

# ARITHMETIC OF CUTS IN ORDERED ABELIAN GROUPS AND OF IDEALS OVER VALUATION RINGS

FRANZ-VIKTOR KUHLMANN

**ABSTRACT.** We investigate existence, uniqueness and maximality of solutions  $T$  for equations  $S_1 + T = S_2$  and inequalities  $S_1 + T \subseteq S_2$  where  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are final segments of ordered abelian groups. Since cuts are determined by their upper cut sets, which are final segments, this gives information about the corresponding equalities and inequalities for cuts. We apply our results to investigate existence, uniqueness and maximality of solutions  $J$  for equations  $I_1 J = I_2$  and inequalities  $I_1 J \subseteq I_2$  where  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are ideals of valuation rings. This enables us to compute the annihilators of quotients of the form  $I_1/I_2$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For the notions and notation we use in this paper, see Sections 2.1 and 3.1.

The main purpose of this manuscript is to address a problem that comes up in the papers [2, 3]. There we work with a valued field  $(K, v)$  and consider quotients  $U/UV$  of ideals  $U$  and  $V$  of its valuation ring  $\mathcal{O}_v$ . We wish to compute the annihilator of the  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -module  $U/UV$ . In the present manuscript, we will consider the more general case of quotients  $I_1/I_2$  of  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1, I_2$  (see Section 3.5). To this end, we consider equations  $I_1 J = I_2$  and inequalities  $I_1 J \subseteq I_2$ , as we will describe in detail below.

Our approach is to translate the appearing questions to questions about final segments in the value group  $vK$  of  $(K, v)$ . The latter are connected with the investigation of cuts in ordered abelian groups which has appeared at several points in the literature. For a survey and a list of references, see [7]. The present paper uses, and improves, parts of the unpublished manuscript [9]. Let us describe the background on cuts first.

Take an ordered abelian group  $(G, \leq)$ . By a **cut** in  $(G, \leq)$  we mean a pair

$$\Lambda = (\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R),$$

where  $\Lambda^L$  is an initial segment of  $G$  and  $\Lambda^R$  is a final segment of  $S$  such that  $\Lambda^L \cup \Lambda^R = S$  and  $\Lambda^L \cap \Lambda^R = \emptyset$ . We call  $\Lambda^L$  the **lower cut set** of  $\Lambda$ , and  $\Lambda^R$  the **upper cut set** of  $\Lambda$ . For operations on cuts and final segments, see Section 2.1. In the present paper we are particularly interested in the **addition of cuts**. It can be defined in various ways. The two immediately obvious ways to define  $\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$  are the following:

- 1) the lower cut set of  $\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$  is  $\Lambda_1^L + \Lambda_2^L$ ,
- 2) the upper cut set of  $\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2$  is  $\Lambda_1^R + \Lambda_2^R$ ,

---

*Date:* 15. 6. 2024.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 06F20, 13F30; secondary 13A15.

*Key words and phrases.* ordered abelian group, cut, final segment, valuation ring, ideal.

where for any  $S_1, S_2 \subset G$ ,  $S_1 + S_2 := \{a + b \mid a \in S_1, b \in S_2\}$ . The two additions are usually not the same, but their properties are very similar.

Under both additions, the set of all cuts in  $G$  is a commutative monoid. However, in general it is not a group as for fixed  $\Lambda$  the function

$$\Lambda' \mapsto \Lambda + \Lambda'$$

may not be injective. There may even be idempotents. For instance, the lexicographically ordered group  $G = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$  has the proper nontrivial subgroup  $H = \{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}$ , which gives rise to two idempotent cuts. Indeed, since  $H + H = H$ , the two cuts

$$(\{a \in G \mid \exists b \in H : a \leq b\}, \{a \in G \mid \forall b \in H : a > b\})$$

and

$$(\{a \in G \mid \forall b \in H : a < b\}, \{a \in G \mid \exists b \in H : a \geq b\})$$

are idempotent under both additions.

In the present paper, we will exclusively work with the second definition, which we call the **upper cut set addition**. Every cut is uniquely determined by its upper cut set, so instead of cuts we will just work with final segments (for a reason that will be explained later).

From our observations about cut addition, the following questions arise:

*Take final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ .*

*(QFS1) Is there a final segment  $T$  of  $G$  such that  $S_1 + T = S_2$ ?*

*(QFS2) If yes, is  $T$  uniquely determined? If so, determine it.*

*(QFS3) If  $T$  exists but is not uniquely determined, determine the largest final segment  $T_{\max}$  such that  $S_1 + T_{\max} = S_2$ .*

*(QFS4) If  $T$  does not exist, compute the largest final segment  $T_{\max}$  such that  $S_1 + T_{\max} \subset S_2$ .*

Here, ‘‘largest  $T$ ’’ is meant in the sense that  $T$  contains all final segments  $T'$  that satisfy the respective condition; note that the final segments of  $G$  are linearly ordered by inclusion and unions and intersections of any collections of final segments are again final segments.

The aim of this paper is to answer these questions and to compute  $T_{\max}$  explicitly. This will be done in Section 2.7. A key to this is the notion of *invariance group* of a final segment, which always is a convex subgroup of  $G$ . This sheds light on the important role that convex subgroups play in nonarchimedean ordered groups for the answer to the above questions. The case of archimedean ordered groups is significantly easier.

Our interest in the above questions arose from our work with cuts and its applications to ordered abelian groups and ordered fields, see [7, 9] and the citations therein. Recently, it gained importance through questions that came up in the papers [2, 3], as we will explain now.

Take a valued field  $(K, v)$  with value group  $vK$  and valuation ring  $\mathcal{O}_v$ . When we talk of  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -**ideals** we will also include fractional ideals; in other words, we talk about  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -modules  $I \subseteq K$ . The set of  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals is linearly ordered by inclusion, as is the set of final segments of  $vK$ . The function

$$(1) \quad v : I \mapsto vI := \{vb \mid 0 \neq b \in I\}$$

is an order preserving bijection from the set of all  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals onto the set of all final segments of  $vK$  (including the final segment  $\emptyset$ ):  $J \subseteq I$  holds if and only if  $vJ \subseteq vI$  holds. The inverse of this function is the order preserving function

$$(2) \quad S \mapsto I_S := (a \in L \mid va \in S) = \{a \in L \mid va \in S\} \cup \{0\}.$$

Further, the function is a homomorphism from the multiplicative monoid of  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals onto the additive monoid of final segments:

$$(3) \quad vIJ = vI + vJ \quad \text{and} \quad I_{S+S'} = I_S I_{S'}.$$

Via this function, the following questions are reduced to questions (QFS1)-(QFS4):

Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ .

(QID1) *Is there an  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $J$  such that  $I_1 J = I_2$ ?*

(QID2) *If yes, is  $J$  uniquely determined? If so, compute it.*

(QID3) *If  $J$  exists but is not uniquely determined, compute the largest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $J_{\max}$  such that  $I_1 J_{\max} = I_2$ , and the smallest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $J_{\min}$  such that  $I_1 J_{\min} = I_2$ .*

(QID4) *If  $J$  does not exist, compute the largest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $J_{\max}$  such that  $I_1 J_{\max} \subset I_2$ .*

The notions “largest” and “smallest” are defined as in the case of final segments, using the fact that unions and intersections of any collections of  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals are again  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals.

We will derive answers to these questions in Section 3.4, using the results of Section 2.7. Here, a key role is played by the notion of the *invariance valuation ring* of an ideal  $I$ , which corresponds to the invariance group of the final segment  $vI$ .

The final Section 3.5 is devoted to the computation of the annihilators ( $I_2 : I_1$ ) of quotients  $I_1/I_2$  of  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1, I_2$ . In particular, we answer a question that arose in the papers [2, 3]: in which cases is the annihilator of  $I_1/I_2$  equal to the maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M}_v$  of  $\mathcal{O}_v$ ?

Ideals over valuation domains have been studied extensively in the literature, see for instance [6, Chapter II, §4]. Equations of the form  $I_1 J = I_2$  are implicitly related to groups in the semigroups formed by the isomorphy classes of the ideals, which for instance are studied in [1]. However, we have not found in the literature explicit solutions to our questions (QID1)-(QID4), and the exploitation of their connection with questions (QFS1)-(QFS4).

## 2. FINAL SEGMENTS

### 2.1. Preliminaries on cuts and final segments.

Take any ordered set  $(\Gamma, \leq)$  (by “ordered”, we will always mean “totally ordered”). If  $M_1, M_2$  are nonempty subsets of  $\Gamma$  and  $a \in \Gamma$ , we will write  $a < M_2$  if  $a < b$  for all  $b \in M_2$ , and we will write  $M_1 < M_2$  if  $a < M_2$  for all  $a \in M_1$ . Similarly, we use the relations  $>, \leq$  and  $\geq$  in place of  $<$ .

An ordered set  $(\Gamma, \leq)$  is **discretely ordered** if every element has an immediate successor, and it is **densely ordered** if for every  $a, b \in \Gamma$  with  $a < b$  there is  $c \in \Gamma$  with  $a < c < b$ .

A subset  $M$  of  $\Gamma$  is called **convex in**  $(\Gamma, \leq)$  if for every two elements  $a, b \in M$  and every  $c \in \Gamma$  such that  $a \leq c \leq b$ , it follows that  $c \in M$ . A subset  $S$  of  $\Gamma$  is an **initial segment of**  $\Gamma$  if for every  $a \in S$  and every  $c \in \Gamma$  with  $c \leq a$ , it follows that  $c \in S$ . Symmetrically,  $S$  is a **final segment of**  $\Gamma$  if for every  $a \in S$  and every  $c \in \Gamma$  with  $c \geq a$ , it follows that  $c \in S$ . Note that  $S$  is a final segment of  $\Gamma$  if and only if  $S$  is convex and  $S > \Gamma \setminus S$ . Further,  $S$  is a final segment of  $\Gamma$  if and only if  $\Gamma \setminus S$  is an initial segment of  $\Gamma$ . Note also that  $\emptyset < \Gamma$  and  $\Gamma < \emptyset$  by definition; so  $\emptyset$  is an initial segment as well as a final segment of  $\Gamma$ . Initial and final segments of  $\Gamma$  are called **proper** if they are not equal to  $\Gamma$ . We will denote the set of all proper final segments of  $(\Gamma, \leq)$  by

$$\Gamma^\uparrow.$$

If  $M_1, M_2 \subseteq \Gamma$  are such that  $M_1 \leq M_2$  and  $\Gamma = M_1 \cup M_2$ , then we call  $(M_1, M_2)$  a **quasi-cut** in  $\Gamma$ . It follows that  $M_1$  is an initial segment of  $\Gamma$ ,  $M_2$  is a final segment of  $\Gamma$ , and the intersection of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  consists of at most one element. If this intersection is empty, then  $(M_1, M_2)$  is a **cut** in  $\Gamma$ , in which case we write  $\Lambda^L = M_1$ ,  $\Lambda^R = M_2$ , and

$$\Lambda = (\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R).$$

A cut  $(\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$  with  $\Lambda^L \neq \emptyset$  and  $\Lambda^R \neq \emptyset$  is called a **Dedekind cut**.

For any subset  $M \subseteq \Gamma$ , we let  $M^+$  denote the final segment

$$M^+ := \{s \in \Gamma \mid s > M\}.$$

That is,  $M^+$  is the largest final segment having empty intersection with  $M$ . If  $M = \emptyset$ , then  $M^+ = \Gamma$ , and if  $M = \Gamma$ , then  $M^+ = \emptyset$ . Similarly, we set

$$M^- := \{s \in \Gamma \mid \exists m \in M : s \geq m\}.$$

That is, if  $M^-$  is the smallest final segment of  $\Gamma$  which contains  $M$ . If  $M = \emptyset$ , then  $M^- = \emptyset$ , and if  $M = S$ , then  $M^- = S$ .

We will write  $s^+$  instead of  $\{s\}^+$  and  $s^-$  instead of  $\{s\}^-$ . A final segment of the form  $s^-$  will be called **principal**; it has smallest element  $s$ . The principal final segments are exactly the final segments that contain smallest elements. Analogously, we define an initial segment to be **principal** if it contains a largest element.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Take a final segment  $S$  of the ordered set  $\Gamma$ . If  $S$  is nonprincipal, then  $\{t \in S \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in S\} = S$ . If  $S$  is principal with smallest element  $s_0$ , then  $\{t \in S \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in S\} = S \setminus \{s_0\} = s_0^+$ .*

*Proof.* If  $S$  is nonprincipal, then it has no smallest element. Hence for every  $t' \in S$  there is  $s \in S$  such that  $s < t'$ , whence  $t' \in \{t \in S \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in S\}$ . This proves the first statement. If  $S = s_0^-$ , then all  $t' \in S \setminus \{s_0\}$  satisfy  $s_0 < t'$  and are therefore contained in  $\{t \in S \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in S\}$ . Since  $S$  is a final segment, the latter is equal to  $s_0^+$ . This proves the second statement.  $\square$

For every subset  $M$  of  $\Gamma$ , we will denote by  $M^c$  its complement in  $\Gamma$ , i.e.,

$$M^c = \Gamma \setminus M.$$

We note that if  $S$  is a final segment of  $\Gamma$ , then  $S^c = \{t \in \Gamma \mid t < S\}$ .

An element  $s \in G$  is called **infimum** of a final segment  $S$  if it is the smallest element of  $S$  or  $S$  is nonprincipal and  $S = s^+$ . Analogously, suprema of initial segments are defined.

The proof of the following lemma is straightforward.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Take a final segment  $S$  of the ordered set  $\Gamma$ .*

- 1) *If  $S$  is nonprincipal but has infimum  $s$  in  $\Gamma$ , then  $S^c$  is principal with largest element  $s$ .*
- 2) *We have that  $S^c$  has a supremum if and only if  $S$  has an infimum in  $\Gamma$ .*
- 3) *If  $\Gamma$  is densely ordered, then an element  $s \in G$  is an infimum of  $S$  if and only if it is a supremum of  $S^c$ .*

Every ordered set  $\Gamma$  carries a topology with the open intervals  $(s, t)$ ,  $s, t \in \Gamma$  with  $s < t$ , as its basic open sets. We leave the proof of the following lemma to the reader.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Take a final segment  $S$  in  $\Gamma$ .*

- 1) *If  $S$  is principal, then it is closed, and it is clopen if and only if  $\Gamma$  is discretely ordered.*
- 2) *If  $S$  does not have an infimum in  $\Gamma$ , then it is clopen.*
- 3) *If  $S$  is nonprincipal but has an infimum in  $\Gamma$ , then  $S$  is open, but not closed.*
- 4) *The final segment  $S$  is closed if and only if  $S$  is principal or does not have an infimum in  $\Gamma$ .*

Given a final segment  $S$  in  $\Gamma$ , we set

$$\hat{S} := \begin{cases} S \cup \{g\} & \text{if } S \text{ has infimum } g \text{ in } G, \text{ and} \\ S & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $\hat{S}$  is the closure of  $S$  in  $\Gamma$ . We leave the proof of the following lemma to the reader.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Take a nonempty subset  $M$  of  $\Gamma$ . Then the closure of the final segment  $\{s \in \Gamma \mid s > M\}$  is the final segment  $\{s \in \Gamma \mid s \geq M\}$ , and the two final segments are equal if and only if  $M$  does not have a largest element.*

The function

$$(4) \quad \Gamma \ni s \mapsto s^- \in \Gamma^\uparrow$$

is an embedding of  $(\Gamma, \leq)$  in  $(\Gamma^\uparrow, \subseteq)$ . Also sending  $s$  to  $s^+$  produces such an embedding, but throughout this paper we will work with the embedding (4).

## 2.2. Final segments in ordered abelian groups.

From now on, we will work with ordered abelian groups  $(G, \leq)$  and their final segments. The definitions and results of the previous section remain valid for  $\Gamma = G$ . We note that  $(G, \leq)$  is discretely ordered if and only if it contains a smallest positive element, and it is densely ordered otherwise.

If  $M, M_1$  and  $M_2$  are subsets of  $G$ , then we set  $M_1 + M_2 = \{a + b \mid a \in M_1, b \in M_2\}$  and  $M_1 - M_2 = \{a - b \mid a \in M_1, b \in M_2\}$ . From this, the sets  $a + M$ ,  $a - M$  and  $M - a$  are obtained via replacing  $a$  by  $\{a\}$ . Now the embedding (4) is a homomorphism, that is,

$$(5) \quad (s_1 + s_2)^- = s_1^- + s_2^- .$$

We note that

$$(6) \quad s^- + 0^+ = s^+.$$

Further, the reader may prove:

**Lemma 2.5.** 1) *Assume that  $G$  is densely ordered. Then  $0^+ + 0^+ = 0^+$ .*

2) *Assume that  $G$  is discretely ordered with smallest positive element  $g$ . Then  $0^+ = g^-$  and  $0^+ + 0^+ = (2g)^-$ . Moreover, if the final segment  $S$  of  $G$  has an infimum, then this is the smallest element of  $S$ .*

**Proposition 2.6.** 1) *The sum of two final segments is again a final segment. The sum of two principal final segments is again a principal final segment. The sum of two final segments of which at least one is nonprincipal is a nonprincipal final segment.*

2) *If  $S_1$  is a final segment of  $G$  with infimum  $s_1$  and  $S_2$  is a final segment of  $G$  with infimum  $s_2$ , then the final segment  $S_1 + S_2$  has infimum  $s_1 + s_2$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of part 1) is straightforward.

2): If both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are principal, then the assertion follows from (5). If at least one of them is nonprincipal, then by part 2) of Lemma 2.5,  $G$  must be densely ordered. Now we have to consider the following two cases (up to symmetry). If  $S_1 = s_1^-$  and  $S_2 = s_2^+$ , then by (6) and (5),

$$S_1 + S_2 = s_1^- + s_2^+ = s_1^- + s_2^- + 0^+ = (s_1 + s_2)^- + 0^+ = (s_1 + s_2)^+.$$

If  $S_1 = s_1^+$  and  $S_2 = s_2^+$ , then by (6) and (5) together with part 1) of Lemma 2.5,

$$S_1 + S_2 = s_1^+ + s_2^+ = s_1^- + 0^+ + s_2^- + 0^+ = (s_1 + s_2)^- + 0^+ = (s_1 + s_2)^+.$$

□

Via the embedding (4) we can view  $(G, \leq)$  as an ordered subgroup of the ordered monoid  $(G^\dagger, \subseteq)$ , consisting of all principal final segments in  $G^\dagger$ . We note that  $0^-$  is the neutral element of the monoid  $G^\dagger$ , i.e.,

$$S + 0^- = S$$

for every final segment  $S$ . From this, we obtain the following positive answers to questions (QFS1) and (QFS2) in the case of principal final segments. The proofs are straightforward.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Take principal final segments  $s_1^-$  and  $s_2^-$  of  $G$ .*

1) *The function  $G^\dagger \ni T \mapsto s_1^- + T$  is a bijection with inverse  $G^\dagger \ni T \mapsto (-s_1)^- + T$ .*

2) *If  $S$  is any final segment of  $G$ , then the unique final segment  $T$  of  $G$  such that  $s_1^- + T = S$  is  $T = S + (-s_1)^-$ . In particular, the unique final segment  $T$  of  $G$  such that  $s_1^- + T = s_2^-$  is  $T = (s_2 - s_1)^-$ .*

Analogously to what we already mentioned in the case of cuts, for certain final segments  $S$ , the function

$$(7) \quad G^\dagger \ni T \mapsto S + T \in G^\dagger$$

may not be injective. Part 1) of the previous proposition shows that the function (7) is injective if  $S$  is principal. Part 3) of the following Lemma shows that if  $S$  is nonprincipal, then the function (7) is never injective, provided that  $G$  is nontrivial.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Take a final segment  $S$  of  $G$ .*

- 1) *We have that  $0^+ + S = \{t \in S \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in S\}$ .*
- 2) *If there is  $g \in G$  such that  $S = g^-$ , then  $0^+ + S = g^+$ .*
- 3) *If  $S$  is nonprincipal, then  $0^+ + S = S$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of statements 1) and 2) is straightforward. Statement 3) follows from 1) together with Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

For the conclusion of this section, we note the following fact; its proof is straightforward. If  $M \subseteq G$ , then

$$(8) \quad 0^- + M = M^- .$$

### 2.3. Subtraction of final segments.

The notion of subtraction of Dedekind cuts has been defined in several articles in the literature. When upper cut set addition is used, then for two Dedekind cuts  $\Lambda_1 = (\Lambda_1^L, \Lambda_1^R)$  and  $\Lambda_2 = (\Lambda_2^L, \Lambda_2^R)$ , their difference  $\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_2$  has been defined to be the cut with upper cut set  $\Lambda_1^R - \Lambda_2^L = \Lambda_1^R + (-\Lambda_2^L)$ . Note that since  $\Lambda_2^L$  is an initial segment,  $-\Lambda_2^L := \{-a \mid a \in \Lambda_2^L\}$  is a final segment. Hence,  $\Lambda_1^R - \Lambda_2^L$  is a sum of two final segments and thus again a final segment.

Analogously, we can define a difference of two proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$  as

$$S_1 -_{\text{cut}} S_2 := \{a - b \mid a \in S_1, b \in S_2^c\}$$

which is the sum of the final segments  $S_1$  and  $-S_2^c$ . This definition has for instance been used in [5, 8]. However, it does not extend the difference operation of the embedded copy of  $G$ . Indeed, for every  $a \in G$  we have  $(a^-)^c = \{b \in G \mid b < a\}$ , whence

$$-(a^-)^c = \{\gamma \in G \mid \gamma > -a\} ,$$

which is nonprincipal. Hence,  $a^- -_{\text{cut}} a^-$  is nonprincipal and thus not equal to the neutral element  $0^-$ . In fact,

$$a^- -_{\text{cut}} a^- = 0^+ .$$

In order to obtain a difference operation that extends the one of  $G$ , we define the **final segment difference** of two proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  as

$$S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 := \{a - b \mid a \in S_2, b \leq S_1\} .$$

This extends the difference operation of  $G$ : for arbitrary  $a, b \in G$ ,

$$(9) \quad a^- -_{\text{fs}} b^- = a^- + (-b)^- = (a - b)^- .$$

**Lemma 2.9.** *A final segment of  $G$  has an additive inverse if and only if it is principal.*

*Proof.* By (9), a principal final segment  $a^-$  has additive inverse  $(-a)^-$ . On the other hand, if a final segment  $S$  is nonprincipal, then by part 1) of Proposition 2.6 the equation  $S + T = 0^-$  cannot have a solution  $T$  since  $0^-$  is principal.  $\square$

To simplify notation, for a proper final segment  $S$  of  $G$ , we set

$$\Delta S := \{c \in G \mid c \geq -S\}.$$

We observe that

$$\Delta 0^- = 0^-$$

and more generally,

$$(10) \quad \Delta a^- = (-a)^-$$

for every  $a \in G$ .

**Lemma 2.10.** *Take a proper final segment  $S$  of  $G$ . If  $S = a^-$  for some  $a \in G$ , then  $\Delta S = (-a)^- = \widehat{-S^c}$  if  $G$  is densely ordered, and  $\Delta S = (g - a)^-$  if  $G$  is discretely ordered with smallest positive element  $g$ . If  $S$  is nonprincipal, then  $\Delta S = -S^c = \widehat{-S^c}$ . Consequently,  $\Delta S$  is always closed.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $S = a^-$  for some  $a \in G$ . Then  $S^c = \{b \in G \mid b < a\}$  and therefore,  $-S^c = \{c \in G \mid c > -a\} = (-a)^+$ . If  $G$  is densely ordered, then  $-a$  is the infimum of  $(-a)^+$ , whence which is equal to  $\Delta S$  by equation (10). If  $G$  is discretely ordered, then  $(-a)^+ = (g - a)^-$  as  $-a + g = g - a$  is the immediate successor of  $a$ .

Assume now that  $S$  is nonprincipal. Then  $c \geq -S \Leftrightarrow -c \leq S \Leftrightarrow -c < S \Leftrightarrow -c \in S^c \Leftrightarrow c \in -S^c$ , so  $\Delta S = -S^c$ . If  $S = a^+$  for some  $a \in G$ , then  $\Delta a^+$  is closed by equation (10), so  $-S^c = \widehat{-S^c}$  in this case. If  $S$  has no infimum in  $G$ , then  $S^c$  has no supremum and  $-S^c$  has no infimum, hence again,  $-S^c = \widehat{-S^c}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.11.** The final segment  $a^+$  is nonprincipal if and only if  $G$  is densely ordered; if  $G$  has smallest positive element  $g$ , then  $a^+ = (a + g)^-$ . Therefore, we have

$$\Delta a^+ = \begin{cases} (-a)^- & \text{if } G \text{ is densely ordered,} \\ (-a - g)^- & \text{if } G \text{ is discretely ordered.} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 2.12.** *Take three proper final segments  $S_1, S_2$  and  $S_3$  of  $G$ .*

1) *We have that*

$$S_2 \text{ -fs } S_1 = S_2 + \Delta S_1.$$

2) *If  $S_1$  is nonprincipal, then*

$$(11) \quad S_2 \text{ -fs } S_1 = S_2 - S_1^c.$$

3) *If  $S_1 = a^-$  for some  $a \in G$ , then*

$$S_2 \text{ -fs } S_1 = S_2 + (-a)^-.$$

4) *The sets  $\Delta S_1, S_2 \text{ -fs } S_1, -S_1^c$  and  $S_2 - S_1^c$  are again final segments of  $G$ .*

5) *The following holds:*

$$(12) \quad S_1 + (S_2 \text{ -fs } S_1) = (S_1 \text{ -fs } S_1) + S_2.$$

6) *We have that  $\Delta(\Delta S) = \hat{S}$ .*

7) *The following holds:*

$$S_3 \text{ -fs } (S_2 \text{ -fs } S_1) = S_3 + \Delta S_2 + \hat{S}_1 = (S_3 \text{ -fs } S_2) + \hat{S}_1.$$



In particular,

$$(13) \quad 0^- -_{\text{fs}} (0^- -_{\text{fs}} S_1) = \hat{S}_1.$$

*Proof.* 1): We compute:

$$S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = S_2 + \{-b \mid b \leq S_1\} = S_2 + \{c \mid c \geq -S_1\} = S_2 + \Delta S_1.$$

2): This follows from part 1) together with Lemma 2.10.

3): This follows from part 1) together with equation (10).

4): For  $\Delta S_1$  this holds by definition, so for  $S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  it follows from part 1). For  $-S_1^c$  we observe that  $S_1^c$  is an initial segment, hence  $-S_1^c$  is a final segment and the same holds for  $S_2 - S_1^c = S_2 + (-S_1^c)$ .

5): The proof is straightforward, using the equality  $a + (b - c) = (a - c) + b$ .

6): We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\Delta S) &= \Delta\{a \in G \mid a \geq -S\} = \{b \in G \mid b \geq -\{a \in G \mid a \geq -S\}\} \\ &= \{b \in G \mid b \geq \{c \in G \mid c \leq S\}\} = \hat{S}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the last equality is seen as follows. If  $S$  has infimum  $g$  in  $G$ , then  $c \leq S \Leftrightarrow c \leq g$  and therefore,  $\{b \in G \mid b \geq \{c \in G \mid c \leq S\}\} = \{b \in G \mid b \geq g\} = \hat{S}$ . If  $S$  has no infimum in  $G$ , then  $\{c \in G \mid c \leq S\} = \{c \in G \mid c < S\}$  has no supremum in  $G$ , whence  $\{b \in G \mid b \geq \{c \in G \mid c \leq S\}\} = \{b \in G \mid b > \{c \in G \mid c < S\}\} = S = \hat{S}$ .

7): First, we observe:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(S_2 + S) &= \{a \in G \mid a \geq -(S_2 + S)\} = \{a \in G \mid a \geq -S_2 + (-S)\} \\ &= \{b \in G \mid b \geq -S_2\} + \{c \in G \mid c \geq -S\} = \Delta S_2 + \Delta S. \end{aligned}$$

Using this together with parts 1) and 5), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 -_{\text{fs}} (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) &= S_3 + \Delta(S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) = S_3 + \Delta(S_2 + \Delta S_1) \\ &= S_3 + \Delta S_2 + \hat{S}_1 = (S_3 -_{\text{fs}} S_2) + \hat{S}_1. \end{aligned}$$

From what we have just proved, together with part 5) and equation (10), we obtain:  $0^- -_{\text{fs}} (0^- -_{\text{fs}} S_1) = 0^- + \Delta(0^-) + \Delta(\Delta S_1) = 0^- + 0^- + \hat{S}_1 = \hat{S}_1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.13.** The final segment  $S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  is closed, except in the following cases. If  $S_2 = a^+$  and  $S_1 = b^-$  for some  $a, b \in G$  and  $a$  has no immediate successor in  $G$ , then  $a + b$  has no immediate successor in  $G$  and therefore,  $S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = (a + b)^+$  is not closed. If  $S_2$  and  $S_1$  have no infimum in  $G$ , then  $S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  may or may not have an infimum in  $G$ . For instance, if  $G = \mathbb{Q}$  and  $S_1 = S_2 = \{a \in \mathbb{Q} \mid a > \pi\}$ , then  $\Delta S_1 = \{a \in \mathbb{Q} \mid a > -\pi\}$  and  $S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = 0^+$  which is not closed although  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are.

The question arises whether the difference operation  $-_{\text{fs}}$  provides some positive answer to our questions (QFS1) and (QFS2). At this point, we can give a first immediate answer:

**Lemma 2.14.** *Take two proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ .*

1) *If  $S_1$  is principal, say  $S_1 = a^-$ , then*

$$S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = 0^-$$

and

$$(14) \quad S_1 + (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) = S_2$$

with  $T = S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = S_2 + (-a)^-$  the unique solution of  $S_1 + T = S_2$ .

2) If  $S_2$  is principal but  $S_1$  is not, then there is no final segment  $T$  such that  $S_1 + T = S_2$ .

3) Assume that  $S_1$  is nonprincipal and  $T$  is a proper final segment of  $G$ . If  $S_1 + T = S_2$ , then also  $S_1 + \hat{T} = S_2$  holds. If  $S_1 + T \subseteq S_2$ , then also  $S_1 + \hat{T} \subseteq S_2$  holds.

*Proof.* 1): For  $S_1 = a^-$ , the first equation follows from equation (9). Now equation (14) follows from equation (12). The uniqueness of the solution  $T = S_2 + (-s_1)^-$  is stated in part 2) of Proposition 2.7.

2): This follows from part 1) of Proposition 2.6.

3): It suffices to show the second statement, as it implies the first. Since  $S_1$  is nonprincipal, part 3) of Lemma 2.8 shows that  $S_1 = S_1 + 0^+$ . If  $T$  is closed in  $G$ , then  $\hat{T} = T$  and there is nothing to show. If  $T$  has infimum  $g \in G \setminus T$ , then  $\hat{T} = g^-$  and  $0^+ + \hat{T} = g^+ = T$ . Thus,  $S_1 + \hat{T} = S_1 + 0^+ + \hat{T} = S_1 + T \subseteq S_2$ .  $\square$

#### 2.4. The case of an archimedean ordered abelian group.

An ordered abelian group  $(G, \leq)$  is **archimedean ordered** if it admits an order preserving embedding in the additive group of the reals. We will now investigate the special case of an archimedean ordered abelian group  $(G, \leq)$ ; w.l.o.g. we will assume that  $(G, +, \leq)$  is an ordered subgroup of  $(\mathbb{R}, +, \leq)$ . Then every final segment  $S$  of  $G$  has an infimum in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

When we try to answer questions (QFS1)–(QFS4), part 3) of Lemma 2.12 suggests to compute  $S -_{\text{fs}} S$ . We know already that  $S -_{\text{fs}} S = 0^-$  if  $S$  is principal.

**Lemma 2.15.** *Assume that  $(G, \leq)$  is archimedean ordered, and take two proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ .*

1) *If  $S_1$  is nonprincipal, then*

$$S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = 0^+,$$

and the following holds:

$$(15) \quad S_1 + (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) = 0^+ + S_2 = \{t \in S_2 \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in S_2\}.$$

2) *We have that  $S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = 0^+$  if and only if  $S_1$  is nonprincipal.*

3) *If  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are nonprincipal, then equation (14) holds.*

*Proof.* 1) Since we assume that  $(G, \leq)$  is a subgroup of  $(\mathbb{R}, +, \leq)$  and  $S_1 \neq G$ ,  $S_1$  has an infimum  $r$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $r$  is the supremum of  $S_1^c$ . Pick any  $g \in G$ . Every proper final segment in an archimedean discretely ordered abelian group is principal. Hence our assumption on  $S_1$  implies that  $G$  is densely ordered. Thus there is some  $a \in S_1$  such that  $a - r \leq g/2$  and some  $b \in S_1^c$  such that  $r - b \leq g/2$ . We obtain  $a - b \leq g$ . In view of part 2) of Lemma 2.12, this proves that

$$0^+ \subseteq S_1 - S_1^c = S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1.$$

On the other hand, if  $a \in S_1$  and  $b \in S_1^c$ , then  $a \neq b$ , so  $0 \notin S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$ . This proves that  $S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = 0^+$ . Equation (15) follows from this by use of part 5) of Lemma 2.12 and part 1) of Lemma 2.8.

2): This follows from part 1) of Lemma 2.14 together with what we have just proved.

3): This follows from equation (15) together with part 3) of Lemma 2.8.  $\square$

### 2.5. Invariance groups.

Throughout, we let  $G$  be an arbitrary ordered abelian group. For a subset  $M$  of  $G$ , we define its **invariance group** to be

$$\mathcal{G}(M) := \{g \in G \mid M + g = M\}.$$

**Lemma 2.16.** *Take any non-empty subset  $M \subseteq G$ . Then we have:*

1)  $\mathcal{G}(M)$  is a subgroup of  $G$ .

2) We have that

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{G}(M) = \{g \in G \mid M + g \subseteq M \text{ and } M - g \subseteq M\}.$$

3) The following holds:

$$\mathcal{G}(M) = \mathcal{G}(-M) = \mathcal{G}(M^c).$$

4) If  $0 \in M$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(M) \subseteq M$ .

5) If  $M$  is convex, then  $\mathcal{G}(M)$  is a convex subgroup of  $G$ .

6) If  $M$  has an infimum in  $G$ , then

$$\mathcal{G}(M^-) = \mathcal{G}(\{t \in M \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in M\}) = \mathcal{G}(M) = \{0\}.$$

In particular, for every  $a \in G$ ,

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{G}(a^-) = \mathcal{G}(a^+) = \mathcal{G}(\{a\}) = \{0\},$$

which shows that the invariance group of every final segment that has an infimum in  $G$  is trivial.

*Proof.* 1): Take  $a, b \in \mathcal{G}(M)$ . Then  $M + a + b = M + b = M$ , whence  $a + b \in \mathcal{G}(M)$ . Further,  $M - a = M + a - a = M$ , whence  $-a \in \mathcal{G}(M)$ . This proves that  $\mathcal{G}(M)$  is a group.

2): The inclusion “ $\subseteq$ ” in (16) follows from the definition of the invariance group and part 1) of our lemma. If  $M + g \subseteq M$  and  $M - g \subseteq M$ , then  $M + g \subseteq M = M - g + g \subseteq M + g$ , whence  $M + g = M$ . This proves the inclusion “ $\supseteq$ ” in (16).

3): The first equality holds since  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M) \Leftrightarrow -g \in \mathcal{G}(M) \Leftrightarrow M - g = M \Leftrightarrow -M + g = -M \Leftrightarrow g \in \mathcal{G}(M)$ , where we used that  $\mathcal{G}(M)$  is a group.

To prove the second equality, we observe that if  $g \notin \mathcal{G}(M)$ , then there exists some  $a \in M$  such that  $a + g \notin M$ , whence  $a + g \in M^c$ . Then  $a + g - g = a \notin M^c$ , so  $g \notin \mathcal{G}(M^c)$  by (16). This shows that  $\mathcal{G}(M^c) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(M)$ . The reverse inclusion follows by substituting  $M^c$  for  $M$  in our argument.

4): If  $0 \in M$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(M) = 0 + \mathcal{G}(M) \subseteq M + \mathcal{G}(M) = M$ .

5): By part 1), it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{G}(M)$  is convex. Take  $a, b \in \mathcal{G}(M)$  and  $g \in G$  with  $a \leq g \leq b$ . Then for all  $c \in M$ ,  $c + a \leq c + g \leq c + b$  and  $c + a, c + b \in M$ .

Hence  $c + g \in M$  by convexity of  $M$ . This proves that  $M + g \subseteq M$ . In the same way, we also obtain that  $M - g \subseteq M$  because  $-a, -b \in \mathcal{G}(M)$  (since  $\mathcal{G}(M)$  is a group) and  $-b \leq -g \leq -a$ . By part 2) it follows that  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M)$ .

6): Assume that  $a \in G$  is the infimum of  $M$  in  $G$ . Then for every positive  $g \in G$  there is  $b \in M$  such that  $0 \leq b - a < g$ . Hence  $b - g < a$  so that  $b - g \notin M$  and thus  $g \notin \mathcal{G}(M)$  by (16). This proves that  $\mathcal{G}(M) = \{0\}$ . Since  $a$  is also the infimum of  $M^-$  and  $\{t \in M \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in M\}$ , we conclude that  $\mathcal{G}(M^-) = \mathcal{G}(\{t \in M \mid s < t \text{ for some } s \in M\}) = \{0\}$ , too.  $\square$

We set  $G^{>0} := \{g \in G \mid g > 0\}$ .

**Lemma 2.17.** *Take a proper final segment  $S$  of  $G$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  is the largest of all convex subgroups  $H$  of  $G$  satisfying that  $(S^c + H) \cap S = \emptyset$ . The latter holds if and only if  $S^c \cap (S + H) = \emptyset$ , and this holds if and only if  $H \cap (S - S^c) = \emptyset$ . Further,*

$$(18) \quad S - S^c = G^{>0} \setminus \mathcal{G}(S) = \mathcal{G}(S)^+.$$

*Proof.* Since every convex subgroup  $H$  of  $G$  contains 0, it satisfies  $S^c \subseteq S^c + H$ . The latter is an initial segment of  $G$  since it is the union of initial segments of the form  $S^c + g$  with  $g \in H$ . Therefore, as  $G$  is the disjoint union of  $S^c$  and  $S$ , we have that  $S^c = S^c + H$  if and only if  $(S^c + H) \cap S = \emptyset$ . This proves the first assertion.

For the second and third assertion, just observe that  $(S^c + g) \cap S \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $S^c \cap (S - g) \neq \emptyset$ , and this holds if and only if  $g \in S - S^c$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{G}(S) \cap (S - S^c) = \emptyset$ . Since  $a < b$  whenever  $a \in S^c$  and  $b \in S$ , it follows that  $S - S^c \subseteq G^{>0} \setminus \mathcal{G}(S)$ . For the converse, assume that  $g \in G^{>0} \setminus \mathcal{G}(S)$ . Then there is some  $a \in S^c$  such that  $a + g \in S$  and therefore,  $g \in S - S^c$ . This proves (18).  $\square$

If  $G$  is archimedean ordered, then it admits only  $\{0\}$  and itself as convex subgroups. Hence if  $S$  is a proper final segment of  $G$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(S) = \{0\}$  since  $G + S = G \neq S$ . Therefore, the following is a generalization of parts 1) and 3) of Lemma 2.15.

**Corollary 2.18.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ .*

1) *If  $S_1$  is nonprincipal, then*

$$S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = S_1 - S_1^c = \mathcal{G}(S_1)^+,$$

*so that*

$$(19) \quad S_1 + (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_1)^+ + S_2 \subseteq S_2.$$

2) *If  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are nonprincipal and  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \{0\}$ , then*

$$S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = S_1 - S_1^c = 0^+,$$

*and equation (14) holds.*

3) *If  $S_1$  is nonprincipal and  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ , then equation (14) holds.*

*Proof.* 1): This follows from equation (11) in part 2) of Lemma 2.12 together with Lemma 2.17. The inequality holds since  $\mathcal{G}(S_1)^+$  only contains positive elements.

2): This follows from part 1) together with part 3) of Lemma 2.8

3): Since  $S_1$  is nonprincipal, we can apply part 1). As  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ , there is some  $a \in \mathcal{G}(S_1)^+ \cap \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . We obtain that  $S_2 = a + S_2 \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_1)^+ + S_2$ . In view of (19), this proves statement 3).  $\square$

Observe that in the linear ordering given by inclusion on the set of all convex subgroups,

$$H_1 \cup H_2 = H_1 + H_2 = \max\{H_1, H_2\}$$

for every two convex subgroups  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ .

**Lemma 2.19.** 1) *If  $M_1, M_2$  are arbitrary subsets of  $G$ , then*

$$\mathcal{G}(M_1) \cup \mathcal{G}(M_2) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(M_1 + M_2).$$

2) *If both  $S_1, S_2$  are initial segments or final segments of  $G$ , then*

$$\mathcal{G}(S_1 + S_2) = \mathcal{G}(S_1) \cup \mathcal{G}(S_2).$$

3) *If  $a \in G$  and  $S$  is a final segment of  $G$ , then  $a + S = a^- + S$  is again a final segment of  $G$ , and*

$$\mathcal{G}(a + S) = \mathcal{G}(S).$$

4) *If  $S$  is a final segment and  $H$  a convex subgroup of  $G$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(H) = H$  and*

$$\mathcal{G}(S + H) = \mathcal{G}(S) \cup H.$$

5) *For every convex subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ ,*

$$\mathcal{G}(H^-) = \mathcal{G}(H^+) = H.$$

*Proof.* 1): Take  $g_1 \in \mathcal{G}(M_1)$  and  $g_2 \in \mathcal{G}(M_2)$ . Then for all  $a_1 \in M_1$  and  $a_2 \in M_2$ ,  $(a_1 + a_2) + g_1 = (a_1 + g_1) + a_2 \in M_1 + M_2$  and  $(a_1 + a_2) + g_2 = a_1 + (a_2 + g_2) \in M_1 + M_2$ . Hence,  $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}(M_1 + M_2)$ .

2): In view of part 1), it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1 + S_2) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_1) \cup \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be final segments of  $G$ ; the proof for initial segments is similar. Take a positive  $g \in G$  such that  $g \notin \mathcal{G}(S_1) \cup \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Then there are  $a_1 \in S_1$  and  $a_2 \in S_2$  such that  $a_1 - g \notin S_1$  and  $a_2 - g \notin S_2$ . Since  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are final segments of  $G$ , this means that  $a_1 - g < S_1$  and  $a_2 - g < S_2$ . Thus  $a_1 + a_2 - 2g < S_1 + S_2$ , which means that  $2g \notin \mathcal{G}(S_1 + S_2)$  and hence  $g \notin \mathcal{G}(S_1 + S_2)$ .

3): The proof of the first statement is straightforward. It follows that  $\mathcal{G}(a + S) = \mathcal{G}(a^- + S) = \mathcal{G}(a^-) \cup \mathcal{G}(S) = \{0\} \cup \mathcal{G}(S) = \mathcal{G}(S)$ , where we have used part 2) of our lemma and equation (17) of Lemma 2.16.

4): If  $H'$  is any convex subgroup of  $G$ , then it is comparable to  $H$  by inclusion. Hence  $H + H' = H$  holds if and only if  $H' \subseteq H$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{G}(H) = H$ . Thus we obtain from part 1) that  $\mathcal{G}(S) \cup H = \mathcal{G}(S) \cup \mathcal{G}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S + H)$ . Take a positive  $g \in G$  such that  $g \notin \mathcal{G}(S) \cup H$ . Then there are  $a_1 \in S$  and  $a_2 \in H$  such that  $a_1 - g < S$  and  $a_2 - g < H$ . Thus  $a_1 + a_2 - 2g < S + H$ , which means that  $2g \notin \mathcal{G}(S + H)$  and hence  $g \notin \mathcal{G}(S + H)$ .

5): By equation (8),  $H^- = 0^- + H$ . Hence by part 4) and equation (17) of Lemma 2.16,  $\mathcal{G}(H^-) = \mathcal{G}(0^- + H) = \mathcal{G}(0^-) + H = H$ . We observe that the complement of  $-H^+$  in  $G$  is  $H^-$ . Applying part 3) of Lemma 2.16 twice, we obtain that  $\mathcal{G}(H^+) = \mathcal{G}(-H^+) = \mathcal{G}(H^-) = H$ .  $\square$

For a final segment  $S$ , we define

$$nS := \{a_1 + \dots + a_n \mid a_i \in S\}.$$

Note that the set  $\{na \mid a \in S\}$  is a final segment if and only if  $G$  is  $n$ -divisible; in general,  $nS$  is the smallest final segment that contains  $\{na \mid a \in S\}$ . By a repeated application of part 2) of the last lemma, we obtain:

**Corollary 2.20.** *Take a final segment  $S$  of  $G$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{G}(nS) = \mathcal{G}(S).$$

From part 1) of Lemma 2.19 we obtain:

**Proposition 2.21.** *Take final segments  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and  $T$ . Then the equation  $S_1 + T = S_2$  can only hold if  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ .*

**Lemma 2.22.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ .*

1) *The following holds:*

$$\mathcal{G}(-S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_1^c) = \mathcal{G}(\Delta S_1).$$

2) *We have that*

$$\mathcal{G}(S_2 \text{ -fs } S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_1) + \mathcal{G}(S_2).$$

*Proof.* 1): The first and second equality are special cases of part 3) of Lemma 2.16. The equality  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(\Delta S_1)$  is seen as follows. If  $S_1$  is nonprincipal, then by part 2) of Lemma 2.12,  $\Delta S_1 = -S_1^c$  and the equality follows from what we have already proved. If  $S_1$  is principal, say  $S_1 = a^-$  for some  $a \in G$ , then  $\Delta S_1 = (-a)^-$  by (10), whence  $\mathcal{G}(\Delta S_1) = \{0\} = \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  by (17).

2): This follows from part 1) of our lemma together with parts 1) and 4) of Lemma 2.12 and part 2) of Lemma 2.19.  $\square$

It is also possible to define the invariance group of a quasi-cut.

**Proposition 2.23.** *If  $(\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$  is a quasi-cut in  $G$ , then*

$$\mathcal{G}(\Lambda^L) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda^R).$$

*If  $(\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$  is not a cut, then these groups are trivial.*

*Proof.* The first statement follows from the fact that for every  $g \in G$ ,

$$\Lambda^L + g = \Lambda^L \Leftrightarrow \Lambda^R + g = \Lambda^R.$$

If  $(\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$  is not a cut, then  $\Lambda^L \cap \Lambda^R = \{g\}$  for some  $g \in G$ . It follows that  $\Lambda^R = g^-$ , hence by part 1) of Lemma 2.22,  $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda^L) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda^R) = \{0\}$ .  $\square$

For every quasi-cut  $\Lambda = (\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$  we can now define

$$\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) := \mathcal{G}(\Lambda^L) = \mathcal{G}(\Lambda^R).$$

## 2.6. Ordered abelian groups modulo convex subgroups.

In what follows,  $G$  will be an ordered abelian group with arbitrary convex subgroup  $H$ . The quotient  $G/H$  carries a canonical ordering such that for all  $\alpha, \beta \in G$ ,

$$(20) \quad \alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow \alpha + H \leq \beta + H.$$

Note that under this induced ordering on  $G/H$ , we have  $a + H < b + H$  if and only if it holds for  $a + H$  and  $b + H$  as subsets of  $G$  as defined at the beginning of Section 2.1.

For the image of an element  $g \in G$  under the canonical epimorphism  $G \rightarrow G/H$ , i.e., the coset  $g + H$ , we prefer to write  $g/H$  since we also have to deal with subsets of the form  $g + H$  in  $G$ . With this notation,  $M/H = \{g/H \mid g \in M\}$  for every subset  $M \subseteq G$ . Since the epimorphism preserves  $\leq$ , we have that  $M/H$  is convex if  $M$  is convex, and  $S/H$  is a final segment (or initial segment) of  $G/H$  if  $S$  is a final segment (or initial segment, respectively) of  $G$ . We note that for each subset  $M$  of  $G$  the preimage of  $M/H$  is  $M + H$ .

**Proposition 2.24.** *Take a subset  $M \subseteq G$ , a final segment  $S$  of  $G$ , and a convex subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ .*

1) *If  $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(M)$ , then*

$$\mathcal{G}(M/H) = \mathcal{G}(M)/H.$$

2) *If  $\mathcal{G}(S) \subseteq H$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(S/H)$  is trivial.*

3) *If  $\mathcal{G}(S)$  is trivial, then also  $\mathcal{G}(S/H)$  is trivial.*

4) *If  $\mathcal{G}(S) \subsetneq H$ , then  $S/H$  is principal.*

*Proof.* 1): Assume that  $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(M)$ . Then  $M + H = M$ . It follows that  $M + H + g + H = M + g$  for every  $g \in G$ , so we have  $M/H + g/H = M/H$  if and only if  $M + g = M$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{G}(M/H) = \mathcal{G}(M)/H$ .

2): Assume that  $\mathcal{G}(S) \subseteq H$ . Take a convex subgroup  $H'$  of  $G$  containing  $H$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(S/H) = H'/H$ . That is,  $S/H + H'/H = S/H$ . It follows that  $S + H + H' + H = S + H$ , showing that  $H'$  is a subgroup of  $\mathcal{G}(S + H)$ . By part 4) of Lemma 2.19,  $\mathcal{G}(S + H) = \mathcal{G}(S) \cup H = H$ . We conclude that  $H' = H$  and thus,  $\mathcal{G}(S/H) = H'/H$  is trivial.

3): This follows from part 2) since the trivial subgroup is contained in  $H$ .

4): Since  $\mathcal{G}(S) \subsetneq H$ , we have  $S + H \neq S$ , so there is some  $a \in S + H$  such that  $a < S$  (since  $S$  is a final segment). As  $a \in S + H$ , it follows that  $a/H \in S/H$ . We wish to show that  $a/H$  is the smallest element of  $S/H$ . Take any  $b \in G$  such that  $b/H < a/H$ . This means that  $b + H < a < S$ , so  $S \cap (b + H) = \emptyset$  and therefore,  $b/H \notin S/H$ . This proves our claim.  $\square$

We note that if  $(\Lambda^L, \Lambda^R)$  is a cut in  $G$ , then  $\Lambda^L/H \leq \Lambda^R/H$ , hence

$$(21) \quad \Lambda/H := (\Lambda^L/H, \Lambda^R/H)$$

is a quasicut in  $G/H$ .

**Remark 2.25.** If  $0 \in \Lambda^L$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) \subseteq \Lambda^L$  by part 4) of Lemma 2.16. Symmetrically, if  $0 \in \Lambda^R$ , then  $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) \subseteq \Lambda^R$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) = G$  if and only if  $\Lambda^L$  or  $\Lambda^R$  is empty, that is, if  $\Lambda$  is not a Dedekind cut.

**Theorem 2.26.** *The induced quasi-cut (21) in  $G/H$  is a cut if and only if  $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ . If  $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\Lambda) \neq G$ , then  $\Lambda/H$  is a Dedekind cut in  $G/H$ . The invariance group of the cut  $\Lambda/\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$  in  $G/\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$  is trivial.*

*Proof.* The quasi-cut  $\Lambda/H$  is a cut in  $G/H$  if and only if  $\Lambda^L/H \cap \Lambda^R/H = \emptyset$ . This holds if and only if  $\Lambda^L + H \subseteq \Lambda^L$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ , this in turn holds if and only if  $H \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$ .

If  $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda) \neq G$  then by Remark 2.25,  $\Lambda^L$  and  $\Lambda^R$  are non-empty. Hence also  $\Lambda^L/H$  and  $\Lambda^R/H$  are non-empty. So  $\Lambda/H$  is a Dedekind cut as soon as it is a cut.

The last statement follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{G}(\Lambda)$  together with Proposition 2.24.  $\square$

### 2.7. The equation $S_1 + T = S_2$ in ordered abelian groups of arbitrary rank.

In this section we will first assume that  $S_1, S_2$  are proper final segments of the ordered abelian group  $G$  and that the equation

$$(22) \quad S_1 + T = S_2$$

has a solution  $T = T_0$ . We determine whether it is unique, and if not, compute the largest solution.

**Lemma 2.27.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1, S_2$  and  $T_0$  of  $G$  and assume that  $S_1$  is nonprincipal and  $\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is trivial. If  $T = T_0$  is a solution of (22), then  $T = \widehat{T}_0$  is the largest solution of (22).*

*Proof.* If  $S_1 + T_0 = S_2$ , then by part 3) of Lemma 2.14, also  $S_1 + \widehat{T}_0 = S_2$  holds. Suppose that  $T'$  is a larger solution, and pick some  $t' \in T' \setminus \widehat{T}_0$ . If  $\widehat{T}_0$  has a minimum, then denote it by  $t$ . If  $\widehat{T}_0$  has no minimum, then  $\widehat{T}_0 = T_0$  has no infimum and  $G \setminus T_0$  has no supremum, so there is  $t \in G$  such that  $t' < t < T_0$ . In both cases, we have that  $t \leq \widehat{T}_0$ . Consequently,

$$S_2 = S_1 + \widehat{T}_0 \subseteq S_1 + t \subseteq S_1 + t' \subseteq S_1 + T' = S_2,$$

so equality holds everywhere. It follows that  $S_2 + t' - t = S_1 + t + t' - t = S_1 + t' = S_2$ , whence  $t' - t \in \mathcal{G}(S_2) = \{0\}$ . Thus  $t' = t$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 2.28.** If  $S_1$  is principal, then  $\widehat{T}_0$  will not always be a solution, even if  $\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is trivial. As a simple counterexample, consider the equation  $0^- + T = 0^+$ . Then  $T = 0^+$  is a solution, but  $T = 0^-$  is not.

Take a proper final segment  $T$  of  $G$ . We set

$$T^\diamond := a^- + \mathcal{G}(T)$$

if there exists  $a \in G$  such that  $a/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is the infimum of  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$  in  $G/\mathcal{G}(T)$ ; otherwise, we set  $T^\diamond := T$ . Observe that  $T^\diamond = T$  holds if and only if  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is closed in  $G/\mathcal{G}(T)$ . If  $\mathcal{G}(T)$  is trivial, then  $T^\diamond = \widehat{T}$ .

**Lemma 2.29.** *Take a proper final segment  $T$  of  $G$ .*

1) *For each  $a \in G$ ,  $a^- + \mathcal{G}(T)$  is the preimage of  $(a/\mathcal{G}(T))^-$  under the epimorphism  $G \rightarrow G/\mathcal{G}(T)$ .*



2) Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and that  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal, say  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (a/\mathcal{G}(T))^-$  for some  $a \in G$ . Then  $T = S_2 + (-a)^-$  is a solution of equation (22).

3) The final segment  $T^\diamond$  is the preimage of  $\widehat{T/\mathcal{G}(T)}$ .

4) If  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is nonprincipal, then  $\Delta T$  is the preimage of

$$\Delta(T/\mathcal{G}(T)) = \{c/\mathcal{G}(T) \mid c/\mathcal{G}(T) \geq -T/\mathcal{G}(T)\}.$$

*Proof.* 1): The preimage of  $(a/\mathcal{G}(T))^-$  contains the final segment  $a^- + \mathcal{G}(T) = (a + \mathcal{G}(T))^-$ . If it were larger, then there would exist  $b \in G$  such that  $b < a + \mathcal{G}(T)$ , which implies that  $b + \mathcal{G}(T) < a + \mathcal{G}(T)$ . However, this means that  $b/\mathcal{G}(T) < a/\mathcal{G}(T)$ , contradiction.

2): By part 1) of Lemma 2.14, applied to  $G/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  in place of  $G$ ,

$$S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + (-a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^- = S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1).$$

Passing to preimages, using part 1) of our Lemma, we thus obtain

$$S_1 + S_2 + (-a)^- = S_1 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) + S_2 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) + (-a)^- + \mathcal{G}(S_1) = S_2 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) = S_2,$$

where we have used that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) + \mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ .

3): If  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is closed in  $G/\mathcal{G}(T)$ , then  $\widehat{T/\mathcal{G}(T)} = T/\mathcal{G}(T)$ , whose preimage is  $T + \mathcal{G}(T) = T$  which by definition equals  $T^\diamond$  in this case. If  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is not closed in  $G/\mathcal{G}(T)$ , then there is some  $a \in G$  such that  $a/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is the infimum of  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$ . Then  $\widehat{T/\mathcal{G}(T)} = a/\mathcal{G}(T)^-$ . By part 1), its preimage is  $a^- + \mathcal{G}(T)$ , which by definition equals  $T^\diamond$  in this case, too.

4): As  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is nonprincipal, also  $T$  is nonprincipal, so  $-T$  has no maximal element and we thus have  $\Delta T = \{c \in G \mid c \geq -T\} = \{c \in G \mid c > T\}$ . Similarly, since  $T/\mathcal{G}(T)$  is nonprincipal we have  $\Delta(T/\mathcal{G}(T)) = \{c/\mathcal{G}(T) \mid c/\mathcal{G}(T) \geq -T/\mathcal{G}(T)\} = \{c/\mathcal{G}(T) \mid c/\mathcal{G}(T) > -T/\mathcal{G}(T)\}$ . By implication (20),  $\{c \in G \mid c \geq -T\}$  is contained in the preimage of  $\Delta(T/\mathcal{G}(T))$ . By the contrapositive of the same implication, the preimage of  $\{c/\mathcal{G}(T) \mid c/\mathcal{G}(T) > -T/\mathcal{G}(T)\}$  is contained in  $\{c \in G \mid c > -T\}$ , hence it is equal to  $\Delta T$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.30.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$  and assume that  $T = T_0$  is a solution of equation (22). Set  $T_1 := T_0 + \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Then the following statements hold.*

1) *If  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is principal, then  $T = T_1$  is the largest solution of (22).*

2) *If  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is nonprincipal, then  $T = T_1^\diamond$  is the largest solution of (22).*

*Proof.* Since  $S_1 + T_1 = S_1 + T_0 + \mathcal{G}(S_2) = S_2 + \mathcal{G}(S_2) = S_2$ , we have  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2) + T_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2) = S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . If  $\overline{T}$  is the maximal final segment of  $G/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  such that  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2) + \overline{T} = S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$ , then the maximal final segment  $T$  of  $G$  satisfying  $S_1 + T = S_2$  is equal to the preimage in  $G$  of  $\overline{T}$ .

1): If  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is principal, then by part 2) of Proposition 2.7,  $\overline{T} = T_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is the unique solution of  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2) + \overline{T} = S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Hence  $T = T_1 + \mathcal{G}(S_2) = T_1$  is the largest solution of (22).

2): We observe that  $\mathcal{G}(S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_2))$  is trivial by part 2) of Proposition 2.24, so we can apply Lemma 2.27 to infer that  $\overline{T} = \widehat{T_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)}$  is the maximal final segment

of  $G/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  such that  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2) + \overline{T} = S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Since  $S_1 + T_0 = S_2$ , we know from part 2) of Lemma 2.19 that  $\mathcal{G}(S_2) = \mathcal{G}(S_1 + T_0) = \mathcal{G}(S_1) \cup \mathcal{G}(T_0)$ , whence  $\mathcal{G}(T_0) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Using part 4) of the same lemma, we conclude that  $\mathcal{G}(T_1) = \mathcal{G}(T_0 + \mathcal{G}(S_2)) = \mathcal{G}(T_0) \cup \mathcal{G}(S_2) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Therefore, we can apply part 3) of Lemma 2.29 to obtain that  $T_1^\diamond$  is the maximal final segment  $T$  of  $G$  such that  $T/\mathcal{G}(S_2) = \widehat{T_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)}$ . This proves statement 2).  $\square$

**Remark 2.31.** Remark 2.28 shows that  $T = T_1^\diamond$  is not always a solution of (22).

For an arbitrary proper final segment  $S$  of  $G$ , the following application of the foregoing proposition gives an interesting characterization of  $S^\diamond$ :

**Corollary 2.32.** *Take a proper final segment  $S$  of  $G$ . Then  $T = S^\diamond$  is the largest solution of the equation*

$$S + T = S + S.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{G}(S + S) = \mathcal{G}(S)$  by Corollary 2.20 and  $S + \mathcal{G}(S) = S$ , we can apply the foregoing proposition to  $T_1 = S$ . If  $S/\mathcal{G}(S)$  is nonprincipal, then our claim follows from part 2) of the proposition. If  $S/\mathcal{G}(S)$  is principal, then by part 1) of the proposition,  $S$  is the largest solution, and we need to show that  $S = S^\diamond$  in this case. If  $S/\mathcal{G}(S)$  is principal, then it is closed in  $G/\mathcal{G}(S)$  and by our remark before Lemma 2.29, we indeed have  $S^\diamond = S$ .  $\square$

Now we turn to the question when solutions of equation (22) exist.

**Theorem 2.33.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ . The equation (22) has a solution if one of the following cases holds:*

- a)  $S_1$  is principal,
- b)  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal,
- c)  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  are nonprincipal,
- d)  $\{0\} \neq \mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal.

*In cases a)-c),  $T = S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  is a solution. In case d), write  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^-$  for some  $a \in S_1$ ; then  $T = S_2 + (-a)^-$  is a solution.*

*If none of the above cases holds, that is, one of the cases*

- i)  $\mathcal{G}(S_2) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  or
  - ii)  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal, but  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal
- holds, then equation (22) has no solution.*

*Proof.* If  $S_1$  is principal, then by part 1) of Lemma 2.14,  $T = S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  is a solution of equation (22). Under the condition of b), the same follows from part 3) of Corollary 2.18 because if  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal, then so is  $S_1$ .

Now assume that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  are nonprincipal. From part 2) of Proposition 2.24 we know that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)) = \mathcal{G}(S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)) = \{0\}$ . Hence by part 2) of Corollary 2.18 together with Lemma 2.10 applied to  $G/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  in place of  $G$ ,

$$S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + \Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)) = S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1).$$

Passing to preimages altogether, using part 4) of Lemma 2.29, we obtain

$$S_1 + S_2 + \Delta S_1 = S_1 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) + S_2 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) + \Delta S_1 = S_2 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) = S_2.$$

Since  $S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = S_2 + \Delta S_1$  by part 1) of Lemma 2.12, this proves our statement in case c).

Our statement in case d) follows from part 2) of Lemma 2.29.

Now assume that none of the cases a)-d) holds. Then one of the cases i) or ii) must hold; note that in both cases it follows that  $S_1$  is nonprincipal. In case i), Proposition 2.21 shows that equation (22) has no solution. Assume that case ii) holds and that the final segment  $T$  is a solution of equation (22). Then  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + T/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ , but this contradicts part 1) of Proposition 2.6 applied to the group  $G/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.34.** Assume that case d) holds with  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Then  $S_1$  is nonprincipal since  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \neq \{0\}$ . Thus it follows from part 3) of Corollary 2.18 that also  $T = S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  is a solution. This is no longer true when  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and also  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal, as we will see in the next lemma.

**Lemma 2.35.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{G}(S_2) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ , or that  $\mathcal{G}(S_2) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and both  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  are principal. Then  $S_1 + (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) \subsetneq S_2$ .*

*Proof.* Under the assumptions of our lemma we have  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \neq \{0\}$ , so  $S_1$  is nonprincipal and we can again apply part 1) of Corollary 2.18 to obtain that  $S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1 = \mathcal{G}(S_1)^+$ . We also have that  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal since in the case of  $\mathcal{G}(S_2) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  this follows from part 4) of Proposition 2.24. We write  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (b/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^-$  with suitable  $b \in G$ . Now we compute, using part 5) of Lemma 2.12:

$$\begin{aligned} (S_1 + (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1))/\mathcal{G}(S_1) &= ((S_1 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) + S_2)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \\ &= (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \\ &= \mathcal{G}(S_1)^+/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + (b/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^- \\ &= (0/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^+ + (b/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^- = (b/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^+ \\ &\subsetneq S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1). \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $S_1 + (S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1) \subsetneq S_2$ .  $\square$

The question arises whether by modifying our definition of the subtraction of final segments we can obtain a universal solution. Analyzing the proof of our theorem, we see that the problem in case d) is that  $\Delta S_1$  is not the preimage of  $(-a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^-$ . Therefore, we modify the definition of  $S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  as follows:

$$(23) \quad S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1 := S_2 + (\Delta S_1)^\diamond.$$

The reader may think of  $-_{\text{dfs}}$  as “deep subtraction of final segments”.

**Proposition 2.36.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ . Assume that one of the cases a)-d) of Theorem 2.33 holds. Then the following statements hold:*

- 1)  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond$  is the preimage of  $\Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1))$  under the epimorphism  $G \rightarrow G/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ ,
- 2) in cases a), b) and c), we have  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond = \Delta S_1$ ,
- 3)  $T = S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$  is a solution of equation (22),

4)  $\mathcal{G}(S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ .

*Proof.* 1): Assume first that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \{0\}$ . Then  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond = \widehat{\Delta S_1} = \Delta S_1 = \Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1))$ , where we have used that  $\Delta S_1$  is closed by Lemma 2.10.

Now assume that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \neq \{0\}$ . By part 1) of Lemma 2.22,  $\mathcal{G}(-S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . Take any  $c \in G$  that satisfies  $c \geq -S_1$ . For every  $b \in -S_1$  we have  $b + \mathcal{G}(S_1) \subset -S_1$ , so  $c > b + \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and therefore  $c/\mathcal{G}(S_1) > b/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . This shows that  $(\Delta S_1)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \{c/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \in G/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \mid c/\mathcal{G}(S_1) > -S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)\}$ . The reverse inclusion follows from the contrapositive of implication (20). We find that the closure of  $(\Delta S_1)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \{c/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \in G/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \mid c/\mathcal{G}(S_1) > -S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)\}$  is  $\Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1))$ . Now the assertion of part 1) follows from part 3) of Lemma 2.29.

2): In case a),  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \{0\}$  and therefore,  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond = \widehat{\Delta S_1} = \Delta S_1$  since  $\Delta S_1$  is closed by Lemma 2.10.

In cases b) and c),  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal by assumption. Hence it follows from part 4) of Lemma 2.29 and from part 1) of our lemma that  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond = \Delta S_1$ .

3): In cases a), b), c) we have  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond = \Delta S_1$  by part 2) of our lemma. Hence in these cases,  $S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1 = S_2 -_{\text{fs}} S_1$  which is a solution by Theorem 2.33.

In case d),  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal, say  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^-$  for some  $a \in S_1$ , and  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Thus by part 2) of Lemma 2.29,  $T = S_2 + (-a)^-$  is a solution of equation (22). Further, we have  $\Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)) = (-a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^-$ , and by part 1) of Lemma 2.29 its preimage is  $(-a)^- + \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . On the other hand, as we have shown above, also  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond$  is the preimage of this set, so it is equal to  $(-a)^- + \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . Therefore,  $T = S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1 = S_2 + (\Delta S_1)^\diamond = S_2 + (-a)^- + \mathcal{G}(S_1) = S_2 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) + (-a)^- = S_2 + (-a)^-$  is a solution of equation (22).

4): In all cases a)-d), we have  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . For the cases a), b), d), as well as case c) when  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal, it is shown in the proof of part 2) that  $(\Delta S_1)^\diamond = \Delta S_1$ , therefore by part 2) of Lemma 2.22,  $\mathcal{G}(S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_1) \cup \mathcal{G}(S_2) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ .

For the remaining cases it is shown in the proof of part 1) that  $S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1 = S_2 + (-a)^-$ , whence  $\mathcal{G}(S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2 + (-a)^-) = \mathcal{G}(S_2) \cup \{0\} = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.37.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ . Assume that one of the cases a)-d) of Theorem 2.33 holds. Then the largest solution  $T$  of equation (22) is equal to  $S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$  in cases a), b) and d), and to  $(S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1)^\diamond$  in case c).*

*Proof.* By part 3) of Proposition 2.36, in all cases a)-d),  $T_1 = S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$  is a solution of equation (22), and by part 4) of Proposition 2.36,  $\mathcal{G}(S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . Hence we can apply Proposition 2.30 with  $T_1 = S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1 + \mathcal{G}(S_2) = S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$ . In case a),  $S_1$  is principal, hence so is  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$ . In case b),  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is principal by part 4) of Proposition 2.24. In case d),  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is principal since  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal and  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  by assumption. Thus in these three cases, Proposition 2.30 shows that the largest solution  $T$  of equation (22) is equal to  $S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$ .

In case c), we have that  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal and  $\mathcal{G}(S_2) = \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  by assumption, so  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_2)$  is nonprincipal. In this case, Proposition 2.30 shows that the largest solution  $T$  of equation (22) is equal to  $(S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1)^\diamond$ .  $\square$

The following theorem addresses question (QFS4) in the case where no solution to equation (22) exists:

**Theorem 2.38.** *Take proper final segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of  $G$ .*

1) *Assume that  $\mathcal{G}(S_2) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . Then there exists a maximal nonempty final segment  $S'_2$  contained in  $S_2$  having invariance group  $\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . We have that  $S'_2 \subsetneq S_2$ . Further,  $T = S'_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$  is the largest final segment  $T$  such that  $S_1 + T \subset S_2$ ; it is the largest solution of  $S_1 + T = S'_2$ .*

2) *Assume that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  and  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal, but  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is principal, say  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^-$  for some  $a \in G$ . Then  $T = S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$  is the largest final segment  $T$  such  $S_1 + T \subset S_2$ ; it is the largest solution of  $S_1 + T = (a + \mathcal{G}(S_1))^+ \subsetneq S_2$ .*

*Proof.* 1): By the definition of  $\mathcal{G}(S_2)$ , there is some  $a \in S_2$  such that  $a + \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is not contained in  $S_2$ . Set  $S'_2 = (a + \mathcal{G}(S_1))^+$ . By definition,  $S'_2$  is a final segment, and since  $a \in S_2 \setminus S'_2$ , we have that  $S'_2 \subsetneq S_2$ . We show that  $\mathcal{G}(S'_2) = \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . Take any positive  $g \in \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and suppose that there is some  $b \in S'_2$  such that  $b - g \notin S'_2$ , that is,  $b - g < S'_2$ . Then there is some  $c \in a + \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  such that  $a \leq c$  and  $b - g \leq c$ . Then  $b = c + g = a + c - a + g$ . However,  $c - a \in \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ , whence  $c - a + g \in \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and therefore,  $b \in a + \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ , contradiction. This shows that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S'_2)$ . On the other hand, if  $g' > \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ , then  $a + g' \in S'_2$  and  $a = a + g' - g'$ , so  $g' \notin \mathcal{G}(S'_2)$ . This proves that  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S'_2)$ .

We observe that  $S'_2$  is the largest final segment  $S$  contained in  $S_2$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(S) = \mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . Indeed, otherwise there would exist an element  $b \in (a + \mathcal{G}(S_1)) \cap S_2$  such that  $b + \mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq S_2$ . However, it would follow that  $b - a \in \mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and  $a + \mathcal{G}(S_1) = b + \mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq S_2$ , contradiction. Consequently, if  $S_1 + T \subseteq S_2$ , then we must have that  $S_1 + T \subseteq S'_2$  because of  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(S_1 + T)$  by part 2) of Lemma 2.19. Now the assertion of part 1) of our theorem follows from Theorem 2.37.

2): It follows from part 1) of Corollary 2.18 together with equation (6), applied to  $G/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  in place of  $G$ , that  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + \Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)) = (0/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^+ + S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^+$ . Passing to preimages, using part 1) of Lemma 2.36, we obtain

$$S_1 + S_2 + (\Delta S_1)^\diamond = S_1 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) + S_2 + \mathcal{G}(S_1) + (\Delta S_1)^\diamond = (a + \mathcal{G}(S_1))^+.$$

This proves that  $T = S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1 = S_2 + (\Delta S_1)^\diamond$  is a solution of  $S_1 + T = (a + \mathcal{G}(S_1))^+$  and satisfies  $S_1 + T \subset S_2$ . Take any  $g \in G$  such that  $g < S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}(S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  by part 4) of Lemma 2.36 and  $\mathcal{G}(S_1) = \mathcal{G}(S_2)$  by assumption, it follows that  $g + \mathcal{G}(S_1) < S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1$ . This implies  $g/\mathcal{G}(S_1) < (S_2 -_{\text{dfs}} S_1)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^- + \Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1))$ . Therefore,  $(g - a)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = g/\mathcal{G}(S_1) - a/\mathcal{G}(S_1) < \Delta(S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1))$ . Consequently,  $(g - a)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \in -S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ , whence  $(a - g)/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \in S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and  $a/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \in S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + g/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . Since  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  and thus also  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + g/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  is nonprincipal,  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + g/\mathcal{G}(S_1) = (a/\mathcal{G}(S_1))^-$  is impossible, so  $S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + g/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$  will also include elements smaller than  $a/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ . Therefore,  $S_2/\mathcal{G}(S_1) \subsetneq S_1/\mathcal{G}(S_1) + g/\mathcal{G}(S_1)$ , showing that  $S_2 \subsetneq S_1 + g$ . This proves both assertions of part 2).  $\square$

**Remark 2.39.** As mentioned already in the introduction, a survey and a list of references on the arithmetic of cuts is given in [7]. However, there we missed (at least) one important reference, namely to the work of Schikhof, see e.g. [10]. The solution of equations of the form  $S_1 + T = S_2$  is implicitly connected with

the investigation of the set  $S_1 + G^\uparrow$ , which is done in [10]. Also there, invariance groups, appearing under the name of *stabilizer*, play a crucial role, as well as the final segments  $H^-$  and  $H^+$ . At this point, let us mention that in our terminology indicated in [7], the cuts determined by  $H^-$  and  $H^+$  are called *group cuts*, and the *shifted* cuts determined by  $g + H^-$  and  $g + H^+$ , with  $g \in G$ , are called *ball cuts*.

### 3. $\mathcal{O}$ -IDEALS

Throughout, we consider a valued field  $(K, v)$  with valuation ring  $\mathcal{O}_v$  and denote its maximal ideal by  $\mathcal{M}_v$ . We will consider (possibly fractional)  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I, I_1, I_2, J, \dots$

#### 3.1. Preliminaries on valuation theory.

For general background from valuation theory, we recommend [4, 11]. The set  $\mathcal{R}$  of all valuation rings which contain  $\mathcal{O}_v$  is linearly ordered by inclusion. For every  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$ , we set

$$H(\mathcal{O}) := v\mathcal{O} \cap -v\mathcal{O} = v\mathcal{O}^\times.$$

This is a convex subgroup of the value group  $vK$  of  $(K, v)$ . In fact,  $v$  is finer or equal to the valuation  $w$  associated with  $\mathcal{O}$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{O}_v \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ , or equivalently,  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_v$ , where  $\mathcal{M}$  denotes the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}$ ), the value group of  $w$  is canonically isomorphic to  $vK/H(\mathcal{O})$  since the valuation  $w$  is (up to equivalence) given by

$$(24) \quad wa = va/H(\mathcal{O})$$

for every  $a \in K$ , and the value group of the valuation induced by  $v$  on the residue field  $Kw$  is canonically isomorphic to  $H(\mathcal{O})$  (cf. [11]).

Conversely, for every convex subgroup  $H$  of  $vK$ , we set

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{O}(H) := \{b \in K \mid \exists \alpha \in H : \alpha \leq vb\}.$$

Therefore,

$$(26) \quad v\mathcal{O}(H) = H^-.$$

Note that

$$(27) \quad v\mathcal{O}(H)^\times = H,$$

or in other words,  $\mathcal{O}(H)^\times = v^{-1}(H)$ .

We recall the following facts from general valuation theory (cf. [11]):

**Proposition 3.1.** *The map  $H \mapsto \mathcal{O}(H)$  is an order preserving bijection from the set of all convex subgroups of  $vK$  onto the set  $\mathcal{R}$  of all valuation rings which contain  $\mathcal{O}_v$ . Its inverse is the order preserving map  $\mathcal{R} \ni \mathcal{O} \mapsto H(\mathcal{O})$ . Thus,*

$$(28) \quad \mathcal{O}(H(\mathcal{O})) = \mathcal{O} \quad \text{and} \quad H(\mathcal{O}(H)) = H.$$

### 3.2. $\mathcal{O}$ -ideals.

We recall:

**Proposition 3.2.** *The map  $v : I \mapsto vI$  establishes an order preserving bijection between the  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals and the final segments of  $vK$ ; its inverse map is  $S \mapsto I_S = v^{-1}(S)$ .*

Therefore, we can expect to read off information about an  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$  from the invariance group of the associated final segment  $vI$ . We start with the case of  $I = \mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$ . Note that for every  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$  with maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals.

**Lemma 3.3.** *For every  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$  with maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$(29) \quad H(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{G}(v\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{G}(v\mathcal{M}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(v\mathcal{O})) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(v\mathcal{M})).$$

*Further,  $v\mathcal{O}$  is the disjoint union of  $H(\mathcal{O}) = v\mathcal{O}^\times$  and  $H(\mathcal{O})^+ = v\mathcal{M}$ , with  $H(\mathcal{O}) < v\mathcal{M}$ .*

*Proof.* Denote the valuation associated with  $\mathcal{O}$  by  $w$ . For every  $a \in \mathcal{O}^\times$  and every  $b \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have  $wa = 0 < wb$ . By the contrapositive of implication (20), this implies that  $H(\mathcal{O}) = v\mathcal{O}^\times < v\mathcal{M}$ , which shows that  $v\mathcal{O}$  is the disjoint union of  $v\mathcal{O}^\times = H(\mathcal{O})$  and  $v\mathcal{M}$ . Here we have used that  $H(\mathcal{O}) = v\mathcal{O}^\times$  by definition. Thus,  $v\mathcal{O} = H(\mathcal{O})^-$  and  $v\mathcal{M} = H(\mathcal{O})^+$ . Now (29) follows from part 5) of Lemma 2.19 and Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Take any  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$ . Then  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(vI))$  is the largest of all rings  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$  with the property that  $I$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal.*

*Proof.* We have that  $I$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal if and only if  $I\mathcal{O} = I$ , which by Proposition 3.2 is equivalent to  $vI + v\mathcal{O} = vI\mathcal{O} = vI$ . From Lemma 3.3 we know that  $v\mathcal{O} = H(\mathcal{O}) \cup v\mathcal{M}$  with  $H(\mathcal{O}) < v\mathcal{M}$ . Therefore,  $vI + v\mathcal{O} = (vI + H(\mathcal{O})) \cup (vI + v\mathcal{M})$ . Since  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_v$ , we have  $vI + v\mathcal{M} \subseteq vI$ . It follows that  $vI + v\mathcal{O} = vI$  is equivalent to  $vI + H(\mathcal{O}) = vI$ , which in turn holds if and only if  $H(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(vI)$ . By means of Proposition 3.1, this is equivalent to  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(vI))$ .  $\square$

### 3.3. The invariance valuation ring of an $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal.

Take an  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$ . We set

$$(30) \quad \mathcal{O}(I) := \{b \in K \mid bI \subseteq I\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}(I) = \{b \in K \mid bI \subsetneq I\} \cup \{0\}.$$

For example, for every  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$  with maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{O} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}.$$

Further,  $\mathcal{O}(K) = \mathcal{O}(\{0\}) = K$  and  $\mathcal{M}(K) = \mathcal{M}(\{0\}) = \{0\}$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** *For every  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(I)$  is a valuation ring of  $K$  with maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M}(I)$  and containing  $\mathcal{O}_v$ . It is the largest of all valuation rings  $\mathcal{O}$  of  $K$  for which  $I$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal. Further,  $\mathcal{O}(I)^\times = \{b \in K \mid bI = I\}$ .*

*Proof.* It is straightforward to prove that  $\mathcal{O}(I)$  is a ring. As  $I$  is an  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal, we have that  $\mathcal{O}_v I = I$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{O}_v \subseteq \mathcal{O}(I)$ . By general valuation theory, it follows that  $\mathcal{O}(I)$  is a valuation ring.

The inclusion  $\{b \in K \mid bI = I\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(I)^\times$  holds since  $bI = I \Leftrightarrow I = b^{-1}I$  for  $b \neq 0$ . The converse inclusion holds since if  $b, b^{-1} \in \mathcal{O}(I)$ , then  $I = bb^{-1}I \subseteq bI \subseteq I$  and thus,  $bI = I$ .

In every valuation ring, the unique maximal ideal consists precisely of all non-units. Hence by what we have already proved, the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}(I)$  is  $\mathcal{O}(I) \setminus \{b \in K \mid bI = I\} = \mathcal{M}(I)$ .

Finally, it follows directly from the definition that if  $\mathcal{O}$  is a valuation ring of  $K$  such that  $I$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal, then  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}(I)$ . On the other hand, it also follows from the definition that  $I$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(I)$ -ideal; therefore,  $\mathcal{O}(I)$  is the largest of all valuation rings of  $K$  with this property.  $\square$

By this theorem and Lemma 3.4 we find that

$$(31) \quad \mathcal{O}(I) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(vI)),$$

which shows that definition (30) is coherent with definition (25). Keeping in mind that  $H(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{G}(v\mathcal{O})$  by (29), we define

$$H(I) := \mathcal{G}(vI).$$

**Lemma 3.6.** 1) For every  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$ ,

$$\mathcal{O}(I) = \mathcal{O}(H(I)) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(vI)) \quad \text{and} \quad H(I) = H(\mathcal{O}(I)) = \mathcal{G}(vI).$$

2) Take  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideals  $I$  and  $IJ$ . Then  $\mathcal{O}(IJ) = \mathcal{O}(I) \cup \mathcal{O}(J)$ .

*Proof.* 1): From the definition of  $H(I)$  and equation (31), we obtain  $\mathcal{O}(I) = \mathcal{O}(H(I)) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(vI))$ . Applying Proposition 3.1 and the definition of  $H(I)$  gives us  $H(\mathcal{O}(I)) = H(\mathcal{O}(H(I))) = H(I) = \mathcal{G}(vI)$ .

2): We have  $\mathcal{G}(vIJ) = \mathcal{G}(vI + vJ) = \mathcal{G}(vI) \cup \mathcal{G}(vJ)$  by part 2) of Lemma 2.19. Our statement follows from this by means of Proposition 3.1,  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** Take  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$  and an  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$ .

1) We have that  $I\mathcal{O}$  is an  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal with

$$(32) \quad vI\mathcal{O} = vI + H(\mathcal{O}).$$

2) If  $0 \neq a \in K$ , then

$$va\mathcal{O}(I) = va^- + \mathcal{G}(vI).$$

3) Denote by  $w$  the valuation associated with  $\mathcal{O}$ . Then the primage of  $wI = vI/H(\mathcal{O})$  in  $vK$  is equal to  $vI\mathcal{O}$ .

*Proof.* 1): We compute:  $vI\mathcal{O} = vI + v\mathcal{O} = vI + (H(\mathcal{O}) \cup H(\mathcal{O})^+) = (vI + H(\mathcal{O})) \cup (vI + H(\mathcal{O})^+)$ , where we have used Lemma 3.3. Since  $H(\mathcal{O})^+$  consists only of positive elements, we have  $vI + H(\mathcal{O})^+ \subseteq vI$ . Since  $0 \in H(\mathcal{O})$ , we have  $vI \subseteq vI + H(\mathcal{O})$ . Thus,  $(vI + H(\mathcal{O})^+) \cup (vI + H(\mathcal{O})) = vI + H(\mathcal{O})$ .

2): By equations (31) and (26),  $v\mathcal{O}(I) = v\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(vI)) = \mathcal{G}(vI)^-$ . It follows that  $va\mathcal{O}(I) = va + v\mathcal{O}(I) = va + 0^- + \mathcal{G}(vI) = va^- + \mathcal{G}(vI)$ , where we have used equation (8) twice.



3): In view of equation (24), the primage of  $wI$  in  $vK$  is  $vI + H(\mathcal{O})$ . By part 1) of our lemma, this is equal to  $vI\mathcal{O}$ .  $\square$

### 3.4. The equation $I_1J = I_2$ .

We will use Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 to deduce the results in this section from our results in Section 2.

The proof of the following facts is straightforward.

**Lemma 3.8.** 1) For  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1, I_2$  and  $J$ , the equation

$$(33) \quad I_1J = I_2$$

holds if and only if

$$(34) \quad vI_1 + vJ = vI_2.$$

2) An  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$  is principal if and only if the final segment  $vI$  of  $vK$  is principal.

If  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals, then

$$(I_2 : I_1) := \{a \in K \mid aI_1 \subseteq I_2\}$$

is an  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal. Consequently,  $J = (I_2 : I_1)$  is the largest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal that satisfies  $I_1J \subseteq I_2$ . Our aim now is to use the results of Section 2 to compute  $(I_2 : I_1)$  and to determine under which conditions the equation  $I_1(I_2 : I_1) = I_2$  holds. The statements in the next lemma follow from the definition of  $\Delta S$  and part 1) of Lemma 2.12.

**Lemma 3.9.** Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ . We have

$$(35) \quad v(I_2 : I_1) = \{\alpha \in vK \mid \alpha + vI_1 \subseteq vI_2\}.$$

In particular,

$$(36) \quad v(\mathcal{O}_v : I_1) = \{\alpha \in vK \mid \alpha + vI_1 \geq 0\} = \Delta vI_1,$$

and

$$(37) \quad v(I_2(\mathcal{O}_v : I_1)) = vI_2 + \Delta vI_1 = vI_2 -_{\text{fs}} vI_1.$$

For every  $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{R}$  with associated valuation  $w$  and every proper  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal  $J$ , we define:

$$\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}} := \begin{cases} a\mathcal{O} & \text{if there exists } a \in K \text{ such that } wa \text{ is the infimum of } wJ, \text{ and} \\ J & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence,  $\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}} = I_{w\hat{J}}$ . We will call  $\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}}$  the **closure of  $J$  as an  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal**. If  $wJ$  is closed in  $wK$ , then  $\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}} = J$ .

The next result follows from equation (13) of part 7) of Lemma 2.12.

**Proposition 3.10.** For every proper  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideal  $J$ ,

$$\mathcal{O} : (\mathcal{O} : J) = \hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}}.$$

For every proper  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $J$ , we define:

$$J^{\diamond} := I_{(vJ)^{\diamond}}.$$

We have the following characterizations of  $J^{\diamond}$ :

**Proposition 3.11.** *Take any  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $J$ .*

- 1) *The ideal  $J^\diamond$  is the closure of  $J$  as an  $\mathcal{O}(J)$ -ideal, that is,  $J^\diamond = \hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}(J)}$ .*
- 2) *We have*

$$(J^2 : J) = J^\diamond.$$

*Hence if  $vJ/\mathcal{G}(vJ)$  is closed in  $vK/\mathcal{G}(vJ)$ , then  $(J^2 : J) = J$ .*

*Proof.* 1): By Theorem 3.5,  $J$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(J)$ -ideal. Denote by  $w$  the valuation associated with  $\mathcal{O}(J)$ . Then  $\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}(J)} = I_{\widehat{wJ}}$ , that is,  $w\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}(J)} = \widehat{wJ}$ . By part 1) of Lemma 3.6, we have  $H(\mathcal{O}(J)) = \mathcal{G}(vJ)$ . By part 3) of Lemma 2.29,  $(vJ)^\diamond$  is the preimage of  $vJ/\widehat{\mathcal{G}(vJ)} = vJ/\widehat{H(\mathcal{O}(J))} = \widehat{wJ} = w\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}(J)}$  in  $vK$ . Applying part 3) of Lemma 3.7, we obtain that  $J^\diamond = I_{(vJ)^\diamond} = \hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}(J)}\mathcal{O}(J) = \hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}(J)}$ , where the last equality holds since  $\hat{J}_{\mathcal{O}(J)}$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(J)$ -ideal.

2): This follows from Corollary 2.32.  $\square$

We now consider solutions  $J$  of equation (33).

**Theorem 3.12.** *Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  and assume that  $J = J_0$  is a solution of equation (33). Set  $J_1 := J_0\mathcal{O}(I_2)$ . Then the following statements hold.*

- 1) *If  $I_1\mathcal{O}(I_2)$  is a principal  $\mathcal{O}(I_2)$ -ideal, then  $(I_2 : I_1) = J_1$ .*
- 2) *If  $I_1\mathcal{O}(I_2)$  is a nonprincipal  $\mathcal{O}(I_2)$ -ideal, then  $(I_2 : I_1) = J_1^\diamond$ .*

*Proof.* Denote by  $w$  the valuation associated with  $\mathcal{O}(I_2)$ . By part 1) of Lemma 3.6, we have  $H(\mathcal{O}(I_2)) = \mathcal{G}(vI_2)$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} wI_1\mathcal{O}(I_2) &= v(I_1\mathcal{O}(I_2))/H(\mathcal{O}(I_2)) = vI_1/H(\mathcal{O}(I_2)) + v\mathcal{O}(I_2)/H(\mathcal{O}(I_2)) \\ &= vI_1/H(\mathcal{O}(I_2)) + (0/H(\mathcal{O}(I_2)))^- = vI_1/H(\mathcal{O}(I_2)) = vI_1/\mathcal{G}(vI_2). \end{aligned}$$

By part 2) of Lemma 3.8,  $I_1\mathcal{O}(I_2)$  is a principal  $\mathcal{O}(I_2)$ -ideal if and only if  $wI_1\mathcal{O}(I_2)$  is principal. Now statements 1) and 2) follow from Proposition 2.30.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.13.** *Take proper  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ . Then  $v(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1) = (\Delta vI_1)^\diamond$  and*

$$(38) \quad vI_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1) = vI_2 \text{ -dfs } vI_1.$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $w$  the valuation associated with  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ . By part 1) of Proposition 2.36,  $(\Delta vI_1)^\diamond$  is the preimage of  $\Delta(vI_1/H(\mathcal{O}(I_1))) = \Delta wI_1$ . By equation (36) with  $w$  in place of  $v$ , the latter is equal to  $w(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$ . The preimage of the latter in  $vK$  is  $v(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1) + H(\mathcal{O}(I_1)) = v((\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)\mathcal{O}(I_1))$ , but as  $(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$  is an  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal, this is equal to  $v(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$ . We have now proved the first assertion of our lemma. Further, we compute:  $vI_2 \text{ -dfs } vI_1 = vI_2 + (\Delta vI_2)^\diamond = vI_2 + v(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1) = v(I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1))$ ; this proves equation (38).  $\square$

From Theorems 2.33 and 3.12 together with equation (37) we obtain:

**Theorem 3.14.** *Take proper  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ .*

- 1) *The equation (33) has a solution if one of the following cases holds:*
  - a)  *$I_1$  is principal,*
  - b)  *$\mathcal{O}(I_1) \subsetneq \mathcal{O}(I_2)$  and  $I_1$  is a nonprincipal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal,*

c)  $\mathcal{O}(I_1) = \mathcal{O}(I_2)$  and  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are nonprincipal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideals,

d)  $\mathcal{O}_v \neq \mathcal{O}(I_1) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(I_2)$  and  $I_1$  is a principal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal.

In cases a)-c),  $J = I_2(\mathcal{O}_v : I_1)$  is a solution. In case d), write  $I_1 = a\mathcal{O}(I_1)$  for some  $a \in I_1$ ; then  $J = a^{-1}I_2$  is a solution. In all cases,  $J = I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$  is a solution.

If none of the above cases holds, that is, one of the cases

i)  $\mathcal{O}(I_2) \subsetneq \mathcal{O}(I_1)$ , or

ii)  $\mathcal{O}(I_1) = \mathcal{O}(I_2)$  and  $I_1$  is a nonprincipal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal, but  $I_2$  is a principal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal,

holds, then equation (33) has no solution.

2) If one of the cases of part 1) holds, then

$$I_1(I_2 : I_1) = I_2,$$

and  $(I_2 : I_1)$  is equal to:

- $I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$  in cases a), b) and d),
- $(I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1))^\diamond$  in case c).

*Proof.* 1): Since  $\mathcal{O}(I) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}(vI))$  for every  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal  $I$  by equation (31), we know that  $\mathcal{O}(I_1) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(I_2)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{G}(vI_1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(vI_2)$ . By part 2) of Lemma 3.8,  $I_1$  is principal if and only if  $vI_1$  is principal, and if  $w$  denotes the valuation associated with  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ , then by Lemma 3.8 with  $w$  in place of  $v$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $I_i$  is a principal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal if and only if  $wI_i = vI_i/\mathcal{G}(I_1)$  is principal. Further, by part 1) of Lemma 3.8,  $I_1J = I_2$  holds if and only if  $vI_1 + vJ = vI_2$ . Now our assertions about the existence and the nonexistence of solutions follow from Theorem 2.33.

The assertions about the particular solutions follow from Theorem 2.33 together with equation (37) of Lemma 3.9 and equation (38) of Lemma 3.13.

2): As  $J = (I_2 : I_1)$  is the largest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal that satisfies  $I_1J \subseteq I_2$ , it is the largest solution of the equation  $I_1J = I_2$  if any solution exists. Therefore, our statements follow from part 1) together with Theorem 3.12.  $\square$

The following theorem addresses question (QID4) in the case where no solution to equation (33) exists; we derive it from Theorem 2.38. For the translation of the properties of final segments to the properties of ideals, see the proof of Theorem 3.14.

**Theorem 3.15.** *Take proper  $\mathcal{O}$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ .*

1) *Assume that  $\mathcal{O}(I_2) \subsetneq \mathcal{O}(I_1)$ . Then there exists a nontrivial maximal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal  $I'_2$  contained in  $I_2$ . We have that  $I'_2 \subsetneq I_2$ . Further,  $J = I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$  is the largest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal such that  $I_1J \subset I_2$ ; it is the largest solution of  $I_1J = I'_2$ .*

2) *Assume that  $\mathcal{O}(I_1) = \mathcal{O}(I_2)$  and  $I_1$  is a nonprincipal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal, but  $I_2$  is a principal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideal, say  $I_2 = a\mathcal{O}(I_1)$  for some  $a \in K$ . Then  $J = I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$  is the largest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal such that  $I_1J \subset I_2$ ; it is the largest solution of  $I_1J = a\mathcal{M}(I_1) = I_2\mathcal{M}(I_1) \subsetneq I_2$ .*

### 3.5. Annihilators of quotients $I_1/I_2$ .

Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ . The annihilator of the quotient  $I_1/I_2$  is  $(I_2 : I_1)$ . In general, the equation  $I_1J = I_2$  is not solvable and  $J = (I_2 : I_1)$  will not be a solution, but it will be the largest  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal such that  $I_1J \subset I_2$ . However, in the situation appearing in the papers [2, 3], we have  $I_1 = U$  and  $I_2 = UV$  for  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $U, V$ . Then  $J = V$  is a solution of  $I_1J = I_2$  and our task is just to compute the largest solution  $(I_1J : I_1)$ , which we do in the next theorem.

**Theorem 3.16.** *Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I$  and  $J$ . Then the annihilator of  $I/IJ$  is*

$$(IJ : I) = \begin{cases} J\mathcal{O}(IJ) & \text{if } I\mathcal{O}(IJ) \text{ is a principal } \mathcal{O}(IJ)\text{-ideal, and} \\ (J\mathcal{O}(IJ))^\diamond & \text{if } I\mathcal{O}(IJ) \text{ is a nonprincipal } \mathcal{O}(IJ)\text{-ideal.} \end{cases}$$

*In the special case where  $\mathcal{O}(I) = \mathcal{O}(J)$ , we have  $I\mathcal{O}(IJ) = I$  and  $J\mathcal{O}(IJ) = J$ .*

*Proof.* Our assertions follow from Theorem 3.12. If  $\mathcal{O}(I) = \mathcal{O}(J)$ , then  $\mathcal{O}(IJ) = \mathcal{O}(I) \cup \mathcal{O}(J) = \mathcal{O}(I) = \mathcal{O}(J)$  by part 2) of Lemma 3.6, which yields our last assertion.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.17.** *Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ . If the annihilator of  $I_1/I_2$  is  $\mathcal{M}_v$ , then  $I_1$  is a principal  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideal.*

*Proof.* If  $I_1$  is nonprincipal, then by part 3) of Lemma 2.8 we obtain  $vI_1 = vI_1 + 0^+ = vI_1 + v\mathcal{M}_v$ , whence  $I_1 = I_1\mathcal{M}_v$ . As  $\mathcal{M}_v$  annihilates  $I_1/I_2$ , it follows that  $I_1 = I_1\mathcal{M}_v \subseteq I_2$ . This means that  $I_1/I_2$  is zero, so that its annihilator is  $\mathcal{O}_v$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.18.** *1) Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ . Then the annihilator of  $I_1/I_2$  is equal to  $\mathcal{M}_v$  if and only if  $I_1$  is principal and  $I_2 = I_1\mathcal{M}_v$ .*

*2) Take  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I$  and  $J$ . Then the annihilator of  $I/IJ$  is equal to  $\mathcal{M}_v$  if and only if  $I$  is principal and  $J = \mathcal{M}_v$ .*

*Proof.* 1) Assume that  $I_1$  is principal and  $I_2 = I_1\mathcal{M}_v$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}_v$  annihilates  $I_1/I_2$ . On the other hand,  $I_2 = I_1\mathcal{M}_v \subsetneq I_1$ , so  $I_1/I_2$  is not zero and  $\mathcal{O}_v$  does not annihilate it. Thus,  $\mathcal{M}_v$  is the annihilator of  $I_1/I_2$ .

In order to prove the reverse implication, assume that  $\mathcal{M}_v$  is the annihilator of  $I_1/I_2$ . From Lemma 3.17 we infer that  $I_1$  must be principal, say  $I_1 = (a)$  for some  $a \in K$ . As  $\mathcal{M}_v$  annihilates  $I_1/I_2$ , we have  $a\mathcal{M}_v = I_1\mathcal{M}_v \subseteq I_2$ . We cannot have  $a\mathcal{M}_v \subsetneq I_2$  since then  $(a) \subseteq I_2$  so that  $I_1/I_2$  is zero and  $\mathcal{O}_v$  is its annihilator. Thus we have  $I_2 = a\mathcal{M}_v = I_1\mathcal{M}_v$ .

2): By part 1), applied to  $I_1 = I$  and  $I_2 = IJ$ , the annihilator of  $I/IJ$  is equal to  $\mathcal{M}_v$  if and only if  $I$  is principal and  $IJ = I\mathcal{M}_v$ . As  $I$  is principal, the latter is equivalent to  $J = \mathcal{M}_v$ .  $\square$

Finally, we treat the general case. From Theorems 3.14 and 3.15, we obtain:

**Theorem 3.19.** *Take proper  $\mathcal{O}_v$ -ideals  $I_1, I_2$ . Then the annihilator of  $I_1/I_2$  is  $I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)^\diamond$  if  $\mathcal{O}(I_1) = \mathcal{O}(I_2)$  and  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are nonprincipal  $\mathcal{O}(I_1)$ -ideals, and  $I_2(\mathcal{O}(I_1) : I_1)$  otherwise.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bazzoni, S. – Salce, L.: *Groups in the class semigroups of valuation domains*, Israel J. Math. **95** (1996), 135–155
- [2] Cutkosky, S. D. – Kuhlmann, F.-V. – Rzepka, A.: *On the computation of Kähler differentials and characterizations of Galois extensions with independent defect*, submitted; <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10022>
- [3] Cutkosky, S. D. – Kuhlmann, F.-V.: *Kähler differentials of extensions of valuation rings and deeply ramified fields*, submitted; <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.04967>
- [4] Engler, A.J. – Prestel, A.: *Valued fields*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005
- [5] Fornasiero, A. – Mamino, M.: *Arithmetic of Dedekind cuts of ordered abelian groups*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **156** (2008), 210–244
- [6] Fuchs, L. – Salce, L.: *Modules over non-Noetherian domains*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **84**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001
- [7] Kuhlmann, F.-V.: *Selected methods for the classification of cuts and their applications*, Proceedings of the ALANT 5 conference 2018, Banach Center Publications **121** (2020), 85–106
- [8] Kuhlmann, F.-V. - Kuhlmann, S. - Fornasiero, A.: *Towers of complements to valuation rings and truncation closed embeddings of valued fields*, Journal of Algebra **323** (2010), 574–600
- [9] Kuhlmann, F.-V.: *Invariance group and invariance valuation ring of a cut*, manuscript available at <https://www.fvkuhlmann.de/CUTS.pdf>
- [10] Olivos, E. – Schikhof, W. H.: *Extending the multiplication of a totally ordered group to its completion*, Advances in non-Archimedean analysis, 231–242, Contemp. Math. **551**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011
- [11] Zariski, O. – Samuel, P.: *Commutative Algebra*, Vol. II, New York–Heidelberg–Berlin, 1960

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SZCZECIN, UL. WIELKOPOLSKA 15, 70-451 SZCZECIN, POLAND

*Email address:* [fvk@usz.edu.pl](mailto:fvk@usz.edu.pl)