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#### Abstract

We prove that for any automorphism $\phi$ of the restricted wreath product $\mathbb{Z}_{2}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{2 d}$ the Reidemeister number $R(\phi)$ is infinite, i.e. these groups have the property $R_{\infty}$.

For $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{2 d+1}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$, where $p>3$ is prime, we give examples of automorphisms with finite Reidemeister numbers. So these groups do not have the property $R_{\infty}$.

For these groups and $\mathbb{Z}_{m}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}$, where $m$ is relatively prime to 6 , we prove the twisted Burnside-Frobenius theorem $\left(\mathrm{TBFT}_{f}\right)$ : if $R(\phi)<\infty$, then it is equal to the number of equivalence classes of finite-dimensional irreducible unitary representations fixed by the action $[\rho] \mapsto[\rho \circ \phi]$.


## Introduction

The Reidemeister number $R(\phi)$ of an automorphism $\phi$ of a (countable discrete) group $G$ is the number of its Reidemeister or twisted conjugacy classes, i.e. the classes of the twisted conjugacy equivalence relation: $g \sim h g \phi\left(h^{-1}\right), h, g \in G$. Denote by $\{g\}_{\phi}$ the class of $g$.

The following two interrelated problems are in the mainstream of the study of Reidemeister numbers.

In [5] A.Fel'shtyn and R.Hill conjectured that $R(\phi)$ is equal to the number of fixed points of the associated homeomorphism $\widehat{\phi}$ of the unitary dual $\widehat{G}$ (the set of equivalence classes of irreducible unitary representations of $G$ ), if one of these numbers is finite. The action of $\widehat{\phi}$ on the class of a representation $\rho$ is defined as $[\rho] \mapsto[\rho \circ \phi]$. This conjecture is called TBFT (twisted Burnside-Frobenius theorem). This statement can be considered as a generalization to infinite groups and to the twisted case the classical Burnside-Frobenius theorem: the number of conjugacy classes of a finite group is equal to the number of equivalence classes of its irreducible representations. The TBFT conjecture (more precisely, its modification $\mathrm{TBFT}_{f}$, taking into account only finite-dimensional representations) was proved for polycyclic-byfinite groups in $[9,13]$. Preliminary and related results, examples and counter-examples can be found in $[5,8,10,6,26,11,15,27]$.

Also A.Fel'shtyn and co-authors formulated the second problem (a historical overview can be found in [7]): the problem of description of the class of groups having the following $R_{\infty}$ property: $R(\phi)=\infty$ for any automorphism $\phi: G \rightarrow G$. Thus, the second problem is in some sense complementary to the first one: the question about TBFT has no sense for $R_{\infty}$ groups (formally having a positive answer). The property $R_{\infty}$ was studied very intensively during the last years and was proved and disproved for many groups (see a bibliography overview in [7] and [15], and very recent papers [3, 24, 12] and the literature therein). For Jiang type spaces the property $R_{\infty}$ has some direct topological consequences (see e.g.

[^0][19]). Relations with group growth are discussed e.g. in [17]. Concerning applications of Reidemeister numbers in Dynamics we refer to [20, 4].

The $R_{\infty}$ property was studied for the lamplighter group $\mathbb{Z}_{2} w r \mathbb{Z}$ and some its generalizations being restricted wreath products with $\mathbb{Z}$ in $[18,25,24]$. In particular, in [18] it was proved that most part of groups of the form $\mathbb{Z}_{q}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}$ are not $R_{\infty}$ groups. More precisely, it is an $R_{\infty}$ group if and only if $(q, 6) \neq 0$. In contrast with this result, in [24] it is proved that the generalizations $\Gamma_{d}(q)$ of the lamplighter group always have the $R_{\infty}$ property for $d>2$ (for $d=2$ one has $\Gamma_{d}(q) \cong \mathbb{Z}_{q}$ wr $\left.\mathbb{Z}\right)$. The groups $\Gamma_{d}(q)$ admit a Cayley graph isomorphic to a Diestel-Leader graph $D L_{d}(q)$. The lamplighter group and its generalizations attracted a lot of attention recently, in particular due to its relations with automata groups, self-similar groups, and branch groups (see e.g. [1]).

For groups under consideration in the present paper, even for $k=2$, the situation is much more complicated, because $\mathbb{Z}$ has only one automorphism with finite Reidemeister number, namely - Id, and its square has infinite Reidemeister number, but for $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ we have a lot of automorphisms with finite Reidemeister numbers, and many of them have finite Reidemeister numbers for all their iterations (see, e.g. [4]).

In the present paper we prove that for any automorphism $\phi$ of the restricted wreath product $\mathbb{Z}_{2}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ (Theorem 2.3) and $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{2 d}$ (Theorem 4.1) the Reidemeister number $R(\phi)$ is infinite, i.e. these groups have the property $R_{\infty}$.

For $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{2 d+1}$ (Theorem 4.1) and $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$, where $p>3$ is prime, (Theorem 3.5) we give examples of automorphisms with finite Reidemeister numbers. So these groups do not have the property $R_{\infty}$.

For these groups and $\mathbb{Z}_{m}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}$, where $m$ is relatively prime to 6 , we prove in Theorem 5.1 the twisted Burnside-Frobenius theorem ( $\mathrm{TBFT}_{f}$ ): if $R(\phi)<\infty$, then it is equal to the number of equivalence classes of finite-dimensional irreducible unitary representations fixed by $\widehat{\phi}: \rho \mapsto \rho \circ \phi$.

This gives (probably first) examples of finitely generated residually finite but not almost polycyclic groups (having infinitely generated subgroup, [23, p. 4]), for which the TBFT is true.
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## 1. Preliminaries

The following easy statement is well known:
Proposition 1.1. Suppose, $H$ is a $\phi$-invariant normal subgroup of $G$ and $\bar{\phi}: G / H \rightarrow G / H$ is the induced automorphism. Then $\phi$ induces an epimorphism of each Reidemeister class of $\phi$ onto some Reidemeister class of $\bar{\phi}$. In particular, one has $R(\bar{\phi}) \leqslant R(\phi)$.

Denote by $C(\phi)$ the fixed point subgroup. The following much more non-trivial statement can be extracted from [16] (see also [9]):

Lemma 1.2. In the above situation $R\left(\left.\phi\right|_{H}\right) \leqslant R(\phi) \cdot|C(\bar{\phi})|$.

It is well known (see [8]) the following.
Lemma 1.3. For an abelian group $G$ the Reidemeister class of the unit element is a subgroup, and the other classes are corresponding cosets.

The following statement is very useful in the field.
Lemma 1.4. $A$ right shift by $g \in G$ maps Reidemeister classes of $\phi$ onto Reidemeister classes of $\tau_{g^{-1}} \circ \varphi$, where $\tau_{g}$ is the inner automorphism: $\tau_{g}(x)=g x g^{-1}$. In particular, $R\left(\tau_{g} \circ \phi\right)=R(\phi)$.

Proof. Indeed,

$$
x y \varphi\left(x^{-1}\right) g=x(y g) g^{-1} \varphi\left(x^{-1}\right) g=x(y g)\left(\tau_{g^{-1}} \circ \varphi\right)\left(x^{-1}\right)
$$

Also we need the following statement ([14], [11, Prop. 3.4]):
Lemma 1.5. Let $\phi: G \rightarrow G$ be an automorphism of a finitely generated residually finite group $G$ with $R(\phi)<\infty$ (in particular, $G$ can be a finitely generated abelian group). Then the subgroup of fixed elements is finite: $|C(\phi)|<\infty$.

Note, that this is not correct for infinitely generated groups, see [27].
Combining this lemma with some results of [16] one can prove:
Lemma 1.6. Suppose in the situation of Lemma 1.1 that $G / H$ is a finitely generated residually finite group. Then $R(\phi)<\infty$ if and only if $R(\bar{\phi})<\infty$ and $R\left(\tau_{g} \phi^{\prime}\right)<\infty$ for any $g \in G$.

## 2. The case of $\mathbb{Z}_{2}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$

Let $\Gamma:=\mathbb{Z}_{2}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ be a restricted wreath product. In other words,

$$
\Gamma=\oplus_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}}\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)_{(x)} \rtimes_{\alpha} \mathbb{Z}^{k}, \quad\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)_{(x)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2}, \quad \alpha(y)\left(\delta_{x}\right):=\delta_{y+x}
$$

where $y \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ and $\delta_{x}$ is a unique non-trivial element of $\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)_{(x)} \subset \Gamma$. The direct sum supposes only finitely many non-trivial components for each element (in contrast with the direct product corresponding to the (unrestricted) wreath product).

The group $\Gamma$ is a finitely generated metabelian group, in particular, residually finite (see e.g. [22]).

Let $\phi: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ be an automorphism. We will prove that $R(\phi)=\infty$. Denote $\Sigma:=$ $\oplus_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}}\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)_{(x)} \subset \Gamma$. Then $\Sigma$ is a characteristic subgroup as the torsion subgroup. Denote the restriction of $\phi$ by $\phi^{\prime}: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$, and the quotient automorphism by $\bar{\phi}: \mathbb{Z}^{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k}$.

If $R(\phi)<\infty$, then $R(\bar{\phi})<\infty$ by Proposition 1.1. Hence, by Lemma 1.5, $\bar{\phi}$ has finitely many fixed elements. Thus, by Lemma $1.2, R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)<\infty$. Hence, to prove that $R(\phi)=\infty$, it is sufficient to verify that $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)=\infty$.

Since $\Sigma$ is abelian, the results of e.g. [2] imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi^{\prime}(\alpha(g)(h))=\alpha(\bar{\phi}(g))\left(\phi^{\prime}(h)\right), \quad h \in \Sigma, \quad g \in \mathbb{Z}^{k} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Any element of $\Sigma$ is a finite sum of some elements $\delta_{x}$. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=\delta_{x(1)}+\cdots+\delta_{x(n)} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following lemma generalizes [18, Prop. 2.1] from the case $k=1$ to arbitrary $k$.

Lemma 2.1. In (2) one has $n=1$. Moreover, $\phi^{\prime}$ is a permutation of $\delta_{x}$ 's.
Proof. First of all, apply (1) to $h=\delta_{0}$. We have:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{g}\right)=\phi^{\prime}(\alpha(g)(h))=\alpha(\bar{\phi}(g))\left(\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)\right) . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, for any $g \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}$, the element $\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{g}\right)$ is obtained by the appropriate shift of indexes in the right side expression in (2).

Now suppose that $n \neq 1$, and $\phi^{\prime}(h)=\delta_{0}$ for some $h=\delta_{r(1)}+\cdots+\delta_{r(t)}$. Then $t \neq 1$, because the statement of the lemma for $\phi^{\prime}$ and its inverse are equivalent. Denote by $T \subset \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ the support of $\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)$, i.e.,

$$
T=\{x(1), \ldots, x(n)\} .
$$

Denote by $T_{1}, \ldots, T_{t}$ the supports of $\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{r(1)}\right), \ldots, \phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{r(t)}\right)$ respectively. They are appropriate distinct shifts of $T$. Denote $S:=T_{1} \cup \cdots \cup T_{t}$ (without cancellations). After cancellations in $\Sigma$ (i.e. excluding of points in $S$ covered by an even number of $T_{j}$ 's) we should obtain only one point, namely, 0 .

Introduce now the notion of $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)$-vertex $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)[R] \in R$ for any bounded subset $R \subset \mathbb{Z}^{k}$, where $\left(\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{k}\right)$ is a permutation of $(1, \ldots, k)$ and $\varepsilon_{i}= \pm 1$. We define it inductively in the following way: $R_{k-1}$ is the subset of points of $R$ with minimal (if $\varepsilon_{1}=-1$ ) or maximal (if $\varepsilon_{1}=+1$ ) coordinate number $\sigma_{1}, R_{k-2}$ is the subset of points of $R_{k-1}$ with minimal (if $\varepsilon_{2}=-1$ ) or maximal (if $\varepsilon_{2}=+1$ ) coordinate number $\sigma_{2}$, and so on. Then $R_{0}$ is one point. This point we define to be $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)[R]$. This point also can be considered as a lexicographic maximum of points of $R$ for the ordering $\sigma$ and the inverse direction of that coordinates, where $\sigma_{j}=-1$, i.e. a lexicographic maximum with respect to $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)$.

Evidently, $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)\left[T_{j}\right]$ is a $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$-shift of $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)[T]$ and $T_{j}=T_{i}$ if and only if

$$
\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)\left[T_{j}\right]=\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)\left[T_{i}\right]
$$

for at least one (thus, for any) $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)$. Hence, in our situation, they are distinct.

We claim that for any $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)$ the vertex $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)[S]$ coincides with $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)\left[T_{j}\right]$ for one and only one $j$ and is not covered by other points. Indeed, the uniqueness follows from the argument above. If it is covered by some point of $T_{j}$ other than $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)\left[T_{j}\right]$, then it would be not the lexicographic maximum w.r.t. $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)$, because $\left(\varepsilon_{1} \sigma_{1}, \varepsilon_{2} \sigma_{2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{k} \sigma_{k}\right)\left[T_{j}\right] \in S$ would be greater.

Thus no vertex will be canceled. Thus they all coincide with 0 and $S=\{0\}$. Hence, $n=r=1$.

Together with the argument at the beginning of the proof, this gives the second statement.

By this lemma, we can define $x_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ by $\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=\delta_{x_{0}}$. Equation (3) can be written now as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{y}\right)=\delta_{y^{\prime}}, \quad y^{\prime}:=\bar{\phi}(y)+x_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{k} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2.2. If $\delta_{x_{1}}$ and $\delta_{x_{2}}$ belong to the same Reidemeister class of $\phi^{\prime}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\phi}^{t}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{t-1}\left(x_{0}\right)+\cdots+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}=x_{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\phi}^{t}\left(x_{2}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{t-1}\left(x_{0}\right)+\cdots+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}=x_{1} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some integer $t$.
Proof. By Lemma 1.3, the elements $\delta_{x_{1}}$ and $\delta_{x_{2}}$ belong to the same Reidemeister class of $\phi^{\prime}$ if and only if $\delta_{x_{1}}-\delta_{x_{2}}=h-\phi^{\prime}(h)$ for some $h \in \Sigma$. Representing $h$ as $h=\delta_{u(1)}+\cdots+\delta_{u(t)}$ (with distinct summands) and applying (4) one has

$$
\delta_{x_{1}}-\delta_{x_{2}}=h-\phi^{\prime}(h)=\sum_{j=1}^{t}\left[\delta_{u(j)}-\delta_{u(j)^{\prime}}\right] .
$$

This is the same in $\Sigma$ as

$$
\delta_{x_{1}}+\delta_{x_{2}}=\sum_{j=1}^{t}\left[\delta_{u(j)}+\delta_{u(j)^{\prime}}\right] .
$$

Since all $\delta_{u(j)}$ are distinct, all $\delta_{u(j)^{\prime}}$ are distinct too, by Lemma 2.1. So the cancellation on the right can be only when $\delta_{u(j)}=\delta_{u(i)^{\prime}}$. So one of $\delta_{u(j)}$ should be equal to $\delta_{x_{1}}$, one of $\delta_{u(i)^{\prime}}$ should be equal to $\delta_{x_{2}}$ (or vice versa), and the remaining $\delta$ 's should annihilate. Thus, after the appropriate renumbering of $1, \ldots, t$, we have in the first case:

$$
x_{1}=u(1), \quad u(1)^{\prime}=u(2), \quad \ldots \quad u(t-1)^{\prime}=u(t), \quad u(t)^{\prime}=x_{2}
$$

or

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
\bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right)+x_{0} & =u(2), \\
\bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0} & =u(2)^{\prime}=u(3), \\
\bar{\phi}^{3}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0} & =u(3)^{\prime}=u(4), \\
\cdots & \cdots
\end{array}\right] . \quad \begin{aligned}
& \cdots(t)^{\prime}=x_{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In the second case we need to interchange $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ :

$$
\bar{\phi}^{t}\left(x_{2}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{t-1}\left(x_{0}\right)+\cdots+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}=x_{1} .
$$

Theorem 2.3. The group $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z}_{2}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ has the property $R_{\infty}$.
Proof. One can reduce the proof of $R(\phi)=\infty$ to the case $x_{0}=0$. Indeed, consider the element $w:=-x_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{k} \subset \Gamma$ and the corresponding inner automorphism $\tau_{w}: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$. Then by Lemma 1.4, $R\left(\tau_{w} \circ \phi\right)=R(\phi)$. On the other hand, by the definition of a semidirect product,

$$
\left(\tau_{w} \circ \phi\right)^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=\alpha(w)\left(\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)\right)=\alpha\left(-x_{0}\right)\left(\delta_{x_{0}}\right)=\delta_{0} .
$$

So, suppose $x_{0}=0$. Then (5) and (6) take the form $\bar{\phi}^{t}\left(x_{1}\right)=x_{2}$ for some integer $t$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that $\bar{\phi}: \mathbb{Z}^{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ has infinitely many orbits.

For this purpose denote by $A \in G L_{k}(\mathbb{Z})$ the matrix of $\bar{\phi}$. Let us show that each orbit intersects the first coordinate axis not more than in 2 points. Denote by $(x, 0, \ldots, 0)=x \cdot e_{1}$, $x \neq 0$, one point from the intersection, and let $\bar{\phi}^{n}\left(x \cdot e_{1}\right)=x \cdot \bar{\phi}^{n}\left(e_{1}\right)=x \cdot y \cdot e_{1}$ be another intersection point. Since $A^{n}$ as an element of $G L_{k}(\mathbb{Z})$ has the first column $\left(r_{1}, \ldots, r_{k}\right)$ such that $\operatorname{gcd}\left(r_{1}, \ldots, r_{k}\right)=1$ (because the expansion of the determinant by the first column has the form $\pm 1=r_{1} \cdot R_{1}+\cdots+r_{k} \cdot R_{k}$ ). Thus, $y= \pm 1$ and $x y= \pm x$.

## 3. The case of $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ FOR $p>3$

A part of argument in this section will be close to some argument of [18]. Suppose now that $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z}_{p} \mathrm{wr}^{\mathbb{Z}^{k}}$ for a general prime $p$. We conserve the notation $\Sigma$ for the normal subgroup $\oplus \mathbb{Z}_{p}$.

Now $\delta_{x}$ is a generator of a subgroup $A_{x}$ isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$, and $p \cdot \delta_{x}=0$. Suppose

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m_{1} \delta_{x(1)}+\cdots+m_{n} \delta_{x(n)} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then as above,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{x}\right)=m_{1} \delta_{\bar{\phi}(x)+x(1)}+\cdots+m_{n} \delta_{\bar{\phi}(x)+x(n)} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

First of all we need an analog of Lemma 2.1.
In the general situation instead of the sets $T_{j}$ we need $\left(T_{j}, s_{j} \cdot \vec{m}\right)$, which are some shifts with multiplication of $(T, \vec{m})$, where $\vec{m}=\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{n}\right)$. Fortunately (and that is why we have restricted ourselves to the prime order case) if $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}, m \neq 0$, then it generates $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$. That is why the sum of several elements with the same $T_{j(1)}=\cdots=T_{j(r)}$ either has the same support $=T_{j(1)}$ and coefficients vector $\left(m_{j(1)}+\cdots+m_{j(r)}\right) \vec{m}$, or completely annihilates, when $m_{j(1)}+\cdots+m_{j(r)}=0 \bmod p$.

So, after cancellations we may assume that all supports $T_{j}$ are distinct and repeat the remaining part of the proof of Lemma 2.1 and obtain

Lemma 3.1. If $p$ is prime, one has

$$
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m \cdot \delta_{x_{0}}
$$

for some $x_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ and $0 \neq m \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}$.
Let us note, that generally $m \neq 1$ in this situation. For example, in $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ one can take $s=m=2$ and $s m=4=1 \bmod 3$.

For other elements we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{x}\right)=m \delta_{\bar{\phi}(x)+x_{0}} . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

To calculate $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)$ we need to calculate the index of the image of $\left(1-\phi^{\prime}\right) \Sigma$ in $\Sigma$.
Suppose first that $x_{0}=0$,

$$
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{x}\right)=m \delta_{\bar{\phi}(x)}
$$

Then for any $x$ we have $\left(1-\phi^{\prime}\right)$-invariant subgroup

$$
\begin{equation*}
\cdots \oplus A_{\bar{\phi}^{-1}(x)} \oplus A_{x} \oplus A_{\bar{\phi}(x)} \oplus A_{\bar{\phi}^{2}(x)} \oplus \cdots \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

In contrast with the case $k=1$ considered in [18], the corresponding orbit of $\bar{\phi}$ can be infinite or finite, but not necessary of length 2 .

Let us note that since $\overline{\tau_{g} \phi}=\bar{\phi}$, they have the same orbit structure.
Lemma 3.2. If an orbit is infinite, then the corresponding restriction of $1-\phi^{\prime}$ on the subgroup (10) is not an epimorphism.
Proof. Indeed, under the appropriate description,
$1-\phi^{\prime}:\left(\ldots, 0,0, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{r}, 0,0, \ldots\right) \mapsto\left(\ldots, 0,-m a_{1}, a_{1}-m a_{2}, a_{2}-m a_{3}, \ldots, a_{r}, 0,0, \ldots\right)$
If $a_{1} \neq 0$ and $a_{r} \neq 0$, then $-m a_{1} \neq 0$ and the length of non-trivial part increases. Thus, elements concentrated in one summand, e.g. $\delta_{x}$, are not in the image.

If the orbit is finite of length $s$, the matrix of $\left(1-\phi^{\prime}\right)$ has the form

$$
E-M=\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 0 & \cdots & & 0 & -m  \tag{11}\\
-m & 1 & 0 & & & 0 \\
0 & -m & 1 & 0 & & \\
0 & 0 & -m & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & -m & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

and is an epimorphism if and only if its determinant is not zero (for prime $p$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det}(E-M)=1-m^{s} \not \equiv 0 \quad \bmod p \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 3.3. For a non-trivial orbit of $\bar{\phi}: \mathbb{Z}^{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k}$, there exist infinitely many orbits of the same cardinality (finite or infinite).

If $R(\bar{\phi})<\infty$ there is a unique trivial orbit.
Proof. Let $\left(r_{1}, \ldots, r_{k}\right) \neq 0$ be a point of the orbit. Since $\bar{\phi}$ as an element of $G L(\mathbb{Z}, k)$ preserves $\operatorname{gcd}\left(r_{1}, \ldots, r_{k}\right)$, the elements $\left(i \cdot r_{1}, \ldots, i \cdot r_{k}\right), i \in \mathbb{Z}, i>2$, belong to distinct orbits of the same cardinality.

If there is a non-zero fixed point $x_{*}$ of $\phi^{\prime}$, then there is an infinite series $\left\{s \cdot x_{*}\right\}, s \in \mathbb{Z}$, of fixed points. By Lemma 1.5 this contradicts to $R(\bar{\phi})<\infty$.

Lemma 3.4. If $\bar{\phi}$ has an infinite orbit, $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)=\infty$ and $R(\phi)=\infty$.
If $\bar{\phi}$ has only finite orbits, there are two possibilities:

1) $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)=R(\phi)=\infty$. This occurs if, at least for one orbit, the corresponding restriction of $1-\phi^{\prime}$ is not an epimorphism.
2) $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)=1$. This occurs if, for all orbits, the corresponding restriction of $1-\phi^{\prime}$ is an epimorphism.
If we have one of this cases for $\phi^{\prime}$, then the same is true for all $\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}$.
Proof. Let us note that $\tau_{g}=\tau_{g^{\prime}}: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ if $g^{-1} g^{\prime} \in \Sigma$, so all automorphisms $\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ are described by $g \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}$. In this case $\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}=\alpha(g) \circ \phi^{\prime}$ and the sizes of above invariant groups are the same as for $\phi^{\prime}$.
As it was explained above all possible automorphisms $\phi^{\prime}$ corresponding to a given $\bar{\phi}=$ $\overline{\tau_{g} \circ \phi}$ are completely defined by $m$ and $x_{0}$ such that $\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m \cdot \delta_{x_{0}}$, and each pair ( $m, x_{0}$ ) defines some $\phi^{\prime}$ and $\phi$. The relation

$$
\tau_{y_{0}} \circ \phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=\alpha\left(y_{0}\right) \circ \phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m \cdot \delta_{y_{0}+x_{0}}
$$

shows that all automorphisms of $\Sigma$ with the same $m$ differ from each other by an appropriate $\tau_{y_{0}}$ and vice versa.

Hence, if $\bar{\phi}$ has an infinite orbit and we take for $\phi$, some $g \in \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ such that $\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=$ $m \cdot \delta_{0}$, then there exists an appropriate invariant subgroup of $\phi^{\prime}$ (over this orbit) with a non-epimorphic restriction of $1-\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}$ (Lemma 3.2). Since we have infinitely many such orbits (Lemma 3.3) then $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)=\infty$ and $R(\phi)=\infty$.

Now we will describe the matrix form of restrictions onto invariant subgroups of an arbitrary $\phi^{\prime}$ (i.e. not necessary $x_{0}=0$ ) for the case of finite orbits of $\bar{\phi}$. Suppose, $\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m \delta\left(x_{0}\right), s$ is the length of the orbit $x_{1}, \bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, \bar{\phi}^{s-1}\left(x_{1}\right), t$ is the length of the
orbit $x_{0}, \bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right), \ldots, \bar{\phi}^{t-1}\left(x_{0}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{x_{1}}\right)=\alpha\left(\bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right)\right) \phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m \cdot \delta_{\bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right)+x_{0}}, \\
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{\bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right)+x_{0}}\right)=\alpha\left(\bar{\phi}\left(\bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right)+x_{0}\right)\right) \phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m \cdot \delta_{\bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}}, \\
\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{\bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}}\right)=\alpha\left(\bar{\phi}\left(\bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}\right)\right) \phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=m \cdot \delta_{\bar{\phi}^{3}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}}, \ldots
\end{gathered}
$$

In order to estimate the length $r$ of the underlying orbit

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1} \mapsto \bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right)+x_{0} \mapsto \bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0} \mapsto \bar{\phi}^{3}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{2}\left(x_{0}\right)+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0} \mapsto \cdots \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

remark that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y:=\bar{\phi}^{t-1}\left(x_{0}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{t-2}\left(x_{0}\right)+\cdots+x_{0}=0 . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed,

$$
\bar{\phi}(y)-y=\bar{\phi}^{t}\left(x_{0}\right)-x_{0}=0
$$

Hence, if $y \neq 0$, we have a non-trivial fixed point for $\bar{\phi}$. This contradicts $R(\bar{\phi})<\infty$ (as in the proof of Lemma 3.3).

Equality (14) and the definition of $s$ imply

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1}=\bar{\phi}^{r}\left(x_{1}\right)+\bar{\phi}^{r-1}\left(x_{0}\right)+\cdots+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}, \text { where } r=\operatorname{lcm}(s, t) . \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose now that $\bar{\phi}$ does not have infinite orbits. Then the length of any orbit is bounded by $\operatorname{lcm}\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{k}\right)$, where $l_{i}$ is the length of the orbit of the element $e_{i}$ of the standard base. More precisely, any orbit length is a divisor of $\operatorname{lcm}\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{k}\right)$. In particular, for any $s$ and $t$, as above, $r=\operatorname{lcm}(t, s)$ is a divisor of $\operatorname{lcm}\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{k}\right)$. Hence, by (15) the length $r^{\prime}$ of (13) is some divisor of $r$ and so of $\operatorname{lcm}\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{k}\right)$.

If the underlying orbit (13) does not start from the point $x_{1}=0$, one can obtain infinitely many underlying orbits by multiplying $x_{1}$ by different positive integers $j=1,2$. . More precisely, some of them can coincide, but for a sufficiently large $j$, the point $j x_{1}$ will not be an element of the orbit (13), etc. So, there is infinitely many distinct orbits. Moreover, we can find a sufficiently large $J$ such that for any $j \geqslant J$, the distances between $j x_{1}$ and $\bar{\phi}\left(j \cdot x_{1}\right)=j \cdot \bar{\phi}\left(x_{1}\right)$ are more than $x_{0}, \bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}, \ldots \bar{\phi}^{t-1}\left(x_{0}\right)+\cdots+\bar{\phi}\left(x_{0}\right)+x_{0}$. Evidently, for these orbits the length $r^{\prime}=r$ (not only a divisor of $r$ ). So among the orbits starting in $x_{1}, 2 x_{1}, \ldots$, we have infinitely many orbits of length $r$ and some finite number $<J$ of orbits of some length dividing $r$. Then the Reidemeister number of the restriction on the subgroup over the union of these orbits is finite if and only if $1-m^{r} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$. But then for any divisor $r^{\prime}$ of $r$ we have, for $r^{\prime \prime}:=r / r^{\prime}$,

$$
1-m^{r}=\left(1-m^{r^{\prime}}\right)\left(1+m^{r^{\prime}}+m^{2 r^{\prime}}+\cdots+m^{r^{\prime}-1}\right) \not \equiv 0 \quad \bmod p
$$

Hence, $1-m^{r^{\prime}} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Thus, $1-\phi^{\prime}$ is an epimorphism over the orbits from the above finite series too. In particular, for the "initial" orbit (13).

It remains to discuss the case of $x_{1}=0$. In this case the length of the orbit is $t$. Considering some $x_{1} \neq 0$ with the length of $\bar{\phi}$-orbit equal to some $s \neq 0$ we arrive as above to $1-m^{r} \not \equiv 0$ $\bmod p$, where $r=\operatorname{lcm}(s, t)$. Since $t$ divides $r=\operatorname{lcm}(s, t)$, we obtain $1-m^{t} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$ similarly to the case of $r^{\prime}$ above. Thus $1-\phi^{\prime}$ is an epimorphism over this orbit too. Hence, it is an epimorphism in entire $\Sigma$.

As it was explained in the beginning of the proof, to vary $\phi^{\prime}$ is the same as to consider various $\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}$ for a fixed $\phi^{\prime}$. This completes the proof.

Theorem 3.5. If $p>3$, we can find an authomorphism with finite Reidemeister number. Thus, $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ does not have the property $R_{\infty}$ if $p>3$.

Proof. For $p>3$ consider $\bar{\phi}=-\mathrm{Id}$. Then $R(\bar{\phi})=2^{k}$ and all non-trivial orbits are of length 2. Define $\phi^{\prime}$ by $x_{0}=0$ and some non-zero $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}$, satisfying $1-m^{2} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Take e.g. $m=2$ (cf. [18, p. 879]). Then $1-m^{2}=-3 \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for any prime $p>3$.

The intermediate case of $p=3$ will be studied in the next section and the answer will depend on parity of $k$.

## 4. The case of $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$

Theorem 4.1. The group $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ has the property $R_{\infty}$ for odd $k$ and does not have the property $R_{\infty}$ for even $k$.
Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $R(\phi)$ may be finite only if all orbits of $\bar{\phi}$ are finite.
First, note that in this case $m$ can be equal to 1 or 2 .
If $m=1$, then $1-m^{s} \equiv 0 \bmod 3$ not depending on the length $s$ of the corresponding orbit. Keeping in mind the argument from the previous section, in particular, Lemma 3.3, we obtain $R(\phi)=\infty$.

If $m=2$, then $1-m^{r} \equiv 0 \bmod 3$ for even $r$ and $1-m^{s} \not \equiv 0 \bmod 3$ for odd $r$.
Denote by $M \in G L(k, \mathbb{Z})$ the matrix of $\bar{\phi}$. Since all orbits are finite, in particular, the orbits of the elements of the standard base, we have $M^{r}=E$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}, r>1$ (see the previous section for more detail).

If $k=2 d+1$, then $\operatorname{det}(M-\lambda E)=0$ has at least one real solution $\lambda_{0}$. It must be a root of 1 of degree $r$. Thus, $\lambda_{0}= \pm 1$. If $\lambda_{0}=1$, then $\operatorname{det}(E-M)=0$ and $R(\bar{\phi})=\infty$. If $\lambda_{0}=-1$, then $r$ is even, and $\bar{\phi}$ has an orbit of even length $s=2 m$. Let $t$ be the length of the $\bar{\phi}$-orbit of $x_{0}$, where $\phi^{\prime}\left(\delta_{0}\right)=\delta_{x_{0}}$. Then, as in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we can detect infinitely many orbits of length $r=\operatorname{lcm}(s, t)$. Since $r$ is even, the restriction of $1-\phi^{\prime}$ on the subgroup, related the underlying orbit of the form (13) is not an epimorphism. Since there is infinitely many such orbits, $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)=\infty$. Then $R(\phi)=\infty$, as above.

If $k=2$, consider $M$ to be the generator $\left(\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1\end{array}\right)$ of a subgroup in $G L(2, \mathbb{Z})$ isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ (see, e.g. [21, p. 179]). For this $M, R(\bar{\phi})=\operatorname{det}(E-M)=3$. It has only orbits of length 3 (except of the trivial one). The same is true for $\underbrace{M \oplus \cdots \oplus M}_{d}$ in $\mathbb{Z}^{2 d}$ with $R(\bar{\phi})=3^{d}$. Then the lengths of all underlying orbits are some powers of 3 (except maybe of the trivial one) and $1-\phi^{\prime}$ is an epimorphism (for $\phi$ defined by this $\bar{\phi}, m=2$, and arbitrary $\left.x_{0}\right)$. As in the previous section, this means that all $\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}$ have $R\left(\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}\right)=1$ and $R(\phi)=R(\bar{\phi})<\infty$.

Remark 4.2. If $k=1$, in particular, is odd, we obtain the $R_{\infty}$ property for $\mathbb{Z}_{3} \mathrm{wr} \mathbb{Z}$. This is a particular case of [18].

## 5. Twisted Burnside-Frobenius theorem

Theorem 5.1. Suppose, $\Gamma$ is $\mathbb{Z}_{m}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}$, where $m$ is relatively prime to 6 , or $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k}$ for a prime $p>3$ and an arbitrary $k$, or $\mathbb{Z}_{3}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{2 d}$. Then the twisted Burnside-Frobenius theorem is true for $\Gamma$.

Proof. In all these cases for $\phi$ with $R(\phi)<\infty$, we have $R\left(\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}\right)=1$ (for prime cases this is proved in Lemma 3.4, for $\mathbb{Z}_{m}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}$ a similar statement can be easily extracted from the proof of Theorem 2.3 in [18]).

Evidently, $\{h\}_{\phi^{\prime}} \subset\{h\}_{\phi}, h \in \Sigma$. Thus, $R\left(\phi^{\prime}\right)=1$ implies that only one Reidemeister class of $\phi$ is mapped onto the class $\{e\}_{\bar{\phi}}$. By Lemma $1.4 R\left(\tau_{g} \circ \phi^{\prime}\right)=1$ implies the same for other classes $\{g\}_{\bar{\phi}}$. Thus, $\pi: \mathbb{Z}_{p}$ wr $\mathbb{Z}^{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{k}$ induces a bijection of Reidemeister classes, or, speaking geometrically, the Reidemeister classes of $\phi$ are cylinders over Reidemeister classes of $\bar{\phi}$. Then $R=R(\phi)=R(\bar{\phi})=\# \operatorname{Fix}(\widehat{\bar{\phi}})$, because the TBFT is true for an automorphism of a finitely generated Abelian group (see [4]). If $\rho_{1}, \ldots, \rho_{R}$ are these representations, then $\rho_{1} \circ \pi, \ldots, \rho_{R} \circ \pi$ are some pairwise non-equivalent $\widehat{\phi}$-fixed representations of $\Gamma$. Then $R(\phi) \leqslant$ \# $\operatorname{Fix}(\widehat{\phi})$. The opposite inequality is always true ([9, The proof of Theorem 5.2]).

An alternative argument is to see that, since the classes are cylinders, the dimension of the space of shifts of indicator functions of Reidemeister classes of $\phi$ is the same as for $\bar{\phi}$, and in particular, is finite. Then the $\mathrm{TBFT}_{f}$ follows from Lemma 3.8 of [9].
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