A REPRESENTATION THEOREM FOR MEASURABLE RELATION ALGEBRAS WITH CYCLIC GROUPS

HAJNAL ANDRÉKA AND STEVEN GIVANT

Abstract. A relation algebra is measurable if the identity element is a sum of atoms, and the square $x;1;x$ of each subidentity atom $x$ is a sum of non-zero functional elements. These functional elements form a group $G_x$. We prove that a measurable relation algebra in which the groups $G_x$ are all finite and cyclic is completely representable. A structural description of these algebras is also given.

1. Introduction

Relation algebras were defined by Tarski as a class of abstract algebras satisfying ten equations, to serve as an algebraic counterpart of logic. They are Boolean algebras with operators where the extra-Boolean operators $; , 1'$ form an involuted monoid (satisfying some further equations). In particular, the complex algebra of a group is a relation algebra. Algebras of binary relations with standard set theoretic Boolean operations and relation-composition, inverse of a relation and set theoretic identity relation as the extra-Boolean operations are called set relation algebras. These are relation algebras, and a relation algebra isomorphic to a set relation algebra is called representable. In particular, the function assigning the Cayley-representation to each element of a group extends to a representation of the complex algebra of the group.

Measurable relation algebras were introduced in [6]. In a relation algebra, a subidentity atom $x$ is defined to be measurable if $x;1;x$ is the sum of functional elements and a relation algebra is measurable if $1'$ is the sum of measurable atoms. (Atoms below the identity $1'$ are called subidentity atoms, and an element $f$ is called functional if $f;f \leq 1'$.) Measurable relation algebras are closely related to groups. They are put together from various groups as follows. The non-zero functional elements below $x;1;x$ are atoms and they form a group $G_x$ with identity element $x$ under the operations of $;\mathbin{\wedge}$, and the atoms below $x;1;y$ specify isomorphisms between quotient groups $G_x/H_{xy}$ and $G_y/K_{xy}$, when $x,y$ are distinct subidentity atoms (see [6, p.53], [3] and Section 4 in this paper).

A group pair is defined as a system of groups $G_x$ with normal subgroups $H_{xy}$ and $K_{xy}$, and isomorphisms $\varphi_{xy}$ between quotient groups $G_x/H_{xy}$ and $G_y/K_{xy}$, for $x,y \in I$. When the isomorphisms are linked by certain natural conditions, we can put together the Cayley-representations of the various groups occurring in the group pair $F$ to get a set relation algebra $\mathfrak{S}[F]$. A group frame is a group pair that satisfies the natural conditions, given in this paper as Definition 3.7. The
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algebras $\mathfrak{S}[F]$ constructed from group frames are called (generalized full) *group relation algebras*. Group relation algebras are all measurable, atomic, complete set algebras, with all suprema being union in them (i.e., completely representable). For examples and illustrations see [6] and [3].

An immediate question is whether group relation algebras exhaust the examples of all atomic complete measurable relation algebras.

This paper proves that indeed this is the case when all the groups $G_x$ in the measurable relation algebra are finite and cyclic (Representation Theorem 5.7). Even the conditions of being atomic and complete can be omitted: all measurable relation algebras $\mathfrak{A}$ with finite cyclic groups are atomic and essentially isomorphic to group relation algebras. This latter means that the completion (the minimal complete extension) of $\mathfrak{A}$ is isomorphic to a group relation algebra. The passage to the completion of $\mathfrak{A}$ does not change the structure of $\mathfrak{A}$, it only fills in any missing infinite sums that are needed in order to obtain isomorphism with the necessarily complete full group relation algebra. We note that an atomic measurable relation algebra is essentially isomorphic to a group relation algebra if and only if it is completely representable ([7, Theorems 7.4, 7.6]).

In the case when all the groups are cyclic, the group frame conditions considerably simplify, see Definition 4.1 here. This fact gives measurable relation algebras with finite cyclic groups an especially clear structural description.

The algebras that come up in Theorem 4.30 of Jónsson-Tarski [9] are all measurable with associated groups being one-element. Hence, the hard direction (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) of [9] Theorem 4.30 follows from our Theorem 5.7. Algebras with all the associated groups being cyclic of order one or two also have come up in the literature. We show, in Lemma 5.8, that among atomic relation algebras they are exactly the pair-dense algebras of Maddux [10]. This gives a possibility for giving a new proof for [10, Theorem 51].

An extension of Representation Theorem 5.7 is known. If $\mathfrak{A}$ is a measurable relation algebra in which the group $G_x$ is a product of two finite cyclic groups for each subidentity atom $x$, then $\mathfrak{A}$ is essentially isomorphic to a group relation algebra (this is announced in [6, Theorem 6]). The proof of this extended theorem (due to the authors) is complicated, and will not be given here.

The theorem cannot be extended to the case in which the groups $G_x$ are allowed to be products of three finite cyclic groups. Indeed, an example is presented in [6, pp.56-59], and proved to be nonrepresentable in [11, Theorem 5.2], of a finite measurable relation algebra with five measurable atoms $x$ such that, the group $G_x$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, for all $x$.

There are several other instances in which an atomic measurable relation algebra is essentially isomorphic to a group relation algebra. This proves to be the case, for example, if there are at most four measurable atoms in all. It is also the case if, for every measurable atom $x$, every chain of normal subgroups of $G_x$ has length at most three (so that there cannot be normal subgroups $H$ and $K$ of $G_x$ such that $\{x\} \subseteq H \subseteq K \subseteq G_x$). Another case is when the normal subgroups $K_{xy}$ and $H_{yz}$ are always the same. See [6, pp.56-59].

As an application of some of these ideas, let us paraphrase Maddux’s terminology by calling a relation algebra $n$-dense if it is measurable, and if, for each measurable atom $x$, the group $G_x$ has cardinality at most $n$. Every group of cardinality at most 7 is either cyclic, the product of two cyclic groups, or has no normal subgroup chains.
of length more than three. As a result, we obtain that every 7-dense relation algebra is representable, but there exist 8-dense relation algebras (with five measurable atoms) that are not representable.

The above results are summarized in [6] (without proofs), along with detailed motivation and many illustrations. Readers who wish to learn more about the subject of relation algebras are recommended to look at the books by Hirsch-Hodkinson [8], Maddux [11], or Givant [4], [5].

The remainder of the paper is divided into four sections. Section 2 reviews the necessary relation algebraic background for reading the paper. Throughout the paper, there are references to the earlier papers [3], [1], and [7]; the results needed from those papers are explained as they are encountered. In Section 3, a characterization is given, in terms of a system of simple invariants, of when it is possible to construct a full group relation algebra from a given system of mutually disjoint, finite, cyclic groups. Section 4 discusses the notion of a regular element—a kind of generalization of the notion of an atom—and of the index of such an element. Some important properties of indices are formulated and proved. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to a proof of the main theorem of the paper, namely to Representation Theorem 5.7.

2. Relation Algebras

In the next few sections, most of the calculations will involve the arithmetic of relation algebras. This section provides a review of the essential results that will be needed.

A relation algebra is an algebra of the form

$$\mathfrak{A} = (A, +, -, ;, \sim, 1'),$$

where + and ; are binary operations called addition and relative multiplication, while - and \(\sim\) are unary operations called complement and converse, and 1’ is a distinguished constant called the identity element, such that ten equational axioms hold in \(\mathfrak{A}\). The exact nature of these axioms is not important for the present discussion. Further operations and relations such as Boolean multiplication \(\cdot\) and the Boolean partial order relation \(\leq\) are defined in the standard way. The following laws, which are either members of Tarski’s ten axioms or are derivable from them, play a role in this paper. For their derivation, see e.g., [4].

**Lemma 2.1.** If \(\mathfrak{A} = (A, +, -, ;, \sim, 1')\) is a relation algebra, then \((A, +, \sim)\) is a Boolean algebra, and the operation of converse is an automorphism of this Boolean algebra. In particular, the following laws hold.

(i) \((a + b)^\sim = a^\sim + b^\sim\).
(ii) \((a \cdot b)^\sim = a^\sim \cdot b^\sim\).
(iii) \(a \leq b\) if and only if \(a^\sim \leq b^\sim\).
(iv) \(a\) is an atom if and only if \(a^\sim\) is an atom.
(v) \(x^\sim = x\) and \(x; x = x\) whenever \(x\) is a subidentity element.

Properties (i) and (iii) are called the distributive and monotony laws for converse.

**Lemma 2.2.**

(i) \(r; (s; t) = (r; s); t\).
(ii) \(r; 1' = r\).
(iii) \(r^\sim \sim = r\).
These properties are commonly referred to by the following names: the associative law for relative multiplication, the (right-hand) identity law for relative multiplication, the first involution law, the second involution law, the (right-hand) distributive law for relative multiplication, and the monotony law for relative multiplication. An element \( x \) in \( \mathcal{A} \) is called a subidentity element if it is below the identity element, in symbols \( x \leq 1' \). Whenever parentheses indicating the order of performing operations are lacking, it is understood that unary operations have priority over binary operations, and multiplications have priority over addition.

A square is an element of the form \( x; 1; x \) for some subidentity element \( x \), and a rectangle is an element of the form \( x; 1; y \) for some subidentity elements \( x \) and \( y \). The elements \( x \) and \( y \) are sometimes referred to as the sides of the rectangle.

Lemma 2.3. Let \( x, y, z, w \) be subidentity elements.
(i) \( (x; 1; y) = y; 1; x \).
(ii) \( (x; 1; y); b \leq x; 1; z \) for every \( b \leq y; 1; z \), and equality holds whenever \( x, y, \) and \( z \) are atoms, and \( x; 1; y \) and \( b \) are both non-zero.
(iii) If \( x \) and \( y \) are subidentity atoms, and if \( 0 \leq b \leq x; 1; y \), then \( x; b = b; y = b \).

3. Group relation algebras with finite cyclic groups

Let \( G = \langle G_x : x \in I \rangle \) be a system of pairwise disjoint, finite, cyclic groups \((G_x, \ast, \cdot, e_x)\), and

\[
m = \langle m_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle,
\]

a system of positive integers indexed by an equivalence relation \( \mathcal{E} \) on the index set \( I \). We may assume that for each \( x \) in \( I \), the cyclic group \( G_x \) is a copy of the cyclic group \( \mathbb{Z}_{n_x} \) of integers modulo \( n_x \) for some positive integer \( n_x \). We shall usually act and write as if the two groups were identical, although technically it is important to pass to a copy of \( \mathbb{Z}_{n_x} \) in order to achieve the assumed disjointness of the groups in the system \( G \). The greatest common divisor of two numbers \( m, n \) is denoted by \( \gcd(m, n) \). For the following definition see also [6, p.51].

Definition 3.1. The system of indices

\[
m = \langle m_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle,
\]

is said to satisfy the index conditions if the following conditions hold.

(i) \( m_{xy} \) is a common divisor of the orders of \( G_x \) and \( G_y \).
(ii) \( m_{xx} \) is equal to the order of \( G_x \).
(iii) \( m_{yx} = m_{xy} \).
(iv) \( \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}) = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{xz}) = \gcd(m_{xz}, m_{yz}) \).

Assume \( m \) does satisfy the index conditions, and write

\[
d = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{xz}) = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}).
\]

This equation holds because of index condition (iv). For each pair \((x, y)\) in \( \mathcal{E} \), take \( H_{xy} \) and \( K_{xy} \) be the respective subgroups of \( G_x \) and \( G_y \) that consist of the multiples of \( m_{xy} \). This definition makes sense because of the first index condition. It follows
that $H_{xy}$ and $K_{xy}$ have index $m_{xy}$ in $G_x$ and $G_y$ respectively, that is to say, they each have $m_{xy}$ cosets, in symbols,

$$m_{xy} = |G_x/H_{xy}| = |G_y/K_{xy}|.$$  

Notice that these subgroups are always normal, since the groups in the system $G$ are all cyclic, and hence Abelian. Because $m_{xy}$ is the index in $G_x$ of the subgroup $H_{xy}$, this subgroup must consist of the multiples of the integer $m_{xy}$ modulo $n_x$. In particular, the cosets of $H_{xy}$ are the sets of the form

$$H_{xy} + \ell = \{pm_{xy} + \ell : p < n_x/m_{xy}\}$$  

for $\ell < m_{xy}$.

The composite group

$$H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} = \{h \circ k : h \in H_{xy} \text{ and } k \in H_{xz}\}$$

consists of the multiples of $d$ modulo $n_x$, and the cosets of $H_{xy} \circ H_{xz}$ are the sets of the form

$$H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s$$

for $0 \leq s < d$.

\textbf{Lemma 3.2.} For each integer $s$ with $0 \leq s < d$,

$$H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s = \bigcup \{H_{xy} + \ell : 0 \leq \ell < m_{xy} \text{ and } \ell \equiv s \mod d\}$$

$$= \bigcup \{H_{xy} + qd + s : q < m_{xy}/d\}.$$

\textit{Proof.} Each non-negative integer $\ell < m_{xy}$ can be written in one and only one way in the form

$$\ell = qd + s$$

for some integers $s$ and $q$ satisfying $0 \leq s < d$ and $0 \leq q < m_{xy}/d$, by the division algorithm for integers, so the second equality of the lemma is clear.

Observe that $H_{xy}$ is included in the composite group $H_{xy} \circ H_{xz}$. Also, $d$ generates the composite group, so $qd$ is in the composite group for every integer $q$ with $0 \leq q < m_{xy}/d$. Combine these observations to see that

$$H_{xy} + qd \subseteq H_{xy} \circ H_{xz},$$

and therefore

$$H_{xy} + qd + s \subseteq H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s,$$

for every $s < d$ and every $q < m_{xy}/d$. It follows that

(1) \[ \bigcup \{H_{xy} + qd + s : q < m_{xy}/d\} \subseteq H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s, \]

for every $s < d$.

The cosets that make up the union on the left side of (1) partition $G_x$ as $q$ and $s$ vary, since there are assumed to be $m_{xy}$ such cosets, one for each $\ell = qd + s < m_{xy}$. Also the cosets on the right partition $G_x$ as $s$ varies. It follows that equality must hold in (1). In more detail, if $f$ belongs to the right side of (1), then $f \equiv s \mod d$. Consequently, $f$ cannot belong to any of the cosets $H_{xy} + qd + t$ for $0 \leq t < d$ and $t \neq s$, since the elements in these cosets are congruent to $t$ modulo $d$. Thus, $f$ must belong to $H_{xy} + qd + s$ for some $q$ with $0 \leq q < m_{xy}/d$. \qed
One sees in a similar fashion that the subgroup $K_{xy}$ has $n_y/m_{xy}$ elements and $m_{xy}$ cosets, which have the form $K_{xy} + \ell$ for $\ell < m_{xy}$. The composite subgroup $K_{xy} \circ H_{yz}$ is generated by $d$, and has $n_y/d$ elements and $d$ cosets
\[
K_{xy} \circ H_{yz} + s
\]
for $0 \leq s < d$. The proof of the next lemma is very similar to that of Lemma 3.2 and will therefore be omitted.

**Lemma 3.3.** For each integer $s$ with $0 \leq s < d$,
\[
K_{xy} \circ H_{yz} + s = \bigcup \{K_{xy} + \ell : 0 \leq \ell < m_{xy} \text{ and } \ell \equiv s \mod d\}
\]
\[
= \bigcup \{K_{xy} + qd + s : q < m_{xy}/d\}.
\]

Define a mapping $\varphi_{xy}$ from $G_z/H_{xy}$ to $G_y/K_{xy}$ by
\[
\varphi_{xy}(H_{xy} + \ell) = K_{xy} + \ell
\]
for $0 \leq \ell < m_{xy}$. The mapping is certainly a bijection, by the preceding remarks, and it maps the generator $H_{xy} + 1$ of the quotient group $G_z/H_{xy}$ to the generator $K_{xy} + 1$ of the quotient group $G_y/K_{xy}$, so it must be an isomorphism, as is easy to check directly. This isomorphism induces an isomorphism $\hat{\varphi}_{xy}$ from $G_z/(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz})$ to $G_y/(K_{xy} \circ H_{yz})$.

**Lemma 3.4.** $\hat{\varphi}_{xy}(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s) = K_{xy} \circ H_{yz} + s$ for $0 \leq s < d$.

**Proof.** Use the definition of $\hat{\varphi}_{xy}$, Lemma 3.2, the definition of $\varphi_{xy}$, and Lemma 3.3 to obtain
\[
\hat{\varphi}_{xy}(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s) = \varphi_{xy}[\bigcup \{H_{xy} + qd + s : 0 \leq q < m_{xy}/d\}]
\]
\[
= \bigcup \{\varphi_{xy}(H_{xy} + qd + s) : 0 \leq q < m_{xy}/d\}
\]
\[
= \bigcup \{K_{xy} + qd + s : 0 \leq q < m_{xy}/d\}
\]
\[
= K_{xy} \circ H_{yz} + s.
\]

In a similar fashion, there is a quotient isomorphism $\varphi_{yz}$ from $G_y/H_{yz}$ to $G_z/K_{yz}$ that is defined by
\[
\varphi_{yz}(H_{yz} + \ell) = K_{yz} + \ell
\]
for $0 \leq \ell < m_{yz}$. This isomorphism, in turn, induces an isomorphism $\hat{\varphi}_{yz}$ from $G_y/(K_{xy} \circ H_{yz})$ to $G_z(K_{xz} \circ K_{yz})$ that satisfies the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.5.** $\hat{\varphi}_{yz}(K_{xy} \circ H_{yz} + s) = K_{xz} \circ K_{yz} + s$ for $0 \leq s < d$.

Finally, there is a quotient isomorphism $\varphi_{xz}$ from $G_z/H_{xz}$ to $G_z/K_{xz}$ that is defined by
\[
\varphi_{xz}(H_{xz} + \ell) = K_{xz} + \ell
\]
for $0 \leq \ell < m_{xz}$. This isomorphism induces an isomorphism $\hat{\varphi}_{xz}$ from $G_z/(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz})$ to $G_z(K_{xz} \circ K_{yz})$ that satisfies the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.6.** $\hat{\varphi}_{xz}(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s) = K_{xz} \circ K_{yz} + s$ for $0 \leq s < d$.

The following definition is from [6, Definition 1], see also [3, Definition 4.1]).

**Definition 3.7.** A group frame is a group pair
\[
\mathcal{F} = (\langle G_z : x \in I \rangle, \langle \varphi_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle)
\]
satisfying the following frame conditions for all pairs $(x, y)$ and $(y, z)$ in $\mathcal{E}$.
(i) \( \varphi_{xx} \) is the identity automorphism of \( G_x/\{e_x\} \) for all \( x \).
(ii) \( \varphi_{yx} = \varphi_{yx}^{-1} \).
(iii) \( \varphi_{xy}[H_{xy} \circ H_{xz}] = K_{xy} \circ H_{yz} \).
(iv) \( \hat{\varphi}_{yz} \circ \hat{\varphi}_{yx} = \hat{\varphi}_{xz} \).

\[ \square \]

It is shown in [3] that this definition gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a group pair \( \mathcal{F} \) to give rise to a group relation algebra \( \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}] \). We recall the definition of \( \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}] \) from [6, 3]. Suppose that \( (H_{xy,\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa_{xy}) \) is a listing of the cosets of \( H_{xy} \) in \( G_x \). Define

\[ R_{xy,\alpha} = \bigcup_{\gamma < \kappa_{xy}} H_{xy,\gamma} \times \varphi_{xy}(H_{xy,\gamma} \circ H_{xy,\alpha}) \]

Let \( A \) be the set of all binary relations of form \( \bigcup \{ R_{xy,\alpha} : (x, y, \alpha) \in X \} \), where \( X \subseteq \{(x, y, \alpha) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } \alpha < \kappa_{xy}\} \). When \( \mathcal{F} \) is a group frame, then \( A \) is a set of binary relations that is closed under the Boolean set-theoretic operations, that contains the identity relation on \( \bigcup \{ G_x : x \in I \} \), and that is closed under the operations of forming the composition of two binary relations and the converse of a binary relation. The set relation algebra with universe \( A \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}] \). It is easy to see that each supremum in \( \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}] \) is indeed a union, so \( \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}] \) is completely represented.

Theorem 3.8 (GCD Theorem). Let \( G = \langle G_x : x \in I \rangle \) be a system of mutually disjoint, finite, cyclic groups, and \( \mathcal{E} \) an equivalence relation on \( I \). For each system

\[ m = \langle m_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle \]

of positive integers satisfying the index conditions, there exists a system of quotient isomorphisms \( \varphi = \langle \varphi_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle \) such that the group pair \( \mathcal{F} = (G, \varphi) \) satisfies the four frame conditions and is therefore a group frame. The corresponding group relation algebra \( \mathcal{G}[\mathcal{F}] \) therefore exists. Moreover,

\[ m_{xy} = |G_x|/H_{xy}|, \]

where \( H_{xy} \) is the kernel of \( \varphi_{xy} \).

Proof. Consider, first, frame condition (i). Index condition (ii) implies that \( m_{xx} \) coincides with the cardinality \( n_x \) of the group. The subgroups \( H_{xz} \) and \( K_{xz} \) consist of the multiples of \( m_{xx} \) in \( G_x \), so they must be the trivial subgroup \( \{0\} \). The definition of \( \varphi_{xx} \) and the natures of \( H_{xz} \) and \( K_{xz} \) imply that

\[ \varphi_{xx}(\{\ell\}) = \varphi_{xx}(H_{xz} + \ell) = K_{xz} + \ell = \{\ell\}, \]

so \( \varphi_{xx} \) is the identity automorphism of \( G_x/\{0\} \). Thus, frame condition (i) holds.

Turn now to frame condition (ii). The subgroup \( H_{yx} \) is defined to be the set of multiples of \( m_{yx} \) in \( G_y \), and the subgroup \( K_{yx} \) is defined to be the set of multiples of \( m_{xy} \) in \( G_y \). Index condition (ii) says that \( m_{yx} = m_{xy} \), so \( H_{yx} = K_{xy} \), and similarly, \( K_{yz} = H_{xy} \). Furthermore,

\[ \varphi_{yx}(H_{xy} + \ell) = K_{yx} + \ell, \]

by the definition of \( \varphi_{yx} \), while

\[ \varphi_{xy}(K_{yx} + \ell) = \varphi_{xy}(H_{xy} + \ell) = K_{xy} + \ell = H_{yx} + \ell, \]

by the preceding remarks and the definition of \( \varphi_{xy} \). Combine these observations to conclude that \( \varphi_{yx} = \varphi_{xy}^{-1} \), which is what frame condition (ii) asserts.
To verify frame condition (iii), just take $s = 0$ in Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5. In a similar fashion, frame condition (iv) follows from Lemmas 3.4–3.6, because
\[
(\hat{\phi}_{xy} | \hat{\phi}_{yz})(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s) = \hat{\phi}_{yz}(\hat{\phi}_{xy}(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s)) = \hat{\phi}_{yz}(K_{xy} \circ H_{yz} + s) = K_{xz} \circ K_{yz} + s,
\]
by the definition of the relational composition of two functions, and Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, while
\[
\hat{\phi}_{xz}(H_{xy} \circ H_{xz} + s) = K_{xz} \circ K_{yz} + s,
\]
by Lemma 3.6.

It is helpful to visualize index conditions (ii)-(iv) by making a diagram such as the one in Figure 1. Condition (ii) says that each square in the diagram that is on the line $y = x$ (the identity relation) carries the same number as the cardinality of the corresponding group. In the example given in Figure 1 each such square is labeled with the same number 6, because each group is assumed to have cardinality 6, but of course in other examples different groups may have different cardinalities. Condition (iii) says that the diagram must be symmetric across the line $y = x$. To check the validity of condition (iv), it must be shown that any two of any three given indices $m_{rs}$, $m_{rt}$, $m_{st}$ have the same greatest common divisor as any other two of the given indices. This can be checked one column at a time. Take two numbers that are in the $r$th column, $m_{rs}$ and $m_{rt}$, and then use either row $s$ (if $s$ is to the left of $t$ in the column listing) or row $t$ (if $t$ is to the left of $s$ in the column listing) to locate $m_{st}$ or $m_{ts}$ respectively (it doesn’t matter which one because the two indices must be equal), by going along the row to the right until the appropriate column is reached. For a concrete example, observe that in the $u$th column, $m_{uv} = 3$ and $m_{uy} = 2$. Since $y$ is to the left of $v$ in the column listing, go to the $y$th row, and move right to the $v$th column. The entry there is $m_{vy} = 1$. Any two of the three numbers 3, 2, and 1 have the same greatest common divisor, namely 1.
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Figure 1. A graphical example of verifying the index conditions.

There is a kind of converse to the GCD Theorem that is true.
Theorem 3.9. Suppose that a group pair \( F = (G, \varphi) \) consists of finite, cyclic groups, with
\[
G = \langle G_x : x \in I \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi = \langle \varphi_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle,
\]
and satisfies the four frame conditions. If
\[
m_{xy} = |G_x/H_{xy}|
\]
for every pair \((x, y)\) in \( \mathcal{E} \), where \( H_{xy} \) is the kernel of \( \varphi_{xy} \), then the resulting system
\[
m = \langle m_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle
\]
satisfies the index conditions.

Proof. Index condition (i) is satisfied, by the very definition of \( m_{xy} \). As regards index condition (ii), it follows from frame condition (i). In more detail, \( \varphi_{xx} \) is the identity automorphism of \( G_x/\{0\} \), by frame condition (i), so \( H_{xx} = \{0\} \) and therefore
\[
m_{xx} = |G_x/H_{xx}| = |G_x|.
\]
Frame condition (ii) says that \( \varphi_{yx} = \varphi_{xy}^{-1} \). In particular,
\[
H_{yx} = K_{xy}
\]
and therefore
\[
m_{yx} = |G_y/K_{yx}| = |G_y/H_{yx}| = m_{xy}.
\]

Turn now to index condition (iv). Because \( m_{xy} \) is the index of \( H_{xy} \) in \( G_x \), the subgroup \( H_{xy} \) must consist of the multiples of \( m_{xy} \) modulo \( n_x \). Similarly, \( H_{xz} \) must consist of the multiples of \( m_{xz} \) modulo \( n_x \). It follows from cyclic group theory that the composite group \( H_{xy} \ast H_{xz} \) is generated by \( d = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{xz}) \), and therefore
\[
d = |G_x/(H_{xy} \ast H_{xz})|.
\]

Similar arguments show that \( K_{xz} \ast K_{yz} \) is generated by \( d' = \gcd(m_{xz}, m_{yz}) \), so that
\[
d' = |G_y/(K_{xz} \ast K_{yz})|,
\]
and \( K_{zx} \ast K_{zy} \) is generated by \( d'' = \gcd(m_{zx}, m_{zy}) \), so that
\[
d'' = |G_z/(K_{zx} \ast K_{zy})|.
\]
The induced isomorphism \( \hat{\varphi}_{xy} \) maps the quotient \( G_x/(H_{xy} \ast H_{xz}) \) isomorphically to the quotient \( G_y/(K_{xz} \ast K_{yz}) \), by frame condition (iii), so \( (1) \) and \( (2) \) imply that \( d = d' \). Similarly, the induced isomorphism \( \hat{\varphi}_{yz} \) maps the quotient \( G_y/(K_{xy} \ast H_{yz}) \) isomorphically to the quotient \( G_z/(K_{xz} \ast K_{zy}) \), so \( (2) \) and \( (3) \) imply that \( d' = d'' \). Combine these observations with the definitions of \( d, d', \) and \( d'' \) to conclude that index condition (iv) holds.

4. Regular elements and indices

We now fix a measurable relation algebra \( \mathfrak{A} \). Thus, the identity element in \( \mathfrak{A} \) is the sum of a set \( I \) of subidentity atoms, and each atom \( x \) in \( I \) is measurable in the sense that the square \( x; 1; x \) is a sum of non-zero functions below it. These functions are atoms and form a group \( G_x \) under the operations of relative multiplication and converse in \( \mathfrak{A} \), with \( x \) as the group identity element, by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 in [7].
We assume that each such group is finite and cyclic. All elements are assumed to be in $\mathfrak{A}$. The left and right stabilizers of an element $a$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ are the sets

$$H_a = \{ f \in G_x : f; a = a \} \quad \text{and} \quad K_a = \{ g \in G_y : a; g = a \},$$

and these stabilizers are (normal) subgroups of $G_x$ and $G_y$ respectively. For measurable atoms $x$ and $y$, an element $a \leq x; 1; y$ is called regular if

$$a; a^- = \sum H_a \quad \text{and} \quad a^-; a = \sum R_a.$$

It turns out that regular elements have some of the properties of atoms. In particular, every atom is regular, by Partition Lemma 4.11 in [7].

**Definition 4.1.** For each regular element $a$, define the index of $a$ to be the cardinality of the quotient algebra $G_x/H_a$, in symbols,

$$\text{index}(a) = |G_x/H_a| = |G_y/K_a|.$$

In other words, the index of $a$ is the number of cosets that the normal subgroup $H_a$ has in $G_x$, or, equivalently, that the normal subgroup $K_a$ has in $G_y$. Moreover, for every coset $H$ of $H_a$ there is a uniquely determined coset $K$ of $K_a$ such that

$$H; a = a; K,$$

and conversely, so that the function $\varphi_a$ from $G_x/H_a$ to $G_y/K_a$ defined by

$$\varphi_a(H) = K \quad \text{if and only if} \quad H; a = a; K$$

is a bijection, and actually a quotient isomorphism.

**Lemma 4.2.** If $G_y$ is a cyclic group, and $a \leq x; 1; y$ and $b \leq y; 1; z$ are regular elements, then $a; b \leq x; 1; y$ are regular elements, and

$$\text{index}(a; b) = \gcd(\text{index}(a), \text{index}(b)).$$

**Proof.** For notational convenience, assume that $G_y$ is the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_n$, under the operation of addition modulo $n$, and write

1. $k = \text{index}(a) = |G_y/K_a|$ \quad and \quad $\ell = \text{index}(b) = |G_y/H_b|$.

Thus, $K_a$ and $H_b$ consist of the multiples of $k$ and $\ell$ modulo $n$ respectively. The complex product

$$K_a; H_b = \{ f : f \in K_a \text{ and } g \in H_b \}$$

consists of the multiples of $\gcd(k, \ell)$ modulo $n$, by cyclic group theory. Consequently,

2. $|G_y/(K_a; H_b)| = \gcd(k, \ell) = \gcd(\text{index}(a), \text{index}(b))$,

by cyclic group theory and [1]. According to Relative Product Theorem 5.14 in [7], $a; b$ is a regular element, and the isomorphism $\varphi_a$ from $G_x/H_a$ to $G_y/K_a$ induces an isomorphism $\hat{\varphi}_a$ from $G_x/H_a; b$ to $G_y/(K_a; H_b)$. In particular,

3. $|G_y/H_a; b| = |G_x/(K_a; H_b)|$.

By definition,

4. $\text{index}(a; b) = |G_x/H_a; b|$.

Combine (2)–(4) to arrive at the desired equation. \hfill \square

**Lemma 4.3.** Let $x$ and $y$ be measurable atoms, and $a, b \leq x; 1; y$ regular elements with $a \leq b$. If $\text{index}(a) = \text{index}(b)$, then $a = b$. \hfill \square
Proof. The assumption \( a \leq b \) implies that
\[
H_a \subseteq H_b,
\]
by Lemma 4.14 in [7]. The assumption on the indices implies that \( H_a \) and \( H_b \) have the same number of cosets in \( G_x \). These cosets partition \( G_x \), so it follows from (1) that the inclusion symbol in (1) may be replaced by equality. Apply (the reverse implication of) Lemma 4.14 from [7] to conclude that \( a = b \). \( \square \)

The next lemma is a known result from cyclic group theory.

**Lemma 4.4.** If \( H \) and \( K \) are subgroups of \( \mathbb{Z}_n \) with relatively prime indices \( h \) and \( k \), then \( \mathbb{Z}_n = H \cdot K \), and the cosets of \( H \cap K \) in \( \mathbb{Z}_n \) are the sets \((H + i) \cap (K + j)\) for \( 0 \leq i < h \) and \( 0 \leq j < k \). Each coset has \( n/(h \cdot k) \) elements.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \( x \) and \( y \) be measurable atoms, and assume that \( a, b \leq x; 1; y \) are regular elements with \( a \cdot b \neq 0 \). If index\((a)\) and index\((b)\) are relatively prime, then
\[
\text{index}(a \cdot b) = \text{index}(a) \cdot \text{index}(b).
\]

**Proof.** Product Theorem 4.13 from [7] and the hypothesis that \( a \cdot b \neq 0 \) imply that
\[
(1) \quad H_{a,b} = H_a \cap H_b.
\]
The cosets of \( H_a \) and \( H_b \) have the form \( H_a + i \) and \( H_b + j \) for \( 0 \leq i < \text{index}(a) \) and \( 0 \leq j < \text{index}(b) \) respectively. Apply Lemma 4.4 (with \( H_a \) and \( H_b \) in place of \( H \) and \( K \) respectively), and use the assumption that the indices of \( a \) and \( b \) are relatively prime, to see that
\[
\langle (H_a + i) \cap (H_b + j) : i < \text{index}(a) \text{ and } j < \text{index}(b) \rangle
\]
is a coset system for (1) in \( G_x \), consisting of \( \text{index}(a) \cdot \text{index}(b) \) cosets, and each coset has \( \ell \) elements, where
\[
|G_x| = n_x = \text{index}(a) \cdot \text{index}(b) \cdot \ell.
\]
Consequently, the index of (1) in \( G_x \) is
\[
(2) \quad |G_x/(H_a \cap H_b)| = \text{index}(a) \cdot \text{index}(b),
\]
by the definition of the index. Apply (1), (2), and the definition of the index of an element to conclude that
\[
\text{index}(a \cdot b) = |G_x/H_{a,b}| = |G_x/(H_a \cap H_b)| = \text{index}(a) \cdot \text{index}(b).
\]
\( \square \)

**Corollary 4.6.** Let \( x \) and \( y \) be measurable atoms. If \( a_i \leq x; 1; y \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) are regular elements with pairwise relatively prime indices, and if \( \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i \neq 0 \), then
\[
\text{index}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \text{index}(a_i).
\]

The proof is by induction on \( n \). The details are left to the reader. Observe that the symbol \( \prod \) is being used in two different ways in the preceding corollary. In its first occurrence, it denotes the Boolean operation of multiplication on finite sequences of elements in a Boolean algebra. In its second occurrence, it denotes the arithmetic operation of multiplication on finite sequences of natural numbers. This double usage of the symbol is very common and should not cause readers any confusion. A similar remark applies to the use of the symbol \( \cdot \) in Lemma 4.5.
Lemma 4.7. Let \( x \) and \( y \) be measurable atoms, and \( a, b \leq x; 1; y \) regular elements. If the indices of \( a \) and \( b \) are relatively prime, then \( a \cdot b \) is a regular element below \( x; 1; y \).

Proof. The assumption on the indices of \( a \) and \( b \) implies that the left stabilizers \( H_a \) and \( H_b \) have relatively prime indices, and therefore

\[
H_a; b = H_b; H_a = G_x,
\]

by Lemma 4.4. The definition of \( H_b \) as the left stabilizer of \( b \) means that

\[
H_b; b = b.
\]

Consequently,

\[
\sum H_a; b = \sum H_a; H_b; b = \sum G_x; b = (x; 1; x); b = x; 1; y,
\]

by (2), (1), the fact that \( \sum G_x = x; 1; x \), by Corollary 3.5 in [7], and Lemma 2.3(ii).

Similarly,

\[
\sum H_b; a = \sum H_b; H_a; a = \sum G_x; a = (x; 1; x); a = x; 1; y.
\]

Combine (3) and (4) to arrive at

\[
\sum H_a; b = \sum H_b; a.
\]

Use the assumption that \( a \) and \( b \) are regular elements, together with the definition of such elements, and apply it to (5) to obtain

\[
a; a \overset{\_}{\_}; b = b; b \overset{\_}{\_}; a.
\]

Part (i) of Product Theorem 4.18 in [7] says that the condition in (6) is equivalent to the assertion that \( a \cdot b \neq 0 \). Apply Product Theorem 4.13 from [7] to conclude that \( a \cdot b \) is a regular element below \( x; 1; y \).

Corollary 4.8. Let \( x \) and \( y \) be measurable atoms. If \( a_i \leq x; 1; y \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) are regular elements with pairwise relatively prime indices, then \( \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i \) is a regular element below \( x; 1; y \).

The proof is by induction on \( n \). The details are left to the reader.

5. The representation theorem

We continue with the assumption that \( A \) is a measurable relation algebra. The assumption that the groups are finite and cyclic implies that the algebra \( A \) is finitely measurable, and hence automatically atomic, by Theorem 8.3 in [7]. The goal is to show that \( A \) is essentially isomorphic to a group relation algebra \( \mathcal{G}[F] \) for one of the group frames \( F \) constructed in GCD Theorem 3.8. This means that we must show that the completion of \( A \) (in the sense of the minimal complete extension of \( A \)) is isomorphic to \( \mathcal{G}[F] \). Scaffold Representation Theorem 7.4 in [7] says that an atomic measurable relation algebra \( \mathfrak{A} \) is essentially isomorphic to some group relation algebra if and only if it has a scaffold. A scaffold in \( \mathfrak{A} \) is a system \( \langle a_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle \) of atoms in \( \mathfrak{A} \) that satisfies the following conditions for all \( (x, y) \) and \( (y, z) \) in \( \mathcal{E} \).

(i) \( a_{xx} = x \).

(ii) \( a_{yx} = a_{xy} \).
Thus, to prove the desired representation theorem for $\mathfrak{A}$, it suffices to construct a scaffold in $\mathfrak{A}$.

Fix measurable atoms $x$ and $y$ in $\mathfrak{A}$ with $(x,y)$ in $\mathcal{E}$, and consider a regular element $a \leq x; 1; y$. Regular elements are always non-zero, by Lemma 4.4 in [7], so $a \neq 0$. If functions $f$ and $g$ belong to the same coset $H$ of $H_a$, then the left translations $f; a$ and $g; a$ of $a$ are equal, and if they belong to different cosets of $H_a$, then $(f; a) \cdot (g; a) = 0$, by Lemma 4.6(iii) in [7]. Thus, it makes sense to write $H; a$ whenever $H$ is a coset of $H_a$, and this just denotes the element $f; a$ for some (any) element $f$ in $H$. The left translations $b = H; a$ by cosets $H$ of $H_a$ are mutually disjoint, regular elements below $x; 1; y$ with the same normal stabilizer $H_a$ as $a$, and in fact these left translations form a partition of $x; 1; y$, by Partition Lemma 4.9 in [7]. Similar remarks apply to the right translations $a; K$ of $a$ by cosets $K$ of $K_a$ (in $G_y$).

Since $\mathfrak{A}$ is atomic, there must be an atom below $x; 1; y$, and such atoms are regular elements with the same stabilizer, by Partition Lemma 4.11 in [7]. Write $H_{xy}$ and $K_{xy}$ for the left and right stabilizer of these atoms, and for a fixed atom $a$, write $\varphi_{xy}$ for the quotient isomorphism $\varphi_a$. The choice of $\varphi_{xy}$ is dependent on $a$, but a system of atoms can be chosen with the following properties (see, for example, the remarks in Section 7 of [7]).

(P1) $H_{xx} = \{x\}$, and $\varphi_{xx}$ is the identity isomorphism of $G_x/H_{xx}$.
(P2) $H_{yy} = K_{yy}$, $K_{yx} = H_{xy}$, and $\varphi_{yz} = \varphi_{xy}^{-1}$.
(P3) $\varphi_{xy}[H_{xy}; H_{xx}] = K_{xy}; H_{yy}$, and $\varphi_{yz}[K_{xy}; H_{yy}] = K_{xx}; K_{yx}$, and $\varphi_{zx}[H_{zy}; H_{xz}] = K_{zx}; K_{yz}$.
(P4) $|G_x/(H_{xy}; H_{xx})| = |G_y/(K_{xy}; H_{yy})| = |G_z/(K_{xx}; K_{yx})|$.

In fact, the isomorphism $\varphi_{xy}$ induces an isomorphism $\hat{\varphi}_{xy}$ from $G_x/(H_{xy}; H_{xx})$ to $G_y/(K_{xy}; H_{yy})$, while $\varphi_{yz}$ induces an isomorphism $\hat{\varphi}_{yz}$ from $G_y/(K_{xy}; H_{yy})$ to $G_z/(K_{xx}; K_{yx})$. Property (P4) is an immediate consequence of this observation.

Put $m_{xy} = |G_x/H_{xy}|$.

**Lemma 5.1 (Index Lemma).** Suppose $(x,y)$ and $(y,z)$ are pairs of measurable atoms in $\mathcal{E}$.

(i) $m_{xx} = |G_x/H_{xx}| = |G_x/\{x\}| = |G_x|$
(ii) $m_{yx} = m_{xy}$.
(iii) $\gcd(m_{xy}, m_{xz}) = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}) = \gcd(m_{xz}, m_{yz})$.

**Proof.** Property (P1) and the definition of $m_{xx}$ imply that $m_{xx} = |G_x/H_{xx}| = |G_x/\{0\}| = |G_x|$.

Property (P2) and the definitions of $m_{xy}$ and $m_{yz}$ imply that $m_{yx} = |G_y/H_{yx}| = |G_y/K_{xy}| = |G_x/H_{xy}| = m_{xy}$.

Since $H_{xy}$ and $H_{xz}$ have indices $m_{xy}$ and $m_{xz}$, they are respectively generated by (copies of) the integers $m_{xy}$ and $m_{xz}$ modulo $n_x$. Consequently, the group composition $H_{xy}; H_{xz}$ (under the operation of relative multiplication in $\mathfrak{A}$) is generated by the element $\gcd(m_{xy}, m_{xz})$, so that

$$\gcd(m_{xy}, m_{xz}) = |G_x/(H_{xy}; H_{xz})|.$$
Similarly,

\[(2) \quad \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}) = |\mathcal{G}_y/(\mathcal{K}_{xy}; H_{yz})|.
\]

\[(3) \quad \gcd(m_{xz}, m_{yz}) = |\mathcal{G}_z/(\mathcal{K}_{xz}; K_{yz})|.
\]

Combine (1)–(3) with property (P4) to arrive at (iii). \(\square\)

Fix a prime number \(p\) for the next definition and two lemmas, and in terms of this prime, define a binary relation \(\sim_k\) as follows.

**Definition 5.2.** For \(x\) and \(y\) in \(I\), define \(x \sim_k y\) if and only if \(x = y\), or \((x, y)\) is in \(E\) and \(p^k\) divides \(m_{xy}\).

**Lemma 5.3.** The relation \(\sim_k\) is an equivalence relation on the set \(I\).

**Proof.** The relation is automatically reflexive, by its very definition. For symmetry, suppose that \(x \sim_k y\) and \(x \neq y\). In this case \((x, y)\) belongs to \(E\) and \(p^k\) divides \(m_{xy}\). The relation \(E\) is symmetric, so it contains \((y, x)\), and \(m_{yx} = m_{xy}\), so \(p^k\) divides \(m_{yx}\). Thus, \(y \sim_k x\), by Definition 5.2.

Turn now to transitivity. Assume that \(x \sim_k y\) and \(y \sim_k z\). If two of these atoms are equal, then the proof of transitivity is trivial, so suppose that all three atoms are distinct. The hypotheses and Definition 5.2 imply that \(p^k\) divides \(m_{xy}\) and \(m_{yz}\), so it divides their greatest common divisor. Since \(\gcd(m_{xz}, m_{yz}) = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz})\) by Index Lemma 5.1, it follows that \(p^k\) divides \(m_{xz}\). Also, \(E\) is transitive, so the pair \((x, z)\) is in \(E\). Therefore, \(x \sim_k z\), by Definition 5.2. \(\square\)

**Lemma 5.4.** For each prime \(p\), there is a system of elements

\[\langle a^k_{xy} : k \geq 0 \text{ and } x \sim_k y \rangle\]

with the following properties whenever \(x \sim_k y\) and \(y \sim_k z\).

\[(i) \quad a^k_{xy} \text{ is a regular element below } x; 1; y, \text{ and } a^k_{xy} = x; 1; y \text{ when } x \neq y \text{ and } k = 0.
\]

\[(ii) \quad \text{If } x = y, \text{ then } a^k_{xy} = x.
\]

\[(iii) \quad \text{If } x \neq y, \text{ then } \text{index}(a^k_{xy}) = p^k.
\]

\[(iv) \quad a^k_{yx} = (a^k_{xy})^{-}.\]

\[(v) \quad a^k_{xz} \leq a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz}, \text{ and equality holds when } x \neq z.
\]

\[(vi) \quad a^k_{xy} \leq a^{k-1}_{xy} \text{ for } k \geq 1.
\]

**Proof.** The construction is by induction on \(k\) starting at \(k = 0\). In this case, the definition of \(a^k_{xy}\) is dictated by the first two conditions:

\[(1) \quad a^0_{xy} = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x = y, \\ x; 1; y & \text{if } x \neq y. \end{cases}
\]

It is not difficult to verify that in this case properties (i)–(vi) hold. If \(x = y\), then the element \(x \leq x; 1; x\) is regular with left and right stabilizers \{\(x\)\}. If \(x \neq y\), then \(x; 1; y\) is regular with left and right stabilizers \(G_x\) and \(G_y\) respectively. Consequently,

\[\text{index}(a^k_{xy}) = |G_x/G_x| = 1 = p^0,
\]

so properties (i)–(iii) hold.
For property (iv), observe that if \( x = y \), then
\[
a^0_{yx} = y = x = x^\sim = (a^k_{xy})^\sim,
\]
by Lemma 2.1(v). On the other hand, if \( x \neq y \), then
\[
a^0_{yx} = y; 1; x = (x; 1; y)^\sim = (a^0_{xy})^\sim,
\]
by Lemma 2.3(i).

The verification of property (v) breaks down into cases. If \( x = y \), then
\[
a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz} = x; a^k_{yz} = x; a^k_{xz} = a^k_{xz},
\]
by condition (ii), the assumption that \( x = y \), and Lemma 2.3(iii). A similar argument applies if \( y = z \). If \( x = z \), then
\[
a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz}, a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz}, (a^k_{xy})^\sim = \sum H_{xy} \geq x = a^k_{xx} = a^k_{xz},
\]
by the assumption that \( x = z \), condition (iv) (which has already been shown to hold when \( k = 0 \)), the regularity of \( a^k_{xy} \) from condition (i) (which has already been shown to hold when \( k = 0 \)), the fact that \( x \) is in its left stabilizer \( H_{xy} \), condition (ii) (which has already been shown to hold when \( k = 0 \)), and the assumption \( x = z \).

If \( x, y, \) and \( z \) are pairwise distinct, then
\[
a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz} = (x; 1; y); (y; 1; z) = x; 1; z = a^k_{xz},
\]
by the definition in (1) and Lemma 2.3(ii).

Condition (vi) holds vacuously.

Assume now that \( a^{k-1}_{xy} \) has been defined for all pairs \((x, y)\) with \( x \sim_{k-1} y \) so that conditions (i)–(vi) hold (with \( k - 1 \) in place of \( k \), and \( k \geq 1 \)). For each measurable atom \( x \) in \( I \), choose a representative \( \bar{x} \) of the equivalence class \( x/ \sim_k \). Thus,
\[
(2) \quad x \sim_k y \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \bar{x} = \bar{y}.
\]

The next step is to construct for each element \( y \sim_k x \) an element \( c_{y\bar{x}} \leq y; 1; \bar{x} \) as follows. If \( y = \bar{x} \), put
\[
c_{y\bar{x}} = \bar{x}.
\]
If \( y \neq \bar{x} \), then write \( b = a^{k-1}_{y\bar{x}} \), and fix an atom \( d \leq b \). Such an atom exists because \( b \) is a regular element, by the induction hypothesis for condition (i), and hence \( b \) is non-zero. The atomicity of \( \mathfrak{A} \) implies that every non-zero element is above an atom. The element \( b \) has index \( p^{k-1} \) by the induction hypothesis for condition (iii), so the subgroup \( H_b \) is generated by \( p^{k-1} \). Let \( L \) be the subgroup of \( G_x \) generated by \( p^k \). The element \( p^{k-1} \) generates \( H_b \), and \( p^k \) is a multiple of \( p^{k-1} \), so \( p^k \) belongs to \( H_b \), and therefore \( L \) is included in \( H_b \). On the other hand, \( m_{y\bar{x}} \) generates \( H_{y\bar{x}} \), and \( p^k \) divides \( m_{y\bar{x}} \), so \( H_{y\bar{x}} \) must be included in \( L \). Thus,
\[
(4) \quad H_{y\bar{x}} \subseteq L \subseteq H_b.
\]
Observe that
\[
(5) \quad |G_x/L| = p^k,
\]
since \( p^k \) generates \( L \).

Put
\[
c_{y\bar{x}} = \sum L; d.
\]
Because \( L \) is a subgroup of \( G_x \), and \( d \) is an atom satisfying \( d \leq b \leq y; 1; \bar{x} \) (the second inequality uses the induction hypothesis for condition (i)), the element \( c_{y\bar{x}} \)
is a regular element below \(y;1;\overline{x}\), and its left stabilizer is \(L\), by Theorem 9.1 in [7]. Consequently,

\[
(7) \quad \text{index}(c_{y\overline{x}}) = |G_x/L| = p^k, 
\]

by (3). The preceding observations and (3) show that conditions (i)–(iii) of the lemma hold with \(c_{y\overline{x}}\) in place of \(a_{y\overline{x}}^k\).

For \(y \neq \overline{x}\) define

\[
(8) \quad c_{xy} = c_{y\overline{x}}^{-1},
\]

and observe that since the converse of a regular element below \(y;1;\overline{x}\) is a regular element below \(\overline{x};1;y\), with the left and right stabilizers reversed, by Converse Theorem 5.13 from [7], the element defined in (8) must be regular, below \(\overline{x};1;y\), and have the same index as \(c_{y\overline{x}}\), so that

\[
(9) \quad \text{index}(c_{xy}) = p^k, 
\]

by (7).

For arbitrary \(x\) and \(y\) in \(I\) with \(x \sim_k y\), define

\[
(10) \quad a_{xy}^k = \begin{cases} 
    y & \text{if } x = y, \\
    c_{xy};c_{xy} & \text{if } x \neq y.
\end{cases}
\]

Observe that \(a_{xy}^k\) is well defined by (2). The relative product of a regular element below \(x;1;\overline{x}\) and a regular element below \(\overline{x};1;y\) is a regular element below \(x;1;y\), by Relative Product Theorem 5.16 in [7], so condition (i) of the lemma is satisfied.

The value of index \((c_{xy})\) is either \(p^k\) or \(|G_x|\) according to whether \(x \neq \overline{x}\) or \(x = \overline{x}\), by (7) and (3), and similarly for \(c_{xy}\), by (7), (3), and (8). At least one of them must be \(p^k\) since \(y \neq x\), so the value of (11) is \(p^k\). This completes the verification of condition (iii).

Take up now condition (iv). If \(x = y\), then

\[
a_{yx}^k = y = x = x^{-1} = (a_{xy}^k)^{-1},
\]

by (10) and Lemma 2.1(v). If \(x \sim_k y\) are distinct, then

\[
a_{yx}^k = (c_{y\overline{x}};c_{y\overline{x}}) = c_{y\overline{x}}^{-1};c_{y\overline{x}}^{-1} = (c_{xy};c_{xy})^{-1} = (c_{xy};c_{xy}) = (a_{xy}^k)^{-1},
\]

by (10), (3), the second involution law, (2), and (10).

The next verification is of condition (v). Assume that \(x \sim_k y \sim_k z\), and consider first the cases when at least two of the three atoms are equal. If \(x = y\), then

\[
a_{xy}^k = a_{y\overline{z}}^k = x; a_{yx}^k = x; a_{xz}^k = a_{xz}^k,
\]

by (10), the assumption that \(x = y\), and Lemma 2.3(iii). The argument when \(y = z\) is similar. If \(x = z\), then

\[
a_{xy}^k a_{yz}^k = a_{xy}^k a_{yz}^k = a_{xy}^k (a_{xy}^k)^{-1} = \sum H_{xy} \geq x = a_{xz}^k,
\]

by the assumption that \(x = z\), condition (iv), the regularity of \(a_{xy}^k\), which is ensured by condition (i), the fact that \(H_{xy}\) contains \(x\), monotony, and (10).
Assume now that the atoms $x$, $y$, and $z$ are mutually distinct. The element $c_{yy}$ is regular, and it is the converse of $c_{y\bar{y}}$, by (3), so
\begin{equation}
(12) \quad c_{yy} = c_{y\bar{y}} \land c_{\bar{y}y} = \sum K_{yy} \geq \bar{y}
\end{equation}
(the last step uses monotony and the fact that $\bar{y}$ is in $K_{yy}$). Consequently,
\begin{align*}
a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz} &= (c_{xy}; c_{yz}) = (c_{xy}; c_{y\bar{y}}; c_{\bar{y}z}) \\
&= \bar{x}z; (c_{xy}; c_{y\bar{y}}; c_{\bar{y}z}) \land c_{x\bar{x}}; c_{y\bar{y}} = c_{x\bar{x}}; c_{y\bar{y}} = c_{x\bar{x}}; c_{\bar{x}z} = a^k_{xz},
\end{align*}
by (10), (2), the associative law, (12) and monotony, Lemma 2.3(iii), (2), and (10). This argument shows that
\begin{equation}
(13) \quad a^k_{xz} \leq a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz}.
\end{equation}
On the other hand,
\begin{equation}
(14) \quad \text{index}(a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz}) = \gcd(\text{index}(a^k_{xy}), \text{index}(a^k_{yz}))
\end{equation}
\begin{equation*}
= \gcd(p^k, p^k) = p^k = \text{index}(a^k_{xz}),
\end{equation*}
by condition (i), Lemma 4.2, condition (iii), and the assumption on $x$, $y$, and $z$. Use condition (i), (13), (14) and Lemma 4.3 (with $a^k_{xz}$ and $a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz}$ in place of $a$ and $b$) to conclude that
\begin{equation}
(15) \quad a^k_{xz} = a^k_{xy}; a^k_{yz}.
\end{equation}
Turn finally to the verification of condition (vi). If $x = y$, then
\begin{equation}
(16) \quad a^k_{xy} = x = a^k_{y\bar{y}}.
\end{equation}
by (10) and the induction hypothesis for condition (ii), so condition (vi) holds in this case. Assume now that $x \sim_k y$ are distinct. At least one of $x$ and $y$ must be different from $\bar{x}$, say it is $y$. If $x = \bar{x}$, then
\begin{equation}
(17) \quad c_{y\bar{x}} = \sum L; d \leq \sum H_b; d \leq \sum H_b; b = b = a^k_{y\bar{x}}.
\end{equation}
by (5), monotony, the fact that $d \leq b$, the definition of $H_b$ as the stabilizer of $b$, and the definition of $b$. Apply (16), monotony, and the induction hypothesis for condition (iv) to arrive at
\begin{equation}
(18) \quad c_{xy} \preceq (a^{k-1}_{xy}) = a^{k-1}_{xy}.
\end{equation}
With the help of (15), (17), Lemma 2.3(iii), the assumption that $x = \bar{x}$, the induction hypotheses for (ii) and (v), and the assumption that $y \neq \bar{x}$, conclude that
\begin{equation}
(19) \quad c_{xy} \preceq a^{k-1}_{xy} = \bar{x}; a^{k-1}_{xz} = x; a^{k-1}_{xz} = a^{k-1}_{xz}; a^{k-1}_{xy} = a^{k-1}_{xy}.
\end{equation}
Consider finally the case when both $x$ and $y$ are different from $\bar{x}$. An argument analogous to that of (16) shows that
\begin{equation}
(18) \quad c_{xy} \preceq a^{k-1}_{xy}.
\end{equation}
Also, it follows from (17) and (8) that
\begin{equation}
(19) \quad c_{xy} \preceq a^{k-1}_{xy}.
Compute:
\[ a^k_{xy} = c_{x\bar{x}}^{-1}; a^{-1}_{xy} = a^{-1}_{x\bar{x}}, \]
by \([10],[13],[19]\), monotony, and the induction hypothesis for (v) (with \(\bar{x}\) and \(y\) in place of \(y\) and \(z\) respectively). This completes the proof of the lemma.

For each pair \((x, y)\) in \(E\) and each natural number \(k \geq 0\) such that \(x \sim_k y\), an element \(a^k_{xy}\) has been constructed in Lemma 5.4 such that the system of these elements possesses certain properties. The next step is to use these elements and properties in order to construct a scaffold. Fix a pair \((x, y)\) in \(E\), and let

\[ m_{xy} = p^{k_1}_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot p^{k_n}_n \]
be the decomposition of \(m_{xy}\) into distinct primes. If \(m_{xy} = 1\), write \(m_{xy} = 2^0\) for the prime decomposition. Thus, for each index \(i = 1, \ldots, n\), we have \(x \sim_{k_i} y\), and \(p^{k_i}_i\) is the largest power of \(p_i\) that divides \(m_{xy}\) when \(x \neq y\).

We now change notation a bit by letting the prime numbers \(p_i\) vary as \(i\) varies over \(1, \ldots, n\), and writing \(a^{k_i}_{xy}\) to denote the element constructed in Lemma 5.4 using the prime \(p = p_i\) and the natural number \(k = k_i\). Thus, in contrast to the lemma, we let \(k_i\) and \(k_j\) represent powers of different primes, namely \(p_i\) and \(p_j\), in the notations \(a^{k_i}_{xy}\) and \(a^{k_j}_{xy}\).

**Definition 5.5.** For each pair \((x, y)\) in \(E\), write

\[ a_{xy} = a^{k_1}_{xy} \cdot \ldots \cdot a^{k_n}_{xy} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} a^{k_i}_{xy}, \]
where \(m_{xy} = p^{k_1}_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot p^{k_n}_n\) is the prime decomposition of \(m_{xy}\).

**Theorem 5.6 (Scaffold Theorem).** The system \(\langle a_{xy} : (x, y) \in E \rangle\) is a scaffold in \(A\).

**Proof.** The first task is to prove that

\[ \text{index}(a_{xy}) = m_{xy} \]
for all \((x, y) \in E\). Consider the case when \(x \neq y\). The element \(a_{xy}^{ki}\) is regular and below \(x; 1; y\), and

\[
\text{index}(a_{xy}^{ki}) = p^{ki},
\]

by Lemma 5.4(i),(iii). In particular, these indices are relatively prime to one another for distinct indices \(i\). There are now two subcases to consider. If \(m_{xy} > 1\), then

\[
a_{xy} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_{xy}^{ki}
\]

is a product of regular elements below \(x; 1; y\) with mutually relatively prime indices, so it is a regular element below \(x; 1; y\), and

\[
\text{index}(a_{xy}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \text{index}(a_{xy}^{ki}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p^{ki} = m_{xy},
\]

by Corollary 4.6 and (2). On the other hand, if \(m_{xy} = 1\), then

\[
a_{xy} = x; 1; y,
\]

by Lemma 5.4(i), so the left stabilizer of \(a_{xy}\) is \(G_x\), and consequently

\[
\text{index}(a_{xy}) = |G_x/G_x| = 1 = m_{xy}.
\]

In the remaining case, \(x = y\), so that \(a_{xy}^{ki} = x\) for each \(i\), by Lemma 5.4(ii), and therefore

\[
a_{xy} = a_{xx} = x,
\]

by (3). The left stabilizer of \(x\) is \(\{x\}\), by the group identity law, so

\[
\text{index}(a_{xx}) = \text{index}(x) = |G_x/\{x\}| = |G_x| = m_{xx},
\]

by (7), Definition 4.1, and Lemma 5.1(i). Combine (4), (9), and (8) to conclude that (1) holds in all cases.

The next task is to prove that the element \(a_{xy}\) is an atom. As was pointed out earlier, the algebra \(A\) is finitely measurable, and hence atomic. Since \(a_{xy}\) is regular, it is non-zero, and therefore there must be an atom \(d \leq a_{xy}\). The atom \(d\) is regular, by Corollary 4.7 in [7], and its left stabilizer is \(H_{xy}\), by Corollary 4.16 in [7]. Use the definition of the index of an element, the definition of \(m_{xy}\), and (4) to arrive at

\[
\text{index}(d) = |G_x/H_{xy}| = m_{xy} = \text{index}(a_{xy}).
\]

Apply Lemma 4.3 to conclude that \(d = a_{xy}\), and hence that \(a_{xy}\) is an atom with left stabilizer \(H_{xy}\).

It remains to verify the three scaffold conditions. The first one holds by (7). To verify the second scaffold condition, it suffices to check the case when \(x \neq y\) (see Theorem 4.4 in [3]). If \(m_{xy} > 1\), then Lemma 5.4(iv) ensures that

\[
a_{yx} = (a_{xy})^{-}\,
\]

for each \(i\), and consequently,

\[
a_{xy} = (\prod_i a_{xy}^{ki})^{-} = \prod_i (a_{xy}^{ki})^{-} = \prod_i a_{yx}^{ki} = a_{yx},
\]

by (3) and the assumption that \(m_{xy} > 1\), Lemma 2.1(ii), (9), and (3) (with \(y\) and \(z\) in place of \(x\) and \(y\) respectively). If \(m_{xy} = 1\), then \(m_{yx} = 1\), and

\[
a_{xy} = (x; 1; y)^{-} = y; 1; x = a_{yx},
\]

by (3) and Lemma 2.3(i). Thus, the second scaffold condition holds in all cases, by (10) and (11).
It remains to verify the third scaffold condition. Consider pairs \((x, y)\) and \((y, z)\) in \(E\). If \(x = y\), then
\[
a_{xz} = x; a_{zz} = a_{xzx}; a_{xz} = a_{xzy}; a_{yz},
\]
by Lemma 2.3(iii), (7), and the assumption \(x = y\). A similar argument applies if \(y = z\). If \(x = z\), then
\[
a_{xz} = a_{xx} = x \leq \sum H_{xy} = a_{xy}; a_{xy} = a_{xy}; a_{xzy}; a_{yz},
\]
by the assumption \(x = z\), (7), the fact that \(x\) belongs to the left stabilizer \(H_{xy}\), monotony, the regularity of the atom \(a_{xy}\), and scaffold condition (ii), which has already been shown to hold.

Assume now that \(x, y,\) and \(z\) are all distinct. If \(m_{xy} = 1\), then (5) holds, and therefore
\[
a_{xy}; a_{yz} = x; 1; y; a_{yz} = x; 1; z \geq a_{xz},
\]
by (6), Lemma 2.3(ii), and Lemma 5.4(i). A similar argument applies if \(m_{yz} = 1\). We may therefore assume that \(m_{xy} > 1\) and \(m_{yz} > 1\). Thus, \(m_{xy}\) and \(m_{yz}\) each have at least one prime in their prime decompositions. Suppose
\[
m_{xy} = p_1^{s_1} \cdots p_n^{s_n} = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i^{s_i},
\]
so that \(a_{xy}\) has the form (3). Forming the product of \(a_{xy}\) with the element \(x; 1; y\) does not change the value of \(a_{xy}\), since \(a_{xy}\) is below this element, by Lemma 5.4(i). This amounts to forming the product of \(a_{xy}\) with elements of the form \(a_{ly}^{\ell_j}\) in which \(\ell_j = 0\), by Lemma 5.4(i). The same reasoning applies to the values of \(a_{yz}\) and \(a_{xz}\), so by multiplying such zero powers of primes into the factorizations of \(m_{xy}, m_{yz}\), and \(m_{xz}\), we may assume that
\[
m_{yz} = p_1^{s_1} \cdots p_n^{s_n} = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i^{s_i} \quad \text{and} \quad m_{xz} = p_1^{s_1} \cdots p_n^{s_n} = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i^{s_i},
\]
that is to say, the same primes \(p_i\) occur in all three factorizations, some of them raised to the zeroth power. Consequently,
\[
a_{yz} = \prod_{i=1}^n a_{yz}^{s_i} \quad \text{and} \quad a_{xz} = \prod_{i=1}^n a_{xz}^{s_i}.
\]

Write
\[
s_i = \min\{k_i, \ell_i\}
\]
for each \(i = 1, \ldots, n\), and observe that
\[
gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}) = \gcd(\prod_i p_i^{k_i}, \prod_i p_i^{\ell_i}) = \prod_i p_i^{s_i}.
\]
Since
\[
gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}) = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{xz}),
\]
by Lemma 5.4(iii), it follows from (19) that
\[
p_i^{s_i} \quad \text{divides} \quad m_{xz}.
\]
The definition of \(a_{xy}\) implies that \(k_i\) is the largest natural number such that \(x \sim s_i y\). Similarly, \(\ell_i\) is the largest natural number such that \(y \sim s_i z\). It follows from (18) and the definition of the relation \(\sim s_i\) that \(x \sim s_i, y\) and \(y \sim s_i, z\), so
\[
x \sim s_i, z,
\]
by transitivity. Since \( j_i \) is the largest natural number such that \( x \sim_{j_i} z \), it follows from (20) and (21) that \( s_i \leq j_i \), and therefore

\[
\alpha_{xz}^{j_i} \leq \alpha_{xz}^{s_i},
\]

by Lemma 5.4(vi). Use (17) and (22) to conclude that

\[
a_{xz} = \prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{j_i} \leq \prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{s_i}.
\]

The element \( a_{xz} \) is an atom, so in particular, (23) implies that

\[
\alpha_{xz}^{s_i} \neq 0.
\]

Use Corollary 4.6, Lemma 5.4(iii), and (19) to arrive at

\[
\text{index}(\prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{s_i}) = \prod_i \text{index}(\alpha_{xz}^{s_i}) = \prod_i p_i^s = \gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}).
\]

The indices of \( a_{xy} \) and \( a_{yz} \) are \( m_{xy} \) and \( m_{yz} \) respectively, by (4). Use this observation and Lemma 5.4 to write

\[
\gcd(m_{xy}, m_{yz}) = \gcd(\text{index}(a_{xy}), \text{index}(a_{yz})) = \text{index}(a_{xy}; a_{yz}).
\]

Combine (26) with (25) to arrive at

\[
\text{index}(a_{xy}; a_{yz}) = \text{index}(\prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{s_i}).
\]

Use (3), (17), monotony, (18), and Lemma 5.4(vi) to obtain

\[
a_{xy}; a_{yz} = (\prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{b_i}; \prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{\ell_i}) \leq \prod_i (\alpha_{xz}^{b_i}; \alpha_{xz}^{\ell_i}) \leq \prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{s_i}.
\]

In view of (28), Lemma 4.3 (with \( a_{xy}; a_{yz} \) and \( \prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{s_i} \) in place of \( a \) and \( b \) respectively) may be applied to (27), and then (23) may be invoked, to conclude that

\[
a_{xy}; a_{yz} = \prod_i \alpha_{xz}^{s_i} \geq a_{xz}.
\]

This completes the verification of the third scaffold condition and hence the proof of the theorem.

Here, finally, is the representation theorem for measurable relation algebras with finite cyclic groups.

**Theorem 5.7** (Representation Theorem). *If \( \mathfrak{A} \) is a measurable relation algebra, and if, for each measurable atom \( x \), the group \( G_x \) is finite and cyclic, then \( \mathfrak{A} \) is essentially isomorphic to one of the cyclic group relation algebras constructed in GCD Theorem 3.8. Hence, \( \mathfrak{A} \) is completely representable.*

**Proof.** Here is a summary of the strategy that was outlined at the beginning of the section. The groups \( G_x \) are all assumed to be finite, so \( \mathfrak{A} \) is finitely measurable and therefore atomic. Using this fact, a scaffold is constructed in \( \mathfrak{A} \), by Scaffold Theorem 5.6. A measurable relation algebra with a scaffold is essentially isomorphic to a full group relation algebra, by Scaffold Representation Theorem 7.4 in [7].

To see which full group relation algebra, let \( I \) be the set of measurable atoms in \( \mathfrak{A} \), and for each atom \( x \) in \( I \), let \( G_x \) be the group of non-zero functions below the square \( x; 1; x \). Take \( \mathcal{E} \) to be the set of pairs \( (x, y) \) such that \( x; 1; y \neq 0 \). Fix a scaffold

\[
\langle a_{xy} : (x, y) \in \mathcal{E} \rangle
\]
in \(\mathfrak{A}\). For each pair \((x, y)\) in \(\mathcal{E}\), take \(H_{xy}\) and \(K_{xy}\) to be the left and right stabilizers of the atom \(a_{xy}\). The function \(\varphi_{xy}\) from \(G_x/H_{xy}\) to \(G_y/K_{xy}\) defined for cosets \(H\) of \(H_{xy}\) and \(K\) of \(K_{xy}\) by

\[
\varphi_{xy}(H) = K \quad \text{if and only if} \quad H; a_{xy} = a_{xy}; K
\]
is an isomorphism. The group pair \(\mathcal{F} = (G, \varphi)\) consisting of the systems

\[
G = \langle G_x : x \in I \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi = \langle \varphi_{xy} : (x, y) \in E \rangle
\]
satisfies the group frame conditions, by Frame Theorem 7.3 in [7], and \(\mathfrak{A}\) is essentially isomorphic to the full group relation algebra \(G[\mathcal{F}]\), by (the proof of) Theorem 7.4 in [7]. The group relation algebra \(G[\mathcal{F}]\) is one of the ones considered in Theorem 3.9, and therefore also in GCD Theorem 3.8 (up to isomorphism).

Alternatively, let \(m_{xy} = |G_x/H_{xy}|\) and observe that the system

\[
m = \langle m_{xy} : (x, y) \in E \rangle
\]
satisfies the index conditions by the proof of Scaffold Theorem 5.6. Consequently, \(\mathfrak{A}\) is essentially isomorphic to the cyclic group relation algebra constructed in GCD Theorem 3.8 using the system \(m\).

\[\square\]

Theorem 4.30 in Jónsson-Tarski [9] states that for a relation algebra \(\mathfrak{A}\) the following are equivalent. (i) \(\mathfrak{A}\) is isomorphic to a full set relation algebra. (ii) \(\mathfrak{A}\) is complete, atomic, with all atoms \(x\) satisfying \(x^{-1}; 1; x \leq 1'\). The hard part of this theorem is to show that (ii) implies (i). Assume (ii) and let \(x\) be a subidentity atom. Then \(x^{-1}; 1; x \leq 1'\) by assumption, and thus \((x; 1; x)^{-1}; (x; 1; x) = x^{-1}; 1; x \leq 1'\) by Lemma 2.1(v) and Lemma 2.3(i),(ii). This means that \(x; 1; x\) is functional. Thus the square \(x; 1; x\) is the sum of one functional element, hence \(x\) is measurable with measure 1. Since \(\mathfrak{A}\) is atomic, the identity is a sum of atoms, and we have seen that these atoms are measurable, hence \(\mathfrak{A}\) is measurable. Each of the associated groups have one element, thus finite and cyclic. Since \(\mathfrak{A}\) is complete, then \(\mathfrak{A}\) is isomorphic, and not just essentially isomorphic, to a group relation algebra \(G[\mathcal{F}]\) with all the groups in \(\mathcal{F}\) being one-element. It is not hard to see that such a \(G[\mathcal{F}]\) is isomorphic to a full set relation algebra. We have proved the hard part of [9, Theorem 4.30] by using Theorem 5.7.

We note that a representation theorem is given in [2] which uses a generalization of the above condition (ii) in another direction, not toward measurability.

Next we turn to pair-dense relation algebras. Let \(\mathfrak{A}\) be a relation algebra. In [10], an element \(x \in \mathfrak{A}\) is called a pair if \(x; 0'; x; 0'; x \leq 1'\) and \(x\) is nonzero, where \(0'\) denotes \(-1'\), and the algebra \(\mathfrak{A}\) is called pair-dense if the identity element \(1'\) is a sum of pairs.

**Lemma 5.8.** Let \(\mathfrak{A}\) be an atomic relation algebra. Then (i) and (ii) below are equivalent.

(i) \(\mathfrak{A}\) is pair-dense.

(ii) \(\mathfrak{A}\) is measurable with all the associated groups cyclic of order \(\leq 2\).

**Proof.** In the proof, we will use Lemma 2.1 Lemma 2.3 without mentioning them. Let \(x \leq 1'\) be an atom, in particular \(x\) is nonzero. First we show that \(x\) is a pair just in case it is measurable with measure \(\leq 2\). Now, by definition, \(x\) is a pair just in case \(x; 0'; x; 0'; x \leq 1'\), we are going to show that this latter holds just when \(x; 0'; x\) is functional. Indeed, \(x; 0'; x\) is functional, by definition, just
when \((x; 0'; x) \sim (x; 0'; x)\) \(\leq 1'\), but \((x; 0'; x) \sim (x; 0'; x) = (x; 0'; x); (x; 0'; x) = x; 0'; x; 0'; x\). Note that each subidentity element \(x\) is functional by \(x \sim x \leq 1'\).

Assume now that \(x\) is a pair. Then \(x; 1; x\) is the sum of \(x; 1'; x\) and \(x; 0'; x\), both being functional (since \(x; 1'; x = x\)). The first one, \(x; 1'; x\) is nonzero by \(x\) being nonzero. If the second one, \(x; 0'; x\) is zero, then \(x\) has measure 1, and if \(x; 0'; x\) is nonzero, then \(x\) has measure 2. We have seen that \(x\) is measurable with measure \(\leq 2\).

Assume now that \(x\) has measure \(\leq 2\). Then \(x\) is the sum of \(\leq 2\) nonzero functional elements, and we mentioned at the beginning of Section 4 that each of these functional elements is an atom. Since \(x\) is a subidentity atom, it is nonzero and functional. Now, \(x; 1; x = x; 1'; x + x; 0'; x\), where \(x = x; 1'; x\). Thus, one of the functional elements below \(x; 1; x\) is \(x\) itself. If \(x\) has measure 1, then \(x; 1; x = x\) and so \(x; 0'; x = 0\) hence functional. If \(x\) has measure 2, then the other functional element below \(x; 1; x\) must be \(x; 0'; x\). So in both cases \(x; 0'; x\) is functional. We have already seen that \(x; 0'; x\) is functional just in case \(x\) is a pair.

We are ready to prove the lemma. Assume that \(\mathfrak{A}\) is pair-dense and atomic. By definition and monotony, if \(x\) is a pair, then each nonzero element below it is also a pair. Therefore, \(1'\) is the sum of pairs that are atoms. We have seen that all these atoms are measurable with measure \(\leq 2\), hence (ii) holds. Assume now that (ii) holds, then \(1'\) is the sum of measurable atoms with measure \(\leq 2\). Each of these atoms is a pair, so \(\mathfrak{A}\) is pair-dense.

Finally, notice that each group of order \(\leq 2\) is cyclic. \(\square\)

In view of Lemma 6.8, our Theorem 5.7 implies that all atomic pair-dense relation algebras are completely representable, and in fact essentially isomorphic to a group relation algebra where the associated groups have order one or two. This gives a structural description for atomic pair-dense relation algebras. Theorem 48 of [10] states that simple pair-dense relation algebras are atomic, and Theorem 51 of [10] states that for simple pair-dense algebras (α) and (β) are equivalent, where (α) states that \(\mathfrak{A}\) is completely representable on the set \(U\), and (β) states that the cardinality of \(U\) is \(n + 2m\) where \(n\) is the number of atomic pairs \(x\) below \(1'\) for which \(x; 0'; x\) is zero, and \(m\) is the number for those where \(x; 0'; x\) is nonzero. Now, using [10] Theorem 48 and Theorem 5.7 Lemma 6.8 one can give an alternative proof for [10] Theorem 51.
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