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Abstract

In this article, we describe all the possible discrete vertex transitive actions on affine buildings with dimension at least 4 over $F$ a non-Archimedean local field of characteristic zero. Indeed, we classify all the maximal such actions. We show that there are exactly eleven family of such actions and explicitly construct them. Moreover, we show that four of these families simply transitively act on the vertices. In particular, we show that there is no such actions if either dimension of the building is larger than 7, $F$ is not isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}_p$ for some prime $p$, or building is associated to $\mathbb{SL}_n, D_0$ where $D_0$ is a non-commutative division algebra. Along the way we also give a new proof of Siegel-Klingen theorem on the rationality of certain Dedekind zeta functions and $L$-functions.

1 Introduction and statement of the results.

1.1

In the 80s, several mathematicians constructed discrete chamber transitive actions on the Bruhat-Tits buildings [Ka85, KMW90, Me86, We85]. One of the reasons that these rare groups are interesting is because of the finite building-like geometries that they produce. In 1987, a classification of such groups was announced in [KLT87], in which they show that in the “generic case” the simply transitive action does not occur. Their approach is more geometric and makes use of similar results in the finite setting by Seitz [Se73].

In [BP89], Borel and Prasad heavily used arithmetic properties and proved several very strong finiteness results. In particular, they show that there are only finitely many $(F, G, \Gamma)$ consisting of a non-archimedean local field $F$ of characteristic zero, an absolutely almost simple $F$-group of absolute rank at least 2,
and a discrete subgroup $\Gamma$ of $G(F)$ which is transitive on the set of the facets of a given type of the associated Bruhat-Tits building. In their work, they only wanted to achieve a finiteness result. In particular, if one likes to get a quantitative version of their work [Be] or to describe the structure of these finitely many possibilities for a particular given upper bound [PY08] [PY07] [Sa], one has to go through the whole proof and keep track of the estimates or possibilities of all the parameters. For instance, the relation between simply chamber transitive actions on the Bruhat-Tits building of an orthogonal group and the class number had been also observed by Kantor [Ka90]. However R. Scharlau [Sc07] puts it as an open problem if one can use the class number condition effectively for a new proof of [KLT87].

Following works on the discrete chamber transitive actions, the natural question of existence of simply vertex transitive actions on the Bruhat-Tits building was considered. In [CMSZ93(I), CMSZ93(II)], the problem of finding and classifying such actions was studied. Their approach was of geometric nature. They called a subgroup of $\text{PGL}_m(D)$, where $D$ is a division algebra over $F$ a local field, an $\tilde{A}_{m-1}$-group if it acts simply transitively on the vertices of the corresponded Bruhat-Tits building. In these papers, they mainly focus on the case of $m = 3$ and the residue field of $F$ of either 2 or 3 elements. To any such group, they corresponded a presentation, called an $\tilde{A}_{m-1}$-triangle presentation, such that the Caley graph of the group with respect to this generating set gives the 1-skeleton of the corresponded building. They essentially classified such presentations for dimension 2 and $q = 2$ or 3, and then studied the embedding problem of such a group into the appropriate linear group. In [CS98], Cartwright and Steger constructed a family of $\tilde{A}_n$-groups for any $n \geq 2$ over a positive characteristic local field. They give a very explicit arithmetic description of these groups. These groups have been also used in the construction of explicit Ramanujan complexes in [LSV05].

1.2

In the current work, we would like to classify all the discrete vertex transitive actions on a Bruhat-Tits building of dimension at least 4 over $F$ a local field of characteristic zero. We show that in contrast with the positive characteristic case and the result of [CS98], in this situation, there are only finitely many of such actions. It is worth mentioning that by Tits’ classification of buildings [T74] [T86], any irreducible affine building of dimension at least 4 is a Bruhat-Tits building associated to $(F, G_0)$ a pair of a non-Archimedean local field and a simply connected, almost simple $F$-group. In particular, group of isometries of the building is the group of automorphisms of $G(F)$, which consists of the $F$-points of the adjoint form and the Galois action.

---

2By the extend of the results of [PY08] [PY07], or the current work, it should not be hard to show that the mentioned question has an affirmative answer.
Theorem A [Construction]. All the following lattices act transitively on the vertices of the corresponded Bruhat-Tits buildings. Either

$$\overline{\Gamma} = N_{\text{PGL}_m(q_{p_0})}(\text{Ad}(\{g \in \text{SL}_m(O_l[1/p_0])| \rho(g)(h') = h'\})),$$

where \(l = \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-a_1}]\) is a complex quadratic extension of \(\mathbb{Q}\), \(p_0 = p_0 \cdot \overline{p}_0\) splits over \(l\), \(O_l\) is the ring of integers of \(l\), \(g^*\) is the conjugate transpose of \(g\), and \(\rho(g)(h') = gh'g^*\), \(h' = q \cdot q^*\), and these parameters are given as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>(a_1)</th>
<th>(p_0)</th>
<th>(q)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8     | 3     | 1(mod 3) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_2 & I_2 \\
Y_1 & I_2 \\
Y_1 & I_2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] \(\text{diag}(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}I_4, 2I_4)\) |
| 7     | 3     | 1(mod 3) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & v \\
w & I_3 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] \(\text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}I_2, 2I_3)\) |
| 6     | 1     | 1(mod 4) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2}I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2}I_2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] \(\text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}I_2, 2I_2)\) |
| 5     | 3     | 1(mod 3) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & I_2 \\
Y_1 & I_2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] \(\text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}I_2, 2I_2)\) |
| 5     | 3     | 1(mod 3) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & I_2 \\
Y_4 & I_2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] \(\text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}I_2, 2I_2)\) |
| 5     | 3     | 1(mod 3) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & I_2 \\
Y_4 & I_2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] \(\text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}I_2, 2I_2)\) |
| 5     | 1     | 1(mod 4) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2}I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2}I_2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] \(\text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}I_2, 2I_2)\) |

\[\alpha = 10 - 3\sqrt{-3}, \quad \beta = -2 + \sqrt{-3}, \quad v = -4 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad w = \alpha v, \quad Y_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & -4 \\ 4 & \alpha \end{bmatrix}, \]

\[Y_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & -4 \\ -4 & \alpha \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -2 + i & 1 + i \\ -1 + i & -2 - i \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_4 = \begin{bmatrix} \beta & \beta \\ 4 & \beta \end{bmatrix}.\]

or let \(l = \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-7}]\), \(p_0 = \frac{1 + \sqrt{-7}}{2}\), \(D\) an \(l\)-central division algebra such that

i) \(\text{inv}_{p_0}(D) = -\text{inv}_{\overline{p}_0}(D) = \frac{1}{5}\) or \(\frac{2}{5}\),

ii) \(\text{inv}_D(D) = 0\) otherwise,
where \( \text{inv}_p(D) \) is the local Hasse invariants of \( D \), \( \tau \) an involution of second kind on \( D \), and \( G \) the unique simply connected, absolutely almost simple, unitary group associated to \((D,1,\tau)\), \( \{P_p\} \) a coherent family of parahoric subgroups of \( G(\mathbb{Q}_p) \) such that \( P_p \) is hyper-special for all \( p \) except for \( p = 2,7 \), \( P_2 = G(\mathbb{Q}_2) \), \( P_7 \) a special parahoric, \( p_0 \) an odd prime which is congruence to 1, 2, or 4 modulo 7,

\[
\Lambda = G(\mathbb{Q}) \cap \prod_{p \neq p_0} P_p, \text{ and } \Gamma = N_{\text{PGL}_5(\mathbb{Q}_{p_0})}(A).
\]

Furthermore in the second case, \( \Gamma \) simply transitively acts on the vertices of the associated Bruhat-Tits building.

Overall we give 11 new families of maximal discrete vertex-transitive actions on Bruhat-Tits buildings of dimension at least 4. Four of these families simply transitively act on the vertices. In the next theorem, we prove that these are the only possible such actions, up to isomorphism.

**Theorem B [Classification].** Let \( \mathcal{B} \) be an irreducible affine building of dimension at least 4. Assume that there is a discrete vertex transitive action on \( \mathcal{B} \). Then \( \mathcal{B} \) is a Bruhat-Tits building associated with a pair \((F,G_0)\) of a non-Archimedean local field and a simply connected, absolutely almost simple \( F \)-group of type A. If \( F \) is of characteristic zero, then

i) \( F \) is isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Q}_{p_0} \) for an odd prime \( p_0 \) which is congruence to either 1 modulo 4, 1 modulo 3, or 1, 2, or 4 modulo 7.

ii) \( G_0 \) is \( F \)-isomorphic to \( \text{SL}_m \), where \( m \) is either 5, 6, 7 or 8.

Furthermore any such action arises from a lattice which is a subgroup of one of the lattices described in theorem A.

### 1.3 Structure of the paper.

In the second section, we shall fix some of the needed notations, and review Tits’ indices of groups of absolute type A. In the third section, we will use Margulis’ arithmeticity, describe the possible global structure of a lattice in \( \text{PGL}_m(D_0) \), and recall part of Rohlfs’ maximality criteria in our setting. The fourth section is devoted to giving a good upper-bound on the index of a “principle congruence subgroup” in a desired maximal lattice, and description of the action on the local Dynkin diagrams along the way. In the fifth section, we evaluate co-volume of the “principle congruence subgroup” of the desired maximal lattices, volume of maximal parahorics, and conclude all the needed inequalities which are responsible for most of the results of this paper. In the sixth section, we prove that the global structure is defined over \( \mathbb{Q} \), and as a consequence there is no Galois group in the group of isometries of the building. In the seventh section coupled with appendices A and B, we will use different information on the Dedekind zeta and \( L \)-functions to find all the possible \( l \)'s the quadratic complex extensions of \( \mathbb{Q} \) over which the quasi-split inner form of \( G \) splits. By the
end of section eight, using classification of hermitian forms over global number fields and over division algebras, Witt ring of \( \mathbb{Q} \), and Brauer-Hasse-Noether theorem, we will describe all the possible global arithmetic structures of the desired maximal lattices. In the ninth section, we provide more information on the structure of the desired maximal lattices by giving the possible type of related parahorics. In section ten, we will translate our data from the adjoint form to the simply-connected setting and calculate the number of elements of the stabilizer of a vertex in the desired maximal lattices. In the last section, first we show that if we choose two different set of coherent parahorics whose types are the same up to an automorphism of local Dynkin diagrams, we end up with the same lattices up to isomorphism. Then we describe new simply vertex transitive actions on the building of \( SL_5(\mathbb{Q}_{p_0}) \). At the end, we will describe a lattice in \( \mathbb{C}^n \), number of whose symmetries which fix the origin is tightly related to the number of stabilizer of a vertex in the building which we have already computed in section ten. Then using MAGMA, we will compute the number of symmetries of such lattices. Appendix C is devoted to providing a new proof of Siegel-Klingen theorem on rationality of certain Dedekind zeta and \( L \)-function values, using co-volume of lattices in \( SL_m(F) \), which in part gives an upper bound on the denominator of product of values of certain Dedekind zeta and \( L \)-functions. Such a bound is needed to get the exact value of this product using a software.
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2 Notation, conventions and preliminaries.

2.1

For a given number field \( k \), let \( V(k) \) (resp. \( V_\infty(k), V_f(k) \)) be the set of places (resp. Archimedean places, non-Archimedean places) of \( k \). For a given place \( p \), let \( k_p \) denote the completion of \( k \) with respect to \( p \). If \( p \) is a non-Archimedean place, let \( \mathcal{O}_p \) be the valuation ring of \( k_p \), \( \pi_p \) a uniformizer, and \( f_p \) the residue field. Moreover \( | \cdot |_p \) is normalized such that \( |\pi_p|_p = (\#f_p)^{-1} \). Let \( \mathbb{A}_k \) be the adele ring of \( k \). For \( S \) a finite set of places of \( k \), let \( \mathbb{A}_{k,S} \) be the projection of \( \mathbb{A}_k \) onto the places outside of \( S \). \( \mathcal{O}_k \) denotes the ring of integers of \( k \). \( h_k \) is the
class number of $k$, and $D_k$ denotes the absolute value of the discriminant of $k$. For a given local field $F$, let $\hat{F}$ be the maximal unramified extension of $F$, $\mathcal{O}_F$ the valuation ring of $F$, $\pi_F$ a uniformizer, and $f_F$ the residue field.

2.2

We assume that reader is fairly familiar with the Bruhat-Tits theory. All the theorems or terms of the Bruhat-Tits theory which we use can be found in [T79]. Let $\mathbb{H}/F$ be an absolutely almost simple of type $A$. If $\mathbb{H}$ is quasi-split, its local Dynkin diagram is one of the followings:

(I) The split case

(II) Quasisplit, Even dim, Split/unramified

(III) Quasisplit, Odd dim, Split/unramified

(IV) Quasisplit, Odd dim, Nonsplit/unramified

(V) Quasisplit, Even dim, Nonsplit/unramified

If $\mathbb{H}$ is an inner form and non-split, then as we said in [3.2], $\mathbb{H}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{H}_{d,R}$, where $R$ is an $F$-central division algebra. In this case, we call $\mathbb{H}$ of kind (VI), and the absolute local Dynkin diagram is a cycle of length $\text{ind}(R) \cdot d$ on which $\text{Gal}(\hat{F}/F)$ acts through a cyclic group of order $d$ generated by a rotation of the cycle. The relative diagram is a cycle of length $d$ all vertices of which are
special but not hyper-special. If \( H \) is an outer form and non-quasi-split, then its local Dynkin diagram is one of the followings:

(VII) Non-quasisplit, Split/unramified

(VIII) Non-quasisplit, Nonsplit/unramified

3 Arithmetic structure and maximality.

3.1 Let \( G_0 \) be an absolutely almost simple \( F \)-group, where \( F \) is a finite extension of \( \mathbb{Q}_p \), and \( B = B(G_0, F) \) the associated Bruhat-Tits building. Since there is a transitive action on the vertices of \( B \), \( G \) is an inner form of type A \([T79]\).

Thus \( G_0 = SL_{n,D_0} \) where \( D_0 \) is a \( F \)-central division algebra \([PR94 \text{ chapter } ?]\). Tits \([T74]\) proved that for \( n > 4 \), the group of combinatorial automorphisms of \( B \) is isomorphic to \( \text{Ad}(G_0)(F) \times \text{Aut}(F) = \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \times \text{Aut}(F) \). By a linear action on \( B \), we mean an action which arises from a subgroup of \( \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \).

Any discrete action on \( B \) corresponds to \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 \) a discrete subgroup of \( \text{Aut}(B) \). Since \( \text{Aut}(F) \) is a finite group, \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 = \hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \) is a discrete subgroup of \( \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \) which is of finite index in \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 \). In particular, if \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 \) is a lattice in \( \text{Aut}(B) \), then \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \) is a lattice in \( \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \). Consequently any discrete transitive action on \( B \) determines co-compact lattices \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 \) and \( \Gamma_0 \) in \( \text{Aut}(B) \) and \( \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \), respectively. Let \( \text{Ad} : \text{SL}_{n,D_0} \to \text{PGL}_{n,D_0} \) be the adjoint map and \( \Gamma_0 \) the pre-image of \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 \) under the adjoint map from \( \text{SL}_n(D_0) \) to \( \text{PGL}_n(D_0) \).

3.2 In this paper, we will restrict ourselves to the case of \( n > 4 \) (Some of the statements are also valid for \( 2 \leq n \leq 4 \).) In particular, by Margulis' arithmeticity \([Ma91]\), \( \Gamma_0 \) is an arithmetic subgroup. This means that there is a number field \( k \), a non-Archimedean place \( p_0 \), a simply connected absolutely almost simple \( k \)-group \( G \) with the following properties:

i) \( k_{p_0} \) is isomorphic to \( F \).

ii) \( G_0 \) is \( k_{p_0} \)-isomorphic to \( G \), where \( F \) is identified with \( k_{p_0} \) by means of the above isomorphism.

iii) There is \( K \) a compact subset of \( G(\mathbb{A}_k,S) \), where \( S = V_\infty(k) \cup \{p_0\} \), such that \( \Lambda \) projection of \( G(k) \cap K \) to the \( p_0 \) factor is commensurable to \( \hat{\Gamma}_0 \).
Since $\Gamma_0$ is a co-compact lattice and because of (iii), we further know:

iv) $G$ is $k$-anisotropic.

v) $G$ is $k_p$-anisotropic, for any $p \in V_\infty(k)$. In particular, $k$ is totally real.

By classification of possible $A$-forms [PR94, Chapter 2], we know that if $G$ is an inner form of type $A$ and $k$-anisotropic, then there is a $k$-central division algebra $D$ of index $m$ such that $G = SL_1(D)$, where $M_d(D) \otimes_k k_p \simeq M_n(D_0)$ as $k_p$-algebras. Hence for $m > 2$ there is no inner form of type $A$ which satisfies both (iv) and (v). If $G$ is an outer form of type $A$, then there are

i) $l$ a quadratic extension of $k$ such that $p_0$ splits over $l$, i.e. $l \otimes_k k_p \simeq l \otimes k_p$, and because of the above property (v), $l$ is totally complex,

ii) $D$ an $l$-central division algebra such that

$$M_d(D) \otimes_k k_p \simeq M_n(D_0) \oplus M_n(D_0),$$

iii) $\tau$ an involution of second kind on $D$, whose restriction to $l$ is the generator of the Galois group of $l/k$,

iv) $h$ a non-degenerate Hermitian form on $D$, whose restriction to $l$ is $\tau$.

such that $G = SU_h$. (For the definition of undefined terms, we refer the reader to [PR94, Chapter 2].) Following [BP89], let $G/k$ be the unique inner form of $G$ which is $k$-quasi-split, i.e. $G \simeq SU_{h_0}$ where $h_0$ is a hermitian form on $l^{\text{ind}(D) \cdot d}$, which is either

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_p \\ I_p & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

or

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{p-1} \\ 0 & I_{p-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $r = \text{ind}(D) \cdot d$.

### 3.3

When $p$ is a finite place, $\text{Ad}(G)(k_p)$ acts on $D_p$ the local Dynkin diagram. Let $\xi_p : \text{Ad}(G)(k_p) \to \text{Aut}(D_p)$ be the corresponded homomorphism. The simply connected group acts trivially on $D_p$, i.e. $\text{Ad}(G(k_p))$ is a subgroup of $\ker(\xi_p)$. On the other hand, the short exact sequence $1 \to \mu \to G \to \text{Ad}(G) \to 1$ gives

$$1 \to \mu(k) \to G(k) \to \text{Ad}(G)(k) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^1(k, \mu) \to 1$$

where $\delta : \text{Ad}(G)(k_p) \to H^1(k_p, \mu)$.

Moreover, when $p$ is a finite place, $H^1(k_p, G) = \{1\}$. Therefore $H^1(k_p, G)$ can be identified with $\text{Ad}(G)(k_p)/\text{Ad}(G(k_p))$. In particular, $\xi_p$ induces a homomorphism from $H^1(k_p, \mu)$ to $\text{Aut}(D_p)$. Let us denote it also with $\xi_p$, and
\[ \Xi_p = \text{Im}(\xi_p). \]

There is a correspondence between parahoric subgroups of \( G(k_p) \) up to conjugacy and subsets of \( D_p \), called their type. \( \{P_p\}_{p \in V_f(k)} \) a collection of parahoric subgroups \( P_p \) of \( G(k_p) \) is said to be coherent if \( \prod_{p \in V_f(k)} G(k_p) \cdot \prod_{p \in V_f(k)} P_p \) is an open subgroup of \( G(A_k) \). Let \( V_f(k) = V_f(k) \setminus \{p_0\} \), and \( P_{p_0} \) a fixed standard parahoric subgroup of \( G(k_{p_0}) \) with maximal volume. \( \Theta = \{\Theta_p\}_{p \in V_f(k)} \) collection of types is called a \( p_0 \)-global-type if the standard parahoric subgroups of type \( \Theta_p \) form a coherent collection. A type \( \Theta_p \) is called maximal if \( D_p \setminus \Theta_p \) the complement is an orbit of a subgroup of \( \Xi_p \). A \( p_0 \)-global-type \( \Theta = \{\Theta_p\}_{p \in V_f(k)} \) is called maximal if all \( \Theta_p \)'s are. For a given type \( \Theta_p \subseteq D_p \), let \( \Xi_{\Theta_p} \) be the stabilizer of \( \Theta_p \) in \( \Xi_p \), and \( H^1(k_p, \mu)_{\Theta_p} \) the stabilizer of \( \Theta_p \) in \( H^1(k_p, \mu) \). For \( \Theta = \{\Theta_p\}_{p \in V_f(k)} \), a given \( p_0 \)-global-type, let

\[
\delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_{\Theta} = \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k)) \cap \prod_{p \in V_f(k)} H^1(k_p, \mu)_{\Theta_p}, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_{\Theta} = \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k)) \cap \{1\} \cdot \prod_{p \in V_f(k)} H^1(k_p, \mu)_{\Theta_p},
\]

where \( \{1\} \) is the identity element in \( H^1(k_{p_0}, \mu) \). By virtue of Rohlfs’ maximality criteria, one can prove the following theorem for \( \Gamma_0 \).

**Theorem 1.** There is \( \{P_p\}_{p \in V_f(k)} \) a coherent collection of parahoric subgroups \( P_p \) of maximal type \( \Theta_p \) such that

i) If we set \( \Lambda = G(k) \cap \prod_{p \in V_f(k)} P_p \), \( \Gamma = N_G(k_{p_0})(\Lambda) \), \( \overline{\Lambda} = \text{Ad}(\Lambda) \), and \( \Gamma = N_{\text{Ad}(G)(k_{p_0})}(\overline{\Lambda}) \). Then \( \Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma \& \Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma. \)

ii) \( \Gamma \) and \( \Gamma \) are lattices in \( G(k_{p_0}) \) and \( \text{Ad}(G)(k_{p_0}) \), respectively.

iii) \( \Lambda = \Gamma \cap G(k). \)

iv) The following sequence is exact

\[ 1 \to \mu(k_{p_0})/\mu(k) \to \Gamma/\Lambda \to \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_{\Theta} \to 1. \]

where \( \Theta = \{\Theta_p\}_{p \in V_f(k)} \). Moreover

\[ \overline{\Gamma}/\overline{\Lambda} \simeq \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_{\Theta}. \]

**Proof.** See [CR97, R79], or [BP89] Propositions 1.4, 2.9]. \( \square \)

### 4 An upper bound for \( \#\Gamma/\Lambda. \)

#### 4.1

Since \( G \) is an inner form of \( G \), their centers are \( k \)-isomorphic. Hence the following sequence is exact

\[ 1 \to \mu \to R_{1/k}(\mu_m) \xrightarrow{\phi} \mu_m \to 1, \]
where $\mu_m$ is the $k$-group of $m^{th}$-roots of unity and $N$ is induced by the norm map. It arises to the following long exact sequence

$$\mu_m(l) \to \mu_m(k) \to H^1(k, \mu) \to H^1(k, R_{l/k}(\mu_m)) \to H^1(k, \mu_m).$$

Consequently

$$1 \to \mu_m(k)/N(\mu_m(l)) \to H^1(k, \mu) \to \ker(l^\times/(l^\times)^m) \to k^\times/(k^\times)^m \to 1.$$ 

Let $l_0/(l^\times)^m = \ker(l^\times/(l^\times)^m \to k^\times/(k^\times)^m)$. If $m$ is odd, then $\mu_m(k) = N(\mu_m(l))$, and so $H^1(k, \mu) \simeq l_0/(l^\times)^m$. Similarly $H^1(k_p, \mu) = \{1\}$, for any $p \in V_\infty(k)$. On the other hand, the following diagram is commutative and the horizontal sequences are “exact”.

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Ad}(G)(k) & \delta \to & H^1(k, \mu) & \to & H^1(k, G) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \\
\prod_{p \in V_\infty(k)} \text{Ad}(G)(k_p) & \to & \prod_{p \in V_\infty(k)} H^1(k_p, \mu) & \to & \prod_{p \in V_\infty(k)} H^1(k_p, G),
\end{array}$$

(1)

where the vertical correspondence is because of Hasse local-global theorem [PR94]. Thus $\delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k)) = l_0/(l^\times)^m$.

Now assume $m$ is even. Since $l$ is totally complex, and $k$ is totally real, we have

$$1 \to \{\pm 1\} \to H^1(k, \mu) \to l_0/(l^\times)^m \to 1$$

$$1 \to \{\pm 1\} \to H^1(k_p, \mu) \to 1$$

(2)

for any $p \in V_\infty(k)$. In particular, $H^1(k, \mu) \simeq \{\pm 1\} \times l_0/(l^\times)^m$ as the first row splits. On the other hand, $G(k_p) \xrightarrow{\text{Ad}} \text{Ad}(G)(k_p)$ is surjective, for any $p \in V_\infty(k)$. So the fiber over the trivial element in $H^1(k_p, G)$ is trivial in $H^1(k_p, \mu)$. Thus combining with (1) and (2), we again have $\delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k)) = l_0/(l^\times)^m$.

4.2

Looking at the local Dynkin diagrams given in [2.2], one can see that $\Xi_p = \{1\}$ except possibly when

i) $p$ splits over $l$, i.e. $l \otimes_k k_p = l_p \oplus l_q$ where $l_p$ and $l_q$ are isomorphic to $k_p$.

ii) $m$ is even, and $p$ is a prime over $l$, i.e. $l \otimes_k k_p = l_p$ is an unramified field extension of $k_p$.

iii) $m$ is even, $p$ is a ramified prime over $l$, and $G$ is quasi-split over $k_p$.

If $G$ splits over $\hat{k}_p$, then since $\Xi_p$ is a subquotient of $\hat{\Xi}_p$ (e.g. see [BP89, Lemma 2.3]) and the later is generated by $\pi_p(\hat{k}_p^\times)^m$, after identifying $H^1(\hat{k}_p, \mu)$ with


\( \hat{k}^x \slash (\hat{k}^x)^m \), one can describe the action of \( l_0/((l^x)^m \) on the local Dynkin diagram in the first and the second cases:

i) Let \( p \) be a finite place on \( k \) which splits over \( l \). Then \( \mathbb{G} \cong SL_{n_p, D_p} \) where \( D_p \) is a \( k_p \)-central division algebra and \( d_p \cdot n_p = m \) for \( d_p = \text{ind}(D_p) \). If we identify \( l_0/((l^x)^m \) with \( \delta(\text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(k)) \) via the isomorphism in (4.1), then it acts on \( D_p \) via the following homomorphism to \( \mathbb{Z} / m \mathbb{Z} \):

\[
x((l^x)^m \mapsto d_p \pi_p(x) \mod m.
\]

ii) Let \( m \) be even and \( p \) a finite place on \( k \) which is also a prime over \( l \). Then \( \Xi_p \) is a group with two elements generated by \( \xi_p(\pi_p(\xi^x)^m) \).

iii) To understand the third case, one can identify \( \Xi_p \) with \( \mathbb{T}(k_p)/(T_0, \text{Ad}(\mathbb{T}(k_p))) \), where \( \mathbb{T} \) is a maximal \( k_p \)-torus, \( \mathbb{T} \) its image under the adjoint map, and \( T_0 = \{ t \in \mathbb{T}(k_p) \mid \forall \alpha \in X(k_p, \mathbb{T}) \mid \alpha(t) = 1 \} \); and deduce that \( \pi_p(\pi_p^{-1}(\xi^x)^m \) acts non-trivially on \( D_p \) and so give rise to the generator of \( \Xi_p \). If \( \mathfrak{P} \) does not divide 2, then one can choose a trace less uniformizer \( \pi_{\mathfrak{P}} \), and so \( -1(\xi^x)^m \) gives us the generator.

4.3

For any \( p \in V_f(k) \), \( H^1(k, \mu) \) acts on \( D_p \) via \( \xi_p \). Let \( \xi : H^1(k, \mu) \to \prod_{p \in V_f(k)} \Xi_p \) be the corresponding homomorphism, and \( \xi^x : H^1(k, \mu) \to \prod_{p \in V_f(k)^x} \Xi_p \). Hereafter identifying \( \delta(\text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(k)) \) with \( l_0/((l^x)^m \) via isomorphism given in (4.1), we describe

\[
\prod_p \mathfrak{P}^{i_1} \mathfrak{P}^m \cdot \prod_p \mathfrak{P}^{i_2} \cdot \prod_p \mathfrak{P}^{i_3} \cdot \prod_p \mathfrak{P}^{i_4}.
\]

where intersection of \( p = \mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{P}' \), \( p' \), and \( p'' \) = \( \mathfrak{P}' \mathfrak{P}'' \) with \( \mathcal{O}_k \) are prime ideals, \( \mathfrak{P} \neq \mathfrak{P}' \), i.e. \( p \) splits over \( l \), and \( \mathfrak{P}'' \) = \( \mathfrak{P}' \mathfrak{P}'' \), i.e. \( p'' \) is ramified over \( l \). If \( x \) is in \( l_0 \), then, by definition, \( N_{l/k}(x) \) is in \( (k^x)^m \), and so \( m \) divides \( i_1 + i_2, 2i', \) and \( i'' \). Moreover by discussions in (4.2), having this decomposition, we can understand action of \( x \) on the local Dynkin diagrams for primes which are unramified. Indeed \( x \) induces a trivial action on local Dynkin diagrams \( D_p \) (resp. \( D_{p'} \) if \( m \) divides \( d_p i_1 \) (resp. \( i' \)). Let

\[
T_1 = \{ p \in V_f(k) \mid p \text{ splits } l \& \mathbb{G} \text{ not split } k_p \},
\]

and \( T^*_1 = T_1 \setminus \{ p_0 \} \). Let \( T^*_1 \) be a subset of \( V(l) \) such that

\[
\{ \mathfrak{P} \in V(l) \mid \exists p \in T_1 : \mathfrak{P} \mid p \} = T^*_1 \cup \mathfrak{T}^*_1.
\]
Then by the above discussion
\[ 0 \to (l_m \cap l_0)/(l^\times)^m \to l_\xi/(l^\times)^m \xrightarrow{(v_p)_{p \in V(I)}} (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^T, \tag{3} \]
where \( l_m = \{ x \in l \mid \forall P \in V(l) : m|v_P(x) \} \). On the other hand, as it is discussed in [BP89, Proposition 0.12],
\[ 1 \to U_l / U_l^m \to l_m / (l^\times)^m \to \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{I} / \mathcal{P}^m \to 1, \]
where \( \mathcal{I} \) is the group of all fractional ideals, \( \mathcal{P} \) is the group of principle fractional ideals, and \( U_l \) is the group of units of \( \mathcal{O}_l \). By virtue of Dirichlet’s unit theorem, \( N_{l/k} \) induces an isomorphism between the non-torsion factors of \( U_l \) and \( U_k \).

Therefore
\[ \# l_m \cap l_0 / (l^\times)^m \leq \# ((l_m \cap l_0 \cap U_l) : U_l^m) / U_l^m \cdot \# \mathcal{C}_{l,m} \leq \# \mu_m(l) \cdot h_{l,m}, \]
where \( \mathcal{C}_{l,m} \) is the subgroup of all elements of the class group of \( l \) whose order is a divisor of \( m \), and \( h_{l,m} = \# \mathcal{C}_{l,m} \). Combining with (3), we get
\[ \# l_\xi / (l^\times)^m \leq m^#T_1 \cdot h_{l,m} \cdot \# \mu_m(l), \]
and similarly
\[ \# l_{\xi^o} / (l^\times)^m \leq m^#T_1^{+1} \cdot h_{l,m} \cdot \# \mu_m(l). \tag{4} \]

Let \( \Theta \) be as in theorem 1. Then clearly
\[ \# \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_\Theta \leq \# l_\xi / (l^\times)^m \cdot \prod_{p \in V^\times(k)} \# \Xi_{\Theta_p}. \]

Hence by (1), (4), and the above inequality,
\[ \# \Gamma / \Lambda \leq m^#T_1^{+1} \cdot h_{l,m} \cdot \# \mu_m(l) \cdot \prod_{p \in V^\times(k)} \# \Xi_{\Theta_p}. \tag{5} \]

5 Volume formula and estimates.

5.1 Throughout this paper, we will use notations and results of [P89] and [BP89]. Here we will recall Prasad’s result and adapt it to our setting. Let \( \{ P_p \}_{p \in V^\times(k)} \) be as in theorem 1. Let \( G \) be the unique \( k \)-inner form of \( G \) which is \( k \)-quasi-split. Let \( \{ P_p^m \}_{p \in V^\times(k)} \) and \( \{ P_p \}_{p \in V^\times(k)} \) be coherent families of parahoric subgroups \( P_p^m \) (resp. \( P_p \)) of \( G(k_p) \) (resp. \( G(k_p) \)), such that, for any \( p \), volume of \( P_{p}^{m} \) (resp. \( P_{p} \)) is maximum among all parahoric subgroups of \( G(k_p) \) (resp. \( G(k_p) \)). It describes a unique parahoric subgroup up to an element of \( \text{Ad}(G)(k) \) (resp. \( \text{Ad}(G)(k) \)), unless \( G \) (resp. \( G \)) is of kind (IV). In that case, \( P_{p}^{m} \) (resp. \( P_{p} \)) corresponds to the right special vertex in the diagram given in 2.2. (Since hyper-special parahoric subgroups, if exists, are of maximum volume among the
parahoric subgroups [BP89, it is clear that such a coherent collection exists.) Bruhat-Tits theory associates \( G_p \) (resp. \( G^m_p, \overline{G}_p \)) an \( \mathcal{O}_p \)-smooth scheme to each parahoric \( P_p \) (resp. \( P^m_p, \overline{P}_p \)). Let \( \overline{G}_p \) (resp. \( \overline{G}^m_p, \overline{G}_p \)) be its (resp. their) special fiber(s). Let \( \overline{M}_p \) (resp. \( \overline{M}^m_p, \overline{M}_p \)) be the reductive part of \( \overline{G}_p \) (resp. \( \overline{G}^m_p, \overline{G}_p \)). Type of the semisimple part of \( \overline{M}_p \) can be determined by dropping \( \Theta_p \) the vertices corresponded to the type of \( P_p \) from the local Dynkin diagram.

5.2
Let \( \text{vol} \) be the unique Haar measure on \( G(k_{p_0}) \) such that \( \text{vol}(P^m_{p_0}) = 1 \). Then the main result of [PS9] says that

\[
\text{vol}(G/\Lambda) = D_{k}^{\frac{1}{2}(m^2-1)} \cdot \left( \frac{D_1}{D_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} s(G)} \cdot \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{i!}{(2\pi)^{i+1}} \right)^d \cdot \mathcal{E},
\]

where \( d = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} k, s(G) = \frac{1}{2}(m - 2)(m + 1) \) for \( m \) even, \( s(G) = \frac{1}{2}(m - 1)(m + 2) \) for \( m \) odd, \( \mathcal{E} = \prod_{p \in V_f(k)} e(P_p) \), and

\[
e(P_p) = \frac{d_p^{\dim \overline{M}_p + \dim \overline{M}_p}/2}{\#\overline{M}_p(L_{p_0})}.
\]

For almost all \( p \), \( P_p \) is a hyper-special parahoric subgroup, in which case, \( e'(P_p) \) equals to the local factor of

\[
Z(l/k, m) = \zeta_k(2) \cdot L_{l/k}(3) \cdot \ldots \cdot s(m),
\]

where the last term is either \( \zeta_k(m) \) if \( m \) is even, or \( L_{l/k}(m) \) if \( m \) is odd. Thus

\[
\text{vol}(G/\Lambda) = D_{k}^{\frac{1}{2}(m^2-1)} \cdot \left( \frac{D_1}{D_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} s(G)} \cdot \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{i!}{(2\pi)^{i+1}} \right)^d \cdot Z(l/k, m) \cdot \prod e'(P_p),
\]

where \( e'(P_p) \) is one for almost all \( p \).

Lemma 2. For any \( p \), \( e'(P_p) \) is a rational integer.

Proof. It is clear that if \( P'_p \) contains \( P_p \), then \( e'(P_p) \) is an integral multiple of \( e'(P'_p) \). So without loss of generality we can assume that \( P_p \) is a maximal parahoric.

i) \( p \) splits over \( l \): The local Dynkin diagram of \( G \) (resp. \( G \)) over \( k_p \) is of type (VI) (resp. I) in [22]. Hence there is no difference between maximal parahorics and

\[
e'(P_p) = \prod_{d_p | i, i = 1}^{m-1} (q^i_p - 1).
\]
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ii) $p$ a prime over $l$, and $G$ quasi-split over $k_p$: Either $G$'s local Dynkin diagram is either of type (II) or (III). In the either case, for some $i$ between 1 and $[m/2]$,

$$e'(P_p) = \prod_{j=1}^{i'} q_p^{j+m-i'} - (-1)^{j+m-i'} \frac{q_p^j - (-1)^j}{q_p^j - (-1)^j},$$

where $i' = 2i - 2$.

iii) $p$ a prime over $l$, and $G$ not quasi-split over $k_p$: In this case, the local Dynkin diagram of $G$ (resp. $G$) over $k_p$ is of type (VII) (resp. (II)). Hence for some $i$ between 1 and $m/2$,

$$e'(P_p) = \prod_{j=1}^{i'} q_p^{j+m-i'} - (-1)^{j+m-i'} \frac{q_p^j - (-1)^j}{q_p^j - (-1)^j},$$

where $i' = 2i - 1$.

iv) $p$ ramified over $l$, and $G$ quasi-split over $k_p$: If $m$ is odd, then $G/k_p$ is of type (IV) and for some $i$

$$e'(P_p) = \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (q_p^{2j} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (q_p^{2j} - 1).$$

If $m$ is even, then $G/k_p$ is of type (V) and for some $i$

$$e'(P_p) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} (q_p^{2j} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^{m} (q_p^{2j} - 1).$$

v) $p$ ramified over $l$, and $G$ not quasi-split over $k_p$: In this case, $m$ is even and $G$ (resp. $G$) over $k_p$ is of type (VIII) (resp. (V)). Hence for some $i$

$$e'(P_p) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} (q_p^{2j} - 1) \prod_{j=1}^{m} (q_p^{2j} - 1).$$

To finish proof of the lemma, it is enough to note that for any non-negative integers $i$ and $i'$

$$Q_{i,i'}(x,y) = \prod_{j=1}^{i'} \frac{x^{j+i} - y^{j+i}}{x^j - y^j}$$

is an integral polynomial in two variables $x$ and $y$ (since $\prod_{j=1}^{i'} x^j - y^j \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$).

$\square$
Lemma 3. In the above setting,\
\[
\mathcal{R}(l/k,m) = D_k^{l^2(m^2-1)} \cdot \left( \frac{D_l}{D_k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}(G)} \cdot \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{i!}{(2\pi i)^{i+1}} \right)^d \cdot Z(l/k, m) =
\]
\[
\frac{c_m}{2^{d(m-1)}} \zeta_k(-1) \cdot L_l(-2) \cdot \ldots \cdot (1-m),
\]
where \(c_m\) is equal to \((1)\) (resp. \((-1)^{m/2}\)) if \(m\) is odd (resp. even), and the last term is either \(\zeta_k(1-m)\) if \(m\) is even, or \(L_l(-2)\) if \(m\) is odd.

Proof. When \(m\) is odd, this is observed in [PY08]. One can verify it by induction on \(m\), using functional equations of the Dedekind zeta functions and \(L\)-functions. \(\square\)

Corollary 4. \(\text{vol}(G/\Lambda)\) is an integral multiple of \(\mathcal{R}(l/k,m)\).

Proof. This is a consequence of equation (6), lemma 2, and lemma 3. \(\square\)

5.3

Let \(\hat{K}\) (resp. \(K, \hat{K}\)) be the stabilizer of a vertex in \(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{B})\) (resp. \(\text{PGL}_n(D_0), \text{SL}_n(D_0)\)). Then \(\hat{K} = K \times \text{Aut}(F), K \simeq \text{PGL}_n(O_{D_0}), \text{and } K \simeq \text{SL}_n(O_{D_0}).\) Let \(\hat{\text{vol}}\) (resp. \(\text{vol}, \hat{\text{vol}}\)) be a Haar measure on \(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{B})\) (resp. \(\text{PGL}_n(D_0), \text{SL}_n(D_0)\)) such that \(\hat{\text{vol}}(\hat{K}) = 1\) (resp. \(\text{vol}(K) = 1\)). Since \(\hat{\Gamma}_0\) transitively acts on the vertices of \(\mathcal{B}\)
\[
\hat{\text{vol}}(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{B})/\hat{\Gamma}_0) = \frac{1}{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap K}.
\]
Hence,
\[
\hat{\text{vol}}(\text{PGL}_n(D_0)/\hat{\Gamma}_0) = \frac{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0}{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap K} \&
\]
\[
\text{vol}(G/\Lambda) = \frac{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0}{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap K} \cdot \frac{\#K/\text{Ad}(K)}{\#\text{PGL}_n(D_0)/\text{PSL}_n(D_0)} \cdot \frac{1}{\#\mu(k)} \cdot \frac{\#\Gamma/\Lambda}{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\hat{\Gamma}_0} = \frac{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0}{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap K} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{\#\mu(k)} \cdot \frac{\#\Gamma/\Lambda}{\#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\hat{\Gamma}_0}.
\]

Corollary 5. If \((l,k)\) is an admissible pair of number fields, then any prime factor of the numerator of \(\mathcal{R}(l/k,m)\) is either a prime factor of \(\#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0\) (and consequently \(\#\text{Aut}(F)\)), or \(m\).

Proof. This is a direct consequence of theorem 3.3, corollary 4, and equation (7). \(\square\)
From equations (6) and (7), we further get \( \frac{\# \hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0}{\# \mu(k) \cdot \# \Gamma/\Gamma_0 \cdot \# \hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap K} \) is equal to

\[
\frac{n}{\# \Gamma_0/\Lambda} \cdot D_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (m^2 - 1) \cdot \left( \frac{D_1}{D_k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} s(G)} \cdot \left( \frac{m-1}{(2\pi)^{-1}} \right)^d \cdot Z(l/k, m) \cdot \mathcal{E}',
\]

where \( \mathcal{E}' = \prod e'(P_p) \).

**Corollary 6 (Main Inequality).** In the above setting

\[
\frac{\# \hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0}{\# \mu(k) \cdot \# \Gamma/\Gamma_0 \cdot \# \hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap K} \geq \frac{n \cdot e'(P_{p_0})}{m} \cdot \mathcal{E}'' \cdot \frac{B(G) \cdot V^d_m}{h_{l,m} \cdot \# \mu_m(l)} \cdot Z(l/k, m),
\]

where \( B(G) = D_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (m^2 - 1) \cdot \left( \frac{D_1}{D_k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} s(G)} \), \( V_m = \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{i}{(2\pi)^{i+1}} \), and

\[
\mathcal{E}'' = \frac{\prod_{p \neq p_0} e'(P_p)}{m \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \zeta(2di)} \cdot \prod_{p \in V^+(k)} \zeta(dm)\cdot \zeta(m).
\]

In particular, if \( \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} k = d \), we can take \( d \) as an upper bound.

**Proof.** From equations (6) and (7), we get

\[
\frac{\# \hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0}{\# \mu(k) \cdot \# \Gamma/\Gamma_0 \cdot \# \hat{\Gamma}_0 \cap K} = \frac{n}{\# \Gamma_0/\Lambda} \cdot B(G) \cdot V^d_m \cdot Z(l/k, m) \cdot \mathcal{E}',
\]

Hence, by inequality (5), we get the claimed. To complete the proof, it is enough to note that \( \hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0 \) can be embedded into \( \text{Aut}(F) = \text{Aut}(k_{p_0}) \), and so it has at most \( d \) elements.

**Lemma 7.** Both \( \frac{n \cdot e'(P_{p_0})}{m} \) and \( \mathcal{E}'' \) are at least 1, when \( m > 4 \).

**Proof.** Let us start with the first factor. If \( D_0 \) is commutative, i.e. \( D_0 = F \), then clearly the first factor is 1 and there is nothing to discuss. If not, then as discussed in the proof of lemma 2, \( e'(P_{p_0}) = \prod_{q_i^m > 1} (q_i^m - 1) \). To see why both of the factors are at least 1, it is enough to note that \( 2^{m-1} - 1 > m^2/2 \), when \( m > 4 \), and use the formula for \( e'(P_p) \) given in lemma 2.

**Lemma 8.** \( Z(l/k, m) > Z(m) > 1 \), where

\[
Z(m) = \begin{cases} 
\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \zeta(2di)^{\frac{1}{2}} & 2 \mid m \\
\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \zeta(2di)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \zeta(dm) & 2 \nmid m
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** This is a direct consequence of [PY08 lemma 1].
Corollary 9 (The First Estimate). In the above setting, we have
\[ f(m, d, \hat{d}, s) = \left( \hat{d} \cdot 50(s-1) s \cdot m \right)^{1/d} \cdot \left( \frac{h(s)}{V_m} \right)^{\frac{m^2 - 1 - 2s}{d}} \geq D_k^{1/d}, \]
where \( \hat{d} = \#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0 \), \( h(s) = \frac{\Gamma(s) \zeta(s)^2}{\pi^{s-1}} \) and \( s > 1 \).

Proof. Using Brauer-Siegel theorem and a result of Zimmert [Z81], Prasad and Yeung [PY08] get the following inequality for the class number of \( l \)
\[ \frac{1}{h_l} \geq \frac{1}{50(s-1)} \cdot \frac{1}{h(s)^d} \cdot \frac{1}{D_l^{s/2}}. \] (8)
Let \( \hat{d} = \#\hat{\Gamma}_0/\Gamma_0 \). By lemmas 7 and 8 and inequality (8), we have
\[ \hat{d} \geq \frac{B(G) \cdot V_d}{h_{l,m} \cdot \#\mu_m(l)} \geq \frac{D_k^{1(m^2-1)} \cdot \left( \frac{D_l}{B_l} \right)^{\frac{s(G)}{2s}} \cdot \frac{V_d}{V_m} \cdot h_l}{50(s-1) \cdot m \cdot h(s)^d \cdot D_l^{s/2}} \geq \frac{D_k^{1(m^2-1-2s)} \cdot \frac{V_d}{V_m}}{50(s-1) \cdot m \cdot h(s)^d}, \]
which finishes the proof. (Here we used the fact that \( D_l \geq D_k^2 \).) \( \square \)

Corollary 10 (The Second Estimate). With the same notations as before, we have
\[ \left[ \hat{d} \cdot 50(s-1) s \cdot m \right] \cdot \left( \frac{h(s)}{V_m} \right)^d \cdot \left( D_k^{s(G) - \frac{1}{2}(m^2-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{m^2-1}} \geq D_l \]
\[ \left[ \hat{d} \cdot 50(s-1) s \cdot m \right] \cdot \left( \frac{h(s)}{V_m} \right)^d \cdot \left( D_k^{s(G) - \frac{1}{2}(m^2-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{m^2-1}} \geq D_l \]
Proof. It is a corollary of Main Inequality, lemma 8 and inequality (8). \( \square \)

When we have a candidate for an admissible pair \((k, l)\), we check the following inequality, which follows from the Main Inequality, lemma 7 and lemma 8.

Corollary 11 ((k, l)-Checker). \( \hat{d} \geq \frac{B(G) \cdot V_d}{h_{l,m} \cdot \#\mu_m(l)} \).

6 \( k = \mathbb{Q} \).

6.1
Prasad and Yeung [PY08 Proposition 2] showed that if \( k \) is a totally real number field of degree \( d \neq 1 \). Then we get the following bounds on \( D_k^{1/d} \).
\[ \frac{d}{D_k^{1/d}} \geq \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2.23 & 3.65 & 5.18 & 6.8 \end{bmatrix} \]
(9)
At this point, we apply The First Estimate to get an upper bound on \( D_k^{1/d} \) and apply the above mentioned result.
Lemma 12. If $k$ is an admissible number field of degree $d$, then we have the following.

\[ m \geq \begin{array}{c} 13 \\ d \leq \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ 6 \\ 5 \\ 1 \end{array} \end{array} \]

In particular, for $m \geq 13$, $k = \mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. $f(m, d, \hat{d}, s)$ is clearly increasing in $\hat{d}$ for $s$ less than $(m^2 - 1)/2$, and so it is at most $f(m, d, d, s)$. On the other hand, $f(m, d, d, s)$ is at most $f(m, e, e, s)$, for any $m, d$, and $s < (m^2 - 1)/2$, and it is decreasing in $d$ for $d > e$. It is also decreasing in $m$, for $m > 19$, since $(i - 1)! > (2\pi)^i$ for $i \geq 19$.

By the above discussion and calculating $f(n, e, e, 3)$ for $n$ between 19 and 13, we get an upper bound 2.16 for $D_k^{1/d}$. Therefore by table 9 we get that $d = 1$, and thus $k = \mathbb{Q}$.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccccc}
  m & 19 & 18 & 17 & 16 & 15 \\
  f(m, e, e, 3) & 1.47 & 1.55 & 1.64 & 1.75 & 1.87
\end{array}
\]

The last needed value is $f(5, 5, 5, 2) = 6.58$. \qed

6.2

Let $d = 2$ and $m$ between 9 and 13. We can calculate $f(m, 2, 2, 2.5)$ to get an upper bound on $D_k$.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccccc}
  m & 12 & 11 & 10 & 9 \\
  D_k \leq & 5 & 6 & 8 & 10 \\
  D_k & 5 & 5 & 5,8 & 5,8
\end{array}
\]

For each of the above possible discriminant, we will apply The Second Estimate, and we get the following upper bounds for $D_l$, which are impossible as the smallest $D_l$ for $l$ a totally complex quartic is 117. (We set $s = 2.5$)

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccccc}
  D_k \setminus m & 12 & 11 & 10 & 9 \\
  5 & 34 & 45 & 85 & 103 \\
  8 & 75 & 113
\end{array}
\]

Corollary 13. For $m \geq 9$, $k = \mathbb{Q}$.
Let $d = 3$. Again, we calculate $f(m, 3, 3, 2.5)$ to get an upper bound for $D_k$, and then use the list of cubic fields \[ \text{[133.001]} \] to write the possible discriminants.

As before, for each of the above possible $D_k$, we apply The Second Estimate (for $s=2$), and get the following upper bounds for $D_l$ and $\delta_{l/k} = D_l/D_k^2$.

To get more information, we appeal to the table of totally complex number fields of degree 6 \[ \text{[3 t60.001]} \], and observe that because of the above restrictions,

\[(m, D_k, \delta_{l/k}) \in \{(5, 49, 7), (5, 81, 3), (5, 148, 4), (6, 49, 7), (6, 81, 3)\}.\]

Furthermore there is a unique number field with $D_l = -49^2 \times 7$, which is $l = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_7)$ where $\zeta_7$ is a primitive 7th root of unity, $h_l = 1$, and the group of roots of unity in $l$ has 14 elements. Using these data, we can use $(k, l)$-Checker, to see that this pair is not possible for $m = 6$, and for $m = 5$, as it has been computed in \[ \text{[PY08, Proof of theorem 1]} \], the numerator of $R_l/l/k, 5)$ has a prime factor other than 3 and 5. Hence it is not an admissible pair, by corollary 5.

Similarly there is a unique number field with $D_l = -81^2 \times 3$, which is $l = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_9)$ where $\zeta_9$ is a primitive 9th root of unity, $h_l = 1$, and the group of roots of unity in $l$ has 18 elements. Again by $(k, l)$-Checker, we can see that this pair is not acceptable for $m = 6$. For $m = 5$, we once more refer to \[ \text{[PY08]} \] for the computation of value of $R_l/l/k, 5)$, and notice that its numerator is not a product of a power of 3 and a power of 5. Therefore, by corollary 5, it is not an admissible pair.

Once more, looking at the table, we see that there is a unique totally complex number field with $D_l = -148^2 \times 4$. Moreover its class number is 1, and it has 4 roots of unity. $(k, l)$-Checker says that such a pair is not admissible for $m = 5$. 
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6.4

Let \( d = 4 \). Then by the discussion in 6.1 the only possible value for \( m \) is 5.
To get an upper bound for \( D_k \), we again use The First Estimate. Calculating \( f(5, 4, 4, 2.5) \) gives us that \( D_k \leq 2222 \). Looking at the table of totally real quartic number fields \([2, t44.001]\), we see that there are exactly 6 fields with this property. Here are their discriminants.

\[
D_k \in \{725, 1125, 1600, 1957, 2000, 2048\}.
\]

Again by The Second Estimate (for \( s = 2.5 \)), we get the following bounds for \( \delta_{l/k} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( D_k )</th>
<th>725</th>
<th>1125</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \delta_{l/k} \leq )</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prasad and Yeung [PY08] used the database in [4] and find out that the class number of any totally complex octic number field with discriminant less than 5000000 is 1. Now, applying \((k, l)\)-Checker with \( h_{l,m} = 1 \) and \( m \) instead of \( \#\mu_m(l) \), we get that the only possibility is \((D_k, \delta_{l/k}) = (725, 1)\). However the minimum \( D_l \) for \( l \) a totally complex octic number field is 1257728, which is larger than 725\(^2\). Hence \( d \) is not 4.

6.5

Let \( d = 2 \) and \( m \) between 5 and 8. As always, using The First Estimate, we get an upper bound for \( D_k \) (for \( s = 2 \)).

\[
\begin{array}{c|cccccc}
 m & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 & 14 & 20 & 32 & 63 \\
\hline
 5 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 8 & 13 & 15 & 31 & 68 \\
 6 & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 & 10 & 13 & 38 & 129 & & \\
 7 & & & 1 & 2 & 5 & 12 & & & & & \\
 8 & & & & 1 & 4 & 12 & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Hence we have that

\[
D_k \in \{5, 8, 12, 13, 17, 21, 24, 28, 29, 33, 37, 40, 41, 44, 52, 53, 56, 57, 60, 61\}.
\]

By The Second Estimate, for a given \( D_k \), we get an upper bound for \( \delta_{l/k} \) (Let \( s = 2 \)).

Looking at the table of totally complex quartic number fields, we can see what the possible \((D_l, h_l, r_l)\) are, where \( h_l \) is the class number of \( l \), and \( r_l \) is the number of roots of unity in \( l \). In particular, we observe that for all such number fields \( h_l \leq 2 \). Then we apply a variation of \((k, l)\)-Checker to get an upper bound for \( \delta_{k/l} \). Namely we apply

\[
\left( \frac{\hat{d} \cdot h_{l,m} \cdot \#\mu_m(l)}{D_k^{2(m^2-1)} \cdot V_m^d} \right)^{\frac{s}{k}} \geq \delta_{k/l}, \tag{10}
\]
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for 2 (resp. $m, d$) instead of $h_{l,m}$ (resp. $\#\mu_m(l), \hat{d}$), and we will get the following bounds for $\delta_{l/k}$.

Further looking at the mentioned table, we will see that the class number of all of the remaining fields is one. Applying inequality (10) for the second time, we will have the following modification of the upper bounds for $\delta_{l/k}$.

Now looking at the table, we have a relatively small list of possibilities. Thus we can use $(k, l)$-Checker with $h_l = 1$ and the right value of $\#\mu_m(l)$, and overall we get the following possibilities for $\delta_{l/k}$.

By the discussion in [PY08, Proof of theorem 1] and the above table, we get the following possibilities for $(l, k)$. (These are the only possible pairs with the above prescribed discriminants and $l$ containing $k$.)

At this point calculating $R(l/k, m)$ and using corollary 5, we show that none of the above pairs are admissible. Most of the needed zeta function or $L$-function values are borrowed from [PY08], and the rest are computed using PARI/GP and functional equations. Having the values, we see that numerator of $R(l/k, m)$ has the following prime factor, which is neither $d = 2$ nor a prime factor of $m,$
and therefore \((k, l)\) is not admissible and subsequently \(d = 1\), i.e. \(k = \mathbb{Q}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(m) (\backslash) ((k, l))</th>
<th>(C_1)</th>
<th>(C_2)</th>
<th>(C_3)</th>
<th>(C_4)</th>
<th>(C_5)</th>
<th>(C_6)</th>
<th>(C_7)</th>
<th>(C_8)</th>
<th>(C_9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theorem 14.** In our setting \(k = \mathbb{Q}\). In particular, if \(F\) is a local field of characteristic zero, \(D_0\) an \(F\)-central division algebra, and there is a discrete vertex transitive action on the Bruhat-Tits building of \(\text{SL}_n(D_0)\), then \(F = \mathbb{Q}_p\) for some prime number \(p\), and \(\text{Aut}(F) = 1\).

**Remark 15.** Since there is no Galois action, \(\hat{\Gamma}_0 = \Gamma_0\) is contained in \(\Gamma\). Hence \(\Gamma\) also acts transitively on the vertices. From this point on, without loss of generality, we assume that \(\Gamma_0 = \Gamma\).

**7 Determining possible \(l\)'s.**

**7.1**

In the previous section, we have established that \(k = \mathbb{Q}\) and \(\text{Aut}(F) = 1\) (so \(\hat{d} = 1\)). Here first we use a variation of The Second Estimate to get an upper bound for the possible \(D_l\)'s. In fact, we notice that \(\#\mu_m(l)\) is at most 6 since \(l\) is a quadratic number field. Therefore

\[
\left[ 300s(s-1) \cdot \frac{h(s)}{V_m} \right]^{\frac{2}{s-2}} \geq D_l.
\]

By the above inequality, we get the following \((s = 1.5)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D_l) (\leq)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover since the the left hand side of the above inequality decreases for \(m \geq 19\), we get \(D_l \leq 2\) for \(m \geq 17\). On the other hand, there is no quadratic field with absolute value of discriminant less than 3.

**Proposition 16 (First Bound).** Let \(F\) be a local field of characteristic zero, and \(\mathbb{G}_0\) an absolutely almost simple \(F\)-group, with absolute rank \(r_{\mathbb{G}_0}\). If \(r_{\mathbb{G}_0} > 15\), then there is no discrete vertex transitive action on the Bruhat-Tits building of \(\mathbb{G}_0/F\).

**7.2**

Since \(l\) is a complex quadratic field, there is \(a_l\) a square free positive integer such that \(l = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-a_l})\). It is well-known that \(D_l = a_l\) (resp. \(4a_l\)) if \(a_l = 3\).
mod 4 (resp. otherwise). We define $\chi$ on prime numbers and then extend it multiplicatively to all the positive integers.

$$\chi(p) = \begin{cases} 1 & p \text{ splits over } l, \\ -1 & p \text{ is a prime over } l, \\ 0 & p \text{ ramifies over } l. \end{cases}$$

If $p \neq 2$, then clearly $\chi(p) = \left( \frac{-a_l}{p} \right)$, where $\left( \cdot \right)$ is the Jacobi symbol. It is also well-known that $p = 2$ is a ramified prime over $l$ unless $a_l = 3 \mod 4$, on that case $\chi(2) = 1$ (resp. $-1$) if $a_l = 7$ (mod 8) (resp. $a_l = 3$ (mod 8)). If $a_l$ is odd, then by the reciprocity law, for any odd prime $p$,

$$\chi(p) = (-1)^{p-1} \cdot (-1)^{\frac{p-1}{2} \cdot a_l - 1} \cdot \left( \frac{p}{a_l} \right) = (-1)^{p-1} \cdot \frac{a_l+1}{2} \cdot \left( \frac{p}{a_l} \right).$$

Coupling with the description of $\chi(2)$, we have that when $a_l = 3 \mod 4$, for any natural number $n$,

$$\chi(n) = \left( \frac{n}{a_l} \right),$$

and consequently it is a primitive Dirichlet character whose conductor is $D_l = a_l$. When $a_l \neq 3 \mod 4$, by the above discussion, $\chi$ is again a primitive Dirichlet character whose conductor is $D_l = 4a_l$. So overall $L_{l/k}(s) = L(\chi, s)$, where the later is a Dirichlet $L$-function.

On the other hand, one can compute value of Dirichlet L-functions (resp. zeta function) at negative integers using generalized Bernoulli (resp. Bernoulli) numbers. Indeed, if

$$F_{\chi}(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{D_l} \frac{\chi(j)z^j}{e^{D_lz} - 1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B_{j,\chi} \frac{z^j}{j!},$$

then $B_{j,\chi}$’s are called generalized Bernoulli numbers, and $L(\chi, 1-j) = -\frac{B_{j,\chi}}{j}$. Similarly, if

$$F(z) = \frac{ze^z}{e^z - 1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B_j \frac{z^j}{j!},$$

then $B_j$’s are called Bernoulli numbers, and $\zeta(1-j) = -\frac{B_j}{j}$.

The von Staudt-Clausen theorem states that $B_{2j} + \sum_{(p-1)|2j} \frac{1}{p} \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, the denominator of $B_{2j}$ is a square free number, and any of its prime factors is at most $2j + 1$. Analog of this theorem for the generalized Bernoulli numbers is proved by Leopoldt [Le58] and Carlitz [Ca59]. In particular, prime factors of the denominator of $B_{j,\chi}/j$ are at most $D_l$. Indeed they prove that if $D_l$ is not power of a prime number, then $B_{j,\chi}/j$ is an integer.
7.3

Computing the first 12 terms of \( F(z) \), we calculate the Bernoulli numbers, and consequently \( \zeta(-2j+1) \) for \( j \) between 1 and 6. In particular, \( \zeta(-11) = \frac{691}{2^{8} \cdot 3^{6} \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 13} \). In 7.1, we saw that for \( m > 11 \), \( D_l \) is at most 7. Hence by the discussion in 7.2, 691 does not appear as a prime factor of any of the zeta or \( L \)-function values in \( R(l/Q, m) \) for any possible \( l \) and \( m \leq 16 \). Hence \( R(l/Q, m) \) has 691 as a prime factor of its numerator if \( 11 < m < 17 \) and \((Q, l)\) is an admissible pair, which contradicts corollary 5. Hence we have the following improvement of proposition 16.

Proposition 17 (Second Bound). Let \( \mathcal{G}_0, F, \) and \( r_{\mathcal{G}_0} \) be as in proposition 16. If \( r_{\mathcal{G}_0} > 10 \), then there is no discrete vertex transitive action on the Bruhat-Tits building of \( \mathcal{G}_0/F \).

7.4

To get a list of admissible \( l = Q(\sqrt{-a_l}) \), we apply corollary 5. To this end, we have to be able to effectively compute \( R(l/Q, m) \) for a large list of \( l \) and small range of \( m \), which is an easy task applying the generalized Bernoulli numbers and discussion in 7.2. We use Mathematica to compute value of \( L \)-functions for the needed complex quadratic fields (see the Appendix B). We look for the cases where we do not have “bad” prime factors in the numerator of \( R(l/k, m) \). As a consequence, we get the following possible \((m, a_l)\).

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
(m, a_l) & (8, 3) & (7, 3) & (5, 3) & (5, 1) & (5, 31) \\
\hline
R(Q(\sqrt{a})/Q, m)^{-1} & 2^1 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2 & 2^1 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 & 2^1 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 & 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 7 & 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 7 \\
\hline
R(Q(\sqrt{a})/Q, m)^{-1} & 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 5 & 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 7 & 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 7 & 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 7 & 2^1 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 7 \\
\hline
R(Q(\sqrt{a})/Q, m)^{-1} & 2^1 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 & 2^1 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 & 2^1 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 & 2^1 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 & 2^1 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

(11)

Proposition 18. With the previous setting, the only possible pairs of \((m, a_l)\)'s for \( m > 4 \) are

\((8, 3), (7, 3), (6, 3), (6, 1), (6, 7), (6, 31), (5, 3), (5, 1), \) and \((5, 7)\).

Proof. By the above discussion, it is enough to exclude \((m, a_l) = (5, 31)\). By the Main Inequality, lemma 7 and theorem 14, we have that

\[
1 \geq \frac{R(l/Q, m)}{h_{l, m} \cdot \#\mu_m(l)}
\]

for any possible \( m \) and \( l \). On the other hand, \( h_{Q(\sqrt{-31})} = 3 \) and clearly no quadratic field has a primitive \( 5^{th} \) root of unity. Hence the right hand side of the above inequality, for \((m, a_l) = (5, 31)\), is equal to \( 2^2 \cdot 3^2 \), which is a contradiction. \( \square \)
Corollary 19 (Third Bound). Let $G_0, F$, and $r_{G_0}$ be as in proposition 16. If $r_{G_0} > 7$, then there is no discrete vertex transitive action on the Bruhat-Tits building of $G_0/F$.

8 Determining $G$.

In this section, we will describe the possible global forms, via the description of the local forms of $G$. Namely, we will find the possible set of primes over which $G$ is not quasi-split.

8.1

Definition 20. For a given natural number $b > 1$, a prime factor of $b^c - 1$ is called a primitive prime factor if it does not divide $b^{c'} - 1$ for any natural number $c'$ less than $c$.

Lemma 21. i) Let $q$ be a positive integer. A primitive prime factor of $q^c - 1$ exists and any such factor is larger than 7 if $c \in \{5, 7, 10, 14, 8\}$.

ii) If $q$ is an integer larger than 2, then $(q^2 - q + 1)(q^2 + q + 1)$ has a prime factor larger than 7.

Proof. i) By Bang’s theorem, any $(q, c) \neq (2, 6)$ has a primitive factor. Let $p$ be a primitive prime factor of $q^c - 1$. Clearly $p$ and $q$ are co-prime. Hence $q^p - 1$ is also divisible by $p$. In particular, $p - 1$ is divisible by $c$, which finishes proof of the first part.

ii) If not, then $p$ a primitive prime factor of $q^6 - 1$ should be equal to 7 (by Bang’s theorem such a prime exists.) Hence 7 does not divide $q - 1, q + 1, and q^2 + q + 1$. Since $q^2 - q + 1$ and $q^2 + q + 1$ are co-prime, 7 divides $q^2 - q + 1$ and $q^2 + q + 1$ is an odd number, the only possible prime factors of $q^2 + q + 1$ are 3 and 5. On the other hand, if 5 divides $q^2 + q + 1$, then it also divides $q^5 - 1$, and consequently $q - 1$, which is a contradiction. Hence $q^2 + q + 1 = 3^\alpha$ for some positive integer $\alpha$. Thus we have $(2q + 1)^2 = 4 \cdot 3^\alpha - 3$, and as a result 3 divides $4 \cdot 3^{\alpha - 1} - 1$, which happens only when $\alpha = 1$. Therefore $q^2 + q + 1 = 3$ and so $q = 1$, which is a contradiction.

8.2

Proposition 22. As in the setting of section 3.2, if $D$ is non-commutative, then $(m, a_1) = (5, 7)$. Moreover, $D$ does not split only over primes which divide $2$. In particular, $D_0 = F$ and $n = m$. 
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Proof. Let $D$ be a non-commutative $l$-central division algebra, with an involution of second kind. Since there is no non-commutative division algebra over a local field with an involution of second kind, if $D$ does not split over $p$, $(p) = N_{l/Q}(p)$ splits over $l$. In this case, as in the proof of lemma 2, $e'(P_p) = \prod_{d_p, t, i = 1}^{m-1} (q^i_p - 1)$.

If $m \neq 5$, then by lemma 8.1 $e'(P_p)$ has a prime factor larger than 7. On the other hand, in all of the possible cases, $R(l/Q, m)$ has no prime factor larger than 7 in its denominator. Hence we get a contradiction from

$$1 \geq \frac{n \cdot R(l/Q, m)}{|\mu(l) \cap K|} \prod_{p \in T_l} e'(P_p)$$

as the denominator of the right hand side of the above equality has no prime factor larger than 7. Hence $D$ should split over all the finite places, and therefore $D$ is commutative.

If $m = 5$, then by proposition 18, $h_l = 1$. On the other hand, no quadratic field has a 5th root of unity, and so $\# \mu_5(l) = 1$. Since 5 is a prime number, $D_0 = F$ and $D$ either splits over a prime, or it remains a division algebra. Now by the Main Inequality, we have

$$1 \geq R(l/Q, 5) \prod_{p \in T_l^5} e'(P_p) = \frac{R(l/Q, 5)}{5} \prod_{p \in T_l^5} \frac{(p-1)(p^2-1)(p^3-1)(p^4-1)}{5}.$$

From this inequality, we get that the only possibilities for $(a_l, p)$ are

$$(3, 2), (1, 2), (7, 2), (3, 3), \text{ and } (1, 3).$$

However for $p = 2$, we get 7 as a prime factor in the numerator for $a_l = 3$ or 1, which is not possible, and for $p = 3$, 13 appears as a prime factor in all the cases. Altogether the only remaining possibility is $(a_l, p) = (7, 2)$. (We also note that 2 splits over $l = Q(\sqrt{-7})$.)

Now it is clear that $D_0$ should be commutative as otherwise $D$ is non-commutative and so $m = 5$, in which case $n = 1$, and $G_0$ is anisotropic over $F$, which is a contradiction. \hfill $\square$

Corollary 23. For $(m, a_l) = (5, 7)$, there are at most four possibilities for $D$.

Proof. By Brauer-Hasse-Noether theorem, any division algebra over a number field is a cyclic algebra. Moreover, it can be classified with its local Hasse invariants. By the above proposition, $D$ splits over any prime except those which divide $2 = p_0 \cdot \overline{p}_0$. Since $D$ admits an involution of second kind,

$$inv_{p_0}(D) + inv_{\overline{p}_0}(D) = 0$$
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in \(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}\). So for a given \(\text{inv}_{\mathbb{Q}}(D)\), there is a unique \(D\). On the other hand, \(\exp(|D|) = \text{ind}(D) = 5\). Hence
\[
\text{inv}_{\mathbb{Q}}(D) \in \left\{ \frac{1}{5}, \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{4}{5} \right\},
\]
and we are done.

\[\square\]

8.3

Let \(p\) be a prime, which is unramified over \(l\), and does not split over \(l\). If \(G\) is not quasi-split over \(p\), then \(m\) is even. So under our assumptions \(m\) is either 6 or 8.

Let \(m = 8\). As it is discussed in the proof of lemma 8.2, \(e'(P_p)\) is divisible by either
\[
\frac{p^8 - 1}{p + 1}, \text{ or } \frac{(p^8 - 1)(p^7 + 1)(p^6 - 1)}{(p^3 + 1)(p^2 - 1)(p + 1)}.
\]
In either case by lemma 8.1, it has a prime factor larger than 7, which gives us a contradiction similar to the discussion in 8.2.

Let \(m = 6\). Again as we have seen in the proof of lemma 8.2, \(e'(P_p)\) is divisible by either
\[
\frac{p^6 - 1}{p + 1}, \text{ or } \frac{(p^6 - 1)(p^5 + 1)(p^4 - 1)}{(p^3 + 1)(p^2 - 1)(p + 1)}.
\]
The second term always has a prime factor larger than 7 by lemma 8.1 [part i], and the first term has such a prime factor if \(p > 2\) by lemma 8.1 [part iii]. Hence the only possibility for \(p\) is 2. Since \(p\) is supposed to be a prime over \(l\), the only possibilities for \(a_l\) are either 3 or 31.

**Proposition 24.** In the previous setting, if \(p\) is a prime over \(l\), and \(G\) is not quasi-split over \(\mathbb{Q}_p\), then \(m = 6\), \(a_l\) is either 3 or 31, and \(p = 2\). Furthermore in these cases all the maximal parahorics containing \(P_p\) are special.

**Proof.** By the above discussion, the only possibility for \(m\) is 6, and \(p\) is definitely 2. On the other hand, since \(p\) is supposed to be a prime over \(l\), the only possibilities for \(a_l\) are either 3 or 31. The second part of the proposition is also a direct consequence of the above analysis, coupling with the fact that the first terms in the above formulas are associated with the special parahorics. \(\square\)

8.4

Let \(p\) be a ramified prime over \(l\). If \(G\) is not quasi-split over \(\mathbb{Q}_p\), then, as above, \(m\) is equal to 6 or 8.
Let $m = 8$. Similar to the analysis in 8.3, we use the proof of lemma 2, to say that $e'(P_p)$ is divisible by either

$$p^4 - 1, \frac{(p^8 - 1)(p^3 - 1)}{(p^2 - 1)}(p^4 - 1)(p^2 - 1), \frac{(p^8 - 1)(p^6 - 1)}{(p^2 - 1)}(p^2 - 1), \text{ or } \frac{(p^8 - 1)}{(p^2 - 1)}(p - 1).$$

By lemma 8.1, except the first term, the others, have a prime factor larger than 7. Hence with a similar analysis as in 8.2, they are not acceptable.

Let $m = 6$. Similar to the previous cases, from the proof of lemma 2, we know that $e'(P_p)$ is divisible by either

$$p^3 - 1, p^6 - 1, \text{ or } p^6 - 1 \frac{1}{p + 1}.$$

When $p \neq 2$, except the first term, the rest, have a prime factor larger than 7, and so they are not acceptable. On the other hand, $p$ is ramified over $l$. Thus it divides $D_l$. By proposition 18, we know that $D_l \in \{3, 4, 7, 31\}$. Notice that $3^3 - 1, 7^3 - 1, \text{ and } 31^3 - 1$ have prime factors larger than 7.

**Proposition 25.** In the previous setting, if $p$ is ramified over $l$, and $\mathbb{G}$ is not quasi-split over $\mathbb{Q}_p$, then $(m, a_l, p)$ is either $(8, 3, 3)$ or $(6, 1, 2)$. Furthermore when $m = 8$, $P_p$ is a special parahoric with only one vertex in its type.

*Proof.* It is a direct corollary of the above analysis. \qed

### 8.5

Here we will study the Hermitian form $h$ (same notation as in 3.2). We start with the case $(m, a_l) = (5, 7)$, where we have an $l$-central division algebra. Corollary 23 gives us the local Hasse invariants, and by a theorem of Landherr [Sc85, Chapter 10, Theorem 2.4.], $D$ has $\tau$ an involution of second kind. In this case, $h$ is a map from $D \times D \rightarrow D$ which is $\mathbb{Q}$-linear in both of the variables,

i) $h(xd, y) = \tau(d)h(x, y)$

and ii) $h(x, yd) = h(x, y)d$

iii) $h(x, y) = \tau(h(y, x))$,

for any $x, y, d$ in $D$. Thus $h$ is uniquely determined by $a_h = h(1, 1)$.

**Proposition 26.**

i) By changing $a_h$, without loss of generality we can take any involution of second kind on $D$.

ii) For a given second kind involution on $D$, there is an Hermitian form over $D$ which has signature $\text{ind}(D)$ over the Archimedean place.

iii) For a given second kind involution on $D$, any two Hermitian forms over $D$ which are anisotropic over the Archimedean place determine the same unitary group.
iv) There are exactly two possible \( G \) simply connected \( \mathbb{Q} \)-absolutely almost simple group which are anisotropic over \( \mathbb{R} \), and coming from a hermitian form over \( D \).

Proof. i) Let \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) be two involution of second kind on \( D \). Then \( \tau_1 \circ \tau_2 \) is an \( l \)-automorphism of \( D \). Hence by Skolem-Noether, there is \( d \in D \) such that

\[
\tau_2(x) = d^{-1} \tau_1(x) d,
\]

for any \( x \) in \( D \). Since \( \tau_2 \circ \tau_2 = id \), \( d^{-1} \tau_1(x) d = \tau_1(d x d^{-1}) = \tau_1(d)^{-1} \tau_1(x) \tau_1(d) \). Hence \( \tau_1(d) = \lambda d \) for some \( \lambda \) in \( l \). On the other hand, \( d = \tau_1 \circ \tau_1(d) = N_{l/\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) d \), and so \( N_{l/\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) = 1 \). By Hilbert’s tenth problem, there is \( \mu \) in \( l \), such that \( \lambda = \mu \bar{\mu}^{-1} \). Let \( a \in D \) such that \( a = \tau_1(a) \). Then

\[
\tau_1(x) a x = a \iff \tau_2(x) \cdot \mu^{-1} d^{-1} a \cdot x = \mu^{-1} d^{-1} a.
\]

Moreover \( \tau_2(\mu^{-1} d^{-1} a) = \mu^{-1} d^{-1} a \). Therefore we get the same \( \mathbb{Q} \)-algebraic group, which proves the first part of proposition.

ii) See [Sc85, Theorem 6.9, 6.11].

iii) Any Hermitian form and any of its scalar multiples determine the same unitary group. On the other hand, index of \( D \) is odd in our case, so without loss of generality we can assume that determinant of our Hermitian form is 1. On the other hand, by [Sc85, Corollary 6.6], two hermitian forms with the same dimension, determinant, and signature over the Archimedean place are isomorphic, which finishes the proof.

iv) To see the last part is enough to note that \((D, \tau, a_h)\) and \((D^{op}, \tau, a_h)\) determine isomorphic unitary groups. 

In the other possible cases, there is no division algebra, and we have a hermitian form over a global field. Such a form is uniquely determined by its dim, det, and its sign over the Archimedean places [Sc85, Chapter 10, Corollary 6.6]. In particular, without loss of generality we can assume that \( h = \text{diag}(b, 1, \cdots, 1) \) for some positive rational number \( b \). We even can and will assume that \( b \) is a positive square-free rational integer.

If \( m \) is odd, then unitary group of \( \text{diag}(b, 1, \cdots, 1) \) and \( \text{diag}(b^2, b, \cdots, b) \) are equal. The determinant of the later is 1, and its signature is the same as the identity matrix over the Archimedean places. Hence without loss of generality, we can assume that \( h = I_m \).

Let \( m = 8 \). As a result of proposition 24 and proposition 25 either the hermitian form splits over all the finite places, or it does not split only over 3. If it splits over all the finite places, then \( b \) is in the image of the norm map over any finite place. By our assumption it is also positive. Hence at each place it is
isomorphic to $I_8$. Therefore by Hasse-Minkowski [Sc85, Chapter 5, Lemma 7.4] and the fact that any unitary form is determined uniquely with the quadratic form $q_h(x) = h(x,x)$, we conclude that $h$ is isomorphic to $I_8$.

Now we claim that if a hermitian form on $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})^8$ splits over any prime except 3, then it also splits over 3. Let $q_h$ be the corresponded quadratic form to $h$, as before. First we show that $b$ is odd since $q_h$ splits over $\mathbb{Q}_2$. Assume the contrary. $b = 2b'$, where $b'$ is odd. Since $q_h$ splits over $\mathbb{Q}_2$, we have

$$\langle 2b' \rangle + 7\langle 1 \rangle + (6b') + 7\langle 3 \rangle = 0.$$ 

As $8\langle 1 \rangle = 0$ in $W(\mathbb{Q}_2)$ the Witt ring of $\mathbb{Q}_2$, we get

$$\langle 1, 3 \rangle = \langle 2b' \rangle \otimes \langle 1, 3 \rangle,$$

which happens if and only if $2b'$ is represented by $\langle 1, 3 \rangle$ over $\mathbb{Q}_2$. Looking at it modulo 8, we get a contradiction with the fact that $b'$ is odd.

Now, let us also recall some of the well-known facts on $W(\mathbb{Q})$ the Witt ring of $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $\partial_p$ be a homomorphism from $W(\mathbb{Q})$ to $W(f_p)$ defined as follows

$$\partial_p(a) = 0, \quad \partial_p(pa) = \langle a \rangle,$$

for each integer $a$ relatively prime to $p$. Combining these homomorphisms we get one homomorphism $\partial: W(\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \oplus W(f_p)$. It is well-known [MiHu73] that

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\langle 1 \rangle \hookrightarrow W(\mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow{\partial} \oplus W(f_p) \rightarrow 0 \quad (12)$$

is a short exact sequence. By the definition of $\partial_p$, it factors through $W(f_p)$. In particular, since $h$ splits over any prime $p \neq 3$, $\partial_p(q_h) = 0$. On the other hand,

$$q_h = \langle 1, 3 \rangle \otimes (\langle b \rangle + 7\langle 1 \rangle).$$

So

$$\partial_p(q_h) = \langle 1, 3 \rangle \otimes \partial_p(b) \quad \text{in} \quad W(f_p).$$

Hence if $p \neq 3$ is a prime factor of $b$, then $\langle 1, 3 \rangle = 0$ in $W(f_p)$. Hence by quadratic reciprocity, if $p \neq 2, p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. Since $b$ is odd, either $b \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ or $b/3 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. Let us examine $\partial_3$. By the definition,

$$\partial_3(q_h) = \partial_3(b) + \partial_3(3b) + 7\langle 1 \rangle.$$ 

By the above discussion, $\partial_3(q_h) = 8\langle 1 \rangle = 0$ in $W(f_3)$. Overall $q_h$ is in the kernel of $\partial$, and its dimension is 16. Thus $q_h = 16\langle 1 \rangle$ in $W(\mathbb{Q})$. In particular, it also splits over $\mathbb{Q}_3$, which proves our claim.

Let $m = 6$, and as before $q_h$ the corresponded quadratic form to $h$. By [12], if $h$ splits at all the finite places, $q_h$ is a multiple of $\langle 1 \rangle$. For $m = 6$, dim $q_h = 12$, and so $q_h = 12\langle 1 \rangle$, which contradicts the fact that $12\langle 1 \rangle$ is not zero in $W(\mathbb{Q}_2)$. 

Hence by proposition 24 and proposition 25, \( a \neq 7 \), and moreover 2 is the only prime over which \( q_h \) is not trivial. However, even in this case, we claim that \( \partial_2 q_h = 0 \) for any \( p \). For odd primes, there is nothing to prove. Over \( p = 2 \), since \( q_h \) does not split over 2, \( q_h = 2 \langle 1, a \rangle \). Thus by the definition \( \partial_2 \) maps it to zero in \( W(f_2) \). Therefore by (12), \( q_h = 12(1) \). On the other hand, it is the quadratic form associated to the hermitian form \( \text{diag}(b, 1, \cdots, 1) \) over \( \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-a}) \). Hence we have

\[
(1, a) \otimes \langle b, 1, \cdots, 1 \rangle = 12(1).
\]

By Euler’s theorem, \( 4(1) = 4(a) \), and so

\[
4(1) = (1, a) \otimes \langle b, 1 \rangle.
\]

(13)

From equation (13), one can easily see that \( b = 1 \) (resp. \( b = 2 \)) works for \( a = 1 \) (resp. \( a = 3 \)). However we claim that \( a = 31 \) is not possible.

To show this claim, using equation (13), it is enough to show that the quaternion algebra \((-1, -1)\) is not isomorphic to the algebra \((-31, -b)\) for any positive square free \( b \). Assume the contrary, so for any \( p \in V(\mathbb{Q}) \),

\[
\left( \frac{-1, -1}{\nu_p} \right) = \left( \frac{-31, -b}{\nu_p} \right)
\]

(14)

By equation (14) and Weil’s reciprocity law, we have

\[
\left( \frac{-1, -1}{\nu_2} \right) = -1 = \left( \frac{-31, -1}{\nu_2} \right) \cdot \prod_{p \mid b} \left( \frac{-31, p}{\nu_2} \right)
\]

(15)

On the other hand, since 31 can be represented by \( 2 \langle 1 \rangle \),

\[
(1, 1, 31, 31) = 0
\]

(16)

in \( W(\mathbb{Q}_2) \). Similarly, as \(-31\) represented by \((1, -2)\) in \( \mathbb{Q}_2 \), we get

\[
\left( \frac{-31, 2}{\nu_2} \right) = 1.
\]

(17)

For odd primes, we have

\[
\left( \frac{-31, p}{\nu_2} \right) = \left( \frac{-1, p}{\nu_2} \right) \left( \frac{31, p}{\nu_2} \right) = (-1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \cdot (-1)^{\frac{31-1}{2}} \cdot \frac{-1}{2}
\]

\[
= 1.
\]

(18)

Equations (15), (16), (17), and (18) give a contradiction, which finishes proof of our claim.
Theorem 27. As in the previous setting, \( G \) is isomorphic to \( \mathfrak{SU}_{h,D} \), where \( D \) is an \( l \)-central division algebra, \( l = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-a_l}) \) for some \( a_l \), \( h \) is hermitian form, and \( m = n \cdot \text{ind}(D) \). Moreover when \( m \) is larger than 4, the only possibilities for the above parameters are

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( G_1 )</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>( l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_2 )</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>( l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_3 )</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>( l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_4 )</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_5 )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>( l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_6 )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_7 )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>( l )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( G_8 )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>( D )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where the only nonzero Hasse invariants of \( D \) are over \( p_0 = \frac{1+\sqrt{-7}}{2} \) and \( \bar{p}_0 = \frac{1-\sqrt{-7}}{2} \). Moreover \( \text{inv}_{p_0} D + \text{inv}_{\bar{p}_0} D = 0 \).

Proof. It is a direct consequence of theorem 14, proposition 18, corollary 23, proposition 26, and the above discussion.

9 Type of parahorics.

In this section, we describe the possible types of \( \mathbf{P}_p \) parahorics of maximal type.

9.1

We start with the primes which split over \( l \), i.e. \( p = p \cdot \bar{p} \). For instance by theorem 27 we know that except for the case \( G_8 \) and \( p = 2 \), any maximal parahoric subgroup of \( G(\mathbb{Q}_p) \) is isomorphic to \( \text{SL}_m(\mathbb{Z}_p) \). In the \( G_8 \) case, \( G(\mathbb{Q}_2) \) is a compact subgroup, and so \( \mathbf{P}_2 = G(\mathbb{Q}_2) \). In the other cases, since \( \mathbf{P}_p \) is parahoric of maximal type, \( m_p \) number of elements of its type \( \Theta_p \) divides \( m \). Moreover its index in a maximal subgroup containing it is

\[
\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{m_p} (p^i - 1)}{\prod_{i=1}^{m/m_p} (p^i - 1)^{m/m_p}}. \tag{19}
\]

By lemma 8.1, \( p^m - 1 \) has a primitive factor larger than 7 if \( m \in \{5,7,8\} \). In which case, if \( m_1 < m \), \( e'(\mathbf{P}_p) \) has a prime factor larger than 7, and we get a contradiction by a similar argument as in 8.2. Thus for these dimensions \( \mathbf{P}_p \) is a maximal parahoric. For \( m = 6 \), by equation (19), \( p^5 - 1 \) appears in the numerator and not in the denominator, and by lemma 8.1 it has a prime factor larger than 7. Therefore again \( \mathbf{P}_p \) is a maximal parahoric.
9.2

Here assume that \( p \) is a prime over \( l \), and moreover \( G \) is quasi-split over \( \mathbb{Q}_p \). In this case, by the virtue of the formula given in the second item of the proof of lemma 5 and lemma 8.1, \( e'(P_p) \) has a prime factor larger than 7 if \( m \neq 6 \) and \( \Theta_p \) contains a non-hyper-special vertex. If \( m = 6 \), we can use the same formula in the proof of lemma 5 and this time use the primitive factor of \( p^{10} - 1 \) to get a similar result. There is only one maximal type containing hyper-special vertices which is not hyper-special itself. This occurs only for even dimension with \( \Theta_p \) containing exactly two hyper-special vertices. In which case,

\[
e'(P_p) = \frac{\prod_{i=2}^{m}(p^i - (-1)^i)}{\prod_{i=1}^{m/2}(p^i - 1)}.
\]

Again we can apply lemma 8.1 and conclude that \( p^5 + 1 \) has a prime factor larger than 7, and so does \( e'(P_p) \), which is a contradiction as we have seen in 8.2. Overall, we conclude that for this kind of prime, \( P_p \) is hyper-special.

9.3

Let \( p \) be an inert prime over \( l \), and assume that \( G \) is not quasi-split over \( \mathbb{Q}_p \). Then by proposition 24 and theorem 27, \((m, a_l, p) = (6, 3), \) and \( p = 2 \). Furthermore by proposition 24, all the vertices of \( \Theta_p \) the type of \( P_p \) are special. Hence type of the only possible non-special parahoric contains both of the special vertices. In which case,

\[
e'(P_p) = \frac{(2^5 + 1)(2^4 - 1)(2^3 + 1)(2^2 - 1)}{(2^2 - 1)(2 - 1)},
\]

that gives us a contradiction as the numerator has a prime factor larger than 7. Therefore in this case, \( e'(P_2) = 21 \).

9.4

Let \( p \) be a ramified prime over \( l \), and assume that \( G \) is quasi-split over \( \mathbb{Q}_p \). Since \( P_p \) is of maximal type \( \Theta_p \), either \( \Theta_p \) contains one vertex, or it consists of two special vertices and the dimension is even. We consider them case-by-case. For \((m, a_l, p) = (8, 3, 3), \) 41 appears as a prime factor of the numerator of \( e'(P_p) \) if \( P_p \) is not special. When \((m, a_l, p) = (7, 3, 3) \) and \( P_p \) is not special, 13 is a prime factor of the numerator of \( e'(P_p) \). Thus in these cases, \( e'(P_p) \) is one.

\((m, a_l, p) = (6, 3, 3). \) If either \( \Theta_3 = \{2\} \) or it consists of two special vertices, then \( e'(P_3) \) has 13 as a prime factor of its numerator. Hence the only possible
non-special type is $\Theta_3 = \{1\}$, in which case $e'(P_3) = 28$.

\[ m = 6 \]
\[ m = 5 \]

$(m, a_l, p) = (5, 3, 3), (5, 1, 2)$, and $(5, 7, 7)$. When $m = 5$, there is only one non-special maximal type. One can easily compute $e'(P_3)$ in each case, and see that it is equal to 10, 5, and 50, respectively.

9.5

Again let $p$ be a ramified prime over $l$. But this time $G$ is not quasi-split over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. By proposition 25 $(m, a_l, p)$ is either $(8, 3, 3)$ or $(6, 1, 2)$. Furthermore when $m = 8$, only type $\Theta_3 = \{1\}$ is allowed, in which case, $e'(P_3) = 80$.

\[ m = 8 \]
\[ m = 6 \]

When $m = 6$, all the maximal types have one vertex, and $e'(P_2)$ is 7, 63, or 21 if $\Theta_2 = \{1\}, \{2\}$, or $\{3\}$, respectively.

9.6

**Proposition 28.** As in the previous setting. Let $T = \{p \in V_f(\mathbb{Q})| e'(P_p) \neq 1\}$. Then

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$(p, \Theta_p, e'(P_p))$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$G_1$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_2$</td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_3$</td>
<td>${2} \subseteq \bullet \subseteq {2, 3}$</td>
<td>$(2, s, 21), (3, {1}, 28)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_4$</td>
<td>${2}$</td>
<td>$(2, {1}, 7), (2, {2}, 63), (2, {3}, 21)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_5$</td>
<td>$\bullet \subseteq {3}$</td>
<td>$(3, {1}, 10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_6$</td>
<td>$\bullet \subseteq {2}$</td>
<td>$(2, {1}, 5)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_7$</td>
<td>$\bullet \subseteq {7}$</td>
<td>$(7, {1}, 50)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_8$</td>
<td>${2} \subseteq \bullet \subseteq {2, 7}$</td>
<td>$(2, \varnothing, 315), (7, {1}, 50)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In particular, \( \#\Theta_p = 1 \) for any \( p \).

**Proof.** It is a direct result of the above discussion. \( \square \)

**Corollary 29.** The only automorphism of \( D_p \) local Dynkin diagram which fixes \( \Theta_p \) is identity. Moreover \( e'(P_p) = 1 \) when \((m, a_i, p)\) is either \((6, 3, 3)\) or \((5, 7, 7)\).

**Proof.** By proposition 28, it is enough to show that \( e'(P_3) = 1 \) for \((m, a_i) = (6, 3)\) to prove the first claim. To show this, we use the original formula

\[
\frac{1}{\# \mu(\mathbb{Q}) \cdot \# \Gamma_0 \cap K} = \frac{n \cdot R(l/\mathbb{Q}, m)}{\# \Gamma_0/\Lambda} \cdot \prod e'(P_p).
\]

Here we know that \( n = m \) and all the prime factors of \( \Gamma_0/\Lambda \) are also prime factors of \( m \). Moreover \( R(\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})/\mathbb{Q}, 6)^{-1} = 2^{10} \cdot 3^7 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \) and \( R(\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-7})/\mathbb{Q}, 5)^{-1} = 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \). Hence if \( e'(P_3) \neq 1 \) and \((m, a_i) = (6, 3)\), then there is an extra 7 in the numerator of the right hand side of the above equality. Similarly if \( e'(P_7) \neq 1 \) and \((m, a_i) = (5, 7)\), then there is an extra 2 in the numerator of the right hand side. Both of them give us contradiction, which finishes our proof. \( \square \)

### 10 Stabilizer of a vertex of \( B \).

#### 10.1

Using the volume formula, we will compute the number of elements of \( \Gamma_0 \) which stabilize a vertex in the Bruhat-Tits building, for any lattice described by theorem 27 together with proposition 28 and corollary 29.

First we compute number of elements of \( \Gamma_0/\Lambda \). By theorem it is enough to compute \( \# \delta(\text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(k))_{\Omega0}^\mathbb{O} \). On the other hand, by corollary \( \delta(\text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(k))_{\Omega0}^\mathbb{O} = \ker(\xi^\circ) \cap \delta(\text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(k)) \).

So by 4.3 we have to compute \( \# l_{\xi^0}/(l^x)^m \). We follow a similar argument as in 4.3 to describe \( l_{\xi^0}/(l^x)^m \). However here we also use the fact that \( h_1 = 1 \) for all the fields \( l \) under consideration.

Let \( x(l^x)^m \in l_{\xi^0}/(l^x)^m \). Without loss of generality, we can assume that \( x \) is in \( \mathcal{O}_l \). Since \( \mathcal{O}_l \) is UFD, we can write

\[
x = u \prod p^{i_1} \bar{p}^{i_2} \cdot \prod p'^{i_3} \cdot \prod p''^{i_4},
\]

where \( u \) is a unit in \( \mathcal{O}_l \), \( p, p', \) and \( p'' \) are prime elements in \( \mathcal{O}_l \), \( \bar{p} \) is the Galois conjugate of \( p \), \( p^{-1} \bar{p} \) is not a unit in \( \mathcal{O}_l \), \( p' \) is rational, and \( p''/\bar{p} \) is a unit in \( \mathcal{O}_l \). By the definition, we have

\[
N_{l/\mathbb{Q}}(x) = N(u) \cdot \prod N(p)^{i_1 + i_2} \cdot \prod p^{2i_3} \cdot \prod N_{l/\mathbb{Q}}(p'')^{i_4}
\]
is the \( m \)-th power of a rational number. Hence \( m \) divides \( i_1 + i_2, 2i', \) and \( i'' \). We also know that \( x(l^x)^m \) acts trivially on all the local Dynkin diagrams except possibly at the \( p_0 \). Thus by the discussion in \[4.2\]

\[ x(l^x)^m = u \cdot p_0^{i_1} \cdot \tilde{p}_0^{i_2} \cdot (l^x)^m. \]

If either \( G \) is not quasi-split over the ramified prime, or \( m \) is odd, then the local Dynkin diagram over the ramified place has a trivial group of isometries. So

\[ \#\Gamma_0/\Lambda = \#\xi/\langle l^x \rangle^m = m \cdot \#\mu_m(l). \quad (21) \]

Otherwise, \( l = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3}) \) and \( (-1)^{i''} \) acts non-trivially on the local Dynkin diagram over the ramified place. Hence

\[ \#\Gamma_0/\Lambda = \#l\xi/\langle l^x \rangle^m = m \cdot \#\mu_{\gcd(m,3)}(l). \quad (22) \]

**Proposition 30.** As in the previous setting, we have

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|l|l|}
\hline
\text{Label} & T & (T_{\mathfrak{p}}, e'(P_\mathfrak{p})) & \#\Gamma_0/\Lambda & \#\mu_{\mu}(Q) \cdot \#\Gamma_0 \cap K \\
\hline
G_1 & \emptyset & & 1 & 2^{15} \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2 \\
G_2 & \emptyset & (s, 21) & 3 & 2^{10} \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \\
G_3 & \{2\} & (\{1\}, 7), (\{2\}, 63), (\{3\}, 21) & 1 & 2^{14} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 2^{14} \cdot 3^4 \\
G_4 & \{2\} & (\{1\}, 10) & 1 & 2^2 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7 \\
G_5 & \bullet \leq \{3\} & & 1 & 2^2 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7 \\
G_6 & \emptyset & (\emptyset, 315) & 1 & 2^2 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7 \\
G_7 & \emptyset & & 1 & 2^2 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7 \\
G_8 & \{2\} & (\emptyset, 315) & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

**Proof.** It is a direct consequence of proposition \[28\] corollary \[29\] and equations \[11\], \[20\], \[21\], and \[22\].

\[ \square \]

**10.2**

Since working with the simply connected cover is much easier than working with the adjoint form, we will reformulate proposition \[30\] for the simply connected form and \( \Lambda_0 \). Note that

\[ \text{Ad}(\Lambda \cap K) = \overline{\Lambda} \cap \overline{K}. \]

On the other hand, \( \Gamma_0 \cap \overline{K}/\Lambda_0 \cap \overline{K} \) can be identified with a subgroup of \( \Gamma_0/\overline{\Lambda} \) which is isomorphic to \( \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_{\overline{\Lambda}} \). By corollary \[29\] and the definition of \( \overline{K} \), we can identify \( \Gamma_0 \cap \overline{K}/\Lambda_0 \cap \overline{K} \) with a subgroup of

\[ \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_{\xi} = \ker(\xi) \cap \delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k)). \]

By a similar argument as in \[10.1\] we know that

\[ \#\delta(\text{Ad}(G)(k))_{\xi} = \begin{cases}
\#\mu_{\gcd(m,3)}(l) & \text{if } 2|m, a_t = 3 \& G \text{ quasi-split/ } p = 3; \\
\#\mu_m(l), & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases} \]
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Hence in all the cases except possibly for type $G_3$, $\Gamma_0 \cap K = \Lambda \cap K$. For type $G_3$, $\Gamma_0 \cap K/\Lambda \cap K$ either is trivial or has three elements. On the other hand, $\#\Lambda \cap K = \#\mu(\mathbb{Q}) \cdot \#\text{Ad}(\Lambda \cap K)$.

Thus overall, we have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$(\Theta_p, e'(P_p))$</th>
<th>$#\Lambda \cap K$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$G_1$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$(\Theta_p, e'(P_p))$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_2$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$(\Theta_p, e'(P_p))$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^8 \cdot 5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_3$</td>
<td>${2}$</td>
<td>$(s, 21)$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^6 \cdot 5$ or $2^{10} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_4$</td>
<td>${2}$</td>
<td>$((1), 7), ((2), 63), ((3), 21)$</td>
<td>$2^{14} \cdot 3^2, 2^{14} \cdot 3^2, 2^{14} \cdot 3^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_5$</td>
<td>$\subseteq (3)$</td>
<td>$((1), 10)$</td>
<td>$2^{11} \cdot 3^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_6$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_7$</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>$(\emptyset, 315)$</td>
<td>$1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_8$</td>
<td>${2}$</td>
<td>$(\emptyset, 315)$</td>
<td>$1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Final check.

At this point we only know type of $(P_p)$’s up to an automorphism of the local Dynkin diagrams. In this section, first we show that we are allowed to take any coherent family of parahoric subgroups with that restriction on their type.

Then we will have all the information of the possible lattices. At the final step, we have to check if they act transitively on the vertices of the Bruhat-Tits building or not. To do so, we have to compute number of elements of $\Lambda \cap K$ directly and see if we get the same number as in the previous section. We will explain our method of finding the number of elements of this finite group implementing MAGMA.

11.1 Proposition 31. Let $\Theta$ be an admissible $p_0$-global type, and $(P_p)_{p \neq p_0}$ a coherent family of parahoric subgroups of type $\Theta$. Then

$$(\text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(\mathcal{A}) = \text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(\mathbb{Q}) \cdot \prod_{p \in \{\infty, p_0\}} \text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(\mathbb{Q}_p) \prod_{p \in V_f \setminus \{p_0\}} \overline{P}_p.$$  

Proof. Let $(g_p)$ be an element in $\text{Ad}(\mathbb{G})(\mathcal{A})$. For any $p$, we map $g_p$ to $H^1(\mathbb{Q}_p, \mu)$ via the boundary map $\delta_p$. By the discussion in 142 and using the fact that $\mathcal{O}_l$ is UFD, we can identify elements of $\text{Aut}(D_p)$ with some elements of $\ker(H^1(\mathbb{Q}_p, R_l/\mathbb{Q}(\mu)) \to H^1(\mathbb{Q}_p, \mu))$.

as follows,

$$\begin{align*}
&\left\{ p^1(l_p \times)^m \times \overline{p}^{-1}(l_p \times)^m \right\} \quad p = p\overline{p} \text{ splits/ } l; \\
&\left\{ p^{m/2}(l_p \times)^m \right\} \quad 2|m \text{ and } p \text{ prime/ } l; \\
&\left\{ (-1)(l_p \times)^m \right\} \quad 2|m, \mathbb{G} \text{ quasi-split/ } l, \text{ and } p \text{ ramified/ } l.
\end{align*}$$
Hence \( x(l^\times)^m \) maps to these elements where
\[
x = \prod p^{i_p} \cdot \bar{p}^{(-i_p)} \cdot \prod p^\eta_p m/2 \cdot (-1)^{\varepsilon_p},
\]
i_p, \eta_p, and \( \varepsilon_p \) are coming from the action on the Dynkin diagram. On the other hand, it is easy to see that \( x(l^\times)^m \) is in \( l_0/(l^\times)^m \). Hence there is \( g \) an element of \( \text{Ad}(\mathcal{G})(\mathbb{Q}) \) which is mapped to \( x(l^\times)^m \) by the boundary map. Thus \( g^{-1}g_p \)
acts trivially on the local Dynkin diagrams for any prime \( p \). In particular, \( g^{-1}g_p(P_p) \) has the same type as \( P_p \). Thus there is \( 1 \). For the Archimedean place and \( p_0 \), let \( \tilde{g}_p = 1 \). So \( (\tilde{g}_p) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A}) \). By strong approximation, there are \( \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Q}) \) and \( (\tilde{g}'_p) \in \prod_{p \in \{\infty, p_0\}} \text{Ad}(\mathcal{G})(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cdot \prod_{p \in V_f \setminus \{p_0\}} P_p \subseteq \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A}) \) such that, \( (\tilde{g}_p) = (\tilde{g}'_p) \cdot \tilde{g} \). Hence for any \( p \neq p_0 \), \( \text{Ad}(\tilde{g})g^{-1}g_p(P_p) = P_p \), which completes the proof.

**Corollary 32.** Let \( \Theta^1 \) and \( \Theta^2 \) be two admissible \( p_0 \)-global types in the same orbit of \( \prod \text{Aut}(D_p) \), and \( \{P^1_p\} \) and \( \{P^2_p\} \) be two family of coherent parahoric subgroups of type \( \Theta^1 \) and \( \Theta^2 \), respectively. Then the corresponded lattices \( \Gamma^1 \)
and \( \Gamma^2 \) are conjugate of each other.

**Proof.** Since in our cases \( \xi \) is surjective, using the assumptions we can conclude that there is \((g_p) \in \text{Ad}(\mathcal{G})(\mathbb{A}) \) such that \( g_p(P^1_p) = P^2_p \) for any \( p \neq p_0 \). By proposition 31 there are \( g \in \text{Ad}(\mathcal{G})(\mathbb{Q}) \) and \( (g'_p) \in \prod_{p \in \{\infty, p_0\}} \text{Ad}(\mathcal{G})(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cdot \prod_{p \in V_f \setminus \{p_0\}} \bar{P}^1_p \)
such that \( g_p = gg'_p \) for any \( p \). Thus for any \( p \neq p_0 \), \( g(P^1_p) = P^2_p \), and so \( g(\Lambda^1) = \Lambda^2 \), where
\[
\Lambda^1 = \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Q}) \cap \prod_{p \in V_f \setminus \{p_0\}} P^1_p \quad \& \quad \Lambda^2 = \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Q}) \cap \prod_{p \in V_f \setminus \{p_0\}} P^2_p.
\]
Therefore \( \text{Ad}(\Lambda^1) \) and \( \text{Ad}(\Lambda^2) \) are conjugate of each other, and so are \( \Gamma^1 \)
and \( \Gamma^2 \) their normalizers.

11.2

Here we introduce new families of simply transitive actions on the vertices of Bruhat-Tits buildings. These examples are coming from the \( G_8 \) case. We note that by [PY08, Lemma 4], \( \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Q}) \) is torsion free. In particular, \( \Lambda \cap K = \{1\} \).
Hence by proposition 30 and 10.2, for any odd prime \( p \) which is 1, 2, or 4 modulo 7, \( \text{PGL}_5(\mathbb{Q}_p) \) has at least four non-isomorphic lattices which act transitively on the vertices of the associated Bruhat-Tits building. These four lattices are coming from two possible \( \mathbb{Q} \)-groups described by certain hermitian forms over division algebras of degree 5 over \( \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-7}) \), and except over 2 or 7 the other parahorics are hyper-special, over 7 we can choose either of the special parahorics. This way, we get four family of vertex-simply-transitive actions on Bruhat-Tits building of dimension 4.

11.3

In this section, we will find the number of elements of the desired finite groups. For this purpose, technically we first describe \( \mathbb{Z}_p \)-schemes of the corresponded parahorics, and then give \( H \) an \( \mathbb{Z} \)-scheme whose fibers over different primes give us the given \( \mathbb{Z}_p \)-schemes. As a result, we reduce the problem of finding the number of elements of \( \Lambda \cap K \) to finding \( \# H(\mathbb{Z}) \). Alternatively, for each possible lattice, we describe \( h' \) a hermitian form, and one has to find number of elements of \( \text{SL}_m(\mathcal{O}_l) \) which preserve \( h' \). For this end, we first look at \( q_{h'} \) the quadratic form associated to \( h' \) over \( \mathbb{Z}^{2m} \). Using MAGMA [BCP97], find the group of symmetries of \( q_{h'} \) and elements which commute with \( l_\omega \), where \( \mathcal{O}_l = \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) and \( l_\omega \) is the linear map associated to multiplication by \( \omega \) in \( \mathcal{O}_m = \mathbb{Z}^{2m} \).

For a given \( G \), i.e. \( a_l, m \), and \( h \). We will do the following four steps.

1- For \( p \) a non-splitting prime over \( l \), describing \( h_p \) hermitian form on \( l_p^m \), such that the corresponded special unitary group is isomorphic to \( G \) over \( \mathbb{Q}_p \), and moreover,

\[
\{ g \in \text{SL}_m(\mathcal{O}_p) \mid \rho(g)(h_p) = h_p \}
\]

is mapped to a parahoric of the same type as \( \text{P}_p \).

2- For \( p \) a non-splitting prime over \( l \), find \( g_p \in \text{GL}_m(\mathcal{O}_p) \in \text{GL}_m(l_p)/\text{GL}_m(\mathbb{Q}_p) \), such that \( \rho(g_p)(h_p) = h \). For \( p \) a splitting prime over \( l \), by proposition 28 without loss of generality we can assume that \( g_p \in \text{GL}_m(\mathbb{Z}_p) \).

3- Find \( g \in \text{GL}_m(l) \), such that \( g \text{GL}_m(\mathcal{O}_p) = g_p \text{GL}_m(\mathcal{O}_p) \), where \( p \) is a prime in \( \mathcal{O}_l \) which divides \( p \).

4- Let \( h' = \rho(g^{-1})(h) \),

\[
q_{h'} = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{Re}(h') & \text{Re}(wh') \\
\text{Re}(wh')^t & N(w)\text{Re}(h')
\end{bmatrix},
\]

and

\[
l_\omega = \begin{bmatrix}
-N(\omega)I_m & I_m \\
I_m & \text{Tr}(\omega)I_m
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Find group of \( 2m \) by \( 2m \) integer matrices which preserve \( q_{h'} \) and commute with \( l_\omega \), using MAGMA. By looking at the generators of this group find the image of determinant map from \( \text{GL}_m(\mathcal{O}_l) \) if needed.
Note that with these choices of $g$ and $h_p$’s, after identifying $G$ with the $\mathbb{Q}$-special unitary group associated with $h'$, for any non-split prime $p$,

$$\{x \in \text{SL}_m(\mathcal{O}_p) | \rho(x)(h') = h'\}$$

is a parahoric subgroup of the desired type in $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. In particular,

$$\Lambda \cap K = \{x \in \text{SL}_m(\mathcal{O}_p) | \rho(x)(h') = h'\}$$

gives us a precise description of this intersection.

11.3.1

The first step is an easy consequence of Bruhat-Tits theory, proposition 28, and corollary 29, we will just summarize the result as a proposition. Let

$$J_k = \begin{cases} 
I_{k/2} & \text{if } k \text{ is even}, \\
1 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.}
\end{cases}$$

Proposition 33. In the above setting, except for the $G_8$ case, we have the following possibilities for $h_p$. If a prime is not mentioned, $h_p$ is the hermitian form associated to $J_m$. For $(m, a_1, h) = (8, 3, I_8)$ and $p = 3$,

$$(G^1_1) \quad h_p = \rho(\text{diag}(\sqrt{-3}I_4, I_4))(J_8).$$

For $(m, a_1, h) = (7, 3, I_7)$, $h_2 = -J_7$, and $h_3$ is equal to either

$$(G^1_2) \quad J_7, \quad \text{or} \quad (G^2_2) \quad \rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-3}I_4, I_4))(J_7).$$

For $(m, a_1, h) = (6, 3, \text{diag}(2, 1, \cdots, 1))$ and $p = 2$ (resp. $p = 3$),

$$(G^1_3) \quad h_p = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\
1 & I_2 \\
I_2 & I_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{resp. } \rho(\text{diag}(\sqrt{-3}I_3, I_3))(J_6).)$$

For $(m, a_1, h) = (6, 1, I_6)$ and $p = 2$, $h_p$ is equal to either $(G^1_4) \ X$,

$$(G^2_4) \quad \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, (1 + i)I_2, I_2))(X), \quad \text{or} \quad (G^3_4) \quad \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, 1 + i, I_3))(X),$$

where $X = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & I_2 \\
I_2 & I_2 \end{bmatrix}$. 
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For \((m,a_1,h) = (5, 3, I_5)\) and \(p = 3\), \(h_p\) is equal to either \((G_5^1)\) \(J_5\),
\[\rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-3}I_2, I_2))(J_5),\] or \((G_5^3)\) \(\rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-3}, I_3))(J_5).\)

For \((m,a_1,h) = (5, 1, I_5)\) and \(p = 2\), \(h_p\) is equal to either
\[\rho(\text{diag}(1, I_2, I_2))(J_5),\] or \((G_5^3)\) \(\rho(\text{diag}(1, 1+i)I_2, I_2))(J_5).\)

For \((m,a_1,h) = (5, 7, I_5)\) and \(p = 7\), \(h_p\) is equal to either
\[\rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-7}I_2, I_2))(J_5).\]

11.3.2

Here we will go through the possibilities of \(h_p\)’s for any prime \(p\), and find \(g_p\) GL\(_m\)(\(O_p\)) as described in the second step. Before going to each case separately, let us describe \(g_p\) GL\(_m\)(\(O_p\))’s for almost all primes.

**Lemma 34.** In the above setting, if \(p\) a non-splitting prime over \(l\) does not divide \(2a_l\), then there is \(g_p\) GL\(_m\)(\(O_p\)) such that \(\rho(g_p)(h_p) = h\).

**Proof.** Let
\[B_m = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}I_{m/2} & -\frac{1}{2}I_{m/2} \\ I_{m/2} & I_{m/2} \end{bmatrix} & \text{if } m \text{ is even,} \\ 1 & \text{if } m \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}\]

Then \(\rho(B_m)(\text{diag}(I_{[m/2]}, -I_{[m/2]})) = J_m.\)

On the other hand, for any prime \(p\) which does not divide \(2a_l\), there are \(x_1, x_2 \in I_p\) such that \(x_1^2 + ax_2^2 = -1\) (resp \(2(x_1^2 + x_2^2) = 1\)). Thus, by virtue of Hensel’s lemma, there are \(x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_p\) such that \(x_1^2 + ax_2^2 = -1\) (resp \(2(x_1^2 + x_2^2) = 1\)). Therefore there is \(y_p\) a diagonal matrix in GL\(_m\)(\(O_p\)), such that \(\rho(y_p)(h) = \text{diag}(I_{[m/2]}, -I_{[m/2]}).\)

By the above discussion, and proposition 33, we have that \(\rho(B_my_p)(h) = J_m = h_p.\) So \(y_p = y_pB_m^{-1}\) satisfies all the desired conditions. \(\square\)

\((G_1^1)\) By lemma 34 we should only understand \(g_2\) and \(g_3.\) Let us start with \(p = 2\). It is clear that \((x_1, x_2) = (2, 1)\) is a solution of \(x_1^2 + 3x_2^2 = -1\) in \(\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}\). Hence by virtue of Hensel’s lemma, there are \(x_1\) and \(x_2\) in \(\mathbb{Z}_2\) such that \(x_1^2 + 3x_2^2 = -1\). So
\[h_2 = J_3 = \rho(B_3\text{diag}(I_4, (x_1 + \sqrt{-3}x_2)I_4))(h).\]

Hence \(g_2 = \text{diag}(I_4, (x_1 + \sqrt{-3}x_2)I_4)B_3^{-1}\) brings \(h_2\) to \(h.\) Now we will go one step further, and find a representative of \(g_2\) GL\(_8\)(\(\mathbb{Z}_2[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}]\)) in GL\(_8\)(\(\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-3}]\)).
Indeed using the fact that \( x_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \) and \( x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \), it is easy to check that

\[
g_2 \text{GL}_8 \left( \mathbb{Z}_2 \left[ \frac{1 + \sqrt{-3}}{2} \right] \right) = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \frac{1}{2} I_4 & \frac{1}{2} I_4 \\ -2 + \sqrt{-3} I_4 & 2 I_4 \end{array} \right] \text{GL}_8 \left( \mathbb{Z}_2 \left[ \frac{1 + \sqrt{-3}}{2} \right] \right).
\]

Now consider \( p = 3 \). \((\pi_1, \pi_2) = (1, 1)\) is a solution of \( \pi_1^2 + \pi_2^2 = -1 \) in \( \mathbb{Q}_3 \). So there are \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) in \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \) such that \( x_1^2 + x_2^2 = -1 \). Hence

\[
h_3 = \rho \left( \text{diag}(\sqrt{-3} I_4, I_4) \cdot B_8 \cdot \text{diag}(I_4, \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x_1 & x_2 \\ -x_2 & x_1 \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x_1 & x_2 \\ -x_2 & x_1 \end{array} \right]) \right) (h),
\]

and as a consequence, we have to find a representative of \( g_3 \text{GL}_8(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) \) in \( \text{GL}_8(\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-3}]) \), where

\[
g_3 = \left( \text{diag}(\sqrt{-3} I_4, I_4) \cdot B_8 \cdot \text{diag}(I_4, \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x_1 & x_2 \\ -x_2 & x_1 \end{array} \right], \left[ \begin{array}{cc} x_1 & x_2 \\ -x_2 & x_1 \end{array} \right]) \right)^{-1}.
\]

Using the fact that \( x_1 \equiv x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \), it is easy to check that

\[
g_3 \text{GL}_8(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} I_2 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} I_2 \\ -\sqrt{3} Z(1, -1) & I_2 \end{array} \right] \text{GL}_8(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]),
\]

where \( Z(y_1, y_2) = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} y_1 & y_2 \\ -y_2 & y_1 \end{array} \right] \).

(G) By lemma \([34]\) we only have to find \( g_2 \) and \( g_3 \). Similar to the previous case, one can easily find that

\[
g_2 \text{GL}_7 \left( \mathbb{Z}_2 \left[ \frac{1 + \sqrt{-3}}{2} \right] \right) = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \frac{1}{2} I_3 \\ -2 + \sqrt{-3} I_3 & 2 I_3 \end{array} \right] \text{GL}_7 \left( \mathbb{Z}_2 \left[ \frac{1 + \sqrt{-3}}{2} \right] \right).
\]

Now let \( p = 3 \).

\[
h_3 = -J_7 = \rho(B_7)(\text{diag}(-I_4, 3)) = \rho(B_7 \cdot \text{diag}(Z(x_1, x_2), Z(x_1, x_2), I_3))(h),
\]

where \( (x_1, x_2) \) is a solution of \( x_1^2 + x_2^2 = -1 \) in \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \). So it clear that

\[
g_3 \text{GL}_7(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) = \text{GL}_7(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]).
\]

(G) By lemma \([34]\) again we only have to find \( g_2 \) and \( g_3 \). \( g_2 \) is the same as \( \textbf{G}_{2} \).

For \( p = 3 \), we proceed similar to the previous case, and we get

\[
h_3 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-3} I_3, I_3) \cdot B_7 \cdot \text{diag}(Z(x_1, x_2), Z(x_1, x_2), I_3))(h),
\]
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where $x_1$ and $x_2$ are as in $G_2^4$ case. We can and will assume that $x_1 \equiv x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, and then use it to check that

\[
g_3 \text{GL}_7(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} & 1 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} I_2 & I_3
\end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_7(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]),
\]

where

\[
Y_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{-1}{\sqrt{-3}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{-1}{\sqrt{-3}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{-1}{\sqrt{-3}}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

$(G_3^1)$ We only have to study $p = 2$ and $p = 3$. We start with $h_2$.

$h_2 = \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, B_4))(\text{diag}(2, I_3, -1_2)) = \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, B_4)\text{diag}(I_4, (2+\sqrt{-3}x)I_2)(h),$

where $x$ is a solution of $3x^2 = -5$ in $\mathbb{Z}_2$. By virtue of Hensel’s lemma such a solution exist, as it is the case in $\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$. We can further assume that $x \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Now it is easy to check that

\[
g_2 \text{GL}_6\left(\mathbb{Z}_2\left[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right]\right) = \begin{bmatrix}
I_2 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \cdot \frac{-2+\sqrt{-3}}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2} I_2 \cdot \frac{-2+\sqrt{-3}}{2} I_2 & 2I_2
\end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_6\left(\mathbb{Z}_2\left[\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right]\right).
\]

Now we study $h_3$. We know that

\[
h_3 = \rho(\text{diag}(\sqrt{-3}I_3, I_3)B_6)(\text{diag}(I_3, -I_3)).
\]

Let $x$ be a solution of $x^2 = -2$ in $\mathbb{Z}_3$. Then $\rho(\text{diag}(Z(x, 1), x)(-I_3) = \text{diag}(I_2, 2)$. Hence we have

\[
h_3 = \rho(\text{diag}(\sqrt{-3}I_3, I_3)B_6\text{diag}(I_3, Z(x, 1), x^{-1}))(\text{diag}(I_3, 2)).
\]

Let $\sigma$ be the permutation matrix corresponded to the following permutation $(6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1)$. So

\[
h_3 = \rho(\text{diag}(\sqrt{-3}I_3, I_3)B_6\text{diag}(I_3, Z(x, 1), x^{-1})\sigma)(h).
\]

One can check that

\[
g_3 \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} I_3, I_3\right) \begin{bmatrix}
I_3 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} I_2 \\
\end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]),
\]

where

\[
Y_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & -1 \\
1 & 1 & 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
(G_{4}^{I}) In this case, by lemma 34 we only have to study \( h_2 \). We have
\[
h_2 = \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, B_4))(\text{diag}(I_4, -I_2)).
\]
On the other hand, by virtue of Hensel’s lemma, there are \( x_1, x_2, x_3 \) and \( x_4 \) in \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) such that
\[
x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 = -1.
\]
Let \( H(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 + \sqrt{-1} y_2 & y_3 + \sqrt{-1} y_4 \\ -y_3 + \sqrt{-1} y_4 & y_1 - \sqrt{-1} y_2 \end{bmatrix} \). Hence we have
\[
h_2 = \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, B_4)\text{diag}(I_4, H(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)))(h).
\]
We can and will assume that \( x_1 = 2, x_3 = x_4 = 1, \) and \( x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \). One can check that
\[
g_2 \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]) = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & \frac{1}{2}I_2 \\ \frac{1}{2}H(-2, 1, 1, 1) & 2I_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]).
\]

(G_{4}^{II}) In this case, again by lemma 34 we only have to study \( h_2 \). Borrowing notations from the previous case, we have
\[
h_2 = \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, B_4)\text{diag}(I_4, H(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)))(h).
\]
One can check that
\[
g_2 \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]) = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & \frac{1}{2}I_2 \\ \frac{1}{2}H(-2, 1, 1, 1) & (1 - i)I_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]).
\]

(G_{4}^{III}) Here again, we only have to calculate \( g_2 \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]) \). As before we start with \( h_2 \).
\[
h_2 = \rho(\text{diag}(I_2, 1 + i, I_3)\text{diag}(I_2, B_4)\text{diag}(I_4, H(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)))(h).
\]
It can be checked that
\[
g_2 \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]) = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & \frac{1}{2}I_2 \\ \frac{1}{2}H(-2, 1, 1, 1) & 2Y_3 \end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]),
\]
where \( Y_3 = \text{diag}((1 + i)^{-1}, 1) \).

(G_{4}^{IV}) The only primes which should be studied are 2 and 3. \( p = 2 \) is almost identical to \( G_{3}^{I} \), and we have
\[
g_2 \text{GL}_5\left(\mathbb{Z}_2\left[\frac{1 + \sqrt{-3}}{2}\right]\right) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2}I_2 \\ -2 + \sqrt{-3}I_2 & 2I_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_5\left(\mathbb{Z}_2\left[\frac{1 + \sqrt{-3}}{2}\right]\right).
\]
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Now let $p = 3$. We have

$$h_3 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, B_4) \ \text{diag}(I_3, Z(x_1, x_2))(h),$$

where $(x_1, x_2)$ is a solution of $x_1^2 + x_2^2 = -1$ in $\mathbb{Z}_3$. Hence

$$g_3 \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) = \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]).$$

($G_{III}^5$) Again we have two primes to look at, and $p = 2$ is the same as $G_{III}^1$. For $h_3$, we know that

$$h_3 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-3}I_2, I_2) \ \text{diag}(I_3, Z(x_1, x_2))(h),$$

where $x_1$ and $x_2$ are as in the previous case. We can and will assume that $x_1 \equiv x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. One can check that

$$g_3 \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}}I_2 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}}Z(1, -1) & I_2
\end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]).$$

($G_{VII}^5$) As in the previous case, by lemma $34$, we only have to study $p = 2$ and $p = 3$, and the case of $p = 2$ is identical with $G_{IV}^1$. On the other hand, we know that

$$h_3 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-3}, I_3) \ \text{diag}(1, B_4) \ \text{diag}(I_3, Z(x_1, x_2))(h),$$

where $x_1$ and $x_2$ are as in the previous two cases. One can check that

$$g_3 \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_3[\sqrt{-3}]) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & Y_4 \\
Y_5 & I_2
\end{bmatrix},$$

where $Y_4 = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}}, 1)$ and $Y_5 = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} & 0 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} & 0
\end{bmatrix}$.

($G_{VI}^1$) In this case, we only have to describe $g_2$. We know that

$$h_2 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, B_4) \ \text{diag}(I_3, H(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4))(h),$$

where $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ is a solution of $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 = -1$ in $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Indeed we can and will assume that $x_1 = 2, x_3 = x_4 = 1, \text{ and } x_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. One can check that

$$g_2 \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2}I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2}H(-2, 1, 1, 1) & 2I_2
\end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]).$$

($G_{VI}^6$) Following the previous case, we have to find $g_2$, and we have

$$h_2 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, (1 + i)I_2, I_2) \ \text{diag}(1, B_4) \ \text{diag}(I_3, H(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4))(h),$$

45
where are $x_i$’s are as in the previous case. One can see that, in this case,

$$g_2 \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2}I_2 & \frac{1}{2}H(-2, 1, 1, 1) & (1 - i)I_2 \\ \frac{1}{2}H(-2, 1, 1, 1) & (1 - i)I_2 & \end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_6(\mathbb{Z}_2[\sqrt{-1}]).$$

(G7

By lemma [34] we only have to study $p = 2$ and $p = 7$. However in this case, $p = 2$ splits over $l$, and so we only have to find $g_7$. We know that

$$h_7 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, B_4) \text{ diag}(I_3, Z(x_1, x_2)))(h),$$

where $(x_1, x_2)$ is a solution of $x_1^2 + x_2^2 = -1$ in $\mathbb{Z}_7$. Thus, it is clear that

$$g_7 \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_7[\sqrt{-7}]) = \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_7[\sqrt{-7}]).$$

(G7

As in the previous case, we only have to find $g_7$. Similarly, we know that

$$h_7 = \rho(\text{diag}(1, \sqrt{-7}I_2, I_2) \text{ diag}(1, B_4) \text{ diag}(I_3, Z(x_1, x_2)))(h),$$

where $x_i$’s are as in the previous case. Further we can and will assume that $x_1 \equiv 3 \pmod{7}$ and $x_2 \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$. I can be checked that

$$g_7 \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_7[\sqrt{-7}]) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & I_2 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}Z(3, -2) \\ I_2 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}Z(3, -2) & I_2 \\ \end{bmatrix} \text{GL}_5(\mathbb{Z}_7[\sqrt{-7}]).$$

11.3.3

Now, we will use the given local data, and list matrices in $\text{GL}_m(l)$ which represent the described local cosets. In all the cases, there are at most two non-trivial local matrices, and all of them are lower triangular matrices. When $a_l = 1$, there is only one non-trivial local matrix for which we have a representative in $\text{GL}_m(O[\frac{1}{17}])$. Thus it also satisfies the other local conditions. By this or a similar argument, we get the following $l$-matrix representatives with the desired
local conditions for the following cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th>( g \in \text{GL}_m(l) )</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>( g \in \text{GL}_m(l) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \( G_1^2 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2} I_3 \\
\frac{2 + \sqrt{3}}{2} I_3 & 2I_3
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \( G_4^1 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_2 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2} Y_6 & 2I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] |
| \( G_3^4 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_2 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2} Y_6 & (1 - i)I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \( G_4^3 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
I_2 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2} Y_6 & 2Y_3
\end{bmatrix}
\] |
| \( G_5^6 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{-2 + \sqrt{3}}{2} I_2 & 2I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \( G_6^5 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2} Y_6 & 2I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] |
| \( G_6^8 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{2} Y_6 & (1 - i)I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \( G_7^4 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} Z(3,-2) & I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] |
| \( G_7^8 \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{3\sqrt{-3}} I_2 & I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \( G_{17} \) | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{1}{2} I_2 \\
\frac{1}{3\sqrt{-3}} I_2 & I_2
\end{bmatrix}
\] |

where \( Y_3 = \text{diag}((1 + i)^{-1}, 1) \) and \( Y_6 = H(-2, 1, 1, 1) \).

For the other cases, we will write the local matrices as product of a unipotent matrix and a diagonal matrix. Then use method of Chinese remainder argument to find the needed \( l \)-matrix representative. We get the following matrices.

\[
(G_1^1) \quad g = \begin{bmatrix}
I_2 & I_2 \\
Y_7 & I_2
\end{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{-3}} I_4, 2I_4), \text{ where }
\]

\[
Y_7 = \begin{bmatrix}
10 - 3\sqrt{-3} & -4 \\
4 & 10 - 3\sqrt{-3}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
\[(\text{G}_2)\]  
\[g = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & v & I_3 \\ w & Y_8 & I_3 \end{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-3}} I_2, 2I_3),\]  
where 
\[v = -4 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, w = (10 - 3\sqrt{-3})v, Y_8 = \begin{bmatrix} 10 - 3\sqrt{-3} & -10 + 3\sqrt{-3} & -4 \\ -10 + 3\sqrt{-3} & 4 & -10 + 3\sqrt{-3} \end{bmatrix}.

\[(\text{G}_3)\]  
\[g = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & Y_9 & I_2 \\ Y_{10} & Y_{11} & I_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}} I_2, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-3}}, \frac{1}{2}, 2I_2),\]  
where 
\[Y_9 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, Y_{10} = \begin{bmatrix} 6 - 3\sqrt{-3} & -2 \\ -2 & -2 \end{bmatrix}, Y_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 - 3\sqrt{-3} & -4 \\ -4 & 6 - 3\sqrt{-3} \end{bmatrix}.

\[(\text{G}_5^\text{I})\]  
\[g = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & Y_7 \\ Y_{12} & I_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{-3}}, 2I_2),\]  
where \(Y_7\) is as above.

\[(\text{G}_5^\text{II})\]  
\[g = \begin{bmatrix} I_2 & Y_{12} \\ Y_7 & I_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{diag}(1, \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-3}}, \frac{1}{2}, 2I_2),\]  
where 
\[Y_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} -2 + \sqrt{-3} \\ 4 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } -2 + \sqrt{-3}.

In each case, by the choice of \(g\), \(\Gamma\) acts transitively on the vertices of the associated Bruhat-Tits building if and only if 
\[\# \{ x \in SL_m(\mathcal{O}) \mid \rho(x)(\rho(g^{-1})(h)) = \rho(g^{-1})(h) \} \quad (23)\]  
is equal to the value of \(\# \Lambda \cap K\) as we have already computed in \(10.2\). So to complete the panorama, one has to compute \(23\), which can be done as described in the forth step, and we execute in the next section.

11.3.4

In this section, we will summarize the results of programming with MAGMA as described in the forth step. Namely, at each case, we looked at the associated quadratic form over \(\mathbb{Z}^{2m}\), found its group of symmetries, a generating set and image of the determinant map if needed to find the number of those with determinant one. In some of the cases, it is clear that the determinant is onto the group of roots of unity of \(\mathcal{O}_l\), e.g. when \(m\) is odd and \(l = \mathbb{Q}[\omega]\) or \(l = \mathbb{Z}[i]\). Consequently, we get the following table, which combined with the results of \(10.2\) finishes our proof of theorem A and theorem B.
Proposition 35. Let $\Lambda$, $K$, and $G_i^1$ be as above. Then

$\Lambda \cap K$ 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Full group of symmetries</th>
<th>$# \Lambda \cap K$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_1$</td>
<td>$2^{15} \cdot 3^{10} \cdot 5^2$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^2_1$</td>
<td>$2^{11} \cdot 3^9 \cdot 5$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_2$</td>
<td>$2^{11} \cdot 3^9 \cdot 5$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_3$</td>
<td>$2^6 \cdot 3^5$</td>
<td>$2^6 \cdot 3^5$ or $2^3 \cdot 3^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_4$</td>
<td>$2^{11} \cdot 3^2$</td>
<td>$2^{11} \cdot 3^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_5$</td>
<td>$2^6 \cdot 3^5$</td>
<td>$2^6 \cdot 3^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_6$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^5$</td>
<td>$2^{10} \cdot 3^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_7$</td>
<td>$2^6 \cdot 3^5$</td>
<td>$2^6 \cdot 3^5$ or $2^3 \cdot 3^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_8$</td>
<td>$2^{13} \cdot 3^2$</td>
<td>$2^{13} \cdot 3^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G^1_9$</td>
<td>$2^8 \cdot 3^5$</td>
<td>$2^8 \cdot 3^5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A: Table $d=2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$D_k = 5$</th>
<th>$D_k = 8$</th>
<th>$D_k = 12$</th>
<th>$D_k \geq 13$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_{l/k}$</td>
<td>$h_l$</td>
<td>$r_l$</td>
<td>$\delta_{l/k}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Values of Zeta and $L$-functions.

As it is mentioned before, using Bernoulli numbers, we compute values of zeta function at negative odd integer numbers, and we get the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$i$</th>
<th>$\zeta(-i)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{120}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{252}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{132}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$\frac{691}{32760}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$\frac{691}{32760}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we provide the Mathematica program which gives us a bad prime factor of the corresponded $L$-functions, together with the results. These prime factors do not appear in the denominator of the other zeta or $L$-function factors of $\mathcal{R}(l/Q, m)$. Wherever an entry is 0, it means that the numerator does not have a large enough prime factor.

For a given number, first we establish if it is discriminant of a complex quadratic field or not. Then define the character $\chi$ associated to this quadratic field $l$. Finally we introduce the related exponential function of the generalized Bernoulli numbers, compute the $L$-function via the generalized Bernoulli numbers, and give a large enough prime factor of the numerator.

```
For[i = 2, i < 135, i++,
  bool1 := Mod[i, 4] == 0 && ! (MoebiusMu[i/4] == 0) && ! (MoebiusMu[i/4] == 3);
  bool2 := Mod[i, 4] == 3 && ! (MoebiusMu[i] == 0);
  If [bool1 || bool2, a := If[bool1, i/4, i];
    Chi[s_] := If[OddQ[s], JacobiSymbol[-i, s],
      OddPart := s/2^((FactorInteger[s][[2]] + 1)/2);
      (If[OddQ[i], 0, If[Mod[i, 8] == 7, 1, -1]])^OddPart*
      JacobiSymbol[-i, OddPart];
    F[z_] := Sum[Chi[k]*z^k*E^(-k*z)/(E^(-k*z) - 1), {k, 1, i - 1}];
    B = Series[F[z], {z, 0, 12}];
    For[b = 1, b < 11, b = b + 2;
      L = FactorInteger[SeriesCoefficient[B, b]*(b - 1)!];
      ABadPrimeFactor = 0;
      NotFound = True;
      For[counter = 1, counter < Length[L] + 1, counter++,
        If[NotFound && L[[counter]][[2]] > 0 && L[[counter]][[2]] < L[[counter]][[1]] &&
          GCD[L[[counter]][[1]], i] == 1 && PrimeQ[L[[counter]][[1]]],
          ABadPrimeFactor = L[[counter]][[1]]; NotFound = False; ]; ];
      Print["\", ABadPrimeFactor]; ];
  ];
];
```

The Mathematica program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$L_{1/Q}(-2)$</th>
<th>$L_{1/Q}(-4)$</th>
<th>$L_{1/Q}(-6)$</th>
<th>$L_{1/Q}(-8)$</th>
<th>$L_{1/Q}(-10)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8831</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>83579</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>821063</td>
<td>1682150401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1116041413</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18517</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>249089</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>30509</td>
<td>552942737</td>
<td>3480906042721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39521</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>109493813441</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76565663</td>
<td>202075601281</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5099</td>
<td>13640153</td>
<td>3671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>116111407</td>
<td>17235782633</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>55257133</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>16747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10687</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>997121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7963537</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14813</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>787706624037007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1367650871</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3272681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19211</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95621</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>4021907</td>
<td>30007358867</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46411</td>
<td>3511</td>
<td>22079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3633269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>5171</td>
<td>7507</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154877</td>
<td>1000621267</td>
<td>11827264167629</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42013</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7193</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>34471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>39161</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>6451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51341</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1031593</td>
<td>34369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6949</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1305771999480399871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24123887717272745429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10957</td>
<td>1209625671061</td>
<td>3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6091875511</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9947794325893</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6067</td>
<td>4603</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>79829759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>10333</td>
<td>8189899</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Siegel-Klingen theorem.

In section 6, we had to find the exact value of $R(l/k, m)$ for certain $k, l$ and $m$. To do so, we used PARI, and we had to have a bound for the denominator of $R(l/k, m)$. Here we give a new proof of Siegel-Klingen theorem, which also provides a bound for the denominator of $R(l/k, m)$. J-P. Serre in [Se71] had already mentioned relation between co-volume of $S$-arithmetic lattices and rationality of zeta-values (Siegel’s theorem). He used Euler-Poincaré measures to get Siegel’s theorem. Here we proceed with a similar approach, in the $p$-adic setting, and as a result we also get rationality of certain $L$-function values (Klingen’s theorem).

Let $k$ be a totally real number field, and $l$ a totally complex quadratic extension of $k$. Consider the hermitian space $(l^m, I_m)$, and $G$ the corresponded absolutely almost simple, simply connected unitary $k$-group. Let $(P_p)_{p \in V_f(k)}$ be a coherent family of parahorics with maximum volume among the parahoric subgroups of the corresponded group. For any prime $p$ which splits over $l$, as we have seen in section 3, one can construct $\Lambda_p$ a lattice in $SL_m(k_p)$. By equation (6), lemma 2, and lemma 3, we have that

$$\text{vol}(SL_m(k_p)/\Lambda_p) = R(l/k, m) \cdot \prod e'(P_{p'}).$$

By the choice of $P_{p'}$’s, whenever $G$ is quasi-split over a place, $e'(P_{p'}) = 1$. On the other hand, if $m$ is odd, over any prime we get a quasi-split group. When $m$ is a multiple of 4, then over any prime the determinant of the split hermitian form is equal to one. Hence $G$ is again quasi-split over any prime. So overall we have

$$\text{vol}(SL_m(k_p)/\Lambda_p) = R(l/k, m), \quad \text{when } m \text{ is odd or } 4 \mid m.$$  

When $m$ is congruence to 2 modulo 4, $G$ is quasi-split over a place whenever $-1$ is in the image of norm map. In particular, over all the unramified places, it is quasi-split. Over a ramified place, by lemma 2, $e'(P_{p'})$ is either one or $q_p^{m/2} - 1$.

On the other hand, we know that $\Lambda_p$’s are co-compact lattices, and have a finite set of vertices as a fundamental domain in the associated Bruhat-Tits building. Since the first congruence subgroup of $SL_m(O_p)$ is a pro-$p$ group where $p$ is an odd rational prime divisible by $p$, the intersection of $\Lambda_p$ with the stabilizer of any vertex is a finite group whose order divides $\#SL_m(f_p)$ times a power of $p$. As a consequence

$$\text{vol}(SL_m(k_p)/\Lambda_p) \in \frac{1}{\#\text{SL}_m(f_p)} \mathbb{Z}[1/p].$$

Hence if $m$ is either odd or a multiple of 4,

$$R(l/k, m) \cdot \mathbb{W}_m \in \mathbb{Z},$$

---

3The second author would like to thank Professor A. Rapinchuk for pointing out this reference to him.
where $\mathfrak{m}_m = \text{g.c.d.}_p(\#\text{SL}_m(p))$, $p$ splits over $l$, and does not divide 2. When $m$ is congruence to 2 modulo 4, then by a similar argument

$$\mathcal{R}(l/k, m) \cdot \mathfrak{m}_m \cdot \prod_{p \text{ ramify}/l} (q_p^{m/2} - 1) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$ 
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