DOI: 10.37863/umzh.v73i5.288

UDC 512.5

I. Dimitrova (South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria),
J. Koppitz (Institute of Mathematics and Informatics Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria)

ON RELATIVE RANKS OF FINITE TRANSFORMATION SEMIGROUPS WITH RESTRICTED RANGE

ПРО ВІДНОСНІ РАНГИ НАПІВГРУП ФІНІТНИХ ПЕРЕТВОРЕНЬ З ОБМЕЖЕНОЮ ОБЛАСТЮ ЗНАЧЕНЬ

We determine the relative rank of the semigroup $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ of all transformations on a finite chain X with restricted range $Y \subseteq X$ modulo the set $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ of all orientation-preserving transformations in $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. Moreover, we state the relative rank of the semigroup $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo the set $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ of all order-preserving transformations in $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$. In both cases we characterize the minimal relative generating sets.

Визначено відносний ранг напівгрупи $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ усіх перетворень на скінченному ланцюгу X з обмеженою областю значень $Y \subseteq X$ за модулем множини $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ усіх перетворень у $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$, що зберігають орієнтацію. Крім того, встановлено відносний ранг напівгрупи $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ за модулем множини $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ усіх перетворень в $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$, що зберігають порядок. В обох випадках охарактеризовано відповідні мінімальні породжуючі множини.

1. Introduction and preliminaries. Let S be a semigroup. The *rank* of S (denoted by $\operatorname{rank} S$) is defined to be the minimal number of elements of a generating set of S. The ranks of various known semigroups have been calculated [7, 8, 10, 11]. For a set $A \subseteq S$, the *relative rank* of S modulo A, denoted by $\operatorname{rank}(S : A)$, is the minimal cardinality of a set $B \subseteq S$ such that $A \cup B$ generates S. It follows immediately from the definition that $\operatorname{rank}(S : \varnothing) = \operatorname{rank} S$, $\operatorname{rank}(S : S) = 0$, $\operatorname{rank}(S : A) = \operatorname{rank}(S : \langle A \rangle)$ and $\operatorname{rank}(S : A) = 0$ if and only if A is a generating set for S. The relative rank of a semigroup modulo a suitable set was first introduced by Ruškuc in [14] in order to describe the generating sets of semigroups with infinite rank. In [12], Howie, Ruškuc, and Higgins considered the relative ranks of the monoid $\mathcal{T}(X)$ of all full transformations on X, where X is an infinite set, modulo some distinguished subsets of $\mathcal{T}(X)$. They showed that $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X) : \mathcal{S}(X)) = 2$, $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X) : \mathcal{E}(X)) = 2$ and $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X) : J) = 0$, where $\mathcal{S}(X)$ is the symmetric group on X, $\mathcal{E}(X)$ is the set of all idempotent transformations on X and J is the top $\mathcal{J}$-class of $\mathcal{T}(X)$, i.e., $J = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{T}(X) : |X\alpha| = |X|\}$. But also if the rank is finite, the relative rank gives information about the generating sets. In the present paper, we will determine the relative rank for a particular semigroup of transformations on a finite set.

Let X be a finite chain, say $X = \{1 < 2 < \ldots < n\}$ for a natural number n. A transformation $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}(X)$ is called *order-preserving* if $x \leq y$ implies $x\alpha \leq y\alpha$ for all $x,\ y \in X$. We denote by $\mathcal{O}(X)$ the submonoid of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ of all order-preserving full transformations on X. The relative rank of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X)$ was considered by Higgins, Mitchell, and Ruškuc in [9]. They showed that $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X) : \mathcal{O}(X)) = 1$, when X is an arbitrary countable chain or an arbitrary well-ordered set, while $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{R}) : \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{R}))$ is uncountable, by considering the usual order of the set $\mathbb{R}$ of real numbers. In [2], Dimitrova, Fernandes, and Koppitz studied the relative rank of the semigroup $\mathcal{O}(X)$ modulo $J = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}(X) : |X\alpha| = |X|\}$ for an infinite countable chain X. We say that a transformation $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}(X)$ is *orientation-preserving* if there are subsets $X_1, X_2 \subseteq X$ with $\varnothing \neq$

$\neq X_1 < X_2$ (i.e., $x_1 < x_2$ for $x_1 \in X_1$ and $x_2 \in X_2$), $X = X_1 \cup X_2$, and $x\alpha \leq y\alpha$, whenever either $(x, y) \in X_1^2 \cup X_2^2$ with $x \leq y$ or $(x, y) \in X_2 \times X_1$. Note that $X_2 = \varnothing$ provides $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}(X)$. We denote by $\mathcal{OP}(X)$ the submonoid of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ of all orientation-preserving full transformations on X. An equivalent notion of an orientation-preserving transformation was first introduced by McAlister in [13] and, independently, by Catarino and Higgins in [1]. It is clear that $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is a submonoid of $\mathcal{OP}(X)$, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(X) \subset \mathcal{OP}(X) \subset \mathcal{T}(X)$. It is interesting to note that the relative rank of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X)$ as well as the relative rank of $\mathcal{OP}(X)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is one (see [1, 12]), but the situation will change if one considers transformations with restricted range.

Let $Y = \{a_1 < a_2 < \ldots < a_m\}$ be a nonempty subset of X, for a natural number $m \leq n$, and denote by $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ the subsemigroup $\{\alpha \in \mathcal{T}(X) \colon X\alpha \subseteq Y\}$ of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ of all transformations with range (image) restricted to Y. The set $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ coincides with $\mathcal{T}(X)$, whenever $Y = X$ (i.e., $m = n$). In 1975, Symons [15] introduced and studied the semigroup $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$, which is called semigroup of transformations with restricted range. Recently, the rank of $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ was computed by Fernandes and Sanwong in [6]. They proved that the rank of $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ is the Sterling number $S(n, m)$ of second kind with $|X| = n$ and $|Y| = m$. The rank of the order-preserving counterpart $\mathcal{O}(X, Y)$ of $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ was studied in [4] by Fernandes, Honyam, Quinteiro, and Singha. The authors found that $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{O}(X, Y) = \binom{n-1}{m-1} + \left|Y^{\#}\right|$, where $Y^{\#}$ denotes the set of all $y \in Y$ with one of the following properties: (i) y has no successor in X; (ii) y is no successor of any element in X; (iii) both the successor of Y and the element whose successor is y belong to Y. Moreover, the regularity and the rank of the semigroup $\mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ were studied by the same authors in [5]. They showed that $\operatorname{rank} \mathcal{OP}(X, Y) = \binom{n}{m}$. In [16], Tinpun and Koppitz studied the relative rank of $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X, Y)$ and proved that $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X, Y) \colon \mathcal{O}(X, Y)) = S(n, m) - \binom{n-1}{m-1} + a$, where $a \in \{0, 1\}$ depending on the set Y. In this paper, we determine the relative rank of $\mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X, Y)$ as well as the relative rank of $\mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$.

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}(X, Y)$. The kernel of α is the equivalence relation $\ker \alpha$ with $(x, y) \in \ker \alpha$ if $x\alpha = y\alpha$. It corresponds uniquely to a partition on X. This justifies to regard $\ker \alpha$ as a partition on X. We will call a block of this partition as $\ker \alpha$-class. In particular, the sets $x\alpha^{-1} = \{y \in X : y\alpha = x\}$, for $x \in X\alpha$, are the $\ker \alpha$-classes. We say that a partition P is a subpartition of a partition Q of X if for all $p \in P$ there is $q \in Q$ with $p \subseteq q$. A set $T \subseteq X$ with $\left|T \cap x\alpha^{-1}\right| = 1$, for all $x \in X\alpha$, is called a transversal of $\ker \alpha$. Let $A \subseteq X$. Then $\alpha|_A : A \to Y$ denotes the restriction of α to A and A will be called convex if $x < y < z$ with $x, z \in A$ implies $y \in A$.

Let $l \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_l$ the set of all partitions $\{A_1, \ldots, A_l\}$ of X such that $A_2 < A_3 < \ldots < A_l$ are convex sets (if $l > 1$) and A_1 is the union of two convex sets with $1, n \in A_1$. Further, let $\mathcal{Q}_l$ be the set of all partitions $\{A_1, \ldots, A_l\}$ of X such that $A_1 < A_2 < \ldots < A_l$ are convex and let $\mathcal{R}_l$ be the set of all partitions of X, which not belong to $\mathcal{Q}_l \cup \mathcal{P}_l$. We observe that $\ker \beta \in \mathcal{Q}_l \cup \mathcal{P}_l$, whenever $\beta \in \mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ with $|X\beta| = l$. In particular, $\ker \beta \in \mathcal{Q}_l$, whenever $\beta \in \mathcal{O}(X, Y)$.

Let us consider the case $l = m > 1$. For $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$ with the blocks $A_1,\ A_2 < \ldots < A_m$, let α_P be the transformation on X defined by

$$x\alpha_P := a_i, \qquad \text{whenever} \quad x \in A_i \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le m,$$

in the case $1 \notin Y$ or $n \notin Y$ and

$$x\alpha_P := \begin{cases} a_{i+1}, & \text{if} \quad x \in A_i \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i < m, \\ a_1, & \text{if} \quad x \in A_m, \end{cases}$$

in the case $1, n \in Y$. Clearly, $\ker \alpha_P = P$. For $X_1 = \{1, \ldots, \max A_m\}$, $X_2 = \{\max A_m + 1, \ldots, n\}$ in the case $1 \notin Y$ or $n \notin Y$ and $X_1 = \{1, \ldots, \max A_{m-1}\}$, $X_2 = \{\max A_{m-1} + 1, \ldots, n\}$ in the case $1, n \in Y$, where $\max A_m$ ($\max A_{m-1}$) denotes the greatest element in the set A_m (A_{m-1}, respectively), we can easy verify that α_P is orientation-preserving.

Further, let $\eta \in \mathcal{T}(X, Y)$ be defined by

$$x\eta := \begin{cases} a_{i+1}, & \text{if} \quad a_i \le x < a_{i+1}, \quad 1 \le i < m, \\ a_1, & \text{if} \quad x = a_m, \\ a_\Gamma, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \Gamma := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad 1 \notin Y, \\ 2, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

in the case $1 \notin Y$ or $n \notin Y$ and

$$x\eta := \begin{cases} a_{i+1}, & \text{if} \quad a_i \le x < a_{i+1}, \quad 1 \le i < m, \\ a_1 = 1, & \text{if} \quad x = a_m = n, \end{cases}$$

in the case that $1, n \in Y$. Notice that $P_0 := \ker \eta \in \mathcal{P}_m$ if $1 \notin Y$ or $n \notin Y$ and $\ker \eta \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ if $1, n \in Y$. In fact, $\eta \in \mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ with $X_1 = \{1, 2, \ldots, a_m - 1\}$ and $X_2 = \{a_m, a_m + 1, \ldots, n\}$. Moreover, $\eta|_Y$ is a permutation on Y, namely

$$\eta|_Y = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & \ldots & a_{m-1} & a_m \\ a_2 & \ldots & a_m & a_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will denote by $\mathcal{S}(Y)$ the set of all permutations on Y. Note that $\beta \in \mathcal{O}(X, Y)$ implies that either $\beta|_Y$ is the identity mapping on Y or $\beta|_Y \notin \mathcal{S}(Y)$.

2. The relative rank of $\mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X, Y)$. In this section, we determine the relative rank of $\mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X, Y)$. A part of these results were presented at the 47 th spring conference of the Union of Bulgarian mathematicians in March 2018 and are published in the proceedings of this conference [3].

If $m = 1$, then $\mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ is the set of all constant mappings and coincides with $\mathcal{O}(X, Y)$, i.e., $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{OP}(X, Y) : \mathcal{O}(X, Y)) = 0$. So, we admit that $m > 1$.

First, we will show that

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\alpha_P : P \in \mathcal{P}_m\} \cup \{\eta\}$$

is a relative generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X, Y)$. Notice that $\eta = \alpha_{P_0}$ if $1 \notin Y$ or $n \notin Y$.

Lemma 1. *For each* $\alpha \in \mathcal{OP}(X, Y)$ *with* $\operatorname{rank} \alpha = m$, *there is* $\widehat{\alpha} \in \{\alpha_P : P \in \mathcal{P}_m\} \cup \mathcal{O}(X, Y)$ *with* $\ker \alpha = \ker \widehat{\alpha}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ and let $X_1, X_2 \subseteq X$ as in the definition of an orientation-preserving transformation. If $X_2 = \varnothing$, then $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. Suppose now that $X_2 \neq \varnothing$ and let $X_1\alpha = \{x_1 < \ldots < x_r\}$ and $X_2\alpha = \{y_1 < \ldots < y_s\}$ for suitable natural numbers r and s. We observe that $X_1\alpha$ and $X_2\alpha$ have at most one joint element (only $x_1 = y_s$ could be possible). If $x_1 \neq y_s$, then

$$\ker\alpha = \left\{x_1\alpha^{-1} < \ldots < x_r\alpha^{-1} < y_1\alpha^{-1} < \ldots < y_s\alpha^{-1}\right\} = \ker\widehat{\alpha}$$

with

$$\widehat{\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1\alpha^{-1} & \ldots & x_r\alpha^{-1} & y_1\alpha^{-1} & \ldots & y_s\alpha^{-1} \\ a_1 & \ldots & a_r & a_{r+1} & \ldots & a_{r+s} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y).$$

If $x_1 = y_s$, then $1, n \in x_1\alpha^{-1} = y_s\alpha^{-1}$ and $\ker\alpha = \ker\alpha_P$ with

$$P = \left\{x_1\alpha^{-1}, x_2\alpha^{-1} < \ldots < x_r\alpha^{-1} < y_1\alpha^{-1} < \ldots < y_{s-1}\alpha^{-1}\right\} \in \mathcal{P}_m.$$

Lemma 1 is proved.

Proposition 1. $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y) = \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), \mathcal{A}\rangle$.

Proof. Let $\beta \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ with $\operatorname{rank}\beta = m$. Then there is $\theta \in \{\alpha_P : P \in \mathcal{P}_m\} \cup \mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ with $\ker\beta = \ker\theta$ by Lemma 1. In particular, there is $r \in \{0, \ldots, m-1\}$ with $a_1\theta^{-1} = a_{r+1}\beta^{-1}$. Then it is easy to verify that $\beta = \theta\eta^r$, where $\eta^0 = \eta^m$.

Admit now that $i = \operatorname{rank}\beta < m$. Suppose that $\ker\beta \in \mathcal{P}_i$, say $\ker\beta = \{A_1, A_2 < \ldots < A_i\}$ with $1, n \in A_1$. Then there is a subpartition $P' \in \mathcal{P}_m$ of $\ker\beta$. We put $\theta = \alpha_{P'}$, $a = \min X\beta$, and let T be a transversal of $\ker\theta$. In particular, we have $Y = \{x(\theta|_T)\eta^k : x \in T\}$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Since both mappings $\theta|_T : T \to Y$ and $\eta|_Y : Y \to Y$ are bijections, there is $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $a_1((\theta|_T)\eta^k)^{-1}\beta = a$ and $a_1((\theta|_T)\eta^{k+1})^{-1}\beta \neq a$. Moreover, since $(\theta|_T)\eta^k$ is a bijection from T to Y and both transformations $\theta\eta^k$ and β are orientation-preserving, it is easy to verify that $f^* = \left((\theta|_T)\eta^k\right)^{-1}\beta$ can be extended to an orientation-preserving transformation f defined by

$$xf = \begin{cases} a_1 f^*, & \text{if} \quad x < a_1, \\ a_i f^*, & \text{if} \quad a_i \leq x < a_{i+1}, \quad 1 \leq i < m, \\ a_m f^*, & \text{if} \quad a_m \leq x, \end{cases}$$

i.e., f and f^* coincide on Y. Moreover, $a_1 f = a_1 f^* = a_1\left((\theta|_T)\eta^k\right)^{-1}\beta = a$. In order to show that f is order-preserving, it left to verify that $nf \neq a$. Assume that $nf = a$, where $n \geq a_m$. Then $nf = a_m f^* = a_m f$, i.e., $(n, a_m) \in \ker f$ and $n\eta = a_m\eta = a_1$. So, there is $x^* \in T$ such that $x^*\left((\theta|_T)\eta^k\right) = a_m$, i.e., $x^* = a_m\left((\theta|_T)\eta^k\right)^{-1}$. Now, we have $a = nf = a_m f^* = a_m\left((\theta|_T)\eta^k\right)^{-1}\beta = a_m(\eta^k|_Y)^{-1}(\theta|_T)^{-1}\beta = a_1(\eta|_Y)^{-1}(\eta^k|_Y)^{-1}(\theta|_T)^{-1}\beta = a_1((\theta|_T)\eta^{k+1})^{-1}\beta \neq a$, a contradiction.

Finally, we will verify that $\beta = \theta\eta^k f \in \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), \mathcal{A}\rangle$. For this let $x \in X$. Then there is $\widetilde{x} \in T$ such that $(x, \widetilde{x}) \in \ker\beta$. So, we have $x\theta\eta^k f = x\theta\eta^k f^* = \widetilde{x}\theta\eta^k\left((\theta|_T)\eta^k\right)^{-1}\beta = \widetilde{x}\beta = x\beta$.

Suppose now that $\ker\beta \notin \mathcal{P}_i$ and, thus, $\ker\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_i$. Let $X\beta = \{b_1, \ldots, b_i\}$ such that $b_1\beta^{-1} < \ldots < b_i\beta^{-1}$. Then we define a transformation φ by $x\varphi = a_j$ for all $x \in b_{j-1}\beta^{-1}$ and $2 \leq j \leq i+1$. Clearly, $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. Further, we define a transformation $\nu \in \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ by

$$x\nu = \begin{cases} b_{j-1}, & \text{if} \quad a_j \leq x < a_{j+1}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq i, \\ b_i, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Since β is orientation-preserving, there is $k \in \{1, \ldots, i\}$ such that $k = i$ or $b_1 < \ldots < b_{k-1} < < b_k < \ldots < b_i$. Then $X_1 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{k+1} - 1\}$ and $X_2 = \{a_{k+1}, \ldots, n\}$ gives a partition of X providing that ν is orientation-preserving. Clearly, $\operatorname{rank} \nu = i$ and $1\nu = n\nu = b_i$. Thus, it is easy to verify that $\ker \nu \in \mathcal{P}_i$. Hence, $\nu \in \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), \mathcal{A} \rangle$ by the previous case and it remains to show that $\beta = \varphi\nu \in \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), \mathcal{A} \rangle$. For this let $x \in X$. Then $x \in b_j\beta^{-1}$ for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, i\}$, i.e., $x\varphi\nu = a_{j+1}\nu = b_j = x\beta$.

Proposition 1 is proved.

The previous proposition shows that $\mathcal{A}$ is a relative generating set for $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. It remains to show that $\mathcal{A}$ is of minimal size.

Lemma 2. *Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ be a relative generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. Then $\mathcal{P}_m \subseteq \{\ker \alpha \colon \alpha \in B\}$.*

Proof. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_m$. Since $\alpha_P \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y) = \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B \rangle$, there are $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y) \cup B$ and $\theta_2 \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ with $\alpha_P = \theta_1\theta_2$. Because of $\operatorname{rank} \alpha_P = m$, we obtain $\ker \alpha_P = \ker \theta_1$. Since $1\alpha_P = n\alpha_P$, we conclude that $\theta_1 \notin \mathcal{O}(X,Y)$, i.e., $\theta_1 \in B$ with $\ker \theta_1 = \ker \alpha_P = P$.

Lemma 2 is proved.

In order to find a formula for the number of elements in $\mathcal{P}_m$, we have to compute the number of possible partitions of X into $m+1$ convex sets. This number is $\dbinom{n-1}{m}$.

***Remark* 1.** $|\mathcal{P}_m| = \dbinom{n-1}{m}$.

Now, we are able to state the main result of the section. The relative rank of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ depends of the fact whether both 1 and n belong to Y or not.

Theorem 1. *For each $1 < m < n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

1) $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{OP}(X,Y) \colon \mathcal{O}(X,Y)) = \dbinom{n-1}{m}$ *if $1 \notin Y$ or $n \notin Y$;*

2) $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{OP}(X,Y) \colon \mathcal{O}(X,Y)) = 1 + \dbinom{n-1}{m}$ *if $\{1, n\} \subseteq Y$.*

Proof. 1. Note that $\ker \eta \in \mathcal{P}_m$ and $\eta = \alpha_{P_0}$. Hence, the set $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_P \colon P \in \mathcal{P}_m\}$ is a generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ by Proposition 1, i.e., the relative rank of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ is bounded by the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}_m$, which is $\dbinom{n-1}{m}$ by Remark 1. But this number cannot be reduced by Lemma 2.

2. Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ be a relative generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. By Lemma 2, we know that $\mathcal{P}_m \subseteq \{\ker \alpha \colon \alpha \in B\}$. Assume that the equality holds. Note that $\ker \eta \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ and η is not order-preserving. Hence, there are $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_l \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y) \cup B$ for a suitable natural number l, such that $\eta = \theta_1 \ldots \theta_l$. From $\operatorname{rank} \eta = m$, we obtain $\ker \theta_1 = \ker \eta$ and $\operatorname{rank} \theta_i = m$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$ and, thus, $\{1, n\} \subseteq Y$ implies $(1, n) \notin \ker \theta_i$ for $i \in \{2, \ldots, l\}$. This implies $\theta_2, \ldots, \theta_l \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. Since $\ker \theta_1 = \ker \eta \notin \mathcal{P}_m$, we get $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y)$, and, consequently, $\eta = \theta_1\theta_2 \ldots \theta_l \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y)$, a contradiction. So, we have verified that $|\mathcal{P}_m| < |B|$, i.e., the relative rank of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ is greater than $\dbinom{n-1}{m}$. But it is bounded by $1 + \dbinom{n-1}{m}$ due to Proposition 1. This proves the assertion.

Theorem 1 is proved.

We finish this section with the characterization of the minimal relative generating sets of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. We will recognize that among them there are sets with size greater than $\operatorname{rank}\big(\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)\colon \mathcal{O}(X,Y)\big)$.

Theorem 2. *Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$. Then B is a minimal relative generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ if and only if for the set $\widetilde{B} = \{\beta \in B\colon \ker\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_m\} \subseteq B$ the following three statements are satisfied:*

(i) $\mathcal{P}_m \subseteq \big\{\ker\beta\colon \beta \in B \setminus \widetilde{B}\big\}$,

(ii) $|B \setminus \widetilde{B}| = |\mathcal{P}_m|$,

(iii) $\eta|_Y \in \langle \beta|_Y : \beta \in B\rangle$ *but* $\eta|_Y \notin \big\langle \beta|_Y : \beta \in B \setminus \{\gamma\}\big\rangle$ *for any* $\gamma \in \widetilde{B}$.

Proof. Suppose that the conditions (i) – (iii) are satisfied for $\widetilde{B} = \{\beta \in B\colon \ker\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_m\}$. We will show that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B\rangle$. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\eta\}$. Then there is a partition $P = \{A_1, A_2 < \ldots \ldots < A_m\} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ such that

$$\alpha = \alpha_P = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & \ldots & A_m \\ a_1 & a_2 & \ldots & a_m \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{if} \quad 1 \notin Y \quad \text{or} \quad n \notin Y,$$

or

$$\alpha = \alpha_P = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & \ldots & A_{m-1} & A_m \\ a_2 & a_3 & \ldots & a_m & a_1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{if} \quad 1, n \in Y.$$

Notice that in the latter case $a_1 = 1$ and $a_m = n$.

Further, from (i) it follows that there is $\beta \in B$ with $\ker\beta = \ker\alpha_P$, i.e., $\beta = \alpha_P$ or

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & \ldots & A_{m-i+1} & A_{m-i+2} & \ldots & A_m \\ a_i & a_{i+1} & \ldots & a_m & a_1 & \ldots & a_{i-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $i \in \{3, \ldots, m\}$. It is easy to verify that $\alpha_P = \beta^k \in \langle B\rangle$ for a suitable natural number k. Hence, $\{\alpha_P\colon P \in \mathcal{P}_m\} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B\rangle$. Further, $\ker\eta \in \mathcal{P}_m$, whenever $1 \notin Y$ or $n \notin Y$, and $\ker\eta \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ otherwise. Thus, there is $\delta \in \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B\rangle$ with $\ker\delta = \ker\eta$. Then we obtain as above that $\eta = \delta^l \in \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B\rangle$ for a suitable natural number l. Consequently, $\langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), \mathcal{A}\rangle \subseteq \subseteq \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B\rangle$. By Proposition 1, we obtain $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y) = \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B\rangle$. The generating set B is minimal by properties (i) and (ii) together with Lemma 2 and by the property (iii) of $\widetilde{B}$.

Conversely, let B be a minimal relative generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. By Lemma 2, there is a set $\overline{B} \subseteq B$ such that $\mathcal{P}_m = \{\ker\beta\colon \beta \in \overline{B}\}$ and $\big|\overline{B}\big| = |\mathcal{P}_m|$. Since $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y) = \langle \mathcal{O}(X,Y), B\rangle$, there are $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k \in \mathcal{O}(X,Y) \cup B$ such that $\eta = \beta_1 \ldots \beta_k$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that there is not $\gamma \in \big\{\beta_i\colon 1 \le i \le k,\ \ker\beta_i \in \mathcal{Q}_m\big\} =: \widehat{B}$ such that η is a product of transformations in $\overline{B} \cup (\widehat{B} \setminus \{\gamma\})$. In the first part of the proof, we have shown that $\overline{B} \cup \widehat{B}$ is a relative generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$. Because of the minimality of B, we obtain $B = \overline{B} \cup \widehat{B}$, where $\big\{\ker\beta\colon \beta \in B \setminus \widehat{B}\big\} \supseteq \mathcal{P}_m$, $|B \setminus \widehat{B}| = |\overline{B}| = |\mathcal{P}_m|$ and $\eta|_Y \in \langle \beta|_Y : \beta \in B\rangle$ but $\eta|_Y \notin \big\langle \beta|_Y : \beta \in B \setminus \{\gamma\}\big\rangle$ for any $\gamma \in \widehat{B}$.

Theorem 2 is proved.

In particular, for the relative generating sets of minimal size we have the following remark.

***Remark* 2.** $B \subseteq \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ is a relative generating set of $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{O}(X,Y)$ of minimal size if and only if $|\widetilde{B}| = 1$ if $1, n \in Y$ and $\widetilde{B} = \varnothing$, otherwise.

3. The relative rank of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$. In this section, we determine the relative rank of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ and characterize all minimal relative generating sets of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$. Since $\mathcal{O}(X,Y) \leq \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$, we see immediately that $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X,Y)\colon \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)) \leq S(n,m) - \binom{n-1}{m-1} + 1$. First, we state a sufficient condition for a set $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ to be a relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$.

Lemma 3. *Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. If $\mathcal{R}_m \subseteq \{\ker\beta\colon \beta\in B\}$ and $\mathcal{S}(Y) \subseteq \big\langle\{\beta|_Y\colon \beta\in B\}, \eta|_Y\big\rangle$, then $\langle \mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B\rangle = \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ with $\operatorname{rank}\gamma = k \leq m$. We will consider two cases.

Case 1. Suppose that $\ker\gamma \in \mathcal{R}_k$. Then $\ker\gamma$ contains a non-convex set which cannot be decomposed into two convex sets, which contain 1 and n, respectively. Since $k \leq m$, we can divide the partition $\ker\gamma$ into a partition $P \in \mathcal{R}_m$ such that P contains a non-convex set which cannot be decomposed into two convex sets, which contain 1 and n, respectively (if $k = m$, then we put $P = \ker\gamma$). Since $\mathcal{R}_m \subseteq \{\ker\beta\colon \beta\in B\}$, there is $\lambda\in B$ with $\ker\lambda = P$. It is clear that $X\lambda = Y$.

Further, let $X\gamma = \{y_1 < y_2 < \ldots < y_k\}$ and define the sets

$$A_i = \left\{x \in Y\colon x\lambda^{-1} \subseteq y_i\gamma^{-1}\right\}$$

for $i = 1,\ldots,k$. It is clear that $\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k\}$ is a partition of Y. Moreover, let $\{C_1 < C_2 < \ldots < C_k\} \in \mathcal{Q}_k$ be a partition of X such that $|C_i \cap Y| = |A_i|$ for all $i = 1,\ldots,k$. Let $A_i = \{a_{i_1} < a_{i_2} < \ldots < a_{i_{t_i}}\}$ and $C_i \cap Y = \{c_{i_1} < c_{i_2} < \ldots < c_{i_{t_i}}\}$ with $t_i \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ for $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$. We define a bijection

$$\sigma\colon \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} A_i = Y \longrightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{k}(C_i\cap Y) = Y$$

on Y with $a_{i_l}\sigma = c_{i_l}$ for $l = 1,\ldots,t_i$ and $i = 1,\ldots,k$. Since $\sigma\in\mathcal{S}(Y)$ and $\mathcal{S}(Y)\subseteq\big\langle\{\beta|_Y\colon \beta\in B\}, \eta|_Y\big\rangle$, there is $\mu\in\langle B,\eta\rangle$ with $\mu|_Y = \sigma$.

Finally, we define a transformation $\nu\in\mathcal{O}(X,Y)\subseteq\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ with $\ker\nu = \{C_1 < C_2 < \ldots < C_k\}$ and $x\nu = y_i$ for all $x\in C_i$ and $i = 1,\ldots,k$.

Therefore, we have $\lambda,\mu,\nu\in\langle\mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B\rangle$ and it remains to show that $\gamma = \lambda\mu\nu$, i.e., $\gamma\in\langle\mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B\rangle$. Let $x\in X$. Then $x\gamma = y_i$ for some $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$ and we get

$$x\gamma = y_i \Rightarrow x\lambda = z\in A_i \Rightarrow z\mu = u\in C_i\cap Y \Rightarrow u\nu = y_i.$$

Hence, $x\gamma = y_i = x(\lambda\mu\nu)$ and we conclude $\gamma = \lambda\mu\nu$.

Case 2. Suppose that $\ker\gamma\notin\mathcal{R}_k$, i.e., $\ker\gamma\in\mathcal{Q}_k\cup\mathcal{P}_k$ and there is $\rho_1\in\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ with $\ker\rho_1 = \ker\gamma$. Further, there is a partition $P = \{D_y\colon y\in X\rho_1\}\in\mathcal{R}_k$ such that $y\in D_y$ for all $y\in X\rho_1$. Then we define a transformation $\rho_2\colon X\to X\gamma$ with $\ker\rho_2 = P$ and $\{x\rho_2\} = y\rho_1^{-1}\gamma$ for all $x\in D_y$ and $y\in X\rho_1$. Since $\ker\rho_1 = \ker\gamma$, the transformation ρ_2 is well defined and we have $\gamma = \rho_1\rho_2$. Moreover, $\rho_2\in\langle\mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B\rangle$ by Case 1 (since $\ker\rho_2\in\mathcal{R}_k$) and thus $\gamma = \rho_1\rho_2\in\langle\mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B\rangle$.

Lemma 3 is proved.

Lemma 4. $\langle\eta|_Y\rangle = \big\langle\{\beta|_Y\colon \beta\in\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)\}\big\rangle\cap\mathcal{S}(Y)$.

Proof. The inclusion $\langle\eta|_Y\rangle\subseteq\big\langle\{\beta|_Y\colon \beta\in\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)\}\big\rangle\cap\mathcal{S}(Y)$ is obviously. Let now $\beta\in\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ with $\beta|_Y\in\mathcal{S}(Y)$. Then there is $k\in\{1,\ldots,m\}$ such that

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & \ldots & A_{m-k+1} & A_{m-k} & \ldots & A_m \\ a_k & \ldots & a_m & a_1 & \ldots & a_{k-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\{A_1, A_2 < \ldots < A_m\} \in \mathcal{P}_m \cup \mathcal{Q}_m$ and $a_i \in A_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ since Y is a transversal of $\ker \beta$. Thus,

$$\beta|_Y = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & \ldots & a_{m-k+1} & a_{m-k} & \ldots & a_m \\ a_k & \ldots & a_m & a_1 & \ldots & a_{k-1} \end{pmatrix} = (\eta|_Y)^{m-k+1} \in \langle \eta|_Y \rangle .$$

This shows that $\left\langle \left\{ \beta|_Y : \beta \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y) \right\} \right\rangle \cap \mathcal{S}(Y) \subseteq \left\{ (\eta|_Y)^p : p \in \mathbb{N} \right\} = \langle \eta|_Y \rangle .$

Lemma 4 is proved.

The following lemmas give us necessary conditions for a set $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ to be a relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$.

Lemma 5. *Let* $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X,Y) \setminus \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ *with* $\langle \mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B \rangle = \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. *Then* $\mathcal{S}(Y) \subseteq$ $\subseteq \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in B\}, \eta|_Y \rangle$.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(Y)$. We extend σ to a transformation $\gamma \colon X \to Y$, i.e., $\gamma|_Y = \sigma$. Hence, there are $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y) \cup B$ (for a suitable natural number k) such that $\gamma = \gamma_1 \ldots \gamma_k$. Since the image of any transformation in $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ belongs to Y, we have $\sigma = \gamma|_Y = \gamma_1|_Y \ldots \gamma_k|_Y$. Moreover, from $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(Y)$, we conclude $\gamma_i|_Y \in \mathcal{S}(Y)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Then by Lemma 4

$$\gamma_i|_Y = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & \ldots & a_t & a_{t+1} & \ldots & a_m \\ a_{m-t+1} & \ldots & a_m & a_1 & \ldots & a_{m-t} \end{pmatrix} \in \langle \eta|_Y \rangle$$

for a suitable natural number t. This shows $\sigma \in \left\langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in B\}, \eta|_Y \right\rangle$.

Lemma 5 is proved.

Lemma 6. *Let* $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X,Y) \setminus \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ *with* $\langle \mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B \rangle = \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. *Then* $\mathcal{R}_m \subseteq$ $\subseteq \{\ker \beta \colon \beta \in B\}$.

Proof. Assume that there is $P \in \mathcal{R}_m$ with $P \notin \{\ker \beta \colon \beta \in B\}$. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ with $\ker \gamma = P$. Then there are $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y) \cup B$ and $\theta_2 \in \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ such that $\gamma = \theta_1 \theta_2$. Since $\operatorname{rank} \gamma = m$, we obtain $\ker \gamma = \ker \theta_1 = P$. Thus, $\theta_1 \notin B$, i.e., $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ and $\ker \theta_1 \in$ $\in \mathcal{Q}_m \cup \mathcal{P}_m$, contradicts $\ker \theta_1 = P \in \mathcal{R}_m$.

Lemma 6 is proved.

Lemma 6 shows that $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X,Y) : \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)) \geq |\mathcal{R}_m|$. We will verify the equality.

Lemma 7. $|\mathcal{R}_m| = S(m,n) - \dbinom{n}{m}$.

Proof. The cardinality of the set $\mathcal{D}_m := \mathcal{R}_m \cup \mathcal{P}_m$ was determined in [16]. The authors show that $|\mathcal{D}_m| = S(m,n) - \dbinom{n-1}{m-1}$. Because of $\mathcal{R}_m \cap \mathcal{P}_m = \varnothing$, we obtain $\mathcal{R}_m = \mathcal{D}_m \setminus \mathcal{P}_m$. Since $|\mathcal{P}_m| = \dbinom{n-1}{m}$ (see Remark 1) it follows

$$|\mathcal{R}_m| = |\mathcal{D}_m| - |\mathcal{P}_m| = S(m,n) - \binom{n-1}{m-1} - \binom{n-1}{m} = S(m,n) - \binom{n}{m}.$$

Lemma 7 is proved.

Finally, we can state the relative rank of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$.

Theorem 3. $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X,Y)\colon \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)) = S(m,n) - \binom{n}{m}$.

Proof. If $m = 1$ then $\mathcal{T}(X,Y) = \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$, i.e., $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X,Y)\colon \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)) = 0$. On the other hand, we have $S(1,n) = n = \binom{n}{1}$. Suppose now that $n \geq 2$. By Lemmas 6 and 7, we obtain $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X,Y)\colon \mathcal{OP}(X,Y)) \geq |\mathcal{R}_m| = S(m,n) - \binom{n}{m}$. In order to prove the equality, we have to find a relative generating set B of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ with $|B| = |\mathcal{R}_m|$. We observe that for each $P \in \mathcal{R}_m$, there is $\beta_P \in \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ with $\ker\beta_P = P$, which will be fixed. Let $\mathcal{B} := \{\beta_P : P \in \mathcal{R}_m\}$. If $m = 2$ then $\mathcal{R}_m = \varnothing$ and $\mathcal{S}(Y) = \{\eta|_Y, (\eta|_Y)^2\} = \langle \eta|_Y\rangle$, obviously. If $m \geq 3$ then without loss of generality, we can assume that there is $P' \in \mathcal{R}_m$ such that Y is a transversal of $\ker\beta_{P'}$ and $\beta_{P'}|_Y = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \ldots & a_m \\ a_2 & a_1 & a_3 & \ldots & a_m \end{pmatrix}$. It is known that $\mathcal{S}(Y) = \langle \beta_{P'}|_Y, \eta|_Y\rangle$. Hence, $\mathcal{B}$ is a relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ by Lemma 3. Since $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{R}_m|$, we obtain the required result.

Theorem 3 is proved.

Now we will characterize the minimal relative generating sets of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$. The minimal relative generating sets do not coincide with the relative generating sets of size $\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{T}(X,Y)\colon \mathcal{OP}(X,Y))$.

Theorem 4. *Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. Then B is a minimal relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ if and only if there is a set $\widetilde{B} \subseteq B$ such that the following three statements are satisfied*:

(i) $\mathcal{R}_m \subseteq \{\ker\beta : \beta \in B \setminus \widetilde{B}\}$,

(ii) $|B \setminus \widetilde{B}| = |\mathcal{R}_m|$,

(iii) $\mathcal{S}(Y) \subseteq \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in B\}, \eta|_Y\rangle$ *but* $\mathcal{S}(Y) \nsubseteq \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in B \setminus \{\gamma\}\}, \eta|_Y\rangle$ *for any* $\gamma \in B$ *with* $\ker\gamma \in \{\ker\beta : \beta \in \widetilde{B}\}$.

Proof. Suppose that the conditions (i) – (iii) are satisfied. Then by Lemma 3 we have $\langle \mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B\rangle = \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. It remains to show that B is minimal. Assume that there is $\gamma \in B$ such that $\langle \mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B \setminus \{\gamma\}\rangle = \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. Note that $\alpha\beta|_Y = \alpha|_Y\beta|_Y$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$. Hence, we can conclude that

$$\mathcal{S}(Y) \subseteq \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in \mathcal{T}(X,Y)\}\rangle \subseteq$$

$$\subseteq \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in \mathcal{OP}(X,Y) \cup (B \setminus \{\gamma\})\}\rangle = \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in B \setminus \{\gamma\}\}, \eta|_Y\rangle$$

by Lemma 4. Hence, $\ker\gamma \notin \{\ker\beta : \beta \in \widetilde{B}\}$ by (iii). This implies that $\gamma \in B \setminus \widetilde{B}$ and $|(B \setminus \widetilde{B}) \setminus \{\gamma\}| < |\mathcal{R}_m|$ by (ii), i.e., $\mathcal{R}_m \nsubseteq \{\ker\beta : \beta \in (B \setminus \widetilde{B}) \setminus \{\gamma\}\}$. Since $\ker\gamma \notin \{\ker\beta : \beta \in \widetilde{B}\}$, we have $\mathcal{R}_m \nsubseteq \{\ker\beta : \beta \in (B \setminus \{\gamma\})\}$ and, by Lemma 6, we obtain that $\langle \mathcal{OP}(X,Y), B \setminus \{\gamma\}\rangle \neq \neq \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$, a contradiction. This shows that B is a minimal relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$.

Conversely, let B be a minimal relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$. We have $\mathcal{R}_m \subseteq \{\ker\beta : \beta \in B\}$ and $\mathcal{S}(Y) \subseteq \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in B\}, \eta|_Y\rangle$ by Lemmas 5 and 6, respectively. Then there exists a set $\widetilde{B} \subseteq B$ with $|B \setminus \widetilde{B}| = |\mathcal{R}_m|$ and $\mathcal{R}_m \subseteq \{\ker\beta : \beta \in (B \setminus \widetilde{B})\}$. For the set $\widetilde{B}$, the conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied. Assume now that there is $\gamma \in B$ with $\ker\gamma \in \{\ker\beta : \beta \in \widetilde{B}\}$ such that $\mathcal{S}(Y) \subseteq \langle \{\beta|_Y : \beta \in B \setminus \{\gamma\}\}, \eta|_Y\rangle$. Then because of $\mathcal{R}_m \subseteq \{\ker\beta : \beta \in (B \setminus \{\gamma\})\}$, the set $B \setminus \{\gamma)$ is a relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ by Lemma 3. This contradicts the minimality of B. Consequently, (iii) is satisfied.

Theorem 4 is proved.

In particular, for the relative generating sets of minimal size we have the following remark.

***Remark* 3.** $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ is a relative generating set of $\mathcal{T}(X,Y)$ modulo $\mathcal{OP}(X,Y)$ of minimal size if and only if $\widetilde{\widetilde{B}} = \varnothing$.

References

1. P. M. Catarino, P. M. Higgins, *The monoid of orientation-preserving mappings on a chain*, Semigroup Forum, **58**, 190 – 206 (1999).
2. I. Dimitrova, V. H. Fernandes, J. Koppitz, *A note on generators of the endomorphism semigroup of an infinite countable chain*, J. Algebra and Appl., **16**, № 2, Article 1750031 (2017).
3. I. Dimitrova, J. Koppitz, K. Tinpun, *On the relative rank of the semigroup of orientation-preserving transformations with restricted range*, Proc. 47th Spring Conf. Union Bulg. Math., 109 – 114 (2018).
4. V. H. Fernandes, P. Honyam, T. M. Quinteiro, B. Singha, *On semigroups of endomorphisms of a chain with restricted range*, Semigroup Forum, **89**, 77 – 104 (2014).
5. V. H. Fernandes, P. Honyam, T. M. Quinteiro, B. Singha, *On semigroups of orientation-preserving transformations with restricted range*, Commun. Algebra, **44**, 253 – 264 (2016).
6. V. H. Fernandes, J. Sanwong, *On the rank of semigroups of transformations on a finite set with restricted range*, Algebra Colloq., **21**, 497 – 510 (2014).
7. G. M. S. Gomes, J. M. Howie, *On the rank of certain semigroups of order-preserving transformations*, Semigroup Forum, **51**, 275 – 282 (1992).
8. G. M. S. Gomes, J. M. Howie, *On the ranks of certain finite semigroups of transformations*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc., **101**, 395 – 403 (1987).
9. P. M. Higgins, J. D. Mitchell, N. Ruškuc, *Generating the full transformation semigroup using order preserving mappings*, Glasgow Math. J., **45**, 557 – 566 (2003).
10. J. M. Howie, *Fundamentals of semigroup theory*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford (1995).
11. J. M. Howie, R. B. McFadden, *Idempotent rank in finite full transformation semigroups*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh A, **114**, 161 – 167 (1990).
12. J. M. Howie, N. Ruškuc, P. M. Higgins, *On relative ranks of full transformation semigroups*, Commun. Algebra, **26**, 733 – 748 (1998).
13. D. McAlister, *Semigroups generated by a group and an idempotent*, Commun. Algebra, **26**, 515 – 547 (1998).
14. N. Ruškuc, *On the rank of completely 0-simple semigroups*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc., **116**, 325 – 338 (1994).
15. J. S. V. Symons, *Some results concerning a transformation semigroup*, J. Austr. Math. Soc., **19**, 413 – 425 (1975).
16. K. Tinpun, J. Koppitz, *Relative rank of the finite full transformation semigroup with restricted range*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenian., **85**, № 2, 347 – 356 (2016).

Received 04.09.18