## ON THE SIMILARITY OF HOLOMORPHIC MATRICES

Let $X$ be a (reduced) complex space, and let $A, B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ be holomorphic.

Definition. $A$ and $B$ are called (globally) holomorphically similar on $X$ if $\exists$ holomorphic $H: X \rightarrow \operatorname{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ s.t. $H^{-1} A H=B$ on $X$.
$A$ and $B$ are called locally holomorphically similar at $z_{0} \in X$ if $\exists$ neighborhood $U$ of $z_{0}$ s.t. $\left.A\right|_{U}$ and $\left.B\right|_{U}$ are holomorphically similar on $U$.

Correspondingly we define, for $k=0,1,2, \ldots, \infty$, (globally) $\mathcal{C}^{k}$ similar on $X$
locally $\mathcal{C}^{k}$ similar at a point

It seems, the first who studied the similarity of holomorphic matrices was Wolfgang Wasow [J. Math. Anal. Appl. 4, 202-206 (1962)].

He first observes that "pointwise similarity" is not sufficient, for example, let

$$
A(z):=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & z^{2} \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad B(z):=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
0 & z \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} .
$$

Then $A(z)$ and $B(z)$ are similar for each $z \in \mathbb{C}$, but $A$ and $B$ are not locally $\mathcal{C}^{0}$ similar at 0 ,

Then Wasow proves the following sufficient criterion:
Consider the holomorphic map (Wasow map)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& W_{A, B}: X \longrightarrow \text { End Mat }(n \times n, \mathbb{C}) \\
& \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C}) \ni \Phi \\
& \\
& A(z) \Phi-\Phi B(z), \quad z \in X .
\end{aligned}
$$

Assume that dim Ker $W_{A, B}(z)$ does not depend on $z$ (Wasow condition), and that, for each $z \in X, A(z)$ and $B(z)$ are similar. Then $A$ and $B$ are locally holomorphically similar at each point of $X$.

In general, the Wasow condition is not satisfied, and it is not necessary for local holomorphic similarity. The following (obviously necessay) criteria are sufficient:
(a) $X$ a domain in $\mathbb{C}, A$ and $B$ locally $\mathcal{C}^{0}$ similar at $z_{0} \in X$ $\Longrightarrow A$ and $B$ locally holomorphically similar at $z_{0}$.
(b) $X$ an arbitrary complex space, $A$ and $B$ locally $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}$ similar at $z_{0} \in X \Longrightarrow A$ and $B$ locally holomorphically similar at $z_{0}$.

Proof of (a): Let $N=n^{2}$ and let $W: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(N \times N, \mathbb{C})$ be a representation matrix of the Wasow map $W_{A, B}$. Then, for each $z_{0} \in X$, in a neighborhood $U$ of $z_{0}$, we have a Smith factorization:

$$
W(z)=E(z)\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\Delta(z) & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) F(z), \quad z \in U
$$

where $E, F: U \rightarrow \operatorname{GL}(N, \mathbb{C})$ are invertible, and $\Delta(z)$ is the $N \times N$ diagonal matrix with the diagonal

$$
\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{\kappa_{1}}, \ldots,\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{\kappa_{m}}, 0, \ldots, 0
$$

where $\kappa_{1}, \ldots, \kappa_{m} \geq 0$ are some integers. This shows that the family $\{\operatorname{Ker} W(z)\}_{z \in U \backslash\left\{z_{0}\right\}}$, is a holomorphic sub-vector bundle of the product bundle $\left(U \backslash\left\{z_{0}\right\}\right) \times \mathbb{C}^{N}$, which extends as a holomorphic vector bundle to $z_{0}$.
(b) is more difficult and due to [K. Spallek, Math. Ann. 177, 1967, Satz 5.4, applied to the Wasow map].

In (b), $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}$ cannot be replaced with $\mathcal{C}^{k}, k<\infty$. For example, let
$A, B: \mathbb{C}^{2} \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ be defined by

$$
A(z, w)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
z^{2+k} w^{2+k} & z^{3+k} \\
w^{3+k} & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad B(z, w)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & z^{3+k} \\
w^{3+k} & z^{2+k} w^{2+k}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Then, one can prove
(i) $A$ and $B$ are locally $\mathcal{C}^{k}$ similar, but not locally holomorphically similar at 0 ;
(ii) moreover, $\exists 1$-dim. analytic subsets $X$ of $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ with $0 \in X$ s.t. $\left.A\right|_{X}$ and $\left.B\right|_{X}$ are not locally holomorphically similar at 0 . For example,

1) $X=\left\{z^{p}=w^{q}\right\}$, where $p, q$ are relatively prime and $k+2<q<p$,
2) $X$ is the union of $2 k+5$ pairwise different 1-dimensional linear subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^{2}$.

## Global similarity

Theorem 1. (arXiv:1703.09524, arXiv:1703.09530) Let $X$ be a one-dimensional Stein space, and let $A, B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ be two holomorphic maps, which are locally holomorphically similar at each point of $X$. Then $A$ and $B$ are globally holomorphically similar on $X$.

If $X$ is smooth (i.e., a non-compact connected Riemann surface), this was proved by R. Guralnick [Lin. Alg. Appl. 99, 85-96 (1988)]. Actually, Guralnick proves a more general algebraic theorem for matrices with elements in certain Bezout rings, and then applies this to the ring $\mathcal{O}(X)$.
This does not work if $X$ is not smooth, or smoooth an higher dimensional.
In arXiv:1703.09530 we give a proof, using Guralnick's result, passing to the normalization of $X$ (which is smooth).
In arXiv:1703.09524 we give a proof which is independent of Guralnick's work. This proof is longer but has the advantage that it applies also to the higher dimensional case.

Theorem 2. Let $X$ be a 2-dimensional contractible Stein manifold. Then any two holomorphic maps $A, B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$, which are locally holomorphic similar at each point of $X$, are globally holomorphically similar on $X$.

## Counterexample

$$
A(z):=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}-2\right)^{2}+\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right) z_{3}^{2} & 1 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^{3}
$$

Then there exists a convex domain $X \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{3}$ and a holomorphic map $B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(2 \times 2, \mathbb{C})$ which is locally holomorphically similar to $A$ at each point of $X$, but not globally holomorphically similar to $A$ on $X$.

To prove Theorems 1 and 2, we use the Oka principle for Oka pairs of Forster and Ramspott [Invent. mat. 1, 1966, Satz 1]. Together with Spallek's result [Math. Ann. 177, 1967, Satz 5.4], this also gives the following

Theorem 3. (arXiv:1703.09530) Let $X$ be a Stein space (of arbitrary dimension), and let $A, B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ two holomorphic maps, which are globally $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}$ similar on $X$.
Then $A$ and $B$ are globally holomorphically similar on $X$.

In Theorem 3, " $\mathcal{C}$ " " cannot be replaced by
" $C^{k}$ with $k<\infty$ " + "loc. hol. similar at each point":
There is a Stein domain $X$ in $\mathbb{C}^{5}$ such that, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \exists$ holomorphic maps $A, B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(2 \times 2, \mathbb{C})$ s.t. $A$ and $B$ are locally holomorphically similar at each point of $X$, globally $\mathcal{C}^{k}$ similar on $X$, but not globally holomorphically similar on $X$.

Question. $\mathbb{C}^{4}$ instead of $\mathbb{C}^{5}$ ?

## On the proofs

For $\Phi \in \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$, we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Com} \Phi=\{\Theta \in \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C}): \Phi \Theta=\Theta \Phi\} \\
& \operatorname{GCom} \Phi=\operatorname{GL}(n, \mathbb{C}) \cap \operatorname{Com} \Phi
\end{aligned}
$$

Now let $A: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ be a holomorphic map. Then we introduce the "bundles"

$$
\operatorname{Com} A:=\{\operatorname{Com} A(z)\}_{z \in X} \quad(\subseteq X \times \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C}))
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{GCom} A:=\{\operatorname{GCom} A(z)\}_{z \in X}(\subseteq X \times \operatorname{GL}(n, \mathbb{C}))
$$

These "bundles" are not locally trivial, but nevertheless we have the sheaves $\mathcal{O}^{\operatorname{Com} A}$ and $\mathcal{O}^{\text {GCom } A}$ of holomorphic sections, and the sheaves $\mathcal{C}^{\operatorname{Com} A}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}$ of continuous sections.

Moreover, we introduce the Forster-Ramspott sheaf $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}{ }^{\text {GCom } A}$, which is defined as follows: For $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq X$ open, $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\text {GCom } A}(U)$ is the group of all $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\operatorname{GCom} A}(U)$ s.t., $\forall \xi \in U, \exists$ a neigh. $V \subseteq U$ of $\xi$ and $h \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}(V)$ s.t.

$$
h(\xi)=f(\xi)
$$

Now let $B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ be a second holomorphic map which is locally holomorphically similar to $A$ at each point of $X$, i.e., $\exists$ a covering $\left\{U_{i}\right\}$ of $X$ and holom. $H_{i}: U_{i} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ s.t.

$$
\begin{equation*}
B=H_{i}^{-1} A H_{i} \quad \text { on } \quad U_{i} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $H_{i}^{-1} A H_{i}=B=H_{j}^{-1} A H_{j}$ on $U_{i} \cap U_{j}$, and, hence,

$$
A H_{i} H_{j}^{-1}=H_{i} H_{j}^{-1} A \quad \text { on } \quad U_{i} \cap U_{j},
$$

i.e.,

$$
H_{i} H_{j}^{-1} \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}\left(U_{i} \cap U_{j}\right)
$$

is a cocycle (Cousin problem) in $\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}$.

If this cocycle splits, i.e., if $H_{i} H_{j}^{-1}=h_{i} h_{j}^{-1}$ on $U_{i} \cap U_{j}$ for some $h_{i} \in \mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}\left(U_{i}\right)$, then

$$
h_{i}^{-1} H_{i}=h_{j}^{-1} H_{j} \quad \text { on } \quad U_{i} \cap U_{j}
$$

and, hence, there is a well-defined global holomorphic map $H: X \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ s.t. $H:=H_{i}^{-1} h_{i}$ on $U_{i}$, and which satisfies

$$
H^{-1} B H=h_{i}^{-1} H_{i} B H_{i}^{-1} h_{i} \stackrel{(1)}{=} h_{i}^{-1} A h_{i}=A,
$$

i.e., $B$ is globally holomorphically similar to $A$. One can prove also the opposite, so that we have the following
Statement. Each holomorphic $B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ which is locally holomorphically similar to $A$ gives rise to a cocycle in $\mathcal{O}^{\text {GCom } A}$, and $B$ is globally holomorphically similar to $A$ if and only if this cocycle splits.

It is not difficult to see that the pair $\left(\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}\right)$ is an Oka pair in the sense of [O. Forster and K. J. Ramspott, Invent. mat. 1, 1966]. Therefore the following is a special case of Satz 1 in this paper of Forster and Ramspott:
If $X$ be a Stein space, then an $\mathcal{O}^{\text {GCom }} A_{\text {-cocycle }}$ splits if and only if it splits as an $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\text {GCom }} \mathrm{A}_{\text {-cocycle. }}$
Summary. If $X$ is a Stein space, then each holomorphic
$B: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ which is locally holomorphically similar to $A$ gives rise to an $\mathcal{O}^{\text {GCom } A}$-cocycle, and $B$ is globally holomorphically similar to $A$ if and only if this cocycle splits as an $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\text {GCom } A-c o c y c l e . ~}$
Corollary. To prove Theorems 1 and 2, now it is sufficient to prove the following topological result:
If $X$ is a 1-dimensional Stein space, or a contractible 2-dimensional Stein manifold, then, for each holomorphic $A: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{1}\left(X, \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{\mathrm{GCom} A}\right)=0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove (2), the difficulty is that GCom $A$ is not locally trivial.
For example, let

$$
A(z):=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
z & 1 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} .
$$

Then $A(0)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right)$ and, therefore,

$$
\operatorname{GCom} A(0)=\left\{\left.\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & b \\
0 & a
\end{array}\right) \right\rvert\, a \in \mathbb{C}^{*}, b \in \mathbb{C}\right\}
$$

On the other hand, if $z \neq 0$, then the Jordan form of $A(z)$ is $\left(\begin{array}{ll}z & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{array}\right)$, which shows that, for some $T(z) \in \operatorname{Gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$,

$$
\operatorname{GCom} A(z)=T(z)^{-1}\left\{\left.\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a & 0 \\
0 & d
\end{array}\right) \right\rvert\, a, d \in \mathbb{C}^{*}\right\} T(z)
$$

Hence $\pi_{1}(\operatorname{GCom} A(0))=\mathbb{Z}$, whereas $\pi_{1}(\operatorname{GCom} A(z))=\mathbb{Z}^{2}$ if $z \neq 0$.

This shows: The fiber of GCom A over 0 is even not homeomorphic to the fibers over $z$ with $z \neq 0$ (although the bundle $\operatorname{Com} A$ is trivial as a holomorphic vector bundle).
The following fact helps to overcome this difficulty.
If $X$ is a complex space and $A: X \rightarrow \operatorname{Mat}(n \times n, \mathbb{C})$ is a holomorphic map, then the set of points of $X$ where the "Jordan structure of $A$ changes" is an analytic subset of $X, Y$, which of codimension $\geq 1$ everywhere in $X$.

This fact can be found in a book of H . Baumgärtel [Birkhäuser, 1985]. I have another proof in arXiv:1703.09535.

This is helpful, because one can prove that, over $X \backslash Y$, GCom $A$ is locally trivial in the following sense:

For each contractible open set $W \subseteq X \backslash Y$ and each $z_{0} \in W$, there exists a holomorphic map $H: W \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$
H(z)^{-1} \operatorname{GCom} A(z) H(z)=\operatorname{GCom} A\left(z_{0}\right) \quad \text { for all } \quad z \in W
$$

