

# Subresiduated lattice ordered commutative monoids

Cornejo J.M., San Martín H.J. and Sígala V.

## Abstract

A subresiduated lattice ordered commutative monoid (or srl-monoid for short) is a pair  $(\mathbf{A}, Q)$  where  $\mathbf{A} = (A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  is an algebra of type  $(2, 2, 2, 0)$  such that  $(A, \wedge, \vee)$  is a lattice,  $(A, \cdot, e)$  is a commutative monoid,  $(a \vee b) \cdot c = (a \cdot c) \vee (b \cdot c)$  for every  $a, b, c \in A$  and  $Q$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}$  such that for each  $a, b \in A$  there exists  $c \in Q$  with the property that for all  $q \in Q$ ,  $a \cdot q \leq b$  if and only if  $q \leq c$ . This  $c$  is denoted by  $a \rightarrow_Q b$ , or simply by  $a \rightarrow b$ .

The srl-monoids  $(\mathbf{A}, Q)$  can be regarded as algebras  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$ . These algebras are a generalization of subresiduated lattices and commutative residuated lattices respectively.

In this paper we prove that the class of srl-monoids forms a variety. We show that the lattice of congruences of any srl-monoid is isomorphic to the lattice of its strongly convex subalgebras and we also give a description of the strongly convex subalgebra generated by a subset of the negative cone of any srl-monoid. We apply both results in order to study the lattice of congruences of any srl-monoid by giving as application alternative equational basis for the variety of srl-monoids generated by its totally ordered members.

## 1 Introduction

A *lattice ordered monoid* (or l-monoid for short) is an algebra  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  of type  $(2, 2, 2, 0)$  such that  $(A, \wedge, \vee)$  is a lattice,  $(A, \cdot, e)$  is a monoid and the equalities  $(a \vee b) \cdot c = (a \cdot c) \vee (b \cdot c)$  and  $c \cdot (a \vee b) = (c \cdot a) \vee (c \cdot b)$  are satisfied for every  $a, b, c \in A$ <sup>1</sup>. Note that in particular  $\cdot$  is monotone, i.e., for every  $a, b, c \in A$ , if  $a \leq b$  then  $a \cdot c \leq b \cdot c$  and  $c \cdot a \leq c \cdot b$ . A *lattice ordered commutative monoid* (or commutative l-monoid for short) is an l-monoid  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  where the binary operation  $\cdot$  is commutative<sup>2</sup>.

Many varieties of interest for algebraic logic are commutative l-monoids or have reduct in them. Some relevant examples of algebras with reduct in commutative l-monoids are commutative residuated lattices and algebras with reduct in distributive lattices with a greatest element.

<sup>1</sup>In [12] the terminology *lattice ordered monoid* is used in a different sense to that employed in the present paper. More precisely, in [12] a *lattice ordered monoid* is defined as an algebra  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  of type  $(2, 2, 2, 0)$  such that  $(A, \wedge, \vee)$  is a lattice,  $(A, \cdot, e)$  is a monoid and the equalities  $(a \vee b) \cdot c = (a \cdot c) \vee (b \cdot c)$ ,  $c \cdot (a \vee b) = (c \cdot a) \vee (c \cdot b)$ ,  $(a \wedge b) \cdot c = (a \cdot c) \wedge (b \cdot c)$  and  $c \cdot (a \wedge b) = (c \cdot a) \wedge (c \cdot b)$  are satisfied for every  $a, b, c \in A$ .

<sup>2</sup>The definition of *lattice ordered commutative monoid* used in the present paper is exactly the definition of *lattice-ordered monoid* given in [14].

**Definition 1.** A *subresiduated lattice ordered commutative monoid* (or *srl-monoid for short*) is a pair  $(\mathbf{A}, Q)$  where  $\mathbf{A} = (A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  is a commutative l-monoid and  $Q$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}$  such that for each  $a, b \in A$  there exists  $c \in Q$  with the property that for all  $q \in Q$ ,  $a \cdot q \leq b$  if and only if  $q \leq c$ . This  $c$  is denoted by  $a \rightarrow_Q b$ , or simply by  $a \rightarrow b$ .

Let  $(\mathbf{A}, Q)$  be an srl-monoid. If there is not ambiguity we write  $(A, Q)$  in place of  $(\mathbf{A}, Q)$ . The srl-monoids can be regarded as algebras  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$ . Moreover, if  $(A, Q)$  is an srl-monoid then  $Q = \{a \in A : e \rightarrow a = a\}$ . In this sense we say that the binary operation  $\rightarrow$  determines the set  $Q$ .

Note that if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is an srl-monoid then for every  $a, b \in A$  we have that  $a \rightarrow b = \max \{q \in Q : a \cdot q \leq b\}$ . Conversely, if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  is a commutative l-monoid and  $Q$  is a subalgebra of  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  such that for every  $a, b \in A$  there exists the maximum of the set  $\{q \in Q : a \cdot q \leq b\}$  (which will be denoted by  $a \rightarrow b$ ) then  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is an srl-monoid.

**Definition 2.** An srl-monoid  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is called *integral* if it has greatest element, which is denoted by  $1$ , and  $e = 1$ .

In [8] a logic for left continuous t-norms is introduced as a general framework for fuzzy logic. Their corresponding algebraic structures are MTL-algebras, which can be also presented as the variety of prelinear commutative integral bounded residuated lattices. This variety is generated as such by the class of its totally ordered members. In this sense, the variety of prelinear integral (and bounded) srl-monoids, which is an appropriate expansion (with bottom) of a subvariety of that of prelinear srl-monoids studied in Section 5, can be seen as a generalization of that of MTL-algebras. Hence, its assertional logic generalizes monoidal t-norm based logic.

The definition of srl-monoid is motivated by the definitions of subresiduated lattice (or sr-lattice for short) [7] and commutative residuated lattice [11] respectively. We recall both definitions in what follows.

A *subresiduated lattice* (or sr-lattice for short) is a pair  $(A, Q)$ , where  $A$  is a bounded distributive lattice,  $Q$  is a bounded sublattice of  $A$  and for every  $a, b \in A$  there is  $c \in Q$  such that for all  $q \in Q$ ,  $q \wedge a \leq b$  if and only if  $q \leq c$ . This  $c$  is denoted by  $a \rightarrow_Q b$ , or simply by  $a \rightarrow b$ . Let  $(A, Q)$  be a sr-lattice. The pair  $(A, Q)$  can be regarded as an algebra  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  of type  $(2, 2, 2, 0, 0)$ . Moreover,  $Q = \{a \in A : 1 \rightarrow a = a\}$ . The class of subresiduated lattices forms a variety [7] which properly contains to the variety of Heyting algebras [5, 13]. If  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a subresiduated lattice and  $a, b, c \in A$ , then the following condition is satisfied:

$$\text{if } a \leq b \rightarrow c \text{ then } a \wedge b \leq c.$$

However, the converse of the above mentioned property is not true in general.

An algebra  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$  is said to be a *commutative residuated lattice* if  $(A, \cdot, e)$  is a commutative monoid,  $(A, \wedge, \vee)$  is a lattice and for every  $a, b, c \in A$ ,

$$a \cdot b \leq c \text{ if and only if } a \leq b \rightarrow c.$$

The class of commutative residuated lattices forms a variety [11]. A commutative residuated lattice is called *integral* if  $a \leq e$  for every  $a$ .

**Remark 1.** *If  $(A, Q)$  is an srl-monoid then the algebra  $(Q, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is a commutative residuated lattice.*

We write **SR** for the class of srl-monoids, **iSR** for the class of integral srl-monoids, **SRL** for the variety of sr-lattices and **CRL** for the variety of commutative residuated lattices respectively.

The following elemental properties establish the connection between sr-lattices, commutative residuated lattices and srl-monoids:

- If  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, 0, 1) \in \mathbf{SRL}$  then  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, 1) \in \mathbf{SR}$  (in this sense we say that every sr-lattice is an srl-monoid). Moreover,  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, 0, 1) \in \mathbf{SRL}$  if and only if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, 1) \in \mathbf{iSR}$  and this algebra has a least element.
- If  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e) \in \mathbf{CRL}$  then  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e) \in \mathbf{SR}$  (it can be proved by defining  $Q = A$ ). Moreover,  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e) \in \mathbf{CRL}$  if and only if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e) \in \mathbf{SR}$  and  $e \rightarrow a = a$  for every  $a \in A$ .

In every srl-monoid  $A$  the following condition is satisfied for every  $a, b, c \in A$ :

$$\text{if } a \leq b \rightarrow c \text{ then } a \cdot b \leq c.$$

The converse of the previous property is verified if and only if  $A \in \mathbf{CRL}$ .

In what follows we will make some remarks about the logical counterpart of the varieties **SRL** and **CRL** respectively.

**S4**-algebras are defined as Boolean algebras with a modal operator  $\Box$  in the language that satisfies the identities  $\Box(1) = 1$ ,  $\Box(a \wedge b) = \Box(a) \wedge \Box(b)$ ,  $\Box(a) \leq a$  and  $\Box(a) \leq \Box(\Box(a))$ . It is known that the variety **S4**, whose members are the **S4**-algebras, is the algebraic semantics of the modal logic **S4**. This means that  $\phi$  is a theorem of **S4** if and only if the variety **S4** satisfies  $\phi \approx 1$ . The variety **SRL** corresponds to the variety of algebras defined for all the equations  $\phi \approx 1$  satisfied in the variety **S4** where only appears the connectives conjunction  $\wedge$ , disjunction  $\vee$ , bottom  $\perp$ , top  $\top$  and a new connective of implication (called strict implication) defined by  $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi := \Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$ , where  $\rightarrow$  denotes the classical implication [4, 7].

We write  $\mathbf{HFL}_e^+$  for the system obtained from  $\mathbf{HFL}_e$  removing the constant 0 from its language, where  $\mathbf{HFL}_e$  is defined as the Hilbert system mentioned in [10, Figure 2.9]. The variety **CRL** is the equivalent algebraic semantics for the consequence relation  $\vdash_{\mathbf{HFL}_e^+}$ , where we recall that the translations  $\rho$  and  $\tau$  from equations to formulas and from formulas to equations respectively are defined by  $s \approx t \mapsto^\rho (s \rightarrow t) \wedge (t \rightarrow s)$  and  $\varphi \mapsto^\tau e \approx e \wedge \varphi$ , where  $e$  denotes the constant in the signature of **CRL**.

In this paper we focus our attention in the study of the classes **SR** and **iSR**, which are varieties (see Theorem 1). However, it would be also interesting to study the features of the logic semantically defined by these varieties. For the case of the variety **iSR**, there is a standard way to obtain a logic which has this variety as its algebraic semantics. We define **L** as the implicative logic, where  $\rightarrow$  denotes the implication, in the language  $\{\wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow\}$  with the additional axioms given by the translation of the set of equations which characterize the variety **iSR** (obtained from Theorem 1 and the additional equation  $x \wedge 1 \approx 1$ ), where the translation from equations to axioms is defined by  $s \approx t \mapsto (s \rightarrow t) \wedge (t \rightarrow s)$ . Since **L** is an implicative logic then it follows from [9, Theorem 2.9] that **L** is

complete with respect to the class of algebras  $\text{Alg}^*(\mathbf{L})$  defined in [9, Definition 2.5], where the element 1 is included in the language of the algebras. Moreover, it follows from [9, Proposition 2.7] that  $\text{Alg}^*(\mathbf{L})$  coincides with the class of algebras in the signature of integral srl-monoids given by the equations and quasi-equations that result by applying the transformation  $\varphi \mapsto \varphi \approx 1$  to the axioms and rules of  $\mathbf{L}$ . It is immediate that  $\text{Alg}^*(\mathbf{L}) = \text{iSR}$ , so  $\mathbf{L}$  is complete with respect to  $\text{iSR}$ . Furthermore, if we consider the logic  $\mathbf{L}$  with the additional axiom

$$((\top \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha) \wedge (\alpha \rightarrow (\top \rightarrow \alpha))$$

(where  $\top$  is defined as  $x \rightarrow x$  by a fixed variable  $x$ ), then we get that this logic is complete with respect to the variety of integral commutative residuated lattices. A more detailed study of the logical counterpart of the variety  $\text{iSR}$ , as well as a study of the of the logical counterpart of the variety  $\text{SR}$ , will be considered in a future paper. In particular, we will give another presentation of a logic which is complete with respect to  $\text{iSR}$ .

There are other connections of integral srl-monoids with existing literature. In [2] Celani introduced distributive lattices with fusion and implication, which are defined as algebras  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0, 0)$  such that  $(A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$  is a bounded distributive lattice and for every  $a, b, c \in A$  the following conditions are satisfied:

$$(F1) \quad a \cdot (b \vee c) = (a \cdot b) \vee (a \cdot c),$$

$$(F2) \quad (b \vee c) \cdot a = (b \cdot a) \vee (c \cdot a),$$

$$(F3) \quad 0 \cdot a = a \cdot 0 = 0,$$

$$(I1) \quad (a \rightarrow b) \wedge (a \rightarrow c) = a \rightarrow (b \wedge c),$$

$$(I2) \quad (a \rightarrow c) \wedge (b \rightarrow c) = (a \vee b) \rightarrow c,$$

$$(I3) \quad 0 \rightarrow a = a \rightarrow 1 = 1.$$

The variety of algebras with fusion and implication appears in a natural way in all algebraic structures associated with many-valued logic and relevance logic. A direct computation based in properties of srl-monoids (see Section 2) shows that if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1)$  is a bounded distributive lattice and  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, 1) \in \text{iSR}$  then  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a distributive lattice with fusion and implication.

The aim of the present paper is to generalize some results on subresiduated lattices and commutative residuated lattices respectively in the framework of srl-monoids. Inspired by some results from [4, 7] we prove that the class of srl-monoids forms a variety and we present two equational basis for it. Besides, motivated by the results given in [11], we also study the lattice of congruences of any srl-monoid and as an application we present alternative equational basis for the variety of srl-monoids generated by its totally ordered members.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give some basic properties and examples of srl-monoids. We also prove that the class of srl-monoids is a variety. In Section 3 we introduce the definition of strongly convex subalgebra and we prove that for  $A \in \text{SR}$  there exists an order isomorphism between the lattice of congruences of  $A$  and the lattice of strongly convex subalgebras of  $A$ . This result is a natural generalization of [11, Theorem 2.3], which establishes an order isomorphism between the lattice of congruences and the lattice of

convex subalgebras of each commutative residuated lattice. In Section 4 we give a description of the strongly convex subalgebra generated by a subset of the negative cone of any srl-monoid and we apply this result in order to give some properties of the lattice of strongly convex subalgebras of each srl-monoid. We finish this section by giving a characterization of the principal congruences of any srl-monoid. Finally, in Section 5 we study the variety generated by the class of srl-monoids whose order is total. The main goal of this section is to give alternative equational basis for the mentioned variety.

## 2 Basic results

In this section we give some preliminary properties of srl-monoids. Our main goal is to show that the class SR is a variety.

We start by given some examples of srl-monoids.

**Example 1.** Let  $A$  be a commutative l-monoid where the underlying lattice of  $A$  is bounded (the first element is denoted by  $0$  and the greatest element is denoted by  $1$ ). Also assume that  $e = 1$ . Consider  $Q$  as a subset of the universe of  $A$  which is a finite chain closed under  $\cdot, 0$  and  $1$ . Then for every  $a$  and  $b$  elements in the universe of  $A$  we get  $0 \in \{q \in Q : a \cdot q \leq b\}$ , so this is a non empty set. Thus, there exists the maximum of the set  $\{q \in Q : a \cdot q \leq b\}$ . Therefore,  $(A, Q)$  is an integral srl-monoid.

**Example 2.** Consider the chain of three elements  $A = \{0, e, 1\}$  with  $0 < e < 1$ . We define the binary operation  $\cdot$  by

$\cdot$	$0$	$e$	$1$
$0$	$0$	$0$	$0$
$e$	$0$	$e$	$1$
$1$	$0$	$1$	$1$

Let  $Q = \{0, e\}$ . A direct computation shows that  $(A, Q)$  is an srl-monoid. Moreover, the operation  $\rightarrow$  is given by

$\rightarrow$	$0$	$e$	$1$
$0$	$e$	$e$	$e$
$e$	$0$	$e$	$e$
$1$	$0$	$0$	$e$

Note that since  $e \neq 1$ ,  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e) \notin \text{iSR}$ . Moreover, this algebra is not a sr-lattice because  $e \cdot 1 \neq e \wedge 1$  and this is not a commutative residuated lattice because  $e \rightarrow 1 \neq 1$ .

**Example 3.** Consider the chain of three elements  $A = \{0, a, 1\}$  with  $0 < a < 1$ . We define binary operation  $\cdot$  by

$\cdot$	$0$	$a$	$1$
$0$	$0$	$0$	$0$
$a$	$0$	$0$	$a$
$1$	$0$	$a$	$1$

Let  $Q = \{0, 1\}$ . We have that  $(A, Q)$  is an integral srl-monoid. Moreover, the operation  $\rightarrow$  is given by

$\rightarrow$	0	$a$	1
0	1	1	1
$a$	0	1	1
1	0	0	1

Note that the algebra  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, 1)$  is not a srl-lattice because  $a \cdot a \neq a \wedge a$  and this is not an integral commutative residuated lattice because  $1 \rightarrow a \neq a$ .

**Example 4.** Let  $A$  be the real interval  $[0, 1]$ . This set can be seen as an MV-algebra [6] and in consequence also as a commutative residuated lattice. In particular,  $(a \vee b) \cdot c = (a \cdot c) \vee (b \cdot c)$ , where we write  $\cdot$  for the usual product in the MV-algebra  $[0, 1]$ . Note that for each natural number  $n$  with  $n \geq 2$  we have that  $L_n = \{0, \frac{1}{n-1}, \frac{2}{n-1}, \dots, \frac{n-2}{n-1}, 1\}$  is a subalgebra of the commutative residuated lattice  $A$ . In what follows we also write  $A$  for the  $\{\wedge, \vee, \cdot, 1\}$ -reduct of the mentioned commutative residuated lattice. We have that  $(A, L_n)$  is an integral srl-monoid.

Now we give an equational characterization for the class of srl-monoids.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  be an algebra of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$ .

Then  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is an srl-monoid if and only if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  is a commutative l-monoid and the following identities are satisfied:

- 1)  $e \leq (x \wedge y) \rightarrow y$ ,
- 2)  $x \rightarrow y \leq (z \wedge e) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y)$ ,
- 3)  $x \cdot (x \rightarrow y) \leq y$ ,
- 4)  $z \rightarrow (x \wedge y) = (z \rightarrow x) \wedge (z \rightarrow y)$ ,
- 5)  $e \rightarrow ((e \rightarrow x) \cdot (e \rightarrow y)) = (e \rightarrow x) \cdot (e \rightarrow y)$ ,
- 6)  $e \rightarrow y \leq x \rightarrow (x \cdot (e \rightarrow y))$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is an srl-monoid. It is immediate that the conditions 5) and 6) are verified.

Since  $e \in Q$  and  $e \cdot (a \wedge b) = a \wedge b \leq b$  then  $e \leq (a \wedge b) \rightarrow b$ , which is 1). Taking into account the definition of  $a \rightarrow b$  we obtain  $a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq b$ , which is 3). Besides, since  $(c \wedge e) \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq e \cdot (a \rightarrow b) = a \rightarrow b$  then  $a \rightarrow b \leq (c \wedge e) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b)$ , which is 2). Now we will see that

$$c \rightarrow (a \wedge b) = (c \rightarrow a) \wedge (c \rightarrow b).$$

By 3),  $c \cdot (c \rightarrow (a \wedge b)) \leq a \wedge b \leq a$ , so  $c \rightarrow (a \wedge b) \leq c \rightarrow a$ . In a similar way we have that  $c \rightarrow (a \wedge b) \leq c \rightarrow b$ . Thus,  $c \rightarrow (a \wedge b)$  is a lower bound of  $\{c \rightarrow a, c \rightarrow b\}$  in  $Q$ . Let  $d$  be a lower bound of  $\{c \rightarrow a, c \rightarrow b\}$  in  $Q$ . Then  $d \in Q$ ,  $d \leq c \rightarrow a$  and  $d \leq c \rightarrow b$ , so  $d \cdot c \leq a$  and  $d \cdot c \leq b$ . Hence,  $d \cdot c \leq a \wedge b$ , which implies the inequality  $d \leq c \rightarrow (a \wedge b)$ . Hence, we have proved 4).

Conversely, suppose that  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  is a commutative l-monoid and that the identities 1), ..., 6) are satisfied in  $A$ . Let  $Q = \{a \in A : e \rightarrow a = a\}$  and  $a, b, c \in A$ . It follows from 3) that

$$1) \ e \rightarrow a \leq a.$$

It follows from 4) that

II) if  $a \leq b$  then  $c \rightarrow a \leq c \rightarrow b$ .

We also have that

III) if  $a \leq b$  then  $a \cdot c \leq b \cdot c$ .

Suppose that  $q, r \in Q$ . It follows from I) and II) that  $q = e \rightarrow q \leq e \rightarrow (q \vee r) \leq q \vee r$ . By the same reason,  $r \leq e \rightarrow (q \vee r) \leq q \vee r$ . Thus,  $q \vee r = e \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ , i.e.,  $q \vee r \in Q$ . By 4) we also have that  $q \wedge r \in Q$ . By 1) and I) we have that  $e \rightarrow e = e$ , so  $e \in Q$ . By 5) we have that  $e \rightarrow (q \cdot r) = q \cdot r$ , so  $q \cdot r \in Q$ . Hence,  $Q$  is a subalgebra of  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$ .

Let  $a, b \in A$ . By I) and 2) we have that  $e \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b) \leq a \rightarrow b \leq e \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b)$ , so  $e \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b) = a \rightarrow b$ . Hence,  $a \rightarrow b \in Q$ .

Finally, let  $a, b \in A$  and  $q \in Q$ . Assume that  $a \cdot q \leq b$ . It follows from 6) and II) that  $q = e \rightarrow q \leq a \rightarrow (a \cdot q) \leq a \rightarrow b$ , so  $q \leq a \rightarrow b$ . Now assume that  $q \leq a \rightarrow b$ . Hence, by III) and 3),  $a \cdot q \leq a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq b$ . Thus,  $a \cdot q \leq b$ . Therefore,  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is an srl-monoid.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *The class SR is a variety.*

It is interesting to note that if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is an algebra of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$  such that  $(A, \wedge, \vee)$  is a lattice,  $(A, \cdot, e)$  is a monoid and  $\cdot$  is a monotone map then the following two conditions are equivalent:

- 1)  $a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq b$  for every  $a, b \in A$ .
- 2) For every  $a, b, c \in A$ , if  $a \leq b \rightarrow c$  then  $b \cdot a \leq c$ .

This property is a particular case of [1, Proposition 1.1]. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 1 that condition 2) previously mentioned is satisfied in any srl-monoid.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  be an srl-monoid.*

*The following conditions are satisfied for every  $a, b, c \in A$ :*

- 1)  $(a \vee b) \rightarrow c = (a \rightarrow c) \wedge (b \rightarrow c)$ ,
- 2)  $(a \rightarrow b) \cdot (b \rightarrow c) \leq a \rightarrow c$ ,
- 3)  $e \leq a \rightarrow a$ ,
- 4)  $a \leq b$  if and only if  $e \leq a \rightarrow b$ ,
- 5)  $e \rightarrow a \leq a$ ,
- 6)  $e \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b) = a \rightarrow b$ ,
- 7)  $e \rightarrow a \leq b \rightarrow (a \cdot b)$ .

*Proof.* 1) Since  $a \cdot ((a \vee b) \rightarrow c) \leq (a \vee b) \cdot ((a \vee b) \rightarrow c) \leq c$  then  $(a \vee b) \rightarrow c \leq a \rightarrow c$ . Similarly,  $(a \vee b) \rightarrow c \leq b \rightarrow c$ . Thus,  $(a \vee b) \rightarrow c$  is a lower bound of  $\{a \rightarrow c, b \rightarrow c\}$  in  $Q$ . Let  $d$  be a lower bound of  $\{a \rightarrow c, b \rightarrow c\}$  in  $Q$ , so  $d \in Q$ ,  $d \leq a \rightarrow c$  and  $d \leq b \rightarrow c$ , so  $d \cdot a \leq c$  and  $d \cdot b \leq c$ . Hence,  $d \cdot (a \vee b) = (d \cdot a) \vee (d \cdot b) \leq c$ . Then  $d \leq (a \vee b) \rightarrow c$ . Thus,  $(a \vee b) \rightarrow c = (a \rightarrow c) \wedge (b \rightarrow c)$ .

2) Since  $a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq b$  and  $b \cdot (b \rightarrow c) \leq c$  then  $a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \cdot (b \rightarrow c) \leq b \cdot (b \rightarrow c) \leq c$ . But  $(a \rightarrow b) \cdot (b \rightarrow c) \in Q$ , so  $(a \rightarrow b) \cdot (b \rightarrow c) \leq a \rightarrow c$ .

3) The inequality  $e \leq a \rightarrow a$  follows from that  $e \in Q$  and  $e \cdot a = a \leq a$ .

4) Suppose  $a \leq b$ . Then  $a \rightarrow b \geq b \rightarrow b$ . But  $b \rightarrow b \geq e$ , so  $e \leq a \rightarrow b$ . Conversely, assume that  $e \leq a \rightarrow b$ . Hence,  $a = a \cdot e \leq a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq b$ . Then  $a \leq b$ .

5) The inequality  $e \rightarrow a \leq a$  follows that  $e \rightarrow a = e \cdot (e \rightarrow a) \leq a$ .

6) It is immediate that the equality  $e \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b) = a \rightarrow b$  is satisfied.

7) Finally we will see that  $e \rightarrow a \leq b \rightarrow (a \cdot b)$ . First note that  $e \rightarrow a \leq b \rightarrow (b \cdot (e \rightarrow a))$ . Since  $e \rightarrow a \leq a$  then  $b \cdot (e \rightarrow a) \leq a \cdot b$ , so  $b \rightarrow (b \cdot (e \rightarrow a)) \leq b \rightarrow (a \cdot b)$ . Therefore,  $e \rightarrow a \leq b \rightarrow (a \cdot b)$ .  $\square$

Let  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  be an algebra of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$ . For every  $a \in A$  we define

$$\square(a) = e \rightarrow a.$$

In the proof of the following corollary we will use Theorem 1 and Lemma 3.

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  be an algebra of type  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$ .*

*Then  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is an srl-monoid if and only if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, e)$  is an l-commutative monoid and the following identities are satisfied:*

1)  $z \rightarrow (x \wedge y) = (z \rightarrow x) \wedge (z \rightarrow y),$

2)  $(x \vee y) \rightarrow z = (x \rightarrow z) \wedge (y \rightarrow z),$

3)  $(x \rightarrow y) \cdot (y \rightarrow z) \leq x \rightarrow z,$

4)  $e \leq x \rightarrow x,$

5)  $x \cdot (x \rightarrow y) \leq y,$

6)  $x \rightarrow y \leq (z \wedge e) \rightarrow (x \rightarrow y),$

7)  $\square(\square(x) \cdot \square(y)) = \square(x) \cdot \square(y),$

8)  $\square(y) \leq x \rightarrow (x \cdot \square(y)).$

*Proof.* After Theorem 1 and Lemma 3 the implication from left to right is immediate. Conversely, notice that conditions 1), 5), 6), 7) and 8) are exactly conditions 4), 3), 2), 5) and 6) of Theorem 1, so we only need to prove the first equation of Theorem 1. Let  $a, b \in A$ . Since  $a \wedge b \leq b$  then  $e \leq b \rightarrow b \leq (a \wedge b) \rightarrow b$ , so  $e \leq (a \wedge b) \rightarrow b$ .  $\square$

In commutative residuated lattices it holds that

$$a \cdot b \leq c \text{ if and only if } a \leq b \rightarrow c. \quad (1)$$

Now we will prove a weak version of (1) in the framework of srl-monoids.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, b, c \in A$ . The following conditions are true:*

1) *If  $a \leq b \rightarrow c$  then  $a \cdot b \leq c$ .*

2) *If  $a \cdot b \leq c$  then  $\square(a) \leq b \rightarrow c$ .*

*Proof.* Condition 1) is immediate. In order to prove 2), suppose that  $a \cdot b \leq c$ . Then, by 7) of Lemma 3,  $\square(a) \leq b \rightarrow (a \cdot b) \leq b \rightarrow c$ , so  $\square(a) \leq b \rightarrow c$ .  $\square$



### 3 Strongly convex subalgebras

In this section we prove that for every  $A \in \text{SR}$  there exists an order isomorphism between the lattice of congruences of  $A$  and the lattice of strongly convex subalgebras of  $A$ .

We start with some preliminary results.

Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ . We write  $\text{Con}(A)$  for the set of congruences of  $A$ . If  $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$  and  $a \in A$ , we write  $a/\theta$  for the equivalence class of  $a$ . Let  $H$  be a *convex subalgebra* of  $A$ , that is, a subalgebra of  $A$  such that for every  $a, b, c \in A$ , if  $a, b \in H$  and  $a \leq c \leq b$  then  $c \in H$ . We write  $\text{Sub}_C(A)$  for the set of convex subalgebras of  $A$ .

The following definition will play a fundamental role in this section.

**Definition 3.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ . A subset  $H$  of  $A$  is said to be a strongly convex subalgebra of  $A$  if it is a convex subalgebra of  $A$  such that for every  $a \in A$  and  $h \in H$  such that  $a \cdot h \leq e \leq h \rightarrow a$  it holds that  $a \in H$ .*

We write  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  for the set of strongly convex subalgebras of  $A$ .

The following question naturally arises: is there any  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $H \in \text{Sub}_C(A)$  such that  $H \notin \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ ? The answer is positive. Indeed, consider Example 2. We have that  $\{0, e\} \in \text{Sub}_C(A)$  and this is not a strongly convex subalgebra because  $1 \cdot 0 \leq e \leq 0 \rightarrow 1$  but  $1 \notin H$ .

The aim of this section is to show that there exists an order isomorphism between  $\text{Con}(A)$  and  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ . If  $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ , then  $e/\theta \in \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ . The convexity of  $e/\theta$  follows from the known fact that the equivalence blocks of a lattice congruence are convex sublattices. We now prove that  $e/\theta$  is a subalgebra. To this end, let  $a, b \in e/\theta$ , i.e.,  $(a, e), (b, e) \in \theta$ . It is immediate that  $(a \wedge b, e), (a \vee b, e)$  and  $(a \cdot b, e)$  are elements of  $\theta$ . Since  $e \rightarrow e = e$  we also have that  $(a \rightarrow b, e) \in \theta$ . Thus,  $e/\theta$  is a convex subalgebra of  $A$ .

Finally we will see that  $e/\theta$  is a strongly convex subalgebra of  $A$ . In order to show this, let  $h \in e/\theta$  and  $a \in A$  such that  $a \cdot h \leq e \leq h \rightarrow a$ , i.e.,  $a \cdot h \leq e$  and  $h \leq a$ . Since  $(h, e) \in \theta$  then  $(a \cdot h \vee e, a \vee e) \in \theta$ , i.e.,  $(e, a \vee e) \in \theta$ . Again, since  $(h, e) \in \theta$  then  $(h \vee a, e \vee a) \in \theta$ , i.e.,  $(a, e \vee a) \in \theta$ . It follows from the symmetry and the transitivity of  $\theta$  that  $(a, e) \in \theta$ , which was our aim.  $\square$

Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, b \in A$ . We define  $s(a, b) = (a \rightarrow b) \wedge (b \rightarrow a) \wedge e$ .

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ . Then  $(a, b) \in \theta$  if and only if  $s(a, b) \in e/\theta$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ . Suppose that  $(a, b) \in \theta$ . In consequence,  $((a \rightarrow a) \wedge e, (a \rightarrow b) \wedge e) \in \theta$ , i.e.,  $(e, (a \rightarrow b) \wedge e) \in \theta$ . By the same reason,  $(e, (b \rightarrow a) \wedge e) \in \theta$ . This implies that  $(e, s(a, b)) \in \theta$ , so  $s(a, b) \in e/\theta$ . Conversely, suppose that  $s(a, b) \in e/\theta$ . Hence,  $(a, a \cdot s(a, b)) \in \theta$  and  $(b, b \cdot s(a, b)) \in \theta$ . Let  $x = a \cdot s(a, b)$  and  $y = b \cdot s(a, b)$ . It is immediate that  $x \leq b$  and  $y \leq a$ , i.e.,  $x = x \wedge b$  and  $y = y \wedge a$ . Since  $(x, a) \in \theta$  and  $(y, b) \in \theta$  then  $(x \wedge b, a \wedge b) \in \theta$  and  $(y \wedge a, b \wedge a) \in \theta$ , i.e.,  $(x, a \wedge b) \in \theta$  and  $(y, a \wedge b) \in \theta$ . Thus,  $(x, y) \in \theta$ . Therefore,  $(a, b) \in \theta$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $\theta, \psi \in \text{Con}(A)$ . Then  $\theta \subseteq \psi$  if and only if  $e/\theta \subseteq e/\psi$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $\theta, \psi \in \text{Con}(A)$ . It is immediate that if  $\theta \subseteq \psi$  then  $e/\theta \subseteq e/\psi$ . The converse of this property follows from a straightforward computation based in Lemma 6.  $\square$

Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $H \in \text{Sub}_C(A)$ . We define the following subset of  $A \times A$ :

$$\theta_H = \{(a, b) \in A \times A : a \cdot h \leq b \text{ and } b \cdot h \leq a \text{ for some } h \in H\}.$$

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ ,  $H \in \text{Sub}_C(A)$  and  $a, b \in A$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- a)  $(a, b) \in \theta_H$ .
- b)  $(a \rightarrow b) \wedge e \in H$  and  $(b \rightarrow a) \wedge e \in H$ .
- c)  $s(a, b) \in H$ .
- d) *There exists  $h \in H$  such that  $h \leq a \rightarrow b$  and  $h \leq b \rightarrow a$ .*

*Proof.* a)  $\Rightarrow$  b). Suppose that  $(a, b) \in \theta_H$ , so there exists  $h \in H$  such that  $a \cdot h \leq b$  and  $b \cdot h \leq a$ . It follows from Proposition 1 that  $\Box(h) \leq a \rightarrow b$  and  $\Box(h) \leq b \rightarrow a$ . Since  $h \in H$  then  $\Box(h) \in H$  and  $\Box(h) \wedge e \in H$ . Thus,  $\Box(h) \wedge e \leq (a \rightarrow b) \wedge e \leq e$ . Similarly,  $\Box(h) \wedge e \leq (b \rightarrow a) \wedge e \leq e$ . By the convexity of  $H$  we have that  $(a \rightarrow b) \wedge e \in H$  and  $(b \rightarrow a) \wedge e \in H$ .

b)  $\Rightarrow$  c). Now assume that  $(a \rightarrow b) \wedge e \in H$  and  $(b \rightarrow a) \wedge e \in H$ . Then  $(a \rightarrow b) \wedge e \wedge (b \rightarrow a) \wedge e \in H$ , i.e.,  $s(a, b) \in H$ .

c)  $\Rightarrow$  d). Suppose that  $s(a, b) \in H$ . Hence,  $s(a, b) \leq a \rightarrow b$  and  $s(a, b) \leq b \rightarrow a$ .

d)  $\Rightarrow$  a). Finally, suppose that there exists  $h \in H$  such that  $h \leq a \rightarrow b$  and  $h \leq b \rightarrow a$ . Thus,  $a \cdot h \leq a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq b$ . Analogously,  $b \cdot h \leq a$ . Hence,  $(a, b) \in \theta_H$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ . If  $H \in \text{Sub}_C(A)$ , then  $\theta_H \in \text{Con}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* It is routine to prove that  $\theta_H$  is an equivalence relation.

Let  $(a, b), (c, d) \in \theta_H$ . First we will show that  $(a \cdot c, b \cdot d), (a \vee c, b \vee d) \in \theta_H$ . Since  $(a, b), (c, d) \in \theta_H$  then it follows from Lemma 8 that there exist  $h, j \in H$  such that  $h \leq a \rightarrow b$ ,  $h \leq b \rightarrow a$ ,  $j \leq c \rightarrow d$  and  $j \leq d \rightarrow c$ . Clearly we can replace  $h$  and  $j$  by  $k = h \wedge j$ . Then

$$(a \cdot c) \cdot k^2 = (a \cdot k) \cdot (c \cdot k) \leq b \cdot d,$$

i.e.,  $(a \cdot c) \cdot k^2 \leq b \cdot d$ . In a similar way we can show that  $(b \cdot d) \cdot k^2 \leq a \cdot c$ , so  $(a \cdot c, b \cdot d) \in \theta_H$ . Besides

$$(a \vee c) \cdot k = (a \cdot k) \vee (c \cdot k) \leq b \vee d.$$

Analogously we can show that  $(b \vee d) \cdot k \leq a \vee c$ , so  $(a \vee c, b \vee d) \in \theta_H$ . Besides,

$$k \cdot (a \rightarrow c) \cdot k \leq (b \rightarrow a) \cdot (a \rightarrow c) \cdot (c \rightarrow d) \leq b \rightarrow d.$$

Hence,  $(a \rightarrow c) \cdot k^2 \leq b \rightarrow d$ . The inequality  $(b \rightarrow d) \cdot k^2 \leq a \rightarrow c$  follows in like manner. Thus,  $(a \rightarrow c, b \rightarrow d) \in \theta_H$ .

Finally we will show that  $(a \wedge c, b \wedge d) \in \theta_H$ . In order to prove it, note that

$$\begin{aligned} (a \wedge c) \rightarrow (b \wedge d) &= ((a \wedge c) \rightarrow b) \wedge ((a \wedge c) \rightarrow d) \\ &\geq (a \rightarrow b) \wedge (c \rightarrow d) \\ &\geq k. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously,  $(b \wedge d) \rightarrow (a \wedge c) \geq k$ . Therefore,  $(a \wedge c, b \wedge d) \in \theta_H$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 10.** *If  $A$  is a member of  $\text{SR}$  then  $\text{Con}(A)$  is order isomorphic to  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ . The order isomorphism is established via the assignments  $\theta \mapsto e/\theta$  and  $H \mapsto \theta_H$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $F : \text{Con}(A) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  and  $G : \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A) \rightarrow \text{Con}(A)$  be the maps given by  $F(\theta) = e/\theta$  and  $G(H) = \theta_H$  respectively. The maps  $F$  and  $G$  are well-defined by Lemmas 5 and 9 respectively.

Let  $\theta \in \text{Con}(A)$ . It follows from Lemma 6 that  $\theta = \theta_{e/\theta}$ , i.e.,  $G(F(\theta)) = \theta$ . Let  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ . We will prove that  $H = e/\theta_H$ . Let  $a \in H$ . Since  $H$  is a subalgebra of  $A$  and  $a \in H$  then  $a \rightarrow e, e \rightarrow a, e \in H$ . Hence,  $s(a, e) \in H$ , so it follows from Lemma 8 that  $(a, e) \in \theta_H$ , i.e.,  $a \in e/\theta_H$ . Thus,  $H \subseteq e/\theta_H$ . Conversely, let  $a \in e/\theta_H$ , i.e.,  $(a, e) \in \theta_H$ . Hence, there exists  $h \in H$  such that  $a \cdot h \leq e$  and  $h \leq a$ . Since  $H$  is a strongly convex subalgebra of  $A$  we obtain that  $a \in H$ . Thus,  $e/\theta_H \subseteq H$ . We have proved the equality  $e/\theta_H = H$ , i.e.,  $F(G(H)) = H$ . Hence,  $F$  and  $G$  are bijective maps.

It follows from Corollary 7 that  $F$  is an order isomorphism. A straightforward computation based in Lemma 8 shows that if  $H_1, H_2 \in \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  then  $H_1 \subseteq H_2$  if and only if  $\theta_{H_1} \subseteq \theta_{H_2}$ . Therefore,  $G$  is also an order isomorphism.  $\square$

Let  $(A, \leq)$  be a poset and  $H \subseteq A$ . We say that  $H$  is an *upset* if for every  $a, b \in A$ , if  $a \leq b$  and  $a \in H$  then  $b \in H$ .

The following definition will be used in order to give a simpler description of the congruences of the algebras of  $\text{iSR}$ .

**Definition 4.** *Let  $A \in \text{iSR}$  and  $H \subseteq A$ . We say that  $H$  is a filter if  $1 \in H$ ,  $H$  is an upset and  $a \cdot b \in H$  whenever  $a, b \in H$ . If in addition  $H$  is closed under  $\square$  we say that  $H$  is a  $\square$ -filter.*

For  $A \in \text{iSR}$  we write  $\text{Fil}(A)$  for the set of filters of  $A$  and  $\square\text{Fil}(A)$  for the set of  $\square$ -filters of  $A$ .

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $A \in \text{iSR}$  and  $H \subseteq A$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1)  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ .
- 2)  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ .
- 3)  $H \in \square\text{Fil}(A)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \text{iSR}$  and  $H \subseteq A$ . It is immediate that if  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  then  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ . Conversely, let  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ ,  $a \in A$  and  $h \in H$  such that  $a \cdot h \leq 1$  and  $h \leq a$  (in this case the first inequality is redundant). In particular,

$h \leq a \leq 1$ . Since  $h, 1 \in H$  then it follows from the convexity of  $H$  that  $a \in H$ . Hence,  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ . We have proved the equivalence between 1) and 2).

Now we will show the equivalence between 2) and 3). Let  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ . In order to show that  $H$  is an upset, let  $h \in H$  and  $a \in A$  such that  $h \leq a$ . Since  $a \leq 1$ , it follows from the convexity of  $H$  that  $a \in H$ . Thus,  $H \in \square\text{Fil}(A)$ . Conversely, suppose that  $H \in \square\text{Fil}(A)$ . In order to show that  $H$  is a subalgebra of  $A$ , notice that for  $a, b \in H$  we have that  $a \cdot b \leq a \wedge b$  and  $a \cdot b \leq a \vee b$ , so the fact that  $H$  is an upset implies that  $a \wedge b \in H$  and  $a \vee b \in H$ . Besides,  $\square(b) \leq a \rightarrow b$ . Since  $\square(b) \in H$  and  $H$  is an upset,  $a \rightarrow b \in H$ . Hence,  $H$  is a subalgebra of  $A$ . Finally, notice that if  $h \leq a \leq k$  for  $a \in A$  and  $h, k \in H$  then  $a \in H$  because  $H$  is an upset. Therefore,  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ .  $\square$

The following result follows from Theorem 10 and Lemma 11.

**Corollary 12.** *If  $A \in \text{iSR}$  then  $\text{Con}(A)$  is order isomorphic to  $\square\text{Fil}(A)$ . The order isomorphism is established via the assignments  $\theta \mapsto 1/\theta$  and  $H \mapsto \theta_H$ .*

In what follows we will apply Theorem 10 for the particular cases of CRL and SRL respectively.

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $A \in \text{CRL}$ . Then  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A) = \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \text{CRL}$ . Let  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ ,  $a \in A$  and  $h \in H$  such that  $a \cdot h \leq e \leq h \rightarrow a$ , i.e.,  $h \leq a \leq h \rightarrow e$ . It follows from the convexity of  $H$  that  $a \in H$ , so  $H \in \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ . Thus,  $\text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A) \subseteq \text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$ . Since  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A) \subseteq \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$  then  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A) = \text{Sub}_{\text{C}}(A)$ .  $\square$

It follows from Lemma 13 that Theorem 10 generalizes [11, Theorem 2.3], which establishes an order isomorphism between the lattice of congruences and the lattice of convex subalgebras of each commutative residuated lattice. Also note that if  $A$  is an integral commutative residuated lattice then  $\text{Fil}(A) = \square\text{Fil}(A)$ , so it follows from Lemma 11 that there exists an order isomorphism between the lattice of congruences and the lattice of filters of each integral commutative residuated lattice.

Let  $A \in \text{SRL}$  and  $H$  a subset of  $A$ . We say that  $H$  is a *lattice filter* if  $1 \in H$ ,  $H$  is an upset and  $a \wedge b \in H$  whenever  $a, b \in H$ . We say that  $H$  is an *open lattice filter* if it is a lattice filter such that  $\square(a) \in H$  whenever  $a \in H$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $A \in \text{SRL}$  (seen as an algebra of SR). Then  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  coincides with the set of open lattice filters of  $A$ .*

*Proof.* It is a direct consequence of Lemma 11.  $\square$

It follows from Proposition 2 that Theorem 10 also generalizes [7, Theorem 2] (see also [4, Theorem 6.12]), which establishes an order isomorphism between the lattice of open lattice filters and the lattice of congruences of each subresiduated lattice.

## 4 The strongly convex subalgebra generated by a subset of the negative cone and some applications

In this section we give a description of the strongly convex subalgebra generated by a subset of the negative cone of any srl-monoid. We apply this result in order to give some properties of the lattice of strongly convex subalgebras of any srl-monoid.

Let  $\mathbb{N}$  be the set of natural numbers. Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ ,  $a \in A$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We define  $a^0 = e$  and  $a^{n+1} = a \cdot a^n$ . We also define  $\square^0(a) = a$ ,  $\square^1(a) = \square(a)$  and for  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\square^{n+1}(a) = \square(a) \cdot \square^n(a)$ .

The following lemma follows from a straightforward computation.

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ . Then*

- 1)  $\square(\square(a_1) \cdot \square(a_2) \cdot \dots \cdot \square(a_n)) = \square(a_1) \cdot \square(a_2) \cdot \dots \cdot \square(a_n)$ .
- 2)  $\square(a_1) \cdot \square(a_2) \cdot \dots \cdot \square(a_n) \leq a \rightarrow (a \cdot \square(a_1) \cdot \square(a_2) \cdot \dots \cdot \square(a_n))$ .

Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $H$  a subalgebra of  $A$ . We define  $H^- = \{a \in H : a \leq e\}$ . This set is called the *negative cone* of  $H$ .

**Remark 2.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ ,  $a \in A^-$  and  $n_1, n_2, m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . A direct computation shows that if  $n_1 \geq n_2$  and  $m_1 \geq m_2$  then  $a^{m_1} \leq a^{m_2}$  and  $\square^{n_1}(a^{m_1}) \leq \square^{n_2}(a^{m_2})$ .*

Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ . For any  $S \subseteq A$  we will let  $\text{C}[S]$  denote the smallest strongly convex subalgebra containing  $S$  and will let  $\text{C}[a] = \text{C}[\{a\}]$ . In what follows, we will let  $\langle S \rangle$  denote the submonoid of  $(A, \cdot, e)$  generated by  $S$ .

The following result is a generalization of [11, Lemma 2.7].

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $S \subseteq A^-$ . Then*

$$\text{C}[S] = \{x \in A : \square^n(h) \leq x \text{ and } x \cdot \square^n(h) \leq e, \text{ for some } h \in \langle S \rangle \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

*Proof.* Note that if  $a \in A^-$ , then  $\square(a) \in A^-$ . Let  $S \subseteq A^-$ . Then,  $\langle S \rangle \subseteq A^-$ . Put

$$K = \{x \in A : \square^n(h) \leq x \text{ and } x \cdot \square^n(h) \leq e, \text{ for some } h \in \langle S \rangle \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

It is clear that  $S \subseteq K \subseteq \text{C}[S]$ . It will suffice to show that  $K$  is a strongly convex subalgebra of  $A$ . Let  $a, b \in K$ . Thus, there are  $h_a, h_b \in \langle S \rangle$  and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\square^n(h_a) \leq a$ ,  $a \cdot \square^n(h_a) \leq e$ ,  $\square^m(h_b) \leq b$  and  $b \cdot \square^m(h_b) \leq e$ . We may replace  $h_a$  and  $h_b$  by  $h = h_a \cdot h_b$ , and  $n, m$  by  $k = \max\{n, m, 1\}$ .

On the other hand,  $\square^k(h) \leq a \wedge b \leq a \vee b$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \square^k(h) \cdot (a \wedge b) &\leq \square^k(h) \cdot (a \vee b) \\ &= (\square^k(h) \cdot a) \vee (\square^k(h) \cdot b) \\ &\leq e, \end{aligned}$$

so  $K$  is closed under meets and joins. Besides,

$$\square^{2k}(h) = \square^k(h) \cdot \square^k(h) \leq a \cdot b$$

and

$$\square^{2k}(h) \cdot (a \cdot b) = (\square^k(h) \cdot a) \cdot (\square^k(h) \cdot b) \leq e,$$

so  $K$  is also closed under product.

Now we will show that  $K$  is closed under the arrow. First note that

$$a \cdot \square^{2k}(h) = (a \cdot \square^k(h)) \cdot \square^k(h) \leq \square^k(h) \leq b,$$

so

$$a \rightarrow (a \cdot \square^{2k}(h)) \leq a \rightarrow b. \quad (2)$$

Besides, it follows from Lemma 14 that

$$\square^{2k}(h) \leq a \rightarrow (a \cdot \square^{2k}(h)). \quad (3)$$

Thus, it follows from (2) and (3) that

$$\square^{2k}(h) \leq a \rightarrow b. \quad (4)$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \square^{2k}(h) \cdot (a \rightarrow b) &= \square^k(h) \cdot \square^k(h) \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \\ &\leq \square^k(h) \cdot a \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \\ &\leq \square^k(h) \cdot b \\ &\leq e, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\square^{2k}(h) \cdot (a \rightarrow b) \leq e. \quad (5)$$

Hence, it follows from (4) and (5) that  $a \rightarrow b \in K$ . Thus,  $K$  is a subalgebra of  $A$ .

Finally we will see that  $K$  is a strongly convex subalgebra of  $A$ . The set  $K$  is convex because if  $a \leq x \leq b$  then  $\square^k(h) \leq a \leq x$  and  $a \cdot \square^k(h) \leq x \cdot \square^k(h) \leq b \cdot \square^k(h) \leq e$ , so  $\square^k(h) \leq x$  and  $x \cdot \square^k(h) \leq e$ , i.e.,  $x \in K$ . We have proved the convexity of  $K$ . Consider  $x \in A$  such that  $x \cdot a \leq e$  and  $a \leq x$  for some  $a \in K$ . Since  $\square^k(h) \leq a \leq x$  then  $\square^k(h) \leq x$ . Besides,  $x \cdot \square^k(h) \leq a \cdot x \leq e$ , so  $x \cdot \square^k(h) \leq e$ . Then  $x \in K$ . Therefore,  $K$  is a strongly convex subalgebra of  $A$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 16.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a \in A^-$ . Then*

$$C[a] = \{x \in A : \square^n(a^m) \leq x \text{ and } x \cdot \square^n(a^m) \leq e, \text{ for some } n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

*Moreover, if  $x \in A^-$  then  $x \in C[a]$  if and only if there are  $n, m$  such that  $\square^n(a^m) \leq x$ .*

**Remark 3.** *It follows from Remark 2 that the conclusions of Corollary 16 also hold by considering  $n = m$ .*

Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $S \subseteq A \times A$ . We write  $\theta(S)$  for the smallest congruence  $\theta$  such that  $S \subseteq \theta$ . If  $S = \{(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)\}$  we write  $\theta((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n))$  in place of  $\theta(\{(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)\})$ . If  $S = \{(a, b)\}$  we write  $\theta(a, b)$  in place of  $\theta(\{(a, b)\})$ .

**Lemma 17.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, b \in A$ . Then  $e/\theta(a, b) = C[s(a, b)]$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, b \in A$ . Taking into account Theorem 10 we have that

$$e/\theta(a, b) = \bigcap_{(a,b) \in \theta} e/\theta = \bigcap_{s(a,b) \in e/\theta} e/\theta = C[s(a, b)].$$

□

Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ ,  $S \subseteq A^-$  and  $T \subseteq A^-$ . Notice that it follows from Lemma 15 that if  $S \subseteq T$  then  $C[S] \subseteq C[T]$ .

**Theorem 18.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ . Then  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  is an algebraic and distributive lattice such that for every  $a, b \in A^-$  the equality  $C[a \wedge b] = C[a] \vee C[b]$  is satisfied. Moreover, the compact elements of  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  are the elements of the form  $C[a]$  for  $a \in A^-$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ . It follows from Theorem 10 that  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  is an algebraic and distributive lattice.

Let  $a, b \in A^-$ . Notice that  $C[a] \vee C[b] = C[\{a, b\}]$ . In what follows we will see that  $C[a \wedge b] = C[\{a, b\}]$ . Since  $a \wedge b \in C[\{a, b\}]$  then  $C[a \wedge b] \subseteq C[\{a, b\}]$ . Conversely, since  $a \wedge b \leq a \leq e$  and  $a \wedge b \leq b \leq e$  then  $a \in C[a \wedge b]$  and  $b \in C[a \wedge b]$ , i.e.,  $\{a, b\} \subseteq C[a \wedge b]$ . Hence,  $C[\{a, b\}] \subseteq C[a \wedge b]$ . Therefore,

$$C[a \wedge b] = C[a] \vee C[b]. \quad (6)$$

It is known that the compact elements of  $\text{Con}(A)$  are the finitely generated members  $\theta((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n))$  of  $\text{Con}(A)$ , so the compact elements of  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  are that of the form  $e/\theta((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n))$ . But

$$\theta((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)) = \theta(a_1, b_1) \vee \dots \vee \theta(a_n, b_n),$$

so it follows from Theorem 10, Lemma 17 and (6) that

$$e/\theta((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)) = C[s(a_1, b_1) \wedge \dots \wedge s(a_n, b_n)].$$

Therefore, the compact elements of  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  are that of the form  $C[a]$  for  $a \in A^-$ . □

It is natural to ask the following question: for every  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, b \in A^-$ , does it hold the equality  $C[a \vee b] = C[a] \cap C[b]$ ? The answer is negative. Indeed, let  $A$  be the bounded lattice of four elements, where 0 is the bottom, 1 is the top and  $a, b$  are incomparable elements. Let  $Q = \{0, 1\}$ . We have that  $(A, Q)$  is a subresiduated lattice, where the binary operation  $\rightarrow$  is determined by

$\rightarrow$	0	a	b	1
0	1	1	1	1
a	0	1	0	1
b	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	1

Thus, this subresiduated lattice can be seen as an algebra of  $\text{SR}$ . Moreover, for  $c \in \{0, a, b, 1\}$  we have that  $C[c]$  is the open lattice filter generated by  $c$ , i.e., the least open lattice filters (with respect to the inclusion) which contains to

the element  $c$ . It is immediate that  $C[1] = \{1\}$  and  $C[a] = C[b] = \{0, a, b, 1\}$ , so  $C[a \vee b] \neq C[a] \cap C[b]$ .

We finalize this section with a characterization of the principal congruences of the algebras of SR.

**Theorem 19.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, b \in A$ . Then  $(x, y) \in \theta(a, b)$  if and only if there exist natural numbers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\square^m(s(a, b)^n) \leq s(x, y)$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 6, Corollary 16 and Lemma 17.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** *It follows from Theorem 19 and Remark 3 that if  $A \in \text{SR}$  and  $a, b \in A$ ,  $(x, y) \in \theta(a, b)$  if and only if there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\square^n(s(a, b)^n) \leq s(x, y)$ .*

## 5 The variety generated by the totally ordered algebras of SR

We write  $\text{SR}^c$  for the subvariety of SR generated by its totally ordered members. The aim of this section is to give alternative equational basis for the variety  $\text{SR}^c$ .

Consider the following identities:

$$C_1 \quad e \leq (x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x),$$

$$C_2 \quad e \wedge (x \vee y) = (e \wedge x) \vee (e \wedge y),$$

$$E_1 \quad (x \wedge y) \rightarrow z = (x \rightarrow z) \vee (y \rightarrow z),$$

$$E_2 \quad z \rightarrow (x \vee y) = (z \rightarrow x) \vee (z \rightarrow y).$$

**Lemma 20.** *Let  $A \in \text{SR}$ .*

- a) *If  $A$  satisfies  $E_1$  or  $E_2$  then  $A$  satisfies  $C_1$ .*
- b) *If  $A$  satisfies  $C_1$  then for every  $a, b \in A^-$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(a \vee b)^{2^m} = a^{2^m} \vee b^{2^m}$ .*
- c) *If  $A$  satisfies  $E_2$  then for every  $a, b \in A^-$  and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\square^{2^n}((a \vee b)^{2^m}) = \square^{2^n}(a^{2^m}) \vee \square^{2^n}(b^{2^m})$ .*

*Proof.* a) First suppose that  $A$  satisfies  $E_1$  and let  $a, b \in A$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} e &\leq (a \wedge b) \rightarrow (a \wedge b) \\ &= (a \rightarrow (a \wedge b)) \vee (b \rightarrow (a \wedge b)) \\ &\leq (a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a), \end{aligned}$$

so  $e \leq (a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a)$ . Similarly it can be proved that if  $A$  satisfies  $E_2$  then  $A$  satisfies  $C_1$ .

b) Assume that  $A$  satisfies  $C_1$  and let  $a, b \in A^-$ . Then

$$(a \vee b)^2 = a^2 \vee b^2 \vee (a \cdot b).$$



Since  $e \leq (a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a)$  then

$$\begin{aligned} a \cdot b &\leq [b \cdot a \cdot (a \rightarrow b)] \vee [a \cdot b \cdot (a \rightarrow b)] \\ &\leq b^2 \vee a^2, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$(a \vee b)^2 = a^2 \vee b^2. \quad (7)$$

Now suppose that  $(a \vee b)^{2^m} = a^{2^m} \vee b^{2^m}$  for some  $m$ . Since  $a^{2^m}, b^{2^m} \in A^-$  then it follows from (7) that

$$\begin{aligned} (a \vee b)^{2^{m+1}} &= [(a \vee b)^{2^m}]^2 \\ &= [a^{2^m} \vee b^{2^m}]^2 \\ &= a^{2^{m+1}} \vee b^{2^{m+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

c) Finally assume that  $A$  satisfies  $E_2$  and let  $a, b \in A^-$  and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . First we will see that  $\square((a \vee b)^{2^m}) = \square(a^{2^m}) \vee \square(b^{2^m})$ . Indeed, it follows from b) and  $E_2$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \square((a \vee b)^{2^m}) &= \square(a^{2^m} \vee b^{2^m}) \\ &= \square(a^{2^m}) \vee \square(b^{2^m}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\square((a \vee b)^{2^m}) = \square(a^{2^m}) \vee \square(b^{2^m}). \quad (8)$$

Hence, since  $\square(a^{2^m}), \square(b^{2^m}) \in A^-$ , by b) and (8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \square^{2^n}((a \vee b)^{2^m}) &= [\square(a^{2^m}) \vee \square(b^{2^m})]^{2^n} \\ &= \square^{2^n}(a^{2^m}) \vee \square^{2^n}(b^{2^m}), \end{aligned}$$

which was our aim.  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *Assume that  $A \in \text{SR}$  satisfies  $E_2$ . If  $a, b \in A^-$  then  $C[a \vee b] = C[a] \cap C[b]$ .*

*Proof.* Consider  $a, b \in A^-$ . Since  $a \leq a \vee b \leq e$  and  $b \leq a \vee b \leq e$  then  $a \vee b \in C[a] \cap C[b]$ , so  $C[a \vee b] \subseteq C[a] \cap C[b]$ . Conversely, let  $x \in C[a] \cap C[b]$ . Thus, it follows from Corollary 16 that there exist  $n_1, n_2, m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\square^{n_1}(a^{m_1}) \leq x$ ,  $\square^{n_2}(b^{m_2}) \leq x$ ,  $x \cdot \square^{n_1}(a^{m_1}) \leq e$  and  $x \cdot \square^{n_2}(b^{m_2}) \leq e$ . Take  $n = \max\{n_1, n_2, 1\}$  and  $m = \max\{m_1, m_2, 1\}$ . Hence,  $\square^n(a^m) \leq x$ ,  $x \cdot \square^n(a^m) \leq e$ ,  $\square^n(b^m) \leq x$  and  $x \cdot \square^n(b^m) \leq e$ . Moreover, since  $n \leq 2^n$  and  $m \leq 2^m$  then  $\square^{2^n}(a^{2^m}) \leq x$ ,  $x \cdot \square^{2^n}(a^{2^m}) \leq e$ ,  $\square^{2^n}(b^{2^m}) \leq x$  and  $x \cdot \square^{2^n}(b^{2^m}) \leq e$ . Then, it follows from item c) of Lemma 20 that

$$\square^{2^n}((a \vee b)^{2^m}) = \square^{2^n}(a^{2^m}) \vee \square^{2^n}(b^{2^m}),$$

so  $\square^{2^n}((a \vee b)^{2^m}) \leq x$  because  $\square^{2^n}(a^{2^m}) \leq x$  and  $\square^{2^n}(b^{2^m}) \leq x$ .

Besides,

$$\begin{aligned} x \cdot \square^{2^n}((a \vee b)^{2^m}) &= x \cdot (\square^{2^n}(a^{2^m}) \vee \square^{2^n}(b^{2^m})) \\ &= (x \cdot \square^{2^n}(a^{2^m})) \vee (x \cdot \square^{2^n}(b^{2^m})) \\ &\leq e, \end{aligned}$$

so  $x \cdot \square^{2^n}((a \vee b)^{2^m}) \leq e$ . Thus, again by Corollary 16 we get  $x \in C[a \vee b]$ . Therefore,  $C[a \vee b] = C[a] \cap C[b]$ .  $\square$

The following result follows from Theorem 18 and Lemma 21.

**Corollary 22.** *Assume that  $A \in \text{SR}$  satisfies  $E_2$ . Then  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  is an algebraic and distributive lattice whose compact elements are that of the form  $C[a]$  for  $a \in A^-$ . Moreover, the compact elements of  $\text{Sub}_{\text{SC}}(A)$  form a sublattice, with joins and meets given by the following formulas for every  $a, b \in A^-$ :*

$$C[a \wedge b] = C[a] \vee C[b] \quad \text{and} \quad C[a \vee b] = C[a] \cap C[b].$$

**Remark 5.** *The totally ordered members of  $\text{SR}$  satisfy  $E_2$ . Hence, the members of  $\text{SR}^c$  satisfy  $E_2$ .*

The structure of the proof of the following theorem is like that done for [11, Theorem 3.1]. However, by completeness we opt to give a self contained proof of it.

**Theorem 23.** *The identities  $C_2$  and  $E_2$ , together with those defining  $\text{SR}$ , form an equational basis for  $\text{SR}^c$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be denote the subvariety of  $\text{SR}$  determined by identities  $C_2$  and  $E_2$ . Since any totally ordered member of  $\text{SR}$  clearly satisfies these identities, it follows that  $\text{SR}^c \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ .

To prove the converse it will suffice to prove that every subdirectly irreducible member of  $\mathcal{V}$  is totally ordered. We prove the contrapositive. Suppose that  $A$  satisfies identities  $C_2$  and  $E_2$  but that it is not totally ordered. Let  $a$  and  $b$  incomparable elements in  $L$ , i.e.,  $e \not\leq a \rightarrow b$  and  $e \not\leq b \rightarrow a$ . Let  $u = e \wedge (a \rightarrow b)$  and  $v = e \wedge (b \rightarrow a)$ . Note that  $u \neq e$  and  $v \neq e$ . By identity  $C_2$ ,  $u \vee v = e \wedge [(a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a)]$ . Since  $A$  satisfies  $E_2$  then it follows from a) of Lemma 20 that  $A$  satisfies  $C_1$ . Thus, by identity  $C_1$ ,  $u \vee v = e$ . Hence, it follows from c) of Lemma 20 and Lemma 21 that

$$\begin{aligned} C[u] \cap C[v] &= C[u \vee v] \\ &= C[e] \\ &= \{e\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $C[u] \cap C[v] = \{e\}$  and in consequence  $\text{Con}(A)$  cannot have a monolith. Then,  $A$  is not subdirectly irreducible. Therefore,  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \text{SR}^c$ .  $\square$

The following result is similar to [11, Theorem 3.4].

**Corollary 24.** *Coupled with the identities defining  $\text{SR}$ , both  $\{E_1, C_2\}$  and  $\{C_1, C_2\}$  form alternative equational basis for  $\text{SR}^c$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be the subvariety of  $\text{SR}$  which satisfies the equations  $E_1, C_2$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  the subvariety of  $\text{SR}$  which satisfy the equations  $C_1, C_2$ . Since every chain in  $\text{SR}$  satisfies  $E_1, C_2$ , it follows from Theorem 23 that  $\text{SR}^c \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ . The inclusion  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{W}$  follows from Lemma 20.

Finally we will see that  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \text{SR}^c$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $a, b, c \in A$ . Define  $u = (a \rightarrow b) \vee (a \rightarrow c)$ . It is immediate that  $u \leq a \rightarrow (b \vee c)$ . Our aim is to show the other inequality, which is equivalent to showing that

$$e \leq [a \rightarrow (b \vee c)] \rightarrow u.$$

In order to see it, first notice that  $(b \vee c) \rightarrow b \leq [(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \rightarrow u]$  if and only if

$$[(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \cdot [(b \vee c) \rightarrow b]] \leq u.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} [(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \cdot [(b \vee c) \rightarrow b]] &\leq a \rightarrow b \\ &\leq (a \rightarrow b) \vee (a \rightarrow c) \\ &= u, \end{aligned}$$

so  $[(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \cdot [(b \vee c) \rightarrow b]] \leq u$ . Hence,

$$(b \vee c) \rightarrow b \leq [(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \rightarrow u].$$

Similarly, we have that  $[(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \cdot [(b \vee c) \rightarrow c]] \leq u$ , so

$$(b \vee c) \rightarrow c \leq [(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \rightarrow u].$$

Thus, taking into account  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} [(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \rightarrow u] &\geq [(b \vee c) \rightarrow b] \vee [(b \vee c) \rightarrow c] \\ &= [(b \rightarrow b) \wedge (c \rightarrow b)] \vee [(c \rightarrow c) \wedge (b \rightarrow c)] \\ &\geq [(e \wedge (c \rightarrow b))] \vee [e \wedge (b \rightarrow c)] \\ &= e \wedge [(c \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow c)] \\ &= e, \end{aligned}$$

so  $e \leq [(a \rightarrow (b \vee c)) \rightarrow u]$ , i.e.,  $a \rightarrow (b \vee c) \leq u$ .  $\square$

Let  $A$  be a totally ordered member of  $\mathbf{SR}$ . A straightforward computation shows that for every  $a, b, c \in A$ ,  $(a \vee b) \wedge c = (a \wedge c) \vee (b \wedge c)$  and  $a \cdot (b \wedge c) = (a \cdot b) \wedge (a \cdot c)$ . Thus, these two equations are also satisfied in  $\mathbf{SR}^c$ . The fact that the underlying lattice of an algebra of  $\mathbf{SR}^c$  is distributive can be also proved by using Corollary 24 and making the proof done in [11, Theorem 3.5].

Finally, note that Corollary 24 in the framework of commutative residuated lattices is [11, Theorem 3.4]. We also have that Corollary 24 implies that the subvariety of  $\mathbf{SRL}$  generated by its totally ordered members is characterized by the equation  $(a \rightarrow b) \vee (b \rightarrow a) = 1$  or, equivalently, by the equations  $E_1$  or  $E_2$  (these properties can be also obtained from results of [3]).

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper we have introduced and studied subresiduated lattice ordered commutative monoids (or srl-monoids for short) and integral srl-monoids. The definition of srl-monoid was motivated by the definitions of subresiduated lattice (or sr-lattice for short) [7] and commutative residuated lattice [11] respectively.

The following elemental properties establish the connection between sr-lattices, commutative residuated lattices and srl-monoids:

- If  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a sr-lattice then  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, 1)$  is a srl-monoid (in this sense we say that every sr-lattice is an srl-monoid). Moreover,  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, 0, 1)$  is a sr-lattice if and only if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, 1)$  is an integral srl-monoid and this algebra has a least element.
- If  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is a commutative residuated lattice then the algebra  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is a srl-monoid (it can be proved by defining  $Q = A$ ). Moreover,  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is a commutative residuated lattice if and only if  $(A, \wedge, \vee, \cdot, \rightarrow, e)$  is a srl-monoid and  $e \rightarrow a = a$  for every  $a \in A$ .

The aim of the present paper was to generalize results on sr-lattices and commutative residuated lattices respectively in the framework of srl-monoids. In particular, we have showed that the class of srl-monoids is a variety. We have also studied the lattice of congruences of any srl-monoid and as an application it was proved that coupled with the identities defining srl-monoids, both  $\{E_1, C_2\}$  and  $\{C_1, C_2\}$  form alternative equational basis for the the variety of srl-monoids generated by its totally ordered members, where the identities  $C_1, C_2, E_1$  and  $E_2$  are defined by

$$C_1 \quad e \leq (x \rightarrow y) \vee (y \rightarrow x),$$

$$C_2 \quad e \wedge (x \vee y) = (e \wedge x) \vee (e \wedge y),$$

$$E_1 \quad (x \wedge y) \rightarrow z = (x \rightarrow z) \vee (y \rightarrow z),$$

$$E_2 \quad z \rightarrow (x \vee y) = (z \rightarrow x) \vee (z \rightarrow y).$$

In a future paper we will study the class whose members are the  $\{\wedge, \cdot, \rightarrow, 1\}$ -subreducts of integral srl-monoids. We will also study the features of the logics semantically defined by the class previously mentioned and the variety of integral srl-monoids.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank José Luis Castiglioni for several conversations concerning the matter of this paper. This work was supported by Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (PIP 11220170100195CO and PIP 11220200100912CO, CONICET-Argentina), Universidad Nacional del Sur (PGI24/LZ18), Universidad Nacional de La Plata (11X/921) and Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica (PICT2019-2019-00882, ANPCyT-Argentina).

## References

- [1] Castiglioni J.L. and San Martín H.J., *l-Hemi-Implicative-Semilattices*. *Studia Logica* 106, 675–690 (2018).
- [2] Celani S.A., *Distributive Lattices with Fusion and Implication*. *Southeast Asian Bulletin of Mathematics* 28, 999-1010 (2004).
- [3] Celani S.A., *n-linear weakly Heyting algebras*. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 52, no. 4, 404–416 (2006).
- [4] Celani S.A. and Jansana R., *Bounded distributive lattices with strict implication*. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 51, no. 3, 219–246 (2005).

- [5] Celani S.A., Nagy A.L. and San Martín H.J., *Dualities for subresiduated lattices*. Algebra Universalis, vol. 82, no. 59 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00012-021-00752-3>.
- [6] Cignoli R., D'Ottaviano I. and Mundici D., *Algebraic Foundations of Many-valued Reasoning*. Trends in Logic-Studia Logica library (2000).
- [7] Epstein G. and Horn A., *Logics which are characterized by subresiduated lattices*. Mathematical Logic Quarterly, vol. 22, no. 1, 199–210 (1976).
- [8] Esteva F. and Godo L., *Monoidal t-norm based logic: towards a logic for left-continuous t-norms*. Fuzzy Sets and Systems, vol. 124, no. 3, 271–288 (2001).
- [9] Font J.M., *Abstract Algebraic Logic. An introductory Textbook*. Studies in Logic 60, College Publ. (2016).
- [10] Galatos N., Jipsen P., Kowalski T. and Ono H., *Residuated Lattices: An Algebraic Glimpse at Substructural Logics*. Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam ISBN:9780444521415 (2007).
- [11] Hart J., Raftery L. and Tsinakis C., *The structure of commutative residuated lattices*. Internat. J. Algebra Comput. 12, 509–524 (2002).
- [12] Jasem M., *On ideals of lattice ordered monoids*. Mathematica Bohemica, vol. 132, no. 4, 369–387 (2007).
- [13] San Martín H.J., *Compatible operations in some subvarieties of the variety of weak Heyting algebras*. In: Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the Eur. Soc. for Fuzzy Logic and Technology (EUSFLAT 2013). Advances in Intelligent Systems Research, pp. 475–480. Atlantis Press (2013).
- [14] Wille A.M., *The Variety of Lattice-Ordered Monoids Generated by the Natural Numbers*. Studia Logica 76, 275–290 (2004).

---

Juan Manuel Cornejo,  
 Departamento de Matemática,  
 Universidad Nacional del Sur,  
 and CONICET.  
 Av. Leandro N. Alem N°1253 - 2º Piso,  
 Bahía Blanca (8000),  
 Argentina.  
 jmcornejo@uns.edu.ar

---

Corresponding author:  
 Hernán Javier San Martín,  
 Departamento de Matemática,  
 Facultad de Ciencias Exactas (UNLP),  
 and CONICET.  
 Casilla de correos 172,  
 La Plata (1900), Argentina.  
 hsanmartin@mate.unlp.edu.ar

---

Valeria Anahí Sígál,  
 Departamento de Matemática,  
 Facultad de Ciencias Exactas (UNLP),  
 and CONICET.  
 Casilla de correos 172,  
 La Plata (1900), Argentina.  
 vsigal@mate.unlp.edu.ar