

Distribution of matrices over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$

Yibo Ji

Abstract

In this paper, we give an explicit formula for number of square matrices within an $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$ orbit satisfying some additional restrictions on degrees of the entries. The formula gives an equidistribution result over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ which is an analogue of a result over \mathbb{Z} proved by [DRS93] and [EM93].

1 Background

In 1993, there were two papers linking number of integer points with volumes on quotient spaces over affine symmetric varieties, via ergodic theory([EM93]) and spectral decomposition([DRS93]). The following is the main theorem in [DRS93].

Theorem 1.1. (*Theorem 1.2 [DRS93]*) *Suppose we have a semisimple \mathbb{Q} -group G which admits a \mathbb{Q} -representation on a real vector space W . Take $w \in W$ such that Gw is Zariski closed in W . Suppose the stabilizer $H(\mathbb{R})$ of w is a group consisting of fixed elements of an involution of $G(\mathbb{R})$. In this case, Gw is called symmetry affine variety. Suppose that $Vol(H(\mathbb{R})/H(\mathbb{Z}))$ and $Vol(G(\mathbb{R})/G(\mathbb{Z}))$ both are finite. Furthermore, we normalize dg on $G(\mathbb{R})$ and dh on $H(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$Vol(H(\mathbb{R})/H(\mathbb{Z})) = Vol(G(\mathbb{R})/G(\mathbb{Z})) = 1.$$

Moreover, it induces a $G(\mathbb{R})$ -invariant measure $d\dot{g}$ on $G(\mathbb{R})/H(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $dg = d\dot{g}dh$. Denote $\mu(T) := \int_{\|\dot{g}w\| \leq T} d\dot{g}$ ($\|\cdot\|$ means Euclidean norm here) Take $O = G(\mathbb{Z})w$. Denote the distribution function of O to be

$$N(T, O) = \{w' \in O \mid \|w'\| \leq T\}.$$

Then we have the following asymptotic behavior:

$$N(T, O) \sim \mu(T).$$

In the above theorem, the symmetry condition that H consists of fixed points of an involution plays a central role. In 1996 and 1997, [EMS96] and [EMS97] generalized the result to the cases that the stabilizer H is not contained in any proper parabolic \mathbb{Q} -subgroup of G .

Let us focus on an example which we will further investigate in this paper. Denote $V_{n,k} = \{A \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R}) | \det(A) = k\}$. Take $G = SL_n \times SL_n$ with action on $V_{n,k}$ by $(g_1, g_2)x = g_1 x g_2^{-1}$. Notice that $SL_n(\mathbb{R})/SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ is of finite volume. Thus all the finiteness conditions will naturally hold. Over \mathbb{R} , the action is transitive on $V_{n,k}$. For any $x \in V_{n,k}$, the stabilizer is $H := \{(xgx^{-1}, g) | g \in SL_n(\mathbb{R})\}$. Consider the involution $\sigma(g_1, g_2) = (xg_2x^{-1}, x^{-1}g_1x)$ on $G(\mathbb{R})$. Then H consists of points fixed by σ . Thus we can take arbitrary $x \in V_{n,k}(\mathbb{Z})$ to be w to apply the above theorem. By taking sum of all $SL_n(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -orbits, we have the following asymptotic behavior as Example 1.6 in [DRS93] shows:

$$N(V_{n,k}, T) \sim c_{n,k} T^{n^2-n}.$$

where, if $k = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r} p_i^{a_i}$, then

$$c_{n,k} = \frac{\pi^{n^2/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{n^2-n+2}{2})\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}) \prod_{2 \leq j \leq n} \xi(j)} k^{1-n} \prod_{1 \leq j \leq r} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} \frac{p_j^{a_j+i} - 1}{p_j^i - 1}.$$

In fact, the ratio between distributions of two $SL_n(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -orbits is proportional to the ratio between the number of $SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -orbits (with respect to left(right) multiplication) contained in them. Here is a concrete example:

Example 1.2. Take $n = 2$ and $k = 4$. There are only two $G(\mathbb{Z})$ -orbits with representatives $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$. We will denote the first one as O_1 and the latter one as O_2 . We will find $N(T, O_1)/N(T, O_2) \rightarrow 1/6, T \rightarrow \infty$.

On the other hand, there are seven $SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -orbits with respect to left multiplication with representatives: $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \in O_1$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in O_2$.

So there arises a natural question: are $SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ -orbits of equidistribution once we fix the determinant?

Remark 1.3. Notice that the theorem stated above does not apply to this case because the symmetry condition is not satisfied. The stabilizer here is a trivial group. And every automorphism of $SL_n(\mathbb{R})$ will preserve the center and 2-torsion elements. Thus every automorphism will preserve the set $\{I_n, -I_n\}$ which means that the stabilizer cannot be realized as fixed points of involution. [EMS96] and [EMS97] cannot be applied as well because trivial group will be naturally contained in any proper parabolic \mathbb{Q} -subgroup.

It's common to compare results on \mathbb{Z} with results on $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$. To imitate the Euclidean norm, we are going to take the norm given by the valuation: deg .

Here are some reasons. These are unique metrics such that \mathbb{Z} (resp. $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$) are discrete with respect to the corresponding completion. Thus they are the unique metrics for us to add restrictions to get a reasonable counting problem.

After moving to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ in the rest, we will get a stronger result than what we conjecture above over \mathbb{Z} . The main reason is that deg is a non-archimedean valuation. We will also go back to \mathbb{C} to give some geometric meaning of our results.

2 Main Results

From now on, let's fix a finite field \mathbb{F}_q .

Definition 2.1. Given a matrix $M \in Mat_{l \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$ and a natural number k , we call M satisfies (\mathbf{k}) , if all the entries $M_{i,j}$ of M are of degree smaller or equal k .

Here is the distribution theorem we are going to prove:

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose we are given an $M \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$, $det(M) \neq 0$ and $deg(det(M)) = t$. Then for any $k \geq t$ we have*

$$\#\{X \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x])M : X \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} = \#GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)q^{(n-1)(nk-t)}$$

To prove the above theorem, we are going to break into two parts.

Firstly, notice that we can always find an upper-triangular matrix $B \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x])M$. Then we may assume M is upper-triangular. In fact, we are able to assume that M is diagonal by taking $l = n$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose we are given two positive integers $1 \leq l \leq n$ and an upper-triangular $M = \begin{pmatrix} D & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix} \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$, $D \in Mat_{l \times l}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$. Then, there*

*exists an upper-triangular $M' = \begin{pmatrix} D' & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix} \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$ such that $D' \in Mat_{l \times l}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$ is a diagonal matrix, $deg(det(D')) \geq deg(det(D))$, $deg(det(M')) = deg(det(M))$ and for any $k \geq 0$, we have*

$$\#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} = \#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM' \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\}$$

Remark 2.4. We only require an identity on the size of the sets instead of an identity of the sets. The identity of the sets does not hold in general.

Notice that when M is a diagonal matrix, we only care for the degree of its entries on the diagonal. So we are reduced to calculate the size of the following sets:

$$\{A = (a_{i,j}) \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : deg(a_{i,j}) \leq k - t_j, \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$$

where t_i is the degree of the (i, i) th entry of the diagonal matrix and $t_1 + t_2 + \dots + t_n = t$.

For any $A \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$, we may write it as $A = \sum_{d \geq 0} A_d x^d$ where $A_d \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. If A is invertible, we know that $A_0 \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is invertible. Notice that left multiplication of $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ stabilizes the set we are counting and leaves (\mathbf{k}) invariant. So it suffices to count those with $A_0 = I_n$. Then we will utilize the following lemma:

Lemma 2.5.

$$\#\{A = (a_{i,j}) \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : \deg(a_{i,j}) \leq k_j, \forall 1 \leq i, j \leq n; A_0 = I_n\} = q^{(n-1) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} k_i}.$$

Remark 2.6. In fact, the set on the left hand can be viewed as \mathbb{F}_q point of a scheme defined over \mathbb{Z} . This lemma tells us this scheme is strong polynomial count over \mathbb{Z} (for definition, see the appendix of [HRV08]). In an answer posted by Will Sawin, he proved that the étale cohomology is \mathbb{Q}_l in degree 0. Then, to use the Grothendieck trace formula to prove our above identity, it reduces to show this variety is rationally smooth of dimension $(n-1) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} k_i$. When

we take $k_i = 1, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n$, the left side actually corresponds to nilpotent cone which was proved rationally smooth in [BM83]. So it does sound like a geometric potential way to give the proof. But we will only stick to an elementary proof in this paper.

The organization of this paper is as follows. We shall prove Lemma 2.3 in Section 3. Then we will prove Lemma 2.5 in Section 4.

3 Proof of Lemma 2.3

We are going to prove this lemma by induction on l .

Notice that the base case $l = 1$ is trivial, since every upper-triangular matrix M satisfies the condition itself.

Now let's deal with the induction part. Suppose the lemma is proved in the case that $l = l_0 - 1, l_0 \geq 2$. We are now attacking the case that $l = l_0$.

Suppose the original upper-triangular matrix is

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} D_0 & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix} \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x]), \det(M_0) \neq 0, D_0 \in Mat_{(l_0-1) \times (l_0-1)}(\mathbb{F}_q[x]).$$

Suppose our induction step for M_0 fails.

Firstly, we are going to prove the following technical lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *For the above M_0 , the following set:*

$$S_{M_0} := \{M \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : M \text{ satisfies conditions (1), (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6)}\}$$

is nonempty where the conditions are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \begin{pmatrix} D & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}, D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{l_0-1}) \\ \deg(\det(D)) &\geq \deg(\det(D_0)), \deg(\det(M)) = \deg(\det(M_0)) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$\#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM_0 \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} = \#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} \quad (2)$$

$$\deg(d_1) \leq \deg(d_2) \leq \dots \leq \deg(d_{l_0-1}). \quad (3)$$

$$x^{\deg(d_i)+1} \text{ divides the } (i, l_0)\text{th entry of } M, \forall 1 \leq i \leq l_0 - 1. \quad (4)$$

$$\deg(n_{i, l_0}) + 1 \leq \deg(n_{l_0, l_0}), \forall 1 \leq i < l_0 \quad (5)$$

$$x^{\deg(d_1)+1} \text{ divides the } (l_0, l_0)\text{th entry of } M \quad (6)$$

Proof. By induction hypothesis, we may take an upper-triangular matrix $M = (M_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ which satisfies conditions (1) and (2).

Notice that conjugation by a matrix in $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ does not affect the property (k) for any k . Thus, for any $h \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} \\ &= \#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : hgMh^{-1} \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} \\ &= \#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : hghh^{-1}Mh^{-1} \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} \\ &= \#\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : ghMh^{-1} \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\}. \end{aligned}$$

So we may choose h to be a permutation matrix which only permutes the first $l_0 - 1$ numbers to further assume that M also satisfies the condition (3) (notice that this step does not change the condition (1)(2)).

Now let's consider the following definition.

For a polynomial $f = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i x^i \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ and $u > 0$, we define

$$T_u(f) := \sum_{0 \leq i \leq u} a_i x^i.$$

To produce a matrix satisfying more conditions, let's take $M' = (m'_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in Mat_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$ such that

$$m'_{i, l_0} = m_{i, l_0} - T_{\deg(d_i)}(m_{i, l_0}), 1 \leq i \leq l_0 - 1;$$

$$m'_{i, j} = m_{i, j}, \text{ otherwise.}$$

Notice that M' is still an upper-triangular matrix satisfying conditions (1)(3). And, by the construction, M' satisfies the condition (4)

We are going to prove that

$$\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} = \{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM' \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} \quad (7)$$

This will imply that M' also satisfies condition (2).

Denote the i 's column vector of M (resp. M') by α_i (resp. β_i). Notice that we only change the l_0 's column. So we will only change the l_0 th column of gM .

Thus if the identity (7) fails, there exists a vector $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]^n$ (where γ^T is some row vector of an element $g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$) such that either:

$$\deg(\gamma^T \alpha_{l_0}) \leq k, \deg(\gamma^T \beta_{l_0}) > k \text{ and } \deg(\gamma^T \alpha_i) \leq k, \forall i < l_0;$$

or

$$\deg(\gamma^T \alpha_{l_0}) > k, \deg(\gamma^T \beta_{l_0}) \leq k \text{ and } \deg(\gamma^T \alpha_i) \leq k, \forall i < l_0.$$

In both cases, we have

$$\deg(\gamma^T (\alpha_{l_0} - \beta_{l_0})) > k \text{ and } \deg(\gamma^T \alpha_i) \leq k, \forall i < l_0$$

Suppose the first $l_0 - 1$ entries of γ are f_1, \dots, f_{l_0-1} . Expanding the above inequalities in detail, we get that

$$\deg\left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0-1} f_i T_{\deg(d_i)}(m_{i,l_0})\right) > k;$$

$$\deg(f_i) + \deg(d_i) \leq k, \forall 1 \leq i \leq l_0 - 1.$$

By the latter one and the non-archimedean property of \deg , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \deg\left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0-1} f_i T_{\deg(d_i)}(m_{i,l_0})\right) \\ & \leq \max\{\deg(f_i T_{\deg(d_i)}(m_{i,l_0})), 1 \leq i \leq l_0 - 1\} \\ & \leq \max\{\deg(f_i) + \deg(d_i), 1 \leq i \leq l_0 - 1\} \\ & \leq k \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with the first inequality. Above all, we have proved that the identity (7) holds.

So far, we have shown that M' satisfies conditions (1),(2),(3) and (4).

Notice that we may use $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$ to reduce the entries above m'_{l_0,l_0} to elements of degree strictly smaller than $\deg(m'_{l_0,l_0})$ without changing the diagonal matrix D attached to M' . This reduction also won't change conditions listed in S_{M_0} which M' already satisfies. Hence we may further assume that M' also satisfies the condition (5).

Now if $\deg(n_{l_0,l_0}) \leq \deg(d_1) + 1$, by the conditions (4) and (5), we know that M' is already of the following form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} D' & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}, D' = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{l_0-1}, d_{l_0})$$

for some $d_{l_0} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$. Hence the induction step works for M_0 which contradicts with the assumption. So we are reduced to consider the case that $\deg(n_{l_0,l_0}) > \deg(d_1) + 1$.

We are going to construct $M'' = (m''_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ as follows:

$$m''_{l_0,l_0} := m'_{l_0,l_0} - T_{\deg(d_1)+1}(m'_{l_0,l_0});$$

$$m''_{i,j} = m'_{i,j}, \text{ otherwise.}$$

We are going to prove that M'' satisfies

$$\{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM' \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} = \{g \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : gM'' \text{ satisfies } (\mathbf{k})\} \quad (8)$$

which implies that M'' satisfies condition (2).

Suppose the identity (8) does not hold. Imitating what we have done for M' , we know that there exists a row vector $(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]^n$ such that either

$$\deg\left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0} f_i m'_{i,l_0}\right) > k, \deg\left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0} f_i m''_{i,l_0}\right) \leq k \text{ and } \deg(f_i m'_{i,i}) \leq k, \forall 1 \leq i < l_0;$$

or

$$\deg\left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0} f_i m'_{i,l_0}\right) \leq k, \deg\left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0} f_i m''_{i,l_0}\right) > k \text{ and } \deg(f_i m'_{i,i}) \leq k, \forall 1 \leq i < l_0.$$

holds. In both cases, we have

$$\deg(f_{l_0} T_{\deg(d_1)+1}(m'_{l_0,l_0})) > k \text{ and } \deg(f_i m'_{i,i}) \leq k, \forall 1 \leq i < l_0.$$

So we know that

$$\deg(f_{l_0}) > k - 1 - \deg(d_1); \quad (9)$$

$$\deg(f_{l_0} m'_{l_0,l_0}) = \deg(f_{l_0} m''_{l_0,l_0}) > k + \deg(m'_{l_0,l_0}) - \deg(d_1) - 1 > k. \quad (10)$$

By the fact that one of $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0} f_i m''_{i,l_0}$, $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq l_0} f_i m'_{i,l_0}$ is of degree smaller or equal than k and the identity (10), we know there exists $1 \leq i < l_0$ such that

$$\deg(f_i m'_{i,l_0}) = \deg(f_{l_0} m''_{l_0,l_0}). \quad (11)$$

Combining identities and inequalities listed above, we have the following result:

$$\begin{aligned} & \deg(f_i m'_{i,i}) \\ &= \deg(f_i) + \deg(d_i) \\ &\stackrel{(11)}{=} \deg(f_{l_0}) + \deg(m''_{l_0,l_0}) - \deg(m'_{i,l_0}) + \deg(d_i) \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{>} k - 1 - \deg(d_1) + \deg(m''_{l_0,l_0}) - \deg(m'_{i,l_0}) + \deg(d_i) \\ &\geq k - 1 + \deg(m''_{l_0,l_0}) - \deg(m'_{i,l_0}) \\ &= k - 1 + \deg(m'_{l_0,l_0}) - \deg(m'_{i,l_0}) \\ &\stackrel{(5)}{\geq} k \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with the inequality $\deg(f_i m'_{i,i}) \leq k$. Hence we have proved that M'' satisfies (2). Notice that the construction of M'' does not affect other conditions in S_{M_0} which M' already satisfies. Moreover, by the construction and the condition (4), we know that M'' satisfies the condition (6).

Above all, we have constructed an $M'' \in S_{M_0}$. \square

Notice that for any element $M \in S_{M_0}$ and its attached d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n , we have

$$\deg(d_1) + \deg(d_2) + \dots + \deg(d_{l_0-1}) \leq \deg(\det(M)) = \deg(\det(M_0)).$$

Thus we may pick up $M_{max} \in S_{M_0}$ such that $\deg(d_1) + \deg(d_2) + \dots + \deg(d_{l_0-1})$ is maximal.

Let's conjugate M_{max} by the permutation matrix corresponding to the two cycle $(1 \ l_0) \in S_n$ to get a matrix M'_{max} .

By what we formulated in the proof of the foregoing lemma, M'_{max} still satisfies the condition (2). Then we may find an upper-triangular matrix in the orbit $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x])M'_{max}$:

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} D_N & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}, D_N \in Mat_{(l_0-1) \times (l_0-1)}(\mathbb{F}_q[x]).$$

This N also satisfies the condition (2).

Notice that the above operation does not change the g.c.d of the columns. Thus we know that the g.c.d. of the i th column of N is of degree:

$$\begin{cases} \geq \deg(d_1) + 1, & i = 1 \\ = \deg(d_i), & 2 \leq i \leq l_0 - 1 \\ = \deg(d_1), & i = l_0 \end{cases}$$

Thus we know that

$$\deg(\det(D_N)) \geq \deg(d_1) + \deg(d_2) + \dots + \deg(d_{l_0-1}) + 1 > \deg(\det(D_0)).$$

As well, notice that $\det(N) = \det(M_{max})$. Combining this with the fact that M_{max} satisfies the condition (1), we know that $\deg(\det(N)) = \deg(\det(M_0))$.

Above all, we see that $S_N \subset S_{M_0}$. Also, if the induction step works for N , it will work for M_0 . So, by our assumption, the induction step for N fails as well. Then we may apply the above lemma to N , i.e. S_N is not empty.

Pick up one element $N' \in S_N$ with attached $d'_1, d'_2, \dots, d'_{l_0-1}$. By the condition (1), we see that $N' \in S_{M_0}$ has strictly bigger $\deg(d'_1) + \deg(d'_2) + \dots + \deg(d'_{l_0-1})$ compared with M_{max} , which contradicts with our choice of M_{max} . Hence we have shown that the induction step for M_0 works.

4 Proof of Lemma 2.5

We shall prove this lemma 2.5 by induction both on n and the sum $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} k_i$.

The base case for $n = 1$ or $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} k_i = 0$ is trivial. It suffices to prove the induction step.

Pick up $n_0, k > 0$. Suppose the Lemma 2.5 holds for any n, k_1, \dots, k_n such that $n < n_0$ or $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} k_i < k$. Now we are going to attack the case that $n = n_0$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} k_i = k$.

Let's define $P_{n;k_1,k_2,\dots,k_n}$ to be

$$\{A = (a_{i,j}) \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : \deg(a_{i,j}) \leq k_j, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n; A_0 = I_n\}$$

For any $P_{n;k_1,k_2,\dots,k_n}$, let's rewrite A as $(\alpha_1 \ \alpha_2 \ \cdots \ \alpha_n)$ where α_i are column vectors in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$. Then we decompose these vectors in each degree as follows:

$$\alpha_i = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k_i} \alpha_i^{(j)} x^j, \alpha_i^{(j)} \in \mathbb{F}_q, i = 1, 2, \dots, n_0.$$

Notice that for any $A \in P_{n_0;k_1,k_2,\dots,k_{n_0}}$, we have $\det(A) \in \mathbb{F}_q$. By checking the degree $k_1 + k_2 + \cdots + k_{n_0}$ part, we know that $\det((\alpha_1^{k_1}, \alpha_2^{k_2}, \dots, \alpha_{n_0}^{k_{n_0}})) = 0$ which means $\alpha_1^{k_1}, \alpha_2^{k_2}, \dots, \alpha_{n_0}^{k_{n_0}}$ are linearly dependent.

Let's introduce one further definition before going back to main proof:

$$Q_{n_0;l_1,\dots,l_{n_0}}^i := \{A \in P_{n_0;l_1,l_2,\dots,l_{n_0}} : \begin{array}{l} \alpha_i^{(l_i)}, \dots, \alpha_{n_0}^{(l_{n_0})} \text{ are linearly dependent} \\ \alpha_{i+1}^{(l_{i+1})}, \dots, \alpha_{n_0}^{(l_{n_0})} \text{ are linearly independent} \end{array} \}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n_0$$

$$R_{n_0;l_1,\dots,l_{n_0}}^i := \{A \in P_{n_0;l_1,l_2,\dots,l_{n_0}} : \alpha_i^{(l_i)}, \dots, \alpha_{n_0}^{(l_{n_0})} \text{ are linearly dependent}\}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n_0$$

where

$$Q_{n_0;l_1,\dots,l_{n_0}}^{n_0} = P_{n_0;l_1,l_2,\dots,l_{n_0}-1} = R_{n_0;l_1,\dots,l_{n_0}}^{n_0} \quad (12)$$

Moreover, we have

$$R_{n_0;l_1,\dots,l_{n_0}}^i = \bigsqcup_{n_0 \geq j \geq i} Q_{n_0;l_1,\dots,l_{n_0}}^j. \quad (13)$$

With these notations, let's go back to the main proof.

Firstly, notice that we may assume $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \cdots \geq k_{n_0}$.

If $k_{n_0} = 0$, the number which we want to count is:

$$\#\{A = \begin{pmatrix} A' & 0 \\ * & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x]) : A' \in P_{n_0-1;k_1,k_2,\dots,k_{n_0-1}}\}.$$

The $*$ part does not affect the invertibility. It only subjects to degree restriction. Thus we know that the number we are exactly counting is

$$q^{k_1+k_2+\dots+k_{n_0-1}} \#P_{n_0-1;k_1,k_2,\dots,k_{n_0-1}}.$$

By induction hypothesis, we will get the result we want.

Now it suffices to deal with the case that $k_{n_0} \geq 1$.

Lemma 4.1. *Given a descending sequence $l_i \geq l_{i+1} \geq \cdots \geq l_{n_0} \geq 1, 2 \leq i \leq n$ and any nonnegative sequence l_1, \dots, l_{i-1} , we have*

$$\#R_{n_0;l_1,\dots,l_{n_0}}^i = \sum_{\tilde{l}=(\tilde{l}_i,\tilde{l}_{i+1},\dots,\tilde{l}_{n_0}) \in L} c_{\tilde{l}} \#P_{l_1,l_2,\dots,l_{i-1},\tilde{l}_i,\tilde{l}_{i+1},\dots,\tilde{l}_{n_0}} \quad (14)$$

where L is a set of $n_0 - i + 1$ tuples which only depends on $i, l_i, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{n_0}$ such that for any tuple $\tilde{l} \in L$, we have

$$\tilde{l}_i + \tilde{l}_{i+1} + \dots + \tilde{l}_{n_0} < l_i + l_{i+1} + \dots + l_{n_0}$$

and $c_{\tilde{l}}$ only depends on i and \tilde{l} .

Proof. Let's prove this lemma by induction on $n_0 - i$.

When $n_0 - i = 0$, we know that $R_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i$ is exactly $P_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{n_0} - 1}$ since a single vector is linearly dependent if and only if it's zero. Thus we may take $c_{\tilde{l}}$ to be 1 when $\tilde{l} = (l_1, \dots, l_{n_0} - 1)$ and to be 0 for other choices to make the formula works. Thus the base case is proved.

Now let's attack the induction step.

Notice that we can use the latter $n_0 - i$ columns to reduce elements in $Q_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i$ to elements in $P_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}, l_i - 1, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{n_0}} \setminus R_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}, l_i - 1, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{n_0}}^{i+1}$ (due to the ascending assumption). Let's call this map f .

And every element A in $P_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}, l_i - 1, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{n_0}} \setminus R_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}, l_i - 1, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{n_0}}^{i+1}$ can give us $p^{n_0 - i}$ different elements in $Q_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i$ which is exactly the preimage $f^{-1}(A)$.

Thus we know that:

$$\#Q_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i = q^{n_0 - i} (\#P_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}, l_i - 1, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{n_0}} - \#R_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}, l_i - 1, l_{i+1}, \dots, l_{n_0}}^{i+1}). \quad (15)$$

For the new sub-index of R , the last $n_0 - i$ sequences is still descending. So once we substitute identity (13) into (15), we are able to use the induction hypothesis to prove the induction step. \square

Corollary 4.2. *In addition to those conditions in Lemma 4.1, we further assume that $l_1 \geq 1$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} l_i \leq k$. Then we have*

$$\#R_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i = q^{n_0 - 1} \#R_{n_0; l_1 - 1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i. \quad (16)$$

Proof. Just use the induction hypothesis directly in the identity (14):

$$\begin{aligned} & \#R_{n_0; l_1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{l} = (\tilde{l}_1, \tilde{l}_2, \dots, \tilde{l}_{n_0}) \in L} c_{\tilde{l}} \#P_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{i-1}, \tilde{l}_i, \tilde{l}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{l}_{n_0}} \\ &= q^{n_0 - 1} \sum_{\tilde{l} = (\tilde{l}_1, \tilde{l}_2, \dots, \tilde{l}_{n_0}) \in L} c_{\tilde{l}} \#P_{l_1 - 1, l_2, \dots, l_{i-1}, \tilde{l}_i, \tilde{l}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{l}_{n_0}} \\ &= q^{n_0 - 1} \#R_{n_0; l_1 - 1, \dots, l_{n_0}}^i \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

\square

Let's take $i = 2$ and $l_j = k_j, 1 \leq j \leq n_0$ into the identity (16), we will get that

$$\#R_{n_0; k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}}^2 = q^{n_0 - 1} \#R_{n_0; k_1 - 1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}}^2 \quad (18)$$

Above all, we are able to make the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \#P_{n_0; k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}} \\
&= \#Q_{n_0; k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}}^1 + \#R_{n_0; k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}}^2 \\
&\stackrel{(15)}{=} q^{n_0-1} (\#P_{n_0; k_1-1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}} - \#R_{n_0; k_1-1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}}^2) + \#R_{n_0; k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}}^2 \\
&\stackrel{(16)}{=} q^{n_0-1} \#P_{n_0; k_1-1, k_2, \dots, k_{n_0}} \\
&= q^{\binom{n_0-1}{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} k_i}}
\end{aligned}$$

The last identity is due to the induction hypothesis. Now we are done with the induction step now.

References

- [BM83] Walter Borho and Robert MacPherson. Partial resolutions of nilpotent varieties. *Astérisque* 101-102, 23-74 (1983)., 1983.
- [DRS93] William Duke, Zeev Rudnick, and Peter Sarnak. Density of integer points on affine homogeneous varieties. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 71(1):143 – 179, 1993.
- [EM93] Alex Eskin and Curt McMullen. Mixing, counting, and equidistribution in Lie groups. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 71(1):181 – 209, 1993.
- [EMS96] Alex Eskin, Shahar Mozes, and Nimish Shah. Unipotent flows and counting lattice points on homogeneous varieties. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 143(2):253–299, 1996.
- [EMS97] Alex Eskin, Shahar Mozes, and Nimish Shah. Non-divergence of translates of certain algebraic measures. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(1):48–80, 1997.
- [HRV08] Tamás Hausel and Fernando Rodriguez-Villegas. Mixed Hodge polynomials of character varieties. With an appendix by Nicholas M. Katz. *Invent. Math.*, 174(3):555–624, 2008.