

ON ENDOTRIVIAL COMPLEXES AND THE GENERALIZED DADE GROUP

SAM K. MILLER

ABSTRACT. Let p be a prime, G a p -group, and k a field of characteristic p . We give a complete description of the group $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ of endotrivial complexes, identifying $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ with the additive subgroup of class functions $f : s_p(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the Borel-Smith conditions. This is done by constructing a short exact sequence isomorphic to a short exact sequence of rational p -biset functors constructed by Bouc and Yalçın, endowing $\mathcal{E}_k$ with rational p -biset structure. We also determine all the possible h-marks which arise in $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ when G is a finite group via the induced restriction map to a Sylow p -subgroup. As a consequence, we prove that every p -permutation autoequivalence of a p -group extends to a splendid Rickard autoequivalence. Additionally, we give a positive answer to a question of Gelvin and Yalçın in [13], showing the kernel of the Bouc homomorphism for an arbitrary finite group G is described by class functions $f : s_p(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying the oriented Artin-Borel-Smith conditions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a finite group and k a field of characteristic $p > 0$. In [17] and [18], we previously introduced the notions of endotrivial chain complexes and relatively endotrivial chain complexes of p -permutation kG -modules respectively. These complexes may be considered analogues of endotrivial kG -modules and relatively endotrivial kG -modules respectively.

In this paper, we apply much of the theory previously developed to answer questions both about endotrivial complexes and beyond; these questions concern class functions, the Bouc homomorphism, and derived equivalences. A key structure in this study is the Dade group $D_k(G)$ of a finite group. First introduced by Dade in [11] and [12] for the case when G is a p -group, $D_k(G)$ parameterizes the “capped” endopermutation kG -modules. $D_k(G)$ was generalized to all finite groups G by Linckelmann and Mazza in [16], by Lassueur in [15], and by Gelvin and Yalçın in [13] via separate techniques.

In Lassueur’s construction, the generalized Dade group $D_k(G)$ parameterizes the “strongly capped” endo- p -permutation kG -modules. We take special interest in Lassueur’s construction, as it relies on relatively endotrivial kG -modules which are endo- p -permutation as well. Define the kG -module $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ by

$$V(\mathcal{F}_G) := \bigoplus_{P \in [s_p(G) \setminus \text{Syl}_p(G)]} k[G/P].$$

Then, $D_k(G)$ is realized as a subgroup of the group $T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ of $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial kG -modules. These modules are closely tied to $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complexes, as defined in [18], as a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex is equivalently a shifted endosplit p -permutation resolution (as defined by Rickard in [20]) of a relatively $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial module. This observation gives us the following short exact sequence, which is developed in Theorems 3.8 and 3.8.

Theorem 1.1. *Let G be a finite group and S a Sylow p -subgroup of G . We have a short exact sequence of abelian groups*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \rightarrow 0.$$

Here $\mathcal{TE}_k(G) \leq \mathcal{E}_k(G)$ is the subgroup of homology-normalized endotrivial complexes, that is, equivalences classes of endotrivial complexes $[C]$ with nonzero homology isomorphic to the trivial kG -module k . $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ is the group of $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complexes. $D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \leq D_k(G)$ is a subgroup of the generalized Dade group.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20J05, 19A22, 20C05, 20C20 .

Key words and phrases. Endotrivial complex, endopermutation module, Dade group, Bouc homomorphism, splendid Rickard complex, p -permutation equivalence.

Therefore, we have a relationship between the groups of endotrivial complexes, $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complexes, and the generalized Dade group. If G is a p -group, this short exact sequence is isomorphic to a short exact sequence constructed by Bouc and Yalçin in [8], and as a result, we can completely determine the h -marks which arise for all endotrivial complexes for p -groups. This is Theorem 4.6.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a p -group. We have an isomorphism of short exact sequences:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k(G) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow = \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C_b(G, p) & \hookrightarrow & C(G, p) & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Here, $C_b(G, p)$ is the subgroup of $C(G, p)$ consisting of Borel-Smith functions. The map $\Psi : C(G, p) \rightarrow D^\Omega(G)$ is the Bouc homomorphism (see Definition 3.12). In particular, $[C] \in \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ has an endotrivial cap if and only if its h -mark function h_C is a Borel-Smith function.

Furthermore, the bottom short exact sequence arises from a short exact sequence of rational p -biset functors, allowing us to transport biset functor structure to $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ and $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$. This is the topic of Section 5. In particular, we verify that the biset structure of $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ is what one might expect. Interestingly, the induction operation does not coincide with the usual tensor induction of chain complexes. We ask the question of whether there is a closed-form description of the induction operator - at the moment, it is not clear.

Though it is not possible to fully realize $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ as a biset functor for all groups, we still may extend the results of p -groups to the general finite group case. Let $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. In [18], we characterized the image of the homomorphism $\text{Res}_S^G : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(S)$ as the subgroup of “fusion-stable” endotrivial complexes, denoted $\mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F}$. Then, the h -marks of endotrivial complexes of kG -modules correspond to class functions which upon restriction to a Sylow p -subgroup are Borel-Smith functions.

Bouc and Yalçin’s short exact sequence above determines the kernel of the Bouc homomorphism $\Psi : C(G, p) \rightarrow D^\Omega(G)$ when G is a p -group. The Bouc homomorphism was generalized to all finite groups in [13, Theorem 1.4], and in general, we have an inclusion $\ker \Psi \subseteq C_b(G, p)$. Gelvin and Yalçin in [13] proposed an additional condition, the *oriented Artin condition*, and proved that $C_{ba^+}(G, p) \subseteq \ker \Psi \subseteq C_b(G, p)$, where $C_{ba^+}(G, p)$ denotes the subgroup of $C(G, p)$ consisting of class functions satisfying the oriented Artin-Borel-Smith conditions. Furthermore, they posed the question of whether in general, $C_{ba^+}(G, p) = \ker \Psi$. We provide a positive answer to this question by rephrasing it into a question regarding certain endotrivial complexes; this is Theorem 6.15.

Theorem 1.3. $\ker \Psi = C_{ba^+}(G, p)$.

The proof relies on the group homomorphism $\Lambda : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow O(T(kG))$ induced by taking the Lefschetz invariant of a chain complex, which was studied by the author in [17], and some character theory developed by Boltje and Carman in [2]. Here, $O(T(kG))$ denotes the orthogonal unit group of the trivial source ring.

In [17], we determined that in many cases, the homomorphism $\Lambda : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow O(T(kG))$ is not surjective for non- p -groups. In particular, the image of Λ is contained in the subgroup $O(T(\mathbb{F}_p G)) \leq O(T(kG))$. However, the question remained open for p -groups. Using further results of Bouc and Yalçin, we determine that indeed, Λ is surjective for any p -group. This is Theorem 7.5.

Theorem 1.4. *Let G be a p -group. $\Lambda : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow O(T(kG))$ is surjective.*

We obtain as corollary that if P is a p -group, every p -permutation autoequivalence of a block kP is obtained from a splendid Rickard autoequivalence of kP . This is Theorem 7.9.

Theorem 1.5. *Let G be a p -group and let $\gamma \in O(T^\Delta(kG, kG))$ be a p -permutation autoequivalence of kG . There exists a splendid Rickard complex Γ satisfying $\Lambda(\Gamma) = \gamma$.*

Notation and conventions: For the paper, we fix p a prime, k a field of characteristic p , G a finite group, V an absolutely p -divisible kG -module (possibly 0), and $\mathcal{X}_V \subseteq s_p(G)$ the set of p -subgroups of G for which $V(P) = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{X}_V$ contains all Sylow p -subgroups of G , since V is absolutely p -divisible.

We write $s_p(G)$ for the set of p -subgroups of G , $[s_p(G)]$ for a set of representatives of conjugacy classes of $s_p(G)$, and $\text{Syl}_p(G)$ for the set of Sylow p -subgroups of G . We let $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ denote an arbitrary Sylow p -subgroup of G . Given a kG -module M , we let $M[i]$ denote the chain complex with M in degree i and the zero module in all other degrees.

We refer the reader to [14] for review of projectivity relative to modules, absolute p -divisibility, relatively endotrivial modules, and to [18] for relatively stable module and chain complex categories and relatively endotrivial chain complexes. Additionally, we refer the reader to [6] for a complete overview of biset functors, and to [8, Section 2] for a quicker overview of rational p -biset functors.

2. V -ENDOSPLIT-TRIVIAL COMPLEXES

First, we review some results regarding V -endosplit-trivial chain complexes and endotrivial chain complexes.

Definition 2.1. Let $C \in Ch^b(kG\mathbf{triv})$. Say C is a V -endosplit-trivial complex if

$$\text{End}_k(C) \cong C^* \otimes_k C \simeq (k \oplus M)[0],$$

where M is a V -projective kG -module.

If $V = 0$, we say C is an *endotrivial complex* for short. This coincides with the definition of an endotrivial complex given in [17].

Proposition 2.2. (*Omnibus properties*) Let C be a V -endosplit-trivial complex. Then the following hold:

- (a) C has a unique indecomposable summand C_0 which is V -endosplit-trivial, and all other direct summands are V -projective or contractible. We call C_0 the *cap* of C .
- (b) There exists a unique $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for which $H_i(C) \neq 0$.
- (c) C_0 has vertex set $\text{Syl}_p(G)$.
- (d) If $H \leq G$, then $\text{Res}_H^G C$ is a $\text{Res}_H^G V$ -endosplit-trivial complex.
- (e) If G is a quotient of $\tilde{G}$, then $\text{Inf}_G^{\tilde{G}} C$ is a $\text{Inf}_G^{\tilde{G}} V$ -endosplit-trivial complex.
- (f) If $P \in s_p(G)$, then $C(P)$ is a $V(P)$ -endosplit-trivial complex. In particular, if $P \in \mathcal{X}_V$, i.e. $V(P) = 0$, then $C(P)$ is an endotrivial complex.
- (g) If $H_i(C) \neq 0$, then $H_i(C)$ is a relatively V -endotrivial kG -module.

Proof. Proofs of all these statements can be found in [18]. □

Theorem 2.3. [18, Corollary 8.4]

Let $C \in Ch^b(kG\mathbf{triv})$. The following are equivalent:

- (a) C is V -endosplit-trivial.
- (b) For all $P \in s_p(G)$, $C(P)$ has nonzero homology concentrated in exactly one degree, and if $P \in \mathcal{X}_V$, that homology has k -dimension one.
- (c) For all $P \in s_p(G)$, $C(P)$ has nonzero homology concentrated in exactly one degree i and $H_i(C)$ is a V -endotrivial kG -module.
- (d) C is isomorphic to a shift of an endosplit p -permutation resolution of a V -endotrivial kG -module.

In particular, C is endotrivial if and only if for all $P \in s_p(G)$, $C(P)$ has nonzero homology concentrated in one degree with that homology having k -dimension one.

Definition 2.4. We define the group $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ of V -endosplit-trivial chain complexes as the set of all isomorphism classes of endotrivial complexes in the relative stable homotopy category $\underline{K}^b(kG\mathbf{triv})_V$. $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ forms an abelian group with group addition induced from $\otimes_k$. Write $[C] \in \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ for the equivalence class of a V -endosplit-trivial complex C . We have $[C]^{-1} = [C^*]$.

We have an equivalent definition of $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ as follows. Say two V -endosplit-trivial complexes C_1, C_2 are equivalent, written $C_1 \sim C_2$, if and only if C_1 and C_2 have isomorphic caps. Set $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ to be the set of equivalence classes of V -endosplit-trivial complexes, with group addition induced from $\otimes_k$. It follows that this definition coincides with the previous one. See [18, Remark 6.8(b)] for details.

If C is a V -endosplit-trivial complex, we write $[C] \in \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ to denote the corresponding class of complexes in the group. We set $\mathcal{E}_k(G) := \mathcal{E}_k^{\{0\}}(G)$. This construction agrees with the definition of $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ given in [17]

- Definition 2.5.** (a) [14, Proposition 3.5.1] Let V be an absolutely p -divisible kG -module. Define an equivalence relation $\sim_V$ on the class of V -endotrivial kG -modules as follows: given two V -endotrivial modules M, N , write $M \sim_V N$ if and only if M and N have isomorphic caps, or equivalently, if $M \cong N$ in ${}_kG\mathbf{mod}_V$. Let $T_V(G)$ denote the resulting set of equivalence classes, then $\otimes_k$ induces an abelian group structure on $T_V(G)$.
- (b) Let $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. We define $T_V(G, S) \leq T_V(G)$ as the kernel of $\text{Res}_S^G : T_V(G) \rightarrow T_{\text{Res}_S^G V}(S)$. Equivalently, $T_V(G, S)$ is the subgroup of $T_V(G)$ generated by trivial source V -endotrivial kG -modules, see [18, Theorem 5.5] for details.

Proposition 2.6. [18, Proposition 6.4]

- (a) If U, V are two kG -modules satisfying ${}_kG\text{Proj}(U) \subseteq {}_kG\text{Proj}(V)$, then we have an injective group homomorphism $\mathcal{E}_k^U(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$. In particular, we have an injective group homomorphism $\mathcal{E}_k(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$.
- (b) We have an injective group homomorphism $T_V(G, S) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ given by $[M] \mapsto [M[0]]$.

In this way, we identify both $T_V(G, S)$ and $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ as subgroups of $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$. However, the equivalence classes in $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ which are in the image of the inclusion $\mathcal{E}_k(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ will in general be larger than their preimage in $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$.

Proposition 2.7. [18, Theorem 9.15] Let U, V be kG -modules for which ${}_kG\text{Proj}(U) \subseteq {}_kG\text{Proj}(V)$, and let C be a V -endosplit-trivial complex. $[C] \in \text{im } \iota : \mathcal{E}_k^U(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ if and only if the cap of $\mathcal{H}_C(1)$ is a relatively U -projective kG -module.

In particular, $\text{im } \iota : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ is the following subgroup:

$$\{[C] \in \mathcal{E}_k^V(G) \mid \mathcal{H}_C(1) \text{ has cap with } k\text{-dimension one}\}.$$

Definition 2.8. Let $C(G, p)$ denote the set of $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued class functions on the set of p -subgroups of G . We may identify $C(G, p)$ in the following way:

$$C(G, p) \xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\prod_{P \in s_p(G)} \mathbb{Z} \right)^G, f \mapsto (f(P))_{P \in s_p(G)}.$$

In particular, when G is a p -group, $C(G, p) = B(G)^*$, the $\mathbb{Z}$ -dual of the Burnside ring $B(G)$, via the identification

$$C(G, p) \rightarrow B(G)^*, f \mapsto ([G/H] \mapsto f(H)).$$

In this situation, these groups arise from isomorphic rational p -biset functors, which we describe in detail in Section 4.

It is common notation to remove the p in $C(G, p)$ when G is a p -group. However, since $C(G)$ could also refer to the Brauer construction, we keep the p -notation to avoid ambiguity.

Definition 2.9. Let C be a V -endosplit-trivial chain complex. The h -mark of C at P , denoted $h_C(P)$, is the unique integer for which $H_{h_C(P)}(C(P)) \neq 0$. The homology of C at P , denoted $\mathcal{H}_C(P)$, is $[H_{h_C(P)}(C(P))] \in T_{V(P)}(N_G(P)/P)$. If $V = 0$, we identify $T_0(G) = X(G)$, the group of isomorphism classes of k -dimension one kG -modules, with group law induced by $\otimes_k$. $X(G)$ may also be identified with the group of group homomorphism $\text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$ by sending a group homomorphism $\omega : G \rightarrow k^\times$ to the k -dimension one kG -module k_ω defined by $g \cdot m := \omega(g)m$ for $m \in k_\omega, g \in G$.

Note that h_C may be regarded as a class function $h_C : s_p(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, since for any $g \in G$ and $P \in s_p(G)$ $C(gP) \cong ({}^gC)(P)$, see [17, Proposition 2.7(c)].

This notation for h -marks differs slightly from the notation in [17], where we instead regard h -marks as a collection of integers indexed by $s_p(G)$. However, it is easy to see these are equivalent formulations.

Proposition 2.10. [18, Definition 9.7] We have a well-defined, injective group homomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi : \mathcal{E}_k^V(G) &\rightarrow \prod_{P \in s_p(G)} (\mathbb{Z} \times T_{V(P)}(N_G(P)/P)) \\ [C] &\mapsto (h_C(P), \mathcal{H}_C(P))_{P \in s_p(G)}. \end{aligned}$$

Regarding h_C as a $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued class function on $s_p(G)$ gives another group homomorphism, which we call the h -mark homomorphism,

$$h : \mathcal{E}_k^V(G) \rightarrow C(G, p) \\ [C] \mapsto h_C$$

$\ker h \cong T_V(G, S)$, the torsion subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$. In particular, $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G)$ is a finitely generated abelian group.

2.1. The module $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$. We next introduce a specific absolutely p -divisible kG -module which plays a crucial role in the sequel. This module was used by Lassueur in [15] in her construction of the generalized Dade group.

Definition 2.11. We define the kG -module $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ as follows:

$$V(\mathcal{F}_G) = \bigoplus_{Q \in [s_p(G) \setminus \text{Syl}_p(G)]} k[G/Q].$$

$V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ is absolutely p -divisible, and may be considered the “largest” absolutely p -divisible module via the next theorem.

Theorem 2.12. *Let V be an absolutely p -divisible kG -module.*

- (a) *If M is a V -endotrivial kG -module, M is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial.*
- (b) *If C is a V -endosplit-trivial kG -complex, C is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial.*

Proof. For (a), write $V = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_n$ with each V_i indecomposable. Since V is absolutely p -divisible, each V_i has vertex strictly contained in a Sylow p -subgroup. [18, Theorem 5.6(a)] asserts that ${}_kG\text{Proj}(V_i) \subseteq {}_kG\text{Proj}(Q_i)$ with Q_i the vertex of V_i . We have

$${}_kG\text{Proj}(V) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n {}_kG\text{Proj}(V_i) \subseteq \bigoplus_{i=1}^n {}_kG\text{Proj}(Q_i) \subseteq {}_kG\text{Proj}(V(\mathcal{F}_G)),$$

where the last containment follows from the fact that ${}_kG\text{Proj}(H) = {}_kG\text{Proj}(k[G/H])$. Now (b) follows directly from (a) and [18, Corollary 8.4]. $\square$

Definition 2.13. Given any G -set X , we write $\Delta(X)$ for the kG -module given by the kernel of the augmentation homomorphism,

$$kX \rightarrow k, x \mapsto 1.$$

This is referred to as the *relative syzygy* of X .

Theorem 2.14. *Let $V = V(\mathcal{F}_G)$. Then $h : \mathcal{E}_k^V(G) \rightarrow C(G, p)$ is surjective. In particular, if G is a p -group, we have an isomorphism $\mathcal{E}_k^V(G) \cong C(G, p) \cong B(G)^*$.*

Proof. We give an explicit set of V -endosplit-trivial chain complexes C_Q for every $Q \in [s_p(G)]$ such that the set $\{h_{C_Q}\}$ forms a basis of $C(G, p)$.

If $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$, we define $C_S = k[1]$. Otherwise, if $Q \notin \text{Syl}_p(G)$, we define

$$C_Q = 0 \rightarrow k[G/Q] \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0,$$

with k in degree 0, and the differential given by the augmentation map, that is, the homomorphism induced by $gQ \mapsto 1 \in k$. C_Q is a V -endosplit-trivial chain complex, as the augmentation map $k[G/Q] \rightarrow k$ is Q -split, hence $k[G/Q]$ -split. Therefore $H_1(C_Q) \cong \Delta(G/Q)$ is $k[G/Q]$ -endotrivial, hence $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial. It follows that

$$h_{C_Q}(P) = \begin{cases} 1 & P \leq_G Q \\ 0 & P \not\leq_G Q \end{cases}.$$

It follows by a standard Möbius inversion argument on the poset of p -subgroups of G that the set $\{h_{C_Q}\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)]}$ forms a $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of $C(G, p)$, as desired. The last statement follows immediately, since if G is a p -group, h is injective as well. $\square$

Remark 2.15. Explicitly, if $\{e_Q\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)]}$ is the idempotent basis for $C(G, p)$, i.e. $e_Q(P) = 1$ if $Q =_G P$ and $e_Q(P) = 0$ otherwise, then

$$e_Q = \sum_{P \in [s_p(G)]} \mu(P, Q) h_{C_P},$$

where μ denotes the Möbius function for the poset $[s_p(G)]$.

Definition 2.16. For the rest of this paper, we will always use the notation used in the previous proof for the $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex C_Q . We write ω_Q for h_{C_Q} . We will use extensively the facts that $\{C_Q\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)]}$ forms a $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of a free complement of $T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ (the torsion subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$), and $\{\omega_Q\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)]}$ forms a $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of $C(G, p)$.

Moreover, observe that when $Q \notin \text{Syl}_p(G)$, $\mathcal{H}_{C_Q}(1) = [\Delta(G/Q)] \in T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$, and for $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$, $\mathcal{H}_{C_S}(1) = [k]$.

Extending notation, for a G -set X , define $\omega_X \in C(G, p)$ as follows:

$$\omega_X(P) = \begin{cases} 1 & X^P \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

In this case, $\omega_{G/Q} = \omega_Q$.

Using Theorem 2.14, we may obtain a construction for a V -endosplit-trivial chain complex C given only its h-marks, up to a twist by a unique trivial source V -endotrivial kG -module.

Theorem 2.17. *Let V be an absolutely p -divisible kG -module (possibly 0), and C be an indecomposable V -endosplit-trivial chain complex of kG -modules with h-marks $h_C \in C(G, p)$. For $P \in [s_p(G)]$, set*

$$b_P := \sum_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} h_C(Q) \mu(P, Q).$$

There exists a unique trivial source $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial kG -module M for which the following holds: C is isomorphic to the unique V -endosplit-trivial indecomposable direct summand of the $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial chain complex

$$M \otimes_k \bigotimes_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} C_Q^{\otimes b_Q},$$

where C_Q is defined in the proof of Theorem 2.14.

Proof. Let h_C denote the corresponding h-marks of C . Note we may regard C as a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex as well by Theorem 2.12, since V is absolutely p -divisible. Then we have

$$h_C = \sum_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} a_Q e_Q = \sum_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} a_Q \left(\sum_{P \in s_p(G)} \mu(P, Q) \omega_P \right) = \sum_{P \in [s_p(G)]} \omega_P \left(\sum_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} a_Q \mu(P, Q) \right) = \sum_{P \in [s_p(G)]} b_P \omega_P.$$

It follows that the $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial chain complex

$$D := \bigotimes_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} C_Q^{\otimes b_Q}$$

has the same h-marks as C , and thus $D^* \otimes_k C$ has h-marks all zero. Therefore,

$$[D]^{-1} + [C] = [M[0]] \in \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G),$$

for some class of $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial p -permutation modules $[M[0]]$. Since every class of relatively $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial modules has a unique indecomposable representative, we may take M to be a trivial source kG -module. Therefore, we have

$$[M[0] \otimes_k D] = [C] \in \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G).$$

Since every class of $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complexes has a unique summand with Sylow vertices, and this chain complex is also $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial, C is the unique indecomposable $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial summand of $M[0] \otimes_k D$. Since C is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial as well, we are done. $\square$

Remark 2.18. In particular, if G is a p -group, C is isomorphic to the unique indecomposable $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial direct summand of

$$\bigotimes_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} C_Q^{\otimes b_Q},$$

since in this case, the only trivial source relatively endotrivial kG -module is k . Therefore, one can reconstruct an endotrivial kG -complex purely from knowing its h-marks.

3. CAPPED ENDOSPLIT p -PERMUTATION RESOLUTIONS AND THE DADE GROUP OF A FINITE GROUP

In this section, we construct a short exact sequence relating V -endosplit-trivial complexes, endotrivial complexes, and the generalized Dade group as defined by Lassueur in [15]. We also determine up to equivalence which strongly capped endo- p -permutation modules, as defined by Lassueur, have endosplit p -permutation resolutions.

Definition 3.1. (a) We say a kG -module M is *endopermutation* (resp. *endo- p -permutation*) if $M^* \otimes_k M$ is a permutation module (resp. p -permutation module).

- (b) The following definition is due to Dade in [11]. Let P be a p -group. We say an endopermutation kP -module M is *capped* if M has a direct summand with vertex P . Equivalently, M is capped if $(M^* \otimes_k M)(P)$ is nonzero, and equivalently, $M^* \otimes_k M$ has k as a direct summand. If M_0 is an indecomposable summand of M with vertex P , we say M_0 is the *cap* of M .

Define an equivalence relation on the set of capped endopermutation kP -modules as follows: say $M \sim N$ if and only if $M \oplus N$ is an endopermutation kP -module. Equivalently, $M \otimes_k N^*$ is endopermutation. It follows by a lemma of Dade that each equivalence class has a unique indecomposable representative. Therefore, two endopermutation kP -module are equivalent if and only if they have isomorphic caps. Write $D_k(P)$ for the set of equivalence classes of capped endopermutation modules. This forms an abelian group with addition induced by $\otimes_k$, and is called *the Dade group*.

- (c) A generalization of the Dade group to non- p -groups was first constructed by Linckelmann and Mazza in [16], and later described using separate techniques by Lassueur in [15]. We give the definition in [15] as it is more closely related to our study of V -endosplit-trivial complexes. An endo- p -permutation kG -module M is *strongly capped* if M is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial. In this case, M has a unique indecomposable strongly capped direct summand, and all other direct summands are $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -projective. As before, say this unique summand is the *cap* of M .

Define an equivalence relation on the set of strongly capped endo- p -permutation modules as before: given two endo- p -permutation kG -modules M, N , say $M \sim N$ if and only if M and N have isomorphic caps. It follows that each equivalence class has a unique indecomposable representative. Write $D_k(G)$ for the set of equivalence classes of strongly capped endo- p -permutation modules. This forms an abelian group as before with addition induced by $\otimes_k$, and is called *the generalized Dade group*. If G is a p -group, we recover the classical Dade group, and for this reason, we refer to $D_k(G)$ as the *Dade group* without further mention.

Recall that $X(G)$ denotes the set of isomorphism classes of k -dimension one kG -modules. We have an series of inclusions

$$X(G) \hookrightarrow T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \hookrightarrow D_k(G) \hookrightarrow T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G).$$

In general, these maps will not be surjective.

- (d) We may extend this notion to V -endosplit-trivial kG -complexes. Say a chain complex of kG -modules C is *capped* if C is a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex. In this case, C is a shifted endosplit p -permutation resolution of a strongly capped endo- p -permutation kG -module (see [18, Remark 9.11]).

The equivalence relation used for the prior definition of $D_k(G)$ is already encoded in $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$. In this way, we may identify $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ as a chain-complex theoretic “Dade group.”

Definition 3.2. (a) For a G -set X , recall $\Delta(X)$ is the kernel of the augmentation homomorphism $kX \twoheadrightarrow k$. Define the element $\Omega_X \in D_k(G)$ as follows:

$$\Omega_X = \begin{cases} [\Delta(X)] & \text{if } X^S = \emptyset. \\ [k] & \text{if } X^S \neq \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Note that this is well-defined since $\Delta(X)$ is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial. Indeed, the chain complex $kX \rightarrow k$ is a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex. If $X = G/P$ for some $P \in s_p(G)$, we set $\Omega_P := \Omega_{G/P}$.

- (b) Let $D_k^\Omega(G) \leq D_k(G)$ be the subgroup generated by elements of the form Ω_X where X runs over all G -sets. When G is a p -group, this group is independent of choice of field k , so we write $D^\Omega(G)$ (see for instance [6, Theorem 12.9.10]).

The following theorem gives a generating set of $D_k^\Omega(G)$.

Proposition 3.3. [15, Lemma 12.1] *The group $D_k^\Omega(G)$ is generated by the relative syzygies $\Omega_{G/Q}$, where Q runs over the proper subgroups of G .*

This was proven using separate techniques in [13, Proposition 5.14] as well.

Remark 3.4. Let $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. For any G -set X for which $X^S = 0$, $\Delta(X)$ is endo- p -permutation and has an endosplit p -permutation resolution (if $X^S \neq 0$, $\Delta(X)$ is permutation). Indeed, the chain complex $kX \rightarrow k$ suffices.

It follows that every element of $D_k^\Omega(G)$ has a representative which has an endosplit p -permutation resolution. Indeed, if

$$[M] = \sum_{i=1}^j \Omega_{Q_i}^{\epsilon_i} \in D_k^\Omega(G),$$

with $\epsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ and Q_i a p -subgroup of G which is non-Sylow, then a corresponding endosplit p -permutation resolution of $[M]$ (up to some representative) is

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^j [C_{Q_i}]^{\epsilon_i} \in \mathcal{E}_k^{V\mathcal{F}(G)}(G).$$

In particular, given any $[M] \in D_k^\Omega(G)$, there exists a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex C with $\mathcal{H}_C(1) = [M] \in D_k(G)$.

However, every element which has an endosplit p -permutation resolution does not necessarily belong to an equivalence class in $D_k^\Omega(G)$. For instance, if G is not a periodic group, any class in $D_k(G)$ with a representative given by a nontrivial k -dimension one representation has an endosplit p -permutation resolution but is not an element of $D_k^\Omega(G)$, see [15, Remark 12.2]. On the other hand, it is shown in [15, Section 12] that in many cases, $D_k^\Omega(G) + \Gamma(X(N_G(S))) = D_k(G)$, where $\Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ is the subgroup of $D_k(G)$ generated by Green correspondents of 1-dimensional $k[N_G(S)]$ -modules. By [15, Proposition 4.1], $\Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ is a well-defined subgroup of $D_k(G)$, that is, each representative of each equivalence class in $\Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial.

This observation may be seen as an analogue of the characterization for p -groups that $D_k(G) = D^\Omega(G)$ for any p -group which is not generalized quaternion. It is unknown when this equality holds in general for non- p -groups. Note that the elements of $\Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ have trivial source representatives, so every element of the subgroup $D_k^\Omega(G) + \Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ has an endosplit p -permutation resolution.

Finally, note that the sum $D_k^\Omega(G) + \Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ may not be direct. See the comment after [15, Theorem 12.6].

In fact, $\Gamma(X(N_G(S))) = T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$ by the following argument.

Proposition 3.5. $\Gamma(X(N_G(S))) = T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$.

Proof. Write $\Gamma(X)$ for $\Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$. Since induction preserves p -permutation, the Green correspondents of any trivial source $V(\mathcal{F}_{N_G(S)})$ -endotrivial $k[N_G(S)]$ -modules are again trivial source. Since every element of $\Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ is trivial source and $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial, $\Gamma(X) \subseteq T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$. Now suppose M is a trivial source $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial kG -module. [18, Theorem 5.6(b)] implies that since $S \trianglelefteq N_G(S)$, all trivial source $V(\mathcal{F}_{N_G(S)})$ -endotrivial $k[N_G(S)]$ -modules have k -dimension one. Since equivalently,

$$\text{Res}_S^{N_G(S)}(\text{Res}_{N_G(S)}^G M) = \text{Res}_S^G M = k \oplus P \text{ for some } P \in {}_{kS}\text{Proj}(V(\mathcal{F}_S)),$$

$\text{Res}_{N_G(S)}^G M$ is a p -permutation $V(\mathcal{F}_{N_G(S)})$ -endotrivial module, hence its indecomposable $V(\mathcal{F}_{N_G(S)})$ -endotrivial summand has trivial source, and has k -dimension one. Therefore, M is the Green correspondent of a k -dimension one $k[N_G(S)]$ -module. Thus $\Gamma(X) \supseteq T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$, as desired. $\square$

From this point on, we replace $\Gamma(X(N_G(S)))$ with $T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$.

Definition 3.6. Denote by $\mathcal{TE}_k(G)$ the subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ consisting of endotrivial complexes C for which $\mathcal{H}_C(1) = [k]$. We call this subgroup *the homology-normalized subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$* . $\mathcal{TE}_k(G)$ may also be identified with the subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ consisting of equivalence classes of complexes C for which $\mathcal{H}_C(1) = [k]$ as well.

Since $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complexes are equivalently shifted endosplit p -permutation resolutions of $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial kG -modules, the image of $\mathcal{H}$ consists of all equivalence classes of strongly capped endo- p -permutation modules which have endosplit p -permutation resolutions. The next theorem characterizes precisely which strongly capped endo- p -permutation modules, up to equivalence in the Dade group, have an endosplit p -permutation resolution.

Theorem 3.7. *Let M be a strongly capped endo- p -permutation kG -module. $[M] \in D_k(G)$ contains a representative which has an endosplit p -permutation resolution if and only if $[M] \in D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$.*

Proof. The reverse direction follows since any $\Omega_X \in D_k^\Omega(G)$ has the corresponding endosplit p -permutation resolution $kX \rightarrow k$ and any $[M] \in T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$ has $M[0]$ as an endosplit p -permutation resolution.

For the forward direction, suppose M has an endo- p -permutation resolution. Since M is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial, there exists a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex C with $\mathcal{H}(C) = [M] \in D_k(G)$.

Theorem 2.14 implies that C shares a cap with a tensor product of the chain complexes C_Q , their duals, and elements of $T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$ considered as chain complexes in degree 0. It follows that

$$[M] = \mathcal{H}(C) = [M_0] + \sum_{i=1}^j \Omega_{Q_i}^{\pm 1} \in D_k(G),$$

where each Q_i is some p -subgroup which is non-Sylow, and M_0 is a trivial source $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial module. Thus $[M] \in D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$, as desired. $\square$

Theorem 3.8. *We have a well-defined group homomorphism $\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \rightarrow D_k(G)$ induced by $[C] \mapsto \mathcal{H}_C(1)$. $\ker \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{TE}_k(G)$ and $\text{im } \mathcal{H} = D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$, so we have a short exact sequence of abelian groups*

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, if G satisfies $D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) = D_k(G)$, then $\mathcal{H}$ is surjective.

Proof. $\mathcal{H}$ is a well-defined group homomorphism from Theorem 2.10 after projection, and Theorem 2.14, which demonstrates that the image of $\mathcal{H}$ is generated by endo- p -permutation kG -modules. In particular, $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}$ is spanned by $\{C_Q\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)]}$ and $T_V(G, S)$, all of which have endo- p -permutation homology.

Given any $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex C , $\mathcal{H}(C) = [k] \in D_k(G)$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}(C) = [k] \in T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$. From this, it follows by definition that $\ker \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{TE}_k(G)$.

Now, $\text{im } \mathcal{H} = D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$ follows directly from Theorem 3.7, since $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complexes are equivalently shifted endosplit p -permutation resolutions. The existence of the short exact sequence follows immediately. $\square$

Remark 3.9. In particular, $\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \rightarrow D_k(G)$ is surjective in the following cases:

- G is a p -group which is not generalized quaternion.
- G has cyclic Sylow p -subgroup.
- p is odd and G has a normal Sylow p -subgroup.
- $N_G(S)$ controls p -fusion of G .
- $G = GL_3(\mathbb{F}_p)$ for odd p .

Surjectivity when G is a p -group which is not generalized quaternion follows by the characterization of the Dade group (see [6, Chapter 12] or [10]), as $D_k(G)$ is generated by relative syzygies. The other cases are known examples of when $D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) = D_k(G)$, see [15, Remark 12.2].

Corollary 3.10. *Let M be an indecomposable $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endotrivial kG -module, that is, a cap of a strongly capped endo- p -permutation module. M has an endosplit p -permutation resolution if and only if $[M] \in D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$.*

Proof. The forward direction follows immediately from the previous theorem. For the reverse direction, the previous theorem implies that $[M]$ has a representative which has an endosplit p -permutation resolution. However, any representative of $[M]$ can be written as $M \oplus P$, where P is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -projective. If $M \oplus P$ has an endosplit p -permutation resolution, M does as well, and the result follows. $\square$

Corollary 3.11. *Let G be a p -group. $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{E}_k(G) = c(G)$, where $c(G)$ is the number of conjugacy classes of cyclic subgroups of G .*

Proof. This follows from the short exact sequence in Theorem 3.8. It is demonstrated in Theorem 2.14 that $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ is equal to the number of conjugacy classes of subgroups of G , and the classification of $D_k(G)$ for p -groups states that $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{Z}} D_k(G)$ is equal to the number of conjugacy classes of non-cyclic subgroups of G , see [6, Corollary 12.9.11]. $\square$

We have another homomorphism, the Bouc homomorphism, which has image in $D_k^{\Omega}(G)$ and which will be critical in the sequel. This homomorphism was defined for non- p -groups by Gelvin and Yalçın in [13, Theorem 1.4]

Definition 3.12. Let G be a finite group. $\Psi : C(G, p) \rightarrow D^{\Omega}(G)$ is defined as follows. For the basis of $C(G, p)$ given by $\{\omega_Q\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)]}$, we $\mathbb{Z}$ -linearize the assignment

$$\omega_Q \mapsto \begin{cases} \Omega_Q & Q \notin \mathrm{Syl}_p(G) \\ [k] & Q \in \mathrm{Syl}_p(G) \end{cases}$$

This homomorphism is called the *Bouc homomorphism*.

Although the Bouc homomorphism is defined by a $\mathbb{Z}$ -linearization for transitive G -sets, the definitions of ω_X and Ω_X ensure that the Bouc homomorphism behaves as expected for all G -sets.

Proposition 3.13. [13, Proposition 6.9] *For all G -sets X , $\Psi(\omega_X) = \Omega_X$.*

4. THE CASE OF p -GROUPS

We focus on the case of p -groups first. For this section, unless we specify otherwise, we assume G is a p -group. In this case, the short exact sequence in Theorem 3.8 can be simplified as follows:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} D^{\Omega}(G) \rightarrow 0.$$

In addition, we have an isomorphism $h : \mathcal{E}_k^V(G) \cong C(G, p)$ induced by the assignment $C_Q \mapsto \omega_Q$. The picture is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k(G) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D^{\Omega}(G) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow h & \nearrow \Psi & \\ & & & & C(G, p) & & \end{array}$$

The Bouc homomorphism is the unique homomorphism which makes the above diagram commute. The next proposition verifies this.

Proposition 4.1. *If G is a p -group, $\mathcal{H} = \Psi \circ h$.*

Proof. Note in this case $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ is a free abelian group. It suffices to show commutativity for a $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$. Recall a basis is given by the set

$$\{C_Q = k[G/Q] \rightarrow k\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)] \setminus G} \cup \{C_G = k[1]\}.$$

In Definition 2.16, we observed $\mathcal{H}(C_Q) = \Omega_{G/Q}$ when $Q \neq G$ and $\mathcal{H}(C_G) = [k]$. For the other side, if $Q \neq G$, $(\Psi \circ h)(C_Q) = \Psi(\omega_Q) = \Omega_Q$, and $(\Psi \circ h)(C_G) = \Psi(\omega_G) = [k]$. Thus the diagram commutes. $\square$

Remark 4.2. In general, this equality will not hold if G is not a p -group (and in fact, one must enlarge the codomain to $D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$). For instance, for any $M \in T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}(M[0]) = [M] \in D^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S),$$

but

$$\Psi \circ h(M[0]) = [k] \in D^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S).$$

There is a subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ for which equality holds however, which we discuss in the sequel.

In [8], Bouc and Yalçın proved that the Bouc homomorphism can be regarded as a surjective natural transformation of biset functors, and computed its kernel, which we now describe.

Definition 4.3. (a) The assignment $G \mapsto D^\Omega(G)$ for all p -groups G defines a rational p -biset functor D^Ω . We refer the reader to [6, Section 12.6] for details on this construction.
 (b) The assignment $G \mapsto C(G, p)$ (resp. $G \mapsto B(G)^*$) for all p -groups G defines isomorphic rational p -biset functors $C \cong B^*$. Given a (H, G) -biset U , $C(U)$ is defined to be the morphism

$$T_U : f \mapsto \left(K \mapsto \sum_{u \in K \backslash U/G} f(K^u) \right),$$

where $K \leq H$, $[K \backslash U/G]$ is a set of representatives of (K, G) -orbits on U , and K^u is the subgroup of G defined by

$$K^u = \{g \in G \mid \exists k \in K, ku = ug\}.$$

Definition 4.4. [22, Page 210] Let G be an arbitrary finite group. Say (T, S) is a *section* of G if $S \trianglelefteq T \leq G$. A class function on G is a *Borel-Smith function* if it satisfies the following conditions, called the *Borel-Smith conditions*.

- If (T, S) is a section of G such that $T/S \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^2$, for some prime number p , then

$$h(S) - \sum_{S < Y < T} h(Y) + ph(T) = 0.$$

- If (T, S) is a section of G such that T/S is cyclic of order p , for an odd prime p , or cyclic of order 4, then $h(S) \equiv h(\hat{S}) \pmod{2}$, where $\hat{S}/S$ is the unique subgroup of prime order of T/S .
- If (T, S) is a section of G such that T/S is a quaternion group of order 8, then $h(S) \equiv h(\hat{S}) \pmod{4}$, where $\hat{S}/S$ is the unique subgroup of order 2 of T/S .

The Borel-Smith functions of G form an additive subgroup of $C(G, p)$, denoted by $C_b(G, p)$. Moreover, the assignment $G \mapsto C_b(G, p)$ forms a rational p -biset biset subfunctor of C , see [8, Proposition 3.7].

We state the following theorem slightly differently than originally stated. In the original paper, the biset functor C is replaced with B^* , however they are canonically identified.

Theorem 4.5. [8, Theorem 1.2] *The kernel of $\Psi : C \rightarrow D^\Omega$ is the biset functor C_b of Borel-Smith functions. Here, there is an exact sequence of p -biset functors of the form*

$$0 \rightarrow C_b \hookrightarrow C \twoheadrightarrow D^\Omega \rightarrow 0.$$

Recall that since G is a p -group, $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ has a canonical basis $\{C_Q\}_{Q \in [s_p(G)]}$ as described in Definition 2.16.

Theorem 4.6. *Let G be a p -group. We have an isomorphism of short exact sequences:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k(G) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow = \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C_b(G, p) & \hookrightarrow & C(G, p) & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

In particular, $[C] \in \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ has an endotrivial cap if and only if h_C is a Borel-Smith function.

Proof. The commutativity of the right-hand square is precisely the statement of Proposition 4.1, and h is an isomorphism by Theorem 2.14. Therefore, we have a short exact sequence isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker \mathcal{H} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow = \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker \Psi & \hookrightarrow & C(G, p) & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since $\ker \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{E}_k(G)$ and $\ker \Psi = C_b(G, p)$, the result follows. $\square$

Corollary 4.7. $f \in C(G, p)$ satisfies $f = h_C$ for some endotrivial complex C if and only if f is a Borel-Smith function.

Proof. This is immediate. $\square$

Remark 4.8. Using the construction presented in Theorem 2.17, given any Borel-Smith function f , we may construct a corresponding $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial complex which contains as a direct summand the unique indecomposable endotrivial complex with h-mark function f .

Remark 4.9. The isomorphism constructed in Theorem 4.6 factors through an injective morphism of short exact sequences, where the intermediate short exact sequence was constructed by Yalçın's study of G -Moore complexes, see [25] for definitions and details. Indeed, there is a unique injective group homomorphism $\mathcal{Y}$ which sends for any $Q \in s_p(G) \setminus \{G\}$ the chain complex C_Q to the equivalence class in $\mathcal{M}_G$ of the G -Moore space G/Q , regarded as a discrete G -CW-complex, and sends C_G to the discrete G -Moore space with two points and trivial G -action. This leads to the following morphisms of short exact sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k(G) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \mathcal{Y} & & \downarrow \mathcal{Y} & & \downarrow = \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{M}_0(G) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{M}(G) & \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{Dim} & & \downarrow \text{Dim} & & \downarrow = \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C_b(G, p) & \hookrightarrow & C(G, p) & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

It follows without much difficulty that $h = \text{Dim} \circ \mathcal{Y}$ and that the diagram commutes.

5. TRANSPORTING RATIONAL p -BISET FUNCTOR STRUCTURE

Remark 5.1. The bottom row of the isomorphism of short exact sequences in Theorem 4.6 arises from the short exact sequence of rational p -biset functors shown in [8, Theorem 1.2],

$$0 \rightarrow C_b \rightarrow B^* \rightarrow D^\Omega \rightarrow 0,$$

where B^* is identified with C . We can transport the structure of those biset functors to the top row, thus realizing $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F})}$ as a rational p -biset functor canonically isomorphic to the rational p -biset functor C and $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ as a subfunctor which is canonically isomorphic to the rational p -biset functor C_b , both isomorphic via the h-mark homomorphism h .

Definition 5.2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the biset category.

(a) We define the biset functor

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F})} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$$

by the assignment $G \mapsto \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$. For any (H, K) -biset U , the action of U on $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_K)}(K)$ is given by

$$h_H^{-1} \circ T_U \circ h_K,$$

where $h_K : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_K)}(K) \xrightarrow{\sim} C(K, p)$ and $h_H : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_H)}(H) \xrightarrow{\sim} C(H, p)$ denote the h-mark isomorphisms over K and H respectively and T_U is the generalized induction defined for C . Since C is a rational p -biset functor and $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F})} \cong C$ by construction, $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F})}$ is a rational p -biset functor.

(b) We define the biset subfunctor

$$\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F})} \supseteq \mathcal{E}_k : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ab}$$

by the assignment $G \mapsto \mathcal{E}_k(G)$. For any (H, K) -biset U , the action of U on $\mathcal{E}_k(K)$ is given by

$$h_H^{-1} \circ T_U \circ h_K,$$

where $h_K : \mathcal{E}_k(K) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_b(K, p)$ and $h_H : \mathcal{E}_k(H) \xrightarrow{\sim} C_b(H, p)$ denote the restricted h-mark isomorphisms over K and H respectively and T_U is the generalized induction defined for C and restricted to C_b . Since C_b is a rational p -biset subfunctor of C , this construction is well-defined, and since C_b is a rational p -biset functor and $\mathcal{E}_k \cong C_b$ by construction, $\mathcal{E}_k$ is a rational p -biset functor.

In [17, Proposition 4.3], we determined what effects restriction, inflation, and the Brauer construction have on h-marks of endotrivial complexes. For $\mathcal{E}_k$, the biset functor structure coincides with those computations. We use this fact to show that the biset functor structure of $\mathcal{E}_k$ coincides in the way we hope.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $H \leq G$ and $N \trianglelefteq G$.*

(a) *Consider the inflation biset $\text{inf}_{G/N}^G := {}_G G / N_{G/N}$. The operation*

$$\text{inf}_{G/N}^G : \mathcal{E}_k(G/N) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(G)$$

coincides with the usual inflation homomorphism $\text{Inf}_{G/N}^G : \mathcal{E}_k(G/N) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(G)$.

(b) *Consider the restriction biset $\text{res}_H^G := {}_H G_G$. The operation*

$$\text{res}_H^G : \mathcal{E}_k(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(G)$$

coincides with the usual restriction $\text{Res}_H^G : \mathcal{E}_k(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(G)$.

(c) *Consider the deflation biset $\text{def}_{G/N}^G := {}_{G/N} G / N_G$. The operation*

$$\text{def}_{G/N}^G : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_{G/N})}(G/N)$$

coincides with the Brauer construction $-(N) : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(G/N)$.

Proof. In [17, Proposition 4.3], the effects of restriction, inflation, and the Brauer construction on h-marks are computed. It suffices to show that these biset operations coincide with those computations.

(a) Let $L \leq G$ and $f \in C(G/N, p)$. We compute:

$$(T_{\text{inf}_{G/N}^G} f)(L) = \sum_{u \in [L \setminus {}_G G / N_{G/N} / G/N]} f(L^u)$$

We may set $u = N \in G/N$ since $\text{inf}_{G/N}^G$ is transitive as right G/N -set. Then, $L^u = \{gN \in G/N \mid \exists l \in L, lN = gN\} = LN/N$.

$$= f(LN/N).$$

This coincides with the description of [17, Proposition 4.3(c)], which shows that the h-mark homomorphism of $\text{Inf}_{G/N}^G C$ is $h_{\text{Inf}_{G/N}^G C}(H) = h_C(HN/N)$ for any $H \leq G$.

(b) Let $L \leq H$ and $f \in C(G, p)$. We compute:

$$(T_{\text{res}_H^G} f)(L) = \sum_{u \in [L \setminus {}_H G_G / G]} f(L^u)$$

We may set $u = 1 \in G$, since res_H^G is transitive as a right G -set. Then, $L^1 = \{g \in G \mid \exists l \in L, l = g\}$.

$$= f(G/L).$$

This coincides with the description of [17, Proposition 4.3(a)], which shows that the h-mark homomorphism of $\text{Res}_H^G C$ is the restriction $\text{Res}_H^G h_C$.

(c) Let $L/N \leq G/N$ and $f \in C(G, p)$. We compute:

$$(T_{\text{def}_{G/N}^G} f)(L/N) = \sum_{u \in [(L/N) \backslash_{G/N} G/N_G/G]} f((L/N)^u)$$

We may set $u = N \in G/N$ since $\text{def}_{G/N}^G$ is transitive on the right. Then, $(L/N)^N = \{g \in G \mid \exists lN \in L/N, lN = gN\} = L$, since $N \trianglelefteq L$.

$$= f(L).$$

This coincides with the description of [17, Proposition 4.3(b)], which shows the h-mark homomorphism of $C(N)$ is $h_{C(N)}(L/N) = h_C(L)$ for any $L \supseteq N$.

□

Remark 5.4. A difficulty in writing down an explicit formula for induction on the chain complex level is that the induction biset ${}_G G_H$ is not transitive on the right, and therefore there may be more than one orbit for the double coset $L \backslash G/H$. In this case, we obtain a the formula

$$(T_{\text{ind}_H^G} f)(L) = \sum_{x \in [L \backslash G/H]} f(H \cap L^x).$$

This does not correspond to the usual tensor induction of chain complexes (see [1, Section 4.1] for a description). In fact, tensor induction of chain complexes does not preserve homotopy equivalence, therefore it does not preserve endotriviality in general. See [17, Remark 5.2] for a basic example. The fact that tensor induction of chain complexes does not preserve homotopy equivalence is instrumental in Balmer and Gallauer's proof that every kG -module has a finite resolution by p -permutation kG -modules, see [19, Theorem 3.1].

One way to compute how induction behaves on the chain complex level would be to use Theorem 2.17. We pose the question of whether the induction operation coincides with any other known operations on chain complexes, or whether the operator has a closed-form expression.

Remark 5.5. By the exact same computations, we can see what effect the restriction, inflation, and deflation bisets have on the h-marks of a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial chain complex. These, however, do not coincide with the usual maps Res_H^G , $\text{Inf}_{G/N}^G$, or $-(N)$ on the group $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$. For instance, the restriction biset res_H^G induces a group homomorphism

$$\text{res}_H^G : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_H)}(H),$$

but the group homomorphism induced by restriction of modules is of the form

$$\text{Res}_H^G : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{\text{Res}_H^G V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(H).$$

If H does not contain a Sylow p -subgroup of G as a subgroup, ${}_H \text{Proj}(\text{Res}_H^G V) = {}_H \mathbf{mod}$, and the restriction of a $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial chain complex may not be $V(\mathcal{F}_H)$ -endosplit trivial. For an example, if $G = D_{16}$, the chain complex

$$C_H = k[D_{16}/H] \rightarrow k,$$

where H is any subgroup of order 4 satisfying $Z(D_{16}) \leq H$ and the differential is the augmentation homomorphism, satisfies

$$\text{Res}_{Z(D_{16})}^{D_{16}} C_H = k \oplus k \oplus k \oplus k \rightarrow k,$$

which is not a $V(\mathcal{F}_{C_2})$ -endosplit-trivial complex. On the other hand, one may compute via h-marks that

$$\text{res}_{Z(D_{16})}^G C_H = C_{Z(D_{16})}.$$

A similar issue arises for deflation, since in general, $(V(\mathcal{F}_G))(N)$ is not an absolutely p -divisible kG -module. For instance, if $G = C_4$, then

$$V(\mathcal{F}_G) = k[C_4/1] \oplus k[C_4/C_2],$$

therefore

$$(V(\mathcal{F}_G))(C_2) \cong k \oplus k.$$

Inflation has a slightly different issue which arises. In general, inflation preserves absolute p -divisibility, but ${}_kG\text{Proj}(\text{Inf}_{G/N}^G V(\mathcal{F}_{G/N})) \subseteq {}_kG\text{Proj}(V(\mathcal{F}_G))$. For instance, let $G = V_4$ with 3 nonconjugate subgroups of order 2 H_1, H_2, H_3 . Then,

$$V(\mathcal{F}_{G/H_1}) = k[(G/H_1)/(H_1/H_1)], \text{ and } \text{Inf}_{G/H_1}^G V(\mathcal{F}_{G/H_1}) = G/H_1.$$

On the other hand,

$$V(\mathcal{F}_G) = k[G/H_1] \oplus k[G/H_2] \oplus k[G/H_3] \oplus k[G/1].$$

Therefore, $k[G/H_2]$ and $k[G/H_3]$ are $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -projective but not $\text{Inf}_{G/H_1}^G V(\mathcal{F}_{G/H_1})$ -projective.

6. APPLICATION TO NON- p -GROUPS

Using the results of the previous sections, we consider the case of G not necessarily a p -group. Recall that in this case, we have the short exact sequence from Theorem 3.8,

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \rightarrow 0.$$

6.1. On restriction to a Sylow p -subgroup. Via restriction, we may transport the results of the previous section to the case of arbitrary finite groups.

Definition 6.1. Let V be a (possibly zero) absolutely p -divisible kG -module and let $H \leq G$ be a subgroup containing a Sylow p -subgroup S . We define the *fusion-stable* stable subgroup $\mathcal{E}_k^V(H)^\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{E}_k^V(H)$ as follows.

$$\mathcal{E}_k^V(H)^\mathcal{F} = \{[C] \in \mathcal{E}_k^V(H) \mid \text{For all } P, Q \leq H \text{ with } P =_G Q, h_C(P) = h_C(Q)\}.$$

Theorem 6.2. [18, Theorem 11.7] $\text{Res}_S^G : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F}$ is surjective, with kernel the torsion subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$.

Remark 6.3. Let $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. [18, Theorem 11.7] implies that $\mathcal{E}_k(G) \cong \mathcal{E}_k(S) \times \text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$. Similarly, [18, Theorem 11.17 and Theorem 11.19] imply that $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \cong \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_S)}(S)^\mathcal{F} \times T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$. We have a commutative diagram as follows, where each row is exact.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{TE}_k(G) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G & & \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G & & \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_S)}(S)^\mathcal{F} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D^\Omega(S)^{G-st} \end{array}$$

Here, $D^\Omega(S)^{G-st}$ is the subgroup of $D^\Omega(S)$ consisting of G -stable elements, that is, elements $[M] \in D^\Omega(S)$ for which

$$[\text{Res}_{S \cap xS}^S M] = [(\text{Res}_{S \cap xS}^{xS} \circ c_x)(M)]$$

for all $x \in G$.

[18, Theorem 11.7] asserts that $\text{Res}_S^G : \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \cong \mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F}$, and [18, Theorems 11.17 and 11.19] assert that $\ker \text{Res}_S^G : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_S)}(S)^\mathcal{F}$ is the embedded subgroup $T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$.

Definition 6.4. (a) Let G be an arbitrary finite group and $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. Say a class function on p -groups $f \in C(G, p)$ is a *Borel-Smith function on G* if $\text{Res}_S^G f$ is a Borel-Smith function. It is easy to see this forms a subgroup of $C(G, p)$, which we denote also by $C_b(G, p)$.
 (b) Define $C(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$ (resp. $C_b(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$) as the subgroup of $C(S, p)$ (resp. $C_b(S, p)$) consisting of class functions (resp. Borel-Smith functions) f which satisfy $f(H) = f({}^g H)$ for all $H \leq S$ and $g \in G$ satisfying ${}^g H \leq S$. We call this subgroup the *fusion-stable* or *$\mathcal{F}$ -stable subgroup* of $C(S, p)$ (resp. $C_b(S, p)$).

Observe that $\text{Res}_S^G : C_b(G, p) \rightarrow C_b(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$ is in fact an isomorphism, since every p -subgroup of G is G -conjugate to a p -subgroup of S .

Theorem 6.5. Let $f \in C(G, p)$. $f = h_C$ for some endotrivial kG -complex C if and only if $f \in C_b(G, p)^\mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Let $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. Recall that $\mathcal{E}_k(G) = \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \times \text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$. Moreover, $\text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$ is the torsion subgroup of $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$, and only the unit of $\mathcal{TE}_k(G)$ has trivial h-marks. Therefore, it suffices to consider complexes $C \in \mathcal{TE}_k(G)$. We have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{TE}_k(G) & \xrightarrow{h} & C(G, p) \\ \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G & & \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G \\ \mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F} & \xrightarrow{h} & C(S, p) \end{array}$$

[18, Theorem 11.7] asserts that $\text{Res}_S^G : \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F}$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, it is straightforward from the definition of $\mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F}$ that the image of $h : \mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F} \rightarrow C_b(S, p)$ is $C_b(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$. Since h is injective, we have $\mathcal{TE}_k(G) \cong C_b(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$.

Notice that $\text{Res}_S^G : C(G, p) \rightarrow C(S, p)$ is injective, since every p -subgroup of G is conjugate to a p -subgroup of S . Since the image of the lower arrows lies in $C_b(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$, it follows by commutativity of the diagram that the image of $h : \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \rightarrow C(G, p)$ is the subgroup $C_b(G, p) \cong C_b(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$. Since h is injective, we conclude $h : \mathcal{TE}_k(G) \rightarrow C_b(G, p) \cong C_b(S, p)^\mathcal{F}$ is an isomorphism. The result follows. $\square$

Therefore, we may identify endotrivial complexes of kG -modules Borel-Smith functions defined on G . These can also be viewed as Borel-Smith functions on S which satisfy a fusion stability condition over the fusion system $\mathcal{F}_S(G)$.

Remark 6.6. From [15, Theorem 7.3], we have that $\text{Res}_S^G : D_k(G) \rightarrow D_k(S)^{G-st}$ is surjective, with kernel $T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$. Since the restriction of a relative syzygy is again a relative syzygy, we may ask if the map

$$\text{Res}_S^G : D_k^\Omega(G) \rightarrow D^\Omega(S)^{G-st}$$

is surjective as well. It follows from the diagram in Remark 6.3 that $\text{Res}_S^G : D_k^\Omega(G) \rightarrow D^\Omega(S)^{G-st}$ is surjective if and only if

$$\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_S)}(S)^\mathcal{F} \rightarrow D^\Omega(S)^{G-st}$$

is surjective.

If both maps are surjective, we have a homomorphism of short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{TE}_k(G) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G & & \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G & & \downarrow \text{Res}_S^G \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k(S)^\mathcal{F} & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_S)}(S)^\mathcal{F} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} & D^\Omega(S)^{G-st} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

In particular, we can derive an explicit basis for $D^\Omega(S)^{G-st}$ from the image of $\mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, if this occurs and S is not generalized quaternion (in particular, $D^\Omega(S) = D_k(S)$), we have a homomorphism of short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) & \hookrightarrow & D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}_S^G} & D^\Omega(S)^{G-st} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) & \hookrightarrow & D_k(G) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}_S^G} & D_k(S)^{G-st} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

By the five lemma, we have an isomorphism $D_k(G) \cong D_k^\Omega(G)$. We conclude the following.

Theorem 6.7. *Suppose $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ is not generalized quaternion. The following are equivalent.*

- (a) $\text{Res}_S^G : D_k^\Omega(G) \rightarrow D(S)^{G-st}$ is surjective.
- (b) $\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_S)}(S)^\mathcal{F} \rightarrow D^\Omega(S)^{G-st}$ is surjective.

- (c) $D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S) = D_k(G)$.
 (d) $D^\Omega(S)^{G-st}$ has the following generating set:

$$\left\{ \Omega_P + \sum_{Q \in [s_p(G)], Q=G, Q \neq P} \Omega_Q \mid P \in [s_p(G) \setminus \text{Syl}_p(G)] \right\}$$

Proof. The equivalence of (a) and (b) follows from diagram 6.3. (a) implies (c) follows from the previous remark, and (c) implies (a) follows from the surjective group homomorphism $\text{Res}_S^G : D_k(G) \rightarrow D(S)^{G-st}$.

(b) implies (d) follows since the generating set is precisely the image of $\mathcal{H}$ when restricted to $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$. (d) implies (b) is similarly straightforward, since in this case, for each $\Omega_P + \sum \Omega_Q$, the preimage $[C_P] \cdot \sum [C_Q]$ is fusion-stable, and the corresponding set of chain complexes with C_S added, forms a spanning set for $\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)^{\mathcal{F}}$. $\square$

6.2. The kernel of the Bouc homomorphism for non- p -groups.

Remark 6.8. Theorem 6.5 gives us all possible h-marks which arise from endotrivial complexes, and Theorem 2.17 gives a recipe for reconstructing an endotrivial complex from its h-marks, up to a twist by a strongly capped indecomposable endo- p -permutation kG -module. In the p -group case, this information tells us how to reconstruct a complex, since the only strongly capped indecomposable endo- p -permutation kG -module is k . However, in the non- p -group case, the situation is less clear.

Recall in Theorem 2.17, the setup was as follows: for $P \in [s_p(G)]$, we set

$$b_P := \sum_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} h_C(Q) \mu(P, Q).$$

Then, the chain complex

$$D := \bigotimes_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} C_Q^{b_Q}$$

is $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial. One goal is to determine when D has an endotrivial summand, and if not, a $M \in T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$ for which $M[0] \otimes_k D$ has an endotrivial summand. An even stronger question we may ask is whether $D \in \ker \mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \rightarrow D_k^\Omega(G) + T_{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G, S)$. Note that D is generated by a product of chain complexes representing relative syzygies. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 6.9. Define the subgroup ${}^\Omega \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ by

$${}^\Omega \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) := \langle [C_P] \mid P \in s_p(G) \rangle.$$

Define the subgroup $\mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G) \leq \mathcal{E}_k(G) \leq \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ by

$$\mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G) := {}^\Omega \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \cap \mathcal{E}_k(G).$$

Finally, define $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G) := \mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_k(G) \cap \mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G)$. It is straightforward that

$$\mathcal{H}^\Omega : {}^\Omega \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)} \rightarrow D_k^\Omega(G)$$

is a well-defined surjective group homomorphism, and moreover, $\ker \mathcal{H}^\Omega = \mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G)$. We have a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G) \hookrightarrow {}^\Omega \mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) \twoheadrightarrow D_k^\Omega(G) \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{H}^\Omega$ is the surjection.

Rephrasing the previous remark, we wish to determine $\mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G)$ or $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}_k^\Omega(G)$. One way we may do so is by returning to the Bouc homomorphism $\Psi : C(G, p) \rightarrow D^\Omega(G)$, in the more general case of non- p -groups. In this case, we no longer necessarily have an isomorphism $C_b(G, p) \cong \ker \Psi$.

Gelvin and Yalcin describe in [13] constraints for $\ker \Psi$.

Definition 6.10. [13, Definitions 9.6, 9.7] A function $f \in C(G, p)$ satisfies the *oriented Artin condition* if for any distinct prime numbers p and q , consider $L \triangleleft K \triangleleft H \leq N_G(L)$ subgroups of G such that K is a cyclic p -group, $K/L \cong \mathbb{Z}/p$, and $H/K \cong \mathbb{Z}/q^r$. Then $f(L) \equiv f(K) \pmod{2q^{r-l}}$, where H/K acts on K/L with kernel of order q^l .

A *oriented Artin-Borel-Smith function* is a superclass function that satisfies the Borel-Smith conditions and the oriented Artin condition. The subgroup of $C(G, p)$ consisting of oriented Artin-Borel-Smith functions is denoted by $C_{ba+}(G, p)$.

Note that if $p = 2$, then any Borel-Smith function vacuously satisfies the Artin condition, since there is no nontrivial automorphism of $K/L \cong \mathbb{Z}/2$.

Theorem 6.11. [13, Theorem 9.10] *Let G be a finite group and $\Psi : C(G, p) \rightarrow D^\Omega(G)$ be the Bouc homomorphism. Then*

$$C_{ba+}(G, p) \subseteq \ker \Psi \subseteq C_b(G, p).$$

In particular, if $p = 2$, $\ker \Psi = C_b(G, p)$.

In [13], Gelvin and Yalçin asked if in general, $C_{ba+}(G, p) = \ker \Psi$; they note that they could find no counterexamples to the claim. Moreover, a nontrivial example was provided in which $C_{ba+}(G, p) = \ker \Psi \subset C_b(G, p)$.

Lemma 6.12. [13, Lemma 9.11] *Let $Q \trianglelefteq G$ be a cyclic subgroup of G of order p such that $G/Q \cong \mathbb{Z}/q^r$. Suppose that G/Q acts on Q with kernel order q^l . Then $D^\Omega(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2q^{r-l}$ and the equality $\ker \Psi = C_{ba+}(G, p)$ holds.*

The next proposition gives us an equivalent formulation of $\ker \Psi$.

Proposition 6.13. *We have an isomorphism of short exact sequences:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{TE}_k^\Omega(G) & \hookrightarrow & {}^\Omega\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}^\Omega} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow = \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker \Psi & \hookrightarrow & C(G, p) & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & D^\Omega(G) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Proof. First, note that $\mathcal{H}^\Omega = \Psi \circ h$ by a similar argument as used in the proof of Proposition 4.1. In particular, ${}^\Omega\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ is free abelian with basis given by elements of the form $[C_P]$ for $P \in [s_p(G)]$. The left-hand square commutes simply since the injections are both inclusions of kernels. The image of this basis of ${}^\Omega\mathcal{E}_k^{V(\mathcal{F}_G)}(G)$ under h is precisely the basis of $C(G, p)$ given by elements of the form ω_P . Since $[C_P] \mapsto \omega_P$, h is an isomorphism. Since the top and bottom injective homomorphisms are both subgroup inclusion, $h : \mathcal{TE}_k^\Omega(G) \rightarrow \ker \Psi$ is also an isomorphism. $\square$

In fact, we may use the identification given in Proposition 6.13 to completely determine $\ker \Psi$, giving a positive answer to Gelvin and Yalçin's question. To do this, we briefly recall a character-theoretic result of Boltje and Carman regarding the orthogonal unit group of the trivial source ring $O(T(kG))$, and the relation of $O(T(kG))$ to $\mathcal{E}_k(G)$ studied in [17].

Theorem 6.14. [2, Theorem C] *Let S be a Sylow p -subgroup of G and let $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_S(G)$ be the associated fusion system on S . One has a direct product decomposition*

$$O(T(kG)) \cong B(\mathcal{F})^\times \times \left(\prod_{P \in s_p(G)} \text{Hom}(N_G(P)/P, k^\times) \right)'$$

where the second factor is defined as the set of all tuples

$$(\varphi_P) \in \left(\prod_{P \in s_p(G)} \text{Hom}(N_G(P)/P, k^\times) \right)^G$$

satisfying

$$\varphi_P(xP) = \varphi_{P\langle x_p \rangle}(xP\langle x_p \rangle)$$

for all $P \in s_p(G)$ and $x \in N_G(P)$.

Here, x_p denotes the p -part of x . That is, given any $x \in G$, $x = x_p x_{p'} = x_{p'} x_p$, where x_p has order a power of p and $x_{p'}$ has p' order.

Taking the Lefschetz invariant of an endotrivial complex induces a group homomorphism

$$\Lambda : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow O(T(kG)), [C] \mapsto \Lambda(C).$$

Moreover, given an endotrivial complex C , the tuple (φ_P) in [2, Theorem C] arising in the identification of $\Lambda(C) \in O(T(kG))$ corresponds to the local homology of C via

$$\mathcal{H}_C(P) = [k_{\varphi_P}] \in D^\Omega(N_G(P)/P).$$

See [17, Proposition 4.5] for details.

We are now ready to prove Gelvin and Yalçın's conjecture with endotrivial complex machinery. In fact, we may do so by reducing to the case they prove in [13, Lemma 9.11], then apply some character theory.

Theorem 6.15. $\ker \Psi = C_{ba^+}(G, p)$.

Proof. It suffices to show $C_{ba^+}(G, p) \supseteq \ker \Psi$. Suppose $[C] \in \mathcal{TE}_k^\Omega(G)$ and let C be the unique indecomposable representative of $[C]$. By Proposition 6.13, it suffices to show that h_C satisfies the oriented Artin-Borel-Smith conditions. For any collection of subgroups $L \triangleleft K \triangleleft H \leq N_G(L)$ as specified in the oriented Artin conditions, we will show $h_C(L) \equiv h_C(K) \pmod{2q^{r-l}}$. Note that r and l are local conditions, only depending on K/L and H/K .

Let $D = \text{Res}_{H/L}^{N_G(L)/L} C(L)$. Then

$$h_D(K/L) = h_C(K) \text{ and } h_D(L/L) = h_C(L)$$

by [17, Proposition 4.3]. Moreover, the values of r and l do not change. Therefore, it suffices to show h_D satisfies $h_D(L/L) \equiv h_D(K/L) \pmod{2q^{r-l}}$. Notice that H/L satisfies the conditions of [13, Lemma 9.11], with K/L as the subgroup Q in the lemma. Therefore, by [13, Lemma 9.11], if $h_D \in \ker \Psi$, the congruence holds, and we are done. This occurs if and only if $\mathcal{H}_D(1) = [k] \in D^\Omega(H/K)$ by Proposition 6.13. Note that

$$\text{Res}_{H/L}^{N_G(L)/L} \mathcal{H}_C(L) = \mathcal{H}_D(1) \in D^\Omega(H/K).$$

On the other hand,

$$\text{Res}_{H/L}^{N_G(L)/L} \mathcal{H}_C(L) = [k_{\varphi_L|_{H/L}}],$$

where φ_L is the character corresponding to u from the decomposition in [2, Theorem C]. Thus, it suffices to show that for any $x \in H$, $\varphi_L(xL) = 1$.

Since $h_C \in \ker \Psi$, φ_1 is the trivial character. By [2, Theorem C], we have that for any $x \in H$,

$$1 = \varphi_1(x) = \varphi_{\langle x_p \rangle}(x \langle x_p \rangle) = \varphi_{\langle x_p \rangle}(x_{p'} \langle x_p \rangle).$$

We claim that for every coset xL of H/L , there exists a $y \in H$ for which $\varphi_L(yL) = \varphi_L(xL)$ and y_p is a generator of L , where $y = y_p y_{p'}$ is the unique decomposition of y into p - and p' -parts. Indeed, if $\langle x_p \rangle = L$, $y = x$ suffices. If not, then since K is a p -group, $x_p \in K$, and there exists some $k \in K$ for which $x_p k$ is a generator of $L \leq K$. Let $y = xk$. Then by construction, $\langle y_p \rangle = \langle x_p k \rangle = L$. Now, since φ_L is a linear Brauer character and k is a p -element of H ,

$$\varphi_L(yL) = \varphi_L(xkL) = \varphi_L(x_{p'}L) = \varphi_L(xL),$$

as desired. Therefore, for every coset $xL \in H/L$, we have

$$1 = \varphi_1(y) = \varphi_L(yL) = \varphi_L(xL),$$

thus φ_L is the trivial character, and we are done. □

Corollary 6.16. Let $f \in C_b(G, p)$. For $P \in [s_p(G)]$, set

$$b_P := \sum_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} f(Q) \mu(P, Q).$$

The $V(\mathcal{F}_G)$ -endosplit-trivial chain complex

$$C = \bigotimes_{Q \in [s_p(G)]} C_Q^{\otimes b_Q}$$

has an endotrivial cap C_0 with $\mathcal{H}(C_0) = k$ if and only if $f \in C_{ba^+}(G, p)$.

Proof. For the reverse direction, it follows from the proof of Theorem 2.17 that $h_C = f$. From Proposition 6.13, it follows that $C \in \mathcal{TE}_k^\Omega(G)$, and therefore its cap C_0 has indecomposable homology isomorphic to k , as desired. For the forward direction, if $f \notin C_{ba^+}(G, p)$, then $[C] \notin \ker \mathcal{H}$ by the previous theorem and the isomorphism in Proposition 6.13, and the result follows. $\square$

It remains unclear what occurs if $f \in C_b(G, p)$ but $f \notin C_{ba^+}(G, p)$. One question of interest which remains is when C as constructed in the previous corollary or as in Theorem 2.17 has an endotrivial cap which does not belong to $\ker \mathcal{H}$.

7. LIFTING VIRTUAL MODULES TO INVERTIBLE COMPLEXES FOR p -GROUPS

In this section, we use results from [8] to prove that the Lefschetz homomorphism,

$$\Lambda : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow O(T(kG)), [C] \mapsto \Lambda(C) := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^i [C_i],$$

is surjective when G is a p -group, giving a positive answer for a question posed by the author in [17]. As a corollary, we show that every p -permutation autoequivalence of a p -group (as defined by Boltje and Perepelitsky in [4]) is the Lefschetz invariant of some splendid Rickard autoequivalence of the group algebra.

7.1. Surjectivity of the Lefschetz homomorphism.

Definition 7.1. For any finite group G , the trivial source ring, $T(kG)$ is the Grothendieck group of $kG\mathbf{triv}$. It is a free $\mathbb{Z}$ -module with basis given by representatives of trivial source kG -modules, and every element $X = T(kG)$ can be written $X = [M] - [N]$ for some p -permutation kG -modules M, N . $T(kG)$ forms a commutative ring with multiplication induced by $\otimes_k$.

$(-)^*$ induces an involution on $T(kG)$. The orthogonal unit group $O(T(kG))$ is the subgroup of the unit group $T(kG)^\times$ consisting of units u for which $u^{-1} = u^*$.

If G is a p -group, every permutation kG -module is indecomposable. In this case, we have a canonical ring isomorphism

$$B(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} T(kG), [X] \mapsto [kX].$$

Moreover, $(-)^*$ is the identity map on $T(kG)$, therefore $B(G)^\times \cong T(kG)^\times \cong O(T(kG))$.

Remark 7.2. $B(G)^\times$ is famously difficult to describe for all finite groups. In fact, by an argument of tom Dieck in [21], the statement “if G has odd order, $B(G)^\times \cong C_2$ ” is equivalent to the Feit-Thompson theorem.

However, in the case for which G is a p -group, Yalçin in [24] gave a complete generating set of $B(G)^\times$, which Bouc later refined to a basis in [5] by realizing $B^\times$ as a rational p -biset functor. Note the only interesting case is when $p = 2$. The biset operations on $B^\times$ are described by Bouc’s *generalized tensor induction*. For details, we refer the reader to [6, Section 11.2], but they will not be necessary for the scope of this paper.

For any finite group G , $B(G)$ is characterized similarly to how endotrivial complexes are via h-marks. For a G -set X , its *mark at H* is the integer $|X^H|$. The $\mathbb{Z}$ -linearization of this assignment yields the *mark homomorphism*.

$$m : B(G) \rightarrow B(G)^*, X \mapsto (f_X : G/H \mapsto |X|^H).$$

The mark homomorphism is injective and full-rank, so $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} m : \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} B(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} B(G)^*$ is an isomorphism. However, it is rarely surjective.

Finally, it is easy to see the image of $B(G)^\times$ consists of functions $f \in B(G)^*$ which take values only in ± 1 .

There are two key insights for the proof of this statement. For these next statements, note G is a p -group, so $B(G)^* \cong C(G.p)$.

Proposition 7.3. *Let G be a p -group. The following diagram commutes, where ϕ is the exponential map, $\phi(f)(K) = (-1)^{f(K)}$.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{E}_k(G) & \xrightarrow{h} & C_b(G, p) \\
\downarrow \Lambda & & \searrow \phi \\
O(T(kG)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & B(G)^\times
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \nearrow m \end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ (B(G)^*)^\times \end{array}$$

Proof. This is a reformulation of [17, Proposition 4.6]. $\square$

Proposition 7.4. *Let G be a p -group. Then $\phi(C_b(G, p)) = m(B(G)^\times)$.*

Proof. This is a reformulation of [8, Proposition 5.1], which uses a result of Tornehave in [23]. $\square$

As a result, we obtain a surjective homomorphism $\gamma : C_b(G) \rightarrow B(G)^\times$ for which the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{E}_k(G) & \xrightarrow{h} & C_b(G, p) \\
\downarrow \Lambda & & \downarrow \gamma \\
O(T(kG)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & B(G)^\times
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \nearrow m \end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ (B(G)^*)^\times \end{array}$$

Theorem 7.5. *Let G be a p -group. $\Lambda : \mathcal{E}_k(G) \rightarrow O(T(kG))$ is surjective.*

Proof. This follows from Figure 7.1. Since h is an isomorphism and $O(T(kG)) \cong B(G)^\times$, surjectivity of $\gamma : C_b(G, p) \rightarrow B(G)^\times$ implies Λ is surjective as well. $\square$

7.2. Every p -permutation autoequivalence of a p -group lifts to a splendid Rickard complex.

Next, we use Theorem 7.5 to prove that for any every p -permutation autoequivalence of a p -group G , $\gamma \in O(T^\Delta(kG, kG))$, there exists a splendid Rickard equivalence $\Gamma \in Ch^b({}_G \mathbf{triv}_{kG})$ for which $\Lambda(\Gamma) = \gamma$.

We refer the reader to [4] or [9] for exposition on p -permutation equivalences and splendid Rickard complexes.

Definition 7.6. For any $\phi \in \text{Aut}(G)$, define $\Delta_\phi(G) \leq G \times G$ to be the subgroup defined by

$$\Delta_\phi(G) := \{(\phi(g), g) \in G \times G \mid g \in G\}.$$

Define $\Delta_\phi(G)^{op} \leq G \times G$ to be the subgroup defined by

$$\Delta_\phi(G)^{op} := \{(g, \phi(g)) \in G \times G \mid g \in G\}.$$

Note that $\Delta_\phi(G)^{op} \cong \Delta_{\phi^{-1}}(G)$. We have obvious group homomorphisms

$$G \cong \Delta_\phi(G), \quad g \mapsto (\phi(g), g),$$

and

$$G \cong \Delta_\phi(G)^{op}, \quad g \mapsto (g, \phi(g)).$$

In this way we identify kG -modules with $k\Delta_\phi(G)$ -modules and $k\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}$ -modules.

Proposition 7.7. *Let G be a p -group and let $\gamma \in O(T^\Delta(kG, kG))$ be a p -permutation equivalence. Then there exists a orthogonal unit $u \in O(T(k[\Delta_\phi G])) \cong O(T(kG))$ and group automorphism $\phi : G \xrightarrow{\sim} G$ such that $\gamma = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G}(u)$.*

Proof. This follows from [3, Theorem 1.1(e)], however we provide a mostly self-contained proof as well.

$\mathcal{BP}(\gamma)$ has a maximal γ -Brauer pair $\omega = (\Delta(G, \phi, G), e \otimes e^*)$ by [4, Theorem 10.11], where $\phi : G \rightarrow G$ is a group automorphism and e is the unique block of $Z(G)$, and all other maximal elements of $\mathcal{BP}(\gamma)$ are $G \times G$ -conjugate to ω , every other element of $\mathcal{BP}(\gamma)$ is $G \times G$ -conjugate to some ω' satisfying $\omega' \leq \omega$. Therefore, every trivial source (kG, kG) -bimodule M appearing in γ has a maximal M -Brauer pair $\omega' \in \mathcal{BP}(M)$ satisfying $\omega' \leq \omega$. In particular, there exists a subgroup $P \leq G$ for which M has $\Delta_\phi(P)$ as a vertex. Therefore, we may write

$$\gamma = \left(\sum_{i=1}^a [\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi P_i}^{G \times G} k] \right) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^b [\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi Q_i}^{G \times G} k] \right),$$

for some $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ and each P_i, Q_j a subgroup of G . Since for any $P \leq G$,

$$\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi P}^{G \times G} = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} \circ \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi P}^{\Delta_\phi G},$$

the above equality factors as

$$\gamma = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} \left(\sum_{i=1}^a [\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi P_i}^{\Delta_\phi G} k] - \sum_{i=1}^b [\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi Q_i}^{\Delta_\phi G} k] \right) =: \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} u,$$

with $u \in T(k[\Delta_\phi G])$. It suffices to show $u \in O(T(k[\Delta_\phi G]))$. From here, we identify $T(kG)$ with $T(k[\Delta_\phi(G)])$ in the obvious way.

We have that

$$\left(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} u \right) \cdot_{kG} \left(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} u \right)^* = kG \in O(T^\Delta(kG, kG)).$$

Since $u \in T(kG)$ and G is a p -group, u is a sum of transitive indecomposable virtual permutation modules, hence $\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} u$ is a sum of transitive indecomposable virtual permutation modules with twisted diagonal vertices. It is a straightforward verification that for any $P \leq G$ and $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(G)$,

$$\left(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\varphi(P)}^{G \times G} k \right)^* \cong \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\varphi(P)^{op}}^{G \times G} k,$$

as (kG, kG) -bimodules. Therefore,

$$\left(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} u \right)^* = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}}^{G \times G} u \in T^\Delta(kG, kG).$$

It follows from Bouc's extended tensor product formula [7, Theorem 1.1] that for any $H \leq G$ and kH -modules M, N that

$$\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(H)}^{G \times G} M \otimes_{kG} \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(H)^{op}}^{G \times G} N \cong \text{Ind}_{\Delta_H}^{G \times G} (M \otimes_k N),$$

where on the left, M is regarded as a $k\Delta_\phi H$ -module and N is regarded as a $k\Delta_\phi(H)^{op}$ -module. Moreover, this isomorphism is natural in both arguments. Therefore, we have the following chain of equalities.

$$kG = \left(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} u \right) \cdot_{kG} \left(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} u \right)^* = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} u \cdot_{kG} \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}}^{G \times G} u \cong \text{Ind}_{\Delta_G}^{G \times G} (u \cdot_k u) \in O(T^\Delta(kG, kG)).$$

$\text{Ind}_{\Delta_G}^{G \times G}$ induces a split injective group homomorphism $T(kG) \rightarrow T^\Delta(kG, kG)$ with retraction induced by taking $1 \times G$ -fixed points, see [17, Lemma 4.14]. Therefore, we have

$$k = (kG)^{1 \times G} = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_G}^{G \times G} (u \cdot_k u)^{1 \times G} = u \cdot_k u \in T(kG).$$

Since u contains only permutation modules, as G is a p -group, u is self-dual, and we conclude $u \in O(T(kG))$ as desired. $\square$

Therefore, every p -permutation autoequivalence of a p -group is induced twisted diagonally from an orthogonal unit. Given a p -permutation equivalence $\gamma = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} u$ with $u \in O(T(kG))$, the obvious choice of corresponding splendid Rickard complex Γ which satisfies $\Lambda(\Gamma) = \gamma$ should be $\Gamma = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} C$, where C is some endotrivial complex for which $\Lambda(C) = u$. Indeed,

$$\Lambda \left(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} C \right) = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi G}^{G \times G} u = \gamma \in O(T^\Delta(kG, kG)).$$

Lemma 7.8. *Let M be a kG -module. We have a natural isomorphism*

$$(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} M)^* \cong (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}}^{G \times G} M)^*,$$

as (kG, kG) -bimodules, where the dual induced on the left-hand side arises from the left kG -module k -dual, and the dual on the right-hand side arises from the bimodule k -dual.

Proof. We first note the bimodule structure on the left- and right-hand sides of the proposed isomorphism.

On the left, for $a, b \in G$, $(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} M)^*$, has actions defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} a \cdot f((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \cdot b &= (a, b^{-1}) \cdot f((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \\ &= f((a^{-1}, b)(g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \\ &= f((a^{-1}g_1, bg_2) \otimes m), \end{aligned}$$

and on the right, $(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}}^{G \times G} M)^*$ corresponds to the bottom left composite, that is, it has actions defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} a \cdot f((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \cdot b &= f(b \cdot ((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \cdot a) \\ &= f((bg_1, a^{-1}g_2) \otimes m). \end{aligned}$$

We define an isomorphism $\psi : (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} M)^* \cong (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}}^{G \times G} M)^*$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} M)^* &\rightarrow (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}}^{G \times G} M)^* \\ f &\mapsto ((g_1, g_2) \otimes m \mapsto f((g_2, g_1) \otimes m)) \end{aligned}$$

Here, $(g_2, g_1) \otimes m$ as above is considered an element in $\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} M$. We first check well-definedness of the mapping with respect to the tensor product. Let $f \in (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} M)^*$ and $(g_1, g_2) \otimes m \in \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}}^{G \times G} M$. We have for any $g \in G$ that

$$(g_1, g_2) \otimes m = (g_1g^{-1}, g_2\phi(g^{-1})) \otimes gm.$$

Then for any $f \in (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} M)^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(f)((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) &= \psi(f)((g_1g^{-1}, g_2\phi(g^{-1})) \otimes gm) \\ &= f((g_2\phi(g^{-1}), (g_1g^{-1}) \otimes gm) \\ &= f((g_2, g_1) \otimes m) \\ &= \psi(f)((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \end{aligned}$$

Thus the map is well-defined. We next check that it is a (kG, kG) -bimodule homomorphism. Let $a, b \in G$.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(a \cdot f \cdot b)((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) &= \psi(f((a^{-1}, b) \cdot -))((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \\ &= f((a^{-1}g_2, bg_1) \otimes m) \\ &= \psi(f)((bg_1, a^{-1}g_2) \otimes m) \\ &= (a \cdot \psi(f) \cdot b)((g_1, g_2) \otimes m) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, ψ is a (kG, kG) -bimodule homomorphism. It is apparent ψ is an isomorphism, as its inverse is constructed similarly. Finally we must check naturality. This follows from commutativity of the following diagram, where $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a kG -module homomorphism.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (k[G \times G] \otimes_{k\Delta_\phi(G)} M)^* & \xrightarrow{\psi_M} & (k[G \times G] \otimes_{k\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}} M)^* \\ (\text{id} \otimes f)^* \uparrow & & \uparrow (\text{id} \otimes f)^* \\ (k[G \times G] \otimes_{k\Delta_\phi(G)} N)^* & \xrightarrow{\psi_N} & (k[G \times G] \otimes_{k\Delta_\phi(G)^{op}} N)^* \end{array}$$

□

Theorem 7.9. *Let G be a p -group and let $\gamma \in O(T^\Delta(kG, kG))$ be a p -permutation autoequivalence of kG . There exists a splendid Rickard complex Γ satisfying $\Lambda(\Gamma) = \gamma$.*

Proof. By Proposition 7.7, we may write $\gamma = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} u$ for some $\phi \in \text{Aut}(G)$ and $u \in O(T(kG)) \cong O(T(k[\Delta_\phi(G)]))$. After identifying $O(T(kG))$ with $B(G)^\times$, by 7.5, there exists an endotrivial complex C satisfying $\Lambda(C) = u$. Moreover, by additivity of induction,

$$\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C = \gamma = \text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} u.$$

It suffices to show $\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C$ is a splendid Rickard autoequivalence of kG . We have:

$$(\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C) \otimes_{kG} (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C)^* \cong (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C) \otimes_{kG} (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C)^*$$

The above isomorphism is the identification in Lemma 7.8.

$$\cong (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C) \otimes_{kG} (\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C^*)$$

This follows from the standard natural kG -module isomorphism $\text{Ind}_H^G M^* \cong (\text{Ind}_H^G M)^*$.

$$\cong \text{Ind}_{\Delta_G}^{G \times G} (C \otimes_k C^*)$$

This follows from the isomorphism used in the proof of Proposition 7.7.

$$\cong kG$$

Thus by [20, Theorem 2.1], $\text{Ind}_{\Delta_\phi(G)}^{G \times G} C$ is a splendid Rickard complex. $\square$

Corollary 7.10. *Let P be a p -group, G an arbitrary finite group, and suppose B is a block of kG which is p -permutation equivalent to kP . Then either all p -permutation equivalences for kP and B lift to splendid equivalences between kP and B , or none do.*

Proof. Suppose there exists at least one p -permutation equivalence $\gamma \in O(T^\Delta(B, kP))$ for which there exists a splendid Rickard complex Γ for B and kP satisfying $\Lambda(\Gamma) = \gamma$. Then given any other $\gamma' \in O(T^\Delta(B, kP))$,

$$\gamma^* \cdot_B \gamma' \in O(T^\Delta(kP, kP)).$$

By Theorem 7.9, there exists a splendid autoequivalence X of kP such that

$$\Lambda(X) = \gamma^* \cdot_B \gamma'.$$

Therefore,

$$\Lambda(\Gamma \otimes_{kB} X) = \Lambda(\Gamma) \cdot_B \Lambda(X) = \gamma \cdot_{kP} \gamma^* \cdot_B \gamma' = [B] \cdot_B \gamma' = \gamma'.$$

Thus γ' lifts to a splendid Rickard complex as well, and the result follows. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] D. J. Benson. *Representations and Cohomology, Volume 2*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [2] R. Boltje and R. Carman. The orthogonal unit group of the trivial source ring. *Journal of Algebra*, 2023.
- [3] R. Boltje and P. Perepelitsky. Orthogonal units of the bifree double burnside ring. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 219(1):47–58, 2015.
- [4] R. Boltje and P. Perepelitsky. p -permutation equivalences between blocks of group algebras. 2020.
- [5] S. Bouc. The functor of units of burnside rings for p -groups. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 82:583–615, 2006.
- [6] S. Bouc. *Biset Functors for Finite Groups*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
- [7] S. Bouc. Bisets as categories and tensor product of induced bimodules. *Appl. Categor. Struct.*, 18:517–521, 2010.
- [8] S. Bouc and E. Yalçin. Borel-smith functions and the dade group. *Journal of Algebra*, 311:821–839, 2007.
- [9] J. V. Breland and S. K. Miller. Brauer pairs for splendid rickard complexes. *arXiv:2312.10258 [math.RT]*, 2023.
- [10] J. Carlson and J. Thévenaz. Torsion endo-trivial modules. *Algebras and Representation Theory*, 3:303–335, 2000.
- [11] E. C. Dade. Endo-permutation modules over p -groups i. *Annals of Math*, 107:459–494, 1978.
- [12] E. C. Dade. Endo-permutation modules over p -groups ii. *Annals of Math*, 108:317–346, 1978.
- [13] M. Gelvin and E. Yalçin. Dade groups for finite groups and dimension functions. *Journal of Algebra*, 576:146–196, 2021.
- [14] C. Lassueur. Relative projectivity and relative endotrivial modules. *Journal of Algebra*, 337(1):285–317, 2011.
- [15] C. Lassueur. The dade group of a finite group. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 217:93–113, 2013.
- [16] M. Linckelmann and N. Mazza. The dade group of a fusion system. *Journal of Group Theory*, 12:55–74, 2008.
- [17] S. K. Miller. Endotrivial complexes. *arXiv:2309.12138 [math.RT]*, 2023.
- [18] S. K. Miller. Relatively endotrivial complexes. 2024.
- [19] M. Gallauer P. Balmer. Finite permutation resolutions. *Duke Math J.*, 2020.
- [20] J. Rickard. Splendid equivalences: Derived categories and permutation modules. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 72:331–358, 1996.

- [21] T. tom Dieck. *Transformation groups and representation theory*. Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [22] T. tom Dieck. *Transformation groups*. De Gruyter, 1987.
- [23] J. Tornehave. The unit group for the burnside ring of a 2-group. *Aarhus Universitet Preprint series*, 1984.
- [24] E. Yalçin. An induction theorem for the unit groups of burnside rings of 2-groups. *Journal of Algebra*, 289:105–127, 2005.
- [25] E. Yalçin. Equivariant moore spaces and the dade group. *Advances in Mathematics*, 309:209–237, 2017.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
Email address: `sakmille@ucsc.edu`