



# Perverse Equivalences and Broué's Conjecture

David A. Craven

University of Oxford

University of Bristol, 29th September, 2010

# Notation and Conventions

Throughout this talk,

- $G$  is a finite group,
- $\ell$  is a prime,
- $K$  is a field of characteristic  $\ell$ ,
- $P$  is a Sylow  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $G$ , and
- $Q$  is a general  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $G$ .

I will (try to) use **red** for definitions and **green** for technical bits that can be ignored.

This talk is joint work with Raphaël Rouquier.

## From $\mathbb{C}$ -representations to $K$ -representations

Maschke's theorem says that every  $\mathbb{C}$ -representation of a finite group  $G$  is a sum of simple representations. This is equivalent to  $\mathbb{C}G$  being a direct sum of matrix algebras, each of degree that of a representation, with one  $\mathbb{C}G$ -module associated to each matrix algebra.

If  $K = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_\ell$  (with  $\ell \mid |G|$ ) then this is not true. However, write  $KG$  as a sum of indecomposable 2-sided ideals, called **blocks**. Each indecomposable  $KG$ -module is associated to a block, but this time **more than one**  $KG$ -module is associated to a given block (in general). If an indecomposable module is associated to a block  $B$ , then so are all of its composition factors. Hence every block has at least one simple module associated to it.

The number of simple  $KG$ -modules in a block  $B$  is denoted  $\ell(B)$ .

# Representation Theory is Local

The deepest and most difficult conjectures in representation theory tend to relate the representation theory of  $G$  in characteristic  $\ell$  with that of  $(\ell\text{-})$ local subgroups  $N_G(Q)$ , where  $Q$  is an  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $G$ .

To every block is attached a **defect group**  $D$  (an  $\ell$ -subgroup of  $G$  up to conjugacy), which ‘controls’ the representation theory of  $B$ . The local conjectures are localized further to relate  $B$  with a block  $b$  of  $KN_G(D)$ , called the **Brauer correspondent**.

**Alperin’s weight conjecture** gives a precise conjecture about the number of simple  $B$ -modules,  $\ell(B)$ , in terms of local information. If  $D$  is abelian, the conjecture reduces to

$$\ell(B) = \ell(b).$$

## Broué's Conjecture

[ $B$  is a block of  $KG$ , defect group  $D$ ,  $b$  its Brauer correspondent in  $N_G(D)$ .]

If  $D$  is abelian, Alperin's weight conjecture states that

$$\ell(B) = \ell(b);$$

is there a structural/geometric reason for  $B$  and  $b$  having the same number of simple modules?

### Conjecture (Broué, 1990)

*Let  $G$  be a finite group, and let  $B$  be a  $\ell$ -block of  $G$  with abelian defect group  $D$ . Let  $b$  be the Brauer correspondent in  $N_G(D)$ . Then  $B$  and  $b$  are derived equivalent.*

# When Is Broué's Conjecture Known?

Broué's conjecture is known for quite a few groups:

- $A_n, S_n$  (Chuang–Rouquier, Marcus);
- $GL_n(q), \ell \nmid q$  (Chuang–Rouquier);
- $D$  cyclic,  $C_2 \times C_2$  (Rouquier, Erdmann, Rickard);
- $G$  finite,  $\ell = 2, B$  **principal**;
- $G$  finite,  $\ell = 3, |P| = 9, B$  principal (Koshitani, Kunugi, Miyachi, Okuyama, Waki);
- $SL_2(q), \ell \mid q$  (Chuang, Kessar, Okuyama);
- various low-rank Lie type groups  $L(q)$  with  $\ell \nmid q$  and sporadic groups. (Okuyama, Holloway, Robbins, etc.)

# The Principal Block

If  $B_1, \dots, B_r$  are the blocks of  $KG$ , then the simple  $KG$ -modules are exactly the union of the simple  $B_i$ -modules.

The block contributing the trivial module is called the **principal block**, and denoted by  $B_0(KG)$ . Its defect group is always the Sylow  $\ell$ -subgroup  $P$ , so its Brauer correspondent is a block of  $KN_G(P)$ .

Theorem (Brauer's third main theorem)

*The Brauer correspondent of  $B_0(KG)$  is  $B_0(KN_G(P))$ .*

Thus if we are considering principal blocks, we need to relate the principal block of  $KG$  with the principal block of  $KN_G(P)$ .

## Principal Blocks Are Good

In representation theory, one standard method of proof is to reduce a conjecture to finite simple groups and then use their classification. In general, there is no (known) reduction of Broué's conjecture to simple groups, but for principal blocks there is.

### Theorem

*Let  $G$  be a finite group, and suppose that  $P$  is abelian. Then there are normal subgroups  $H \leq L$  such that*

- $\ell \nmid |H|$ ,
- $\ell \nmid |G : L|$ , and
- $L/H$  is a direct product of simple groups and an abelian  $\ell$ -group.

For **principal** blocks, we may assume that  $H = 1$ . A derived equivalence for  $L$  (compatible with automorphisms of the simple components) passes up to  $G$ . Thus if Broué's conjecture for principal blocks holds for all simple groups, it holds for all groups.



# How Do You Find Derived Equivalences?

There are four main methods to prove that  $B$  and  $b$  are derived equivalent.

- 1 **Okuyama deformations**: using many steps, deform the **Green correspondents of the** simple modules for  $B$  into the simple modules for  $b$ . This works well for small groups.
- 2 **Rickard's Theorem**: randomly find complexes in the derived category of  $b$  related to the **Green correspondents of the** simple modules for  $B$ , and if they 'look' like simple modules (**i.e., Homs and Exts behave nicely**) then there is a derived equivalence  $B \rightarrow b$ .
- 3 **More structure**: if  $B$  and  $b$  are more closely related (say **Morita** or **Puig** equivalent) then they are derived equivalent. More generally, find another block  $B'$  for some other group, an equivalence  $B \rightarrow B'$ , and a (previously known) equivalence  $B' \rightarrow b$ .
- 4 **Perverse equivalence**: build a derived equivalence up step by step in an algorithmic way.

# What is a Perverse Equivalence?

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be finite-dimensional algebras,  $\mathcal{A} = \text{mod-}A$ ,  $\mathcal{B} = \text{mod-}B$

An equivalence  $F : D^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{B})$  is **perverse** if there exist

- orderings on the simple modules  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r$ ,  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_r$ , and
- a function  $\pi : \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$

such that, if  $\mathcal{A}_i$  denotes the **Serre subcategory** generated by  $S_1, \dots, S_i$ , and  $D_i^b(\mathcal{A})$  denotes the subcategory of  $D^b(\mathcal{A})$  with support modules in  $\mathcal{A}_i$ , then

- $F$  induces equivalences  $D_i^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D_i^b(\mathcal{B})$ , and
- $F[\pi(i)]$  induces an equivalence  $\mathcal{A}_i/\mathcal{A}_{i-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_i/\mathcal{B}_{i-1}$ .

Note that  $\text{mod-}B$  is determined, up to equivalence, by  $A$ ,  $\pi$ , and the ordering of the  $S_j$ .

# What is a Perverse Equivalence?

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be finite-dimensional algebras,  $\mathcal{A} = \text{mod-}A$ ,  $\mathcal{B} = \text{mod-}B$

An equivalence  $F : D^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{B})$  is **perverse** if there exist

- orderings on the simple modules  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r$ ,  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_r$ , and
- a function  $\pi : \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$

such that, for all  $i$ , the composition factors of  $H^{-j}(F(S_i))$  are  $S_j$  for  $j < i$  for  $j \neq \pi(i)$  and  $S_j$  for  $j \leq i$  for  $j = \pi(i)$ .

In other words, the cohomology of  $F(S_i)$  only involves  $S_j$  for  $j < i$ , except for one copy of  $S_j$  in degree  $-\pi(i)$ .

## Benefits of a Perverse Equivalence

The perverse equivalence is 'better' than a general derived equivalence.

- Has an underlying geometric interpretation (for Lie-type groups).
- The  $\pi$ -function 'comes from' Lusztig's  $A$ -function (so is approximately known).
- There is an algorithm that gives us a perverse equivalence from  $B_0(KN)$  to **some** algebra, so only need to check that the target is  $B_0(KG)$ . (This is simply checking that the Green correspondents are the last terms in the complexes.)

This algorithm is very useful!

## An Example

Let  $G = M_{11}$ ,  $\ell = 3$ .

$\pi$	Ord. Char.	$S_1$	$S_3$	$S_7$	$S_2$	$S_4$	$S_6$	$S_5$
0	1	1						
2	10		1					
3	10			1				
4	16	1	1		1			
5	11	1			1	1		
6	44			1	1	1	1	
7	55	1	1		1	1	1	1
	10							1
	16	1				1		1

The cohomology of the complexes gives the rows of the decomposition matrix.

## Which Groups Have Perverse Equivalences?

- All groups,  $D$  cyclic or  $C_2 \times C_2$
- $\mathrm{PSL}_3(q)$ ,  $\ell = 3 \mid (q - 1)$ ,  $P$  abelian
- $\mathrm{PSL}_4(q)$ ,  $\mathrm{PSL}_5(q)$ ,  $\ell = 3 \mid (q + 1)$ ,  $P = C_3 \times C_3$
- $\mathrm{PSU}_3(q)$ ,  $\ell = 3 \mid (q + 1)$ ,  $P$  abelian
- $\mathrm{PSU}_4(q)$ ,  $\mathrm{PSU}_5(q)$ ,  $\ell = 3 \mid (q - 1)$
- $\mathrm{PSp}_4(q)$ ,  $\ell = 3 \mid (q - 1)$  or  $(q + 1)$ ,  $P = C_3 \times C_3$
- (almost)  $\mathrm{PSp}_8(q)$ ,  $\ell = 5 \mid (q^2 + 1)$ ,  $P = C_5 \times C_5$
- (almost)  $\Omega_8^+(q)$ ,  $\ell = 5 \mid (q^2 + 1)$ ,  $P = C_5 \times C_5$
- $G_2(q)$ ,  $\ell = 5 \mid (q + 1)$ ,  $P = C_5 \times C_5$
- $S_6$ ,  $A_7$ ,  $A_8$ ,  $\ell = 3$  ( $A_6$  does not)
- $M_{11}$ ,  $M_{22}.2$ ,  $M_{23}$ ,  $HS$ ,  $\ell = 3$  ( $M_{22}$  does not)
- $\mathrm{SL}_2(8)$ ,  $J_1$ ,  ${}^2G_2(q)$ ,  $\ell = 2$  in two steps
- $S_n$ ,  $A_n$ ,  $\mathrm{GL}_n(q)$  in multiple steps

# An Example: $\mathrm{PSL}_3(q)$ , $\ell = 3$ , $3 \mid (q + 1)$ , $P = C_3 \times C_3$

$\pi$	Ord. Char	$S_1$	$S_5$	$S_2$	$S_3$	$S_4$
0	1	1				
2	$q(q + 1)$	1	1			
3	$(q + 1)(q^2 + q + 1)/3$	1	1	1		
3	$(q + 1)(q^2 + q + 1)/3$	1	1		1	
3	$(q + 1)(q^2 + q + 1)/3$	1	1			1

		$H^{-3}$	$H^{-2}$	$H^{-1}$	Total
$X_5$ :	$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(234) \rightarrow C_5 \rightarrow 0.$		$1/5$	11	$5 - 1$
$X_2$ :	$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(34) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow 0.$	$1/5/2$	1		$2 - 5$
$X_3$ :	$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(3) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(24) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow C_3 \rightarrow 0.$	$1/5/3$	1		$3 - 5$
$X_4$ :	$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(23) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow C_4 \rightarrow 0.$	$1/5/4$	1		$4 - 5$

# An Example: $\mathrm{PSp}_4(q)$ , $\ell = 3$ , $3 \mid (q + 1)$ , $P = C_3 \times C_3$

$\pi$	Ord. Char	$S_1$	$S_5$	$S_2$	$S_3$	$S_4$
0	1	1				
3	$q(q-1)^2/2$		1			
3	$q(q^2+1)/2$	1		1		
3	$q(q^2+1)/2$	1			1	
4	$q^4$	1	1	1	1	1

$$X_5 : 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(234) \rightarrow M_{4,1} \oplus M_{4,2} \rightarrow C_5 \rightarrow 0.$$

$$X_2 : 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(3) \oplus M_{1,2} \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

$$X_3 : 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(3) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(2) \oplus M_{1,1} \rightarrow C_3 \rightarrow 0.$$

$$X_4 : 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(23) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow C_4 \rightarrow 0.$$



# An Example: $\mathrm{PSL}_4(q)$ , $\ell = 3$ , $3 \mid (q + 1)$ , $P = C_3 \times C_3$

$\pi$	Ord. Char.	$S_1$	$S_2$	$S_5$	$S_3$	$S_4$
0	1	1				
3	$q(q^2 + q + 1)$	1	1			
4	$q^2(q^2 + 1)$		1	1		
5	$q^3(q^2 + q + 1)$	1	1	1	1	
6	$q^6$	1			1	1

$$X_2 : \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(3) \oplus M_{1,2} \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

$$X_5 : \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(345) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(234) \oplus M_{4,1} \rightarrow M_{4,1} \oplus M_{4,2} \rightarrow C_5 \rightarrow 0.$$

$$X_3 : \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(3) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(34) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(45) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(5) \oplus M_{1,1} \rightarrow M_{1,1} \oplus M_{1,2} \rightarrow C_3 \rightarrow 0.$$

$$X_4 : \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(4) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(3) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(3) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(4) \rightarrow M_{4,2} \rightarrow C_4 \rightarrow 0.$$

## Some Remarks

- Since  $\pi(-)$ , the ordering and the first category determine the perverse equivalence, it is a very compact way of defining a (type of) derived equivalence.
- Computationally, this reduces finding a derived equivalence to finding the Green correspondents of the simple modules for  $G$ , a much simpler task.
- For groups of Lie type, it seems as though the complexes above do not really depend on  $\ell$ , and only on  $d$ , where  $\ell \mid \Phi_d(q)$ . It might be possible to use these perverse equivalences to prove real results in this direction.

# Complex Reflection Groups

Generically, the automizer  $H$  of a  $\Phi_d$ -torus in a group of Lie type is a complex reflection group with  $|H|$  and  $\Phi_d(q)$  coprime. The action of  $H$  on the torus gives a representation of  $H$  over  $\mathbb{F}_\ell^n$  for  $\ell \mid \Phi_d(q)$ .

It is believed (but not proved) that this representation is invariant of  $\ell$  and  $q$ , and only dependent on  $d$  and  $G$  (maybe even only on  $H$  !)

The principal block of the normalizer is Morita equivalent to the group algebra of  $kN_G(P)/O_{\ell'}(C_G(P))$ , which is  $\mathbb{F}_\ell^n \rtimes H$ .

This focuses attention on (in particular complex reflection) groups acting on  $\mathbb{F}_\ell$ -modules  $M$ , and  $M \rtimes H$ .

## $\ell$ -Extended Finite Groups

Let  $H$  be a finite group, and let  $\rho$  be a faithful complex representation of  $H$ . It is well known that there exists an algebraic number field  $K$ , with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_K$ , such that  $H \leq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathcal{O})$  and this induces  $\rho$ .

Let  $\ell \nmid |H|$  be a prime such that the map  $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_\ell$  induces a faithful representation of  $H$  over  $\mathbb{F}_\ell$  via  $\rho$ . Write  $M$  for the  $\mathbb{F}_\ell H$ -module, and  $G_\ell = M \rtimes H$ .

- $k(G_\ell)$  is a polynomial in  $\ell$ , and  $k(G_\ell) \cdot |H|$  is a monic polynomial in  $\ell$  with integer coefficients.
- If  $H$  is a reflection group and  $\rho$  is its natural representation over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , then the second coefficient of  $k(G_\ell) \cdot |H|$  is  $3N$ , where  $N$  is the number of reflections in  $H$ . (A similar formula exists for complex reflection groups.)