



King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Technical Report Series

TR 212

November 1996

Bicycle Extensions - the non-group congruences

R.J. Warne

Bicyclic Extensions - the non-group congruences

R.J. Warne

Abstract

Let T be a monoid with the group of units U . Let θ be a homomorphism of T into U (θ^0 denoting the identity automorphism of T). Let P and K be disjoint sets and let γ be a homomorphism of T into G_K , the full transformation group on K . Let $S = ((I^0 \times \{0\}) \times (T \times P)) \cup ((I^0 \times N) \times (T \times K))$ where $N(I^0)$ are the natural numbers (non-negative integers) under the multiplication $((n, k), (g, p)) ((r, s), (h, q)) = ((n + r - t, k + s - t), (g\theta^{r-t} h\theta^{k-t}, x))$ where $t = \min(k, r)$ and $x = q$ or $p(h\theta^{k-r-1}\gamma)$ according to whether $k \leq r$ or $k > r$. We term S a bicyclic extension of T . A congruence \mathcal{P} on S such that $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ implies $m = p$ and $n = q$ is termed a separating congruence. A congruence \mathcal{P} on S which is not a group congruence (S/\mathcal{P} is a group) or a separating congruence is termed a crossover congruence. We characterized the group congruences in a previous paper. In this paper, we characterize the crossover congruences and the separating congruences. These results generalize the corresponding results of Picochi [7] for Bruck-Reilly extensions ($|P| = |K| = 1$) to bicyclic extensions.

The bicyclic semigroup C has played a central role in the theory of simple semigroups. Any simple semigroup S whose structure is not given by the Rees Theorem [3] is locally bicyclic (in the sense that every element of $E(S)$, the set of idempotents of S , is the identity of some bicyclic subsemigroup of S). In fact, many papers have described various classes of simple semigroups as essentially split extensions of groups or unions of groups by C or generalizations of C . For examples see the references [5, 6, 9, {10, 11}, and 12 - 21]. Of the above constructions, the E -bisimple construction [16, 22] is the most preferable in regard to the combined criteria of elegance, simplicity, generality, and applicability. So, we choose it as the prototype for developing a more general structure theory of simple semigroups, and we begin by replacing "group" with "monoid" in this construction. We termed the resulting construction a bicyclic extension in [23, 24]. In [23, 24], we characterized bicyclic extensions of finite chains of groups as simple regular semigroups S such that $E(S)$ is a strong ω -chain of bands $(P_n \times Y : n \in I^0, \text{ the non-negative integers})$ where P_n is a right zero semigroup ($xy = y$) and Y is a finite chain. This theorem generalizes the structure theorems in [5, 9, {10, 11}, 16]. In [23, 24], we also determined the group congruences of a bicyclic extension. In this paper, we determine the non-group congruences on a bicyclic extension S . A congruence \mathcal{P} on S such that $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ implies $m = p$ and $n = q$ is termed a separating congruence. A congruence \mathcal{P} on S which is not a group congruence or a separating congruence is termed a crossover congruence (following

Proof. First, we show \mathcal{P}_T is a θ -admissible congruence on T . Clearly \mathcal{P}_T is an equivalence relation on T . If $a \mathcal{P}_T b$ and $c \in T$, $((0, 0), (ac, p_0)) = ((0, 0), (a, p_0)) ((0, 0), (c, p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, p_0)) ((0, 0), (c, p_0)) = ((0, 0), (bc, p_0))$. So, $ac \mathcal{P}_T bc$. Similarly, $ca \mathcal{P}_T cb$. So, \mathcal{P}_T is a congruence on T . Next, we show \mathcal{P}_T is θ -admissible. Suppose $g \mathcal{P}_T h$. Then, $((0, 0), (g\theta, p_0)) = ((0, 1), (1, q)) ((0, 0), (g, p_0)) ((1, 0), (1, p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 1), (1, q)) ((0, 0), (h, p_0)) ((1, 0), (1, p_0)) = ((0, 0), (h\theta, p_0))$. So, $g\theta \mathcal{P}_T h\theta$. It is easily checked that $\mathcal{P}_{T \times P}$ is a left \mathcal{P}_T -invariant equivalence relation on $T \times P$. Next, we show $\mathcal{P}_{T \times K}$ is a left \mathcal{P}_T -invariant equivalence relation on $T \times K$ such that $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_T$ and $(a, r) \mathcal{P}_T (b, s)$ implies $(a(u\theta), r(u\gamma)) \mathcal{P}_T (b(v\theta), s(v\gamma))$. Clearly, $\mathcal{P}_{T \times K}$ is an equivalence relation on $T \times K$. Suppose $a \mathcal{P}_T b$ and $(c, r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (d, s)$. Then, $((0, 1), (ac, r)) = ((0, 0), (a, p_0)) ((0, 1), (c, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, p_0)) ((0, 1), (d, s)) = ((0, 1), (bd, s))$. So, $\mathcal{P}_{T \times K}$ is left \mathcal{P}_T -invariant. Suppose, $(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}_T$ and $(a, r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (b, s)$. Thus, $((0, 1), (a(u\theta), r(u\gamma))) = ((0, 1), (a, r)) ((0, 0), (u, p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 1), (b, s)) ((0, 0), (v, p_0)) = ((0, 1), (b(v\theta), s(v\gamma)))$. So, $(a(u\theta), r(u\gamma)) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (b(v\theta), s(v\gamma))$.

Theorem 2. Let $S = (T, P, K, \theta, \gamma)$ be a bicyclic extension. Let Γ be a θ -admissible congruence relation on T , let δ be a left Γ -invariant equivalence relation on $T \times P$, and let λ be a left Γ -invariant equivalence relation on $T \times K$ such that $(u, v) \in \Gamma$ and $(a, k) \lambda (b, t)$ imply $(a(u\theta), k(u\gamma)) \lambda (b(v\theta), t(v\gamma))$. The following relation $\mathcal{P} = (\Gamma, \delta, \lambda)$ is a separating congruence on S . $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ if and only if $m = p$, $n = q$, $a \Gamma b$, $(a, r) \delta (b, s)$ if $n = 0$, and $(a, r) \lambda (b, s)$ if $n \neq 0$. Conversely, every separating congruence \mathcal{P} on S can be so constructed by means of an appropriate triple $(\Gamma, \delta, \lambda)$ (in fact, we may take $\Gamma = \mathcal{P}_T$, $\delta = \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}$, and $\lambda = \mathcal{P}_{T \times K}$).

Proof. We first show $\tau = (\Gamma, \delta, \lambda)$ is a congruence relation on S . It is easily checked that τ is an equivalence relation. Next, we show that τ is compatible. Suppose $((m, n), (a, r)) \tau ((p, q), (b, s))$ and $((h, k), (c, w)) \in S$. Thus, $m = p$, $n = q$, $a \Gamma b$, and $(a, r) \delta (b, s)$ if $n = 0$, and $(a, r) \lambda (b, s)$ if $n \neq 0$. We first show $A = ((m, n), (a, r)) ((h, k), (c, w)) \tau ((m, n), (b, s)) ((h, k), (c, w)) = B$. If $h \geq n$, $A = ((m+h-n, k), (a\theta^{h-n}c, w))$ and $B = ((m+h-n, k), (b\theta^{h-n}c, w))$. Since Γ is a θ -admissible congruence, $a\theta^{h-n}c \Gamma b\theta^{h-n}c$. If $k \neq 0$, then $a\theta^{h-n}c \Gamma b\theta^{h-n}c$ and $(1, w) \lambda (1, w)$ imply $(a\theta^{h-n}c, w) \lambda (b\theta^{h-n}c, w)$ since λ is a left Γ -invariant equivalence relation. If $k = 0$, $(a\theta^{h-n}c, w) \delta (b\theta^{h-n}c, w)$ since δ is a left Γ -invariant equivalence relation. Next, assume $n > h$. Then, $A = ((m, n+k-h), (a(c\theta^{n-h}), r(c\theta^{n-h-1}\gamma)))$ and $B = ((m, n+k-h), (b(c\theta^{n-h}), s(c\theta^{n-h-1}\gamma)))$.

Note, $a(c\theta^{n-h}) \Gamma b(c\theta^{n-h})$ and $n+k-h = k+(n-h) \neq 0$. Since $(a,r) \lambda (b,s)$ (as $n \neq 0$) and $c\theta^{n-h-1} \Gamma c\theta^{n-h-1}$, $(a(c\theta^{n-h}), r(c\theta^{n-h-1}\gamma)) \lambda (b(c\theta^{n-h}), s(c\theta^{n-h-1}\gamma))$. So $A \tau B$. Similarly, τ is a left congruence, so τ is a congruence.

Let \mathcal{P} be any congruence on S such that $((m,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((p,q), (b,s))$ implies $m=p$ and $n=q$. So, $((0,m), (1,x)) ((m,n), (a,r)) ((n,0), (1,p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0,m), (1,x)) ((m,n), (b,s)) ((n,0), (1,p_0))$. Thus, $((0,0), (a,p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0,0), (b,p_0))$. Hence, $a \mathcal{P}_T b$. Suppose, $n \neq 0$. Note $((0,m), (1,x)) ((m,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,m), (1,x)) ((m,n), (b,s))$. Thus, $((0,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,n), (b,s))$. So, $((0,n), (a,r)) ((n-1,0), (1,p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0,n), (b,s)) ((n-1,0), (1,p_0))$. Thus, $((0,1), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,1), (b,s))$. Thus, $(a,r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (b,s)$. If $n=0$, $((m,0), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((m,0), (b,s))$. Hence, $((0,m), (1,x)) ((m,0), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,m), (1,x)) ((m,0), (b,s))$. So, $((0,0), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,0), (b,s))$. Hence, $(a,r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b,s)$. So $\mathcal{P} \subseteq (\mathcal{P}_T, \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}, \mathcal{P}_{T \times K})$. Conversely, suppose $((m,n), (a,r)) (\mathcal{P}_T, \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}, \mathcal{P}_{T \times K}) ((p,q), (b,s))$. Thus, $m=p$, $n=q$, $a \mathcal{P}_T b$, $(a,r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b,s)$ if $n=0$, and $(a,r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (b,s)$ if $n \neq 0$. Suppose $n=0$. Then, $((0,0), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,0), (b,s))$. So, $((m,0), (1,p_0)) ((0,0), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((m,0), (1,p_0)) ((0,0), (b,s))$. Hence, $((m,0), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((m,0), (b,s))$. So, $((m,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((m,n), (b,s))$. Suppose $n \neq 0$. Then, $((0,1), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,1), (b,s))$. Suppose $k > 0$ and $((0,k), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,k), (b,s))$. Then, $((0,k), (a,r)) ((0,1)(1,x)) \mathcal{P} ((0,k), (b,s)) ((0,1)(1,x))$. Hence, $((0,k+1), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,k+1), (b,s))$. So, $((0,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((0,n), (b,s))$. Hence, $((m,0), (1,p_0)) ((0,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((m,0), (1,p_0)) ((0,n), (b,s))$. So, $((m,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((m,n), (b,s))$. So, $((m,n), (a,r)) \mathcal{P} ((p,q), (b,s))$. Thus, $(\mathcal{P}_T, \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}, \mathcal{P}_{T \times K}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$. So, $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_T, \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}, \mathcal{P}_{T \times K})$. Apply Lemma 1.

Let S be a bicyclic extension of a monoid T . We write $S = (T, P, K, \theta, \gamma)$.

If T is a group, S is termed an E -bisimple semigroup [16,22]. In this case, a congruence \mathcal{P} on S is termed block separating if $((n,n), (1,s)) \mathcal{P} ((m,m), (1,t))$ implies $n=m$.

Lemma 3 [22, Theorem 3.1]). *Let \mathcal{P} be a congruence relation on an E -bisimple semigroup. Then, either \mathcal{P} is a group congruence (S/\mathcal{P} is a group) or \mathcal{P} is a block separating congruence.*

Let $\bar{C} = (I^0 \times \{0\}) \times (\{1\} \times P) \cup (I^0 \times N) \times (\{1\} \times K)$ under the multiplication $((m,n), (1,r)) ((p,q), (1,s)) = (m+p-t, n+q-t), (1,x)$ where $x=s$ if $n \leq p$ and $x=r$ if $p > n$. Then, \bar{C} is an E -bisimple semigroup ([22, Theorem 1.1]). Thus, any congruence \mathcal{P} on \bar{C} is either a group congruence or a

block separating congruence by Lemma 3.

If \mathcal{P} is a congruence on S , let $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}} = \mathcal{P}/\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. If X is a semigroup, $E(X)$ will denote its set of idempotents.

Theorem 4. For a congruence \mathcal{P} on S , exactly one of the following conditions hold:

- 1) \mathcal{P} is a group congruence. This is valid if and only if $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}}$ is a group congruence on $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$.
- 2) $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ if and only if $m = p$, $n = q$, $a \mathcal{P}_T b$, $(a, r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b, s)$ if $n = 0$, and $(a, r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (b, s)$ if $n \neq 0$ (i.e. $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_T, \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}, \mathcal{P}_{T \times K})$ is a separating congruence).
- 3) \mathcal{P} is not a group congruence and there exists at least one pair of elements of S such that $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ with $m \neq p$ or $n \neq q$ (i.e. \mathcal{P} is a crossover congruence).

For any such pair, $m = p + 1$, $n = q + 1$ and, $a \mathcal{P}_T b\theta$; or $p = m + 1$, $q = n + 1$ and $b \mathcal{P}_T a\theta$.

For all such pairs $((m', n'), (a', r')) \mathcal{P} ((p', q'), (b', s'))$, $m' = p'$ if and only if $n' = q'$ and then $a' \mathcal{P}_T b'$, $(a', r') \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b', s')$ if $n' = 0$, $(a', r') \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (b', s')$ if $n' \neq 0$.

$(1, k_1) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (1, k_2)$ for all $k_1, k_2 \in K$.

Proof. It is easy to see that (1), (2), and (3) are mutually exclusive. We first show that \mathcal{P} is a group congruence if and only if $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}}$ is a group congruence. Suppose \mathcal{P} is a group congruence on S . Then $e \mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}} f$ for all $e, f \in E(\overline{\mathcal{C}})$. So, $\overline{\mathcal{C}}/\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}}$ is a regular semigroup with precisely one idempotent and hence a group. Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}}$ is a group congruence on $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Thus noting [22, Lemma 2.1(c)], $((n, n), (1, p)) \mathcal{P} ((k, k), (1, q))$ for all $n, k \in I^0$, $p \in P$ ($n = 0$) ($p \in K$ ($n \neq 0$)), $q \in P$ ($k = 0$) ($q \in K$ ($k \neq 0$)). Let $a = ((m, n), (g, p)) \in S$. Thus, for $s \in K$ $((n, m), (g, p)) ((m + 1, n + 1), ((g\theta)^{-1}, s)) = ((n + 1, n + 1), (g\theta(g\theta)^{-1}, s)) = ((n + 1, n + 1), (1, s))$. Let $x = ((m + 1, n + 1), ((g\theta)^{-1}, s))$ and let $e_0 = ((0, 0), (1, p_0))$. So, $a\mathcal{P}x\mathcal{P} = e_0\mathcal{P}$. Furthermore, $((m + 1, n + 1), ((g\theta)^{-1}, u)) ((n, m), (g, p)) = ((m + 1, m + 1), ((g\theta)^{-1}g\theta, u(g\gamma))) = ((m + 1, m + 1), (1, u(g\gamma)))$. Let $y = ((m + 1, n + 1), ((g\theta)^{-1}, u))$. So, $y\mathcal{P}a\mathcal{P} = e_0\mathcal{P}$. Let $b = ((r, s), (h, t)) \in S$. Then, $((r, s), (h, t)) ((s, s), (1, t)) = ((r, s), (h, t)) = ((r, r), (1, v)) \cdot ((r, s), (h, t))$. So, $b\mathcal{P}e_0\mathcal{P} = e_0\mathcal{P}b\mathcal{P} = b\mathcal{P}$. Hence, S/\mathcal{P} is a group.

Suppose \mathcal{P} is not a group congruence on S . Then, $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}}$ is not a group congruence on $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Suppose $\mathcal{P}|S_0$ where $S_0 = (U, P, K, \theta|U, \gamma|U)$ is a group congruence. Thus, $((k, k), (1, s)) \mathcal{P} ((q, q), (1, t))$ for $k, q \in I^0$, $s \in K$ ($k \neq 0$), $s \in P$ ($k = 0$), $t \in K$ ($q \neq 0$), $t \in P$ ($q = 0$). So, $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{C}}}$ is a group congruence on $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$, a

contradiction. Thus, $\mathcal{P}|_{S_0}$ is a block separating congruence on S_0 by Lemma 3. Suppose $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ (in S). Let $k > \max(n, q)$. Thus, $((m+k-n, k), (a\theta^{k-n}, s)) = ((m, n), (a, r)) ((k, k), (1, s)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s)) ((k, k), (1, s)) = ((p+k-q, k), (b\theta^{k-q}, s))$. Hence, by [22, Lemma 4.4], $m+k-n = p+k-q$ or $m-n = p-q$. So, $m-p = n-q$. Thus, $m = p$ if and only if $n = q$. Suppose $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ implies $m = p$ and $n = q$. Hence, \mathcal{P} is a separating congruence and condition (2) follows from Theorem 2. Suppose condition (2) is not valid. Then, again by Theorem 2, there exist $((m, n), (a, s)) \in S$, $((p, q), (b, t)) \in S$ such that $((m, n), (a, s)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, t))$ with $m \neq p$ or $n \neq q$. Hence $m \neq p$ and $n \neq q$ with $m-p = n-q$. Suppose $q < n$ (hence $p < m$).

We first show $a \mathcal{P}_T \theta^{m-p}$. Note, for $v \in P$, $((0, 0), (a, v)) = ((0, m), (1, z)) ((m, n), (a, s)) ((n, 0), (1, v)) \mathcal{P} ((0, m), (1, z)) ((p, q), (b, t)) ((n, 0), (1, v)) = ((0, m+q-p), (b\theta^{m-p}, z(b\theta^{m-p-1}\gamma))) ((n, 0), (1, v)) = ((0, 0), (b\theta^{m-p}, v))$. So

$$(a) \quad a \mathcal{P}_T \theta^{m-p}.$$

Furthermore, for $w \in P$, $((0, 0), (b, w)) = ((0, p), (1, r)) ((p, q), (b, t)) ((q, 0), (1, w)) \mathcal{P} ((0, p), (1, r)) ((m, n), (a, s)) ((q, 0), (1, w)) = ((m-p, n), (a, s)) ((q, 0), (1, w)) = ((m-p, n-q), (a, s))$. So,

$$(b) \quad ((m-p, m-p), (a, s)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, w)) \text{ for all } w \in P.$$

Using (a), for $\bar{p}_0 \in K$, $((m-p, m-p), (a, \bar{p}_0)) = ((m-p, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (a, p_0)) ((0, m-p), (1, \bar{p}_0)) \mathcal{P} ((m-p, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (b\theta^{m-p}, p_0)) ((0, m-p), (1, \bar{p}_0)) = ((m-p, m-p), (b\theta^{m-p}, \bar{p}_0))$. Hence, $((m-p, m-p), (1, \bar{p}_0)) = ((m-p, m-p), (b\theta^{m-p}, \bar{p}_0)) ((m-p, m-p), ((b\theta^{m-p})^{-1}, \bar{p}_0)) \mathcal{P} ((m-p, m-p), (a, \bar{p}_0)) ((m-p, m-p), ((b\theta^{m-p})^{-1}, \bar{p}_0)) = ((m-p, m-p), (a(b\theta^{m-p})^{-1}, \bar{p}_0))$. So,

$$(c) \quad ((m-p, m-p), (1, \bar{p}_0)) \mathcal{P} ((m-p, m-p), (a(b\theta^{m-p})^{-1}, \bar{p}_0)) \text{ for all } \bar{p}_0 \in K.$$

Note that for $\bar{p}_0 \in K$,

$$\begin{aligned} & ((m-p, m-p), (a, s)) \cdot \\ & ((1, 1), ((b\theta)^{-1}, \bar{p}_0)) = \begin{cases} ((m-p, m-p), (a(b\theta^{m-p})^{-1}, s(b\theta^{m-p-1})^{-1}\gamma)) & \text{if } m-p > 1 \\ ((m-p, m-p), (a(b\theta^{m-p})^{-1}, \bar{p}_0)) & \text{if } m-p = 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (c), $((m-p, m-p), (a, s)) ((1, 1), ((b\theta)^{-1}, \bar{p}_0)) \mathcal{P} ((m-p, m-p), (1, \bar{p}_0))$ for some $\bar{p}_0 \in K$. Hence using (b), $((m-p, m-p), (1, \bar{p}_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, w)) ((1, 1), ((b\theta)^{-1}, \bar{p}_0)) = ((1, 1), (1, \bar{p}_0))$. Since $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{C}}$ is a block separating congruence, $m-p = 1$. So, $n-q = 1$. Thus, $m = p+1$, $n = q+1$, and by (a) $a \mathcal{P}_T b\theta$. We have shown that if $((m', n'), (a', r')) \mathcal{P} ((p', q'), (b', s'))$, then $m' = p'$ iff $n' = q'$. Using the proof of Theorem 2, then $a \mathcal{P}_T b$, $(a', r') \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b', s')$ if $n' = 0$, and $(a', r') \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (b', s')$ if $n' \neq 0$.

Finally, we show $((1, k_1) \mathcal{P}_{T \times K} (1, k_2))$ for all $k_1, k_2 \in K$. We have shown there exists at least one pair of elements of S such that $((p+1, q+1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$. Thus for $v \in P$, $((1, 1), (a, r)) = ((0, p), (1, u)) \cdot ((p+1, q+1), (a, r)) ((q, 0), (1, v)) \mathcal{P} ((0, p), (1, u)) ((p, q), (b, s)) ((q, 0), (1, v)) = ((0, 0), (b, v))$. So, for $t \in K$, $((0, 1), (a, r)) = ((0, 1), (1, t)) ((1, 1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 1), (1, t)) ((0, 0), (b, v)) = ((0, 1), (b\theta, t(b\gamma)))$. So, let $k \in K$. Thus, $k = t(b\gamma)$ for some $t \in K$ since $b\gamma \in G_K$. Hence $((0, 1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 1), (b\theta, k))$ for all $k \in K$. Thus if $k_1, k_2 \in K$, $((0, 1), (1, k_1)) = ((0, 0), ((b\theta)^{-1}, p_0)) ((0, 1), (b\theta, k_1)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), ((b\theta)^{-1}, p_0)) ((0, 1), (b\theta, k_2)) = ((0, 1), (1, k_2))$. The congruence given in condition (3) is termed a crossover congruence by Piochi [7].

Lemma 5. *Let \mathcal{P} be a crossover congruence on $S = (T, P, K, \theta, \gamma)$ and let $B = \{b \in T \mid ((1, 1), (b\theta), t) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, s)) \text{ for all } t \in K \text{ and all } s \in P\}$. Then, B is a non-empty ideal of T different from T , B is \mathcal{P}_T saturated (i.e. $u \mathcal{P}_T v$ and $u \in B$ implies $v \in B$), and for $x, y \in B$, $x \mathcal{P}_T y$ iff $x\theta \mathcal{P}_T y\theta$.*

Proof. We first show that $B \neq \emptyset$. By the proof of Theorem 4, there exists $a, b \in T$ and $r \in K$ such that $((1, 1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, v))$ for all $v \in P$. Thus, for $t \in K$, $((1, 1), (a, r)) = ((1, 1), (1, t)) ((1, 1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (1, t)) ((0, 0), (b, v)) = ((1, 1), (b\theta, t(b\gamma)))$. So, $((1, 1), (b\theta, k)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, v))$ for all $k \in K$ and all $v \in P$. Hence, $b \in B$ and $B \neq \emptyset$.

We next show B is an ideal of T . Let $b \in B$ and $c \in T$. For all $s \in P$ and $t \in K$, $((0, 0), (bc, s)) = ((0, 0), (b, s)) ((0, 0), (c, s)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (b\theta, t)) ((0, 0), (c, s)) = ((1, 1), ((bc)\theta, t(c\gamma)))$. So, $((0, 0), (bc, s)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), ((bc)\theta, k))$ for all $s \in P$ and $k \in K$. Thus, $bc \in B$. Similarly, $cb \in B$. We next show $B \neq T$. Suppose $1 \in B$. Then, $((1, 1), (1, t)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (1, s))$ for all $t \in K$ and $s \in P$. This is impossible since $\mathcal{P}_{\overline{C}}$ is not a group congruence in \overline{C} by Theorem 4 and hence must be a block separating congruence on \overline{C} by Lemma 3. So, $B \neq T$. Next, we show B is \mathcal{P}_T saturated. Let $x, y \in B$ and suppose $x \mathcal{P}_T y$ and $x \in B$. Then, for all $s \in P$ and $k \in K$, $((0, 0), (y, s)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (x, s)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (x\theta, k)) = ((0, 0), (x, s)) ((1, 1), (1, k)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (y, s)) ((1, 1), (1, k)) = ((1, 1), (y\theta, k))$. Hence, $y \in B$. Finally, let $x, y \in B$ and assume $x\theta \mathcal{P}_T y\theta$. So, for all $k \in K$, $((1, 1), (x\theta, k)) = ((1, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (x\theta, p_0)) ((0, 1), (1, k)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (y\theta, p_0)) ((0, 1), (1, k)) = ((1, 1), (y\theta, k))$. Hence, $((0, 0), (x, p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (x\theta, k)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (y\theta, k)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (y, p_0))$. So, $x \mathcal{P}_T y$. By Theorem 1, $x \mathcal{P}_T y$ implies $x\theta \mathcal{P}_T y\theta$.

Lemma 6. Let \mathcal{P} be a crossover congruence on S . If $a \in B$ and $a \mathcal{P}_T b$, then $((0, 0), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, s))$ for all $r, s \in P$.

Proof. First note $b \in B$ and $a\theta \mathcal{P}_T b\theta$ by Lemma 5 and Lemma 1. Thus, for $k \in K$, $((1, 1), (a\theta, k)) = ((1, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (a\theta, p_0)) ((0, 1), (1, k)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (b\theta, p_0)) ((0, 1), (1, k)) = ((1, 1), (b\theta, k))$. Hence, for all $r, s \in P$, $((0, 0), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (a\theta, k)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (b\theta, k)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, s))$.

Lemma 7. Let \mathcal{P} be a crossover congruence relation on S and suppose $((p+1, q+1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$. Then, $b \in B$.

Proof. Let $v \in P$. Then, $((1, 1), (a, r)) = ((0, p), (1, u)) ((p+1, q+1), (a, r)) ((q, 0), (1, v)) \mathcal{P} ((0, p), (1, u)) \cdot ((p, q), (b, s)) ((q, 0), (1, v)) = ((0, 0), (b, v))$. Let $t_0 \in K$. Then, $((1, 1), (a, r)) = ((1, 1), (1, t_0)) \cdot ((1, 1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (1, t_0)) ((0, 0), (b, v)) = ((1, 1), (b\theta, t_0(b\gamma)))$. So, $((0, 0), (b, v)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (b\theta, t))$ for all $v \in P$ and $t \in K$. Hence, $b \in B$.

Theorem 8. Let $S = (T, P, K, \theta, \gamma)$. Let Γ be a congruence relation on T , δ be an equivalence relation on $T \times P$, and B be a non-empty ideal of T such that

1. Γ is θ -admissible
2. δ is left Γ -invariant
3. $B \neq T$ and B is Γ -saturated
4. For $x, y \in B$, $x \Gamma y$ if and only if $x\theta \Gamma y\theta$

Then, the following relation $\mathcal{P} = (\Gamma, \delta, B)$ is a crossover congruence relation on S :

$$((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s)) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} m = p, n = q, a \Gamma b, \text{ and if } n = 0, a \in B \text{ or } (a, r) \delta (b, s) & \text{(I)} \\ m = p+1, n = q+1, a \Gamma b\theta, b \in B & \text{(II)} \\ p = m+1, q = n+1, b \Gamma a\theta, a \in B & \text{(III)} \end{cases}$$

Conversely, every crossover congruence \mathcal{P} on S can be so constructed by means of an appropriate triple (Γ, δ, B) .

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a crossover congruence on S . Let $B = \{b \in T : ((0, 0), (b, u)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (b\theta, k)) \text{ for all } u \in P \text{ and } k \in K\}$. Let $\Gamma = \mathcal{P}_T$ and let $\delta = \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}$. By Lemma 1 and Lemma 5, $\Gamma = \mathcal{P}_T$ is a θ -admissible congruence on T and $\delta = \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}$ is a left \mathcal{P}_T -invariant equivalence relation on $T \times P$, and

B is a non-empty ideal of T such that 3-4 is valid. Let $\lambda = (\mathcal{P}_T, \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}, B)$ and suppose $((m, n), (a, r)) \lambda ((p, q), (b, s))$. First assume $m = p, n = q, a \mathcal{P}_T b$, and if $n = 0, a \in B$ or $(a, r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b, s)$. First, suppose $n \neq 0$. Then, by Theorem 4, $((0, 1), (1, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 1), (1, s))$. So, if $((0, k), (1, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, k), (1, s)), ((0, k+1), (1, r)) = ((0, 1), (1, r)) ((0, k), (1, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 1), (1, s)) ((0, k), (1, s)) = ((0, k+1), (1, s))$ for $k \geq 1$. Thus, $((0, n), (1, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, n), (1, s))$. Hence, $((m, n), (a, r)) = ((m, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (a, p_0)) ((0, n), (1, r)) \mathcal{P} ((m, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (b, p_0)) ((0, n), (1, s)) = ((m, n), (b, s))$. Next, assume $n = 0$. If $a \in B, ((0, 0), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, s))$ by Lemma 6. Thus, $((m, 0), (a, r)) = ((m, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((m, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (b, s)) = ((m, 0), (b, s))$. Similarly, if $a \notin B, (a, r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b, s)$ implies $((m, 0), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((m, 0), (b, s))$. Next, assume $m = p+1, n = q+1, a \mathcal{P}_T b\theta$, and $b \in B$. Thus, $((m, n), (a, r)) = ((p, 0), (1, p_0)) ((1, 1), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((0, q), (1, s)) \mathcal{P} ((p, 0), (1, p_0)) ((1, 1), (b\theta, r)) ((0, q), (1, s)) \mathcal{P} ((p, 0), (1, p_0)) ((0, 0), (b, p_0)) ((0, q), (1, s)) = ((p, q), (b, s))$. Dually, $p = m+1, q = n+1, b \mathcal{P}_T a\theta$ and $a \in B$ imply $((p, q), (b, s)) \mathcal{P} ((m, n), (a, r))$. Thus, $\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{P}$. Conversely, let $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$. First assume $m = p$ and $n = q$. Then, pre-multiplying by $((0, m), (1, x))$ and post-multiplying by $((n, 0), (1, p_0))$ gives $((0, 0), (a, p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((0, 0), (b, p_0))$ or $a \mathcal{P}_T b$. If $n = 0$ and $a \notin B$, pre-multiplying by $((0, m), (1, x))$ gives $(a, r) \mathcal{P}_{T \times P} (b, s)$. Suppose $m \neq p$ or $n \neq q$. Then, by Theorem 4 and Lemma 7, $m = p+1, n = q+1, a \mathcal{P}_T b\theta$, and $b \in B$ or dually $p = m+1, q = n+1, b \mathcal{P}_T a\theta$, and $a \in B$. Thus, $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \lambda$ and $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_T, \mathcal{P}_{T \times P}, B)$.

We now show $\mathcal{P} = (\Gamma, \delta, B)$ is a congruence relation on S . Trivially, \mathcal{P} is reflexive. Since $a \in B$ and $a \Gamma b$ imply $b \in B$ by (3), \mathcal{P} is trivially symmetric. We next show that \mathcal{P} is transitive. Let $x = ((m, n), (a, r)), y = ((p, q), (b, s)), z = ((u, v), (c, w))$, and suppose $x \mathcal{P} y$ and $y \mathcal{P} z$. We consider several cases. Assume $x \mathcal{P} y$ by (I) and $y \mathcal{P} z$ by (I). Thus, $m = u, n = v$, and $a \Gamma c$. If $n \neq 0, x \mathcal{P} z$ by (I). Suppose $n = 0$. By (3), $a \in B$ iff $b \in B$ iff $c \in B$. So, if $a \notin B, (a, r) \delta (b, s) \delta (c, w)$. Hence, $x \mathcal{P} z$ by (I). If $a \in B, x \mathcal{P} z$ by (I). Suppose $x \mathcal{P} y$ by (II) and $y \mathcal{P} z$ by (I). Then, $m = u+1$ and $n = v+1$. Since $b \Gamma c, b\theta \Gamma c\theta$ by (1). So, $a \Gamma c\theta$. Since $b \in B$ and $b \Gamma c, c \in B$ by (3). Thus, $x \mathcal{P} z$ by (II). Suppose $x \mathcal{P} y$ by (III) and $y \mathcal{P} z$ by (I). Then, $u = m+1, v = n+1, c \Gamma b \Gamma a\theta$ and $a \in B$. Suppose $x \mathcal{P} y$ by (III) and $y \mathcal{P} z$ by (II). Thus, $m = p-1 = u$ and $n = q-1 = v$. Since $a\theta \Gamma b \Gamma c\theta$ and $a, c \in B, a \Gamma c$ by (4). So, if $n \neq 0, x \mathcal{P} z$ by (I). Since $a \in B$, this is also valid for $n = 0$. The dual cases are similar. Assume $x \mathcal{P} y$ by (II) and $y \mathcal{P} z$ by (II). Since $b \Gamma c\theta$ and $b \in B, c\theta \in B$ by (3). So, $1 = (c\theta)(c\theta)^{-1} \in B$.

and $B = T$ which contradicts (3). Hence this case is impossible. Similarly, the case $x \mathcal{P} y$ by (III) and $y \mathcal{P} z$ by (III) is impossible. Hence, \mathcal{P} is an equivalence relation. We next show \mathcal{P} is a congruence relation. First assume $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ by (I). Thus, $m = p$, $n = q$ and $a \Gamma b$, and if $n = 0$, $a \in B$ or $(a, r) \delta (b, s)$. We show $C = ((h, k), (c, w)) ((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((h, k), (c, w)) ((m, n), (b, s)) = D$. If $k \leq m$, $C = ((h + m - k, n), (c\theta^{m-k}a, r))$ and $D = ((h + m - k, n), (c\theta^{m-k}b, s))$. If $n \neq 0$, $C \mathcal{P} D$ by (I). If $n = 0$ and $a \in B$, $C \mathcal{P} D$ by (I). If $n = 0$ and $(a, r) \delta (b, s)$, then $(c\theta^{m-k}a, r) \delta (c\theta^{m-k}b, s)$ by (2). So, $C \mathcal{P} D$ by (I). If $k > m$, $C = ((h, k + n - m), (c(a\theta^{k-m}), w(a\theta^{k-m-1}\gamma)))$ and $D = ((h, k + n - m), (c(b\theta^{k-m}), w(b\theta^{k-m-1}\gamma)))$. Since $k > m$, $k + n - m > 0$ and, hence, $C \mathcal{P} D$ by (I). So, in case (I) \mathcal{P} is a left congruence. Similarly, \mathcal{P} is a right congruence in this case. Next, assume $((m, n), (a, r)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s))$ by (II). Hence, $m = p + 1$, $n = q + 1$, $a \Gamma b\theta$ and $b \in B$. We will show $E = ((m, n), (a, r)) ((h, k), (c, w)) \mathcal{P} ((p, q), (b, s)) ((h, k), (c, w)) = F$. Assume $h \geq n > q$. Then, $E = ((m + h - n, k), (a\theta^{h-n}c, w))$ and $F = ((p + h - q, k), (b\theta^{h-q}c, w))$. So, $m + h - n = p + 1 + h - q - 1 = p + h - q$, $k = k$, and $a\theta^{h-n}c = a\theta^{h-q-1}c \Gamma (b\theta)\theta^{h-q-1}c = b\theta^{h-q}c$. Thus, if $k \neq 0$, $E \mathcal{P} F$ by (I). Let $k = 0$. Since $a\theta^{h-n}c \Gamma b\theta^{h-q}c$ and $(1, w) \delta (1, w)$, $(a\theta^{h-n}c, w) \delta (b\theta^{h-q}c, w)$ by (2). So, $E \mathcal{P} F$ by (I). Next, assume $h < q < n$. Then, $E = ((m, n + k - h), (a(c\theta^{n-h}), r(c\theta^{n-h-1}\gamma)))$ and $F = ((p, q + k - h), (b(c\theta^{q-h}), s(c\theta^{q-h-1}\gamma)))$. Since $m = p + 1$, $k - h + n = (k - h + q) + 1$, $a(c\theta^{n-h}) \Gamma (b\theta)(c\theta^{n-h}) = (b(c\theta^{n-h-1}))\theta = (b(c\theta^{q-h}))\theta$, and $b(c\theta^{q-h}) \in B$, $E \mathcal{P} F$ by (II). Finally, assume $h = q < n$. Then, $E = ((m, n + k - h), (a(c\theta^{n-h}), r(c\theta^{n-h-1}\gamma)))$ and $F = ((p, k), (bc, w))$. Since $m = p + 1$, $n + k - h = q + 1 + k - h = k + 1$, $a(c\theta^{n-h}) = a(c\theta) \Gamma (bc)\theta$, and $(bc) \in B$, $E \mathcal{P} F$ by (II). So, in case (II), \mathcal{P} is a right congruence. Similarly, \mathcal{P} is a left congruence in this case. The proof that \mathcal{P} is a congruence in case (III) is similar to the proof of case (II). Since $1 \notin B$ (by (3)), $((0, 0), (1, p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (1, r))$ for any $p_0 \in P$ or $r \in K$ is impossible. So \mathcal{P} is not a group congruence. Thus, since $B \neq \emptyset$, \mathcal{P} is a crossover congruence. Let $a \in B$, $b = a\theta$, $p_0 \in P$, and $r \in K$. Then, $((0, 0), (a, p_0)) \mathcal{P} ((1, 1), (b, r))$.

References

1. A.H. Clifford, *Extensions of semigroups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 68(1950), 165-173.
2. A.H. Clifford, *A class of d -simple semigroups*, Amer. J. Math. 75(1953), 547-556.
3. A.H. Clifford and G.B. Preston, *The Algebraic Theory of Semigroups*, Math. Surveys No. 7 (Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1961).
4. J.M. Howie, *An introduction to semigroup theory*, (Academic Press, London, 1976)
5. B.P. Koçin, *Structure of inverse ideal simple ω -semigroups*, Vestnik Leningrad Univ. 23, No. 7 (1968), 41-50 (in Russian).
6. W.D. Munn, *Regular ω -semigroups*, Glasgow Math. J. 9(1968), 46-66.
7. Brunetto Piochi, *Congruences on Bruck-Reilly extensions of monoids*, Semigroup Forum 50(1995), 179-191.
8. D. Rees, *On the ideal structure of a semigroup satisfying the cancellation law*, Quarterly J. Math. Oxford Ser. 19(1948), 101-108.
9. N.R. Reilly, *Bisimple ω -semigroups*, Proc. Glasgow Math. Assoc. 7(1966), 160-169.
10. R.J. Warne, *Homomorphisms of d -simple inverse semigroups with identity*, Pacific J. Math. 14(1964), 1111-1122.
11. R.J. Warne, *A class of bisimple inverse semigroups*, Pacific J. Math. 18(1966), 563-577.
12. R.J. Warne, *Bisimple inverse semigroups mod groups*, Duke Math. J. 34(1967), 787-812.
13. R.J. Warne, *I-bisimple semigroups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 150(1968), 367-368.
14. R.J. Warne, *I-regular semigroups*, Math. Japon. 15(1970), 91-100.
15. R.J. Warne, ω^n *I-bisimple semigroups*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. 21(1970), 121-150.
16. R.J. Warne, *E-bisimple semigroups*, Journal of Natural Sciences and Math. 11(1971), 51-81.
17. R.J. Warne, ωY - \mathcal{L} -*unipotent semigroups*, Jñānabha 3(1973), 99-118.
18. R.J. Warne, *Generalized ω - \mathcal{L} -unipotent bisimple semigroups*, Pacific J. Math. 50(1974), 102-118.
19. R.J. Warne, *Standard regular semigroups*, Pacific J. Math. 65(1976), 539-562.
20. R.J. Warne, *Natural regular semigroups*, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Boylai, Szeged 20(1976), 685-720.
21. R.J. Warne, *Embedding of regular semigroups in wreath products*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 29(1983), 177-207.
22. R.J. Warne, *Some consequences of structure theorem for E-bisimple semigroups*, in Words, Languages, and Combinatorics, II, M. Ito and H. Jurgensen (eds), London, 1994, World Scientific, 425-442.
23. R.J. Warne, *Bicyclic Extensions*, Technical Report No. 201, Dept. of Math. Sci., King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, March 1996, 41 pages.
24. R.J. Warne, *Bicyclic Extensions*, to appear.
25. R.J. Warne and Syed Omar, *Ideal extensions of bicyclic extensions*, to appear.

Department of Mathematical Sciences
King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals
Dhahran 31261, Saudi Arabia