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Abstract

Let \( b \) be a block with normal abelian defect group and abelian inertial quotient. We prove that every Morita auto-equivalence of \( b \) has linear source. We note that this improves upon results of Zhou and Boltje, Kessar and Linckelmann. We also prove that \( \text{Picent}(b) \) is trivial which is conjectured to be the case for all blocks.

1 Introduction

Let \( p \) be a prime, \((K, \mathcal{O}, k)\) a \( p \)-modular system with \( k \) algebraically closed and \( b \) a block of \( \mathcal{O}H \), for a finite group \( H \). We always assume that \( K \) contains all \( |H|^{th} \) roots of unity. The Picard group \( \text{Pic}(b) \) of \( b \) consists of isomorphism classes of \( b \)-bimodules which induce \( \mathcal{O} \)-linear Morita auto-equivalences of \( b \). For \( b \)-bimodules \( M \) and \( N \), the group multiplication is given by \( M \otimes_b N \). \( \mathcal{T}(b) \) (respectively \( \mathcal{L}(b), \mathcal{E}(b) \)) will denote the subgroup \( \text{Pic}(b) \) of \( \mathcal{O}(H \times H) \)-modules with trivial (respectively linear, endopermutation) source.

There are many open problems concerning Picard groups. It is conjectured that \( \text{Pic}(b) \) is finite and in particular that \( \text{Pic}(b) = \mathcal{E}(b) \). Our main result (see Theorem 6.3) is as follows:

**Theorem.** Let \( b \) be a block with a normal abelian defect group and abelian inertial quotient, then \( \text{Pic}(b) = \mathcal{E}(b) \).

We note that this improves upon a result of Zhou [12, Theorem 14]. Zhou proves that if \( b = \mathcal{O}(D \rtimes E) \), where \( D \) is an abelian \( p \)-group and \( E \) is an abelian \( p' \)-group of \( \text{Aut}(D) \), then \( \text{Pic}(b) = \mathcal{E}(b) \). We can also compare with a result of Boltje, Linckelmann and Kessar [1 Proposition 4.3], where it is assumed in addition that \([D, E] = D \) but the result is that \( \text{Pic}(b) = \mathcal{T}(b) \). Note that this result follows immediately from Corollary 6.4.
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We denote by \( \text{Picent}(b) \) the subgroup of \( \text{Pic}(b) \) consisting of Morita auto-equivalences that fix every character of \( b \). There are no known examples of blocks \( b \) where \( \text{Picent}(b) \) is not trivial. Our second theorem (see Theorem 6.5) is:

**Theorem.** Let \( b \) be a block with a normal abelian defect group and abelian inertial quotient, then \( \text{Picent}(b) \) is trivial.

The following notation will hold throughout this article. If \( H \) is a finite group then a block \( b \) of \( H \) will always mean a block of \( O_H \). We set \( \text{Irr}(H) \) (respectively \( \text{IBr}(H) \)) to be the set of ordinary irreducible (respectively irreducible Brauer) characters of \( H \) and \( \text{Irr}(b) \subseteq \text{Irr}(H) \) (respectively \( \text{IBr}(b) \subseteq \text{IBr}(H) \)) the set of ordinary irreducible (respectively irreducible Brauer) characters lying in the block \( b \). If \( N \trianglelefteq H \) and \( \chi \in \text{Irr}(N) \), then we denote by \( \text{Irr}(H,\chi) \) the set of irreducible characters of \( H \) appearing as constituents of \( \chi^H \). Similarly we define \( \text{Irr}(b,\chi) := \text{Irr}(b) \cap \text{Irr}(H,\chi) \). \( 1_H \in \text{Irr}(H) \) will designate the trivial character of \( H \). We use \( e_b \in O_H \) to denote the block idempotent of \( b \). Similarly if \( H \) is a \( p' \)-group and \( \psi \in \text{Irr}(H) \), then we use \( e_\psi \in O_H \) to signify the block idempotent corresponding to \( \psi \). Finally we set \( [h_1, h_2] := h_1^{-1} h_2^{-1} h_1 h_2 \) for \( h_1, h_2 \in H \).

The article is organised as follows. In §2 we establish some preliminaries about abelian \( p' \)-groups acting on abelian \( p \)-groups. We introduce a particular block with normal abelian defect group and abelian inertial quotient in §3. §4 is concerned with perfect isometries and how they relate to our main theorem. In §5 we study the specific case of a block with one simple module in greater detail and our main theorem is proved in §6.

### 2 Abelian \( p' \)-groups acting on abelian \( p \)-groups

**Definition 2.1.** Let \( H \) be a finite abelian \( p' \)-subgroup of \( \text{Aut}(P) \), for some abelian \( p \)-group \( P \). We say \( H \) *acts* on \( P \). If there exists a non-trivial direct decomposition \( P \cong P_1 \times P_2 \) such that \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) are both \( H \)-invariant, then we say \( H \) acts decomposably on \( P \). Otherwise we say \( H \) acts indecomposably on \( P \).

**Remark 2.2.** Note that by [5, §3, Theorem 3.2] we need only require \( P_1 \) to be \( H \)-invariant in the above definition. Note also that [5, §5, Theorem 2.2] says that if \( H \) acts indecomposably on \( P \), then \( P \) is necessarily homocyclic.

The following is proved in [5, Theorem 2.3].

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( H \) act on \( P \). If we form the semi-direct product \( P \rtimes H \) and define \( [P,H] \) and \( C_P(H) \) accordingly, then \( P = [P,H] \times C_P(H) \).

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( H \) act on \( P \). The natural action of \( H \) on \( \text{Irr}(P) \) has a fixed point if and only if its action on \( P \) does.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.3 \( P = [P,H] \times C_P(H) \). Therefore, if \( P \) has a fixed point we can certainly construct some fixed point of \( \text{Irr}(P) \). The converse follows since we can identify the action of \( H \) on \( P \) with that of \( H \) on \( \text{Irr}(P) \). \( \square \)
We denote by $\Phi(P)$ the Frattini subgroup of $P$.

**Lemma 2.5.** Say $H$ acts indecomposably on $P \cong (C_{p^n})^m$, for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have an induced action of $H$ on $P/\Phi(P) \cong (C_{p^n})^m$ and this action is also indecomposable.

Proof. The fact that we have an induced action follows from [5, §5, Theorem 1.4]. Assume $H$ acts decomposably on $P/\Phi(P)$. Let $g \in P\setminus\Phi(P)$ be such that $g\Phi(P)$ is contained in a non-trivial $H$-invariant direct factor of $P/\Phi(P)$ and consider the smallest $H$-invariant subgroup $Q$ of $P$ containing $g$. Certainly $\{1\} < Q < P$ and $Q \nsubseteq \Phi(P)$ and so by Remark 2.5 there exists some $H$-invariant homocyclic direct factor $Q'$ of $Q$ also satisfying $\{1\} < Q' < P$ and $Q' \nsubseteq \Phi(P)$. So $Q' \cong C_{p^m}^r$ for some $1 \leq m' < n$. In particular $Q'$ is an $H$-invariant direct factor of $P$. Again by Remark 2.2, this contradicts the indecomposability of the action of $H$ on $P$. □

**Lemma 2.6.** Let $H$ be a finite abelian $p'$-group acting indecomposably on $P \cong (C_{p^n})^m$, for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.

1. $H$ is cyclic and if $g$ is a generator of $H$ then $g$ has $m$ distinct eigenvalues

$$\{\lambda = \lambda_0^m, \lambda_1^m, \ldots, \lambda_{m-1}^m\},$$

as a linear transformation of $k \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} P/\Phi(P)$.

2. Any non-trivial $g\Phi(P) \in P/\Phi(P)$ has trivial stabiliser in $H$.

3. The actions of $H$ on $k \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} P/\Phi(P)$ and $J(kP)/J^2(kP)$ are isomorphic.

Proof. Certainly $g^p - 1 \in J^2(kP)$ for any $g \in P$ and so the natural group homomorphism $P \to P/\Phi(P)$ induces an isomorphism

$$J(kP)/J^2(kP) \to J(k(P/\Phi(P)))/J^2(k(P/\Phi(P))).$$

Therefore, since by Lemma 2.5 we have an indecomposable action of $H$ on $P/\Phi(P)$, we assume for the remainder of the proof that $P$ is elementary abelian.

1. We identify $P$ with $\mathbb{F}_p^m$ and view $H$ as a subgroup of $G := \text{GL}_m(\mathbb{F}_p)$. Let $g$ be an element of maximal order in $H$. We factorise the characteristic polynomial of $g$ into irreducible factors $f_1(X)^{n_1} \ldots f_s(X)^{n_s}$ in $\mathbb{F}_p[X]$, where $f_i(X)$ and $f_j(X)$ are coprime for $i \neq j$. We first note that

$$\{v \in \mathbb{F}_p^m | f_1(g)v = 0\}$$

is a non-trivial $H$-invariant subspace of $\mathbb{F}_p^m$. Therefore, since $H$ acts indecomposably, we must have $f_1(g) = 0$, in particular $s = 1$ and $f_1(X)$ has degree $d := m/n_1$. It follows that $o(g)|(p^d - 1)$ and $d$ is the smallest integer satisfying this condition, where $o(g)$ is the order of $g$. Then $C_G(g) \cong \text{GL}_{n_1}(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $g$ is represented in $C_G(g)$ by the scalar matrix
with \( \lambda \)'s on the diagonal for some \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{p^d} \) a root of \( f_1(X) \) (see for example \cite[Proposition 1A]{example}).

Certainly \( o(h)|o(g) \) for each \( h \in H \leq C_G(g) \) and so the characteristic polynomial of \( h \) in \( C_G(g) \) must factorise into linear factors. As for \( g \), the characteristic polynomial of \( h \) in \( C_G(g) \), must be the power of an irreducible polynomial. Therefore, \( h \) is also a scalar matrix in \( C_G(g) \) and, since \( o(h)|o(g) \), it must be a power of \( g \) proving \( H \) is cyclic. In particular, \( \mathbb{F}_p^m \) decomposes into the direct sum of \( n_1 \) \( H \)-invariant subspaces and so \( n_1 = 1 \). This proves the first part of the lemma.

2. Note that \( h \in H \leq \text{GL}_m(\mathbb{F}_p) \) has 1 as an eigenvalue if and only if \( h = 1 \).

In other words \( \text{CH}(x) = \{1\} \) for any \( x \in \text{P/}\{1\} \).

3. To prove the final claim we note that the action of \( H \) on \( k \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \text{P} \) is isomorphic to that on \( \text{J}(k\text{P})/\text{J}^2(k\text{P}) \) via

\[
k \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \text{P} \to \text{J}(k\text{P})/\text{J}^2(k\text{P})
\]

\[
x \mapsto 1 - x,
\]

for each \( x \in \text{P} \).

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 2.7.** Let \( H \) act on \( \text{P} \) and \( \psi \in \text{Aut}(\text{P}) \) such that, for all \( g \in \text{P} \), \( g \) is conjugate to \( \psi(g) \) via an element of \( H \). Then \( \psi \in H \).

**Proof.** Let’s first assume that \( \text{P} \) is elementary abelian. Since \( H \) is an abelian \( p' \)-group, we can decompose

\[
k \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \text{P} \cong \bigoplus_i V_i,
\]

where each \( V_i \) is a 1-dimensional \( kH \)-module. In particular, \( k \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \psi \) acts as a scalar, say \( \lambda_i \), on each \( V_i \). Now for each \( i \) let \( 0 \neq v_i \in V_i \). Then there must exist some \( h \in H \) such that

\[
(\lambda_1 v_1, \lambda_2 v_2, \ldots) = \psi(v_1, v_2, \ldots) = h(v_1, v_2, \ldots) = (hv_1, hv_2, \ldots).
\]

Therefore, \( \psi \) is induced by \( h \) as required.

For the general case we may assume that \( \psi \) induces the trivial automorphism of \( \text{P}/\Psi(\text{P}) \). Decompose \( \text{P} = P_1 \times \cdots \times P_n \) so that \( \text{E}/\text{C}_H(P_i) \) acts indecomposably on each \( P_i \). Let \( g_i \in \text{P}/\Psi(P_i) \), for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and set \( g := (g_1, \ldots, g_n) \in \text{P} \). By part (2) of Lemma 2.6 \( \text{C}_H(g\Psi(\text{P})) = \bigcap_i \text{C}_H(P_i) = \{1\} \). Therefore, any \( h \in H \) such that \( \psi(g) = hgh^{-1} \) must be trivial. So \( \psi \) is trivial on \( \text{P}/\Psi(\text{P}) \) and hence on all of \( \text{P} \).  \[ \square \]
We continue with the hypotheses of Lemma 2.6. Set
\[ J_{O}(P) := \left\{ \sum_{g \in P} \alpha_g g \mid \sum_{g \in P} \alpha_g = 0 \right\} = (1 - g_1, \ldots, 1 - g_m) \triangleleft OP, \]
where \( P = \langle g_1 \rangle \times \cdots \times \langle g_m \rangle \). Set
\[ J_{O,2}(P) := \{ x \in J_{O}(P) \mid 1 \otimes x \in J^2(kP) \text{ in } kP \cong k \otimes_O OP \}. \]
Since \( \{1 - g_1, \ldots, 1 - g_m\} \) is a basis for \( J(kP)/J^2(kP) \) we have
\[ J_{O}(P)/J_{O,2}(P) := \{a_1(1 - g_1) + \cdots + a_m(1 - g_m) \mid a_i \in (OP)^\times \text{ for at least one } i\}. \]

**Lemma 2.8.** Let \( x \in J_{O}(P) \), then \( x^{p^n} = py \), for some \( y \in J_{O}(P) \). If, in addition, \( p = 2 \), \( n = 1 \) and \( x \in J_{O}(P)/J_{O,2}(P) \), then \( y \in J_{O}(P)/J_{O,2}(P) \).

**Proof.** Let
\[ x = a_1(1 - g_1) + \cdots + a_m(1 - g_m). \]
for \( a_i \in OP \). Then
\[ (a_1(1 - g_1) + \cdots + a_m(1 - g_m))^{p^n} \equiv (a_1(1 - g_1))^{p^n} + \cdots + (a_m(1 - g_m))^{p^n} \mod pJ_{O,2}(P). \]
By calculating in \( \mathbb{F}_p P \) we have that
\[ (1 - g_i)^{p^n} - 1 + g_i + g_i^2 + \cdots + g_i^{p^n} - 1 + p\mathbb{Z}P, \]
for each \( 1 \leq i \leq m \). Therefore \((1 - g_i)^{p^n} \in p(1 - g_i)OP \) and the first claim follows. If \( p = 2 \) and \( n = 1 \), then \((1 - g_i)^2 = 2(1 - g_i) \) and so
\[ (a_1(1 - g_1) + \cdots + a_m(1 - g_m))^2 \equiv 2a_1^2(1 - g_1) + \cdots + 2a_m^2(1 - g_m) \mod 2J_{O,2}(P) \]
and the second claim follows from the comments preceding the Lemma. \( \square \)

**3 \( O(D \rtimes E) \) and its characters**

We set the following notation that will hold for the rest of the article. Let \( D \) be an abelian \( p \)-group, \( E \) a \( p' \)-group and \( Z \leq E \) a central, cyclic subgroup such that \( L := E/Z \) is abelian. Let \( L \) act on \( D \) set \( G := D \rtimes E \) through this action. We study the block \( B := OE_{\varphi} \), where \( \varphi \) is a faithful character of \( Z \). Set \( D_1 := [D, E] \) and \( D_2 := C_D(E) \). By Lemma 2.3 we have \( D = D_1 \times D_2 \).

Before we go on to describe the irreducible characters of \( B \) we focus on \( \text{Irr}(E, \varphi) \).
Lemma 3.1.

1. If $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$, then there exists $\theta \in \text{Irr}(E, 1_Z)$ such that $\chi_1 \otimes \theta = \chi_2$.

2. $\varphi$ extends in $[Z(E) : Z]$ different ways to $Z(E)$. Moreover, there is a bijection

\[ \text{Irr}(Z(E), \varphi) \to \text{Irr}(E, \varphi) \]

\[ \psi \mapsto \chi_\psi, \]

where $\psi \uparrow^E = \chi_\psi^\oplus_n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, if $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ and $\theta \in \text{Irr}(E, 1_Z)$, then $\chi \otimes \theta = \chi$ if and only if $\theta \in \text{Irr}(E, 1_{Z(E)})$.

Proof.

1. Let $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$. Then

\[ \chi \otimes (1_Z \uparrow^E) = (\chi \downarrow_Z \otimes 1_Z) \uparrow^E = (\varphi \otimes \chi(1) \otimes 1_Z) \uparrow^E = (\varphi \uparrow^E) \otimes \chi(1). \]

Since every element of $\text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ appears as a constituent of $\varphi \uparrow^E$ and $1_Z \uparrow^E$ only has constituents in $\text{Irr}(E, 1_Z)$, the claim follows.

2. Since $Z(E)$ is abelian, the first statement is clear. Now for all $g \in E$

\[ \sum_{h \in E/C_E(g)} h^{-1} g h e_\varphi = \sum_{h \in E/C_E(g)} g g^{-1} h^{-1} g h e_\varphi \]

\[ = \sum_{h \in E/C_E(g)} g \varphi([g, h]) e_\varphi = g \sum_{h \in [g, E]} \varphi(h) e_\varphi. \]

Since $\varphi$ is faithful, this is zero unless $g \in Z(E)$. In other words $Z(K E e_\varphi) = K Z(E) e_\varphi$. So $e_\varphi$ are all the character idempotents of $K E e_\varphi$, as $\psi$ ranges over $\text{Irr}(Z(E), \varphi)$. Setting $\chi_\psi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ to be such that $e_\chi_\psi = e_\psi$, the claim follows by considering the $K E e_\varphi$-module $K E e_\psi = K E e_\chi_\psi$, for all $\psi \in \text{Irr}(Z(E), \varphi)$.

Let $\psi \in \text{Irr}(Z(E), \varphi)$ and $\theta \in \text{Irr}(E, 1_Z)$, then

\[ \psi \uparrow^E \otimes \theta = (\psi \otimes \theta \downarrow_{Z(E)}) \uparrow^E \]

and $\psi \otimes \theta \downarrow_{Z(E)} = \psi$ if and only if $\theta \in \text{Irr}(E, 1_{Z(E)})$. The final claim now follows from the previous paragraph.

We now describe the irreducible characters of $B$. Let $\lambda \in \text{Irr}(D)$ and set $E_\lambda \leq E$ to be the stabiliser of $\lambda$ in $E$. Choose $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda, \varphi)$ and define $(\lambda, \chi) \in \text{Irr}(D \rtimes E_\lambda)$ by

\[ (\lambda, \chi)(gh) = \lambda(g) \chi(h), \]

for $g \in D$ and $h \in E_\lambda$. Note that $\ker(\lambda) \rtimes E_\lambda$ is a normal subgroup of $D \rtimes E_\lambda$ and so we can uniquely extend $\lambda$ to a character of $D \rtimes E_\lambda$ with kernel $\ker(\lambda) \rtimes E_\lambda$. $(\lambda, \chi)$ is just this extension tensored with the inflation of $\chi$ to $D \rtimes E_\lambda$. 
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Lemma 3.2.

1. The irreducible characters of $B$ are precisely of the form $(\lambda, \chi)^G$ for some $\lambda \in \text{Irr}(D)$ and $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda, \varphi)$.

2. $(\lambda_1, \chi_1)^G = (\lambda_2, \chi_2)^G$ if and only if exists $h \in E$ such that $\lambda_1^h = \lambda_2$ and $\chi_1^h = \chi_2$.

Proof.

1. Let $\lambda \in \text{Irr}(D)$. Certainly $(\lambda, \chi) \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda, \lambda)$, for every $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda)$.

Moreover,

$$\dim_K(K(D \rtimes E_\lambda)e_\lambda) = |E_\lambda| = \sum_{\chi \in E_\lambda} \chi(1) = \sum_{\chi \in E_\lambda} (\lambda, \chi)(1)^2$$

$$= \dim_K \left( \bigoplus_{\chi \in E_\lambda} KE_\lambda e \chi_{(\lambda, \chi)} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Irr}(E_\lambda, \lambda) = \{(\lambda, \chi) | \chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda)\}.$$

It now follows from [7, Theorem 6.11(b)] that

$$\text{Irr}(G) = \{(\lambda, \chi)^G | \lambda \in \text{Irr}(D), \chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda)\}.$$

The claim follows by noting that $(\lambda, \chi)^G \in \text{Irr}(B)$ if and only if

$$[E : E_\lambda] \chi(e_\varphi) = (\lambda, \chi)^G (e_\varphi) \neq 0.$$

2. If $\lambda_1^h = \lambda_2$ and $\chi_1^h = \chi_2$, for some $h \in E$, then

$$(\lambda_2, \chi_2)^G = (\lambda_1, \chi_1)^h^G = (\lambda_1, \chi_1)^h^G = (\lambda_1, \chi_1)^G.$$

Conversely if $(\lambda_1, \chi_1)^G = (\lambda_2, \chi_2)^G$, then, by restricting both sides to $D$ and considering irreducible constituents, $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ must be conjugate by an element of $E$ and so we may assume that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. Now $(\lambda_1, \chi_1)$ is the unique irreducible character of $D \rtimes E_{\lambda_1}$ lying between $\lambda_1$ and $(\lambda_1, \chi_1)^G$ and the same statement for $(\lambda_2, \chi_2)$. Therefore, $(\lambda_1, \chi_1) = (\lambda_2, \chi_2)$ and restricting both sides to $E_{\lambda_1} = E_{\lambda_2}$ yields that $\chi_1 = \chi_2$.

\square

For a finite group $H$, we write $H_p'$ for the set of $p$-regular elements of $H$.

Lemma 3.3.
1. There is a bijection

\[ \text{Irr}(E, \varphi) \to \text{IBr}(B) \]
\[ \chi \mapsto \psi \chi, \]
where \( \psi \chi(g) = \text{Inf}^G_E(\chi)(g) \), for all \( g \in G' \) and \( \text{Inf}^G_E \) denotes the inflation of a character from \( E \) to \( G \).

2. Through this bijection we can identify the decomposition map

\[ \mathbb{Z} \text{Irr}(B) \to \mathbb{Z} \text{IBr}(B) \]

with the restriction map

\[ \mathbb{Z} \text{Irr}(B) \to \mathbb{Z} \text{Irr}(E, \varphi). \]

Proof.

1. Every simple \( kG \)-module must have \( D \) in its kernel and the decomposition map is a bijection on \( p' \)-groups, so we can associate a unique irreducible character of \( E \) to each irreducible Brauer character of \( G \). The first part then follows from the fact that an irreducible Brauer character \( \psi \) of \( G \) is in \( B \) if and only if its restriction to \( Z \) is \( \varphi \oplus \psi(1) \).

2. Every \( \chi \in \text{Irr}(B) \) restricted to \( Z \) is \( \varphi \oplus \chi(1) \) and so the restriction map is well-defined. The claim now follows by noting that irreducible Brauer characters of \( B \) are completely determined by their restriction to \( E \).

\[ \square \]

Corollary 3.4. Given any Morita auto-equivalence of \( B \) with corresponding permutation \( \sigma \) of \( \text{Irr}(B) \), there exists a unique permutation \( \sigma_{\text{Br}} \) of \( \text{Irr}(E, \varphi) \) that, when we extend to a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear endomorphism of \( \mathbb{Z} \text{Irr}(E, \varphi) \), satisfies

\[ \sigma(\chi) \downarrow_E = \sigma_{\text{Br}}(\chi \downarrow_E), \]

for all \( \chi \in \text{Irr}(B) \).

Proof. The existence of such a \( \sigma_{\text{Br}} \) is just the statement that any Morita auto-equivalence permutes \( \text{IBr}(B) \), which we identify with \( \text{Irr}(E, \varphi) \) via Lemma 3.3. The uniqueness follows from the fact that every element of \( \text{Irr}(E, \varphi) \) inflates to an element of \( \text{Irr}(B) \).

\[ \square \]

By Lemma 3.3 we may decompose \( D = [D, Z(E)] \times C_D(Z(E)). \)

Lemma 3.5. The subset of irreducible characters of \( B \) that reduce to some number of copies of the same irreducible Brauer character is \( \text{Irr}(B, 1_{[D, Z(E)]}) \).
Lemma 3.6. Let \( \lambda \in \text{Irr}(D) \) and \( \chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda, \varphi) \). Note that, by part (1) of Lemma 3.3, \( (\lambda, \chi)^{\uparrow G} \) reduces to some number of copies of the same Brauer character if and only if \( (\lambda, \chi)^{\uparrow G}_{| E} = \chi^{\uparrow E} \) is the sum of some number of the same irreducible character. Next, since \([D, Z(E)]\) is normal in \( G \), \( (\lambda, \chi)^{\uparrow G} \in \text{Irr}(B, 1_{[D, Z(E)]}) \) if and only if \( \lambda \in \text{Irr}(D, 1_{[D, Z(E)]}) \).

As \( D = [D, Z(E)] \times C_D(Z(E)) \), Lemma 2.4 implies that \( \lambda \in \text{Irr}(D, 1_{[D, Z(E)]}) \) if and only if \( Z(E) \leq E_\lambda \), which by part (2) of Lemma 3.1, happens if and only if \( \chi^{\uparrow E} \) is the sum of some number of the same irreducible character.

Before proceeding we note that if \( \omega \in \mathbb{C} \) is a primitive \( (p^n)^{\text{th}} \)-root of unity then
\[
\prod_{i=0}^{p^n-1} (X - \omega^i) = (X^{p^n} - 1)/(X^{p^n-1} - 1) = \sum_{i=0}^{p^n-1} X^{ip^n-1} \in \mathbb{Q}[X].
\]

In particular,
\[
\prod_{i=0, p \mid i}^{p^n-1} (1 - \omega^i) = p
\]
and so \( 1 - \omega \in p\mathcal{O} \) if and only if \( \omega = 1 \) or \( p = 2 \) and \( \omega = -1 \).

The final lemma of this section is rather technical and will not be used until \[\text{[6]}\]. We set \( \mathcal{O}_p := \mathcal{O}/p\mathcal{O} \) and \( \mathcal{O}_I := \mathcal{O}/I \), where \( I := J \cdot p\mathcal{O} \) for \( J \) the unique maximal ideal of \( \mathcal{O} \). Recall from \[\text{[2]}\] that we denote by \( \Phi(P) \) the Frattini subgroup of \( P \), for a finite abelian \( p \)-group \( P \).

Lemma 3.6. Let \( \lambda \in \text{Irr}(D) \) and \( \chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda, \varphi) \).

1. If \( p \) is odd, then there exists an \( \mathcal{O} \)-free \( \mathcal{O}G \)-module \( V \) affording \( (\lambda, \chi)^{\uparrow G} \) with \( g \) acting as the identity on \( \mathcal{O}_p \otimes \mathcal{O} V \), for all \( g \in D_1 \), if and only if \( \lambda \downarrow_{D_1} = 1_{D_1} \).

2. Let \( p = 2 \).

   (a) There exists an \( \mathcal{O} \)-free \( \mathcal{O}G \)-module \( V \) affording \( (\lambda, \chi) \) with \( g \) acting as the identity on \( \mathcal{O}_2 \otimes \mathcal{O} V \), for all \( g \in D_1 \), if and only if \( \lambda \downarrow_{\Phi(D_1)} = 1_{\Phi(D_1)} \).

   (b) There exists an \( \mathcal{O} \)-free \( \mathcal{O}G \)-module \( V \) affording \( (\lambda, \chi)^{\uparrow G} \) with \( g \) acting as the identity on \( \mathcal{O}_1 \otimes \mathcal{O} V \), for all \( g \in D_1 \), if and only if \( \lambda \downarrow_{D_1} = 1_{D_1} \).

Proof.

1. If such a \( V \) exists then certainly \( \lambda(g) \equiv 1 \mod p \) for all \( g \in D_1 \). However, \( 1 - \omega \in p\mathcal{O} \) for some \( p^{\text{th}} \)-power root of unity \( \omega \in \mathcal{O} \) if and only if \( \omega = 1 \). Therefore \( \lambda = 1_{D_1} \). Conversely suppose \( \lambda = 1_{D_1} \) and let \( U \) be an \( \mathcal{O} \)-free \( \mathcal{O}(D \times E_\lambda) \)-module affording \( (\lambda, \chi) \). Certainly \( g \) acts as the identity on \( \mathcal{O}_p \otimes \mathcal{O} U \), for all \( g \in D_1 \) and therefore setting \( V := U^{\uparrow G} \) proves the claim.
2. (a) The argument is identical for the $p = 2$ case except that $1 - \omega \in 2\mathcal{O}$ for some 2nd-power root of unity $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$ if and only if $\omega = \pm 1$. Therefore, such a $V$ exists if and only if $\lambda(g) = \pm 1$ for all $g \in D_1$. In other words if and only if $\lambda_{\Phi(D_1)} = 1_{\Phi(D_1)}$.

(b) Again the result follows from the fact that $1 - \omega \in I$ for some 2nd-power root of unity $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$ if and only if $\omega = 1$ (now $1 - (-1) \notin I$).

\[ \square \]

4 Perfect isometries

Let $H$ be a finite group and $b$ a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. We write $\text{prj}(b)$ for the set of characters of projective indecomposable $b$-modules.

**Definition 4.1** (\cite{2}). We denote by $\text{CF}(H, b, K)$ the $K$-subspace of class functions on $H$ spanned by $\text{Irr}(b)$, by $\text{CF}(H, b, \mathcal{O})$ the $\mathcal{O}$-submodule

\[ \{ \chi \in \text{CF}(H, b, K) : \chi(h) \in \mathcal{O} \text{ for all } h \in H \} \]

of $\text{CF}(H, b, K)$ and by $\text{CF}_p(H, b, \mathcal{O})$ the $\mathcal{O}$-submodule

\[ \{ \phi \in \text{CF}(H, b, \mathcal{O}) : \chi(h) = 0 \text{ for all } h \in H \setminus H_p' \} \]

of $\text{CF}(H, b, \mathcal{O})$.

Let $H'$ be another finite group and $b'$ a block of $\mathcal{O}H'$. A perfect isometry between $b$ and $b'$ is an isometry

\[ I : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}(b) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}(b'), \]

such that

\[ I_K := K \otimes \mathbb{Z} I : K \text{Irr}(b) \rightarrow K \text{Irr}(b'), \]

induces an $\mathcal{O}$-module isomorphism between $\text{CF}(H, b, \mathcal{O})$ and $\text{CF}(H', b', \mathcal{O})$ and also between $\text{CF}_p(H, b, \mathcal{O})$ and $\text{CF}_p(H', b', \mathcal{O})$. (Note that by an isometry we mean an isometry with respect to the usual inner products on $\mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}(b)$ and $\mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}(b')$. In particular, for all $\chi \in \text{Irr}(b)$, $I(\chi) = \pm \chi'$ for some $\chi' \in \text{Irr}(b')$).

**Remark 4.2.** An alternative way of phrasing the condition that $I_K$ induces an isomorphism between $\text{CF}_p(H, b, \mathcal{O})$ and $\text{CF}_p(H', b', \mathcal{O})$ is that $I$ induces an isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}\text{prj}(b) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{prj}(b')$.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let $\sigma$ be a permutation of $\text{Irr}(B)$ induced by a Morita auto-equivalence of $B$. Then there exists $\theta \in \text{Irr}(D_2)$ such that

\[ \sigma(1_D, \chi) = \psi_\chi \otimes \theta, \]

for all $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$, where $\psi_\chi \in \text{Irr}(D_1 \times E, \varphi)$. 
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Proof. Let’s fix some $\xi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ and define $\theta \in \text{Irr}(D_2)$ by

$$\sigma(1_D, \xi) = \psi_\xi \otimes \theta,$$

where $\psi_\xi \in \text{Irr}(D_1 \rtimes E, \varphi)$.

Let $D' \triangleleft D_1 \rtimes E$ be properly contained in $D_1$ and maximal with respect to these two conditions. Define $E' \leq E$ to be the subgroup inducing the identity on $D_1/D'$. In particular, $D_1/D'$ is elementary abelian and $E/E'$ acts indecomposably on $D_1/D'$. Therefore, by part (1) of Lemma 2.6, $E/E'$ is cyclic and, by part (2) of the same Lemma and Lemma 2.4, $E'$ is the stabiliser in $E$ of any non-trivial character of $D_1/D'$ inflated to $D_1$.

Let $\tau \in \text{Irr}(E', \varphi)$ and consider

$$(1_{D_1} \times D_2, \tau) \in \text{Irr}((D_1 \times D_2) \rtimes E').$$

Since $(D_1 \times D_2) \rtimes E' \triangleleft D \rtimes E'$,

$$(1_{D_1} \times D_2, \tau)^G = (1_{D_1} \times D_2, \tau)^{D \rtimes E'} \uparrow_{D_1 : D'} \text{CF}(G, B, \mathcal{O}).$$

We claim that the set of $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ that satisfy (1) is closed under tensoring with elements of $\text{Irr}(E, 1_{E'})$. Note that if $\tau \uparrow^E$ is irreducible then $\tau \uparrow^E$ (and by part (1) of Lemma 3.1 every character of $\text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$) is fixed under tensoring with elements of $\text{Irr}(E, 1_{E'})$ and there is nothing to prove. So let’s assume $\tau \uparrow^E$ is reducible.

A direct calculation gives

$$(1_{D_1} \times D_2, \tau)^G = \sum_{\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \tau)} (1_D, \chi) + \sum_{1_D \neq \lambda \in \text{Irr}(D, 1_{D_1} \times D_2)} (\lambda, \tau)^G.$$

We define $\sigma_{Br}$ as in Corollary 3.4 and set $X := \sigma_{Br}(\text{Irr}(E, \tau))$. Now

$$\sigma(1_D, \chi) \downarrow_{D_1 \times E} = \theta_\xi \otimes \zeta,$$

for all $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \tau)$, where $\zeta := \sigma_{Br}(\chi)$ and $\theta_\xi \in \text{Irr}(D_2)$. Furthermore, since $E/E'$ is cyclic,

$$\sigma((\lambda, \tau)^G) \downarrow_{E} = \sigma_{Br}((\lambda, \tau)^G \downarrow_{E}) = \sigma_{Br}(\tau^E) = \sum_{\eta \in X} \eta,$$

for all $1 \neq \lambda \in \text{Irr}(D, 1_{D_1} \times D_2)$. So

$$\sigma((\lambda, \tau)^G) = (\lambda_\sigma, \zeta_{\lambda_\sigma})^G = (\lambda_\sigma, \zeta_{\lambda_\sigma} \uparrow_{D_1 \times E} \otimes \lambda_{\sigma, 2}) \text{ and } \zeta_{\lambda_\sigma} \uparrow_{E} = \sum_{\eta \in X} \eta,$$

for some $\lambda_\sigma \in \text{Irr}(D)$, where $\lambda_\sigma = \lambda_{\sigma, 1} \otimes \lambda_{\sigma, 2}$, for $\lambda_{\sigma, 1} \in \text{Irr}(D_1)$, $\lambda_{\sigma, 2} \in \text{Irr}(D_2)$ and $\zeta_{\lambda_\sigma} \in \text{Irr}(E_{\lambda_\sigma}, \varphi)$. In particular,

$$\sigma((\lambda, \tau)^G)(g(e_{\zeta_1} - e_{\zeta_2})) = 0,$$

for some $\lambda_\sigma \in \text{Irr}(D)$, where $\lambda_\sigma = \lambda_{\sigma, 1} \otimes \lambda_{\sigma, 2}$, for $\lambda_{\sigma, 1} \in \text{Irr}(D_1)$, $\lambda_{\sigma, 2} \in \text{Irr}(D_2)$ and $\zeta_{\lambda_\sigma} \in \text{Irr}(E_{\lambda_\sigma}, \varphi)$. In particular,

$$\sigma((\lambda, \tau)^G)(g(e_{\zeta_1} - e_{\zeta_2})) = 0.$$
for all $g \in D_2$ and $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2 \in X$. Now \[2, \text{Théorème 1.2}\] implies that $\sigma$ induces a perfect self-isometry of $B$. So plugging $g(e_{\zeta_1} - e_{\zeta_2})$ into $\sigma$ applied to (3) and applying (2), (4) and (5) gives

$$\theta_{\zeta_1}(g)\zeta_1(e_{\zeta_1}) - \theta_{\zeta_2}(g)\zeta_2(e_{\zeta_2}) \in [D_1 : D']O,$$

for all $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2 \in X$ and $g \in D_2$. Now part (1) of Lemma 3.1 and the fact that $E$ is a $p'$-group imply that $\zeta_1(e_{\zeta_1}) = \zeta_2(e_{\zeta_2}) \in O^\times$. Therefore,

$$\theta_{\zeta_1}(g) - \theta_{\zeta_2}(g) \in [D_1 : D']O.$$

It follows from the comments preceding Lemma 3.6 that $\theta_{\zeta_1}(g) = \theta_{\zeta_2}(g)$ unless $[D_1 : D'] = 2$. However, if $[D_1 : D'] = 2$ then $E' = E$ and there is nothing to prove. Since $g \in D_2$ was arbitrary, $\theta_{\zeta_1} = \theta_{\zeta_2}$. It follows from (4) that

$$\sigma(1_{D_1}, \chi_1) = \psi_{\chi_1} \otimes \theta_{\zeta_1} \text{ and } \sigma(1_{D_1}, \chi_2) = \psi_{\chi_2} \otimes \theta_{\zeta_2},$$

for some $\psi_{\chi_1}, \psi_{\chi_2} \in \text{Irr}(E_1 \times E, \varphi)$, where $\sigma_{Br}(\chi_1) = \zeta_1$ and $\sigma_{Br}(\chi_2) = \zeta_2$. So we have proved that if (11) holds for one $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ it holds for all of them. Since the choice of $\tau \in \text{Irr}(E', \varphi)$ was arbitrary we have proved that the set of $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ satisfying (11) is closed under tensoring with elements of $\text{Irr}(E, 1_{E'})$.

In the final part of the proof we prove that the intersection of all possible choices for $E'$ is $Z$. We will have then proved that the set of $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$ that satisfy (11) is closed under tensoring with elements of $\text{Irr}(E, 1_{E'})$. By part (1) of Lemma 3.1 we will then be done.

Let’s decompose

$$D_1 = Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_t,$$

where $E/C_E(Q_i)$ acts indecomposably on $Q_i$. Now Lemma 2.5 implies that $E/C_E(Q_i)$ also acts indecomposably on each $Q_i/\Phi(Q_i)$. In particular,

$$\prod_{j \neq i} Q_j \times \Phi(Q_i)$$

is a valid choice for $D'$ and $C_E(Q_i)$ a valid choice for $E'$. Finally, by the definition of $Z$,

$$\bigcap_i C_E(Q_i) = C_E(D_1) = C_E(D) = Z$$

and the proof is complete. $\square$

## 5 Blocks with one simple module

Throughout this section we assume that $B$ has, up to isomorphism, a unique simple module. By part (1) of Lemma 3.3 and part (2) of Lemma 3.1 this
implies that $Z = Z(E)$. For each $g \in L$ we define

$$\phi_g : L \to Z$$

$$h \mapsto [\tilde{g}, \tilde{h}],$$

where $\tilde{g}$ and $\tilde{h}$ represent lifts to $E$ of $g$ and $h$ respectively. Note it is easy to check that $\phi_g$ is a well-defined group homomorphism.

**Lemma 5.1.**

$$L \to \text{Hom}(L, \mathcal{O}^\times)$$

$$g \mapsto \varphi \circ \phi_g$$

is an isomorphism of groups.

**Proof.** This is just [6, Lemma 4.1] and its proof. \qed

We now introduce some further notation. First decompose

$$D = P_1 \times \cdots \times P_n,$$

where $E/C(E(P_i))$ acts on each $P_i$ indecomposably and $P_i \cong (C_{p^{n_i}})^{m_i}$. We choose this decomposition such that

$$D_1 = P_1 \times \cdots \times P_t$$

and

$$D_2 = P_{t+1} \times \cdots \times P_n,$$

for some $1 \leq t \leq n$. In particular, $m_i = 1$ for all $i > t$. We set $r := \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$. We now state and prove a partial analogue of [6, Corollary 4.3] over $\mathcal{O}$. Note we do not describe the basic algebra of $B$ exactly, in contrast to [6, Corollary 4.3], where the basic algebra of $k \otimes B$ is completely described.

**Lemma 5.2.** There exists an $\mathcal{O}$-algebra $A$ with the following properties:

1. $B \cong M_d(\mathcal{O}) \otimes \mathcal{O} A$, where $d$ is the dimension of the unique simple $B$-module. In particular, $A$ is basic.

2. There exist $X_{ij} \in A$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$ that generate $A$ as an $\mathcal{O}$-algebra. Furthermore,

$$B := \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} X_{ij}^{l_{ij}} \mid 0 \leq l_{ij} < p^{n_i}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m_i \right\}$$

forms an $\mathcal{O}$-basis for $A$.

3. There exist $q_{i_1j_1,i_2j_2} \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ such that

$$X_{ij}^{p^{n_i}} \in pA, \quad X_{i_1j_1}X_{i_2j_2} = q_{i_1j_1,i_2j_2}X_{i_2j_2}X_{i_1j_1},$$

for all $1 \leq i, i_1, i_2 \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, $1 \leq j_1 \leq m_{i_1}$, $1 \leq j_2 \leq m_{i_2}$. Moreover,
Proof. 

(a) \( q_{ij_1,ij_2} = 1 \), for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq m_i \).

(b) \( q_{i_1,j_1,i_2,j_2} = 1 \), for all \( 1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq j_1 \leq m_{i_1}, 1 \leq j_2 \leq m_{i_2} \).

(c) \( q_{i_1,j_1,i_2(j_2+1)} = q_{i_1,j_1,i_2j_2}, \) for all \( 1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq j_1 \leq m_{i_1}, 1 \leq j_2 \leq m_{i_2}, \) where \( j_2 + 1 \) is considered modulo \( m_{i_2} \).

(d) Let \( 1 \leq i_1 \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq j_1 \leq m_{i_1} \), then \( q_{i_1,j_1,i_2(j_2+1)} = 1 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq m_i \) if and only if \( i_1 > t \).

(e) Let \( 1 \leq i_1 \leq t \) and \( 1 \leq j_1 \leq m_{i_1} \). For all \( 1 \leq j_2 \leq m_{i_1} \) with \( j_2 \neq j_1 \), there exist \( 1 \leq i \leq t \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq m_i \) such that \( q_{i_1,j_1,i_2} \neq q_{i_1,j_1,i_2j_2} \).

4. We can choose the \( O \)-algebra isomorphism \( B \rightarrow M_d(O) \otimes O A \) such that we have the following identification of ideals

\[ ((1 - y)e_\varphi)_{g \in D_1} = M_d(O) \otimes O T, \]

where \( T := (X_{ij}) \mid 1 \leq i \leq t, 1 \leq j \leq m_i \).

5. For all \( i > t \),

\[ \left\langle X_{i1}^{l_i} \mid 0 \leq l_i < p^{m_i} \right\rangle \]

is an \( O \)-subalgebra of \( A \). Moreover, if \( p = 2 \) and \( D_1 \) is elementary abelian, then for each \( 1 \leq i \leq t \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq m_i, m_i > 1 \) and

\[ X_0^2 - 2X_{i(j+1)} \in 2 \left\langle \prod_{l=1}^{m_i} X_{i1}^{\epsilon_{il}} \mid \epsilon_{il} \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{l=1}^{m_i} \epsilon_{il} > 1 \right\rangle \]

where \( j + 1 \) is considered modulo \( m_i \).

\[ \text{Proof.} \]

1. By part (1) of Lemma 3.3 \( |\text{Irr}(E, \varphi)| = 1 \) and so \( O E e_\varphi \cong M_d(O) \), where \( d \) is the dimension of the unique simple \( B \)-module. Therefore, \( O E e_\varphi \) is a central simple subalgebra of \( B \) and so we have \( B \cong O E e_\varphi \otimes O C_B(O E e_\varphi) \).

We, therefore, define \( A := C_B(O E e_\varphi) \).

2. By Lemma 2.6, for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), \( J(kP_i)/J^2(kP_i) \) decomposes into \( m_i \) non-isomorphic linear representations of \( E \), \( \{\rho_i, \rho_i^p, \ldots, \rho_i^{p^{m_i-1}}\} \), with respect to the conjugation action of \( E \) on \( P_i \). Since \( p \nmid |E| \), we can decompose

\[ J(kP_i) = (w_{i1})_k \oplus \cdots \oplus (w_{im_i})_k \oplus J^2(kP_i), \]

into \( kE \)-modules, where \( (w_{ij})_k \) affords the representation \( \rho_i^{p^{ij-1}} \). Again, since \( p \nmid |E| \) and \( k \otimes O J(O)(P_i) = J(kP_i) \), we can lift \( w_{ij} \) to \( W_{ij} \in J(O)(P_i) \) such that \( (W_{ij})_O \) affords the representation \( \rho_i^{p^{ij-1}} \), where \( \varphi_i \) is the unique
lift of \( \rho_i \) to a representation of \( E \) over \( \mathcal{O} \). Since \( Z \) is central, by Lemma 5.1 we can choose \( h_{i_1} \in E \) such that \( \varphi_i = \varphi \circ \phi h_{i_1} Z \). Setting \( h_{i_2} := h^{p_{i_1}^{-1}} \) gives
\[
\varphi_i = \varphi \circ \phi h_{i_2} Z, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq m_i.
\]

Now set \( X_{i,j} = h_{i_2} W_{i,j} e_\varphi \), for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq m_i \). We first note that
\[
\begin{align*}
h X_{i,j} &= h h_{i_2} W_{i,j} e_\varphi = h h_{i_2} h^{-1} h W_{i,j} h^{-1} h e_\varphi = h_{i_2} h_{i_1} h_{i_2} h^{-1} h_{i_2} (h W_{i,j}) h e_\varphi \\
&= h_{i_2} \varphi [h_{i_2}, h^{-1}] (h_{i_2} h W_{i,j}) h e_\varphi = h_{i_2} (h_{i_2} h W_{i,j}) h e_\varphi \\
&= h_{i_2} W_{i,j} h e_\varphi = X_{i,j} h,
\end{align*}
\]
for all \( h \in E \) and so \( X_{i,j} \in C_B(\mathcal{O} e_\varphi) \). Note that the \( (1 \otimes X_{i,j}) \in k \otimes \mathcal{O} A \) are precisely the \( X_i \)'s constructed in the proof of [6 Corollary 4.3]. In particular, \( k \otimes \mathcal{O} B \) forms a basis for \( C_{hE}(E e_\varphi) \). So \( B \) is an \( \mathcal{O} \)-linearly independent set and \( (B)_\mathcal{O} \) is an \( \mathcal{O} \)-summand of \( B \). Therefore, since \( (B)_\mathcal{O} \subseteq C_B(\mathcal{O} e_\varphi) \) and
\[
d^2. \text{rk}_\mathcal{O}(B)_\mathcal{O}) = d^2. \text{dim}_k((k \otimes \mathcal{O} B)_k) = \text{dim}_k(B)
\]
we have that \( (B)_\mathcal{O} = C_B(\mathcal{O} e_\varphi) \).

3. By Lemma 2.8, \( W_{i,j} = p J_k(P_i) \) for all \( i \) and \( j \). Therefore, since \( h_{i_1} \) and \( W_{i,j} \) commute and \( A \) is an \( \mathcal{O} \)-summand of \( B \), we have
\[
X_{i,j}^{p_{i_1}} \in p B \cap A = p A.
\]

Next
\[
X_{i,j_1} X_{i,j_2} e_\varphi = h_{i_1,j_1} W_{i,j_1} h_{i_2,j_2} W_{i,j_2} e_\varphi = \varphi [h_{i_1,j_1}, h_{i_2,j_2}] h_{i_1,j_1} W_{i,j_1} W_{i,j_2} e_\varphi
\]
and so we set \( g_{i_1,j_1} := \varphi [h_{i_1,j_1}, h_{i_1,j_1}] \). Parts (a) and (b) follow immediately from this definition. Part (c) holds since
\[
\varphi [h_{i_1,j_1}, h_{i_1,j_1}] = \varphi [h_{i_1,j_1}, h_{i_1,j_1}]^{p_{i_1}}.
\]

Next we claim that the \( g_{i,j} \)'s, for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq m_i \), generate \( \text{Hom}(L, \mathcal{O}^\times) \). Assume this is not the case and so they generate some proper subgroup of \( \text{Hom}(L, \mathcal{O}^\times) \). Therefore, there exists some \( \{1\} \neq L' \leq L \) such that \( g_{i,j}(l) = 1 \), for all \( 1 \leq i \leq t \), \( 1 \leq j \leq m_i \) and \( l \in L' \). So,
by the definition of the $g_{ij}$’s and Lemma 2.6, $L'$ commutes with $P_t / \Phi(P_t)$ and therefore by Lemma 2.5, $L'$ commutes with $P_t$, for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. This contradicts $Z := C_E(D) = C_E(D_1)$.

It now follows from the definition of the $h_{ij}$’s and Lemma 5.1 that the $h_{ij}Z$’s for $1 \leq i \leq t$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$ generate $L$.

For part (d) note that $q_{i_1j_1, ij} = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$ if and only if $q_{i_1}(h_{ij}Z) = 1$ for all such $i$ and $j$ if and only if $q_{i_1}$ is the trivial character of $L$. However, by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6, $q_{i_1}$ is trivial if and only if $E$ acts trivially on $P_t$ i.e. $i_1 > t$.

For part (e) we suppose the contrary, that is there exists $1 \leq j_2 \leq m_{i_1}$ with $j_1 \neq j_2$ such that $q_{i_1j_1, ij} = q_{i_1j_2, ij}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. In other words $q_{i_1j_1}q_{i_1j_2}^{-1}(h_{ij}) = 1$ for all such $i$ and $j$ but since the $h_{ij}Z$’s generate $L$ this implies that $q_{i_1j_1} = q_{i_1j_2}$ contradicting Lemma 2.6.

4. Since each $W_{ij} \in \mathcal{O}P_t$, we have

\[
((1 - g)e_\varphi)_{g \in D_1} = (W_{ij}e_\varphi)_{1 \leq j \leq m_i} \triangleleft B
\]

and

\[
W_{ij}e_\varphi = h_{ij}^{-1}e_\varphi \otimes X_{ij} \in \mathcal{O}Ee_\varphi \otimes \mathcal{O} C_B(\mathcal{O}Ee_\varphi),
\]

giving that

\[
((1 - g)e_\varphi)_{g \in D_1} = \mathcal{O}Ee_\varphi \otimes \mathcal{O} (X_{ij})_{1 \leq j \leq m_i}. \tag{6}
\]

5. First note that, since the corresponding statement certainly holds over $k$,

\[
\left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} W_{ij}^{l_{ij}} \middle| 0 \leq l_{ij} < p^{n_i}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq m_i \right\}
\]

forms an $\mathcal{O}$-basis of $\mathcal{O}P_t$, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. The first statement now follows from the fact that $h_{i_1} \in Z$, for all $i > t$.

From now on we assume $p = 2$ and $D_1$ is elementary abelian. We fix some $1 \leq i \leq t$. If $m_i = 1$, then $P_t$ has no non-trivial automorphisms and so $P_t \leq C_D(E) = D_2$, a contradiction. So we must have $m_i > 1$.

Next note that $m_i = 1$, and let $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, where we are considering $j$ modulo $m_i$. By Lemma 2.8, $W_{ij}^2 = 2y$ for some $y \in \mathcal{O}P_t \setminus \mathcal{O}P_t$.

Therefore, $(y)_\mathcal{O}$ affords $2^{2m_i}$ and, the by the construction of the $W_{ij}$’s and (6), $y = \lambda_j W_{ij(j+1)} + W_j$ for some $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{O}$ and

\[
W \in \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{m_i} W_{ij}^{\epsilon_{ij}} \middle| \epsilon_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{i=1}^{m_i} \epsilon_{ij} > 1 \right\}_\mathcal{O}.
\]
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Corollary 5.3. 

Since $y \notin J_{\mathcal{O}}(P_i)_2$, in fact $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{O}^\times$. By Lemma 5.1 we also have $h_{ij}^2Z = h_{ij(j+1)}Z$ and so $h_{ij}^2e_\varphi = \mu_j h_{ij(j+1)}e_\varphi$, for some $\mu_j \in \mathcal{O}^\times$. Therefore,

$$X_{ij}^2 = (h_{ij}W_{ij}e_\varphi)^2 = h_{ij}^2W_{ij}^2e_\varphi = \mu_j h_{ij(j+1)}(\lambda_j W_{ij(j+1)} + W)e_\varphi = \mu_j \lambda_j X_{ij(j+1)} + \mu_j h_{ij(j+1)}W e_\varphi.$$ 

Let $\prod_{i=1}^{m_i} W_{il}^{\epsilon_{il}}$ appear with non-zero coefficient in $W$. Since $(W)_\mathcal{O}$ affords the character $\phi_{ij}$ so does $(\prod_{i=1}^{m_i} W_{il}^{\epsilon_{il}})_\mathcal{O}$. Therefore, by the construction of the $h_{il}'s$, $h_{i(j+1)}Z = (\prod_{i=1}^{m_i} h_{il}^{\epsilon_{il}})Z$ and so

$$\left\langle h_{i(j+1)} \prod_{l=1}^{m_i} W_{il}^{\epsilon_{il}} e_\varphi \right\rangle_\mathcal{O} = \left\langle \prod_{l=1}^{m_i} X_{il}^{\epsilon_{il}} \right\rangle_\mathcal{O},$$

for all such terms. We have now shown that

$$X_{ij}^2 - \lambda_j \mu_j X_{i(j+1)} = \mu_j h_{i(j+1)}W e_\varphi \in \left\langle \prod_{l=1}^{m_i} X_{il}^{\epsilon_{il}} | \epsilon_{il} \in \{0,1\}, \sum_{l=1}^{m_i} \epsilon_{il} > 1 \right\rangle_\mathcal{O},$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. Since raising to the power $2^{m_i} - 1$ on $\mathcal{O}^\times$ is a surjective map, there exists $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ such that

$$\alpha_1^{2^{m_i} - 1} = (\lambda_1^{2^{m_i-1}} \mu_1^{2^{m_i-1}})^{-1}(\lambda_2^{2^{m_i-2}} \mu_2^{2^{m_i-2}})^{-1} \cdots (\lambda_{m_i} \mu_{m_i})^{-1}.$$ 

Now set $\alpha_{j+1} = \alpha_j^2 \lambda_j \mu_j$, for all $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. Note that by this definition

$$\alpha_{m_i+1} = \alpha_1^{2^{m_i}} (\lambda_1^{2^{m_i-1}} \mu_1^{2^{m_i-1}})^{(\lambda_2^{2^{m_i-2}} \mu_2^{2^{m_i-2}})^{-1}} \cdots (\lambda_{m_i} \mu_{m_i})^{-1} = \alpha_1.$$

In other words $\alpha_j$ is well-defined when we consider $j \mod m_i$. Therefore,

$$(\alpha_j X_{ij})^2 - \alpha_{j+1} X_{i(j+1)} \in \left\langle \prod_{l=1}^{m_i} X_{il}^{\epsilon_{il}} | \epsilon_{il} \in \{0,1\}, \sum_{l=1}^{m_i} \epsilon_{il} > 1 \right\rangle_\mathcal{O},$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. Let’s replace $W_{ij}$ with $\alpha_j W_{ij}$ and therefore $X_{ij}$ with $\alpha_j X_{ij}$, for $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. These new $X_{ij}$’s satisfy the required properties.

For what follows, recall that $T := (X_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq t} <\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{O}_p := \mathcal{O}/p\mathcal{O}$ and also $\mathcal{O}_I := \mathcal{O}/I$, where $I := \mathcal{J} \cdot p\mathcal{O}$, for $\mathcal{J}$ the unique maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}$. In addition we set $A_k := k \otimes \mathcal{O} \mathcal{A}$, $A_p := \mathcal{O}_p \otimes \mathcal{O} \mathcal{A}$, $A_I := \mathcal{O}_I \otimes \mathcal{O} \mathcal{A}$, $T_p := \mathcal{O}_p \otimes \mathcal{T} < A_p$ and $T_I := \mathcal{O}_I \otimes \mathcal{T} < A_I$. The following is an immediate consequence of Lemma 5.2.

**Corollary 5.3.**

$$A_p \cong \mathcal{O}_p[X_{ij}, 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m_i]/(X_{ij}X_{ij}, X_{ij} = g_{ij}^i, X_{ij}^p = 0).$$
We may express each element of $A_k$ uniquely as a $k$-linear combination of elements of $k \otimes \mathcal{B}$ and in the following Lemma we refer to the terms of this $k$-linear combination. Similarly we refer to the terms of an element of $A_p$ and $A_I$. Set

$$A = \{(a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_n) | 0 \leq a_i < p^{n_i} \text{ for all } t + 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$ 

We denote by $X_a$ the monomial $X^{a_{t+1}} \ldots X^{a_n} \in k[X_i]_{t+1 \leq i \leq n}$, where $a = (a_{t+1}, \ldots, a_n) \in A$. For $a, b \in A$, $a + b$ signifies the componentwise sum, when this is still in $A$. We have a partial order on $A$ given by $a \preceq c$ if and only if there exists $b \in A$ such that $a + b = c$. In this case note that $X_a + b = X_a X_b$. We adopt the same notation for monomials in $\mathcal{O}_p[X_{i1}]_{t+1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\mathcal{O}_I[X_{i1}]_{t+1 \leq i \leq n}$. $\mathcal{O}$ will denote the image of $q \in \mathcal{O}$ in $k$.

**Lemma 5.4.**

1. Let $\phi$ be an $\mathcal{O}_p$-algebra automorphism of $A_p$, $1 \leq l \leq n$ and $1 \leq m \leq m_l$. Then there exists some $1 \leq l_0 \leq n$ and $1 \leq m_0 \leq m_{l_0}$ such that $X_{l_0m_0}$ appears with unit coefficient in $\phi(X_{lm})$. If in addition, $1 \leq u \leq n$ and $1 \leq v \leq m_u$ such that $X_{uvm_0}$ appears with unit coefficient in $\phi(X_{uv})$, for some $1 \leq u_0 \leq n$ and $1 \leq v_0 \leq m_{u_0}$, then $q_{lm,uv} = q_{l_0m_0,uv_0}$. In particular, there does not exist $1 \leq m'_0 \leq m_{l_0}$ different from $m_0$ such that $X_{l_0m'_0}$ also appears with unit coefficient in $\phi(X_{lm})$. We have all the analogous results for $A_I$.

2. All $\mathcal{O}_p$-algebra automorphisms of $A_p$ leave $T_p$ invariant.

3. Assume $p = 2$ and $D_1$ is elementary abelian. All $\mathcal{O}_I$-algebra automorphisms of $A_I$ leave $T_I$ invariant.

**Proof.**

1. We prove all the results for $A_p$ and $A_I$ simultaneously.

As noted in the proof of Lemma 5.2, the $X_{ij} \in A_k$ are precisely the $X_i$'s constructed in the proof of [6, Corollary 4.3]. Certainly $A_k$ is local, it is the basic algebra of a block with one simple module, and so $J(A_k)$ is the ideal generated by the $X_{ij}$'s. In particular, the $X_{ij}$'s form a basis of $J(A_k)/J^2(A_k)$. Now $\phi$ induces a $k$-algebra automorphism $\phi_k$ of $A_k$. Therefore, there exists some $X_{l_0m_0}$ appearing with non-zero coefficient in $\phi_k(X_{lm})$. Since an element $x \in \mathcal{O}$ is invertible if and only if $x \notin J$, the first claim follows.

Suppose $X_{l_0m_0} \in A_k$ (respectively $X_{uvm_0} \in A_k$) appears with coefficient $\lambda_{uv} \in k^\times$ (respectively $\lambda_{lm} \in k^\times$) in $\phi_k(X_{lm})$ (respectively $\phi_k(X_{uv})$). By considering the coefficient of $X_{l_0m_0}X_{uvm_0} = \overline{\eta}_{l_0m_0,uvm_0}X_{uvm_0}X_{l_0m_0}$ in $\phi_k(X_{lm}X_{uv}) = \overline{\eta}_{lm,uv}\phi_k(X_{uv}X_{lm})$, we get that $\overline{\eta}_{lm,uv} = \overline{\eta}_{l_0m_0,uvm_0}$. Since $p^t$-roots of unity in $k$ lift uniquely to $\mathcal{O}$, we have $q_{lm,uv} = q_{l_0m_0,uvm_0}$.
For the final claim suppose such an $m_0'$ does exist and choose $1 \leq u_0 \leq t$ and $1 \leq v_0 \leq m_0$ such that $q_{l_0m_0,u_0,v_0} \neq q_{l_0m_0',u_0,v_0}$. The existence of $u_0$ and $v_0$ is guaranteed by part (3e) of Lemma 5.2. Now, by the same reasoning as in the first paragraph, there exists some $X_{u_0,v_0}$ such that $X_{u_0,v_0}$ appears with unit coefficient in $\phi(X_{u_0})$. By the second paragraph $q_{l_0m_0,u_0,v_0} = q_{l_0m_0',u_0,v_0}$, a contradiction.

2. Let $\phi$ be an $\mathcal{O}_p$-algebra automorphism of $A_p$ and assume that $\phi(X_{lm}) \notin T_p$, for some $1 \leq l \leq t$ and $1 \leq m \leq m_i$. By part (3d) of Lemma 5.2 there exist $1 \leq u \leq t$ and $1 \leq v \leq m_i$ such that $q_{l,m,u,v} \neq 1$. Let $a \in A$ such that $X_a$ appears with non-zero coefficient in either $\phi(X_{lm})$ or $\phi(X_{uv})$ and let $a$ be minimal with respect to this property. We set these coefficients to be $a_{lm}$ and $a_{uv}$ respectively.

Let $X_{l_0m_0}$ (respectively $X_{u_0,v_0}$) appear with coefficient $a_{l_0m_0} \in \mathcal{O}_p^\times$ (respectively $a_{u_0,v_0} \in \mathcal{O}_p^\times$) in $\phi(X_{lm})$ (respectively $\phi(X_{uv})$), note their existence is guaranteed by part (1). Furthermore let $X_{l_0m_0}$ appear with coefficient $b_{l_0m_0}$ in $\phi(X_{uv})$ and similarly $X_{u_0,v_0}$ with coefficient $b_{u_0,v_0}$ in $\phi(X_{lm})$.

$X_aX_{l_0m_0}$ appears with coefficient $a_{uv}a_{l_0m_0} + a_{lm}b_{l_0m_0}$ in both $\phi(X_{uv}X_{lm})$ and $\phi(X_{lm}X_{uv}) = q_{l,m,u,v}\phi(X_{uv}X_{lm})$. Now $1 - q_{l,m,u,v}$ is invertible in $k$ and hence also in $\mathcal{O}_p$ and so $a_{uv}a_{l_0m_0} + a_{lm}b_{l_0m_0} = 0$. Similarly, by comparing coefficients of $X_aX_{u_0,v_0}$, we have that $a_{lm}a_{u_0,v_0} + a_{uv}b_{u_0,v_0} = 0$. Taking these two equalities together gives $v_p(a_{lm}) = v_p(a_{uv})$, where $v_p$ is the valuation of $\mathcal{O}_p$ with respect to its unique maximal ideal. This implies $b_{l_0m_0}$ and $b_{u_0,v_0}$ are both invertible. Part (3a) of Lemma 5.2 and part (1) of this lemma now give $1 = q_{l_0m_0,l_0m_0} = q_{l_0m_0,u_0,v_0}$, a contradiction.

3. Let $\phi$ be an $\mathcal{O}_T$-algebra automorphism of $A_T$ and assume that $\phi(X_{lm}) \notin T_I$, for some $1 \leq l \leq t$ and $1 \leq m \leq m_i$. We define $u,v,a,a_{lm}$ and $a_{uv}$ exactly as in part (2). Without loss of generality, let $a_{lm}$ be non-zero. Note that by part (2), we must have $a_{lm}, a_{uv} \in 2\mathcal{O}_T$. As in part (2), there must exist some $X_{u_0,v_0}$ (respectively $X_{l_0m_0}$) with unit coefficient in $\phi(X_{uv})$ (respectively $X_{lm}$). Let $X_{u_0,v_0}$ appear with coefficient $a_{u_0,v_0}$ in $\phi(X_{uv})$ and $b_{u_0,v_0}$ in $\phi(X_{lm})$. We note that by part (1), $b_{u_0,v_0}$ is not invertible.

We now study the coefficient of $X_aX_{u_0,v_0}$ in $\phi(X_{uv}X_{lm})$ and $\phi(X_{lm}X_{uv})$. By part (5) of Lemma 5.2 the only non-zero contributions must come from taking $X_a$ in $\phi(X_{lm})$ and $X_{u_0,v_0}$ in $\phi(X_{uv})$ or taking $X_aX_{u_0,v_0}$ with unit coefficient in $\phi(X_{lm})$ and $X_{a_2}X_{u_0,v_0}$ with unit coefficient in $\phi(X_{uv})$, where $a_1 + a_2 = a$. (Note that as $a_{uv} \in 2\mathcal{O}_T$ and $b_{u_0,v_0}$ is not invertible, $a_{uv}b_{u_0,v_0} = 0$ and so we need not consider taking $X_a$ in $\phi(X_{uv})$ and $X_{u_0,v_0}$ in $\phi(X_{lm})$.) In particular the coefficients of $X_aX_{u_0,v_0}$ in $\phi(X_{uv}X_{lm})$ and $\phi(X_{lm}X_{uv})$ are the same and hence, as in part (1), zero. This implies the case of taking $X_aX_{u_0,v_0}$ with unit coefficient
in \(\phi(X_{lm})\) and \(X_{a_2}X_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) with unit coefficient in \(\phi(X_{uv})\) must make a non-zero contribution in both \(\phi(X_{uv}X_{lm})\) and \(\phi(X_{lm}X_{uv})\).

Let \(b \in A\) such that \(X_bX_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) appears with unit coefficient in \(\phi(X_{lm})\) or \(\phi(X_{uv})\) and let \(b\) be minimal with respect to this property. Note that \(b < a\) since otherwise \(X_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) itself appears with unit coefficient in either \(\phi(X_{lm})\) or \(\phi(X_{uv})\), contradicting the minimality of \(b\), unless \(a = b = \emptyset\). In this case \(X_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) appears with unit coefficient in \(\phi(X_{lm})\) but this contradicts part (1) since by part (3a) of Lemma 5.2 \(q_{u_0v_0,u_0(v_0-1)} = 1\).

Say \(X_bX_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) appears with unit coefficient in \(\phi(X_{lm})\). Then we consider the coefficient of \(X_bX_{u_0(v_0-1)}X_{u_0v_0}\) in both \(\phi(X_{lm}X_{uv})\) and \(\phi(X_{uv}X_{lm})\). In particular we consider their images in \(k\). The only non-zero contribution is from taking \(X_bX_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) in \(\phi(X_{lm})\) and \(X_{u_0v_0}\) in \(\phi(X_{uv})\). (Note that by the final part of (1), \(X_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) cannot appear with unit coefficient in \(\phi(X_{uv})\)). So the coefficients are equal and non-zero, a contradiction.

If \(X_bX_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) appears with unit coefficient in \(\phi(X_{uv})\) we consider the image of the coefficients of \(X_bX_{u_0(v_0-1)}X_{u_0v_0}\) in \(\phi(X_{lm}X_{uv})\) and \(\phi(X_{uv}X_{lm})\) in \(k\). The only non-zero contribution is from taking \(X_{lm,a_0}\) in \(\phi(X_{lm})\) and \(X_bX_{u_0(v_0-1)}\) in \(\phi(X_{uv})\). Comparing coefficients gives \(\eta_{lm,uv} = \eta_{lm,a_0,u_0(v_0-1)}\) and so \(\eta_{lm,a_0,u_0(v_0-1)} = \eta_{lm,a_0,u_0v_0}\). However, part (3c) of Lemma 5.2 now implies \(\eta_{lm,a_0,u_0v_0} = 1\). As in part (1), this means \(q_{lm,a_0,u_0v_0} = 1\). Finally, by part (1), we have \(q_{lm,uv} = q_{lm,a_0,u_0v_0} = 1\), a contradiction.

\[\Box\]

6 Weiss’ condition and the main theorem

In this section we prove our main result. Along with the results already proved in this article, our main tool will be an application of Weiss’ condition. Weiss’ condition is a statement about permutation modules originally stated in [11] Theorem 2] but proved in its most general form in [10] Theorem 1.2]. Proposition 6.1 is a consequence of the condition that was proved in [3] Propositions 4.3,4.4. We first set up some notation.

Let \(b\) be a block of \(OH\), for some finite group \(H\) and \(Q\) a normal \(p\)-subgroup of \(H\). We denote by \(b^Q\) the direct sum of blocks of \(OH/Q\) dominated by \(b\), that is those blocks not annihilated by the image of \(e_b\) under the natural \(O\)-algebra homomorphism \(OH \rightarrow OH/Q\). In this section it is also necessary to extend our definition of \(T(b)\) to include the possibility of \(b\) being a direct sum of blocks.

**Proposition 6.1.**

1. The inflation map \(\text{Inf} : \text{Irr}(H/Q) \rightarrow \text{Irr}(H)\) induces a bijection between \(\text{Irr}(b^Q)\) and \(\text{Irr}(b,1_Q)\).
2. Suppose $M$ is a $b$-$b$-bimodule inducing a Morita auto-equivalence of $b$ that permutes the elements of $\text{Irr}(b, 1_Q)$. Then $Q^\ast M$, the set of fixed points of $M$ under the left action of $Q$, induces a Morita auto-equivalence of $b^Q$. Furthermore, the permutation of $\text{Irr}(b^Q)$ induced by $Q^\ast M$ is identical to the permutation that $M$ induces on $\text{Irr}(b, 1_Q)$, once these two sets have been identified using part (1).

3. If $Q^\ast M \in \mathcal{T}(b^Q)$, then $M \in \mathcal{T}(b)$.

**Lemma 6.2.** Let $M \in \text{Pic}(B)$ and $\sigma$ the corresponding permutation of $\text{Irr}(B)$. Then $\sigma$ permutes the elements of $\text{Irr}(B, 1_D)$. 

**Proof.** We first assume $p > 2$ and that $B$ has a unique simple module. By part (1) Lemma 5.5 we need only check that $\sigma_p$, the corresponding permutation of 

$$\{ \mathcal{O}_p \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V | V \text{ an } \mathcal{O}\text{-free } B\text{-module affording some } \chi \in \text{Irr}(B) \}$$

induced by $\mathcal{O}_p \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M$, permutes the $\mathcal{O}_p \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$ with $D_1$ acting trivially. However, this follows from part (4) of Lemma 5.2 and part (2) of Lemma 5.4.

We now drop the assumption that $B$ has a unique simple module. By Lemma 3.5 we may apply part (2) of Proposition 6.1 with respect to $B$, $M$ and $[D, Z(E)]$. Note that every character of $B[D, Z(E)]$ reduces to some number of copies of the same irreducible Brauer character. In other words $B[D, Z(E)]$ is the direct sum of blocks each with a unique simple module.

By part (1) of Lemma 6.1 any two of the blocks appearing in the direct sum $B[D, Z(E)]$ are Morita equivalent via tensoring with an irreducible character of $\text{Irr}(G, 1_{D \times Z})$. Therefore, by the first paragraph, any Morita auto-equivalence of $B[D, Z(E)]$ permutes $\text{Irr}(B[D, Z(E)], 1_{D_1/([D, Z(E)])})$. The fact that $\sigma$ permutes $\text{Irr}(B, 1_{[D, Z(E)]})$ now follows from the last sentence in part (2) of Proposition 6.1.

In the above paragraph we need to be a little careful when we apply the conclusion from the first paragraph. First note that a block $C$ appearing in the direct sum $B[D, Z(E)]$ may not be of the form of a block as described in 43. In particular, the relevant character $\varphi_C$ of $Z(E)$ may not be faithful. However, $C$ is naturally Morita equivalent to a block of $G/\langle [D, Z(E)] \ker(\varphi_C) \rangle$ that will be of the desired form. Secondly we are implicitly using the fact that $[D/([D, Z(E)], E) = D_1/([D, Z(E)])$. This is required to ensure that $[D, Z(E)]M$ does indeed permute $\text{Irr}(B[D, Z(E)], 1_{D_1/([D, Z(E)])})$.

A slightly more delicate argument is required for the $p = 2$ case due to the weaker result obtained for $p = 2$ in Lemma 3.6. When $B$ has a unique simple module we first use part (2a) of Lemma 3.6, part (4) of Lemma 5.2 and part (2) of Lemma 6.4 to apply part (2) of Proposition 6.1 with respect to $B$, $M$ and $\Phi(D_1)$. In other words we may assume that $D_1$ is elementary abelian. We can now use part (2b) of Lemma 3.6, part (4) of Lemma 5.2 and part (3) of
Lemma 5.4 to apply part (2) of Proposition 6.1 with respect to $B$, $M$ and $D_1$. The general $p = 2$ case now follows exactly as for $p > 2$.

This time we are implicitly using the fact that $[D/\Phi(D_1), E] = D_1/\Phi(D_1)$. This is required when we reduce to the situation of $D_1$ being elementary abelian. □

We are now ready to state and prove our main theorem.

**Theorem 6.3.** Let $b$ be a block with normal abelian defect group and abelian inertial quotient. Then $\text{Pic}(b) = \mathcal{L}(b)$.

**Proof.** We first note that $b$ is source algebra equivalent to a block of the form as introduced in §3, where the defect group of $b$ is isomorphic to $D$ and its inertial quotient is isomorphic to $L$. The fact that we have a Morita equivalence follows from [8, Theorem A] and that this Morita equivalence is in fact a source algebra equivalence from [9, Theorem 6.14.1]. Note that in both of these articles actually an equivalence with a twisted group algebra $O_\alpha(D_1 \rtimes E)$ is constructed. However, $O_\alpha(D_1 \rtimes L)$ and $B$ are isomorphic as interior $D$-algebras, for an appropriately chosen $B$. (See the comments following [6, Theorem 4.2] for a discussion of [8, Theorem A].) Note that $E$ must be a $p'$-group as otherwise $G$ has a normal $p$-subgroup strictly containing its defect group.

By [1, Lemma 2.8(ii)] the source algebra equivalence between $b$ and $B$ induces an isomorphism $\text{Pic}(b) \cong \text{Pic}(B)$ that restricts to an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}(b) \cong \mathcal{L}(B)$. Therefore, from now on we assume that $b = B$.

Let $M \in \text{Pic}(B)$ and $\sigma$ the corresponding permutation of $\text{Irr}(B)$. Let $\theta \in \text{Irr}(D_2)$ be as defined in Lemma 4.3 and $M_{\theta^{-1}} \in \text{Pic}(B)$ the $B$-$B$-bimodule inducing the Morita auto-equivalence given by tensoring with $\theta^{-1}$. In other words

$$M_{\theta^{-1}} = \mathcal{O}(D_1 \rtimes E)e_{\varphi} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\theta^{-1}) \uparrow^{D \times D},$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\theta^{-1}}$ is the $\mathcal{O}(\Delta D)$-module affording the character $\theta$, with $\Delta D$ denoting the diagonal subgroup of $D \times D$. In particular, $M_{\theta^{-1}}$ has linear source and, since $\mathcal{L}(B)$ is a subgroup of Pic($B$), we may replace $M$ with $M_{\theta^{-1}} \otimes_B M$. In other words we may assume that $\sigma$ satisfies

$$\sigma(1_D, \chi) = \psi_\chi \otimes 1_{D_2},$$

for all $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E, \varphi)$, where $\psi_\chi \in \text{Irr}(D_1 \rtimes E, \varphi)$. However, by Proposition 6.2 we also have that $\psi_\chi \in \text{Irr}(D_1 \rtimes E, 1_{D_1})$. Therefore, we can apply parts (2) and (3) of Proposition 6.1 with respect to $B$, $M$ and $D$. Since $G/D$ is a $p'$-group, certainly $M \in \mathcal{T}(B^D)$ and so $M \in \mathcal{T}(B) \leq \mathcal{L}(B)$ as required. □

In fact we can say more about Pic($B$).

**Corollary 6.4.**

$$\text{Pic}(B) \cong \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{O}(D_1 \rtimes E)e_{\varphi}) \times \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}D_2)$$

$$= \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{O}(D_1 \rtimes E)e_{\varphi}) \times (\text{Hom}(D_2, \mathcal{O}^\times) \rtimes \text{Aut}(D_2)).$$
Proof. By the proof of Theorem 6.3 Pic(B) is generated by $\mathcal{T}(B)$ and $\mathcal{L}(OD_2)$. Now it is well-known that $\mathcal{L}(P) = (\text{Hom}(P, O^\times) \times \text{Aut}(P))$ for any finite $p$-group $P$. It therefore suffices to show that $\mathcal{T}(B) \cong \mathcal{T}(O(D_1 \times E)e_\varphi) \times \mathcal{T}(OD_2)$.

Let $M \in \mathcal{T}(B)$. It follows from [1] Theorem 1.1(ii), Remark 1.2(f)] that $M$ has vertex of the form $\Delta \psi := \{(g, \psi(g))|g \in D\}$ for some $\psi \in N_{\text{Aut}(D)}(L)$. In particular, $\psi$ must respect the direct product $D = D_1 \times D_2$. We claim that every $B$-$B$-bimodule summand of $O_{\Delta \psi} \uparrow^{G \times G}$ induces a bijection of simple $K$-$B$-modules if and only if $K \otimes O M_1 \otimes O M_2$ induces a bijection of simple $KB$-modules and $M_1 \in \mathcal{T}(O(D_1 \times E)e_\varphi)$ and $M_2 \in \mathcal{T}(OD_2)$. This is proved in [3] Lemma 2.3] with the added assumption that $\psi$ is the identity. The argument in this more general setting is almost identical but we outline the main points for the convenience of the reader.

Every indecomposable direct summand of $O_{\Delta \psi} \uparrow^{G \times G}$ is of the form $M_1 \otimes O M_2$, for $M_1$ an indecomposable summand of $O_{\Delta \psi \downarrow^G}$ and $M_2$ an indecomposable direct summand of $O_{\Delta \psi \downarrow^G} \uparrow^{B_2 \times D_2}$. Now $K \otimes O (M_1 \otimes O M_2)$ induces a bijection of simple $KB$-modules if and only if $K \otimes O M_1$ induces a bijection of simple $K(D_1 \times E)e_\varphi$-modules (respectively simple $KD_2$-modules). The claim now follows from [2] Théorème 1.2].

**Theorem 6.5.** Let $b$ be a block with normal abelian defect group and abelian inertial quotient. Then Picent(b) is trivial.

**Proof.** As in the proof of Theorem 6.3 we may first assume that $b = B$ as introduced in [3]. Let $M \in \text{Picent}(B)$. Also due to the proof of Theorem 6.3 we have that $M \in \mathcal{T}(B)$ and so by the proof of Corollary 6.3 that $M \in \mathcal{T}(O(D_1 \times E)e_\varphi) \times \mathcal{T}(OD_2)$.

As noted in the proof of Corollary 6.4, $M$ has source $O_{\Delta \psi}$ for some $\psi \in N_{\text{Aut}(D)}(L)$. Let $\lambda \in \text{Irr}(D)$ and $V_\lambda$ an $O$-free $OD$-module affording $\lambda$. Then

$$M \otimes_{OG} (OG \otimes OD V_\lambda) \cong M \otimes_{OD} V_\lambda$$

affords a sum of irreducible characters of the form $(\lambda, \chi) \uparrow^G$, where $\chi \in \text{Irr}(E_\lambda, \varphi)$. However,

$$OD \otimes_{OD} M \otimes_{OD} OD \cong O_{\Delta \psi} \uparrow^{D \times D} \otimes N,$$

for some $O(D \times D)$-module $N$ and

$$O_{\Delta \psi} \uparrow^{D \times D} \otimes_{OD} V_\lambda \cong V_{\lambda \circ \psi}.$$

Therefore, $\lambda \circ \psi$ is conjugate to $\lambda$ via an element of $E$, for each $\chi \in \text{Irr}(D)$, and so, by Lemma 2.4, $\psi \in L$. Since we are ultimately interested in $O_{\Delta \psi} \uparrow^{G \times G}$, we may assume that $\psi = \text{Id}_D$. Hence, we are concerned with the indecomposable summands of

$$e_\varphi O_{\Delta D} \uparrow^{G \times G} e_\varphi \cong \bigoplus_{\chi \in \text{Irr}(G, 1_D \times z)} M_\chi,$$
where $M_\chi \in \text{Pic}(B)$ induces the Morita equivalence given by tensoring with $\chi$. To complete the proof we need only prove that if $M_\chi$ fixes all characters of $B$, then $\chi = 1_G$. In other words we need to show that $K \otimes \mathcal{O} M_\chi$ is not isomorphic to $K \otimes \mathcal{O} M_{1_G}$ for any $\chi \neq 1_G$. Note that $M_\chi \cong N^G_{\chi}$, where $N_\chi$ is the $\mathcal{O}((D \times Z) \times (D \times Z), (\Delta E))$-module $\mathcal{O}(D \times Z)e_{e_\phi}$, where $(g, g) . m = \chi(g) g mg^{-1}$, for all $g \in E$. Using this description one can see that $1_{\mathcal{O}(D \times D), (\Delta E)}$ appears as a constituent of $K \otimes \mathcal{O} M_\chi \downarrow^\Delta_{(D \times D), (\Delta E)}$ if and only if $\chi = 1_G$. The result follows.

References


