

Ján Jakubík

Distinguished completion of a direct product of lattice ordered groups

*Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, Vol. 51 (2001), No. 3, 661–671

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/127676>

## Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2001

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>

DISTINGUISHED COMPLETION OF A DIRECT PRODUCT  
OF LATTICE ORDERED GROUPS

JÁN JAKUBÍK, Košice

(Received December 18, 1998)

*Abstract.* The distinguished completion  $E(G)$  of a lattice ordered group  $G$  was investigated by Ball [1], [2], [3]. An analogous notion for  $MV$ -algebras was dealt with by the author [7].

In the present paper we prove that if a lattice ordered group  $G$  is a direct product of lattice ordered groups  $G_i$  ( $i \in I$ ), then  $E(G)$  is a direct product of the lattice ordered groups  $E(G_i)$ .

From this we obtain a generalization of a result of Ball [3].

*Keywords:* lattice ordered group, distinguished completion, direct product

*MSC 2000:* 06F15

1. PRELIMINARIES

For lattice ordered groups we apply the notation as in Conrad [4]. We recall the following basic definitions (cf. [3]).

**1.1. Definition.** Let  $G$  and  $H$  be lattice ordered groups such that  $H$  is an extension of  $G$ . Suppose that

- (i)  $G$  is a dense  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $H$ ;
- (ii) if  $h_1, h_2 \in H$  and  $h_1 < h_2$ , then there are  $g_1, g_2 \in G$  such that  $g_1 < g_2$  and the interval  $[g_1, g_2]$  of  $H$  is projective to a subinterval of  $[h_1, h_2]$  in  $H$ .

Under these conditions  $H$  is said to be a distinguished extension of  $G$ .

---

Supported by Grant Vega 2/6087/01.

**1.2. Definition.** A lattice ordered group  $G$  is called distinguished if it has no proper distinguished extension.

**1.3. Definition.** Let  $G$  and  $H$  be lattice ordered groups such that

- (i)  $H$  is a distinguished extension of  $G$ ;
- (ii) the lattice ordered group  $H$  is distinguished.

Then  $H$  is said to be a distinguished completion of  $G$ .

In [3] it was proved that each lattice ordered group  $G$  possesses a distinguished completion which is determined uniquely up to isomorphisms leaving all elements of  $G$  fixed.

## 2. THE LATTICE ORDERED GROUP $E(G)$

We recall some notation and results from [3] which we shall apply below.

First, let  $G$  be a distributive lattice and let  $\text{Int } G$  be the set of all intervals in  $G$ . For  $[a, b]$  and  $[c, d]$  in  $\text{Int } G$  we write

$$[a, b] \sim [c, d]$$

if the intervals  $[a, b]$  and  $[c, d]$  are projective. Further, we put

$$[a, b] \leq [c, d]$$

if  $[a, b]$  is projective to a subinterval of  $[c, d]$ . We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a, b \rangle &= \{[a_1, b_1] \in \text{Int } G : [a_1, b_1] \sim [a, b]\}, \\ S(G) &= \{\langle a, b \rangle : [a, b] \in \text{Int } G\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also set  $\langle a, b \rangle \leq \langle c, d \rangle$  if  $[a, b] \leq [c, d]$ . Then  $\leq$  is a correctly defined relation of partial order on  $S(G)$  and with respect to this relation,  $S(G)$  turns out to be a meet-semilattice with the least element  $\langle g, g \rangle$ , where  $g$  is an arbitrary element of  $G$ . We denote  $\langle g, g \rangle = \bar{0}$ . We put

$$\langle a, b \rangle^\perp = \{\langle c, d \rangle \in S(G) : \langle a, b \rangle \wedge \langle c, d \rangle = \bar{0}\}.$$

For  $X \subseteq S(G)$  we denote

$$X^\perp = \bigcap \{\langle c, d \rangle^\perp : \langle c, d \rangle \in X\}.$$

Let  $B(G)$  be the system

$$\{\emptyset \neq X \subseteq S(G) : X = X^{\perp\perp}\};$$

this system is partially ordered by the set-theoretical inclusion. Then  $B(G)$  is a Boolean algebra such that

$$\bigwedge_{i \in I} X_i = \bigcap_{i \in I} X_i,$$

$$\bigvee_{i \in I} X_i = \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \right)^{\perp\perp}.$$

Further, for  $X \in B(G)$ ,  $X^\perp$  is the complement of  $X$  in  $B(G)$ .

For each  $g \in G$  we put

$$\varphi(g) = \{\langle a, b \rangle \in S(G) : g \vee a = g \vee b\}.$$

Then  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism of the lattice  $G$  into  $B(G)$ . If  $g$  and  $\varphi(g)$  are identified, then  $G$  can be viewed as a sublattice of  $B(G)$ .

Now suppose that  $G$  is a lattice ordered group; we use the notation as above. Let  $g \in G$ ,  $\langle a, b \rangle \in S(G)$  and  $X \subseteq S(G)$ . We put

$$\langle a, b \rangle + g = \langle a + g, b + g \rangle,$$

$$X + g = \{\langle a, b \rangle + g : \langle a, b \rangle \in X\};$$

the meanings of  $g + \langle a, b \rangle$  and  $g + X$  are analogous. Further, we set

$$X' = \{u + \langle a, b \rangle + v : \langle a, b \rangle \in X \text{ and } u, v \in G^-\}^{\perp\perp}.$$

**2.1. Definition.** We denote by  $E(G)$  the system of all  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq S(G)$  such that

- (i)  $X' = X$ ;
- (ii) for each  $g \in G$  with  $g > 0$ ,  $g + X \neq X \neq X + g$ .

This system is partially ordered by the set-theoretical inclusion.

**2.2. Definition.** For  $\langle a, b \rangle$  and  $\langle c, d \rangle$  in  $S(G)$  we put

$$\langle a, b \rangle + \langle c, d \rangle = \langle (a + d) \vee (b + c), b + d \rangle.$$

Further, for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  in  $E(G)$  we set

$$X_1 + X_2 = \{\langle s_1, t_1 \rangle + \langle s_2, t_2 \rangle : \langle s_i, t_i \rangle \in X_i \quad (i = 1, 2)\}.$$

**2.3. Theorem** (cf. [3]).  *$E(G)$  is a lattice ordered group. Moreover, it is a distinguished completion of  $G$ .*

### 3. DIRECT PRODUCT DECOMPOSITIONS (FINITE CASE)

Let  $I$  be a nonempty set and for each  $i \in I$  let  $G_i$  be a lattice ordered group. The direct product

$$\prod_{i \in I} G_i$$

is defined in the usual way. If  $G = \prod_{i \in I} G_i$  and  $g \in G$ , then the component of  $G$  in  $G_i$  will be denoted by  $g_i$ .

Let  $i(0) \in I$  and  $x \in G_{i(0)}$ . Then the element  $x$  is identified with the element  $g \in G$  such that

$$g_i = \begin{cases} x & \text{for } i = i(0), \\ 0 & \text{for } i \neq i(0). \end{cases}$$

This means that all direct product decompositions we are dealing with are internal (in the sense of [5]). Hence under this convention, each  $G_i$  is an  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $G$ .

In the present section we deal with the case when the set  $I$  is finite, i.e.,

$$G = G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_n.$$

We start with the assumption that

$$(1) \quad G = A \times B.$$

For  $g \in G$  we denote by  $g_A$  or  $g_B$  the component of  $g$  in  $A$  or in  $B$ , respectively.

The following lemma is a consequence of the fact that the lattice  $G$  is distributive; we omit the proof.

**3.1. Lemma.** *Let  $[a, b]$  and  $[c, d]$  be intervals in  $G$ . Put*

$$u_1 = a \wedge c, \quad v_1 = b \wedge d, \quad u_2 = a \vee c, \quad v_2 = b \vee d.$$

*Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $[a, b]$  and  $[c, d]$  are projective.
- (ii) The relations

$$\begin{aligned} a \wedge v_1 = u_1 = c \wedge v_1, & \quad a \vee v_1 = b, \quad c \vee v_1 = d, \\ b \wedge u_2 = a, & \quad d \wedge u_2 = c, \quad b \vee u_2 = v_2 = d \vee u_2 \end{aligned}$$

*are valid.*

Since the lattice operations in a direct product are performed componentwise, from 3.1 we conclude

**3.2. Lemma.** *Let  $[a, b]$  and  $[c, d]$  be intervals in  $G$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $[a, b] \sim [c, d]$ .
- (ii)  $[a_A, b_A] \sim [c_A, d_A]$  and  $[a_B, b_B] \sim [c_B, d_B]$ .

Let  $S(G)$  be as above; also, let the relation  $\leq$  in  $S(G)$  be as in Section 2. The symbols  $S(A)$  and  $S(B)$  are defined analogously.

For each  $\langle a, b \rangle \in S(G)$  we put

$$\varphi_1(\langle a, b \rangle) = (\langle a_A, b_A \rangle, \langle a_B, b_B \rangle).$$

**3.3. Lemma.**  $\varphi_1$  is an isomorphism of the partially ordered set  $S(G)$  onto  $S(A) \times S(B)$ .

*Proof.* This is a consequence of the relation (1) and of 3.2. □

For each nonempty subset  $X$  of  $S(G)$  we put

$$\varphi_2(X) = (X^A, X^B),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X^A &= \{\langle a_A, b_A \rangle : \langle a, b \rangle \in X\}, \\ X^B &= \{\langle a_B, b_B \rangle : \langle a, b \rangle \in X\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for each  $g \in G$  we have

$$(2) \quad \varphi_2(g + X) = (g_A + X^A, g_B + X^B),$$

and similarly for  $\varphi_2(X + g)$ .

Further, from 3.3 we obtain by a simple calculation that the implication

$$(3) \quad \varphi_2(X_1) = \varphi_2(X_2) \Rightarrow X_1 = X_2$$

is valid.

**3.4. Lemma.** *Let  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq S(G)$ . Then*

$$\varphi_2(X^\perp) = ((X^A)^\perp, (X^B)^\perp).$$

*Proof.* This follows from 3.2 and 3.3. □

Since the group operation in  $G$  is performed componentwise, from 3.4 we obtain

**3.5. Lemma.** *Let  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq S(G)$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $X' = X$ .
- (ii)  $(X^A)' = X^A$  and  $(X^B)' = X^B$ .

In fact, the first equation in (ii) is taken with respect to the lattice ordered group  $A$ , and similarly, the second with respect to  $B$ .

**3.6. Lemma.** *Let  $X$  be as in 3.5. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) For each  $g \in G$  with  $0 < g$  we have  $g + X \neq X \neq X + g$ .
- (ii) If  $0 < a \in A$  and  $0 < b \in B$ , then

$$a + X^A \neq X^A \neq X^A + a, \quad b + X^B \neq X^B \neq X^B + b.$$

*Proof.* Suppose that (i) holds. Let  $a \in A$ ,  $a > 0$ . In view of the above convention we have  $a \in G$  and  $a_A = a$ ,  $a_B = 0$ . Thus in view of (2)

$$\varphi_2(a + X) = (a + X^A, X^B).$$

According to (i),  $a + X \neq X$ . If  $a + X^A = X^A$ , then we would have

$$\varphi_2(a + X) = \varphi_2(X),$$

whence in view of (3),  $a + X = X$ , which is a contradiction. Thus  $a + X \neq X$ . Similarly we obtain the other relations from (ii).

Conversely, suppose that (ii) is valid. Let  $0 < g \in G$ . Then  $g_A \geq 0$ ,  $g_B \geq 0$  and either  $g_A > 0$  or  $g_B > 0$ . E.g., let  $g_A > 0$ . Hence  $g_A + X^A \neq X^A$ . Thus (2) holds.

If  $g + X = X$ , then  $\varphi_2(g + X) = (X^A, X^B)$ , whence  $g_A + X^A = X^A$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore  $g + X \neq X$ . Analogously we obtain  $X + g \neq X$ .  $\square$

From 3.5 and 3.6 we conclude

**3.7. Lemma.** *Let  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq S(G)$ .*

- (i) If  $X \in E(G)$ , then  $X^A \in E(A)$  and  $X^B \in E(B)$ .
- (ii) If  $X^A \in E(A)$  and  $X^B \in E(B)$ , then  $X \in E(G)$ .

From 3.3 we infer that for each  $P \subseteq S(A)$  and each  $Q \subseteq S(B)$  there exists a uniquely determined  $X \subseteq S(G)$  such that

$$\varphi_2(X) = (P, Q).$$

Thus if we restrict ourselves, by the application of  $\varphi_2$ , to elements of  $E(G)$  only, then from 3.7 we obtain

**3.8. Lemma.**  $\varphi_2$  is a one-to-one mapping of the set  $E(G)$  onto  $E(A) \times E(B)$ .

In view of 2.2 we have an operation  $+$  on  $S(G)$ , and similarly on  $S(A)$  and on  $S(B)$ . From this definition and from 3.3 we obtain that  $\varphi_2$  is an isomorphism with respect to the operation  $+$  (where  $\varphi_2$  is taken as in 3.8).

Finally, 3.3 and 3.8 yield also that  $\varphi_2$  is an isomorphism of the partially ordered set  $E(G)$  onto  $E(A) \times E(B)$ .

Summarizing, we have

**3.9. Lemma.** Let (1) be valid. Then the lattice ordered group  $E(G)$  is isomorphic to the direct product  $E(A) \times E(B)$ .

By the obvious induction we obtain

**3.10. Proposition.** Let  $G$  be a lattice ordered group which is isomorphic to the direct product  $G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_n$ . Then  $E(G)$  is isomorphic to the direct product  $E(G_1) \times E(G_2) \times \dots \times E(G_n)$ .

Hence, up to isomorphisms, we can write

$$E(G) = E(G_1) \times E(G_2) \times \dots \times E(G_n).$$

#### 4. DIRECT PRODUCT DECOMPOSITIONS (INFINITE CASE)

Now let us suppose that we have a direct product decomposition

$$(1) \quad G = \prod_{i \in I} G_i,$$

where the set  $I$  can be infinite. Then for each fixed  $i(0) \in I$  there exists a direct product decomposition

$$G = G_{i(0)} \times G'_{i(0)},$$

where

$$G'_{i(0)} = \prod G_i \quad (i \in I \setminus \{i(0)\}).$$

Thus in view of 3.10 we can write

$$(2) \quad E(G) = E(G_{i(0)}) \times E(G'_{i(0)}).$$



In fact, the relation (2) is meant in the sense that  $E(G)$  has a direct product decomposition of the form  $E(G) = H_1 \times H_2$ , where  $H_1$  is isomorphic to  $E(G_{i(0)})$  and  $H_2$  is isomorphic to  $E(G'_{i(0)})$ . We prefer the simpler formulation from (2), and analogously at similar places below. Cf. also the convention introduced in Section 3.

Moreover, if  $i(1)$  and  $i(2)$  are distinct elements of  $I$ , then there exists a direct product decomposition

$$G = G_{i(1)} \times G_{i(2)} \times C,$$

where

$$C = \prod G_i \quad (i \in I \setminus \{i(1), i(2)\}).$$

Hence

$$E(G) = E(G_{i(1)}) \times E(G_{i(2)}) \times E(C).$$

This yields that the relation

$$(3) \quad E(G_{i(1)}) \cap E(G_{i(2)}) = \{0\}$$

is valid whenever  $i(1)$  and  $i(2)$  are distinct elements of  $I$ .

We apply the following result which is a consequence of the facts expressed in the diagram on p. 143 of [2].

**4.1. Proposition** (cf. [2]). *For each lattice ordered group  $G$ ,  $E(G)$  is laterally complete.*

**4.2. Lemma.**  $\bigcap_{i \in I} E(G'_i) = \{0\}.$

*Proof.* By way of contradiction suppose that

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} E(G'_i) = G^0 \neq \{0\}.$$

Then there exists  $0 < g^0 \in G^0$ . Each  $E(G'_i)$  is a convex  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $E(G)$ , whence  $G^0$  is a convex  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $E(G)$  as well. Further,  $G$  is a dense  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $E(G)$ , thus there is  $0 < g \in G$  with  $g \leq g^0$ . We obtain  $g \in G^0$ , hence  $g \in G'_i$  for each  $i \in I$ . This yields that  $g_i = 0$  for each  $i \in I$ . But then, in view of (1), we get  $g = 0$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**4.3. Lemma.** *Let  $H$  be a laterally complete lattice ordered group. Let  $I$  be a nonempty set and for each  $i \in I$  let*

$$H = H_i \times H'_i$$

where

a)  $H_{i(1)} \cap H_{i(2)} = \{0\}$  whenever  $i(1)$  and  $i(2)$  are distinct elements of  $I$ ;

b)  $\bigcap_{i \in I} H'_i = \{0\}$ .

Then  $H = \prod_{i \in I} H_i$ .

*P r o o f.* Put  $\prod_{i \in I} H_i = H^*$ . Consider the mapping  $\psi: H \rightarrow H^*$  such that  $\psi(h) = (\dots, h_i, \dots)_{i \in I}$ , where  $h_i$  is the component of  $h$  in  $H_i$ . Then  $\psi$  is a homomorphism of  $H$  into  $H^*$ . Let  $h \in H$  be such that  $\psi(h) = 0$ . Then  $h_i = 0$  for each  $i \in I$ , whence

$$h \in \bigcap_{i \in I} H'_i,$$

and thus, according to b),  $h = 0$ . Therefore  $\psi$  is an isomorphism of  $H$  into  $H^*$ .

Let  $0 \leq h^* \in H^*$  and let  $h_i^*$  denote the component of  $h^*$  in  $H_i$ . If  $i(1)$  and  $i(2)$  are distinct elements of  $I$ , then in view of a) we have

$$h_{i(1)}^* \wedge h_{i(2)}^* = 0.$$

Thus  $(h_i^*)_{i \in I}$  is an orthogonal indexed system of elements of  $H$ . Since  $H$  is laterally complete, there exists  $h \in H$  with

$$h = \bigvee_{i \in I} h_i^*.$$

For each  $i \in I$  there is also  $h' \in H$  with

$$h' = \bigvee h_j^* \quad (j \in I \setminus \{i\}).$$

Thus we have

$$h = h_i^* \vee h'.$$

If  $0 \leq x \in H_i$  and  $j \in I \setminus \{i\}$ , then  $x \wedge h_j^* = 0$  and hence (in view of the infinite distributivity of  $H$ )  $x \wedge h' = 0$ ; therefore  $h'_i = 0$ . Clearly  $(h_i^*)_i = h_i^*$ , thus

$$h_i = (h_i^*)_i \vee h'_i = h_i^*.$$

Hence  $h = h^*$  and therefore  $(H^*)^+ \subseteq \psi(H)$ . This obviously implies that  $H^* \subseteq \psi(H)$ . Then  $\psi(H) = H^*$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**4.4. Proposition.** *Let (1) be valid. Then*

$$E(G) = \prod_{i \in I} E(G_i).$$

*Proof.* This is a consequence of 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. (Again, the above equality is meant in the sense of an isomorphism.)  $\square$

For a lattice ordered group  $G$  let  $G^\wedge$  be the Dedekind completion of  $G$ . If  $G$  is linearly ordered, then  $G^\wedge$  is linearly ordered as well.

**4.5. Proposition** (cf. Ball [3], 4.4). *Let  $G$  be a linearly ordered group. Then  $E(G) = G^\wedge$ .*

The following result extends Proposition 4.5.

**4.6. Proposition.** *Let (1) be valid. Suppose that each  $G_i$  is a linearly ordered group. Then*

$$E(G) = \prod_{i \in I} G_i^\wedge.$$

*Proof.* In view of 4.5, for each  $i \in I$  we have  $E(G_i) = G_i^\wedge$ . Now it suffices to apply 4.4.  $\square$

The following result was proved in [5] under the assumption that  $G$  is abelian, but the proof remains valid also without this assumption.

**4.7. Proposition** (cf. [5], Theorem 2.7). *Let (1) be valid. Then*

$$G^\wedge = \prod_{i \in I} G_i^\wedge.$$

**4.8. Proposition.** *Let (1) be valid. Suppose that all  $G_i$  are linearly ordered. Then  $E(G) = G^\wedge$ .*

*Proof.* This is a consequence of 4.6 and 4.7.  $\square$

**4.9. Proposition.** *Let  $H$  be a distinguished lattice ordered group. Suppose that*

$$(4) \quad H = \prod_{i \in I} H_i.$$

*Then all  $H_i$  are distinguished.*

P r o o f. In view of 4.4 we have

$$(5) \quad H = \prod_{i \in I} E(H_i),$$

since  $E(H) = H$ . If  $i(1)$  and  $i(2)$  are distinct elements of  $I$ , then from (5) we infer

$$E(H_{i(1)}) \cap E(H_{i(2)}) = \{0\}.$$

Because  $E(H_{i(1)})$  is a direct factor of  $H$ , the relation (4) yields

$$(6) \quad E(H_{i(1)}) = \prod_{i \in I} (H_i \cap E(H_{i(1)}).$$

If  $i \neq i(1)$ , then  $H_i \cap E(H_{i(1)}) = \{0\}$ , whence in view of (6)

$$E(H_{i(1)}) = H_{i(1)} \cap E(H_{i(1)}) = H_{i(1)}.$$

Therefore  $H_{i(1)}$  is distinguished. □

#### References

- [1] *R. N. Ball*: The distinguished completion of a lattice ordered group. In: Algebra Carbondale 1980, Lecture Notes Math. 848. Springer Verlag, 1980, pp. 208–217.
- [2] *R. N. Ball*: Completions of  $\ell$ -groups. In: Lattice Ordered Groups (A. M. W. Glass and W. C. Holland, eds.). Kluwer, Dordrecht-Boston-London, 1989, pp. 142–177.
- [3] *R. N. Ball*: Distinguished extensions of a lattice ordered group. *Algebra Univ.* 35 (1996), 85–112.
- [4] *P. Conrad*: Lattice Ordered Groups. Tulane University, 1970.
- [5] *J. Jakubík*: Generalized Dedekind completion of a lattice ordered group. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 28 (1978), 294–311.
- [6] *J. Jakubík*: Maximal Dedekind completion of an abelian lattice ordered group. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 28 (1978), 611–631.
- [7] *J. Jakubík*: Distinguished extensions of an *MV*-algebra. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* 49 (1999), 867–876.

*Author's address*: Matematický ústav SAV, Grešáková 6, 040 01 Košice, Slovakia, e-mail: musavke@mail.saske.sk.