



INSTITUT DE FRANCE  
Académie des sciences

# *Comptes Rendus*

---

# *Mathématique*


Roland Bacher

**Euclid meets Popeye: The Euclidean Algorithm for  $2 \times 2$  Matrices**

Volume 361 (2023), p. 889-895

Published online: 18 July 2023

<https://doi.org/10.5802/crmath.451>

 This article is licensed under the  
CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION 4.0 INTERNATIONAL LICENSE.  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



*Les Comptes Rendus. Mathématique* sont membres du  
Centre Mersenne pour l'édition scientifique ouverte  
[www.centre-mersenne.org](http://www.centre-mersenne.org)  
e-ISSN : 1778-3569



Number theory / *Théorie des nombres*

# Euclid meets Popeye: The Euclidean Algorithm for $2 \times 2$ Matrices

Roland Bacher<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Institut Fourier, 38000 Grenoble, France

E-mail: [roland.bacher@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr](mailto:roland.bacher@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr)

**Abstract.** An analogue of the Euclidean algorithm for square matrices of size 2 with integral non-negative entries and positive determinant  $n$  defines a finite set  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  of Euclid-reduced matrices corresponding to elements of  $\{(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{N}^4 \mid n = ab - cd, 0 \leq c, d < a, b\}$ . With Popeye's help<sup>1</sup> on the use of sails of lattices we show that  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  contains  $\sum_{d|n, d^2 \geq n} \left(d + 1 - \frac{n}{d}\right)$  elements.

**2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.** 11A05, 11H06, 11J70.

*Manuscript received 29 October 2022, revised 7 December 2022, accepted 29 November 2022.*

## 1. Introduction

We let  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  denote the set of all non-negative integers and we let  $\mathcal{P} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N}, ad - bc > 0 \right\}$  denote the set of all square matrices of size 2 with entries in  $\mathbb{N}$  and positive determinant. The subset of matrices of determinant  $n$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  is written as  $\mathcal{P}(n)$ .

An *elementary reduction* of a matrix  $M$  is a matrix which belongs to the set  $\{EM, E^t M, ME, ME^t\}$  where  $E = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Elementary reductions of  $M$  subtract a row/column from the other row/column of  $M$ .

A matrix  $M$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  is *Euclid-reduced* if and only if  $\mathcal{P}$  contains no elementary reduction of  $M$ . Equivalently,  $M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  is Euclid-reduced if  $\min(a, d) > \max(b, c)$ .

Euclid-reduced matrices are sort of a 2-dimensional analogue of the greatest common divisor computed by Euclid's algorithm: Given two natural integers  $A, B$ , replace  $\max(A, B)$  by  $\max(A, B) - \min(A, B)$  until  $AB = 0$ . Here we do the same with rows and columns of  $2 \times 2$ -matrices and we stop if we get negative entries.

We let  $\mathcal{R}$  denote the subset of Euclid-reduced matrices in  $\mathcal{P}$  and we let  $\mathcal{R}(n) = \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{P}(n)$  denote the subset of  $\mathcal{R}$  corresponding to Euclid-reduced matrices of determinant  $n$ .

The main result of this paper describes the number  $\#\mathcal{R}(n)$  of elements in the set  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  of Euclid-reduced matrices of determinant  $n$ :

<sup>1</sup>Acknowledged by his appearance in the title (he refused co-authorship on the flimsy pretext of a weak contribution due to a poor spinach-harvest).

**Theorem 1.** *The number of elements  $(a, b, c, d)$  in  $\mathbb{N}^4$  such that  $n = ab - cd$  and  $\min(a, b) > \max(c, d)$  is given by*

$$\sum_{d|n, d^2 \geq n} \left( d + 1 - \frac{n}{d} \right). \tag{1}$$

*The map  $(a, b, c, d) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ d & b \end{pmatrix}$  is a one-to-one correspondence between such solutions and elements in the set  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  of Euclid-reduced matrices having determinant  $n$ .*

**Remark 2.** The finite set occurring in Theorem 1 has two natural descriptions: In terms of matrices in  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  or as solutions of the Diophantine equation occurring at the beginning of Theorem 1. Natural notations for both descriptions are unfortunately somewhat incompatible. We have opted for the Diophantine viewpoint in Theorem 1 and in the sequel. This makes the coefficients of the associated matrices a bit awkward.

All summands occurring in (1) are positive and the last summand (corresponding to the trivial divisor  $d = n$  of  $n$ ) equals  $n$ . We have therefore  $\#\mathcal{R}(n) \geq n$  with equality for  $n > 1$  if and only if  $n$  is a prime number. Our proof of Theorem 1 shows that solutions associated with a prime number  $p$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the  $p$  sublattices of index  $p$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  which do not contain the vector  $(1, 1)$ .

Similarly,  $\#\mathcal{R}(n) = n + 1$  if and only if  $n = p^2$  is the square of prime number  $p$ .

Cardinalities of the sets  $\mathcal{R}(1), \mathcal{R}(2), \dots$  are given by the integer sequence

$$1, 2, 3, 5, 5, 8, 7, 11, 10, 14, 11, 19, 13, 20, 18, 24, 17, 30, 19, 31, \dots$$

defining sequence A357259 of the Online-Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences [4].

Klein's Vierergruppe  $\mathbb{V}$  (underlying the 2-dimensional vector space over the field of two elements) acts on solutions  $(a, b, c, d)$  by permuting the first two entries, the last two entries or the first two and the last two entries. We let  $\mathcal{O} = \{(a, b, c, d), (b, a, c, d), (a, b, d, c), (b, a, d, c)\}$  denote the orbit of a solution  $(a, b, c, d)$  under the action of  $\mathbb{V}$ . The following lists give lexicographically largest representants of all orbits for the sets of solutions associated with the prime numbers 11, 13 and 17:

$a \ b \ c \ d$	$\#\mathcal{O}$	$a \ b \ c \ d$	$\#\mathcal{O}$	$a \ b \ c \ d$	$\#\mathcal{O}$
11 1 0 0	2	13 1 0 0	2	17 1 0 0	2
6 2 1 1	2	7 2 1 1	2	9 2 1 1	2
4 3 1 1	2	5 3 2 1	4	5 4 3 1	4
5 3 2 2	2	4 4 3 1	2	7 3 2 2	2
5 4 3 3	2	5 5 4 3	2	5 5 4 2	2
6 6 5 5	1	7 7 6 6	1	7 6 5 5	2
	11		13		17

For  $n = 12, 14, 15$  we get

$$\#\mathcal{R}_{12} = (4 + 1 - 3) + (6 + 1 - 2) + (12 + 1 - 1) = 19,$$

$$\#\mathcal{R}_{14} = (7 + 1 - 2) + (14 + 1 - 1) = 20,$$

$$\#\mathcal{R}_{15} = (5 + 1 - 3) + (15 + 1 - 1) = 18.$$

The associated lexicographically largest solutions in orbits are given by

$a\ b\ c\ d$	$\#(\mathcal{O})$	$a\ b\ c\ d$	$\#(\mathcal{O})$	$a\ b\ c\ d$	$\#(\mathcal{O})$
12 1 0 0	2	14 1 0 0	2	15 1 0 0	2
6 2 0 0	2	7 2 0 0	2	5 3 0 0	2
6 2 1 0	4	7 2 1 0	4	5 3 1 0	4
4 3 0 0	2	5 3 1 1	2	5 3 2 0	4
4 3 1 0	4	4 4 2 1	2	8 2 1 1	2
4 3 2 0	4	6 3 2 2	2	4 4 1 1	1
4 4 2 2	1	5 4 3 2	4	6 4 3 3	2
	19		20		18

It is perhaps worthwhile to note that non-negative integral solutions of  $n = ab + cd$  with  $\min(a, b) > \max(c, d)$  are also interesting: For  $n = p$  an odd prime there are  $(p + 1)/2$  solutions. If  $p$  is congruent to 1 modulo 4, the number  $(p + 1)/2$  of such solutions is odd and the action of Klein's Vierergruppe has a fixed point expressing  $p$  as a sum of two squares, see [2].

The sequel of this paper is organized as follows:

Section 2 uses Moebius inversion in order to obtain the number of elements with coprime entries in  $\mathcal{R}(n)$ .

Section 3 recalls a well-known formula for the number of sublattices of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . We give an elementary proof.

Unless stated otherwise, a lattice is always a discrete subgroup isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  of the Cartesian coordinate plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$  considered as a vector space.

Section 4 describes the sail of a lattice  $\Lambda$  contained in the Cartesian coordinate plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Section 5 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.

Section 6 contains a few complements: An elementary proof for finiteness of the set  $\mathcal{R}(n)$ , a short discussion on matrices of larger size or of determinant 0. It ends with the description of a perhaps interesting variation over the ring of Gaußian integers.

## 2. Coprime solutions

We let  $\mathcal{R}'(n)$  denote the subset of  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  containing all Euclid-reduced matrices with coprime entries. Dividing all entries of matrices in  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  by their greatest common divisor, we get a bijection between  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  and the union  $\bigcup_{d, d^2|n} \mathcal{R}'(n/d^2)$  showing the identity  $\#(\mathcal{R}(n)) = \sum_{d, d^2|n} \#(\mathcal{R}'(n/d^2))$ . Moebius inversion of this identity yields now the formula

$$\#(\mathcal{R}'(n)) = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d) \#(\mathcal{R}(n/d^2)) \tag{2}$$

(where the Moebius function  $\mu$  is defined by  $\mu(n) = (-1)^e$  if  $n$  is a product of  $e$  distinct primes and  $\mu(n) = 0$  if  $n$  has a non-trivial square-divisor).

Observe that  $\mathcal{R}'(n) = \mathcal{R}(n)$  if and only if  $\mu(n) \neq 0$ .

Cardinalities of  $\mathcal{R}'(1), \mathcal{R}'(2), \dots$  yield the integer sequence

$$1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 7, 9, 9, 14, 11, 16, 13, 20, 18, 19, 17, 28, 19, 26, \dots$$

defining A357260 of [4].

## 3. Sublattices of finite index in $\mathbb{Z}^2$

The following well-known result (see Remark 4 below) is a crucial ingredient for proving Theorem 1. We give an elementary proof for the comfort of the reader.

**Theorem 3.** *The lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  has  $\sum_{d|n} d$  different sublattices of index  $n$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a sublattice of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . The order  $d$  of  $(1, 0)$  in the finite quotient group  $\mathbb{Z}^2/\Lambda$  is therefore a divisor of  $n$  and we have  $\Lambda \cap \mathbb{Z}(1, 0) = \mathbb{Z}(d, 0)$ . Hence there exists a unique element  $a$  in  $\{0, \dots, d - 1\}$  such that  $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}(d, 0) + \mathbb{Z}(a, n/d)$ . This shows that the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  has  $d$  different sublattices of index  $n$  intersecting  $\mathbb{Z}(1, 0)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}(d, 0)$  for every divisor  $d$  of  $n$ . Summing over all divisors yields the result.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** More generally, the number of sublattices of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  is given by

$$\prod_{p|n} \binom{e_p+d-1}{d-1}_p \tag{3}$$

(see e.g. [3] or [5]) where  $\prod_{p|n} p^{e_p} = n$  is the factorization of  $n$  into prime-powers and where

$$\binom{e_p+d-1}{d-1}_p = \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} \frac{p^{e_p+j} - 1}{p^j - 1}$$

is the evaluation of the  $q$ -binomial

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} e_p+d-1 \\ d-1 \end{matrix} \right]_q = \frac{[e_p + d - 1]_q!}{[e_p]_q! [d - 1]_q!}$$

(with  $[k]_q! = \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{q^j-1}{q-1}$ ) at the prime-divisor  $p$  of  $n$ .

Formula (3) boils of course down to  $\sum_{k,k|n} k$  if  $d = 2$ .

#### 4. The sail of a lattice

Sails of lattices in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , introduced and studied by V. Arnold, cf. e.g. [1], are a possible generalization of continued fraction expansions to higher dimension. We define and discuss here only the case  $d = 2$  corresponding to ordinary continued fractions.

We let  $Q_I = \{(x, y) | 0 \leq x, y\}$  denote the closed first quadrant containing all points with non-negative coordinates of the Cartesian coordinate plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

The *sail*  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$  of a lattice  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is the boundary with respect to the closed first quadrant  $Q_I$  of the convex hull of all non-zero elements  $(\Lambda \setminus (0, 0)) \cap Q_I$  of  $\Lambda$  contained in  $Q_I$ .

The sail  $\mathcal{S}$  of a lattice  $\Lambda$  is a piecewise linear path with vertices in  $\Lambda$  which intersects every 1-dimensional subspace of finite positive slope in a unique point. Affine pieces of sails have finite negative slopes. Any affine line intersecting a sail in two points has therefore finite negative slope.

Each coordinate axis intersects a sail either in a unique point (this happens if and only if the coordinate axis contains infinitely many points of the underlying lattice  $\Lambda$ ) or is an asymptote of the sail (if  $\Lambda$  contains no non-zero elements of the coordinate axis).

The sail  $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$  of a sublattice  $\Lambda$  of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is always bounded with endpoints  $(\alpha_x, 0), (0, \omega_y)$  for two divisors  $\alpha_x$  and  $\omega_y$  of  $n$  such that  $\alpha_x \omega_y \geq n$ .

Two distinct lattice elements  $u, v \in \Lambda$  on the sail  $S = \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$  of a lattice  $\Lambda$  are *consecutive* if the open segment joining  $u$  and  $v$  is contained in  $\mathcal{S} \setminus \Lambda$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Two distinct lattice elements  $u, v$  on the sail  $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \cap \Lambda$  of a lattice  $\Lambda$  generate  $\Lambda$  if and only if they are consecutive.*

**Proof.** Since all non-zero lattice points in  $Q_I$  belong to  $\mathcal{S}$  or to the unbounded convex region of  $Q_I \setminus \mathcal{S}$ , the closed triangle  $\Delta = \Delta(u, v)$  with vertices  $(0, 0), u, v$  contains no other element of  $\Lambda$  if and only if  $u$  and  $v$  are consecutive.

Pairs of consecutive points  $u, v$  generate  $\Lambda$  since  $\Delta \cup (-\Delta)$  is a fundamental domain for the lattice spanned by  $u$  and  $v$ .  $\square$

A *sailbasis* of a lattice  $\Lambda$  is a basis of  $\Lambda$  consisting of two consecutive elements in the sail  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\Lambda$ . Every lattice has a sailbasis.

Two linearly independent elements  $u, v$  in the first quadrant  $Q_1$  form a sailbasis of the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}u + \mathbb{Z}v$  generated by  $u$  and  $v$  if and only if the affine line containing  $u$  and  $v$  has finite negative slope.

**Remark 6.** Sails are generalisations of continued fractions: Given a real number  $\theta$ , vertices of the sail for the lattice  $e^{-i \arctan(\theta)}(\mathbb{Z} + i\mathbb{Z})$  correspond essentially to convergents of  $\theta$ , see for example [1].

### 5. Proof of Theorem 1

A sailbasis  $u, v$  of a lattice is *central* if the open segment joining  $u$  and  $v$  intersects the diagonal line  $x = y$ . The two elements of a central sailbasis belong therefore to different connected components of  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}(1, 1)$ . Every lattice has at most one central sailbasis.

A lattice  $\Lambda$  is *bad* if it has no central sailbasis. Equivalently, a lattice is bad if its sail  $\mathcal{S}$  intersects the set  $\Lambda \cap \mathbb{R}(1, 1)$  of diagonal lattice-elements.

A sailbasis  $u, v$  of a bad lattice  $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}u + \mathbb{Z}v$  is *normalized* if  $u$  in  $\mathbb{R}(1, 1)$  is a diagonal element and  $v$  belongs to the open halfplane  $\{(x, y) \mid x > y\}$  below the diagonal line. Lemma 5 shows that a bad lattice  $\Lambda$  has a unique normalized sailbasis given by  $u = \mathcal{S} \cap \mathbb{R}(1, 1)$  and by the unique consecutive element  $v$  in  $\mathcal{S} \cap \Lambda$  of  $u$  which lies below the diagonal line  $x = y$ .

**Proposition 7.** *The lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  contains*

$$\sum_{d, d^2 < n, d|n} d + \sum_{d, d^2 \geq n, d|n} (n/d - 1)$$

*bad sublattices of index  $n$ .*

**Proof.** Bad lattices are in one-to-one correspondence with their normalized sailbases. We count them by adapting the proof of Theorem 3.

Let  $u = (d, d)$  in  $\Lambda \cap \mathcal{S}$  be the diagonal element of a normalized sailbasis  $u, v$  generating a bad sublattice  $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}u + \mathbb{Z}v$  of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . The image of the element  $(1, 1)$  in the quotient group  $\mathbb{Z}^2 / \Lambda$  is therefore of order  $d$  dividing  $n$ . Since  $u, v$  is a sailbasis, the coefficients  $v_x, v_y$  of the remaining basis element  $v = (v_x, v_y)$  satisfy the inequalities  $0 \leq v_y < d < v_x$ . Since  $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}u + \mathbb{Z}v$  is a sublattice of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , the element  $v$  of  $\mathbb{N}^2$  belongs to the line  $(n/d, 0) + \mathbb{R}(1, 1)$ . We have therefore  $v = (n/d + a, a)$  for a suitable non-negative integer  $a$ .

If  $d < \sqrt{n}$ , the trivial inequalities  $d < n/d \leq n/d + a = v_x$  imply  $v_x > d$  for all choices of  $a$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ . The inequality  $v_y < d$  implies that  $a = v_y$  belongs to the set  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, d - 1\}$  of the  $d$  smallest non-negative integers. For every divisor  $d < \sqrt{n}$  there are therefore  $d$  bad sublattices of index  $n$  containing  $(d, d)$  in their sail.

If  $d$  is a divisor of  $n$  such that  $d \geq \sqrt{n}$ , the inequality  $d < v_x = n/d + a$  implies  $a \geq d - n/d + 1 \geq 0$ . We have also  $a = v_y < d$ . This shows that  $a$  belongs to the set  $\{d - n/d + 1, d - n/d + 2, \dots, d - 1\}$  containing  $n/d - 1$  elements.

Summing over all contributions given by divisors of  $n$  ends the proof. □

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Solutions of  $ab - cd = n$  with  $\min(a, b) > \max(c, d)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with central sailbases  $(a, d), (d, b)$  generating sublattices of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . The number of elements in  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  is therefore obtained by subtracting the number  $\sum_{d, d^2 < n, d|n} d + \sum_{d, d^2 \geq n, d|n} (n/d - 1)$  of bad lattices of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  given by Proposition 7 from the total number  $\sum_{d, d|n} d$  of lattices of index  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  given by Theorem 3. Simplification yields the result. □

## 6. Complements

### 6.1. Finiteness

We discuss in this Section a few finiteness properties of Euclid-reduced sets.

First, we give an elementary proof of finiteness for the number of Euclid-reduced matrices in  $\mathcal{P}$  of fixed positive determinant which does not make use of Theorem 1.

We consider then briefly the case of square matrices of size larger than 2 and of square matrices of size two with determinant 0.

### 6.2. An easy bound on entries of Euclid-reduced matrices

**Proposition 8.** *Matrices in  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  involve only entries in  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ .*

**Corollary 9.** *There are at most  $(n + 1)^4$  matrices in the set  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  of Euclid-reduced matrices of determinant  $n$ .*

We leave the obvious proof of the Corollary to the reader.

**Proof of Proposition 8.** Let  $n = ab - cd$  with  $\min(a, b) > \max(c, d)$  be a solution corresponding to the Euclid-reduced matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ d & b \end{pmatrix}$  with  $\max(a, b)$  maximal among entries occurring in elements of  $\mathcal{R}(1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(n)$ . Up to exchanging  $a$  and  $b$  we can suppose that  $a \geq b$ . Since  $n = ab - cd \geq ab - (b - 1)^2 > 0$  we can assume  $c = d = b - 1$ . Restricting  $ax - (x - 1)^2$  to  $x$  in  $[1, \dots, a]$  we can furthermore assume either  $x = 1$  or  $x = a$ . In the first case we get  $n \geq a \cdot 1 - 0^2 = a$  and in the second case we get  $n \geq a^2 - (a - 1)^2 = 2a - 1$  showing the inequality  $\max(a, b) = a \leq n$  in both cases.  $\square$

### 6.3. Finiteness for size larger than two

Euclidean reduction for square matrices of size 2 has an obvious generalization to square matrices of arbitrary size with coefficients in  $\mathbb{N}$ : Subtract (if possible) a different row or column from a given row or column. This leads in general to infinite sets of matrices of given positive determinant which have no further reductions: The matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 4+x & 2+x & 1+x \\ x & 1+x & 3+x \\ 1+x & 1+x & 2+x \end{pmatrix}$  has determinant 1 and is “Euclid-reduced” for any natural integer  $x$ .

### 6.4. Finiteness for determinant zero

All square matrices of size two with (at least) three zero entries and an arbitrary entry in  $\mathbb{N}$  are Euclid-reduced and every Euclid-reduced matrix with determinant 0 and entries in  $\mathbb{N}$  is of this form: If a matrix  $M$  (of square size two with entries in  $\mathbb{N}$  has determinant 0 then its rows (or columns) are linearly dependent. Subtracting the smaller row iteratively from the larger one we end up with a matrix having a zero-row. Working with columns we get finally a matrix having a unique non-zero entry.

Requiring the entries of such a matrix to have a given non-zero greatest divisor ensures uniqueness up to the location of the non-zero entry. There are therefore exactly four Euclid-reduced matrices (of square size 2) with determinant 0 and greatest common divisor of entries a given positive integer  $d \geq 1$ .

### 6.5. *Gaußian integers*

We discuss briefly an analogue of  $\mathcal{R}(n)$  over the ring of Gaußian integers (the case of integers in an imaginary quadratic number field is probably similar).

Given a non-zero Gaußian integer  $z$ , we define the set  $\mathcal{S}(z)$  containing all solutions of  $ab + cd = z$  satisfying  $\min(|a|, |b|) > \max(|c|, |d|)$  with  $a, b, c, d$  in the set  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  of Gaußian integers.

The two identities

$$2m + 1 = (2n + (2n^2 - m - 1)i)(2n - (2n^2 - m - 1)i) - (2n^2 - m)^2$$

and

$$2m = (2n + 1 + (2n^2 + 2n - m)i)(2n + 1 - (2n^2 + 2n - m)i) - (2n^2 + 2n - m + 1)^2$$

show that the sets  $\mathcal{S}(z)$  are always infinite for  $z \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ .

More generally,  $\mathcal{S}(z)$  is infinite for every Gaußian integer  $z$  of the form  $z = nu^2$  for  $n$  in  $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  a sum of two squares (i.e. containing no odd power of a prime congruent to 3 modulo 4 in its prime-factorization) and for  $u \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \setminus \{0\}$  an arbitrary non-zero Gaußian integer.

Solutions can be fairly large as shown by the identity

$$2 + 3i = -(7 - 18)^2 + (3 + 19i)(-15 + 12i)$$

contributing to  $\mathcal{S}(2 + 3i)$  which has seemingly only finitely many elements.

There are obvious bijections between  $\mathcal{S}(z), \mathcal{S}(\bar{z}), \mathcal{S}(-z), \mathcal{S}(\pm iz)$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{S}(z)$  infinite implies  $\mathcal{S}(s\bar{s}t^2z)$  infinite for non-zero Gaußian integers  $s, t$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[i] \setminus \{0\}$ .

### References

- [1] V. I. Arnol'd, "Higher dimensional continued fractions", *Regul. Chaotic Dyn.* **3** (1998), no. 3, p. 10-17.
- [2] R. Bacher, "A Quixotic Proof of Fermat's Two Squares Theorem for Prime Numbers", to appear in *Am. Math. Mon.*
- [3] B. Gruber, "Alternative formulae for the number of sublattices", *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A* **53** (1997), no. 6, p. 807-808.
- [4] N. J. A. Sloane, "The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences", 2010, <http://oeis.org>.
- [5] Y. M. Zou, "Gaussian binomials and the number of sublattices", *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A* **62** (2006), no. 5, p. 409-410.