

Towards a Theory of SIC-like Phenomena: Regular Bouquets and Generalised Heisenberg Groups

David Solomon

January 3, 2025

Abstract

We lay the foundations for a broad algebraic theory encompassing SICs in the hope of elucidating their heuristic connections with Stark units. What emerges is greatly generalised set-up with added structure and potential for applications in other areas. Let A and B be finite modules for a commutative ring R , C a finite abelian group and $\lambda : A \times B \rightarrow C$ an R -balanced bilinear pairing. The main constructs are the generalised Heisenberg group $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ attached to these data (an abstract central extension of $A \oplus B$ by C) which plays the role of the Weyl-Heisenberg group in SIC theory, together with its canonical, unitary Schrödinger representations. The SIC itself is replaced by an \mathcal{H} -orbit of complex lines in the representation space, termed a *bouquet*. The overlaps of the SIC are interpreted as a map from $\mathcal{H}/Z(\mathcal{H})$ into \mathbb{C} whose absolute values are the Hermitian ‘angles’ between the lines in the bouquet. We also introduce a regularity condition on bouquets in terms of the angle-map, intended to weaken the equiangularity condition of SICs. At the same time, it allows the incorporation of the R -structure *via* the abstract automorphism group of \mathcal{H} which in turn generalises the Clifford group of SIC theory *via* its associated Weil representation. As well as several subsidiary definitions and ‘structural’ results, we prove a new ‘clinometric relation’ for the angle-map, determine the structure of the automorphism group and introduce a large class of examples of arithmetic origin, derived from the trace-pairing on quotients of fractional ideals in an arbitrary number field, which we investigate in greater detail.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This paper is inspired by the remarkable results and observations made by many different workers in the theory of SICs (or SIC-POVMS) over the past 25 years, and particularly by the number-theoretic connections that they have more recently uncovered.

Depending on applications and context, the idea of a ‘SIC’ is interpreted in different but equivalent ways in the literature. Two common interpretations are as maximal sets of equiangular lines in \mathbb{C}^s (with $s > 3$) and as certain sets of Hermitian $s \times s$ matrices. We briefly explain the first viewpoint which is the one adopted here. (For the second, see for

instance [Ko], and for the correspondence between the two viewpoints in an equivariant context, see §6.2.) For us, a SIC is, at base, simply a set of s^2 complex lines through the origin in \mathbb{C}^s which is *equiangular* in the sense that, the ‘angle’ between two unit vectors generating any pair of distinct lines (*i.e.* the absolute value of their standard Hermitian inner product) is independent of the pair chosen. It was shown in [DGS] that no more than s^2 equiangular lines can exist in \mathbb{C}^s , but it is still unknown whether this bound is attained (*i.e.* whether SICs exist) for every $s > 3$. One part of *Zauner’s Conjecture* affirms that this is so, see [Za].

Serious interest in SICs *per se* began at the tail end of the last century, in the areas of Quantum Designs and (later) Finite Tight Frames. They find applications in signal processing, orthogonal polynomials, quantum information theory *etc.* (The last of these is responsible for much of the SIC-nomenclature used here, starting with the term ‘SIC-POVM’: an abbreviation of *Symmetric, Informationally Complete Positive Operator-Valued Measure*.) There is by now a large literature concerning the theory and applications of SICs, comprising both proven results and extensive computations that give rise to heuristic observations, known as ‘SIC phenomenology’. For a sampling of this work, see the papers [ABGHM], [AFMY], [Ap1], [AYZ], [BGM], [HRZ], [Ko], and [Za]. Waldron’s book [Wa] on tight frames gives a thorough introduction to the theory of SICs in Chapter 14.

A first and fundamental example of SIC phenomenology is the observation that all known SICs (except the *Hoggar lines* in \mathbb{C}^8) are ‘*Heisenberg (equivariant) SICs*’. This means that the lines in question consist of a single orbit of the discrete Weyl-Heisenberg group which we denote here $WH(s)$. It is a certain finite subgroup of the unitary group U_s which is nilpotent of class 2 and of order s^3 if s is odd and $2s^3$ if s is even. For details, we refer to §7.2 where this appears as the simplest possible special case – we call it the ‘Base Case’ – of a vastly generalised set-up introduced in §§2–5. (More on the latter below.)

Increasingly though, SICs and ‘SIC-like phenomena’ are also catching the attention of number theorists. This is due to unexpected and hitherto unexplained connections with units in the rings of integers of certain algebraic number fields. More precisely, in every one of the very many Heisenberg SICs computed so far, it has also been observed that the values of Hermitian inner products of the unit vectors (before taking absolute values) are of form $(s+1)^{-1/2}$ multiplied by algebraic complex numbers of absolute value 1, namely certain *rational powers of Galois conjugates of Stark units* in the ray-class field $k_s((s)_{\infty_1 \infty_2})$ over the real quadratic field $k_s := \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{(s-3)(s+1)})$. (See for instance [ABGHM] for a recent, account and [Ko] for a conjecture postulating a precise connection in a special case.) Now, on the one hand Stark’s *unproven* (first order, abelian) conjecture affirms that such algebraic units always exist and can be specified in terms of the derivatives of certain Artin L -functions at $z = 0$ (see [St], [Ta]). On the other hand, if they do exist, Stark himself showed that in many cases they generate the abelian extensions of k_s in question. This gives rise to the hope that a better understanding of SICs and related objects could lead to advances in the study of Stark’s conjecture and/or that of Hilbert’s 12th problem (the analytic construction of class-fields) over such real quadratic fields or even, perhaps, more generally.

1.2 Overview of this Paper

Our principal aim here is to lay the foundations of a broad *algebraic theory* around SICs that, by adding several new layers of structure and generality, may help to fulfil the above hope. In fact, the algebraic structure we uncover here seems sufficiently general and extensive to be of interest in itself and, maybe, even to lead to new, SIC-like phenomena in other areas of mathematics.

This theory can be described in the vaguest and most general terms as ‘*a new machine for attaching systems of numbers to a certain class of algebraic structures*’. More precisely, the class consists of tuples (A, B, C, λ) (plus certain other data) where A and B are finite (later profinite) modules for a commutative ring R , C is a finite abelian group and $\lambda : A \times B \rightarrow C$ is an R -balanced, \mathbb{Z} -bilinear form. Such tuples can be seen as the objects of a category whose morphisms are triples (t_A, t_B, t_C) of homomorphisms satisfying certain conditions (see Proposition 5.1 and preceding). From this viewpoint, we are concerned here with certain functors from this category *e.g.* a ‘Schrödinger functor’ to the category of unitary representations of finite groups. Rather than pursue the categorical viewpoint here, however, we now describe informally several interconnected ‘cogs’ of the machine which we shall put together piece-by-piece in Sections 2–5.

The drive-wheel, so to speak, of this machine is the Generalised Heisenberg Group (or GHG) $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ attached to the tuple (A, B, C, λ) . This is a certain abstract, finite group of nilpotency class ≤ 2 . The R -structure on A and B is a novel feature introduced here to enrich the theory. It does not affect the group structure of \mathcal{H} itself but it does provide an extra mechanism for encoding algebraic information, as we shall later see. Without it (or by taking R to be \mathbb{Z} , the default option) our definition of GHGs coincides with [Sz, Def. 4.1] and generalises the role of the matrix group $\text{WH}(s)$. (For other versions of finite Heisenberg groups, see for example [MNN], [Ho] and [Wi1].) In fact, Szabó shows that *every* class ≤ 2 nilpotent group is a subgroup of some $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$, even with the added condition that λ be non-degenerate. This condition, together with cyclicity of C , is in fact our normal working Hypothesis 5.1 for GHGs. It ensures, for instance, that the quotient of \mathcal{H} by its centre Z is (canonically) isomorphic to $A \oplus B$ and hence inherits an R -module structure.

Connected directly to the drive-wheel are, on the one hand, the subgroup $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H})$ (automorphisms which fix Z elementwise and are R -linear modulo Z) and on the other, a pair of canonical and isomorphic ‘left and right *Schrödinger representations* of \mathcal{H} ’ which we denote σ_p and τ_p . They are finite-dimensional, unitary and (under Hypothesis 5.1 plus a mild condition) irreducible representations of ‘*Stone-Von Neumann Type*’ (‘SV’ for short) in the terminology of [Ho]. In the Base Case with s odd, $\text{WH}(s)$ is essentially the image of $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Z}/s, \mathbb{Z}/s, \mathbb{Z}/s, \times)$ under the faithful, left or right Schrödinger representation.

An important part of the mechanism connecting these two cogwheels is the projective *Weil representation* of $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}) = \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}}^0(\mathcal{H})$ associated to σ_p (when the latter is irreducible). In the Base Case, the Weil representation (essentially) embeds $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ in U_s as the ‘*Clifford group*’ which has been observed heuristically to ‘carry a piece of the Galois action’ on the associated Stark units in this case (see [Wa, Ch. 14] or [ABGHM], for example).

The Weil representation also allows $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ to act naturally on another important component of the machine, namely the set of ‘ *\mathcal{H} -bouquets*’. Each such bouquet \mathcal{Y} is defined to

be an \mathcal{H}/Z -orbit of (complex) lines in the representation space $\mathcal{M}(A)$ of σ_p whose dimension is $s = |A|$. It comes equipped with an *overlap-map* from \mathcal{H}/Z into \mathbb{C} whose absolute values constitute the so-called *angle-map* because they represent the complex angles between unit generators of the lines. The squares of these absolute values must satisfy a certain ‘clinometric relation’ (see Theorem 4.2). Moreover, if \mathcal{Y} is free, its cardinality is s^2 so it will be an \mathcal{H} -equivariant SIC in $\mathcal{M}(A)$ iff the angle-map is constant on the non-identity elements of \mathcal{H}/Z . However, the above-mentioned phenomenology strongly suggests that this would (essentially) force $\mathcal{H} \cong \text{WH}(s)$ which is a much stronger condition than we want. Thus we introduce in §3 a novel condition on bouquets, namely *\mathcal{A} -regularity* – for a subgroup \mathcal{A} of $\text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H})$ e.g. $\mathcal{A} = \text{Out}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ – which weakens equiangularity. (Conceptually, it means that the unit vectors of \mathcal{Y} ‘span an \mathcal{A} -regular complex polytope’ in a sense that we shall not make completely formal.)

The output of our machine is then the overlap-map of a given \mathcal{A} -regular bouquet \mathcal{Y} for the GHG $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ and some such \mathcal{A} . If \mathcal{Y} is actually a SIC, the clinometric relation alone forces the angle map to take the constant value $(s+1)^{-1/2}$ on all non-identity elements of \mathcal{H}/Z . And, heuristically at least, the overlap values themselves are always the algebraic numbers described above. We would like something similar to hold in our generalised set-up when \mathcal{Y} is \mathcal{A} -regular but not equiangular. However, it seems that there is still something missing from the picture here. Indeed, even for $\mathcal{A} = \text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H})$, the clinometric relation by itself is usually insufficient to determine the angle-map and thus, in all likelihood, to force the desired algebraicity of the overlap-values. For a discussion of this problem in the Base Case, see the last half of §7.2.1

We mention in passing another condition on bouquets, namely *invariance*, introduced in §4 to generalise yet another aspect of SIC phenomenology: the symmetry of order 3 discovered by Zauner.

As for the input tuples (A, B, C, λ) to be fed into the machine, we give a large class of examples in §7 derived from the trace-map on dual pairs, I and \hat{I} , of fractional ideals in a number field k . We focus on the case where $R = \mathcal{O}_k/\mathfrak{f}$ (where \mathfrak{f} is a certain ‘modulus’ ideal of \mathcal{O}_k) but similar constructions with non-maximal orders of k are probably also possible. We expect these ‘arithmetic cases’ to be the closest natural context for an expanded theory of SICs, possibly with further applications to explicit class-field theory. Indeed, the Base Case is simply a narrow class of subcases in which $k = \mathbb{Q}$ and is reconciled in detail with our general arithmetic formalism in §7.2.

A feature of the arithmetic cases is that the modules A and B are *free of rank 1* over $\mathcal{O}_k/\mathfrak{f}$ (although without canonical generators in general). This leads to a proof that in all arithmetic cases with $|\mathcal{H}|$ odd, $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{O}_k/\mathfrak{f}}^0(\mathcal{H})$ is isomorphic to a certain semidirect product of $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}_k/\mathfrak{f})$ (Theorem 6.2 plus Theorem 7.1). This generalises a result of [Ap1] in the Base Case. The proof of Theorem 6.2 (concerning $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ for any GHG \mathcal{H} with R -structure, satisfying Hypothesis 5.1 and of odd order) relies in turn on a natural generalisation of the ‘classical’ *displacement operators* of SIC-theory that we introduce in §6.

1.3 Some Future Directions

A key first goal is to fill the insufficiency mentioned above by finding the ‘correct’ values (or sets of values) of the angle-map in arithmetic examples of regular bouquets, in order to force algebraicity of the overlap-values (as happens heuristically with SICs). Our examination of the Base Case in §7.2.1 reveals the nature of this insufficiency and suggests to the author that a first step might be to gather additional relations by studying connections between the Schrödinger representations for a fixed fractional ideal I and varying \mathfrak{f} . (The association with Stark units, which form an Euler System, suggests the existence of such relations.) Computations would be a helpful guide in this search but they currently present daunting technical challenges. Variation of I within and outside an ideal-class is also of interest.

A related goal in the general context is to develop the profinite theory for directed systems of tuples $\{(A_i, B_i, C_i, \lambda_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ in the category. In the specific context of the Base Case, a profinite, p -adic theory is already at least partially available and will be introduced in a future paper. Connections with p -adic analysis (involving p -adic measures) will be developed, giving rise to certain theta-like p -adic integrals. See Remark 5.4. Passage to a more general profinite limit of arithmetic cases might lead to an adelic set-up analogous to the one studied in [We] in relation to certain, more classical theta-functions.

Back at the finite level, our definition of the Weil representation in the general case (see §2) is inexplicit but Appleby has given an *explicit* description in the Base Case over $\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ in [Ap1] (and even over finite fields in [Ap2]). It would be interesting to generalise this, at least to our general arithmetic case.

It is possible to replace the complex lines mentioned above by r -dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ (for fixed r , $1 < r < s$) on which GHGs also act via their Schrödinger representations. This generalises the theory of ‘ r -SICs’ developed recently by Appleby *et al.* in the Base Case.

Finally, and much more distantly, the general machine developed here can be applied largely without change to other natural classes of input tuples $(A, B, C; \lambda)$. For example, it would be interesting to apply it to tuples of algebro-geometric origins, rather than arithmetic ones, and especially in situations where A and B have more complicated R -structure. Particularly intriguing questions concern the nature of the resulting output in such cases – that is, the overlap-values for regular bouquets w.r.t. the Schrödinger representations of the corresponding GHGs – as well as explicit forms for the Weil representations.

1.4 Acknowledgements

I am very pleased to be able to thank Marcus Appleby for many useful and inspiring conversations about SICs and for his expert guidance to their voluminous literature. I am grateful also to I.H.E.S. where this work was started and partially written in March-May 2024.

1.5 Notations

If M is a module for a commutative ring R , we shall write $\text{End}_R(M)$ for $\text{Hom}_R(M, M)$ considered as an R -algebra, with composition as multiplication, and $\text{Aut}_R(M)$ for its unit-group. If R is \mathbb{Z} , it will often be dropped from the notation. Thus $\text{Aut}(A)$ simply denotes the automorphism group of an abelian group A and we extend this notation to nonabelian

groups. If X is an abelian group (*resp.* a ring) and d is a positive integer, we shall write simply X/d for the quotient group (*resp.* ring) X/dX . For any complex number z , we shall write z^* for the complex conjugate and we write \mathbb{T} for the circle group $\{z : z^*z = 1\} < \mathbb{C}^\times$. (NB: its elements are usually referred to as ‘*phases*’ in the physics literature on SICs.) A representation of a group G on a vector space V will be thought of either as a homomorphism $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ or, equivalently, as a linear, left group action ‘ \cdot_ρ ’ of G on V . Thus $g \cdot_\rho v$ (or just $g \cdot v$) will mean the same thing as $\rho(g)(v)$, for any $g \in G$ and $v \in V$ and we shall move between the two forms for purposes of clarification or notational simplicity. Quotients by normal subgroups will be written G/N while quotient sets (without group structure) by a group action will generally be written $H \backslash S$.

2 SV Representations and their Weil Representations

We begin by characterising the class of representations of finite groups, called *representations of Stone-Von Neumann type* in [Ho, §3] (*q.v.* for the reason for the name). Let G be finite group, V a complex vector space of dimension s and $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ a representation of with character χ_ρ . For any $g \in G$, the eigenvalues of $\rho(g)$ are roots of unity, so $|\chi_\rho(g)| \leq s$. We recall that if ρ is irreducible then the centre $Z = Z(G)$ acts by scalars through ρ (by Schur’s Lemma) so there is a (unique) homomorphism $\psi = \psi_\rho : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$, called the *central character of ρ* such that $\rho(z) = \psi(z)\text{id}_V$ for all $z \in Z$. In particular, $|\chi_\rho(z)| = s$ for all $z \in Z$.

Theorem 2.1 *Suppose $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ (not a priori irreducible) χ_ρ , s and Z are as above and let t denote $|G/Z|$. The following are equivalent.*

- (i). $\chi_\rho(g) = 0$ for all $g \notin Z$, and $t = s^2$
- (ii). ρ is irreducible and $t = s^2$
- (iii). ρ is irreducible and $\chi_\rho(g) = 0$ for all $g \notin Z$
- (iv). ρ is irreducible and $\rho(g_1), \rho(g_2), \dots, \rho(g_t)$ are linearly independent in $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$, for some set of representatives g_1, g_2, \dots, g_t of Z in G
- (v). ρ is irreducible and $\rho(g_1), \rho(g_2), \dots, \rho(g_t)$ form a basis of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$, for any set of representatives g_1, g_2, \dots, g_t of Z in G

PROOF Suppose $\rho \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n l_i \rho_i$ where the ρ_i are irreducible and $l_i \in \mathbb{N} \forall i$. By character theory:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n l_i^2 = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} |\chi_\rho(g)|^2 = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in Z} |\chi_\rho(g)|^2 + \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \notin Z} |\chi_\rho(g)|^2$$

If (i) holds, the R.H.S. is at most $s^2|Z|/|G| + 0 = 1$, hence also the L.H.S. and it follows that ρ is irreducible, so (ii) and (iii) must hold. If ρ is irreducible the above equations give

$$1 = \frac{s^2}{t} + \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \notin Z} |\chi_\rho(g)|^2 \tag{1}$$

so (iii) implies (ii) and (ii) implies (i). Recall that irreducibility also implies that $\{\rho(g)\}_{g \in G}$ spans $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$ over \mathbb{C} , hence also $\{\rho(g_1), \rho(g_2), \dots, \rho(g_r)\}$ for any set or representatives of Z in G , since Z acts by scalars. The equivalence of (ii), (iv) and (v) follows, since $\dim(\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)) = s^2$. \square

Any representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ satisfying the equivalent conditions of Theorem 2.1 will be called an *SV-representation*. In particular, it must be irreducible.

REMARK 2.1 Replacing ρ by *any* irreducible representation $\sigma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(W)$ in (1) gives $\dim(W)^2 \leq |G/Z|$. This shows that SV-representations have the maximal possible dimension for irreducible representations of a given group G . If it has any such representations G is said to be a *group of central type*. For more details, and literature on such groups, see [Ho] and its references.

Any representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ is a composite $G \xrightarrow{\eta} G/\ker(\rho) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\rho}} \text{GL}(V)$ where $\tilde{\rho}$ is a faithful representation, and the surjectivity of the quotient map η implies $\eta(Z(G)) \subset Z(G/\ker(\rho))$. Thus we have a *surjective* homomorphism,

$$\bar{\eta} : G/Z(G) =: \bar{G} \longrightarrow (G/(\ker(\rho)))/Z(G/\ker(\rho)) =: \overline{G/(\ker(\rho))}$$

and hence the equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{G}| = |\overline{G/(\ker(\rho))}| &\iff |\bar{G}| \leq |\overline{G/(\ker(\rho))}| \iff \bar{\eta} \text{ is an isomorphism} \iff \\ \bar{\eta} \text{ is injective} &\iff Z(G) \supset \ker(\rho) \text{ and } Z(G)/\ker(\rho) = Z(G/\ker(\rho)) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Since ρ is irreducible iff $\tilde{\rho}$ is irreducible, we have, by equivalent condition (ii) of Theorem 2.1:

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\rho, \tilde{\rho}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{G}$ and $\overline{G/(\ker(\rho))}$ be as above. If either of ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$ is SV, then the other is SV iff any (hence all) of the equivalent conditions in (2) holds. \square*

Note that if ρ is SV with central character ψ then Theorem 2.1 (i) shows that

$$\ker(\rho) = \ker(\psi) \subset Z \quad (3)$$

since $g \in G$ lies in $\ker(\rho)$ iff $\chi_{\rho}(g) = \dim(V)$. So one half of the last equivalent condition in (2) is automatically satisfied in this case.

Now suppose $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is a positive-definite, Hermitian form (or ‘PDHF’) on V . We write $U(V)$ for the *unitary* subgroup of $\text{GL}(V)$ w.r.t. this form (*i.e.* those elements which preserve it) and call any representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ ‘unitary’ (w.r.t. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$) iff $\rho(g) \in U(V)$ for all $g \in G$.

Theorem 2.2 (Isomorphism of SV-Representations)

Let $\rho_1 : G_1 \rightarrow \text{GL}(V_1)$ and $\rho_2 : G_1 \rightarrow \text{GL}(V_2)$ be two SV-representations with central characters ψ_1 and ψ_2 respectively, and $\alpha : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ an isomorphism (so $\alpha(Z(G_1)) = Z(G_2)$). Then

(i). *For an isomorphism $T : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ satisfying*

$$T \circ \rho_1(g) = \rho_2(\alpha(g)) \circ T \quad \text{for all } g \in G_1 \quad (4)$$

to exist, it is necessary and sufficient that

$$\psi_1 = \psi_2 \circ \alpha \quad \text{on } Z(G_1) \quad (5)$$

(ii). If T is an isomorphism satisfying (4) then it is unique up to scalars.

(iii). Suppose ρ_1 and ρ_2 are unitary w.r.t. PDHFs $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_1$ on V_1 and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$ on V_2 respectively. If T is an isomorphism satisfying (4) then it can be taken to satisfy

$$\langle Tv, Tw \rangle_2 = \langle v, w \rangle_1 \quad \text{for all } v, w \in V_1 \quad (6)$$

(and is then unique up to multiplication by an element t of \mathbb{T} , by (ii))

PROOF The necessity of (5) for (4) is clear by taking $g \in Z(G_1)$. For sufficiency, by condition (i) of Theorem 2.1, equation (5) implies that ρ_1 and $\rho_2 \circ \alpha$ have the same character as representations of G_1 , so they are isomorphic, *i.e.* there exists an isomorphism T satisfying (4). Schur's lemma implies the uniqueness of T up to $t \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Finally, suppose the conditions of (iii) hold and T is an isomorphism satisfying (4). We need to show that it can be adjusted by a scalar to satisfy (6). Let T^\dagger denote the adjoint isomorphism $V_2 \rightarrow V_1$ w.r.t. the two PDHFs. Since $\rho_1(g)$ and $\rho_2(\alpha(g))$ are unitary, taking adjoints everywhere in (4) (w.r.t. the appropriate pairs of PDHFs) gives

$$\rho_1(g)^{-1} \circ T^\dagger = T^\dagger \circ \rho_2(\alpha(g))^{-1} \quad \text{for all } g \in G_1$$

and post-composing with (4) on both sides, we get

$$\rho_1(g)^{-1} \circ T^\dagger T \circ \rho_1(g) = T^\dagger T \quad \text{for all } g \in G_1$$

Now Schur's Lemma for ρ_1 implies $T^\dagger T = r \text{id}_{V_1} \in \text{GL}(V_1)$ for some $r \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. But since

$$r^* \langle v, v \rangle_1 = \langle T^\dagger T v, v \rangle_1 = \langle Tv, Tv \rangle_2$$

for any non-zero $v \in V_1$, we see that r^* , hence r , must be real and positive. Thus we may replace T by $r^{-1/2}T$ to get $T^\dagger T = \text{id}_{V_1}$ so

$$\langle Tv, Tw \rangle_2 = \langle T^\dagger T v, w \rangle_1 = \langle v, w \rangle_1 \quad \text{for all } v, w \in V_1$$

as required. \square

Now we consider a fixed SV-representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ which is unitary w.r.t. a fixed PDHF $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on V and has central character ψ . First, we apply the Theorem with $\rho_1 = \rho$ and $\rho_2 = \rho' : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V')$ another SV-representation which is unitary w.r.t. some PDHF on V' , and $\alpha = \text{id}_G$. We deduce that ρ and ρ' are actually *unitarily* equivalent iff they have the same central character.

Next, we write $\text{Aut}^0(G)$ for the subgroup of automorphisms in $\text{Aut}(G)$ which *fix* $Z(G)$ *elementwise* and take, $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \rho$ and $\alpha = \phi \in \text{Aut}^0(G)$ in Theorem 2.2 to get

$$T_\phi \circ \rho(g) = \rho(\phi(g)) \circ T_\phi \quad \text{for all } g \in G \quad (7)$$

for some $T_\phi \in \text{U}(V)$ determined up to an element of \mathbb{T} . Given also $T_{\phi'}$ obeying a similar equation for another automorphism $\phi' \in \text{Aut}^0(G)$ and applying it to both sides of (7), we find, by uniqueness, that $T_{\phi'} T_\phi = T_{\phi' \phi} \text{ mod } \mathbb{T}$. In other words, the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\rho : \text{Aut}^0(G) &\longrightarrow \text{PU}(V) \\ \phi &\longmapsto T_\phi \text{ mod } \mathbb{T} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

to the projective unitary group is a well-defined homomorphism called the *Weil representation* associated to ρ . Note however that the above construction of \mathcal{T}_ρ is essentially *implicit*.

In a certain sense, \mathcal{T}_ρ *extends* ρ . Indeed, associated to any h in G is the inner automorphism $\phi_h : g \mapsto hgh^{-1}$. The set $\text{Inn}(G)$ of all such automorphisms is a normal subgroup of $\text{Aut}^0(G)$ and for $\phi = \phi_h$, equation (7) is satisfied with $T_\phi = \rho(h)$. The map $\iota : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}^0(G)$ sending h to ϕ_h , has image $\text{Inn}(G)$ and kernel Z . Thus we get a commuting diagram (9) with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & G & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \text{Inn}(G) & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ & & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow \rho & & \downarrow \mathcal{T}_\rho & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{T} & \longrightarrow & U(V) & \longrightarrow & \text{PU}(V) & \longrightarrow & 1 \end{array} \quad (9)$$

REMARK 2.2 Assume that ψ , hence ρ , is *injective* (i.e. ‘faithful’). Then so is \mathcal{T}_ρ . (Indeed, if $T_{\phi'}$ lies in $\mathbb{T}\text{id}_V$ then (7) – with ϕ' for ϕ – implies $\phi' = \text{id}_G$.) Now, (7) also shows that any T_ϕ lies in the normaliser $N := N_{U(V)}(\rho(G))$. Conversely, our assumption implies easily that any $n \in N$ equals T_ϕ (defined modulo \mathbb{T}) for some automorphism $\phi \in \text{Aut}^0(G)$. In summary, it implies that \mathcal{T}_ρ maps $\text{Aut}^0(G)$ isomorphically onto the image of N in $\text{PU}(V)$.

3 Overlap- and Angle-Maps, and Bouquets

3.1 Definitions and First Properties

To start, we assume only that $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ is a representation of dimension $s < \infty$ of a finite group G and that ρ is unitary w.r.t. a PDHF $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on V . For each $u_1, u_2 \in V$ we define a linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2} & : V \longrightarrow V \\ u & \longmapsto \sum_{g \in G} \langle g \cdot u_1, u \rangle g \cdot u_2 \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.1 *For any ρ as above and $u_1, u_2 \in V$*

(i). $\mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2}(h \cdot u) = h \cdot \mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2}(u)$ for all $h \in G$ and $u \in V$

(ii). $\text{Tr } \mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2} = |G| \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle$

PROOF Since ρ is unitary, $\langle g \cdot u_1, h \cdot u \rangle = \langle h^{-1}g \cdot u_1, u \rangle$, and part (i) follows easily. For part (ii), let $\{e_1, \dots, e_s\}$ be an orthonormal basis of V . We find $\langle e_i, \mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2}(e_i) \rangle = \sum_{g \in G} \langle g \cdot$

$u_1, e_i \rangle \langle e_i, g \cdot u_2 \rangle$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Tr } \mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2} &= \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{g \in G} \langle g \cdot u_1, e_i \rangle \langle e_i, g \cdot u_2 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{g \in G} \sum_{i=1}^s \langle e_i, g \cdot u_1 \rangle^* \langle e_i, g \cdot u_2 \rangle \\
&= \sum_{g \in G} \langle g \cdot u_1, g \cdot u_2 \rangle \\
&= |G| \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.2 *Suppose ρ as above is irreducible and let $Z = Z(G)$. Then, for any $g \in G$ and $u_1, u_2, u \in V$, the vector $\langle g \cdot u_1, u \rangle g \cdot u_2$ depends only on the the image \bar{g} of g in G/Z . Moreover,*

$$\sum_{\bar{g} \in G/Z} \langle g \cdot u_1, u \rangle g \cdot u_2 = \left(\frac{|G/Z| \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle}{s} \right) u \quad \text{for all } u_1, u_2, u \in V \quad (10)$$

PROOF Since ρ is irreducible, Z acts by roots of unity, which are of absolute value 1, giving the first statement. For the second, Proposition 3.1 part (i) and Schur's Lemma imply that \mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2} must be multiplication by some $k \in \mathbb{C}$ and part (ii) implies $k = s^{-1}|G| \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle$. Thus

$$|Z| \sum_{\bar{g} \in G/Z} \langle g \cdot u_1, u \rangle g \cdot u_2 = \mathcal{F}_{u_1, u_2}(u) = \left(\frac{|G| \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle}{s} \right) u \quad \square$$

For the rest of this section we shall suppose that our $\rho : G \rightarrow V$ is also *irreducible* with central character $\psi : Z \rightarrow \mu_f$ where $Z = Z(G)$ and f is the exponent of Z . We shall often abbreviate G/Z to \bar{G} and write \bar{g} for the image in \bar{G} of $g \in G$. We write $\mathbb{P}V$ for the projective space $\mathbb{C}^\times \backslash (V \setminus \{0\})$ identified with the set of all complex lines $\ell = \mathbb{C}v$ for some $v \neq 0$ in V . Since Z acts by ψ on V , there is a well-defined action of \bar{G} on $\mathbb{P}V$ given by $\bar{g} \cdot \ell := \mathbb{C}(g \cdot v)$. For any $\ell \in \mathbb{P}V$ we write Γ_ℓ for the *stabiliser* of ℓ in \bar{G} , namely $\Gamma_\ell = \{\gamma \in \bar{G} : \gamma \cdot \ell = \ell\}$.

For any $\ell \in \mathbb{P}V$ and any map $\mathcal{R} : \bar{G} \rightarrow G$ which is right inverse to the quotient homomorphism $G \rightarrow \bar{G}$, we define the *overlap-map*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell} &: \bar{G} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \\
\gamma &\longmapsto \langle v, \mathcal{R}(\gamma) \cdot v \rangle
\end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for any *unit vector* $v \in \ell$. Note that $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma)$ is independent of the choice of such v and changing \mathcal{R} only multiplies it by $\psi(z)$ for some $z \in Z$ (so by an element of μ_f). We also define the *angle* between any two lines $\ell, \ell' \in \mathbb{P}V$ to be

$$\mathbf{a}(\ell, \ell') = |\langle v, v' \rangle|$$

for any two unit vectors $v \in \ell$ and $v' \in \ell'$, so that $\mathbf{a}(\ell, \ell') = \mathbf{a}(\ell', \ell)$ and we define the *angle-map* \mathbf{a}_ℓ by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{a}_\ell &: \bar{G} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \\
\gamma &\longmapsto \mathbf{a}(\ell, \gamma \cdot \ell) = |\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma)| \quad \text{for any } \mathcal{R}
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.3 (Properties of the Overlap- and Angle-Maps for an Irreducible Unitary Representation)

Let $\rho: G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ be irreducible and unitary of dimension s and suppose ℓ, ℓ' are in $\mathbb{P}V$.

(i). We have $0 \leq \mathbf{a}(\ell, \ell') \leq 1$ and $\mathbf{a}(\ell, \ell') = 1$ iff $\ell = \ell'$. In particular, the angle-map \mathbf{a}_ℓ takes values in $[0, 1]$ and, for any $\gamma \in \bar{G}$, $\mathbf{a}_\ell(\gamma) = 1$ iff $\gamma \in \Gamma_\ell$.

(ii). For every $\gamma \in \bar{G}$ we have

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma^{-1}) = \zeta \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma)^* \quad (12)$$

for some $\zeta \in \mu_f$, so $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma)\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma^{-1}) = \zeta \mathbf{a}_\ell(\gamma)^2$ and $\mathbf{a}_\ell(\gamma^{-1}) = \mathbf{a}_\ell(\gamma)$.

(iii). For all $\gamma, \gamma' \in \bar{G}$ we have

$$\mathbf{a}_{\gamma'\ell}(\gamma) = \mathbf{a}_\ell(\gamma'^{-1}\gamma\gamma') \quad (13)$$

(iv). We have

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \bar{G}} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma)^* \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell'}(\gamma) = \frac{|G/Z|}{s} \mathbf{a}(\ell, \ell')^2 \quad (14)$$

and

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \bar{G}} \mathbf{a}_\ell(\gamma)^2 = \frac{|G/Z|}{s} \quad (15)$$

PROOF The first statement in part (i) is a consequence of the complex Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the others follow. For each $\gamma \in \bar{G}$ we have $\mathcal{R}(\gamma^{-1}) = z\mathcal{R}(\gamma)^{-1}$ for some $z \in Z$. Thus, for any unit vector v generating ℓ we have:

$$\langle v, \mathcal{R}(\gamma^{-1})v \rangle = \psi(z)\langle v, \mathcal{R}(\gamma)^{-1}v \rangle = \psi(z)\langle \mathcal{R}(\gamma)v, v \rangle = \psi(z)\langle v, \mathcal{R}(\gamma)v \rangle^*$$

by unitarity and hermitianness. This proves (12) and the rest of part (ii) follows. Part (iii) is clear from the definition. For part (iv), take $u_1 = u = v$ (a unit vector in ℓ) and $u_2 = v'$ (a unit vector in ℓ') in equation (10) to get

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \bar{G}} \langle \mathcal{R}(\gamma) \cdot v, v \rangle \mathcal{R}(\gamma) \cdot v' = \left(\frac{|G/Z|\langle v, v' \rangle}{s} \right) v$$

and applying $\langle v', \cdot \rangle$ to both sides gives (14). Equation (15) follows on taking $\ell' = \ell$. \square

REMARK 3.1 Under certain conditions (e.g. if $|\bar{G}|$ is odd) we can choose \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{R}(\gamma^{-1}) = \mathcal{R}(\gamma)^{-1} \forall \gamma \in \bar{G}$ and the proof of (12) shows that we then have $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma^{-1}) = \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma)^* \forall \gamma \in \bar{G}$. Note also that the rational number $|G/Z|/s$ appearing above is actually a positive *integer*. Indeed, Theorem 3.12 of [Is] states that, whenever ρ is irreducible, s divides the index in G of the subgroup there denoted $Z(\chi)$, namely, the elements of G acting by scalars through ρ . But irreducibility also implies $Z \subset Z(\chi)$ because of the central character.

Definition 3.1 (G -Bouquets) Let $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ be an irreducible unitary representation of dimension s w.r.t. a PDHF $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on V . A G -bouquet (with respect to ρ) – or just a bouquet when G and ρ are clear – is an orbit of \bar{G} acting on $\mathbb{P}V$. We write $\bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V$ for the set of all such bouquets and say that a bouquet $\mathcal{Y} \in \bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V$ is free iff $\Gamma_\ell = \{1\}$ for one, hence any, $\ell \in \mathcal{Y}$, i.e. iff $|\mathcal{Y}| = |\bar{G}|$.

REMARK 3.2 (Polytope Picture of a Bouquet) We may imaginatively (and cautiously) associate the bouquet \mathcal{Y} with a ‘complex polytope’, say $\text{Poly}(\mathcal{Y})$, consisting of ‘vertices’ (actually copies of \mathbb{T}) which are the intersections of the complex lines $\ell \in \mathcal{Y}$ with the $(2s-1)$ -real-dimensional unit sphere in V w.r.t. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. In this somewhat illusory picture, \bar{G} acts on the sphere by unitary ‘rotations’ which transitively permute the ‘vertices’ of $\text{Poly}(\mathcal{Y})$. For $\ell \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\gamma \in \bar{G}$, the ‘angle subtended at the origin’ by the ‘vertices’ corresponding to the lines ℓ and $\gamma \cdot \ell$ is simply $\mathbf{a}_\ell(\gamma)$.

3.2 Equiangularity

Definition 3.2 (Equiangularity of a Bouquet) With ρ as in Definition 3.1, a free G -bouquet $\mathcal{Y} \in \bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V$ will be called equiangular iff $\mathbf{a}(\ell, \ell')$ is independent of $\ell \neq \ell' \in \mathcal{Y}$. Equivalently, the angle map \mathbf{a}_ℓ is constant on $\bar{G} \setminus \{1_{\bar{G}}\}$ for one (hence any) $\ell \in \mathcal{Y}$.

REMARK 3.3 G The condition vacuously satisfied if \bar{G} is trivial, i.e. if G is abelian, which is also equivalent to $s = 1$ by irreducibility and freeness. In the Base Case detailed in §7.2 an equiangular bouquet is precisely a ‘Weyl-Heisenberg SIC(-POVM)’

Equiangularity is a very strong condition as the following result shows.

Theorem 3.1 Let ρ be as in Definition 3.1 and let \mathcal{Y} be an equiangular G -bouquet for ρ . Then ρ must be an SV-representation (see Section 2). Moreover, it is necessary that $\mathbf{a}(\ell, \ell') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s+1}}$ for all $\ell \neq \ell' \in \mathcal{Y}$.

PROOF According to a theorem of [DGS], the maximal number of equiangular lines in V is $\dim(V)^2 = s^2$. (Even when they are not, *a priori*, the orbit of some group-action on V .) Since \mathcal{Y} is free and equiangular, we deduce $|\bar{G}| \leq s^2$. It follows that $|\bar{G}| = s^2$ (see Remark 2.1) and ρ must be SV by Theorem 2.1 (ii). The second statement, holds vacuously if $s = 1$. So assume $s > 1$, let a be the common value of $\mathbf{a}(\ell_1, \ell_2)$ for $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and choose $\ell \in \mathcal{Y}$. By freeness, equation (15) reads $1 + (s^2 - 1)a^2 = s$ so $a = (s + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. (In fact, this equality is also proven in [DGS] even without the group-orbit assumption.) \square

4 Groups of Nilpotency Class ≤ 2

Throughout this section we suppose that

$$\text{the group } G \text{ is nilpotent of class } \leq 2 \tag{16}$$

This means that $\bar{G} = G/Z$ is abelian. (G is nilpotent of class 1 iff it is abelian.) As mentioned in the introduction, the Weyl-Heisenberg group $\text{WH}(s)$ satisfies this condition, as indeed do

all Generalised Heisenberg Groups, to be introduced in the next section. We shall see that it has significant simplifying consequences for overlap- and angle-maps and allows us to define ‘regular’ bouquets. The SV condition – and hence the existence of the Weil representation – also becomes very natural

4.1 SV Representations, Overlap- and Angle-Maps

Compare the following with [Wa, Theorem 13.5].

Theorem 4.1 *If G is nilpotent of class ≤ 2 then every faithful, irreducible representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ is SV.*

PROOF This follows from Theorem 2.31 of [Is] and condition (ii) of our Theorem 2.1. (In fact, Isaacs’ proof really establishes condition (iii).) It suffices to check that, in our situation, Z is equal to the subgroup denoted $Z(\chi)$ in [Is], already mentioned in Remark 3.1. But we noted there that irreducibility implies $Z \subset Z(\chi)$ and faithfulness clearly implies $Z \supset Z(\chi)$. \square

REMARK 4.1 If ρ is faithful and irreducible, its central character must also be faithful, which forces Z to be *cyclic* (of order f).

Applying Lemma 2.1 we deduce

Corollary 4.1 *If G is nilpotent of class ≤ 2 then an irreducible representation ρ of G is SV iff the equivalent conditions (2) hold (with notations as in Lemma 2.1). \square*

From now on, we suppose once again that the irreducible (but, for the moment, not necessarily SV) representation $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ of dimension s is unitary w.r.t. a PDHF $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on V , and write ψ for its central character. Since \bar{G} is abelian, equation (13) shows that, for any ℓ in $\mathbb{P}V$, the angle map \mathbf{a}_ℓ depends only on the G -bouquet \mathcal{Y} w.r.t. ρ containing ℓ and may be denoted $\mathbf{a}_\mathcal{Y}$. For the same reason we can write $\Gamma_\mathcal{Y}$ for the common stabiliser Γ_ℓ of all $\ell \in \mathcal{Y}$. Now, condition (16) is also equivalent to the commutator $[g_1, g_2] = g_1 g_2 g_1^{-1} g_2^{-1}$ lying in Z for all $g_1, g_2 \in G$, so it descends to give a well-defined map of abelian groups:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_G : \quad \bar{G} \times \bar{G} &\longrightarrow Z \\ (\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2) &\longmapsto [g_1, g_2] \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The standard commutator identities show that δ_G is skew-symmetric and bilinear. It is also non-degenerate in the sense that $\delta_G(\bar{g}, \bar{g}') = 1_G$ for all $g' \in G$ clearly implies $g \in Z$, so $\bar{g} = 1_{\bar{G}}$. For any unit vector $v \in \ell$, any \mathcal{R} and any $g, g' \in G$, we now have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \bar{g}' \cdot \ell}(\bar{g}) &= \langle g' \cdot v, \mathcal{R}(\bar{g}) g' \cdot v \rangle = \langle g' \cdot v, [\mathcal{R}(\bar{g}), g'] g' \mathcal{R}(\bar{g}) \cdot v \rangle \\ &= \psi(\delta_G(\bar{g}, \bar{g}')) \langle g' \cdot v, g' \mathcal{R}(\bar{g}) \cdot v \rangle \\ &= \psi(\delta_G(\bar{g}, \bar{g}')) \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\bar{g}) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

A first consequence of (18) is the existence of a map $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ (depending on ℓ only through \mathcal{Y} and not on \mathcal{R}):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{Y}} : \bar{G} &\longrightarrow \mu_f \backslash \mathbb{C} \\ \bar{g} &\longmapsto \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R},\ell}(\bar{g}) \bmod \mu_f = \langle v, g \cdot v \rangle \bmod \mu_f \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We now introduce some notation for use in the rest of this paper. For any finite abelian group X we shall write $\mathcal{M}(X)$ for the complex vector space of all functions from X to \mathbb{C}

$$\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{M}(X, \mathbb{C}) = \{f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}\}$$

under pointwise addition and scalar multiplication, equipped with the PDHF given by

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \sum_{x \in X} f(x)^* g(x) \quad \text{for all } f, g \in \mathcal{M}(X) \quad (20)$$

Thus $\mathcal{M}(X)$ has an obvious orthonormal basis $\mathcal{E}_X := \{\mathbf{e}_y\}_{y \in X}$ where $\mathbf{e}_y(x)$ is defined to be 1 if $x = y$ and zero otherwise.

Taking X to be \bar{G} as above, the central character ψ of ρ determines a map $\Upsilon_{\psi} \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{M}(\bar{G}))$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{\psi} : \mathcal{M}(\bar{G}) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(\bar{G}) \\ f &\longmapsto (\gamma' \mapsto \sum_{\gamma \in \bar{G}} \psi(\delta_G(\gamma, \gamma')) f(\gamma)) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \bar{G}$, we have $\langle \mathbf{e}_{\gamma_2}, \Upsilon_{\psi}(\mathbf{e}_{\gamma_1}) \rangle = \psi(\delta_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_2))$, so Υ_{ψ} is Hermitian by the skew symmetry of δ_G . For the bouquet \mathcal{Y} as above, the square $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 = |\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}|^2$ of the angle-map lies in $\mathcal{M}(\bar{G})$, is constant on cosets of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}}$ in \bar{G} and, by Proposition 3.3 (i), takes values in $[0, 1]$ with $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2(\bar{\gamma}) = 1$ iff $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Theorem 4.2 (Clinometry for Nilpotent Groups of Class ≤ 2) *With the above hypotheses and notations, $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2$ is an eigenvector of Υ_{ψ} with eigenvalue $|\bar{G}|/s$, that is:*

$$\Upsilon_{\psi}(\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2) = (|\bar{G}|/s)\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2 \quad (21)$$

PROOF Choose any $\ell \in \mathcal{Y}$ and any \mathcal{R} right inverse to the quotient $G \rightarrow \bar{G}$. Let γ' be any element of \bar{G} and set $\ell' = \gamma' \cdot \ell$. Then equation (14) reads

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \bar{G}} \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R},\ell}(\gamma)^* \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R},\ell'}(\gamma) = (|\bar{G}|/s)\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\gamma')^2$$

But, according to (18), we have $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R},\ell'}(\gamma) = \psi(\delta_G(\gamma, \gamma'))\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R},\ell}(\gamma)$, so

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \bar{G}} \psi(\delta_G(\gamma, \gamma'))\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\gamma)^2 = (|\bar{G}|/s)\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\gamma')^2$$

for any $\gamma' \in \bar{G}$, as required. \square

REMARK 4.2 We shall refer to (21) as the ‘*clinometric relation*’. Equation (15) amounts (in the nilpotent case) to evaluating both sides of (21) at $1_{\bar{G}}$. Incidentally, since the matrix coefficients of Υ_{ψ} in the basis $\mathcal{E}_{\bar{G}}$ are roots of unity, one deduces from Theorem 4.2 another proof that $|\bar{G}|/s$ must be a rational (because algebraic) integer in this case, cf Remark 3.1.

4.2 Regularity and Invariance of a Bouquet

Any $\phi \in \text{Aut}(G)$ preserves Z and so descends to an automorphism $\bar{\phi}$ of \bar{G} . Obviously, $\text{Inn}(G)$ actually fixes Z elementwise, but condition (16) implies that its action on \bar{G} is also trivial. Thus $\bar{\phi}$ depends only on the image $\hat{\phi}$ of ϕ in $\text{Out}(G)$. We use the resulting action of $\text{Out}(G)$ on \bar{G} to weaken the definition of equiangularity as follows.

Definition 4.1 (\mathcal{A} -Regularity of a Bouquet) *Let $\mathcal{Y} \in \bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V$ be a free G -bouquet and \mathcal{A} be a subgroup of $\text{Out}(G)$. We say that \mathcal{Y} is \mathcal{A} -regular (as in ‘regular polytope’) iff $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is constant on orbits of \mathcal{A} acting on \mathcal{Y} , that is, iff*

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\gamma) = \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\bar{\phi}(\gamma)) \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \bar{G} \text{ and } \hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{A} \quad (22)$$

In the case $\mathcal{A} = \text{Out}(G)$, we shall simply call \mathcal{Y} ‘regular’.

Since $\text{Out}(G)$ acts on \bar{G} by automorphisms, $\bar{G} \setminus \{1_{\bar{G}}\}$ is always a union of \mathcal{A} -orbits, so equiangularity does imply \mathcal{A} -regularity for any \mathcal{A} . On the other hand, if \bar{G} is not an elementary abelian p -group, $\bar{G} \setminus \{1_{\bar{G}}\}$ will contain elements of different orders, and so more than one orbit under $\text{Out}^0(G)$. In such cases, it is *a priori* possible to have regular bouquets which are not equiangular.

For the rest of this section we shall add the condition that ρ be SV (but not necessarily faithful). By Theorem 2.2 and the comments following it, this implies that each $\phi \in \text{Aut}^0(G)$ is associated to a unitary isomorphism $T_{\phi} : V \rightarrow V$ satisfying (7), whose image in $\text{PU}(V)$ is uniquely defined. In particular T_{ϕ} acts unambiguously on $\mathbb{P}V$ and (7) shows that it sends G -bouquets to G -bouquets. (In the polytope picture of Remark 3.2, it corresponds to a ‘special rotation’ about the origin that maps the polytope $\text{Poly}(\mathcal{Y})$ onto $\text{Poly}(T_{\phi}(\mathcal{Y}))$.)

Proposition 4.1 *Let $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ be as above, let ϕ be an automorphism in $\text{Aut}^0(G)$, choose T_{ϕ} as above and let $\mathcal{Y} \in \bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V$ be a G -bouquet.*

(i). *The bouquet $T_{\phi}(\mathcal{Y}) \in \bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V$ depends only on the image $\hat{\phi}$ of ϕ in $\text{Out}^0(G)$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Out}^0(G) \times \bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V &\longrightarrow \bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V \\ (\hat{\phi}, \mathcal{Y}) &\longmapsto T_{\phi}(\mathcal{Y}) \end{aligned}$$

is an action of $\text{Out}^0(G)$ on the set $\bar{G} \backslash \mathbb{P}V$.

(ii). *Let $\mathcal{R} : \bar{G} \rightarrow G$ be any right inverse to the quotient $G \rightarrow \bar{G}$. Then $\mathcal{R}^{\phi} := \phi \circ \mathcal{R} \circ \bar{\phi}^{-1}$ is also such a right inverse, and for all $\ell \in \mathbb{P}V$ the following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{G} & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}} & \mathbb{C} \\ \downarrow \bar{\phi} & \searrow \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}^{\phi}, T_{\phi}(\ell)} & \\ G & & \end{array} \quad (23)$$

(iii). The maps $\mathfrak{D}_{T_\phi(\mathcal{Y})} \circ \bar{\phi}$ and $\mathfrak{D}_\mathcal{Y}$ from \bar{G} to $\mu_f \setminus \mathbb{C}$ are the same, as are the maps $\mathfrak{a}_{T_\phi(\mathcal{Y})} \circ \bar{\phi}$ and $\mathfrak{a}_\mathcal{Y}$ from \bar{G} to $[0, 1]$.

PROOF For every inner automorphism $\phi_h \in \text{Inn}(G)$, we have seen (cf. diagram (9)) that $T_{\phi_h} = \rho(h)$ up to scalars, so $T_{\phi_h}(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}$, since \mathcal{Y} is an orbit of \bar{G} . The first part follows since T_ρ is a homomorphism. For the second, it is clear that \mathcal{R}^ϕ has the required property. Let v be a unit vector generating ℓ so that $T_\phi(v)$ generates $T_\phi(\ell)$. Since T_ϕ is unitary, $T_\phi(v)$ is also a unit vector and, using equation (7) we have, for any $\gamma \in \bar{G}$,

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}^\phi, T_\phi(\ell)}(\bar{\phi}(\gamma)) = \langle T_\phi(v), \phi(\mathcal{R}(\gamma)) \cdot T_\phi(v) \rangle = \langle T_\phi(v), T_\phi(\mathcal{R}(\gamma) \cdot v) \rangle = \langle v, \mathcal{R}(\gamma) \cdot v \rangle = \mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell}(\gamma)$$

giving (23). Taking ℓ to be any line in the bouquet \mathcal{Y} , the third part also follows from the above equation and the definitions of the overlap- and angle-maps of \mathcal{Y} . \square

We can now reformulate the regularity of a bouquet \mathcal{Y} with respect to a subgroup \mathcal{A} of $\text{Out}^0(G)$ in terms of the equality of the angle maps associated to the image-bouquets $T_\phi(\mathcal{Y})$ for the corresponding automorphisms $\phi \in \text{Aut}^0(G)$. Indeed, parts (i) and (iii) of Proposition 4.1 lead immediately to the following.

Proposition 4.2 (Equivalent Condition for \mathcal{A} -Regularity in the SV Case)

Let $\mathcal{Y} \in \bar{G} \setminus \mathbb{P}V$ be a free G -bouquet and \mathcal{A} be a subgroup of $\text{Out}^0(G)$. Then \mathcal{Y} is \mathcal{A} -regular iff

$$\mathfrak{a}_{T_\phi(\mathcal{Y})} = \mathfrak{a}_\mathcal{Y} : \bar{G} \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } \hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{A}$$

where, as usual, ϕ denotes any lift of $\hat{\phi}$ to $\text{Aut}^0(G)$ and the bouquet $T_\phi(\mathcal{Y})$ is independent of the lift chosen. \square

In practice, the isomorphisms T_ϕ may be harder to calculate than the action of \mathcal{A} on \bar{G} . In such cases, formulation (22) of \mathcal{A} -regularity, which is intrinsic to \mathcal{Y} , may be more useful than that of Proposition 4.2. Next, we make the

Definition 4.2 (Symmetry Group and Invariance of a Bouquet)

Let $\mathcal{Y} \in \bar{G} \setminus \mathbb{P}V$ be a G -bouquet. The symmetry group of \mathcal{Y} is its stabiliser in $\text{Out}^0(G)$ for the action of part (i) of Proposition 4.1 namely the subgroup

$$\text{Sym}(\mathcal{Y}) := \{ \hat{\phi} \in \text{Out}^0(G) : T_\phi(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y} \} < \text{Out}^0(G)$$

Let $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ be a subgroup of $\text{Out}^0(G)$. We say that \mathcal{Y} is $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ -invariant iff $T_\varepsilon(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}$ for all $\varepsilon \in \text{Aut}^0(G)$ with $\hat{\varepsilon} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$, that is, iff $\hat{\mathcal{E}} \subset \text{Sym}(\mathcal{Y})$.

Proposition 4.2 shows that the $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ -invariance of a free bouquet implies its $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ -regularity.

REMARK 4.3 In the Base Case, the symmetry groups of all known equiangular $\text{WH}(s)$ -bouquets with $s > 3$ (see §7.2) are non-trivial. Indeed, it has been observed experimentally that they all contain an element $\hat{\phi}_3$ of order 3. Zauner conjectured that this happens for all such bouquets, and specified a matrix of order 3 that should represent a corresponding T_{ϕ_3} in a standard basis of V . See his PhD thesis [Za].

5 Generalised Heisenberg Groups and Their Schrödinger Representations

In this section we introduce a large class of abstract, class ≤ 2 nilpotent groups with explicit, irreducible, unitary, SV-representations, for which we can apply the preceding theory. In Section 7 we shall provide a broad family of concrete ‘arithmetic’ examples of such groups.

5.1 Definitions and Basic Properties

Given any three *finite* abelian groups A , B and C , and a (\mathbb{Z} -)bilinear map $\lambda : A \times B \rightarrow C$ we define the *generalised Heisenberg group* – or *GHG* for short – $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ attached to the tuple (A, B, C, λ) to be the set $A \times B \times C$ with group-law

$$h(a, b, c)h(a', b', c') = h(a + a', b + b', c + c' + \lambda(a, b'))$$

(The symbol ‘ h ’ is redundant but helpful.) The following are easily checked: \mathcal{H} is a finite group with $h(a, b, c)^{-1} = h(-a, -b, \lambda(a, b) - c)$ and

$$h(a, b, c) = h(0, 0, c)h(0, b, 0)h(a, 0, 0) = h(0, b, 0)h(a, 0, 0)h(0, 0, c) \quad (24)$$

The natural surjection $\pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow A \oplus B$ and injection $m : C \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ (with image $h(0, 0, C)$) are homomorphisms. If $h = h(a, b, c)$ and $h' = h(a', b', c')$ then

$$[h, h'] = h(0, 0, \lambda(a, b') - \lambda(a', b)) \quad (25)$$

The centre Z and derived subgroup \mathcal{H}' of \mathcal{H} are therefore given by

$$Z = h(K_A, K_B, C) \supset m(C) \supset \mathcal{H}' = h(0, 0, \Lambda) \quad (26)$$

where K_A and K_B denote the left- and right-kernels of λ , and Λ denotes the image of the map $A \otimes B \rightarrow C$ defined by λ . In particular, \mathcal{H} is always *nilpotent of class 2* (or 1 iff $\lambda = 0$) and we have a *central* extension of groups

$$1 \rightarrow C \xrightarrow{m} \mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{\pi} A \oplus B \rightarrow 1 \quad (27)$$

There are canonical, commuting automorphisms ϕ_-, ϕ^- and $\phi_{-1} = \phi^- \circ \phi_-$ in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$\phi_-(h(a, b, c)) = h(-a, b, -c), \quad \phi^-(h(a, b, c)) = h(a, -b, -c) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{-1}(h(a, b, c)) = h(-a, -b, c)$$

all of order 1 or 2. Thus $\mathfrak{B} := \{\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}, \phi_-, \phi^-, \phi_{-1}\}$ is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H})$ isomorphic to (a quotient of) $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^2$. Defining $\lambda^{\text{op}} : B \times A \rightarrow C$ by $\lambda^{\text{op}}(b, a) = \lambda(a, b)$ we get an *anti*-isomorphism $\tilde{\varphi} : \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(B, A, C, \lambda^{\text{op}})$ sending $h(a, b, c)$ to $h(b, a, c)$. Composing $\tilde{\varphi}$ with inversion therefore gives an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}(B, A, C, \lambda^{\text{op}}) \\ h(a, b, c) &\longmapsto h(-b, -a, \lambda(a, b) - c) \end{aligned}$$

In special cases where $A = B$ and λ is symmetric (*e.g.* the Base Case for odd d) φ becomes an additional automorphism of $\mathcal{H}(A, A, C, \lambda)$ of order 1 or 2. Together with \mathfrak{V} it then generates a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H}(A, A, C, \lambda))$ isomorphic to (a quotient of) the dihedral group of order 8 and with ϕ_{-1} in its centre and in $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}(A, A, C, \lambda))$.

REMARK 5.1 In another wide class of cases (Hypothesis 5.1) there are also *non-canonical* isomorphisms between A and B and hence between $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}(B, A, C', \mu)$ for any *nondegenerate* μ and $C \cong C'$ (see Corollary 5.1 with $R = \mathbb{Z}$).

Let $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ be any homomorphism. Since C is finite, its values are roots of unity in \mathbb{T} . For any $f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ (see §4) and any $h(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}$ we define $h(a, b, c) \cdot_{\sigma_p} f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ by

$$(h(a, b, c) \cdot_{\sigma_p} f)(x) = p(\lambda(x, b) + c)f(x + a) \quad \text{for all } x \in A \quad (28)$$

One checks easily that \cdot_{σ_p} thus defined is a \mathbb{C} -linear, left group-action of \mathcal{H} on $\mathcal{M}(A)$ and that it preserves its PDHF. It follows that we get a well defined a unitary representation

$$\sigma_p : \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda) \longrightarrow \text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$$

by setting $\sigma_p(h)(f) := h \cdot_{\sigma_p} f$ for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. We call this the (*discrete*) *left Schrödinger representation* of \mathcal{H} , attached to p . One checks similarly that there is another \mathbb{C} -linear left group action \cdot_{τ_p} of \mathcal{H} on $\mathcal{M}(B)$ given for any $l \in \mathcal{M}(B)$ by

$$(h(a, b, c) \cdot_{\tau_p} l)(y) = p(c - \lambda(a, y + b))l(y + b) \quad \text{for all } y \in B \quad (29)$$

and that it preserves the PDHF on $\mathcal{M}(B)$ defined in the same way as (20). Thus we get another well-defined a unitary representation

$$\tau_p : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \text{U}(\mathcal{M}(B))$$

by setting $\tau_p(h)(l) := h \cdot_{\tau_p} l$ for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $l \in \mathcal{M}(B)$. We call this the (*discrete*) *right Schrödinger representation* of $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ attached to p . Note that the central element $m(c) = h(0, 0, c)$ of \mathcal{H} acts by multiplication by $p(c)$ in both Schrödinger representations.

REMARK 5.2 In fact, it is an easy exercise to check that $\tau_p = \tilde{\sigma}_{p^*} \circ \varphi \circ \phi_{-1}$ where where $\tilde{\sigma}_{p^*}$ denotes the left Schrödinger representation of $\mathcal{H}(B, A, C, \lambda^{\text{op}})$ with respect to the complex conjugate homomorphism p^* , *i.e.* p composed with inversion in C .

Calculating traces in the bases \mathcal{E}_A and \mathcal{E}_B , one shows easily:

Lemma 5.1 *The characters χ_{σ_p} and χ_{τ_p} and of σ_p and τ_p respectively are given by*

$$\chi_{\sigma_p}(h(a, b, c)) = \begin{cases} p(c)|A| & \text{if } a = 0 \text{ and } \lambda(A, b) \subset \ker(p) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\chi_{\tau_p}(h(a, b, c)) = \begin{cases} p(c)|B| & \text{if } b = 0 \text{ and } \lambda(a, B) \subset \ker(p) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $h(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{H}$. \square

For reasons that will become apparent in the next subsection, we will mainly be concerned with σ_p in the rest of this one. In fact, we shall be concerned more generally with homomorphisms, isomorphisms and automorphisms of various kinds between generalised Heisenberg groups, and how they interact with σ_p . A particularly simple type is as follows. Let (A, B, C, λ) and $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ be two tuples as above, suppose $t_A : A \rightarrow \tilde{A}$, $t_B : B \rightarrow \tilde{B}$, $t_C : C \rightarrow \tilde{C}$ are homomorphisms and consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} t_A \times t_B \times t_C & : \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda}) \\ h(a, b, c) & \longmapsto h(t_A(a), t_B(b), t_C(c)) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to prove

Proposition 5.1 (Criterion for Diagonal Homomorphisms) *With notations and assumptions as above, $t_A \times t_B \times t_C$ is a homomorphism if and only if*

$$t_C(\lambda(a, b)) = \tilde{\lambda}(t_A(a), t_B(b)) \quad \text{for all } a \in A, b \in B \quad \square \quad (30)$$

Homomorphisms of form $t_A \times t_B \times t_C$ will be called *diagonal*. They commute with left Schrödinger representations as follows. Consider the linear map $\check{t}_A : \mathcal{M}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\tilde{A})$ sending \mathbf{e}_a to $\mathbf{e}_{t_A(a)}$ $\forall a \in A$. Explicitly

$$\check{t}_A(f)(\tilde{a}) := \sum_{\substack{a \in A \\ t_A(a) = \tilde{a}}} f(a) \quad \text{for all } \tilde{a} \in \tilde{A} \quad (31)$$

where we interpret the R.H.S. as zero for $\tilde{a} \notin t_A(A)$.

REMARK 5.3 It is easy to see that \check{t}_A preserves PDHF's iff t_A is injective.

Proposition 5.2 *In the situation of Proposition 5.1, suppose $\underline{t} := t_A \times t_B \times t_C$ is a diagonal homomorphism (so (30) holds) and suppose $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $\tilde{p} : \tilde{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ are homomorphisms satisfying $\tilde{p} \circ t_C = p$. Then*

$$\underline{t}(h) \cdot_{\sigma_{\tilde{p}}} \check{t}_A(f) = \check{t}_A(h \cdot_{\sigma_p} f) \quad (32)$$

for all $h \in \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$.

PROOF By linearity, it suffices to check (32) for f every basis element \mathbf{e}_a for $a \in A$. Setting $h = h(a_1, b_1, c_1)$ and evaluating both sides at $x' \in \tilde{A}$, we find they both vanish unless $x' = t_A(a - a_1)$ in which case they both equal $p(\lambda(a - a_1, b_1) + c_1)$. \square

REMARK 5.4 (**Projective Systems of Schrödinger Representations**) Notice that (31) is a form of distribution relation. In a future paper we shall study profinite Heisenberg groups as projective limits of systems of the form $(\mathcal{H}_i := \mathcal{H}(A_i, B_i, C_i, \lambda_i))_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, with diagonal transition homomorphisms, together with their Schrödinger representations, ‘correctly’ defined. This is somewhat in line with the goals of [We]. However, in such situations, the distribution relations mean that the (infinite-dimensional) spaces for the left Schrödinger representations of such profinite groups will most naturally be certain spaces of *distributions*, contained in $\mathcal{M}_\infty := \varprojlim \mathcal{M}(A_i)$, rather than the real- or complex-valued *functions*, on the compact set

$A_\infty := \varprojlim A_i$ which appear in the situations studied by Weil. Here is a simple, concrete example: take $\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{N}$ and let $A_i = B_i = C_i = \mathbb{Z}/p^i$ for some fixed odd prime p , with λ being multiplication modulo p^i . Each ‘layer’ in the projective system is thus a Base Case with $\mathcal{H}_i \cong \text{WH}(p^i)$ (see §7.2.1) together with its usual, complex Schrödinger representation on $\mathcal{M}(A_i)$. If, however, we innocuously replace $\mathcal{M}(A_i) = \mathcal{M}(A_i, \mathbb{C})$ by $\mathcal{M}(A_i, \mathcal{C}_p)$ for a large, complete p -adic field \mathcal{C}_p , then we can apply p -adic boundedness conditions to the limit, and end up with a representation of the *Heisenberg group over \mathbb{Z}_p* (the p -adic integers) on the space of \mathcal{C}_p -valued measures on $A_\infty = \mathbb{Z}_p$. This allows the introduction of p -adic analytic methods. In particular, in the limit, we can ‘extend’ to continuous p -adic central characters $\psi_\kappa : C_\infty = \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_p^\times$ of *infinite* order, analytically parametrised by κ lying in the ‘open’ unit disc in \mathcal{C}_p . Moreover, it appears that the analogue of the Weil representation in the limit can be made explicit by means of certain p -adic, theta-like integrals with values in \mathcal{C}_p . Details will appear in a sequel to this paper.

5.2 The ‘Non-Degenerate-by-Cyclic’ Hypothesis

Unless otherwise stated we assume henceforth the following hypothesis on the tuple (A, B, C, λ) which is commonly satisfied in the applications.

Hypothesis 5.1 (‘Non-Degenerate by Cyclic’)

- (i). λ is non-degenerate (i.e. $K_A = K_B = 0$)
- (ii). C is cyclic, say $C \cong \mathbb{Z}/r$ with $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Since C is cyclic, we can choose an injective homomorphism $q : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ to get

$$A \xrightarrow{\lambda_*} \text{Hom}(B, C) \xrightarrow{q_*} \text{Hom}(B, \mathbb{C}^\times) := \hat{B} \quad (33)$$

where the dual group \hat{B} is non-canonically isomorphic to B and the homomorphism λ_* (induced by λ) is injective by (i), as is q_* . We deduce $|A| \leq |\hat{B}| = |B|$. The same argument but reversing the roles of A and B gives $|B| \leq |A|$. Thus $|A| = |B|$ so λ_* and q_* must be *isomorphisms* and $A \cong \hat{B} \cong B$. We write s and e respectively for the common cardinalities and exponents of A and B . Thus s is a multiple of e and has the same prime factors. Since r kills $\text{Hom}(B, C) \cong \hat{B}$, it must also be a multiple of e . If λ is surjective then e will kill C , so also $r|e$ and $r = e$. Note that we *do not* insist that this be the case under Hypothesis 5.1. Thus, in particular, it is quite possible for r to have prime factors that do not divide e .

Abbreviating $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ to \mathcal{H} as before, we have $Z = Z(\mathcal{H}) = m(C)$ by (26) and \mathcal{H}' is the unique subgroup of Z of cardinality e . Also,

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(A)) = s \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{H} : Z| = s^2 \quad (34)$$

since $\mathcal{H}/Z \cong A \oplus B$. Clearly, \mathcal{H} has cardinality $s^2 r$ and we shall see in §6.1 that, at least when r is odd, it is precisely the exponent of \mathcal{H} .

By Theorem 4.1, faithful irreducible representations and faithful SV representations of \mathcal{H} are the same thing. We can now characterise them precisely up to isomorphism.

Proposition 5.3 *Suppose Hypothesis 5.1 is satisfied.*

- (i). *If $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is an injective homomorphism then σ_p is a faithful SV representation of \mathcal{H} with central character ψ given by $\psi \circ m = p$.*
- (ii). *Conversely, if ρ is any faithful SV representation of \mathcal{H} with central character ψ , then ψ is injective and ρ is isomorphic to σ_p if and only if p is the (injective) homomorphism $\psi \circ m$.*

PROOF If p is injective then, by the non-degeneracy of λ and Lemma 5.1, $\chi_{\sigma_p} h(a, b, c) = 0$ unless $a = b = 0$, i.e. $h(a, b, c) \in m(C) = Z$. Thus σ_p is SV by equation (34) and condition (i) of Theorem 2.1. It is faithful by (3) and $\psi \circ m = p$ also follows from Lemma 5.1. This proves part (i). Part (ii) is proved similarly, again using (3), Theorem 2.1, Lemma 5.1 and the fact that a representation is determined up to isomorphism by its character. \square

Now suppose $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is injective and define a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\xi_p : \mathcal{M}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$:

$$\xi_p(f)(y) = s^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{x \in A} f(x) p(\lambda(x, y)) \quad \text{for all } y \in B, \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$$

(Thus ξ_p is the normalised, discrete Fourier transform.) Given $a \in A$, define $\omega_{a,p} \in \hat{B}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{a,p} \in \mathcal{M}(B)$ by

$$\omega_{a,p}(y) := p(\lambda(a, y)) \quad \text{for all } y \in B, \text{ and } \tilde{\omega}_{a,p} := s^{-\frac{1}{2}} \omega_{a,p}$$

Note that $\omega_{a,p}$ is just the image of a under the isomorphisms of (33) (with p for q) so it runs through \hat{B} as a runs through A . Hence, by the character theory of finite abelian groups, it follows that $\mathcal{G}_B := \{\tilde{\omega}_{a,p} : a \in A\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{M}(B)$ independent of p . Similarly, we define $\omega_{b,p} \in \hat{A}$ for each b by $\omega_{b,p}(x) := p(\lambda(x, b))$, set $\tilde{\omega}_{b,p} = s^{-\frac{1}{2}} \omega_{b,p} \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ and get an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{G}_A := \{\tilde{\omega}_{b,p} : b \in B\}$ of $\mathcal{M}(A)$.

Proposition 5.4 (τ_p and σ_p are Fourier Duals under Hypothesis 5.1)

With p and $\xi_p : \mathcal{M}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$ as above,

- (i). $\xi_p(e_a) = \tilde{\omega}_{a,p} \quad \forall a \in A$ and $\xi_p(\tilde{\omega}_{p,b}) = e_{-b} \quad \forall b \in B$ and
- (ii). ξ_p is an isomorphism satisfying $\langle \xi_p(f_1), \xi_p(f_2) \rangle = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle \quad \forall f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{M}(A)$
- (iii). *We have*

$$\xi_p(h \cdot_{\sigma_p} f) = h \cdot_{\tau_p} \xi_p(f) \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda) \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{M}(A) \quad (35)$$

PROOF The formulae in (i) are easily checked and imply (ii) since, for example, ξ_p takes \mathcal{E}_A to \mathcal{G}_B and both are orthonormal bases. For part (iii), since ‘ \cdot_{σ_p} ’, and ‘ \cdot_{τ_p} ’ are both group actions, it suffices to check (35) taking h to be each of the generators of $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ of form $h(0, 0, c)$, $h(0, b, 0)$ and $h(a, 0, 0)$ (see (24)). This is straightforward and LTR. \square

It follows in particular that σ_p and τ_p are isomorphic as faithful SV-representations of \mathcal{H} . What’s more, $\mathbb{P}\xi_p$ maps every \mathcal{H} -bouquet $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{P}\mathcal{M}(A)$ w.r.t. σ_p explicitly onto a ‘dual’ \mathcal{H} -bouquet $\mathbb{P}\xi_p(\mathcal{Y}) \subset \mathbb{P}\mathcal{M}(B)$ w.r.t. τ_p , which has *the same overlap- and angle-maps*. Thus, for the purposes of studying equiangular and \mathcal{A} -regular bouquets, σ_p and τ_p are largely equivalent. We shall therefore focus on the former from now on, usually referring to it simply as *the Schrödinger representation of \mathcal{H}* .

5.3 GHGs ‘with R -Structure’

We temporarily suspend the assumption of Hypothesis 5.1 to greatly enrich the theory of generalised Heisenberg groups: we consider tuples (A, B, C, λ) where A and B are modules over a commutative ring R . (Note: we allow R to be infinite, but its action on A will factor through the necessarily finite ring $R/\text{ann}(A)$.) We also require λ to be R -balanced in the sense that

$$\lambda(ra, b) = \lambda(a, rb) \quad \text{for all } r \in R, a \in A, b \in B \quad (36)$$

This is equivalent to saying that homomorphism $\lambda_* : A \rightarrow \text{Hom}(B, C)$ induced by λ is an R -module homomorphism (where R acts on $\text{Hom}(A, C)$ by pre-composition with its action on A) or indeed to the same thing with A and B interchanged. We shall summarise this situation by saying that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ ‘has R -structure’. The phrase should strictly be applied to the tuple (A, B, C, λ) defining \mathcal{H} , moreover the R -structure is usually *not* determined by the group structure of \mathcal{H} itself. Nevertheless, in this situation, identifying $\mathcal{H}/m(C)$ with $A \oplus B$ imposes on it the natural structure of an R -module.

Suppose that $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ also has R -structure and $\theta : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is any homomorphism of groups with $\theta(m(C)) \subset m(\tilde{C})$. (For instance, if θ is surjective and Hypothesis 5.1 is satisfied by both tuples, so $m(C) = Z(\mathcal{H})$ and $m(\tilde{C}) = Z(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$.) Then we shall say abusively that θ is R -linear (or an R -homomorphism) iff the induced homomorphism $\bar{\theta} : A \oplus B \rightarrow \tilde{A} \oplus \tilde{B}$ is R -linear in the usual sense. In particular, a diagonal homomorphism $t_A \times t_B \times t_C$ is R linear iff t_A and t_B are R -linear. If Hypothesis 5.1 holds, we may define $\text{Aut}_R(\mathcal{H})$ to be the subgroup of R -linear automorphisms in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ to be $\text{Aut}_R(\mathcal{H}) \cap \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ which contains $\text{Inn}(\mathcal{H})$ since the latter acts by the identity on $A \oplus B$. Similarly, we set $\text{Out}_R(\mathcal{H}) := \text{Aut}_R(\mathcal{H})/\text{Inn}(\mathcal{H}) < \text{Out}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\text{Out}_R^0(\mathcal{H}) := \text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})/\text{Inn}(\mathcal{H}) < \text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H})$. It seems natural to investigate \mathcal{A} -regular bouquets for \mathcal{H} with \mathcal{A} contained in $\text{Out}_R(\mathcal{H})$ (and with respect to σ_p , assuming the latter is irreducible).

5.4 GHGs of Direct Sums and Tensor-Product Representations

Consider now the situation where, for given (cyclic) C , the tuples (A_i, B_i, C, λ_i) for $i = 1, \dots, m$ all satisfy Hypothesis 5.1, with A_i , and B_i being R -modules and λ_i being R -balanced for all i . Suppose A is the direct sum $\bigoplus_{i=1}^m A_i$ as an R -module and similarly $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m B_i$ as an R -module. We define a pairing λ :

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda : A \times B & \longrightarrow C \\ ((a_1, \dots, a_m), (b_1, \dots, b_m)) & \longmapsto \lambda_1(a_1, b_1) + \dots + \lambda_m(a_m, b_m) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that λ is R -balanced, bilinear and non-degenerate, so (A, B, C, λ) satisfies Hypothesis 5.1 and $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ is a generalised Heisenberg group with R -structure. For each i , let j_{A_i} and j_{B_i} be the natural injective R -module maps from A_i into A and B_i into B , respectively. By Proposition 5.1 we have an (injective, R -linear) diagonal homomorphism for each i

$$\underline{t}_i := j_{A_i} \times j_{B_i} \times \text{id}_C : \mathcal{H}_i := \mathcal{H}(A_i, B_i, C, \lambda) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$$

For each (i, k) with $i \neq k$ we have $\lambda(j_{A,i}(A_i), j_{B,k}(B_k)) = \{0\}$. Thus $\text{im}(\underline{t}_i) \cong \mathcal{H}_i$ and $\text{im}(\underline{t}_k) \cong \mathcal{H}_k$ centralise each other and, moreover, $\text{im}(\underline{t}_i) \cap \text{im}(\underline{t}_k) = m(C) = Z(\mathcal{H})$. One proves easily:

Proposition 5.5 (Heisenberg Group of Direct Sums under Hypothesis 5.1)

The map from the direct product

$$\begin{aligned} \theta : \quad \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H} \\ (h_1, \dots, h_m) &\longmapsto \underline{t}_1(h_1) \dots \underline{t}_m(h_m) \end{aligned}$$

is a surjective group homomorphism and $\text{im}(\underline{t}_i)$ is normal in \mathcal{H} for all i . Moreover

$$\ker \theta = \{(m(c_1), \dots, m(c_m)) : c_1 + \dots + c_m = 0\} < \prod_{i=1}^m Z(\mathcal{H}_i) = Z\left(\prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i\right) = \theta^{-1}(Z(\mathcal{H}))$$

In particular, θ induces an isomorphism modulo centres. \square

Now suppose $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is an injective homomorphism so that $\sigma_p : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ is faithful and SV. It follows (*e.g.* by Proposition 5.5 and Lemma 2.1) that the inflation of σ_p to the group $\prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i$ – which is class ≤ 2 nilpotent, but does not have cyclic centre if $m > 1$ – is also SV. Explicitly, this is the representation $\rho_1 := \sigma_p \circ \theta$ so that

$$\underline{h} \cdot_{\rho_1} f = \theta(\underline{h}) \cdot_{\sigma_p} f \quad \forall \underline{h} \in \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i, \forall f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$$

On the other hand, writing $\sigma_{i,p}$ for the Schrödinger representation of \mathcal{H}_i on $\mathcal{M}(A_i)$, we have the tensor-product representation of $\prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i$ on $\otimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ namely the representation

$$\rho_2 := \bigotimes_{i=1}^m \sigma_{i,p} \quad \text{so} \quad \underline{h} \cdot_{\rho_2} \left(\sum_{s=1}^S f_{1,s} \otimes \dots \otimes f_{m,s} \right) = \sum_{s=1}^S (h_1 \cdot_{\sigma_{1,p}} f_{1,s}) \otimes \dots \otimes (h_m \cdot_{\sigma_{m,p}} f_{m,s})$$

where $\underline{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_m) \in \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i$ and $f_{i,s} \in \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ for all i and s . (All tensor products are, of course, over \mathbb{C} .) Note also that ρ_2 is unitary w.r.t. the PDHF on $\otimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ given by

$$\langle f_1 \otimes \dots \otimes f_m, g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_m \rangle := \langle f_1, g_1 \rangle \dots \langle f_m, g_m \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$$

(extended bilinearly) and that we have a linear isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} : \quad \otimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}(A_i) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(A) \\ f_1 \otimes \dots \otimes f_m &\longmapsto (f : (a_1, \dots, a_m) \mapsto f_1(a_1) \dots f_m(a_m)) \end{aligned}$$

which sends orthonormal basis elements $e_{a_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{a_m}$ to orthonormal basis elements $e_{(a_1, \dots, a_m)}$ and so respects the PDHFs.

Proposition 5.6 *In the above situation and notations, the map \mathcal{V} defines an isomorphism between ρ_2 and ρ_1 as unitary representations of $\prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i$, that is:*

$$\mathcal{V}(\underline{h} \cdot_{\rho_2} v) = \underline{h} \cdot_{\rho_1} \mathcal{V}(v) \quad \forall \underline{h} \in \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{H}_i, \forall v = \sum_{s=1}^S f_{1,s} \otimes \dots \otimes f_{m,s} \in \otimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}(A_i) \quad (37)$$

In particular, ρ_2 is an SV-representation and factors through a representation $\bar{\rho}_p$, say, of $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C; \lambda)$ on $\bigotimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{M}(A_i)$ which is isomorphic by \mathcal{V} to σ_p , as unitary representations of \mathcal{H} . Explicitly, we can write

$$h((a_1, \dots, a_m), (b_1, \dots, b_m), c) \cdot_{\bar{\rho}_p} \left(\sum_{s=1}^S f_{1,s} \otimes \dots \otimes f_{m,s} \right) = p(c) \sum_{s=1}^S (h'_1 \cdot_{\sigma_{1,p}} f_{1,s}) \otimes \dots \otimes (h'_m \cdot_{\sigma_{m,p}} f_{m,s})$$

where $h'_i = h(a_i, b_i, 0) \in \mathcal{H}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

PROOF The main thing to check is (37) and, for this, it suffices to take \underline{h} to be of form $(1, \dots, 1, h(a, b, c), 1, \dots, 1)$ with $a \in A_i$, $b \in B_i$, $c \in C$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and v to be a basis element of form $e_{a_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{a_m}$ where $a_i \in A_i \forall i$. In this case, we find that both sides of (37) are equal to $p(\lambda_i(a_i - a, b) + c)e_{(a_1, \dots, a_i - a, \dots, a_m)}$. The rest is LTR. \square

5.5 Diagonal R -Isomorphisms under Hypothesis 5.1

We suppose now that (A, B, C, λ) and $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ are two tuples, both satisfying Hypothesis 5.1 and such that the groups $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ have R -structure for the same commutative ring R (possibly $R = \mathbb{Z}$). In this situation, the following result shows that diagonal R -isomorphisms of the form $t_A \times t_B \times t_C$ exist and are determined uniquely by the pairs (t_A, t_C) , with $t_A \in \text{Hom}_R(A, \tilde{A})$ and $t_C \in \text{Hom}(C, \tilde{C})$. (The same is not true without the isomorphism condition.) This has important consequences for the isomorphism of Heisenberg groups and their Schrödinger representations. (An analogous result holds for pairs (t_B, t_C) and can be proven by an analogous argument.)

Theorem 5.1 (Extension to Diagonal Isomorphisms)

Suppose that (A, B, C, λ) , $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ are as specified above and suppose that $t_A \in \text{Hom}_R(A, \tilde{A})$ and $t_C \in \text{Hom}(C, \tilde{C})$ are both isomorphisms.

- (i). There exists a unique element t_B of $\text{Hom}(B, \tilde{B})$ such that $\underline{t} := t_A \times t_B \times t_C$ is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ to $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$.
- (ii). Moreover, t_B and \underline{t} are R -isomorphisms.

PROOF We have R -homomorphisms $\lambda_* : B \rightarrow \text{Hom}(A, C)$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_* : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{C})$ induced by λ and $\tilde{\lambda}$ respectively. By Proposition 5.1, given $t_B \in \text{Hom}(B, \tilde{B})$, the map \underline{t} will be a homomorphism from $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ to $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ iff $t_C \circ \lambda_*(b) = \tilde{\lambda}_*(t_B(b)) \circ t_A$ in $\text{Hom}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{C})$, for all $b \in B$. But t_A is an isomorphism and we have seen that Hypothesis 5.1 for $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ implies that $\tilde{\lambda}_*$ is also an isomorphism so this condition can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{\lambda}_*^{-1}(t_C \circ \lambda_*(b) \circ t_A^{-1}) = t_B(b) \tag{38}$$

for all $b \in B$. (The expression in large parentheses on the L.H.S. is clearly an element of $\text{Hom}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{C})$.) Thus part (i) will follow if we can show that the L.H.S. of (38), as a function of $b \in B$, is a homomorphism from B to \tilde{B} . But this follows from the fact that λ_* , t_C and $\tilde{\lambda}_*^{-1}$ are homomorphisms. For part (ii), it suffices to show that t_B , as defined by (38), is an

R -isomorphism, as this will imply the same for \underline{t} . The R -linearity of t_B follows from that of λ_* , t_A^{-1} and $\tilde{\lambda}_*^{-1}$ so it only remains to show that t_B is bijective. Since t_A is an isomorphism we have $|A| = |\tilde{A}|$, i.e. $|B| = |\tilde{B}|$ by Hypothesis 5.1, so injectivity suffices. But for $b, b' \in B$, the equality

$$\tilde{\lambda}_*^{-1}(t_C \circ \lambda_*(b) \circ t_A^{-1}) = \tilde{\lambda}_*^{-1}(t_C \circ \lambda_*(b') \circ t_A^{-1})$$

implies $b = b'$ since t_C is injective and λ_* is too, by Hypothesis 5.1 for (A, B, C, λ) . \square

Corollary 5.1 *Suppose (A, B, C, λ) and $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ satisfy Hypothesis 5.1 and the groups $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ have R -structure. Then*

$$(A \cong \tilde{A} \text{ as } R\text{-modules and } C \cong \tilde{C}) \implies (\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda) \cong \mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda}) \text{ over } R) \quad \square \quad (39)$$

REMARK 5.5 Note in particular that, if Hypothesis 5.1 is satisfied, then the R -isomorphism type of $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ doesn't depend on λ , only on that of A (as well the isomorphism type of C , but that is determined by $r = |C|$)! Obviously, implication (39) holds equally with $B \cong \tilde{B}$ in place of $A \cong \tilde{A}$ on the L.H.S., by a similar argument. Also the converse implication also holds under Hypothesis 5.1, at least if $R = \mathbb{Z}$: if $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ are isomorphic as groups, then so are their centres and quotients-by-centres. Thus $C \cong \tilde{C}$ and $A \oplus B \cong \tilde{A} \oplus \tilde{B}$, hence $A \oplus A \cong \tilde{A} \oplus \tilde{A}$ so $A \cong \tilde{A}$ by the structure theorem for finite abelian groups.

Let us take $(A, B, C, \lambda) = (\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$ and $t_C = \text{id}_C$ in Theorem 5.1. Writing α for $t_A \in \text{Aut}_R(A)$, we easily deduce:

Corollary 5.2 (Diagonal Automorphisms)

Suppose that (A, B, C, λ) satisfies Hypothesis 5.1 and $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ has R -structure. Then there is an injective homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta : \text{Aut}_R(A) &\longrightarrow \text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H}) \\ \alpha &\longmapsto \alpha \times \beta \times \text{id}_C \end{aligned}$$

where β is the unique element of $\text{Aut}(B)$ satisfying

$$\lambda(\alpha(a), \beta(b)) = \lambda(a, b) \quad \forall a, b. \quad (40)$$

In fact, β lies in $\text{Aut}_R(B)$ and is the inverse of the 'dual automorphism' to α w.r.t. λ . In particular, if α is the action of $r \in R^\times$ then β is the action of r^{-1} .) \square

The image $\Delta(\text{Aut}_R(A))$ of Δ in $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ will be called the subgroup of *diagonal (R -) automorphisms of \mathcal{H} (fixing the centre)*. Combining Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 gives:

Corollary 5.3 *Suppose that (A, B, C, λ) , $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda})$, t_A and t_C satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5.1 and that $\underline{t} = t_A \times t_B \times t_C$ is the unique R -isomorphism described therein. Suppose also $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $\tilde{p} : \tilde{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ are homomorphisms satisfying $\tilde{p} \circ t_C = p$ and let $\sigma_p : \mathcal{H} :=$*

$\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(A)$ and $\sigma_{\tilde{p}} : \tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \mathcal{H}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\tilde{A})$ be the (left) Schrödinger representations associated to p and \tilde{p} respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \check{t}_A &: \mathcal{M}(A) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}(\tilde{A}) \\ f &\longmapsto f \circ t_A^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

satisfies equation (32) and is an isomorphism of unitary representations from σ_p to $\sigma_{\tilde{p}}$.

PROOF It only remains to note that \check{t}_A is an isomorphism (obvious) and that it preserves PDHFs (by Remark 5.3). \square

Corollary 5.3 now yields the Weil representation on $\Delta(\text{Aut}(A)) < \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda))$:

Corollary 5.4 (Weil Representation for Diagonal Automorphisms in $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$)

Suppose that (A, B, C, λ) satisfies Hypothesis 5.1 and that $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is a homomorphism such that the Schrödinger representation σ_p of $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ is irreducible (e.g. p is injective). Thus the Weil representation $\mathcal{T}_{\sigma_p} : \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \text{PU}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ with respect to σ_p is well-defined. Then, for any $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(A)$ the element $\mathcal{T}_{\sigma_p}(\Delta(\alpha))$ of $\text{PU}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ is precisely the image of $\check{\alpha} \in \text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$, namely the map sending $f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ to $\check{\alpha}(f) = f \circ \alpha^{-1}$.

PROOF Take $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{\lambda}) = (A, B, C, \lambda)$, $t_A = \alpha$ and $t_C = \text{id}_C$ in Corollary 5.3, so that $\tilde{p} = p$. Then \check{t} equals $\Delta(\alpha)$ by definition of the latter and $\check{t}_A = \check{\alpha}$. So, according to the last Corollary, $\check{\alpha}$ lies in $\text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ and the following version of equation (32) holds

$$\Delta(\alpha)(h) \cdot_{\sigma_p} \check{\alpha}(f) = \check{\alpha}(h \cdot_{\sigma_p} f) \tag{41}$$

for all $h \in \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. In other words

$$\check{\alpha} \circ \sigma_p(h) = \sigma_p(\Delta(\alpha)(h)) \circ \check{\alpha}$$

in $\text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$. Comparing this last equation with (7) (with $\rho = \sigma_p$ and $g = h \in \mathcal{H}$) and the definition (8) of \mathcal{T}_{σ_p} gives the result. \square

By contrast to Corollary 5.4 the explicit characterisation of \mathcal{T}_{σ_p} on *non*-diagonal elements of $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ is a much harder – but also more interesting – task, even in the Base Case. See Remark 7.3.

REMARK 5.6 A special case occurs when $\mathcal{H}(A, B, C, \lambda)$ has R -structure and α is the action of $r \in R^\times$. In particular, if we take $r = -1$, so that $\alpha = \alpha^{-1}$ is inversion in A , we find $\Delta(\alpha) = \phi_{-1}$. Thus (if σ_p is irreducible) the Corollary tells us that $\mathcal{T}_{\sigma_p}(\phi_{-1})$ sends $f(x) \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ to $f(-x)$.

REMARK 5.7 (**An \mathbb{R} -Linear Extension of the Weil Representation**) Suppose $r \neq 2$ so that the automorphism ϕ^- of \mathcal{H} sending $h(a, b, c)$ to $h(a, -b, -c)$ is of order exactly 2 and does *not* lie in $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$. We define $\mathbf{c} \in \text{GL}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ of order two by $\mathbf{c}(f)(a) = f(a)^*$ (complex conjugate) for all $f \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ and $a \in A$. One checks easily the following analogue of (41):

$$\phi^-(h) \cdot_{\sigma_p} \mathbf{c}(f) = \mathbf{c}(h \cdot_{\sigma_p} f)$$

for all h and f . Now, given any $\phi \in \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ and $T_\phi \in \text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ representing $\mathcal{T}_{\sigma_p}(\phi)$ modulo \mathbb{T} , it follows easily from (7) (with $\rho = \sigma_p$ and $g = h \in \mathcal{H}$) and the last equation (twice) that

$$\phi^- \phi \phi^- (h) \cdot_{\sigma_p} \mathbf{c} T_\phi \mathbf{c} (f) = \mathbf{c} T_\phi \mathbf{c} (h \cdot_{\sigma_p} f)$$

for all h and f . But $\phi^- \phi \phi^-$ and $\mathbf{c} T_\phi \mathbf{c}$ clearly lie in $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ and $\text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ respectively, so, by the definition of \mathcal{T}_{σ_p} , we must have

$$\mathcal{T}_{\sigma_p}(\phi^- \phi \phi^-) = \mathbf{c} \mathcal{T}_{\sigma_p}(\phi) \mathbf{c} \pmod{\mathbb{T}} \quad (42)$$

in $\text{PU}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. Let us denote by $\widetilde{\text{Aut}}^0(\mathcal{H})$ the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of those automorphisms acting on $Z(\mathcal{H}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/r$ by ± 1 . Then, clearly, $\widetilde{\text{Aut}}^0(\mathcal{H}) = \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}) \dot{\cup} \phi^- \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ and it follows easily from (42) that \mathcal{T}_{σ_p} extends to a (unique) *homomorphism* $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\sigma_p} : \widetilde{\text{Aut}}^0(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \text{GL}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{M}(A))/\mathbb{T}$ sending ϕ^- to $\mathbf{c} \pmod{\mathbb{T}}$. By construction, it clearly satisfies

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\sigma_p}(v) \circ \sigma_p(h) = \sigma_p(v(h)) \circ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\sigma_p}(v) \pmod{\mathbb{T}}$$

for all $v \in \widetilde{\text{Aut}}^0(\mathcal{H})$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Note that ϕ_- lies in $\widetilde{\text{Aut}}^0(\mathcal{H})$ and equals $\phi^- \phi_{-1}$. Thus, by the previous remark, $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\sigma_p}(\phi_-)$ is the image in $\text{GL}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{M}(A))/\mathbb{T}$ of the map sending f to $\mathbf{c}(f)$ composed with inversion in A . We return to the representation $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\sigma_p}$ in the Base Case in §7.2.

6 Automorphism Groups and Displacement Operators

Throughout this section, we assume Hypothesis 5.1 on the tuple (A, B, C, λ) . Thus $Z \cong C$ is cyclic of order r and A and B are dual via λ . We shall further assume for simplicity that r is odd (so also $e = \exp(\mathcal{H}/Z)$ and $s = |A| = \sqrt{|\mathcal{H}/Z|}$) and that \mathcal{H} is non-abelian, *i.e.* A is non-trivial, hence also C . Thus $r > 1$ and $\mathcal{H} \neq Z \neq \{1\}$.

Notation: we shall usually write \mathbf{a} generically for (a, b) , \mathbf{a}' for (a', b') *etc* in $A \oplus B$. We shall often write $h(\mathbf{a}, c)$ for $h(a, b, c)$ *etc* in \mathcal{H} . To further save notation we shall also make an identification permitted by Hypothesis 5.1: we shall (usually) identify $\bar{\mathcal{H}} := \mathcal{H}/Z$ with $A \oplus B$ by means of π (*i.e.* we identify $\overline{h(\mathbf{a}, c)}$ with \mathbf{a} for any $c \in C$.)

Two linked goals to be tackled in a future paper are, firstly, to render explicit the Weil representation of $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ w.r.t. an irreducible Schrödinger representation σ_p of \mathcal{H} , and, secondly, to investigate invariant and regular \mathcal{H} -bouquets w.r.t. σ_p and subgroups $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ and \mathcal{A} of $\text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H})$ respectively. An essential first step for both of these is to get a description of $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ and $\text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H})$ in terms of A , B and λ . This is achieved in the first subsection here, making use of a map $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{H}/Z = A \oplus B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ which is right inverse to π and has special properties: its associated 2-cocycle is essentially $\delta_{\mathcal{H}}$ (see (45)) and it ‘commutes’ with powers and with diagonal automorphisms (see (46) and (56)).

The composition of \mathcal{D} with the Schrödinger representation yields elements $D(\mathbf{a})$ of $\text{U}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ which form a \mathbb{C} -basis of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. In the Base Case these elements are the unitary endomorphisms of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d) \cong \mathbb{C}^d$ referred to as ‘*displacement operators*’ in most of the SIC-related literature of quantum physics, from which the name, of course, derives (see §7.2.1).

In the second subsection here we briefly explain the connection between the overlap-maps introduced in §3 – now specialised by taking $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{D}$ – and the coefficients of the $D(\mathbf{a})$'s in certain projectors in $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. (See Remark 6.4.) In the Base Case, these coefficients are (essentially) the so-called ‘*overlaps*’ – another word with a ‘physical’ etymology giving rise to the terminology used in this paper.

6.1 Automorphism Groups *via* the Map \mathcal{D}

Since we are identifying \mathcal{H}/Z with $A \oplus B$, the skew-symmetric bilinear form $\delta_{\mathcal{H}} : \bar{\mathcal{H}} \times \bar{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow Z$ (cf (17)) becomes $m \circ \delta$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta = \delta_{\lambda} \quad : \quad (A \oplus B) \times (A \oplus B) &\longrightarrow C \\ (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') &\longmapsto \lambda(a, b') - \lambda(a', b) \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

(cf (25)). Note that δ is non-degenerate (zero left- and right-kernels) since λ is being assumed non-degenerate. None of this requires that r be odd, of course, however, since r is odd here, every $c \in C$ has a unique square-root, written $\frac{1}{2}c$ and the map $\mathcal{D} : A \oplus B \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}) := h\left(\mathbf{a}, \frac{1}{2}\lambda(a, b)\right) \tag{44}$$

Thus $\pi \circ \mathcal{D} = \text{id}_{A \oplus B}$, $\mathcal{D}(0)$ is the identity and direct calculation shows that

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}') = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}')m\left(\frac{1}{2}\delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}')\right) \tag{45}$$

by (17) and (25). The skew-symmetry of δ then implies the special property

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})^n = \mathcal{D}(n\mathbf{a}) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{46}$$

(It follows from this that the exponent of \mathcal{H} is exactly r .) Equation (25) (or (45)) implies

$$[\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}), \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}')] = m(\delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}')) \tag{47}$$

Now suppose ϕ is an automorphism in $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$. It preserves (in fact, fixes) $Z = m(C)$ and so induces an automorphism $\bar{\phi}$ of the abelian group $A \oplus B$ defined by

$$\phi(h(\mathbf{a}, c)) = h(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}), c') \quad \text{for some } c' = c'(\phi, \mathbf{a}, c) \in C, \text{ for all } c \in C \text{ and } \mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B \tag{48}$$

Here, $\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a})$ depends only on \mathbf{a} but the unique element $c' \in C$ satisfying (48) depends *a priori* on ϕ , \mathbf{a} and c . In particular, if we take $c = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(a, b)$ in (48) we get

$$\phi(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})) = \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}))m(\eta_{\phi}(\mathbf{a})) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B \tag{49}$$

for some unique $\bar{\phi} \in \text{Aut}(A \oplus B)$ and some unique function $\eta_{\phi} : A \oplus B \rightarrow C$ depending on ϕ . We next show that for each $\phi \in \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$

(i). The automorphism $\bar{\phi}$ must preserve the skew-symmetric form δ on $A \oplus B$

(ii). The function η_ϕ must be a homomorphism of abelian groups.

For (i), since ϕ is an automorphism fixing Z we have, for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \in A \oplus B$:

$$[\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}), \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}')] = \phi([\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}), \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}')]) = ([\phi(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})), \phi(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}'))]) = [\mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a})), \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}'))]$$

by (49), since $m(\eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}))$ and $m(\eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}'))$ commute with everything. So, by (47) and the injectivity of m we must have:

$$\delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') = \delta(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}), \bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}')) \quad (50)$$

which is statement (i). For future use (even in cases where $2|r$) we introduce the notation $\text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$ for the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(A \oplus B)$ consisting of automorphisms which preserve the form δ :

$$\text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta) := \{\bar{\phi} \in \text{Aut}(A \oplus B) : \delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') = \delta(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}), \bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}')) \text{ for all } \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \in A \oplus B\} \quad (51)$$

For statement (ii) above, we apply ϕ to equation (45) with the two sides interchanged and use (49) on each side to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}'))m\left(\eta_\phi(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}') + \frac{1}{2}\delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}')\right) &= \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}))m(\eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}))\mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}'))m(\eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}')) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}))\mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}'))m(\eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}) + \eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}')) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}) + \bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}'))m\left(\frac{1}{2}\delta(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}), \bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}')) + \eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}) + \eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}'))\right) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}'))m\left(\frac{1}{2}\delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') + \eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}) + \eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}')\right) \end{aligned}$$

using (45) again, (50) and the fact that $\bar{\phi}$ is a homomorphism. Cancelling and using the injectivity of m , gives $\eta_\phi(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}') = \eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}) + \eta_\phi(\mathbf{a}')$ which is statement (ii). So far, we have shown that there is a well-defined map of sets

$$\tilde{\Theta} : \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \times \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$$

$$\phi \longmapsto (\eta_\phi, \bar{\phi})$$

with η_ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$ defined by (49). If $\tilde{\Theta}(\phi) = \tilde{\Theta}(\phi')$ then, by (49), ϕ and ϕ' agree on $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B$ and since they both fix Z , they are equal, so $\tilde{\Theta}$ is injective. To see that $\tilde{\Theta}$ is surjective, we suppose given $\eta \in \text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C)$ and $\alpha \in \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$. Each element of \mathcal{H} can be written uniquely as $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})m(c)$ with $\mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B$ and $c \in C$, so we can define a map

$$\begin{aligned} \nu : \quad \mathcal{H} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H} \\ \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})m(c) &\longmapsto \mathcal{D}(\alpha(\mathbf{a}))m(\eta(\mathbf{a}) + c) \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

It suffices to show that ν lies in $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$, for then, taking $c = 0$ and comparing with (49) shows that $\eta_\nu = \eta$ and $\bar{\nu} = \alpha$ so $\tilde{\Theta}(\nu) = (\eta, \alpha)$. Now, the injectivity of \mathcal{D} , m and α implies that of ν , so ν is bijective since \mathcal{H} is finite. Also, taking $\mathbf{a} = 0$ in (52) shows that ν fixes Z . To prove that ν is a homomorphism, we first check that for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \in A \oplus B$ we have, using (45)

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}))\nu(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}')) &= \mathcal{D}(\alpha(\mathbf{a}) + \alpha(\mathbf{a}'))m\left(\frac{1}{2}\delta(\alpha(\mathbf{a}), \alpha(\mathbf{a}')) + \eta(\mathbf{a}) + \eta(\mathbf{a}')\right) \\ \nu(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}')) &= \mathcal{D}(\alpha(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}'))m\left(\eta(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}') + \frac{1}{2}\delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}')\right)\end{aligned}$$

The RHS's are equal since α and η are homomorphisms and α preserves δ . Since also $\nu(hm(c')) = \nu(h)m(c')$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}, c' \in C$ by (52), it follows that ν is a homomorphism. Thus ν lies in $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$, so $\tilde{\Theta}$ is surjective, hence a bijective map of sets.

One way to turn $\tilde{\Theta}$ into a group isomorphism is to simply carry the group structure across from $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ to the product set $\text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \times \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$. However, this results in an unconventional group structure on the latter. Here is one way to tackle this (essentially notational) problem. A more conventional group structure on the product set is obtained by first making $\text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$ act *on the left* on $\text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C)$, namely $\nu \in \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$ sends $\eta \in \text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C)$ to $\eta \circ \nu^{-1}$. The usual definition of the semidirect product with this action (see e.g. [Wi2]) is the group denoted $\text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \rtimes \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$, with underlying set $\text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \times \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$ and product defined by:

$$(\eta_1, \nu_1) \cdot (\eta_2, \nu_2) = (\eta_1 + \eta_2 \circ \nu_1^{-1}, \nu_1 \circ \nu_2)$$

It fits into a canonical exact sequence with the obvious homomorphisms

$$1 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \rtimes \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta) \longrightarrow \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta) \rightarrow 1 \quad (53)$$

for which the non-normal subgroup $(0, \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta))$ provides a natural splitting.

Theorem 6.1 *The map*

$$\Theta : \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \rtimes \text{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$$

$$\phi \longmapsto (\eta_\phi, \bar{\phi}^{-1})$$

is a group anti-isomorphism.

PROOF Θ is clearly a bijection, since $\tilde{\Theta}$ is. The anti-homomorphic property (*viz* $\Theta(\phi_1 \circ \phi_2) = \Theta(\phi_2) \cdot \Theta(\phi_1)$ for all $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$) is proven by showing that

$$\eta_{\phi_1 \circ \phi_2} = \eta_{\phi_2} + \eta_{\phi_1} \circ \bar{\phi}_2$$

which follows from (49). Details are left to the reader. \square

REMARK 6.1 This seems the most natural result, but if an isomorphism is required, one can simply compose Θ with inversion.

Now suppose that \mathcal{H} has R -structure for a commutative ring R , as defined in the previous section. Thus A and B are R -modules (so also $A \oplus B$) and λ is R -balanced (so also δ). Define a subgroup $\mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta)$ of $\mathrm{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta)$ by

$$\mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta) := \{\nu \in \mathrm{Sp}(A \oplus B; \delta) : \alpha : A \oplus B \rightarrow A \oplus B \text{ is } R\text{-linear}\} \quad (54)$$

By its very definition, $\mathrm{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ is the the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of those automorphisms ϕ such that $\bar{\phi}$ lies in $\mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta)$ so Θ maps it anti-isomorphically onto $\mathrm{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \times \mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta)$. Consider diagram (55) where the exact top row is by definition of $\mathrm{Out}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$, the bottom one is (53) and we define the map Θ_1 by $\Theta_1(\phi_h) := \eta_{\phi_h}$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Inn}(\mathcal{H}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Out}_R^0(\mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow 1 \\ & & \downarrow \Theta_1 & & \downarrow \Theta & & \downarrow \Theta_2 \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(A \oplus B, C) \times \mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta) \longrightarrow 1 \end{array} \quad (55)$$

Since $\bar{\phi}_h = \mathrm{id}_{A \oplus B}$, the left-hand square commutes and so Θ_1 must be an injective anti-homomorphism (but see Remark 6.2 (i) below). Moreover

$$|\mathrm{Hom}(A \oplus B, C)| = |\mathrm{Hom}(A, C)| |\mathrm{Hom}(B, C)| = |A| |B| = |A \oplus B| = |\bar{\mathcal{H}}| = |\mathrm{Inn}(\mathcal{H})|$$

so Θ_1 is an anti-isomorphism. Hence there is an anti-isomorphism Θ_2 making the right square commute. It is simply the map sending the image $\hat{\phi}$ of $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ to $\bar{\phi}^{-1}$. (One checks using (25) and (43) that this gives a well-defined anti-homomorphism into $\mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta)$ even when $2|r$). We have proved:

Theorem 6.2 *Diagram (55) commutes and has exact rows. The vertical maps (described above) are anti-isomorphisms. In particular, the map $\tilde{\Theta}_2 : \hat{\phi} \mapsto \Theta_2(\hat{\phi})^{-1} = \bar{\phi}$ is an isomorphism from $\mathrm{Out}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta)$. \square*

REMARK 6.2 (Comments on Theorem 6.2)

- (i). The groups $\mathrm{Inn}(\mathcal{H}) \cong \mathcal{H}/Z = A \oplus B$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(A \oplus B, C)$ are always *abelian* and have natural R -module structures such that the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta)$ on the latter is R -linear. In particular, the map Θ_1 is both an isomorphism and an anti-isomorphism. Note also that equation (49) reads

$$h\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})h^{-1} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})m(\eta_{\phi_h}(\mathbf{a})) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B$$

Thus $m(\eta_{\phi_h}(\mathbf{a})) = [h, \mathcal{D}(a)] = \delta_{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{h}, \mathbf{a})$ and so $\Theta_1(\phi_h) = \eta_{\phi_h}$ is simply the homomorphism $\delta(\bar{h}, \cdot)$ in $\mathrm{Hom}(A \oplus B, C)$. Of course, his definition of Θ_1 makes sense, without assuming r to be odd. It is always an isomorphism because δ is non-degenerate. It is also R -linear because δ is R -balanced,

- (ii). **(The Subgroup $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})_{\mathcal{D}}$)** The natural splitting of the bottom row of (55) induces one of the top row via Θ , namely that associated to the non-normal subgroup of $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of those automorphisms, ϕ such that η_ϕ is trivial, *i.e.* those that ‘commute with \mathcal{D} ’ in the sense that $\phi(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})) = \mathcal{D}(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{a}))$ for all \mathbf{a} . We therefore denote it $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})_{\mathcal{D}}$. It obviously intersects $\text{Inn}(\mathcal{H})$ trivially and maps isomorphically onto $\text{Out}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$. Notice also that $\text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H})_{\mathcal{D}}$ contains the subgroup $\text{im}(\Delta)$ of diagonal R -automorphisms (*cf.* Corollary 5.2)). Indeed, it follows from the definitions of \mathcal{D} and Δ that, for any $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_R(A)$ and $a \in A, b \in B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\alpha)(\mathcal{D}((a, b))) &= h\left(\alpha(a), \beta(b), \frac{1}{2}\lambda(a, b)\right) \\ &= h\left(\alpha(a), \beta(b), \frac{1}{2}\lambda(\alpha(a), \beta(b))\right) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\alpha(a), \beta(b)) \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where the middle equality comes from the definition (40) of β .

- (iii). The theorem leads to a description of $\text{Aut}_R(\mathcal{H})$ itself. Indeed the sequence

$$1 \rightarrow \text{Aut}_R^0(\mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}_R(\mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(C) = (\mathbb{Z}/r)^\times \rightarrow 1$$

is clearly exact on the left and in the middle. It is also exact on the right and splits: since r kills A and B we may consider (for example) the splitting homomorphism from $(\mathbb{Z}/r)^\times$ to $\text{Aut}_R(\mathcal{H})$ sending \bar{i} to the automorphism $\bar{i} \times \text{id}_B \times \bar{i}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(i, r) = 1$.

- (iv). Finally, for versions of the theorem and the above comments ‘without subscript R ’s’ we can obviously just take $R = \mathbb{Z}$!

The study of the subgroups $\text{Out}_R^0(\mathcal{H})$ of $\text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H})$ now reduces to that of the subgroups of $\text{Sp}_R(A \oplus B; \delta)$. The latter can be made explicit when, for instance, $A \oplus B$ is a free R -module, as in the examples of Section 7.

6.2 Overlap- and Angle-Maps in Terms of Projectors

Now suppose $p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is an injective homomorphism and define the homomorphism $\psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ by $\psi \circ m = p$ so that σ_p is a faithful SV-representation of \mathcal{H} on $\mathcal{M}(A)$ with character χ_p and central character ψ (by Proposition 5.3). We define the *displacement operators* (w.r.t. p) by

$$D(\mathbf{a}) = D_p(\mathbf{a}) := \sigma_p(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})) \in U(\mathcal{M}(A)) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B$$

Applying σ_p to equation (45) shows in particular that the map $D : \mathbf{a} \mapsto D(\mathbf{a})$ induces a homomorphism $A \oplus B \rightarrow \text{PU}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. (It is not hard to show that this cannot be lifted to a homomorphism of $A \oplus B$ into $U(\mathcal{M}(A))$.) The adjoint $D(\mathbf{a})^\dagger$ w.r.t. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is equal to $D(\mathbf{a})^{-1} = \sigma_p(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})^{-1}) = D(-\mathbf{a})$ (using (45) for $n = -1$).

Proposition 6.1 *With the above assumptions and notations*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(D(\mathbf{a})^\dagger D(\mathbf{a}')) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}' \text{ in } A \oplus B \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the subset $\mathbf{D} := \{D(\mathbf{a}) : \mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B\}$ of $U(\mathcal{M}(A))$ is a \mathbb{C} -basis for $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{M}(A))$.

PROOF Note that $\mathrm{Tr}(D(\mathbf{a})^\dagger D(\mathbf{a}'))$ equals $\chi_p(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})^{-1} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}'))$ which is zero unless $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})^{-1} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}')$ lies in Z (since σ_p is SV) in which case $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}'$ so $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a})^{-1} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}') = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$. The equation follows. An easy argument then shows that \mathbf{D} is linearly independent and since $|\mathbf{D}| = s^2$, it is a basis of $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. (Alternatively, use Theorem 2.1 (v).) \square

REMARK 6.3 The proposition amounts to the statement that the normalised displacement operators $s^{-\frac{1}{2}} D(\mathbf{a})$ for $\mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B$ form an orthonormal basis of $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ w.r.t. the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product.

REMARK 6.4 (**Relation between the Overlap-Map $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{D},\ell}$ and ‘Physical’ Overlaps**)
Let $\ell \in \mathbb{P}\mathcal{M}(A)$ be a line generated by a unit vector v , say, and let $\Pi_\ell \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ be the orthogonal projector of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ onto ℓ . By the proposition, we have:

$$\Pi_\ell = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in A \oplus B} \iota_{\mathbf{a}} D(\mathbf{a}) \quad \text{where} \quad s \iota_{-\mathbf{a}} = \mathrm{Tr}(D(\mathbf{a}) \Pi_\ell)$$

In the very special Base Case, the physics literature on SICs defines the *overlaps* of ℓ or, equivalently, of Π_ℓ , to be precisely the quantities $s \iota_{\mathbf{a}}$ above. (*Warning:* in that case, \mathbf{a} is naturally an element of $(a, b) \in (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$ yet – for reasons made clearer in §7.2.1 – the complex number corresponding to our $s \iota_{(a,b)}$ is conventionally labelled with the pair $(-a, b)$.) To relate these to the *overlap-maps* for Generalised Heisenberg Groups in our set-up, we can calculate $\mathrm{Tr}(D(\mathbf{a}) \Pi_\ell)$ by extending $\{v\}$ to an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{V} := \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s\}$ of $\mathcal{M}(A)$ with $v_1 = v$. Indeed, the coefficient of v_i in $D(\mathbf{a}) \Pi_\ell v_i$ is just $\langle v, D(\mathbf{a}) v \rangle$ if $i = 1$ and otherwise 0. So $\mathrm{Tr}(D(\mathbf{a}) \Pi_\ell) = \langle v, D(\mathbf{a}) v \rangle$. Thus, the definition (11) of our overlap-map (still identifying $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ with $A \oplus B$) gives

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{D},\ell}(\mathbf{a}) = \langle v, D(\mathbf{a}) \cdot_{\sigma_p} v \rangle = \langle v, D(\mathbf{a}) v \rangle = s \iota_{-\mathbf{a}} \quad (57)$$

It follows more generally that $\langle v, h(\mathbf{a}, c) \cdot_{\sigma_p} v \rangle = \psi\left(c - \frac{1}{2}\lambda(a, b)\right) s \iota_{-\mathbf{a}}$.

7 Examples: GHGs from Number Rings

7.1 The General Case

Let k be a number field of degree $n \geq 1$ over \mathbb{Q} and let \mathcal{O} be an order in k . For simplicity, we shall assume that all non-zero ideals of \mathcal{O} are invertible. Equivalently, \mathcal{O} is maximal, i.e. $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_k$, the ring of algebraic integers in k . With this assumption, we let $I \subset k$ be a fractional \mathcal{O} -ideal with inverse I^{-1} and write \hat{I} for the fractional ideal $\mathfrak{D}^{-1} I^{-1}$ where $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{D}_{k/\mathbb{Q}}$, is the

absolute different of k (an integral ideal of \mathcal{O} , see [Se, Ch. 3]). If $\text{Tr} := \text{Tr}_{k/\mathbb{Q}}$ denotes the trace from k to \mathbb{Q} , then we have a well-defined pairing of free, rank- n \mathbb{Z} -modules:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_I &: I \times \hat{I} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \\ (a, b) &\longmapsto \text{Tr}(ab) \end{aligned}$$

By definition of \mathfrak{D}^{-1} this pairing is *perfect*: it induces an isomorphism of \hat{I} with the \mathbb{Z} -dual $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(I, \mathbb{Z})$ of I , and *vice versa*. Now let $r > 1$ be an integer (not necessarily odd) so that Tr_I descends to a non-degenerate pairing $\bar{\text{Tr}}_I$ from $I/rI \times \hat{I}/r\hat{I}$ to \mathbb{Z}/r . Given any two integral ideals \mathfrak{f} and $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}$ satisfying $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\mathfrak{f} = r\mathcal{O}$, the annihilator of $\mathfrak{f}I/rI$ w.r.t. $\bar{\text{Tr}}_I$ is clearly $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I}/r\hat{I}$ so $\bar{\text{Tr}}_I$ descends further to a non-degenerate pairing

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda = \lambda_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r} &: I/\mathfrak{f}I \times \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I}/r\hat{I} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/r \\ (\bar{a}, \bar{b}) &\longmapsto \overline{\text{Tr}_I(a, b)} = \overline{\text{Tr}(ab)} \end{aligned}$$

REMARK 7.1 (Two Simplifications) The ideals \mathfrak{f} and \mathfrak{D} are relatively prime iff all (rational) primes dividing \mathfrak{f} are unramified in k . In this situation we get a simplification:

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}I^{-1} + r\hat{I} = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}I^{-1} + r\mathfrak{D}^{-1}I^{-1} = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}I^{-1}\mathfrak{D}^{-1}(\mathfrak{D} + \mathfrak{f}) = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}I^{-1}\mathfrak{D}^{-1} = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I}$$

It follows that the inclusion $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}I^{-1} \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I}$ induces an isomorphism $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}I^{-1}/rI^{-1} \cong \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I}/r\hat{I}$ which allows us to replace the latter by former by the former in $\lambda_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}$. If, in addition we take $\mathfrak{f} = r\mathcal{O}$ then we simply get a pairing of I/rI with I^{-1}/rI^{-1} .

To simplify notation we set

$$A_{I, \mathfrak{f}} := I/\mathfrak{f}I \quad \text{and} \quad B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r} := \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I}/r\hat{I} = (\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I})/\mathfrak{f}(\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I})$$

We consider $A_{I, \mathfrak{f}}$ and $B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}$ as modules over the ring \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} . Since $\lambda_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}$ is clearly \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -balanced,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r} := \mathcal{H}(A_{I, \mathfrak{f}}, B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}, \mathbb{Z}/r, \lambda_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r})$$

is a generalised Heisenberg group with \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -structure, satisfying Hypothesis 5.1 with $s = N\mathfrak{f}$ (the norm) for each I and each \mathfrak{f} dividing $r\mathcal{O}$. We identify $\mathcal{H}/Z(\mathcal{H})$ with $A_{I, \mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I, \mathfrak{f}}$ as usual. For convenience, we shall write its elements as column vectors, so, by definition,

$$\delta((\bar{a}, \bar{b})^T, (\bar{a}', \bar{b}')^T) = \overline{\text{Tr}(ab' - a'b)} \in \mathbb{Z}/r \quad \text{for all } a, a' \in I, b, b' \in \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I} \quad (58)$$

There is a well-defined homomorphism from $\text{Out}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}^0(\mathcal{H})$ to $\text{Sp}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I, \mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}; \delta)$ sending $\hat{\phi}$ to $\bar{\phi}$ for all $\phi \in \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}^0(\mathcal{H})$. In the case that r is *odd* this is the homomorphism $\tilde{\Theta}_2$ of Theorem 6.2, which shows that it is then an isomorphism.

We now exhibit an explicit (but largely non-canonical) isomorphism from $\text{Sp}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I, \mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}, \delta)$ to $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f})$ for any r . Similar analyses can be performed for $\text{Sp}_R(A_{I, \mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}, \delta)$, considering $A_{I, \mathfrak{f}}$ and $B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}$ as modules over other choices of ring R , *e.g.* $R = \mathbb{Z}$. However, it is particularly simple for $R = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}$ because $A_{I, \mathfrak{f}}$ and $B_{I, \mathfrak{f}, r}$ are both *free of rank 1* over this ring.

(We also expect this choice to be more relevant to class-field theoretic applications of SIC-like phenomena, namely *via* invariant equiangular or regular $\mathcal{H}_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}$ -bouquets with respect to subgroups of $\text{Out}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}^0(\mathcal{H})$.) In fact, the Weak Approximation Theorem allows us to choose $x \in I$ such that $x\mathcal{O} + \mathfrak{f}I = I$. Thus we have surjective \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -module homomorphism from \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} onto $I/\mathfrak{f}I = A_{I,\mathfrak{f}}$ sending $a \in \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}$ to $a\bar{x}$. Since $|\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}| = N\mathfrak{f} = |I/\mathfrak{f}I|$, it must be an isomorphism, *i.e.* $\{\bar{x}\}$ is an \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -basis for $A_{I,\mathfrak{f}}$. In the same way, we choose $y \in \hat{\mathfrak{f}}I$ such that $y\mathcal{O} + r\hat{I} = \hat{\mathfrak{f}}I$ and $\{\bar{y}\}$ is an \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -basis for $\hat{\mathfrak{f}}I/r\hat{I} = B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}$. In the general case, there is no canonical choice of \bar{x} and \bar{y} . Nevertheless, writing elements of $A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}$ as column vectors, we have an ordered \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -basis $((\bar{x}, 0)^T, (0, \bar{y})^T)$ of $A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}$ and so an isomorphism of \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -algebras

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi = \Xi_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}} &: \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}) \longrightarrow \text{M}_2(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}) \\ \bar{\phi} &\longmapsto M_{\bar{\phi}} := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_{\bar{\phi}} & \bar{v}_{\bar{\phi}} \\ \bar{w}_{\bar{\phi}} & \bar{z}_{\bar{\phi}} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where $u_{\bar{\phi}}, v_{\bar{\phi}}, w_{\bar{\phi}}$ and $z_{\bar{\phi}}$ are elements of \mathcal{O} whose images $\bar{u}_{\bar{\phi}}, \bar{v}_{\bar{\phi}}, \bar{w}_{\bar{\phi}}, \bar{z}_{\bar{\phi}}$ in \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} are uniquely defined by $\bar{\phi}((\bar{x}, 0)^T) = (\bar{u}_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{x}, \bar{w}_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{y})^T$ and $\bar{\phi}((0, \bar{y})^T) = (\bar{v}_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{x}, \bar{z}_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{y})^T$. Restricting Ξ to unit-groups gives an isomorphism $\Xi^\times = \Xi_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}^\times$ from $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r})$ to $\text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f})$.

Theorem 7.1 *For each pair of elements \bar{x} and \bar{y} as above, the isomorphism $\Xi^\times = \Xi_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}^\times$ restricts further to an isomorphism from $\text{Sp}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}, \delta)$ to $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f})$.*

PROOF By definitions (51) and (54), $\text{Sp}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}, \delta)$ consists of the elements $\bar{\phi}$ of $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r})$ satisfying the equality

$$\delta(\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\phi}(\mathbf{x}')) = \delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \tag{60}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}$. Since both sides are \mathbb{Z} -bilinear, \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} -balanced and skew-symmetric as functions of $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$, this is equivalent to (60) holding for $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ equal to $((\bar{c}\bar{x}, 0)^T, (\bar{x}, 0)^T)$, $((0, \bar{c}\bar{y})^T, (0, \bar{y})^T)$ and $((\bar{c}\bar{x}, 0)^T, (0, \bar{y})^T)$, for any $c \in \mathcal{O}$. In the first two cases, one checks easily using (58) that equation (60) reads ‘ $0 = 0$ ’ for any $\bar{\phi}$. In the third case, it reads

$$\delta((\overline{cu_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{x}}, \overline{cw_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{y}})^T, (\overline{v_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{x}}, \overline{z_{\bar{\phi}}\bar{y}})^T) = \delta((\bar{c}\bar{x}, 0)^T, (0, \bar{y})^T)$$

where we are using the notation of equation (59) and following. Thus, using (58), we see that $\bar{\phi}$ lies in $\text{Sp}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}, \delta)$ iff

$$\overline{\text{Tr}((u_{\bar{\phi}}z_{\bar{\phi}} - v_{\bar{\phi}}w_{\bar{\phi}})cxy)} = \overline{\text{Tr}(cxy)} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}/r \text{ for all } c \in \mathcal{O}$$

or, in other words, iff

$$\text{Tr}((d_{\bar{\phi}} - 1)cxy) \in r\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for all } c \in \mathcal{O}$$

where $d_{\bar{\phi}} := u_{\bar{\phi}}z_{\bar{\phi}} - v_{\bar{\phi}}w_{\bar{\phi}} \in \mathcal{O}$ or, equivalently, iff

$$(d_{\bar{\phi}} - 1)xy \in r\mathcal{D}^{-1} \tag{61}$$

I claim that equation (61) holds iff $d_{\bar{\phi}} - 1$ lies in \mathfrak{f} . Since $\det(M_{\bar{\phi}}) = \overline{d_{\bar{\phi}}}$, this in turn is equivalent to $\det(\Xi^\times(\bar{\phi})) = \bar{1}$ in \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} and the result will follow. But $d_{\bar{\phi}} - 1 \in \mathfrak{f}$ certainly

implies (61), since $xy \in I\hat{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I} = \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\mathcal{D}^{-1}$. For the converse implication, note that, by choice of x and y , we have

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\mathcal{D}^{-1} = I\hat{\mathfrak{f}}\hat{I} = xy\mathcal{O} + xr\hat{I} + y\mathfrak{f}I + \mathfrak{f}rI\hat{I} \subset xy\mathcal{O} + r\mathcal{D}^{-1}$$

Multiplying this containment through by $d_{\bar{\phi}} - 1$, we see that equation (61) implies $(d_{\bar{\phi}} - 1)\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}\mathcal{D}^{-1} \subset r\mathcal{D}^{-1}$ so $d_{\bar{\phi}} - 1 \in \mathfrak{f}$, proving the claim, and hence the theorem. \square

REMARK 7.2 (Variation of \bar{x} , \bar{y} , and Diagonal Matrices) Changing the basis elements \bar{x} and \bar{y} will obviously compose $\Xi_{\bar{x},\bar{y}}^{\times}$ with conjugation by a *diagonal* transition matrix in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f})$. Since $A_{I,\mathfrak{f}}$ is free of rank-1, $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}})$ is *canonically* identified with $(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f})^{\times}$ and for every u in the latter, the *diagonal automorphism* $\Delta(u) = u \times u^{-1} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{Z}/r}$ is mapped by the composite homomorphism

$$\Psi_{\bar{x},\bar{y}} : \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}^0(\mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Out}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}^0(\mathcal{H}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Theta}_2} \mathrm{Sp}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f}}(A_{I,\mathfrak{f}} \oplus B_{I,\mathfrak{f},r}, \delta) \xrightarrow{\Xi_{\bar{x},\bar{y}}^{\times}} \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f})$$

to the *diagonal matrix* $\mathrm{diag}(u, u^{-1})$, irrespective of the choice of \bar{x} and \bar{y} .

7.2 The Base Case

We specialise the General Case by taking $k = \mathbb{Q}$, $I = \hat{I} = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathfrak{f} = d\mathbb{Z}$ for an integer $d \geq 2$ so $R = \mathbb{Z}/d$. We shall see that certain generalised Heisenberg groups in our sense are exactly the Weyl-Heisenberg groups of the ‘classical’ SIC literature, and equiangular bouquets are, of course, SICs themselves. This follows easily by choosing r according to the parity of d and unwinding the appropriate definitions

7.2.1 The Case d Odd

In this case, we take $r = d$. Thus $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}} = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda_{\mathbb{Z},d\mathbb{Z},d}$ is simply the multiplication λ_d in \mathbb{Z}/d

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_d & : \mathbb{Z}/d \times \mathbb{Z}/d \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/d \\ & (a, b) \longmapsto ab \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathcal{H}_d := \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Z}/d, \mathbb{Z}/d, \mathbb{Z}/d, \lambda_d)$ is a (generalised) Heisenberg group with \mathbb{Z}/d -structure, of order d^3 and exponent d , nilpotent of class 2. The group-law is given explicitly by

$$h(a, b, c)h(a', b', c') = h(a + a', b + b', c + c' + ab') \quad \text{for all } a, b, c, a', b', c' \in \mathbb{Z}/d$$

(It follows that \mathcal{H}_d may also be represented as the group of 3×3 upper-triangular, unipotent matrices with coefficients in \mathbb{Z}/d , cf [Wil].) We have $Z_d := Z(\mathcal{H}_d) = m(\mathbb{Z}/d) = h(0, 0, \mathbb{Z}/d) \cong \mathbb{Z}/d$ and $\mathcal{H}_d/Z_d \cong (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$. We shall regard these natural isomorphisms as identifications. We set $h_1 := h(-\bar{1}, 0, 0)$ and $h_2 := h(0, \bar{1}, 0)$, so that $[h_2, h_1] = h(0, 0, \bar{1})$ generates Z_d . It follows easily that h_1 and h_2 generate \mathcal{H}_d . Writing elements of $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_d = (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$ as column vectors $\mathbf{a} = (a, b)^T$, there is in this case a *canonical* identification of $\mathrm{Aut} = \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}/d}(\mathcal{H}_d/Z_d)$ with $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/d)$, sending α to the matrix N_{α} , say. Since $\delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') = \det(\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{a}') \in \mathbb{Z}/d$ by (58), it is clear that this identifies the subgroup $\mathrm{Sp} = \mathrm{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}/d}(\mathbb{Z}/d \oplus \mathbb{Z}/d)$ with $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/d)$

Now let ζ_d denote $\exp(2\pi i/d)$ generating μ_d . The homomorphism $p : \mathbb{Z}/d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ sending \bar{c} to $\exp(2\pi ic/d) = \zeta_d^c$ is injective, so the associated (left) Schrödinger representation $\sigma = \sigma_p : \mathcal{H}_d \rightarrow U(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d))$ is the faithful, d -dimensional SV-representation associated to the \mathcal{H}_d -action on $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ given explicitly by

$$h(a, b, c) \cdot_\sigma f(x) = \zeta_d^{bx+cx} f(x+a) \quad \text{for all } a, b, c, x \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}/d \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d) \quad (62)$$

and with above identifications, its central character is just p . Referring everything to the ordered basis $\mathcal{E}_d := (e_{\bar{0}}, \dots, e_{\overline{d-1}})$ of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ gives an isomorphism from $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ to \mathbb{C}^d with the standard PDHF, and an injective homomorphism Σ_d from \mathcal{H}_d (acting on $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$) to $U_d(\mathbb{C})$ (acting naturally on \mathbb{C}^d). Using (62), we find explicitly:

$$\Sigma_d(h_1) = X := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_d(h_2) = Z := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \zeta_d & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \zeta_d^2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \zeta_d^{d-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (63)$$

Thus Σ_d induces an isomorphism from \mathcal{H}_d onto the subgroup of $U_d(\mathbb{C})$ generated by the matrices X and Z . Since $[Z, X] = \Sigma_d(h(0, \bar{0}, \bar{1}))$ is ζ_d times the identity matrix, this subgroup is exactly the *Weyl-Heisenberg Group* as defined for odd d in [Ko], for example. It is variously denoted as $H(d)$ in *idem* as $GP(d)$ in [Ap1] (where it is called the *Generalised Pauli Group*) and as $WH(d)$ elsewhere and here.

Since $r = d$ is odd, we may apply the results of Section 6. First, we consider the map \mathcal{D} . The quantity $m := (d+1)/2$ is a positive integer and so, as $(a, b)^T$ runs through $(\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$, the elements $\mathcal{D}((a, b)^T) = h(a, b, mab)$ defined by equation (44) run through a complete set of representatives for \mathcal{H}_d modulo Z_d . One checks that $\Sigma_d(\mathcal{D}((a, b)^T))$ is the element $\tau^{-ab} X^{-a} Z^b$ of $H(d)$ where $\tau = \zeta_d^m = \exp((d+1)\pi i/d)$. This is denoted $D_{-a,b}$ in [Ko].

Next, Theorem 6.1 or 6.2 establishes an *anti*-isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_d : \text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}_d) &\longrightarrow \text{Hom}((\mathbb{Z}/d)^2, \mathbb{Z}/d) \rtimes \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/d) \\ \phi &\longmapsto (\eta_\phi, N_\phi^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where η_ϕ is defined by equation (49), that is: $h(0, 0, \eta_\phi((a, b)^T)) = \phi(\mathcal{D}(a, b)^T) \mathcal{D}(N_\phi^{-1}(a, b)^T)^{-1}$. (In the semidirect product, an element N of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ acts on the left on $\eta \in \text{Hom}((\mathbb{Z}/d)^2, \mathbb{Z}/d)$ by precomposition with the left multiplication of column vectors by N^{-1} .) And this descends to an anti-isomorphism from $\text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H}_d) = \text{Out}_{\mathbb{Z}/d}^0(\mathcal{H}_d)$ to $\text{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}/d}(\mathbb{Z}/d \oplus \mathbb{Z}/d) = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ sending $\hat{\phi}$ to N_ϕ^{-1} .

REMARK 7.3 (The Clifford Group) This is defined in *e.g.* [Ap1] to be the normaliser of $H(d) = WH(d)$ in $U_d(\mathbb{C})$. Thus, by Remark 2.2, it identifies with the pre-image in $U(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d))$ of the isomorphic image of $\text{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}_d)$ in $\text{PU}(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d))$ under the Weil representation \mathcal{T}_σ . Equation (64) therefore essentially delivers the isomorphism f in Theorem 1 of [Ap1] in the case of odd d . Appleby has also given a variant over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q in [Ap2],

relating the Clifford group there to $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$. This could be compared to the isomorphism in Theorem 7.1, in the case where \mathfrak{f} is a prime ideal of \mathcal{O} , for then \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f} is indeed a finite field. Note, however, in both papers, Appleby gives considerably more, namely an *explicit characterisation* of the Weil representation. See, for example Lemma 4 of [Ap1] for the Base Case, and the detailed account in [Wa, Ch. 14].

The so-called *Extended Clifford Group* of [Ap1] identifies in a similar way with the pre-image of $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_\sigma(\mathrm{Aut}^0(\mathcal{H}_d))$ in $\mathrm{GL}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d))$, referred again to the basis \mathcal{E}_d . (See Remark 5.7. Indeed the element \hat{J} of the Extended Clifford Group corresponds to our \mathbf{c} .)

Now for the bouquets. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{P}\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ be a complex line in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ and let \mathcal{Y} be the \mathcal{H}_d -bouquet which is its orbit under the action of $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_d$ on $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ induced by σ . If we identify the latter with $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{C}^d$ using the basis \mathcal{E}_d as above, \mathcal{Y} becomes the orbit under the Weyl-Heisenberg group $\mathrm{H}(d) = \mathrm{WH}(d) \subset U_d(\mathbb{C})$ of the line $l_0 \in \mathbb{P}\mathbb{C}^d$ corresponding to ℓ . We shall assume that \mathcal{Y} is free, *i.e.* $|\mathcal{Y}| = d^2$. Let $\mathcal{R} : (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_d$ be any right-inverse to π (for instance $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{D}$) and consider the overlap-map $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{R}, \ell} : (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ sending $(a, b)^T$ to $\langle v, \mathcal{R}((a, b)^T) \cdot_\sigma v \rangle$ for any unit vector v generating ℓ (see (11) and (57)). It descends to a well-defined map $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{Y}} : (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2 \rightarrow \mu_d \setminus \mathbb{C}$ which is independent of \mathcal{R} , as in (19), and depends on ℓ only through \mathcal{Y} . Composing with the absolute value $|\cdot|$ gives the angle-map $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}} : (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of the bouquet \mathcal{Y} . It follows from Theorem 3.1 that \mathcal{Y} will be *equiangular* (*i.e.* correspond to a SIC) iff $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\gamma)^2 = (d+1)^{-1}$ for all for all non-identity $\gamma \in (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$.

We now consider \mathcal{A} -regular bouquets for $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{Out}^0(\mathcal{H}_d)$. It is well known (and not hard to see) that the orbits of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ acting on $(\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$ are the just the disjoint subsets

$$\{(a, b)^T \in (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2 : \text{additive order of } (a, b)^T \text{ is } j\} \subset (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2 \quad (65)$$

as j runs through the set S_d , say, of positive divisors of d . Let W_d denote the subspace of $\mathcal{M}((\mathbb{Z}/d)^2)$ consisting of (complex-valued) functions which are constant on these orbits. Then a free bouquet \mathcal{Y} is $\mathrm{Out}^0(\mathcal{H}_d)$ -regular iff $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2$ lies in W_d . To analyse the clinometric relation (21) that $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2$ must also satisfy, we write \mathbf{w}_j for the characteristic function of the subgroup $j(\mathbb{Z}/d)^2 < (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$ for each $j \in S_d$. One checks that $\{\mathbf{w}_j : j \in S_d\}$ is a basis of W_d and that

$$\Upsilon_p(\mathbf{w}_j) = (d/j)^2 \mathbf{w}_{d/j} \quad (66)$$

(To prove (66), observe that, for fixed $\gamma' \in (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$, the function $\gamma \mapsto p(\delta_{\mathcal{H}_d}(\gamma, \gamma'))$ is a character on $(\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$ which is trivial on $j(\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$ iff $\gamma' \in (d/j)(\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$, *etc.*) It follows without difficulty that Υ_p acts on W_d and that its eigenspace in W_d for the eigenvalue $|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_d|/d = d$ has the basis

$$\mathcal{B}_d := \left\{ \mathbf{u}_j := \frac{j^2}{j^2 + d} \mathbf{w}_j + \frac{d}{j^2 + d} \mathbf{w}_{d/j} : j \in \tilde{S}_d \right\}$$

where \tilde{S}_d denotes the set $S_d \cap [1, \sqrt{d}]$, of cardinality $\lceil |S_d|/2 \rceil$. Thus the clinometric relation forces $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2$ to be a linear combination of \mathcal{B}_d . Note also that $\mathbf{u}_j(\gamma)$ lies in $[0, 1]$ for all $j \in \tilde{S}_d$ and all $\gamma \in (\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$ but equals 1 for all j iff $\gamma = (\bar{0}, \bar{0})^T$.

If d is prime then, $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2$ must be equal to \mathbf{u}_1 because it is then the sole element of \mathcal{B}_d , and so \mathcal{Y} must correspond to a SIC. As mentioned in the introduction, SIC phenomenology strongly suggests that in this case (and for $d > 3$) the values of the overlap-map $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ are then always

(up to roots of unity) rational powers of Stark units in the ray-class field $k_d((d)\infty_1\infty_2)$ over $k_d := \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{(d-3)(d+1)})$.

Suppose on the other hand that d is not prime. Then \mathcal{B}_d has at least 2 elements and so the interior of its (real) convex hull in W_d , denoted $\langle \mathcal{B}_d \rangle^0$, is infinite. Any f in $\langle \mathcal{B}_d \rangle^0$ is then a potential candidate for $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2$. Indeed, $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ would then satisfy both the clinometric relation and the conditions imposed by Proposition 3.3 (i), while causing \mathcal{Y} to be $\text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H}_d)$ -regular but not equiangular.

Nevertheless, I conjecture firstly that there are still *natural, discrete* choices for $f \in \langle \mathcal{B}_d \rangle^0$ which may be attained as $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{Y}}^2$ for some free \mathcal{Y} . Secondly, I conjecture that the ‘right’ such choices will again force the values of $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ to be algebraic and, indeed, related to Stark units in ray-class fields over some base fields and with some conductor related to d . (These might both depend on the precise choices made.) It is even possible that similar phenomena occur in the general arithmetic case described in the previous subsection, perhaps with added conditions relating to invariance of bouquets, as well as regularity, for correctly chosen subgroups $\mathcal{A} < \text{Out}^0(\mathcal{H}) \cong \text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{f})$.

All this is currently rather vague and highly conjectural. Effective numerical investigation of these questions is therefore very desirable. Unfortunately, as for SICs themselves, it is also extremely computationally intensive in all but the simplest examples and, so far, has provided only the meagrest of evidence. We hope to report more fully on these issues in a sequel to this paper.

7.2.2 The Case d Even

For even d we just sketch the connection with the Weyl-Heisenberg groups of the SIC literature. The necessary changes to the analysis of automorphism groups and bouquets are left to the reader. For the former, the relevant information on the corresponding Clifford group appears in [Ap1] alongside the odd case.

In the even case, we again take $k = \mathbb{Q}$, $I = \hat{I} = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathfrak{f} = d\mathbb{Z}$ in the General Case, but now we let $r = 2d$ (so $4|r$). Thus $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}} = 2\mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda_{\mathbb{Z}, d\mathbb{Z}, 2d}$ is the pairing

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_d &: \mathbb{Z}/d \times 2\mathbb{Z}/2d\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2d \\ (a, b) &\longmapsto ab \end{aligned}$$

It is not surjective but is still (of course) non-degenerate, and we write $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d$ for $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Z}/d, 2\mathbb{Z}/2d\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}/2d, \tilde{\lambda}_d)$, again a generalised Heisenberg group with \mathbb{Z}/d -structure. Its centre (denoted \tilde{Z}_d) is now isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/2d$ but the quotient $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d/\tilde{Z}_d$ is still isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}/d)^2$, as in the odd case, thus $|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d| = 2d^3$. It is easy to see that the elements $\tilde{h}_1 = h(-\bar{1}, 0, 0)$, $\tilde{h}_2 = h(0, \bar{2}, 0)$, now supplemented by $\tilde{h} := h(0, 0, \bar{1})$, give a set of three generators of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d$. The injective homomorphism $\tilde{p} : \mathbb{Z}/2d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ sending \bar{c} to ζ_{2d}^c gives a faithful, SV, Schrödinger representation $\sigma_{\tilde{p}} : \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d \rightarrow \text{U}(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d))$ in the usual way. Referring to the same basis \mathcal{E}_d of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{Z}/d)$ as before, we now get an isomorphism $\tilde{\Sigma}_d$ from $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d$ to the subgroup of $\text{U}_d(\mathbb{C})$ generated by the same matrices $X = \tilde{\Sigma}_d(\tilde{h}_1)$ and $Z = \tilde{\Sigma}_d(\tilde{h}_2)$ as in (63) (note that $\tilde{p}(\tilde{\lambda}_d(\bar{i}, \bar{2})) = \zeta_d^i$ for each $\bar{i} \in \mathbb{Z}/d$), but now supplemented by $\tilde{\Sigma}_d(\tilde{h})$, which is ζ_{2d} times the identity matrix. Once again,

this subgroup is exactly the *Weyl-Heisenberg Group* $H(d)$ as defined for even d (see [Ko], for example).

References

- [ABGHM] Appleby D.M., Bengtsson I., Grassl M., Harrison M., McConnell G., *SIC-POVMs from Stark units: Prime dimensions $n^2 + 3$* , J. Math. Phys., **63**, (2022)
- [AFMY] Appleby D.M., Flammia S., McConnell G., Yard J., *SICs and Algebraic Number Theory*, Found. Phys., **47**, (2017)
- [Ap1] Appleby D.M., *Symmetric Informationally Complete Positive Operator Valued Measures and the Extended Clifford Group*, J. Math. Phys., **46**, (2005)
- [Ap2] Appleby D.M., *Properties of the extended Clifford group with applications to SIC-POVMs and MUBs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:0909.5233 (2009).
- [AYZ] Appleby D.M., Yadsan-Appleby H., Zauner G., *Galois automorphisms of a symmetric measurement*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1209.1813 (2012)
- [BGM] Bengtsson I., Grassl M., McConnell G., *SIC-POVMs from Stark Units: Dimensions $n^2 + 3 = 4p$, p prime*, arXiv preprint arXiv: 2403.02872 (2024)
- [DGS] Delsarte P., Goethals J.M. and Seidel J.J. *Bounds for systems of lines, and Jacobi polynomials*, Philips Res. Rep., **30**, (1975)
- [Ho] Howe R., *Nice error bases, mutually unbiased bases, induced representations, the Heisenberg group and finite geometries*, Indag. Mathem., **16 (3-4)**, (2005)
- [HRZ] Horodecki P., Rudnicki L., Życzkowski K., *Five Open Problems in Quantum Information Theory*, PRX Quantum **3**, no. 1, (2022)
- [Is] Isaacs J.M., *Character Theory of Finite Groups*, AMS Chelsea Publishing, 1976
- [Ko] Kopp G., *SIC-POVMs and the Stark Conjectures*, International Mathematics Research Notices, **18**, (2021)
- [MNN] D. Mumford D., with Nori M. and Norman P., *Tata Lectures on Theta III*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1991
- [Se] Serre J.-P., *Local Fields*, Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [St] Stark H, *L-Functions at $s = 1$ I,II,III,IV*, Advances in Mathematics, **7**, (1971), **17**, (1975), **22**, (1976), **35**, (1980)
- [Sz] Szabó D., *Finite Class 2 Nilpotent and Heisenberg Groups*, arXiv preprint arXiv::2301.01863, (2023)

- [Ta] Tate J., *Les Conjectures de Stark sur les Fonctions L d'Artin en $s = 0$* , Birkhäuser, Boston, 1984
- [Wa] Waldron S., *An introduction to finite tight frames*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2018
- [We] Weil A., *Sur Certaines Groupes d'Opérateurs Unitaires*, Acta Math., **111**, (1964)
- [Wi1] Wikipedia, *Heisenberg group*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heisenberg_group
- [Wi2] Wikipedia, *Semidirect product*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semidirect_product
- [Za] Zauner G, *Quantendesigns: Grundzüge einer nichtkommutativen Designtheorie.*, PhD Thesis, University of Vienna, (1999)