

# Finite dimensional modules and perpendicular subcategories\*

M. Grime  
University of Bristol  
email: Matt.Grime@bris.ac.uk

June 2007

## Abstract

We explain how, under some hypotheses, one can construct a sequence of finite dimensional  $kG$ -modules that lie in certain prescribed additive subcategories, but whose direct limits do not. We use these to show that many of the triangulated quotients of  $\text{Mod}(kG)$  are not generated, as triangulated categories, by the corresponding quotient of  $\text{mod}(kG)$  considered as a full subcategory.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Let  $G$  be a finite group, and  $k$  an field such that  $\text{char}(k)$  divides  $|G|$ . The categories  $\text{mod}(kG)$  and  $\text{Mod}(kG)$  are Frobenius categories (see [3] for example, for an explanation), which implies that the quotients

$$\text{stmod}(kG) := \frac{\text{mod}(kG)}{\text{f.g.projective } kG\text{-modules}}$$

and

$$\text{StMod}(kG) \frac{\text{Mod}(kG)}{\text{projective } kG\text{-modules}}$$

are triangulated categories. Whenever one has a triangulated category it is natural to ask if there is a smaller subcategory which generates it. Recall that if  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}$  are triangulated categories, then  $\mathcal{S}$  generates  $\mathcal{T}$  if  $(S, X)_{\mathcal{T}} = 0$  for all  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  implies that  $X = 0$ . It is not too hard to show that  $\text{stmod}(kG)$  generates  $\text{StMod}(kG)$ . Our aim is to show that in other triangulated quotients of  $\text{Mod}(kG)$  the finite dimensional objects do not often form a generating subcategory. We will do this by producing a sequence of finite dimensional modules in  $\text{mod}(kG)$  that are zero in the quotient, but with direct limit in  $\text{Mod}(kG)$  that does not become zero.

## 2 MODULAR REPRESENTATION THEORY AND TRIANGULATED QUOTIENTS

We continue with the assumption that  $k$  is a field, and  $\text{char}(k)$  divides  $|G|$ . We assume that the reader is familiar with the content of, say, Alperin's book [1].

**DEFINITION 2.1** (Relatively projectivity).

Let  $w$  be a finite dimensional  $kG$ -module. Let  $\mathcal{P}(w)$  denote the smallest additive subcategory of  $\text{Mod}(kG)$  that contains  $w$  and is closed under tensor with an arbitrary module and arbitrary direct sums and summands.

The class  $\mathcal{P}(w)$  is sufficient to allow a relative cohomology theory, and a triangulated quotient of  $\text{Mod}(kG)$ . Objects in  $\mathcal{P}(w)$  are called  $w$ -projective.

---

\*2000 MSC 16G60 18A30 18Exx 18G25 20C05 20C20

THEOREM 2.2.

Let  $\Delta$  be the class of short exact sequences in  $\text{Mod}(kG)$  that split when tensored with  $w$ . Then  $\Delta$  is an exact structure on  $\text{Mod}(kG)$ , and the class of objects  $\mathcal{P}(w)$  constitute the projective and injective objects with respect to that structure. Moreover, there are enough pro/injective objects, and we can define triangulated quotients

$$\text{StMod}_w(kG) := \frac{\text{Mod}(kG)}{\mathcal{P}(w)} \quad \text{stmod}_w(kG) := \frac{\text{mod}(kG)}{\mathcal{P} \cap \text{mod}(kG)}$$

*Proof.* See, e.g. [2]. □

If one picks a subgroup  $H < G$ , and sets  $w = \text{Ind}_H^G(k)$ , then one obtains the usual definition of  $H$ -projective. The ordinary stable category can be recovered by choosing  $w = kG$ .

### 2.1 TWISTING $kH$ -MODULES

We continue with the assumption that  $k$  is a field of characteristic  $p$ , and further suppose that  $q$  is a power of  $p$ . Let  $H$  be a group,

$$0 \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{d_1} Y \xrightarrow{d_2} Z \longrightarrow 0$$

a short exact sequence of  $kH$ -modules, and let  $G = H \times C_q$ . We wish to use this short exact sequence to define a  $kG$ -module,  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$ . The reader should think of  $\mathfrak{I}$  as meaning *twisted induction*<sup>1</sup>. As a vector space sum  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$  will be given by

$$\underbrace{X + \cdots + X}_{q-1} + Y + \underbrace{Z + \cdots + Z}_{q-1}$$

and the  $H$ -action will be the obvious one in each summand. Thus it remains to describe the  $C_q$ -action. Let  $C_q$  be generated by  $u$ . Then  $u - 1$  acts by shifting summands in the following manner:

$$X \xrightarrow{1} \cdots \xrightarrow{1} X \xrightarrow{d_1} Y \xrightarrow{d_2} Z \xrightarrow{1} \cdots \xrightarrow{1} Z \xrightarrow{0} 0$$

Notice that  $(u - 1)^q = u^q - 1 = 0$ , since applying  $u - 1$   $q$  times to any of the summands of  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$  will mean applying  $d_2 d_1$ , or 0, at some point.

PROPOSITION 2.3.

Let  $X, Y, Z$  and  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$  be as above, then  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$  is  $H$ -projective if and only if the map  $X \rightarrow Y$  splits.

*Proof.* Consider  $X \otimes k$  as a  $kH \times C_q$  module with the diagonal action. The module  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$  is  $H$ -projective if and only if it has the lifting property with respect to  $H$ -split short exact sequences, thus consider the  $H$ -split surjection

$$\pi : \text{Ind}_H^G(\text{Res}_H^G(X \otimes k)) \twoheadrightarrow X \otimes k$$

There is a map from  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$  to  $X \otimes k$  given by projection into the first copy of  $X$ . We will show that this map factors through  $\pi$  if and only if  $d_1 : X \rightarrow Y$  is split.

Suppose that  $\theta$  is such that  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G \rightarrow X \otimes k$  factors as  $\pi\theta$ . We will use the vector space decomposition of  $(X, Y, Z) \mathfrak{I}_H^G$  as above, and we can consider  $\text{Ind}_H^G(X)$  as a vector space sum

$$\underbrace{X + \cdots + X}_q$$

in the usual manner: the summands are indexed by cosets of  $H$ , i.e. powers of  $u$ . Let us write  $\theta$  as a block matrix with respect to these vector space sum

<sup>1</sup>I am indebted to Jeremy Rickard for suggesting this construction to me

$$\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{1,1} & \theta_{1,2} & \cdots & \theta_{1,2q-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \theta_{q,1} & \theta_{q,2} & \cdots & \theta_{q,2q-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

with each  $\theta_{r,s}$  a  $kH$ -equivariant map. Similarly  $\pi$  is given by

$$\underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_q$$

and the projection from  $(X, Y, Z) \uparrow_H^G$  to  $X \otimes k$  is

$$(1, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{2q-2})$$

From the factorization of the projection as  $\pi\theta$  one obtains

$$\left( \sum_i \theta_{i,1}, \sum_i \theta_{i,2}, \dots, \sum_i \theta_{i,2q-1} \right) = (1, 0, \dots, 0).$$

We also know that  $h\theta = \theta h$ . The reader is encouraged to work out the case of  $q = 2$  by hand, and to write down the matrices for larger  $q$ . When they have done so they will notice that one has the extra relations (indices are to be read mod  $q$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{r,s} &= \theta_{r+1,s} + \theta_{r+1,s+1} & 1 \leq r \leq q-1 \\ \theta_{q,q-1} &= \theta_{1,q-1} + \theta_{1,q}d_1 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

It follows from (1) by induction on  $k$  that

$$\theta_{r,s} = \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} \theta_{r-k+i, s-k}$$

for all  $1 \leq s \leq q-1$ . We find it easiest not to insert limits in the sums for what follows. Recall that we define  $\binom{n}{m}$  to be zero if  $m$  is not between 0 and  $n$ . Thus, using the relations we generated, (2), and showing a healthy disregard for indices it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{1,q}d_1 &= \theta_{q,q-1} - \theta_{1,q-1} \\ &= \sum_i (-1)^i \binom{q-1}{i} \theta_{p-(p-1)+i,1} - \sum_i (-1)^i \binom{q-1}{i} \theta_{1-(q-1)+i,1} \\ &= \sum_i (-1)^i \binom{q-1}{i} \theta_{1+i,1} - \sum_i (-1)^i \binom{q-1}{i} \theta_{2-q+i,1} \\ &= \sum_i (-1)^i \binom{q-1}{i} \theta_{1+i,1} - \sum_i (-1)^i \binom{q-1}{i} \theta_{2+i,1} \\ &= \sum_i (-1)^i \left( \binom{q-1}{i} + \binom{q-1}{i-1} \right) \theta_{1+i,1} \\ &= \sum_i (-1)^i \binom{q-1}{i} \theta_{1+i,1} = \sum_i ((-1)^i)^2 \theta_{1+i,1} \end{aligned}$$

and thus (recalling that indices are mod  $q$ )

$$\theta_{1,q}d = \sum_i \theta_{i,1} = 1_X$$

which completes the proof that  $d_1$  splits.  $\square$

### 3 THE INCLUSION OF $\text{stmod}_w(kG)$ IN $\text{StMod}_w(kG)$

In this section we will argue that under some reasonable assumptions on  $G$ , and  $w$ , we may show that  $\text{stmod}_w(kG)$  does not generate  $\text{StMod}_w(kG)$ . The tactic is to write some non- $w$ -projective module as a direct limit of  $w$ -projective modules. In fact, we shall show something slightly stronger: the direct limit will not be  $\text{vtx}(w)$ -projective. First, we will need a way to show a module is not  $w$ -projective.

LEMMA 3.1.

Let  $X$  be a  $w$ -projective  $kG$ -module, then  $X$  is projective with respect to any vertex of  $w$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to consider the case  $X \cong w \otimes Y$ . Let  $Q$  be a vertex of  $w$  and let  $v$  be a source. Then

$$w \otimes Y \mid \text{Ind}_Q^G(v) \otimes Y \cong \text{Ind}(v \otimes \text{Res}_Q^G(Y))$$

and we see  $X$  is  $Q$ -projective. □

Now we show that it suffices to pass to the Sylow- $p$  subgroup of  $G$ .

PROPOSITION 3.2.

Suppose that  $P$  is a Sylow- $p$  subgroup of  $G$  and let  $v$  the restriction of  $w$  to  $kP$ . Suppose that  $M = \varinjlim m_\alpha$  is a filtered colimit in  $\text{Mod}(kP)$  where each  $m_\alpha$  is finite dimensional and  $v$ -projective and  $M$  is not projective with respect to  $\text{vtx}(w)$ , then  $\text{Ind}_P^G(M) = \varinjlim \text{Ind}_P^G(m_\alpha)$  is a non- $w$ -projective  $kG$ -module that is the direct limit of finite dimensional  $w$ -projectives.

*Proof.* This is reasonably clear by the last lemma. □

Thus we may suppose that  $G$  is a  $p$ -group. The most natural statement (i.e. the one with fewest hypotheses) is when  $w = \text{Ind}_H^G(k)$ .

THEOREM 3.3.

Let  $H$  be a  $p$ -group with non-finite representation type, and let  $G = H \times C_q$ . Set  $w = \text{Ind}_H^G(k)$ , then  $\text{StMod}_w(kG)$  is not generated by  $\text{stmod}_w(kG)$ .

*Proof.* The hypothesis on  $H$  ensures that there is an indecomposable countable dimensional  $kH$ -module  $M$ . Suppose that we write  $M$  as the direct limit of a sequence of finite dimensional modules

$$\varinjlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n$$

Let  $\iota_n$  denote the inclusion of  $m_n$  into  $m_{n+1}$  and consider the (non-split) short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \coprod m_n \xrightarrow{1-\iota_n} \coprod m_n \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

which is the direct limit of the split short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \prod_{n=1}^N m_n \rightarrow \prod_{n=1}^{N+1} m_n \rightarrow m_{N+1} \rightarrow 0$$

Construct the module  $(\coprod m_n, \coprod m_n, M) \upharpoonright_H^G$  as in subsection 2.1. This is *not*  $H$ -projective as the map  $\coprod m_n \rightarrow M$  does not split. However,  $(\coprod m_n, \coprod m_n, M) \upharpoonright_H^G$  is the direct limit of the modules

$$\left( \prod_{n=1}^N m_n, \prod_{n=1}^{N+1} m_n, m_{N+1} \right) \upharpoonright_H^G$$

each of which is  $H$ -projective, since  $\prod_{n=1}^{N+1} m_n \rightarrow m_{N+1}$  is split. Now, any map from a finite dimensional  $kG$ -module to  $(\coprod m_n, \coprod m_n, M) \upharpoonright_H^G$  factors through a finite dimensional

submodule, and thus through some  $H$ -projective submodule. Hence  $(\coprod m_n, \coprod m_n, M) \uparrow_H^G$  is orthogonal to the set of finite dimensional modules.  $\square$

All that remains is to extend this to the case when  $w$  is not a trivial source module.

**THEOREM 3.4.**

Let  $G$ ,  $H$  and  $M$  be as in 3.3, and suppose that  $w$  is a  $kG$ -module with  $\text{vtx}(w) \leq_G H$ . Suppose that  $\text{Res}_H^G(w) \otimes M$  is not pure projective. Then  $\text{stmod}_w(kG)$  does not generate  $\text{StMod}_w(kG)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $v = \text{Res}_H^G(w)$ . The hypotheses imply that

$$0 \longrightarrow \coprod v \otimes m_n \xrightarrow{1-\iota_n} \coprod v \otimes m_n \longrightarrow v \otimes M \longrightarrow 0$$

is non-split, and hence,  $(\coprod v \otimes m_n, \coprod v \otimes m_n, v \otimes M) \uparrow_H^G$  is not  $w$ -projective. This module is the direct limit of the modules

$$\left( \prod_{n=1}^N v \otimes m_n, \prod_{n=1}^{N+1} v \otimes m_n, v \otimes m_{N+1} \right) \uparrow_H^G.$$

Thus we need to show that these are  $w$ -projective for each  $n$ . We know that any such module is  $H$ -projective, which means it is a summand of

$$\text{Ind}_H^G(\text{Res}_H^G((\prod_{n=1}^N v \otimes m_n, \prod_{n=1}^{N+1} v \otimes m_n, v \otimes m_{N+1}) \uparrow_H^G))$$

but this is nothing more than a direct sum of copies of modules of the form

$$\text{Ind}_H^G(v \otimes m_n) \cong w \otimes \text{Ind}_H^G(m_n)$$

and thus is  $w$ -projective as we were required to show.  $\square$

We will end by collecting these theorems into one statement.

**THEOREM 3.5.**

Let  $G$  be a finite group and  $w$  a  $kG$ -module with vertex (conjugate to)  $Q$ . Assume that  $G$  and  $w$  satisfy the following conditions:

- if  $P$  is a Sylow- $p$  subgroup of  $G$  then  $P$  is isomorphic to  $P' \times C_q$  for some  $P'$ ;
- in such a decomposition  $Q \leq_G P'$ ;
- there is a  $kP'$  module  $M$  such that neither  $M$  nor  $M \otimes \text{Res}(w)$  are pure projective (in particular  $kQ$  and thus  $kP'$  cannot have finite representation type);

then  $\text{stmod}_w(kG)$  does not generate  $\text{StMod}_w(kG)$  as a triangulated category.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Jon Alperin, *Local representation theory*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, vol 11, CUP, 1986.
- [2] Jon F. Carlson, Chuang, ‘Transfer maps and virtual projectivity’, *J. Algebra*, 204 (1), pp 286–311, 1998.
- [3] Dieter Happel. ‘On the derived category of a finite dimensional algebra’, *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 62, pp 339–389, 1992.