

# SIMILARITY FOR ZERO-SQUARE MATRICES

GRIGORE CĂLUGĂREANU

ABSTRACT. We show that an  $n \times n$  zero-square matrix over a commutative unital ring  $R$  is similar to a multiple of  $E_{1n}$  if  $R$  is a Bézout domain and  $n = 2, 3$ , but there are zero-square matrices which are not similar to any multiple of  $E_{1n}$  whenever  $n \geq 4$ , over any commutative unital ring. As a consequence, for  $n = 2, 3$  such matrices have stable range one.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

An integral domain is a GCD domain if every pair  $a, b$  of nonzero elements has a greatest common divisor, denoted by  $\gcd(a, b)$  and a Bézout domain if  $\gcd(a, b)$  is a linear combination of  $a$  and  $b$ . GCD domains include unique factorization domains, Bézout domains and valuation domains. If  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$  we say that  $a$  and  $b$  are coprime.

It is not hard to prove that every zero-square  $2 \times 2$  matrix over a Bézout domain  $R$  is similar to  $rE_{12}$ , for some  $r \in R$  (see [2]).

The aim of this paper is to extend the above result for zero-square  $3 \times 3$  matrices over Bézout domains and to show that the property cannot be extended for  $n \times n$  zero-square matrices if  $n \geq 4$ . That is, we prove the following

**Theorem.** *Let  $R$  be a Bézout domain. Every zero-square matrix of  $\mathbb{M}_3(R)$  is similar to  $rE_{13}$  for some  $r \in R$ .*

**Theorem.** *Over any commutative ring and for every  $n \geq 4$ , there are zero-square  $n \times n$  matrices which are not similar to multiples of  $E_{1n}$ .*

In our extension we have to solve a special type of completion problem: two unimodular 3-rows are given with some additional properties and we are searching for a completion to an invertible  $3 \times 3$  matrix.

In Section 2, general results on zero-square  $n \times n$  matrices are proved together with second theorem above.

For the sake of completeness, Section 3 covers the zero-square  $2 \times 2$  case. In Section 4 we prove the first theorem above, that is, we settle the  $3 \times 3$  zero-square case. Since multiples of  $E_{ij}$  are known to have stable range one, a consequence of our results is that zero-square  $2 \times 2$  and  $3 \times 3$  matrices over any Bézout domain (in particular over the integers) have stable range one.

$E_{ij}$  denotes the  $n \times n$  matrix with all entries zero excepting the  $(i, j)$  entry which is 1. By  $0_n$  we denote the zero  $n \times n$  matrix. For a square matrix  $A$  over a commutative ring  $R$ , the determinant and trace of  $A$  are denoted by  $\det(A)$  and  $\text{Tr}(A)$ , respectively. For a matrix  $A$ ,  $\gcd(A)$  denotes the greatest common divisor of all the entries of  $A$ . For a unital ring  $R$ ,  $U(R)$  denotes the set of all the units of  $R$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 15B33; Secondary: 16U100, 16U30 .

*Key words and phrases.* zero-square matrix; GCD domain; Bézout domain; matrix similarity.

2. ZERO-SQUARE  $n \times n$  MATRICES

In order to describe the zero-square  $n \times n$  matrices over commutative (unital) rings or over integral domains, denote by  $T_{ab}^{cd}$  the  $2 \times 2$  minor on the rows  $a$  and  $b$  and on the columns  $c$  and  $d$ . A simple computation of  $\text{row}_i(T) \cdot \text{col}_j(T)$  for  $i \neq j$  or  $i = j$  gives

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $T = [t_{ij}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix over a commutative ring  $R$  and let  $t_{ij}^{(2)}$  be the entries of  $T^2$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} t_{ij}^{(2)} &= t_{ij} \text{Tr}(T) + \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} - \{i, j\}} T_{ik}^{kj} & i \neq j \\ t_{ii}^{(2)} &= t_{ii} \text{Tr}(T) + T_{i1}^{1i} + \dots + T_{i, i-1}^{i-1, i} + T_{i, i+1}^{i+1, i} + \dots + T_{in}^{ni} & i = j \end{aligned} .$$

First recall that the rank of a (not necessarily square) matrix  $A$  (denoted  $\text{rk}(A)$ ) can be defined over any commutative ring  $R$ , using the annihilators of the ideals  $I_t(A)$  generated by the  $t \times t$  minors of  $A$  (see e. g. [1]). In particular,  $\text{rk}(A) = 1$  if all  $2 \times 2$  minors are zero and these two condition are equivalent over integral domains. Then it can be shown that *equivalent matrices* (so, in particular, similar matrices) *have the same rank* (see [1], 4.11).

Therefore

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let  $T$  be an  $n \times n$  matrix over any commutative ring. If all  $2 \times 2$  minors of  $T$  are zero and  $\text{Tr}(T) = 0$  then  $T^2 = 0_n$ .*

**Remark.** Over any integral domain a (well-known) converse also holds: *If  $T^2 = 0_n$  then  $\det(T) = \text{Tr}(T) = 0$ .*

Over any integral domain, in order to have a characterization of form

$$T^2 = 0_n \text{ if and only if } \text{rk}(T) = 1 \text{ and } \text{Tr}(T) = 0,$$

the only remaining implication is that,  $T^2 = 0_n$  and  $\text{Tr}(T) = 0$  imply  $\text{rk}(T) = 1$  (i.e. all  $2 \times 2$  minors of  $T$  vanish).

In what follows we show that this implication holds over a commutative ring for  $n = 3$  if 2 is not a zero divisor, but fails for any  $n \geq 4$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative unital ring such that 2 is not a zero divisor and let  $T \in \mathbb{M}_3(R)$  with  $\text{Tr}(T) = 0$ . Then  $T^2 = 0_3$  if and only if all  $2 \times 2$  minors of  $T$  equal zero.*

*Proof.* To avoid too many indexes and emphasize the diagonal elements (i.e. the

zero trace) we write  $T = \begin{bmatrix} x & a & c \\ b & y & e \\ d & f & -x-y \end{bmatrix}$ .

If  $\text{Tr}(T) = 0$ , the condition  $T^2 = 0_3$  is *equivalent* to the following nine LHS equalities

$$\begin{aligned} x^2 + ab + cd &= 0 & (1) \\ a(x+y) + cf &= 0 & (2) \\ ae = cy & & (3) \\ b(x+y) + de &= 0 & (4) \\ y^2 + ab + ef &= 0 & (5) \\ bc = ex & & (6) \\ bf = dy & & (7) \\ ad = fx & & (8) \\ (x+y)^2 + cd + ef &= 0 & (9) \end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned} T_{13}^{23} &= 0 \\ T_{12}^{23} &= 0 \\ T_{23}^{13} &= 0 \\ T_{12}^{13} &= 0 \\ T_{23}^{12} &= 0 \\ T_{13}^{12} &= 0 \end{aligned} .$$

The two terms equalities (i.e., (3), (6), (7), (8)) are *equivalent* to the vanishing of four  $2 \times 2$  minors. Just look at the RHS column of vanishing minors. Further, two other equalities, namely, (2) and (4), are *equivalent* to the vanishing of another two minors.

Thus, this equivalently covers the six *off diagonal*  $2 \times 2$  minors. What remains are the vanishing of the three  $2 \times 2$  *diagonal* minors.

From  $x^2 + ab + cd = 0$ ,  $y^2 + ab + ef = 0$  and  $(x + y)^2 + cd + ef = 0$  we get (since 2 is not a zero divisor)  $xy = ab$ , and so another zero  $2 \times 2$  minor. Finally using  $x^2 + ab + cd = 0$ ,  $y^2 + ab + ef = 0$  and  $xy = ab$ , we get the last two zero  $2 \times 2$  diagonal minors:  $x(x + y) + cd = 0$  and  $y(x + y) + ef = 0$ .

The converse was settled in the general  $n \times n$  case in Corollary 2.2.  $\square$

**Remark.** The hypothesis "2 is not a zero divisor" is essential for the vanishing of the three diagonal  $2 \times 2$  minors (over any commutative ring). Consider  $R = \mathbb{Z}_2[X, Y]/I$  for  $I := (X^2, Y^2)$  and the diagonal matrix over  $R$ ,  $T = \begin{bmatrix} X + I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Y + I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & X + Y + I \end{bmatrix}$ . Then  $T^2 = 0_3$ ,  $\text{Tr}(T) = 0$ , but the diagonal minors are not zero. Clearly, 2 is a zero divisor in  $R$ .

Before dealing with the  $3 \times 3$  matrices case, here is an example of  $4 \times 4$  zero-square matrix (over any commutative unital ring) with zero trace and rank 2.

**Example.**  $C_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^2 = 0_4$ , has zero trace but many not zero  $2 \times 2$  minors (e.g.  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , in the center).

Hence  $T^2 = 0_4$  does not generally imply  $\text{rk}(T) = 1$ . Adding to this example as many zero rows and columns as necessary,  $T^2 = 0_n$  does not generally imply  $\text{rk}(T) = 1$ , for any  $n \geq 5$ .

Since nonzero multiples of  $E_{1n}$  have rank 1, and similar matrices have the same rank, we obtain

**Theorem 2.4.** *Over any commutative unital ring and for every  $n \geq 4$ , there are  $n \times n$  zero-square matrices which are not similar to any multiple of  $E_{1n}$ .*

### 3. THE ZERO-SQUARE $3 \times 3$ CASE

The following lemma and proposition will be useful for the extension from  $2 \times 2$  to zero-square  $3 \times 3$  matrices.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $a, b, c, a', b', c' \in R$ , a GCD domain. If  $ab' = a'b$ ,  $ac' = a'c$ ,  $bc' = b'c$  and the rows  $[a \ b \ c]$  and  $[a' \ b' \ c']$  are unimodular then the pairs  $a, a'$ ,  $b, b'$  and  $c, c'$  are associated. Moreover, there exists a unit  $u \in U(R)$  such that  $[a' \ b' \ c'] = [a \ b \ c]u$ .*

*Proof.* Denote  $\delta = \text{gcd}(a, b)$  with  $a = \delta a_1$ ,  $b = \delta b_1$  and  $\delta' = \text{gcd}(a', b')$  and  $a' = \delta' a'_1$ ,  $b' = \delta' b'_1$ . From  $ab' = a'b$  cancelling  $\delta\delta'$  we obtain  $a_1 b'_1 = a'_1 b_1$ . Since  $a_1, b_1$  are coprime, it follows  $a_1 \mid a'_1$ . Symmetrically, since  $a'_1, b'_1$  are coprime, it follows  $a'_1 \mid a_1$ , so that  $a_1, a'_1$  are associates. Hence there is a unit  $u \in U(R)$  such that  $a_1 = a'_1 u$ .

Further, notice that  $\gcd(\delta, c) = \gcd(\gcd(a, b), c) = 1$  and so  $\delta, c$  are coprime. Now we use  $ac' = a'c$ , that is,  $\delta(a'_1u)c' = \delta a_1c' = \delta' a'_1c$ . Cancelling  $a'_1$  we get  $\delta uc' = \delta'c$  and since  $\delta, c$  are coprime,  $\delta \mid \delta'$ . Symmetrically,  $\delta' \mid \delta$  and so  $\delta, \delta'$  are also associates. Therefore  $a = \delta a_1$  and  $a' = \delta' a'_1$  are associates.

In a similar way, it follows that  $b, b'$  and  $c, c'$  are associates, respectively.

Finally, suppose  $a' = au$ ,  $b' = bv$  and  $c' = cw$  for some  $u, v, w \in U(R)$ . From  $ab' = a'b$  we get  $abv = aub$ , so  $v = u$ . Analogously,  $w = v$  and so  $w = v = u$ , as claimed.  $\square$

**Remark.** The second hypothesis of the lemma can be stated as a matrix rank:

$$\text{rk} \begin{bmatrix} a & b & c \\ a' & b' & c' \end{bmatrix} = 1.$$

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $R$  be a GCD domain. If  $\text{rk} \begin{bmatrix} a & b & c \\ a' & b' & c' \end{bmatrix} = 1$  (i.e.,  $ab' = a'b$ ,  $ac' = a'c$ ,  $bc' = b'c$ ),  $\delta = \gcd(a, b, c)$ ,  $\lambda = \gcd(a', b', c')$  and  $a = \delta a_1$ ,  $b = \delta b_1$ ,  $c = \delta c_1$ ,  $a' = \lambda a'_1$ ,  $b' = \lambda b'_1$  and  $c' = \lambda c'_1$ , then  $a_1, b_1, c_1$  and  $a'_1, b'_1, c'_1$  are respectively associated (in divisibility). Moreover,  $\begin{bmatrix} a'_1 & b'_1 & c'_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & b_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} u$  for some  $u \in U(R)$ .*

*Proof.* We just use the previous lemma.  $\square$

In the sequel, for 3-vectors we use the well-known operations of *dot* product, *cross* product and *scalar triple* product.

**Definition.** The 3-vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3) \in R^3$  is *unimodular* iff the ideal generated by its components is the whole ring, i.e.  $I = (a_1, a_2, a_3) = Ra_1 + Ra_2 + Ra_3 = R$ . Equivalently, there exists  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, b_3) \in R^3$  such that  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = 1$ .

More detailed, for 3 elements of a ring  $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in R$ , the ideal generated by these  $I = (a_1, a_2, a_3) = Ra_1 + Ra_2 + Ra_3$  can be the whole ring  $R$ , case when  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  (ideal) generates the whole  $R$ , or else, it is *not* the whole ring. Since by Zorn's Lemma, every proper ideal is included in a maximal ideal, the second case can be characterized as follows: the system  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  is *not* an (ideal) generating system iff these elements (and so is the ideal these generate) are included in a maximal ideal.

This way, a 3-vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3) \in R^3$  is unimodular iff  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  is not included in any maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$ . Equivalently, for every maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$ , at least one of the  $a_i \notin M$ , or else, at least one of  $a_1 + M, a_2 + M, a_3 + M \in R/M$  is  $\neq M$  (i.e. is not zero in  $R/M$ ).

To simplify the writing, we denote  $\mathbf{a} + M = (a_1 + M, a_2 + M, a_3 + M)$ , and this can be viewed as a 3-vector in  $(R/M)^3$ . Moreover, we extend accordingly the dot product  $(\mathbf{a} + M) \cdot (\mathbf{b} + M) = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} + M \in R/M$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ ,  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, c_3)$  are unimodular 3-vectors such that  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0$ . Then the cross product  $\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{c}$  is also a unimodular row.*

*Proof.* As mentioned above, it suffices to show that the 3-vector  $\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{c}$  (as customarily identified with the (ideal) generating system  $\{b_2c_3 - b_3c_2, b_3c_1 - b_1c_3, b_1c_2 - b_2c_1\}$ ) is nonzero, modulo any maximal ideal. Since  $R$  is a commutative (unital) ring, modulo any maximal ideal  $M$  of  $R$ ,  $R/M$  is a field and (with the above notation)  $\mathbf{b} + M, \mathbf{c} + M$  are nonzero 3-vectors in  $(R/M)^3$  (otherwise these are not unimodular). It is easy to see that these two vectors are linearly independent (indeed, if

$(\mathbf{a} + M) \cdot (\mathbf{b} + M) = 1 + M$ ,  $(\mathbf{a} + M) \cdot (\mathbf{c} + M) = M$  and  $\mathbf{b} + M = k(\mathbf{c} + M)$  for some  $k \in R$  then  $1 + M = M$ , impossible). Hence their cross product is (well-known to be) nonzero and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring and let  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}$  be unimodular 3-vectors such that  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = 1$  and  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0$ . There exists a unimodular 3-vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , also orthogonal on  $\mathbf{a}$ , such that  $\mathbf{b} \cdot (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{c}) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* By the above proposition, since  $\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{c}$  (which is just the three  $2 \times 2$  minors of the matrix  $[\mathbf{bc}] = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \\ c_1 & c_2 & c_3 \end{bmatrix}$ ) is also unimodular, there exists a unimodular 3-vector  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $(\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{c}) \cdot \mathbf{x} = 1$ , that is,  $\det[\mathbf{bcx}] = 1$ .

Hence  $\mathbf{b} \cdot (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{c}) = 1$ . If  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} = s$ , replace  $\mathbf{x}$  by  $\mathbf{x} - s\mathbf{b}$  and then this vector is also orthogonal on  $\mathbf{a}$  (indeed,  $\mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - s\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} - s(\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}) = s - s = 0$ ).  $\square$

We are now ready to prove our main result

**Theorem 3.5.** *Zero-square  $3 \times 3$  matrices over a Bézout domain, are similar to multiples of  $E_{13}$ .*

*Proof.* Again consider  $T = \begin{bmatrix} x & a & c \\ b & y & e \\ d & f & -x-y \end{bmatrix}$  with  $T^2 = 0_3$  (by Theorem 2.3,  $\text{rank}(T) = 1$ , that is, all  $2 \times 2$  minors are zero).

Denote  $\delta = \gcd(x, a, c)$ ,  $\lambda = \gcd(b, y, e)$  and  $\gamma = \gcd(d, f, x+y)$  so that  $x = \delta x_1$ ,  $a = \delta a_1$ ,  $c = \delta c_1$ ,  $b = \lambda b_1$ ,  $y = \lambda y_1$ ,  $e = \lambda e_1$ ,  $d = \gamma d_1$ ,  $f = \gamma f_1$  and  $x+y = \gamma(x_2+y_2)$ .

According to Proposition 3.2, there are units  $u, v$  such that  $\begin{bmatrix} b_1 & y_1 & e_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} u$  and  $\begin{bmatrix} d_1 & f_1 & -x_2 - y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} v$ .

Hence  $T = \begin{bmatrix} \delta x_1 & \delta a_1 & \delta c_1 \\ \lambda u x_1 & \lambda u a_1 & \lambda u c_1 \\ \gamma v x_1 & \gamma v a_1 & \gamma v c_1 \end{bmatrix}$  and since  $\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix}$  is unimodular, there are  $s, t, z \in R$  and  $s x_1 + t a_1 + z c_1 = 1$ .

Note that  $\text{Tr}(T) = \delta x_1 + \lambda u a_1 + \gamma v c_1 = 0$ .

Denote  $r = \gcd(\delta, \lambda, \gamma) = \gcd(T)$  and denote  $\delta = r \delta_1$ ,  $\lambda = r \lambda_1$ ,  $\gamma = r \gamma_1$ . We are looking for an invertible matrix  $U$  such that  $TU = U(rE_{13}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & r u_{11} \\ 0 & 0 & r u_{21} \\ 0 & 0 & r u_{31} \end{bmatrix}$ .

Our choice for  $r$  is necessary: indeed, writing  $T = rUE_{13}U^{-1}$ , shows that  $r$  divides all entries of  $T$ . Also note that, if  $\det(U) = 1$ , every row and every column of  $U$  is unimodular.

We choose  $\text{col}_3(U) = \begin{bmatrix} s \\ t \\ z \end{bmatrix}$ . By computation

$$r u_{11} = \text{row}_1(T) \cdot \text{col}_3(U) = \delta(x_1 u_{13} + a_1 u_{23} + c_1 u_{33}) = \delta,$$

$$r u_{21} = \text{row}_2(T) \cdot \text{col}_3(U) = \lambda u(x_1 u_{13} + a_1 u_{23} + c_1 u_{33}) = \lambda u,$$

$$r u_{31} = \text{row}_3(T) \cdot \text{col}_3(U) = \gamma v(x_1 u_{13} + a_1 u_{23} + c_1 u_{33}) = \gamma v, \text{ and,}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} \\ u_{21} \\ u_{31} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_{12} \\ u_{22} \\ u_{32} \end{bmatrix} = 0 \text{ and so}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, the first column of  $U$  must be  $\text{col}_1(U) = \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} \\ u_{21} \\ u_{31} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta}{r} \\ \frac{\lambda}{r}u \\ \frac{\gamma}{r}v \end{bmatrix}$ . These

fractions exist since  $r = \text{gcd}(\delta, \lambda, \gamma)$ .

We indeed have  $\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\delta}{r} \\ \frac{\lambda}{r}u \\ \frac{\gamma}{r}v \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{r}(\delta x_1 + \lambda u a_1 + \gamma v c_1) = \frac{1}{r}(x + y - (x + y)) = 0$  (because  $\text{Tr}(T) = 0$ ).

We are searching for a suitable column  $\text{col}_2(U)$  such that  $U = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_1 & u_{12} & s \\ \lambda_1 u & u_{22} & t \\ \gamma_1 v & u_{32} & z \end{bmatrix}$

is invertible and  $\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & a_1 & c_1 \end{bmatrix} U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ .

Taking  $\mathbf{a} = [x_1 \ a_1 \ c_1]$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = [s \ t \ z]$  and  $\mathbf{c} = [\delta_1 \ \lambda_1 u \ \gamma_1 v]$  the existence of  $\mathbf{x} = [u_{12} \ u_{22} \ u_{32}]$  follows (by transpose) from the previous proposition.  $\square$

**Example.** Now  $x_1 = 6 = 2 \cdot 3$ ,  $a_1 = 10 = 2 \cdot 5$ ,  $c_1 = 15 = 3 \cdot 5$ , so that no two of these are coprime.

$$T_6 = \begin{bmatrix} -180 & -300 & -450 \\ 90 & 150 & 225 \\ 12 & 20 & 30 \end{bmatrix}, \delta = -30, \lambda = 15, \gamma = 2 \text{ and so } r = 1.$$

The second equation is a linear Diophantine equation,  $6s + 10t + 15z = 1$ . We denote  $w = 3s + 5t$  and solve  $2w + 15z = 1$ . It gives  $w = -7 + 15n$ ,  $z = 1 - 2n$ .

We choose  $w = -7$  (for  $n = 0$ ) and solve  $3s + 5t = -7$ . This gives for instance  $s = -14$ ,  $t = 7$ , so we choose also  $z = 1$  and  $U = \begin{bmatrix} -30 & u_{12} & -14 \\ 15 & u_{22} & 7 \\ 2 & u_{32} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ .

Now the first equation is

$$-u_{12} \begin{vmatrix} 15 & 7 \\ 2 & 1 \end{vmatrix} + u_{22} \begin{vmatrix} -30 & -14 \\ 2 & 1 \end{vmatrix} - u_{32} \begin{vmatrix} -30 & -14 \\ 15 & 7 \end{vmatrix} = 1,$$

that is,  $-u_{12} - 2u_{22} = 1$ .

Hence  $2u_{22} = -1 - u_{12}$  and so  $6u_{12} - 5 - 5u_{12} + 15u_{32} = 0$  or  $u_{12} + 15u_{32} = 5$ . We can choose  $u_{12} = 5$ ,  $u_{32} = 0$  and so  $u_{22} = -3$ .

Indeed  $\begin{bmatrix} -180 & -300 & -450 \\ 90 & 150 & 225 \\ 12 & 20 & 30 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -30 & 5 & -14 \\ 15 & -3 & 7 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -30 \\ 0 & 0 & 15 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ , as desired.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. C. Brown *Matrices over commutative rings*. Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, Basel, Hong Kong, 1993.
- [2] G. Călugăreanu, Y. Zhou *Rings with fine nilpotents*. Annali del Univ. Ferrara **67** (2) (2021), 231-241.