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Abstract

In this paper, we give a brief survey of recent developments on Noether’s problem and rationality problem for multiplicative invariant fields including author’s recent papers Hoshi [Hos15] about Noether’s problem over $\mathbb{Q}$, Hoshi, Kang and Kunyavskii [HKK13], Chu, Hoshi, Hu and Kang [CHHK15], Hoshi [Hos16] and Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY16] about Noether’s problem over $\mathbb{C}$, and Hoshi, Kang and Kitayama [HKK14] and Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY] about rationality problem for multiplicative invariant fields.
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§ 1. Introduction

Let $k$ be a field and $G$ be a finite group acting on the rational function field $k(x_g \mid g \in G)$ by $k$-automorphisms $h(x_g) = x_{hg}$ for any $g, h \in G$. We denote the fixed field $k(x_g \mid g \in G)^G$ by $k(G)$. Emmy Noether [Noe13, Noe17] asked whether $k(G)$...
is rational (= purely transcendental) over $k$. This is called Noether’s problem for $G$ over $k$, and is related to the inverse Galois problem, to the existence of generic $G$-Galois extensions over $k$, and to the existence of versal $G$-torsors over $k$-rational field extensions (see Swan [Swa81, Swa83], Saltman [Sal82], Manin and Tsfasman [MT86], Garibaldi, Merkurjev and Serre [GMS03] Section 33.1, page 86], Colliot-Thélen and Sansuc [CTS07]).

**Theorem 1.1** (Fischer [Fis15], see also Swan [Swa83, Theorem 6.1]). Let $G$ be a finite abelian group with exponent $e$. Assume that (i) either $\text{char } k = 0$ or $\text{char } k > 0$ with $\text{char } k \nmid e$, and (ii) $k$ contains a primitive $e$-th root of unity. Then $k(G)$ is rational over $k$. In particular, $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is rational over $\mathbb{C}$.

**Theorem 1.2** (Kuniyoshi [Kun54, Kun55, Kun56], see also Gaschütz [Gas59]). Let $G$ be a $p$-group and $k$ be a field with $\text{char } k = p > 0$. Then $k(G)$ is rational over $k$.

**Definition 1.3.** Let $K/k$ and $L/k$ be finitely generated extensions of fields.

1. $K$ is said to be rational over $k$ (for short, $k$-rational) if $K$ is purely transcendental over $k$, i.e. $K \simeq k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ for some algebraically independent elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ over $k$;
2. $K$ is said to be stably $k$-rational if $K(y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ is $k$-rational for some algebraically independent elements $y_1, \ldots, y_m$ over $K$;
3. $K$ and $L$ are said to be stably $k$-isomorphic if $K(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \simeq L(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ for some algebraically independent elements $y_1, \ldots, y_m$ over $K$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ over $L$;
4. (Saltman, [Sal84b, Definition 3.1]) when $k$ is an infinite field, $K$ is said to be retract $k$-rational if there exists a $k$-algebra $A$ contained in $K$ such that (i) $K$ is the quotient field of $A$, (ii) there exist a non-zero polynomial $f \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and $k$-algebra homomorphisms $\varphi: A \rightarrow k[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f]$ and $\psi: k[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f] \rightarrow A$ satisfying $\psi \circ \varphi = 1_A$;
5. $K$ is said to be $k$-unirational if $k \subset K \subset k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ for some integer $n$.

We see that if $K$ and $L$ are stably $k$-isomorphic and $K$ is retract $k$-rational, then $L$ is also retract $k$-rational (see [Sal84b, Proposition 3.6]), and hence it is not difficult to verify the following implications:

$$k\text{-rational} \Rightarrow \text{stably } k\text{-rational} \Rightarrow \text{retract } k\text{-rational} \Rightarrow \text{ } k\text{-unirational}.$$
§ 2. Noether’s problem over \( \mathbb{Q} \)

Masuda [Mas55, Mas68] gave an idea to use a technique of Galois descent to Noether’s problem for cyclic groups \( C_p \) of order \( p \). Let \( \zeta_p \) be a primitive \( p \)-th root of unity, \( L = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p) \) and \( \pi = \text{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q}) \). Then, by Theorem 1.1 we have \( \mathbb{Q}(C_p) = \mathbb{Q}(x_1, \ldots, x_p)^{C_p} = (L(x_1, \ldots, x_p)^{C_p})^\pi = L(y_0, \ldots, y_{p-1})^\pi = L(M)^\pi(y_0) \) where \( y_0 = \sum_{i=1}^p x_i \) is \( \pi \)-invariant, \( M \) is free \( \mathbb{Z}[\pi]\)-module and \( \pi \) acts on \( y_1, \ldots, y_{p-1} \) by \( \sigma(y_i) = \prod_{j=1}^p y_{j}^{a_{ij}} \), \( [a_{ij}] \in GL_n(\mathbb{Z}) \) for any \( \sigma \in \pi \). Thus the field \( L(M)^\pi \) may be regarded as the function field of some algebraic torus of dimension \( p - 1 \) (see e.g. [Vos98, Chapter 3], [HY17, Chapter 1]).

**Theorem 2.1** (Masuda [Mas55, Mas68], see also [Swa83, Lemma 7.1]).

1. \( M \) is projective \( \mathbb{Z}[\pi]\)-module of rank one;
2. If \( M \) is a permutation \( \mathbb{Z}[\pi]\)-module, i.e. \( M \) has a \( \mathbb{Z}\)-basis which is permuted by \( \pi \), then \( L(M)^\pi \) is \( \mathbb{Q}\)-rational. In particular, \( \mathbb{Q}(C_p) \) is \( \mathbb{Q}\)-rational for \( p \leq 11 \).

Swan [Swa69] gave the first negative solution to Noether’s problem by investigating a partial converse to Masuda’s result.

**Theorem 2.2** (Swan [Swa69], Voskresenskii [Vos70]).

1. If \( \mathbb{Q}(C_p) \) is \( \mathbb{Q}\)-rational, then there exists \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[^{\zeta_{p-1}}] \) such that \( N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{p-1})/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = \pm p \);
2. (Swan [Swa69, Theorem 1]) \( \mathbb{Q}(C_{47}), \mathbb{Q}(C_{113}) \) and \( \mathbb{Q}(C_{233}) \) are not \( \mathbb{Q}\)-rational;
3. (Voskresenskii [Vos70, Theorem 2]) \( \mathbb{Q}(C_{47}), \mathbb{Q}(C_{167}), \mathbb{Q}(C_{359}), \mathbb{Q}(C_{383}), \mathbb{Q}(C_{479}), \mathbb{Q}(C_{503}) \) and \( \mathbb{Q}(C_{719}) \) are not \( \mathbb{Q}\)-rational.

**Theorem 2.3** (Voskresenskii [Vos71, Theorem 1]). \( \mathbb{Q}(C_p) \) is \( \mathbb{Q}\)-rational if and only if there exists \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[^{\zeta_{p-1}}] \) such that \( N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{p-1})/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = \pm p \).

Hence if the cyclotomic field \( \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{p-1}) \) has class number one, then \( \mathbb{Q}(C_p) \) is \( \mathbb{Q}\)-rational. However, it is known that such primes are exactly \( p \leq 43 \) and \( p = 61, 67, 71 \) (see Masley and Montgomery [MM76, Main theorem] or Washington’s book [Was97, Chapter 11]).

Endo and Miyata [EM73] refined Masuda-Swan’s method and gave some further consequences on Noether’s problem when \( G \) is abelian (see also [Vos73]).

**Theorem 2.4** (Endo and Miyata [EM73, Theorem 2.3]). Let \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) be finite groups and \( k \) be a field with char \( k = 0 \). If \( k(G_1) \) and \( k(G_2) \) are \( k\)-rational (resp. stably \( k\)-rational), then \( k(G_1 \times G_2) \) is \( k\)-rational (resp. stably \( k\)-rational).

---

1. The author [Hos05, Chapter 5] generalized Theorem 2.1 (2) to Frobenius groups \( F_{pl} \) of order \( pl \) with \( l \mid p - 1 \) (\( p \leq 11 \)).

2. Kang and Plans [KP09, Theorem 1.3] showed that Theorem 2.4 is also valid for any field \( k \).
Theorem 2.5 (Endo and Miyata [EM73, Theorem 3.1]). Let $p$ be an odd prime and $l$ be a positive integer. Let $k$ be a field with $\text{char } k = 0$ and $[k(\zeta_p^l) : k] = p^{m_0}d_0$ with $0 \leq m_0 \leq l - 1$ and $d_0 \mid p - 1$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. For any faithful $k[C_p^l]$-module $V$, $k(V)^{C_p^l}$ is $k$-rational;
2. $k(C_p^l)$ is $k$-rational;
3. There exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[^{l-1}p^{m_0}d_0]$ such that
\[
N_{\mathbb{Q}(^{l-1}p^{m_0}d_0)/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 
\pm p & m_0 > 0 \\
\pm p^l & m_0 = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Further suppose that $m_0 > 0$. Then the above conditions are equivalent to each of the following conditions:

1'. For any $k[C_p^l]$-module $V$, $k(V)^{C_p^l}$ is $k$-rational;
2'. For any $1 \leq l' \leq l$, $k(C_p^{l'})$ is $k$-rational.

Theorem 2.6 (Endo and Miyata [EM73, Proposition 3.2]). Let $p$ be an odd prime and $k$ be a field with $\text{char } k = 0$. If $k$ contains $\zeta_p + \zeta_p^{-1}$, then $k(C_p^l)$ is $k$-rational for any $l$. In particular, $\mathbb{Q}(C_p^l)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational for any $l$.

Theorem 2.7 (Endo and Miyata [EM73, Proposition 3.4, Corollary 3.10]).

1. For primes $p \leq 43$ and $p = 61, 67, 71$, $\mathbb{Q}(C_p^l)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational;
2. For $p = 5, 7$, $\mathbb{Q}(C_p^{l_2})$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational;
3. For $l \geq 3$, $\mathbb{Q}(C_{2^l})$ is not stably $\mathbb{Q}$-rational.

Theorem 2.8 (Endo and Miyata [EM73, Theorem 4.4]). Let $G$ be a finite abelian group of odd order and $k$ be a field with $\text{char } k = 0$. Then there exists an integer $m > 0$ such that $k(G^m)$ is $k$-rational.

Theorem 2.9 (Endo and Miyata [EM73, Theorem 4.6]). Let $G$ be a finite abelian group. Then $\mathbb{Q}(G)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational if and only if $\mathbb{Q}(G)$ is stably $\mathbb{Q}$-rational.

Ultimately, Lenstra [Len74] gave a necessary and sufficient condition of Noether’s problem for abelian groups.

Theorem 2.10 (Lenstra [Len74, Main Theorem, Remark 5.7]). Let $k$ be a field and $G$ be a finite abelian group. Let $k_{cyc}$ be the maximal cyclotomic extension of $k$ in an algebraic closure. For $k \subset K \subset k_{cyc}$, we assume that $\rho_K = \text{Gal}(K/k) = \langle \tau_k \rangle$ is finite cyclic. Let $p$ be an odd prime with $p \neq \text{char } k$ and $s \geq 1$ be an integer. Let $a_K(p^s)$ be a $\mathbb{Z}[^{l-1}p^s]$-ideal defined by
\[
a_K(p^s) = \begin{cases} 
\mathbb{Z}[\rho_K] & \text{if } K \neq k(\zeta_{p^s}) \\
(\tau_K - t, p) & \text{if } K = k(\zeta_{p^s}) \text{ where } t \in \mathbb{Z} \text{satisfies } \tau_K(\zeta_p) = \zeta_p^t.
\end{cases}
\]
and put $a_K(G) = \prod_{p,s} a_K(p^s)^{m(G,p,s)}$ where $m(G,p,s) = \dim_{\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}}(p^{s-1}G/p^sG)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. $k(G)$ is $k$-rational;
2. $k(G)$ is stably $k$-rational;
3. for $k \subseteq K \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$, the $\mathbb{Z}[p_K]$-ideal $a_K(G)$ is principal and if $\text{char } k \neq 2$, then $k(\zeta_{r(G)})/k$ is cyclic extension where $r(G)$ is the highest power of 2 dividing the exponent of $G$.

**Theorem 2.11** (Lenstra [Len74, Corollary 7.2], [Len80 Proposition 2, Corollary 3]). Let $n$ be a positive integer. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. $\mathbb{Q}(C_n)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational;
2. $k(C_n)$ is $k$-rational for any field $k$;
3. $\mathbb{Q}(C_{p^s})$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational for any $p^s \mid n$;
4. $8 \nmid n$ and for any $p^s \mid n$, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_{p^s}]$ such that $N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{p^s})/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = \pm p$.

**Theorem 2.12** (Lenstra [Len74, Corollary 7.6], [Len80 Proposition 6]). Let $k$ be a field which is finitely generated over its prime field. Let $P_k$ be the set of primes $p$ for which $k(C_p)$ is $k$-rational. Then $P_k$ has Dirichlet density 0 inside the set of all primes. In particular,

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\pi^*(x)}{\pi(x)} = 0$$

where $\pi(x)$ is the number of primes $p \leq x$, and $\pi^*(x)$ is the number of primes $p \leq x$ for which $\mathbb{Q}(C_p)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational.

**Theorem 2.13** (Lenstra [Len80 Proposition 4]). Let $p$ be a prime and $s \geq 2$ be an integer. Then $\mathbb{Q}(C_{p^s})$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational if and only if $p^s \in \{2^2, 3^m, 5^2, 7^2 \mid m \geq 2\}$.

By using Theorem 2.4, Endo and Miyata [EM73 Appendix] checked whether $\mathbb{Q}(C_p)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational for some primes $p < 2000$. By using PARI/GP [PARI2], Hoshi [Hos15] confirmed that for primes $p < 20000$, $\mathbb{Q}(C_p)$ is not $\mathbb{Q}$-rational except for 17 rational cases with $p \leq 43$ and $p = 61, 67, 71$ and undetermined 46 cases. Eventually, Plans [Pla17] determined the complete set of primes for which $\mathbb{Q}(C_p)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational:

**Theorem 2.14** (Plans [Pla17 Theorem 1.1]). Let $p$ be a prime. Then $\mathbb{Q}(C_p)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational if and only if $p \leq 43$, $p = 61, 67$ or 71.

Combining Theorem 2.11, Theorem 2.13 and Theorem 2.14 we have:

**Corollary 2.15** (Plans [Pla17 Corollary 1.2]). Let $n$ be a positive integer. Then $\mathbb{Q}(C_n)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational if and only if $n$ divides

$$2^2 \cdot 3^m \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7^2 \cdot 11 \cdot 13 \cdot 17 \cdot 19 \cdot 23 \cdot 29 \cdot 31 \cdot 37 \cdot 41 \cdot 43 \cdot 61 \cdot 67 \cdot 71$$

for some integer $m \geq 0$. 

On the other hand, just a handful of results about Noether’s problem are obtained when the groups are non-abelian.

**Theorem 2.16** (Maeda [Mae89, Theorem, page 418]). Let $k$ be a field and $A_5$ be the alternating group of degree 5. Then $k(A_5)$ is $k$-rational.

**Theorem 2.17** (Rikuna [Rik], Plans [Pla07], see also [HKY11, Example 13.7]). Let $k$ be a field with $\text{char } k \neq 2$. Then $k(SL_2(\mathbb{F}_3))$ and $k(GL_2(\mathbb{F}_3))$ are $k$-rational.

**Theorem 2.18** (Serre [GMS03, Chapter IX], see also Kang [Kan05]). Let $G$ be a finite group with a 2-Sylow subgroup which is cyclic of order $\geq 8$ or the generalized quaternion $Q_{16}$ of order 16. Then $\mathbb{Q}(G)$ is not stably $\mathbb{Q}$-rational.

**Theorem 2.19** (Plans [Pla09, Theorem 2]). Let $A_n$ be the alternating group of degree $n$. If $n \geq 3$ is odd integer, then $\mathbb{Q}(A_n)$ is rational over $\mathbb{Q}(A_{n-1})$. In particular, if $\mathbb{Q}(A_{n-1})$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-rational, then so is $\mathbb{Q}(A_n)$.

However, it is an open problem whether $k(A_n)$ is $k$-rational for $n \geq 6$.

**§ 3. Noether’s problem over $\mathbb{C}$ and unramified Brauer groups**

We consider Noether’s problem for $G$ over $\mathbb{C}$, i.e. the rationality problem for $\mathbb{C}(G)$ over $\mathbb{C}$. Let $G$ be a $p$-group. Then, by Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 we may focus on the case where $G$ is a non-abelian $p$-group and $k$ is a field with $\text{char } k \neq p$. For $p$-groups of small order, the following results are known.

**Theorem 3.1** (Chu and Kang [CK01]). Let $p$ be any prime and $G$ be a $p$-group of order $\leq p^4$ and of exponent $e$. If $k$ is a field containing a primitive $e$-th root of unity, then $k(G)$ is $k$-rational. In particular, $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

**Theorem 3.2** (Chu, Hu, Kang and Prokhorov [CHKP08]). Let $G$ be a group of order 32 and of exponent $e$. If $k$ is a field containing a primitive $e$-th root of unity, then $k(G)$ is $k$-rational. In particular, $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

Saltman introduced a notion of retract $k$-rationality (see Definition 1.3) and the unramified Brauer group:

**Definition 3.3** (Saltman [Sal84a, Definition 3.1], [Sal85 page 56]). Let $K/k$ be an extension of fields. The unramified Brauer group $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(K/k)$ of $K$ over $k$ is defined to be

\[ \text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(K/k) = \bigcap_R \text{Image} \{ \text{Br}(R) \rightarrow \text{Br}(K) \} \]
where \( \text{Br}(R) \to \text{Br}(K) \) is the natural map of Brauer groups and \( R \) runs over all the discrete valuation rings \( R \) such that \( k \subset R \subset K \) and \( K \) is the quotient field of \( R \). We write just \( \text{Br}_{nr}(K) \) when the base field \( k \) is clear from the context.

**Proposition 3.4** (Saltman [Sal84a, Sal85 Proposition 1.8], [Sal87]). If \( K \) is retract \( k \)-rational, then \( \text{Br}(k) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Br}_{nr}(K) \). In particular, if \( k \) is an algebraically closed field and \( K \) is retract \( k \)-rational, then \( \text{Br}_{nr}(K) = 0 \).

**Theorem 3.5** (Bogomolov [Bog88, Theorem 3.1], Saltman [Sal90, Theorem 12]). Let \( G \) be a finite group and \( k \) be an algebraically closed field with \( \text{char} \ k = 0 \) or \( \text{char} \ k = p \neq |G| \). Then \( \text{Br}_{nr}(k(G)/k) \) is isomorphic to the group \( B_0(G) \) defined by
\[
B_0(G) = \bigcap_A \ker\{\text{res} : H^2(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \to H^2(A, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})\}
\]
where \( A \) runs over all the bicyclic subgroups of \( G \) (a group \( A \) is called bicyclic if \( A \) is either a cyclic group or a direct product of two cyclic groups).

**Remark 3.6.** For a smooth projective variety \( X \) over \( \mathbb{C} \) with function field \( K \), \( \text{Br}_{nr}(K/\mathbb{C}) \) is isomorphic to the birational invariant \( H^3(X, \mathbb{Z})_{\text{tors}} \) which was used by Artin and Mumford [AM72] to provide some elementary examples of \( k \)-unirational varieties which are not \( k \)-rational (see also [Bog88 Theorem 1.1 and Corollary]).

Note that \( B_0(G) \) is a subgroup of \( H^2(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \) which is isomorphic to the Schur multiplier \( H_2(G, \mathbb{Z}) \) of \( G \) (see Karpilovsky [Kar87]). We call \( B_0(G) \) the **Bogomolov multiplier** of \( G \) (cf. Kunyavskii [Kun10]). Because of Theorem 3.5, we will not distinguish \( B_0(G) \) and \( \text{Br}_{nr}(k(G)/k) \) when \( k \) is an algebraically closed field, and char \( k = 0 \) or char \( k = p \not| \ |G| \). Using \( B_0(G) \), Saltman and Bogomolov gave counter-examples to Noether’s problem for non-abelian \( p \)-groups over algebraically closed field.

**Theorem 3.7** (Saltman [Sal84a], Bogomolov [Bog88]). Let \( p \) be any prime and \( k \) be any algebraically closed field with char \( k \neq p \).

1. (Saltman [Sal84a, Theorem 3.6]) There exists a meta-abelian group \( G \) of order \( p^9 \) such that \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \). In particular, \( k(G) \) is not (retract, stably) \( k \)-rational;
2. (Bogomolov [Bog88, Lemma 5.6]) There exists a group \( G \) of order \( p^6 \) such that \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \). In particular, \( k(G) \) is not (retract, stably) \( k \)-rational.

Colliot-Thélène and Ojanguren [CTO89] generalized the notion of the unramified Brauer group \( \text{Br}_{nr}(K/k) \) to the unramified cohomology \( H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_p^j) \) of degree \( i \geq 1 \), that is \( F_{n,j}^i(K/k) \) in [CTO89 Definition 1.1].

**Definition 3.8** (Colliot-Thélène and Ojanguren [CTO89, CT95 Sections 2–4]). Let \( n \) be a positive integer and \( k \) be a field with char \( k = 0 \) or char \( k = p \) with \( p \not| n \). Let
$K/k$ be a function field, that is finitely generated field extension as a field over $k$. For any positive integer $i \geq 2$, any integer $j$, the unramified cohomology group $H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j})$ of $K$ over $k$ of degree $i$ is defined to be

$$H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) := \bigcap_R \ker \{ r_R : H^i(K, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) \to H^{i-1}(\mathbb{K}^R, \mu_n^{\otimes (j-1)}) \}$$

where $R$ runs over all the discrete valuation rings $R$ of rank one such that $k \subset R \subset K$ and $K$ is the quotient field of $R$, $\mathbb{K}^R$ is the residue field of $R$ and $r_R$ is the residue map of $K$ at $R$.

By [CT95, Theorem 4.1.1, page 30], if it is assumed furthermore that $K$ is the function field of a complete smooth variety over $k$, the unramified cohomology group $H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j})$ may be defined as well by

$$H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) = \bigcap_R \text{Image} \{ H^i_{\text{ét}}(R, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) \to H^i_{\text{ét}}(K, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) \}$$

where $R$ runs over all the discrete valuation rings $R$ of rank one such that $k \subset R \subset K$ and $K$ is the quotient field of $R$.

Note that the unramified cohomology groups of degree two are isomorphic to the $n$-torsion part of the unramified Brauer group: $n \text{Br}_{nr}(K/k) \simeq H^2_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n)$.

**Theorem 3.9.** Let $n$ be a positive integer and $k$ be an algebraically closed field with $\text{char } k = 0$ or char $k = p \nmid n$.

1. (Colliot-Thélène and Ojanguren [CTO89, Proposition 1.2]) If $K$ and $L$ are stably $k$-isomorphic, then $H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) \sim H^i_{nr}(L/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j})$. In particular, $K$ is stably $k$-rational, then $H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) = 0$;

2. ([Mer08, Proposition 2.15], see also [CTO89, Remarque 1.2.2], [CT95, Sections 2–4], [GS10, Example 5.9]) If $K$ is retract $k$-rational, then $H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_n^{\otimes j}) = 0$.

Colliot-Thélène and Ojanguren [CTO89, Section 3] produced the first example of not stably $\mathbb{C}$-rational but $\mathbb{C}$-unirational field $K$ with $H^3_{nr}(K, \mu_2^{\otimes j}) \neq 0$, where $K$ is the function field of a quadric of the type $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \langle g_1 g_2 \rangle$ over the rational function field $\mathbb{C}(x, y, z)$ with three variables $x, y, z$ for a 2-fold Pfister form $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$, as a generalization of Artin and Mumford [AM72]. Peyre [Pey93, Corollary 3] gave a sufficient condition for $H^i_{nr}(K/k, \mu_p^{\otimes i}) \neq 0$ and produced an example of the function field $K$ with $H^3_{nr}(K/k, \mu_2^{\otimes 3}) \neq 0$ and $\text{Br}_{nr}(K/k) = 0$ using a result of Suslin [Sus91] where $K$ is the function field of a product of some norm varieties associated to cyclic central simple algebras of degree $p$ (see [Pey93, Proposition 7]). Using a result of Jacob and Rost [JR89], Peyre [Pey93, Proposition 9] also gave an example of $H^3_{nr}(K/k, \mu_2^{\otimes 4}) \neq 0$ and $\text{Br}_{nr}(K/k) = 0$ where $K$ is the function field of a product of quadrics associated to a 4-fold Pfister form $\langle a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \rangle$ (see also [CT95, Section 4.2]).
In case char $k = 0$, take the direct limit with respect to $n$:

$$H^i(K/k, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}(j)) = \lim_{n \to \infty} H^i(K/k, \mu_{n^j})$$

and we may define the unramified cohomology group

$$H^{i}_{\text{nr}}(K/k, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}(j)) = \bigcap_{R} \ker\{r_{R}: H^{i}(K/k, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}(j)) \to H^{i-1}(K_{R}, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}(j - 1))\}.$$  

We write simply $H^{i}_{\text{nr}}(K, \mu_{n^j})$ and $H^{i}_{\text{nr}}(K, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}(j))$ when the base field $k$ is understood. When $k$ is an algebraically closed field with char $k = 0$, we will write $H^{i}_{\text{nr}}(K/k, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ for $H^{i}_{\text{nr}}(K/k, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}(j))$. Then we have $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(K/k) \simeq H^{2}_{\text{nr}}(K/k, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$.

Peyre [Pey08] constructed an example of a field $K$, as $K = \mathbb{C}(G)$, whose unramified Brauer group vanishes, but unramified cohomology of degree three does not vanish:

**Theorem 3.10** (Peyre [Pey08] Theorem 3). Let $p$ be any odd prime. Then there exists a $p$-group $G$ of order $p^{12}$ such that $B_{0}(G) = 0$ and $H^{3}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(G), \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$. In particular, $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is not (retract, stably) $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

The idea of Peyre’s proof is to find a subgroup $K^{3}_{\text{max}}/K^{3}$ of $H^{3}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(G), \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ and to show that $K^{3}_{\text{max}}/K^{3} \neq 0$ (see [Pey08 page 210]).

Asok [Aso13] generalized Peyre’s argument [Pey93] and established the following theorem for a smooth proper model $X$ (resp. a smooth projective model $Y$) of the function field of a product of quadrics of the type $\langle s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n-1} \rangle = \langle s_{n} \rangle$ (resp. Rost varieties) over some rational function field over $\mathbb{C}$ with many variables.

**Theorem 3.11** (Asok [Aso13], see [AM11 Theorem 3] for retract rationality).

1. ([Aso13 Theorem 1]) For any $n > 0$, there exists a smooth projective complex variety $X$ that is $\mathbb{C}$-unirational, for which $H^{i}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(X), \mu_{2}^{\otimes n}) = 0$ for each $i < n$, yet $H^{n}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(X), \mu_{2}^{\otimes n}) \neq 0$, and so $X$ is not $\mathbb{A}^{1}$-connected, nor (retract, stably) $\mathbb{C}$-rational;

2. ([Aso13 Theorem 3]) For any prime $l$ and any $n \geq 2$, there exists a smooth projective rationally connected complex variety $Y$ such that $H^{n}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(Y), \mu_{l}^{\otimes n}) \neq 0$. In particular, $Y$ is not $\mathbb{A}^{1}$-connected, nor (retract, stably) $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

Namely, the triviality of the unramified Brauer group or the unramified cohomology of higher degree is just a necessary condition of $\mathbb{C}$-rationality of fields. It is unknown whether the vanishing of all the unramified cohomologies is a sufficient condition for $\mathbb{C}$-rationality. It is interesting to consider an analog of Theorem 3.11 for quotient varieties $V/G$, e.g. the case of Noether’s problem $\mathbb{C}(V_{\text{reg}}/G) = \mathbb{C}(G)$.

Colliot-Thélène and Voisin [CTV12] established:

**Theorem 3.12** (Colliot-Thélène and Voisin [CTV12], [Voi14 Theorem 6.18]). For any smooth projective complex variety $X$, there is an exact sequence

$$0 \to H^{3}_{\text{nr}}(X, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \to H^{3}_{\text{nr}}(X, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \to \text{Tors}(Z^{4}(X)) \to 0.$$
where

\[ Z^4(X) = \text{Hdg}^4(X, \mathbb{Z})/\text{Hdg}^4(X, \mathbb{Z})_{\text{alg}} \]

and the lower index “alg” means that we consider the group of integral Hodge classes which are algebraic. In particular, if \( X \) is rationally connected, then we have

\[ H^3_{nr}(X, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong Z^4(X). \]

Using Peyre’s method [Pey08], we obtain the following theorem which is an improvement of Theorem 3.10 and gives an explicit counter-example to integral Hodge conjecture with the aid of Theorem 3.12.

**Theorem 3.13** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY16, Theorem 1.4]). Let \( p \) be any odd prime. Then there exists a \( p \)-group \( G \) of order \( p^5 \) such that \( B_0(G) = 0 \) and \( H^3_{nr}(\mathcal{C}(G), \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \neq 0 \). In particular, \( \mathcal{C}(G) \) is not (retract, stably) \( \mathbb{C} \)-rational.

The case where \( G \) is a group of order \( p^5 \) (\( p \geq 3 \)).

From Theorem 3.7 (2), Bogomolov [Bog88, Remark 1] raised a question to classify the groups of order \( p^6 \) with \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \). He also claimed that if \( G \) is a \( p \)-group of order \( \leq p^5 \), then \( B_0(G) = 0 \) ([Bog88, Lemma 5.6]). However, this claim was disproved by Moravec:

**Theorem 3.14** (Moravec [Mor12, Section 8]). Let \( G \) be a group of order 243. Then \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \) if and only if \( G = G(3^5, i) \) with \( 28 \leq i \leq 30 \), where \( G(3^5, i) \) is the \( i \)-th group of order 243 in the GAP database [GAP]. Moreover, if \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \), then \( B_0(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \).

Moravec [Mor12] gave a formula for \( B_0(G) \) by using a nonabelian exterior square \( G \wedge G \) of \( G \) and an implemented algorithm \texttt{b0g.g} in computer algebra system GAP [GAP], which is available from his website \texttt{www.fmf.uni-lj.si/~moravec/Papers/b0g.g}. The number of all solvable groups \( G \) of order \( \leq 729 \) apart from the orders 512, 576 and 640 with \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \) was given as in [Mor12, Table 1].

Hoshi, Kang and Kunyavskii [HKK13] determined \( p \)-groups \( G \) of order \( p^5 \) with \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \) for any \( p \geq 3 \). It turns out that they belong to the same isoclinism family.

**Definition 3.15** (Hall [Hal40, page 133]). Let \( G \) be a finite group. Let \( Z(G) \) be the center of \( G \) and \([G,G] \) be the commutator subgroup of \( G \). Two \( p \)-groups \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) are called *isoclinic* if there exist group isomorphisms \( \theta: G_1/Z(G_1) \to G_2/Z(G_2) \) and \( \phi: [G_1,G_1] \to [G_2,G_2] \) such that \( \phi([g,h]) = [g',h'] \) for any \( g,h \in G_1 \) with \( g', h' \in G_2 \).
\[ \theta(gZ(G_1)), h' \in \theta(hZ(G_1)) : \]
\[ G_1/Z_1 \times G_1/Z_1 \xrightarrow{(\theta, \theta)} G_2/Z_2 \times G_2/Z_2 \]
\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
& \circ & \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
[G_1, G_1] & \phi & [G_2, G_2].
\end{array} \]

For a prime \( p \) and an integer \( n \), we denote by \( G_n(p) \) the set of all non-isomorphic groups of order \( p^n \). In \( G_n(p) \), consider an equivalence relation: two groups \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) are equivalent if and only if they are isoclinic. Each equivalence class of \( G_n(p) \) is called an isoclinism family, and the \( j \)-th isoclinism family is denoted by \( \Phi_j \).

For \( p \geq 5 \) (resp. \( p = 3 \)), there exist \( 2p + 61 + \gcd \{4, p - 1\} + 2 \gcd \{3, p - 1\} \) (resp. 67) groups \( G \) of order \( p^5 \) which are classified into ten isoclinism families \( \Phi_1, \ldots, \Phi_{10} \) (see [Jam80, Section 4]). The main theorem of [HKK13] can be stated as follows:

**Theorem 3.16** (Hoshi, Kang and Kunyavskii [HKK13, Theorem 1.12]). Let \( p \) be any odd prime and \( G \) be a group of order \( p^5 \). Then \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \) if and only if \( G \) belongs to the isoclinism family \( \Phi_{10} \). Moreover, if \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \), then \( B_0(G) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \).

For the last statement, see [Kan14, Remark, page 424]. The proof of Theorem 3.16 was given by purely algebraic way. There exist exactly 3 groups which belong to \( \Phi_{10} \) if \( p = 3 \), i.e. \( G = G(243, i) \) with \( 28 \leq i \leq 30 \). This agrees with Moravec’s computational result (Theorem 3.14). For \( p \geq 5 \), there exist exactly \( 1 + \gcd \{4, p - 1\} + \gcd \{3, p - 1\} \) groups which belong to \( \Phi_{10} \) (see [Jam80, page 621]).

The following result for the \( k \)-rationality of \( k(G) \) supplements Theorem 3.14 although it is unknown whether \( k(G) \) is \( k \)-rational for groups \( G \) which belong to \( \Phi_7 \):

**Theorem 3.17** (Chu, Hoshi, Hu and Kang [CHHK15, Theorem 1.13]). Let \( G \) be a group of order 243 with exponent \( e \). If \( B_0(G) = 0 \) and \( k \) be a field containing a primitive \( e \)-th root of unity, then \( k(G) \) is \( k \)-rational except possibly for the five groups \( G \) which belong to \( \Phi_7 \), i.e. \( G = G(243, i) \) with \( 56 \leq i \leq 60 \).

In [HKK13] and [CHHK15], not only the evaluation of the Bogomolov multiplier \( B_0(G) \) and the \( k \)-rationality of \( k(G) \) but also the \( k \)-isomorphisms between \( k(G_1) \) and \( k(G_2) \) for some groups \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) belonging to the same isoclinism family were given.

Bogomolov and Böning [BB13] gave an answer to the question raised as [HKK13, Question 1.11] in the affirmative as follows.

**Theorem 3.18** (Bogomolov and Böning [BB13 Theorem 6]). If \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) are isoclinic, then \( \mathbb{C}(G_1) \) and \( \mathbb{C}(G_2) \) are stably \( \mathbb{C} \)-isomorphic. In particular, \( H^j_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(G_1), \mu_n^{\otimes j}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^j_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(G_2), \mu_n^{\otimes j}) \).
A partial result of Theorem 3.18 was already given by Moravec. Indeed, Moravec [Mor14] Theorem 1.2] proved that if $G_1$ and $G_2$ are isoclinic, then $B_0(G_1) \simeq B_0(G_2)$.

The case where $G$ is a group of order 64.

The classification of the groups $G$ of order 64 = $2^6$ with $B_0(G) \neq 0$ was obtained by Chu, Hu, Kang and Kunyavskii [CHKK10]. Moreover, they investigated Noether’s problem for groups $G$ with $B_0(G) = 0$. There exist 267 groups $G$ of order 64 which are classified into 27 isoclinism families $\Phi_1, \ldots, \Phi_{27}$ by Hall and Senior [HS64] (see also [JNO90, Table I]). The main result of [CHKK10] can be stated in terms of the isoclinism families as follows.

Theorem 3.19 (Chu, Hu, Kang and Kunyavskii [CHKK10]). Let $G = G(2^6, i)$, $1 \leq i \leq 267$, be the $i$-th group of order 64 in the GAP database [GAP].

1. ([CHKK10, Theorem 1.8]) $B_0(G) \neq 0$ if and only if $G$ belongs to the isoclinism family $\Phi_{16}$, i.e. $G = G(2^6, i)$ with $149 \leq i \leq 151$, $170 \leq i \leq 172$, $177 \leq i \leq 178$ or $i = 182$. Moreover, if $B_0(G) \neq 0$, then $B_0(G) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ (see [Kan14, Remark, page 424] for this statement);

2. ([CHKK10, Theorem 1.10]) If $B_0(G) = 0$ and $k$ is a quadratically closed field, then $k(G)$ is $k$-rational except possibly for five groups which belong to $\Phi_{13}$, i.e. $G = G(2^6, i)$ with $241 \leq i \leq 245$.

For groups $G$ which belong to $\Phi_{13}$, $k$-rationality of $k(G)$ is unknown. The following two propositions supplement the cases $\Phi_{13}$ and $\Phi_{16}$ of Theorem 3.19. For the proof, the case of $G = G(2^6, 149)$ is given in [HKK14, Proof of Theorem 6.3], see also [CHKK10, Example 5.11, page 2355] and the proof for other cases can be obtained by the similar manner.

Definition 3.20. Let $k$ be a field with char $k \neq 2$ and $k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6)$ be the rational function field over $k$ with variables $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6$.

1. The field $L_k^{(0)}$ is defined to be $k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6)^H$ where $H = \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ acts on $k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6)$ by $k$-automorphisms

$$\sigma_1 : X_1 \mapsto X_3, \ X_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{X_1X_2X_3}, \ X_3 \mapsto X_1, \ X_4 \mapsto X_6, \ X_5 \mapsto \frac{1}{X_4X_5X_6}, \ X_6 \mapsto X_4,$$

$$\sigma_2 : X_1 \mapsto X_2, \ X_2 \mapsto X_1, \ X_3 \mapsto \frac{1}{X_1X_2X_3}, \ X_4 \mapsto X_5, \ X_5 \mapsto X_4, \ X_6 \mapsto \frac{1}{X_4X_5X_6}.$$

2. The field $L_k^{(1)}$ is defined to be $k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)^{(\tau)}$ where $\langle \tau \rangle \simeq C_2$ acts on $k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)$ by $k$-automorphisms

$$\tau : X_1 \mapsto -X_1, \ X_2 \mapsto \frac{X_4}{X_2}, \ X_3 \mapsto \frac{(X_4 - 1)(X_4 - X_1^2)}{X_3}, \ X_4 \mapsto X_4.$$
**Proposition 3.21** ([CHKK10, Proposition 6.3], see also [HY17, Proposition 12.5]). Let $G$ be a group of order 64 which belongs to $\Phi_{13}$, i.e. $G = G(2^6, i)$ with $241 \leq i \leq 245$. There exists a $\mathbb{C}$-injective homomorphism $\varphi : L_C^{(0)} \to \mathbb{C}(G)$ such that $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is rational over $\varphi(L_C^{(0)})$. In particular, $\mathbb{C}(G)$ and $L_C^{(0)}$ are stably $\mathbb{C}$-isomorphic and $B_0(G) \simeq \text{Br}_n(L_C^{(0)}) = 0$.

**Proposition 3.22** ([CHKK10, Example 5.11], [HKK14, Proof of Theorem 6.3]). Let $G$ be a group of order 64 which belongs to $\Phi_{16}$, i.e. $G = G(2^6, i)$ with $149 \leq i \leq 151, 170 \leq i \leq 172, 177 \leq i \leq 178$ or $i = 182$. There exists a $\mathbb{C}$-injective homomorphism $\varphi : L_C^{(1)} \to \mathbb{C}(G)$ such that $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is rational over $\varphi(L_C^{(1)})$. In particular, $\mathbb{C}(G)$ and $L_C^{(1)}$ are stably $\mathbb{C}$-isomorphic, $B_0(G) \simeq \text{Br}_n(L_C^{(1)}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and hence $\mathbb{C}(G)$ and $L_C^{(1)}$ are not (retract, stably) $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

**Question 3.23** ([CHKK10, Section 6], [HY17, Section 12]). Is $L_k^{(0)}$ $k$-rational?

**The case where $G$ is a group of order 128.**

There exist 2328 groups of order 128 which are classified into 115 isoclinism families $\Phi_1, \ldots, \Phi_{115}$ ([JNO90, Tables I, II, III]).

**Theorem 3.24** (Moravec [Mor12, Section 8, Table 1]). Let $G$ be a group of order 128. Then $B_0(G) \neq 0$ if and only if $G$ belongs to the isoclinism family $\Phi_{16}$, $\Phi_{30}$, $\Phi_{31}$, $\Phi_{37}$, $\Phi_{39}$, $\Phi_{43}$, $\Phi_{58}$, $\Phi_{60}$, $\Phi_{80}$, $\Phi_{106}$ or $\Phi_{114}$. Moreover, we have

\[
B_0(G) \simeq \begin{cases} 
\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} & \text{if } G \text{ belongs to } \Phi_{16}, \Phi_{31}, \Phi_{37}, \Phi_{39}, \Phi_{43}, \Phi_{58}, \Phi_{60}, \Phi_{80}, \Phi_{106} \text{ or } \Phi_{114}, \\
(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^\oplus 2 & \text{if } G \text{ belongs to } \Phi_{30}.
\end{cases}
\]

In particular, $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is not (retract, stably) $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

It turns out that there exist 220 groups $G$ of order 128 with $B_0(G) \neq 0$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>$\Phi_{16}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{31}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{37}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{39}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{43}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{58}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{60}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{80}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{106}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{114}$</th>
<th>$\Phi_{30}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exp($G$)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 or 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_0(G)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^\oplus 2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of $G$'s</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is natural to ask the (stably) birational classification of $\mathbb{C}(G)$ for groups $G$ of order 128. In particular, what happens to $\mathbb{C}(G)$ with $B_0(G) \neq 0$? The following theorem (Theorem 3.26) gives a partial answer to this question.

**Definition 3.25.** Let $k$ be a field with char $k \neq 2$ and $k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7)$ be the rational function field over $k$ with variables $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7$. 
The field \( L_k^{(2)} \) is defined to be \( k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6)^{(\rho)} \) where \( \langle \rho \rangle \simeq C_4 \) acts on \( k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6) \) by \( k \)-automorphisms
\[
\rho : X_1 \mapsto X_2, X_2 \mapsto -X_1, X_3 \mapsto X_4, X_4 \mapsto X_3,
\]
\[
X_5 \mapsto X_6, X_6 \mapsto \frac{(X_1^2 X_2^2 - 1)(X_1^2 X_3^2 + X_2^2 - X_3^2) - 1)}{X_5}.
\]

The field \( L_k^{(3)} \) is defined to be \( k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7)^{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)} \) where \( \langle \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \rangle \simeq C_2 \times C_2 \) acts on \( k(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7) \) by \( k \)-automorphisms
\[
\lambda_1 : X_1 \mapsto X_1, X_2 \mapsto \frac{X_1}{X_2}, X_3 \mapsto \frac{1}{X_1}, X_4 \mapsto \frac{X_2X_4}{X_1X_3},
\]
\[
X_5 \mapsto -\frac{X_1 X_2^2 - 1}{X_5}, X_6 \mapsto -X_6, X_7 \mapsto X_7,
\]
\[
\lambda_2 : X_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{X_1}, X_2 \mapsto X_3, X_3 \mapsto X_2, X_4 \mapsto \frac{(X_1X_6^2 - 1)(X_1X_7^2 - 1)}{X_4},
\]
\[
X_5 \mapsto -X_5, X_6 \mapsto -X_1X_6, X_7 \mapsto -X_1X_7.
\]

Theorem 3.26 (Hoshi [Hos16, Theorem 1.31]). Let \( G \) be a group of order 128. Assume that \( B_0(G) \neq 0 \). Then \( \mathbb{C}(G) \) and \( L_C^{(m)} \) are stably \( \mathbb{C} \)-isomorphic where
\[
m = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } G \text{ belongs to } \Phi_{16}, \Phi_{31}, \Phi_{37}, \Phi_{43}, \Phi_{58}, \Phi_{60} \text{ or } \Phi_{80}, \\
2 & \text{if } G \text{ belongs to } \Phi_{106} \text{ or } \Phi_{114}, \\
3 & \text{if } G \text{ belongs to } \Phi_{30}.
\end{cases}
\]

In particular, \( \text{Br}_{nr}(L_C^{(1)}) \simeq \text{Br}_{nr}(L_C^{(2)}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \) and \( \text{Br}_{nr}(L_C^{(3)}) \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{\oplus 2} \) and hence the fields \( L_C^{(1)}, L_C^{(2)} \) and \( L_C^{(3)} \) are not (retract, stably) \( \mathbb{C} \)-rational.

For \( m = 1, 2 \), the fields \( L_C^{(m)} \) and \( L_C^{(3)} \) are not stably \( \mathbb{C} \)-isomorphic because their unramified Brauer groups are not isomorphic. However, we do not know whether the fields \( L_C^{(1)} \) and \( L_C^{(2)} \) are stably \( \mathbb{C} \)-isomorphic. If not, it is interesting to evaluate the higher unramified cohomologies.

§ 4. Rationality problem for multiplicative invariant fields

Let \( k \) be a field, \( G \) be a finite group and \( \rho : G \to GL(V) \) be a faithful representation of \( G \) where \( V \) is a finite-dimensional vector space over \( k \). Then \( G \) acts on the rational function field \( k(V) \).

We consider the rationality problem for \( k(V)^G \). By No-name Lemma (cf. Miyata [Miy71, Remark 3]), it is known that \( k(G) \) is stably \( k \)-rational if and only if so is \( k(V)^G \).
where $\rho : G \to GL(V)$ is any faithful representation of $G$ over $k$. Thus the rationality problem of $k(V)^G$ over $k$ is also called Noether’s problem.

In order to solve the rationality problem of $k(V)^G$, it is natural and almost inevitable that we reduce the problem to that of the multiplicative invariant field $k(M)^G$ defined in Definition 4.2, an illustration of reducing Noether’s problem to the multiplicative invariant field can be found in, e.g. [CHKK10], [HY11] Example 13.7.

When $M$ is a $G$-lattice with $\text{rank}_\mathbb{Z}M = n$, the multiplicative invariant field $k(M)^G$ is nothing but $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$, the fixed field of the rational function field $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ on which $G$ acts by multiplicative actions.

**Definition 4.1.** Let $G$ be a finite group and $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ be the group ring. A finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module $M$ is called a $G$-lattice if, as an abelian group, $M$ is a free abelian group of finite rank. We will write $\text{rank}_\mathbb{Z}M$ for the rank of $M$ as a free abelian group. A $G$-lattice $M$ is called faithful if, for any $\sigma \in G \setminus \{1\}$, $\sigma \cdot x \neq x$ for some $x \in M$.

Suppose that $G$ is any finite group and $\Phi : G \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ is a group homomorphism, i.e. an integral representation of $G$. Then the group $\Phi(G)$ acts naturally on the free abelian group $M := \mathbb{Z}^\oplus n$; thus $M$ becomes a $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module. We call $M$ the $G$-lattice associated to $\Phi$ (or $\Phi(G)$). Conversely, if $M$ is a $G$-lattice with $\text{rank}_\mathbb{Z}M = n$, write $M = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$. Then there is a group homomorphism $\Phi : G \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ defined as follows: If $\sigma \cdot x_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} a_{ij} x_j$ where $\sigma \in G$ and $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$, define $\Phi(\sigma) = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$.

When the group homomorphism $\Phi : G \to GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ is injective, the corresponding $G$-lattice is a faithful $G$-lattice. For examples, any finite subgroup $G$ of $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ gives rise to a faithful $G$-lattice of rank $n$.

The list of all the finite subgroups of $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ (with $n \leq 4$), up to conjugation, can be found in the book [BBNWZ78] and in GAP [GAP]. As to the situations of $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ (with $n \geq 5$), Plesken etc. found the lists of all the finite subgroups of $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ (with $n = 5$ and 6); see [PS00] and the references therein. These lists may be found in the GAP package CARAT [CARAT] and also in [HY17] Chapter 3.

Here is a list of the total number of lattices, up to isomorphism, of a given rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of $G$-lattices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>6079</td>
<td>85308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition 4.2.** Let $M$ be a $G$-lattice of rank $n$ and write $M = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$. For any field $k$, define $k(M) = k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ the rational function field over $k$ with $n$ variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Define a multiplicative action of $G$ on $k(M)$: For any $\sigma \in G$, if $\sigma \cdot x_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} a_{ij} x_j$ in the $G$-lattice $M$, then we define $\sigma \cdot x_i = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j^{a_{ij}}$ in the field $k(M)$. Note that $G$ acts trivially on $k$. The above multiplicative action is called a
purely monomial action of $G$ on $k(M)$ in [HK92] and $k(M)^G$ is called a multiplicative invariant field in [Sal87].

When $M$ is the $G$-lattice $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ where $M = \oplus_{g \in G} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_g$ and $h \cdot x_g = x_{hg}$ for $h, g \in G$, we have $k(M) = k(x_g \mid g \in G)$ and $k(M)^G = k(G)$ (see Section 1). Note that $k(G) = k(V_{\text{reg}})^G$ where $G \to GL(V_{\text{reg}})$ is the regular representation of $G$ over $k$.

**Theorem 4.3** (Hajja [Haj87]). Let $k$ be a field and $G$ be a finite group acting on $k(x_1, x_2)$ by monomial $k$-automorphisms. Then $k(x_1, x_2)^G$ is $k$-rational.

**Theorem 4.4** (Hajja and Kang [HK92, HK94], Hoshi and Rikuna [HR08]). Let $k$ be a field and $G$ be a finite group acting on $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by purely monomial $k$-automorphisms. Then $k(x_1, x_2, x_3)^G$ is $k$-rational.

**Theorem 4.5** (Hoshi, Kang and Kitayama [HKK14, Theorem 1.16]). Let $k$ be a field, $G$ be a finite group and $M$ be a $G$-lattice with rank$_\mathbb{Z} M = 4$ such that $G$ acts on $k(M)$ by purely monomial $k$-automorphisms. If $M$ is decomposable, i.e. $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ as $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules where $1 \leq \text{rank}_\mathbb{Z} M_1 \leq 3$, then $k(M)^G$ is $k$-rational.

**Theorem 4.6** (Hoshi, Kang and Kitayama [HKK14, Theorem 6.2]). Let $k$ be a field, $G$ be a finite group and $M$ be a $G$-lattice such that $G$ acts on $k(M)$ by purely monomial $k$-automorphisms. Assume that (i) $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ as $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules where rank$_\mathbb{Z} M_1 = 3$ and rank$_\mathbb{Z} M_2 = 2$, (ii) either $M_1$ or $M_2$ is a faithful $G$-lattice. Then $k(M)^G$ is $k$-rational except the following situation: char $k \neq 2$, $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \cong D_4$ and $M_1 = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathbb{Z} x_i$, $M_2 = \bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \mathbb{Z} y_j$ such that $\sigma : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2, x_3 \leftrightarrow -x_1 - x_2 - x_3, y_1 \leftrightarrow y_2 \leftrightarrow -y_1, \tau : x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3, x_2 \leftrightarrow -x_1 - x_2 - x_3, y_1 \leftrightarrow y_2$ where the $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-module structure of $M$ is written additively. For the exceptional case, $k(M)^G$ is not retract $k$-rational.

**Definition 4.7.** Let $k$ be a field and $\mu$ be a multiplicative subgroup of $k \setminus \{0\}$ containing all the roots of unity in $k$. If $M$ is a $G$-lattice, a $\mu$-extension is an exact sequence of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules given by $(\alpha) : 1 \to \mu \to M_\alpha \to M \to 0$ where $G$ acts trivially on $\mu$. Be aware that $M_\alpha = \mu \oplus M$ as abelian groups, but not as $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules except when the extension $(\alpha)$ splits.

As in Definition 4.2 if $M = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$ and $M_\alpha$ is a $\mu$-extension, we define the field $k_\alpha(M) = k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ the rational function field over $k$ with $n$ variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$; the action of $G$ on $k_\alpha(M)$ will be described in the next paragraph. Note that $M_\alpha$ is embedded into the multiplicative group $k_\alpha(M) \setminus \{0\}$ by sending $(\epsilon, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} b_i x_i) \in \mu \oplus M$ to the element $\epsilon \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i^{b_i}$ in the field $k_\alpha(M) = k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

The group $G$ acts on $k_\alpha(M)$ by a twisted multiplicative action: Suppose that, in $M$ we have $\sigma \cdot x_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} a_{ij} x_j$, and in $M_\alpha$ we have $\sigma \cdot x_i = \epsilon_i(\sigma) \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} a_{ij} x_j$ where $\epsilon_i(\sigma) \in \mu$. Then we define $\sigma \cdot x_i = \epsilon_i(\sigma) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j^{a_{ij}}$ in $k_\alpha(M)$. Again $G$ acts
trivially on the coefficient field \( k \). The above group action is called \textit{monomial group action} in [HK92] and \( k_\alpha(M)^G \) is called \textit{twisted multiplicative invariant field} in [Sal90].

Note that, if the extension \( (\alpha): 1 \to \mu \to M_\alpha \to M \to 0 \) is a split extension, then \( k_\alpha(M) = k(M) \) and the twisted multiplicative action is reduced to the multiplicative action in Definition 4.2.

For any faithful linear representation \( G \to GL(V) \) of \( G \), we have \( Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(V)^G) \simeq B_0(G) \) by No-name Lemma (see [Sal90]).

The formula in [Sal90, Theorem 12] (Theorem 3.5) can be used to compute not only \( Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \), but also \( Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}_\alpha(M)^G) \) where \( \mathbb{C}_\alpha(M) \) is the rational function field associated to the \( \mu \)-extension \( M_\alpha \):

**Theorem 4.8** (Saltman [Sal90, Theorem 12]). Let \( k \) be an algebraically closed field with \( \text{char} \ k = 0 \), and \( G \) be a finite group. If \( M \) is a \( G \)-lattice and \( (\alpha): 1 \to \mu \to M_\alpha \to M \to 0 \) is a \( \mu \)-extension such that (i) \( M \) is a faithful \( G \)-lattice, and (ii) \( H^2(G, \mu) \to H^2(G, M_\alpha) \) is injective, then

\[
Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) = \bigcap_A \ker\{res : H^2(G, M_\alpha) \to H^2(A, M_\alpha)\}
\]

where \( A \) runs over all the bicyclic subgroups of \( G \).

In particular, if the \( \mu \)-extension \( (\alpha): 1 \to \mu \to M_\alpha \to M \to 0 \) splits, then \( Br_{nr}(k(M)^G) \simeq B_0(G) \oplus \bigcap_A \ker\{res : H^2(G, M) \to H^2(A, M)\} \) where \( A \) runs over bicyclic subgroups of \( G \).

**Definition 4.9.** By Definition 3.3, \( Br_{nr}(K) \) is a subgroup of the Brauer group \( Br(K) \). On the other hand, the map of the Brauer groups \( Br(k_\alpha(M)^G) \to Br(k_\alpha(M)) \) sends \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) to \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)) \) [Sal87, Theorem 2.1]. Since \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)) = 0 \) by [Sal87, Proposition, 2.2], it follows that the unramified Brauer group \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) is a subgroup of the relative Brauer group \( Br(k_\alpha(M)/k_\alpha(M)^G) \). As \( Br(k_\alpha(M)/k_\alpha(M)^G) \) is isomorphic to the cohomology group \( H^2(G, k_\alpha(M)^\times) \), we may regard \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) as a subgroup of \( H^2(G, k_\alpha(M)^\times) \).

Through the embedding \( M_\alpha \hookrightarrow k_\alpha(M)^\times \), there is a canonical injection \( H^2(G, M_\alpha) \hookrightarrow Br(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) [Sal90, page 536]. Identifying \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) and \( H^2(G, M_\alpha) \) as subgroups of \( H^2(G, k_\alpha(M)^\times) \), we see that \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) is a subgroup of \( H^2(G, M_\alpha) \) [Sal90, page 536]. Thus we write \( H^2_{nr}(G, M_\alpha) \) for \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) (see [Sal90]).

Note that there is a natural map \( H^2(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \to H^2(G, M_\alpha) \). Clearly this map is injective if the \( \mu \)-extension \( (\alpha): 1 \to \mu \to M_\alpha \to M \to 0 \) splits. In this case, regarding \( H^2(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \) and \( H^2(G, M) \) as subgroups of \( H^2(G, M_\alpha) \), we define \( H^2_{nr}(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) = H^2(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \cap Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \) and \( H^2_{nr}(G, M) = H^2(G, M) \cap Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) \). It follows that \( Br_{nr}(k_\alpha(M)^G) = H^2_{nr}(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^2_{nr}(G, M) \). By Theorems 3.5 and 4.8, we have
$H^2_{nr}(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \simeq B_0(G)$ and $H^2_{nr}(G, M) \simeq \bigcap_A \ker\{\text{res} : H^2(G, M) \to H^2(A, M)\}$ where $A$ runs over bicyclic subgroups of $G$.

**Theorem 4.10** (Barge [Bar89, Theorem II.7]). Let $G$ be a finite group. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. All the Sylow subgroups of $G$ are bicyclic;
2. $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) = 0$ for all $G$-lattices $M$.

**Theorem 4.11** (Barge [Bar97, Theorem IV-1]). Let $G$ be a finite group. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. All the Sylow subgroups of $G$ are cyclic;
2. $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}_\alpha(M)^G) = 0$ for all $G$-lattices $M$, for all short exact sequences of $\mathbb{Z}[G]$-modules $\alpha : 0 \to \mathbb{C}^\times \to M_\alpha \to M \to 0$.

As in Definition 4.9, we have $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \simeq B_0(G) \oplus H^2_{nr}(G, M)$ where $B_0(G)$ is the Bogomolov multiplier and $H^2_{nr}(G, M) \leq H^2(G, M)$. We remark that $B_0(G)$ is related to the rationality of $\mathbb{C}(V)^G$ where $G \to GL(V)$ is any faithful linear representation of $G$ over $\mathbb{C}$; on the other hand, $H^2_{nr}(G, M)$ arises from the multiplicative nature of the field $\mathbb{C}(M)^G$.

In case $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M \leq 3$, $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) = 0$ for all $G$-lattices $M$ because $\mathbb{C}(M)^G$ are always $\mathbb{C}$-rational (see Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4). The following theorem [HKY, Theorem 1.10] gives the classification of all the lattices $M$ with $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$ when $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M \leq 6$. Thus $\mathbb{C}(M)^G$ are not retract $\mathbb{C}$-rational for these lattices (and thus are not $\mathbb{C}$-rational).

Let $C_n$ (resp. $D_n$, $QD_{8n}$, $Q_{8n}$) be the cyclic group of order $n$ (resp. the dihedral group of order $2n$, the quasi-dihedral group of order $16n$, the generalized quaternion group of order $8n$).

**Theorem 4.12** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY, Theorem 1.10]). Let $G$ be a finite group and $M$ be a faithful $G$-lattice.

1. If $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M \leq 3$, then $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) = 0$.
2. If $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M = 4$, then $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$ if and only if $M$ is one of the 5 cases in Table 1. Moreover, if $M$ is one of the 5 $G$-lattices with $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$, then $B_0(G) = 0$ and $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) = H^2_{nr}(G, M)$.
3. If $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M = 5$, then $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$ if and only if $M$ is one of the 46 cases in [HKY, Table 2]. Moreover, if $M$ is one of the 46 $G$-lattices with $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$, then $B_0(G) = 0$ and $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) = H^2_{nr}(G, M)$.
4. If $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M = 6$, then $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$ if and only if $M$ is one of the 1073 cases as in [HKY, Table 3]. Moreover, if $M$ is one of the 1073 $G$-lattices with $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$, then $B_0(G) = 0$ and $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) = H^2_{nr}(G, M)$, except for 24 cases with $B_0(G) = 0$ and $Br_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) = H^2_{nr}(G, M)$.
$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ where the CARAT ID of $G$ are $(6, 6458, i)$, $(6, 6459, i)$, $(6, 6464, i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq 8$). Note that 22 cases out of the exceptional 24 cases satisfy $H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M) = 0$.

Table 1: 5 $G$-lattices $M$ of rank 4 with $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$G(n, i)$</th>
<th>$G$</th>
<th>GAP ID</th>
<th>$B_0(G)$</th>
<th>$H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(8, 3)$</td>
<td>$D_4$</td>
<td>$(4, 12, 4, 12)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(8, 4)$</td>
<td>$Q_8$</td>
<td>$(4, 32, 1, 2)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^\otimes 2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(16, 8)$</td>
<td>$QD_8$</td>
<td>$(4, 32, 3, 2)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(24, 3)$</td>
<td>$SL_2(\mathbb{F}_3)$</td>
<td>$(4, 33, 3, 1)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^\otimes 2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(48, 29)$</td>
<td>$GL_2(\mathbb{F}_3)$</td>
<td>$(4, 33, 6, 1)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remark 4.13.** (1) The above theorem remains valid if we replace the coefficient field $\mathbb{C}$ by any algebraically closed field $k$ with char $k = 0$.

(2) If $M$ is of rank $\leq 6$ and $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M^G)) \neq 0$, then $G$ is solvable and non-abelian, and $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M^G)) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. The case where $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M^G)) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ occurs only for 4 groups $G$ of order 27, 27, 54, 54 with the CARAT ID $(6, 2865, 1)$, $(6, 2865, 3)$, $(6, 2899, 3)$, $(6, 2899, 5)$ which are isomorphic to $C_9 \times C_3$, $C_9 \times C_3$, $(C_9 \times C_3) \times C_2$, $(C_9 \times C_3) \times C_2$ respectively. For CARAT ID, see Hoshi and Yamasaki [HY17 Chapter 3].

(3) The group $G \simeq D_4$ which appears as the exceptional case in Theorem 4.6 (i.e. [HKK14, Theorem 6.2]) satisfies the property that $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M^G)) = H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M) \neq 0$ where $M$ is the associated lattice. It follows that $\mathbb{C}(M)^G$ is not retract rational.

In Theorem 4.6 note that both $\mathbb{C}(M_1)^G$ and $\mathbb{C}(M_2)^G$ are rational by Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.13. Thus $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M_2^G)) = 0$ and $H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M_2) = 0$. But $M_1$ is not a faithful $G$-lattice and we cannot apply Theorem 4.8 to $\mathbb{C}(M_1)^G$. Hence it is possible that $H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M_1)$ is non-trivial. Because $H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M) \simeq H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M_1) \oplus H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M_2)$, this allows for the possibility that $H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M)$ is non-trivial. Indeed, it can be shown that $H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M_1) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and therefore $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M^G)) = H^2_{\text{nr}}(G, M_1) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

(4) Here is a summary of Theorem 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank$_\mathbb{Z} M$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of $G$-lattices $M$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>6079</td>
<td>85308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of $G$-lattices $M$ with $\text{Br}_{\text{nr}}(\mathbb{C}(M^G)) \neq 0$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theorem 4.14** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY, Theorem 4.4]). The following fields $K$ are stably equivalent each other:

(1) $\mathbb{C}(G)$ where $G$ is a group of order 64 which belongs to the 16th isoclinism class $\Phi_{16}$ (see the 9 groups defined as in Theorem 3.19 (1)).
(2) $\mathbb{C}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)^{D_4}$ where $D_4 = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ acts on $\mathbb{C}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ by

$$\sigma : x_1 \mapsto x_2x_3, x_2 \mapsto x_1x_3, x_3 \mapsto x_4, x_4 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_3},$$

$$\tau : x_1 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_2}, x_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_1}, x_3 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_4}, x_4 \mapsto \frac{1}{x_3}$$

(see Theorem 4.12 (2) and Table 1);

(3) $\mathbb{C}(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5)^{D_4}$ where $D_4 = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ acts on $\mathbb{C}(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5)$ by

$$\sigma : y_1 \mapsto y_2, y_2 \mapsto y_1, y_3 \mapsto \frac{1}{y_1y_2y_3}, y_4 \mapsto y_5, y_5 \mapsto \frac{1}{y_4},$$

$$\tau : y_1 \mapsto y_3, y_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{y_1y_2y_3}, y_3 \mapsto y_1, y_4 \mapsto y_5, y_5 \mapsto y_4$$

(see Theorem 4.6);

(4) $\mathbb{C}(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)^{C_2 \times C_2}$ where $C_2 \times C_2 = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ acts on $\mathbb{C}(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$ by

$$\sigma : z_1 \mapsto z_2, z_2 \mapsto z_1, z_3 \mapsto \frac{1}{z_1z_2z_3}, z_4 \mapsto -\frac{1}{z_4},$$

$$\tau : z_1 \mapsto z_3, z_2 \mapsto \frac{1}{z_1z_2z_3}, z_3 \mapsto z_1, z_4 \mapsto -z_4$$

(see [HKK14, Proof of Theorem 6.4]);

(5) $\mathbb{C}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)^{C_2}$ where $C_2 = \langle \sigma \rangle$ acts on $\mathbb{C}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ by

$$\sigma : w_1 \mapsto -w_1, w_2 \mapsto \frac{w_4-1}{w_2}, w_3 \mapsto \frac{(w_4-1)(w_4-w_2)}{w_3}, w_4 \mapsto w_4$$

(see [HKK14, Theorem 6.3]).

In particular, the unramified cohomology groups $H_{nr}^i(K, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ of the fields $K$ in (1)–(5) coincide and $\text{Br}_{nr}(K) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}.$

As in Remark 4.13 (2), all the $G$-lattices $M$ with $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} M \leq 6$ and $H_{nr}^2(G, M) \neq 0$ in Theorem 4.12 satisfy the condition that $G$ is non-abelian and solvable. Examples of $G$-lattices $M$ with $H_{nr}^2(G, M) \neq 0$ where $G$ is abelian (resp. non-solvable; in fact, simple) are given in [HKY] as follows:

**Theorem 4.15** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY] Theorem 6.1]). Let $G$ be an elementary abelian group of order $2^n$ in $GL_7(\mathbb{Z})$ and $M$ be the associated $G$-lattice of rank 7. Then $\text{Br}_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$ if and only if $G$ is isomorphic up to conjugation to one of the nine groups $G_1, \ldots, G_9 \leq GL_7(\mathbb{Z})$ as in [HKY] Theorem 6.1 where each of $G_i$ is isomorphic to $(C_2)^3$ as an abstract group. Moreover, $\text{Br}_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^{G_i}) = H_{nr}^2(G_i, M) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$) for $1 \leq i \leq 8$ (resp. $i = 9$).

**Theorem 4.16** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY] Theorem 6.2]). Embed $A_6$ into $S_{10}$ through the isomorphism $A_6 \simeq PSL_2(\mathbb{F}_9)$, which acts on the projective line $\mathbb{P}^1_{\mathbb{F}_9}$ via fractional linear transformations. Thus we may regard $A_6$ as a transitive subgroup of
$S_{10}$. Let $N = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq 10} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$ be the $S_{10}$-lattice defined by $\sigma \cdot x_i = x_{\sigma(i)}$ for any $\sigma \in S_{10}$; it becomes an $A_6$-lattice by restricting the action of $S_{10}$ to $A_6$. Define $M = N/(\mathbb{Z} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{10} x_i)$ with rank$_{\mathbb{Z}}M = 9$. There exist exactly six $A_6$-lattices $M = M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_6$ which are $\mathbb{Q}$-conjugate but not $\mathbb{Z}$-conjugate to each other; in fact, all these $M_i$ form a single $\mathbb{Q}$-class, but this $\mathbb{Q}$-class consists of six $\mathbb{Z}$-classes. Then we have

$$H^2_{nr}(A_6, M_1) \simeq H^2_{nr}(A_6, M_3) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}, \quad H^2_{nr}(A_6, M_i) = 0 \text{ for } i = 2, 4, 5, 6.$$

In particular, $\mathbb{C}(M_1)^{A_6}$ and $\mathbb{C}(M_3)^{A_6}$ are not retract $\mathbb{C}$-rational. Furthermore, the lattices $M_1$ and $M_3$ may be distinguished by the Tate cohomology groups:

$$H^1(A_6, M_1) = 0, \quad \hat{H}^{-1}(A_6, M_1) = \mathbb{Z}/10\mathbb{Z},
H^1(A_6, M_3) = \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}, \quad \hat{H}^{-1}(A_6, M_3) = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}.$$

Motivated by the $G$-lattices in Theorem 4.12 (2) (see Table 1), the following $G$-lattices $M$ of rank $2n + 2, 4n$ and $p(p - 1)$ ($n$ is any positive integer and $p$ is any odd prime number) with $\text{Br}_{nr}(\mathbb{C}(M)^G) \neq 0$ were constructed in [HKY]:

**Theorem 4.17** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY, Theorem 7.2]). Let $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^{4n} = \tau^2 = 1, \tau^{-1}\sigma\tau = \sigma^{-1} \rangle \simeq D_{4n}$, the dihedral group of order $8n$ where $n$ is any positive integer. Let $M$ be the $G$-lattice of rank $2n + 2$ defined in [HKY, Definition 7.1]. Then $H^2_{nr}(G, M) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, $\mathbb{C}(M)^G$ is not retract $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

**Theorem 4.18** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY, Theorem 7.5]).

1. Let $n$ be any positive integer and $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^{8n} = \tau^2 = 1, \tau^{-1}\sigma\tau = \sigma^{-1} \rangle \simeq QD_{8n}$ be the quasi-dihedral group of order $16n$. Let $M$ be the $G$-lattice of rank $4n$ defined in [HKY, Definition 7.4]. Then $H^2_{nr}(G, M) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, $\mathbb{C}(M)^G$ is not retract $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

2. Let $\hat{G} = \langle \sigma^2, \sigma \tau \rangle \simeq Q_{8n} \leq G$ be the generalized quaternion group of order $8n$. Let $\hat{M} = \text{Res}_{G}^\hat{G}(M)$ be the $\hat{G}$-lattice of rank $4n$ defined in [HKY, Definition 7.4]. Then $H^2_{nr}(\hat{G}, \hat{M}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, $\mathbb{C}(\hat{M})^{\hat{G}}$ is not retract $\mathbb{C}$-rational.

**Theorem 4.19** (Hoshi, Kang and Yamasaki [HKY, Theorem 7.7]). Let $p$ be an odd prime and $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^{p^2} = \tau^p = 1, \tau^{-1}\sigma\tau = \sigma^{p+1} \rangle \simeq C_{p^2} \times C_p$. Let $M$ be the $G$-lattice of rank $p(p - 1)$ defined in [HKY, Definition 7.6]. Then $H^2_{nr}(G, M) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, $\mathbb{C}(M)^G$ is not retract $\mathbb{C}$-rational.
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