

COMMUTATORS IN REES MATRIX SEMIGROUPS

JELENA RADOVIĆ AND NEBOJŠA MUDRINSKI

Jelena Radović¹
Department of Mathematics
University of East Sarajevo
71123 East Sarajevo
Bosnia and Herzegovina
ORCID: 0000-0002-1023-4463
jelena.radovic@ff.ues.rs.ba

Nebojša Mudrinski²
Department of Mathematics and Informatics
Faculty of Sciences
University of Novi Sad
21000 Novi Sad
Serbia
ORCID: 0000-0001-9830-6603
nmudrinski@dmi.uns.ac.rs

ABSTRACT. We study the centralizing condition and commutators on Rees matrix semigroups. We obtain a complete characterization of the binary commutator on Rees matrix semigroups, and use it to study other properties of the commutator. Consequently, we deduce that a Rees matrix semigroup is nilpotent (solvable) if and only if its maximal subgroup is nilpotent (solvable).

Keywords and phrases. completely simple semigroups, commutators, nilpotency, solvability

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathbf{S} = (S, \cdot)$ denote a semigroup, that is, an algebra with a associative binary operation \cdot on a nonempty set S . We say that an algebra \mathbf{A} satisfies the term condition, in abbreviation \mathbf{A} is a TC algebra, if for every $(n + 1)$ -ary term $t = t(x, \mathbf{y})$, and for every $a, b \in A$, $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in A^n$ we have $t(a, \mathbf{c}) = t(a, \mathbf{d}) \implies t(b, \mathbf{c}) =$

Date: August 11, 2022.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 08A30, 20M17.

¹Corresponding author

²Supported by the Ministry of Science, Education and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (Grant No. 451-03-68/2022- 14/200125)

$t(b, \mathbf{d})$. The term condition for algebras has been introduced by R. McKenzie in [6]. TC algebras have also been called abelian algebras, since the TC condition can be translated to the centralizing condition $C(1_A, 1_A; 0_A)$, that is, the equality $[1_A, 1_A] = 0_A$, where 1_A denotes the full relation and 0_A denotes the equality relation on the set A . R. McKenzie [7] has described TC semigroups of finite exponent, where we say that a semigroup \mathbf{S} has exponent n if it satisfies the identity $x^n \approx x^{2n}$. W. Taylor [9] has also studied TC condition for semigroups. R.J. Warne has obtained a complete characterization of TC semigroups, and more specifically, regular TC semigroups, in [10] and [11]. Among other results, it has been proved [10, Corollary 2.6] that a regular semigroup \mathbf{S} satisfies the term condition if and only if $\mathbf{S} \simeq H \times A \times B$, where H is an abelian group, A is a left zero semigroup and B is a right zero semigroup.

In this paper we will study a generalization of the term condition, the centralizing condition, and commutators in a special class of regular semigroups – completely simple semigroups. A semigroup \mathbf{S} is *completely simple* if it has no proper ideals, and it contains a primitive idempotent. A *primitive idempotent* is the element e that uniquely satisfies the equations $ex = xe = x$ on x . Let us recall that a nonempty set $I \subseteq S$ is an *ideal* in a semigroup \mathbf{S} if $SI \subseteq I$ and $IS \subseteq I$, and the ideal I is *proper* if $I \neq S$. Completely simple semigroups are described with Rees matrix semigroups, more precisely, any completely simple semigroup \mathbf{S} is isomorphic to a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$, see Proposition 2.1. Any semigroup is built of its principal factors, which are either null or a 0-simple semigroup. In a finite semigroup, all non-null principal factors are completely 0-simple. Therefore, by studying Rees matrix semigroups we can obtain information about building blocks of any semigroup. The following theorems are the main results of the paper, and they are proved in Sections 5 and 6.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Let ρ, σ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . Then $[\rho, \sigma]$ corresponds to the linked triple $(0_I, [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \vee \Theta_{\rho, \sigma}, 0_\Lambda)$.*

Here $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$ denotes the congruence determined by the matrix P and components of ρ and σ on the index sets I and Λ , see Definition 5.6. As a corollary, we deduce that the binary commutator on Rees matrix semigroups behaves as in congruence modular algebras: every congruence above it, centralizes the congruences in the commutator (Proposition 6.1), the commutator is symmetric (Proposition 6.2) and agrees with the join of congruences (Proposition 6.3). We also prove the equivalence between the nilpotency (solvability) of a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ and the group G .

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$, then:*

- (a) *semigroup \mathbf{S} is nilpotent if and only if \mathbf{G} is a nilpotent group;*
- (b) *semigroup \mathbf{S} is solvable if and only if \mathbf{G} is a solvable group.*

2. PRELIMINARIES FROM SEMIGROUP THEORY

We will denote the set of all term functions over a semigroup \mathbf{S} by $\text{Term}(\mathbf{S})$, while the set of all polynomials over \mathbf{S} will be denoted by $\text{Pol}(\mathbf{S})$. Furthermore, by $\text{Term}_k(\mathbf{S})$ we will denote the set of all term functions of arity k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly, we will use the notation $\text{Pol}_k(\mathbf{S})$ for the set of all polynomials over \mathbf{S} of arity k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall also that a term $t = t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of semigroup type is a word over the alphabet $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, while a polynomial term $p = p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of semigroup type is a word over the alphabet $\{x_1, \dots, x_n, c_1, \dots, c_m\}$, for some constants c_1, \dots, c_m .

A relation ρ on a semigroup \mathbf{S} is *left compatible* if for every $s, t, a \in S$ we have $s \rho t \implies as \rho at$. Similarly, a relation $\rho \subseteq S \times S$ is *right compatible* if for every $s, t, a \in S$ we have $s \rho t \implies sa \rho ta$. We say that a relation ρ is *compatible* if for every $s, s', t, t' \in S$ we have $s \rho t, s' \rho t' \implies ss' \rho tt'$. If ρ is an equivalence relation, and ρ is left (right) compatible, then ρ is a *left (right) congruence*. A compatible equivalence relation is called a *congruence*. A relation ρ on a semigroup \mathbf{S} is a congruence if and only if it is both a left and a right congruence. By $\text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$ we denote the lattice of all congruences on the semigroup \mathbf{S} .

We say that elements $a, b \in S$ are \mathcal{L} (\mathcal{R}) related if there exist $x, y \in S^1$, such that $xa = b, yb = a$ ($ax = b, by = a$). Elements a, b are \mathcal{J} related if there exist $x, y, u, v \in S^1$ such that $xay = b$ and $ubv = a$. We also consider the relations $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{L} \vee \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{R}$, which together with \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{J} , are called the *Green's equivalences* on semigroup \mathbf{S} ([4], page 45). It should be noted that Green's equivalences are not necessarily congruences on \mathbf{S} . More precisely, \mathcal{L} is always a right congruence, while \mathcal{R} is always a left congruence. Recall also that \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{L} commute, that is $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{R} \vee \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{R}$ [4, Proposition 2.1.3]. Green's equivalences are the basis for researching the properties of any class of semigroups. Completely simple semigroups have been extensively studied, and their Green's equivalences structure is well known. If \mathbf{S} is a completely simple semigroup, then it's only \mathcal{J} -class is S itself, and also $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{J} = 1_S$. Green's equivalences \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} on a completely simple semigroup \mathbf{S} are congruences ([3], Exercise 2.7.9). Consequently, their intersection \mathcal{H} is also a congruence. Structure of completely simple semigroups is entirely characterized by Rees-Suschkewitsch's theorem. Here we present the *normalized* version of this theorem.

Proposition 2.1. ([4] Theorem 3.3.1, Theorem 3.4.2) *Let G be a group, let I, Λ be non-empty sets, and let $P = [p_{\lambda i}]$ be a $\Lambda \times I$ matrix with entries in G . Let $S = I \times G \times \Lambda$, and define multiplication on S by*

$$(i, g, \lambda) \cdot (j, h, \mu) = (i, gp_{\lambda j}h, \mu).$$

Then (S, \cdot) is a completely simple semigroup. Conversely, every completely simple semigroup is isomorphic to a semigroup constructed in this way. Moreover, every

completely simple semigroup is isomorphic to a semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ in which the structure matrix P is normal, that is $p_{\lambda i} = e = p_{\lambda 1}$ for every $i \in I$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, where e is the identity element of group \mathbf{G} .

The semigroup $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ defined by Proposition 2.1 is called the *Rees matrix semigroup*.

Note that representation of a completely simple semigroup as a Rees matrix semigroup is not unique. However, the second part of the Proposition 2.1 allows us to assume, without loss of generality, that every completely simple semigroup \mathbf{S} with which we will be working is presented with a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ that has a normal structure matrix P . Without loss of generality, we will also assume that both index sets I and Λ contain the element 1. The neutral element of the group \mathbf{G} will be denoted by e . Recall that sets I and Λ are in one-to-one correspondence with the sets of \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{L} -classes in \mathbf{S} , respectively. Also each \mathcal{H} -class $H_{i\lambda}$, $i \in I$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, is the maximal subgroup of the semigroup \mathbf{S} , and it is isomorphic to the group \mathbf{G} .

Definition 2.2. Let ρ be a congruence on a completely simple semigroup $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. We define equivalence relations ρ_I and ρ_Λ on sets I and Λ , respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_I &= \{(i, j) \in I^2 : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda)(i, p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, \lambda) \rho (j, p_{\lambda j}^{-1}, \lambda)\}, \\ \rho_\Lambda &= \{(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda^2 : (\forall i \in I)(i, p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, \lambda) \rho (i, p_{\mu i}^{-1}, \mu)\}.\end{aligned}$$

A congruence ρ on a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ is uniquely determined by its associated *linked triple* $(\rho_I, N_\rho, \rho_\Lambda)$ [4, Theorem 4.23]. Here N_ρ denotes the normal subgroup of \mathbf{G} defined with $N_\rho = \{g \in G : (1, g, 1) \rho (1, e, 1)\}$. Equivalences ρ_I , ρ_Λ and normal subgroup N_ρ satisfy the following condition: if $i \rho_I j$ or $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$, then $q_{\lambda\mu ij} := p_{\lambda i} p_{\mu i}^{-1} p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1} \in N_\rho$, which is the defining property of a linked triple.

Since we have a one-to-one correspondence between normal subgroups of group \mathbf{G} and its congruences, we will use a modified definition of linked triples. The normal subgroup N_ρ determines a congruence ρ_G on group \mathbf{G} by $a \rho_G b \iff ab^{-1} \in N_\rho$. The condition $ab^{-1} \in N_\rho$ is equivalent with $(1, ab^{-1}, 1) \rho (1, e, 1)$. This is further equivalent with $(1, a, 1) = (1, ab^{-1}, 1) \cdot (1, b, 1) \rho (1, e, 1) \cdot (1, b, 1) = (1, b, 1)$. Therefore, instead of with the linked triple $(\mathcal{S}, N, \mathcal{T})$ we will work with the ordered triple $(\mathcal{S}, \gamma, \mathcal{T})$ where γ is a congruence on the group \mathbf{G} , \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are equivalence relations on I and Λ , respectively, such that $q_{\lambda\mu ij} \gamma e$, whenever $i \mathcal{S} j$ or $\lambda \mathcal{T} \mu$. Such a triple will also be called a *linked triple*. Recall that $q_{\lambda\mu ij} = p_{\lambda i} p_{\mu i}^{-1} p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$, therefore, the condition $q_{\lambda\mu ij} \gamma e$ can also be written as $p_{\lambda i} p_{\mu i}^{-1} \gamma p_{\lambda j} p_{\mu j}^{-1}$.

Proposition 2.3. Let $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ be a completely simple semigroup. The mapping $\Psi : \alpha \mapsto (\alpha_I, \alpha_G, \alpha_\Lambda)$ is an order-preserving bijection from the set of all

congruences on \mathbf{S} onto the set of all linked triples. The inverse map is defined in the following way: a linked triple $(\mathcal{S}, \gamma, \mathcal{T})$ determines the congruence $\rho \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$ such that $(i, g, \lambda) \rho (j, h, \mu)$ if and only if

- (1) $i \mathcal{S} j$ and $\lambda \mathcal{T} \mu$,
- (2) $p_{\xi i} g p_{\lambda x} p_{\mu x}^{-1} h^{-1} p_{\xi j}^{-1} \gamma e$ for some $x \in I$ and some $\xi \in \Lambda$.

Proof. From [4, Theorem 4.23] we know that the map $\Phi : \alpha \mapsto (\alpha_I, N_\alpha, \alpha_\Lambda)$ is an order preserving bijection from the set of all congruences on \mathbf{S} onto the set of all linked triples. On the other hand, we know that there is an isomorphism Θ from the lattice of normal subgroups of \mathbf{G} onto $\text{Con}(\mathbf{G})$. Therefore, the mapping $\tilde{\Theta} : (\alpha_I, N_\alpha, \alpha_\Lambda) \mapsto (\alpha_I, \alpha_G, \alpha_\Lambda)$ is also an order preserving bijection. Hence, the mapping $\Psi = \Phi \circ \tilde{\Theta} : \alpha \mapsto (\alpha_I, \alpha_G, \alpha_\Lambda)$ is a lattice isomorphism. \square

Proposition 2.3 establishes an isomorphism between the lattice of all congruence on a completely simple semigroup $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$, and the lattice of all linked triples on $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Therefore, we can identify the congruence $\rho \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$ and its linked triple $(\rho_I, \rho_G, \rho_\Lambda)$. Also note that the congruence \mathcal{H} is uniquely determined with the linked triple $(0_I, 1_G, 0_\Lambda)$, while congruences \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} are determined by linked triples $(1_I, 1_G, 0_\Lambda)$ and $(0_I, 1_G, 1_\Lambda)$, respectively.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ be a completely simple semigroup. Let ρ be a congruence on \mathbf{S} , and $i, j \in I$, $g, h \in G$, $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. Then $(i, g, \lambda) \rho (j, h, \mu)$ if and only if $i \rho_I j$, $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$ and $g \rho_G h$.*

Proof. Assume that $(i, g, \lambda) \rho (j, h, \mu)$. Then [4, Lemma 3.5.3, 3.5.4] implies $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$. If we multiply the relation $(i, g, \lambda) \rho (j, h, \mu)$ with $(1, e, 1)$ on the left and on the right, we obtain $(1, p_{1i} g p_{\lambda 1}, 1) \rho (1, p_{1j} h p_{\mu 1}, 1)$. By definition of the congruence ρ_G , it follows that $p_{1i} g p_{\lambda 1} \rho_G p_{1j} h p_{\mu 1}$. However, since the matrix P is normal, that is $p_{1k} = e = p_{\xi 1}$ for every $k \in I$, $\xi \in \Lambda$, it follows that $g \rho_G h$.

Now assume that $i \rho_I j$, $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$ and $g \rho_G h$. From Definition 2.2, and the normality of matrix P , it follows that $(i, e, 1) \rho (j, e, 1)$ and $(1, e, \lambda) \rho (1, e, \mu)$, respectively. On the other hand, $g \rho_G h$ implies $(1, g, 1) \rho (1, h, 1)$. Using the compatibility of the congruence ρ and the equality $p_{11} = e$, we obtain

$$(i, g, \lambda) = (i, e, 1)(1, g, 1)(1, e, \lambda) \rho (j, e, 1)(1, h, 1)(1, e, \mu) = (j, h, \mu).$$

\square

3. CENTRALIZING CONDITION

In this section we study the centralizing condition for congruences on semigroups. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \neq \emptyset$ we denote an arbitrary element of A^n by \mathbf{x} and its coordinates by x_1, \dots, x_n , therefore $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. If \mathbf{A} is an algebra and

θ a congruence of \mathbf{A} we write $\mathbf{a} \theta \mathbf{b}$ for $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in A^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if $a_i \theta b_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Definition 3.1. ([8], Definition 4.148) Let \mathbf{A} be an algebra, and α, β, δ congruences on \mathbf{A} . We say that α *centralizes* β *modulo* δ , in abbreviation $C(\alpha, \beta; \delta)$, if for all $t \in \text{Term}_{n+1}(\mathbf{A})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $a, b \in A$, $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in A^n$ such that $a \alpha b$, $\mathbf{c} \beta \mathbf{d}$, the following implication is true:

$$(3.1) \quad t(a, \mathbf{c}) \delta t(a, \mathbf{d}) \implies t(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta t(b, \mathbf{d}).$$

Note that the above definition will not be restricted if we demand an equivalence in (3.1), due to the symmetry of congruence α .

Definition 3.2. ([8], Definition 4.150) Let \mathbf{A} be an algebra. *The commutator* $[\alpha, \beta]$ of congruences $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{A})$ is the least congruence δ such that α centralizes β modulo δ .

Proposition 3.3. ([5], Proposition 3.4) *Let \mathbf{A} be an algebra and $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{A})$. Then we have*

- (i) $[\alpha, \beta] \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$;
- (ii) if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha$ and $\beta_1 \leq \beta$, then $[\alpha_1, \beta_1] \leq [\alpha, \beta]$.

Proposition 3.4. (cf. [5], Proposition 4.2) *Let \mathbf{A} be an algebra from a congruence modular variety and let $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{A})$. Then $C(\alpha, \beta; \delta)$ if and only if $[\alpha, \beta] \leq \delta$.*

If we replace term function t with a polynomial of the same arity in the Definition 3.2, we obtain the same centralizing condition, as stated in [8, Excercises 4.156.2] and proved in [1].

Lemma 3.5. *Let \mathbf{A} be an algebra, and let $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{A})$. Then $C(\alpha, \beta; \delta)$ if and only if for every polynomial $p \in \text{Pol}_{n+1}(\mathbf{A})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $a, b \in A$, $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in A^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a \alpha b$ and $\mathbf{c} \beta \mathbf{d}$, the following implication is true:*

$$(3.2) \quad p(a, \mathbf{c}) \delta p(a, \mathbf{d}) \implies p(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta p(b, \mathbf{d}).$$

Motivated by conditions (TC1), (TC2) and (TC3) that are equivalent to the term condition for semigroups (see [10]), we introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.6. Congruences α, β, δ on a semigroup S satisfy

- (C1) if $ac \delta ad \implies bc \delta bd$;
- (C2) if $ca \delta da \implies cb \delta db$;
- (C3) if $c_1ac_2 \delta d_1ad_2 \implies c_1bc_2 \delta d_1bd_2$;

for all $a, b, c, d, c_1, d_1, c_2, d_2 \in S$ such that $a \alpha b$, $c \beta d$, $c_1 \beta d_1$, $c_2 \beta d_2$.

Proposition 3.7. *Let \mathbf{S} be a semigroup, and let $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$. Then we have $C(\alpha, \beta; \delta)$ if and only if α, β and δ satisfy (C1), (C2) and (C3).*

Proof. (\rightarrow) Assume that we have $C(\alpha, \beta; \delta)$. We obtain (C1), (C2) and (C3) using Definition 3.1 for terms $t_1(x, y) = xy$, $t_2(x, y) = yx$ and $t_3(x, y, z) = yxz$, respectively. (\leftarrow) Now assume that the conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3) are satisfied in the semigroup \mathbf{S} . We proceed using Lemma 3.5. Let $p \in \text{Pol}_{n+1}(\mathbf{S})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $a, b \in S$ and $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d} \in S^n$ be such that $a \alpha b$ and $\mathbf{c} \beta \mathbf{d}$. We note that for any polynomial $f \in \text{Pol}_{n+1}(\mathbf{S})$ and $g \in \text{Pol}_n(\mathbf{S})$, we have $f(b, \mathbf{c}) \beta f(b, \mathbf{d})$ and $g(\mathbf{c}) \beta g(\mathbf{d})$. Assume that $p(a, \mathbf{c}) \delta p(a, \mathbf{d})$. We will prove that $p(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta p(b, \mathbf{d})$ by induction on the number k , $k \geq 0$ of appearances of x in the corresponding word of polynomial $p(x, \mathbf{y})$. First, let $k = 0$, then $p(x, \mathbf{y}) = q(\mathbf{y})$ where $q \in \text{Pol}_n(\mathbf{S})$. Therefore, we have $q(\mathbf{c}) \delta q(\mathbf{d})$, which trivially implies $p(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta p(b, \mathbf{d})$. Now assume that the statement is true for every polynomial $p \in \text{Pol}_{n+1}(\mathbf{S})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with less than k occurrences of x in the corresponding polynomial word, $k \geq 1$ and let $p(x, \mathbf{y})$ be a polynomial over \mathbf{S} , with exactly k occurrences of x in the corresponding word of $p(x, \mathbf{y})$. Let us observe the first occurrence of x in the corresponding word of $p(x, \mathbf{y})$. We have the following three possibilities:

(i) $p(x, \mathbf{y}) = x \cdot q(x, \mathbf{y})$, where q has exactly $k - 1$ occurrences of x in the corresponding word of $q(x, \mathbf{y})$. Define the polynomial $r(x, \mathbf{y}) = a \cdot q(x, \mathbf{y})$. Then we have $r(a, \mathbf{c}) = a \cdot q(a, \mathbf{c}) = p(a, \mathbf{c}) \delta p(a, \mathbf{d}) = a \cdot q(a, \mathbf{d}) = r(a, \mathbf{d})$. Since $r(x, \mathbf{y})$ has $k - 1$ occurrences of x in the corresponding word, we obtain $a \cdot q(b, \mathbf{c}) = r(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta r(b, \mathbf{d}) = a \cdot q(b, \mathbf{d})$ by the inductive hypothesis. Hence we have $p(b, \mathbf{c}) = b \cdot q(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta b \cdot q(b, \mathbf{d}) = p(b, \mathbf{d})$ using $q(b, \mathbf{c}) \beta q(b, \mathbf{d})$ and the condition (C1).

(ii) $p(x, \mathbf{y}) = q(\mathbf{y}) \cdot x$. Let us note that in this case q has exactly 0 occurrences of x and our assumption simplifies to $q(\mathbf{c}) \cdot a \delta q(\mathbf{d}) \cdot a$. Therefore, we have $p(b, \mathbf{c}) = q(\mathbf{c}) \cdot b \delta q(\mathbf{d}) \cdot b = p(b, \mathbf{d})$ using $q(\mathbf{c}) \beta q(\mathbf{d})$ and the condition (C2).

(iii) $p(x, \mathbf{y}) = q_1(\mathbf{y}) \cdot x \cdot q_2(x, \mathbf{y})$, where x does not occur in the corresponding word of q_1 and q_2 has $k - 1$ occurrences of x in its corresponding word. Define the polynomial $s(x, \mathbf{y}) = q_1(\mathbf{y}) \cdot a \cdot q_2(x, \mathbf{y})$. Then we have

$$s(a, \mathbf{c}) = q_1(\mathbf{c}) \cdot a \cdot q_2(a, \mathbf{c}) = p(a, \mathbf{c}) \delta p(a, \mathbf{c}) = q_1(\mathbf{d}) \cdot a \cdot q_2(a, \mathbf{d}) = s(a, \mathbf{d}).$$

Since s has $k - 1$ occurrences of x in the corresponding word, we obtain $q_1(\mathbf{c}) \cdot a \cdot q_2(b, \mathbf{c}) = s(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta s(b, \mathbf{d}) = q_1(\mathbf{d}) \cdot a \cdot q_2(b, \mathbf{d})$ by the inductive hypothesis. Hence we have $p(b, \mathbf{c}) = q_1(\mathbf{c}) \cdot b \cdot q_2(b, \mathbf{c}) \delta q_1(\mathbf{d}) \cdot b \cdot q_2(b, \mathbf{d}) = p(b, \mathbf{d})$ using $q_1(\mathbf{c}) \beta q_1(\mathbf{d})$, $q_2(b, \mathbf{c}) \beta q_2(b, \mathbf{d})$ and the condition (C3). \square

In the next proposition we obtain that similar equivalent conditions for $C(\alpha, \beta; \delta)$ are true for congruences on groups. It follows directly from [2, Proposition 5.4].

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\mathbf{G} = (G, \cdot, ^{-1}, e)$ be a group, and let $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{G})$. Then $C(\alpha, \beta; \delta)$ if and only if α, β and δ satisfy (C3).*

4. CENTRALIZING CONDITION ON REES MATRIX SEMIGROUPS

Similarly as in the case when a semigroup \mathbf{S} is a group, the condition $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$ can be simplified for all congruences ρ, σ, θ on a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $S = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ and let ρ, σ, θ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . Then the condition $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$ is true if and only if ρ, σ and θ satisfy (C3).*

Proof. If we assume $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$, then (C3) is true by Proposition 3.7. Now assume that ρ, σ, θ are congruences on \mathbf{S} such that (C3) is true. According to Proposition 3.7, it suffices to show that the conditions (C1) and (C2) are also satisfied. To prove (C1) we let $a, b, c, d \in S$ be such that $a \rho b$ and $c \sigma d$, where $a = (i_1, f_1, \lambda_1)$, $b = (i_2, f_2, \lambda_2)$ and $c = (j, g, \mu)$, $d = (k, h, \nu)$. Assume that $ac \theta ad$, then we have $\bar{e}ac \theta \bar{e}ad$, where $\bar{e} = (1, e, 1)$. By (C3) we obtain $\bar{e}bc \theta \bar{e}bd$, because $\bar{e} \sigma \bar{e}$. Hence, we have $(1, p_{1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2j}g, \mu) \theta (1, p_{1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2k}h, \nu)$, that is $(1, f_2p_{\lambda_2j}g, \mu) \theta (1, f_2p_{\lambda_2k}h, \nu)$ since $p_{1i_2} = e$. If we multiply both sides of the last relation on the left with $(i_2, e, 1)$ and use the equality $p_{11} = e$ we obtain $bc = (i_2, f_2p_{\lambda_2j}g, \mu) \theta (i_2, f_2p_{\lambda_2k}h, \nu) = bd$. Hence, the condition (C1) is satisfied. Analogously, we can prove (C2). Therefore, the condition $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$ is true. \square

Hence, it is not necessary to check conditions (C1) and (C2) in order to check whether $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$ is true for some congruences ρ, σ, θ on a Rees matrix semigroup. However, we should not disregard them, since their alternative formulations will be used for the description of the commutator.

Proposition 4.2. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$, and let ρ, σ, θ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . Then ρ, σ and θ satisfy (C1) if and only if*

(RC1) *for every $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, $i, j \in I$ such that $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$ and $i \sigma_I j$, we have $p_{\mu i}p_{\lambda i}^{-1} \theta_G p_{\mu j}p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$.*

Proof. (C1) \rightarrow (RC1) Assume that the condition (C1) is satisfied for congruences ρ, σ, θ . Let $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, $i, j \in I$ be such that $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$ and $i \sigma_I j$. By the definition of ρ_Λ , it follows that $(i, p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, \lambda) \rho (i, p_{\mu i}^{-1}, \mu)$. Similarly, we obtain $(i, p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, \lambda) \sigma (j, p_{\lambda j}^{-1}, \lambda)$ by definition of σ_I . If we denote $(i, p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, \lambda)$ by a and $(i, p_{\mu i}^{-1}, \mu)$ by b then we have $a \rho b$. We take $c = a$ and $d := (j, p_{\lambda j}^{-1}, \lambda)$ and obtain $c \sigma d$. Now we have $ac = a^2 = a = ad$ and therefore $ac \theta ad$. Condition (C1) then gives us $bc \theta bd$, that is,

$$(i, p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, \lambda) = (i, p_{\mu i}^{-1}, \mu)(i, p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, \lambda) = bc \theta bd = (i, p_{\mu i}^{-1}, \mu)(j, p_{\lambda j}^{-1}, \lambda) = (i, p_{\mu i}^{-1}p_{\mu j}p_{\lambda j}^{-1}, \lambda).$$

From Lemma 2.4 it follows $p_{\lambda i}^{-1} \theta_G p_{\mu i}^{-1}p_{\mu j}p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$, which further implies $p_{\mu i}p_{\lambda i}^{-1} \theta_G p_{\mu j}p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$.

(RC1) \rightarrow (C1) Let $a, b, c, d \in S$ be such that $a \rho b$, $c \sigma d$, where $a = (i, f, \lambda)$, $b = (i', f', \lambda')$, $c = (j, g, \mu)$, $d = (k, h, \nu)$. Assume that $ac \theta ad$, that is,

$(i, fp_{\lambda_j}g, \mu) \theta (i, fp_{\lambda_k}h, \nu)$. By Lemma 2.4 it follows that $fp_{\lambda_j}g \theta_G fp_{\lambda_k}h$, that is, $p_{\lambda_j}g \theta_G p_{\lambda_k}h$. From $a \rho b$ and $c \sigma d$, again by Lemma 2.4, it follows that $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \lambda'$ and $j \sigma_I k$, respectively. Condition (RC1) then gives us $p_{\lambda'j}p_{\lambda_j}^{-1} \theta_G p_{\lambda'k}p_{\lambda_k}^{-1}$. Since θ_G is a group congruence, the two obtained relations imply

$$(4.1) \quad p_{\lambda'j}g = p_{\lambda'j}p_{\lambda_j}^{-1}p_{\lambda_j}g \theta_G p_{\lambda'k}p_{\lambda_k}^{-1}p_{\lambda_k}h = p_{\lambda'k}h.$$

If we multiply the relation (4.1) by f' on the left, we obtain $f'p_{\lambda'j}g \theta_G f'p_{\lambda'k}h$. By Lemma 2.4, from relation $ac \theta ad$ we have $i' \theta_I i'$ and $\mu \theta_\Lambda \nu$, which further on gives us $bc = (i', f'p_{\lambda'j}g, \mu) = (i', f'p_{\lambda'k}h, \nu) = bd$. Hence, we have proved that the condition (C1) follows from (RC1). \square

Analogously to the Proposition 4.2, we can prove the following proposition.

Proposition 4.3. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$, and let ρ, σ, θ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . Then ρ, σ and θ satisfy (C2) if and only if*

(RC2) *for every $i, j \in I$, $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ such that $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \sigma_\Lambda \mu$, we have $p_{\mu i}p_{\lambda i}^{-1} \theta_G p_{\mu j}p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$.*

Proposition 4.4. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Let $\rho, \sigma, \theta, \tau$ be congruences on \mathbf{S} such that $\theta_G = \tau_G$. Then $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$ if and only if $C(\rho, \sigma; \tau)$.*

Proof. Assume that $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$ is true. By Proposition 4.1, it suffices to prove the condition (C3) for congruences ρ, σ and τ . Let $a, b, c_s, d_s \in S$, $s = 1, 2$ be such that $a \rho b$ and $c_s \sigma d_s$, $s = 1, 2$. Here we denote $a = (i_1, f_1, \lambda_1)$, $b = (i_2, f_2, \lambda_2)$ and $c_s = (j_s, g_s, \mu_s)$, $d_s = (k_s, h_s, \nu_s)$, $s = 1, 2$. Assume that $c_1ac_2 \tau d_1ad_2$, that is, $(j_1, g_1p_{\mu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1j_2}g_2, \mu_2) \tau (k_1, h_1p_{\nu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1k_2}h_2, \nu_2)$. By Lemma 2.4, the last relation is equivalent with $j_1 \tau_I k_1$, $\mu_2 \tau_\Lambda \nu_2$ and $g_1p_{\mu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1j_2}g_2 \tau_G h_1p_{\nu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1k_2}h_2$. Since we have $\tau_G = \theta_G$, it follows that $g_1p_{\mu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1j_2}g_2 \theta_G h_1p_{\nu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1k_2}h_2$. By definition of θ_G , the last relation is equivalent with

$$(1, g_1p_{\mu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1j_2}g_2, 1) \theta (1, h_1p_{\nu_1i_1}f_1p_{\lambda_1k_2}h_2, 1).$$

Since P is a normal matrix, we have $p_{1j_1} = p_{1k_1} = e = p_{\mu_21} = p_{\nu_21}$. Therefore, we can write the previous relation as $\bar{e}c_1 \cdot a \cdot c_2\bar{e} \theta \bar{e}d_1 \cdot a \cdot d_2\bar{e}$, where $\bar{e} = (1, e, 1)$. Since σ is a congruence, from $c_1 \sigma d_1$ and $c_2 \sigma d_2$ we obtain $\bar{e}c_1 \sigma \bar{e}d_1$ and $c_2\bar{e} \sigma d_2\bar{e}$. Then the condition $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$ gives us $\bar{e}c_1 \cdot b \cdot c_2\bar{e} \theta \bar{e}d_1 \cdot b \cdot d_2\bar{e}$, that is,

$$(1, g_1p_{\mu_1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2j_2}g_2, 1) \theta (1, h_1p_{\nu_1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2k_2}h_2, 1).$$

From the definition of θ_G and the equality $\theta_G = \tau_G$, we obtain

$$g_1p_{\mu_1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2j_2}g_2 \tau_G h_1p_{\nu_1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2k_2}h_2.$$

Since we also have $j_1 \tau_I k_1$ and $\mu_2 \tau_\Lambda \nu_2$, Lemma 2.4 gives us

$$c_1bc_2 = (j_1, g_1p_{\mu_1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2j_2}g_2, \mu_2) \tau (k_1, h_1p_{\nu_1i_2}f_2p_{\lambda_2k_2}h_2, \nu_2) = d_1bd_2.$$

Hence, we have proved that $c_1bc_2 \tau d_1bd_2$ follows from $c_1ac_2 \tau d_1ad_2$, that is, the condition (C3) is true. Therefore, from Proposition 4.1 it follows that $C(\rho, \sigma; \tau)$ is true. Analogously, we obtain that $C(\rho, \sigma; \tau)$ implies $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$. \square

5. COMMUTATORS ON REES MATRIX SEMIGROUPS

Using the results of the previous section, we can give the first description of the commutator of two congruences on a Rees matrix semigroup. First we need to prove that $(0_I, [\rho, \sigma]_G, 0_\Lambda)$ is always a linked triple.

Lemma 5.1. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Let $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$ and let τ be a congruence of \mathbf{G} . Then $(0_I, \tau, 0_\Lambda)$ is a linked triple.*

Proof. Let $i, j \in I$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. As described in Section 2 and Proposition 2.3, we need to check whether $q_{\lambda\mu ij} \tau e$. First assume that $i 0_I j$, that is $i = j$. Then $q_{\lambda\mu ij} = p_{\lambda i} p_{\mu i}^{-1} p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1} = p_{\lambda i} p_{\mu i}^{-1} p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} = e$, therefore, the condition $q_{\lambda\mu ij} \tau e$ is trivially true. Similarly, if $\lambda 0_\Lambda \mu$, that is $\lambda = \mu$, then $q_{\lambda\mu ij} = e$, which implies $q_{\lambda\mu ij} \tau e$. Hence, $(0_I, \tau, 0_\Lambda)$ is a linked triple. \square

As a consequence of the proposition 4.1 and characterization of the Green's relation \mathcal{H} in a completely simple semigroup, we obtain the following property.

Proposition 5.2. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ and let ρ, σ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . Then $C(\rho, \sigma; \mathcal{H})$, and consequently $[\rho, \sigma] \leq \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. We will prove that the condition (C3) is satisfied for congruences ρ, σ and \mathcal{H} . Let $a, b, c_s, d_s \in S$, $s = 1, 2$ be such that $a \rho b$ and $c_s \sigma d_s$, $s = 1, 2$. Here we denote $a = (i_1, f_1, \lambda_1)$, $b = (i_2, f_2, \lambda_2)$ and $c_s = (j_s, g_s, \mu_s)$, $d_s = (k_s, h_s, \nu_s)$, $s = 1, 2$. Assume that $c_1ac_2 \mathcal{H} d_1ad_2$, that is $(j_1, g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 j_2} g_2, \mu_2) \mathcal{H} (k_1, h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 k_2} h_2, \nu_2)$. Then we have $j_1 = k_1$ and $\mu_2 = \nu_2$, because $\mathcal{H}_I = 0_I$ and $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$. Since two triples from $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ are \mathcal{H} -related if and only if their left and right coordinates coincide, it follows that $(j_1, g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 j_2} g_2, \mu_2) \mathcal{H} (k_1, h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 k_2} h_2, \nu_2)$, that is $c_1bc_2 \mathcal{H} d_1bd_2$. From Proposition 4.1 we obtain $C(\rho, \sigma; \mathcal{H})$. Definition of the commutator then implies $[\rho, \sigma] \leq \mathcal{H}$. \square

Corollary 5.3. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. If $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$, then $[\rho, \sigma]$ is determined by the linked triple $(0_I, [\rho, \sigma]_G, 0_\Lambda)$.*

Proof. From Proposition 5.2 we have $[\rho, \sigma] \leq \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 2.3 it follows that $[\rho, \sigma]_I \leq \mathcal{H}_I = 0_I$ and $[\rho, \sigma]_\Lambda \leq \mathcal{H}_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$. Hence, we must have $[\rho, \sigma]_I = 0_I$ and $[\rho, \sigma]_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$, that is, $[\rho, \sigma]$ is the linked triple $(0_I, [\rho, \sigma]_G, 0_\Lambda)$. \square

Hence, for any two congruences $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$, the I and Λ components of the linked triple $([\rho, \sigma]_I, [\rho, \sigma]_G, [\rho, \sigma]_\Lambda)$ are trivial, and the commutator $[\rho, \sigma]$ is completely determined by $[\rho, \sigma]_G$.

Proposition 5.4. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. If ρ, σ are congruences on \mathbf{S} , then $C(\rho_G, \sigma_G; [\rho, \sigma]_G)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.8, it suffices to prove that the condition (C3) is satisfied for congruences ρ_G, σ_G and $[\rho, \sigma]_G$ on group \mathbf{G} . Let $a, b, c_s, d_s \in G$, $s = 1, 2$ be such that $a \rho_G b$, and $c_s \sigma_G d_s$, $s = 1, 2$. By definition of ρ_G and σ_G it follows that $(1, a, 1) \rho (1, b, 1)$ and $(1, c_s, 1) \sigma (1, d_s, 1)$, $s = 1, 2$. Assume that $c_1 a c_2 [\rho, \sigma]_G d_1 a d_2$, that is $(1, c_1 a c_2, 1) [\rho, \sigma] (1, d_1 a d_2, 1)$. Since the matrix P is normal, we have $p_{11} = e$. Therefore, we can write the last relation as

$$(1, c_1, 1)(1, a, 1)(1, c_2, 1) [\rho, \sigma] (1, d_1, 1)(1, a, 1)(1, d_2, 1)$$

Hence, the condition $C(\rho, \sigma; [\rho, \sigma])$ implies

$$(1, c_1, 1)(1, b, 1)(1, c_2, 1) [\rho, \sigma] (1, d_1, 1)(1, b, 1)(1, d_2, 1).$$

Therefore, we have finally obtained $(1, c_1 b c_2, 1) [\rho, \sigma] (1, d_1 b d_2, 1)$, which further implies $c_1 b c_2 [\rho, \sigma]_G d_1 b d_2$. Since we have proved (C3), it follows that $C(\rho_G, \sigma_G; [\rho, \sigma]_G)$. \square

Since the commutator $[\rho_G, \sigma_G]$ is the least congruence which centralizes ρ_G modulo σ_G , previous proposition directly implies the following statement.

Corollary 5.5. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. If ρ, σ are congruences on \mathbf{S} , then $[\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$.*

Now we will give a complete description of the group part of the commutator $[\rho, \sigma]$. First, Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 motivate the following notion.

Definition 5.6. Let $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ and let ρ, σ, θ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . By $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$ we denote the congruence on \mathbf{S} generated by all ordered pairs $(p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1})$ where $i, j \in I$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ are such that $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \sigma_\Lambda \mu$, or $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$ and $i \sigma_I j$.

Corollary 5.7. *Let $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ and let ρ, σ, θ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . Then $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$.*

Proof. Since $C(\rho, \sigma; [\rho, \sigma])$, by Proposition 3.7 it follows that the conditions (C1) and (C2) are true for congruences ρ, σ and $[\rho, \sigma]$. Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 then imply that $p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} [\rho, \sigma]_G p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$ for all $i, j \in I$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ such that $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \sigma_\Lambda \mu$, or $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$ and $i \sigma_I j$. Therefore, we have the inequality $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$, by Definition 5.6. \square

Corollary 5.8. *If $S = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ is a Rees matrix semigroup and $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$, then $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$.*

Proof. From Corollary 5.7 it follows that $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$, while Corollary 5.5 implies $[\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$. Therefore, we have $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$. \square

Lemma 5.9. *Let $S = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ be a Rees matrix semigroup and let $\rho, \sigma, \delta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$. Then $C(\rho, \sigma; \delta)$ if and only if $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq \delta_G$.*

Proof. (\rightarrow) From Corollary 5.8 it follows that $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$. By the definition of the commutator, condition $C(\rho, \sigma; \delta)$ implies $[\rho, \sigma] \leq \delta$. Proposition 2.3 then gives us $[\rho, \sigma]_G \leq \delta_G$, which further implies $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq \delta_G$.

(\leftarrow) Assume now that $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq \delta_G$. By Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 5.1 we know that $C(\rho, \sigma; \delta)$ is equivalent with $C(\rho, \sigma; \bar{\delta})$ where $\bar{\delta}$ is the linked triple $(0_I, \delta_G, 0_\Lambda)$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that $C(\rho, \sigma; \bar{\delta})$. By Proposition 4.1 it suffices to show that (C3) is true for ρ, σ and $\bar{\delta}$. Let $a, b, c_s, d_s \in S$, be such that $a \rho b$, $c_s \sigma d_s$, $s = 1, 2$, where $a = (i_1, f_1, \lambda_1)$, $b = (i_2, f_2, \lambda_2)$ and $c_s = (j_s, g_s, \mu_s)$, $d_s = (k_s, h_s, \nu_s)$, for $s = 1, 2$. Assume that $c_1 a c_2 \bar{\delta} d_1 a d_2$, that is, $(j_1, g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 j_2} g_2, \mu_2) \bar{\delta} (k_1, h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 k_2} h_2, \nu_2)$. By Lemma 2.4 it follows that $j_1 = k_1$, $\mu_2 = \nu_2$ and

$$(5.1) \quad g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 j_2} g_2 \delta_G h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 k_2} h_2.$$

We introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} A'_1 &= p_{\mu_1 i_2}^{-1} p_{\mu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 j_2} p_{\lambda_2 j_2}^{-1} \\ A''_1 &= p_{\nu_1 i_2}^{-1} p_{\nu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 k_2} p_{\lambda_2 k_2}^{-1} \\ A_2 &= f_2 \\ B_1^1 &= g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_2}, B_1^2 = p_{\lambda_2 j_2} g_2 \\ B_2^1 &= h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_2}, B_2^2 = p_{\lambda_2 k_2} h_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then the relation (5.1) can be written as

$$(5.2) \quad t(A'_1, B_1^1, B_1^2) = B_1^1 A'_1 B_1^2 \delta_G B_2^1 A''_1 B_2^2 = t(A''_1, B_2^1, B_2^2),$$

where $t(x, y, z) = yxz$ is a ternary term over variables x, y, z .

By Lemma 2.4, from $a \rho b$ it follows that $i_1 \rho_I i_2$ and $\lambda_1 \rho_\Lambda \lambda_2$. On the other hand, again by Lemma 2.4, from $c_s \sigma d_s$, $s = 1, 2$ it follows that $j_2 \sigma_I k_2$ and $\mu_1 \sigma_\Lambda \nu_1$. By definition of $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$ we have $p_{\lambda_1 j_2} p_{\lambda_2 j_2}^{-1} \Theta_{\rho, \sigma} p_{\lambda_1 k_2} p_{\lambda_2 k_2}^{-1}$ and $p_{\mu_1 i_1} p_{\nu_1 i_1}^{-1} \Theta_{\rho, \sigma} p_{\mu_1 i_2} p_{\nu_1 i_2}^{-1}$. Since $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \leq \delta_G$, it follows

$$(5.3) \quad p_{\lambda_1 j_2} p_{\lambda_2 j_2}^{-1} \delta_G p_{\lambda_1 k_2} p_{\lambda_2 k_2}^{-1}$$

and

$$(5.4) \quad p_{\mu_1 i_1} p_{\nu_1 i_1}^{-1} \delta_G p_{\mu_1 i_2} p_{\nu_1 i_2}^{-1}.$$

If we multiply both sides of the the relation (5.4) with $p_{\mu_1 i_2}^{-1}$ on the left, and with $p_{\nu_1 i_1}$ on the right, we obtain

$$(5.5) \quad p_{\mu_1 i_2}^{-1} p_{\mu_1 i_1} \delta_G p_{\nu_1 i_2}^{-1} p_{\nu_1 i_1}.$$

Since δ_G is a congruence, relations (5.5) and (5.3) give us

$$(5.6) \quad A'_1 = p_{\mu_1 i_2}^{-1} p_{\mu_1 i_1} \cdot f_1 \cdot p_{\lambda_1 j_2} p_{\lambda_2 j_2}^{-1} \delta_G p_{\nu_1 i_2}^{-1} p_{\nu_1 i_1} \cdot f_1 \cdot p_{\lambda_1 k_2} p_{\lambda_2 k_2}^{-1} = A''_1.$$

Furthermore, after multiplying the last relation with B_1^1 on the left, and B_1^2 on the right, we obtain $B_1^1 A'_1 B_1^2 \delta_G B_1^1 A''_1 B_1^2$. Now, by the transitivity of the congruence δ_G , previous relation and (5.2) imply

$$(5.7) \quad t(A''_1, B_1^1, B_1^2) = B_1^1 A''_1 B_1^2 \delta_G B_2^1 A''_1 B_2^2 = t(A''_1, B_2^1, B_2^2).$$

Let us return to the condition $(i_1, f_1, \lambda_1) = a \rho b = (i_2, f_2, \lambda_2)$. If we multiply the relation $a \rho b$ with $(1, e, \nu_1)$ on the left, and with $(k_2, e, 1)$ on the right, we obtain $(1, p_{\nu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 k_2}, 1) \rho (1, p_{\nu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 k_2}, 1)$. From definition of ρ_G it follows $p_{\nu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 k_2} \rho_G p_{\nu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 k_2}$, that is,

$$(5.8) \quad A''_1 = p_{\nu_1 i_2}^{-1} p_{\nu_1 i_1} f_1 p_{\lambda_1 k_2} p_{\lambda_2 k_2}^{-1} \rho_G f_2 = A_2.$$

On the other hand, if we multiply the relation $(j_1, g_1, \mu_1) \sigma (j_1, h_1, \nu_1)$ with $(i_2, e, 1)$ on the right, we obtain $(j_1, g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_2}, 1) \sigma (k_1, h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_2}, 1)$. From Lemma 2.4 it follows

$$(5.9) \quad B_1^1 = g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_2} \sigma_G h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_2} = B_2^1.$$

Similarly, when we multiply the relation $(j_2, g_2, \mu_2) \sigma (k_2, h_2, \nu_2)$ with $(1, e, \lambda_2)$ on the left, we obtain $(1, p_{\lambda_2 j_2} g_2, \mu_2) \sigma (1, p_{\lambda_2 k_2} h_2, \nu_2)$. Again from Lemma 2.4 we obtain $p_{\lambda_2 j_2} g_2 \sigma_G p_{\lambda_2 k_2} h_2$. Therefore,

$$(5.10) \quad B_1^2 = p_{\lambda_2 j_2} g_2 \sigma_G p_{\lambda_2 k_2} h_2 = B_2^2.$$

Since the group \mathbf{G} belongs to a congruence modular variety, by Proposition 3.4, from $[\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq \delta_G$ it follows that $C(\rho_G, \sigma_G; \delta_G)$. In (5.8), (5.9), (5.10) and (5.7) we have proved the following relations: $A''_1 \rho_G A_2$, $B_1^1 \sigma_G B_2^1$, $B_1^2 \sigma_G B_2^2$, and $t(A''_1, B_1^1, B_1^2) \delta_G t(A''_1, B_2^1, B_2^2)$, hence the condition $C(\rho_G, \sigma_G; \delta_G)$ implies $t(A_2, B_1^1, B_1^2) \delta_G t(A_2, B_2^1, B_2^2)$, that is,

$$(5.11) \quad g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 j_2} g_2 \delta_G h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 k_2} h_2.$$

By Lemma 2.4, $j_1 = k_1$, $\mu_2 = \nu_2$ and relation (5.11) imply

$$(j_1, g_1 p_{\mu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 j_2} g_2, \mu_2) \bar{\delta} (k_1, h_1 p_{\nu_1 i_2} f_2 p_{\lambda_2 k_2} h_2, \nu_2),$$

that is, $c_1 b c_2 \bar{\delta} d_1 b d_2$. Therefore, the condition (C3) is satisfied for ρ, σ and $\bar{\delta}$, which completes the proof of the other implication. \square

Previous proposition gives us the complete description of the binary commutator in Rees matrix semigroups.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

Denote by θ the congruence determined by the linked triple $(0_I, \Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G], 0_\Lambda)$. Lemma 5.9 directly implies $C(\rho, \sigma; \theta)$. By the definition of the commutator, it

follows that $[\rho, \sigma] \leq \theta$. In Corollary 5.3 we have proved that the commutator $[\rho, \sigma]$ is determined by the linked triple $(0_I, [\rho, \sigma]_G, 0_\Lambda)$. Proposition 2.3 then implies that $[\rho, \sigma]_G \leq \theta_G = \Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G]$. On the other hand, Corollary 5.8 gives us $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} \vee [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \leq [\rho, \sigma]_G$. Therefore, $[\rho, \sigma]_G$ is equal to $[\rho_G, \sigma_G] \vee \Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$, and consequently, $[\rho, \sigma] = \theta$ is determined by the linked triple $(0_I, [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \vee \Theta_{\rho, \sigma}, 0_\Lambda)$. \square

Example 5.10. Let us calculate the commutator of Green's relations \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} . By Theorem 1.1 we have $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}]_G = [\mathcal{L}_G, \mathcal{R}_G] \vee \Theta_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}} = [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}}$. Here $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}}$ is the congruence generated by all ordered pairs $(p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1})$, where $i, j \in I$, $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ are such that $i \mathcal{L}_I j$ and $\lambda \mathcal{R}_\Lambda \mu$, or $i \mathcal{R}_I j$ and $\lambda \mathcal{L}_\Lambda \mu$. Recall that the congruences \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} correspond to linked triples $(1_I, 1_G, 0_\Lambda)$ and $(0_I, 1_G, 1_\Lambda)$, respectively. Hence, in the case $i \mathcal{L}_I j$ and $\lambda \mathcal{R}_\Lambda \mu$ we obtain all possible pairs $(p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1})$, while in the case that $i \mathcal{R}_I j$ and $\lambda \mathcal{L}_\Lambda \mu$ we obtain the pair (e, e) . Therefore, the congruence $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}}$ is equal to $\Theta_{1,1}$, and the commutator $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}]$ equals the commutator $[1_S, 1_S]$, which corresponds to the linked triple $(0_I, [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}, 0_\Lambda)$.

Remark 5.11. Let $S = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ be a Rees matrix semigroup. The congruence $\Theta_{1,1}$ is generated by all pairs $(p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1})$, where $i, j \in I$, $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, by Definition 5.6. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $i \in I$ be arbitrary, and $\mu = 1, j = 1$. Then we have $p_{1i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} \Theta_{1,1} p_{11} p_{\lambda 1}^{-1}$, which implies $p_{\lambda i}^{-1} \Theta_{1,1} e$, since P is a normal matrix. Hence, we have $p_{\lambda i} \Theta_{1,1} e$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda, i \in I$. Therefore, the set $\mathcal{P} = \{p_{\lambda i} : \lambda \in \Lambda, i \in I\}$ is contained in the $\Theta_{1,1}$ -class of element e . Hence, if we assume that the set \mathcal{P} equals G , then we have $[e]_{\Theta_{1,1}} = G$, that is $\Theta_{1,1} = 1_G$.

If we assume some additional conditions on congruences ρ and σ , the group part of the commutator $[\rho, \sigma]$ simplifies, as we can see in the following result.

Corollary 5.12. *Let $S = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ be a Rees matrix semigroup and let ρ, σ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . If at least one of the following conditions:*

- (i) $\rho_I = \sigma_I = 0_I$;
- (ii) $\rho_\Lambda = \sigma_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$;
- (iii) $\rho_I = 0_I$ and $\rho_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$;
- (iv) $\sigma_I = 0_I$ and $\sigma_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$.

is satisfied, then $[\rho_G, \sigma_G] = [\rho, \sigma]_G$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.1, it follows that $[\rho, \sigma]_G = [\rho_G, \sigma_G] \vee \Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$, where $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$ is the congruence generated by ordered pairs $(p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1}, p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1})$, where $i, j \in I$, $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ are such that $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \sigma_\Lambda \mu$, or $i \sigma_I j$ and $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$. Let $i, j \in I$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, and assume that $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \sigma_\Lambda \mu$, or $i \sigma_I j$ and $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$.

- (i) If $\rho_I = \sigma_I = 0_I$, then we must have $i = j$. Hence, $p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} = p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$.
- (ii) If $\rho_\Lambda = \sigma_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$, then we must have $\lambda = \mu$. We obtain $p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} = e = p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$.
- (iii) Assume that $\rho_I = 0_I$ and $\rho_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$. Then, if the condition $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \sigma_\Lambda \mu$

is satisfied, we have $i = j$, hence $p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} = p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$. Otherwise, we have $i \sigma_I j$ and $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$, which implies $\lambda = \mu$ and $p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} = e = p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$.

(iv) Finally, assume that $\sigma_I = 0_I$ and $\sigma_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$. Then, if the condition $i \rho_I j$ and $\lambda \sigma_\Lambda \mu$ is satisfied, we have $\lambda = \mu$, hence $p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} = e = p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$. Otherwise, we have $i \sigma_I j$ and $\lambda \rho_\Lambda \mu$, which implies $i = j$ and $p_{\mu i} p_{\lambda i}^{-1} = p_{\mu j} p_{\lambda j}^{-1}$.

In all the cases, we obtain that $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$ is generated with pairs of equal elements, hence $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} = 0_G$, which further implies $[\rho, \sigma]_G = [\rho_G, \sigma_G]$. \square

Example 5.13. We can use Corollary 5.12 to determine the commutator $[\rho, \sigma]$ when $\rho = \sigma$ are Green's relations \mathcal{H} , \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} .

(a) First observe the case when $\rho = \mathcal{H} = \sigma$, then we can apply the Corollary 5.12(iii), which gives us $[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}]_G = [\mathcal{H}_G, \mathcal{H}_G] = [1_G, 1_G]$. Therefore, the commutator of $[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}]$ is equal to $(0_I, [1_G, 1_G], 0_\Lambda)$.

(b) If we have $\rho = \sigma = \mathcal{L}$, then we can apply the Corollary 5.12(ii), which gives us $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]_G = [\mathcal{L}_G, \mathcal{L}_G] = [1_G, 1_G]$. Hence, the commutator $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}]$ corresponds to $(0_I, [1_G, 1_G], 0_\Lambda)$.

(c) Similarly to (b), from Corollary 5.12(i) it follows that $[\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}]$ also corresponds to $(0_I, [1_G, 1_G], 0_\Lambda)$.

6. APPLICATIONS

Let us recall that congruence lattice of a Rees matrix semigroup is semi-modular [4, Theorem 3.6.2]. However, Lemma 5.9 and Theorem 1.1 allows us to prove some properties of the commutator which are satisfied in modular varieties. First, Lemma 5.9 directly gives us the following result.

Proposition 6.1. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Let $\rho, \sigma, \delta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$, then $C(\rho, \sigma; \delta)$ if and only if $[\rho, \sigma] \leq \delta$.*

Proposition 6.2. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Let $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$, then $[\rho, \sigma] = [\sigma, \rho]$.*

Proof. We have previously observed that the definition of congruence $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma}$ is symmetric, that is, $\Theta_{\rho, \sigma} = \Theta_{\sigma, \rho}$. On the other hand, since groups form a congruence modular variety, by Proposition 3.4 in \mathbf{G} we have $[\rho_G, \sigma_G] = [\sigma_G, \rho_G]$. Theorem 1.1 then implies that $[\rho, \sigma]_G = [\sigma, \rho]_G$. Therefore, we have the equality $[\rho, \sigma] = [\sigma, \rho]$. \square

Proposition 6.3. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Let ρ and $\sigma_i, i \in I$ be congruences on \mathbf{S} . Then $[\rho, \bigvee_{i \in I} \sigma_i] = \bigvee_{i \in I} [\rho, \sigma_i]$.*

Proof. The proof of this proposition follows the same steps as the proof of Proposition 4.3 ([5]). From Proposition 3.3 (ii) we obtain $\bigvee_{i \in I} [\rho, \sigma_i] \leq [\rho, \bigvee_{i \in I} \sigma_i]$. We use Propositions 6.1 in place of Proposition 4.2 ([5]) to prove that $C(\rho, \bigvee_{i \in I} \sigma_i; \bigvee_{i \in I} [\rho, \sigma_i])$.

Therefore $[\rho, \bigvee_{i \in I} \sigma_i] \leq \bigvee_{i \in I} [\rho, \sigma_i]$, which completes the proof of the equality from the statement. \square

Definition 6.4. (cf.[5], Definition 6.1) Let \mathbf{S} be a semigroup, and let $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{S})$. We define the series of congruences $(\alpha, \beta)^{(k)} = [\alpha, \underbrace{[\alpha, \dots, [\alpha, \beta] \dots]}_k]$, for

$k \in \mathbb{N}$. Semigroup \mathbf{S} is n -nilpotent, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if we have the equality $(1_S, 1_S)^{(n)} = 0_S$. Similarly, we define a series of congruences $[\alpha]^{(k)}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ where $[\alpha]^{(1)} = [\alpha, \alpha]$ and $[\alpha]^{(k)} = [[\alpha, \alpha]^{(k-1)}, [\alpha, \alpha]^{(k-1)}]$ for $k \geq 2$. Semigroup \mathbf{S} is n -solvable, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if we have the equality $[1_S]^{(n)} = 0_S$.

From Proposition 6.2, inductively it follows that the left $(\rho, \sigma)^{(n)}$ and right $[\rho, \sigma]^{(n)}$ central series are equal, therefore, in Rees matrix semigroups, notions of left n -nilpotency and right n -nilpotency are equivalent.

Lemma 6.5. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$ we have the equalities*

$$(6.1) \quad (1_S, 1_S)_G^{(k)} = (1_G, [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1})^{(k-1)};$$

$$(6.2) \quad [1_S]_G^{(k)} = [[1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}]^{(k-1)}.$$

Proof. First note that from Theorem 1.1 it follows that $[1_S, 1_S]$ is determined by the linked triple $(0_I, [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}, 0_\Lambda)$.

(i) Since $[1_S, 1_S]_I = 0_I$ and $[1_S, 1_S]_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$ from Corollary 5.12(iv) we obtain that $(1_S, 1_S)_G^{(2)} = [1_S, [1_S, 1_S]]_G = [1_G, [1_S, 1_S]_G] = (1_G, [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1})^{(1)}$. Inductively, by using the equalities $(1_S, 1_S)_I^{(k)} = 0_I$ and $(1_S, 1_S)_\Lambda^{(k)} = 0_\Lambda$ obtained from Corollary 5.3, by Corollary 5.12(iv) we obtain $(1_S, 1_S)_G^{(k)} = (1_G, [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1})^{(k-1)}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$.

(ii) Since $[1_S, 1_S]_I = 0_I$ and $[1_S, 1_S]_\Lambda = 0_\Lambda$, from Corollary 5.12(iii) it follows that $[1_S]_G^{(2)} = [[1_S, 1_S], [1_S, 1_S]]_G = [[1_S, 1_S]_G, [1_S, 1_S]_G] = [[1_S, 1_S]_G]^{(1)}$. Inductively, using the equalities $[1_S]_I^{(k)} = 0_I$ and $[1_S]_\Lambda^{(k)} = 0_\Lambda$ obtained from Corollary 5.3, by Corollary 5.12(iii), we obtain $[1_S]_G^{(k)} = [[1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}]^{(k-1)}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. \square

Proposition 6.6. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

- (a) *if the semigroup \mathbf{S} is n -nilpotent, then the group \mathbf{G} is also n -nilpotent;*
- (b) *if the semigroup \mathbf{S} is n -solvable, then the group \mathbf{G} is also n -solvable.*

Proof. (a) Note that for all congruences $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{G})$, such that $\alpha \leq \beta$ we have $(1, \alpha)^{(k)} \leq (1, \beta)^{(k)}$ by Proposition 3.3 (ii). Then for $\alpha = [1_G, 1_G]$ and $\beta = [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}$, it follows $(1_G, 1_G)^{(k)} = (1_G, [1_G, 1_G])^{(k-1)} \leq (1_G, [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1})^{(k-1)}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. Also note that $(1_G, 1_G)^{(1)} = \alpha \leq \beta = (1_S, 1_S)_G^{(1)}$.

Therefore, from the equality (6.1) we obtain $(1_G, 1_G]^{(k)} \leq (1_S, 1_S]_G^{(k)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, if we have $(1_S, 1_S]^{(n)} = 0_S$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then from Corollary 5.3 it follows that $(1_S, 1_S]_G^{(n)} = 0_G$. Hence, $(1_G, 1_G]^{(n)} = 0_G$, that is, the group \mathbf{G} is n -nilpotent.

(b) Similarly as in (a), note that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Con}(\mathbf{G})$ such that $\alpha \leq \beta$ we have $[\alpha]^{(k)} \leq [\beta]^{(k)}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by Proposition 3.3 (ii). Therefore, for $\alpha = [1_G, 1_G]$ and $\beta = [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}$, we obtain $[1_G]^{(k)} = [[1_G, 1_G]]^{(k-1)} \leq [[1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}]^{(k-1)}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. Also note that $\alpha = [1_G]^{(1)}$ and $\beta = [1_S]_G^{(1)}$. Then, from equality (6.2) we obtain $[1_G]^{(k)} \leq [1_S]_G^{(k)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, if we have $[1_S]^{(n)} = 0_S$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then from Corollary 5.3 it follows that $[1_S]_G^{(n)} = 0_G$. Hence, $[1_G]^{(n)} = 0_G$, that is, the group \mathbf{G} is n -solvable. \square

Proposition 6.7. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

- (a) *if the group \mathbf{G} is n -nilpotent, then the semigroup \mathbf{S} is $(n+1)$ -nilpotent;*
- (b) *if the group \mathbf{G} is n -solvable, then the semigroup \mathbf{S} is $(n+1)$ -solvable.*

Proof. (a) Since $[1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1} \leq 1_G$, applying the Proposition 3.3(ii) inductively, we obtain that $(1_G, [1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}]^{(k-1)} \leq (1_G, 1_G]^{(k-1)}$. Therefore, using (6.1) we have

$$(6.3) \quad (1_S, 1_S]_G^{(k)} \leq (1_G, 1_G]^{(k-1)}, \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2.$$

Now assume that the group \mathbf{G} is n -nilpotent, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have $(1_G, 1_G]^{(n)} = 0_G$. From inequality (6.3) it follows that $(1_S, 1_S]_G^{(n+1)} \leq 0_G$. Therefore, from Corollary 5.3 we obtain that $(1_S, 1_S]^{(n+1)} = 0_S$, that is, semigroup \mathbf{S} is $(n+1)$ -nilpotent.

(b) From inequality $[1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1} \leq 1_G$, inductively applying Proposition 3.3(ii) we obtain that $[[1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1}]^{(k-1)} \leq [1_G]^{(k-1)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. Therefore, using (6.2) we have

$$(6.4) \quad [1_S]_G^{(k)} \leq [1_G]^{(k-1)}, \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2.$$

Now assume that the group \mathbf{G} is n -solvable, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have $[1_G]^{(n)} = 0_G$. From inequality (6.4) it follows that $[1_S]_G^{(n+1)} \leq 0_G$. Therefore, from Corollary 5.3 we obtain that $[1_S]^{(n+1)} = 0_S$, that is, semigroup \mathbf{S} is $(n+1)$ -solvable. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2:

Theorem 1.2 follows directly from Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.7. \square

We finish the section with remark that the class of nilpotency (solubility) of the semigroup $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ and the group \mathbf{G} can be the same, under a special condition.

Proposition 6.8. *Let \mathbf{S} be a Rees matrix semigroup $\mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$. If $\Theta_{1,1} \leq [1_G, 1_G]$ then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

- (a) *if the group \mathbf{G} is n -nilpotent, then the semigroup \mathbf{S} is n -nilpotent;*
- (b) *if the group \mathbf{G} is n -solvable, then the semigroup \mathbf{S} is n -solvable.*

Proof. First note that from $\Theta_{1,1} \leq [1_G, 1_G]$, we obtain $[1_G, 1_G] \vee \Theta_{1,1} = [1_G, 1_G]$. Hence, we have $(1_S, 1_S)_G^{(1)} = [1_G, 1_G] = (1_G, 1_G)^{(1)}$ and $[1_S]_G^{(1)} = [1_G, 1_G] = [1_G]^{(1)}$. Therefore, (a) and (b) are true for $n = 1$.

(a) By equality (6.1) it follows $(1_S, 1_S)_G^{(k)} = (1_G, [1_G, 1_G])^{(k-1)} = (1_G, 1_G)^{(k)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. Hence, if the group \mathbf{G} is n -nilpotent, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$ then $(1_S, 1_S)_G^{(n)} = (1_G, 1_G)^{(n)} = 0_G$, and consequently \mathbf{S} is also n -nilpotent.

(b) Similarly to (a), from equality (6.2) it follows that $[1_S]_G^{(k)} = [[1_G, 1_G]]^{(k-1)} = [1_G]^{(k)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 2$. Hence, if the group \mathbf{G} is n -solvable, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$ then $[1_S]_G^{(n)} = [1_G]^{(n)} = 0_G$, and consequently \mathbf{S} is also n -solvable. \square

In the next example we show that the condition $\Theta_{1,1} \leq [1_G, 1_G]$ can not be omitted from the statement of Proposition 6.8.

Example 6.9. Let \mathbf{G} be the dihedral group $D_3 = \langle \rho, \sigma \mid \rho^3 = e = \sigma^2, \rho\sigma = \sigma\rho^2 \rangle$. We know that the group D_3 is 2-solvable, and consequently also 3-solvable. Let $I = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} = \Lambda$, and let P be a normal matrix, such that all elements of the group D_3 appear in P . Now let us consider the Rees matrix semigroup $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[D_3; I, \Lambda; P]$. Since group D_3 is 2-solvable, by Proposition 6.7 it follows that the semigroup \mathbf{S} is 3-solvable. However, the condition $\Theta_{1,1} \leq [1_G, 1_G]$ is not satisfied, since $\Theta_{1,1} = 1_G$ by Remark 5.11, and $[1_G, 1_G]$ is the congruence corresponding to the proper normal subgroup $[G, G] = \{e, \rho, \rho^2\} \neq G$.

Let us note that if we take in the previous example the quaternion group Q_8 , or other 2-nilpotent group instead of D_3 , then we obtain a 3-nilpotent semigroup $\mathbf{S} = \mathcal{M}[G; I, \Lambda; P]$ and also $\Theta_{1,1} = 1_G > [1_G, 1_G]$. Here $[1_G, 1_G]$ is the congruence corresponding to the proper normal subgroup $[Q_8, Q_8] = \{1, -1\}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aichinger E (2006) The polynomial functions of certain algebras that are simple modulo their center. *Contr. to Gen. Algebra.* 17:9–24.
- [2] Aichinger E, Mudrinski N (2010) Some applications of higher commutators in Mal'cev algebras. *Algebra Univers.* 63(4):367–403. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00012-010-0084-1>
- [3] Clifford AH, Preston GB (1961) The algebraic theory of semigroups - Volume I, Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society.

- [4] Howie JM (1995) *Fundamentals of Semigroup Theory*. Oxford: University Press.
- [5] Freese R, McKenzie RN (1987) *Commutator theory for Congruence Modular Varieties*. Cambridge: University Press.
- [6] McKenzie RN (1976) On minimal, locally finite varieties, with permuting congruence relations, Berkley Manuscript.
- [7] McKenzie RN (1983) The number of non-isomorphic models in quasi-varieties of semigroups. *Algebra Univers.* 16(1):195–203. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01191768>
- [8] McKenzie RN, McNulty GF, Taylor WF (1987) *Algebras, Lattices, Varieties–Volume I*, Monterey, California: The Wadsworth Brooks/Cole Mathematics Series.
- [9] Taylor W (1982) Some applications of the term condition. *Algebra Univers.* 14(1):11–24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02483903>
- [10] Warne RJ (1994) Semigroups obeying the term condition. *Algebra Univers.* 31(1):113–123. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01188183>
- [11] Warne RJ (1997) TC semigroups and inflations. *Semigroup Forum.* 54(1):271–277. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02676610>