

## A NOTE ON $G$ -INVARIANT FORMS

STEPHEN M. GAGOLA, JR.

(Communicated by Ronald Solomon)

**ABSTRACT.** If  $G$  is a finite group, the reduction mod  $p$  of a module supporting a nondegenerate  $G$ -invariant form need not itself support such a form. However, under a suitable hypothesis on the splitting field (quadratic closure) and a carefully chosen lattice within the module (for reduction mod  $p$ ), this will always be the case. The argument given is elementary and self-contained.

Let  $K \supseteq R \rightarrow F$  be a “ $p$ -modular system” for the finite group  $G$ . That is,  $R$  is a valuation domain with maximal ideal  $P$ , field of fractions  $K$ , and residue class field  $F$  where  $K$  and  $F$  are splitting fields for  $G$  in characteristics 0 and  $p$  respectively. Thus, every (finitely generated)  $KG$ -module  $V$  contains an  $RG$ -lattice  $V_0$ , that is, an  $R$ -free, finitely generated  $RG$ -submodule of  $V$  which generates  $V$  as a  $K$ -space. Necessarily,  $\text{rank}_R V_0 = \dim_K V$  holds for any such  $V_0$ . Suppose now  $V$  is an irreducible  $KG$ -module affording the “real-valued” character  $\chi$  (that is,  $\chi(g) = \chi(g^{-1})$  for  $g \in G$ ). Then  $V$  supports a nondegenerate symmetric or alternating  $G$ -invariant form  $(, )$  and it is natural to ask whether some reduction mod  $p$  has this property. Specifically, this asks for the existence of an  $RG$ -lattice  $V_0 \subseteq V$  with  $R$ -basis  $\{v_i\}$  so that the Gram matrix  $((v_i, v_j))$  has entries in  $R$  and has determinant a unit of  $R$ . This last condition of course implies that  $(, )$  induces a nondegenerate  $G$ -invariant form on the  $FG$ -module  $\overline{V}_0 = V_0/PV_0$ .

Let  $\text{OChar}(G)$  and  $\text{OBr}(G)$  denote the set of ordinary characters and Brauer characters afforded by  $G$ -modules supporting a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form. Similarly, define  $\text{SkChar}(G)$  and  $\text{SkBr}(G)$  for the case of alternating forms. Let  $\chi'$  denote the restriction of  $\chi \in \text{Char}(G)$  to  $p$ -regular elements. A consequence of an affirmative answer to the question of the first paragraph is that the function  $\chi \mapsto \chi'$  sends  $\text{OChar}(G)$  to  $\text{OBr}(G)$  and  $\text{SkChar}(G)$  to  $\text{SkBr}(G)$ . However, these weaker assertions are already proven in [3] when  $R$  is a discrete valuation domain. (The argument is also outlined in [4].)

In fact, the proof in the DVR case amounts to finding an  $RG$ -lattice  $V_0$  in  $V$  so that  $(, )$  restricted to  $V_0$  takes on values in  $R$  and induces a form on  $\overline{V}_0$  whose radical  $\overline{V}_0^\perp$  relative to this induced form is an  $FG$ -submodule which possesses a nondegenerate  $G$ -invariant form of the same type as  $(, )$ .

Received by the editors May 27, 1994; a preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 22nd OSU-Denison Mathematics Conference in March 1994.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 20C15.

*Key words and phrases*.  $G$ -invariant forms,  $RG$ -lattice, reduction mod  $p$ .

The question of the first paragraph essentially asks whether  $V_0$  can always be chosen as above so that  $\overline{V}_0^\perp = 0$ . The answer depends on the choice of  $p$ -modular system, which the main result of this paper shows.

**Theorem.** *Let  $K \supseteq R \rightarrow F$  be a  $p$ -modular system for  $G$  with  $K$  quadratically closed. If  $V$  is any  $KG$ -module and  $(\ , \ )$  is a nondegenerate symmetric or alternating  $G$ -invariant form on  $V$ , then an  $RG$ -lattice  $V_0 \subseteq V$  can always be found satisfying  $(V_0, V_0) \subseteq R$  and  $\overline{V}_0^\perp = 0$ .*

The result above is not always true (nor even desirable) for other choices of  $p$ -modular systems. For example, in establishing the basic structure of a  $p$ -block of defect 1 (in particular, in establishing the uniserial nature of  $RG$ -lattices contained in simple  $KG$ -modules) it appears necessary to work with representations over “ $p$ -minimal” fields (as defined in Goldschmidt’s book [2]). In that setting, suppose  $\overline{V}_0$  is the reduction mod  $p$  of an  $RG$ -lattice in a simple module in a block of defect 1, and assume  $\overline{V}_0$  supports a nondegenerate  $G$ -invariant form. Suppose also  $\overline{V}_0$  has two real-valued irreducible Brauer constituents. If  $M \leq \overline{V}_0$  is a maximal locally isotropic submodule, then  $M^\perp/M$  is semisimple of composition length 2, violating the uniseriality of  $\overline{V}_0$ . (Explicit examples are easy to construct. Let  $G = S_3$  be the smallest nonabelian group and  $p = 3$ , and let  $V$  be the  $QG$ -module corresponding to the faithful irreducible character. In this case,  $R \subseteq G$  is the ring of 3-local integers. Then  $\overline{V}_0$  can never support a nondegenerate  $G$ -invariant form for any choice of  $V_0 \subseteq V$ .)

On the other hand, there are settings in which it is desirable to find  $V_0 \subseteq V$  satisfying  $(V_0, V_0) \subseteq R$  and  $\overline{V}_0^\perp = 0$ . For example, if  $p$  is odd and if  $O(W)$  denotes the full orthogonal group of a vector space over  $K$  or  $F$  relative to some nondegenerate symmetric form, then  $O(W)$  has a double cover. Hence, if  $\rho: G \rightarrow O(W)$  is any orthogonal representation of  $G$ , then the pull-back along  $\rho$  determines a double cover of  $G$ . The cohomology class of this cover depends only on the character afforded by  $W$ , and we have functions  $h: O\text{Char}(G) \rightarrow H^2(G, \{\pm 1\})$  and  $h: O\text{Br}(G) \rightarrow H^2(G, \{\pm 1\})$ . If now  $\chi \in O\text{Char}(G)$  is afforded by  $V$  and if  $V_0 \subseteq V$  can be chosen so that  $(V_0, V_0) \subseteq R$  with  $\overline{V}_0^\perp = 0$ , then the equality  $h(\chi) = h(\chi')$  becomes transparent. This result is Theorem 6.2 of [1], except now (with the right hypothesis on the  $p$ -modular system) the existence of the special lattice  $V_0 \subseteq V$  is already guaranteed and need not appear as a hypothesis.

Following [4], it is convenient to introduce the following notation. Let

$$\mathcal{L}(V) = \{V_0 | V_0 \text{ is an } R\text{-sublattice of } V\}$$

where  $V$  is a finite-dimensional  $K$ -space. If  $(\ , \ )$  is a nondegenerate form on  $V$  the collection of integral lattices is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(V) = \{V_0 \in \mathcal{L}(V) | (V_0, V_0) \subseteq R\},$$

while if  $V$  is also a  $KG$ -module, set

$$\mathcal{L}_G(V) = \{V_0 \in \mathcal{L}(V) | V_0 \text{ is } G\text{-invariant}\}.$$

Finally, set

$$\mathcal{L}_{G, \text{int}}(V) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(V) \cap \mathcal{L}_G(V).$$

In the presence of a nondegenerate form, the dual  $L^*$  of a lattice  $L$  in  $\mathcal{L}(V)$  is defined by  $L^* = \{x \in V | (x, L) \subseteq R\}$  and, by considering dual bases,  $L^* \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ . Evidently  $L \subseteq L^*$  if and only if  $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(V)$ .

For the purposes of this note, call a lattice  $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(V)$  “ $c$ -homogeneous” if the Gram matrix of this form computed with respect to some (hence any)  $R$ -basis of  $L$  has the form  $c \cdot U$  for some nonsingular matrix  $U$  over  $R$  whose inverse also has entries in  $R$ . Notice that by consideration of dual bases we have  $L^* = \frac{1}{c}L$  for  $c$ -homogeneous lattices (and  $L^*$  is  $\frac{1}{c}$ -homogeneous).

It is convenient to start with an elementary lemma (which is essentially the Gram-Schmidt process).

**Lemma.** *Let  $(, )$  be a nondegenerate form defined on the  $K$ -space  $V$ , and let  $L$  be any integral  $R$ -sublattice of  $V$ . Then there exists an orthogonal decomposition of  $L$  as*

$$L = W_1 \perp W_2 \perp \dots \perp W_k$$

where each  $W_i$  is  $c_i$ -homogeneous for some  $c_i \neq 0$  and  $R \supseteq (c_1) \supseteq (c_2) \supseteq \dots \supseteq (c_k)$ .

*Proof.* The set  $(L, L) \subseteq R$  is an ideal of  $R$  which is finitely generated (by the entries of the Gram matrix with respect to some basis) and so it is principally generated, say by  $c_1 \in R$ . Let  $(, )'$  denote the form  $\frac{1}{c_1}(, )$ . Then  $(, )'$  induces a nonzero form on  $\bar{L} = L/PL$ , whose radical  $\bar{L}^\perp$  therefore is proper in  $\bar{L}$ . Write  $d = \dim_F \bar{L}/\bar{L}^\perp$  and choose  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d \in L$  so that the natural image of  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d\}$  in  $\bar{L}/\bar{L}^\perp$  is an  $F$ -basis. If  $W_1 = \sum_{i=1}^d Rv_i$ , then the original form restricted to  $W_1$  is nondegenerate, and  $W_1$  is  $c_1$ -homogeneous by construction. Thus, if  $\{v_1^*, v_2^*, \dots, v_d^*\}$  denotes the dual basis of  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d\}$  in  $KW_1$ , then  $v_i^* \in \frac{1}{c_1}W_1$  for every  $i$ . Hence, if  $x \in L$ , then  $(x, v_i)v_i^* \in W_1$  for each  $i$ , so that  $x' = x - \sum(x, v_i)v_i^*$  belongs to  $L$  and  $(x', W_1) = 0$ . This shows  $L = W_1 \perp Y$  where  $Y = \{x \in L | (x, W_1) = 0\}$ .

This construction may be continued in the  $R$ -submodule  $Y$ , producing the decomposition of the lemma, as required.  $\square$

Notice that if  $L = W_1 \perp W_2 \perp \dots \perp W_k$  as in the lemma, then

$$L^* = \frac{1}{c_1}W_1 \perp \frac{1}{c_2}W_2 \perp \dots \perp \frac{1}{c_k}W_k.$$

It is possible to refine the decomposition so that  $\text{rank}_R(W_i) \leq 2$  for all  $i$  and even  $\text{rank}_R(W_i) = 1$  in the symmetric case when  $p$  is odd.

*Proof of Theorem.* If  $L \in \mathcal{L}_{G, \text{int}}(V)$  define  $r(L)$  to be the rank over  $F$  of the matrix obtained from the Gram matrix of  $(, )$  by reducing the entries mod  $P$ . Select  $L \in \mathcal{L}_{G, \text{int}}(V)$  so that  $r(L)$  is maximal, and let  $L = W_1 \perp W_2 \perp \dots \perp W_k$  be the decomposition of  $L$  as in the previous lemma. We may clearly assume, using the notation of that lemma, that each inclusion  $(c_{i+1}) \subset (c_i)$  is strict. If  $(c_1) \neq R$ , then  $r(L) = 0$ ,  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{c_1}}L \in \mathcal{L}_{G, \text{int}}(V)$  and  $r(\frac{1}{\sqrt{c_1}}L) > 0$ , for a contradiction. If  $(c_k) \neq R$  let  $V_1 = L + \sqrt{c_k}L^* \in \mathcal{L}_G(V)$ . Then  $V_1 = X_1 \perp X_2 \perp \dots \perp X_k$ , where

$$X_i = W_i + \frac{\sqrt{c_k}}{c_i}W_i = \begin{cases} W_i & \text{if } \sqrt{c_k} \in (c_i), \\ \frac{\sqrt{c_k}}{c_i}W_i & \text{if } \sqrt{c_k} \notin (c_i). \end{cases}$$

Clearly,

$$(X_i, X_i) = (W_i, W_i) = (c_i) \subseteq R \quad \text{if } \sqrt{c_k} \in (c_i)$$

while

$$(X_i, X_i) = \left( \frac{\sqrt{c_k}}{c_i} W_i, \frac{\sqrt{c_k}}{c_i} W_i \right) = \frac{c_k}{c_i^2} (c_i) \subseteq R \quad \text{if } \sqrt{c_k} \notin (c_i).$$

This proves that  $V_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{G, \text{int}}(V)$ , and at the same time  $(X_i, X_i) = R$  for both  $i = 1$  and  $k$ . As each  $X_i$  is homogeneous we conclude that  $r(V_1) \geq \text{rank}_R(X_1) + \text{rank}_R(X_k) > \text{rank}_R(X_1) = r(L)$ , for another contradiction.

Thus  $(c_i) = R$  for all  $i$ , proving the theorem.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

1. S. M. Gagola, Jr. and S. C. Garrison, III, *Real characters, double covers, and the multiplier*. II, *J. Algebra* **98** (1986), 38–75.
2. D. M. Goldschmidt, *Lectures on character theory*, Publish or Perish, Berkeley, CA, 1980.
3. D. Quillen, *The Adams conjecture*, *Topology* **10** (1971), 67–80.
4. J. G. Thompson, *Bilinear forms in characteristic  $p$  and the Frobenius-Schur indicator*, *Group Theory (Beijing 1984)*, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. 1185, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1985, pp. 221–230.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, KENT, OHIO 44242

*E-mail address:* gagola@mcs.kent.edu