A VARIETY CONTAINING EMV-ALGEBRAS AND PIERCE SHEAVES OF EMV-ALGEBRAS
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Abstract. According to [DvZa], we know that the class of all EMV-algebras, EMV, is not a variety, since it is not closed under the subalgebra operator. The main aim of this work is to find the least variety containing EMV. For this reason, we introduced the variety $\text{wEMV}$ of $\text{wEMV}$-algebras of type $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$ induced by some identities. We show that, adding a derived binary operation $\ominus$ to each $\text{EMV}$-algebra $(M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)$, we extend its language, so that $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, \oplus, 0)$, called an associated $\text{wEMV}$-algebra, belongs to $\text{wEMV}$. Then using the congruence relations induced by the prime ideals of a $\text{wEMV}$-algebra, we prove that each $\text{wEMV}$-algebra can be embedded into an associated $\text{wEMV}$-algebra. We show that $\text{wEMV}$ is the least subvariety of the variety of $\text{wEMV}$-algebras containing EMV. Finally, we study Pierce sheaves of proper EMV-algebras.

1. Introduction

C.C. Chang [Cha1, Cha2] introduced MV-algebras to provide an algebraic proof of the completeness theorem of Lukasiewicz’s infinite-valued propositional calculus. D. Mundici [Mun1] proved that there is a categorical equivalence between the category of unital Abelian $\ell$-groups and the category of MV-algebras. Today, the theory of MV-algebras is very deep and has many connections with other algebraic structures and other parts of mathematics with many important applications to different areas (for more details see [CDM, Mun2]). It is well known that MV-algebras form a variety. In [Kom1], Y. Komori has described all subvarieties of the variety of MV-algebras. He proved that the lattice of subvarieties of the variety MV of MV-algebras is countably infinite. A. Di Nola and A. Lettieri presented in [DiLe1] an equational base of any subvariety of the variety MV which consists of finitely many MV-equations.

Recently in [DvZa], we introduced EMV-algebras to generalize MV-algebras and generalized Boolean algebras. An EMV-algebra locally resembles MV-algebras, but a top element is not guaranteed. Conjunction and disjunction exist but negation exists only in a local sense, i.e. negation of $a$ in $b$ exists whenever $a \leq b$, but the total negation of the event $a$ is not assumed. There is an interesting representation for EMV-algebras. Indeed, an EMV-algebra either has a top element or we can find an EMV-algebra $N$ with top element where the original EMV-algebra can be embedded as a maximal ideal of the EMV-algebra $N$, [DvZa, Thm 5.21]. This result is crucial for our reasoning. The Loomis-Sikorski theorem for these algebras was established in [DvZa1]. States as analogues of finitely additive measures were investigated in [DvZa2] and morphisms and free EMV-algebras were described in [DvZa3]. In [DvZa4], we showed that every EMV-algebra $M$ is a homomorphic image of $\text{Br}(M)$, the generalized Boolean algebra $R$-generated by $M$, where a homomorphism is a homomorphism of generalized effect algebras. Unfortunately, as we proved in [DvZa5], the class of all EMV-algebras, EMV, does not form a variety, since it is not closed under the subalgebra operator.
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The main aim of the paper is two-fold: (1) investigate EMV in order to find the least variety “containing” EMV, (2) and study Pierce sheaves of EMV-algebras.

(1) For the first purpose, we introduced a new class of algebras, wEMV-algebras, of type (2,2,2,2,0) which form a variety. The language of every EMV-algebra can be naturally extended by a derived binary operation \( \ominus \), so we obtain an associated wEMV-algebra corresponding to the original EMV-algebra. The class of EMV\(_a\) of such associated wEMV-algebras is a proper subclass of wEMV-algebras. Then we define a strict wEMV-algebra and use it to show that each wEMV-algebra \( M \) of the variety \( \text{HMV}_a \) is a strict wEMV-algebra. Then it is proved that the class of wEMV-algebras is the least subvariety containing EMV\(_a\). We show that every wEMV-algebra without top element can be embedded into an associated wEMV-algebra with top element as its maximal ideal. We describe all subvarieties of wEMV-algebras and we show that they are only countably many.

(2) For the second goal, we note that if \( M \) is a bounded EMV-algebra, then \( M \) is termwise equivalent to an MV-algebra on \( M \), and the Pierce representation of MV-algebras is studied in [Gel07, Part 4]. So, in the article, we concentrate to a case when an EMV-algebra \( M \) does not have a top element (proper EMV-algebra). Thus we construct a Pierce sheaf of a proper EMV-algebra and we show that a global section of \( T = (E_M, \pi, X) \) forms an EMV-algebra. It is proved that a semisimple EMV-algebra under a suitable condition can be embedded into a sheaf of bounded EMV-algebras on the space \( X \). Finally, we show that if \( (M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0) \) is a Stone EMV-algebra, then it can be embedded into the MV-algebra of global sections of a Hausdorff Boolean sheaf whose stalks are MV-chains.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we gather basic facts on EMV-algebras and their Basic Representation Theorem. Section 3 defines wEMV-algebras which form a variety whereas the class of EMV-algebras not. For every EMV-algebra, we extend its language adding a new derived binary operation \( \ominus \), so that it is a wEMV-algebra associated to the original EMV-algebra, and we show that the variety of wEMV-algebras is the least subvariety of the variety of wEMV-algebras containing all associated wEMV-algebras. In addition, we study a decomposition of wEMV-algebras as a direct product. In the last section, we study the Pierce sheaves of EMV-algebras.

2. Preliminaries

Recently, we have introduced in [DvZa] a common extension of generalized Boolean algebras and of MV-algebras called EMV-algebras.

An algebra \( (M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0) \) of type \( (2, 2, 2, 0) \) is said to be an extended MV-algebra, an EMV-algebra in short, if it satisfies the following conditions:

(E1) \( (M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0) \) is a distributive lattice with the least element \( 0 \);

(E2) \( (M; \ominus, 0) \) is a commutative ordered monoid (with respect to the lattice ordering \( (E1) \), i.e. \( a \leq b \) implies \( a \ominus c \leq b \ominus c \) for each \( c \in M \) with a neutral element \( 0 \);

(E3) for each \( a \in I(M) := \{ x \in M \mid x \ominus x = x \} \), the element \( \lambda_a(x) = \min \{ z \in [0, a] \mid x \ominus z = a \} \) exists in \( M \) for all \( x \in [0, a] \), and the algebra \( ([0, a]; \ominus, \lambda_a, 0, b) \) is an MV-algebra;

(E4) for each \( x \in M \), there is \( a \in I(M) \) such that \( x \leq a \).

An EMV-algebra \( M \) is called proper if it does not have a top element. Clearly, if in a generalized Boolean algebra we put \( \ominus = \lor \), \( \lambda_a(x) \) is a relative complement of \( x \in [0, a] \) in \([0, a]\), every generalized Boolean algebra can be viewed as an EMV-algebra where top element is not necessarily assumed. If \( 1 \) is a top element of an EMV-algebra \( M \), by \( (E3) \), \( ([0, 1]; \ominus, \lambda_1, 0, 1) = (M; \ominus, 0, 1) \) is an MV-algebra. Conversely, if \( (M; \ominus, 0, 1) \) is an MV-algebra, then \( (M; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0) \) is an EMV-algebra with top element \( 1 \). In addition, every EMV-algebra \( (M; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0) \) with top element \( 1 \) is termwise equivalent to an MV-algebra \( (M; \ominus, 0, 1) \).

We note that in [DvZa], there is a list of interesting examples of EMV-algebras.
Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be an EMV-algebra. Its reduct \((M; \lor, \land, 0)\) is a distributive lattice with a bottom element \(0\). The lattice structure of \(M\) yields a partial order relation on \(M\), denoted by \(\leq\), that is \(x \leq y\) if \(x \lor y = y\) if \(x \land y = x\). Also, if \(a\) is a fixed idempotent element of \(M\), there is a partial order relation \(\preceq_a\) on the MV-algebra \(([0, a]; \oplus, \land, a, 0, a)\) defined by \(x \preceq_a y\) iff \(\lambda_a(x) \oplus y = a\). By [DvZa3], we know that for each \(x, y \in [0, a]\), we have

\[
x \leq y \iff x \preceq_a y.
\]

In addition, if also \(x, y \leq b \in \mathcal{I}(M)\), then

\[
x \preceq_a y \iff x \leq y \iff x \preceq_b y.
\]

**Proposition 2.1.** [DvZa] Prop 3.9) Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be an EMV-algebra and \(a, b \in \mathcal{I}(M)\) such that \(a \leq b\). Then for each \(x \in [0, a]\), we have

(i) \(\lambda_a(x) = \lambda_b(x) \land a\);  
(ii) \(\lambda_b(x) = \lambda_a(x) \oplus \lambda_b(a)\);  
(iii) \(\lambda_a(a) = 0\).

**Lemma 2.2.** [DvZa] Lem 5.1] Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be an EMV-algebra. For all \(x, y \in M\), we define

\[
x \odot y = \lambda_a(\lambda_a(x) \oplus \lambda_a(y)),
\]

(2.1)

where \(a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\) and \(x, y \leq a\). Then \(\odot : M \times M \to M\) is an order preserving, associative well-defined binary operation on \(M\) which does not depend on \(a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\) with \(x, y \leq a\). In addition, if \(x, y \in M\), \(x \leq y\), then \(y \odot \lambda_a(x) = y \odot \lambda_b(x)\) for all idempotents \(a, b\) of \(M\) with \(x, y \leq a, b\).

The following important result on representing EMV-algebras was established in [DvZa] Thm 5.21, it generalizes an analogous result for generalized Boolean algebras, see [CoDa].

**Theorem 2.3.** [Basic Representation Theorem] Every EMV-algebra \(M\) either has a top element or \(M\) can be embedded into an EMV-algebra \(N\) with top element as a maximal ideal of \(N\) such that every element \(x \in N\) is either the image of some element from \(M\) or \(x\) is the complement of the image of some element from \(M\).

The EMV-algebra \(N\) with top element in the latter theorem is unique up to isomorphism and it is said to be representing the EMV-algebra \(M\). For more details, we refer to [DvZa].

An **MV-algebra** is an algebra \((M; \oplus, 0, 1)\) (henceforth written simply as \(M = (M; \oplus, 0, 1)\)) of type \(\langle 2, 1, 0, 0 \rangle\), where \((M; \oplus, 0)\) is a commutative monoid with the neutral element \(0\) and for all \(x, y \in M\), we have:

(i) \(x'' = x\);  
(ii) \(x \oplus 1 = 1\);  
(iii) \(x \oplus (x \oplus y)'' = y \oplus (y \oplus x)''\).

In any MV-algebra \((M; \oplus, 0, 1)\), we can also define the following operations:

\[
x \odot y := (x' \oplus y)'', \quad x \odot y := (x' \oplus y)'.
\]

(2.2)

We note that any MV-algebra is a distributive lattice where \(x \oplus (x \oplus y)'' = x \lor y = y \oplus (y \oplus x)''\) and \(x \land y = x \odot (x' \oplus y)\). Prototypical examples of MV-algebras are connected with unital \(\ell\)-groups, i.e. with couples \((G, u)\), where \(G\) is an Abelian \(\ell\)-group with a fixed strong unit of \(u \in G^+\). If we set \([0, u] = \{g \in G \mid 0 \leq g \leq u\}\), then \(\Gamma(G, u) = ([0, u]; \oplus, 0, u)\), where \(x \odot y := (x + y) \land u\) and \(a' := u - x, x, y \in [0, u]\), is an MV-algebra, and every MV-algebra is isomorphic to a unique \(\Gamma(G, u)\).
3. A Variety Containing EMV-Algebras

As we showed in [DvZa, Sec 3], the class of EMV-algebras, EMV, is not closed under subalgebras so it is neither a variety nor a quasivariety with respect to the original EMV-operations. In the section, we introduce a new class of algebras called wEMV-algebras. If we extend the language of EMV-algebras adding a derived binary operation ⊕, we obtain an associated wEMV-algebra, and the variety of wEMV-algebras contains the class of associated wEMV-algebras, EMV. We show that this class is the least subvariety of the variety sEMV containing EMV. In addition, we find some properties of this class as a direct decomposition of an wEMV-algebra to two its factors.

Definition 3.1. An algebra $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$ of type $(2, 2, 2, 2, 0)$ is called a $wEMV$-algebra (w means weak) if it satisfying the following conditions:

(i) $(M; \lor, \land, 0)$ is a distributive lattice with the least element 0;
(ii) $(M; \oplus, 0)$ is a commutative monoid;
(iii) $(x \oplus y) \ominus x \leq y$;
(iv) $x \ominus (y \ominus x) = x \lor y$;
(v) $x \ominus (x \land y) = x \ominus y$;
(vi) $z \ominus (z \ominus x) = x \land z$;
(vii) $z \ominus (x \lor y) = (z \ominus x) \land (z \ominus y)$;
(viii) $(x \land y) \ominus z = (x \ominus z) \land (y \ominus z)$;
(ix) $x \ominus (y \ominus z) = (x \ominus y) \ominus z$;
(x) $x \ominus (y \lor z) = (x \ominus y) \lor (x \ominus z)$.

An idempotent of a wEMV-algebra $M$ is any element $x \in M$ such that $x = x \ominus x$. We denote by $I(M)$ the set of all idempotents of $M$, then $0 \in I(M)$. It can happen that $I(M) = \{0\}$ as in Example 3.2 below.

In the following, we present some important examples of wEMV-algebras.

Example 3.2. If $M = G^+$ is the positive cone of an Abelian $\ell$-group $G$, and if we define on $G^+$ two operations $x \ominus y := x + y$ and $x \ominus y := (x - y) \lor 0$, $x, y \in G^+$, then $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$ is an example of a wEMV-algebra, called also a wEMV-algebra of a positive cone. Moreover, it can be embedded into the MV-algebra $N := \Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times G, (1, 0))$ as an maximal ideal of $N$, and every element of $N$ is either $(0, g)$ for some $g \in G^+$ or $(0, g)' = (1, 0) - (0, g)$ for some $g \in G^+$.

Example 3.3. Let $(M; \oplus', 0, 1)$ be an MV-algebra. If we set $x \ominus y := x \ominus y'$, $x, y \in M$, then $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$ is a wEMV-algebra with a top element 1.

Example 3.4. Consider an arbitrary proper EMV-algebra $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0)$. By Theorem 2.3, $M$ can be embedded into an EMV-algebra $N_0$ with top element as a maximal ideal of $N_0$. Then $(N_0; \ominus, \lambda_1, 0, 1)$ is an MV-algebra. For simplicity, we use $x^\lambda$ instead of $\lambda(x)$, for all $x \in N_0$. Let $\ominus$ be the well-known operation on $N_0$, that is $x \ominus y = (x^\lambda + y^\lambda)$ for all $x, y \in N_0$. Since $M$ is an ideal of $N_0$, then $M$ is closed under $\ominus$. So, we have an example of a wEMV-algebra without top element.

Combining Examples 3.3-3.4 with the Basic Representation Theorem, we see that if $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0)$ is an arbitrary EMV-algebra, extending its language with a binary operation $\ominus$, we obtain a wEMV-algebra $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$; it is said to be a wEMV-algebra associated with the EMV-algebra $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0)$; simply we say $M$ is an associated wEMV-algebra. We denote by EMV the class of associated wEMV-algebras $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$, where $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0)$ is any EMV-algebra. By a way, it is possible to show that if $x, y \leq a$, where $a$ is an idempotent of $M$, then

$$x \ominus y = \lambda_a(x \ominus y)$$

and it does not depend on the idempotent $a$. The same is true if we define

$$x \ominus y = \lambda_a(x \ominus \lambda_a y).$$
Example 3.5. Let \( \{ (M_i; \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus, 0) \} \) be a family of wEMV-algebras. Then we can easily prove that \( \sum_{i \in I} M_i = \{ f \in \prod_{i \in I} M_i \mid \text{Supp}(f) \text{ is finite} \} \) with the componentwise operations form a wEMV-algebra. Recall that \( \text{Supp}(f) = \{ i \in I \mid f(i) \neq 0 \} \).

Let \( a \) be an element of a wEMV algebra \( (M; \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus, 0) \). We define
\[
0.a = 0, \quad (n+1).a = (n.a) \oplus a, \quad n \geq 0.
\]
Now, we present some properties of wEMV-algebras.

Proposition 3.6. Basic properties of a wEMV-algebra are as follows:

(a) \( (M; \oplus, 0) \) is an ordered monoid, i.e. \( x \leq y \) implies \( x \oplus z \leq y \oplus z \) for each \( z \in M \). Moreover, \( x \leq y \) iff there is an \( a \in M \) such that \( y = x \oplus a \).

(b) If \( x \leq y \), then \( x \ominus z \leq y \ominus z \) for each \( z \in M \). If \( z_1 \leq z_2 \), then \( x \ominus z_2 \leq x \ominus z_1 \) for each \( x \in M \).

(c) \( z \ominus x \leq z \) for all \( x, z \in M \).

(d) \( x \lor y \leq x \ominus y, x, y \in M \).

(e) If \( x \leq z \), then \( (z \ominus x) \ominus x = z \) and \( (z \ominus (z \ominus x)) = x \).

(f) If \( x \leq z \), then \( z \ominus x = \min\{y \in [0, z] : x \ominus y = z\} \).

(g) For all \( x, z \in M \), we have \( z \ominus x = \min\{t \in [0, z] : t \ominus (z \land x) = z\} \).

(h) For \( x, y, z \in M \), there holds \( z \leq x \ominus y \) if and only if \( z \ominus x \leq y \).

(i) \( z \ominus 0 = z \) and \( z \ominus z = 0 \) for each \( z \in M \). Moreover, \( z \ominus y = 0 \) if and only if \( z \leq y \).

(j) If \( x \leq z \) and \( z \ominus x = 0 \), then \( z = x \).

(k) If \( a \) and \( b \) are two different atoms of \( M \), then \( a \lor b = a \oplus b \).

(l) If \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \) are mutually different atoms of \( M \), then \( a_1 \lor \cdots \lor a_n = a_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus a_n \).

Proof. (a) Definition \ref{def:ordered_monoid}(x) implies that \( (M; \oplus, 0) \) is an ordered monoid. Let \( x \leq y \), then by (iv), \( y = x \lor y = x \ominus (y \ominus x) \); we put \( a = y \ominus x \). Conversely, let \( y = x \oplus a \) for some \( a \in M \). Then \( x \lor y = x \ominus (y \ominus x) \geq x \ominus 0 = x \), i.e. \( x \leq x \ominus y \). Similarly, \( y \leq x \ominus y \). Now, let \( y = x \oplus a \) for some \( a \in M \). Then \( y = x \ominus a \geq x \ominus 0 = x \).

(b) It follows from (vii) and (viii).

(c) We have \( z \land (z \ominus x) = z \ominus (z \ominus (z \ominus x)) = z \ominus (x \land z) = z \ominus x \), i.e. \( z \ominus x \leq z \).

(d) \( x \ominus y \ominus z = 0 \), i.e. \( x \leq x \ominus y \). Similarly, \( y \leq x \ominus y \). Hence, \( x \lor y \leq x \ominus y \).

(e) Applying (iv), we have \( (z \ominus x) \ominus x = z \lor x = z \).

(f) By (e), \( z \ominus x \in \{ y \in [0, z] \mid x \ominus y = z \} \). If \( x \ominus y = z \), then \( z \leq x \ominus y \) which implies that
\[
(z \ominus x) \land ((x \ominus y) \ominus x) = (z \land (x \ominus y)) \ominus x = z \ominus x.
\]
That is, \( z \ominus x \leq (x \ominus y) \ominus x \), by (iii). Hence, (f) is proved.

(g) Let \( x, y \in M \). By (v), \( z \ominus x = z \ominus (x \land z) \). Applying (f), we have establish (g).

(h) Let \( x \leq y \). By (b), \( z \ominus x \leq (x \ominus y) \ominus x \leq y \), by (iii).

Conversely, let \( z \ominus x \leq y \). Using (iv), we get \( z \leq z \lor x = (z \ominus x) \ominus x \leq y \ominus x \leq x \ominus y \).

(i) Check \( z \ominus 0 = (z \ominus 0) \ominus 0 = z \ominus 0 = z \). On the other side, \( z \ominus 0 \ominus z = 0 \). The second part follows from (v) and the first part of the present proof of (i): \( z \ominus y = z \ominus (z \land y) = 0 \) iff \( z \land y = z \).

(j) Let \( x \leq z \) and \( z \ominus x = 0 \), then by (e) and (i), we have \( x = z \ominus (z \ominus x) = z \ominus 0 = x \).

(k) Due to (b), we have \( (a \lor b) \ominus a \leq (a \lor b) \ominus a \leq b \). If \( (a \lor b) \ominus a = 0 \), then (j) entails \( a = a \lor b \), so that \( b \leq a \) which means \( a = b \), a contradiction. Whence, \( (a \lor b) \ominus a = b \). Then \( a \lor b = ((a \lor b) \ominus a) \ominus a = b \ominus a = a \ominus b \).

(l) We proceed by induction. Due to (k), the statement holds for \( n = 2 \). Assume that it holds for each integer \( i \leq n \), i.e. \( a_1 \lor \cdots \lor a_i = a_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus a_i \). Set \( b_n = a_1 \lor \cdots \lor a_n = a_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus a_n \). Check
\[
(b_n \lor a_{n+1}) \ominus b_n \leq (b_n \ominus a_{n+1}) \ominus b_n \leq a_{n+1}.
\]
There are two cases: First \( b_n \lor a_{n+1} \ominus b_n = 0 \). Then by (j), \( b_n \lor a_{n+1} = b_n \) and \( a_{n+1} \leq b_n = a_1 \lor \cdots \lor a_n \). Distributivity implies \( a_{n+1} = (a_{n+1} \land a_1) \lor \cdots \lor (a_{n+1} \land a_n) = 0 \) which is a contradiction. Therefore, we
have the second case \((b_n \lor a_{n+1}) \oplus b_n = (b_n \oplus a_{n+1}) \oplus b_n = a_{n+1}\) which yields
\[
b_n \lor a_{n+1} = ((b_n \lor a_{n+1}) \oplus b_n) \lor b_n = a_{n+1} \lor b_n
\]
as claimed.

Lemma 3.7. Let \(a\) be an atom of a wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus, 0)\) and \(b\) an arbitrary element of \(M\). If there is an integer \(n \geq 0\) such that \(b \leq n.a\), then \(b = m.a\) for some \(m \geq 0\).

Proof. (1) We first show that either \((n+1).a\) is a cover of \(n.a\) for each \(n \geq 0\) or \(n.a\) is an idempotent for some \(n \geq 1\). Assume that there is an integer \(n \geq 0\) such that \(n.a < b \leq (n+1).a\). We show that \(b = (n+1).a\). By Proposition 3.3(a), there is an element \(c \in M\) such that \(b = (n.a) \oplus c\). Hence, \((n.a) \oplus c \in M\) and \(b = (n.a) \oplus c\). There are two cases: Either \(((n.a) \oplus c \ominus (n.a)) = 0\) or \(((n.a) \oplus c \ominus (n.a)) = a\). In the first one, we have
\[
n.a = \left(\left((n.a) \ominus c \ominus (n.a)\right) \oplus (n.a)\right) = \left((n.a) \ominus c \ominus (n.a)\right) \lor (n.a) = (n+1).a
\]
which is a contradiction. Hence, we have the second case \(((n.a) \ominus c \ominus (n.a)) = a\) which yields
\[
\left(\left((n.a) \ominus c \ominus (n.a)\right) \oplus (n.a)\right) \lor (n.a) = (n+1).a
\]
\[
(n.a) \ominus c \ominus (n.a) \lor (n.a) = (n+1).a
\]
Now, let \(b \leq n.a\). If \(n = 1\), then \(b = 0\) or \(b = a = 1.a\). Let \(n \geq 2\) and let, for all \(k < n\), we have \(b \leq k.a\) implies that \(b = m.a\) for some \(m \leq k\). We assume that \(m.a \neq (m+1).a\) for all \(m < n\). Otherwise, the proof follows from the assumption. Consider the elements \(b \land a, b \land 2.a, \ldots, b \land (n-1).a\) and \(b \land n.a\).

(2) If there exist integers \(k\) and \(m\) with \(k < m < n\) such that \(b \land m.a = k.a\), we add \((n-m).a\) to each side of the equation, so that \((b \ominus (n-m).a) \land n.a = k.a \ominus (n-m).a\). Therefore, \(b \leq (b \ominus (n-m).a) \land n.a = k.a \oplus (n-m).a \ominus (n-1).a\) and by the assumption, \(b = t.a\) for some integer \(t \leq n\).

(3) From \(b \land a \leq a\) we get that \(b \land a = 0\) or \(b \land a = a\). If \(b \land a = 0\), then \(b = b \land n.a \leq n.(b \land a) = 0\).

Proposition 3.8. Let \(a\) be an atom of a wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus, 0)\). Let \(\ominus\) on \(N\) denote the truncate difference, i.e. \(m \ominus n = (m-n) \lor 0, m, n \in N\). If we denote by \(M_a := \{m.a \mid m \geq 0\}\), then \(M_a\) is a subalgebra of \(M\).

In addition, if there is the least integer \(m_0\) such that \(m_0.a\) is an idempotent element of \(M\), then \(M_a = \{0, a, \ldots, m_0.a\}\) is an EMV-algebra that is termwise equivalent to the MV-algebra \((M_a; \oplus, \land, 0)\) that is isomorphic to \(\Gamma(\frac{1}{m_0} \mathbb{Z}, 1)\), and \(m.a \ominus n.a = (m \ominus n).a\) for each \(0 \leq m, n \leq m_0\).

Otherwise, \(M_a\) is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra \((\mathbb{Z}^+; \lor, \land, 0)\), where \(m \ominus n = m + n, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\).

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.7 it is clear that \(M_a\) is closed under \(0, \lor, \land, \ominus\). We show that it is closed also under \(\oplus\). If \(m \leq n\), then clearly \(m.a \ominus n.a = 0 = (m \ominus n).a\). In the rest, we assume that \(m > n\).

(1) First, let \(m_0\) be the least integer \(m\) such that \(m.a\) is an idempotent of \(M\). Let \(0 \leq m, n \leq m_0\). Let \(n = m - i\) for some \(i = 1, \ldots, n\). Then \(m.a \ominus (m - i).a = j.a\), where \(j = 0, \ldots, i\). Assume that \(j < i\). Then \((m.a \ominus (m - i).a) \ominus (m - i).a = m.a\ominus j.a \ominus (m - i).a = (m + j - i).a < m.a\) when we apply Lemma
This gives a contradiction, so that $j = i$ and \( m.a \odot n.a = (m - n).a \). Clearly, \( M_a \) corresponds to \( \Gamma(m, Z, 1) \).

(2) Now, let any \( m.a \) be no idempotent and let \( m > n \). Then \( m.a \odot n.a = i.a \) for some integer \( i > 0 \) and due to Lemma 3.7, every \( (k + 1).a \) is a cover of \( k.a, k \geq 0 \). Hence, as at the end of (1), we conclude that \( m.a \odot n.a = (m - n).a = (m \odot n).a \) whenever \( m > n \). This implies that \( k.a \otimes t.a = (k + 1).a \) and \( M_a \) is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra \((Z^+; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) of the positive cone \( Z^+ \), see Example 3.2.

**Lemma 3.9.** Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be a wEMV-algebra and let \( a \) be an arbitrary element of \( M \). For each \( x, y, z \in [0, a] \) we have:

1. \( a \odot (a \odot x) = x \);
2. \( x \land y = a \odot ((a \odot x) \lor (a \odot y)) \);
3. \( (x \land y) \odot z = (x \odot z) \land (y \odot z) \);
4. \( z \odot (x \land y) = (z \odot x) \lor (z \odot y) \).

**Proof.**

(i) It follows from Definition 3.1(iv).

(ii) By (i), \( x \land y = (a \odot (a \odot x)) \lor (a \odot (a \odot y)) = a \odot ((a \odot x) \lor (a \odot y)) \).

(iii) By Proposition 3.6(a), \( (x \land y) \odot z \leq x \odot z, x \odot y \). Now, let \( w \in M \) such that \( w \leq x \odot z, x \odot y \). Proposition 3.6(h) implies that \( w \odot z \leq x \land y (w \odot z) \odot z \leq (x \land y) \odot z \) and so \( w \leq (x \land y) \odot z \) (by Definition 3.1(iv)). Therefore, \( (x \land y) \odot z = (x \odot z) \land (y \odot z) \).

(iv) By Proposition 3.6(b), \( z \odot (x \land y) \geq z \odot x, z \odot y \). Now, let \( u \in M \) such that \( u \geq z \odot x, z \odot y \). Then \( u \odot x, u \odot y \geq z \) which imply that \( u \odot (x \land y) = (u \odot x) \land (u \odot y) \geq z \) (by (iii)). Now, by Proposition 3.6(h), \( u \geq z \odot (x \land y) \). It follows that \( z \odot (x \land y) = (z \odot x) \lor (z \odot y) \).

**Proposition 3.10.** Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be a wEMV-algebra. For each \( a \in M \), \((M; \oplus_a, \lambda_a, 0, a)\) is an MV-algebra, where for each \( x, y \in [0, a] \),

\[
x \oplus_a y = (x \oplus y) \land a, \ & \lambda_a(x) = a \odot x.
\]

Moreover, if we put \( x \oplus_a y := a \odot ((a \odot x) \oplus_a y) \), see (3.2), then \( x \oplus_a x = x \odot y \).

**Proof.**

Put \( x, y, z \in [0, a] \).

\[
(x \oplus_a y) \oplus_a z = \left( ((x \oplus y) \land a) \odot z \right) \land a, \ & \text{by Lemma } 3.9(\text{iii})
\]

\[
= \left( ((x \oplus y) \odot z) \land (a \odot z) \right) \land a.
\]

In a similar way, \( x \oplus_a (y \oplus_a z) = (x \oplus (y \oplus z)) \land a \) and so \( \oplus_a \) is associative. Now, we can easily show that \(([0, a]; \oplus_a, 0)\) is a commutative ordered monoid with the neutral element 0, and \(([0, a]; \lor, \land, 0, a)\) is a bounded distributive lattice.

We know that \( x \oplus y \oplus y = x \lor y \leq a \), so

\[
(x \oplus y) \lor y = ((x \oplus y) \lor y) \land a = (x \oplus y) \oplus_a y.
\]  

(3.3)

On the other hand,

\[
a \odot \left( ((a \odot x) \oplus y) \land a \right) = \left( a \odot ((a \odot x) \oplus y) \right) \lor (a \odot a), \ & \text{by Lemma } 3.9(\text{iv}),
\]

\[
= \left( a \odot ((a \odot x) \oplus y) \right) \lor 0 = (a \odot (a \odot x)) \odot y, \ & \text{by Definition } 3.1(\text{ix})
\]

\[
= x \odot y, \ & \text{by Lemma } 3.9(\text{i}).
\]  

(3.4)

It follows from (3.3) that

\[
y \oplus_a \left( a \odot ((a \odot x) \oplus y) \right) = y \oplus_a (x \odot y) = y \odot (x \odot y) = x \lor y, \ & \text{by } 3.3.
\]  

(3.5)
In a similar way, \( x \oplus_a \left( a \ominus (x \ominus_a (a \ominus y)) \right) = x \lor y \).

Finally, let \( x, y \leq a \). Check
\[
x \ominus_a y = a \ominus ((a \ominus x) \ominus_a y) = a \ominus ((a \ominus x) \ominus y) \\
= [a \ominus ((a \ominus x) \ominus y)] \lor (a \ominus a) = (a \ominus (a \ominus x)) \ominus y \\
= x \ominus y.
\]

Recall that if \( f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \) is a map between wEMV-algebras \((M_1; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) and \((M_2; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\), then \( f \) is a wEMV-homomorphism if \( f \) preserves the operations \( \lor, \land, \oplus \) and 0. Moreover, a non-empty subset \( S \) of \( M_1 \) is a wEMV-subalgebra of the wEMV-algebra \( M_1 \) if it is closed under operations \( \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus \).

Consider the class wEMV of all wEMV-algebras. Clearly, wEMV is a variety. Due to BuSa Thm 12.5, this variety is even arithmetical which can be demonstrated by the Pixley term \( m(x,y,z) := ((x \ominus y) \ominus z) \land ((z \ominus y) \ominus x) \land (x \lor z) \). By Proposition 3.10 we can easily show that wEMV contains EMV, the class of all wEMV-algebras which are associated with EMV-algebras (for more details see [DvZa]). There is a natural question. "Is EMV a proper subclass of wEMV?" According to the following example the answer to this question is positive.

**Example 3.11.** Consider the positive cone \( M := G^+ \) of a non-trivial Abelian \( \ell \)-group \( G \). Define \( x \ominus y := 0 \lor (x - y) \) and \( x \ominus y := x + y \). According to Example 3.2 \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) is a wEMV-algebra. But, its reduct \((M; \lor, \land, +, 0)\) is not an EMV-algebra, since for each \( x \in M \setminus \{0\} \), we have \( x < x + x \), so that for every \( x \in G^+ \setminus \{0\} \), there is no idempotent \( a \in M \) such that \( x \leq a \), see (E4). Therefore, EMV is a proper subclass of wEMV.

A non-empty subset \( I \) of a wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) is called an ideal if \( I \) is a down set which is closed under \( \ominus \). Clearly, by Proposition 3.6 we can easily see that \( I \) is closed under the operations \( \lor, \land \) and \( \ominus \), too. An ideal \( P \) of the wEMV-algebra \( M \) is prime if \( x \land y \in P \) implies that \( x \in P \) or \( y \in P \). The set of all prime ideals of \( M \) is denoted by \( \text{Spec}(M) \).

**Lemma 3.12.** In each wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) the following inequality holds:
\[
x \ominus z \leq (x \ominus y) \ominus (y \ominus z).
\] (3.6)

**Proof.** Let \( x, y, z \in M \). Put \( a \in M \) such that \( x \oplus y \ominus z \leq a \). Then by Proposition 3.10 consider the MV-algebra \([0, a], \ominus_a, \ominus_a, 0, a\). Let \( \ominus_a \) be the well-known binary operation in this MV-algebra, that is \( x \ominus_a y = \lambda_a(\lambda_a(x) \ominus_a y) \) for all \( x, y \leq a \). Then by Lemma 3.9 (iv) and Definition 3.11 (iv), we have
\[
x \ominus_a y = \ a \ominus \left( ((a \ominus x) \ominus y) \land \ominus \right) = \ (a \ominus ((a \ominus x) \ominus y)) \lor (a \ominus a) \\
= \ ((a \ominus x) \ominus y) \ominus (a \ominus a) \ominus y = x \ominus y.
\] (3.7)

So, the result follows directly since in the MV-algebra \([0, a], \ominus_a, \ominus_a, 0, a\) we have
\[
x \ominus_a z \leq (x \ominus_a y) \ominus_a (y \ominus_a z) \leq (x \ominus_a y) + (y \ominus z).
\]

**Proposition 3.13.** Let \( I \) be an ideal of a wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\). Then the relation \( \theta_I := \{(x, y) \in M \times M \mid x \ominus y, y \ominus x \in I\} \) is a congruence relation on \( M \).

**Proof.** Clearly, \( \theta_I \) is reflexive and symmetric. Transitivity follows from Lemma 3.12. Let \( z \in M \) and \( (x, y) \in \theta_I \). Put \( a \in M \) such that \( x \oplus y, x \oplus z, y \oplus z \leq a \). By Proposition 3.10 \(([0, a], \ominus_a, \ominus_a, 0, a)\) is an MV-algebra. Clearly, \( I_a := I \cap [0, a] \) is an ideal of this MV-algebra. Let \( * \in \{\lor, \land, \ominus\} \). Then
$x \ast z, y \ast z \in [0, a]$ and we can easily see that $(x \ast z) \ominus_a (y \ast z) \in I_a \subseteq I$, (since $I_a$ is an ideal of the MV-algebra $[0, a]$). In a similar way, $(x \ast z) \ominus_a (y \ast z) \subseteq I$. From equation (3.7), we have

$$
(x \ast z, y \ast z) \in \theta_i, \quad \ast \in \{\vee, \wedge, \ominus\}.
$$

On the other hand, since $x \oplus y \leq a$, then $(x \oplus y) \in I_a$ and $(x \ominus_a z) \ominus_a (y \ominus_a z) \in I_a$. Now, $x \ominus z, y \ominus z \leq a$ and equation (3.7) imply that $(x \oplus z) \ominus (y \ominus z) \in I_a \subseteq I$. By the similar way, we can prove that $(y \ominus z) \ominus (x \ominus z) \in I$. Therefore, $\theta_i$ is a congruence relation on the wEMV-algebra $(M; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$. □

Let $I$ be an ideal of a wEMV-algebra $(M; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$. The set of all congruence classes with respect to $I$ is denoted by $M/I$. Clearly, $M/I$ together with the natural operations forms a wEMV-algebra, see Proposition 3.13. For simplicity, we use $x/I$ to denote the class $x/\theta_i$. Therefore, $(M/I; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0/I)$ is a wEMV-algebra which is called the quotient wEMV-algebra with respect to $I$.

**Proposition 3.14.** Let $P$ be a prime ideal of a wEMV-algebra $(M; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$. Then the lattice $(M/P; \vee, \wedge)$ is a chain.

**Proof.** Let $x, y \in M$. There is $a \in M$ such that $x \oplus y \leq a$. Consider the MV-algebra $([0, a]; \oplus_a, \lambda_a, 0, a)$. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 3.13, we can show that $P_a := P \cap [0, a]$ is a prime ideal of the MV-algebra $[0, a]$, and so the quotient MV-algebra $[0, a]/P_a$ is a chain (with the natural operations). Without loss of generality, we assume that $x/P_a \leq y/P_a$. Then $(x \ominus_a y) \in P_a \subseteq P$ and so by equation (3.7), $x \ominus y \in P$. Now, we can easily conclude that $x/P \leq y/P$ on the wEMV-algebra $(M/P; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0/P)$. □

We can easily check that the converse of Proposition 3.14 is also true, that is if $E/I$ is a chain, then $I$ is a prime ideal.

A wEMV-algebra $(M; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$ with no non-zero idempotent element is called a strict wEMV-algebra.

**Proposition 3.15.** Let $(M; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$ be a linearly ordered wEMV-algebra. Then it is strict or $M$ is termwise equivalent to an EMV-algebra with a top element.

**Proof.** Assume that $M$ is not strict. Then there exists an idempotent element $a \in M \setminus \{0\}$. We claim that $M = [0, a]$. Otherwise, put $x \in M \setminus [0, a]$. Set $b := (x \ominus a) \uplus (a \ominus x)$. By Proposition 3.10, $([0, b]; \ominus_b, \lambda_b, 0, b)$ is an MV-algebra containing $a$ in which $a \ominus_b a = (a \ominus a) \wedge b = a \ominus a = a$ and $b = a \ominus b = b$. That is, $0 \leq a \leq b$ is a chain of Boolean elements in the MV-chain $([0, b]; \ominus_b, \lambda_b, 0, b)$. It follows that $a = b$ and so $x \leq a$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, $M = [0, a]$. □

In each wEMV-algebra $(M; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$, we can easily check that, for each ideal $I$ of $M$ and each non-empty subset $S \subseteq M$, the ideal of $M$ generated by $I \cup S$ is the set $\{x \in M \mid x \leq a \ominus x_1 \cdots \ominus x_n, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \exists a \in I, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_n \in S\}$. Now, let $z \in M \setminus I$. Let $T$ be the set of all ideals of $M$ containing $I$ such that $z \in M \setminus I$. By Zorn’s lemma, $T$ has a maximal element, say $P$. Clearly, $z \notin P$. Let $x \wedge y \in P$ for some $x, y \in M$. We claim that $x \in P$ or $y \in P$. Otherwise, $z \in \langle P \cup \{x\} \rangle$ and $z \in \langle P \cup \{y\} \rangle$. Then there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u, v \in P$ such that $z \leq u \ominus n \cdot x$ and $z \leq v \ominus n \cdot y$. Let $b \in M$ be such that $2n \cdot (u \ominus v) \oplus n^2 \cdot (x \ominus y) \leq b$. Consider the MV-algebra $([0, b]; \ominus_b, \lambda_b, 0, b)$. Then we have $z \leq (u \ominus b \cdot n \cdot x) \wedge (v \ominus n \cdot y) \leq (u \ominus v \ominus n \cdot x \wedge u \ominus v \ominus n \cdot y)$. Since the right hand side of the last inequality belongs to $[0, b]$, we have $z \leq (u \ominus v \ominus n \cdot x \wedge u \ominus v \ominus n \cdot y)$, where $1 \cdot x = x$ and $n \cdot x = x \ominus_b (n - 1) \cdot x$ for all integer $n \geq 2$. Since $([0, b]; \ominus_b, \lambda_b, 0, b)$ is an MV-algebra by (CLe Prop 1.17.4)),

$$
z \leq (u \ominus v) \ominus_b (n \cdot x \wedge n \cdot y) \leq 2n \cdot (u \ominus v) \ominus_b n^2 \cdot (x \wedge y) \leq 2n \cdot (u \ominus v) \ominus_b n^2 \cdot (x \wedge y) \in P,
$$

which is a contradiction. So, $P$ is a prime ideal of the wEMV-algebra $M$. Summing up the above arguments, we have the next proposition.

**Proposition 3.16.** Let $(M; \vee, \wedge, \ominus, \ominus, 0)$ be a non-zero wEMV-algebra. Then we have:

(i) For each $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$ there exists a prime ideal $P$ of $M$ such that $x \notin P$. 


Lemma 3.17. (1) Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be a cancellative wEMV-algebra. Then it is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone of some \(\ell\)-group \((G; +, 0)\).

(2) In addition, every linearly ordered strict wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) is a cancellative wEMV-algebra, and \(M\) is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone of a linearly ordered group \((G; +, 0)\).

Proof. (1) Let \(M\) be a cancellative wEMV-algebra. Since according to Proposition 3.16(a), \(M\) is naturally ordered, i.e. \(x \leq y\) iff \(y = x \oplus z\) for some \(z \in M\), due to the Nakada Theorem, there is an \(\ell\)-group \(G\) such that \(M\) is isomorphic to \((G^+; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\), where \(g_1 \oplus g_2 = g_1 + g_2\), \(g_1 \ominus g_2 = (g_1 - g_2) \lor 0\) (see Example 3.2).

(2) Let \(M\) be a strict and linearly ordered wEMV-algebra. We claim that the operation \(\oplus\) in the commutative monoid \((M; \oplus, 0)\) is cancellative. Indeed, assume that \(x, y, z \in M\) such that \(x \oplus z = y \oplus z\). Since \(M\) is a linearly ordered strict wEMV, for each \(u \in M\), there is an element \(v \in M\) such that \(u \leq v\). Let \(a \in M\) be such that \(2, (x \oplus y \oplus z) \leq a\). Consider the MV-algebra \((\{0, a\}; \ominus, \wedge, \lor, 0, a)\). There exists an \(\ell\)-group \((G_a; +, 0)\) with a strong unit \(u_a\) such that \((\{0, a\}; \ominus_a, \wedge_a, 0, a) \cong (G_a, u_a)\) (see Sec 2 and 7). We put \(\Gamma(G_a, u_a) = [0, a]\) and so \(u_a = a\). Then \(x \oplus_a z = (x + z) \land_a a\) and \(x \ominus_a z = (x \lor_a) \land_a a\). Since \(x \oplus z \leq a\), then \(x \ominus_a z \leq a\) which implies that \(x + z \leq a\) (otherwise, \(a \leq (x + z)\), that is \((x + z) \land a = a\).

In a similar way, we can show that \(y + z \leq a\). Hence, \(x + z = x \oplus_a z = y \ominus_a z = y + z\) and so \(x = y\), and \(M\) is a cancellative wEMV-algebra.

According to (1), there is an \(\ell\)-group \((G^+; +, 0)\) such that \(M\) is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone \(G^+\). Since \(M\) is linearly ordered, \((G^+; +, 0)\) is a linearly ordered group.

Theorem 3.18. Each wEMV-algebra is a subalgebra of an associated wEMV-algebra with top element.

Proof. If \(M = \{0\}\), then the proof is evident. Let \(M \neq \{0\}\).

Let \(S_1 := \{P \in \text{Spec}(M) \mid M/P\) has a non-zero idempotent element\} and \(S_2 := \{P \in \text{Spec}(M) \mid M/P\) is strict\}. Then \(\text{Spec}(M) = S_1 \cup S_2\). Also, by Proposition 3.16(ii), we can easily prove that the map \(\varphi: M \to \prod_{P \in \text{Spec}(M)} M/P\) sending \(x \in M\) to \((x/P)_{P \in \text{Spec}(M)}\) is a one-to-one homomorphism. On the other hand, \(\prod_{P \in \text{Spec}(M)} M/P \cong \left(\prod_{P \in S_1} M/P\right) \times \left(\prod_{P \in S_2} M/P\right)\), so we identify these two wEMV-algebras. By Propositions 3.15 and 3.14 for each \(P \in S_1\), \(M/P\) is an associated wEMV-algebra and so \(\prod_{P \in S_1} M/P\) can be viewed as an EMV-algebra, too. Note that due to [DvZa] Thm 3.24, this associated wEMV-algebra has a top element. Now, let \(P \in S_2\). If there is \(a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\) such that \(a \notin P\), then clearly \(a/P\) is a non-zero idempotent element of \(M/P\), which is a contradiction. That is, \(\mathcal{I}(M) \subseteq P\) for all \(P \in S_2\), so that \(\mathcal{I}(M) \subseteq \cap\{P \mid P \in S_2\}\).

Suppose that \(P \in S_2\). Then \(M/P\) is a linearly ordered strict wEMV-algebra. So, by Lemma 3.17, it is the positive cone of an \(\ell\)-group \(G_P\). Example 3.2 entails that \(M/P\) can be embedded into an associated wEMV-algebra with top element. Hence, \(\prod_{P \in S_2} M/P\) can be embedded into an associated wEMV-algebra with top element, too.

Summing up the above arguments, the wEMV-algebra \(M\) is a subalgebra of an associated wEMV-algebra with top element.

The latter theorem allows us to present a similar representation result as the Basic Representation Theorem 2.3 for EMV-algebras. We recall that if a wEMV-algebra possesses a top element, then \(1 \ominus x\) is said to be a "complement of \(x\)."
Theorem 3.19. Every wEMV-algebra $M$ either has a top element and so it is an associated wEMV-algebra or it can be embedded into an associated wEMV-algebra $N$ with top element as a maximal ideal of $N$. Moreover, every element of $N$ is either the image of $x \in M$ or is a complement of the image of some element $x \in M$.

Proof. If $M$ has a top element, the statement is trivial. So suppose that the wEMV-algebra has no top element. Take $S_1$ and $S_2$ as the sets of prime ideals of $M$ defined in the proof of Theorem 3.18. If $S$ is the set of all prime ideals, then $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. If $P \in S_1$, then $M/P$ is an associated linearly ordered EMV-algebra with top element. If $P \in S_2$, then $M/P$ is a linearly ordered strict and consequently cancellative wEMV-algebra without top element which corresponds to a wEMV-algebra of a positive cone $G^+_P$. So it can be embedded into $\Gamma(Z \rightarrow G_P, (1,0))$. Denote by $N_0 = (\prod_{P \in S_1} M/P) \times (\prod_{P \in S_2} \Gamma(Z \rightarrow G_P, (1,0)))$ which is an associated wEMV-algebra with a top element 1, and according to Theorem 3.18 $M$ can be embedded into $N_0$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $M \subset N_0$ is a proper wEMV-subalgebra of $N_0$. We denote by $\ominus$ and $\oplus$ also the binary operations of $N_0$. Denote by $M^* = \{1 \oplus x \mid x \in M\}$. We assert that $M \cap M^* = \emptyset$. Indeed, if $1 \ominus x = y$ for some $x, y \in M$, then $1 = (1 \ominus x) \oplus x = x \oplus y$ which says $1 = x \oplus y \in M$, a contradiction.

First, we define a binary operation $\ominus$ on $N_0$ as $x \ominus y := 1 \ominus ((1 \ominus x) \oplus (1 \ominus y))$, $x, y \in N_0$.

Claim If $x, y \in M$, then $x \ominus y \in M$ and $x \ominus y = x \ominus (1 \ominus y)$.

Let $x = (x_P)_{P \in S}, y = (y_P)_{P \in S}, 1 = (1_p)_{P \in S} \in N_0$. Then $1 \ominus ((1 \ominus x) \oplus (1 \ominus y)) = (1_p)_{P \in S} \ominus ((1_p)_{P \in S} \ominus (x_P)_{P \in S}) \ominus ((1_p)_{P \in S} \ominus (y_P)_{P \in S})$.

If $P \in S_1$, then $1_P \ominus ((1_P \ominus x_P) \ominus (1_p \ominus y_P)) \in M/P$ since $M/P$ is an associated wEMV-algebra and applying [24]. If $P \in S_2$, then using calculations in $\Gamma(Z \rightarrow G_P, (1,0))$, we have also $1_P \ominus ((1_P \ominus x_P) \ominus (1_p \ominus y_P)) \in M/P$. Then $1 \ominus ((1 \ominus x) \ominus (1 \ominus y)) \in M$.

In addition, $x \ominus (1 \ominus y) = 1 \ominus ((1 \ominus x) \ominus (1 \ominus (1 \ominus y))) = 1 \ominus ((1 \ominus x) \ominus y) = x \ominus y$ (applying Definition 3.11).

Set $N = M \cup M^*$. We show that $N$ is an associated EMV-subalgebra of $N_0$ which satisfies the conditions of our theorem.

Clearly $N$ contains $M$ and 1. Let $x, y \in N$. We have three cases: (i) $x = x_0, y = y_0 \in M$. Then $x \vee y, x \wedge y, x \ominus y \in N$. Due to Proposition 3.10 we have $x \ominus y = x \ominus y$ and using (3.11) and a similar verification as in Claim, we have $x \ominus y \in M \subset N$.

(ii) $x = 1 \ominus x_0, y = 1 \ominus y_0$ for some $x_0, y_0 \in M$. Then $x \vee y = (1 \ominus x_0) \vee (1 \ominus y_0) = 1 \ominus (x_0 \wedge y_0), x \wedge y = 1 \ominus (x_0 \cap y_0)$ and $x \ominus y = (1 \ominus x_0) \ominus (1 \ominus y_0) = 1 \ominus (x_0 \ominus y_0) \in N$. Finally, by Claim (1 \ominus x_0) \ominus (1 \ominus y_0) = (1 \ominus x_0) \ominus y_0 = y_0 \ominus x_0 \in M \subset N$.

(iii) $x = x_0$ and $y = 1 \ominus y_0$ for some $x_0, y_0 \in M$. We note that $N_0$ can be viewed also as an EMV-algebra with top element, according to [DvZa] Lem 5.1], we have $x \ominus (1 \ominus y) = x \ominus (1 \ominus (x \ominus y))$. Then $x \ominus y = x_0 \ominus (1 \ominus y_0) = 1 \ominus (y_0 \ominus (1 \ominus x_0)) = 1 \ominus (y_0 \ominus (1 \ominus (x_0 \ominus y_0))) = 1 \ominus (y_0 \ominus (x_0 \ominus y_0)) \in M^* \subset N$.

In addition, we have $x \wedge y = x_0 \wedge (1 \ominus y_0) = x_0 \ominus ((1 \ominus x_0) \ominus (1 \ominus y_0)) = x_0 \ominus (1 \ominus (x_0 \ominus y_0)) = x_0 \ominus (x_0 \ominus y_0) \in M \subset N$.

Using $x \vee y = 1 \ominus ((1 \ominus x) \ominus (1 \ominus y)) = 1 \ominus ((1 \ominus x_0) \ominus y_0)$, we have, due to the latter paragraph, $x \vee y \in N_0$. Moreover, $x \ominus y = x_0 \ominus (1 \ominus y_0) = x_0 \ominus y \in M$ and $y \ominus x = (1 \ominus y_0) \ominus x_0 = 1 \ominus (x_0 \ominus y_0) \in M^*$, when we have used (ix) of Definition 3.11.

Now, we prove that $M$ is a maximal ideal of $N$. Since $M$ is a wEMV-algebra without top element, $M$ is a proper subset of $N$. To show that $M$ is an ideal, it is sufficient to assume $y \leq x \in M$. If $y = (1 \ominus y_0)$, then $1 = (1 \ominus y_0) \ominus y_0 \geq x_0 \ominus y_0 \in M$ which is absurd while $1 \notin M$. Therefore, $M$ is a proper ideal of
N. Now, let \( y \in N \setminus M \), then \( y = 1 \oplus y_0 \) for some \( y_0 \in M \). Then the ideal \( \langle M, y \rangle \) of \( N \) generated by \( M \) and \( 1 \oplus y_0 \) contains 1, so that \( \langle M, 1 \oplus y_0 \rangle = N \) proving \( M \) is a maximal ideal of \( N \).

The associated wEMV-algebra \( N \) with top element in the latter theorem is said to be a representing \( M \). We note that all representing associated wEMV-algebras of \( M \) are mutually isomorphic.

**Theorem 3.20.** The class wEMV is the least subvariety of the variety wEMV containing EMV\(_\lambda\). Moreover, wEMV = HSP(C), where C is the class of all linearly ordered wEMV-algebras.

**Proof.** By Example 3.14 wEMV contains EMV\(_\lambda\). Let \( V \) be an arbitrary variety of wEMV-algebras containing EMV. Then by Theorem 3.18 wEMV \( \subseteq V \). The second part follows from the proof of Theorem 3.18.

As it was already mentioned, according to [Kom], the lattice of subvarieties of the variety MV of MV-algebras is countably infinite. Di Nola and Lettieri presented in [DiLe1] an equational base of any subvariety of the variety MV which consists of finitely many MV-equations using only \( \oplus \) and \( \odot \). We know that we can define a binary operation \( \odot \) on \( M \), see Claim in the proof of Theorem 3.19. Given \( x \in M \) and an integer \( n \geq 1 \), we define

\[
x^1 := x, \quad x^{n+1} := x \odot x^n, \quad n \geq 1,
\]

and \( x^0 := 1 \) if \( M \) has a top element 1. We note that the subvariety of MV-algebras generated by the MV-algebra \( \Gamma(Z \rightarrow Z, (1, 0)) \) has an equational base \( (2.x)^2 = 2.x^2 \), see [DiLe, Thm 5.11], [DiLe1]; it is the subvariety generated by perfect MV-algebras. Denote by \( O \) the trivial subvariety of wEMV-algebras consisting only of the zero element.

**Theorem 3.21.** Let \( \text{Can} \) denote the class of cancellative wEMV-algebras. Then \( \text{Can} \) is a subvariety of the variety wEMV, and a wEMV-algebra \( M \) belongs to \( \text{Can} \) if and only if \( M \) satisfies the identity

\[
(x \oplus y) \odot x = y.
\]

Equivalently, \( M \in \text{Can} \) if and only if \( M \) is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone \( G^+ \) of some \( \ell \)-group \( G \). In addition, if \( Z^+ = (Z^+; \lor, \land, \oplus, \odot, 0) \) is the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone \( Z^+ \), then \( \text{Can} = \text{Var}(Z^+) \), and \( \text{Can} \) is an atom of the lattice of subvarieties of wEMV.

Moreover, if we denote by \( \text{Perf} \) the subvariety of wEMV-algebras satisfying the equation \( (2.x)^2 = 2.x^2 \), then \( \text{Perf} \) is a cover of the subvariety \( \text{Can} \), and the associated wEMV-algebra \( (\Gamma(Z \rightarrow Z, (1, 0)); \lor, \land, \oplus, \odot, 0) \) with top element and representing the cancellative wEMV-algebra \( Z^+ \) is a generator of the variety \( \text{Perf} \).

**Proof.** Let a wEMV-algebra \( M \) satisfy the equation \( (x \oplus y) \odot x = y \). We assert that \( M \) is cancellative. If \( x \oplus y = x \oplus z, \, x, y, z \in M \), then \( y = (x \oplus y) \odot x = (x \oplus z) \odot x = z \), so that \( M \) is a cancellative wEMV-algebra. If \( M \) is a cancellative wEMV-algebra, according to Lemma 3.17(1), \( M \) is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone \( (G^+; \lor, \land, \oplus, \odot, 0) \) of some \( \ell \)-group \( G \). Whence, \( \text{Can} \) is a proper non-trivial subvariety of the variety wEMV. It is well known that the group of integers \( Z \) generates the variety of Abelian \( \ell \)-groups, see e.g. [Gin, Thm 10.1]. Using this fact, and the HSP-technique, it is possible to show that the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone \( Z^+ \) generates the variety \( \text{Can} \).

Clearly, \( O \subseteq \text{Can} \) is a subvariety of \( \text{Perf} \). Let \( V \) be a subvariety of wEMV-algebras such that \( O \subseteq V \subseteq \text{Can} \). Then every non-trivial wEMV-algebra of \( V \) is cancellative. Let \( M \in \text{Can} \) be non-trivial and let \( f \in M \) be a non-zero element. Then \( \{n.f \mid n \geq 0\} \) is a wEMV-subalgebra of \( M \) generated by \( f \) and it is isomorphic to the wEMV-algebra of the positive cone \( Z^+ \), which implies \( Z^+ \in V \) and thus \( V = \text{Can} \), and \( \text{Can} \) is an atom in the lattice of subvarieties of wEMV.

Let \( M \in \text{Perf} \). If \( M \) possesses a top element, then \( \langle M; \oplus, \land_1, 0, 1 \rangle \) is an MV-algebra satisfying the equation \( (2.x)^2 = 2.x^2 \). If \( M \) has no top element, let \( N \) be its representing associated wEMV-algebra. Without loss of generality we can assume that \( M \cup M^* = N \). If \( x \in M \), then clearly \( (2.x)^2 = 2.x^2 \). If
If $M$ is cancellative and non-trivial, then $M$ is without top element and is isomorphic to the positive cone $wEMV$-algebra $G^+$. Its representing $wEMV$-algebra is isomorphic to the associated $wEMV$-algebra $N = \Gamma(G, u)$ and it satisfies as an $MV$-algebra the identity of perfect $MV$-algebras $(2.x)^2 = 2.x^2$, therefore, $N$ as a $wEMV$-algebra, satisfies the identity $(2.x)^2 = 2.x^2$, and $N \in \text{Perf}$. Henceforth, we conclude that $\text{Can} \subseteq \text{Perf}$. Take the associated $wEMV$-algebra with top element $M_0 = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, (1,0))$. Then the cancellative $wEMV$-algebra $\mathbb{Z}^+$ is a subalgebra of $M_0$ and $\mathbb{Z}^+ \subseteq \text{Var}(M_0)$, where $\text{Var}(M_0)$ is the subvariety of $wEMV$ generated by $M_0$. Whence, $\text{Can} \subseteq \text{Var}(M_0)$. The associated $wEMV$-algebra with top element $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, (1,0))$ satisfies the identity $(2.x)^2 = 2.x^2$, so that $\text{Var}(M_0) \subseteq \text{Perf}$. Now, let $M \in \text{Perf}$ be an arbitrary $wEMV$-algebra. Using Theorem 3.22, we know that $M$ is a subdirect product algebra of $N := (\bigoplus_{P \in \mathcal{S}_1} M/P) \times (\bigoplus_{P \in \mathcal{S}_2} M/P)$. Let $N_1 := \prod_{P \in \mathcal{S}_1} M/P$ and $N_2 := \prod_{P \in \mathcal{S}_2} M/P$. Then $N_1$ is an associated $wEMV$-algebra with top element satisfying $(2.x)^2 = 2.x^2$. Therefore, $N_1 \in \text{Var}(M_0)$ and $N_2$ is a cancellative $wEMV$-algebra so that $N_2 \in \text{Can} \subseteq \text{Var}(M_0)$ which yields $N = N_1 \times N_2 \in \text{Var}(M_0)$ and $\text{Perf} \subseteq \text{Var}(M_0)$ which proves that the associated $wEMV$-algebra $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, (1,0))$ generates the variety Perf.

In what follows, we show that Perf is a cover of Can. So let $V$ be a subvariety of $wEMV$-algebras such that $\text{Can} \subseteq V \subseteq \text{Perf}$ and let $M \in V \setminus \text{Can}$. There are two cases. (1) If $M$ has a top element, then $M$ is an associated $wEMV$-algebra with top element so that the termwise $MV$-algebra belongs to the variety generated by perfect $MV$-algebras, so that the $MV$-algebra $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, (1,0))$ belongs to the variety of $MV$-algebras generated by $M$, consequently, the associated $wEMV$-algebra $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, (1,0))$ belongs to the subvariety $\text{Var}(M)$ of $wEMV$-algebras generated by the $wEMV$-algebra $M$. As it was established in the latter paragraph, $\text{Var}(M) = \text{Perf}$. If $M$ has no top element, use again the subdirect embedding of $M$ into $N = N_1 \times N_2$ from the latter paragraph. (2) If $S_1 = \emptyset$, then $N \in \text{Can}$ and $M$ as a subalgebra of $N_2$ also belongs to Can, an absurd. Hence, $S_1$ is non-empty and there is $P \in S_1$ so that $M/P$ is an associated $wEMV$-algebra with top element and $M/P \in \text{Var}(M)$. As in case (1), $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, (1,0)) \in \text{Var}(M/P) \subseteq \text{Var}(M) \subseteq V$ and therefore, $V = \text{Perf}$ which proves that Perf is a cover of Can.

**Theorem 3.22.** The lattice of subvarieties of the variety $wEMV$ is countably infinite.

**Proof.** Due to [Kom], the lattice of subvarieties of the variety $MV$ of $MV$-algebras is countably infinite and in [DiLe1], there is an equational base of any subvariety of the variety $MV$ which consists of finitely many $MV$-equations using only $\oplus$ and $\odot$. Hence, let $V_{MV}$ be any subvariety of $MV$-algebras with a finite equational base $\{f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = g_i(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \mid i = 1, \ldots, k\}$, where $f_i, g_i$ are finite $MV$-terms using only $\oplus$ and $\odot$. Denote by $W(V_{MV})$ the subvariety of $wEMV$-algebras which satisfies $\{f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = g_i(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \mid i = 1, \ldots, k\}$.

Now, let $W$ be any non-trivial subvariety of $wEMV$-algebras. Let $V(W)$ denote the system of all $wEMV$-algebras $(M; \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus) \in W$ with top element, and let $V_{MV}(W)$ be the subvariety of $MV$-algebras generated by equivalent $MV$-algebras $(M; \ominus, 1, 0, 1)$ from $V(W)$. It has a finite equational base using only $\oplus$ and $\odot$. The system of $wEMV$-algebras satisfying these identities forms a subvariety $W(V_{MV}(W)) \subseteq W$.

Take an arbitrary $wEMV$-algebra $M$ from $W$. If $M$ has a top element, then $M \in W(V_{MV}(W))$. If $M$ is without top element, we have an embedding of $M$ into the subdirect product $(\bigoplus_{P \in \mathcal{S}_1} M/P) \times (\bigoplus_{P \in \mathcal{S}_2} M/P)$. If $S_1$ is non-empty, then $N_1 = \prod_{P \in \mathcal{S}_1} M/P \in W(V_{MV}(W))$. If $S_2$ is non-empty, then $N_2 = \prod_{P \in \mathcal{S}_2} M/P \in \text{Can}$. Whence, we have three cases. (1) For each non-trivial $M \in W$, $S_2$ is empty, then $W \subseteq W(V_{MV}(W)) \subseteq W$. (2) For each non-trivial $M \in W$, $S_1$ is empty, then $W \subseteq \text{Can}$ and since $\text{Can}$ is an atom in the lattice of subvarieties of $wEMV$, see Theorem 3.21 we have $W = \text{Can}$.
(3) There is a non-trivial wEMV-algebra $M \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $S_1$ and $S_2$ are both non-empty. Then $\text{Can} \subseteq \mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}(W)) \lor \text{Can} \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ which proves $W = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}(W)) \lor \text{Can}.$

Summarizing, we see that every subvariety $W$ of wEMV-algebras either satisfies some finite system of MV-algebras, so it is $W(\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}})$, or it is equal to $W(\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}) \lor \text{Can}$ for some subvariety $\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}$ of MV-algebras. Due to Komori, we see that the lattice of wEMV-subvarieties is countably infinite. \hfill $\square$

To illustrate the last mentioned three possibilities, case (1) is true e.g. for the subvariety $\text{Idem}$ of wEMV-algebras determined by $x \oplus x = x$, case (2) for $\text{Can}$, and case (3) for $\text{Idem} \lor \text{Can}$. More generally, we have the following characterization.

\textbf{Remark 3.23.} For each integer $n \geq 1$, we define MV-algebras $L_n = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}, n)$ and $K_n = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}, (n, 0)).$ It is known, see \cite[Thm 8.4.4]{CDM}, that for every proper variety $\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}$ of MV-algebras, there are finite sets $I$ and $J$ such that $I \cup J$ is non-empty and $\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}$ is generated by $\{L_i, K_j : i \in I, j \in J\}.$ Then situation (1) at the end of the proof of Theorem \ref{thm:finitegenerating} happens only if $\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}(W)$ is generated only by finitely many $L_i$’s and no $K_j.$ For situation (3), we have two subcases. (3i) $\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}(W)$ is generated only by finitely many $L_i$’s, then $W = (\mathcal{W}_{\text{MV}}(W)) \lor \text{Can}.$ (3ii) $\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}(W)$ contains at least one generator of the form $L_i$ and at least one generator of the form $K_j.$ Then $W = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}(W)) \lor \text{Can} = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{V}_{\text{MV}}(W))$ because the cancellative wEMV-algebra $\mathbb{Z}^+$ is a subalgebra of the associated wEMV-algebra $K_j.$

In what follows, we investigate a question when a wEMV-algebra $M$ and its representing associated wEMV-algebra $N$ with top element belong to the same variety and when not.

\textbf{Corollary 3.24.} Let $M$ be a wEMV-algebra without top element, let $N$ be its representing associated wEMV-algebra with top element, let $W$ be a proper variety of wEMV-algebras, and $M \in W.$

1. If $W$ satisfies case (1) or case (3ii), then $N$ belongs to $W.$
2. If $W$ satisfies case (2), then $N \not\in W.$
3. If $W$ satisfies case (3i), then it can happen that $N \not\in W.$

\textbf{Proof.} Let $M \in W.$ Applying Theorem \ref{thm:finitegenerating} we know that $M$ is a subdirect product of $N_0 := (\prod_{P \in S_1} M/P) \times (\prod_{P \in S_2} M/P)$ and let $N_1 = \prod_{P \in S_1} M/P$ and $N_2 = \prod_{P \in S_2} M/P.$

1. Case (1). Then $S_2 = \emptyset$ and $M$ is a subdirect product of $\{M/P : P \in S_1\}.$ Since every $M/P$ has a top element, $N$ is a subalgebra of $N_1$ and thus $N \in W.$ Case (3ii). Then $S_1$ and $S_2$ are non-empty. The wEMV-algebra $N_1$ has a top element. Every $M/P$ is cancellative for each $P \in S_2.$ But $M/P$ can be isomorphically embedded into $\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times G_P, (1, 0)) \subseteq \Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times G_P, (j, 0)) \subseteq W,$ so that $N \in W.$
2. Case (2). Then $W = \text{Can},$ so that $N \not\in W.$
3. Case (3i). If $S_2 = \emptyset,$ then $N \subseteq \prod\{M/P : P \in S_1\} \in W.$ If $S_2$ is non-empty, then $N$ is a subalgebra of $N_1 \times \prod\{\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times G_P, (1, 0)) : P \in S_2\}$ but $N_1$ has a top element and $\prod\{\Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times G_P, (1, 0)) : P \in S_2\} \not\in W.$ Whence, $N \not\in W.$ \hfill $\square$

In the following remark, we describe some interesting categories of wEMV-algebras and their $\ell$-group representations.

\textbf{Remark 3.25.} (1) Denote by $\text{wEMV}_1$ the class of wEMV-algebras with top element. Applying Proposition \ref{prop:unital} and Mundici’s representation of MV-algebras by unital $\ell$-group, the category $\text{wEMV}_1$ is categorically equivalent to the category of MV-algebras and also to the category of unital $\ell$-groups.

(2) The category $\text{Can}$ of cancellative wEMV-algebras is categorically equivalent to the category of Abelian $\ell$-groups.

(3) The category of associated wEMV-algebras without top element is categorically equivalent to the category of $\ell$-groups with a fixed special maximal $\ell$-ideal, see \cite[Thm 6.8]{DvZa}.

\textbf{Remark 3.26.} By \cite[Cor 1.4.7]{CDM}, an MV-equation is satisfied by all MV-algebras if and only if it is satisfied by all linearly ordered MV-algebras. We can simply check that the following identities hold in
each linearly ordered MV-algebras:

\[(x \lor y) \ominus z = (x \ominus z) \lor (y \ominus z),\]  
\[(x \oplus y) = (x \lor y) \ominus (x \land y).\]  

(3.9)  
(3.10)

So, they hold in each MV-algebra, too. Now, let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be a wEMV-algebra and \(x, y, z \in M\). Let \(u \geq x \oplus y \ominus z\) be an element of \(M\). In the MV-algebra \((\{0, u\}; \ominus, \wedge, 0, u)\), we have \((x \lor y) \ominus u \ominus z = (x \ominus u \ominus z) \lor (y \ominus u \ominus z)\) which entails that \((x \lor y) \ominus z = (x \ominus z) \lor (y \ominus z)\) (by equation (3.7)). So, (3.9) holds in each wEMV-algebra. In a similar way, we can easily show that (3.10) holds in each wEMV-algebra.

In addition, identity (3.10) implies the following quasi identity

\[x \land y = 0 \Rightarrow x \oplus y = x \lor y\]  

(3.11)

holding in each wEMV-algebra.

Now, given an wEMV-algebra \(M\), we introduce two important its subalgebras \(M_1\) and \(M_2\).

**Proposition 3.27.** Given a wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\), we define \(M_1 := \downarrow \mathcal{I}(M)\) and \(M_2 := \{x \in M \mid x \land y = 0, \forall y \in \mathcal{I}(M)\}\). Then \(M_1\) is the biggest associated wEMV-subalgebra of \(M\) and \(M_2\) is a strict wEMV-subalgebra of \(M\).

Moreover, if \(x_1 \lor x_2 = y_1 \lor y_2\), where \(x_1, y_1 \in M_1\) and \(x_2, y_2 \in M_2\), then \(x_1 = y_1\) and \(x_2 \lor y_2\). In addition, \(x \in M_1\) and \(y \in M_2\) imply \(x \land y = 0\) and \(x \lor y = x \lor y\). Similarly, if \(x_1, y_1 \in M_1\) and \(x_2, y_2 \in M_2\), then \(x_1 \oplus x_2 = y_1 \oplus y_2\) entails \(x_1 = y_1\) and \(x_2 = y_2\).

**Proof.** Consider an arbitrary wEMV-algebra \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\). Clearly, \(M := \downarrow \mathcal{I}(M)\) is closed under the operations \(\lor, \land, \oplus\) and \(0\) which implies that \(M_1\) is a subalgebra of \(M\). Also, by definition, \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) is an EMV-algebra and \(M_1\) is an ideal of \(M\), too. In addition, let \(M'_1\) be an associated wEMV-algebra that is a subalgebra of \(M_1\). Then clearly, \(M'_1 \subseteq M_1\).

Now, let \(M_2 := \{x \in M \mid x \land y = 0, \forall y \in \mathcal{I}(M)\}\). Then \(0 \in M_2\) and by Proposition 3.6, \(M_2\) is closed under \(\land\) and \(\oplus\). Also, distributivity of \((M; \lor, \land)\) implies that \(M_2\) is closed under \(\lor\). Let \(x, y \in M_2\). Put an arbitrary idempotent element \(a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\). For \(b := x \oplus y \oplus a\), by Proposition 3.10, \((0, b); \oplus, \wedge, 0\) is an MV-algebra and so by the assumption and [Gelo Prop 1.17], we have

\[(x \oplus y) \land a = (x \oplus y \oplus a) \land (y \land a) = [(x \land a) \oplus (y \land b)] \land b \leq (x \land a) \oplus (y \land a) = 0.\]

Thus, \(M_2\) is a subalgebra of the wEMV-algebra \(M\). Clearly, \(M_2\) does not have any non-zero idempotent element, so that \(M_2\) is strict.

Let \(x \in M\) such that \(x = x_1 \lor x_2\) and \(x = y_1 \lor y_2\), where \(x_1, y_1 \in M_1\) and \(x_2, y_2 \in M_2\). Then

\[x_1 = x_1 \land (y_1 \lor y_2) = (x_1 \land y_1) \lor (x_1 \land y_2) = x_1 \land y_1,\]

and so \(x_1 \leq y_1\). In a similar way, \(y_1 \leq x_1\) and so \(x_1 = x_2\). We can easily show that \(x_2 = y_2\).

Now, if \(x \in M_1\) and \(y \in M_2\), we conclude that \(x \land y = 0\) and (3.11) entails \(x \oplus y = x \lor y\). Consequently \(x_1 \oplus x_2 = y_1 \oplus y_2\) implies \(x_1 \lor x_2 = y_1 \lor y_2\), so that \(x_1 = y_1\) and \(x_2 \lor y_2\).

The associated wEMV-subalgebra \(M_1\) and a strict wEMV-subalgebra \(M_2\) of \(M\) play an important role in a decomposition of \(M\) as a direct product of \(M_1\) and \(M_2\).

**Theorem 3.28.** Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be a wEMV-algebra such that the ideal of \(M\) generated by \((M_1 \cup M_2)\) is equal to \(M\). Then \(M \cong M_1 \times M_2\) as wEMV-algebras.

**Proof.** Let \(x \in M\). Then by the paragraph just after Proposition 3.15, there are \(x_1 \in M_1\) and \(x_2 \in M_2\) such that \(x \leq x_1 \oplus x_2\) (note that \(M_1\) and \(M_2\) are ideals of \(M\)). Put \(u \in M\) such that \(x \oplus x_1 \oplus x_2 \leq u\). Then by [Gelo Prop 1.17], in the MV-algebra \((\{0, u\}; \oplus, \wedge, 0, u)\), we have \(x = x \land (x_1 \oplus x_2) = x \land ((x_1 \oplus x_2) \land u) = x \land (x_1 \land x) \oplus (x_2 \land x) = (x_1 \land x) \oplus (x_2 \land x)\). So, we can always assume that \(x_1, x_2 \leq x\). Then \(x \leq x_1 \oplus x_2\) and Proposition 3.6(h) entails that \(x \oplus x_1 \leq x_2\), whence
$x_3 := x \oplus x_1 \in M_2$. It follows that $x_1 \oplus x_3 = x_1 \oplus (x \oplus x_1) = x \vee x_1 = x$ (since $x_1 \leq x$). Define $\varphi : M \to M_1 \times M_2$ by $\varphi(x) = (x_1, x_2)$, where $x_1 \in M_1$, $x_2 \in M_2$ and $x = x_1 \oplus x_2$.

(i) If $u \in M_1$ and $v \in M_2$, then by equation (3.10), $u \oplus v = u \lor v$.

(ii) $\varphi$ is well defined. Let $x = x_1 \oplus x_2 = y_1 \oplus y_2$ for some $x_1, y_1 \in M_1$ and $x_2, y_2 \in M_2$. By (i), $y_1 \oplus y_2 = y_1 \lor y_2$. Then $x_1 = x_1 \land (y_1 \lor y_2) = (x_1 \land y_1) \lor (x_1 \land y_2)$. Since $x_1 \in M_1$, then there is $a \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ such that $x_1 \leq a$ and so $x_1 \land y_2 \leq a \land y_2 = 0$. It follows that $x_1 = x_1 \land y_1$ and so $x \leq y_1$. In a similar way, $y_1 \leq x_1$ which implies that $x_1 = y_1$. Similarly, we can show that $x_2 = y_2$. It follows that $\varphi$ is well defined.

(iii) $\varphi$ preserves $\lor, \land, \oplus$ and $0$. Clearly, $\varphi$ preserves $\lor$ and $0$. Let $x, y \in M$. Then there exist $x_1, y_1 \in M_1$ and $x_2, y_2 \in M_2$ such that $x = x_1 \lor x_2$ and $y = y_1 \lor y_2$.

$$\varphi(x \lor y) = \varphi((x_1 \lor y_1) \lor (x_2 \lor y_2)) = (x_1 \lor y_1, x_2 \lor y_2) = (x_1, x_2) \lor (y_1, y_2) = \varphi(x) \lor \varphi(y).$$

$$\varphi(x \land y) = \varphi((x_1 \land y_2) \land (y_1 \lor y_2)) = \varphi((x_1 \land y_1) \lor (x_2 \lor y_2)) = (x_1 \land y_1, x_2 \lor y_2) = \varphi(x) \land \varphi(y)$$ (note that $x_1 \land y_2 = 0 = x_2 \land y_1$).

By the properties of wEMV-algebras and equation (3.9), we have $(x_1 \lor x_2) \land (y_1 \lor y_2) = ((x_1 \lor x_2) \land y_1) \land ((x_1 \lor x_2) \land y_2) = ((x_1 \land y_1) \lor (x_2 \land y_2)) \land ((x_1 \lor y_2) \lor (x_2 \lor y_2))$. Also, $x_2 \land y_1 = x_2 \land (x_2 \lor y_1) = x_2 \lor 0 = x_2$.

Similarly, since $\lambda_2 \lor y_2 = x_1$, then $x_1 \land y_2 = x_1$. So, $(x_1 \lor x_2) \land (y_1 \lor y_2) = ((x_1 \land y_1) \lor (x_2 \lor y_2)) \land ((x_1 \lor y_2) \lor (x_2 \lor y_2))$

It follows that $\varphi(x \land y) = \varphi((x_1 \land y_1) \lor (x_2 \lor y_2)) = (x_1 \land y_1, x_2 \lor y_2) = \varphi((x_1 \land y_1) \lor (x_2 \lor y_2)) = (x_1 \land y_1, x_2 \lor y_2) = \varphi(x \lor y).

(iii) $\varphi$ is an isomorphism. Clearly, $\varphi$ is one-to-one and onto.

From (i)–(iii) we conclude that $M \cong M_1 \times M_2$. 

We note that in the last theorem, $M_1$ is an associated wEMV-algebra and $M_2$ is a strict wEMV-algebra. So, if $M$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.28 then $M$ is a direct product of an associated wEMV-algebra and a strict wEMV-algebra. We can easily prove that the converse also holds.

**Corollary 3.29.** Let $(M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)$ be a wEMV-algebra. Then $M \cong M_1 \times M_2$ if and only if, for each $x \in M$, the set $\{x \land a \mid a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\}$ has a greatest element.

Proof. Let $M \cong M_1 \times M_2$. Then $M = (M_1 \cup M_2)$. Put $x \in M$. There exist two elements $x_1 \in M_1$ and $x_2 \in M_2$ such that $x = x_1 \oplus x_2$. Let $a$ be an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{I}(M)$. By part (i) in the proof of Theorem 3.28, we have $x \land a = (x \land a) \land (x \land a) = (x \land a) \land (x \land a) = ((x \land a) \land (x \land a) \land (x \land a) \land (x \land a)) = (x \land a) \land (x \land a) \land (x \land a)$.

It follows that $x_1$ is the greatest element of the set $\{x \land a \mid a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\}$.

Conversely, by Theorem 3.28, it suffices to show that $M = (M_1 \cup M_2)$. Put $x \in M$. Let $x_1 := \max\{x \land a \mid a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\}$. Then $x_1 = x \land a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{I}(M)$. Set $x_2 := x \oplus x_1$. Note that $x_1 \land x_2 = 0$. Indeed, we have $x_1 \oplus x_2 = x_1 \lor x_2$. We claim that $x_2 \in M_2$.

(1) Let $u \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ and $z := x \oplus u$. According to Proposition 3.4g, we have $x \oplus u = \min\{t \in [0, x] \mid t \lor (x \land u) = x\}$. Also, it is well known that in the MV-algebra $\{0, z; \oplus, \land, 0, z\}$ we have $x \oplus u = \min\{t \leq x \mid t \lor (x \land u) = x\}$. Since $x \oplus u \leq x$, then $(x \oplus u) \lor (x \land u) \leq x \lor u \leq z$, then $(x \oplus u) \lor (x \land u) = (x \oplus u) \land (x \land u)$. Since $z \land u = 0$, then $x \oplus u = 0 \land x \land u = z \land (x \land u) = x \land u$. Therefore, we get $x_1 \land x_2 = 0$.

(2) Let $b \in \mathcal{I}(M)$. By the assumption, $x \land (a \lor b) = x \land a$.

$$\begin{align*}
(x \lor a) \land b & = (x \lor (x \land a)) \land b = (x \lor (x \land (a \lor b))) \land b = (x \lor (a \lor b)) \land b \\
& \leq (x \lor (a \lor b)) \land (a \lor b).
\end{align*}$$

By part (1), $(x \lor (a \lor b)) \land (a \lor b) = 0$, which implies that $x_2 = x \oplus (x \land a) = x \oplus a \in M_2$. 

**Remark 3.30.** Let $(G^+; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)$ be a wEMV-algebra.
(1) Let $M \cong A \times B$, where $A$ is an associated $wEMV$-algebra and $B$ is a strict $wEMV$-algebra. Then $\mathcal{I}(M) \cong \{(a, 0) \mid a \in \mathcal{I}(A)\}$. Clearly, $M_1 \cong A \times \{0\}$. Also, $M_2 \cong \{0\} \times B$ (since $B$ does not have any non-zero element).

(2) As a direct corollary, we have that if a $wEMV$-algebra $M$ admits a decomposition $M \cong M_1 \times M_2$, where $M_2$ is a strict part of $M$ and $M_2$ is even cancellative, then there is an $\ell$-group $G$ such that $M_2 \cong (G^+: \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus, 0)$, where the latter $wEMV$-algebra is defined in Example 3.2.

Corollary 3.31. Consider the assumptions and notations in Theorem 3.2. The $wEMV$-algebra $M/M_1$ is a strict $wEMV$-algebra which is isomorphic to $M_2$.

Proof. By the note just before Proposition 3.13 $M_1$ is an ideal of the $wEMV$-algebra $M$ and so by Proposition 3.13 $M/M_1$ is a $wEMV$-algebra. According to the proof of Theorem 3.28 for each $x \in M$, there are unique elements $x_1 \in M_1$ and $x_2 \in M_2$ such that $x = x_1 \oplus x_2$. Define $f : M/M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ by $f(x/M_1) = x_2$. We can easily check that $f$ is an isomorphism. Since $M_2$ is strict, then $M/M_1$ is strict, too.

We note that another type of a direct decomposition of a $wEMV$-algebra using a non-zero idempotent will be present in Remark 4.3 below; it will use the representation result Theorem 3.19.

Now, we give two examples of $wEMV$-algebras satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 3.28.

Example 3.32. Suppose that $(M; \lor, \land, \oplus, \ominus, 0)$ is a $wEMV$-algebra.

(1) Let $M$ be a chain and take $x \in M$.

(i) If there exists $x \in M_2 \setminus \{0\}$, then for each $a \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ we have $a \land x = 0$. Since $M$ is a chain, $x \leq a$ or $a \leq x$. From $x \leq a$, we get that $x = 0$ which is absurd. Hence $a \leq x$ which implies that $a = 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}(M) = \{0\}$. That is $M = M_2$. (ii) Otherwise, $M_2 = \{0\}$. If $x \in M \setminus M_1$, then $x \geq a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ (since $M$ is a chain). If there is $z \in M$ such that $x \preceq z$, then

$$0 < \lambda_2(x) \land a = \lambda_2(x) \ominus z \land a \leq \lambda_2(x) \ominus z \land x = 0, \quad a \in \mathcal{I}(M),$$

where $\ominus$ is the well-known binary operation of the MV-algebra $(M; \oplus, \lambda_2, 0, z)$. It follows that $\lambda_2(x)$ is a non-zero element of $M_2$ which is a contradiction. So, $x$ is the greatest element of $M$, which means that $x \oplus x = x \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ and $M = M_1$. By (i) and (ii), we entail that if $M$ is a chain, then $M = M_1$ or $M = M_2$. That is, $M = (M_1 \cup M_2)$.

(2) Let $M$ be the product of a family $\{M_i\}_{i \in T}$ of linearly ordered $wEMV$-algebras.

(i) Clearly, $\mathcal{I}(M) = \{(x_i)_{i \in T} \mid x_i \in \mathcal{I}(M_i), \forall i \in T\} = \bigcap_{i \in T} \mathcal{I}(M_i)$. It follows that $M_1 = \bigcap_{i \in T} M_1^i$.

(ii) $(x_i)_{i \in T} \in M_2$ iff $(x_i)_{i \in T} \land (a_i)_{i \in T} = (0)_{i \in T}$ for all $(a_i)_{i \in T} \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ iff $x_i \land a_i = 0$ for all $a_i \in \mathcal{I}(M_i)$ and all $i \in T$. Hence $N_2 = \bigcap_{i \in T} M_2^i$.

Let $x = (x_i)_{i \in T} \in M$. For each $i \in T$ by Case 1, $M_i = M_1^i$ or $M_2^i$. Let $T_1 := \{i \in T \mid M_i = M_1^i\}$ and $T_2 := \{i \in T \mid M_i = M_2^i\}$. Then $T = T_1 \cup T_2$. For each $i \in T$ assume that

$$y_i = \begin{cases} x_i & i \in T_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad z_i = \begin{cases} x_i & i \in T_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then by (i) and (ii), $y := (y_i)_{i \in T} \in M_1$ and $z := (z_i)_{i \in T} \in M_2$. Also, $x = y \oplus z$, so $M = (M_1 \cup M_2)$.

4. EMV-Algebras and Pierce Sheaves

In the section, we study sheaves of EMV-algebras. If $M$ is a bounded EMV-algebra, $M$ is termwise equivalent to an MV-algebra on $M$, and the Pierce representation of MV-algebras is studied for example in [PiGe] or in [GeIo, Part 4]. Theory of sheaf spaces of universal algebras is described in [Dav]. In this part we concentrate to a case when an EMV-algebra $M$ does not have a top element.

First we investigate question on direct decomposability of an EMV-algebra. We show that every idempotent element $a$ of an EMV-algebra determines a decomposition.
Proposition 4.1. Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be an EMV-algebra and let \(a > 0\) be a fixed idempotent of \(M\) which is not top element. If \(M\) is with top element, \(M\) is isomorphic to the direct product of bounded non-trivial EMV-algebras \(\langle [0, a]; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0, \rangle\) and \(\langle [0, a']; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0, \rangle\), where \(a' = \lambda_1(a)\), i.e.

\[ M \cong [0, a] \times [0, a']. \]

If \(M\) has no top element, let \((N; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be its representing EMV-algebra with top element 1, where \(M\) can be embedded onto a maximal ideal of \(N\). For simplicity, let \(M \subseteq N\). Let \(a' = \lambda_1(a)\). Then \(M\) is isomorphic to the direct product of the bounded non-trivial EMV-algebra \(\langle [0, a]; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0, \rangle\) with a proper EMV-algebra \(M_1 = M \cap [0, a'], \ i.e.

\[ M \cong [0, a] \times ([0, a'] \cap M). \]

Moreover, the set \([0, a'] \cap M\) is a maximal ideal of the EMV-algebra \(\langle [0, a']; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0, \rangle\) with top element \(a'\) such that every element \(x \in [0, a'] \cap M\) is either from \(M\) or \(x = \lambda_\alpha(x_0)\) for a unique element \(x_0 \in M\).

Proof. The mapping \(f_a : M \to [0, a]\) defined by \(f_a(x) = (x \land a), x \in M\), preserves \(\lor, \land, \oplus, \land_0 (b \in \mathcal{I}(M))\) and also 1 if it exists in \(M\), that is, \(f_a\) is an EMV-homomorphism from \(M\) into the bounded EMV-algebra \(\langle [0, a]; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0, \rangle\).

If \(M\) has a top element, then the mapping \(\phi : M \to [0, a] \times [0, a']\) defined by \(\phi(x) = (x \land a, x \land a')\), \(x \in M\), is an isomorphism of the EMV-algebras \(M\) and \([0, a] \times [0, a'], \ i.e.\ M \cong [0, a] \times [0, a']\).

Now, let \(M\) be a proper EMV-algebra, \((N; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be its representing EMV-algebra with top element, \(M \subseteq N\). Then \(M\) is a maximal ideal of \(N\).

The mapping \(\varphi : N \to [0, a] \times [0, a']\) sending \(x \in N\) to \((x \land a, x \land a')\) is an isomorphism of EMV-algebras and \(N \cong [0, a] \times [0, a']\). Set \(E := \varphi(M) = \{(x \land a, x \land a') \mid x \in M\}\). Clearly, \(E\) and \(M\) are isomorphic EMV-algebras. We claim that \(E = [0, a] \times ([0, a'] \cap M)\). If \((x, y) \in [0, a] \times ([0, a'] \cap M)\), then clearly \(\varphi(x \lor y) = (x, y)\), which implies that \([0, a] \times ([0, a'] \cap M) \subseteq E\). Conversely, for each \(x \in M\), we have \(x \land a' \leq x \in M\), which gives \(x \land a' \in M\) because \(M\) is an ideal of \(N\). Whence, \((x \land a, x \land a') \in [0, a] \times ([0, a'] \cap M)\), so the claim is true. We note that \(\langle [0, a']; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0, \rangle\) is an EMV-algebra, thus \([0, a'] \cap M\) is a proper EMV-algebra, too. Indeed, if \(y \in [0, a'] \cap M\), then \(y \in M\) and there is an idempotent \(b \in M\) such that \(y \leq b\). The element \(b \land a' \leq b\), so that \(b \land a' = \lambda_\alpha(b)\) is an idempotent of \([0, a'] \cap M\) such that \(b \land a' \leq b \land a'\). In addition, if \(b\) is an idempotent of \([0, a'] \cap M\), so is of \(M\). If we take \(y \in [0, b]\), then clearly \(\lambda_\alpha(y) = \lambda_\alpha(b)\) is the least element \(z \in [0, a'] \cap M\) such that \(z \land a' = b \land a'\). Finally, \(M \cong [0, a] \times ([0, a'] \cap M)\).

Clearly, \([0, a'] \cap M\) is closed under \(\oplus\). Let \(x \in [0, a'] \cap M\) and \(y \in [0, a']\) such that \(y \leq x\). Since \(M\) is an ideal of the EMV-algebra \(N, y \in M\), so that \(y \in [0, a'] \cap M\). Now, let \(z \in [0, a] \setminus ([0, a'] \cap M)\). Then \(z \in N \setminus M\) and the ideal of \(N\) generated by \(z\) and \(z\) has to be \(N\) because \(M\) is a maximal ideal of \(N\). Consequently, the ideal of the EMV-algebra \([0, a'] \cap M\) generated by \([0, a'] \cap M\) and \(z\) is equal to \([0, a']\) which means that \([0, a'] \cap M\) is a maximal ideal of \([0, a']\). Finally, let \(x \in [0, a'] \cap M\). If \(x \in [0, a'] \cap M\), then \(x \in N \setminus M\) and there is a unique element \(y_0 \in M\) such that \(x = \lambda_1(y_0)\). Now, we use that there is a unital Abelian \(\ell\)-group \((G, u)\) such that \(N = \Gamma(G, u)\) which means that \(x = u - y_0\). Then \(x = a + a' - y_0\) and \(x = x \land a' = (a \land a') + (a' \land a') - (y_0 \land a') = a' - x_0\), where \(x_0 = y_0 \land a' \in [0, a'] \cap M\). Clearly that \(x = \lambda_\alpha(x_0)\), where \(\lambda_\alpha(x_0) = \min\{t \in [0, a'] \cap M \mid t \oplus x_0 = a'\}\) and it finishes the proof.

We note that an EMV-algebra \(M\) with top element is directly indecomposable (i.e. it cannot be expressed as a direct product of two non-trivial EMV-algebras) iff \(\mathcal{I}(M) = \{0, 1\}\). If \(M\) has no top element it is always decomposable as a product of two non-trivial EMV-algebras.

Recall that a bounded distributive lattice \((L; \lor, \land, 0, 1)\) is called a Stone algebra if, for any \(a \in L\), there exists a Boolean element \(b \in L\) such that \([x \in L \mid x \land a = 0] = \downarrow b\).

Remark 4.2. Let \((M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)\) be an EMV-algebra. If \(M\) is directly indecomposable, then \(M\) has a greatest element 1 and is termwise equivalent to an MV-algebra, \((M; \oplus, \lambda_1, 0, 1)\). From [Gel] Lem 4.9.
it follows that $(M; ∨, \land, \oplus, 0)$ is directly indecomposable and $(M; ∨, \land, 0, 1)$ is a Stone algebra if and only if $(M; ∨, \land, \oplus, 0)$ is termwise equivalent to a linearly ordered MV-algebra.

**Remark 4.3.** Let $(M; ∨, \land, \oplus, 0)$ be a wEMV-algebra and let $N$ be its representing associated wEMV-algebra with a top element 1, see Theorem 3.19. We can assume that $M \subseteq N$ and $N$ is equivalent to the MV-algebra $(N; \oplus, \lambda, 0, 1)$. Then Proposition 4.1 can be reformulated and proved verbatim in the same way also for wEMV-algebras. We note that we have non-trivial wEMV-algebras without any non-zero idempotent, see Example 3.2.

A sheaf space of sets over $X$ or a sheaf is a triple $T = (E, \pi, X)$, where $E$ and $X$ are topological spaces and $\pi : E \to X$ is a surjective mapping that is a local homeomorphism, i.e., for all $e \in E$, there exist neighborhoods $U$ of $e$ and $V$ of $\pi(e)$ such that $\pi$ on $U$ is a homeomorphism of $U$ onto $V$. For all $x \in X$, the set $\pi^{-1}(\{x\})$ is a fiber of $x$. If $U$ is an open set of $X$, a local section over $U$ is a continuous function $g : U \to E$ such that $g(x) \in \pi^{-1}(\{x\})$ for all $x \in U$. If $U = X$, a local section $g$ is called a global section of the sheaf.

We note that a sheaf $(E, \pi, X)$ is a sheaf of EMV-algebras if

1. each fiber $E_x = \pi^{-1}(\{x\})$ is an EMV-algebra,
2. if $EDE = \bigcup_{x \in X} (E_x \times E_x)$ with the induced topology from $E \times E$, then all operations $\oplus, \lor, \land$ are continuous from $EDE$ to $E$.

If $(M; ∨, \land, \oplus, 0)$ is a bounded EMV-algebra with top element 1, then $(M; \oplus', 0, 1)$, where $x' := \lambda_1(x)$, $x \in M$, is an MV-algebra which is termwise to $(M; ∨, \land, \oplus, 0)$ and for MV-algebras there are known their Pierce representation by Boolean sheaves whose stalks are directly indecomposable, see [GeIo, Sect 4] for more information. Inspired by this result, we present a representation of proper EMV-algebras by Pierce sheaves.

Let $(M; ∨, \land, \oplus, 0)$ be a proper EMV-algebra and $a \in I(M)$. Let $P(I(M))$ be the set of all prime ideals of $I(M)$. Define $V_a := \{P \in P(I(M)) \mid a \notin P\}$. Consider the relation $\sim_a$ on $M$ define by $x \sim_a y$ if and only if $x \land a = y \land a$. Clearly, $\sim_a$ is an equivalence relation on $M$. There is $b \in I(M)$ such that $a, x, y < b$. Since $([0, b]; \land, \lambda_b, 0, b)$ is an MV-algebra, by [GeIo] Lem 4.15, $x \sim_a y$ if and only if $(x \lor y) \land (y \lor x) \leq \lambda_b(a)$. Note that, by Lemma 5.1, the operation $x \land y := x \land \lambda_b(y)$ is correctly defined and $x \land y = x \land a$. It follows that $\sim_a$ is a congruence relation on the MV-algebra $[0, b]$ and so by Proposition 3.13, it is a congruence relation on the EMV-algebra $M$.

1. For each $a \in I(M)$, set $M_a := M/ \sim_a$, the quotient EMV-algebra induced by the congruence relation $\sim_a$. Also, for simplicity, we denote $x/ \sim_a$ by $x/a$.

2. If $V_b \subseteq V_a$, then $a \leq b$. Otherwise, $a \notin [0, b]$ and so by [DvZa] Thm 5.12, there exists prime ideal $P$ such that $a \notin P$ and $[0, b] \subseteq P$, which is absurd. So, for each couple of elements $a, b \in I(M)$ with $a \leq b$, define $\pi_{a,b} : M_b \to M_a$ by $\pi_{a,b}(x/b) = x/a$. It is an onto homomorphism of EMV-algebras. We can easily see that if $a, b, c \in I(M)$ such that $a \leq b \leq c$, then $\pi_{a,b} \circ \pi_{b,c} = \pi_{a,c}$. Moreover, $\pi_{a,a} : M_a \to M_a$ is the identity map on $M_a$.

3. Let $X$ be the set of all prime ideals of $I(M)$ endowed with the Stone–Zariski topology (= the hull-kernel topology) $\tau$. The sets $\{V_a \mid a \in I(M)\}$ form a base of clopen subsets for this topological space. Since $M$ does not have a top element, the Stone–Zariski topology on $X$ gives a Hausdorff topological space that is locally compact but not compact and every $V_a$ is compact and clopen, see [DvZa] Lem 4.2, Thm 4.10.

Then we can extend the assignment $V_a \mapsto M_a$ and $V_b \subseteq V_a \mapsto \pi_{a,b} : M_b \to M_a$ to a Boolean sheaf $T$ of EMV-algebras, called a Pierce sheaf of $M$.

**Remark 4.4.** Consider the above assumptions.

1. Let $I$ be an ideal of $I(M)$. Then $\downarrow I := \{x \in X \mid x \leq a \exists a \in I\}$ is an ideal of $M$, we call it a Stonean ideal. By Theorem 3.16, $M/ \downarrow I$ is an EMV-algebra. We can easily show that

\[
x/ \downarrow I = y/ \downarrow I \Leftrightarrow x \land y, y \land x \in \downarrow I \Leftrightarrow x \land y, y \land x \leq a, \exists a \in I.
\]
(ii) Set $E_M := \{x/ \downarrow P \mid x \in M, P \in X\}$. Define $\pi : E_M \to X$ by $\pi(x/ \downarrow P) = P$. We show that $\pi$ is a well-defined surjective mapping. Let $x/ \downarrow P = y/ \downarrow Q$ for some $x, y \in M$. If $z \in x/ \downarrow P$, then $z/ \downarrow P = z/ \downarrow Q$, which yields $\downarrow P = 0/ \downarrow P = (z \oplus z)/ \downarrow P = z/ \downarrow P \oplus z \downarrow Q = z/ \downarrow Q \oplus z/ \downarrow Q = 0/ \downarrow Q = \downarrow Q$. Now, we show that $\downarrow P = \downarrow Q$ implies that $P = Q$. Indeed, if there exists $a \in P \setminus Q$, then from $a \in \downarrow Q$ we get that $a \leq b$ for some $b \in Q$ and so $a \in Q$ (since $Q$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{I}(M)$). It follows that $\pi$ is well defined, moreover, $\pi$ is surjective. Suppose that $U(I,x) := \{x/ \downarrow P \mid I \not\subseteq P\}$, where $I$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{I}(M)$. Then $U(\{0\},x) = \emptyset$, and in addition, we have:

(1) $z \in P \in U(I,x) \cap U(J,y)$ implies that $z = x/ \downarrow P = y/ \downarrow Q$ for some $P,Q \in X$. Hence by (ii), $P = Q, I \not\subseteq P, J \not\subseteq Q$ and $z = (x \wedge y)/ \downarrow P$. There exist $w_1 \in I \setminus P$ and $w_2 \in J \setminus P$. Clearly, $w_1 \wedge w_2 \not\subseteq P$ and so $I \cap J \not\subseteq P$ which entails that $z = (x \wedge y)/ \downarrow P \in U(I \cap J, x \wedge y)$.

(2) For each $x/ \downarrow P \in E_M$, choose an idempotent $a$ such that $a \notin P$. Then clearly, $x/ \downarrow P \in U(\{a\}, x)$.

From (i) and (ii) it follows that $\{U(I,x) \mid I \in \text{Ideal}(\mathcal{I}(M)), x \in M\}$ is a base for a topology $\tau'$ on $E_M$. Denote this topological space by $(E_M, \tau')$.

We note that $\{V_a \mid a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\}$ is a base of the topology $\tau$. Clearly, $V_a \cap V_b = V_{a \oplus b}$, since if $P \in V_a, V_b$, then $a, b \not\subseteq P$ and so $a \wedge b \not\subseteq P$. Conversely, if $P \in V_{a \wedge b}$, then $a \wedge b \not\subseteq P$ and so $a \not\subseteq P$ and $b \not\subseteq P$, so that $a \not\subseteq P$ or $b \not\subseteq P$ which implies that $a \wedge b \not\subseteq P$. That is $\{V_a \mid a \in \mathcal{I}(M)\}$ is closed under finite intersections. Moreover, we can easily show that, for the family $\{V_a, a \in \mathcal{I}(M), i \in J\}$, we have $\bigcup_{i \in J} V_a = \{P \in X \mid \{a_i \mid i \in J\} \not\subseteq P\} = \{P \in X \mid \{a_i \mid i \in J\} \not\subseteq P\}$.

Theorem 4.5. Let $(M; \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)$ be an EMV-algebra. Then

(i) $T = (E_M, \pi, X)$ is a sheaf of sets over $X$.
(ii) For each $P \in X$, $\pi^{-1}(P) = M/ \downarrow P$ is a bounded directly indecomposable EMV-algebra.
(iii) $T = (E_M, \pi, X)$ is a sheaf of bounded EMV-algebras over $X$.
(iv) For each $x \in M$, the map $\hat{x} : X \to E_M$ defined by $\hat{x}(P) = x/ \downarrow P$, is a global section of $T$.

Proof. (i) This part is straightforward to verify.

(ii) Now, we show $M/ \downarrow P$ is a bounded directly indecomposable EMV-algebra. The proof is divided into three steps.

(1) Let $x/ \downarrow P$ be an idempotent element of $M/ \downarrow P$. Then $(x \oplus x)/ \downarrow P = x/ \downarrow P$ and so $(x \oplus x) \oplus x \leq p \in P$. Put $a \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ such that $x \leq a$. Then $2.x \leq x \oplus p$. Also, $x \oplus p \leq 2.(x \oplus p) = (2.x) \oplus p \leq (x \oplus p) \oplus p = x \oplus p$, so $x \oplus p \in \mathcal{I}(M)$. On the other hand, from $\lambda_a(x)/ \downarrow P \in \mathcal{I}(M/ \downarrow P)$, we can show that $\lambda_a(x) \oplus q \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ for some $q \in P$. Let $a, p, q \leq b \in \mathcal{I}(M)$. Consider the MV-algebra $0, b; \oplus, \land, 0, b$. Then

$$x \land \lambda_a(x) \leq x \land \lambda_b(x) = \lambda_b(x \oplus x) \land x = (x \oplus x) \land x \leq P \leq c,$$

where $c := p \oplus q$ (note that, $c \leq b$). It follows that $(x \oplus c) \land (\lambda_a(x) \land c) = (x \land \lambda_a(x)) \land c \leq c \land c = c \in P$. Clearly, $x \oplus c = x \oplus p \oplus q \in \mathcal{I}(M)$. In a similar way, $\lambda_a(x) \land c \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ and so $x \oplus c \in P$ or $\lambda_a(x) \land c \in P$. Consequently, $x \in \downarrow P$ or $\lambda_a(x) \in \downarrow P$. That is either $x/ \downarrow P = 0/ \downarrow P$ or $\lambda_a(x)/ \downarrow P = 0/ \downarrow P$ for all idempotent $a \geq x$.

(2) Now, we prove that $M/ \downarrow P$ is a bounded EMV-algebra, i.e. it has a top element. First, let $x$ and $y$ be such elements of $M$ that $x/ \downarrow P$ and $y/ \downarrow P$ are idempotents of $M/ \downarrow P$ and $x/ \downarrow P \leq y/ \downarrow P$. From the previous paragraph we know that we can assume without loss of generality that $x$ and $y$ are idempotents of $M$. In addition, since $x/ \downarrow P \leq y/ \downarrow P$ if $x \leq y \oplus p$ for some idempotent $p \in P$. Hence, we can assume
that $x$ and $y$ are idempotents such that $x \leq y$. Denote by $x_0 = y \ominus x$. Then $x_0$ is an idempotent of $M$ such that $x_0/\downarrow P = y/\downarrow P \ominus x/\downarrow P$. Since $\lambda_y(x_0) \in \mathcal{I}(M)$, from $x_0 \land \lambda_y(x_0) = 0 \in P$, we have either $x_0 \in P$ or $\lambda_y(x_0) \in P$, so that either $x_0/\downarrow P = 0/\downarrow P$ or $\lambda_y(x_0)/\downarrow P = 0/\downarrow P$. In the first case we have $x/\downarrow P = y/\downarrow P$. In the second one from $y = x_0 \ominus \lambda_y(x_0)$ we have $y/\downarrow P = x_0/\downarrow P = y/\downarrow P \ominus x/\downarrow P$ which yields $x/\downarrow P = 0/\downarrow P$.

(3) Now, assume that $M/\downarrow P$ does not have a top element. Therefore, there exists an infinite sequence $\{a_n\}_n$ of elements of $M$ such that every $a_n/\downarrow P$ is a top element of $M/\downarrow P$ and $a_n/\downarrow P < a_{n+1}/\downarrow P$. Due to the last paragraph, we can assume that every $a_n$ is an idempotent of $M$, and due to fact that for each $n$, there is an idempotent $p_n$ such that $a_n \leq a_{n+1} \ominus p_n$ which allows us to assume that $a_n \leq a_{n+1}$ for each $n \geq 1$. By paragraph (2), we see that in each interval $[0/\downarrow P, a_n/\downarrow P]$ there is no idempotent of $M/\downarrow P$ different from $0/\downarrow P$ and $a_n/\downarrow P$ which is a contradiction with $a_n \downarrow P < a_{n+1}/\downarrow P$. Whence, $M/\downarrow P$ is a bounded EMV-algebra.

Finally, we have therefore, $M/\downarrow P$ has only two different idempotent elements, so it is bounded and directly indecomposable.

(iii) By (ii), we have that $T = (E_M, \pi, X)$ is a sheaf whose each fiber $\pi^{-1}(P)$ is a bounded indecomposable EMV-algebra. We have to show that $\ominus$ is continuous; the proof of continuity of $\lor$ and $\land$ is similar.

Thus, let $x, y \in M$, $P \in X$, and $\hat{x}(P), \hat{y}(P) \in \pi^{-1}(\{P\}) = M/\downarrow P$ be given. Let $V$ be an open neighborhood of $x \ominus y(P)$. Without loss of generality, let $V = U(I, x \ominus y)$ for some neighborhood $V_I$ of $P$. The set $B = \{(\hat{x}(P), \hat{y}(P)) \mid P \in U(I, x \ominus y)\}$ is an open neighborhood of $(\hat{x}(P), \hat{y}(P))$ in $E_M \Delta E_M$. For the mapping $\beta : (t, s) \mapsto t \ominus s$, we have $\beta^{-1}(V) = B$, so that $\beta$ is continuous.

(iv) Let $x \in M$. Since $\hat{x}(P) = x/\downarrow P \in \pi^{-1}(\{P\})$, it is necessary to show that $\hat{x}$ is a continuous mapping. Take an arbitrary open set in $E_M$ of the form $U(I, x) = \{x/\downarrow P \mid I \notin P\}$, where $I$ is any ideal of $\mathcal{I}(M)$. Then

$$\hat{x}^{-1}(U(I, x)) = \{P \in X \mid x/\downarrow P \in U(I, x)\}$$
$$= \{P \in X \mid x/\downarrow P = y/\downarrow Q, y \in M, I \notin P, Q\}$$
$$= \{P \in X \mid I \notin P\} = V_I,$$

which is an open set in the hull-kernel topology on $X$. Whence, each $\hat{x}$ is a global section. \hfill $\Box$

**Corollary 4.6.** Let $(M; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0)$ be an EMV-algebra and $\hat{M} := \{\hat{x} \mid x \in M\}$. Consider the following operations on $\hat{M}$:

$$(\hat{x} \ast \hat{y})(P) = \hat{x}(P) \ast \hat{y}(P), \quad \forall \ast \in \{\lor, \land, \ominus\}.$$

Then $(\hat{M}; \lor, \land, \ominus, 0)$ is an EMV-algebra.

**Proof.** It is a direct corollary of Theorem 4.5 \hfill $\Box$

We say that an EMV-algebra $M$ is *semisimple* if it is a subdirect product of simple EMV-algebras. It is possible to show that $M$ is semisimple iff the intersection of all maximal ideals of $M$ is the set $\{0\}$. In addition, in [DvZa, Thm 4.11], we have characterized semisimple EMV-algebras as EMV-algebras of fuzzy sets where all EMV-operations are defined poitwisely.

We say that an EMV-algebra $M$ satisfies the *general comparability property* if it holds for every MV-algebra $([0, a]; \oplus, \land_0, 0, a)$, i.e. if, for any $a \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ and $x, y \in [0, a]$, there is an idempotent $e \in [0, a]$ such that $x \land e \leq y$ and $y \land \land_0(e) \leq x$.

In what follows we show that every semisimple proper EMV-algebra with the general comparability property can be embedded into a sheaf of bounded EMV-algebras on the space $X$.

**Theorem 4.7.** Every semisimple EMV-algebra with the general comparability property can be embedded into a sheaf of bounded EMV-algebras on the space $X$.\hfill $\Box$
Proof. Due to [DvZa] Thm 4.4, the restriction of any maximal ideal $I$ of $M$ to $I \cap \mathcal{I}(M)$ gives a maximal ideal of $\mathcal{I}(M)$, so it belongs to $X$. Conversely, according to [DvZa] Thm 4.9, every prime ideal $P$ of $\mathcal{I}(M)$ (hence every maximal ideal of $\mathcal{I}(M)$) can be extended to a maximal ideal $\downarrow P$. Then $\bigcap \{ \downarrow P \mid P \in X \} = \text{Rad}(M) = \{0\}$ which implies that $M$ is a subdirect product of the system $\{ M/\downarrow P \mid P \in X \}$ of bounded indecomposable EMV-algebras.

Now, we present the following representation of EMV-algebras as sections of sheaves.

**Theorem 4.8.** Let $M$ be an EMV-algebra and $X$ be a Hausdorff topological space. If for $x \in M$, there is an ideal $I_x$ of $M$ such that $\bigcap_{x \in X} I_x = \{0\}$ and for all $x \in M$, the set $\{ x \in X \mid x \in I_x \}$ is open, then $M$ can be embedded into a sheaf of EMV-algebras on the space $X$.

Proof. Let $E = \bigcup_{x \in X} \{ M/I_x \times \{ x \} \}$ and define a mapping $\pi : E \to X$ by $\pi(a/I_x, x) = x$. Define $\alpha : M \to E$ by $\alpha(a/I_x, x) = (a/I_x, x)$. Without loss of generality, let $\alpha(a/I_x, x) = (a/I_x, x) \in E$. It is a well-defined mapping because if $(a/I_x, x) = (b/I_y, y)$, then $x = y$ and $a/I_x = b/I_y$. In addition, $\pi$ is surjective and $\pi^{-1}\{\{ x \}\} = M/I_x$ for each $x \in X$. For all $a \in M$, define a mapping $\hat{a} : X \to E$ by $\hat{a}(x) = (a/I_x, x), x \in X$.

We assert that the system $\{ \hat{a}(U) \mid U \text{ open in } X, a \in M \}$ is a base of a topology on $E$. Let $a, b \in M$ and $U, V$ be open in $X$. Since $\{ x \in X \mid a/I_x \}$ is open, then $A = \{ x \in X \mid a(I_x) = (0/I_x, x) \}$ is open. In $X$. Whence, $B = A \cap U \cap V$ is also open. For all $w \in B$, $\hat{a}(w) = \hat{b}(w)$ and $\hat{a}(w) \in \hat{a}(U) \cap \hat{b}(V)$. If $t \in \hat{a}(U) \cap \hat{b}(V)$, then $\hat{a}(\pi(t)) = t = \hat{b}(\pi(t))$ which yields $\hat{a}(B) = \hat{b}(B) = \hat{a}(U) \cap \hat{b}(V)$. So this system is a base of a topology on $E$. Every mapping $\hat{a}$ is continuous. Indeed, choose $b \in M$ and $V$ open in $X$. Then we have $\hat{a}^{-1}(\hat{b}(V)) = \{ x \in X \mid \hat{a}(x) = (a/I_x, x) \in \hat{b}(V) \} = \{ x \in V \mid (a/I_x, x) = (b/I_x, x) \} = \{ x \in V \mid a/I_x = b/I_x \} = \{ x \in V \mid b \oplus a \in I_x \}$ is open in $X$. In addition, $\hat{a}$ is an open mapping and $\pi$ is a local homeomorphism.

The system $T = (E, \pi, X)$ is thus a sheaf. Now, we show that all operations $\oplus, \lor, \land$ are continuous. We verify it only for $\oplus$ and for other operations it is similar. Let $x \in X$ and $\hat{a}(x), \hat{b}(x) \in \pi^{-1}\{\{ x \}\} = M/I_x$. Let $V$ be an open neighborhood of $(a \oplus b)(x)$. Without loss of generality, let $V = (a \oplus b)(U)$ for some open neighborhood $U$ of $x \in X$. The set $C = \{ \hat{a}(u), \hat{b}(u) \mid u \in U \}$ is an open neighborhood of $(a \oplus b)(x)$ in $E \Delta E$. The mapping $\alpha : (s, t) \mapsto s \oplus t$ from $E \Delta E$ to $E$ has the property $\alpha^{-1}(V) = C$, so that $\alpha$ is continuous and hence, $\oplus$ is continuous.

**Definition 4.9.** A distributive lattice $(L, \lor, \land)$ with the least element 0 is called a weak Stone algebra.

**Theorem 4.10.** Let $(M, \lor, \land, \oplus, 0)$ be a Stone EMV-algebra and $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{I}(M))$. Then

(i) $[0, a] \cap \downarrow P$ is a prime ideal of the MV-algebra $(M; \oplus, \land, 0, a)$;

(ii) $Q := \downarrow P$ is a prime ideal of EMV-algebra $M$;

(iii) $M$ can be embedded into the MV-algebra of global sections of a Hausdorff Boolean sheaf whose stalks are MV-chains.

**Proof.** (i) Let $a \in \mathcal{I}(M)$ and $Q := \downarrow P$. Clearly, $Q$ is an ideal of $M$ and $[0, a] \cap Q = (P \cap [0, a])$. Since $[0, a] \cap P$ is a prime ideal of $\mathcal{I}[0, a]$, then by the assumption and [Gel] Lem 4.20, $Q \cap [0, a] = \downarrow ([0, a] \cap P)$ is a prime ideal of the MV-algebra $[0, a]; \oplus, \land, 0, a)$. 


(ii) Put $x, y \in M$ such that $x \wedge y \in Q$. Then there exists $a \in I(M)$ such that $x, y \leq a$. Consider the MV-algebra $([0, a]; \oplus, \lambda_a, 0, a)$. By (i), $Q \cap [0, a]$ is a prime ideal of $[0, a]$, so from $x, y \in [0, a]$ and $x \wedge y \in Q \cap [0, a]$ it follows that $x \in Q \cap [0, a]$ or $y \in Q \cap [0, a]$, which means that $Q$ is a prime ideal of $M$.

(iii) First, we show that the natural map $M \to \prod_{P \in X} M/\downarrow P$ is one-to-one, where $X = P(I(M))$. Let $x \in M$ be such that $x \in \downarrow P$ for all $P \in X$. If $x \in I(M)$, then clearly $x = 0$ (since $\bigcap_{P \in X} P = \{0\}$).

Otherwise, if $x \notin I(M)$, then by the assumption, there is $a \in I(M)$ and $b \in I([0, a])$ such that $x \leq a$, $([0, a]; \oplus, \lambda_a, 0, a)$ is a Stone MV-algebra and $\{y \in [0, a] \mid y \wedge x = 0\} = \downarrow b$. Put $P \in X$. Then there is $e \in P$ such that $x \leq e$. Clearly, $x \leq a \wedge e \in P$. Set $f := a \wedge e$. Then $x \wedge \lambda_a(f) = x \wedge \lambda_a(f) = 0$ which implies that $\lambda_a(f) \leq b$ and so $\lambda_a(b) \leq f \in P$. It follows that $\lambda_a(b) \in \bigcap_{P \in X} P = \{0\}$. Thus $b = a$ and so $x = x \wedge a = 0$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\bigcap_{P \in X} \downarrow P = \{0\}$, which implies that the natural map $M \to \prod_{P \in X} M/\downarrow P$ is one-to-one. The rest part of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.7. □

5. Conclusion

EMV-algebras are a common generalization of MV-algebras and generalized Boolean algebras so that the existence of a top element is not assumed a priori. Every EMV-algebra either has a top element and then is equivalent to an MV-algebra or a top element fails but it can be embedded into an EMV-algebra with top element as the maximal ideal of the second one. The class of EMV-algebras is not a variety because it is not closed under forming subalgebras. Therefore, we were looking for an appropriate variety of algebras very closed to EMV-algebras containing the class of EMV-algebras as the least variety. We showed that such a class of algebras is forming by new introduced wEMV-algebras which form a variety. If we added to the language of every EMV-algebra a new derived operation $\odot$, we obtained a wEMV-algebra associated to the original EMV-algebra. One of the basic result is to show that the variety of EMV-algebras is the least subvariety of the variety of wEMV-algebra containing all associated EMV-algebras, see Theorem 3.20. This was possible due to the fact that every wEMV-algebra can be embedded into some associated wEMV-algebra, Theorem 3.19. A representation of a wEMV-algebra $M$ by an associated wEMV-algebra $N$ with top element, where $M$ can be embedded as a maximal ideal of $N$ was presented in Theorem 3.22. We have shown that we have countably many different subvarieties of wEMV-algebras, see Theorem 3.22. In addition, we studied a situation when a wEMV-algebra $M$ is isomorphic to a direct product of two subalgebras $M_1$ and $M_2$ of $M$, where $M_1$ is a greatest associated wEMV-subalgebra and $M_2$ is a strict wEMV-subalgebra, see Theorem 3.28.

Finally, we studied the Pierce sheaves of EMV-algebras without top element in Section 4, see Theorem 4.13.
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