

# MATRIX INVERTIBLE EXTENSIONS OVER COMMUTATIVE RINGS. PART II: DETERMINANT LIFTABILITY

GRIGORE CĂLUGĂREANU, HORIA F. POP, ADRIAN VASIU

**ABSTRACT.** A unimodular  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $A$  with entries in a commutative ring  $R$  is called weakly determinant liftable if there exists a matrix  $B$  congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ ; if we can choose  $B$  to be unimodular, then  $A$  is called determinant liftable. If  $A$  is extendable to an invertible  $3 \times 3$  matrix  $A^+$ , then  $A$  is weakly determinant liftable. If  $A$  is simple extendable (i.e., we can choose  $A^+$  such that its  $(3, 3)$  entry is 0), then  $A$  is determinant liftable. We present necessary and/or sufficient criteria for  $A$  to be (weakly) determinant liftable and we use them to show that if  $R$  is a  $\Pi_2$  ring in the sense of Part I (resp. is a pre-Schreier domain), then  $A$  is simply extendable (resp. extendable) iff it is determinant liftable (resp. weakly determinant liftable). As an application we show that each  $J_{2,1}$  domain (as defined by Lorenzini) is an elementary divisor domain.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with identity. For  $n \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , let  $\mathbb{M}_n(R)$  be the  $R$ -algebra of  $n \times n$  matrices with entries in  $R$ . We say that  $B, C \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  are congruent modulo an ideal  $I$  of  $R$  if all entries of  $B - C$  belong to  $I$ , i.e.,  $B - C \in \mathbb{M}_2(I)$ . Let  $SL_n(R) := \{M \in \mathbb{M}_n(R) \mid \det(M) = 1\}$ . For a free  $R$ -module  $F$ , let  $Um(F)$  be the set of *unimodular* elements of  $F$ , i.e., of elements  $v \in F$  for which there exists an  $R$ -linear map  $L : F \rightarrow R$  such that  $L(v) = 1$ .

In this paper we study a unimodular matrix  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ .

Recall that  $A$  is called extendable if there exists  $A^+ = \begin{bmatrix} a & b & f \\ c & d & -e \\ -t & s & v \end{bmatrix} \in SL_3(R)$

(see [2], Def. 1.1); we call  $A^+$  an extension of  $A$ . If we can choose  $A^+$  such that  $v = 0$ , then  $A$  is called simply extendable and  $A^+$  is called a simple extension of  $A$ . Several characterizations of simply extendable matrices were proved in [2], Thm. 4.3. For instance,  $A$  is simply extendable iff there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that

$ax + by + cz + dw = 1$  and the matrix  $N = \begin{bmatrix} x & y \\ z & w \end{bmatrix}$  is non-full, i.e., it is a product

$\begin{bmatrix} l \\ m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} o & q \end{bmatrix}$  with  $(l, m, o, q) \in R^4$ ; thus  $\det(N) = 0$ . In practice, it is not easy to check if a unimodular matrix of zero determinant is non-full and hence one is led to weaken the non-full assumption and implicitly to identify classes of rings when the weakening is not an actual weakening. The natural weakening is to replace

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 15A83, 13G05, 19B10. Secondary: 13A05, 13F05, 13F25, 15B33, 16U10.

*Key words and phrases.* ring, matrix, projective module, unimodular.

the non-full assumption by the weaker  $\det(N) = 0$  assumption. Modulo equivalent characterizations, we are led to introduce the following new notions.

**Definition 1.1.** *We say that  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  is weakly determinant liftable if there exists  $B \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ . If there exists such a matrix  $B$  which is unimodular, then we remove the word ‘weakly’, i.e., we say that  $A$  is determinant liftable.*

If either  $A$  is invertible or  $\det(A) = 0$ , then  $A$  is determinant liftable. The (weakly) determinant liftability of  $A$  depends only on the equivalence class of  $A$ . The following characterizations of determinant liftability are proved in Section 3.

**Theorem 1.2.** *For  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *The matrix  $A$  is determinant liftable.*
- (2) *There exists  $C \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  such that  $A + \det(A)C \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  and  $\det(C) = \det(A + \det(A)C) = 0$ .*
- (3) *There exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $ax + by + cz + dw = 1$  and  $xw - yz = 0$ .*
- (4) *There exists  $C \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  such that  $\det(C) = \det(A + \det(A)C) = 0$ .*

Definition 1.1 is motivated by the following implications proved in Section 4.

**Theorem 1.3.** *For  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  the following properties hold:*

- (1) *If  $A$  is simply extendable, then  $A$  is determinant liftable.*
- (2) *If  $A$  is extendable, then  $A$  is weakly determinant liftable.*

Recall from [2], Def. 1.2(1) that  $R$  is called a  $\Pi_2$  ring if each matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  of zero determinant is extendable, equivalently it is simply extendable by [2], Lem. 4.1(1). If  $R$  is a Dedekind domain but not a PID, then it is not a  $\Pi_2$  ring (see [2], Thm. 1.7(4)), so there exist matrices  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  of zero determinant that are not (simply) extendable, thus the converses of Theorem 1.3 do not hold in general.

We will use stable ranges and pre-Schreier domains as recalled in [2], Def. 1.5 and Sect. 2. Each pre-Schreier domain is a  $\Pi_2$  ring (see [2], paragraph after Thm. 1.4). Recall from [2], Def. 1.2(3) that  $R$  is called an  $SE_2$  ring if each matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  is simply extendable. The next two theorems are proved in Section 6.

**Theorem 1.4.** *The ring  $R$  is a  $\Pi_2$  ring iff the simply extendable and determinant properties on a matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  are equivalent.*

From Theorem 1.4 and [2], Thm. 1.6 we get directly:

**Corollary 1.5.** *If  $R$  is a  $\Pi_2$  ring with  $sr(R) \leq 2$ , then the simply extendable, extendable and determinant properties on a matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  are equivalent.*

As each  $SE_2$  ring is a  $\Pi_2$  ring, from Theorem 1.4 we get directly:

**Corollary 1.6.** *The ring  $R$  is an  $SE_2$  ring iff it is a  $\Pi_2$  ring with the property that each matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  with nonzero determinant is determinant liftable.*

**Theorem 1.7.** *Assume  $R$  is such that each zero determinant matrix in  $\mathbb{M}_2(R)$  is non-full (e.g.,  $R$  is a product of pre-Schreier domains). Then a unimodular matrix  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  is extendable iff it is weakly determinant liftable.*

From Theorems 1.3 and 1.7 and [2], Thm. 1.6 we get directly:

**Corollary 1.8.** *Assume  $R$  is such that  $sr(R) \leq 2$  and each zero determinant matrix in  $\mathbb{M}_2(R)$  is non-full (e.g.,  $R$  is a product of pre-Schreier domains of stable range at most 2). Then the simply extendable, extendable, determinant liftable and weakly determinant liftable properties on a matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  are equivalent.*

**Example 1.9.** Let  $R$  be a pre-Schreier domain such that  $sr(R) = 3$  and there exists  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  which is extendable but not simply extendable (e.g.,  $R = K[X, Y]$  with  $K$  a subfield of  $\mathbb{R}$ , see [2], Ex. 6.1). Then  $A$  is weakly determinant liftable by Theorem 1.3(2) but it is not determinant liftable by Theorem 1.4. So the inequalities in Corollaries 1.5 and 1.8 are optimal.

Recall that  $R$  is a Hermite ring in the sense of Kaplansky if  $R^2 = RUm(R^2)$ . Lorenzini introduced 3 classes of rings that are ‘between’ elementary divisor rings and Hermite rings (see [7], Prop. 4.11). We define the first class,  $J_{2,1}$ , as follows.

**Definition 1.10.** *We say that  $R$  is:*

- (1) *a  $WJ_{2,1}$  ring if for each  $(a, b, c, d) \in Um(R^4)$  and every  $(\Psi, \Delta) \in R^2$ , there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $ax + by + cx + dw = \Psi$  and  $xy - zw = \Delta$ ;*
- (2) *a  $J_{2,1}$  ring if it is a Hermite ring and a  $WJ_{2,1}$  ring.*

The above definition of a  $J_{2,1}$  ring is equivalent to the one in [7], Def. 4.6 (see Proposition 8.1). In Section 7 we use Theorem 1.4 to solve a problem posed by Lorenzini as follows.

**Theorem 1.11.** *Let  $R$  be a  $WJ_{2,1}$  ring. The following properties hold:*

- (1) *Each matrix  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  is determinant liftable.*
- (2) *Assume  $R$  is also a Hermite ring (i.e.,  $R$  is a  $J_{2,1}$  ring). Then  $R$  is an elementary divisor ring iff it is a  $\Pi_2$  ring (thus the ring  $R$  is an elementary divisor domain iff it is an integral domain).*

Therefore the constructions for an arbitrary commutative ring performed in [7], Ex. 3.5 always produce rings which are either elementary divisor rings or are not  $\Pi_2$  rings (in particular, the integral domains produced are elementary divisor domains).

The  $R$ -algebras required in the proofs of above theorems are introduced in Section 2 and their main properties are presented in Theorem 2.1. Sections 5 and 9 prove criteria for weakly determinant liftability and determinant liftability via completions (respectively). Section 8 studies rings  $R$  for which all  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  are (weakly) determinant liftable. Part III will contain applications to Hermite rings.

## 2. FIVE ALGEBRAS

Let  $N(R)$  and  $Z(R)$  be the nilradical and the set of zero divisors of  $R$  (respectively). Let  $Spec R$  be the spectrum of  $R$ . Let  $Max R$  be the set of maximal prime ideals of  $R$ . For an element  $r$  of an  $R$ -algebra,  $(r)$  will be the principal ideal generated by it and  $\bar{r}$  will be its reductions via surjective ring homomorphisms.

For  $E \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  let  $Tr(E)$  be its trace, let  $adj(E) \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  be its adjugate, and let  $Ker_E$  and  $Im_E$  be the kernel and the image (respectively) of the  $R$ -linear map  $L_E : R^2 \rightarrow R^2$  defined by  $E$ . Let  $I_2$  be the identity of  $\mathbb{M}_2(R)$ . Let  $X, Y, Z, W, V, U$  be indeterminates. To  $A$  and elements  $x, y, z, w$  of an  $R$ -algebra, we define matrices

$$C = C_{(x,y,z,w)} := \begin{bmatrix} -w & z \\ y & -x \end{bmatrix},$$

$$D = D_{A,(x,y,z,w)} := I_2 + \operatorname{adj}(A)C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - by - dw & bx + dz \\ ay + cw & 1 - ax - cz \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B = B_{A,(x,y,z,w)} := AD = A + \det(A)C = \begin{bmatrix} a - \det(A)w & b + \det(A)z \\ c + \det(A)y & d - \det(A)x \end{bmatrix}.$$

To  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \operatorname{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  we attach five  $R$ -algebras. The  $R$ -algebra

$$\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_A := R[X, Y, Z, W]/(1 - aX - bY - cZ - dW)$$

represents unimodular relations  $ax + by + cz + dw = 1$  in  $R$ -algebras. The  $R$ -algebra

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_A := R[X, Y, Z, W, V]/(1 - aXW - bXZ - cYW - dYZ - (ad - bc)V),$$

represents extensions  $\begin{bmatrix} a & b & y \\ c & d & -x \\ -z & w & v \end{bmatrix}$  of (images of)  $A$  in rings of  $2 \times 2$  matrices with entries in  $R$ -algebras. Similarly, the  $R$ -algebra

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_A := R[X, Y, Z, W]/(1 - aXW - bXZ - cYW - dYZ) = \mathcal{E}/(\bar{V}),$$

represents simple extensions of (images of)  $A$  in rings of  $2 \times 2$  matrices with entries in  $R$ -algebras. The polynomial

$$\Phi = \Phi_A(X, Y, Z, W) := 1 - aX - bY - cZ - dW + (ad - bc)(XW - YZ) \in R[X, Y, Z, W]$$

is a determinant with many decompositions of the form  $e_{1,1}e_{2,2} - e_{1,2}e_{2,1}$ , e.g.,  $\Phi = (1 - aX - cZ)(1 - bY - dW) - (aY + cW)(bX + dZ)$ . Thus the  $R$ -algebra

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_A := R[X, Y, Z, W]/(\Phi)$$

represents  $2 \times 2$  matrices  $C = C_{(x,y,z,w)}$  with entries in  $R$ -algebras for which  $\det(D) = 0$  and the  $R$ -algebra

$$\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_A := R[X, Y, Z, W]/(1 - aX - bY - cZ - dW, XW - YZ) = \mathcal{W}/(\bar{X}\bar{W} - \bar{Y}\bar{Z}) = \mathcal{U}/(\bar{X}\bar{W} - \bar{Y}\bar{Z})$$

represents such matrices  $C$  for which  $\det(C) = \det(D) = 0$ ; note that

$$(I) \quad \det(D) = \Phi(x, y, z, w) \quad \text{and} \quad \det(B) = \det(A)\Phi(x, y, z, w).$$

If  $c = 0$ , then

$$(II) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} &= R[X, Y, Z, W]/((1 - aX)(1 - dW) - Y(b + adZ)) \\ &= R[X, Y, Z, W]/((1 - aX)(1 - bY - dW) - aY(bX + dZ)). \end{aligned}$$

The matrix  $A$  is extendable (resp. simply extendable) iff the  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $R \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$  (resp.  $R \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ ) has a retraction.

If  $b = c$ , then the  $R$ -algebras  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  have an involution defined by fixing  $X$  and  $W$  and by interchanging  $Y$  and  $Z$ , and we have

$$\mathcal{W}/(\bar{Y} - \bar{Z}) = R[X, Y, W]/((1 - aX - bY)(1 - bY - dW) - (bX + dY)(aY + bW)),$$

$$\mathcal{S}/(\bar{Y} - \bar{Z}) = R[X, Y, W]/((1 - aXW) - Y(b(X + W) + dY)).$$

We define an arrow diagram of  $R$ -algebra homomorphisms

$$(III) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{W} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Z} & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{U} \\ & & \downarrow \rho & & \\ \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{S} & & \end{array}$$

as follows. The horizontal homomorphisms are epimorphisms defined by identifications  $\mathcal{W}/(\bar{X}\bar{W} - \bar{Y}\bar{Z}) = \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{U}/(\bar{X}\bar{W} - \bar{Y}\bar{Z})$  and  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{E}/(\bar{V})$ , and  $\rho$  is defined by mapping  $\bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{W}$  to  $\bar{X}\bar{W}, \bar{X}\bar{Z}, \bar{Y}\bar{W}, \bar{Y}\bar{Z}$  (respectively). Equation (II) and Diagram (III) encode many applications in this Part II and the sequel Part III.

As  $A \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ , the  $R$ -linear map  $M_A : R^4 \rightarrow R$  that maps  $[x, y, z, w]^T$  to  $ax + by + cz + dw$  is surjective. Thus

$$P = P_A := \text{Ker}(M_A) = \{(x, y, z, w) \in R^4 \mid ax + by + cz + dw = 0\}$$

and its dual  $P^*$  are projective  $R$ -modules of rank 3 such that  $P \oplus R \cong P^* \oplus R \cong R^4$ . From [6], Ch. III, Sect. 6, Thm. 6.7 (1) it follows that  $P \cong P^*$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *The following properties hold:*

- (1) *For  $f \in \{a, b, c, d\}$ , the  $R_f$ -algebra  $(\mathcal{U})_f$  is a polynomial  $R_f$ -algebra in 3 indeterminates. Also, the  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{U}$  is isomorphic to the symmetric  $R$ -algebra of  $P$  (thus the homomorphism  $R \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  is smooth of relative dimension 3).*
- (2) *The  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{Z}$  is smooth of relative dimension 2.*
- (3) *The  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{E}$  is smooth of relative dimension 4.*
- (4) *The  $R$ -algebra  $(\mathcal{W})_{1-(ad-bc)(XW-YZ)}$  is smooth of relative dimension 3 (thus, if  $ad - bc \in N(R)$ , then the  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{W}$  is smooth of relative dimension 3).*
- (5) *The morphism of schemes  $\text{Spec } \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{Z}$  defined by  $\rho$  is a  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{Z}}$ -torsor and hence it is smooth of relative dimension 1 (thus the  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{S}$  is smooth of relative dimension 3).*
- (6) *If  $\det(A) = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{U}$ , for  $f \in \{a, b, c, d\}$ , the  $R_f$ -algebra  $(\mathcal{Z})_f$  is a polynomial  $R_f$ -algebra in 2 indeterminates, and there exists a self-dual projective  $R$ -module  $Q$  of rank 2 such that the  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{Z}$  is isomorphic to the symmetric  $R$ -algebra of  $Q$  and  $Q \oplus R \cong P$  (thus  $Q \oplus R^2 \cong R^4$ ).*

*Proof.* (1) As  $A \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ , we have  $\text{Spec } R = \cup_{f \in \{a, b, c, d\}} \text{Spec } R_f$ . To show that the  $R_f$ -algebra  $(\mathcal{U})_f$  is a polynomial  $R_f$ -algebra we can assume that  $f = a$  and by replacing  $(R, X)$  with  $(R_f, a^{-1}X)$  we can assume that  $a = 1$ , in which case we have  $\mathcal{U} \cong R[Y, Z, W]$ . If  $(a', b', c', d') \in R^4$  is such that  $M_A(a', b', c', d') = 1$ , then under the substitution  $(X', Y', Z', W') := (a', b', c', d') + (X, Y, Z, W)$ , the  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{U} = R[X', Y', Z', W']/(aX' + bY' + cZ' + dW')$  is isomorphic to the symmetric  $R$ -algebra of the  $R$ -module  $(X', Y', Z', W')/(aX' + bY' + cZ' + dW' + (X', Y', Z', W')^2)$  of quotient of ideals; as this  $R$ -module is isomorphic  $P^*$  and so to  $P$ , part (1) holds.

(2) It suffices to show that if  $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Max}(R[X, Y, Z, W])$  contains  $XW - YZ$  and  $1 - aX - bY - cZ - dW$ , then, denoting  $\kappa := R[X, Y, Z, W]/\mathfrak{n}$ , the  $\kappa$ -vector space

$$\kappa\delta X \oplus \kappa\delta Y \oplus \kappa\delta z \oplus \kappa\delta w / (\kappa\delta(aX + bY + cZ + dW) + \kappa\delta(XW - YZ))$$

has dimension 2 (see [9], Exp. II, Thm. 4.10); here  $\delta$  is the differential operator denoted in an unusual way in order to avoid confusion with the element  $d \in R$ . To show this, it suffices to show that the assumption that the reduction of the matrix

$$N_A := \begin{bmatrix} a & b & c & d \\ W & -Z & -Y & X \end{bmatrix}$$

modulo  $\mathfrak{n}$  has rank  $\leq 1$ , leads to a contradiction; as  $N_A$  modulo  $\mathfrak{n}$  has unimodular rows, there exists  $\alpha \in R[X, Y, Z, W] \setminus \mathfrak{n}$  such that  $(a, b, c, d) + \alpha(W, -Z, -Y, X) \in \mathfrak{n}^4$ . From this, as  $XW - YZ, 1 - aX - bY - cZ - dW \in \mathfrak{n}$ , it follows that  $2\alpha(XW - YZ)$  is congruent to both 0 and  $-1$  modulo  $\mathfrak{n}$ , a contradiction. Thus part (2) holds.

(3) Based on [9], Exp. II, Thm. 4.10, it suffices to show that for

$$\Theta(X, Y, Z, W, V) := 1 - aXW - bXZ - cYW - dYZ - (ad - bc)V \in R[X, Y, Z, W, V],$$

$\Theta$  and its partial derivatives  $\Theta_X, \Theta_Y, \Theta_Z, \Theta_W$  and  $\Theta_V$  generate  $R[X, Y, Z, W, V]$ , but this follows directly from the identity  $1 = \Theta - V\Theta_V - X\Theta_X - Y\Theta_Y$ .

(4) Similar to (3), part (4) follows from the fact that  $1 - (ad - bc)(XW - YZ)$  is  $\Phi - X\Phi_X - Y\Phi_Y - Z\Phi_Z - W\Phi_W$ .

(5) The  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{Z}}$ -action

$$\text{Spec}(\mathcal{S}[U, U^{-1}]) = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{Z}[U, U^{-1}]) \times_{\text{Spec}(\mathcal{Z})} \text{Spec}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathcal{S})$$

is given by the  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}[U, U^{-1}]$  that maps  $\bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{Z}$ , and  $\bar{W}$  to  $U\bar{X}, U\bar{Y}, U^{-1}\bar{Z}$ , and  $U^{-1}\bar{W}$  (respectively); the fact that it makes the morphism  $\text{Spec} \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \mathcal{Z}$  a  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{Z}}$ -torsor is a standard exercise as the morphism  $\rho$  represents decompositions of  $\begin{bmatrix} \bar{X} & \bar{Y} \\ \bar{W} & \bar{Z} \end{bmatrix} \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{Z}))$  as a product  $\begin{bmatrix} \bar{X}_{\mathcal{S}} \\ \bar{Y}_{\mathcal{S}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W}_{\mathcal{S}} & \bar{Z}_{\mathcal{S}} \end{bmatrix}$ , the lower right index  $\mathcal{S}$  emphasizing indeterminates for  $\mathcal{S}$  (triviality over the open cover  $\{\text{Spec} \mathcal{Z}_{\bar{X}}, \text{Spec} \mathcal{Z}_{\bar{Y}}, \text{Spec} \mathcal{Z}_{\bar{Z}}, \text{Spec} \mathcal{Z}_{\bar{W}}\}$  of  $\text{Spec} \mathcal{Z}$ ).

(6) Clearly,  $W = U$ . For the polynomial  $R$ -algebra part we can assume that  $f = a$ . By eliminating  $\bar{X} = a^{-1}(1 - b\bar{Y} - c\bar{Z} - \bar{W})$ , we obtain an isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{Z})_a \cong R_a[Y, Z, W]/(YZ - a^{-1}W(1 - bY - cZ - dW)),$$

which via the change of indeterminates  $(Y_1, Z_1, W_1) := (aY + cW, aZ + bW, aW)$  is isomorphic, as  $ad = bc$ , to  $R_a[Y_1, Z_1, W_1]/a^{-2}(Y_1Z_1 - W_1) \cong R_a[Y_1, Z_1]$ . From [1], Thm. 4.4 it follows that  $\mathcal{Z}$  is isomorphic to the symmetric  $R$ -algebra of a projective  $R$ -module  $Q$  of rank 2. As  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a symmetric  $R$ -algebra, there exists an  $R$ -algebra epimorphism (retraction)  $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow R$  and hence there exists a quadruple  $\zeta := (a', b', c', d') \in R^4$  such that  $1 - M_A(\zeta) = 0 = a'd' - b'c'$ . With the substitution  $(X', Y', Z', W') := (a', b', c', d') + (X, Y, Z, W)$ , we identify

$$\mathcal{Z} = R[X', Y', Z', W']/(aX' + bY' + cZ' + dW', a'W' - c'Y' - b'Z' + d'X' - X'W' + Y'Z').$$

Endowing  $R^4$  with the inner product  $\langle (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4), (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^4 x_i y_i$ , we have  $\langle \zeta, (d', -c', -b', a') \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle \zeta, (a, b, c, d) \rangle = 1$ . Therefore the  $R$ -submodule  $W := R(a, b, c, d) + R(d', -c', -b', a')$  of  $R^4$  is a direct sum (so  $W \cong R^2$ ) and a direct summand (i.e., and  $R^4/W$  is a projective  $R$ -module of rank 2). Let

$$\mathcal{Z}' := R[X', Y', Z', W']/(aX' + bY' + cZ' + dW', a'W' - b'Z' - c'Y' + d'X').$$

Note that  $\text{Spec} R = \cup_{f \in \{a, b, c, d\}} \text{Spec} R_{ff'}$  and for  $f \in \{a, d\}$  (resp.  $f \in \{b, c\}$ ), the  $R_{ff'}$ -algebra  $(\mathcal{Z}')_{ff'}$  is isomorphic to  $R_{ff'}[Y', Z']$  (resp.  $R_{ff'}[X', W']$ ). Let  $J$  and  $J'$  be the ideals of  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}'$  (respectively) generated by the images of  $X', Y', Z', W'$ . We view  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}'$  as augmented  $R$ -algebras (in the terminology of [1]) with the augmentations given by the natural identifications  $\mathcal{Z}/J = \mathcal{Z}'/J' = R$  of  $R$ -algebras. The  $R$ -modules  $Q := J/J^2$  and  $Q' = J'/(J')^2$  are identified via the third isomorphism theorem with the following quotient of ideals

$$(X', Y', Z', W')/((aX' + bY' + cZ' + dW', a'W' - b'Z' - c'Y' + d'X') + (X', Y', Z', W')^2)$$

of  $R[X', Y', Z', W']$ , thus are isomorphic to  $R^4/W$ . From [1], Cor. 4.3 and the above part on isomorphisms of localizations  $(\mathcal{Z})_f$  and  $(\mathcal{Z}')_{ff'}$  that involve indeterminates that are linear (not necessary homogeneous) polynomials in  $X', Y', Z', W'$ , it follows that the augmented  $R$ -algebras  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{Z}'$  are isomorphic to the symmetric  $R$ -algebras of  $Q$  and  $Q'$  (respectively) endowed with their natural augmentations, and

so they are isomorphic. As  $W$  is a direct summand of  $R^4$ , there exists a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow P^* \rightarrow Q' \rightarrow 0$  of  $R$ -modules, so  $Q \oplus R \cong P$ . Thus  $Q \oplus R^2 \cong R^4$ . As  $Q$  is stable free of rank 2, it is self-dual by [6], Ch. III, Sect. 6, Thm. 6.8.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.2.** *Assume there exists two ideals  $\mathfrak{i}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{i}_2$  of  $R$  such that  $\mathfrak{i}_1 \cap \mathfrak{i}_2 = 0$  and  $\det(A) \in \mathfrak{i}_2$ . Then for  $\mathcal{E} \in \{\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{W}\}$ , each  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{i}_1$  lifts to an  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow R$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $h_{1,2} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow R/(\mathfrak{i}_1 + \mathfrak{i}_2)$  be induced by an  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $h_1 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{i}_1$ . As  $A$  modulo  $\mathfrak{i}_2$  has zero determinant,  $\mathcal{E}/\mathfrak{i}_2\mathcal{E}$  is the symmetric algebra of a projective  $R/\mathfrak{i}_2$ -module  $Q_2$  of rank 2 if  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{Z}$  and of rank 3 if  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{W}$  (see Theorem 2.1(1) and (6)). The  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $h_{1,2}$  is uniquely determined by an  $R$ -linear map  $l_{1,2} : Q_2 \rightarrow R/(\mathfrak{i}_1 + \mathfrak{i}_2)$ . If  $l_2 : Q_2 \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{i}_2$  is an  $R$ -linear map that lifts  $l_{1,2}$  and if  $h_2 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{i}_2$  is the  $R$ -algebra homomorphism uniquely determined by  $l_2$ , then  $h_2$  lifts  $h_{1,2}$ . As  $\mathfrak{i}_1 \cap \mathfrak{i}_2 = 0$ , we have a pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \longrightarrow & R/\mathfrak{i}_1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ R/\mathfrak{i}_2 & \longrightarrow & R/(\mathfrak{i}_1 + \mathfrak{i}_2), \end{array}$$

so there exists a unique  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow R$  that lifts  $h_1$  and  $h_2$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.3.** (1) The fact that if the Picard group  $\text{Pic}(R)$  is trivial then  $R$  is a  $\Pi_2$  ring (see [2], paragraph after Thm. 1.4) also follows easily from Theorem 2.1(5) and (6) via the equivalence between  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -torsors and line bundles.

(2) For each  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R$ , the image of  $A$  in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R_{\mathfrak{m}}))$  is simply extendable (for instance, see [2], Cor. 4.6(2)). Thus, if  $ab = bc$  and  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a polynomial  $R$ -algebra in 2 indeterminates, Quillen Patching Theorem (see [8], Thm. 1) implies that the  $\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathcal{Z}}$ -torsor of Theorem 2.1(5) is the pullback of a  $\mathbb{G}_{m,R}$ -torsor.

**Example 2.4.** Assume  $R$  is a Hermite ring. As  $P$  is stable free, it is free (see [10], Cor. 3.2); so  $P \cong R^3$  and the  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{U}$  is a polynomial  $R$ -algebra in 3 indeterminates. If  $\det(A) = 0$ , then similarly we argue that  $Q \cong R^2$  and the  $R$ -algebra  $\mathcal{Z}$  is a polynomial  $R$ -algebra in 2 indeterminates and we will prove that the  $\mathbb{G}_{m,\mathcal{Z}}$ -torsor of Theorem 2.1(5) is the pullback of a  $\mathbb{G}_{m,R}$ -torsor. Due to the equivalence between  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -torsors and line bundles, it suffices to show that for a polynomial  $R$ -algebra  $R_1$ , the functorial homomorphism  $\text{Pic}(R) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(R_1)$  is an isomorphism. To show this we can assume that  $R$  is reduced, i.e.,  $N(R) = 0$ . For each  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R$ , the reduced local Hermite ring  $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is a reduced valuation ring (see [4], Thms. 1 and 2), hence a valuation domain (this was already stated in [5], Sect. 10).<sup>1</sup> Thus  $R$  is a normal ring (i.e., all its localizations  $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$  are integral domains that are integrally closed in their fields of fractions); hence it is a seminormal ring in the sense of [3]. From this and [3], Thm. 1.5 it follows that  $\text{Pic}(R) \rightarrow \text{Pic}(R_1)$  is an isomorphism.

<sup>1</sup>Recall from [5], Sect. 10, Def. that a ring  $R$  is called a valuation ring if for each  $(a, b) \in R^2$ , either  $a$  divides  $b$  or  $b$  divides  $a$ , equivalently, if the ideals of  $R$  are totally ordered by set inclusion. Reduced valuation rings are integral domains. This is so as for a reduced local ring  $S$  which is not an integral domain there exists nonzero elements  $a, b \in S$  such that  $ab = 0$ , thus the nilpotent ideal  $Sa \cap Sb$  is 0, and it follows that the finitely generated ideal  $Sa + Sb \cong Sa \oplus Sb$  is not principal.

**Example 2.5.** Assume  $A$  is symmetric and  $\det(A) = 0$ . As  $(a, b, c, d) \in Um(R^4)$ ,  $b = c$ ,  $ad = bc$ , we have  $(a, d) \in Um(R^2)$ . Thus  $Spec \mathcal{S} = Spec \mathcal{S}_a \cup Spec \mathcal{S}_d$ . We have canonical  $R$ -algebra identifications  $(\mathcal{S})_a \cong R_a[X_1, Y, Z, W_1]/(1 - X_1W_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{S})_d \cong R_d[X, Y_1, Z_1, W]/(1 - Y_1Z_1)$ , where  $X_1 := aX + bY$ ,  $W_1 := W + ba^{-1}Z$ ,  $Y_1 := Y + bd^{-1}X$ , and  $Z_1 := dZ + bW$ .

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

For  $v = (x, y, z, w) \in R^4$ , let  $C = C_v, B = B_{A,v}, D = D_{A,v} \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  be as in Section 2. As  $\text{Tr}(D) = 2 - ax - by - cz - dw$ , from Equation (I) it follows that

$$(IV) \quad 1 - \det(A)\det(C) = \text{Tr}(D) - \det(D).$$

We first prove the following general lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $G, H, E \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$ . The following properties hold:*

- (1) *There exists a matrix  $O \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  such that  $H = G(I_2 + \text{adj}(G)O)$  iff  $G$  and  $H$  are congruent modulo  $R\det(G)$ .*
- (2) *If  $GE$  is unimodular, then  $G$  and  $E$  are unimodular.*
- (3) *If  $G$  is unimodular,  $H = GE$  and  $G$  and  $H$  are congruent modulo  $R\det(G)$ , then  $H$  is unimodular iff  $E$  is unimodular.*

*Proof.* As  $G\text{adj}(G) = \det(G)I_2$ , for  $O \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  we have  $H = G + \det(G)O$  iff  $H = G(I_2 + \text{adj}(G)O)$ . So part (1) holds. The only nontrivial part of parts (2) and (3) is the ‘if’ part of part (3). It suffices to show that the ideal  $\mathfrak{h}$  of  $R$  generated by the entries of  $H$  is not contained in any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R$ . This holds if  $\det(G) \in \mathfrak{m}$  as  $G$  and  $H$  are congruent modulo  $R\det(G)$ . If  $\det(G) \notin \mathfrak{m}$ , then  $G$  modulo  $\mathfrak{m}$  is invertible, thus  $GE$  modulo  $\mathfrak{m}$  is nonzero as this is so for  $E$  modulo  $\mathfrak{m}$ , so  $\mathfrak{h} \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ .  $\square$

To prove Theorem 1.2, we first remark that clearly  $(2) \Rightarrow (1) \wedge (4)$ .

If  $v = (x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  is such that  $ax + by + cz + dw = 1$  and  $xw - yz = 0$ , then  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) = 0$ ,  $\det(C) = 0$ ,  $C \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  and for  $B = A + \det(A)C$  we have  $\det(B) = 0$  (see Equation (I)); as  $\text{Tr}(D) - \det(D) = 1$  by Equation (IV),  $D$  is unimodular, so  $B = AD$  is unimodular by Lemma 3.1(2), hence  $(3) \Rightarrow (2)$  holds.

To show that  $(4) \Rightarrow (3)$ , let  $v = (x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  be such that  $C = C_v$  and assume that  $\det(B) = \det(C) = 0$ . Thus  $xw - zy = 0$  and  $\det(A)\Phi(x, y, z, w) = \det(B) = 0$  (by Equation (I)). If  $\det(A) \notin Z(R)$ , then  $1 - ax - by - cz - dw = 0$ , hence  $(4) \Rightarrow (3)$ .

In general, we have to show that the  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $R \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  has a retraction  $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow R$ . By replacing  $R$  with a finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}$ -subalgebra  $S$  of  $R$  such that  $A, B \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(S))$  and  $C \in \mathbb{M}_2(S)$ , we can assume that  $R$  is noetherian. Thus the set of minimal prime ideals  $\{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_j\}$  of  $R$  has a finite number of elements  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . As the homomorphism  $R \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  is smooth (see Theorem 2.1(2)), each  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow R/N(R)$  lifts to an  $R$ -algebra epimorphism  $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow R$ . So, by replacing  $R$  with  $R/N(R)$ , we can assume that  $N(R) = \cap_{i=1}^j \mathfrak{p}_i = 0$ . Let  $\det(A)_i$  be the image of  $\det(A)$  in  $R/\mathfrak{p}_i$ . Based on Theorem 2.1(6) we can assume that  $\det(A) \neq 0$ , and hence there exists an  $i \in \{1, \dots, j\}$  such that  $\det(A) \notin \mathfrak{p}_i$ , i.e.,  $\det(A)_i \neq 0$ . We can assume that the minimal prime ideals are indexed such that there exists  $j' \in \{1, \dots, j\}$  for which  $\det(A)_i \neq 0$  if  $i \in \{1, \dots, j'\}$  and  $\det(A)_i = 0$  if  $i \in \{j' + 1, \dots, j\}$ . If  $\mathfrak{i}_1 := \cap_{i=1}^{j'} \mathfrak{p}_i$  and  $\mathfrak{i}_2 := \cap_{i=j'+1}^j \mathfrak{p}_i$ , we have  $\mathfrak{i}_1 \cap \mathfrak{i}_2 = 0$  and  $\det(A) \in \mathfrak{i}_2$ . As  $\det(A) + \mathfrak{i}_1 \notin Z(R/\mathfrak{i}_1)$ , from the prior paragraph it follows that



there exists an  $R$ -algebra homomorphism  $h_1 : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{i}_1$ . From Corollary 2.2 we get that there exists a retraction  $\mathcal{Z} \rightarrow R$  that lifts  $h_1$ . So (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) holds.

We conclude that statements (2), (3) and (4) are equivalent and imply (1).

We prove that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). As (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3), as above we argue that it suffices to prove that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) when  $R$  is noetherian and  $N(R) = 0$ . Let the ideals  $\mathfrak{i}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{i}_2$  of  $R$  be as above. Let  $B \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  be congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ . Let  $v = (x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  be such that  $B = B_{A,v}$  (see Lemma 3.1(1)). With  $C = C_v$  and  $D = D_{A,v}$ , as  $B = AD \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  we have  $D \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  (see Lemma 3.1(2)). As  $\det(A) + \mathfrak{i}_1 \notin Z(R/\mathfrak{i}_1)$ , from the identity  $\det(B) = \det(A)\det(D) = 0$  and Equation (I) it follows that  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) \in \mathfrak{i}_1$ , hence there exists an  $R$ -algebra epimorphism  $g_1 : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{i}_1$  that maps the elements  $\bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{W}$  of  $\mathcal{W}$  to  $x + \mathfrak{i}_1, y + \mathfrak{i}_1, z + \mathfrak{i}_1, w + \mathfrak{i}_1$  (respectively). Let  $g : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow R$  be an  $R$ -algebra homomorphism that lifts  $g_1$  (see Corollary 2.2). Let  $v' = (x', y', z', w') \in R^4$  be the images via  $g^4$  of  $(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{W}) \in \mathcal{W}^4$ . For the matrices  $C' := C_{v'}$  and  $D' := D_{A,v'}$  we have (see Equation (I))  $\det(D') = \Phi(x', y', z', w') = 0$  and  $C'$  and  $C$  are congruent modulo  $\mathfrak{i}_1$ . Hence  $D'$  and  $D$  are congruent modulo  $\mathfrak{i}_1$ . As  $D$  is unimodular, it follows that the ideal  $\mathfrak{d}'$  of  $R$  generated by the entries of  $D'$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{d}' + \mathfrak{i}_1 = R$  and thus  $\mathfrak{d}'$  is not contained in any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R$  with  $\det(A) \notin \mathfrak{m}$ . As  $\text{Tr}(D') - \det(D') = 1 - \det(A)\det(C') \in \mathfrak{d}'$  by Equation (IV),  $\mathfrak{d}'$  is not contained in any maximal ideal which does not contain  $1 - \det(A)\det(C')$ . Hence  $\mathfrak{d}'$  is not contained in any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R$ , thus  $\mathfrak{d}' = R$ , i.e.,  $D'$  is unimodular. From Lemma 3.1(2) it follows that  $B' := AD'$  is unimodular.

By replacing the triple  $(C, B, D)$  with  $(C', B', D')$ , we can assume that  $\det(D) = 0$ . As  $D = I_2 + \text{adj}(A)C$  has zero determinant, it follows that  $C \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ .

To complete the proof that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2), it suffices to show that we can replace  $C$  by a matrix  $C_1 \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  with  $\det(C_1) = 0$  and such that for  $D_1 := I_2 + \text{adj}(A)C_1$  we have  $\det(D_1) = 0$  and  $D_1 \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ : so  $B_1 := AD_1$  is congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  and unimodular by Lemma 3.1(1) and (3) with  $\det(B_1) = 0$ . Recall that  $\text{Ker}_D$  and  $\text{Im}_D$  are projective  $R$ -modules of rank 1 (see [2], Sect. 3) thus the short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}_D \rightarrow R^2 \rightarrow \text{Im}_D \rightarrow 0$  splits, i.e., it has a section  $\sigma : \text{Im}_D \rightarrow R^2$ . Let  $C_1 \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  be the unique matrix such that  $\text{Ker}_D \subseteq \text{Ker}_{C_1 - C}$  and  $\sigma(\text{Im}_D) \subseteq \text{Ker}_{C_1}$ . As  $\text{Ker}_D$  is a direct summand of  $R^2$  of rank 1 and for  $t \in \text{Ker}_D$  we have  $\text{adj}(A)C_1(t) = \text{adj}(A)C(t) = -t$ , it follows first that  $\text{Ker}_D \subseteq \text{Ker}_{D_1}$ , second that  $\text{Im}_{C_1} = C_1(\text{Ker}_D) = C(\text{Ker}_D)$  is a direct summand of  $R^2$  of rank 1 isomorphic to  $\text{Ker}_D$ , and third that  $\text{Ker}_{C_1} = \sigma(\text{Im}_D)$  is also a direct summand of  $R^2$  of rank 1. Moreover, we compute

$$\text{Im}_{D_1} = D_1(\sigma(\text{Im}_D)) = \{x + \text{adj}(A)C_1(x) \mid x \in \sigma(\text{Im}_D)\} = \sigma(\text{Im}_D).$$

We conclude that  $C_1, D_1 \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  and  $\det(C_1) = \det(D_1) = 0$ . Hence (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2), thus Theorem 1.2 holds.

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

Part (1) holds as clearly statement (4) of [2], Thm. 4.3 implies statement (3) of Theorem 1.3. To prove part (2) we first note that  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  is simply extendable (see [2], Lem. 4.1(1)) and hence from [2], Prop. 5.1(1) it follows that it is non-full, i.e., there exist  $\bar{l}, \bar{m}, \bar{o}, \bar{q} \in R/R\det(A)$  such that  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  is

$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{l} \\ \bar{m} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{o} & \bar{q} \end{bmatrix}$ . If  $l, m, o, q \in R$  lift  $\bar{l}, \bar{m}, \bar{o}, \bar{q}$  (respectively), then

$B := \begin{bmatrix} l & \\ & m \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} o & q \end{bmatrix}$  is congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R \det(A)$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ , hence  $A$  is weakly determinant liftable. Thus Theorem 1.3 holds.

## 5. A CRITERION FOR WEAKLY DETERMINANT LIFTABILITY

**Theorem 5.1.** *For  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  the following properties hold:*

(1) *If  $A$  is determinant liftable, then there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) = 0$ .*

(2) *If there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) = 0$ , then  $A$  is weakly determinant liftable.*

(3) *If either  $N(R) = 0$  or  $\det(A) \notin Z(R)$ , then the converse of part (2) holds.*

(4) *If  $\det(A) \in Z(R)$  and  $A$  is weakly determinant liftable, then there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) \in N(R)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $A$  is determinant liftable, then there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $ax + by + cz + dw = 1$  and  $xw - yz = 0$  by Theorem 1.2, so  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) = 0$ . Thus part (1) holds. If  $v = (x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  is as in part (2), then for  $B = B_{A,v}$  we have  $\det(B) = 0$  by Equation (I). Thus, as  $A$  and  $B$  are congruent modulo  $R \det(A)$ ,  $A$  is weakly determinant liftable. The proof that part (3) holds if  $N(R) = 0$  is the same as for the existence of a retraction  $\mathcal{W} \rightarrow R$  in the proof of Theorem 1.2 (see the implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) of Section 3). If  $\det(A) \notin Z(R)$  and  $B \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  is congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R \det(A)$  with  $\det(B) = 0$ , then for a  $v = (x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $B = B_{A,v} = A(I_2 + \text{adj}(A)C_v)$  (see Lemma 3.1(1)), we have  $\det(I_2 + \text{adj}(A)C_v) = 0$  and part (3) holds by Equation (I). Part (4) follows from part (3).  $\square$

**Example 5.2.** If  $R$  is such that  $N(R) = 0$  and there exists  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  which is not determinant liftable but is weakly determinant liftable (see Example 1.9), then there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) = 0$  by Theorem 5.1(3). Hence the converse of Theorem 5.1(1) does not hold in general.

**Remark 5.3.** If  $v = (x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  is such that  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) \neq 0 = \Phi(x, y, z, w)^2$  and the matrix  $B_{A,v}$  is not unimodular, i.e., the ideal  $\mathfrak{b}$  generated by its entries is not  $R$ , then there exists  $v' = (x', y', z', w') \in v + R\Phi(x, y, z, w)^4$  such that  $\Phi(x', y', z', w') = 0$  iff  $\Phi(x, y, z, w) \in \Phi(x, y, z, w)\mathfrak{b}$ .

## 6. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.4 AND 1.7

The ‘if’ part of Theorem 1.4 follows from the fact that all unimodular matrices in  $\mathbb{M}_2(R)$  of zero determinant are determinant liftable. Based on Theorem 1.3(1), for the ‘only if’ part it suffices to show that if  $R$  is a  $\Pi_2$  and if for  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  there exists  $B = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & b_1 \\ c_1 & d_1 \end{bmatrix} \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R \det(A)$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ , then  $A$  is simply extendable. As  $R$  is a  $\Pi_2$  ring,  $B$  is simply extendable. From this and [2], Thm. 4.3 it follows that there exists  $(e, f) \in Um(R^2)$  such that  $(a_1e + c_1f, b_1e + d_1f) \in Um(R^2)$  and so  $(a_1e + c_1f, b_1e + d_1f, ad - bc) \in Um(R^2)$ . As  $B - A \in \mathbb{M}_2(R \det(A))$ , it follows that  $(ae + cf, be + df, ad - bc) \in Um(R^2)$ . Thus  $A$  is simply extendable by [2], Cor. 4.7(2). So Theorem 1.4 holds.

To prove Theorem 1.7, we note that  $R$  is a  $\Pi_2$  ring by [2], Thm. 1.4. Hence, based on Theorems 1.3(1) and 5.1(1) and (2), it suffices to show that if  $A$  is weakly

determinant liftable, then it is extendable. Let  $B \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  be congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ . As  $B$  is non-full by hypothesis,  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  is non-full. Thus  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  is simply extendable (see [2], Prop. 5.1(1)) and hence  $A$  is extendable (see [2], Lem. 4.1(1)). Thus Theorem 1.7 holds.

## 7. ON $WJ_{2,1}$ AND $J_{2,1}$ RINGS

We first prove Theorem 1.11. Let  $R$  be a  $WJ_{2,1}$  ring. Let  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ . By taking  $(\Psi, \Delta) = (1, 0)$  in Definition 1.10(1), it follows that there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $ax + by + cz + dw = 1$  and  $xw - yz = 0$ , and hence  $A$  is determinant liftable by Theorem 1.2. Thus part (1) holds. We assume now that  $R$  is also a Hermite ring. The ‘only if’ part of part (2) follows from the fact that each elementary divisor ring is an  $SE_2$  ring (see [2], Prop. 1.3) and hence a  $\Pi_2$  ring. For the ‘if’ part of part (2), if  $R$  is also a  $\Pi_2$  ring, then from part (1) and Theorem 1.4 we get that  $R$  is an  $SE_2$  ring and hence an elementary divisor ring by [2], Cor. 1.8. Note that each Hermite domain is a Bézout domain and hence a pre-Schreier domain (see [2], Sect. 2) and a  $\Pi_2$  domain (see [2], paragraph after Thm. 1.4). Hence part (2) holds. Thus Theorem 1.11 holds.

**Proposition 7.1.** *A ring  $R$  is a  $J_{2,1}$  ring in the sense of Definition 1.10(2) iff it is a  $J_{2,1}$  ring in the sense of [7], Def. 4.6.*

*Proof.* For the ‘only if’ part, let  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) \in R^4$ . As  $R$  is a Hermite ring, there exist  $e \in R$  and  $(a, b, c, d) \in \text{Um}(R^4)$  such that  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = e(a, b, c, d)$ . For  $\Psi \in R$ , the equation  $\alpha X + \beta Y + \gamma Z + \delta W = \Psi$  has a solution  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  iff  $\Psi \in Re$ . Assume now  $(\Psi, \Delta) \in Re \times R$ . Let  $f \in R$  be such that  $\Psi = fe$ . From Definition 1.10 applied to  $(\Psi, \Delta) = (f, 0)$  it follows that there exists  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$  such that  $ax + by + cz + dw = f$  and  $xw - yz = \Delta$ . Hence  $\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + \delta w = \Psi$  and  $xw - yz = \Delta$ , thus the ‘only if’ part of part (2) holds.

For the ‘if’ part of part (2), if  $R$  is a  $J_{2,1}$  ring in the sense of [7], Def. 4.6, then clearly it is a  $WJ_{2,1}$  ring and it is a Hermite ring by [7], Prop. 4.11.  $\square$

## 8. RINGS WITH UNIVERSAL (WEAKLY) DETERMINANT LIFTABILITY

Let  $GL_2(R)$  be the group of units of  $\mathbb{M}_2(R)$ . For a matrix  $E \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$ , let  $[E] \in GL_2(R) \backslash \mathbb{M}_2(R) / GL_2(R)$  be its equivalence class. For a projective  $R$ -module  $P$  of rank 1, let  $[P] \in \text{Pic}(R)$  be its class.

**Proposition 8.1.** *We consider the following statements on  $R$ :*

(1) *For each  $a \in R$ , the map of sets*

$$\{B \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R)) \mid \det(B) = 0\} \rightarrow \{\bar{B} \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R/Ra)) \mid \det(\bar{B}) = 0\},$$

*defined by the reduction modulo  $Ra$ , is surjective.*

(2) *For each  $a \in R$ , the map of sets of equivalence classes*

$$\{[B] \mid B \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R)), \det(B) = 0\} \rightarrow \{[\bar{B}] \mid \bar{B} \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R/Ra)), \det(\bar{B}) = 0\},$$

*defined by the reduction modulo  $Ra$ , is surjective.*

(3) *For each  $a \in R$ , every projective  $R/Ra$ -module of rank 1 generated by 2 elements is isomorphic to the reduction modulo  $Ra$  of a projective  $R$ -module of rank 1 generated by 2 elements.*

(4) Each matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  is determinant liftable.

Then (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) and (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4). If  $sr(R) \leq 4$ , then (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (4).

*Proof.* For a pair  $\pi := (P, Q)$  of projective  $R$ -submodules of  $R^2$  of rank 1 and generated by 2 elements such that we have a direct sum decomposition  $R^2 = P \oplus Q$ , let  $E_\pi \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  be the projection on  $P$  along  $Q$ ; so  $\det(E_\pi) = 0$ ,  $P$  and  $Q$  are dual to each other (i.e.,  $[Q] = -[P]$ , with  $Pic(R)$  viewed additively), and  $U_{[P]} := [E_\pi]$  depends only on  $[P]$ . Each projective  $R$ -module of rank 1 generated by 2 elements is isomorphic to such a  $P$ . For  $F \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  with  $\det(F) = 0$ ,  $\text{Ker}_F$  and  $\text{Im}_F$  are projective  $R$ -module of rank 1 generated by 2 elements and the short exact  $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker}_F \rightarrow R^2 \rightarrow \text{Im}_F \rightarrow 0$  has a section  $\varphi : \text{Im}_F \rightarrow R^2$  (see [2], Sect. 3); if  $\tau_F := (\text{Im}(\varphi), \text{Ker}_F)$ , then  $[F] = [E_{\tau_F}] = U_{[\text{Im}_F]}$ . Thus

$$\{[B] | B \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R)), \det(B) = 0\} = \{U_{[P]} | P \text{ as above}\}.$$

From this and its analogue over  $R/Ra$ , it follows that (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3). Clearly, (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2).

For (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (4), let  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ . By applying (1) to  $a = \det(A)$  and the reduction  $\bar{B}$  of  $A$  modulo  $Ra$ , it follows that there exists  $B \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  congruent to  $A$  modulo  $R\det(A)$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ , so  $A$  is determinant liftable.

Assume  $sr(R) \leq 4$ . To prove (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1), let  $a \in R$ . Let  $\bar{B} \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R/Ra))$  with  $\det(\bar{B}) = 0$ . Let  $C \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  be such that its reduction modulo  $Ra$  is  $\bar{B}$  by [2], Prop. 2.4(1); we have  $\det(C) \in Ra$ . As  $C$  is determinant liftable, there exists  $B \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  with  $\det(B) = 0$  and congruent to  $C$  modulo  $R\det(C)$  and hence also modulo  $Ra$ ; so the map of statement (1) is surjective, hence (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).  $\square$

**Example 8.2.** If  $R$  is an integral domain of dimension 1, then each matrix  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  is determinant liftable. To check this we can assume that  $\det(A) \neq 0$  and this case follows from [2], Thm. 1.7(1) and Theorem 1.3(1).

**Proposition 8.3.** We consider the following two statements on  $R$ :

(1) For each  $a \in R$ ,  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R/Ra))$  is contained in the image of the modulo  $Ra$  reduction map  $\{B \in \mathbb{M}_2(R) | \det(B) = 0\} \rightarrow \{\bar{B} \in \mathbb{M}_2(R/Ra) | \det(\bar{B}) = 0\}$ .

(2) Each matrix in  $Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  is weakly determinant liftable.

Then (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2), and the converse holds if  $sr(R) \leq 4$ .

*Proof.* It is the same as the last two paragraphs of the proof of Proposition 8.1, with determinant and  $B \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$  replaced by weakly determinant and  $B \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  (respectively).  $\square$

## 9. A CRITERION FOR DETERMINANT LIFTABILITY VIA COMPLETIONS

The following proposition is likely to be well-known.

**Proposition 9.1.** Let  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ , let  $t \in R$  be such that  $\det(A) \in Rt$  and let  $\hat{R}$  be the  $t$ -adic completion of  $R$ . Then there exists  $B \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(\hat{R}))$  whose reduction modulo  $\text{Ker}(\hat{R} \rightarrow R/Rt)$  is the reduction of  $A$  modulo  $Rt$  and  $\det(B) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $B_0 := A$ . By induction on  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we show that there exists  $B_n \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$  congruent to  $B_{n-1}$  modulo  $Rt^{2^{n-1}}$  and  $\det(B_n) \in Rt^{2^n}$ . For  $n = 1$ , let  $s \in R$  be such that  $\det(A) = st$ . With  $A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$ , for  $B_1 := A + t \begin{bmatrix} x & y \\ z & w \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{M}_2(R)$ ,  $\det(B_1)$  is congruent modulo  $Rt^2$  to  $st + (dx + cy + bz + aw)t$ . As  $A \in Um(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ ,

the linear equation  $dx + cy + bz + aw = -s$  has a solution  $(x, y, z, w) \in R^4$ ; for such a solution we have  $\det(B_1) \in Rt^2$ . The passage from  $n$  to  $n + 1$  follows from the case  $n = 1$  applied to  $(B_n, Rt^{2^{n+1}})$  instead of  $(A, Rt^2)$ . This completes the induction. As  $t$  belongs to the Jacobson radical  $J(\hat{R})$  of  $\hat{R}$ , the limit  $B \in \mathbb{M}_2(\hat{R})$  of the sequence  $(B_n)_{n \geq 1}$  exists. Clearly,  $\det(B) = 0$ . As  $\text{Ker}(\hat{R} \rightarrow R/Rt) \subset J(\hat{R})$ , we have  $B \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(\hat{R}))$ .  $\square$

Proposition 9.1 also follows from the smoothness part of Theorem 2.1(2) via a standard lifting argument. From Proposition 9.1 we get directly:

**Corollary 9.2.** *Let  $A \in \text{Um}(\mathbb{M}_2(R))$ . If  $R$  is complete in the  $\det(A)$ -adic topology, then  $A$  is determinant liftable.*

**Acknowledgement.** The third author would like to thank SUNY Binghamton for good working conditions and Ofer Gabber for sharing the argument of the footnote.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. Bass, E. H. Connell, D. Wright *Locally polynomial algebras are symmetric algebras*. Invent. Math. **38** (1977), no. 3, 279–299.
- [2] G. Călugăreanu, H. F. Pop, and A. Vasiu *Matrix invertible extensions over commutative rings. Part I: general theory*, 17 pages manuscript dated April 4, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.05780>.
- [3] R. Gilmer, R. C. Heitmann *On  $\text{Pic}(R[X])$  for  $R$  seminormal*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **16** (1980), no. 3, 251–257.
- [4] C. U. Jensen *Arithmetical rings*. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **17** (1966), 115–123.
- [5] I. Kaplansky *Elementary divisors and modules*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **66** (1949), 464–491.
- [6] T. Y. Lam *Serre’s problem on projective modules*. Springer Monogr. Math., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [7] D. Lorenzini *Elementary divisor domains and Bézout domains*. J. Algebra **371** (2012), 609–619.
- [8] D. Quillen *Projective modules over polynomial rings*. Invent. Math. **36** (1976), 167–171.
- [9] *Revêtements Étales et groupe fondamental. Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois Marie 1960–1961 (SGA 1)*. Dirigé par Alexandre Grothendieck. Augmenté de deux exposés de M. Raynaud, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. **224**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1971.
- [10] R. Wiegand, S. Wiegand *Finitely generated modules over Bézout rings*. Pacific J. Math. **58** (1975), no. 2, 655–664.

Grigore Călugăreanu E-mail: calu@math.ubbcluj.ro  
Address: Department of Mathematics, Babeş-Bolyai University,  
1 Mihail Kogălniceanu Street, Cluj-Napoca 400084, Romania.

Horia F. Pop E-mail: horia.pop@ubbcluj.ro  
Address: Department of Computer Science, Babeş-Bolyai University,  
1 Mihail Kogălniceanu Street, Cluj-Napoca 400084, Romania.

Adrian Vasiu, E-mail: avasiu@binghamton.edu  
Address: Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Binghamton University,  
P. O. Box 6000, Binghamton, New York 13902-6000, U.S.A.