

ON PRODUCT-ONE SEQUENCES OVER SUBSETS OF GROUPS

VICTOR FADINGER AND QINGHAI ZHONG

ABSTRACT. Let G be a group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a subset. A sequence over G_0 means a finite sequence of terms from G_0 , where the order of elements is disregarded and the repetition of elements is allowed. A product-one sequence is a sequence whose elements can be ordered such that their product equals the identity element of the group. We study algebraic and arithmetic properties of monoids of product-one sequences over finite subsets of G and over the whole group G , with a special emphasis on the infinite dihedral group.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a subset. Elements of the free abelian monoid over G_0 are called sequences over G_0 . Thus, in combinatorial language, a sequence over G_0 means a finite sequence of terms from G_0 , where the order of elements is disregarded and the repetition of elements is allowed, and the concatenation of sequences corresponds to the multiplication in the free abelian monoid. A product-one sequence is a sequence whose elements can be ordered such that their product equals the identity element of the group. Thus, the set $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ of product-one sequences over G_0 is a submonoid of the free abelian monoid over G_0 .

The study of sequences, in particular the study of their structure under extremal properties, is a classical topic in additive combinatorics. The monoid of product-one sequences arises naturally in various subfields of algebra, from abstract semigroup theory, to factorization theory, and to invariant theory. For a long time the focus of interest was in the abelian setting, but the last decade has seen a growing interest for the non-abelian setting. There is work on combinatorial invariants (including small and large Davenport constants and Erdős-Ginzburg-Ziv constants [16, 30, 31, 4, 34, 23, 25, 26]), on problems stemming from invariant theory (including work on Noether numbers [8, 7, 6, 9]), and on algebraic properties of the monoid $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ ([29, 28, 10]).

All work in the non-commutative setting was restricted so far to finite groups. In the present paper we study sequences over finite subsets of arbitrary groups (note that there are infinite torsion groups having finite sets of generators). In Section 3, we provide an in-depth study of algebraic properties of the monoid $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ for subsets of arbitrary groups. Under certain conditions, we characterize when $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is Krull, root closed, finitely generated, or a C-monoid (Theorem 3.11). For the whole group G , we establish characterizations for being weakly Krull, or seminormal, and more (Theorem 3.14). In Section 4, we investigate arithmetical invariants of monoids of product-one sequences, where our focus is on sets of lengths. Based on these results for general groups, Section 5 offers explicit algebraic characterizations for the finiteness of key arithmetical invariants, including the catenary degree, the k th elasticities, local tame degrees,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20M12, 20M13, 11B30, 13A50.

Key words and phrases. product-one sequences, Davenport constant, v -noetherian monoids, sets of lengths, dihedral groups.

This work was supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF (Projects W1230 and P33499-N) and by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12001331).

and more in the special case of finite subsets of infinite dihedral groups (Theorem 5.1) and for the whole group (Theorem 5.2).

2. PRELIMINARIES

We denote by \mathbb{N} the set of positive integers and we put $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For real numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $[a, b] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : a \leq x \leq b\}$ the discrete interval between a and b .

Monoids. A *monoid* means a commutative, unitary and cancellative semigroup. Our notation and terminology for ideal theory and the arithmetic of monoids are consistent with [24, 18]. We briefly gather some key notions. Let H be a monoid and $\mathfrak{q}(H)$ its quotient group. There are three common closure operations for a monoid H , namely

- $H' = \{x \in \mathfrak{q}(H) : \text{there is } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } x^n \in H \text{ for all } m \geq n\}$ is called the *seminormalization* of H ,
- $\tilde{H} = \{x \in \mathfrak{q}(H) : \text{there is } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } x^n \in H\}$ is called the *root closure* of H and
- $\hat{H} = \{x \in \mathfrak{q}(H) : \text{there is } c \in H \text{ such that } cx^n \in H \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is called the *complete integral closure* of H .

A monoid H is called *seminormal* (resp. *root closed*, resp. *completely integrally closed*) if $H = H'$ (resp. \tilde{H} , resp. \hat{H}).

Note the following two facts:

1. $H \subseteq H' \subseteq \tilde{H} \subseteq \hat{H}$ (the first two inclusions being clear, the third follows from [18, Proposition 2.7.11]).
2. H is seminormal if and only if for every $x \in \mathfrak{q}(H)$ we have that $x^2, x^3 \in H$ implies $x \in H$ (e.g. see [32, Lemma 2.4]).

A monoid homomorphism $\varphi : H \rightarrow D$ is

- a *divisor homomorphism* if for all $a, b \in H$ we have that $\varphi(a) \mid_D \varphi(b)$ implies $a \mid_H b$;
- *cofinal* if for all $a \in D$, there exists $b \in H$ such that $a \mid_D \varphi(b)$.

A submonoid $H \subseteq D$ is called *saturated* if the inclusion $H \hookrightarrow D$ is a divisor homomorphism (equivalently, $\mathfrak{q}(H) \cap D = H$) and it is called *divisor closed* if for all $d \in D$ and $h \in H$ we have that $d \mid_D h$ implies $d \in H$. A monoid H is said to have a *divisor theory* if there exists a divisor homomorphism $\varphi : H \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(P)$ into a free abelian monoid over some set P such that, for every $p \in P$, there is a finite nonempty subset $X \subseteq H$ with $p = \gcd(\varphi(X))$.

Let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{q}(H)$. We set $(H : X) = \{y \in \mathfrak{q}(H) : yX \subseteq H\}$ and $X_v = (H : (H : X))$. We say X is

- an *s-ideal* if $X \subseteq H$ and $XH = X$;
- a *v-ideal* if $X \subseteq H$ and $X = X_v$.
- a *t-ideal* if $X \subseteq H$ and

$$X = \bigcup_{E \subset X \text{ nonempty and finite}} E_v.$$

We denote by $s\text{-spec}(H)$ the set of all nonempty prime s -ideals of H and by $\mathfrak{X}(H)$ the set of all nonempty minimal prime s -ideals of H .

A monoid is *v-noetherian* if it satisfies the ascending chain condition for v -ideals and a monoid is a *Krull monoid* if it is completely integrally closed and v -noetherian (equivalently, if it has a divisor theory). A list of further equivalent conditions can be found in [18, Theorems 2.3.11 and 2.4.8]. If H is a Krull monoid and $F = \mathcal{F}(P)$ is a free abelian monoid such that $H_{\text{red}} \subseteq F$ and

the inclusion $H_{\text{red}} \hookrightarrow F$ is a divisor theory (such an F always exists), then F is called a *monoid of divisors* and P a *set of prime divisors* for H . In the given case, we call $\mathcal{C}(H) = F/H_{\text{red}}$ the *divisor class group* (or just *class group*) of H . Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime s -ideal. We denote by $H_{\mathfrak{p}} = \{s_1/s_2 \in \mathfrak{q}(H) : s_1 \in H \text{ and } s_2 \in H \setminus \mathfrak{p}\}$ the localization of H at \mathfrak{p} . A monoid H is called a *weakly Krull monoid* ([24, Corollary 22.5]) if

$$H = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(H)} H_{\mathfrak{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(H) : a \in \mathfrak{p}\} \text{ is finite for all } a \in H.$$

Let D be a monoid and $H \subseteq D$ a submonoid. Two elements $y, y' \in D$ are called *H -equivalent* if $y^{-1}H \cap D = y'^{-1}H \cap D$ (equivalently: If $x \in D$, then $yx \in H$ if and only if $y'x \in H$). This is a congruence relation on D and for $y \in D$ we denote its congruence class by $[y]_H^D$. We set

$$\mathcal{C}(H, D) = \{[y]_H^D : y \in D\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}^*(H, D) = \{[y]_H^D : y \in D \setminus D^\times \cup \{1_D\}\},$$

the first being called the *class semigroup* of $H \subseteq D$ and the latter the *reduced class semigroup* of $H \subseteq D$. A monoid H is called a *C-monoid* if it is a submonoid of a factorial monoid F such that $H^\times = H \cap F^\times$ and the reduced class semigroup $\mathcal{C}^*(H, F)$ is finite. To emphasize the fact that H is a C-monoid as a submonoid of the factorial monoid F , we also say that H is a C-monoid defined in F . Every Krull monoid H with finite divisor class group is a C-monoid in $H^\times \times F$, where F is a monoid of divisors for H . We refer to ([18, Chapter 2.8 and 2.9], [32, 21]) for background on C-monoids and for further examples.

Monoids of product-one sequences. Let G be a multiplicatively written group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a subset. The submonoid generated by G_0 will be denoted by $[G_0]$, while the notation for the subgroup generated by G_0 is $\langle G_0 \rangle$. If $g, h \in G$, then the commutator of g and h is the element $[g, h] = g^{-1}h^{-1}gh \in G$. The commutator subgroup of G is $G' = \langle [g, h] : g, h \in G \rangle$.

Elements of the free abelian monoid over G_0 will be called *sequences* (over G_0). Our notation on sequences is consistent with [23, 9]. We recall and fix notation for the key objects needed in the sequel. To begin with, let $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$ denote the free abelian monoid over G_0 . Then every element $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ has a unique representation of the form

$$S = \prod_{i=1}^n g_i^{[m_i]},$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $m_1, \dots, m_n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $g_1, \dots, g_n \in G_0$. In order to distinguish the group multiplication from the operation on $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$, we denote the first by " \cdot " (and avoid it when possible) and the latter by " \cdot ". For the same reason, if $g \in G_0$, the sequence $g \cdot \dots \cdot g$ of length n is denoted $g^{[n]}$, whence $g^{[n]} \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ and $g^n \in G$. Let $S = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_\ell \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ be a sequence. Then $|S| = \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is the *length* of S , $\text{supp}(S) = \{g_1, \dots, g_\ell\}$ is the *support* of S , and

$$\pi(S) = \{g_{\sigma(1)} \cdot \dots \cdot g_{\sigma(n)} \in G : \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \text{ is a permutation of } [1, n]\}$$

is the *product set* of S . If $T, S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$, then T *divides* S , denoted by $T \mid S$, provided there exists $U \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ such that $TU = S$. In this case T is called a *subsequence* of S .

We say that S is

- a *product-one sequence* if $1_G \in \pi(S)$,
- *product-one free* if $1_G \notin \pi(T)$ for any $1 \neq T \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ with $T \mid S$.

The set

$$\mathcal{B}(G_0) = \{S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) : 1_G \in \pi(S)\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$$

is a reduced submonoid of $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$, called the *monoid of product-one sequences* over G_0 . We denote by $\mathcal{A}(G_0)$ its set of irreducible elements and by

$$D(G_0) = \sup\{|S|: S \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)\} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$$

the (*large*) *Davenport constant* of G_0 .

We call G_0 *condensed* if every element of G_0 is in the support of some sequence in $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ (equivalently, if $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is cofinal). If $G_0 \subseteq G$, then $G_1 = \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)} \text{supp}(S) \subseteq G_0$ is the maximal condensed subset of G_0 and $\mathcal{B}(G_1) = \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. If G_0 is condensed, then $[G_0] = \langle G_0 \rangle$. It is obvious, that $[G_0] \subseteq \langle G_0 \rangle$. For the other inclusion let $g \in G_0$. Then by condensedness there exists $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $g \in \text{supp}(S)$, say $S = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_{|S|}$ with $1 = g_1 \dots g_{|S|}$ and $g = g_r$ for some $r \in [1, |S|]$. Then, since elements that are inverse to each other commute, we have that $1 = g_{r+1} \dots g_{|S|} g_1 \dots g_r$. Therefore $g^{-1} \in \pi(S \cdot g^{[-1]})$, so $g^{-1} \in [G_0]$ and $\langle G_0 \rangle \subseteq [G_0]$ follows. We will use this fact and the argument of its proof throughout the manuscript without further reference. For simplicity of notation, many statements will be formulated for condensed subsets, which entails no restriction in generality.

3. ALGEBRAIC PROPERTIES OF $\mathcal{B}(G)$ AND $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$

This section contains our main algebraic results (Propositions 3.3, 3.6, and Theorems 3.11 and 3.14). Parts of these results were known before for abelian groups and for finite groups. We start with some elementary remarks on monoids of product-one sequences. For the following lemma, we denote the set $\{g \in G: \text{there is } S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) \text{ such that } g \in \pi(S)\}$ by $\pi(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset such that $\langle G_0 \rangle = G$. Then $\pi(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = G' = \pi(\mathcal{B}(G))$. Moreover,*

$$\{S \in \mathcal{F}(G): |S| = 1, S \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))\} = \{S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0): |S| = 1, \text{supp}(S) \subseteq G'\}.$$

Proof. Note that for every sequence $S \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, we have that $\pi(S) \subseteq G'$. Then $\pi(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \subseteq \pi(\mathcal{B}(G)) \subseteq G'$. To show $G' \subseteq \pi(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$, it suffices to show $ghg^{-1}h^{-1} \in \pi(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ for every $g, h \in G$. Let $g, h \in G = \langle G_0 \rangle = [G_0]$. Then there exist $S_g, S_h, S_{g^{-1}}, S_{h^{-1}} \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ such that $g \in \pi(S_g)$, $h \in \pi(S_h)$, $g^{-1} \in \pi(S_{g^{-1}})$, and $h^{-1} \in \pi(S_{h^{-1}})$. Therefore $\{1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}\} \subseteq \pi(S_g \cdot S_h \cdot S_{g^{-1}} \cdot S_{h^{-1}})$ and we are done.

For the moreover statement, let $S = g \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ with $S = \frac{S_1}{S_2} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$, where $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Then $\text{supp}(S) \subseteq G_0$ and $\pi(S_1), \pi(S_2) \subseteq G'$, whence $g \in \pi(S_1) \subseteq G'$, i.e., $\text{supp}(S) \subseteq G'$. For the other inclusion, let $S = g \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ with $g \in G'$. Then $g^{-1} \in G'$ and hence $g^{-1} \in \pi(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$. There exists $T \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $g^{-1} \in \pi(T)$, whence $S = \frac{g \cdot T}{T} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ and we are done. \square

In view of the previous lemma we obtain the following: If $G_0 \subseteq \langle G_0 \rangle'$ (in case $G_0 = G$, we speak of *perfect groups*), then $\mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{F}(G_0))$, since by $\{S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0): |S| = 1\} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ it follows that $\mathcal{F}(G_0) \subseteq \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$. Therefore $\mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0) = \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. If $\langle G_0 \rangle'$ is trivial, it is well known that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is saturated in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$. In this sense we can consider the commutator subgroup $\langle G_0 \rangle'$ to be a measure of how non-saturated $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is.

The first statement of the following lemma is known for finite groups ([29, Lemma 3.3]). Nonetheless, we provide its simple proof.

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a subset.*

1. A submonoid $H \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is divisor closed if and only if there exists a subset $G_1 \subseteq G_0$ such that $H = \mathcal{B}(G_1)$.
2. Let $G_1 \subseteq G_0$ be a subset consisting of torsion elements. Then G_1 is a condensed subset and $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is a divisor-closed submonoid of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$.

Proof. 1. Let $G_1 \subseteq G_0$. Then clearly $\mathcal{B}(G_1) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is divisor closed. Conversely, let $H \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ be a divisor closed submonoid. We define $G_1 = \bigcup_{B \in H} \text{supp}(B)$ and hence $H \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_1)$. Let $S = g_1 \cdots g_n \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$, where $g_1, \dots, g_n \in G_1$. By the definition of G_1 , there exist $T_1, \dots, T_n \in H$ such that $g_i \in \text{supp}(T_i)$ for all $i \in [1, n]$. It follows that $g_i^{-1} \in \pi(T_i \cdot g_i^{[-1]})$ for all $i \in [1, n]$ and hence $1 \in \pi(g_1^{-1} \cdots g_n^{-1}) \subseteq \pi(T_1 \cdots T_n \cdot g_1^{[-1]} \cdots g_n^{[-1]})$. Therefore S divides $T_1 \cdots T_n$ in $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$. By $H \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ being divisor closed, we obtain $S \in H$ and we are done.

2. It is sufficient to show that G_1 is condensed. But this is clear, since for all $g \in G_1$ we have that $g^{[\text{ord}(g)]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$. \square

Lemma 3.2.2 need not be true in the non-torsion case. Indeed, if $G = \langle a, b : a^n = b^n = 1 \rangle$ and $G_0 = \{a, b, ab\}$, then a and b have finite order, but ab has infinite order. Moreover, G_0 is condensed, since $ab \cdot a^{[n-1]} \cdot b^{[n-1]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, but $G_1 = \{ab\}$ is not.

Our next result generalizes and refines [9, Theorem 3.2.1]. Let G be a group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a subset. The set

$$\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* = \{S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) : \pi(S) \subseteq \langle G_0 \rangle'\}$$

is a monoid with

$$\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0).$$

If $\langle G_0 \rangle$ is abelian, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0) = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$, and if $\langle G_0 \rangle$ is perfect, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* = \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. Thus, in both extremal cases, $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a Krull monoid, and the next proposition shows that this holds true in all cases.

Proposition 3.3. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset such that $\langle G_0 \rangle = G$.*

1. The map

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0) &\rightarrow G/G' \\ [S]_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0)} &\mapsto gG' \text{ for any } g \in \pi(S), \end{aligned}$$

is a group isomorphism.

2. $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is a saturated submonoid of $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$. In particular, $\mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*)$ and $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a Krull monoid.
3. $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is a divisor theory if and only if for all $g \in G_0$ we have that $[hG' : h \in G_0] = [hG' : h \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$. In this case, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) \cong G/G'$.
4. Suppose $|G| \neq 2$. Then the inclusion $\mathcal{B}(G)^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(G)$ is a divisor theory, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G)^*) \cong G/G'$ and each class contains precisely $|G'|$ prime divisors.
5. The following are equivalent.
 - (a) $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is saturated.
 - (b) The map $\varphi : \mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}, \mathcal{F}(G_0)) \rightarrow G/G'$ defined by $\varphi([S]_{\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}^{\mathcal{F}(G_0)}}) = gG'$, where $g \in \pi(S)$, is an isomorphism.
 - (c) $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$.

Proof. 1. First, note that G_0 is condensed if and only if $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is cofinal, whence $\mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a group. For $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ we denote $[S]_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$ by $[S]$ and recall that $[S_1] = [S_2]$ if and only if there exist $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $S_1 \cdot C_1 = S_2 \cdot C_2$.

To show that Φ is well-defined, let $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ with $[S_1] = [S_2]$ and let $g_1 \in \pi(S_1)$ and $g_2 \in \pi(S_2)$. Then there exist $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $S_1 \cdot C_1 = S_2 \cdot C_2$. As $g_1 \in \pi(S_1) \subseteq \pi(S_1 \cdot C_1) = \pi(S_2 \cdot C_2) \subseteq g_2 G'$, we obtain $g_1 G' = g_2 G'$.

Obviously, Φ is a group homomorphism. For the surjectivity, let $g \in G = \langle G_0 \rangle = [G_0]$. Then there is $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ such that $g \in \pi(S)$. To prove injectivity, let $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ with $g_1 \in \pi(S_1), g_2 \in \pi(S_2)$ such that $g_1 G' = g_2 G'$. Then there exists $h \in G'$ such that $g_1 = g_2 h$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists $T \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with $h \in \pi(T)$. Since $G = [G_0]$, there is a sequence $W \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ such that $g_1^{-1} \in \pi(W)$, whence $1 = g_1 g_1^{-1} \in \pi(S_1 \cdot W \cdot T)$ and $1 = g_2 h g_1^{-1} \in \pi(S_2 \cdot T \cdot W)$. Note that $S_1 \cdot (S_2 \cdot T \cdot W) = S_2 \cdot (S_1 \cdot W \cdot T)$ and hence $[S_1] = [S_2]$.

2. Let $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$. Then $\pi(S) \subseteq G'$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists $T \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $1 \in \pi(S \cdot T)$. Therefore $S = \frac{S \cdot T}{T} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. Let $S \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. Then there exist $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $S = \frac{S_1}{S_2}$, whence $\pi(S) \subseteq \pi(S_1)\pi(S_2)^{-1} \subseteq G'G' = G'$. Therefore $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$.

We proved $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. Since $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \subseteq \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$, we obtain $\mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. It follows that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a saturated submonoid of $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$. In particular, as a saturated submonoid of a Krull monoid, $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is Krull [18, Proposition 2.4.4.3].

3. Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is a divisor theory and let $g \in G_0$. It suffices to show $gG' \in [fG' : f \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$. Note that for every $h \in G_0$, there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S_1, \dots, S_n \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ such that $h = \gcd(S_1, \dots, S_n)$. If $h \neq g$, then there exists $i \in [1, n]$ such that $v_h(S_i) > 0$ and $v_g(S_i) = 0$. Assume that $S_i = h \cdot h_1 \cdot \dots \cdot h_t$ with $h h_1 \dots h_t \in G'$, where $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_1, \dots, h_t \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}$. Then $h^{-1}G' = (h_1 G') \dots (h_t G') \in [fG' : f \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$. This implies that $[fG' : f \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$ is indeed an abelian group. If $h = g$, then there exists $i \in [1, n]$ such that $v_g(S_i) = 1$, whence $g^{-1}G' \in [fG' : f \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$. It follows by the fact that $[fG' : f \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$ is a group that $gG' \in [fG' : f \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$.

Suppose for all $g \in G_0$, we have that $[hG' : h \in G_0] = [hG' : h \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}]$. To show $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is a divisor theory, by 2., it suffices to prove for every $g \in G_0$, there exist $T_1, \dots, T_n \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ such that $g = \gcd(T_1, \dots, T_n)$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $g \in G_0$. Note that $[G_0] = G$, whence $[hG' : h \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}] = G/G'$. So there exists $W = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_\ell \in \mathcal{F}(G_0 \setminus \{g\})$ such that $\pi(g \cdot W) \subseteq G'$. Furthermore, for every $j \in [1, \ell]$, there exists $W_j \in \mathcal{F}(G_0 \setminus \{g_j\})$ such that $\pi(g \cdot W_j) \subseteq G'$. It follows that $\gcd(g \cdot W, g \cdot W_1, \dots, g \cdot W_\ell) = g$ and we are done. If this is the case, we obtain that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) = \mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ just by the very definition of the class group [18, Definition 2.4.9]. Since by 2. we have that $\mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$, we obtain by 1. that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) = \mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* = \mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0) \cong G/G'$.

4. If $|G| = 1$, the statement is trivial. Suppose $|G| \geq 3$. By 3. we just need to show that $G = [G \setminus \{g\}]$ for all $g \in G$. Let $g \in G$. Then there is $h \in G \setminus \{1, g\}$ such that $g = h(h^{-1}g) \in [G \setminus \{g\}]$ and we are done.

It remains to prove the statement on the prime divisors. Let $S \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ with $g \in \pi(S)$ and let $h \in G$. It suffices to show $[S] = [h]$ if and only if $h \in gG'$. In fact, if $[S] = [h]$, then there exist $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G)^*$ such that $h = \frac{S \cdot C_1}{C_2}$ and hence $h \in \pi(S)\pi(C_1)\pi(C_2)^{-1} \subseteq gG'$. If $h \in gG'$, then $h g^{-1} \in G'$ and thus $h \cdot g^{-1}, S \cdot g^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$. It follows that $S \cdot (h \cdot g^{-1}) = h \cdot (S \cdot g^{-1})$.

5. (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) Since G_0 is condensed, we obtain $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ and hence $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ are cofinal. By 1., we have that $\mathcal{F}(G_0)/\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0) \cong G/G'$. By [18, Prop. 2.8.7.3], the map φ is a well-defined epimorphism and $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is saturated if and only if φ is an isomorphism.

(a) \Leftrightarrow (c) It follows by 2. that $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is saturated if and only if $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \mathfrak{q}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0) = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_0) = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset such that $\langle G_0 \rangle = G$. If G' is torsion or G_0 consists of torsion elements, then $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \overline{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is Krull.*

Proof. We just proved in Proposition 3.3, that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a Krull monoid, having the same quotient group as $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Therefore $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ and it suffices to show $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$.

Let $S = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_\ell \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ and $g \in \pi(S)$. We have to verify that $S \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$. If G' is torsion, then g has finite order, whence $S^{[\text{ord}(g)]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and $S \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$. If G_0 consists of torsion elements, then for $\alpha = \text{lcm}\{\text{ord}(g_i) : i \in [1, \ell]\}$, we have that $S^{[\alpha]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, whence $S \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$. \square

The above statement provides sufficient conditions implying that $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$. However, in general, iterated complete integral closures of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ may still be proper submonoids of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$, even for finite subsets G_0 .

Example 3.5. Let $G = \langle a, b \rangle$ be the free group with two generators and consider the subset $G_0 = \{a, a^{-1}, b, b^{-1}, aba^{-1}b^{-1}\}$. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0) = \overline{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$, but $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subsetneq \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$.

Proof. It is easy to see, that $\mathcal{A}(G_0) = \{a \cdot a^{-1}, b \cdot b^{-1}, aba^{-1}b^{-1} \cdot a \cdot a^{-1} \cdot b \cdot b^{-1}\}$ and that therefore $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is factorial, since the occurrence of the commutator element $aba^{-1}b^{-1}$ in a sequence determines its factorization uniquely. Thus $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is completely integrally closed, but $aba^{-1}b^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let G be a group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a subset consisting of torsion elements. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (a) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is Krull.
- (b) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is root closed.
- (c) $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is saturated.
- (d) $\mathcal{B}(G_0) = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) is by definition and (c) \Rightarrow (a) is by [18, Proposition 2.4.4.3].

(b) \Rightarrow (c) By Lemma 3.2, we know G_0 is condensed. It follows by Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 3.3.2, that $\mathcal{B}(G_0) = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a saturated submonoid of $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$.

(b) \Rightarrow (d) is clear by Lemma 3.4 and (d) \Rightarrow (b) follows from Proposition 3.3. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset. Then $s\text{-spec}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{\mathfrak{p}_X : X \subseteq G_0\}$, where $\mathfrak{p}_X = \{S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) : \text{there is } g \in X \text{ such that } v_g(S) \geq 1\}$. In particular, $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \subseteq \{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0\}$.*

1. If $G_0 = G$ or G_0 consists of torsion elements, then equality holds and $|\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))| = |G_0|$.
2. If $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0\}$, then $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$.

Proof. Let $X \subseteq G_0$. Clearly, \mathfrak{p}_X is a prime s -ideal of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$. So it remains to show that every prime s -ideal can be written in such a form. Let $P \in s\text{-spec}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus P$ is a divisor closed submonoid. By Lemma 3.2, we obtain $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus P = \mathcal{B}(G_1)$ for some $G_1 \subseteq G_0$. Therefore

$$P = \{S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) : \text{there is } g \in G_0 \setminus G_1 \text{ such that } v_g(S) \geq 1\} = \mathfrak{p}_{G_0 \setminus G_1}.$$

By definition, we know $X \subseteq X'$ implies $\mathfrak{p}_X \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_{X'}$, whence $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \subseteq \{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0\}$.

Suppose $G_0 = G$. It suffices to show $\{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G\} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G))$. Note that $g \cdot g^{-1} \in \mathfrak{p}_g \setminus \mathfrak{p}_h$ for all $h \in G \setminus \{g, g^{-1}\}$ and if $g \neq g^{-1}$, then $g^{[2]} \cdot g^{-2} \in \mathfrak{p}_g \setminus \mathfrak{p}_{g^{-1}}$, where $g, h \in G$. Therefore $\mathfrak{p}_g \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_h$ for any distinct elements $g, h \in G$ and we are done.

Suppose G_0 consists of torsion elements. It suffices to show $\{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0\} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$. Note that $g^{[\text{ord}(g)]} \in \mathfrak{p}_g \setminus \mathfrak{p}_h$ for all $g \in G_0$ and all $h \in G_0 \setminus \{g\}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{p}_g \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_h$ for any distinct elements $g, h \in G_0$ and we are done.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0\}$ and that $S \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Say $S = \frac{U}{T}$, where $U, T \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ with $\text{supp}(U) \cap \text{supp}(T) = \emptyset$. We have to prove that $T = 1_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)}$. Since for every $g \in G_0$ we have that $S = \frac{U_g}{T_g}$ with $U_g, T_g \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and $g \notin \text{supp}(T_g)$, it follows by $U \cdot T_g = U_g \cdot T$ that $g \notin \text{supp}(T)$ for all $g \in G_0$, what proves the assertion. \square

If G is a finite group, it is well-known (and for the convenience of the reader this will also follow from Theorem 3.11) that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a C-monoid. The next statement shows that this is never the case for infinite groups.

Proposition 3.8. *Let G be a group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset.*

1. If G_0 is infinite, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not a C-monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$.
2. If G is infinite, then $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is not a C-monoid.
3. If $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$, then $\langle G_0 \rangle / \langle G_0 \rangle'$ is finite.

Proof. 1. Suppose G_0 is infinite. Let $g \in G_0$ and $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ such that $g \cdot S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Then for every $h \in G_0$ with $[h]_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}^{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} = [g]_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}^{\mathcal{F}(G_0)}$, we have that $h \cdot S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, whence

$$\left\{ h \in G_0 : [h]_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}^{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} = [g]_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}^{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} \right\} \subseteq \{h \in G_0 : h^{-1} \in \pi(S)\} \quad \text{is finite.}$$

Therefore $\{[h]_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}^{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} : h \in G_0\}$ and hence $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0), \mathcal{F}(G_0))$ are infinite.

2. Assume to the contrary that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a C-monoid. By [18, Theorem 2.9.11.2], it follows that $\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G)})$ is finite and $(\mathcal{B}(G) : \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G)}) \neq \emptyset$. If G' is finite, then by Proposition 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, we know $\mathcal{C}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G)}) \cong G/G'$ is infinite, a contradiction. Suppose G' is infinite.

If G' is torsion, then by Proposition 3.3 $\{S \in \mathcal{F}(G') : |S| = 1\} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)^*) = \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G))$ and for all $g \in G'$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^{[n]} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, whence $\{S \in \mathcal{F}(G') : |S| = 1\} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G)}$. Let $U \in (\mathcal{B}(G) : \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G)})$. Then $U \cdot g \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ for all $g \in G'$, whence $G' \subseteq \pi(U)$ must be finite, a contradiction.

If G' is not torsion, then there exists an element $g \in G'$ such that $\text{ord}(g) = \infty$. Then $\mathcal{B}(\langle g \rangle) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G)$ is a divisor closed submonoid, but is a Krull monoid with infinite class group, whence not a C-monoid. Therefore $\mathcal{B}(G)$ cannot be a C-monoid, because divisor closed submonoids of C-monoids are C-monoids by [18, Theorem 2.9.15.1].

3. Since G_0 is condensed, $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is cofinal and by Proposition 3.3 and [18, Theorem 2.8.7.1], there exists an epimorphism $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0), \mathcal{F}(G_0)) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0) \cong \langle G_0 \rangle / \langle G_0 \rangle'$, which completes the proof, since $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0), \mathcal{F}(G_0))$ is finite by definition, as $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a reduced C-monoid. \square

The next example shows that in the proof of Proposition 3.8.1 it is necessary to assume that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$. Moreover, we can see that the statements " $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid" and " $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$ " are not equivalent.

Example 3.9. Let X be a set, G be the free group over X , and $G_0 = \{x, x^{-1} : x \in X\}$. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid, but not a C-monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$.

Proof. Since the elements of X have no relations, a sequence $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is a product-one sequence if and only if for all $g \in G_0$ we have that $v_g(S) = n$ implies $v_{g^{-1}}(S) = n$. Therefore the elements of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ are of the form $g_1^{[n_1]} \cdot (g_1^{-1})^{[n_1]} \cdot \dots \cdot g_r^{[n_r]} \cdot (g_r^{-1})^{[n_r]}$ for $g_i \in X$ and $r, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathcal{A}(G_0) = \{g \cdot g^{-1} : g \in X\}$ and we obtain the factoriality of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$. By definition, every factorial monoid is a C-monoid in itself. To see that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not a C-monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$, just note that for every $x \in X$ we have that $x, x^{[2]}, x^{[3]}, \dots$ are all in different classes. \square

Let H be a monoid and $a \in H$. We set $\llbracket a \rrbracket$ to be the submonoid of H consisting of all the divisors of powers of a . H is said to be

- a *G-monoid* if there exists $a \in H$ such that $H = \llbracket a \rrbracket$ is a divisor closed submonoid generated by a (or equivalently if $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in s\text{-spec}(H) \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \mathfrak{p} \neq \emptyset$; for a list of equivalent conditions see [18, Lemma 2.7.7]),
- *finitary* if it is a BF-monoid (see Section 4) and there exist $n, M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u_1, \dots, u_n \in H \setminus H^\times$ such that $(H \setminus H^\times)^M \subseteq \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}H$, where $(H \setminus H^\times)^M = \{a_1 \cdot \dots \cdot a_M : a_i \in H \setminus H^\times\}$. In that case $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ is called a *finite almost generating set* of H (for background on finitary monoids we refer to [18, Chapters 2.7 and 4.4]).

Finitely generated monoids are v -noetherian G-monoids, and v -noetherian G-monoids are finitary (see [18, Theorems 2.7.9 and 2.7.13]), but none of the converse implication holds. The next proposition characterizes when monoids of product-one sequences are finitary. Theorem 3.11, in combination with Example 5.12, shows that a finitary monoid of product-one sequences need not be a G-monoid.

Proposition 3.10. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitary if and only if there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and nonempty sequences $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that for all nonempty sequences $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, there exists $i \in [1, n]$ with $\text{supp}(A_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(S)$. In particular, if G_0 is finite, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitary.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitary. Then there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a finite almost generating set A_1, \dots, A_n , and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all nonempty sequences $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ there exists $i \in [1, n]$ with $A_i \mid_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} S^{[m]}$, whence $\text{supp}(A_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(S^{[m]}) = \text{supp}(S)$.

On the other hand, suppose there are $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that for every nonempty sequence $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, there exists $i \in [1, n]$ such that $\text{supp}(A_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(S)$. Since $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a BF-monoid, it suffices to show there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}\})^M \subseteq \{A_1, \dots, A_n\} \cdot \mathcal{B}(G_0)$.

Set $m = \max\{|A_i| : i \in [1, n]\}$ and $M = n(m-1) + 1$. Let $S_1, \dots, S_M \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}\}$. Then there exists $i \in [1, n]$, say $i = 1$, such that there exists a subset $I \subseteq [1, M]$ with $|I| = m$

and $\text{supp}(A_1) \subseteq \text{supp}(S_j)$ for all $j \in I$. After renumbering if necessary, we may assume that $I = [1, m]$. Suppose $A_1 = g_1 \cdots g_\ell$, where $\ell \leq m$ and $g_1, \dots, g_\ell \in G_0$, and let $T_i = S_i \cdot g_i^{[-1]}$ for all $i \in [1, \ell]$. Therefore $g_i^{-1} \in \pi(T_i)$ for all $i \in [1, \ell]$. It follows by $1 \in \pi(A_1)$ that

$$1 \in \pi(g_1^{-1} \cdots g_\ell^{-1}) \subseteq \pi(T_1 \cdots T_\ell) \subseteq \pi(S_1 \cdots S_\ell \cdot A_1^{[-1]}) \subseteq \pi(S_1 \cdots S_M \cdot A_1^{[-1]}),$$

whence $S_1 \cdots S_M \in A_1 \cdot \mathcal{B}(G_0)$.

For the "in particular" statement, we suppose G_0 is finite. Let $E \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ be a maximal subset such that for any two distinct $S_1, S_2 \in E$, we have that $\text{supp}(S_1) \neq \text{supp}(S_2)$. It follows by the fact that G_0 has only finitely many subsets that E is finite, whence the assertion follows. \square

Theorem 3.11. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset.*

1. *The following statements are equivalent.*
 - (a) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a G -monoid.
 - (b) G_0 is finite.
 - (c) $s\text{-spec}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ is finite.
 - (d) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a finitely generated Krull monoid.
2. *The following statements are equivalent.*
 - (a) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated.
 - (b) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a G -monoid and $\text{D}(G_0) < \infty$.
 - (c) G_0 is finite and $\text{D}(G_0) < \infty$.

If, in addition, G_0 consists of torsion elements, then the following conditions are also equivalent to the conditions 2(a) – 2(c) listed above.

- (d) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C -monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$ and G_0 is finite.
- (e) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C -monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$.
- (f) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C -monoid and G_0 is finite.
- (g) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is v -noetherian and G_0 is finite.
- (h) G_0 is finite.

Proof. 1. (a) \Rightarrow (b) If $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a G -monoid, then there exists $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $\mathcal{B}(G_0) = \llbracket S \rrbracket = \mathcal{B}(\text{supp}(S))$. Since G_0 is condensed, it follows that $G_0 = \text{supp}(S)$ is finite.

(b) \Rightarrow (c) If G_0 is finite, then there are only finitely many subsets of G_0 and the assertions follows by Proposition 3.7.

(c) \Rightarrow (a) follows from [18, Lemma 2.7.7].

(b) \Rightarrow (d) Let G_0 be finite. We say $S_1 \leq S_2$ if $S_1 \mid_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} S_2$, where $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. Then Dickson's Lemma [18, Theorem 1.5.3] implies $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ has finitely many minimal elements, say A_1, \dots, A_n , where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition 3.3, it follows that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a Krull monoid and hence it suffices to show $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) \subseteq \{A_i : i \in [1, n]\}$. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*)$. Then there exists $i \in [1, n]$ such that $A_i \mid_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} A$. Since $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a saturated submonoid of $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$ by Proposition 3.3, we obtain $A \cdot A_i^{[-1]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ and hence $A = A_i$.

(d) \Rightarrow (b) Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is finitely generated and suppose $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since G_0 is condensed, we obtain $G_0 = \bigcup_{i \in [1, n]} \text{supp}(A_i)$ is finite.

2. (b) \Rightarrow (c) follows from 1.

(a) \Rightarrow (b) Every finitely generated monoid is a G -monoid by [18, Theorem 2.7.13]. Moreover, if $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated, then $\mathcal{A}(G_0)$ is finite, whence $\text{D}(G_0) < \infty$.

(c) \Rightarrow (a) Suppose G_0 and $D(G_0)$ are both finite. Then the set $\{S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) : |S| \leq D(G_0)\}$ is finite and the assertion follows by the fact that $\mathcal{A}(G_0) \subseteq \{S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) : |S| \leq D(G_0)\}$.

Now suppose G_0 consists of torsion elements. Then (d) \Rightarrow (f) and (g) \Rightarrow (h) follow by definition, (f) \Rightarrow (g) is just [18, Theorem 2.9.13] and (e) \Rightarrow (d) follows by Proposition 3.8. It suffices to show (h) \Rightarrow (a) \Rightarrow (e).

(h) \Rightarrow (a) Let G_0 be finite and let

$$E = \{S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) : v_g(S) < \text{ord}(g) \text{ for all } g \in G_0\}.$$

Then E is finite and for every $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ there exists precisely one $T \in E$ such that $v_g(A) \equiv v_g(T) \pmod{\text{ord}(g)}$ for all $g \in G_0$, whence $A \cdot T^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}(P)$, where $P = \{g^{\text{ord}(g)} : g \in G_0\}$ is finite.

For every $T \in E$, we set

$$W_T = \{A \cdot T^{-1} : A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \text{ and } v_g(A) \equiv v_g(T) \pmod{\text{ord}(g)} \text{ for all } g \in G_0\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(P).$$

To show $\mathcal{A}(G_0)$ is finite, it is sufficient to show W_T is finite for all $T \in E$. Let $T \in E$. If there exist $U, V \in W_T$ such that $U \mid_{\mathcal{F}(P)} V$, then $U \cdot T$ divides $V \cdot T$ in $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ which implies $U = V$. We say $U \leq V$ if $U \mid_{\mathcal{F}(P)} V$ for $U, V \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. Thus every element of W_T can be viewed as a minimal element of W_T . Note that $\mathcal{F}(P) \cong \mathbb{N}_0^{|G_0|}$. It follows by Dickson's Lemma [18, Theorem 1.5.3] that W_T is finite.

(a) \Rightarrow (e) Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated. Then G_0 is finite, as we already proved 2.(a) being equivalent to 2.(c). Note that G_0 consists of torsion elements. Let $\alpha = \text{lcm}\{\text{ord}(g) : g \in G_0\}$. Then for all $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$, we have that $S^{[\alpha]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. It follows by [9, Proposition 2.6.3] that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid defined in $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$. \square

Remark 3.12. Neither Proposition 3.6 nor Theorem 3.11.2 hold true in the non-torsion case, since for both, Example 5.11 is a counterexample with just one non-torsion element. Also we cannot conclude that finite G_0 implies $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated in the non-torsion case, as this example shows. To see that G_0 finite need not imply $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid, we take a look at $G = \mathbb{Z}$ and $G_0 = \{1, -1, 2, -2\}$. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a finitely generated Krull monoid with infinite class group, hence not a C-monoid.

Before stating the next theorem, we need the following elementary lemma for avoiding too many calculations. We will use it without further mention.

Lemma 3.13. *Let G be a group such that the commutator subgroup G' is an elementary 2-group and $G' \subseteq Z(G)$ is a subgroup of the center $Z(G) = \{g : gh = hg \text{ for all } h \in G\}$ and let $g, f, h \in G$.*

1. $[g, h] = [h^{-1}, g] = [h, g]$.
2. $[fh, g] = [f, g][h, g]$.
3. $[fh, gf] = [f, h][f, g][h, g]$.

Proof. 1. Since every non-trivial element of G' has order 2, we obtain $[g, h] = [g, h]^{-1} = [h, g]$. On the other hand we have that $[g, h] = g^{-1}h^{-1}gh = hh^{-1}(g^{-1}h^{-1}gh) = h(g^{-1}h^{-1}gh)h^{-1} = hg^{-1}h^{-1}g = [h^{-1}, g]$.

2. $[fh, g] = h^{-1}f^{-1}g^{-1}fhg = h^{-1}(f^{-1}g^{-1}fg)g^{-1}f^{-1}fhg = [f, g][h, g]$.

3. Just apply 1. and 2. repeatedly and use the fact that G' is abelian. \square

On the one hand, the next theorem generalizes the fact that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is Krull if and only if G is abelian to arbitrary groups. On the other hand, the additional equivalent statements that are formulated show us reasons why $\mathcal{B}(G)$ fails to be Krull for non-abelian G . Since one of these is the root closedness of $\mathcal{B}(G)$, one could ask if it also lacks seminormality and except for a rare case where $|G'| = 2$, non-seminormality holds true.

Since the notion of *transfer Krull monoid* appears in the next theorem, but is more recent, we want to recall its definition. A monoid homomorphism $\theta : H \rightarrow D$ is called a *transfer homomorphism* if it has the following two properties:

- (T1) $D = \theta(H)D^\times$ and $\theta^{-1}(D^\times) = H^\times$.
- (T2) If $u \in H$, $b, c \in D$ and $\theta(u) = bc$, then there exist $v, w \in H$ such that $u = vw$, $\theta(v) \simeq b$ and $\theta(w) \simeq c$.

Now a monoid H is said to be *transfer Krull* if there exists a transfer homomorphism from H into a Krull monoid.

Theorem 3.14. *Let G be a group.*

1. *The following are equivalent.*
 - (a) *G is abelian.*
 - (b) *$\mathcal{B}(G)$ is Krull.*
 - (c) *$\mathcal{B}(G)$ is completely integrally closed.*
 - (d) *$\mathcal{B}(G)$ is root closed.*
 - (e) *$\mathcal{B}(G)$ is weakly Krull.*
 - (f) *$\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a transfer Krull monoid.*
 - (g) *$\mathcal{B}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G)$ is saturated.*
2. *$\mathcal{B}(G)$ is seminormal if and only if $|G'| \leq 2$.*
3. *$\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a C -monoid if and only if $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a G -monoid if and only if G is finite.*

Proof. 1. By definition, (a) \Rightarrow (g) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (d), (a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (e), and (a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (f) are clear.

(d) \Rightarrow (a) Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is root closed and assume to the contrary, that G is non-abelian. Thus there exist $g, h \in G$ such that $gh \neq hg$. If $gh^2 = h^2g$ and $gh^3 = h^3g$, then $gh^3 = h^3g = hgh^2$, whence $gh = hg$, a contradiction. Therefore $gh^2 \neq h^2g$ or $gh^3 \neq h^3g$. We distinguish three cases.

If $gh^2 = h^2g$, then $T = h \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) = \frac{h \cdot g^{-1} \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) \cdot g}{g \cdot g^{-1}} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$, but $T^{[2]} = h^{[2]} \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, a contradiction to our assumption that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is root closed.

If $gh^3 = h^3g$, then $T = h \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$, but $T^{[3]} = h^{[3]} \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) \cdot (gh^{-1}g^{-1}) \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, a contradiction to our assumption that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is root closed.

If $gh^2 \neq h^2g$ and $gh^3 \neq h^3g$, then

$$T = g \cdot (h^2g^{-1}h^{-2}) \cdot h \cdot h^{-1} = \frac{g \cdot h^{-1} \cdot h^{-1} \cdot (h^2g^{-1}h^{-2}) \cdot h \cdot h}{h \cdot h^{-1}} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G),$$

but $T^{[2]} = g^{[2]} \cdot h^{-1} \cdot h^{-1} \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h \cdot h \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, a contradiction to our assumption that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is root closed.

(e) \Rightarrow (a) Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a weakly Krull monoid. We claim that $\mathcal{B}(G)^* = \mathcal{B}(G)$. If this holds, then for every element $g \in G'$, the sequence g is a product-one sequence. Therefore G' is

trivial and hence G is abelian. In fact we will show

$$\mathcal{B}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G)^* \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G))} \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathcal{B}(G).$$

In view of Proposition 3.7, it suffices to prove $\mathcal{B}(G)^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$ for all $x \in G$.

We first show $ghg^{-1}h^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$ for all $x \in G$ and $g, h \in G$. Let $g, h \in G$ and $f = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$. If $f = 1$, then $f \in \bigcap_{x \in G} \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$. Suppose $f \neq 1$. Then $\{hg, g^{-1}h^{-1}\} \cap \{h, h^{-1}, g, g^{-1}\} = \emptyset$. Since

$$f = \frac{f \cdot hg \cdot g^{-1}h^{-1}}{hg \cdot g^{-1}h^{-1}} = \frac{f \cdot g \cdot g^{-1} \cdot h \cdot h^{-1}}{g \cdot g^{-1} \cdot h \cdot h^{-1}} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)),$$

and $f \cdot hg \cdot g^{-1}h^{-1}, f \cdot g \cdot g^{-1} \cdot h \cdot h^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G),$

we know $f \in \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$ for all $x \in G$.

Next, we show that $f \in \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$ for all $x \in G$, where $f \in G'$. Let $f \in G' = [ghg^{-1}h^{-1} : g, h \in G]$ and let $x \in G$. Then there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \{ghg^{-1}h^{-1} : g, h \in G\}$ such that $f = f_1 \dots f_k$. For each $i \in [1, k]$, there exists $S_i \in \mathcal{B}(G) \setminus \mathfrak{p}_x$ such that $f_i \cdot S_i \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, whence $S = S_1 \dots S_k \in \mathcal{B}(G) \setminus \mathfrak{p}_x$ and $f \cdot S \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. Therefore $f = (f \cdot S)/S \in \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$.

Finally we prove $\mathcal{B}(G)^* \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$ for all $x \in G$. Let x_1G and $A \in \mathcal{F}(G)$ with $\pi(A) \subseteq G'$ be arbitrary. For any $f \in \pi(A) \subseteq G'$, we have that $f \in \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$ as shown in the previous paragraph. Then there exists $S \in \mathcal{B}(G) \setminus \mathfrak{p}_x$ such that $f \cdot S \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, which implies that $A \cdot S \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ and hence $A = (A \cdot S)/S \in \mathcal{B}(G)_{\mathfrak{p}_x}$.

(f) \Rightarrow (a) Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a transfer Krull monoid. Then there is a transfer homomorphism $\theta: \mathcal{B}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, where $G_0 \subseteq G_1$ and G_1 is an abelian group. Assume to the contrary that G is non-abelian. Then there exist $g, h \in G$ such that $gh \neq hg$.

Suppose $gh^2 = h^2g$. Let $T = h \cdot gh^{-1}g^{-1}$ and $W = g \cdot g^{-1}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$, $T^{[2]} = h^{[2]} \cdot gh^{-1}g^{-1} \cdot gh^{-1}g^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, and $W, W \cdot T$ are atoms of $\mathcal{B}(G)$. It follows that $\theta(W)$ and $\theta(W \cdot T)$ are atoms of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Note that $\theta(W \cdot T)^2 = \theta(W^{[2]} \cdot T^{[2]}) = \theta(W)^2 \theta(T^{[2]})$. Then $\theta(W)$ divides $\theta(W \cdot T)$ in $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$, a contradiction to the fact that $\theta(W)$ and $\theta(W \cdot T)$ are both atoms.

Suppose $gh^2 \neq h^2g$ and $gh^3 = h^3g$. Let $T = h \cdot gh^{-1}g^{-1}$ and $W = g \cdot g^{-1}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$, $T^{[3]} = h^{[3]} \cdot gh^{-1}g^{-1} \cdot gh^{-1}g^{-1} \cdot gh^{-1}g^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, and $W, W \cdot T$ are atoms of $\mathcal{B}(G)$. It follows that $\theta(W)$ and $\theta(W \cdot T)$ are atoms of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Note that $\theta(W \cdot T)^{[3]} = \theta(W^{[3]} \cdot T^{[3]}) = \theta(W)^{[3]} \theta(T^{[3]})$. Then $\theta(W)$ divides $\theta(W \cdot T)$ in $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$, a contradiction to the fact that $\theta(W)$ and $\theta(W \cdot T)$ are both atoms.

Suppose $gh^2 \neq h^2g$ and $gh^3 \neq h^3g$. Let $T = g \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h \cdot h^{-1}$ and $W = h \cdot h^{-1}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$, $T^{[2]} = g^{[2]} \cdot (h^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$, and $W, W \cdot T$ are atoms of $\mathcal{B}(G)$. It follows that $\theta(W)$ and $\theta(W \cdot T)$ are atoms of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Note that $\theta(W \cdot T)^{[2]} = \theta(W^{[2]} \cdot T^{[2]}) = \theta(W)^{[2]} \theta(T^{[2]})$. Then $\theta(W)$ divides $\theta(W \cdot T)$ in $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$, a contradiction to the fact that $\theta(W)$ and $\theta(W \cdot T)$ are both atoms.

2. The proof for (\Leftarrow) is the same as in [29, Theorem 3.10]. It remains to prove (\Rightarrow) . Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is seminormal. Assume to the contrary that $|G'| \geq 3$. To get a contradiction, we will show that there exists a sequence $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$ such that $T^{[2]}, T^{[3]} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$.

Since G is non-abelian, there exist $g, h \in G$ such that $gh \neq hg$. If $gh^2 = h^2g$ and $gh^3 = hg^3$, then $gh = hg$, a contradiction. Therefore either $gh^2 \neq h^2g$ or $gh^3 \neq hg^3$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: There exist $g, h \in G$ such that $gh \neq hg$ and $gh^2 \neq h^2g$.

If $gh^3 \neq h^3g$, then let $T = g \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h \cdot h^{-1}$. Therefore $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} T^{[2]} &= g^{[2]} \cdot (h^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h^2g^{-1}h^{-2} \cdot h^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G), \\ T^{[3]} &= g^{[3]} \cdot (h^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot (h^2g^{-1}h^{-2})^{[3]} \cdot h^{[2]} \cdot h \cdot h^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G). \end{aligned}$$

Now we may assume $gh^3 = h^3g$. If $g^2h = hg^2$, then let $T = hgh^2 \cdot h^{-1}g^{-1} \cdot h^{-2}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} T^{[2]} &= hgh^2 \cdot hgh^2 \cdot h^{-1}g^{-1} \cdot h^{-2} \cdot h^{-1}g^{-1} \cdot h^{-2} \in \mathcal{B}(G), \\ T^{[3]} &= hgh^2 \cdot (h^{-2})^{[2]} \cdot (h^{-1}g^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot h^{-2} \cdot h^{-1}g^{-1} \cdot (hgh^2)^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G). \end{aligned}$$

If $g^2h \neq hg^2$ and $g^3h \neq hg^3$, then let $T = h \cdot g^2h^{-1}g^{-2} \cdot g \cdot g^{-1}$. Therefore $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} T^{[2]} &= h^{[2]} \cdot (g^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot g^2h^{-1}g^{-2} \cdot g^2h^{-1}g^{-2} \cdot g^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G), \\ T^{[3]} &= h^{[3]} \cdot (g^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot (g^2h^{-1}g^{-2})^{[3]} \cdot g^{[2]} \cdot g \cdot g^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $g^2h \neq hg^2$ and $g^3h = hg^3$. If $\text{ord}(ghg^{-1}h^{-1}) = 2$, then let $T = ghg^{-1} \cdot h^{-1}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{[2]} &= (ghg^{-1} \cdot h^{-1})^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G), \\ \text{and } T^{[3]} &= (ghg^{-1})^{[3]} \cdot (h^{-1})^{[3]} \in \mathcal{B}(G). \end{aligned}$$

If $ghgh = hghg$, then let $T = hg \cdot h^{-1}g^{-1}h \cdot h^{-1}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{[2]} &= (hg)^{[2]} \cdot (h^{-1}g^{-1}h \cdot h^{-1})^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G), \\ \text{and } T^{[3]} &= (h^{-1} \cdot hg)^{[3]} \cdot (h^{-1}g^{-1}h)^{[3]} \in \mathcal{B}(G) \quad (\text{note that } g^3h = hg^3). \end{aligned}$$

If $ghgh = h^2g^2$, then let $T = gh \cdot g^{-1}h^{-1}g \cdot g^{-1}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{[2]} &= (gh)^{[2]} \cdot g^{-1} \cdot (g^{-1}h^{-1}g)^{[2]} \cdot g^{-1} \in \mathcal{B}(G), \\ \text{and } T^{[3]} &= (g^{-1} \cdot gh)^{[3]} \cdot (g^{-1}h^{-1}g)^{[3]} \in \mathcal{B}(G) \quad (\text{note that } gh^3 = h^3g). \end{aligned}$$

If $\text{ord}(ghg^{-1}h^{-1}) \neq 2$, $ghgh \neq h^2g^2$, and $ghgh \neq hghg$, then let $T = ghg^{-1} \cdot h^{-1} \cdot h^{-1}gh \cdot g^{-1}$. Then $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{[2]} &= g^{-1} \cdot (ghg^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot g^{-1} \cdot (h^{-1})^{[2]} \cdot (h^{-1}gh)^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G), \\ \text{and } T^{[3]} &= (ghg^{-1})^{[3]} \cdot (h^{-1})^{[3]} \cdot (h^{-1}gh)^{[3]} \cdot (g^{-1})^{[3]} \in \mathcal{B}(G). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: For all $g, h \in G$ with $gh \neq hg$, we have that $gh^2 = hg^2$.

Then $G_1 = \langle h^2 : h \in G \rangle \subseteq Z(G) = \{g : gh = hg \text{ for every } h \in G\}$, whence G_1 is a normal subgroup of G . Since every element of G/G_1 has order at most 2, we obtain that G/G_1 is abelian and hence $G' \subseteq G_1 \subseteq Z(G)$. Therefore G' is an abelian group. Let $g, h \in G$ such that $gh \neq hg$. Since $G' \subseteq Z(G)$ it follows that

$$ghg^{-1}h^{-1}ghg^{-1}h^{-1} = gghg^{-1}h^{-1}hg^{-1}h^{-1} = 1,$$

whence $\text{ord}(ghg^{-1}h^{-1}) = 2$ and G' is an elementary 2-group. Therefore $|G'| \geq 4$ and we proceed by the following claim.

Claim A. *There exist distinct elements $g, h, f \in G$ such that the three elements $1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}, gfg^{-1}f^{-1}$ are distinct and $hfh^{-1}f^{-1} \notin \{1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}gfg^{-1}f^{-1}\}$.*

Proof of Claim A. Since G is non-abelian, there exist $g, h \in G$ such that $ghg^{-1}h^{-1} \neq 1$. Since $|G'| \geq 4$, there exists $x \in G'$ such that $x \notin \{1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}\}$. Note that $x \in \langle yzy^{-1}z^{-1} : y, z \in G \rangle$. Then there exist $u, v \in G$ such that $uvu^{-1}v^{-1} \notin \{1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}\}$, whence it follows that $|\{g, h\} \cap \{u, v\}| \leq 1$ by applying Lemma 3.13. From now on Lemma 3.13 will be used frequently without further mention for the rest of the argument. We distinguish two cases.

Suppose $|\{g, h\} \cap \{u, v\}| = 1$. By symmetry we may assume $g = u$. If $hvh^{-1}v^{-1} \notin \{1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}gvg^{-1}v^{-1}\}$, then g, h, v are the required three elements. If $hvh^{-1}v^{-1} = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$, then g, v, h are the required three elements. If $hvh^{-1}v^{-1} = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}gvg^{-1}v^{-1}$, then $g(gv)g^{-1}(gv)^{-1} = gvg^{-1}v^{-1}$ (note that $G' \subseteq Z(G)$) and $h(gv)h^{-1}(gv)^{-1} = hvh^{-1}v^{-1}ghg^{-1}h^{-1} = gvg^{-1}v^{-1}$, whence g, h, gv are the required three elements. If $hvh^{-1}v^{-1} = 1$, then $g(gv)g^{-1}(gv)^{-1} = gvg^{-1}v^{-1}$ and $h(gv)h^{-1}(gv)^{-1} = hvh^{-1}v^{-1}ghg^{-1}h^{-1} = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$, whence gv, g, h are the required three elements.

Suppose $|\{g, h\} \cap \{u, v\}| = 0$. If there exist $x \in \{g, h\}$ and $y \in \{u, v\}$ such that $xyx^{-1}y^{-1} \neq 1$, then by symmetry we may assume $x = g$ and $y = u$. If $gug^{-1}u^{-1} \neq ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$, then consider the elements g, h, u and go back to the previous case. If $gug^{-1}u^{-1} = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$, then $gug^{-1}u^{-1} \neq uvu^{-1}v^{-1}$, consider the elements u, g, v , and go back to the previous case. Therefore we may assume that the elements from $\{g, h\}$ commute with those from $\{u, v\}$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} (gu)h(gu)^{-1}h^{-1} &= guhu^{-1}g^{-1}h^{-1} = uu^{-1}ghg^{-1}h^{-1} = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}, \\ (gu)v(gu)^{-1}v^{-1} &= guvu^{-1}g^{-1}v^{-1} = gg^{-1}uvu^{-1}v^{-1} = uvu^{-1}v^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the elements gu, h, v and go back to the previous case.

□[End of proof of Claim A.]

By Claim A, we can choose distinct $g, h, f \in G$ such that the three elements $1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}, gfg^{-1}f^{-1}$ are distinct and $hfh^{-1}f^{-1} \notin \{1, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}, ghg^{-1}h^{-1}gfg^{-1}f^{-1}\}$. Consider the sequence $T = f^{-1}g^{-1}h^{-1}g^{-1}f^{-1} \cdot g \cdot gf \cdot fh$. To simplify the notation, we set $e_1 = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$, $e_2 = gfg^{-1}f^{-1}$, $e_3 = hfh^{-1}f^{-1}$, and $q = f^{-1}g^{-1}h^{-1}g^{-1}f^{-1}$. Note that $G' \subseteq \langle h^2 : h \in G \rangle \subseteq Z(G)$. We consider the following products.

- ① $qq(gf)(fh) = qq^2f^2h = f^{-1}g^{-1}h^{-1}gfh = f^{-1}g^{-1}h^{-1}ghh^{-1}fh = [g, h][f, h] = e_1e_3,$
- ② $qq(fh)(gf) = qggffh(fh)^{-1}(gf)^{-1}fhgf = [g, h][f, h][fh, gf] = [f, g] = e_2,$
- ③ $q(fh)g(gf) = qgfh(fh)^{-1}g^{-1}fhggf = [f, g][fh, g] = [h, g] = e_1,$
- ④ $q(fh)(gf)g = q(fh)g(gf)(gf)^{-1}g^{-1}gfg = [h, g][gf, g] = [h, g][f, g] = e_1e_2,$
- ⑤ $q(gf)(fh)g = q(fh)(gf)(gf)^{-1}(fh)^{-1}gffhg = [h, g][f, g][gf, fh] = [f, h] = e_3,$
- ⑥ $q(gf)g(fh) = [gf, h][g, f] = [f, h][f, g][g, h] = e_1e_2e_3.$

It follows that $\pi(T) \supseteq \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_1e_2, e_1e_3, e_1e_2e_3\}$, whence $1 \in \pi(T^{[2]})$ and $1 \in \pi(T^{[3]})$. Since $T \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G))$, it suffices to show $T \notin \mathcal{B}(G)$. Assume to contrary that $1 \in \pi(T)$. Then $1 \in \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_1e_2, e_1e_3, e_1e_2e_3\}$, a contradiction to the choice of the three elements g, h, f .

3. Theorem 3.11 implies that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a G-monoid if and only if G is finite. If G is finite, then $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is a C-monoid by [9, Theorem 3.2.1], and the converse follows by Proposition 3.8.2. □

4. ARITHMETIC PROPERTIES OF $\mathcal{B}(G)$ AND $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$

In this section, we study arithmetic properties of monoids of product-one sequences. Theorem 3.11 provides conditions ensuring that monoids of product-one sequences are finitely generated resp. C-monoids. The arithmetic of such monoids is well understood (see [18, Theorems 3.1.5, 3.3.4, 4.4.11, and 4.6.6]), and our goal is to obtain results beyond these classes of monoids (see Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 4.4). In Section 5, we get more precise results for infinite dihedral groups.

We recall some concepts from factorization theory (for details see [18, Chapter 1]), and for simplicity we do this in the setting of reduced atomic monoids. Let H be a reduced atomic monoid and let $\mathcal{A}(H)$ be its set of atoms. Consider the free abelian monoid $Z(H) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}(H))$ with the epimorphism $\pi : Z(H) \rightarrow H$ via $\pi(u) = u$ for all $u \in \mathcal{A}(H)$. For $a \in H$,

- $Z(a) = \pi^{-1}(\{a\})$ is the *set of factorizations* of a , and
- $L(a) = \{|z| : z \in Z(a)\}$ is the *set of lengths* of a .

Then H is said to be a BF- (resp. FF-) monoid, if $L(a)$ (resp. $Z(a)$) is finite for all $a \in H$. We consider the system $\mathcal{L}(H) = \{L(a) : a \in H\}$ of all sets of lengths of H . We need further invariants, describing its structure. The *set of distances* of H is $\Delta(H) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}(H)} \Delta(L)$, where $\Delta(L) = \{d \in \mathbb{N} : \text{there is } l \in L \text{ such that } L \cap [l, l+d] = \{l, l+d\}\}$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathcal{U}_k(H) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}(H)} L$ and set $\rho_k(H) = \sup \mathcal{U}_k(H)$ and $\lambda_k(H) = \min \mathcal{U}_k(H)$. The *elasticity* of H is $\rho(H) = \sup \left\{ \frac{\sup(L)}{\min(L)} : L \in \mathcal{L}(H) \right\}$.

For $a \in H$, we set $\omega(H, a) = \omega(a)$ to be the smallest $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ with the property that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in H$ we have that whenever $a \mid \prod_{i=1}^n a_i$, there is $\Omega \subseteq [1, n]$ with $|\Omega| \leq N$ such that $a \mid \prod_{i \in \Omega} a_i$. We denote by $\omega(H) = \sup \{\omega(H, u) : u \in \mathcal{A}(H)\}$.

Now let $u \in \mathcal{A}(H)$. We define $\tau(H, u) = \tau(u)$ to be the smallest $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ with the property that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ with $u \mid a_1 \dots a_n$ and $u \nmid \prod_{i \in [1, n] \setminus \{j\}} a_i$ for every $j \in [1, n]$, we have that $\min L(a_1 \dots a_n \cdot u^{-1}) \leq N$. We denote by $\tau(H) = \sup \{\tau(H, u) : u \in \mathcal{A}(H)\}$. We denote by $t(H, u) = t(u)$ the smallest $N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ with the property that if $a \in H$ and there is a factorization of a , where u occurs, then for every factorization z of a there is a factorization z' of a such that u occurs in z' and $d(z, z') \leq N$, where $d(z, z') = \max\{|z|, |z'|\} - |\gcd(z, z')|$. As before, we set $t(H) = \sup \{t(H, u) : u \in \mathcal{A}(H)\}$. H is said to be *locally tame* if $t(H, u)$ is finite for all $u \in \mathcal{A}(H)$, and *tame* if $t(H)$ is finite.

Let $a \in H$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. A finite sequence $z_0, \dots, z_k \in Z(a)$ is called an N -*chain of factorizations* if $d(z_{i-1}, z_i) \leq N$ for all $i \in [1, k]$. We denote by $c_H(a) = c(a)$ the smallest $N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ such that for any two factorizations $z, z' \in Z(a)$ there is an N -chain of factorizations from z to z' . The *catenary degree* of H is defined to be $c(H) = \sup \{c_H(a) : a \in H\}$. Let G be a group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ a subset. As is convenient, instead of $\ast(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ we write $\ast(G_0)$ for the above explained invariants \ast .

By [18, Theorem 1.6.3] and by [20, Propositions 3.5 and 3.6], we have

$$(4.1) \quad \rho(G_0) \leq \omega(G_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup \Delta(G_0) \leq c(G_0) \leq \omega(G_0) \leq t(G_0) \leq \omega(G_0)^2,$$

and by [19, Lemma 3.5], for all $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$, we have that

$$(4.2) \quad t(G_0, A) = \max\{\omega(G_0, A), 1 + \tau(G_0, A)\}, \quad \text{whence} \quad t(G_0) = \max\{\omega(G_0), 1 + \tau(G_0)\}.$$

In particular, if $\omega(G_0) < \infty$, then the set of distances $\Delta(G_0)$ is finite.

Proposition 4.1. *Let G be a group and $G_0 \subseteq G$ a condensed subset. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is an FF-monoid and we have*

1. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho_k(G_0) \leq kD(G_0)/2$ and $\rho(G_0) \leq D(G_0)/2$.*
2. *If G_0 is finite and $D(G_0) < \infty$, then the elasticity $\rho(G_0)$ is accepted and $\omega(G_0) < \infty$.*
3. *If $\langle G_0 \rangle$ is abelian and $D(G_0) < \infty$, then $\omega(G_0) < \infty$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a submonoid of the free abelian monoid $\mathcal{F}(G_0)$, it is an FF-monoid by [18, Corollary 1.5.7].

1. The argument is the same as when G is abelian. Since it is short, we give it here. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $U_1, \dots, U_k, V_1, \dots, V_\ell \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ such that $U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_k = V_1 \cdot \dots \cdot V_\ell$, where $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell \geq k$. If $|V_i| = 1$ for some $i \in [1, \ell]$, then V_i is a prime element of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and hence there exists $j \in [1, k]$ such that $U_j = V_i$. Set $I = \{i \in [1, \ell]: |V_i| = 1\}$ and $J = \{j \in [1, k]: |U_j| = 1\}$. It follows that

$$2(\ell - |I|) + |I| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |V_i| = \sum_{j=1}^k |U_j| \leq |J| + D(G_0)(k - |J|) \leq |I| + D(G_0)(k - |I|),$$

whence $\frac{\ell}{k} \leq \frac{\ell - |I|}{k - |I|} \leq D(G_0)/2$ and $\rho_k(G_0) \leq kD(G_0)/2$. Since, by [18, Proposition 1.4.2],

$$\rho(G_0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho_k(G_0)}{k},$$

we obtain the upper bound for $\rho(G_0)$.

2. If G_0 is finite and $D(G_0) < \infty$, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated by Theorem 3.11. Thus the claim follows from (4.1) and from [18, Theorem 3.1.4].

3. Suppose that $\langle G_0 \rangle$ is abelian. Then it is easy to see that $\omega(G_0, U) \leq |U| \leq D(G_0)$ for all $U \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ (details can be found in [18, Chapter 3.4]). \square

Let G_0 be a condensed subset of a group. If G_0 consists of finitely many torsion elements, then $D(G_0) < \infty$ by Theorem 3.11. Examples 5.11 and 5.12 provide finite subsets with infinite Davenport constant.

To describe the structure of sets of lengths, we need the concept of almost arithmetical (multi)progressions. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [0, d]$ with $\{0, d\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. A subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is said to be an

- *almost arithmetical multiprogression* (AAMP) with difference d , period \mathcal{D} , and bound M if

$$L = y + (L' \cup L^* \cup L'') \subseteq y + \mathcal{D} + d\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{is finite,}$$

where $\min L^* = 0$, $L^* = (\mathcal{D} + d\mathbb{Z}) \cap [0, \max L^*]$, $L' \subseteq [-M, -1]$, and $L'' \subseteq \max L^* + [1, M]$, and $y \in \mathbb{Z}$. L' resp. L'' is called the initial resp. the end part of L .

- *almost arithmetical progression* (AAP) with difference d and bound M if

$$L = y + (L' \cup L^* \cup L'') \subseteq y + d\mathbb{Z},$$

where L^* is a nonempty arithmetical progression with difference d such that $\min L^* = 0$, $L' \subseteq [-M, -1]$, and $L'' \subseteq \sup L^* + [1, M]$ (with the convention that $L'' = \emptyset$ if L^* is infinite), and $y \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Thus, if L is finite, then it is an AAP with difference d and bound M if and only if it is an AAMP with difference d , bound M , and period $\{0, d\}$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a condensed subset with $\omega(G_0) < \infty$.*

1. *There is $M \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that every $L \in \mathcal{L}(G_0)$ is an AAMP with difference $d \in \Delta(G_0)$ and bound M .*
2. *There is $M \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{U}_k(H)$ is an AAP with difference $\min \Delta(G_0)$ and bound M . Moreover, if G_0 is finite and $D(G_0) < \infty$, then the initial and end parts of the sets $\mathcal{U}_k(G_0)$ repeat periodically.*

Proof. 1. This follows from Proposition 4.1 and from [20, Theorem 5.1].

2. The first statement follows from [12, Theorems 3.5 and 4.2]. Suppose that G_0 is finite and $D(G_0) < \infty$. Then Proposition 4.1 implies that $\omega(G_0) < \infty$ and that the elasticity $\rho(G_0)$ is accepted. Therefore, the statement follows from [33, Theorem 1.2]. \square

For every positive integer $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there are a group G and a subset $G_0 \subseteq G$ with $\min \Delta(G_0) = d$. Furthermore, the initial and end parts of the sets $\mathcal{U}_k(G_0)$ are non-trivial. Our next goal is to show that if $G_0 = G$ is the whole group, then $\min \Delta(G) = 1$ and the initial and end parts are empty.

Lemma 4.3. *If G is an infinite group, then $\mathcal{B}(G)$ has atoms of every length. In particular, $D(G) = \infty$.*

Proof. Suppose G is infinite. Then there exists an infinite sequence $(g_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ with terms from G such that $g_1 \neq 1_G$ and for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $g_{j+1}^{-1} \notin \pi(S^{(j)})$, where $S^{(j)}$ ranges over all subsequences of $g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_j$. It follows that $g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_j$ has no product-one subsequence for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that 1_G is an atom of length 1. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $h_m = g_1^{-1} \cdot \dots \cdot g_m^{-1}$, and $W_m = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_m \cdot h_m$. Then W_m is a product-one sequence of length $m+1$. It suffices to show W_m is an atom. Suppose $W = V_1 \cdot V_2$ with $h_m \in \text{supp}(V_2)$, where $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. Then V_1 is a subsequence of $g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_m$ and hence V_1 is empty. It follows that W is an atom of length $m+1$ and we are done. \square

The proof of the first part of the first statement in the following theorem runs along the same lines as in [29, Theorem 5.5], whose origin is [13, Theorem 3.1.3] in the abelian setting. Since the proof is not long, we give it.

Theorem 4.4. *Let G be a group.*

1. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. We have $\mathcal{U}_k(G) = [\lambda_k(G), \rho_k(G)]$. Furthermore, if G is infinite, then $\mathcal{U}_k(G) = \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$.*
2. *If G has an element of infinite order or the orders of the abelian subgroups are unbounded, then $\mathcal{L}(G) = \{L \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2} : L \text{ finite and nonempty}\} \cup \{\{0\}, \{1\}\}$ and hence $\Delta(G) = \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. 1. If $|G| \leq 5$, then G is an abelian group and the statement is known (either [29, Theorem 5.5] or [13, Theorem 3.1.3]). Suppose that $|G| \geq 6$. We need to show $[\lambda_k(G), \rho_k(G)] \subseteq \mathcal{U}_k(G)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We assert $[k, \rho_k(G)] \subseteq \mathcal{U}_k(G)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose the assertion holds. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $l \in [\lambda_k(G), k]$. Then $l \leq k \leq \rho_{\lambda_k(G)}(G) \leq \rho_l(G)$. It follows by the assertion that $k \in \mathcal{U}_l(G)$ and consequently $l \in \mathcal{U}_k(G)$. Therefore $[\lambda_k(G), \rho_k(G)] \subseteq \mathcal{U}_k(G)$.

Thus we only need to show the assertion. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\ell \in [k, \rho_k(G)]$ be minimal such that $[\ell, \rho_k(G)] \subseteq \mathcal{U}_k(G)$. Assume to the contrary that $k < \ell$. Then $\ell - 1 \notin \mathcal{U}_k(G)$ and $k + 2 \leq \ell$. Define

$$\Omega = \{A \in \mathcal{B}(G) : \text{there exists } j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } j \geq \ell \text{ such that } \{k, j\} \subseteq L(A)\}$$

and choose $B \in \Omega$ such that $|B|$ is minimal. Then $B = U_1 \cdots U_k = V_1 \cdots V_t$, where $t \geq \ell \geq k + 2$ and $U_1, \dots, U_k, V_1, \dots, V_t \in \mathcal{A}(G)$ and where the order is such that all commonly occurring terms occur at the beginning, i.e. $U_i = V_i$ say for $i \in [1, a]$ but $U_i \neq V_j$ for any $i > a$ and $j > a$. Then, since $l > k$, we cannot have $a = k$. There must exist $i \in [a + 1, k]$, say $i = a + 1$, such that $|U_{a+1}| \geq 2$. Suppose $U_{a+1} = g_1 \cdots g_l$ with $1 = g_1 g_2 \cdots g_l$, where $l \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $g_1, \dots, g_l \in G$. Then there exists $j \in [a + 1, t]$, say $j = a + 1$, such that $g_1 \in \text{supp}(V_{a+1})$. Let $x \in [1, l]$ be maximal such that $g_1 \cdots g_x$ is a subsequence of V_{a+1} . Then $x < l$ and there exists $r \in [a + 2, t]$, say $r = a + 2$, such that $g_{x+1} \in \text{supp}(V_{a+2})$. Therefore $U'_{a+1} = U_{a+1} \cdot (g_x g_{x+1}) \cdot (g_x \cdot g_{x+1})^{[-1]}$ is an atom and $V' = V_{a+1} \cdot V_{a+2} \cdot (g_x g_{x+1}) \cdot (g_x \cdot g_{x+1})^{[-1]} \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. Set $B' = B \cdot (g_x g_{x+1}) \cdot (g_x \cdot g_{x+1})^{[-1]}$. Then $|B'| < |B|$ and

$$t - 2 + \mathbf{L}(V') \cup \{k\} \subseteq \mathbf{L}(B').$$

Then the minimality of $|B|$ implies that $B' \notin \Omega$, whence $V' \in \mathcal{A}(G)$ and $t = \ell$. It follows that $\{k, \ell - 1\} \subseteq \mathbf{L}(B')$ and hence $\ell - 1 \in \mathcal{U}_k(G)$, a contradiction.

To show the "furthermore" statement, let G be infinite. It follows by Lemma 4.3 that for every $k \geq 2$ there is an atom A_k of length k . Suppose $A_k = h_1 \cdots h_k$ and $A_k^{-1} = h_1^{-1} \cdots h_k^{-1}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_1, \dots, h_k \in G$. Thus $\{2, k\} \subseteq \mathbf{L}(A_k \cdot A_k^{-1})$. Therefore $\rho_2(G) = \infty$ and $2 \in \mathcal{U}_k(G)$ for every $k \geq 2$, whence $\rho_k(G) = \infty$ and $\lambda_k(G) = 2$. The assertion follows by the main statement.

2. If G contains an element of infinite order, then $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{Z}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(G)$ and the assertion follows by Kainrath's Theorem ([27, Theorem 1], [18, Theorem 7.4.1]). If G contains abelian subgroups of unbounded order, then $\mathcal{L}(G)$ contains the systems of sets of lengths of infinitely many pairwise non-isomorphic finite abelian groups and the assertion follows by [22, Theorem 3.7]. \square

Remark 4.5. The proof of the second statement of Theorem 4.4 relies heavily on the existence of arbitrary large abelian subgroups, since only then we can use the already known results on sets of lengths. The case that remains open is the one where G is infinite and does not contain arbitrarily large abelian groups, i.e. G is a torsion group and there are only finitely many pairwise non-isomorphic finite abelian subgroups. Such groups exist; indeed there exist infinite groups such that every subgroup is a cyclic group of order a fixed prime; the latter groups are called *Tarski monsters*.

5. ON INFINITE DIHEDRAL GROUPS

Product-one sequences over finite dihedral groups received considerable attention in the literature (see [15, 23, 7, 4, 30, 31, 16, 34, 35]). In this final section we consider infinite dihedral groups, and in this setting we can extend and refine the algebraic and arithmetic results of the previous two sections. We formulate our two main results (Theorems 5.1 and 5.2).

Theorem 5.1. *Let G be an infinite dihedral group, say $G = \langle \alpha, \tau : \tau^2 = 1, \alpha\tau = \tau\alpha^{-1} \rangle$, and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a finite nonempty subset.*

1. $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a v -noetherian G -monoid, $(\mathcal{B}(G_0) : \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}) \neq \emptyset$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a finitely generated Krull monoid. Moreover, if $\langle G_0 \rangle \cong G$, then $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $G/G' \cong C_2 \times C_2$.
2. $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull if and only if one of the following holds.
 - $G_0 \subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle$.
 - $G_0 \setminus \{1\} \subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle \tau$ with $|G_0| \leq 3$.

- $G_0 \setminus \{1\} = \{\alpha^k \tau\} \cup \{\alpha^i : i \in I\} \cup \{\alpha^{-j} : j \in J\}$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and I, J are nonempty sets of positive integers such that there exist pairwise co-prime positive integers b_i , for $i \in I \cup J$, such that $kb_k = \gcd(I \cup J) \prod_{i \in I \cup J} b_i$ for every $k \in I \cup J$. In particular, the above property holds for $G_0 = \{\alpha^i, \alpha^{-j}, \alpha^k \tau\}$, where $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
3. The following statements are equivalent.
 - (a) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is tame.
 - (b) $\omega(G_0) < \infty$.
 - (c) $D(G_0) < \infty$.
 - (d) $G_0 \subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle$ or $G_0 \subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \cup \{1\}$.
 - (e) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated.
 4. The following statements are equivalent.
 - (a) $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is locally tame.
 - (b) $\rho(G_0) < \infty$.
 - (c) $\rho_k(G_0) < \infty$ for all $k \geq 2$.
 - (d) $\rho(G_0)$ is accepted.
 - (e) $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle) \subseteq \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}, 1_G^{[n]} : n \geq 0\}$ or $G_0 \subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle$.
 5. The set of distances $\Delta(G_0)$ is finite, $c(G_0) < \infty$, and there is $M \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that, for all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{U}_k(G_0)$ is an AAP with difference $\min \Delta(G_0)$ and bound M .

Theorem 5.2. *Let G be an infinite dihedral group.*

1. $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is neither seminormal nor weakly Krull.
2. $\mathcal{L}(G) = \{L \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2} : L \text{ is finite and nonempty}\} \cup \{\{0\}, \{1\}\}$, whence $\Delta(G) = \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{U}_k(G) = \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ for all $k \geq 2$.
3. $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is an FF-monoid, but not locally tame, and $c(G) = \omega(G) = \infty$.

We introduce notation which remains valid for the remainder of this section. Let G be an infinite dihedral group, say $G = \langle \alpha, \tau : \tau^2 = 1, \alpha\tau = \tau\alpha^{-1} \rangle$, and let $G_0 \subseteq G$ be a finite nonempty subset. We start with the proof of Theorem 5.1, which will be given in five steps. Then we discuss three examples, which show the diversity of the behavior of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with respect to properties such as seminormality and root closure. The proof of Theorem 5.2 will be given at the very end of Section 5.

Proof of Theorem 5.1.1. Let S be a sequence over G_0 . We set $G_1 = G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle$, $S_{G_1} = \prod_{g \in G_1} g^{[v_g(S)]}$, $G_2 = G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau$, and $S_{G_2} = \prod_{g \in G_2} g^{[v_g(S)]}$. Then $G_0 = G_1 \cup G_2$ is a partition of G_0 and $S = S_{G_1} \cdot S_{G_2}$. Next we define $\varphi: \mathcal{F}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\langle \alpha \rangle)$ via $\varphi(\alpha^i \tau) = \alpha^i$, $\varphi(\alpha^i) = \alpha^i$, and $\psi: \mathcal{F}(\langle \alpha \rangle) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Z})$ via $\psi(\alpha^i) = i$. If $G_2 = \emptyset$, then $G_0 = G_1$ is a subset of a cyclic group $\langle \alpha \rangle$ and there is nothing to do. Now we assume that $G_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Claim A. *For every sequence $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ such that $|S_{G_2}| \geq 2$ is even, we have that $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ if and only if S can be written as $S = T_1 \cdot T_2 \cdot W_1 \cdot W_2$ such that $\sigma(\psi(T_1 \cdot \varphi(W_1))) = \sigma(\psi(T_2 \cdot \varphi(W_2)))$, where $T_1 \cdot T_2 = S_{G_1}$ and $W_1 \cdot W_2 = S_{G_2}$ with $|W_1| = |W_2|$.*

Proof of Claim A. Let $S = f_1 \cdot \dots \cdot f_n \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with $f_1 \dots f_n = 1$ and $|S_{G_2}| \geq 2$ even. We set $\beta = \psi \circ \varphi$ and $\chi(f_i) = |\{f_j : j < i, f_j \in G_2\}|$. Then

$$1 = f_1 \dots f_n = \alpha^{(-1)^{\chi(f_1)}\beta(f_1) + (-1)^{\chi(f_2)}\beta(f_2) + \dots + (-1)^{\chi(f_n)}\beta(f_n)},$$

and hence $\sum_{\chi(f_i) \text{ even}} \beta(f_i) = \sum_{\chi(f_j) \text{ odd}} \beta(f_j)$. Now the statement follows by defining

$$T_1 = \prod_{\substack{f_i \in G_1 \\ \chi(f_i) \text{ even}}} f_i, \quad T_2 = \prod_{\substack{f_i \in G_1 \\ \chi(f_i) \text{ odd}}} f_i, \quad W_1 = \prod_{\substack{f_i \in G_2 \\ \chi(f_i) \text{ even}}} f_i, \quad W_2 = \prod_{\substack{f_i \in G_2 \\ \chi(f_i) \text{ odd}}} f_i,$$

Conversely, suppose S has such a decomposition with $W_1 = w_1^{(1)} \cdot \dots \cdot w_n^{(1)}$ and $W_2 = w_1^{(2)} \cdot \dots \cdot w_n^{(2)}$, where $n \geq 1$, $w_1^{(1)}, \dots, w_n^{(1)}, w_1^{(2)}, \dots, w_n^{(2)} \in G_2$. Then

$$T_1 \cdot w_1^{(1)} \cdot T_2 \cdot w_1^{(2)} \cdot w_2^{(1)} \cdot w_2^{(2)} \cdot \dots \cdot w_n^{(1)} \cdot w_n^{(2)} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0).$$

□[Proof of Claim A]

Let

$$(5.1) \quad D = [\mathcal{A}(G_0) \cup \{g^{[2]} : g \in G_1\}] \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$$

be the submonoid generated by $\mathcal{B}(G_0) \cup \{g^{[2]} : g \in G_1\}$. It is easy to see that $\{x \in D : \text{supp}(x) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and that $\mathcal{A}(D) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(G_0) \cup \{g^{[2]} : g \in G_1\}$.

Claim B: $\mathcal{A}(D)$ is finite.

Proof of Claim B. To begin with, we first show $\text{sup}\{\nu_g(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}(D)\}$ is finite for every $g \in G_2$. Assume to the contrary that there exist $g_1 \in G_2$ and a sequence $(A_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of atoms of D with $|\nu_{g_1}(A_i)| \geq 2$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{g_1}(A_i) = \infty$. Furthermore, since G_0 is finite, we may assume that $(\nu_g(A_i))_{i=1}^\infty$ is increasing (maybe not strictly) for every $g \in G_0$. Then $A_i \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each i , we fix $T_1^{(i)}, T_2^{(i)}, W_1^{(i)}, W_2^{(i)}$ such that A_i can be written as $A_i = T_1^{(i)} \cdot T_2^{(i)} \cdot W_1^{(i)} \cdot W_2^{(i)}$, $\sigma(\psi(T_1^{(i)} \cdot \varphi(W_1^{(i)}))) = \sigma(\psi(T_2^{(i)} \cdot \varphi(W_2^{(i)})))$, $T_1^{(i)} \cdot T_2^{(i)} = (A_i)_{G_1}$, and $W_1^{(i)} \cdot W_2^{(i)} = (A_i)_{G_2}$ with $|W_1^{(i)}| = |W_2^{(i)}|$ and $g_1 \in \text{supp}(W_1^{(i)})$. Since $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{g_1}(A_i) = \infty$ it follows that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |W_1^{(i)}| = \infty$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |W_2^{(i)}| = \infty$. If $\text{supp}(W_1^{(i)}) \cap \text{supp}(W_2^{(i)}) \neq \emptyset$, say $h \in \text{supp}(W_1^{(i)}) \cap \text{supp}(W_2^{(i)})$, then $h^{[2]}$ and $A_i \cdot (h^{[2]})^{[-1]}$ are both product-one sequences by Claim A, a contradiction. Thus $\text{supp}(W_1^{(i)}) \cap \text{supp}(W_2^{(i)}) = \emptyset$. Therefore there exists $g_2 \in G_2$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{g_2}(W_2^{(i)}) = \infty$. After reordering if necessary, we may assume that $g_1 = \alpha^r \tau$ and $g_2 = \alpha^s \tau$ with $r < s$ such that $g_1 \in \text{supp}(W_1^{(i)})$, $g_2 \in \text{supp}(W_2^{(i)})$, and

$$r = \min\{y : g = \alpha^y \tau \text{ such that } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_g(W_1^{(i)}) = \infty\},$$

$$\text{and } s = \min\{y : g = \alpha^y \tau \text{ such that } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_g(W_2^{(i)}) = \infty\}.$$

Suppose $\max\{y \in \mathbb{Z} : g = \alpha^y \tau \text{ such that } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_g(W_1^{(i)}) = \infty\} > s$. Then there exists $g_3 = \alpha^k \tau \in G_2 \setminus \{g_1, g_2\}$ with $k > s$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{g_3}(W_1^{(i)}) = \infty$. Let $T = g_1^{[k-s]} \cdot g_2^{[k-r]} \cdot g_3^{[s-r]}$. Then T and $A_i \cdot T^{[-1]}$ are both product-one sequences by Claim A, a contradiction, where i is large enough.

Suppose $\max\{y \in \mathbb{Z} : g = \alpha^y \tau \text{ such that } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nu_g(W_1^{(i)}) = \infty\} < s$. It follows by $|W_1^{(i)}| = |W_2^{(i)}| \rightarrow \infty$ that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(\psi(\varphi(W_2^{(i)}))) - \sigma(\psi(\varphi(W_1^{(i)}))) = \infty$. Then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(\psi(T_1^{(i)})) - \sigma(\psi(T_2^{(i)})) =$

∞ . Then there must exist $g = \alpha^k \in G_1$ such that either $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} v_g(T_1^{(i)}) = \infty$ (if $k > 0$) or $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} v_g(T_2^{(i)}) = \infty$ (if $k < 0$). Let $T = g_1^{\lfloor k \rfloor} \cdot g_2^{\lfloor k \rfloor} \cdot g^{[s-r]}$. Then T and $A_i \cdot T^{[-1]}$ are both product-one sequences by Claim A, a contradiction, where i is large enough.

Thus, we proved $\sup\{v_g(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}(D)\}$ is finite for every $g \in G_2$. Next, we show $\sup\{v_g(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}(D)\}$ is finite for every $g \in G_1$. Note that $\sup\{v_g(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}(D) \cap \mathcal{F}(G_1)\} \leq D(G_1)$ is finite. It is sufficient to show $\sup\{v_g(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}(D) \text{ with } \text{supp}(A) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite for every $g \in G_1$. Assume to the contrary that there exist $g_1 \in G_1$ and a sequence $(A_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of atoms of D with $\text{supp}(A_i) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} v_{g_1}(A_i) = \infty$. Furthermore, since G_0 is finite, we may assume that $(v_g(A_i))_{i=1}^\infty$ is increasing (maybe not strictly) for every $g \in G_0$. Then $A_i \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each i , we fix $T_1^{(i)}, T_2^{(i)}, W_1^{(i)}, W_2^{(i)}$ such that A_i can be written as $A_i = T_1^{(i)} \cdot T_2^{(i)} \cdot W_1^{(i)} \cdot W_2^{(i)}$, $\sigma(\psi(T_1^{(i)} \cdot \varphi(W_1^{(i)}))) = \sigma(\psi(T_2^{(i)} \cdot \varphi(W_2^{(i)})))$, $T_1^{(i)} \cdot T_2^{(i)} = (A_i)_{G_1}$, and $W_1^{(i)} \cdot W_2^{(i)} = (A_i)_{G_2}$ with $|W_1^{(i)}| = |W_2^{(i)}|$ and $g_1 \in \text{supp}(T_1^{(i)})$. If $\text{supp}(T_1^{(i)}) \cap \text{supp}(T_2^{(i)}) \neq \emptyset$, say $h \in \text{supp}(T_1^{(i)}) \cap \text{supp}(T_2^{(i)})$, then $h^{[2]} \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ and $A_i \cdot (h^{[2]})^{[-1]}$ is a product-one sequence by Claim A, a contradiction. Thus $\text{supp}(T_1^{(i)}) \cap \text{supp}(T_2^{(i)}) = \emptyset$, whence in combination with $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} v_{g_1}(A_i) = \infty$ it follows that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |T_1^{(i)}| = \infty$. Note that $T_1^{(i)}$ is a sequence over a cyclic group $\langle \alpha \rangle$. Then $T_1^{(i)}$ is product-one free and hence $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma(\psi(T_1^{(i)}))| = \infty$. To see this, assume to the contrary that $S_i = \psi(T_1^{(i)})$ are sequences over a finite subset $\psi(G_1)$ of integers with $|\sigma(S_i)| < N$. Then $D(G_1 \cup [-N, N]) = L < \infty$ by Dickson's Lemma. Thus, if $|S_i| \geq L$, then $S_i \cdot -\sigma(S_i)$ is a product-one sequence of length greater than L , implying it factors into two non-trivial product-one sequences, one of which is a subsequence of S_i . As a result, once $|S_i| \rightarrow \infty$ is large enough, we would be guaranteed of $S_i = \sigma(T_1^{(i)})$ having a non-trivial product-one subsequence, contradicting that $T_1^{(i)}$ is product-one free. This shows $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma(\psi(T_1^{(i)}))| = \infty$. In combination with $|W_1^{(i)}| = |W_2^{(i)}| \leq \sum_{g \in G_2} \sup\{v_g(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}(D)\} < \infty$ (we already proved that) this gives $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma(\psi(T_2^{(i)}))| = \infty$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |T_2^{(i)}| = \infty$, whence there exists $g_2 \in G_1$ with $\psi(g_1)\psi(g_2) > 0$ (i.e. with the same sign) such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} v_{g_2}(T_2^{(i)}) = \infty$. Suppose $g_1 = \alpha^r$ and $g_2 = \alpha^t$. Then $T = g_1^{[2|t|]} \cdot g_2^{[2|r|]} \in D$ and $A_i \cdot T^{[-1]}$ is a product-one sequence by Claim A, a contradiction, where i is large enough. To sum up, we proved that $N = \sum_{g \in G_0} \sup\{v_g(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}(D)\} < \infty$. Since N is the greatest length an atom in D can have, the finiteness of G_0 gives that $\mathcal{A}(D)$ is finite. \square [Proof of Claim B]

Let $X \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ be an infinite subset. For every $S \in X$, we fix a factorization $z_S \in Z(D)$. Since $Z(D)$ is a finitely generated free abelian monoid, by Dickson's Lemma ([18, Theorem 1.5.3]), we obtain the existence of a finite subset $X' \subseteq X$ such that $\{z_S : S \in X'\}$ is the set of all minimal elements of $\{z_S : S \in X\}$. For every $A \in X'$, if $\{A \cdot A' \in X \setminus X' : A' \in D \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)\} \neq \emptyset$, then we choose such an $A \cdot A'$ and add it to X' . Finally, we get a finite set X_0 with $|X_0| \leq 2|X'|$. We claim $(\mathcal{B}(G_0) : X) = (\mathcal{B}(G_0) : X_0)$, which implies $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is v -noetherian by [18, Proposition 2.1.10].

It suffices to show $(\mathcal{B}(G_0) : X_0) \subseteq (\mathcal{B}(G_0) : X)$. Let $\frac{S_1}{S_2} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ with $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $\frac{S_1}{S_2} X_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Let $S \in X$. Then there exists $A \in X' \subseteq X$ such that $\frac{S}{A} \in D$.

If $\frac{S}{A} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, then $\frac{S_1}{S_2}S = \frac{S_1}{S_2}A\frac{S}{A} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Otherwise $\frac{S}{A} = B \cdot B'$ with $B \in \mathcal{B}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle)$ and $B' = [g^{[2]} : g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle] \setminus \{1\}$. Since $A \in X'$ and $A \cdot B \cdot B' \in X$, by our construction of X_0 , there is an $A' \in D \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $A \cdot A' \in X_0$. We have that $\frac{S_1}{S_2}A \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and $\frac{S_1}{S_2}A \cdot A' \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Assume to the contrary, that $\frac{S_1}{S_2}A \in \mathcal{B}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle)$. Then $\frac{S_1}{S_2}A$ is a product-one sequence over the abelian group $\langle \alpha \rangle$ and since $A' \in D \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, we have that $\text{supp}(A') \subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle$, and $\sigma(\psi(A')) \neq 0$ as $A' \notin \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. But now $\frac{S_1}{S_2}A \cdot A'$ is a sequence over the abelian group $\langle \alpha \rangle$ with $\sigma(\psi(\frac{S_1}{S_2}A \cdot A')) = \sigma(\text{psi}(\frac{S_1}{S_2}A)) + \sigma(\psi(A')) = \sigma(\psi(A')) \neq 0$, contradicting that $\frac{S_1}{S_2}A \cdot A' \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. We obtain that $\frac{S_1}{S_2}A \notin \mathcal{B}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle)$. Therefore $\frac{S_1}{S_2}S = \frac{S_1}{S_2}A \cdot \frac{S}{A} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. It follows that $\frac{S_1}{S_2}X \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and the v -noetherian property is shown.

By Theorem 3.11, $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a finitely generated Krull monoid and $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a G -monoid. Suppose $g \in G_2$ (then $g^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$) and $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) = \{T_1, \dots, T_r\}$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Using Proposition 3.3.2, for every $i \in [1, r]$ we fix one $T'_i \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $T_i \cdot T'_i \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Set $W = \prod_{i \in [1, r]} T'_i$. Thus for every $T \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$, we have that $T = \prod_{i \in [1, r]} T_i^{\ell_i}$, where $\ell_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for every $i \in [1, r]$, whence

$$T \cdot W \cdot g^{[2]} = \left(\prod_{i \in [1, r]} T_i^{[2\ell_i/2]} \cdot g^{[2]} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{i \in [1, r], \ell_i \text{ is odd}} T_i \cdot T'_i \right) \cdot \prod_{i \in [1, r], \ell_i \text{ is even}} T'_i \in \mathcal{B}(G_0).$$

Therefore $(\mathcal{B}(G_0) : \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$. It follows by $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ that $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} = \mathcal{B}(G_0)^*$ is a finitely generated Krull monoid and $(\mathcal{B}(G_0) : \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}) \neq \emptyset$.

Moreover, suppose that $\langle G_0 \rangle \cong G$. From Proposition 3.3, we know that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ is a saturated and cofinal submonoid. Furthermore, denoting the given inclusion by $\varphi : \mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(G_0)$, we have that $\mathcal{C}(\varphi) = \mathcal{F}(G_0)/\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \cong G/G' \cong C_2 \times C_2$. Now by [18, Theorem 2.4.7.2], there are submonoids $F_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ and $\mathcal{C}_0 = \{[c]_\varphi : c \in F_0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\varphi)$ such that there is an epimorphism $\varphi^* : \mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*)$. Since $\mathcal{B}(G_0)^* \subseteq F_0$ is still cofinal, it follows that \mathcal{C}_0 is a subgroup of $\mathcal{C}(\varphi)$, whence $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)^*)$ is a factor group of a subgroup of $\mathcal{C}(\varphi) \cong C_2 \times C_2$. \square

To continue with the proof we need the following results.

Lemma 5.3. *Let i, j, k be distinct positive integers with $\gcd(i, j, k) = 1$. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *There exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd(x, y, z) = 1$ such that $ix + jy = kz$ and $ix \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$.*
2. *There exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd(x, y, z) = 1$ such that $ix + jy = kz$, $ix' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ for every $x' \in [1, x]$, and $jy' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ for every $y' \in [1, y]$.*
3. *$k \neq \gcd(i, k)\gcd(j, k)$.*

Proof. Since $\gcd(i, j, k) = 1$, we have that $\gcd(\gcd(i, k), \gcd(j, k)) = 1$ and hence $\gcd(i, k)\gcd(j, k)$ divides k .

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose $k \neq \gcd(i, k)\gcd(j, k)$. There exist $y', z' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gcd(j, k) = kz' - jy'$ and hence $i\gcd(j, k) + j(y'i) = k(z'i)$. Assume to the contrary that $i\gcd(j, k) \equiv 0 \pmod{k}$. Then $k/(\gcd(i, k)\gcd(j, k))$ divides $i/\gcd(i, k)$, a contradiction to the fact that

$$\gcd(i/\gcd(i, k), k/\gcd(i, k)) = 1.$$

Let $d = \gcd(\gcd(j, k), y'i, z'i)$. Then the assertion follows by choosing

$$(x, y, z) = (\gcd(j, k)/d, y'i/d, z'i/d).$$

(1) \Rightarrow (2). Among all the choices of $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ with $\gcd(x, y, z) = 1$ such that $ix + jy = kz$ and $ix \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$, we let (x_0, y_0, z_0) be the choice such that $x_0 + y_0$ is minimal. If there exists $x' \in [1, x_0 - 1]$ such that $ix' \equiv 0 \pmod{k}$, then there exists $z' \in [1, z_0 - 1]$ such that $ix' = kz'$ and hence $i(x_0 - x') + jy_0 = k(z_0 - z')$. Thus dividing $x_0 - x', y_0$ and $z_0 - z'$ by their gcd leads to a contradiction to the minimality of $x_0 + y_0$. Suppose there exists $y' \in [1, y_0]$ such that $jy' \equiv 0 \pmod{k}$. If $y' = y_0$, then k divides ix_0 , a contradiction. If $y' < y_0$, then there exists $z' \in [1, z_0 - 1]$ such that $jy' = kz'$ and hence $ix_0 + j(y_0 - y') = k(z_0 - z')$, as before a contradiction to the minimality of $x_0 + y_0$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Suppose there exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $ix + jy = kz$ and $ix \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$. Assume to the contrary that $k = \gcd(i, k) \gcd(j, k)$. Since $\gcd(i, k)$ divides ix and $\gcd(j, k)$ divides ix , we obtain that $k = \gcd(i, k) \gcd(j, k)$ divides ix , a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.4. *Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a subset with $|I| \geq 3$. Suppose that for any three elements i, j, k of I , we have that $i = \frac{\gcd(i, j, k)jk}{\gcd(j, k)^2}$, $j = \frac{\gcd(i, j, k)ik}{\gcd(i, k)^2}$, and $k = \frac{\gcd(i, j, k)ij}{\gcd(i, j)^2}$. Then there exist pairwise co-prime positive integers b_i , for $i \in I$, such that*

$$kb_k = \gcd(I) \prod_{i \in I} b_i$$

for every $k \in I$.

Proof. Suppose $|I| = 3$, say $I = \{i, j, k\}$. Let $b_i = \gcd(j, k) / \gcd(i, j, k)$, $b_j = \gcd(i, k) / \gcd(i, j, k)$, and $b_k = \gcd(i, j) / \gcd(i, j, k)$. By symmetry, it suffices to show that $k = \gcd(i, j, k) b_i b_j$. Since $i \gcd(i, j, k) = jk/b_i^2$ and $j \gcd(i, j, k) = ik/b_j^2$, we obtain that $ij \gcd(i, j, k)^2 = \frac{ijk^2}{b_i^2 b_j^2}$, whence $k = \gcd(i, j, k) b_i b_j$.

Suppose $t = |I| \geq 4$. We proceed by induction on t . Suppose the assertion holds for every subset $J \subseteq I$ with $|J| = t - 1$. Let $I = \{a_1, \dots, a_t\}$ and $b_t = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}) / \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t)$. By induction hypothesis, there exist pairwise co-prime positive integers b_1, \dots, b_{t-1} such that $a_i b_i = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) b_1 \dots b_t$ for every $i \in [1, t - 1]$. Let $j \in [2, t - 1]$. Consider the subset $\{a_1, a_j, a_t\}$ of I . In view of $\gcd(a_1, a_j) = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) \gcd(\frac{b_1 \dots b_t}{b_1}, \frac{b_1 \dots b_t}{b_j}) = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) \frac{b_1 \dots b_t}{b_1 b_j}$, we have that

$$(5.2) \quad a_t = \frac{\gcd(a_1, a_j, a_t) a_1 a_j}{\gcd(a_1, a_j)^2} = \gcd(a_1, a_j, a_t) b_1 b_j,$$

whence b_j divides $a_t / \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t)$ for every $j \in [1, t - 1]$. It follows that $b_1 \dots b_{t-1}$ divides $a_t / \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t)$. Using the equation $\gcd(a_1, a_j) = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) \frac{b_1 \dots b_t}{b_1 b_j}$ again, it follows by $\gcd(b_t, \frac{a_t}{\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t)}) = 1$, that

$$\gcd(a_1, a_j, a_t) = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) \gcd\left(\frac{b_1 \dots b_t}{b_1 b_j}, \frac{a_t}{\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t)}\right) = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) \frac{b_1 \dots b_{t-1}}{b_1 b_j}.$$

Therefore $a_t b_t = \gcd(a_1, a_j, a_t) b_1 b_j b_t = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t) b_1 \dots b_t$ by (5.2).

Since $1 = \gcd(b_t, \frac{a_t}{\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_t)}) = \gcd(b_t, b_1 \dots b_{t-1})$, we know b_1, \dots, b_t are pairwise co-prime positive integers. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let G be an infinite dihedral group, say $G = \langle \alpha, \tau : \tau^2 = 1, \alpha\tau = \tau\alpha^{-1} \rangle$, and let $G_0 = \{\tau\} \cup \{\alpha^i : i \in I\} \cup \{\alpha^{-j} : j \in J\}$, where I, J are nonempty sets of positive integers.*

1. $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{\mathfrak{p}_a : a \in G_0\}$ and $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$, where $\mathfrak{p}_a = \{S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) : a \in \text{supp}(S)\}$.

2. If $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull, then for any disjoint subsets $K_1, K_2 \subseteq I \cup J$ with $1 \leq |K_1| + |K_2|$ and $|K_1| < |I \cup J|$, we have that $\mathcal{B}(\{\tau\} \cup \{\alpha^i : i \in (I \cup J) \setminus K_1\} \cup \{\alpha^{-k} : k \in K_1 \cup K_2\})$ is weakly Krull.

Proof. 1. Let $\mathfrak{p}_a = \{S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) : a \in \text{supp}(S)\}$, where $a \in G_0$. Then Proposition 3.7 implies that $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \subseteq \{\mathfrak{p}_a : a \in G_0\}$. Assume to the contrary that there exist distinct $a, b \in G_0$ such that $\mathfrak{p}_a \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_b$. Since $\tau^{[2]}$ is an atom, we obtain that $a \neq \tau$ and hence $a \in G_0 \setminus \{\tau\}$. Since $a^{[2]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$ is an atom, we have that b can only be τ . Note that I and J are both nonempty sets. There exists a product-one sequence B with $a \in \text{supp}(B) \subseteq G_0 \setminus \{\tau\}$, whence $B \in \mathfrak{p}_a \setminus \mathfrak{p}_b$, a contradiction. Therefore $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{\mathfrak{p}_a : a \in G_0\}$ and it follows by Proposition 3.7.2 that $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_0)$.

2. Let $i \in I$ and let $j \in J$. It suffices to show the following Claim.

Claim:

- (a) $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cup \{\alpha^{-i}\} \setminus \{\alpha^i\})$ is weakly Krull, provided that $|I| \geq 2$.
- (b) $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cup \{\alpha^j\} \setminus \{\alpha^{-j}\})$ is weakly Krull, provided that $|J| \geq 2$.
- (c) $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cup \{\alpha^{-i}\})$ is weakly Krull.
- (d) $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cup \{\alpha^j\})$ is weakly Krull.

By symmetry, we only prove items (a) and (c). Let $G_1 = G_0 \cup \{\alpha^{-i}\}$ and let $G_2 = G_1 \setminus \{\alpha^i\}$. We define a homomorphism $\phi: \mathcal{F}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ by $\phi(\alpha^{-i}) = \alpha^i$ and $\phi(x) = x$ for all $x \in G_0 \setminus \{\alpha^{-i}\}$. It is easy to see that, for a sequence $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_1)$ with $v_{\tau}(S) > 0$, we have that $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$ if and only if $\phi(S) \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. It follows by 1. that $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_1))} \mathcal{B}(G_1)_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_1)$ and $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_2))} \mathcal{B}(G_2)_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(G_2)$.

Assume to the contrary that $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is not weakly Krull. Then there exist $T \in \mathcal{F}(G_1) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_1)$ and $S_a \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$, for every $a \in G_1$, such that $a \notin \text{supp}(S_a)$ and $T \cdot S_a \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$. If $\tau \notin \text{supp}(T)$, then $T \cdot S_{\tau}$ and S_{τ} are both product-one sequences over $\langle \alpha \rangle$, whence T is a product-one sequence, a contradiction. Thus $\tau \in \text{supp}(T)$ and hence $\phi(T) \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, $\phi(S_a \cdot \tau^{[2]}) \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, and $\phi(T \cdot S_a \cdot \tau^{[2]}) \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ for every $a \in G_1 \setminus \{\tau\}$. Suppose $t = v_{\alpha^{-i}}(S_{\tau})$. Then $\alpha^{2it} \in \pi(\phi(S_{\tau}))$ and $T_{\tau} := \phi(S_{\tau}^{[j]}) \cdot (\alpha^{-j})^{[2it]}$ is a product-one sequence with $\tau \notin \text{supp}(T_{\tau})$. Since $T \cdot S_{\tau}^{[j]} = T \cdot S_{\tau} \cdot S_{\tau}^{[j-1]}$ is a product-one sequence over G_1 , we obtain that $\phi(T \cdot S_{\tau}^{[j]})$ is a product-one sequence over G_0 and hence $\phi(T) \cdot T_{\tau}$ is a product-one sequence. Putting this all together, we obtain that $\phi(T) \in (\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}}) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, a contradiction.

Assume to the contrary that $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is not weakly Krull. Then there exist $T \in \mathcal{F}(G_2) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_2)$ and $S_a \in \mathcal{B}(G_2)$, for every $a \in G_2$, such that $a \notin \text{supp}(S_a)$ and $T \cdot S_a \in \mathcal{B}(G_2)$. If $\tau \notin \text{supp}(T)$, then $T \cdot S_{\tau}$ and S_{τ} are both product-one sequences over $\langle \alpha \rangle$, whence T is a product-one sequence, a contradiction. Thus $\tau \in \text{supp}(T)$ and hence $\phi(T) \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, $\phi(S_a \cdot \tau^{[2]}) \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, and $\phi(T \cdot S_a \cdot \tau^{[2]}) \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ for every $a \in G_2 \setminus \{\tau\}$. Suppose $t = v_{\alpha^{-i}}(S_{\tau})$. Then $\alpha^{2it} \in \pi(\phi(S_{\tau}))$ and $T_{\tau} := \phi(S_{\tau}^{[j]}) \cdot (\alpha^{-j})^{[2it]}$ is a product-one sequence with $\tau \notin \text{supp}(T_{\tau})$. Since $T \cdot S_{\tau}^{[j]} = T \cdot S_{\tau} \cdot S_{\tau}^{[j-1]}$ is a product-one sequence over G_2 , we obtain that $\phi(T \cdot S_{\tau}^{[j]})$ is a product-one sequence over G_0 and hence $\phi(T) \cdot T_{\tau}$ is a product-one sequence. Putting this all together, we obtain that $\phi(T) \in (\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}}) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let G be an infinite dihedral group, say $G = \langle \alpha, \tau : \tau^2 = 1, \alpha\tau = \tau\alpha^{-1} \rangle$. Let $G_0 = \{\alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}, \tau\}$ be a subset, where i, j, k are distinct positive integers with $\gcd(i, j, k) = 1$.*

If $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull, then there exist pairwise co-prime integers $r, s, t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i = st$, $j = rt$, and $k = rs$.

Proof. Let $i = 2^{i_0}i_1$, $j = 2^{j_0}j_1$, and $k = 2^{k_0}k_1$, where $i_0, j_0, k_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and i_1, j_1, k_1 are odd. Let $G_1 = \{\alpha^i, \alpha^{-j}, \alpha^k, \tau\}$ and $G_2 = \{\alpha^{-i}, \alpha^j, \alpha^k, \tau\}$. Then Lemma 5.5.2 implies that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull if and only if $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is weakly Krull if and only if $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is weakly Krull. Therefore the elements i, j, k are symmetric and hence we may assume that $i_0 \geq j_0 \geq k_0$. Since $\gcd(i, j, k) = 1$, we know $k_0 = 0$, i.e., k is odd.

Let $r = \gcd(j, k)$, $s = \gcd(i, k)$, and $t = \gcd(i, j)$. It follows from $\gcd(i, j, k) = 1$ that r, s, t are pairwise co-prime. We distinguish four cases.

Case 1: i is even and j is odd.

Since the assertion can not hold in this case, we need to show that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull. Let $S = (\alpha^{-i})^{[j]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then S is not a product-one sequence. It follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[k+j]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[i]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^{-i})^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[i]}} = \frac{(\alpha^j)^{[i]} \cdot (\alpha^{-i})^{[j]} \cdot \tau^{[4]}}{(\alpha^j)^{[i]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_2))} \mathcal{B}(G_2)_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Therefore $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is not weakly Krull and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull.

Case 2: i, j are both even and $i_0 > j_0$.

Since the assertion can not hold in this case, we need to show that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull. Let $S = (\alpha^{-i})^{[k]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then S is not a product-one sequence. It follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[i]} \cdot \tau^{[4]}}{(\alpha^k)^{[i]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \\ &= \frac{(\alpha^j)^{[2^{i_0-j_0}i_1]} \cdot (\alpha^{-i})^{[j_1+k]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^j)^{[2^{i_0-j_0}i_1]} \cdot (\alpha^{-i})^{[j_1]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_2))} \mathcal{B}(G_2)_{\mathfrak{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is not weakly Krull and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull.

Case 3: i, j, k are odd.

Suppose $k \neq rs$. Then Lemma 5.3 implies that there exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd(x, y, z) = 1$ such that $ix + jy = kz$, $ix' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ for every $x' \in [1, x]$, and $jy' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ for every $y' \in [1, y]$. If z is odd, then x or y must be odd. By symmetry, we may assume that x is odd. Then y is even. Let $S = (\alpha^i)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Assume to the contrary that S is a product-one sequence. Then there are subsequences T_1, T_2 over $\{\alpha^i, \alpha^{-k}\}$ such that $S = T_1 \cdot \tau \cdot T_2 \cdot \tau$ and $\pi(T_1) = \pi(T_2)$. Suppose $T_1 = (\alpha^i)^{[x_0]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z_0]}$ and $T_2 = (\alpha^i)^{[x-x_0]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z-z_0]}$, where $x_0 \in [0, x]$ and $z_0 \in [0, z]$. Then $ix_0 - kz_0 = i(x - x_0) - k(z - z_0)$ and hence $i|x - 2x_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{k}$, a contradiction to the fact that $ix' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ for every $x' \in [1, x]$. Therefore S is not a product-one sequence and it follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{S \cdot (\alpha^i)^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[i]}}{(\alpha^i)^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[i]}} = \frac{S \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

whence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction. If z is even, then x and y must be odd. Let $S = (\alpha^i)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z+j]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then S is not a product-one sequence and it follows by Lemma

5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{S \cdot (\alpha^i)^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[i]}}{(\alpha^i)^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[i]}} = \frac{S \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y+k]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^j)^{[y+k]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

whence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction.

Suppose $i \neq st$. Similarly we can prove that $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is not weakly Krull and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction. Suppose $j \neq rt$. Similarly we can prove that $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is not weakly Krull and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction.

Case 4: $i = 2^u i_1$ and $j = 2^u j_1$ such that $u \in \mathbb{N}$ and i_1, j_1, k odd.

Suppose $k \neq rs$. Then Lemma 5.3 implies that there exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd(x, y, z) = 1$ such that $ix + jy = kz$, $ix' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ for every $x' \in [1, x]$, and $jy' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k}$ for every $y' \in [1, y]$. Note that z is even and either x or y must be odd. By symmetry, we may suppose x is odd. If y is even, we let $S = (\alpha^i)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then S is not a product-one sequence. Note that $x+k$ and $z+i$ are both even, whence $(\alpha^i)^{[x+k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z+i]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$ is a product-one sequence. It follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{(\alpha^i)^{[x+k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z+i]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^i)^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[i]}} = \frac{(\alpha^i)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z]} \cdot \tau^{[4]}}{(\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

whence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction. If y is odd, we let $S = (\alpha^i)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z+j]} \cdot \tau^2$. Then S is not a product-one sequence. It follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{(\alpha^i)^{[x+k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z+i+j]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^i)^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[i]}} = \frac{(\alpha^i)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y+k]} \cdot (\alpha^{-k})^{[z+j]} \cdot \tau^{[4]}}{(\alpha^j)^{[y+k]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

whence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction.

Suppose $i \neq st$. Then Lemma 5.3 implies that there exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd(x, y, z) = 1$ such that $ix = jy + kz$, $kz' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{i}$ for every $z' \in [1, z]$, and $jy' \not\equiv 0 \pmod{i}$ for every $y' \in [1, y]$. Note that z is even and either x or y must be odd. If x is odd and y is even, we let $S = (\alpha^{-i})^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[z]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then S is not a product-one sequence. It follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[x+k]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[z+i]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^{-i})^{[k]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[i]}} = \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[z]} \cdot \tau^{[4]}}{(\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_2))} \mathcal{B}(G_2)_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

whence $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is not weakly Krull. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction. If x and y are both odd, we let $S = (\alpha^{-i})^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then S is not a product-one sequence. It follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[x+j_1]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y+i_1]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^{-i})^{[j_1]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[i_1]}} = \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[z]} \cdot \tau^{[4]}}{(\alpha^k)^{[z]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_2))} \mathcal{B}(G_2)_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

whence $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is not weakly Krull. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction. If x is even and y is odd, we let $S = (\alpha^{-i})^{[x+k]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then S is not a product-one sequence. It follows by Lemma 5.5.1 that

$$S = \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[x+k+j_1]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y+i_1]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{(\alpha^{-i})^{[j_1]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[i_1]}} = \frac{(\alpha^{-i})^{[x+k]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[y]} \cdot (\alpha^k)^{[z+i]} \cdot \tau^{[4]}}{(\alpha^k)^{[z+i]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_2))} \mathcal{B}(G_2)_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Then $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is not weakly Krull and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction.

Suppose $j \neq rt$. Similarly, we can prove that $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is not weakly Krull and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction. \square

Proposition 5.7. *Let G be an infinite dihedral group, say $G = \langle \alpha, \tau : \tau^2 = 1, \alpha\tau = \tau\alpha^{-1} \rangle$. Let I be a set of positive integers with $|I| \geq 2$ and $\gcd(I) = 1$, let $J \subseteq I$ be a subset with $1 \leq |J| < |I|$, and let $G_0 = \{\tau\} \cup \{\alpha^i : i \in I \setminus J\} \cup \{\alpha^{-j} : j \in J\}$. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull if and only if there exist pairwise co-prime positive integers b_i , for $i \in I$, such that $kb_k = \prod_{i \in I} b_i$ for every $k \in I$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull. If $|I| = 2$, say $I = \{i, j\}$, then the assertion follows by letting $b_i = j$ and $b_j = i$. Now suppose $|I| \geq 3$. Let $\{i, j, k\}$ be a subset of I . By Lemma 5.5.2, we may assume that $i, j \in I \setminus J$ and $k \in J$. If $\mathcal{B}(\{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\})$ is not weakly Krull, then by Lemma 5.5.1 there exist $S \in \mathcal{F}(\{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\}) \setminus \mathcal{B}(\{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\})$ and $S_a \in \mathcal{B}(\{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\})$ with $a \notin \text{supp}(S_a)$ for all $a \in \{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\}$ such that $S \cdot S_a \in \mathcal{B}(\{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\})$ for every $a \in \{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\}$. Since $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and $\text{supp}(S_\tau) \cap (G_0 \setminus \{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\}) = \emptyset$, we obtain that $S \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}} \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, whence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull, a contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{B}(\{\tau, \alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^{-k}\})$ is weakly Krull. Let $d = \gcd(i, j, k)$. Then $\mathcal{B}(\{\tau, \alpha^{i/d}, \alpha^{j/d}, \alpha^{-k/d}\})$ is also weakly Krull. It follows by Lemma 5.6 that there exist pairwise co-prime positive integers r, s, t such that $i/d = st$, $j/d = rt$, and $k/d = rs$, whence $\gcd(j, k) = dr$, $\gcd(i, j) = dt$, and $\gcd(i, k) = ds$. Therefore $i = dst = \frac{d^3 str^2}{d^2 r^2} = \frac{\gcd(i, j, k)jk}{\gcd(j, k)^2}$, $j = drt = \frac{d^3 rts^2}{d^2 s^2} = \frac{\gcd(i, j, k)ik}{\gcd(i, k)^2}$, and $k = drs = \frac{d^3 rst^2}{d^2 t^2} = \frac{\gcd(i, j, k)ij}{\gcd(i, j)^2}$. The assertion follows by Lemma 5.4.

Suppose there exist pairwise co-prime positive integers b_i , for $i \in I$, such that $kb_k = \prod_{i \in I} b_i$ for every $k \in I$. Then $\gcd(I \setminus \{i\}) = b_i$ for all $i \in I$. For every sequence $T \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$, we define $v_i(T) = v_{\alpha^i}(T) + v_{\alpha^{-i}}(T)$ (note that $v_{\alpha^i}(T) = 0$ or $v_{\alpha^{-i}}(T) = 0$) for all $i \in I$.

Claim C: *Let $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ such that $v_\tau(S)$ is a positive even integer. Then $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ if and only if there exist $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, for $i \in I$, such that $v_i(S) = x_i b_i + 2y_i$ for every $i \in I$ and $\sum_{i \in I} x_i$ is even.*

Proof of Claim C. (\Rightarrow) Suppose $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. There exist subsequences T_1, T_2 over $G_0 \setminus \{\tau\}$ such that $S = T_1 \cdot \tau \cdot T_2 \cdot \tau^{[v_\tau(S)-1]}$ and $\pi(T_1) = \pi(T_2)$. Suppose $T_1 = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J} (\alpha^i)^{[k_i]} \cdot \prod_{j \in J} (\alpha^{-j})^{[k_j]}$ and $T_2 = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J} (\alpha^i)^{[r_i]} \cdot \prod_{j \in J} (\alpha^{-j})^{[r_j]}$. Then $\sum_{i \in I \setminus J} i k_i - \sum_{j \in J} j k_j = \sum_{i \in I \setminus J} i r_i - \sum_{j \in J} j r_j$, whence $b_\ell = \gcd(I \setminus \{\ell\})$ divides $\ell(k_\ell - r_\ell)$ for every $\ell \in I$. Since $\gcd(I) = 1$, we obtain that $\gcd(b_\ell, \ell) = 1$ and hence $b_\ell \mid (k_\ell - r_\ell)$ for every $\ell \in I$. Let $x'_\ell = (k_\ell - r_\ell)/b_\ell$ and $x_\ell = |x'_\ell|$ for every $\ell \in I$. Then $v_\ell(S) = v_\ell(T_1 \cdot T_2) = k_\ell + r_\ell = x_\ell b_\ell + 2 \min\{k_\ell, r_\ell\}$ for every $\ell \in I$. Since

$$\sum_{i \in I \setminus J} i b_i x'_i = \sum_{i \in I \setminus J} i(k_i - r_i) = \sum_{j \in J} j(k_j - r_j) = \sum_{j \in J} j b_j x'_j,$$

and $i b_i = j b_j$ for all $i, j \in I$, we obtain that $\sum_{i \in I \setminus J} x'_i - \sum_{j \in J} x'_j = 0$, whence

$$\sum_{\ell \in I} x_\ell \equiv \sum_{\ell \in I} x'_\ell \equiv \sum_{i \in I \setminus J} x'_i - \sum_{j \in J} x'_j \equiv 0 \pmod{2}.$$

(\Leftarrow) Suppose there exist $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, for $i \in I$, such that $v_i(S) = x_i b_i + 2y_i$ for every $i \in I$ and $\sum_{i \in I} x_i$ is even. Then there exist $c_i, d_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, for $i \in I$, such that $\sum_{i \in I} c_i = \sum_{i \in I} d_i$ and

$c_i + d_i = x_i$ for every $i \in I$. Let

$$T_1 = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J} (\alpha^i)^{[c_i b_i + y_i]} \cdot \prod_{j \in J} (\alpha^{-j})^{[d_j b_j + y_j]} \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J} (\alpha^i)^{[d_i b_i + y_i]} \cdot \prod_{j \in J} (\alpha^{-j})^{[c_j b_j + y_j]}.$$

Then $\pi(T_1) = \pi(T_2)$ and hence $S = T_1 \cdot \tau \cdot T_2 \cdot \tau^{[v_\tau(S)-1]}$ is a product-one sequence.

□[Claim C.]

Let $S \in \cap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then Lemma 5.5.1 implies that $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$. It suffices to show that S is a product-one sequence.

Since there exists $S_\tau \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with $\tau \notin \text{supp}(S_\tau)$ such that $S \cdot S_\tau$ is a product-one sequence, we obtain that $v_\tau(S)$ is even. If $v_\tau(S) = 0$, then S is a product-one sequence. Now we suppose $v_\tau(S)$ is a positive even integer. For every $i \in I$, there exists $S_i \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with $\{\alpha^i, \alpha^{-i}\} \cap \text{supp}(S_i) = \emptyset$ such that $S \cdot S_i$ is a product-one sequence. Then **Claim C** implies that $v_i(S) = v_i(S \cdot S_i) = r_i b_i + 2s_i$ for some $r_i, s_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $v_i(S_\tau) = v_i(S_\tau \cdot \tau^{[2]}) = r'_i b_i + 2s'_i$ for some $r'_i, s'_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\sum_{i \in I} r'_i$ even.

Case 1: The b_i are odd for all $i \in I$.

Since $S \cdot S_\tau$ is a product-one sequence, it follows by **Claim C** that there exist $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, for $i \in I$, such that $v_i(S \cdot S_\tau) = x_i b_i + 2y_i$ for every $i \in I$ and $\sum_{i \in I} x_i$ is even. Therefore

$$\sum_{i \in I} r_i \equiv \sum_{i \in I} v_i(S) \equiv \sum_{i \in I} v_i(S) + \sum_{i \in I} r'_i \equiv \sum_{i \in I} v_i(S \cdot S_\tau) \equiv \sum_{i \in I} x_i \equiv 0 \pmod{2},$$

whence S is a product-one sequence by **Claim C**.

Case 2: There exists $i_0 \in I$ such that b_{i_0} is even.

Then b_j is odd for all $j \in I \setminus \{i_0\}$ and $v_{i_0}(S) = r_{i_0} b_{i_0} + 2s_{i_0}$ is even. We may suppose $v_{i_0}(S) = r_{i_0} b_{i_0} + 2s_{i_0}$ with $2s_{i_0} < b_{i_0}$, where $r_{i_0}, s_{i_0} \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If $\sum_{i \in I \setminus \{i_0\}} r_i$ is even, then $S \cdot (\alpha^{i_0})^{[-v_{i_0}(S)]}$ is a product-one sequence by **Claim C**. It follows by the fact that $v_{i_0}(S)$ is even that S is a product-one sequence. If $\sum_{i \in I \setminus \{i_0\}} r_i$ is odd and $r_{i_0} \geq 1$, then $S \cdot (\alpha^{i_0})^{[-v_{i_0}(S) + b_{i_0}]}$ is a product-one sequence by **Claim C**. It follows by the fact that $v_{i_0}(S) - b_{i_0}$ is even that S is a product-one sequence.

Suppose $\sum_{i \in I \setminus \{i_0\}} r_i$ is odd and $r_{i_0} = 0$. Let S_0 be a product-one sequence with $v_{i_0}(S_0) = 0$ such that $S \cdot S_0$ is a product-one sequence. Then **Claim C** implies that $v_i(S_0) = v_i(S_0 \cdot \tau^{[2]}) = r''_i b_i + 2s''_i$ for some $r''_i, s''_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\sum_{i \in I} r''_i$ even and that there exist $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, for $i \in I$, such that $v_i(S \cdot S_0) = x_i b_i + 2y_i$ for every $i \in I$ and $\sum_{i \in I} x_i$ is even. Since $v_{i_0}(S \cdot S_0) = v_{i_0}(S) = 2s_{i_0} < b_{i_0}$, we obtain that $x_{i_0} = 0$. Therefore

$$\sum_{i \in I \setminus \{i_0\}} r_i \equiv \sum_{i \in I} v_i(S) \equiv \sum_{i \in I} v_i(S) + \sum_{i \in I} r''_i \equiv \sum_{i \in I} v_i(S \cdot S_0) \equiv \sum_{i \in I \setminus \{i_0\}} x_i \equiv \sum_{i \in I} x_i \equiv 0 \pmod{2},$$

a contradiction. □

For the notions that are used in the next proposition but are not introduced in this work we refer to [24].

Proposition 5.8. *Let H_1 and H_2 be monoids. Then $H_1 \times H_2$ is weakly Krull if and only if H_1 and H_2 are both weakly Krull.*

Proof. Let $H = H_1 \times H_2$. We need the following claims.

Claim A. *Let I be a nonempty t -ideal of H . Then $I = I_1 \times I_2$, where*

$$I_1 = \{x \in H_1 : \text{there exists } y \in H_2 \text{ such that } (x, y) \in I\}$$

$$\text{and } I_2 = \{y \in H_2 : \text{there exists } x \in H_1 \text{ such that } (x, y) \in I\}.$$

Furthermore, if I is a prime s -ideal, then $I_1 = H_1$ or $I_2 = H_2$.

Proof of Claim A. Clearly $I \subseteq I_1 \times I_2$. It remains to prove the converse inclusion. Let $(a, b) \in I_1 \times I_2$. Then there exist $c \in H_2$ and $d \in H_1$ such that $(a, c), (d, b) \in I$. Let $(x, y) \in (H : \{(a, c), (d, b)\})$. Then $(ax, cy), (dx, by) \in I$, whence $ax \in H_1$ and $by \in H_2$. It follows that $(a, b)(x, y) \in I$ and hence $(a, b) \in \{(a, c), (d, b)\}_v$. Since I is a t -ideal, we have $(a, b) \in \{(a, c), (d, b)\}_v \subset I$.

For the "furthermore" part, suppose I is a prime s -ideal. Let $(a, b) \in I$. Then $(a, 1)(1, b) \in I$ implies that $(a, 1) \in I$ or $(1, b) \in I$. If $(a, 1) \in I$, then $1 \in I_2$ and hence $I_2 = H_2$. If $(1, b) \in I$, then $1 \in I_1$ and hence $I_1 = H_1$. □[Proof of Claim A.]

Claim B. $\mathfrak{X}(H) = \{P_1 \times H_2 : P_1 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_1)\} \cup \{H_1 \times P_2 : P_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_2)\}$.

Proof of Claim B. We first show that $\mathfrak{X}(H) \supset \{P_1 \times H_2 : P_1 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_1)\}$. Let $P_1 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_1)$. It is clear that $P_1 \times H_2$ is a prime s -ideal of H . By [24, Proposition 11.6(ii)] it follows that $P_1 \times H_2$ contains a nonempty prime t -ideal I . We will show that $P_1 \times H_2$ equals every nonempty prime t -ideal it contains. Then $P_1 \times H_2$ is a minimal prime t -ideal. By using [24, Proposition 11.6(ii)] again, we obtain that $P_1 \times H_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(H)$. Let $I \subset P_1 \times H_2$ be a nonempty prime t -ideal. Then Claim A implies $I = I_1 \times H_2$, where $I_1 \subset P_1$ is a prime s -ideal. Hence the minimality of P_1 implies that $I_1 = P_1$.

By symmetry we can show that $\mathfrak{X}(H) \supset \{H_1 \times P_2 : P_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_2)\}$. Now we prove that $\mathfrak{X}(H) \subset \{P_1 \times H_2 : P_1 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_1)\} \cup \{H_1 \times P_2 : P_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_2)\}$. Let $I \in \mathfrak{X}(H)$. Then [24, Proposition 11.6(iii)] shows that I is a t -ideal and Claim A implies that $I = I_1 \times H_2$ or $I = H_1 \times I_2$, where $I_1 \subset H_1$ and $I_2 \subset H_2$ are prime s -ideals. The minimality of I and $\mathfrak{X}(H) \supset \{P_1 \times H_2 : P_1 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_1)\} \cup \{H_1 \times P_2 : P_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(H_2)\}$ imply that I_1 and I_2 must be minimal, and we complete the proof. □[Proof of Claim B.]

Suppose H_1 and H_2 are weakly Krull. Let $(a, b) \in H \setminus H^\times$. Then $a \notin H_1^\times$ or $b \notin H_2^\times$, say $a \notin H_1^\times$. Then by [24, Theorem 22.7] there exist primary ideals Q_1, \dots, Q_n of H_1 such that $aH_1 = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_n$ and $\sqrt{Q_i} = P_i \in \mathfrak{X}(H_1)$ for all $i \in [1, n]$. If $b \in H_2^\times$, then $(a, b)H = (aH_1) \times H_2 = \bigcap_{i=1}^n Q_i \times H_2$. By Claim B, we obtain that $\sqrt{Q_i \times H_2} = P_i \times H_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(H)$ for all $i \in [1, n]$. If $b \notin H_2^\times$, then there exist primary ideals $L_1, \dots, L_m \subset H_2$ such that $bH_2 = L_1 \cap \dots \cap L_m$ and $\sqrt{L_j} = N_j \in \mathfrak{X}(H_2)$ for all $j \in [1, m]$. Then $(a, b)H = (\bigcap_{i=1}^n Q_i \times H_2) \cap (\bigcap_{j=1}^m H_1 \times L_j)$ and Claim B implies that all radicals of those ideals are in $\mathfrak{X}(H)$. It follows by [24, Theorem 22.7] that both cases imply that H is weakly Krull.

Conversely, suppose H is weakly Krull. By symmetry, we only need to show that H_1 is weakly Krull. Let $a \in H_1 \setminus H_1^\times$. Then $(a, 1) \in H \setminus H^\times$ and by [24, Theorem 22.7] there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and primary t -ideals $I_1, \dots, I_n \subset H$ such that $(a, 1)H = (aH_1) \times H_2 = I_1 \cap \dots \cap I_n$ and $\sqrt{I_i} \in \mathfrak{X}(H)$ for all $i \in [1, n]$. Since $(aH_1) \times H_2 \subset I_i$, it follows by Claim A that $I_i = Q_i \times H_2$ for every $i \in [1, n]$. It is easy to see that each Q_i must be primary. Since $\sqrt{I_i} = \sqrt{Q_i} \times H_2 \in \mathfrak{X}(H)$, Claim B implies that $\sqrt{Q_i} \in \mathfrak{X}(H_1)$ for all $i \in [1, n]$. Note that $aH_1 = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_n$. It follows by [24, Theorem 22.7] that H_1 is weakly Krull. □

Corollary 5.9. *Let G be a group and let $G_0 \subset G$ be a subset. Then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull if and only if $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \setminus \{1\})$ is weakly Krull.*

Proof. If $1 \notin G_0$ the statement is trivial, so let $1 \in G_0$. Since 1 (considered as a sequence) has the property that $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ if and only if $S \cdot 1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$, it is clear that $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \setminus \{1\}) \times \mathcal{F}(\{1\}) \cong \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ (the isomorphism being $(S, 1^{[n]}) \mapsto S \cdot 1^{[n]}$). Now the assertion follows by Proposition 5.8. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1.2. By Corollary 5.9 we can assume that G_0 does not contain the element 1. If $G_0 \subset \langle \alpha \rangle$ or $|G_0| = 1$, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is Krull and hence weakly Krull. For every $g \in G_0$, we let $\mathfrak{p}_g = \{S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) : g \in \text{supp}(S)\}$. We distinguish three cases depending on G_0 and in each case we prove the asserted equivalence.

Case 1: $G_0 \subset \langle \alpha \rangle \tau$ with $|G_0| \geq 2$.

If $|G_0| = 2$, say $G_0 = \{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau\}$, where $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ are distinct, then $\mathcal{A}(G_0) = \{(\alpha^i \tau)^{[2]}, (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]}\}$, which implies $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is factorial and hence weakly Krull.

Suppose $|G_0| = 3$. We will show $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull. Let $G_0 = \{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau, \alpha^k \tau\}$, where $i, j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ are distinct.

Claim D: *Let $d = \gcd(|k - i|, |k - j|, |j - i|)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{(\alpha^i \tau)^{[2]}, (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]}, (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]}, A := (\alpha^i \tau)^{\lfloor |k-j|/d \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{\lfloor |k-i|/d \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{\lfloor |j-i|/d \rfloor}\}.$$

Proof of Claim D. Let $S = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[y]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[z]} \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$, where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We define the map $\phi: \mathcal{F}(G_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by $\phi(S) = ix + jy + kz$. To show the assertion, we will use the fact that $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ if and only if there exist subsequences T_1 and T_2 such that $S = T_1 \cdot T_2$, $|T_1| = |T_2|$, and $\phi(T_1) = \phi(T_2)$ (see **Claim A** of Proof of Theorem 5.1.1). In particular, if S is an atom, then $\text{supp}(T_1) \cap \text{supp}(T_2) = \emptyset$, since otherwise $h^{[2]} \cdot (S \cdot h^{[-2]})$ would be a decomposition of S for every $h \in \text{supp}(T_1) \cap \text{supp}(T_2)$ by **Claim A**; contradicting the fact that S is an atom.

Let $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$. If $|\text{supp}(A_0)| = 1$, then $A_0 \in \{(\alpha^i \tau)^{[2]}, (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]}, (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]}\}$.

Suppose $|\text{supp}(A_0)| = 2$, say $\text{supp}(A_0) = \{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau\}$. Let T_1 and T_2 be the subsequences such that $A_0 = T_1 \cdot T_2$, $|T_1| = |T_2|$, $\phi(T_1) = \phi(T_2)$, $\alpha^i \tau \in \text{supp}(T_1)$. Then $\text{supp}(T_1) \cap \text{supp}(T_2) = \emptyset$ and hence $T_1 = (\alpha^i \tau)^{\lfloor \nu_{\alpha^i \tau}(A_0) \rfloor}$ and $T_2 = (\alpha^j \tau)^{\lfloor \nu_{\alpha^j \tau}(A_0) \rfloor}$. Therefore $\nu_{\alpha^i \tau}(S) = \nu_{\alpha^i \tau}(A_0)$ and $\nu_{\alpha^j \tau}(S) = \nu_{\alpha^j \tau}(A_0)$, a contradiction.

Suppose $|\text{supp}(A_0)| = 3$. After renumbering if necessary, we may suppose $i < j < k$ and $A_0 = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[y]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[z]}$, where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$. Let T_1 and T_2 be the subsequences such that $A_0 = T_1 \cdot T_2$, $|T_1| = |T_2|$, $\phi(T_1) = \phi(T_2)$, and $\alpha^i \tau \in \text{supp}(T_1)$. Then $\text{supp}(T_1) \cap \text{supp}(T_2) = \emptyset$. If $\text{supp}(T_1) = \{\alpha^i \tau\}$, then $T_1 = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[x]}$ and $T_2 = (\alpha^j \tau)^{[y]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[z]}$, whence $x = y + z$ and $ix = jy + kz > iy + iz$, a contradiction. If $\text{supp}(T_1) = \{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau\}$, then $T_1 = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[y]}$ and $T_2 = (\alpha^k \tau)^{[z]}$, whence $x + y = z$ and $ix + jy = kz = kx + ky > ix + jy$, a contradiction. Therefore $\text{supp}(T_1) = \{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^k \tau\}$ and hence $T_1 = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[x]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[z]}$ and $T_2 = (\alpha^j \tau)^{[y]}$. It follows that $ix + kz = jy$ and $x + z = y$. Since $((k - j)/d, (k - i)/d, (j - i)/d)$ is a solution of the above linear equations, we obtain that $(x, y, z) = r((k - j)/d, (k - i)/d, (j - i)/d)$, where r is a positive rational. Since $\gcd((k - j)/d, (k - i)/d, (j - i)/d) = 1$, we have that $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence $r = 1$, since A_0 is an atom. \square [Claim D.]

Since G_0 consists of torsion elements, it follows by Proposition 3.7 that $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0\}$ is finite. Now let $S \in \bigcap_{g \in G_0} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}_g}$. Then $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ and $|S|$ is even. By definition of weakly Krull monoids, we need to show $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. If $|\text{supp}(S)| = 1$, then $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. If $|\text{supp}(S)| = 2$, say $\text{supp}(S) = \{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau\}$, then there exist $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[n]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[m]}$. It follows by the fact that $|S|$ is even that n and m are either both even or both odd. If both are even, then $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Suppose both are odd. Since $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha^k \tau}}$, we obtain there exists $S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha^k \tau}$ such that $S \cdot S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau\})$. It follows that $v_{\alpha^i \tau}(S \cdot S_1)$ and $v_{\alpha^j \tau}(S \cdot S_1)$ are both even, whence $v_{\alpha^i \tau}(S_1)$ and $v_{\alpha^j \tau}(S_1)$ are both odd, a contradiction to $S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha^k \tau} = \mathcal{B}(\{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau\})$.

So it remains to treat the case when $|\text{supp}(S)| = 3$. Assume $S = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[k_1]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[k_2]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[k_3]}$, where $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_1 + k_2 + k_3$ even. If all three of them are even, then $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Otherwise, after renumbering if necessary, we may assume k_1, k_2 are odd and k_3 is even. Since $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha^k \tau}}$, we obtain some $S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha^k \tau}$ such that $S \cdot S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. It follows by $\text{supp}(S_1) \subset \{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau\}$ that $v_{\alpha^i \tau}(S_1)$ is even and hence $v_{\alpha^i \tau}(S \cdot S_1)$ is odd. By **Claim D**, we may suppose

$$S \cdot S_1 = A^{[w]} \cdot ((\alpha^i \tau)^{[2]})^{[x]} \cdot ((\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]})^{[y]} \cdot ((\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]})^{[z]}, \quad \text{where } w, x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Then $w \cdot v_{\alpha^i \tau}(A)$ and hence $v_{\alpha^i \tau}(A)$ are odd. A similar argument shows $v_{\alpha^j \tau}(A)$ is odd and $|A|$ even implies that $v_{\alpha^k \tau}(A)$ is even. If $A \mid_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} S$, then $v_{\alpha^l \tau}(S \cdot A^{[-1]})$ is even for all $l \in \{i, j, k\}$, which implies $S \cdot A^{[-1]}$ and hence S are product-one sequences. If $A \nmid_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} S$, then there is $l \in \{i, j, k\}$ such that $v_{\alpha^l \tau}(S) < v_{\alpha^l \tau}(A)$. Since $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha^l \tau}}$, it follows that there is $S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0 \setminus \{\alpha^l \tau\})$ such that $S \cdot S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Since $v_{\alpha^l \tau}(S \cdot S_1) = v_{\alpha^l \tau}(S) < v_{\alpha^l \tau}(A)$, there exist $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $S \cdot S_1 = (\alpha^i \tau)^{[2x]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2y]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2z]}$, whence $k_1 + v_{\alpha^i \tau}(S_1) = 2x$ is even. Since k_1 is odd, we have that $v_{\alpha^i \tau}(S_1)$ is odd, a contradiction to the fact that $S_1 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0 \setminus \{\alpha^l \tau\})$.

Suppose $|G_0| \geq 4$. Then there exist distinct $i, j, k, r \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\{\alpha^i \tau, \alpha^j \tau, \alpha^k \tau, \alpha^r \tau\} \subset G_0$. In this case, we will show $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull. Set $d_i = \gcd(j - k, j - r, k - r) = 2^{\beta_i} d'_i$, $d_j = \gcd(i - k, i - r, k - r) = 2^{\beta_j} d'_j$, $d_k = \gcd(j - i, j - r, i - r) = 2^{\beta_k} d'_k$, and $d_r = \gcd(j - k, j - i, k - i) = 2^{\beta_r} d'_r$ such that d'_i, d'_j, d'_k, d'_r are all odd. By symmetry, we may assume that $\beta_i = \max\{\beta_i, \beta_j, \beta_k, \beta_r\}$.

Note that $A_i = (\alpha^j \tau)^{\lfloor k-r/d_i \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{\lfloor j-r/d_i \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^r \tau)^{\lfloor j-k/d_i \rfloor} \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ and $|A_i|$ is even. It follows by $d_i = \gcd(j - k, j - r, k - r)$ that two of $(j - k)/d_i, (j - r)/d_i, (k - r)/d_i$ are odd. By symmetry, we may suppose $(k - r)/d_i$ is even and $(j - r)/d_i, (j - k)/d_i$ are odd. Consider $A_j = (\alpha^i \tau)^{\lfloor k-r/d_j \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{\lfloor i-r/d_j \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^r \tau)^{\lfloor i-k/d_j \rfloor} \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$. Since $\beta_i \geq \beta_j$, we obtain $(k - r)/d_j$ is even and hence $(i - r)/d_j, (i - k)/d_j$ are both odd.

Let $S = (\alpha^k \tau)^{\lfloor j-r/d_i \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^r \tau)^{\lfloor j-k/d_i \rfloor}$. Then $S \notin \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and

$$S = \frac{A_i}{(\alpha^j \tau)^{\lfloor k-r/d_i \rfloor}} = \frac{A_j \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{\lfloor j-r/d_i - |i-r/d_j| \rfloor} \cdot (\alpha^r \tau)^{\lfloor j-k/d_i - |i-k/d_j| \rfloor}}{(\alpha^i \tau)^{\lfloor k-r/d_j \rfloor}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

By definition of weakly Krull monoids, we obtain $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull.

Case 2: $|G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle| \geq 1$ and $|G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau| \geq 2$.

Then there are $i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and distinct $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\{\alpha^i, \alpha^j \tau, \alpha^k \tau\} \subset G_0$. Therefore $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \subset \{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0\}$ and

$$(\alpha^i)^{[2]} = \frac{(\alpha^i)^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]}}{(\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]}} = \frac{(\alpha^i)^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]}}{(\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

By definition of weakly Krull monoids, it follows that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull.

Case 3: $|G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle| \geq 1$ and $|G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau| = 1$.

Suppose $G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau = \{\alpha^k \tau\}$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $G_0 \setminus \{\alpha^k \tau\} \subset \{\alpha^i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ or $G_0 \setminus \{\alpha^k \tau\} \subset \{\alpha^{-i} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then $\mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{\mathfrak{p}_g : g \in G_0 \setminus \{\alpha^k \tau\}\}$ and hence for $\alpha^x \in G_0$ we have that

$$(\alpha^x)^{[2]} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))} \mathcal{B}(G_0)_{\mathfrak{p}} \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0).$$

By definition of weakly Krull monoids, it follows that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not weakly Krull.

Now we assume that $G_0 \setminus \{\alpha^k \tau\} = \{\alpha^i : i \in I\} \cup \{\alpha^{-j} : j \in J\}$, where I, J are nonempty sets of positive integers. Let $d = \gcd(I \cup J)$ and let $G_1 = \{\tau\} \cup \{\alpha^{i/d} : i \in I\} \cup \{\alpha^{-j/d} : j \in J\}$. By changing bases, we obtain that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is weakly Krull if and only if $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is weakly Krull.

Suppose $|I \cup J| \geq 2$. Let $i_0 \in I \cup J$ and $G_2 = \{\tau, \alpha^{i_0/d}\} \cup \{\alpha^{-j/d} : j \in (I \cup J) \setminus \{i_0\}\}$. By Lemma 5.5.2, we obtain that $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is weakly Krull if and only if $\mathcal{B}(G_2)$ is weakly Krull. Now the assertion follows from Proposition 5.7.

Suppose $|I \cup J| = 1$, say $I \cup J = \{i\}$. Then $G_1 = \{\tau, \alpha, \alpha^{-1}\}$. To finish the proof, we only need to show that $\mathcal{B}(G_1)$ is weakly Krull. Let $S \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{B}(G_1))} \mathcal{B}(G_1)_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then Lemma 5.5.1 implies that $S \in \mathcal{F}(G_1)$. It suffices to show that S is a product-one sequence. Since there exists $S_{\tau} \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$ with $\tau \notin \text{supp}(S_{\tau})$ such that $S \cdot S_{\tau}$ is a product-one sequence, we obtain that $v_{\tau}(S)$ is even. If $v_{\tau}(S) = 0$, then S is a product-one sequence. Now we suppose $v_{\tau}(S)$ is a positive even integer. Since there exists $S_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$ with $\alpha \notin \text{supp}(S_{\alpha})$ such that $S \cdot S_{\alpha}$ is a product-one sequence, we obtain that $v_{\alpha}(S \cdot S_{\alpha}) + v_{\alpha^{-1}}(S \cdot S_{\alpha})$ and $v_{\alpha^{-1}}(S_{\alpha})$ are both even, whence $v_{\alpha}(S) + v_{\alpha^{-1}}(S)$ is even. It follows that S is a product-one sequence. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1.3. (c) \Leftrightarrow (e) follows by Theorem 3.11.2, (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) follows by Equation (4.1), and (c) \Rightarrow (b) follows by Proposition 4.1.2. It remains to show (b) \Rightarrow (d) and (d) \Rightarrow (e).

(b) \Rightarrow (d) If $G_0 \not\subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle$ and $G_0 \not\subseteq \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \cup \{1\}$, then there are $i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\alpha^i, \alpha^j \tau \in G_0$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $A_n = (\alpha^i)^{[2n]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]} \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$. Since $A_n \mid_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} ((\alpha^i)^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]})^n$ and $A_n \nmid_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} ((\alpha^i)^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^j \tau)^{[2]})^m$ for any $m \in [1, n-1]$, it follows that $\omega(\mathcal{B}(G_0), A_n) \geq n$ and hence $\omega(G_0) = \infty$.

(d) \Rightarrow (e) If $G_0 \subset \langle \alpha \rangle$, then $\langle G_0 \rangle$ is abelian and hence the finiteness of G_0 implies $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated. If $G_0 \subset \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \cup \{1\}$, then G_0 consists of torsion elements. It follows by Theorem 3.11.2 that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitely generated. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1.4. (d) \Rightarrow (b) is clear. For (b) \Rightarrow (c), recall that $\rho = \sup\{\rho_k/k : k \geq 2\}$. (a) \Rightarrow (e) and (c) \Rightarrow (e) If $G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle) \not\subseteq \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}, 1_G^{[n]} : n \geq 0\}$, then there exist $i \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\{\alpha^i, \alpha^j, \alpha^k \tau\} \subset G_0$. We will show that $t(G_0, (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]}) = \infty$

and $\rho_2(G_0) = \infty$. Let $m = \text{lcm}(i, -j)$ and $n_i = m/i$, $n_j = m/(-j)$. Then $(\alpha^i)^{[n_i]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[n_j]}$ is an atom. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S_n = (\alpha^k \tau)^{[4]} \cdot (\alpha^i)^{[2n_i n]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[2n_j n]}$. Then

$$Z(S_n) \cap (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]} \cdot Z(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) = \{z'_n := (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]} \cdot ((\alpha^i)^{[n_i]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[n_j]})^{[2n]}\}.$$

Set $z_n = ((\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^i)^{[2n_i n]} \cdot ((\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^j)^{[2n_j n]}) \in Z(S_n)$. Then $\mathfrak{t}(G_0, (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]}) \geq \mathfrak{d}(z_n, z'_n) = 2n + 2$ and $\rho_2(G_0) \geq 2n + 2$, whence $\mathfrak{t}(G_0, (\alpha^k \tau)^{[2]}) = \infty$ and $\rho_2(G_0) = \infty$.

(e) \Rightarrow (a) and (e) \Rightarrow (d) If $G_0 \subset \langle \alpha \rangle$, then it follows by Theorem 5.1.3 that $\mathfrak{D}(G_0) < \infty$ and $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is tame. Now Proposition 4.1.2 implies $\rho(G_0)$ is accepted.

Suppose $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle) \subset \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}, 1_G^{[n]} : n \geq 0\}$ and $G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$. First, we prove that for all $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \setminus \{1_G\}$ we have that

$$2 \leq \sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(A) \leq \max \left\{ \sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(S) : S \in \mathcal{A}(D) \right\} =: M,$$

where D is the finitely generated monoid defined in Equation (5.1). The first inequality $2 \leq \sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(A)$ follows from the fact that $\mathcal{B}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle) \subset \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}, 1_G^{[n]} : n \geq 0\}$. Let $W \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \setminus \mathcal{A}(D)$. Then $1_G \notin \text{supp}(W)$. We can write $W = U_1 \cdots U_r \cdot g_1^{[2]} \cdots g_t^{[2]}$, where $r, t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $g_1, \dots, g_t \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle$, and $U_1, \dots, U_r \in \mathcal{A}(D) \cap \mathcal{A}(G_0)$. Thus $\text{supp}(U_i) \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in [1, r]$. If $r = 0$, then $\text{supp}(W) \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle$, a contradiction. Suppose $r \geq 2$. Since $U'_1 := U_1 \cdot g_1^{[2]} \cdots g_t^{[2]} \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$, we obtain that $W = U'_1 \cdot U_2 \cdots U_r$, a contradiction. Thus $r = 1$ and hence $\sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(W) = \sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(U_1) \leq M$. The second inequality follows.

We will show $\mathfrak{t}(G_0, A) < \infty$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ and $\rho(G_0) = M/2$ is accepted.

If $A = 1_G$ this is clear by [18, Lemma 1.6.5.2], so let $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \setminus \{1_G\}$. By Equation (4.2), it suffices to prove $\omega(G_0, A)$ and $\tau(G_0, A)$ are both finite. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $U_1, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus \{1_G\}$ such that $A \mid_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} U_1 \cdots U_n$. Let $A = A_1 \cdots A_m$ be a factorization of A in D . Note that $\omega(D)$ is finite by [18, Theorem 3.1.4]. Since $\omega(D, A) \leq m\omega(D)$, after renumbering if necessary, we may assume $A \mid_D U_1 \cdots U_{m\omega(D)}$. Set $A' = U_1 \cdots U_{m\omega(D)} \cdot A^{-1}$. Since $\sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(U_{m\omega(D)+1}) \geq 2$,

we obtain $A' \cdot U_{m\omega(D)+1} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and hence $A \mid_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} U_1 \cdots U_{m\omega(D)+1}$. Therefore $\omega(G_0, A) \leq m\omega(D) + 1$ is finite. Note that for every $U \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \setminus \{1_G\}$ we have that $\sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(U) \geq 2$.

Suppose $A \mid_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} U_1 \cdots U_n$, but A does not divide any proper subproduct. Then $n \leq \omega(G_0, A)$ and $U_1 \cdots U_n \cdot A^{[-1]} = W_1 \cdots W_m$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $W_1, \dots, W_m \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$. Since $2 \leq \sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(W_i)$ for every $i \in [1, m]$ and $M \geq \sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \mathfrak{v}_g(U_j)$ for every $j \in [1, n]$, we obtain that $m \leq \frac{nM}{2} \leq \frac{M \cdot \omega(G_0, A)}{2}$. The definition of $\tau(G_0, A)$ implies that $\tau(G_0, A) \leq \frac{M \cdot \omega(G_0, A)}{2}$ is finite.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(G_0) &= \sup \left\{ \frac{\max(\mathfrak{L}(S))}{\min(\mathfrak{L}(S))} : S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0 \setminus \{1_G\}) \setminus \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}\} \right\} \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \frac{M/2 \cdot \min(\mathfrak{L}(S))}{\min(\mathfrak{L}(S))} : S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0 \setminus \{1_G\}) \setminus \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}\} \right\} \\ &= \frac{M}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ such that $\sum_{g \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau} \nu_g(A) = M$. Then $A = h_1 \cdots \cdot h_r \cdot g_1 \cdots \cdot g_M$, where $h_i \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle$ and $g_i \in G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau$. It follows that $A^{[2]} = (h_1^{[2]} \cdots \cdot h_r^{[2]} \cdot g_1^{[2]}) \cdot g_2^{[2]} \cdots \cdot g_M^{[2]}$, whence $\rho(\mathbf{L}(A^{[2]})) \geq \frac{M}{2}$, thus, using the above inequality, $\rho(\mathbf{L}(A^{[2]})) = \frac{M}{2}$ and $\rho(G_0)$ is accepted. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1.5. Suppose $c(G_0) < \infty$. Then the set of distances is finite by Equation (4.1). If $\rho_k(G_0) = \infty$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sets $\mathcal{U}_k(G_0)$ have the asserted form by [12, Theorem 4.2]. If $\rho_k(G_0) < \infty$ for all $k \geq 2$, then $\rho(G_0)$ is accepted by Theorem 5.1.4, whence the claim for $\mathcal{U}_k(G_0)$ holds by [12, Lemma 3.3 and Theorem 4.2] (see also [33, Theorem 1.2]).

It remains to show the finiteness of the catenary degree. Let D be the finitely generated monoid defined in Equation (5.1). If $G_0 \subset \langle \alpha \rangle$, then by Theorem 5.1.3 and Equation (4.1) we obtain $c(G_0)$ is finite. Suppose $G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$ and set

$$N = \max\{|A| : A \in \mathcal{A}(D)\}.$$

Let $G_1 = \langle \alpha \rangle \cap G_0$. We first show the following two claims.

Claim A. *Let $S_1, \dots, S_{|G_1|+1} \in \mathcal{B}(G_1)$. Then there exists a nonempty subset $I \subset [1, |G_1| + 1]$ such that $\nu_g(\prod_{i \in I} S_i)$ is even for all $g \in G_1$.*

Proof of Claim A. Suppose $(e_1, \dots, e_{|G_1|})$ is a basis of the elementary 2-group $C_2^{|G_1|}$ and let $\eta: \mathcal{F}(G_1) \rightarrow C_2^{|G_1|}$ be a monoid homomorphism defined by $\eta(g_i) = e_i$, where $\{g_1, \dots, g_{|G_1|}\} = G_1$. Therefore for every sequence S over G_1 , we know $\nu_g(S)$ is even for all $g \in G_1$ if and only if $\sigma(\eta(S)) = 0$.

Since $\sigma(\eta(S_1)) \cdots \sigma(\eta(S_{|G_1|+1}))$ is a sequence over $C_2^{|G_1|}$ of length $|G_1| + 1 = D(C_2^{|G_1|})$, there exists a nonempty subset $I \subset [1, |G_1| + 1]$ such that the sequence $\prod_{i \in I} \sigma(\eta(S_i))$ is a product-one sequence, whence $\nu_g(\prod_{i \in I} S_i)$ is even for all $g \in G_1$. \square [End of proof of Claim A.]

Claim B. *Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ with $\text{supp}(A) \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$ and let T be a sequence over G_1 .*

- (i) *For every $T_0 \in \mathcal{F}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle)$, we have that $T_0^{[2]} \cdot A \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and $\max \mathbf{L}(T_0^{[2]} \cdot A) \leq 2|T_0| + N + |G_1|$.*
- (ii) *Suppose $A \in \mathcal{A}(D)$. Let $T_0 \in \mathcal{F}(G_1)$ be a subsequence of T such that $(T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with minimal length. Then $\max \mathbf{L}(T_0^{[2]} \cdot A) \leq |G_1| + N$.*

Proof of Claim B. (i) Let $T_0 \in \mathcal{F}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle)$. Since $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \subset \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, there is an even number of terms from $G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau$ contained in A , so distributing $T_0^{[2]}$ appropriately gives $T_0^{[2]} \cdot A \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. The definition of D implies that there exist a sequence $T_1 \in \mathcal{F}(G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle)$ and an atom $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ such that $A = T_1^{[2]} \cdot A_1$. Suppose

$$T_0^{[2]} \cdot A = T_0^{[2]} \cdot T_1^{[2]} \cdot A_1 = W_1 \cdots \cdot W_r,$$

where $W_i \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ for all $i \in [1, r]$. Let $I \subset [1, r]$ be the maximal subset such that $\prod_{i \in I} W_i$ is a subsequence of $T_1^{[2]}$. Then for every $j \in [1, r] \setminus I$, we have that $W_j \cdot \prod_{i \in I} W_i \notin_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} T_1^{[2]}$, whence $r - |I| \leq 2|T_0| + |A_1| \leq 2|T_0| + N$. Assume to the contrary that $|I| \geq |G_1| + 1$. Then **Claim A** implies that there exists a nonempty subset $J \subset I$ such that $\prod_{i \in J} W_i = T_3^{[2]}$ for some $T_3 \in \mathcal{F}(G_1)$. Note that $(T_1 \cdot T_3^{[-1]})^{[2]} \cdot A_1$ is still a product-one sequence, using the same argument

as above for $T_0^{[2]} \cdot A \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, since we just cancel out terms of T_1 . This is a contradiction to the fact that $A \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$. Therefore $r \leq 2|T_0| + N + |I| \leq 2|T_0| + N + |G_1|$.

(ii) Suppose $A \in \mathcal{A}(D)$. Let $T_0 \in \mathcal{F}(G_1)$ be a subsequence of T such that $(T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with minimal length. Suppose

$$T_0^{[2]} \cdot A = W_1 \cdot \dots \cdot W_r,$$

where $W_i \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ for all $i \in [1, r]$. After renumbering if necessary, we may assume there exists $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$W_1 \cdot \dots \cdot W_t \downarrow_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} T_0^{[2]} \text{ and } W_j \not\downarrow_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)} T_0^{[2]} \cdot (W_1 \cdot \dots \cdot W_t)^{[-1]} \text{ for all } j \in [t+1, r],$$

whence $r - t \leq |A| \leq N$. If $t \geq |G_1| + 1$, then **Claim A** implies that there is a subset $I \subset [1, t]$ such that $\prod_{i \in I} W_i = T_1^{[2]}$ for some sequence $T_1 \in \mathcal{F}(G_1)$. It follows that $T_0 \cdot T_1^{[-1]}$ is a subsequence of T such that $(T \cdot (T_0 \cdot T_1^{[-1]})^{[-1]})^{[2]} = T_1^{[2]} \cdot (T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[2]} = \prod_{i \in I} W_i \cdot (T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, a contradiction to the minimality of $|T_0|$. Thus $t \leq |G_1|$ and $r \leq |G_1| + N$. \square [End of proof of Claim B.]

To prove the finiteness of $c(G_0)$, we show that

$$c(G_0) \leq \gamma = 4t(D) + 2 + 2|G_1| + 2N.$$

Assume to the contrary that there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with $c_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}(B) > \gamma$. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ be the counter example such that $|B|$ is minimal and let $z_1 = U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_k$, $z_2 = V_1 \cdot \dots \cdot V_\ell$ be two factorizations of B between which there is no γ -chain. Since $\mathcal{A}(G_1) \subset \mathcal{A}(D)$, we obtain that $c(G_1) \leq D(G_1) \leq N$, whence $\text{supp}(B) \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$. By symmetry, we may suppose $\text{supp}(V_2 \cdot \dots \cdot V_\ell) \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $V_1 = V'_1 \cdot h_1^{[2]} \cdot \dots \cdot h_r^{[2]}$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $V'_1 \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \cap \mathcal{A}(D)$, and $h_1, \dots, h_r \in G_1$. Therefore for every subset $I \subset [1, r]$, we have that $V'_1 \cdot \prod_{i \in I} h_i^{[2]} \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ and $V'_1 \cdot \prod_{i \in I} h_i^{[2]} \Big|_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} B$. To see this, note that $\text{supp}(V'_1) \subset \langle \alpha \rangle$ implies that $r = 0$ and the statement is trivial. In the case $\text{supp}(V'_1) \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau \neq \emptyset$, we use the same argument as above to see that $V'_1 \cdot \prod_{i \in I} h_i^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, namely distribute the h_i appropriately. If $V'_1 \cdot \prod_{i \in I} h_i^{[2]} \notin \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ we could distribute the remaining h_j and would get a contradiction to $V_1 \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$. Also the second statement can be seen using the argument above to show that $(V_2 \cdot \dots \cdot V_\ell) \cdot \prod_{j \in [1, r] \setminus I} h_j^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. We proceed by the following two claims.

Claim C. *There is a factorization $z_3 = V'_1 \cdot W_1 \cdot \dots \cdot W_t$ such that there is a γ -chain between z_1 and z_3 .*

Claim D. *Let $I \subsetneq [1, r]$, $V_1^* = V'_1 \cdot \prod_{i \in I} h_i^{[2]}$, and $j \in [1, r] \setminus I$. If $z' = V_1^* \cdot Y_1 \cdot \dots \cdot Y_x$ is a factorization of B , then there exists a factorization $z'' = (V_1^* \cdot h_j^{[2]}) \cdot Y'_1 \cdot \dots \cdot Y'_x$ of B such that there is a γ -chain between z' and z'' .*

If **Claim C** and **Claim D** hold, then there exists a factorization $z_4 = V_1 \cdot X_1 \cdot \dots \cdot X_t$ of B such that there is a γ -chain between z_1 and z_4 . Since $|V_2 \cdot \dots \cdot V_\ell| = |X_1 \cdot \dots \cdot X_t| < |B|$, by the minimality of $|B|$ there is a γ -chain between z_4 and z_2 , whence we are done.

Proof of Claims C and D. Let $G_2 = G_0 \cap \langle \alpha \rangle \tau$. Let U^* be an atom of D . If U^* is also an atom of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$, then let $U_0 = 1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$ and otherwise let U_0 be an atom of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ such that $U^* \cdot U_0$ is also an atom of $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$.

Suppose B has two factorizations $z_7 = U_0 \cdot U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_l$ and $z_8 = (U_0 \cdot U^*) \cdot V_1 \cdot \dots \cdot V_m$ and suppose $\text{supp}(U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_l \cdot (U^*)^{[-1]}) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset$. It suffices to show that there is a γ -chain between them. Then both statements follow by choosing the parameters for Claim C as $U^* = V_1'$, U_0 trivial, $U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_l = z_1$ and for Claim D as $U^* = h_j^{[2]}$ and $U_0 = V_1'$.

Note that U^* divides $U_1 \cdot \dots \cdot U_l$ in D . There is a subset $I \subset [1, l]$, say $I = [1, w]$, such that $|I| = w \leq \omega(D) + 1$, $U^* \mid_D \prod_{i=1}^w U_i$, and $\text{supp}((U^*)^{[-1]} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^w U_i) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset$. Therefore $(U^*)^{[-1]} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^w U_i \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and $U^* \mid_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \prod_{i=1}^w U_i$. For each $i \in [1, w]$, suppose $U_i = U_i' \cdot g_{i,1}^{[2]} \cdot \dots \cdot g_{i,t_i}^{[2]}$, where $U_i' \in \mathcal{A}(D)$, $t_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $g_{i,1}, \dots, g_{i,t_i} \in G_1$. Let $J \subset [1, w]$ and $I_i \subset [1, t_i]$ for each $i \in [1, w]$ be subsets such that

$$U^* \mid_D X = \prod_{j \in J} U_j' \cdot \prod_{i=1}^w \left(\prod_{j_i \in I_i} g_{i,j_i}^{[2]} \right),$$

but U^* does not divide any proper subproduct. Thus $(U^*)^{[-1]} \cdot X$ has a factorization in D of length $\leq \tau(D)$. Suppose

$$X \cdot \prod_{j \in [1, w] \setminus J} U_j' = U^* \cdot X_1 \cdot \dots \cdot X_\tau,$$

where $X_i \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ and $\tau \leq \tau(D) + w - |J| \leq 2\mathfrak{t}(D) + 1$.

Let $T = \prod_{i=1}^w (\prod_{j_i \in [1, t_i] \setminus I_i} g_{i,j_i})$. Then

$$B = U_0 \cdot T^{[2]} \cdot X \cdot \prod_{j \in [1, w] \setminus J} U_j' \cdot \prod_{j=w+1}^l U_j.$$

Let $T_0 = \prod_{i=1}^w (\prod_{j_i \in I_i'} g_{i,j_i})$ be a subsequence of T such that $(T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ with minimal length, where $I_i' \subset [1, t_i] \setminus I_i$. Note that T_0 can be trivial or equal to T . Suppose

$$(T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[2]} = W_1 \cdot \dots \cdot W_y,$$

where $W_i \in \mathcal{A}(G_1)$. Let $U_i'' = U_i' \cdot \prod_{j \in I_i \cup I_i'} g_{i,j}^{[2]}$. Then $U_i'' \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ (using the same argument as above Claim C) and B has a factorization

$$z_{10} = U_0 \cdot U_1'' \cdot \dots \cdot U_w'' \cdot W_1 \cdot \dots \cdot W_y \cdot U_{w+1} \cdot \dots \cdot U_l \quad (\text{note that } U_0 \in \mathcal{A}(G_0) \cup \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}\}).$$

After renumbering if necessary, we may assume there exists $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X_i \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ for all $i \in [1, \tau_0]$, $X_i \notin \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ for all $i \in [\tau_0 + 1, \tau]$, and $\text{supp}(X_1) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset$ (note that $\text{supp}((U^*)^{[-1]} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^w U_i) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset$). Then $|X_i| = 2$ for every $i \in [\tau_0 + 1, \tau]$, $X_1 \cdot T_0^{[2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, and by **Claim B**, $X_1 \cdot T_0^{[2]}$ has a factorization $X_1 \cdot T_0^{[2]} = Y_1 \cdot \dots \cdot Y_s$ of length $s \leq |G_1| + N$. We may suppose $\text{supp}(Y_1) \cap G_2 \neq \emptyset$. Then by **Claim B** again, $X' = Y_1 \cdot X_{\tau_0+1} \cdot \dots \cdot X_\tau \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ has a factorization of length $\leq |X_{\tau_0+1} \cdot \dots \cdot X_\tau| + N + |G_1| = 2(\tau - \tau_0) + N + |G_1|$. It follows by $B \cdot (T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[-2]} \cdot (U_{w+1} \cdot \dots \cdot U_l)^{[-1]} \cdot (U^* \cdot U_0)^{[-1]} = T_0^2 \cdot X_1 \cdot \dots \cdot X_\tau = X_2 \cdot \dots \cdot X_{\tau_0} \cdot Y_2 \cdot \dots \cdot Y_s \cdot X'$ that $B \cdot (T \cdot T_0^{[-1]})^{[-2]} \cdot (U_{w+1} \cdot \dots \cdot U_l)^{[-1]} \cdot (U^* \cdot U_0)^{[-1]}$ has a factorization of length $\leq (\tau_0 - 1) + |G_1| + N + 2(\tau - \tau_0) + N + |G_1| \leq \gamma$. Therefore B has a factorization

$$z_3 = (U^* \cdot U_0) \cdot W_1' \cdot \dots \cdot W_x' \cdot W_1 \cdot \dots \cdot W_y \cdot U_{w+1} \cdot \dots \cdot U_l$$

with $x \leq \gamma - 1$, whence $\mathfrak{d}(z_3, z_{10}) \leq \max\{\gamma, \omega(D) + 1\}$, where $W_1', \dots, W_x' \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$. Note that by choice and Equation 4.1 we get that $w \leq \omega(D) + 1 \leq \mathfrak{t}(D) + 1$.

By **Claim A**, there exist $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and sequences T'_1, \dots, T'_a over G_1 such that $[1, y] = K_1 \uplus \dots \uplus K_a$, where K_1, \dots, K_a are disjoint subsets of $[1, y]$ with $|K_i| \leq |G_1| + 1$ for every $i \in [1, a]$, and $(T'_i)^{[2]} = \prod_{j \in K_i} W_j$. Furthermore, there exist $J_i^{(j)} \subset [1, t_i] \setminus (I_i \cup I'_i)$ for all $i \in [1, w]$ and all $j \in [1, a]$ such that $T'_k = \prod_{i=1}^w (\prod_{j \in J_i^{(k)}} g_{i,j})$ for all $k \in [1, a]$. Set

$$U_i^{(k)} = U_i'' \cdot \prod_{j \in J_i^{(1)} \cup \dots \cup J_i^{(k)}} g_{i,j}^{[2]}$$

and hence $U_i^{(k)} \in \mathcal{A}(G_0)$ for all $k \in [1, a]$ and $i \in [1, w]$. Then

$$z_{10+k} = U_0 \cdot U_1^{(k)} \cdot \dots \cdot U_w^{(k)} \cdot \prod_{j \in [1, y] \setminus (K_1 \cup \dots \cup K_a)} W_j \cdot \prod_{i=w+1}^l U_i$$

is a factorization of B , where $k \in [1, a]$. Note that $z_{10+a} = z_7$ and $\mathbf{d}(z_{10+i}, z_{10+i+1}) \leq w + |G_1| + 1$ for every $i \in [0, a-1]$. Then there is a $(w + |G_1| + 1)$ -chain between z_7 and z_{10} .

By the minimality of the choice of $|B|$, we obtain there is a γ -chain between z_3 and z_8 , whence there is a γ -chain between z_7 and z_8 .

□[End of proof of Claims C and D.]

Thus the proof of Theorem 5.1.5 is complete. □

We continue with three examples.

Example 5.10. If $G_0 = \{\alpha, \alpha^{-1}, \tau\}$, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a root closed v -noetherian G-monoid, but neither a C-monoid nor locally tame, and $\mathbf{D}(G_0) = \omega(G_0) = \infty$.

Proof. Since G_0 is finite, it follows by Theorem 5.1 that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a v -noetherian G-monoid, $\mathbf{D}(G_0) = \omega(G_0) = \infty$, and not locally tame, whence not a C-monoid by [18, Theorem 3.3.4.3].

To show $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is root closed, it suffices to prove $\widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subset \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Let $\frac{S_1}{S_2} \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)} \subset \mathcal{F}(G_0)$ with $S_1 = \alpha^{[n_1]} \cdot (\alpha^{-1})^{[m_1]} \cdot \tau^{[l_1]}$, $S_2 = \alpha^{[n_2]} \cdot (\alpha^{-1})^{[m_2]} \cdot \tau^{[l_2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Then $n_1 \geq n_2$, $m_1 \geq m_2$, $l_1 \geq l_2$, and $l_1, l_2, |n_1 - n_2|, |n_2 - m_2|$ are even. Therefore $(n_1 - n_2) - (m_1 - m_2), l_1 - l_2$ are even and $\frac{S_1}{S_2} = \alpha^{[n_1 - n_2]} \cdot (\alpha^{-1})^{[m_1 - m_2]} \cdot \tau^{[l_1 - l_2]}$. If $l_1 - l_2 \neq 0$, then $\frac{S_1}{S_2} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. Suppose $l_1 = l_2$. Since $\frac{S_1}{S_2} \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\frac{S_1}{S_2})^{[N]} = \alpha^{[N(n_1 - n_2)]} \cdot (\alpha^{-1})^{[N(m_1 - m_2)]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, which implies that $(\frac{S_1}{S_2}) = \alpha^{[n_1 - n_2]} \cdot (\alpha^{-1})^{[m_1 - m_2]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and we are done. □

Example 5.11. If $G_0 = \{\alpha, \tau\}$, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a root closed v -noetherian G-monoid, a half-factorial non-finitely generated C-monoid whence locally tame, but not completely integrally closed, and $\mathbf{D}(G_0) = \omega(G_0) = \infty$.

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{A}(G_0) = \{\alpha^{[2n]} \cdot \tau^{[2]} : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. Thus $\mathbf{D}(G_0) = \omega(G_0) = \infty$, $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not finitely generated, and every sequence $S \in \mathcal{B}(G_0) \setminus \{1_{\mathcal{B}(G_0)}\}$ can be written as $S = \alpha^{[2n]} \cdot \tau^{[2m]}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_0, m \in \mathbb{N}$, whence $\mathbf{L}(S) = \{\frac{\sqrt{\tau(S)}}{2}\}$. Therefore $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is half-factorial and

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}(G_0), \mathcal{F}(G_0)) = \{[1_{\mathcal{F}(G_0)}], [\alpha^{[2]}], [\alpha], [\tau^{[2]}], [\tau], [\alpha \cdot \tau^{[2]}], [\alpha \cdot \tau]\},$$

whence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a C-monoid and therefore locally tame by [18, Theorem 3.3.4.3]. Example 5.10 implies that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is root closed. Note that $\alpha^{[2]} = \frac{\alpha^{[2]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}}{\tau^{[2]}} \in \mathbf{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0))$ and $\tau^{[2]} \cdot (\alpha^{[2]})^{[n]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, but $\alpha^{[2]} \notin \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. We obtain $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not completely integrally closed. □

In Proposition 3.10 we proved that monoids of product-one sequences over finite subsets of groups are finitary. Next we show that there are finitary monoids of product-one sequences over infinite subsets of groups.

Example 5.12. If $G_0 = \{\tau, \alpha^m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitary, but neither a G-monoid nor seminormal, and $D(G_0) = \omega(G_0) = \infty$.

Proof. If $G_1 = \{\alpha, \tau\}$, then $\mathcal{B}(G_1) \subset \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is a divisor closed submonoid, whence Example 5.11 implies that $\infty = D(G_1) \leq D(G_0)$ and $\infty = \omega(G_1) \leq \omega(G_0)$.

In the notation of Proposition 3.10, let $n = 1$ and $A_1 = \tau^{[2]}$. Then $\{A_1\}$ satisfies the conditions in Proposition 3.10 and hence $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is finitary. By Theorem 3.11, $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not a G-monoid. To see that $\mathcal{B}(G_0)$ is not seminormal, we set $S_1 = (\alpha^2)^{[3]} \cdot \alpha^6 \cdot \tau^{[4]}$ and $S_2 = (\alpha^2)^{[2]} \cdot \tau^{[2]}$. Then $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$ and $S = \alpha^2 \cdot \alpha^6 \cdot \tau^{[2]} = \frac{S_1}{S_2} \in \mathfrak{q}(\mathcal{B}(G_0)) \setminus \mathcal{B}(G_0)$, but $S^{[2]}, S^{[3]} \in \mathcal{B}(G_0)$. \square

Finally, we give the proof of Theorem 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Let G be an infinite dihedral group.

1. This follows from Theorem 3.14
2. Theorem 4.4 implies that $\mathcal{L}(G)$ has the given form, whence $\Delta(G)$ and $\mathcal{U}_k(G)$ are as asserted.
3. The monoid $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is an FF-monoid by Proposition 4.1. Since $\Delta(G) = \mathbb{N}$, we obtain $c(G) = \omega(G) = \infty$ by Equation (4.1). Example 5.10 shows that $\mathcal{B}(G)$ has divisor-closed submonoids, that are not locally tame, whence $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is not locally tame. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors have discussed this work with A. Geroldinger in innumerable conversations. We want to thank him for his suggestions and comments. We are also grateful to the anonymous referee for his careful reading; he found a mistake in a proof and helped a lot to get the manuscript into a readable shape.

REFERENCES

- [1] N.R. Baeth and R. Sampson, *Upper triangular matrices over information algebras*, Linear Algebra Appl. **587** (2020), 334 – 357.
- [2] N.R. Baeth and D. Smertnig, *Arithmetical invariants of local quaternion orders*, Acta Arith. **186** (2018), 143 – 177.
- [3] V. Blanco, P. A. García-Sánchez, and A. Geroldinger, *Semigroup-theoretical characterizations of arithmetical invariants with applications to numerical monoids and Krull monoids*, Illinois J. Math. **55** (2011), 1385 – 1414.
- [4] F.E. Brochero Martínez and S. Ribas, *Extremal product-one free sequences in Dihedral and Dicyclic Groups*, Discrete Math. **341** (2018), 570 – 578.
- [5] S. T. Chapman, F. Gotti, and M. Gotti, *Factorization invariants of Puiseux monoids generated by geometric sequences*, Comm. Algebra **48** (2020), 380 – 396.
- [6] K. Cziszter and M. Domokos, *Groups with large Noether bound*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **64** (2014), 909 – 944.
- [7] ———, *The Noether number for the groups with a cyclic subgroup of index two*, J. Algebra **399** (2014), 546 – 560.
- [8] K. Cziszter, M. Domokos, and I. Szöllösi, *The Noether number and the Davenport constants of the groups of order less than 32*, J. Algebra **510** (2018), 513 – 541.
- [9] K. Cziszter, M. Domokos, and A. Geroldinger, *The interplay of invariant theory with multiplicative ideal theory and with arithmetic combinatorics*, in Multiplicative Ideal Theory and Factorization Theory, Springer, 2016, pp. 43 – 95.

- [10] M. Domokos, *On syzygies for rings of invariants of abelian groups*, in *Advances in Rings, Modules, and Factorizations*, vol. 321, Springer, 2020, pp. 105 – 124.
- [11] Y. Fan, A. Geroldinger, F. Kainrath, and S. Tringali, *Arithmetic of commutative semigroups with a focus on semigroups of ideals and modules*, *J. Algebra Appl.* **11** (2017), 1750234 (42 pages).
- [12] W. Gao and A. Geroldinger, *On products of k atoms*, *Monatsh. Math.* **156** (2009), 141 – 157.
- [13] A. Geroldinger, *Additive group theory and non-unique factorizations*, *Combinatorial Number Theory and Additive Group Theory*, *Advanced Courses in Mathematics CRM Barcelona*, Birkhäuser, 2009, pp. 1 – 86.
- [14] A. Geroldinger and D.J. Gryniewicz, *On the arithmetic of Krull monoids with finite Davenport constant*, *J. Algebra* **321** (2009), 1256 – 1284.
- [15] A. Geroldinger and D.J. Gryniewicz, *The large Davenport constant I: Groups with a cyclic index 2 subgroup*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **217** (2013), 863 – 885.
- [16] A. Geroldinger D. J. Gryniewicz, J. Oh, and Q. Zhong, *On product-one sequences over dihedral groups*, *Journal of Algebra and its Applications* (to appear).
- [17] A. Geroldinger and F. Halter-Koch, *Arithmetical theory of monoid homomorphisms*, *Semigroup Forum* **48** (1994), 333 – 362.
- [18] ———, *Non-Unique Factorizations. Algebraic, Combinatorial and Analytic Theory*, *Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 278, Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2006.
- [19] A. Geroldinger and W. Hassler, *Local tameness of v -noetherian monoids*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **212** (2008), 1509–1524.
- [20] A. Geroldinger and F. Kainrath, *On the arithmetic of tame monoids with applications to Krull monoids and Mori domains*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **214** (2010), 2199–2218.
- [21] A. Geroldinger and S. Ramacher and A. Reinhart, *On v -Marot Mori rings and C -rings*, *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **52** (2015), 1 – 21.
- [22] A. Geroldinger, W. A. Schmid and Q. Zhong, *Systems of sets of lengths: Transfer Krull monoids versus weakly Krull monoids*, in *Rings, Polynomials and Modules*, 191–235, Springer, 2017.
- [23] D.J. Gryniewicz, *The large Davenport constant II: General upper bounds*, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **217** (2013), 2221 – 2246.
- [24] F. Halter-Koch, *Ideal Systems. An Introduction to Multiplicative Ideal Theory*, Marcel Dekker, 1998.
- [25] Dongchun Han, *The Erdős-Ginzburg-Ziv Theorem for finite nilpotent groups*, *Archiv Math.* **104** (2015), 325 – 332.
- [26] Dongchun Han and Hanbin Zhang, *The Erdős-Ginzburg-Ziv Theorem and Noether number for $C_m \times C_{mn}$* , *J. Number Theory* **198** (2019), 159 – 175.
- [27] F. Kainrath, *Factorization in Krull monoids with infinite class group*, *Colloq. Math* **80** (1999), 23–30.
- [28] J.S. Oh, *On the algebraic and arithmetic structure of the monoid of product-one sequences II*, *Periodica Math. Hungarica* **78** (2019), 203 – 230.
- [29] J.S. Oh, *On the algebraic and arithmetic structure of the monoid of product-one sequences*, *J. Commut. Algebra* **12** (2020), 409 – 433.
- [30] J.S. Oh and Q. Zhong, *On minimal product-one sequences of maximal length over dihedral and dicyclic groups*, *Communications of the Korean Math. Soc.* **35** (2020), 83 – 116.
- [31] J.S. Oh and Q. Zhong, *On Erdős-Ginzburg-Ziv inverse theorems for dihedral and dicyclic groups*, *Israel J. Math.* **238** (2020), 715 – 743.
- [32] A. Reinhart, *On integral domains that are C -monoids*, *Houston J. Math.* **39** (2013), 1095 – 1116.
- [33] S. Tringali, *Structural properties of subadditive families with applications to factorization theory*, *Israel J. Math.* **234** (2019), 1 – 35.
- [34] K. Zhao, *On product-one sequences with congruence conditions over non-abelian groups*, manuscript.
- [35] Q. Zhong, *On an inverse problem of Erdős, Kleitman, and Lemke*, *J. Comb. Th. Series A* **177** (2021), 105323.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, ZIBO, SHANDONG 255000, CHINA.

Email address: qinghai.zhong@uni-graz.at

URL: <https://imsc.uni-graz.at/zhong/>

UNIVERSITY OF GRAZ, NAWI GRAZ, INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, HEINRICH-STRASSE 36, 8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA

Email address: `victor.fadinger@uni-graz.at`, `qinghai.zhong@uni-graz.at`