

ON THE SINGULAR VALUE DECOMPOSITION OVER FINITE FIELDS AND ORBITS OF $GU \times GU$

ROBERT M. GURALNICK

Dedicated to the memory of Tonny Springer

ABSTRACT. The singular value decomposition of a complex matrix is a fundamental concept in linear algebra and has proved extremely useful in many subjects. It is less clear what the situation is over a finite field. In this paper, we classify the orbits of $GU_m(q) \times GU_n(q)$ on $M_{m \times n}(q^2)$ (which is the analog of the singular value decomposition). The proof involves Kronecker's theory of pencils and the Lang-Steinberg theorem for algebraic groups. Besides the motivation mentioned above, this problem came up in a recent paper of Guralnick, Larsen and Tiep [7] where a concept of character level for the complex irreducible characters of finite, general or special, linear and unitary groups was studied and bounds on the number of orbits was needed. A consequence of this work determines possible pairs of Jordan forms for nilpotent matrices of the form AA^* and A^*A over a finite field and AA^\top and $A^\top A$ over arbitrary fields.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Hermitian Matrices over Finite Fields	4
3.	Quivers	5
4.	Algebraic Groups and Descent	7
5.	Orbits	8
6.	Further Remarks	10
	References	12

1. INTRODUCTION

The singular value decomposition of a complex $m \times n$ matrix A is a very fundamental topic and has applications in many areas of mathematics. The eigenvalues of A^*A are all non-negative real numbers. The singular values are the positive square roots of the nonzero eigenvalues of A^*A (which are the same as those of AA^*). This can be interpreted in terms of orbits of $GU_m(\mathbb{C}) \times GU_n(\mathbb{C})$ acting on $M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{C})$ (the action is given by $A \rightarrow XAY^*$). The result is that the orbits are in bijection with the similarity classes of A^*A (either under

Date: August 19, 2020.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 15B57, 15A18, 15A22, 20G15, 20G40.

Key words and phrases. singular value decomposition over finite fields.

The author was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1901595 and a Simons Foundation Fellowship.

GU or GL) and each orbit contains a unique matrix where the entries on the diagonal are non-negative and non-increasing and all other entries are 0.

This fundamental result is not hard to prove but it depends on the fact that any complex Hermitian matrix is diagonalizable with all eigenvalues real. The results hold for any algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 with respect to a (positive definite) inner product (and any two such are equivalent).

For many reasons, the result becomes much more complicated if the field is not algebraically closed or the characteristic is not 0. Even over \mathbb{C} , the result is more complicated if we consider Hermitian forms which are not definite (in particular, the stabilizer of the form is not compact). In this paper, we are interested in an analog for finite fields. In this case any two nondegenerate Hermitian forms are equivalent. This was asked about on math.overflow in November 2009 (and the answers indicated incorrectly that there was not much to say).

Fix a prime power q and let F be the field of q^2 and F_0 the subfield with q elements. Let K be an algebraic closure of F . We will completely characterize the orbits of $\mathrm{GU}_m(q) \times \mathrm{GU}_n(q)$ on $M_{m \times n}(q^2)$ and in particular give formulas for the number of orbits. This problem seems quite natural from a linear algebra point of view and was used in a recent paper of Guralnick, Larsen and Tiep [7] in proving some results about complex irreducible characters of $\mathrm{GU}_m(q)$ and $\mathrm{SU}_m(q)$.

The problem essentially reduces to two cases. The first is the case $m = n$ and A is invertible. In this case, it is easy to see that an analog of the complex case holds: the orbits are determined by the conjugacy class of A^*A . Thus, the orbits of invertible matrices are in bijection with the conjugacy classes of $\mathrm{GL}_n(q)$ as well as the unitary orbits on nondegenerate Hermitian matrices.

The second case is when A^*A is nilpotent (for definite Hermitian forms over \mathbb{C} , this does not occur unless $A = 0$). In this case, the number of orbits, $f(m, n)$, is independent of q (and the characteristic). We will give a formula for $f(m, n)$ in terms of partitions. In this case, it is not true that the orbit is determined by the similarity classes of A^*A (or even the pair of similarity classes A^*A and AA^*).

The proof has two basic ingredients. The first is the classification of the representations a certain quiver (closely related to Kronecker's theory of matrix pencils). This gives the orbits of the action of $\mathrm{GL}_m(K) \times \mathrm{GL}_n(K)$ on $M_{m \times n}(K) \times M_{n \times m}(K)$ (where the action is given by $(A, B) \rightarrow (XAY^{-1}, YBX^{-1})$). We then use the Lang-Steinberg theorem (and the fact that stabilizers are connected) to determine the orbits of $\mathrm{GU}_m(q) \times \mathrm{GU}_n(q)$ on $M_{m \times n}(q^2)$.

We now state our main results. It is slightly more convenient to state some of the results in terms of linear transformations rather than matrices. So fix a pair of vector spaces W, V over F of dimensions m and n with nondegenerate Hermitian forms on each. If $T : V \rightarrow W$ is an F -linear transformation, then we can define $T^* : W \rightarrow V$ by $(Tv, w) = (v, T^*w)$ for $v \in V$ and $w \in W$ (the first inner product is defined on W and the second on V). If we choose orthonormal bases for V and W , then the matrix of T^* is obtained by the matrix of T in the usual way.

The first (quite elementary) result shows how we reduce to the two cases.

Theorem 1.1. . *Let $T : V \rightarrow W$ be a linear transformation. Then there are canonical decompositions $V = V_0 \perp V_1$ and $W = W_0 \perp W_1$ such that*

- (1) $\dim V_0 = \dim W_0$, $TV_0 = W_0$, $T^*W_0 = V_0$ (so T^*T is bijective on V_0);
- (2) $TV_1 \subset W_1$, $T^*W_1 \subset V_1$ and T^*T is nilpotent on V_1 .

The invertible case is quite easy. There is no harm in assuming that $W = V$ and the Hermitian forms are the same. If G is a finite group, let $k(G)$ denote the number of conjugacy classes of G .

Theorem 1.2. *Let $T : V \rightarrow V$ be an invertible linear transformation.*

- (1) T^*T is conjugate to an element of $GL_n(q)$;
- (2) Any element of $GL_n(q)$ is conjugate to T^*T for some $T \in GL_n(q^2)$;
- (3) The map $T \rightarrow T^*T$ induces bijections between the orbits of $GU_n(q) \times GU_n(q)$ on $GL_n(q^2)$ and conjugacy classes of $GL_n(q)$ and $GU_n(q)$ orbits on invertible Hermitian matrices;
- (4) The number of orbits is $k(GL_n(q))$.

We will describe the nilpotent orbits explicitly, but for now we just note:

Theorem 1.3. *The number of orbits of $GU(V) \times GU(W)$ on F -linear maps T from V to W such that T^*T is nilpotent is a function $f(m, n)$ independent of q .*

We give a formula $f(m, n)$ in Section 5. It is easy to see that we have $f(m, d) = f(m, 2m)$ for any $d \geq 2m$ (and clearly $f(m, n)$ does not decrease as n increases). Also, it follows that all such orbits have representatives over the prime field.

Combining the two previous results gives:

Corollary 1.4. *Assume that $m \leq n$. The number of orbits of $GU_m(q) \times GU_n(q)$ is*

$$\sum_{i=0}^m f(m-i, n-i)k(GL_i(q)).$$

Note that $k(GL_i(q))$ is very close to q^i (but less than q^i) and in particular is a monic polynomial in q of degree i [11]. Thus, the total number of orbits is a monic polynomial in q of degree m .

Next, we note an analog of Flanders' theorem (see below for the statement). If N is a nilpotent square matrix of size n , we let $\mu(N) = \mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_r$ be the partition of n associated to the Jordan form of N (for convenience of notation we allow the possibility of $\mu_j = 0$).

The theorem of Flanders [4] (see also [8]) is:

Theorem 1.5. [Flanders] *Let L be a field and m, n positive integers. Let λ be a partition of m and μ a partition of n . There exist $A \in M_{m \times n}(L)$ and $B \in M_{n \times m}(L)$ with AB nilpotent such that $\mu(AB) = \lambda$ and $\mu(BA) = \mu$ if and only if $|\lambda_i - \mu_i| \leq 1$ for all i .*

Note that this result follows immediately from the classification of the representations of the appropriate quiver (and in particular from Kronecker's theorem).

We consider the same problem for A^*A and AA^* . We note that not every possible pair of partitions allowed by Flanders' Theorem can occur. For example, if $d > 1$ and A is a $d \times d$

matrix over a finite field, then it cannot be the case that both AA^* and A^*A are nilpotent matrices with a single Jordan block. In order to state the result, we need to introduce some notation.

Let α be a partition of m and β a partition on n . Let $\gamma = \gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ be the partition where parts are the $\alpha_i = \beta_i > 0$. If $\lambda = \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r > 0$, a component of λ is a maximal consecutive subsequence of the parts of λ such that the difference of any two consecutive pieces is at most 1.

Theorem 1.6. *Let α be a partition of m and β a partition of n . There exists $A \in M_{m \times n}(q^2)$ so that AA^* is nilpotent and $\mu(A^*A) = \beta$ and $\mu(AA^*) = \alpha$ if and only if*

- (1) $|\alpha_i - \beta_i| \leq 1$ for all i ; and
- (2) Every connected component of $\gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ not involving 1 has even length.

If A is a matrix over a finite field F_0 , let F be a quadratic field extension. Then viewing A as a matrix over F , we have $A^\top = A^*$. Thus, the previous result applies to $A^\top A$ as well (over finite fields). By standard arguments, this gives the following result over an arbitrary field.

Corollary 1.7. *Let K be a field. Let α be a partition of m and β a partition of n . If there exists $A \in M_{m \times n}(K)$ so that AA^\top is nilpotent and $\mu(A^\top A) = \beta$ and $\mu(AA^\top) = \alpha$, then*

- (1) $|\alpha_i - \beta_i| \leq 1$ for all i ; and
- (2) Every connected component of $\gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ not involving 1 has even length.

Over an arbitrary field, given two partitions satisfying the two conditions above, one cannot in general find an A with $A^\top A$ nilpotent and $\alpha(A^\top A)$ and $\beta(AA^\top)$ as specified (e.g. over \mathbb{R} but also over any field where -1 is not a square). It is not hard to show that if -1 is a square in F , then the converse does hold and in particular holds over an algebraically closed field.

The paper is organized as follows. We first recall some basic results about Hermitian matrices over a finite fields. In the following section, we recall some general results about quivers with particular attention to the quiver associated to Kronecker's theory. We then recall some basic results about algebraic groups and passing between finite groups and algebraic groups. In the next section, we prove the main results and give a formula for the number of orbits. In the final section, we make some further remarks.

2. HERMITIAN MATRICES OVER FINITE FIELDS

We recall some easy facts about Hermitian matrices over finite fields. See [5, Lemma 3.1]. We give a quick proof.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $A \in M_n(q^2)$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) A is similar to a Hermitian matrix.
- (2) A is similar to a matrix in $M_n(q)$.

Moreover, if A and B are Hermitian matrices, they are similar as matrices if and only if they are conjugate by an element of $\text{GU}_n(q)$.

Proof. If A is similar to a Hermitian matrix, then it is similar to its conjugate via the q -Frobenius map (because any matrix is similar to its transpose). Thus, all the invariant factors of A are defined over \mathbb{F}_q , whence A is similar to a matrix in $M_n(q)$.

Suppose that A is similar to $B \in M_n(q)$. Then there exists a symmetric matrix $S \in GL_n(q)$ with $SB = B^\top S = B^*S$ [17]. Thus, B is self adjoint with respect to the Hermitian form induced by S , whence B is conjugate to a Hermitian matrix.

The last statement follows by the Lang-Steinberg theorem (see below) and is proved in [5, Lemma 3.1]. \square

The next result follows from the the primary decomposition for a matrix and the previous result that any two Hermitian matrices which have the same rational canonical form are conjugate via an element of the unitary group.

Corollary 2.2. *Let V be a vector space over the field F of q^2 elements equipped with a nondegenerate Hermitian form. Let F_0 be the subfield of size q . Let T be a Hermitian linear transformation on V (i.e. self adjoint with respect to the Hermitian form). Then there is a unique decomposition $V = V_1 \perp V_2 \perp \dots \perp V_r$ where $T(V_i) = V_i$ and the characteristic polynomial of T on V_i is a power of the monic irreducible polynomial $f_i(x) \in F_0[x]$ with $f_i(x) \neq f_j(x)$ for $i \neq j$. In particular, there is a unique decomposition $V = X \perp Y$ with $TX = X$ and $TY \subset Y$ with T nilpotent on Y .*

The next result follows easily from the fact that any nondegenerate form has an orthonormal basis.

Lemma 2.3. *If D is a rank r Hermitian matrix in $M_m(q^2)$, then $D = X^*X$ for some $X \in M_{r \times m}(q^2)$.*

3. QUIVERS

We first recall some facts about quivers and their representations. We refer the reader to [1, 2, 3, 12] for more details. All quivers considered will be finite.

Fix a field k and let Q be a quiver (i.e. a finite directed graph). Let $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be the vertex set of the graph and let E denote the set of edges of Q .

A (finite dimensional) representation of Q (over k) is an assignment of finite dimensional vector spaces $V_i, i \in I$ and for each edge $e \in E$ from i to j , a linear transformation T_e from V_i to V_j . The dimension vector of such a representation is the vector $(\dim V_1, \dots, \dim V_n)$. If we fix the dimension vector, there is no harm in considering only representations where the vector spaces V_i are fixed.

Note that $G := GL(V_1) \times \dots \times GL(V_n)$ acts the set of representations (for fixed V_i) in the obvious way. Two representations are equivalent if they are in the same G -orbit. Note also that the representations of Q are in bijection with modules over the path algebra $k[Q]$ of the quiver. If we consider representations with a fixed dimension vector, we can then fix the spaces V_i . In that case, there is a bijection between modules and G -orbits. The next result is a special case of the Noether-Deuring Theorem (see [10, 19.25]).

Lemma 3.1. *Let Q be a quiver and let k be a field. If two representations of Q defined over k become isomorphic over some field extension k' of k , then they are already isomorphic over k .*

Here are some other basic facts that we will require.

Lemma 3.2. *If k is algebraically closed and Q is a quiver, then the centralizer in G of a given representation of a quiver Q is a connected algebraic group.*

Proof. We first work in $A := \text{End}(V_1) \times \dots \times \text{End}(V_n)$. Note that the centralizer of a representation in this algebra is a subalgebra of A (i.e. the endomorphism ring of the module over the path algebra) and the centralizer is G is the unit group of this algebra and so is connected (since it is Zariski dense in the subalgebra). \square

The next result shows that reversing the direction of edges does not really make a big difference in the representation theory.

Lemma 3.3. *If k is a finite field and Q is a quiver, then the number of equivalence classes of representations of Q for a fixed dimension vector depends only on Q as an undirected graph.*

Proof. We may fix the $V_i, i \in I$. Let $g := (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G$. The representations of Q with the V_i fixed is a linear space and as a kG -module is isomorphic to a direct sum of $V_i \otimes V_j^*$ (one term for each edge from i to j).

If we reverse one edge it has the effect of replacing one $V_i \otimes V_j^*$ by $V_j \otimes V_i^*$.

We claim that the number of fixed points of g depends only Q as undirected graph – i.e. the direction of each edge does not change this number. It suffices to consider the case where we reverse precisely one arrow. Since the kG -modules are a direct sum, we see the problem reduces to showing that (g_i, g_j) has the same number of fixed points on $V_i \otimes V_j^*$ and $V_j \otimes V_i^*$.

This follows from the more general fact that we have a finite group H and W is a finite dimensional kH -modules, then for any $h \in H$, h has the same number of fixed points on W as on W^* . This is because the dual representation is obtained by applying transpose inverse to the original representation and a matrix and its transpose are conjugate in GL .

Now the result follows by Burnside's Lemma (due to Frobenius): the number of orbits of a finite group acting on a finite set is the average number of fixed points of an element in the group. \square

We are interested in a very special easy case. We first consider the quiver Q with two vertices $\{1, 2\}$ with two edges each going from 1 to 2. In this case, the representations of Q correspond to pairs (or pencils) of linear transformations S, T from V_1 to V_2 and were classified by Kronecker (see [13, 6]). Let $d_i = \dim V_i$.

In particular the indecomposable representations are (up to equivalence) the following:

- (1) $d_1 = d_2 = d$, $S = I$ and T is the companion matrix of a monic polynomial $f(x)$ which is a power of an irreducible polynomial in $k[x]$ (other than x);
- (2) $d_1 = d_2 = d$, $S = I$ and T is a single nilpotent Jordan block;
- (3) $d_1 = d_2 = d$, $T = I$ and S is a single nilpotent Jordan block;

- (4) $d = d_2 = d_1 - 1$ with $d_1 \geq 1$. Let e_0, \dots, e_d be a basis for V_1 and f_1, \dots, f_d be a basis for V_2 . Let $Se_i = f_i$ for $i > 0$ and $Se_0 = 0$ and $Tf_i = e_{i-1}$;
- (5) $d = d_1 = d_2 - 1$ and S and T are interchanged from the previous case.

For our purposes, we want to study the quiver Q with two vertices 1, 2 over a field k and two maps $S : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ and $T : V_2 \rightarrow V_1$.

It is known that representations of the two quivers have almost identical descriptions. We deduce the second case from the first. We will work over a finite field (but one can extend the analysis to the case of general fields).

Now we write down some indecomposable modules for our second quiver. They are quite closely related to the first. We will show that this is a complete set of indecomposables.

Theorem 3.4. *Let k be a finite field. The indecomposable finite dimensional modules for $k[Q]$ with Q as above are:*

- (1) $d_1 = d_2 = d$, $S = I$ and T is the companion matrix of a monic polynomial $f(x) \in k[x]$ that is power of an irreducible polynomial in $k[x]$ (other than x);
- (2) $d_1 = d_2 = d$, $S = I$ and T is a single nilpotent Jordan block;
- (3) $d_1 = d_2 = d$, $T = I$ and S is a single nilpotent Jordan block;
- (4) $d = d_2 = d_1 - 1$ with $d_1 \geq 1$. Let e_0, \dots, e_d be a basis for V_1 and f_1, \dots, f_d be a basis for V_2 . Let $Se_i = f_i$ for $i > 0$ and $Se_0 = 0$ and $Tf_i = e_{i-1}$;
- (5) $d = d_1 = d_2 - 1$ and S and T are interchanged from the previous case.

Proof. It is easy to see that the above representations are indecomposable (consider the products ST and TS – they are indecomposable in each case) and there is an obvious bijection between the indecomposables given above and for the other quiver with two arrows in the same direction. Note this bijection preserves dimension vectors. Since any representation is (up to equivalence) uniquely a direct sum of indecomposable representations, it follows that the number of inequivalent representations of Q with a fixed dimension vector that involves only the indecomposables described above is the same as the total number of inequivalent representations of the Kronecker quiver with the same dimension vector. Now by Lemma 3.3, this accounts for all representations and the result holds. \square

In fact, the assumption that k is finite is superfluous. This can be seen by splitting the problem into two parts – the case where $\dim V_1 = \dim V_2$ and ST is invertible and the case where ST is nilpotent. We will not pursue this since our interest is in the case of finite fields.

We denote these indecomposables by $I[f]$, $J[d]$, $J'[d]$, $R[d]$ and $R'[d]$. The two obvious invariants associated to a representation are the dimension vector and the similarity classes of ST and TS (and these determine the dimension vector). For the indecomposables, these uniquely determine the module aside from $J[d]$ and $J'[d]$.

4. ALGEBRAIC GROUPS AND DESCENT

We recall some basic facts about algebraic groups over an algebraically closed field K of characteristic $p > 0$. We refer the reader to [14, 15, 16]. If σ is endomorphism of an algebraic group G , we let G_σ be the fixed point set of σ on G . The next result was proved in a special case by Lang and in general by Steinberg [16].

Theorem 4.1. *Let G be a connected algebraic group over K . If σ is an endomorphism of G with G_σ finite, then the map $g \rightarrow g^{-1}\sigma(g)$ is surjective.*

It also follows that any endomorphism σ with only a finite number of fixed points is an abstract automorphism of G . The previous result can be reformulated in the following way. Set $H = \langle G, \sigma \rangle$. Then all elements in the coset $\sigma G = G\sigma$ are conjugate via an element of G .

If a group H acts on a set W and $w \in W$, we let $C_H(w)$ be the stabilizer of w in H . The next well known result is an easy consequence of the Lang-Steinberg theorem.

Corollary 4.2. *Let G be a connected algebraic group over K and let σ be an endomorphism of G with G_σ finite. Let $H := \langle G, \sigma \rangle$. Assume that H acts on an irreducible algebraic variety Z with G and σ acting algebraically. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a G -orbit.*

- (1) σ fixes Y if and only if $\sigma(y) = y$ for some $y \in Y$.
- (2) Let Y be a σ invariant orbit of G on X . If $C_G(y)$ is connected for $y \in Y$, then Y_σ is a single G_σ orbit.

Proof. Clearly, if σ fixes a point of Y , it fixes the orbit (as it permutes the orbits). Conversely if $\sigma y \in Y$, for some $y \in Y$, then $\sigma y = gy$ for some $g \in G$, whence $g^{-1}\sigma$ has a fixed point on Y . Since $g^{-1}\sigma$ is conjugate to σ , σ has a fixed point on Y as well.

Let Y be a σ invariant orbit and $y, z \in Y_\sigma$ with $C := C_G(y)$ is connected. Note that C is σ invariant. So $z = gy$ for some $g \in G$ and applying σ we see that $z = \sigma(g)y$. Thus, $g^{-1}\sigma(g) \in C$. Since C is connected, $g^{-1}\sigma(g) = c^{-1}\sigma(c)$ for some $c \in C$. Hence $gc^{-1} \in G_\sigma$ and $gy = gc^{-1}y = z$, whence y and z are in the G_σ orbit. \square

5. ORBITS

Let k be a field of characteristic p . Let $m \leq n$ be positive integers. We consider the action of $G := GL_m(k) \times GL_n(k)$ acting on $W := M_{m \times n}(k) \times M_{n \times m}$ given by

$$(X, Y)(A, B) := (XAY^{-1}, YBX^{-1}).$$

As we noted earlier, two invariants of the orbit containing (A, B) are the conjugacy class of AB and the conjugacy class of BA . The indecomposable orbits are described in Section 3. It follows from the description that the indecomposables are determined by these two invariants aside from the cases where the orbits have representative (I, J_d) and (J_d, I) where J_d is a single nilpotent Jordan block of size d . These orbits both have invariants J_d, J_d .

We first recall (from the section on quivers):

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that k is algebraically closed. The stabilizer of a point (A, B) is connected.*

We now work over the finite field F of q^2 -elements. Let k be the algebraic closure of F .

Let σ denote the q -Frobenius map on G (on each factor) and let τ be the graph automorphism (i.e. the transpose inverse map) on each factor of G . Let $H = \langle G, \sigma, \tau \rangle$. We extend the action of G to H on W as follows:

- (1) $\sigma(A, B) = (\sigma(A), \sigma(B))$; and
- (2) $\tau(A, B) = (B^\top, A^\top)$.

It is straightforward to check this gives an action of H on W .

Let $\rho = \sigma\tau$. Then ρ is an endomorphism of G with fixed point group $G_\rho = GU_m(q) \times GU_n(q)$. Note that ρ fixes (A, B) if and only if $A = \sigma(B^\top)$ and $B = \sigma(A^\top)$. This implies that A and B are fixed by σ^2 and so are matrices over F . Thus, we see that $W_\rho = \{(A, A^*) | A \in M_{m \times n}(q^2)\}$.

By Corollary 4.2(1), the orbits of G_ρ on W_ρ correspond to the ρ stable orbits. An invertible orbit containing (I, B) is stable if and only B is similar to an invertible Hermitian matrix (equivalently to a matrix over the field of q elements). The nilpotent orbits are all defined over the prime field and so are all fixed by σ . Thus, it suffices to see how τ acts on the indecomposable nilpotent orbits. The ones with dimension vector $(d, d \pm 1)$ are uniquely determined by their dimension vector and so are invariant. The other indecomposable nilpotent orbits have representatives (I, J_d) or (J_d, I) for some d (where J_d is the matrix consisting of single Jordan block) and clearly τ interchanges the orbits of (I, J_d) and (J_d, I) .

Thus, we see that the orbits of G_ρ on W_ρ must have the same number of terms for those orbits, no other condition on the nilpotent orbits and the invertible part must correspond to a similarity class defined over the field of q elements.

We can now give a formula for the number of orbits. As noted in the introduction, it suffices to do this in the case of nilpotent orbits. (i.e. AA^* is nilpotent). Let $p(d)$ be the number of partitions of d .

From the above discussion, we see that every nilpotent orbit on $M_{m \times n}(q^2)$ can be written uniquely as direct sum of 4 pieces. Choose nonnegative integers m_1, m_2, m_3 so that $m_1 + m_2 + 2m_3 = m$. The first piece would correspond to the orbit (for the algebraic group) to $\sum R[\lambda_i]$ where the λ_i form a partition of m_1 , the second piece to $\sum R'[\lambda_i]$ where the λ_i form a partition of m_2 and the third piece to $\sum J[\lambda_i] + J'[\lambda_i]$ where the λ_i form a partition of m_3 . The fourth piece is just a sum of some number of copies of $J'[1]$ to make sure the matrix has the right size. If $n \geq 2m$, all such decompositions are possible. If $n < 2m$, then there is an extra condition (that the corresponding partitions for the columns is no more than n) and so there will be fewer orbits. This gives:

Corollary 5.2. *Let m, n be positive integers. Assume that $n \geq 2m$. The number of nilpotent orbits of $GU(m, q) \times GU(n, q)$ on $M_{m \times n}(F)$ is:*

$$\sum p(m_1)p(m_2)p(m_3),$$

where the sum is over all triples of non-negative integers m_i with $m_1 + m_2 + 2m_3 = m$.

One can easily work out a similar formula for the case that $n < 2m$.

We can now easily prove Theorem 1.6 about the possible canonical forms for AA^* and A^*A . The proof is by induction on the number of "indecomposable" summands. If the orbit is indecomposable the result is clear.

If $mn = 0$, the result is clear. So assume this is not the case.

Suppose first that $\alpha_1 \neq \beta_1$ and $\alpha_1\beta_1 > 1$. Suppose that $\alpha_1 > \beta_1$. This forces the orbit to have an indecomposable summand $R[\alpha_1]$. Remove this piece and use induction to conclude the result. A symmetric argument handles the case that $\beta_1 > \alpha_1$.

Suppose that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$. If $\alpha_1 = 1$ and there is no condition to satisfy. So assume that $\alpha_1 = d > 1$. Then there must be a summand of the form $J[\alpha_1] + J'[\alpha_1]$ or $R[\alpha_1] + R'[\alpha_1]$. Remove this piece and use induction.

Conversely, we can construct any admissible pair of partitions by reversing the argument.

We now prove Corollary 1.7. So let α and β be partitions of m and n . Suppose that there exists $A \in M_{m \times n}(F)$ with AA^\top nilpotent and $\mu(AA^\top) = \alpha$ and $\mu(A^\top A) = \beta$. We first work over a finite field F . Let E be a quadratic extension of F . Then $A^\top = A^*$ (with respect to the nontrivial automorphism of E/F) and so Theorem 1.6 gives the result. This shows that the only allowable possibilities for α, β over the algebraic closure of F are as given.

By a usual compactness argument (quite elementary in this case), this shows the same is true over any algebraically closed field and the result follows. It is clear that not every possibility can be achieved over an arbitrary field (e.g. over \mathbb{R} or more generally a field in which -1 is not a square). If -1 is a square, in fact every possibility can be realized as we shall see later.

6. FURTHER REMARKS

We first give an elementary proof of the decomposition into invertible and nilpotent parts. The result already follows from the results of the previous section on orbits.

Let F be a finite field with q^2 elements. Let V, W be finite dimensional vector spaces equipped with nondegenerate Hermitian forms.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $T : V \rightarrow W$ be an F -linear transformation. Then there exist canonical decompositions $V = V_1 \perp V_2$ and $W = W_1 \perp W_2$ with $TV_1 = W_1$ bijective and $TV_2 \subset W_2$ and T^*T nilpotent on V_2 .*

Proof. Let $S = T^*T$. Then S is an Hermitian operator on V . Thus, $V = V_1 \perp V_2$ where S is invertible on V_1 and S is nilpotent on V_2 (e.g. V_1 is the image of sufficiently large power M of S and V_2 is the kernel of the same power).

It follows that $\ker(T) \cap V_1 = 0$. Let $W_1 = TV_1$. We claim that W_1 is nonsingular. If $(Tv_1, Tv_2) = 0$ with $v_1, v_2 \in V_1$, then $(T^*Tv_1, v_2) = 0$ and if this holds for all $v_1 \in V_1$, then as $S = T^*T$ is bijective on V_1 we see that $v_2 \in V_1 \cap V_2^\perp = 0$ and the claim is proved.

A similar argument shows that W_1 is orthogonal to TV_2 and so $TV_2 \subset W_2 := W_1^\perp$. This completes the proof. \square

Suppose we are given T . Let $X = T^*T$ and $Y = TT^*$. Note that the orbit of T contains S with S^*S any Hermitian matrix similar to X and SS^* similar to Y . In particular, if X and Y are similar (whence we are working with square matrices), there is an element in the orbit with $S^*S = SS^*$ (and so S commutes with S^* , i.e. S is normal). We record this:

Lemma 6.2. *Let $T : V \rightarrow V$ be an F -linear transformation. Then the orbit of T contains a normal matrix if and only if T^*T and TT^* are similar. In particular, this is always the case if T is invertible.*

It follows from the classification in the last section that it is possible for T^*T to be a single Jordan block of size $n > 1$ and then necessarily TT^* would have two Jordan blocks of sizes $n - 1$ and 1 and so there are no normal matrices in the orbit.

If T is invertible, by the classification and the previous lemma, we can reduce to the case where $H := T^*T$ is non-derogatory (i.e. the minimal and characteristic polynomials coincide) and T is normal. Thus, $T = f(H)$ is a polynomial in H and $T^* = \bar{f}(H)$.

For the nilpotent case, there do not seem to be "nice" canonical normal forms, but we give a different proof for the existence in the indecomposable case.

Lemma 6.3. *Fix a positive integer d . If H is a Hermitian $d \times d$ matrix in $M_d(F)$ of rank $d - 1$, then there exists a column vector v of size d such that $H - vv^*$ is invertible.*

Proof. Suppose $Hw = vv^*w$ with $w \neq 0$. Then either $w \in \ker(H)$ and $v^*w = 0$ or v is in the image of H . Thus, we just need to guarantee that there is a vector v outside the hyperplane $\text{im}(H)$ and $v^*w \neq 0$ for $0 \neq w \in \ker(H)$. This is true since a finite dimensional vector space is not the union of two proper subspaces. \square

Corollary 6.4. *Fix a positive integer d . Then there exists $B \in M_{d \times d+1}(F)$ such that BB^* and B^*B are nilpotent matrices with a single Jordan block.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, there exists an Hermitian $d \times d$ matrix over F so that H is nilpotent with a single Jordan block. By the previous result, there exist a column vector of size d with $H + vv^*$ invertible. So $H - vv^* = AA^*$ for some $A \in GL_d(F)$ by Lemma 2.3.

Set $B = [A|v] \in M_{d \times d+1}(F)$. Then. $BB^* = AA^* + vv^* = H$ is nilpotent with a single Jordan block. Thus B^*B is nilpotent. Since B has rank d , it follows that B^*B has a 1 dimensional kernel (since B^* is injective and B has a 1 dimensional null space). Thus, B^*B is a single Jordan block. \square

Now assume that we are over an arbitrarily field K and $*$ is replaced by transpose. The same proof applies with H replaced by a symmetric matrix. We note any that nonzero square matrix (in particular any nilpotent matrix) is similar to a symmetric matrix (over some extension field) [17]. Over some extension field any symmetric matrix (in characteristic 2, we also need to ensure the matrix is not skew) can be written as AA^T (again possibly passing to an extension field). This yields:

Corollary 6.5. *Let K be an algebraically closed field. Fix a positive integer d . Then there exists $B \in M_{d \times d+1}(K)$ such that BB^T and $B^T B$ are both nilpotent matrices with a single Jordan block.*

This shows that the necessary condition of Corollary 1.7 is also sufficient at least over some extension field. In fact, all that is required is that -1 is a square in the field (and thinking of the 1×2 this is necessary). We sketch the proof of this.

Let J be a nilpotent $d \times d$ matrix over a field K that is a single Jordan block (taking J to have 1's just above the diagonal). Let. S be the symmetric matrix with the only nonzero entries being 1 on the anti-diagonal. Then $SJ = J^T S$ and so J is a self adjoint operator with respect to the bilinear form given by S .

If the characteristic is not 2 and -1 is a square, then $S = X^T X$ for some X . (i.e S is congruent to I). Thus, some conjugate L of J is symmetric and moreover the Gram matrix of this form is easily seen to be congruent to $\text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, 0)$ (this is again using that -1 is a square).

In characteristic 2, the same argument applies for d odd, but if d is even, then S is skew symmetric and the argument does not apply. In that case, we replace S by $S(I + J)$ which will be symmetric and invertible with nonzero trace. In a perfect field of characteristic 2, any invertible symmetric matrix that is not skew can be written as $X^\top X$.

Thus, $L + vv^\top$ is congruent to I and so can be written as $Y^\top Y$. Now argue as above.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Crawley-Boevey, Lectures on representations of quivers, preprint.
- [2] H. Derksen and J. Weyman, An introduction to quiver representations, GSM, 184, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2017.
- [3] V. Dlab and C. M. Ringel, Representations of graphs and algebras. Carleton Mathematical Lecture Notes, No. 8. Department of Mathematics, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- [4] H. Flanders, Elementary divisors of AB and BA , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 2 (1951), 871–874.
- [5] J. Fulman and R. Guralnick, Enumeration of commuting pairs in Lie algebras over finite fields, Annals Comb. 22 (2018), 295–316.
- [6] F. R. Gantmacher, Matrix Theory, vol. 2, Chelsea, New York, 1977.
- [7] R. Guralnick, M. Larsen and P. Tiep, Character levels and character bounds, Forum of Mathematics, Pi (2020), Vol. 8, e2, 81 pages, doi:10.1017/fmp.2019.9.
- [8] C. R. Johnson and E. A. Schreiner, The Relationship Between AB and BA , The American Mathematical Monthly Vol. 103. (1996), 578–582.
- [9] A. Kirillov, Jr., Quiver representations and quiver varieties, GSM, 174, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2016.
- [10] T. Y. Lam, A first course in noncommutative rings. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 131. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [11] D. Maslen and D. Rockmore, Separation of variables and the computation of Fourier transforms on finite groups. I, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 10 (1997), 169–214.
- [12] R. Schiffler, Quiver representations, CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [13] C. de Seguins Pazzis, Invariance of simultaneous similarity and equivalence of matrices under extension of the ground field, Linear Alg. Appl. 433 (2010), 618–624.
- [14] T. A. Springer, Linear algebraic groups. Second edition. Progress in Mathematics, 9. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1998.
- [15] T. A. Springer and R. Steinberg, Conjugacy classes, 1970 Seminar on Algebraic Groups and Related Finite Groups, pp. 167–266 Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 131, Springer, Berlin
- [16] R. Steinberg, On theorems of Lie-Kolchin, Borel, and Lang, Contributions to algebra (collection of papers dedicated to Ellis Kolchin), pp. 349–354. Academic Press, New York, 1977.
- [17] O. Taussky and H. Zassenhaus, On the similarity transformation between a matrix and its transpose, Pacific J. Math. 9 (1959), 893–896.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-2532, USA

E-mail address: guralnic@usc.edu