

# Lattices of oscillator groups

Mathias Fischer

March 1, 2018

This paper is concerned with discrete, uniform subgroups (lattices) of oscillator groups, which are certain semidirect products of the Heisenberg group and the additive group  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers.

The present paper rectifies the uncertainties in [Med85] of Medina and Revoy and gives a complete classification of the lattices of the 4-dimensional oscillator group up to isomorphism.

## 1. Introduction

Oscillator groups are certain semidirect products of the Heisenberg group and the additive group  $\mathbb{R}$ . They are interesting because they are the only simply connected solvable Lie groups, besides the abelian ones, which have a biinvariant Lorentzian metric. In addition, the quotient of an oscillator group by a lattice gives an example of a compact homogeneous Lorentzian manifold.

In [Med85], Medina and Revoy already classified the lattices of the oscillator group. But unfortunately the given maps in [Med85, p. 92] aren't necessarily automorphisms, different from the assumption. Hence, theorem III and the following corollary is incorrect. Our goal is to classify the lattices of the 4-dimensional oscillator group.

More precisely we consider groups  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$ , i. e.  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}$  with the group multiplication given by

$$(z, \xi, t)(v, \eta, s) = \left( z + v + \frac{1}{2}\omega(\xi, e^{tB}\eta), \xi + e^{tB}\eta, t + s \right).$$

Here  $B$  is an invertible  $2n \times 2n$ -matrix and  $\omega$  a symplectic form on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  such that  $\omega(B\xi, \eta) = -\omega(\xi, B\eta)$  for all  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot)$  is definite. Every oscillator group is isomorphic to some  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$ . In addition, these groups are isomorphic to the groups  $G_k(\lambda)$  considered in [Med85].

We compute the automorphisms of  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$  in Theorem 1. The theorem also rectifies the assertion in [Med85, p. 92]. Afterwards we classify the lattices of  $Osc_1(\omega, B)$  in three steps (Theorem 2-4). In Theorem 2, which also holds for lattices in  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$ , we get to know that we can always assume that a lattice of a 4-dimensional oscillator group is

## 2. Oscillator groups

generated by  $\{(1, 0, 0), (0, e_i, 0) \mid i = 1, 2\}$  and some 4th element  $(0, \xi_0, 1)$  in an oscillator group  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$  with a certain standard symplectic form  $\omega_r$ . Furthermore, we see in Theorem 3 that there is also, besides  $\omega_r$ , a unique standard matrix, denoted by  $B = \lambda B_{x,y}$ . Then, the last step is to describe all lattices of the special kind we get in Theorem 3 up to automorphisms in Theorem 4. This gives restrictions for  $\xi_0$ . Our main tools for these steps are special isomorphisms and automorphisms of oscillator groups preserving the subgroup  $\langle (1, 0, 0), (0, e_i, 0) \mid i = 1, 2 \rangle$ , we characterize in Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.6. Finally, each lattice  $L$  in  $Osc_1(\omega, B)$  gives a data  $(r, \lambda, (x, y), \xi_0)$ . Thereby  $r$  is a positive integer,  $\lambda$  a certain angle,  $(x, y)$  an element of the "half fundamental domain" for the modular group and  $\xi_0$  a vector from a finite set to be extracted from the list in Appendix A.

This data describes the lattices of the oscillator group in the sense that two lattices  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  of  $Osc_1(\omega, B)$  have the same data if and only if there is an automorphism in  $Osc_1(\omega, B)$  mapping  $L_1$  onto  $L_2$ .

## 2. Oscillator groups

**2.1 Definition.** For a symplectic form  $\omega$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , let  $H_n(\omega)$  denote the group  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  with the multiplication given by

$$(z, \xi)(v, \eta) = \left( z + v + \frac{1}{2}\omega(\xi, \eta), \xi + \eta \right).$$

Since each of these groups are isomorphic we call them Heisenberg groups.

Let  $H$  be a Heisenberg group,  $\mathfrak{h}$  its Lie algebra and  $\mathfrak{z}$  the center of  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Suppose that  $p$  is a one-parameter subgroup of the automorphism group of  $H$  with trivial action on the center of the Heisenberg group and satisfying that the map

$$A : \mathfrak{h}/\mathfrak{z} \times \mathfrak{h}/\mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \mathfrak{z} \cong \mathbb{R}, \quad A(h_1 + \mathfrak{z}, h_2 + \mathfrak{z}) := [((d_0 f)(1))(h_1), h_2]$$

is definite, where  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Aut(\mathfrak{h})$  is the differential of the automorphism  $p(t) \in Aut(H)$  at the point  $0 \in \mathfrak{h}$ , i. e.  $f(t) := d_0(p(t))$ . Then the semidirect product  $H \rtimes_p \mathbb{R}$  of  $H$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  with respect to  $p$  is called oscillator group.

Later, we will see that these groups are isomorphic to the groups  $G_k(\lambda)$  introduced in [Med85].

**2.2 Lemma.** *Let  $p$  be a one-parameter group of the automorphisms of  $H_n(\omega)$ . Then  $p$  satisfies the conditions in Definition 2.1 if and only if there is a  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and a  $B \in \mathfrak{gl}(2n, \mathbb{R})$  satisfying  $\omega(B\xi, \eta) = -\omega(\xi, B\eta)$  for all  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot)$  is definite, such that*

$$p(t) = \exp \left( t \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta^T \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

*If  $B$  satisfies  $\omega(B\xi, \eta) = -\omega(\xi, B\eta)$  for all  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot)$  is definite, then  $B$  has purely imaginary eigenvalues and can be diagonalized over  $\mathbb{C}$ .*

## 2. Oscillator groups

*Proof.* The equivalence follows directly from the definition and known results for automorphisms of the Heisenberg group (see for instance [Tol78]).

Let  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot)$  be positive definite (otherwise we consider  $-\omega(B\cdot, \cdot)$ ) and consider the complexification of  $B$  and the complex bilinear extension of  $\omega$ . One can check that  $\omega(Bz, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\omega(Bz, \bar{z}) > 0$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ . Suppose  $z$  is an eigenvector of  $B$  with its corresponding eigenvalue  $\lambda \neq 0$ , then we see  $\mathbb{R} \ni \omega(Bz, \bar{z}) = \lambda\omega(z, \bar{z})$ . On the other hand  $\omega(z, \bar{z}) \in i\mathbb{R}$ . Hence,  $\lambda \in i\mathbb{R}$  and finally the first part follows.

Now, we prove the second part by induction over  $n$ . For  $n = 1$  the assertion holds. Assuming the assertion holds for  $n$ , we will prove it for  $n + 1$ . Let  $Z_1$  be an eigenvector of  $B$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  with corresponding eigenvalue  $i\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ . Then  $\omega(Z_1, \bar{Z}_1) = \frac{1}{i\lambda_1}\omega(BZ_1, \bar{Z}_1) \neq 0$ . In particular  $\omega|_{\text{span}\{Z_1, \bar{Z}_1\}}$  is nondegenerate. Also  $\bar{Z}_1$  is an eigenvector of  $B$  with corresponding eigenvalue  $-i\lambda_1$ , so  $B$  maps the subspace  $\text{span}\{Z_1, \bar{Z}_1\}$  onto itself. Since  $B$  is antisymmetric with respect to  $\omega$ ,  $B$  maps  $\text{span}\{Z_1, \bar{Z}_1\}^\perp$  into itself. Making use of the induction hypothesis on  $B|_{\text{span}\{Z_1, \bar{Z}_1\}^\perp}$  yields the assertion.  $\square$

**2.3 Remark.** The Lie algebra of the oscillator group  $H_n(\omega) \rtimes_p \mathbb{R}$  is the semidirect sum of  $\mathfrak{h}_n(\omega)$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  with respect to the derivation  $s \mapsto s \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta^T \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$ .

Hence, there is a basis  $\{X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_n, Y_n\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$  satisfying  $\omega(X_i, Y_j) = \delta_{i,j}$ , ( $\delta_{i,j}$  denotes the Kronecker symbol) and  $\omega(X_i, X_j) = \omega(Y_i, Y_j) = 0$  for  $i, j=1, \dots, n$  such that the Lie algebra of the oscillator group  $H_n(\omega) \rtimes_p \mathbb{R}$  is

$$\mathbb{R}Z \oplus \text{span}\{X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_n, Y_n\} \oplus \mathbb{R}T$$

with the non-zero brackets of  $\{Z, X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_n, Y_n, T\}$  given by

$$[X_i, Y_i] = Z, \quad [T, X_i] = BX_i + \delta_{2i-1}Z, \quad [T, Y_i] = BY_i + \delta_{2i}Z$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Here  $\delta_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th. component of  $\delta$ .

**2.4 Definition.** The Lie group  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega, B)$  is the oscillator group  $H_n(\omega) \rtimes_p \mathbb{R}$ , where  $p(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{tB} \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot) = -\omega(\cdot, B\cdot)$  and  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot)$  definite.

**2.5 Remark.** Each oscillator group  $H_n(\omega) \rtimes_p \mathbb{R}$  is isomorphic to some  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega, B)$ , since the map

$$\phi : T \mapsto T + \sum_{j=1}^n (\delta_{2j}X_j - \delta_{2j-1}Y_j), \quad X_i \mapsto X_i, \quad Y_i \mapsto Y_i, \quad Z \mapsto Z$$

is an isomorphism from the Lie algebra of  $H_n(\omega) \rtimes_p \mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathfrak{osc}_n(\omega, B)$ , where  $p(t) = \exp\left(t \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta^T \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}\right)$ ,  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot) = -\omega(\cdot, B\cdot)$  and  $\omega(B\cdot, \cdot)$  definite. I. e., we can always assume that  $\delta = 0$ .

The group multiplication in  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega, B)$  is given by

$$(z, \xi, t)(v, \eta, s) = \left( z + v + \frac{1}{2}\omega(\xi, e^{tB}\eta), \xi + e^{tB}\eta, t + s \right),$$

## 2. Oscillator groups

and inversion by

$$(z, \xi, t)^{-1} = (-z, -e^{-tB} \xi, -t),$$

where  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and  $z, v, s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**2.6 Definition.** We also define for  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ ,  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$  the matrix

$$N_\lambda := \begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{cc|c} 0 & -\lambda_1 & \\ \lambda_1 & 0 & \\ \hline & & \mathbf{0} \end{array} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \begin{array}{cc|c} \mathbf{0} & & \\ & & \hline 0 & -\lambda_n & \\ \lambda_n & 0 & \end{array} \end{pmatrix}$$

and the symplectic form  $\omega_\lambda(\xi, \eta) := \xi^T N_{-\lambda} \eta$ . We denote  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega_{(1, \dots, 1)}, N_\lambda)$  by  $\text{Osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ , where  $\lambda_i \lambda_{i+1} > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ .

**2.7 Lemma.** The oscillator groups  $\text{Osc}_1(\omega, B)$  and  $\text{Osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ , where  $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$  denote the positive imaginary parts of the eigenvalues of  $B$  with multiplicity, are isomorphic.

**2.8 Remark.** Note that  $\text{Osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is isomorphic to  $G_k(\lambda)$  in [Med85].

*Proof of the lemma.* Suppose that  $\omega(B \cdot, \cdot)$  is positive definite (similarly for  $\omega(B \cdot, \cdot)$  negative definite).

Let  $\{Z_1, \overline{Z}_1, \dots, Z_n, \overline{Z}_n\}$  be a basis of eigenvectors as in the proof of Lemma 2.2, such that  $BZ_j = i\lambda_j Z_j$  with  $\lambda_j > 0$  and  $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ . We set  $\mu_j := \frac{1}{2}\omega(Z_j, \overline{Z}_j) = \frac{1}{2\lambda_j}\omega(BZ_j, \overline{Z}_j) > 0$ . Then

$$Z \mapsto Z, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \text{Re}(Z_j) \mapsto X_j, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_j}} \text{Im}(Z_j) \mapsto Y_j, \quad T \mapsto -T$$

is an isomorphism from  $\mathfrak{osc}_n(\omega, B)$  to  $\mathfrak{osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . □

**2.9 Lemma.** (Medina/Revoy: [Med85, p. 91])

Let  $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$  and  $0 < \lambda'_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda'_n$ . Then  $\text{Osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  and  $\text{Osc}(\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_n)$  are isomorphic if and only if there is a  $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , such that  $k\lambda'_i = \lambda_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{osc}$  denote the Lie algebra of  $\text{Osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . We choose  $b + [\mathfrak{osc}, \mathfrak{osc}] \in \mathfrak{osc}/[\mathfrak{osc}, \mathfrak{osc}]$ ,  $b \notin [\mathfrak{osc}, \mathfrak{osc}]$ , and assign to this element a linear operator  $\hat{B}$  of  $[\mathfrak{osc}, \mathfrak{osc}]/\mathfrak{3}$ , by

$$\hat{B}(x + \mathfrak{3}) = [b, x] + \mathfrak{3}.$$

The operator  $\hat{B}$  and therefore also its eigenvalues are uniquely determined by the structure of the Lie algebra up to a factor  $k \neq 0$ . On the other hand, eigenvalues of  $\hat{B}$  associated with  $b = (0, 0, 1)^T$  are exactly the eigenvalues of  $N_\lambda$ .

Hence, if there is no  $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , such that  $\lambda_i = k\lambda'_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , then  $\text{Osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  and  $\text{Osc}(\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_n)$  are not isomorphic.

For the other implication note that the map

$$\varphi : X_i \mapsto X_i, Y_i \mapsto Y_i, Z \mapsto Z, T \mapsto kT$$

## 2. Oscillator groups

is an isomorphism of Lie algebras from  $\mathfrak{osc}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  to  $\mathfrak{osc}(\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_n)$ , where  $\{X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_n, Y_n, Z, T\}$  is the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n+2}$ .  $\square$

Thus, each oscillator group of dimension  $2n + 2 = 4$  is isomorphic to  $Osc(1)$ .

**Theorem 1.** *A map  $\phi : Osc_n(\omega, B) \rightarrow Osc_n(\omega, B)$  is an automorphism if and only if there are numbers  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu \in \{+1, -1\}$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , a vector  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  and a matrix  $S \in GL(2n, \mathbb{R})$  with  $S^* \omega = a\omega$  and  $SB = \mu BS$ , such that*

$$\phi(z, \xi, t) = \left( az + \frac{1}{2}\omega(S\xi, e^{t\mu B} b + b) + mt + \frac{1}{2}\omega(e^{t\mu B} b, b), S\xi + e^{t\mu B} b - b, \mu t \right). \quad (1)$$

*Proof.* One can check that a map satisfying condition (1) is an automorphism. So we only verify the other implication. Let  $\phi$  be an automorphism.

First of all, we check how elements of  $\{0\} \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$  will be mapped. Therefore, suppose  $\phi(0, 0, t) = (z(t), \xi(t), \mu(t))$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (z(s+t), \xi(s+t), \mu(s+t)) &= \phi(0, 0, s)\phi(0, 0, t) \\ &= \left( z(s) + z(t) + \frac{1}{2}\omega(\xi(s), e^{\mu(s)B} \xi(t)), \xi(s) + e^{\mu(s)B} \xi(t), \mu(s) + \mu(t) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We notice that  $\mu$  is a linear mapping, i. e.  $\mu(t) = \mu t$  for some  $\mu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ .

Differentiating  $\xi(s+t) = \xi(s) + e^{\mu s B} \xi(t)$  with respect to  $s$  and setting  $s = 0$ , we get

$$\xi'(t) = \mu B b + \mu B \xi(t),$$

where  $\mu B b = \xi'(0)$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . The solution of this ODE with  $\xi(0) = 0$  is

$$\xi(t) = e^{t\mu B} b - b.$$

Finally, the comparison of the first components shows that

$$z(s+t) + \frac{1}{2}\omega(b, e^{(s+t)\mu B} b) = z(s) + \frac{1}{2}\omega(b, e^{s\mu B} b) + z(t) + \frac{1}{2}\omega(b, e^{t\mu B} b)$$

and thus

$$z(t) = mt - \frac{1}{2}\omega(b, e^{t\mu B} b)$$

for some  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Since  $H_n(\omega)$  is the commutator subgroup of  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$ , the automorphism  $\phi$  maps  $H_n(\omega)$  onto itself.

Hence  $\phi(z, \xi, 0) = (az + \delta^T \xi, S\xi, 0)$ , where  $S^* \omega = a\omega$  and  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  (compare to [Tol78, p. 294]).

### 3. Lattices

Thus  $\phi(z, e^{tB} \xi, 0)\phi(0, 0, t) = \phi(0, 0, t)\phi(z, \xi, 0)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} & (\delta^T e^{tB} \xi + az + mt + \frac{1}{2}\omega(e^{t\mu B} b, b) + \frac{1}{2}\omega(S e^{tB} \xi, e^{t\mu B} b - b), S e^{tB} \xi + e^{t\mu B} b - b, \mu t) \\ &= (mt + \frac{1}{2}\omega(e^{t\mu B} b, b) + \delta^T \xi + az + \frac{1}{2}\omega(e^{t\mu B} b - b, e^{t\mu B} S\xi), e^{t\mu B} b - b + e^{t\mu B} S\xi, \mu t). \end{aligned}$$

From the second component it follows, that  $SB = \mu BS$ . Since  $\det(SB) = \mu^{2n} \det(BS)$ , we get  $\mu \in \{+1, -1\}$ .

From the first component, we get  $\delta^T e^{tB} \xi + \omega(S e^{tB} \xi, e^{t\mu B} b - b) = \delta^T \xi$  for all  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Differentiating and setting  $t = 0$  gives  $\delta^T B\xi - \omega(SB\xi, b) = 0$  for all  $\xi$ .

This completes the proof.  $\square$

So the automorphisms  $\varphi$  satisfying  $\varphi|_{H_n(\omega)} = id$  are of the form  $(z, \xi, t) \mapsto (z + mt, \xi, t)$  with  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ . This contradicts the assertion in [Med85, p. 92].

### 3. Lattices

Now, we study the lattices of oscillator groups and begin with an example.

**3.1 Example.** Let  $\Gamma_\omega$  denote the subgroup in  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$  generated by  $\{(1, 0, 0), (0, e_i, 0) \mid i = 1, \dots, 2n\}$ . For each  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$  the subgroup  $L := \langle \Gamma_\omega \cup \{(z_0, \xi_0, 1)\} \rangle$  is a lattice in  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$  with  $L \cap H_n(\omega) = \Gamma_\omega$  if and only if  $(\omega(\xi_0, e^B e_i), e^B e_i, 0) \in \Gamma_\omega$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 2n$ .

To see this, one can check that

$$(z, \xi, t)(v, \eta, 0)(z, \xi, t)^{-1} = (v + \omega(\xi, e^{tB} \eta), e^{tB} \eta, 0) \quad (2)$$

for each  $(v, \eta, 0) \in H_n(\omega) \cap L$  and  $(z, \xi, t) \in L$ .

If  $L = \langle \Gamma_\omega \cup \{(0, \xi, 1)\} \rangle$  defines a lattice in  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$  with  $L \cap H_n(\omega) = \Gamma_\omega$ , then we just call it  $L(\xi)$ . Furthermore, we set  $\Gamma_r := \Gamma_{\omega_r}$ . Note that

$$\Gamma_r = \left\{ (z, \xi, 0) \mid \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}, z \in \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{2} \xi_{2i-1} \xi_i + \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

In particular for  $n = 1$ , we have  $\Gamma_r = \mathbb{Z}^3 \times \{0\}$  for  $r$  even and  $\Gamma_r = \{(z, \xi, 0) \mid \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^2, z \in \frac{1}{2} \xi_1 \xi_2 + \mathbb{Z}\}$  for  $r$  odd. Moreover let  $\Pi$  denote the projection on the last component and for a lattice  $L$  of  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$  we denote by  $\Pi(L)$  the set  $\Pi(L) := \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists z, \xi : (z, \xi, t) \in L\}$ . Note that  $\Pi(L)$  is a non-trivial discrete subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}$  for each lattice  $L$  (compare to [Med85, p. 90]).

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $L$  be a lattice in  $Osc_n(\omega, B)$ . Then there exists a uniquely determined  $r \in \mathbb{N}^n$  satisfying  $r_i$  divides  $r_{i+1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ , a linear map  $\tilde{B}$ , an isomorphism*

### 3. Lattices

$\Phi : \text{Osc}_n(\omega, B) \rightarrow \text{Osc}_n(\omega_r, \tilde{B})$  and a  $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , such that

$$\Phi(L) = L(\xi_0).$$

*Proof.* At first, note that  $L \cap H_n(\omega)$  is a lattice in  $H_n(\omega)$ , see [Rag72, p. 50]. Furthermore, we know from theorem 1.10 in [Tol78, p. 303] that there is a uniquely determined  $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$  where  $r_i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$  and an isomorphism  $\varphi : H_n(\omega) \rightarrow H_n(\omega_r)$ ,  $\varphi(z, \xi) = (\delta^T \xi + az, S\xi)$ , where  $S^* \omega_r = a\omega$ , such that  $\varphi(L \cap \text{Heis}(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega)) = \Gamma_r$ . We choose  $b$ , such that  $\delta^T \xi = \omega_r(S\xi, b)$  for all  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ . Then

$$\bar{\varphi}(z, \xi, t) = \left( az + \frac{1}{2} \omega_r(S\xi, e^{tSBS^{-1}} b + b) + \frac{1}{2} \omega_r(e^{tSBS^{-1}} b, b), S\xi + e^{tSBS^{-1}} b - b, t \right)$$

is an isomorphism from  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega, B)$  to  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega_r, SBS^{-1})$ , mapping  $L \cap H_n(\omega)$  onto  $\Gamma_r$ . Let  $t_0$  denote the smallest positive element in  $\Pi(\bar{\varphi}(L))$ . So there is a  $z_0$  and a  $\xi_0$ , such that  $(z_0, \xi_0, t_0) \in \bar{\varphi}(L)$ . The map

$$\phi : (z, \xi, t) \mapsto \left( z - \frac{z_0}{t_0} t, \xi, \frac{t}{t_0} \right)$$

is an isomorphism from  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega_r, SBS^{-1})$  to  $\text{Osc}_n(\omega_r, t_0 SBS^{-1})$  such that  $\phi|_{H_n(\omega_r)} = id$  and  $(z_0, \xi_0, t_0)$  maps to  $(0, \xi_0, 1)$ . Hence the theorem is proved.  $\square$

From now on we consider  $n = 1$ .

**3.2 Lemma.** *There is an isomorphism  $\varphi : \text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, B) \rightarrow \text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, \tilde{B})$  mapping  $\Gamma_r$  onto  $\Gamma_r$  and satisfying  $\Pi(\varphi(0, 0, 1)) = \pm 1$  if and only if  $B$  or  $-B$  is conjugate to  $\tilde{B}$  with respect to an integer matrix with determinant  $\pm 1$ .*

*Proof.* At first, we will construct an isomorphism satisfying the conditions in the lemma. Let  $B$  and  $\tilde{B}$  be conjugate with respect to an integer matrix with determinant  $\pm 1$ . This is sufficient to assume, since the map  $\phi : (z, \xi, t) \mapsto (z, \xi, -t)$  is an isomorphism from  $\text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, B)$  to  $\text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, -B)$ , satisfying the conditions in the lemma. Let

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & s_2 \\ s_3 & s_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

be the integer conjugation matrix with determinant  $\pm 1$ , such that  $\tilde{B} = SBS^{-1}$ ,  $a = \det(S)$  and

$$b := \begin{cases} (0, 0), & s_1 s_2 \text{ and } s_3 s_4 \text{ are even} \\ (0, \frac{1}{2}), & s_1 s_2 \text{ is even and } s_3 s_4 \text{ is odd} \\ (\frac{1}{2}, 0), & s_3 s_4 \text{ is even and } s_1 s_2 \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

We only get these three cases, since  $\det(S)$  is odd. Then

$$\varphi : (z, \xi, t) \mapsto \left( az + \frac{1}{2} \omega_r(S\xi, e^{t\tilde{B}} b + b) + \frac{1}{2} \omega_r(e^{t\tilde{B}} b, b), S\xi + e^{t\tilde{B}} b - b, t \right)$$

### 3. Lattices

is an isomorphism from  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$  to  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \tilde{B})$ , satisfying  $\varphi(\Gamma_r) = \Gamma_r$  and  $\Pi(\varphi(0, 0, 1)) = \pm 1$ . Here we will verify this only for the case that  $s_1 s_2$  is even and  $s_3 s_4$  odd (the other cases run similar). It's not hard to see that  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism and  $\Pi(\varphi(0, 0, 1)) = 1$ . Furthermore  $\varphi(0, e_1, 0) = (s_1 \frac{r}{2}, (s_1, s_3)^T, 0) \in \Gamma_r$ , since  $s_1 \frac{r}{2} \in \frac{r}{2} s_1 s_3 + \mathbb{Z}$  and similarly  $\varphi(0, e_2, 0) = (s_2 \frac{r}{2}, (s_2, s_4)^T, 0) \in \Gamma_r$ . In addition  $(-\frac{r}{2}, a(s_4, -s_3)^T, 0)$  and  $(0, a(-s_2, s_1)^T, 0)$  are elements of  $\Gamma_r$  and will be mapped to  $(0, e_1, 0)$  respectively  $(0, e_2, 0)$ . Since, moreover,  $\varphi(1, 0, 0) = (a, 0, 0) = (\pm 1, 0, 0)$ , we see finally that  $\varphi(\Gamma_r) = \Gamma_r$ .

So one direction of the lemma is verified.

Now, let  $\varphi$  be an isomorphism satisfying the conditions in the lemma. We know from Lemmas 2.7 and 2.9 that there is a  $k \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  and a  $T \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ , such that  $TBT^{-1} = k\tilde{B}$ . So we can write  $\varphi = \varphi_2 \circ \varphi_1$ , where

$$\varphi_1(z, \xi, t) = (z, T\xi, kt)$$

is an isomorphism from  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$  to  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \tilde{B})$  and  $\varphi_2$  an automorphisms of  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \tilde{B})$ . Thus

$$\varphi_2(z, \xi, t) = (az + \frac{1}{2}\omega_r(\tilde{T}\xi, e^{t\mu\tilde{B}}b + b) + mt + \frac{1}{2}\omega_r(e^{t\mu\tilde{B}}b, b), \tilde{T}\xi + e^{t\mu\tilde{B}}b - b, \mu t),$$

where  $\det(\tilde{T}) = a$ ,  $\tilde{T}\tilde{B}\tilde{T}^{-1} = \mu\tilde{B}$  and  $\mu \in \{+1, -1\}$ . Hence

$$\varphi(z, \xi, t) = (az + \frac{1}{2}\omega_r(\tilde{T}T\xi, e^{kt\mu\tilde{B}}b + b) + mt + \frac{1}{2}\omega_r(e^{kt\mu\tilde{B}}b, b), \tilde{T}T\xi + e^{kt\mu\tilde{B}}b - b, \mu kt).$$

We get  $\tilde{T}TBT^{-1}\tilde{T}^{-1} = \pm\tilde{B}$ , since  $TBT^{-1} = k\tilde{B}$ ,  $\tilde{T}\tilde{B}\tilde{T}^{-1} = \mu\tilde{B}$  and  $\Pi(\varphi(0, 0, 1)) = \pm 1$ .

In addition,  $\varphi$  maps  $(1, 0, 0)$  to  $(\pm 1, 0, 0)$  and  $(0, e_i, 0)$  into  $\Gamma_r$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Hence  $\det(\tilde{T}T) = \pm 1$  and  $\tilde{T}Te_i \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Thus we obtain the assertion.  $\square$

To classify the lattices of oscillator groups, we have to choose representatives for the conjugacy classes of matrices, which appeared in the previous lemma.

**3.3 Definition.** For  $y \neq 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  we denote

$$B_{x,y} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x}{y} & -\frac{x^2}{y} - y \\ \frac{1}{y} & -\frac{x}{y} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The set of all  $B_{x,y}$  is equal to the set of all matrices which are conjugate to  $N_1$ , and to the set of all  $2 \times 2$ -matrices with determinant 1 and trace 0. The subsets  $\mathbb{B}^+ := \{B_{x,y} \mid y > 0\}$  and  $\mathbb{B}^- := \{B_{x,y} \mid y < 0\}$  are invariant under conjugation with elements of  $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ . Furthermore, conjugation with elements of  $GL(2, \mathbb{R})$  with determinant  $-1$  maps elements of  $\mathbb{B}^+$  to  $\mathbb{B}^-$  and reverse.

**3.4 Definition.** We define

$$\mathbb{F}_1 := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}, y > 0, x^2 + y^2 \geq 1 \right\}$$



### 3. Lattices

and

$$\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_1 \cup \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -\frac{1}{2} < x < 0, y > 0, x^2 + y^2 > 1 \right\}.$$

Note that the map  $\iota : B_{x,y} \mapsto x + iy$  is a bijection from  $\{B_{x,y} \mid y > 0\}$  to the upper half plane of  $\mathbb{C}$ , satisfying  $\iota(AB_{x,y}A^{-1}) = A(x + iy)$  for all  $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $Az = \frac{az+b}{cz+d}$ . With this in mind, we rewrite the theorem in [Koe98, p. 109]:

**3.5 Remark.** For all  $B_{x',y'}$ ,  $y' > 0$  there is a uniquely defined  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}$  and an  $S \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ , such that  $SB_{x',y'}S^{-1} = B_{x,y}$ .

**Theorem 3.** Let  $L$  be a lattice of  $Osc_1(\omega, B)$ . Then there exist

- a uniquely determined  $r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ ,
- a uniquely determined  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + k\pi$  with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{1}{3}\pi, \frac{1}{2}\pi, \frac{2}{3}\pi, \pi\}$
- and a uniquely determined

$$(x, y) \begin{cases} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}), & \lambda_0 \in \{\frac{1}{3}\pi, \frac{2}{3}\pi\} \\ = (0, 1), & \lambda_0 = \frac{1}{2}\pi \\ \in \mathbb{F}_1, & \lambda_0 = \pi \end{cases},$$

and an isomorphism  $\varphi : Osc_1(\omega, B) \rightarrow Osc_1(\omega_r, \lambda B_{x,y})$  satisfying  $\varphi(L) \cap H_1(\omega_r) = \Gamma_r$  and  $\Pi(\varphi(L)) = \mathbb{Z}$ .

Conversely, for any such data  $(r, \lambda, (x, y))$  there exists a lattice  $L$  in  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \lambda B_{x,y})$  satisfying  $L \cap H_1(\omega_r) = \Gamma_r$  and  $\Pi(L) = \mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* Because of Theorem 2 we can suppose that  $\omega = \omega_r$  and the lattice  $L$  given in  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$  satisfies  $L \cap H_1(\omega_r) = \Gamma_r$  and  $\Pi(L) = \mathbb{Z}$ . The procedure is to find a  $\tilde{B} (= \lambda B_{x,y})$  for a given  $B$ , such that there is an isomorphism  $\varphi$  from  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$  to  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \tilde{B})$ , mapping  $\Gamma_r$  onto  $\Gamma_r$  and satisfying  $\Pi(\varphi(L)) = \mathbb{Z}$ .

Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  be the positive imaginary part of the eigenvalue of  $B$ . Then we see that  $B$  and  $N_\lambda$  are conjugate. Hence  $e^B$  and  $e^{N_\lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \lambda & -\sin \lambda \\ \sin \lambda & \cos \lambda \end{pmatrix}$  are conjugate. So  $\text{tr}(e^B) = 2 \cos \lambda$  and  $\cos \lambda \in \{-1, -\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ , since  $e^B \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ . Thus  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + k\pi \neq 0$ , where  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{2\pi}{3}, \pi\}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . There is an  $x' \in \mathbb{R}$  and a  $y' \neq 0$ , such that  $B = \lambda B_{x',y'}$ . Now we can use that  $B_{x',-y'} = -B_{x',y'}$  to assume that  $y' > 0$ . Now we choose an  $S \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ , such that  $SB_{x',y'}S^{-1} = B_{x,y}$ , where  $x$  and  $y$  satisfy the conditions in Remark 3.5. So we set  $\tilde{B} := |\lambda|B_{|x|,y}$ . Because of Lemma 3.2 and the fact that  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} B_{x,y} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = -B_{-x,y}$ , there is an isomorphism  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B) \rightarrow Osc_1(\omega_r, \tilde{B})$  mapping  $\Gamma_r$  onto  $\Gamma_r$  and satisfying  $\Pi(\varphi(L)) = \mathbb{Z}$ . Now we want to see that  $\lambda > 0$  and  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_1$  are uniquely determined. Let  $\lambda, \lambda_2 > 0$  and  $(x, y), (x_2, y_2) \in \mathbb{F}_1$ . Suppose that there is an isomorphism  $\varphi : Osc_1(\omega_r, \lambda B_{x,y}) \rightarrow Osc_1(\omega_r, \lambda_2 B_{x_2,y_2})$  mapping  $\Gamma_r$  onto  $\Gamma_r$  and satisfying  $\Pi(\varphi(0, 0, 1)) = \pm 1$ . Then we will see

### 3. Lattices

that  $\lambda B_{x,y} = \lambda_2 B_{x_2,y_2}$ . At first Lemma 3.2 gives that  $\pm \lambda B_{x,y}$  and  $\lambda_2 B_{x_2,y_2}$  are conjugate. Since  $\det(\pm \lambda B_{x,y}) = \det(\lambda_2 B_{x_2,y_2})$ , we get  $\lambda = \lambda_2$ . Hence  $\pm B_{x,y}$  and  $B_{x_2,y_2}$  are conjugate. For a better readability we write  $\mathbb{Z}_1$ -conjugate, if two matrices are conjugate with respect to a matrix in  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{-1}$ -conjugate, if two matrices are conjugate with respect to an integer matrix, having determinant  $-1$ .

It is clear that  $-B_{x,y} = B_{x,-y}$  and  $B_{x_2,y_2}$  are not  $\mathbb{Z}_1$ -conjugate. In addition  $B_{x,y}$  and  $B_{x_2,y_2}$  are not  $\mathbb{Z}_{-1}$ -conjugate. If  $B_{x,y}$  and  $B_{x_2,y_2}$  are  $\mathbb{Z}_1$ -conjugate, then  $(x, y) = (x_2, y_2)$  because of Remark 3.5. Finally, if  $-B_{x,y}$  and  $B_{x_2,y_2}$  are  $\mathbb{Z}_{-1}$ -conjugate, then  $B_{-x,y}$  and  $B_{x_2,y_2}$  are  $\mathbb{Z}_1$ -conjugate. Using Remark 3.5 gives  $x = x_2 \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$  and  $y = y_2$  easily follows.

At last, we want to see how  $\lambda$  and  $(x, y)$  fit together. Suppose  $B = \lambda B_{x,y}$ , where  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_1$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + k\pi$ , satisfying  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{1}{3}\pi, \frac{1}{2}\pi, \frac{2}{3}\pi\}$ . Let  $L$  be a lattice in  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \lambda B_{x,y})$  such that  $L \cap H_1(\omega_r) = \Gamma_r$  and  $\Pi(L) = \mathbb{Z}$ . Then, using equation (2) with  $t = 1$ ,

$$e^B = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \lambda + \frac{x}{y} \sin \lambda & -\frac{x^2}{y} \sin \lambda - y \sin \lambda \\ \frac{1}{y} \sin \lambda & -\frac{x}{y} \sin \lambda + \cos \lambda \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}). \quad (3)$$

Thus  $\frac{1}{y} \sin \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $y = |\sin \lambda|$ . So  $x = \frac{1}{2}$  if  $\cos \lambda = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ , and  $x = 0$  if  $\cos \lambda = 0$ . We get

$$B = \begin{cases} \lambda B_{0,1}, & \cos \lambda = 0 \\ \lambda B_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}}, & \cos \lambda = \pm \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}.$$

Conversely, it is obvious that  $e^{\lambda B_{x,y}} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  for the data  $(r, \lambda, (x, y))$  described in the theorem. Hence there is a lattice satisfying the claimed conditions (see Example 3.1, where  $\xi_0 = (0, 0)$ ,  $\xi_0 = (0, \frac{1}{2})$  or  $\xi_0 = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)$  depending on  $r$  and  $e^B$ ).  $\square$

**3.6 Lemma.** *Let  $B = \lambda B_{x,y}$ , where  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y > 0$ . Then an automorphism  $\varphi$  of  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$  maps  $\Gamma_r$  onto itself if and only if*

$$\varphi(z, \xi, t) = \left( \mu z + \frac{1}{2} \omega_r(S\xi, e^{t\mu B} b + b) + mt + \frac{1}{2} \omega_r(e^{t\mu B} b, b), S\xi + e^{t\mu B} b - b, \mu t \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu \in \{\pm 1\}$ ,  $S$  is an integer matrix

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & s_2 \\ s_3 & s_4 \end{pmatrix} \in \left\{ e^{tB}, e^{tB} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

with  $\det(S) = \mu$  and  $b \in (\frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}, \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}) := \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z} \times \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}$ , if  $r$  is even, respectively

$$b = (b_1, b_2) \in \begin{cases} (\frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}, \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}), & s_1 s_2 \text{ and } s_3 s_4 \text{ are even} \\ (\frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}, \frac{1}{2r} + \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}), & s_1 s_2 \text{ is even and } s_3 s_4 \text{ is odd} \\ (\frac{1}{2r} + \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}, \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{r}), & s_3 s_4 \text{ is even and } s_1 s_2 \text{ is odd} \end{cases},$$

if  $r$  is odd. For short, we call such an automorphism  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving.

### 3. Lattices

*Proof.* It's not hard to show that an automorphism as defined in the theorem maps  $\Gamma_r$  onto  $\Gamma_r$ . Let  $\varphi$  be an automorphism in  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$ , given as in (1), mapping  $\Gamma_r$  onto itself. Then  $a = \pm 1$ . In addition  $\det S = a$ , since  $\det(S)\omega_r = S^*\omega_r = a\omega_r$ . Since  $B = \lambda B_{x,y}$  and  $SB_{x,y}S^{-1} = \mu B_{x,y} = B_{x,\mu y}$ , we get  $\det(S) = \mu$ .

Because  $\varphi(0, e_i, 0) = (\omega_r(Se_i, b), Se_i, 0)$ , the invertible matrix  $S$  has integer entries.

For

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{y} & \frac{x}{\sqrt{y}} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}} \end{pmatrix},$$

it holds that  $TN_1T^{-1} = B_{x,y}$ . Since  $SB = \mu BS$  we see that  $STN_1T^{-1} = \mu TN_1T^{-1}ST$ . Then  $T^{-1}ST$  and  $N_1$  (anti-)commute. Hence  $T^{-1}ST \in O(2, \mathbb{R})$ . Thus  $T^{-1}ST = e^{t\lambda N_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix}$  and  $S = e^{tB} T \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix} T^{-1}$ , for some  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $\mu = 1$ , then  $S = e^{tB}$ , if  $\mu = -1$ , then

$$S = e^{tB} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence  $S$  is an integer matrix in

$$\left\{ e^{tB}, e^{tB} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Finally we want to see how  $b$  looks like. Let  $r$  be even. Then  $\Gamma_r = \mathbb{Z}^3$  and hence

$$\omega_r((s_1, s_3), (b_1, b_2)), \omega_r((s_2, s_4), (b_1, b_2)) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus  $b \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ .

Now let  $r$  be odd, so  $\Gamma_r = \{(z, (\xi_1, \xi_2), 0) \mid z \in \frac{1}{2}\xi_1\xi_2 + \mathbb{Z}\}$ .

We see that there are the same three cases to consider as in the previous lemma. Here, we only check the case that  $s_1s_2$  is even and  $s_3s_4$  is odd, especially  $s_1$  is even (the case that  $s_2$  is even runs similarly). Since  $\det(S)$  is odd, we get that  $s_2$  is odd. Then  $\omega_r((s_1, s_3), (b_1, b_2)) \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\omega_r((s_2, s_4), (b_1, b_2)) \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$ . Hence

$$r \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix} = \det(S) \begin{pmatrix} -s_2 & s_1 \\ -s_4 & s_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ k_2 + \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix},$$

for some  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus  $rb_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $rb_2 \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$ .

Finally, for each case we obtain the assertion. □

Now we can completely classify the lattices of  $Osc_1(\omega, B)$  by using Theorem 3 and the following one.

**Theorem 4.** Suppose  $B = \lambda B_{x,y}$ ,  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_1$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + k\pi$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  and  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{1}{3}\pi, \frac{1}{2}\pi, \frac{2}{3}\pi, \pi\}$ . Let  $L = \langle \Gamma_r \cup \{(z, \xi, 1)\} \rangle$  be a lattice in  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$  with  $L \cap H_1(\omega_r) = \Gamma_r$ .

### 3. Lattices

Then there is a uniquely defined  $\xi_0$  to extract from the list in Appendix A and an automorphism  $\varphi$  of  $\text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, B)$ , such that  $\varphi(L) = L(\xi_0)$ .

*Proof.* We will say that  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  are equivalent if there is an automorphism mapping  $L(\xi)$  onto  $L(\eta)$ .

**Existence** We begin with showing the existence of a  $\xi_0$  in the list in Appendix A and an  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving automorphism  $\varphi$  for each lattice  $L$  satisfying that  $L \cap H_1(\omega_r) = \Gamma_r$ , such that  $\varphi(L) = L(\xi_0)$ .

The proof will be divided into parts, dependent on the value of  $\lambda$ . We, always, use  $e^B$ , which we can compute with equation (3) in the proof of Theorem 3.

First we notice, depending on  $r$ , which values are possible for  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , such that  $\langle \Gamma_r \cup \{(z, \xi, 1)\} \rangle$  defines a lattice. Therefor we use example 3.1. Afterward, we give automorphisms given as in (4) in Lemma 3.6, which map  $\langle \Gamma_r \cup \{(z, \xi, 1)\} \rangle$  onto  $L(\xi_0)$  for some  $\xi_0$  from the list.

It is clear that the automorphism  $(z, \xi, t) \mapsto (z + mt, \xi, t)$  for some  $m$  maps  $(z_0, \xi_0, 1)$  to  $(0, \xi_0, 1)$ . Furthermore, we know from  $S$  how the last component will be mapped by the automorphism (4), since  $\mu = \det(S)$ . Therefore we just give  $S$  and  $b$  and check, how  $(0, \xi, 1)$  will be mapped. Each automorphism we give is  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving, so we don't make mention of that always. For further argumentation let  $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$  denote an arbitrary vector in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  which satisfies the condition in Example 3.1. Now, we begin with showing the existence of a vector of the list in Appendix A.

Suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + 2k\pi$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{5\pi}{3}\}$ . Let  $r$  be even. Then  $\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . In addition  $\det(e^B - E_2) = 1$ . So the automorphism (4), where  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := E_2$ , maps  $(0, 0, 1)$  to  $(0, \xi, 1)$ . Thus  $(0, 0)$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. Now let  $r$  be odd. For  $\lambda_0 = \frac{\pi}{3}$  one can check that  $\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2r}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . Since, again,  $\det(e^B - E_2) = 1$ , the automorphism (4) given by  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1 - \frac{1}{2r}, \xi_2) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := E_2$  shows that  $(\frac{1}{2r}, 0)$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. For  $\lambda_0 = \frac{5}{3}\pi$  an analogous argumentation holds, except having  $\frac{1}{2r}$  in the other component.

Suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + 2k\pi$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\}$ . Then  $\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . In addition  $\det(e^B - E_2) = 2$ . If  $r\xi_1 - r\xi_2$  is even, then the automorphism defined by  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := E_2$  maps  $(0, 0, 1)$  to  $(0, \xi, 1)$ . Hence  $(0, 0)$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. If  $r\xi_1 - r\xi_2$  is odd, then we set  $S := E_2$  and  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1, \xi_2 - \frac{1}{r}) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . Thus  $(0, \frac{1}{r})$  is equivalent to  $\xi$ . If additionally  $r$  is odd, we instead set  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(1 + \xi_1, \xi_2) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . The related automorphism shows that  $(0, 0)$  is equivalent to  $(1, 0) + \xi$ , which is equivalent to  $\xi$ .

Suppose  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + 2k\pi$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{2\pi}{3}, \frac{4\pi}{3}\}$ . Let  $r$  be even. Then  $\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . If  $r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 \equiv 0(3)$ , the automorphism given by  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := E_2$  maps  $(0, 0, 1)$  to  $(0, \xi, 1)$ . Hence  $(0, 0)$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. If  $r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 \equiv 1(3)$ , then the automorphism defined by  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1 - \frac{1}{r}, \xi_2) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := E_2$  shows that  $(\frac{1}{r}, 0)$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. If  $r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 \equiv 2(3)$ , we set

### 3. Lattices

$b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1 - \frac{1}{r}, \xi_2 - \frac{1}{r}) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . Thus  $(\frac{1}{r}, 0)$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. If additionally 3 is not a factor of  $r$ , we set  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(x + \xi_1, \xi_2) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ , where  $rx + r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 \equiv 0(3)$ , and  $S := E_2$ . So we get that  $(0, 0)$  is equivalent to  $(x, 0) + \xi$ , which is equivalent to  $\xi$ .

Now let  $r$  be odd. We obtain  $\lambda_0 = \frac{2}{3}\pi$ . Using equation (2), we get  $\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2r})$ . If  $r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 - 1/2 \equiv 0(3)$ , then the automorphism given by  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1, \xi_2 - \frac{1}{2r}) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := E_2$  shows that  $(0, \frac{1}{2r})$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. If  $r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 - 1/2 \equiv 1(3)$ , then we set  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1 - \frac{1}{r}, \xi_2 - \frac{1}{2r}) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and  $S := E_2$ . The related automorphism shows that  $(\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{2r})$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent. If  $r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 - 1/2 \equiv 2(3)$ , then we set  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1, \xi_2 + \frac{1}{2r}) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ ,  $S := -E_2$  and get that  $(0, \frac{1}{2r})$  and  $\xi$  are equivalent.

If additionally 3 is not a factor of  $r$ , then we set  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(x + \xi_1, \frac{1}{2r} + \xi_2) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ , where  $rx + r\xi_1 + r\xi_2 - 1/2 \equiv 0(3)$ , and  $S := E_2$ . The related automorphism shows that  $(0, \frac{1}{2r})$  is equivalent to  $(x, 0) + \xi$ , which is equivalent to  $\xi$ .

For  $\lambda_0 = \frac{4}{3}\pi$  there is an analogue argumentation, where  $\frac{1}{2r}$  is in the other component.

Suppose  $\lambda = \pi + 2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\xi_0 \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . Let  $r$  be odd. So there are  $x', y' \in \{0, 1\}$ , such that  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_1 + x', \xi_2 + y') \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  and the automorphism defined by  $S = E_2$  and the above given  $b$  shows that  $(0, 0)$  is equivalent to  $\xi + (x', y')$ , which is equivalent to  $\xi$ . Now let  $r$  be even. We set  $\eta := \frac{1}{2r}(-1 + (-1)^{r\xi_1}, -1 + (-1)^{r\xi_2})$ . Then  $\eta \in \{(0, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, 0), (0, \frac{1}{r}), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})\}$  and the automorphism given by  $S = E_2$  and  $b := (e^B - E_2)^{-1}(\xi_0 + \eta) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  maps  $(0, \eta, 1)$  to  $(0, \xi, 1)$ .

If  $x^2 + y^2 = 1$ , then the automorphism given by  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $b = (0, 0)$  maps  $(0, (\frac{1}{r}, 0), 1)$  to  $(0, (0, \frac{1}{r}), -1) = (0, (0, \frac{1}{r}), 1)^{-1}$ . Thus  $(\frac{1}{r}, 0)$  and  $(0, \frac{1}{r})$  are equivalent.

If  $x = \frac{1}{2}$ , then the automorphism given by  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $b = (-\frac{1}{r}, -\frac{1}{r})$  maps  $(0, (0, \frac{1}{r}), 1)$  to  $(0, (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r}), -1) = (0, (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r}), 1)^{-1}$ . Hence  $(0, \frac{1}{r})$  and  $(\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})$  are equivalent. If  $(x, y) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$ , then both automorphisms can be used. Thus every  $\xi_0 \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  is equivalent to  $(0, 0)$  or  $(\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})$ .

We come to the last case: Suppose  $\lambda = 2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Using equation (2) we get  $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ .

In this case we can neglect  $b$ , since  $S\xi + e^B b - b = S\xi + b - b = S\xi$ . Instead, it's more important to consider all the finitely many integer matrices in

$$\left\{ e^{tB_{x,y}}, e^{tB_{x,y}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

for  $B_{x,y}$ .

At first we give some automorphisms which map  $\Gamma_r$  onto itself for all  $x$  and  $y$ . Afterwards, we restrict our observation to the different cases.

For each  $(0, (\xi_1, \xi_2), 1)$  there are  $0 \leq k, l < r$  such that  $\Gamma_r \cup \{(0, (\xi_1, \xi_2), 1)\}$  and  $\Gamma_r \cup$

### 3. Lattices

$\left\{ \left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right) \right\}$  generate the same lattice.

The automorphism where  $S = -E_2$  maps  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$  to  $\left( 0, (-1, -1), 0 \right) \left( 0, \left( \frac{r-k}{r}, \frac{r-l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$ . Thus there is for each  $\xi \in \left( \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z} \right)$  an equivalent

$$\xi_0 \in M_1 := \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 \leq k, l \leq \frac{r}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 < k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r \right\}.$$

Thus the first row is verified.

If additionally  $x = 0$ , then the automorphism where  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$  to a  $\left( \left( 0, (0, -1), 0 \right) \left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{r-l}{r} \right), 1 \right) \right)^{-1}$ . Thus the second row is verified.

If  $x = \frac{1}{2}$  instead, then the automorphism where  $S = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$ , where  $k > l$ , to  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k-l}{r}, \frac{r-l}{r} \right), 1 \right)^{-1}$ . So we can narrow the set of all  $\xi_0$  down to

$$\left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 \leq k \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 < k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, 0 \right) \mid 0 \leq k \leq \frac{r}{2} \right\}.$$

Furthermore  $S = -\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  gives an  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving automorphism, which maps  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$ , where  $l \geq k$ , to  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{l-k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)^{-1}$ . Hence the third row follows.

For further argumentation suppose  $x^2 + y^2 = 1$ . We know that there is for each  $\xi \in \left( \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z} \right)$  an equivalent  $\xi_0 \in M_1$ . We can still restrict this set. The automorphism where  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$  to  $\left( 0, \left( -\frac{l}{r}, -\frac{k}{r} \right), -1 \right) = \left( 0, \left( \frac{l}{r}, \frac{k}{r} \right), 1 \right)^{-1}$ . So there is for each  $\xi \in \left( \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z} \right)$  an equivalent

$$\xi_0 \in \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 \leq k \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 < k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r \right\}.$$

Additionally the automorphism where  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$  to

$$\left( \left( 0, (-1, 0), 0 \right) \left( 0, (0, -1), 0 \right) \left( 0, \left( \frac{r-l}{r}, \frac{r-k}{r} \right), 1 \right) \right)^{-1}.$$

Hence for  $x^2 + y^2 = 1$  and  $\xi \in \left( \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z} \right)$  there is an equivalent

$$\xi_0 \in M_2 := \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 \leq k \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid k+l \leq r, 0 < k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r \right\}.$$

Now we want to see, which elements in  $M_2$  are equivalent, if  $(x, y) = (0, 1)$  or  $(x, y) = \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right)$ .

So suppose  $(x, y) = (0, 1)$ . The automorphism where  $S = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $\left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right), 1 \right)$  to  $\left( \left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{r-l}{r} \right), 1 \right) \left( 0, (0, -1), 0 \right) \right)^{-1}$ . Hence the fourth row follows.

### 3. Lattices

At last suppose  $(x, y) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$ . The automorphism where  $S := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $(0, (\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r}), 1)$  to  $(0, (\frac{k-l}{r}, -\frac{l}{r}), -1) = (0, (\frac{l-k}{r}, \frac{l}{r}), 1)^{-1}$ . Hence we get for each  $\xi \in (\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$  an equivalent

$$\xi_0 \in \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid k+l \leq r, 0 < k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r, k \leq \frac{l}{2} \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right)^T \mid 0 \leq k \leq \frac{l}{2} \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2} \right\}.$$

Additionally the automorphism where  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $(0, (\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r}), 1)$  to

$$\left( (0, (0, -1), 0) \left( 0, \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{r-l+k}{r} \right), 1 \right) \right)^{-1}.$$

Thus the last row follows.

**Uniqueness** Now we want to see that  $\xi_0$  from the list is uniquely determined. Therefore, we use a proof by contradiction.

Assume that for an  $r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_1$  and a  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + k\pi$ , where  $\lambda_0 = \{\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{2\pi}{3}, \pi\}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are  $\xi$  and  $\tilde{\xi}$  from the list, such that there is an automorphism  $\varphi$  of  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \lambda B_{x,y})$ , mapping  $L(\xi)$  onto  $L(\tilde{\xi})$ . Then, moreover, this automorphism maps  $\Gamma_r$  onto itself.

So we can check each  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving automorphism and will note that none of them maps  $L(\xi)$  onto  $L(\tilde{\xi})$ , and we get our contradiction.

Let us begin with  $\lambda = \pi + 2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r$  even.

Let  $\varphi$  be an automorphism, given as in (1) in Theorem 1, which maps  $L(\xi)$  onto  $L(\tilde{\xi})$ . Then the corresponding map

$$\hat{\varphi} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \xi \mapsto S\xi + e^B b - b = S\xi - 2b$$

maps  $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$  to a vector  $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2)$ , where  $r\eta_{1/2}$  is even if and only if  $\xi_{1/2}$  is even. But the corresponding map  $\hat{\varphi}$  for an  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving automorphism maps  $(0, 0)$  to a vector in  $\frac{2}{r}\mathbb{Z}^2$ . Thus there is a contradiction for  $\tilde{\xi} \in \{(\frac{1}{r}, 0), (0, \frac{1}{r}), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})\}$ .

In an analogue way, we find a contradiction if  $\xi = (\frac{1}{r}, 0)$ . But we have to subdivide the proof, depending on the value of  $x$  and  $y$ .

If  $x^2 + y^2 > 1$  and  $x \neq \frac{1}{2}$ , then each  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving automorphism gives a corresponding map  $\hat{\varphi}$ , which maps  $(\frac{1}{r}, 0)$  to a vector in  $(\frac{2}{r}\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{r}, \frac{2}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . Thus there is a contradiction for all  $\tilde{\xi} \in \{(0, \frac{1}{r}), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})\}$ . If  $x^2 + y^2 > 1$  and  $x = \frac{1}{2}$ , then each  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving automorphism gives a corresponding map  $\hat{\varphi}$ , which maps  $(\frac{1}{r}, 0)$  to a vector in  $(\frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{2}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . Thus there is a contradiction for  $\tilde{\xi} = (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})$ .

If  $x^2 + y^2 = 1$  and  $x \notin \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ , then the corresponding map  $\hat{\varphi}$  for every  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving

### 3. Lattices

automorphism maps  $(\frac{1}{r}, 0)$  to a vector with one entry in  $\frac{2}{r}\mathbb{Z}$  and one in  $\frac{2}{r}\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{r}$ . Thus there is a contradiction for  $\tilde{\xi} = (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})$ .

At last suppose  $\xi = (0, \frac{1}{r})$  for  $x^2 + y^2 > 1$  and  $x \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . Each  $\Gamma_r$ -preserving automorphism gives a corresponding map  $\hat{\phi}$ , which maps  $(0, \frac{1}{r})$  to a vector in  $(\frac{2}{r}\mathbb{Z}, \frac{1}{r}\mathbb{Z})$ . Thus there is a contradiction for  $(\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})$ .

Altogether, we verified that the  $\xi_0$  from the list, which we refer to a lattice  $L(\xi)$  in  $\text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, \lambda B_{x,y})$ , where  $\lambda = \pi + 2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_1$ , is uniquely determined.

Now, we consider the case that  $\lambda = 2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , and get the same contradiction. But, first of all, we note that  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\tilde{\xi}$  are equivalent if and only if there are  $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  and an integer matrix

$$S \in \left\{ e^{tB}, e^{tB} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

with  $\det S = \mu$ , such that  $\tilde{\xi} = \mu S\xi + t_1 e_1 + t_2 e_2$ .

So it suffices to fix a  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  for each integer matrix  $S \in \left\{ e^{tB}, e^{tB} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$  and each  $\xi$ , such that  $\mu S\xi + t_1 e_1 + t_2 e_2 \in [0, 1]^2$  and show that  $\mu S\xi + t_1 e_1 + t_2 e_2$  is equal to  $\xi$  or not an element in the set from the list.

We consider the case that  $(x, y) = (0, 1)$ . Note that  $\pm E_2$ ,  $\pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $\pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  are the only integer matrices in  $\left\{ e^{tB}, e^{tB} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2x \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \mid t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$  for this case.

We will denote by  $M$  the set  $M := \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \mid 0 \leq k \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2} \right\}$  and set  $\xi = \left( \frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \in M$ .

- If  $S = E_2$ , then  $S\xi = \xi$ .
- Let  $S = -E_2$ . For the cases that  $k = l = 0$ ,  $k = l = \frac{r}{2}$ , or  $k = 0$  and  $l = \frac{r}{2}$ , we get  $S\xi = \xi$ ,  $S\xi + e_1 + e_2 = \xi$  or  $S\xi + e_1 = \xi$  respectively. If  $0 < k, l < \frac{r}{2}$ , then  $S\xi + e_1 + e_2 = \left( \frac{r-k}{r}, \frac{r-l}{r} \right) \in [0, 1]^2$ , but  $\frac{r-k}{r} > \frac{r}{2}$ . At last, if  $k = 0$  and  $0 < l < \frac{r}{2}$ , then  $S\xi + e_1 = \left( 0, \frac{r-l}{r} \right) \in [0, 1]^2$ , but  $\frac{r-l}{r} > \frac{r}{2}$ .
- Let  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . First of all, we see that  $S\xi + e_1 = \xi$ , respectively  $S\xi = \xi$  for  $k = l = \frac{r}{2}$  or  $k = l = 0$ . If  $l \notin \{0, \frac{r}{2}\}$ , then  $S\xi + e_1 = \left( \frac{r-l}{r}, \frac{k}{r} \right) \in [0, 1]^2$ , but  $\frac{r-l}{r} > \frac{1}{2}$ . If  $l = \frac{r}{2}$  and  $k < \frac{r}{2}$ , then  $S\xi + e_1 = \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k}{r} \right) \in [0, 1]^2$ , but  $\frac{k}{r} < \frac{1}{2}$ .
- Similar arguments apply to the case  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .
- Let  $S = -\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . It follows that  $-S\xi = \left( \frac{l}{r}, \frac{k}{r} \right) \in [0, 1]^2$ . Hence, we get  $\left( \frac{l}{r}, \frac{k}{r} \right) \notin M$  for  $k < l$ , and  $-S\xi = \xi$ , for  $k = l$ .
- Let  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . We see again that  $-S\xi = \xi$  for  $k = l = 0$ . If  $k = 0$  and  $l > 0$ , then  $-S\xi + e_1 \in [0, 1]^2$ , but  $\frac{r-l}{r} > 0$ . For  $k, l \neq 0$  we get  $-S\xi + e_1 + e_2 = \left( \frac{r-l}{r}, \frac{r-k}{r} \right) \in [0, 1]^2$ . If, additionally,  $k < \frac{r}{2}$ , then  $\frac{r-k}{r} > \frac{r}{2}$ . If, however,  $k = l = \frac{r}{2}$ , then  $\left( \frac{r-l}{r}, \frac{r-k}{r} \right) = \xi$ .
- Let  $S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ . If  $k \notin \{0, \frac{r}{2}\}$ , then  $-S\xi + e_1 = \left( \frac{r-k}{r}, \frac{l}{r} \right) \in [0, 1]^2$ , but  $\frac{r-k}{r} > \frac{r}{2}$ . If  $k = l = \frac{r}{2}$ , then  $-S\xi + e_1 = \xi$  and if  $k = 0$ , then  $-S\xi = \xi$ .



### 3. Lattices

- The same reasoning applies to the case  $S = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

Finally, for  $(x, y) = (0, 1)$  it follows that  $(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r}) \in M$  and  $(\frac{k'}{r}, \frac{l'}{r}) \in M$  are equivalent, if and only if  $k = k'$  and  $l = l'$ .

The rest of the case  $\lambda = 2\pi k$  runs as before.

For  $\lambda = \lambda_0 + k\pi$ , where  $\lambda_0 \in \{\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{2\pi}{3}\}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we use some other way to prove the assertion. First of all we begin with a definition.

**3.7 Definition.** A group, generated by four elements  $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$  is called O-lattice, if:

- There is an  $r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , such that  $\alpha\beta\alpha^{-1}\beta^{-1} = \gamma^r$ .
- There is a  $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ , such that  $\delta^k$  and  $\gamma$  generate the center of the group and
- $\delta\alpha\delta^{-1}$  and  $\delta\beta\delta^{-1}$  are both elements of  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$ .

It is not hard to see that the computed lattices of  $Osc_1(\omega_r, \lambda B_{x,y})$ , where  $\lambda \neq k\pi$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy Definition 3.7.

Standard arguments yield the following lemma.

**3.8 Lemma.** Let  $G$  be an O-lattice as in Definition 3.7,  $H$  a group and  $\tilde{\varphi} : \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\} \rightarrow H$  a map. The map  $\varphi : G \rightarrow H$ , defined by

$$\varphi(\alpha^x \beta^y \gamma^z \delta^t) = \tilde{\varphi}(\alpha)^x \tilde{\varphi}(\beta)^y \tilde{\varphi}(\gamma)^z \tilde{\varphi}(\delta)^t$$

for all  $x, y, z, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , is a homomorphism, if and only if:

- $\varphi(\delta)\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\delta)^{-1} = \varphi(\delta\alpha\delta^{-1})$ ,
- $\varphi(\delta)\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\delta)^{-1} = \varphi(\delta\beta\delta^{-1})$ ,
- $\varphi(\gamma)$  is an element of the center of  $H$  and
- $\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\alpha)^{-1}\varphi(\beta)^{-1} = \varphi(\gamma)^r$ .

**3.9 Remark.** Let  $G$  be an O-lattice as in Definition 3.7. Let, furthermore,  $H$  be an O-lattice, generated by  $\{\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\delta}\}$ , where  $\tilde{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{\delta}^l$  generate the center of  $H$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}\tilde{\alpha}^{-1}\tilde{\beta}^{-1} = \tilde{\gamma}^s$ . Let  $\varphi : G \rightarrow H$  be an isomorphism. Then  $\varphi(\gamma) = \tilde{\gamma}^{\pm 1}$ . To see this, note that  $\varphi(\gamma) \in \langle \tilde{\gamma} \rangle$ , since  $\gamma$  is in the center of  $G$  and  $\gamma^r$  in the commutator subgroup. Then using the bijectivity of  $\varphi$  yields the assertion. Furthermore,  $\varphi(\delta^k) = \tilde{\gamma}^p \tilde{\delta}^{\pm l}$  for some  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Indeed, since  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism, there are  $p, q, u, v \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that  $\varphi(\delta^k) = \tilde{\gamma}^p \tilde{\delta}^{ul}$  and  $\varphi(\gamma^q \delta^{vk}) = \tilde{\delta}^l$ . So we get  $\delta^k = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\delta^k)) = \gamma^{qu \pm p} \delta^{u \pm vk}$  and the assertion holds. In addition, it is straight forward to see that  $\varphi$  maps  $\delta$  to  $\tilde{\alpha}^x \tilde{\beta}^y \tilde{\gamma}^z \tilde{\delta}^{\pm 1}$  for some  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$  and that  $k = l$ .

**3.10 Lemma.** For a fixed  $B = \lambda B_{0,1}$ , where  $\cos \lambda = 0$  and an even  $r$ , the lattices  $L(\xi)$  and  $L(\tilde{\xi})$  of  $Osc_1(\omega_r, B)$ , where  $\xi \neq \tilde{\xi}$  from the list, are not isomorphic as abstract groups.

### 3. Lattices

*Proof.* We first prove the assertion for  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\pi + 2\pi k$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We set  $\alpha := (0, e_1, 0)$ ,  $\beta := (0, e_2, 0)$ ,  $\gamma := (1, 0, 0)$ ,  $\delta_0 := (0, 0, 1)$  and  $\delta_1 := (0, (\frac{1}{r}, 0), 1)$ . Using equation (2) and  $e^B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  we get

$$\delta_0 \alpha \delta_0^{-1} = \beta, \quad \delta_0 \beta \delta_0^{-1} = \alpha^{-1}, \quad \delta_1 \alpha \delta_1^{-1} = \beta \gamma, \quad \delta_1 \beta \delta_1^{-1} = \alpha^{-1}.$$

Suppose that there is an isomorphism  $\varphi$  from  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_0 \rangle$  onto  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_1 \rangle$ . Then  $\varphi(\delta_0) = \alpha^x \beta^y \gamma^z \delta_1^{\pm 1}$  for some  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Furthermore  $\varphi(\alpha) = \alpha^{n_1} \beta^{n_2} \gamma^{n_3}$  for some  $n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , since  $\varphi(\delta_0)^2 \varphi(\alpha) \varphi(\delta_0)^{-2} = \varphi(\alpha)^{-1}$  and  $\delta_1 \eta \delta_1^{-1} \in \langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$  for every  $\eta \in \langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$ . On the same way, we get that  $\varphi(\beta) = \alpha^{n'_1} \beta^{n'_2} \gamma^{n'_3}$  for some  $n'_1, n'_2, n'_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Let  $\varphi(\delta_0) = \alpha^x \beta^y \gamma^z \delta_1^1$  (similar arguments apply to the case  $\varphi(\delta_0) = \alpha^x \beta^y \gamma^z \delta_1^{-1}$ ). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{n'_1} \beta^{n'_2} \gamma^{n'_3} &= \varphi(\beta) = \varphi(\delta_0) \varphi(\alpha) \varphi(\delta_0)^{-1} \\ &= \alpha^{-n_2} \beta^{n_1} \gamma^{n_1+n_3+r\mathcal{O}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\mathcal{O}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Hence  $n'_1 = -n_2$ ,  $n'_2 = n_1$  and  $n'_3 = n_1 + n_3 + r\mathcal{O}_1$ . Similar computation for  $\varphi(\delta_0) \varphi(\beta) \varphi(\delta_0)^{-1}$  shows that  $-n_3 = n'_1 + n'_3 + r\mathcal{O}_2$ , for some  $\mathcal{O}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Hence  $-n_2 + n'_3 + n_3$  and  $n_1 + n_3 - n'_3$  are even. Thus  $n_1 + n_2$  is even. This contradicts the bijectivity of  $\varphi$ . So there is no isomorphism.

We consider the second case now. For  $B = \lambda B_{0,1}$ ,  $\lambda = \frac{3}{2}\pi + 2\pi k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r$  even we set  $\tilde{\alpha} := (0, e_1, 0)$ ,  $\tilde{\beta} := (0, e_2, 0)$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma} := (1, 0, 0)$ ,  $\tilde{\delta}_0 := (0, 0, 1)$  and  $\tilde{\delta}_1 := (0, (0, \frac{1}{r}), 1)$ .

The maps defined by

$$\tilde{\alpha} \mapsto \alpha^{-1}, \quad \tilde{\beta} \mapsto \beta^{-1}, \quad \tilde{\gamma} \mapsto \gamma, \quad \tilde{\delta}_i \mapsto \delta_i^{-1}$$

are isomorphisms from the O-lattice  $\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\delta}_i \rangle$  onto  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_i \rangle$  for  $i = 0, 1$ . Hence, the lemma follows, by using the first case of the proof.  $\square$

**3.11 Lemma.** For a fixed  $B = \lambda B_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}}$ , where  $\cos \lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$  and an  $r$  divisible by 6, the lattices  $L(\xi)$  and  $L(\tilde{\xi})$  of  $\text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, B)$ , where  $\xi \neq \tilde{\xi}$  from the list, are not isomorphic as abstract groups.

*Proof.* We subdivide the proof into two parts and argue as in the proof of the previous lemma.

At first let  $B = \lambda B_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}}$ , where  $\cos \lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\sin \lambda = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$  and let  $r$  be divisible by 6. We set  $\alpha := (0, e_1, 0)$ ,  $\beta := (0, e_2, 0)$ ,  $\gamma := (1, 0, 0)$ ,  $\delta_0 := (0, 0, 1)$  and  $\delta_1 := (0, (\frac{1}{r}, 0), 1)$ . Using equation (2) and  $e^B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$  gives:

$$\delta_0 \alpha \delta_0^{-1} = \beta, \quad \delta_0 \beta \delta_0^{-1} = \alpha^{-1} \beta^{-1} \gamma^{-\frac{r}{2}}, \quad \delta_1 \alpha \delta_1^{-1} = \beta \gamma, \quad \delta_1 \beta \delta_1^{-1} = \alpha^{-1} \beta^{-1} \gamma^{-\frac{r}{2}-1}.$$

Suppose that there is an isomorphism  $\varphi$  from  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_0 \rangle$  onto  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_1 \rangle$ .

Then  $\varphi(\delta_0) \varphi(\alpha) \varphi(\delta_0)^{-1} = \varphi(\delta_0 \alpha \delta_0^{-1}) = \varphi(\beta)$ .

Let  $\varphi(\delta_0) = \alpha^x \beta^y \gamma^z \delta_1^1$  (The case  $\varphi(\delta_0) = \alpha^x \beta^y \gamma^z \delta_1^{-1}$  runs similar).

### 3. Lattices

Since  $\delta_0 \eta \delta_0^{-1} \in \langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$  for all  $\eta \in \langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$ , one can check that  $\varphi(\alpha) = \alpha^{m_1} \beta^{m_2} \gamma^{m_3}$  for some  $m_1, m_2, m_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\beta) &= \varphi(\delta_0) \varphi(\alpha) \varphi(\delta_0^{-1}) \\ &= \alpha^{-m_2} \beta^{m_1 - m_2} \gamma^{m_1 + m_2(-r/2 - 1) + m_3 + r\mathcal{O}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Furthermore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^{\pm r} &= \varphi(\alpha) \varphi(\beta) \varphi(\alpha)^{-1} \varphi(\beta)^{-1} \\ &= \gamma^{r(m_1^2 - m_1 m_2 + m_2^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\varphi(\gamma) = \gamma$  and  $(m_1, m_2) \in \{(1, 0), (-1, 0), (0, 1), (0, -1), (1, 1), (-1, -1)\}$ .

In addition

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha^{m_2 - m_1} \beta^{-m_1} \gamma^{-m_1 - m_2(-\frac{r}{2} - 1) - 2m_3 - \frac{r}{2} + r\mathcal{O}_3} \\ &= \varphi(\alpha)^{-1} \varphi(\beta)^{-1} \varphi(\gamma)^{-\frac{r}{2}} \\ &= \varphi(\delta_0) \varphi(\beta) \varphi(\delta_0)^{-1} \\ &= \alpha^x \beta^y \gamma^z \alpha^{-m_2} \beta^{m_1 - m_2} \gamma^{m_1 + m_2(-\frac{r}{2} - 1) + m_3 + r\mathcal{O}_1} \delta_1^{-1} \beta^{-y} \alpha^{-x} \\ &= \alpha^{m_2 - m_1} \beta^{-m_1} \gamma^{-m_2 - \frac{r}{2} m_1 + m_3 + r\mathcal{O}_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_2, \mathcal{O}_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus  $3m_3 = \frac{r}{2}m_1 - m_1 + \frac{r}{2}m_2 + 2m_2 - \frac{r}{2} + r\mathcal{O}_4$ , for some  $\mathcal{O}_4 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $m_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the term  $-m_1 + 2m_2$  must be divisible by 3.

But, contrarily, for  $(m_1, m_2) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (-1, 0), (0, -1), (1, 1), (-1, -1)\}$  it follows that  $2m_2 - m_1$  is not divisible by 3. Finally, the first case is shown.

For the second case let  $\sin \lambda = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ . We set  $\tilde{\alpha} := (0, e_1, 0)$ ,  $\tilde{\beta} := (0, e_2, 0)$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma} := (1, 0, 0)$ ,  $\tilde{\delta}_0 := (0, 0, 1)$  and  $\tilde{\delta}_1 = (0, (0, \frac{1}{r}), 1)$ . The maps defined by

$$\tilde{\alpha} \mapsto \beta, \quad \tilde{\beta} \mapsto \alpha, \quad \tilde{\gamma} \mapsto \gamma^{-1}, \quad \tilde{\delta}_i \mapsto \delta_i$$

are isomorphisms from the O-lattice  $\{\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\delta}_i\}$  onto  $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta_i\}$  for  $i = 0, 1$ . Using the first part brings the assertion.  $\square$

**3.12 Lemma.** For a fixed  $B = \lambda B_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}}$  where  $\cos \lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$  and an odd  $r$  divisible by 3, the lattices  $L(\xi)$  and  $L(\tilde{\xi})$  of  $\text{Osc}_1(\omega_r, B)$ , where  $\xi \neq \tilde{\xi}$  from the list, are not isomorphic as abstract groups.

*Proof.* This follows by the same method as in Lemma 3.11.  $\square$

Finally, Theorem 4 is verified.  $\square$

A. List of  $\xi_0$

A. List of  $\xi_0$

$\lambda$	$x, y$	$\xi_0$ for an even $r$	$\xi_0$ for an odd $r$
$\frac{1}{3}\pi + 2\pi k$	$x = \frac{1}{2}, y = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$	$\{(0, 0)\}$	$\{(\frac{1}{2r}, 0)\}$
$\frac{5}{3}\pi + 2\pi k$	$x = \frac{1}{2}, y = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$	$\{(0, 0)\}$	$\{(0, \frac{1}{2r})\}$
$\frac{1}{2}\pi + 2\pi k$	$x = 0, y = 1$	$\{(0, 0), (0, \frac{1}{r})\}$	$\{(0, 0)\}$
$\frac{3}{2}\pi + 2\pi k$	$x = 0, y = 1$	$\{(0, 0), (0, \frac{1}{r})\}$	$\{(0, 0)\}$
$\frac{2}{3}\pi + 2\pi k$	$x = \frac{1}{2}, y = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$	$r \equiv 0(3): \{(0, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, 0)\}$ else: $\{(0, 0)\}$	$r \equiv 0(3): \{(0, \frac{1}{2r}), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{2r})\}$ else: $\{(0, \frac{1}{2r})\}$
$\frac{4}{3}\pi + 2\pi k$	$x = \frac{1}{2}, y = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$	$r \equiv 0(3): \{(0, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, 0)\}$ else: $\{(0, 0)\}$	$r \equiv 0(3): \{(\frac{1}{2r}, 0), (\frac{1}{2r} + \frac{1}{r}, 0)\}$ else: $\{(\frac{1}{2r}, 0)\}$
$\pi + 2\pi k$	$x^2 + y^2 > 1,$ $x \neq \frac{1}{2}$	$\{(0, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, 0), (0, \frac{1}{r}), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})\}$	$\{(0, 0)\}$
	$x^2 + y^2 > 1,$ $x = \frac{1}{2}$	$\{(0, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})\}$	
	$x^2 + y^2 = 1,$ $x \neq \frac{1}{2}$	$\{(0, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})\}$	
	$x = \frac{1}{2}, y = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$	$\{(0, 0), (\frac{1}{r}, \frac{1}{r})\}$	
$2\pi k$	$x^2 + y^2 > 1$ $x \notin \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$	$\{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 \leq k, l \leq \frac{r}{2}\} \cup \{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 < k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r\}$	
	$x^2 + y^2 > 1$ $x = 0$	$\{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 \leq k, l \leq \frac{r}{2}\}$	
	$x^2 + y^2 > 1$ $x = \frac{1}{2}$	$\{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 \leq k \leq \frac{r}{2} \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2}\} \cup \{(\frac{k}{r}, 0)   0 \leq k \leq \frac{r}{2}\} \cup \{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r, k \leq \frac{l}{2}\}$	
	$x^2 + y^2 = 1$ $x \notin \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$	$\{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 \leq k \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2}\} \cup \{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 < k < \frac{r}{2} < l < r, k + l \leq r\}$	
	$x = 0, y = 1$	$\{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 \leq k \leq l \leq \frac{r}{2}\}$	
	$x = \frac{1}{2}, y = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$	$\{(\frac{k}{r}, \frac{l}{r})   0 \leq 2k \leq l \leq \frac{k+r}{2}\}$	

## References

- [Koe98] Koecher, M; Krieg, A. *Elliptische Funktionen und Modulformen*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1998.
- [Med85] Medina, A.; Revoy, P. "Les groupes oscillateurs et leurs reseaux". In: *Manuscripta Mathematica* 52 (1985), pp. 81–95.
- [Rag72] Raghunathan, M. S. *Discrete Subgroups of Lie Groups*. Springer-Verlag New York Heidelberg Berlin, 1972.
- [Tol78] Tolimieri, R. "Heisenberg manifolds and theta functions". In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 239 (1978), pp. 293–319.