

# INVERSE SETS AND INVERSE CORRESPONDENCES OVER INVERSE SEMIGROUPS

TOMOKI UCHIMURA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we introduce notions called inverse set and inverse correspondence over inverse semigroups. These are analogies of Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules and  $C^*$ -correspondences in the  $C^*$ -algebra theory. We show that inverse semigroups and inverse correspondences form a bicategory. In this bicategory, two inverse semigroups are equivalent if and only if they are Morita equivalent.

## 0. INTRODUCTION

The constructions of  $C^*$ -algebras from inverse semigroups through étale groupoids are studied well (see [Pat99], [Exe08], or [FKU24] for examples);

inverse semigroup  $\longmapsto$  étale groupoid  $\longmapsto$   $C^*$ -algebra.

Many researches import notions in the theory of étale groupoids and inverse semigroups from the  $C^*$ -algebra theory. Our result is a part of this direction.

The notions of Morita equivalence have been already introduced in the theory of  $C^*$ -algebras, groupoids and inverse semigroups respectively. Rieffel introduced and studied the notion of strong Morita equivalence between  $C^*$ -algebras in [Rie74a, Rie74b, Rie76]. Muhly, Renault, and Williams introduced Morita equivalence for a certain types of groupoids. They showed that Morita equivalent groupoids produce strong Morita equivalent groupoid  $C^*$ -algebras in [MRW87, Ren87]. Steinberg introduced the notion of strong Morita equivalence between inverse semigroups, and showed that strong Morita equivalent inverse semigroups produce Morita equivalent universal groupoids in [Ste11].

In the  $C^*$ -algebra theory, there exists the notion called  $C^*$ -correspondence. This is a kind of generalization of both  $*$ -homomorphisms and Morita equivalences. Buss, Meyer, and Zhu studied the bicategory  $\mathbf{Corr}$  consisting of  $C^*$ -algebras and non-degenerate  $C^*$ -correspondences in [BMZ13]. In the bicategory  $\mathbf{Corr}$ , two  $C^*$ -algebras are equivalent if and only if they are Morita equivalent. Albandik introduced *groupoid correspondences* between étale groupoids and the bicategory  $\mathbf{Gr}$  consisting of étale groupoids and groupoid correspondences in [Alb15]. In the bicategory  $\mathbf{Gr}$ , two groupoids are equivalent if and only if they are Morita equivalent.

However, any notion similar to  $C^*$ -correspondences or groupoid correspondences in the inverse semigroup theory have not been introduced in our knowledge. In this paper, we introduce the notion called *inverse correspondence*, which corresponds to  $C^*$ -correspondence or groupoid correspondence. This is a kind of generalization of both semigroup homomorphisms and Morita equivalences between inverse semigroups. More precisely, we

define inverse correspondences as follows: We first introduce *inverse set*  $\mathcal{U}$  and *adjointable maps* on  $\mathcal{U}$  with the Hilbert  $C^*$ -module theory in mind. We show that the set  $L(\mathcal{U})$  of all adjointable maps becomes an inverse semigroup (Theorem 3.30). In order to prove this fact, we show that all “one-rank operators”  $K(\mathcal{U})$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  becomes an inverse subsemigroup of  $L(\mathcal{U})$ . For inverse semigroups  $S$  and  $T$ , we define an inverse correspondence as a couple of a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$  and a semigroup homomorphism from  $S$  to the inverse semigroup  $L(\mathcal{U})$ .

In the  $C^*$ -algebra theory, it is well-known that all adjointable operators  $L(\mathcal{E})$  on a Hilbert  $C^*$ -module becomes a  $C^*$ -algebra, and all compact operators  $K(\mathcal{E})$  becomes a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $L(\mathcal{E})$ . For  $C^*$ -algebras  $A$  and  $B$ , the  $C^*$ -correspondence from  $A$  to  $B$  consists of a right Hilbert  $B$ -module  $\mathcal{E}$  and a  $*$ -homomorphism from  $A$  to the  $C^*$ -algebra  $L(\mathcal{E})$  of adjointable operators on  $\mathcal{E}$ . Our result are analogies of these facts.

We show that all inverse semigroups and all non-degenerate inverse correspondences form a bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$  in Theorem 5.12. Two inverse semigroups are equivalent in our bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$  if and only if they are Morita equivalent by Theorem 5.16.

In the forthcoming paper [Uch24], we will construct a bifunctor from  $\mathfrak{IC}$  to  $\mathfrak{Gr}$ . This bifunctor will generalize the construction from Morita equivalence between inverse semigroups to one between étale groupoids in [Ste11]. We will also construct a bifunctor from  $\mathfrak{IC}$  to  $\mathfrak{Corr}$ , and investigate these bifunctors.

The inverse semigroups  $K(\mathcal{U})$  and  $L(\mathcal{U})$  have applications to the inverse semigroup theory in addition to defining the inverse correspondences. In Section 6, we introduce the *multiplier semigroups* of inverse semigroups, which are analogue to the multiplier algebras of  $C^*$ -algebras. We show the existence of multiplier semigroups for all inverse semigroups by using the inverse semigroup  $L(\mathcal{U})$ . The inverse semigroup  $K(\mathcal{U})$  can be used to describe the inverse Rees matrix semigroups (Section 7).

This paper consists of follows: In Section 1, we recall the basics of the theory of inverse semigroups. In Section 2, we introduce the notions called inverse sets and partial Morita equivalences. These correspond to Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules and Hilbert bimodules in the  $C^*$ -algebra theory. In Section 3, we introduce adjointable maps on an inverse set and show that all adjointable maps becomes an inverse semigroup. In Section 4, we define tensor product of inverse correspondences. In Section 5, we introduce the bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$  of inverse semigroups and non-degenerate inverse correspondences, and characterize equivalences in  $\mathfrak{IC}$ . In Section 6, we introduce the multiplier semigroups, and show that they exist for all inverse semigroups. In Section 7, we investigate the inverse Rees matrix semigroups in terms of inverse sets.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

We recall definitions and propositions in the inverse semigroup theory. See [Law98, Pat99], or [Law23] for more details.

A semigroup  $S$  is *regular* if for every  $s \in S$  there exists an element  $t \in S$  with  $sts = s$  and  $tst = t$ . Such an element  $t$  is called a *generalized inverse* of

$s$ . A regular semigroup  $S$  is said to be *inverse* if each element has a unique generalized inverse. For an inverse semigroup  $S$ , we denote the generalized inverse of  $s \in S$  as  $s^*$ . It is clear that  $s^{**} = s$  for  $s \in S$ . We have  $(st)^* = t^*s^*$  for  $s, t \in S$  by using Proposition 1.4.

Let  $S$  and  $T$  be semigroups. A map  $\theta: S \rightarrow T$  is a *semigroup homomorphism* if  $\theta(ss') = \theta(s)\theta(s')$  for  $s, s' \in S$ . If  $S$  and  $T$  are inverse,  $\theta(s^*) = \theta(s)^*$  holds for  $s \in S$ .

*Example 1.1.* A discrete group is an inverse semigroup which has the unit as a unique idempotent.

*Example 1.2.* For topological spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , a *partial homeomorphism*  $u$  from  $X$  to  $Y$  is a homeomorphism from an open subset  $D_u$  of  $X$  to an open subset  $R_u$  of  $Y$ . For a partial homeomorphism  $u$  from  $X$  to  $Y$ , we define a partial homeomorphism from  $Y$  to  $X$  called an inverse of  $u$  as the homeomorphism  $u^{-1}$  from  $R_u$  to  $D_u$ . We denote the partial homeomorphism by the same symbol  $u^{-1}$ . For topological spaces  $X_1, X_2, X_3$ , and partial homeomorphisms  $u_1$  from  $X_1$  to  $X_2$  and  $u_2$  from  $X_2$  to  $X_3$ , we define a composition  $u_2u_1$  of  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  as the partial homeomorphism from  $X_1$  to  $X_3$  defined by  $u_2u_1(x) := u_2(u_1(x))$  for every  $x \in D_{u_2u_1} := u_1^{-1}(D_{u_2})$ . We denote the set of all partial homeomorphisms from  $X$  to  $Y$  as  $I(X, Y)$  and  $I(X, X)$  as  $I(X)$ . The set  $I(X)$  becomes an inverse semigroup with respect to the composition of partial homeomorphisms.

A subset  $I$  of a semigroup  $S$  is a *left (resp. right) ideal* if  $st \in I$  (resp.  $ts \in I$ ) holds for every  $s \in S$  and  $t \in I$ . An *ideal* of  $S$  is a left or right ideal of  $S$ . A *two-sided ideal* of  $S$  is a subset of  $S$  which is a left ideal and a right ideal. An ideal of a semigroup becomes a subsemigroup. A two-sided ideal of an inverse semigroup becomes an inverse subsemigroup. We use the following lemma in Lemma 4.8.

**Lemma 1.3.** *Let  $S, T$  be inverse semigroups, and  $\theta: S \rightarrow T$  be a semigroup homomorphism. If two-sided ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  of  $S$  satisfy that the restrictions  $\theta|_{I_1}$  and  $\theta|_{I_2}$  of  $\theta$  are injective and  $\theta(I_1) = \theta(I_2)$  holds, then we have  $I_1 = I_2$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $s_1 \in I_1$ . By assumption, there exists  $s_2 \in I_2$  with  $\theta(s_1) = \theta(s_2)$ . Thus we have

$$\theta(s_1) = \theta(s_1s_1^*s_1) = \theta(s_1s_1^*)\theta(s_1) = \theta(s_1s_1^*)\theta(s_2) = \theta(s_1s_1^*s_2).$$

Since  $I_1$  is a two-sided ideal, we get  $s_1s_1^*s_2 \in I_1$ . Thus  $s_1 = s_1s_1^*s_2$  because the restriction  $\theta|_{I_1}$  of  $\theta$  is injective. Since  $I_2$  is a two-sided ideal, we get  $s_1 = s_1s_1^*s_2 \in I_2$ . Thus  $I_1 \subset I_2$ . We can obtain the reverse inclusion in a similar way.  $\square$

An element  $s$  of a semigroup  $S$  is an *idempotent* if  $ss = s$  holds. The set of all idempotents of  $S$  is denoted as  $E(S)$ . We can prove the next proposition in a similar way to [Pat99, Proposition 2.1.1] or [Law98, Theorem 3].

**Proposition 1.4.** *Let  $S$  be a semigroup and  $I$  be a two-sided ideal of  $S$ . If  $I$  is an inverse subsemigroup of  $S$ , then for every  $e \in E(S)$  and  $f \in E(I)$ ,  $ef = fe$  holds.*

*Proof.* Fix  $e \in E(S)$  and  $f \in E(I)$  arbitrarily. Since  $I$  is an ideal,  $ef$  is an element of  $I$ . This element has a generalized inverse  $(ef)^* \in I$  because  $I$  is inverse. Since  $f(ef)^*e \in I$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} e f f (e f)^* e e f &= e f (e f)^* e f = e f, \text{ and} \\ f (e f)^* e e f f (e f)^* e &= f (e f)^* e f (e f)^* e = f (e f)^* e, \end{aligned}$$

we get  $f(ef)^*e = (ef)^*$ . By simple calculations, we get  $f(ef)^*e$  is an idempotent of  $I$ . Thus  $(ef)^*$  is an idempotent of  $I$ . Because an idempotent is self-inverse, this implies that  $(ef)^* = (ef)^{**} = ef$ . Thus  $ef$  is an idempotent of  $I$ . In a similar way, we get  $fe$  is also an idempotent of  $I$ .

The fact that  $ef$  and  $fe$  are idempotents of  $I$  follows

$$\begin{aligned} (ef)(fe)(ef) &= e f e f = e f \text{ and} \\ (fe)(ef)(fe) &= f e f e = f e. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $(ef)^* = fe$ . Thus we get  $ef = (ef)^* = fe$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.5.** *A regular semigroup  $S$  is inverse if and only if all idempotents of  $S$  commute.*

*Proof.* The only if part follows from Proposition 1.4. See [Law98, Theorem 3] for a proof of the if part.  $\square$

Let  $S$  be an inverse semigroup. The following lemma is well-known:

**Lemma 1.6.** *Let  $s, t$  be elements of  $S$ . The following are equivalent;*

- (i)  $s = ts^*s$ ,
- (ii) there exists  $e \in E(S)$  with  $s = te$ ,
- (iii)  $s = ss^*t$ ,
- (iv) there exists  $f \in E(S)$  with  $s = ft$ .

*Proof.* We see that (i) implies (ii) and that (iii) implies (iv) trivially. Let us show that (ii) implies (iii). For  $s, t \in S$  and  $e \in E(S)$  with  $s = te$ , we get

$$ss^*t = (te)(te)^*t = tet^*t = tt^*te = te = s.$$

The third equal follows from Theorem 1.5. We can see that (iv) implies (i) similarly.  $\square$

We define a binary relation on  $S$  by declaring that  $s \leq t$  if and only if  $s$  and  $t$  satisfies one (and hence all) of the conditions in Lemma 1.6. We can check easily that this relation  $\leq$  becomes a partial order on  $S$ . We can show that  $s \leq t$  implies  $s's \leq s't$  and  $ss' \leq ts'$  for every  $s' \in S$ , and that  $s \leq t$  implies  $s^* \leq t^*$ . We prove an analogy of Lemma 1.6 in Proposition 3.21.

**Lemma 1.7.** *Let  $s_1, s_2$  be elements of  $S$ .*

- (i) *If  $s_1s_1^* = s_1s_2^* = s_2s_2^*$ , then  $s_1 = s_2$ .*
- (ii) *If  $s_1s = s_2s$  for all  $s \in S$ , then  $s_1 = s_2$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Take  $s_1, s_2 \in S$  with  $s_1s_1^* = s_1s_2^* = s_2s_2^*$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} s_2^*s_1s_2^* &= s_2^*s_2s_2^* = s_2^*, \\ s_1s_2^*s_1 &= s_1s_1^*s_1 = s_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since both  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are the generalized inverse of  $s_2^*$ , we obtain  $s_1 = s_2$ .

- (ii) Let  $s_1, s_2$  be elements of  $S$  such that  $s_1s = s_2s$  for all  $s \in S$ . Taking  $s_1^*$  and  $s_2^*$  as  $s$ , we get  $s_1s_1^* = s_2s_1^*$  and  $s_1s_2^* = s_2s_2^*$ . The first equation implies  $s_1s_1^* = s_1s_2^*$  by taking generalized inverses. Thus  $s_1 = s_2$  holds by (i).  $\square$

## 2. INVERSE SETS AND PARTIAL MORITA EQUIVALENCES

In this section, we introduce notions of *inverse set* and *partial Morita equivalence*. These correspond to Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules and Hilbert bimodules in the  $C^*$ -algebra theory. Steinberg introduced the notion of Morita contexts in [Ste11]. This corresponds to imprimitivity bimodule in the theory of  $C^*$ -algebras. Partial Morita equivalences are generalization of Morita contexts.

**2.1. Inverse sets.** Let  $S$  be an inverse semigroup.

**Definition 2.1.** A *left  $S$ -set*  $\mathcal{U}$  is a set  $\mathcal{U}$  equipped with a left  $S$ -action, that is, a map  $S \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}; (s, u) \mapsto su$  such that  $s'(su) = (s's)u$  for every  $s, s' \in S$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . A *right  $S$ -set*  $\mathcal{U}$  is defined in a similar way.

**Definition 2.2.** A *left regular  $S$ -set* is a left  $S$ -set equipped with a map  $\mathcal{U}\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow S$  called a *left regular pairing* on  $\mathcal{U}$  which satisfies that

- (L-i)  $\mathcal{U}\langle su | u' \rangle = s\mathcal{U}\langle u | u' \rangle$ ,
- (L-ii)  $\mathcal{U}\langle u | u' \rangle^* = \mathcal{U}\langle u' | u \rangle$ ,
- (L-iii)  $\mathcal{U}\langle u | u \rangle u = u$ ,

for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $s \in S$ . A *left inverse  $S$ -set* is a left regular  $S$ -set whose left regular pairing satisfies that

- (L-iv)  $\mathcal{U}\langle u | u' \rangle u = u$  and  $\mathcal{U}\langle u' | u \rangle u' = u'$  imply  $u = u'$

for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ . We call a left regular pairing with (L-iv) as a *left inverse pairing*, or just a *left pairing*.

A *right regular  $S$ -set*  $\mathcal{U}$  is a right  $S$ -set with a map  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow S$  called a *right regular pairing* on  $\mathcal{U}$  which satisfies that

- (R-i)  $\langle u | u's \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}s$ ,
- (R-ii)  $\langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}^* = \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ ,
- (R-iii)  $u\langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u$ ,

for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $s \in S$ . A *right inverse  $S$ -set*  $\mathcal{U}$  is a right regular  $S$ -set whose right regular pairing satisfies that

- (R-iv)  $u\langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u$  and  $u'\langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u'$  imply  $u = u'$

for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ . We call a right regular pairing with (R-iv) as a *right inverse pairing*, or just a *right pairing*.

As a first example, we regard an inverse semigroup  $S$  as a left (and right) inverse  $S$ -set.

*Example 2.3.* We define a left action of  $S$  on  $S$  as the multiplication from the left side. We set a map  ${}_S\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle: S \times S \rightarrow S$  as  ${}_S\langle s' | s \rangle := s's^*$  for every  $s, s' \in S$ . It is clear that this map satisfies (L-i) and (L-ii). The map  ${}_S\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$  satisfies (L-iii) by the definition of the generalized inverse and satisfies (L-iv) since  $S$  is inverse. Thus  $S$  is a left inverse  $S$ -set with respect to the above structures. We can regard  $S$  as also a right inverse  $S$ -set as follows: We set a right action of  $S$  on  $S$  as the multiplication from the right side and define a map  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_S: S \times S \rightarrow S$  by  $\langle s | s' \rangle_S := s^*s'$  for every  $s, s' \in S$ .

*Remark 2.4.* Steinberg imposed (L-iii) and (R-iii) when defining Morita contexts in [Ste11]. With Example 2.3 in mind, we receive (L-iii) and (R-iii) as kinds of regularity. There we impose (L-iv) and (R-iv) as corresponding to the uniqueness of the generalized inverse. These conditions imply many important properties as seen in Lemma 2.6 and Proposition 3.12.

Let  $S$  be an inverse semigroup.

**Lemma 2.5.** *For a left regular  $S$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ ,*

- (i)  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle \in E(S)$
- (ii)  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | su' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle s^*$

*hold for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $s \in S$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,

$${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle u | u \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle$$

holds by (L-i) and (L-iii). For  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,

$${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | su' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle su' | u \rangle^* = (s {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle)^* = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle^* s^* = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle s^*$$

holds by (L-ii) and (L-i).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a left inverse  $S$ -set. For  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , the following hold:*

- (i) *If  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u' \rangle$ , then  $u = u'$ .*
- (ii) *If  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u'' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u'' \rangle$  holds for all  $u'' \in \mathcal{U}$ , then  $u = u'$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  with  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle$ . By taking the generalized inverse, we obtain  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u' \rangle$ . We see that

$$u {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle = u {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle = u \text{ and } u' {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle = u' {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u' \rangle = u'.$$

These imply  $u = u'$  by (L-iv) in Definition 2.2.

Assume  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  satisfy  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u'' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u'' \rangle$  for all  $u'' \in \mathcal{U}$ . Taking  $u$  and  $u'$  as  $u''$ , we get  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u' \rangle$  respectively. As we see in the above argument, these imply  $u = u'$ .  $\square$

We will show that for a left regular  $S$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , (i) in the lemma above implies that  $\mathcal{U}$  is inverse in Proposition 3.12.

**Definition 2.7.** For every regular  $S$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , we set the subset  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle$  of  $S$  as  $\{ {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle \mid u, u' \in \mathcal{U} \}$ .

For a regular  $S$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the subset  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle$  is a two-sided ideal (and especially an inverse subsemigroup) of  $S$  by (L-i) in Definition 2.2 and Lemma 2.5 (ii).

**Definition 2.8.** For a left regular  $S$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the left pairing on  $\mathcal{U}$  is said to be *left full* if  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle = S$ . In this case, we also say that  $\mathcal{U}$  is left full. We define a term *right full* for a right regular  $S$ -set in a similar way.

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  be left regular  $S$ -sets.

**Definition 2.9.** Let  $\sigma$  be a map from  $\mathcal{U}$  to  $\mathcal{V}$ .

- (i) A map  $\sigma$  is a *left  $S$ -map* if  $\sigma(su) = s\sigma(u)$  holds for every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $s \in S$ .

- (ii) A map  $\sigma$  is *left pairing preserving* if  $\mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(u) | \sigma(u')\rangle = \mathcal{U}\langle u | u'\rangle$  holds for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ .

For a map between right regular  $S$ -sets, we similarly define that it is a *right  $S$ -map* and is *right pairing preserving*.

**Definition 2.10.** A left pairing preserving left  $S$ -map  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is an *isomorphism* if there exists a left pairing preserving left  $S$ -map  $\tau: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\tau \circ \sigma$  is the identity map  $1_{\mathcal{U}}$  for  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\sigma \circ \tau$  is the identity map  $1_{\mathcal{V}}$  for  $\mathcal{V}$ . Two left regular  $S$ -sets are *isomorphic* if there exists an isomorphism between them. For right regular  $S$ -sets  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  and a map  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ , we similarly define that  $\sigma$  is an isomorphism and that  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are isomorphic.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  be a left pairing preserving left  $S$ -map. A map  $\tau: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  which satisfies  $\sigma \circ \tau = 1_{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\tau \circ \sigma = 1_{\mathcal{U}}$  becomes a left pairing left  $S$ -map.*

*Proof.* For every  $s \in S$  and  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} s\tau(v) &= \tau(\sigma(s\tau(v))) = \tau(s\sigma(\tau(v))) = \tau(sv), \\ \mathcal{U}\langle\tau(v) | \tau(v')\rangle &= \mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(\tau(v)) | \sigma(\tau(v'))\rangle = \mathcal{V}\langle v | v'\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\tau$  is a left pairing preserving left  $S$ -map.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.12.** *If  $\mathcal{V}$  is inverse, then a left pairing preserving map  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is a left  $S$ -map.*

*Proof.* For  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $s \in S$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(su) | \sigma(su)\rangle &= \mathcal{U}\langle su | su\rangle, \\ \mathcal{V}\langle s\sigma(u) | \sigma(su)\rangle &= s\mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(u) | \sigma(su)\rangle = s\mathcal{U}\langle u | su\rangle = \mathcal{U}\langle su | su\rangle, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{V}\langle s\sigma(u) | s\sigma(u)\rangle &= s\mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(u) | \sigma(u)\rangle s^* = s\mathcal{U}\langle u | u\rangle s^* = \mathcal{U}\langle su | su\rangle \end{aligned}$$

hold. This implies  $\sigma(su) = s\sigma(u)$  by Lemma 2.6 (i).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.13.** *If  $\mathcal{U}$  is inverse, then a left pairing preserving map  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is injective.*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  be a left pairing preserving map. For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  with  $\sigma(u) = \sigma(u')$ ,  $\mathcal{U}\langle u | u\rangle = \mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(u) | \sigma(u)\rangle$ ,  $\mathcal{U}\langle u | u'\rangle = \mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(u) | \sigma(u')\rangle$ , and  $\mathcal{U}\langle u' | u'\rangle = \mathcal{V}\langle\sigma(u') | \sigma(u')\rangle$  are the same element of  $S$ . This implies  $u = u'$  by Lemma 2.6 (i).  $\square$

**Corollary 2.14.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  be left inverse  $S$ -set and  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  be a map. The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\sigma$  is an isomorphism.
- (ii)  $\sigma$  is a left pairing preserving left  $S$ -map, and there exists a map  $\tau: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  which satisfies  $\sigma \circ \tau = 1_{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\tau \circ \sigma = 1_{\mathcal{U}}$ .
- (iii)  $\sigma$  is left pairing preserving and surjective.

*Proof.* It is clear that (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). By Lemma 2.11, we get (ii) implies (i). It follows from Lemma 2.12 and 2.13 that (iii) implies (ii).  $\square$

We can similarly show right versions of Lemma 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 and Corollary 2.14.

**2.2. Partial Morita equivalences.** Let  $S$  and  $T$  be inverse semigroups.

**Definition 2.15.** A  $S$ - $T$  *biset*  $\mathcal{U}$  is a set  $\mathcal{U}$  equipped with a left action of  $S$  and a right action of  $T$  which satisfy  $s(ut) = (su)t$  for  $s \in S$ ,  $t \in T$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .

**Definition 2.16.** A *partial Morita equivalence* from  $S$  to  $T$  is a  $S$ - $T$  biset  $\mathcal{U}$  equipped with a left regular pairing  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow S$  and a right regular pairing  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow T$  which satisfy  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle u'' = u \langle u' | u'' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  for all  $u, u', u'' \in \mathcal{U}$ .

**Lemma 2.17.** A *partial Morita equivalence* is a left inverse  $S$ -set and a right inverse  $T$ -set.

*Proof.* We show that  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$  satisfies the condition (L-iv). We can check that  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  satisfies the condition (R-iv) in a similar way. Fix elements  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  with  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle u = u$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle u' = u'$ . Since

$${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle u | u' \rangle u = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle$$

holds, we get  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle \in E(S)$ . Hence  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle$  holds. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} u &= {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle u = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle u = u' \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}, \text{ and} \\ u' &= {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' | u \rangle u' = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle u' = u \langle u' | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \end{aligned}$$

hold. We set  $e := \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $e' := \langle u' | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ . By Lemma 2.5, we get  $e, e' \in E(T)$ . We remark that  $u' = u' \langle u' | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u' e'$  by (R-iii). Thus we get

$$u = u' e = u' e' e = u' e e' = u e' = u'. \quad \square$$

**Definition 2.18.** A *Morita equivalence* from  $S$  to  $T$  is a partial Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$  which is full as both a left regular  $S$ -set and a right regular  $T$ -set. Two inverse semigroup  $S$  and  $T$  are *Morita equivalent* if there exists a Morita equivalence from  $S$  to  $T$ .

*Remark 2.19.* In [Ste11, Definition 2.1], Steinberg called a Morita equivalence as an *equivalence bimodule*, and a tuple of two inverse semigroups and a Morita equivalence between them as a *Morita context*. Two Morita equivalent inverse semigroups in our term are said to be *strongly Morita equivalent* in [Ste11, FLS11]. According to [FLS11], strong Morita equivalence is equivalent to the three notions; topos Morita equivalence, semigroup Morita equivalence, and enlargement Morita equivalence between inverse semigroups.

*Remark 2.20.* Steinberg showed that strong Morita equivalence is an equivalence relation. In [Ste11, Proposition 2.5], the transitivity is proved by introducing the tensor products of equivalence bimodules. We will introduce the notion of tensor product for inverse sets in Section 4. This is a generalization of the one introduced by Steinberg. We check that being Morita equivalent is reflexive, transitive, and symmetry in Example 2.21, 4.14, and p.27 respectively.

For a partial Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$ , we get a Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from the subsemigroup  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle$  of  $S$  to the subsemigroup  $\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  of  $T$ . Our term ‘‘partial Morita equivalence’’ is derived from this fact.



*Example 2.21.* Let  $S$  be an inverse semigroup and  $T$  be an inverse subsemigroup of  $S$ . If  $T$  satisfies  $TST = T$ , then  $TS$  is a left full partial Morita equivalence from  $T$  to  $S$  with respect to the left  $T$ -action defined as the multiplication from the left side, the left pairing  ${}_{TS}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle := u_1 u_2^* \in T$ , the right  $S$ -action defined as the multiplication from the right side, and the right pairing  $\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle_{TS} := u_1^* u_2 \in S$  for  $u_1, u_2 \in TS$ . Moreover, if the subsemigroup  $T$  satisfies  $STS = S$ , then  $TS$  is a Morita equivalence from  $T$  to  $S$ . Especially, an inverse semigroup  $S$  can be regarded as a Morita equivalence from  $S$  to  $S$ .

*Remark 2.22.* For an inverse subsemigroup  $T$  of  $S$  with  $TST = T$  and  $STS = S$ , Lawson called  $S$  an *enlargement* of  $T$  in [Law96]. Steinberg gave an enlargement as a first example of a Morita context in [Ste11, Proposition 2.2].

### 2.3. Examples of inverse sets and partial Morita equivalences.

*Example 2.23.* Let  $G$  be a group. We can check that the empty set is an inverse  $G$ -set trivially. The left inverse  $G$ -set  $G$  in Example 2.3 is another example. We show that every left inverse  $G$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$  is either the empty set or isomorphic to the left inverse  $G$ -set  $G$ .

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a non-empty left inverse  $G$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ . Fix  $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$  arbitrarily. We define a map  $\sigma: G \rightarrow \mathcal{U}: g \mapsto gu_0$ . Let us show that this map is surjective. For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , we set  $g_u := {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u_0 \rangle$ . The elements  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle g_u u_0 | g_u u_0 \rangle$ ,  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle g_u u_0 | u \rangle$ , and  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle$  are idempotents of  $G$ . Hence these are the identity of  $G$ . By Lemma 2.6 (i), we get  $g_u u_0 = u$ . The map  $\sigma$  is a left pairing preserving because we can see

$${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle g' u_0 | g u_0 \rangle = g' {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_0 | u_0 \rangle g^{-1} = g' g^{-1} = {}_G\langle g' | g \rangle$$

for every  $g, g' \in G$ . By Lemma 2.14,  $\sigma$  is an isomorphism between left inverse  $G$ -sets  $G$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ .

*Example 2.24.* Let  $E$  be an inverse semigroup that consists of only idempotents. We analyze left inverse  $E$ -sets. We first show that the following pair produces a left inverse  $E$ -set: A pair  $(\{\mathcal{U}_e\}_{e \in E}, \{\sigma_{e,f}\}_{e,f \in E})$  consists of

- a family of sets  $\{\mathcal{U}_e\}_{e \in E}$ , and
- a family of maps  $\{\sigma_{e,f}: \mathcal{U}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_e \mid e, f \in E \text{ with } e \leq f\}$ .

We assume that this pair satisfies the following conditions:

- (i)  $\sigma_{e,e}$  is the identity map on  $\mathcal{U}_e$  for every  $e \in E$ .
- (ii)  $\sigma_{e_1, e_2} \sigma_{e_2, e_3} = \sigma_{e_1, e_3}$  for every  $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in E$  with  $e_1 \leq e_2$  and  $e_2 \leq e_3$ .
- (iii) For every  $e_1, e_2 \in E$ ,  $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_1}$ , and  $u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_2}$ , there exists the largest element  $e \in E$  which satisfies  $e \leq e_1, e_2$  and  $\sigma_{e, e_1}(u_1) = \sigma_{e, e_2}(u_2)$ , where ‘‘largest’’ means that every  $e' \in E$  with  $e' \leq e_1, e_2$  and  $\sigma_{e', e_1}(u_1) = \sigma_{e', e_2}(u_2)$  satisfies  $e' \leq e$ .

For such a pair  $(\{\mathcal{U}_e\}_{e \in E}, \{\sigma_{e,f}\}_{e,f \in E})$ , the set  $\mathcal{U} := \bigsqcup_{e \in E} \mathcal{U}_e$  becomes a left inverse  $E$ -set with respect to

- a left action of  $E$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  defined as  $f u_1 := \sigma_{f e_1, e_1}(u_1)$ , and
- a left pairing on  $\mathcal{U}$  defined as  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle := e$  appeared in (iii)

for  $e_1, e_2, f \in E$ ,  $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_1}$ , and  $u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_2}$ .

Let us show that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a left inverse  $E$ -set. The map  $E \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}; (f, u) \mapsto fu$  is a left action by the condition (ii). Since the condition (iii) is symmetry for  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , the map  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow E$  satisfies (L-ii). The condition (L-iii) follows from the condition (i). We check the condition (L-i). Take  $e_1, e_2, f \in E$ ,  $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_1}$  and  $u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_2}$ . Put  $e := {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle fu_1 | u_2 \rangle$  and  $e' := {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle$ . These satisfy that  $e \leq fe_1, e_2$ ,  $\sigma_{e, fe_1}(fu_1) = \sigma_{e, e_2}(u_2)$ ,  $e' \leq e_1, e_2$ , and  $\sigma_{e', e_1}(u_1) = \sigma_{e', e_2}(u_2)$ . We get  $fe' \leq fe_1$ ,  $fe' \leq e' \leq e_2$ , and  $f'e'fu_1 = f'e'u_1 = f'e'u_2$ . By the maximality of  $e$ , we have  $fe' \leq e$ . We get  $e \leq e_2$ ,  $e \leq fe_1 \leq e_1$ , and  $eu_1 = e'fu_1 = e'u_2$ . The last equation follows from  $e \leq fe_1 \leq f$ . By the maximality of  $e'$ , we have  $e \leq e'$ . This shows  $e = fe \leq f'e'$ . Thus we conclude  $e = f'e'$ . This means that  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle fu_1 | u_2 \rangle = f {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle$ . We check the condition (L-iv). Take  $e_1, e_2 \in E$ ,  $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_1}$ , and  $u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{e_2}$  with  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle u_1 = u_1$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_2 | u_1 \rangle u_2 = u_2$ . Put  $e := {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle$ . The assumptions mean  $eu_1 = u_1$  and  $eu_2 = u_2$ . By the definition of  $e$ , we get  $eu_1 = eu_2$ . Thus  $u_1 = u_2$  holds. We have shown that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a left inverse  $E$ -set.

Conversely, we can show that every inverse  $E$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$  is constructed from such a pair  $(\{\mathcal{U}_e\}_{e \in E}, \{\sigma_{e, f}\}_{e, f \in E})$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a left inverse  $E$ -set. For every  $e \in E$ , we define

- $\mathcal{U}_e := \{u \in \mathcal{U} \mid {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u \rangle = e\}$ , and
- $\sigma_{e, f}: \mathcal{U}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_e; u \mapsto eu$  for every  $e, f \in E$  with  $e \leq f$ .

We can easily verify that these satisfy the conditions (i)-(iii), and this pair produces the given inverse  $E$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ .

*Example 2.25.* Let  $S$  be an inverse semigroup and  $\mathcal{U}$  be a left inverse  $S$ -set. For an inverse subsemigroup  $T$  of  $S$  with  $TST = T$ , we set  $T\mathcal{U} := \{tu \in \mathcal{U} \mid t \in T, u \in \mathcal{U}\}$ . The set  $T\mathcal{U}$  becomes a left inverse  $T$ -set. If  $\mathcal{U}$  is left full, then so is  $T\mathcal{U}$ .

*Example 2.26.* Let  $S$  be an inverse semigroup with  $0$ , where  $0 \in S$  is the element such that  $0s = s0 = 0$  for every  $s \in S$ . For a left inverse  $S$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$  and every  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathcal{U}$ , we get

$${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle 0u_1 | u_3 \rangle = 0 {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_3 \rangle = 0 = 0 {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_2 | u_3 \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle 0u_2 | u_3 \rangle.$$

Thus we get  $0u_1 = 0u_2$  by Lemma 2.6 (ii). This implies that  $0u$  is the same element for all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . We denote the element  $0u$  as  $0_{\mathcal{U}}$ .

For two non-empty left inverse  $S$ -sets  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$ , we define a set  $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{U}'$  as the disjoint union of  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$  identified  $0_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $0_{\mathcal{U}'}$ . We can define a left action  $S$  on  $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{U}'$  by using left actions on  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$ . A left pairing on  $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{U}'$  is defined as

$${}_{\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{U}'}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle := \begin{cases} {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle & u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}, \\ {}_{\mathcal{U}'}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle & u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The set  $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{U}'$  becomes a left inverse  $S$ -set with respect to the above structures.

*Example 2.27.* We define a left action of  $I(Y)$  on  $I(X, Y)$  by the composition from the left side and a left pairing on  $I(X, Y)$  by

$${}_{I(X, Y)}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle := u_1 u_2^{-1}$$

for  $u_1, u_2 \in I(X, Y)$ . We define a right action of  $I(X)$  on  $I(X, Y)$  by the composition from the right side and a right pairing on  $I(X, Y)$  by

$$\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle_{I(X, Y)} := u_1^{-1} u_2$$

$u_1, u_2 \in I(X, Y)$ . We can check that the set  $I(X, Y)$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $I(Y)$  to  $I(X)$  with respect to the above structures.

### 3. ADJOINTABLE MAPS

**3.1. Adjointable maps.** In this subsection, we introduce *adjointable maps* on regular sets. This notion is an analogy of the adjointable operators on right Hilbert  $C^*$ -modules (see [Lan95, p.8]). From now on, we mainly consider right regular sets and right inverse sets with the right Hilbert  $C^*$ -module theory in mind. We can give a similar theory for left regular sets and left inverse sets. Let  $T$  be an inverse semigroup and  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W}$  be right regular  $T$ -sets.

**Definition 3.1.** A map  $\varphi: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is said to be *adjointable* if there exists a map  $\psi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  such that

$$\langle \psi(v) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle v | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$$

holds for every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . Such a map  $\psi$  is said to be an *adjoint* of  $\varphi$ . We denote the set of all adjointable maps from  $\mathcal{U}$  to  $\mathcal{V}$  as  $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ . We abbreviate  $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U})$  as  $L(\mathcal{U})$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** For every  $\varphi_1 \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $\varphi_2 \in L(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W})$ ,  $\varphi_2 \varphi_1 \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W})$  holds.

*Proof.* Let  $\psi_i$  be an adjoint of  $\varphi_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $w \in \mathcal{W}$ ,

$$\langle w | \varphi_2 \varphi_1(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{W}} = \langle \psi_2(w) | \varphi_1(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \langle \psi_1 \psi_2(w) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$$

holds. Thus  $\psi_1 \psi_2$  is an adjoint of  $\varphi_2 \varphi_1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.** The set  $L(\mathcal{U})$  becomes a semigroup with respect to the composition of maps.

The next definition is an analogy of the rank-one operator on a right Hilbert  $C^*$ -module (see [Lan95, p.9]).

**Definition 3.4.** For  $u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}$ , we define a map  $\omega_{v,u}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  as

$$\omega_{v,u}(u') := v \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$$

for every  $u' \in \mathcal{U}$ . We set  $K(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) := \{\omega_{v,u} \mid u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ . We abbreviate  $K(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U})$  as  $K(\mathcal{U})$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** For  $t \in T, u \in \mathcal{U}$ , and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\omega_{vt,u} = \omega_{v,ut^*}$  holds.

*Proof.* For  $t \in T, u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$\omega_{vt,u}(u') = vt \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = v \langle ut^* | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \omega_{v,ut^*}(u')$$

holds. Thus  $\omega_{vt,u} = \omega_{v,ut^*}$  holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , the map  $\omega_{u,v}: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  is an adjoint of  $\omega_{v,u}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ .

*Proof.* For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v' | \omega_{v,u} u' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} &= \langle v' | v \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= \langle v' | v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \langle v | v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle \omega_{u,v}(v') | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \end{aligned}$$

holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $\varphi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$  be a right  $T$ -map. For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\varphi \omega_{v,u} = \omega_{\varphi(v),u}$  holds.*

*Proof.* For every  $u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , we get

$$\varphi \omega_{v,u}(u') = \varphi(v \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}) = \varphi(v) \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \omega_{\varphi(v),u}(u'). \quad \square$$

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\varphi: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  be an adjointable map, and  $\psi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  be an adjoint of  $\varphi$ . For every  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $w \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $\omega_{w,v} \varphi = \omega_{w,\psi(v)}$  holds.*

*Proof.* For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , we get

$$\omega_{w,v} \varphi(u) = w \langle v | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = w \langle \psi(v) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \omega_{w,\psi(v)}(u). \quad \square$$

**Corollary 3.9.** *The set  $K(\mathcal{U})$  is a two-sided ideal of the semigroup  $L(\mathcal{U})$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.10.** *For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\omega_{v,u} \omega_{u,v} \omega_{v,u} = \omega_{v,u}$  holds.*

*Proof.* For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{v,u} \omega_{u,v} \omega_{v,u} &= \omega_{v \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle v | v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}, u} \\ &= \omega_{v \langle v | v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}, u} \\ &= \omega_{v \langle v | v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}, u \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}} \\ &= \omega_{v,u}. \end{aligned}$$

The third equal follows from Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.11.** *The subsemigroup  $K(\mathcal{U})$  of  $L(\mathcal{U})$  is regular.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.10, an adjoint  $\omega_{v,u}$  of  $\omega_{u,v}$  is a generalized inverse of  $\omega_{u,v}$  for every  $u, v \in \mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

The following proposition is an analogy of Theorem 1.5.

**Proposition 3.12.** *For a right regular  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $u \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u$  and  $u' \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u'$  imply  $u = u'$  for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  (that is,  $\mathcal{U}$  is inverse),
- (ii)  $\langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle u' | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  implies  $u = u'$  for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,
- (iii)  $u \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u' \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,
- (iv)  $\omega_{u,u}$  and  $\omega_{u',u'}$  commutes for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) is proved in Lemma 2.6.

- (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) We set  $x := u \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $y := u' \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ . We can easily check that  $\langle x | x \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle y | y \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle x | y \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  holds. (ii) implies  $x = y$  holds.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) By (iii) and Lemma 3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \omega_{u,u}\omega_{u',u'} &= \omega_{u\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},u'} \\
 &= \omega_{u'\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},u} \\
 &= \omega_{u'\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},u'\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}} \\
 &= \omega_{u'\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},u\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}} \\
 &= \omega_{u'\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},u\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u'|u \rangle_{\mathcal{U},u}} \\
 &= \omega_{u'\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},u} \\
 &= \omega_{u',u'}\omega_{u,u}.
 \end{aligned}$$

(iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) Fix elements  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $u\langle u'|u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u$  and  $u'\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u'$ . We get  $\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \in E(S)$  by the same way as in Lemma 2.17. Hence  $\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle u'|u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ . This implies that

$$u = u\langle u|u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \omega_{u,u}(u') \text{ and } u' = u'\langle u'|u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \omega_{u',u'}(u).$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 u &= \omega_{u,u}(u') \\
 &= \omega_{u,u}\omega_{u',u'}(u') \\
 &= \omega_{u',u'}\omega_{u,u}(u') \\
 &= \omega_{u',u'}(u) \\
 &= u'.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

From now on, we assume that  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  are right inverse  $T$ -sets.

**Lemma 3.13.** *For  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ , an adjoint of  $\varphi$  is unique.*

*Proof.* Let  $\psi_1, \psi_2: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  be adjoints of  $\varphi: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ . For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$\langle \psi_1(v) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle v | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \langle \psi_2(v) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$$

holds. By Lemma 2.6 (ii), we get  $\psi_1(v) = \psi_2(v)$  for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . Thus we have  $\psi_1 = \psi_2$ . □

**Definition 3.14.** We denote the adjoint of  $\varphi: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  as  $\varphi^\dagger: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ .

**Lemma 3.15.** *For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ ,  $\varphi$  is a right  $T$ -map.*

*Proof.* For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $t \in T$ ,

$$\langle v | \varphi(ut) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \langle \varphi^\dagger(v) | ut \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle \varphi^\dagger(v) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} t = \langle v | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} t = \langle v | \varphi(u)t \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$$

holds. By Lemma 2.6 (ii),  $\varphi(ut) = \varphi(u)t$  holds. □

**Proposition 3.16.** *For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $\psi \in L(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{W})$ ,  $(\psi\varphi)^\dagger = \varphi^\dagger\psi^\dagger$  holds.*

*Proof.* See the proof of Lemma 3.2. □

**Proposition 3.17.** *For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ , we have  $\varphi^{\dagger\dagger} = \varphi$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$\langle \varphi^{\dagger\dagger}(u) \mid v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \langle u \mid \varphi^{\dagger}(v) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle \varphi(u) \mid v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$$

holds, where the second equal follows by taking generalized inverses of the two sides of the equation in Definition 3.1. By Lemma 2.6 (ii), we get  $\varphi^{\dagger\dagger}(u) = \varphi(u)$  for every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . Thus  $\varphi^{\dagger\dagger} = \varphi$  holds.  $\square$

We will see that

- $K(\mathcal{U})$  is an inverse subsemigroup of  $L(\mathcal{U})$  in Theorem 3.19,
- $L(\mathcal{U})$  is an inverse semigroup in Theorem 3.30, and
- $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is a partial Morita equivalence from  $L(\mathcal{V})$  to  $L(\mathcal{U})$  in Theorem 3.31.

We first prove that  $K(\mathcal{U})$  is an inverse semigroup. We can easily see that  $\omega_{u,u}$  is an idempotent of  $K(\mathcal{U})$  for  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .

**Lemma 3.18.** *All idempotents of  $K(\mathcal{U})$  is in the form of  $\omega_{u,u}$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\omega_{u,u'} \in E(K(\mathcal{U}))$  holds. We put an idempotent  $e$  of  $T$  as  $e := \langle u \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ . We get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle ue \mid ue \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u'e \mid u'e \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = e \text{ and} \\ \langle u'e \mid ue \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u' \langle u \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \mid u \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' \mid u \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid u \langle u' \mid u \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid \omega_{u,u'} \omega_{u,u'} u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid \omega_{u,u'} u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid u \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= e. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.6 (i),  $ue = u'e$  holds. Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{u,u'} &= \omega_{u \langle u \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}, u' \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}} \\ &= \omega_{u \langle u \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}, u' \langle u \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}} \\ &= \omega_{ue, u'e}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**Theorem 3.19.** *For a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the semigroup  $K(\mathcal{U})$  is inverse. The generalize inverse  $k^*$  of  $k \in K(\mathcal{U})$  is its adjoint  $k^{\dagger}$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.11, Lemma 3.18, and Proposition 3.12,  $K(\mathcal{U})$  becomes a regular semigroup whose idempotents commute. Theorem 1.5 implies that  $K(\mathcal{U})$  is an inverse semigroup.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.20.** *Every right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$  becomes a Morita equivalence from  $K(\mathcal{U})$  to  $\langle \mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  with respect to the left action and the left pairing defined as  $ku := k(u)$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u \mid u' \rangle := \omega_{u,u'}$  for  $k \in K(\mathcal{U})$ ,  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  respectively.*

*Proof.* These structures satisfy (L-i)-(L-iii) by Lemma 3.7, 3.6, and (R-iii). It is clear that the left and right pairings are compatible.  $\square$

We gave an analogy of Lemma 1.6:

**Proposition 3.21.** *For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , the following are equivalent;*

- (i)  $u = u'\langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ ,
- (ii) there exists  $e \in E(T)$  with  $u = u'e$ ,
- (iii)  $u = \omega_{u,u'u'}$ ,
- (iv) there exists  $k \in E(K(\mathcal{U}))$  with  $u = k(u')$ .

*Proof.* We can see that (i) implies (ii), and that (iii) implies (iv). If we assume (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{u,u'u'} &= u\langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u'e\langle u'e | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= u'e\langle u' | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u'\langle u' | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}e = u'e = u. \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus we obtain (iii). If we assume (iv),

$$\begin{aligned} u'\langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= u'\langle k(u') | k(u') \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u'\langle u' | k(u') \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \omega_{u',u'}k(u') = k\omega_{u',u'}(u') = k(u') = u \end{aligned}$$

holds, where the second equal holds since we have  $k^\dagger = k^*$  by Theorem 3.19 and  $k^* = k$  by  $k \in E(K(\mathcal{U}))$ . Thus we obtain (i).  $\square$

**Definition 3.22.** For  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $u \leq u'$  if and only if  $u$  and  $u'$  satisfies one (and hence all) of the conditions in Proposition 3.21.

We can check that this binary relation  $\leq$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  becomes a partial order on  $\mathcal{U}$ . Steinberg introduced order on Morita equivalences in [Ste11, Proposition 3.2, 3.5]. For a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , Steinberg's order defined on the Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $K(\mathcal{U})$  to  $\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  coincides with our order on  $\mathcal{U}$  in Definition 3.22. We can see easily the following: For every  $k \in K(\mathcal{U})$ ,  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , and  $t \in T$ ,  $u \leq u'$  implies  $ut \leq u't$  and  $k(u) \leq k(u')$ . Let  $u_i, u'_i \in \mathcal{U}$  with  $u_i \leq u'_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . We obtain  $\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \leq \langle u'_1 | u'_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\omega_{u_1, u_2} \leq \omega_{u'_1, u'_2}$ .

We proceed to show that  $L(\mathcal{U})$  is an inverse semigroup and  $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is a right inverse  $L(\mathcal{U})$ -set. By virtue of Corollary 3.9 and Theorem 3.19, we have the following key lemma:

**Lemma 3.23.** *For every idempotent  $\varphi$  of  $L(\mathcal{U})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\varphi$  and  $\omega_{u,u}$  commute.*

*Proof.* Apply Theorem 1.4 to  $S = L(\mathcal{U})$  and  $I = K(\mathcal{U})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.24.** *For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u}$  and  $\omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi$  are idempotents of  $L(\mathcal{U})$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.7 (i), (ii), and Corollary 3.17,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u} &= \varphi^\dagger \omega_{\varphi(u), \varphi(u)} \omega_{\varphi(u), u} \\ &= \varphi^\dagger \omega_{\varphi(u) \langle \varphi(u) | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}, u} \\ &= \varphi^\dagger \omega_{\varphi(u), u} \\ &= \varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u} \end{aligned}$$

holds for every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . In a similar way,  $\omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi$  is an idempotent for every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.25.** *For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\varphi^\dagger \varphi$  and  $\omega_{u,u}$  commute.*

*Proof.* For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u}$  and  $\omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi$  commute with  $\omega_{u,u}$  by Lemma 3.23 and 3.24. Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u} &= \varphi^\dagger \varphi (\omega_{u,u} \omega_{u,u}) \\
&= (\varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u}) \omega_{u,u} \\
&= \omega_{u,u} (\varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u}) \\
&= (\omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi) \omega_{u,u} \\
&= \omega_{u,u} (\omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi) \\
&= (\omega_{u,u} \omega_{u,u}) \varphi^\dagger \varphi \\
&= \omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi.
\end{aligned}
\quad \square$$

**Proposition 3.26.** *For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ ,  $\varphi \varphi^\dagger \varphi = \varphi$  and  $\varphi^\dagger \varphi \varphi^\dagger = \varphi^\dagger$  hold.*

*Proof.* For every  $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{U})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(u) &= \varphi(u) \langle \varphi(u) | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= \varphi(u \langle \varphi(u) | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}) \\
&= \varphi \left( u \left\langle u \middle| \varphi^\dagger \varphi(u) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \right) \\
&= \varphi(\omega_{u,u} \varphi^\dagger \varphi(u)) \\
&= \varphi(\varphi^\dagger \varphi \omega_{u,u}(u)) \\
&= \varphi \varphi^\dagger \varphi(u),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equal follows from Lemma 3.15, and the fifth equal follows from Lemma 3.25. Thus  $\varphi \varphi^\dagger \varphi = \varphi$  holds. This implies that  $\varphi^\dagger = (\varphi \varphi^\dagger \varphi)^\dagger = \varphi^\dagger \varphi \varphi^\dagger$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.27.** *For every idempotent  $\varphi$  of  $L(\mathcal{U})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , the following hold:*

- (i)  $\varphi(u) = u \langle u | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ .
- (ii)  $\langle u | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle \varphi(u) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle \varphi(u) | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$ .

By (i) and (ii),  $\varphi(u) = u \langle u | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u \langle \varphi(u) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = u \langle \varphi(u) | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  holds.

*Proof.* For every idempotent  $\varphi$  of  $L(\mathcal{U})$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , Lemma 3.23 implies (i) as

$$\varphi(u) = \varphi(\omega_{u,u}(u)) = \omega_{u,u}(\varphi(u)) = u \langle u | \varphi(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}.$$



Lemma 3.23 also implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varphi(u) &= \varphi(u)\langle\varphi(u) \mid \varphi(u)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \omega_{\varphi(u), \varphi(u)}(\varphi(u)) \\
 &= \varphi(\omega_{\varphi(u), \varphi(u)}(u)) \\
 &= \varphi(\varphi(u)\langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}) \\
 &= \varphi(\varphi(u))\langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \varphi(u)\langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle\varphi(u) \mid \varphi(u)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle\varphi(u) \mid \varphi(u)\langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\varphi(u) \mid \varphi(u)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}
 \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus we have (ii).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.28.** *For every idempotent  $\varphi$  of  $L(\mathcal{U})$ ,  $\varphi^\dagger = \varphi$  holds.*

*Proof.* For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  and an idempotent  $\varphi$  of  $L(\mathcal{U})$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle u' \mid \varphi(u)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u' \mid u\langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle u' \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}\langle\varphi(u) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\varphi(u)\langle u \mid u'\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\varphi(u\langle u \mid u'\rangle_{\mathcal{U}}) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\varphi(\omega_{u, u'}(u)) \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\omega_{u, u'}\varphi(u') \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\varphi(u') \mid \omega_{u, u'}(u)\rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle\varphi(u') \mid u\rangle_{\mathcal{U}},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the first equal follows from Lemma 3.27, the third equal follows from Lemma 3.15, the fifth equal follows from Lemma 3.23, and the sixth equal follows from Lemma 3.6.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.29.** *Let  $\varphi$  be an element of  $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ . If  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in L(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U})$  satisfies  $\varphi\psi_i\varphi = \varphi$  and  $\psi_i\varphi\psi_i = \psi_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , then  $\psi_1 = \psi_2$  holds.*

*Proof.* Notice that  $\varphi\psi_i$  is an idempotent of  $L(\mathcal{V})$  and  $\psi_i\varphi$  is an idempotent of  $L(\mathcal{U})$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . By Lemma 3.28, we get  $(\varphi\psi_i)^\dagger = \varphi\psi_i$  and  $(\psi_i\varphi)^\dagger = \psi_i\varphi$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \psi_1 &= \psi_1\varphi\psi_1 \\
 &= (\psi_1\varphi)^\dagger\psi_1 \\
 &= (\psi_1\varphi\psi_2\varphi)^\dagger\psi_1 \\
 &= (\psi_2\varphi)^\dagger(\psi_1\varphi)^\dagger\psi_1 \\
 &= \psi_2\varphi\psi_1\varphi\psi_1 \\
 &= \psi_2\varphi\psi_1
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_2 &= \psi_2 \varphi \psi_2 \\
&= \psi_2 (\varphi \psi_2)^\dagger \\
&= \psi_2 (\varphi \psi_1 \varphi \psi_2)^\dagger \\
&= \psi_2 (\varphi \psi_2)^\dagger (\varphi \psi_1)^\dagger \\
&= \psi_2 \varphi \psi_2 \varphi \psi_1 \\
&= \psi_2 \varphi \psi_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\psi_1 = \psi_2$  holds.  $\square$

Now we obtain our desired theorems:

**Theorem 3.30.** *For a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the semigroup  $L(\mathcal{U})$  is inverse.*

*Proof.* This follows from Proposition 3.26 and 3.29.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.31.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  be right inverse  $T$ -sets. The set  $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $L(\mathcal{V})$  to  $L(\mathcal{U})$  with respect to the following structures: The left and right actions are defined by composing from the left side and the right side respectively. The left and right pairings are defined as  ${}_{L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})}\langle \varphi_1 | \varphi_2 \rangle := \varphi_1 \varphi_2^\dagger$  and  $\langle \varphi_1 | \varphi_2 \rangle_{L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})} := \varphi_1^\dagger \varphi_2$  for every  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  respectively. With the same structures,  $K(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $K(\mathcal{V})$  to  $K(\mathcal{U})$ .*

*Proof.* The associative law of composition of maps implies that  $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  becomes a right  $L(\mathcal{U})$ -set and  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})}$  satisfies the condition (R-i) in Definition 2.2. Proposition 3.16 implies (R-ii). Proposition 3.26 implies (R-iii). Corollary 3.17 and Proposition 3.29 imply (R-iv). We can also check that  $K(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $K(\mathcal{V})$  to  $K(\mathcal{U})$ .  $\square$

#### 4. INVERSE CORRESPONDENCES AND THEIR TENSOR PRODUCTS

In this section, we introduce a notion of *inverse correspondence* between inverse semigroups and their tensor product. In the  $C^*$ -algebra theory, a  $C^*$ -correspondence from a  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  to  $B$  consists of a right Hilbert  $B$ -module  $\mathcal{E}$  and a  $*$ -homomorphism from  $A$  to the  $C^*$ -algebra  $L(\mathcal{E})$  of all adjointable maps on  $\mathcal{E}$ . By virtue of Theorem 3.30, we can define inverse correspondences in a similar way to  $C^*$ -correspondences. Let  $S$  and  $T$  be inverse semigroups.

**Definition 4.1.** An *inverse correspondence*  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$ , denoted as  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$ , is a right inverse  $T$ -set equipped with a semigroup homomorphism  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$ .

We denote  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s)(u)$  as  $su$  for every  $s \in S$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$  be an inverse correspondence. The following hold:*

- (i)  $S \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}; (s, u) \mapsto su$  is a left action of  $S$  on  $\mathcal{U}$ .
- (ii)  $s(ut) = (su)t$  for every  $s \in S$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $t \in T$ .
- (iii)  $\langle u' | su \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle s^* u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  for every  $s \in S$ ,  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ .

*Proof.* (i) is clear since  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$  is a semigroup homomorphism. (ii) follows from Lemma 3.15. (iii) holds because  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$  keeps generalized inverses.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *A right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$  equipped with a left action of  $S$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $\langle u' | su \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle s^* u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  holds for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $s \in S$  becomes an inverse correspondence from  $S$  to  $T$ .*

*Proof.* We can check easily that  $\theta(s): \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}; u \mapsto su$  is an adjointable map on  $\mathcal{U}$  for every  $s \in S$ , and  $\theta: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U}); s \mapsto \theta(s)$  is a semigroup homomorphism.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$  be an inverse correspondence. For  $e \in E(S)$ ,  $\varphi \in E(L(\mathcal{U}))$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $e\varphi(u) = \varphi(eu)$  holds.*

*Proof.* The semigroup homomorphism  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}$  keeps idempotents. Two idempotents  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(e)$  and  $\varphi$  in  $L(\mathcal{U})$  commutes by Theorem 3.30.  $\square$

For an inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$ ,

$$S\mathcal{U} := \{su \in \mathcal{U} \mid s \in S, u \in \mathcal{U}\}$$

becomes an inverse correspondence from  $S$  to  $T$ .

**Definition 4.5.** An inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$  is *non-degenerate* if  $S\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}$ .

*Example 4.6.* A partial Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$  becomes an inverse correspondence by forgetting the left pairing. We can check this fact as follows: Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a partial Morita equivalence from  $S$  to  $T$ . For  $s \in S, u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$u \langle su | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = {}_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | su \rangle u' = {}_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u \rangle s^* u' = u \langle u | s^* u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},$$

where the second equal follows from Lemma 2.5. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u' | su \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u' | su \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u' | su \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \langle su | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \langle u | s^* u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle s^* u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle s^* u' | u \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle s^* u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third and fifth equals follow from Lemma 2.5 (this is an another proof of [Ste11, Proposition 2.3 (10)]). Thus  $\mathcal{U}$  is an inverse correspondence from  $S$  to  $T$  by Lemma 4.3. For every element  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $u = {}_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u \rangle u \in S\mathcal{U}$  holds. Thus  $\mathcal{U}$  is non-degenerate.

**Lemma 4.7.** *An inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$  comes from a partial Morita equivalence if and only if there exists a two-sided ideal  $I$  of  $S$  such that  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}|_I: I \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  is an isomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U})$ .*

*Proof.* For a partial Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$ , the subset  $I = {}_{\mathcal{U}} \langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle$  is a two-sided ideal of  $S$ . By the compatibility of left and right pairings, we have  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}({}_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle) = \omega_{u_1, u_2} \in K(\mathcal{U})$  for every  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ . Thus

$\theta_{\mathcal{U}|I}$  is a semigroup homomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U})$ . For  $s_1, s_2 \in {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle$  with  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s_1) = \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s_2)$ , we have

$$s_1 {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle s_1 u | u' \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle s_2 u | u' \rangle = s_2 {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u | u' \rangle$$

for every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ . This implies that  $s_1 = s_2$  by applying Lemma 1.7 for the inverse semigroup  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle$ . Thus  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}|I}$  is an isomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U})$ .

We assume that  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}|I}$  is an isomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U})$  with some two-sided ideal  $I$  of  $S$ . For every  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ , we set  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle := (\theta_{\mathcal{U}|I})^{-1}(\omega_{u_1, u_2}) \in I \subset S$ . We can check easily that  $\mathcal{U}$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$  form a regular left  $S$ -set. The compatibility of left and right pairings in Definition 2.16 is clear by the definition of the left pairing.  $\square$

The following lemma means that we can reconstruct a left pairing of a partial Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from the other structures of  $\mathcal{U}$ . This fact is nothing but an analogy of [Kat03, Lemma 2.4].

**Lemma 4.8.** *If two partial Morita equivalence produces the same inverse correspondence by forgetting the left pairings, then they are same as partial Morita equivalences.*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 1.3.  $\square$

The following corollary follows from Lemma 4.7:

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an inverse correspondence from  $S$  to  $T$ .*

- (i)  $\mathcal{U}$  comes from a partial Morita equivalence which is left full if and only if  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  is an isomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U})$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{U}$  comes from a Morita equivalence if and only if  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  is an isomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U})$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  is right full.

We give another example of non-degenerate inverse correspondence.

*Example 4.10.* For a semigroup homomorphism  $\theta: S \rightarrow T$ , the subset  $\mathcal{U}_{\theta} := \{\theta(s)t \mid s \in S, t \in T\}$  of  $T$  becomes a non-degenerate inverse correspondence from  $S$  to  $T$  with respect to the following structures: The right action of  $T$  is defined as the multiplication from the right hand side. The right pairing is defined by  $\langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_{\theta}} := u_1^* u_2 \in T$  for every  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{\theta}$ . The left action of  $S$  is defined as  $S \times \mathcal{U}_{\theta} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\theta}; (s, u) \mapsto \theta(s)u$ . Especially, taking  $\theta$  as the identity homomorphism for  $S$ , we get a Morita equivalence  $S$  from  $S$  to  $S$ .

We define tensor products of inverse correspondences. This is a generalization of the tensor product of Morita contexts introduced in [Ste11, Proposition 2.5].

Let  $S_2$  and  $S_3$  be inverse semigroups,  $\mathcal{U}$  be a right inverse  $S_2$ -set, and  $\mathcal{V}: S_2 \rightarrow S_3$  be an inverse correspondence. We define a set  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  as the quotient of  $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$  by the least equivalence relation  $\sim$  such that  $(us_2, v) \sim (u, s_2v)$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $s_2 \in S_2$ . The equivalence class of  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$  is denoted as  $u \otimes v \in \mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$ . We define a right action of  $S_3$  on  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  as

$$(u \otimes v)s_3 = u \otimes (vs_3),$$

and a right pairing  $(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \times (\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \rightarrow S_3$  as

$$\langle u' \otimes v' | u \otimes v \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} := \langle v' | \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$$

for all  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ , and  $s_3 \in S_3$ .

**Proposition 4.11.** *The set  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  becomes an inverse  $S_3$ -set.*

*Proof.* We can easily check the well-definedness of the right action of  $S_3$  on  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$ . For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $s_2 \in S_2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v' | \langle u' s_2 | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} &= \langle v' | s_2^* \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} = \langle s_2 v' | \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}, \text{ and} \\ \langle v' | \langle u' | u s_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} &= \langle v' | \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} s_2 v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the map  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}: (\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \times (\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}) \rightarrow S_3$  is well-defined.

We can easily check the condition (R-i) in Definition 2.2.

For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u \otimes v | u' \otimes v' \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}^* &= \langle v | \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}^* \\ &= \langle \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}^* v | v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}^* \\ &= \langle \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v | v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}^* \\ &= \langle v' | \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= \langle u' \otimes v' | u \otimes v \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \end{aligned}$$

holds, where the second equal follows from Lemma 4.2 (iii). Thus we see the condition (R-ii) in Definition 2.2.

For every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (u \otimes v) \langle u \otimes v | u \otimes v \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} &= u \otimes v \langle v | \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= u \otimes v \langle \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v | \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= u \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes v \langle \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v | \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= u \otimes \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \langle \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v | \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\ &= u \otimes \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \\ &= u \langle u | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes v \\ &= u \otimes v, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equal follows from Lemma 4.2 (iii). Thus the condition (R-iii) in Definition 2.2 holds. Hence  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  becomes a right regular  $S_3$ -set.

We see that the condition (iii) in Proposition 3.12 holds for checking that the condition (R-iv) holds. For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& (u' \otimes v') \langle u' \otimes v' | u \otimes v \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \langle u \otimes v | u' \otimes v' \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \\
&= u' \otimes v' \langle v' | \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \langle v | \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= u' \otimes v' \langle v' | \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \langle \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v | v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= u' \otimes \omega_{v', v'} \omega_{\langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v, \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v} (v') \\
&= u' \otimes \omega_{\langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v, \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v} \omega_{v', v'} (v') \\
&= u' \otimes \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \langle \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v | v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= u' \otimes \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \langle v | \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= u' \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes v \langle v | \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= u \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes v \langle v | \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= u \otimes \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \langle v | \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= u \otimes \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \omega_{v, v} (\langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v') \\
&= u \otimes \omega_{v, v} (\langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v') \\
&= u \otimes \omega_{v, v} (\langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v') \\
&= u \otimes v \langle v | \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
&= (u \otimes v) \langle u \otimes v | u' \otimes v' \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second and sixth equals follow from Lemma 4.2(iii), the eleventh equal follows from Lemma 4.4, and the fourth and eighth equals follow from Proposition 3.12. Thus  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  becomes an inverse  $S_3$ -set.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.12.** *If  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  is right full, then so is  $\mathcal{V}$ .*

*Proof.* We can see

$$S_3 = \langle \mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V} | \mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V} \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} = \langle V | \langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} V \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \subset \langle V | V \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \subset S_3. \quad \square$$

Let  $S_1, S_2, S_3$  be inverse semigroups, and  $\mathcal{U}: S_1 \rightarrow S_2, \mathcal{V}: S_2 \rightarrow S_3$  be inverse correspondences. We define a left action of  $S_1$  on the right inverse  $S_3$ -set  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  as

$$s_1(u \otimes v) = (s_1 u) \otimes v$$

for  $u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}$ , and  $s_1 \in S_1$ .

**Proposition 4.13.** *The right inverse  $S_3$ -set  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  becomes an inverse correspondence from  $S_1$  to  $S_3$  with respect to the left action of  $S_1$  defined above. If  $\mathcal{U}$  is non-degenerate, then so is  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$ .*

*Proof.* We can easily check the well-definedness of the left action of  $S_1$  on  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  and that  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  becomes a  $S_1$ - $S_3$  biset. For every  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}, v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$s_1 \in S_1$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle u' \otimes v' | s_1(u \otimes v) \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} &= \langle u' \otimes v' | (s_1 u) \otimes v \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \\
 &= \langle v' | \langle u' | s_1 u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
 &= \langle v' | \langle s_1^* u' | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \\
 &= \langle (s_1^* u') \otimes v' | u \otimes v \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \\
 &= \langle s_1^* (u' \otimes v') | u \otimes v \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.3,  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  becomes an inverse correspondence from  $S_1$  to  $S_3$ .

Assume that  $\mathcal{U}$  is non-degenerate. Take  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  arbitrarily. There exists  $s' \in S$  and  $u' \in \mathcal{U}$  with  $u = s'u'$ . Hence we get  $u \otimes v = s'u' \otimes v = s'(u' \otimes v) \in S(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V})$ . Thus  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  is non-degenerate.  $\square$

*Example 4.14.* If two inverse correspondences  $\mathcal{U}: S_1 \rightarrow S_2$  and  $\mathcal{V}: S_2 \rightarrow S_3$  come from partial Morita equivalences, then so does the inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}: S_1 \rightarrow S_3$ . We can check this fact as follows: By Lemma 4.7, there exist the two-sided ideals  $I, J$  of  $S_1, S_2$  such that  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}|_I, \theta_{\mathcal{V}}|_J$  are isomorphisms onto  $K(\mathcal{U}), K(\mathcal{V})$  respectively. We define a subset  $W$  of  $S_1$  as

$$W := \{s \in I \mid \langle u' | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s)u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \in J \text{ for all } u, u' \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

It is easy to see that this is a two-sided ideal of  $S_1$ . We can prove the restriction  $\theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}|_W$  of  $\theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}: S_1 \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V})$  is an isomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V})$  as follows: Take  $s, s' \in W$  with  $\theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}(s) = \theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}(s')$ . For  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle v' | \theta_{\mathcal{V}}(\langle u' | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s)u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}})(v) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} &= \langle u' \otimes v' | \theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}(s)(u \otimes v) \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \\
 &= \langle u' \otimes v' | \theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}(s')(u \otimes v) \rangle_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \\
 &= \langle v' | \theta_{\mathcal{V}}(\langle u' | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s')u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}})(v) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.6 and the injectivity of  $\theta_{\mathcal{V}}|_J$ , we have

$$\langle u' | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s)u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \langle u' | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s')u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}.$$

In a similar way, we obtain  $s = s'$ . Thus  $\theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}$  is injective on  $W$ .

Take  $s \in W$ . There exist  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$  with  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s) = \omega_{u_2, u_1}$ , and  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $\theta_{\mathcal{V}}(\langle u_2 | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s)u_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}) = \omega_{v_2, v_1}$ . We obtain  $\theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}(s) = \omega_{u_2 \otimes v_2, u_1 \otimes v_1}$  by simple calculations. Thus  $\theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}|_W$  is into  $K(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V})$ .

For  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ , there exist  $s_2 \in J$  with  $\theta_{\mathcal{V}}(s_2) = \omega_{v_2, v_1}$ , and  $s_1 \in I$  with  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s_1) = \omega_{u_2, u_1}$ . For  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle u' | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s_1)u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u' | \omega_{u_2, u_1} u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle u' | u_2 s_2 \langle u_1 | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\
 &= \langle u' | u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} s_2 \langle u_1 | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $s_2 \in J$  and  $J$  is a two-sided ideal,  $\langle u' | \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s_1)u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \in J$ . Thus we have  $s_1 \in W$ . By simple calculations, we obtain  $\omega_{u_2 \otimes v_2, u_1 \otimes v_1} = \theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}(s_1)$ . This implies that  $\theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}|_W$  is onto  $K(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V})$ .

By Lemma 4.8, the inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}: S_1 \rightarrow S_3$  has a unique left pairing which makes it a partial Morita equivalence. This left pairing satisfies that

$${}_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}} \langle u_2 \otimes v_2 | u_1 \otimes v_1 \rangle = {}_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u_2 | {}_{\mathcal{V}} \langle v_2 | v_1 \rangle | u_1 \rangle$$

for  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ . This follows from the fact mentioned above such that  $\omega_{u_2 \otimes v_2, u_1 \otimes v_1} = \theta_{\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}}(s_1)$  holds.

If  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  comes from Morita equivalences, then so does their tensor product  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$ . This is nothing but the tensor product of Morita contexts defined in [Ste11, Proposition 2.5].

*Example 4.15.* Let  $S_i$  be inverse semigroups with  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $\theta_i: S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$  be semigroup homomorphisms with  $i = 1, 2$ . We can check that the map  $\mathcal{U}_{\theta_1} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\theta_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\theta_2 \theta_1}; u_1 \otimes u_2 \mapsto \theta_2(u_1)u_2$  becomes bijective, right pairing preserving, and a left  $S_1$ -map (that is, this is an isomorphism between inverse correspondences mentioned in Subsection 5.2). Thus the tensor product  $\mathcal{U}_{\theta_1} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{\theta_2}$  is isomorphic to the inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U}_{\theta_2 \theta_1}$ .

## 5. A BICATEGORY $\mathfrak{IC}$ OF INVERSE SEMIGROUPS

In this section, we will see that inverse semigroups and non-degenerate inverse correspondences form a bicategory. See [Bén67] or [Lei98] for more details of the bicategory theory.

**5.1. Definition and examples of bicategories.** We fix some conventions and notations in category theory before defining bicategories. A category consists of objects, morphisms, compositions of morphisms, and identity morphisms. For objects  $x$  and  $y$ , we denote a morphism  $f$  from  $x$  to  $y$  as  $f: x \rightarrow y$ . For morphisms  $f: x \rightarrow y$  and  $g: y \rightarrow z$ , the composition of  $f$  and  $g$  is denoted as  $g \cdot f: x \rightarrow z$ . We denote the identity morphism for an object  $x$  as  $1_x: x \rightarrow x$ . These satisfy the associative law and the unit law. A morphism  $f: x \rightarrow y$  is an *isomorphism* if there exists a morphism  $g: y \rightarrow x$  such that  $g \cdot f = 1_x$  and  $f \cdot g = 1_y$ . We say that  $x$  and  $y$  are *isomorphic* if there exists an isomorphism between  $x$  and  $y$ .

**Definition 5.1.** A *bicategory*  $\mathfrak{C}$  consists of the following data;

- (i) a collection of 0-arrows,
- (ii) a category  $\mathfrak{C}(x, y)$  for every 0-arrows  $x, y$ ; an object  $f$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(x, y)$  is called a 1-arrow from  $x$  to  $y$  and denoted as  $f: x \rightarrow y$ ; a morphism  $\sigma$  from a 1-arrow  $f: x \rightarrow y$  to  $g: x \rightarrow y$  is called a 2-arrow from  $f$  to  $g$  and denoted as  $\sigma: f \Rightarrow g: x \rightarrow y$  or  $\sigma: f \Rightarrow g$ ; the identity morphism for a 1-arrow  $f$  is called a *unit 2-arrow* and denoted as  $1_f: f \Rightarrow f$ .
- (iii) a functor  $\circ_{x, y, z}: \mathfrak{C}(x, y) \times \mathfrak{C}(y, z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(x, z)$  called a *composition functor* for each triplet of 0-arrows  $x, y, z$ ; the object  $\circ_{x, y, z}(f, g)$  is denoted as  $g \bullet f: x \rightarrow z$  for 1-arrows  $f: x \rightarrow y, g: y \rightarrow z$ ; the morphism  $\circ_{x, y, z}(\sigma, \tau)$  is denoted as  $\tau \bullet \sigma: g \bullet f \Rightarrow g' \bullet f': x \rightarrow z$  for 2-arrows  $\sigma: f \Rightarrow f': x \rightarrow y, \tau: g \Rightarrow g': y \rightarrow z$ ,
- (iv) an isomorphic 2-arrow  $\alpha_{f, g, h}: h \bullet (g \bullet f) \Rightarrow (h \bullet g) \bullet f$  called an *associator* for each triplet of 1-arrows  $f: x \rightarrow y, g: y \rightarrow z, h: z \rightarrow w$ ; the associators make the following diagram commute;

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 h \bullet (g \bullet f) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{f, g, h}} & (h \bullet g) \bullet f \\
 \nu \bullet (\tau \bullet \sigma) \Downarrow & & \Downarrow (\nu \bullet \tau) \bullet \sigma \\
 h' \bullet (g' \bullet f') & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{f', g', h'}} & (h' \bullet g') \bullet f',
 \end{array}$$



- (v) a 1-arrow  $1_x: x \rightarrow x$  called *unit 1-arrow for  $x$*  for each 0-arrow  $x$ ,  
 (vi) an isomorphic 2-arrow  $\lambda_f: 1_y \bullet f \Rightarrow f$  called a *left unitor*, and an isomorphic 2-arrow  $\rho_f: f \bullet 1_x \Rightarrow f$  called a *right unitor* for each 1-arrow  $f: x \rightarrow y$ ; the left and right unitors make the following diagrams commute;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 1_y \bullet f & \xrightarrow{\lambda_f} & f \\ 1_{1_y} \bullet \sigma \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \sigma \\ 1_y \bullet f' & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{f'}} & f' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} f \bullet 1_x & \xrightarrow{\rho_f} & f \\ \sigma \bullet 1_{1_x} \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \sigma \\ f' \bullet 1_x & \xrightarrow{\rho_{f'}} & f' \end{array}$$

These make the following diagrams commute;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} g \bullet (1_y \bullet f) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{f,1_y,g}} & (g \bullet 1_y) \bullet f \\ & \searrow 1_g \bullet \lambda_f & \swarrow \rho_g \bullet 1_f \\ & g \bullet f & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f_4 \bullet (f_3 \bullet (f_2 \bullet f_1)) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{(f_2 \bullet f_1), f_3, f_4}} & (f_4 \bullet f_3) \bullet (f_2 \bullet f_1) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{f_1, f_2, (f_4 \bullet f_3)}} & ((f_4 \bullet f_3) \bullet f_2) \bullet f_1 \\ 1_{f_4} \bullet \alpha_{f_1, f_2, f_3} \Downarrow & & & & \Uparrow \alpha_{f_2, f_3, f_4} \bullet 1_{f_1} \\ f_4 \bullet ((f_3 \bullet f_2) \bullet f_1) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{f_1, (f_3 \bullet f_2), f_4}} & (f_4 \bullet (f_3 \bullet f_2)) \bullet f_1. \end{array}$$

**Definition 5.2.** A 1-arrow  $f: x \rightarrow y$  in a bicategory  $\mathfrak{C}$  is said to be an *equivalence* if there exists a 1-arrow  $g: y \rightarrow x$  such that  $g \bullet f$  is isomorphic to  $1_x$  and  $f \bullet g$  is isomorphic to  $1_y$ . Two 0-arrows  $x, y$  are *equivalent* if there exists an equivalence from  $x$  to  $y$ .

*Example 5.3.* The bicategory  $\mathfrak{Gr}$  of étale groupoids and groupoid correspondences is studied in [Alb15] and [AKM22]. The composition of groupoid correspondences  $\mathcal{X}: G \rightarrow H$  and  $\mathcal{Y}: H \rightarrow K$  is the groupoid correspondence  $\mathcal{X} \circ_H \mathcal{Y}: G \rightarrow K$  defined in [Alb15, Subsection 2.3] and [AKM22, Section 5].

For two groupoid correspondences  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}: G \rightarrow H$ , a 2-arrow between them is a  $G, H$ -equivariant homeomorphism defined in [Alb15, p.23] (that is, a homeomorphism which is compatible with left and right actions of  $G$  and  $H$ ). Two étale groupoids are equivalent in this bicategory  $\mathfrak{Gr}$  if and only if they are Morita equivalent (see [Alb15, Theorem 2.30]). In [AKM22], the authors allowed injective  $G, H$ -equivariant continuous maps as 2-arrows of  $\mathfrak{Gr}$ .

*Example 5.4.* The bicategory  $\mathfrak{Corr}$  of  $C^*$ -algebras and non-degenerate  $C^*$ -correspondences is studied in [BMZ13]. The composition of  $C^*$ -correspondences  $\mathcal{E}: A \rightarrow B$  and  $\mathcal{F}: B \rightarrow C$  is defined by their interior tensor product  $\mathcal{E} \otimes_B \mathcal{F}: A \rightarrow C$  (see [Lan95, p.38-44]). For two  $C^*$ -correspondences  $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}: A \rightarrow B$ , a 2-arrow between them is a unitary  $A, B$ -bimodule map  $\sigma: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  in [BMZ13]. Two  $C^*$ -algebras are equivalent in this bicategory  $\mathfrak{Corr}$  if and only if they are Morita equivalent (see [BMZ13, Proposition 2.11]). In [AKM22], the authors allowed isometric (not necessary invertible or adjointable)  $A, B$ -bimodule maps as 2-arrows of  $\mathfrak{Corr}$ .

**5.2. A bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$  of inverse semigroups.** Now we construct a bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$  consisting of inverse semigroups and non-degenerate inverse correspondences. We set inverse semigroups as 0-arrows.

Let  $S, T$  be inverse semigroups and  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}'$  be inverse correspondences from  $S$  to  $T$ .

**Definition 5.5.** A *correspondence map*  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'$  is a right pairing preserving left  $S$ -map from  $\mathcal{U}$  to  $\mathcal{U}'$ .

We can easily check that the composition of two correspondence maps is also a correspondence map. Thus all non-degenerate inverse correspondences from  $S$  to  $T$  and all correspondence maps form a category with respect to the usual composition  $\circ$  of maps and the identity maps  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{U}}$  on inverse correspondences  $\mathcal{U}$ . We denote this category as  $\mathfrak{IC}(S, T)$ .

**Lemma 5.6.** A *correspondence map*  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'$  is an isomorphism in the category  $\mathfrak{IC}(S, T)$  if and only if  $\sigma$  is surjective.

*Proof.* We can easily check that a correspondence map is an isomorphism in this category  $\mathfrak{IC}(S, T)$  if and only if it is bijective. By Lemma 2.13, every correspondence map is injective.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** For an isomorphism  $\iota: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'$  between inverse correspondences, if  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$  are partial Morita equivalences, then  $\iota$  preserves the left pairings.

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 4.8.  $\square$

Let  $S_i$  be an inverse semigroup with  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $\mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{U}'_i: S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$  be inverse correspondences with  $i = 1, 2$ . For correspondence maps  $\sigma_i: \mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , the *tensor product*  $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2: \mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}'_2$  of correspondence maps is defined as

$$(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2)(u_1 \otimes u_2) := \sigma_1(u_1) \otimes \sigma_2(u_2)$$

for every  $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$  with  $i = 1, 2$ .

**Lemma 5.8.** For correspondence maps  $\sigma_i: \mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$  is well-defined and a correspondence map.

*Proof.* For every  $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1$ ,  $u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2$ , and  $s_2 \in S_2$ ,

$$(\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2)(u_1 \otimes s_2 u_2) = (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2)(u_1 s_2 \otimes u_2)$$

holds since  $\sigma_1$  is a right  $S_2$ -map and  $\sigma_2$  is a left  $S_2$ -map. Thus  $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$  is well-defined. The map  $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2$  is a left  $S_1$ -map because  $\sigma_1$  is a left  $S_1$ -map. This map is right pairing preserving because  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are right pairing preserving and  $\sigma_2$  is a left  $S_2$ -map.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.9.** For inverse semigroups  $S_1, S_2$ , and  $S_3$ , the tensor product of inverse correspondences and the tensor product of correspondence maps form a functor

$$\otimes_{S_1, S_2, S_3}: \mathfrak{IC}(S_1, S_2) \times \mathfrak{IC}(S_2, S_3) \rightarrow \mathfrak{IC}(S_1, S_3).$$

*Proof.* If two inverse correspondences are non-degenerate, then so is their tensor product by Proposition 4.13. We can easily check that

$$(\sigma'_1 \otimes \sigma'_2) \circ (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) = (\sigma'_1 \circ \sigma_1) \otimes (\sigma'_2 \circ \sigma_2)$$

for inverse correspondences  $\mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{U}'_i, \mathcal{U}''_i: S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$ , and correspondence maps  $\sigma_i: \mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'_i$ ,  $\sigma'_i: \mathcal{U}'_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}''_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . The tensor product of the identity maps  $1_{\mathcal{U}_1}$  and  $1_{\mathcal{U}_2}$  is the identity map for  $\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.10.** *For inverse correspondences  $\mathcal{U}_i: S_i \rightarrow S_{i+1}$  with  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , a map defined as*

$\alpha_{\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2, \mathcal{U}_3}: \mathcal{U}_1 \otimes (\mathcal{U}_2 \otimes \mathcal{U}_3) \rightarrow (\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2) \otimes \mathcal{U}_3; u_1 \otimes (u_2 \otimes u_3) \mapsto (u_1 \otimes u_2) \otimes u_3$  *is well-defined and an isomorphic correspondence map. This map is natural for  $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ , and  $\mathcal{U}_3$ , that is, for every correspondence maps  $\sigma_i: \mathcal{U}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , the following diagram commutes;*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{U}_1 \otimes (\mathcal{U}_2 \otimes \mathcal{U}_3) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2, \mathcal{U}_3}} & (\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2) \otimes \mathcal{U}_3 \\ \sigma_1 \otimes (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_3) \downarrow & & \downarrow (\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2) \otimes \sigma_3 \\ \mathcal{U}'_1 \otimes (\mathcal{U}'_2 \otimes \mathcal{U}'_3) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\mathcal{U}'_1, \mathcal{U}'_2, \mathcal{U}'_3}} & (\mathcal{U}'_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}'_2) \otimes \mathcal{U}'_3. \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Straightforward.  $\square$

As seen in Example 4.15, an inverse semigroup  $S$  can be regarded as a non-degenerate inverse correspondence from  $S$  to  $S$ . We set this correspondence  $S$  as a unit 1-arrow for  $S$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** *For an inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U}$  from an inverse semigroup  $S$  to  $T$ , the map*

$$\rho_{\mathcal{U}}: \mathcal{U} \otimes T \rightarrow \mathcal{U}; u \otimes t \mapsto ut$$

*is an isomorphic correspondence map. If  $\mathcal{U}$  is non-degenerate, then the map*

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{U}}: S \otimes \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}; s \otimes u \mapsto su$$

*is an isomorphic correspondence map. These maps make the following diagrams commute;*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{U} \otimes T & \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathcal{U}}} & \mathcal{U} & S \otimes \mathcal{U} & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{U}}} & \mathcal{U} \\ \sigma \otimes \text{id}_T \downarrow & & \downarrow \sigma & \text{id}_S \otimes \sigma \downarrow & & \downarrow \sigma \\ \mathcal{U}' \otimes T & \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathcal{U}'}} & \mathcal{U}' & S \otimes \mathcal{U}' & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathcal{U}'}} & \mathcal{U}' \end{array}$$

*for every inverse correspondences  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}': S \rightarrow T$ , and every correspondence map  $\sigma: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.6, it is enough to check that  $\lambda_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\rho_{\mathcal{U}}$  are surjective correspondence maps.

The map  $\rho_{\mathcal{U}}: \mathcal{U} \otimes T \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  is right pairing preserving by (R-i) in 2.2 and the right version of Lemma 2.5 (ii), and is a left  $S$ -map by Lemma 4.2 (ii). The surjectivity of  $\rho_{\mathcal{U}}$  follows from (R-iii) in Definition 2.2.

The map  $\lambda_{\mathcal{U}}$  is right pairing preserving since  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s^*) = \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s)^\dagger$  holds for every  $s \in S$ , and is a left  $S$ -map clearly. The surjectivity of  $\lambda_{\mathcal{U}}$  follows from non-degeneracy of  $\mathcal{U}$ .

The diagrams commute because  $\sigma$  is a correspondence map.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.12.** *The above data form a bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$  of inverse semigroups and non-degenerate inverse correspondences.*

*Proof.* We need to see that the triangle diagram and the pentagon diagram in Definition 5.1 commute. It is easy to check these.  $\square$

We investigate equivalences in the bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$ . Let  $S, T$  be inverse semigroups.

For a right regular  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , we can obtain a left regular  $T$ -set  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  as follows: We define a set  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  as the set of all symbols  $\tilde{u}$  running over all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . The left action of  $T$  and the left pairing is defined as

$$t\tilde{u} := \widetilde{ut^*}, \text{ and } \tilde{u}_1 \langle \tilde{u}_2 | \tilde{u}_3 \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} := \langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$$

for every  $t \in T$  and  $u, u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ . The set  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  becomes a left regular  $T$ -set with respect to the above structures. If  $\mathcal{U}$  is a right inverse  $T$ -set, then  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  is a left inverse  $T$ -set.

For a partial Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$ , we obtain a right action of  $S$  and a right pairing on the left inverse  $T$ -set  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  as follows: For every  $u, u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $s \in S$ ,

$$\tilde{u}s := \widetilde{s^*u}, \text{ and } \langle \tilde{u}_1 | \tilde{u}_2 \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} := \langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}.$$

The left inverse  $T$ -set  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $T$  to  $S$  with respect to these structures. If  $\mathcal{U}$  is a Morita equivalence, then so is  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ .

*Remark 5.13.* An inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$  becomes a generalized heap with respect to a ternary operation  $\{, , \}: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  defined by  $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}_{\mathcal{U}} := u_1 \langle u_2 | u_3 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  for  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathcal{U}$  (see [Law11, p.318] for the definition of generalized heaps). This ternary operation satisfy that  $\{u_1, su_2, u_3\}_{\mathcal{U}} = \{u_1, u_2, s^*u_3\}_{\mathcal{U}}$  and  $\{u_1, u_2t, u_3\}_{\mathcal{U}} = \{u_1t^*, u_2, u_3\}_{\mathcal{U}}$  for  $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $s \in S$  and  $t \in T$ . These equations are analogue to the axioms of generalized correspondences in the  $C^*$ -algebra theory (see [Exe07, p.5]). The left inverse  $T$ -set  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  also becomes a generalized heap with respect to a ternary operation  $\{, , \}_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}}: \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  defined by  $\{\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3\}_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} := \tilde{u}_1 \langle \tilde{u}_2 | \tilde{u}_3 \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}}$ . We can define a right action of  $S$  on the generalized heap  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  in the same way as the case of partial Morita equivalence mentioned above. The ternary operation satisfy that  $\{\tilde{u}_1, t\tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3\} = \{\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, t^*\tilde{u}_3\}$  and  $\{\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2s, \tilde{u}_3\} = \{\tilde{u}_1s^*, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3\}$  for  $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \tilde{u}_3 \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ ,  $t \in T$ , and  $s \in S$ .

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a partial Morita equivalence from  $S$  to  $T$ . We recall that  ${}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle$  is a two-sided ideal of  $S$ . Hence this becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $S$  to  $S$ . The two-sided ideal  $\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  of  $T$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $T$  to  $T$ .

**Proposition 5.14.** *For a partial Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{U} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \simeq {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \otimes \mathcal{U} \simeq \langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}},$$

*as partial Morita equivalences.*

*Proof.* We define a map  $\iota: \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \otimes \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{U} | \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  as

$$\iota(\tilde{u} \otimes u') := \langle u | u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$$

for  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ . It is clear that  $\iota$  is surjective. For  $t \in T$  and  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(t(\tilde{u} \otimes u')) &= \iota((t\tilde{u}) \otimes u') \\ &= \iota(\tilde{u}t^* \otimes u') \\ &= \langle ut^* \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= t\langle u \mid u' \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= t\iota(\tilde{u} \otimes u'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\iota$  is a left- $T$  map. For  $u_1, u'_1, u_2, u'_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{u}_1 \otimes u'_1 \mid \tilde{u}_2 \otimes u'_2 \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \otimes \mathcal{U}} &= \langle u'_1 \mid \langle \tilde{u}_1 \mid \tilde{u}_2 \rangle_{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} u'_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u'_1 \mid_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u_1 \mid u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} u'_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u'_1 \mid u_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u_2 \mid u'_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u'_1 \mid u_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle u_2 \mid u'_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u_1 \mid u'_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}^* \langle u_2 \mid u'_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle \iota(\tilde{u}_1 \otimes u'_1) \mid \iota(\tilde{u}_2 \otimes u'_2) \rangle_{\langle \mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{U} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\iota$  is right pairing preserving. By Lemma 5.6,  $\iota$  is an isomorphism.

In a similar way, we obtain that the map  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \rightarrow {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle \mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{U} \rangle; u' \otimes \tilde{u} \mapsto {}_{\mathcal{U}}\langle u' \mid u \rangle$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

The following proposition is analogues to [EKQR06, Lemma 2.4].

**Proposition 5.15.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$  and  $\mathcal{V}: T \rightarrow S$  be non-degenerate inverse correspondences. If  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  is isomorphic to  $S$  and  $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{U}$  is isomorphic to  $T$  as inverse correspondences, then  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are Morita equivalence.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.12,  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are right full. By symmetry, we only see that  $\mathcal{U}$  becomes a Morita equivalence. To prove this, it is enough to show that  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  is an isomorphism onto  $K(\mathcal{U})$  by Corollary 4.9 (ii).

For  $s_1, s_2 \in S$  with  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s_1) = \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s_2)$ , we get  $s_1(u \otimes v) = s_2(u \otimes v)$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . This implies that  $s_1s = s_2s$  for all  $s \in S$  because  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{V}$  is isomorphic to  $S$  as inverse correspondences. By Lemma 1.7, we have  $s_1 = s_2$ . Thus  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  is injective.

We put the isomorphism from  $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{U}$  to  $T$  as  $\iota$ . To show that  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(S) = K(\mathcal{U})$ , we construct a surjection from  $\mathcal{V}$  to  $\mathcal{U}$ . We define a map  $\Phi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  as the unique map which satisfies that

$$\langle \Phi(v) \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \iota(v \otimes u)$$

for every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . The uniqueness of  $\Phi$  is clear by Lemma 2.6. We can construct  $\Phi$  as follows: Every element of  $\mathcal{V}$  is in the form of  $\iota(v' \otimes u')^*v$  with some  $u' \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$  because  $\mathcal{V}$  is non-degenerate and  $\iota$  is surjective. We define  $\Phi(\iota(v' \otimes u')^*v) := \langle v \mid v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} u'$  for every  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $u' \in \mathcal{U}$ . We get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \langle v \mid v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} u' \mid u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u' \mid \langle v' \mid v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle v' \otimes u' \mid v \otimes u \rangle_{\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{U}} \\ &= \iota(v' \otimes u')^* \iota(v \otimes u) \\ &= \iota(\iota(v' \otimes u')^*v \otimes u) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . This implies that  $\Phi$  is well-defined and satisfies  $\langle \Phi(v) | u \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} = \iota(v \otimes u)$  for every  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ . Every element of  $\mathcal{U}$  is in the form of  $\langle v | v' \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} u'$  with some  $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $u' \in \mathcal{U}$  because  $\mathcal{U}$  is non-degenerate and  $\mathcal{V}$  is right full. Thus we get that  $\Phi$  is surjective.

Take an element  $k$  of  $K(\mathcal{U})$ . There exist  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $k = \omega_{\Phi(v_1), \Phi(v_2)}$  because  $\Phi$  is surjective. For every  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_1 | \omega_{\Phi(v_1), \Phi(v_2)} u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u_1 | \Phi(v_1) \langle \Phi(v_2) | u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u_1 | \Phi(v_1) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle \Phi(v_2) | u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \iota(v_1 \otimes u_1)^* \iota(v_2 \otimes u_2) \\ &= \langle v_1 \otimes u_1 | v_2 \otimes u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u_1 | \langle v_1 | v_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} u_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $k = \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(\langle v_1 | v_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}) \in \theta_{\mathcal{U}}(S)$  holds.

Take an element  $s \in S$ . There exists  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $s = \langle v_1 | v_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$  because  $\mathcal{V}$  is right full. By the above discussion, we get  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(s) = \omega_{\Phi(v_1), \Phi(v_2)} \in K(\mathcal{U})$ . Thus we get  $\theta_{\mathcal{U}}(S) = K(\mathcal{U})$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.16.** *For a non-degenerate inverse correspondence  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$ ,  $\mathcal{U}$  is a Morita equivalence if and only if  $\mathcal{U}$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$ .*

*Proof.* For a Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}: S \rightarrow T$ , the Morita equivalence  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}: T \rightarrow S$  satisfies  $\mathcal{U} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{U}} \simeq S$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} \otimes \mathcal{U} \simeq T$  by Proposition 5.14. Thus  $\mathcal{U}$  is an equivalence in the bicategory  $\mathfrak{IC}$ . The if part follows from Proposition 5.15.  $\square$

## 6. MULTIPLIER SEMIGROUPS

In the  $C^*$ -algebra theory, the *multiplier algebras*  $M(A)$  of  $C^*$ -algebras  $A$  are studied well; see [Bus68], [APT73] or [Lan95] for example. In this section, we define the multiplier semigroups  $M(S)$  of inverse semigroups  $S$  as an analogy of the multiplier algebras, and show that every inverse semigroup has its multiplier semigroup.

Let  $S$  be an inverse semigroup.

**Definition 6.1.** The *multiplier semigroup*  $M(S)$  of  $S$  is an inverse semigroup which includes  $S$  as a two-sided ideal and satisfies the following universality: For every inverse semigroup  $\tilde{S}$  which includes  $S$  as a two-sided ideal, there exists a unique semigroup homomorphism  $\theta: \tilde{S} \rightarrow M(S)$  such that the following diagram commutes;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{S} & & \\ \uparrow & \searrow \theta & \\ S & \hookrightarrow & M(S). \end{array}$$

We can check easily that the multiplier semigroup is unique up to isomorphism if it exists. Before proving that there exist the multiplier semigroups for all inverse semigroups, we investigate the universality of the inverse semigroup of adjointable maps.

Let  $S, T$  be inverse semigroups, and  $\mathcal{U}$  be an inverse  $T$ -set. We say that a semigroup homomorphism  $\theta: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  is *non-degenerate* if every element  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  is in the form of  $\theta(s')u'$  with some  $s' \in S$  and  $u' \in \mathcal{U}$  (that is,  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\theta$  form a non-degenerate inverse correspondence from  $S$  to  $T$ ).

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $\theta: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  be a non-degenerate semigroup homomorphism. For every inverse semigroup  $\tilde{S}$  which includes  $S$  as a two-sided ideal, there exists a unique semigroup homomorphism  $\tilde{\theta}: \tilde{S} \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  such that the following diagram commutes;*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{S} & & \\ \uparrow & \searrow \tilde{\theta} & \\ S & \xrightarrow{\theta} & L(\mathcal{U}). \end{array}$$

*Proof.* For every  $s_0 \in \tilde{S}$ , we define a map  $\tilde{\theta}(s_0): \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  as

$$\tilde{\theta}(s_0)(\theta(s)u) := \theta(s_0s)(u)$$

for  $s \in S$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . We can see that this map  $\tilde{\theta}(s_0)$  is well-defined and adjointable by the following calculation: For  $s, s' \in S$  and  $u, u' \in \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta(s)u \mid \theta(s_0s')(u') \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u \mid \theta(s)^* \theta(s_0s')(u') \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid \theta(s^*s_0s')(u') \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u \mid \theta(s_0^*s)^* \theta(s')(u') \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle \theta(s_0^*s)(u) \mid \theta(s')(u') \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the map  $\tilde{\theta}: \tilde{S} \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  is a semigroup homomorphism, and that the restriction of  $\tilde{\theta}$  to  $S$  coincides with  $\theta$ .  $\square$

We recall that  $S$  produces the inverse  $S$ -set  $S$  and the inverse semigroup  $L(S)$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** (i) *For  $s \in S$ , the map  $\lambda_s: S \rightarrow S; s' \mapsto ss'$  is adjointable, and  $\lambda_s^\dagger = \lambda_{s^*}$  holds.*

(ii) *The map  $\lambda: S \rightarrow L(S); s \mapsto \lambda_s$  is an injective semigroup homomorphism.*

(iii) *For  $s \in S$  and  $\varphi \in L(S)$ , we have  $\varphi\lambda_s = \lambda_{\varphi(s)}$  and  $\lambda_s\varphi = \lambda_{\varphi^\dagger(s^*)}$ .*

(iv) *For  $\varphi, \varphi' \in L(S)$ , if  $\varphi\lambda_s = \varphi'\lambda_s$  for all  $s \in S$ , then  $\varphi = \varphi'$  holds.*

*Proof.* It is easy to show (i) and that the map  $\lambda: S \rightarrow L(S)$  is a semigroup homomorphism. The map  $\lambda$  is injective by Lemma 1.7. For  $s, s' \in S$  and  $\varphi \in L(S)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi\lambda_s(s') &= \varphi(ss') = \varphi(s)s' = \lambda_{\varphi(s)}(s') \\ \lambda_s\varphi(s') &= s\varphi(s') = \langle s^* \mid \varphi(s') \rangle_T \\ &= \langle \varphi^\dagger(s^*) \mid s' \rangle_T = \varphi^\dagger(s^*)^* s' = \lambda_{\varphi^\dagger(s^*)}(s'), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equal follows from Lemma 3.15. Thus  $\varphi\lambda_s = \lambda_{\varphi(s)}$  and  $\lambda_s\varphi = \lambda_{\varphi^\dagger(s^*)}$  hold. For  $\varphi, \varphi' \in L(S)$  such that  $\varphi\lambda_s = \varphi'\lambda_s$  for all  $s \in T$ , we have  $\lambda_{\varphi(s)} = \varphi\lambda_s = \varphi'\lambda_s = \lambda_{\varphi'(s)}$ . The injectivity of  $\lambda$  implies  $\varphi(s) = \varphi'(s)$ . Thus we have  $\varphi = \varphi'$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.4.** *For every inverse semigroup  $S$ , there exists the multiplier semigroup  $M(S)$  of  $S$ .*

*Proof.* The inverse semigroup  $L(S)$  includes  $S$  as a two-sided ideal through the semigroup homomorphism  $\lambda: S \rightarrow L(S)$  by Lemma 6.3. By Proposition 6.2,  $L(S)$  has the universality in Definition 6.1.  $\square$

*Remark 6.5.* An *identity element* of an inverse semigroup  $S$  is an element  $1 \in S$  such that  $1s = s = s1$  for all  $s \in S$ . This is unique if it exists. For every inverse semigroup  $S$ ,  $M(S)$  has the identity element because  $L(S)$  has the identity map on  $S$  as the identity element. We can easily check that  $S = M(S)$  if and only if  $S$  has the identity element.

*Remark 6.6.* For a semigroup  $S$ , the semigroup of double centralizers on  $S$  are introduced in [Joh64]: The *double centralizer* on  $S$  is a couple of maps  $\lambda: S \rightarrow S$  and  $\rho: S \rightarrow S$  with  $s_1\lambda(s_2) = \rho(s_1)s_2$  for  $s_1, s_2 \in S$ . The set of all double centralizers  $D(S)$  on  $S$  becomes a semigroup with respect to the multiplication  $(\lambda_1, \rho_1)(\lambda_2, \rho_2) = (\lambda_1\lambda_2, \rho_2\rho_1)$  for  $(\lambda_1, \rho_1), (\lambda_2, \rho_2) \in D(S)$ . We can easily check that a couple of maps  $\lambda_s: S \rightarrow S; s' \mapsto ss'$  and  $\rho_s: S \rightarrow S; s' \mapsto s's$  becomes a double centralizer for  $s \in S$ . The map  $S \rightarrow D(S); s \mapsto (\lambda_s, \rho_s)$  is a semigroup homomorphism. If  $S$  is inverse, this map becomes injective by Lemma 1.7. We can see that for an inverse semigroup  $S$  the semigroup  $D(S)$  is isomorphic to the inverse semigroup  $L(S)$  as follows: For every  $(\lambda, \rho) \in M(S)$ , a map  $S \ni s \mapsto \rho(s^*)^* \in S$  between the inverse  $S$ -set  $S$  is the adjoint of  $\lambda$  because

$$\langle s_1 | \lambda(s_2) \rangle_S = s_1^* \lambda(s_2) = \rho(s_1^*) s_2 = \langle \rho(s_1^*)^* | s_2 \rangle_S$$

for  $s_1, s_2 \in S$ . Thus a map  $\iota: D(S) \ni (\lambda, \rho) \mapsto \lambda \in L(S)$  is well-defined. This map is a semigroup homomorphism obviously. We can see that for  $\varphi \in L(S)$ , a couple of  $\varphi$  and a map  $\varphi': S \rightarrow S; s \mapsto \varphi^\dagger(s^*)^*$  is a double centralizer on  $S$ , and that a map  $L(S) \rightarrow D(S); \varphi \mapsto (\varphi, \varphi')$  becomes the inverse of  $\iota$ . Thus we have  $D(S) \simeq L(S)$ . Especially, for every inverse semigroup  $S$ , double centralizers  $D(S)$  becomes an inverse semigroup. This is another description of the multiplier semigroup of  $S$ . The fact that  $D(S)$  becomes an inverse semigroup is analogue to the fact that the set of all double centralizers on a  $C^*$ -algebra  $A$  becomes a  $C^*$ -algebra proved in [Bus68].

We give the condition such that  $\tilde{\theta}$  in Proposition 6.2 becomes injective.

**Definition 6.7.** A two-sided ideal  $I$  of  $S$  is *essential* if for every  $s, s' \in S$ ,  $st = s't$  for all  $t \in I$  implies  $s = s'$ .

**Lemma 6.8.** *For a two-sided ideal  $I$  of  $S$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $I$  is essential.
- (ii) For every  $s, s' \in S$ ,  $ts = ts'$  for all  $t \in I$  implies  $s = s'$ .

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be an essential two-sided ideal of  $S$ . Since  $I$  is a two-sided ideal,  $I$  becomes an inverse subsemigroup of  $S$ . Take  $t_0 \in I$  and  $s, s' \in S$  such that  $ts = ts'$  for all  $t$  arbitrarily. We have  $tst_0 = ts't_0$  for all  $t \in I$ . By Lemma 1.7, we get  $st_0 = s't_0$ . Since  $I$  is essential,  $s = s'$  holds. We can prove the converse implication similarly.  $\square$



**Lemma 6.9.** *Let  $T$  be an inverse semigroup,  $\tilde{S}$  be an inverse semigroup which includes  $S$  as an essential two-sided ideal,  $\theta: S \rightarrow T$  be a semigroup homomorphism, and  $\tilde{\theta}: \tilde{S} \rightarrow T$  be a semigroup homomorphism whose restriction to  $S$  coincides with  $\theta$ ;*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{S} & & \\ \uparrow & \searrow \tilde{\theta} & \\ S & \xrightarrow{\theta} & T. \end{array}$$

The semigroup homomorphism  $\tilde{\theta}$  is injective if and only if so is  $\theta$ .

*Proof.* The only if part is clear. Take  $s_0, s'_0 \in \tilde{S}$  with  $\tilde{\theta}(s_0) = \tilde{\theta}(s'_0)$ . For all  $s \in S$ , we have  $\theta(s_0s) = \tilde{\theta}(s_0)\theta(s) = \tilde{\theta}(s'_0)\theta(s) = \theta(s'_0s)$ . By the injectivity of  $\theta$ ,  $s_0s = s'_0s$  holds. We obtain  $s_0 = s'_0$  because  $S$  is an essential two-sided ideal of  $\tilde{S}$ . Thus  $\tilde{\theta}$  is injective.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.10.** *An inverse semigroup  $S$  is an essential two-sided ideal of  $M(S)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.3 (iv), the inverse semigroup  $L(S)$  which is isomorphic to the multiplier semigroup  $M(S)$  of  $S$  includes  $S$  as an essential two-sided ideal.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.11.** *The multiplier semigroup  $M(S)$  of  $S$  is the largest inverse semigroup in which  $S$  is an essential two-sided ideal, where “largest” means that for every inverse semigroup  $\tilde{S}$  which includes  $S$  as an essential two-sided ideal, there exists a unique injective semigroup homomorphism  $\theta: \tilde{S} \rightarrow M(S)$  such that the diagram in Definition 6.1 commutes.*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 6.10 and 6.9.  $\square$

We now characterize the multiplier semigroup in terms of the notion of idealizers in the inverse semigroup of adjointable maps. Let  $U$  be a sub-semigroup of  $S$ . We define the *idealizer*  $I(U)$  of  $U$  in  $S$  as the largest subsemigroup of  $S$  in which  $U$  is a two-sided ideal. It is easy to see the following;

$$I(U) = \{s \in S \mid sU \subset U, Us \subset U\}.$$

**Proposition 6.12.** *Let  $\theta: S \rightarrow L(\mathcal{U})$  be an injective non-degenerate semigroup homomorphism. The semigroup homomorphism in Proposition 6.2 becomes an isomorphism from the multiplier semigroup  $M(S)$  to the idealizer  $I(\theta(S))$  of  $\theta(S)$  in  $L(\mathcal{U})$ ;*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M(S) & & \\ \uparrow & \searrow \tilde{\theta} & \\ S & \xrightarrow{\theta} & L(\mathcal{U}). \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We first show that  $I(\theta(S))$  includes  $\theta(S)$  as an essential two-sided ideal. Take  $\varphi, \varphi' \in I(\theta(S))$  such that  $\varphi\theta(s) = \varphi'\theta(s)$  for all  $s \in S$ . This implies  $\varphi(\theta(s)u) = \varphi'(\theta(s)u)$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . Since  $\theta$  is non-degenerate,  $\varphi = \varphi'$  holds. Thus  $\theta(S)$  is an essential two-sided ideal in  $I(\theta(S))$ . The idealizer

$I(\theta(S))$  includes  $S$  as an essential ideal through the injective semigroup homomorphism  $\theta$ .

By Corollary 6.11, we obtain the injective semigroup homomorphism  $\iota$  from  $I(\theta(S))$  to  $M(S)$  whose restriction to  $S$  is the inclusion map from  $S$  to  $M(S)$ .

The restriction of the composition  $\iota\tilde{\theta}$  to  $S$  is the identity map on  $S$ . By the universality of  $M(S)$ , we see that  $\iota\tilde{\theta}$  is the identity map on  $M(S)$ .

Since  $\iota$  is injective and  $\iota\tilde{\theta}$  is the identity map on  $M(S)$ , we obtain that  $\tilde{\theta}$  is an isomorphism from  $M(S)$  to  $I(\theta(S))$ .  $\square$

As an example of multiplier semigroup, we calculate the multiplier semigroup of the inverse semigroup  $K(\mathcal{U})$  for a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ . This is an analogy of Kasparov's Theorem (see [Lan95, Theorem 2.4]).

**Theorem 6.13.** *For a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the multiplier semigroup  $M(K(\mathcal{U}))$  of  $K(\mathcal{U})$  is isomorphic to  $L(\mathcal{U})$ .*

*Proof.* Apply Proposition 6.12 to the case such that  $S = K(\mathcal{U})$  and  $\theta$  is the inclusion map. The idealizer of  $K(\mathcal{U})$  in  $L(\mathcal{U})$  is nothing but  $L(\mathcal{U})$ .  $\square$

## 7. RELATION TO INVERSE REES MATRIX SEMIGROUPS

In the semigroup theory, the *Rees matrix semigroups* are studied well (see [McA81] or [McA83], for example). For an inverse semigroup  $T$  and a set  $I$ , Afara and Lawson introduced a *McAlister function*  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$  and an inverse semigroup  $IM(T, I, p)$  called the *inverse Rees matrix semigroup over  $T$*  in [AL13]. Using this inverse semigroup, they characterized the inverse semigroups which are Morita equivalent to given inverse semigroup ([AL13, Theorem 3.5]). We reprove this in Corollary 7.8 in terms of our inverse set theory. In this section, we see McAlister functions from the perspective of inverse sets. We first recall the definition of McAlister functions and inverse Rees matrix semigroups.

**Definition 7.1.** For a set  $I$  and an inverse semigroup  $T$ , a map  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$  is a *partial McAlister function* if the following conditions hold: For all  $i, j, k \in I$ ,

$$(MF1) \quad p_{i,i} \in E(T),$$

$$(MF2) \quad p_{i,i}p_{i,j}p_{j,j} = p_{i,j},$$

$$(MF3) \quad p_{i,j}^* = p_{j,i}, \text{ and}$$

$$(MF4) \quad p_{i,j}p_{j,k} \leq p_{i,k}.$$

If a map  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$  satisfies (MF1)-(MF4) and

$$(MF5) \quad \text{For every } e \in E(T), \text{ there exists } i \in I \text{ such that } e \leq p_{i,i},$$

we call it a *McAlister function*.

McAlister studied functions of this kind in [McA83]. Afara and Lawson introduced the name ‘‘McAlister function’’ in [AL13]. The name ‘‘partial McAlister function’’ is introduced in this paper.

The inverse Rees matrix semigroup  $IM(T, I, p)$  over  $T$  is constructed as follows: Let  $T$  be an inverse semigroup,  $I$  be a set, and  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$  be a partial McAlister function. The set

$$RM(T, I, p) := \{(j, t, i) \in I \times T \times I \mid p_{j,j}tp_{i,i} = t\}.$$

becomes a regular semigroup with respect to the multiplication defined as

$$(j_2, t_2, i_2)(j_1, t_1, i_1) := (j_2, t_2 p_{i_2, j_1} t_1, i_1)$$

for  $(j_1, t_1, i_1), (j_2, t_2, i_2) \in RM(T, I, p)$ . See [AL13, Lemma 2.1 and 2.3] for the proof of this fact. This semigroup is called the *regular Rees matrix semigroup*.

We define an equivalence relation  $\gamma$  on  $RM(T, I, p)$  by declaring that

$$(j_1, t_1, i_1)\gamma(j_2, t_2, i_2) :\Leftrightarrow p_{j_1, j_2} t_2 p_{i_2, i_1} = t_1 \text{ and } p_{j_2, j_1} t_1 p_{i_1, i_2} = t_2.$$

We denote the quotient  $RM(T, I, p)/\gamma$  as  $IM(T, I, p)$  and the equivalence class of  $(j, t, i)$  as  $[j, t, i]$ . The set  $IM(T, I, p)$  becomes an inverse semigroup with respect to the induced multiplication by  $RM(T, I, p)$ , that is,

$$[j_2, t_2, i_2][j_1, t_1, i_1] := [j_2, t_2 p_{i_2, j_1} t_1, i_1]$$

for every  $[j_1, t_1, i_1], [j_2, t_2, i_2] \in IM(T, I, p)$ . The generalized inverse of  $[j, t, i]$  is  $[i, t^*, j]$ . We remark that [AL13, Lemma 2.6] claims that  $\gamma$  is the minimum inverse congruence on  $RM(T, I, p)$ .

We show that for every partial McAlister function  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$ , there exists an inverse right  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}_p$  such that the inverse Rees matrix semigroup  $IM(T, I, p)$  is isomorphic to the inverse semigroup  $K(\mathcal{U}_p)$ .

For a partial McAlister function  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$ , we define a set

$$\mathcal{U}'_p := \{(j, t) \in I \times T \mid p_{j,j}t = t\}$$

and a relation  $\sim$  on  $\mathcal{U}'_p$  by

$$(j_1, t_1) \sim (j_2, t_2) :\Leftrightarrow t_1 = p_{j_1, j_2} t_2 \text{ and } t_2 = p_{j_2, j_1} t_1.$$

**Lemma 7.2.** *The relation  $\sim$  on  $\mathcal{U}'_p$  is an equivalence relation.*

*Proof.* For every  $(j, t) \in \mathcal{U}'_p$ ,  $(j, t) \sim (j, t)$  holds by  $t = p_{j,j}t$ . It is clear that the relation  $\sim$  is symmetric. Take elements  $(j_k, t_k) \in \mathcal{U}'_p$  for  $k = 1, 2, 3$  with  $(j_k, t_k) \sim (j_{k+1}, t_{k+1})$  for  $k = 1, 2$ . By (MF4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &= p_{j_1, j_2} t_2 \\ &= p_{j_1, j_2} p_{j_2, j_3} t_3 \\ &\leq p_{j_1, j_3} t_3 \\ &= p_{j_1, j_3} p_{j_3, j_2} t_2 \\ &\leq p_{j_1, j_2} t_2 \\ &= t_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get  $t_1 = p_{j_1, j_3} t_3$ . In a similar way,  $t_3 = p_{j_3, j_1} t_1$  holds. Thus  $(j_1, t_1) \sim (j_3, t_3)$ .  $\square$

We denote the quotient set  $\mathcal{U}'_p/\sim$  as  $\mathcal{U}_p$  and the equivalence class of  $(j, t)$  as  $[j, t]$ . We define a right action of  $T$  on  $\mathcal{U}_p$  as

$$[j_1, t_1]t := [j_1, t_1 t]$$

and a right pairing on  $\mathcal{U}_p$  as

$$\langle [j_2, t_2] \mid [j_1, t_1] \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_p} := t_2^* p_{j_2, j_1} t_1$$

for  $[j_1, t_1], [j_2, t_2] \in \mathcal{U}_p$  and  $t \in T$ .

**Lemma 7.3.** *The set  $\mathcal{U}_p$  becomes a right regular  $T$ -set.*

*Proof.* We first show that the above structures are well-defined. Take elements  $[j_1, t_1]$  and  $[j'_1, t'_1]$  of  $\mathcal{U}_p$  with  $[j_1, t_1] = [j'_1, t'_1]$ , that is,  $t'_1 = p_{j'_1, j_1} t_1$  and  $t_1 = p_{j_1, j'_1} t'_1$ . For every  $t \in T$ , these imply  $t'_1 t = p_{j'_1, j_1} t_1 t$  and  $t_1 t = p_{j_1, j'_1} t'_1 t$ . Thus we get  $[j_1, t_1 t] = [j'_1, t'_1 t]$ . This implies that the right action is well-defined. Take  $[j_k, t_k], [j'_k, t'_k] \in \mathcal{U}_p$  with  $[j_k, t_k] = [j'_k, t'_k]$  for  $k = 1, 2$ . We get

$$\begin{aligned} t_2^* p_{j'_2, j'_1} t'_1 &= t_2^* p_{j_2, j'_2} p_{j'_2, j'_1} p_{j'_1, j_1} t_1 \\ &\leq t_2^* p_{j_2, j_1} t_1 \\ &= t_2^* p_{j'_2, j_2} p_{j_2, j_1} p_{j_1, j'_1} t'_1 \\ &\leq t_2^* p_{j'_2, j'_1} t'_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $t_2^* p_{j_2, j_1} t_1 = t_2^* p_{j'_2, j'_1} t'_1$  holds. This implies that the right pairing is well-defined.

We can check easily that  $\mathcal{U}_p \times T \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_p; ([j, t], t') \mapsto [j, tt']$  becomes a right action, and that (R-i) and (R-ii) holds for  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_p}$ . We get (R-iii) because

$$[j, t] \langle [j, t] | [j, t] \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_p} = [j, tt^* p_{j, j} t] = [j, t]$$

holds for every  $[j, t] \in \mathcal{U}_p$ . □

We define a left action of  $IM(T, I, p)$  on  $\mathcal{U}_p$  as

$$[j_2, t_2, i_2][j_1, t_1] := [j_2, t_2 p_{i_2, j_1} t_1]$$

for every  $[j_1, t_1] \in \mathcal{U}_p$  and  $[j_2, t_2, i_2] \in IM(T, I, p)$ , and a left pairing as

$$\mathcal{U}_p \langle [j_2, t_2] | [j_1, t_1] \rangle := [j_2, t_2 t_1^*, j_1]$$

for every  $[j_1, t_1], [j_2, t_2] \in \mathcal{U}_p$ . We can check that these structures are well-defined and form a left regular  $IM(T, I, p)$ -set in a similar way to Lemma 7.3. We can also check that the left and right actions and the left and right pairings are compatible respectively. Hence  $\mathcal{U}_p$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $IM(T, I, p)$  to  $T$ .

**Lemma 7.4.** *For a partial McAlister function  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_p$  becomes a partial Morita equivalence from  $IM(T, I, p)$  to  $T$  which is left full. If  $p$  is a McAlister function, then  $\mathcal{U}_p$  becomes a Morita equivalence.*

*Proof.* As mentioned above,  $\mathcal{U}_p$  is a partial Morita equivalence from  $IM(T, I, p)$  to  $T$ . For every  $[j, t, i] \in IM(T, I, p)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_p \langle [j, t] | [i, t^* t] \rangle = [j, t, i]$  holds. Thus  $\mathcal{U}_p$  is left full. Assume  $p$  is a McAlister function. Take  $t \in T$ . By the axiom (MF5), there exists  $i \in I$  with  $tt^* \leq p_{ii}$ . Hence we have  $\langle [i, tt^*] | [i, t] \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_p} = tt^* p_{ii} t = t$ . Thus  $\mathcal{U}_p$  is right full. □

**Corollary 7.5.** *For a partial McAlister function  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$ ,  $IM(T, I, p)$  is isomorphic to the inverse semigroup  $K(\mathcal{U}_p)$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 7.4 and Corollary 4.9 (i). □

Conversely, for a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , we obtain a partial McAlister function  $p_{\mathcal{U}}$  as follows: The following proposition is similar to [AL13, Lemma 3.3].

**Proposition 7.6.** *For a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , a map  $p_{\mathcal{U}}: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow T; (u, v) \mapsto \langle u | v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  is a partial McAlister function. If the right pairing  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  is right full, then  $p_{\mathcal{U}}$  is a McAlister function.*

*Proof.* It is easy to check that (MF1)-(MF3) hold. For every  $u, v, w \in \mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u | v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle v | w \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} &= \langle u | v \langle v | w \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u | w \langle w | v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle v | w \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \langle u | w \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle w | v \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \langle v | w \rangle_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &\leq \langle u | w \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $p_{\mathcal{U}}$  is a partial McAlister function. If the right pairing  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{U}}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  is full, then the  $p_{\mathcal{U}}$  satisfies (MF5) obviously.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.7.** *For a right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , the right inverse  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}_{p_{\mathcal{U}}}$  associated with the partial McAlister function  $p_{\mathcal{U}}$  defined in Proposition 7.6 is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{U}$ .*

*Proof.* For an inverse right  $T$ -set  $\mathcal{U}$ , we can check easily that the map  $\mathcal{U}_{p_{\mathcal{U}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}; [u, t] \mapsto ut$  is an isomorphism between right inverse  $T$ -sets.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.8** ([AL13, Theorem 3.5]). *Let  $T$  be an inverse semigroup. For every McAlister function  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$ , the inverse Rees matrix semigroup  $IM(T, I, p)$  is Morita equivalent to  $T$ , and every inverse semigroup  $S$  Morita equivalent to  $T$  is isomorphic to one of this form.*

*Proof.* For every McAlister function  $p: I \times I \rightarrow T$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_p$  becomes a Morita equivalence from  $IM(T, I, p)$  to  $T$  by Lemma 7.4.

For a Morita equivalence  $\mathcal{U}$  from  $S$  to  $T$ ,  $S$  is isomorphic to  $K(\mathcal{U})$  by Corollary 4.9 (ii). The inverse semigroup  $K(\mathcal{U})$  is isomorphic to  $K(\mathcal{U}_{p_{\mathcal{U}}})$  by Lemma 7.7. This is isomorphic to  $IM(T, \mathcal{U}, p_{\mathcal{U}})$  by Corollary 7.5.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [AKM22] C. Antunes, J. Ko, and R. Meyer. The bicategory of groupoid correspondences. *New York J. Math.*, 28:1329–1364, 2022.
- [AL13] B. Afara and M. V. Lawson. Morita equivalence of inverse semigroups. *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 66(1):119–130, 2013.
- [Alb15] S. Albandik. *A colimit construction for groupoids*. PhD thesis, 2015.
- [APT73] C. A. Akemann, G. K. Pedersen, and J. Tomiyama. Multipliers of  $C^*$ -algebras. *J. Functional Analysis*, 13:277–301, 1973.
- [Bén67] J. Bénabou. Introduction to bicategories. pages 1–77, 1967.
- [BMZ13] A. Buss, R. Meyer, and C. Zhu. A higher category approach to twisted actions on  $C^*$ -algebras. *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society*, 56(2):387–426, 2013.
- [Bus68] R. C. Busby. Double centralizers and extensions of  $C^*$ -algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 132:79–99, 1968.
- [EKQR06] S. Echterhoff, S. Kaliszewski, J. Quigg, and I. Raeburn. A categorical approach to imprimitivity theorems for  $C^*$ -dynamical systems. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 180(850):viii+169, 2006.
- [Exe07] R. Exel. Interactions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 244(1):26–62, 2007.
- [Exe08] R. Exel. Inverse semigroups and combinatorial  $C^*$ -algebras. *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 39(2):191–313, 2008.
- [FKU24] T. Fujieda, T. Katsura, and T. Uchimura. A categorical approach to inverse semigroups, étale groupoids, and their  $C^*$ -algebras. 2024. In Preparation.

- [FLS11] J. Funk, M. V. Lawson, and B. Steinberg. Characterizations of Morita equivalent inverse semigroups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 215(9):2262–2279, 2011.
- [Joh64] B. E. Johnson. An introduction to the theory of centralizers. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 14:299–320, 1964.
- [Kat03] T. Katsura. A construction of  $C^*$ -algebras from  $C^*$ -correspondences. In *Advances in quantum dynamics (South Hadley, MA, 2002)*, volume 335 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 173–182. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [Lan95] E. C. Lance. *Hilbert  $C^*$ -Modules a toolkit for operator algebraists*. London Mathematical Society lecture note series ; 210. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [Law96] M. V. Lawson. Enlargements of regular semigroups. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2)*, 39(3):425–460, 1996.
- [Law98] M. V. Lawson. *Inverse semigroups*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1998. The theory of partial symmetries.
- [Law11] M. V. Lawson. Generalized heaps, inverse semigroups and Morita equivalence. *Algebra Universalis*, 66(4):317–330, 2011.
- [Law23] M. V. Lawson. Introduction to inverse semigroups. 2023.
- [Lei98] T. Leinster. Basic bicategories. *arXiv:math/9810017*, 1998.
- [McA81] D. B. McAlister. Regular Rees matrix semigroups and regular Dubreil-Jacotin semigroups. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 31(3):325–336, 1981.
- [McA83] D. B. McAlister. Rees matrix covers for locally inverse semigroups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 277(2):727–738, 1983.
- [MRW87] P. S. Muhly, J. N. Renault, and D. P. Williams. Equivalence and isomorphism for groupoid  $C^*$ -algebras. *J. Operator Theory*, 17(1):3–22, 1987.
- [Pat99] A. L. T. Paterson. *Groupoids, inverse semigroups, and their operator algebras*, volume 170 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
- [Ren87] J. Renault. Représentation des produits croisés d’algèbres de groupoïdes. *J. Operator Theory*, 18(1):67–97, 1987.
- [Rie74a] M. A. Rieffel. Induced representations of  $C^*$ -algebras. *Advances in Math.*, 13:176–257, 1974.
- [Rie74b] M. A. Rieffel. Morita equivalence for  $C^*$ -algebras and  $W^*$ -algebras. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 5(1):51 – 96, 1974.
- [Rie76] M. A. Rieffel. Strong Morita equivalence of certain transformation group  $C^*$ -algebras. *Math. Ann.*, 222(1):7–22, 1976.
- [Ste11] B. Steinberg. Strong Morita equivalence of inverse semigroups. *Houston J. Math.*, 37(3):895–927, 2011.
- [Uch24] T. Uchimura. A bicategorical approach to inverse semigroups, étale groupoids, and their  $C^*$ -algebras. 2024. In Preparation.