

# Fusion systems of blocks of finite groups over arbitrary fields\*

Robert Boltje, Çisil Karagüzel, Deniz Yılmaz

Department of Mathematics

University of California

Santa Cruz, CA 95064

U.S.A.

boltje@ucsc.edu, ckaraguz@ucsc.edu, deyilmaz@ucsc.edu

June 20, 2019

## Abstract

To any block idempotent  $b$  of a group algebra  $kG$  of a finite group  $G$  over a field  $k$  of characteristic  $p > 0$ , Puig associated a fusion system and proved that it is saturated if the  $k$ -algebra  $kC_G(P)e$  is split, where  $(P, e)$  is a maximal  $kGb$ -Brauer pair. We investigate in the non-split case how far the fusion system is from being saturated by describing it in an explicit way as being generated by the fusion system of a related block idempotent over a larger field together with a single automorphism of the defect group.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic  $p$ , let  $G$  be a finite group and let  $b$  be a block idempotent of  $kG$ . Puig defined a fusion system  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  associated to  $kGb$  after choosing a maximal  $kGb$ -Brauer pair  $(P, e)$ . Up to category isomorphism, this fusion system does not depend on the choice of  $(P, e)$ . Puig also proved that  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  is saturated if the  $k$ -algebra  $kC_G(P)e$  is split. It is known that in the non-split case it can happen that the fusion system associated to  $kGb$  is not saturated. In fact, the Sylow axiom can fail, while the extension axiom always holds. In the Main Theorem 5.2 of this paper we establish a precise connection between the fusion systems of related blocks in a Galois extension  $L/K$  of fields of characteristic  $p$  with Galois group  $\Gamma$ . More precisely, let  $b$  be a block idempotent of  $LG$  and  $\tilde{b}$  the unique block idempotent of  $KG$  with  $b\tilde{b} = b$ . Moreover, let  $(P, e)$  be a maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pair and let  $\tilde{e}$  be the unique block idempotent of  $KC_G(P)$  with  $e\tilde{e} = e$ . Then  $(P, \tilde{e})$  is a maximal  $KG\tilde{b}$ -Brauer pair and one has an inclusion of the fusion systems

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(LGb) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(P,\tilde{e})}(KG\tilde{b}) =: \tilde{\mathcal{F}}.$$

Theorem 5.2 states that there exists an element  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(P)$  such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \langle \mathcal{F}, \sigma \rangle$ . As consequences of the nature of  $\sigma$  we obtain that  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is saturated if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is saturated and

---

\*MR Subject Classification: 20C20. Keywords: Blocks of finite groups; fusion systems

$p$  does not divide the index  $[\Gamma_b : \Gamma_e] = [K(e) : K(b)]$  of the stabilizers of  $b$  and  $e$  under the Galois action, or equivalently the degree of the field extensions after adjoining the coefficients of  $e$  and  $b$  to  $K$ . In the case that  $L$  is chosen such that  $LC_G(P)e$  is split, this gives a particularly handy criterion for a fusion system of a block  $K\tilde{G}b$  in the non-split case to be saturated, see Theorem 6.3. The main result allows an alternative easy proof for the known fact that the extension axiom holds also in the non-split case, see Theorem 6.2. Finally, the Main Theorem implies that a weak form of Alperin's fusion theorem holds also for arbitrary block fusion systems, see Theorem 6.5.

**1.1 Notation** We will use the following standard notations without further notice:

For a group  $G$  and  $x \in G$ , we denote by  $c_x: G \rightarrow G$  the conjugation map  $g \mapsto xgx^{-1}$ . If  $k$  is a commutative ring, its  $k$ -linear extension to the group algebra  $kG$  is again denoted by  $c_x: kG \rightarrow kG$ . We frequently will use left-exponential notation  ${}^x(-) := c_x$  for these maps. The maps  $c_x$ ,  $x \in G$ , define an action of  $G$  on  $kG$  via  $k$ -algebra homomorphisms.

For  $H \leq G$ , we denote by  $[G/H]$  a set of representatives of the cosets  $G/H$ .

If a group  $G$  acts on a set  $X$ , we usually denote the stabilizer of an element  $x \in X$  by  $G_x$ . Moreover, for  $H \leq G$ , we denote by  $X^H$  the set of  $H$ -fixed points of  $X$ .

## 2 Brauer pairs

Throughout this section,  $G$  denotes a finite group,  $k$  denotes a field of characteristic  $p > 0$ , and  $b$  denotes a block idempotent of  $kG$ , i.e., a primitive idempotent of  $Z(kG)$ . We recall the definition and properties of Brauer pairs for  $kG$  following the treatment in [AKO11, IV.2]. We note that the blanket assumption in [AKO11, IV.2] that  $k$  is algebraically closed is not used in the proofs of any of the statements that we cite from there. Alternatively, see also [L18, Sections 5.9 and 6.3].

Recall that, for a  $p$ -subgroup  $P$  of  $G$ , the *Brauer homomorphism* with respect to  $P$  is the  $k$ -linear projection map  $\text{Br}_P: (kG)^P \rightarrow kC_G(P)$ ,  $\sum_{g \in G} \alpha_g g \mapsto \sum_{g \in C_G(P)} \alpha_g g$ . This is a surjective  $k$ -algebra homomorphism which respects  $G$ -conjugation:  $c_x \circ \text{Br}_P = \text{Br}_{x_P} \circ c_x: (kG)^P \rightarrow kC_G({}^xP)$  for  $x \in G$ . Thus,  $\text{Br}_P(b)$  is an idempotent of  $Z(kC_G(P)) = (kC_G(P))^{C_G(P)}$ . Recall further that a  $kG$ -Brauer pair is a pair  $(P, e)$  consisting of a  $p$ -subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  and a block idempotent  $e$  of  $kC_G(P)$ . If  $e$  occurs in the unique decomposition of  $\text{Br}_P(b)$  into a sum of primitive idempotents of  $Z(kC_G(P))$  (that is, if  $\text{Br}_P(b)e = e$ ), then we call  $(P, e)$  a  $(kG, b)$ -Brauer pair. We denote by  $\mathcal{BP}(kG)$  the set of  $kG$ -Brauer pairs and by  $\mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  the set of  $(kG, b)$ -Brauer pairs. Clearly,  $\mathcal{BP}(kG)$  is the disjoint union of the subsets  $\mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$ , where  $b$  runs through the block idempotents of  $kG$ . The set  $\mathcal{BP}(kG)$  is a  $G$ -set under the conjugation action given by  ${}^x(P, e) := ({}^xP, {}^xe)$ , and the subset  $\mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  is  $G$ -stable. Finally, we say that an idempotent  $i$  of  $(kG)^P$  is *associated* to a  $kG$ -Brauer pair  $(P, e)$  if

$$e\text{Br}_P(i) = \text{Br}_P(i) \neq 0.$$

Note that if  $i$  is primitive in  $(kG)^P$  then  $e\text{Br}_P(i) \neq 0$  implies that  $\text{Br}_P(i) \neq 0$  and that  $\text{Br}_P(i)$  is primitive in  $kC_G(P)$ . Thus,  $e\text{Br}_P(i) = \text{Br}_P(i)$ . One writes  $(Q, f) \leq (P, e)$  if  $Q \leq P$  and if any primitive idempotent  $i$  of  $(kG)^P$  which is associated to  $(P, e)$  is also associated to  $(Q, f)$ , see [AKO11, Definition 2.9]. This relation has the following properties.

**2.1 Theorem** ([AKO11, Theorems 2.10, 2.16]) (a) Let  $(P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG)$  and let  $Q \leq P$ . Then there exists a unique block idempotent  $f$  of  $kC_G(Q)$  such that  $(Q, f) \leq (P, e)$ .

(b) Let  $(Q, f) \leq (P, e)$  be in  $\mathcal{BP}(kG)$  with  $Q \trianglelefteq P$ . Then  $f$  is the unique block idempotent of  $kC_G(Q)$  which is  $P$ -stable and satisfies  $Br_P(f)e = e$ .

(c) The relation  $\leq$  on  $\mathcal{BP}(kG)$  is a partial order which is respected by the conjugation action of  $G$ .

Clearly  $(\{1\}, b) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  and Part (b) of the above theorem implies that if  $(P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  then  $(\{1\}, b) \leq (P, e)$ . Parts (a) and (c) further imply that if  $(Q, f) \leq (P, e)$  holds for elements in  $\mathcal{BP}(kG)$  then  $(Q, f) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  if and only if  $(P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$ .

For Brauer pairs  $(Q, f), (P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG)$  one writes  $(Q, f) \trianglelefteq (P, e)$  if  $Q \trianglelefteq P$ ,  $f$  is  $P$ -stable and  $Br_P(f)e = e$ , cf. [AKO11, Definition IV.2.13]. The following result is well-known to specialists. We state it for convenient future reference and give a proof for the convenience of the reader.

**2.2 Theorem** For  $(Q, f), (P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG)$  with  $Q \leq P$  the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) One has  $(Q, f) \leq (P, e)$ .
- (ii) There exist primitive idempotents  $i$  of  $(kG)^P$  and  $j$  of  $(kG)^Q$  such that  $ij = j = ji$ ,  $Br_P(i)e \neq 0$  and  $Br_Q(j)f \neq 0$ .
- (iii) There exist Brauer pairs  $(Q_i, d_i) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG)$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, n$ , such that

$$(Q, f) = (Q_0, d_0) \trianglelefteq (Q_1, d_1) \trianglelefteq \dots \trianglelefteq (Q_n, d_n) = (P, e).$$

- (iv) For every primitive idempotent  $i$  of  $(kG)^P$  with  $Br_P(i)e \neq 0$  one has  $Br_Q(i)f \neq 0$ .
- (v) There exists a primitive idempotent  $i$  of  $(kG)^P$  such that  $Br_P(i)e \neq 0$  and  $Br_Q(i)f = Br_Q(i) \neq 0$ .
- (vi) There exists a primitive idempotent  $i$  of  $(kG)^P$  such that  $Br_P(i)e \neq 0$  and  $Br_Q(i)f \neq 0$ .

**Proof** The equivalences (i)  $\iff$  (ii)  $\iff$  (iii) follow from [AKO11, Proposition IV.2.14]. Moreover, the implications (i)  $\implies$  (iv) and (v)  $\implies$  (vi) are trivial and the implication (i)  $\implies$  (v) follows from the fact that the image of a primitive idempotent under a surjective  $k$ -algebra homomorphism is either 0 or a primitive idempotent.

Next we show that (iv) implies (i). Let  $i$  be a primitive idempotent of  $(kG)^P$  such that  $Br_P(i)e = Br_P(i) \neq 0$ . By (iv),  $Br_Q(i)f \neq 0$ . By Theorem 2.1(a) there exists a block idempotent  $f'$  of  $kC_G(Q)$  such that  $(Q, f') \leq (P, e)$ . Thus,  $Br_Q(i)f' = Br_Q(i)$  which implies that  $0 \neq Br_Q(i)f = Br_Q(i)f'f$  and further that  $f = f'$  and thus  $(Q, f) \leq (P, e)$ .

Finally, we show that (vi) implies (i). Let  $i$  be as in (vi). By Theorem 2.1(a) there exists a block idempotent  $f'$  of  $kC_G(Q)$  such that  $(Q, f') \leq (P, e)$ . This implies  $Br_Q(i)f' = Br_Q(i) \neq 0$  and  $0 \neq Br_Q(i)f = Br_Q(i)f'f$ . Thus  $f = f'$  and  $(Q, f) \leq (P, e)$ .  $\square$

Recall that if  $I \leq H \leq G$  then we have a well-defined trace map

$$\mathrm{Tr}_I^H : (kG)^I \rightarrow (kG)^H, \quad a \mapsto \sum_{x \in [H/I]} x a.$$

A subgroup  $P$  of  $G$ , minimal with the property that  $b \in \mathrm{Tr}_P^G((kG)^P)$ , is called a *defect group* of the block idempotent  $b$  and of the block algebra  $kGb$ . The defect groups of  $kGb$  form a single

$G$ -conjugacy class of  $p$ -subgroups of  $G$ . Maximal elements in  $\mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  enjoy properties that resemble the Sylow Theorem for finite groups.

**2.3 Theorem** ([AKO11, Theorem 2.20]) (a) *The maximal elements in  $\mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  with respect to  $\leq$  form a single  $G$ -orbit.*

(b) *For  $(P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$  the following are equivalent.*

(i)  *$(P, e)$  is a maximal element in  $\mathcal{BP}(kG, b)$ .*

(ii)  *$P$  is a defect group of  $kGb$ .*

(iii)  *$P$  is maximal among all  $p$ -subgroups of  $G$  with the property  $\text{Br}_P(b) \neq 0$ .*

### 3 Fusion systems of block algebras

Throughout this section,  $p$  is a prime. We first recall the basic notions and properties of fusion systems, a structure introduced by Puig. Our terminology follows [AKO11, Chapter I].

For subgroups  $Q$  and  $R$  of a finite group  $G$  we denote by  $\text{Hom}_G(Q, R)$  the set of all group homomorphisms  $\varphi: Q \rightarrow R$  with the property that there exists  $x \in G$  with  $\varphi(u) = c_x(u)$  for all  $u \in Q$ . Moreover, we set  $\text{Aut}_G(Q) := \text{Hom}_G(Q, Q)$ .

**3.1 Definition** ([AKO11, Definition I.2.1]) Let  $P$  be a finite  $p$ -group. A subcategory  $\mathcal{F}$  of the category of finite groups whose objects are the subgroups of  $P$  is called a *fusion system* over  $P$  if for any two subgroups  $Q$  and  $R$  of  $P$ , the set  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, R)$  has the following properties:

(i)  $\text{Hom}_P(Q, R) \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, R)$  and every element of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, R)$  is injective.

(ii) For each  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, R)$ , the group isomorphism  $Q \rightarrow \varphi(Q)$ ,  $u \mapsto \varphi(u)$ , and its inverse are morphisms in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

For instance, if  $G$  is a finite group and  $P$  is a  $p$ -subgroup of  $G$ , we obtain a fusion system  $\mathcal{F}_P(G)$  over  $P$  by setting  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}_P(G)}(Q, R) := \text{Hom}_G(Q, R)$ , for all subgroups  $Q$  and  $R$  of  $P$ . Note that the intersection of two fusion systems over  $P$  is again a fusion system and that a fusion system over  $P$  is determined by the isomorphisms it contains. Thus the smallest fusion system over a finite  $p$ -group  $P$  is the fusion system  $\mathcal{F}_P(P)$ .

**3.2 Definition** ([AKO11, Definition I.2.4]) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a fusion system over a finite  $p$ -group  $P$ . A subgroup  $Q$  of  $P$  is called *fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -centralized* if  $|C_P(Q)| \geq |C_P(Q')|$  for any subgroup  $Q'$  of  $P$  which is  $\mathcal{F}$ -isomorphic to  $Q$ . Similarly,  $Q$  is called *fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -normalized* if  $|N_P(Q)| \geq |N_P(Q')|$  for any subgroup  $Q'$  of  $P$  which is  $\mathcal{F}$ -isomorphic to  $Q$ .

**3.3 Definition** ([AKO11, Definition I.2.2]) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a fusion system on a finite  $p$ -group  $P$  and let  $\varphi: Q \rightarrow R$  be an isomorphism in  $\mathcal{F}$ . One denotes by  $N_{\varphi}$  the set of all elements  $y \in N_P(Q)$  for which there exists  $z \in N_P(R)$  with the property  $\varphi \circ c_y = c_z \circ \varphi: Q \rightarrow R$ . Note that  $QC_P(Q) \leq N_{\varphi} \leq N_P(Q)$  and that  $N_{\varphi}$  does not depend on  $\mathcal{F}$ , but only on  $\varphi$  and  $P$ .

If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a fusion system over a finite  $p$ -group  $P$  and  $Q \leq P$  then we set  $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, Q)$ , a subgroup of the automorphism group of  $Q$ . The following definition of saturation goes back to Stancu and is an equivalent reformulation of the original definition, see [AKO11, Proposition I.9.3].

**3.4 Definition** A fusion system  $\mathcal{F}$  over a  $p$ -group  $P$  is called *saturated* if the following two conditions hold.

(i) *Sylow axiom*: The group  $\text{Aut}_P(P)$  is a Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$ .

(ii) *Extension axiom*: For every  $Q \leq P$  and every  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, P)$  such that  $\varphi(Q)$  is fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -normalized there exists a morphism  $\psi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(N_{\varphi}, P)$  whose restriction to  $Q$  equals  $\varphi$ .

For instance, if  $P$  is a Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of a finite group  $G$  then the fusion system  $\mathcal{F}_P(G)$  is saturated (see [AKO11, Theorem 2.3]).

**3.5 Definition** Let  $G$  be a finite group, let  $k$  be a field of characteristic  $p$ , let  $b$  be a block idempotent of  $kG$ , and let  $(P, e)$  be a maximal  $(kG, b)$ -Brauer pair. We define a category  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  as follows. First, for every  $Q \leq P$  denote by  $e_Q$  the unique block idempotent of  $kC_G(Q)$  with  $(Q, e_Q) \leq (P, e)$ . The objects of  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  are the subgroups of  $P$  and for subgroups  $Q$  and  $R$  of  $P$  let  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)}(Q, R)$  denote the set of group homomorphisms  $\varphi: Q \rightarrow R$  such that there exists  $x \in G$  with  $\varphi(u) = c_x(u)$  for all  $u \in Q$  and  ${}^x(Q, e_Q) \leq (R, e_R)$ . Composition in  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  is the usual composition of functions.

**3.6 Remark** Let  $kG$ ,  $b$ , and  $(P, e)$  be as in Definition 3.5.

(a) It is clear from the definition that  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  is a fusion system over  $P$ .

(b) If  $kGb$  is the principal block of  $kG$ , then by Brauer's third main theorem,  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  is equal to  $\mathcal{F}_P(G)$  and  $P$  is a Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $G$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  is saturated in this case.

(c) Example 3.8 below shows that in general the Sylow axiom does not hold for  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$ . But we will show in Theorem 6.2 that the extension axiom holds for  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$ .

The following theorem was first proved by Puig. It follows from Theorem IV.3.2 and Proposition IV.3.14 in [AKO11]. See also [L18, Theorem 8.5.2] and note that there the terminology is different: Fusion systems in [L18] are defined to be saturated fusion systems in our terminology.

**3.7 Theorem** Let  $kG$ ,  $b$ , and  $(P, e)$  be as in Definition 3.5 and suppose that the  $k$ -algebra  $kC_G(P)e$  is split, i.e., for every simple  $kC_G(P)e$ -module  $V$  one has a  $k$ -algebra isomorphism  $\text{End}_{kC_G(P)e}(V) \cong k$ . Then the fusion system  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(kGb)$  is saturated.

We are grateful to Radha Kessar who suggested the following example to us.

**3.8 Example** Let  $p = 2$ ,  $k = \mathbb{F}_2$ , the field with 2 elements, and  $G := D_{24} = (C_3 \times C_4) \rtimes C_2$ , the dihedral group with 24 elements, with  $C_2$  acting by inversion on  $C_3 \times C_4$ . Let  $g$  denote a generator of  $C_3$ . Then  $b := g + g^2$  is a block idempotent of  $\mathbb{F}_2G$  and  $(P, e) := (C_4, b)$  is a maximal  $(\mathbb{F}_2G, b)$ -Brauer pair. We have  $\text{Aut}_P(P) = \{1\}$ , since  $P$  is abelian and an easy computation shows that  $\text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(\mathbb{F}_2Gb)}(P) \cong C_2$ . Thus, the Sylow axiom does not hold for  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(\mathbb{F}_2Gb)$  and therefore the fusion system  $\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(\mathbb{F}_2Gb)$  is not saturated.

## 4 Extension of scalars

Throughout this section  $L/K$  denotes a finite Galois extension of fields of characteristic  $p > 0$  and  $\Gamma$  denotes its Galois group. Moreover,  $G$  denotes a finite group.

$\Gamma$  acts via  $K$ -algebra automorphisms on the group algebra  $LG$  and also on  $Z(LG)$  by applying  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  to the coefficients of an element in  $LG$ . Thus,  $\Gamma$  permutes the block idempotents of  $LG$  and fixes the block idempotents  $b$  of  $KG$ . Since  $\text{Br}_P: (LG)^P \rightarrow LC_G(P)$

commutes with the  $\Gamma$ -action, Theorem 2.3 implies that any  $\Gamma$ -conjugate of  $b$  has the same defect groups as  $b$ . We denote by  $\Gamma_b$  the stabilizer of  $b$  in  $\Gamma$  and set

$$\tilde{b} := \sum_{\gamma \in [\Gamma/\Gamma_b]} \gamma b.$$

Clearly,  $\tilde{b}$  is an idempotent in  $(Z(LG))^\Gamma = Z(KG)$ . More precisely one has the following:

**4.1 Proposition** (a) *Let  $b$  be a block idempotent of  $LG$ . Then  $\tilde{b} := \sum_{\gamma \in [\Gamma/\Gamma_b]} \gamma b$  is a block idempotent of  $KG$ .*

(b) *The map  $b \mapsto \tilde{b}$  induces a bijection between the set of  $\Gamma$ -orbits of block idempotents of  $LG$  and the set of block idempotents of  $KG$ .*

(c) *If  $b$  is a block idempotent of  $LG$  and  $\tilde{b}$  is the block idempotent of  $KG$  associated to it as in (a) then  $b$  and  $\tilde{b}$  have the same defect groups.*

**Proof** (a) By definition,  $\tilde{b}$  is the sum of the distinct  $\Gamma$ -conjugates of  $b$ , thus an idempotent of  $Z(KG)$ . To see that  $\tilde{b}$  is primitive in  $Z(KG)$ , assume that  $\tilde{b} = c_1 + c_2$  for non-zero orthogonal idempotents  $c_1, c_2 \in Z(KG)$  and let  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  denote the set of primitive idempotents of  $Z(LG)$  that occur in a primitive decomposition of  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  in  $Z(LG)$ , respectively. Then  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are disjoint and  $\Gamma$ -stable. On the other hand  $I_1 \cup I_2$  is the single  $\Gamma$ -orbit of  $b$ . This is a contradiction.

(b) This is immediate from (a).

(c) Let  $P$  be a defect group of  $\tilde{b}$ . By Theorem 2.3, one has  $\text{Br}_P(\tilde{b}) \neq 0$  in  $KC_G(P) \subseteq LC_G(P)$ . Thus  $0 \neq \text{Br}_P(\tilde{b}) = \sum_{\gamma \in [\Gamma/\Gamma_b]} \text{Br}_P(\gamma b)$  implies that some  $\Gamma$ -conjugate of  $b$ , and therefore also  $b$ , has a defect group  $Q$  containing  $P$ . Thus,  $0 \neq \text{Br}_Q(b) = \text{Br}_Q(\tilde{b}) = \text{Br}_Q(b)\text{Br}_Q(\tilde{b})$ , which implies that  $\text{Br}_Q(\tilde{b}) \neq 0$  and therefore  $|Q| \leq |P|$ . This implies  $P = Q$ .  $\square$

Note that  $\Gamma$  acts on  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$  via

$$\gamma(P, e) = (P, \gamma e), \quad (1)$$

for  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and  $(P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(LG)$ . Note that this action commutes with the  $G$ -action on  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$  so that we obtain an action of  $\Gamma \times G$  on  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$ . Moreover, since  $\text{Br}_P$  commutes with the action of  $\Gamma$  and since the  $G$ -action on  $LG$  commutes with the  $\Gamma$ -action on  $LG$ ,  $\Gamma \times G$  acts via poset isomorphisms on  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$ . Thus, if  $b$  is a block idempotent of  $LG$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , the  $G$ -posets  $\mathcal{BP}(LGb)$  and  $\mathcal{BP}(LG\gamma b)$  are isomorphic via (1) and  $\Gamma_b \times G$  acts via poset automorphisms on  $\mathcal{BP}(LGb)$ .

In the next proposition we write  $\leq_K$  and  $\leq_L$  for the poset structures of  $\mathcal{BP}(KG)$  and  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$ , respectively. They are related as follows.

**4.2 Proposition** *For  $(Q, f), (P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(LG)$  with  $Q \leq P$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *One has  $(Q, \tilde{f}) \leq_K (P, \tilde{e})$  in  $\mathcal{BP}(KG)$ .*
- (ii) *There exists  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that  $(Q, f) \leq_L \gamma(P, e)$  in  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$ .*

**Proof** Assume first that (i) holds and let  $i$  be a primitive idempotent of  $(KG)^P$  such that  $\text{Br}_P(i)\tilde{e} = \text{Br}_P(i) \neq 0$ . Then, by definition also  $\text{Br}_Q(i)\tilde{f} = \text{Br}_Q(i) \neq 0$ . Let  $J$  be a primitive decomposition of  $i$  in  $(LG)^P$ . Since  $\text{Br}_P(i)\tilde{e} \neq 0$ , there exists  $j \in J$  such that  $\text{Br}_P(j)\tilde{e} \neq 0$ . Thus, there exists  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that  $\text{Br}_P(j)\gamma e \neq 0$ . Since  $\text{Br}_P(j)$  is primitive in  $LC_G(P)$ , we have  $\text{Br}_P(j)\gamma e = \text{Br}_P(j)$ . Let  $f'$  be the block idempotent of  $LC_G(Q)$  such that  $(Q, f') \leq_L$

$(P, \gamma e) = \gamma(P, e)$ . Then, by Theorem 2.2 also  $\text{Br}_Q(j)f' = \text{Br}_Q(j) \neq 0$ . Thus  $\text{Br}_Q(j)f'\tilde{f} = \text{Br}_Q(j)\text{Br}_Q(i)f'f = \text{Br}_Q(j)f'\text{Br}_Q(i)\tilde{f} = \text{Br}_Q(j)\text{Br}_Q(i) = \text{Br}_Q(j) \neq 0$  which implies that  $f'f \neq 0$ . This implies  $f' = \delta f$  for some  $\delta \in \Gamma$ . Thus  $\delta(Q, f) \leq_L \gamma(P, e)$  and (ii) holds after applying  $\delta^{-1}$ .

Next assume that  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with  $(Q, f) \leq_L \gamma(P, e)$ . By Theorem 2.1(a) there exists a block idempotent  $f_1$  of  $LC_G(Q)$  such that  $(Q, f_1) \leq_K (P, \tilde{e})$ . Since we already proved that (i) implies (ii), there exists  $\delta \in \Gamma$  such that  $(Q, f_1) \leq_L \delta(P, e)$ . Thus we have  $(Q, \gamma^{-1}f) \leq_L (P, e)$  and also  $(Q, \delta^{-1}f) \leq_L (P, e)$ . The uniqueness part of Theorem 2.2(a) now implies that  $f$  and  $f_1$  are  $\Gamma$ -conjugate. Thus  $f = \tilde{f}_1$  and  $(Q, \tilde{f}) \leq_K (P, \tilde{e})$ .  $\square$

The following corollaries are now immediate from Proposition 4.2.

**4.3 Corollary** *The map*

$$\mathcal{BP}(LG) \rightarrow \mathcal{BP}(KG), \quad (P, e) \mapsto (P, \tilde{e}),$$

*is a surjective morphism of  $G$ -posets, which restricts to a surjective morphism of  $G$ -posets  $\mathcal{BP}(LGb) \rightarrow \mathcal{BP}(KG\tilde{b})$  for every block idempotent  $b$  of  $LG$ .*

**4.4 Corollary** *Let  $b$  be a block idempotent of  $LG$  and let  $(P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(LGb)$  be a maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pair. Then  $(P, \tilde{e}) \in \mathcal{BP}(KG\tilde{b})$  is a maximal  $(KG\tilde{b})$ -Brauer pair and one obtains an inclusion of fusion systems*

$$\mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(LGb) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{(P,\tilde{e})}(KG\tilde{b})$$

*which is the identity on objects and on morphisms.*

## 5 The Main Theorem

We keep  $p$ ,  $G$ ,  $L/K$ , and  $\Gamma$  as introduced at the beginning of Section 4. Moreover we fix a block idempotent  $b$  of  $LG$  and denote by  $\Gamma_b$  the stabilizer of  $b$  in  $\Gamma$ . We fix a maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pair  $(P, e) \in \mathcal{BP}(LGb)$ . For every  $Q \leq P$ , let  $e_Q$  denote the unique block idempotent of  $LC_G(Q)$  such that  $(Q, e_Q) \leq (P, e)$  in  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$ . By Proposition 4.2, one has  $(Q, \tilde{e}_Q) \leq (P, \tilde{e})$  so that  $\tilde{e}_Q = \tilde{e}_Q$ . This allows us to use the notation  $\tilde{e}_Q$  for both purposes. Recall that  $\Gamma \times G$  acts on  $\mathcal{BP}(LG)$  and  $\Gamma_b \times G$  acts on  $\mathcal{BP}(LGb)$  via poset isomorphisms. Note that for any  $(Q, f) \in \mathcal{BP}(LGb)$  one has  $\Gamma_{(Q,f)} = \Gamma_f$ . For the stabilizer in  $G$  of a  $KG$ -Brauer pair or  $LG$ -Brauer pair  $(Q, f)$  we will write  $N_G(Q, f)$ .

Let  $p_1: G \times \Gamma \rightarrow G$  and  $p_2: G \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$  denote the projection maps. For any subgroup  $X$  of  $G \times \Gamma$ , we set  $k_1(X) := \{g \in G \mid (g, 1) \in X\}$  and  $k_2(X) := \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid (1, \gamma) \in X\}$ . As explained in [B10, p. 24], one has

$$k_1(X) \trianglelefteq p_1(X) \leq G \quad \text{and} \quad k_2(X) \trianglelefteq p_2(X) \leq \Gamma \quad \text{with} \quad p_1(X)/k_1(X) \cong p_2(X)/k_2(X) \quad (2)$$

via  $gk_1(X) \leftrightarrow \gamma k_2(X)$  if and only if  $(g, \gamma) \in X$ .

We denote by  $K(b)$  and  $K(e)$  the subfields of  $L$  obtained by adjoining the coefficients of the block idempotents  $b \in LG$  and  $e \in LC_G(P)$ . Thus,  $K(b)$  is the fixed field of  $\Gamma_b$  in  $L$  and  $K(e)$  is the fixed field of  $\Gamma_e$  in  $L$ .

**5.1 Proposition** *Let  $b$  be a block idempotent of  $LG$ .*

(a) *For any  $(R, e_R) \leq (Q, e_Q)$  in  $\mathcal{BP}(LGb)$  one has  $\Gamma_e = \Gamma_{(P,e)} \leq \Gamma_{(Q,e_Q)} \leq \Gamma_{(R,e_R)} \leq \Gamma_{(\{1\},b)} = \Gamma_b$ . In particular,  $K(b) \subseteq K(e)$ .*

(b) *Let  $X := \text{stab}_{G \times \Gamma}(P, e)$  be the stabilizer of the maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pair  $(P, e)$ . One has*

$$k_1(X) = N_G(P, e), \quad p_1(X) = N_G(P, \tilde{e}), \quad k_2(X) = \Gamma_e, \quad \text{and} \quad p_2(X) = \Gamma_b.$$

(c) *One has  $N_G(P, e) \trianglelefteq N_G(P, \tilde{e})$  and  $N_G(P, \tilde{e})/N_G(P, e) \cong \Gamma_b/\Gamma_e$ . Moreover,  $K(e)/K(b)$  is a Galois extension with cyclic Galois group isomorphic to  $N_G(P, \tilde{e})/N_G(P, e)$ .*

**Proof** (a) It suffices to show that  $\Gamma_{(Q,e_Q)} \leq \Gamma_{(R,e_R)}$ . Let  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{(Q,e_Q)}$ . Then  $\gamma(R, e_R) \leq_L \gamma(Q, e_Q) = (Q, \gamma e_Q) = (Q, e_Q)$ . The uniqueness part of Theorem 2.1(a) implies that  $\gamma e_R = e_R$ . Thus,  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{(R,e_R)}$ .

(b) The first equation is clear from the definition of  $k_1(X)$ . For the proof of the second equation, let  $g \in p_1(X)$ . Then there exists  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with  $(P, e) = {}^{(g,\gamma)}(P, e) = ({}^gP, {}^{g\gamma}e)$ . From  ${}^{g\gamma}e = e$  it follows that  ${}^g\tilde{e} = \tilde{e}$ . Thus  ${}^g(P, \tilde{e}) = (P, \tilde{e})$  and  $g \in N_G(P, \tilde{e})$ . Conversely, if  $g \in N_G(P, \tilde{e})$  then  ${}^g\tilde{e} = \tilde{e}$  which implies that there exists  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with  ${}^g e = \gamma e$ . Thus,  ${}^{(g,\gamma^{-1})}(P, e) = (P, e)$  and  $g \in p_1(X)$ . The third equation follows immediately from the definition of  $k_2(X)$ . For the proof of the fourth equation let  $\gamma \in p_2(X)$ . Then there exists  $g \in G$  with  ${}^{(g,\gamma)}(P, e) = (P, e)$ . Since  $(\{1\}, b) \leq (P, e)$ , this implies  ${}^{(g,\gamma)}(\{1\}, b) \leq {}^{(g,\gamma)}(P, e) = (P, e)$ . The uniqueness part in Theorem 2.1(a) implies that  ${}^{(g,\gamma)}(\{1\}, b) = (1, b)$  and that  $\gamma \in \Gamma_b$ . Conversely, assume that  $\gamma \in \Gamma_b$ . Then  $(\{1\}, b) \leq (P, e)$  implies  $(\{1\}, b) = {}^{(1,\gamma)}(\{1\}, b) \leq {}^{(1,\gamma)}(P, e) = (P, \gamma e)$ . This implies that both  $(P, e)$  and  $(P, \gamma e)$  are maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pairs. By Theorem 2.3(a), there exists  $g \in G$  such that  ${}^g(P, \gamma e) = (P, e)$ . Thus  $(g, \gamma) \in X$  and  $\gamma \in p_2(X)$ .

(c) The assertions of the first sentence follow from Part (b) and (2). For the second statement it suffices to show that  $\Gamma_b/\Gamma_e$  is cyclic. Note that the coefficients of  $e \in LC_G(P)$  generate a finite field extension of the prime field  $\mathbb{F}_p$  in  $L$ , which we denote by  $\mathbb{F}_p(e)$ . Since  $\Gamma_e \trianglelefteq \Gamma_b$ , we have a Galois extension  $K(e)/K(b)$  with Galois group  $\Delta \cong \Gamma_b/\Gamma_e$ . Now, restriction from  $K(e)$  to  $\mathbb{F}_p(e)$  is an injective group homomorphism from  $\Delta$  to the cyclic Galois group  $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_p(e)/\mathbb{F}_p)$ . In fact, if  $\delta \in \Delta$  restricts to the identity on  $\mathbb{F}_p(e)$ , then it is the identity on  $\mathbb{F}_p(e)$  and on  $K$ , thus on  $K(e)$ . This completes the proof of Part (c).  $\square$

Next we give a more precise picture of the inclusion of fusion systems from Corollary 4.4. In the following theorem the term  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \sigma \rangle$  denotes the fusion system *generated* by  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\sigma$ , i.e., the intersection of all fusion systems over  $P$  that contain  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\sigma$ .

**5.2 Theorem** *Let  $L/K$  be a finite Galois extension of fields of characteristic  $p > 0$  with Galois group  $\Gamma$ , let  $b$  be a block idempotent of  $LG$ , and let  $(P, e)$  be a maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pair. Set  $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{(P,e)}(LGb)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} := \mathcal{F}_{(P,\tilde{e})}(KG\tilde{b})$ . Let  $g_0 \in N_G(P, e)$  be such that  $g_0 N_G(P, \tilde{e})$  generates  $N_G(P, e)/N_G(P, \tilde{e})$  (see Proposition 5.1(c)) and set  $\sigma := c_{g_0} \in \text{Aut}(P)$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \langle \mathcal{F}, \sigma \rangle$ .*

*More precisely,  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(P)$  and, for any subgroups  $Q$  and  $R$  of  $P$  and any  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(Q, R)$ , there exist  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\psi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, \sigma^{-i}(R))$  and  $\psi' \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma^i(Q), R)$  with  $\varphi = \sigma^i|_{\sigma^{-i}(R)} \circ \psi = \psi' \circ \sigma^i|_Q$ .*

**Proof** Since  $g_0 \in N_G(P, \tilde{e})$ , we have  $\sigma = c_{g_0} \in \text{Aut}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(P)$ . It follows that  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \sigma \rangle \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ . In order to prove the reverse inclusion, let  $Q$  and  $R$  be subgroups of  $P$  and let  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(Q, R)$ . Then there exists  $g \in G$  such that  $\varphi = c_g: Q \rightarrow R$  and  ${}^g(Q, \tilde{e}_Q) \leq_K (R, \tilde{e}_R)$ . By Proposition 4.2



there exists  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that  ${}^g(Q, e_Q) \leq_L (R, \gamma e_R)$ . Since  $(\{1\}, b) = {}^g(\{1\}, b) \leq_L {}^g(Q, e_Q) \leq_L (R, \gamma e_R)$  and also  $(\{1\}, \gamma b) \leq_L (R, \gamma e_R)$ , Theorem 2.1(a) implies  $(\{1\}, b) = (\{1\}, \gamma b)$  so that  $\gamma \in \Gamma_b$ . Thus, both  $(P, e)$  and  $(P, \gamma e)$  are maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pairs. Theorem 2.3(a) implies that there exists  $h \in G$  such that  ${}^h(P, e) = (P, \gamma e)$  and we obtain  $(P, e) = {}^{h^{-1}}(P, \gamma e) \geq_L {}^{h^{-1}}(R, \gamma e_R) = ({}^{h^{-1}}R, {}^{h^{-1}}\gamma e_R)$ . Again, Theorem 2.1(a) implies that  ${}^{h^{-1}}\gamma e_R = e_{h^{-1}Rh}$  and therefore  ${}^{h^{-1}}g(Q, e_Q) \leq_L {}^{h^{-1}}(R, \gamma e_R) = ({}^{h^{-1}}R, e_{h^{-1}Rh})$ . This in turn implies that the homomorphism  $\alpha := c_{h^{-1}g}: Q \rightarrow {}^{h^{-1}}R$  belongs to  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, {}^{h^{-1}}R)$  and that the homomorphism  $\varphi = c_g: Q \rightarrow R$  factors as

$$\varphi = c_h \circ \alpha: Q \rightarrow {}^{h^{-1}}R \rightarrow R. \quad (3)$$

Since  ${}^h(P, e) = (P, \gamma e)$ , we obtain  $h \in N_G(P, \tilde{e})$  and can write  $h = g_0^i x$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $x \in N_G(P, e)$ . This implies that the map  $c_h: P \rightarrow P$  factors as  $c_h = \sigma^i \circ \beta: P \rightarrow P$  where  $\sigma^i = c_{g_0^i}: P \rightarrow P$  and  $\beta := c_x \in \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$ , since  $x \in N_G(P, e)$ . Restriction to  ${}^{h^{-1}}R$  yields the factorization

$$c_h|_{{}^{h^{-1}}R} = \sigma^i|_{\beta({}^{h^{-1}}R)} \circ \beta|_{{}^{h^{-1}}R}: {}^{h^{-1}}R \rightarrow \beta({}^{h^{-1}}R) \rightarrow R$$

with  $\beta({}^{h^{-1}}R) = \sigma^{-i}(R)$  and  $\beta|_{{}^{h^{-1}}R} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}({}^{h^{-1}}R, R)$ . Setting  $\psi := \beta|_{{}^{h^{-1}}R} \circ \alpha: Q \rightarrow \sigma^{-1}(R)$  and using (3) we obtain the desired factorization of  $\varphi$ . This also implies the inclusion  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{F}, \sigma \rangle$ .

In order to find  $\psi'$  with the desired property we use the elements  $g, h, x$ , and  $i$  from the first part of the proof and note that

$$(P, e) = \gamma^{-1}h(P, e) \geq_L \gamma^{-1}({}^hQ, {}^h e_Q) = ({}^hQ, \gamma^{-1}h e_Q),$$

which implies that  $\gamma^{-1}h e_Q = e_{hQh^{-1}}$ . Thus,

$${}^{gh^{-1}}({}^hQ, e_{hQh^{-1}}) = {}^{gh^{-1}}({}^hQ, \gamma^{-1}h e_Q) = ({}^gQ, {}^{g\gamma^{-1}}e_Q) \leq_L (R, e_R),$$

which implies that  $\alpha' := c_{gh^{-1}}: {}^hQ \rightarrow R$  belongs to  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}({}^hQ, R)$ . Thus,  $\varphi$  can be factored as

$$\varphi = c_g = c_{gh^{-1}} \circ c_h = \alpha' \circ c_h: Q \rightarrow {}^hQ \rightarrow R. \quad (4)$$

We can rewrite  $h = g_0^i x = x' g_0^i$  for some  $x' \in N_G(P, e)$  and obtain an element  $\beta' \in \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$  together with a factorization  $c_h = \beta' \circ \sigma^i: P \rightarrow P$ . Restricting this equation to  $Q$  yields a factorization

$$c_h = \beta'|_{\sigma^i(Q)} \circ \sigma^i|_Q: Q \rightarrow \sigma^i(Q) \rightarrow {}^hQ.$$

Setting  $\psi' := \alpha' \circ \beta'|_{\sigma^i(Q)} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma^i(Q), R)$ , the factorization in (4) can now be expressed as  $\varphi = \psi' \circ \sigma^i|_Q$  as claimed.  $\square$

## 6 Consequences of the Main Theorem

In this section we prove several consequences of Theorem 5.2.

Recall that if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a fusion system over a  $p$ -group  $P$ , a subgroup  $Q$  of  $P$  is called  $\mathcal{F}$ -centric if  $C_P(R) = Z(R)$  for all subgroups  $R$  of  $P$  which are  $\mathcal{F}$ -isomorphic to  $Q$ .

**6.1 Proposition** *Let  $L/K$ ,  $b$ ,  $(P, e)$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  be as in Theorem 5.2.*

- (a) *A subgroup  $Q$  of  $P$  is fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -centralized if and only if it is fully  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -centralized.*
- (b) *A subgroup  $Q$  of  $P$  is fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -normalized if and only if it is fully  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -normalized.*
- (c) *A subgroup  $Q$  of  $P$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -centric if and only if it is  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -centric.*

**Proof** The ‘if’-parts follow immediately from the fact that the  $\mathcal{F}$ -isomorphism class of  $Q$  is a subset of the  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -isomorphism class of  $Q$ . For the forward implications note that by Theorem 5.2 two subgroups  $Q$  and  $Q'$  of  $P$  are  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -isomorphic if and only if there exists a subgroup  $Q''$  of  $P$  such that  $Q$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -isomorphic to  $Q''$  and  $Q' = \sigma^i(Q'')$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Moreover,  $\sigma^i(C_P(Q'')) = C_P(\sigma^i(Q''))$ ,  $\sigma^i(N_P(Q'')) = N_P(\sigma^i(Q''))$ , and  $\sigma^i(Z(Q'')) = Z(\sigma^i(Q''))$ , since  $\sigma^i$  is an automorphism of  $P$ . The result is now immediate.  $\square$

The following Theorem is known to experts. See for instance the part of the proof of [L18, Theorem 8.5.2] dealing with the extension axiom and note that it does not use any assumptions on the field of coefficients  $k$ . Below is a proof with a different approach, using Theorem 5.2.

**6.2 Theorem** *Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic  $p > 0$  and let  $c$  be a block idempotent of  $kG$ . Then the extension axiom holds for the fusion system of  $kGc$ , for any choice of maximal Brauer pair.*

**Proof** Let  $(P, f)$  be a maximal  $kGc$ -Brauer pair. We apply Theorem 5.2 with  $K = k$ , a splitting field  $L$  of  $KC_G(P)f$  such that  $L/K$  is a finite Galois extension with Galois group  $\Gamma$ , and to a block idempotent  $b$  of  $LG$  with  $cb \neq 0$ . Then  $c = \tilde{b}$ . Moreover, there exists a maximal  $LGb$ -Brauer pair  $(P, e)$  such that  $ef = e$  and therefore  $f = \tilde{e}$ . We aim to show that the fusion system  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_{(P, \tilde{e})}(KG\tilde{b})$  satisfies the extension axiom. Note that by Theorem 3.7, the extension axiom holds for  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{(P, e)}(LGb)$ , since  $L$  is a splitting field of  $LC_G(P)e$ . Let  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(Q, P)$  be such that  $\varphi(Q)$  is fully  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -normalized. By Theorem 5.2 we can factorize  $\varphi = \sigma^i \circ \psi$  for some  $\psi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, P)$ . With  $\varphi(Q)$  also  $\psi(Q) = \sigma^{-i}(\varphi(Q))$  is fully  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -normalized, since they are  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -isomorphic and  $N_P(\psi(Q)) = \sigma^{-i}(N_P(\varphi(Q)))$ . By Proposition 6.1(b),  $\psi(Q)$  is fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -normalized. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  satisfies the extension axiom, there exists  $\hat{\psi} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(N_\psi, P)$  such that  $\hat{\psi}|_Q = \psi$ . It follows that  $\hat{\varphi} := \sigma^i \circ \hat{\psi} \in \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(N_\psi, P)$  extends  $\varphi$ . To finish the proof it suffices to show that  $N_\varphi \subseteq N_\psi$ . So let  $x \in N_\varphi$ . Then  $x \in N_P(Q)$  and there exists  $y \in N_P(\varphi(Q))$  with  $\varphi \circ c_x = c_y \circ \varphi: Q \xrightarrow{\sim} \varphi(Q)$ . But this implies

$$\psi \circ c_x = \sigma^{-i} \circ \varphi \circ c_x = \sigma^{-i} \circ c_y \circ \varphi = c_{\sigma^{-i}(y)} \circ \sigma^{-i} \circ \varphi = c_{\sigma^{-i}(y)} \circ \psi,$$

with  $\sigma^{-i}(y) \in \sigma^{-i}(N_P(\varphi(Q))) = N_P(\sigma^{-i}(\varphi(Q))) = N_P(\psi(Q))$ . Thus,  $N_\varphi \subseteq N_\psi$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**6.3 Theorem** *Let  $L/K$ ,  $b$ ,  $(P, e)$  and  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  be as in Theorem 5.2. The fusion system  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is saturated if and only if the fusion system  $\mathcal{F}$  is saturated and  $p$  does not divide  $[N_G(P, \tilde{e}) : N_G(P, e)] = [\Gamma_b : \Gamma_e] = [K(e) : K(b)]$ . In particular, if moreover  $L$  is a splitting field for  $LC_G(P)e$ , then  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  is saturated if and only if  $p$  does not divide  $[N_G(P, \tilde{e}) : N_G(P, e)] = [\Gamma_b : \Gamma_e] = [K(e) : K(b)]$ .*

**Proof** Note that the map  $N_G(P, e) \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$ ,  $g \mapsto c_g$  induces an isomorphism  $N_G(P, e)/C_G(P) \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$  which maps  $PC_G(P)/C_G(P)$  to  $\text{Aut}_P(P)$ . Thus, the Sylow axiom holds for  $\mathcal{F}$  if and only if  $p \nmid [N_G(P, e) : PC_G(P)]$ . Similarly, the Sylow axiom holds for  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  if

and only if  $p \nmid [N_G(P, \tilde{e}) : PC_G(P)]$ . By Theorem 6.2 it suffices to show that the Sylow axiom holds for  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$  if and only if it holds for  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $p \nmid [\Gamma_b : \Gamma_e]$ . But, by Proposition 5.1(c), one has  $[\Gamma_b : \Gamma_e] = [N_G(P, \tilde{e}) : N_G(P, e)] = [K(e) : K(b)]$  which implies the result.  $\square$

Next we will show that a weak form of Alperin's fusion theorem holds for arbitrary block fusion systems.

**6.4 Definition** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a fusion system over a  $p$ -group  $P$ . We say that *Alperin's weak fusion theorem holds for  $\mathcal{F}$*  if  $\mathcal{F} = \langle \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q) \mid Q \in \mathcal{C} \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of subgroups of  $P$  which are  $\mathcal{F}$ -centric and fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -normalized.

**6.5 Theorem** *Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic  $p$  and let  $c$  be a block idempotent of  $kG$ . Then Alperin's weak fusion theorem holds for the fusion system of  $kGc$ , for any choice of maximal  $kGc$ -Brauer pair.*

**Proof** Set  $K := k$  and choose  $L, b, (P, e)$  as in the proof of Theorem 6.2 with  $c = \tilde{b}$  and apply Theorem 5.2 to this situation with  $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_{(P, e)}(LGb)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} := \mathcal{F}_{(P, \tilde{e})}(KG\tilde{b})$ . We need to show that Alperin's weak fusion theorem holds for  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is saturated, Alperin's weak fusion theorem holds for  $\mathcal{F}$ , see for instance [L18, Theorem 8.2.8]. Thus,  $\mathcal{F} = \langle \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q) \mid Q \in \mathcal{C} \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  denotes the set of subgroups of  $P$  which are  $\mathcal{F}$ -centric and fully  $\mathcal{F}$ -normalized. Moreover, by Proposition 6.1,  $\mathcal{C}$  is equal to the set  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  of subgroups of  $P$  which are  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -centric and fully  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ -normalized. Thus, by Theorem 5.2, we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \langle \mathcal{F}, \sigma \rangle = \langle \{ \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q) \mid Q \in \mathcal{C} \} \cup \{ \sigma \} \rangle \subseteq \langle \text{Aut}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(Q) \mid Q \in \mathcal{C} \rangle \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}.$$

But this implies  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \langle \text{Aut}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(Q) \mid Q \in \mathcal{C} \rangle = \langle \text{Aut}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(Q) \mid Q \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rangle$ , which means that Alperin's weak fusion theorem holds for  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ .  $\square$

## References

- [AKO11] M. ASCHBACHER, R. KESSAR, B. OLIVER: Fusion systems in Algebra and topology. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 391. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.
- [B10] S. BOUC: Biset functors for finite groups. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1990. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
- [L18] M. LINCKELMANN: The block theory of finite group algebras. Vol. II. London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 92. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2018.