

SKEW LEFT BRACES AND 2-REDUCTIVE SOLUTIONS OF THE YANG-BAXTER EQUATION

PŘEMYSL JEDLIČKA AND AGATA PILITOWSKA

ABSTRACT. We study 2-reductive non-involutive non-degenerate set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation. We give a combinatorial construction of any such solution of any (even infinite) size. We also prove that solutions associated to a skew left brace are 2-reductive if and only if the skew left brace is nilpotent of class 2. Moreover, all such skew left braces are actually bi-skew left braces. We focus on these structures and we give several equivalent properties characterizing solutions associated to bi-skew left braces.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Yang-Baxter equation is a fundamental equation occurring in mathematical physics. It appears, for example, in integrable models in statistical mechanics, quantum field theory or Hopf algebras (see e.g. [20, 21]). Searching for its solutions has been absorbing researchers for many years.

Let us recall that, for a vector space V , a *solution of the Yang–Baxter equation* is a linear mapping $r : V \otimes V \rightarrow V \otimes V$ such that

$$(id \otimes r)(r \otimes id)(id \otimes r) = (r \otimes id)(id \otimes r)(r \otimes id).$$

Description of all possible solutions seems to be extremely difficult and therefore there were some simplifications introduced by Drinfeld in [11]. Let X be a basis of the space V and let $\sigma : X^2 \rightarrow X$ and $\tau : X^2 \rightarrow X$ be two mappings. We say that (X, σ, τ) is a *set-theoretic solution of the Yang–Baxter equation* if the mapping

$$x \otimes y \mapsto \sigma(x, y) \otimes \tau(x, y)$$

extends to a solution of the Yang–Baxter equation. It means that $r : X^2 \rightarrow X^2$, where $r = (\sigma, \tau)$, is a bijection and satisfies the *braid relation*:

$$(1.1) \quad (id \times r)(r \times id)(id \times r) = (r \times id)(id \times r)(r \times id).$$

A solution $(X, r) = (X, \sigma, \tau)$ is called *non-degenerate* if the mappings $\sigma_x = \sigma(x, -)$ and $\tau_y = \tau(-, y)$ are bijections, for all $x, y \in X$. A solution is *involutive* if $r^2 = id_{X^2}$, i.e. for each $x, y \in X$, $\tau_y(x) = \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)}^{-1}(x)$ and $\sigma_x(y) = \tau_{\tau_y(x)}^{-1}(y)$. Moreover, it is *square free* if $r(x, x) = (x, x)$, for every $x \in X$.

All solutions we study in this paper are set-theoretic and non-degenerate and we will call them simply *solutions*. Although researchers usually focus on finite solutions only, in our paper the set X can be of arbitrary cardinality.

In the last decade, the main interest of researchers lied in the study of involutive solutions, mainly due to the fact that every involutive solution embeds into a solution associated to a ring-like structure called *left brace* [24, 7]. A special emphasis was taken onto so-called *multipermutation*

Date: March 28, 2023.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 16T25. Secondary: 20B25n.

Key words and phrases. Yang–Baxter equation, set-theoretic solution, multipermutation solution, nilpotency, skew left brace, left distributivity, bi-skew left brace.

solution since the property resembles nilpotency and it is connected to the nilpotency of left braces (see e.g. [13, 26]).

In 2017 Guarnieri and Vendramin [15] generalized the concept of left braces introducing the skew left braces (Definition 4.1). These structures yield non-involutive solutions and we can also define *multipermutation* solutions (Definition 2.1). Due to Bachiller [2], we have, analogously as in the involutive case, that the multipermutation property of solutions corresponds to the nilpotency property of skew left braces (Corollary 4.28). The path is therefore cleared for researchers to study non-involutive multipermutation solutions as Vendramin formulated in [30, Problem 23]. Of course, such a study is more complicated in the non-involutive case since we now need to consider two almost independent mappings σ and τ , whereas in the involutive case one of the mappings was defined uniquely from the other one.

The least complicated involutive solutions are so called *2-reductive* ones. The authors together with Zamojska-Dzienio showed in [19] that the nature of such solutions is a combinatorial one rather than algebraic and a combinatorial construction of any such solution was presented there. The notion of 2-reductivity can be naturally generalized for non-involutive solutions too, only instead of one identity we need four identities (Definition 3.1). It then turns out that the combinatorial construction from [19] translates straightforwardly for non-involutive solutions. We also prove, analogously as in the involutive case, that a skew left brace yields a 2-reductive solution if and only if it is nilpotent of class 2 (Theorem 6.4).

The 2-reductive involutive solutions appeared in a different context as well. Stefanello and Trappeniers studied in [29] so called *bi-skew left braces* (Definition 4.11) and their connections with solutions. They proved that an involutive solution associated to a bi-skew left brace is always 2-reductive. In the non-involutive case, we find in Theorem 5.5 that the solution associated to a bi-skew left brace is left distributive, a property introduced (in the context of solutions) in [18]. On the other hand, Bardakov, Neshchadim and Yadav investigated in [3] skew left braces (B, \cdot, \circ) for which the mapping λ is a homomorphism of groups (B, \cdot) and $\text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$ (*λ -homomorphic skew left braces*). In Proposition 6.1 we showed that each skew left brace with 2-reductive associated solution is λ -homomorphic.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we recall basic definitions and properties of solutions. In Section 3 we introduce the definition of 2-reductivity and we present the combinatorial construction of 2-reductive solutions (Theorem 3.9). In Section 4 we recall the definition of a skew left brace, of a bi-skew left brace and of their associated solutions. We also recall many properties of these structures. In Section 5 we characterize the solutions associated to bi-skew left braces using several equivalent properties (Theorem 5.5) and we show the impact of these properties on bi-skew left braces. Finally, in Section 6 we describe the skew left braces that yield 2-reductive solutions; more precisely we give an equivalent characterization for each of the four identities defining the 2-reductivity separately (Proposition 6.1) as well as a characterization for all the four properties combined (Theorem 6.4).

2. PRELIMINARIES

Since $r: X^2 \rightarrow X^2$ is a bijective map there is $r^{-1}: X^2 \rightarrow X^2$. It is also true that (X, r^{-1}) is a solution. Let for $x \in X$, $\hat{\sigma}_x, \hat{\tau}_x: X \rightarrow X$ be such that $r^{-1}(x, y) = (\hat{\sigma}_x(y), \hat{\tau}_x(y))$. Clearly, we have that for $x, y \in X$:

$$\begin{aligned} (x, y) &= rr^{-1}(x, y) = r(\hat{\sigma}_x(y), \hat{\tau}_x(y)) = (\sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)}\hat{\tau}_x(y), \tau_{\hat{\tau}_x(y)}\hat{\sigma}_x(y)), \quad \text{and} \\ (x, y) &= r^{-1}r(x, y) = r^{-1}(\sigma_x(y), \tau_y(x)) = (\hat{\sigma}_{\sigma_x(y)}\tau_y(x), \hat{\tau}_{\tau_y(x)}\sigma_x(y)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)} \hat{\tau}_y(x) = x \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{\tau}_y(x) = \sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)}^{-1}(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sigma_y^{-1}(x) = \hat{\tau}_{\hat{\sigma}_x^{-1}(y)}(x)$$

$$(2.2) \quad \tau_{\hat{\tau}_y(x)} \hat{\sigma}_x(y) = y \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{\sigma}_x(y) = \tau_{\hat{\tau}_y(x)}^{-1}(y) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tau_x^{-1}(y) = \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\tau}_y^{-1}(x)}(y)$$

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{\sigma}_{\sigma_x(y)} \tau_y(x) = x \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tau_y(x) = \hat{\sigma}_{\sigma_x(y)}^{-1}(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{\sigma}_y^{-1}(x) = \tau_{\sigma_x^{-1}(y)}(x)$$

$$(2.4) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\tau_y(x)} \sigma_x(y) = y \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sigma_x(y) = \hat{\tau}_{\tau_y(x)}^{-1}(y) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{\tau}_x^{-1}(y) = \sigma_{\tau_y^{-1}(x)}(y).$$

By definition, in an involutive solution we always have $\hat{\sigma}_x = \sigma_x$ and $\hat{\tau}_x = \tau_x$.

A solution (X, σ, τ) is called *permutational*, if for every $x, y \in X$, $\sigma_x = \sigma_y$ and $\tau_x = \tau_y$. It is a *projection* (or *trivial*) solution if for every $x \in X$, $\sigma_x = \tau_x = \text{id}$.

We say that a solution (X, σ, τ) satisfies Condition **(lri)** if, for each $x \in X$, the permutations σ_x and τ_x are mutually inverse, i.e.

$$(lri) \quad \forall_{x \in X} \quad \sigma_x = \tau_x^{-1}.$$

If (X, σ, τ) is a solution then directly by braid relation we obtain for $x, y, z \in X$:

$$(2.5) \quad \sigma_x \sigma_y = \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} \sigma_{\tau_y(x)}$$

$$(2.6) \quad \tau_{\sigma_{\tau_y(x)}(z)} \sigma_x(y) = \sigma_{\tau_{\sigma_y(z)}(x)} \tau_z(y)$$

$$(2.7) \quad \tau_x \tau_y = \tau_{\tau_x(y)} \tau_{\sigma_y(x)}$$

To describe involutive solutions (X, σ, τ) , the groups of the form $\langle \sigma_x : x \in X \rangle$ were investigated by many authors (see e.g. [8]) and called *IYB groups*. In the non-involutive cases various types of such kind of groups were introduced – see e.g. [2, 18, 6]. In the paper we will focus on three of them. The *left permutation group* of a solution (X, σ, τ) is the permutation group generated by the permutations from the left-hand coordinate of r , i.e. the group $\mathcal{G}_\ell(X) = \langle \sigma_x : x \in X \rangle$. Similarly, one defines the *right permutation group* of (X, σ, τ) as the permutation group $\mathcal{G}_r(X) = \langle \tau_x : x \in X \rangle$. The permutation group $\mathcal{G}(X) = \langle \sigma_x, \tau_y : x, y \in X \rangle$ generated by all translations σ_x and τ_x is called the *permutation group* of a solution.

Etingof, Schedler and Soloviev ([12]) introduced, for each solution (X, σ, τ) , its *structure group* $G(X, r) := \langle X \mid x \circ y = \sigma_x(y) \circ \tau_y(x) \forall x, y \in X \rangle$. A solution is called *injective* if the canonical map $X \rightarrow G(X, r)$; $x \mapsto x$ is injective. Involutive solutions are always injective.

Let us recall that a bijection $\Phi: X \rightarrow X'$ is an *isomorphism* of two solutions (X, σ, τ) and (X', σ', τ') if, for each $x \in X$,

$$\Phi \sigma_x = \sigma'_{\Phi(x)} \Phi \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi \tau_x = \tau'_{\Phi(x)} \Phi.$$

Congruences. Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution. An equivalence relation $\asymp \subseteq X \times X$ such that, for $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$,

$$(2.8) \quad x_1 \asymp x_2 \quad \text{and} \quad y_1 \asymp y_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sigma_{x_1}^\varepsilon(y_1) \asymp \sigma_{x_2}^\varepsilon(y_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{x_1}^\varepsilon(y_1) \asymp \tau_{x_2}^\varepsilon(y_2),$$

where $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$, is called a *congruence* of the solution (X, σ, τ) . A congruence induces a quotient solution on its classes.

In [12] Etingof, Schedler and Soloviev introduced, for each involutive solution (X, σ, τ) , the equivalence relation \sim on the set X : for each $x, y \in X$

$$(2.9) \quad x \sim y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sigma_x = \sigma_y$$

and they showed that \sim is a congruence of the solution. In the case of non-involutive solution (X, σ, τ) , the equivalence relation \sim need not to be a congruence. But it is so if the solution is left distributive (see [18, Theorem 3.4]). The quotient solution (X^\sim, σ, τ) is then called the *left retract* of X and denoted by $\text{LRet}(X, \sigma, \tau)$.

Analogously to (2.9), we can define the symmetrical relation

$$(2.10) \quad x \smile y \iff \tau_x = \tau_y$$

and this relation induces a solution on the quotient set X^\smile of every right distributive solution. The quotient solution (X^\smile, σ, τ) is called the *right retract* of (X, σ, τ) and denoted by $\text{RRet}(X, \sigma, \tau)$. If a solution is involutive then $x \sim y$ if and only if $x \smile y$ [12, Proposition 2.2].

The intersection of the two relations here defined is the relation

$$(2.11) \quad x \approx y \iff x \sim y \wedge x \smile y \iff \sigma_x = \sigma_y \wedge \tau_x = \tau_y.$$

Lebed and Vendramin showed in [23] that the relation \approx is a congruence of injective solutions. In [17] the authors together with Zamojska-Dzienio proved that the relation \approx induces a solution on the quotient set X^\approx for any solution (X, σ, τ) . A substantially shorter proof has recently appeared in [6].

Definition 2.1. Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution. The quotient solution $\text{Ret}(X, \sigma, \tau) := (X^\approx, \sigma, \tau)$ with $\sigma_{x^\approx}(y^\approx) = \sigma_x(y)^\approx$ and $\tau_{y^\approx}(x^\approx) = \tau_y(x)^\approx$, for $x^\approx, y^\approx \in X^\approx$ and $x \in x^\approx, y \in y^\approx$, is called the *retraction* solution of (X, σ, τ) . We say that a solution (X, σ, τ) is *irretractable* if $\text{Ret}(X, \sigma, \tau) = (X, \sigma, \tau)$, i.e. \approx is the trivial relation. On the other hand, if there exists an integer k such that $\text{Ret}^k(X, \sigma, \tau)$ has one element only then we say that (X, σ, τ) has *multipermutation level* k .

3. 2-REDUCTIVE SOLUTIONS

In this section we reprove the results of [19] concerning 2-reductive solutions. A question is how to naturally generalize the notion for non-involutive solutions; a fundamental property of involutive 2-reductive solutions is that the orbits of the permutation group lie within the classes of \sim . Since, for non-involutive solutions, the congruence \sim is generalized by \approx , it is natural to assume that the orbits of the permutation group lie within the same classes of \approx ; this is encoded by Identities (3.1)–(3.4). It then turns out that the generic construction of involutive 2-reductive solutions straightforwardly generalizes for non-involutive ones.

Definition 3.1. A solution (X, σ, τ) is called *2-reductive* if, for every $x, y \in X$:

$$(3.1) \quad \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} = \sigma_y,$$

$$(3.2) \quad \tau_{\tau_x(y)} = \tau_y,$$

$$(3.3) \quad \sigma_{\tau_x(y)} = \sigma_y,$$

$$(3.4) \quad \tau_{\sigma_x(y)} = \tau_y.$$

Example 3.2. Let $(A, +)$ be an abelian group and $0 \neq \alpha \in \text{End}(A, +)$ be such that $\alpha^2 = 0$. By [28, Lemma 8], (A, σ, τ) with $\sigma_x(y) = \alpha(x) + y$ and $\tau_y(x) = x + \alpha(y)$, for $x, y \in A$, is a solution. A straightforward calculation shows that (A, σ, τ) is 2-reductive. By [28, Theorem 3.1] it is injective if and only if $2\alpha = 0$. In this case it is involutive.

For 2-reductive solution we also have:

$$(3.5) \quad \sigma_{\sigma_x^{-1}(y)} = \sigma_y, \quad \tau_{\tau_x^{-1}(y)} = \tau_y, \quad \tau_{\sigma_x^{-1}(y)} = \tau_y \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\tau_x^{-1}(y)} = \sigma_y.$$

In the case of involutive solutions [19] the property of 2-reductivity was defined by (3.1) only. It is nevertheless easy to prove that all the properties (3.1)–(3.5) are equivalent for involutive solutions.

For an involutive solution (X, σ, τ) , Gateva-Ivanova considered in [14, Definition 4.3] a condition saying

$$(*) \quad \forall x \in X \quad \exists y \in X \quad \sigma_y(x) = x.$$

It is evident, that each square free solution satisfies Condition (*). On the other hand solutions without fixed points are examples of ones which do not satisfy this condition.

Fact 3.3. [13, Proposition 8.2], [14, Proposition 4.7] *If an involutive solution satisfies Condition (*) then it is a multipermutation solution of level 2 if and only if it is 2-reductive.*

For non-involutive solutions we have a similar result.

Proposition 3.4. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution satisfying the following two properties:*

$$(3.6) \quad \forall x \in X \exists y \in X \quad \sigma_y(x) = x,$$

$$(3.7) \quad \forall x \in X \exists y \in X \quad \tau_y(x) = x.$$

Then (X, σ, τ) is a multipermutation solution of level at most 2 if and only if it is 2-reductive.

Proof. A solution is of multipermutation level 1 if and only if $\sigma_x(z) = \sigma_y(z)$ and $\tau_x(z) = \tau_y(z)$, for all $x, y, z \in X$. Hence a solution is of multipermutation level at most 2 if and only if $\sigma_x(z) \approx \sigma_y(z)$ and $\tau_x(z) \approx \tau_y(z)$, for all $x, y, z \in X$. This can be rewritten into four identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\sigma_x(z)} &= \sigma_{\sigma_y(z)}, & \sigma_{\tau_x(z)} &= \sigma_{\tau_y(z)}, \\ \tau_{\sigma_x(z)} &= \tau_{\sigma_y(z)}, & \tau_{\tau_x(z)} &= \tau_{\tau_y(z)}. \end{aligned}$$

It is therefore clear that a 2-reductive solution is always of multipermutation level 2. On the other hand, if a solution is of multipermutation level 2 then, in each of the identities, we can pick a suitable y such that $\sigma_y(z) = z$ or $\tau_y(z) = z$, respectively which transforms the identities into 2-reductivity. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution. Then*

- (i) *if the solution satisfies (3.1) and (3.3) then the left permutation group $\mathcal{G}_\ell(X)$ is abelian;*
- (ii) *if the solution satisfies (3.2) and (3.4) then the right permutation group $\mathcal{G}_r(X)$ is abelian;*
- (iii) *if the solution is 2-reductive then the permutation group $\mathcal{G}(X)$ is abelian.*

Proof. Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution.

- (i) $\sigma_x \sigma_y \stackrel{(2.5)}{=} \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} \sigma_{\tau_y(x)} \stackrel{(3.1),(3.3)}{=} \sigma_y \sigma_x;$
- (ii) $\tau_x \tau_y \stackrel{(2.7)}{=} \tau_{\tau_x(y)} \tau_{\sigma_y(x)} \stackrel{(3.2),(3.4)}{=} \tau_y \tau_x;$
- (iii) $\tau_z \sigma_x(y) \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \tau_{\sigma_x(z)} \sigma_x(y) \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \tau_{\sigma_{\tau_y(x)}(z)} \sigma_x(y) \stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_{\sigma_y(z)}(x)} \tau_z(y) \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_z(x)} \tau_z(y) \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \sigma_x \tau_z(y).$

\square

Gateva-Ivanova showed [14] that 2-reductive involutive solutions always satisfy Condition **(lri)**. Actually, involutive solutions are the only 2-reductive ones satisfying **(lri)**.

Lemma 3.6. *2-reductive solution satisfies $\sigma_x = \tau_x^{-1}$ if and only if it is involutive.*

Proof. Let (X, σ, τ) be 2-reductive solution which satisfies Condition **(lri)**. Then, for each $x \in X$, $\sigma_x = \tau_x^{-1}$. Hence by (3.5), for every $x, y \in X$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_y(x) &= \sigma_y^{-1}(x) \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_x^{-1}(y)}^{-1}(x) \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \hat{\tau}_x(y) \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma_x(y) &= \tau_x^{-1}(y) \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \tau_{\sigma_y^{-1}(x)}^{-1}(y) \stackrel{(2.3)}{=} \hat{\sigma}_x(y). \end{aligned}$$

\square

In Section 5 we shall encounter similar identities, namely $\sigma_x = \hat{\tau}_x^{-1}$ and $\tau_x = \hat{\sigma}_x^{-1}$.

Now we shall present a construction of, not necessarily involutive, 2-reductive solutions based on abelian groups and we will obtain an example of a family of 2-reductive solutions. The idea of this combinatorial construction originates from involutive case (see [19, Theorem 7.8]). The same

construction for involutive solutions was described by Rump in the language of category theory under the name *transvection torsor* (see [25, Definition 2]).

Theorem 3.7. *Let I be a non-empty set, $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of abelian groups over I , $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ be the disjoint union of the sets A_i , $c_{i,j}, d_{i,j} \in A_j$, for $i, j \in I$, be some constants. Then $(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i, \sigma, \tau)$, where for $x \in A_i$, $y \in A_j$,*

$$(3.8) \quad \sigma_x(y) = y + c_{i,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_y(x) = x + d_{j,i},$$

is a 2-reductive solution.

Proof. Clearly, for each $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$, the mappings σ_x and τ_y are bijections with

$$\sigma_x^{-1}(y) = y - c_{i,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_y^{-1}(x) = x - d_{j,i}.$$

Moreover, for $z \in A_k$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x \sigma_y(z) &= \sigma_x(z + c_{j,k}) = z + c_{j,k} + c_{i,k} = \\ &= z + c_{i,k} + c_{j,k} = \sigma_{(y+c_{i,j})}(z + c_{i,k}) = \sigma_{(y+c_{i,j})} \sigma_{(x+d_{j,i})}(z) = \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} \sigma_{\tau_y(x)}(z); \\ \tau_{\sigma_{\tau_y(x)}(z)} \sigma_x(y) &= \tau_{\sigma_{(x+d_{j,i})}(z)}(y + c_{i,j}) = \tau_{(z+c_{i,k})}(y + c_{i,j}) = y + c_{i,j} + d_{k,j} = \\ &= y + d_{k,j} + c_{i,j} = \sigma_{(x+d_{k,i})}(y + d_{k,j}) = \sigma_{\tau_{(z+c_{j,k})}(x)}(y + d_{k,j}) = \sigma_{\tau_{\sigma_y(z)}(x)} \tau_z(y); \\ \tau_x \tau_y(z) &= \tau_x(z + d_{j,k}) = z + d_{j,k} + d_{i,k} = \\ &= z + d_{i,k} + d_{j,k} = \tau_{(y+d_{i,j})}(z + d_{i,k}) = \tau_{(y+d_{i,j})} \tau_{(x+c_{j,i})}(z) = \tau_{\tau_x(y)} \tau_{\sigma_y(x)}(z), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that (2.5)–(2.7) are satisfied.

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)}(z) &= \sigma_{(y+c_{i,j})}(z) = z + c_{j,k} = \sigma_y(z), \\ \tau_{\tau_x(y)}(z) &= \tau_{(y+d_{i,j})}(z) = z + d_{j,k} = \tau_y(z), \\ \sigma_{\tau_x(y)}(z) &= \sigma_{(y+d_{i,j})}(z) = z + c_{j,k} = \sigma_y(z), \\ \tau_{\sigma_x(y)}(z) &= \tau_{(y+c_{i,j})}(z) = z + d_{j,k} = \tau_y(z), \end{aligned}$$

which justifies 2-reductivity. □

Example 3.8. Let I be a (finite or infinite) index set and let A_i , for $i \in I$, be cyclic groups. Let $(c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ and $(d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ be constants such that $c_{i,j}, d_{i,j} \in A_j$, for all $i, j \in I$. Then $(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i, \sigma, \tau)$, with σ and τ defined in (3.8), is a 2-reductive solution. If for each $j \in I$, there exists at least one $i \in I$, such that $c_{i,j}$ or $d_{i,j}$ is a generator of the group A_j then orbits of the action of $\mathcal{G}(X)$ equal to A_j .

In general, since $\sigma_x \tau_y(z) = z + c_{i,k} + d_{j,k} \in A_k$, the group $\mathcal{G}(X)$ acts transitively on A_k if and only if $A_k = \langle \{c_{i,k}, d_{j,k} \mid i \in I\} \rangle$, for every $k \in I$. Hence if we assume that

$$(3.9) \quad A_j = \langle \{c_{i,j}, d_{i,j} \mid i \in I\} \rangle, \quad \text{for every } j \in I,$$

then the solution has orbits of the action of $\mathcal{G}(X)$ equal to A_j , $j \in I$ and each orbit is a permutational solution.

We will denote the solution satisfying (3.9) by $\mathcal{A} = ((A_i)_{i \in I}, (c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}, (d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I})$ and call it *the disjoint union, over a set I , of abelian groups*.

Theorem 3.9. *A solution (X, σ, τ) is 2-reductive if and only if it is a disjoint union, over a set I , of abelian groups. The orbits of the action of $\mathcal{G}(X)$ coincide with the groups.*

Proof. By comment after Example 3.8, the disjoint union, over a set I , of abelian groups is 2-reductive solution with orbits of the action of $\mathcal{G}(X)$ equal to A_j , $j \in I$.

Now let (X, σ, τ) be a 2-reductive solution, and choose a transversal E to the orbit decomposition of the action of $\mathcal{G}(X)$. By Theorem 3.5, the group $\mathcal{G}(X)$ is abelian. Hence, for every $e \in E$, the orbit $Xe = \{\alpha(e) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)\}$ can be endowed with an abelian group structure $(Xe, +, -, e)$ defined by $\alpha(e) + \beta(e) = \alpha\beta(e)$ and $-\alpha(e) = \alpha^{-1}(e)$, for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{G}(X)$.

Let, for every $e, f \in E$,

$$c_{e,f} := \sigma_e(f) \in Xf \text{ and } d_{e,f} := \tau_e(f) \in Xf.$$

Since $\mathcal{G}(X)$ is abelian, and the solution is 2-reductive then, for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X)$, we have $\sigma_{\alpha(e)} = \sigma_e$ and $\tau_{\alpha(e)} = \tau_e$. This implies that the set

$$\begin{aligned} \{c_{e,f}, d_{e,f} \mid e \in E\} &= \{\sigma_e(f), \tau_e(f) \mid e \in E\} = \\ \{\sigma_{\alpha(e)}(f), \tau_{\alpha(e)}(f) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{G}(X), e \in E\} &= \{\sigma_x(f), \tau_x(f) \mid x \in X\} \end{aligned}$$

generates the group $(Xf, +, -, f)$. This shows that the disjoint union of abelian groups over a set E , $((Xe)_{e \in E}, (c_{e,f})_{e,f \in E}, (d_{e,f})_{e,f \in E})$ has exactly the same orbits as the solution X .

Finally, let $x = \alpha(e) \in Xe$ and $y = \beta(f) \in Xf$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{G}(X)$. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x(y) &= \sigma_{\alpha(e)}\beta(f) = \sigma_e(f) + \beta(f) = c_{e,f} + y, \text{ and} \\ \tau_y(x) &= \tau_{\beta(f)}\alpha(e) = \tau_f(e) + \alpha(e) = d_{f,e} + x. \end{aligned}$$

So we verified that the disjoint union of abelian groups $((Xe)_{e \in E}, (c_{e,f})_{e,f \in E}, (d_{e,f})_{e,f \in E})$ yields the original solution (X, σ, τ) . \square

Note that the disjoint union of abelian groups is square free if and only if $c_{i,i} = d_{i,i} = 0$, for each $i \in I$ and it is involutive if and only if $d_{i,j} = -c_{i,j}$ (see [19]).

Proposition 3.10. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a disjoint union of $\mathcal{A} = ((A_i)_{i \in I}, (c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}, (d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I})$. Then $(X, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ is the disjoint union of $\mathcal{A} = ((A_i)_{i \in I}, (-d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}, (-c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I})$.*

Proof. According to (2.3), $\hat{\sigma}_x(y) = \tau_{\sigma_y^{-1}(x)}^{-1}(y) \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \tau_x^{-1}(y) \stackrel{(3.8)}{=} y - d_{i,j}$. Analogously for $\hat{\tau}$. \square

Theorem 3.11. *Let $\mathcal{A} = ((A_i)_{i \in I}, (c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}, (d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I})$ and $\mathcal{A}' = ((A'_i)_{i \in I}, (c'_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}, (d'_{i,j})_{i,j \in I})$ be two disjoint unions of abelian groups, over the same index set I . Then the unions \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' are isomorphic 2-reductive solutions $(\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i, \sigma, \tau)$ and $(\bigcup_{i \in I} A'_i, \sigma', \tau')$ if and only if there is a bijection π*

of the set I and group isomorphisms $\psi_i: A_i \rightarrow A'_{\pi(i)}$ such that

$$(3.10) \quad \psi_j(c_{i,j}) = c'_{\pi(i), \pi(j)} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_j(d_{i,j}) = d'_{\pi(i), \pi(j)},$$

for every $i, j \in I$.

Proof. The proof goes in similar way as the proof of [16, Theorem 4.2] for medial quandles in the case of 2-reductive ones.

(\Leftarrow) Let us define a mapping $\psi: \bigcup A_i \rightarrow \bigcup A'_i$ by

$$\psi(x) = \psi_i(x),$$

for every $x \in A_i$. We will prove that ψ is an isomorphism between the solutions. It is clearly a bijection. Let $x \in A_i$, $y \in A_j$. Using the fact that ψ_j is a group homomorphism, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\sigma_x(y)) &= \psi_j(\sigma_x(y)) = \psi_j(y) + \psi_j(c_{i,j}) \text{ and} \\ \psi(\tau_x(y)) &= \psi_j(\tau_x(y)) = \psi_j(y) + \psi_j(d_{i,j}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma'_{\psi(x)}(\psi(y)) &= \sigma'_{\psi_i(x)}(\psi_j(y)) = \psi_j(y) + c'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} \text{ and} \\ \tau'_{\psi(x)}(\psi(y)) &= \tau'_{\psi_i(x)}(\psi_j(y)) = \psi_j(y) + d'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)}.\end{aligned}$$

By (3.10) we can see the two expressions are equal.

(\Rightarrow) Let f be an isomorphism between the two disjoint unions of abelian groups. Since isomorphisms preserve orbits, there is a permutation π of I such that $f(A_i) = A'_{\pi(i)}$ for every $i \in I$.

Let, for $j \in I$, $0_j \in A_j$ be the neutral element in the group A_j . Let define the mappings

$$\psi_i: A_i \rightarrow f(A_i) = A'_{\pi(i)}; \quad \psi_i(x) = f(x) - f(0_i),$$

for every $i \in I$. Since f is an isomorphism of solutions for $x \in A_i$ we have:

$$f(0_j) + c'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} = \sigma'_{f(x)}(f(0_j)) = f(\sigma_x(0_j)) = f(0_j + c_{i,j}) = f(c_{i,j}) = \psi_j(c_{i,j}) + f(0_j).$$

This gives $\psi_j(c_{i,j}) = c'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)}$. Similarly,

$$f(0_j) + d'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} = \tau'_{f(x)}(f(0_j)) = f(\tau_x(0_j)) = f(0_j + d_{i,j}) = f(d_{i,j}) = \psi_j(d_{i,j}) + f(0_j),$$

and $\psi_j(d_{i,j}) = d'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)}$.

To verify that the mappings ψ_j are automorphisms of groups, let for $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$, consider:

$$\begin{aligned}f(\sigma_x(y)) &= f(y + c_{i,j}) = \psi_j(y + c_{i,j}) + f(0_j) \text{ and} \\ f(\tau_x(y)) &= f(y + d_{i,j}) = \psi_j(y + d_{i,j}) + f(0_j).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}f(\sigma_x(y)) &= \sigma'_{f(x)}(f(y)) = c'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} + f(y) = \psi_j(c_{i,j}) + \psi_j(y) + f(0_j) \text{ and} \\ f(\tau_x(y)) &= \tau'_{f(x)}(f(y)) = d'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} + f(y) = \psi_j(d_{i,j}) + \psi_j(y) + f(0_j)\end{aligned}$$

Cancelling $f(0_j)$ we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \psi_j(c_{i,j} + y) = \psi_j(c_{i,j}) + \psi_j(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_j(d_{i,j} + y) = \psi_j(d_{i,j}) + \psi_j(y).$$

for every $y \in A_j$.

By assumption, every group A_j is generated by all the elements $c_{i,j}$ and $d_{i,j}$, $i \in I$. Hence (3.11) implies $\psi_j(x + y) = \psi_j(x) + \psi_j(y)$ for every $x, y \in A_j$, i.e., ψ_j is an automorphism of groups. \square

If I is a finite set we will usually display a disjoint union of abelian groups as a triple $((A_i)_{i \in I}, C, D)$, where $C = (c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ and $D = (d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ are $|I| \times |I|$ matrices of constants.

We can construct all 2-reductive solutions of size n using the following algorithm:

Algorithm 3.12. Outputs all 2-reductive solutions of size n :

- (1) For all partitionings $n = n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k$ do (2)–(4).
- (2) For all abelian groups A_1, \dots, A_k of size $|A_i| = n_i$ do (3)–(4).
- (3) For all constants $c_{i,j}, d_{i,j} \in A_j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, do (4).
- (4) If, for all $1 \leq j \leq k$, we have $A_j = \langle \{c_{i,j}, d_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} \rangle$ then construct a solution $(\bigcup A_i, \sigma, \tau)$ using (3.8).

When all solutions are constructed, we can get rid of isomorphic copies using Theorem 3.11.

Example 3.13. Up to isomorphism, there are exactly fourteen 2-reductive solutions of size 3. They are the following disjoint unions of abelian groups:

- One orbit: $(\mathbb{Z}_3, (1), (1)), (\mathbb{Z}_3, (0), (1)), (\mathbb{Z}_3, (1), (0)).$

- Two orbits: $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}),$
 $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}),$
 $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}), (\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}),$
 $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}).$
- Three orbits: $(\mathbb{Z}_1 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}).$

Five of them are involutive and three are square free. Furthermore, there are exactly ninety six 2-reductive solutions of size 4:

- 3 with one orbit \mathbb{Z}_4 ,
- 20 with two orbits: \mathbb{Z}_3 and \mathbb{Z}_1 and 42 with two orbits \mathbb{Z}_2 and \mathbb{Z}_2 ,
- 30 with three orbits: \mathbb{Z}_2 , \mathbb{Z}_1 and \mathbb{Z}_1 ,
- 1 with four orbits each equal to \mathbb{Z}_1 .

The representation of 2-reductive solutions as a disjoint union of abelian groups allows one to quickly verify the conditions defined in Proposition 3.4.

Remark 3.14. Let a 2-reductive solution (X, σ, τ) be a disjoint union of abelian groups over a set I . Then (X, σ, τ) satisfies (3.6) - (3.7) if and only if

$$\forall i \in I \quad \exists j \in I, \quad \text{such that} \quad c_{j,i} = d_{j,i} = 0.$$

Injective solutions were investigated, among others, by Soloviev in [28]. He showed that some properties of such solutions are similar to that of involutive ones. He also gave some criterions to recognize injective solutions. In particular, he characterized affine injective solutions. Here we have presented 2-reductive solutions as disjoint unions of abelian groups. This presentation shows, in fact, that each their component is an affine solution. Hence, it allows us to formulate some conditions for the elements lying in diagonals in matrices of constants.

Proposition 3.15. [28] *Let (X, σ, τ) be a disjoint union of $\mathcal{A} = ((A_i)_{i \in I}, (c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}, (d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I})$. If (X, σ, τ) is injective then, for all $i \in I$, $c_{i,i} = -d_{i,i}$.*

Proof. Let $x \in A_i$, for $i \in I$. Then, in the structure group $G(X, r)$ of the solution (X, σ, τ) ,

$$x \circ \sigma_x^{-1}(x) = \sigma_x \sigma_x^{-1}(x) \circ \tau_{\sigma_x^{-1}(x)}(x) \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} x \circ \tau_x(x)$$

and, by cancellativity, $\sigma_x^{-1}(x) = \tau_x(x)$ and therefore $-c_{i,i} = d_{i,i}$, for all $i \in I$. \square

Proposition 3.16. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a disjoint union of $\mathcal{A} = ((A_i)_{i \in I}, (c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}, (d_{i,j})_{i,j \in I})$. If (X, σ, τ) is injective then, for all $i, j \in I$, $o(c_{i,j} + d_{i,j}) = o(c_{j,i} + d_{j,i})$.*

Proof. Let $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$, for $i, j \in I$. In the structure group $G(X, r)$ we have

$$x \circ y = \sigma_x(y) \circ \tau_y(x) = \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} \tau_y(x) \circ \tau_{\tau_y(x)} \sigma_x(y) \stackrel{(3.1),(3.2)}{=} \sigma_y \tau_y(x) \circ \tau_x \sigma_x(y).$$

Suppose that there exist $i, j \in I$ such that $k = o(c_{i,j} + d_{i,j}) < o(c_{j,i} + d_{j,i})$. Then we obtain

$$x \circ y = \sigma_y^k \tau_y^k(x) \circ \tau_x^k \sigma_x^k(y) = (x + kc_{j,i} + kd_{j,i}) \circ (y + kc_{i,j} + kd_{i,j}) = (x + kc_{j,i} + kd_{j,i}) \circ y$$

and we obtain $x = x + k(c_{j,i} + d_{j,i}) \neq x$ in the structure group. Hence (X, σ, τ) is not an injective solution. \square

Example 3.17. Let $(\{x, y, z\}, \sigma, \tau)$ be the union of $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \cup \mathbb{Z}_1, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix})$. This square-free solution is neither involutive, since $c_{2,1} \neq -d_{2,1}$, nor injective since $c_{2,1} + d_{2,1} = 1$ and $c_{1,2} + d_{1,2} = 0$. Indeed, we have $\sigma_x = \sigma_y = \sigma_z = \tau_x = \tau_y = \text{id}_X$ and $\tau_z = (xy)$. Then

$$x \circ z = z \circ y = y \circ z$$

and the structure group of this solution is a free abelian group with two generators $\{x, z\}$.

Problem 3.18. For a finite 2-reductive solution $\mathcal{A} = ((A_i)_{i \in I}, C, D)$, find a necessary and sufficient condition on the matrices C and D so that the solution is injective.

There were three equivalences defined on X in Section 2, namely \sim , \smile and \approx ; only the last one is a congruence in general. In the case of 2-reductive solutions all of them are congruences.

Proposition 3.19. Let (X, σ, τ) be a 2-reductive solution. Then \sim and \smile are congruences of (X, σ, τ) .

Proof. Let $x \sim y$ and $a \sim b$. We need to prove four properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\sigma_x(a)} &\stackrel{(3.1)}{=} \sigma_a = \sigma_b \stackrel{(3.1)}{=} \sigma_{\sigma_y(b)} &\Rightarrow & \sigma_x(a) \sim \sigma_y(b), \\ \sigma_{\sigma_x^{-1}(a)} &\stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \sigma_a = \sigma_b \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \sigma_{\sigma_y^{-1}(b)} &\Rightarrow & \sigma_x^{-1}(a) \sim \sigma_y^{-1}(b), \\ \sigma_{\tau_x(a)} &\stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \sigma_a = \sigma_b \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_y(b)} &\Rightarrow & \tau_x(a) \sim \tau_y(b), \\ \sigma_{\tau_x^{-1}(a)} &\stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \sigma_a = \sigma_b \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_y^{-1}(b)} &\Rightarrow & \tau_x^{-1}(a) \sim \tau_y^{-1}(b). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is analogous for \smile . □

Corollary 3.20. Let (X, σ, τ) be a 2-reductive solution. Then the retraction solutions $\text{Ret}(X, \sigma, \tau)$, $\text{LRet}(X, \sigma, \tau)$ and $\text{RRet}(X, \sigma, \tau)$ are projection ones.

Proof. Since the solution (X, σ, τ) is 2-reductive, for $x, y \in X$ we immediately have that

$$\sigma_x(y) \approx y \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_x(y) \approx y.$$

This means that in $\text{Ret}(X, \sigma, \tau)$, for $x^\approx \in X^\approx$, $\sigma_{x^\approx} = \tau_{x^\approx} = \text{id}$. Since the relation \approx is the intersection of \sim and \smile , the left and the right retracts are factors of $\text{Ret}(X, \sigma, \tau)$. □

Lemma 3.21. Let a 2-reductive solution (X, σ, τ) be a disjoint union of abelian groups over a set I . For $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$ one has $x \sim y$ if and only if $c_{i,k} = c_{j,k}$ and one has $x \smile y$ if and only if $d_{i,k} = d_{j,k}$ for all $k \in I$.

Proof. Let $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$. Then

$$x \sim y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall k \in I \quad \forall z \in A_k \quad z + c_{i,k} = \sigma_x(z) = \sigma_y(z) = z + c_{j,k} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall k \in I \quad c_{i,k} = c_{j,k}$$

and analogously for \smile . □

4. SKEW LEFT BRACES

The notion of left braces was introduced by Rump [24] to investigate involutive solutions. Guarnieri and Vendramin [15] generalized the idea and defined so called *skew left braces*. These structures provide the most accessible examples of solutions and it is therefore natural to ask how the 2-reductivity property translates in the context of skew left braces. In this section we mainly recall properties of the skew left braces and its associated solutions.

Definition 4.1. [15, Definition 1.1] An algebra (B, \cdot, \circ) is called a *skew left brace* if (B, \cdot) and (B, \circ) are groups and the operations satisfy, for all $a, b, c \in B$,

$$(4.1) \quad a \circ (b \cdot c) = (a \circ b) \cdot a^{-1} \cdot (a \circ c).$$

The neutral element in the group (B, \cdot) and the neutral element in the group (B, \circ) are equal and we will denote it by 1. Moreover, the inverse element to a in the group (B, \cdot) shall be denoted by a^{-1} and the inverse element to a in the group (B, \circ) by \bar{a} .

A skew left brace is a left brace if the group (B, \cdot) is abelian. In this case we say that the skew left brace is of *abelian type*.

Lemma 4.2. [15, Lemma 1.7] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. Then the following hold for all $a, b, c \in B$:*

$$(4.2) \quad a \circ (b^{-1} \cdot c) = a \cdot (a \circ b)^{-1} \cdot (a \circ c),$$

$$(4.3) \quad a \circ (b \cdot c^{-1}) = (a \circ b) \cdot (a \circ c)^{-1} \cdot a.$$

A skew left brace is said to be a *two-sided skew brace* if

$$(4.4) \quad (a \cdot b) \circ c = (a \circ c) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot (b \circ c),$$

holds for all $a, b, c \in B$. For any skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) there is so called *opposite skew left brace* (B, \cdot_{op}, \circ) , with $a \cdot_{op} b = b \cdot a$ (see [22]).

Remark 4.3. [15, Remark 1.8, Proposition 1.9] Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. For each $a \in B$, the mapping

$$\lambda_a: B \rightarrow B; \quad \lambda_a(b) = a^{-1} \cdot (a \circ b),$$

is an automorphism of the group (B, \cdot) with the inverse defined by $\lambda_a^{-1}(b) = \bar{a} \circ (a \cdot b)$.

Similarly as for a left brace, one can define the *associated solution* to a skew left brace.

Theorem 4.4. [15, Theorem 3.1] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. Then (B, λ, ρ) , with*

$$\rho_y(x) := \lambda_{\lambda_x(y)}^{-1}((x \circ y)^{-1} \cdot x \cdot (x \circ y)) = \overline{x^{-1} \cdot (x \circ y)} \circ x \circ y = \overline{\lambda_x(y)} \circ x \circ y, \quad \text{for } x, y \in B,$$

is a solution. It is involutive if and only the skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) is of abelian type.

Note that solutions associated to skew left braces satisfy the conditions (3.6)–(3.7).

By results of Koch and Truman [22], for a skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) , the solution associated to the opposite skew left brace is the inverse solution to the solution associated to (B, \cdot, \circ) .

Theorem 4.5. [22, Theorem 4.1] *Let (B, λ, ρ) be the solution associated to a skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) . Then its inverse solution $(B, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\rho})$ is the solution associated to the opposite skew left brace (B, \cdot_{op}, \circ) .*

In particular, for $x, y \in B$

$$(4.5) \quad \hat{\lambda}_x(y) = (x \circ y) \cdot x^{-1}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(4.6) \quad \hat{\rho}_y(x) = \overline{(x \circ y) \cdot x^{-1}} \circ x \circ y.$$

Example 4.6. Let (B, \cdot) be a group. Then $Triv(B, \cdot) = (B, \cdot, \cdot)$ is the *trivial skew left brace* on (B, \cdot) . The associated solution (B, λ, ρ) is of the form : $\lambda_a(b) = b$ and $\rho_b(a) = b^{-1} \cdot a \cdot b$.

Example 4.7. Let (B, \cdot) be a group. The associated solution to an *almost trivial* skew left brace (B, \cdot, \cdot_{op}) is: $\lambda_a(b) = a^{-1} \cdot b \cdot a$ and $\rho_b(a) = a$. Moreover, $\hat{\lambda}_a(b) = b$ and $\hat{\rho}_b(a) = b \cdot a \cdot b^{-1}$.

In particular, if a group (B, \cdot) is abelian, then (B, λ, ρ) is a projection solution.

Remark 4.8. Let (B, \cdot, \cdot_{op}) be an almost trivial skew left brace and let (B, λ, ρ) its associated solution. Then (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) are trivially satisfied and (3.1) is equivalent to

$$\lambda_{\lambda_x(y)}(z) = \lambda_y(z) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x^{-1}y^{-1}zx x^{-1}yx = y^{-1}zy \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [[x, y], z] = 1$$

and therefore the solution is 2-reductive if and only if the group (B, \cdot) is nilpotent of class 2.

Example 4.9. Let (G, \cdot) be a non-abelian group. The solution $(G \times G, \lambda, \rho)$ associated with the product $(G, \cdot, \cdot) \times (G, \cdot, \cdot_{op})$ of trivial and almost trivial skew left braces is, for $(x, y), (u, w) \in G \times G$ the following:

$$\lambda_{(x,y)}((u, w)) = (u, y^{-1} \cdot w \cdot y) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{(u,w)}((x, y)) = (u^{-1} \cdot x \cdot u, y).$$

Example 4.10. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be an odd natural number and let $(\mathbb{Z}_{2n}, \cdot, +_{2n})$ be a skew left brace such that for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}$

$$x \cdot y = x + (-1)^x y \pmod{2n} \quad \text{and} \quad x^{-1} = (-1)^{x+1} x \pmod{2n}.$$

The solution associated with this skew left brace is the following:

$$\lambda_x(y) = \lambda_x^{-1}(y) = (-1)^x y \pmod{2n} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_x(y) = (-1)^{y+1} x + x + y \pmod{2n}.$$

All these examples above were actually examples of bi-skew left braces.

Definition 4.11. [10, Definition 2] A skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) is a *bi-skew left brace* if (B, \circ, \cdot) is a skew left brace as well.

Bi-skew left braces were introduced by Childs in [10], studied by Caranti in [4] and also recently by Bardakov et al. in [3] under the name *symmetric* skew left braces. Caranti (see also [3, Proposition 5.2]) presented the following equivalence.

Lemma 4.12. [4, Lemma 3.1] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) (B, \cdot, \circ) is a bi-skew left brace,
- (ii) $\lambda: B \rightarrow B; \quad a \mapsto \lambda_a$ is an anti-homomorphism of groups (B, \cdot) and $\text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$ that means $\lambda_{a \cdot b} = \lambda_b \lambda_a$, for all $a, b \in B$.

Bi-skew left braces and their associated solutions were also studied by Stefanello and Trappeniers in [29] who gave the following characterization:

Theorem 4.13. [29, Theorem 5.2] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. Then (B, \cdot, \circ) is a bi-skew left brace if and only if its associated solution (B, λ, ρ) satisfies*

$$(4.7) \quad \lambda_{\hat{\lambda}_x(y)} = \lambda_y, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in B.$$

This property is visually similar to (3.1) but it is actually equivalent to a different identity defining 2-reductivity.

Proposition 4.14. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution. Then (X, σ, τ) satisfies $\sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)} = \sigma_y$, for $x, y \in X$, if and only if it satisfies (3.3).*

Proof. Let (X, σ, τ) satisfy (4.7). Then, for $x, y \in X$, we obtain

$$\sigma_x \stackrel{(2.3)}{=} \sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_{\sigma_x(y)} \tau_y(x)} \stackrel{(4.7)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_y(x)}.$$

On the other hand, for (3.3), we have

$$\sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_y^{-1}(x)} \stackrel{(2.3)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_{\sigma_x^{-1}(y)}(x)} \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \sigma_x,$$

and replacing x by $\hat{\sigma}_y(x)$ completes the proof. □

Corollary 4.15. *Each 2-reductive solution satisfies (4.7) and an involutive solution satisfying (4.7) is 2-reductive.*

Analogously we can say that the identity

$$(4.8) \quad \tau_{\hat{\tau}_x(y)} = \tau_y.$$

is equivalent to the identity (3.4).

Example 4.16. [18, Example 2.6] Let (G, \cdot) be a non elementary abelian 2-group such that for each $x \in G$, $x^2 \in Z(G)$. Let us define a solution (G, σ, τ) as follows:

$$\sigma_x(y) = xy^{-1}x^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_y(x) = xy^{-1}.$$

This solution, with $\hat{\sigma}_x(y) = y^3$ and $\hat{\tau}_y(x) = x^{-1}y^{-1}x$, satisfies (4.7) but not (4.8).

Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace.

Definition 4.17. A subset $I \subseteq B$ is an *ideal* of (B, \cdot, \circ) if it is a normal subgroup of (B, \cdot) , a normal subgroup of (B, \circ) and $\lambda_a(I) \subseteq I$, for all $a \in B$.

Definition 4.18. The *socle* of (B, \cdot, \circ) is the ideal

$$\text{Soc}(B) = \{a \in B : a \circ b = a \cdot b = b \cdot a, \text{ for all } b \in B\} = \ker \lambda \cap Z(B, \cdot),$$

where $Z(B, \cdot)$ denotes the center of (B, \cdot) .

Example 4.19. For an almost trivial skew left brace (B, \cdot, \cdot_{op}) , $\text{Soc}(B) = Z(B, \cdot)$.

Lemma 4.20. [15, Lemma 3.3] *For a skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) and an ideal $I \subseteq B$, for all $a \in B$, $a \cdot I = a \circ I$.*

Lemma 4.21. [9, Lemma 1.10] *Let $a \in \text{Soc}(B)$. Then for all $b \in B$,*

$$\lambda_b(a) = b^{-1} \cdot (b \circ a) = b \circ a \circ \bar{b}.$$

Since the socle $\text{Soc}(B)$ is an ideal of a skew left brace, the quotient $(B, \circ)/\text{Soc}(B)$ of the the group (B, \circ) is also the quotient of the group (B, \cdot) and the factor skew left brace $B/\text{Soc}(B) := (B, \cdot, \circ)/\text{Soc}(B)$ by $\text{Soc}(B)$ is well defined.

Definition 4.22. The socle series of (B, \cdot, \circ) is defined as the sequence

$$B_0 = B, \quad B_{n+1} = B_n/\text{Soc}(B_n), \quad n \geq 0.$$

We say that (B, \cdot, \circ) is *nilpotent of class n* if n is the least number such that $|B_n| = 1$.

Theorem 4.23. [27, Theorem 4.21] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a nilpotent skew left brace. Then the group (B, \cdot) is nilpotent.*

In the rest of the section we shall focus on the correspondence between the nilpotency of skew left braces and the multipermutation level of the associated solutions. For involutive solutions, the correspondence was described by Rump in [24]. In the involutive case, the mapping ρ is uniquely determined by λ hence there was no need to consider this mapping. In the non-involutive case, the relation \approx depends both on λ and ρ and hence we need to take a closer look at the role of ρ in the skew left brace.

Proposition 4.24. [15, Proposition 1.9] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. The mapping $\lambda: B \rightarrow B; \quad a \mapsto \lambda_a$ is a homomorphism of the groups (B, \circ) and $\text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$.*

The mapping ρ_a is not an automorphism in general, as we can see on the following example.

Example 4.25. Let $(B, +) = \mathbb{Z}_2^3$ and let us denote $e_0 = (0, 0, 0)$, $e_1 = (1, 0, 0)$, $e_2 = (0, 1, 0)$, $e_3 = (0, 0, 1)$ and $f = (1, 1, 1)$. Then each $b \in B$ can be uniquely written as $b = \varepsilon f + e_i$, for some $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_4$. Define now

$$(\varepsilon f + e_i) \circ (\zeta f + e_j) = (\varepsilon + \zeta)f + e_{i+3\varepsilon j} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\varepsilon f + e_i} = \varepsilon f + e_{3^{1+\varepsilon}i},$$

for any $\varepsilon, \zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_4$. It is easy to check that (B, \circ) is the 8-element dihedral group and it is more complicated but still straightforward to check that $(B, +, \circ)$ is a skew left brace (of abelian type). Then, for its associated solution, we have: $\rho_{f+e_1}(f+e_1) = f+e_1$, $\rho_{f+e_1}(f) = f$ and $\rho_{f+e_1}(e_1) = f+e_3$ but $(f+e_1)+f \neq f+e_3$ and therefore ρ_{f+e_1} is not an endomorphism of $(B, +)$. Note that an equivalent but different presentation of this left brace was given by Bachiller in [1].

Nevertheless, even if the mappings ρ_a are not endomorphisms, Bachiller showed that we can still have a partial counterpart of Proposition 4.24 for the mapping ρ .

Proposition 4.26. [2, Lemma 2.4] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. The mapping $\rho: B \rightarrow B; a \mapsto \rho_a$ is an anti-homomorphism of the groups (B, \circ) and S_B , that means $\rho_{a \circ b} = \rho_b \rho_a$, for all $a, b \in B$.*

Proposition 4.27. [2, Proposition 2.8] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace and let (B, λ, ρ) its associated solution. Then $\text{Soc}(B) = \text{Ker } \lambda \cap \text{Ker } \rho$.*

Corollary 4.28. [6, Remark 4.4] *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace and let (B, λ, ρ) its associated solution. Then*

- (i) $\text{Ret}(B, \lambda, \rho)$ is the solution associated to $(B, \cdot, \circ) / \text{Soc}(B)$,
- (ii) (B, λ, ρ) is a multipermutation solution of level n if and only if (B, \cdot, \circ) is nilpotent of class n .

Definition 4.29. [3, Definition 2.11] A skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) is called *meta-trivial* if there exists an ideal N of (B, \cdot, \circ) such that (N, \cdot, \circ) is a trivial skew left brace and the quotient skew left brace B/N is trivial as well.

Corollary 4.30. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. If its associated solution is 2-reductive then (B, \cdot, \circ) is meta-trivial.*

Proof. It follows directly by Corollaries 3.20 and 4.28(i) and the fact that the socle of (B, \cdot, \circ) is a trivial skew left brace (of abelian type). \square

5. DISTRIBUTIVE SOLUTIONS

In [18] the authors and Zamojska-Dzienio were studying so called distributive solutions. In this section we establish a connection between bi-skew left braces and results about distributive solutions.

Definition 5.1. We will say that a solution (X, σ, τ) is *left distributive*, if for every $x, y \in X$:

$$(5.1) \quad \sigma_x \sigma_y = \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} \sigma_x,$$

and it is *right distributive*, if for every $x, y \in X$:

$$(5.2) \quad \tau_x \tau_y = \tau_{\tau_x(y)} \tau_x.$$

A solution is *distributive* if it is left and right distributive.

Example 5.2 (Lyubashenko, see [11]). Let X be a non-empty set and let $f, g: X \rightarrow X$ be two bijections such that $fg = gf$. Then the permutational solution (X, σ, τ) with $\sigma_x = f$ and $\tau_y = g$, for each $x, y \in X$, is distributive.

Example 5.3. Let (X, σ, id) be a solution. Then by (2.5) it is distributive. By (2.7) the same we have for a solution (X, id, τ) . Hence, solutions from Examples 4.6 and 4.7 are both distributive.

Example 5.4. The solution from Example 4.10 is left distributive but not right distributive.

Theorem 5.5. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) (X, σ, τ) is left distributive,
- (ii) (X, σ, τ) satisfies (3.3), that means $\sigma_{\tau_x(y)} = \sigma_y$, for all $x, y \in X$,
- (iii) (X, σ, τ) satisfies (4.7), that means $\sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)} = \sigma_y$, for all $x, y \in X$,
- (iv) (X, σ, τ) satisfies $\hat{\tau}_x = \sigma_x^{-1}$, for all $x \in X$,
- (v) $\mathcal{G}_\ell(X) \leq \text{Aut}(X, \sigma, \tau)$.

Proof. By [18, Lemma 2.8], the following conditions are equivalent:

$$(5.3) \quad \sigma_x \sigma_y = \sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} \sigma_x \Leftrightarrow \sigma_x = \sigma_{\tau_y(x)} \Leftrightarrow \sigma_x = \sigma_{\tau_y^{-1}(x)}.$$

This is actually (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii). The equivalence (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) was proved in Proposition 4.14. Now

$$(5.4) \quad \hat{\tau}_x^{-1}(y) \stackrel{(2.4)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_y^{-1}(x)}(y) \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \sigma_x(y) \Leftrightarrow \hat{\tau}_x = \sigma_x^{-1},$$

proving (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iv). Finally, for each $x \in X$, the mapping σ_x is a permutation and (v) \Rightarrow (i) follows from the definition. On the other hand,

$$\tau_{\sigma_{\tau_y(x)}(z)} \sigma_x(y) \stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \sigma_{\tau_{\sigma_y(z)}(x)} \tau_z(y) \stackrel{(3.3)}{\Rightarrow} \tau_{\sigma_x(z)} \sigma_x = \sigma_x \tau_z$$

proving (i)&(ii) \Rightarrow (v). \square

Corollary 5.6. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace. Then (B, \cdot, \circ) is a bi-skew left brace if and only if its associated solution (B, λ, ρ) satisfies one of the properties from Theorem 5.5.*

Analogously we can prove the mirror image of Theorem 5.5.

Theorem 5.7. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) (X, σ, τ) is right distributive,
- (ii) (X, σ, τ) satisfies (3.4), that means $\tau_{\sigma_x(y)} = \tau_y$, for all $x, y \in X$,
- (iii) (X, σ, τ) satisfies (4.8), that means $\tau_{\hat{\tau}_x(y)} = \tau_y$, for all $x, y \in X$,
- (iv) (X, σ, τ) satisfies $\hat{\sigma}_x = \tau_x^{-1}$, for all $x \in X$,
- (v) $\mathcal{G}_r(X) \leq \text{Aut}(X, \sigma, \tau)$.

Corollary 5.8. *A solution (X, σ, τ) is left distributive if and only if $(X, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ is right distributive.*

Proof. Let (X, σ, τ) be a left distributive solution. By Theorem 5.5, we have $\hat{\tau}_y = \sigma_y^{-1}$, for $y \in X$. Then

$$\hat{\tau}_{\tau_y(x)} = \sigma_{\tau_y(x)}^{-1} \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \sigma_x^{-1} = \hat{\tau}_x,$$

which is equivalent to right distributivity of $(X, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$.

If a solution $(X, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ is right distributive we have $\sigma_y = \hat{\tau}_y^{-1}$ which implies

$$\sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_y(x)} = \hat{\tau}_{\hat{\sigma}_y(x)}^{-1} \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \hat{\tau}_x^{-1} = \sigma_x$$

and shows that (X, σ, τ) is left distributive. \square

By Theorem 4.5, Corollary 5.6 and Corollary 5.8 we obtain the following:

Corollary 5.9. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace and (B, λ, ρ) its associated solution. Then (B, \cdot_{op}, \circ) is a bi-skew left brace if and only if (B, λ, ρ) satisfies (4.8), that means $\rho_{\hat{\rho}_a(b)} = \rho_b$, for all $a, b \in B$.*

Corollary 5.10. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace and (B, λ, ρ) its associated solution. Then (B, λ, ρ) is distributive if and only if (B, \circ, \cdot) is a skew two-sided brace.*

Proof. Recall, a solution (B, λ, ρ) is left distributive if and only if (B, \cdot, \circ) is a bi-skew left brace which is equivalent to (B, \circ, \cdot) being a skew left brace.

A solution (B, λ, ρ) is right distributive if and only if $(B, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\rho})$ is left distributive if and only if (B, \cdot_{op}, \circ) is a bi-skew left brace, according to Corollary 5.9 and Theorem 5.7. This is equivalent to satisfying Condition (4.4). \square

Lemma 5.11. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a left distributive solution. Then for $x, y \in X$*

$$(5.5) \quad \tau_y \tau_x = \tau_{\hat{\tau}_y(x)} \tau_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)}.$$

Proof. For $x, y \in X$ we have

$$\tau_y \stackrel{(2.2)}{=} \tau_{\tau_{\hat{\tau}_y(x)} \hat{\sigma}_x(y)} \stackrel{(2.7)}{=} \tau_{\hat{\tau}_y(x)} \tau_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)} \tau_{\sigma_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)} \hat{\tau}_y(x)}^{-1} \stackrel{\text{Th. 5.5}}{=} \tau_{\hat{\tau}_y(x)} \tau_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)} \tau_{\sigma_y \sigma_y^{-1}(x)}^{-1} = \tau_{\hat{\tau}_y(x)} \tau_{\hat{\sigma}_x(y)} \tau_x^{-1}. \quad \square$$

We have discussed in Section 2 that the equivalences \sim and \simeq are not congruences in general. Nevertheless, they have to be congruences of distributive solutions:

Theorem 5.12. [19, Theorem 3.4] *Let (X, σ, τ) be a solution. If (X, σ, τ) is left distributive then \sim is its congruence. If (X, σ, τ) is right distributive then \simeq is its congruence.*

For bi-skew left braces, we have a left-sided analogy to Corollary 4.28.

Proposition 5.13. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a bi-skew left brace and (B, λ, ρ) its associated solution. Then*

- (i) $\text{Ker } \lambda$ is an ideal of (B, \cdot, \circ) ,
- (ii) $\text{LRet}(B, \lambda, \rho)$ is the solution associated to $(B, \cdot, \circ) / \text{Ker } \lambda$.

Proof. Let $a, b \in \text{Ker } \lambda$ and $x, z \in B$. Then $\lambda_a(x) = x$ which means $a \cdot x = a \circ x$ and $a^{-1} = \bar{a}$.

(i) At first we will show that $\text{Ker } \lambda$ is an ideal of a skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) .

- $\text{Ker } \lambda$ is a normal subgroup of (B, \circ) since λ is a homomorphism $(B, \circ) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$;
- $\lambda_{a \cdot b} = \lambda_{a \circ b} = \lambda_a \lambda_b = \text{id}$ which proves that $\text{Ker } \lambda$ is a subgroup of (B, \cdot) ;
- $\lambda_{x^{-1} \cdot a \cdot x}(z) = (x^{-1} \cdot a \cdot x)^{-1} \cdot ((x^{-1} \cdot a \cdot x) \circ z) = x^{-1} \cdot a^{-1} \cdot x \cdot ((x^{-1} \cdot a \cdot x) \circ z) = x^{-1} \cdot \bar{a} \cdot ((a \cdot x) \circ \bar{x} \circ (x \cdot z)) = x^{-1} \cdot (\bar{a} \circ a \circ x \circ \bar{x} \circ (x \cdot z)) = x^{-1} \cdot x \cdot z = z$ which proves that $\text{Ker } \lambda$ is a normal subgroup of (B, \cdot) ;
- $\lambda_{\lambda_x(a)} \stackrel{(5.1)}{=} \lambda_x \lambda_a \lambda_x^{-1} = \text{id}$ and therefore $\lambda_x(\text{Ker } \lambda) \subseteq \text{Ker } \lambda$, for all $x \in X$.

(ii) Now we want to prove that the cosets of $\text{Ker } \lambda$ coincide with the classes of \sim . But

$$x \circ \bar{y} \in \text{Ker } \lambda \Leftrightarrow \lambda_{x \circ \bar{y}} = \text{id} \Leftrightarrow \lambda_x = \lambda_y \Leftrightarrow x \sim y. \quad \square$$

The mirror version of Proposition 5.13 is not that straightforward since ρ_a may behave differently than λ_a , for instance, it is not an automorphism for general skew left braces.

Lemma 5.14. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace and let (B, λ, ρ) be its associated solution. If the solution (B, λ, ρ) is right distributive then*

- (i) $\rho_y(x) = \bar{y} \circ (x \cdot y)$, for all $x, y \in B$,
- (ii) ρ_x is an anti-automorphism of (B, \cdot) , for all $x \in B$.

Proof. Let $x, y \in B$. According to Theorem 5.7, $\rho_y^{-1} = \hat{\lambda}_y$.

(i) By Theorem 4.5 we have

$$\rho_y^{-1}(x) = \hat{\lambda}_y(x) = (y \circ x) \cdot y^{-1}.$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\rho_y^{-1}(\bar{y} \circ (x \cdot y)) = (y \circ \bar{y} \circ (x \cdot y)) \cdot y^{-1} = x \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_y((y \circ x) \cdot y^{-1}) = \bar{y} \circ ((y \circ x) \cdot y^{-1} \cdot y) = x,$$

which completes the proof.

(ii) The mapping $\hat{\lambda}$ is a homomorphism $(B, \circ) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(B, \cdot_{op})$, according to Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 4.24. Therefore, for all $a, b, x \in B$,

$$\rho_x^{-1}(a \cdot b) = \hat{\lambda}_x(b \cdot_{op} a) = \hat{\lambda}_x(b) \cdot_{op} \hat{\lambda}_x(a) = \rho_x^{-1}(a) \cdot \rho_x^{-1}(b).$$

and ρ_x is an automorphism of (B, \cdot) . □

Theorem 5.15. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace, (B, λ, ρ) be its associated solution and (B, \cdot_{op}, \circ) be a bi-skew left brace. Then*

- (i) $\text{Ker } \rho$ is an ideal of (B, \cdot, \circ) ,

(ii) $\text{RRet}(B, \cdot, \circ)$ is the solution associated to $(B, \cdot, \circ) / \text{Ker } \rho$.

Proof. Let $x, y \in B$. By Corollary 5.9 and Theorem 5.7 the solution (B, λ, ρ) is right distributive and $\rho_x = \hat{\lambda}_x^{-1}$ for all $x \in B$. Hence

(i) $\text{Ker } \rho = \text{Ker } \hat{\lambda}^{-1}$ and this is a normal subgroup of both (B, \cdot) as well as (B, \circ) , according to Proposition 5.13. Now $\rho_{\lambda_x(y)} = \rho_y$, according to Theorem 5.7 (ii) and this means that $\lambda_x(\text{Ker } \rho) \subseteq \text{Ker } \rho$, for all $x \in B$.

(ii) $x \circ \bar{y} \in \text{Ker } \rho \Leftrightarrow \rho_{x \circ \bar{y}} = \text{id} \Leftrightarrow \rho_x = \rho_y \Leftrightarrow x \smile y$. \square

Example 5.16. Consider the bi-skew left brace $(\mathbb{Z}_{2n}, \cdot, +_{2n})$ defined in Example 4.10. Let $(\mathbb{Z}_{2n}, \lambda, \rho)$ be its associated left distributive solution. The mapping ρ is an anti-homomorphism of the groups (\mathbb{Z}_{2n}, \cdot) and $S_{\mathbb{Z}_{2n}}$, according to Proposition 4.26 but $\text{Ker } \rho = \{0, n\}$ is not a normal subgroup since $1^{-1} \cdot n \cdot 1 = 2 - n \notin \{0, n\}$.

The equivalence \sim is a congruence, namely, for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}$,

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow \forall (a \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}) \lambda_x(a) = \lambda_y(a) \Leftrightarrow \forall (a \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}) (-1)^x a = (-1)^y a \Leftrightarrow x \equiv y \pmod{2}.$$

The quotient solution $(\mathbb{Z}_{2n}^{\sim}, \lambda, \rho)$ is a two element trivial solution. On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} x \smile y &\Leftrightarrow \forall (a \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}) \rho_x(a) = \rho_y(a) \Leftrightarrow \\ &\forall (a \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}) (-1)^{a+1} x + x + a = (-1)^{a+1} y + y + a \Leftrightarrow \\ &\forall (a \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}) x(1 + (-1)^{a+1}) = y(1 + (-1)^{a+1}) \Leftrightarrow 2x = 2y \Leftrightarrow x \equiv y \pmod{n}. \end{aligned}$$

But $\lambda_0(1) = 1$ and $\lambda_n(1) = -1$ are not \smile related, hence the induced solution is not defined on the quotient \mathbb{Z}_{2n}^{\sim} . Finally,

$$x \approx y \Leftrightarrow x \sim y \wedge x \smile y \Leftrightarrow x \equiv y \pmod{2} \wedge x \equiv y \pmod{n} \Leftrightarrow x = y,$$

which means that the solution $(\mathbb{Z}_{2n}, \lambda, \rho)$ is irretractable. It corresponds to the fact $\text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{2n}) = \{0\}$.

Example 5.17. Let (G, \cdot) be a non-abelian group and let $(G \times G, \lambda, \rho)$ be the solution defined in Example 4.9. This solution is clearly distributive and therefore all the three equivalences \sim, \smile and \approx are congruences. In particular, for $(x, y), (a, b) \in G \times G$

$$\begin{aligned} (x, y) \sim (a, b) &\Leftrightarrow \forall ((u, w) \in G \times G) \lambda_{(x,y)}((u, w)) = \lambda_{(a,b)}((u, w)) \Leftrightarrow \\ &\forall (w \in G) y^{-1} \cdot w \cdot y = b^{-1} \cdot w \cdot b \Leftrightarrow y \cdot b^{-1} \in Z(G). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously $(x, y) \smile (a, b) \Leftrightarrow x \cdot a^{-1} \in Z(G)$. Combining, we obtain

$$(x, y) \approx (a, b) \Leftrightarrow (x, y) \sim (a, b) \wedge (x, y) \smile (a, b) \Leftrightarrow x \cdot a^{-1}, y \cdot b^{-1} \in Z(G).$$

In the case of $Z(G)$ being trivial, the solution $(G \times G, \lambda, \rho)$ is irretractable.

6. 2-REDUCTIVE SKEW LEFT BRACES

In this section we analyze which skew left braces yield 2-reductive solutions. Since these solutions are distributive, we can specialize all the results of the previous section. The first result tells how the identities of 2-reductivity translate to properties of skew left braces.

Proposition 6.1. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace and (B, λ, ρ) its associated solution. Then*

- (i) (B, λ, ρ) satisfies (3.1), that means $\lambda_{\lambda_x(y)} = \lambda_y$, for all $x, y \in B$, if and only if the mapping $\lambda: B \rightarrow B$; $a \mapsto \lambda_a$ is a homomorphism of groups (B, \cdot) and $\text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$,
- (ii) (B, λ, ρ) satisfies (3.2), that means $\rho_{\rho_x(y)} = \rho_y$, for all $x, y \in B$, if and only if the mapping $\rho: B \rightarrow B$; $a \mapsto \rho_a$ is a homomorphism of groups (B, \cdot) and S_B ,

- (iii) (B, λ, ρ) satisfies (3.3), that means $\lambda_{\rho_x(y)} = \lambda_y$, for all $x, y \in B$, if and only if the mapping $\lambda: B \rightarrow B$; $a \mapsto \lambda_a$ is an anti-homomorphism of groups (B, \cdot) and $\text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$,
- (iv) (B, λ, ρ) satisfies (3.4), that means $\rho_{\lambda_x(y)} = \rho_y$, for all $x, y \in B$, if and only if the mapping $\rho: B \rightarrow B$; $a \mapsto \rho_a$ is an anti-homomorphism of groups (B, \cdot) and $\text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$,

Proof. By Remark 4.3 and Proposition 4.26 we have for $x, y \in B$:

- (i) $\lambda_{\lambda_x(y)} = \lambda_y \Leftrightarrow \lambda_y = \lambda_{\lambda_x^{-1}(y)} = \lambda_{\bar{x} \circ (x \cdot y)} = \lambda_x^{-1} \lambda_{x \cdot y} \Leftrightarrow \lambda_{x \cdot y} = \lambda_x \lambda_y$;
- (ii) $\rho_x = \rho_{\rho_y(x)} = \rho_{\overline{\lambda_x(y) \circ x \circ y}} = \rho_y \rho_x \rho_{\overline{\lambda_x(y)}} = \rho_y \rho_x \rho_{\lambda_x^{-1}(y)} \Leftrightarrow \rho_y \rho_x = \rho_x \rho_{\lambda_x(y)} \Leftrightarrow \rho_x \rho_y = \rho_{\lambda_x^{-1}(y)} \rho_x = \rho_{\bar{x} \circ (x \cdot y)} \rho_x = \rho_{x \cdot y} \rho_x^{-1} \rho_x = \rho_{x \cdot y}$;
- (iii) Follows from Lemma 4.12 and Theorem 5.5 but we give a direct proof anyway since it is analogous to the proof of (ii): $\lambda_x = \lambda_{\tau_y(x)} = \lambda_{\overline{\lambda_x(y) \circ x \circ y}} = \lambda_{\lambda_x^{-1}(y)} \lambda_x \lambda_y \Leftrightarrow \lambda_x \lambda_y = \lambda_{\lambda_x(y)} \lambda_x \Leftrightarrow \lambda_y \lambda_x = \lambda_x \lambda_{\lambda_x^{-1}(y)} = \lambda_x \lambda_{\bar{x} \circ (x \cdot y)} = \lambda_{x \cdot y}$;
- (iv) $\rho_{\lambda_x(y)} = \rho_y \Leftrightarrow \rho_y = \rho_{\lambda_x^{-1}(y)} = \rho_{\bar{x} \circ (x \cdot y)} = \rho_{x \cdot y} \rho_x^{-1} \Leftrightarrow \rho_y \rho_x = \rho_{x \cdot y}$ and ρ_x is an automorphism according to Theorem 5.15. \square

Skew left braces (B, \cdot, \circ) for which the mapping λ is a homomorphism of groups (B, \cdot) and $\text{Aut}(B, \cdot)$ were investigated in [3] under the name λ -homomorphic skew left braces. In particular, it was shown there ([3, Theorem 2.12]) that any λ -homomorphic skew left brace is meta-trivial. Hence, by Proposition 6.1(i) we immediately obtain:

Corollary 6.2. *Each skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) which satisfies (3.1), that means $\lambda_{\lambda_x(y)} = \lambda_y$, for all $x, y \in B$, is meta-trivial.*

Lemma 6.3. *Let (B, λ, ρ) be a 2-reductive solution associated to a skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) . Then for $x, y \in B$ we have*

- (i) $y \circ y = y \cdot \overline{y^{-1}}$,
- (ii) $(y^{-1} \circ x) \cdot y = (\bar{y} \circ x) \cdot \bar{y}^{-1} = \rho_y(x)$,
- (iii) $\bar{y} \cdot y = y \cdot \bar{y}$,
- (iv) $y^{-1} \cdot \bar{y}^{-1} = y^{-1} \circ y$,
- (iv) $y \circ y = \overline{y^{-1} \circ \bar{y}^{-1}}$,
- (vi) $\overline{\bar{y} \cdot y} = (\bar{y} \cdot y)^{-1} = y^{-1} \circ y$,
- (vii) $x \circ y \circ \bar{x} \circ \bar{y} = (x \circ y) \cdot (y \circ x)^{-1}$.

Proof. Let $x, y \in B$.

(i) By Lemma 4.12 we have the following:

$$y^{-1} \cdot (y \circ y) = \lambda_y(y) = \lambda_{y^{-1}}^{-1}(y) = \overline{y^{-1} \circ (y^{-1} \cdot y)} = \overline{y^{-1}} \Rightarrow y \circ y = y \cdot \overline{y^{-1}}.$$

(ii) By Lemma 5.14 we obtain

$$(6.1) \quad \rho_y(x) = \bar{y} \circ (x \cdot y) \stackrel{(4.1)}{=} (\bar{y} \circ x) \cdot \bar{y}^{-1}.$$

Hence, by 2-reductivity

$$\rho_y(x) \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \rho_{\lambda_{y^{-1}}^{-1}(y)}(x) = \rho_{\overline{y^{-1}}}(x) = (y^{-1} \circ x) \cdot y.$$

(iii) Once again by Lemma 5.14:

$$\overline{y^{-1}} = \overline{y^{-1} \circ (y \cdot y^{-1})} = \rho_{y^{-1}}(y) \stackrel{(ii)}{=} (y \circ y) \cdot y^{-1} \Rightarrow \overline{y^{-1}} \cdot y = y \circ y \stackrel{(i)}{=} y \cdot \overline{y^{-1}} \Rightarrow \bar{y} \cdot y = y \cdot \bar{y}.$$

(iv) By Lemma 4.12

$$y^{-1} = \lambda_y(\bar{y}) = \lambda_{\bar{y}^{-1}}(\bar{y}) = \bar{y} \cdot (\bar{y}^{-1} \circ \bar{y}) \Rightarrow \bar{y}^{-1} \cdot y^{-1} = \bar{y}^{-1} \circ \bar{y} \xrightarrow{y \rightarrow \bar{y}} y^{-1} \cdot \bar{y}^{-1} = y^{-1} \circ y.$$

(v) Conditions (iii) and (iv) imply:

$$\begin{aligned} y^{-1} \circ y &\stackrel{(iv)}{=} y^{-1} \cdot \bar{y}^{-1} = (\bar{y} \cdot y)^{-1} \stackrel{(iii)}{=} (y \cdot \bar{y})^{-1} = \bar{y}^{-1} \cdot y^{-1} \stackrel{(iv)}{=} \bar{y}^{-1} \circ \bar{y} \Rightarrow \\ y^{-1} \circ y \circ y &= \bar{y}^{-1} \Rightarrow \overline{y^{-1}} \circ \bar{y}^{-1} = y \circ y. \end{aligned}$$

(vi) By Lemma 4.12 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} y \circ (\bar{y} \cdot y) &= \lambda_{\bar{y}}^{-1}(y) = \lambda_y(y) = \overline{y^{-1}} \Rightarrow \\ \bar{y} \cdot y &= \bar{y} \circ \overline{y^{-1}} = \overline{y^{-1} \circ y} \stackrel{(iv)}{=} \overline{(y \cdot \bar{y})^{-1}} \Rightarrow \overline{\bar{y} \cdot y} = (\bar{y} \cdot y)^{-1} \stackrel{(iv)}{=} y^{-1} \circ y. \end{aligned}$$

(vii) By 2-reductivity the group $\mathcal{G}_\ell(X)$ is commutative. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x^{-1} \cdot (x \circ (y^{-1}(y \circ \bar{x}))) &= \lambda_x(y^{-1} \cdot (y \circ \bar{x})) = \lambda_x \lambda_y(\bar{x}) = \\ \lambda_y \lambda_x(\bar{x}) &= \lambda_y(x^{-1} \cdot (x \circ \bar{x})) = \lambda_y(x^{-1}) = y^{-1} \cdot (y \circ x^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.2 we have:

$$x^{-1} \cdot (x \circ (y^{-1} \cdot (y \circ \bar{x}))) \stackrel{(4.2)}{=} x^{-1} \cdot x \cdot (x \circ y)^{-1} \cdot (x \circ y \circ \bar{x}) = (x \circ y)^{-1} \cdot (x \circ y \circ \bar{x})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} y^{-1} \cdot (y \circ x^{-1}) &= y^{-1} \cdot (y \circ (1 \cdot x^{-1})) \stackrel{(4.3)}{=} y^{-1} \cdot (y \circ 1) \cdot (y \circ x)^{-1} \cdot y = \\ y^{-1} \cdot y \cdot (y \circ x)^{-1} \cdot y &= (y \circ x)^{-1} \cdot y. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (x \circ y)^{-1} \cdot (x \circ y \circ \bar{x}) &= (y \circ x)^{-1} \cdot y \Rightarrow \\ (6.2) \quad x \circ y \circ \bar{x} &= (x \circ y) \cdot (y \circ x)^{-1} \cdot y. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting y by \bar{x} and x by y in (6.2) we complete the proof:

$$\begin{aligned} y \circ \bar{x} \circ \bar{y} &= (y \circ \bar{x}) \cdot (\bar{x} \circ y)^{-1} \cdot \bar{x} \Rightarrow x \circ y \circ \bar{x} \circ \bar{y} = x \circ ((y \circ \bar{x}) \cdot (\bar{x} \circ y)^{-1} \cdot \bar{x}) \stackrel{(4.1)}{=} \\ (x \circ ((y \circ \bar{x}) \cdot (\bar{x} \circ y)^{-1})) \cdot x^{-1} \cdot (x \circ \bar{x}) &\stackrel{(4.3)}{=} (x \circ y \circ \bar{x}) \cdot (x \circ \bar{x} \circ y)^{-1} \cdot x \cdot x^{-1} = \\ (x \circ y \circ \bar{x}) \cdot y^{-1} \stackrel{(6.2)}{=} &(x \circ y) \cdot (y \circ x)^{-1} \cdot y \cdot y^{-1} = (x \circ y) \cdot (y \circ x)^{-1}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.4. *Let (B, \cdot, \circ) be a skew left brace and let (B, λ, ρ) be its associated solution. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) (B, λ, ρ) is 2-reductive,
- (ii) $\lambda_{a \cdot b} = \lambda_{b \cdot a} = \lambda_{a \circ b}$ and $\rho_{a \cdot b} = \rho_{b \cdot a} = \rho_{a \circ b}$, for all $a, b \in B$,
- (iii) (B, λ, ρ) is of multipermutation level at most 2,
- (iv) (B, \cdot, \circ) is nilpotent of class at most 2,
- (v) (B, \cdot_{op}, \circ) is nilpotent of class at most 2.

Proof. (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) follows from Proposition 6.1, (iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv) follows from Corollary 4.28, (iii) \Leftrightarrow (i): We use Proposition 3.4 since $\lambda_1(x) = x = \rho_1(x)$.

(iv) \Leftrightarrow (v): Condition (v) is now equivalent to $(B, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\rho})$ being 2-reductive, according to Theorem 4.5. But this is equivalent to (B, λ, ρ) being 2-reductive, according to Proposition 3.10. \square

Corollary 6.5. *Let (B, λ, ρ) be a 2-reductive solution associated to a skew left brace (B, \cdot, \circ) . Then (B, \cdot) is nilpotent of class at most 2.*

Proof. We have $\text{Soc}(B) \leq Z(B, \cdot)$. And, according to Theorem 6.4, $(B, \cdot)/\text{Soc}(B)$ is abelian. \square

In Section 3 we were constructing 2-reductive solutions as the disjoint unions of abelian groups. There is hence a natural question whether these abelian groups have some structural meaning in the skew left brace. The following example shows that it is not really so.

Example 6.6. (See also [3, Example 5.6]) Let $(\mathbb{Z}_{2n}, +_{2n}, \cdot)$ be the skew left brace dual to the Example 4.10, that means $a \cdot b = a + (-1)^{ab}$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{2n}$. Then $\lambda_a(b) = \rho_a(b) = (-1)^{ab}$. Since $[\mathbb{Z}_{2n} : \text{Soc}(\mathbb{Z}_{2n})] = 2$, the associated solution is 2-reductive. It is isomorphic to the union of

$$\left(\underbrace{\mathbb{Z}_1, \mathbb{Z}_2, \dots, \mathbb{Z}_2}_{\frac{n-1}{2} \times}, \mathbb{Z}_1, \underbrace{\mathbb{Z}_2, \dots, \mathbb{Z}_2}_{\frac{n-1}{2} \times}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & \vdots & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ & \vdots & & \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & \vdots & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ & \vdots & & \\ 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Recall that, for a solution (X, σ, τ) , we can associate two groups:

$$G(X, r) = \langle X \mid x \circ y = \sigma_x(y) \circ \tau_y(x) \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad A(X, r) = \langle X \mid x \cdot y = y \cdot \sigma_y \hat{\sigma}_y(x) \rangle.$$

These two groups, when put across each other, form a skew left brace. A major part of the proof of the following theorem is almost a copy-paste of the proof of [29, Theorem 5.4]. It also directly follows from [5, Theorem 3.13] just published by Castelli and Trappeniers.

Theorem 6.7. *Let (X, σ, τ) be a 2-reductive solution. Then $G(X, r)$ is a nilpotent skew left brace of class 2.*

Proof. Let $(G(X, r), \lambda, \rho)$ be the solution associated with the skew left brace $G(X, r)$. According to Theorem 6.4, we need to prove $\lambda_{a \cdot b} = \lambda_{b \cdot a} = \lambda_a \lambda_b$ and $\rho_{a \cdot b} = \rho_{b \cdot a} = \rho_a \rho_b$, for all $a, b \in G(X, r)$. The part $\lambda_{b \cdot a} = \lambda_a \lambda_b$ follows from [29, Corollary 5.5].

Let us focus on λ being a homomorphism. From (3.1) we have $\sigma_{\sigma_x(y)} = \sigma_y$, for all $x, y \in X$, and therefore $\lambda_{\lambda_x(y)} = \lambda_y$, for all $x, y \in X$. Since X generates $G(X, r)$, we inductively obtain $\lambda_{\lambda_a(y)} = \lambda_y$, for all $a \in G(X, r)$ and $y \in X$.

Let now $w = x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_k^{e_k}$, where $x_i \in X$ and $e_i = \pm 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$. We shall prove, by an induction on k , that

$$\lambda_w = \lambda_{x_1}^{e_1} \lambda_{x_2}^{e_2} \cdots \lambda_{x_k}^{e_k}.$$

For $k = 1$ and $e_1 = 1$ the claim is trivial. For $e_1 = -1$ we remark

$$\lambda_a(\bar{a}) = a^{-1} \quad \Rightarrow \quad a = \lambda_a(\bar{a}^{-1}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{a} = \lambda_{\bar{a}}(a^{-1}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad a = \overline{\lambda_{\bar{a}}(a^{-1})},$$

hence

$$\lambda_{x^{-1}} = \lambda_{\overline{\lambda_{x^{-1}}(x)}} = \lambda_{\lambda_{x^{-1}}(x)}^{-1} = \lambda_x^{-1}.$$

Now we assume that the induction hypothesis is valid for $k - 1$ and we compute, for $w = x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_k^{e_k}$ and $v = x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_{k-1}^{e_{k-1}}$

$$\lambda_w = \lambda_{v \cdot x_k^{e_k}} = \lambda_{v \cdot \lambda_v \lambda_v^{-1}(x_k^{e_k})} = \lambda_{v \circ \lambda_v^{-1}(x_k^{e_k})} = \lambda_v \lambda_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}(x_k)^{e_k}} = \lambda_v \lambda_{\lambda_{\bar{v}}(x_k)}^{e_k} = \lambda_{x_1}^{e_1} \cdots \lambda_{x_{k-1}}^{e_{k-1}} \lambda_{x_k}^{e_k}$$

and λ is a homomorphism with respect to \cdot .

Now $(X, \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ is 2-reductive as well, according to Proposition 3.10. Hence, for the skew left brace $G(X, \hat{r})$, we have $\hat{\lambda}_{a \cdot_{\hat{r}} b} = \hat{\lambda}_{b \cdot_{\hat{r}} a} = \hat{\lambda}_a \hat{\lambda}_b$, for all $a, b \in G(X, \hat{r})$. According to Theorem 5.7, we have $\rho_a^{-1} = \hat{\lambda}_a$ and therefore we obtain $\rho_{a \cdot b} = \hat{\lambda}_{b \cdot_{\hat{r}} a}^{-1} = \hat{\lambda}_b^{-1} \hat{\lambda}_a^{-1} = \rho_b \rho_a$ and analogously $\rho_{b \cdot a} = \rho_b \rho_a$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bachiller, *Classification of braces of order p^3* , J. Pure Appl. Algebra **219**(8) (2015), 3568–3603.
- [2] D. Bachiller, *Solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation associated to skew left braces, with applications to racks*, Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications **27** No. 08 (2018), 1850055.
- [3] V.G. Bardakov, M.V. Neshchadim, M.K. Yadav, *On λ -homomorphic skew braces*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **226**(6) (2022), 106961.
- [4] A. Caranti, *Bi-Skew Braces and Regular Subgroups of the Holomorph*, J. Algebra **516**(2020), 352–372.
- [5] M. Castelli, S. Trappeniens, *Studying solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation through skew braces, with an application to indecomposable involutive solutions with abelian permutation group*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.00581.pdf>
- [6] F. Cedó, E. Jespers, L. Kubat, A. Van Antwerpen, C. Verwimp, *On various types of nilpotency of the structure monoid and group of a set-theoretic solution of the Yang–Baxter equation*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **227**(2) (2022), 107194.
- [7] F. Cedó, E. Jespers, J. Okniński, *Braces and the Yang-Baxter equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **327** (2014), 101–116. Extended version arXiv:1205.3587.
- [8] F. Cedó, E. Jespers, Á. del Río, *Involutive Yang-Baxter groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), 2541–2558.
- [9] F. Cedó, A. Smoktunowicz, L. Vendramin, *Skew left braces of nilpotent type*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3), **118**(6) (2019), 1367–1392.
- [10] L.N. Childs, *Bi-skew braces and Hopf Galois structures*, New York J. Math. **25** (2019), 574–588.
- [11] V.G. Drinfeld, *On some unsolved problems in quantum group theory*, Quantum groups (Leningrad, 1990), 1992, pp. 1.8.
- [12] P. Etingof, T. Schedler, A. Soloviev, *Set-theoretical solutions to the quantum Yang-Baxter equation*, Duke Math. J. **100** (1999), 169–209.
- [13] T. Gateva-Ivanova, P. Cameron, *Multipermutation solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **309** (2012), 583–621. Extended version arXiv:0907.4276.
- [14] T. Gateva-Ivanova, *Set-theoretic solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation, braces and symmetric groups*, Adv. in Math. **338** (2018), 649–701.
- [15] L. Guarnieri, L. Vendramin, *Skew braces and the Yang Baxter equation*, Math. Comp. **86**(307) (2017), 2519–2534.
- [16] P. Jedlička, A. Pilitowska, D. Stanovský, A. Zamojska-Dzienio, *The structure of medial quandles*, J. Algebra **443** (2015), 300–334.
- [17] P. Jedlička, A. Pilitowska, A. Zamojska-Dzienio, *The retraction relation for biracks*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **223** (2019), 3594–3610.
- [18] P. Jedlička, A. Pilitowska, A. Zamojska-Dzienio, *Distributive biracks and solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation*, Int. J. Algebra Comput. **30** (2020), 667–683.
- [19] P. Jedlička, A. Pilitowska, A. Zamojska-Dzienio, *The construction of multipermutation solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation of level 2*, J. Comb. Theory Ser. A. **176** (2020), 105295.
- [20] M. Jimbo, *Introduction to the Yang-Baxter equation*, Int. J. Modern Physics A **4**(15) (1989), 3759–3777.
- [21] C. Kassel, *Quantum Groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 155, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [22] A. Koch, P.J. Truman, *Opposite skew left braces and applications*, J. Algebra **546** (2020), 218–235.
- [23] V. Lebed, L. Vendramin, *On structure groups of set-theoretical solutions to the Yang-Baxter equation*, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. **62**(3) (2019), 683–717.
- [24] W. Rump, *Braces, radical rings, and the quantum Yang-Baxter equation*, J. Algebra **307** (2007), 153–170.
- [25] W. Rump, *Classification of Non-Degenerate Involutive Set-Theoretic Solutions to the Yang-Baxter Equation with Multipermutation Level Two*, Algebras and Representation Theory **25** (2022), 1293–1307.
- [26] A. Smoktunowicz, *On Engel groups, nilpotent groups, rings, braces and the Yang-Baxter equation*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **370**(9) (2018), 6535–6564.
- [27] A. Smoktunowicz, L. Vendramin, *On skew braces (with an appendix by N. Byott and L. Vendramin)*, J. Comb. Algebra **2**(1) (2018), 47–86.
- [28] A. Soloviev, *Non-unitary set-theoretical solutions to the quantum Yang-Baxter equation*, Math. Res. Lett. **7** (2000), 577–596.
- [29] L. Stefanello, S. Trappeniens, *On bi-skew braces and brace blocks*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **227**(5) (2023), 107295.
- [30] L. Vendramin, *Problems on skew left braces*, Adv. Group Theory Appl. Algebra **7** (2019), 15–37.

(P.J.) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CZECH UNIVERSITY OF LIFE SCIENCES, KAMÝČKÁ 129, 16521 PRAHA 6, CZECH REPUBLIC

(A.P.) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, WARSAW UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, KOSZYKOWA
75, 00-662 WARSAW, POLAND
Email address: (P.J.) `jedlickap@tf.czu.cz`
Email address: (A.P.) `agata.pilitowska@pw.edu.pl`