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## cedram

# Corrigendum to "On traces of the Brandt-Eichler matrices" 

par Juliusz BRZEZIŃSKI

RÉsumé. Cette note est une correction de mon article [1]. Elle corrige une formule dans la proposition 2.2. D'après le résultat corrigé, le nombre $\iota(n, m)$ d'idéaux principaux à gauche de norme $q^{m}$ dans l'ordre de Eichler de niveau $n$ sur un anneau de valuation discrète $R$ dont le corps résiduel est de cardinalité $q$ est $\iota(n, m)=$ $(m+1) q^{m}$ si $m<n$ et

$$
\iota(n, m)=(n+1) q^{m}+2 q^{m-1}+\cdots+2 q^{n}+q^{n-1}
$$

lorsque $m \geq n$. La démonstration de la proposition n'était pas donnée dans mon article (étant "pénible mais sans obstacle"). Malheureusement, certains coefficients dans le second cas étaient erronés. Une démonstration complète suit ci-dessous.

Abstract. This is a correction to my paper [1]. It corrects a formula in Proposition 2.2. The corrected result says that the number $\iota(n, m)$ of principal left ideals with norm $q^{m}$ in the Eichler order of level $n$ over a discrete valuation ring $R$ with residue field of cardinality $q$ is $\iota(n, m)=(m+1) q^{m}$ if $m<n$ and

$$
\iota(n, m)=(n+1) q^{m}+2 q^{m-1}+\cdots+2 q^{n}+q^{n-1}
$$

when $m \geq n$. The proof of the Proposition was not given in my paper (as "tedious but straightforward"). Unfortunately, some coefficients in the second case were erroneous. A complete proof follows below.

Let $R$ be a discrete valuation ring with maximal ideal $(\pi)$. Assume that the residue ring $R /(\pi)$ is finite and let $q=|R /(\pi)|$ be its cardinality. The discrete valuation defined by $R$ will be denoted by $v$. Thus $v\left(\pi^{m}\right)=m$. Let

$$
\Lambda_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
R & R \\
\pi^{n} R & R
\end{array}\right)
$$

be an Eichler order in the matrix algebra $M_{2}(K)$ over the quotient field $K$ of $R$.

[^0]Our purpose is to find the number of principal left ideals in $\Lambda_{n}$ with norm $q^{m}(m>0)$, which will be denoted by $\iota(n, m)$. Since each such ideal has form $\Lambda_{n} M$, where $M \in \Lambda_{n}$ and the determinant of $M$ is a generator of $\left(\pi^{m}\right)$, we want to find a set of representatives for the orbits $\Lambda_{n}^{*} M$ of the unit group $\Lambda_{n}^{*}$ of $\Lambda_{n}$ acting on the set of matrices in $\Lambda_{n}$ having norm $q^{m}$ (recall that the norm of $\Lambda_{n} M$ is the cardinality of $\left.R /(\operatorname{det}(M))\right)$.

We denote by

$$
\varepsilon=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
e_{11} & e_{12} \\
\pi^{n} e_{21} & e_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

the elements of $\Lambda_{n}^{*}$, and by

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
m_{11} & m_{12} \\
\pi^{n} m_{21} & m_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

the matrices in $\Lambda_{n}$.
Our purpose is to choose a "canonical" set of representatives of the orbits $\Lambda_{n}^{*} M$.

We split the orbits into 3 types: Type 1 are those having a representant with $m_{11}=0$, Type 2 those having a representant with $m_{21}=0$ and Type 3 those which can not be represented by a matrix with $m_{11} m_{21}=0$.

First we give a canonical choice of matrices representing each type and when this is done, we count the number of orbits by counting the number of representatives of each kind.

Type 1. If a matrix $M$ has $m_{11}=0$, then $\operatorname{det} M=\pi^{n} m_{21} m_{12} \neq 0$, so multiplying $M$ from the left by a suitable diagonal unit matrix, we may assume that

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & \pi^{s} \\
\pi^{n+r} & m_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Now, we can take a product

$$
\varepsilon M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
\pi^{n} q & 1
\end{array}\right) M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & \pi^{s} \\
\pi^{n+r} & m_{22}+q \pi^{n+s}
\end{array}\right)
$$

so we can assume that $m_{22}$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{n+s}$. Thus we arrive to the description of the matrices of Type 1:

$$
M_{r, s, c}^{(1)}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & \pi^{s} \\
\pi^{n+r} & c
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $c$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{n+s}$. We check easily that two matrices $M_{r, s, c}^{(1)}$ and $M_{r^{\prime}, s^{\prime}, c^{\prime}}^{(1)}$ define the same orbit if and only if $r=r^{\prime}, s=s^{\prime}$ and $c=c^{\prime}$ $\left(\bmod \pi^{n+s}\right)$.

The number $\iota_{1}(n, m)$ of matrices of Type 1 with norm $q^{m}$ is equal to all possible choices of $r, s, c$ such that $r+s+n=m$ and $c$ is reduced
modulo $\pi^{n+s}$. Thus, we have such matrices only if $m \geq n$ and for each $s=0, \ldots, m-n$ we have $q^{s+n}$ such matrices, that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iota_{1}(n, m)=q^{n}+\cdots+q^{m} . \tag{0.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Type 2. Since this time, we have $\operatorname{det} M=m_{11} m_{22} \neq 0$, we can multiply $M$ by a diagonal unit matrix, so that

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\pi^{r} & m_{12} \\
0 & \pi^{s}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Now, we can take a product

$$
\varepsilon M=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & q \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right) M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\pi^{r} & m_{12}+q \pi^{s} \\
0 & \pi^{s}
\end{array}\right)
$$

so we can assume that $m_{12}$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{s}$. Thus, the matrices of Type 2 are

$$
M_{r, s, c}^{(2)}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\pi^{r} & c \\
0 & \pi^{s}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $c$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{s}$. We check easily that two matrices $M_{r, s, c}^{(2)}$ and $M_{r^{\prime}, s^{\prime}, c^{\prime}}^{(2)}$ define the same orbit if and only if $r=r^{\prime}, s=s^{\prime}$ and $c=c^{\prime}$ $\left(\bmod \pi^{s}\right)$.

The number $\iota_{2}(n, m)$ of matrices of Type 2 with norm $q^{m}$ is equal to all possible choices of $r, s, c$ such that $r+s=m$ and $c$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{s}$. Thus, for each $s=0, \ldots, m$ we have $q^{s}$ such matrices, that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\iota_{2}(n, m)=1+q+\cdots+q^{m} . \tag{0.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Type 3. This time, we assume that there is no representant of the orbit $\Lambda_{n} M$ with $m_{11} m_{21}=0$, so we can start with a representant

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\pi^{k} & m_{12} \\
\pi^{N} & m_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $N \geq n$, which we obtain multiplying $M$ by a suitable diagonal unit matrix. First of all, we will show that it is possible to choose a representant of the orbit $\Lambda_{n}^{*} M$ such that $N-k \in\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ (that is, $\left.n+k>N\right)$. In fact, if $N-k \geq n$, then we can multiply $M$ by the matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
-\pi^{N-k} & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

which gives a representant with 0 in the left lower position.
Let now $r=v\left(m_{22}-\pi^{N-k} m_{12}\right)$, so $\operatorname{det} M=\pi^{k}\left(m_{22}-\pi^{N-k} m_{12}\right)$ and $v(\operatorname{det} M)=k+r$. It is easy to check that two matrices

$$
M=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\pi^{k} & m_{12} \\
\pi^{N} & m_{22}
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad M^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\pi^{k^{\prime}} & m_{12}^{\prime} \\
\pi^{N^{\prime}} & m_{22}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)
$$

with $r=v\left(m_{22}-\pi^{N-k} m_{12}\right), r^{\prime}=v\left(m_{22}^{\prime}-\pi^{N^{\prime}-k^{\prime}} m_{12}^{\prime}\right)$ represent the same orbit of $\Lambda_{n}^{*}$ if and only if $(N, k, r)=\left(N^{\prime}, k^{\prime}, r^{\prime}\right)$ and $m_{12}=m_{12}^{\prime}\left(\bmod \pi^{r}\right)$ and $m_{22}=m_{22}^{\prime}\left(\bmod \pi^{(n+k)-N+r}\right)$. Moreover, a product $\varepsilon M_{N, k, r}$, where $\varepsilon \in \Lambda_{n}^{*}$ never has 0 in the first column, that is, these matrices can not represent an orbit of Type 1 or 2 . Thus the matrices of Type 3 are

$$
M_{N, k, r, a, b}^{(3)}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\pi^{k} & b \\
\pi^{N} & a
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $N \geq n, N-n<k<N, r=v\left(a-\pi^{N-k} b\right), a$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{(n+k)-N+r}$ and $b$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{r}$. Notice that $v\left(\operatorname{det} M_{N, k, r, a, b}^{(3)}\right)=$ $k+r$.

In the sequel, we will use the following observations: If $r<N-k$, then $a=\pi^{r} a_{0}, \pi \nmid a_{0}$. If $r \geq N-k$, then $a=\pi^{N-k} a_{0}, \pi^{r-(N-k)} \mid a_{0}-b$ and $\pi^{r-(N-k)+1} \nmid a_{0}-b$.

Now we want to compute the number $\iota_{3}(n, m)$ of matrices of Type 3 with norm $q^{m}$. This is a little more complicated than the corresponding task in cases 1 and 2. First of all, notice that fixing $n$, $m$, we have $n \leq N<n+m$ (that is, $N$ assumes $m$ values). In fact, if $N \geq m+n$, then $k>N-n \geq m$, which is impossible, since $k+r=m$. If we fix $N$, then the number of possible pairs $(k, r)$ such that $k+r=m$ and $N-n<k<N$ will be denoted by $c_{N}$. It is easy to check that

$$
c_{N}=n-\max (1, N-m)
$$

In order to compute $\iota_{3}(n, m)$, we start counting the contribution coming from matrices of Type 3 with fixed $N$. For each $r$ (and $k=m-r$ ), we count the number of corresponding matrices of Type 3.

We have two cases. First we consider the case $r<N-k$. As we know, we have $q^{r}$ possibilities for $b$. As regards $a$, we have $a=\pi^{r} a_{0}, \pi \nmid a_{0}$, so the number of possibilities for $a$ is given by the number of possible residues $a_{0}$ modulo $\pi^{(n+k)-N}$, which are invertible in $R /\left(\pi^{(n+k)-N}\right)$, that is, we get $q^{(n+k)-N}-q^{(n+k)-N-1}$ possibilities for $a_{0}$. The number of possible matrices is

$$
\begin{align*}
q^{r}\left(q^{(n+k)-N}-q^{(n+k)-N-1}\right) & =q^{r+(n+k)-N}-q^{r+(n+k)-N-1}  \tag{0.3}\\
& =q^{(n+m)-N}-q^{(n+m)-N-1}
\end{align*}
$$

The second case is $r \geq N-k$. This time, we have as before that $b$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{r}$, but $a=\pi^{N-k} a_{0}$, where $\pi^{r-(N-k)} \mid a_{0}-b$ and $\pi^{r-(N-k)+1} \nmid a_{0}-b$. Since $a$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{n+k-N+r}$, we have to count the number of pairs $\left(a_{0}, b\right)$ such that $a_{0}$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{n+2 k-2 N+r}, b$ is reduced modulo $\pi^{r}$ and $\pi^{r-(N-k)} \mid a_{0}-b, \pi^{r-(N-k)+1} \nmid a_{0}-b$. These configuration seems to be rather messy, but the situation is essentially very simple: we have residues modulo some $\pi^{x}$ and $\pi^{y}$ and we have to count
the number of pairs of residues whose difference is divisible by $\pi^{z}$ and not divisible by $\pi^{z+1}$ for some $z \leq \min (x, y)$. If we use $q$ as before, then the answer is

$$
q^{x} q^{y-z}-q^{x} q^{y-z-1}=q^{x+y-z}-q^{x+y-z-1},
$$

which can be easily checked (take $q^{x}$ residues $a_{0}=0,1, \ldots, q^{x}-1$ and for each of them, those residues among $b=0,1, \ldots, q^{y}-1$ for which $q^{z}$ divides $a_{0}-b$; then repeat the counting looking at those for which $q^{z+1}$ divides $a_{0}-b$ and subtract their number).

In our case, we have $x=n+2 k-2 N+r, y=r, z=r+k-N$. Thus $x+y-z=n+k-N+r=n+m-N$, which means that the number of matrices is exactly the same as in the case $r<N-k$ and is given by (0.3).

Now, it remains to compute the number $\iota(n, m)$ of all matrices of Types 1 , 2,3 . We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iota(n, m) & =\iota_{1}(n, m)+\iota_{2}(n, m)+\iota_{3}(n, m) \\
& =\sum_{i=n}^{m} q^{i}+\sum_{i=0}^{m} q^{i}+\sum_{N=n}^{n+m-1} c_{N}\left(q^{n+m-N}-q^{n+m-N-1}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first sum is 0 when $m<n$.
If $m<n$, then it is easy to check that $c_{N}=m+n-N$ for $N=$ $n, \ldots, n+m-1$. Thus, we have the sum:
$\iota(n, m)=\sum_{i=0}^{m} q^{i}+\sum_{N=n}^{n+m-1}(n+m-N)\left(q^{n+m-N}-q^{n+m-N-1}\right)=(m+1) q^{m}$.
If $m \geq n$, then $c_{N}=n-1$ for $N=n, \ldots, m$ and $c_{N}=n+m-N$ for $N=m+1, \ldots, n+m-1$. Hence, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\iota(n, m)= & \sum_{i=n}^{m} q^{i}+\sum_{i=0}^{m} q^{i}+\sum_{N=n}^{m}(n-1)\left(q^{n+m-N}-q^{n+m-N-1}\right) \\
& +\sum_{N=m+1}^{n+m-1}(n+m-N)\left(q^{n+m-N}-q^{n+m-N-1}\right) \\
= & (n+1) q^{m}+2 q^{m-1}+\cdots+2 q^{n}+q^{n-1}
\end{aligned}
$$
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