

# QUESTION AND HOMOMORPHISMS ON ARCHIPELAGO GROUPS

KATSUYA EDA

ABSTRACT. The classical archipelago group is a quotient group of the fundamental group of the Hawaiian earring by the normal closure of the free group of countable rank, which is denoted by  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$ . Since the fundamental group of the Hawaiian earring is expressed by the free  $\sigma$ -product  $\times_{\omega}\mathbb{Z}$ , we obtain an archipelago group  $\mathcal{A}(G)$  by replacing  $\mathbb{Z}$  with  $G$ . In [1] the authors asserted that  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$  and  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})$  are isomorphic for  $k \geq 3$ . We clarify a gap in their proof and show that there are surjective homomorphisms between  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z})$ 's and  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$  for  $k \geq 2$ .

Finally we state our conjecture and some direction showing the conjecture.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITIONS

The main purpose of this note is to state the main question about archipelago groups and to investigate the homomorphisms defined in [1]. We also point out a gap in their proof of the main result in [1] by showing a certain property of the homomorphisms and also state a conjecture. For future developments, we define many things again and somewhat differently from [1]. Archipelago groups are the fundamental groups of so-called archipelagos, which are objects in wild algebraic topology. The reader is referred to [1] for the background.

We intend explicit presentations, but words are also used to express elements of free  $\sigma$ -products. For basic notions we refer to [2]. First we define archipelago groups. Let  $G_i$  ( $i < \omega$ ) be groups. Define  $\mathcal{A}(G_i : i < \omega)$  to be the quotient group of the free  $\sigma$ -product  $\times_{i < \omega} G_i$  factored by  $N(*_{i < \omega} G_i)$ , which is the normal closure of the free product  $*_{i < \omega} G_i$ . We simply write  $\mathcal{A}(G)$  for  $\mathcal{A}(G_i : i < \omega)$  in case  $G_i = G$ .

Let  $\sigma_G : \times_{i < \omega} G_i \rightarrow \times_{i < \omega} G_i / N(*_{i < \omega} G_i)$  and  $\sigma_H : \times_{i < \omega} H_i \rightarrow \times_{i < \omega} H_i / N(*_{i < \omega} H_i)$  be the quotient homomorphisms.

Next we introduce interesting homomorphisms in [1]. Let  $\varphi_i : G_i \rightarrow H_i$  for  $i < \omega$  be maps which preserve the inverses, i.e.  $\varphi_i(x^{-1}) =$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 20E06, 55Q20  
Secondary:20F05.

$\varphi_i(x)^{-1}$ . We define  $\varphi : \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}(H_i : i < \omega)$  by:  $\overline{\varphi(W)} = \{\alpha \in \overline{W} \mid \varphi_i(W(\alpha)) \neq e \text{ where } W(\alpha) \in G_i\}$  and

$$\varphi(W)(\alpha) = \varphi_i(W(\alpha)), \text{ if } W(\alpha) \in G_i.$$

Then, we define  $\overline{\varphi} : \mathbb{N}_{i < \omega} G_i \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{i < \omega} H_i$  by  $\overline{\varphi}(W) = \varphi(W)$  for reduced words  $W$ . Since  $W$  is restricted to reduced words,  $\overline{\varphi}$  is well-defined.

Finally we define  $\overline{\varphi} : \mathcal{A}(G_i : i < \omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(H_i : i < \omega)$  by:  $\overline{\varphi} \circ \sigma_G = \sigma_H \circ \overline{\varphi}$ , where the well-defined-ness is assured by the fundamental homomorphism theorem.

## 2. RESULTS AND PROOFS

A main part of the following theorem is contained in [1].

**Theorem 2.1.** [1] *Let  $\varphi_i$  be an inverse preserving map for each  $i < \omega$ . Then,  $\overline{\varphi}$  is a homomorphism and the non-triviality of  $\overline{\varphi}$  is equivalent to the existence of infinitely many  $i$  for which there exists an  $x \in G_i$  such that  $x \neq e$  and  $\varphi_i(x) \neq e$ .*

*Proof.* First we show that  $\sigma_H \circ \overline{\varphi}$  is a homomorphism. Let  $U, V \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$  be reduced words and  $W \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$  be the reduced word such that  $W = UV$ . Then, there exists a reduced word  $W_0$  such that

- (1)  $U \equiv U_0 W_0$ ,  $V \equiv W_0^- V_0$  and  $U_0 V_0$  is reduced; or
- (2)  $U \equiv U_0 a W_0$ ,  $V \equiv W_0^- b V_0$  for some  $a, b \in G_i$  satisfying  $ab \neq e$  and  $U_0(ab)V_0$  is reduced.

Therefore  $W \equiv U_0 V_0$  or  $W \equiv U_0(ab)V_0$  and hence  $\overline{\varphi}(W) = \varphi(U_0)\varphi(V_0)$  or  $\overline{\varphi}(W) = \varphi(U_0)\varphi_i(ab)\varphi(V_0)$ .

Since  $\varphi(W_0^-) \equiv \varphi(W_0)^-$  by preservation of the inverses,

$$\overline{\varphi}(U)\overline{\varphi}(V) = \varphi(U_0)\varphi(W_0)\varphi(W_0^-)\varphi(V_0) = \varphi(U_0)\varphi(V_0)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\varphi}(U)\overline{\varphi}(V) &= \varphi(U_0)\varphi_i(a)\varphi(W_0)\varphi(W_0^-)\varphi_i(b)\varphi(V_0) \\ &= \varphi(U_0)\varphi_i(a)\varphi_i(b)\varphi(V_0) \end{aligned}$$

Now, in the both bases we have

$$\sigma_H(\overline{\varphi}(U)\overline{\varphi}(V)) = \sigma_H(\varphi(U_0)\varphi(V_0)) = \sigma_H(\varphi(W))$$

and we have shown  $\sigma_H \circ \overline{\varphi}$  is a homomorphism.

If there exist  $x_i \in G_i$  for infinitely many  $i$  such that  $x_i \neq e$  and  $\varphi_i(x_i) \neq e$ , the non-triviality of the map follows from considering a word obtained by ordering  $x_i$  in a natural way. Since a reduced word

consists of nontrivial elements of groups  $G_i$ , the negation of the condition implies that  $\varphi(W) \in *_{i < \omega} H_i$  for any reduced word  $W \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$ , which implies  $\overline{\varphi}(W) = e$ .  $\square$

Since  $\sigma_H \circ \overline{\varphi}(*_{i < \omega} G_i) = \{e\}$ , we have a homomorphism  $\overline{\overline{\varphi}} : *_{i < \omega} G_i / N(*_{i < \omega} G_i) \rightarrow *_{i < \omega} H_i / N(*_{i < \omega} H_i)$  such that  $\sigma_H \circ \overline{\varphi} = \overline{\overline{\varphi}} \circ \sigma_G$ .

An element of  $*_{i < \omega} G_i / N(*_{i < \omega} G_i)$  is expressed as  $\sigma_G(W)$  for a word  $W \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$ . In particular we may restrict  $W$  to be a reduced one.

**Lemma 2.2.** *A word  $W$  is reduced, if  $W | (\alpha, \beta) \neq e$  for each pair  $\alpha < \beta \in \overline{W}$  satisfying that  $W(\alpha), W(\beta) \in G_{i_0}$  and no letter in  $G_{i_0}$  appears in  $W | (\alpha, \beta)$  for some  $i_0$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that  $*_{i < \omega} G_i \cong G_{i_0} * *_{i \neq i_0} G_i$ , we see every occurrence of a letter in  $W$  remains in the reduced word of  $W$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $h : G \rightarrow H$  is an inverse-preserving surjective map which is not a homomorphism, then*

- (1) *there exist  $a, b, c \in G$  which are not the identity such that  $abc \neq e$  and  $h(a)h(b)h(c) = e$ ; or*
- (2) *there exist  $a, b \in G$  which are not the identity such that  $ab \neq e$  and  $h(a)h(b) = e$ .*

*Proof.* In case  $h(e) \neq e$ , we have  $a \in G$  such that  $a \neq e$  and  $h(a) = e$ . Since  $h(a^{-1}) = e^{-1} = e$ , we have  $a^2 = e$ . Setting  $b = c = a$  are desired ones for (1).

Otherwise, i.e.  $h(e) = e$ . Then,  $h(uv) \neq h(u)h(v)$  implies  $u \neq e$  and  $v \neq e$  and also  $uv \neq e$ . Choose  $w$  so that  $h(w) = h(u)h(v)$ . If  $w \neq e$ ,  $a = u, b = v, c = w^{-1}$  are desired ones for (1). Otherwise, i.e.  $w = e$ ,  $a = u$  and  $b = v$  are desired ones for (2).  $\square$

To define domains of words, we introduce some notions. The empty sequence is denoted by  $()$  and let  $n = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$  for  $n < \omega$ . A finite sequence is denoted by  $(i_0, \dots, i_k)$  whose length is  $k+1$ . For a finite sequence  $s = (i_0, \dots, i_{k-1})$ , let  $s * (j) = (i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, j)$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *Suppose that  $\varphi_i : G_i \rightarrow H_i$  is an inverse preserving surjective map for every  $i < \omega$ . If there exist infinitely many  $i$  such that  $\varphi_i$  are not homomorphisms, then  $\overline{\overline{\varphi}}$  is never injective.*

*Proof.* Let  $J$  be the subset of  $\omega$  consisting of all  $i$  such that  $\varphi_i$  are not homomorphisms. Enumerate  $J$  increasingly, i.e.  $\{j_k \mid k < \omega\} = J$  and  $j_k < j_{k+1}$ .

Let  $a_{j_k}, b_{j_k} \in G_{j_k}$  or  $a_{j_k}, b_{j_k}, c_{j_k} \in G_{j_k}$  which satisfy the required properties (2) or (1) in Lemma 2.3 respectively. We define  $\overline{W}_\alpha \subseteq Seq(3)$

inductively as the domain of  $W$  which is a tree with lexicographical ordering.

In the 0-step, if (2) in Lemma 2.3 holds for  $\varphi_{j_0}$ , then define  $W((0)) = a_{j_0}$ ,  $W((1)) = b_{j_0}$ , and otherwise, define  $W((0)) = a_{j_0}$ ,  $W((1)) = b_{j_0}$ ,  $W((2)) = c_{j_0}$ .

Suppose that  $W(s)$  is defined. Let  $m = lh(s)$ . As in the 0-step, if (2) in Lemma 2.3 holds for  $\varphi_{j_m}$ , then define  $W(s*(0)) = a_{j_m}$ ,  $W(s*(1)) = b_{j_m}$ , and otherwise, define  $W(s*(0)) = a_{j_m}$ ,  $W(s*(1)) = b_{j_m}$ ,  $W(s*(2)) = c_{j_m}$ .

We can see that  $W$  is reduced and  $\varphi(W) = e$  as follows. Since for each pair of letters indexed  $j_k$  appearing in  $W$  there appear  $a_{j_{k+1}}, b_{j_{k+1}}$  between them and  $a_{j_{k+1}}b_{j_{k+1}} = e$ , or  $a_{j_{k+1}}, b_{j_{k+1}}, c_{j_{k+1}}$  between them and  $a_{j_{k+1}}b_{j_{k+1}}c_{j_{k+1}} = e$ . Hence non-empty subwords of  $W$  is not equal to  $e$ . On the other hand, for every finite subset  $F$  of  $\omega$  consider the projection to  $*_{i \in F} H_i$  and letters indexed by the largest element  $j_k$  in  $F$ . We see  $\varphi_{j_k}(a_{j_k}), \varphi_{j_k}(b_{j_k})$  or  $\varphi_{j_k}(a_{j_k}), \varphi_{j_k}(b_{j_k}), \varphi_{j_k}(c_{j_k})$  appear contiguously. Since  $\varphi_{j_k}(a_{j_k})\varphi_{j_k}(b_{j_k}) = e$ , or  $\varphi_{j_k}(a_{j_k})\varphi_{j_k}(b_{j_k})\varphi_{j_k}(c_{j_k}) = e$ , we can cancel them and so on and we conclude the projectum is equal to  $e$ , which implies  $\varphi(W) = e$ .

Since  $W$  is a reduced word and there appear infinitely many letters,  $\sigma_G(W)$  is not the identity. Since  $\overline{\varphi}(W) = \varphi(W)$ ,  $\overline{\varphi}(\sigma_G(W)) = \sigma_H(\varphi(W)) = e$ . We have shown that  $\overline{\varphi}$  is not injective.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Suppose that  $\varphi_i : G_i \rightarrow H_i$  are surjective homomorphisms. Let  $V \in \mathcal{W}(H_i : i < \omega)$  be a reduced word. Then, there exists a reduced word  $U \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$  such that  $\varphi(U) \equiv V$ .*

*Proof.* By the surjectivity of  $\varphi_i$ , we have  $U \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$  such that  $\overline{U} = \overline{V}$  and  $\varphi_i(U(\alpha)) = V(\alpha)$  for each  $\alpha \in \overline{V}$ , where  $V(\alpha) \in H_i$ . To show that  $U$  is reduced by contradiction, suppose that there exists a non-empty subword  $W$  of  $U$  such that  $W = e$ . For any  $F \in \omega$ ,  $W_F = e$  where  $W_F$  is a finite word such that  $\overline{W}_F = \{\alpha \in \overline{W} \mid W(\alpha) \in \bigcup_{i \in F} G_i \setminus \{e\}\}$ . Since  $\varphi_i$  is a homomorphism for each  $i$ ,  $\varphi(W)_F = e$ , which implies  $V$  is not reduced. Now, we see that  $U$  is reduced.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.6.** *Suppose that  $\varphi_i : G_i \rightarrow H_i$  is an inverse preserving surjective map for every  $i < \omega$ . Then  $\overline{\varphi}$  is surjective.*

*Proof.* If almost all  $\varphi_i$  are homomorphisms, by ignoring finitely many  $G_i$  and  $H_i$  we may assume that all  $\varphi_i$  are homomorphisms. Then,  $\overline{\varphi}$  is surjective by Lemma 2.5. So we deal with the case that infinitely many  $\varphi_i$  are not homomorphisms.

For a given reduced word  $V$ , we consider  $\varphi^{-1}(V)$ . We cannot say it is a reduced word in  $\mathcal{W}(G_i : i \in I)$  and even  $\varphi^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i \in I)$ , since there may appear  $e$  in this sequence. When  $V(\alpha) \in H_i$  and  $\varphi_i(e) = V(\alpha)$ , we replace  $e$  by letters  $u_i, v_i$  such that  $u_i, v_i \neq e$  and  $\varphi(u_i)\varphi(v_i) = V(\alpha)$ . This is done by the additional condition. Let  $U$  be the obtained one. Since such  $\alpha$  appear only finitely many times for each  $i$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i \in I)$  and  $\varphi(U) = V$ . We claim the existence of a reduced word  $U_0 \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i \in I)$  such that  $\varphi(U_0) = \varphi(U)$ . Since  $\varphi(U) = V$ , we have  $\overline{\varphi}(U_0) = V$  and hence  $\overline{\varphi}(\sigma_G(U_0)) = \sigma_H(V)$ .

Actually we show the following:

Suppose that  $\varphi(U) = V$  for  $U \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$  and  $V \in \mathcal{W}(H_i : i < \omega)$ . Then, there exists a reduced word  $U_0 \in \mathcal{W}(G_i : i < \omega)$  such that  $\varphi(U_0) = V$ .

We keep Lemma 2.2 in our mind and inserting reduced words  $W$  satisfying  $\varphi(W) = e$  to  $U$ . We will define  $W_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}(G_n : n \in J)$  for each  $\alpha \in \overline{U}$  such that  $\varphi(W_\alpha) = e$ . To state our proof rigorously we introduce some notions. Recall  $3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$  and  $5 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . We construct trees consisting of finite sequence of members of  $5$  whose lengths are nonzero. Enumerate  $J \setminus \{0\}$  increasingly, i.e.  $\{j_k \mid k < \omega\} = J \setminus \{0\}$  and  $j_k < j_{k+1}$ . Let  $a_{j_k}, b_{j_k}, c_{j_k} \in G_{j_k}$  which satisfy the required properties assured by Lemma 2.3.

In the first step, i.e. the 0-th step, we consider  $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{U}$  such that  $U(\alpha), U(\beta) \in G_0$  and  $\alpha < \beta$  are contiguous, i.e.  $\alpha < \gamma < \beta$  implies  $U(\gamma) \notin G_0$ . We admit  $\beta = \infty$ . We construct  $W_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}(G_j : j \in J)$  similarly to  $W$  in (2), using  $a, b, c \in G_j$  satisfying  $abc \neq e$  and  $\varphi_j(a)\varphi_j(b)\varphi_j(c) = e$ . We define  $\overline{W}_\alpha$  as a tree with lexicographical ordering. In the 0-substep, let  $u$  be the result of multiplications of elements of  $G_{j_0}$  appearing in the subword  $U(\alpha, \beta)$  of  $U$ . We define  $W_\alpha((0)) = a, W_\alpha((1)) = b, W_\alpha((2)) = c$ , if  $abcu \neq e$  and also  $W_\alpha((3)) = a, W_\alpha((4)) = b, W_\alpha((5)) = c$  if  $abcu = e$ . We move  $\beta$  to the place of the leftmost appearance of a letter of  $G_{j_0}$  in  $U$ , if such a letter appears, and make  $\beta$  stay at the previous  $\beta$  otherwise.

Generally in the  $k$ -th substep, we let  $u$  to be the result of multiplications of letters of  $G$  appearing in  $U|(\alpha, \beta)$  and define  $W_\alpha(s * (0)) = a_{j_k}, W_\alpha(s * (1)) = b_{j_k}, W_\alpha(s * (2)) = c_{j_k}$  for  $s$  satisfying  $lh(s) = k$ . In addition if  $a_{j_k}b_{j_k}c_{j_k}u = e$ , we define  $W_\alpha(s * (3)) = a_{j_k}, W_\alpha(s * (4)) = b_{j_k}, W_\alpha(s * (5)) = c_{j_k}$  for  $s$  which is the largest element in  $\overline{W}_\alpha$  satisfying  $lh(s) = k$ . Then, we move  $\beta$  to the position of the leftmost appearance among letters whose multiplication is  $u$  in  $\overline{U}$ . If  $u$  does not exist, then we make  $\beta$  stay at the previous position. In this way we define  $W_\alpha$ . If no letters of  $G_0$  appear in  $U$ , we do not define anything.

Now in the  $m$ -step we consider the word obtained  $Y$  deleting all letters which do not belong to  $\bigcup_{i=0}^m G_i$  from  $U$ , i.e. picking letters in  $\bigcup_{i=0}^m G_i$  and order in the same way as in  $U$ . We define  $W_\alpha$  for  $\alpha$  satisfying  $U(\alpha) \in G_m$  by letting  $\beta \in \bar{U}$  to correspond to the next letter in the word in  $\mathcal{W}(\bigcup_{i=0}^m G_i)$ . We replace  $j_0$  by  $j_m$  and  $j_k$  by  $j_{m+k}$ .

Our attaching  $W_\alpha$  are done after the whole construction. Let  $\bar{U}_0 = \{(\alpha, s) \mid \alpha \in \bar{U}, s \in \bar{W}_\alpha \text{ or } s = \langle \rangle\}$  with the lexicographical ordering and  $U_0(\alpha, \langle \rangle) = U(\alpha)$  and  $U_0(\alpha, s) = W_\alpha(s)$  for  $s \in \bar{W}_\alpha$ .

The fact that  $\varphi(U_0) = V$  follows from  $\varphi(W_\alpha) = e$ . To see that  $U_0$  is reduced, let  $Y$  be a non-empty subword of  $U_0$ . Choose  $m$  be the least natural number such that a letter of  $G_m$  appears in  $Y$ . If there is only one letter of  $G_m$  which appears in  $Y$ , it implies  $Y \neq e$ . Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \bar{Y}$  such that  $\lambda < \mu$  and  $Y(\lambda), Y(\mu)$  are contiguous letters in  $G_m$ , i.e.  $Y(\lambda), Y(\mu) \in G_m$  and  $X(\nu) \notin G_m$  for  $\lambda < \nu < \mu$ .

(1) If the both appear as of form  $U_0(\gamma, \langle \rangle)$  for some  $\gamma$ , then  $Y(\lambda)$  and  $Y(\mu)$  are considered in the  $m$ -th step. We remark that no letters of  $\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} G_i$  appear in  $Y$ . According to considering letters in  $G_{j_m}$  in the substep 0 for  $W_\alpha$  we conclude  $Y \mid (\lambda, \mu) \neq e$ .

(2) If  $Y(\lambda)$  appears as of form  $U_0(\gamma, s)$  for some  $\gamma$  and  $s \in \bar{W}_\gamma$  and  $Y(\mu)$  appears as of form  $U_0(\delta, \langle \rangle)$  for some  $\delta$ . We need to consider the remaining three cases where  $Y(\lambda)$  appears as  $U_0(\gamma, s)$  for some  $\gamma$  and  $s \in W_\gamma$  and  $Y(\mu)$  appears as  $U_0(\delta, \langle \rangle)$  for some  $\delta$ . There exists  $k < m$  such that  $U(\gamma) \in G_k$ . By the minimality of  $m$ , no letter in  $\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} G_i$  appears in  $Y$ . Hence  $\beta$  in the initial stage of the construction of  $W_\gamma$  is located to the right hand side of  $Y(\mu)$ . Therefore,  $m = j_{k+l}$  and  $\beta$  in the substep  $l$  for  $\gamma$  is  $\mu \in \bar{Y}$  and by the setting for elements of  $G_{j_{k+l+1}}$  we conclude  $Y(\lambda, \mu) \neq e$ .

(3) If  $Y(\lambda)$  appears as of form  $U_0(\gamma, \langle \rangle)$  for some  $\gamma$  and  $Y(\mu)$  appears as of form  $U_0(\delta, s)$  for some  $\delta$  and  $s \in \bar{W}_\delta$ . There exists  $k < m$  such that  $U(\delta) \in G_k$ . By the minimality of  $m$ ,  $\delta$  is located at the left hand side of  $\alpha$ , i.e.  $\delta < \alpha$  in  $\bar{U}$ . Since no letters in  $U$  appear between  $U_0(\delta, \langle \rangle)$  and  $U_0(\delta, s)$ , a contradiction occurs, i.e. this case does not happen.

(4) If  $Y(\lambda)$  appears as of form  $U_0(\gamma, s)$  for some  $\gamma$  and  $s \in \bar{W}_\gamma$  and  $Y(\mu)$  appears as of form  $U_0(\delta, t)$  for some  $\delta$  and  $t \in \bar{W}_\delta$ . By the minimality of  $m$  we have  $\gamma = \delta$ . Since  $W_\gamma$  is a reduced word  $Y \mid (\alpha, \beta) \neq e$ .

Now we have shown that  $Y$  is reduced.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let  $G_i$  and  $H_i$  be at most countable non-trivial groups. Then, there exists a surjective homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}(G_i : i < \omega)$  to  $\mathcal{A}(H_i : i < \omega)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $G * G'$  is infinite for non-trivial groups  $G$  and  $G'$  and  $\times_{i < \omega} (G_{2i} * G_{2i+1}) \cong \times_{i < \omega} G_i$ , we may assume that  $G_i$  and  $H_i$  are infinite. Therefore we have an inverse-preserving surjective map from  $G_i$  to  $H_i$  for each  $i$  and hence have the conclusion by Theorem 2.6.  $\square$

Now we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.8.** *Let  $G$  and  $H$  be groups  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$  for some  $k \geq 2$ . Then, there are surjections from  $\mathcal{A}(G)$  to  $\mathcal{A}(H)$  and from  $\mathcal{A}(H)$  to  $\mathcal{A}(G)$ .*

*Remark 2.9.* (1) G. Conner informed me that the surjectivity of homomorphisms in the assumption of Theorem 2.4 is essential.

(2) If there are surjections between finite groups  $G$  and  $H$ , then  $G$  and  $H$  are obviously isomorphic. There are many infinite groups for which the statement does not hold. The author debts to M. Dugas, L. Fuchs and D. Herden for this.

### 3. CONJECTURE

First impression to this question should be negative. Here we first explain the reason. For short expressions, let  $C_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ . There are natural surjections from  $\times_{\omega} \mathbb{Z}$  to  $\mathbb{Z}^{\omega}$  and  $\times_{\omega} C_p$  to  $C_p^{\omega}$  respectively. These induce surjections from  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$  to  $\mathbb{Z}^{\omega} / \oplus_{\omega} \mathbb{Z}$  and from  $\mathcal{A}(C_p)$  to  $C_p^{\omega} / \oplus_{\omega} C_p$  respectively. Though  $\mathbb{Z}^{\omega} / \oplus_{\omega} \mathbb{Z}$  is a torsionfree group,  $C_p^{\omega} / \oplus_{\omega} C_p$  is a torsion group. These themselves do not imply the non-isomorphism of  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$  and  $\mathcal{A}(C_p)$ , but we extract a conjecture:  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$  is not isomorphic to any  $\mathcal{A}(C_p)$ . Let  $\sigma : \times_{\omega} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\omega}$  be the natural surjection. From the preceding argument, we have a surjective homomorphism  $h : \times_{\omega} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(C_p)$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(C_p)/h(\text{Ker}(\sigma)) \cong C_p^{\omega} / \oplus_{\omega} C_p$ . We conjecture the non-existence of a surjective homomorphism  $h : \times_{\omega} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{Z})/h(\text{Ker}(\sigma))$  is a torsion group.

### REFERENCES

1. G. R. Conner, W. Hojka, and M. Meilstrupp, *Archipelago groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **143** (2015), 4973–4988.
2. K. Eda, *Free  $\sigma$ -products and noncommutatively slender groups*, J. Algebra **148** (1992), 243–263.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WASEDA UNIVERSITY, TOKYO 169-8555, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* eda@waseda.jp