k,1} \rightarrow M_{h,1} = \text{Im}(\varrho).$$

The inverse homomorphic completion of $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ in $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ is defined in the same way as for $M_{2,1}$ in $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$.

(2) A completion of $f \in M_{2,1}$ (or $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$) is the choice of any element in $\varrho^{-1}(f)$.

The homomorphism ϱ is an *inverse completion*; one could also call it a “completion removal operation”, or an “un-completion”. The completion of f is nondeterministic (being a choice within $\varrho^{-1}(f)$), whereas the inverse completion $\varrho(f)$ is deterministic.

Remark: A more general inverse homomorphic completion of $M_{h,1}$ in $\text{tot}M_{k,1}$ can be defined by a semigroup homomorphism (not necessarily surjective) $\varrho : \text{Dom}(\varrho) (\subseteq \text{tot}M_{k,1}) \rightarrow M_{h,1}$, such that for every $f \in M_{h,1}$ there exists $s \in \text{Dom}(\varrho)$ satisfying $f \subseteq \varrho(s)$.

Theorem 9.5 (inverse homomorphic completion).

(1) The monoid $M_{2,1}$ is a homomorphic image of a submonoid of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} f &\in F_0 = \text{Fix}_{\text{tot}M_{2,1}}(0 \cdot \{0,1\}^\omega) \quad (\subseteq \text{tot}M_{2,1}) \\ &\xrightarrow{\rho} f \cap 1\{0,1\}^\omega \times 1\{0,1\}^\omega \\ &\quad \in \{ (f \cap 1\{0,1\}^\omega \times 1\{0,1\}^\omega) \in M_{2,1} : f \in F_0 \} \\ &\xrightarrow{\iota} M_{2,1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{Fix}_{\text{tot}M_{2,1}}(0 \cdot \{0,1\}^\omega) = \{ f \in \text{tot}M_{2,1} : (\forall z \in \{0,1\}^\omega) [f(0z) = 0z] \} \quad (\text{fixator});$$

ρ is a surjective monoid homomorphism;

ι is a monoid isomorphism;

$\varrho = \iota \circ \rho : F_0 \twoheadrightarrow M_{2,1}$ is a surjective monoid homomorphism.

The restriction of ϱ to $\varrho^{-1}(\text{tot}M_{2,1})$ is injective, i.e., elements of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ have a unique completion.

(2) The monoid $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ is a homomorphic image of a submonoid of $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} f &\in S_0 = \text{Stab}_{\text{tlep}M_{2,1}}(0 \cdot \{0,1\}^\omega) \quad (\subseteq \text{tlep}M_{2,1}) \\ &\xrightarrow{\rho} \{ (f \cap 1\{0,1\}^\omega \times 1\{0,1\}^\omega) \in \text{plep}M_{2,1} : f \in S_0 \} \\ &\xrightarrow{\iota} \text{plep}M_{2,1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\text{Stab}_{\text{tlep}M_{2,1}}(0 \cdot \{0,1\}^\omega) = \{ f \in \text{tlep}M_{2,1} : (\forall z \in \{0,1\}^\omega) [f(0z) \in 0\{0,1\}^\omega] \} \quad (\text{stabilizer});$$

ι and ϱ are as in (1)

(3) The same results hold for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (instead of $M_{2,1}$), and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (instead of $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$).

PROOF. In (1) the proof works in the same way for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ as for $M_{2,1}$ and $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$. And in (2) the proof works in the same way for $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ as for $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ and $\text{tlep}M_{2,1}$. We only give the proof for $M_{2,1}$ and $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$. For $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $\{0,1\}^\omega$ is replaced by $\{0,1\}^*$.

(1) A function $f \in \text{tot}M_{2,1}$ belongs to the fixator F_0 iff f has a table of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1x_1 & \dots & 1x_k & 1x'_1 & \dots & 1x'_h \\ 0 & 1y_1 & \dots & 1y_k & 0y'_1 & \dots & 0y'_h \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\text{dom}C(f) = \{0\} \cup 1P \cup 1P'$, and where $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$, $P' = \{x'_1, \dots, x'_h\}$ are any finite prefix codes such that $P\{0,1\}^* \cap P'\{0,1\}^* = \emptyset$. Moreover, $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ is any set of size $\leq |P|$, and $\{y'_1, \dots, y'_h\}$ is any set of size $\leq |P'|$. Since f is total, $\text{dom}C(f)$ is a maximal finite prefix code; hence, $P \cup P'$ is a maximal finite prefix code, so P' is a complementary finite prefix code of P .

The function $f^\rho = (f \cap 1\{0,1\}^\omega \times 1\{0,1\}^\omega) \in M_{2,1}$ is such that f^ρ is undefined if the input, or the output, is in $0\{0,1\}^\omega$. Thus the table of f^ρ is

$$f^\rho = \begin{bmatrix} 1x_1 & \dots & 1x_k \\ 1y_1 & \dots & 1y_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

The image set of ρ is the set of all elements of $M_{2,1}$ that have a table of the above form for f^ρ (since P can be any finite prefix code),

The function

$$\iota : \begin{bmatrix} 1x_1 & \dots & 1x_k \\ 1y_1 & \dots & 1y_k \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & \dots & x_k \\ y_1 & \dots & y_k \end{bmatrix}$$

is an isomorphism from $\rho(F_0)$ onto $M_{2,1}$. It is surjective because $\{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$ can be the table of any element of $M_{2,1}$. (Remark: The function ρ could also be defined on all of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$, but then it would not be a homomorphism, since $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ is congruence-simple.)

Let us prove that the restriction of ϱ to $\varrho^{-1}(\text{tot}M_{2,1})$ is injective: If $\varphi = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$ is the table of an element of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ then $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ is a maximal prefix code, and $P' = \emptyset$. Hence $\varrho^{-1}(\varphi)$ consists of just the element given by the table $\{(0, 0), (1x_1, 1y_1), \dots, (1x_k, 1y_k)\}$.

We still need to prove the following.

Claim: $\rho : f \in F_0 \mapsto f^\rho \in \rho(F_0)$ is a semigroup homomorphism.

Proof of Claim: For $g, f \in F_0$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^\omega$ there are several cases. We use parentheses $(.)$ for application of functions, and we use brackets $[.]$ for grouping in the composition of functions.

◦ $x, f(x) \in 1\{0, 1\}^\omega$:

Then $g^\rho(f^\rho(x)) = g^\rho(f(x)) = g(f(x))$. Since gf is total, $g(f(x))$ belongs either to $1\{0, 1\}^\omega$ or to $0\{0, 1\}^\omega$.

If $g(f(x)) \in 1\{0, 1\}^\omega$ then $g(f(x)) = [gf]^\rho(x)$. Hence $g^\rho(f^\rho(x)) = [gf]^\rho(x)$.

If $g(f(x)) \in 0\{0, 1\}^\omega$ then $[gf]^\rho(x)$ is undefined. Moreover, $g^\rho(f^\rho(x)) = g(f(x)) \in 0\{0, 1\}^\omega$, i.e., the image of $f(x)$ under g is in $0\{0, 1\}^\omega$; therefore, $g^\rho(f^\rho(x))$ is undefined. So $g^\rho(f^\rho(x)) = [gf]^\rho(x)$, both being undefined.

◦ $x \in 1\{0, 1\}^\omega$ and $f(x) = 0z \in 0\{0, 1\}^\omega$:

Then $f^\rho(x)$ is undefined, hence $g^\rho(f^\rho(x))$ is undefined. And $[gf]^\rho(x) \in \{gf(x)\} \cap 1\{0, 1\}^\omega$, where $gf(x) = g(0z) \in 0\{0, 1\}^\omega$ (since $g \in F_0$); hence $[gf]^\rho(x) \in \{gf(x)\} \cap 1\{0, 1\}^\omega = \emptyset$, so $[gf]^\rho(x)$ is also undefined.

◦ $x = 0z \in 0\{0, 1\}^\omega$:

Then $f^\rho(x)$ is undefined, hence $g^\rho(f^\rho(x))$ is undefined. Since $g, f \in F_0$, $gf(0z) = 0z$. Now $[gf]^\rho(x) \in \{gf(0z)\} \cap 1\{0, 1\}^\omega = \{0z\} \cap 1\{0, 1\}^\omega = \emptyset$, so $[gf]^\rho(x)$ is also undefined.

This proves the Claim and part (1) of the Theorem.

The same proof works for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, by replacing $\{0, 1\}^\omega$ by $\{0, 1\}^*$.

(2) The proof is similar to the proof of (1), but now we have to be careful about lengths.

A function $f \in \text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ belongs to the stabilizer S_0 iff f has a table of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0u_1 & \dots & 0u_r & 1x_1 & \dots & 1x_k & 1x'_1 & \dots & 1x'_h \\ 0v_1 & \dots & 0v_r & 1y_1 & \dots & 1y_k & 0y'_1 & \dots & 0y'_h \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\text{dom}C(f) = 0U \cup 1P \cup 1P'$, and where $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$, $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$, $P' = \{x'_1, \dots, x'_k\}$ are finite prefix codes such that $P\{0, 1\}^* \cap P'\{0, 1\}^* = \emptyset$. Moreover, $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ is a set of size $\leq |P|$, $\{y'_1, \dots, y'_h\}$ is a set of size $\leq |P'|$, and $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ is a set of size $\leq |U|$. Since f is total, $\text{dom}C(f)$ is a maximal finite prefix code; hence, U and $P \cup P'$ are each a maximal finite prefix code, so P' is a complementary finite prefix code of P . Since f is tlep , we have the additional properties that for all i (in the appropriate ranges),

$$|v_i| - |u_i| = |y_i| - |x_i| = |y'_i| - |x'_i| = \delta(f).$$

The remainder of the proof is the same as for (1).

The same proof works for $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, by replacing $\{0, 1\}^\omega$ by $\{0, 1\}^*$. \square

Remark. The reason why the fixator is not used in (2) is that we want \bar{f} to be length-equality preserving (lep). As a result, in (2), the restriction of ϱ to $\varrho^{-1}(\text{tlep}M_{2,1})$ is not injective.

Inverse-homomorphic nondeterministic completion algorithm:

For a finite prefix code $P \subseteq A^*$ we define the *size of P* by $\|P\| = \sum_{x \in P} |x|$, where $|x|$ is the length of x .

For a right-ideal morphism $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ given by a table $\{(x_i, y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, the *size of the table* is defined by $\|g\| = \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i y_i|$.

By [8, Def. 3.29, Lemma 3.30] and [14, Prop. 5.2], every finite prefix code $P \subseteq A^*$ has a complementary prefix code $Q \subseteq A^*$ such that $\text{maxlen}(P) = \text{maxlen}(Q)$. If $P \subseteq A^m$ then $A^m \setminus P$ is a complementary prefix code of P .

In Prop. 9.6, ϱ is as in Theorem 9.5.

Proposition 9.6.

(1) $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$:

The following nondeterministic algorithm, on input $g \in M_{2,1}$ (given by the table of a right-ideal morphism in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ that represents g), outputs an element $\bar{g} \in \text{tot}M_{2,1}$ (given by the table of a right-ideal morphism in $\text{tot}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), such that $\varrho(\bar{g}) = g$.

(2) $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$:

A variant of this nondeterministic algorithm, on input $g \in \text{plep}M_{2,1}$ (given by the table of a right-ideal morphism in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), outputs an element $\bar{g} \in \text{tlep}M_{2,1}$ (given by the table of a right-ideal morphism in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), such that $\varrho(\bar{g}) = g$. The algorithm can find such a \bar{g} in time $O(\|g\|)$.

Algorithm:

For any function $g \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ with table

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & \dots & x_k \\ y_1 & \dots & y_k \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\text{dom}C(g) = P = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ is a finite prefix code, a completion can be obtained by choosing

$$\bar{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1x_1 & \dots & 1x_k & 1x'_1 & \dots & 1x'_h \\ 0 & 1y_1 & \dots & 1y_k & 0y'_1 & \dots & 0y'_h \end{bmatrix},$$

where $P' = \{x'_1, \dots, x'_h\}$ is an arbitrary complementary finite prefix code of P , and $g' = \{(x'_1, y'_1), \dots, (x'_h, y'_h)\}$ is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ with domain code P' . (If g is total, i.e. P is maximal, then $P' = \emptyset$, so g' is the empty function θ .)

If $g \in \text{plep}M_{2,1}$, represented by a right-ideal morphism in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, then $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$, and $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, with $n = m + \delta(g)$. We chose

$$\bar{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 0u_1 & \dots & 0u_r & 1x_1 & \dots & 1x_k & 1x'_1 & \dots & 1x'_h \\ 0v_1 & \dots & 0v_r & 1y_1 & \dots & 1y_k & 0y'_1 & \dots & 0y'_h \end{bmatrix},$$

where $U = \{0, 1\}^m$ (no choice). We arbitrarily choose a set $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, and we choose the pairing arbitrarily so that $\{(u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_r, v_r)\} \in \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. We let $P' = \{0, 1\}^m \setminus P$ (no choice), we arbitrarily choose a set $\{y'_1, \dots, y'_h\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, and we choose the pairing $g' = \{(x'_i, y'_i) : i = 1, \dots, h\}$ in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. The resulting table for \bar{g} gives a right-ideal morphism in $\text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, with fixed input length $m+1$ and fixed output length $n+1$.

In the case of $\text{pfl}M_{2,1}$, if g is given by a table with $\text{dom}C(g) \subseteq \{0,1\}^m$, then the complementary prefix code of $\text{dom}C(g)$ is easily found.

The choices in the construction of \bar{g} from g are of course nondeterministic, but the inverse process $\varrho : \bar{g} \mapsto g$ is a function, and a homomorphism $F_0 \twoheadrightarrow M_{2,1}$, respectively $S_0 \twoheadrightarrow \text{tfl}M_{2,1}$. \square

Remark. In part (1) of the algorithm we do not know whether the time complexity is polynomial in $\|g\|$ because we do not know an efficient algorithm for finding a finite complementary prefix code of a finite prefix code.

Besides the above nondeterministic completion procedure, there are many other ones; there are many monoid homomorphisms from submonoids of $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$ onto $M_{2,1}$, respectively submonoids of $\text{pfl}M_{2,1}$ onto $\text{tfl}M_{2,1}$.

The above algorithm does not run in polynomial time (except in the pfl case). In the next two subsections we give algorithms that run in log-space, but use a different form of input than the above algorithm: g will either be given by a generator word over Γ or $\Gamma \cup \tau$, or (in the pfl case) by an acyclic circuit.

9.3 Generator-based completion

Generator-based completion for $M_{2,1}$

Let $\varrho : F_0 \twoheadrightarrow M_{2,1}$, with $F_0 \leq \text{tot}M_{2,1}$, be as in Theorem 9.5. Let Γ_M be any finite set such that $\Gamma_M \cup \tau$ generates $M_{2,1}$; similarly, let Γ_{tot} be any finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{tot}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$.

For each generator γ in the finite set Γ_M we choose a word $\bar{\gamma} \in (\Gamma_{\text{tot}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that $E_{\bar{\gamma}} \in \varrho^{-1}(\gamma) \subseteq F_0$.

For a transposition $\tau_{i,j} \in \tau$ with $1 \leq i < j$ we choose $\bar{\tau}_{i,j}$ as follows: For all $x \in \{0,1\}^{\geq j}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\tau}_{i,j}(0x) &= 0x, \\ \bar{\tau}_{i,j}(1x) &= \tau_{i+1,j+1}(1x),\end{aligned}$$

so $\text{dom}C(\bar{\tau}_{i,j}) = \{0,1\}^{j+1} = \text{im}C(\bar{\tau}_{i,j})$. Then $\bar{\tau}_{i,j} \in \varrho^{-1}(\tau_{i,j}) \subseteq F_0$, so $\bar{\tau}_{i,j}$ is indeed a completion of $\tau_{i,j}$ according to Theorem 9.5(1). To represent $\bar{\tau}_{i,j}$ be a word in $(\Gamma_{\text{tot}} \cup \tau)^*$ we use the following formula: For every string $bx \in \{0,1\}^{j+1}$ with $b \in \{0,1\}$,

$$\bar{\tau}_{i,j}(bx) = ((b')^{j+1} \text{ and}_{j+1} bx) \text{ or}_{j+1} (b^{j+1} \text{ and}_{j+1} \tau_{i+1,j+1}(bx)),$$

where $b' = \text{not}(b)$, z^n denotes the concatenation of n copies of z , and_n (or or_n) is the bitwise and (respectively or) of two bitstrings of length n .

Based on this formula, one can easily build an acyclic boolean circuit for $\bar{\tau}_{i,j}$, and this circuit then yields a word in $(\Gamma_{\text{tot}} \cup \tau)^*$ (by Theorem 3.8(1)). Thus for $\tau_{i,j}$ we can construct a word for $\bar{\tau}_{i,j}$ in space $O(\log j)$.

This proves the following:

Corollary 9.7 *For any $w = w_n \dots w_1 \in (\Gamma_M \cup \tau)^*$ with $w_i \in \Gamma_M \cup \tau$ (for $i = 1, \dots, n$), let $E_w = w_n \circ \dots \circ w_1(\cdot) \in M_{k,1}$ be the function generated. By completing each generator and concatenating we obtain $W = \bar{w}_n \dots \bar{w}_1 \in (\Gamma_{\text{tot}} \cup \tau)^*$, which generates the total function $E_W = \bar{w}_n \circ \dots \circ \bar{w}_1(\cdot) \in F_0 \subseteq \text{tot}M_{k,1}$.*

Then E_W is a completion of E_w , i.e., $\varrho(E_W) = E_w$.

The word W can be computed from w in log-space. \square

In other words, a completion of a function $f \in M_{k,1}$, given by a sequence of generators, can be efficiently obtained by completing the generators and composing them. The same approach works for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

Generator-based completion for $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$

For $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ we obtain more results, based on the generating sets $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau$, respectively $\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau$, with Γ_{pfl} and Γ_{tfl} finite.

For the finitely many generators $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{pfl}}$ we choose $\bar{\gamma} \in \varrho^{-1}(\gamma) \subseteq S_0$ nondeterministically as in Prop. 9.6. For a position transposition $\tau_{i,j} \in \tau$ with $1 \leq i < j$ we choose

$$\bar{\tau}_{i,j} = \tau_{i+1,j+1}.$$

For this choice, $\tau_{i+1,j+1}(0z) \in 0\{0,1\}^*$ for all $z \in \{0,1\}^{\geq j+1}$ and for all $z \in \{0,1\}^\omega$; so $\tau_{i+1,j+1} \in S_0$ ($\subseteq \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), and $\varrho(\tau_{i+1,j+1}) = \tau_{i,j}$.

Remarks: (1) Many completions of $\tau_{i,j}$ are possible, but the above one has the advantage of being itself in τ . (2) Note that $\tau_{i+1,j+1} \notin F_0$, so the above completion of $\tau_{i,j}$ only works for $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$, not for $M_{2,1}$.

Proposition 9.8 (completion in terms of generators).

For every $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ there exists a word $\bar{w} \in (\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that

- (1) $E_{\bar{w}} \in S_0$ ($\subseteq \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$) is a completion of E_w , and \bar{w} can be found from w by a deterministic algorithm that runs in linear time and log-space.
- (2) $|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} \leq |\bar{w}|_{\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau} \leq c|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau}$, for some constant $c \geq 1$;
 $\text{maxindex}_\tau(w) \leq \text{maxindex}_\tau(\bar{w}) \leq \text{maxindex}_\tau(w) + 1$;
 $\ell_{\text{in}}(\bar{w}) = \ell_{\text{in}}(w) + 1$, and $\ell_{\text{out}}(\bar{w}) + 1 = \ell_{\text{out}}(w) + 1$; hence,
 $|w| \leq |\bar{w}| \leq c|w|$, for some constant $c \geq 1$.
- (3) $\bar{w} \in (\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ can be chosen so that in addition to the above,
 $\text{depth}(\bar{w}) \leq c + \max\{\text{depth}(w), \log_2 |w|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}}}\}$, for some constant $c \geq 1$.

PROOF. (1) This is proved in the same way as Corollary 9.7, except that a simpler form for $\bar{\tau}_{i,j}$ is now used. The construction of \bar{w} implies that it can be computed from w in linear times and log-space (if every transposition $\tau_{i,j}$ is encoded in the form $0^i 1^j$ over the alphabet $\{0,1\} \cup \Gamma_{\text{pfl}}$, assuming $\{0,1\}^* \cap \Gamma_{\text{pfl}} = \emptyset$).

(2) The claims about $|\bar{w}|_{\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau}$ and $\text{maxindex}_\tau(\bar{w})$ follow immediately from the construction of \bar{w} .

The claims about $\ell_{\text{in}}(\bar{w})$ and $\ell_{\text{out}}(\bar{w})$ follow from the definition. Let $x \in \{0,1\}^m$. By induction on $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, one proves that $\bar{w}_i \circ \dots \circ \bar{w}_1(1x)$ is defined iff $w_i \circ \dots \circ w_1(x)$ ($\in \{0,1\}^n$) is defined. And for $x \notin \text{Dom}(w_i \circ \dots \circ w_1)$, $\bar{w}_i \circ \dots \circ \bar{w}_1(1x) \in 0\{0,1\}^n$. Moreover, $\bar{w}_i \circ \dots \circ \bar{w}_1(0\{0,1\}^m) \subseteq 0\{0,1\}^n$. Hence, $\ell_{\text{in}}(\bar{w}) = \ell_{\text{in}}(w) + 1$ and $\ell_{\text{out}}(\bar{w}) = \ell_{\text{out}}(w) + 1$.

(3) The claim about $\text{depth}(\bar{w})$ follows from Prop. 9.9(2) below, and the definition of depth in terms of circuits (Def. 3.12). \square

9.4 Circuit-based completion

We now construct circuit completions that do not use generators nor Theorems 3.8 and 3.11 (about the conversion between words and circuits or partial circuits). By a circuit we always mean an acyclic circuit.

Proposition 9.9 (boolean circuit for the completion).

Let ϱ be as in Theorem 9.5. Suppose that $f \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ has a partial circuit C_f with input-length m , output-length n , and size s . Then we have:

- (1) f has a completion $\bar{f} \in \varrho^{-1}(f) \subseteq \text{tfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ that has a boolean circuit with input-length $m+1$, output-length $n+1$, and size $\leq cs$ (for some constant $c \geq 1$).

(2) If, in addition, C_f has depth d , then f has a completion $\bar{f} \in \varrho^{-1}(f)$ that has a boolean circuit with depth $\leq O(1) + \max\{d, \lceil \log_2 s \rceil + 2 \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil\}$, input-length $m+1$, output-length $n+1$, and size $O(s)$.

The boolean circuit for \bar{f} can be computed from C_f in log-space.

(3) Under the assumptions of (2), the classical completion $\tilde{f} \in \text{tflRM}^{\text{fin}}$ (defined in Subsection 9.1) has a boolean circuit with depth $\leq O(1) + \max\{d, \lceil \log_2 s \rceil + 2 \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil\}$, input-length m , output-length n , and size $\leq O(s)$.

The boolean circuit for \tilde{f} can be computed from the partial circuit C_f in log-space.

PROOF. (1) This follows from Prop. 9.8(2) (about the word-lengths of $f = E_w$ and $\bar{f} = E_{\bar{w}}$), combined with Theorems 3.8 and 3.11 (about the connection between word-length and circuit-size). (1) also follows from the construction in part (2) below.

(2) We pick the completion

$$\bar{f} = \begin{bmatrix} 0u^{(1)} & \dots & 0u^{(r)} & 1x^{(1)} & \dots & 1x^{(k)} & 1z^{(1)} & \dots & 1z^{(h)} \\ 0^{n+1} & \dots & 0^{n+1} & 1y^{(1)} & \dots & 1y^{(k)} & 0^{n+1} & \dots & 0^{n+1} \end{bmatrix},$$

with $\varrho(\bar{f}) = f$. Here $U = \{u^{(1)}, \dots, u^{(r)}\} = \{0, 1\}^m$, with $r = 2^m$; $\text{domC}(f) = P = \{x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(k)}\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$, and $y^{(i)} = f(x^{(i)}) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ for $i \in [1, k]$; $P' = \{z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(h)}\} = \{0, 1\}^m \setminus P$ (complementary prefix code), with $h = 2^m - k$. In other words, for all inputs $x_0 x$ with $x_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(x_0 x) &= 1 f(x) && \text{if } x_0 = 1 \text{ and } x \in P; \\ \bar{f}(x_0 x) &= 0^{n+1} && \text{if } x_0 = 0 \text{ or } x \in \{0, 1\}^m \setminus P. \end{aligned}$$

Claim: Suppose f has a *partial circuit* C_f with input-length m , output-length n , size s , and depth d . Then there is a boolean circuit C_G with the following properties:

◦ The input-output function of C_G is $G : x \in \{0, 1\}^m \mapsto G(x) \in \{0, 1\}^{n+1}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} G(x) &= 1 f(x) && \text{if } x \in P, \\ G(x) &= 0^{n+1} && \text{if } x \in \{0, 1\}^m \setminus P. \end{aligned}$$

So, $G(x) = \bar{f}(1x)$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$.

◦ The boolean circuit C_G has size $\leq c_0 s$, and depth $\leq c_1 + \max\{d, \lceil \log_2 s \rceil + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil\}$ (for some constants $c_0, c_1 \geq 1$).

Proof of the Claim: We modify the partial circuit C_f by completing every partial gate g as follows. To g we add a new output wire that outputs 0 if the gate-output is undefined on the given gate-input; and for that gate-input, the already existing output wires of the gate g now receive the value 0. If on the given gate-input of g , the gate-output is defined, the newly added output wire outputs 1. This modified gate, which is total, is the *completion* of the partial gate g .

The newly added output wires do not feed into any existing gates, but into a binary tree of and-gates, of size $\leq s$ and depth $\leq 1 + \lceil \log_2 s \rceil$. Let y_0 be the single output bit of this tree of and-gates. Let \bar{y} be output, other than y_0 , of the completed circuit; so \bar{y} has length n .

Next, n copies of y_0 are produced by a binary tree of $\leq n$ fork gates (of depth $1 + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$).

The output \bar{y} is combined (using and-gates) with the n copies of y_0 . In other words, this yields the bitstring $y_0^n \text{and}_n \bar{y}$, where and_n is the bitwise and of two bitstrings of length n . We also output y_0 itself. The output of C_G is thus $y_0 (y_0^n \text{and}_n \bar{y})$, which is $1 f(x)$ if $x \in P$, and 0^{n+1} if $x \in \{0, 1\}^m \setminus P$. This completes the construction of C_G .

The claim about circuit size is straightforward.

The depth of C_G is $\leq \max\{d, 2 + \lceil \log_2 s \rceil + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil\}$, since the **and**-tree, followed by the **fork**-tree, can be put in parallel with the completed circuit for G , except for a delay of one gate (this is why there is “2+” in $2 + 2 \lceil \log_2 s \rceil + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ instead of the previous “1+”). [End, proof of Claim.]

The definition of $\bar{f} : \{0, 1\}^{m+1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n+1}$ can be formulated as follows. For all inputs $x_0 x$ with $x_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$,

$$\bar{f}(x_0 x) = x_0^{n+1} \text{ and}_{n+1} G(x),$$

where $x_0^{n+1} \in \{0^{n+1}, 1^{n+1}\}$ is the concatenation of $n+1$ copies of the bit x_0 .

Let us now describe a log-space algorithm that constructs a boolean circuit $C_{\bar{f}}$ for \bar{f} , based on the partial circuit C_f . First, the boolean circuit C_G is constructed as the proof of the Claim; on input x , C_G outputs $\bar{f}(1x)$. Second, $n+1$ copies of x_0 are made, by using a binary tree of **fork** gates, of depth $1 + \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil$. This can be done in log-space. Finally, we use the formula $\bar{f}(x_0 x) = x_0^{n+1} \text{ and}_{n+1} G(x)$; for this, a row of $n+1$ **and**-gates combines x_0^{n+1} bitwise with the output of C_G .

The size of $C_{\bar{f}}$ is $O(s)$, and the depth is $\leq 3 + \max\{d, 2 + \lceil \log_2 s \rceil + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil + \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil\}$.

(3) The boolean circuit $C_{\bar{f}}$ can be modified to a boolean circuit that it computes \tilde{f} , as follows. On input $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$, the circuit prepends 1, and computes $\bar{f}(1x)$. If the result is 1 $f(x)$ the circuit outputs $f(x)$; if the output is in $0\{0, 1\}^*$, the circuit outputs 0^n . \square

10 Representation of a function in $M_{2,1}$ or $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ by a union of partial circuits with disjoint domains

10.1 Preliminaries

Recall the definitions of $\ell_{\text{in}}(C)$, $\ell_{\text{out}}(C)$ (Def. 3.1), circuit size (Def. 3.2), $\ell_{\text{in}}(w)$, $\ell_{\text{out}}(w)$ (Def. 3.3), and various word-lengths and $\text{maxlen}(\mathcal{F})$ (Def. 3.5).

Proposition 10.1.

(1) For any partial acyclic circuit C :

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(C), \ell_{\text{out}}(C) \leq |C|.$$

(2) Let Γ_{RM} be a finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau$ generates $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. For every word $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ let $|w| = |w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w)$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{in}}(w) &\leq c|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}}} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w) \leq c|w|, \\ \ell_{\text{out}}(w) &\leq 2c|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}}} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w) \leq 2c|w|, \end{aligned}$$

where $c = \text{maxlen}(\Gamma_{\text{RM}})$.

PROOF. (1) The inequality is immediate from the definition of circuit size (Def. 3.2).

(2) Let $\ell = c|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}}} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w)$. For the first inequality it suffices to show that $E_w(x)$ is defined for every $x \in \{0, 1\}^{\geq \ell}$ such that $x \{0, 1\}^{\omega} \subseteq \text{Dom}(E_w) \{0, 1\}^{\omega}$.

When w is applied to x , the generators in τ do not cause any change in length, and can only have an effect within length $\leq \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w)$; indeed, the generators of w in Γ_{RM} cannot cause a decrease of more than $c|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}}}$, so the string that results at any moment has length $\geq \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w)$. And the $|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}}}$ generators in Γ_{RM} cause a length-increase of at most $c \cdot |w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}}}$.

Hence, if $|x| \geq \ell$ then x is not too short for any of the generators to be applied (if $x \{0, 1\}^{\omega} \in \text{Dom}(E_w)$). Hence $m \leq \ell$. And in the output of the action of w on $x \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell}$ is a most $c \cdot |w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}}}$ longer than x . \square

Definition 10.2 (common input-length and common output-length).

Let Γ_{pfl} be a finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

(1) For a set of words $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\} \subseteq (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$, the common input-length is

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(u_1, \dots, u_k) = \max\{\ell_{\text{in}}(u_1), \dots, \ell_{\text{in}}(u_k)\},$$

where $\ell_{\text{in}}(u_i)$ is as in Def. 3.3.

(2) If $\delta(E_{u_i})$ is the same for all $i \in [1, k]$, then the common output-length of $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ is

$$\ell_{\text{in}}(u_1, \dots, u_k) + \delta(E_{u_i}),$$

which is the same for all i .

If $\delta(E_{u_i})$ is not the same for all $i \in [1, k]$ then $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ has no common output-length.

Lemma 10.3 Under the conditions of Def. 10.2, the common input-length m and the common output-length n satisfy

$$m, n \leq \max\{\text{maxlen}(\Gamma_{\text{pfl}}) \cdot |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}}} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(u_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

PROOF. This is proved in a similar way as Prop. 10.1. \square

Depth of words in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $M_{2,1}$

We saw that words in $(\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ or $(\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ are closely related to boolean circuits, respectively partial circuits. Words in $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$, where Γ_{RM} is finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau$ generates $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (and hence $M_{2,1}$) are a generalization of partial circuits. However, the previous definition of depth of an element of $(\Gamma_{\text{tfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ or $(\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ are based on circuits that are directly obtained from words of generators. This approach does not directly apply to $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ since a generator in Γ_{RM} need not have a fixed input-length and a fixed output-length, so no circuit digraph with fixed in- and out-degrees can be formed.

Nevertheless, Def. 10.4 gives the depth of a word $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ for a given input $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$. Let $w = w_k \dots w_1$ with $w_i \in \Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau$ (for $1 \leq i \leq k$). For a fixed input $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ of length $|x| \geq \ell_{\text{in}}(w) = m$, each $w_i(\cdot)$ has a fixed input-length, and a fixed output-length. So for a given $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^{\geq m}$, there is a partial circuit $C_{w,x}$ such that $C_{w,x}(x) = E_w(x)$ (as constructed for partial circuits in Theorem 3.11). If $E_w(x)$ is undefined then $C_{w,x}$ and its depth are undefined.

Definition 10.4 (depth of a word in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$).

Let Γ_{RM} be a finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau$ generates $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and hence $M_{2,1}$. Let $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$, and let $\ell_{\text{in}}(w) = m$ be the input-length of w (Def. 3.3). For any $x \in \text{Dom}(E_w) \cap \{0, 1\}^m$, let $C_{w,x}$ be the partial circuit just constructed for w on input x . Then the depth of w is defined by

$$\text{depth}(w) = \max\{\text{depth}(C_{w,x}) : x \in \text{Dom}(E_w) \cap \{0, 1\}^m\}.$$

If $E_w = \theta$ (the empty function) then $\text{depth}(w)$ is not defined.

10.2 Unambiguous union

Definition 10.5 (unambiguous union).

(1) **Sets:** For an indexed family of sets $(D_i : i \in I)$ the unambiguous union, denoted by $!\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i$, is the set of elements that belong to exactly one of the sets D_i :

$$!\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i = \{d \in \bigcup_{i \in I} D_i : (\exists! j \in I)[d \in D_j]\}.$$

In particular, if $D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset$ for all $i, j \in I$ with $i \neq j$, then $!\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} D_i$.

(2) Functions: Consider a family of functions $(f_i : i \in I)$, where $f_i = (X, r_i, X)$ (see Def. 2.1); so all f_i have the same source and target set X . The unambiguous union of that family of functions is denoted by

$$!\bigcup_{i \in I} f_i$$

and defined to be (X, r, X) where r is the restriction of the relation $\bigcup_{i \in I} r_i$ to the unambiguous union $!\bigcup_{i \in I} \text{Dom}(r_i)$.

In particular, if all the functions f_i have two-by-two disjoint domains, then $!\bigcup_{i \in I} f_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} f_i$.

The empty set is a neutral element for unambiguous union: If $D_{j_0} = \emptyset$ then $!\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i = !\bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \{j_0\}} D_i$. For unambiguous union the order of the sets or functions in a family does not matter, i.e., the unambiguous union operation satisfies generalized commutativity.

Associativity, and relation between unambiguous union and symmetric difference:

For any *two* sets D_1, D_2 : $D_1 !\cup D_2 = D_1 \Delta D_2$ (symmetric difference). The symmetric difference is associative. Since Δ and $!\cup$ are the same when applied to two sets, the unambiguous union, as a binary operation, is *associative*.

The symmetric difference of a finite family of sets (D_1, \dots, D_N) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i=1}^N D_i &= \{x \in \bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i : x \text{ occurs in } D_i \text{ for an odd number of indices } i\} \\ &= (\dots ((D_1 \Delta D_2) \Delta D_3) \Delta \dots \Delta D_{n-1}) \Delta D_n. \end{aligned}$$

However, for unambiguous union the situation is different. As a variable-arity operation,

$$!\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i = \{x \in \bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i : x \text{ occurs in } D_i \text{ for exactly one index } i\}.$$

This is usually different from $(\dots ((D_1 !\cup D_2) !\cup D_3) !\cup \dots !\cup D_{n-1}) !\cup D_n$, since the latter is the same as the symmetric difference. So, non-binary unambiguous union (of a family) is *not associative*.

For an infinite family the unambiguous union $!\bigcup_{i \in I} D_i$ is well-defined but the symmetric difference is not defined. [End, Remark.]

Proposition 10.6.

(1) For any family (f_1, \dots, f_k) with $f_i \in M_{2,1}$ (or $\in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$) for all $i \in [1, k]$:

$$!\bigcup_{i=1}^k f_i \in M_{2,1} \quad (\text{respectively } \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}).$$

(2) Consider any $f_i \in \text{plep}M_{2,1} \setminus \{\theta\}$ (or $\in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} \setminus \{\theta\}$), for $i \in [1, n]$.

If $\delta(f_i)$ is the same for every i , then

$$!\bigcup_{i=1}^k f_i \in \text{plep}M_{2,1} \quad (\text{respectively } \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}).$$

PROOF. (1) follows straightforwardly from the definition of unambiguous union. (2) follows easily from the definitions of $!\cup$, $\delta(\cdot)$, $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$, and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. \square

The input-output length difference function $\delta(\cdot)$ (see Def. 7.5 for total functions, and Prop. 7.8 for partial functions) can be generalized to $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, $M_{2,1}$, and $G_{2,1}$:

Definition 10.7 (general input-output length difference $\delta_M(\cdot)$).

For $f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ we define

$$\delta_M(f) = \{|f(x)| - |x| : x \in \text{dom}C(f)\}.$$

Then δ_M is a total function from $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ onto $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{Z})$ (the set of all finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}).

For $f \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, we have: $\delta_M(f) = \{\delta(f)\}$. In particular, for the empty function θ we have $\delta_M(\theta) = \emptyset$; so $\delta_M(\theta)$ is defined, while $\delta(\theta)$ is undefined.

Proposition 10.8.

(1) If $g, f \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ satisfy $g \equiv_{\text{fin}} f$, then $\delta_M(g) = \delta_M(f)$. Hence δ_M is well-defined on $M_{2,1}$.

(2) For all $g, f \in M_{2,1}$:

$$\delta_M(g \circ f) \subseteq \delta_M(g) + \delta_M(f)$$

where $+$ denotes elementwise addition in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{Z})$.

(3) Let Γ be a finite set such that $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$. Then for every word $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$,

$$\delta_M(E_w) \subseteq [-c_{(-)} |w|_{\Gamma}, c^{(+)} |w|_{\Gamma}],$$

where $c^{(+)} = \max\{j : j \geq 0, j \in \delta_M(\gamma), \gamma \in \Gamma\}$, and $c_{(-)} = \max\{|j| : j \leq 0, j \in \delta_M(\gamma), \gamma \in \Gamma\}$.

PROOF. Both (1) and (2) are straightforward. Elementwise addition of $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{Z})$ is defined by $X + Y = \{x + y : x \in X, y \in Y\}$; hence, if $X = \emptyset$ or $Y = \emptyset$ then $X + Y = \emptyset$.

(3) This follows from (2), using the fact that $\delta_M(\tau_{i,j}) = \{0\}$ for all $\tau_{i,j} \in \tau$. \square

The inclusion “ \subseteq ” in (2) can be strict, e.g. if $g \circ f = \theta$, but $g \neq \theta \neq f$. So the function $\delta_M(\cdot)$ is not a semigroup homomorphism.

The invariance of $\delta(\cdot)$ under \equiv_{fin} (Prop. 10.8(1)), and the fact that f is a right-ideal morphism, imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_M(f) &= \{|f(x)| - |x| : x \in \text{dom}C(f)\} \\ &= \{|f(x)| - |x| : x \in \text{Dom}(f)\}. \end{aligned}$$

This is a finite set (although $\text{Dom}(f)$ is infinite), and part (3) gives bounds on that set.

Since the monoids $M_{2,1}$, $\text{tot}M_{2,1}$, and $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ are congruence-simple (see Subsection 7.1), $\delta_M(\cdot)$ is not a semigroup morphism on these monoids.

Theorem 10.9 will use the functions $C(\cdot)$ and $W(\cdot)$ from Theorems 3.8 and 3.11. Let Γ_{RM} be a finite generating set of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (and hence $M_{2,1}$), and let Γ_{pfl} be a finite set such that $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau$ generates $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ (and hence $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$).

Theorem 10.9 (I. From an unambiguous union of partial circuits to a $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)$ -word).

(1) Unambiguous union of partial circuits with the same δ -value

An unambiguous union of acyclic partial circuits with the same δ -value is equivalent to an acyclic partial circuit, or equivalently, to a word in $(\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$. In detail:

Let $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\} \subseteq (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ be such that for all $i \neq j$ in $[1, k]$:

$$\delta(E_{u_i}) = \delta(E_{u_j}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Dom}(E_{u_i}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{u_j}) = \emptyset.$$

Let m and n be the common input-length, respectively output-length, of $(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})$.

Then there exists a partial circuit C , and hence a word $w = W(C) \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ with $E_w = E_C$, such that:

- $!\bigcup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k E_{u_i} = E_C \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.
- $|C| \leq O(mk + nk + \sum_{i=1}^k |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau})$.
- $\ell_{\text{im}}(C) = m, \quad \ell_{\text{out}}(C) = n$.
- $\text{depth}(C) \leq O(\log k + \log n + \log m + \max\{\max\{\text{depth}(u_i), \log_2 |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau}\} : i \in [1, k]\})$.
- There is a deterministic algorithm that computes C on input (u_1, \dots, u_k) , in log-space

(in terms of the input-length $\sum_{i=1}^k |u_i|$, where any $\tau_{i,j} \in \tau$ is given the length j).

(2) Unambiguous union of partial circuits with different δ -values

An unambiguous union of partial circuits with different δ -values is equivalent to a word in $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$. In detail:

Let $\{u_1, \dots, u_k\} \subseteq (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ be such that for all $i \neq j$ in $[1, k]$:

$$\delta(E_{u_i}) \neq \delta(E_{u_j}) \quad (\text{hence } \text{Dom}(E_{u_i}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{u_j}) = \emptyset).$$

Let m be the common input-length of $(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})$, let $n_i = m + \delta(E_{u_i})$ (for $i \in [1, k]$), and let $n_{\max} = \max\{n_i : i \in [1, k]\}$.

Then there exists a word $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that

- $!\bigcup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^k E_{u_i} = E_w \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.
- $|w|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau} \leq O(\sum_{i=1}^k |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau})$.
- $\ell_{\text{in}}(w) = m$.
- $\text{depth}(w) \leq O(1) + \max\{\max\{\text{depth}(u_i), \lceil \log_2 |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} \rceil\} : i \in [1, k]\}$
- There is a deterministic algorithm that computes w on input (u_1, \dots, u_k) , in log-space (in terms of the input-length $\sum_{i=1}^k |u_i|$, where any $\tau_{i,j} \in \tau$ is given the length j).

PROOF. (1) By Prop. 10.6(2), $!\bigcup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k}) \in \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, so there exists $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that $E_w = !\bigcup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})$. We will construct a partial circuit for w ; then Theorem 3.11 immediately yields w as a word over $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau$. The partial circuit to be constructed has an input-output function $x \in \{0, 1\}^m \mapsto E_w(x) \in \{0, 1\}^n$, where m is the common input-length of $(E_{u_i} : i \in [1, k])$, and n is the common output-length.

The partial circuit is constructed so as to have four levels.

Level 1: The input is $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$. The output is x^k (i.e., k copies of x). It is produced by m binary trees, each of depth $\lceil \log_2 k \rceil$, and each consisting of $k-1$ fork-gates. It is straightforward to construct the boolean circuit of level 1 in space $O(\log(km))$.

Level 2: A preliminary remark: If we would apply $(E_{u_1}, E_{u_2}, \dots, E_{u_k})$ to (x, \dots, x) ($= x^k$), the result would be the concatenation $E_{u_1}(x) E_{u_2}(x) \dots E_{u_k}(x)$, which is undefined for all x (by disjointness of the domains). So instead, we first use the completion \overline{E}_{u_i} of each E_{u_i} .

Level 2 takes input x^k , and consists of the k circuits $\overline{C}_{u_1}, \dots, \overline{C}_{u_k}$ in parallel, where \overline{C}_{u_i} is a circuit for the completion of $C(u_i)$ (constructed in Prop. 9.9). Each \overline{C}_{u_i} takes one copy of $1x$ as input (so, for this, a 1 is prepended to each of the k copies of x , i.e., $(1x)^k$ is produced). Each \overline{C}_{u_i} has the same output-length, namely $n+1$. Recall that $\overline{E}_{u_i}(1x) = 1 E_{u_i}(x)$ if $E_{u_i}(x)$ is defined, and $= 0^{n+1}$ otherwise. The output of level 2 is the concatenation $\overline{E}_{u_1}(1x) \dots \overline{E}_{u_k}(1x)$ of length $k(n+1)$. So, the boolean circuit for level 2 has input-output function

$$x^k \mapsto \overline{E}_{u_1}(1x) \overline{E}_{u_2}(1x) \dots \overline{E}_{u_{k-1}}(1x) \overline{E}_{u_k}(1x).$$

The size of the boolean circuit for level 2 is

$$\leq k + \sum_{i=1}^k |\overline{u}_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} < c \sum_{i=1}^k |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau},$$

for some constant $c > 1$. The $+k$ is for producing the k 1s for $(1x)^k$, and the size of the boolean circuit \overline{C}_{u_i} is $O(|u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau})$, by Prop. 9.9.

The depth of this boolean circuit is

$$\leq O(1) + \max\{\text{depth}(u_i), \log_2 |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} + 2 \log_2(n+1) : i \in [1, k]\},$$

by Prop. 9.9. And \overline{C}_{u_i} and \overline{u}_i can be computed from u_i in log-space, by Prop. 9.9 and Theorem 3.8(1).

Level 3: This level has input $\overline{E}_{u_1}(1x) \dots \overline{E}_{u_k}(1x)$, and its output is the completion of $!\cup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})(x)$. Equivalently, the output is $\overline{E}_{u_j}(1x)$, where $j \in [1, k]$ is the unique index for which $E_{u_j}(x)$ is defined; otherwise the output is 0^{n+1} , if $E_{u_i}(x)$ is undefined for all $i \in [1, k]$.

To obtain this output, we form the bitwise or of the k bitstrings $\overline{E}_{u_i}(1x)$, for $i \in [1, k]$. Let $y_j^{(i)}$ be the j th output bit of $\overline{E}_{u_i}(1x)$, for $j \in [0, n]$, $i \in [1, k]$ (using the fact that all $E_{u_i}(x)$ are 0^{n+1} , except perhaps one). Then the j th output bit is

$$y_j = \text{OR}_{i=1}^k y_j^{(i)} \quad \text{for every } j \in [0, n].$$

Thus, level 3 consists of $n+1$ or-trees, each of size $k-1$ and depth $\lceil \log_2 k \rceil$. The j th or-tree (for $j \in [0, n]$) has k input bits and one output bit, namely y_j . The total output of level 3 is the concatenation $y_0 y_1 \dots y_n$.

The boolean circuit for level 3 has size $(n+1)(k-1)$ and depth $\lceil \log_2 k \rceil$.

Levels 1, 2, and 3 together form an acyclic boolean (total) circuit.

Level 4: This level turns $y_0 y_1 \dots y_n$, which is the output of completion $!\cup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})(x)$, into the final partial output $!\cup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})(x)$. This is equal to $y_1 \dots y_n$ if $y_0 = 1$, and is undefined if $y_0 = 0$.

We build a partial circuit for level 4 as follows. We use the partial one-bit gate h_0 such that $h_0(1) = 1$, and $h_0(0)$ is undefined. First, a partial h_0 -gate is connected to the leftmost wire (that carries the bit y_0). Second, n copies of the output-wire of the h_0 -gate are made (by a binary tree of depth $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$, made of $n-1$ fork-gates); then we form

$$(h_0(y_0))^n \text{ and } y_1 \dots y_n$$

(the bitwise and of two bitstrings of length n). Thus the result is undefined if $y_0 = 0$; and it is $y_1 \dots y_j \dots y_n$ if $y_0 = 1$.

The size the partial circuit of level 4 is $n-1+n$, and the depth is $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + 1$. [End, Level 4]

This completes the construction of a partial circuit for $!\cup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})$. As mentioned at the beginning of the proof, an equivalent word $w = W(C) \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ can now be obtained by Theorem 3.11.

By adding up the sizes and the depths of the four levels we obtain that the total size of the partial circuit is

$$\leq O(mk + nk + \sum_{i=1}^k |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau});$$

and the depth is

$$\leq O(\log k + \log n + \log m + \max\{\max\{\text{depth}(u_i), \log_2 |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau}\} : i \in [1, k]\}).$$

Complexity of computing w : For levels 1, 3, and 4, the log-space computability is straightforward. For level 2, Prop. 9.9 yields log-space computability of \overline{u}_i .

(2) Since $!\cup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k}) \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, by Prop. 10.6(1), there exists a word $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that $E_w = !\cup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})$. We construct the word w in four levels similar to the ones in part (1). Let m be the common input-length of $(E_{u_i} : i = 1, \dots, k)$. There is no common output-length.

We first construct a (slightly generalized) partial circuit for $!\cup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})$, and then a word in $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$.

Level 1: The input is $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$, the output is x^k (i.e., k copies of x), and a boolean circuit for this is built as in part (1).

Level 2: The input is x^k . Level 2 consists of the k boolean circuits $\overline{C}_{u_1}, \dots, \overline{C}_{u_k}$ in parallel, just as in part (1), except that now \overline{C}_{u_i} has output-length $n_i + 1$, which is different for every $i \in [1, k]$. The output of level 2 is the concatenation $\overline{E}_{u_1}(1x) \dots \overline{E}_{u_k}(1x)$, of length $k + \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$. By the same reasoning as in part (1) we find that the size of the boolean circuit $C^{(2)}$ of level 2 is

$$|C^{(2)}| \leq k + \sum_{i=1}^k |\overline{u}_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} < O(\sum_{i=1}^k |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau}),$$

and the depth of level 2 is

$$\text{depth}(C^{(2)}) \leq O(1) + \max\{\text{depth}(u_i), \log_2 |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cup \tau} + 2 \log_2(n_i + 1) : i \in [1, k]\},$$

Level 3: This level has input $\overline{E}_{u_1}(1x) \dots \overline{E}_{u_k}(1x)$, of length $k + \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$. Its output is $\overline{E}_{u_j}(1x)$ ($= 1 E_{u_j}(x)$), where $j \in [1, k]$ is the unique index for which $E_{u_j}(x)$ is defined; otherwise the output is 0 (if $E_{u_i}(x)$ is undefined for all $i \in [1, k]$).

As in level 3 of part (1), let y_0 be the or of the leading bits of the k strings $\overline{E}_{u_i}(1x)$ (for $i \in [1, k]$). Hence, $y_0 = 1$ if $!\bigcup(E_{u_1}, \dots, E_{u_k})(x)$ is defined, and $y_0 = 0$ otherwise. As in level 3 of (1), we can use an or-tree (of size $k-1$ and depth $\lceil \log_2 k \rceil$) to compute y_0 .

Since the strings $\overline{E}_{u_i}(1x)$ (for $i \in [1, k]$) all have different lengths, the output cannot be obtained by an or-trees as in level 3 of part (1). Instead, we first apply the transformation ξ_i to each $\overline{E}_{u_i}(1x)$, so the output of level 3 is $y_0 \xi_1(\overline{C}_{u_1}(1x)) \dots \xi_k(\overline{C}_{u_k}(1x))$. Each $\xi_i(\cdot)$ (for $i \in [1, k]$) is the right-ideal morphism defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i : z_0 y \in \{0, 1\} \{0, 1\}^{n_i} &\longmapsto \xi_i(z_0 y) \in \{\varepsilon\} \cup \{0, 1\}^{n_i}, \text{ where} \\ \xi_i(0y) &= \varepsilon, \text{ and} \\ \xi_i(1y) &= 1y; \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{domC}(\xi_i) = \{0, 1\}^{n_i+1}$. To express ξ_i by a word in $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ we introduce the right-ideal morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta : z_0 z_1 \in \{0, 1\}^2 &\longmapsto \zeta(z_0 z_1) \in \{\varepsilon\} \cup \{0, 1\}, \text{ where} \\ \zeta(0z_1) &= \varepsilon, \text{ and} \\ \zeta(1z_1) &= z_1; \end{aligned}$$

so $\text{domC}(\zeta) = \{0, 1\}^2$.

We can either include ζ into the generating set Γ_{RM} , or express it by a fixed word in $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$. Now for all $y = y_1 \dots y_j \dots y_{n_i}$, with $y_j \in \{0, 1\}$ for $j \in [1, n_i]$, we have

$$\xi_i(z_0 y_1 \dots y_j \dots y_{n_i}) = \zeta(z_0 y_1) \dots \zeta(z_0 y_j) \dots \zeta(z_0 y_{n_i}).$$

Indeed, if $z_0 = 0$ this expression becomes ε , and if $z_0 = 1$ the expression becomes y .

Thus, $\xi_i(z_0 y_1 \dots y_{n_i})$ can be computed by a tree of fork-gates (of size $n_i - 1$ and depth $\lceil \log_2 n_i \rceil$), that makes n_i copies of z_0 ; this tree can be converted into a $(\Gamma_{\text{ff}} \cup \tau)$ -word of size $O(n_i)$. The n_i copies of z_0 are then combined with $y_1 \dots y_j \dots y_{n_i}$ in a row of n_i instances of $\zeta(\cdot)$. This yields a word for ξ_i over $\{\zeta, \text{fork}\}$ of size $O(n_i)$.

Hence the output $y_0 \xi_1(\overline{C}_{u_1}(1x)) \dots \xi_k(\overline{C}_{u_k}(1x))$ of level 3 can be computed by a word $w^{(3)} \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ of size

$$|w^{(3)}|_{\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau} \leq k - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k O(n_i) \leq O(\sum_{i=1}^k n_i),$$

where, $k-1$ is for computing y_0 , and $O(n_i)$ is for ξ_i . And the depth is

$$\text{depth}(w^{(3)}) \leq \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + \max\{\lceil \log_2 n_i \rceil : i \in [1, k]\} + O(1).$$

Level 4: This level has input 0 if $E_{u_i}(x)$ is undefined for all $i \in [1, k]$; or it is $\overline{E}_{u_j}(1x)$ ($= 1 E_{u_j}(x)$), where $j \in [1, k]$ is the unique index for which $E_{u_j}(x)$ is defined. The circuit for level 4 consists of the single right-ideal morphism e , defined by $\text{domC}(e) = \{1\}$, $\text{imC}(e) = \{\varepsilon\}$, and

$$e(1) = \varepsilon$$

with $e(0)$ undefined.

Then the output of level 4 is either $E_{u_j}(x)$, if $y_0 = 1$ and j is as given for the input of level 4; or the output is undefined (if $y_0 = 0$).

Hence the size and depth of level 4 are constants.

The total size of the word w of part (2) is $\leq O(\sum_{i=1}^k (|u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pf}} \cup \tau} + n_i))$.

The total depth of w is

$$\text{depth}(w) \leq O(1) + \max\{\max\{\text{depth}(u_i), \lceil \log_2 |u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pf}} \cup \tau} \rceil + 2 \lceil \log_2(n_i + 1) \rceil\} : i \in [1, k]\}.$$

Finally, since $n_i \leq c|u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pff}} \cup \tau}$ by Prop. 10.1, the term involving n_i can be removed from the formulas for size and depth.

All the levels are easily computed in log-space. For levels 1 and 2, this is similar to part (1); level 3 has a very simple structure, and level 4 has just one gate. \square

Definition 10.10 ($\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expressions, their length, depth and evaluation).

Let Γ be one of the finite sets $\Gamma_{\text{RM}}, \Gamma_{\text{pff}}$, or Γ_{tff} , seen above.

(1) A $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expression over $\Gamma \cup \tau$ is defined recursively as follows.

- (Words) Any word $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ is a $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expression.
- (Concatenation) If W_1 and W_2 are $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expressions, then so is $W_2 \cdot W_1$ (also denoted by $W_2 W_1$).
- (Unambiguous union) If (W_k, \dots, W_1) is a sequence of $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expressions with $k \geq 2$, then $! \cup (W_k, \dots, W_1)$ is a $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expression.

The length $|W|_{\Gamma \cup \tau}$ and the depth of a $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expression W are defined recursively:

- For any word $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$, the length $|w|_{\Gamma \cup \tau}$ and $\text{depth}(w)$ are as in Definitions 3.5 and 3.12.
- If W_1 and W_2 are $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expressions, then

$$|W_2 \cdot W_1|_{\Gamma \cup \tau} = |W_1|_{\Gamma \cup \tau} + |W_2|_{\Gamma \cup \tau},$$

$$\text{depth}(W_2 \cdot W_1) = \text{depth}(W_2) + \text{depth}(W_1).$$
- If (W_k, \dots, W_1) is a sequence of $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expressions with $k \geq 2$, then

$$|! \cup (W_k, \dots, W_1)|_{\Gamma \cup \tau} = \sum_{i=1}^k |W_i|_{\Gamma \cup \tau},$$

$$\text{depth}(! \cup (W_k, \dots, W_1)) = \max\{\text{depth}(W_i) : i \in [1, k]\}.$$

(2) The evaluation function E_W of a $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expression W is defined recursively:

- A word $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ has an evaluation function $E_w \in M_{2,1}$ (or $\in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), obtained by composing the generators from right to left, as they appear in w .
- The concatenation $W_2 \cdot W_1$ of $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expressions has the evaluation function $E_{W_2} \circ E_{W_1}(\cdot)$ (composition of functions).
- The unambiguous union $! \cup (W_k, \dots, W_1)$ of $\{\cdot, !\cup\}$ -expressions has the evaluation function $! \cup (E_{W_k}, \dots, E_{W_1})$ (unambiguous union of functions).

Lemma 10.11 (distributivity of composition over union with disjoint domains).

(1) Let f, g, α, β be functions $X \rightarrow X$ for some set X , such that $\text{Dom}(\alpha) \cap \text{Dom}(\beta) = \emptyset$. Then

$$(1.a) \quad \text{Dom}(\alpha \circ f(\cdot)) \cap \text{Dom}(\beta \circ f(\cdot)) = \emptyset,$$

$$(1.b) \quad \text{Dom}(f \circ \alpha(\cdot)) \cap \text{Dom}(f \circ \beta(\cdot)) = \emptyset.$$

(2) Let $(f_i : i \in I)$ and $(g_j : j \in J)$ be families of functions on X with $\text{Dom}(f_{i_1}) \cap \text{Dom}(f_{i_2}) = \emptyset$ for all $i_1 \neq i_2$ in I , and $\text{Dom}(g_{j_1}) \cap \text{Dom}(g_{j_2}) = \emptyset$ for all $j_1 \neq j_2$ in J . Then:

$$(2.a) \quad \text{For all } i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 \text{ such that } (j_1, i_1) \neq (j_2, i_2) : \quad \text{Dom}(g_{j_1} \circ f_{i_1}) \cap \text{Dom}(g_{j_2} \circ f_{i_2}) = \emptyset.$$

$$(2.b) \quad (\text{Distributivity:}) \quad (! \cup_{j \in J} g_j) \circ (! \cup_{i \in I} f_i) = ! \cup_{(i,j) \in I \times J} g_j \circ f_i.$$

PROOF. (1.a) For any function $X \xrightarrow{F} X$, $\text{Dom}(F) = F^{-1}(X)$. Hence, $\text{Dom}(\alpha \circ f(\cdot)) \cap \text{Dom}(\beta \circ f(\cdot)) = f^{-1}\alpha^{-1}(X) \cap f^{-1}\beta^{-1}(X) = f^{-1}(\alpha^{-1}(X) \cap \beta^{-1}(X)) = f^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

(1.b) We have $\text{Dom}(f \circ \alpha(\cdot)) \subseteq \text{Dom}(\alpha)$; indeed, if $f(\alpha(x))$ is defined, then $\alpha(x)$ is defined too. Hence, $\text{Dom}(f \circ \alpha(\cdot)) \cap \text{Dom}(f \circ \beta(\cdot)) \subseteq \text{Dom}(\alpha) \cap \text{Dom}(\beta) = \emptyset$.

(2) If $i_1 \neq i_2$ then (1.b) implies $\text{Dom}(g_{j_1} \circ f_{i_1}) \cap \text{Dom}(g_{j_2} \circ f_{i_2}) = \emptyset$ for all j_1, j_2 (including if $j_1 = j_2$). If $i_1 = i_2$ and $j_1 \neq j_2$ then (1.a) implies $\text{Dom}(g_{j_1} \circ f_{i_1}) \cap \text{Dom}(g_{j_2} \circ f_{i_1}) = \emptyset$.

By disjointness of the domains, the distributivity of composition over unambiguous union now follows from the distributivity of composition over union. \square

Proposition 10.12 (partial circuits for the composition of unambiguous unions).

Consider two finite sets

$$\{(u^{(1)}, d_u^{(1)}), \dots, (u^{(h)}, d_u^{(h)})\}, \{(v^{(1)}, d_v^{(1)}), \dots, (v^{(k)}, d_v^{(k)})\} \subseteq (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^* \times \mathbb{Z}$$

satisfying the following assumptions:

- for all $i \in [1, h]$: if $E_{u^{(i)}} \neq \theta$ then $d_u^{(i)} = \delta(u^{(i)})$;
- for all $j \in [1, k]$: if $E_{v^{(j)}} \neq \theta$ then $d_v^{(j)} = \delta(v^{(j)})$;
- for all $i_1 \neq i_2$ in $[1, h]$: $\text{Dom}(E_{u_{i_1}}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{u_{i_2}}) = \emptyset$;
- for all $j_1 \neq j_2$ in $[1, k]$: $\text{Dom}(E_{v_{j_1}}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{v_{j_2}}) = \emptyset$.

Let m be the common input-length of $\{v_j u_i : i \in [1, h], j \in [1, k]\}$;

let $n_b = m + \max\{d_u^{(i)} + d_v^{(j)} : i \in [1, h], j \in [1, k]\}$;

let $n_a = m + \min\{d_u^{(i)} + d_v^{(j)} : i \in [1, h], j \in [1, k]\}$.

We restrict every $E_{v_j u_i}(\cdot)$ to $\{0, 1\}^{\geq m}$ (for $i \in [1, h], j \in [1, k]$). Then we have:

(1) (Decomposition according to δ -values).

For every $r \in [n_a, n_b]$ there exists $w^{(r)} \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad E_{w^{(r)}} = !\bigcup (E_{v_j} \circ E_{u_i}(\cdot) : (i, j) \in [1, h] \times [1, k], \delta(E_{v_j u_i}) = r - m);$$

moreover, by Def. 10.10, this is the evaluation function of the expression

$$!\bigcup (v_j u_i : (i, j) \in [1, h] \times [1, k], \delta(E_{v_j u_i}) = r - m);$$

$$(1.2) \quad E_{w^{(r)}} \in \text{pfl} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{M}^{\text{fin}};$$

(1.3) if $E_{w^{(r)}} \neq \theta$ then $E_{w^{(r)}}$ satisfies:

$$\text{imC}(E_{w^{(r)}}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^r, \quad \text{domC}(E_{w^{(r)}}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m, \quad \text{so} \\ \delta(E_{w^{(r)}}) = r - m;$$

$$(1.4) \quad |w^{(r)}|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} \leq O(|I| |J| m n + \sum (|v_j u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau} : (i, j) \in [1, h] \times [1, k], \delta(E_{v_j u_i}) = r - m));$$

$$(1.5) \quad \text{maxindex}_\tau(w) \leq O(\max(\{|I| |J| m, |I| |J| n\} \\ \cup \{\text{maxindex}_\tau(v_j u_i) : (i, j) \in [1, h] \times [1, k], \delta(E_{v_j u_i}) = r - m\})).$$

$$(1.6) \quad \text{depth}(w^{(r)}) \leq O(\log_2(hk) + \\ \max\{\text{depth}(v_j) + \text{depth}(u_i) + \log_2 |v_j u_i|_{\Gamma_{\text{pfl}}} : i \in [1, h], j \in [1, k], \delta(E_{v_j u_i}) = r - m\});$$

(1.7) $w^{(r)}$ and $m - r$ can be computed from $\{u_1, \dots, u_h\}, \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ in log-space.

(2) (Recombination into an unambiguous union).

(2.1) $\text{Dom}(E_{w^{(r)}}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{w^{(s)}}) = \emptyset$ for all $r \neq s$ in $[n_a, n_b]$.

(2.2) $!\bigcup (E_{w^{(r)}} : r \in [n_a, n_b]) \in M_{2,1}$ is the evaluation function of the expression

$$!\bigcup (v_j u_i : (i, j) \in [1, h] \times [1, k]) = (!\bigcup_{j=1}^k v_j) \cdot (!\bigcup_{i=1}^h u_i);$$

and δ_M of this function is $\{r-m : r \in [n_a, n_b], E_{w^{(r)}} \neq \theta\}$.

The set $\{(w^{(r)}, r-m) : r \in [n_a, n_b]\}$ can be computed from $\{u_1, \dots, u_h\}, \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ in log-space.

Moreover, a word $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ for the disjoint union of functions in (2.2) can be found in log-space, by Theorem 10.9(2).)

PROOF. (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3) follow from Theorem 10.9(1), since for $E_{w^{(r)}}$ we only consider words $v_j u_i$ with the same δ -value (namely $r-m$). (1.4) follows from the fact that for $x \in \text{Dom}(E_{w^{(r)}})$ we have $|E_{w^{(r)}}(x)| - |x| = r$, while for $x \in \text{Dom}(E_{w^{(s)}})$ we have $|E_{w^{(s)}}(x)| - |x| = s \neq r$. (1.5), (1.6), (1.7), and (1.8) follow from Theorem 10.9(1), applied to the unambiguous union $!\bigcup (v_j u_i : (i, j) \in [1, h] \times [1, k], m + \delta(E_{v_j u_i}) = r)$. (2) follows immediately from the properties of the functions $E_{w^{(r)}}$ proved in (1). \square

So far we have proved the following: (1) The unambiguous union of a finite family of functions in $M_{2,1}$ (or in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$) is in $M_{2,1}$ (respectively in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), by Prop. 10.6. (2) The unambiguous union of a finite family of functions in $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ (or $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$) with the same δ -value is in $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ (respectively $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), and a circuit for it can be constructed (Theorem 10.9). If the functions have different δ -values then their unambiguous union is just in $M_{2,1}$ (or in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$), and a word in $(\Gamma_{\text{RM}} \cup \tau)^*$ can be constructed by Theorem 10.9. (3) The composition of two finite unambiguous unions of functions in $M_{2,1}$ (or in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$) is a function in $M_{2,1}$ (respectively in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$); a finite set of $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ (or $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$) circuits for it can be constructed, one for each δ -value (Prop. 10.12).

10.3 Decomposition into an unambiguous union of partial circuits

The next Theorem shows that, conversely, any ‘‘generalized circuit’’ $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ (where Γ is finite and $\Gamma \cup \tau$ generates $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, hence $M_{2,1}$) can be decomposed into an equivalent unambiguous union of partial circuits, one for each number in $\delta_M(w)$.

The proof of the Theorem uses the following finite generating set of $M_{2,1}$ (see [6, Section 3]):

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 \end{array} \right), & a_1 &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} 00 & 01 & 1 \\ \hline 00 & 1 & 01 \end{array} \right), & a_2 &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} 0 & 10 & 11 \\ \hline 10 & 0 & 11 \end{array} \right), & \tau_{1,2} &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 00 & 01 & 10 & 11 \\ \hline 00 & 10 & 01 & 11 \end{array} \right), \\ a_3 &= (\varepsilon \rightarrow 0), & a_4 &= (0 \rightarrow \varepsilon), & a_5 &= (0 \rightarrow 00), & a_6 &= (00 \rightarrow 0), & a_7 &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), \text{ and} \\ a_8 &= \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 01 \end{array} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Gamma_M = \{a_i : i \in [0, 8]\}$; then $\Gamma_M \cup \tau$ generates $M_{2,1}$. Since we will use a generating set of the form $\Gamma \cup \tau$, the generator $\tau_{1,2}$ above will be considered to be only in τ , and not in Γ_M .

The elements of Γ_M are pfl (plep with fixed input-length) except for a_1 , a_2 , and a_8 . The non-pfl generators can be written as unambiguous unions of pfl functions as follows:

$$a_1 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} 00 & 01 & 1 \\ \hline 00 & 1 & 01 \end{array} \right) = !\bigcup \{(01 \rightarrow 1), (00 \rightarrow 00), (1 \rightarrow 01)\} = !\bigcup \{a_{1,-1}, a_{1,0}, a_{1,1}\};$$

the $a_{1,k}$ (for $k \in \{-1, 0, 1\} = \delta_M(a_1)$) have 2-by-2 disjoint domains;

$$a_2 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} 0 & 10 & 11 \\ \hline 10 & 0 & 11 \end{array} \right) = !\bigcup \{(10 \rightarrow 0), (11 \rightarrow 11), (0 \rightarrow 10)\} = !\bigcup \{a_{2,-1}, a_{2,0}, a_{2,1}\};$$

the $a_{2,k}$ (for $k \in \{-1, 0, 1\} = \delta_M(a_2)$) have 2-by-2 disjoint domains.

$$a_8 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 01 \end{array} \right) = !\bigcup\{(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 01)\} = !\bigcup\{a_{8,0}, a_{8,1}\};$$

moreover, the $a_{8,k}$ (for $k \in \{0, 1\} = \delta_M(a_8)$) have disjoint domains;

From Γ_M we thus obtain the set

$$\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} = \{a_0, a_{1,-1}, a_{1,0}, a_{1,1}, a_{2,-1}, a_{2,0}, a_{2,1}, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7, a_{8,0}, a_{8,1}\}.$$

So, $\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \subseteq \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$; and $\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}}$ consists of the pfl elements of Γ_M , together with the eight newly introduced pfl fragments of the non-plep elements of Γ_M .

The monoid generated by $\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau$ in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is a submonoid of $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ that, under the map of the congruence \equiv_{fin} , maps onto $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$. If we want to generate all of $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ we can add the gates {and, or, fork} to $\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}}$ (the gate not is already included).

In Theorem 10.13(2), flog unif AC_2 denotes the parallel complexity class AC_2 with log-space uniformity.

Theorem 10.13 (II. Decomposing functions in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ or $M_{2,1}$ into an unambiguous union of partial circuits).

(1) Function form of the Theorem:

For any $f \in M_{2,1}$, let $m = \text{maxlen}(\text{dom}C(f))$. And let $n_a = \text{minlen}(f(\{0, 1\}^m))$ and $n_b = \text{maxlen}(f(\{0, 1\}^m))$. Then there exist functions $f^{(n_a)}, \dots, f^{(n_b)} \in \text{plep}M_{2,1}$ such that:

- $f = \bigcup_{i=n_a}^{n_b} f^{(i)} = !\bigcup_{i=n_a}^{n_b} f^{(i)}$.
- For all $i \neq j$: $\text{Dom}(f^{(i)}) \cap \text{Dom}(f^{(j)}) = \emptyset$.
- For all $i \in [n_a, n_b]$: $f^{(i)}$ is the restriction of f such that

$$\text{dom}C(f^{(i)}) = \{0, 1\}^m \cap f^{-1}(\{0, 1\}^i); \text{ hence}$$

$$f^{(i)}(\{0, 1\}^m) = \text{im}C(f^{(i)}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^i,$$

$$\delta(f^{(i)}) = i - m \text{ if } f^{(i)} \neq \theta.$$

(2) Circuit form of the Theorem:

Let $\Gamma_M = \{a_i : i \in [0, 8]\}$ and $\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \subseteq \Gamma_{\text{pfl}}$ be as described before the Theorem.

For any $w \in (\Gamma_M \cup \tau)^*$, let $m = \ell_{\text{in}}(w)$. Then there exist $n_b \geq n_a \geq 0$, and there exist partial circuits $W^{(n_a)}, \dots, W^{(n_b)} \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that the following holds:

(2.1) Decomposition of w into partial circuits:

- $E_w = \bigcup_{i=n_a}^{n_b} E_{W^{(i)}} = !\bigcup_{i=n_a}^{n_b} E_{W^{(i)}};$ so E_w is the evaluation function of $!\bigcup_{i=n_a}^{n_b} W^{(i)}$.
- For all $i \neq j$: $\text{Dom}(E_{W^{(i)}}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{W^{(j)}}) = \emptyset$.
- $m \leq \text{maxlen}(\Gamma_M) \cdot |w|_{\Gamma_M} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w);$
 $n_a \leq n_b \leq 2 \text{maxlen}(\Gamma_M) \cdot |w|_{\Gamma_M \cup \tau} + \text{maxindex}_{\tau}(w).$

(2.2) For all $i \in [n_a, n_b]$:

- $E_{W^{(i)}}$ is the restriction of E_w such that

$$\text{dom}C(E_{W^{(i)}}) = \{0, 1\}^m \cap E_w^{-1}(\{0, 1\}^i) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m.$$
 Hence $E_{W^{(i)}}$ (but not the word $W^{(i)}$) is uniquely determined by E_w ;

$$E_{W^{(i)}}(\{0, 1\}^m) = \text{im}C(E_{W^{(i)}}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^i,$$

$$\delta(E_{W^{(i)}}) = i - m \text{ if } E_{W^{(i)}} \neq \theta.$$

- $|W^{(i)}|_{\Gamma_M, \text{pfl}\cup\tau} \leq \text{maxlen}(\Gamma_M) |w|_{\Gamma_M \cup \tau} + \text{maxindex}_\tau(w)$;
 $\text{maxindex}_\tau(W^{(i)}) \leq \text{maxindex}_\tau(w)$.
- $\text{depth}(w) = \max\{\text{depth}(W^{(i)}) : i \in [n_a, n_b]\}$ (where $\text{depth}(w)$ was defined in Def. 10.4).
- On input w , the sequence $(W^{(n_a)}, \dots, W^{(n_b)})$ can be computed in fLog unif AC_2
 (where the length of the input w is taken to be $\text{maxlen}(\Gamma_M) |w|_{\Gamma_M} + \text{maxindex}_\tau(w)$).

(3) The results of (2) also hold with $M_{2,1}$ replaced by $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, and $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$ replaced by $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

PROOF. (1) We represent $f \in M_{2,1}$ by a maximally extended right-ideal morphism in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, that we also call f . Let $m = \text{maxlen}(\text{domC}(f))$; we assume $m \geq 1$ (otherwise we choose $m = 1$). Let $n_b = \text{maxlen}(f(\{0, 1\}^m))$, and let $n_a = \text{minlen}(f(\{0, 1\}^m))$.

For every $i \in [n_a, n_b]$, let $f^{(i)}$ be the restriction of f with $\text{domC}(f^{(i)}) = \{0, 1\}^m \cap f^{-1}(\{0, 1\}^i)$. Then $f^{(i)} \in \text{plep}M_{2,1}$, and the other properties in part (1) of the Theorem are easily verified.

Note that some of the functions $f^{(i)}$ could be the empty function θ .

(2) Let Γ_M and $\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}}(\subseteq \Gamma_{\text{pfl}})$ be as above. For any $w \in (\Gamma_M \cup \tau)^*$, there exists $m \geq 1$ such that by Prop. 10.1:

$$\begin{aligned} m &\leq \text{maxlen}(\Gamma_M) \cdot |w|_{\Gamma_M} + \text{maxindex}_\tau(w), \\ \text{domC}(E_w) &\text{ is } \equiv_{\text{fin}}\text{-equivalent to a subset of } \{0, 1\}^m, \quad \text{and} \\ E_w(\{0, 1\}^m) &\subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\leq n} \quad \text{for some } n \geq 1 \text{ with} \\ n &\leq 2 \text{ maxlen}(\Gamma_M) \cdot |w|_{\Gamma_M} + \text{maxindex}_\tau(w). \end{aligned}$$

We represent E_w by a right-ideal morphism restricted to $\{0, 1\}^{\geq m}$, i.e., $\text{domC}(E_w) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$. In $\text{Dom}(E_w) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\geq m}$ we have: $E_w \equiv_{\text{fin}} w_\ell \circ \dots \circ w_1(\cdot)$, where $w = w_\ell \dots w_1$ with $w_t \in \Gamma_M \cup \tau$ for all $t \in [1, \ell]$. So, when $w_\ell \circ \dots \circ w_1(x)$ is calculated for $|x| \geq m$, the functions w_t are composed and they are defined without any need of a further restriction of right-ideal morphisms (see also [2, Cor. 3.7], [7, Thm. 4.5], [12, Prop. 6.5], [14, Def. 2.4]).

Among the generators that appear in $\{w_\ell, \dots, w_1\}$, some are in $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$, namely those in $\{a_0, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7\} \cup \tau$. For the other generators, namely those in $\{a_1, a_2, a_8\}$, we use the decompositions into unambiguous unions with disjoint domains: $a_1 = !\cup\{a_{1,-1}, a_{1,0}, a_{1,1}\}$ ($= a_1^!$), $a_2 = !\cup\{a_{2,-1}, a_{2,0}, a_{2,1}\}$ ($= a_2^!$), and $a_8 = !\cup\{a_{8,0}, a_{8,1}\}$ ($= a_8^!$). For $w_t \in \{a_1, a_2, a_8\}$, we denote the relevant decomposition of w_t into an unambiguous union by $w_t^!$; for $w_t \in \text{plep}M_{2,1}$ we have $w_t^! = w_t$.

Main idea of the proof: In the composition $E_w = w_\ell \circ \dots \circ w_1(\cdot)$ we will replace each w_t by $w_t^!$, for all $t \in [1, \ell]$. Then, by using distributivity of composition over union in $w_\ell^! \circ \dots \circ w_1^!(\cdot)$ (Lemma 10.11), we obtain an expression for E_w in the form of an unambiguous union of pfl-functions with disjoint domains. If, moreover, we collect together the terms of equal δ -value we obtain $E_w = !\cup(E_{W^{(n_a)}}, \dots, E_{W^{(n_b)}})$, where for every $i \in [n_a, n_b]$: either $E_{W^{(i)}} = \theta$ or $\delta(E_{W^{(i)}}) = i - m$.

The claimed properties of the words $W^{(i)}$ in the Theorem do not depend on the order in which the distributivity steps are carried out in $w_\ell^! \circ \dots \circ w_1^!(\cdot)$. However, the complexity of the algorithm for finding the words $W^{(i)}$ depends on this order.

We implement this idea in two algorithms.

In the first algorithm, called the **sequential algorithm**, the generators and distributivity are applied from right to left (starting with $w_1^!$, then $w_2^! w_1^!$, then $w_3^! w_2^! w_1^!$, etc.). At each step, Theorem 10.9 and Prop. 10.12 are used in order to collect the terms with the same δ -value. This algorithm runs in polynomial time (but it is not an NC-algorithm).

In the second algorithm, called the **parallel algorithm**, a binary tree of pairwise compositions is used. So we compute the sequence

$$\dots, \dots, (w_{2h}^! \circ w_{2h-1}^!), \dots, (w_4^! \circ w_3^!), (w_2^! \circ w_1^!);$$

then we again compose the results in pairs, and again in pairs, etc. In each step, distributivity and Prop. 10.12 are applied. There are $\lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$ parallel steps. This can be carried out as a parallel algorithm, since all the pairs used in the same step can be composed independently at the same time. We will see that this is an AC_2 -algorithm.

We next describe the two algorithms in detail. In the algorithms, “:=” denotes assignment, “=” is equality, and in a loop “for $k \in [a, b] : \dots$ ” the variable k ranges over the integers in $[a, b]$ in increasing order.

Sequential algorithm:

/ Input: $w = w_\ell \dots w_1$ (with $w_t \in \Gamma_M \cup \tau$ for $t \in [1, \ell]$);
 * Output: $\{(W^{(i)}, i-m) : i \in [n_a, n_b]\} \subseteq (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^* \times \mathbb{Z}$, satisfying the conditions of the Theorem. */*

$m := \maxlen(\Gamma_M) \cdot |w|_{\Gamma_M \cup \tau} + \maxindex_\tau(w);$ */* will not change */*

$n_b := m;$ $n_a := m;$ $W^{(n_a)} := \varepsilon;$ */* initialization, will change */*

for $t \in [1, \ell]$:

/ Loop assertion: At the beginning of the loop (i.e., at value $t-1$), numbers $n_b \geq n_a \geq 0$, and words*

** $W^{(n_a)}, \dots, W^{(n_b)} \in (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ have been found such that for all $i, j \in [n_a, n_b]$:*

** $E_{w_{t-1} \dots w_1} = !\bigcup_{r=n_a}^{n_b} E_{W^{(r)}}$,*

** $\text{Dom}(E_{W^{(i)}}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{W^{(j)}}) = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$,*

** $E_{W^{(i)}}$ is pfl with $\text{domC}(E_{W^{(i)}}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ and $E_{W^{(i)}}(\{0, 1\}^m) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^i$. */*

/ Case 1: w_t is pfl */*

if $w_t \in \{a_0, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7\} \cup \tau$ then:

for $i \in [n_a, n_b]$: $W_{\text{new}}^{(i+\delta(w_t))} := w_t \cdot W^{(i)}$;

$n_b := n_b + \delta(w_t);$ $n_a := n_a + \delta(w_t);$

for $j \in [n_a, n_b]$: $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} := W^{(j)}$;

/ Case 2: w_t is not plep; so, $w_t \in \{a_1, a_2, a_8\}$. Note that $\delta(a_{i,k}) = k$ if $i \in \{1, 2, 8\}$, $k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ */*

if $w_t = a_1$ */* Case 2.a1: */*

then:

for $j \in [n_a-1, n_b+1]$:

Let $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} \in (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ be the word constructed in Theorem 10.9 for

$!\bigcup \{a_{1,k} \cdot W^{(i)} : i \in [n_a, n_b] \text{ and } k \in \{-1, 0, 1\} \text{ such that } i + \delta(a_{1,k}) = j\}$;

$n_b := n_b + 1;$ $n_a := n_a - 1;$

for $j \in [n_a, n_b]$: $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} := W^{(j)}$;

if $w_t = a_2$ */* Case 2.a2: */*

then:

for $j \in [n_a-1, n_b+1]$:

Let $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} \in (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ be the word constructed in Theorem 10.9 for

$!\bigcup \{a_{2,k} \cdot W^{(i)} : i \in [n_a, n_b], \text{ and } k \in \{-1, 0, 1\} \text{ such that } i + \delta(a_{2,k}) = j\}$;

$n_b := n_b + 1;$ $n_a := n_a - 1;$

for $j \in [n_a, n_b]$: $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} := W^{(j)}$;

if $w_t = a_8$ */* Case 2.a8: */*

then:

for $j \in [n_a, n_b+1]$:

Let $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} \in (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$ be the word constructed in Theorem 10.9 for

$$\text{!} \bigcup \{ a_{s,k} \cdot W^{(i)} : i \in [n_a, n_b] \text{ and } k \in \{0, 1\} \text{ such that } i + \delta(a_{s,k}) = j \};$$

$$n_b := n_b + 1; \quad /* n_a \text{ is not changed} */$$
for $j \in [n_a, n_b]$: $W^{(j)} := W_{\text{new}}^{(j)}$;

/* End of the “for t ” loop; all the generators in w have been applied. */

output $\{(W^{(i)}, i-m) : i \in [n_a, n_b]\}$.

[End, Sequential algorithm.]

Correctness of the Sequential Algorithm follows from the following claim.

Claim. If the *loop assertion* holds at the beginning of an execution of the for-loop then it holds at the end of the loop for the new n_a , n_b , and $(W^{(n_a)}, \dots, W^{(n_b)})$.

Proof of Claim. In case 1, $W^{(i)}$ and w_t are pfl; moreover, $\text{dom}C(E_{W^{(i)}}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ and $E_{W^{(i)}}(\{0, 1\}^m) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^i$. Therefore the new $W^{(i+\delta(w_t))}$ is also pfl, and $E_{W^{(i)}}(\{0, 1\}^m) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{i+\delta(w_t)}$.

In case 2, $W^{(i)}$ and each fragment $w_{t,k}$ are pfl, and $W^{(i)}$ satisfies $\text{dom}C(E_{W^{(i)}}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ and $E_{W^{(i)}}(\{0, 1\}^m) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^i$. Therefore, $W^{(i)} \cdot w_{t,k}$ is pfl; and the construction of $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)}$ makes it pfl (with input-length m and output-length j).

In both cases 1 and 2, at the end of the loop we have $\text{Dom}(E_{W^{(i_1)}}) \cap \text{Dom}(E_{W^{(i_2)}}) = \emptyset$ (if $i_1 \neq i_2$); this follows from Lemma 10.11.

At the end of the loop with value t , $E_{w_t w_{t-1} \dots w_1} = \text{!} \bigcup_{s=n_a}^{n_b} E_{W^{(s)}}$. This holds because the relation is true at the beginning of the loop (for $w_{t-1} \dots w_1$). Moreover, in case 1, w_t is applied in the next loop, so the relation then holds for $w_t w_{t-1} \dots w_1$. In case 2, the fragments of w_t are applied (and the disjoint union of the fragments is equal to w_t); the operation “ $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} := \dots$ ” permutes the functions and sorts them according to output-length, but this does not change the disjoint union (which is commutative). [This proves the Claim.]

For the length we have $|W^{(i)}| \leq \text{maxlen}(\Gamma_M) |w|_{\Gamma_M} + \text{maxindex}_\tau(w)$, since in every execution of the loop, $|W^{(i)}|$ grows by at most by length c ($= \text{maxlen}(\Gamma_M)$), or increases to some length $\leq \text{maxindex}_\tau(w)$.

The computation of final expressions $(W^{(n_a)}, \dots, W^{(n_b)})$ for w takes polynomial time. Indeed, the loop is iterated $\leq \ell$ ($= |w|_{\Gamma_M \cup \tau}$) times. Moreover, each execution of the body of the loop takes polynomial time: For case 1, it is straightforward that the execution takes linear time. In case 2, the set

$$W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} = \{ a_{r,k} \cdot W^{(i)} : i \in [n_a, n_b], k \in \{-1, 0, 1\} \text{ (or } \in \{0, 1\}), \text{ such that } j = i + \delta(a_{r,k}) \}$$

has 3 elements (if $a_r = a_1$ or $a_r = a_2$), or 2 elements (if $a_r = a_3$); e.g. for a_1 , $\delta(a_{1,k})$ ranges over $\{-1, 0, 1\}$, and i is determined by $\delta(a_{1,k})$ (since $i = j - \delta(a_{1,k})$); so

$$W_{\text{new}}^{(j)} = \{ a_{1,-1} \cdot W^{(j+1)}, a_{1,0} \cdot W^{(j)}, a_{1,1} \cdot W^{(j-1)} \}.$$

In the formation of the set $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)}$, no new copy of any existing $W^{(i)}$ is made; the exiting $W^{(i)}$ s are simply either left unchanged, or rearranged and concatenated with one letter $a_{r,k}$. Thus, $W_{\text{new}}^{(j)}$ is constructed in linear time.

The next algorithm is an AC₂ algorithm, with parallel for-loops. In “parallelfor $i \in [a, b] \dots$ ”, the $b-a+1$ iterations of the body of the loop are independent and are executed simultaneously. See again the earlier descriptions of the sequential algorithm and the parallel algorithm.

Parallel algorithm

/* Input: $w = w_\ell \dots w_1$ (with $w_t \in \Gamma_M \cup \tau$ for $t \in [1, \ell]$);

* Output: $\{(W^{(j)}, j-m) : j \in [n_a, n_b]\} \subseteq (\Gamma_M, \text{pfl} \cup \tau)^* \times \mathbb{Z}$, satisfying the conditions of the Theorem. */

parallelfor $t \in [1, \ell]$: $x_t := w_t$;

$$D = \lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil;$$

if ℓ is not a power of 2 then:

parallelfor $t \in [\ell+1, 2^D]$: $x_t := \mathbb{1}$;
 /* attach a prefix of $2^D - \ell$ copies of $\mathbb{1}$ to x , acting as the identity function in compositions */
 $\ell := 2^D$; /* Now, $\ell = |x| = 2^D$ */

parallelfor $t \in [1, \ell]$:

$n_{a,t} := m + \min(\delta_M(x_t))$;
 $n_{b,t} := m + \max(\delta_M(x_t))$;

for $d \in [0, D-1]$:

/* Loop assertion:

- * For all $i \in [1, 2^{D-d}]$: Assume that x_i has been decomposed into an unambiguous union
- * $x_i = !\bigcup (x_i^{(j)} : j \in [n_{a,i}, n_{b,i}])$, with $x_i^{(j)} \in (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$, and $\text{imC}(E_{x_i^{(j)}}) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^j$.
- * Assume that x_i is represented by a set $\{(x_i^{(j)}, d_i^{(j)}) : j \in [n_{a,i}, n_{b,i}]\} \subseteq (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^* \times \mathbb{Z}$,
- * with $d_i^{(j)} = j - m$; and $d_i^{(j)} = \delta(E_{x_i^{(j)}})$ if $E_{x_i^{(j)}} \neq \theta$. */

parallelfor $h \in [1, 2^{D-d-1}]$:

$N_{a,h} := m + \min\{d_{2h}^{(j)} + d_{2h-1}^{(j')} : j \in [n_{a,2h}, n_{b,2h}], j' \in [n_{a,2h-1}, n_{b,2h-1}]\}$;

$N_{b,h} := m + \max\{d_{2h}^{(j)} + d_{2h-1}^{(j')} : j \in [n_{a,2h}, n_{b,2h}], j' \in [n_{a,2h-1}, n_{b,2h-1}]\}$;

Let $X_h = \{(X_h^{(j)}, D_h^{(j)}) : j \in [N_{a,h}, N_{b,h}]\} \subseteq (\Gamma_{M, \text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^* \times \mathbb{Z}$

be the set constructed in Prop. 10.12 for

$x_{2h} \circ x_{2h-1} = \{(x_{2h}^{(j)}, d_{2h}^{(j)}) : j \in [n_{a,2h}, n_{b,2h}]\} \circ \{(x_{2h-1}^{(j)}, d_{2h-1}^{(j)}) : j \in [n_{a,2h-1}, n_{b,2h-1}]\}$;

parallelfor $h \in [1, 2^{D-d-1}]$:

$n_{a,h} := N_{a,h}$; $n_{b,h} := N_{b,h}$;

parallelfor $j \in [n_{a,h}, n_{b,h}]$:

$(x_h^{(j)}, d_h^{(j)}) := (X_h^{(j)}, D_h^{(j)})$; /* i.e., $x_h := X_h$ */

output x_1 /* = $\{(x_1^{(j)}, d_1^{(j)}) : j \in [n_{a,1}, n_{b,1}]\}$ */ .

[End, Parallel algorithm.]

The parallel algorithm and the sequential algorithm produce the same output. Indeed, the two algorithms differ only by the grouping of subexpressions, and composition is associative and distributes over union.

The parallel algorithm uses $D = \lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$ sequential steps, where $\ell = |w|_{\Gamma_M \cup \tau}$. In step $d \in [0, D-1]$ there are 2^{D-d-1} simultaneous compositions of the form $x_{2h} \circ x_{2h-1}$ (in “parallelfor $h \in [1, 2^{D-d-1}]$ ”); each such composition is computed in log-space (by Prop. 10.12). Since log-space is contained in AC_1 , each parallel step d is in AC_1 . Thus the parallel algorithm is in AC_2 .

(3) The proof for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is similar to the proof for $M_{2,1}$, using a generating set of the form $\Gamma \cup \tau$, where Γ is finite. Just as in the proof of (2), each generator $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ can be decomposed as into an unambiguous union of elements of $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ with disjoint domains. From there on the reasoning is the same as in (2). \square

Comments on Theorem 10.13

1. Theorem 10.13(2) and the function-emptiness problem:

A subtle aspect of Theorem 10.13(2)(3) is that it produces a correct output in polynomial time (in fact in complexity AC_2) regardless of whether $E_w = \theta$, which is coNP -complete Prop. 11.1(1).

2. Equivalent forms of the input-length, and of the depth of a word in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$

Based on the unambiguous union decomposition of the elements of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ we obtain the following characterization of input-length and depth.

Proposition 10.14 (input-length and depth for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and union of partial circuits).

Let $\ell_{\text{in}}(\cdot)$ be the input-length function (Def. 3.3 and Lemma 3.4), and let $\text{depth}(\cdot)$ be the depth function (Def. 10.4). Then for any $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ and its decomposition $! \bigcup_{i=n_a}^{n_b} W^{(i)}$, given in Theorem 10.13(2), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{in}}(w) &= \ell_{\text{in}}(W^{(i)}), \quad \text{for every } i \in [n_a, n_b]; \\ \text{depth}(w) &= \max\{\text{depth}(W^{(i)}) : i \in \delta_M(w)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For an element $w \in (\Gamma \cup \tau)^*$ with $E_w \in \mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}} \setminus \text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, there is more than one output-length; the output-lengths for the set $\{\ell_{\text{in}}(w) + d : d \in \delta_M(w)\}$.

PROOF. The property of $\ell_{\text{in}}(w)$ is given in the first item of Theorem 10.13(2.2). The depth property is proved in the third item of Theorem 10.13(2.2). \square

11 Appendix: The function emptiness problem, and computing $\delta(\cdot)$ in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$

We consider the following three problems about $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ with generating set $\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau$, with Γ_{pfl} finite. The function emptiness problem also applies to $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ with generating set $\Gamma_{\text{fin}} \cup \tau$, with Γ_{fin} finite.

(1) **The function emptiness problem** is the following decision problem.

Input: $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$, or $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{fin}} \cup \tau)^*$.

Question: Is $E_w = \theta$ (the empty function, as an element of $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, respectively of $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$)?

In $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, this is equivalent to the question: Is $\delta(w)$ defined?

In $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ it is equivalent to the question: Is $\delta_M(w) = \emptyset$?

(2) **The computation problem for δ in the non-empty case** is the following premiss problem.

Input: $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$.

Premiss: $E_w \neq \theta$.

Output: $\delta(E_w)$ (a number in \mathbb{Z} , written in sign-magnitude binary notation).

(3) **The computation problem for δ** is the following input-output problem.

Input: $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{pfl}} \cup \tau)^*$.

Output: $\delta(E_w)$ (a number in \mathbb{Z} , written in sign-magnitude binary notation).

The coNP-completeness of function emptiness problem for $M_{2,1}$ over $\Gamma \cup \tau$ was already proved in [8, Prop. 6.2]. In Prop. 11.1(1) this is now proved for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$.

Proposition 11.1 (complexity of $\delta(\cdot)$).

(1) *The function emptiness problem for $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, or for $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$, is coNP-complete (with respect to log-space many-one reduction).*

(2) *The premiss problem for computing $\delta(\cdot)$ in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ belongs deterministic log-space. (However, checking the premiss is the negation of the function emptiness problem, hence it is NP-complete.)*

(3) *The computation problem for $\delta(\cdot)$ in $\text{pfl}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ is coNP-hard.*

PROOF. (1) The function emptiness problem is in **coNP**. Indeed for any w in $(\Gamma_{\text{pff}} \cup \tau)^*$ or $(\Gamma_{\text{fin}} \cup \tau)^*$ we have: $E_w = \theta$ iff $(\forall x \in \{0,1\}^m)[E_w(x) \text{ is undefined}]$. Here we can choose m to be $m = \max(\text{len}(\Gamma_{\text{pff}}) |w|_{\Gamma_{\text{pff}} \cup \tau} + \max \text{index}_{\tau}(w))$; hence m is easily computed. And for a given w and x , it can be checked in polynomial time (in terms of $|w| + |x|$) whether $E_w(x)$ is undefined.

To show **coNP**-hardness we first consider the following problem: The input is an acyclic circuit C with a single output wire and m input wires, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$; and the question is whether for all inputs in $\{0,1\}^m$ the output of C is 0. Let us call this problem **NonSat**; it is the negation of the satisfiability problem for acyclic circuits, and it is well-known to be **coNP**-complete (see e.g. [24, 25]).

Next, **NonSat** is reduced to the function emptiness problem. Given a circuit C , we find $W(C) \in (\Gamma_{\text{tff}} \cup \tau)^*$ such that $E_{W(C)}$ is the input-output function of C ; by Theorem 3.8, $W(C)$ can be computed in log-space. Thus C has output 0 on all inputs in $\{0,1\}^m$ iff $[W(C)](x) = 0$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^m$. Next, we define $\zeta \in \text{pff}\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ as follows: $\zeta(1z) = 1z$, and $\zeta(0z)$ is undefined (for all $z \in \{0,1\}^*$). Let $w_0 \in (\Gamma_{\text{pff}} \cup \tau)^*$ be such that $E_{w_0} = \zeta$. Then C is a yes-case of **NonSat** iff $E_{w_0 W(C)} = \theta$.

(2) Let $w = w_k \dots w_1$ with $w_t \in \Gamma_{\text{pff}} \cup \tau$ for $t \in [1, k]$. By Prop. 7.8(3), $\delta(w) = \sum_{t=1}^k \delta(w_t)$ if $E_w \neq \theta$. And for $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{pff}} \cup \tau$, $\delta(\gamma)$ is bounded by constants from above and from below, since Γ_{pff} is finite, and $\delta(\tau_{i,j}) = 0$ for all $\tau_{i,j} \in \tau$. We now use the well-known and easy fact that the sum of k bounded integers can be computed in space $O(\log k)$.

(3) This follows immediately from (1) and (2). \square

Remark: We have for all $w \in (\Gamma_{\text{fin}} \cup \tau)^*$: $E_w = \theta$ in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ iff $E_w = \theta$ in $M_{2,1}$. Indeed, $E_w = \theta$ iff $\text{dom}C(E_w) = \emptyset$, and this holds whether E_w is taken in $\mathcal{RM}^{\text{fin}}$ or in $M_{2,1}$. Hence the above Proposition also applies to $M_{2,1}$ and $\text{plep}M_{2,1}$.

References

- [1] J. Berstel, D. Perrin, *Theory of Codes*, Academic Press (1985).
- [2] J.C. Birget, “The groups of Richard Thompson and complexity”, *International J. of Algebra and Computation* 14 (Nos. 5 & 6) (Dec. 2004) 569-626. <http://arXiv.org/abs/math.GR/0204292> (Apr. 2002)
- [3] J.C. Birget, “Circuits, coNP-completeness, and the groups of Richard Thompson”, *International J. of Algebra and Computation* 16(1) (Feb. 2006) 35-90.
- [4] J.C. Birget, “Factorizations of the Thompson-Higman groups, and circuit complexity”, *International J. of Algebra and Computation* 18.2 (March 2008) 285-320.
- [5] J.C. Birget, “One-way permutations, computational asymmetry and distortion”, *J. of Algebra* 320(11) (Dec. 2008) 4030-4062. <https://arXiv.org/pdf/0704.1569.pdf>
- [6] J.C. Birget, “Monoid generalizations of the Richard Thompson groups”, *J. of Pure and Applied Algebra* 213(2) (Feb. 2009) 264-278.
- [7] J.C. Birget, “Monoid generalizations of the Richard Thompson groups”, <http://arXiv.org/abs/0704.0189> Version 3 (corrected version of [6]).
- [8] J.C. Birget, “The \mathcal{R} - and \mathcal{L} -orders of the Thompson-Higman monoid $M_{k,1}$ and their complexity”, *International J. of Algebra and Computation* 20.4 (June 2010) 489-524. <http://arXiv.org/abs/0812.4434> (Dec 2008).
- [9] J.C. Birget, “Monoids that map onto the Thompson-Higman groups”, *Semigroup Forum* 83.1 (Aug. 2011) 33-51. <http://arXiv.org/abs/1009.0502>
- [10] J.C. Birget, “Polynomial-time right-ideal morphisms and congruences”, *International J. of Algebra and Computation* 28.05 (Aug. 2018) 791-835. (doi.org/10.1142/S0218196718500364) <http://arXiv.org/abs/1511.02056>

- [11] J.C. Birget, “The word problem of the Brin-Thompson groups is coNP-complete”, *J. Algebra* 553 (1 July 2020) 268-318. (doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2020.02.013)
- [12] J.C. Birget, “A monoid version of the Brin-Higman-Thompson groups”, arXiv.org (27 June 2020).
- [13] J.C. Birget, “New embeddings between the Higman-Thompson groups”, *Communications in Algebra* 48(8) (2020) 3429-3438. (doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2020.1739290)
- [14] J.C. Birget, “Evaluation problems for the Thompson group and the Brin-Thompson group, and their relation to the word problem”, arXiv:2111.08646 (Nov 2021)
- [15] Matthew G. Brin, Personal communication on monoid generalizations of the Thompson group V (Jan.-Mar. 2021).
- [16] Matthew G. Brin, Lecture at the Logic Seminar, Mathematics Department, Cornell University (Fall 2021).
- [17] Matt Brin’s answer to “Who was Richard Thompson?” (10 July 2022)
https://hsm.stackexchange.com/questions/14594/who-was-richard-thompson
- [18] J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd, W. R. Parry, “Introductory notes on Richard Thompson’s groups”, *L’Enseignement Mathématique* 42 (1996) 215-256.
- [19] P. Clote, E. Kranakis, *Boolean functions and computation models*, Springer (2002).
- [20] Bill de Witt, Luke Elliott, “Finite presentability of Brin-Higman-Thompson monoids via free Jónsson-Tarski algebras”, https://arXiv.org/abs/2303.16044
- [21] G. Higman, “Finitely presented infinite simple groups”, Notes on Pure Mathematics 8, The Australian National University, Canberra (1974).
- [22] J.E. Hopcroft, J.D. Ullman, *Introduction to automata theory, languages, and computation*, Addison-Wesley (1979).
- [23] H.J. Hoover, M.M. Klawe, N.J. Pippenger, “Bounding fan-out in logical networks”, *J. of the ACM* 31(1) (1984) 13-18.
- [24] Ch. Papadimitriou, *Computational Complexity*, Addison-Wesley (1994).
- [25] J.E. Savage, *Models of computation*, Addison-Wesley (1998).
- [26] Richard J. Thompson, Manuscript (mid 1960s).
- [27] R. McKenzie, R. J. Thompson, “An elementary construction of unsolvable word problems in group theory”, in *Word Problems*, (W. W. Boone, F. B. Cannonito, R. C. Lyndon, editors), North-Holland (1973) pp. 457-478.
- [28] Richard J. Thompson, Lecture, Palo Alto, 10 Jan. 2004 (notes by M. Brin).
- [29] Richard J. Thompson, Lecture, Luminy, 2 June 2008 (notes by M. Brin).
- [30] I. Wegener, *The complexity of boolean functions*, Teubner and Wiley (1987).

birget@camden.rutgers.edu