

## SYSTEMS OF IMPRIMITIVITY FOR WREATH PRODUCTS

MIKKO KORHONEN AND CAI HENG LI

ABSTRACT. Let  $G$  be an irreducible imprimitive subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is a field. Any system of imprimitivity for  $G$  can be refined to a *nonrefinable* system of imprimitivity, and we consider the question of when such a refinement is unique. Examples show that  $G$  can have many nonrefinable systems of imprimitivity, and even the number of components is not uniquely determined. We consider the case where  $G$  is the wreath product of an irreducible primitive  $H \leq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{F})$  and transitive  $K \leq S_k$ , where  $n = dk$ . We show that  $G$  has a unique nonrefinable system of imprimitivity, except in the following special case:  $d = 1$ ,  $n = k$  is even,  $|H| = 2$ , and  $K$  is a transitive subgroup of  $C_2 \wr S_{n/2}$ . As a simple application, we prove results about inclusions between wreath product subgroups.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $G$  be an irreducible subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ , where  $V$  is a finite-dimensional vector space over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ . We say that  $G$  is *imprimitive*, if there exists a decomposition

$$V = W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_k$$

with  $k > 1$  such that  $G$  acts on the set  $\Gamma = \{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$  of the summands  $W_i$ . In this case  $\Gamma$  is called a *system of imprimitivity* for  $G$ . A system of imprimitivity  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_\ell\}$  is said to be a *refinement* of  $\Gamma$ , if each  $W_i$  is a direct sum of some  $Z_j$ 's. If no proper refinement of  $\Gamma$  exists, we say that  $\Gamma$  is *nonrefinable*.

Is a nonrefinable system of imprimitivity of  $G$  unique? Examples show that the answer is no in general. Even the number of summands in a nonrefinable system is not uniquely determined — we provide examples of such behaviour in the next section.

Let  $\Gamma$  be a nonrefinable system of imprimitivity for  $G$ . Then it is a basic result [Sup76, Lemma 15.5] that  $G$  is conjugate to a subgroup of  $N_G(W_1) \wr K$ , where  $K$  is the image of  $G$  in the symmetric group  $S_k$ . Since  $G$  is irreducible, it follows that  $K$  is transitive and furthermore the action of  $N_G(W_1)$  on  $W_1$  is nontrivial, irreducible, and primitive [Sup76, Theorem 15.1, Lemma 15.4]. In the case where  $G$  is equal to such a wreath product, we have the following positive result which will be proven in this note.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that  $n = dk$ , where  $k > 1$ . Let  $H$  be a nontrivial irreducible primitive subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{F})$  and let  $K \leq S_k$  be transitive, so that the subgroup  $G = H \wr K$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  is irreducible. Then  $G$  has a unique nonrefinable system of imprimitivity, except when the following statements hold:*

- (i)  $n = k$ ,  $d = 1$ , and  $|H| = 2$ ; and
- (ii)  $n$  is even and  $K$  is a transitive subgroup of  $C_2 \wr S_{n/2}$ .

---

*Date:* May 10, 2021.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20H20, 20C99.

Partially supported by NSFC grant 11931005.

A similar result was previously claimed in [Kon73, Theorem 2], but unfortunately the proof given there is based on a false result (Remark 2.2). Uniqueness for systems of imprimitivity has been considered by some authors in the context of finite complex reflection groups. See for example [Coh76, Lemma 2.7] or [KM97, Lemma 1.1], which are related to Theorem 1.1 in the case where  $d = 1$ ,  $K = S_n$ , and  $H$  is finite cyclic. The exceptional case of Theorem 1.1 is also related to examples of wreath products where the base group is not a characteristic subgroup, see [Gro88, Theorem 5.1] and [Neu64, Theorem 9.12].

The proof of Theorem 1.1 will be given in Section 3. As a simple application, we prove results about maximal solvable subgroups of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  (Corollary 4.1) and inclusions between wreath product subgroups (Corollary 4.3) in Section 4.

## 2. EXAMPLES OF NONUNIQUENESS

In general a nonrefinable system of imprimitivity  $\Gamma$  is not unique for  $G$ , and an infinite family of examples is provided by the exception in Theorem 1.1 (see Remark 3.3 in the next section). In this family of examples, the number of components in a nonrefinable system of imprimitivity is uniquely determined. It turns out that it is also possible for  $G$  to have nonrefinable systems of imprimitivity with different numbers of components. The following provides the smallest possible examples.

*Example 2.1.* Let  $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(3)$  and let  $q$  be a prime power such that  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ . Then one can embed  $G \leq \mathrm{GL}_4(q)$  such that for  $V = \mathbb{F}_q^4$ , we have:

- (i)  $G$  is irreducible;
- (ii)  $V = Z_1 \oplus Z_2 \oplus Z_3 \oplus Z_4$ , such that  $\dim Z_i = 1$  and  $G$  acts on  $\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4\}$ ;
- (iii)  $V = W_1 \oplus W_2$ , such that  $\dim W_i = 2$  and  $G$  acts on  $\{W_1, W_2\}$ ;
- (iv) Both systems of imprimitivity in (ii) and (iii) are nonrefinable.

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in G$  be as follows:

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $K = \langle x, y \rangle \cong D_{12}$ , since  $o(x) = 2$ ,  $o(y) = 6$ , and  $x^2 = 1$ ,  $y^6 = 1$ ,  $xyx^{-1} = y^{-1}$ .

Note that  $K/[K, K] = \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \cong C_2 \times C_2$ . Let  $W$  be the 1-dimensional  $\mathbb{F}_q[K]$ -module corresponding to the linear character  $\theta : K \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  such that  $\theta(x) = 1$  and  $\theta(y) = -1$ . Consider the induced  $\mathbb{F}_q[G]$ -module  $V = \mathrm{Ind}_K^G(W)$ . We have  $\dim V = [G : K] = 4$ , and a calculation shows that  $V$  is a faithful irreducible  $\mathbb{F}_q[G]$ -module, so claim (i) holds. Since we are inducing a 1-dimensional module, it is clear that we get a decomposition  $V = Z_1 \oplus Z_2 \oplus Z_3 \oplus Z_4$  as in (ii), which is nonrefinable since  $\dim Z_i = 1$ .

Let  $H = \mathrm{SL}_2(3)$ , so  $[G : H] = 2$  and  $H \trianglelefteq G$ . Note that by Maschke's theorem  $\mathbb{F}_q[H]$  is semisimple. Thus by examining the ordinary character table of  $H$ , we can see that  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is a splitting field for  $H$ , since it contains a primitive cube root of unity. Then by looking at the character degrees, we conclude that there is no irreducible  $\mathbb{F}_q[H]$ -module of dimension 4.

In particular, the restriction of  $V$  to  $H$  is not irreducible. Thus by Clifford theory, the restriction decomposes as

$$V = W_1 \oplus W_2,$$

where  $W_1, W_2$  are non-isomorphic irreducible  $\mathbb{F}_q[H]$ -modules with  $\dim W_i = 2$ . Then  $G$  acts on  $\{W_1, W_2\}$  and claim (iii) holds.

What remains is to check that  $V = W_1 \oplus W_2$  provides a nonrefinable system of imprimitivity for  $G$ . Equivalently, we need to check that the action of  $H$  on  $W_1$  is primitive, but this is immediate from the fact that  $H$  does not have a subgroup of index 2.  $\square$

*Remark 2.2.* The paper [Kon73] claims in its main theorem that for an irreducible imprimitive subgroup of  $\text{GL}(V)$ , the number of components in a nonrefinable system of imprimitivity is unique. Example 2.1 shows that the claim is false, and the mistake in [Kon73] is on p.6, line 7: the author argues that  $N = N_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus N_\ell$  since  $N_i \cap N_j = 0$  for  $i \neq j$  (which is in general false, unless  $\ell = 2$ .)

### 3. SYSTEMS OF IMPRIMITIVITY

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.1. We first need two lemmas. The first one of these is well known and not difficult to prove, so we will omit the proof.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $M$  be a group and suppose that  $V$  is a completely reducible  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -module such that  $V = W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_k$ , where  $W_1, \dots, W_k$  are irreducible and pairwise non-isomorphic  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -modules. Then any nonzero  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -submodule of  $V$  is of the form  $W_{i_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{i_\alpha}$ , for some  $\alpha > 0$  and  $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_\alpha \leq k$ .*

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $M = H_1 \times \cdots \times H_k$  be a group, and let  $V$  be an  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -module such that the following hold:*

- (i)  $V = W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_k$ , where  $W_i$  is a nontrivial irreducible  $\mathbb{F}[H_i]$ -module for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ;
- (ii) the action of  $H_i$  on  $W_i$  is primitive for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ; and
- (iii) the direct factors  $H_j$  act trivially on  $W_i$  for all  $j \neq i$ .

*If  $V = Q_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_\ell$  and  $M$  acts on  $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ , then we have  $\ell \leq k$ .*

*Proof.* Note that the  $W_i$  are irreducible and pairwise non-isomorphic  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -modules, so by Lemma 3.1 any  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -submodule of  $V$  is a direct sum  $W_{i_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{i_\alpha}$  for some  $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_\alpha \leq k$ . (We will use this fact throughout the proof.)

For the proof of the lemma, we proceed by induction on  $k$ . In the case  $k = 1$ , if  $V = Q_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_\ell$  and  $M$  acts on  $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ , then  $\ell = 1$  since  $M = H_1$  acts primitively on  $V = W_1$ . Suppose then that  $k > 1$ .

Consider first the case where  $M$  is not transitive on  $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ . Let

$$\{Q_1^{(1)}, \dots, Q_{d_1}^{(1)}\}, \dots, \{Q_1^{(s)}, \dots, Q_{d_s}^{(s)}\}$$

be the orbits of  $M$  on  $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ . Then

$$V = (Q_1^{(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_{d_1}^{(1)}) \oplus \cdots \oplus (Q_1^{(s)} \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_{d_s}^{(s)})$$

where by Lemma 3.1, for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$  we have

$$Q_1^{(i)} \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_{d_i}^{(i)} = W_1^{(i)} \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{\alpha_i}^{(i)}$$

for some subset  $\{W_1^{(i)}, \dots, W_{\alpha_i}^{(i)}\}$  of  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &= d_1 + \cdots + d_s, \\ k &= \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_s, \end{aligned}$$

and  $d_i \leq \alpha_i$  for all  $i$  by induction, so  $\ell \leq k$ .

Thus we can assume that  $M$  acts transitively on  $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ . Let  $k_0 > 0$  be minimal such that

$$Q_j \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_{k_0}}) \neq 0$$

for some  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$  and  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_{k_0} \leq k$ .

For  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , set  $Q'_i := Q_i \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_{k_0}})$ . Then  $M$  acts on  $\{Q'_1, \dots, Q'_\ell\}$ , so  $Q'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Q'_\ell$  is an  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -submodule of  $W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_{k_0}}$ . By Lemma 3.1 and the minimality of  $k_0$ , we have in fact

$$W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_{k_0}} = Q'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Q'_\ell.$$

If  $k_0 < k$ , then by induction we have  $\ell \leq k_0$  and so  $\ell < k$ . Thus we can assume that  $k_0 = k$ , so

$$(3.1) \quad Q_i \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_{k-1}}) = 0$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$  and  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_{k-1} \leq k$ . In particular, the projection of  $Q_j$  into any  $W_i$  is injective, so

$$(3.2) \quad \dim Q_j \leq \dim W_i$$

for all  $i$  and  $j$ .

Next let  $s > 0$  be minimal such that

$$W_i \cap (Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_s}) \neq 0$$

for some  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_s \leq \ell$ .

Since  $H_j$  acts trivially on  $W_i$  for  $j \neq i$ , it follows from the minimality of  $s$  that  $H_j$  acts on  $Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_s}$ . Let  $v \in Q_{i_1}$  be nonzero. Then by (3.1), we have  $v = w_1 + \dots + w_k$  where  $w_r \in W_r$  and  $w_r \neq 0$  for all  $1 \leq r \leq k$ . Since  $W_j$  is a nontrivial irreducible  $\mathbb{F}[H_j]$ -module, we have  $gw_j \neq w_j$  for some  $g \in H_j$ . Then  $gv \neq v$ , so  $H_j$  acts nontrivially on  $Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_s}$ . Consequently  $W_j$  must be contained in  $Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_s}$ . In particular  $W_j \cap (Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_s}) \neq 0$ , so by repeating the same argument we conclude that  $W_i$  is also contained in  $Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_s}$ .

Therefore  $Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_s} = W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_k$ , so  $s = \ell$  and  $W_i \cap (Q_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Q_{i_{\ell-1}}) = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{\ell-1} \leq \ell$ . Hence the projection of  $W_i$  into any  $Q_j$  is injective, so  $\dim W_i \leq \dim Q_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . By (3.2) we conclude that  $\dim Q_j = \dim W_i$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ , from which it follows that  $\ell = k$ . This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$  be the system of imprimitivity defining  $G$ . Then  $V = W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_k$  and  $G = (H_1 \times \dots \times H_k) \rtimes K$ , where the action of  $H_i$  is nontrivial irreducible primitive on  $W_i$ , and trivial on  $W_j$  for  $j \neq i$ . Furthermore, the action of  $K$  on  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$  is faithful and transitive. We denote the base group  $H_1 \times \dots \times H_k$  by  $M$ .

Suppose that there is another nonrefinable system of imprimitivity, say  $V = Z_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Z_\ell$  such that  $\ell > 1$  and  $G$  acts on  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_\ell\}$ . Since  $G$  is irreducible, the action on  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_\ell\}$  must be transitive. Furthermore, the action of  $N_G(Z_i)$  on  $Z_i$  must be irreducible and primitive [Sup76, Theorem 15.1].

Let  $s > 0$  be minimal such that  $Z_i \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_s}) \neq 0$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$  and  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_s \leq k$ . First consider the case where  $s = 1$ , so  $Z_i \cap W_j \neq 0$  for some  $i$  and  $j$ . Then

$$(Z_1 \cap W_j) \oplus \dots \oplus (Z_\ell \cap W_j)$$

is a non-zero  $N_G(W_j)$ -submodule of  $W_j$ . Since  $N_G(W_j)$  acts irreducibly on  $W_j$ , we have  $W_j = (Z_1 \cap W_j) \oplus \dots \oplus (Z_\ell \cap W_j)$ . Furthermore, the action of  $N_G(W_j)$  is

primitive, and thus  $W_j = Z_i \cap W_j$ . Repeating this argument for  $Z_i$ , we see that  $Z_i = Z_i \cap W_j$ , so  $Z_i = W_j$  and  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_\ell\}$ .

Therefore we can suppose that  $s > 1$  in what follows. Let  $\{Z_{i_1}, \dots, Z_{i_r}\}$  be the orbit of  $Z_i$  under the base group  $M$ . For  $1 \leq t \leq r$ , set

$$Q_t := Z_{i_t} \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_s}).$$

Then  $Q_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Q_r$  is an  $\mathbb{F}[M]$ -submodule of  $W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_s}$ , so by Lemma 3.1 and the minimality of  $s$  we conclude that

$$W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_s} = Q_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Q_r.$$

Let  $v \in Z_i \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_s})$  be non-zero, and write  $v = w_1 + \dots + w_s$ , where  $w_t \in W_{j_t}$ . By minimality of  $s$  each  $w_t$  is non-zero, and so there exists  $h_t \in H_{j_t}$  such that  $h_t w_t \neq w_t$ . For  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{s-1} \in \{0, 1\}$  we define

$$v_{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{s-1}} := h_1^{\varepsilon_1} w_1 + \dots + h_{s-1}^{\varepsilon_{s-1}} w_{s-1} + w_s.$$

Since  $v \in Z_i$  and  $H$  acts on  $W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_s} \subseteq Z_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus Z_{i_r}$ , each  $v_{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{s-1}}$  is contained in some  $Z_{i_t}$ .

We claim that  $v_{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{s-1}}$  and  $v_{\varepsilon'_1, \dots, \varepsilon'_{s-1}}$  can be contained in the same  $Z_{i_t}$  only if  $\varepsilon_d = \varepsilon'_d$  for all  $1 \leq d \leq s-1$ . Indeed, if  $v_{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{s-1}}$  and  $v_{\varepsilon'_1, \dots, \varepsilon'_{s-1}}$  are both contained in  $Z_{i_t}$ , then

$$v_{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{s-1}} - v_{\varepsilon'_1, \dots, \varepsilon'_{s-1}} = (h_1^{\varepsilon_1} - h_1^{\varepsilon'_1})w_1 + \dots + (h_{s-1}^{\varepsilon_{s-1}} - h_{s-1}^{\varepsilon'_{s-1}})w_{s-1}$$

is contained in  $Z_{i_t} \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus W_{j_{s-1}})$ , and thus must be zero by the minimality of  $s$ . Consequently  $(h_t^{\varepsilon_t} - h_t^{\varepsilon'_t})w_t = 0$  for all  $1 \leq d \leq s-1$ , which forces  $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon'_t$  for all  $1 \leq t \leq s-1$ .

Therefore the vectors  $v_{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{s-1}}$  are contained in distinct  $Z_{i_t}$ 's, and so  $r \geq 2^{s-1}$ . On the other hand, we have  $r \leq s$  by Lemma 3.2, so  $s \geq r \geq 2^{s-1}$  which forces  $s = r = 2$ . So now  $Z_{i_1} \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus W_{j_2}) \neq 0$ , and  $W_{j_1} \oplus W_{j_2} = Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \subseteq Z_{i_1} \oplus Z_{i_2}$ .

Let  $v \in Z_{i_1} \cap (W_{j_1} \oplus W_{j_2})$  be nonzero and write  $v = w_1 + w_2$  with  $w_t \in W_{j_t}$  for  $t = 1, 2$ . Since  $Z_{i_1} \cap W_{j_2} = 0$ , both  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are nonzero. For any  $h \in H_{j_1}$ , we have that  $hw = hw_1 + w_2$  is contained in  $Z_{i_1}$  or  $Z_{i_2}$ . Therefore the orbit of  $w_1$  under  $H_{j_1}$  has at most two elements, thus exactly two since  $H_{j_1}$  acts nontrivially. If  $\{w_1, w'_1\}$  is the  $H_{j_1}$ -orbit of  $w_1$ , then  $w_1 + w'_1$  is fixed by the action of  $H_{j_1}$  and thus  $w_1 + w'_1 = 0$ . Hence  $hw_1 = \pm w_1$  for all  $h \in H_{j_1}$ . We conclude then from the irreducibility of  $H_{j_1}$  that  $\dim W_j = 1$  for all  $j$ , and furthermore  $|H| = 2$ , so statement (i) of the theorem holds. Note that this also forces  $\text{char } \mathbb{F} \neq 2$ .

Next we adapt an argument from [ST54, p. 276] to show that  $\dim Z_{i_1} = 1$ . Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $\dim Z_{i_1} > 1$ . Let  $h \in H_{j_1}$  be such that  $hw_1 = -w_1$ . Since  $h$  acts trivially on  $W_t$  for  $t \neq j_1$ , it follows that the fixed point space  $V^h$  has dimension  $n-1$ . Thus  $Z_{i_1}$  has nonzero intersection with  $V^h$ , which implies that  $hZ_{i_1} = Z_{i_1}$  since  $G$  acts on  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_\ell\}$ . So then both  $v = w_1 + w_2$  and  $hv = -w_1 + w_2$  would be contained in  $Z_{i_1}$ , which implies that  $v + hv = 2w_2 \in Z_{i_1}$ . Thus  $w_2 \in Z_{i_1}$  since  $\text{char } \mathbb{F} \neq 2$ , so we have a contradiction due to  $Z_{i_1} \cap W_{j_2} = 0$ .

Therefore we have  $\ell = k = n$  and  $\dim Z_j = 1$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Note that now  $W_{j_1} \oplus W_{j_2} = Z_{i_1} \oplus Z_{i_2}$ , and  $\{Z_{i_1}, Z_{i_2}\}$  is an orbit for the action of  $M$  on  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ . Since  $M$  is a normal subgroup of  $G$  and since  $G$  acts transitively on  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ , every  $M$ -orbit is of order 2, and so  $n$  is even. By relabeling the

summands if necessary, we can assume that the  $M$ -orbits are

$$\{Z_1, Z_2\}, \dots, \{Z_{n-1}, Z_n\}$$

and furthermore that we have

$$W_1 \oplus W_2 = Z_1 \oplus Z_2, \dots, W_{n-1} \oplus W_n = Z_{n-1} \oplus Z_n.$$

Thus  $G$  acts on the set of pairs  $\{\{W_1, W_2\}, \dots, \{W_{n-1}, W_n\}\}$ , which shows that statement (ii) of the theorem holds.  $\square$

*Remark 3.3.* The exception in Theorem 1.1 is a genuine exception. In this case  $H$  is cyclic of order 2, so  $H = \{\pm 1\} \leq \text{GL}_1(\mathbb{F})$  and  $\text{char } \mathbb{F} \neq 2$ . We can write  $G = (H_1 \times \dots \times H_n) \rtimes K$ , where  $H_i = \langle \sigma_i \rangle$  is cyclic of order 2. Furthermore  $n$  is even, and  $K$  is a transitive subgroup of  $C_2 \wr S_{n/2}$ . Thus we can find a basis  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  of  $V = \mathbb{F}^n$  such that  $G$  acts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i(e_i) &= -e_i && \text{for all } i, \\ \sigma_i(e_j) &= e_j && \text{for all } i \neq j, \\ \pi e_i &= e_{\pi(i)} && \text{for all } \pi \in K. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover we can assume that  $K$  acts on the pairs  $\{\{e_1, e_2\}, \dots, \{e_{n-1}, e_n\}\}$ . Now  $\{\langle e_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle e_n \rangle\}$  is the system of imprimitivity that defines  $G$ , and it is clear from the action that the decomposition

$$V = \langle e_1 + e_2 \rangle \oplus \langle e_1 - e_2 \rangle \oplus \dots \oplus \langle e_{n-1} + e_n \rangle \oplus \langle e_{n-1} - e_n \rangle$$

provides another system of imprimitivity for  $G$ . If there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$  with  $\lambda^2 = -1$ , then

$$V = \langle e_1 + \lambda e_2 \rangle \oplus \langle e_1 - \lambda e_2 \rangle \oplus \dots \oplus \langle e_{n-1} + \lambda e_n \rangle \oplus \langle e_{n-1} - \lambda e_n \rangle$$

gives also a system of imprimitivity for  $G$ . For  $n = 2$ , these examples appear in [Coh76, Remark 2.8].

With a few more arguments, we can describe all systems of imprimitivity for  $G$ . The proof of Theorem 1.1 shows that any system of imprimitivity distinct from  $\{\langle e_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle e_n \rangle\}$  must be of the form  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ , where  $\dim Z_i = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $Z_i \cap \langle e_j \rangle = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . Furthermore, the action of  $K$  on  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  has a system of imprimitivity  $\{\{f_1, f_2\}, \dots, \{f_{n-1}, f_n\}\}$  (possibly different from  $\{\{e_1, e_2\}, \dots, \{e_{n-1}, e_n\}\}$ ) such that

$$Z_1 \oplus Z_2 = \langle f_1 \rangle \oplus \langle f_2 \rangle, \dots, Z_{n-1} \oplus Z_n = \langle f_{n-1} \rangle \oplus \langle f_n \rangle.$$

Therefore  $Z_1 = \langle f_1 + \lambda f_2 \rangle$  and  $Z_2 = \langle f_1 + \mu f_2 \rangle$  for some  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \{0\}$ . An element of  $G$  for which  $f_1 \mapsto f_1$  and  $f_2 \mapsto -f_2$  must map  $Z_1$  to  $Z_2$ , so we conclude that  $\mu = -\lambda$ . Since  $K$  acts transitively, there exists an element of  $G$  which swaps  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ . Such an element acts on  $\{Z_1, Z_2\}$  and maps  $f_1 + \lambda f_2$  to  $\lambda(f_1 + \lambda^{-1} f_2)$ , so  $\lambda^{-1} = \lambda$  or  $\lambda^{-1} = -\lambda$ . Furthermore, the action of  $K$  on the pairs  $\{f_i, f_{i+1}\}$  is transitive, so  $Z_i = \langle f_i \pm \lambda f_{i+1} \rangle$  and  $Z_{i+1} = \langle f_i \mp \lambda f_{i+1} \rangle$  for all  $1 \leq i < n$  odd.

We conclude then that any system of imprimitivity distinct from  $\{\langle e_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle e_n \rangle\}$  corresponds to a decomposition

$$V = \langle f_1 + \lambda f_2 \rangle \oplus \langle f_1 - \lambda f_2 \rangle \oplus \dots \oplus \langle f_{n-1} + \lambda f_n \rangle \oplus \langle f_{n-1} - \lambda f_n \rangle,$$

where  $\{\{f_1, f_2\}, \dots, \{f_{n-1}, f_n\}\}$  is some system of imprimitivity for the action of  $K$  on  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ , and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$  is such that  $\lambda^2 = \pm 1$ .

## 4. APPLICATIONS

Our original motivation for Theorem 1.1 was in the problem of classifying maximal irreducible solvable subgroups of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ . It follows from [Sup76, Theorem 15.4] that if  $G \leq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  is maximal irreducible solvable, then either:

- (1)  $G$  is primitive; or
- (2)  $n = dk$  for  $k > 1$ , and  $G = H \wr K$ , where  $H \leq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{F})$  is maximal irreducible primitive solvable and  $K \leq S_k$  is maximal transitive solvable.

Note that the groups in case (2) are not always maximal solvable. For example, the imprimitive subgroup  $\mathrm{GL}_1(q) \wr C_2$  is not maximal solvable in  $\mathrm{GL}_2(q)$  if  $q = 3$  or  $q = 5$ . When are they maximal solvable? As a corollary of Theorem 1.1, we can reduce this question to the problem of determining when such  $H \wr K$  lie in a primitive solvable subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ .

**Corollary 4.1.** *Suppose that  $n = dk$  with  $k > 1$ . Let  $G = H \wr K \leq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ , where  $H \leq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{F})$  is maximal irreducible primitive solvable and  $K \leq S_k$  is maximal solvable transitive. Then either  $G$  is maximal solvable in  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ , or the following conditions hold:*

- (i)  $k = \ell' \ell$ ,  $K = X \wr Y$ , where  $X \leq S_{\ell'}$  and  $Y \leq S_{\ell}$  are maximal transitive solvable; and
- (ii)  $H \wr X$  is contained in a maximal irreducible primitive solvable subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_{d\ell'}(\mathbb{F})$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $G$  is not maximal solvable. Then by a theorem of Zassenhaus [Zas37, Satz 8], there exists a maximal solvable subgroup  $G_0 \leq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  that contains  $G$ .

If  $G_0$  is primitive, then (i) and (ii) hold with  $X = 1$  and  $Y = K$ . Suppose then that  $G_0$  is imprimitive. In this case, by [Sup76, Theorem 15.4] we have  $G_0 = H_0 \wr K_0$  for some  $H_0 \leq \mathrm{GL}_e(\mathbb{F})$  maximal irreducible primitive solvable and  $K_0 \leq S_{\ell}$  maximal transitive solvable, where  $n = e\ell$  for  $\ell > 1$ .

Suppose first that  $G$  is not as in the exceptional case of Theorem 1.1. Write  $\mathbb{F}^n = W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_k = Z_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Z_{\ell}$ , where  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$  and  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_{\ell}\}$  are the systems of imprimitivity defining  $G$  and  $G_0$ , respectively. Applying Theorem 1.1 to  $G$ , it follows that  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$  must be a refinement of  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_{\ell}\}$ . In other words, we conclude that  $\ell$  divides  $k$ , and for all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$  we have

$$Z_i = W_1^{(i)} \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{k/\ell}^{(i)}$$

for some subset  $B_i := \{W_1^{(i)}, \dots, W_{k/\ell}^{(i)}\}$  of  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$ .

Therefore the sets  $\{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell}\}$  form a block system for the action of  $K$  on  $\{W_1, \dots, W_k\}$ , so  $K$  is a subgroup of  $X \wr Y$ , where  $X \leq S_{k/\ell}$  is the action of  $N_K(B_1)$  on  $B_1$ , and  $Y \leq K_0$  is the action of  $K$  on  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_{\ell}\}$ . Furthermore, in this case we have  $H \wr X \leq H_0$ . By the maximality of  $K$  we must have  $K = X \wr Y$  with  $X$  and  $Y$  maximal transitive solvable, so (i) and (ii) hold.

What remains then is to consider the exceptional case of Theorem 1.1, in which case  $n = k$ ,  $d = 1$ , and  $H \leq \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{F})$  is cyclic of order 2. Furthermore, in this case  $n$  is even and  $K$  is a transitive subgroup of  $C_2 \wr S_{n/2}$ . Since  $H$  is assumed to be maximal solvable, we have  $H = \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{F})$ , so  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_3$  and  $H = \{\pm 1\}$ . Now  $K$  normalizes the elementary abelian base group  $C_2^{n/2}$  of  $C_2 \wr S_{n/2}$ , so by maximality  $K$  must contain  $C_2^{n/2}$ . Thus  $K = C_2 \wr T$  for some maximal transitive solvable subgroup

$T$  of  $S_{n/2}$ . Since  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}) = \mathrm{GL}_2(3)$  is solvable, we conclude that (i) and (ii) hold with  $X = C_2$  and  $Y = T$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.2.* Note that when conditions (i) – (ii) of Corollary 4.1 hold, the subgroup  $G$  is not maximal solvable in  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ . Indeed, in this case  $G = H \wr (X \wr Y) = (H \wr X) \wr Y < H_0 \wr Y$  for some maximal irreducible primitive solvable subgroup  $H_0$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_{d\ell}(\mathbb{F})$ .

With similar arguments, we can apply Theorem 1.1 to the problem of describing the inclusions between irreducible wreath product subgroups  $H_1 \wr K_1$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ , where  $H_1$  is primitive. The following corollary of Theorem 1.1 provides a solution in most cases.

**Corollary 4.3.** *Suppose that  $n = dk$ , where  $k > 1$ . Let  $G_1 = H_1 \wr K_1 \leq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ , where  $H_1 \leq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{F})$  is nontrivial irreducible primitive and  $K_1 \leq S_k$  is transitive. Suppose that  $G_1$  is not one of the exceptions of Theorem 1.1. Then  $G_1$  is contained in an imprimitive subgroup  $H_2 \wr K_2$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  if and only if all of the following conditions hold:*

- (i)  $n = e\ell$ ,  $H_2 \leq \mathrm{GL}_e(\mathbb{F})$  and  $K_2 \leq S_\ell$  with  $\ell > 1$  dividing  $k$ ;
- (ii)  $K_1 \leq X \wr Y$ , where  $X \leq S_{k/\ell}$  and  $Y \leq K_2$ ;
- (iii)  $H_1 \wr X \leq H_2$ .

*Proof.* If conditions (i) – (iii) hold, it is clear that  $H_1 \wr K_1 \leq H_1 \wr (X \wr Y) = (H_1 \wr X) \wr Y \leq H_2 \wr K_2$ . The other direction of the claim follows from Theorem 1.1, by arguing as in the proof of Corollary 4.1 (paragraphs 3–4).  $\square$

What about when  $G_1 = H_1 \wr K_1 \leq \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  is as in the exception of Theorem 1.1? In this case we know all the systems of imprimitivity for  $G_1$  (Remark 3.3), which readily gives a description of the wreath product subgroups of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$  that contain  $G_1$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [Coh76] A. M. Cohen. Finite complex reflection groups. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 9(3):379–436, 1976.
- [Gro88] F. Gross. Automorphisms of permutational wreath products. *J. Algebra*, 117(2):472–493, 1988.
- [KM97] G. Kemper and G. Malle. The finite irreducible linear groups with polynomial ring of invariants. *Transform. Groups*, 2(1):57–89, 1997.
- [Kon73] V. S. Konjuh. Imprimitive linear groups. *Vesci Akad. Navuk BSSR Ser. Fiz.-Mat. Navuk*, (5):5–9, 135, 1973.
- [Neu64] P. M. Neumann. On the structure of standard wreath products of groups. *Math. Z.*, 84:343–373, 1964.
- [ST54] G. C. Shephard and J. A. Todd. Finite unitary reflection groups. *Canad. J. Math.*, 6:274–304, 1954.
- [Sup76] D. A. Suprunenko. *Matrix groups*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1976. Translated from the Russian, Translation edited by K. A. Hirsch, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 45.
- [Zas37] H. Zassenhaus. Beweis eines satzes über diskrete gruppen. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, 12(1):289–312, 1937.



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SHENZHEN  
518055, GUANGDONG, P. R. CHINA

*Email address:* [korhonen\\_mikko@hotmail.com](mailto:korhonen_mikko@hotmail.com) (Korhonen)

SUSTECH INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICS AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,  
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SHENZHEN 518055, GUANGDONG, P.R. CHINA

*Email address:* [lich@sustech.edu.cn](mailto:lich@sustech.edu.cn) (Li)