

lemma Every decomposition of  $\varepsilon$  in 2-cycles has an even number of 2-cycles.

proof of lemma:

Goal: use induction to show that if  $\varepsilon = \beta_1 \dots \beta_n$ , then  $n$  even.

Base case: ( $n = 1$  or  $2$ )

$\varepsilon \neq (ab)$  because  $(ab)$  doesn't fix  $a$  or  $b$ .

if  $\varepsilon = \beta_1 \beta_2$ ,  $2$  is even, so okay.

e.g.  $(12)(12)$

Now, suppose that if  $\varepsilon$  is a product of  $m$  2-cycles

where  $m < n$ , then  $m$  is even.

Finally, suppose that  $\varepsilon = \beta_1 \dots \beta_n$ . NTS  $n$  even

induction step.

Express

$$\varepsilon = ( ) ( ) \dots ( ) (a b)$$

There are four possibilities:

Goal: shuffle a to the left...

$\beta_{n-1}\beta_n$	replace with
1. (a b)(a b)	$\varepsilon$
2. (a c)(a b)	(a b)(b c) $\approx$ (a b c)
3. (b d)(a b)	(a d)(d b) $\approx$ (a d b)
4. (c d)(a b)	(a b)(c d)

*Note: A blue bracket groups rows 2, 3, and 4, with an arrow pointing down from the group.*

Result of replacement: a appears in  $\beta_{n-1}$  but not  $\beta_n$ .

In case (1), get  $\varepsilon = \beta_1 \dots \beta_n = \beta_1 \beta_2 \dots \beta_{n-2}$

↳ Done because  $n-2$  is even by induction


hypothesis, so  $n$  is even as well ✓

For the remaining three cases, repeat process with

Claim Must eventually find  $\beta_i \beta_{i+1} = (ax)(ax)$   
for some  $i$  and some  $x$ .

Why? If not, move  $a$  all the way to  $\beta_i$ :

$$\varepsilon = (ax)(\dots)(\dots)$$

  
↑ no a here.

where  $a$  appears only in the first transposition.

But then  $\varepsilon(a) = x$

↑ a contradiction because  $\varepsilon(a) = a$ .

Thus  $\beta_i \beta_{i+1} = (ax)(ax)$  for some  $i$  and some  $x$ . So

replace  $\beta_i \beta_{i+1}$  with  $\varepsilon$  to see that

$\varepsilon$  is a product of  $n-2$  2-cycles. By induction  $n-2$  is even, so  $n$  is even ✓