Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal

Andrzej Walendziak

On the Kurosh-Ore replacement property

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 49 (1999), No. 4, 831–834

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/127532

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1999

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.

This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://dml.cz

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 49 (124) (1999), 831–834

ON THE KUROSH-ORE REPLACEMENT PROPERTY

Andrzej Walendziak, Warszawa

(Received December 23, 1996)

In this note we give a generalization of results of papers [2] and [3]. Moreover, it is shown here that the question (see [3], p. 183) has negative answer.

Next we recall some definitions and results. Let L be a lattice. Denote by $J(L)$ the set of all join-irreducible elements of L. For two elements $a, b \in L (a \leqslant b)$ we define $[a, b] = \{c \in L\colon\ a \leqslant c \leqslant b\}$. We say that a is a lower cover of b, if $a < b$ and $[a, b] = \{a, b\}$; in this case we write $a \prec b$. L is called strongly atomic (strongly dually atomic), if for any $a, b \in L$ with $a < b$ there is $p \in [a, b]$ such that $a \prec p (p \prec b)$.

Let L be a complete strongly dually atomic lattice. If $u \in J(L) - \{0\}$, then by u' we denote the uniquely determined lower cover of u. For $a \in L - \{1\}$, let $a^+ = \bigvee\{b \in L\colon\ a \prec b\}$. We say that L is locally modular, or locally distributive if for each $a \in L$, $a \neq 1$, the interval $[a, a^+]$ is a modular sublattice or a distributive sublattice, respectively.

A complete lattice L has replaceable irredundant $\vee$-decompositions ($\bigvee$-KORP, for short) if each element of L has at least one irredundant $\vee$-decomposition, and whenever $a = \bigvee T = \bigvee R$ are two irredundant $\vee$-decompositions of an element $a \in L$, for each $t \in T$ there exists $r \in R$ such that $a = \bigvee(T - \{t\}) \vee r$ is also an irredundant $\vee$-decomposition.

The $\bigwedge$-KORP is defined dually. P. Crawley and R. P. Dilworth investigated the $\bigwedge$-KORP in algebraic strongly atomic lattices. We recall the following result.

Theorem A (cf. [1], Theorems 7.5 and 7.6). *Let L be an algebraic strongly atomic lattice.*

(i) *L has the $\bigwedge$-KORP if and only if for all $x, y \in L$, if the interval $[x, x \vee y]$ has exactly one atom, then the interval $[x \wedge y, y]$ has exactly one atom.*

(ii) *If L is semimodular, then L has the $\bigwedge$-KORP if and only if L is locally modular.*

Let us recall the following definition from [4], p. 570. A lattice L is strong if for $a, b \in L$, $u \in J(L)$, $b < u \leqslant a \vee b$ implies $u \leqslant a$. We note that for a class of strongly

dually atomic lattices, the preceding notion of strongness is essentially the same as given in Stern [3]. The next result is a generalization of [3], Lemma 2.

Proposition 1. *A lattice L is strong if and only if L does not contain a pentagon isomorphic to the lattice in Figure* 1 *(where $u \in J(L)$).*



Fig. 1

P r o o f. Assume that L is not strong. Then there are $a, c \in L$, $u \in J(L)$ such that $c < u \leqslant a \vee c$ and $u \nleqslant a$. Let $b = c \vee (a \wedge u)$. Since u is join-irreducible, $b < u$. We have

$$a \wedge b \leqslant a \wedge u \leqslant a \wedge [c \vee (a \wedge u)] = a \wedge b,$$

and hence $a \wedge b = a \wedge u$. Now we observe that $a \wedge b < b$. Namely, $a \wedge b = b$ yields $b \leqslant a$ and thus $u \leqslant a \vee b = a$ contradicting our assumption $u \nleqslant a$. It is easy to see that $a \wedge b < a$ and $a < a \vee b \leqslant a \vee u$. On the other hand, $a \vee u \leqslant a \vee b$. Therefore, $a \vee b = a \vee u$, and thus L contains a pentagon isomorphic to the lattice in Figure 1.

The converse is trivial. □

Remark 1. Proposition 1 implies that any modular is strong.

From Theorem 2 of [4] we obtain

Theorem B. *A semimodular, dually algebraic, strongly dually atomic lattice L has the* $\bigvee$-KORP *if and only if L is strong.*

We denote by $\mathcal{K}$ the class of all lattices L such that both L and its dual L^* are algebraic and strongly atomic.

The first major result is

Theorem 1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{K}$. If L is semimodular or lower semimodular, then L has both* $\bigwedge$-KORP *and the* $\bigvee$-KORP *if and only if L is modular.*

P r o o f. Without loss of generality we can assume that L is semimodular. Let L have both the $\bigwedge$-KORP and the $\bigvee$-KORP. We know that if an algebraic, strongly

atomic lattice is both semimodular and lower semimodular, then it is modular (see [1], Theorem 3.6). Therefore, we only need to show that L is lower semimodular. Then we prove that L satisfies the following condition:

$$\text{(LS)} \qquad x \prec x \vee y \quad \text{implies} \quad x \wedge y \prec y.$$

Assume that $x \prec x \vee y$. By Theorem A(i), the interval $[x \wedge y, y]$ has exactly one atom, say p. We shall now prove that $p = y$. On the contrary, suppose that $p < y$. Since every element of L has at least one irredundant $\vee$-decomposition, we conclude that there is $u \in J(L)$ such that $u \leqslant y$ and $u \nleqslant p$. From Theorem B it follows that L is strong. We have

$$x \leqslant x \vee u' \leqslant x \vee y \quad \text{and} \quad x \prec x \vee y.$$

Observe that $x = x \vee u'$. Indeed, if $x \vee u' = x \vee y$, then $u \leqslant x \vee u'$ and strongness implies $u \leqslant x$, a contradiction. Therefore, $u' \leqslant x$. Hence, $u \wedge x \wedge y = u' \prec u$, and by semimodularity we deduce that $x \wedge y \prec u \vee (x \wedge y) \leqslant y$. Then $p = u \vee (x \wedge y)$, and this contradicts the fact that $u \nleqslant p$. Thus $x \wedge y \prec p = y$, that is, (LS) holds in L, and, in consequence, L is modular.

The converse follows from Theorems A and B. □

Remark 2. The preceding theorem generalizes Theorem 6 of [3], since any lattice satisfying the Descending Chain Condition is strongly atomic.

Theorem 2. *If $L \in \mathcal{K}$, then L has both the uniqueness property for irredundant $\wedge$-decompositions and the uniqueness property for irredundant $\vee$-decompositions if and only if L is distributive.*

The proof is the same as in [3], Theorem 7.

Theorem 3. *If $L \in \mathcal{K}$, then*
(i) *L is strong and locally modular if and only if L is modular.*
(ii) *L is strong and locally distributive if and only if L is distributive.*

Proof. (i). If L is locally modular, then L is also semimodular (see [1], p. 25). From Theorems A(ii) and B we conclude that L has both the $\bigwedge$-KORP and the $\bigvee$-KORP. Therefore, by Theorem 1, L is modular. The converse is obvious.

(ii). Let L be strong and locally distributive. By local distributivity, every modular sublattice of L is distributive (cf. [1], first paragraph on page 53). But L is modular, which follows from (i). Consequently, L is distributive.

The converse is clear. □

Remark 3. Theorem 3 is a generalization of Theorems 1 and 2 of [2].

Finally we recall that a complete lattice L has the Kurosh-Ore property for $\vee$-decompositions ($\bigvee$-KOP, for short), if every element of L has an irredundant finite $\vee$-decomposition and for each $a \in L$, the number of join-irreducible elements in any irredundant finite $\vee$-decomposition of a is unique. In a dual way one defines the $\bigwedge$-KOP. It is obvious that the KORP implies the corresponding KOP, whereas the converse does not hold in general. In semimodular algebraic lattices satisfying the Descending Chain Condition, the $\bigwedge$-KORP is equivalent to the $\bigwedge$-KOP (see [1], Theorems 7.6 and 7.7). Hence in Theorem 6 of [3] we may replace the $\bigwedge$-KORP by the $\bigwedge$-KOP, but here it is not possible to replace the $\bigvee$-KORP by the $\bigvee$-KOP, that is, the question of [3] has a negative answer. Indeed, let L be a lattice diagrammed in Figure 2. L is locally modular, and therefore it has the $\bigwedge$-KORP (and, evidently, the $\bigwedge$-KOP). This lattice also has the $\bigvee$-KOP, whereas the $\bigvee$-KORP does not hold.



Fig. 2

References

[1] *P. Crawley, R. P. Dilworth*: Algebraic Theory of Lattices. Prentice Hall (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973).

[2] *M. Stern*: On the Kurosh-Ore replacement property in semimodular lattices. Algebra Universalis *30* (1993), 352–353.

[3] *M. Stern*: A converse to the Kurosh-Ore theorem. Acta Math. Hungar. *70 (3)* (1996), 177–184.

[4] *A. Walendziak*: Strongness in lattices. Demonstratio Mathematica *27* (1994), 569–572.

Author's address: Department of Mathematics, Podlasie University, PL-08110 Siedlce, Poland.