Binary forms with the same value set III. The case of D_3 and D_6

Étienne Fouvry^{*1} and Peter Koymans^{†2}

¹Université Paris–Saclay ²ETH Zurich

April 30, 2024

Abstract

Let $F, G \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ be binary forms of degree ≥ 3 with automorphism groups isomorphic to the dihedral group of cardinality 6 or 12. We characterize exactly when F and G have the same value set, that is when F and G satisfy $F(\mathbb{Z}^2) = G(\mathbb{Z}^2)$.

1 Introduction

We continue the study initiated in [1] and [2] to characterize pairs (F, G) of binary forms in $\mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ of degree $d \geq 3$, with integral coefficients, such that $F(\mathbb{Z}^2) = G(\mathbb{Z}^2)$, but which are not $\operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ -equivalent. To be more precise, let $d \geq 3$ be a fixed integer and let $\operatorname{Bin}(d, \mathbb{Q})$ be the set of binary forms with rational coefficients and non-zero discriminant. If the matrix

$$\gamma := \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

belongs to $\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Q})$ and if F = F(X,Y) is an element of $\operatorname{Bin}(d,\mathbb{Q})$, we denote by $F \circ \gamma$ the form $(F \circ \gamma)(X,Y) := F(aX + bY, cX + dY)$. We say that the forms F and G are $\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ equivalent when there exists $\gamma \in \operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ such that $F \circ \gamma = G$, and we use the notation $F \sim_{\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} G$ in that case. Of course, we have the implication

$$F \sim_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} G \Longrightarrow F \sim_{\mathrm{val}} G,$$

where, by definition, $F \sim_{\text{val}} G$ if and only if $F(\mathbb{Z}^2) = G(\mathbb{Z}^2)$. Here we defined $F(\mathbb{Z}^2) = \{F(x,y) : (x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}.$

We are interested in the existence and in the characterization of pairs of *extraordinary* forms (F, G), which by definition are two forms F and G satisfying the two properties

$$F(\mathbb{Z}^2) = G(\mathbb{Z}^2)$$
 and $F \not\sim_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} G$.

^{*}CNRS, Laboratoire de mathématiques d'Orsay, Université Paris–Saclay, 91405 Orsay, France, etienne.
fouvry@universite-paris-saclay.fr

[†]Institute for Theoretical Studies, ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland, peter.koymans@eth-its.ethz.ch

In this case we say that F and G are *linked*. The characterization of an extraordinary form F deeply depends on the group of automorphisms of F defined by

$$\operatorname{Aut}(F, \mathbb{Q}) := \{ \gamma \in \operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Q}) : F \circ \gamma = F \}.$$

Up to $\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Q})$ -conjugation, there are ten possibilities for $\operatorname{Aut}(F,\mathbb{Q})$. With the notations of [5, Table 1], these ten subgroups of $\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Q})$ are

 $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_6, D_1, D_2, D_3, D_4, D_6.$

The case of the first seven subgroups was treated in [1] and the case of \mathbf{D}_4 was solved in [2]. In this paper, we finish the study of value sets by investigating the case of \mathbf{D}_3 and \mathbf{D}_6 . These subgroups have cardinalities 6 and 12 and are generated by two matrices. Setting

$$S := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } R := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

we have $\mathbf{D}_3 = \langle S, R \rangle$ and $\mathbf{D}_6 = \langle S, -R \rangle$. Explicitly, we have

$$\mathbf{D}_3 = \{ \text{id}, R, R^2, S, SR, SR^2 \},$$
(1.1)

and

$$\mathbf{D}_6 = \mathbf{D}_3 \cup (-\mathbf{D}_3).$$

For instance, the cubic form

$$F_0(X,Y) := XY(X+Y)$$
 (1.2)

satisfies the equality $\operatorname{Aut}(F_0, \mathbb{Q}) = \mathbf{D}_3$. The sextic form

$$F_{a,c} := aX^6 - 3aX^5Y + cX^4Y^2 + (5a - 2c)X^3Y^3 + cX^2Y^4 - 3aXY^5 + aY^6,$$
(1.3)

where a and c are integers such that disc $F_{a,c} \neq 0$, is stable by \mathbf{D}_6 (see [4, p. 818] for more details). To follow the notation introduced in [1, §1.1], we write (C3) for the condition

(C3): Aut (F, \mathbb{Q}) is $GL(2, \mathbb{Q})$ -conjugate with \mathbf{D}_3 or \mathbf{D}_6 .

The following statement gives an efficient way to detect extraordinary forms.

Corollary 1.1. Let $d \ge 3$. Suppose that $F \in Bin(d, \mathbb{Q})$ satisfies the condition (C3). Then F is extraordinary if and only if $Aut(F, \mathbb{Q})$ contains an element

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

with the following properties

- 1. the order of σ is equal to 3,
- 2. the quadruple (a, b, c, d) of rational numbers satisfies one of the four properties
 - (a) $(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$,
 - (b) $(a,d) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $(b,c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2})$,
 - (c) $(a,d) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $(b,c) \in (\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}) \times \mathbb{Z}$,

(d) $(a, b, c, d) \in \left(\mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}\right)^4$.

As announced in [1, Theorem B], this corollary is the analogue of [1, Corollary 1.2], but its proof below will contain more difficulties to solve. This is due to the complexity of the groups of automorphisms of F which now are \mathbf{D}_3 and \mathbf{D}_6 . This new situation leads to more intricate combinatorial problems of covering \mathbb{Z}^2 by lattices (see §3.3, particularly Lemmas 3.13 and 3.14). We solve these challenges by developing new algorithms to enumerate coverings of \mathbb{Z}^2 , see Appendix A and B.

Example 1.2. From Corollary 1.1, we deduce that the forms F_0 and $F_{a,c}$ defined in (1.2) and (1.3) are extraordinary. Now consider the form

$$F(X,Y) := 9 \cdot (F_0 \circ T) (X,Y) = XY(X+3Y)$$

with $T := \begin{pmatrix} 1/3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. By the conjugation formula, we have the equality

$$\operatorname{Aut}(F, \mathbb{Q}) = T^{-1}\operatorname{Aut}(F_0, \mathbb{Q})T.$$
(1.4)

By the description (1.1) the only elements $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(F, \mathbb{Q})$ with order 3 are $\sigma = T^{-1}RT$ and $\sigma = T^{-1}R^2T$. The corresponding matrices have one entry with its denominator equal to 3. So σ has not the shape required by Corollary 1.1 and the form F is not extraordinary.

However, Corollary 1.1 gives no information on the extraordinary form G linked with F. This drawback is fixed in the following statements, which were announced in [1, Theorem B]. We designate by $[F]_{GL(2,\mathbb{Z})}$ and $[F]_{val}$ the equivalence classes of the form F relatively to $\sim_{GL(2,\mathbb{Z})}$ and \sim_{val} . Of particular importance will be the form F^{\dagger} attached to F defined by

$$F^{\dagger}(X,Y) := F(2X,Y).$$

Corollary 1.3. Let $d \ge 3$. A form $F \in Bin(d, \mathbb{Z})$ satisfying (C3) is extraordinary if and only if there exists $G \in [F]_{val}$ such that

$$\{\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(G, \mathbb{Q}) : \sigma^3 = \operatorname{id}\} \subseteq \operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \text{ and } 3 \mid |\operatorname{Aut}(G, \mathbb{Q})|.$$

Furthermore, we have a decomposition into two disjoint $\sim_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})}$ classes

$$[F]_{\mathrm{val}} = [G]_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} \cup [G^{\dagger}]_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})}.$$

Since F satisfies (C3), we note that the condition $3 \mid |\operatorname{Aut}(G, \mathbb{Q})|$ is automatically satisfied. We have opted to state the corollary in this way to keep the statement fully analogous for automorphism groups other than \mathbf{D}_3 or \mathbf{D}_6 .

In fact, Corollaries 1.1 and 1.3 are consequences of the following theorem, the proof of which occupies the most important part of this paper.

Theorem 1.4. Let $d \ge 3$. Let $F_1 \in Bin(d, \mathbb{Q})$ be an extraordinary form satisfying (C3). Let $F_2 \in Bin(d, \mathbb{Q})$ be an extraordinary form linked with F_1 , in other words, by hypothesis we have

$$F_1 \sim_{\mathrm{val}} F_2$$
 and $F_1 \not\sim_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} F_2$.

Then there exist two forms G_1 and G_2 such that $G_i \sim_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} F_i$ and such that

$$G_1^{\dagger} = G_2 \text{ or } G_2^{\dagger} = G_1.$$
 (1.5)

In the first case we have

$$\{\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(G_1, \mathbb{Q}) : \sigma^3 = \operatorname{id}\} \subseteq \operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z}),\$$

and in the second case, we have

$$\{\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(G_2, \mathbb{Q}) : \sigma^3 = \operatorname{id}\} \subseteq \operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z}).$$
(1.6)

It is not difficult to see that the converse of Theorem 1.4 also holds. Indeed, this is an easy consequence of Corollary 1.3.

Acknowledgements

The first author thanks Michel Waldschmidt for inspiring the thema of this paper, for sharing his ideas and for his encouragements. The second author gratefully acknowledges the support of Dr. Max Rössler, the Walter Haefner Foundation and the ETH Zürich Foundation.

2 From Theorem 1.4 to Corollaries 1.1 and 1.3

2.1 From Corollary 1.3 to Corollary 1.1

The proof is exactly the same as in [1, §3.2].

2.2 From Theorem 1.4 to Corollary 1.3

The proof is exactly the same as in $[1, \S 4]$.

2.3 Overview of Theorem 1.4

It remains to prove Theorem 1.4. Its proof follows the strategy from [1, Theorem 1.5] and [2, Theorem 1.2]. We summarize this strategy as follows: starting from a pair of linked extraordinary forms (F_1, F_2) , we build two forms $G_i \in [F_i]_{\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})}$ (i = 1 or 2) and two integers D and ν such that $G_1(X, Y) = G_2(DX, DY/\nu)$ by appealing to a result of Fouvry and Waldschmidt [3] on the geometry of binary forms (see Proposition 3.16). This leads to a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by a certain number of lattices, the definition of which is based on the coefficients of the matrices of $\mathrm{Aut}(G_1, \mathbb{Q})$ (but not on the coefficients of G_1 or G_2). The number of these lattices is equal to the cardinality of $\mathrm{Aut}(G_1, \mathbb{Q})$, divided by 2 if d is even.

In the present work we study coverings of \mathbb{Z}^2 by six lattices. This leads to a substantial increase of complexity, and we have resorted to the help of a computer to solve it. The condition that these lattices cover \mathbb{Z}^2 is a huge constraint, leading to essentially one value for (D, ν) which is (2, 2).

In the next section, we recall all the basic tools from [1, 2]. However, Lemmas 3.13 and 3.14 are new.

3 Lattices, coverings and extraordinary forms

3.1 Lattices

By a *lattice*, we mean an additive subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^2 with rank 2. A lattice is *proper* when it is different from \mathbb{Z}^2 . If Λ is a lattice generated by linearly independent vectors $\vec{u}, \vec{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the *index* of Λ is the positive integer

$$[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda] = |\mathbb{Z}^2 / \Lambda| = |\det(\vec{u}, \vec{v})|.$$

Definition 3.1. Let $\gamma \in GL(2, \mathbb{Q})$. We define the lattice $L(\gamma)$ through

$$L(\gamma) := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \gamma \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \right\}.$$

We will frequently use the obvious remarks

$$L(\gamma) = L(-\gamma) \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$L(\gamma) = \mathbb{Z}^2 \iff \gamma$$
 has integer coefficients. (3.2)

We recall the following property, which is proved by a direct calculation (see [1, Lemma 6.9]).

Lemma 3.2. Let $\gamma \in GL(2,\mathbb{Q})$. Then $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L(\gamma)]$ is an integer multiple of $|\det \gamma|^{-1}$.

The following lemma provides a unique decomposition of matrices in $GL(2, \mathbb{Q})$ (see [1, Lemma 6.8]).

Lemma 3.3. Every matrix $f \in GL(2, \mathbb{Q})$ can be uniquely written under the form

$$f = \frac{N}{D} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ a_3 & a_4 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the integers a_1 , a_2 , a_3 , a_4 , D and N satisfy the conditions

$$D, N \ge 1, \ \gcd(D, N) = 1, \ \gcd(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = 1.$$

Let $p \geq 2$ be a prime and let $v_p(n)$ be the *p*-adic valuation of the integer *n* with the convention $v_p(0) = +\infty$. Several times we will use the following easy lemma without further reference.

Lemma 3.4. Let p be a prime. Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$, with $\gamma \neq 0$. Then the lattice defined by the equation

$$\alpha x_1 + \beta x_2 \equiv 0 \bmod \gamma$$

• is included in the lattice

 $\{(x_1, x_2): x_1 \equiv 0 \bmod p\}$

as soon as the following inequality holds

$$v_p(\alpha) < \min\left(v_p(\beta), v_p(\gamma)\right),$$

• has its index divisible by p as soon as the following inequality holds

$$\min\left(v_p(\alpha), v_p(\beta)\right) < v_p(\gamma)$$

3.2 Coverings

Definition 3.5. Let $k \ge 1$ be an integer and let $(\Lambda_i)_{1 \le i \le k}$ be k lattices. We say that

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_k\}$$

is a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 (or a covering) if and only if we have the equality

$$\bigcup_{1 \le i \le k} \Lambda_i = \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

The lattices Λ_i are the component lattices of the covering C.

Here is a first property of coverings that we will use to assert that some given sets of lattices can not be coverings.

Lemma 3.6. Let $k \geq 2$ and $C = \{\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_k\}$ be a covering. We then have the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{[\mathbb{Z}^2:\Lambda_i]} > 1$$

Proof. We state a general combinatorial inequality: let $k \geq 2$ be an integer and let \mathcal{E}_i (for $1 \leq i \leq k$) be subsets of some set \mathcal{E} . Let $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the characteristic function of a subset \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{E} . Then for every $x \in \mathcal{E}$ one has the inequality

$$\chi_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{E}_k}(x) \le \chi_{\mathcal{E}_1}(x) + \dots + \chi_{\mathcal{E}_k}(x) - \chi_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2}(x).$$
(3.3)

In the euclidean plane, let D(R) be the disk centered at the origin and with radius R. By hypothesis we have $(\Lambda_1 \cup \cdots \cup \Lambda_k) \cap D(R) = \mathbb{Z}^2 \cap D(R)$. As R tends to infinity, one has

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^2}\chi_{\Lambda_i\cap D(R)}(\boldsymbol{x})\sim \frac{\pi R^2}{[\mathbb{Z}^2:\Lambda_i]}.$$
(3.4)

We apply the above formula (3.3) with the choice

$$\mathcal{E}_i = \Lambda_i \cap D(R).$$

We sum over all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, apply (3.4) and let R tend to infinity to obtain the inequality

$$\pi \leq \pi \left(\frac{1}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda_1]} + \dots + \frac{1}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda_k]} - \frac{1}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2]} \right).$$

This gives Lemma 3.6, since $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2$ is also a lattice.

Definition 3.7 (Minimal covering). Let $k \ge 1$, let Λ_i be lattices and let $\mathcal{C} = \{\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_k\}$ be a covering. We say that \mathcal{C} is a minimal covering of length k if and only if replacing any Λ_i by some proper sublattice $\Lambda'_i \subsetneq \Lambda_i$, the set

$$\{\Lambda_1,\ldots,\Lambda_{i-1},\Lambda'_i,\Lambda_{i+1},\ldots,\Lambda_k\}$$

is not a covering.

If C is a minimal covering of length $k \ge 2$ and if $1 \le i \ne j \le k$, we never have $\Lambda_i \subseteq \Lambda_j$. In particular, every Λ_i is a proper lattice. The following lemma asserts that, from any covering, one can extract a minimal covering (see [2, Lemma 3.3]).

Lemma 3.8. Let $k \ge 1$ and let

 $\mathcal{C} := \{\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_k\}$

be a covering. Then there exists an integer $1 \leq k' \leq k$, an injection $\phi : \{1, \ldots, k'\} \rightarrow \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and lattices Λ'_i $(1 \leq j \leq k')$ such that

$$\mathcal{C}' := \{\Lambda'_1, \dots, \Lambda'_{k'}\}$$

is a minimal covering, and for all $1 \leq j \leq k'$ one has $\Lambda'_j \subseteq \Lambda_{\phi(j)}$. In particular, for all $1 \leq j \leq k'$, one has

$$\left[\mathbb{Z}^2:\Lambda_{\phi(j)}\right] \mid [\mathbb{Z}^2:\Lambda'_j]. \tag{3.5}$$

Definition 3.9. With the conventions from Lemma 3.8 we say that C' is a minimal covering extracted from the covering C. Note that, C being given, the minimal extracted covering C' is not necessarily unique.

The divisibility condition (3.5) will prove to be an efficient tool for eliminating a given set of k lattices as a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 , as soon as one has at their disposal a catalog of minimal coverings with length $\leq k$. This remark is a crucial tool in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

3.3 A catalog of minimal coverings

If the lattice Λ is \mathbb{Z} -generated by the two vectors $\vec{u} = (u_1, u_2)$ and $\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2)$ we write

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & v_1 \\ u_2 & v_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Below we summarize the facts on minimal coverings C that we will use in our proofs.

Lemma 3.10. There is no minimal covering with length 2.

Lemma 3.11 ([1, Lemma 6.7]). There is exactly one minimal covering with length 3, namely

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.12 ([2, Theorem 3.4]). There are exactly four minimal coverings with length 4. These are ((1, 0), (1, 0), (2, 0))

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \\ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \\ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \\ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

For larger lengths, we used a computer to enumerate all the minimal coverings of length 5 or 6 (see the Appendix, Table 1). From the data of this table, we extract the following information necessary to our proofs.

Lemma 3.13. There are exactly 9 minimal coverings with length equal to 5. Among these coverings:

- 1. There is no minimal covering with all the indices of the component lattices divisible by 4.
- 2. There is no minimal covering with at least one component with index divisible by 5.

Lemma 3.14. There are exactly 40 minimal coverings with length equal to 6. Among these coverings, there are only two minimal coverings with all the indices of the components greater or equal to 4. These are

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{C}_{4^6} &:= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \\ \mathcal{C}_{5^6} &:= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 5 \end{pmatrix} \right\}. \end{split}$$

Furthermore, C_{5^6} is the unique minimal covering with length 6 comprised of at least one component with index divisible by some prime ≥ 5 .

3.4 Links with extraordinary forms

We recall the definition and some straightforward properties of an isomorphism between two forms.

Definition 3.15. Let F_1 and F_2 be two forms in $Bin(d, \mathbb{Q})$. An isomorphism from F_1 to F_2 is an element $\rho \in GL(2, \mathbb{Q})$ such that $F_1 \circ \rho = F_2$. The set of all such isomorphisms is denoted by $Isom(F_1 \to F_2, \mathbb{Q})$. Suppose $Isom(F_1 \to F_2, \mathbb{Q})$ is not empty and let ρ be one of its elements. Then we have the equalities

Isom
$$(F_1 \to F_2, \mathbb{Q}) = \rho \cdot \operatorname{Aut}(F_2, \mathbb{Q}) = \operatorname{Aut}(F_1, \mathbb{Q}) \cdot \rho$$

Isom $(F_2 \to F_1, \mathbb{Q}) = \rho^{-1} \cdot \operatorname{Aut}(F_1, \mathbb{Q}) = \operatorname{Aut}(F_2, \mathbb{Q}) \cdot \rho^{-1}.$

The following key proposition is [2, Prop. 2.5] (see also the remarks [2, Comments 2.6]). The equality (3.9) exhibits two coverings of \mathbb{Z}^2 that we will deeply investigate in the context of the hypothesis (C3).

Proposition 3.16. Let $d \ge 3$ and let (F_1, F_2) be a pair of linked extraordinary forms. Then there exists $\rho \in GL(2, \mathbb{Q})$, a pair of linked extraordinary forms (G_1, G_2) and a pair (D, ν) of positive integers such that

- 1. we have $F_1 = F_2 \circ \rho$,
- 2. we have

$$(G_1 \sim_{\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} F_1 \text{ and } G_2 \sim_{\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} F_2) \text{ or } (G_1 \sim_{\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} F_2 \text{ and } G_2 \sim_{\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})} F_1),$$

3. we have

$$D, \nu \ge 1, D\nu > 1, D \mid \nu \text{ and } 1 \le \nu \le D^2$$
 (3.6)

and the matrix

$$\gamma := \begin{pmatrix} D & 0\\ 0 & D/\nu \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.7}$$

satisfies $G_1 = G_2 \circ \gamma$,

4. we have

$$[\mathbb{Z}^2: L(\gamma)] = \min\left\{ [\mathbb{Z}^2: L(\tau)] : \tau \in \operatorname{Isom}(G_1 \to G_2, \mathbb{Q}) \cup \operatorname{Isom}(G_2 \to G_1, \mathbb{Q}) \right\}, \quad (3.8)$$

5. and finally, we have the two coverings

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \bigcup_{\tau \in \operatorname{Isom}(G_1 \to G_2, \mathbb{Q})} L(\tau) = \bigcup_{\tau \in \operatorname{Isom}(G_2 \to G_1, \mathbb{Q})} L(\tau).$$
(3.9)

The definition of γ directly implies the equality

$$[\mathbb{Z}^2: L(\gamma)] = \nu/D. \tag{3.10}$$

4 Beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.4

4.1 The two coverings

We start from a pair of linked extraordinary forms (F_1, F_2) , such that $\operatorname{Aut}(F_1, \mathbb{Q})$ is $\operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Q})$ conjugate with \mathbf{D}_3 or with \mathbf{D}_6 (condition (C3)). Let (G_1, G_2) be a pair of linked extraordinary forms, whose existence is assured by Proposition 3.16. By the conjugation formula (1.4) and by the items 1. and 2. of Proposition 3.16 we deduce that

Aut
$$(F_1, \mathbb{Q})$$
, Aut (F_2, \mathbb{Q}) , Aut (G_1, \mathbb{Q}) and Aut $(G_2, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq_{\operatorname{GL}(2,\mathbb{Q})} \mathbb{D}_3$ or \mathbb{D}_6 .

So we have

$$\operatorname{Aut}(G_2, \mathbb{Q}) = \begin{cases} T_2^{-1} \mathbf{D}_3 T_2 \\ \text{or} \\ T_2^{-1} \mathbf{D}_3 T_2 \ \bigcup \ \left(-T_2^{-1} \mathbf{D}_3 T_2 \right), \end{cases}$$
(4.1)

where T_2 is some invertible matrix where the entries t_i are coprime integers

$$T_2 := \begin{pmatrix} t_1 & t_2 \\ t_3 & t_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (4.2)

- Suppose that we are in the first case of (4.1). By the definition (3.7), γ belongs to $\text{Isom}(G_2 \to G_1, \mathbb{Q})$. We appeal to Definition 3.15 and to the explicit description (1.1) of the group \mathbf{D}_3 in order to split the double equality of (3.9) into
 - the main covering

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}} \Lambda(\sigma), \tag{4.3}$$

• and the *dual covering*

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}} \Gamma(\sigma), \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{S} := \operatorname{Aut}(G_2, \mathbb{Q}) = \{ \operatorname{id}, T_2^{-1} R T_2, T_2^{-1} R^2 T_2, T_2^{-1} S T_2, T_2^{-1} R S T_2, T_2^{-1} R^2 S T_2 \}, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\Lambda(\sigma) = L(\gamma^{-1}\sigma) = \{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \gamma^{-1}\sigma(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \},$$
(4.6)

and

$$\Gamma(\sigma) = L(\sigma\gamma) = \{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \sigma\gamma(\boldsymbol{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \}.$$
(4.7)

Suppose that we are in the second case of (4.1). Then the equalities (3.9) will lead to two coverings of twelve lattices each. But the equality (3.1) shows that each lattice appears twice, thus giving coverings consisting of six lattices. In conclusion, the equalities (4.3) and (4.4) are true as soon as any case of (4.1) holds.

By (3.8) and (3.10), we have

$$[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)], \ [\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Gamma(\sigma)] \ge \nu/D \ (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}).$$

$$(4.8)$$

A useful lemma is the following

Lemma 4.1. Suppose that the coverings (4.3) and (4.4) exist. Then we have the inequality

 $\nu/D \leq 5.$

Proof. Indeed, these two coverings have six components. By (4.8), each component has index $\geq \nu/D$, which is an integer. By Lemma 3.6 we have $6D/\nu > 1$ and we complete the proof. \Box

4.2 A particular case already treated

Suppose that

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \{ \mathrm{id}, T_2^{-1} R T_2, T_2^{-1} R^2 T_2 \}} \Lambda(\sigma) = \mathbb{Z}^2$$

This situation has already been treated in [1, §11] when the automorphism group is \mathbb{C}_3 or \mathbb{C}_6 . It leads to the values D = 2 and $\nu = 2$ and $\operatorname{Aut}(G_2, \mathbb{Q}) \subseteq \operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ (see [1, (11.1)]). Hence Theorem 1.4 is proved in that particular case. So, henceforth, we assume that

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \{ \mathrm{id}, T_2^{-1} R T_2, T_2^{-1} R^2 T_2 \}} \Lambda(\sigma) \neq \mathbb{Z}^2.$$
(4.9)

4.3 Proper lattices

We will first prove that the covering (4.3) is never the trivial covering, by which we mean that one of the component lattices equals \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Lemma 4.2. We adopt the hypotheses of Proposition 3.16 and the notations of §4.1. Then for every $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$, the lattice $\Lambda(\sigma)$ is proper.

Proof. We give a proof by contradiction. Suppose that there exists some $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ satisfying

$$[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)] = [\mathbb{Z}^2 : L(\gamma^{-1}\sigma)] = 1.$$

By (3.2), we deduce that $\gamma^{-1}\sigma$ has integral coefficients. By (3.8), we have $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L(\gamma)] = 1$, thus γ also has integral coefficients. Consider the equality $\sigma = \gamma \cdot (\gamma^{-1} \cdot \sigma)$. Since det $\sigma = \pm 1$ and since det γ and det $(\gamma^{-1}\sigma)$ are integers, we have det $\gamma = \pm 1$. But then G_1 and G_2 are GL $(2, \mathbb{Z})$ -equivalent, contradiction.

The strategy now will be to exploit the main covering (4.3) as long as possible to restrict the possible values of D and ν . When we are at an impasse, we will study the dual covering (4.4). One indication of the additional complexities of the present paper is by comparison with [1] and [2], where we did not investigate the dual covering.

Throughout the paper, we define the positive integer d_2 by

$$d_2 = |\det T_2| = |t_1 t_4 - t_2 t_3|, \tag{4.10}$$

where T_2 is the conjugation matrix defined in (4.1) and (4.2). We also introduce the numbers

$$g_{1,3} := \gcd(t_1, t_3), \quad g_{2,4} := \gcd(t_2, t_4).$$
 (4.11)

They satisfy the relations

$$gcd(g_{1,3}, g_{2,4}) = 1$$
 and $g_{1,3}g_{2,4} \mid d_2.$ (4.12)

4.4 Description of the lattices Λ by their equations

Recalling the notations (3.7), (4.5) and (4.6) we have

Lemma 4.3. The lattices $\Lambda(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ are defined by the following systems of equations with $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$:

$$\Lambda(\mathrm{id}) : \begin{cases} x_1 \equiv 0 \mod D\\ \nu x_2 \equiv 0 \mod D, \end{cases}$$

$$(4.13)$$

$$\Lambda(T_2^{-1}RT_2) : \begin{cases} (t_1t_2 + t_2t_3 + t_3t_4)x_1 + (t_2^2 + t_2t_4 + t_4^2)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D \\ \nu((t_1^2 + t_1t_3 + t_3^2)x_1 + (t_1t_2 + t_1t_4 + t_3t_4)x_2) &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D, \end{cases}$$
(4.14)

$$\Lambda(T_2^{-1}R^2T_2):\begin{cases} (t_1t_2+t_1t_4+t_3t_4)x_1+(t_2^2+t_2t_4+t_4^2)x_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2D\\ \nu((t_1^2+t_1t_3+t_3^2)x_1+(t_1t_2+t_2t_3+t_3t_4)x_2) \equiv 0 \mod d_2D, \end{cases}$$
(4.15)

$$\Lambda(T_2^{-1}ST_2) : \begin{cases} (t_3t_4 - t_1t_2)x_1 + (t_4^2 - t_2^2)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D \\ \nu((t_3^2 - t_1^2)x_1 + (t_3t_4 - t_1t_2)x_2) &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D, \end{cases}$$
(4.16)

$$\Lambda(T_2^{-1}RST_2):\begin{cases} (t_1t_2+t_1t_4+t_2t_3)x_1+(t_2^2+2t_2t_4)x_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2D\\ \nu((t_1^2+2t_1t_3)x_1+(t_1t_2+t_1t_4+t_2t_3)x_2) \equiv 0 \mod d_2D, \end{cases}$$
(4.17)

and finally

$$\Lambda(T_2^{-1}R^2ST_2) : \begin{cases} (t_1t_4 + t_2t_3 + t_3t_4)x_1 + (t_4^2 + 2t_2t_4)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D \\ \nu((t_3^2 + 2t_1t_3)x_1 + (t_1t_4 + t_2t_3 + t_3t_4)x_2) &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D. \end{cases}$$
(4.18)

Proof. This follows from a direct computation.

Remark 4.4. The condition $D \mid \nu$ appearing in (3.6) enables us to simplify these equations: we may delete the second equation of (4.13) to obtain the equality $\Lambda(id) = \Lambda_D$ with

$$\Lambda_D := \{ (x_1, x_2) : x_1 \equiv 0 \bmod D \}.$$

To shorten notations, we use the symbol $\Lambda^{?}$ to denote an unspecified proper lattice (this symbol may denote different lattices at each occurrence). We also write

$$\mathfrak{S}^{\flat} := \{ \sigma \in \mathfrak{S} : \sigma \neq \mathrm{id} \} = \{ T_2^{-1} R T_2, \, T_2^{-1} R^2 T_2, \, T_2^{-1} S T_2, \, T_2^{-1} R S T_2, \, T_2^{-1} R^2 S T_2 \}.$$

Similarly, for $2 \le k \le 5$, we denote by

$$\mathfrak{S}^{\flat}_{\leq k} \tag{4.19}$$

some unspecified subset of \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} with cardinality $\leq k$.

For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$, we write each of these systems $(4.14), \ldots, (4.18)$ in the form

$$\Lambda(\sigma):\begin{cases} p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_1 + p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D, \\ \nu\left(P_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_1 + P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2\right) &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D, \end{cases}$$
(4.20)

where $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$. Notice that $p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ is a polynomial in t_2 and t_4 only and that $P_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ is a polynomial in t_1 and t_3 only. Furthermore, we put

$$(p_{1,id}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,id}(\mathbf{t})) = (1,0).$$
 (4.21)

Remark 4.5. The representative matrix $Mat(\sigma)$ of the morphism σ , for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$, is

$$\operatorname{Mat}(\sigma) = \pm \begin{pmatrix} p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})/d_2 & p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})/d_2 \\ P_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})/d_2 & P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})/d_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular, $Mat(\sigma)$ belongs to $GL(2,\mathbb{Z})$ if and only if d_2 divides $p_{i,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ and $P_{i,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$.

Remark 4.6. Fix $\nu = 1$. Then each of the six systems (4.13),...(4.18) defining the lattices $\Lambda(\sigma)$ benefit from the following symmetry: consider the change of parameters and variables

$$\Theta: (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, x_1, x_2) \longleftrightarrow (t_2, t_1, t_4, t_3, x_2, x_1).$$

Then Θ permutes the two equations of each system.

We will frequently work with the reduced variable $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}$ defined by the equality

$$\tilde{\mathbf{t}} := (t_1, \tilde{t}_2, t_3, \tilde{t}_4), \text{ with } \tilde{t}_i = t_i/g_{2,4} \ (i = 2, 4).$$
 (4.22)

By homogeneity, the first equation of (4.20) is equivalent to

$$p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4} p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2 D/g_{2,4}.$$

For any divisor ℓ of $d_2D/g_{2,4}$ we introduce the lattice $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\ell)}(\sigma)$ defined by

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\ell)}(\sigma) : p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) x_1 + g_{2,4} \, p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) x_2 \equiv 0 \mod \ell.$$
(4.23)

This lattice is not necessarily proper, but it satisfies the relation

$$\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \widehat{\Lambda}^{(\ell)}(\sigma) \ (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} \text{ and } \ell \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4}).$$

$$(4.24)$$

For convenience, we define

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\ell)}(\mathrm{id}) = \Lambda_{\ell} \quad \mathrm{if} \ \ell \mid D, \tag{4.25}$$

so that (4.24) is also satisfied. This inclusion will be frequently used in our proof, so we call $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\ell)}(\sigma)$ the ℓ -enveloping lattice associated with σ .

4.5 The determinant D^2/ν and its properties

By the definition (4.5) of \mathfrak{S} , the definition (3.7) of γ , we have, for every $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$, the equality

$$|\det(\gamma^{-1}\sigma)| = \frac{\nu}{D^2} = \frac{b}{a},$$
(4.26)

where a and b are integers satisfying the conditions

$$gcd(a,b) = 1, \quad 1 \le b \le a. \tag{4.27}$$

The last inequality is a consequence of (3.6).

Remark 4.7. As a consequence of Lemma 3.2, the index of every component lattice $\Lambda(\sigma)$ of the main covering (4.3) is an integer divisible by a.

Little by little, we will restrict the possible values for the integers a, b, D, ν and d_2 . The *steps* of these successive restrictions are based on more and more intricate considerations on the index and on the equations of the components of the coverings (4.3) and (4.4). The first one is

Step 4.8. With the above notations and hypotheses, one has the inequalities

$$1 \le b \le a \le 5.$$

Proof. The six lattices $\Lambda(\sigma)$ are a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by (4.3). By Remark 4.7, for each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ the index $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)]$ is an integer multiple of a, so its value is at least a. Then Lemma 3.6 leads to the inequality 6/a > 1, so $a \leq 5$.

We will now discuss the intimate properties of the coefficients defining the first equations of the lattices $\Lambda(\sigma)$ (see (4.20)).

4.6 Congruence properties of the coefficients defining the lattices Λ

We want to extract some structure in the equations defining the lattices $\Lambda(\sigma)$.

Definition 4.9. We adopt the notations from equations (4.20) and (4.21). For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$, for $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ a 4-tuple of coprime integers with $d_2 \neq 0$ and for x an integer ≥ 1 , we denote by $Z_{\mathbf{t}, \text{top}}(x)$ the number of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ for which the point

 $(p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}))$

has order less than x in the additive group $(\mathbb{Z}/x\mathbb{Z})^2$.

Now consider the set $S = S_{\mathbf{t}, \mathrm{top}}(x)$ of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ for which

 $(p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}))$

has order x in $(\mathbb{Z}/x\mathbb{Z})^2$. We say that $\sigma \sim \sigma'$ if there exists an invertible element $\alpha \in (\mathbb{Z}/x\mathbb{Z})^*$ such that

$$\alpha \cdot (p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) = (\alpha p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), \alpha p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) = (p_{1,\sigma'}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,\sigma'}(\mathbf{t})).$$

We write $n_{t,top}(x)$ for the number of equivalence classes in S.

Remark 4.10. Let $x \ge 1$ and let σ and σ' be two elements from $S_{t,top}(x)$ such that $\sigma \sim \sigma'$. Then, for every integer g the two lattices respectively defined by the equations

$$p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_1 + g \cdot p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod x$$

and

$$p_{1,\sigma'}(\mathbf{t})x_1 + g \cdot p_{2,\sigma'}(\mathbf{t})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod x$$

are equal. We will use this remark several times below to delete some redundant lattices appearing in a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Remark 4.11. By the definition (4.21), we observe that $(1,0) \in S_{t,top}(x)$. So $S_{t,top}(x)$ is never empty and we have $n_{t,top}(x) \ge 1$ and $Z_{t,top}(x) \le 5$.

From the equality

$$Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(x) + |S_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(x)| = |\mathfrak{S}| = 6,$$

we deduce the inequality

$$Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(x) + n_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(x) \le 6.$$

The following lemma improves on this inequality for small values of the integer x. We have

Lemma 4.12. Let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ with $gcd(t_2, t_4) = 1$.

• (x = 5). We have the inequalities

$$Z_{t,top}(5) + n_{t,top}(5) \le 3, \quad Z_{t,top}(5) \le 1.$$
 (4.28)

• (x = 4). We have the inequalities

$$Z_{\mathbf{t},\text{top}}(4) + n_{\mathbf{t},\text{top}}(4) \le 4, \quad Z_{\mathbf{t},\text{top}}(4) \le 1.$$
 (4.29)

- (i) The inequalities (4.29) become both equalities only if there exists an element $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ such that $(p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) \equiv (2,0) \mod 4$.
- (ii) Additionally suppose that $gcd(t_1, t_3, 2) = 1$. Then

 $\{(0,1), (0,3), (2,1), (2,3)\} \not\subseteq \{(\alpha \, p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), \alpha \, p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) : \alpha \in (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^*, \sigma \in S_{\mathbf{t}, \mathrm{top}}(4)\}.$

(iii) If $gcd(t_1, t_3, 2) = 1$ and furthermore $Z_{t,top}(4) = 1$, then

$$\{(0,1), (0,3), (2,1), (2,3)\} \cap \{(\alpha p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), \alpha p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) : \alpha \in (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^*, \sigma \in S_{\mathbf{t}, \mathrm{top}}(4)\} = \emptyset.$$

• (x = 3). We have the inequalities

$$Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(3) + n_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(3) \le 3 \text{ and } Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(3) \le 1, \text{ or } Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(3) = 5.$$
 (4.30)

- We have
$$Z_{t,top}(3) = 5$$
 if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \ \mathrm{mod} \ 3 \in \\ \mathcal{T}_3 &:= \{(0, 1, 0, 1), (0, 2, 0, 2), (1, 1, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2, 2), (1, 2, 1, 2), (2, 1, 2, 1)\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have the inequality $v_3(t_1t_4 - t_2t_3) \ge 1$.

Proof. This follows from a direct computation, see Subsection A.3.

The case x = 9 requires some variation that we describe now. Let \mathcal{T}_3 be the set of 4-tuples **t** appearing on the right-hand side of (4.31). So we have

$$p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv 0 \mod 3$$

for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}_3$ and for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$. We are now searching for information about these coefficients modulo 9. This is the purpose of Lemma 4.13 below. For $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}_3$, for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ and for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we consider the integers $\widetilde{p_{i,\sigma}}(\mathbf{t}) := p_{i,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})/3$. By convention, we define $(\widetilde{p_{1,\mathrm{id}}}(\mathbf{t}), \widetilde{p_{2,\mathrm{id}}}(\mathbf{t})) =$ (1,0). Let $\widetilde{Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}}(9)$ be the number of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ such that

$$(\widetilde{p_{1,\sigma}}(\mathbf{t}), \widetilde{p_{2,\sigma}}(\mathbf{t})) \equiv (0,0) \mod 3.$$

On the set

$$\mathcal{E}_9(\mathbf{t}) := \{ \sigma \in \mathfrak{S} : (\widetilde{p_{1,\sigma}}(\mathbf{t}), \widetilde{p_{2,\sigma}}(\mathbf{t})) \not\equiv (0,0) \bmod 3 \}$$

we define the following equivalence relation: we set $\sigma \sim \sigma'$ if and only if there exists $\alpha \not\equiv 0 \mod 3$ such that

$$\widetilde{p_{1,\sigma}}(\mathbf{t}), \widetilde{p_{2,\sigma}}(\mathbf{t})) = (\alpha \, \widetilde{p_{1,\sigma'}}(\mathbf{t}), \alpha \, \widetilde{p_{2,\sigma'}}(\mathbf{t})).$$

Then we denote by $\widetilde{n_{t,top}}(9)$ the number of equivalence classes in $\mathcal{E}_9(t)$ under the equivalence relation ~. We now state

Lemma 4.13. We adopt the notations just above. Let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ such that $gcd(t_2, t_4) = 1$ and such that $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}_3$. Then we have the inequalities

$$\widetilde{Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}}(9) + \widetilde{n_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}}(9) \le 3 \text{ and } \widetilde{Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}}(9) \le 1.$$
 (4.32)

Proof. This also follows from a direct computation, see Subsection A.3.

It is perhaps worthwhile to point out the analogy between the inequality (4.32) and the first part of the inequality (4.30). We announce one more property of $p_{1,\sigma}$ before proceeding.

Lemma 4.14. Let $p \neq 3$ be a prime number or let p = 9. Let $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ be such that $gcd(t_2, t_4) = gcd(t_1, t_3) = 1$. Then we have

$$|\{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} : p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv 0 \bmod p\}| \le 3$$

with equality only possible for the set $\{T_2^{-1}ST_2, T_2^{-1}RST_2, T_2^{-1}R^2ST_2\}$ and $p \equiv 1 \mod 3$. Furthermore, we have

$$|\{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} : p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv 0 \mod 3\}| \in \{0, 1, 2, 5\}.$$

If the above cardinality equals 5, then \mathbf{t} lies in the set

$$\mathcal{T}_3^* := \{ (1, 1, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2, 2), (1, 2, 1, 2), (2, 1, 2, 1) \}.$$

Proof. It is possible to prove this without using the aid of a computer algebra package. However, to save some effort, we have decided to use SageMath. Let us suppose that

$$p_{1,T_2^{-1}RT_2}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv p_{1,T_2^{-1}R^2T_2}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv p_{1,T_2^{-1}ST_2}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv 0 \mod p.$$

For the other combinations of polynomials from Lemma 4.3, we refer the reader to Subsection A.2.2. Then we run the following script.

R.<t1, t2, t3, t4, u, v, w, x> = ZZ['t1, t2, t3, t4, u, v, w, x']
I = ideal(t1 * t2 + t2 * t3 + t3 * t4, t1 * t2 + t1 * t4 + t3 * t4,
t3 * t4 - t1 * t2, t2 * u + t4 * v - 1, t1 * w + t3 * x - 1)
B = I.groebner_basis()

The first three elements in the ideal are the polynomials from Lemma 4.3, specifically from the top of equations (4.14), (4.15), (4.16), while the last equation encodes the coprimality conditions $gcd(t_2, t_4) = gcd(t_1, t_3) = 1$. SageMath shows that 3 is always contained in the Gröbner basis. This implies the first part of the lemma.

The second part of the lemma can be checked directly by hand or by the brute force computations in Subsection A.3, specifically A.3.5. $\hfill \Box$

Since the conclusion of Lemma 4.14 depends only on t_i modulo p, it is straightforward to slightly weaken the hypotheses of this lemma to $gcd(t_1, t_3, p) = 1$. We shall often use the lemma this way without further comment.

Concerning the polynomial $P_{1,\sigma}$ we will use the following

Lemma 4.15. Consider the set $S := \{A, B, C, D\}$ of four polynomials in two variables Uand V given by $A(U,V) = U^2 + UV + V^2$, $B(U,V) = V^2 - U^2$, $C(U,V) = U^2 + 2UV$, $D(U,V) = V^2 + 2UV$. Let $(u,v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be such that gcd(u,v,3) = 1. We then have

$$A(u,v) \not\equiv 0 \bmod 9$$

and

$$|\{P \in \mathcal{S} : P(u, v) \equiv 0 \mod 9\}| \le 1. \tag{4.33}$$

Proof. We make a succession of simple observations:

- For any integers (u, v), we have $A(u, v) \equiv 0 \mod 3$ if and only if $u \equiv v \mod 3$. If $u \equiv v \mod 3$, then $A(u, v) \equiv 3u^2 \mod 9$. We deduce that gcd(u, v, 3) = 1 implies $A(u, v) \not\equiv 0 \mod 9$.
- Since B = D C, in order to prove the inequality (4.33), it is sufficient to show that the polynomials C and D do not simultaneously vanish modulo 9, on some $(u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with gcd(u, v, 3) = 1.
- Let (u, v) be such that $C(u, v) \equiv D(u, v) \equiv 0 \mod 9$. By taking the difference, we obtain that $(u v)(u + v) \equiv 0 \mod 9$. We analyze this congruence in three subcases
 - if $u \equiv v \mod 9$, then $C(u, v) \equiv 3u^2 \mod 9$, and the condition $C(u, v) \equiv 0 \mod 9$ implies $u \equiv 0 \mod 3$, so $v \equiv 0 \mod 3$,
 - if $u \equiv -v \mod 9$, then $C(u, v) \equiv -u^2 \mod 9$ and we obtain once again $u \equiv v \equiv 0 \mod 3$,
 - if $u \equiv v \mod 3$ and $u \equiv -v \mod 3$, then $u \equiv v \equiv 0 \mod 3$.

This completes the proof of the lemma.

Applying this lemma yields the inequality

$$\left|\left\{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} : P_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv 0 \bmod 9\right\}\right| \le 1.$$

$$(4.34)$$

4.7 The indicator g_2

We want to measure the discrepancy between two natural ways of expressing the matrix representing σ . Given $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$, we define $d_2(\sigma) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by writing

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{d_2(\sigma)} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$
(4.35)

in its minimal form, which is possible thanks to Lemma 3.3 and the equality det $\sigma = \pm 1$. In particular, we have gcd(a, b, c, d) = 1. Furthermore, by (4.5) and by the definition of T_2 (see (4.2)) we can also write

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{d_2} \begin{pmatrix} a' & b' \\ c' & d' \end{pmatrix}$$

with integers a', b', c' and d' and d_2 defined in (4.10). Comparing this expression with (4.35), we deduce that $d_2(\sigma) \mid d_2$, which allows us to introduce the integer $g_2(\sigma) := d_2/d_2(\sigma)$. By definition, we have

$$g_2(\sigma) = \gcd(a', b', c', d').$$
 (4.36)

Lemma 4.16. Let σ and σ' be two distinct elements in \mathfrak{S} and suppose that σ, σ' do not both have order 3. Then we have

$$\gcd(g_2(\sigma), g_2(\sigma')) \in \{1, 3\}.$$

Proof. We will only consider the case $\sigma = T_2^{-1}R^2T_2$ and $\sigma' = T_2^{-1}ST_2$. For the other cases, we refer the reader to Subsection A.2.1. In this case, we run the following script.

R.<t1, t2, t3, t4, u1, u2, u3, u4> = ZZ['t1, t2, t3, t4, u1, u2, u3, u4']
I = ideal(t1 * t2 + t1 * t4 + t3 * t4, t2 * t2 + t2 * t4 + t4 * t4,
t1 * t1 + t1 * t3 + t3 * t3, t1 * t2 + t2 * t3 + t3 * t4, t3 * t4 - t1 * t2,
t4 * t4 - t2 * t2, t1 * t1 - t3 * t3, t1 * t2 - t3 * t4,
u1 * t1 + u2 * t2 + u3 * t3 + u4 * t4 - 1)
B = I.groebner_basis()

Here we include all the polynomials in the defining equations in Lemma 4.3, so equation (4.15) and equation (4.16) in our specific case. We have also included the condition $gcd(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = 1$ in the last equation. SageMath gives that 3 is always contained in the Gröbner basis, which readily implies the lemma.

5 Restricting the possible values for a

We want to tighten the interval $1 \le a \le 5$ appearing in Step 4.8.

5.1 The case a = 5 is impossible

We will improve Step 4.8 into

Step 5.1. With the notations and hypotheses of Step 4.8, one has the inequalities

$$1 \le b \le a \le 4.$$

We give a proof by contradiction. So we suppose that a = 5. Recall the definitions of $g_{1,3}$ and $g_{2,4}$ from (4.11). Then (4.26) and (4.27) imply

$$\frac{D^2}{\nu} = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{5}{b} \quad (5 \nmid b),$$

so we know that 5 divides D. For every $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$, one has

$$5 \mid [\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)] \tag{5.1}$$

by Remark 4.7. By Lemmas 3.11, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14, we deduce that the main covering $(\Lambda(\sigma))_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}}$ necessarily coincides with the covering \mathcal{C}_{5^6} . In particular, all the lattices have index 5 but we will not use this equality in the proof. So far, we know that

$$v_5(D) \ge 1$$
 and $v_5(\nu) = 2v_5(D) - 1$.

In all cases we have $5 \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4}$, so we are allowed to consider the 5-enveloping lattices $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\sigma)$ as defined in (4.22), (4.23), (4.24) and (4.25). In particular, we have the inclusion

$$\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\sigma) \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}) \tag{5.2}$$

with

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\sigma): p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 5 \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}),$$
(5.3)

and

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\mathrm{id}) = \Lambda_5. \tag{5.4}$$

5.1.1 When $5 \nmid g_{2,4}$

By (4.21) and by (4.28) there is at most one $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ such that $5 \mid p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ and $5 \mid p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ since $Z_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathrm{top}}(5) \in \{0, 1\}$. We denote by σ_0 this potential element (necessarily different from id) of \mathfrak{S} . The main covering (4.3) becomes either

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda(\sigma_0) \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S} - \{\sigma_0\}} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\sigma)$$
(5.5)

or

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\sigma) \tag{5.6}$$

depending on the existence of σ_0 .

Consider the first covering (5.5): the first lattice on the RHS has an index divisible by 5 by (5.1). We apply Lemma 4.12, equation (4.28): with the notations there, we have $Z_{\tilde{t},top}(5) = 1$ and $n_{\tilde{t},top}(5) \leq 2$. Then by Remark 4.10, the last union contains at most two distinct lattices and their index is divisible by 5. The covering (5.5) produces a contradiction, since \mathbb{Z}^2 is not equal to the union of three lattices with index divisible by 5, see Lemma 3.6.

We follow the same strategy to deduce that the decomposition (5.6) is also impossible. Since σ_0 does not exist, we have $Z_{\tilde{t},top}(5) = 0$, so $n_{\tilde{t},top}(5) \leq 3$. Once more we obtain a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by three lattices with index divisible by 5.

5.1.2 When $5 \mid g_{2,4}$

With this condition, the coefficient of x_2 in (5.3) is 0 mod 5. Therefore the equations defining the 5-enveloping lattice (4.23) are simplified as

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\sigma): p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 5 \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}).$$

However, by (4.12), we certainly have

$$gcd(t_1, t_3, 5) = 1.$$

By Lemma 4.14, there exists some $\mathfrak{S}_{\leq 2}^{\flat}$ (see definition (4.19)) such that for every $\sigma \notin \mathfrak{S}_{\leq 2}^{\flat}$, one has $p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \not\equiv 0 \mod 5$. For those σ we obviously have $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(5)}(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_5$. After these observations, the main covering (4.3) gives the equality

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda^? \cup \Lambda^? \cup \Lambda_5,$$

which is nonsense by Lemma 3.11. The proof of Step 5.1 is now complete.

5.2 The case a = 3 is impossible

We continue our study of the possible values of a by improving Step 5.1 into

Step 5.2. With the notations and hypotheses of Step 4.8, one has the relations

$$1 \le b \le a \le 4$$
 and $a \ne 3$.

The proof of this step has several similarities with the proof of Step 5.1, in particular it works by contradiction. So we suppose that a = 3. By the equality

$$\frac{D^2}{\nu} = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{3}{b} \tag{5.7}$$

we know that 3 divides D and that

$$3 \mid [\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)] \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$$

$$(5.8)$$

by Remark 4.7. We have $3 \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4}$, so we are allowed to consider the 3-enveloping lattices $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$. We have the inclusion

$$\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma) \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat})$$

with

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma): p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 3 \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^\flat)$$
(5.9)

and

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\mathrm{id}) = \Lambda_3.$$

5.2.1 When $3 \nmid g_{2,4}$

We appeal to Lemma 4.12 with x = 3.

• If $Z_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathrm{top}}(3) + n_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathrm{top}}(3) \leq 3$ and $Z_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathrm{top}}(3) \leq 1$. In this situation we follow the argument presented for a = 5, as it was done in §5.1.1, leading to the impossibility of the covering (4.3). Indeed, we would obtain a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by three lattices with index ≥ 3 by (5.8). This is impossible by Lemma 3.6.

• If $Z_{\tilde{t},top}(3) = 5$. This subcase has no analogue in the case where a = 5. Under this assumption, we know that

$$\mathbf{\tilde{t}} \mod 3 \in \mathcal{T}_3 := \{(0,1,0,1), (0,2,0,2), (1,1,1,1), (2,2,2,2), (1,2,1,2), (2,1,2,1)\}$$

thanks to (4.31) from Lemma 4.12. We have $t_1 \tilde{t_4} - \tilde{t_2} t_3 \equiv 0 \mod 3$. This implies that $3 \mid \frac{d_2}{g_{2,4}}$ and therefore

$$9 \mid \frac{d_2 D}{g_{2,4}}.$$

This divisibility property allows us to work with the 9-enveloping lattices $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(9)}(\sigma)$. The 9-enveloping lattices are given by the equations

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}^{(9)}(\sigma): \widetilde{p_{1,\sigma}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}\widetilde{p_{2,\sigma}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 \equiv 0 \bmod 3 \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}),$$

where the notations are introduced before Lemma 4.13. The inequalities contained in that lemma play the same rôle as the inequalities given by the first part of (4.30). The rest of the proof is the same: the covering (4.3) becomes a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by three lattices of index divisible by 3. This is impossible due to Lemma 3.6.

5.2.2 When $3 \mid g_{2,4}$

By (4.12) we have $3 \nmid g_{1,3}$. In this case, the 3-enveloping lattices $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$ from (5.9) become

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma) : p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 3 \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat})$$
(5.10)

and $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(id) = \Lambda_3$. We apply the last part of Lemma 4.14. We will distinguish cases based on

$$|\{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} : p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \equiv 0 \text{ mod } 3\}| \in \{0, 1, 2, 5\}.$$
(5.11)

Suppose that this cardinality is at most 2. Returning to (5.10), we see that, for all other σ outside this set, one has $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_3$. With these properties, we deduce that the main covering (4.3) leads to

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda^? \cup \Lambda^? \cup \Lambda_3, \tag{5.12}$$

which is impossible since the two $\Lambda^{?}$ have an index ≥ 3 by (5.8).

Now suppose that the cardinality in equation (5.11) is 5. Then we have $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}_3^*$ by the last part of Lemma 4.14, so 3 divides $p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$, $p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ but also 3 divides $d_2/g_{2,4}$. Thus we may consider the 9–enveloping lattices

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(9)}(\sigma): p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 \equiv 0 \bmod 9.$$

Because $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}_3^*$, we know that 3 divides $p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$. Since 3 also divides $g_{2,4}$, the above equation is equivalent to

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(9)}(\sigma) : p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 9.$$

We apply the first part of Lemma 4.14 with p = 9. Following the same argument as above leads us to the non-existent cover (5.12).

The proof of Step 5.2 is complete.

5.3 The case a = 4 is impossible

We continue our study of the possible values of a by improving Step 5.2 into

Step 5.3. With the notations and hypotheses of Step 4.8, one has the relations

 $1 \le b \le a \le 2.$

In particular, the ratio D^2/ν can only be equal to 1 or to 2.

We still need to analyze a = 4 to arrive at a contradiction. So we suppose that a = 4. As a consequence of the equality $D^2/\nu = 4/b$, with b odd, we obtain

$$4 \mid [\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)] \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$$

by Remark 4.7. Referring to Lemma 3.13, we deduce that the main covering (4.3) must correspond to the minimal covering C_{4^6} , so all lattices have index 4. In particular, we have

$$D = 4$$
 and $2^2 \| \nu$. (5.13)

Since we have $4 \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4}$, we consider the 4-enveloping lattice $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ (see (4.23)) defined by

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma) : p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4} \, p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 4 \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^\flat)$$
(5.14)

and

$$\Lambda^{(4)}(\mathrm{id}) = \Lambda_4.$$

We subdivide our argument according to the parity of $g_{2,4}$.

5.3.1 When $2 \nmid g_{2,4}$

We apply inequality (4.29) of Lemma 4.12, which leads to two cases.

If $Z_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathrm{top}}(4) = 0$, then among the six lattices $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$, at most four are distinct, and they all have an index equal to 4. So the main covering gives a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by at most four lattices with index 4. This is absurd.

If $Z_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \text{top}}(4) = 1$, write σ_0 for the corresponding automorphism. Here also, we arrive at a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by four lattices of index 4, one of these being $\Lambda(\sigma_0)$, again a contradiction.

5.3.2 When $2 \mid g_{2,4}$

In this case, the equation defining $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ degenerates. We rather work with the second equation of (4.20). Since $2 \mid g_{2,4} \mid d_2$ and since $v_2(D) = v_2(\nu) = 2$ by (5.13), we have the following inclusion

$$\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{M}^{(2)}(\sigma) \quad (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}),$$

where $\tilde{M}^{(2)}(\sigma)$ is the lattice defined by

$$M^{(2)}(\sigma) : P_{1,\sigma}(t_1, t_3)x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 2.$$

Since (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) are coprime, we necessarily have $(t_1, t_3) \not\equiv (0, 0) \mod 2$. By the explicit definition of the polynomials $P_{1,\sigma}$, we deduce

• when $(t_1, t_3) \equiv (1, 0) \mod 2$, we have $\tilde{M}^{(2)}(\sigma) = \Lambda_2$, for the four cases

$$\sigma \in \{T_2^{-1}RT_2, T_2^{-1}R^2T_2, T_2^{-1}ST_2, T_2^{-1}RST_2\}.$$

Since $\Lambda(id) \subseteq \Lambda_2$, the main covering (4.3) gives the equality

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda^?,$$

which is impossible.

- when $(t_1, t_3) \equiv (0, 1) \mod 2$, we also have the equality $\tilde{M}^{(2)}(\sigma) = \Lambda_2$ for four σ and we arrive at a contradiction.
- when $(t_1, t_3) \equiv (1, 1) \mod 2$, the equality $\tilde{M}^{(2)}(\sigma) = \Lambda_2$ holds for four σ , and here also we reach a dead end.

The proof of Step 5.3 is complete.

6 The dual covering

The strong equality $D^2/\nu \in \{1,2\}$ stated in Step 5.3 however gives no detail on D and ν separately. In the above section we exploited the properties of the main covering (4.3) to gain information on a and b. In order to understand the parameters D and ν , we will incorporate the study the dual covering (4.4).

6.1 Description of the lattices Γ by their equations

Lemma 6.1. For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$, let $\Gamma(\sigma)$ be the lattice defined in (4.7). Then we have the equations

$$\Gamma(\mathrm{id}): \begin{cases} Dx_1 \equiv 0 \mod 1\\ Dx_2 \equiv 0 \mod \nu, \end{cases}$$

$$\Gamma(T_2^{-1}RT_2): \begin{cases} D\nu(t_1t_2+t_2t_3+t_3t_4)x_1 + D(t_2^2+t_2t_4+t_4^2)x_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu \\ D\nu(t_1^2+t_1t_3+t_3^2)x_1 + D(t_1t_2+t_1t_4+t_3t_4)x_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu, \end{cases}$$

$$\Gamma(T_2^{-1}R^2T_2) : \begin{cases} D\nu(t_1t_2 + t_1t_4 + t_3t_4)x_1 + D(t_2^2 + t_2t_4 + t_4^2)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu \\ D\nu(t_1^2 + t_1t_3 + t_3^2)x_1 + D(t_1t_2 + t_2t_3 + t_3t_4)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu, \end{cases}$$

$$\Gamma(T_2^{-1}ST_2) : \begin{cases} D\nu(t_3t_4 - t_1t_2)x_1 + D(t_4^2 - t_2^2)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu \\ D\nu(t_1^2 - t_3^2)x_1 + D(t_1t_2 - t_3t_4)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu, \end{cases}$$

$$\Gamma(T_2^{-1}RST_2) : \begin{cases} D\nu(t_1t_2 + t_1t_4 + t_2t_3)x_1 + D(t_2^2 + 2t_2t_4)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu, \\ D\nu(t_1^2 + 2t_1t_3)x_1 + D(t_1t_2 + t_1t_4 + t_2t_3)x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Gamma(T_2^{-1}R^2ST_2):\begin{cases} D\nu(t_1t_4+t_2t_3+t_3t_4)x_1+D(t_4^2+2t_2t_4)x_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu\\ D\nu(t_3^2+2t_1t_3)x_1+D(t_1t_4+t_2t_3+t_3t_4)x_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2\nu. \end{cases}$$

Proof. One can prove this by a direct computation. Instead we may also appeal to Lemma 4.3 to exploit the obvious link between $\Lambda(\sigma)$ and $\Gamma(\sigma)$: to obtain $\Gamma(\sigma)$ we postmultiply by γ but to obtain $\Lambda(\sigma)$ we premultiply by γ^{-1} (see (4.6) and (4.7)). But the matrices γ and γ^{-1} are diagonal and this property explains that the variation in these two calculations reduces to putting D and ν in different places without perturbating the quadratic forms $p_{i,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ and $P_{i,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ in \mathbf{t} (see (4.20)).

6.2 Key claim: finitely many possibilities for D

We now translate Step 5.3 in terms of (D, ν) .

Step 6.2. With the notations and hypotheses of Step 4.8 one has

$$(D,\nu) \in \{(2,4), (3,9), (4,16), (5,25), (2,2), (4,8), (6,18), (8,32), (10,50)\}.$$
 (6.1)

Proof. Since $D \mid \nu$, we write $\nu = D\mu$ for some integer $\mu \ge 1$. Lemma 4.1 implies the inequality $1 \le \mu \le 5$. Since $D^2/\nu = D/\mu = a/b$, Step 5.3 leads to the equality $(D, \nu) = (\mu, \mu^2)$ or $(D, \nu) = (2\mu, 2\mu^2)$. We recover the list given in (6.1), since the pair $(D, \nu) = (1, 1)$ is not allowed by (3.6).

We continue to shrink the set of possible values of the pair (D, ν) by forbidding the prime p = 5 as a possible divisor of D. We have

Step 6.3. With the notations and hypotheses of Step 4.8 one has

$$(D,\nu) \in \{(2,4), (3,9), (4,16), (2,2), (4,8), (6,18), (8,32)\}.$$
 (6.2)

Proof. For the sake of contradiction suppose that $5 \mid D$. By (4.8) we still have $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)] \geq 5$. The proof is similar to the proof of Step 5.1 (see §5.1) and we use the same notations. So we appeal to the 5–enveloping lattices based on the relations (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4). We mimic the proof of Step 5.1 based on a discussion of the value of $gcd(5, g_{2,4})$ and on Lemmas 4.12 and 4.14. We then prove that the main covering (4.3) is impossible. So D can not be divisible by 5. Eliminating the corresponding D from the list (6.1), we find the list (6.2) and Step 6.3 is proved.

We continue to shorten the list (6.2) by proving

Step 6.4. With the notations and hypotheses of Step 4.8 one has

$$(D,\nu) \in \{(2,4), (3,9), (4,16), (2,2), (4,8), (6,18)\}.$$

Proof. We suppose that D = 8 and $\nu = 32$ to arrive at a contradiction. By (4.8), we have $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)] \ge 4$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$. As a direct consequence of (4.13) we also have $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\operatorname{id})] = 8$. The main covering (4.3) is then built with one component with index 8 and five components with index at least 4. From such a covering, it is impossible to extract a minimal covering as described in Lemmas 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14. So the pair $(D, \nu) = (8, 32)$ is not allowed.

Another progress is the following one

Step 6.5. With the notations and hypotheses of Step 4.8 one has

$$(D,\nu) \in \{(2,4), (4,16), (2,2), (4,8)\}.$$
 (6.3)

Proof. We suppose that $(D, \nu) \in \{(3, 9), (6, 18)\}$. In both cases we have $3 = \nu/D$. By (4.8) we have the lower bound

$$[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)] \ge 3. \tag{6.4}$$

In §5.2, for the proof of Step 5.2 the hypothesis a = 3 led to the property (5.8), which implies (6.4). The proof of Step 5.2 is readily adapted to this slight generalization.

6.3 Restricting the prime divisors of d_2

The index of the lattices $\Lambda(\sigma)$ and $\Gamma(\sigma)$ obviously depends on the value of d_2 (see Lemmas 4.3 and 6.1). We now restrict the possible values of d_2 by the following step.

Step 6.6. With the above hypotheses and notations, we have the following restrictions for the triples (d_2, D, ν) :

$$\begin{cases} (D,\nu) \in \{(2,4), (4,16), (2,2), (4,8)\}, \\ p \mid d_2 \Rightarrow p \in \{2,3\}. \end{cases}$$
(6.5)

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, suppose that there exists some prime $p \mid d_2$ with $p \geq 5$. Recall that $g_2(\sigma) = d_2/d_2(\sigma)$ (see § 4.7). If $\sigma \neq \sigma'$ do not both have order 3, then we have

$$gcd(g_2(\sigma), g_2(\sigma')) \in \{1, 3\}$$

(6.6)

by Lemma 4.16. We remark that $p \nmid g_2(\sigma) \Rightarrow p \mid d_2(\sigma)$. By this remark and by (6.6), we are allowed to split our proof in two cases:

- Case 1: If p divides at most one $g_2(\sigma)$ ($\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$), then p does not divide at least four $g_2(\sigma)$, so $p \mid d_2(\sigma)$ for at least four different $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$,
- Case 2: If p divides at least two $g_2(\sigma)$ ($\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$), then the number of these σ is exactly two and they both have order three. In particular, $p \mid d_2(\sigma)$ for σ in the set $\{T_2^{-1}ST_2, T_2^{-1}RST_2, T_2^{-1}R^2ST_2\}$, which are precisely the elements of order two.

6.3.1 Case 1

We use the functions $d_2(\sigma)$ and $g_2(\sigma)$ to write in another way the equations of the lattices $\Lambda(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ when $p \mid d_2(\sigma)$. Consider the equation of such a lattice $\Lambda(\sigma)$ schematically written as in Lemma 4.3 (see §4.7)

$$\Lambda(\sigma): \begin{cases} a'x_1 + b'x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D\\ \nu(c'x_1 + d'x_2) &\equiv 0 \mod d_2D. \end{cases}$$

Dividing by $g_2(\sigma)$ and using the property (4.36), we obtain, for certain coprime integers (a, b, c, d), the equivalent system of equations

$$\Lambda(\sigma) : \begin{cases} ax_1 + bx_2 \equiv 0 \mod d_2(\sigma)D\\ \nu(cx_1 + dx_2) \equiv 0 \mod d_2(\sigma)D. \end{cases}$$
(6.7)

But p divides $d_2(\sigma)D$ and it is coprime with $gcd(a, b, \nu c, \nu d)$ as a consequence of (6.3). This implies that $\Lambda(\sigma)$ ($\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$) has an index divisible by p. When $p \geq 7$, the covering (4.3) is nonsense: four of the six lattices would have an index divisible by $p \geq 7$ and we do not encounter an associated minimal covering in Lemmas 3.11, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14. In the case p = 5 we also have to avoid the minimal covering \mathcal{C}_{5^6} of Lemma 3.14, where the indices of all the lattices are equal to 5. But in our case, we have the equality (see Remark 4.4)

$$[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\mathrm{id})] = D, \tag{6.8}$$

which certainly does not divide 5 by (6.3).

6.3.2 Case 2

We make the same considerations as in Case 1. Since there are three σ with order 2, the equations (6.7) imply that in the covering (4.3) at least three lattices have an index divisible by $p \geq 5$. The lattice $\Lambda(id)$ has an index which is divisible by no prime ≥ 5 , by (6.8) and by Step 6.5. By considering Lemmas 3.11, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14, we deduce that in the main covering (4.3) the three lattices associated with σ of order 2 are superfluous, which means that the extracted minimal covering has necessarily length three. So this covering leads to the equality

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \{\mathrm{id}, T_2^{-1}RT_2, T_2^{-1}R^2T_2\}} \Lambda(\sigma) = \mathbb{Z}^2$$

But this equality contradicts (4.9). The proof of Step 6.6 is complete.

6.4 Further restrictions on d_2D , part 1

We continue to restrict the possible values of the triples (d_2, D, ν) by eliminating the value D = 4 in the set (6.5).

Step 6.7. With the above hypotheses and notations, we have the following restrictions for the triples (d_2, D, ν) :

$$\begin{cases} (D,\nu) \in \{(2,4), (2,2)\}, \\ p \mid d_2 \Rightarrow p \in \{2,3\}. \end{cases}$$
(6.9)

For the sake of contradiction, we suppose that D = 4. We recall the notations (4.11), (4.12) and (4.22) and we notice

$$4 \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4}.$$

Thus we are allowed to use the 4-enveloping lattices $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ (see (4.23), (4.24), (4.25) and (5.14)). The main covering (4.3) implies the following covering

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_4 \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^\flat} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma), \tag{6.10}$$

since $\Lambda(id) = \Lambda_D = \Lambda_4$. We will use the following facts from Lemma 4.12, with x = 4, to shorten the number of lattices participating in the covering (6.10) in order to arrive at a contradiction.

(i) if $2 \nmid g_{2,4}$, we apply Lemma 4.12. The second part of (4.29) of Lemma 4.12, for x = 4, shows that there is at most one $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ such that $2 \mid p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ and $2 \mid p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$. We denote this potential element by σ_0 and its existence corresponds to the equality $Z_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \text{top}}(4) = 1$. By Remark 4.10 and by the first part of (4.29), the main covering (6.10) becomes

if
$$\sigma_0$$
 exists: $\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_4 \cup \Lambda(\sigma_0) \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}_{\leq 2}} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ (6.11)

if
$$\sigma_0$$
 does not exist: $\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_4 \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}_{\leq 3}} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ (6.12)

for some $\mathfrak{S}_{\leq 2}^{\flat}$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{\leq 3}^{\flat}$ (see (4.19)). In these two coverings, there are at most 4 lattices, all different from \mathbb{Z}^2 . Since in these formulas the enveloping lattices $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ and Λ_4 have index 4, the coverings (6.11) and (6.12) are nonexistent, since it is impossible to extract a minimal covering appearing in Lemma 3.11 or 3.12.

- (ii) if $2 | g_{2,4}$, then the coefficient of x_2 in the equation (5.14) is always even. We continue to denote by σ_0 the potential σ such that $2 | p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ and $2 | p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$. We investigate different situations
 - If σ_0 exists, we will use the fact that the index of Λ_4 is equal to D = 4 and that the index of $\Lambda(\sigma_0)$ is at least 2. For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} - \{\sigma_0\}$, we appeal to Lemma 4.12, formula (4.29), alinea (*iii*) to conclude that the pair of coefficients $(p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}))$ modulo 4 has its values in the set

$$(p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})) \in \{(1,0), (1,1), (1,2), (1,3), (3,0), (3,1), (3,2), (3,3)\},\$$

where we notice that the first component of each pair is odd. Returning to (5.14), we see that every $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ ($\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat} - \{\sigma_0\}$) is included in the lattice Λ_2 , since $g_{2,4}$ is even. Hence the covering (6.11) leads to a contradiction, since it reduces to

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda^?, \tag{6.13}$$

which is not compatible with Lemma 3.10.

– If σ_0 does not exist, we use Lemma 4.12, formula (4.29), alinea (*ii*). We suppose that (0, 1) (and equivalently (0, 3)) does not belong to the set

$$\left\{ \left(\alpha p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), \alpha p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \right) : \alpha \in (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^*, \sigma \in S_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \text{top}}(4) \right\}.$$

We will treat the case where (2,1) replaces (0,1) below. We know that the pair of coefficients $(p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}))$ ($\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$) modulo 4 has its values in the set

$$(p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})) \in \{(1,0), (1,1), (1,2), (1,3), (2,1), (2,3), (3,0), (3,1), (3,2), (3,3)\}.$$

We return to the equation (5.14) to deduce, by straightforward calculations, that in the present situation we have (recall that $g_{2,4}$ is even) the inclusions

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma) \subseteq \begin{cases} \Lambda_2 & \text{if } 2 \nmid p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \\ \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 + (g_{2,4}/2)x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2\} & \text{if } 2 \mid p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}). \end{cases}$$

where the lattices, on the RHS, are independent from σ . We deduce that the covering (6.12) is simplified to

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda^?. \tag{6.14}$$

This is impossible due to Lemma 3.10.

It remains to analyze the case

$$(2,1) \notin \left\{ \left(\alpha p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), \alpha p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \right) : \alpha \in (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^*, \sigma \in S_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \text{top}}(4) \right\}.$$

In this case, $(p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}))$ modulo 4 has its values in the set $(p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})) \in \{(1,0), (1,1), (1,2), (1,3), (0,1), (0,3), (3,0), (3,1), (3,2), (3,3)\}.$

If $4 \nmid g_{2,4}$, then we consider the 4-enveloping lattices from equation (5.14). By looking at the above set of values for $(p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}), p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}))$, we obtain the inclusions

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma) \subseteq \begin{cases} \Lambda_2 & \text{if } 2 \nmid p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \\ \{(x_1, x_2) : x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2\} & \text{if } 2 \mid p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \end{cases}$$

for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$, and we finish the argument as before.

So suppose that $4 \mid g_{2,4}$, hence $4 \mid d_2$. We now distinguish two further cases.

- * If $(D, \nu) = (4, 16)$, all lattices have index at least 4 (since $\Gamma(\text{id})$ has index 4). This situation is readily handled by looking at the top equations of the system (4.20) and finding a σ with $p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \not\equiv 0 \mod 2$, see Lemma 4.14.
- * If $(D, \nu) = (4, 8)$, we switch to the bottom equations of (4.20). After dividing by ν , we obtain a congruence modulo d_2D/ν , which is divisible by 2. An explicit study of the polynomial $P_{1,\sigma}$ shows that it vanishes modulo 2 at $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}$ for at most one σ . For all the other σ , we have $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_2$ thus leading to an impossible covering.

The proof of Step 6.7 is complete.

6.5 Further restrictions on d_2D , part 2

We continue to restrict the possible values of the triples (d_2, D, ν) by eliminating the even values of d_2 in the set (6.9).

Step 6.8. With the above hypotheses and notations, we have the following restrictions for the triples (d_2, D, ν) :

$$\begin{cases} (D,\nu) \in \{(2,4), (2,2)\}, \\ p \mid d_2 \Rightarrow p = 3. \end{cases}$$

For the sake of contradiction, we suppose $(D, \nu) \in \{(2, 4), (2, 2)\}$, but $v_2(d_2) \geq 1$. The proof mimics the proof of Step 6.7 but is more delicate, since the lattice $\Lambda(id)$ is now Λ_2 instead of the smaller lattice Λ_4 as in Step 6.7. We write the covering (4.3) as

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = (\Lambda_2 \setminus \Lambda_4) \cup \mathcal{L},$$

with

$$\mathcal{L} = \Lambda_4 \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^\flat} \Lambda(\sigma).$$

The set \mathcal{L} is well suited to apply Lemma 4.12 with x = 4. We explain how to modify the proof of Step 6.7 to obtain Step 6.8.

6.5.1 Case where $v_2(g_{2,4}^2) < v_2(d_2D)$

This inequality combined with the hypothesis D = 2 leads to

 $4 \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4},$

which allows us to consider the 4-enveloping lattices $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(4)}(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ (see (4.23)).

- if $2 \nmid g_{2,4}$, the proof is the same as in §6.4 (ii) with the help of (4.29), alinea (i).
- if $2 | g_{2,4}$, we follow the proof of §6.4 (iii). We now have $\Lambda(id) = \Lambda_2$ instead of $\Lambda_4 \subset \Lambda_2$. This alteration does not modify the final equalities (6.13) (σ_0 exists) or (6.14) (σ_0 does not exist). However, we need to modify the last paragraph of §6.4 (iii), when we handle the case $4 | g_{2,4}$. In our current situation, we switch to the bottom equations (as in the case $(D, \nu) = (4, 8)$ before). An explicit study of the polynomial $P_{1,\sigma}$ shows that it vanishes modulo 2 at $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}$ for at most one σ , and we are done.

So the hypothesis $2 \mid d_2$ is incorrect when $v_2(g_{2,4}^2) < v_2(d_2D)$ and $(D,\nu) \in \{(2,2), (2,4)\}$.

6.5.2 Case where $v_2(g_{2,4}^2) \ge v_2(d_2D)$

The initial assumption $v_2(d_2D) \ge 2$ implies the inequality $v_2(g_{2,4}) \ge 1$. Furthermore, since $g_{2,4} \mid d_2$, we always have $v_2(g_{2,4}) < v_2(d_2D)$. So we have the conditions

$$v_2(g_{2,4}^2) \ge v_2(d_2D)$$
 and $1 \le v_2(g_{2,4}) < v_2(d_2D)$.

Recalling the notations (4.11) and (4.22) we prove the following

Lemma 6.9. Let $D \ge 1$ be an integer. For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$, suppose that the lattice $\Lambda(\sigma)$ is proper. Let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ be a 4-tuple of coprime integers such that $d_2 = |t_1t_4 - t_2t_3|$. We assume that $v_2(g_{2,4}^2) \ge v_2(d_2D)$ and $1 \le v_2(g_{2,4}) < v_2(d_2D)$. Then, with at most one exception that we will denote by σ_{\dagger} , one has for every σ in the set \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}

- 1. either $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_2$,
- 2. or $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : \Lambda(\sigma)]$ is odd (hence ≥ 3).

In particular, the first case happens when $p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \not\equiv 0 \mod 2$.

Proof. Let $T := \text{gcd}(d_2D, 2^{\infty})$ and let T_1 be the odd integer defined by $T_1 := d_2D/T$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, the two equations of (4.20) are equivalent to the system of four equations modulo T and T_1 , that, with obvious notations, we write as

$$\Lambda(\sigma): \begin{cases} g_{2,4}p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 &\equiv 0 \mod T \\ g_{2,4}p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}^2p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 &\equiv 0 \mod T_1 \\ \nu(P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}P_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2) &\equiv 0 \mod T \\ \nu(P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}P_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2) &\equiv 0 \mod T_1, \end{cases}$$
(6.15)

where we used the inequality $v_2(g_{2,4}^2) \ge v_2(d_2D) = v_2(T)$ to shorten the first equation. Our discussion splits in the following cases:

- If $v_2(g_{2,4}p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) < v_2(T)$, the first equation shows that $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_2$. In particular, since we assumed that $v_2(g_{2,4}) < v_2(d_2D)$, this case certainly happens when $2 \nmid p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$.

- If $v_2(g_{2,4}p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) \ge v_2(T)$, the first equation gives no more constraints. Suppose now that $v_2(\nu) < v_2(T)$. Then the third equation of the system (6.15) leads to the equation

$$P_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_1 + g_{2,4}P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2,$$

which reduces to

$$P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 2.$$

But the hypothesis $v_2(g_{2,4}) \ge 1$ implies that among the integers t_1 and t_3 at least one is odd. By a direct study of the explicit values of $P_{1,\sigma}$ we have already met the equality

$$\left|\left\{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}: P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \equiv 0 \bmod 2\right\}\right| = 1.$$

Denote by σ_{\dagger} this element. So for $\sigma \neq \sigma_{\dagger}$, one has again $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_2$.

- If $v_2(g_{2,4}p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) \geq v_2(T)$ and $v_2(\nu) \geq v_2(T)$, the first and the third equations of the system (6.15) disappear. We are left with the second and fourth equations, which imply that the index of $\Lambda(\sigma)$ is necessarily odd. This corresponds to case 2. of Lemma 6.9.

We now prove that the covering (4.3) leads to a contradiction by appealing to Lemma 6.9. By Lemma 4.14, we know that there exists $\mathfrak{S}_{\leq 2}^{\flat}$ such that

$$p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \not\equiv 0 \mod 2 \quad \text{for } \sigma \notin \mathfrak{S}_{<2}^{\flat}.$$

For $\sigma \notin \mathfrak{S}_{\leq 2}^{\flat}$, one has $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_2$. We will only treat the case where $\mathfrak{S}_{\leq 2}^{\flat}$ contains exactly two elements that we call σ_1 and σ_2 since it is the worst case. If it exists, σ_{\dagger} belongs to the set $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$.

Since D = 2, we have $\Lambda(id) = \Lambda_2$. Therefore Lemma 6.9 transforms the main covering (4.3) into

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda(\sigma_1) \cup \Lambda(\sigma_2). \tag{6.16}$$

At most for one σ_i , we merely know that $\Lambda(\sigma_i)$ is proper, this corresponds to $\sigma_i = \sigma_{\dagger}$ and $\Lambda(\sigma_{\dagger}) = \Lambda^2$. For the remaining $\Lambda(\sigma_j)$ $(j \neq i)$, we know that it is either contained in Λ_2 or it has an odd index ≥ 3 . In any of these cases, the equality (6.16) is absurd since we find no corresponding minimal covering in Lemma 3.11.

We considered all the possible cases related to the hypothesis $2 \mid d_2$. They all lead to a dead end. The proof of Step 6.8 is complete.

6.6 Further restrictions on d_2D , part 3

We continue to restrict the possible values of the triples (d_2, D, ν) by eliminating the triples such that $9 \mid d_2$. In particular, this implies that the set of such triples is finite. We will prove

Step 6.10. With the above hypotheses and notations, we have the following restrictions for the triples (d_2, D, ν) :

$$\begin{cases} (D,\nu) \in \{(2,2), (2,4)\}, \\ d_2 \in \{1,3\}. \end{cases}$$

The proof mimics the proof of some steps above with necessary modifications. So we have D = 2 and for the sake of contradiction, we suppose that $9 \mid d_2$. We recall the notations and properties (4.11), (4.12) and (4.22). We also recall the ℓ -enveloping lattice $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\ell)}(\sigma)$ defined in (4.23), when $\ell \mid d_2D/g_{2,4}$ and $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$. In this subsection, we will work with $\ell = 3$ or $\ell = 9$. We will distinguish cases according to the value of $v_3(g_{2,4})$.

6.6.1 Case where $v_3(g_{2,4}) = 0$

We apply Lemma 4.12 (x = 3) and split our discussion according to the value of $Z_{\tilde{t}, top}(3) \in \{0, 1, 5\}$.

• If $Z_{\tilde{t},top}(3) = 0$. We have the equalities of coverings

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}} \Lambda(\sigma) = \Lambda_2 \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{<3}^\flat} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$$

for some $\mathfrak{S}_{\leq 3}^{\flat}$. This covering is inadmissible, since the last three lattices have their index equal to 3 and the first lattice has index divisible by 2. This corresponds to no minimal covering in Lemmas 3.11 and 3.12.

• If $Z_{\tilde{t},top}(3) = 1$. The main covering (4.3) is written as

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}} \Lambda(\sigma) = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda^? \cup \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}_{\leq 2}} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$$
(6.17)

for some $\mathfrak{S}_{\leq 2}^{\flat}$, where all $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$ have index equal to 3. The covering (6.17) is impossible: by Lemmas 3.11 and 3.12 it has no associated minimal covering. • If $Z_{\tilde{\mathbf{t}}, \mathrm{top}}(3) = 5$, then we have $p_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \equiv p_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \equiv 0 \mod 3$ for every $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$. Since $9 \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4}$ in this case, we have the inclusion $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(9)}(\sigma)$ and, after division by 3, we write the equation defining $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(9)}(\sigma)$ ($\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$) as

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}^{(9)}(\sigma): \widetilde{p_{1,\sigma}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 + g_{2,4}\widetilde{p_{2,\sigma}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{t}})x_2 \equiv 0 \bmod 3$$

with the notations of Lemma 4.13. Now the proof is similar to the proof given in the two items above by replacing the pair of integers $(Z_{\tilde{t},top}(3), n_{\tilde{t},top}(3))$ by $(\widetilde{Z_{\tilde{t},top}}(9), \widetilde{n_{\tilde{t},top}}(9))$, and the first part of (4.30) by Lemma 4.13. Here also we show that this case is impossible.

We investigated all the cases related to $v_3(g_{2,4}) = 0$. They all lead to impossibilities.

6.6.2 Case where $v_3(g_{2,4}) \ge 2$

These conditions imply

$$9 \mid d_2 D, \quad (t_1, t_3) \not\equiv (0, 0) \mod 3, \quad D = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad 3 \nmid \nu,$$

the two last ones being a consequence of Step 6.8. We now work with the bottom equations of (4.20). By an explicit study of this bottom equation, we see that, after factoring $g_{2,4}$ out of $P_{2,\sigma}$, one has the inclusion $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{M}^{(9)}(\sigma)$, where $\tilde{M}^{(9)}(\sigma)$ is the lattice defined by

$$\tilde{M}^{(9)}(\sigma) : P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 9 \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}.$$
 (6.18)

Actually, $P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})$ is a polynomial in the variables t_1 and t_3 only. Since $(t_1, t_3) \not\equiv (0, 0) \mod 3$, we apply Lemma 4.15 in the form of the inequality (4.34) to state that there is at most one $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ such that $P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \equiv 0 \mod 9$. Let σ_0 denote this potential element. Then for every $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$, $\sigma \neq \sigma_0$, we have the inclusion $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \Lambda_3$. Then the main covering (4.3) reads

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda_3 \cup \Lambda^?.$$

Such a covering is ruled out by Lemma 3.11.

6.6.3 Case where $v_3(g_{2,4}) = 1$

The conditions now are

$$3 || g_{2,4}, 9 | d_2 D, (t_1, t_3) \not\equiv (0, 0) \mod 3, D = 2 \text{ and } 3 \nmid \nu,$$

the two last ones being a consequence of Step 6.8. We again work with the bottom equation of (4.20). For every $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$, one has the inclusion $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{M}^{(3)}(\sigma)$ where $\tilde{M}^{(3)}(\sigma)$ is the lattice defined by

$$\tilde{M}^{(3)}(\sigma): P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 3.$$

We investigate several cases

• if $t_1 \not\equiv t_3 \mod 3$, then we check by hand that there exists at most one $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ such that $P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \equiv 0 \mod 3$. For the remaining $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ one has $\tilde{M}^{(3)}(\sigma) = \Lambda_3$ and the main covering (4.3) leads to the equality

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda_3 \cup \Lambda^?,$$

which is absurd due to Lemma 3.11.

• if $t_1 \equiv t_3 (\not\equiv 0) \mod 3$, we return to the enveloping lattices $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma) \ (\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat})$, which are defined by

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma): p_{1,\sigma}(\pm 1, \tilde{t}_2, \pm 1, \tilde{t}_4) x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 3.$$

We verify that if $\tilde{t}_2 \not\equiv \tilde{t}_4 \mod 3$, then the equation of each $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$ is equivalent to $x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 3$ from which we deduce the impossible equality

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \Lambda_2 \cup \Lambda_3.$$

• if $t_1 \equiv t_3 \neq 0 \mod 3$ and if $\tilde{t}_2 \equiv \tilde{t}_4 \neq 0 \mod 3$, we utilize the inclusion $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{M}^{(9)}(\sigma)$. Note that the defining equation of $\tilde{M}^{(9)}(\sigma)$ is given by

$$\tilde{M}^{(9)}(\sigma): P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 9 \quad \text{ for } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^\flat,$$

since $g_{2,4}P_{2,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}) \equiv 0 \mod 9$ in this case. We recognize the situation already treated in §6.6.2, equation (6.18), leading to an impossible covering.

The proof of Step 6.10 is complete. We rephrase the set described in Step 6.10 in the form

$$(d_2, D, \nu) \in \{(1, 2, 2), (1, 2, 4), (3, 2, 2), (3, 2, 4)\}$$

$$(6.19)$$

that we continue to shrink.

6.7 The case $(d_2, D, \nu) = (1, 2, 4)$ is impossible

So suppose that we have $(d_2, D, \nu) = (1, 2, 4)$ in order to arrive at a contradiction. We consider the dual covering (4.4), where equations for $\Gamma(\sigma)$ are given in Lemma 6.1. In particular, we have

$$\Gamma(\mathrm{id}) = \{ (x_1, x_2) : x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2 \}.$$
(6.20)

This lattice has index 2 and by (3.8) all the $\Gamma(\sigma)$ have an index ≥ 2 . With the above values of (d_2, D, ν) we have $D\nu = 8$ and $d_2\nu = 4$. So every system of equations defining $\Gamma(\sigma)$ is equivalent to

$$\Gamma(\sigma) : \begin{cases} p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2\\ P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2. \end{cases}$$
(6.21)

Since $\Gamma(\sigma)$ is a proper lattice, at least one of the integers $p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ and $P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ is odd. This leads to the equality

$$\Gamma(\sigma) = \{ (x_1, x_2) : x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2 \} \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}.$$

Upon combining with (6.20), we deduce that the covering (4.4) is not possible.

The relation (6.19) is thus strengthened to

$$(d_2, D, \nu) \in \{(1, 2, 2), (3, 2, 2), (3, 2, 4)\}.$$

6.8 The case $(d_2, D, \nu) = (3, 2, 4)$ is impossible

This case generalizes what we just did. We now have $d_2\nu = 12$ and the $\Gamma(\sigma)$ ($\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$) are defined by congruences modulo 12. These lattices are proper, since $\Gamma(\mathrm{id})$ is proper, but this does not imply that they remain proper, when one replaces the modulus 12 by 4. The equality (6.21) is no more true, but we still have the inclusion

$$\Gamma(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}(\sigma) : \begin{cases} p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2\\ P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2, \end{cases}$$

where $p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ and $P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ are defined by (4.20). We have the inclusion $\Gamma(\sigma) \subseteq \{(x_1, x_2) : x_2 \equiv 0 \mod 2\}$ as soon as at least one of the integers $p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ and $P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})$ is odd. By a direct verification, we see that this congruence modulo 2 is verified for each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ and for each quadruple \mathbf{t} such that $t_1t_4 - t_2t_3$ is odd. Since $3 = d_2 = |t_1t_4 - t_2t_3|$ is indeed odd for us, the dual covering (4.4) is the following nonsense

$$\mathbb{Z}^2 = \{ (x_1, x_2) : x_2 \equiv 0 \bmod 2 \},\$$

and the case $(d_2, D, \nu) = (3, 2, 4)$ is impossible. So we know that necessarily

$$(d_2, D, \nu) \in \{(1, 2, 2), (3, 2, 2)\}.$$

6.9 Study when $(d_2, D, \nu) = (3, 2, 2)$

We have $g_{2,4} \in \{1,3\}$ in our current situation.

6.9.1 When $g_{2,4} = 1$

We have $3 \mid d_2 D/g_{2,4}$, so we can use the 3-enveloping lattice $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$ to exploit the inclusion

$$\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma) \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat},$$

and the equality $\Lambda(id) = \Lambda_2$. Our discussion is again based on the possible values of the function $Z_{t,top}(3)$ that we find in Lemma 4.12, equation (4.30), in order to understand the behavior of the equations (5.9).

• The equality $Z_{t,top}(3) = 0$ is impossible. Indeed, the first inequality of (4.30) and the covering (4.3) would lead to a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by four lattices, one with index 2 (corresponding to Λ_2), and at most three with index equal to 3 (corresponding to $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\sigma)$). Such a covering is impossible as a consequence of Lemmas 3.11 and 3.12.

• The equality $Z_{t,top}(3) = 1$ is impossible. Now we are led to a covering of \mathbb{Z}^2 by at most four lattices: one with index 2 (corresponding to Λ_2), and at most two with index equal to 3 and finally some Λ^2 . This is also impossible by Lemmas 3.11 and 3.12.

• The situation when $Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(3) = 5$. By (4.31), we know that $\mathbf{t} = \tilde{\mathbf{t}}$ belongs to the exceptional set \mathcal{T}_3 containing six elements. So, by definition, we have $p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv 0 \mod 3$ for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$. We check (or, alternatively, we apply Remark 4.6) that we also have the equalities $P_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv P_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}) \equiv 0 \mod 3$. Then by Remark 4.5 we deduce that the representative matrix of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$ belongs to $\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$. This gives the inclusion

$$\operatorname{Aut}(G_2, \mathbb{Q}) \subset \operatorname{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z}), \tag{6.22}$$

which implies (1.6) of Theorem 1.4. Since $(D, \nu) = (2, 2)$ holds in both cases, the matrix γ defined in (3.7) has the value

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0\\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6.23}$$

which leads to $G_1 = G_2^{\dagger}$. This is precisely the second part of (1.5). So we recovered the conclusion of Theorem 1.4 in this case.

6.9.2 When $g_{2,4} = 3$

Recall that the t_i are coprime. So we now have the condition $g_{1,3} = 1$. We consider the bottom equations of (4.20). Since $(d_2, D, \nu) = (3, 2, 2)$, we have the inclusion $\Lambda(\sigma) \subseteq \tilde{M}^{(3)}(\sigma)$, where

 $\tilde{M}^{(3)}(\sigma): P_{1,\sigma}(\tilde{\mathbf{t}})x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 3.$

In this case we get the inclusion (6.22) precisely when $t_1 \equiv t_3 \mod 3$, and all other cases lead to an invalid covering. Indeed, we get $\tilde{M}^{(3)}(\sigma) \subseteq \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 \equiv 0 \mod 3\}$ for all but one σ if $t_1 \not\equiv t_3 \mod 3$. The remainder of the proof is identical to §6.9.1.

6.10 Study when $(d_2, D, \nu) = (1, 2, 2)$

This is the easiest case. By Remark 4.5 we deduce that (6.22) holds and finally the matrix γ (see (3.7)) here also has the value given in (6.23), which leads to $G_1 = G_2^{\dagger}$. This is the second part of (1.5). So we recovered the conclusion of Theorem 1.4 in this case.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is complete.

A Algorithms

Consider the set

 $\mathcal{S} = \{ (L_1, \dots, L_6) : L_1 \cup \dots \cup L_6 = \mathbb{Z}^2, L_i \text{ is a subgroup of } \mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ for all } i \}.$

It will be most convenient to consider general subgroups of \mathbb{Z}^2 , i.e. we allow the rank of L_i to be smaller than 2. We turn the set of 6-tuples (L_1, \ldots, L_6) in a partial order by defining

$$(L_1,\ldots,L_6) \preccurlyeq (K_1,\ldots,K_6)$$

if there exists a permutation $\sigma \in S_6$ such that

$$L_i \subseteq K_{\sigma(i)}.$$

In particular, this gives a partial order on the set S by restriction. Recall that S consists of infinitely many elements. A good way to describe them is as follows.

Theorem A.1. There are finitely many minimal elements in S under the ordering \preccurlyeq .

Write \mathcal{T} for this finite set. Then one may reconstruct \mathcal{S} as

$$\mathcal{S} = \{ (L_1, \dots, L_6) : t \preccurlyeq (L_1, \dots, L_6) \text{ for some } t \in \mathcal{T} \}.$$

The goal of this section is to give a constructive proof of the above theorem. In fact, we will use an algorithm to compute a finite superset of \mathcal{T} . We will also show the following result in the process.

Theorem A.2. There exists a finite set of points $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$ with the following property. Suppose that (L_1, \ldots, L_6) satisfies

$$P \subseteq L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_6.$$

Then we have $L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_6 = \mathbb{Z}^2$.

The list P will be completely explicit.

A.1 Finding covers

The goal of this subsection is to give and explain the algorithm that computed Table 1. We will first give an important subroutine. All our algorithms are implemented with SageMath.

A.1.1 Subroutine for covering

We will now give an algorithm that accomplishes the following task.

```
Routine isCover(L).
Input: a list (L_i)_{1 \le i \le n}, where each L_i is a subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^2.
Output: return True if and only if \bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} L_i = \mathbb{Z}^2.
```

```
V = FreeModule(ZZ, 2)
e1 = vector((1, 0))
e2 = vector((0, 1))
def isCover(L):
    boolean = True
    for i in range(len(L)):
        if L[i].rank() == 2:
            boolean = False
    if boolean:
        return False
    W = V.span([e1, e2])
    for i in range(len(L)):
        if L[i].rank() == 2:
            W = W.intersection(L[i])
    genList = W.gens()
    gen1 = genList[0]
    gen2 = genList[1]
    a = gen1[0]
    b = gen2[1]
    for i in range(a):
        for j in range(b):
            boolean = False
            for k in range(len(L)):
```

```
v = vector((i, j))
if L[k].rank() == 2 and v in L[k]:
            boolean = True
if not boolean:
        return False
```

return True

Lemma A.3. The subroutine is Cover(L) outputs true if and only if $\bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} L_i = \mathbb{Z}^2$.

Proof. We have

$$\bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} L_i \ne \mathbb{Z}^2,$$

if the rank of L_i is smaller than 2 for all *i*. This is checked in the first seven lines of the algorithm. Write S for the subset of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that the rank of L_i equals 2. Then we observe that

$$\bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} L_i = \mathbb{Z}^2 \Longleftrightarrow \bigcup_{i \in S} L_i = \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

So it suffices to show that is Cover(L) outputs true if and only if $\bigcup_{i \in S} L_i = \mathbb{Z}^2$. Now we check this last condition as follows. Define

$$W := \bigcap_{i \in S} L_i.$$

Since all the L_i are of rank 2, we see that W is of finite index in \mathbb{Z}^2 . The generators of W are given by SageMath in row echelon form with the first generator being (a, 0) for some a, and the second generator being (*, b) for some b. From this, we see that a fundamental domain for \mathbb{Z}^2/W is

$$\mathcal{F} = \{ (i, j) : 0 \le i < a, 0 \le j < b \}.$$

By this we mean that

$$\bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f + W = \mathbb{Z}^2,$$

and $(f + W) \cap (g + W) = \{0\}$ for all distinct $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$. By construction of W, we have that

$$\bigcup_{i\in S} L_i = \mathbb{Z}^2 \iff \mathcal{F} \subseteq \bigcup_{i\in S} L_i.$$

This last condition is checked at the end of the algorithm.

A.1.2 Main algorithm

We will now give the main recursive algorithm. We define the following list

We write P[j] for the *j*-th item of *P*, and len(P) for the length of *P*.

Routine FindLattice(L, index).

Input: a list $(L_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$, where each L_i is a subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^2 , and an integer index satisfying $0 \le \text{index} < \text{len}(P)$.

Assumptions on input: we assume that

$$P[j] \in \bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} L_i$$

for all $j \ge 0$ smaller than the variable index and that

$$\bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} L_i \ne \mathbb{Z}^2$$

Output: return a set \mathcal{T} of tuples $(K_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ such that $(L_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \preccurlyeq (K_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} K_i = \mathbb{Z}^2$ and such that the following property holds. Let $(L'_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ be a tuple satisfying

$$\bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} L'_i = \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad (L_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \preccurlyeq (L'_i)_{1 \le i \le n}, \quad L'_i \ne \mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ for all } i.$$

Then there exists $(K_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(K_i)_{1 \le i \le n} \preccurlyeq (L'_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$.

```
e1 = vector((1, 0))
e2 = vector((0, 1))
def FindLattice(L, index):
    Solutions = []
    v = PointList[index]
    LatticeIndex = 0
    while L[LatticeIndex].rank() != 0 and LatticeIndex < len(L) - 1:
        LatticeIndex = LatticeIndex + 1
Boolean = True
```

```
while Boolean:
    Boolean = False
    for i in range(len(L)):
        if v in L[i]:
            Boolean = True
            index = index + 1
            v = PointList[index]
            break
for i in range(LatticeIndex + 1):
    genList = []
    for j in range(len(L[i].gens())):
        genList = genList + [L[i].gen(j)]
    genList = genList + [v]
    Lnew = L[i].span(genList)
    Lold = L[i]
    if e1 not in Lnew or e2 not in Lnew:
        L[i] = Lnew
        if isCover(L):
            Solutions = Solutions + L
        else:
            Solutions = Solutions + FindLattice(L, index + 1)
    L[i] = Lold
return Solutions
```

Here PointList is the list P as specified in equation (A.1).

Lemma A.4. Suppose that $n \leq 6$. Then the algorithm FindLattice(L, index) terminates and gives the claimed output.

Proof. Let us first remark that the algorithm FindLattice(L, index) in principle may crash. This can only happen in the assignment

v = PointList[index]

in the first while loop, because the variable index may be out of bounds, or in other words the variable index might be at least the length of the list P. We will first show that this does not happen for $n \leq 6$, and here we will of course use the specific shape of P in equation (A.1).

We run the algorithm with $L = (\{0\})_{1 \le i \le 6}$ on the computer, and we find that the algorithm terminates without crashing. Now suppose that

$$P \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \le i \le 6} L_i \tag{A.2}$$

for some subgroups $L_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then we claim that

$$\bigcup_{1 \le i \le 6} L_i = \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

Suppose that the claim is false. We will show that then the algorithm crashes. Indeed, take such a list $(L_i)_{1 \le i \le 6}$. By equation (A.2) we may ensure that we recursively call the routine FindLattice(K, index) with a list $(K_i)_{1 \le i \le 6}$ satisfying

$$(K_i)_{1 \le i \le 6} \preccurlyeq (L_i)_{1 \le i \le 6}.$$

But then the algorithm must crash.

From the claim we deduce that the algorithm does not crash on all valid inputs for $n \leq 6$. Furthermore, it is also clear that the algorithm terminates if it does not crash, since at each recursive call we increase the variable index by 1.

It remains to show that the algorithm gives the claimed output. Take a tuple $(L'_i)_{1 \le i \le 6}$ satisfying

$$\bigcup_{1 \le i \le 6} L'_i = \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad (L_i)_{1 \le i \le 6} \preccurlyeq (L'_i)_{1 \le i \le 6}, \quad L'_i \ne \mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ for all } i.$$

To find our tuple $(K_i)_{1 \le i \le 6}$, we simply enforce that $(K_i)_{1 \le i \le 6} \preccurlyeq (L'_i)_{1 \le i \le 6}$ at each recursive step.

A.1.3 Reducing the list

The above algorithm gives an output of 6131 elements. However, many of those are not minimal under the ordering \preccurlyeq . We prune them to a list of only 54 elements using the following algorithm.

```
n = 6
V = FreeModule(ZZ,2)
TrivialModule = V.zero_submodule()
e1 = vector((1, 0))
e2 = vector((0, 1))
Answer = FindLattice([TrivialModule for i in range(n)], 0)
RealAnswer = [[TrivialModule for i in range(n)] for
j in range(Integer(len(Answer)/n))]
for i in range(Integer(len(Answer)/n)):
    RealAnswer[i] = prune([Answer[n * i + j] for j in range(n)])
ShortList = []
boolean = True
for i in range(len(RealAnswer)):
    for j in range(len(ShortList)):
        boolean = True
        if containment(ShortList[j], RealAnswer[i]):
            boolean = False
            break
    if boolean:
        ShortList.append(RealAnswer[i])
```

```
print(ShortList)
```

The subroutine prune checks if one can remove any element of the list $(L_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ such that the result still has union \mathbb{Z}^2 . If so, it removes such elements from the list.

```
def prune(L):
    for i in range(len(L)):
        Lold2 = L[i]
        L[i] = TrivialModule
        if not isCover(L):
            L[i] = Lold2
    zeroCount = 0
    for i in range(len(L)):
        if L[i] == TrivialModule:
            zeroCount = zeroCount + 1
    for i in range(len(L) - zeroCount):
        if L[i] == TrivialModule:
            for j in range(len(L) - zeroCount, len(L)):
                if L[j] != TrivialModule:
                    L[i] = L[j]
                    L[j] = TrivialModule
                    break
```

return(L)

Finally, the subroutine containment returns true if and only if $L_1 \preccurlyeq L_2$. We remark that SageMath considers permutations on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, while indices of lists start at 0. Therefore we use $\sigma(i+1) - 1$ to get a permutation on $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$.

```
def containment(L1, L2):
    for iter in range(len(L1)):
        if L1[iter] == TrivialModule:
            break

G = SymmetricGroup(iter + 1)
    for sigma in G:
        boolean = True
        for i in range(len(L1)):
            genList = L1[i].gens()
            for j in range(len(genList)):
                if genList[j] not in L2[sigma(i + 1) - 1]:
                  boolean = False

        if boolean:
        return True
    return False
```

A.2 Gröbner bases

Here we shall provide full proofs of Lemma 4.16 and Lemma 4.14. The following routine will be essential.

Routine Groebner(L). Input: a list L of polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{x}]$. Output: return True if and only if 3 is in the Gröbner basis of the ideal generated by the elements in L.

```
def Groebner(L):
    I = ideal(L)
    B = I.groebner_basis()
    if 3 in B:
        return True
    else:
        return False
```

We will now define the polynomials from Lemma 4.3 in SageMath.

```
R.<t1, t2, t3, t4, u1, u2, u3, u4> = ZZ['t1, t2, t3, t4, u1, u2, u3, u4']
R1 = t1 * t2 + t2 * t3 + t3 * t4
R2 = t2 * t2 + t2 * t4 + t4 * t4
Rsquared1 = t1 * t2 + t1 * t4 + t3 * t4
Rsquared2 = t2 * t2 + t2 * t4 + t4 * t4
S1 = t3 * t4 - t1 * t2
S2 = t4 * t4 - t2 * t2
RS1 = t1 * t2 + t1 * t4 + t2 * t3
RS2 = t2 * t2 + 2 * t2 * t4
RsquaredS1 = t1 * t4 + t2 * t3 + t3 * t4
RsquaredS1 = t1 * t4 + t2 * t3 + t3 * t4
RsquaredS2 = t4 * t4 + 2 * t2 * t4
```

A.2.1 Proof of Lemma 4.16

In order to prove Lemma 4.16 in the other cases, we start by defining the polynomials in the bottom equations. We will only need the polynomial appearing in front of x_1 .

botR = t1 * t1 + t1 * t3 + t3 * t3 botRsquared = t1 * t1 + t1 * t3 + t3 * t3 botS = t1 * t1 - t3 * t3

```
botRS = t1 * t1 + 2 * t1 * t3
botRsquaredS = t3 * t3 + 2 * t1 * t3
We may now prove Lemma 4.16 in full generality.
print(Groebner([R1, R2, Rsquared1, Rsquared2, botR, botRsquared, coprime]))
print(Groebner([R1, R2, S1, S2, botR, botS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([R1, R2, RS1, RS2, botR, botRS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([R1, R2, RsquaredS1, RsquaredS2,
 botR, botRsquaredS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, Rsquared2, S1, S2, botRsquared, botS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, Rsquared2, RS1, RS2,
 botRsquared, botRS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, Rsquared2, RsquaredS1, RsquaredS2,
 botRsquared, botRsquaredS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([S1, S2, RS1, RS2, botS, botRS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([S1, S2, RsquaredS1, RsquaredS2,
 botS, botRsquaredS, coprime]))
print(Groebner([RS1, RS2, RsquaredS1, RsquaredS2,
 botRS, botRsquaredS, coprime]))
```

Once more we see that the first prompt returns False, and this corresponds precisely to the case that σ and σ' both have order 3.

A.2.2 Proof of Lemma 4.14

We will now prove Lemma 4.14.

```
print(Groebner([R1, Rsquared1, S1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([R1, Rsquared1, RS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([R1, Rsquared1, RsquaredS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([R1, S1, RS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([R1, RS1, RsquaredS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([R1, RS1, RsquaredS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, S1, RS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, S1, RsquaredS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, S1, RsquaredS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, RS1, RsquaredS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
print(Groebner([Rsquared1, RS1, RsquaredS1, coprimet1t3, coprimet2t4]))
```

We remark that in this case the last prompt returns False, which is caused by the exceptional case $\{T_2^{-1}ST_2, T_2^{-1}RST_2, T_2^{-1}R^2ST_2\}$. However, we see that $t_1^2 + t_1t_3 + t_3^2$ is in the Gröbner basis for the exceptional case. If $gcd(t_1, t_3, p) = 1$, then this can only be zero modulo p if t_1 and t_3 are both invertible. But then we see that $x^2 + x + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p$ has a solution. For a prime p, this implies that $p \equiv 1 \mod 3$. For p = 9, we directly check that there are no solutions to $x^2 + x + 1 \equiv 0 \mod 9$.

A.3 Brute force searches

Here we will prove Lemma 4.12.

A.3.1 Computing the number of equivalence classes

Let S be a subset of $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^2$. We can decompose S as $S_{<n}$ and S_n of elements of order respectively smaller than n and exactly equal to n. Write m for the number of equivalence classes in S_n under the equivalence relation \sim defined in Definition 4.9. The next code computes

$$|\mathcal{S}_{< n}| + m.$$

```
def Total(L, n):
    total = 0
    l = len(L)
    for i in range(l):
        boolean = True
        point = L[i]
        if gcd(point[0], n) != 1 and gcd(point[1], n) != 1:
            total = total + 1
        else:
            for j in range(i):
                for k in range(n):
                    if gcd(k, n) == 1 and k * point[0] == L[j][0] and
                     k * point[1] == L[j][1]:
                        boolean = False
            if boolean:
                total = total + 1
    return total
```

A.3.2 Proof of Lemma 4.12 for 3, 4 and 5

We are now ready to prove Lemma 4.12. Consider the following code.

```
def BruteForce(n):
for a in [0..n - 1]:
for b in [0..n - 1]:
for c in [0..n - 1]:
for d in [0..n - 1]:
x1 = Mod(c * d - a * b, n)
y1 = Mod(d * d - b * b, n)
x^2 = Mod(a * b + a * d + b * c, n)
y^2 = Mod(b * b + 2 * b * d, n)
x3 = Mod(a * d + b * c + c * d, n)
y3 = Mod(d * d + 2 * b * d, n)
x4 = Mod(a * b + b * c + c * d, n)
y4 = Mod(b * b + b * d + d * d, n)
x5 = Mod(a * b + a * d + c * d, n)
y5 = Mod(b * b + b * d + d * d, n)
L = [vector((1, 0)), vector((x1, y1)),
```

```
vector((x2, y2)), vector((x3, y3)),
vector((x4, y4)), vector((x5, y5))]
count = Total(L, n)
if count > 3 and gcd(n, gcd(b, d)) == 1:
print(count)
print('(' + str(x1) + ',' + str(y1) + ')' + ' AND '
+ '(' + str(x2) + ',' + str(y2) + ')' + ' AND '
+ '(' + str(x3) + ',' + str(y3) + ')' + ' AND '
+ '(' + str(x3) + ',' + str(y3) + ')' + ' AND '
+ '(' + str(x4) + ',' + str(y4) + ')' + ' AND '
+ '(' + str(x5) + ',' + str(y5) + ')'
+ ' AND (1, 0)')
print(a, b, c, d)
```

We run BruteForce(3), BruteForce(4) and BruteForce(5). If $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ satisfies $gcd(t_2, t_4, x) = 1$, then the variable count is exactly equal to $Z_{\mathbf{t}, top}(x) + n_{\mathbf{t}, top}(x)$. Note that output gets printed precisely when the variable count is strictly larger than 3. We now examine the output for $x \in \{3, 4, 5\}$.

If x = 5, then no output gets printed, which proves Lemma 4.12 in that case. If x = 4, then the variable count can only equal 4 when $Z_{\mathbf{t},\mathrm{top}}(4) = 1$ coming from some σ with $(p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) \equiv (2,0) \mod 4$. Examining the output, we see that this is indeed the case proving alinea (i). We will prove the contents of alinea (ii) and alinea (iii) in the next subsubsection. If x = 3, then Lemma 4.12 dictates that the variable count is greater than 3 exactly when \mathbf{t} lies in \mathcal{T}_3 defined in (4.31). In this case we get that $(p_{1,\sigma}(\mathbf{t}), p_{2,\sigma}(\mathbf{t})) \equiv$ $(0,0) \mod 3$ for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}^{\flat}$. This is indeed the case.

A.3.3 Additional results for 4

We will now focus on the supplemental results for x = 4, i.e. Lemma 4.12 alinea (*ii*) and alinea (*iii*). For this we use the following routine.

```
def check(L):
  badnessCounter = 0
  boolean1 = True
  boolean2 = True
for i in range(len(L)):
    if boolean1 and (L[i] == vector((0, 1)) or L[i] == vector((0, 3))):
       badnessCounter = badnessCounter + 1
       boolean1 = False
    if boolean2 and (L[i] == vector((2, 1)) or L[i] == vector((2, 3))):
       badnessCounter = badnessCounter + 1
       boolean2 = False
    if L[i] == vector((2, 0)) or L[i] == vector((0, 2)) or
    L[i] == vector((0, 0)) or L[i] == vector((2, 2)):
       badnessCounter = badnessCounter + 1
```

```
return badnessCounter
```

Suppose that $gcd(t_1, t_3, 2) = 1$. Then badnessCounter is at most 1 if and only if alinea *(ii)* and alinea *(iii)* of Lemma 4.12 are true. This motivates us to insert the following code in the main body

```
badness = check(L)
if badness > 1 and gcd(2, gcd(a, c)) == 1 and gcd(2, gcd(b, d)) == 1:
    print("ERROR!")
```

Running this script produces no output, so alinea (ii) and alinea (iii) of Lemma 4.12 hold.

A.3.4 Proof of Lemma 4.13 for 9

For the part about the reduction modulo 9, we consider the following variation of Brute-Force(n).

```
def BruteForce(n, BadTuple1, BadTuple2, BadTuple3, BadTuple4):
    for a in [0..n - 1]:
        for b in [0..n - 1]:
            for c in [0..n - 1]:
                for d in [0..n - 1]:
                    a1 = 3 * a + BadTuple1
                    b1 = 3 * b + BadTuple2
                    c1 = 3 * c + BadTuple3
                    d1 = 3 * d + BadTuple4
                    x1 = Mod((c1 * d1 - a1 * b1)/n, n)
                    y1 = Mod((d1 * d1 - b1 * b1)/n, n)
                    x^2 = Mod((a1 * b1 + a1 * d1 + b1 * c1)/n, n)
                    y_2 = Mod((b_1 * b_1 + 2 * b_1 * d_1)/n, n)
                    x3 = Mod((a1 * d1 + b1 * c1 + c1 * d1)/n, n)
                    y3 = Mod((d1 * d1 + 2 * b1 * d1)/n, n)
                    x4 = Mod((a1 * b1 + b1 * c1 + c1 * d1)/n, n)
                    y4 = Mod((b1 * b1 + b1 * d1 + d1 * d1)/n, n)
                    x5 = Mod((a1 * b1 + a1 * d1 + c1 * d1)/n, n)
                    y5 = Mod((b1 * b1 + b1 * d1 + d1 * d1)/n, n)
                    L = [vector((1, 0)), vector((x1, y1)),
                    vector((x2, y2)), vector((x3, y3)),
                    vector((x4, y4)), vector((x5, y5))]
                    count = Total(L, n)
                    if count > 3:
                        print('(' + str(x1) + ',' + str(y1) + ')' + ' AND '
                         + '(' + str(x2) + ',' + str(y2) + ')' + ' AND '
                         + '(' + str(x3) + ',' + str(y3) + ')' + ' AND '
                         + '(' + str(x4) + ',' + str(y4) + ')' + ' AND '
                         + '(' + str(x5) + ',' + str(y5) + ')'
                         + ' AND (1, 0)')
```

print(a, b, c, d) print(x1, y1, x2, y2, x3, y3, x4, y4, x5, y5)

We now run BruteForce(3, 0, 1, 0, 1), BruteForce(3, 1, 1, 1, 1), BruteForce(3, 1, 2, 1, 2) to complete the proof of Lemma 4.13 as the script does not print any output.

A.3.5 Proof of last part of Lemma 4.14

We run a minor variation of the usual brute force script to demonstrate the last part of Lemma 4.14.

```
def BruteForce2(n):
    for a in [0..n - 1]:
        for b in [0..n - 1]:
            for c in [0..n - 1]:
                for d in [0..n - 1]:
                    x1 = Mod(c * d - a * b, n)
                    x2 = Mod(a * b + a * d + b * c, n)
                    x3 = Mod(a * d + b * c + c * d, n)
                    x4 = Mod(a * b + b * c + c * d, n)
                    x5 = Mod(a * b + a * d + c * d, n)
                    count = 0
                    if x1 == 0:
                        count = count + 1
                    if x^2 == 0:
                        count = count + 1
                    if x3 == 0:
                         count = count + 1
                    if x4 == 0:
                         count = count + 1
                    if x5 == 0:
                        count = count + 1
                    if count > 2 and gcd(a, c) != 0 and gcd(b, d) != 0:
                        print(a, b, c, d)
```

BruteForce2(3)

The output is precisely the set \mathcal{T}_3^* in accordance with the last part of Lemma 4.14.

B Output of main algorithm

Below we give the complete list (up to permutations) of the 54 minimal coverings of \mathbb{Z}^2 requiring 3, 4, 5 or 6 lattices. Each lattice is described by a \mathbb{Z} -basis: the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

in the cell corresponding to the lattice L_i means that $L_i = \mathbb{Z} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \end{pmatrix} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix}$.

Entry	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_4	L_5	L_6
1	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$			
2	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$		
3	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	
4	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 16 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$
5	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$
6	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	
7	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 3 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 7 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
8	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 5 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
9	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$
10	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 6 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$
11	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$		
12	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	
13	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 14 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
14	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 10 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
15	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	
16	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 8 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
17	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 12 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
18	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$
19	$ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 8 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
20	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $		
21	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$ \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} $	
22	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$

23	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
24	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$
25	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
26	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$		
27	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	
28	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 9 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
29	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 13 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
30	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	
31	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 15 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
32	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
33	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 11 & 16 \end{pmatrix}$
34	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$
35	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	
36	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$
37	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$
38	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
39	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
40	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$
41	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 9 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$
42	$ \begin{array}{cc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{pmatrix} 6 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$ \begin{array}{cc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} $
43	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{array}{cc} \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$ \begin{array}{cc} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} $
44	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 6 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 6 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} $

45	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$
46	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	
47	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
48	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
49	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
50	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 7 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 8 \end{pmatrix}$
51	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$
52	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 8 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 5 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$
53	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$
54	$ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 \end{pmatrix} $	$\begin{pmatrix} 5 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 4 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 3 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$

Table 1: Minimal coverings, up to permutation, of lengths between 3 and 6.

References

- [1] E. Fouvry and P. Koymans, *Binary forms with the same value set I.* arXiv preprint:2404.11231.
- [2] É. Fouvry and P. Koymans, Binary forms with the same value set II. The case of \mathbf{D}_4 . arXiv preprint:2404.13952.
- [3] É. Fouvry and M. Waldschmidt, Number of integers represented by families of binary forms (I). Acta Arith. 209 (2023), 219–267.
- [4] C. L. Stewart, On the number of solutions of polynomial congruences and Thue equations.
 J. Am. Math. Soc. 4 (1991), no. 4, 793–835.
- [5] C. L. Stewart and S. Y. Xiao, On the representation of integers by binary forms. Math. Ann. 375 (2019), no. 1–2, 133–163.