

# BOUNDED GENERATION FOR CONGRUENCE SUBGROUPS OF $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$

ALEXANDER A. TROST

**ABSTRACT.** This paper describes a bounded generation result concerning the minimal natural number  $K$  such that for  $Q(C_2, 2R) := \{A\varepsilon_\phi(2x)A^{-1} | x \in R, A \in \mathrm{Sp}_4(R), \phi \in C_2\}$ , one has  $N_{C_2, 2R} = \{X_1 \cdots X_K | \forall 1 \leq i \leq K : X_i \in Q(C_2, 2R)\}$  for certain rings of algebraic integers  $R$  and the principal congruence subgroup  $N_{C_2, 2R}$  in  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ . This gives an explicit version of an abstract bounded generation result of a similar type as presented by Morris [15, Theorem 6.1(1)]. Furthermore, the result presented does not depend on several number-theoretic quantities unlike Morris' result. Using this bounded generation result, we further give explicit bounds for the strong boundedness of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  for certain examples of rings  $R$ , thereby giving explicit versions of earlier strong boundedness results in [21]. We further give a classification of normally generating subsets of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  for  $R$  a ring of algebraic integers.

## INTRODUCTION

Bounded generation is a classic topic in the discussion of non-uniform lattices. For a group  $G$ , it is usually about finding a collection  $Z_1, \dots, Z_N$  of 'nice' (often cyclic) subgroups of  $G$  such that  $G = Z_1 \cdots Z_N$ . There have been some fascinating papers about this topic in the last decade, for example Morris' paper [15] about bounded generation for  $\mathrm{SL}_n(R)$  from a model theoretic viewpoint, Rapinchuk, Morgan and Sury's paper [14] about bounded generation of  $\mathrm{SL}_2(R)$  for  $R$  a ring of  $S$ -algebraic integers with infinitely many units and Nica's paper [17] about bounded generation of  $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{F}[T])$  by root elements.

A new variant of bounded generation that has emerged is the study of bounded generation not by way of subgroups but by collections of conjugacy classes: That is for a group  $G$  and a subset  $T$  of  $G$  that generates  $G$  and is closed under conjugation, one asks if there is a (minimal) natural number  $L := L(G, T)$  such that

$$G = \{t_1 \cdots t_L | \forall 1 \leq i \leq L : t_i \in T \cup T^{-1}\}$$

and if such a  $L$  exists how it depends on  $T$  and on  $G$ . This type of problem has been studied for various different groups like diffeomorphism groups by Burago, Ivanov and Polterovich [4], finite simple groups by Liebeck, Lawther and Shalev [12], [11] and Lie Groups and linear algebraic groups by Kedra, Libman and Martin [10]. Further, for  $\Phi$  an irreducible root system of rank at least 2 and  $R$  a ring of algebraic integers, one can use classical bounded generation results for  $G(\Phi, R)$  to see that  $L(G(\Phi, R), T)$  always exists as observed by Burago, Ivanov and Polterovich [4, Example 1.6] and Kedra and Gal [7, Theorem 1.1]. But there are choices for  $T$  and  $G$  that give rise to new questions about bounded generation and in this paper we are interested in two in particular: First, the case of  $G$  being the principal congruence subgroup  $N_{I, \Phi}$  in  $G(\Phi, R)$  for  $I$  a proper ideal in  $R$  and  $T = Q(\Phi, I) := \{A\varepsilon_\phi(x)A^{-1} | x \in I, A \in G(\Phi, R), \phi \in \Phi\}$ . Note that this uses that  $Q(\Phi, I)$  generates  $N_{I, \Phi}$ , which is true according to Milnor's, Serre's and Bass' solution for the Congruence subgroup problem [2, Theorem 3.6, Corollary 12.5], if  $R$  has infinitely many units or  $I = 2R$ , which are the two cases we are interested in in this paper. A result by Morris [15, Theorem 6.1(1)] implies



that the quantity  $L(N_{I,\Phi}, Q(\Phi, I)) =: K(I, \Phi)$  exists and has an upper bound depending on the number of generators of the ideal  $I$ ,  $\text{rank}(\Phi)$ ,  $|R/I|$  as well as  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$  for  $K$  the number field containing  $R$ . Crucially, this upper bound does not depend on the algebraic structure of  $R/I$  or  $R$ , but only on some numbers associated with the tuple  $(\Phi, R, I, K)$ . However, we believe that the situation is better than described by Morris, if  $R$  has infinitely many units:

**Conjecture 1.** *Let  $R$  be a ring of algebraic integers with infinitely many units,  $I$  a non-trivial ideal in  $R$ ,  $\Phi$  an irreducible root system of rank at least 2. Then there is a minimal constant  $K := K(\Phi)$  proportional to  $\text{rank}(\Phi)$  and independent of  $R$  and  $I$  such that  $N_{I,\Phi} = Q(\Phi, I)^K$ .*

We want to provide supporting evidence for this conjecture in the case that  $I = 2R$  is a prime ideal, namely in the sub-case that each element of  $R$  is a sum of a unit in  $R$  and an element of  $2R$ . I call such rings *2R-pseudo-good*. The motivating example is, of course, the ring of integers  $\mathbb{Z}$ , but we will show that some rings of quadratic and cubic integers  $R$  with  $2R$  prime have this property as well. We will give bounds on  $K(C_2, 2R)$  for such rings:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $R$  be a 2R-pseudo-good ring of S-algebraic integers.*

- (1) *If  $R$  has infinitely many units, then  $K(C_2, 2R) \leq 46$ .*
- (2) *If  $R$  is a principal ideal domain, then  $K(C_2, 2R) \leq 646$ .*

This is essentially shown by determining how 'expensive' a classical proof for the existence of the Bruhat decomposition on  $\text{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  is in terms of  $Q(C_2, 2R)$  when forced on  $\text{Sp}_4(R)$ . Theorem 1 does not depend on the ring  $R$  and the corresponding field extension  $K|\mathbb{Q}$  at least if  $R$  has infinitely many units, which supports Conjecture 1.

Second, we study the case that  $T$  is a union of finitely many conjugacy classes  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  generating  $G(\Phi, R)$ . This problem has been studied in recent years, too. For example, we have shown in [21, Theorem 5.13] that independently of the specific conjugacy classes  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  the quantity  $L(G(\Phi, R), T)$  has an upper bound  $L_k$  only depending on  $k, \Phi$  and  $R$ . For a group  $G$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the minimal  $L_k$  that works for all conjugacy classes  $C_1, \dots, C_k$  generating  $G$  is denoted by  $\Delta_k(G)$ , if it exists. In fact, our result [21, Theorem 5.13] shows that there is a  $C(\Phi, R) \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \leq \Delta_k(G(\Phi, R)) \leq C(\Phi, R)k$  for  $k$  sufficiently big. Further explicit bounds in [10, Corollary 6.2] and by myself [20, Theorem 3] strongly suggest for  $R$  a ring of integers with infinitely many units and  $\Phi$  irreducible of rank at least 3 that  $\Delta_k(G(\Phi, R))$  has an upper bound proportional to  $\text{rank}(\Phi)^2 \cdot k$  and a lower bound proportional to  $\text{rank}(\Phi) \cdot k$  with proportionality factors independent of  $R$ . I believe that  $\Delta_k(G(\Phi, R))$  has an upper bound proportional to  $\text{rank}(\Phi) \cdot k$ , too, and a research strategy suggested to us by the anonymous referee of [21] would imply this. This strategy however depends on Conjecture 1.

Our results in [21] showed further that the discussion of  $\Delta_k(G)$  for  $G = \text{Sp}_4(R)$  or  $G_2(R)$  is more involved than for higher rank root systems  $\Phi$  and involves certain number theoretic problems related to what I call *bad primes of  $R$* . Our result [21, Theorem 5.13] does still show that  $\Delta_k(\text{Sp}_4(R))$  has upper and lower bounds proportional to  $k$  for  $k$  sufficiently big, but as of now explicit bounds on  $\Delta_k(\text{Sp}_4(R))$  have not appeared in the literature. This is partly due to the fact giving explicit bounds for  $\Delta_k(\text{Sp}_4(R))$  requires one to consider the value of  $K(C_2, 2R)$ , because contrary to higher rank groups  $G(\Phi, R)$ , it is hard to construct all root elements of  $\text{Sp}_4(R)$  from a collection of generating conjugacy classes  $T$ . So Theorem 1 can be used to derive explicit bounds on  $\Delta_k(\text{Sp}_4(R))$  for 2R-pseudo-good rings  $R$ :

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be given,  $p$  a prime greater than 3. Further, let  $D$  be a positive, square-free number with  $D \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$  such that there are  $a, b$  positive odd numbers with*



$b^2D = a^2 \pm 4$  and such that  $R_D$  the ring of algebraic integers in the number field  $\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]$ , is a principal ideal domain. Then

- (1)  $\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R_D)) \leq 4 + 17644k$ ,
- (2)  $\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}])) \leq 5 + 17644k$ ,
- (3)  $\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{Z})) \leq 5 + 248064k$  and
- (4)  $\Delta_k\left(\mathrm{Sp}_4\left(\mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right]\right)\right) \leq 4 + 248064k$  hold.

We also provide an improved version of [21, Theorem 6.3] to demonstrate that even for  $k \geq r(R)$ , the number of bad primes  $r(R)$  of  $R$  can not be ignored when determining  $\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R))$ :

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $R$  be a ring of  $S$ -algebraic integers in a number field. Further let*

$$r := r(R) := |\{\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ divides } 2R, \text{ is a prime ideal and } R/\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{F}_2\}|$$

*be given. Then  $\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)) \geq 4k + r(R)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \geq r(R)$ .*

Lastly, we prove the following theorem classifying normally generating subsets of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ , whose proof we promised in an earlier paper [21, Corollary 6.8]:

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $R$  be a ring of  $S$ -algebraic integers and  $A : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/[\mathrm{Sp}_4(R), \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)]$  the abelianization homomorphism. Then  $S \subset \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  normally generates  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  precisely if  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$  and  $A(S)$  generates  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/[\mathrm{Sp}_4(R), \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)]$ .*

This paper is divided into six sections: In the first section, we introduce necessary definitions and notations. The second section explains how to provide values for  $K(C_2, 2R)$  for  $2R$ -pseudo-good rings. The third section gives some examples of  $2R$ -pseudo-good rings of algebraic integers and proves Theorem 1. In the fourth section, we restate and slightly rephrase [21, Theorem 3.1] in order to prove Theorem 2. The fifth and sixth section prove Theorem 4 and Theorem 3 respectively.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank Benjamin Martin for his continued support and advice.

## 1. DEFINITIONS

Let  $G$  be a group and  $S$  a finite subset of  $G$ . In this paper  $\|\cdot\|_S : G \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{+\infty\}$  denotes the word norm given by the conjugacy classes  $C_G(S)$  on  $G$ , that is  $\|1\|_S := 0$ ,

$$\|X\|_S := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists A_1, \dots, A_n \in C_G(S \cup S^{-1}) : X = A_1 \cdots A_n\}$$

for  $X \in \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle - \{1\}$  and  $\|X\|_S := +\infty$  for  $X \notin \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle$ . We also set  $B_S(k) := \{A \in G \mid \|A\|_S \leq k\}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\|G\|_S = \mathrm{diam}(\|\cdot\|_S)$  of  $G$  as the minimal  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $B_S(N) = G$  or as  $+\infty$  if there is no such  $N$ . If  $S = \{A\}$ , then we write  $\|\cdot\|_A$  instead of  $\|\cdot\|_{\{A\}}$  and  $B_A(k)$  instead of  $B_{\{A\}}(k)$ . Further define for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  the invariant

$$\Delta_k(G) := \sup\{\mathrm{diam}(\|\cdot\|_S) \mid S \subset G \text{ with } |S| \leq k \text{ and } \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle = G\} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{+\infty\}$$

with  $\Delta_k(G)$  defined as  $-\infty$ , if there is no normally generating set  $S \subset G$  with  $|S| \leq k$ . The group  $G$  is called *strongly bounded*, if  $\Delta_k(G)$  is finite or  $-\infty$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We also define:

$$\Delta_\infty(G) := \sup\{\mathrm{diam}(\|\cdot\|_S) \mid S \subset G \text{ with } |S| < \infty \text{ and } \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle = G\} \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{+\infty\}$$



with  $\Delta_\infty(G)$  defined as  $-\infty$ , if there is no finite, normally generating set  $S \subset G$ . Also note  $\Delta_k(G) \leq \Delta_\infty(G)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We will omit defining the simply-connected split Chevalley-Demazure groups  $G(\Phi, R)$  and the corresponding root elements  $\varepsilon_\alpha(x)$  in this paper. Instead, we use a representation of the complex, simply-connected Lie group  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{C})$  that gives the following, classical definition of  $G(C_2, R) = \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  for  $R$  a commutative ring with 1 :


**Definition 1.1.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1 and let

$$\mathrm{Sp}_4(R) := \{A \in R^{4 \times 4} \mid A^T J A = J\}$$

be given with

$$J = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} 0_2 & I_2 \\ \hline -I_2 & 0_2 \end{array} \right)$$

We can choose a system of positive simple roots  $\{\alpha, \beta\}$  in  $C_2$  such that the Dynkin-diagram of this system of positive simple roots has the following form



Then subject to the choice of the maximal torus in  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{C})$  as diagonal matrices in  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{C})$ , the root elements for positive roots in  $G(C_2, R) = \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  can be chosen as:  $\varepsilon_\alpha(t) = I_4 + t(e_{1,2} - e_{4,3})$ ,  $\varepsilon_\beta(t) = I_4 + te_{2,4}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(t) = I_4 + t(e_{14} + e_{23})$  and  $\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(t) = I_4 + te_{13}$  for all  $t \in R$ . Root elements for negative roots  $\phi \in C_2$  and  $x \in R$  are then  $\varepsilon_\phi(x) = \varepsilon_{-\phi}(x)^T$ .

Next, let  $\phi \in C_2$ . Then the group elements  $\varepsilon_\phi(t)$  are *additive in  $t \in R$* , that is  $\varepsilon_\phi(t+s) = \varepsilon_\phi(t)\varepsilon_\phi(s)$  holds for all  $t, s \in R$ . Further, a couple of commutator formulas, expressed in the next lemma, hold. We will use the additivity and the commutator formulas implicitly throughout the thesis usually without reference.

**Lemma 1.2.** [8, Proposition 33.2-33.5] *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1 and let  $a, b \in R$  be given.*

- (1) *If  $\phi, \psi \in C_2$  are given with  $0 \neq \phi + \psi \notin C_2$ , then  $(\varepsilon_\phi(a), \varepsilon_\psi(b)) = 1$ .*
- (2) *If  $\alpha, \beta$  are positive, simple roots in  $C_2$  with  $\alpha$  short and  $\beta$  long, then*

$$\begin{aligned} (\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(b), \varepsilon_\alpha(a)) &= \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(\pm 2ab) \text{ and} \\ (\varepsilon_\beta(b), \varepsilon_\alpha(a)) &= \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(\pm ab)\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(\pm a^2b). \end{aligned}$$

We also define the Weyl group elements and diagonal elements in  $G(\Phi, R)$ :

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1 and let  $\Phi$  be a root system. Define for  $t \in R^*$  and  $\phi \in \Phi$  the elements:

$$w_\phi(t) := \varepsilon_\phi(t)\varepsilon_{-\phi}(-t^{-1})\varepsilon_\phi(t).$$

We will often write  $w_\phi := w_\phi(1)$ . We also define  $h_\phi(t) := w_\phi(t)w_\phi(1)^{-1}$  for  $t \in R^*$  and  $\phi \in \Phi$ .

*Remark 1.4.* Let  $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_u\}$  be a system of simple, positive roots in the root system  $\Phi$ . If  $w = w_{\alpha_{i_1}} \cdots w_{\alpha_{i_k}}$  is an element of the Weyl group  $W(\Phi)$ , then there is an element  $\tilde{w} \in G(\Phi, R)$  defined by  $\tilde{w} := w_{\alpha_{i_1}}(1) \cdots w_{\alpha_{i_k}}(1)$ . We will often denote this element  $\tilde{w}$  of  $G(\Phi, R)$  by  $w$  as well.

Further, we use the following concept:



**Definition 1.5.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1,  $\Phi$  an irreducible root system,  $\phi \in \Phi$  and let  $S \subset G(\Phi, R)$  be given. Then for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  define the subset  $\varepsilon(S, \phi, k)$  of  $R$  as  $\{x \in R \mid \varepsilon_\phi(x) \in B_S(k)\}$ . Further for  $A \in G(\Phi, R)$ , set  $\varepsilon(A, \phi, k) := \varepsilon(\{A\}, \phi, k)$ .

The subgroup  $U^+(\Phi, R)$ , called *the subgroup of upper unipotent elements of  $G(\Phi, R)$* , is the subgroup of  $G(\Phi, R)$  generated by the root elements  $\varepsilon_\phi(x)$  for  $x \in R$  and  $\phi \in \Phi$  a positive root. Similarly, one can define  $U^-(\Phi, R)$ , *the subgroup of lower unipotent elements of  $G(\Phi, R)$*  by root elements for negative roots. We also define  $B(\Phi, R) := B^+(\Phi, R) := B(R)$  as the subgroup of  $G(\Phi, R)$  generated by the sets  $U^+(\Phi, R)$  and  $\{h_\phi(t) \mid t \in R^*, \phi \in \Phi\}$ . This subgroup is called *the upper Borel subgroup of  $G(\Phi, R)$* . Similarly, one defines the *lower Borel subgroup  $B^-(\Phi, R)$  of  $G(\Phi, R)$* .

Further for a non-trivial ideal  $I \subset R$ , we denote the group homomorphism  $G(\Phi, R) \rightarrow G(\Phi, R/I)$  induced by the quotient map  $\pi_I : R \rightarrow R/I$  by  $\pi_I$  as well. This group homomorphism is commonly called *the reduction homomorphism induced by  $I$* . Next, we define:

**Definition 1.6.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1,  $I$  an ideal in  $R$ ,  $\Phi$  an irreducible root system and  $S$  a subset of  $G(\Phi, R)$ . Then define the following two subsets of maximal ideals in  $R$ :

- (1)  $V(I) := \{m \text{ maximal ideal in } R \mid I \subset m\}$  and
- (2)  $\Pi(S) := \{m \text{ maximal ideal of } R \mid \forall A \in S : \pi_m(A) \text{ central in } G(\Phi, R/m)\}$

## 2. $2R$ -PSEUDO-GOOD RINGS AND POSSIBLE VALUES FOR $K(C_2, 2R)$

First, we define  $2R$ -pseudo-good rings:

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1 such that the set of coset representatives  $X$  of  $2R$  in  $R$  can be chosen with the following properties:

- (1) each  $x \in X - 2R$  is a unit in  $R$ ,
- (2)  $0 \in X$  and
- (3) if  $R \neq 2R$ , then  $1 \in X$ .

Then we call  $R$  a  $2R$ -pseudo-good ring.

*Remark 2.2.* If  $R$  is  $2R$ -pseudo-good, then either  $R/2R$  is a field or 2 is a unit in  $R$ . This is the case, because each element  $\bar{x}$  in  $R/2R - \{0\}$  can be written as  $\bar{x} = x + 2R$  for some  $x \in X$  a unit. But then  $\bar{x}$  is itself a unit and hence each non-zero element of  $R/2R$  is a unit and so  $R$  is a field. On the other hand,  $R = 2R$  implies that  $2 \in R$  is a unit. We should mention that  $2R$ -pseudo-goodness is our own concept named so as an homage to good rings [23].

We want to point out that being  $2R$ -pseudo-good is equivalent to the map  $R^* \rightarrow R/2R, u \mapsto u + 2R$  mapping onto  $R/2R - \{0\}$ . Further, define for a  $2R$ -pseudo-good ring  $R$  with the corresponding set of coset representatives  $X$ , the set

$$B_R := \{\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(x_1)\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(x_2)\varepsilon_\beta(x_3)\varepsilon_\alpha(x_4)h_\alpha(t)h_\beta(s) \mid t, s \in X \cap R^*, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in X\}.$$

The goal of this section is to prove:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $R$  be a  $2R$ -pseudo-good ring such that 2 is not a unit and let  $J \in \mathbb{N}$  be given such that  $\text{Sp}_4(R) = (U^+(C_2, R)U^-(C_2, R))^J$  or  $\text{Sp}_4(R) = (U^-(C_2, R)U^+(C_2, R))^J$ . Then  $K(C_2, 2R) \leq 8J + 6$  holds.*



*Remark 2.4.* Technically, we should assume that also  $R$  is a ring of algebraic integers but this does not play a role in the proof, so we will omit this assumption. Furthermore, we will write  $N$  instead of  $N_{C_2, 2R}$  and  $Q$  instead of  $Q(C_2, 2R)$  in this section to simplify the notation.

To show this, we define the usual Cayley word norms on finitely generated groups next:

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $G$  be a group and  $S \subset G$  with  $S = S^{-1}$  a generating set of  $G$  be given. Then define the function  $l_S : G \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  by  $l_S(1) := 0$  and by

$$l_S(x) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists s_1, \dots, s_n \in S : x = s_1 \cdots s_n\}$$

for  $x \neq 1$ .

*Remark 2.6.* Note that in this definition  $S$  does not normally generate  $G$  but generate  $G$ .

We also need the following definition:

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $G$  be a group and  $S \subset G$  be given with  $S = S^{-1}$  a generating set of  $G$ . Further, let  $w = s_1 \cdots s_n$  be given with all  $s_i \in S$ .

- (1) The tuple (or string)  $(s_1, \dots, s_n) \in S^n$  is called an *expression for  $w$  in terms of  $S$  of length  $n$* . If  $n = l_S(w)$  holds, then the tuple  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  is called a *minimal expression for  $w$  (with respect to  $S$ )*.
- (2) An element  $w' \in G$  is called a *subword of  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$*  if there is a sequence of integers  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n$  such that  $w' = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k}$  and  $l_S(w') = k$ .

If  $G$  is the Weyl group  $W(\Phi)$  of an irreducible root system  $\Phi$ , then the generating set  $S$  is usually chosen as the set  $F = \{w_{\alpha_1}, \dots, w_{\alpha_u}\}$  of fundamental reflections associated to a system of positive, simple roots  $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_u\}$ .

The group  $W(\Phi)$  further contains a unique element  $w_0$  with the property that  $l_F(w_0)$  is maximal, named the longest element of  $W(\Phi)$ . According to [18, Appendix, p. 151, (24)Theorem], this element  $w_0$  can equivalently be characterized by the property that  $w_0(\phi)$  is a negative root in  $\Phi$  for each positive root  $\phi \in \Phi$ . Next, note that the Weyl group  $W(C_2)$  is generated by the set  $F := \{w_\alpha, w_\beta\}$  for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  chosen as in the beginning of Section 1. Then one easily checks that  $w_0 = (w_\alpha \cdot w_\beta)^2$  and  $l_F(w_0) = 4$  holds.

To prove Proposition 2.3, we show the following proposition now:

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $R$  be a  $2R$ -pseudo-good ring,  $w_1 = s_1^{(1)} \cdots s_{k_1}^{(1)}$  and  $w_2 = s_1^{(2)} \cdots s_{k_2}^{(2)}$  elements of  $W(C_2)$  with  $s_1^{(1)}, \dots, s_{k_1}^{(1)}, s_1^{(2)}, \dots, s_{k_2}^{(2)}$  elements of  $F$  and  $l_F(w_1) = k_1$  and  $l_F(w_2) = k_2$ . Then up to multiplication by  $l_F(w_2)$  elements of  $Q$ , each element of  $(B(C_2, R)w_1B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_2B(C_2, R))$  is an element of  $B(C_2, R)wB(C_2, R)$  for  $w$  some subword of the (possibly non-minimal) expression  $(s_1^{(1)}, \dots, s_{k_1}^{(1)}, s_1^{(2)}, \dots, s_{k_2}^{(2)})$ .*

We first show how to derive Proposition 2.3 from this proposition:

*Proof.* To begin, note that we may assume wlog that each  $A \in N \subset \text{Sp}_4(R)$  can be written as

$$A = \prod_{i=1}^J u_i^+ u_i^-$$

6



for all  $u_i^+$  elements of  $U^+(C_2, R)$  and all  $u_i^-$  elements of  $U^-(C_2, R)$ . But each element  $w_0^{-1}u_i^-w_0$  is a product of root elements of positive roots in  $C_2$  and hence an element of  $B(C_2, R)$ . But then  $w_0^{-1} = -w_0$  implies

$$u_i^+u_i^- = (u_i^+w_0)(w_0^{-1}u_i^-w_0)w_0^{-1} \in (B(C_2, R)w_0) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_0) \subset (B(C_2, R)w_0B(C_2, R))^2.$$

holds for all  $i$ . This implies  $A \in (B(C_2, R)w_0B(C_2, R))^{2J}$ .

But  $l_F(w_0) = 4$  holds, so according to Proposition 2.8, the matrix  $A$  can be written as a product  $b'_1wb'_2$  for  $b'_1, b'_2 \in B(C_2, R)$  and  $w \in W(C_2)$  after multiplication by  $l_F(w_0)(2J-1) \leq 4(2J-1)$  elements of  $Q$ . But each element of  $B(C_2, R)wB(C_2, R)$  is conjugate to an element of  $B(C_2, R)w$ . Observe that each element of  $B(C_2, R)$  has the form

$$\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(t_{2\alpha+\beta})\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(t_{\alpha+\beta})\varepsilon_\beta(t_\beta)\varepsilon_\alpha(t_\alpha)h_\alpha(s_\alpha)h_\beta(s_\beta)$$

for  $t_{2\alpha+\beta}, t_{\alpha+\beta}, t_\beta, t_\alpha \in R$  and  $s_\alpha, s_\beta \in R^*$ . Hence after multiplication with 4 elements of  $Q$ , we may assume that  $t_{2\alpha+\beta}, t_{\alpha+\beta}, t_\beta, t_\alpha$  are elements of the set  $X$  of coset representatives of  $2R$  in  $R$  given by  $2R$ -pseudo-goodness instead. Furthermore,

$$h_\alpha(s_\alpha) = w_\alpha(s_\alpha)w_\alpha^{-1}$$

holds and  $w_\alpha(s_\alpha) = \varepsilon_\alpha(s_\alpha)\varepsilon_{-\alpha}(-s_\alpha^{-1})\varepsilon_\alpha(s_\alpha)$ . Note, that all elements of  $X - \{0\}$  are units in  $R$  and so we can consider the set

$$Y := \{-x^{-1}|x \in X - \{0\}\} \cup \{0\}.$$

One easily checks that this set  $Y$  is also a set of coset representatives of  $2R$  in  $R$ . Thus after multiplication with 3 elements of  $Q$ , we may assume that  $s_\alpha$  is an element of  $X - \{0\}$ . Similarly, we may assume after multiplication by 3 elements of  $Q$  that  $s_\beta$  is an element of  $X - \{0\}$ . So each element of  $B(C_2, R)w$  agrees with an element of  $B_Rw$  after multiplication by  $4 + 3 + 3 = 10$  elements of  $Q$ .

To summarize: Up to multiplication by at most  $4(2J-1) + 10 = 8J + 6$  elements of  $Q$ , each element  $A$  of  $N$  can be rewritten as an element of  $B_Rw$  for some  $w \in W(C_2)$ . Next, remember that  $N = \ker(\pi_{2R} : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R))$ . We are going to show that  $B_Rw \cap N \neq \emptyset$  implies  $w = I_4$  and  $B_Rw \cap N = \{I_4\}$ . Together with  $Q \subset N$ , this implies

$$K(C_2, R) \leq 8J + 6.$$

To show that  $B_Rw \cap N \neq \emptyset$  implies  $w = I_4$  and  $B_Rw \cap N = \{I_4\}$ , assume there is an  $A = bw \in B_Rw \cap N$  for some  $w \in W(C_2)$ . Observe that  $\pi_{2R}(A) = I_4$ . But  $\pi_{2R}(b)$  is an element of  $B(R/2R, C_2)$  of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$ . Further, slightly abusing notation, we obtain  $\pi_{2R}(w) = w$  and hence  $\pi_{2R}(A)$  is an element of  $B(R/2R, C_2)w$ . But  $R/2R$  is a field. Hence by the uniqueness of the Bruhat-decomposition for  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  [18, Chapter 3, p. 26, Theorem 4'], we obtain  $\pi_{2R}(b) = w = I_4$ . But according to the definition of  $B_R$  and remembering that  $X$  is a set of coset-representatives of  $2R$  in  $R$ , this implies  $b \in \{h_\alpha(t)h_\beta(s) \mid t, s \in X \cap R^*\}$ . So there are  $t, s \in X \cap R^*$  with

$$A = h_\alpha(t)h_\beta(s) = \left( \begin{array}{cc|cc} t & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & st^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & t^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & s^{-1}t \end{array} \right)$$

But  $\pi_{2R}(A) = I_4$  and hence  $t \equiv 1 \pmod{2R}$ . But  $1 \in X$  and so  $t = 1$ . Then  $s = 1$  follows the same way. Hence  $A = I_4$ . This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.3.  $\square$



*Remark 2.9.* This proof can also be used to see that  $Q(C_2, 2R)$  does indeed generate  $N_{C_2, 2R}$  for  $R$  a  $2R$ -pseudo-good ring without using the complete congruence subgroup property.

To prove Proposition 2.8, we need:

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $R$  be a  $2R$ -pseudo-good ring. Then up to multiplication by an element of  $Q$ , we have*

$$(B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \subset B(C_2, R) \cup (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)).$$

*The same holds for  $\beta$  instead of  $\alpha$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $b_1, b_2, b'_1, b'_2 \in B(C_2, R)$  be given. Note that we may write  $b_2 b'_1$  as

$$b_2 b'_1 = \varepsilon_\alpha(a) u_{P-\alpha} h$$

for  $a \in R$ ,  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(b)\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(c)\varepsilon_\beta(d) = u_{P-\{\alpha\}}$  for  $b, c, d \in R$  and  $h \in \{h_\alpha(t)h_\beta(s) \mid t, s \in R^*\}$ . Together with  $w_\alpha^{-1} = -w_\alpha$ , this implies:

$$b_1 w_\alpha b_2 b'_1 w_\alpha b'_2 = b_1 w_\alpha \varepsilon_\alpha(a) u_{P-\alpha} h w_\alpha b'_2 = b_1 \varepsilon_{-\alpha}(\pm a) w_\alpha [u_{P-\alpha}(-h)] w_\alpha^{-1} b'_2.$$

Next,  $w_\alpha [u_{P-\alpha}(-h)] w_\alpha^{-1}$  is an element of  $B(C_2, R)$ , because  $w_\alpha u_{P-\alpha} w_\alpha^{-1}$  is a product of root elements associated to positive roots in  $C_2$  and  $w_\alpha(-h) w_\alpha^{-1}$  is an element of  $\{h_\alpha(t)h_\beta(s) \mid t, s \in R^*\}$  as required. Thus  $b_1 w_\alpha b_2 b'_1 w_\alpha b'_2 \in B(C_2, R) \varepsilon_{-\alpha}(\pm a) B(C_2, R)$  holds.

There are two possible cases now. Either  $a$  is an element of  $2R$ , then we are done after multiplying with one element of  $Q$ . On the other hand, if  $a \notin 2R$  holds, then as  $R$  is  $2R$ -pseudo-good, there is a unit  $x \in R$  such that  $a \equiv -x^{-1} \pmod{2R}$ . Hence after multiplying with one element of  $Q$ , we may assume  $a = -x^{-1}$  and so we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{-\alpha}(a) &= \varepsilon_\alpha(-x)(\varepsilon_\alpha(x)\varepsilon_{-\alpha}(-x^{-1})\varepsilon_\alpha(x))\varepsilon_\alpha(-x) \\ &= \varepsilon_\alpha(-x)w_\alpha(x)\varepsilon_\alpha(-x) = \varepsilon_\alpha(-x)h_\alpha(x)w_\alpha\varepsilon_\alpha(-x). \end{aligned}$$

But  $\varepsilon_\alpha(-x)h_\alpha(x)$  and  $\varepsilon_\alpha(-x)$  are elements of  $B(C_2, R)$ , so  $\varepsilon_{-\alpha}(a)$  is an element of  $B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 w_\alpha b_2 b'_1 w_\alpha b'_2 &\in B(C_2, R) \varepsilon_{-\alpha}(\pm a) B(C_2, R) \subset B(C_2, R) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \cdot B(C_2, R) \\ &= B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R) \end{aligned}$$

holds after multiplication with up to one element of  $Q$ . □

Next, we are going to prove the Proposition 2.8:

*Proof.* Slightly abusing notation, we set  $T(w_1, w_2) := (s_1^{(1)}, \dots, s_{k_1}^{(1)}, s_1^{(2)}, \dots, s_{k_2}^{(2)})$ . We will first show by induction on  $l_F(w_2)$  that

$$(B(C_2, R)w_1 B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_2 B(C_2, R)) \subset \bigcup_{w \text{ subword of } T(w_1, w_2)} B(C_2, R)w B(C_2, R)$$

holds up to multiplication by  $l_F(w_2)$  elements of  $Q$ .

For  $l_F(w_2) = 0$ , we obtain  $B(C_2, R)w_2 B(C_2, R) = B(C_2, R)$  and hence the claim is obvious. So let  $w_2 \in W(C_2)$  be given with  $l_F(w_2) \geq 1$  and assume without loss of generality that



$w_2 = w'_2 w_\alpha$  and  $l_F(w_2) = l_F(w'_2) + 1$ . Then by induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned}
& (B(C_2, R)w_1B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_2B(C_2, R)) \\
&= (B(C_2, R)w_1B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w'_2) \cdot (w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \\
&\subset \left[ \bigcup_{w \text{ subword of } T(w_1, w'_2)} B(C_2, R)wB(C_2, R) \right] \cdot w_\alpha B(C_2, R) \\
&= \bigcup_{w \text{ subword of } T(w_1, w'_2)} (B(C_2, R)wB(C_2, R) \cdot w_\alpha B(C_2, R))
\end{aligned}$$

holds up to multiplication by  $l_F(w'_2)$  elements of  $Q$ . Hence it suffices to consider the special case  $w_2 = w_\alpha$ . We distinguish two cases: First  $l_F(w_1 w_\alpha) > l_F(w_1)$  and second  $l_F(w_1 w_\alpha) < l_F(w_1)$ .

In the first case, it suffices to show that  $w_1 B(C_2, R) w_\alpha \subset B(C_2, R) w_1 w_\alpha B(C_2, R)$ . To see this let

$$b = \varepsilon_\alpha(a) u_{P-\{\alpha\}} h \in B(C_2, R)$$

be given with  $a \in R$ ,  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(b) \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(c) \varepsilon_\beta(d) = u_{P-\{\alpha\}}$  for  $b, c, d \in R$  and  $h \in \{h_\alpha(t) h_\beta(s) \mid t, s \in R^*\}$ . Note that

$$w_1 \varepsilon_\alpha(a) w_1^{-1} = \varepsilon_{w_1(\alpha)}(\pm a).$$

Yet according to [18, Appendix, p. 151, (19)Lemma], the inequality  $l_F(w_1 w_\alpha) > l_F(w_1)$  implies that the root  $w_1(\alpha)$  is positive root. Thus  $w_1 \varepsilon_\alpha(a) w_1^{-1} \in B(C_2, R)$ . On the other hand, similar to the proof of Lemma 2.10,  $w_\alpha^{-1} u_{P-\{\alpha\}} h w_\alpha$  is also an element of  $B(C_2, R)$ . Hence we obtain for all  $b \in B(C_2, R)$  that

$$w_1 b w_\alpha = w_1 \varepsilon_\alpha(a) u_{P-\{\alpha\}} h w_\alpha = (w_1 \varepsilon_\alpha(a) w_1^{-1}) w_1 w_\alpha (w_\alpha^{-1} u_{P-\{\alpha\}} h w_\alpha) \in B(C_2, R) w_1 w_\alpha B(C_2, R).$$

This finishes the proof of the first case. Note in particular that in the first case we need not multiply by an element of  $Q$ .

In the second case, we can write  $w_1 = w'_1 w_\alpha$  for  $l_F(w_1) = l_F(w'_1) + 1$  and so

$$\begin{aligned}
& (B(C_2, R)w_1B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \\
&= (B(C_2, R)w'_1) \cdot (w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)).
\end{aligned}$$

But according to Lemma 2.10, we know that up to multiplication by an element of  $Q$ , we have

$$(w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \subset B(C_2, R) \cup (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)).$$

Thus up to multiplication by an element of  $Q$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (B(C_2, R)w_1B(C_2, R)) \cdot (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)) \\
&\subset (B(C_2, R)w'_1) \cdot [B(C_2, R) \cup (B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R))] \\
&= (B(C_2, R)w'_1 B(C_2, R)) \cup (B(C_2, R)w'_1 B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R)).
\end{aligned}$$

But according to the first case  $B(C_2, R)w'_1 B(C_2, R)w_\alpha B(C_2, R) \subset B(C_2, R)w'_1 w_\alpha B(C_2, R)$ . This finishes the second case and the proof of the proposition.  $\square$



### 3. RINGS OF ALGEBRAIC INTEGERS

In this section, we will study certain examples of rings of algebraic integers  $R$  to prove Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. This will require to talk about bounded generation by root elements and about  $2R$ -pseudo-goodness to apply Proposition 2.3.

**3.1.  $2R$ -pseudo-good rings of algebraic integers and bounded generation.** First, the definition of  $S$ -algebraic integers:

**Definition 3.1.** [16, Chapter I, §11] Let  $K$  be a finite field extension of  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Then let  $S$  be a finite subset of the set  $V$  of all valuations of  $K$  such that  $S$  contains all archimedean valuations. Then the ring  $\mathcal{O}_S$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_S := \{a \in K \mid \forall v \in V - S : v(a) \geq 0\}$$

and  $\mathcal{O}_S$  is called *the ring of  $S$ -algebraic integers in  $K$* . Rings of the form  $\mathcal{O}_S$  are called *rings of  $S$ -algebraic integers*.

Then for  $R$  a ring of  $S$ -algebraic integers, the group  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  is boundedly generated by root elements. The following theorem combines bounded generation results by several people among them Tavgen [19], Rapinchuk, Morgan and Sury [14] as well as Carter and Keller [5].

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $K$  be a number field and  $R$  a ring of  $S$ -algebraic integers in  $K$ .*

- (1) *If  $R$  is a principal ideal domain, then  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R) = (U^+(C_2, R) \cdot U^-(C_2, R))^{80}$  or  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R) = (U^-(C_2, R) \cdot U^+(C_2, R))^{80}$ .*
- (2) *If  $R$  has infinitely many units, then  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R) = (U^+(C_2, R) \cdot U^-(C_2, R))^5$  or  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R) = (U^-(C_2, R) \cdot U^+(C_2, R))^5$ .*

Using Theorem 3.2 and Proposition 3.3, we can prove Theorem 1:

*Proof.* According to Theorem 3.2, we can choose  $J$  in Proposition 2.3 as 80, if  $R$  is a principal ideal domain and as 5, if  $R$  has infinitely many units. Thus using Proposition 2.3, we obtain the claim of the theorem.  $\square$

We will provide some examples of rings of algebraic integers that are  $2R$ -pseudo-good:

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $D$  be a square-free, positive integer with  $D \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$  such that one of the two following conditions holds:*

- (1) *There is a unit  $u \in R_D$  with  $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(u)$  odd.*
- (2) *There are odd numbers  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $b^2 D = a^2 \pm 4$ .*

*Then  $R_D$  is  $2R_D$ -pseudo-good and  $K(C_2, 2R_D) \leq 46$ .*

*Proof.* Due to [13, Theorem 25], we know that  $D \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$  implies that  $2R_D$  is a prime ideal in  $R_D$ . Thus we obtain that  $R_D/2R_D$  is a field extension of  $\mathbb{F}_2$  of degree two, that is  $R_D/2R_D = \mathbb{F}_4$ . Further we know for each  $x \in R_D$  that it is a root of

$$\chi_x(T) := T^2 - \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(x) \cdot T + N_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(x).$$

The polynomial  $\chi_x(T)$  is an element of  $\mathbb{Z}[T]$ . So  $x + 2R_D$  is a root of the polynomial

$$\bar{\chi}_x(T) := T^2 - (\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(x) + 2\mathbb{Z}) \cdot T + (N_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(x) + 2\mathbb{Z})$$

in  $\mathbb{F}_2[T]$ . But if we assume that  $u \in R_D$  is a unit with  $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(u)$  odd, then this implies two things: First, the norm  $N_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(u)$  is either 1 or  $-1$  and so  $N_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]\mathbb{Q}}(x) + 2\mathbb{Z} = \bar{1}$ . Second,



the trace  $\text{tr}_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]/\mathbb{Q}}(u)$  also reduces to  $\bar{1}$  in  $\mathbb{F}_2$ . Thus,  $u + 2R_D$  is a root of the polynomial  $\bar{\chi}_x(T) = T^2 + T + \bar{1}$ . But this implies that  $u + 2R_D$  can not be  $1 + 2R_D$ . Consequently, the group homomorphism  $R_D^* \rightarrow (R_D/2R_D)^*$  can not be trivial. However,  $R_D/2R_D$  is the field  $\mathbb{F}_4$  and so  $(R_D/2R_D)^*$  has three elements, which is a prime. Thus  $R_D^* \rightarrow R_D/2R_D - \{0\}$  must be surjective and hence  $R_D$  is indeed  $2R$ -pseudo-good. This finishes the proof of the first part of the proposition. For the second part, we will show that the fraction  $x := \frac{a+b\sqrt{D}}{2}$  is an element of  $R_D$  and a unit with the property that  $\text{tr}_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]/\mathbb{Q}}(x)$  is odd, which will finish the proof by applying the first part. To this end, observe first that

$$N_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]/\mathbb{Q}}(x) = \frac{a + b\sqrt{D}}{2} \cdot \frac{a - b\sqrt{D}}{2} = \frac{a^2 - b^2D}{4} = \pm 1$$

by assumption. Second, observe that

$$\text{tr}_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{D}]/\mathbb{Q}}(x) = \frac{a + b\sqrt{D}}{2} + \frac{a - b\sqrt{D}}{2} = a$$

is odd. But now remember that  $x$  is a root of  $\chi_x(T) \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$  and thus an element of  $R_D$ . Lastly,  $R_D$  has infinitely many units according to Dirichlet's Unit Theorem [16, Corollary 11.7] and thus Theorem 1 implies  $K(C_2, 2R_D) \leq 46$ .  $\square$

Quite many squarefree, positive  $D$  with  $D \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$  satisfy the properties required in the second part of Proposition 3.3. For example, all the ones below 100 except for  $D = 37$  satisfy them, as seen by the following equations:

$$1^2 \cdot 5 = 1^2 + 4, 1^2 \cdot 13 = 3^2 + 4, 1^2 \cdot 21 = 5^2 - 4, 1^2 \cdot 29 = 5^2 + 4, 1^2 \cdot 53 = 7^2 + 4, 5^2 \cdot 61 = 39^2 + 4, \\ 3^2 \cdot 69 = 25^2 - 4, 1^2 \cdot 77 = 9^2 - 4, 1^2 \cdot 85 = 9^2 + 4, 3^2 \cdot 93 = 29^2 - 4$$

However, the ring  $R_{37}$  has fundamental unit  $6 + \sqrt{37}$  as can be seen by applying [16, Chapter 1§7, Exercise 1]. But then the image of the units  $R_{37}^*$  in  $(R_{37}/2R_{37})^*$  agrees with the cyclic subgroup (multiplicatively) generated by the image of  $6 + \sqrt{37}$  in  $(R_{37}/2R_{37})^*$ . However, one easily checks that  $6 + \sqrt{37}$  maps to  $1 + 2R_{37}$ . Thus  $R_{37}$  can not be  $2R_{37}$ -pseudo-good. Furthermore, if  $D \leq -11$  is squarefree with  $D \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$ , then  $R_D$  can not be  $2R_D$ -pseudo-good either, because rings of quadratic imaginary numbers have at most one unit if  $D \neq -3$ . But there are other examples of rings of algebraic integers that are  $2R$ -pseudo-good besides some quadratic rings of integers:

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $p$  be a prime number greater than 2 and consider the polynomial*

$$Q_p(T) := T^3 + pT^2 - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$$

*Then  $Q_p(T)$  is irreducible with three distinct, real roots. Let  $x_p$  the biggest root of  $Q_p(T)$  and let  $R$  be the ring of algebraic integers in the number field  $K := \mathbb{Q}[x_p]$ . Then  $R$  is  $2R$ -pseudo-good and  $K(C_2, 2R) \leq 46$  holds.*

*Proof.* Reducing  $Q_p(T)$  modulo 2 yields the irreducible polynomial  $T^3 + T^2 + 1 \in \mathbb{F}_2[T]$  and hence  $Q_p(T)$  itself is irreducible as well. We leave it as an exercise to the reader to show that all roots of  $Q_p(T)$  are real and different. Next, we are going to show that  $R$  is  $2R$ -pseudo-good. To this end, we will first show that  $2R$  is a prime ideal. Note that  $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = 3$  and hence there are the following possibilities for the prime factorization of  $2R$  in  $R$ :

$$(1) 2R = \mathcal{P}_1 \cdot \mathcal{P}_2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_3, (2) 2R = \mathcal{P}_1^2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_2, (3) 2R = \mathcal{P}_1^3, (4) 2R = \mathcal{P}_1 \cdot \mathcal{Q}, (5) 2R = S$$



with  $R/\mathcal{P}_i = \mathbb{F}_2$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$  and  $\mathcal{P}_3$  being distinct prime ideals,  $R/\mathcal{Q} = \mathbb{F}_4$  and  $R/S = \mathbb{F}_8$ . Observe that the following equation holds:

$$1 = x_p^3 + px_p^2 = x_p^2(x_p + p).$$

Thus not only is  $x_p$  a unit in  $R$  but also  $x_p + p$  is a unit. Hence setting  $\bar{x}_p := x_p + 2R$ , we obtain that both  $\bar{x}_p$  and  $\bar{x}_p + 1$  are units in the ring  $R/2R$ . But all the possible  $R/2R$  corresponding to the prime factorizations (1) through (4) have the quotient ring  $R/\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathbb{F}_2$ . Thus  $\mathbb{F}_2$  would have a unit  $u$  such that  $u + 1$  is also a unit, but this is clearly impossible. Hence  $2R$  must be a prime ideal itself. But then  $R/2R$  must be the field  $\mathbb{F}_8$ . But the unit group  $\mathbb{F}_8^*$  has order 7, which is a prime number. Thus to prove the  $2R$ -pseudo-goodness of  $R$ , it suffices to show that there is a unit in  $R$  which maps to a non-trivial unit of  $R/2R$ . However, observe that as  $1 = \bar{x}_p^2(\bar{x}_p + 1)$  holds in  $R/2R$ , it is impossible that  $\bar{x}_p$  is equal to 1. Thus  $R$  is a  $2R$ -pseudo-good ring. The inequality  $K(C_2, 2R) \leq 46$  follows from Theorem 1, because  $R$  has infinitely many units according to Dirichlet's Unit Theorem [16, Corollary 11.7].  $\square$

#### 4. PROVING STRONG BOUNDEDNESS FOR $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ EXPLICITLY

To prove Theorem 2, we will rephrase [21, Theorem 3.1]. To this end, we note two statements:

**Lemma 4.1.** [21, Lemma 3.4] *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1 such that  $(R : 2R) < \infty$  and such that  $G := \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  is boundedly generated by root elements. Further define*

$$Q' := \{\varepsilon_\phi(2x) \mid x \in R, \phi \in C_2\}.$$

*and  $N' := \langle\langle Q' \rangle\rangle$  and let  $\|\cdot\|_{Q'} : N' \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  be the conjugation invariant word norm on  $N'$  defined by  $Q'$ .*

- (1) *Then the group  $G/N'$  is finite.*
- (2) *Then there is a minimal  $K'(C_2, 2R) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|N'\|_{Q'} \leq K'(C_2, 2R)$ .*

*Remark 4.2.* If  $R$  is a ring of algebraic integers, then the groups  $N_{C_2, 2R}$  and  $N'$  as well as the constants  $K(C_2, 2R)$  and  $K'(C_2, 2R)$  are the same due to the congruence subgroup property [2, Theorem 3.6, Corollary 12.5].

We also need:

**Theorem 4.3.** [21, Theorem 3.2] *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1. Then there is a constant  $L(C_2, R) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for  $A \in \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ , there is an ideal  $I(A) \subset R$  with the following two properties:*

- (1)  *$V(I(A)) \subset \Pi(\{A\})$  and*
- (2)  *$2I(A) \subset \varepsilon(A, \phi, L(C_2, R))$  for all  $\phi \in C_2$ .*

We can recast [21, Theorem 3.1] slightly more explicitly as follows:

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1 and  $(R : 2R) < +\infty$  such that  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  is boundedly generated by root elements. Further, let  $L(C_2, R) \in \mathbb{N}$  be as in Theorem 4.3 and  $K'(C_2, 2R) \in \mathbb{N}$  as in Lemma 4.1. Then for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , one has*

$$\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)) \leq L(C_2, R) \cdot K'(C_2, 2R) \cdot k + \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N')$$

*Remark 4.5.* The group  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N'$  is finite as observed in Lemma 4.1 and hence  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N')$  is a well-defined natural number.



So to prove Theorem 2, we have to determine  $L(C_2, R), K'(C_2, 2R) = K(C_2, 2R)$  and  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N') = \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N_{C_2, 2R}) = \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R))$  for the rings of S-algebraic integers mentioned in Theorem 2. First, regarding  $K(C_2, 2R)$ : Note that  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]$  are principal ideal domains. This is obvious for  $\mathbb{Z}$  and follows for  $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]$ , because  $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]$  is a euclidean domain by way of using the norm map

$$N_{\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-3}]/\mathbb{Q}} : \mathbb{Z} \left[ \frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2} \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}.$$

Further,  $R_D$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]$  have infinitely many units. Lastly, all the rings  $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}], R_D$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]$  are  $2R$ -pseudo-good: This is clear for  $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]$  and follows for  $R_D$  from Proposition 3.3. For  $R := \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]$  this follows from  $X := \{0, 1, \frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}, \frac{1-\sqrt{-3}}{2}\}$  being a set of coset representatives of  $2R$  in  $R$  satisfying the definition of  $2R$ -pseudo-goodness. Thus applying Theorem 1, we obtain

$$K(C_2, 2\mathbb{Z}) \leq 646, K(C_2, 2\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]) \leq 646, K(C_2, 2\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]) \leq 46 \text{ and } K(C_2, 2R_D) \leq 46.$$

Next, we determine  $L(C_2, R)$  and  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R))$ . In regards to  $L(C_2, R)$ , we state the following:

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $R$  be a principal ideal domain. Then  $L(C_2, R)$  as in Theorem 4.3 can be chosen as 320.*

We will omit the proof as it is rather lengthy and similar to the proofs of [20, Theorem 2.3] and [10, Proposition 6.17]. The interested reader however can find the proof in the author's PhD thesis [22, Theorem 4.2.1]. We note that all the rings  $R$  from Theorem 2 are principal ideal domains. This is true by assumption for  $R_D$ , obvious for  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]$  and we saw already that  $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]$  is euclidean. Thus for all rings  $R$  as in Theorem 2 the constant  $L(C_2, R)$  can be chosen as 320.

Next, we must determine  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R))$  for these rings  $R$ :

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $K$  be either  $\mathbb{F}_2$  or  $\mathbb{F}_4$ .*

- (1) *If  $K = \mathbb{F}_2$ , then  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)) \leq 5$ .*
- (2) *If  $K = \mathbb{F}_4$ , then  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)) \leq 4$ .*

*Proof.* For the purposes of this proof, we define the following invariant for a group  $G$ :

$$\mathrm{cn}(G) := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \forall C \text{ a conjugacy class in } G \text{ with } G = \langle C \rangle : G = C^n\}$$

with  $\mathrm{cn}(G)$  being defined as  $+\infty$ , if the corresponding set is empty. Then one easily obtains  $\Delta_1(G) \leq \mathrm{cn}(G)$  for all groups  $G$ . Next, let  $S$  be a normally generating subset of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$ . We distinguish the two cases for  $K$ . First, assume  $K = \mathbb{F}_4$ . Observe that  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K) = \mathrm{PSp}_4(K)$ , because each scalar matrix in  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$  must be  $I_4$  as  $\mathrm{char}(K) = 2$ . But as  $K \neq \mathbb{F}_2$ , the group  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K) = \mathrm{PSp}_4(K)$  is simple by [18, Chapter 4, p. 33, Theorem 5]. Hence any non-trivial element  $A_S \in S$  also normally generates  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$ . But in the second case  $K = \mathbb{F}_2$ , it is well-known that the group  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$  is isomorphic to the permutation group  $S_6$ . This group however only has three normal subgroups namely  $\{1\}, S_6$  and the alternating subgroup  $A_6$ . Thus if we pick an  $A_S \in S$ , that does not lie in  $A_6$ , then necessarily  $A_S$  normally generates



$\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$ . So for each normally generating set  $S$  of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$  there is an  $A_S \in S$  that normally generates  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$  for both  $K = \mathbb{F}_2$  and  $K = \mathbb{F}_4$ . This implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)) &\geq \Delta_1(\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)) \geq \sup\{\|\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)\|_{A_S} \mid S \text{ normally generates } \mathrm{Sp}_4(K)\} \\ &\geq \sup\{\|\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)\|_S \mid S \text{ normally generates } \mathrm{Sp}_4(K)\} = \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence to give upper bounds on  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(K))$ , it suffices to give upper bounds on  $\mathrm{cn}(\mathrm{Sp}_4(K))$ . First, for  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_2) = S_6$ , the invariant  $\mathrm{cn}(S_6)$  can be determined to be 5 from the main result in [3]. Second for  $K = \mathbb{F}_4$ , we use that the paper [9] contains a list of the invariants  $\mathrm{cn}(G)$  for simple groups  $G$  with less than 1000000 elements calculated using a computer algebra system and states on page 61 that  $\mathrm{cn}(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_4)) = 4$ . This yields  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_4)) \leq 4$ .  $\square$

Note next that  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{F}_2 = \mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]/2\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}]$  and  $R_D/2R_D = \mathbb{F}_4 = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]/2\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]$  hold. Hence Proposition 4.7 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{Z})/N') &\leq 5 \geq \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{Z}[p^{-1}])/N') \\ \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R_D)/N') &\leq 4 \geq \Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}])/N') \end{aligned}$$

Combining these bounds on  $\Delta_\infty(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N')$ , the value of  $L(C_2, R) = 320$  from Theorem 4.6 and the bounds on  $K(C_2, 2R)$  determined before with Theorem 4.4, we obtain Theorem 2.

## 5. CLASSIFYING NORMAL GENERATING SUBSETS OF $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$

In this section, we show Theorem 4. To prove this, we need the following:

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with 1 and of characteristic 2 and let  $S \subset \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  be given with  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$ . Then  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1)\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1) \in \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle$  and  $\nu_2(R) := (x^2 - x \mid x \in R) \subset \{y \in R \mid \forall \phi \in C_2 : \varepsilon_\phi(x) \in \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle\}$  hold.*

*Proof.* We will first show that  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1)\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1) \in \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle$ . Second, we will show that any normal subgroup of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  containing  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1)\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1)$  also contains  $\varepsilon_\phi(y)$  for any  $\phi \in C_2$  and  $y \in \nu_2(R)$ . For the first claim note that  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$  implies

$$R = \sum_{A \in S} (x_{ij}^{(A)}, x_{ii}^{(A)} - x_{jj}^{(A)} \mid 1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4)$$

for  $A = (x_{ij}^{(A)})$ . But using Freshmen's dream, this implies that there are  $A_1, \dots, A_k \in S$  as well as  $u_{ij}^{(l)}, t_{ij}^{(l)} \in R$  with

$$1 = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4} (u_{ij}^{(l)} x_{ij}^{(A_l)} + t_{ij}^{(l)} (x_{ii}^{(A_l)} - x_{jj}^{(A_l)}))^2.$$

However using [6, Theorem 2.6, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2], we know that the element

$$\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}((u_{ij}^{(l)} x_{ij}^{(A_l)} + t_{ij}^{(l)} (x_{ii}^{(A_l)} - x_{jj}^{(A_l)}))^2) \cdot \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}((u_{ij}^{(l)} x_{ij}^{(A_l)} + t_{ij}^{(l)} (x_{ii}^{(A_l)} - x_{jj}^{(A_l)}))^2)$$

is contained in the normal subgroup generated by  $A_l$  for all  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$  and all  $1 \leq l \leq k$ . But the elements of the root subgroups  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(R)$  and  $\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(R)$  commute and this implies



that the normal subgroup generated by  $S$  contains the product

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{1 \leq l \leq k} \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4} \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}((u_{ij}^{(l)} x_{ij}^{(A_l)} + t_{ij}^{(l)}(x_{ii}^{(A_l)} - x_{jj}^{(A_l)}))^2) \cdot \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}((u_{ij}^{(l)} x_{ij}^{(A_l)} + t_{ij}^{(l)}(x_{ii}^{(A_l)} - x_{jj}^{(A_l)}))^2) \\
&= \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(\sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4} (u_{ij}^{(l)} x_{ij}^{(A_l)} + t_{ij}^{(l)}(x_{ii}^{(A_l)} - x_{jj}^{(A_l)}))^2) \cdot \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(\sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4} (u_{ij}^{(l)} x_{ij}^{(A_l)} + t_{ij}^{(l)}(x_{ii}^{(A_l)} - x_{jj}^{(A_l)}))^2) \\
&= \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1) \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the first step. For the second step, let  $M$  be the normal subgroup of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  generated by  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1) \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1)$ . Then we obtain for  $x \in R$  that

$$(1) \quad M \ni (\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1) \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1), \varepsilon_{-\beta}(x)) = \varepsilon_{\alpha}(x) \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(x).$$

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
M & \ni w_{\beta} w_{\alpha} w_{\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha}(x) \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(x) w_{\beta}^{-1} w_{\alpha}^{-1} w_{\beta}^{-1} \\
&= w_{\beta} w_{\alpha} \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(x) \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(x) w_{\alpha}^{-1} w_{\beta}^{-1} \\
&= w_{\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(x) \varepsilon_{\beta}(x) w_{\beta}^{-1} = \varepsilon_{\alpha}(x) \varepsilon_{-\beta}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand (1) implies for  $x, y \in R$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
M & \ni (\varepsilon_{\alpha}(y) \varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(y), \varepsilon_{-(\alpha+\beta)}(x)) = \varepsilon_{\alpha}(y) (\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(y), \varepsilon_{-(\alpha+\beta)}(x)) \varepsilon_{-\beta}(2xy) \\
&= \varepsilon_{\alpha}(xy) \varepsilon_{-\beta}(x^2 y).
\end{aligned}$$

But this implies that

$$\varepsilon_{-\beta}(x^2 y - xy) = \varepsilon_{-\beta}(x^2 y) \varepsilon_{-\beta}(xy) = (\varepsilon_{-\beta}(x^2 y) \varepsilon_{\alpha}(xy)) \cdot (\varepsilon_{\alpha}(xy) \varepsilon_{-\beta}(xy)) \in M.$$

This implies in particular that the ideal  $\nu_2(R) := (x^2 - x | x \in R)$  is contained in  $\{z \in R | \forall \phi \in C_2 \text{ long: } \varepsilon_{\phi}(z) \in M\}$ . However, [21, Lemma 4.8] implies that if  $\varepsilon_{\phi}(z) \in M$  for all  $\phi \in C_2$  long, then  $\varepsilon_{\phi}(z) \in M$  for all  $\phi \in C_2$ . This finishes this proof.  $\square$

We can prove Theorem 4 now:

*Proof.* According to [21, Corollary 3.11], the set  $S$  normally generates  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  precisely if  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$  and the image of  $S$  normally generates the quotient  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N'$  for

$$N' = \langle \langle \varepsilon_{\phi}(2x) | x \in R, \phi \in C_2 \rangle \rangle.$$

As before, the congruence subgroup property [2, Theorem 3.6, Corollary 12.5] can be used to identify the normal subgroup  $N'$  as the kernel of the reduction homomorphism  $\pi_{2R} : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  and hence  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/N' = \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$ . So  $S$  normally generates  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  precisely if  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$  and  $S$  maps to a normal generating set of the finite group  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$ . So to finish the proof of this corollary, it suffices to show that  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$  and  $S$  mapping to a generating set of the abelianization of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ , implies that  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  is normally generated by the image  $\bar{S}$  of  $S$ . But  $R/2R$  is a finite ring and so is semi-local. Thus [1, Corollary 2.4] implies that  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  is generated by root elements. Hence it suffices to show that the normal subgroup  $\bar{W}$  of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  normally generated by  $\bar{S}$  contains all root elements. However, [21, Lemma 4.8] implies that if  $\{\varepsilon_{\alpha}(\bar{x}) | \bar{x} \in R/2R\}$  is a subset of  $\bar{W}$ , then  $\bar{W}$  contains all root elements. Hence it suffices to show that

$$\bar{R}_0 := \{\bar{x} \in R/2R | \varepsilon_{\alpha}(\bar{x}) \in \bar{W}\} = R/2R.$$



To this end, observe that  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$  implies  $\Pi(\bar{S}) = \emptyset$ . But then Lemma 5.1 implies that  $\nu_2(R/2R) := (\bar{x}^2 - \bar{x}|\bar{x} \in R/2R)$  is a subset of  $\bar{R}_0$  and  $\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1)\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1)$  is an element of  $\bar{W}$ . Next, let the ideal  $2R$  in  $R$  split into primes as follows:

$$2R = \left( \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{P}_i^{l_i} \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{j=1}^s \mathcal{Q}_j^{k_j} \right)$$

with  $[R/\mathcal{P}_i : \mathbb{F}_2] = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $[R/\mathcal{Q}_j : \mathbb{F}_2] > 1$  for  $1 \leq j \leq s$ . Using the Chinese Remainder Theorem, this implies that

$$R/2R = \left( \prod_{i=1}^r R/\mathcal{P}_i^{l_i} \right) \times \left( \prod_{j=1}^s R/\mathcal{Q}_j^{k_j} \right).$$

As the next step, we show that  $\{(0 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, \dots, 0 + \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, x + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1}, \dots, x + \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s}) | x \in R\} \subset \bar{R}_0$ . To this end for each  $j = 1, \dots, s$ , pick an element  $x_j \in R$  such that neither  $x_j$  nor  $x_j - 1$  are elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ . Such elements do exist, because otherwise  $[R/\mathcal{Q}_j : \mathbb{F}_2] = 1$  would hold. This implies that

$$(0 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, \dots, 0 + \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, x_1(x_1 - 1) + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1}, \dots, x_s(x_s - 1) + \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$$

is not only an element of  $\nu_2(R/2R) \subset \bar{R}_0$ , but also that  $(x_1(x_1 - 1) + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1}, \dots, x_s(x_s - 1) + \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$  is a unit in the quotient ring  $\prod_{j=1}^s R/\mathcal{Q}_j^{k_j}$ . But then [21, Proposition 6.4] implies

$$\{(0 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, \dots, 0 + \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, x + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s}) | x \in R\} \subset \bar{R}_0.$$

Next, we show that  $S$  mapping to a generating set of the abelianization of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ , implies further that

$$\{(x + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, 0 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s}) | x \in R\} \subset \bar{R}_0.$$

First, observe that according to the proof of [21, Theorem 6.3], the abelianization homomorphism of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  is uniquely defined by  $A : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^r, \varepsilon_\phi(x) \mapsto (x + \mathcal{P}_1, \dots, x + \mathcal{P}_r)$  for all  $\phi \in C_2$ . According to the same proof the abelianization of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  factors through  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$ . Also the element  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1)\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1)$  of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  clearly vanishes under the abelianization map. Thus the abelianization map of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  factors through  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)/\bar{M}$  for  $\bar{M}$  the normal subgroup of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/2R)$  generated by  $\varepsilon_{2\alpha+\beta}(1)\varepsilon_{\alpha+\beta}(1)$ .

Second, we leave it as an exercise to the reader to show that  $\bar{M}$  also contains the set

$$\{\varepsilon_{\phi_1}(\bar{x})\varepsilon_{\phi_2}(\bar{x}) | \bar{x} \in R/2R, \phi_1, \phi_2 \in C_2\}.$$

But  $\bar{M}$  is contained in  $\bar{W}$  and so if  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n \in C_2$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in R$  are given with

$$\bar{X} = \prod_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{\phi_i}(x_i + 2R),$$

an element of  $\bar{W}$ , then  $\varepsilon_\alpha(x_1 + \dots + x_n + 2R)$  is also an element of  $\bar{W}$  and both  $\bar{X}$  and  $\varepsilon_\alpha(x_1 + \dots + x_n + 2R)$  map to  $(x_1 + \dots + x_n + \mathcal{P}_1, \dots, x_1 + \dots + x_n + \mathcal{P}_r)$  under the abelianization map.

Third,  $S$  maps to a generating set of the abelianization of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  and hence by the previous observation, there must be a  $y_1 \in R$  such that  $(y_1 + \mathcal{P}_1, \dots, y_1 + \mathcal{P}_r) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$  and

$$(y_1 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, \dots, y_1 + \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, y_1 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1}, \dots, y_1 + \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s}) \in \bar{R}_0.$$



But we already know that  $(0 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, \dots, 0 + \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, y_1 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1}, \dots, y_1 + \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s}) \in \bar{R}_0$  and so we obtain that  $(y_1 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, y_1 + \mathcal{P}_2^{l_2} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, 0 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$  is an element of  $\bar{R}_0$ . Next, observe that if  $z + 2R$  is an element of  $\bar{R}_0$ , then so is  $u \cdot (z + 2R)$  for any unit in  $R/2R$ . This can be seen by conjugating  $\varepsilon_\alpha(z + 2R)$  with  $h_\beta(u^{-1})$ . But  $y_1$  is an element of  $\mathcal{P}_2 \cdots \mathcal{P}_r$  and hence

$$(1 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, y_1 - 1 + \mathcal{P}_2^{l_2} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, 1 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$$

is a unit in  $R/2R$  and we already know by Lemma 5.1 that

$$(0 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, (1 - y_1)y_1 + \mathcal{P}_2^{l_2} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, 0 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$$

is an element of  $\bar{R}_0$ . So, we can conclude that

$$(0 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, y_1 + \mathcal{P}_2^{l_2} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, 0 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$$

is an element of  $\bar{R}_0$ . Thus finally  $(y_1 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, 0 + \mathcal{P}_2^{l_2} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r} \cdot \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$  is an element of  $\bar{R}_0$ . But  $y_1 + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}$  is a unit in  $R/\mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}$  by choice and hence for any unit  $u \in R/\mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}$  the element  $(u + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, 0 + \mathcal{P}_2^{l_2} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r} \cdot \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$  is an element of  $\bar{R}_0$ . But each element of  $R/\mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}$  is a sum of at most two units according to [21, Proposition 6.4] and hence  $(x + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1}, 0 + \mathcal{P}_2^{l_2} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r} \cdot \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s})$  is an element of  $\bar{R}_0$  for all  $x \in R$ . But running through similar arguments for the other prime ideals  $\mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_r$ , then finally yields that

$$\{(x + \mathcal{P}_1^{l_1} \cdots \mathcal{P}_r^{l_r}, 0 + \mathcal{Q}_1^{k_1} \cdots \mathcal{Q}_s^{k_s}) | x \in R\} \subset \bar{R}_0.$$

So summarizing, we finally obtain that indeed  $\bar{R}_0 = R/2R$  and this finishes the proof.  $\square$

## 6. LOWER BOUNDS FOR $\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R))$ ALWAYS DEPEND ON THE NUMBER $r(R)$

In this section, we prove Theorem 3. The proof is quite similar to the proof of [20, Theorem 2,3], so we will be rather brief about it. First, we need the following:

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $K$  be a field,  $t \in K - \{0\}$ . Then the element  $E := \varepsilon_\beta(t)$  normally generates  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$  and  $\|\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)\|_E \geq 4$ . Further,  $\|\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)\|_E \geq 5$  holds, if  $K = \mathbb{F}_2$ .*

*Proof.* The first claim is the content of [20, Proposition 5.1]. The second claim can be seen by noting that there is an isomorphism between  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_2)$  and  $S_6$  that maps  $\varepsilon_\beta(1)$  to the transposition  $(4, 6)$ . Hence it suffices to show that  $S_6$  is normally generated by  $(4, 6)$  and  $\|S_6\|_{(4,6)} \geq 5$ . The first claim is well-known and to see the the second one observe that for  $\sigma \in S_6$  the number of orbits of the induced group action of the cyclic subgroup  $\langle \sigma \rangle$  on  $\{1, \dots, 6\}$  only depends on the conjugacy class of  $\sigma$  in  $S_6$  and not on the permutation  $\sigma$  itself. However, for  $k \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ , a product of  $k$  transpositions in  $S_6$  has at least  $6 - k$  such orbits in  $\{1, \dots, 6\}$ . Thus the cycle  $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$ , which gives rise to just one such orbit, cannot be written as a product of at most 4 transpositions and hence  $\|S_6\|_{(4,6)} \geq 5$ .  $\square$

This proposition can be used now to prove Theorem 3:

*Proof.* We can assume without loss that  $R \neq 2R$ . Let  $2R$  split into distinct prime ideals as follows:

$$2R = \left( \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{P}_i^{l_i} \right) \cdot \left( \prod_{j=1}^s \mathcal{Q}_j^{k_j} \right)$$

with  $[R/\mathcal{P}_i : \mathbb{F}_2] = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $[R/\mathcal{Q}_j : \mathbb{F}_2] > 1$  for  $1 \leq j \leq s$ . Next, let  $c$  be the class number of  $R$ . Pick elements  $x_1, \dots, x_r \in R$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_i^c = (x_i)$  for all  $i$ . Also choose  $r + 1$



distinct prime ideals  $V_{r+1}, \dots, V_k$  in  $R$  different from all the  $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_r, \mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_s$ . Passing to the powers  $V_{r+1}^c, \dots, V_k^c$ , we can find elements  $v_{r+1}, \dots, v_k \in R$  with  $V_{r+1}^c = (v_{r+1}), \dots, V_k^c = (v_k)$ . Further, define the following elements for  $1 \leq u \leq r$ ,

$$r_u := \left( \prod_{1 \leq i \neq u \leq r} x_i \right) \cdot v_{r+1} \cdots v_k.$$

For  $k \geq u \geq r+1$  set

$$r_u := x_1 \cdots x_r \cdot \left( \prod_{r+1 \leq u \neq q \leq k} v_q \right).$$

We consider the set  $S := \{\varepsilon_\beta(r_1), \dots, \varepsilon_\beta(r_k)\}$  in  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ . Then clearly  $\Pi(S) = \emptyset$  holds. Further, according to the proof of [21, Theorem 6.3], the abelianization map  $A : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)/[\mathrm{Sp}_4(R), \mathrm{Sp}_4(R)] = \mathbb{F}_2^{r(R)}$  is uniquely defined through  $A(\varepsilon_\phi(x)) = (x + \mathcal{P}_1, \dots, x + \mathcal{P}_{r(R)})$  for all  $x \in R$  and  $\Phi \in C_2$ . But then  $S$  clearly maps to a generating set of  $\mathbb{F}_2^{r(R)}$ . Thus Theorem 4 implies that  $S$  is indeed a normally generating set of  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$ . Next, consider the map

$$\pi : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/\mathcal{P}_i) \times \prod_{j=r+1}^k \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/V_j), X \mapsto (\pi_{\mathcal{P}_1}(X), \dots, \pi_{\mathcal{P}_r}(X), \pi_{V_{r+1}}(X), \dots, \pi_{V_k}(X))$$

for the  $\pi_{\mathcal{P}_i} : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/\mathcal{P}_i)$  and  $\pi_{V_j} : \mathrm{Sp}_4(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/V_j)$  being the reduction homomorphisms. Then note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)\|_S &\geq \left\| \left( \prod_{i=1}^r \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/\mathcal{P}_i) \right) \times \left( \prod_{j=r+1}^k \mathrm{Sp}_4(R/V_j) \right) \right\|_{\pi(S)} \\ &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \|\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/\mathcal{P}_i)\|_{\varepsilon_\beta(r_i + \mathcal{P}_i)} \right) + \left( \sum_{j=r+1}^k \|\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/V_j)\|_{\varepsilon_\beta(r_j + V_j)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So to finish the proof, it suffices to apply Proposition 6.1 to obtain

$$\|\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/\mathcal{P}_i)\|_{\varepsilon_\beta(x_i + \mathcal{P}_i)} \geq 5 \text{ and } \|\mathrm{Sp}_4(R/V_j)\|_{\varepsilon_\beta(r_j + V_j)} \geq 4$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $j = r+1, \dots, k$ . □

## CLOSING REMARKS

We should also mention that contrary to how similar the question of strong boundedness of  $G_2(R)$  appeared to  $\mathrm{Sp}_4(R)$  in [21], it is actually easier to determine  $\Delta_k(G_2(R))$  than  $\Delta_k(\mathrm{Sp}_4(R))$ . This is mainly due to the fact that the 'intermediate' normal subgroup we construct in the proof of [21, Theorem 5.13] is not the  $2R$ -congruence subgroup  $N_{G_2, 2R}$  but instead the bigger group

$$N_{G_2} = \langle \{ \varepsilon_\phi(2x) | x \in R, \phi \in G_2 \text{ short} \} \cup \{ \varepsilon_\phi(x) | x \in R, \phi \in G_2 \text{ long} \} \rangle.$$

We might address this in a future paper.



## REFERENCES

- [1] Eiichi Abe and Kazuo Suzuki. On normal subgroups of Chevalley groups over commutative rings. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 28(2):185–198, 1976.
- [2] H. Bass, J. Milnor, and J.-P. Serre. Solution of the congruence subgroup problem for  $SL_n$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) and  $Sp_{2n}$  ( $n \geq 2$ ). *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (33):59–137, 1967.
- [3] J. L. Brenner. Covering theorems for FINASIGs. VIII. Almost all conjugacy classes in  $A_n$  have exponent  $\leq 4$ . *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 25(2):210–214, 1978.
- [4] Dmitri Burago, Sergei Ivanov, and Leonid Polterovich. Conjugation-invariant norms on groups of geometric origin. In *Groups of diffeomorphisms*, volume 52 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 221–250. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2008.
- [5] David Carter and Gordon Keller. Bounded elementary generation of  $SL_n(\mathcal{O})$ . *Amer. J. Math.*, 105(3):673–687, 1983.
- [6] Douglas L. Costa and Gordon E. Keller. Radix redux: normal subgroups of symplectic groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 427:51–105, 1992.
- [7] Światosław R. Gal and Jarek Kędra. On bi-invariant word metrics. *J. Topol. Anal.*, 3(2):161–175, 2011.
- [8] James E. Humphreys. *Linear algebraic groups, corrected fifth printing*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 21.
- [9] S. Karni. Covering numbers of groups of small order and sporadic groups. In *Products of conjugacy classes in groups*, volume 1112 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 52–196. Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [10] Jarek Kędra, Assaf Libman, and Ben Martin. On boundedness properties of groups. *In preparation.*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.01815>.
- [11] R. Lawther and Martin W. Liebeck. On the diameter of a Cayley graph of a simple group of Lie type based on a conjugacy class. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 83(1):118–137, 1998.
- [12] Martin W. Liebeck and Aner Shalev. Diameters of finite simple groups: sharp bounds and applications. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 154(2):383–406, 2001.
- [13] Daniel A. Marcus. *Number fields*. Universitext. Springer, Cham, 2018. Second edition of [MR0457396], With a foreword by Barry Mazur.
- [14] Aleksander V. Morgan, Andrei S. Rapinchuk, and Balasubramanian Sury. Bounded generation of  $SL_2$  over rings of  $S$ -integers with infinitely many units. *Algebra Number Theory*, 12(8):1949–1974, 2018.
- [15] Dave Witte Morris. Bounded generation of  $SL(n, A)$  (after D. Carter, G. Keller, and E. Paige). *New York J. Math.*, 13:383–421, 2007.
- [16] Jürgen Neukirch. *Algebraic number theory*, volume 322 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. Translated from the 1992 German original and with a note by Norbert Schappacher, With a foreword by G. Harder.
- [17] B. Nica. On bounded elementary generation for  $sl\ n$  over polynomial rings. *Isr. J. Math.*, pages 403–410, 2018.
- [18] Robert Steinberg. *Lectures on Chevalley groups*, volume 66 of *University Lecture Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016.
- [19] O. I. Tavgen. Bounded generability of Chevalley groups over rings of  $S$ -integer algebraic numbers. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 54(1):97–122, 221–222, 1990.
- [20] Alexander Trost. Explicit strong boundedness for higher rank symplectic groups. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2012.12328.pdf>, 2020.
- [21] Alexander Trost. Strong boundedness of simply connected Split Chevalley groups defined over rings. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2004.05039.pdf>, 2020, submitted.
- [22] Alexander Trost. Quantitative aspects of normal generation of split Chevalley groups. *PhD thesis*, University of Aberdeen 2020, supervised by B. Martin.
- [23] Peter Vámos. 2-good rings. *Q. J. Math.*, 56(3):417–430, 2005.

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

Email address: `r01aat17@abdn.ac.uk`