

Groups that are the union of two semigroups have left-orderable quotients

Casey Donovan*

February 18, 2022

Abstract

In this article, we show that a group G is the union of two proper subsemigroups if and only if G has a nontrivial left-orderable quotient. Furthermore, if G is the union of two proper semigroups, then there exists a minimum normal subgroup $N \trianglelefteq G$ for which G/N is left-orderable and nontrivial.

1 Introduction

The *covering number* of group G with respect to subgroups, $\sigma_g(G)$, is the minimum number of proper subgroups of G whose union is G . The covering number of groups has been extensively studied and was formally defined by [1]. Early results on covering numbers (not phrased as such) include [7], in which Scorza showed that a group has covering number three if and only if G has a homomorphic image isomorphic to the Klein-Four group. While it is elementary to show no group is the union of two proper subgroups, it is also the case that no group has covering number seven [8]. It is now known for all n satisfying $2 \leq n \leq 129$ whether n is a covering number of a group [5]. Similar studies have explored analogous results for rings and loops, see [4], [6], and [9].

This paper explores covering groups with subsemigroups, as opposed to subgroups. A *semigroup* is a set with an associative operation and a *subsemigroup* is simply a subset of a semigroup that is closed with respect to the inherited operation. Note that all groups are semigroups, but semigroups need not have an identity or inverses. The covering number of a semigroup S with respect to subsemigroups, $\sigma_s(S)$, is defined analogously to covering numbers of groups. Covering numbers of semigroups are explored in [3] and are characterized for finite semigroups and some specific classes of semigroups.

While a group is never the union of two proper subgroups, a group may be the union of two proper subsemigroups. For example, the additive group of integers, \mathbb{Z} , is the union of two proper subsemigroups, namely the positive and non-positive integers. Our main result characterizes precisely when a group is the union of two semigroups. Before stating our main result, we first give the following definition of left-orderable groups and a proposition alluding to the relationship between left-orderable groups and semigroups.

Definition 1.1. A group G is *left-orderable* when there is a total order \leq on G that respects left multiplication, i.e. for $g_1, g_2, h \in G$, we have $g_1 \leq g_2$ if and only if $hg_1 \leq hg_2$.

*Email address: cdonoven@binghamton.com

Throughout this paper, we will use the following proposition as an equivalent definition of left-orderable groups. For a subset A of a group G , define $A^{-1} = \{a^{-1} \mid a \in A\}$.

Proposition 1.2. *If G is a group with left-order \leq , then $P = \{g \in G \mid 1 \leq g\}$ satisfies $P \cup P^{-1} = G$ and $P \cap P^{-1} = \{1\}$. Conversely, if G is a group with subsemigroup P satisfying $P \cup P^{-1} = G$ and $P \cap P^{-1} = \{1\}$, then G has a left-order \leq defined by $g \leq h$ if and only if $g^{-1}h \in P$.*

Examples of left-orderable groups include torsion-free abelian or nilpotent groups, free groups, and Thompson's group F . See [2] for more details and examples of left-orderable groups.

Our main result extends the relationship between left-orderability and groups as the union of two subsemigroups.

Theorem 1.3. *A group G is the union of two proper subsemigroups if and only if G has a nontrivial left-orderable quotient.*

As a brief example, consider $G = \mathbb{Z} \times C_2$, where C_2 is the cyclic group of order two. Since G has elements of finite order, G is not left-orderable. However, G is the union of two proper subsemigroups, $P \times C_2$ and $P^{-1} \times C_2$, where P is the set of non-negative integers. Also, it is clear that G quotients onto \mathbb{Z} and thus has a left-orderable quotient.

After we prove Theorem 1.3, we give some simple remarks on minimality of normal subgroups inducing left-orderable quotients and finish with some open questions.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 1.3 after presenting several useful lemmas. We begin with the proof of the reverse implication in Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 2.1. *Let G be a group and $H \trianglelefteq G$ such that G/H is left-orderable and not the trivial group. Then G is the union of two proper subsemigroups.*

Proof. Since G/H is a nontrivial left-orderable group, G/H has a proper subsemigroup $P = \{gH \in G/H \mid H \leq gH\}$ where \leq is the order on G/H . Moreover, P^{-1} is also a proper subsemigroup of G/H such that $P \cup P^{-1} = G/H$. Letting $\phi : G \rightarrow G/H$ be the quotient map, we see $\phi^{-1}(P)$ and $\phi^{-1}(P^{-1})$ are proper subsemigroups of G such that $\phi^{-1}(P) \cup \phi^{-1}(P^{-1}) = G$. \square

For the remainder of this section, let G be a group such that G is the union of two proper subsemigroups, A and B . Note that if S is a proper subsemigroup of G , then $S \cup \{1\}$ is also a proper subsemigroup, so we implicitly assume $1 \in A \cap B$.

Define $I = A \cap B$. We use $\langle I \rangle$ to mean the group generated by I . The following four lemmas will be used to show that we may assume $I = \{1\}$ without loss of generality.

Lemma 2.2. *$\langle I \rangle$ is contained in A or B .*

Proof. Consider the following two disjoint sets:

$$I_A = \{x \in I \mid x^{-1} \in A \text{ and } x^{-1} \notin B\}$$

and

$$I_B = \{y \in I \mid y^{-1} \in B \text{ and } y^{-1} \notin A\}.$$

Suppose that $x \in I_A$ and $y \in I_B$. Then the element $x^{-1}y^{-1}$ must be in A or B . If $x^{-1}y^{-1} \in A$, then $xx^{-1}y^{-1} = y^{-1} \in A$ which contradicts $y \in I_B$. Likewise, if $x^{-1}y^{-1} \in B$, then $x^{-1}y^{-1}y = x^{-1} \in B$ which contradicts $x \in I_A$. Therefore I_A or I_B is empty.

Without loss of generality, assume $I_A = \emptyset$. This implies that $I^{-1} \subseteq B$ and thus the group generated by I is a subset of B . \square

Henceforth, we will assume $\langle I \rangle \subseteq B$. Note that the inverse of *some* elements in I may be contained in A , however the inverse of *every* element in I is contained in B .

Define $H = \{h \in B \mid h^{-1} \in B\}$. We see H is a subgroup of B and moreover H is the maximal subgroup of B with respect to inclusion. Note that $\langle I \rangle \leq H$.

Lemma 2.3. *If $h \in H$, then $h(A - I) = (A - I) = (A - I)h$ and $h(B - H) = (B - H) = (B - H)h$.*

Proof. Since B is a semigroup, $bH \subseteq B$ for all $b \in B$. Thus, B is a union of left cosets of H . The complement of B , i.e. $A - I$, is also a union of left cosets of H . This implies $(A - I)h = (A - I)$ and $(B - H)h = (B - H)$. A similar argument with right cosets finishes the proof. \square

The following lemma describes the inverses of elements in A and B .

Lemma 2.4. $(A - I)^{-1} = B - H$

Proof. Let $b \in B - H$. Then $b^{-1} \notin B$ and thus $b^{-1} \in A - I$. Also let $a \in (A - I)$. Suppose for contradiction that $a^{-1} \in A - I$.

If there exists an $h \in H$ such that $h \notin I$, then $ha \in A$ by the previous lemma. Therefore $haa^{-1} = h \in A$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $a^{-1} \in B - H$.

However, if there does not exist an $h \in H$ such that $h \notin I$, then $\langle I \rangle = H = I$. Let $H' = \{h \in A \mid h^{-1} \in A\}$. We see that for all $a' \in A - H'$, $a' \in B - H' = B - I$ and therefore $(B - I)^{-1} = A - H'$. In this case, without loss of generality, switch the names of A and B as well as H and H' to complete the proof. \square

Note that Lemma 2.4 implies every subgroup of A is contained in I .

Lemma 2.5. $A - I$ is a semigroup.

Proof. Let $a_1, a_2 \in A - I$. Assume for contradiction that $a_1a_2 \in I$. Since $I \subseteq H$, this means $a_1a_2 \in H$ and therefore $a_1 \in Ha_2^{-1}$. By Lemma 2.4, $a_2^{-1} \in B - H$ so we see $Ha_2^{-1} \subseteq B - H$. Since $B - H$ is the complement of A , this contradicts the fact that $a_1 \in A$. \square

Using Lemma 2.5, we see that G is the union of two proper semigroups, $(A - I) \cup \{1\}$ and B , who intersect only on the identity. For the rest of the paper, we will assume without loss of generality that $I = A \cap B = \{1\}$.

As an aside, we point out that all torsion elements of G must be contained in H , the maximal subgroup of B . We express a consequence of this in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6. *A group that is generated by elements of finite order is not the union of two proper subsemigroups.*

Proof. Let the group G be the union of proper subsemigroups, A and B , with the same assumptions on A and B as above. If $g \in G$ has order n , then $g^{n-1} = g^{-1}$. This implies $g, g^{-1} \notin A - \{1\}$, since $A - \{1\}$ is closed under multiplication by Lemma 2.5, but does

not contain the inverses of any of its elements by Lemma 2.4. We see $g, g^{-1} \in B$ and thus $g \in H$. We conclude that if G were generated by elements of finite order, then H contains a generating set of G so $G = H$, which is a contradiction. \square

With the assumptions on the subsemigroups A and B , we can now construct left-orderable quotients of G .

If $H \trianglelefteq G$, then Lemma 2.4 implies that $B/H \cap (B/H)^{-1} = \{H\}$ and $B/H \cup (B/H)^{-1} = G/H$. We then see G/H is left-orderable using Proposition 1.2, where the order is defined as $xH \leq yH$ if and only if $x^{-1}y \in B$

If $H \not\trianglelefteq G$, we construct new subsemigroups A' and B' whose union is G that will be used to construct a left-order. Fix a $g \in G$ such that $H^g \neq H$. Define $H_A = H \cap A^{g^{-1}}$ and $H_B = H \cap B^{g^{-1}}$. Since $H^g \neq H$ and H is the maximal subgroup of B , H_A contains a non-identity element. Also, H_A is a semigroup since it is the intersection of two semigroups. Similarly, H_B is a semigroup. Note that $H = H_A \cup H_B$ and $H_A \cap H_B = \{1\}$.

Define $A' = A \cup H_A$ and $B' = (B - H_A) \cup \{1\}$.

Lemma 2.7. *A' and B' are semigroups.*

Proof. Since A and H_A are semigroups, Lemma 2.3 implies that A' is a semigroup.

Let $b_1, b_2 \in B'$. Firstly, note that if $b_1, b_2 \notin B - H$, then $b_1, b_2 \in H_B$ which means $b_1 b_2 \in H_B$. Therefore $b_1 b_2 \in B'$.

Now suppose for contradiction that $b_1 b_2 = h \in H_A$, implying that either b_1 or b_2 must be contained in $B - H$. If $b_1 \in B - H$, then $b_1^{-1} \in A - \{1\}$. This implies $b_2 = b_1^{-1} h \in A - \{1\}$ by Lemma 2.3, which is a contradiction. We get a similar contradiction if $b_2 \in B - H$. We can conclude that $b_1 b_2 \in B'$ and B' is a semigroup. \square

We have constructed a new pair of semigroups A' and B' such that $G = A' \cup B'$ and $A' \cap B' = \{1\}$. It is also important to note that that $A \subsetneq A'$ and $B' \subsetneq B$. To further the comparison between A and A' and B and B' , the following lemma parallels Lemma 2.4.

Lemma 2.8. *If $a \in A'$, then $a^{-1} \in B'$.*

Proof. If $a \in A - \{1\}$, then $a^{-1} \in B - H \subseteq B'$.

Now let $a \in H_A$ with $a \neq 1$. Then $a^{-1} \in H$ since H is a group. Suppose for contradiction that $a^{-1} \in H_A$. Then $a^{-1} \in A^{g^{-1}}$, meaning $(a^{-1})^g \in A$ and therefore $(a^g)^{-1} \in A$. However, by definition $a \in H_A$ implies $a^g \in A$. Having both $a^g, (a^g)^{-1} \in A$ contradicts Lemma 2.4 so $a^{-1} \notin H_A$. \square

Like A , the semigroup A' does not contain a nontrivial subgroup.

We now consider the space \mathcal{F} of pairs of proper subsemigroups of G , (U, V) , such that

1. $G = U \cup V$ and $U \cap V = \{1\}$;
2. $A \subseteq U$ and $V \subseteq B$;
3. U does not contain a nontrivial subgroup.

Define a partial order on this space as $(U_1, V_1) \leq (U_2, V_2)$ if and only if $V_1 \subseteq V_2$. Note that $V_1 \subseteq V_2$ if and only if $U_2 \subseteq U_1$.

Lemma 2.9. *\mathcal{F} has a minimal element*

Proof. Let $\{(U_i, V_i)\}_i$ be a chain in \mathcal{F} . We claim that $(\bigcup U_i, \bigcap V_i) \in \mathcal{F}$. Clearly $\bigcap V_i$ is a proper subsemigroup of G , as the intersection of semigroups is a semigroup. Let $x, y \in \bigcup U_i$. There then exists an n such that $x, y \in U_n$ and therefore $xy \in U_n$. We see that $\bigcup U_i$ is also a semigroup. (We show it is proper later.)

For condition 1, clearly $(\bigcup U_i) \cup (\bigcap V_i) \subseteq G$. For the reverse containment, let $g \in G$. If there exists an n such that $g \in U_n$, then $g \in \bigcup U_i$. If there is no n such that $g \in U_n$, then $g \in V_i$ for all i . Therefore $g \in (\bigcap V_i)$. In either case, $g \in (\bigcup U_i) \cup (\bigcap V_i)$. Lastly, if $h \in (\bigcap V_i)$, then $h \notin U_i$ for each i unless $h = 1$, implying $(\bigcup U_i) \cap (\bigcap V_i) = \{1\}$.

Condition 2 is straightforward using the fact that $A \subseteq U_i$ and $V_i \subseteq B$ for all i .

Lastly, suppose $\bigcup U_i$ contains a nontrivial subgroup. This would imply that there exists a $g \in \bigcup U_i$ such that $g^{-1} \in \bigcup U_i$. Therefore there exists an n such that $g, g^{-1} \in U_n$, contradicting the fact that U_n has no nontrivial subgroups. This also implies $\bigcup U_i$ is proper in G .

By Zorn's Lemma, \mathcal{F} has a minimal element. □

This minimal element will give us a partial order on G .

Lemma 2.10. *Let (U, V) be a minimal element of \mathcal{F} . Then the subgroup $N = \{h \in V \mid h^{-1} \in V\}$ is normal in G .*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $N \not\trianglelefteq G$. Then there exists an element $g \in G$ such that $N^g \neq N$. Using g , define U' and V' analogously to A' and B' before Lemma 2.7. Then $(U', V') \in \mathcal{F}$ and $(U', V') \preceq (U, V)$, which is a contradiction. □

Since $N \trianglelefteq G$, we see that G/N is left-orderable, where the order is defined as $xN \leq yN$ if and only if $x^{-1}y \in B/N$.

We now give a proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let G be a group with proper subsemigroups A and B such that $G = A \cup B$. We may assume without loss of generality that $A \cap B = \{1\}$ and $A^{-1} \subseteq B$, using Lemmas 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5. Let H be the maximal subgroup of B with respect to inclusion. If $H \trianglelefteq G$, then G/H is left-orderable where $xH \leq yH$ if and only if $x^{-1}y \in B$. If $H \not\trianglelefteq G$, let \mathcal{F} be the partially ordered family of pair of subsemigroups defined above. Further let (U, V) be the minimal pair of subsemigroups with N being the maximal subgroup of V . Since $N \trianglelefteq G$ by Lemma 2.10, we see that G/N is left-orderable, where the order is defined as $xN \leq yN$ if and only if $x^{-1}y \in V$. □

We can also state a corollary of Proposition 2.6.

Corollary 2.11. *A group generated by elements of finite order has no nontrivial left-orderable quotients.*

3 Minimal Normal Subgroups and Coverings

In this section, we include some brief remarks on minimal normal subgroups inducing left-orderable quotients and coverings of groups by two proper subgroups.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $N_1, N_2 \trianglelefteq G$ such that G/N_1 and G/N_2 are left-orderable. Then $G/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ is left-orderable. Furthermore, both $N_1/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ and $N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ are also left-orderable.*

Proof. Let \leq_1 be the order on G/N_1 and \leq_2 be the order on G/N_2 . Define a partial order \leq on $G/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ as $a(N_1 \cap N_2) \leq b(N_1 \cap N_2)$ if and only if $aN_1 < bN_1$ or $aN_1 = bN_1$ and $aN_2 \leq bN_2$. It is clear that this is a left order on $G/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ as both \leq_1 and \leq_2 are left orders.

Every subgroup of a left-orderable group is left-orderable, simply by restricting the order to the subgroup. Therefore $N_1/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ and $N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ are also left-orderable as they are subgroups of $G/(N_1 \cap N_2)$. \square

Proposition 3.1 indicates the presence of a minimal normal subgroup inducing a left-orderable quotient, which is simply the intersection of all normal subgroups inducing left-orderable quotients. Also, given two covering of G by two proper subsemigroups, we may construct a ‘new’ covering from the order given in Proposition 3.1.

Let $G = A_1 \cup B_1 = A_2 \cup B_2$ where A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 are proper subsemigroups of G with the usual assumptions that $A_1 \cap B_1 = \{1\}$ and $A_2 \cap B_2 = \{1\}$, A_1 and A_2 contain no nontrivial subgroups, and the maximal subgroups of B_1 and B_2 are normal in G . (Essentially, we pass to a minimal element of the partially ordered pairs given by Lemma 2.10.) Let N_1 and N_2 be the maximal subgroups of B_1 and B_2 respectively, with the left orders on the quotients being $x \leq_i y$ if and only if $x^{-1}y \in B_i/N_i$.

Define $B' = \{g \in G \mid N_1 \cap N_2 \leq g(N_1 \cap N_2)\}$ where \leq is the partial order given in the proof of Proposition 3.1. Notice that B' is the preimage of the non-negative elements of $G/(N_1 \cap N_2)$. We see that B' is the union of the preimage of strictly positive elements with respect to \leq_1 (i.e. $B_1 - N_1$) and the elements of N_1 that are preimages of non-negative elements with respect to \leq_2 (i.e. $N_1 \cap B_2$). This implies $B' = (B_1 - N_1) \cup (N_1 \cap B_2)$ and therefore $B' \subseteq B_1$.

We may also define $A' = \{g \in G \mid g(N_1 \cap N_2) < N_1 \cap N_2\} \cup \{1\}$ and we see that A' and B' are proper subsemigroups of G such that $G = A' \cup B'$, $A' \cap B' = \{1\}$, A' contains no nontrivial subgroups, and the maximal subgroup of B' , $N_1 \cap N_2$, is normal in G . Furthermore, $A_1 \subseteq A'$ and $B' \subseteq B_1$.

4 Open Questions

Recall the covering number of a group G with respect to semigroups, $\sigma_s(G)$, is the minimum number of proper subsemigroups of G whose union is G . Theorem 1.3 can then be restated as $\sigma_s(G) = 2$ if and only if G has a nontrivial left-orderable quotient.

A simple argument shows that subsemigroups of torsion groups are in fact subgroups, since the inverse of an element g with finite order is a positive power of g . Therefore, for a torsion group G , $\sigma_s(G) = \sigma_g(G)$. Presently, the author knows of no examples of groups for which the covering number with respect to semigroups is not two nor the covering number with respect to groups.

Question 1 Is it true that for every group G , either $\sigma_s(G) = 2$ or $\sigma_s(G) = \sigma_g(G)$?

For instance, one could look for a group G such that $\sigma_s(G)$ is 7 or 11, as 7 and 11 are not equal to $\sigma_g(G)$ for any G [5].

On the other hand, given that n is a covering number of a group G with respect to subsemigroups, we may attempt to give a characterization of groups with covering number n (as we have for two).

Question 2 For valid $n > 2$, characterize the groups G such that $\sigma_s(G) = n$.

Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely thank Marcin Mazur and Matt Brin for their insight and help with these results.

References

- [1] J. H. E. Cohn, *On n -sum groups*, *Mathematica Scandinavica* **75** (1994), no. 1, 44–58.
- [2] B. Deroin, A. Navas, and C. Rivas, *Groups, orders, and dynamics*, arxiv1408.5805.
- [3] Casey Donovan and Luise-Charlotte Kappe, *Finite coverings of semigroups and related structures*, Submitted arxiv2002.04072.
- [4] Stephen M. Gagola III and Luise-Charlotte Kappe, *On the covering number of loops*, *Expositiones Mathematicae* **34** (2016), no. 4, 436 – 447.
- [5] Martino Garonzi, Luise-Charlotte Kappe, and Eric Swartz, *On integers that are covering numbers of groups*, *Experimental Mathematics* **0** (2019), no. 0, 1–19.
- [6] Andrea Lucchini and Attila Maróti, *Rings as the unions of proper subrings*, *Algebras and Representation Theory* **15** (2012), no. 6, 1035–1047.
- [7] G. Scorza, *I gruppi che possono pensarsi come somma di tre loro sottogruppi*, *Bollettino dell’Unione Matematica Italiana* **5** (1926), 216–218.
- [8] M. J. Tomkinson, *Groups as the union of proper subgroups.*, *Mathematica Scandinavica* **81** (1997), 191–198.
- [9] Nicholas J. Werner, *Covering numbers of finite rings*, *The American Mathematical Monthly* **122** (2015), no. 6, 552–566.