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#### Abstract

We consider the endomorphisms of a Brandt semigroup $B_{n}$, and the semigroup of mappings $E\left(B_{n}\right)$ that they generate under pointwise composition. We describe all the elements of this semigroup, determine Green's relations, consider certain special types of mapping which we can enumerate for each $n$, and give complete calculations for the size of $E\left(B_{n}\right)$ for small $n$.
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## 1 Introduction

For a group $G$, the set $M(G)$ of all functions $G \rightarrow G$ admits two natural binary operations: it is a semigroup under composition of functions (written multiplicatively) and a group under pointwise composition (written additively) using the group operation in $G$. If we write maps on the right, we find that function composition distributes on the left over pointwise composition, so that $f(g+h)=f g+f h$ for all $f, g, h \in M(G)$. This endows the set $M(G)$ with the structure of a near-ring, see Meldrum (1985). Now $M(G)$ contains the set $\operatorname{End}(G)$ of endomorphisms of $G$ (a semigroup under composition of functions), and it is easy to see that the endomorphisms are precisely the elements that always distribute on the right: $(f+g) h=f h+g h$ for all $f, g \in M(G)$ if and
only if $h \in \operatorname{End}(G)$. We let $E(G)$ be the subnear-ring of $M(G)$ generated by the subset $\operatorname{End}(G)$. The fact that $\operatorname{End}(G)$ is a right distributive semigroup implies that $E(G)$ is generated by $\operatorname{End}(G)$ as a group (that is, using only the pointwise composition). These ideas have their origin - as part of the more general theory of distributively generated near-rings - in Neumann (1956) and more particularly in Fröhlich (1958). The near-ring $E(G)$ is called the endomorphism near-ring of $G$, see Lyons and Malone (1970).
If the group $G$ is replaced by a semigroup $S$, then the above ideas may be generalised. The set $M(S)$ of all functions $S \rightarrow S$ is now a seminear-ring: it is a semigroup under both composition of functions and pointwise composition, and left distributivity holds. We consider the subsemigroup $E^{+}(S)$ of $M(S)$ generated by $\operatorname{End}(S)$ using pointwise composition: $E^{+}(S)$ will be a subseminearring, but we focus on its semigroup structure. Earlier work has been done in the second author's thesis (Samman, (1998)) and the case of a Clifford semigroup $S$ has been considered in Gilbert and Samman (2009) where it is shown that for certain semilattices of groups $S$, the semigroup $E^{+}(S)$ is again a semilattice of groups with a precisely defined structure.
In the present paper, we turn to another class of inverse semigroups, and take $S$ to be a finite Brandt semigroup $B_{n}$. The endomorphism semigroup of $B_{n}$ is obtained by adjoining a zero to the symmetric group $S_{n}$ of degree $n$, and so we have a rich but fully understood supply of endomorphisms. The key components in our approach to the structure of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ are then: combinatorial information about the symmetric group $S_{n}$; Green's relations; and a filtration by ideals determined by the support of mappings in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, that is by the subsets not mapped to 0 . In addition to some general structural results on $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, we also record the results of some calculations in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ for $n \leqslant 6$ carried out by the computer algebra package GAP (The GAP group, 2007).
This research was supported by the BAE Systems Postdoctoral Summer Research Programme, which enabled the second author to visit the School of Mathematical and Computer Sciences at Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh in 2007 and 2008. The authors are grateful to Nik Ruškuc for the injection of his GAP skills into their proceedings, and to Des Johnston for further computing expertise.

## 2 Background

A (left) seminear-ring is a set $L$ admitting two associative binary operations + and $\cdot$ that satisfy the left distributive law: for all $a, b, c \in L$ we have $a(b+c)=$ $a b+a c$. An element $d \in L$ is called distributive if, for all $a, b \in S$, we have $(a+b) d=a d+b d$ : the set of distributive elements is clearly a subsemigroup of $(L, \cdot)$. We say that $L$ is a distributively generated seminear-ring if it contains a subsemigroup of distributive elements $(K, \cdot)$ that generates $(L,+)$.
Let $S$ be a semigroup and let $M(S)$ be the set of all functions $S \rightarrow S$. Then $M(S)$ is a seminear-ring, under the operations of composition of functions and
pointwise composition: for $s \in S$ and $f, g \in M(S)$ we have

$$
s(f g)=(s f) g \quad \text { and } \quad s(f+g)=(s f)(s g)
$$

Our first result identifies the distributive elements in $M(S)$, and is a straightforward generalisation of Lemma 9.6 of Meldrum (1985).

Lemma 2.1. The set of distributive elements of $M(S)$ is precisely the set of endomorphisms $\operatorname{End}(S)$.

Proof. Suppose that $f, g \in M(S)$ and $\phi \in \operatorname{End}(S)$. Then for each $s \in S$,

$$
s(f+g) \phi=((s f)(s g)) \phi=(s f \phi)(s g \phi)=s(f \phi+g \phi),
$$

and hence $\phi$ is a distributive element. Conversely, suppose that $d \in M(S)$ is distributive, and for any $s \in S$ let $c_{s} \in M(S)$ be the constant function at $s \in S$, defined by $x c_{s}=s$ for all $x \in S$. Then for any $s, t, x \in S$ we have

$$
(s t) d=\left(\left(x c_{s}\right)\left(x c_{t}\right)\right) d=x\left(c_{s}+c_{t}\right) d=x\left(c_{s} d+c_{t} d\right)=(s d)(t d),
$$

and $d$ is an endomorphism.
The subsemigroup of $(M(S),+)$ generated by $\operatorname{End}(S)$ is therefore a distributively generated seminear-ring that we denote by $E^{+}(S)$. We call $E^{+}(S)$ the endomorphism seminear-ring of $S$.
We now define the Brandt semigroups, and determine their endomorphisms. For any integer $n \geqslant 1$, we set $[n]=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$. The Brandt semigroup $B_{n}$ has underlying set $([n] \times[n]) \cup\{0\}$ with multiplication

$$
(i, j)(k, l)= \begin{cases}(i, l) & \text { if } j=k \\ 0 & \text { if } j \neq k\end{cases}
$$

with 0 acting as a (two-sided) zero element in $B_{n}$. The set of idempotents of $B_{n}$ is $\{0,(1,1),(2,2), \ldots,(n, n)$,$\} , and the product of distinct idempotents in B_{n}$ is always 0 . We shall denote the set of idempotents of $B_{n}$ by $\operatorname{Idem}\left(B_{n}\right)$, to avoid a clash with the established use of $E$ for the endomorphism seminear-ring. We now determine the endomorphisms of $B_{n}$ : the following result is probably wellknown, and is in any case a simple consequence of Munn's description (Munn (1955)) of all endomorphisms of Rees matrix semigroups (see also Houghton (1977)), but we give a proof for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 2.2. The endomorphism monoid $\operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ is isomorphic to the monoid $\left(S_{n}\right)^{0}$ obtained by adjoining the zero map to the group $S_{n}$, where $S_{n}$ is the symmetric group of degree $n$. A permutation $\sigma \in S_{n}$ induces the endomorphism of $B_{n}$ mapping $(i, j) \mapsto(i \sigma, j \sigma)$ and $0 \mapsto 0$.

Proof. Let $\theta \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$. Then $0 \theta=0$. Suppose that, for some $(i, j) \in B_{n}$, we have $(i, j) \theta=0$. Then for any $p, q \in[n]$,

$$
(p, q) \theta=((p, i)(i, j)(j, q)) \theta=(p, i) \theta(i, j) \theta(j, q) \theta=0 .
$$

Therefore, if $\theta \neq 0$ we have $(i, j) \theta \neq 0$ for all $i, j \in[n]$.
A non-zero $\theta \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ therefore determines two functions $\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}:[n] \times[n] \rightarrow$ $[n]$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
(i, j) \theta=\left((i, j) \theta_{1},(i, j) \theta_{2}\right) . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now for any $k \in[n]$ we have $(i, k) \theta(k, j) \theta \neq 0$ if and only if $(i, k) \theta_{2}=(k, j) \theta_{1}$, and then

$$
\begin{equation*}
(i, k) \theta(k, j) \theta=\left((i, k) \theta_{1},(k, j) \theta_{2}\right) . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Comparing (2.1) and (2.2) we deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(i, j) \theta_{1} & =(i, k) \theta_{1} \\
(i, j) \theta_{2} & =(k, j) \theta_{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that $\theta_{1}$ depends only on the first coordinate, $\theta_{2}$ depends only on the second coordinate, and then the equality $(i, k) \theta_{2}=(k, j) \theta_{1}$ implies that $\theta_{1}=\theta_{2}$. We write $\sigma=\theta_{1}=\theta_{2}$, with $\sigma$ now regarded as a function $[n] \rightarrow[n]$.
Now $\sigma$ must be injective, for suppose that $j \sigma=k \sigma$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
((i, j)(k, l)) \theta & =(i \sigma, j \sigma)(k \sigma, l \sigma) \\
& =(i \sigma,, l \sigma) \neq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $(i, j)(k, l) \neq 0$ and so $j=k$. Hence $\sigma$ is a permutation of $[n]$. Conversely, it is clear that for any permutation $\sigma$ of $[n]$, the mapping $(i, j) \mapsto$ $(i \sigma, j \sigma), 0 \mapsto 0$ is an endomorphism of $B_{n}(G)$.

## 3 Green's relations

If $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ we define its support to be the set

$$
\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, j):(i, j) \alpha \neq 0\}
$$

Let $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ and suppose that

$$
\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\cdots+\sigma_{m}, \sigma_{r} \in S_{n}, m \geqslant 2,
$$

where each $\sigma_{r}$ is regarded as an endomorphism of $B_{n}$ as in Proposition 2.2, with $(i, j) \sigma_{r}=\left(i \sigma_{r}, j \sigma_{r}\right)$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
(i, j) \alpha & =\left(i \sigma_{1}, j \sigma_{1}\right)\left(i \sigma_{2}, j \sigma_{2}\right) \cdots\left(i \sigma_{m}, j \sigma_{m}\right) \\
& = \begin{cases}\left(i \sigma_{1}, j \sigma_{m}\right) & \text { if }(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha) \\
0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

and $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$ if and only if

$$
j \sigma_{1}=i \sigma_{2}, j \sigma_{2}=i \sigma_{3}, \ldots, j \sigma_{m-1}=i \sigma_{m}
$$

For $r \geqslant 2$ write $\varphi_{r}=\sigma_{r} \sigma_{r-1}^{-1}$ and set $\varphi_{1}=\sigma_{1}$. Then

$$
(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha) \Longleftrightarrow j=i \varphi_{2}=i \varphi_{3}=\cdots=i \varphi_{m}
$$

and $\varphi_{1}, \varphi_{2}, \ldots, \varphi_{m}$ determine the $\sigma_{r}$ (and hence determine $\alpha$ ) since we have $\sigma_{r}=\varphi_{r} \varphi_{r-1} \cdots \varphi_{2} \varphi_{1}$. Moreover, for a given $\alpha \notin \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$, if $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$ then $j$ is determined by $i$ : hence for a given $i \in[n]$ there exists at most one $j$ with $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$, and hence $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)| \leqslant n$. We record these observations, and some other useful facts about supports, in our next result.

Lemma 3.1. (a) If $\alpha, \beta \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ then $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha+\beta) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha) \cap \operatorname{supp}(\beta)$.
(b) If $\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2} \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ then $\left|\operatorname{supp}\left(\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}\right)\right|=n$.
(c) If $\alpha \notin \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ then $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)| \leqslant n$ and there exists $U \subseteq[n]$ and $\pi \in S_{n}$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, i \pi): i \in U\}$.
(d) If $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ and $(i, i) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$ then $(i, i) \alpha=(j, j)$ for some $j \in[n]$.

Proof. (a) is obvious. To prove (b), consider $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}$ with $\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2} \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$. Then $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$ if and only if $j \sigma_{1}=i \sigma_{2}$ and $\operatorname{sosupp}\left(\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}\right)=\{(i, j): j=$ $\left.i \sigma_{2} \sigma_{1}^{-1}\right\}$. It follows that $\left|\operatorname{supp}\left(\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}\right)\right|=n$. Part (c) was proved above, and for part (d) we note that since the idempotents in $B_{n}$ commute, any $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ must map idempotents to idempotents.

Rephrasing part (c) of Lemma 3.1, the support of $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\cdots+\sigma_{m} \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ (with $m \geqslant 2$ ) is determined by a partial bijection $U \rightarrow V$ of $[n]$, that is by an element $\pi$ of the symmetric inverse monoid $\mathcal{I}_{n}$ (see Howie (1995)). Then $\alpha$ is determined by its support mapping $\pi$ and by two further partial bijections $\lambda=\left.\sigma_{1}\right|_{U}$ and $\rho=\left.\sigma_{m}\right|_{V}$. We call $\lambda$ and $\rho$ the left action and the right action of $\alpha$. Then if $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$ we have $j=i \pi$ and $(i, j) \alpha=(i \lambda, j \rho)$. However, not every choice of $\pi, \lambda, \rho$ gives rise to an element of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, and we now characterize those choices that do. In what follows, for any subset $U \subseteq[n]$, we denote by $\operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U)$ the pointwise stabiliser of $U$ in $S_{n}$.

Proposition 3.2. The triple $(\pi ; \lambda, \rho)$ of partial bijections of $[n]$ represents an element $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\cdots+\sigma_{m}$ of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with $m \geqslant 2$ if and only if $\pi, \lambda$ and $\rho$ extend to permutations $\pi_{*}, \lambda_{*}$ and $\rho_{*}$ such that, if $U$ is the domain of $\pi$ and $H$ is the subgroup of $S_{n}$ generated by $\pi_{*}$ and $\operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U)$, then $H \lambda_{*}=H \rho_{*}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\pi, \lambda$ and $\rho$ arise from an element $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\cdots \sigma_{m}$ of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$. Set $\lambda_{*}=\sigma_{1}, \rho_{*}=\sigma_{m}$ and as above, let $\pi$ be the partial bijection defined by $i \pi=j$ if and only if $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$. Choose $\pi_{*}$ to be any permutation of $[n]$ extending $\pi$. Then $H=\left\langle\operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U), \pi_{*}\right\rangle$ does not depend on the choice of $\pi_{*}$. Now $\sigma_{m}=\varphi_{m} \varphi_{m-1} \cdots \varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}$ where $\varphi_{k}=\sigma_{k} \sigma_{k-1}^{-1}$ and satisfies $i \varphi_{k}=j=i \pi$ for all $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$. Hence $\varphi_{k} \in H$ for all $k$ and therefore $H \sigma_{1}=H \sigma_{m}$.
Conversely, suppose that $\pi, \lambda$ and $\rho$ do extend to permutations $\pi_{*}, \lambda_{*}$ and $\rho_{*}$ such that $\rho_{*}=h \lambda_{*}$ for some $h \in H$. We may write $h=s_{m} \pi_{*} s_{m-1} \pi_{*} \cdots s_{2} \pi_{*}$ for some $m \geqslant 2$, where $s_{k} \in \operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U)$ for all $k$. We may assume that at least one
$s_{k}$ acts fixed-point-free on $[n] \backslash U$, for if no such $s_{k}$ exists in the given expression for $h$, we may choose such an $s \in \operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U)$ and if $q=\mathrm{o}\left(s \pi_{*}\right)$ in $S_{n}$, we consider the expression $h\left(s \pi_{*}\right)^{q}$ instead. Now set $\psi_{k}=s_{k} \pi_{*}$, and define $\sigma_{1}=\lambda_{*}$ and $\sigma_{k}=\psi_{k} \cdots \psi_{2} \lambda_{*}$ for $k \geqslant 2$. Let $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\cdots+\sigma_{m}$.
Now $\sigma_{k} \sigma_{k-1}^{-1}=\psi_{k}=s_{k} \pi_{*}$ and so, if $i \in U$ and $j=i \pi$, then $i \sigma_{k}=i s_{k} \pi_{*} \sigma_{k-1}=$ $j \sigma_{k-1}$, and hence $\left\{\left(i, i \pi_{*}\right): i \in U\right\} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$. But if $r \notin U$ and $s_{k}$ acts fixed-point-free on $[n] \backslash U$ then $r \sigma_{k}=r s_{k} \pi_{*} \sigma_{k-1} \neq r \pi_{*} \sigma_{k-1}$ and so $\left(r, r \pi_{*}\right) \notin \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$. It follows that $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, i \pi): i \in U\}$, and clearly $\alpha$ has left action equal to $\lambda$ and right action equal to $\rho$.

The support and actions of an element in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ also determines its Green's classes, as our next result explains.

Proposition 3.3. (a) The $\mathcal{R}$-class and the $\mathcal{L}$-class of an endomorphism $\sigma$ in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ each consists only of $\sigma$.
(b) Two elements in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ are $\mathcal{R}$-related if and only if they have the same support and the same left action, and are $\mathcal{L}$-related if and only if they have the same support and the same right action.
(c) For any $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, the $\mathcal{R}$-class of $\alpha$ and the $\mathcal{L}$-class of $\alpha$ have the same size.
(d) If $\alpha$ has support mapping $\pi: U \rightarrow V$ with $\pi_{*} \in S_{n}$ extending $\pi$, then $\left|R_{\alpha}\right|$ is equal to the size of the orbit of $H=\left\langle\operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U), \pi_{*}\right\rangle$ on the subset $U$.
(e) The $\mathcal{H}$-relation on $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ is trivial.
(f) Two elements $\alpha, \beta$ are $\mathcal{D}$-related if and only if they have the same support mapping $\pi: U \rightarrow V$ extending to $\pi_{*} \in S_{n}$ such that their left and right actions extend to permutations in the same coset of $H=\left\langle\operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U), \pi_{*}\right\rangle$ in $S_{n}$.

Proof. For (a), we observe that if $\sigma \mathcal{R} \beta$ with $\sigma \neq \beta$ then $\sigma=\beta+\gamma$ for some $\gamma \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, and then $\sigma$ cannot be an endomorphism, by Proposition 3.1. The same reasoning applies to the $\mathcal{L}$-relation.
(b) Let $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\cdots+\sigma_{m}$ and suppose that $\alpha$ has support mapping $\pi_{\alpha}: U_{\alpha} \rightarrow V_{\alpha}$ with left and right actions $\lambda_{\alpha}, \rho_{\alpha}$. Similarly, let $\beta=\tau_{1}+\cdots+\tau_{t}$ with support mapping $\pi_{\beta}: U_{\beta} \rightarrow V_{\beta}$ with left and right actions $\lambda_{\beta}, \rho_{\beta}$.
Suppose that $\alpha \mathcal{R} \beta$ so that, for some $\gamma, \delta \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ we have $\alpha=\beta+\gamma$ and $\beta=$ $\alpha+\gamma$. By part (a) of Lemma 3.1, $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\beta)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\beta) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$ : it follows that $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\operatorname{supp}(\beta)$, and so $\pi_{\alpha}=\pi_{\beta}$. Then for all $(i, j)$ in the support, we have
$(i, j) \alpha=\left(i \lambda_{\alpha}, j \rho_{\alpha}\right)=(i, j)(\beta+\gamma)=(i, j) \beta(i, j) \gamma=\left(i \lambda_{\beta}, j \rho_{\beta}\right)(i, j) \gamma=\left(i \lambda_{\beta}, j \rho_{\gamma}\right)$
and hence $i \lambda_{\alpha}=i \lambda_{\beta}$. Therefore $\alpha$ and $\beta$ have the same support and the same left actions.

Conversely, suppose that $\alpha$ and $\beta$ as above have the same support mapping $\pi: U \rightarrow V$ and the same left action $\lambda$. It suffices to show that there exists $\gamma \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ such that $\alpha=\beta+\gamma$. Represent $\alpha$ by the triple ( $\pi ; \lambda, \rho$ ) and $\beta$ by the triple $(\pi ; \lambda, \xi)$. Extend $\pi$ to a permutation $\pi_{*}$ and extend $\lambda$ to a permutation $\lambda_{*}$. (Note that we could take $\lambda_{*}=\sigma_{1}$ or $\lambda_{*}=\tau_{1}$ ). Then if $H=\left\langle\operatorname{stab}_{S_{n}}(U), \pi_{*}\right\rangle$, the coset $H \lambda_{*}$ does not depend on the choice of $\lambda_{*}$, and by Proposition 3.2 the right actions $\rho$ and $\xi$ extend to permutations $\rho_{*}, \xi_{*}$ such that $H \rho_{*}=H \lambda_{*}=H \xi_{*}$. There exist $\varphi_{k}, 2 \leqslant k \leqslant m$ and $\psi_{l}, 2 \leqslant l \leqslant t$ such that, if $i \in U$ then $i \varphi_{k}=i \pi=i \psi_{l}$, and with $\rho_{*}=\varphi_{m} \cdots \varphi_{2} \lambda_{*}, \xi_{*}=\psi_{t} \cdots \psi_{2} \lambda_{*}$. Now let $p_{j}=\mathrm{o}\left(\psi_{j}\right)-1$ and consider the factors in the product

$$
\omega=\varphi_{m} \varphi_{m-1} \cdots \varphi_{2} \psi_{2}^{p_{2}} \cdots \psi_{t}^{p_{t}} \psi_{t} \psi_{t-1} \cdots \psi_{2} \lambda_{*}
$$

regarding $\psi_{j}^{p_{j}}$ as the product of $p_{j}$ separate factors each equal to $\psi_{j}$. Hence there are $(m-1)+p_{2}+\cdots+p_{t}+t=q$ factors in all, which we rename in order as $\chi_{i},(1 \leqslant i \leqslant q)$, starting with $\chi_{1}=\lambda_{*}$ and concluding with $\chi_{q}=\varphi_{m}$. Then for $i \geqslant 2,\left.\chi_{i}\right|_{U}=\pi$ and clearly $\omega=\varphi_{m} \varphi_{m-1} \cdots \varphi_{2} \lambda_{*}$ in $S_{n}$ so that $\left.\omega\right|_{V}=\rho$. We define $v_{i}=\chi_{i} \chi_{i-1} \cdots \chi_{1}$. Then for $1 \leqslant k \leqslant t$, we have $v_{i}=\tau_{i}$ so that $\beta=v_{1}+\cdots+v_{t}$. If we then define $\gamma=v_{t+1}+\cdots+v_{q}$ we find that $\beta+\gamma$ has support mapping $\pi$, left action $\lambda$ and right action obtained by restricting $v_{q}=\chi_{q} \chi_{q-1} \cdots \chi_{2} \chi_{1}=\omega$ to $V$, so that the right action is $\left.v_{q}\right|_{V}=\left.\omega\right|_{V}=\rho$. It follows that $\beta+\gamma=\alpha$.
The proof of the characterisation of Green's $\mathcal{L}$-relation proceeds in the same way, and we omit the details.
Now part (c) follows for an endomorphism $\sigma \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ by part (a). So consider $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right) \backslash \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$, with support mapping $\pi$ and actions $\lambda, \rho$. By part (b) the $\mathcal{R}$-class $R_{\alpha}$ of $\alpha$ consists of those mappings represented by triples $(\pi ; \lambda, \xi)$ where $\xi$ is a partial bijection with domain $V$ that extends to some permutation $\xi_{*}$ such that $H \lambda_{*}=H \xi_{*}$, and the $\mathcal{L}$-class $L_{\alpha}$ of $\alpha$ consists of those mappings represented by triples $(\pi ; \eta, \rho)$ where $\eta$ is a partial bijection with domain $U$ that extends to some permutation $\eta_{*}$ such that $H \eta_{*}=H \rho_{*}$. The mappings

$$
R_{\alpha} \rightarrow L_{\alpha},(\pi ; \lambda, \xi) \mapsto(\pi ; \pi \xi, \rho)
$$

and

$$
L_{\alpha} \rightarrow R_{\alpha},(\pi ; \eta, \rho) \mapsto\left(\pi ; \lambda, \pi^{-1} \eta\right)
$$

(where $\pi^{-1}: V \rightarrow U$ is a partial bijection on $[n]$ ) are then inverse bijections.
For part (d), let $\alpha$ have left action $\lambda$ and extend $\lambda$ to $\lambda_{*} \in S_{n}$. As above, the coset $H \lambda_{*}$ does not depend on the choice of $\lambda_{*}$, and we see by part (a) and Proposition 3.2 that $\left|R_{\alpha}\right|$ is the number of distinct actions on $V$ by permutations $\rho_{*}$ such that $H \lambda_{*}=H \rho_{*}$. There are $|H|$ choices for $\rho_{*}$, and the number of distinct actions on $V$ is equal to the number of distinct actions of $H$ on $U$.
Part (e) follows from part (b). Two mappings that are both $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{L}$-related have the same support and the same left and right actions and so are equal. Part (f) also follows from part (b) and Proposition 3.2. Suppose that $\alpha \mathcal{D} \beta$ and let $\gamma \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ be such that $\alpha \mathcal{R} \gamma \mathcal{L} \beta$. By part (b), $\alpha, \beta$ and $\gamma$ have the
same support mapping $\pi$, and if $\alpha$ is represented by the triple $(\pi ; \lambda, \rho), \beta$ by $(\pi ; \eta, \xi)$, then $\gamma$ is represented by $(\pi ; \lambda, \xi)$ and $H \rho_{*}=H \lambda_{*}=H \xi_{*}=H \eta_{*}$. Conversely, if $\alpha, \beta$ are represented by $(\pi ; \lambda, \rho)$ and $(\pi ; \eta, \xi)$ respectively, with $H \rho_{*}=H \lambda_{*}=H \xi_{*}=H \eta_{*}$, we take $\gamma$ represented by $(\pi ; \lambda, \xi)$ and then $\alpha \mathcal{R} \gamma \mathcal{L} \beta$.

## 4 Classification by support

### 4.1 Endomorphisms

$\sigma \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ is induced by a permutation $\sigma \in S_{n}$, and such elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ are characterised by their support:

$$
\sigma \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right) \Longleftrightarrow \operatorname{supp}(\sigma)=B_{n} \backslash\{0\}
$$

As shown in Proposition 3.3, endomorphisms lie in singleton $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{L}$-classes, and we further observe:

Proposition 4.1. For any $\sigma \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ we have $\sigma+\sigma=\sigma+\sigma+\sigma$ in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, with support $\{(i, i): 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$. Hence $\sigma$ generates a subsemigroup of order 2 in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$.

### 4.2 Elements with full support

An element $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ is said to have full support if $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)|=n$. Proposition 3.1 shows that the sum of any two endomorphisms in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ has full support, and that for any $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with full support we have $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=$ $\{(i, i \pi): 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$ for some permutation $\pi \in S_{n}$.
Let $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\cdots+\sigma_{m}$ have full support, where $\sigma_{j} \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ and $m \geqslant 2$. Then as in section 3,

$$
(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha) \Longleftrightarrow j=i \varphi_{2}=i \varphi_{3}=\cdots=i \varphi_{m}
$$

and hence $\pi=\varphi_{k}$ for all $k, 2 \leqslant k \leqslant m$. Since $\sigma_{k}=\varphi_{k} \cdots \varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}$ it follows that

$$
\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\pi \sigma_{1}+\cdots+\pi^{m-1} \sigma_{1} .
$$

Then $(i, j) \alpha=\left(i \sigma_{1}, j \pi^{m-1} \sigma_{1}\right)=\left(i, j \pi^{m-1}\right) \sigma_{1}$. Hence $\alpha$ is determined by its support mapping $\pi$ and its left action $\sigma_{1}$. For fixed $\pi, \sigma_{1}$ we obtain a sequence of distinct mappings $\alpha$ for $m=1,2, \ldots, o(\pi)$, where $o(\pi)$ is the order of the permutation $\pi$ in the symmetric group $S_{n}$.

Proposition 4.2. The number of elements of full support in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ is given by

$$
n!\sum_{\pi \in S_{n}} \mathrm{o}(\pi)
$$

The sequence $\left(\sum_{\pi \in S_{n}} \mathrm{o}(\pi)\right)$ is sequence A060014 in Sloane (2007): its initial values are

| $n$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 3 | 13 | 67 | 471 | 3271 |

As a corollary of part (d) of Proposition 3.3 we have:
Proposition 4.3. The size of an $\mathcal{R}$ or $\mathcal{L}$-class of an element $\alpha$ having full support and action permutation $\pi$ is equal to the order of $\pi$ in $S_{n}$.

Proposition 4.4. The set $\left\{\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right):|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)| \leqslant n\right\}$ is an ideal of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ and is generated, as a subsemigroup, by the subset of elements with full support.

Proof. It is obvious from part (a) of Lemma 3.1 that $\left\{\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right):|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)| \leqslant\right.$ $n\}$ is an ideal. In order to show that, as a subsemigroup, it is generated by the elements of full support, by part (b) of Lemma 3.1 it suffices to show that a sum $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\sigma_{3}$ of three endomorphisms may also be written as the sum of elements of full support.
To this end, let $\varphi_{2}=\sigma_{2} \sigma_{1}^{-1}$ and $\varphi_{3}=\sigma_{3} \sigma_{2}^{-1}$, and let $r$ be the order of $\varphi_{2}$ in $S_{n}$. Consider the mappings

$$
\beta=\sigma_{1}+\varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}+\cdots+\varphi_{2}^{r-1} \sigma_{1}+\sigma_{1}
$$

and $\gamma=\varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}+\varphi_{3} \varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}=\varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}+\sigma_{3}$. Then $\beta$ and $\gamma$ are of full support, and $\beta+\gamma$ has the same left and right actions as $\alpha$. Moreover, we have $(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\beta+\gamma)$ if and only if $i \varphi_{2}=j=i \varphi_{3}$ and so $\operatorname{supp}(\beta+\gamma)=\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)$. It follows that $\alpha=\beta+\gamma$.

### 4.3 Elements with partial support

An element $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)|<n$ is said to have partial support. In this case, by part (c) of Lemma 3.1, the support is given by $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, i \pi)$ : $i \in U\}$ for some partial bijection $\pi \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$ with domain $U$.

Lemma 4.5. If $0 \neq \alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ has partial support then $3 \leqslant n$ and $1 \leqslant$ $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)| \leqslant n-2$. Morever, given any $k$ with $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n-2$, and any partial bijection $\pi: U \rightarrow V$ between two subsets $U, V \subseteq[n]$ of size $k$, there exists $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\sigma_{3} \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, i \pi): 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$.

Proof. We know from part (b) of Proposition 4.3 that if $\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2} \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$ then $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}$ has full support. So suppose that $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\sigma_{3}$ with $\sigma_{j} \in \operatorname{End}\left(B_{n}\right)$. Regarding the $\sigma_{j}$ as permutations in $S_{n}$, we set $\varphi_{2}=\sigma_{2} \sigma_{1}^{-1}$ and $\varphi_{3}=\sigma_{3} \sigma_{2}^{-1}$. Then

$$
(i, j) \in \operatorname{supp}(\alpha) \Longleftrightarrow j=i \varphi_{2}=i \varphi_{3}
$$

Hence $\varphi_{2}$ and $\varphi_{3}$ are permutations agreeing with the partial bijection $\pi$ on its domain. If $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)|>n-2$ then $\varphi_{2}$ and $\varphi_{3}$ are permutations of degree $n$
agreeing on $n-1$ elements: hence $\varphi_{2}=\varphi_{3}$, and $\alpha$ has full support. So if $\alpha$ has partial support, then $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)| \leqslant n-2$. Since $\alpha \neq 0$ we must have $n \geqslant 3$.
Now given two sets of distinct integers $U=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots a_{k}\right\}$ and $V=\left\{b_{1}, \ldots, b_{k}\right\}$, each of size $k \leqslant n-2$ and with $1 \leqslant a_{p}, b_{q} \leqslant n$ for all $p, q$, choose $\varphi_{2}$ to be any permutation in $S_{n}$ such that $a_{p} \varphi_{2}=b_{p}$ for all $p, 1 \leqslant p \leqslant k$, and let $\phi$ be any permutation in $S_{n}$ whose set of fixed points is precisely $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}\right\}$. (This is always possible if $k \leqslant n-2$ ). Set $\varphi_{3}=\phi \varphi_{2}$. Then $i \varphi_{2}=i \varphi_{3}$ if and only if $i \in\left\{a_{1}, \ldots a_{k}\right\}$. Hence if we set

$$
\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}+\varphi_{3} \varphi_{2} \sigma_{1}
$$

for any $\sigma_{1} \in S_{n}$, it follows that

$$
\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\left\{\left(a_{1}, b_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(a_{k}, b_{k}\right)\right\}
$$

However, although we can construct each possible support for some $\alpha$ of the form $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\sigma_{3}$, it is not true that every mapping in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ arises in this way.

Example 4.6. Take $n=3$. Then the mapping $\alpha=(12)+(23)+(132)+\mathrm{id}$ has partial support equal to the singleton set $\{(1,2)\}$, with $(1,2) \alpha=(2,2)$. Suppose that $\alpha=\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\sigma_{3}$. Then $1 \sigma_{1}=2,2 \sigma_{3}=2$ and for $\{a, b\}=\{1,3\}$ we have $a=2 \sigma_{1}=1 \sigma_{2}, b=2 \sigma_{2}=1 \sigma_{3}$. Hence only two possibilities arise, and for each we find that $\sigma_{1}+\sigma_{2}+\sigma_{3}$ has full support, with support permutation (123) in each case.

### 4.4 Elements with singleton support

By Lemma 4.5 there are no elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{2}\right)$ with singleton support. For $n \geqslant 3$, we shall now describe the subsemigroup of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ consisting of the elements of singleton support, together with 0 . For each $(i, j) \in B_{n},(n \geqslant 3)$ we let

$$
E_{(i, j)}=\left\{\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right): \operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, j)\}\right\} \cup\{0\} .
$$

Proposition 4.7. Let $n \geqslant 3$.
(a) The number of mappings in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with singleton support is equal to $n^{2}\left(n^{2}-n+1\right)$.
(b) If $i \neq j$ then $E_{(i, j)}$ is a subsemigroup of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ that is isomorphic to $B_{n}$.
(c) If $i=j$ then $E_{(i, i)}$ is a subsemigroup of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ that is isomorphic to $\operatorname{Idem}\left(B_{n}\right)$.
(d) The set of all mappings in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with singleton support, together with zero, forms a subsemigroup of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ isomorphic to the zero direct union of $n(n-1)$ copies of $B_{n}$ and $n$ copies of $\operatorname{Idem}\left(B_{n}\right)$.

Proof. (a) Suppose that $\alpha \in E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with $|\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)|=1$. If $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, i)\}$ then, by part (d) of Lemma 3.1, $(i, i) \alpha=(j, j)$. Given $i$, any value of $j$ can occur: without loss of generality, suppose $i=1$. Set $\varphi_{2}=1$ and $\varphi_{3}=(23 \ldots n)$. Then $(1,1)(1+1+(23 \ldots n))=(1,1)$ and so if $\sigma: 1 \mapsto j$ then $(1,1)(\sigma+\sigma+$ $(23 \ldots n) \sigma)=(j, j)$. There are $n$ possibilities for $i$ and $n$ for $j$, and therefore $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ contains $n^{2}$ mappings $\alpha$ with $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, i)\}$.
Now suppose that $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, j)\}$ with $i \neq j$. We claim that for any $p, q \in[n]$ we can find $\alpha$ (with support $\{(i, j)\}$ ) such that $(i, j) \alpha=(p, q)$. Without loss of generality suppose that $(i, j)=(1,2)$. Now take $\varphi_{2}=(12)$ and $\varphi_{3}=(23 \ldots n)$. Then $(1,2)\left(1+\varphi_{2}+\varphi_{3}\right)=(1,2)(2,1)(1,3)=(1,3)$. If $p \neq q$, choose $\sigma$ with $1 \sigma=p$ and $3 \sigma=q$. Then $(1,2)\left(\sigma+\varphi_{2} \sigma+\varphi_{3} \sigma\right)=(p, q)$. If $p=q$ we need a slightly different approach. Again assuming that $(i, j)=(1,2)$, choose $\varphi_{2}=(12), \varphi_{3}=(23 \ldots n)$ and $\varphi_{4}=(132)$. Then if $\beta=1+\varphi_{2}+\varphi_{3}+\varphi_{4}$ we have $\operatorname{supp}(\beta)=\{(1,2)\}$ with $(1,2) \beta=(1,1)$. Then for any $\sigma: 1 \mapsto p$ the map $\alpha=\sigma+\varphi_{2} \sigma+\varphi_{3} \sigma+\varphi_{4} \sigma$ has $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(1,2)\}$ with $(1,2) \alpha=(p, p)$. There are $n(n-1)$ possibilities for the support element $(i, j)$, and for each of these there are $n^{2}$ possibilities for $(i, j) \alpha$. Therefore $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ contains $n^{3}(n-1)$ mappings $\alpha$ with $\operatorname{supp}(\alpha)=\{(i, j)\}$ with $i \neq j$.
The total number of mappings in $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with singleton support is therefore $n^{2}+n^{3}(n-1)=n^{2}\left(n^{2}-n+1\right)$.
For part (b), we observe that each $\alpha \in E_{(i, j)}$ is completely determined by the element $(i, j) \alpha$, and that if $\beta \in E_{(i, j)}$ then either $\alpha+\beta=0$ or the element $(i, j) \alpha(i, j) \beta$ is non-zero and completely determines $\alpha+\beta$. It follows that $E_{(i, j)}$ is a subsemigroup of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, and that the mapping defined by $\alpha \mapsto(i, j) \alpha$ and $0 \mapsto 0$ is an isomorphism $E_{(i, j)} \rightarrow B_{n}$. Similarly, for part (c), we observe that each $\alpha \in E_{(i, i)}$ is completely determined by the element $(i, i) \alpha \in \operatorname{Idem}\left(B_{n}\right)$, and that the mapping defined by $\alpha \mapsto(i, i) \alpha$ and $0 \mapsto 0$ is then an isomorphism $E_{(i, i)} \rightarrow \operatorname{Idem}\left(B_{n}\right)$. For part (d) it follows from part (a) of Lemma 3.1 that if $\alpha \in E_{(i, j)}$ and $\beta \in E_{(k, l)}$ with $(i, j) \neq(k, l)$ then $\alpha+\beta=0$.

## 5 Enumerating elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$

## $5.1 n=2$

When $n=2, \operatorname{End}\left(B_{2}\right)=\{1, \tau, 0\}$, where $\tau$ is the transposition (12). There are six other non-zero elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{2}\right)$, with full support. The Cayley table for the semigroup $\left(E^{+}\left(B_{2}\right),+\right)$ is

| + | 1 | $\tau$ | $\gamma$ | $\mu$ | $\nu$ | $\delta$ | $\eta$ | $\xi$ | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\delta$ | $\mu$ | 0 | 0 | $\eta$ | $\delta$ | 0 | $\mu$ | 0 |
| $\tau$ | $\nu$ | $\gamma$ | $\gamma$ | $\xi$ | 0 | 0 | $\nu$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\gamma$ | 0 | $\gamma$ | $\gamma$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mu$ | $\eta$ | 0 | 0 | $\mu$ | 0 | 0 | $\eta$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\nu$ | 0 | $\xi$ | 0 | 0 | $\nu$ | 0 | 0 | $\xi$ | 0 |
| $\delta$ | $\delta$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\delta$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\eta$ | 0 | $\mu$ | 0 | 0 | $\eta$ | 0 | 0 | $\mu$ | 0 |
| $\xi$ | $\nu$ | 0 | 0 | $\xi$ | 0 | 0 | $\nu$ | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The actions of the elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{2}\right)$ on the non-zero elements of $B_{2}$ are shown in the following table:

| $\alpha$ | $(1,1) \alpha$ | $(1,2) \alpha$ | $(2,1) \alpha$ | $(2,2) \alpha$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $(1,1)$ | $(1,2)$ | $(2,1)$ | $(2,2)$ |
| $\tau$ | $(2,2)$ | $(2,1)$ | $(1,2)$ | $(1,1)$ |
| $\gamma$ | $(2,2)$ | 0 | 0 | $(1,1)$ |
| $\mu$ | 0 | $(1,1)$ | $(2,2)$ | 0 |
| $\nu$ | 0 | $(2,2)$ | $(1,1)$ | 0 |
| $\delta$ | $(1,1)$ | 0 | 0 | $(2,2)$ |
| $\eta$ | 0 | $(1,2)$ | $(2,1)$ | 0 |
| $\xi$ | 0 | $(2,1)$ | $(1,2)$ | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## $5.2 n=3$

For $n=3$, Proposition 4.2 gives us $3!\times 13=78$ elements of full support. By Lemma 4.5 , the only possible partial supports are singleton sets, and by Proposition 4.7 we find 63 such mappings. Hence $\left|E^{+}\left(B_{3}\right)\right|=7+78+63=148$.

## $5.3 n>3$

We have investigated the size of the semigroup $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ for $n=4,5,6$ using the computational discrete algebra system GAP (The GAP group, 2007). Propositions 4.3 and 4.4 give exact calculations for support sizes $n$ and 1 , but our calculations show that the bulk of the elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ have support size $n-2$. Our GAP code, which is given in an appendix, counts elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ by enumerating triples $(\pi ; \lambda, \rho)$ as in Proposition 3.2. We summarize our findings (including those for $n=2,3$ ) in the following table, recalling that support size $n-1$ does not occur (by Lemma 4.5).

Enumeration of elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ by support size

| $n$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| endomorphisms | 3 | 7 | 25 | 121 | 721 |
| full support | 6 | 78 | 1,608 | 56,520 | $2,355,120$ |
| support size $n-2$ | - | 63 | 5,112 | $1,005,000$ | $142,533,000$ |
| support size $n-3$ | - | - | 208 | 53,400 | $17,743,200$ |
| support size $n-4$ | - | - | - | 525 | 289,350 |
| support size $n-5$ | - | - | - | - | 1,116 |
| $\left\|E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)\right\|$ | 9 | 148 | 6,953 | $1,115,566$ | $162,922,507$ |

## Appendix: GAP code for enumeration

The following GAP code produces a list suppulist of all possible supports of size suppsize for elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$, and then constructs for each support $U$, a list actionlist of all triples $(\pi ; \lambda, \rho)$ that represent elements of $E^{+}\left(B_{n}\right)$ with support $U$, as in Proposition 3.2. The number of elements found for each $U$ is the summed by the counter esize.

```
#Enumeration of E(B_n) by triples
#Set required value of n here
n:=4;
#Set required support size here
suppsize:=2;
#Initialize counter
esize:=0;
sn:=SymmetricGroup(n);
#Define suppulist as list of possible sets U of size suppsize in degree n
ulist:=[];
seed:=[1..suppsize];
for g in sn do
Add(ulist,AsSortedList(OnTuples(seed,g)));
od;
suppulist:=DuplicateFreeList(ulist);
#List all possible U,V,pi in the list pilist
pilist:= [];
```

```
for uset in suppulist do
stabuset:=Stabilizer(sn,uset,OnTuples);
stabtrans:=RightTransversal(sn,stabuset);
for g}\mathrm{ in stabtrans do
newpi:=[uset,OnTuples(uset,g),g];
Add(pilist,newpi);
od;
od;
for pee in pilist do
actionlist:=[];
stabu:=Stabilizer(sn,pee[1],OnTuples);
transv:=RightTransversal(sn,stabu);
cosetgens:=AsList(RightCoset(stabu,pee[3]));
hgp:=Group(cosetgens);
#for each left action lam find all possible distinct right actions rho
for lam in transv do
lamaction:=OnTuples(pee[1],lam);
bigrholist:=[];
for rho in RightCoset(hgp,lam) do
Add(bigrholist,OnTuples(pee[2],rho));
rholist:=Unique(bigrholist);;
od;
for rhoaction in rholist do
newaction:=[pee[1], pee [2],lamaction,rhoaction];
Add(actionlist,newaction);
od;
od;
#add new actions to running total
esize:=esize+Length(actionlist);;
od;
#Reveal final total
esize;
```
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