

Butler's method applied to $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ -permutation modules

John W. MacQuarrie^a and Marlon Stefano^a

^aUniversidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil

June 30, 2022

Abstract

Let G be a finite p -group with normal subgroup N of order p . The first author and Zalesskii have previously given a characterization of permutation modules for $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ in terms of modules for G/N , but the necessity of their conditions was not known. We apply a correspondence due to Butler to demonstrate the necessity of the conditions, by exhibiting highly non-trivial counterexamples to the claim that if both the N -invariants and the N -coinvariants of a given lattice U are permutation modules, then so is U .

1 Introduction

Let R be a complete discrete valuation ring whose residue field has characteristic p (R will almost always be \mathbb{Z}_p or \mathbb{F}_p) and let G be a finite p -group. An RG -module is a *lattice* if it is free of finite R -rank. An RG -lattice is a *permutation module* if it possesses an R -basis that is set-wise preserved by multiplication from G . Given an RG -module U and a normal subgroup N of G , the N -invariants of U , U^N , is the largest submodule of U on which N acts trivially, and the N -coinvariants of U , U_N , is the largest quotient module of U on which N acts trivially.

In [MZ20], extending the famous sufficient condition of Weiss [Wei88, Theorem 2] to a characterization, the first author and Pavel Zalesskii proved the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let G be a finite p -group, U a $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ -lattice and N a normal subgroup of G of order p . Then U is a permutation module if, and only if*

1. U^N and U_N are permutation $\mathbb{Z}_p[G/N]$ -modules and
2. $(U/U^N)_N$ is a permutation $\mathbb{F}_p[G/N]$ -module.

Email addresses: john@mat.ufmg.br (John MacQuarrie), mestanislau@ufmg.br (Marlon Stefano)

Simple examples are given in [MZ20] showing that we cannot remove the conditions of Part 1. It was however left open whether Condition 2 is redundant. That is, whether U is a permutation module if, and only if, both U^N and U_N are permutation modules. We will show here that Condition 2 cannot be removed, by exhibiting examples of lattices U for $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ (p odd) and for $\mathbb{Z}_2[C_2 \times C_2 \times C_2]$ for which both U^N and U_N are permutation modules, but U is not. The examples seem to be highly non-trivial.

We believe that the methods used to construct these examples are interesting in their own right, utilizing in a new way a wonderful correspondence due to Butler [But74a, But74b], wherein he associates to a lattice what he calls a “diagram”. For Butler, the idea was to analyze the *category* of lattices for a given abelian p -group, using the correspondence to compare it with a category that is better understood. The novelty of our approach is to use Butler’s correspondence to analyze the structure of a *given* lattice, by analyzing how prescribed properties of the lattice affect the corresponding diagram. In particular, we will characterize the diagrams of those $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ -lattices U for which U , U^N and U_N are permutation modules. Using these characterizations, we find a diagram whose corresponding lattice U has the properties that both U^N and U_N are permutation modules, but U is not. In the future, we believe that analyses of this type will yield further insights in the study of permutation modules.

2 Preliminaries

Notations introduced here will be used throughout our discussion. In what follows, G is always a finite abelian p -group and N

is a subgroup of G of order p .

Given a $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ -lattice U , the $\mathbb{Z}_p[G/N]$ -modules of N -invariants U^N and N -coinvariants U_N are, respectively, the largest submodule and the largest quotient module of U on which N acts trivially. Explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} U^N &= \{u \in U \mid nu = u \ \forall n \in N\} \\ U_N &= U/I_N U \end{aligned}$$

where I_N , the augmentation ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_p N$, is the ideal generated by the kernel of the map $\mathbb{Z}_p N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ sending $\sum_{n \in N} \lambda_n n$ to $\sum \lambda_n$.

By [HR62, Theorem 2.6] there are three isomorphism classes of indecomposable $\mathbb{Z}_p N$ -lattice, being the trivial module \mathbb{Z}_p , the free module $\mathbb{Z}_p N$ and a non-permutation module S of \mathbb{Z}_p -rank $p-1$, which can be described in either of the following equivalent ways:

$$S = I_N = \mathbb{Z}_p N / (\mathbb{Z}_p N)^N.$$

Lemma 2.1 ([MZ20, Lemma 8]). *Let H be a cyclic group of order p and U a $\mathbb{Z}_p H$ -lattice. Then U_H is a lattice if, and only if, U is a permutation module.*

If ever H is a subgroup of G , we use the symbol \widehat{H} to denote the element $\sum_{h \in H} h$ in $\mathbb{Z}_p G$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $G = C_p \times C_p$ and H, K subgroups of G . In $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ we have $\widehat{H} \cdot \widehat{K} = |H \cap K| \cdot \widehat{HK}$.*

Proof. This follows by direct calculations. □

3 Butler's Correspondence for $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p]$

We describe the parts we require from [But74b] for the special case of $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p]$, which is what we require to construct examples for p odd. The case of $p = 2$ must be treated separately, but the methods are similar and we only present the example, in Section 6.

In what follows, $G = C_p \times C_p = N \times C$. We denote as usual by $\mathbb{Q}_p, \mathbb{F}_p$ the field of fractions and the residue field of the p -adic integers \mathbb{Z}_p , respectively. The group algebra $\mathbb{Q}_p G = \mathbb{Q}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{Z}_p G$ has a decomposition

$$\mathbb{Q}_p G = e_0 \mathbb{Q}_p G \times \prod_{\substack{H \leq G \\ |H|=p}} e_H \mathbb{Q}_p G,$$

where the e_i are the $p + 2$ primitive orthogonal idempotents of $\mathbb{Q}_p G$, given as

$$e_0 = \frac{1}{p^2} \widehat{G}, \quad e_H = \frac{1}{p^2} (p\widehat{H} - \widehat{G}).$$

Denote by I the indexing set $\{0, H_1, \dots, H_{p+1}\}$ of the primitive idempotents, where the H_i are the subgroups of G of order p . For each $i \in I$ we denote by $\Lambda_{(i)}$ both the $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ -algebra $e_i \mathbb{Z}_p G$ and the free $e_i \mathbb{Z}_p G$ -module of rank 1ⁱ. Recall that $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ is a local algebra, with maximal ideal $I_G + p\mathbb{Z}_p G$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let H, K be distinct subgroups of order p .*

1. $\widehat{H} \cdot e_K = 0$,
2. $\Lambda_{(K)}$ has no non-zero H -fixed points,
3. $J(\Lambda_{(K)}) = I_H \Lambda_{(K)}$.

Proof. 1. By Lemma 2.2,

$$\widehat{H} \cdot e_K = \frac{1}{p^2} (p\widehat{H}\widehat{K} - \widehat{H}\widehat{G}) = \frac{1}{p^2} (p\widehat{G} - p\widehat{G}) = 0.$$

2. \widehat{H} acts as multiplication by p on a fixed point of $\Lambda_{(K)}$, and so $\Lambda_{(K)}^H = 0$ by Part 1.
3. $p\Lambda_{(K)} \subseteq I_H \Lambda_{(K)}$ because by Part 1

$$pe_K = pe_K - \widehat{H}e_K = \sum_{h \in H} (1 - h)e_K \in I_H \Lambda_{(K)}.$$

□

ⁱwe write $\Lambda_{(i)}$ rather than Λ_i to avoid confusion with coinvariants.

Definition 3.2. The $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ -lattice U is *reduced* if it has neither free direct summands nor summands isomorphic to any Λ_i .

Definition 3.3 ([But74b, §2.2]). A *diagram* for $C_p \times C_p$ is a $(p+3)$ -tuple $V_* = (V; V_{(i)}, i \in I)$, where

- V is a finitely generated $\mathbb{F}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ -module,
- the $V_{(i)}$ are $\mathbb{F}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ -submodules of V ,
- for each $j \in I$ we have $\sum_{i \neq j} V_{(i)} = V$,
- for each $i \in I$, the induced action of $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ on $V_{(i)}$ factors through the canonical surjection $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p] \rightarrow \Lambda_{(i)}$ sending 1 to e_i .

A *map of diagrams* $V_* \rightarrow V'_*$ is an $\mathbb{F}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ -module homomorphism $\rho : V \rightarrow V'$ such that $\rho(V_{(i)}) \subseteq V'_{(i)}$ for each $i \in I$.

We make explicit how one obtains a diagram from a reduced lattice, and vice-versa, fixing as we do some notation that will remain in force throughout the rest of the article. As we follow Butler's arguments in [But74b], simply specialising to the case of $\mathbb{Z}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ (which simplifies things slightly), we don't give any justifications.

- **Getting a diagram from a reduced lattice:** Let U be a reduced lattice. We regard U as the sublattice $1 \otimes U$ of the $\mathbb{Q}_p G$ -module $\mathbb{Q}_p U = \mathbb{Q}_p \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} U$. Defining for each $i \in I$ the submodule $U_{(i)} := e_i U$ of $\mathbb{Q}_p U$, the sum

$$U_* := \sum_{i \in I} U_{(i)}$$

is direct, and since U is reduced we have

$$pU_* \subsetneq U \subsetneq U_*.$$

Defining

$$V = U_*/U, \quad V_{(i)} = (U_{(i)} + U)/U,$$

the tuple $V_* = (V; V_{(i)}, i \in I)$ is the diagram corresponding to U .

- **Getting a reduced lattice from a diagram:** Let $V_* = (V; V_{(i)}, i \in I)$ be a diagram. For each $i \in I$, let $F_{(i)}$ be the direct sum of $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_p}(V_{(i)}/\text{Rad}(V_{(i)}))$ copies of $\Lambda_{(i)}$ and denote by F the direct sum $\bigoplus_{i \in I} F_{(i)}$. For each i let $f_i : F_{(i)} \rightarrow V_{(i)}$ be a surjective homomorphism of $\Lambda_{(i)}$ -modules inducing an isomorphism $F_{(i)}/\text{Rad}(F_{(i)}) \rightarrow V_{(i)}/\text{Rad}(V_{(i)})$. We thus obtain for each i a map $F_{(i)} \xrightarrow{f_i} V_{(i)} \hookrightarrow V$ and hence by summing these maps, a map $f : F \rightarrow V$. The reduced lattice corresponding to V_* is $\text{Ker}(f)$.

These processes are mutually inverse in the sense that if U' is the reduced lattice obtained from the diagram of U , then $U' \cong U$ as $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ -lattices, and if V'_* is the diagram coming from the reduced lattice associated to V_* , then $V'_* \cong V_*$.

It follows that given a reduced lattice U , we may associate a unique (up to isomorphism) diagram V_* and from this, the modules $F_{(i)}, F$, with U being considered as a submodule of F . We will use these notations freely in what follows.

4 Characterizations using diagrams

Throughout this section, U is a reduced $\mathbb{Z}_p G$ -lattice with diagram $V_* = (V; V_{(i)}, i \in I)$ and $F_{(i)}, F$ are the corresponding modules defined in the previous section. Given an element $x \in F$, we denote by \bar{x} its image in V . Throughout, the letters H, K will always refer to subgroups of order p . If an element of $\bigoplus F_{(i)}$ is written like $x = \sum_{H \neq N} x_H$, this should be taken to mean that $x \in \bigoplus_{\substack{H \leq G \\ |H|=p \\ H \neq N}} F_{(H)}$ with each $x_H \in F_{(H)}$, and similarly in V .

Theorem 4.1. *The reduced lattice U is a permutation module if, and only if, G acts trivially on each $V_{(i)}$ and $V = V_{(0)} = \bigoplus_{\substack{H \leq G \\ |H|=p}} V_{(H)}$.*

Proof. A direct calculation shows that the reduced permutation lattice $\mathbb{Z}_p[G/H] = \langle u \rangle$ has diagram

$$(\mathbb{F}_p; \mathbb{F}_p, 0, \dots, 0, \mathbb{F}_p, 0, \dots, 0)$$

where the last non-zero entry occurs in the position indexed by H : taking K to be any subgroup of order p different from H we have by Lemma 2.2:

$$\begin{aligned} e_0 \cdot u &= \frac{1}{p^2} \widehat{G}u = \frac{1}{p^2} \widehat{K}\widehat{H}u = \frac{1}{p} \widehat{K}u \\ e_H \cdot u &= \frac{1}{p^2} (p\widehat{H} - \widehat{K}\widehat{H})u = \frac{1}{p} (p\widehat{1} - \widehat{K})u \\ e_K \cdot u &= \frac{1}{p^2} (p\widehat{K} - \widehat{H}\widehat{K})u = \frac{1}{p^2} (p\widehat{1} - \widehat{H})\widehat{K}u = \frac{1}{p^2} (p\widehat{1} - p\widehat{1})\widehat{K}u = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $e_0 \cdot u + e_H \cdot u = u \in U$, U_*/U has dimension 1 and the claim follows. A reduced permutation module is a direct sum of modules $\mathbb{Z}_p[G/H]$ for different H of order p , and the diagram of a direct sum is the direct sum of the diagrams. The result follows. \square

Lemma 4.2. 1. $U^N = U \cap (F_{(0)} + F_{(N)})$

2. For any subgroup $H \neq N$ of order p we have $I_H U^N \subseteq U \cap F_{(N)}$, with equality if, and only if, U^N is a permutation module.

Proof. 1. N acts trivially on $F_{(0)}, F_{(N)}$, while $F_{(H)}$ has no N -fixed points for $H \neq N$ by Lemma 3.1. Part 1 now follows because F is the direct sum of the $F_{(i)}$.

2. The inclusion follows from Part 1 because $I_H F_{(0)} = 0$. For any $u \in U \cap F_{(N)}$ we have $\widehat{H}u = \widehat{H}e_N u = 0$ by Lemma 3.1 and so

$$pu = pu - \widehat{H}u = \sum_{h \in H} (1 - h)u \in I_H U^N.$$

If U^N is a permutation module, then $U^N/I_H U^N$ is a lattice by Lemma 2.1 and so $u \in I_H U^N$. On the other hand, if $I_H U^N = U \cap F_{(N)}$ then

$$U^N/I_H U^N = U^N/(U^N \cap F_{(N)}),$$

which is a lattice since $F_{(N)}$ is a summand of F , and so U^N is a permutation module by Lemma 2.1 again. \square

Theorem 4.3. *The lattice U^N is a permutation module if, and only if, $V_{(N)}^G \subseteq V_{(0)}$.*

Proof. Suppose first that U^N is a permutation module and fix $\bar{x} \in V_{(N)}^G$, with lift $x \in F_N$. Since $(1-c)\bar{x} = 0$, we have $(1-c)x \in U \cap F_{(N)}$. But by Lemma 4.2, $U \cap F_{(N)} = I_C U^N$ so by Part 1 of Lemma 4.2 there are $x_0 \in F_{(0)}, x_N \in F_{(N)}$ with $x_0 + x_N \in U$ and $(1-c)x = (1-c)(x_0 + x_N) = (1-c)x_N$. As $(1-c)(x - x_N) = 0$ and $F_{(N)}$ has no non-zero C -fixed points, $x = x_N$, so that $x_0 + x \in U$. Hence $\bar{x} = -\bar{x}_0 \in V_{(0)}$, as required.

Suppose now that $V_{(N)}^G \subseteq V_{(0)}$. To conclude that U^N is a permutation module, it is enough to check that $U \cap F_{(N)} \subseteq I_C U^N$, by Lemma 4.2. So fix $y \in U \cap F_{(N)}$. Since U is reduced, $y \in \text{Rad}(F_{(N)}) = I_C F_{(N)}$, by Lemma 3.1, so we may write $y = (1-c)x$ with $x \in F_{(N)}$. Since $(1-c)\bar{x} = 0$, $\bar{x} \in V_{(N)}^G$, so in $V_{(0)}$ by hypothesis. Thus there is $x_0 \in F_{(0)}$ with $\bar{x}_0 = \bar{x}$, hence $x - x_0 \in U^N$ and so $y = (1-c)(x - x_0) \in I_C U^N$ as required. \square

Lemma 4.4. *We have*

$$I_N U \subseteq U \cap \left(\bigoplus_{H \neq N} F_{(H)} \right)$$

with equality if, and only if, U_N is a lattice.

Proof. The inclusion is clear because $(1-n)(F_{(0)} + F_{(N)}) = 0$. Suppose that U_N is a lattice and take x in the right hand set. Since $\widehat{N}x = 0$ by Lemma 3.1, $px = \sum_{n \in N} (1-n)x \in I_N U$ and hence $x \in I_N U$ since U_N is a lattice. On the other hand, the right hand set is a pure submodule of U because $\bigoplus_{H \neq N} F_{(H)}$ is a summand of F , and hence if this set is equal to $I_N U$ then U_N is a lattice. \square

We need a technical lemma:

Lemma 4.5. *Fix $a \in I$ and $B \subseteq I \setminus \{a\}$. The homomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : U \cap \bigoplus_{i \in B \cup \{a\}} F_{(i)} &\rightarrow V_{(a)} \cap \sum_{i \in B} V_{(i)} \\ \sum x_i &\mapsto \bar{x}_a \end{aligned}$$

is well-defined and surjective.

Proof. The element \bar{x}_a is in $V_{(a)} \cap \sum_{i \in B} V_{(i)}$ because $\sum x_i \in U$, and hence $\bar{x}_a = -\sum_{i \in B} \bar{x}_i$. Given $v \in V_{(a)} \cap \sum_{i \in B} V_{(i)}$, write $v = -\sum_{i \in B} v_i$ and lift v to x_a in $F_{(a)}$ and each v_i to x_i in $F_{(i)}$. The element $\sum_{i \in B \cup \{a\}} x_i \in U \cap \bigoplus_{i \in B \cup \{a\}} F_{(i)}$ and maps to v by φ . \square

Recall that by Lemma 2.1, U_N is a lattice if, and only if, the restriction $U \downarrow_N$ of U to N is a permutation module. Thus the following theorem is also a characterization of those reduced U for which $U \downarrow_N$ is a permutation module.

Theorem 4.6. *The module U_N is a lattice if, and only if*

1. *For each $H \neq N$ of order p , $V_{(H)} \cap (\sum_{K \neq N, H} V_{(K)}) \subseteq I_N V_{(H)}$, and*
2. $V^N \subseteq V_{(0)} + V_{(N)}$.

Proof. Suppose first that U_N is a lattice. We check the first condition, so fix an element $v \in V_{(H)} \cap (\sum_{K \neq N, H} V_{(K)})$. By Lemma 4.5 there is $u = \sum_{K \neq N} u_K \in U \cap \bigoplus_{K \neq N} F_{(K)}$ such that $\overline{u_H} = v$. By Lemma 4.4, there is $u' = \sum_{i \in I} u'_i \in U$ such that $u = (1-n)u' = \sum (1-n)u'_i$. As the sum of the $F_{(i)}$ is direct, we have $u_H = (1-n)u'_H$ and hence

$$v = \overline{u_H} = (1-n)\overline{u'_H} \in I_N V_{(H)}.$$

To show the second condition, it is enough to confirm that $(\sum_{H \neq N} V_{(H)})^N \subseteq V_{(0)} + V_{(N)}$ so fix $v = \sum_{H \neq N} \overline{x_H} \in V^N$ and a lift $\sum_{H \neq N} x_H$ of v . Then $(1-n)\sum_{H \neq N} x_H \in U \cap \bigoplus_{H \neq N} F_{(H)}$, which is $I_N U$ by Lemma 4.4 and so

$$(1-n) \sum_{H \neq N} x_H = (1-n) \sum_{i \in I} y_i$$

with $\sum y_i \in U$. As $F_{(H)}$ has no non-zero N -fixed points, $x_H = y_H$ for each $H \neq N$. Hence

$$V_{(0)} + V_{(N)} \ni -(\overline{y_0} + \overline{y_N}) = \sum_{H \neq N} \overline{y_H} = \sum_{H \neq N} \overline{x_H} = v.$$

Suppose conversely that Conditions 1 and 2 hold for U . We will check the conditions of Lemma 4.4. Given $u = \sum x_H \in U \cap \bigoplus_{H \neq N} F_{(H)}$, Lemma 4.5 and Condition 1 imply that $\overline{x_H} \in I_N V_{(H)} = \text{Rad}(V_{(H)})$ for each $H \neq N$ and hence, since $F_{(H)}/\text{Rad}(F_{(H)}) \rightarrow V_{(H)}/\text{Rad}(V_{(H)})$ is an isomorphism, $x_H \in \text{Rad}(F_{(H)}) = I_N F_{(H)}$. For each $H \neq N$, write $x_H = (1-n)y_H$ for some $y_H \in F_{(H)}$. Then $(1-n)\sum_{H \neq N} \overline{y_H} = 0$ so that $\sum_{H \neq N} \overline{y_H} \in V^N$ and hence

$$\sum_{H \neq N} \overline{y_H} = -\overline{y_0} - \overline{y_N} \in V_{(0)} + V_{(N)}$$

for some $y_0 \in F_{(0)}$ and $y_N \in F_{(N)}$, by Condition 2. Thus $y = \sum_{i \in I} y_i \in U$ and

$$I_N U \ni (1-n)y = \sum_{H \neq N} x_H = u.$$

□

Lemma 4.7. *Let U be a reduced lattice such that U_N is a lattice. Then*

$$I_G U \subseteq U \cap \left(\bigoplus_H F_{(H)} \right)$$

with equality if, and only if, U_N is a permutation module.

Proof. The inclusion is clear because $(1-g)F_{(0)} = 0$ for every $g \in G$. Since U_N is a lattice, Lemma 2.1 says that $(U_N)_C = U/I_G U$ is a lattice if, and only if, U_N is a permutation module. Suppose that U_N is a permutation module and fix $u = \sum_H x_H \in U \cap \bigoplus_H F_{(H)}$. By Lemma 2.2, $(p \cdot 1 - \widehat{K})u = \sum_{H \neq K} p x_H \in I_G U$, and hence, summing over the subgroups of order p we get that $\sum_H p^p x_H = p^p u \in I_G U$, and hence $u \in I_G U$ since $U/I_G U$ is a lattice. On the other hand, the right hand submodule is pure in U because $\bigoplus_H F_{(H)}$ is a summand of F , so if the sets are equal then $I_G U$ is pure in U and U_N is a permutation module. □

Remark 4.8. Lemma 4.7 is false without the condition that U_N be a lattice: the given equality applies for the $\mathbb{Z}_2[C_2 \times C_2]$ -lattice U whose diagram has $V = \mathbb{F}_2 \oplus \mathbb{F}_2$, $V_{(0)} = \langle(1, 1)\rangle$, $V_{(N)} = 0$, $V_{(C)} = \langle(1, 0)\rangle$ and $V_{(\langle nc \rangle)} = \langle(0, 1)\rangle$. Here U_N is not a lattice.

Theorem 4.9. *Let U be a reduced lattice such that U_N is a lattice. Then U_N is a permutation module if, and only if $V_{(H)} \cap \sum_{K \neq H} V_{(K)} \subseteq I_G V_{(H)}$ for every subgroup H of order p .*

Proof. Suppose that U_N is a permutation module. Given an element $\overline{x_H} = \sum_{K \neq H} \overline{x_K}$ in $V_{(H)} \cap \sum_{K \neq H} V_{(K)}$, then $x_H - \sum_{K \neq H} x_K \in U \cap \left(\bigoplus_H F_{(H)} \right)$, hence in $I_G U \subseteq I_G F$ by Lemma 4.7. Thus $x_H \in I_G F_{(H)}$ and hence $\overline{x_H} \in I_G V_{(H)}$.

Suppose now that $V_{(H)} \cap \sum_{K \neq H} V_{(K)} \subseteq I_G V_{(H)}$ for every H . By Lemma 4.7, to prove that U_N is a permutation module, it is enough to consider an element $u \in U \cap \bigoplus_K F_{(K)}$ and check that it is in $I_G U$. The given inclusion implies that $U \cap \left(\bigoplus_K F_{(K)} \right) \subseteq I_G \left(\bigoplus_K F_{(K)} \right)$, so we can write

$$u = (1 - c)y_N - (1 - n) \sum_{K \neq N} y_K,$$

so that $(1 - c)\overline{y_N} = (1 - n) \sum_{K \neq N} \overline{y_K}$. But by the definition of a diagram, we have $V = V_{(0)} + \sum_{K \neq N} V_{(K)}$ and so we can write $\overline{y_N} = \overline{x_0} + \overline{x_C} + \sum_{K \neq N, C} \overline{x_K}$, and hence

$$(1 - c)\overline{y_N} = (1 - c) \sum_{K \neq N, C} \overline{x_K}.$$

Thus the element $w := (1 - c)y_N - (1 - c) \sum_{K \neq N, C} x_K$ is in U , and indeed in $I_C U$ because $y_N - \sum_{K \neq N, C} x_K - x_0 - x_C \in U$ and

$$w = (1 - c)(y_N - x_0 - x_C - \sum_{K \neq N, C} x_K).$$

On the other hand, since

$$(1 - n) \sum_{K \neq N} \overline{y_K} = (1 - c)\overline{y_N} = (1 - c) \sum_{K \neq N, C} \overline{x_K},$$

the element $w' := (1 - n) \sum_{K \neq N} y_K - (1 - c) \sum_{K \neq N, C} x_K \in U \cap \bigoplus_{K \neq N} F_{(K)}$, so $w' \in I_N U$ by Lemma 4.4 since U_N is a lattice. It follows that $u = w - w' \in I_C U + I_N U = I_G U$, as required. \square

5 Examples for $C_p \times C_p$

If $p = 2$, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that a $\mathbb{Z}_2[C_2 \times C_2]$ -lattice U is a permutation module if, and only if, both U^N and U_N are permutation modules, because every $\mathbb{F}_2[G/N]$ -module is a permutation module so that Condition 2 is automatically satisfied. But this is not the case for odd primes. Here we present a counterexample for each odd prime p , using the results from the previous section.

Example 5.1. Fix an odd prime p and let $G = C_p \times C_p = \langle n \rangle \times \langle c \rangle$. We construct a diagram for $\mathbb{Z}_p G$. Let V be the $\mathbb{F}_p[C_p \times C_p]$ -module with \mathbb{F}_p -basis v_1, \dots, v_{p+2} and action from G given as follows:

$$n \cdot v_1 = v_1, \quad n \cdot v_2 = v_2, \quad n \cdot v_j = v_1 + v_j \quad \forall j \geq 3,$$

$$c \cdot v_1 = v_1, \quad c \cdot v_2 = v_1 + v_2, \quad c \cdot v_3 = v_3, \quad c \cdot v_j = -k_j v_1 + v_j \quad \forall j \geq 4,$$

where $k_j \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ is such that $(j-3)k_j = 1$ modulo p . The submodules $V_{(i)}$ are defined as follows:

$$V_{(0)} = \langle v_1, v_2 - v_3 + v_4, (k_{j+1} - k_j)v_2 - v_j + v_{j+1} \text{ for } 4 \leq j \leq p+1 \rangle,$$

$$V_{(N)} = \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle,$$

$$V_{(C)} = \langle v_1, v_3 \rangle,$$

$$V_{(\langle nc^a \rangle)} = \langle v_1, v_{a+3} \rangle, \quad a \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$$

The tuple $(V; V_{(i)}, i \in I)$ is a diagram, with corresponding reduced lattice U . Then

- U^N is a permutation module by Theorem 4.3, because $V_{(N)}^G = \langle v_1 \rangle \subseteq V_{(0)}$.
- U_N is a lattice by Theorem 4.6: the first condition is satisfied because $V_{(H)} \cap \sum_{K \neq N, H} V_{(K)} = \langle v_1 \rangle$ and $v_1 = (n-1)v_j$ for any $j \geq 3$. The second condition is satisfied because the element $\sum_{j=1}^{p+2} \lambda_j v_j \in V^N$ if, and only if, $p \mid \sum_{j=3}^{p+2} \lambda_j$, and hence V^N is generated by v_1, v_2 and the elements $v_j - v_{j+1}$ for $j \in \{3, \dots, p+1\}$, which are in $V_{(0)} + V_{(N)}$.
- U_N is a permutation module by Theorem 4.9: $V_{(H)} \cap \sum_{K \neq H} V_{(K)} = \langle v_1 \rangle$ which is in $I_N V_{(H)}$ if $H \neq N$ and, since $v_1 = (c-1)v_2$, is in $I_C V_{(H)}$ if $H = N$.
- But U is not a permutation module by Theorem 4.1, since G does not act trivially on V .

The lattice U has \mathbb{Z}_p -rank $p^2 + p - 1$. In the smallest case, when $p = 3$, it has \mathbb{Z}_3 -rank 11 and with respect to some \mathbb{Z}_3 -basis of U , the matrices of the actions of n and c respectively, are

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -3 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

6 Example for $C_2 \times C_2 \times C_2$

A similar application of Butler's Correspondence to the group $G = C_2 \times C_2 \times C_2 = \langle n \rangle \times \langle b \rangle \times \langle c \rangle$ yields the following lattice U for which U^N and U_N are permutation

modules, but U is not. The matrices of n, b, c respectively, are:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

References

- [But74a] M. C. R. Butler. The 2-adic representations of Klein's four group. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Theory of Groups (Australian Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1973)*, pages 197–203. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 372, 1974.
- [But74b] M. C. R. Butler. On the classification of local integral representations of finite abelian p -groups. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Representations of Algebras (Carleton Univ., Ottawa, Ont., 1974)*, Paper No. 6, pages 18 pp. Carleton Math. Lecture Notes, No. 9, 1974.
- [HR62] A. Heller and I. Reiner. Representations of cyclic groups in rings of integers. I. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 76:73–92, 1962.
- [MZ20] John W. MacQuarrie and Pavel A. Zalesskii. A characterization of permutation modules extending a theorem of Weiss. *Doc. Math.*, 25:1159–1169, 2020.
- [Wei88] Alfred Weiss. Rigidity of p -adic p -torsion. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 127(2):317–332, 1988.