

RATIONAL $SU(3)$ -EQUIVARIANT COHOMOLOGY THEORIES

J.P.C.GREENLEES

ABSTRACT. We describe the spectral space of conjugacy classes of subgroups of $SU(3)$, together with the additional structure of a sheaf of rings and a component structure. It is a disjoint union of 18 blocks each dominated by a subgroup. For each of these blocks we identify a sheaf of rings and component structure. Taken together, this gives an abelian category $\mathcal{A}(SU(3))$ designed to reflect the structure of rational $SU(3)$ -equivariant cohomology theories, and we assemble the results from elsewhere to show that the category of rational $SU(3)$ -spectra is Quillen equivalent to the category of differential graded objects of $\mathcal{A}(SU(3))$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Subgroups of proper subgroups of $SU(3)$	4
3. Old subgroups of $SU(3)$	7
4. New subgroups of $SU(3)$	8
5. Models	11
References	14

1. INTRODUCTION

1.A. **Context.** It is conjectured [4] that for each compact Lie group G there is an abelian category $\mathcal{A}(G)$ and a Quillen equivalence between the category of rational G -spectra and the category of differential graded objects of $\mathcal{A}(G)$:

$$G\text{-spectra} \simeq_Q \text{DG-}\mathcal{A}(G).$$

This is known for a range of small groups and the purpose of this note is to prove the conjecture for $G = SU(3)$ and all its subgroups.

1.B. **Strategy.** In effect the algebraic model $\mathcal{A}(G)$ is built by assembling data for each conjugacy class of subgroups $H \subseteq G$. Indeed, the data over (H) is a model for G -spectra with geometric isotropy concentrated on the single conjugacy class (H) , which is equivalent to free $W_G(H)$ -spectra [6] and this has the model $\mathcal{A}(G|(H))$ consisting of torsion modules over the twisted group ring $H^*(BW_G^e(H))[W_G^d(H)]$ [14], where the Weyl group $W_G(H) = N_G(H)/H$

The author is grateful for comments, discussions and related collaborations with S.Balchin, D.Barnes, T.Barthel, M.Kedziorek, L.Pol, J.Williamson. The work is partially supported by EPSRC Grant EP/W036320/1. The author would also like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme Equivariant Homotopy Theory in Context, where later parts of work on this paper was undertaken. This work was supported by EPSRC grant EP/Z000580/1.

has identity component $W_G^e(H)$ and discrete quotient $W_G^d(H) = \pi_0(W_G(H))$. We will view this as stating that $\mathcal{A}(G)$ consists of ‘sheaves’ over the space $\mathfrak{X}_G = \text{Sub}(G)/G$ of conjugacy classes of subgroups of G , but the precise meaning of the word ‘sheaves’ and the additional structure on these ‘sheaves’ needs considerable elucidation; indeed it is the main content of the model.

In any case, this form suggests that if H is a subgroup of G and we restrict sheaves over $\text{Sub}(G)/G$ to conjugacy classes of subgroups of H , we may expect the category to be closely related to $\mathcal{A}(H)$, though of course the fusion of conjugacy classes along the map $\mathfrak{X}_H = \text{Sub}(H)/H \rightarrow \text{Sub}(G)/G = \mathfrak{X}_G$ will need to be taken into account, along with the transition from $W_H(K)$ to $W_G(K)$. This in turn means that when constructing $\mathcal{A}(G)$ it is natural to adopt an inductive approach and begin by giving a construction of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ for all subgroups H of G . Information on subgroups of $U(2)$ is already in [10], which is in effect the most complicated part of the model. Nonetheless, some work and care is needed to assemble the information for $SU(3)$ itself.

1.C. Partitions. The fact that $\text{Sub}(G)/G$ is the Balmer spectrum of finite rational G -spectra [6] suggests some of the relevant additional structure. The Balmer spectrum is equipped with the Zariski topology, and we write $\mathfrak{X}_G = \text{Sub}(G)/G$ for this space. As described in [1] we may use the language of Priestley spaces, and state that \mathfrak{X}_G has underlying constructible topology on $\text{Sub}(G)/G$ being the h -topology (the quotient topology of the Hausdorff metric topology on $\text{Sub}(G)$), and the spectral ordering is the cotal ordering¹. Thus the closed sets of \mathfrak{X}_G are precisely the h -closed sets closed under cotal specialization.

One may show in general that \mathfrak{X}_G admits a partition into Zariski clopen blocks of rather standard forms: thus

$$\mathfrak{X}_G = \mathcal{V}_1^G \amalg \mathcal{V}_2^G \amalg \cdots \amalg \mathcal{V}_n^G,$$

where each summand \mathcal{V}_i^G is ‘dominated’ by a subgroup $H = H_i$ of G . This means first of all that $W_G(H)$ is finite. We may then choose an h -neighbourhood \mathcal{N}_H^H of H in $\Phi(H)$ (conjugacy classes of subgroups of with finite Weyl groups), so that the image \mathcal{N}_H^G of \mathcal{N}_H^H in $\text{Sub}(G)/G$ by fusing H -conjugacy classes into G -conjugacy classes, also consists of subgroups with finite Weyl group. Now we take $\mathcal{V}_i^G = \mathcal{V}_H^G = \Lambda_{ct}(\mathcal{N}_H^G)$ to be the closure under cotal specialization of \mathcal{N}_H^G . In particular \mathcal{V}_H^G consists of conjugacy classes of subgroups of H .

The existence of the partition of \mathfrak{X}_G into blocks means that the algebraic model splits as a product

$$\mathcal{A}(G) = \mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_1^G) \times \mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_2^G) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_n^G).$$

This corresponds to the decomposition

$$G\text{-spectra} \simeq G\text{-spectra}\langle \mathcal{V}_1^G \rangle \times G\text{-spectra}\langle \mathcal{V}_2^G \rangle \times \cdots \times G\text{-spectra}\langle \mathcal{V}_n^G \rangle$$

into G -spectra with the specified geometric isotropy given by the Burnside ring idempotents supported on the blocks.

Restricting attention to one piece, let us consider $\mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_H^G)$ where \mathcal{V}_H^G is the block dominated by the subgroup H . For subgroups of $SU(3)$, it will be easy to see what the category $\mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_H^G)$ should be, but it is worth explaining how this should work more generally.

¹ K is *cotal* in H if K is normal in H with quotient a torus.

1.D. General expectations. The algebraic model $\mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_H^G)$ depends on the structure of the subgroup H , on the fusion from H -conjugacy to G -conjugacy and on the structure of normalizers. We describe here the simplest possible behaviour; the general behaviour is of a similar form. Suppose then that the identity component of H has the form $H_e = \Sigma \times_Z T$, where Σ is semisimple, T is a torus and Z is a finite central subgroup. Here T is the identity component of the centre of H_e so it is characteristic and acted upon by the finite component group $W = H_d$. We consider the rational representation $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}} = H_1(T; \mathbb{Q})$ of the finite group W and write it as a sum of isotypical pieces

$$\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}} = S_1^{n_1} \oplus S_2^{n_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus S_s^{n_s}$$

where the S_i are pairwise non-isomorphic simple representations and S_1 is the trivial representation. The simplest case is when this rational decomposition comes from an integral decomposition of the toral lattice $\Lambda_0 = H_1(T; \mathbb{Z})$, and a direct product decomposition of the torus

$$T = T_1 \times T_2 \times \cdots \times T_s.$$

In this simplest case

$$\mathcal{N}_H^H = \{T_1\} \times \mathcal{N}_2^H \times \cdots \times \mathcal{N}_s^H,$$

where each \mathcal{N}_i^H is the compact, Hausdorff, totally disconnected space of W -invariant subgroups of T_i , and in the simplest case this product decomposition is preserved by the fusion to G -conjugacy classes. In that case, up to fusion, \mathcal{V}_H^G is the product with $\text{Sub}(T_1)$.

The message is that the general form of \mathfrak{X}_G is determined by the isotypical decomposition of the rational toral lattice $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$. Fusion and group theory mean that the actual structure needs detailed analysis.

Almost all the examples H that have so far been completely determined have just one isotypical piece. The exception is the normalizer of the maximal torus in $U(2)$ as in [9].

The model $\mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_H^G)$ takes the form of a sheaf of modules over a sheaf of rings, with stalk $H^*(BW_G^e(K))$ over K . This has some additional structure. First of all, the stalks over cotoral subgroups are related in a way reflecting the Localization Theorem, and the whole structure is equivariant for the component structure given by the finite groups $W_G^d(K)$ associated to each subgroup.

1.E. Associated work in preparation. This paper is the fifth in a series of 5 constructing an algebraic category $\mathcal{A}(SU(3))$ and showing it gives an algebraic model for rational $SU(3)$ -spectra. This series gives a concrete illustrations of general results in small and accessible examples.

The first paper [7] describes the group theoretic data that feeds into the construction of an abelian category $\mathcal{A}(G)$ for a toral group G and makes it explicit for toral subgroups of rank 2 connected groups.

The second paper [8] constructs algebraic models for all relevant 1-dimensional blocks, and the results are applied in the present paper to each of the five 1-dimensional blocks for $SU(3)$. The third paper [9] constructs algebraic models for blocks of rank 2 toral groups of mixed type.

The fourth paper [10] constructs $\mathcal{A}(U(2))$ in 7 blocks (5 of them 1-dimensional, and 2 of them 2-dimensional) and shows it is equivalent to the category of rational $U(2)$ -spectra. The analysis of the 1-dimensional blocks uses [8] and the analysis of the block of the maximal torus normalizer uses [9].

In this fifth paper, the work of the previous four parts is assembled to a model of rational $SU(3)$ -spectra. The 7 blocks from $U(2)$ survive with a little fusion, there are 2 more 1-dimensional blocks and 9 new 0-dimensional blocks.

This series is part of a more general programme. Future installments will consider blocks with Noetherian Balmer spectra [13] (the case where $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a trivial representation) and those with no cotoral inclusions [11] (the case where $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ contains no trivial representation). An account of the general nature of the models is in preparation [12], and the author hopes that this will be the basis of the proof that the category of rational G -spectra has an algebraic model in general.

1.F. Organization. In Section 2 we recall from [8, 10] the blocks $\mathcal{V}_H^{G'}$ of $\mathfrak{X}_{G'}$ for various subgroups G' of G . In Section 3 we explain the necessary changes to the blocks $\mathcal{V}_H^{G'}$ when taken up to G -conjugacy to form blocks \mathcal{V}_H^G in \mathfrak{X}_G , and in Section 4 we describe the blocks \mathcal{V}_H^G of groups H not contained in $U(2)$. Finally, in Section 5 we describe the models $\mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V}_H^G)$ where these differ from $\mathcal{A}(H|\mathcal{V}_H^{G'})$ and explain why they provide models for G -spectra over \mathcal{V}_H^G .

1.G. Notation. The ambient group throughout this paper is $G = SU(3)$, although we will usually write the full name. The principal copy of $U(2)$ is the subgroup preserving the decomposition $\mathbb{C}^3 = \mathbb{C}^2 \oplus \mathbb{C}$. We write \mathbb{T} for the subgroup of diagonal matrices: this is the chosen maximal torus of both $U(2)$ and $SU(3)$. We write Z for the centre of $U(2)$, which consists of matrices $\text{diag}(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda^{-2})$, and \tilde{T} for the maximal torus of $SU(2)$ (consisting of matrices $\text{diag}(\lambda, \lambda^{-1}, 1)$).

Since $Z \cap \tilde{T}$ is of order 2, we may need to consider central products, and if $A \subseteq Z, B \subseteq SU(2)$ we write $A \times_2 B$ for the image of $A \times B$ in $U(2) = (Z \times SU(2))/C_2$ under the central quotient.

2. SUBGROUPS OF PROPER SUBGROUPS OF $SU(3)$

In constructing the models $\mathcal{A}(G)$, it is convenient to proceed group by group, steadily increasing the complexity of G . In fact $\mathcal{A}(G)$ essentially contains the models $\mathcal{A}(H)$ for all subgroups H of G , so it is convenient to have a the models $\mathcal{A}(H)$ to hand before tackling $\mathcal{A}(G)$. The word ‘essentially’ covers two main changes: (i) several H -conjugacy classes may fuse to form a G -conjugacy class and (ii) the normalizer of a subgroup K in H is a subgroup of the normalizer in G and hence the H -Weyl group $W_H(K)$ is a subgroup of the G -Weyl group $W_G(K)$. These two changes mean that $\mathcal{A}(H)$ will need to be adapted to give the corresponding part of the model in G , but the adjustments are secondary in nature. This section gives a summary of the spaces \mathfrak{X}_G for proper subgroups G of $SU(3)$.

We may tabulate the dominant subgroups H and their blocks as follows. A subgroup H is indicated by the pair (H_e, F) where F is a finite subgroup of $W_G(H_e)$. In the rest of the

section we will give a little more detail.

G	(H_e, F)	$\dim(\mathcal{V}_{(H_e, F)}^G)$	$W_G(H)$	
$SO(2)$	$(SO(2), 1)$	1	1	[8]
$O(2)$	$(SO(2), 1)$	1	C_2	[8]
	$(SO(2), C_2)$	1	1	[8]
$SO(3)$	$(T, 1)$	1	C_2	[8]
	(T, C_2)	1	1	[8]
	$(SO(3), 1)$	0	1	Discrete
	$(1, A_5)$	0	1	Discrete
	$(1, \Sigma_4)$	0	1	Discrete
	$(1, A_4)$	0	C_2	Discrete
	$(1, D_4)$	0	Σ_3	Discrete
$U(2)$	$(T^2, 1)$	2	C_2	[5, 2]
	(T^2, C_2)	2	1	[9]
	$(U(2), 1)$	1	1	[8]
	(Z, A_5)	1	1	[8]
	(Z, Σ_4)	1	1	[8]
	(Z, A_4)	1	C_2	[8]
	(Z, D_4)	1	Σ_3	[8]

2.A. **The circle group $SO(2)$.** The proper subgroups of the circle group form the set \mathcal{C} of finite cyclic groups, and $\mathfrak{X}_{SO(2)} = \text{Sub}(SO(2)) = \mathcal{V}_{SO(2)}^{SO(2)}$ is its one-point compactification. The cotoral relation has finite subgroups cotoral in $SO(2)$.

Of course the group $Spin(2)$ is also a circle group, so we do not need a separate entry. However we comment that factoring out the element of order 2 gives a map $\mathfrak{X}_{Spin(2)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_{SO(2)}$ which is surjective, but with fibres consisting of a single point over cyclic subgroups of even order and two points over cyclic subgroups of odd order.

2.B. **The group $O(2)$.** The space $\mathfrak{X}_{O(2)} = \text{Sub}(O(2))/O(2)$ can be broken into two blocks. The toral part $\mathcal{V}_{SO(2)}^{O(2)}$ is equal to $\mathfrak{X}_{SO(2)} = \text{Sub}(SO(2))$ since each subgroup of $SO(2)$ is characteristic. The remainder consists of the discrete space \mathcal{D} of conjugacy classes of finite dihedral groups, together with $O(2)$ itself as the one point compactification. Altogether we have

$$\mathfrak{X}_{O(2)} = \mathcal{V}_{O(2)}^{O(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{SO(2)}^{O(2)}.$$

2.C. **The group $Pin(2)$.** The space $\mathfrak{X}_{Pin(2)} = \text{Sub}(Pin(2))/Pin(2)$ can be broken into two blocks. The toral part $\mathcal{V}_{Spin(2)}^{Pin(2)}$ is homeomorphic to $\mathfrak{X}_{Spin(2)} = \text{Sub}(Spin(2))$ since each subgroup of $Spin(2)$ is characteristic. The remainder consists of the discrete space \mathcal{Q} of conjugacy classes of finite quaternion groups, together with $Pin(2)$ itself as the one point compactification. Altogether we have

$$\mathfrak{X}_{Pin(2)} = \mathcal{V}_{Pin(2)}^{Pin(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{Spin(2)}^{Pin(2)}.$$

The only reason for writing this out is to comment that although this is homeomorphic to $\mathfrak{X}_{O(2)}$ the homeomorphism is factoring out the centre on the $Pin(2)$ block, but not on the $Spin(2)$ block.

2.D. **The group $SO(3)$.** The space $\mathfrak{X}_{SO(3)} = \text{Sub}(SO(3))/SO(3)$ can be broken into 7 blocks. There are 5 singleton blocks $\mathcal{V}_H^{SO(3)}$ dominated by $H \in \{SO(3), A_5, \Sigma_4, A_4, D_4\}$. There is the block $\mathcal{V}_{SO(2)}^{SO(3)}$ dominated by the maximal torus $SO(2)$, and there is the block $\mathcal{V}_{O(2)}^{SO(3)}$ dominated by the normalizer $O(2)$ of the maximal torus. In summary, we have a partition

$$\mathfrak{X}_{SO(3)} = \mathcal{V}_{SO(2)}^{SO(3)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{O(2)}^{SO(3)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{SO(3)}^{SO(3)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{A_5}^{SO(3)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\Sigma_4}^{SO(3)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{A_4}^{SO(3)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{D_4}^{SO(3)}$$

into 7 clopen pieces. We note here that $\mathcal{V}_{O(2)}^{SO(3)}$ is the 1-point compactification of \mathcal{D}' of dihedral subgroups of order ≥ 6 . The remaining two conjugacy classes from \mathcal{D} are treated separately. In $SO(3)$, the dihedral group D_2 is conjugate to C_2 so that it appears in $\mathcal{V}_{SO(2)}^{SO(3)}$. It is convenient to treat the dihedral group D_4 separately in $\mathcal{V}_{D_4}^{SO(3)}$ because its Weyl group is larger than that of all larger dihedral groups.

2.E. **The group $SU(2)$.** At this level, the analysis of $SU(2)$ is exactly like that of $SO(3)$. We need only replace the dominant groups $SO(3), O(2), SO(2), A_5, \Sigma_4, A_4$ and D_4 by their double covers, $SU(2), Pin(2), Spin(2), \tilde{A}_5, \tilde{\Sigma}_4, \tilde{A}_4$ and \tilde{D}_4 . The actual sets of subgroups in each block are different of course.

However the changes are perhaps less than expected, since finite subgroups outside the torus block intersect the centre trivially. This means that reducing mod the centre gives a homeomorphism $\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{H}}^{U(2)} \cong \mathcal{V}_H^{SO(3)}$ unless $H = SO(2)$. This homeomorphism also preserves Weyl groups. On the other hand, reduction modulo the centre gives a map $\mathcal{V}_{Spin(2)}^{SU(2)} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{SO(2)}^{SO(3)}$ which is surjective, but with fibres consisting of a single point over cyclic subgroups of even order and two points over cyclic subgroups of odd order. The Weyl groups also change as we discuss below.

In any case, we have a partition

$$\mathfrak{X}_{SU(2)} = \mathcal{V}_{Spin(2)}^{SU(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{Pin(2)}^{SU(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{SU(2)}^{SU(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{A}_5}^{SU(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{\Sigma}_4}^{SU(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{A}_4}^{SU(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{D}_4}^{SU(2)}$$

2.F. **The group $U(2)$.** The group $U(2)$ is quite involved. We give a summary here, and a full description is given in [10].

The centre of $U(2)$ consists of scalar matrices and the quotient map $q : U(2) \rightarrow PU(2) = SO(3)$ gives a bijection of blocks, so there are 7 blocks of $\text{Sub}(U(2))/U(2)$. Each of them is of dimension one more than the corresponding block in $SO(3)$.

The partition of $SO(3)$ into the seven clopen pieces gives a clopen partition of $\mathfrak{X}_{U(2)}$ into seven blocks,

$$p_*^{-1} \mathcal{V}_H^{SO(3)} = \mathcal{V}_{p^{-1}H}^{U(2)},$$

where

$$p^{-1}(H) = \tilde{H} \times_{C_2} Z,$$

where $Z = ZU(2)$ consists of the scalar matrices. Note that if K lies in $p_*^{-1}(\mathcal{V}_H^{SO(3)})$ then $p(K) \subseteq (H)$ and so $\tilde{K} = p^{-1}(K) \subseteq \tilde{H}$ and $K \subseteq \tilde{H} \times_{C_2} Z$.

Thus the partition takes the form

$$\mathfrak{X}_{U(2)} = \mathcal{V}_{T^2}^{U(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{Pin(2) \times_{C_2} Z}^{U(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{U(2)}^{U(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{A}_5 \times_{C_2} Z}^{U(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{\Sigma}_4 \times_{C_2} Z}^{U(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{A}_4 \times_{C_2} Z}^{U(2)} \amalg \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{D}_4 \times_{C_2} Z}^{U(2)},$$

where the first 2 blocks are 2-dimensional, and the remaining 5 blocks are 1-dimensional.

3. OLD SUBGROUPS OF $SU(3)$

Many subgroups of $SU(3)$ are conjugate to subgroups of $U(2)$, which were analyzed in [10], as summarised in Section 2 above. For these subgroups, the only question is whether $U(2)$ -conjugacy classes fuse in $SU(3)$. The question is settled in this section.

3.A. Singular subgroups. We make constant reference to subgroups of the maximal torus, so it is worth collecting basic facts. The maximal torus consists of elements $\text{diag}(z_1, z_2, z_3)$ with $z_1 z_2 z_3 = 1$. The singular elements are those lying in more than one maximal torus, and they are those lying in the kernel U_α of some global root $\vartheta_\alpha : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow T$, which is to say they are elements with $z_i = z_j$ for some $i \neq j$. The centre is the intersection of these: the cyclic group generated by $\text{diag}(\omega, \omega, \omega)$ with $\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$.

We will repeatedly make the argument that the normalizer of a non-singular subgroup normalizes the maximal torus.

Lemma 3.1. *If $S \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ contains a non-singular element then $N_G(S) \subseteq N_G(\mathbb{T})$.*

Proof: If $S \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ and $S^a = S$ then $S \subseteq \mathbb{T}^a$, so if S contains a non-singular element then $\mathbb{T}^a = \mathbb{T}$. □

This deals with most cases, and the remaining cases are simplified by low dimensions and the following easily verified fact.

Lemma 3.2. *The only subgroups of $SU(3)$ consisting entirely of singular elements are those lying in a single kernel U_α .*

Some other variants are also useful.

Lemma 3.3. *If $a \notin N_G(\mathbb{T})$ and $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ with $A = B^a$ then A lies in a singular circle. The only subgroups lying in two distinct central circles are the trivial group and the centre.*

Proof: Each maximal torus consists of the diagonal matrices for some orthonormal frame. Suppose \mathbb{T} corresponds to the standard frame $E = (e_1, e_2, e_3)$ and \mathbb{T}^a corresponds to $F = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$. Suppose t has eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ for E .

If we write $f_1 = ae_1 + be_2 + ce_3$ then if $abc \neq 0$, since f_1 is an eigenvalue of t , we have $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3$ and t is central. If two of a, b and c are non-zero then the corresponding eigenvalues are equal and t lies in a singular circle. The only remaining alternative that f_1 is a multiple of one of the e_i . Arguing similarly with f_2, f_3 we see that either t is in a central circle or else the tori are equal, contradicting the assumption. □

3.B. Subgroups represented in $U(2)$. We are now equipped to consider the fusion on passage from $U(2)$ to $SU(3)$. We show that in fact there is very little new fusion.

Lemma 3.4. *The map $\text{Sub}(U(2))/U(2) \rightarrow \text{Sub}(SU(3))/SU(3)$ is injective except for conjugacy classes dominated by the maximal torus, or the maximal torus normalizer. In these cases the increase in Weyl group from C_2 to Σ_3 fuses subgroups in an easily understood way.*

Proof: We have seen that $\mathfrak{X}_{U(2)}$ has 7 blocks. The images of different blocks remain separate in $\mathfrak{X}_{SU(3)}$, so we may consider them in turn. If \mathcal{V} is one of the 5 blocks corresponding to

exceptional subgroups of $SO(3)$ two subgroups which are isomorphic are already conjugate. This proves injectivity on \mathcal{V} .

For the remainder we need to understand conjugacy of subgroups of the maximal torus. First, note that if $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ and $B^a = A$ then $A \subseteq \mathbb{T} \cap \mathbb{T}^a$. If $\mathbb{T}^a = \mathbb{T}$ then $a \in N_G(\mathbb{T})$ and the fusion is standard. Otherwise $\mathbb{T} \cap \mathbb{T}^a$ is a proper subgroup of \mathbb{T} . \square

Since subgroups of the circle are classified by their order and since the three singular circles are conjugate, it follows that for the block of the maximal torus the only fusion is due to the enlargement of the Weyl group from C_2 to Σ_3 .

Corollary 3.5. *If $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ are conjugate in $SU(3)$ then B^a is conjugate to A in $U(2)$ where a is a permutation matrix of order 1 or 3.*

Finally, we consider the block of the maximal torus normalizer. The claim that there is no new fusion is covered by the following. First we recall that any full subgroup of the maximal torus normalizer in $U(2)$ is of the form $H(A, \sigma) = \langle H, \sigma \rangle$, where $A \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ and σ maps to the generator of the Weyl group.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose given two full subgroups $H(A, \sigma), H(B, \tau)$ of the maximal torus normalizer. If $H(A, \sigma) = H(B, \tau)^a$ with $a \in SU(3)$ then (i) $A = B^a$ (ii) $A = B^c$ where c is a permutation matrix of order 1 or 3 and (iii) $H(A, \sigma) = H(B, \tau)^d$ with $d \in U(2)$.*

Proof: We will argue below that if $H(A, \sigma) = H(B, \tau)^a$ then in fact $A = B^a$. From Lemma 3.3 either $a \in N_G(\mathbb{T})$ or else A lies in a central circle. If $a \in N_G(\mathbb{T})$ then the fusion is just what is expected from passing from subgroups of $W_{U(2)}(\mathbb{T}) = C_2$ to $N_{SU(3)}(\mathbb{T}) = \Sigma_3$. However there is in fact no instance of a subgroup $H(A, \sigma)$ so that a permutation matrix of order 3 preserves A : no rank 2 lattices (12)-invariant lattices of Λ^0 are also invariant under (123).

Finally we argue that if A lies in a central circle $H(A, \sigma) = H(A, \tau^a)$ implies conjugacy in $U(2)$.

In our case each of the full groups $H(A, \sigma)$ has A as a subgroup of index 2. If A is not fixed by σ then the nonidentity block is determined by group theoretic properties. Indeed $C_H(x)$ is either (i) H if $x \in A^W$ or (ii) A if $x \in A \setminus A^W$ or (iii) A^W if $x \notin A$. Thus if $H(B, \tau)^a = H(B^a, \tau^a) = H(A, \sigma)$ it follows that $B^a = A$.

Finally if $A = A^W$ then $A \cap U(2)$ consists of scalar matrices, so A is generated by $\text{diag}(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda^{-2})$ for some λ . If A is central then A is of order 1 or 3, so $A = B^a$. Otherwise A determines an orthogonal decomposition of $\mathbb{C}^3 = V_1 \oplus V_2$, and hence A is determined as the set of elements acting as a scalar on V_2 . Once again $A = B^a$. \square

4. NEW SUBGROUPS OF $SU(3)$

We need to describe the subgroups not represented in $U(2)$. In principle it might happen that such a subgroup H might have a cotoral subgroup inside $U(2)$, but this does not in fact happen.

Proposition 4.1. *There are 11 conjugacy classes of subgroups of $SU(3)$ not conjugate to subgroups of $U(2)$.*

- (i) $SU(3)$ itself
- (ii) subgroups of local type $T \times T$ and block group Σ_3 or C_3 , together with their full subgroups.
- (iii) subgroups of local type $SU(2)$ isomorphic to $SO(3)$ and
- (iv) subgroups of local type 1, where there are 7 additional conjugacy classes of finite subgroups.

In Subsection 4.C we will deduce this from the classical Miller-Blichfeldt-Dickson classification of finite subgroups of $SU(3)$. Theorem 4.3 gives a summary of the analysis.

4.A. The strategy for classifying subgroups. The general proof is constructive and we simply follow it through in this case. It may be easier to follow if we describe the general process first.

- **Step 1:** Enumerate the local types \mathfrak{h} that can occur. This is routine from the classification of Lie algebras.
- **Step 2:** For each local type \mathfrak{h} , find which connected groups H_e of local type \mathfrak{h} can occur as subgroups of G , and classify occurrences up to conjugacy. If $G = U(n)$, this is just a matter of counting isomorphism classes of n -dimensional representations of H_e . The well-developed apparatus of representation theory makes this routine.
- **Step 3:** For each conjugacy class of connected subgroup H_e , identify conjugacy classes of subgroups H with identity component H_e . Since H_e is normal in H and $N_G(H) \subseteq N_G(H_e)$ we may work inside $W_G(H_e)$. Accordingly, the problem is precisely to classify finite subgroups of $W_G(H_e)$ up to conjugacy. This can be hard, but for small groups the classification is known.

This process reduces us to consideration of the finite subgroups of $W_G(H_e)$ for connected subgroups H_e . This includes finite subgroups of G (corresponding to $H_e = 1$) but for $H_e \neq 1$ $W_G(H_e)$ is of smaller dimension than G .

We are left with a list of pairs (H_e, F) with H_e a connected subgroup of G and F a finite subgroup of $W_G(H_e)$; the associated subgroup H is the inverse image of F in $N_G(H_e)$. Assuming that $\text{Sub}(G')/G'$ has already been identified for subgroups G' of G , we need only consider the maximal subgroups (H_e, F) .

4.B. The strategy for decomposing into blocks. We have described how to identify all conjugacy classes of subgroups, but what we really want to do is to decompose $\text{Sub}(G)/G$ into blocks.

Starting with the largest groups, we allocate subgroups to blocks. Suppose that the process has been started, and that all subgroups of higher rank than the connected subgroup H_e have been allocated to a block.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose H_e is a connected subgroup of G and write $W = W_G(H_e)$. Subgroups H not included in previous blocks with identity component H_e correspond to finite subgroups $F \subseteq W$ with $N_W(F)$ finite.*

Proof: Any subgroup H with identity component H_e will lie in $N_G(H_e)$, so the possibilities for H correspond to finite subgroups of the Weyl group $W_G(H_e)$. For each such finite subgroup F we may consider the inverse image H in $N_G(H_e)$. If $W_G(H)$ is infinite then H is cotoral in a group considered previously. Since $N_G(H) \subseteq N_G(H_e)$, $N_G(H)/H_e = N_W(H/H_e) = N_W(F)$. \square

4.C. Conjugacy classes of maximal subgroups for $SU(3)$. The local types of subgroups of $SU(3)$ of rank 2 are $SU(3)$, $SU(2) \times T$ and T^2 . The local types of rank 1 are $SU(2)$ and T , and in rank 0 there is only the trivial local type.

Local type $SU(3)$: The group G itself is the only subgroup of local type of $SU(3)$ and it is both h-isolated and cotorally isolated, giving $\mathcal{N}_G^G = \mathcal{V}_G^G = \{G\}$.

Local type T^2 : By the uniqueness of maximal tori, there is a single conjugacy class of connected subgroups of local type T^2 . It is well known that the Weyl group of the maximal torus is Σ_3 , and the normalizer is a split extension $T^2 \cdot \Sigma_3$ (The group Σ_3 is generated by transpositions. We lift these to the negative of the permutation matrices).

Any subgroup H of $N_G(T^2)$ with identity component T^2 is of the form $\pi^{-1}(\overline{H})$ for a subgroup \overline{H} of Σ_3 where $\pi : N_G(T^2) \rightarrow \Sigma_3$ is the quotient map. This gives four components:

$$\mathcal{V}_{T^2,1}^G, \mathcal{V}_{T^2,C_2}^G, \mathcal{V}_{T^2,C_3}^G, \mathcal{V}_{T^2,\Sigma_3}^G$$

Local type $SU(2) \times T$: The simple representations are of the form $V_i \otimes z^j$ where V_i is the $(i+1)$ -dimensional representation of $SU(2)$ with weights $x^i, x^{i-1}y, x^{i-2}y^2, \dots, y^i$, and z is the natural representation of T . The representation $V_i \otimes z^j$ has determinant $z^{(i+1)j}$, so it only lies in the special unitary group if $j = 0$, when it is not almost-faithful. The only options for an almost-faithful map to $SU(3)$ are therefore $(V_1 \otimes z^j) \oplus (V_0 \otimes z^{-2j})$. If $j = 0$ this is not almost-faithful, and if $|j| \geq 1$ then the representation factors through $SU(2) \times T/T[j]$. Since we only care about the image, we only need to consider the case $(V_1 \otimes z) \oplus (V_0 \otimes z^{-2})$, giving the subgroup $U(2) = \{A \oplus (t) \mid A \in U(2), t = \det(A)^{-1}\}$. We note that $U(2)$ consists of all matrices zero at $(1, 3), (2, 3), (3, 1), (3, 2)$:

$$U(2) = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

and hence it is self-normalizing with $W_G(U(2)) = 1$. This gives one further block $\mathcal{V}_{U(2)}^G$.

Local type T : Connected subgroups of local type T are conjugate to a subgroup of the maximal torus. There are three singular circles, all of them conjugate; for definiteness, we focus on the subgroup $\text{diag}(z, z, z^{-2})$ which is central in our chosen copy of $U(2)$. One may check that the normalizer is also $U(2)$, so the subgroups have already been seen in our analysis of $U(2)$. The other circles are all regular, so their normalizers are the same as that of the maximal torus, so these subgroups they have been seen in our analysis of subgroups of $N_G(T^2)$.

Local type $SU(2)$: Subgroups of local type $SU(2)$ have almost-faithful 3 dimensional representations $V_1 \oplus V_0$ and V_2 . Those of the first type are copies of $SU(2)$ (since V_1 is faithful) and those of the second type are $SO(3)$ since V_2 has central elements in the kernel. One checks that $N_G(SU(2)) = N_G(U(2)) = U(2)$ and hence we have already seen all subgroups of the first type. Finally, $SO(3)$ is the set of real matrices in $SU(3)$, and therefore consists of points preserving a real subspace of \mathbb{C}^3 , so that $N_G(SO(3)) = SO(3)$.

Local type 1: Finally there are finite subgroups not contained in any of the previous groups.

Blichfeldt's classification [16, Chapter 12] of finite subgroups of $SU(3)$ has 5 families of classes denoted A, B, C, D, E. Type A consists of abelian subgroups, and all of these lie in a maximal torus, so have been already considered above. Those with a two dimensional

faithful representations are subgroups of $U(2)$ and these have been dealt with above. Types C and D occur inside $T^2 \rtimes \Sigma_3$ and so have also been considered above.

Finally, in Type E there are 7 exceptional finite subgroups $PSL_2(7)$, $A_5 \times C_3$, $PSL_2(7) \times C_3$, $A_6 \cdot 3$, $G_{36} \cdot 3$, $G_{72} \cdot 3$, $G_{216} \cdot 3$, giving 7 more singleton blocks. For the general form of the model, the exact structure of these groups is not important; their Weyl groups are finite and the structure is read off [16] and the summary [15].

4.D. The partition for $SU(3)$. We are now in a position to give a complete summary of the partition of closed subgroups of $SU(3)$ up to conjugacy.

Theorem 4.3. *There is a partition of $\mathfrak{X}_G = \text{Sub}(G)/G$ into 18 Zariski clopen sets $\mathcal{V}_{H_e, F}^G$ as follows. We tabulate the pairs (H_e, F) where H_e represents a conjugacy class of connected subgroups and F is a finite subgroup of $W_G(H_e)$. This is in order of decreasing size of (H_e, F) . For each such pair we name the dimension of the block $\mathcal{V}_{H_e, F}^G$ dominated by (H_e, F) , the Weyl group of H (always finite). This much is intrinsic data. We then list the subgroup where $\mathcal{V}_{H_e, F}^G$ is first treated appropriately and the reference.*

(H_e, F)	$\dim(\mathcal{V}_{(H_e, F)}^G)$	$W_G(H)$	\hat{H}	
$(G, 1)$	0	1	$SU(3)$	Discrete
$(U(2), 1)$	1	1	$U(2)$	[10]
(T^2, Σ_3)	1	1	$SU(3)$	[8]
(T^2, C_3)	1	C_2	$SU(3)$	[8]
(T^2, C_2)	2	1	$U(2)$	[10]
(T^2, C_1)	2	Σ_3	T^2	[5, 2]
$(SO(3), 1)$	0	1	$SO(3)$	Discrete
$(Z(U(2)), A_5)$	1	1	$U(2)$	[8]
$(Z(U(2)), \Sigma_4)$	1	1	$U(2)$	[8]
$(Z(U(2)), A_4)$	1	C_2	$U(2)$	[8]
$(Z(U(2)), D_4)$	1	Σ_3	$U(2)$	[8]
$(1, PSL_2(7))$	0	C_3	$SU(3)$	Discrete
$(1, PSL_2(7) \times C_3)$	0	1	$SU(3)$	Discrete
$(1, A_6 \cdot 3)$	0	1	$SU(3)$	Discrete
$(1, A_6)$	0	C_3	$SU(3)$	Discrete
$(1, G_{36} \cdot 3)$	0	1	$SU(3)$	Discrete
$(1, G_{72} \cdot 3)$	0	1	$SU(3)$	Discrete
$(1, G_{216} \cdot 3)$	0	1	$SU(3)$	Discrete

5. MODELS

Having described the partition of $\mathfrak{X}_{SU(3)}$ into 18 blocks, we may describe the models $\mathcal{A}(SU(3)|\mathcal{V}_H^{SU(3)})$, and explain where to find the proofs that each does give a model.

5.A. Dimension 0. There are nine 0-dimensional singleton blocks. By definition their Weyl group is finite, so the data for the one dominated by H is just the finite group $W_G(H)$. It is shown in [14] that $\mathbb{Q}[W_G(H)]$ -modules give a model.

Seven are finite groups occurring first for $SU(3)$. The other two are $SO(3)$ and $SU(3)$ itself, both of which are self-normalizing.

5.B. **Dimension 1.** There are seven 1-dimensional blocks. The data for these consists of a sheaf of rings and a component structure.

The blocks dominated by (T^2, Σ_3) and (T^2, C_3) occur first for $SU(3)$. As blocks of the corresponding toral group they are of Type 0, so there is nothing to say about the sheaf of rings. The component structure in the ambient toral group is determined in [7]. However the sheaf of rings and component structure is a little different in $G = SU(3)$ itself. Indeed, some of the groups (eg the element of order 3) have infinite Weyl groups in the whole groups. Similarly, even subgroups with finite Weyl groups in the ambient toral group could in principle have a bigger Weyl group in $SU(3)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $H = T^2 \rtimes C_3$ or $T^2 \rtimes \Sigma_3$ and $G = SU(3)$ and suppose K is a full subgroup of H with toral part S .*

(a) *If S is not singular $N_G(K) = N_H(K)$.*

(b) *If S is singular then S is central, then K is self-normalizing in H , so that $W_H(K) = 1$. If $H = T^2 \rtimes C_3$ then $W_G(K)$ is a 2-torus, and if $H = T^2 \rtimes \Sigma_3$ then $W_G(K)$ is of order 2.*

Proof: Suppose $K = H(S, \sigma)$ and $a \in N_G(K)$. Then by Lemma 3.6 we find $a \in N_G(S)$. If S is not singular in G then this means $a \in N_G(T^2)$. Since S is invariant under C_3 in both cases, this means that S is central, and therefore $S = 1$ or $S = C_3$.

If $S = 1$ and $H = T^2 \rtimes C_3$ then K is a non-central subgroup of order 3. It lies in some (other) maximal torus T' , where it is non-singular (the component group of H permutes the three coordinates transitively). Its normalizer therefore lies in $N_G(T')$, and it is not invariant under any non-identity element of $W_G(T')$. Its normalizer is thus T' . If $H = T^2 \rtimes \Sigma_3$ then may argue similarly with the Sylow 3-subgroup, so that $K = H(C_3, \tau)$ for an involution τ and $W_G(K)$ is of order 2.

If $S = C_3$ is central we may argue similarly in $G/Z = PSU(3)$. □

The five blocks dominated by a subgroup of $U(2)$ are of Type 1 in $U(2)$. The one dominated by $U(2)$ is straightforward.

Lemma 5.2. *Any subgroup K in the block dominated by $U(2)$ has the same normalizer in $SU(3)$ as in $U(2)$.*

Proof: The subgroup $U(2)$ itself is self-normalizing. Any other subgroup in this block has identity component $SU(2)$, which is also self-normalizing. Since $N_G(K) \subseteq N_G(K_e)$, this completes the proof. □

The remaining four need individual attention. For notation, we suppose $A \in \{A_5, \Sigma_4, A_4, D_4\}$, \tilde{A} is the double cover of A and $\hat{A} = Z\tilde{A} = \tilde{A} \times_2 Z$.

Lemma 5.3. *If K is dominated by \hat{A} in $U(2)$ (i.e., $K \in \mathcal{V}_{\hat{A}}^{U(2)}$) then $N_{SU(3)}(K) = N_{U(2)}(K)$.*

Proof: If a is the central element of order 2 in $U(2)$ (ie $a = -I$) then $\langle a \rangle$ lies in K and is characteristic in K . Thus if $g \in N_{SU(3)}(K)$ we have $a^g = a$ and $g \in C_G(a)$. By the standard formula for centralizers ([3, V.2.3]) $C_G(a) = U(2)$. □

Now that we have determined the sheaf of rings and component structure, we may turn to models. We proved in [8] that each 1-dimensional block \mathcal{V} with a single height 1 point

and all other points being finite has $\mathcal{A}(G|\mathcal{V})$ as a model. This applies to all 1-dimensional blocks except for the $(U(2), 1)$ block.

Furthermore, we proved in Lemma 3.4 that the data for the model is unchanged for all relevant subgroups of $U(2)$. Thus inclusion $U(2) \rightarrow SU(3)$ induces an equivalence for these blocks.

The block $(U(2), 1)$ is well behaved: all subgroups are normal and cotoral in $U(2)$ to the methods of [8] apply once again to show

- (1) $\mathcal{A}(SU(3)|\mathcal{V}_{U(2)}^{SU(3)})$ is a model for rational $SU(3)$ -spectra with geometric isotropy dominated by $U(2)$,
- (2) $\mathcal{A}(U(2)|\mathcal{V}_{U(2)}^{U(2)})$ is a model for rational $U(2)$ -spectra with geometric isotropy dominated by $U(2)$, and
- (3) restriction from $SU(3)$ to $U(2)$ induces an isomorphism of categories on this block.

5.C. Dimension 2. There are two 2-dimensional blocks. The one dominated by the maximal torus $\mathcal{A}(G|\text{toral})$ is treated in [5, 2]. However there is quite a lot to spell out. The Weyl groups of individual abelian subgroups A are as follows.

We recall that in $SU(3)$ the maximal torus T^2 consists of diagonal matrices $\text{diag}(z_1, z_2, z_3)$ with $z_1 z_2 z_3 = 1$. The singular elements are those with some pair of z_i being equal, and the centre consists of those where all three are equal.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose $S \subseteq T^2$.*

(a) *If S is non-singular then $N_G(S) \subseteq T^2 \rtimes \Sigma_3$, and is generated by T^2 together with the permutations preserving it.*

(b) *If S is singular then (after conjugating if necessary) it lies in the circle with $z_1 = z_2$. If it is not central, then $N_G(S) = N_{U(2)}(S)$.*

(c) *If S is central then $N_G(S) = G$.*

Proof: (a) This argument is becoming familiar. If S is non singular and $S = S^a$ then $T = T^a$.

(b) By Lemma 3.2 singular subgroups must be of the stated form.

Now if S consists of elements with $z_1 = z_2$ and there is an element with $z_3 \neq z_1$ we find S preserves the decomposition $\mathbb{C}^2 \oplus \mathbb{C}$, and therefore any element normalizing it does too, but this characterizes $U(2)$. \square

The block dominated by $T^2 \rtimes C_2$ in the toral case is treated in [10]. We need detailed discussion of the Weyl groups in $U(2)$ and $SU(3)$.

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose K is a full subgroup of $T^2 \rtimes C_2$, and $S = K \cap T^2$.*

(a) *If S is non-singular then $N_{SU(3)}(K) \subseteq T^2 \rtimes \Sigma_3$, and is generated by T^2 together with the permutations preserving S .*

(b) *If S is singular then (after conjugating if necessary) it lies in the circle with $z_1 = z_2$. If it is not central, then $N_{SU(3)}(S) = N_{U(2)}(S)$.*

(c) *If S is central then $N_{SU(3)}(S) = SU(3)$.*

Proof: To start with Lemma 3.6 (i) shows that the normalizer preserves S . Parts (a) and (b) follow by the same argument as for Lemma 5.4.

The remaining cases have $K = C_2$ or $K = C_3 \times C_2$. In either case, the involution in $U(2)$ is conjugate to $\text{diag}(1, -1)$, which embeds as $\text{diag}(1, -1, -1)$ in $SU(3)$. This picks out a copy of \mathbb{C}^2 . \square

The fact that there are only toral inclusions are of codimension 1 means that there is a model based on pairs without using flags. Furthermore the lack of any new fusion means again that restriction from $SU(3)$ to $U(2)$ induces an isomorphism of categories on this block, so that

$$\mathcal{A}(SU(3)|\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbb{T}, C_2)}^{SU(3)}) = \mathcal{A}(U(2)|\mathcal{V}_{(\mathbb{T}, C_2)}^{U(2)}) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{T} \rtimes C_2 | \mathcal{V}_{(\mathbb{T}, C_2) \geq 3}^{\mathbb{T} \rtimes C_2}),$$

where we have emphasized in the last expression that only anticeutral subgroups of order ≥ 3 are to be used.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Balchin, T. Barthel, and J. P. C. Greenlees. Prismatic decompositions and rational G -spectra. *Preprint*, 59pp, *arXiv 2311.18808*, 2023.
- [2] David Barnes, J.P.C. Greenlees, and Magdalena Kędziołek. An algebraic model for rational toral G -spectra. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 19(7):3541–3599, 2019.
- [3] T. Bröcker and T. tom Dieck. *Representations of compact Lie groups*, volume 98 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. Translated from the German manuscript, Corrected reprint of the 1985 translation.
- [4] J. P. C. Greenlees. Triangulated categories of rational equivariant cohomology theories. *Oberwolfach Reports*, pages 480–488, 2006. (*cit. on p. 2*), 2006.
- [5] J. P. C. Greenlees. Rational equivariant cohomology theories with toral support. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 16(4):1953–2019, 2016.
- [6] J. P. C. Greenlees. The Balmer spectrum of rational equivariant cohomology theories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 223(7):2845–2871, 2019.
- [7] J. P. C. Greenlees. Spaces of subgroups of toral groups. *Preprint*, 38pp, *arXiv:2501.06914*, 2025.
- [8] J. P. C. Greenlees. Algebraic models for one-dimensional categories of rational G -spectra. *Preprint*, 28pp, *arXiv:2501.11200*, 2025.
- [9] J. P. C. Greenlees. Rational G -spectra for rank 2 toral groups of mixed type. *Preprint*, 24pp, *arXiv:2501.15584*, 2025.
- [10] J. P. C. Greenlees. An algebraic model for rational $U(2)$ -spectra. *Preprint*, 15pp, *arXiv:2502.00959*, 2025.
- [11] J. P. C. Greenlees. Rational G -spectra for components with finite Weyl groups. *In preparation*, 4pp, 2025.
- [12] J. P. C. Greenlees. An abelian model for rational G -spectra for a compact Lie group G . *In preparation*, 27pp.
- [13] J. P. C. Greenlees. An algebraic model for rational G -spectra for finite central extensions of a torus. *In preparation*, 18pp.
- [14] J. P. C. Greenlees and B. Shipley. An algebraic model for free rational G -spectra. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 46(1):133–142, 2014.
- [15] P.O. Ludl. The finite subgroups of $SU(3)$. (7):177–183.
- [16] G. A. Miller, H. F. Blichfeldt, and L. E. Dickson. *Theory and applications of finite groups*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1961.

MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, ZEEMAN BUILDING, COVENTRY CV4, 7AL, UK
Email address: john.greenlees@warwick.ac.uk