

The rank of the semigroup of order-, fence-, and parity-preserving partial injections on a finite set

Apatsara Sareeto¹ and Jörg Koppitz^{2*}

¹Corresponding author. Institute of Mathematics, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, 14476, Germany (E-mail: channypooii@gmail.com)

^{2*}Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, 1113, Bulgaria (E-mail: koppitz@math.bas.bg).

October 18, 2023

Abstract

The monoid of all partial injections on a finite set (the symmetric inverse semigroup) is of particular interest because of the well-known Wagner-Preston Theorem. Let n be a positive natural number and PFI_n be the semigroup of all fence-preserving partial one-one maps of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into itself with respect to composition of maps and the fence $1 \prec 2 \succ 3 \prec \dots n$. There is considered the inverse semigroup IOF_n^{par} of all $\alpha \in PFI_n$ such that α is regular in PFI_n , order-preserving with respect to the order $1 < 2 < \dots < n$ and parity-preserving. According to the main result of the paper, it is $3n - 6$ the least of the cardinalities of the generating sets of IOF_n^{par} for $4 \leq n$. There is determined a concrete representation of a generating set of minimal size.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 20M05, 20M18, 20M20

Keywords: Partial transformation semigroup, Order-preserving, Fence-preserving, Parity-preserving, Generating set, Rank

1 Introduction and Preliminaries

It is well-known that every finite semigroup is isomorphic to a subsemigroup of a suitable finite transformation semigroup. It is the analog of Cayley's Theorem for finite groups. Hence, the transformation semigroups and their subsemigroups have an important role in semigroup theory, as the symmetric groups in group theory. In inverse semigroup theory, the Wagner-Preston Theorem states that every inverse semigroup is isomorphic to a subsemigroup of a suitable symmetric inverse semigroup.

Let \bar{n} be a finite set with n elements (n is a positive integer), say $\bar{n} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We denote by PT_n the monoid (under composition) of all partial transformations on \bar{n} . A partial injection α on the set \bar{n} is a one-to-one function from a subset A of \bar{n} into \bar{n} . The set of all partial denoted

by I_n . The domain of α is the set A , denoted by $\text{dom}(\alpha)$. The range of α is denoted by $\text{im}(\alpha)$. The empty transformation will be denoted by ε , it is the transformation with $\text{dom}(\varepsilon) = \emptyset$. The set I_n (under composition) forms a monoid, which is called a symmetric inverse semigroup. The symmetric inverse semigroup was introduced by Wagner [20]. If the domain has cardinality m , which is also the cardinality of the range, then the transformation α is said to be of rank m , in symbol: $\text{rank}(\alpha) = m$.

Let S be a semigroup, and let A be a non-empty subset of S . Then the subsemigroup generated by A , that is the smallest subsemigroup of S containing A , is denoted by $\langle A \rangle$. If a semigroup S has a finite subset A such that $S = \langle A \rangle$, then S is called a finitely generated semigroup. The rank of a finitely generated semigroup S is defined by $\text{rank}(S) = \min\{|A| : \langle A \rangle = S\}$. A generating set for S is called a minimal generating set if no proper subset of it generates S .

Now, we consider a linear order $1 < 2 < \dots < n$ on \bar{n} . We say that a transformation $\alpha \in PT_n$ is order-preserving if $x < y$ implies $x\alpha \leq y\alpha$, for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. We denote by PO_n the submonoid of PT_n of all order-preserving partial transformations and by POI_n the monoid $PO_n \cap I_n$ of all order-preserving partial injections on \bar{n} .

Ganyuskin and Mazorchuk [9] described the maximal subsemigroups of the semigroup POI_n . In [4], Dimitrova and Koppitz characterized the maximal subsemigroups of the ideals of the semigroup POI_n . Fernandes calculated the size of POI_n in [7], it has the size $\binom{2n}{n}$. Moreover, Fernandes has found that POI_n is generated by J_{n-1} , whenever J_k is the J -class of POI_n consisting of the maps in POI_n of rank k , for all $0 \leq k \leq n$. Notice that $J_0 = \{\varepsilon\}$ and $J_n = \{id_{\bar{n}}\}$, where $id_{\bar{n}}$ is the identity mapping on \bar{n} . Recently, Annis and Lopez [1] have shown that POI_n has $(n-1)!$ minimal generating sets.

The rank of the monoid PO_n was established by Gomes and Howie [11] and Garba [10] studied the idempotent ranks of certain semigroups of order-preserving transformations in 1994. Later in 2001, Fernandes calculated that the rank of the monoid POI_n is n .

A non-linear order that is close to a linear order in some sense is the so-called zig-zag order. The pair (\bar{n}, \preceq) is called a zig-zag poset or fence if

$$\begin{aligned} &1 < 2 > \dots < n-1 > n \text{ or } 1 > 2 < \dots > n-1 < n \text{ if } n \text{ is odd} \\ &\text{and } 1 < 2 > \dots > n-1 < n \text{ or } 1 > 2 < \dots < n-1 > n \text{ if } n \text{ is even.} \end{aligned}$$

The definition of the partial order \preceq is self-explanatory. Transformations on fences were first considered by Currie and Visentin [3] as well as Rutkowski [17]. We observe that every element in a fence is either minimal or maximal. Without loss of generality, let $1 < 2 > 3 < \dots > n$ and $1 < 2 > 3 < \dots > n-1 < n$, respectively. Such fences are also called up-fences. The fence $1 > 2 < 3 > \dots < n$ and $1 > 2 < 3 > \dots < n-1 > n$, respectively, would be called down-fence. We avoid both notations up-fence and down-fence. To check whether a fence is an up-fence or down-fence, we need that 1 and 2 are comparable for \preceq . Recall that $x, y \in \bar{n}$ are comparable with respect to \preceq if $x < y$ or $x = y$ or $x > y$. Otherwise, x and y are called incomparable. But the restriction that 1 and 2 belong to the fence and are comparable is an unnecessary restriction for the concept fence since instead of \bar{n} one could choose another n -element set or one could define \preceq on \bar{n} such that 1 and 2 are incomparable. But if the fence (\bar{n}, \preceq) is defined as above (which is the most natural way) then we observe that any $x, y \in \bar{n}$ are comparable if and only

if $x \in \{y - 1, y, y + 1\}$.

We say that a transformation $\alpha \in I_n$ is fence-preserving if $x \prec y$ implies that $x\alpha \prec y\alpha$, for all $x, y \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. We denote by PFI_n the submonoid of I_n of all fence-preserving partial injections of \bar{n} . Fernandes et al. characterized the full transformations on \bar{n} preserving the zig-zag order [8]. It is worth mentioning that several other properties of monoids of fence-preserving full transformations were also studied. In [13, 19], Srithus et al., the regular elements of these monoids were discussed. Some relative ranks of the monoid of all partial transformations preserving an infinite zig-zag order were determined in [6]. We denote by IF_n the inverse subsemigroup of all regular elements in PFI_n . It is easy to see that IF_n is the set of all $\alpha \in PFI_n$ with $\alpha^{-1} \in PFI_n$. For the case that n is even, it is proved that $\text{rank}(IF_n) = n + 1$ and a concrete generating set of IF_n with $n + 1$ elements is given in [5]. Later in 2021, for the case that n is odd, Koppitz and Musunthia [15] calculated that the rank of IF_n is 5 or $\frac{n-5}{2} + \lfloor \frac{n+6}{4} \rfloor \lfloor \frac{n+7}{4} \rfloor$ whenever $n = 3$ and $n \geq 5$ is odd, respectively. Fence-preserving transformations are also studied in [8, 14, 16, 18]. For general background on semigroups and standard notations, we refer the reader to [2, 12].

The previous facts have given us the main inspiration for the study of a submonoid of $POI_n \cap IF_n$, namely the monoid IOF_n^{par} of all $\alpha \in POI_n \cap IF_n$. In the present paper, we restrict us to the case that x and $x\alpha$ have the same parity for all $x \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. It is easy to verify that IOF_n^{par} forms a monoid, the inverse partial injection exists for any $\alpha \in IOF_n^{\text{par}}$ and is order-, fence-, and parity-preserving. This implies that IOF_n^{par} is an inverse submonoid of I_n . We focus our attention on generating sets of IOF_n^{par} . For $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we observe that $IOF_1^{\text{par}} = \{(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}), \varepsilon\}$, $IOF_2^{\text{par}} = \{(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}), \varepsilon\}$ and $IOF_3^{\text{par}} = \{(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 3 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 3 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}), (\begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix}), \varepsilon\}$. It is routine to calculate the ranks of these three monoids. We obtain $\text{rank}(IOF_1^{\text{par}}) = 1$, $\text{rank}(IOF_2^{\text{par}}) = 2$, and $\text{rank}(IOF_3^{\text{par}}) = 5$. Let $n \geq 4$ for the rest of this paper. We can characterize the transformations in IOF_n^{par} as follows:

Proposition 1. Let $\alpha = (\begin{smallmatrix} d_1 & d_2 & \dots & d_p \\ m_1 & m_2 & \dots & m_p \end{smallmatrix}) \in I_n$. Then $\alpha \in IOF_n^{\text{par}}$ if and only if the following four conditions hold.

- (i) $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_p$.
- (ii) d_1 and m_1 have the same parity.
- (iii) $d_{i+1} - d_i = 1$ if and only if $m_{i+1} - m_i = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$.
- (iv) $d_{i+1} - d_i$ is even if and only if $m_{i+1} - m_i$ is even for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow): (i) and (ii) hold since α is order- and parity-preserving, respectively. (iii): Since $\alpha \in IF_n$, we have $d_{i+1}\alpha - d_i\alpha = 1$, i.e. $m_{i+1} - m_i = 1$, if and only if $d_{i+1} - d_i = 1$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$. (iv): Suppose $d_{i+1} - d_i$ is even. Then d_{i+1} and d_i have the same parity. Moreover, α is parity-preserving. This implies $d_{i+1}\alpha$ and $d_i\alpha$ have the same parity, i.e. $m_{i+1} - m_i$ is even. The converse direction can be proved dually.

(\Leftarrow): By (i), we get α is order-preserving. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ and suppose d_i and m_i have the same parity. Then $d_i - m_i = 2k$ for some integer k . By (iv), we have $(d_{i+1} - d_i) - (m_{i+1} - m_i) = 2l$ for some integer l . We obtain $2l = d_{i+1} - m_{i+1} - (d_i - m_i) = d_{i+1} - m_{i+1} - 2k$, i.e. $d_{i+1} - m_{i+1} = 2(l + k)$. This implies d_{i+1} and m_{i+1} have the same parity. Together with (ii), we can conclude that α is parity-preserving. Let $x \prec y$. This provides $|x - y| = 1$. We have $|x\alpha - y\alpha| = 1$ by (iii). Since α is parity-preserving, $|x\alpha - y\alpha| = 1$ and $x \prec y$ give $x\alpha \prec y\alpha$. So,

$\alpha \in PFI_n$. Similarly, we can show that $\alpha^{-1} \in PFI_n$, i.e. $\alpha \in IF_n$. Therefore, $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par}$. \square

Let \bar{v}_i be the partial identity with the domain $\bar{n} \setminus \{i\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and let $Id_{\bar{n}}$ be the set of all partial identities. Further, let

$$\bar{u}_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & i & i+1 & i+2 & i+3 & i+4 & \cdots & n \\ 3 & \cdots & i+2 & - & - & - & i+4 & \cdots & n \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\bar{x}_i = (\bar{u}_i)^{-1}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$. By Proposition 1, it is easy to verify that \bar{u}_i as well as \bar{x}_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$, belong to IOF_n^{par} . We will show that

$$A_n = \{\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_{n-4}, \bar{u}_{n-2}, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{n-4}, \bar{x}_{n-2}\}$$

is a generating set of minimal size for the monoid IOF_n^{par} . Clearly, $\langle A_n \rangle \subseteq IOF_n^{par}$. It is easy to see that all partial identities including the empty transformation are generated by $\{\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n\} \subseteq A_n$. In the next section, we will present any $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par} \setminus (Id_{\bar{n}} \cup \{\varepsilon\})$ as a normal form in $\langle A_n \rangle$.

2 Normal forms of transformations in $\langle A_n \rangle$

In this section, we will find a generating set for IOF_n^{par} . We will fix now an $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par} \setminus (Id_{\bar{n}} \cup \{\varepsilon\})$, say $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & \cdots & d_p \\ m_1 & \cdots & m_p \end{pmatrix}$, where $p = |\text{rank}(\alpha)|$. In order to show that $\alpha \in \langle A_n \rangle$, we consider a word w_α over the alphabet $X_n = \{v_1, \dots, v_n, u_1, \dots, u_{n-2}, x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}\}$ and show that $\bar{w}_\alpha = \alpha$, where \bar{w}_α is the transformation that we obtain from the word w_α by replacing any letter a in w_α by the transformation \bar{a} . For a word $z = a_1 \dots a_k$ over X_n , let $z^{-1} = a_k a_{k-1} \dots a_1$. Let $x_{i,j} = x_i x_{i+2} \dots x_{i+2j-2}$ and $u_{i,j} = u_i u_{i+2} \dots u_{i+2j-2}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}, j \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-i}{2} \rfloor\}$. Further, let $W_x = \{x_{i,j} : i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}, j \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-i}{2} \rfloor\}\}$ and $W_u = \{u_{i,j} : i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}, j \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-i}{2} \rfloor\}\}$. For a non-empty set $A = \{a_1 < \dots < a_r\} \subseteq \bar{n}$, for some $r \in \bar{n}$, we put $v_A = v_{a_1} \dots v_{a_r}$. Additional, v_\emptyset is the empty word ε . First, we construct the word w_α .

There are a unique $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ and a unique set $\{r_1, \dots, r_l\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ such that (i)-(iii) are satisfied:

- (i) $r_1 < \dots < r_l$;
- (ii) $d_{r_i+1} - d_{r_i} \neq m_{r_i+1} - m_{r_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$;
- (iii) $d_{i+1} - d_i = m_{i+1} - m_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\} \setminus \{r_1, \dots, r_l\}$.

Note that $l = 0$ means $\{r_1, \dots, r_l\} = \emptyset$. Further, we put $r_{l+1} = p$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, we define

$$w_i = \begin{cases} x_{m_{r_i}, \frac{(m_{r_i+1}-m_{r_i})-(d_{r_i+1}-d_{r_i})}{2}} & \text{if } m_{r_i+1} - m_{r_i} > d_{r_i+1} - d_{r_i}; \\ u_{d_{r_i}, \frac{(d_{r_i+1}-d_{r_i})-(m_{r_i+1}-m_{r_i})}{2}} & \text{if } m_{r_i+1} - m_{r_i} < d_{r_i+1} - d_{r_i}. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, we have $w_i \in W_x \cup W_u$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. If $m_p = d_p$ then we put $w_{l+1} = \varepsilon$. If $m_p \neq d_p$, we define additionally

$$w_{l+1} = \begin{cases} x_{m_p, \frac{d_p-m_p}{2}} & \text{if } d_p > m_p; \\ u_{d_p, \frac{m_p-d_p}{2}} & \text{if } d_p < m_p. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $w_{l+1} \in W_x \cup W_u$. We will use the notation $w_k = u_{i_k, j_k}$ if $w_k \in W_u$ and $w_k = x_{i_k, j_k}$ if $w_k \in W_x$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, l+1\}$. For $k \in \{1, \dots, l+1\}$, we define integers k_u and k_x , recursively. If $m_p = d_p$ then we put $(l+1)_u = (l+1)_x = d_p$. If $w_{l+1} \in W_u$ then we put $(l+1)_u = i_{l+1}$ and $(l+1)_x = i_{l+1} + 2j_{l+1}$. If $w_{l+1} \in W_x$ then we put $(l+1)_u = i_{l+1} + 2j_{l+1}$ and $(l+1)_x = i_{l+1}$. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. If $w_k \in W_u$ then we put $k_u = i_k$ and $k_x = (k+1)_x - a_k - 2$ with $a_k = (k+1)_u - i_k - 2j_k - 2$. If $w_k \in W_x$ then we put $k_u = (k+1)_u - b_k - 2$ and $k_x = i_k$ with $b_k = (k+1)_x - i_k - 2j_k - 2$.

We observe that $1_u, \dots, (l+1)_u$ and $1_x, \dots, (l+1)_x$ correspond to the domain of α and the image of α , respectively.

Lemma 1. For all $k \in \{1, \dots, l+1\}$, we have $k_u = d_{r_k}, k_x = m_{r_k}$.

Proof. We prove by induction on k . First, we prove that $(l+1)_x = m_{r_{l+1}}$ and $(l+1)_u = d_{r_{l+1}}$. Suppose $m_p \neq d_p$. If $w_{l+1} \in W_x$ then $(l+1)_x = i_{l+1} = m_{r_{l+1}}$ and $(l+1)_u = i_{l+1} + 2j_{l+1} = i_{l+1} + 2(\frac{d_{r_{l+1}} - m_{r_{l+1}}}{2}) = m_{r_{l+1}} + 2(\frac{d_{r_{l+1}} - m_{r_{l+1}}}{2}) = d_{r_{l+1}}$. For $w_{l+1} \in W_u$, the proof is similar. If $m_p = d_p$ then $(l+1)_u = d_p = d_{r_{l+1}}$ and $(l+1)_x = d_p = m_p = m_{r_{l+1}}$.

Suppose that $(k+1)_u = d_{r_{k+1}}$ and $(k+1)_x = m_{r_{k+1}}$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. If $w_k = u_{i_k, j_k} \in W_u$ then $k_u = i_k = d_{r_k}$. On the other hand, we have $(d_{r_{k+1}} - d_{r_k}) - (m_{r_{k+1}} - m_{r_k}) = (d_{r_{k+1}} - d_{r_k}) - (m_{r_{k+1}} - m_{r_k})$. Then $k_x = (k+1)_x - a_k - 2 = (k+1)_x - (k+1)_u + i_k + 2j_k = m_{r_{k+1}} - d_{r_{k+1}} + d_{r_k} + 2(\frac{(d_{r_{k+1}} - d_{r_k}) - (m_{r_{k+1}} - m_{r_k})}{2}) = m_{r_k}$. For $w_k \in W_x$, the proof is similar. \square

We consider the word

$$w = w_1 \dots w_{l+1}.$$

From this word, we construct a new word w_α^* by arranging the subwords x belonging W_x in reverse order at the end of the word w , replacing x by x^{-1} . In other words, we consider the word

$$w_\alpha^* = w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a} w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}$$

such that $w_{s_1}, \dots, w_{s_a} \in W_u, w_{s_{a+1}}, \dots, w_{s_{a+b}} \in W_x$ and $\{w_{s_1}, \dots, w_{s_a}, w_{s_{a+1}}, \dots, w_{s_{a+b}}\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_{a+b}\}$, where $s_1 < \dots < s_a, s_{a+b} < \dots < s_{a+1}$ and $a, b \in \overline{n} \cup \{0\}$ with

$$a + b = \begin{cases} l & \text{if } d_p = m_p; \\ l + 1 & \text{if } d_p \neq m_p. \end{cases}$$

For convenient, $a = 0$ means $w_\alpha^* = w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}$ and $b = 0$ means $w_\alpha^* = w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}$. Now we add recursively letters from the set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\} \subseteq X_n$ to the word w_α^* , obtaining new words $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$.

- (1) For $d_p \leq n - 2$:
 - (1.1) if $m_p < d_p$ then $\lambda_0 = v_{d_p+2} \dots v_n w_\alpha^*$;
 - (1.2) if $n - 1 > m_p > d_p$ then $\lambda_0 = v_{m_p+2} \dots v_n w_\alpha^*$;
 - (1.3) if $m_p = d_p$ then $\lambda_0 = v_{m_p+1} \dots v_n w_\alpha^*$;
 - otherwise $\lambda_0 = w_\alpha^*$.
- (2) If $d_p = m_p = n - 1$ then $\lambda_0 = v_n w_\alpha^*$. Otherwise $\lambda_0 = w_\alpha^*$.
- (3) For $k \in \{2, \dots, p\}$:
 - (3.1) if $2 \leq m_k - m_{k-1} = d_k - d_{k-1}$ then $\lambda_{p-k+1} = v_{d_{k-1}+1} \dots v_{d_k-1} \lambda_{p-k}$;
 - (3.2) if $2 < m_k - m_{k-1} < d_k - d_{k-1}$ then $\lambda_{p-k+1} = v_{d_k-(m_k-m_{k-1}-2)} \dots v_{d_k-1} \lambda_{p-k}$;
 - (3.3) if $m_k - m_{k-1} > d_k - d_{k-1} > 2$ then $\lambda_{p-k+1} = v_{d_{k-1}+2} \dots v_{d_k-1} \lambda_{p-k}$;
 - otherwise $\lambda_{p-k+1} = \lambda_{p-k}$.
- (4) If $d_1 = 1$ or $m_1 = 1$ then $\lambda_p = \lambda_{p-1}$.
- (5) If $1 < d_1 \leq m_1$ then $\lambda_p = v_1 \dots v_{d_1-1} \lambda_{p-1}$.
- (6) If $1 < m_1 < d_1$ then $\lambda_p = v_{d_1-m_1+1} \dots v_{d_1-1} \lambda_{p-1}$.

The word λ_p induces a set $A = \{a \in \bar{n} : v_a \in \text{var}(\lambda_p)\}$ and it is easy to verify that $\rho \notin A$ for all $\rho \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. We put $w_\alpha = \lambda_p$. The word w_α has the form $w_\alpha = v_A w_\alpha^*$. Clearly, the word w_α defines a transformation \bar{w}_α . Moreover, we will point out that $\{\bar{w}_\beta^* : \beta \in \text{IOF}_n^{\text{par}}\}$ provides a set of normal forms for the products in $\langle A_n \rangle$. To verify this, it is enough to show that $\alpha = \bar{w}_\alpha$ since α is fixed but arbitrary. In order to prove the equality of these both transformations, we verify that $\rho\alpha = \rho\bar{w}_\alpha$ for all $\rho \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$ and $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\bar{w}_\alpha)$, whenever $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\alpha)$. The following lemma will show that the words w_{s_1}, \dots, w_{s_a} as well as the words $w_{s_{a+1}}, \dots, w_{s_{a+b}}$ have pairwise no common variables.

Lemma 2. Let $k < k' \leq a + b$.

- (i) If $w_k \in W_x$ and $w_{k'} \in W_x$ then $i_k + 2j_k + 1 < i_{k'}$.
- (ii) If $w_k \in W_u$ and $w_{k'} \in W_u$ then $i_k + 2j_k + 1 < i_{k'}$.
- (iii) If $w_k \in W_u$ then $i_k + 2j_k + 2 \leq (k + 1)_u$.
- (iv) If $w_k \in W_x$ then $i_k + 2j_k + 2 \leq (k + 1)_x$.

Proof. (i) We have $k_x = i_k$ and $k'_x = i_{k'}$. Clearly, $k < k'$ implies $m_{r_k+1} \leq m_{r_{k'}}$. Moreover, we have $d_{r_k+1} - d_{r_k} > 1$ by definition of r_k . This implies $m_{r_k+1} - (d_{r_k+1} - d_{r_k}) + 1 < m_{r_k+1}$, $m_{r_k} + 2(\frac{(m_{r_k+1} - m_{r_k}) - (d_{r_k+1} - d_{r_k})}{2}) + 1 < m_{r_k+1} \leq m_{r'_k}$, $m_{r_k} + 2j_k + 1 < m_{r_{k'}}$, and thus $i_k + 2j_k + 1 < i_{k'}$ by Lemma 1.

(ii) The proof is similar to (i).

(iii) We have that $d_{r_k+1} - d_{r_k} > m_{r_k+1} - m_{r_k} > 1$ and $d_{r_k+1} \leq d_{r_{k+1}}$. This implies $d_{r_k+1} + 1 - (m_{r_k+1} - m_{r_k}) < d_{r_k+1}$ and $d_{r_k+1} - (m_{r_k+1} - m_{r_k}) + 2 \leq d_{r_k+1} \leq d_{r_{k+1}}$. Moreover, we have $d_{r_k+1} - (m_{r_k+1} - m_{r_k}) + 2 = d_{r_k} + 2(\frac{(d_{r_k+1} - d_{r_k}) - (m_{r_k+1} - m_{r_k})}{2}) + 2 = d_{r_k} + 2j_k + 2 = i_k + 2j_k + 2$ and $d_{r_k} = i_k$. Therefore, $i_k + 2j_k + 2 \leq d_{r_{k+1}} \leq d_{r_{k+1}} = (k + 1)_u$ by Lemma 1.

(iv) The proof is similar to (iii). \square

We observe that d_{r_k} can be calculated from m_{r_k} (and conversely) using the length of appropriate subwords of w_α^* . Subsequently, we will use that $|w_{s_k}| = j_{s_k}$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ and $|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| = j_{s_{a+d}}$ for all $d \in \{1, \dots, b\}$.

Lemma 3. Let $d \in \{1, \dots, b\}$. If there is the least $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ such that $s_k > s_{a+d}$ then $d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|$. Otherwise, $d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$.

Proof. Suppose there is the least $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ such that $s_k > s_{a+d}$. Note that $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + \dots + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k}| - \dots - 2|w_{s_a}|$ and $|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| = \frac{(m_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}}}) - (d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - d_{r_{s_{a+d}}})}{2}$ since $m_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}}} = d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - d_{r_{s_{a+d}}}$. Let $t \in \{s_{a+d} + 1, \dots, l\}$. If $w_t \in W_x$ then $|w_t| = \frac{(m_{r_{t+1}} - m_{r_t}) - (d_{r_{t+1}} - d_{r_t})}{2}$. If $w_t \in W_u$ then we have $-|w_t| = -(\frac{(d_{r_{t+1}} - d_{r_t}) - (m_{r_{t+1}} - m_{r_t})}{2})$. Moreover $|w_{l+1}| = \frac{m_{r_{l+1}} - d_{r_{l+1}}}{2}$, whenever $w_{l+1} \in W_x$ and $-|w_{l+1}| = -(\frac{d_{r_{l+1}} - m_{r_{l+1}}}{2})$, whenever $w_{l+1} \in W_u$. We observe that $s_k > s_{a+d}$ provides $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + \dots + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k}| - \dots - 2|w_{s_a}| = i_{s_{a+d}} + (m_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}}} - d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}}}) + (m_{r_{s_{a+d}+2}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - d_{r_{s_{a+d}+2}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}}) + \dots + (m_{r_{l+1}} - m_{r_l} - d_{r_{l+1}} + d_{r_l}) + (d_{r_{l+1}} - m_{r_{l+1}}) = i_{s_{a+d}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} = i_{s_{a+d}} - i_{s_{a+d}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} = d_{r_{s_{a+d}}}$.

Suppose now that $s_k < s_{a+d}$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ or $w_\alpha^* = w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}$. Then $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + \dots + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| = i_{s_{a+d}} + (m_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}}} - d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}}}) + (m_{r_{s_{a+d}+2}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - d_{r_{s_{a+d}+2}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}}) + \dots + (m_{r_{l+1}} - m_{r_l} - d_{r_{l+1}} + d_{r_l}) + (d_{r_{l+1}} - m_{r_{l+1}}) = i_{s_{a+d}} - m_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} = i_{s_{a+d}} - i_{s_{a+d}} + d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} = d_{r_{s_{a+d}}}$. \square

Similarly, we can prove:

Lemma 4. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$. If there is the greatest $d \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ such that $s_{a+d} > s_k$ then $m_{r_{s_k}} = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. Otherwise, $m_{r_{s_k}} = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|$.

Moreover, we have two technical lemmas.

Lemma 5. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$. It holds $d_{r_{s_k+1}} - (m_{r_{s_k+1}} - m_{r_{s_k}} - 2) = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2$.

Proof. First, we consider the case there is the greatest $d \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ such that $s_{a+d} > s_k$. Suppose $w_{s_k+1} \in W_u$, i.e. $s_k + 1 = s_{k+1}$. Then by Lemmas 1 and 4, we obtain $d_{r_{s_k+1}} = i_{s_{k+1}}, m_{r_{s_k+1}} = i_{s_{k+1}} + 2|w_{s_{k+1}} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$, and $m_{r_{s_k}} = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. This implies $d_{r_{s_k+1}} - (m_{r_{s_k+1}} - m_{r_{s_k}} - 2) = i_{s_{k+1}} - i_{s_{k+1}} - 2|w_{s_{k+1}} \dots w_{s_a}| + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - |w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2 = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2$. Suppose $w_{s_k+1} \in W_x$, i.e. $s_k + 1 = s_{a+d}$. Then by Lemmas 1, 3, and 4, we get $d_{r_{s_k+1}} = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_{k+1}} \dots w_{s_a}|$, $m_{r_{s_k+1}} = i_{s_{a+d}}$, and $m_{r_{s_k}} = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. This implies $d_{r_{s_k+1}} - (m_{r_{s_k+1}} - m_{r_{s_k}} - 2) = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_{k+1}} \dots w_{s_a}| - i_{s_{a+d}} + i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2 = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2$.

It remains the case that $w_r \in W_u$ for all $r \in \{s_k + 1, \dots, a + b\}$. By Lemmas 1, and 4, we obtain $d_{r_{s_k+1}} = i_{s_{k+1}}, m_{r_{s_k+1}} = i_{s_{k+1}} + 2|w_{s_{k+1}} \dots w_{s_a}|$, and $m_{r_{s_k}} = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|$. This implies $d_{r_{s_k+1}} - (m_{r_{s_k+1}} - m_{r_{s_k}} - 2) = i_{s_{k+1}} - i_{s_{k+1}} - 2|w_{s_{k+1}} \dots w_{s_a}| + i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| + 2 = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2$. \square

Lemma 6. Let $d \in \{1, \dots, b\}$. It holds $d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2 = (s_{a+d} + 1)_u - b_{s_{a+d}}$.

Proof. First, we consider the case that there is the least $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ such that $s_k > s_{a+d}$. Suppose $w_{s_{a+d}+1} \in W_u$, i.e. $s_{a+d} + 1 = s_k$. Then by Lemmas 1 and 3, we get $d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2 = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| + 2$ and $(s_{a+d} + 1)_u - b_{s_{a+d}} = i_{s_k} - ((s_{a+d} + 1)_x - i_{s_{a+d}} - 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| - 2) = i_{s_k} - (i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|) + i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2 = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| + 2 = d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2$. Suppose $w_{s_{a+d}+1} \in W_x$, i.e. $s_{a+d} + 1 = s_{a+d-1}$. Then by Lemmas 1 and 3, we get $d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2 = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| + 2$ and $(s_{a+d} + 1)_u - b_{s_{a+d}} = i_{s_{a+d-1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - (i_{s_{a+d-1}} - i_{s_{a+d}} - 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| - 2) = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| + 2 = d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2$.

It remains the case that $w_r \in W_x$ for all $r \in \{s_{a+d} + 1, \dots, a + b\}$. By Lemmas 1 and 3, we obtain $d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2 = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2$ and $(s_{a+d} + 1)_u - b_{s_{a+d}} = i_{s_{a+d-1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - i_{s_{a+d-1}} + i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2 = i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2 = d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2$. \square

If $\rho \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$ then $\rho \notin A$ as already mentioned. So, we have $\rho \bar{v}_A = \rho$ for all $\rho \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. Moreover, if we apply $\bar{w}_\alpha = \bar{v}_A \bar{w}_{s_1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_a} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}}$ to an element ρ of the domain of α , then each of the transformations $\bar{w}_{s_1}, \dots, \bar{w}_{s_a}$ adds successively the double of the length of the corresponding word to ρ or maps identical. So we obtain $\rho' = \rho \bar{v}_A \bar{w}_{s_1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_a}$ for some $\rho' \in \bar{n}$. On the other hand, each of the transformations $\overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}}, \dots, \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}}$ cancels successively the double of the length of the corresponding word from ρ' or maps identical. This procedure will be clear by Remark 1, which characterizes the transformations corresponding to the words in $W_u \cup W_x$.

By the definitions of the transformations \bar{u}_i and \bar{x}_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$, we can easily determine the transformation \bar{s} , for all $s \in W_u \cup W_x$.

Remark 1. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n-i}{2} \rfloor\}$. We have:

- (i) $\text{dom}(\bar{u}_i) = \{1, \dots, i, i+4, \dots, n\}$ and $\rho \bar{u}_i = \begin{cases} \rho + 2 & \text{for } \rho \leq i; \\ \rho & \text{for } \rho \geq i+4. \end{cases}$
- (ii) $\text{dom}(\bar{u}_{i,j}) = \{1, \dots, i, i+2j+2, \dots, n\}$ and $\rho \bar{u}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \rho + 2j & \text{for } \rho \leq i; \\ \rho & \text{for } \rho \geq i+2j+2. \end{cases}$
- (iii) $\text{dom}(\bar{x}_i) = \{3, \dots, i+2, i+4, \dots, n\}$ and $\rho \bar{x}_i = \begin{cases} \rho - 2 & \text{for } 3 \leq \rho \leq i+2; \\ \rho & \text{for } \rho \geq i+4. \end{cases}$
- (iv) $\text{dom}(\overline{x_{i,j}^{-1}}) = \{3+2j-2, \dots, i+2j, i+2j+2, \dots, n\}$ and $\rho \overline{x_{i,j}^{-1}} = \begin{cases} \rho - 2j & \text{for } 3+2j-2 \leq \rho \leq i+2j; \\ \rho & \text{for } \rho \geq i+2j+2. \end{cases}$

Lemma 7 is a technical lemma. Together with Remark 1, it will give an important tool for the calculation of $\rho \bar{w}_\alpha^*$, for any $\rho \in \text{dom}(\bar{w}_\alpha^*)$.

Lemma 7. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$. Further, let $\rho \in \{i_{s_k-1} + 2|w_{s_k-1}| + 2, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$, whenever $w_{s_k-1} \in W_u$, let $\rho \in \{i_{s_k} - b_{s_k-1}, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$, whenever $w_{s_k-1} \in W_x$, let $\rho \in \{1, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$, whenever $s_k = 1$ and $1_u < 1_x$, and let $\rho \in \{1_u - 1_x + 1, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$, whenever $s_k = 1$ and $1_u > 1_x$. Then we have the following statements:

- (i) $\rho \geq i_{s_d} + 2|w_{s_d}| + 2$ for all $d \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$.

(ii) $\rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_{d-1}}| \leq i_{s_d}$ for all $d \in \{k, \dots, a\}$.

Let $h = \max\{z \in \bar{b} : s_k < s_{a+z}\}$ (if it exists). Then:

(iii) $\rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1}| \leq i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}|$ for all $d \in \{1, \dots, h\}$.

(iv) $\rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1}| \geq i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2$ for all $d \in \{h+1, \dots, b\}$.

(v) If $s_k > s_{a+1}$ then $i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq \rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|$.

Proof. (i) Let $d \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. By Lemma 2(ii), we have $i_{s_{k-1}} \geq i_{s_d} + 2|w_{s_d}| + 2$. If $w_{s_{k-1}} \in W_u$ then $\rho \geq i_{s_{k-1}} + 2|w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2 = i_{s_{k-1}} + 2|w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2$, i.e. $\rho \geq i_{s_d} + 2|w_{s_d}| + 2$. Suppose $w_{s_{k-1}} \in W_x$. By Lemma 2(ii, iii), we have $i_{s_d} + 2|w_{s_d}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{k-1}}$ and $i_{s_{k-1}} + 2|w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2 \leq (s_k - 1)_u$, respectively. This implies $(s_k - 1)_u = (s_k)_u - b_{s_{k-1}} - 2 < (s_k)_u - b_{s_{k-1}} \leq \rho$. Thus, $i_{s_d} + 2|w_{s_d}| + 2 \leq \rho$.

(ii) Let $d \in \{k, \dots, a\}$. Since $s_k < s_{k+1}$, we have $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 1 < i_{s_{k+1}}$ by Lemma 2(ii). This implies $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2|w_{s_{k+1}}| + 1 < i_{s_{k+1}} + 2|w_{s_{k+1}}| < i_{s_{k+1}} + 2|w_{s_{k+1}}| + 1 < i_{s_{k+2}}$. After $d - k$ such steps, we have $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2|w_{s_{k+1}}| + \dots + 2|w_{s_{d-1}}| + 1 < i_{s_d}$. Since $\rho \leq i_{s_k}$, we obtain $\rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_{d-1}}| \leq i_{s_d}$.

(iii) Let $d \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ and let c be the greatest $f \in \{0, \dots, a - k\}$ such that $s_{k+f} < s_{a+h}$. We put $m = s_{k+c}$. By Lemma 1, we have $m_u = i_{s_{k+c}}$ and $m_x = (m+1)_x - (m+1)_u + i_{s_{k+c}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c}}|$. Note that $w_{s_{a+h}} = w_{m+1} \in W_x$. So we have $(m+1)_u = (m+2)_u - (m+2)_x + i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$ and $(m+1)_x = i_{s_{a+h}}$. By Lemma 2(iii), we get $i_{s_{k+c}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c}}| < (m+1)_u = (m+2)_u - (m+2)_x + i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$, i.e.

$$i_{s_{k+c}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c}}| - (m+2)_u + (m+2)_x < i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|. \quad (1)$$

If $w_{m+2} \in W_u$ then $w_{m+2} = w_{s_{k+c+1}}$ and (1) provide $i_{s_{k+c}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c}}| - i_{s_{k+c+1}} + (m+3)_x - (m+3)_u + i_{s_{k+c+1}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c+1}}| < i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$, i.e. $i_{s_{k+c}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c}}| + (m+3)_x - (m+3)_u < i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$. If $w_{m+2} \in W_x$ then (1) provides $i_{s_{k+c}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c}}| + (m+3)_x - (m+3)_u - 2|w_{s_{a+h-1}}^{-1}| < i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$. We repeat this procedure until w_{a+b} . If $w_{a+b} \in W_u$ then $a+b = s_a$, i.e. $(a+b)_u = i_{s_a}$ and $(a+b)_x = i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}|$. If $w_{a+b} \in W_x$ then $a+b = s_{a+1}$, i.e. $(a+b)_u = i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$ and $(a+b)_x = i_{s_{a+1}}$. This provides $i_{s_{k+c}} + 2|w_{s_{k+c}} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \leq i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$. If $c = 0$, then we have the required inequality. If $c > 0$ then $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| < i_{s_{k+1}}$, $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2|w_{s_{k+1}}| < i_{s_{k+2}}$, ..., $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_{k+c-1}}| < i_{s_{k+c}}$ and we can conclude $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \leq i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$. Altogether, we have shown that $\rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \leq i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|$ since $\rho \leq i_{s_k}$. If $d = h$ then the statement holds. On the other hand, if $d < h$ then we have $i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}| < i_{s_{a+h}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}| + 1 < i_{s_{a+d}} < i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}|$. This completes the proof.

(iv) Let $d \in \{h+1, \dots, b\}$. Note that $s_{a+h+1} < a+b$. We put $m = s_{a+h+1}$. Then we obtain $m+1 = s_t$, where $t = \min\{z \in \{1, \dots, a\} : s_{a+h+1} < s_z\}$. We have $m_u = (m+1)_u - (m+1)_x + i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}|$ and $m_x = i_{s_{a+h+1}}$. Because $w_{m+1} = w_{s_t} \in W_u$, we have $(m+1)_u = i_{s_t}$ and $(m+1)_x = (m+2)_x - (m+2)_u + i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t}|$. We get $m_x + 2|w_m| + 2 \leq (m+1)_x$, i.e.

$$i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq (m+2)_x - (m+2)_u + i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t}|. \quad (2)$$

If $w_{m+2} \in W_u$ then $m+2 = s_{t+1}$ and (2) provide $i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq (m+3)_x - (m+3)_u + i_{s_{t+1}} + 2|w_{s_{t+1}}| - i_{s_{t+1}} + 2|w_{s_t}| + i_{s_t} = i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t}| + 2|w_{s_{t+1}}| + (m+3)_x - (m+3)_u$.

If $w_{m+2} \in W_x$ then $m+2 = s_{a+h}$ and (2) provide $i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{a+h}} - (m+3)_u + (m+3)_x - i_{s_{a+h}} - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}| + 2|w_{s_t}| + i_{s_t} = i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}| + (m+3)_x - (m+3)_u$. We repeat this procedure until w_{a+b} .

If $w_{a+b} \in W_u$ then $a+b = s_a$, i.e. $(a+b)_u = i_{s_a}$ and $(a+b)_x = i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}|$.

If $w_{a+b} \in W_x$ then $a+b = s_{a+1}$, i.e. $(a+b)_u = i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$ and $(a+b)_x = i_{s_{a+1}}$. This provides

$$i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|. \quad (3)$$

We have $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{a+d-1}}$. This gives $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{a+d-1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{a+d-2}}$. After $d-h$ such steps, we will obtain

$$i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2. \quad (4)$$

Then (3) and (4) provide (by transitivity)

$$i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| \leq i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \text{ and}$$

$$i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \quad (5)$$

Suppose $t = k$. If $\rho = (m+1)_u = i_{s_t}$ then the proof is finished by (3). Suppose $\rho < (m+1)_u$. We show that $i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq (m+1)_u - b_m + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. We have $b_m = (m+1)_x - (i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2)$. This provides $i_{s_k} - ((m+1)_u - b_m) = i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - (i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2)$ by Lemmas 1 and 4 and since $s_{a+h+1} < s_k < s_{a+h}$. Then $i_{s_{a+h+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 = (m+1)_u - b_m + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \leq \rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. By (4) and transitivity, we get $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq \rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. Thus, $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq \rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$.

If $k = t+1$ then $\rho \in \{i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t}| + 2, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$ and by (5), we can conclude that $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| < i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t}| + 2 + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \leq \rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$.

If $k \geq t+2$ then $\rho \in \{i_{s_{k-1}} + 2|w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$ and by Lemma 2(ii), we obtain $i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{t+1}}, i_{s_{t+1}} + 2|w_{s_{t+1}}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{t+2}}, \dots, i_{s_{k-2}} + 2|w_{s_{k-2}}| + 2 \leq i_{s_{k-1}}$. This implies $i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t} \dots w_{s_{k-1}}| \leq i_{s_{k-1}} + 2|w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2$, i.e. $i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t} \dots w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| \leq i_{s_{k-1}} + 2|w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2 + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|$ and $i_{s_t} + 2|w_{s_t} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \leq i_{s_{k-1}} + 2|w_{s_{k-1}}| + 2 + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| \leq \rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. By (5) and transitivity, we get $i_{s_{a+d}} + 2|w_{s_{a+d}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq \rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+d-1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$.

(v) It can be proved similar to (iv). \square

Now we are able to calculate $\rho \bar{w}_\alpha$ for all ρ in the domain of \bar{w}_α .

Proposition 2. Let $k \in \{2, \dots, a\}$ with $w_{s_{k-1}} \in W_u$ and let $\hat{\rho} \in \{0, \dots, a_{s_{k-1}}\}$ such that $d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. We have $(d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\bar{w}_\alpha = (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\alpha$.

Proof. We have $(s_k)_u = i_{s_k} = d_{r_{s_k}}$ by Lemma 1. It is easy to verify that $d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \notin A$ by the definition of set A and we observe that $d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \in \{i_{s_k-1} + 2j_{s_k-1} + 2, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$. Moreover, we have a_{s_k-1}

$$\begin{aligned} &= (s_k)_u - i_{s_k-1} - 2j_{s_k-1} - 2 \\ &= (s_k)_u - (d_{r_q} - m_{r_q} + m_{r_{q-1}} + 2) \quad (\text{by Lemma 5}) \\ &= d_{r_q} - (d_{r_q} - m_{r_q} + m_{r_{q-1}} + 2) \quad (\text{by Lemma 1}) \\ &= m_{r_q} - m_{r_{q-1}} - 2. \text{ Thus, } \hat{\rho} \in \{0, \dots, a_{s_k-1}\} = \{0, \dots, m_{r_q} - m_{r_{q-1}} - 2\}. \text{ This implies } (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\alpha = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{We will show } (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_\alpha = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}. \text{ We have} \\ &(d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{v}_A \overline{w}_{s_1} \dots \overline{w}_{s_a} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \\ &= (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_{s_1} \dots \overline{w}_{s_a} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad (\text{since } d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \notin A) \\ &= (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_{s_k} \dots \overline{w}_{s_a} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(i)}) \\ &= (i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(ii)}). \end{aligned}$$

If $s_{a+1} < s_k$ then $\rho + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| \geq i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2$ by Lemma 7(v). So, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \\ &= i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| \quad (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(v)}) \\ &= m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \quad (\text{by Lemma 4}). \end{aligned}$$

If $\overline{w}_\alpha = \overline{w}_{s_1} \dots \overline{w}_{s_a}$ then we obtain $(d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_\alpha = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}$ by similar arguments.

Suppose now there is the greatest $h \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ such that $\overline{w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}} > s_k$. For $h = b$, Remark 1 and Lemma 4 and 7(iii) provide $(i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} = i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}| = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}$. It remains the case $h \in \{1, \dots, b-1\}$. Here, we have $(i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} = (i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}}$ by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(iii). Since $s_{a+h+1} < s_k$ by Remark 1 and Lemma 4 and 7(iv), we obtain $(i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+h+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} = i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}| = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}$. \square

Proposition 3. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ with $w_{s_k-1} \in W_x$ and let $\hat{\rho} \in \{0, \dots, b_{s_k-1}\}$ such that $d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. We have $(d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_\alpha = (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\alpha$.

Proof. There is $h \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ with $w_{s_k-1} = w_{s_{a+h}}$. By Lemma 1, we have $i_{s_k} = (s_k)_u = d_{r_{s_k}}$. Since $d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$, we can conclude $d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \notin A$ by the definition of set A . We observe that $d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \in \{(s_k)_u - b_{s_k-1}, \dots, i_{s_k}\}$. Moreover, we have $b_{s_k-1} = (s_k)_u - ((s_k)_u - b_{s_k-1}) = d_{r_{s_k}} - (d_{r_{s_k-1}} + 2)$ by Lemmas 1 and 6. Thus, $\hat{\rho} \in \{0, \dots, b_{s_k-1}\} = \{0, \dots, d_{r_{s_k}} - (d_{r_{s_k-1}} + 2)\}$. This implies $(d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\alpha = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}$. We will show $(d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_\alpha = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}$. We have $(d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{v}_A \overline{w}_{s_1} \dots \overline{w}_{s_a} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_{s_1} \dots \overline{w}_{s_a} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad (\text{since } d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \notin A) \\ &= (d_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho})\overline{w}_{s_k} \dots \overline{w}_{s_a} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(i)}) \\ &= (i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(ii)}). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Suppose } h > 1. \text{ Then } (i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \\ &= (i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h-1}}^{-1}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+h}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(iii)}) \\ &= i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+h-1}}^{-1}| \quad (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(iv)}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho} \quad (\text{by Lemma 4}).$$

If $h = 1$ then $(i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} = i_{s_k} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a}| = m_{r_{s_k}} - \hat{\rho}$ by Remark 1, Lemmas 4 and 7(v). \square

It is clear that $\alpha^{-1} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} m_1 & \dots & m_p \\ d_1 & \dots & d_p \end{smallmatrix} \right)$. We consider the word $w_{\alpha^{-1}}^*$ which is defined in the same way as the word w_α^* . We can conclude that $\overline{w_{\alpha^{-1}}^*}$ is the inverse transformation of $\overline{w_\alpha^*}$.

Lemma 8. We have $\overline{w_{\alpha^{-1}}^*} = (\overline{w_\alpha^*})^{-1}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha^{-1} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} m_1 & \dots & m_p \\ d_1 & \dots & d_p \end{smallmatrix} \right) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} d'_1 & \dots & d'_p \\ m'_1 & \dots & m'_p \end{smallmatrix} \right)$. Then we define $r'_1, \dots, r'_{l'+1} \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $w'_1, \dots, w'_{l'+1}$ like in the construction of the word w_α^* . It is easy to verify that $l = l'$ and $r_q = r'_q$ for all $q \in \{1, \dots, l+1\}$. Let $q \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and suppose $w_q = x_{i_q, j_q}$. We have $w_q = x_{m_{r_q}, \frac{(m_{r_q+1} - m_{r_q}) - (d_{r_q+1} - d_{r_q})}{2}}$ and $m_{r_q+1} - m_{r_q} > d_{r_q+1} - d_{r_q}$, i.e. $d'_{r_q+1} - d'_{r_q} > m'_{r_q+1} - m'_{r_q}$. This implies $w'_q = u_{d'_{r_q}, \frac{(d'_{r_q+1} - d'_{r_q}) - (m'_{r_q+1} - m'_{r_q})}{2}} = u_{m_{r_q}, \frac{(m_{r_q+1} - m_{r_q}) - (d_{r_q+1} - d_{r_q})}{2}} = u_{i_q, j_q}$. For $w_q = u_{i_q, j_q}$, we obtain $w'_q = x_{i_q, j_q}$ dually. If w_{l+1} is not the empty word, i.e. $w_{l+1} = x_{i_{l+1}, j_{l+1}}$ or $w_{l+1} = u_{i_{l+1}, j_{l+1}}$, then we obtain $w'_{l+1} = u_{i_{l+1}, j_{l+1}}$ and $w'_{l+1} = x_{i_{l+1}, j_{l+1}}$, respectively by similar arguments. Thus, we get $w_{\alpha^{-1}}^* = u_{i_{s_a+b}, j_{s_a+b}} \dots u_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}} x_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}^{-1} \dots x_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}^{-1}$. We have $\overline{w_{\alpha^{-1}}^*} = \overline{u_{i_{s_a+b}, j_{s_a+b}} \dots u_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}} x_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}^{-1} \dots x_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}^{-1}} = (\overline{x_{i_{s_a+b}, j_{s_a+b}}^{-1}})^{-1} \dots (\overline{x_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}}^{-1}})^{-1} (\overline{u_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}}^{-1})^{-1} \dots (\overline{u_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}}^{-1})^{-1} = (\overline{u_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}} \dots \overline{u_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}} x_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}}^{-1} \dots x_{i_{s_a+b}, j_{s_a+b}}^{-1})^{-1} = (\overline{w_{s_1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_a}} \overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}})^{-1} = (\overline{w_\alpha^*})^{-1}$. \square

We have proved the previous lemmas and propositions for a fixed but arbitrary transformation α . So, we can replace α by α^{-1} and obtain the same results if we adapt the concepts defined for α to α^{-1} . But this is straight forward in the case α^{-1} . Using this idea, the following proposition is easy to prove.

Proposition 4. Let $h \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ with $s_{a+h} \geq 2$ and let

$$\hat{\rho} \in \begin{cases} \{0, \dots, a_{s_{a+h}-1}\} & \text{if } w_{s_{a+h}-1} \in W_u; \\ \{0, \dots, b_{s_{a+h}-1}\} & \text{if } w_{s_{a+h}-1} \in W_x. \end{cases}$$

Then $(d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{w_\alpha} = m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} = (d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \alpha$.

Proof. We have $\alpha^{-1} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} m_1 & \dots & m_p \\ d_1 & \dots & d_p \end{smallmatrix} \right)$ and obtain the words $v_{A'} w_{\alpha^{-1}}^*$ and $w' = w'_1 \dots w'_{l'+1}$ from α^{-1} by the same construction as the words $v_A w_\alpha^*$ and $w = w_1 \dots w_{l+1}$ from α , respectively. It is easy to verify that $w'_{s_{a+h}} \in W_u$. We show that $(d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{w_\alpha} = m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}$. By Propositions 2 and 3, respectively, and Lemma 8, we have $(m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{v_{A'} w_{\alpha^{-1}}^*} = d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} = (m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{v_{A'} (\overline{w_\alpha^*})^{-1}}$. Since $m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha^{-1})$ and $d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$, we can conclude that $m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} \notin A'$ and $d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} \notin A$, respectively. Then $(m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{v_{A'} (\overline{w_\alpha^*})^{-1}} = d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}$ implies $(m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) (\overline{w_\alpha^*})^{-1} = (d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{v_A}$. We apply $\overline{w_\alpha^*}$ to that equation and obtain $m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} = (d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{v_A w_\alpha^*}$, i.e. $m_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho} = (d_{r_{s_{a+h}}} - \hat{\rho}) \overline{w_\alpha}$. \square

It remains to consider all ρ in domain α with $\rho \leq d_{r_1}$ and $\rho > d_{r_1}$, respectively.

Proposition 5. If $w_l = w_{s_a}$ and $m_p = d_p$ then $\rho \bar{w}_\alpha = \rho \alpha = \rho$ for all $\rho \in \{i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2, \dots, n\} \cap \text{dom}(\alpha)$.

Proof. Let $\rho \in \{i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2, \dots, n\} \cap \text{dom}(\alpha)$. First, we show that $m_{r_l} + 2 = i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2$. In fact by Lemma 1, we have $m_{r_l} + 2 = l_x + 2 = i_l + 2|w_l| + 2 = i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2$. Therefore, $\rho \in \{m_{r_l} + 2, \dots, n\}$ and we have $\rho \alpha = \rho$. Since $\rho \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$, we can conclude $\rho \notin A$ by the definition of set A . Hence, we get $\rho \bar{w}_\alpha = \rho \bar{v}_A \bar{w}_{s_1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_a} \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} = \rho \bar{w}_{s_1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_a} \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}$. Then we have $\rho \bar{w}_{s_1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_a} \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} = \rho \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}$ by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(i). By Lemma 7(v), we can conclude $i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2 \leq \rho$, which provides $\rho \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} = \rho$ by Remark 1. Thus, $\rho \bar{w}_\alpha = \rho = \rho \alpha$. \square

Similarly, we can prove:

Proposition 6. If $w_l = w_{s_{a+1}}$ and $m_p = d_p$ then $\rho \bar{w}_\alpha = \rho \alpha = \rho$ for all $\rho \in \{i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}| + 2, \dots, n\} \cap \text{dom}(\alpha)$.

Proposition 7. Let $\hat{\rho} \in \{0, \dots, \min\{1_u, 1_x\} - 1\}$ such that $d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. Then we have $(d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{w}_\alpha = (d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \alpha$.

Proof. Recall that $1_u = d_{r_1}$ and $1_x = m_{r_1}$ by Lemma 1.

If $1_u \leq 1_x$ then $\hat{\rho} \in \{0, \dots, 1_u - 1\}$, i.e. $d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \in \{1, \dots, 1_u\} = \{1, \dots, d_{r_1}\}$.

If $1_u > 1_x$ then $\hat{\rho} \in \{0, \dots, 1_x - 1\}$, i.e. $d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \in \{1_u - 1_x + 1, \dots, 1_u\} = \{d_{r_1} - m_{r_1} + 1, \dots, d_{r_1}\}$.

This implies $(d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \alpha = m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}$. We will show that $(d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{w}_\alpha = m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}$. Since $d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$, we can conclude $d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \notin A$ by the definition of set A .

Suppose that $w_1 \in W_u$, i.e. $w_1 = w_{s_1}$. Then we can calculate $(d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{w}_\alpha$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{v}_A \bar{w}_{s_1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_a} \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} \\ &= (d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{w}_{s_1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_a} \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} && (\text{since } d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \notin A) \\ &= (i_{s_1} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}|) \bar{w}_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots \bar{w}_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} && (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(ii)}) \\ &= i_{s_1} - \hat{\rho} + 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}| && (\text{by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(iii)}) \\ &= m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} && (\text{by Lemma 4}). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now $w_1 \in W_x$, i.e. $w_1 = w_{s_{a+b}}$. We have $\alpha^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & \dots & m_p \\ d_1 & \dots & d_p \end{pmatrix}$ and obtain the words $w' = w'_1 \dots w'_l w'_{l+1}$ and $w_{\alpha^{-1}} = v_{A'} w_{\alpha^{-1}}^*$ by the same constructions as for the words w and w_α , respectively, from α . It is easy to verify that $w'_1 \in W_u$. We will show that $(d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{w}_\alpha = m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}$. As above and using Lemma 8, we can show that $d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} = (m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{v}_{A'} \bar{w}_{\alpha^{-1}}^* = (m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{v}_{A'} (\bar{w}_\alpha^*)^{-1}$. Since $m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \in \text{dom}(\alpha^{-1})$, i.e. $m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \notin A'$, and because $d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} \notin A$, we obtain $(m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) (\bar{w}_\alpha^*)^{-1} = (d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{v}_A$. That equation provides $(m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) (\bar{w}_\alpha^*)^{-1} \bar{w}_\alpha^* = (d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{v}_A \bar{w}_\alpha^*$, i.e. $m_{r_1} - \hat{\rho} = (d_{r_1} - \hat{\rho}) \bar{w}_\alpha$. \square

Up to this point, we have only considered such $\rho \in \bar{n}$ which belong to $\text{dom}(\alpha)$ and could show that $\rho \alpha = \rho \bar{w}_\alpha$. Now we will consider the remaining elements ρ in \bar{n} and show that $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\alpha)$ as well as $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\bar{w}_\alpha)$. If we have done it, then we can conclude that both transformations α and \bar{w}_α are equal.

First, we consider the intervals of \bar{n} regarded in Proposition 2-7 and show that if $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\alpha)$ then $\rho \in A$. This provides that $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\bar{v}_A)$. Since $\text{dom}(\bar{w}_\alpha) = \text{dom}(\bar{v}_A \bar{w}_\alpha^*) \subseteq \text{dom}(\bar{v}_A)$, we obtain $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\bar{w}_\alpha)$.

Proposition 8. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$. Then $\{i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2, \dots, (s_k + 1)_u - 1\} \setminus \text{dom}(\alpha) \subseteq A$.

Proof. By Lemma 5, we have $i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2 = d_{r_{s_k+1}} - (m_{r_{s_k+1}} - m_{r_{s_k}} - 2)$, where $(s_k + 1)_u - 1 = d_{r_{s_k+1}} - 1$ by Lemma 1. Then $\{i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 2, \dots, (s_k + 1)_u - 1\} = \{d_{r_{s_k+1}} - (m_{r_{s_k+1}} - m_{r_{s_k}} - 2), \dots, d_{r_{s_k+1}} - 1\}$. Let $\rho \in \{d_{r_{s_k+1}} - (m_{r_{s_k+1}} - m_{r_{s_k}} - 2), \dots, d_{r_{s_k+1}} - 1\}$. If $\rho \leq d_{r_{s_k+1}} - 1$ then we obtain $\rho \in A$ by (3.2) of the definition of set A . If $\rho > d_{r_{s_k+1}} - 1$ then there is $t \in \{r_{s_k} + 1, \dots, r_{s_k+1} - 1\}$ such that $\rho \in \{d_t + 1, \dots, d_{t+1} - 1\}$. Then $\rho \in A$ by (3.1) of the definition of set A . \square

Proposition 9. Let $d \in \{1, \dots, b\}$. Then $\{(s_{a+d} + 1)_u - b_{s_{a+d}}, \dots, (s_{a+d} + 1)_u - 1\} \setminus \text{dom}(\alpha) \subseteq A$.

Proof. We have $(s_{a+d} + 1)_u - 1 = d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - 1$ and $(s_{a+d} + 1)_u - b_{s_{a+d}} = d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2$ by Lemmas 1 and 6, respectively. Then $\{(s_{a+d} + 1)_u - b_{s_{a+d}}, \dots, (s_{a+d} + 1)_u - 1\} = \{d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2, \dots, d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - 1\}$. Let $\rho \in \{d_{r_{s_{a+d}}} + 2, \dots, d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - 1\}$. If $\rho \leq d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - 1$ then we obtain $\rho \in A$ by (3.3) of the definition of set A . If $\rho > d_{r_{s_{a+d}+1}} - 1$ then there is $t \in \{r_{s_{a+d}} + 1, \dots, r_{s_{a+d}+1} - 1\}$ such that $\rho \in \{d_t + 1, \dots, d_{t+1} - 1\}$. Then $\rho \in A$ by (3.1) of the definition of set A . \square

Finally, we consider the case that $m_p \neq d_p$. In this case, we have $w_{l+1} \in W_u \cup W_x$.

Proposition 10. If $m_p > d_p$ and $i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2 \leq n$ then $\{i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2, \dots, n\} \subseteq A$.

Proof. We have $l + 1 = s_a$, $r_{l+1} = p$, $w_{l+1} \in W_u$, and $(l + 1)_x = i_{l+1} + 2j_{l+1}$. Then $i_{l+1} + 2j_{l+1} + 2 = (l + 1)_x + 2 = m_{r_{l+1}} + 2 = m_p + 2$ by Lemma 1. Thus, $\{i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2, \dots, n\} = \{i_{l+1} + 2|w_{l+1}| + 2, \dots, n\} = \{m_p + 2, \dots, n\}$. Then by (1.2) of the definition of set A , we get that $\{i_{s_a} + 2|w_{s_a}| + 2, \dots, n\} \subseteq A$. \square

Using (1.1) from the definition of set A instead of (1.2), we obtain similarly:

Proposition 11. If $m_p < d_p$ and $i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2 \leq n$ then $\{i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| + 2, \dots, n\} \subseteq A$.

Now, we consider the remaining intervals in \bar{n} . We start with the interval before d_1 and after d_p , respectively.

By (1.3), (2), (5), (6), and (3.1), respectively, of the definition of set A , we obtain immediately:

- Proposition 12.** (i) If $m_p = d_p < n$ then $\{m_p + 1, \dots, n\} \subseteq A$.
(ii) If $1 < d_1 \leq m_1$ then $\{1, \dots, d_1 - 1\} \subseteq A$.
(iii) If $1 < m_1 < d_1$ then $\{d_1 - m_1 + 1, \dots, d_1 - 1\} \subseteq A$.
(iv) If $1_u \neq 1_x$ and $1 \notin \{1_u, 1_x\}$ then $\{d_t + 1, \dots, d_{t+1} - 1\} \subseteq A$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, r_1 - 1\}$.

Proposition 13. If $1_x < 1_u$ then $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\bar{w}_\alpha)$ for all $\rho \in \{1, \dots, 1_u - 1_x\}$.

Proof. If $w_1 \in W_u$ then $w_1 = w_{s_1}$. By Lemmas 1 and 4, we have that $1_x = i_{s_1} + 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}| - 2|w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$ and $1_u = i_{s_1}$. If $w_1 \in W_x$ then $w_1 = w_{s_{a+b}}$. By Lemmas 1 and 3, we have that $1_x = i_{s_{a+b}}$ and $1_u = i_{s_{a+b}} + 2|w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}|$.

Then $1_u - 1_x = 2|w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| - 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}| = 2k$ for some positive integer k . We put $\mathcal{U} = w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}$ and $\mathcal{X} = w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}$, i.e. $2k = 2|\mathcal{X}| - 2|\mathcal{U}|$ and $|\mathcal{X}| = |\mathcal{U}| + k$. Let $\overline{w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} = \overline{y_1 \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+k}}$, where $y_1, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{U}|+k} \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}\}$. Let $\rho \in \{1, \dots, 1_u - 1_x\}$. Clearly, $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\alpha)$ and $\rho \notin A$ by the definition of set A . On the other hand, we have $\rho \overline{v_A w_\alpha^*}$
 $= \rho \overline{w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a} y_1 \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+k}}$ (since $\rho \notin A$)
 $= (\rho + 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{y_1 \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+k}}$ (since $\rho < 1_u \leq i_{s_1}$ and by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(ii)).

Using Lemma 2(i), it is routine to calculate that $2|w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| < i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$, i.e. $(1_u - 1_x) + 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}| = 2|w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}| < i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. This implies $\rho + 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}| \leq i_{s_{a+1}} + 2|w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1}|$. Then $(\rho + 2|w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a}|) \overline{y_1 \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+k}} = \rho \overline{y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+k}}$ using Remark 1. Note that $1_u - 1_x$ is even and there is $i \in \{2, 4, \dots, 1_u - 1_x\}$ such that $\rho \in \{i - 1, i\}$. If $\rho = i - 1$ then $\rho - 2|y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}-1}| = 1$. If $\rho = i$ then $\rho - 2|y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}-1}| = 2$. Therefore, $\rho \overline{y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{1_u-1_x}{2}}} = (\rho - 2|y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}-1}|) \overline{y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{1_u-1_x}{2}}}$ by Remark 1, i.e. $\rho \overline{y_{|\mathcal{U}|+1} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{1_u-1_x}{2}}} = \hat{\rho} \overline{y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}} \dots y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{1_u-1_x}{2}}}$, where $\hat{\rho} \in \{1, 2\}$. Then we have $\hat{\rho} \notin \text{dom}(\overline{y_{|\mathcal{U}|+\frac{i}{2}}})$. This implies $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\overline{w_\alpha})$. \square

It is easy to check that any interval I of \overline{n} , which we have not yet regarded, belongs to an interval of the form $\{d_i + 1, \dots, d_{i+1} - 1\}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, i.e. $I \cap \text{dom}(\alpha) = \emptyset$. It remains to show that $I \cap \text{dom}(\overline{w_\alpha}) = \emptyset$.

Proposition 14. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, a\}$ and let $\rho \in \{i_{s_k} + 1, \dots, i_{s_k} + 2|w_{s_k}| + 1\} \cap \overline{n}$. Then $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\overline{w_\alpha})$.

Proof. First, we have $\rho \overline{v_A w_\alpha^*} = \rho \overline{w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a} w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}}$ since $\rho \notin A$ by the definition of set A and $\rho \overline{w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a} w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} = \rho \overline{w_{s_k} \dots w_{s_a} w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}}$ by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(i), where $w_{s_k} = u_{i_{s_k}} u_{i_{s_k}+2} \dots u_{i_{s_k}+2|w_{s_k}|-2}$. If $\rho \in \{i_{s_k} + 1, i_{s_k} + 2, i_{s_k} + 3\} \cap \overline{n}$ then $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\overline{u_{i_{s_k}}})$ by Remark 1. If $\rho = i_{s_k} + h + t$ for some $h \in \{2, 4, \dots, 2|w_{s_k}| - 2\}$, $t \in \{2, 3\}$ then

$$\rho \overline{u_{i_{s_k}} u_{i_{s_k}+2} \dots u_{i_{s_k}+2|w_{s_k}|-2} w_{s_{k+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_a} w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \\ = (i_{s_k} + h + t) \overline{u_{i_{s_k}+h} \dots u_{i_{s_k}+2|w_{s_k}|-2} w_{s_{k+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_a} w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}} \quad \text{by Remark 1.}$$

We observe that $i_{s_k} + h + t \notin \text{dom}(\overline{u_{i_{s_k}+h}})$. Hence, $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\overline{w_\alpha})$. \square

Proposition 15. Let $d \in \{1, \dots, b\}$ with $(s_{a+d})_u < n$. Then $(s_{a+d})_u + 1 \notin \text{dom}(\overline{w_\alpha})$.

Proof. Assume $(s_{a+d})_u + 1 \in \text{dom}(\overline{w_\alpha})$. We have shown that $(s_{a+d})_u \overline{w_\alpha} = (s_{a+d})_u \alpha = (s_{a+d})_x$ in Proposition 4. Recall that $\overline{w_\alpha} \in IOF_n^{\text{par}}$. Then Proposition 1(i, iii) implies $((s_{a+d})_u + 1) \overline{w_\alpha} = (s_{a+d})_x + 1$ and $(s_{a+d})_u + 1 = ((s_{a+d})_u + 1) \overline{w_\alpha} (\overline{w_\alpha})^{-1} = ((s_{a+d})_x + 1) (\overline{w_\alpha})^{-1}$, i.e. $(s_{a+d})_x + 1 \in \text{dom}((\overline{w_\alpha})^{-1})$. We have
 $(\overline{w_\alpha})^{-1} = (\overline{v_A w_{s_1} \dots w_{s_a} w_{s_{a+1}}^{-1} \dots w_{s_{a+b}}^{-1}})^{-1}$
 $= (x_{i_{s_{a+b}}, j_{s_{a+b}}}^{-1} \dots (x_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}}^{-1})^{-1} (\overline{u_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}})^{-1} \dots (\overline{u_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}})^{-1} (\overline{v_A})^{-1}$

$$= \overline{u}_{i_{s_{a+b}}, j_{s_{a+b}}} \dots \overline{u}_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}} \overline{x_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{x_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}^{-1}} (\overline{v}_A)^{-1}.$$

Since $w_{s_{a+d}} \in W_x$, we get $(s_{a+d})_x = i_{s_{a+d}}$. Then $(i_{s_{a+d}} + 1)(\overline{w}_\alpha)^{-1}$

$$= (i_{s_{a+d}} + 1) \overline{u}_{i_{s_{a+b}}, j_{s_{a+b}}} \dots \overline{u}_{i_{s_{a+d}}, j_{s_{a+d}}} \overline{x_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}}^{-1}} \overline{x_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{x_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}^{-1}} (\overline{v}_A)^{-1}$$

$$= (i_{s_{a+d}} + 1) \overline{u}_{i_{s_{a+d}}, j_{s_{a+d}}} \dots \overline{u}_{i_{s_{a+1}}, j_{s_{a+1}}} \overline{x_{i_{s_a}, j_{s_a}}^{-1}} \dots \overline{x_{i_{s_1}, j_{s_1}}^{-1}} (\overline{v}_A)^{-1} \text{ by Remark 1 and Lemma 7(i).}$$

Clearly, $i_{s_{a+d}} + 1 \notin \text{dom}(\overline{u}_{i_{s_{a+d}}})$ and thus, $(s_{a+d})_x + 1 \notin \text{dom}((\overline{w}_\alpha)^{-1})$, a contradiction. \square

Now, we can summarize all results and obtain that α and \overline{w}_α are equal.

Theorem 1. $\alpha = \overline{w}_\alpha$.

Proof. Let $\rho \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then $\rho \in \{1, \dots, d_{r_1}\}$ or $\rho \in \{d_{r_{k-1}} + 1, \dots, d_{r_k}\}$ for some $k \in \{2, \dots, a+b\}$ or $\rho \in \{d_{r_{a+b}} + 1, \dots, n\}$. We have to show that $\rho\alpha = \rho\overline{w}_\alpha$, whenever $\rho \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$ and $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\overline{w}_\alpha)$, whenever $\rho \notin \text{dom}(\alpha)$. If $\rho \in \{1, \dots, d_{r_1}\}$ we can conclude it by Propositions 7, 12(ii-iv), and 13. If $\rho \in \{d_{r_{k-1}} + 1, \dots, d_{r_k}\}$ then we can conclude it by Propositions 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 14, and 15. If $\rho \in \{d_{r_{a+b}} + 1, \dots, n\}$ then we can conclude it by Propositions 5, 6, 10, 11, 12(i), 14, and 15. \square

Corollary 1. $IOF_n^{par} = \langle A_n \rangle$.

Proof. We have already mentioned that $\langle A_n \rangle \subseteq IOF_n^{par}$. Theorem 1 shows $\alpha = \overline{w}_\alpha$, where $\overline{w}_\alpha \in \langle A_n, \overline{u}_{n-3}, \overline{x}_{n-3} \rangle$. It is easy to verify that $\overline{u}_{n-3} = \overline{v}_{n-2}\overline{u}_{n-2}$ and $\overline{x}_{n-3} = \overline{v}_n\overline{x}_{n-2}$, where $\overline{u}_{n-2}, \overline{x}_{n-2}, \overline{v}_{n-2}, \overline{v}_n \in A_n$. Hence, $\alpha \in \langle A_n \rangle$. Since we have proved $\alpha = \overline{w}_\alpha$ for any $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par}$, we can conclude that $IOF_n^{par} \subseteq \langle A_n \rangle$, which completes the proof. \square

3 The rank of IOF_n^{par}

In this section, we provide the main result of that paper, the rank of IOF_n^{par} . We can calculate that $|A_n| = 2(n-3) + n = 3n-6$. Moreover, A_n is a generating set of the monoid IOF_n^{par} by Corollary 1. This provides:

Proposition 16. $\text{rank}(IOF_n^{par}) \leq 3n-6$.

We have still to show that $\text{rank}(IOF_n^{par}) \geq 3n-6$. First, we consider the transformations with rank $n-1$. Clearly, for any transformation α with rank $n-1$, there is $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\text{dom}(\alpha) = \text{dom}(\overline{v}_i)$. As an immediate consequence of Proposition 1(i, ii), we obtain:

Lemma 9. Let $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $\text{dom}(\alpha) = \text{dom}(\overline{v}_i)$. Then $\alpha = \overline{v}_i$.

Lemma 10. Let G be a generating set of IOF_n^{par} . Then $\overline{v}_1, \dots, \overline{v}_n \in G$.

Proof. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in G \setminus \{id_n\}$ such that $\overline{v}_i = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_m$, where $\text{dom}(\overline{v}_i) \subseteq \text{dom}(\alpha_1)$. Since $\alpha_1 \neq id_n$, we have $\text{rank}(\alpha_1) = n-1$, i.e. $\text{dom}(\overline{v}_i) = \text{dom}(\alpha_1)$. By Lemma 9, we get that $\overline{v}_i = \alpha_1$. \square

Lemma 11. Let $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par}$ with $\text{rank}(\alpha) = n - 2$. Then $\alpha = \bar{v}_A$ with $A = \bar{n} \setminus \text{dom}(\alpha)$ or $\alpha = \bar{u}_{n-2}$ or $\alpha = \bar{x}_{n-2}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} d_1 & & \\ m_1 & & \end{smallmatrix} < \dots < \begin{smallmatrix} d_{n-2} & & \\ m_{n-2} & & \end{smallmatrix} \right)$. Assume there is $i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$ such that $d_i - d_{i-1} \neq m_i - m_{i-1}$, i.e. $d_i - d_{i-1} > m_i - m_{i-1}$ or $d_i - d_{i-1} < m_i - m_{i-1}$. If $d_i - d_{i-1} > m_i - m_{i-1}$ then $m_i - m_{i-1} > 1$ and thus, $d_i - d_{i-1} \geq 4$, by Proposition 1(iii, iv). This implies $|\text{dom}(\alpha)| < n - 3$, a contradiction. If $d_i - d_{i-1} < m_i - m_{i-1}$ then we obtain $|\text{im}(\alpha)| < n - 3$ by dually arguments, a contradiction. Therefore, $d_i - d_{i-1} = m_i - m_{i-1}$ for all $i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$, which together with Proposition 1(ii) implies $k\alpha = k$ for all $k \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$ or $k\alpha = k + 2$ for all $k \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$ or $k\alpha = k - 2$ for all $k \in \text{dom}(\alpha)$. Hence, $\alpha = \bar{v}_A$ with $A = \bar{n} \setminus \text{dom}(\alpha)$ or $\alpha = \bar{u}_{n-2}$ or $\alpha = \bar{x}_{n-2}$. \square

Lemma 12. Let G be a generating set of IOF_n^{par} . Then $\bar{u}_{n-2}, \bar{x}_{n-2} \in G$.

Proof. First, we show that $\bar{u}_{n-2} \in G$. There are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in G \setminus \{id_{\bar{n}}\}$ such that $\bar{u}_{n-2} = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m$. Then $\text{dom}(\bar{u}_{n-2}) \subseteq \text{dom}(\alpha_1)$. If $\text{dom}(\bar{u}_{n-2}) \subset \text{dom}(\alpha_1)$ then we get $\alpha_1 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ by Lemma 9. If $\text{dom}(\alpha_1) = \text{dom}(\bar{u}_{n-2}) \neq \text{dom}(\bar{x}_{n-2})$ then $\alpha_1 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ or $\alpha_1 = \bar{u}_{n-2}$ by Lemma 11. If $\alpha_1 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ then $\text{dom}(\bar{u}_{n-2}) \subseteq \text{dom}(\alpha_2)$, i.e. $\bar{u}_{n-2} = \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_2 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ by the same arguments like for α_1 . Continuing that procedure, we obtain that either there is $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\bar{u}_{n-2} = \alpha_j$ or $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$. Assume that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$. Then $\bar{u}_{n-2} = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ since $Id_{\bar{n}}$ is a submonoid of I_n , a contradiction. Hence, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\bar{u}_{n-2} = \alpha_j \in G$. Dually, we can show $\bar{x}_{n-2} \in G$. \square

For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-4\}$, we put $J_i = \{1, \dots, i, i+4, \dots, n\}$.

Lemma 13. Let G be a generating set of IOF_n^{par} . Then there are pairwise different $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-4}$, $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-4} \in G$ such that $\text{dom}(\gamma_i) = J_i = \text{im}(\beta_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n-4\}$.

Proof. Note, for $n = 4$, we observe that the statement of this lemma is true trivially. We are going to show the rest of the proof for $n \geq 5$. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n-4\}$. It is easy to verify that there is $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par} \setminus Id_{\bar{n}}$ such that $\text{dom}(\alpha) = J_i$. Then there are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in G \setminus \{id_{\bar{n}}\}$ such that $\alpha = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m$. In particular, we have $\text{dom}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{dom}(\alpha_1)$. If $\text{rank}(\alpha) \nmid \text{rank}(\alpha_1)$ then $\alpha_1 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ or $\alpha_1 \in \{\bar{u}_{n-2}, \bar{x}_{n-2}\}$ by Lemma 11. Since $\text{dom}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{dom}(\alpha_1)$, we get $\alpha_1 \notin \{\bar{u}_{n-2}, \bar{x}_{n-2}\}$, i.e. $\alpha_1 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$. If $\text{rank}(\alpha) = \text{rank}(\alpha_1)$ then $\text{dom}(\alpha) = \text{dom}(\alpha_1)$. Suppose $\alpha_1 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$. Then $\text{dom}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{dom}(\alpha_2)$. If $\text{rank}(\alpha) \nmid \text{rank}(\alpha_2)$ then we obtain $\alpha_2 \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ by the same argument like for α_1 . If $\text{rank}(\alpha) = \text{rank}(\alpha_2)$ then $\text{dom}(\alpha) = \text{dom}(\alpha_2)$. Continuing that procedure, we obtain that either $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ or there is $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\text{dom}(\alpha) = \text{dom}(\alpha_j)$ and $\alpha_j \notin Id_{\bar{n}}$. Note $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ is not possible since $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m = \alpha \notin Id_{\bar{n}}$. We put $\gamma_i = \alpha_j$ and we have $\text{dom}(\gamma_i) = \text{dom}(\alpha)$ and $\gamma_i \notin Id_{\bar{n}}$.

Next, we show that there is $\beta_i \in G \setminus Id_{\bar{n}}$ with $\text{im}(\beta_i) = J_i$. It is easy to verify that there is $\alpha \in IOF_n^{par} \setminus Id_{\bar{n}}$, with $\text{im}(\alpha) = J_i$. Then there are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in G$ such that $\alpha = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m$. We have that $\text{im}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{im}(\alpha_m)$. If $\text{im}(\alpha) \subset \text{im}(\alpha_m)$ then $\alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ or $\alpha_m \in \{\bar{u}_{n-2}, \bar{x}_{n-2}\}$ by Lemma 11. Since $\text{im}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{im}(\alpha_m)$, we can conclude that $\alpha_m \notin \{\bar{u}_{n-2}, \bar{x}_{n-2}\}$. Consequently, either $\text{im}(\alpha) = \text{im}(\alpha_m)$ and $\alpha_m \notin Id_{\bar{n}}$ or $\alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$. Suppose $\alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$. Then $\text{im}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{im}(\alpha_{m-1})$. By the same argument as for α_m , we obtain that either $\text{im}(\alpha) = \text{im}(\alpha_{m-1})$ and $\alpha_{m-1} \notin Id_{\bar{n}}$ or $\alpha_{m-1} \in Id_{\bar{n}}$. Continuing that procedure, we obtain that either $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in Id_{\bar{n}}$ or there is

$j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $im(\alpha_j) = im(\alpha)$ and $\alpha_j \notin Id_{\overline{n}}$. The case $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in Id_{\overline{n}}$ is not possible since $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m = \alpha \notin Id_{\overline{n}}$. We put $\beta_i = \alpha_j$ and we have $im(\beta_i) = im(\alpha)$ and $\beta_i \notin Id_{\overline{n}}$.

Let now $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-4\}$. Assume that $\gamma_i = \beta_j$. Then $J_i = dom(\gamma_i) = dom(\beta_j)$ and $im(\gamma_i) = im(\beta_j) = J_j$. It is easy to see by Proposition 1 that $k\gamma_i = k$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, i, i+4, \dots, n\}$. Hence, we have $\gamma_i \in Id_{\overline{n}}$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 10 provides n transformations of rank $n-1$ which have to belong to any generating set of IOF_n^{par} . Lemma 12 provides two transformations of rank $n-2$. Finally, Lemma 13 points out that any generating set of IOF_n^{par} has to contain $2(n-4)$ transformations of rank $n-3$. This shows that any generating set of IOF_n^{par} contains at least $n+2+2(n-4) = 3n-6$ transformations, which proves:

Proposition 17. $\text{rank}(IOF_n^{par}) \geq 3n-6$.

By Proposition 16 and 17, we can state the main result:

Theorem 2. $\text{rank}(IOF_n^{par}) = 3n-6$.

Statements and Declarations

There are no financial or non-financial interests directly or indirectly related to the work submitted for publication.

References

- [1] Annin, S., Lopez, S.: Minimal Generating Sets of the Monoid of Partial Order-Preserving Injections. PUMP Journal of Undergraduate Research 3, 190-204 (2020)
- [2] Clifford, A. H., Preston, G. B.: The Algebraic Theory of Semigroups. Vol. I. Amer. Math. Soc. Surveys 7. Providence. R.I. (1961). Vol. II. Amer. Math. Soc. Surveys 7, Providence R.I. (1967)
- [3] Currie, J. D., Visentin, T. I.: The number of order-preserving maps of fences and crowns. Order 8, 133-142 (1991)
- [4] Dimitrova, I., Koppitz, J.: The Maximal Subsemigroups of the Ideals of Some Semi-groups of Partial Injections. Discussiones Mathematicae. General algebra and applications 29, 153–167 (2009)
- [5] Dimitrova, I., Koppitz J.: On the semigroup of all partial fence preserving injections on a finite set. J. Algebra Appl. 16(11), 1750223 (2017)
- [6] Dimitrova, I., Koppitz J., Lohapan L.: Generating sets of semigroups of partial transformations preserving a zig-zag order on \mathbb{N} . International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics 17(2), 279-289 (2017)

- [7] Fernandes, V. H.: The monoid of all injective order preserving partial transformations on a finite chain. *Semigroup Forum* 62, 178-204 (2001)
- [8] Fernandes, V. H., Koppitz J., Musunthia, T.: The rank of the semigroup of all order-preserving transformations on a finite fence. *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* 42, 2191-2211 (2019)
- [9] Ganyushkin, O., Mazorchuk, V.: On the Structure of IO_n . *Semigroup Forum* 66, 455–483 (2003)
- [10] Garba, G.U.: On the idempotent ranks of certain semigroups of order preserving transformations. *Port. Math.* 51, 185–204 (1994)
- [11] Gomes, G.M.S., Howie, J.M.: On the ranks of certain semigroups of order preserving transformations. *Semigroup Forum* 45, 272–282 (1992)
- [12] Howie, J.M.: *Fundamentals of Semigroup Theory*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1995)
- [13] Jitman, S., Srithus R., Worawannotai C.: Regularity of semigroups of transformations with restricted range preserving an alternating orientation order. *Turkish Journal of Mathematics* 42(4), 1913-1926 (2018)
- [14] Jendana, K., Srithus, R.: Coregularity of order-preserving self-mapping semigroups of fence. *Commun. Korean Math. Soc.* 30, 349-361 (2015)
- [15] Koppitz, J., Musunthia, T.: The rank of the inverse semigroup of partial automorphism on a finite fence. *Semigroup Forum* 102, 437-455 (2021)
- [16] Lohapan, L., Koppitz, J.: Regular semigroups of partial transformations preserving a fence *N. Novi Sad J. Math.* 47, 77-91 (2017)
- [17] Rutkowski, A.: The formula for the number of order-preserving self-mappings of a fence. *Order* 9, 127-137 (1992)
- [18] Srithus, R., Chinram, R., Khongthat, C.: Regularity in the semigroup of transformations preserving a zig-zag order. *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* 43, 1761-1773 (2020)
- [19] Tanyawong, R., Srithus, R., Chinram, R.: Regular subsemigroups of the semigroups of transformations preserving a fence. *Asian-European Journal of Mathematics* 9(1), 1650003 (2016)
- [20] Wagner, V.V.: Generalized groups. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 84, 1119–1122(in Russian) (1952)