Thai Journal of **Math**ematics Volume 20 Number 2 (2022) Pages 1003–1010

http://thaijmath.in.cmu.ac.th



A Characterization of Maximal Subsemigroups of the Injective Transformation Semigroups with equal Gap and Defect

Boorapa Singha

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Chiang Mai Rajabhat University, Chiangmai, 50300, Thailand e-mail : boorapa_sin@cmru.ac.th

Abstract Suppose that X is an infinite set and I(X) is the symmetric inverse semigroup defined on X. It is known that the semigroup A(X) consisting of all $\alpha \in I(X)$ such that $|X \setminus \text{dom } \alpha| = |X \setminus \text{ran } \alpha|$ is a factorisable inverse subsemigroup of I(X). In 2009, all maximal subsemigroups of A(X) has been described when X is uncountable. So, it is an obvious question to ask what happens when X is countably infinite. In this paper, we answer this question by classifying all prime ideals of A(X) and apply these results to characterize all maximal subsemigroups of A(X) for an arbitrary infinite set X. Our results generalize and simplify the results obtained in 2009.

MSC: 20M20; 20M18

Keywords: transformation semigroup; maximal subsemigroup; inverse semigroup; factorisable semigroup; prime ideal

Submission date: 31.10.2019 / Acceptance date: 18.01.2022

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose X is a non-empty set, and let I(X) denote the symmetric inverse semigroup on X under composition (see [1, p.29]): that is, the set of all injective mappings α whose domain, dom α , and range, $X\alpha$ (or ran α) are subsets of X. We denote the composition of maps by jutaposition, and we compose maps from left to right. As usual, |X| denotes the cardinality of X and we write $X \setminus Y = \{x \in X : x \notin Y\}$, where Y is a set. We also write

$$g(\alpha) = |X \setminus \operatorname{dom} \alpha|, \ d(\alpha) = |X \setminus X\alpha| \ \text{and} \ r(\alpha) = |X\alpha|,$$

and refer to these cardinals as the gap, the defect and the rank of α , respectively. And, as usual, G(X) denotes the group of permutations of X: that is, the set of all bijective mappings from X to itself. We write

$$A(X) = \{ \alpha \in I(X) : g(\alpha) = d(\alpha) \}$$

Published by The Mathematical Association of Thailand. Copyright \bigodot 2022 by TJM. All rights reserved.

and call this the *injective transformation semigroup with equal gap and defect* defined on X. We observe that, if $\alpha \in G(X)$, then $\alpha \in I(X)$ with $g(\alpha) = d(\alpha) = 0$. Hence, $G(X) \subseteq A(X) \subseteq I(X)$ and we also note that A(X) = I(X) when X is finite. In addition, the set of all idempotents in I(X) and A(X) coincide, this set consists of all identity transformations on a subset A of X, written as id_A . In particular, id_X is the identity of I(X) and A(X), and \emptyset denotes the empty (one-to-one) mapping, which acts as a zero for I(X) and A(X).

The study of the semigroup A(X) goes back to a 1974 paper of Chen and Hsieh [2]. They showed that A(X) is a *factorisable* inverse semigroup (that is, A(X) = GE, where G is a subgroup and E is the set of idempotents of A(X)) and any inverse semigroup can be embedded in some A(X). In [3, p.238], Jampachon, Saichalee and Sullivan remarked that, if $\alpha \in A(X)$ and $\alpha\beta = \operatorname{id}_X$ for some $\beta \in A(X)$ then $g(\alpha) = 0$, therefore $\alpha \in G(X)$. That is, G(X) is the group of units in A(X). They also showed that A(X) is not a *locally factorisable semigroup* (a semigroup S is locally factorisable if eSe is factorisable for every idempotent e of S).

The semigroup A(X) can be regarded as a model for all factorisable inverse semigroups since any factorisable inverse semigroup S can be embedded in A(S), this was proved by Sanwong and Sullivan in [4]. In the same paper, the authors also characterized Green's relations and ideals on A(X), and they used this to describe all maximal subsemigroups of A(X) when X is uncountable. In one case, they showed that some maximal subsemigroups of A(X) are induced by maximal subsemigroups of G(X).

The purpose of this paper is to provide a description of all maximal subsemigroups of A(X) when X is an arbitrary infinite set. In section 2, we describe all prime ideals of A(X). In section 3, the results of section 2 are applied to determine all maximal subsemigroups of A(X) for any infinite set X, this result is a generalization of [4, Theorem 13].

In this paper, all notations and terminologies will be from [1] and [5] unless specified otherwise.

2. PRIME IDEALS

In this section, we give a characterization of prime ideals of A(X). We first recall that, an ideal P of a semigroup S is termed *prime* if $ab \in P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$, equivalently, $S \setminus P$ is a semigroup. Let S be a semigroup and $\emptyset \neq T \subseteq S$. Then $\langle T \rangle$ denotes the subsemigroup of S generated by T, and, recall that a proper non-empty subsemigroup M of S is *maximal* in S if, whenever $M \subseteq N \subseteq S$ for some subsemigroup N of S, we have M = N or N = S. Throughout this paper, to demonstrate the maximality of M, we show $\langle M, \alpha \rangle = S$ for all $a \in S \setminus M$, or equivalently, select $a, b \in S \setminus M$ and show that acan be expressed as a finite product of b and elements in M.

The following result has been proved in [6, Lemma 3.1] which may be rewritten as follows.

Lemma 2.1 ([6], Lemma 3.1). Let S be a semigroup and suppose that P is a prime ideal of S. Then the following statements hold:

(a) for any maximal subsemigroup M of $S \setminus P$, $M \cup P$ is a maximal subsemigroup of S;

(b) for any maximal subsemigroup N of S such that $(S \setminus P) \setminus N \neq \emptyset$ and $(S \setminus P) \cap N \neq \emptyset$, $(S \setminus P) \cap N$ is a maximal subsemigroup of $S \setminus P$.

From Lemma 2.1, in order to determine some maximal subsemigroups of A(X), we first classify all of its prime ideals. To do this, we recall from [4, Theorem 5] that, for $|X| = n \ge \aleph_0$ and for each cardinal p, let p' denote the successor of p (note that, when p is finite, p' = p + 1). Then the ideals of A(X) are precisely the sets

$$A(r,d) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : r(\alpha) < r \text{ and } d(\alpha) \ge d \}$$

where $1 \le r \le n'$ and $0 \le d \le n$. The authors also showed in [4, p.331] that, these ideals form a chain and each of these containment is proper as follows:

$$\{\emptyset\} = A(1,n) \subset A(2,n) \subset \ldots \subset A(n,n) \subset A(n',n) \subset \ldots \subset A(n',n) \subset \ldots \subset A(n',\aleph_0) \subset \ldots \subset A(n',1) \subset A(n',0) = A(X)$$

In what follows, for any subset Y of X, we write $Y = A \cup B$ for Y is a disjoint union of A and B. We also need the fact: if $\alpha \in I(X)$ and $Y, Z \subseteq X$, then $\alpha^{-1} \in I(X)$ and $(Y \setminus Z)\alpha = Y\alpha \setminus Z\alpha$ (as usual, we interpret $Y\alpha$ as $(Y \cap \operatorname{dom} \alpha)\alpha$), this fact will be used without further mention. We may now describe all the prime ideals of A(X).

Theorem 2.2. Suppose that $|X| = n \ge \aleph_0$. The proper prime ideals of A(X) are precisely the sets A(n',k) where k = 1 or $\aleph_0 \le k \le n$.

Proof. If k = 1, then $A(n', 1) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) \ge 1 \}$. Thus,

$$A(X) \setminus A(n', 1) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) = 0 \} = G(X),$$

which is a subsemigroup (also a subgroup) of A(X). Hence A(n', 1) is a prime ideal of A(X). Next, suppose that $\aleph_0 \leq k \leq n$ and let $\alpha, \beta \in A(X) \setminus A(n', k)$. We note that

$$A(X) \setminus A(n',k) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) < k \}.$$

Then $g(\alpha) < k$ and $g(\beta) < k$. Thus,

 $|X\alpha \setminus \operatorname{dom} \beta| \le |X \setminus \operatorname{dom} \beta| = g(\beta) < k.$

Consequently,

$$|\operatorname{dom} \alpha \setminus \operatorname{dom}(\alpha\beta)| = |[X\alpha \setminus (X\alpha \cap \operatorname{dom} \beta)]\alpha^{-1}| \\ = |(X\alpha \setminus \operatorname{dom} \beta)\alpha^{-1}| \\ = |X\alpha \setminus \operatorname{dom} \beta| < k.$$

Hence,

$$d(\alpha\beta) = g(\alpha\beta) = |X \setminus \operatorname{dom}(\alpha\beta)| = |X \setminus \operatorname{dom}\alpha| + |\operatorname{dom}\alpha \setminus \operatorname{dom}(\alpha\beta)| < k,$$

that is, $A(X) \setminus A(n', k)$ is a subsemigroup of A(X). Therefore, A(n', k) is a prime ideal. Conversely, suppose that A(r, d) is a proper prime ideal of A(X). If r < n', then a subsemigroup $A(X) \setminus A(r, d)$ contains all transformatons of A(X) with rank n. We write $X = C \cup D$ where |C| = |D| = n. Then id_C , $\mathrm{id}_D \in A(X) \setminus A(r, d)$, and thus $\emptyset = \mathrm{id}_C \cdot \mathrm{id}_D \in A(X) \setminus A(r, d)$, which is a contradiction since every ideal of A(X) always contains \emptyset . Hence r = n'. Now, if d = 0, then A(r, d) = A(n', 0) = A(X), a contradiction, so, we deduce that $d \neq 0$. Suppose that d is finite and $d \geq 2$. We write $X = E \cup F$ where |E| = n, |F| = d and choose distinct $x, y \in F$. Then $d(\mathrm{id}_{E \cup \{x\}}) = d(\mathrm{id}_{E \cup \{y\}}) = d - 1$, that is, $\mathrm{id}_{E \cup \{x\}}, \mathrm{id}_{E \cup \{y\}} \in A(X) \setminus A(n', d)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{id}_E = \mathrm{id}_{E \cup \{x\}} \cdot \mathrm{id}_{E \cup \{y\}} \in A(X) \setminus A(n', d)$, a contradiction since $d(\mathrm{id}_E) = d$. Hence, d = 1 or d is infinite. In view of Theorem 2.2, when $n = \aleph_0$, there are only two proper prime ideals of A(X), which are A(n', 1) and $A(n', \aleph_0)$. On the other hand, when $n > \aleph_0$, if there exist cardinals r, s such that $\aleph_0 < r < s < n$, then we have a chain of all proper prime ideals of A(X) as follows:

 $A(n',n) \subset \ldots \subset A(n',s) \subset A(n',r) \subset \ldots \subset A(n',\aleph_0) \subset A(n',1),$

these ideals play an important role in characterizing all maximal subsemigroups of A(X), which will be shown in the next section.

To close this section, we prove following simple result, which establishes a relation between an ideal and a maximal subsemigroup of an arbitrary semigroup. This will be useful when we determine the maximal subsemigroups of A(X).

Lemma 2.3. Let S be a semigroup and suppose that I is a proper ideal of S. If M is a maximal subsemigroup of S, then either $I \subseteq M$ or $S \setminus I \subseteq M$.

Proof. Suppose that $I \not\subseteq M$. Then there exists $\alpha \in I \setminus M$. It follows that $\langle M, \alpha \rangle = S$ by the maximality of M. Thus, for each $\beta \in S \setminus I$, we can write $\beta = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_k$ where $\gamma_i \in M \cup \{\alpha\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Since $\beta \notin I$, we have $\gamma_i \neq \alpha$ for all i. Therefore $\beta = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_k \in M$, that is $S \setminus I \subseteq M$.

3. Maximal Subsemigroups

In what follows, if $\alpha \in I(X)$ is non-zero, then we write

$$\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a_i \\ x_i \end{pmatrix}$$

and take as understood that the subscript *i* belongs to some (unmentioned) index set *I*, that the abbreviation $\{x_i\}$ denotes $\{x_i : i \in I\}$, and that ran $\alpha = \{x_i\}$, $x_i \alpha^{-1} = \{a_i\}$ and dom $\alpha = \{a_i : i \in I\}$.

Refer to a remark in [7, p.157] that, there are infinitely many maximal subsemigroups of G(X) which is not a group. In [4], the authors showed that, when X is uncountable, these maximal subsemigroups of G(X) give rise to a class of maximal subsemigroups of A(X). It is not surprising that, this result also holds for an arbitrary infinite set X, which is shown as follows.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose that $|X| = n \ge \aleph_0$. Then each one of the following types M_1 , M_2 and M_3 is a maximal subsemigroup of A(X).

- (a) $M_1 = A(n', 1) \cup T$, where T is a maximal subsemigroup of G(X);
- (b) $M_2 = (A(X) \setminus A(n', d)) \cup A(n', d')$, where d = 1 or $\aleph_0 \le d < n$;
- (c) $M_3 = (A(X) \setminus A(n', n)) \cup A(n, n).$

Proof. (a) Since A(n', 1) is a prime ideal of A(X) and its complement equals G(X), it is a direct consequent from Lemma 2.1(a) that $A(n', 1) \cup T$ is a maximal subsemigroup of A(X) for each maximal subsemigroup T of G(X).

(b) Suppose that d = 1 or $\aleph_0 \leq d < n$. Then, by Theorem 2.2, A(n', d) is a prime ideal. So, $A(X) \setminus A(n', d)$ is a subsemigroup of A(X). Since A(n', d') is an ideal of A(X),

it is easily seen that $M_2 = (A(X) \setminus A(n', d)) \cup A(n', d')$ is a subsemigroup of A(X). To show the maximality of M_2 , we let $\delta, \epsilon \in A(X) \setminus M_2$. Here, note that

$$M_2 = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) \neq d \},\$$

so $d(\delta) = g(\delta) = d(\epsilon) = g(\epsilon) = d$. Since d < n, we have $r(\delta) = r(\epsilon) = n$. We now write

$$\delta = \begin{pmatrix} a_i \\ x_i \end{pmatrix}, \epsilon = \begin{pmatrix} b_i \\ y_i \end{pmatrix} \text{ where } i \in I, |I| = n$$

and suppose $X \setminus \text{dom } \delta = \{p_j\}, X \setminus X \delta = \{q_j\}, X \setminus \text{dom } \epsilon = \{u_j\} \text{ and } X \setminus X \epsilon = \{v_j\} \text{ where } |J| = d$. Then define $\gamma, \mu \in G(X) \subseteq M_2$ by

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} b_i & u_j \\ a_i & p_j \end{pmatrix}, \mu = \begin{pmatrix} x_i & q_j \\ y_i & v_j \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\epsilon = \gamma \delta \mu$ and hence M_2 is maximal in A(X).

ł

(c) Similar to the proof of (b), since A(n', n) is a prime ideal and A(n, n) is an ideal of A(X), we have $M_3 = (A(X) \setminus A(n', n)) \cup A(n, n)$ is a subsemigroup of A(X) and we note that, in fact,

$$M_3 = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) < n \text{ or } r(\alpha) < n \}.$$

To prove the maximality of M_3 , we let $\delta, \epsilon \in A(X) \setminus M_3$. Thus, $d(\delta) = r(\delta) = d(\epsilon) = r(\epsilon) = n$. The rest of the proof follows in a manner similar to the proof of (b), the mappings δ, ϵ, γ and μ can be written in the same way as we did in the proof of (b), except that, in this case, we let |J| = |I| = n. Then $\gamma, \mu \in G(X) \subseteq M_3$ and $\epsilon = \gamma \delta \mu$, which proves maximality of M_3 .

In order to prove our main theorem, we also need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.2. Suppose that $|X| = n \ge \aleph_0$. Let M be a maximal subsemigroup of A(X). Then $A(n', 2) \setminus A(n', \aleph_0) = \{\alpha \in A(X) : 2 \le d(\alpha) < \aleph_0\} \subseteq M$.

Proof. If $A(n', 2) \subseteq M$, then $A(n', 2) \setminus A(n', \aleph_0) \subseteq A(n', 2) \subseteq M$, and the lemma is proved. On the other hand, if $A(n', 2) \not\subseteq M$, then Lemma 2.3 implies that

$$A(X) \setminus A(n', 2) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) < 2 \} \subseteq M.$$

Now, let $\alpha \in A(n', 2) \setminus A(n', \aleph_0)$, say $d(\alpha) = t$ where $2 \le t < \aleph_0$. Since t is finite, it follows that $r(\alpha) = n$. We write

$$\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a_i \\ x_i \end{pmatrix}, i \in I \text{ and } |I| = n$$

and suppose

$$X \setminus \operatorname{dom} \alpha = \{b_1, b_2, ..., b_t\} \text{ and } X \setminus X \alpha = \{y_1, y_2, ..., y_t\}.$$

Now, we define

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_1 \\ x_i & y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tau = \begin{pmatrix} x_i & y_2 \\ x_i & y_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and ensure that $\sigma, \tau \in A(X)$ with $d(\sigma) = d(\tau) = t - 1$. If t - 1 = 1, then $\sigma, \tau \in A(X) \setminus A(n', 2) \subseteq M$. Thus, $\alpha = \sigma \tau \in M$. Otherwise, if $t - 1 \ge 2$, then the above argument can be repeated a finite number of times to show that $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_r$ and $\tau = \tau_1 \tau_2 \dots \tau_r$ for some positive integer r and $d(\sigma_j) = d(\tau_j) = 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, r$. Thus, $\alpha = \sigma \tau = \sigma_1 \dots \sigma_r \tau_1 \dots \tau_r \in M$. That is, $A(n', 2) \setminus A(n', \aleph_0) \subseteq M$ as required.

By using some ideas of the proof of Lemma 3.2, we can prove the following result.

Lemma 3.3. Suppose that $|X| = n \ge \aleph_0$. Let M be a maximal subsemigroup of A(X). Then $A(n,n) \subseteq M$.

Proof. Suppose that $A(X) \setminus A(n,n) \subseteq M$ and let $\beta \in A(n,n)$. Then $r(\beta) < n$ and $d(\beta) = n$. We write

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} a_i \\ x_i \end{pmatrix}, i \in I \text{ and } |I| = r(\beta).$$

We also write

$$X \backslash \operatorname{dom} \beta = \{c_j\} \, \dot\cup \, \{d_j\} \text{ and } X \backslash X \beta = \{e_j\} \, \dot\cup \, \{f_j\} \text{ where } |J| = n$$

and define

$$\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & c_j \\ x_i & e_j \end{pmatrix}, \mu = \begin{pmatrix} x_i & f_j \\ x_i & f_j \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, $g(\lambda) = d(\lambda) = g(\mu) = d(\mu) = n$ and $r(\lambda) = r(\mu) = n$, so $\lambda, \mu \in A(X) \setminus A(n, n) \subseteq M$. It follows that $\beta = \lambda \mu \in M$, and thus $A(n, n) \subseteq M$. Hence,

$$A(X) = (A(X) \setminus A(n,n)) \cup A(n,n) \subseteq M,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $A(X) \setminus A(n,n) \not\subseteq M$ and it follows by Lemma 2.3 that $A(n,n) \subseteq M$.

Now, we are in a position to state and prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.4. Suppose that $|X| = n \ge \aleph_0$. If M is a maximal subsemigroup of A(X), then M equals one of the following sets:

- (a) $M_1 = A(n', 1) \cup T$, where T is a maximal subsemigroup of G(X);
- (b) $M_2 = (A(X) \setminus A(n', d)) \cup A(n', d')$, where d = 1 or $\aleph_0 \le d < n$;
- (c) $M_3 = (A(X) \setminus A(n', n)) \cup A(n, n).$

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, we have proved that M_1, M_2 and M_3 are maximal subsemigroups of A(X). To complete the proof of the theorem, let M be a maximal subsemigroup of A(X). Since A(n', 1) is a prime ideal, by Lemma 2.3, we have either $A(n', 1) \subseteq M$ or $G(X) = A(X) \setminus A(n', 1) \subseteq M$. If $A(n', 1) \subseteq M$, then $G(X) \cap M \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise, M = A(n', 1), which is not a maximal subsemigroup of A(X) by Lemma 3.1(a)) and $G(X) \setminus M \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise, M = A(X), which is a contradiction). Then, Lemma 2.1(b) implies that $G(X) \cap M$ is a maximal subsemigroup of G(X). Now we can write

$$M = A(n', 1) \cup (G(X) \cap M).$$

It follows that M is a maximal subsemigroup of type M_1 . In the latter case, when $G(X) \subseteq M$, there exists $\alpha \in A(X) \setminus M$ and $g(\alpha) \neq 0$. Furthermore, Lemma 3.2 showed that M contains all transformations of A(X) such that their gap are finite and are greater than 1, this implies $g(\alpha) = 1$ or $\aleph_0 \leq g(\alpha) \leq n$. Then we consider the following cases:

Case 1: $g(\alpha) = d$ (say) where d = 1 or $\aleph_0 \leq d < n$. Then $\alpha \in A(n', d) \backslash M$ and it follows by Lemma 2.3 that $A(X) \backslash A(n', d) \subseteq M$. In addition, $g(\alpha) = d$ also implies $\alpha \in (A(X) \backslash A(n', d')) \backslash M$. Using Lemma 2.3 again, we have that $A(n', d') \subseteq M$. We now see that $(A(X) \backslash A(n', d)) \cup A(n', d') \subseteq M$ and equality follows by Lemma 3.1(b). Thus, M is a maximal subsemigroup of type M_2 . Case 2: $g(\alpha) = n$. Similar to case 1, we see that $\alpha \in A(n', n) \setminus M$. Consequently, $A(X) \setminus A(n', n) \subseteq M$ by Lemma 2.3. Moreover, since M always contains A(n, n) (by Lemma 3.3), it follows that $(A(X) \setminus A(n', n)) \cup A(n, n) \subseteq M$ and equality follows by Lemma 3.1(c). Hence, in this case, we deduce that M is a maximal subsemigroup of type M_3 . This completes the proof.

In [4, p.333], for the cardinals d and e such that $0 \le d \le e \le n = |X|$, the authors defined the sets

$$S[d, e] = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d \le d(\alpha) \le e \} \text{ and}$$
$$S[d, e) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d \le d(\alpha) < e \}.$$

Furthermore, S(d, e] and S(d, e) were defined in a similar way. They showed in [4, Theorem 13] that, when $n > \aleph_0$, there are only four types of maximal subsemigroups of A(X), which are:

(1) $T \cup S[1, n]$, where T is a maximal subsemigroup of G(X);

(2) $G(X) \cup S(1,n];$

(3) $G(X) \cup S[1, d) \cup S(d, n]$, where $\aleph_0 \leq d < n$;

 $(4) G(X) \cup S[1,n) \cup A(n,n).$

In view of Theorem 3.4, our result is a generalization of [4, Theorem 13] since (1) is the maximal subsemigroups of type M_1 , (2) and (3) are the maximal subsemigroups of type M_2 when d = 1 and $\aleph_0 \leq d < n$, respectively, and (4) is equal to M_3 . Moreover, as a specialization of Theorem 3.4 by letting $n = \aleph_0$, the infinite cardinal d in Theorem 3.4(b) does not exist (as it depends on infinite cardinals less than n). Then the following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 3.5. Suppose that $|X| = \aleph_0$. Then the maximal subsemigroups of A(X) are precisely the sets:

- (a) $M_1 = A(\aleph_0', 1) \cup T$, where T is a maximal subsemigroup of G(X);
- (b) $M_2 = (A(X) \setminus A(\aleph_0', 1)) \cup A(\aleph_0', 2) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) \neq 1 \};$
- (c) $M_3 = (A(X) \setminus A(\aleph_0', \aleph_0)) \cup A(\aleph_0, \aleph_0) = \{ \alpha \in A(X) : d(\alpha) < \aleph_0 \text{ or } r(\alpha) < \aleph_0 \}.$

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the referees for their comments and suggestions on the manuscript. The author also acknowledges the support and facilities of Chiang Mai Rajabhat University.

References

- A.H. Clifford, G.B. Preston, The Algebraic Theory of Semigroups, Mathematical Surveys 7 (1-2), American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1961 and 1967.
- [2] S.Y. Chen, S.C. Hsieh, Factorizable inverse semigroups, Semigroup Forum 8 (1974) 283–297.
- [3] P. Jampachon, M. Saichalee, R.P. Sullivan, Locally factosizable transformation semigroups, Southeast Asian Bull. Math. 25 (2001) 233–244.
- [4] J. Sanwong, R.P. Sullivan, Injective transformations with equal gap and defect, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 79 (2009) 327–336.
- [5] J. M. Howie, An Introduction to Semigroup Theory, Academic Press, London, 1976.

- [6] B. Singha, J. Sanwong, On maximal subsemigroups of partial Baer-Levi semigroups, Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. (2011), 14 pp, Art. ID 489674.
- [7] E. Hotzel, Maximality properties of some subsemigroups of Baer-Levi semigroups, Semigroup Forum 51 (1995) 153–190.