

On Morita equivalences with endopermutation source and isotypies

Xin Huang

Abstract

We introduce a new type of equivalence between blocks of finite group algebras called an *almost isotypy*. An almost isotypy restricts to a weak isotypy in Broué's original definition [8, Définition 4.6], and it is slightly weaker than Linckelmann's version [14, §10]. We show that a bimodule of two block algebras of finite groups - which has an endopermutation module as a source and which induces a Morita equivalence - gives rise to an almost isotypy if and only if the character values of a (hence any) source are rational integers. This generalises a previous result of Huang and Zhou [12]. Consequently, if two blocks are Morita equivalent via a bimodule with endopermutation source, then they are almost isotypic.

Keywords: finite groups, blocks, endopermutation modules, Morita equivalences, isotypies

1. Introduction

Throughout this section p is a prime, k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic p , and \mathcal{O} is a complete discrete valuation ring with quotient field K of characteristic 0 and residue field k . Assume that K is a splitting field for finite groups considered below.

Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Denote by $\mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(G, b)$ the group of generalised characters of G over K associated with the block b , and denote by $\mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(G, b)$ the corresponding group of generalised Brauer characters. Following Broué, a *perfect isometry* between b and c is a group isomorphism $\Phi : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(H, c) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(G, b)$ satisfying certain conditions (see [8, Définition 1.4] or [17, Definition 9.2.2]). By arithmetic properties of a perfect isometry, Φ induces an isomorphism $\bar{\Phi} : \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(H, c) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(G, b)$ such that $d_G \circ \Phi = \bar{\Phi} \circ d_H$ (see [17, Corollary 9.2.7]). Here d_G and d_H are the usual decomposition maps. Given a p -element u of G and a block e of $kC_G(u)$, denote by \hat{e} the unique block of $\mathcal{O}C_G(u)$ that lifts e . For any class functor χ in $\text{Cl}_K(G)$ associated with the block b , define a class function $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e)}(\chi)$ in $\text{Cl}_K(C_G(u)_{p'})$ by setting $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e)}(\chi)(s) = \chi(\hat{e}us)$ for all p' -elements s in $C_G(u)$.

In [8], Broué defined the notion of an isotypy. The following definition is Broué's original definition. In order to distinguish different notions, let us call it weak isotypy.

Definition 1.1 (cf. [8, Définition 4.6]). Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Suppose that b and c have a common defect group P . Let $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ and $j \in (\mathcal{O}Hc)^P$ be source idempotents. Suppose further that the fusion system of the source algebras $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ and $j\mathcal{O}Hj$ on P are equal. For any cyclic subgroup Q of P , denote by e_Q the unique block of $kC_G(Q)$ satisfying $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)e_Q \neq 0$ and by f_Q the unique block of $kC_H(Q)$

satisfying $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}H}(j)f_Q \neq 0$. Denote by \hat{e}_Q and \hat{f}_Q the blocks of $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)$ and $\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)$ lifting e_Q and f_Q , respectively. A *weak isotopy between b and c* is a family of perfect isometries

$$\Phi_Q : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q)$$

for every **cyclic** subgroup $Q = \langle u \rangle$ of P , such that we have an equality of maps

$$d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_Q)} \circ \Phi_1 = \bar{\Phi}_Q \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_Q)}$$

from $\mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(H, c)$ to $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q)$. We say that the perfect isometry Φ_1 *extends to a weak isotopy between b and c* , and the family $(\Phi_Q)_{\{1 \neq Q(\text{cyclic}) \subseteq P\}}$ is called a *local system*.

When studying p -permutation equivalences, a very strong version of isotopy (see [14, §10] or [17, Definition 9.5.1]) was defined; see also [5, Definition 15.3] for an equivalent version. The only known examples of isotypic blocks in the sense of [14, §10] are p -permutation equivalent blocks and Galois conjugate blocks (see [14, Theorem 10.1] and [17, Theorem 9.6.1]). We define the notion an almost isotopy which is slightly weaker than [17, Definition 9.5.1].

Definition 1.2. Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Suppose that b and c have a common defect group P . Let $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ and $j \in (\mathcal{O}Hc)^P$ be source idempotents. Suppose further that the fusion systems of the source algebras $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ and $j\mathcal{O}Hj$ on P are equal. For any subgroup Q of P denote by e_Q the unique block of $kC_G(Q)$ satisfying $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)e_Q \neq 0$ and by f_Q the unique block of $kC_H(Q)$ satisfying $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}H}(j)f_Q \neq 0$. Denote by \hat{e}_Q and \hat{f}_Q the blocks of $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)$ and $\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)$ lifting e_Q and f_Q , respectively. We define an *almost isotopy between b and c* to be a family of perfect isometries

$$\Phi_Q : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q)$$

for every subgroup Q of P , with the following properties.

- (i) (Equivariance) For any isomorphism $\varphi : Q \cong R$ in the common fusion system \mathcal{F} we have ${}^\varphi\Phi_Q = \Phi_R$, where ${}^\varphi\Phi_Q$ is obtained from composing Φ_Q with the isomorphisms $\mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_G(R), \hat{e}_R)$ and $\mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(R), \hat{f}_R)$ given by conjugation with elements $x \in G$ and $y \in H$ satisfying $\varphi(u) = xux^{-1} = yuy^{-1}$ for all $u \in Q$.
- (ii) (Compatibility) For any subgroup Q of P , any element $u \in C_P(Q)$, setting $R = Q\langle u \rangle$, we have

$$d_{(C_G(Q), e_Q)}^{(u, e_R)} \circ \Phi_Q = \bar{\Phi}_R \circ d_{(C_H(Q), f_Q)}^{(u, f_R)} \quad \text{or} \quad d_{(C_G(Q), e_Q)}^{(u, e_R)} \circ \Phi_Q = -\bar{\Phi}_R \circ d_{(C_H(Q), f_Q)}^{(u, f_R)}$$

as maps from $\mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q)$ to $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(C_G(R), \hat{e}_R)$. We say that the perfect isometry Φ_1 *extends to an almost isotopy between b and c* , and the family $(\Phi_Q)_{\{1 \neq Q \subseteq P\}}$ is called a *local system*.

The only difference between Definition 1.2 and the isotopy in [14, §10] is that we add a sign in the condition (ii). It is easy to see that from an almost isotopy, one obtains a weak isotopy in Definition 1.1 (after possibly replacing Φ_Q by $-\Phi_Q$ for some non-trivial cyclic subgroups Q of P). Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. An $(\mathcal{O}Gb, \mathcal{O}Hc)$ -bimodule M induces, via tensor products over $\mathcal{O}H$, a \mathbb{Z} -linear map $\Phi_M : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(H, c) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(G, b)$. We say that M extends to an almost isotopy if there is a suitable local system in Definition 1.2 making Φ_M to extend to an almost isotopy. In [12], the author and Zhou proved that if an $(\mathcal{O}Gb, \mathcal{O}Hc)$ -bimodule M induces a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$ and has an endopermutation module V as a source, then M extends to a weak isotopy in Definition 1.1 if and only if the character values of V are rational integers. In this paper we generalise this result: we prove that M extends to an almost isotopy in Definition 1.2 if and only if the same condition holds.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Assume that an $(\mathcal{O}Gb, \mathcal{O}Hc)$ -bimodule M induces a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$ and has an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}X$ -module V as a source with character $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$. For $x \in X$, let T_x be an indecomposable direct summand of $\text{Res}_{\langle x \rangle}^X(V)$ with vertex $\langle x \rangle$ and denote by m_x the multiplicity of the isomorphism class of T_x in an indecomposable decomposition of $\text{Res}_{\langle x \rangle}^X(V)$. The following are equivalent.*

- (i) M extends to a weak isotopy in Definition 1.1 between b and c .
- (ii) For any $x \in X$, $\rho(x) = \pm m_x$.
- (iii) For any $x \in X$, $\rho(x)$ is a rational integer.
- (iv) M extends to an almost isotopy in Definition 1.2 between b and c .

Moreover, if $p \geq 3$ and X is abelian, the above conditions are equivalent to

- (v) M extends to an isotopy in [14, §10] between b and c .

If one of these conditions holds, then M together with its slashed modules (see Notation 4.1 below) gives rise to an almost isotopy, a weak isotopy, and an isotopy in each condition.

The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is due to [12, Theorem] - we will prove (i) implying (ii) again in this paper to slightly repair the arguments in [12]. The equivalence of (ii) and (iii) is by [19, Proposition 52.3]. Since (iv) (resp. (v)) implies (i), it remains to prove that (ii) implies (iv) (resp. (v)).

If $p \geq 3$ or X is abelian, then by the classification of endopermutation modules, the equivalence class of $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$ belongs to the subgroup of the Dade group of kX generated by relative syzygies (see [7] or [20, Theorem 13.3]). If $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$ is an exotic endotrivial modules, the conditions (i)–(iv) in Theorem 1.3 may not be equivalent to (v) in general - the following Proposition provides some evidence. We refer to [20, Proposition 4.3] and the references therein for descriptions of exotic endotrivial modules.

Proposition 1.4. *Keep the notation of Theorem 1.3. Assume that X is isomorphic to Q_8 (the quaternion group of order 8), and V is an endotrivial $\mathcal{O}X$ -module lifting a 3-dimensional (resp. 5-dimensional) exotic endotrivial kX -module. Then the values of ρ_V are rational*

integers, and M extends to an almost isotypy, but M together with its slashed modules cannot give rise to an isotypy in [14, §10].

Remark 1.5. Keep the notation of Proposition 1.4. Although M together with its slashed modules cannot give rise to an isotypy in the sense of [14, §10]. We still don't know whether M extends to an isotypy in the sense of [14, §10], because a local system is not necessarily coming from lifting slashed modules. However, since M has an endopermutation source, lifting slashed modules is the most natural way to find a potential local system. So Proposition 1.4 shows that the notion of almost isotypy is reasonable, and it seems to be the optimal solution for this problem.

Combined with [13, Theorem 1.13 (b)] and [17, Proposition 7.3.13], Theorem 1.3 implies the following theorem.

Theorem 1.6. *Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ with a defect group P and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Denote by \bar{b} and \bar{c} the image of b and c in kG and kH , respectively. Assume that $kG\bar{b}$ and $kH\bar{c}$ are Morita equivalent via a bimodule with endopermutation source. Then $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$ are almost isotypic in the sense of Definition 1.2. If $p \geq 3$ and P is abelian, then $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$ are isotypic in the sense of [14, §10].*

This paper is more than a proof of Theorem 1.3. We take this opportunity to prove many properties of local Morita equivalences induced by slashed modules, such as Propositions 4.3, 4.4, 4.8 and 4.10. They are probably to be used to prove other results. In Section 2 we review some basic concepts and notation. In Section 3 we prove some auxiliary results on character values of endopermutation modules, and in Section 4, we prove some properties of local Morita equivalences induced by slashed modules. Then we prove in Section 5 that these local Morita equivalences can be uniquely lifted to \mathcal{O} to satisfy some good properties. In Section 6 we compare the generalised decomposition numbers of two blocks which are Morita equivalent via a bimodule with endopermutation source. Theorem 1.3 and Proposition 1.4 are proved respectively in Section 7 and 8.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this section, p is a prime, k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic p ; \mathcal{O} is either a complete discrete valuation ring of characteristic 0 with residue field k , or $\mathcal{O} = k$. In this section we review some notation and concepts. For an algebra A , we denote by A^{op} the opposite algebra of A . Unless specified otherwise, all \mathcal{O} -algebras and \mathcal{O} -modules considered in this paper are \mathcal{O} -free of finite \mathcal{O} -rank. For a finite group G , we denote by ΔG the diagonal subgroup $\{(g, g) | g \in G\}$ of the direct product $G \times G$. Whenever useful, we regard an $\mathcal{O}\Delta G$ -module as an $\mathcal{O}G$ -module and vice versa via the isomorphism $G \cong \Delta G$ sending $g \in G$ to (g, g) . For finite groups G and H , an $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}H)$ -bimodule M can be regarded as an $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)$ -module (and vice versa) via $(g, h)m = gmh^{-1}$, where $g \in G$, $h \in H$ and $m \in M$. If M is indecomposable as an $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}H)$ -bimodule, then M is indecomposable as an $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)$ -module, hence has a vertex (in $G \times H$) and a source.

Given two \mathcal{O} -algebras A, B and an (A, B) -bimodule M , $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(M)$ is an $(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} A^{\text{op}}, B \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B^{\text{op}})$ -bimodule: for any $a_1, a_2 \in A$, $b_1, b_2 \in B$, $\varphi \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(M)$ and $m \in M$,

$$((a_1 \otimes a_2) \cdot \varphi \cdot (b_1 \otimes b_2))(m) = a_1 \varphi(a_2 m b_2) b_1.$$

2.1. The Brauer construction. Let G be a finite group. We refer to [19, §10] or [16, Definition 1.3.1] for the definition of a G -algebra. If A is a G -algebra (resp. $\mathcal{O}G$ -module), we denote by A^H the subalgebra (resp. submodule) of H -fixed points of A for any subgroup H of G . For any two p -subgroups $Q \leq P$ of G , the *relative trace map* $\text{Tr}_Q^P : A^Q \rightarrow A^P$, is defined by $\text{Tr}_Q^P(a) = \sum_{x \in [P/Q]} x a$, where $[P/Q]$ denotes a set of representatives of the left cosets of Q in P . We denote by $\text{Br}_P(A)$ or $A(P)$ the *Brauer quotient* of A , i.e., the $N_G(P)$ -algebra (resp. $kN_G(P)$ -module)

$$A^P / \left(\sum_{Q < P} \text{Tr}_Q^P(A^Q) + J(\mathcal{O})A^P \right),$$

where $J(-)$ denotes the Jacobson radical. We denote by $\text{br}_P^A : A^P \rightarrow A(P)$ the canonical map, which is called the *Brauer homomorphism*. Sometimes we write br_Q instead of br_Q^A if no confusion arises.

If A is a G -interior algebra (for instance, $A = \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(M)$ for some $\mathcal{O}G$ -module M), then the Brauer quotient $A(P)$ has a natural structure of $C_G(P)$ -interior algebra. For the group algebra $\mathcal{O}G$ (considered as a G -interior algebra) and a p -subgroup P , the Brauer homomorphism can be identified with the \mathcal{O} -algebra homomorphism $(\mathcal{O}G)^P \rightarrow kC_G(P)$, $\sum_{g \in G} \alpha_g g \mapsto \sum_{g \in C_G(P)} \bar{\alpha}_g g$, where $\bar{\alpha}_g$ denotes the image of α_g in k . If M is an A -module then M can be viewed as an $\mathcal{O}G$ -module via the structure homomorphism $G \rightarrow A^{\times}$.

2.2. Blocks and Brauer pairs. Let G be a finite group. By a *block* of the group algebra $\mathcal{O}G$, we mean a primitive idempotent b of the center of $\mathcal{O}G$, and $\mathcal{O}G b$ is called a *block algebra* of $\mathcal{O}G$. A *defect group* of b is a maximal p -subgroup P of G such that $\text{br}_P^{\mathcal{O}G}(b) \neq 0$.

A *Brauer pair* (or *subpair*) of the group G is a pair (Q, e_Q) , where Q is a p -subgroup of G and e_Q is a block of $kC_G(Q)$. The Brauer pair (Q, e_Q) is a *b-Brauer pair* if $e_Q \text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(b) \neq 0$. For the definition of inclusions of Brauer pairs we refer to [16, Definition 5.9.7] or [17, Definition 6.3.1]. Denote by \hat{e}_Q the unique block of $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)$ lifting e_Q .

Let G and H be finite groups. Denote by $-^{\circ}$ the \mathcal{O} -algebra isomorphism $\mathcal{O}H \cong (\mathcal{O}H)^{\text{op}}$ sending any $h \in H$ to h^{-1} . Let b and c be blocks of $\mathcal{O}G$ and $\mathcal{O}H$ respectively. Clearly c° is a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Then an $(\mathcal{O}G b, \mathcal{O}H c)$ -bimodule M can be regarded as an $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)$ -module belonging to the block $b \otimes c^{\circ}$ of $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)$, and vice versa. Here, we identify $b \otimes c^{\circ}$ and its image under the \mathcal{O} -algebra isomorphism $\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}H \cong \mathcal{O}(G \times H)$ sending $g \otimes h$ to (g, h) for any $g \in G$ and $h \in H$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be a finite group, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and (P, e) a maximal b -Brauer pair of G . For any subgroup Q of P denote by e_Q the unique block of $kC_G(Q)$ such that $(Q, e_Q) \leq (P, e)$. The following hold.*

- (i) *Let $Q' = QC_P(Q)$, then $(C_P(Q), e_{Q'})$ is an e_Q -Brauer pair of $C_G(Q)$.*

- (ii) Let $u \in C_P(Q)$ and $R = Q\langle u \rangle$. Then $(\langle u \rangle, e_R)$ is an e_Q -Brauer pair of $C_G(Q)$, and we have $(\langle u \rangle, e_R) \leq (C_P(Q), e_{Q'})$.

Proof. Let i be a primitive idempotent in $(\mathcal{O}G)^P$ such that $\text{br}_P^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)e_P \neq 0$. By the definition of inclusion of Brauer pairs [16, Definition 5.9.7] and by [16, Theorem 5.9.6], we have $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)e_Q \neq 0$, $\text{br}_{Q'}^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)e_{Q'} \neq 0$ and $\text{br}_R^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)e_R \neq 0$. Note that $C_{C_G(Q)}(C_P(Q)) = C_G(Q')$ and $C_{C_G(Q)}(u) = C_G(R)$. Then we see that $\text{br}_{C_P(Q)}^{kC_G(Q)}(e_Q)e_{Q'} = \text{br}_{Q'}^{\mathcal{O}G}(e_Q)e_{Q'} \neq 0$ and $\text{br}_{\langle u \rangle}^{kC_G(Q)}(e_Q)e_R = \text{br}_R^{\mathcal{O}G}(e_Q)e_R \neq 0$. Hence by [17, Definition 6.3.1], both $(C_P(Q), e_{Q'})$ and $(\langle u \rangle, e_Q)$ are e_Q -Brauer pairs of $C_G(Q)$.

By standard lifting theorems for idempotents, there exists a primitive idempotent $j \in (kC_G(Q))^{C_P(Q)}$ such that $\text{br}_{Q'}^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)\text{br}_{C_P(Q)}^{kC_G(Q)}(j) \neq 0$ and $\text{br}_{C_P(Q)}^{kC_G(Q)}(j)e_{Q'} \neq 0$. By [16, Theorem 5.9.6 (ii)], we have $\text{br}_Q^{kC_G(Q)}(j)e_R \neq 0$. Then by [16, Definition 5.9.7], $(\langle u \rangle, e_R) \leq (C_P(Q), e_{Q'})$. \square

2.4. Points of algebras. Let G be a finite group and A an \mathcal{O} -algebra. A *point* of A is an A^\times -conjugacy class of primitive idempotents in A . Let I be a primitive decomposition of 1_A in A . The *multiplicity* of a point α on A is the cardinal $m_\alpha = |I \cap \alpha|$ and it does not depend on the choice of I . If A is a G -algebra, Q is a p -subgroup of G , a point $\alpha \in A^Q$ is *local* if $\text{br}_Q^A(\alpha) \neq \{0\}$. In this case, α is called a *local point* of Q on A . It is known that $\text{br}_Q^A(\alpha)$ is a point of $A(Q)$ and that the correspondence $\alpha \mapsto \text{br}_Q^A(\alpha)$ induces a bijection between the set of the local points of Q on A and the set of the points of $A(Q)$ (see e.g. [19, Lemma 14.5]).

Let G be a finite group and b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$. The map $G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}Gb$ sending g to gb induces an interior G -algebra structure on $\mathcal{O}Gb$. Let α be a local point of $\langle u \rangle$ on $\mathcal{O}Gb$. Let $\chi \in \text{Irr}_K(G, b)$ afforded by an $\mathcal{O}G$ -module M . We set $\chi(u_\alpha) = \chi(ul)$, where $l \in \alpha$. Note that $\chi(u_\alpha)$ is independent of the choice of l ; see remarks before [16, Definition 5.15.2].

2.5. Almost source algebras. For the concept of fusion systems, we follow the conventions of [17, §8.1]. Almost source algebras of a block was introduced by Linckelmann in [14, Definition 4.3]. Let G be a finite group, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and P a defect group of b . An idempotent $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ is called an *almost source idempotent* if $\text{br}_P^{\mathcal{O}G}(i) \neq 0$ for every subgroup Q of P , there is a unique block e_Q of $kC_G(Q)$ such that $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(i) \in kC_G(Q)e_Q$. The P -interior algebra $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ is then called an *almost source algebra* of the block b . If the almost idempotent i is primitive in $(\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$, then i is called a *source idempotent* and $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ is called an *source algebra* of b . By [14, Proposition 4.1], there is a canonical Morita equivalence between the block algebra $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and an almost source algebra $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ sending an $\mathcal{O}Gb$ -module M to the $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ -module iM . The choice of an almost source idempotent $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ determines a fusion system \mathcal{F} on P such that for any subgroups Q and R of P , the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, R)$ is the set of all group homomorphisms $\varphi : Q \rightarrow R$ for which there is an element $x \in G$ satisfying $\varphi(u) = xux^{-1}$ for all $u \in Q$ and satisfying $xe_Qx^{-1} = e_{xQx^{-1}}$ (see [14, Remark 4.4] or [17, §8.7]). Note that we use here the blanket assumption that k is large enough. Moreover, a subgroup Q of P is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised if and only if $C_P(Q)$ is a defect group of the block e_Q of $kC_G(Q)$. Given a subgroup Q of P , it is always possible to find a subgroup R of P such that $Q \cong R$ in \mathcal{F} and such that R is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised.

The following result of Linckelmann explains why we will need to work with fully centralised subgroups and almost source idempotent rather than source idempotents.

Proposition 2.6 ([14, Proposition 4.5]). *Let G be a finite group, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$, P a defect group of b , and $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ an almost source idempotent of b with associated almost source algebra $A = i\mathcal{O}Gi$. If Q is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised subgroup of P , then $C_P(Q)$ is a defect group of $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)$ is an almost source idempotent of $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ with the associated almost source algebra $A(Q)$. In particular, $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $A(Q)$ are Morita equivalent.*

2.7. Fusion-stable endopermutation modules. Let P be a finite p -group, V an $\mathcal{O}P$ -module. If $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$ admits a P -stable \mathcal{O} -basis under the conjugation action, then V is called an *endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module*, as defined in [9]. Let \mathcal{F} a fusion system on P . Let Q be a subgroup of P and V an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}Q$ -module. Following Linckelmann ([16, Definition 9.9.1]), we say that V is *\mathcal{F} -stable* if for any subgroup R of Q and any morphism $\varphi : R \rightarrow Q$ in \mathcal{F} , the sets of isomorphism classes of indecomposable direct summands with vertex R of the kR -modules $\text{Res}_R^Q(V)$ and ${}_{\varphi}V$ are equal (including the possibility that both sets may be empty). This is equivalent to saying that $\text{Res}_R^Q(V) \oplus {}_{\varphi}V$ is an endopermutation kR -module (see [9, Corollary 6.12]).

Theorem 2.8 (Dade’s slashed modules; see e.g. [17, Proposition 7.3.7 (i)]). *Let P be a finite p -group and V an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module. For any subgroup Q of P , and any subgroup H of P satisfying $H \leq N_P(Q)$, there is up to isomorphism a unique endopermutation kH -module $V[Q]$ such that $(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V))(Q) \cong \text{End}_k(V[Q])$ as H -algebras. $V[Q]$ has an indecomposable direct summand with vertex H .*

The $V[Q]$ above is called a *Q -slashed module* attached to V over the group H . The slashed modules is also known as “deflation–restriction”; see e.g. [17, Definition 7.3.8] or [20, §3].

Proposition 2.9 ([15, Proposition 4.1]). *Let A and B be almost source algebras of blocks of finite group algebras having a common defect group P and the same fusion system \mathcal{F} on P . Let V be an \mathcal{F} -stable indecomposable endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module with vertex P . Let M be a direct summand the (A, B) -bimodule*

$$U := A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B.$$

Consider M as an $\mathcal{O}\Delta P$ -module via the homomorphism $\Delta P \rightarrow A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B^{\text{op}}$ sending $(u, u) \in \Delta P$ to $u1_A \otimes u^{-1}1_B$. Then for any non-trivial subgroup Q of P , there is a canonical $(\text{Br}_Q(A), \text{Br}_Q(B))$ -bimodule M_Q satisfying $\text{Br}_{\Delta Q}(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(M)) \cong \text{End}_k(M_Q)$ as k -algebras and as $(\text{Br}_Q(A) \otimes_k \text{Br}_Q(A)^{\text{op}}, \text{Br}_Q(B) \otimes_k \text{Br}_Q(B)^{\text{op}})$ -bimodules.

A Brauer-friendly module is a direct sum of indecomposable modules with compatible fusion-stable endopermutation sources. we refer to [2, Definition 8] for its definition.

Proposition 2.10 (see [11, Proposition 2.6]). *Let G and H be finite groups, and let b and c be blocks of $\mathcal{O}G$ and $\mathcal{O}H$ respectively. Let M be an indecomposable $(\mathcal{O}Gb, \mathcal{O}Hc)$ -bimodule with an endopermutation source inducing a stable equivalence of Morita type between $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$. Then M is a Brauer-friendly $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)(b \otimes c^{\circ})$ -module.*

Note that although [11, Proposition 2.6] is a statement over k , the proof works over \mathcal{O} .

Lemma 2.11 (see [2, Theorem 18 and 21]). *Let G be a finite group, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$, M a Brauer-friendly $\mathcal{O}Gb$ -module, (P, e_P) a b -subpair, and H a subgroup of G such that $C_G(P) \leq H \leq N_G(P, e_P)$. Then there exists a Brauer-friendly kHe_P -module $Sl_{(P, e_P)}^H(M)$ and an isomorphism of $C_G(P)$ -interior H -algebras*

$$\theta_{(P, e_P)}^H : \text{Br}_P(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_P M)) \cong \text{End}_k(Sl_{(P, e_P)}^H(M)).$$

Following Biland, the pair $(Sl_{(P, e_P)}^H(M), \theta_{(P, e_P)}^H)$ or just the kHe_P -module $Sl_{(P, e_P)}^H(M)$ is called a (P, e_P) -slashed module attached to M over the group H . This is a generalisation of Dade's slashed modules for endopermutation modules of finite p -groups.

Remark 2.12. In Lemma 2.11, H is assumed to satisfy $C_G(P) \leq H \leq N_G(P, e_P)$, while in [2, Theorem 18 and 21], H is assumed to satisfy $PC_G(P) \leq H \leq N_G(P, e_P)$. But Lemma 2.11 follows from the proof of [2, Theorems 18 and 21].

2.13. Vertex subpairs and sources. Let G be a finite group, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$, and M an indecomposable $\mathcal{O}Gb$ -module. We refer to [2, Definition 2] for the definitions of a vertex subpair of M , a source of M with respect to a vertex subpair, and a source triple of M . Let (P, e) be a vertex subpair of M . In [2], the second component e is defined to be a block of $\mathcal{O}C_G(P)$. Since there is a canonical bijection between the blocks of $\mathcal{O}C_G(P)$ and of $kC_G(P)$. So we can define the second component e to be a block of $kC_G(P)$. As in the classical theory of Green, the vertex subpairs (resp. source triples) of M form an orbit under the action of G by conjugation.

The following proposition is the block theoretic version of [16, Theorem 5.6.9], and it is a generalisation of [5, Proposition 5.3 (b), (c)].

Proposition 2.14. *Let G be a finite group, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$, M an indecomposable $\mathcal{O}Gb$ -module, and (Q, e_Q) a b -Brauer pair of G . Then (Q, e_Q) is contained in a vertex subpair of M if and only if $\text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_Q M)) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Assume (P, e_P) is a vertex subpair of M such that $(Q, e_Q) \leq (P, e_P)$. Then by [2, Lemma 1 (ii)], the $\mathcal{O}P$ -module $\hat{e}_P M$ admits an indecomposable direct summand V with vertex P . Hence there is a primitive idempotent $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ such that $\text{br}_P(i)e_P \neq 0$ and that V is a direct summand of iM . So we have $\text{Br}_P(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(iM)) \neq 0$, and hence

$$0 \neq \text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(iM)) \cong \text{Br}_{\Delta Q}(i^\circ M^* \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} iM) \cong \text{br}_{\Delta Q}^{\mathcal{O}(G \times G)}(i^\circ \otimes i) \text{Br}_{\Delta Q}(M^* \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M)$$

(at least) as k -modules, where the second isomorphism is by [14, Lemma 3.9]. By the definition of $(Q, e_Q) \leq (P, e_P)$ and by [16, Theorem 5.9.6], we have

$$\text{br}_{\Delta Q}^{\mathcal{O}(G \times G)}(i^\circ \otimes i) \text{br}_{\Delta Q}^{\mathcal{O}(G \times G)}(\hat{e}_Q^\circ \otimes \hat{e}_Q) \neq 0.$$

Hence $\text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_Q M)) \neq 0$.

The proof of the “if” part is inspired by the proof of [5, Proposition 5.3 (c)]. Assume conversely that $\text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_Q M)) \neq 0$. Then the $\mathcal{O}Q$ -module $\hat{e}_Q M$ admits an indecomposable direct summand V with vertex Q . Since $\text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(M)) \neq 0$, by [16, Theorem 5.6.9], Q is contained in a vertex, say P , of M . We proceed by induction on the index $|P : Q|$. If $Q = P$, then by [2, Lemma 1 (ii)], $(P, e_Q) = (Q, e_Q)$ is a vertex subpair of M , hence the claim is true. Assume now that $Q < P$. Let $c := \text{Tr}_{N_G(Q, e_Q)}^{N_G(Q)}(\hat{e}_Q)$. By [17, Theorem 6.2.6 (iii)], \hat{e}_Q remains a block of $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q, e_Q)$, c is a block of $\mathcal{O}N_G(P)$, and the $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q)c$ - $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q, e_Q)\hat{e}_Q$ -bimodule $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q)\hat{e}_Q$ and its dual $\hat{e}_Q\mathcal{O}N_G(Q)$ induces a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q)c$ and $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q, e_Q)\hat{e}_Q$. It is well-known that that a splendid Morita equivalence preserves vertices and sources of indecomposable modules; this can be easily proved by using some variation of [16, Theorem 5.1.16]. Since $\text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_Q M)) \neq 0$, there is an indecomposable direct summand N of the $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q, e_Q)\hat{e}_Q$ -module $\hat{e}_Q M$ such that Q is contained in a vertex of N . By the splendid Morita equivalence above, there is an indecomposable direct summand N' of $\text{Res}_{N_G(Q)}^G(M)$ such that $N = \hat{e}_Q N'$ and that a vertex of N is a vertex of N' . If Q is a vertex of N (and hence of N'), then by the Burry–Carlson–Puig Theorem ([16, Corollary 5.5.20]), Q is a vertex of M , a contradiction. Thus the $\mathcal{O}N_G(Q, e_Q)\hat{e}_Q$ -module $\hat{e}_Q N'$ has a vertex R properly containing Q . Since $\hat{e}_Q N'$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\text{Res}_{N_G(Q, e_Q)}^G(\hat{e}_Q M)$, we have $\text{Br}_R(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_Q M)) \neq 0$. Hence

$$0 \neq \text{Br}_R(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_Q M)) \cong \text{Br}_R(\hat{e}_Q M^* \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{e}_Q M) \cong \text{br}_{\Delta R}^{\mathcal{O}(G \times G)}(\hat{e}_Q^{\circ} \otimes \hat{e}_Q) \text{Br}_R(M^* \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M)$$

as $kC_G(R)\text{br}_R(\hat{e}_Q)$ - $kC_G(R)\text{br}_R(\hat{e}_R)$ -bimodules, where the second isomorphism is by [14, Lemma 3.9]. Since $\text{br}_R(\hat{e}_Q)$ is an idempotent in the center of $kC_G(R)$, there exists a block e_R of $kC_G(R)$ such that $e_R \text{br}_R(\hat{e}_Q) \neq 0$ and that

$$0 \neq (e_R^{\circ} \otimes e_R) \text{Br}_R(M^* \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M) \cong \text{Br}_R(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_R M)).$$

Note that we have $(Q, e_Q) \leq (R, e_R)$. Applying the induction hypothesis to the b -Brauer pair (R, e_R) , (R, e_R) (and hence (Q, e_Q)) is contained in some vertex subpair of M . \square

Remark 2.15. In Proposition 2.14, if M is an indecomposable p -permutation $\mathcal{O}Gb$ -module, then by [16, Proposition 5.8.6] and [14, Lemma 3.9] we have

$$\text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_Q M)) \cong \text{End}_k(\text{Br}_Q(\hat{e}_Q M)) \cong \text{End}_k(e_Q \text{Br}_Q(M)).$$

Hence Proposition 2.14 generalises [5, Proposition 5.3 (b), (c)].

3. On character values of endopermutation modules

Throughout this section p is a prime, k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic p , and \mathcal{O} is a complete discrete valuation ring of characteristic 0 with residue field k . In this section we prove some auxiliary results on character values of endopermutation modules which will be used for proving Theorem 1.3.

Notation 3.1. For P a finite p -group and V an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module such that $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)(P) \neq 0$. Denote by $\rho_V : V \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ the character of V and \det_V the determinant of V (see e.g. the paragraph after [16, Definition 3.1.2]). Note that \det_V is a linear character of P . For any $u \in P$, by [17, Proposition 7.3.7 (ii)], there is a unique local point δ_u of $\langle u \rangle$ on $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$. Denote by m_u the multiplicity of δ_u on $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}\langle u \rangle}(V)$. Denote by $\omega_V(u)$ the trace of the \mathcal{O} -linear transformation $u\ell \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$, where $\ell \in \delta_u$. Clearly $\omega_V(u)$ is independent of the choice of ℓ . By the proof of [19, Proposition 52.3], we have $\rho_V(u) = m_u \omega_V(u)$ for any $u \in P$. Also by the proof of [19, Proposition 52.3], $\rho_V(u) \in \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $\omega_V(u) = \pm 1$. So if $\rho_V(u) \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\omega_V(u)$ is the sign of $\rho_V(u)$. Assume that \mathcal{F} is a fusion system on P and V is \mathcal{F} -stable. It is easy to show that for any $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(\langle u \rangle, P)$, we have $\omega_V(u) = \omega_V(\varphi(u))$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let P be a finite p -group and V an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module having at least one direct summand with vertex P . Assume that $p \nmid \text{rk}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$. The following hold.*

- (i) *If $\det_V = 1$ then the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} . Conversely, if $p \geq 3$ and the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} , then $\det_V = 1$.*
- (ii) *Assume that $\det_V = 1$. For any u and v in P satisfying $\langle u \rangle = \langle v \rangle$, we have $\rho_V(u) = \rho_V(v)$.*

Proof. (i). Let $W(k)$ be the ring of Witt vectors in \mathcal{O} of k (see e.g. the paragraph before [13, Definition 1.8] for the definition). By [20, Theorem 14.2], there is an endopermutation $W(k)P$ -module V_0 such that $k \otimes_{W(k)} V_0 \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$. By [17, Proposition 7.3.12], V_0 is unique up to tensoring a $W(k)P$ -free module of $W(k)$ -rank 1. Since $p \nmid \text{rk}_{\mathcal{O}}(V_0)$, by [16, Corollary 5.3.4], we can choose V_0 to have determinant 1 and such a choice is unique up to isomorphism. Then $\mathcal{O} \otimes_{W(k)} V_0$ is an $\mathcal{O}P$ -module of determinant 1 which lifts the kP -module $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$.

Assume now $\det_V = 1$. By [16, Corollary 5.3.4] we deduce that $V \cong \mathcal{O} \otimes_{W(k)} V_0$. By [17, Proposition 7.3.13], the values of ρ_{V_0} are in \mathbb{Z} . Hence the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} . Conversely, assume that $p \geq 3$ and the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} . Again by [17, Proposition 7.3.12], there is a unique (up to isomorphism) $\mathcal{O}P$ -module T of \mathcal{O} -rank 1 such that $T \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V \cong \mathcal{O} \otimes_{W(k)} V_0$. Hence we have $\rho_{V_0} = \rho_V \rho_T$ and $\det_{V_0} = (\det_T)^n \det_V$, where $n = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$. We easily deduce that the values of ρ_T are in \mathbb{Z} . Since $p \geq 3$, the only possible situation is $T \cong \mathcal{O}$. It follows that $\det_V = \det_{V_0} = 1$.

(ii). Since $\det_V = 1$, by the proof of statement (i), V is defined over $W(k)$. So we may assume that \mathcal{O} is absolutely unramified. Then the statement follows from the proof of [17, Proposition 7.3.13]. \square

3.3. For a finite p -group P and $\Lambda \in \{\mathcal{O}, k\}$, denote by $D_{\Lambda}(P)$ the Dade group of P over Λ (see e.g. [20, §3]). Let X be a finite P -set and let ΛX be the corresponding permutation ΛP -module. Let $\Omega_X(\Lambda)$ be the kernel of the ‘‘augmentation’’ map $\Lambda X \rightarrow \Lambda$ (mapping every basis element in X to 1). The ΛP -module $\Omega_X(\Lambda)$ is called a *relative syzygy* of Λ . By a result due to Alperin (see e.g. [6, Lemma 2.3.3]), $\Omega_X(\Lambda)$ is an endopermutation ΛP -module. Let Q be a proper subgroup of P , then P/Q (the set of left cosets) is a P -set. Let $\Lambda[P/Q]$ be the corresponding permutation ΛP -module. Since $\text{Soc}(\Omega_{P/Q}(\Lambda)) \subseteq \text{Soc}(\Lambda[P/Q]) \cong \Lambda$, $\Omega_{P/Q}(\Lambda)$ is indecomposable. By [6, 3.2.1], $\Omega_{P/Q}(\Lambda)$ has vertex P . Let $D_{\Lambda}^{\Omega}(P)$ be the subgroup of

$D_\Lambda(P)$ generated by all the relative syzygies $\Omega_X(\Lambda)$, where X runs over all non-empty finite P -sets. By [6, Lemma 5.2.3], $D_\Lambda^\Omega(P)$ is actually generated by all $\Omega_{P/Q}(\Lambda)$, where Q runs over all proper subgroups of P .

Proposition 3.4. *Let P be a finite p -group and V an indecomposable endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module with vertex P . If $[V] \in D_\mathcal{O}^\Omega(P)$, then the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} . Conversely, if $p \geq 3$ and the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} , then $[V] \in D_\mathcal{O}^\Omega(P)$.*

Proof. Assume that $[V] \in D_\mathcal{O}^\Omega(P)$. Since each generator $\Omega_{P/Q}(\mathcal{O})$ (where Q is a proper subgroup of P) is defined over $W(k)$, using [17, Proposition 7.3.4 (vii)], it is easy to see that V is defined over $W(k)$. Hence by [17, Proposition 7.3.13], the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} . Assume conversely that $p \geq 3$ and the values of ρ_V in \mathbb{Z} . By [7], we have $D_k(P) = D_k^\Omega(P)$, hence there exists an indecomposable endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module V' such that $[V'] \in D_\mathcal{O}^\Omega(P)$ and $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V' \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$. By [17, Proposition 7.3.12], there is a unique (up to isomorphism) $\mathcal{O}P$ -module T of \mathcal{O} -rank 1 such that $T \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V \cong V'$. By the first statement, the values of $\rho_{V'}$ are in \mathbb{Z} . It follows that the values of ρ_T are in \mathbb{Z} , which in turn implies $T \cong \mathcal{O}$. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let P be a finite p -group and V an indecomposable endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module with vertex P . Assume that $p \geq 3$ and the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} . Let Q_1, \dots, Q_n be a sequence of subgroups of P and $u_0 = 1, u_1, \dots, u_n$ be a sequence of elements in P such that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $Q_i \leq N_P(\langle u_0, \dots, u_{i-1} \rangle)$ and $u_i \in Q_i$. Let V_i be an indecomposable direct summand of a $\langle u_1, \dots, u_i \rangle$ -slashed module attached to V over Q_i with vertex Q_i , and \hat{V}_i an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}Q_i$ -module such that $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{V}_i \cong V_i$ and such that $\det_{\hat{V}_i} = 1$. Let $\hat{V}_0 = V$. The product $\omega_V(u_1)\omega_{\hat{V}_1}(u_2)\cdots\omega_{\hat{V}_{n-1}}(u_n)$ depends only on $\langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle$ and V - it does not depend on a particular choice of the sequence $Q_1, \dots, Q_n, u_1, \dots, u_n$.*

Proof. Note that by [20, Theorem 14.2] and [16, Corollary 5.3.4], \hat{V}_i exists and is unique up to isomorphism. If $n = 1$, the proposition holds by Proposition 3.2 (ii). Since the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} , by Proposition 3.4, $[V] \in D_\mathcal{O}^\Omega(P)$.

We claim that the problem can be reduced to generators of $D_\mathcal{O}^\Omega(P)$. Let W be another indecomposable endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module with vertex P such that the values of ρ_W are in \mathbb{Z} . Let M be an indecomposable direct summand of $V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} W$ with vertex P . Let $N = V^*$. We can similarly choose $W_i, \hat{W}_i, M_i, \hat{M}_i, N_i$ and \hat{N}_i ($i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$) for W, M and N . Since $\omega_V(u_1)$ is the sign of the integer $\rho_V(u_1)$, it is easy to observe that $\omega_M(u_1) = \omega_{V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} W}(u_1) = \omega_V(u_1)\omega_W(u_1)$ and $\omega_N(u_1) = \omega_V(u_1)$. Since slash functors are additive (see [10, Remark 2.8]) and compatible with tensor products (see [10, 3.2]), M_1 is isomorphic to a direct summand of $V_1 \otimes_k W_1$. Note that $\hat{V}_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{W}_1$ is an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}Q$ -module lifting $V_1 \otimes_k W_1$ and has determinant 1. By the uniquely lifting property [16, Corollary 5.3.4] and Proposition 3.2 (i), we see that $[\hat{M}_1] = [\hat{V}_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{W}_1]$ in $D_\mathcal{O}(Q)$. So we have $\omega_{\hat{M}_1}(u_2) = \omega_{\hat{V}_1}(u_2)\omega_{\hat{W}_1}(u_2)$. By induction and by using the transitivity of slashed modules (see [9, Proposition 5.6] or [2, Lemma 22 (i)]), it is easy to show that $\omega_{\hat{M}_{i-1}}(u_i) = \omega_{\hat{V}_{i-1}}(u_i)\omega_{\hat{W}_{i-1}}(u_i)$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Since slash functors are compatible with duality (see [10, 3.2]), $N_u \cong (V_u)^*$, and hence $\hat{N}_u \cong (\hat{V}_u)^*$. So we have $\omega_{\hat{N}_u}(s) = \omega_{\hat{V}_u}(s)$ (because the character values \hat{V}_u are in \mathbb{Z}). By induction and by using the transitivity of slashed modules (see [9, Proposition 5.6] or [2,

Lemma 22 (i)), it is easy to show that $\omega_{\hat{V}_{i-1}}(u_i) = \omega_{\hat{N}_{i-1}}(u_i)$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Now we have proved the claim.

By the discussion in the previous paragraph, it suffices to consider that case $V = \Omega_{P/R}(\mathcal{O})$ for some proper subgroup R of P . Since we have $\rho_V + \rho_{\mathcal{O}}$ equals the character of the permutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module $\mathcal{O}[P/R]$, it is easy to see that

$$\omega_V(u_1) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle} \neq \emptyset, \\ -1, & \text{if } (P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle} = \emptyset. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Case 1. Assume first that $(P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle} \neq \emptyset$, so $\omega_V(u) = 1$. Using notation in [20, §3], we have $[V_1] = [\text{Def}_{Q_1/\langle u_1 \rangle}^{Q_1}(\text{Res}_{Q_1}^P(V))]$ in $D_k(Q_1)$. By [6, Corollary 4.1.2 (1) and Lemma 4.2.1 (2)], $[V_1] = [\Omega_{(P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle}}(k)]$ in $D_k(Q_1)$, where we regard $(P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle}$ as a Q_1 -set. By the uniquely lifting property [16, Corollary 5.3.4] and Proposition 3.2 (i), we have $[\hat{V}_1] = [\Omega_{(P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle}}(\mathcal{O})]$ in $D_{\mathcal{O}}(Q_1)$. Hence similar to (3.1), we have

$$\omega_{\hat{V}_1}(u_2) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } ((P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle})^{\langle u_2 \rangle} = (P/R)^{\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle} \neq \emptyset, \\ -1, & \text{if } ((P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle})^{\langle u_2 \rangle} = (P/R)^{\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle} = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Case 2. Now assume that $(P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle} = \emptyset$, so $\omega_V(u_1) = -1$. By [6, Corollary 4.1.2 (1) and Lemma 4.2.1 (1)], $[V_1] = [k]$ in $D_k(Q_1)$. By the uniquely lifting property [16, Corollary 5.3.4] and Proposition 3.2 (i), we have $[\hat{V}_1] = [\mathcal{O}]$ in $D_{\mathcal{O}}(Q_1)$. Hence $\omega_{\hat{V}_2}(u_2) = 1$. Since $(P/R)^{\langle u_1 \rangle} = \emptyset$, we have $(P/R)^{\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle} = \emptyset$.

We conclude that in both cases, we have

$$\omega_V(u_1)\omega_{\hat{V}_1}(u_2) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (P/R)^{\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle} \neq \emptyset, \\ -1, & \text{if } (P/R)^{\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle} = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

By induction and by using [6, Corollary 4.1.2 (1) and Lemma 4.2.1], it is routine to show that

$$\omega_V(u_1)\omega_{\hat{V}_1}(u_2) \cdots \omega_{\hat{V}_{n-1}}(u_n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (P/R)^{\langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle} \neq \emptyset, \\ -1, & \text{if } (P/R)^{\langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle} = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

This proves the proposition. \square

Proposition 3.6. *Let P be a finite p -group and V an indecomposable endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -module with vertex P . Assume that $p \geq 3$ and the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} . Assume that \mathcal{F} is a fusion system on P and V is \mathcal{F} -stable. Let Q be a subgroup of P , H_Q a subgroup of $N_P(Q)$, V_Q an indecomposable direct summand of a Q -slashed module attached to V over H_Q with vertex H_Q , and \hat{V}_Q an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}H_Q$ -module such that $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{V}_Q \cong V_Q$ and such that $\det_{\hat{V}_Q} = 1$. Let u be an element in H_Q , $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q\langle u \rangle, P)$, $R = \varphi(Q)$, $v = \varphi(u)$, and H_R a subgroup of $N_P(R)$ containing v . We similarly choose V_R and \hat{V}_R . Then $\omega_{\hat{V}_Q}(u) = \omega_{\hat{V}_R}(v)$.*

Proof. By Notation 3.1 we know that $\omega_{\hat{V}_Q}(u)$ is the sign of $\rho_{\hat{V}_Q}(u)$. Moreover, by Notation 3.1, $\omega_{\hat{V}_Q}(u)$ is the sign of the character value at u of any indecomposable direct summand of $\text{Res}_{\langle u \rangle}^{H_Q}(\hat{V}_Q)$ with vertex $\langle u \rangle$. Let W_Q be an indecomposable direct summand of $\text{Res}_{Q\langle u \rangle}^{H_Q}(V_Q)$ with vertex $Q\langle u \rangle$ and \hat{W}_Q an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}Q\langle u \rangle$ -module such that $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{W}_Q \cong W_Q$ and such that $\det_{\hat{W}_Q} = 1$. Then using the uniquely lifting property [16, Corollary 5.3.4] and Proposition 3.2 (i), we see that \hat{W}_Q is an indecomposable direct summand of $\text{Res}_{Q\langle u \rangle}^{H_Q}(\hat{V}_Q)$ with vertex $Q\langle u \rangle$. So $\omega_{\hat{V}_Q}(u)$ is the sign of the character value at u of any indecomposable direct summand of $\text{Res}_{\langle u \rangle}^{Q\langle u \rangle}(\hat{W}_Q)$ with vertex $\langle u \rangle$. By assumption, there is a kH_Q -module Y such that $V_Q \oplus Y$ is a Q -slashed module attached to V over H_Q . Using the definition of slashed modules, it is easy to check that $\text{Res}_{Q\langle u \rangle}^{H_Q}(V_Q \oplus Y)$ is a Q -slashed module attached to $\text{Res}_{Q\langle u \rangle}^P(V)$ over $Q\langle u \rangle$. So $[W_Q]$ only depends on the isomorphism class of an indecomposable direct summand of $\text{Res}_{Q\langle u \rangle}^P(V)$ with vertex $Q\langle u \rangle$.

Similarly, using the discussion above we can choose W_R and \hat{W}_R for R and v instead of Q and u , respectively. Similarly, $[W_R]$ only depends on the isomorphism class of an indecomposable direct summand of $\text{Res}_{R\langle v \rangle}^P(V)$ with vertex $R\langle v \rangle$. By definition of the \mathcal{F} -stability of V , we deduce that $W_Q \cong_{\varphi} W_R$ as $kQ\langle u \rangle$ -modules and hence $\hat{W}_Q \cong_{\varphi} \hat{W}_R$ as $\mathcal{O}Q\langle u \rangle$ -modules. This implies $\omega_{\hat{V}_Q}(u) = \omega_{\hat{V}_R}(v)$. \square

4. On local Morita equivalences induced by slashed modules

Assume in this section we are in the context of Theorem 1.3.

Notation 4.1. By [17, Theorem 9.11.2], we may assume that

- (i) the blocks b and c have a common defect group P , and a common fusion system \mathcal{F} determined by a source idempotent $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ and also a source idempotent $j \in (\mathcal{O}Hc)^P$;
- (ii) $X = \Delta P$ and when regarding V as an $\mathcal{O}P$ -module, V is \mathcal{F} -stable;
- (iii) M is isomorphic to a direct summand of the $(\mathcal{O}Gb, \mathcal{O}Hc)$ -bimodule

$$\mathcal{O}Gi \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} j\mathcal{O}H.$$

By Proposition 2.10, M is a Brauer-friendly $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)(b \otimes c^\circ)$ -module. We fix the following notation.

- (iv) Write $A = i\mathcal{O}Gi$ and $B = j\mathcal{O}Hj$.
- (v) For any subgroup Q of P denote by e_Q the unique block of $kC_G(Q)$ satisfying $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)e_Q \neq 0$ and by f_Q the unique block of $kC_H(Q)$ satisfying $\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}H}(j)f_Q \neq 0$.
- (vi) Denote by \hat{e}_Q and \hat{f}_Q the blocks of $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)$ and $\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)$ lifting e_Q and f_Q , respectively.
- (vii) Write $i_Q := \text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(i)$ and $j_Q := \text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}H}(j)$.
- (viii) Let M_Q be a $(\Delta Q, e_Q \otimes f_Q^\circ)$ -slashed module attached to M over the group $C_G(Q) \times C_H(Q)$. Note that by [2, Lemma 17], M_Q is unique up to isomorphism.

Theorem 4.2 ([11, Theorem 1.2]). *The $(kC_G(Q)e_Q, kC_H(Q)f_Q)$ -bimodule M_Q induces a Morita equivalence between $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $kC_H(Q)f_Q$ and has an endopermutation module as a source.*

Proposition 4.3. *Let $Q' = QC_P(Q)$. The pair $(\Delta C_P(Q), e_{Q'} \otimes f_{Q'}^\circ)$ is contained in a vertex subpair of the $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ - $kC_H(Q)f_Q$ -bimodule M_Q , and it is a vertex subpair of M_Q if and only if Q is \mathcal{F} -centralised.*

Proof. By the definition of a slashed module (Lemma 2.11), we may regard M_Q as a $k\Delta Q(C_G(Q) \times C_H(Q))$ -module on which ΔQ acts trivially. For the first statement, by Proposition 2.14, it suffices to show that

$$\text{End}_k(e_{Q'}M_Qf_{Q'}) (\Delta C_P(Q)) \neq 0.$$

By the transitivity of slash functors [2, Lemma 22 (i)], we have

$$\text{End}_k(e_{Q'}M_Qf_{Q'}) (\Delta Q') \cong \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_{Q'}M\hat{f}_Q) (\Delta Q').$$

By [11, Lemma 2.7], $(\Delta P, e_P \otimes f_P^\circ)$ is a vertex subpair of M . Since the $b \otimes c^\circ$ -Brauer pair $(\Delta Q', e_{Q'} \otimes f_{Q'}^\circ)$ is contained in $(\Delta P, e_P \otimes f_P^\circ)$, by Proposition 2.14, we have

$$\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{e}_{Q'}M\hat{f}_Q) (\Delta Q') \neq 0.$$

Since $(\Delta C_P(Q), e_{Q'} \otimes f_{Q'}^\circ) \leq (\Delta Q', e_{Q'} \otimes f_{Q'}^\circ)$ as Brauer pairs on $\Delta Q(C_G(Q) \times C_H(Q))$, by Proposition 2.14 again, we have $\text{End}_k(e_{Q'}M_Qf_{Q'}) (\Delta C_P(Q)) \neq 0$. Hence the first statement holds.

Since M_Q induces a Morita equivalence and has an endopermutation module as a source, by [17, Theorem 9.11.2], we see that $\Delta C_P(Q)$ is a vertex of M_Q if and only if the order of $C_P(Q)$ equals to the order of a defect group of $kC_G(Q)e_Q$. By [17, Proposition 8.5.3 (i)], this is equivalent to Q being \mathcal{F} -centralised. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let $Q' = QC_P(Q)$ and let (X_Q, e) be a vertex subpair of the $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ - $kC_H(Q)f_Q$ -bimodule M_Q containing $(\Delta C_P(Q), e_{Q'} \otimes f_{Q'}^\circ)$. Let V_Q be a source of M_Q with respect to the vertex subpair (X_Q, e) . The following hold.*

- (i) *Let X_1 and X_2 be the images of X_Q under the canonical projections $p_1 : C_G(Q) \times C_H(Q) \rightarrow C_G(Q)$ and $p_2 : C_G(Q) \times C_H(Q) \rightarrow C_H(Q)$ respectively. Then p_1 restricts to an isomorphism $p_1 : X_Q \rightarrow X_1$, and p_2 restricts to an isomorphism $p_2 : X_Q \rightarrow X_2$, and X_1 and X_2 are defect groups of $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $kC_H(Q)f_Q$ respectively. The idempotent e is of the form $b_Q \otimes c_Q^\circ$ where b_Q and c_Q are blocks of $kC_G(QX_1)$ and $kC_H(QX_2)$ respectively.*
- (ii) *There exist source idempotents $s_Q \in (kC_G(Q)e_Q)^{X_1}$ and $t_Q \in (kC_H(Q)f_Q)^{X_2}$ such that $\text{br}_{Q'}^{kC_G(Q)}(s_Q)e_{Q'} \neq 0$ and $\text{br}_{Q'}^{kC_H(Q)}(t_Q)f_{Q'} \neq 0$ and that M_Q is isomorphic to a direct summand of*

$$kC_G(Q)s_Q \otimes_{kX_1} \text{Ind}_{X_Q}^{X_1 \times X_2}(V_Q) \otimes_{kX_2} t_Q kC_H(Q).$$

- (iii) Let \mathcal{F}_Q be the fusion system on X_1 determined by s_Q and \mathcal{G}_Q be the fusion system on X_2 determined by t_Q . Then the map $\psi : X_1 \xrightarrow{p_1^{-1}} X_Q \xrightarrow{p_2} X_2$ is an isomorphism of groups, and we have ${}^\psi\mathcal{F}_Q = \mathcal{G}_Q$, where ${}^\psi\mathcal{F}_Q$ the fusion system on X_1 induced by \mathcal{F}_Q via the isomorphism ψ .
- (iv) The restriction of ψ to $C_P(Q)$ is the identity map $C_P(Q) \rightarrow C_P(Q)$.

Proof. By [17, Proposition 7.3.10 (i)], any source of M_Q has dimension prime to p . Then by [17, Proposition 9.7.1] we see that X_1 is a defect group of $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and X_2 is a defect group of $kC_H(Q)f_Q$. The statement on the idempotent e is now clear, whence (i). Statement (ii) follows from [2, Lemma 3 (i)] and Lemma 2.3 (i). Statement (iii) follows from [17, Theorem 9.11.2]. Statement (iv) follows by the choice of X_Q . \square

By [17, Theorem 9.11.9], there is an isomorphism of interior P -algebras

$$f : i\mathcal{O}Gi \cong e(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} j\mathcal{O}Hj)e \quad (4.1)$$

for some primitive local idempotent $e \in (\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} j\mathcal{O}Hj)^P$. We identify $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ with $e(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} j\mathcal{O}Hj)e$ via this isomorphism.

Proposition 4.5. *The $(i\mathcal{O}Gi, j\mathcal{O}Hj)$ -bimodule iMj is isomorphic to $e(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} j\mathcal{O}Hj)$. Here $e(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} j\mathcal{O}Hj)$ is a left $e(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} j\mathcal{O}Hj)e$ -module and we regard it as a left $i\mathcal{O}Gi$ -module via the isomorphism f ; $e(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} j\mathcal{O}Hj)$ is also a right $j\mathcal{O}Hj$ -module via the multiplication $e(v \otimes b_1)b_2 = e(v \otimes b_1b_2)$, for any $v \in V$ and any $b_1, b_2 \in j\mathcal{O}Hj$.*

Proof. The proof of this proposition is to review the choice of e and the construction of f in the proof of [17, Theorem 9.11.9]. Since iMj induces a Morita equivalence between A and B , we have $A \cong \text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}(iMj)$ as interior P -algebras. Since iMj is isomorphic to a direct summand of

$$A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B,$$

we can choose an idempotent e' in $\text{End}_{A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B)$ which is a projection to the direct summand iMj . Then we have an isomorphism

$$iMj \cong e'(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B) \quad (4.2)$$

of $\text{End}_{A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B)$ -modules and an isomorphism

$$f_1 : A \cong e'(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B))e'$$

of interior P -algebras. Note that in (4.2), iMj becomes an $e'(\text{End}_{A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B))e'$ -module, and it can be regarded as an A -module via the isomorphism f_1 .

Since A is a primitive interior P -algebra, it follows that the idempotent e' remains primitive in $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}P \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B)$. So there is an indecomposable summand W of A as an $(\mathcal{O}P, \mathcal{O}P)$ -bimodule and an $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}P \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B)$ -conjugate e of e' , such that we have an isomorphism

$$f_2 : e'(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B))e' \cong e(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}(W \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B))e$$

of interior P -algebras. Note that now iMj becomes an $e'(\text{End}_{A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B^{\text{op}}}(A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B))e'$ -module, it can be regarded as an A -module via the isomorphism $f_2 \circ f_1$, and we have

$$iMj \cong e(W \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B).$$

By [16, Proposition 2.4.12], we have an $(\mathcal{O}P, B)$ -bimodule isomorphism $\text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B \cong V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B$. Hence we have an isomorphism

$$f_3 : e(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}(W \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta P}^{P \times P}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} B))e \cong e(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}(W \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} (V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)))e$$

of interior P -algebras. Since $W \cong (\mathcal{O}P)_{\varphi}$ for some $\varphi \in \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$ and since V and B are \mathcal{F} -stable, we have an isomorphism

$$f_4 : e(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}(W \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} (V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)))e \cong e(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}((V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)))e$$

of interior P -algebras. It is easy to see that we have also an isomorphism

$$f_5 : e(\text{End}_{B^{\text{op}}}((V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)))e \cong e(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)e$$

of interior P -algebras. The isomorphism f is exactly $f_5 \circ f_4 \circ f_3 \circ f_2 \circ f_1$. Note that in the above process, iMj becomes an $e(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)e$ -module, it can be regarded as an A -module via the isomorphism f , and we have $iMj \cong e(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)$. \square

Proposition 4.6. *Let Q be a fully \mathcal{F} -centralised subgroup of Q . Then the $(\text{Br}_Q(A), \text{Br}_Q(B))$ -bimodule $i_Q M_Q j_Q$ satisfies the condition that $\text{Br}_{\Delta Q}(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(iMj)) \cong \text{End}_k(i_Q M_Q j_Q)$ as k -algebras and as $(\text{Br}_Q(A) \otimes_k \text{Br}_Q(A)^{\text{op}}, \text{Br}_Q(B) \otimes_k \text{Br}_Q(B)^{\text{op}})$ -bimodules.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.6, $\text{Br}_Q(A)$ and $\text{Br}_Q(B)$ are almost source algebras of $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $kC_H(Q)f_Q$, respectively. By the definition of a $(\Delta Q, e_Q \otimes f_Q^{\circ})$ -slashed module, we have $\text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(M)) \cong \text{End}_k(M_Q)$ as interior $(C_G(Q) \times C_H(Q))$ -algebras, hence as $(kC_G(Q)e_Q \otimes_k (kC_H(Q)f_Q)^{\text{op}}, kC_G(Q)e_Q \otimes_k (kC_H(Q)f_Q)^{\text{op}})$ -bimodules. The statement follows from the standard Morita equivalences between block algebras and almost source algebras. \square

Lemma 4.7. *For any subgroup Q of P we have $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(B)(Q) \cong \text{End}_k(B(Q))$ as $(B(Q), B(Q))$ -bimodules and as k -algebras.*

Proof. Mimic the proof of [16, Proposition 5.8.6]. \square

Proposition 4.8. *Let Q be a subgroup of P . The following hold.*

- (i) *There is an isomorphism of interior $C_P(Q)$ -algebras*

$$\text{Br}_Q(f) : A(Q) \cong \text{br}_Q(e)(\text{End}_k(V[Q]) \otimes_k B(Q))\text{br}_Q(e) \quad (4.3)$$

for some idempotent $\text{br}_Q(e) \in (\text{End}_k(V[Q]) \otimes_k B(Q))^{C_P(Q)}$, where $V[Q]$ is a $\langle u \rangle$ -slashed module attached to V over $N_P(Q)$.

(ii) Assume Q is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. The $(A(Q), B(Q))$ -bimodule $i_Q M_Q j_Q$ is isomorphic to $\text{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q))$. Here $\text{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q))$ is a left $\text{br}_Q(e)(\text{End}_k(V[Q]) \otimes_k B(Q))\text{br}_Q(e)$ -module and we regard it as a left $A(Q)$ -module via the isomorphism $\text{Br}_Q(f)$; $\text{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q))$ is also a right $B(Q)$ -module via the multiplication $\text{br}_Q(e)(v \otimes b_1)b_2 = \text{br}_Q(e)(v \otimes b_1 b_2)$, for any $v \in V[Q]$ and any $b_1, b_2 \in B(Q)$.

Proof. Taking Q -Brauer quotient on each side of the interior P -algebra isomorphism f , we obtain an isomorphism of interior $C_P(Q)$ -algebras

$$A(Q) \cong \text{br}_Q^{\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B}(e)(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)(Q) \text{br}_Q^{\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B}(e).$$

Using [16, Proposition 5.9.2] and Theorem 2.8, we obtain the desired isomorphism $\text{Br}_Q(f)$ in statement (i).

Next we prove (ii). It is easy to see that the module “ M_Q ” in Proposition 2.9 is uniquely determined by “ M ”, up to isomorphism. So by Proposition 4.6, it suffices to show that $\text{Br}_{\Delta Q}(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(iMj)) \cong \text{End}_k(\text{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q)))$ as $(A(Q) \otimes_k A(Q)^{\text{op}}, B(Q) \otimes_k B(Q)^{\text{op}})$ -bimodules and as k -algebras. By Proposition 4.5, we have $iMj \cong e(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B)$ as (A, B) -bimodules. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(iMj)) &\cong \text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(e(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B))) \\ &\cong \text{Br}_Q(e \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} B) e) \\ &\cong \text{br}_Q(e) \text{Br}_Q(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(B)) \text{br}_Q(e) \\ &\cong \text{br}_Q(e)(\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)(Q) \otimes_k \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(B)(Q)) \text{br}_Q(e) \\ &\cong \text{br}_Q(e)(\text{End}_k(V[Q]) \otimes_k \text{End}_k(B(Q))) \text{br}_Q(e) \\ &\cong \text{br}_Q(e) \text{End}_k(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q)) \text{br}_Q(e) \\ &\cong \text{End}_k(\text{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q))) \end{aligned}$$

as $(A(Q) \otimes_k A(Q)^{\text{op}}, B(Q) \otimes_k B(Q)^{\text{op}})$ -bimodules and as k -algebras, where the third isomorphism is by [14, Lemma 3.9], the fourth isomorphism is by [16, Proposition 5.9.2], and the fifth isomorphism is by Theorem 2.8 and Lemma 4.7. Here we use abusively the same notation $\text{br}_Q(e)$ to denote the images of $\text{br}_Q(e)$ in different algebras under the isomorphisms. This completes the proof. \square

4.9. For a subgroup Q of P , denote by $\mathcal{LP}(Q, i\mathcal{O}Gi)$ the set of local points on $i\mathcal{O}Gi$, and by δ_Q the unique local point of Q on $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)$. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{LP}(Q, i\mathcal{O}Gi)$, denote by W_{α} the simple $A(Q)$ -module

$$A(Q) \text{br}_Q^A(l) / J(A(Q)) \text{br}_Q^A(l),$$

where $l \in \alpha$. Note that W_{α} is uniquely determined by α up to isomorphism. By [19, Lemma 14.5], the correspondence $\alpha \mapsto [W_{\alpha}]$ induces a bijection between $\mathcal{LP}(Q, i\mathcal{O}Gi)$ and the set of isomorphism classes of simple $A(Q)$ -modules.

By [17, Theorem 7.4.2] applied to the isomorphism (4.1), we obtain a bijection

$$\mathcal{LP}(Q, i\mathcal{O}Gi) \rightarrow \mathcal{LP}(Q, j\mathcal{O}Hj), \alpha \mapsto \alpha', \quad (4.4)$$

such that α and α' correspond to each other if and only if both

$$\mathrm{br}_Q(e)(\mathrm{br}_Q^{\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)}(\delta_Q) \otimes \mathrm{br}_Q^B(\alpha'))\mathrm{br}_Q(e)$$

and the image of $\mathrm{br}_Q^A(\alpha)$ under the isomorphism (4.3) belong to the same point of the k -algebra

$$\mathrm{br}_Q(e)(\mathrm{End}_k(V[Q]) \otimes_k B(Q))\mathrm{br}_Q(e).$$

Here we identify $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)(Q)$ and $\mathrm{End}_k(V[Q])$ as $C_P(Q)$ -interior $N_P(Q)$ -algebras.

Proposition 4.10. *Let Q be a fully \mathcal{F} -centralised subgroup of P . The $(A(Q), B(Q))$ -bimodule $i_Q M_Q j_Q$ induces a Morita equivalence between $A(Q)$ and $B(Q)$, such that*

$$i_Q M_Q j_Q \otimes_{B(Q)} W_{\alpha'} \cong W_{\alpha}$$

if α and α' correspond under the bijection (4.4).

Proof. By Theorem 4.2, M_Q induces a Morita equivalence between $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $kC_H(Q)f_Q$. By Proposition 2.6, $i_Q M_Q j_Q$ induces a Morita equivalence between $A(Q)$ and $B(Q)$. By Proposition 4.8 (ii), we have $i_Q M_Q j_Q \cong \mathrm{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q))$ as $(A(Q), B(Q))$ -bimodules. Let $l' \in \alpha'$. So

$$i_Q M_Q j_Q \otimes_{B(Q)} W_{\alpha'} \cong \mathrm{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k W_{\alpha'}) \cong \mathrm{br}_Q(e)(V[Q] \otimes_k B(Q)\mathrm{br}_Q^B(l')/J(B(Q))\mathrm{br}_Q^B(l'))$$

for any $l' \in \alpha'$. It is easy to observe that the right side is a simple module of the k -algebra

$$\mathrm{br}_Q(e)(\mathrm{End}_k(V[Q]) \otimes_k B(Q))\mathrm{br}_Q(e)$$

corresponding to the point containing $\mathrm{br}_Q(e)(\mathrm{br}_Q^{\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{O}}(V)}(\delta_Q) \otimes \mathrm{br}_Q^B(\alpha'))\mathrm{br}_Q(e)$. Now the statement follows from the definition of the bijection (4.4). \square

5. Lifting local Morita equivalences from k to \mathcal{O}

Let \mathcal{O} be a complete discrete valuation ring of characteristic 0 with residue field k , which is a splitting field for finite groups considered below. For P, Q finite p -groups, \mathcal{F} a fusion system on P and $\varphi : P \rightarrow Q$ a group isomorphism, denote by ${}^{\varphi}\mathcal{F}$ the fusion system on Q induced by \mathcal{F} via the isomorphism φ . We set $\Delta\varphi := \{(u, \varphi(u)) \mid u \in P\}$ and whenever useful, we regard an $\mathcal{O}\Delta\varphi$ -module V as an $\mathcal{O}P$ -module and vice versa via the isomorphism $P \cong \Delta\varphi$ sending $u \in P$ to $(u, \varphi(u))$.

Lemma 5.1 (a slightly stronger version of [13, Theorem 1.13]). *Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Denote by \bar{b} and \bar{c} the images of b and c in kG and kH , respectively. For any Morita equivalence (resp. stable equivalence of Morita type) between $kG\bar{b}$ and $kH\bar{c}$ given by an indecomposable bimodule \bar{M} with endopermutation source \bar{V} , there is a Morita equivalence (resp. stable equivalence of Morita type) between $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$ given by a bimodule M with endopermutation source V satisfying the following conditions.*

- (i) $\bar{M} \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M$.
- (ii) $\bar{V} \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V$.
- (iii) V has determinant 1.

Proof. The existence of M satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) follows by [13, Theorem 1.13]. By the proof of [13, Lemma 8.4], M also satisfies condition (iii). \square

The bimodule M in Lemma 5.1 is uniquely determined up to isomorphism.

Lemma 5.2. *Let G and H be finite groups, b a block of $\mathcal{O}G$ and c a block of $\mathcal{O}H$. Let M and N be indecomposable $\mathcal{O}Gb$ - $\mathcal{O}Hc$ -bimodules with endopermutation sources and satisfying $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} N$. Assume that both M and N (together with their \mathcal{O} -duals) induce stable equivalences of Morita type between $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$ and both M and N have sources of determinant 1. Then $M \cong N$.*

Proof. Denote by \bar{b} and \bar{c} the images of b and c in kG and kH , respectively. Since a source of M (resp. N) is of determinant 1, any source of M (resp. N) is of determinant 1. Let P be a defect group of b and Q a defect group of c . Let $i \in (\mathcal{O}Gb)^P$ and $j \in (\mathcal{O}Hc)^Q$ be source idempotents. Denote by \mathcal{F} the fusion system on P determined by i . By [17, Theorem 9.11.2], there are isomorphisms $\varphi : P \rightarrow Q$ and $\psi : P \rightarrow Q$ and indecomposable endopermutation $\mathcal{O}P$ -modules V and W , such that M is isomorphic to a direct summand of the $\mathcal{O}Gb$ - $\mathcal{O}Hc$ -bimodule

$$\mathcal{O}Gi \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta_{\varphi}}^{P \times Q}(V) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}Q} j\mathcal{O}H,$$

and such that N is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathcal{O}Gb$ - $\mathcal{O}Hc$ -bimodule

$$\mathcal{O}Gi \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta_{\psi}}^{P \times Q}(W) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}Q} j\mathcal{O}H.$$

Since $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} N$, by [4, Lemma 2.7], we see that $\varphi^{-1} \circ \psi \in \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$ and that $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} V \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} W$ as kP -modules. Since both V and W are of determinant 1, by [19, Lemma 28.1 (b)], $V \cong W$ as $\mathcal{O}P$ -modules. Since N^* is isomorphic to a direct summand of

$$\mathcal{O}Hj \otimes_{\mathcal{O}Q} \text{Ind}_{\Delta_{\psi^{-1}}}^{Q \times P}(\psi^{-1}(W^*)) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} i\mathcal{O}G$$

(see [4, page 81]), by [4, Lemma 2.6], $M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}Hb} N^*$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of

$$\mathcal{O}Gi \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} \text{Ind}_{\Delta_{\psi^{-1} \circ \varphi}}^{P \times P}(U) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}P} i\mathcal{O}G,$$

where U is an indecomposable direct summand with vertex P of

$$V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} {}_{\varphi \circ \psi^{-1}}(W^*) \cong V \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} {}_{\varphi \circ \psi^{-1}}(V^*).$$

By [17, Theorem 9.11.2 (iii)], V is \mathcal{F} -stable, hence we have $V^* \cong {}_{\varphi \circ \psi^{-1}}(V^*)$ and $U \cong \mathcal{O}$. So $M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}Hc} N^*$ is a p -permutation $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)$ -module which lifts the p -permutation $k(G \times H)$ -module $(k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} M) \otimes_{kH\bar{c}} (k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} N^*) \cong kG\bar{b} \oplus \bar{S}$, where \bar{S} is a projective $kG\bar{b}$ - $kH\bar{c}$ -bimodule.

By [16, Theorem 5.10.2 (iv)], we have $M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}Hc} N^* \cong \mathcal{O}Gb \oplus S$, where S is a projective $\mathcal{O}Gb$ - $\mathcal{O}Hc$ -bimodule lifting \bar{S} . Now it is easy to see that $M \cong N$. \square

Assume in the rest of this section we are in the context of Theorem 1.3. So we can continue to use Notation 4.1.

For a finite group G and any element $g \in G$, we use abusively the same notation c_g to denote various group homomorphisms induced by g -conjugation. For example, if g -conjugation induces an isomorphism between two subgroups Q and R of G , then g -conjugation also induces an isomorphism c_g between $C_G(Q)$ and $C_G(R)$.

Proposition 5.3. *For any isomorphism $c_g = c_h : Q \cong R$ in the fusion system \mathcal{F} , where $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, we have ${}_{c_g^{-1}}(M_Q)_{c_h^{-1}} \cong M_R$ as $kC_G(R)e_R$ - $kC_H(R)f_R$ -bimodules.*

Proof. By the transitivity of slash functors [2, Lemma 22 (ii)], ${}_{c_g^{-1}}(M_Q)_{c_h^{-1}}$ is another $(\Delta R, e_R \otimes f_R^\circ)$ -slashed module attached to M over $C_G(R) \times C_H(R)$. Then the statement follows by [2, Lemma 17]. \square

Proposition 5.4. *For any subgroup Q of P , there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)e_Q$ - $\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)f_Q$ -bimodule \hat{M}_Q satisfying the following conditions.*

- (i) \hat{M}_Q has a vertex subpair (X_Q, e) containing $(\Delta C_P(Q), e_{QC_P(Q)} \otimes f_{QC_P(Q)}^\circ)$ and an endopermutation source \hat{V}_Q of determinant 1 with respect to the vertex subpair (X_Q, e) .
- (ii) $M_Q \cong k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{M}_Q$.
- (iii) For any isomorphism $c_g = c_h : Q \cong R$ in the fusion system \mathcal{F} , where $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, we have ${}_{c_g^{-1}}(\hat{M}_Q)_{c_h^{-1}} \cong \hat{M}_R$ as $\mathcal{O}C_G(R)\hat{e}_R$ - $\mathcal{O}C_H(R)\hat{f}_R$ -bimodules.

Proof. The existence of \hat{M}_Q satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) is ensured by Proposition 4.3 and Lemma 5.1. By Lemma 5.2, \hat{M}_Q is uniquely determined up to isomorphism. By Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 5.2, condition (iii) holds. \square

6. On generalised decomposition maps

Assume in this section we are in the context of Theorem 1.3. So we can continue to use the notation in Notation 4.1.

6.1. A local point α of Q on $\mathcal{O}Gb$ is said to be *associated to the Brauer pair* (Q, e_Q) , if $e_Q \text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(\alpha) \neq 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{LP}(Q, e_Q)$ the set of local points of Q on $\mathcal{O}Gb$ associated to (Q, e_Q) . If Q is a cyclic group generated by u , then we also write (Q, e_Q) as (u, e_u) and called it a *Brauer element*. Denote by S_α the simple $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ -module

$$kC_G(Q)\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(l)/(J(kC_G(Q))\text{br}_Q^{\mathcal{O}G}(l)),$$

where $l \in \alpha$. By [19, Lemma 14.5], the correspondence $\alpha \mapsto S_\alpha$ induces a bijection between $\mathcal{LP}(Q, e_Q)$ and the set of isomorphism classes of simple $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ -modules. Denote by φ_α the Brauer character afforded by the simple module S_α . So we have

$$\text{IBr}_K(C_G(Q), e_Q) = \{\varphi_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{LP}(Q, e_Q)\}.$$

Lemma 6.2. *Let Q be a fully \mathcal{F} -centralised subgroup of P . Then there is a bijection between $\mathcal{LP}(Q, e_Q)$ and the set of local points of Q in $i\mathcal{O}Gi$, sending $\alpha \in \mathcal{LP}(Q, e_Q)$ to $\alpha \cap i\mathcal{O}Gi$. Similarly, there is a bijection between $\mathcal{LP}(Q, f_Q)$ and the set of local points of Q in $j\mathcal{O}Hj$, sending $\alpha' \in \mathcal{LP}(Q, e_Q)$ to $\alpha' \cap j\mathcal{O}Hj$.*

Proof. By [17, Proposition 8.7.3 (ii)], $\alpha \cap i\mathcal{O}Gi \neq \emptyset$. Now the statement easily follows from [19, Proposition 4.12]. \square

Proposition 6.3. *Keep the notation of 6.1. Let Q be a fully \mathcal{F} -centralised subgroup of P . Then M_Q induces a Morita equivalence between $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $kC_H(Q)f_Q$, such that*

$$M_Q \otimes_{kC_H(Q)f_Q} S_{\alpha'} \cong S_{\alpha}$$

if $\alpha \cap i\mathcal{O}Gi$ and $\alpha' \cap j\mathcal{O}Hj$ correspond under the bijection (4.4).

Proof. This follows from Proposition 4.10 and the standard Morita equivalences between block algebras and almost source algebras. \square

6.4. Let $\chi \in \text{Irr}_K(G, b)$, and let N be a simple KG -module affording χ . By [18, Corollary 4.4] (or [16, Theorem 5.15.3]), for any $u \in P$ we have

$$d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)}(\chi) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{LP}(u,e_u)} \chi(u_{\alpha})\varphi_{\alpha},$$

where the notation $\chi(u_{\alpha})$ is introduced in 2.4. Let N' a simple KHc -module corresponding to N under the Morita equivalence induced by M and denote by χ' the character afforded by N' . Let (u, f_u) be a Brauer element contained in (P, f_P) . Similarly, we have

$$d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}(\chi') = \sum_{\alpha' \in \mathcal{LP}(u,f_u)} \chi(u_{\alpha'})\varphi_{\alpha'}.$$

Assume that $\langle u \rangle$ is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{LP}(u, e_u)$ and $\alpha' \in \mathcal{LP}(u, f_u)$ such that $\alpha \cap i\mathcal{O}Gi$ and $\alpha' \cap j\mathcal{O}Hj$ correspond under the bijection (4.4). By [17, Theorem 7.4.3] we have

$$\chi(u_{\alpha}) = \omega_V(u)\chi'(u_{\alpha'});$$

see Notation 3.1 for the meaning of $\omega_V(u)$.

7. Proof of Theorem 1.3

We first prove an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 7.1. *Keep the notation in Definition 1.1. Assume that we have a family of perfect isometries*

$$\Phi_Q : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q) \cong \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q)$$

for every cyclic subgroup Q of P , with the following properties.

- (i) For any isomorphism $\varphi : Q \cong R$ (where Q is cyclic) in the fusion system \mathcal{F} we have ${}^\varphi\Phi_Q = \Phi_R$.
- (ii) For $u \in P$ such that $\langle u \rangle$ is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised, we have $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_1 = \bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}$ or $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_1 = -\bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}$.

Then for any $u \in P$, we have $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_1 = \bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}$ or $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_1 = -\bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}$.

Proof. By condition (i), it is easy to check that for any isomorphism $\varphi : Q \cong R$ (where Q is cyclic) in \mathcal{F} we have ${}^\varphi\bar{\Phi}_Q = \bar{\Phi}_R$, where ${}^\varphi\bar{\Phi}_Q$ is obtained from composing $\bar{\Phi}_Q$ with the isomorphisms $\mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q) \cong \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_G(R), \hat{e}_R)$ and $\mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q) \cong \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_H(R), \hat{f}_R)$ given by conjugation with elements $x \in G$ and $y \in H$ satisfying $\varphi(u) = xux^{-1} = yuy^{-1}$ for all $u \in Q$.

For any $u \in P$, there exists an isomorphism $\varphi : Q = \langle u \rangle \rightarrow R$ in \mathcal{F} such that R is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. Write $v = \varphi(u)$. Assume that $x \in G$ and $y \in H$ satisfying $\varphi(u) = xux^{-1} = yuy^{-1}$ for all $u \in Q$. The equality ${}^\varphi\bar{\Phi}_Q = \bar{\Phi}_R$ means that $\bar{\Phi}_Q$ sends a class function $\lambda' \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q)$ to $\lambda \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q)$ if and only if $\bar{\Phi}_R$ sends a class function $(\lambda')^y \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_H(R), \hat{f}_R)$ to $\lambda^x \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_G(R), \hat{e}_R)$. Here λ^x is the class function sending an element $g \in C_G(R)_{p'}$ to $\lambda(x^{-1}gx) \in K$, and $(\lambda')^y$ is defined similarly.

Let $\chi' \in \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{Irr}_K(H, c)$. Since R is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised, by assumption (ii), the class function $d_{(G,b)}^{(v,e_v)}(\chi)$ equals the class function $\bar{\Phi}_R(d_{(H,c)}^{(v,f_v)}(\chi'))$ or $-\bar{\Phi}_R(d_{(H,c)}^{(v,f_v)}(\chi'))$. In other words, $\bar{\Phi}_R$ sends $d_{(H,c)}^{(v,f_v)}(\chi')$ to $d_{(G,b)}^{(v,e_v)}(\chi)$ or $-d_{(G,b)}^{(v,e_v)}(\chi)$. One easily checks that if we write $\lambda' := d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}(\chi') : C_H(Q)_{p'} \rightarrow K$, then $(\lambda')^y$ is the class function $d_{(H,c)}^{(v,f_v)}(\chi') : C_H(R)_{p'} \rightarrow K$. Similarly, if we write $\lambda := d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)}(\chi)$, then $\lambda^x = d_{(G,b)}^{(v,e_v)}(\chi)$. Since $\bar{\Phi}_R((\lambda')^y) = \lambda^x$ or $\bar{\Phi}_R((\lambda')^y) = -\lambda^x$, by the previous paragraph, we have $\bar{\Phi}_Q(\lambda') = \lambda$ or $\bar{\Phi}_Q(\lambda') = -\lambda$. Equivalently, $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)}(\Phi_1(\chi')) = \bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle}(d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}(\chi'))$ or $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)}(\Phi_1(\chi')) = -\bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle}(d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}(\chi'))$. \square

Assume in the rest of this section we are in the context of Theorem 1.3. So we can continue to use the notation in Notation 4.1 and Section 6.

7.2. The proof of (i) implying (ii). The key points of the proof of (i) implying (ii) are contained in [12, 2.11, 2.12 and 3.5]. We prove it again to slightly repair the arguments there. Let u be an element of P such that $\langle u \rangle$ is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. We define a K -linear map

$$I_{p'}^u : K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_H(u), f_u) \rightarrow K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{IBr}_K(C_G(u), e_u)$$

which sends $\varphi_{\alpha'}$ to $\omega_V(u)\varphi_{\alpha}$ if the local points $\alpha \cap i\mathcal{O}Gi$ and $\alpha' \cap j\mathcal{O}Hj$ correspond under the bijection (4.4). Then using the three equalities in 6.4, it is straightforward to check that

$$d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)}(\Phi_M(\chi')) = I_{p'}^u(d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}(\chi')) \quad (7.1)$$

for any $\chi' \in \mathrm{Irr}_K(C_H(u), f_u)$. Recall that here Φ_M is the \mathbb{Z} -linear map $\mathbb{Z}\mathrm{Irr}_K(H, c) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\mathrm{Irr}_K(G, b)$ induced by the $(\mathcal{O}Gb, \mathcal{O}Hc)$ -bimodule M via tensor products over $\mathcal{O}H$. Note

that the map $I_{p'}^u$ satisfying the equality (7.1), if it exists, is uniquely determined by Φ_M , because $d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}$ extends linearly to a surjective map $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(H, c) \rightarrow K \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(C_G(u), e_u)$.

Assume that the perfect isometry Φ_M induced by M extends to a weak isotypy in Definition 1.1. Hence there is a perfect isometry

$$\Phi_{\langle u \rangle} : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(u), \hat{f}_{\langle u \rangle}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_G(u), \hat{e}_{\langle u \rangle})$$

such that

$$d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)}(\Phi_M(\chi')) = \bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle}(d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}(\chi')).$$

By the uniqueness of $I_{p'}^u$, we have $\bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle}(\varphi_{\alpha'}) = I_{p'}^u(\varphi_{\alpha'}) = \omega_V(u)\varphi_{\alpha}$ for any $\alpha' \in \mathcal{LP}(u, f_u)$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{LP}(u, e_u)$ such that $\alpha' \cap j\mathcal{O}Hj$ and $\alpha \cap i\mathcal{O}Gi$ correspond under the bijection (4.4). Note that $\bar{\Phi}_{\langle u \rangle} : \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(C_H(u), \hat{f}_{\langle u \rangle}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(C_G(u), \hat{e}_{\langle u \rangle})$ is a \mathbb{Z} -linear isomorphism. This forces $\omega_V(u) = \pm 1$.

For any $u \in P$, there exists an isomorphism φ in \mathcal{F} such that $\langle \varphi(u) \rangle$ is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. Write $v = \varphi(u)$. Denote by T_u (resp. T_v) a direct summand of $\text{Res}_{\langle u \rangle}^P(V)$ (resp. $\text{Res}_{\langle v \rangle}^P(V)$) with vertex $\langle u \rangle$ (resp. $\langle v \rangle$). By the previous paragraph, the character value of T_v at v are 1. Since V is \mathcal{F} -stable, we have $T_u \cong_{\varphi^{-1}}(T_v)$, which in turn implies that the character value of T_u at u are ± 1 . Hence $\omega_V(u) = \pm 1$ for all $u \in P$. Then by [19, Proposition 52.3], we have $\rho(x) = \pm m_x$ for any $x \in X = \Delta P$. \square

7.3. The proof of (ii) implying (iv). For any non-trivial subgroup Q of P , we set \hat{M}_Q be as in Proposition 5.4. For $Q = 1$, set $\hat{M}_Q = M$. Since \hat{M}_Q induces a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{O}C_Q(Q)\hat{e}_Q$ and $\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)\hat{f}_Q$, the \mathbb{Z} -linear isomorphism

$$\Phi_{\hat{M}_Q} : \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{Irr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q)$$

is a perfect isometry. Consider the family $(\Phi_{\hat{M}_Q})_{Q \subseteq P}$ of perfect isometries. By Proposition 5.4 (iii), the equivariance condition (i) in Definition 1.2 holds. For any $u \in P$ such that $\langle u \rangle$ is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised, by Proposition 6.3, $\bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_{\langle u \rangle}}(\varphi_{\alpha'}) = \varphi_{\alpha}$ for any pair $(\alpha, \alpha') \in \mathcal{LP}(u, f_u) \times \mathcal{LP}(u, e_u)$ such that $\alpha \cap i\mathcal{O}Gi$ and $\alpha' \cap j\mathcal{O}Hj$ correspond under the bijection (4.4).

Assume that (ii) holds, then by [19, Proposition 52.3], $\omega_V(u) = \pm 1$ for any $u \in P$. Let $u \in P$ such that $\langle u \rangle$ is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. Then using the three equalities in 6.4, it is straightforward to check that

$$d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)}(\Phi_M(\chi')) = \omega_V(u)\bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_{\langle u \rangle}}(d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}(\chi'))$$

for any $\chi' \in \text{Irr}_K(kC_H(u), f_u)$. Hence $d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_M = \omega_V(u)\bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_{\langle u \rangle}} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)}$. By Lemma 7.1 and the last sentence in Notation 3.1, we have

$$d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_M = \omega_V(u)\bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_{\langle u \rangle}} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)} \quad (7.2)$$

for any $u \in P$.

Let Q be a subgroup of P , u an element in $C_P(Q)$, and R the group $Q\langle u \rangle$. Consider the block $\hat{e}_Q \otimes \hat{f}_Q^\circ$ of $\mathcal{O}(C_G(Q) \times C_H(Q))$. $(\Delta\langle u \rangle, e_R \otimes f_R^\circ)$ is an $(\hat{e}_Q \otimes \hat{f}_Q^\circ)$ -Brauer pair.

Consider the $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)\hat{e}_Q\text{-}\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)\hat{f}_Q$ -bimodule \hat{M}_Q . By the transitivity of slash functors [2, Lemma 22 (i)], M_R is a $(\Delta\langle u \rangle, e_R \otimes f_R^\circ)$ -slashed module attached to \hat{M}_Q over $C_G(R) \times C_H(R)$. By Proposition 5.4 (i) and Proposition 3.2 (i), the character values of a source of \hat{M}_Q are rational integers. Recall from Proposition 5.4 that \hat{M}_Q has an $\mathcal{O}X_Q$ -source \hat{V}_Q and X_Q contains $\Delta C_P(Q)$. By Notation 3.1, for any $(u, u) \in \Delta C_P(Q)$, we have $\omega_{\hat{V}_Q}((u, u)) = \pm 1$. By Proposition 4.4, we can apply the equality (7.2) to the $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)\hat{e}_Q\text{-}\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)\hat{f}_Q$ -bimodule \hat{M}_Q instead of the $\mathcal{O}Gb\text{-}\mathcal{O}Hc$ -bimodule M . So we have

$$d_{(C_G(Q), e_Q)}^{(u, e_R)} \circ \Phi_Q = \omega_{\hat{V}_Q}((u, u)) \bar{\Phi}_R \circ d_{(C_H(Q), f_Q)}^{(u, f_R)}.$$

Since $\omega_{\hat{V}_Q}((u, u)) = \pm 1$, this completes the proof. \square

7.4. The proof of (ii) implying (v) when $p \geq 3$ and X is abelian. We continue to use the notation in 7.3. Since P is abelian, any subgroup Q of P is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. Hence both the blocks $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $kC_H(Q)f_Q$ have P as a defect group. By Proposition 4.3, ΔP is a vertex of M_Q . Let $V_Q = k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{V}_Q$. Recall that the notation \hat{V}_Q is from Proposition 5.4. By Proposition 5.4 and Proposition 4.3, $(\Delta P, e_P \otimes f_P^\circ, V_Q)$ is a source triple of M_Q . For any subgroup Q of P , we can choose a sequence of elements $u_0 = 1, u_1, \dots, u_n$ in P such that $Q = \langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let V_i be an indecomposable direct summand of a $\Delta\langle u_1, \dots, u_i \rangle$ -slashed module attached to V over $\Delta C_P(\langle u_0, \dots, u_{i-1} \rangle) = \Delta N_P(\langle u_1, \dots, u_i \rangle) = \Delta P$ with vertex ΔP . By [3, Lemma 3 (iii)], $V_{\langle u_1, \dots, u_i \rangle}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of V_i . Let \hat{V}_i be an endopermutation $\mathcal{O}\Delta P$ -module such that $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{V}_i \cong V_i$ and such that $\det_{\hat{V}_i} = 1$. By the uniquely lifting property [16, Corollary 5.3.4] and Proposition 3.2 (i), we see that $\hat{V}_{\langle u_1, \dots, u_i \rangle}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of \hat{V}_i . Hence by Notation 3.1, we have

$$\omega_{\hat{V}_{\langle u_1, \dots, u_i \rangle}} = \omega_{\hat{V}_i}. \quad (7.3)$$

Let $\varepsilon_Q := \omega_V((u_1, u_1)) \omega_{\hat{V}_1}((u_2, u_2)) \cdots \omega_{\hat{V}_{n-1}}((u_n, u_n))$. By Proposition 3.5, ε_Q depends only on Q and V .

Consider the family $(\varepsilon_Q \Phi_{\hat{M}_Q})_{Q \subseteq P}$ of perfect isometries. By 7.3, the equivariance condition (i) in Definition 1.2 holds for the family $(\Phi_{\hat{M}_Q})_{Q \subseteq P}$. Hence by Proposition 3.6, the equivariance condition (i) also holds for the family $(\varepsilon_Q \Phi_{\hat{M}_Q})_{Q \subseteq P}$. For any subgroup Q of P and u an element in $C_P(Q)$, we have proved that $d_{(C_G(Q), e_Q)}^{(u, e_R)} \circ \Phi_Q = \omega_{\hat{V}_Q}((u, u)) \bar{\Phi}_R \circ d_{(C_H(Q), f_Q)}^{(u, f_R)}$ in 7.3. Multiplying ε_Q on each sides we have $d_{(C_G(Q), e_Q)}^{(u, e_R)} \circ \varepsilon_Q \Phi_Q = \varepsilon_Q \omega_{\hat{V}_Q}((u, u)) \bar{\Phi}_R \circ d_{(C_H(Q), f_Q)}^{(u, f_R)}$. By Proposition 3.5 and the equality (7.3), we have $\varepsilon_Q \omega_{\hat{V}_Q}((u, u)) = \varepsilon_R$, and this completes the proof. \square

8. Proof of Proposition 1.4

Assume we are in the context of Proposition 1.4. So we can continue to use the notation in Notation 4.1 and Section 6. We may assume that

$$P = Q_8 = \{\pm 1, \pm \alpha, \pm \beta, \pm \gamma \mid (-1)^2 = 1, \alpha^2 = \beta^2 = \gamma^2 = \alpha\beta\gamma = -1\}.$$

An easy calculation shows that for any subgroup Q of P with $|Q| = 4$, we have $C_P(Q) = Q$. Hence every subgroup of P is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised. Let L_1 be a 3-dimensional exotic endotrivial kP -module. Let \hat{L}_1 be an endotrivial $\mathcal{O}P$ -module such that $k \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{L}_1 \cong L_1$ (see [1] for the existence of \hat{L}_1). By [17, Proposition 7.3.12], there are four choices of \hat{L}_1 up to isomorphism. The irreducible ordinary character table of $P = Q_8$ is the following.

	$\{1\}$	$\{-1\}$	$\{\alpha, -\alpha\}$	$\{\beta, -\beta\}$	$\{\gamma, -\gamma\}$
χ_1	1	1	1	1	1
χ_2	1	1	1	-1	-1
χ_3	1	1	-1	1	-1
χ_4	1	1	-1	-1	1
χ_5	2	-2	0	0	0

Since \hat{L}_1 is endotrivial we have $\hat{L}_1 \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \hat{L}_1^* \cong \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}P$ as $\mathcal{O}P$ -modules. Comparing the character values of the element $-1 \in P$ on both sides we see that $(\rho_{\hat{L}_1}(-1))^2 = 1$, which implies that the four possibilities of $\rho_{\hat{L}_1}$ are $\chi_1 + \chi_5$, $\chi_2 + \chi_5$, $\chi_3 + \chi_5$ and $\chi_4 + \chi_5$. We may assume that $\hat{L}_1 = \chi_1 + \chi_5$ and $V = \hat{L}_1$, and we can similarly prove other cases. Since the values of ρ_V are in \mathbb{Z} , by Theorem 1.3, M extends to an almost isotypy between $\mathcal{O}Gb$ and $\mathcal{O}Hc$.

Next we show that the bimodule M together with its slashed modules cannot give rise to an isotypy in the sense of [14, §10]. The set of all subgroups of P is $\{\langle 1 \rangle, \langle -1 \rangle, \langle \alpha \rangle, \langle \beta \rangle, \langle \gamma \rangle, P\}$. Since V is an endotrivial $\mathcal{O}P$ -module, by [3, Lemma 3 (iii)], we see that for any non-trivial subgroup Q of P , M_Q is a trivial source $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ - $kC_H(Q)f_Q$ -bimodules. Since Q is fully \mathcal{F} -centralised, both $kC_G(Q)e_Q$ and $kC_H(Q)f_Q$ have $C_P(Q)$ as a defect group. By Proposition 4.3, $(\Delta C_P(Q), e_{C_P(Q)} \otimes f_{C_P(Q)}^\circ)$ is a vertex subpair of M_Q . By [13, Theorem 1.13], we can choose an $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)\hat{e}_Q$ - $\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)\hat{f}_Q$ -bimodules \hat{M}_Q with a linear source \hat{V}_Q (with respect to the source pair $(\Delta C_P(Q), e_{C_P(Q)} \otimes f_{C_P(Q)}^\circ)$) inducing a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{O}C_G(Q)\hat{e}_Q$ and $\mathcal{O}C_H(Q)\hat{f}_Q$. Note that the \mathbb{Z} -linear isomorphism $\bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_Q} : \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(C_H(Q), \hat{f}_Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{IBr}_K(C_G(Q), \hat{e}_Q)$ depends only on M_Q - it does not depend on the choice of \hat{M}_Q . Since $\rho_V(\alpha) = \rho_V(\beta) = \rho_V(\gamma) = 1$ and $\rho_V(-1) = -1$, we have $\omega_V(\alpha) = \omega_V(\beta) = \omega_V(\gamma) = 1$ and $\omega_V(-1) = -1$ (see Notation 3.1). Let $u \in \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$. Then by (7.2), we have

$$d_{(G,b)}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_M = \bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_{(u)}} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(u,f_u)} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{(G,b)}^{(-1,e_{-1})} \circ \Phi_M = -\bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_{(-1)}} \circ d_{(H,c)}^{(-1,f_{-1})}.$$

Assume that there is a local system $(\Phi_Q)_{\{1 \neq Q \subseteq P\}}$ coming from lifting slashed modules, then we have $\Phi_{\langle u \rangle} = \Phi_{\hat{M}_{(u)}}$ and $\Phi_{\langle -1 \rangle} = -\Phi_{\hat{M}_{(-1)}}$. By the transitivity of slash functors [2, Lemma 22 (i)], $M_{\langle u \rangle}$ is a $(\Delta \langle u \rangle, e_u \otimes f_u^\circ)$ -slashed module attached to $\hat{M}_{\langle -1 \rangle}$ over $C_G(u) \times C_H(u)$. Again by (7.2), we have

$$d_{(C_G(-1), \hat{e}_{-1})}^{(u,e_u)} \circ \Phi_{\hat{M}_{(-1)}} = \omega_{\hat{V}_{(-1)}}((u, u)) \bar{\Phi}_{\hat{M}_{(u)}} \circ d_{(C_H(-1), \hat{f}_{-1})}^{(u,f_u)}. \quad (8.1)$$

Since $C_P(-1) = P$, both the blocks $kC_G(-1)e_{\langle -1 \rangle}$ and $kC_H(-1)f_{\langle -1 \rangle}$ have P as a defect group, and \hat{V}_{-1} is a linear $\mathcal{O}\Delta P$ -module. Since $P/[P, P]$ is a Klein four group, there exists

$u_0 \in \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$, such that $\omega_{\hat{V}_{\langle -1 \rangle}}((u_0, u_0)) = 1$. Since $\Phi_{\langle u_0 \rangle} = \Phi_{\hat{M}_{\langle u_0 \rangle}}$ and $\Phi_{\langle -1 \rangle} = -\Phi_{\hat{M}_{\langle -1 \rangle}}$, (8.1) implies

$$d_{(C_G(-1), \hat{e}_{-1})}^{(u_0, e_{u_0})} \circ \Phi_{\langle -1 \rangle} = -\bar{\Phi}_{\langle u_0 \rangle} \circ d_{(C_H(-1), \hat{f}_{-1})}^{(u_0, f_{u_0})},$$

which contradicts to the definition of an isotopy in the sense of [14, §10].

If V is a 5-dimensional endotrivial $\mathcal{O}P$ -module lifting a 5-exotic endotrivial kP -module, then $\Omega_P(M)$ is a 3-dimensional endotrivial $\mathcal{O}P$ -module lifting a 3-exotic endotrivial kP -module. So we can immediately calculate the four possibilities of ρ_V . Using a similar argument as above we can show that the bimodule M together with its slashed modules cannot give rise to an isotopy in the sense of [14, §10]. \square

Acknowledgements. Many propositions and their proofs were obtained under Professor Markus Linckelmann's guidance, such as Proposition 1.4, Proposition 4.5, Lemma 5.2, and so on. The author is very grateful to him for a lot of very useful discussions, and to City, University of London for its hospitality during the research for this paper in the spring of 2024. The author is also very grateful to Professor Yuanyang Zhou for bringing the author into the topic of [12] in 2018.

References

- [1] J. L. Alperin, Lifting endo-trivial modules, *J. Group Theory* **4** (2001) 1–2.
- [2] E. Biland, Brauer-friendly modules and slash functors, *J. Pure App. Algebra* **218** (2014) 2319–2336.
- [3] E. Biland, Strong fusion control and stable equivalences, *Adv. Math.* **259** (2014) 67–88.
- [4] R. Boltje, R. Kessar, M. Linckelmann, On Picard groups of finite groups, *J. Algebra* **558** (2020) 70–101.
- [5] R. Boltje, P. Perepelitsky, p -Permutation equivalences between blocks of group algebras, arXiv:2007.09253.
- [6] S. Bouc, Tensor induction of relative syzygies, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **523** (2000), 113–171.
- [7] S. Bouc, The Dade group of a p -group, *Invent. Math.* **164** (2006) 189–231.
- [8] M. Broué, Isométries parfaites, types de blocs, catégories dérivées, *Astérisque* **181–182** (1990), 61–92.
- [9] E. C. Dade, Endo-permutation modules over p -groups, I, *Ann. Math.* **107** (1978) 459–494.
- [10] X. Huang, Gluing of endopermutation modules, *Comm. Algebra* **48** (2020) 4904–4921.
- [11] X. Huang, Stable equivalences with endopermutation source, slash functors, and functorial equivalences, *J. Algebra* **650** (2024) 335–353.
- [12] X. Huang, Y. Zhou, Basic Morita equivalences and isotopies, *J. Algebra* **557** (2020) 211–223.
- [13] R. Kessar, M. Linckelmann, Descent of equivalences and character bijections, *Geometric and topological aspects of the representation theory of finite groups*, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., **242** (2018) 181–212.
- [14] M. Linckelmann, Trivial source bimodule rings for blocks and p -permutation equivalences, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **361** (2009) 1279–1316.
- [15] M. Linckelmann, On stable equivalences with endopermutation source, *J. Algebra* **434** (2015) 27–45.
- [16] M. Linckelmann, *The Block Theory of Finite Group Algebras I*, London Math. Soc. Student Texts, vol. **91**, Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [17] M. Linckelmann, *The Block Theory of Finite Group Algebras II*, London Math. Soc. Student Texts, vol. **92**, Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [18] L. Puig, Pointed groups and construction of characters, *Math. Z.* **176** (1981) 265–292.
- [19] J. Thévenaz, *G -algebras and Modular Representation Theory*, Oxford Science Publications, Clarendon, Oxford, 1995.
- [20] J. Thévenaz, Endo-permutation modules, a guided tour, in: M. Geck, D. Testerman, J. Thévenaz (Eds.), *Group Representation Theory*, EPFL Press, Lausanne, 2007, pp.115–147.