

REPRESENTATIVES OF SIMILARITY CLASSES OF MATRICES OVER PIDS CORRESPONDING TO IDEAL CLASSES

LUCY KNIGHT AND ALEXANDER STASINSKI

ABSTRACT. For a principal ideal domain A , the Latimer–MacDuffee correspondence sets up a bijection between the similarity classes of matrices in $M_n(A)$ with irreducible characteristic polynomial $f(x)$ and the ideal classes of the order $A[x]/(f(x))$. We prove that when $A[x]/(f(x))$ is maximal (i.e., integrally closed, i.e., a Dedekind domain), then every similarity class contains a representative that is, in a sense, close to being a companion matrix. The first step in the proof is to show that any similarity class corresponding to an ideal (not necessarily prime) of degree one contains a representative of the desired form. The second step is a previously unpublished result due to Lenstra that implies that when $A[x]/(f(x))$ is maximal, every ideal class contains an ideal of degree one.

1. INTRODUCTION

Latimer and MacDuffee [4] showed that there is a bijection between the similarity classes of matrices with integer entries (i.e., the orbits under the action of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ on $M_n(\mathbb{Z})$ by conjugation) with irreducible characteristic polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ and the ideal classes of the order $\mathbb{Z}[x]/(f(x))$. Another proof of this was given by Taussky [15]. Later generalisations show that the correspondence also holds when \mathbb{Z} is replaced by an arbitrary principal ideal domain (PID); see Section 3.

In [10], Ochoa claimed that every similarity class with characteristic polynomial $f(x)$ contains a representative of the form

$$C_f(a, z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ u_{n-1} & u_{n-2} & \dots & u_1 & -f(z)a^{-1} \\ a & 0 & \dots & 0 & z \end{pmatrix},$$

where $u_i, a, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a divides $f(z)$. Note that in this situation, $C_f(a, z)$ is $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Q})$ -similar to the companion matrix of $f(x)$ and that if $f(z)a^{-1} = \pm 1$, then $C_f(a, z)$ is $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -similar to the companion matrix of $f(x)$. In general, it is often of great value to have a normal form for matrices under similarity. Ochoa’s motivation was to give an explicit version of the Latimer–MacDuffee correspondence and transfer the structure of the ideal class monoid of $\mathbb{Z}[x]/(f(x))$ to sets of matrices of the form $C_f(a, z)$, up to similarity. Unfortunately, [10] contains several mistakes (e.g., Theorem I-4 is not true) and while Ochoa’s follow-up paper [11] was an attempt to rectify some of these mistakes, the central Lemma I-1 in [11] is itself not true, as shown by a counter-example given by Rehm (see [12]).

It seems that the approach in [10] and [11] is not salvageable. On the other hand, Rehm [13] did establish Ochoa’s claim that every similarity class as above contains a

representative of the form $C_f(a, z)$ under the (necessary) condition that $\mathbb{Z}[x]/(f(x))$ is the maximal order (i.e., the ring of integers) of the number field $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(f(x))$. (Note that Rehm used conventions that led to the transpose of $C_f(a, z)$.)

The purpose of this paper is to generalise Rehm’s result to the case where \mathbb{Z} is replaced by an arbitrary PID. The most serious obstacle to such a generalisation is Rehm’s use of the fact that every ideal class in the ring of integers of a number field contains a prime ideal of degree one. The classical proofs of this fact are rather non-trivial, based either on the Chebotarev density theorem or on analytic properties of the Dedekind zeta function, and it is not clear whether an analogous proof exists in the more algebraic setting of an arbitrary PID. Nevertheless, Rehm showed more generally (i.e., when $\mathbb{Z}[x]/(f(x))$ is not necessarily maximal) that any similarity class corresponding to an ideal class containing an ideal of the form $\mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_r$, where $r \in \mathbb{N}$, each \mathfrak{q}_i is a prime ideal of degree one and the \mathfrak{q}_i lie over pairwise distinct primes, contains a matrix $C_f(a, z)$ (see [13, Theorem 2]; note again that Rehm used the transposed matrix). Rehm’s proof goes through without difficulty for the order $A[x]/(f(x))$, where A is an arbitrary PID and $f(x) \in A[x]$ is irreducible. It is however not clear (and perhaps not even true) that if $A[x]/(f(x))$ is assumed to be the maximal order, hence a Dedekind domain, then each of its ideal classes contains an ideal of the form $\mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_r$, as above.

Generalising [13, Theorem 2], we show that any similarity class in $M_n(A)$ corresponding to an ideal class of $A[x]/(f(x))$ containing an ideal of the form

$$\mathfrak{q}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_r^{e_r},$$

where $r, e_i \in \mathbb{N}$, each \mathfrak{q}_i is a prime ideal of degree one and of ramification index one, and the \mathfrak{q}_i lie over pairwise distinct primes, contains a matrix $C_f(a, z)$. The main point here is that we allow higher powers of our prime ideals. We prove this by working with “ideals (not necessarily prime) of degree one”. If A is a Dedekind domain with field of fractions K , L/K is a finite separable extension and B is the integral closure of A in L , then it is standard to say that a prime ideal \mathfrak{q} of B is of degree one if $[B/\mathfrak{q} : A/(A \cap \mathfrak{q})] = 1$. As a generalisation of this we say that a proper ideal \mathfrak{b} of B is of *degree one* if $A + \mathfrak{b} = B$, that is, if the inclusion of $A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b})$ in B/\mathfrak{b} is an isomorphism. It turns out that ideals of the form $\mathfrak{q}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_r^{e_r}$, as above, are of degree one. In fact, we prove that any similarity class corresponding to an ideal class containing an ideal of degree one contains a matrix $C_f(a, z)$.

To prove that every similarity class contains a matrix $C_f(a, z)$ when $A[x]/(f(x))$ is the maximal order, it remains to show that in this case, every ideal class contains an ideal of the form $\mathfrak{q}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_r^{e_r}$, as above. This is achieved by a result of Lenstra (Theorem 2.8 and its equivalent formulation Theorem 2.5), which is a strengthening of a previous result of Lenstra–Stevenhagen [5, Theorem 1] with the extra condition that the prime ideals lie over pairwise distinct primes. The proof of Theorem 2.8 was previously unpublished and kindly communicated to us by Lenstra.

2. IDEALS OF DEGREE ONE

Let A be a Dedekind domain with field of fractions K , let L/K be a finite separable field extension of degree n and let B be the integral closure of A in L . Then B is a Dedekind domain (see [6, I.6.2]). An *A-order in L* is a subring \mathcal{O} of L that is a finitely generated A -module such that $K\mathcal{O} = L$. In particular, B is an A -order in L ([6, I.4.7]). Moreover, every element of an A -order \mathcal{O} is integral over

A (see [14, (8.6)]), so $\mathcal{O} \subseteq B$. Let $\theta \in B$ be such that $L = K(\theta)$; then $A[\theta]$ is an A -order in L .

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{O} be an A -order in L . A proper ideal \mathfrak{b} of \mathcal{O} is said to be of *degree one (over A)* if $A + \mathfrak{b} = \mathcal{O}$.

By the second isomorphism theorem, $(A + \mathfrak{b})/\mathfrak{b} \cong A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b})$, so \mathfrak{b} is of degree one if and only if the map $A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{b}$ induced by the embedding $A \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is an isomorphism. Thus the notion of an ideal of degree one generalises the standard notion of a prime ideal of degree one.

Lemma 2.2. *Let \mathfrak{b} be an ideal of $A[\theta]$ and $\mathfrak{a} = A \cap \mathfrak{b}$. Suppose that there exists a $z \in A$ such that $\theta - z \in \mathfrak{b}$. Then the embedding $A \rightarrow A[\theta]$ induces an isomorphism $A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow A[\theta]/(\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$.*

Proof. We have $\mathfrak{b} \supseteq (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$, so

$$\mathfrak{a} = A \cap \mathfrak{b} \supseteq A \cap (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a}) \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$$

and thus $\mathfrak{a} = A \cap (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$. This implies that the map $A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow A[\theta]/(\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$ is injective. The map is also surjective, as for any $g(x) \in A[x]$, we have $g(\theta) - g(z) \in (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$, so $g(z) + \mathfrak{a} \in A/\mathfrak{a}$ maps to $g(\theta) + (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a}) \in A[\theta]/(\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$. We thus have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A[\theta]/(\theta - z, \mathfrak{a}) & \longrightarrow & A[\theta]/\mathfrak{b} \\ & \swarrow \cong & \nearrow \cong \\ & A/\mathfrak{a} & \end{array}$$

implying that the top surjective map must be an isomorphism, that is,

$$\mathfrak{b} = (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a}). \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let \mathfrak{b} be an ideal of $A[\theta]$ and $\mathfrak{a} = A \cap \mathfrak{b}$. Then \mathfrak{b} is of degree one if and only if there exists a $z \in A$ such that $\mathfrak{b} = (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$ and $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{a}}$, where $f(x)$ is the minimal polynomial of θ over A .*

Proof. Assume that \mathfrak{b} is of degree one and choose $z \in A$ such that $\theta \in z + \mathfrak{b}$. Then $\theta \equiv z \pmod{\mathfrak{b}}$, so $f(z) \equiv f(\theta) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{b}}$ and hence $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{a}}$, as $f(z) \in A$. Since $\theta - z \in \mathfrak{b}$, Lemma 2.2 implies that $\mathfrak{b} = (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$.

Conversely, assume that there is a $z \in A$ such that $\mathfrak{b} = (\theta - z, \mathfrak{a})$ and $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{a}}$. By Lemma 2.2 $A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow A[\theta]/(\theta - z, \mathfrak{a}) = A[\theta]/\mathfrak{b}$ is an isomorphism. Thus \mathfrak{b} is of degree one, if it is a proper ideal. This is indeed the case, since if $1 \in \mathfrak{b}$ we have $1 - m(\theta - z) \in \mathfrak{a}A[\theta]$, for some $m \in A[\theta]$, and this implies that $\theta - z$ is invertible in $A[\theta]/\mathfrak{a}A[\theta]$. Then the norm $N_{L/K}(\theta - z)$ must be invertible in A/\mathfrak{a} . But this is impossible, as $N_{L/K}(\theta - z) = (-1)^n f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{a}}$. \square

Recall that a prime ideal \mathfrak{q} of B has ramification index one (over A) if it appears with exponent 1 in the prime ideal decomposition of $(A \cap \mathfrak{q})B$ and it is called *unramified* if, in addition, the field extension $(B/\mathfrak{q})/(A/(A \cap \mathfrak{q}))$ is separable (see [8, Chapter I, (8.3)]).

Proposition 2.4. *If \mathfrak{b} is an ideal of B of degree one, then each of its prime ideal factors is of degree one. Moreover, if $\mathfrak{q}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{q}_r$ are prime ideals of B lying over distinct primes in A (i.e., $A \cap \mathfrak{q}_i \neq A \cap \mathfrak{q}_j$ for $i \neq j$), and each \mathfrak{q}_i is of degree one and has ramification index one, then $\mathfrak{q}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_r^{e_r}$ is of degree one for any $e_i \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Assume that \mathfrak{b} is of degree one, let \mathfrak{q} be a prime ideal factor and write $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{b}'$, for some ideal \mathfrak{b}' . Since \mathfrak{b} is of degree one, we have $A + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{b}' = B$ and thus (as $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{b}' \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$)

$$A + \mathfrak{q} = B,$$

that is, \mathfrak{q} is of degree one. This proves the first assertion.

For the second assertion it is enough to prove the following two statements:

- (1) If \mathfrak{q} is a prime ideal of B of degree one and ramification index one, then \mathfrak{q}^e is of degree one, for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (2) If \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{c} are two ideals of B of degree one such that $A \cap \mathfrak{b}$ is coprime to $A \cap \mathfrak{c}$, then $\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}$ is of degree one.

To prove 1, let $\mathfrak{p} = A \cap \mathfrak{q}$. Then $\mathfrak{p}^e \subseteq A \cap \mathfrak{q}^e$, so $A \cap \mathfrak{q}^e = \mathfrak{p}^m$, for some $m \leq e$. Further, we have

$$(\mathfrak{p}B)^m = \mathfrak{p}^m B \subseteq \mathfrak{q}^e,$$

and since \mathfrak{q} has ramification index one, it appears with multiplicity m in $(\mathfrak{p}B)^m$, hence $e \leq m$, forcing $m = e$, so that

$$A \cap \mathfrak{q}^e = \mathfrak{p}^e.$$

In order to prove that \mathfrak{q}^e is of degree one we thus need to show that $A/\mathfrak{p}^e \rightarrow B/\mathfrak{q}^e$ is surjective (i.e., an isomorphism). We do this by induction on e , the case $e = 1$ holding because of the hypothesis that \mathfrak{q} is of degree one. Assume that the map is surjective for some $i \geq 1$ and consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{q}^i/\mathfrak{q}^{i+1} & \longrightarrow & B/\mathfrak{q}^{i+1} & \longrightarrow & B/\mathfrak{q}^i & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \cong \uparrow & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{p}^i/\mathfrak{p}^{i+1} & \longrightarrow & A/\mathfrak{p}^{i+1} & \longrightarrow & A/\mathfrak{p}^i & \longrightarrow & 1 \end{array}$$

If the leftmost vertical inclusion is surjective then the middle one is as well and we will be done. But $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}^i/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}^{i+1}$ is a vector space over $A/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of dimension 1 (since A is of dimension 1) and similarly $\mathfrak{q}^i/\mathfrak{q}^{i+1}$ is a vector over B/\mathfrak{q} of dimension 1. But $A/\bar{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow B/\mathfrak{q}$ is an isomorphism, as \mathfrak{q} is of degree one, and this isomorphism is compatible with the leftmost vertical inclusion, which is therefore a linear map of $A/\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ -vector spaces of dimension 1 and is hence surjective. Thus \mathfrak{q}^e has degree one for all $e \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now prove 2. Since $A \cap \mathfrak{b}$ is assumed to be coprime to $A \cap \mathfrak{c}$ we have that \mathfrak{b} is coprime to \mathfrak{c} . By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we thus have

$$A[\theta]/\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c} \cong A[\theta]/\mathfrak{b} \times A[\theta]/\mathfrak{c},$$

given by $x + \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c} \mapsto (x + \mathfrak{b}, x + \mathfrak{c})$, for $x \in A[\theta]$. Moreover, we claim that

$$A \cap \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c} = (A \cap \mathfrak{b})(A \cap \mathfrak{c}).$$

Indeed, we trivially have $A \cap \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c} \supseteq (A \cap \mathfrak{b})(A \cap \mathfrak{c})$ and since $A \cap \mathfrak{b}$ and $A \cap \mathfrak{c}$ are coprime, the Second Isomorphism Theorem and the Chinese Remainder Theorem imply that

$$\begin{aligned} A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}) &\cong (A + \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c})/\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c} \cong (A + \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c})/\mathfrak{b} \times (A + \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c})/\mathfrak{c} \\ &\cong A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b}) \times A/(A \cap \mathfrak{c}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $x \in A \cap \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}$, then $x \in A \cap \mathfrak{b}$ and $x \in A \cap \mathfrak{c}$, so, as $A \cap \mathfrak{b}$ and $A \cap \mathfrak{c}$ are coprime, $x \in (A \cap \mathfrak{b}) \cap (A \cap \mathfrak{c}) = (A \cap \mathfrak{b})(A \cap \mathfrak{c})$, which proves the claim.

By another application of the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we conclude that

$$A/(A \cap \mathfrak{bc}) = A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b})(A \cap \mathfrak{c}) \cong A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b}) \times A/(A \cap \mathfrak{c}),$$

given by $x + (A \cap \mathfrak{b})(A \cap \mathfrak{c}) \mapsto (x + (A \cap \mathfrak{b}), x + (A \cap \mathfrak{c}))$, for $x \in A$. We thus have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A[\theta]/\mathfrak{bc} & \xrightarrow{\cong} & A[\theta]/\mathfrak{b} \times A[\theta]/\mathfrak{c} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ A/(A \cap \mathfrak{bc}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & A/(A \cap \mathfrak{b}) \times A/(A \cap \mathfrak{c}) \end{array},$$

where the rightmost inclusion is given by the inclusions in each component. This diagram immediately implies that \mathfrak{bc} is of degree one, since \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{c} are. \square

Remark. It is not true that every prime ideal factor of an ideal of B of degree one has ramification index one. For example, any ramified prime ideal of a quadratic number field has degree one (over \mathbb{Z}).

2.1. Every ideal class contains an ideal of degree one. This section contains a proof of the following result of Lenstra that will play a key role in later parts of the paper:

Theorem 2.5. *Let S be a finite set of prime ideals of B . Then every ideal class of B contains an ideal of the form*

$$\mathfrak{q}_1^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_r^{e_r},$$

where $r, e_i \in \mathbb{N}$, each \mathfrak{q}_i is a prime ideal of B of degree one such that $\mathfrak{q}_i \notin S$ and the \mathfrak{q}_i lie over pairwise distinct prime ideals of A , that is, $A \cap \mathfrak{q}_i \neq A \cap \mathfrak{q}_j$ unless $i = j$.

As is easily seen, this theorem is an equivalent form of Theorem 2.8, but in the proof it is more convenient to use the latter formulation. The result builds on and strengthens a previous result of Lenstra and Stevenhagen [5, Theorem 1]. The following two lemmas on which Theorem 2.8 depends are also due to Lenstra.

In the case A is a field, then B is as well so the class group of B is trivial and Theorem 2.8 likewise. Then to prove the theorem, it will be sufficient to assume for the rest of this subsection that A is not a field, in which case it is infinite.

Note that we do not require A/\mathfrak{p} to be finite in any of the statements below.

Lemma 2.6. *For each positive integer m , the number of primes \mathfrak{p} of A for which $\#(A/\mathfrak{p})$ is at most m is finite.*

Proof. Consider the polynomial $F = \prod_q (X^q - X) \in K[X]$, with q ranging over the set of prime powers (> 1) that are at most m . Since F is non-zero, it has only a finite number of zeros in A , so we can choose $a \in A$ with $F(a)$ non-zero. If \mathfrak{p} is a prime of A with $\#(A/\mathfrak{p})$ at most m , then with $\#(A/\mathfrak{p}) = q$ we have $a^q \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, so \mathfrak{p} divides $F(a)$. But $F(a)$ has only finitely many prime divisors, which proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let d be a non-zero element of A such that $dB \subset A[\alpha]$ and such that every prime of A for which $\#(A/\mathfrak{p})$ is at most $[L : K]$ divides dA . Let U be a finite set of primes of B not dividing dB , and let \mathfrak{q} be a prime of degree one of B that does not divide dB . Then there exists a non-zero element $x \in B$ such that*

- (1) $x \equiv 1 \pmod{dB}$,
- (2) One has $xB = \mathfrak{q} \prod_{i=1}^t \mathfrak{q}_i^{e_i}$, where t is a non-negative integer; each \mathfrak{q}_i is a prime of degree one of B that is not in U , that does not divide dB , and that is different from \mathfrak{q} ; the primes $A \cap \mathfrak{q}_i$ and $A \cap \mathfrak{q}_j$ are different whenever i is different from j ; and each e_i is a positive integer.

Proof. We write $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q} \cap A$ and $\beta = d\theta$. Then we have $B_{\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}[\beta]$, and from Kummer-Dedekind's Theorem we obtain $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}B + (\beta + u)B$ for some $u \in A$, and moreover we may assume that $x' = \beta + u$ does not belong to \mathfrak{q}^2 . The element x whose existence we will prove will be of the form $x = \beta + v$ for some $v \in A$. We list the conditions that we want v to satisfy. The zeroth condition is that v be different from $-\beta$, a condition that is trivially satisfied if $[L : K] > 1$. The first condition is $v \equiv 1 \pmod{dA}$. This condition ensures (1), because β is by definition in dB . The second condition is $v \equiv u \pmod{\mathfrak{q}^2}$. This condition ensures that x , like x' , belongs to \mathfrak{q} but not to \mathfrak{q}^2 , so that \mathfrak{q} occurs exactly once in the prime ideal factorization of the non-zero B -ideal xB . Thus, this prime factorization has the form $xB = \mathfrak{q} \prod_{i=1}^t \mathfrak{q}_i^{e_i}$, where t is a non-negative integer, the \mathfrak{q}_i are pairwise distinct primes of B , and the e_i are positive integers. From $x \equiv 1 \pmod{dB}$ it also follows that none of the \mathfrak{q}_i divides dB .

I claim that it is also automatic that the primes $\mathfrak{p}_i = \mathfrak{q}_i \cap A$ are pairwise distinct and that each \mathfrak{q}_i has degree one over A . To prove this, remark that \mathfrak{q}_i contains $\mathfrak{p}_i B + (\beta + v)B$; that from \mathfrak{p}_i not dividing d it follows that $B_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}[\beta]$ so that $B/(\mathfrak{p}_i B + (\beta + v)B)$ has A/\mathfrak{p}_i -dimension at most 1; but this dimension is at least $[B/\mathfrak{q}_i : A/\mathfrak{p}_i]$, so that we obtain both $\mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{p}_i B + (\beta + v)B$ and $[B/\mathfrak{q}_i : A/\mathfrak{p}_i] = 1$; the latter equality shows that \mathfrak{q}_i has degree one, the former that an equality $\mathfrak{p}_i = \mathfrak{p}_j$ would imply $\mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{q}_j$ and hence $i = j$.

Thus, the only condition in (2) that remains to be verified is that none of the \mathfrak{q}_i are in U . This we do by imposing a further condition on v modulo each of the primes $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q} \cap A$ of A , with \mathfrak{q} ranging over the primes in U . So, suppose that \mathfrak{p} is such a prime. By hypothesis, we have $\#(A/\mathfrak{p}) > [L : K]$. There are at most $[L : K]$ primes \mathfrak{q} of B of degree one over \mathfrak{p} , and by Kummer-Dedekind's Theorem, each of these has the form $\mathfrak{p}B + (\beta + r_{\mathfrak{q}})B$ for some $r_{\mathfrak{q}} \in A$ that is uniquely determined modulo \mathfrak{p} . From $\#(A/\mathfrak{p}) > [L : K]$ we see that we can choose $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in A$ such that $s_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is not congruent to any of the $r_{\mathfrak{q}}$ modulo \mathfrak{p} . Thus, the third condition $x \equiv s_{\mathfrak{p}} \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, for all \mathfrak{p} that occur, does ensure that none of the \mathfrak{q}_i is in U . Since the Chinese remainder theorem implies that all conditions on v can be simultaneously satisfied, we are done with the proof of the lemma. \square

Theorem 2.8. *Let S be a finite set of primes of B . Then every ideal class of B contains an ideal of the form $\prod_{\mathfrak{q} \in T} \mathfrak{q}^{e(\mathfrak{q})}$, where T is a finite set of primes of degree one of B such that*

- (1) T is disjoint from S ,
- (2) For any two distinct $\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{q}' \in T$ the primes $A \cap \mathfrak{q}$ and $A \cap \mathfrak{q}'$ are different; and e is a map $T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

Note that in [5], the lemma is invoked for a prime \mathfrak{q} , but the condition of the lemma that \mathfrak{q} not divide dB is disregarded. To repair this, one should introduce d earlier and add its prime divisors to S , as we do below.

Proof. The first thing one does, is enlarging S , in two ways. By Lemma 2.6, for only finitely many primes \mathfrak{p} of A is $\#(A/\mathfrak{p})$ at most $[L : K]$, and the finitely many primes of B lying over such \mathfrak{p} are adjoined to S . Secondly, one chooses α and d as in Lemma 2.7, but such that d is divisible by all primes in S , and one replaces S by the set of prime divisors of $dB \in B$. One now applies [5, Theorem 1], and one finds that the class group of B is generated by the primes of degree one that are not in S . Hence, any ideal class contains a fractional ideal of the form $\prod_{\mathfrak{q} \in T} \mathfrak{q}^{e(\mathfrak{q})}$, where T is a finite set of primes of degree one of B , the set T is disjoint from S , and $e : T \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ is a map.

What remains to be done, is achieve (2), as well as to achieve that all $e(\mathfrak{q})$ are positive. We deal with these in order, first achieving (2), which requires that all $A \cap \mathfrak{q}$, with $\mathfrak{q} \in T$, are pairwise different. This we do by induction on the number of “coincidences” in the product, a coincidence being defined as a prime $\mathfrak{q} \in T$ for which there exists $\mathfrak{q}' \in T$, $\mathfrak{q}' \neq \mathfrak{q}$, with $A \cap \mathfrak{q} = A \cap \mathfrak{q}'$. If there are no such \mathfrak{q} , then (2) is achieved. Next suppose that \mathfrak{q}^* is a coincidence. Apply Lemma 2.7 to $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}^*$ and U equal to the set of primes of B that lie over the same prime of A as some prime in T . Then we find, with the notation of the conclusion of Lemma 2.7, that \mathfrak{q}^* is in the same ideal class as $\prod_{i=1}^t \mathfrak{q}_i^{-e_i}$ for certain primes \mathfrak{q}_i of degree one of B not in S nor in U , with all $A \cap \mathfrak{q}_i$ pairwise different. Thus, one can replace the factor $(\mathfrak{q}^*)^{e(\mathfrak{q}^*)}$ in our product by $\prod_{i=1}^t \mathfrak{q}_i^{-e_i e(\mathfrak{q}^*)}$. By the choice of U , this replacement does not introduce new coincidences, and it eliminates the coincidence \mathfrak{q}^* . Hence in the new product the number of coincidences is strictly smaller than in the old product.

We now prove that every ideal class of B contains a fractional ideal of the form $\prod_{\mathfrak{q} \in T} \mathfrak{q}^{e(\mathfrak{q})}$, where T is a finite set of primes of degree one of B , the set T is disjoint from S , all primes $A \cap \mathfrak{q}$ of A are pairwise different as \mathfrak{q} ranges over T , and $e : T \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ is a map. It remains to change this product such that all $e(\mathfrak{q})$ are positive. This we do by induction on the number of $\mathfrak{q} \in T$ for which $e(\mathfrak{q}) < 0$. If this number is 0, we are done. Suppose this number is positive, and let $\mathfrak{q}^* \in T$ be such that $e(\mathfrak{q}^*) < 0$. We again apply Lemma 2.7 to the same choices of \mathfrak{q}^* and U , which again enables us to replace the factor $(\mathfrak{q}^*)^{e(\mathfrak{q}^*)}$ in our product by $\prod_{i=1}^t \mathfrak{q}_i^{-e_i e(\mathfrak{q}^*)}$; note that all exponents $-e_i e(\mathfrak{q}^*)$ are positive. By construction, this new product satisfies the same conditions as we listed for the original product, but the number of $\mathfrak{q} \in T$ for which $e(\mathfrak{q}) < 0$ has decreased by 1. Thus, the proof is now finished by induction. \square

Note that the difference between the above theorem and the results in [5] is the extra condition that the \mathfrak{q}_i lie over distinct prime ideals of A . This is necessary for us because from this we can deduce:

Corollary 2.9. *Every ideal class of B contains an ideal of degree one.*

Proof. Let S be the set of prime ideals of B that are not unramified. Then S is finite (see [8, Chapter I, (8.4)]) so by Theorem 2.8, every ideal class of B contains an ideal \mathfrak{b} that is a product of unramified prime ideals of degree one lying above pairwise distinct prime ideals of A . Since unramified primes have ramification index one, Proposition 2.4 implies that \mathfrak{b} is of degree one. \square

3. THE LATIMER–MACDUFFEE CORRESPONDENCE AND IDEAL MATRICES

We keep the A, K, B, L set-up from before, but from now on and throughout the rest of the paper we assume that A is PID. The following is a well-known fact that depends on A being a PID.

Lemma 3.1. *Let \mathcal{O} be an A -order in L and \mathfrak{b} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{O} . Then \mathfrak{b} is free of rank n over A .*

Proof. As already mentioned in the beginning of Section 4, $\mathcal{O} \subseteq B$ and by [6, I.4.9 and I.4.10] B is free of rank n over A . Every submodule of a free module over a PID is free (of smaller or equal rank), and since $K\mathcal{O} = L$ and $[L : K] = n$, \mathcal{O} must be free of rank n . For the same reason, the ideal \mathfrak{b} is free of rank $r \leq n$. Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be an A -basis of \mathcal{O} and let $b \in \mathfrak{b}$ be a non-zero element. Then $\{bx_1, \dots, bx_n\}$ is a subset of \mathfrak{b} that is linearly independent over A and thus $n \leq r$, so $r = n$. \square

Let

$$f(x) = x^n + k_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots + k_1x + k_0 \in A[x]$$

be a monic irreducible polynomial over A and let

$$\theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ -k_0 & -k_1 & \dots & -k_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

be the (row-wise) companion matrix of $f(x)$. Let $A[\theta]$ be the A -subalgebra of $M_n(A)$ generated by θ . Let I be the kernel of the surjective homomorphism $A[x] \rightarrow A[\theta]$, $x \mapsto \theta$, and let $g(x) \in I$ be a non-zero element. Then, as $f(x)$ is the minimal polynomial of θ over A , we have $g(x) = f(x)h(x)$, for some $h(x) \in K[x]$. Since A is a PID, there is a $d \in A$ such that $dh(x) \in A[x]$ and $c(dh) = (1)$, where $c(\cdot)$ denotes the content of a polynomial in $A[x]$. By Gauss's lemma, $d \cdot c(g) = c(f)c(dh) = (1)$, so $d \in (1)$ is a unit and $h(x) \in A[x]$. Thus $I = (f(x))$ is generated by $f(x)$, so we have an isomorphism

$$A[x]/(f(x)) \cong A[\theta].$$

We will consider A as a subring of $A[\theta]$ via the embedding $x \mapsto xI$, where I is the identity matrix. We will also consider $A[\theta]$ as an A -order in the field $K(\theta) \cong K[x]/(f(x))$.

The Latimer–MacDuffee correspondence is often formulated as a bijection between similarity classes of matrices in $M_n(\mathbb{Z})$ and ideal classes in the order $\mathbb{Z}[\theta]$. It was first established by Latimer and MacDuffee [4] and later given a new simpler proof by Taussky (see [15], [9, Chapter III, Section 16] and the last appendix of [3]). As shown by Bender [1] and Buccino [2], Taussky's proof translates readily to the more general situation of similarity classes of matrices over an integral domain R and classes of ideals that are free R -modules of rank n . More precisely, Lemma 3.1 together with [1, Theorem 1] imply:

Theorem 3.2. *There is a canonical bijection between the similarity classes of matrices in $M_n(A)$ with characteristic polynomial $f(x)$ and ideal classes in $A[\theta]$.*

The bijection is canonical in the following sense. Let $\alpha \in M_n(A)$ such that $f(\alpha) = 0$. Then θ is an eigenvalue of α and since $f(x)$ is irreducible, all the eigenvalues are distinct so the eigenspaces have dimension 1 over $K(\theta)$ and thus two eigenvectors corresponding to the same eigenvalue θ must be proportional (by a factor in $K(\theta)$). Since A has an eigenvector in $K(\theta)^n$, it also has an eigenvector

$v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_n \end{pmatrix}$ in $A[\theta]^n$ (by clearing denominators). Let $I = Av_1 + \cdots + Av_n$. Then

$\alpha v = \theta v$ implies that $\theta I \subseteq I$ and thus $\theta^i I \subseteq I$ for every $i \geq 1$, which implies that I is an ideal of $A[\theta]$. It is then easy to see that any other choice of eigenvector v leads to an ideal that is in the same ideal class as I and that any other matrix in the similarity class of α leads to the same ideal class (see [9, Chapter III, Section 16]).

Definition 3.3. A matrix $\kappa \in M_n(A)$ is called an *ideal matrix* for an ideal \mathfrak{b} of $A[\theta]$ (with respect to the basis $1, \theta, \dots, \theta^{n-1}$ of $A[\theta]$) if

$$M_n(A)\mathfrak{b} = M_n(A)\kappa.$$

Such a κ always exists because left ideals in $M_n(A)$ are principal [9, Theorem II.5].

The following characterisation is taken as the definition of ideal matrix in [16] and [3]. The result is essentially a theorem of MacDuffee [7], which we here translate into our notation.

Lemma 3.4. *Let \mathfrak{b} be a non-zero ideal of $A[\theta]$. A matrix $\kappa \in M_n(A)$ is an ideal matrix for \mathfrak{b} (with respect to the basis $1, \theta, \dots, \theta^{n-1}$ of $A[\theta]$) if and only if the entries of*

$$\kappa \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \theta \\ \vdots \\ \theta^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

form an A -basis for \mathfrak{b} .

Proof. Let a_1, \dots, a_n be an A -basis for \mathfrak{b} . In [7], the elements $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are arbitrary generators of the ideal. We may thus take $k = n$ and $\alpha_i = a_i$. As we have embedded $A[\theta]$ in $M_n(A)$ via the regular embedding, the matrices $M(\alpha_1), \dots, M(\alpha_k)$ in [7] are just our a_1, \dots, a_n .

Assume that $\kappa \in M_n(A)$ satisfies the relation in the assertion and write $\kappa = (k_{ij})$, $k_{ij} \in A$, so that

$$(3.1) \quad a_i = \sum_{j=1}^n k_{ij} \theta^{j-1}.$$

For any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, write

$$(3.2) \quad \theta^{i-1} \theta^{j-1} = \sum_{k=1}^n c_{ijk} \theta^{k-1},$$

for some $c_{ijk} \in A$. Since we have embedded $A[\theta]$ in $M_n(A)$ via the regular embedding with respect to the basis $1, \theta, \dots, \theta^{n-1}$, we have, for each fixed j ,

$$(3.3) \quad (c_{ijk})_{ik} = \theta^{j-1}$$

(note that $(c_{ijk})_{ik} = M_j$ in the notation of [7]). For any $r, i = 1, \dots, n$ we then have

$$\theta^{r-1}a_i = \sum_{j=1}^n k_{ij}\theta^{r-1}\theta^{j-1} = \sum_{j=1}^n k_{ij} \sum_{k=1}^n c_{rjk}\theta^{k-1} = \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^n k_{ij}c_{rjk} \right) \theta^{k-1}.$$

On the other hand, since a_1, \dots, a_n is a basis for \mathfrak{b} , there exist uniquely determined elements $q_{rij} \in A$ such that

$$\theta^{r-1}a_i = \sum_{j=1}^n q_{rij}a_j = \sum_{j=1}^n q_{rij} \sum_{k=1}^n k_{jk}\theta^{k-1} = \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^n q_{rij}k_{jk} \right) \theta^{k-1}.$$

From this we conclude that for any $r, i, k = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n k_{ij}c_{rjk} = \sum_{j=1}^n q_{rij}k_{jk}.$$

Letting $Q_i = (q_{ris})_{rs} \in M_n(A)$, for each i , the relations (3.1) and (3.3) imply that (3.4) can be rewritten as

$$a_i = Q_i\kappa.$$

Thus κ is a common right divisor of the matrices a_1, \dots, a_n .

Moreover, writing

$$a_r = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{rj}a_j,$$

for any $r = 1, \dots, n$ (where $\delta_{ij} \in A$ is the Kronecker delta) and

$$\delta_{rj} = \sum_{h=1}^n p_{rjh}\theta^{h-1},$$

with $p_{rj1} = \delta_{rj}$ and $p_{rjh} = 0$ if $h > 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s=1}^n k_{rs}\theta^{s-1} &\stackrel{(3.1)}{=} a_r = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{h=1}^n p_{rjh}\theta^{h-1} \right) a_j = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{h=1}^n p_{rjh}\theta^{h-1} \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^n k_{jl}\theta^{l-1} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(3.2)}{=} \sum_{j,h,l=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^n p_{rjh}k_{jl}c_{hls}\theta^{s-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for each r and s ,

$$k_{rs} = \sum_{j,h,l=1}^n p_{rjh}k_{jl}c_{hls},$$

which, using (3.1) and (3.3), can be written

$$\kappa = \sum_{j=1}^n P_j a_j,$$

where $P_j = (p_{rjh})_{rh}$ (which equals the elementary matrix with a 1 in the $(j, 1)$ -position and has 0s everywhere else). Thus any common right divisor of a_1, \dots, a_n is a right divisor of κ , so κ is a greatest common right divisor and therefore

$$M_n(A)\mathfrak{b} = M_n(A)a_1 + \dots + M_n(A)a_n = M_n(A)\kappa,$$

that is, κ is an ideal matrix for \mathfrak{b} .

Conversely, assume that $M_n(A)\mathfrak{b} = M_n(A)\kappa$, so that κ is a greatest common right divisor of a_1, \dots, a_n . Note that $\det(\kappa) \neq 0$, or else we would have $\det(\mathfrak{b}) = 0$, which implies that $\mathfrak{b} = 0$. This follows from the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K(\theta) & \hookrightarrow & M_n(K) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ A[\theta] & \hookrightarrow & M_n(A) \end{array}$$

induced by the regular embeddings of $K(\theta)$ and $A[\theta]$ with respect to the basis $1, \dots, \theta^{n-1}$ of L over K and $A[\theta]$ over A , respectively; note that the image in $M_n(K)$ of any non-zero element of L is invertible.

Let $\kappa' \in M_n(A)$ be the (uniquely determined) matrix such that

$$\kappa' \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \theta^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have shown above that κ' must be a greatest common right divisor of a_1, \dots, a_n , so, as κ is invertible in $M_n(K)$, there exists an invertible matrix $\omega \in \mathrm{GL}_n(A)$ such that $\kappa = \omega\kappa'$. Thus the entries of

$$\kappa \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \theta^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \omega^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_n \end{pmatrix},$$

form an A -basis for \mathfrak{b} . □

Lemma 3.5. *Let \mathfrak{b} be a non-zero ideal of $A[\theta]$ and κ an ideal matrix for \mathfrak{b} (with respect to the basis $1, \theta, \dots, \theta^{n-1}$ of $A[\theta]$). The similarity class in $M_n(A)$ corresponding to the ideal class of \mathfrak{b} under the Latimer–MacDuffee correspondence contains $\kappa\theta\kappa^{-1}$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in M_n(A)$ be a representative of the class corresponding to the ideal class of \mathfrak{b} . Then

$$\alpha v = \theta v,$$

where θ is considered as a scalar and where the entries $v_1, \dots, v_n \in A[\theta]$ of v span \mathfrak{b} over A . Since \mathfrak{b} is free of rank n over A (Lemma 3.1), the elements v_1, \dots, v_n must be linearly independent, and thus form a basis for the ideal \mathfrak{b} . By Lemma 3.4 there is an $\omega \in \mathrm{GL}_n(A)$ such that

$$\omega\kappa \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \theta^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = v,$$

and therefore

$$(\omega\kappa)^{-1}\alpha\omega\kappa \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \theta^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \theta \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \theta^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This means that $(\omega\kappa)^{-1}\alpha\omega\kappa = \theta$, where θ is considered as a matrix in $M_n(A)$, and thus

$$\alpha = \omega\kappa\theta\kappa^{-1}\omega^{-1},$$

which lies in the same class as $\kappa\theta\kappa^{-1}$. □

4. AN IDEAL MATRIX FOR IDEALS OF DEGREE ONE

Lemma 4.1. *For any $z \in A$ the matrix*

$$\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} -f(z) & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ -z & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ -z^2 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ -z^{n-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is an ideal matrix for $(\theta - z)$, that is, $M_n(A)(\theta - z) = M_n(A)\lambda$.

Proof. We may perform successive elementary row operations on $\theta - z$. The first operation consists of the row permutation $(n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1)$, resulting in the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -k_0 & -k_1 & \cdots & \cdots & -k_n - z \\ -z & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -z & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Next, starting from the second column, successively use each of the 1s on the diagonal to clear the entry just below it. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} -k_0 & -k_1 & \cdots & \cdots & -k_n - z \\ -z & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -z^2 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & -z & 1 & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -z & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} -k_0 & -k_1 & -k_2 & \cdots & \cdots & -k_n - z \\ -z & 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ -z^2 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ -z^3 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -z & 1 & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -z & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \cdots \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} -k_0 & -k_1 & -k_2 & \cdots & -k_n - z \\ -z & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -z^2 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ -z^{n-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, starting from the second column, successively use each of the 1s on the diagonal to clear the top row entry above it. The resulting matrix is

$$\lambda := \begin{pmatrix} g(z) & 0 & \dots\dots\dots & 0 \\ -z & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ -z^2 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ -z^{n-1} & 0 & \dots\dots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

for some polynomial $g(x) \in A[x]$. But since

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) &= \det \lambda = (-1)^{\text{sgn}(n, \dots, 1)} \det(\theta - z) \\ &= (-1)^{n-1} (-1)^n f(z) = -f(z), \end{aligned}$$

the result follows. \square

For any $a, z \in A$, define the matrix

$$\kappa = \kappa(a, z) = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & \dots\dots\dots & 0 \\ -z & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ -z^2 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ -z^{n-1} & 0 & \dots\dots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that \mathfrak{b} is an ideal of $A[\theta]$ of degree one and let a be a generator of $A \cap \mathfrak{b}$. Then there exists a $z \in A$ such that $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{(a)}$ and $\kappa = \kappa(a, z)$ is an ideal matrix for \mathfrak{b} .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, there exists a $z \in A$ such that $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{(a)}$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (\theta - z, a)$. Since $A[\theta] \subseteq M_n(A)$, we then have

$$M_n(A)\mathfrak{b} = M_n(A)(\theta - z) + M_n(A)a = M_n(A)\lambda + M_n(A)a,$$

with λ as in Lemma 4.1. Let $E_{ij} \in M_n(A)$ be the matrix defined by having (i, j) -entry equal to 1 and all other entries equal to 0. Writing $f(z) = am$, for $m \in A$, we then have $\kappa = \lambda + E_{11}(1 - m)a$ and hence

$$M_n(A)\kappa \subseteq M_n(A)\lambda + M_n(A)a.$$

On the other hand, $a \in M_n(A)\kappa$ since the adjoint matrix $\text{adj}(\kappa) \in M_n(A)$ satisfies $\text{adj}(\kappa)\kappa = \det(\kappa)I = aI$. Furthermore, $\lambda \in M_n(A)\kappa$ since $\lambda = \kappa - E_{11}(1 - m)a = (I - (1 - m)E_{11})\kappa$. Thus $M_n(A)\lambda + M_n(A)a \subseteq M_n(A)\kappa$ and so $M_n(A)\mathfrak{b} = M_n(A)\lambda + M_n(A)a = M_n(A)\kappa$. \square

5. REPRESENTATIVES OF SIMILARITY CLASSES

Lemma 5.1. *Let $a \in A$ and assume that there exists a $z \in A$ such that $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{(a)}$. Then the matrix $\kappa\theta\kappa^{-1} \in M_n(A)$ is similar to*

$$C_f(a, z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ u_{n-1} & u_{n-2} & \cdots & u_1 & -f(z)a^{-1} \\ a & 0 & \cdots & 0 & z \end{pmatrix},$$

where $u_i = -(z^i + k_{n-1}z^{i-1} + k_{n-2}z^{i-2} + \cdots + k_{n-i+1}z + k_{n-i})$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. Define the following matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_n(A)$:

$$\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & -z & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -z & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad v = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then direct computation shows that

$$v\tau(\kappa\theta\kappa^{-1})\tau^{-1}v^{-1} = C_f(a, z). \quad \square$$

Remark. Matrices of the form $C_f(a, z)$ were first introduced by Ochoa (see [10] and [11]) who called them “ A -matrices”, presumably because of the shape of their non-zero entries. The matrix $C_f(a, z)$ is similar (i.e., $\mathrm{GL}_n(A)$ -conjugate) to the matrix

$${}^{\mathbf{a}}\theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & u_{n-1} & -f(z)a^{-1} \\ 1 & \ddots & \vdots & u_{n-2} & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 & u_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & a & z \end{pmatrix}$$

considered by Rehm in [13], in the presence of an ideal \mathbf{a} . Indeed, letting

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & k_n & \ddots & \vdots \\ k_{n-1} & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & k_3 & \cdots & k_{n-1} & k_n & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w = \begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & & \vdots \\ & & & \vdots \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix},$$

one easily verifies that

$$w\sigma(\kappa\theta\kappa^{-1})\sigma^{-1}w^{-1} = {}^{\mathbf{a}}\theta.$$

We can now finish the proof of our main result that every similarity class contains a matrix of the form $C_f(a, z)$. Recall that from Section 3 onwards we assumed that A is a PID. We have also assumed throughout that $f(x)$ is irreducible.

Theorem 5.2. *Let \mathfrak{b} be an ideal of $A[\theta]$ of degree one. The similarity class in $M_n(A)$ that corresponds to the ideal class of \mathfrak{b} under the Latimer–MacDuffee correspondence contains a matrix of the form $C_f(a, z)$, where $a, z \in A$ and $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$. In particular, if $A[\theta] = B$ is the maximal order, then every similarity class in $M_n(A)$ contains a matrix of this form.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a similarity class in $M_n(A)$ corresponding to the ideal class of \mathfrak{b} . By Lemma 3.5 \mathcal{C} contains a matrix $\alpha\theta\alpha^{-1}$, where α is an ideal matrix for \mathfrak{b} . By Proposition 4.2, there exists a $z \in A$ such that $f(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$, where a is a generator of $A \cap \mathfrak{b}$ and $\kappa = \kappa(a, z)$ is an ideal matrix for \mathfrak{b} . Thus the similarity class of \mathcal{C} contains $\kappa\theta\kappa^{-1}$, so by Lemma 5.1 \mathcal{C} contains $C_f(a, z)$.

If $A[\theta] = B$, then by Corollary 2.9, every ideal class contains an ideal of degree one, so the argument above implies that every similarity class contains a matrix of the desired form. \square

Acknowledgement. We are deeply grateful to H. W. Lenstra for providing the proof of Theorem 2.8 and allowing us to include it here.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. A. Bender, *Classes of matrices over an integral domain*, Illinois J. Math. **11** (1967), 697–702.
- [2] A. Buccino, *Matrix classes and ideal classes*, Illinois J. Math. **13** (1969), 188–191.
- [3] H. Cohn, *A classical invitation to algebraic numbers and class fields*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1978, with two appendices by Olga Taussky: “Artin’s 1932 Göttingen lectures on class field theory” and “Connections between algebraic number theory and integral matrices”.
- [4] C. G. Latimer and C. C. MacDuffee, *A correspondence between classes of ideals and classes of matrices*, Ann. of Math. (2) **34** (1933), no. 2, 313–316.
- [5] H. W. Lenstra, Jr. and P. Stevenhagen, *Primes of degree one and algebraic cases of Čebotarev’s theorem*, Enseign. Math. (2) **37** (1991), no. 1-2, 17–30.
- [6] D. Lorenzini, *An invitation to arithmetic geometry*, volume 9 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [7] C. C. MacDuffee, *A method for determining the canonical basis of an ideal in an algebraic field*, Math. Ann. **105** (1931), no. 1, 663–665.
- [8] J. Neukirch, *Algebraic number theory*, volume 322 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [9] M. Newman, *Integral Matrices*, Academic Press, New York, 1972, pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 45.
- [10] J. Ochoa, *Un modelo elemental para las clases de ideales de un anillo algebraico*, Rev. Real Acad. Cienc. Exact. Fís. Natur. Madrid **68** (1974), no. 4, 771–806.
- [11] J. Ochoa, *Un modelo elemental para las clases de ideales de un anillo algebraico II*, Rev. Real Acad. Cienc. Exact. Fís. Natur. Madrid **74** (1980), no. 2, 191–202.
- [12] H. P. Rehm, review of “An elementary model for the class of ideals of an algebraic ring. II. (Spanish)” by J. Ochoa, zbMATH, Zbl 0467.15008.
- [13] H. P. Rehm, *On Ochoa’s special matrices in matrix classes*, Linear Algebra Appl. **17** (1977), no. 2, 181–188.
- [14] I. Reiner, *Maximal orders*, Academic Press, London-New York, 1975, London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 5.
- [15] O. Taussky, *On a theorem of Latimer and MacDuffee*, Canad. J. Math. **1** (1949), 300–302.
- [16] O. Taussky, *Ideal matrices. I*, Arch. Math. **13** (1962), 275–282.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, DURHAM UNIVERSITY, DURHAM, DH1 3LE, UK
Email address: `lucy.c.knight@durham.ac.uk`, `alexander.stasinski@durham.ac.uk`