

# POLYNOMIAL MATRICES, SPLITTING SUBSPACES AND KRYLOV SUBSPACES OVER FINITE FIELDS

DIVYA AGGARWAL AND SAMRITH RAM

ABSTRACT. Let  $T$  be a linear operator on an  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -vector space  $V$  of dimension  $n$ . For any divisor  $m$  of  $n$ , an  $m$ -dimensional subspace  $W$  of  $V$  is  $T$ -splitting if

$$V = W \oplus TW \oplus \cdots \oplus T^{d-1}W,$$

where  $d = n/m$ . Let  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  denote the number of  $m$ -dimensional  $T$ -splitting subspaces. Determining  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  for an arbitrary operator  $T$  is an open problem. This problem is closely related to another open problem on Krylov spaces. We discuss this connection and give explicit formulae for  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  in the case where the invariant factors of  $T$  satisfy certain degree conditions. A connection with another enumeration problem on polynomial matrices is also discussed.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Existence of Splitting Subspaces	4
3. Splitting Subspaces and Polynomial Matrices	5
4. Splitting Subspaces and Centralizers	8
References	11

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Denote by  $\mathbb{F}_q$  the finite field with  $q$  elements and by  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$  the  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -algebra of polynomials in the indeterminate  $x$ . In what follows,  $n, k, m, d$  will denote positive integers unless otherwise stated. For any ring  $R$ , the set of all  $n \times k$  matrices over  $R$  is denoted by  $M_{n,k}(R)$  while  $M_n(R)$  indicates the ring of  $n \times n$  matrices over  $R$ . In what follows, we will always assume  $k \leq n$ . Define

$$M_q(n, k, d) := \{x^d I + x^{d-1} C_{d-1} + \cdots + C_0 : C_i \in M_{n,k}(\mathbb{F}_q)\},$$

where  $I$  denotes the  $n \times k$  matrix whose  $(i, j)$ -th entry is 1 if  $i = j$  and 0 otherwise. Evidently any element of  $M_q(n, k, d)$  is a polynomial with matrix coefficients which may also be viewed as a single  $n \times k$  matrix over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  whose entries are polynomials in  $x$ . Given elements  $P, Q \in M_q(n, k, d)$  write  $P \sim Q$  ( $P$  is equivalent to  $Q$ ) if there exist invertible matrices  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$  and  $B \in M_k(\mathbb{F}_q[x])$  such that  $APB = Q$ . It can be shown that each  $P \in M_q(n, k, d)$  is equivalent to a diagonal matrix

$$P \sim \text{diag}_{n,k}(p_1, \dots, p_k),$$

where  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  are monic polynomials over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  satisfying  $p_i \mid p_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i < k$ . This diagonal form is called the Smith Normal Form [16, p. 260] of  $P$ . By a  $k$ -tuple of invariant factors, we mean a  $k$ -tuple  $\mathcal{I} = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$  where each  $f_i$  is a monic

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A15, 11T99, 15B33, 05A05.

*Key words and phrases.* splitting subspace, Krylov space, antiinvariant subspace, polynomial matrix, invariant factor, finite field.

polynomial over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and  $f_i \mid f_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ . Given a  $k$ -tuple  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$  of invariant factors, define

$$\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I}) := |\{P \in M_q(n, k, d) : P \sim \text{diag}_{n,k}(p_1, \dots, p_k)\}|.$$

In other words,  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  is the number of elements in  $M_q(n, k, d)$  whose Smith form comprises precisely the polynomials appearing in  $\mathcal{I}$  as diagonal entries. The quantity  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  is the main object of study in this paper. Determination of  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  given an arbitrary assignment of the parameters in full generality is an open problem. To underscore the significance of studying  $\mu_q$  we briefly mention specific cases in the literature where it has been considered previously in the context of group theory, probability theory, unimodularity and mathematical control theory.

For  $d = 1$  and  $k = n$ , we have

$$\mu_q(n, n, 1; \mathcal{I}) := |\{C_0 \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q) : xI + C_0 \sim \text{diag}_n(p_1, \dots, p_k)\}|.$$

Two matrices  $A, B \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$  are similar if and only if  $xI - A$  and  $xI - B$  have the same Smith form. Thus in this setting we have the matrix conjugacy class size problem: How many matrices are similar to a given matrix  $A$  with invariant factors  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ ? Denoting by  $c(\mathcal{I})$  the size of the centralizer in the general linear group  $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$  corresponding to the conjugacy class indexed by  $\mathcal{I}$ , we have

$$\mu_q(n, n, 1; \mathcal{I}) = \frac{|\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)|}{c(\mathcal{I})}.$$

According to Stanley [24, p. 108] a precise expression (see (3)) for the size of the centralizer  $c(\mathcal{I})$  was first given by Philip Hall based on earlier work by Frobenius.

The case  $k = 1$  is considered in Section 4. In this case, we must have  $\mathcal{I} = (g)$  for some monic polynomial  $g$  and in this case it is not difficult to see that  $\mu_q(n, 1, d, (g))$  counts the number of  $n$ -tuples  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  of monic polynomials over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of degree  $d$  such that  $\text{gcd}(g_1, \dots, g_n) = g$ . In particular, for  $g = 1$ , this problem has been studied by Corteel, Savage, Wilf and Zeilberger [7, Prop. 3] and a nice answer is known in this case.

The case where  $\mathcal{I}$  is a  $k$ -tuple of 1's corresponds to unimodularity. A polynomial matrix is *unimodular* if its maximal minors are coprime. The case  $d = 1$  for arbitrary  $n, k$  with  $k < n$  and  $\mathcal{I} = (1, \dots, 1)$  has been considered, albeit in a slightly different context, by Lieb, Jordan and Helmke [15, Thm. 1] who essentially prove that if  $k < n$  are positive integers, then the number of matrices  $A \in M_{n,k}(\mathbb{F}_q)$  for which  $xI - A$  is unimodular is given by

$$\mu_q(n, k, 1, (1, \dots, 1)) = \prod_{i=1}^k (q^n - q^i).$$

This theorem has connections with mathematical control theory and answers a question of Kociecki and Przyłuski [19] on the number of reachable linear systems over a finite field. We refer to the introduction of [21] for these connections and the link with unimodularity. A recent generalization of this result in the setting of unimodular polynomial matrices appears in [2, Thm. 4.1] and corresponds to the case of general  $d$ :

$$\mu_q(n, k, d, (1, \dots, 1)) = q^{nk(d-1)} \prod_{i=1}^k (q^n - q^i).$$

It follows from Theorem 3.2 that determining  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  for  $n = k$  is intimately connected with an open problem on splitting subspaces. To state the problem we require the definition of a splitting subspace.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $T$  be a linear operator on an  $md$ -dimensional vector space  $V$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . An  $m$ -dimensional subspace  $W$  of  $V$  is said to be  $T$ -splitting if

$$V = W \oplus TW \oplus \dots \oplus T^{d-1}W.$$

Let  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  denote the number of  $m$ -dimensional  $T$ -splitting subspaces. Determining  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  for an arbitrary operator  $T$  is an open problem [11, p. 54]. The case  $d = 1$  is trivial while the case  $m = 1$  is considered in [11, Prop. 4.4]. The case where  $T$  has an irreducible characteristic polynomial was settled by Chen and Tseng [6, Cor. 3.4] who proved a conjecture made in [10]; the case of cyclic nilpotent  $T$  has recently been settled in [1, Cor. 4.7]. Splitting subspaces were originally defined in slightly less generality by Niederreiter [20, p. 54] in connection with his work on pseudorandom number generation. Splitting subspaces are also closely related to anti-invariant subspaces (Definition 2.2) studied by Barrià and Halmos [3], Sourour [23] and Knüppel and Nielsen [17]. The problem of determining  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  has connections with an important unsolved problem on Krylov subspaces which we now discuss.

Let  $T$  be a linear operator on an  $N$ -dimensional vector space  $V$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  be a set of  $m$  vectors in  $V$ . The *truncated Krylov subspace* [5, p. 277] of order  $d$  generated by  $S$  is defined by

$$\text{Kry}(T, S; d) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(T)v_i : f_i(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x] \text{ and } \deg f_i < d \right\}.$$

Define

$$\kappa_{m,d}(T) := \frac{1}{q^{Nm}} |\{(v_1, \dots, v_m) \in V^m : \text{Kry}(T, \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}; d) = V\}|.$$

The number  $\kappa_{m,d}(T)$  may be interpreted as the probability of selecting  $m$  vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  uniformly and independently from  $V$  such that the truncated Krylov subspace of order  $d$  spanned by them is all of  $V$ . Determining  $\kappa_{m,d}(T)$  is useful in solving large sparse linear systems over finite fields which arise frequently in number theory and computer algebra. Krylov-based methods such as Wiedemann's algorithm are used to compute the minimal polynomials of large matrices over finite fields [14]. For another instance, the Number Field Sieve which is a classical algorithm for factoring large integers relies on Krylov subspace methods [4, p. 24]. As the probability  $\kappa_{m,d}(T)$  is relevant to the analysis of the efficiency of such algorithms, obtaining bounds on  $\kappa_{m,d}(T)$  is a difficult and important [5, p. 277] problem. Proposition 2.6 connects  $\kappa_{m,d}(T)$  to splitting subspaces:

$$(1) \quad \kappa_{m,d}(T) = \frac{|\text{GL}_m(\mathbb{F}_q)| \cdot \sigma(m, d; T)}{q^{m^2d}}.$$

In this paper, we prove that if  $T$  is a linear operator on an  $md$  dimensional vector space  $V$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , then  $\sigma(m, d; T) > 0$  if and only if the number of nonconstant invariant factors of  $T$  is at most  $m$ . It is easily seen that the number  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  depends only on the similarity class of  $T$  [1, Prop. 3.2] since a subspace  $W$  is  $T$ -splitting if and only if  $SW$  is  $S \circ T \circ S^{-1}$  splitting for each linear isomorphism  $S$  of  $V$ . Thus, given an  $md$ -tuple of invariant factors  $\mathcal{I}$ , one can define

$$\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) = \sigma(m, d; T),$$

where  $T$  is any linear operator with invariant factors  $\mathcal{I}$ . By the positivity criterion for  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  above, we may restrict ourselves to the case where the first  $m(d-1)$  coordinates of the  $md$ -tuple  $\mathcal{I}$  are equal to 1:

$$\mathcal{I} = (1, 1, \dots, 1, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m).$$

For  $\mathcal{I}$  as above, we prove the following.

**Theorem 1.2.** If  $\deg p_1 = d$  and  $p_1 = g_1^{e_1} \cdots g_t^{e_t}$ , where the  $g_i$  are distinct irreducible polynomials with  $\deg g_i = d_i (1 \leq i \leq t)$ , then

$$\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t \prod_{j=1}^m (1 - q^{-jd_i})}{\prod_{j=1}^m (1 - q^{-j})} q^{m^2(d-1)}.$$

**Theorem 1.3.** If  $\deg p_1 = d - 1$ , then

$$\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) = \frac{c(\mathcal{I})}{c(\tilde{\mathcal{I}})},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} = (\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_m)$  with  $\tilde{p}_i = p_i/p_1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

Note that  $c(\mathcal{I})$  (see (3) for a precise expression) corresponds to a centralizer in  $\mathrm{GL}_{md}(\mathbb{F}_q)$  while  $c(\tilde{\mathcal{I}})$  is associated with the group  $\mathrm{GL}_m(\mathbb{F}_q)$ . In conjunction with (1), the theorems above can be used to derive precise formulae for the probability  $\kappa_{m,d}(T)$  for suitable values of  $T$ .

## 2. EXISTENCE OF SPLITTING SUBSPACES

If  $T$  is a linear operator on a vector space  $V$ , then  $T$  defines an  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ -module on the vector space  $V$ , where the action of  $x$  is defined by  $x \cdot v = Tv$  for  $v \in V$ . The  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$  module  $V$  can be decomposed as a direct sum

$$V \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^t \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \frac{\mathbb{F}_q[x]}{(\phi_i^{\lambda_{i,j}})},$$

where  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_t$  are distinct monic irreducible polynomials and, for each  $i$ ,  $\lambda_i = (\lambda_{i,1}, \lambda_{i,2}, \dots, \lambda_{i,\ell_i})$  is an integer partition corresponding to  $\phi_i (1 \leq i \leq t)$ .

The finite set  $\{(\phi_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (\phi_t, \lambda_t)\}$  completely determines the *similarity class* of  $T$  and corresponds uniquely to the invariant factors of  $T$ , i.e., the invariant factors of  $xI - A$  where  $A$  is the matrix of  $T$  with respect to some basis. If  $d_i = \deg \phi_i$ , then the finite multiset

$$\tau = \{(d_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (d_t, \lambda_t)\}$$

is called the *similarity class type* (or simply type) of the linear operator  $T$ . The notion of similarity class type may be traced back to the work of Green [13, p. 405] on the irreducible characters of the finite general linear groups. One of the main reasons for considering the similarity class type is that many combinatorial invariants associated with  $T$  often depend only on the partitions  $\lambda_i$  and the degrees of the polynomials  $\phi_i$  (and not the polynomials themselves). The *size* of a similarity class type is the dimension of the vector space on which the corresponding operator is defined. For any  $k$ -tuple of invariant factors  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$ , define

$$\deg \mathcal{I} := \deg(p_1 \cdots p_k).$$

As stated in the introduction, the number of splitting subspaces  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  depends only on the similarity class of  $T$ . Here is a precise definition.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an  $md$ -tuple of invariant factors with  $\deg \mathcal{I} = md$ . Then

$$\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) := \sigma(m, d; T),$$

where  $T$  is any linear operator on an  $md$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with invariant factors  $\mathcal{I}$ .

More generally, it is known [1, Cor. 3.7] that the number of splitting subspaces  $\sigma(m, d; T)$  depends only on the similarity class type of  $T$ . In other words, whenever there exists a linear transformation over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of similarity class type  $\tau$ , one can define

$$\sigma(m, d; \tau) := \sigma(m, d; T),$$

where  $T$  is any linear operator of type  $\tau$  defined on an  $md$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . For our purposes it will be more convenient to work with  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I})$  but it is worth emphasizing that all results involving  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I})$  may be reformulated in terms of similarity class type and we will include such examples.

Splitting subspaces are closely related to anti-invariant subspaces.

**Definition 2.2.** Given a non-negative integer  $\ell$ , a subspace  $W$  of  $V$  is called  $\ell$ -fold  $T$ -anti-invariant if

$$\dim(W + TW + \cdots + T^\ell W) = (\ell + 1) \cdot \dim W.$$

If  $\dim V = md$ , then every  $m$ -dimensional  $T$ -splitting subspace is  $(d - 1)$ -fold  $T$ -anti-invariant. Barría and Halmos [3] and Sourour [23] studied 1-fold anti-invariant subspaces and determined the maximum possible dimension of such a subspace. Knüppel and Nielsen (2003) extended their work to  $\ell$ -fold anti-invariant subspaces for arbitrary  $\ell$ . In particular, they gave the following existence criterion.

**Proposition 2.3.** [17, Cor. 2.2] Let  $T$  be a linear operator on an  $N$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  where  $N = (\ell + 1)m$ . Suppose  $(p_1, \dots, p_N)$  is the  $N$ -tuple of invariant factors of  $T$ . Then an  $\ell$ -fold  $T$ -anti-invariant subspace of dimension  $m$  exists if and only if  $p_i = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \ell m$ .

It is important to note that [17, Cor. 2.2] is stated only for invertible operators. However, the proof [17, Lem 3.1, Lem 3.2] does not require the hypothesis that  $T$  is invertible.

Proposition 2.3 yields a criterion for the existence of splitting subspaces.

**Corollary 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_{md})$  with  $\deg \mathcal{I} = md$ . Then  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) > 0$  if and only if  $p_i = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m(d - 1)$ .

**Corollary 2.5.** If  $\tau = \{(d_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (d_t, \lambda_t)\}$ , then  $\sigma(m, d; \tau) > 0$  if and only if each partition  $\lambda_i (1 \leq i \leq t)$  has at most  $m$  parts.

Recall the probability

$$\kappa_{m,d}(T) := \frac{1}{q^{Nm}} |\{(v_1, \dots, v_m) \in V^m : \text{Kry}(T, \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}; d) = V\}|$$

defined in the introduction. The next proposition gives the connection between  $\kappa_{m,d}(T)$  and  $\sigma(m, d; T)$ . In what follows we will denote the order of the general linear group  $\text{GL}_m(\mathbb{F}_q)$  by  $\gamma_q(m) = (q^m - 1)(q^m - q) \cdots (q^m - q^{m-1})$ .

**Proposition 2.6.** Let  $T$  be a linear operator on an  $md$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Then

$$\kappa_{m,d}(T) = \frac{\gamma_q(m) \cdot \sigma(m, d; T)}{q^{m^2 d}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\} \subseteq V$ . By the definition of truncated Krylov subspace, we have  $\text{Kry}(T, S; d) = V$  if and only if  $W = \text{span}(S)$  is an  $m$  dimensional  $T$ -splitting subspace. Since each  $m$ -dimensional subspace has precisely  $\gamma_q(m)$  ordered bases, the proposition follows.  $\square$

### 3. SPLITTING SUBSPACES AND POLYNOMIAL MATRICES

In this section we show that  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I})$  may be recovered from  $\mu_q(m, m, d; \mathcal{I})$ , where  $\mu_q$  is as defined in the introduction. We begin with the following lemma concerning the equivalence of matrices.

**Lemma 3.1.** [12, Thm. 1.1] Let  $P = x^d I + x^{d-1} C_{d-1} + \cdots + C_0 \in M_q(m, m, d)$ . Consider the  $md \times md$  block matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & -C_0 \\ I & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & -C_1 \\ \mathbf{0} & I & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & -C_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & I & -C_{d-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$xI - A \sim \begin{bmatrix} I & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & P \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $I$  and  $\mathbf{0}$  denote the identity and zero matrices of appropriate sizes. In particular, if  $P$  has invariant factors  $(p_1, \dots, p_m)$ , then  $xI - A$  has invariant factors  $(1, \dots, 1, p_1, \dots, p_m)$ .

Given  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ , the above lemma implies that  $\mu_q(m, m, d; \mathcal{I})$  is equal to the number of matrices  $A$  of the block form above whose invariant factors are  $\mathcal{I} = (1, \dots, 1, p_1, \dots, p_m)$ . In view of Corollary 2.4, given any  $m$ -tuple  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$  we interpret  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I})$  to mean  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}')$  where  $\mathcal{I}' = (1, \dots, 1, p_1, \dots, p_m)$  is the  $md$ -tuple obtained from  $\mathcal{I}$  by padding  $m(d-1)$  ones. As a natural extension we will write  $c(\mathcal{I})$  to mean  $c(\mathcal{I}')$  hereafter.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$  be an  $m$ -tuple of invariant factors with  $\deg \mathcal{I} = md$ . Then

$$\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) = \frac{c(\mathcal{I})}{\gamma_q(m)} \mu_q(m, m, d; \mathcal{I}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a linear operator on an  $md$ -dimensional vector space with invariant factors  $\mathcal{I}$  and let  $W$  be an  $m$ -dimensional  $T$ -splitting subspace. Suppose  $\mathcal{B}_W = \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  is an ordered basis for  $W$ . Then an ordered basis for  $V$  is given by

$$\mathcal{B}_V = \{v_1, \dots, v_m, Tv_1, \dots, Tv_m, \dots, T^{d-1}v_1, \dots, T^{d-1}v_m\}.$$

The matrix of  $T$  with respect to the basis  $\mathcal{B}_V$  has the block form

$$(2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & -C_0 \\ I & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & -C_1 \\ \mathbf{0} & I & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & -C_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & I & -C_{d-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

for some matrices  $C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{d-1} \in M_m(\mathbb{F}_q)$ . Conversely, if  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{md}\}$  is an ordered basis for  $V$  with respect to which the matrix of  $T$  is in the above block form, then  $\text{span}\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$  forms a  $T$ -splitting subspace for  $V$ . Since there are  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I})$  splitting subspaces of dimension  $m$  and each such subspace has  $\gamma_q(m)$  bases, it follows that  $V$  has  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) \cdot \gamma_q(m)$  bases with respect to which the matrix of  $T$  has the above block form. Different bases for  $V$  may yield the same matrix for  $T$ . If  $A$  denotes the matrix of  $T$  with respect to the basis  $\mathcal{B}_V$ , then the number of different bases  $\mathcal{B}$  for  $V$  such that the matrix of  $T$  with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $A$  is precisely

$$|\{P \in \text{GL}_{md}(\mathbb{F}_q) : P^{-1}AP = A\}| = c(\mathcal{I}).$$

By Lemma 3.1,  $\mu_q(m, m, d; \mathcal{I})$  is equal to the number of matrices of the block form (2) whose invariant factors are  $\mathcal{I}$ . Thus

$$\mu_q(m, m, d; \mathcal{I}) = \frac{\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) \cdot \gamma_q(m)}{c(\mathcal{I})},$$

which proves the theorem.  $\square$

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $P \in M_q(n, k, d)$  and suppose  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . The  $i^{\text{th}}$  determinantal divisor of  $P$ , denoted  $\delta_i(P)$ , is the greatest common divisor of all  $i \times i$  minors of  $P$ .

The invariant factors of  $P$  can be recovered from the determinantal divisors; if  $P \in M_q(n, k, d; (p_1, \dots, p_k))$ , then [16, p. 260]

$$p_i = \frac{\delta_i(P)}{\delta_{i-1}(P)} \quad (1 \leq i \leq k),$$

where  $\delta_0(P) = 1$ . In what follows,  $M_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  denotes all elements  $P \in M_q(n, k, d)$  which have invariant factors  $\mathcal{I}$ . By definition, we have  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I}) = |M_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})|$ .

**Remark 3.4.** If  $P \in M_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$ , then

$$\deg \mathcal{I} = \deg \prod_{i=1}^k p_i = \deg \delta_k(P) \leq kd,$$

since the maximum possible degree of a minor of  $P$  is precisely  $kd$ . In view of this degree constraint above we will implicitly assume that  $\deg \mathcal{I} \leq kd$  whenever  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  is considered.

The following reduction lemma will prove very useful.

**Lemma 3.5.** We have

$$\mu_q(n, k, d; (p_1, \dots, p_k)) = \mu_q(n, k, d - d_1; (\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_k)),$$

where  $d_1 = \deg p_1$  and  $\tilde{p}_i = p_i/p_1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$  and suppose  $P \in M_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$ . Since  $\delta_1(P) = p_1$ , it follows that  $P = p_1 \cdot Q$  for some  $Q \in M_q(n, k, d - d_1)$ . It is easily seen that  $\delta_i(Q) = \delta_i(P)/p_1^i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Therefore the invariant factors for  $Q$  are

$$\left( \frac{p_1}{p_1}, \frac{p_2}{p_1}, \dots, \frac{p_k}{p_1} \right) = (\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_k) = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}.$$

It follows that the map  $M_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I}) \rightarrow M_q(n, k, d - d_1; \tilde{\mathcal{I}})$  defined by  $P \mapsto P/p_1$  is a bijection.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** Let  $g$  be a monic polynomial of degree  $d$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and  $\mathcal{I} = (g, \dots, g)$  be a  $k$ -tuple of invariant factors. Then

$$\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I}) = 1.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.5,  $\mu_q(n, k, d; (g, \dots, g)) = \mu_q(n, k, 0; (1, \dots, 1))$  and the corollary follows since  $\mu_q(n, k, 0; (1, \dots, 1)) = 1$  by definition.  $\square$

A precise expression for the cardinality of the centralizer in  $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$  of a matrix  $A \in M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$  is known. As we will require this expression in some calculations, we state it here. Suppose the similarity class of  $A$  is given by  $\{(\phi_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (\phi_t, \lambda_t)\}$  for some irreducible polynomials  $\phi_i$  and partitions  $\lambda_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq t$ ). Let the corresponding invariant factors (i.e. those of  $xI - A$ ) be  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ . For any partition  $\lambda$ , let  $\lambda'$  denote its conjugate partition and let  $m_i(\lambda) = \lambda'_i - \lambda'_{i+1}$  denote the number of parts of  $\lambda$  of size  $i$ . Denote by  $\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle$  the sum of squares of the parts of  $\lambda$ . For an indeterminate  $u$  and a non-negative integer  $r$ , define

$$(u)_r := \prod_{i=1}^r (1 - u^i).$$

For any monic irreducible polynomial  $\phi$  of degree  $d$  and integer partition  $\lambda$ , let

$$c_d(\lambda) = q^{d\langle \lambda', \lambda' \rangle} \prod_{i \geq 1} (q^{-d})_{m_i(\lambda)}.$$

If  $d_i = \deg \phi_i$ , then the order of the centralizer of  $A$  is given by [8, p. 55]

$$(3) \quad c(\mathcal{I}) = \prod_{i=1}^t c_{d_i}(\lambda_i).$$

**Remark 3.7.** Note that the expression for  $c(\mathcal{I})$  above involves only the degrees of the polynomials  $\phi_i$  and not the polynomials themselves. Thus given any similarity class type  $\tau$ , the corresponding centralizer size  $c(\tau)$  is given by the product in (3).

Corollary 3.6 and Theorem 3.2 imply a formula for  $\sigma(m, d; (p_1, \dots, p_m))$  in the case where  $\deg p_1 = d$ . In this case we necessarily have  $p_i = p_1$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

**Theorem 3.8.** Let  $g$  be a monic polynomial of degree  $d$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and suppose  $g = \phi_1^{e_1} \cdots \phi_t^{e_t}$  for distinct irreducible polynomials  $\phi_i$  with  $\deg \phi_i = d_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq t$ ). If  $\mathcal{I}$  denotes the  $m$ -tuple  $(g, \dots, g)$ , then

$$\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) = \frac{q^{m^2 d}}{\gamma_q(m)} \prod_{i=1}^t \prod_{j=1}^m (1 - q^{-j d_i}).$$

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.6, we have  $\mu_q(m, m, d, (g, \dots, g)) = 1$ . The conjugacy class data corresponding to  $\mathcal{I}$  is  $\{(\phi_i, \lambda_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq t}$  where  $\lambda_i$  is the integer partition with  $m$  equal parts  $e_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq t$ . If  $d_i = \deg \phi_i$ , then by Theorem 3.2 and (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) &= \frac{c(\mathcal{I})}{\gamma_q(m)} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t c_{d_i}(\lambda_i)}{\gamma_q(m)} \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^t q^{d_i m^2 e_i} (q^{-d_i})_m}{\gamma_q(m)} \\ &= \frac{q^{m^2 \sum d_i e_i}}{\gamma_q(m)} \prod_{i=1}^t (q^{-d_i})_m, \end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows since  $\sum d_i e_i = \deg g = d$ .  $\square$

We may recast Theorem 3.8 in terms of similarity class type.

**Theorem 3.9.** Let  $\tau = \{(d_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (d_t, \lambda_t)\}$  be a similarity class type of size  $md$ . If  $\sum_{i=1}^t d_i \lambda_{i,m} = d$ , then

$$\sigma(m, d; \tau) = \frac{q^{m^2 d}}{\gamma_q(m)} \prod_{i=1}^t \prod_{j=1}^m (1 - q^{-j d_i}).$$

#### 4. SPLITTING SUBSPACES AND CENTRALIZERS

In this section we extend the definition of  $c(\mathcal{I})$  to include  $k$ -tuples of invariant factors  $\mathcal{I}$  for which  $\deg \mathcal{I}$  is not necessarily equal to  $k$  in a natural way. If  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$  and  $\deg \mathcal{I} = \delta > k$ , then we set  $c(\mathcal{I}) = c(\mathcal{I}')$  where  $\mathcal{I}' = (1, \dots, 1, p_1, \dots, p_k)$  denotes the  $\delta$ -tuple obtained by padding  $\delta - k$  ones to  $\mathcal{I}$ . On the other hand, if  $\delta < k$ , then we set  $c(\mathcal{I}) = c(\mathcal{I}')$  where  $\mathcal{I}'$  is the  $\delta$ -tuple  $(p_{k-\delta+1}, \dots, p_k)$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{I}_q(n, k, d)$  the set of all possible  $k$ -tuples of invariant factors that arise as the invariant factors of some element  $P \in M_q(n, k, d)$ .

For  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$ , the definition of  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  states that

$$\mu_q(n, k, 1; \mathcal{I}) = |\{A \in M_{n,k}(\mathbb{F}_q) : xI - A \sim \text{diag}_{n,k}(p_1, \dots, p_k)\}|.$$

A precise formula for  $\mu_q(n, k, 1; \mathcal{I})$  was originally given in [22, Thm. 3.8].



**Theorem 4.1.** Let  $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{I}_q(n, k, 1)$  and suppose  $\deg \mathcal{I} = \delta$ . Then

$$\mu_q(n, k, 1; \mathcal{I}) = \begin{bmatrix} k \\ \delta \end{bmatrix}_q \frac{\gamma_q(\delta)}{c(\mathcal{I})} \prod_{i=\delta+1}^k (q^n - q^i),$$

where  $[\cdot]_q$  denotes a  $q$ -binomial coefficient.

The classical result of Philip Hall [24, Thm. 1.10.4] on conjugacy class size in  $M_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$  can be recovered from the above theorem by setting  $k = n$ ; in this case we necessarily have  $\delta = n$  and it follows that  $\mu_q(n, n, 1; \mathcal{I}) = \gamma_q(n)/c(\mathcal{I})$ .

A polynomial matrix  $P \in M_q(n, k, d)$  is said to be *unimodular* if the greatest common divisor of all  $k \times k$  minors of  $P$  is 1, in other words, if and only if  $\delta_k(P) = 1$ . This corresponds to the case where all invariant factors of  $P$  are equal to 1. For  $k < n$ , a formula for the number of unimodular matrices in  $M_q(n, k, 1)$  was given by Helmke, Jordan, and Lieb [15, Thm. 1]; this formula may be recovered from Theorem 4.1 by setting  $\mathcal{I} = (1, \dots, 1)$ .

Theorem 4.1 can be used to derive an expression for  $\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I})$  when  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$  with  $\deg p_1 = d - 1$  in terms of centralizers in general linear groups.

**Corollary 4.2.** Suppose  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \mathbb{I}_q(n, k, d)$  and  $\deg p_1 = d - 1$ . Then

$$\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I}) = \begin{bmatrix} k \\ \delta \end{bmatrix}_q \frac{\gamma_q(\delta)}{c(\tilde{\mathcal{I}})} \prod_{i=\delta+1}^k (q^n - q^i),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} = (\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_k)$  with  $\tilde{p}_i = p_i/p_1$  and  $\delta = \deg \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.5, we have  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I}) = \mu_q(n, k, 1; \tilde{\mathcal{I}})$ . The corollary now follows from Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3.** Suppose  $\mathcal{I} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$  with  $\deg \mathcal{I} = md$  and  $\deg p_1 = d - 1$ . Then

$$\sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) = \frac{c(\mathcal{I})}{c(\tilde{\mathcal{I}})},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}} = (\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_m)$  and  $\tilde{p}_i = p_i/p_1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\deg \tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \deg \mathcal{I} - m \cdot \deg p_1 = m$ . By Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(m, d; \mathcal{I}) &= \frac{c(\mathcal{I})}{\gamma_q(m)} \mu_q(m, m, d; \mathcal{I}) \\ &= \frac{c(\mathcal{I})}{\gamma_q(m)} \frac{\gamma_q(m)}{c(\tilde{\mathcal{I}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Corollary 4.2 by setting  $n = m$  and  $k = m$ .  $\square$

By considering types we obtain the following generalization of the above corollary. Recall the definition of  $c(\tau)$  from Remark 3.7.

**Corollary 4.4.** Let  $\tau = \{(d_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (d_t, \lambda_t)\}$  be a similarity class type of size  $md$ . If  $\sum_{i=1}^t d_i \lambda_{i,m} = d - 1$ , then

$$\sigma(m, d; \tau) = \frac{c(\tau)}{c(\tilde{\tau})},$$

where  $\tilde{\tau} = \{(d_1, \mu_1), \dots, (d_t, \mu_t)\}$  and  $\mu_i$  is given by  $\mu_{i,j} = \lambda_{i,j} - \lambda_{i,m}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .

Corollary 4.4 may be reformulated in a more explicit form as follows.

**Corollary 4.5.** Let  $\tau = \{(d_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (d_t, \lambda_t)\}$  be a similarity class type of size  $md$ . Suppose  $\sum_{i=1}^t d_i \lambda_{i,m} = d - 1$  and let  $m_i$  denote the multiplicity of  $\lambda_{i,m}$  as a part of  $\lambda_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t$ . Then

$$\sigma(m, d; \tau) = q^{m^2(d-1)} \prod_{i=1}^t \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} (1 - q^{-jd_i}).$$

*Proof.* Continuing with the notation of Corollary 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(m, d; \tau) &= \frac{c(\tau)}{c(\tilde{\tau})} = \prod_{i=1}^t \frac{c_{d_i}(\lambda_i)}{c_{d_i}(\mu_i)} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^t \frac{q^{d_i \langle \lambda'_i, \lambda'_i \rangle} \prod_{j \geq 1} (q^{-d_i})_{m_j(\lambda_i)}}{q^{d_i \langle \mu'_i, \mu'_i \rangle} \prod_{j \geq 1} (q^{-d_i})_{m_j(\mu_i)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\lambda'_i$  may be obtained from  $\mu'_i$  by adding  $\lambda_{i,m}$  new parts, each equal to




FIGURE 1. If  $m = 5$  and  $\lambda_i = (6, 5, 5, 4, 2)$ , then  $\mu_i = (4, 3, 3, 2)$ .

$m$ . Therefore,  $\langle \lambda'_i, \lambda'_i \rangle = m^2 \lambda_{i,m} + \langle \mu'_i, \mu'_i \rangle$ . If we remove all parts equal to  $\lambda_{i,m}$  from  $\lambda_i$ , then the multiplicities of the remaining parts coincide with the multiplicities of the parts of  $\mu_i$ . These observations allow us to rewrite the product above as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(m, d; \tau) &= \prod_{i=1}^t q^{d_i m^2 \lambda_{i,m}} (q^{-d_i})_{m_i} \\ &= q^{m^2(d-1)} \prod_{i=1}^t (q^{-d_i})_{m_i}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by considering  $\mu_q(n, k, d; \mathcal{I})$  for  $k = 1$ . In this case the problem is equivalent to counting  $n$ -tuples of coprime monic polynomials of a given degree over a finite field, a question that appears as an exercise in Knuth [18, Exer. 5 of §4.6.1]. An answer was given by Corteel, Savage, Wilf and Zeilberger [7, Prop. 3] (also see [9, Thm. 4.1]).

**Proposition 4.6.** The number of coprime  $n$ -tuples of monic polynomials of degree  $d$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is  $q^{nd} - q^{n(d-1)+1}$ . Equivalently, if  $n$  monic polynomials of degree  $d$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  are chosen independently and uniformly at random, then the probability that they are coprime is  $1 - 1/q^{n-1}$ .

**Corollary 4.7.** Let  $g \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$  be a monic polynomial of degree  $\delta \leq d$ . Then

$$\mu_q(n, 1, d; (g)) = \begin{cases} q^{n(d-\delta)} (1 - q^{1-n}) & \delta < d, \\ 1 & \delta = d. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.5, we have  $\mu_q(n, 1, d; (g)) = \mu_q(n, 1, d - \delta; (1))$ . If  $\delta = d$ , then by definition we have  $\mu_q(n, 1, d - \delta; (1)) = 1$ . If  $\delta < d$ , then set  $d' = d - \delta$  and note

that  $\mu_q(n, 1, d'; (1))$  equals the number of polynomial matrices

$$(4) \quad \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \\ \vdots \\ g_n \end{bmatrix}$$

such that  $\deg g_1 = d'$ ,  $\deg g_i < d'$  for  $2 \leq i \leq n$  and  $\gcd(g_1, \dots, g_n) = 1$ . Since

$$\gcd(g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n) = \gcd(g_1, g_2 + g_1 \dots, g_n + g_1),$$

it follows that  $\mu_q(n, 1, d'; (1))$  is equal to the number of coprime  $n$ -tuples of monic polynomials of degree  $d'$ . Therefore  $\mu_q(n, 1, d'; (1)) = q^{nd'}(1 - q^{1-n})$ .  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Divya Aggarwal and Samrith Ram. Splitting subspaces of linear operators over finite fields. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.08411>, 2021.
- [2] Akansha Arora, Samrith Ram, and Ayineedi Venkateswarlu. Unimodular polynomial matrices over finite fields. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, pages 1–14, 2020.
- [3] José Barría and P. R. Halmos. Weakly transitive matrices. *Illinois J. Math.*, 28(3):370–378, 1984.
- [4] Charles Bouillaguet and Paul Zimmermann. Parallel structured gaussian elimination for the number field sieve. *Mathematical Cryptology*, (1):22–39, 2020.
- [5] Richard P. Brent, Shuhong Gao, and Alan G. B. Lauder. Random Krylov spaces over finite fields. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 16(2):276–287, 2003.
- [6] Eric Chen and Dennis Tseng. The splitting subspace conjecture. *Finite Fields Appl.*, 24:15–28, 2013.
- [7] Sylvie Corteel, Carla D. Savage, Herbert S. Wilf, and Doron Zeilberger. A pentagonal number sieve. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 82(2):186–192, 1998.
- [8] Jason Fulman. Random matrix theory over finite fields. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 39(1):51–85, 2002.
- [9] Mario García-Armas, Sudhir R. Ghorpade, and Samrith Ram. Relatively prime polynomials and nonsingular Hankel matrices over finite fields. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(3):819–828, 2011.
- [10] Sudhir R. Ghorpade and Samrith Ram. Block companion Singer cycles, primitive recursive vector sequences, and coprime polynomial pairs over finite fields. *Finite Fields Appl.*, 17(5):461–472, 2011.
- [11] Sudhir R. Ghorpade and Samrith Ram. Enumeration of splitting subspaces over finite fields. In *Arithmetic, geometry, cryptography and coding theory*, volume 574 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 49–58. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.
- [12] I. Gohberg, P. Lancaster, and L. Rodman. *Matrix polynomials*, volume 58 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2009.
- [13] J. A. Green. The characters of the finite general linear groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 80:402–447, 1955.
- [14] Gavin Harrison, Jeremy Johnson, and B. David Saunders. Probabilistic analysis of Wiedemann’s algorithm for minimal polynomial computation. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 74:55–69, 2016.
- [15] Uwe Helmke, Jens Jordan, and Julia Lieb. Probability estimates for reachability of linear systems defined over finite fields. *Adv. Math. Commun.*, 10(1):63–78, 2016.
- [16] Kenneth Hoffman and Ray Kunze. *Linear algebra*. Second edition. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971.
- [17] Frieder Knüppel and Klaus Nielsen.  $k$ -fold anti-invariant subspaces of a linear mapping. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 375:13–19, 2003.
- [18] Donald E. Knuth. *The art of computer programming. Vol. 2: Seminumerical algorithms*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont, 1969.
- [19] M. Kociecki and K. M. Przyłuski. On the number of controllable linear systems over a finite field. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 122/123/124:115–122, 1989.
- [20] Harald Niederreiter. The multiple-recursive matrix method for pseudorandom number generation. *Finite Fields Appl.*, 1(1):3–30, 1995.
- [21] Samrith Ram. Counting zero kernel pairs over a finite field. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 495:1–10, 2016.
- [22] Samrith Ram. The number of linear transformations defined on a subspace with given invariant factors. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 532:146 – 161, 2017.

- [23] A. R. Sourour. Anti-invariant subspaces of maximum dimension. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 74:39–45, 1986.
- [24] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2012.

INDRAPRASTHA INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DELHI (IIIT-DELHI), NEW DELHI 110020, INDIA.

*Email address:* `divyaa@iiitd.ac.in`

INDRAPRASTHA INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DELHI (IIIT-DELHI), NEW DELHI 110020, INDIA.

*Email address:* `samrith@gmail.com`