

## STRONGLY $\pi$ -REGULAR MATRIX SEMIGROUPS

JAN OKNIŃSKI

ABSTRACT. We prove that if  $S$  is a strongly  $\pi$ -regular multiplicative sub-semigroup of the matrix algebra  $M_n(K)$ ,  $K$  being a field, then there exists a chain of ideals  $S_1 \triangleleft \cdots \triangleleft S_t = S$  such that  $t \leq 2^{n+1}$  and any Rees factor semigroup  $S_i/S_{i-1}$  is either completely 0-simple or nilpotent of index not exceeding  $\prod_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j}$ . This sharpens the main result of [4], in particular solving Problem 3.9 from [3].

A semigroup  $S$  is said to be strongly  $\pi$ -regular if for any  $s \in S$  there exists an integer  $k \geq 1$  such that  $s^k$  lies in a subgroup of  $S$ . Matrix semigroups (i.e. multiplicative subsemigroups of the matrix algebra  $M_n(K)$  for some field  $K$  and some  $n \geq 1$ ) of this type have been recently the subject of considerable study (for references see [4]). In particular, Putcha proved that any such semigroup admits a chain of ideals  $S_1 \triangleleft \cdots \triangleleft S_t = S$  with all factor semigroups  $S_i/S_{i-1}$  being completely 0-simple or nilpotent [4]. The purpose of this note is to show that, in this case,  $t$  cannot exceed  $2^{n+1}$  and that there is a bound (also depending on  $n$  only) on indices of nilpotency of the nilpotent factors. The former solves Problem 3.9 from [3]. The way we shall proceed is quite different from that used in [4] where the Zariski closure was the main tool.

If  $a \in M_n(K)$ , then by  $\rho(a)$  we shall denote the rank of  $a$ . Further, for any  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , we put  $I_j = \{a \in M_n(K) | \rho(a) \leq j\}$ . Certainly,  $I_j$  is an ideal of the semigroup  $M_n(K)$ . Let  $a \in M_n(K)$ . Then, treating  $a$  as a linear transformation of an  $n$ -dimensional vector space over  $K$  with a fixed basis, we shall denote by  $\Lambda^j a$  the  $j$ th exterior power of  $a$  and treat it (in a usual way) as an element of  $M_{\binom{n}{j}}(K)$ .

We are indebted to Dr. Z. Marciniak for bringing the following well-known result as well as its usefulness for our considerations to our attention.

LEMMA 1 (CF. [1, §5, EXERCISE 11]). *Let  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Then  $\Lambda^j: M_n(K) \rightarrow M_{\binom{n}{j}}(K)$  is a semigroup homomorphism. Moreover  $\rho(\Lambda^j(a)) = 0$  if  $\rho(a) < j$  and  $\rho(\Lambda^j(a)) = \binom{\rho(a)}{j}$  if  $\rho(a) \geq j$ .*

We shall start with an auxiliary result concerning matrices of rank one.

LEMMA 2. *Let  $T \subset M_n(K)$  be a set of idempotents of rank one. Then:*

- (1) *if  $(ef)^2 = 0$  for any  $e, f \in T$ ,  $e \neq f$ , then  $|T| \leq 2^n - 1$ ,*
- (2) *if  $(efg)^2 = 0$  for any  $e, f, g \in T$ ,  $e \neq g$ , then  $|T| \leq n$ .*

PROOF. We will proceed by induction on  $n$ . The result is obvious if  $n = 1$ . Let  $n > 1$  and  $f, g \in T$ ,  $f \neq g$ . Since  $\rho(g) = \rho(f) = 1$ , the condition  $(fg)^2 = 0$  easily implies that  $fg = 0$  or  $gf = 0$ . Thus, in any case,  $(1-g)f(1-g)$  is an idempotent.

Received by the editors March 23, 1984.  
1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 20M10.

©1985 American Mathematical Society  
0002-9939/85 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

Let us fix  $e \in T$  and define  $\bar{f} = (1 - e)f(1 - e)$  for  $f \in T \setminus \{e\}$ ,  $\bar{T} = \{\bar{f} | f \in T \setminus \{e\}\}$ . Then  $\bar{T}$  embeds into  $M_{n-1}(K)$ . Since  $\bar{f} = 0$  would imply  $ef = f$  or  $fe = f$ , then by hypothesis  $\rho(\bar{f}) = 1$  for any  $\bar{f} \in \bar{T}$ .

(1) Put  $T_1 = \{f \in T | ef = 0\}$ ,  $T_2 = \{f \in T | fe = 0\}$  and  $\bar{T}_i = \{\bar{f} | f \in T_i\}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . If  $f, g \in T_1$ , then  $(\bar{f}\bar{g})^2 = (fg)^2(1 - e)$ . Hence  $(\bar{f}\bar{g})^2 = 0$  if and only if  $f \neq g$ . This means that  $\bar{T}_1$  satisfies the induction hypothesis and  $|\bar{T}_1| = |T_1|$ . Since similar arguments can be applied to the set  $T_2$ , by the induction argument we then get

$$|T| \leq |T_1| + |T_2| + 1 = |\bar{T}_1| + |\bar{T}_2| + 1 = 2(2^{n-1} - 1) + 1 = 2^n - 1.$$

(2) It may be easily checked that for any  $\bar{f}, \bar{g} \in \bar{T}$ ,  $f \neq g$ , the element  $\bar{f}\bar{g}$  must be nilpotent. For example, if  $ef = fg = ge = 0$ , then  $(\bar{f}\bar{g})^2 = (feg)^2 = 0$ . Hence, in particular,  $\bar{f} = \bar{g}$  implies  $f = g$ . Thus, as above, the inclusion argument yields  $|T| = |\bar{T}| + 1 \leq n$ .

It is easy to see that the assumption of (1) in Lemma 2 is essentially weaker than that of (2). In fact, take, for example,

$$T = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \subset M_2(K).$$

**COROLLARY 1.** *Let  $T \in M_n(K)$  be a set of idempotents of rank  $j$ . Then*

- (1) *if  $\rho((ef)^2) < j$  for any  $e, f \in T$ ,  $e \neq f$ , then  $|T| \leq 2^{\binom{n}{j}} - 1$ ,*
- (2) *if  $\rho((efg)^2) < j$  for any  $e, f, g \in T$ ,  $e \neq g$ , then  $|T| \leq \binom{n}{j}$ .*

**PROOF.** Let us consider the set  $\Lambda^j(T) \subset M_{\binom{n}{j}}(K)$ . Since  $\Lambda^j$  is a homomorphism, then the assumption of (1) (hence, also the assumption of (2)) implies that  $|T| = |\Lambda^j(T)|$ . Moreover, by Lemma 1,  $\Lambda^j(T)$  consists of idempotents of rank one satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 2(1), (2) accordingly. Thus, the result follows from Lemma 2.

The first part of Corollary 1 solves Problem 3.9 from [3]. However, to get a stronger result in our structure theorem we will use the second assertion of Corollary 1.

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Let  $S \subset M_n(K)$  be a strongly  $\pi$ -regular semigroup. Then  $S$  has at most  $2^n$  regular  $J$ -classes.*

**PROOF.** Let  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Assume that some idempotents  $e, f, g \in S$  of rank  $j$  are given with  $e, g$  lying in distinct  $J$ -classes. Suppose that  $\rho((efg)^2) = j$ . Then, since  $S$  is strongly  $\pi$ -regular, there exist  $x \in S$  and  $y = y^2 \in S$  such that  $(efg)^k x = y$  and  $\rho(y) = \rho((efg)^k)$  for some  $k \geq 1$ . Thus  $\rho(y) = j$ . Now  $y = y^2 = (ey)^2$  and so  $\rho(eye) \geq \rho(y) = j$  which implies that  $\rho(eye) = j$ . Since  $(eye)^2 = eye$ , this yields  $eye = e$ . Hence  $(efg)^k x e = eye = e$  and so  $e \in SgS$ . Similarly  $g \in SeS$ , a contradiction. Now, from Corollary 1 it follows that there are at most  $\binom{n}{j}$  regular  $J$ -classes of  $S$  contained in  $I_j \setminus I_{j-1}$ . This yields the result.

Let us observe that there exists a semigroup  $T \subset M_n(K)$  which is strongly  $\pi$ -regular and has exactly  $2^n$  regular  $J$ -classes—namely the set of all diagonal idempotents.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let  $S \subset M_n(K)$  be a strongly  $\pi$ -regular semigroup. If  $I$  is an ideal of  $S$  such that  $S/I$  is a nil semigroup, then  $(S/I)^m = 0$ , where  $m = \prod_{j=1}^n \binom{n}{j}$ .*

PROOF. Let  $j$  be the least integer such that  $S \subset I_j$ . Define  $H$  as the subsemigroup generated by  $S \setminus I$ . Let  $h = g_1 \cdots g_s$ ,  $g_i \in S \setminus I$ . By hypothesis, there exist  $y \in S$ ,  $e = e^2 \in S$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , such that  $h^k y = (g_1 \cdots g_s)^k y = e$  and  $\rho(e) = \rho(h^k)$ . Suppose that  $\rho(e) = j$ . Then  $\rho(h) = \rho(e)$  and from [4, Lemma 4], it follows that  $g_1 = eg_1$ . Since  $I$  is an ideal of  $S$ , then we must have  $e \notin I$ . This contradicts the fact that  $S/I$  is nil. Hence  $\rho(h^k) = \rho(e) < j$ . While  $h \in H$  is an arbitrary element,  $H/(H \cap I_{j-1})$  is a nil semigroup.

Let us consider the semigroup  $\Lambda^j(H) \subset M_{\binom{n}{j}}(K)$ . Since, by Lemma 1,  $\Lambda^j(I_{j-1}) = 0$ , then the first part of the proof implies that  $\Lambda^j(H)$  is a nil semigroup. Thus, it is well known that  $\Lambda^j(H^{\binom{n}{j}}) = \Lambda^j(H)^{\binom{n}{j}} = 0$  [2, Proposition 17.19]. This means that  $H^{\binom{n}{j}} \subset I_{j-1}$ . Now we have a natural epimorphism  $H/(H \cap I_{j-1}) \rightarrow S/(I \cup (I_{j-1} \cap S))$  and the latter is also nilpotent of index not exceeding  $\binom{n}{j}$ . On the other hand

$$(I \cup (I_{j-1} \cap S))/I \simeq (I_{j-1} \cap S)/(I \cap I_{j-1} \cap S) = (I_{j-1} \cap S)/(I_{j-1} \cap I).$$

Putting  $\bar{S} = I_{j-1} \cap S$ ,  $\bar{I} = I_{j-1} \cap I$ , we get a strongly  $\pi$ -regular semigroup  $\bar{S} \subset I_{j-1}$  and we may repeat the above procedure regarding the nil semigroup  $\bar{S}/\bar{I}$ . Thus, after  $j$  such steps we get  $(S/I)^{\binom{n}{j} \binom{n-1}{j-1} \cdots \binom{n}{1}} = 0$ . Hence  $(S/I)^m = 0$ .

Let us notice that Proposition 2 provides in particular an alternative proof of the implication  $S/I$ -nil  $\Rightarrow S/I$ -nilpotent, which was proved in [4].

Now, by Propositions 1 and 2 and the structure theorem for strongly  $\pi$ -regular semigroups with finitely many regular  $\mathcal{J}$ -classes (cf. [3, Lemma 1.9]) we can summarize our results.

THEOREM. *Let  $S \subset M_n(K)$  be a strongly  $\pi$ -regular semigroup. Then there exists a chain of ideals  $S_1 \triangleleft \cdots \triangleleft S_t = S$  such that  $t \leq 2^{n+1}$  and all factors  $S_i/S_{i-1}$  are completely 0-simple or nilpotent of index not exceeding  $m = \prod_{j=1}^n \binom{n}{j}$ .*

At last, observe that, in view of [4], the Theorem establishes the nonexistence of chains of left (right) principal ideals of  $S$  with length exceeding  $m^{2^{n+1}}$ ,  $m$  as above.

ADDED IN PROOF. Since any periodic semigroup  $S$  is strongly  $\pi$ -regular, the Theorem provides a simple proof of the Burnside theorem for semigroups (cf. [5]). In fact, to show that  $S$  is locally finite it is enough to prove that all  $S_i/S_{i-1}$  are locally finite (cf. [6, Lemma 3]). While the nilpotent case is obvious, the completely 0-simple case easily follows by Rees' theorem and the Burnside theorem for torsion groups.

REFERENCES

1. N. Bourbaki, *Algèbre*, Chapitre III, Hermann, Paris, 1948.
2. C. Faith, *Algebra. II. Ring theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1976.
3. M. Putcha, *On algebraic linear semigroups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **259** (1980), 457-469.
4. —, *Matrix semigroups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **88** (1983), 386-390.
5. R. McNaughton and Y. Zalcstein, *The Burnside problem for semigroups*, J. Algebra **34** (1975), 292-299.
6. J. Okniński, *On regular semigroup rings*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh (to appear).