

# Non-isomorphic metacyclic $p$ -groups of split type with the same group zeta function

Yuto Nogata

Graduate School of Science and Technology, Hirosaki University

3 Bunkyo-cho, Hirosaki, Aomori, 036-8560, Japan

Email: h24ms113@hirosaki-u.ac.jp

January 1, 2026

## Abstract

For a finite group  $G$ , let  $a_n(G)$  be the number of subgroups of order  $n$  and define  $\zeta_G(s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n(G) n^{-s}$ . Examples are known of non-isomorphic finite groups with the same group zeta function. However, no general criterion is known for when two finite groups have the same group zeta function. Fix integers  $m, n \geq 1$  and a prime  $p$ , and consider the metacyclic  $p$ -groups of split type  $G(p, m, n, k)$  defined by  $G(p, m, n, k) = \langle a, b \mid a^{p^m} = b^{p^n} = \text{id}, b^{-1}ab = a^k \rangle$ . For fixed  $m$  and  $n$ , we characterize the pairs of parameters  $k_1, k_2$  for which  $\zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_2)}(s)$ .

## 1 Introduction

There is a long tradition of studying subgroup growth and related subgroup counting problems. Classical congruence results for the number of subgroups of index  $p$  in finite  $p$ -groups go back to (Miller, 1919) and were strengthened in (Dyubyuk, 1950). For free groups, a recursion for the number of subgroups of index  $n$  is given in (Hall, 1949). For the modular group  $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ , explicit computations and asymptotics for the number of subgroups of index  $n$  are studied in (Imrich, 1978), (Stothers, 1977).

Motivated by these developments, the Dirichlet series enumerating finite-index subgroups is defined by

$$\zeta_G^{\text{idx}}(s) := \sum_{\substack{H \leq G \\ [G:H] < \infty}} [G : H]^{-s} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n^{\text{idx}}(G)}{n^s}, \quad a_n^{\text{idx}}(G) := \#\{H \leq G \mid [G : H] = n\}.$$

It was introduced in (Smith, 1983), and it was studied systematically for nilpotent groups in (Grunewald et al., 1988). Analogous Dirichlet series enumerating normal finite-index subgroups are studied in (Lee, 2022).

In this paper, we consider the group zeta function that enumerates all subgroups of a finite group by their orders. Following (Hironaka, 2017), we denote by  $S(G)$  the set of all subgroups of a finite group  $G$ . For each integer  $n \geq 1$ , we define  $a_n(G) := \#\{H \in S(G) \mid |H| = n\}$ . We define the group zeta function of  $G$  by

$$\zeta_G(s) = \sum_{H \in S(G)} |H|^{-s} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n(G)}{n^s}.$$

For isomorphic finite groups  $G \simeq G'$ , we trivially have  $\zeta_G(s) = \zeta_{G'}(s)$ . In general, no criterion is known for when non-isomorphic groups can have the same group zeta function. In (Hironaka, 2017), the following pair is shown to provide an example of this phenomenon:

$$\begin{aligned} G_\lambda &= \langle a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \mid |a_i| = p^{\lambda_i}, a_i a_j = a_j a_i \rangle \simeq \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\lambda_i}}, \\ \tilde{G}_\lambda &= \langle a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \mid |a_i| = p^{\lambda_i}, a_n a_1 a_n^{-1} = a_1^{1+p^{\lambda_1}-1}, a_i a_j = a_j a_i \text{ unless } (i, j) = (1, n) \rangle \\ &\simeq \prod_{i=2}^{n-1} \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\lambda_i}} \times (\mathbb{Z}_{p^{\lambda_1}} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_{p^{\lambda_n}}). \end{aligned}$$

Outside  $p$ -groups, further examples of non-isomorphic finite groups with the same group zeta function have been found, for instance in (Parker and Kanchana, 2014). More generally, no necessary and sufficient condition for this phenomenon is currently known.

A finite group  $G$  is called *metacyclic* if  $G$  has a cyclic normal subgroup  $N \triangleleft G$  and the quotient  $G/N$  is also cyclic. Standard presentations of finite metacyclic groups were given in (Hempel, 2000). For arbitrary finite  $p$ -groups, (Wall, 1961) studied general relations and inequalities between the numbers of subgroups of each order and each index, using Eulerian functions. For metacyclic  $p$ -groups, subgroup-counting formulas were obtained in (Berkovich, 2011), (Mann, 2010). In particular, these results imply that for an odd prime  $p$  and a fixed integer  $\ell \geq 1$ , any two metacyclic  $p$ -groups of order  $p^\ell$  with the same exponent have the same group zeta function. Thus, for metacyclic  $p$ -groups with  $p \geq 3$ , the problem posed in (Hironaka, 2017) admits a partial answer.

For  $p = 2$ , the subgroup-count formulas in (Berkovich, 2011) are given by case distinctions. As summarized in Fact 2.10, these distinctions depend on the structure of certain quotient groups. They determine the numbers  $a_{2^t}(G)$  for each individual metacyclic 2-group. On the other hand, they do not explicitly describe which metacyclic 2-groups are non-isomorphic but have the same group zeta function.

In this paper, we focus primarily on the case  $p = 2$ . For a prime  $p$  and integers  $m, n \geq 1$ , we denote by

$G(p, m, n, k)$  the group defined in (1.1) below. By (Hempel, 2000), every finite metacyclic  $p$ -group of split type is isomorphic to  $G(p, m, n, k)$  for some integers  $m, n \geq 1$  and some "valid"  $k$ . For  $p = 2$ , we give a necessary and sufficient condition for two non-isomorphic groups in this family to have the same group zeta function. The condition depends on the parameters  $m$  and  $n$ , and it is expressed in terms of the 2-adic valuations  $v_2(k+1)$ , where  $v_2(\cdot)$  denotes the 2-adic valuation.

For  $p \geq 3$ , our framework also shows that any two metacyclic  $p$ -groups of split type of order  $p^{m+n}$  with the same exponent have the same group zeta function.

**Theorem 1.1 Main Theorem** *Let  $p$  be a prime and let  $m, n \geq 1$  be integers. Set  $H := \mathbb{Z}_{p^m} = \langle a \rangle$  and  $K := \mathbb{Z}_{p^n} = \langle b \rangle$ , and define*

$$G(p, m, n, k) := \langle a, b \mid a^{p^m} = b^{p^n} = \text{id}, \ bab^{-1} = a^k \rangle. \quad (1.1)$$

*We say that  $G(p, m, n, k)$  is "valid" if this presentation yields a finite metacyclic  $p$ -group of split type. In this case,  $G(p, m, n, k) = H \rtimes_{\phi} K$ , where  $\phi: K \rightarrow \text{Aut}(H)$  is the homomorphism determined by  $\phi(b)(a) = bab^{-1} = a^k$ . Then the following hold.*

(I) *the group  $G(p, m, n, k)$  is valid if and only if*

$$k^{p^n} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^m}. \quad (1.2)$$

(II) *Assume that  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  satisfy (1.2). Then the following equivalence holds:*

$$G(p, m, n, k_1) \simeq G(p, m, n, k_2) \iff \exists v \in (\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^\times \text{ such that } k_2 \equiv k_1^v \pmod{p^m}.$$

(III) *Assume that  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  satisfy (1.2). A necessary and sufficient condition for  $\zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_2)}(s)$  to hold is given as follows:*

- (1) *If  $p$  is an odd prime, then for any  $k_1, k_2$  satisfying (1.2), we have  $\zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_2)}(s)$ .*
- (2) *If  $p = 2$  and  $n < m$ , then for any  $k_1, k_2$  satisfying (1.2), we have  $\zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p, m, n, k_2)}(s)$  if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

$$\begin{cases} (\text{A}) & v_2(k_1 + 1) = v_2(k_2 + 1) \leq m - n, \\ (\text{B}) & \min\{v_2(k_1 + 1), v_2(k_2 + 1)\} > m - n. \end{cases}$$

(3) If  $p = 2$  and  $n \geq m$ , then for any  $k_1, k_2$  satisfying (1.2), we have  $\zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_2)}(s)$ .

In particular, by choosing representatives  $k_i$  of the isomorphism classes as in (II) and applying the criterion in (III), we can systematically obtain examples of non-isomorphic metacyclic  $p$ -groups of split type whose zeta functions coincide.

## 2 Notation and Preliminaries

**Definition 2.1** Throughout this paper, all groups are assumed to be finite. We use the following notation and terminology.

- $S(G)$ : the set of all subgroups of a group  $G$ ,
- $a_n(G) := \#\{H \in S(G) \mid |H| = n\}$ ,
- $p$ : a prime,
- $\zeta_G(s) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n(G)}{n^s}$ ,
- $H := \langle a \rangle \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{p^m}$ ,  $K := \langle b \rangle \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{p^n}$ ,
- $G(p, m, n, \lambda, k) := \langle a, b \mid a^{p^m} = \text{id}, b^{p^n} = a^{p^\lambda}, bab^{-1} = a^k \rangle$ ,
- $G(p, m, n, k) := \langle a, b \mid a^{p^m} = b^{p^n} = \text{id}, bab^{-1} = a^k \rangle$ ,
- A group  $L$  is called a section of a group  $G$  if there exist a subgroup  $A \subset G$  and a normal subgroup  $B \triangleleft A$  such that  $L \simeq A/B$ ,
- For a prime  $p$  and  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we denote by  $v_p(d)$  the  $p$ -adic valuation of  $d$ , and we adopt the convention  $v_p(0) := \infty$ ,
- For a finite  $p$ -group  $P$ , we define  $\mathcal{U}_1(P) := \langle x^p \mid x \in P \rangle$ ,
- For a finite group  $G$ , the exponent of  $G$  is  $\exp(G) := \text{lcm}\{ |g| \mid g \in G \}$ .

By (Hempel, 2000), every finite metacyclic  $p$ -group is isomorphic to a group given by a presentation of the form  $G(p, m, n, \lambda, k)$  for suitable parameters. Moreover, a finite metacyclic  $p$ -group is split if and only if it is isomorphic to one given by a presentation of the form  $G(p, m, n, k)$ . Therefore, it suffices to work with these presentations. We record the necessary and sufficient congruence conditions under which the above presentations define finite metacyclic  $p$ -groups.

We say that  $G(p, m, n, \lambda, k)$  is *valid* if this presentation yields a finite metacyclic  $p$ -group. We say that  $G(p, m, n, k)$  is *valid* if this presentation yields a finite metacyclic  $p$ -group of split type.

**Fact 2.2 (Hempel, 2000)** *The group  $G(p, m, n, \lambda, k)$  is valid if and only if*

$$k^{p^n} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^m} \quad \text{and} \quad p^\lambda(k-1) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^m}.$$

*Moreover, the group  $G(p, m, n, k)$  is valid if and only if*

$$k^{p^n} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^m}. \quad (2.1)$$

In this paper, we consider only valid groups of split type of the form  $G(p, m, n, k)$ .

**Fact 2.3 (Humphries and Skabelund, 2015)** *Let  $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$  and let  $G_i = \langle a, b \mid a^\alpha = \text{id}, b^\beta = \text{id}, bab^{-1} = a^{\gamma_i} \rangle$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then the following equivalence holds:*

$$G_1 \simeq G_2 \iff \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (\mathbb{Z}/\alpha\mathbb{Z})^\times \text{ and } \langle \gamma_1 \rangle = \langle \gamma_2 \rangle \text{ as subgroups of } (\mathbb{Z}/\alpha\mathbb{Z})^\times.$$

**Corollary 2.4** *Let  $m, n \geq 1$ , and let  $k_1, k_2$  be integers satisfying (2.1). Then  $G(p, m, n, k_1) \simeq G(p, m, n, k_2)$  holds if and only if*

$$\exists v \in (\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^\times \text{ such that } k_2 \equiv k_1^v \pmod{p^m}. \quad (2.2)$$

**Definition 2.5** *Let  $p$  be a prime and let  $G$  be a finite metacyclic  $p$ -group. We say that  $G$  is quasi-regular if the following conditions are satisfied:*

**(QR1)** *If  $p = 2$ , then  $G$  has no non-abelian section of order 8.*

**(QR2)** *For every section  $H$  of  $G$ , the set  $\{x^p \mid x \in H\}$  is a subgroup of  $H$ , and it coincides with  $\mathcal{U}_1(H)$ .*

**Fact 2.6 (Mann, 2010)** *Every finite metacyclic  $p$ -group with  $p > 2$  is quasi-regular.*

**Fact 2.7 (Berkovich, 2011)** *Let  $G$  be a finite quasi-regular metacyclic  $p$ -group of order  $p^\ell$ . Assume that  $\exp(G) = p^e < p^\ell$ , and let  $0 \leq t \leq \ell$ . Set  $f := \ell - e \geq 1$ . Then the number  $a_{p^t}(G)$  is given by*

$$a_{p^t}(G) = \begin{cases} \frac{p^{t+1} - 1}{p - 1} & \text{if } t \leq f, \\ \frac{p^{f+1} - 1}{p - 1} & \text{if } f < t \leq e, \\ \frac{p^{\ell-t+1} - 1}{p - 1} & \text{if } t > e. \end{cases}$$

**Corollary 2.8** *Let  $p \geq 3$  and fix integers  $m, n \geq 1$ . Then for any integers  $k_1, k_2$  satisfying (2.1), we have*

$$\zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_2)}(s).$$

*Proof.* For fixed  $p, m, n$  and any integer  $k$  satisfying (2.1), the order and exponent of  $G(p, m, n, k)$  are given by

$$|G(p, m, n, k)| = p^{m+n}, \quad \exp(G(p, m, n, k)) = p^{\max\{m, n\}} < p^{m+n}.$$

By Fact 2.6, each  $G(p, m, n, k)$  is a finite quasi-regular metacyclic  $p$ -group. Applying Fact 2.7, we see that for finite quasi-regular metacyclic  $p$ -groups with the same order  $|G|$  and exponent  $\exp(G)$  the numbers  $a_{p^t}(G)$  coincide for all  $t$ . Hence, for any integers  $k_1, k_2$  satisfying (2.1), we obtain, for every integer  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$a_{p^t}(G(p, m, n, k_1)) = a_{p^t}(G(p, m, n, k_2)).$$

Therefore,  $\zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_2)}(s)$ . □

Thus, for  $p \geq 3$ , the group zeta function is the same for all groups  $G(p, m, n, k)$  with  $k$  satisfying (2.1). For  $p = 2$ , the following is known.

**Fact 2.9 (Berkovich, 2011)** *Let  $G$  be a finite metacyclic 2-group. For each integer  $i \geq 0$ , define*

$$\Omega_i(G) := \{x \in G \mid x^{2^i} = \text{id}\}, \quad w := \max\{i \geq 0 \mid |\Omega_i(G)| = 2^{2i}\}, \quad R := \Omega_w(G).$$

*Then  $|R| = 2^{2w}$ , and the quotient  $G/R$  is isomorphic to one of the following:*

- $\{\text{id}\}$ ,
- $\mathbb{Z}_{2^c}$  for some  $c \geq 1$ ,
- $D_{2^c}, Q_{2^c}$ , or  $\text{SD}_{2^c}$  for some  $c \geq 3$ .

**Fact 2.10 (Berkovich, 2011)** *Let  $G$  be a finite metacyclic 2-group of order  $2^\ell$ . For each integer  $t$  with  $0 \leq t \leq \ell$ , the value of  $a_{2^t}(G)$  is determined by the structure of  $G$  as follows.*

(1) *If  $G \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{2^\ell}$ , then  $a_{2^t}(G) = 1$  for every  $0 \leq t \leq \ell$ .*

(2) *Assume that  $w = 0$  and that  $G \simeq D_{2^\ell}, Q_{2^\ell}$ , or  $\text{SD}_{2^\ell}$ . Then  $a_1(G) = a_{2^\ell}(G) = 1$ , and for every  $2 \leq t < \ell$  we have*

$$a_{2^t}(G) = 2^{\ell-t} + 1.$$

Moreover, for  $t = 1$  we have

$$a_2(D_{2^\ell}) = 2^{\ell-1} + 1, \quad a_2(Q_{2^\ell}) = 1, \quad a_2(\text{SD}_{2^\ell}) = 2^{\ell-2} + 1$$

(3) Assume that  $w > 0$  and  $R = G$ . Then  $|G| = 2^{2w}$ , and for every  $0 \leq t \leq 2w$ ,

$$a_{2^t}(G) = \begin{cases} 2^{t+1} - 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq w, \\ 2^{2w-t+1} - 1 & \text{if } w < t \leq 2w. \end{cases}$$

(4) Assume that  $w > 0$ ,  $R \subsetneq G$ , and  $G/R \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{2^c}$  for some  $c \geq 1$ . Then  $|G| = 2^{2w+c}$ , and for every

$$0 \leq t \leq 2w + c,$$

$$a_{2^t}(G) = \begin{cases} 2^{t+1} - 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq w, \\ 2^{w+1} - 1 & \text{if } w < t < w + c, \\ 2^{2w+c-t+1} - 1 & \text{if } w + c \leq t \leq 2w + c. \end{cases}$$

(5) Assume that  $w > 0$ ,  $R \subsetneq G$ , and  $G/R \simeq D_{2^c}, Q_{2^c}$  or  $\text{SD}_{2^c}$  for some  $c \geq 3$ . Then  $|G| = 2^{2w+c}$ . The numbers  $a_{2^t}(G)$  for  $0 \leq t \leq 2w + c$  are given by explicit formulas in (Berkovich, 2011). We omit the full list of formulas here because it is lengthy.

- If  $G/R \simeq Q_{2^c}$ , see (Berkovich, 2011), Theorem 3.9 and Supplements 1–2
- If  $G/R \simeq D_{2^c}$ , see (Berkovich, 2011), Theorem 3.11 and Supplements 1–3
- If  $G/R \simeq \text{SD}_{2^c}$ , see (Berkovich, 2011), Theorem 3.12 and Supplements 1–2.

Fact 2.10 determines the values of  $a_{2^t}(G)$ . However, counting pairs of non-isomorphic groups with coincident group zeta functions requires one to keep track of the data  $w$ ,  $R$ , and the quotient group  $G/R$ . As a result, the number of such pairs is hard to determine even when  $|G|$  is fixed. The difficulty becomes more pronounced as the order grows.

In contrast, for metacyclic  $p$ -groups of split type of the form  $G(p, m, n, k)$ , zeta equality admits a uniform characterization. When  $p = 2$ , Theorem 1.1 gives a criterion for zeta equality in this family in terms of  $m$ ,  $n$ , and the 2-adic valuations  $v_2(k+1)$ . For odd primes  $p$ , the same method yields an analogous criterion. This criterion is parallel to Corollary 2.8. Therefore, we focus primarily on the case  $p = 2$ .

We will frequently use Lemma 2.11 in our computations.

**Lemma 2.11 (Andreeescu, 2011)** *Let  $p$  be a prime,  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $n \geq 1$ .*

If  $p$  is odd,  $p \mid (x - y)$ ,  $p \nmid x$ , and  $p \nmid y$ , then

$$v_p(x^n - y^n) = v_p(x - y) + v_p(n). \quad (2.3)$$

If  $p = 2$  and  $x \equiv y \pmod{2}$ , then

$$v_2(x^n - y^n) = \begin{cases} v_2(x - y), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ v_2(x - y) + v_2(x + y) + v_2(n) - 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (2.4a)$$

$$(2.4b)$$

### 3 Criteria for zeta equality among the groups $G(p, m, n, k)$

Any semidirect product  $G := V \rtimes_{\phi} U$  fits into a split short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow V \rightarrow G \xrightarrow{\pi} U \rightarrow 1.$$

For subgroups  $W \subset V$  and  $L \subset U$ , we define

$$S_{W,L}(G) := \{ H \leq G \mid H \cap V = W, \pi(H) = L \}.$$

For every subgroup  $H \subset G$ , set  $W := H \cap V$  and  $L := \pi(H)$ . Then there is a short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow W \rightarrow H \xrightarrow{\pi|_H} L \rightarrow 1.$$

Let  $W \subset V$  and  $L \subset U$ . Then  $W \triangleleft \pi^{-1}(L)$  if and only if  $W \triangleleft V$  and  $\phi(\ell)(W) = W$  for every  $\ell \in L$ .

Assume that  $W \triangleleft \pi^{-1}(L)$ . Set  $\tilde{V} := V/W$  and  $\tilde{G} := \pi^{-1}(L)/W$ . Then factoring out  $W$  yields a short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow \tilde{V} \rightarrow \tilde{G} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}} L \rightarrow 1.$$

The group  $L$  acts on  $\tilde{V}$  via conjugation in  $\tilde{G}$ . According to (Robinson, 1996), there is a bijection

$$S_{\{\text{id}\},L}(\tilde{G}) := \{ \tilde{H} \leq \tilde{G} \mid \tilde{H} \cap \tilde{V} = \{\text{id}\}, \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{H}) = L \} \longleftrightarrow Z^1(L, \tilde{V}).$$

Moreover, the map  $H \mapsto H/W$  induces a bijection  $S_{W,L}(G) \longleftrightarrow S_{\{\text{id}\},L}(\tilde{G})$ .

We now apply this to our situation. From now on, we write  $G := G(p, m, n, k)$ . For every subgroup  $A \subset H \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{p^m}$ , the subgroup  $A$  is characteristic in  $H$ . Since  $H \triangleleft G$ , we have  $A \triangleleft G$ . Therefore, for every

subgroup  $B \subset K$ , the subgroup  $A$  is  $B$ -invariant. We obtain a bijection

$$S_{A,B}(G) := \left\{ T \leq G \mid T \cap H = A, \pi(T) = B \right\} \longleftrightarrow Z^1(B, H/A). \quad (3.1)$$

In particular, we have the disjoint union  $S(G) = \bigsqcup_{A \subset H, B \subset K} S_{A,B}(G)$ . For every subgroup  $T \subset G$ , the pair  $(A, B)$  is uniquely determined by  $A = T \cap H$  and  $B = \pi(T)$ . Combining this with (3.1), we obtain

$$\#S(G) = \sum_{A \leq H, B \leq K} |Z^1(B, H/A)|.$$

For each  $0 \leq i \leq m$  and  $0 \leq j \leq n$ , let  $A_i \leq H$  and  $B_j \leq K$  be the unique subgroups with  $|A_i| = p^i$  and  $|B_j| = p^j$ . Restricting to subgroups of order  $p^t$ , we obtain

$$a_{p^t}(G) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq m, 0 \leq j \leq n \\ i+j=t}} |Z^1(B_j, H/A_i)|. \quad (3.2)$$

Putting  $j = t - i$  and using  $0 \leq j \leq n$ , we obtain  $t - n \leq i \leq t$ . Hence  $\max\{0, t - n\} \leq i \leq \min\{t, m\}$ .

Thus, we can rewrite (3.2) as

$$a_{p^t}(G) = \sum_{i=\max\{0, t-n\}}^{\min\{t, m\}} |Z^1(B_{t-i}, H/A_i)|. \quad (3.3)$$

For each  $0 \leq i \leq m$  and  $0 \leq j \leq n$  with  $t = i + j$ , we define

$$A_i := \langle a^{p^{m-i}} \rangle \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{p^i} \subset H, \quad B_j := \langle b^{p^{n-j}} \rangle \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{p^j} \subset K, \quad M_i := H/A_i \simeq \mathbb{Z}_{p^{m-i}}.$$

**Fact 3.1 c.f.(Robinson, 1996), Chap. 3** *Identify  $M_i$  with  $\mathbb{Z}/p^{m-i}\mathbb{Z}$ , and write it additively. Let  $T_{i,j} \in \text{End}(M_i)$  be the endomorphism induced by the action of  $B_j$  on  $M_i$  via the restriction of  $\phi$ . Then*

$$T_{i,j}(x) = u_{i,j} x \quad (x \in \mathbb{Z}/p^{m-i}\mathbb{Z}), \quad u_{i,j} \equiv k^{p^{n-j}} \pmod{p^{m-i}}. \quad (3.4)$$

Define

$$N_{i,j} := 1 + T_{i,j} + T_{i,j}^2 + \cdots + T_{i,j}^{p^j-1}, \quad (3.5)$$

where  $1 = \text{id}_{M_i}$ . With this definition, there is a bijection

$$Z^1(B_j, M_i) \longleftrightarrow \text{Ker}(N_{i,j}) = \{x \in M_i \mid N_{i,j}(x) = 0\}. \quad (3.6)$$

**Corollary 3.2** *Combining (3.3) with (3.6), we obtain*

$$a_{p^t}(G) = \sum_{i=\max\{0, t-n\}}^{\min\{t, m\}} |\text{Ker}(N_{i, t-i})|.$$

**Proposition 3.3** *For  $N_{i,j}$  defined in (3.5), the order  $|\text{Ker}(N_{i,j})|$  is given as follows.*

*Assume that  $p$  is odd. Then*

$$|\text{Ker}(N_{i,j})| = p^{\min\{m-i, j\}}.$$

*Assume that  $p = 2$ . Then*

$$|\text{Ker}(N_{i,j})| = \begin{cases} 2^{\min\{m-i, j\}} & \text{if } u_{i,j} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{m-i}}, \\ 2^{\min\{m-i, v_2(u_{i,j}+1)+j-1\}} & \text{if } u_{i,j} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2^{m-i}}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Put  $r := m - i$ . Under the identification  $M_i \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p^r\mathbb{Z}$ , the formulas (3.4) and (3.5) yield

$$T_{i,j}(x) = u_{i,j}x, \quad N_{i,j}(x) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{p^j-1} u_{i,j}^\nu x = S_{i,j}x,$$

where  $S_{i,j} := \sum_{\nu=0}^{p^j-1} u_{i,j}^\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We have

$$\text{Ker}(N_{i,j}) = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}/p^r\mathbb{Z} \mid S_{i,j}x \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r}\}.$$

Writing  $S_{i,j} = p^\alpha w$  with  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $\gcd(w, p) = 1$ , the condition  $S_{i,j}x \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r}$  holds if and only if  $p^{r-\alpha} \mid x$ . Hence

$$|\text{Ker}(N_{i,j})| = p^{\min\{r, v_p(S_{i,j})\}}. \quad (3.7)$$

Assume that  $p$  is odd. From (2.1), we have  $k^{p^n} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . Since  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$  has order  $p-1$  and  $\gcd(p^n, p-1) = 1$ , it follows that  $k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . Together with (3.4), this gives  $u_{i,j} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . If  $u_{i,j} = 1$ , then  $S_{i,j} = p^j$  and  $v_p(S_{i,j}) = j$ . If  $u_{i,j} \neq 1$ , applying Lemma 2.11, (2.3) to  $x = u_{i,j}$ ,  $y = 1$ , and  $n = p^j$  yields

$$v_p(u_{i,j}^{p^j} - 1) = v_p(u_{i,j} - 1) + v_p(p^j) = v_p(u_{i,j} - 1) + j.$$

Since  $u_{i,j}^{p^j} - 1 = (u_{i,j} - 1)S_{i,j}$ , we obtain  $v_p(S_{i,j}) = j$ . Therefore (3.7) gives

$$|\text{Ker}(N_{i,j})| = p^{\min\{r, j\}} = p^{\min\{m-i, j\}}.$$

Assume that  $p = 2$ . From (2.1) we have  $k^{2^n} \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , so  $k$  is odd. Hence  $u_{i,j} \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  for all  $i, j$ . If  $u_{i,j} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^r}$ , then  $T_{i,j} = \text{id}_{M_i}$ , so  $N_{i,j} = 2^j \text{id}_{M_i}$  and (3.7) yields  $|\text{Ker}(N_{i,j})| = 2^{\min\{r,j\}}$ . If  $u_{i,j} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2^r}$ , then  $u_{i,j} \neq 1$  and  $j \geq 1$ . Applying Lemma 2.11, (2.4b) to  $x = u_{i,j}$ ,  $y = 1$ , and  $n = 2^j$  gives

$$v_2(u_{i,j}^{2^j} - 1) = v_2(u_{i,j} - 1) + v_2(u_{i,j} + 1) + v_2(2^j) - 1 = v_2(u_{i,j} - 1) + v_2(u_{i,j} + 1) + j - 1.$$

Since  $u_{i,j}^{2^j} - 1 = (u_{i,j} - 1)S_{i,j}$ , we obtain  $v_2(S_{i,j}) = v_2(u_{i,j} + 1) + j - 1$ . Therefore (3.7) gives the second formula in the statement.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4** By Corollary 3.2 and Proposition 3.3, when  $p$  is an odd prime, we obtain

$$a_{p^t}(G) = \sum_{i=\max\{0, t-n\}}^{\min\{t, m\}} p^{\min\{m-i, t-i\}}.$$

In particular,  $a_{p^t}(G)$  does not depend on  $k$ . Therefore, for any integers  $k_1, k_2$  satisfying (2.1), we have  $\zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(p,m,n,k_2)}(s)$ . This agrees with Corollary 2.8.

We keep the notation  $G := G(2, m, n, k)$ . For each integer  $t$ , we have

$$a_{2^t}(G) = \sum_{i=\max\{0, t-n\}}^{\min\{t, m\}} 2^{E_{i,t-i}(k)}. \quad (3.8)$$

Using (3.4), we keep in mind that  $u_{i,j} \equiv k^{2^{n-j}} \pmod{2^{m-i}}$ . Define  $E_{i,j}(k)$  by

$$E_{i,j}(k) = \begin{cases} \min\{m-i, j\} & \text{if } u_{i,j} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{m-i}}, \\ \min\{m-i, v_2(u_{i,j} + 1) + j - 1\} & \text{if } u_{i,j} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2^{m-i}}. \end{cases} \quad (3.9a)$$

**Lemma 3.5** Let  $k$  be an odd integer. If  $v_2(k+1) \geq 2$ , then  $v_2(k-1) = 1$ . In particular, for any integer  $m \geq 1$  we have  $\min\{m, v_2(k-1)\} = 1$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $v_2(k+1) \geq 2$ . Then  $4 \mid (k+1)$ , so  $k \equiv -1 \pmod{4}$ . Hence  $k-1 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ . Therefore  $2 \mid (k-1)$  and  $4 \nmid (k-1)$ , which means  $v_2(k-1) = 1$ . The last assertion follows immediately.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.6** Let  $m, n \geq 1$  and let  $k_1, k_2$  be integers satisfying (2.1).

(1) Assume  $n < m$ . Then  $\zeta_{G(2,m,n,k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(2,m,n,k_2)}(s)$  if and only if one of the following conditions

holds:

$$\begin{cases} \text{(A)} & v_2(k_1 + 1) = v_2(k_2 + 1) \leq m - n, \\ \text{(B)} & \min\{v_2(k_1 + 1), v_2(k_2 + 1)\} > m - n. \end{cases}$$

(2) Assume  $n \geq m$ . Then,  $\zeta_{G(2,m,n,k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(2,m,n,k_2)}(s)$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $p = 2$ . For each integer  $k$  satisfying (2.1), set  $G(k) := G(2, m, n, k)$ . For each integer  $t \geq 0$ , write  $a_{2^t}(k) := a_{2^t}(G(k))$ .

Fix an integer  $t$ . Let  $i$  satisfy  $\max\{0, t - n\} \leq i \leq \min\{t, m\}$ , and set  $j := t - i$  and  $r := m - i$ . By (3.8), we have

$$a_{2^t}(k) = \sum_{i=\max\{0, t-n\}}^{\min\{t, m\}} 2^{E_{i,t-i}(k)}.$$

Here  $E_{i,j}(k)$  is defined by (3.9). Moreover, (3.4) gives the congruence  $u_{i,j} \equiv k^{2^{n-j}} \pmod{2^{m-i}}$ . We always take  $u_{i,j}$  to be the unique integer with  $0 \leq u_{i,j} < 2^{m-i}$  satisfying this congruence. In particular, for any integer  $x$ , if  $u_{i,j} \equiv x \pmod{2^{m-i}}$ , then

$$v_2(u_{i,j} + 1) = \min\{m - i, v_2(x + 1)\}. \quad (3.10)$$

**Case 1.  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$ .** We show that, in this range, the values  $E_{i,j}(k)$  are independent of  $k$ .

**Case 1-1.  $j = 0$ .** Here  $B_0 \simeq \{\text{id}\}$ . By (3.6) we have  $\text{Ker}(N_{i,0}) \simeq Z^1(B_0, H/A_i) \simeq \{0\}$ , hence  $|\text{Ker}(N_{i,0})| = 1$  and therefore  $E_{i,0}(k) = 0$ . This does not depend on  $k$ .

**Case 1-2.  $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$ .** Here  $n - j \geq 1$ . Since  $k$  satisfies (2.1), we have  $k^{2^n} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^m}$ . Hence  $k$  is odd. For any odd integer  $\alpha$  and any integer  $\beta \geq 1$ , we have  $\alpha^{2^\beta} \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ , hence  $k^{2^{n-j}} \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ . Recalling that  $u_{i,j} \equiv k^{2^{n-j}} \pmod{2^r}$ , we distinguish two subcases.

**Case 1-2-1.  $2 \leq r$ .** Then  $u_{i,j} \equiv k^{2^{n-j}} \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , so  $v_2(u_{i,j} + 1) = 1$ . Using (3.9b), we obtain

$$E_{i,j}(k) = \min\{m - i, v_2(u_{i,j} + 1) + j - 1\} = \min\{m - i, 1 + (j - 1)\} = \min\{m - i, j\}.$$

Thus  $E_{i,j}(k) = \min\{m - i, j\}$ , and this does not depend on  $k$ .

**Case 1-2-2.  $r = 1$ .** Here  $2^{m-i} = 2$  and  $u_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ . Since  $k^{2^{n-j}}$  is odd, we have  $k^{2^{n-j}} \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Therefore  $u_{i,j} \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , hence  $u_{i,j} = 1$ . In particular,  $u_{i,j} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{m-i}}$ , so only (3.9a) can occur. Hence  $E_{i,j}(k) = \min\{1, j\} = 1$ , which again is independent of  $k$ .

Combining Case 1-1 and Case 1-2, we conclude that, in Case 1,  $E_{i,j}(k) = \min\{m - i, j\}$ , and this is independent of  $k$ .

**Case 2.  $j = n$ .** Substituting  $n - j = 0$  into (3.4), we obtain  $u_{i,n} \equiv k \pmod{2^{m-i}}$ . Therefore

$$u_{i,n} \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{m-i}} \iff k \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{m-i}} \iff v_2(k-1) \geq m-i.$$

Moreover, since  $u_{i,n} \equiv k \pmod{2^{m-i}}$ , we have  $v_2(u_{i,n} + 1) = \min\{m - i, v_2(k + 1)\}$  by (3.10). Using these, (3.9a) and (3.9b) can be rewritten as

$$E_i(k) := E_{i,n}(k) = \begin{cases} \min\{m - i, n\} & \text{if } v_2(k-1) \geq m-i, \\ \min\{m - i, v_2(k+1) + n - 1\} & \text{if } v_2(k-1) < m-i. \end{cases} \quad (3.11a)$$

Since we have been using  $i + j = t$ , in the present case we have  $t = n + i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ . For each  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$  we can write

$$a_{2^{n+i}}(k) = C_{n+i} + 2^{E_i(k)},$$

where we define

$$C_{n+i} := \sum_{j=\max\{0, n+i-m\}}^{n-1} 2^{E_{n+i-j,j}(k)} = \sum_{j=\max\{0, n+i-m\}}^{n-1} 2^{\min\{m-(n+i-j), j\}}.$$

By Case 1, each term  $E_{n+i-j,j}(k)$  with  $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$  is independent of  $k$ . Hence  $C_{n+i}$  does not depend on  $k$ . Since Case 1 also shows that  $a_{2^t}(k)$  is independent of  $k$  for  $0 \leq t \leq n - 1$ , the only possible dependence of  $\zeta_{G(k)}(s)$  on  $k$  comes from the terms  $a_{2^{n+i}}(k)$  with  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ . Therefore we obtain the equivalence

$$\zeta_{G(k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(k_2)}(s) \iff E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2) \quad (0 \leq i \leq m - 1). \quad (3.12)$$

For each integer  $k$  satisfying (2.1), set

$$s_2(k) := v_2(k + 1), \quad c'(k) := \min\{m, v_2(k - 1)\}, \quad \sigma(k) := s_2(k) + n - 1.$$

In terms of this notation, (3.11a) and (3.11b) become

$$E_i(k) = \begin{cases} \min\{m - i, n\} & \text{if } i \geq m - c'(k), \\ \min\{m - i, \sigma(k)\} & \text{if } i < m - c'(k). \end{cases} \quad (3.13a)$$

$$(3.13b)$$

**Case 2-1.  $n < m$ .** We prove statement (1) of the theorem.

**Case 2-1-A.  $s_2(k) \leq m - n$ .** We distinguish two subcases.

**Case 2-1-A1.  $s_2(k) = 1$ .** Then  $\sigma(k) = n$ . Hence (3.13a) and (3.13b) give  $E_i(k) = \min\{m - i, n\}$  for every  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ . Thus, in this subcase, the sequence  $(E_i(k))$  does not depend on  $k$ . In particular, if  $s_2(k_1) = s_2(k_2) = 1$ , then  $E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2)$  for all  $i$ . By (3.12), we obtain  $\zeta_{G(k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(k_2)}(s)$ .

**Case 2-1-A2.  $2 \leq s_2(k) \leq m - n$ .** Since  $k$  is odd and  $s_2(k) \geq 2$ , Lemma 3.5 gives  $v_2(k - 1) = 1$ . Hence  $c'(k) = 1$ . Therefore  $m - c'(k) = m - 1$ . For  $0 \leq i \leq m - 2$ , we have  $i < m - c'(k)$ , so (3.13b) gives

$$E_i(k) = \min\{m - i, \sigma(k)\}.$$

Moreover,  $2 \leq s_2(k) \leq m - n$  implies

$$n + 1 \leq \sigma(k) = s_2(k) + n - 1 \leq m - 1.$$

In particular,  $\sigma(k) \leq m - 1$ , so  $E_0(k) = \sigma(k)$ .

We first prove sufficiency in this subcase. If  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  satisfy  $s_2(k_1) = s_2(k_2)$  and  $2 \leq s_2(k_1) \leq m - n$ , then  $\sigma(k_1) = \sigma(k_2)$  and  $c'(k_1) = c'(k_2) = 1$ . Hence (3.13) gives  $E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2)$  for every  $i$ . By (3.12), we obtain  $\zeta_{G(k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(k_2)}(s)$ .

Next we prove necessity in Case 2-1-A. Assume that  $E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2)$  holds for all  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$  and that  $s_2(k_1) \leq m - n$  and  $s_2(k_2) \leq m - n$ . If  $s_2(k_\nu) = 1$  for some  $\nu \in \{1, 2\}$ , then  $E_0(k_\nu) = n$  by Case 2-1-A1. If  $s_2(k_\mu) \geq 2$  for some  $\mu \in \{1, 2\}$ , then Case 2-1-A2 gives  $E_0(k_\mu) = \sigma(k_\mu) \geq n + 1$ . Therefore  $E_0(k_1) = E_0(k_2)$  implies that either  $s_2(k_1) = s_2(k_2) = 1$  or  $2 \leq s_2(k_1), s_2(k_2) \leq m - n$ .

Assume  $2 \leq s_2(k_1), s_2(k_2) \leq m - n$ . Then Case 2-1-A2 gives  $E_0(k_\nu) = \sigma(k_\nu)$  for  $\nu \in \{1, 2\}$ . Since  $E_0(k_1) = E_0(k_2)$ , it follows that  $\sigma(k_1) = \sigma(k_2)$ . Hence  $s_2(k_1) = s_2(k_2)$ . Combining this with Case 2-1-A1, we conclude that, in Case 2-1-A,

$$E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2) \ (0 \leq i \leq m - 1) \iff s_2(k_1) = s_2(k_2) \leq m - n.$$

By (3.12), this is equivalent to

$$\zeta_{G(k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(k_2)}(s) \iff v_2(k_1 + 1) = v_2(k_2 + 1) \leq m - n.$$

**Case 2-1-B.  $s_2(k) \geq m - n + 1$ .** Assume  $s_2(k) \geq m - n + 1$ . Since  $n < m$ , we have  $m - n + 1 \geq 2$ .

Therefore Lemma 3.5 gives  $c'(k) = 1$ . Moreover,  $\sigma(k) = s_2(k) + n - 1 \geq m$ . Hence, for every  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ , (3.13b) yields

$$E_i(k) = \min\{m - i, \sigma(k)\} = m - i.$$

Thus the sequence  $(E_i(k))_{0 \leq i \leq m-1}$  is independent of  $k$  in this subcase. In particular, if  $s_2(k_1) \geq m - n + 1$  and  $s_2(k_2) \geq m - n + 1$ , then  $E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2)$  for all  $i$ , so  $\zeta_{G(k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(k_2)}(s)$  by (3.12).

Conversely, assume that  $E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2)$  holds for all  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$  and that  $s_2(k_1) \geq m - n + 1$ . Then  $E_0(k_1) = m$  in this subcase. Hence  $E_0(k_2) = m$ . Since  $E_0(k_2) = \min\{m, \sigma(k_2)\}$  by (3.13), we obtain  $\sigma(k_2) \geq m$ , so  $s_2(k_2) \geq m - n + 1$ . Therefore, in Case 2-1-B,

$$\zeta_{G(k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(k_2)}(s) \iff v_2(k_1 + 1) \geq m - n + 1 \text{ and } v_2(k_2 + 1) \geq m - n + 1.$$

Combining Case 2-1-A and Case 2-1-B, we obtain statement (1) of the theorem.

**Case 2-2.  $n \geq m$ .** For any  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ , we have  $\min\{m - i, n\} = m - i$ . Since  $k$  is odd, we have  $s_2(k) \geq 1$ , so  $\sigma(k) = s_2(k) + n - 1 \geq m$ . Therefore (3.13) gives  $E_i(k) = m - i$  for every  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ . Hence  $E_i(k_1) = E_i(k_2)$  holds for all  $i$  and for all  $k_1, k_2$  satisfying (2.1). By (3.12), this implies  $\zeta_{G(k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(k_2)}(s)$ . This proves statement (2) of the theorem.  $\square$

**Example 3.7** We consider the case  $(p, m, n) = (2, 5, 3)$  and apply Theorem 3.6. By (2.1), the group  $G(2, 5, 3, k)$  is valid if and only if  $k^8 \equiv 1 \pmod{32}$ . Any such  $k$  must be odd. Conversely, since the multiplicative group  $(\mathbb{Z}/32\mathbb{Z})^\times \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_8$  has exponent 8, every odd integer  $k$  satisfies  $k^8 \equiv 1 \pmod{32}$ . Hence, the admissible parameters  $k$  are precisely the odd residues modulo 32, namely

$$k \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31\}. \quad (3.14)$$

Moreover, by (2.2), we have

$$G(2, 5, 3, k_1) \simeq G(2, 5, 3, k_2) \iff \exists v \in (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^\times \text{ such that } k_2 \equiv k_1^v \pmod{32}.$$

Among the values of  $k$  in (3.14), the isomorphism classes are given by the following partition:

$$\{1\}, \{3, 11, 19, 27\}, \{5, 13, 21, 29\}, \{7, 23\}, \{9, 25\}, \{15\}, \{17\}, \{31\}. \quad (3.15)$$

Thus we may take a complete set of representatives  $k \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 31\}$ . For these values of  $k$ , we

have

$$v_2(k+1) = 1 \text{ for } k \in \{1, 5, 9, 17\}, \quad v_2(k+1) = 2 \text{ for } k = 3, \quad v_2(k+1) \geq 3 \text{ for } k \in \{7, 15, 31\}.$$

Theorem 3.6 shows that the group zeta function of  $G(2, 5, 3, k)$  is determined by  $v_2(k+1)$  and the threshold  $m - n + 1 = 3$ . Therefore these representatives fall into the following three zeta-classes:

$$\{1, 5, 9, 17\}, \quad \{3\}, \quad \{7, 15, 31\}. \quad (3.16)$$

Let  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  be distinct elements within the same class. Then  $G(2, 5, 3, k_1)$  and  $G(2, 5, 3, k_2)$  are non-isomorphic. Theorem 3.6 implies that they have the same group zeta function.

**Fact 3.8 (Hironaka, 2017)** Let  $G$  and  $G'$  be finite  $p$ -groups with  $\zeta_G(s) = \zeta_{G'}(s)$ . Let  $P'$  be a finite group such that  $p \nmid |P'|$ . Then  $|G|$  and  $|P'|$  are coprime, and hence  $\zeta_{G \times P'}(s) = \zeta_G(s) \zeta_{P'}(s)$ . In particular, we have  $\zeta_{G \times P'}(s) = \zeta_{G' \times P'}(s)$ . Moreover, if  $G \not\cong G'$ , then  $G \times P' \not\cong G' \times P'$ .

**Example 3.9** We continue with the case  $(p, m, n) = (2, 5, 3)$  in Example 3.7. By (3.15), the four groups  $G(2, 5, 3, k)$  with  $k \in \{1, 5, 9, 17\}$  are pairwise non-isomorphic, but have the same group zeta function.

Let  $P'$  be a finite group such that  $2 \nmid |P'|$ . Then, by Fact 3.8, the four direct products

$$G(2, 5, 3, k) \times P' \quad k \in \{1, 5, 9, 17\}$$

are pairwise non-isomorphic and have the same group zeta function.

Let  $L(G)$  denote the subgroup lattice of a finite group  $G$ . We write  $L(G_1) \simeq L(G_2)$  to mean that the lattices  $L(G_1)$  and  $L(G_2)$  are isomorphic as lattices. For subgroups  $H \subset K$  of  $G$ , we write  $H \prec K$  to indicate that  $K$  covers  $H$  in  $L(G)$ . Then the following holds.

**Lemma 3.10** Let  $p$  be a prime and let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be finite  $p$ -groups. Assume that  $|G_1| = |G_2|$ . Then the following implication holds.

$$L(G_1) \simeq L(G_2) \implies \zeta_{G_1}(s) = \zeta_{G_2}(s).$$

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a finite  $p$ -group, and let  $H \subset K \subset G$ . Then  $H \prec K$  in  $L(G)$  is equivalent to saying that  $H$  is a maximal subgroup of  $K$ . Since every maximal subgroup of a finite  $p$ -group has index  $p$ , it follows that  $H \prec K$  if and only if  $[K : H] = p$ .

Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be finite  $p$ -groups with  $|G_1| = |G_2|$ , and let  $\Phi: L(G_1) \rightarrow L(G_2)$  be a lattice isomorphism.

Let  $A \subset G_1$ , and take a maximal chain  $\{\text{id}\} = A_0 \prec A_1 \prec \cdots \prec A_r = A$  in the interval  $[\{\text{id}\}, A]$ . Then  $[A_i : A_{i-1}] = p$  for each  $i$ , hence  $|A| = p^r$  and  $\log_p |A| = r$ . Since  $\Phi$  preserves cover relations, the chain  $\{\text{id}\} = \Phi(A_0) \prec \Phi(A_1) \prec \cdots \prec \Phi(A_r) = \Phi(A)$  is a maximal chain of the same length. Therefore  $|\Phi(A)| = |A|$ .

It follows that  $\Phi$  induces, for each  $r \geq 0$ , a bijection between the subgroups of  $G_1$  of order  $p^r$  and the subgroups of  $G_2$  of order  $p^r$ . Hence  $a_{p^r}(G_1) = a_{p^r}(G_2)$  for every  $r$ , and therefore  $\zeta_{G_1}(s) = \zeta_{G_2}(s)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.11** For the groups  $G(2, 5, 3, k_i)$  in Example 3.7, we verified in GAP that, among the non-isomorphic groups  $G(2, 5, 3, k_i)$ , the subgroup lattices fall into the following lattice-isomorphism classes:

$$\{1, 5, 9, 17\}, \{3\}, \{7\}, \{15\}, \{31\}. \quad (3.17)$$

**Corollary 3.12** In general, the converse of Lemma 3.10 does not hold.

*Proof.* Compare (3.16) with (3.17). If  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are distinct elements of  $\{7, 15, 31\}$ , then  $\zeta_{G(2, 5, 3, k_1)}(s) = \zeta_{G(2, 5, 3, k_2)}(s)$ , while  $L(G(2, 5, 3, k_1)) \not\simeq L(G(2, 5, 3, k_2))$ . This yields a counterexample to the converse implication.  $\square$

**Remark 3.13** The following questions remain open.

- Fix integers  $m, n \geq 1$ . For which pairs  $(k_1, k_2)$  do the groups  $G(p, m, n, k_1)$  and  $G(p, m, n, k_2)$  have the same group zeta function, while their subgroup lattices are non-isomorphic?
- More generally, let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be finite  $p$ -groups with  $\zeta_{G_1}(s) = \zeta_{G_2}(s)$  and  $G_1 \not\simeq G_2$ . Under what additional conditions does it follow that  $L(G_1) \simeq L(G_2)$ ?

## Acknowledgements

We are deeply indebted to Professor Koichi Betsumiya for his constant guidance and supervision throughout this research. We also thank Takara Kondo of Kumamoto University for bringing to our attention the problem of group zeta functions and for helpful discussions. Their support and encouragement were indispensable to the completion of this work.

## References

(Andreescu, 2011) T. Andreescu, ed., *Mathematical Reflections: The First Two Years*, XYZ Press, 2011.

(Berkovich, 2011) Y. Berkovich, The number of subgroups of given order in a metacyclic  $p$ -group. *Glasnik matematički* **46**(66) (2011), no. 1, 79–101.

(Dyubyuk, 1950) P. E. Dyubyuk, On the number of subgroups of given index of a finite  $p$ -group. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)* **27**(69) (1950), no. 1, 129–138.

(Grunewald et al., 1988) F. J. Grunewald, D. Segal, and G. C. Smith, Subgroups of finite index in nilpotent groups. *Inventiones Mathematicae* **93** (1988), no. 1, 185–223.

(Hall, 1949) M. Hall, Jr., Subgroups of finite index in free groups. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **1** (1949), 187–190.

(Hempel, 2000) C. E. Hempel, Metacyclic groups. *Communications in Algebra* **28** (2000), no. 8, 3865–3897.

(Hironaka, 2017) Y. Hironaka, Zeta functions of finite groups by enumerating subgroups. *Communications in Algebra* **45** (2017), no. 8, 3365–3376.

(Humphries and Skabelund, 2015) S. P. Humphries and D. C. Skabelund, Character tables of metacyclic groups. *Glasgow Mathematical Journal* **57** (2015), no. 2, 387–400.

(Imrich, 1978) W. Imrich, On the number of subgroups of given index in  $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ . *Archiv der Mathematik* **31** (1978), 224–231.

(Lee, 2022) S. Lee, Zeta functions enumerating normal subgroups of  $T_2$ -groups and their behavior on residue classes. *Journal of Algebra* **611** (2022), 1–23.

(Mann, 2010) A. Mann, The number of subgroups of metacyclic groups. In *Character Theory of Finite Groups*, Contemp. Math., vol. 524, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, 93–95.

(Miller, 1919) G. A. Miller, Form of the number of subgroups of prime power groups. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **26** (1919), no. 2, 66–72.

(Parker and Kanchana, 2014) C. W. Parker and A. A. C. Kanchana, Examples of groups with the same number of subgroups of every index. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Mathematics & Physics* **7** (2014), no. 1, 95–99.

(Robinson, 1996) D. J. S. Robinson, *A Course in the Theory of Groups*, 2nd ed. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 80, Springer, 1996.

(Smith, 1983) G. C. Smith, *Zeta functions of torsion free finitely generated nilpotent groups*. Ph.D. thesis, Manchester (UMIST), 1983.

(Stothers, 1977) W. W. Stothers, The number of subgroups of given index in the modular group. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics* **78** 1977, no. 1–2, 105–112.

(Wall, 1961) G. E. Wall, Some applications of the Eulerian functions of a finite group. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society* **2** (1961), 35–59.

(Zassenhaus, 1958) H. J. Zassenhaus, *The Theory of Groups*, 2nd ed. Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, 1958.