



HAL
open science

WHICH SETS ARE SETS OF LENGTHS IN ALL NUMERICAL MONOIDS ?

Alfred Geroldinger, Wolfgang Schmid

► **To cite this version:**

Alfred Geroldinger, Wolfgang Schmid. WHICH SETS ARE SETS OF LENGTHS IN ALL NUMERICAL MONOIDS ?. 2018. hal-01700170v2

HAL Id: hal-01700170

<https://hal.science/hal-01700170v2>

Preprint submitted on 24 Feb 2018 (v2), last revised 1 Jul 2018 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

WHICH SETS ARE SETS OF LENGTHS IN ALL NUMERICAL MONOIDS?

ALFRED GEROLDINGER AND WOLFGANG A. SCHMID

ABSTRACT. We explicitly determine those sets of nonnegative integers which occur as sets of lengths in all numerical monoids.

Dedicated to Jerzy Kaczorowski on the occasion of his 60th birthday.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

Numerical monoids have been objects of interest ever since the work of Frobenius. Beyond number theory, numerical monoids have close connections to various branches in commutative algebra. We provide two examples. First, numerical semigroup rings and hence numerical monoids play a crucial role in combinatorial commutative algebra (see [5, 4, 7]). Second, numerical monoids are the simplest cases of finitely primary monoids which appear as localizations of non-principal orders in number fields at prime ideals containing the conductor (see [16, Chapter 2.10]). Motivated by all these connections, the study of the arithmetic of numerical monoids has found wide interest in the literature.

Factorization Theory originated from algebraic number theory before it branched out into various subfields of algebra (see [16, 11, 3, 2, 8]). The goal is to understand from a qualitative and quantitative point of view the various phenomena of non-uniqueness of factorizations into atoms (irreducible elements) that can occur in non-factorial domains and monoids. We refer to Narkiewicz's monograph [26] for a presentation from a number theoretic point of view and to recent progress in the quantitative theory due to Kaczorowski ([25]).

We briefly survey results on the arithmetic of numerical monoids with respect to sets of lengths and then we discuss the more specific topics of the present paper.

By a numerical monoid we mean an additive submonoid of $(\mathbb{N}_0, +)$ whose complement in \mathbb{N}_0 is finite. It is not difficult to show that finitely generated (commutative and cancellative) monoids (and numerical monoids belong to this class) satisfy the main arithmetical finiteness properties studied in factorization theory. To be able to be a little bit more precise, we fix notation and recall some basic definitions. Let H be an additively written, commutative, and cancellative monoid. If $a = u_1 + \dots + u_k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and u_1, \dots, u_k are atoms of H , then k is called a factorization length of a and the set $L(a)$ of all possible factorization lengths is called the set of lengths of a . If $a \in H$ is invertible, then we set $L(a) = \{0\}$, and $\mathcal{L}(H) = \{L(a) \mid a \in H\}$ denotes the system of all sets of lengths. Suppose that $H \subset (\mathbb{N}_0, +)$ is numerical and $\mathcal{A}(H) = \{n_1, \dots, n_t\}$ is its set of atoms with $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq n_1 < \dots < n_t$. Then, clearly, $t = 1$ if and only if $n_1 = 1$ if and only if $H = \mathbb{N}_0$. Suppose that $t \geq 2$. Obviously, every nonzero element has a factorization into atoms and $\max L(a) \leq a/n_1$ for all $a \in H$. Furthermore, we have $\{n_1, n_2\} \subset L(n_1 n_2)$ whence

$$\{(N - i)n_1 + in_2 \mid i \in [0, N]\} \subset L(Nn_1 n_2) \quad \text{for every } N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, all sets of lengths are finite and there are arbitrarily large sets of lengths. For a finite set $L = \{m_1, \dots, m_\ell\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $m_1 < \dots < m_\ell$, we denote by $\Delta(L) = \{m_i - m_{i-1} \mid i \in [2, \ell]\}$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20M13, 20M14.

Key words and phrases. numerical monoids, numerical semigroup algebras, sets of lengths, sets of distances.

This work was supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF, Project Number P 28864-N35.

the set of distances of L . The set

$$\Delta(H) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}(H)} \Delta(L)$$

is the set of distances of the monoid H (also called the delta set of H), and it is easy to see that $\min \Delta(H) = \gcd \Delta(H)$. Now we can formulate a main arithmetical finiteness result (the first statement follows from [6, Proposition 2.9] and the second statement is a special case of [16, Theorem 4.3.6]).

Theorem A. *Let H be a numerical monoid and $\mathcal{A}(H) = \{n_1, \dots, n_t\}$ its set of atoms with $t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $1 < n_1 < \dots < n_t$.*

1. $\Delta(H)$ is finite and $\min \Delta(H) = \gcd(n_2 - n_1, \dots, n_t - n_{t-1})$.
2. There exists some $M \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that every set of lengths $L \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ has the form

$$L = L' \uplus \{y, y + d, \dots, y + \ell d\} \uplus L'' \subset y + d\mathbb{Z},$$

where $y, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $L' \subset y - [1, M]$, $L'' \subset y + \ell d + [1, M]$, and $d = \min \Delta(H)$.

The following two questions ensue.

- (1) *Can the above structural results be improved or do realization theorems show that they are best possible.*
- (2) *Are there sets of lengths which are characteristic for a given numerical monoid (in the sense that they do not occur as a sets of lengths in any other numerical monoid) and which sets of lengths occur in any numerical monoid.*

The focus of the present note is on question (2) for numerical monoids. But before considering numerical monoids we summarize what is known for transfer Krull monoids over finite abelian groups. They include principal orders in number fields, constitute the best investigated class of monoids in factorization theory, but their arithmetic differs significantly from that of numerical monoids. Let H be a transfer Krull monoid over a finite abelian group G . Then the system of sets of lengths of H just depends on G . Indeed, we have

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{L}(H) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}(G)),$$

where $\mathcal{B}(G)$ is the (multiplicatively written) monoid of product-one sequences over G . The monoid H is half-factorial (i.e., $|L| = 1$ for all $L \in \mathcal{L}(H)$) if and only if $|G| < 3$. Suppose that $|G| \geq 3$. Then sets of lengths have a well-described structure (slightly more general than the one given in Theorem A.2) and this description is known to be best possible ([28]). The set of distances $\Delta(H)$ is an interval with $\min \Delta(H) = 1$ ([21]) whose maximum is unknown in general ([22]) (this is in contrast to the fact that in finitely generated Krull monoids any finite set Δ with $\min \Delta = \gcd \Delta$ may occur as set of distances [18]).

The standing conjecture is that the system of sets of lengths is characteristic for the group (see [15] for a survey, and [17, 23, 30, 29] for recent progress). This means that $\mathcal{L}(H) \neq \mathcal{L}(H')$ for all Krull monoids H' having prime divisors in all classes and class group G' not being isomorphic to G (here we need $|G| \geq 4$). If true, this would yield another purely arithmetical characterization of the class group for this class of monoids. Answering a question of Narkiewicz, Kaczorowski gave the first purely arithmetical characterization of the class group (see [24]), and we refer to [16, Chapter 7] for further information on such characterizations.

The question, which sets of nonnegative integers are sets of lengths in all non-half-factorial transfer Krull monoids is completely answered.

Theorem B. *We have*

$$\bigcap_{(1)} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}(G)) \stackrel{(a)}{=} \bigcap_{(2)} \mathcal{L}(H) \stackrel{(b)}{=} \{y + 2k + [0, k] \mid y, k \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \stackrel{(c)}{=} \bigcap_{(3)} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}(G)),$$

where the intersection

- (1) is taken over all finite abelian groups G with $|G| \geq 3$,

- (2) is taken over all non-half-factorial transfer Krull monoids H over finite abelian groups, and
- (3) is taken over all finite groups with $|G| \geq 3$.

We recall that Equation (a) easily follows from Equation (1.1), Equation (b) is proved in [19, Section 3], and Equation (c) can be found in [27, Proposition 4.1].

Getting back to numerical monoids, first recall that sets of lengths in numerical monoids and sets of lengths in transfer Krull monoids are distinct. More precisely, if H is any numerical monoid distinct from \mathbb{N}_0 and H' is any transfer Krull monoid (over any subset of any abelian group), then $\mathcal{L}(H) \neq \mathcal{L}(H')$ by [19, Theorem 5.5].

The standing conjecture on sets of distances of numerical monoids says that every finite set $\Delta \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\min \Delta = \gcd \Delta$ occurs as the set of distances. However, this is far open and for partial results we refer to [10]. Since every finite set $L \subset \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ can be realized as a set of lengths in a numerical monoid ([20]), every finite set of positive integers is contained in the set of distances of some numerical monoid. The maximum of the set of distances is unknown (in terms of the atoms) and this question seems to have the same complexity as questions after the Frobenius number. For partial results and computational approaches we refer to [9, 12, 13, 14].

There are numerical monoids containing no characteristic sets of lengths. Indeed, by [1], there are distinct numerical monoids H_1 and H_2 such that $\mathcal{L}(H_1) = \mathcal{L}(H_2)$. In our main result we determine all sets of nonnegative integers which occur as sets of lengths in all numerical monoids. In particular, it turns out these are only finitely many sets whereas the associated intersection for transfer Krull monoids is infinite, as can be seen from Theorem B.

Theorem 1.1. *We have*

$$\bigcap \mathcal{L}(H) = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}\},$$

where the intersection is taken over all numerical monoids $H \subsetneq \mathbb{N}_0$. More precisely, for every $t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 6}$ we have

$$\bigcap_{|\mathcal{A}(H)|=t} \mathcal{L}(H) = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}\},$$

and for every $t \in [2, 5]$ we have

$$\bigcap_{|\mathcal{A}(H)|=t} \mathcal{L}(H) = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\},$$

where the intersections are taken over all numerical monoids H with the given properties.

2. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Let H be a numerical monoid. Recall that $\mathsf{L}(0) = \{0\}$ by our convention and, by definition, for an element $u \in H$ we have $\mathsf{L}(u) = \{1\}$ if and only if $u \in \mathcal{A}(H)$. Thus $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$ are elements of each of the intersections. If $\mathcal{A}(H) = \{n_1, \dots, n_t\}$, where $t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $1 < n_1 < \dots < n_t$, then $\mathsf{L}(2n_1) = \{2\}$. Thus $\{2\}$ is an element of each of the intersections as well.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $H_{m,d}$ be the numerical monoid generated by $\{1 + (m-1)d, 1 + md, \dots, 1 + (2m-2)d\}$; note that this is a numerical monoid because $\gcd(1 + (m-1)d, \dots, 1 + (2m-2)d) = 1$, and $1 + (2m-2)d < 2(1 + (m-1)d)$ guarantees that each of the generating elements is an atom. By [6, Theorem 3.9]

$$\Delta(H_{m,d}) = \{d\}.$$

Thus, for distinct d and d' , we get that $\mathcal{L}(H_{m,d}) \cap \mathcal{L}(H_{m,d'})$ cannot contain sets of cardinality greater than 1, in other words this intersection is a subset of $\{\{k\} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. This implies that each of the intersections in the statement of our result is contained in $\{\{k\} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$.

To complete the proof of our result, it suffices to establish the following assertions.

- A1.** For every $m \geq 2$ and for every $k \geq 4$, there is a numerical monoid H with $|\mathcal{A}(H)| = m$ such that $\{k\} \notin \mathcal{L}(H)$.
- A2.** For every $m \geq 6$, there is a numerical monoid H with $|\mathcal{A}(H)| = m$ such that $\{3\} \notin \mathcal{L}(H)$.
- A3.** If $|\mathcal{A}(H)| = 3$, then $\{3\} \in \mathcal{L}(H)$.
- A4.** If $|\mathcal{A}(H)| = 4$, then $\{3\} \in \mathcal{L}(H)$.
- A5.** If $|\mathcal{A}(H)| = 5$, then $\{3\} \in \mathcal{L}(H)$.

Proof of A1. Let $m \geq 2$ and let H be the numerical monoid generated by $A = [m, 2m - 1]$; note that $\mathcal{A}(H) = A$. First, we assert that it suffices to show that $\{4\} \notin \mathcal{L}(H)$. Let $k \geq 5$, and let $a \in H$ with $k \in \mathsf{L}(a)$, say, $a = a_1 + \dots + a_k$ with $a_i \in \mathcal{A}(H)$. Assuming $\{4\} \notin \mathcal{L}(H)$, it follows that $a' = a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4$ has a factorization $a' = a'_1 + \dots + a'_l$ with $a'_i \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ and $l \neq 4$. Then, $a'_1 + \dots + a'_l + a_5 + \dots + a_k$ is a factorization of lengths $l + k - 4$ of a , whence $\mathsf{L}(a) \neq \{k\}$.

Now, let $a \in H$ with $4 \in \mathsf{L}(a)$. This means that a is in the 4-fold sumset of A , that is $a \in 4A = [4m, 8m - 4]$. If $a \geq 5m$, then $a - m \in 4A$ and $4 \in \mathsf{L}(a - m)$. Thus $5 \in 1 + \mathsf{L}(a - m) \subset \mathsf{L}(a)$, showing that $\mathsf{L}(a) \neq \{4\}$. If $a \leq 5m - 1$, then $a - (m + 1) \in [2m, 4m - 2] = 2A$ and $2 \in \mathsf{L}(a - (m + 1))$. Thus $3 \in 1 + \mathsf{L}(a - (m + 1)) \subset \mathsf{L}(a)$, and again $\mathsf{L}(a) \neq \{4\}$. \square [Proof of **A1**]

Proof of A2. Let $m \geq 6$ and let H be the numerical monoid generated by

$$A = \{m\} \cup [m + 3, 2m - 1] \cup \{2m + 1, 2m + 2\}.$$

We note that $\mathcal{A}(H) = A$. For the 2-fold, 3-fold, and 4-fold sumsets of A we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 2A &= \{2m\} \cup [2m + 3, 4m + 4], \\ 3A &= \{3m\} \cup [3m + 3, 6m + 6], \quad \text{and} \\ 4A &= \{4m\} \cup [4m + 3, 8m + 8]. \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $3A \subset 2A \cup 4A$. Thus for every $a \in H$ with $3 \in \mathsf{L}(a)$ it follows that $\mathsf{L}(a) \cap \{2, 4\} \neq \emptyset$. \square [Proof of **A2**]

Proof of A3. Assume to the contrary that there exists a numerical monoid H with three atoms, say $\mathcal{A}(H) = \{n_1, n_2, n_3\}$ with $1 < n_1 < n_2 < n_3$, such that $\{3\} \notin \mathcal{L}(H)$. Since $3 \in \mathsf{L}(2n_1 + n_2)$, the element $2n_1 + n_2$ must have a further factorization length. Since $2n_1 + n_2$ cannot be a multiple of n_1 , it follows that $\max \mathsf{L}(2n_1 + n_2) = 3$. Thus, $2 \in \mathsf{L}(2n_1 + n_2)$ and it follows that $2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_3$. Similarly, we infer that $3n_1$ must have a factorization of length 2. Since $3n_1 < 2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_3$, it follows that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3\}$.

Suppose that $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Then, using the just established equalities, $n_2 - n_1 = (2n_1 + n_2) - 3n_1 = 2n_3 - (n_2 + n_3) = n_3 - n_2 =: d$. Thus $n_2 = n_1 + d$ and $n_3 = n_1 + 2d$ which implies that $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3 = 2n_1 + 3d$ whence $n_1 = 3d$. Since $\gcd(n_1, n_2, n_3) = 1$, it follows that $d = 1$ whence $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (3, 4, 5)$. However, since $\mathsf{L}(11) = \{3\}$, we obtain a contradiction.

Suppose that $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Then $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_3 - n_2)$, say $n_3 - n_2 = d$. Then $n_2 = n_1 + 2d$, $3n_1 = 2n_1 + 4d$ whence $n_1 = 4d$, $n_2 = 6d$, and $n_3 = 7d$. Since $\gcd(n_1, n_2, n_3) = 1$, it follows that $d = 1$ whence $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (4, 6, 7)$. However, since $\mathsf{L}(15) = \{3\}$, we obtain a contradiction. \square [Proof of **A3**]

Proof of A4. Assume to the contrary that there exists a numerical monoid H with four atoms, say $\mathcal{A}(H) = \{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$ with $1 < n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < n_4$, such that $\{3\} \notin \mathcal{L}(H)$. Then as in **A3** we obtain $2 \in \mathsf{L}(3n_1)$ and $2 \in \mathsf{L}(2n_1 + n_2)$ which implies

$$(2.1) \quad 2n_1 + n_2 \geq 2n_3.$$

If $2n_1 + n_3$ would have a factorization of length at least four, then

$$2n_1 + n_3 \geq n_1 + 3n_2 > (2n_1 + n_2) + n_2 \stackrel{(2.1)}{\geq} 2n_3 + n_2,$$

a contradiction. Thus $2 \in \mathsf{L}(2n_1 + n_3)$ which implies $2n_1 + n_3 \in \{n_2 + n_4, 2n_4\}$ and hence

$$(2.2) \quad 2n_1 + n_3 \geq n_2 + n_4.$$

If $2n_1 + n_4$ would have a factorization of length two, then $2n_1 + n_4 \leq 2n_3$ but

$$2n_1 + n_4 > 2n_1 + n_2 \stackrel{(2.1)}{\geq} 2n_3, \quad \text{a contradiction.}$$

Therefore, $2n_1 + n_4$ has a factorization of length at least four which implies that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} 2n_1 + n_4 &\geq n_1 + 3n_2 = (2n_1 + n_2) + n_2 + (n_2 - n_1) \\ &\stackrel{(2.1)}{\geq} 2n_3 + n_2 + (n_2 - n_1) = (2n_1 + n_3) + (n_3 - n_1) + 2(n_2 - n_1) \\ &\stackrel{(2.2)}{\geq} n_2 + n_4 + (n_3 - n_1) + 2(n_2 - n_1). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we infer that

$$2n_1 \geq n_2 + (n_3 - n_1) + 2(n_2 - n_1) \quad \text{whence} \quad 3n_1 \geq n_2 + n_3 + 2(n_2 - n_1) > n_2 + n_3$$

which implies that $3n_1 \in \{2n_3, n_2 + n_4, n_3 + n_4, 2n_4\}$. If $3n_1 = 2n_3$, then $2n_1 + n_2 \geq n_3 + n_4$ whence $2n_1 + n_3 = 2n_4$ and if $3n_1 \geq n_2 + n_4$, then $2n_1 + n_3 > n_2 + n_4$ whence $2n_1 + n_3 = 2n_4$. Thus in any case we have $2n_1 + n_3 = 2n_4$ and we can improve the last inequality in (2.3) whence

$$2n_1 + n_4 \geq 2n_4 + (n_3 - n_1) + 2(n_2 - n_1).$$

Therefore, $2n_1 \geq n_4 + (n_3 - n_1) + 2(n_2 - n_1)$ and adding n_1 we obtain that $3n_1 \geq n_4 + n_3 + 2(n_2 - n_1) > n_3 + n_4$. This implies that $3n_1 = 2n_4$, a contradiction to $2 \in \mathbf{L}(2n_1 + n_2)$. \square [Proof of **A4**]

*Proof of **A5**.* Again, assume to the contrary that there exists a numerical monoid H with five atoms, say $\mathcal{A}(H) = \{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5\}$ with $1 < n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < n_4 < n_5$, such that $\{3\} \notin \mathcal{L}(H)$. Then as in **A4** we obtain that 2 is an element of $\mathbf{L}(3n_1)$, of $\mathbf{L}(2n_1 + n_2)$, and of $\mathbf{L}(2n_1 + n_3)$. Moreover,

$$(2.4) \quad 2n_1 + n_2 \geq 2n_3 \quad \text{and} \quad 2n_1 + n_3 \geq n_2 + n_4.$$

We proceed to show that $2 \in \mathbf{L}(2n_1 + n_4)$. Assume not. Then, $\mathbf{L}(2n_1 + n_4)$ contains an element greater than or equal to 4 and it follows that $2n_1 + n_4 \geq n_1 + 3n_2$. Similarly to **A4** we get that, using (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} 2n_1 + n_4 &\geq n_1 + 3n_2 \\ &= (2n_1 + n_2) + n_2 + (n_2 - n_1) \\ &\geq 2n_3 + n_2 + (n_2 - n_1) \end{aligned}$$

whence $n_4 \geq n_3 + (n_3 - n_1) + 2(n_2 - n_1)$. In combination with $2n_1 + n_3 \geq n_2 + n_4$, that is, $n_3 \geq n_4 + n_2 - 2n_1$, we get that $n_4 \geq n_4 + (n_3 - n_1) + 3(n_2 - n_1) - n_1$. Equivalently, $n_1 \geq (n_3 - n_1) + 3(n_2 - n_1)$ and $5n_1 \geq n_3 + 3n_2$. This yields $3n_1 > n_2 + n_3$. Moreover, $2n_1 + n_4 \geq n_1 + 3n_2$, means $n_1 + n_4 \geq 3n_2$, and this implies $2n_1 + n_2 < 3n_2 \leq n_1 + n_4$. Thus, $2n_1 + n_2 \in \{n_2 + n_3, 2n_3\}$. Yet, since $2n_1 + n_2 > 3n_1 > n_2 + n_3$ this is a contradiction, both $2n_1 + n_2$ and $3n_1$ would need to equal $2n_3$. This contradiction shows that $\max \mathbf{L}(2n_1 + n_4) < 4$, and whence $2 \in \mathbf{L}(2n_1 + n_4)$.

We consider the possible factorizations of $2n_1 + n_4$ of length 2. The factorization must not contain n_1 or n_4 . Moreover, $2n_1 + n_4$ is strictly greater than $2n_1 + n_2 \geq 2n_3$ and $2n_1 + n_3 \geq n_2 + n_4$. Thus, $2n_1 + n_4 \in \{n_2 + n_5, n_3 + n_5, 2n_5\}$ and we distinguish these three cases.

CASE 1. $2n_1 + n_4 = n_2 + n_5$. Since $2n_1 + n_3 < 2n_1 + n_4 = n_2 + n_5$ and since by (2.4) we have $2n_1 + n_3 \geq n_2 + n_4$, it follows that $2n_1 + n_3 \in \{n_2 + n_4, 2n_4\}$. We distinguish the two cases.

Case 1.1. $2n_1 + n_3 = n_2 + n_4$. Since $2n_3 \leq 2n_1 + n_2 < 2n_1 + n_3 = n_2 + n_4$, we get that $2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_4 - n_3 = n_5 - n_4$ and moreover $n_3 - n_2 = (n_4 - n_3) + (n_2 - n_3)$. Thus, $n_4 - n_3 = 2(n_3 - n_2)$. We set $d = n_3 - n_2$. We have that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3\}$. We distinguish the two cases.

Case 1.1.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_3 - n_2) = 2d$. Consequently, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 7d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (4, 6, 7, 9, 11)$. Thus, $n_1 + n_3 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 1.1.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 = d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 3d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_4$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2. $2n_1 + n_3 = 2n_4$. We get that $2n_1 + n_2 \in \{2n_3, n_3 + n_4\}$. We distinguish the two cases.

Case 1.2.1. $2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_3 - n_2 = 2(n_4 - n_3)$. Moreover, $n_4 - n_3 = (n_5 - n_4) + (n_2 - n_4)$. Thus, setting $d = n_4 - n_3$ we have $n_3 - n_2 = 2d$ and $n_5 - n_4 = 4d$. We have that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3\}$ and distinguish cases.

Case 1.2.1.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_3 - n_2) = 4d$. It follows that $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 6d, n_1 + 7d, n_1 + 11d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 8d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (8, 12, 14, 15, 19)$. We check that $L(35) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2.1.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2$. It follows that $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 9d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 6d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (6, 8, 10, 11, 15)$. We check that $L(27) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2.2. $2n_1 + n_2 = n_3 + n_4$. It follows that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3, n_2 + n_4, 2n_3\}$. We distinguish cases.

Case 1.2.2.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_3 - n_2 = n_4 - n_3 =: d$. Moreover, $n_2 - n_1 = (n_4 - n_2) + (n_3 - n_2) = 3d$ and $n_4 - n_1 = n_5 - n_2$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 8d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 6d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (6, 9, 10, 11, 14)$. We check that $L(26) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2.2.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_3 - n_2 = n_4 - n_3 =: d$ and $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_2 = 2d$. Moreover, $n_4 - n_1 = n_5 - n_3$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 7d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 5d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2.2.3. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 =: d$ and $n_3 - n_2 = n_4 - n_3 = d$. Moreover, $n_4 - n_1 = n_5 - n_4 = 3d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$ whence $n_1 + n_3 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2.2.4. $3n_1 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_3 =: d$ and $n_3 - n_2 = n_4 - n_3 = d$. Moreover, $n_4 - n_1 = n_5 - n_3 + (n_2 - n_3)$ and thus $n_5 - n_3 = (n_4 - n_1) + (n_3 - n_2) = 4d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (4, 5, 6, 7, 10)$. Thus, $n_1 + n_3 = n_5$, a contradiction.

CASE 2. $2n_1 + n_4 = n_3 + n_5$. Since $2n_1 + n_3 < 2n_1 + n_4 = n_3 + n_5$, it follows that $2n_1 + n_3 \in \{n_2 + n_4, 2n_4, n_2 + n_5\}$. We distinguish the three cases.

Case 2.1. $2n_1 + n_3 = n_2 + n_4$. We get that $2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_4 - n_3 = (n_3 - n_2) + (n_5 - n_4)$ and $n_3 - n_2 = (n_4 - n_3) + (n_2 - n_3)$. It follows that $n_4 - n_3 = 2(n_3 - n_2)$ and $n_5 - n_4 = (n_4 - n_3) - (n_3 - n_2)$. We set $d = n_3 - n_2$ to get $n_4 - n_3 = 2d$ and $n_5 - n_4 = d$. We infer that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3\}$ and distinguish the two cases.

Case 2.1.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_3 - n_2) = 2d$. It follows that $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 2.1.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 = d$. It follows that $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 3d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_4$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2. $2n_1 + n_3 = 2n_4$. We infer that $2n_1 + n_2 \in \{2n_3, n_3 + n_4\}$ and distinguish the two cases.

Case 2.2.1. $2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_3 - n_2 = 2(n_4 - n_3)$. Moreover, $n_4 - n_3 = n_5 - n_4 + (n_3 - n_4)$ and thus $n_5 - n_4 = 2(n_4 - n_3)$. We infer that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3, n_2 + n_4\}$ and distinguish three cases. Set $d = n_4 - n_3$.

Case 2.2.1.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_3 - n_2) = 4d$. Thus, it follows that $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 6d, n_1 + 7d, n_1 + 9d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 8d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (8, 12, 14, 15, 17)$. We check that $L(33) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.1.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 = 2d$. Thus, it follows that $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 7d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 6d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (6, 8, 10, 11, 13)$. We check that $L(25) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.1.3. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = (n_3 - n_2) + (n_3 - n_4) = d$. Thus, it follows that $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$ we infer that $n_1 = 5d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.2. $2n_1 + n_2 = n_3 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_3 - n_2 = n_4 - n_3 =: d$. Moreover, $n_4 - n_3 = n_5 - n_4 + (n_3 - n_4)$ and thus $n_5 - n_4 = 2(n_4 - n_3) = 2d$. We observe that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3, n_2 + n_4, 2n_3\}$ and distinguish cases.

Case 2.2.2.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_2 + (n_3 - n_2) = 3d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 7d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 6d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (6, 9, 10, 11, 13)$. We check that $L(25) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.2.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_2 = 2d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 5d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (5, 7, 8, 9, 11)$. We check that $L(21) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.2.3. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 = d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 5d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2.2.4. $3n_1 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_3 = d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 5d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3. $2n_1 + n_3 = n_2 + n_5$. We obtain that $2n_1 + n_2 \in \{2n_3, n_3 + n_4, 2n_4\}$ and distinguish the three cases.

Case 2.3.1. $2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get $n_4 - n_3 = n_3 - n_2 =: d$. Moreover, $n_4 - n_2 = n_5 - n_3 = 2d$ and therefore $n_5 - n_4 = d$. We infer that $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3, n_2 + n_4\}$ and distinguish the three cases.

Case 2.3.1.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_3 - n_2) = 2d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$ whence $2n_1 = n_4$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.1.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 = d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 3d$ whence $2n_1 = n_4$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.1.3. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 - (n_4 - n_3) = 0$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.2. $2n_1 + n_2 = n_3 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_4 - n_3 = n_3 - n_2 =: d$ and $n_5 - n_4 = n_4 - n_2 = 2d$. We have $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3, n_2 + n_4, 2n_3\}$. We distinguish the four cases.

Case 2.3.2.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_2 + (n_3 - n_2) = 3d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 7d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 6d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (6, 9, 10, 11, 13)$. We check that $L(25) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.2.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_2 = 2d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 5d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (5, 7, 8, 9, 11)$. We check that $L(21) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.2.3. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_3 - n_2 = d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 5d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.2.4. $3n_1 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_3 = d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 5d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 4d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.3. $2n_1 + n_2 = 2n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_4 - n_3 = n_3 - n_2 =: d$ and $n_3 - n_2 = (n_5 - n_4) + (n_2 - n_4)$, that is, $n_5 - n_4 = n_4 - n_2 + (n_3 - n_2) = 3d$. We have $3n_1 \in \{2n_2, n_2 + n_3, n_2 + n_4, 2n_3, n_3 + n_4\}$. We distinguish the five cases.

Case 2.3.3.1. $3n_1 = 2n_2$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_4 - n_2) = 4d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 6d, n_1 + 9d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_2$ we infer that $n_1 = 8d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (8, 12, 13, 14, 17)$. We check that $L(31) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.3.2. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_2 + (n_4 - n_3) = 3d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 5d, n_1 + 8d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 7d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (7, 10, 11, 12, 15)$. We check that $L(27) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.3.3. $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_2 = 2d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 7d)$. From $3n_1 = n_2 + n_4$ we infer that $n_1 = 6d$. We get $d = 1$, and $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (6, 8, 9, 10, 13)$. We check that $L(23) = \{3\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2.3.3.4. $3n_1 = 2n_3$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = 2(n_4 - n_3) = 2d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 4d, n_1 + 7d)$. From $3n_1 = 2n_3$ we infer that $n_1 = 6d$, and we conclude as in the preceding case.

Case 2.3.3.5. $3n_1 = n_3 + n_4$. Considering differences we get that $n_2 - n_1 = n_4 - n_3 = d$. Thus, $(n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5) = (n_1, n_1 + d, n_1 + 2d, n_1 + 3d, n_1 + 6d)$. From $3n_1 = n_3 + n_4$ we infer that $n_1 = 5d$ whence $n_1 + n_2 = n_5$, a contradiction.

CASE 3. $2n_1 + n_4 = 2n_5$. It follows that $2n_1 > n_5$. We consider $2n_1 + n_5$. Since $2n_5 < 2n_1 + n_5 < 4n_1$. The first inequality shows that $L(2n_1 + n_5)$ cannot contain 2, the second shows that $L(2n_1 + n_5)$ cannot contain 4 or any larger element. Thus, $L(2n_1 + n_5) = \{3\}$. \square [Proof of **A5**]

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Amos, S.T. Chapman, N. Hine, and J. Paixão, *Sets of lengths do not characterize numerical monoids*, Integers **7** (2007), Paper A50, 8p.
- [2] N.R. Baeth and D. Smertnig, *Factorization theory: From commutative to noncommutative settings*, J. Algebra **441** (2015), 475 – 551.
- [3] N.R. Baeth and R. Wiegand, *Factorization theory and decomposition of modules*, Amer. Math. Monthly **120** (2013), 3 – 34.
- [4] V. Barucci, *Numerical semigroup algebras*, Multiplicative Ideal Theory in Commutative Algebra (J.W. Brewer, S. Glaz, W. Heinzer, and B. Olberding, eds.), Springer, 2006, pp. 39 – 53.
- [5] V. Barucci, D.E. Dobbs, and M. Fontana, *Maximality Properties in Numerical Semigroups and Applications to One-Dimensional Analytically Irreducible Local Domains*, vol. 125, Memoirs of the Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.
- [6] C. Bowles, S.T. Chapman, N. Kaplan, and D. Reiser, *On delta sets of numerical monoids*, J. Algebra Appl. **5** (2006), 695 – 718.
- [7] W. Bruns and J. Gubeladze, *Polytopes, Rings, and K-Theory*, Springer, 2009.
- [8] S.T. Chapman, M. Fontana, A. Geroldinger, and B. Olberding (eds.), *Multiplicative Ideal Theory and Factorization Theory*, Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics, vol. 170, Springer, 2016.
- [9] S.T. Chapman, P.A. García-Sánchez, D. Llena, A. Malyshev, and D. Steinberg, *On the delta set and the Betti elements of a BF-monoid*, Arab. J. Sci. Eng. **1** (2012), 53 – 61.
- [10] S. Colton and N. Kaplan, *The realization problem for delta sets of numerical monoids*, J. Commut. Algebra **9** (2017), 313 – 339.
- [11] M. Fontana, E. Houston, and T. Lucas, *Factoring Ideals in Integral Domains*, Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana, vol. 14, Springer, 2013.
- [12] J. I. García-García, M. A. Moreno-Frías, and A. Vigneron-Tenorio, *Computation of delta sets of numerical monoids*, Monatsh. Math. **178** (2015), 457–472.
- [13] P. A. García-Sánchez, D. Llena, and A. Moscariello, *Delta sets for symmetric numerical semigroups with embedding dimension three*, Aequationes Math. **91** (2017), no. 3, 579–600.
- [14] ———, *Delta sets for nonsymmetric numerical semigroups with embedding dimension three*, Forum Math. **30** (2018), no. 1, 15–30.
- [15] A. Geroldinger, *Sets of lengths*, Amer. Math. Monthly **123** (2016), 960 – 988.
- [16] A. Geroldinger and F. Halter-Koch, *Non-Unique Factorizations. Algebraic, Combinatorial and Analytic Theory*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 278, Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2006.

- [17] A. Geroldinger and W. A. Schmid, *A characterization of class groups via sets of lengths*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.04679>.
- [18] A. Geroldinger and W. A. Schmid, *A realization theorem for sets of distances*, *J. Algebra* **481** (2017), 188 – 198.
- [19] A. Geroldinger, W. A. Schmid, and Q. Zhong, *Systems of sets of lengths: transfer Krull monoids versus weakly Krull monoids*, In: Fontana M., Frisch S., Glaz S., Tartarone F., Zanardo P. (eds) *Rings, Polynomials, and Modules*, Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 191 – 235.
- [20] A. Geroldinger and W.A. Schmid, *A realization theorem for sets of lengths in numerical monoids*, *Forum Math.*, to appear.
- [21] A. Geroldinger and P. Yuan, *The set of distances in Krull monoids*, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **44** (2012), 1203 – 1208.
- [22] A. Geroldinger and Q. Zhong, *The catenary degree of Krull monoids II*, *J. Australian Math. Soc.* **98** (2015), 324 – 354.
- [23] ———, *A characterization of class groups via sets of lengths II*, *J. Théor. Nombres Bordx.* **29** (2017), 327 – 346.
- [24] J. Kaczorowski, *A pure arithmetical characterization for certain fields with a given class group*, *Colloq. Math.* **45** (1981), 327 – 330.
- [25] ———, *Analytic monoids and factorization problems*, *Semigroup Forum* **94** (2017), 532 – 555.
- [26] W. Narkiewicz, *Elementary and Analytic Theory of Algebraic Numbers*, 3rd ed., Springer, 2004.
- [27] J. Oh, *On the algebraic and arithmetic structure of the monoid of product-one sequences II*, to be posted on arxiv.
- [28] W.A. Schmid, *A realization theorem for sets of lengths*, *J. Number Theory* **129** (2009), 990 – 999.
- [29] Q. Zhong, *A characterization of finite abelian groups via sets of lengths in transfer Krull monoids*, *Communications in Algebra*, to appear. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05437>.
- [30] ———, *Sets of minimal distances and characterizations of class groups of Krull monoids*, *Ramanujan J.*, to appear, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11139-016-9873-2>.

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, UNIVERSITY OF GRAZ, NAWI GRAZ, HEINRICHSTRASSE 36, 8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: alfred.geroldinger@uni-graz.at

URL: <http://imsc.uni-graz.at/geroldinger>

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 13, SORBONNE PARIS CITÉ, LAGA, CNRS, UMR 7539, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 8, F-93430, VILLETANEUSE, FRANCE, AND, LABORATOIRE ANALYSE, GÉOMÉTRIE ET APPLICATIONS (LAGA, UMR 7539), COMUE UNIVERSITÉ PARIS LUMIÈRES, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 8, CNRS, 93526 SAINT-DENIS CEDEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: schmid@math.univ-paris13.fr