

Distributivity in congruence lattices of graph inverse semigroups*

Yongle Luo^{a,b}, Zhengpan Wang^b and Jiaqun Wei^{a†}

^a*School of Mathematics Sciences, Nanjing Normal University, 210023 Nanjing, China*

^b*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Southwest University, 400715 Chongqing, China*

E-mail: yongleluo@nnu.edu.cn, zpwang@swu.edu.cn, weijiaqun@njnu.edu.cn

Abstract

Let Γ be a directed graph and $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ be the graph inverse semigroup of Γ . Luo and Wang [7] showed that the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of any graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is upper semimodular, but not lower semimodular in general. Anagnostopoulou-Merkouri, Mesyan and Mitchell characterized the directed graph Γ for which $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is lower semimodular [2]. In the present paper, we show that the lower semimodularity, modularity and distributivity in the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of any graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ are equivalent.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 20M18, 05C20, 06D99

Keywords: directed graph; graph inverse semigroup; congruence lattice; semimodularity; distributivity.

1 Introduction and main result

The earliest research on graph inverse semigroups can be traced back to 1975. Ash and Hall in [3] introduced these semigroups to study the nonzero \mathcal{J} -classes of inverse semigroups. Graph inverse semigroups are closely related to the study of Leavitt path algebras [1, 8] and Cuntz inverse semigroups in the C^* -algebras [6, 10].

A *directed graph* $\Gamma = (V, E, s, r)$ is a quadruple consisting of two sets V, E and two functions $s, r : E \rightarrow V$. The elements of V are called *vertices* and the elements of E are called *edges*. For each edge e in E , $s(e)$ is the *source* of e and $r(e)$ is the

*Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11771212) and the Postgraduate Research & Practice Innovation Program of Jiangsu Province.

†Corresponding author

range of e . In this case, we say that the *direction* of e is from $s(e)$ to $r(e)$. For any set X , we denote by $|X|$ the *cardinality* of X . For any vertex v , $|s^{-1}(v)|$ is called the *index* of v . Where there is no possibility for confusion, we may write $\Gamma = (V, E, s, r)$ simply as Γ . A directed graph Γ is *finite* if both V and E are finite.

A *nontrivial path* in Γ is a sequence $\alpha := e_1 \cdots e_n$ of edges such that $r(e_i) = s(e_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. In this case, $s(\alpha) := s(e_1)$ is the *source* of α , $r(\alpha) := r(e_n)$ is the *range* of α . We denote by $u(\alpha)$ the set $\{s(e_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. A nontrivial path α is called a *cycle* if $s(\alpha) = r(\alpha)$ and $s(e_i) \neq s(e_j)$ whenever $i \neq j$. Given a subset V_1 of V , we denote by $C(V_1)$ the set of all cycles c with $u(c) \subseteq V_1$. We say that Γ is *acyclic* if it contains no cycles, that is, $C(V) = \emptyset$. Moreover, we also view a vertex v of V as a *trivial path* with $s(v) = r(v) = v$. In this case, we naturally take $u(v) = \emptyset$, since it has no edges. Denote by $\text{Path}(\Gamma)$ the set of all paths in Γ .

The *graph inverse semigroup* $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is the semigroup with zero generated by V , E and E^* , where E^* is the set $\{e^* : e \in E\}$, satisfying the following relations for all $u, v \in V$ and $e, f \in E$:

$$(GI1) \quad uv = \delta_{u,v}u;$$

$$(GI2) \quad s(e)e = er(e) = e;$$

$$(GI3) \quad r(e)e^* = e^*s(e) = e^*;$$

$$(CK1) \quad f^*e = \delta_{f,e}r(e).$$

The symbol δ is the Kronecker delta.

Certainly, $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is finite if and only if Γ is finite and acyclic. One can see that every nonzero element in $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ can be uniquely written as $\alpha\beta^*$ for some α, β in $\text{Path}(\Gamma)$ with $r(\alpha) = r(\beta)$. The semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is an inverse semigroup with semilattice $\mathcal{E}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of idempotents, where

$$\mathcal{E}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma)) = \{\alpha\alpha^* : \alpha \in \text{Path}(\Gamma)\} \cup \{0\}.$$

Moreover, the multiplication on $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is also defined as follows:

$$(\alpha\beta^*)(\zeta\eta^*) = \begin{cases} (\alpha\xi)\eta^* & \text{if } \zeta = \beta\xi \text{ for some } \xi \in \text{Path}(\Gamma), \\ \alpha(\eta\xi)^* & \text{if } \beta = \zeta\xi \text{ for some } \xi \in \text{Path}(\Gamma), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

There are many papers about congruences and congruence lattices of graph inverse semigroups. Mesyan and Mitchell [9] showed that the Green's \mathcal{H} -relation on any graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is trivial. Thus every graph inverse semigroup is combinatorial. For a finite combinatorial inverse semigroup, Jones [5] proved

that the congruence lattice is M -symmetric, hence upper semimodular. Wang [11] described the congruences of $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ in terms of certain sets of vertices and integer-valued functions on the cycles in Γ . Based on this description, Wang showed that each graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ of a finite directed graph Γ is congruence Noetherian. Luo and Wang [7] proved that the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of any graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is upper semimodular, but not lower semimodular in general. In [2], Anagnostopoulou-Merkouri, Mesyan and Mitchell provided a characterization of the directed graph Γ for which $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is lower semimodular.

Based on the results of [2], [7] and [11], we further show that the lower semimodularity, modularity and distributivity in the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of any graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ are equivalent, which extends the result in [2, Corollary 2.4]. The main result in the present paper is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Γ be a directed graph and $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ be the congruence lattice of the graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (i) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is lower semimodular;*
- (ii) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is modular;*
- (iii) *The lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is distributive.*

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Lattices

In this subsection, we recall some fundamental materials on lattices that can be found in the standard lattice theory book [4].

Let (L, \leq) be a partially ordered set. For any $a, b \in L$, we say that a covers b , and write $a \succ b$, if $a > b$ and there is no $x \in L$ such that $a > x > b$. A partially ordered set (L, \leq) is called a *lattice* if, for all $a, b \in L$, there exists a least upper bound $a \vee b \in L$, called the *join* of a and b , and a greatest lower bound $a \wedge b \in L$, called the *meet* of a and b .

Let $L = (L, \leq, \vee, \wedge)$ be a lattice. Recall that L is *distributive* if $(a \vee b) \wedge c = (a \wedge c) \vee (b \wedge c)$, for all $a, b, c \in L$. Moreover, L is *modular* if $a \leq c$ implies that $a \vee (b \wedge c) = (a \vee b) \wedge c$, for all $a, b, c \in L$. The lattice L is *upper semimodular* if $a, b \succ a \wedge b$ implies that $a \vee b \succ a, b$, for all $a, b \in L$. Dually, L is *lower semimodular* if $a \vee b \succ a, b$ implies that $a, b \succ a \wedge b$, for all $a, b \in L$.

It is clear that every distributive lattice is modular. Every modular lattice is both upper semimodular and lower semimodular, but the converse does not hold for some infinite lattices.

A sublattice L_1 of a lattice L is called a *pentagon*, respectively a *diamond*, if L_1 is isomorphic to \mathfrak{N}_5 , respectively to \mathfrak{M}_3 , shown in Figure 1. The following two lemmas give some characterizations of a lattice to be distributive or modular.

Lemma 2.1. [4, Theorem 101]) *A lattice L is distributive if and only if it does not contain a pentagon or a diamond.*

Lemma 2.2. [4, Theorem 102]) *A lattice L is modular if and only if it does not contain a pentagon.*




Figure 1: The lattices \mathfrak{N}_5 and \mathfrak{M}_3 .

2.2 Graphs

Let $\Gamma = (V, E, s, r)$ be a directed graph. For any path $\alpha \in \text{Path}(\Gamma)$, we say that the path α is *from* v_1 *to* v_2 if $s(\alpha) = v_1$ and $r(\alpha) = v_2$. A directed graph Γ is *strongly connected* if, for all vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$, there exists both a path from v_1 to v_2 and a path from v_2 to v_1 . Moreover, Γ is *unilaterally connected* if, for all vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$, there exists either a path from v_1 to v_2 or a path from v_2 to v_1 .

For any edge $e \in E$, when we do not consider its direction, we say that the unordered pair $(s(e), r(e)) = (r(e), s(e))$ is the *undirected edge* corresponding to e . Denote by \overline{E} the set $\{(s(e), r(e)) : e \in E\}$. Then the pair $\overline{\Gamma} = (V, \overline{E})$ is called the *underlying graph* of Γ . Roughly speaking, $\overline{\Gamma}$ is the undirected graph obtained from Γ by forgetting the direction of each edge. A *nontrivial undirected path* in $\overline{\Gamma}$ is a sequence $\overline{\alpha} := (v_1, v_2)(v_2, v_3) \cdots (v_{n-1}, v_n)$ of undirected edges. In this case, we say that v_1 and v_n are connected by $\overline{\alpha}$.

A directed graph Γ is *weakly connected* if its underlying graph $\overline{\Gamma}$ is connected (i.e., any two distinct vertices are connected by some nontrivial undirected path). A *subgraph* of Γ is a directed graph $\Gamma_i = (V_i, E_i, s_i, r_i)$ such that $V_i \subseteq V$, $E_i \subseteq E$ and the restrictions $s|_{E_i}, r|_{E_i}$ of s, r to E_i are respectively equal to s_i, r_i . A subgraph Γ_i of Γ is called a *weakly connected component* if Γ_i is the maximal weakly connected subgraph of Γ .

In addition, we need the following notions, which are used to describe the lower semimodularity of the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ in [2].

Given a directed graph Γ , there is a natural *preorder* \succeq on V : for any $v_1, v_2 \in V$, $v_1 \succeq v_2$ if there exists a path from v_1 to v_2 . We say that $v \in V$ is a *forked vertex* if there exist distinct edges $e, f \in s^{-1}(v)$ such that the following properties hold:

- (i) $r(g) \not\preceq r(e)$ for all $g \in s^{-1}(v) \setminus \{e\}$;
- (ii) $r(g) \not\preceq r(f)$ for all $g \in s^{-1}(v) \setminus \{f\}$.

For instance, there are two directed graphs shown in Figure 2. The directed graph Γ_1 has a forked vertex v_1 . But Γ_2 has no forked vertices.




Figure 2: There are two directed graphs. The directed graph Γ_1 has a forked vertex v_1 . But the directed graph Γ_2 has no forked vertices.

2.3 Congruences and congruence triples

We need Wang's results in [11], which proved that there is a one-to-one correspondence between congruences on a graph inverse semigroup and so-called congruence triples. For convenience, we briefly recall the relevant concepts as follows (see [7]).

Given a directed graph Γ , a subset H of V is *hereditary* if $s(e) \in H$ always implies $r(e) \in H$ for all $e \in E$. Let H be a hereditary subset of V . For any $v \in V$, we call $|\{e \in E : s(e) = v, r(e) \notin H\}|$ the *index of v relative to H* . Let W be a subset of vertices with index 1 relative to H . Certainly, H and W are two disjoint subsets. We call $f : C(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ a *cycle function* if f satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $f(c) = 1$, if $c \in C(H)$;
- (ii) $f(c) = f(c')$, if c and c' are cyclic permutations of each other;
- (iii) $f(c) = \infty$, if $c \notin C(H)$ and $c \notin C(W)$.

A *congruence triple* of Γ , written by (H, W, f) , consists of a hereditary subset H , a subset W of the set of vertices with index 1 relative to H , and a cycle function f . If Γ is acyclic, that is, $C(V) = \emptyset$, then we denote by (H, W, \emptyset) the corresponding congruence triple.

For any $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we denote by $\gcd(m_1, m_2)$ their *greatest common divisor* and $\text{lcm}(m_1, m_2)$ their *least common multiple*. We naturally assume that

any element in $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ divides ∞ , which means that $\gcd(m, \infty) = m$ and $\text{lcm}(m, \infty) = \infty$, for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$. There is a partial order on $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$: for any $(H_1, W_1, f_1), (H_2, W_2, f_2) \in \mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$, $(H_1, W_1, f_1) \leq (H_2, W_2, f_2)$ if $H_1 \subseteq H_2$, $W_1 \setminus H_2 \subseteq W_2$ and $f_2(c) \mid f_1(c)$ for any $c \in C(V)$.

Denote by $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$ the set of all congruence triples of Γ , and denote by $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ the set of all congruences on $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$. The following lemma shows that $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$ is a lattice isomorphic to $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$.

Lemma 2.3. [7, Proposition 1.2] *The two partially ordered sets $(\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma)), \subseteq)$ and $(\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma), \leq)$ are order isomorphic.*

Let $T_1 = (H_1, W_1, f_1)$ and $T_2 = (H_2, W_2, f_2)$ be any congruence triples in $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$. It is clear that both $H_1 \cap H_2$ and $H_1 \cup H_2$ are hereditary subsets. Given a vertex $v \in W_1 \cup W_2$, the index of v relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is at most 1. We denote by V_0 the set of vertices in $(W_1 \cup W_2) \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$ with index 0 relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$.

Given a vertex $v \in W_1 \cap W_2$, the index of v relative to both H_1 and H_2 is 1. If the index of v relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is 0, then $v \in V_0$, and the index of v relative to $H_1 \cap H_2$ is 2. If the index of v relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is 1, then the index of v relative to $H_1 \cap H_2$ is also 1.

We denote by X the set $(W_1 \cap W_2) \setminus V_0$ and J the set

$$\{v \in (W_1 \cup W_2) \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2) : (\exists \alpha \in \text{Path}(\Gamma)) v = s(\alpha), u(\alpha) \subseteq W_1 \cup W_2, r(\alpha) \in V_0\}.$$

Certainly, $V_0 \subseteq J$ since we consider a vertex as a trivial path.

Moreover, we also need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. [7, Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8] *Let $T_1 = (H_1, W_1, f_1)$ and $T_2 = (H_2, W_2, f_2)$ be arbitrary congruence triples in $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *The meet $T_l = (H_l, W_l, f_l)$ of T_1 and T_2 can be determined as follows: $H_l = H_1 \cap H_2$, $W_l = (W_1 \cap H_2) \cup (W_2 \cap H_1) \cup X$ and $f_l(c) = \text{lcm}(f_1(c), f_2(c))$ for $c \in C(V)$.*
- (ii) *The join $T_u = (H_u, W_u, f_u)$ of T_1 and T_2 can be determined as follows: $H_u = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup J$, $W_u = (W_1 \cup W_2) \setminus H_u$ and $f_u(c) = \gcd(f_1(c), f_2(c))$ for $c \in C(V)$.*

Remark 2.5. Since $H_1 \cap W_1 = H_2 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$, the subsets $W_1 \cap H_2$, $W_2 \cap H_1$ and $W_1 \cap W_2$ are disjoint. Moreover, the join T_u satisfies the property that $H_u \cup W_u = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup W_1 \cup W_2$.

3 Proof of the main result

For any disjoint sets A and B , we sometimes write their union as $A \uplus B$. The following lemma will be used to prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Γ be a directed graph, and let $T_1 = (H_1, W_1, f_1)$, $T_2 = (H_2, W_2, f_2)$ and $T_3 = (H_3, W_3, f_3)$ be congruence triples in $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$ such that $T_1 \wedge T_2 = T_1 \wedge T_3$ and $T_1 \vee T_2 = T_1 \vee T_3$. Then we have $H_2 = H_3$ and $f_2 = f_3$.*

Proof. Denote by $T_l = (H_l, W_l, f_l)$ the meet of T_1 and T_2 , and $T_u = (H_u, W_u, f_u)$ the join of T_1 and T_2 . We know from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\gcd(f_1(c), f_2(c)) = \gcd(f_1(c), f_3(c)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{lcm}(f_1(c), f_2(c)) = \text{lcm}(f_1(c), f_3(c))$$

for any cycle $c \in C(V)$. By the distributivity of $(\mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}, |)$, we have $f_2(c) = f_3(c)$ for any cycle $c \in C(V)$.

Suppose there is a vertex $v \in H_3 \setminus H_2$. It is clear that $v \notin H_1$. Otherwise, it follows from $v \in H_1 \cap H_3 = H_1 \cap H_2$ that $v \in H_2$. Moreover, since $T_1 \vee T_2 = T_1 \vee T_3$, then we get from Lemma 2.4 again that

$$H_1 \cup W_1 \cup H_2 \cup W_2 = H_1 \cup W_1 \cup H_3 \cup W_3.$$

Now we have

$$v \in H_3 \cap (W_1 \cup W_2) = (H_3 \cap W_1) \cup (H_3 \cap W_2).$$

If $v \in H_3 \cap W_2$, then certainly $v \in W_2 \setminus H_1$. If $v \in H_3 \cap W_1$, then we also get $v \in W_2 \setminus H_1$, since

$$H_3 \cap W_1 \subseteq W_l \quad \text{and} \quad W_l \subseteq (W_1 \cap H_2) \uplus (W_2 \cap H_1) \uplus (W_1 \cap W_2).$$

We claim that the index of v relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is 1. Indeed, it follows from $v \in W_2$ that there exists a unique edge $e_v \in s^{-1}(v)$ such that $r(e_v) \notin H_2$ and the ranges of the rest of edges in $s^{-1}(v)$ are all in $H_2 \subseteq H_1 \cup H_2$. Since H_3 is hereditary, we have $r(e_v) \in H_3 \setminus H_2$. Similar to the discussion of v , it follows $r(e_v) \notin H_1$, that is, $r(e_v) \notin H_1 \cup H_2$. Thus the claim holds.

On the other hand, since $v \in H_3 \subseteq H_u$, by the definition of the join of T_1 and T_2 , there must exist a path α starting at v such that $u(\alpha) \subseteq W_1 \cup W_2$, $r(\alpha) \in (W_1 \cup W_2) \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$, and the index of $r(\alpha)$ relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is 0. Note that $r(\alpha) \in H_3 \setminus H_2$. Similar to the discussion of v , the index of $r(\alpha)$ relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is 1, which is a contradiction. Then we proved that $H_3 \setminus H_2 = \emptyset$, that is, $H_3 \subseteq H_2$.

Dually, we also have $H_2 \subseteq H_3$. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ be a directed graph and $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ be the congruence lattice of the graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$. Then $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is modular if and only if it is distributive.*

Proof. By Lemmas 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, we only need to prove that $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$ does not have a diamond \mathfrak{M}_3 . Suppose $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$ has a diamond. Without loss of generality, we may assume that there are three different congruence triples $T_i = (H_i, W_i, f_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that

$$T_1 \wedge T_2 = T_1 \wedge T_3 = T_2 \wedge T_3 \quad \text{and} \quad T_1 \vee T_2 = T_1 \vee T_3 = T_2 \vee T_3.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we have $H_1 = H_2 = H_3$ and $f_1 = f_2 = f_3$. Then we get from Lemma 2.4 that

$$W_1 \cap W_2 = W_1 \cap W_3 \quad \text{and} \quad W_1 \cup W_2 = W_1 \cup W_3.$$

Hence we have $W_2 = W_3$, which contradicts the fact that $T_2 \neq T_3$. \square

Anagnostopoulou-Merkouri, Mesyan and Mitchell [2] characterized the directed graph Γ for which the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is lower semimodular.

Lemma 3.3. *[2, Theorem 2.3] Let Γ be a directed graph. Then Γ has no forked vertices if and only if the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is lower semimodular.*

Inspired by this result, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let Γ be a directed graph. If Γ has no forked vertices, then the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is modular.*

Proof. Let Γ be a directed graph with no forked vertices. Suppose that $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is not modular. Equivalently, $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$ is not modular. Then it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma)$ has a pentagon \mathfrak{N}_5 . Without loss of generality, we may assume that there are congruence triples $T_i = (H_i, W_i, f_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that

$$T_1 \wedge T_2 = T_1 \wedge T_3, \quad T_1 \vee T_2 = T_1 \vee T_3 \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 < T_3.$$

By Lemma 3.1, we have $H_2 = H_3$, $f_2 = f_3$, and $W_2 \subsetneq W_3$.

Denote by $T_l = (H_l, W_l, f_l)$ the meet of T_1 and T_2 , and $T_u = (H_u, W_u, f_u)$ the join of T_1 and T_2 . Let X_2 (respectively, X_3) be the subset of $W_1 \cap W_2$ (respectively, $W_1 \cap W_3$) such that the index of each vertex relative to H_l is 1. It follows from Lemma 2.4 that

$$(W_1 \cap H_2) \uplus (W_2 \cap H_1) \uplus X_2 = (W_1 \cap H_3) \uplus (W_3 \cap H_1) \uplus X_3.$$

Since $H_2 = H_3$, we have $(W_2 \cap H_1) \uplus X_2 = (W_3 \cap H_1) \uplus X_3$. For any vertex $v \in X_2$, it follows from

$$X_2 \cap H_1 \subseteq (W_1 \cap W_2) \cap H_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap H_1 = \emptyset$$

that $v \notin H_1$. Thus we have $v \in X_3$, that is, $X_2 \subseteq X_3$. Similarly, we also have $X_3 \subseteq X_2$. So we obtain from $X_2 = X_3$ that $W_2 \cap H_1 = W_3 \cap H_1$.

On the other hand, it follows from $T_1 \vee T_2 = T_1 \vee T_3$ that

$$H_1 \cup W_1 \cup H_2 \cup W_2 = H_1 \cup W_1 \cup H_3 \cup W_3.$$

Note that $H_2 = H_3$. Denote by

$$A = H_1 \cup W_1 \cup H_2 = H_1 \cup W_1 \cup H_3.$$

Then we have $W_2 \setminus A = W_3 \setminus A$. It follows from

$$(W_1 \cap W_2) \uplus (W_2 \cap H_1) \uplus (W_2 \setminus A) = W_2 \subsetneq W_3 = (W_1 \cap W_3) \uplus (W_3 \cap H_1) \uplus (W_3 \setminus A)$$

that $W_1 \cap W_2 \subsetneq W_1 \cap W_3$. Let B_2 (respectively, B_3) be the subset of $W_1 \cap W_2$ (respectively, $W_1 \cap W_3$) such that the index of each vertex relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is 0. We know from

$$X_2 = X_3 \quad \text{and} \quad W_1 \cap W_2 = X_2 \uplus B_2 \subsetneq X_3 \uplus B_3 = W_1 \cap W_3$$

that $B_2 \subsetneq B_3$. Certainly, $B_3 \neq \emptyset$, which means that there is a vertex v_0 in B_3 such that the index of v_0 relative to $H_1 \cup H_2$ is 0. In this case, the index of v_0 relative to both H_1 and H_3 is 1, and its index relative to $H_1 \cap H_3$ is 2. Thus there are at least two distinct edges $e, f \in s^{-1}(v_0)$ such that $r(e) \in H_1 \setminus H_3$ and $r(f) \in H_3 \setminus H_1$. And if there is any other edge $g \in s^{-1}(v_0)$, then $r(g) \in H_1 \cap H_3$. Note that H_1 , H_3 and $H_1 \cap H_3$ are all hereditary subsets. Thus v_0 is a forked vertex, which is a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It is clear that (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (i). The proof of (i) \Rightarrow (iii) follows from Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. \square

As corollaries, we have the following interesting results.

Corollary 3.5. *Let Γ be a directed graph with $|s^{-1}(v)| \leq 1$ for any vertex v in V . Then the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is distributive.*

Proof. Since the index of every forked vertex is at least 2, the directed graph Γ has no forked vertices. Thus the lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ is distributive by Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 3.3. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let Γ be a directed graph. If Γ is unilaterally connected, in particular, strongly connected, then the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is distributive.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 3.3, it is enough to show that Γ has no forked vertices. Suppose that v is a forked vertex in V . For any distinct edges $e, f \in s^{-1}(v)$, it follows from the unilateral connectivity of Γ that there is either a path from $r(e)$ to $r(f)$ (i.e., $r(e) \succeq r(f)$), or a path from $r(f)$ to $r(e)$ (i.e., $r(f) \succeq r(e)$), which contradicts the hypothesis that v is a forked vertex. \square

Corollary 3.7. *Let Γ be a directed graph and $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \in I}$ be the collection of all weakly connected components of Γ , where I is an index set. Then the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma))$ of $\text{Inv}(\Gamma)$ is distributive if and only if, for all $i \in I$, the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma_i))$ of $\text{Inv}(\Gamma_i)$ is distributive.*

Proof. It is clear that Γ has no forked vertices if and only if Γ_i has no forked vertices, for all $i \in I$. \square

Example 3.8. As shown in Figure 2, the directed graph Γ_1 has a forked vertex v_1 . It has been proved in [7, Example 2] that the congruence lattice $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma_1))$ is not lower semimodular.

For the directed graph Γ_2 in Figure 2, it is easy to see that the graph inverse semigroup $\text{Inv}(\Gamma_2) = \{0, v_2, u_2, w_2, e_2, f_2, g_2, e_2^*, f_2^*, g_2^*\}$. There are 6 congruence triples in $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma_2)$: $T_1 = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, $T_2 = (\{u_2\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, $T_3 = (\{w_2\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$, $T_4 = (\{w_2\}, \{v_2\}, \emptyset)$, $T_5 = (\{u_2, w_2\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ and $T_6 = (\{u_2, v_2, w_2\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$. It follows from the Hasse diagram of $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma_2)$ shown in Figure 3 that $\mathcal{C}(\text{Inv}(\Gamma_2))$ is distributive.




Figure 3: The Hasse diagram of the lattice $\mathcal{CT}(\Gamma_2)$.

References

- [1] Abrams, G., Pino, G. A. (2005). The Leavitt path algebra of a graph. *J. Algebra* 293(2):319-334. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2005.07.028.

- [2] Anagnostopoulou-Merkouri, M., Mesyan, Z., Mitchell, J. D. (2022). Properties of congruence lattices of graph inverse semigroups. arXiv: 10.48550/arXiv.2108.08277.
- [3] Ash, C. J., Hall, T. E. (1975). Inverse semigroups on graphs. *Semigroup Forum* 11(1):140-145. DOI: 10.1007/BF02195262.
- [4] Grätzer, G. (2011). *Lattice Theory: Foundation*. Springer, Birkhäuser, Basel. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-0348-0018-1.
- [5] Jones, P. R. (1983). On congruence lattices of regular semigroups. *J. Algebra* 82(1):18-39. DOI: 10.1016/0021-8693(83)90171-0.
- [6] Kumjian, A., Pask, D., Raeburn, I. (1998). Cuntz-Krieger algebras of directed graphs. *Pac. J. Math.* 184(1):161-174. DOI: 10.2140/pjm.1998.184.161.
- [7] Luo, Y., Wang, Z. (2021). Semimodularity in congruence lattice of graph inverse semigroups. *Comm. Algebra* 49(6):2623–2632. DOI: 10.1080/00927872.2021.1879826.
- [8] Meakin, J., Milan, D., Wang, Z. (2021). On a class of inverse semigroups related to Leavitt path algebras. *Adv. in Math* 384, 107729. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2021.107729.
- [9] Mesyan, Z., Mitchell, J. D. (2016). The structure of a graph inverse semigroup. *Semigroup Forum* 93(1):111-130. DOI: 10.1007/s00233-016-9793-x.
- [10] Paterson, A. L. T. (2002). Graph inverse semigroups, groupoids and their C*-Algebras. *J. Operator theory* 48(3):645–662.
- [11] Wang, Z. (2019). Congruences on graph inverse semigroups. *J. Algebra* 534:51-64. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2019.06.020.