

# REPRESENTATIONS AND IDENTITIES OF HYPOPLACTIC MONOIDS WITH INVOLUTION

BIN BIN HAN, WEN TING ZHANG\*, AND YAN FENG LUO

ABSTRACT. Let  $(\mathbf{hypo}_n, \sharp)$  be the hypoplactic monoid of finite rank  $n$  with Schützenberger’s involution  $\sharp$ . In this paper, we exhibit a faithful representation of  $(\mathbf{hypo}_n, \sharp)$  as an involution monoid of upper triangular matrices over any semiring from a large class including the tropical semiring under the skew transposition. We then give a transparent combinatorial characterization of the word identities satisfied by  $(\mathbf{hypo}_n, \sharp)$ . Further, we prove that  $(\mathbf{hypo}_n, \sharp)$  is non-finitely based if and only if  $n = 2, 3$  and give a polynomial time algorithm to check whether a given word identity holds in  $(\mathbf{hypo}_n, \sharp)$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The plactic monoid, a kind of tableaux algebra introduced by Knuth [29] in the 1970s, was studied in detail by Lascoux and Schützenberger [44]. The plactic monoid arises from the combinatorics of Young tableaux by identifying words over a fixed ordered alphabet whenever they produce the same tableau via Schensted’s insertion algorithm [54]. Plactic-like monoids are also tableaux algebras which arise from the combinatorics of tableaux as the plactic monoid, including the hypoplactic monoid [32, 50], the stalactic monoid [20, 53], the taiga monoid [53], the sylvester monoid [19], the baxter monoid [15] and the stylic monoid [2]. These monoids have attracted much attention due to their interesting connection with combinatorics [35] and applications in symmetric functions [49], representation theory [14], Kostka-Foulkes polynomials [43, 44] and Schubert polynomials [45, 46].

Identities and varieties of algebras have long been studied, and several important questions arise in this area. An *identity basis* for an algebra  $A$  is a set of identities satisfied by  $A$  that axiomatize all identities satisfied by  $A$ . An algebra  $A$  is said to be *finitely based* if it has some finite identity basis. Otherwise, it is said to be *non-finitely based*. The *finite basis problem* for finite algebras, that is the problem of classifying algebras according to the finite basis property, is one of the most prominent research problems in universal algebra. It is known that finite groups [51], finite associative rings [30, 34], and finite lattices [48] are finitely based, but not all finite algebras are finitely based. In the 1960s, Perkins gave the first example of non-finitely based finite semigroup [52], since then the finite basis problem for semigroups has attracted much attention. Refer to the survey [57] for more information on the finite basis problem for semigroups. For a given semigroup  $S$ , the *identity checking problem*  $\text{CHECK-ID}(S)$  is the decision problem whose instance is an arbitrary identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ , and the answer to such an instance is ‘YES’ if  $S$  satisfies  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ , and ‘NO’ if it does not. For a finite semigroup  $S$ , the identity checking problem  $\text{CHECK-ID}(S)$  is always decidable but this is not necessarily true

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20M07, 20M30, 05E99, 12K10, 16Y60.

*Key words and phrases.* hypoplactic monoid, Schützenberger’s involution, representation, identity, finite basis problem.

The authors are partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 12271224, 12171213, 11771191).

\* Corresponding author.

for an infinite semigroup [47]. Studying the computational complexity of identity checking in semigroups and other ‘classical’ algebras such as groups and rings was proposed by Sapir [31, Problem 2.4], and up to now, there are many results in this area [4, 6, 13, 27, 33].

Recall that a unary operation  $*$  on a semigroup  $S$  is an *involution* if  $S$  satisfies the identities

$$(x^*)^* \approx x \quad \text{and} \quad (xy)^* \approx y^*x^*. \quad (1.1)$$

An *involution semigroup* is a pair  $(S, *)$  where  $S$  is a semigroup with involution  $*$ , and  $S$  is called the *semigroup reduct* of  $(S, *)$ . Common examples of involution semigroups include groups  $(G, {}^{-1})$  with inversion  ${}^{-1}$ , multiplicative matrix semigroups  $(M_n, {}^T)$  over any field with transposition  ${}^T$  and multiplicative matrix semigroups  $(M_n, {}^D)$  over any field with skew transposition  ${}^D$ . Over the years, the identities and varieties of involution semigroups have received less attention than that for semigroups. Since the turn of the millennium, interest in involution semigroups has significantly increased. For example, many counterintuitive results were established and examples have been found to demonstrate that an involution semigroup  $(S, *)$  and its semigroup reduct  $S$  may not be simultaneously finitely based [16, 17, 28, 36–40]. Refer to Lee [18, 41, 42] for more information on the identities and varieties of involution semigroups.

Recently the representations and identities of plactic monoids and plactic-like monoids have received a lot of attention. Johnson et al. have given a faithful representation of the plactic monoid of each finite rank as a monoid of upper triangular matrices over the tropical semiring [26, Theorem 2.8]. Since the monoid of all upper triangular  $n \times n$  tropical matrices satisfies non-trivial identities [23], it follows from the representations of [26, Theorem 2.8] that every plactic monoid of finite rank satisfies non-trivial identities. However, the plactic monoid of infinite rank only satisfies trivial identity [9, Proposition 3.1], and so the plactic monoid of infinite rank is finitely based. The plactic monoids of rank equal to 2 and 3 are non-finitely based by [7, 13] and [21, 26] respectively. For the involution cases of the plactic monoids of rank equal to 2 and 3, by the result [38, Theorem 4], it is routine to show that they are non-finitely based. The finite basis problem for the plactic monoids of rank greater than or equal to 4 and their involution cases are still open. Cain et al. have given faithful representations of the hypoplactic, stalactic, taiga, sylvester and baxter monoids of each finite rank as monoids of upper triangular matrices over any semiring from a large class including the tropical semiring and fields of characteristic 0 [8]. Cain and Malheiro have shown that the hypoplactic, stalactic, taiga, sylvester and baxter monoids satisfy non-trivial identities [10]. In [12] [resp. [8, 11, 22]], it is shown that all hypoplactic [resp. stalactic, taiga, sylvester and baxter] monoids of rank greater than or equal to 2 generate the same variety and are finitely based. Aird and Ribeiro have given a faithful representation of the stylic monoid of each finite rank as a monoid of upper unitriangular matrices over tropical semiring, and then solved the finite basis problems for the stylic monoid and its involution case [3]. Also, Volkov has solved the finite basis problem for the stylic monoid by different mean [58]. The identity checking problems for the sylvster, baxter and stylic monoids have been considered [3, 11], which can be done in polynomial time. By the characterization of the identities satisfied by the hypoplactic, stalactic and taiga monoids [8, 11, 22], it is easy to show that the identity checking problems for them are in the complexity class P.

The hypoplactic monoid of finite rank  $n$   $\text{hypo}_n$ , first studied in depth by Novelli [50], can be obtained by factoring the free monoid  $\mathcal{A}_n^* = \mathcal{A}_n^+ \cup \{\varepsilon\}$  over the finite ordered alphabet  $\mathcal{A}_n = \{1 < 2 < \dots < n\}$  by a congruence that can be defined by the Krob-Thibon insertion algorithm that computes a combinatorial object from

a word. Its elements can be uniquely identified with quasi-ribbon tableaux, and it is presented by the Knuth relations and the hypoplactic relations  $cadb \equiv acbd$  for  $a \leq b < c \leq d$  and  $bdac \equiv dbca$  for  $a < b \leq c < d$  with  $a, b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}_n$ . The hypoplactic monoid  $\text{hypo}_n$  forms an involution monoid, denoted by  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$ , under the unique order-reversing permutation on  $\mathcal{A}_n$ .

In this paper, we investigate the representations and identities of finite-rank hypoplactic monoid with involution  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$ . Notation and background information of the paper are given in Section 2. In Section 3, we exhibit a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  for each finite  $n$  as an involution monoid of upper triangular matrices over any semiring from a large class including the tropical semiring under the skew transposition. In Section 4, we give a characterization of the word identities satisfied by  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$ . In Section 5, we prove that  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  is non-finitely based if and only if  $n = 2, 3$  and that each variety generated by  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  with  $n \geq 3$  contains continuum many subvarieties. And we give a polynomial time algorithm to check whether a given word identity holds in  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  in Section 6.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Most of the notation and definition of this article are given in this section. Refer to the monograph of Burris and Sankappanavar [5] for any undefined notation and terminology of universal algebra in general.

**2.1. Words and content.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a countably infinite alphabet and let  $\mathcal{X}^* = \{x^* \mid x \in \mathcal{X}\}$  be a disjoint copy of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Elements of  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*$  are called *variables*, elements of  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+ \cup \{\emptyset\}$  are called *words*, and elements of  $\mathcal{X}^+ \cup \{\emptyset\}$  are called *plain words*. A word  $\mathbf{u}$  is a *factor* of a word  $\mathbf{w}$  if  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{u}\mathbf{b}$  for some  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+ \cup \{\emptyset\}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{u} \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  be a word and  $x \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*$  be a variable. The *content* of a word  $\mathbf{u}$ , denoted by  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ , is the set of variables that occur in  $\mathbf{u}$ , and  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u})$  is the number of occurrences of the letter  $x$  in  $\mathbf{u}$ . Let  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$  be the plain word obtained from  $\mathbf{u}$  by removing all occurrences of the symbol  $*$ . For  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*$  such that  $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_n \in \mathcal{X}$  are distinct variables, let  $\mathbf{u}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  denote the word obtained from  $\mathbf{u}$  by retaining only the variables  $x_1, x_1^*, x_2, x_2^*, \dots, x_n, x_n^*$ .

**Example 2.1.** Let  $\mathbf{u} = x^*zxy^*x$  for some  $x, y, z \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then

- $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \{x, z, x^*, y^*\}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{u}} = xzxyx$ ;
- $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) = 2$ ,  $\text{occ}(x^*, \mathbf{u}) = \text{occ}(z, \mathbf{u}) = \text{occ}(y^*, \mathbf{u}) = 1$ ;
- $\mathbf{u}[x] = x^*x^2$ ,  $\mathbf{u}[x, y] = x^*xy^*x$ .

We use  ${}_i x$  to refer to the  $i$ -th occurrence from the left occurrence of  $x$  in  $\mathbf{u}$  and  ${}_{\infty} x$  to refer to the last occurrence of  $x$  in  $\mathbf{u}$ . The set  $\text{occset}(\mathbf{u}) = \{{}_i x \mid x \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*, 1 \leq i \leq \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u})\}$  of all occurrences of all variables in  $\mathbf{u}$  is called the *occurrence set of  $\mathbf{u}$* . The word  $\mathbf{u}$  induces a order  $\prec_{\mathbf{u}}$  on the set  $\text{occset}(\mathbf{u})$  defined by  ${}_i x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} {}_j y$  if and only if the  $i$ -th occurrence of  $x$  precedes the  $j$ -th occurrence of  $y$  in  $\mathbf{u}$ . We write

$$\{m_1 x_1, m_2 x_2, \dots, m_r x_r\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{n_1 y_1, n_2 y_2, \dots, n_t y_t\}$$

to mean that  ${}_i x_i \prec_{\mathbf{u}} {}_j y_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . In particular, if  $r = 1$  [resp.  $t = 1$ ], we write  ${}_i x_1 \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{n_1 y_1, n_2 y_2, \dots, n_t y_t\}$  [resp.  $\{m_1 x_1, m_2 x_2, \dots, m_r x_r\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} n_1 y_1$ ] rather than  $\{m_1 x_1\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{n_1 y_1, n_2 y_2, \dots, n_t y_t\}$  [resp.  $\{m_1 x_1, m_2 x_2, \dots, m_r x_r\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{n_1 y_1\}$ ]. For convenience, if  $m_1 = m_2 = \dots = m_r = \infty$  and  $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_t = 1$ , we also write  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$ .

**2.2. Terms and identities.** The set  $\mathsf{T}(\mathcal{X})$  of *terms* over  $\mathcal{X}$  is the smallest set containing  $\mathcal{X}$  that is closed under concatenation and  $*$ . The proper inclusion  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+ \cup \{\emptyset\} \subset \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{X})$  holds and the identities (1.1) can be used to convert any nonempty term  $\mathbf{t} \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{X})$  into some unique word  $[\mathbf{t}] \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$ . For instance,  $[x(x^2(yx^*)^*)^*zy^*] = xy(x^*)^3zy^*$ .

An *identity* is an expression  $\mathbf{s} \approx \mathbf{t}$  formed by nonempty terms  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \in \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{X})$ , a *word identity* is an identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  formed by words  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$ . We write  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$  if  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  are identical. An identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is *non-trivial* if  $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{v}$ . An identity  $\mathbf{s} \approx \mathbf{t}$  is directly deducible from an identity  $\mathbf{p} \approx \mathbf{q}$  if there exists some substitution  $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathsf{T}(\mathcal{X})$  such that  $\mathbf{p}\varphi$  is a subterm of  $\mathbf{s}$ , and replacing this particular subterm  $\mathbf{p}\varphi$  of  $\mathbf{s}$  with  $\mathbf{q}\varphi$  results in the term  $\mathbf{t}$ . An identity  $\mathbf{s} \approx \mathbf{t}$  is deducible from some set  $\Sigma$  of identities if there exists a sequence  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, \mathbf{s}_r = \mathbf{t}$  of terms such that each identity  $\mathbf{s}_i \approx \mathbf{s}_{i+1}$  is directly deducible from some identity in  $\Sigma$ .

An involution semigroup  $(S, *)$  *satisfies* an identity  $\mathbf{s} \approx \mathbf{t}$ , if for any substitution  $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow S$ , the elements  $\mathbf{s}\varphi$  and  $\mathbf{t}\varphi$  of  $S$  coincide; in this case,  $\mathbf{s} \approx \mathbf{t}$  is also said to be an *identity of*  $(S, *)$ .

Clearly any involution monoid that satisfies a word identity  $\mathbf{s} \approx \mathbf{t}$  also satisfies the identity  $\mathbf{s}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] \approx \mathbf{t}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$  for any distinct variables  $\overline{x_1}, \overline{x_2}, \dots, \overline{x_n} \in \mathcal{X}$ , since assigning the unit element 1 to a variable  $x$  in a word identity is effectively the same as removing all occurrences of  $x$  and  $x^*$ .

For any involution semigroup  $(S, *)$ , a set  $\Sigma$  of identities of  $(S, *)$  is an *identity basis* for  $(S, *)$  if every identity in  $\text{Id}(S, *)$  is deducible from  $\Sigma$ . An involution semigroup is *finitely based* if it has some finite identity basis; otherwise, it is *non-finitely based*.

The variety generated by semigroup  $S$  [resp. involution semigroup  $(S, *)$ ] is denoted by  $\text{Var}S$  [resp.  $\text{Var}(S, *)$ ]. For any set  $\Sigma$  of identities, denote by  $\text{Var}\Sigma$  the variety determined by  $\Sigma$ .

**2.3. The hypoplactic monoid and its involution.** Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{1 < 2 < 3 < \dots\}$  denote the set of positive integers, viewed as an infinite ordered alphabet. The tableau and insertion algorithm related to the hypoplactic monoid are given in the following.

A *quasi-ribbon tableau* is a finite grid of cells, aligned so that the leftmost cell in each row is below the rightmost cell of the previous row, filled with letters from  $\mathcal{A}$ , such that the entries in each row are weakly increasing from left to right, and the entries in each column are strictly increasing from top to bottom. The associated insertion algorithm is as follows:

**Algorithm** (Krob–Thibon algorithm). Input a quasi-ribbon tableau  $T$  and a letter  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . If there is no entry in  $T$  that is less than or equal to  $a$ , output the tableau obtained by creating a new cell, labelled with  $a$ , and gluing  $T$  by its top-leftmost entry to the bottom of this new cell; otherwise let  $x$  be the right-most and bottom-most entry of  $T$  that is less than or equal to  $a$ . Separate  $T$  in two parts, such that one part is from the top left down to and including  $x$ . Put a new entry  $a$  to the right of  $x$  and glue the remaining part of  $T$  (below and to the right of  $x$ ) onto the bottom of the new entry  $a$ . Output the resulting tableau.

Let  $w_1, \dots, w_k \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathbf{w} = w_1 \cdots w_k \in \mathcal{A}^*$ . Then the quasi-ribbon tableau  $\text{P}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}(\mathbf{w})$  of  $\mathbf{w}$  is obtained as follows: reading  $\mathbf{w}$  from left-to-right, one starts with an empty tableau and inserts each symbol in  $\mathbf{w}$  into a quasi-ribbon tableau according to the above Algorithm. For example,  $\text{P}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}(36131512665)$  is given as

follows:

1	1	1	2				
			3	3	5	5	
					6	6	6

Note that the same letter cannot appear in two different rows of a quasi-ribbon tableau.

Define the relation  $\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  by

$$\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad P_{\text{hypo}_\infty}(\mathbf{u}) = P_{\text{hypo}_\infty}(\mathbf{v})$$

for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ . The relation  $\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  is a congruence on  $\mathcal{A}^*$ . The hypoplactic monoid  $\text{hypo}_\infty$  is the factor monoid  $\mathcal{A}^*/\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$ . The rank- $n$  analogue  $\text{hypo}_n$  is the factor monoid  $\mathcal{A}_n^*/\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$ , where the relation  $\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  is naturally restricted to  $\mathcal{A}_n^* \times \mathcal{A}_n^*$  and  $\mathcal{A}_n = \{1 < 2 < \dots < n\}$  is the set of the first  $n$  natural numbers viewed as a finite ordered alphabet. It follows from the definition of  $\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  that each element  $[\mathbf{u}]_{\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}}$  of the factor monoid  $\text{hypo}_\infty$  can be identified with the combinatorial object  $P_{\text{hypo}_\infty}(\mathbf{u})$ . Clearly  $\text{hypo}_1$  is a free monogenic monoid  $\langle 1 \rangle = \{\varepsilon, 1, 1^2, 1^3, \dots\}$  and so it is commutative. Note that

$$\text{hypo}_1 \subset \text{hypo}_2 \subset \dots \subset \text{hypo}_i \subset \text{hypo}_{i+1} \subset \dots \subset \text{hypo}_\infty. \quad (2.1)$$

For any word  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ , the *length* of  $\mathbf{u}$  is the number of letters occurring in  $\mathbf{u}$  and is denoted by  $|\mathbf{u}|$ , and denote by  $|\mathbf{u}|_a$  the number of times the symbol  $a$  appears in  $\mathbf{u}$ ; the *evaluation* of  $\mathbf{u}$ , denoted by  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u})$ , is the infinite tuple of non-negative integers, indexed by  $\mathcal{A}$ , whose  $a$ -th element is  $|\mathbf{u}|_a$ , thus this tuple describes the number of each symbol in  $\mathcal{A}$  that appears in  $\mathbf{u}$ . It is immediate from the definition of the hypoplactic monoid that if  $\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$ , then  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$ , and hence it makes sense to define the evaluation of each element of hypoplactic monoid to be the evaluation of any word representing it. The *support* of a word  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ , denoted by  $\text{sup}(\mathbf{u})$ , is the set of letters that occur in  $\mathbf{u}$ . Note that  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$  implies  $\text{sup}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{sup}(\mathbf{v})$ .

Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^*$  and  $\text{sup}(\mathbf{u}) = \{a_1 < \dots < a_k\}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say  $\mathbf{u}$  has an  $a_{i+1}$ - $a_i$  *inversion*, if for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$  there is at least one occurrence of  $a_{i+1}$  before the last occurrence of  $a_i$  when reading  $\mathbf{u}$  from left-to-right. Note that we only consider inversions of consecutive elements of the support of  $\mathbf{u}$ . Denote by  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{u})$  the set of all inversions occurring in  $\mathbf{u}$ . For example,  $\text{inv}(36131512665) = \{3-2, 6-5\}$ .

**Proposition 2.2** ([50, Subsection 4.2]). *For any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$  if and only if  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{inv}(\mathbf{v})$ .*

Note that if the word  $\mathbf{u}$  has an  $a_{i+1}$ - $a_i$  inversion, then each word in  $[\mathbf{u}]_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  has an  $a_{i+1}$ - $a_i$  inversion.

The hypoplactic monoid can also be defined by the presentation  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \rangle$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty} = & \{(acb, cab) : a \leq b < c\} \cup \{(bac, bca) : a < b \leq c\} \\ & \cup \{(cadb, acbd) : a \leq b < c \leq d\} \cup \{(bdac, dbca) : a < b \leq c < d\}. \end{aligned}$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , a presentation for the hypoplactic monoid of rank  $n$  can be obtained by restricting generators and relations of the above presentation to generators in  $\mathcal{A}_n$ . Note that these relations are length-preserving.

If the hypoplactic monoid  $\text{hypo}_n$  under the unary operation  $*$  is an involution monoid, then the relation  $\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  must be compatible with the involution operation, that is, if  $\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$ , then  $\mathbf{u}^* \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}^*$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}_n^\sharp := \{1^\sharp > 2^\sharp > \dots > n^\sharp\}$  be the alphabet  $\mathcal{A}_n$  on which the order relation has been reversed and  $(\mathcal{A}_n^\sharp)^\sharp := \mathcal{A}_n$ . For  $w_1 w_2 \dots w_n \in \mathcal{A}^*$ ,  $(w_1 w_2 \dots w_n)^\sharp := w_n^\sharp \dots w_2^\sharp w_1^\sharp$ .

**Proposition 2.3** ([50, Theorem 5.4]). *Let  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{w}'$  be two words in  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$ . Then  $\mathbf{w} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{w}'$  if and only if  $\mathbf{w}^\sharp \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} (\mathbf{w}')^\sharp$ .*

The relation  $\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  is compatible with the unary operation  $^\sharp$ . Thus  $(\text{hypo}_n, ^\sharp)$  is an involution monoid. This involution is always called *Schützenberger's involution*.

**Proposition 2.4.** *Schützenberger's involution is the unique involution on the hypoplactic monoid  $\text{hypo}_n$  for  $n \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $*$  is an involution operation on  $\text{hypo}_n$ . Note that the relations in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$  are length-preserving. Thus the involution of a generator in  $\mathcal{A}_n$  is still a generator in  $\mathcal{A}_n$ . Since  $\text{hypo}_1$  has only one generator 1, we have  $1^* = 1$ . Thus the involution on  $\text{hypo}_1$  is trivial. For  $\text{hypo}_n$  with  $n \geq 2$ , let  $a < b \leq n$ . Then  $(aba)^* = a^* b^* a^* \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} a^* a^* b^* = (baa)^*$  by  $aba \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} baa \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$ . This implies  $a^* b^* a^* \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} a^* a^* b^* \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$ , and so  $b^* < a^*$ . Hence for any  $a < b$ , there must be  $b^* < a^*$  under the involution  $*$ . Therefore  $*$  is the unique order-reversing permutation on  $\mathcal{A}_n$ .  $\square$

**2.4. Matrix representations over semirings.** Recall that  $\mathbb{S} = (S, +, \cdot)$  is a *commutative semiring* with additive identity  $\mathbf{0}$  and multiplicative identity  $\mathbf{1}$  if  $S$  is a set equipped with two binary operations  $+$  and  $\cdot$  such that  $(S, +)$  and  $(S, \cdot)$  are commutative monoids satisfying

$$a(b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{0} \cdot a = \mathbf{0}$$

for all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{S}$ . We say that  $\mathbb{S}$  is *idempotent* if  $a + a = a$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{S}$ . An element  $a \in \mathbb{S}$  is *infinite multiplicative order* if for any non-negative integers  $i, j$ ,  $a^i = a^j$  if and only if  $i = j$ . In this paper, we always assume that  $\mathbb{S}$  is a commutative and idempotent semiring with  $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}$  containing an element of infinite multiplicative order. A common example of such semiring is the tropical semiring  $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \oplus, \otimes)$ , which is the set  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers together with minus infinity  $-\infty$ , with the addition and multiplication defined as follows

$$a \oplus b = \max\{a, b\} \quad \text{and} \quad a \otimes b = a + b.$$

In other words, the tropical sum of two numbers is their maximum and the tropical product of two numbers is their sum, and  $-\infty$  is the additive identity and 0 is the multiplicative identity. Note that except  $-\infty$  and 0, all other elements in  $\mathbb{T}$  have infinite multiplicative order.

It is easy to see that the set of all  $n \times n$  matrices with entries in  $\mathbb{S}$  forms a semigroup under the matrix multiplication induced from the operations in  $\mathbb{S}$ . We denote this semigroup by  $M_n(\mathbb{S})$ . Let  $UT_n(\mathbb{S})$  be subsemigroup of  $M_n(\mathbb{S})$  of all upper triangular  $n \times n$  matrices. For any matrix  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{S})$ , denote by  $A^D$  the matrix obtained by reflecting  $A$  with respect to the secondary diagonal (from the top right to the bottom left corner), that is,  $(A^D)_{ij} = A_{(n+1-j)(n+1-i)}$ . It is easy to verify that this unary operation  $^D$  is an involution operation of  $M_n(\mathbb{S})$ . A (linear) representation of a semigroup  $S$  [resp. involution semigroup  $(S, *)$ ] is a homomorphism  $\rho : S \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{S})$  [resp.  $\rho : (S, *) \rightarrow (M_n(\mathbb{S}), ^D)$ ]. The homomorphism  $\rho$  is said to be *faithful* if it is injective. Note that an involution semigroup representation  $\rho : (S, *) \rightarrow (M_n(\mathbb{S}), ^D)$  deduces a semigroup representation  $\rho : S \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{S})$ , but a semigroup representation  $\rho : S \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{S})$  does not necessarily deduce an involution semigroup representation  $\rho : (S, *) \rightarrow (M_n(\mathbb{S}), ^D)$ . The tropical semiring is of interest as a natural carrier for representations of semigroups. For example,

the bicyclic monoid  $\mathcal{B} := \langle a, b \mid ba = 1 \rangle$ , which is ubiquitous in infinite semigroup theory, admits no faithful finite dimensional representations over any field; however it has a number of natural representations over the tropical semiring [13, 24].

### 3. MATRIX REPRESENTATIONS OF $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$

In this section, we exhibit a faithful matrix representation of  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  for each finite  $n$  as an involution monoid of upper triangular matrices over  $\mathbb{S}$  under the skew transposition, and we prove that all involution semigroups  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  with  $n \geq 4$  generate the same variety.

For convenience, denote by

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} s & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}, Q = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & s \end{pmatrix}, J = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}, K = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $s \in \mathbb{S}$  is an element of infinite multiplicative order. Denote by  $\text{diag}\{\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_n\}$  the block diagonal matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 & & & \\ & \Lambda_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \Lambda_n \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_n$  are square matrices. And let  $E_n$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix with  $\mathbf{1}$ s on the main diagonal and  $\mathbf{0}$ s elsewhere.

First we give a matrix representation of  $(\text{hypo}_1, \#)$ . Define a map  $\varphi_1 : \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \{\varepsilon\} \rightarrow UT_2(\mathbb{S})$  given by  $\varepsilon \mapsto E_2$  and  $1 \mapsto PQ$ . Clearly, the map  $\varphi_1$  induces a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_1, \#)$ .

Next we consider the matrix representation of  $(\text{hypo}_2, \#)$ . Define a map  $\varphi_2 : \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \{\varepsilon\} \rightarrow UT_5(\mathbb{S})$  given by  $\varepsilon \mapsto E_5$ ,

$$1 \mapsto \text{diag}\{s, J, \mathbf{1}\}, \quad 2 \mapsto \text{diag}\{\mathbf{1}, K, s\}.$$

Clearly,  $\varphi_2$  can be extended to a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}_2^*$  to  $UT_5(\mathbb{S})$ . Note that  $\varphi_2(1^\#) = \varphi_2(2) = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{1}, K, a\} = (\varphi_2(1))^D$  and  $\varphi_2(2^\#) = \varphi_2(1) = \text{diag}\{a, J, \mathbf{1}\} = (\varphi_2(2))^D$ . Thus  $\varphi_2$  can be extended to a homomorphism  $\varphi_2 : (\mathcal{A}_2^*, \#) \rightarrow (UT_5(\mathbb{S}), ^D)$ . In fact,  $\varphi_2$  induces a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_2, \#)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *The map  $\varphi_2 : (\text{hypo}_2, \#) \rightarrow (UT_5(\mathbb{S}), ^D)$  is a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_2, \#)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\varphi_2$  is a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_2^*, \#)$  to  $(UT_5(\mathbb{S}), ^D)$ . Then to show that  $\varphi_2$  induces a homomorphism from  $(\text{hypo}_2, \#)$  to  $(UT_5(\mathbb{S}), ^D)$ , we only need to show that for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_2^*$ , if  $\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$ , then  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) = \varphi_2(\mathbf{v})$ . By the definition of  $\varphi_2$ , it is easy to verify that for any  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{A}_2^*$ ,

$$\varphi_2(\mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} E_5, & \text{if } \mathbf{w} = \varepsilon, \\ \text{diag}\{s^{|\mathbf{w}|_1}, J, \mathbf{1}\}, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1\}, \\ \text{diag}\{\mathbf{1}, K, s^{|\mathbf{w}|_2}\}, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{2\}, \\ \text{diag}\{s^{|\mathbf{w}|_1}, KJ, s^{|\mathbf{w}|_2}\}, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1, 2\} \text{ and } 2-1 \in \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}), \\ \text{diag}\{s^{|\mathbf{w}|_1}, JK, s^{|\mathbf{w}|_2}\}, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1, 2\} \text{ and } 2-1 \notin \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}). \end{cases}$$

Since  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v}), \text{inv}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{inv}(\mathbf{v})$  by Proposition 2.2, it is routine to show that  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) = \varphi_2(\mathbf{v})$ .

Suppose that  $\mathbf{u} \not\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$ . Then  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$  or  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \text{inv}(\mathbf{v})$  by Proposition 2.2. By the definition of  $\varphi_2$  it is easy to see that  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_2(\mathbf{v})$ , a contradiction.

Hence  $\varphi_2$  is injective. Therefore  $\varphi_2 : (\text{hypo}_2, \sharp) \rightarrow (UT_5(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$  is a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$ .  $\square$

Next we consider the matrix representation of  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$ . Define a map  $\varphi_3 : \mathcal{A}_3 \cup \{\varepsilon\} \rightarrow UT_{13}(\mathbb{S})$  given by  $\varepsilon \mapsto E_{13}$ ,

$$1 \mapsto \text{diag}\{P, J, J, E_3, E_2\}, \quad 2 \mapsto \text{diag}\{Q, K, KJ, J, P\}, \quad 3 \mapsto \text{diag}\{E_2, E_3, K, K, Q\}.$$

Clearly,  $\varphi_3$  can be extended to a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}_3^*$  to  $UT_{13}(\mathbb{S})$ . Note that  $\varphi_3(1^\sharp) = \varphi_3(3) = \text{diag}\{E_2, E_3, K, K, Q\} = (\varphi_3(1))^D$ ,  $\varphi_3(2^\sharp) = \varphi_3(2) = \text{diag}\{Q, K, KJ, J, P\} = (\varphi_3(2))^D$  and  $\varphi_3(3^\sharp) = \varphi_3(1) = \text{diag}\{P, J, J, E_3, E_2\} = (\varphi_3(1))^D$ . Thus  $\varphi_3$  can be extended to a homomorphism  $\varphi_3 : (\mathcal{A}_3^*, \sharp) \rightarrow (UT_{13}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$ . In fact,  $\varphi_3$  induces a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *The map  $\varphi_3 : (\text{hypo}_3, \sharp) \rightarrow (UT_{13}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$  is a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\varphi_3$  is a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_3^*, \sharp)$  to  $(UT_{13}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$ . Then to show that the map  $\varphi_3$  induces a homomorphism from  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$  to  $(UT_{13}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$ , we only need to show that for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_3^*$ , if  $\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$ , then  $\varphi_3(\mathbf{u}) = \varphi_3(\mathbf{v})$ . By the definition of  $\varphi_3$ , it is easy to verify that for any  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{A}_3^*$ ,

$$\varphi_3(\mathbf{w}) = \text{diag}\{\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3, \Lambda_4, \Lambda_5\}$$

where  $\Lambda_1 = P^{|\mathbf{w}|_1} Q^{|\mathbf{w}|_2}$ ,  $\Lambda_5 = P^{|\mathbf{w}|_2} Q^{|\mathbf{w}|_3}$  and

$$\Lambda_2 = \begin{cases} I_3, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{3\}, \\ J, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1\} \text{ or } \{1, 3\}, \\ K, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{2\} \text{ or } \{2, 3\}, \\ KJ, & \text{if } \{1, 2\} \subseteq \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) \text{ and } 2-1 \in \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}), \\ JK, & \text{if } \{1, 2\} \subseteq \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) \text{ and } 2-1 \notin \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}), \end{cases}$$

$$\Lambda_3 = \begin{cases} J, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1\}, \\ K, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{3\}, \\ JK, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1, 3\} \text{ and } 3-1 \notin \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}), \\ KJ, & \text{if } \{2\} \subseteq \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}), \text{ or } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1, 3\} \text{ and } 3-1 \in \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}), \end{cases}$$

$$\Lambda_4 = \begin{cases} E_3, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{1\}, \\ J, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{2\} \text{ or } \{1, 2\}, \\ K, & \text{if } \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{3\} \text{ or } \{1, 3\}, \\ KJ, & \text{if } \{2, 3\} \subseteq \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) \text{ and } 3-2 \in \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}), \\ JK, & \text{if } \{2, 3\} \subseteq \text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) \text{ and } 3-2 \notin \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}). \end{cases}$$

Since  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{inv}(\mathbf{v})$  by Proposition 2.2, it is routine to show that  $\varphi_3(\mathbf{u}) = \varphi_3(\mathbf{v})$ .

Suppose that  $\mathbf{u} \not\equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$ . Then  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$  or  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \text{inv}(\mathbf{v})$  by Proposition 2.2. By the definition of  $\varphi_3$  it is easy to see that  $\varphi_3(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_3(\mathbf{v})$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\varphi_3$  is injective. Therefore  $\varphi_3 : (\text{hypo}_3, \sharp) \rightarrow (UT_{13}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$  is a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$ .  $\square$

Now we consider the matrix representation of  $(\text{hypo}_n, \sharp)$  for  $n \geq 4$ . For any  $([\mathbf{u}]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{v}]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \in \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$ , we can define an involution operation  $\sharp$  on  $\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$  by  $([\mathbf{u}]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{v}]_{\text{hypo}_3})^\sharp = ([\mathbf{v}]_{\text{hypo}_3}^\sharp, [\mathbf{u}]_{\text{hypo}_3}^\sharp)$ . For any  $i < j \in \mathcal{A}_n$  with  $n \geq 4$ , it follows from the definition of  $\sharp$  that  $j^\sharp < i^\sharp$  and there is at most one  $k \in \mathcal{A}_n$  satisfying  $k = k^\sharp$  and  $j - i = i^\sharp - j^\sharp$  when  $i \neq i^\sharp, j \neq j^\sharp$ . So there are seven cases about the order of  $i, j, i^\sharp, j^\sharp$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n$ :  $i^\sharp = j, i < j = j^\sharp < i^\sharp, j^\sharp < i = i^\sharp < j, i < j < j^\sharp < i^\sharp, j^\sharp < i^\sharp < i < j, i < j^\sharp < j < i^\sharp, j^\sharp < i < i^\sharp < j$ . For any



$i < j \in \mathcal{A}_n$  with  $n \geq 4$ , we can define a map  $\varphi_{ij}$  from  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  to  $\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$  which can be determined by the following four cases according to the order of  $i, i^\#, j, j^\#$  in  $\mathcal{A}_n$ .

**Case 1.**  $i^\# = j$ . Define a map  $\lambda : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$  given by

$$k \mapsto \begin{cases} [1]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i, \\ [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = j, \\ [31]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i < k < j, \\ [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, this map can be extended to a homomorphism  $\lambda : \mathcal{A}_n^* \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$ . Define a map  $\lambda_{ij} : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$  given by

$$k \mapsto (\lambda(k), \lambda(k)).$$

This map can be extended to a homomorphism  $\lambda_{ij} : \mathcal{A}_n^* \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$ . Further,  $\lambda_{ij}$  is also a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_n^*, \#)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . This is because for any  $k \in \mathcal{A}_n$ ,  $\lambda(k^\#) = (\lambda(k))^\#$  which follows from

$$\begin{cases} \lambda(k^\#) = (\lambda(k))^\# = [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i, \\ \lambda(k^\#) = (\lambda(k))^\# = [31]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i < k < j, \\ \lambda(k^\#) = (\lambda(k))^\# = [1]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = j, \\ \lambda(k^\#) = (\lambda(k))^\# = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore for any  $\mathbf{w} = k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{w}^\#) &= (\lambda(\mathbf{w}^\#), \lambda(\mathbf{w}^\#)) \\ &= (\lambda(k_n^\#) \cdots \lambda(k_1^\#), \lambda(k_n^\#) \cdots \lambda(k_1^\#)) \\ &= ((\lambda(k_n))^\# \cdots (\lambda(k_1))^\#, (\lambda(k_n))^\# \cdots (\lambda(k_1))^\#) \\ &= ((\lambda(\mathbf{w}))^\#, (\lambda(\mathbf{w}))^\#) \\ &= (\lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{w}))^\#. \end{aligned}$$

**Case 2.**  $i < j = j^\# < i^\#$  or  $j^\# < i = i^\# < j$ . For convenience, let  $i_1 = i, i_2 = j$  and  $i_3 = i^\#$  when  $i < j = j^\# < i^\#$  and  $i_1 = j^\#, i_2 = i$  and  $i_3 = j$  when  $j^\# < i = i^\# < j$ . Define maps  $\theta_1 : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$  and  $\theta_2 : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$  by

$$k \mapsto \begin{cases} [1]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_1, \\ [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_2, \\ [21]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_1 < k < i_2, \\ [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad k \mapsto \begin{cases} [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_2, \\ [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_3, \\ [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_2 < k < i_3, \\ [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

respectively. Clearly,  $\theta_1, \theta_2$  can be extended to homomorphisms from  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  to  $\text{hypo}_3$  respectively. Define a map  $\theta_{ij} : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$  by

$$k \mapsto (\theta_1(k), \theta_2(k)).$$

This map can be extended to a homomorphism  $\theta_{ij} : \mathcal{A}_n^* \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$ . Further,  $\theta_{ij}$  is also a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_n^*, \#)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . This is because for

any  $k \in \mathcal{A}_n$ ,  $\theta_1(k^\sharp) = (\theta_2(k))^\sharp$ ,  $(\theta_1(k))^\sharp = \theta_2(k^\sharp)$  which follows from

$$\begin{cases} \theta_1(k^\sharp) = (\theta_2(k))^\sharp = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\theta_1(k))^\sharp = \theta_2(k^\sharp) = [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_1, \\ \theta_1(k^\sharp) = (\theta_2(k))^\sharp = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\theta_1(k))^\sharp = \theta_2(k^\sharp) = [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_1 < k < i_2, \\ \theta_1(k^\sharp) = (\theta_2(k))^\sharp = [2]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\theta_1(k))^\sharp = \theta_2(k^\sharp) = [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_2, \\ \theta_1(k^\sharp) = (\theta_2(k))^\sharp = [21]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\theta_1(k))^\sharp = \theta_2(k^\sharp) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_2 < k < i_3, \\ \theta_1(k^\sharp) = (\theta_2(k))^\sharp = [1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\theta_1(k))^\sharp = \theta_2(k^\sharp) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_3, \\ \theta_1(k^\sharp) = (\theta_2(k))^\sharp = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\theta_1(k))^\sharp = \theta_2(k^\sharp) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k < i_1 \text{ or } k > i_3. \end{cases}$$

Therefore for any  $\mathbf{w} = k_1 k_2 \cdots k_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{ij}(\mathbf{w}^\sharp) &= (\theta_1(\mathbf{w}^\sharp), \theta_2(\mathbf{w}^\sharp)) \\ &= (\theta_1(k_n^\sharp) \cdots \theta_1(k_1^\sharp), \theta_2(k_n^\sharp) \cdots \theta_2(k_1^\sharp)) \\ &= ((\theta_2(k_n))^\sharp \cdots (\theta_2(k_1))^\sharp, (\theta_1(k_n))^\sharp \cdots (\theta_1(k_1))^\sharp) \\ &= ((\theta_2(\mathbf{w}))^\sharp, (\theta_1(\mathbf{w}))^\sharp) \\ &= (\theta_{ij}(\mathbf{w}))^\sharp. \end{aligned}$$

**Case 3.**  $i < j < j^\sharp < i^\sharp$  or  $j^\sharp < i^\sharp < i < j$ . For convenience, let  $i_1 = i, i_2 = j, i_3 = j^\sharp$  and  $i_4 = i^\sharp$  when  $i < j < j^\sharp < i^\sharp$  and  $i_1 = j^\sharp, i_2 = i^\sharp, i_3 = i$  and  $i_4 = j$  when  $j^\sharp < i^\sharp < i < j$ . Define maps  $\eta_1 : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$  and  $\eta_2 : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$  by

$$k \mapsto \begin{cases} [1]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_1, \\ [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_2, \\ [21]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_1 < k < i_2, \\ [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad k \mapsto \begin{cases} [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_3, \\ [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_4, \\ [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_3 < k < i_4, \\ [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

respectively. Clearly,  $\eta_1, \eta_2$  can be extended to homomorphisms from  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  to  $\text{hypo}_3$  respectively. Define a map  $\eta_{ij} : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$  by

$$k \mapsto (\eta_1(k), \eta_2(k)).$$

This map can be extended to a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  to  $\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$ . Further,  $\eta_{ij}$  is also a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_n^*, \sharp)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$ . This is because for any  $k \in \mathcal{A}_n$ ,  $\eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp$ ,  $(\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp)$  which follows from

$$\begin{cases} \eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp) = [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_1, \\ \eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp) = [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_1 < k < i_2, \\ \eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp) = [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_2, \\ \eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp = [2]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_3, \\ \eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp = [21]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_3 < k < i_4, \\ \eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp = [1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_4, \\ \eta_1(k^\sharp) = (\eta_2(k))^\sharp = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\eta_1(k))^\sharp = \eta_2(k^\sharp) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore it is routine to verify that  $\eta_{ij}(\mathbf{w}^\sharp) = (\eta_{ij}(\mathbf{w}))^\sharp$  for any  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$ .

**Case 4.**  $i < j^\sharp < j < i^\sharp$  or  $j^\sharp < i^\sharp < i < j$ . For convenience, let  $i_1 = i, i_2 = j^\sharp, i_3 = j$  and  $i_4 = i^\sharp$  when  $i < j^\sharp < j < i^\sharp$  and  $i_1 = j^\sharp, i_2 = i, i_3 = i^\sharp$  and  $i_4 = j$  when  $j^\sharp < i^\sharp < i < j$ . Define maps  $\kappa_1 : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$  and  $\kappa_2 : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3$  by

$$k \mapsto \begin{cases} [1]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_1, \\ [21]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_1 < k < i_3, \\ [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_3, \\ [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad k \mapsto \begin{cases} [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_2, \\ [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_4, \\ [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_2 < k < i_4, \\ [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

respectively. Clearly,  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2$  can be extended to homomorphisms from  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  to  $\text{hypo}_3$  respectively. Define a map  $\kappa_{ij} : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$ ,

$$k \mapsto (\kappa_1(k), \kappa_2(k)).$$

Clearly, this map can be extended to a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  to  $\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$ . Further,  $\kappa_{ij}$  is a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_n^*, \#)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . This is because for any  $k \in \mathcal{A}_n$ ,  $\kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\#, (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#)$  which follows from

$$\begin{cases} \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [3]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_1, \\ \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_1 < k < i_2, \\ \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [2]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_2, \\ \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [21]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [32]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_2 < k < i_3, \\ \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [21]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [2]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_3, \\ \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [21]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } i_3 < k < i_4, \\ \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{if } k = i_4, \\ \kappa_1(k^\#) = (\kappa_2(k))^\# = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, & (\kappa_1(k))^\# = \kappa_2(k^\#) = [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore it is routine to verify that  $\kappa_{ij}(\mathbf{w}^\#) = (\kappa_{ij}(\mathbf{w}))^\#$  for any  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$ .

Now we can define the map  $\varphi_{ij} : \mathcal{A}_n^* \rightarrow \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$  by

$$\varphi_{ij} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{ij} & \text{if } i^\# = j, \\ \theta_{ij} & \text{if } i < j = j^\# < i^\# \text{ or } j^\# < i = i^\# < j, \\ \eta_{ij} & \text{if } i < j < j^\# < i^\# \text{ or } j^\# < i^\# < i < j, \\ \kappa_{ij} & \text{if } i < j^\# < j < i^\# \text{ or } j^\# < i < i^\# < j \end{cases}$$

where  $\lambda_{ij}, \theta_{ij}, \eta_{ij}, \kappa_{ij}$  are defined as above. Since each of maps  $\lambda_{ij}, \theta_{ij}, \eta_{ij}, \kappa_{ij}$  is a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_n^*, \#)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . Therefore  $\varphi_{ij}$  is a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_n^*, \#)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *The homomorphism  $\varphi_{ij}$  induces a homomorphism  $\varphi_{ij} : (\text{hypo}_n, \#) \rightarrow (\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$  for any  $n \geq 4$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\varphi_{ij}$  is a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{A}_n^*, \#)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . Then to show that the homomorphism  $\varphi_{ij}$  induces a homomorphism from  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  to  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ , we only need to show that for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$ , if  $\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$ , then  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u}) = \varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$ . It follows from Proposition 2.2 and the definition of  $\varphi_{ij}$  that the evaluations of the first and the second components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same respectively. In the following, we prove that the inversions of the first and the second components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same respectively.

**Case 1.**  $\varphi_{ij} = \lambda_{ij}$ . If there exists  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $i < k < j$ , then it follows from  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$  that the first components of  $\lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  have a 3-1 inversion; if there is no  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $i < k < j$ , then since the 3-1 inversion in the first component of  $\lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  [resp.  $\lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$ ] corresponds to the  $j$ - $i$  inversion in  $\mathbf{u}$  [resp.  $\mathbf{v}$ ], it follows from Proposition 2.2 that the first component of  $\lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  has a 3-1 inversion if and only if the first component of  $\lambda_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  has a 3-1 inversion. Therefore, the inversions of the first components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same. A similar argument can show that the second components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same.

**Case 2.**  $\varphi_{ij} = \theta_{ij}, \eta_{ij}$  or  $\kappa_{ij}$ .

**2.1.**  $i < j = j^\# < i^\#, i < j < j^\# < i^\#$  or  $i < j^\# < j < i^\#$ . If there exists  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $i < k < j$ , then it follows from  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$  that the first components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  have a 2-1 inversion; if there is no  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $i < k < j$ , then since the 2-1 inversion in the first component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  [resp.  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$ ] corresponds to the  $j$ - $i$  inversion in  $\mathbf{u}$  [resp.  $\mathbf{v}$ ], it follows from Proposition

2.2 that the first component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  has a 2-1 inversion if and only if the first component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  has a 2-1 inversion. Therefore, the inversions of the first components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same. A similar argument can show that the inversions of the second components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same.

**2.2.**  $j^\# < i = i^\# < j$ ,  $j^\# < i^\# < i < j$ , or  $j^\# < i < i^\# < j$ . If there exists  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $i < k < j$ , then it follows from  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ev}(\mathbf{v})$  that the second components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  have a 3-2 inversion; if there is no  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{u})$  satisfying  $i < k < j$ , then since the 3-2 inversion in the second component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  [resp.  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$ ] corresponds to the  $j$ - $i$  inversion in  $\mathbf{u}$  [resp.  $\mathbf{v}$ ], it follows from Proposition 2.2 that the second component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  has a 3-2 inversion if and only if the second component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  has a 3-2 inversion. Therefore, the inversions of the second components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same. A similar argument can show that the inversions of the first components of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  are the same.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$  for any  $n \geq 4$ . Then  $\mathbf{u} \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}$  if and only if  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{u}) = \varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{v})$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ .*

*Proof.* The necessity follows from the proof of Lemma 3.3. Let  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$  for some  $n \geq 4$ . Suppose  $\text{sup}(\mathbf{w}) = \{a_1 < \cdots < a_\ell\}$  for some  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any  $i$  with  $1 \leq i < \ell$ , if  $a_i^\# = a_{i+1}$ , then since there is no  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{w})$  satisfying  $a_i < k < a_{i+1}$ , it follows from the definition of  $\varphi_{ij}$  that the number of occurrences of 1 in the first [resp. second] component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  equals to  $|\mathbf{w}|_{a_i}$  and the number of occurrences of 3 in the first [resp. second] component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  equals to  $|\mathbf{w}|_{a_{i+1}}$  and the 3-1 inversion in the first [resp. second] component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  corresponds to the  $a_{i+1}$ - $a_i$  inversion in  $\mathbf{w}$ ; if  $a_i < a_{i+1} = a_{i+1}^\# < a_i^\#$ ,  $a_i < a_{i+1} < a_{i+1}^\# < a_i^\#$  or  $a_i < a_{i+1}^\# < a_{i+1} < a_i^\#$ , then since there is no  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{w})$  satisfying  $a_i < k < a_{i+1}$ , it follows from the definition of  $\varphi_{ij}$  that the number of occurrences of 1 in the first component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  equals to  $|\mathbf{w}|_{a_i}$  and the number of occurrences of 2 in the first component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  equals to  $|\mathbf{w}|_{a_{i+1}}$  and the 2-1 inversion in the first component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  corresponds to the  $a_{i+1}$ - $a_i$  inversion in  $\mathbf{w}$ ; if  $a_{i+1}^\# < a_i = a_i^\# < a_{i+1}$ ,  $a_{i+1}^\# < a_i^\# < a_i < a_{i+1}$ , or  $a_{i+1}^\# < a_i < a_i^\# < a_{i+1}$ , then since there is no  $k \in \text{sup}(\mathbf{w})$  satisfying  $a_i < k < a_{i+1}$ , it follows from the definition of  $\varphi_{ij}$  that the number of occurrences of 2 in the second component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  equals to  $|\mathbf{w}|_{a_i}$  and the number of occurrences of 3 in the second component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  equals to  $|\mathbf{w}|_{a_{i+1}}$  and the 3-2 inversion in the second component of  $\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  corresponds to the  $a_{i+1}$ - $a_i$  inversion in  $\mathbf{w}$ . Therefore both the number of occurrences of  $a_i$  and  $a_{i+1}$  in  $\mathbf{w}$  and whether  $w$  has an  $a_{i+1}$ - $a_i$  inversion can be derived from the maps  $\varphi_{a_i a_{i+1}}$ . Thus the sufficiency follows from Proposition 2.2.  $\square$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $n \geq 4$ , let  $I_n$  be the index set

$$\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}.$$

Now, consider the map

$$\phi_n : (\text{hypo}_n, \#) \rightarrow \prod_{I_n} (\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#),$$

whose  $(i, j)$ -th component is given by  $\varphi_{ij}([\mathbf{w}]_{\text{hypo}_n})$  for  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$  and  $(i, j) \in I_n$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *The map  $\phi_n$  is an embedding from  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  to  $\prod_{I_n} (\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$ .*

*Proof.* The map  $\phi_n$  is a homomorphism by Lemma 3.3. It follows from the definition of  $\phi_n$  and Corollary 3.4 that  $[\mathbf{u}]_{\text{hypo}_n} = [\mathbf{v}]_{\text{hypo}_n}$  if and only if  $\phi_n([\mathbf{u}]_{\text{hypo}_n}) = \phi_n([\mathbf{v}]_{\text{hypo}_n})$  for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_n^*$ . Hence  $\phi_n$  is an embedding.  $\square$

For any  $([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}, \dots, [\mathbf{u}_{2|I_n|}]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \in \prod_{2I_n} \text{hypo}_3$ , define an involution operation  $\#$  on  $\prod_{2I_n} \text{hypo}_3$  by

$$([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}, \dots, [\mathbf{u}_{2|I_n|}]_{\text{hypo}_3})^\# = ([\mathbf{u}_{2|I_n|}]_{\text{hypo}_3}^\#, \dots, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}^\#, [\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}^\#).$$

Define a map  $\psi : \prod_{I_n} (\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#) \rightarrow (\prod_{2I_n} \text{hypo}_3, \#)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} & (([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}), ([\mathbf{u}_3]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_4]_{\text{hypo}_4}), \dots, ([\mathbf{u}_{2|I_n|-1}]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_{2|I_n|}]_{\text{hypo}_3})) \\ & \mapsto ([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_3]_{\text{hypo}_3}, \dots, [\mathbf{u}_{2|I_n|-1}]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_{2|I_n|}]_{\text{hypo}_3}, \dots, [\mathbf{u}_4]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}). \end{aligned}$$

It is routine to verify that the map  $\psi$  is an isomorphism. By Theorem 3.2, each element in  $(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  corresponds to a matrix in  $UT_{13}(\mathbb{S})$  and the involution  $\#$  on  $(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  corresponds to the skew transposition on  $UT_{13}(\mathbb{S})$ . It follows that there is an embedding, denoted by  $\varphi$ , from  $(\prod_{2I_n} \text{hypo}_3, \#)$  to  $(UT_{26|I_n|}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$ . Let

$$\varphi_n = \varphi \circ \psi \circ \phi_n.$$

Then the following result hold.

**Theorem 3.6.** *For each  $n \geq 4$ , the map  $\varphi_n : (\text{hypo}_n, \#) \rightarrow (UT_{26|I_n|}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$  is a faithful representation of  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$ .*

**Remark 3.7.** Cain et al. have shown that  $\text{hypo}_n$  can be embedded into a direct product of  $n$  copies of the free monogenic monoid and  $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$  copies of the finite monoid  $A_0^1$  (denoted by  $\mathcal{H}$  in [8]) which will be defined in Section 4. They gave a faithful representation of the free monogenic monoid as a monoid of  $1 \times 1$  matrices and a faithful representation of  $A_0^1$  as a monoid of  $2 \times 2$  matrices. It follows that there is a faithful representation from  $\text{hypo}_n$  to  $M_{n^2}(\mathbb{S})$  [8, Theorems 3.3 and 3.4]. Since the representation of  $A_0^1$  they gave can not be extended to a representation from  $(A_0^1, *)$  to  $(M_2(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$ , the representation can not be extended to a representation from  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  to  $(M_{n^2}(\mathbb{S}), {}^D)$ .

Let  $a < b < c < d$  be a 4-element ordered alphabet and

$$H = \langle a, b, c, d \mid \mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}, ac = ca, ad = da, bc = cb, bd = db \rangle \cup \{1\}$$

be a monoid. The involution operation  $\#$  on  $H$  can be defined by  $a \mapsto d, b \mapsto c$ .

**Theorem 3.8.** *For any  $m, n \geq 4$ , the involution monoids  $(\text{hypo}_m, \#)$  and  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  generate the same variety.*

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 3.5 that

$$\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_4, \#) \subseteq \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_5, \#) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#).$$

It suffices to show that  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#) \subseteq \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_4, \#)$ . It is easy to see that  $(H, \#)$  is a homomorphism image of  $(\text{hypo}_4, \#)$ , and so  $\text{Var}(H, \#) \subseteq \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_4, \#)$ . In the following, we show that  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#) \subseteq \text{Var}(H, \#)$ .

Let  $\varphi$  be a map from  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$  to  $(H, \#) \times (H, \#) \times (H, \#)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} & ([\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \mapsto (1, 1, 1), \\ & ([1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \mapsto (a, a, 1), \quad ([2]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \mapsto (b, ba, a), \\ & ([3]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \mapsto (1, b, b), \quad ([\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [1]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \mapsto (1, c, c), \\ & ([\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \mapsto (c, dc, d), \quad ([\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [3]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \mapsto (d, d, 1). \end{aligned}$$

First to show that  $\varphi$  is well-defined, that is, if  $\mathbf{u}_1 \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}_2$ , then

$$(U_1, U_2, U_3) = \varphi([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) = \varphi([\mathbf{v}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{v}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) = (V_1, V_2, V_3).$$

Since  $\mathbf{u}_1 \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}_2$ , it is easy to see that  $\text{ev}(U_i) = \text{ev}(V_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . It follows from Proposition 2.2 and the definition of  $(H, \#)$  that, for any  $([\mathbf{w}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{w}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \in \text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3$ , the inversions of each component of  $\varphi([\mathbf{w}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{w}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) = (W_1, W_2, W_3)$  can be characterized as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} b-a \in \text{inv}(W_1) \text{ [resp. } d-c \in \text{inv}(W_3)]} &\Leftrightarrow 2-1 \in \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}_1) \text{ [resp. } \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}_2)], \\ b-a \in \text{inv}(W_3) \text{ [resp. } d-c \in \text{inv}(W_1)]} &\Leftrightarrow 3-2 \in \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}_1) \text{ [resp. } \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}_2)], \\ b-a \in \text{inv}(W_2) \text{ [resp. } d-c \in \text{inv}(W_2)]} &\Leftrightarrow 3-1 \in \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}_1) \text{ [resp. } \text{inv}(\mathbf{w}_2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{u}_1 \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \equiv_{\text{hypo}_\infty} \mathbf{v}_2$ , it is easy to see that  $\text{inv}(U_i) = \text{inv}(V_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Thus  $\varphi$  is well-defined, and so  $\varphi$  is a homomorphism.

Next, to show that the homomorphism  $\varphi$  is injective. Suppose that  $([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \neq ([\mathbf{v}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{v}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3})$ . Then  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}_1) \neq \text{ev}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ , or  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{v}_1) \neq \text{ev}(\mathbf{v}_2)$ , or  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{u}_1) \neq \text{inv}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  or  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{v}_1) \neq \text{inv}(\mathbf{v}_2)$ . If  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{u}_1) \neq \text{ev}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  or  $\text{ev}(\mathbf{v}_1) \neq \text{ev}(\mathbf{v}_2)$ , then  $\varphi([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \neq \varphi([\mathbf{v}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{v}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3})$ ; if  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{u}_1) \neq \text{inv}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  or  $\text{inv}(\mathbf{v}_1) \neq \text{inv}(\mathbf{v}_2)$ , then  $\varphi([\mathbf{u}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{u}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3}) \neq \varphi([\mathbf{v}_1]_{\text{hypo}_3}, [\mathbf{v}_2]_{\text{hypo}_3})$  by the definition of  $\varphi$ . Thus  $\varphi$  is injective. Therefore  $\varphi$  is an embedding from  $(\text{hypo}_3 \times \text{hypo}_3, \#)$  to  $(H, \#) \times (H, \#) \times (H, \#)$ .  $\square$

#### 4. THE IDENTITIES SATISFIED BY $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$

In this section, we obtain a complete characterization of the word identities satisfied by  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  for each finite  $n$ . Clearly, a word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(\text{hypo}_1, \#)$  if and only if  $\text{occ}(x, \bar{\mathbf{u}}) = \text{occ}(x, \bar{\mathbf{v}})$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\bar{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}})$ .

Let  $\mathbf{u}$  be a word. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) &= \{x \mid x, x^* \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})\}, \\ \text{ml}(\mathbf{u}) &= \{x \mid x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) = 1\}, \\ \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) &= \{x \mid x \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  if and only if  $x^* \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $\text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \emptyset$ . For example, if  $\mathbf{u} = x^*z^2xy^*x$ , then  $\text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) = \{x, x^*\}$ ,  $\text{ml}(\mathbf{u}) = \{x^*\}$  and  $\text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \{y^*\}$ .

Let

$$A_0^1 = \langle a, b \mid a^2 = a, b^2 = b, aba = bab = ba \rangle \cup \{1\} = \{a, b, ab, ba, 1\}.$$

The involution monoid  $(A_0^1, *)$  can be defined by  $A_0^1$  under the unary operation  $*$  that interchanges the generators  $a$  and  $b$  and fixes all other elements. The involution monoid  $(A_0^1, *)$  has been studied in [17] which showed that  $(A_0^1, *)$  is the first example of a non-finitely based involution semigroup of order five. Clearly the generators of  $A_0^1$  satisfy the relations in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$ , thus  $(A_0^1, *)$  is a homomorphic image of  $(\text{hypo}_2, \#)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(A_0^1, *)$  if and only if  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i)  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v}), \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{mix}(\mathbf{v}), \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{lin}(\mathbf{v})$ ;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,
  - (a) if  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y^*\}$ ;
  - (b) if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$  and  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} x^*$ ;
  - (c) if  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  be a word identity satisfied by  $(A_0^1, *)$ . Then it is easy to show or see [17, Lemma 4.2] that  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v})$ . Suppose that  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ . Then  $x^* \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , and so  $\{x, x^*\} \subseteq \text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v})$ . This implies that  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{v})$  and so  $\text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) \subseteq \text{mix}(\mathbf{v})$ . That  $\text{mix}(\mathbf{v}) \subseteq \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  by symmetry. Hence  $\text{mix}(\mathbf{v}) = \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ . Suppose that there exists  $x \in \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) \setminus \text{lin}(\mathbf{v})$ . Then  $x \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{mix}(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v}) \geq 2$ . Let  $\varphi_1$  be the homomorphism that maps  $x$  to  $ab$  and any other variable to 1. Then  $ab = \varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_1(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{lin}(\mathbf{v})$ . Therefore the condition (i) holds.

Suppose that there exist  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  but  $\{x, y\} \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y^*\}$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}[x, y] \in \{x, y\}^+ \cdot \{x^*, y^*\}^+$  while either some  $x$  occurs after the first  $x^*$  or the first  $y^*$ , or some  $y$  occurs after the first  $x^*$  or the first  $y^*$  in  $\mathbf{v}$ . Let  $\varphi_2$  be the homomorphism that maps  $x, y$  to  $a$  and any other variable to 1. Then  $ab = \varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_2(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  for any  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ . Thus (iia) holds. Suppose that there exist  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$  but  $\{x, y\} \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} x^*$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}[x, y] \in \{x, y\}^+ \cdot \{x^*\}^+$  while either some  $x$  occurs after the first  $x^*$ , or some  $y$  occurs after the first  $x^*$  in  $\mathbf{v}$ . Thus  $ab = \varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_2(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} x^*$  for any  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ . Suppose that there exist  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$  but  $x \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}[x, y] \in \{x\}^+ \cdot \{x^*, y\}^+$  while some  $x$  occurs after the first  $x^*$  or the first  $y$  in  $\mathbf{v}$ . Let  $\varphi_3$  be the homomorphism that maps  $x$  to  $a, y$  to  $b$  and any other variable to 1. Then  $ab = \varphi_3(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_3(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ , a contradiction. Hence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$  for any  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ . Thus (iib) holds. Suppose that there exist  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  but  $x \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}[x, y] \in \{x\}^+ \cdot \{y\}^+$  while some  $x$  occurs after the first  $y$  in  $\mathbf{v}$ . Thus  $ab = \varphi_3(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_3(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ , a contradiction. Hence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  for any  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ . Thus (iic) holds. Therefore the condition (ii) holds.

Conversely, let  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  be a word identity satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) and  $\phi$  be any homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(A_0^1, *)$ . First we show that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = ab$  if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ab$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = ab$ . Note that  $\phi$  mapping a variable  $x$  in  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  to 1 is the same as removing all occurrences of  $x$  and  $x^*$  in  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ . Hence if  $\phi(x) = 1$  for some  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ , then we only need to consider the identity obtained from  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  by deleting all occurrences of  $x$  and  $x^*$ . Therefore we may assume that  $\phi(x) \neq 1$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ . Now by the definition of  $A_0^1$ , either  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2$  for some nonempty words  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2$  such that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}_1) = a, \phi(\mathbf{u}_2) = b$ , or  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 z \mathbf{u}_2$  for some possibly empty words  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2$  such that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}_1) = a, \phi(\mathbf{u}_2) = b$  and  $\phi(z) = ab$ . If  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2$ , then since  $\phi(x) = a$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  and  $\phi(y) = b$  for any  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ , it follows that  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \cap \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2) = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Suppose that  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Then there exist some  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  and  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  such that  ${}_1 y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty x$ . If  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x^* \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  and  $y^* \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  satisfying  $\{x, y^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$ , whence  $\{x, y^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$  by (iia); if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x^* \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  satisfying  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$ , whence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$  by (iib); if  $x \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $y^* \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  satisfying  $\{x, y^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$ , whence  $\{x, y^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  by (iib); if  $x \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$ , whence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  by (iic). Hence in any case,  $\infty x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} {}_1 y$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Consequently,  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ab$ . If  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 z \mathbf{u}_2$ , then  $\phi(x) = a$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$ ,  $\phi(y) = b$  for any  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ , and  $z, z^* \notin \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2)$ . Hence  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \cap \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2) = \emptyset$  and  $z \in \text{lin}(\mathbf{u})$ . Therefore,  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{u}} z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Suppose that  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ . Then there exists  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  such that  ${}_1 z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty x$ . Since  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} z$ , it follows from (iib) and (iic) that  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ . Suppose that  $z \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Then there exists  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  such that

$1x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty z$ . Since  $z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x$ , it follows from (iib) and (iic) that  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} x$ , a contradiction. Hence  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Therefore  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Consequently  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ab$ .

Clearly  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = 1$  [resp.  $a, b$ ] if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = 1$  [resp.  $a, b$ ] by the definition of  $A_0^1$  and the condition (i). These imply that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = ba$  if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ . Therefore any word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) holds in  $(A_0^1, *)$ .  $\square$

Let

$$A = \langle a, b \mid ab = ba \rangle = \{a^m b^n \mid m, n \geq 0\}$$

be a monoid. The monoid  $A$  forms an involution monoid  $(A, *)$  under the unary operation  $*$  :  $a^m b^n \mapsto a^n b^m$ . It is routine to verify that  $(A, *)$  is a homomorphic image of  $(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$  under the map given by  $[1]_{\text{hypo}_2} \mapsto a$  and  $[2]_{\text{hypo}_2} \mapsto b$ . A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is *balanced* if  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) = \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v})$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v})$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(A, *)$  if and only if  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is balanced.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is a word identity satisfied by  $(A, *)$  such that either  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) \neq \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v})$  or  $\text{occ}(x^*, \mathbf{u}) \neq \text{occ}(x^*, \mathbf{v})$  for some  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $\varphi$  be a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(A, *)$  that maps  $x$  to  $a$  and any other variable to 1. Then  $\varphi(\mathbf{u}) = a^{\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u})} b^{\text{occ}(x^*, \mathbf{u})} \neq a^{\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v})} b^{\text{occ}(x^*, \mathbf{v})} = \varphi(\mathbf{v})$ , a contradiction.

Conversely, if  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is balanced, then  $\varphi(\mathbf{u}) = \varphi(\mathbf{v})$  for any homomorphism  $\varphi$  from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(A, *)$  since  $(A, *)$  is commutative. Therefore any balanced word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(A, *)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** *A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$  if and only if*

- (i)  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is balanced;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,
  - (a) if  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y^*\}$ ;
  - (b) if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$  and  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} x^*$ ;
  - (c) if  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $(A, *), (A_0^1, *) \in \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$ . Then  $(A, *) \times (A_0^1, *) \in \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$ . On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 3.1 that  $(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$  is isomorphic to the submonoid of  $(UT_5(\mathbb{S}), \mathcal{D})$  generated by  $E_5, \text{diag}\{s, J, \mathbf{1}\}$  and  $\text{diag}\{\mathbf{1}, K, s\}$ . Note that  $(A, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution matrix monoid generated by  $P, Q, E_2$  under the skew transposition and  $(A_0^1, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution matrix monoid generated by  $J, K, E_3$  under the skew transposition. Let  $\varphi$  be a map from the involution matrix monoid generated by  $E_5, \text{diag}\{s, J, \mathbf{1}\}$  and  $\text{diag}\{\mathbf{1}, K, s\}$  to  $(A, *) \times (A_0^1, *)$  given by

$$E_5 \mapsto (E_2, E_3), \text{diag}\{s, J, \mathbf{1}\} \mapsto (P, J), \text{diag}\{\mathbf{1}, K, s\} \mapsto (Q, K).$$

Then  $\varphi$  is an embedding. Hence  $(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp) \in \text{Var}((A, *) \times (A_0^1, *))$ . Therefore  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp) = \text{Var}((A, *) \times (A_0^1, *))$ . Now the result follows from Theorems 4.1 and 4.2.  $\square$

Let

$$B = \left\langle a, b, c \left| \begin{array}{l} a^2 = a, b^2 = b, c^2 = c, aba = bab = ba, aca = cac = ca, \\ bcb = cbc = cb, acb = cab, bac = bca, bcab = cba \end{array} \right. \right\rangle \cup \{1\} \\ = \{1, a, b, c, ab, ba, ac, ca, bc, cb, abc, acb, bac, cba\}.$$

The monoid  $B$  admits a unique involution  $*$  which is induced by the mapping  $(a, b, c) \mapsto (c, b, a)$ . Clearly the generators of  $B$  satisfy the relations in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{hypo}_\infty}$ , thus  $(B, *)$  is a homomorphic image of  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$ .



**Theorem 4.4.** *A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(B, *)$  if and only if  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfies the conditions*

- (i)  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v}), \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{mix}(\mathbf{v}), \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{lin}(\mathbf{v})$ ;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,
  - (a) if  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y^*\}$ ;
  - (b) if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$  and  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} x^*$ ;
  - (c) if  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ ;
- (iii) if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$ , then  $x \in \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})$  if and only if  $x \in \text{ml}(\mathbf{v})$  and  $x^* \in \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})$  if and only if  $x^* \in \text{ml}(\mathbf{v})$ ;
- (iv) if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $\{x, x^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $\{x, x^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  and  $y \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x, x^*\}$  if and only if  $y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x, x^*\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  be a word identity satisfied by  $(B, *)$ . Clearly, the involution submonoid of  $(B, *)$  generated by  $a, c$  is isomorphic to  $(A_0^1, *)$ . It follows from Theorem 4.1 that conditions (i) and (ii) hold. If  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$ , then  $\mathbf{u}[x] \in x^\alpha (x^*)^\beta$  for some  $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$ . It follows from the condition (iia) that  $\mathbf{v}[x] \in x^{\alpha'} (x^*)^{\beta'}$  for some  $\alpha', \beta' \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $\alpha = 1$  but  $\alpha' > 1$ . Let  $\varphi_1$  be the homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(B, *)$  that maps  $x$  to  $ab$  and any other variable to 1. Then  $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) \in \{abc, acb\}, \varphi_1(\mathbf{v}) \in \{bac, cba\}$ , which implies  $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_1(\mathbf{v})$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\alpha = 1$  if and only if  $\alpha' = 1$ . A similar argument can show that  $\beta = 1$  if and only if  $\beta' = 1$ . Therefore the condition (iii) holds.

Suppose that there exist  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $\{x, x^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  but  $\{x, x^*\} \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}[x, y] \in \{x, x^*, y^*\}^+ \{y, y^*\}^+$  and some  $x$  or  $x^*$  occurs after the first  $y$  in  $\mathbf{v}$ . Let  $\varphi_2$  be the homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(B, *)$  that maps  $x$  to  $b, y$  to  $c$  and any other variable to 1. Then  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) \in \{bc, abc, bac\}$  and  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{v}) \in \{cb, acb, cba\}$ , which implies that  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_2(\mathbf{v})$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\{x, x^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $\{x, x^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ . A similar argument can show that  $y \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x, x^*\}$  if and only if  $y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x, x^*\}$ . Therefore the condition (iv) holds.

Conversely, let  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  be an identity that satisfies the conditions (i)–(iv) and  $\phi$  be any homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(B, *)$ . Since  $(A_0^1, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution subsemigroup  $\{a, c, ac, ca, 1\}$  of  $(B, *)$ , it follows from Theorem 4.1 that  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $\{a, c, ac, ca, 1\}$ . Hence  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = \phi(\mathbf{v})$  when  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) \in \{a, c, ac, ca, 1\}$ . Clearly  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = b$  if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = b$  by the definition of  $B$  and the condition (i).

Next, to show that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = ab$  if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ab$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = ab$ . Note that  $\phi$  mapping a variable  $x$  in  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  to 1 is the same as removing all occurrences of  $x$  and  $x^*$  in  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ . Hence if  $\phi(x) = 1$  for some  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ , then we only need to consider the identity obtained from  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  by deleting all occurrences of  $x$  and  $x^*$ . Therefore we may assume that  $\phi(x) \neq 1$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ . Now by the definition of the monoid  $B$ , either  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2$  for some nonempty words  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2$  such that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}_1) = a, \phi(\mathbf{u}_2) = b$ , or  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 z \mathbf{u}_2$  for some possibly empty words  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2$  such that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}_1) = a, \phi(\mathbf{u}_2) = b$  and  $\phi(z) = ab$ . If  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2$ , then  $\phi(x) = a$  and  $x^* \notin \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  and  $\phi(y) = b$  for any  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Hence  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \cap \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) = \emptyset$  and  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \cap \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2) = \emptyset$ , whence  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Suppose that  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Then there exist some  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  and  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  such that  $1y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty x$ . If  $y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $y^* \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  satisfying  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{y, y^*\}$ , whence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{y, y^*\}$  by (iv); if  $y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$ , whence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  by (iic). Hence in any case,  $\infty x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} 1y$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . It follows from (i) that  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ab$ . If  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 z \mathbf{u}_2$ , then  $\phi(x) = a$  and  $x^* \notin \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$ ,  $\phi(y) = b$  for any  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ , and  $z, z^* \notin \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2)$ . Hence  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \cap \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}) = \emptyset, \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \cap \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2) = \emptyset$  and  $z \in \text{lin}(\mathbf{u})$ , whence  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{u}} z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Suppose that  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ . Then

there exists  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1)$  such that  $1z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty x$ . Since  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} z$ , it follows from (iic) that  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ , a contradiction. Hence  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ . Suppose that  $z \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Then there exists  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$  such that  $1y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty z$ . Since  $z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$ , it follows from (iic) and (iv) that  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ , a contradiction. Hence  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . Therefore  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}_1) \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \text{con}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ . It follows from (i) that  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ab$ . A similar argument can show that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = bc$  if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = bc$ .

To show that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = ba$  if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ . By symmetry, we may assume that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = ba$ . Then by the definition of  $B$  and our assumption,  $\phi(x) \in \{a, b, ab, ba\}$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ . It follows from definition of  $B$  and the condition (i) that  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) \in \{a, b, ab, ba\}$ . Note that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = a$  [resp.  $b, ab$ ] if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = a$  [resp.  $b, ab$ ]. Hence  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = ba$ . Similarly,  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = cb$  if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = cb$ .

Now to show that  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = abc$  [resp.  $acb, bac, cba$ ] if and only if  $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = abc$  [resp.  $acb, bac, cba$ ]. We only need to show that  $a$  precedes  $b$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{u})$  if and only if  $a$  precedes  $b$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$  and that  $b$  precedes  $c$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{u})$  if and only if  $b$  precedes  $c$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$ . In the following, we show that  $a$  precedes  $b$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{u})$  if and only if  $a$  precedes  $b$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$ , and  $b$  precedes  $c$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{u})$  if and only if  $b$  precedes  $c$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$  can be obtained by a similar argument. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $a$  precedes  $b$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{u})$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_3 \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  satisfying  $\phi(x) \in \{a, ac, ca\}$  for  $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$ ,  $\phi(y) \in \{b, bc, cb\}$  for  $y \in \mathcal{X}_2$  and  $\phi(w) = c$  for  $w \in \mathcal{X}_3$ . It follows from the definition of  $B$  that either  $\mathbf{u} \in \{\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+ \cdot \{\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+$ , or  $\mathbf{u} \in \{\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+ \cdot z \cdot \{\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+$  satisfying  $\phi(z) \in \{ab, abc, acb\}$ . If  $\mathbf{u} \in \{\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+ \cdot \{\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+$ , then  $\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}_2 = \emptyset$ , whence  $\mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \mathcal{X}_2$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{X}_1 \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \mathcal{X}_2$ . Then there exist some  $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$  and  $y \in \mathcal{X}_2$  such that  $1y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty x$ . Note that if  $y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $y^* \in \mathcal{X}_2$  satisfying  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{y, y^*\}$ , whence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{y, y^*\}$  by (iv); if  $y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$ , whence  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  by (iic). Hence in any case,  $\infty x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} 1y$ , a contradiction. Therefore  $\mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \mathcal{X}_2$  and so  $a$  precedes  $b$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$  by (i). If  $\mathbf{u} \in \{\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+ \cdot z \cdot \{\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{X}_3\}^+$ , then  $z \notin \mathcal{X}_1 \mathcal{X}_2 \mathcal{X}_3$ ,  $z^* \in \mathcal{X}_2$  when  $\phi(z) = ab$  and  $z^* \notin \mathcal{X}_1 \mathcal{X}_2 \mathcal{X}_3$  otherwise. Hence  $\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}_2 = \emptyset$ , whence  $\mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{\mathbf{u}} z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \mathcal{X}_2$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{X}_1 \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ . Then there exists  $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$  such that  $1z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty x$ . If  $z \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$  by  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} z$  (iic), a contradiction. If  $z \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{z, z^*\}$  by  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{z, z^*\}$  and (iv), a contradiction. Hence  $\mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z$ . Suppose that  $z \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} \mathcal{X}_2$ . Then there exists  $y \in \mathcal{X}_2$  such that  $1y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty z$ . If  $y = z^*$ , then  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z^*$  by  $z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} z^*$  and (iia), a contradiction. If  $y \neq z^*$  and  $y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $y^* \in \mathcal{X}_2$  satisfying  $z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{y, y^*\}$ , it follows from (iv) that  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{y, y^*\}$ , a contradiction. If  $y \neq z^*$  and  $y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  by  $z \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  and (iic), a contradiction. Hence  $z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \mathcal{X}_2$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{X}_1 \prec_{\mathbf{v}} z \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \mathcal{X}_2$ , and so  $a$  precedes  $b$  in  $\phi(\mathbf{v})$  by (i).

Therefore any word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfying conditions (i)–(iv) is satisfied by  $(B, *)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.5.** *A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  if and only if*

- (i)  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is balanced;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,
  - (a) if  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y^*\}$ ;
  - (b) if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x^*, y\}$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x^*, y\}$  and  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} x^*$  if and only if  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} x^*$ ;
  - (c) if  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ ;
- (iii) if  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  and  $y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $\{x, x^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $\{x, x^*\} \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$  and  $y \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \{x, x^*\}$  if and only if  $y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \{x, x^*\}$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $(A, *), (B, *) \in \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . Then  $(A, *) \times (B, *) \in \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 3.2 that  $(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  is isomorphic to the submonoid of  $(UT_{13}(\mathbb{S}), \mathcal{D})$  generated by matrices  $E_{13}$ ,  $\text{diag}\{P, J, J, E_3, E_2\}$ ,  $\text{diag}\{Q, K, KJ, J, P\}$  and  $\text{diag}\{E_2, E_3, K, K, Q\}$ . Note that  $(A, *)$  is isomorphic

to the involution matrix monoid generated by  $P, Q, E_2$  under the skew transposition and  $(B, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution matrix monoid generated by  $E_9, \text{diag}\{J, J, E_3\}, \text{diag}\{K, KJ, J\}, \text{diag}\{E_3, K, K\}$  under the skew transposition. Let  $\varphi$  be a map from the involution matrix monoid generated by  $E_{13}, \text{diag}\{P, J, J, E_3, E_2\}, \text{diag}\{Q, K, KJ, J, P\}$  and  $\text{diag}\{E_2, E_3, K, K, Q\}$  to  $(A, *) \times (B, *) \times (A, *)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{13} &\mapsto (E_2, 1, E_2), & \text{diag}\{P, J, J, E_3, E_2\} &\mapsto (P, a, E_2), \\ \text{diag}\{Q, K, KJ, J, P\} &\mapsto (E_2, b, PQ) & \text{diag}\{E_2, E_3, K, K, Q\} &\mapsto (Q, c, E_2) \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\varphi$  is an embedding. Hence  $(\text{hypo}_3, \#) \in \text{Var}((A, *) \times (B, *))$ . Therefore  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#) = \text{Var}((A, *) \times (B, *))$ . Now the result follows from Theorems 4.2 and 4.4.  $\square$

Let  $C$  be the 25-element monoid  $A_0^1 \times A_0^1$ . The monoid  $C$  forms an involution monoid  $(C, *)$  with the unary operation  $*$  given by  $(x, y)^* = (y^*, x^*)$ . Clearly,  $(C, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution monoid generated by  $E_6, \text{diag}\{J, E_3\}, \text{diag}\{K, E_3\}, \text{diag}\{E_3, J\}, \text{diag}\{E_3, K\}$  under the skew transposition. It is routine to verify that  $(C, *)$  is a homomorphic image of  $(\text{hypo}_4, \#)$  under the map given by  $[\varepsilon]_{\text{hypo}_4} \mapsto (1, 1)$ ,  $[1]_{\text{hypo}_4} \mapsto (a, 1)$ ,  $[2]_{\text{hypo}_4} \mapsto (b, 1)$ ,  $[3]_{\text{hypo}_4} \mapsto (1, a)$  and  $[4]_{\text{hypo}_4} \mapsto (1, b)$ . Note that  $(C, *)$  is also a homomorphic image of  $(H, \#)$  under the map given by  $1 \mapsto (1, 1)$ ,  $a \mapsto (a, 1)$ ,  $b \mapsto (b, 1)$ ,  $c \mapsto (1, a)$  and  $d \mapsto (1, b)$ .

**Theorem 4.6.** *A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(C, *)$  if and only if*

- (i)  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v}), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{ml}(\mathbf{v}), \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{lin}(\mathbf{v})$ ;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  be a word identity satisfied by  $(C, *)$ . Clearly, the involution submonoid of  $(C, *)$  generated by  $(a, a)$  and  $(b, b)$  is isomorphic to  $(A_0^1, *)$ . It follows from Theorem 4.3 that  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v}), \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{lin}(\mathbf{v})$ . Suppose that  $\text{ml}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \text{ml}(\mathbf{v})$ . Then there exists  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) = 1$  but  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v}) \geq 2$ . Let  $\varphi_1$  be the homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(C, *)$  that maps  $x$  to  $(1, ab)$  and any other variable to  $(1, 1)$ . Then  $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) \in \{(ab, ab), (ba, ab)\}$ ,  $\varphi_1(\mathbf{v}) \in \{(ab, ba), (ba, ba)\}$ , which implies that  $\varphi_1(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_1(\mathbf{v})$ , a contradiction. Therefore the condition (i) holds.

Suppose that there exist  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  but  $x \not\prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ . Then  $\mathbf{u}[x, y] \in \{x, x^*, y^*\}^+ \cdot \{y, x^*, y^*\}^+$  while some  $x$  occurs after the first  $y$  in  $\mathbf{v}$ . Let  $\varphi_2$  be the homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(C, *)$  that maps  $x$  to  $(a, 1)$ ,  $y$  to  $(b, 1)$  and any other variable to  $(1, 1)$ . Then  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) \in \{(ab, 1), (ab, a), (ab, b), (ab, ab), (ab, ba)\}$  and  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{v}) \in \{(ba, 1), (ba, a), (ba, b), (ba, ab), (ba, ba)\}$ , which implies that  $\varphi_2(\mathbf{u}) \neq \varphi_2(\mathbf{v})$ , a contradiction. Therefore the condition (ii) holds.

Conversely, let  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  be any word identity satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) and  $\phi$  be any homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+$  to  $(C, *)$ . A word  $\mathbf{u}$  is a *scattered subword* of  $\mathbf{w}$  if there exist  $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*)^+ \cup \{\emptyset\}$  such that  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \cdots \mathbf{u}_n$  and  $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_0 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \mathbf{u}_n \mathbf{w}_n$ . The set of all scattered subwords of  $\mathbf{w}$  of length  $k$  is denoted by  $\text{sca}_k(\mathbf{w})$ . Recall that  $(C, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution monoid generated by  $E_6, \text{diag}\{J, E_3\}, \text{diag}\{K, E_3\}, \text{diag}\{E_3, J\}, \text{diag}\{E_3, K\}$  under the skew transposition. It follows from [25, Corollary 3.3] that to show  $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = \phi(\mathbf{v})$ , it suffices to show  $\text{sca}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \text{sca}_k(\mathbf{v})$  for each  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ . Further, since each matrix in the involution semigroup generated by  $E_6, \text{diag}\{J, E_3\}, \text{diag}\{K, E_3\}, \text{diag}\{E_3, J\}, \text{diag}\{E_3, K\}$  is a diagonal block matrix, we only need to show that  $\text{sca}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \text{sca}_k(\mathbf{v})$  for each  $k = 1, 2$ . Clearly  $\text{sca}_1(\mathbf{u}) = \text{sca}_1(\mathbf{v})$  by  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v})$ . Note that  $\text{sca}_2(\mathbf{u}) = \{x^2, xy\}$  for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ . If  $x^2 \in \text{sca}_2(\mathbf{u})$  for some  $x$ , then  $x^2 \in \text{sca}_2(\mathbf{v})$  by (i); if  $xy \in \text{sca}_2(\mathbf{u})$ , then  $xy \in \text{sca}_2(\mathbf{v})$  by (i) and (ii). Hence  $\text{sca}_2(\mathbf{u}) \subseteq \text{sca}_2(\mathbf{v})$ , and  $\text{sca}_2(\mathbf{v}) \subseteq \text{sca}_2(\mathbf{u})$  by symmetry. Therefore,  $\text{sca}_2(\mathbf{u}) = \text{sca}_2(\mathbf{v})$ , as required.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.7.** *A word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $(\text{hypo}_n, *)$  for  $n \geq 4$  if and only if*

- (i)  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is balanced;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ .

*Proof.* It follows from the proof of Theorem 3.8 that  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_n, \sharp) = \text{Var}(H, \sharp)$  for  $n \geq 4$ . Clearly  $(A, *)$ ,  $(C, *) \in \text{Var}(H, \sharp)$ , thus  $(A, *) \times (C, *) \in \text{Var}(H, \sharp)$ . Note that  $(A, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution matrix monoid generated by  $P, Q, E_2$  under the skew transposition. Let  $\varphi$  be a map from  $(H, \sharp)$  to  $(A, *) \times (A, *) \times (C, *)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\mapsto (E_2, E_2, (1, 1)), \quad a \mapsto (P, E_2, (a, 1)), \\ b &\mapsto (Q, E_2, (b, 1)), \quad c \mapsto (E_2, P, (1, a)), \quad d \mapsto (E_2, Q, (1, b)). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\varphi$  is an embedding. Hence  $(H, \sharp) \in \text{Var}((A, *) \times (C, *))$ . Therefore  $\text{Var}(H, \sharp) = \text{Var}((A, *) \times (C, *))$ . Now the result follows from Theorems 4.2 and 4.6.  $\square$

**Remark 4.8.** It follows from Theorems 4.1, 4.4 and 4.6 that the involution monoids  $(A_0^1, *)$ ,  $(B, *)$  and  $(C, *)$  generate different varieties. However, the monoids  $A_0^1$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  generate the same variety. Clearly  $A_0^1 \in \text{Var}B$ . Recall that  $(A_0^1, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution matrix monoid generated by  $J, K, E_3$  under the skew transposition and  $(B, *)$  is isomorphic to the involution matrix monoid generated by  $E_9$ ,  $\text{diag}\{J, J, E_3\}$ ,  $\text{diag}\{K, KJ, J\}$ ,  $\text{diag}\{E_3, K, K\}$  under the skew transposition. Hence  $B$  is a submonoid of  $A_0^1 \times A_0^1 \times A_0^1$ , and so  $B \in \text{Var}A_0^1$ . Therefore  $\text{Var}A_0^1 = \text{Var}B$ . It is obvious that  $\text{Var}A_0^1 = \text{Var}C$ . Therefore  $\text{Var}A_0^1 = \text{Var}B = \text{Var}C$ . Furthermore, the word identities satisfied by  $A_0^1$  or  $B$  or  $C$  can be characterized as follows: an identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $A_0^1$  [resp.  $B, C$ ] if and only if

- (i)  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v})$ ,  $\text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{lin}(\mathbf{v})$ ;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ .

This fact also has been shown in [56, Proposition 4.2(ii) and (iv)].

**Remark 4.9.** It follows from Theorems 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7 that the involution monoids  $(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$ ,  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$  and  $(\text{hypo}_n, \sharp)$  with  $n \geq 4$  generate different varieties. However, the monoids  $\text{hypo}_n$  with  $n \geq 2$  generate the same variety [12, Theorem 3.7]. Also by Theorems 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7, the word identities satisfied by  $\text{hypo}_n$  with  $n \geq 2$  can be characterized as follows: an identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  holds in  $\text{hypo}_n$  with  $n \geq 2$  if and only if

- (i)  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is balanced;
- (ii) for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} y$  if and only if  $x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} y$ .

This fact also has been shown in [12, Theorem 4.1].

## 5. FINITE BASIS PROBLEM FOR $(\text{hypo}_n, \sharp)$

In this section, the finite basis problem for involution monoid  $(\text{hypo}_n, \sharp)$  for each finite  $n$  is solved. Clearly,  $(\text{hypo}_1, \sharp)$  is finitely based since its involution is trivial and it is commutative.

To show that  $(\text{hypo}_2, \sharp)$  and  $(\text{hypo}_3, \sharp)$  are non-finitely based, a sufficient condition under which an involution monoid is non-finitely based is needed. For each  $k \geq 2$ , define

$$\mathcal{X}_k = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k, x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_k^*, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k, y_1^*, y_2^*, \dots, y_k^*\}.$$

Then let  $P_k$  denote the set of all words  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{X}_k^+$  such that

$$\begin{array}{l} \{\infty y_1, \infty y_2, \dots, \infty y_k, \infty x_1\} \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1y_1^* \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty x_2 \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1y_2^* \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty x_3 \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1y_3^* \\ \vdots \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty x_{k-1} \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1y_{k-1}^* \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty x_k \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \{1y_k^*, 1x_1^*, 1x_2^*, \dots, 1x_k^*\}, \end{array}$$

and dually, let  $Q_k$  denote the set of all words  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{X}_k^+$  such that

$$\begin{array}{l} \{\infty x_1, \infty x_2, \dots, \infty x_k, \infty y_k\} \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1x_k^* \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty y_{k-1} \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1x_{k-1}^* \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty y_{k-2} \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1x_{k-2}^* \\ \vdots \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty y_2 \prec_{\mathbf{w}} 1x_2^* \\ \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \infty y_1 \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \{1x_1^*, 1y_1^*, 1y_2^*, \dots, 1y_k^*\}. \end{array}$$

**Lemma 5.1** ([17, Theorem 3.1]). *Suppose that  $(S, *)$  is any involution monoid such that*

- (I) *for each  $k \geq 2$ , there exist  $\mathbf{p}_k \in P_k$  and  $\mathbf{q}_k \in Q_k$  such that  $(S, *)$  satisfies the identity  $\mathbf{p}_k \approx \mathbf{q}_k$ ;*
- (II) *if  $(S, *)$  satisfies some word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  with*

$$\infty x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} 1x^* \prec_{\mathbf{u}} \infty y \prec_{\mathbf{u}} 1y^*,$$

*then either*

$$\infty x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} 1x^* \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} 1y^* \quad \text{or} \quad \infty y \prec_{\mathbf{v}} 1y^* \prec_{\mathbf{v}} \infty x \prec_{\mathbf{v}} 1x^*.$$

*Then  $(S, *)$  is non-finitely based.*

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{p}_k \in P_k, \mathbf{q}_k \in Q_k$  for each  $k \geq 2$ . Then every involution monoid  $(S, *)$  such that*

$$(A_0^1, *) \in \text{Var}(S, *) \subseteq \text{Var}\{\mathbf{p}_k \approx \mathbf{q}_k \mid k \geq 2 \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

*is non-finitely based.*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.1 or see [17, Lemma 4.4] that  $(A_0^1, *)$  satisfies the condition (II) of Lemma 5.1. Since  $(A_0^1, *) \in \text{Var}(S, *)$ , it follows that  $(S, *)$  satisfies the condition (II) of Lemma 5.1. And for each  $k \geq 2$ , the identity  $\mathbf{p}_k \approx \mathbf{q}_k$  satisfies the condition (I) of Lemma 5.1. Therefore  $(S, *)$  is non-finitely based by Lemma 5.1.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.3.** *Any variety in the interval  $[\text{Var}(A_0^1, *), \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)]$  is non-finitely based. Consequently,  $\text{Var}(B, *)$ ,  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_2, \#)$  and  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  are non-finitely based.*

*Proof.* For each  $k \geq 2$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}_k &= x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k y_1 y_2 \cdots y_k \cdot \mathbf{l}_k \cdot x_1^* x_2^* \cdots x_k^* y_1^* y_2^* \cdots y_k^*, \\ \mathbf{q}_k &= x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k y_1 y_2 \cdots y_k \cdot \mathbf{r}_k \cdot x_1^* x_2^* \cdots x_k^* y_1^* y_2^* \cdots y_k^*, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{l}_k = [\mathbf{r}_k^*] = y_1 y_2 \cdots y_k \cdot (x_1 y_1^* \cdot x_2 y_2^* \cdots x_k y_k^*) \cdot x_1^* x_2^* \cdots x_k^*$ . It is routine to show that  $\mathbf{p}_k \in P_k$  and  $\mathbf{q}_k \in Q_k$ . It follows from Theorem 4.5 that  $(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  satisfies the identity  $\mathbf{p}_k \approx \mathbf{q}_k$  for each  $k \geq 2$  and so each subvariety of  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  also satisfies the identity  $\mathbf{p}_k \approx \mathbf{q}_k$ . Therefore for any variety  $\text{Var}(S, *) \in [\text{Var}(A_0^1, *), \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)]$ ,

it follows from Theorem 5.2 that  $\text{Var}(S, *)$  is non-finitely based. Note that  $\text{Var}(A_0^1, *) \subset \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_2, \#) \subset \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  and  $\text{Var}(A_0^1, *) \subset \text{Var}(B, *) \subset \text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$ . Therefore,  $\text{Var}(B, *)$ ,  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_2, \#)$  and  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_3, \#)$  are non-finitely based.  $\square$

A pair  $\{i c, j d\} \subseteq \text{occset}(\mathbf{u})$  is *unstable* in a balanced identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  if  $i c \prec_{\mathbf{u}} j d$  but  $j d \prec_{\mathbf{v}} i c$ . The set of all unstable pairs in  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  will be referred as  $\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v})$ . A pair  $\{i c, j d\} \subseteq \text{occset}(\mathbf{u})$  is *critical* in a balanced identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  if  $\{i c, j d\}$  is adjacent in  $\mathbf{u}$  and unstable in  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *If  $\{i c, j d\} \subseteq \text{occset}(\mathbf{u})$  is unstable in a balanced word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  and  $i c \prec_{\mathbf{u}} j d$  then there exist a pair  $\{s p, t q\} \subseteq \text{occset}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $s p \prec_{\mathbf{u}} t q$  and  $\{s p, t q\}$  is critical in  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ .*

*Proof.* For every non-trivial balanced plain word identity, the result holds by [55, Lemma 3.2]. Clearly, if  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is any balanced word identity, then by the proof of [55, Lemma 3.2], it is easy to see that the result still holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** *The identities (1.1) and*

$$x z x t x \approx x z t x, \quad (5.1)$$

$$x y z x t y \approx y x z x t y, \quad (5.2)$$

$$x z y t x y \approx x z y t y x \quad (5.3)$$

*constitute an identity basis for  $(C, *)$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.6 that  $(C, *)$  satisfies the identities (1.1) and (5.1)–(5.3). Note that the identities (1.1) can be used to convert any nonempty term into some unique word. It suffices to show that each non-trivial word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfied by  $(C, *)$  can be deduced from (5.1)–(5.3). If  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is not balanced, then it follows from Theorem 4.6(i) that there exists some  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}), \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v}) \geq 2$  and  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) \neq \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v})$ . By using the identity (5.1), we can delete all of the non-first and non-last occurrences of  $x$  in both  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  such that  $x$  occurs exactly twice. By repeating this process,  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  can be converted into a balanced word identity. Therefore we may assume that  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is a non-trivial balanced word identity. It follows from Theorem 4.6(ii) that  $\mathbf{u}[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})] = \mathbf{v}[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})]$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  with  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) = 2$ . Since  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is non-trivial, it follows from Lemma 5.4 that  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  contains a critical pair  $\{i c, j d\} \subseteq \text{occset}(\mathbf{u})$ . By Theorem 4.6,  $\text{occ}(c, \mathbf{u}) = \text{occ}(d, \mathbf{u}) = 2$  and  $(i, j) \notin \{(1, 2), (2, 1)\}$ , and so  $(i, j) \in \{(1, 1), (2, 2)\}$ . Therefore, one can swap  $i c$  and  $j d$  in  $\mathbf{u}$  by using identities (5.2) and (5.3) and obtain a new word  $\mathbf{u}_1$  such that  $\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u}_1 \approx \mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}) \cup \{i c, j d\} = \text{chaos}(\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v})$ . If  $\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u}_1 \approx \mathbf{v}_1) = \emptyset$ , then  $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1$  and so  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  can be deduced from (5.2) and (5.3). Otherwise,  $\mathbf{u}_1 \approx \mathbf{v}_1$  is a non-trivial balanced word identity satisfying  $\mathbf{u}_1[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})] = \mathbf{v}_1[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})]$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  with  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) \geq 2$ . Then by using identities (5.2) and (5.3), we can get the identity  $\mathbf{u}_2 \approx \mathbf{v}_2$  such that  $\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u}_2 \approx \mathbf{v}_2) \subset \text{chaos}(\mathbf{u}_1 \approx \mathbf{v}_1)$  and  $|\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u}_2 \approx \mathbf{v}_2)| + 1 = |\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u}_1 \approx \mathbf{v}_1)|$ . By repeating this procedure  $|\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v})| = k$  times, we can get the identity  $\mathbf{u}_k \approx \mathbf{v}_k$  such that  $\text{chaos}(\mathbf{u}_k \approx \mathbf{v}_k) = \emptyset$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  can be deduced from (5.2) and (5.3).  $\square$

**Remark 5.6.** Note that there exists another involution operation on  $C$  which can be defined by  $(x, y)^{\otimes} = (x^*, y^*)$ . Clearly involution semigroups  $(C, *)$  and  $(C, \otimes)$  are not isomorphic and anti-isomorphic although they have the same semigroup reduct. It is easy to see that  $\text{Var}(C, *)$  is finitely based by Theorem 5.5 while  $\text{Var}(C, \otimes) = \text{Var}(A_0^1, *)$  is non-finitely based by [17].

**Theorem 5.7.** *The identities (1.1), (5.2), (5.3) and*

$$xzxytx \approx xzyxtx, \quad (5.4)$$

*constitute an identity basis for  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  with  $n \geq 4$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 4.7 that  $(\text{hypo}_4, \#)$  satisfies the identities (1.1), (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4). Note that the identities (1.1) can be used to convert any nonempty term into some unique word. It suffices to show that each non-trivial word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfied by  $(\text{hypo}_4, \#)$  can be deduced from (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4). If there exists some  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  $\mathbf{u}[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})] \neq \mathbf{v}[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})]$ , then  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) > 2$  by Theorem 4.7(ii) and there exists  $t \in \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}) \cup \text{ml}(\mathbf{u})$  such that  ${}_i x \prec_{\mathbf{u}} {}_1 t$  while  ${}_1 t \prec_{\mathbf{v}} {}_i x$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u})$ . It follows from Theorem 4.7(ii) that  $i \notin \{1, \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u})\}$ . Therefore by (5.4),  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  can be converted into an identity  $\mathbf{u}' \approx \mathbf{v}'$  such that  $\mathbf{u}'[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{u}'), \text{ml}(\mathbf{u}')] = \mathbf{v}'[x, \text{lin}(\mathbf{v}'), \text{ml}(\mathbf{v}')] for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u})$ . Now the case is the same as Theorem 5.5, and so  $\mathbf{u}' \approx \mathbf{v}'$  can be derived from (5.2) and (5.3), as required.  $\square$$

In the end, we consider the number of subvarieties of  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  for each  $n \geq 3$ . Recall that a word  $\mathbf{u}$  is an *isoterm* for an involution monoid if it does not satisfy any non-trivial word identity of the form  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ .

**Lemma 5.8** ([18, Theorem 3.6]). *Let  $(M, *)$  be any involution monoid with isoterms  $xx^*yy^*$  and  $xyy^*x^*$ . Then the variety  $\text{Var}(M, *)$  contains continuum many subvarieties.*

**Theorem 5.9.** *Each of varieties  $\text{Var}(B, *)$ ,  $\text{Var}(C, *)$  and  $\text{Var}(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  with  $n \geq 3$  contains continuum many subvarieties.*

*Proof.* By Theorems 4.4–4.7, it is routine to show that both the words  $xx^*yy^*$  and  $xyy^*x^*$  are isoterms for involution monoids  $(B, *)$ ,  $(C, *)$  and  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  with  $n \geq 3$ . Now the results follows from Lemma 5.8.  $\square$

**Remark 5.10.** In [41, Question 1.5], Lee asked whether there exists a finitely based finite involution monoid such that its variety contains continuum many subvarieties. And in the same paper, he gave an example of such involution monoid of order 31. By Theorems 5.5 and 5.9, the involution monoid  $(C, *)$  of order 25 is finitely based which contains continuum many subvarieties. Hence  $(C, *)$  is another example to answer the question of [41, Question 1.5].

## 6. RECOGNIZING IDENTITIES OF $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$ IN POLYNOMIAL TIME

In this section, it is shown that the identity checking problem of  $(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  belong to the complexity class P.

**Theorem 6.1.** *The decision problems  $\text{CHECK-ID}(A_0^1, *)$ ,  $\text{CHECK-ID}(B, *)$  and  $\text{CHECK-ID}(C, *)$  belong to the complexity class P.*

*Proof.* For decision problem  $\text{CHECK-ID}(A_0^1, *)$ , it suffices to show that, given any word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ , one can check whether or not the words  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  satisfy conditions of Theorem 4.1 in polynomial time of the sum of the lengths of  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  time. For this, it suffices to exhibit algorithms that, given a word  $\mathbf{w} = z_1 z_2 \cdots z_n$ , calculate  $\text{con}(\mathbf{w})$ ,  $\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$  and  $\text{lin}(\mathbf{w})$  and check whether or not  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \{x^*, y^*\}$  when  $x, y \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ ,  $x \prec_{\mathbf{w}} \{x^*, y\}$  or  $\{x, y\} \prec_{\mathbf{w}} x^*$  when  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ ,  $y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ , and  $x \prec_{\mathbf{w}} y$  when  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$  for any  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{w})$ .

To calculate  $\text{con}(\mathbf{w})$ , we initialize  $\overrightarrow{\text{con}}(\mathbf{w}) = \emptyset$  and then scan the word  $\mathbf{w}$  variable-by-variable from left to right. Each time when we read a variable of  $\mathbf{w}$ , we check whether the variable occurs in  $\overrightarrow{\text{con}}(\mathbf{w})$ , and if it does not occur, then we append the

variable to  $\overrightarrow{\text{con}}(\mathbf{w})$ . Then we pass to the next variable if it exists or stop if the current variable is the last variable of  $\mathbf{w}$ . Clearly, at the end of the process,  $\overrightarrow{\text{con}}(\mathbf{w})$  contains all variables that occur in  $\mathbf{w}$  and so  $\overrightarrow{\text{con}}(\mathbf{w}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{w})$ . The algorithm makes  $n$  steps and on each step it compares with the current set  $\overrightarrow{\text{con}}(\mathbf{w})$  whose cardinal number does not exceed  $|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})|$ . Hence, the time spent is linear in  $|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})|n$ . For  $\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ , for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{w})$ , we only need to check whether the variable  $x^*$  occurs in  $\text{con}(\mathbf{w})$  or not. Clearly the time spent is linear in  $|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})|(|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})| - 1)$ . For  $\text{lin}(\mathbf{w})$ , for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{w}) \setminus \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ , we only need to count the times of the variable  $x$  occurring in  $\mathbf{w}$ . Clearly the time spent is linear in  $n(|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})| - |\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|)$ . Therefore, checking whether the word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfies the condition (i) of Theorem 4.1 can be completed in polynomial time.

For any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{w})$ , define  $f(x)$  and  $\ell(x)$  which are used to record the positions of  ${}_1x$  and  ${}_\infty x$  respectively. We scan the word  $\mathbf{w}$  variable-by-variable from left to right. Each time we check whether  $z_i = x$ . If  $z_i = x$ , then we assign  $i$  to  $f(x)$  and stop the algorithm, otherwise we pass to the next variable. Hence, the time spent to obtain  $f(x)$  is linear in  $n$ . Similarly, we scan the word  $\mathbf{w}$  variable-by-variable from right to left to obtain  $\ell(x)$ . Clearly, the time spent to obtain  $\ell(x)$  is linear in  $n$ .

Let  $x, y \in \text{con}(\mathbf{w})$ . If  $x = y^* \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ , then we locate the positions of  ${}_\infty x$  and  ${}_1x^*$  and check whether  $\ell(x) < f(x^*)$ . There are  $|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|$  such  $x$ . Hence, the time spent is linear in  $|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|(2n + 1)$ . If  $x \neq y^* \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ , then we locate the positions of  ${}_\infty x, {}_\infty y$  and  ${}_1x^*, {}_1y^*$  and check whether  $\ell(x) < f(x^*), \ell(x) < f(y^*), \ell(y) < f(x^*), \ell(y) < f(y^*)$ . There are  $\binom{|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|}{2} - \frac{|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|}{2}$  pairs of such  $x, y$ . Hence, the time spent is linear in  $(\binom{|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|}{2} - \frac{|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|}{2})(4n + 4)$ . If  $x \in \text{mix}(\mathbf{w}), y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ , then we locate the positions of  ${}_\infty x, {}_1x^*$  and  ${}_\infty y, {}_1y$  and check whether  $\ell(x) < f(x^*), \ell(x) < f(y)$  or  $\ell(x) < f(x^*), \ell(y) < f(x^*)$ . There are  $|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|(|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})| - |\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|)$  pairs of such  $x, y$ . Hence, the time spent is linear in  $|\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|(|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})| - |\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|)(4n + 4)$ . If  $x, y \notin \text{mix}(\mathbf{w})$ , then we locate the positions of  ${}_\infty x, {}_1y$  and  ${}_\infty y, {}_1x$  and check whether  $\ell(x) < f(y)$  or  $\ell(y) < f(x)$ . There are  $\binom{|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})| - |\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|}{2}$  pairs of such  $x, y$ . Hence, the time spent is linear in  $(\binom{|\text{con}(\mathbf{w})| - |\text{mix}(\mathbf{w})|}{2})(4n + 2)$ . Therefore, checking whether  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  satisfies the condition (ii) of Theorem 4.1 can be completed in polynomial time.

Therefore the decision problem  $\text{CHECK-ID}(A_0^1, *)$  belongs to the complexity class P. By a similar argument, the decision problems  $\text{CHECK-ID}(B, *)$  and  $\text{CHECK-ID}(C, *)$  also belong to the complexity class P.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.2.** *The decision problem  $\text{CHECK-ID}(\text{hypo}_n, \#)$  for each finite  $n$  belong to the complexity class P.*

*Proof.* By Theorems 4.3, 4.5, 4.7 and 6.1, it suffices to show that, given any word identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$ , there is an algorithm to check the identity  $\mathbf{u} \approx \mathbf{v}$  is balanced in polynomial time. Then we only need to check whether  $\text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v})$  and  $\text{occ}(x, \mathbf{u}) = \text{occ}(x, \mathbf{v})$  for any  $x \in \text{con}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{con}(\mathbf{v})$ . Clearly, these can be completed in polynomial time.  $\square$

Cain et al. give a complete characterization of the identities satisfied by  $\text{hypo}_n$  for each  $n \geq 2$  in [12, Theorem 4.1]. By a similar argument with Theorem 6.2, it can be shown that the decision problem  $\text{CHECK-ID}(\text{hypo}_n)$  belongs to the complexity class P.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Auinger, Y.Z. Chen, X. Hu, Y.F. Luo, M.V. Volkov, The finite basis problem for Kauffman monoids, *Algebra Univers.* 74 (2015) 333–350.
- [2] A. Abram, C. Reutenauer, The stylic monoid, *Semigroup Forum* 105(1) (2022) 1–45.



- [3] T. Aird, D. Ribeiro, Tropical representations and identities of the stylic monoid, *Semigroup Forum*, (2022) DOI:10.1007/s00233-022-10328-9.
- [4] J. Almeida, M.V. Volkov, S.V. Goldberg, Complexity of the identity checking problem for finite semigroups, *J. Math. Sci.* 158(5) (2009) 605–614.
- [5] S. Burris, H.P. Sankappanavar, *A Course in Universal Algebra*, Springer, New York, 1981.
- [6] Y.Z. Chen, X. Hu, N.V. Kitov, Y.F. Luo, M.V. Volkov, Identities of the Kauffman monoid  $\mathcal{K}_3$ , *Commun. Algebra*, 48(5) (2020) 1956–1968.
- [7] Y.Z. Chen, X. Hun, Y.F. Luo, O. Sapir, The finite basis problem for the monoid of two-by-two upper triangular tropical matrices, *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* 94(1) (2016) 54–64.
- [8] A.J. Cain, M. Johnson, M. Kambites, A. Malheiro, Representations and identities of plactic-like monoids, *J. Algebra* 606 (2022) 819–850.
- [9] A.J. Cain, G. Klein, L. Kubat, A. Malheiro, J. Okniński, A note on identities in plactic monoids and monoids of upper-triangular tropical matrices, (2017) arXiv:1705.04596.
- [10] A.J. Cain, A. Malheiro, Identities in plactic, hypoplactic, sylvester, Baxter, and related monoids, *Electron. J. Combin.* 25(3) (2018) 3.30.
- [11] A.J. Cain, A. Malheiro, D. Ribeiro, Identities and bases in the sylvester and baxter monoids, (2021) arXiv: 2106.00733.
- [12] A.J. Cain, A. Malheiro, D. Ribeiro, Identities and bases in the hypoplactic monoid, *Commun. Algebra* 50(1) (2022) 146–152.
- [13] L. Daviaud, M. Johnson, M. Kambites, Identities in upper triangular tropical matrix semigroups and the bicyclic monoid, *J. Algebra* 501 (2018) 503–525.
- [14] W. Fulton, *Young Tableaux: With Applications to Representation Theory and Geometry*, LMS Student Texts, vol. 35, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [15] S. Giraudo, Algebraic and combinatorial structures on pairs of twin binary trees, *J. Algebra* 360 (2012) 115–157.
- [16] M. Gao, W.T. Zhang, Y.F. Luo, The monoid of  $2 \times 2$  triangular boolean matrices under skew transposition is non-finitely based, *Semigroup Forum* 100 (2020) 153–168.
- [17] M. Gao, W.T. Zhang, Y.F. Luo, A non-finitely based involution semigroup of order five, *Algebra Univers.* 81(31) (2020).
- [18] M. Gao, W.T. Zhang, Y.F. Luo, Varieties of involution J-trivial monoids with continuum many subvarieties, *Algebr. Colloq.* (2022) accepted.
- [19] F. Hivert, J.C. Novelli, J.Y. Thibon, The algebra of binary search trees, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 339(1) (2005) 129–165.
- [20] F. Hivert, J.C. Novelli, J.Y. Thibon, Commutative combinatorial Hopf algebras, *J. Algebr. Comb.* 28(1) (2007) 65–95.
- [21] B.B. Han, W.T. Zhang, Y.F. Luo, Equational theories of upper triangular tropical matrix semigroups, *Algebra Univers.* 82(44) (2021).
- [22] B.B. Han, W.T. Zhang, Finite basis problems for stalactic, taiga, sylvester and baxter monoids, *J. Algebra Appl.* (2022) DOI:10.1142/S0219498823502043.
- [23] Z. Izhakian, Semigroup identities in the monoid of triangular tropical matrices, *Semigroup Forum* 88(1) (2014) 145–161.
- [24] Z. Izhakian, S.W. Margolis, Semigroup identities in the monoid of two-by-two tropical matrices, *Semigroup Forum* 80(2) (2010) 191–218.
- [25] M. Johnson, P. Fenner, Identities in untriangular and gossip monoids, *Semigroup Forum* 98 (2019) 338–354.
- [26] M. Johnson, M. Kambites, Tropical representations and identities of plactic monoids, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 374 (2021) 4423–4447.
- [27] M. Jackson, R. McKenzie, Interpreting graph colorability in finite semigroups, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* 16(1) (2006) 119–140.
- [28] M. Jackson, M.V. Volkov, The algebra of adjacency patterns: Rees matrix semigroups with reversion, in: Blass A., Dershowitz N., Reisig W. (eds.), *Fields of Logic and Computation*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pp. 414–443. Springer, Berlin, (2010).
- [29] D. Knuth, Permutations, matrices, and generalized Young tableaux, *Pacific J. Math.* 34 (1970) 709–727.
- [30] R. Kruse, Identities satisfied in a finite ring, *J. Algebra* 26 (1973) 298–318.
- [31] O.G. Kharlampovich, M.V. Sapir, Algorithmic problems in varieties, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* 5(4-5) (1995) 379–602.
- [32] D. Krob, J. Y. Thibon, Noncommutative Symmetric Functions IV: Quantum Linear Groups and Hecke Algebras at  $q = 0$ , *J. Algebr. Comb.* 6(4) (1997) 339–376.
- [33] N.V. Kitov, M.V. Volkov, Identities of the Kauffman monoid  $\mathcal{K}_4$  and of the Jones monoid  $\mathcal{J}_4$ , in: Blass, A., Cegielski, P., Dershowitz, N., Droste, M., Finkbeiner, B. (eds) *Fields of Logic and Computation III. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 12180. Springer, Cham. (2020).

- [34] I.V. L’vov, Varieties of associative rings I, *Algebra i Logika* 12, (1973) 269–297.
- [35] M. Lothaire, *Algebraic Combinatorics on Words*, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 90, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [36] E.W.H. Lee, Finite involution semigroups with infinite irredundant bases of identities, *Forum Math.* 28 (2016) 587–607.
- [37] E.W.H. Lee, Finitely based finite involution semigroups with non-finitely based reducts, *Quaest. Math.* 39 (2016) 217–243.
- [38] E.W.H. Lee, Equational theories of unstable involution semigroups, *Electron. Res. Announc. Math. Sci.* 24 (2017) 10–20.
- [39] E.W.H. Lee, A sufficient condition for the absence of irredundant bases, *Houston J. Math.* 44 (2018) 399–411.
- [40] E.W.H. Lee, Non-finitely based finite involution semigroups with finitely based semigroup reducts, *Korean J. Math.* 27 (2019) 53–62.
- [41] E.W.H. Lee, Varieties of involution monoids with extreme properties, *Quart. J. Math.* 70 (2019) 1157–1180.
- [42] E.W.H. Lee, Contributions to the theory of varieties of semigroups. D.Sc. Thesis, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia, (2020).
- [43] A. Lascoux, M. P. Schützenberger, Sur une conjecture de H. O. Foulkes, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A–B* 286(7) (1978) A323–A324.
- [44] A. Lascoux, M.P. Schützenberger, Le monoïde plaxique, in: *Noncommutative Structures in Algebra and Geometric Combinatorics*, in: *Quaderni de La Ricerca Scientifica*, vol. 109, CNR, Rome, 1981, pp. 129–156.
- [45] A. Lascoux, M.P. Schützenberger, Schubert polynomials and the Littlewood-Richardson rule, *Lett. Math. Phys.* 10(2–3) (1985) 111–124.
- [46] A. Lascoux, M. P. Schützenberger, Tableaux and noncommutative Schubert polynomials, *Funct. Anal. Its Appl.* 23(3) (1990) 223–225.
- [47] V.L. Murskii, Examples of varieties of semigroups, *Math. Notes* 3(6) (1968) 423–427.
- [48] R. McKenzie, Equational bases for lattice theories, *Math. Scand.* 27 (1970) 24–38.
- [49] I. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2008.
- [50] J. C. Novelli, On the hypoplactic monoid, *Discrete Mathematics* 217(1–3) (2000) 315–336.
- [51] S. Oates, M.B. Powell, Identical relations in finite groups, *J. Algebra* 1 (1964) 11–39.
- [52] P. Perkins, Bases for equational theories of semigroups, *J. Algebra* 11 (1969) 298–314.
- [53] J.-B. Prieze, A lattice of combinatorial Hopf algebras: binary trees with multiplicities, in: *Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics*, Nancy, 2013, The Association. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, 2013.
- [54] C. Schensted, Longest increasing and decreasing subsequences, *Canad. J. Math* 13 (1961) 179–191.
- [55] O. Sapir, Finitely based words, *Int. J. Algebr. Comput.* 10(4) (2000) 457–480.
- [56] O. Sapir, Finitely based monoids, *Semigroup Forum* 90 (2015) 587–614.
- [57] M.V. Volkov, The finite basis problem for finite semigroups, *Sci. Math. Jpn.* 53 (2001) 171–199.
- [58] M.V. Volkov, Identities of the stylic monoid, *Semigroup Forum* 105 (2022) 345–349.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, LANZHOU UNIVERSITY, LANZHOU, GANSU 730000, PR CHINA

*Email address:* hanbb19@lzu.edu.cn, zhangwt@lzu.edu.cn, luoyf@lzu.edu.cn