THE RATIONALITY PROBLEM FOR MULTINORM ONE TORI

SUMITO HASEGAWA, KAZUKI KANAI, AND YASUHIRO OKI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the rationality problem for multinorm one tori, a natural generalization of norm one tori. We give a necessary and sufficient condition for the multinorm one tori to be stably rational and retract rational in the case that split over finite Galois extensions with nilpotent Galois groups. This generalizes the result of Endo in 2011 on the rationality problem for norm one tori. To accomplish it, we develop the technique of Endo in 2001, and construct some reduction methods for an investigation of the rationality problem for arbitrary multinorm one tori.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Basic facts on the rationality of tori	6
3. Multinorm one tori and their character groups	10
3.1. Multinorm one tori	10
3.2. <i>G</i> -lattices $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$	11
3.3. Reduction to smaller G -lattices	12
3.4. Reduction to lattices over smaller groups	18
4. <i>p</i> -groups	19
5. Proof of Theorem 1.2	20
6. Flabby resolutions of particular lattices	23
6.1. Quasi-permutation lattices	23
6.2. Non-quasi-invertible lattices	30
7. Proof of Theorem 1.3	32
7.1. First step: The case for groups of order 8	32
7.2. Second step: The case consisting of normal subgroups with indices ≤ 4	35
7.3. Third step: The case admitting normal factors	37
7.4. Final step: General case	37
8. Proof of Theorem 1.4	41
References	42

1. INTRODUCTION

Let k be a field and k^{sep} a fixed separable closure of k. In algebraic geometry, a fundamental problem is to determine whether a given algebraic variety over k is rational; that is birationally equivalent to projective space over k. It is also important to determine stably rationality, retract rationality, and unirationality which are weaker notions of rationality. These properties satisfy:

rational \Rightarrow stably rational \Rightarrow retract rational \Rightarrow unirational.

²⁰²⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. 11E72, 12F20, 13A50, 14E08, 20C10, 20G15.

The multinorm one tori primarily studied in this paper are algebraic tori. We recall that an algebraic torus over k is a group k-scheme T that satisfies $T \otimes_k k^{\text{sep}} \cong (\mathbb{G}_{m,k^{\text{sep}}})^n$ for some non-negative integer n. Note that an algebraic k-torus T is always unirational (see [Vos98, p. 40, Example 21]) and Voskresenskii conjectured that stably rational tori are rational (see [Vos98, p. 68]). Hence, the study on the stably rationality and the retract rationality are of particular importance.

The rationality problem is well-understood for tori of small dimensions. It is known by Voskresenskii [Vos67] that all tori of dimension 2 are rational. Moreover, Kunyavskii [Kun90] solved the rationality problem for 3-dimensional algebraic k-tori. After that, Hoshi–Yamasaki [HY17] classified algebraic k-tori of dimensions 4 and 5 that are stably rational (resp. retract rational).

In this paper, we restrict our attention to the stably rationality and the retract rationality for *multinorm one tori*. Let **K** be a finite étale algebra over k, that is, a finite product of finite separable field extensions of k which are contained in k^{sep} . Then, we set

$$T_{\mathbf{K}/k} := \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{N}_{\mathbf{K}/k} \colon \operatorname{Res}_{\mathbf{K}/k} \mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{G}_m),$$

where $\operatorname{Res}_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is the Weil restriction. We call it the multinorm one torus associated to \mathbf{K}/k . If **K** is a field, then $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is called the *norm one torus*. Note that $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ has rank $\dim_k(\mathbf{K}) - 1$, and splits over the Galois closure of the composite field of all factors of **K**. This means that there is an isomorphism of *L*-tori $T_{\mathbf{K}/k} \cong \mathbb{G}_{m,L}^{\oplus \dim_k(\mathbf{K})-1}$, where **K** is the product of finite separable field extensions K_1, \ldots, K_r of k, and L is the Galois closure of $K_1 \cdots K_r$ over k.

The rationality problem for norm one tori has been extensively investigated by [EM75], [CS77], [Hür84], [CS87], [LeB95], [CK00], [LL00], [Flo], [End11], [HY17], [HHY20], [HY21], [HY24] and [HY]. On the other hand, the rationality problem for multinorm one tori (especially not norm one tori) has not been studied, except for pioneering works of [Hür84] and [End01].

As a motivation for studying the rationality problem for multinorm one tori, it is expected that this problem has applications to the rationality problem for norm one tori. Consider the norm one torus $T_{K/k}$ associated to a finite separable field extension K/k. Let K'/k be a finite separable field extension. By definition, there is an isomorphism of K'-tori

$$T_{K/k} \otimes_k K' \cong T_{(K \otimes_k K')/K'}.$$

Here $K \otimes_k K'$ may not be a finite separable field extension of K', however it is a finite étale algebra over K'. This means that multinorm one tori appear by taking base change of norm one tori. Moreover, if $T_{(K \otimes_k K')/K'}$ is not rational (resp. stably rational; retract rational) over K', then one can prove that $T_{K/k}$ is so over k. In fact, this approach is used in [End11] to obtain the non-retract rationality of some norm one tori.

The essential part of the main theorem of [End01] can be stated in our notation as follows:

Theorem 1.1 ([End01, Theorem 2]). Let p be a prime, k a field, $\mathbf{K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} K_i$ a finite étale k-algebra with $r \geq 1$, and L the Galois closure of the composite field of K_1, \ldots, K_r over k. Assume

- $\operatorname{Gal}(L/k)$ is an elementary p-abelian group;
- $K_i \neq K_j$ for any $i \neq j$; and
- $[K_i:k] = p$ for all i.

Then the following hold.

- (1) In case of $p \neq 2$, the following are equivalent:
 - (i) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k;
 - (ii) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is retract rational over k;
 - (iii) r = 1.

- (2) In case of p = 2, the following are equivalent:
 - (i) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k;
 - (ii) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is retract rational over k;
 - (iii) r = 1 or 2.

Theorem 1.1 states that stable rationality is determined solely by the number r of direct factors, which is both simple and interesting. Moreover, it naturally raises the question of how this extends to more general cases. Our first main theorem generalize Theorem 1.1 to the case where Gal(L/k) is a p-group.

Theorem 1.2. Let p be an odd prime number, k a field, $\mathbf{K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} K_i$ a finite étale k-algebra with $r \geq 1$, and L the Galois closure of the composite field of K_1, \ldots, K_r over k. Assume

- $K_i \not\subset K_j$ for any $i \neq j$; and
- [L:k] is a power of p.

Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k;
- (ii) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is retract rational over k;
- (iii) r = 1 and L is cyclic over k.

We denote by D_n the dihedral group of order 2n, that is,

$$D_n := \langle \sigma_n, \tau_n \mid \sigma_n^n = \tau_n^2 = 1, \tau_n \sigma_n \tau_n^{-1} = \sigma_n^{-1} \rangle.$$

Note that there is an isomorphism $D_2 \cong (C_2)^2$.

Theorem 1.3. Let k be a field, $\mathbf{K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} K_i$ a finite étale k-algebra with $r \ge 1$, and L the Galois closure of the composite field of K_1, \ldots, K_r over k. Assume

- $K_i \not\subset K_j$ for any $i \neq j$; and
- [L:k] is a power of 2.

Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k;
- (ii) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is retract rational over k;
- (iii) **K** satisfies the condition (a) or (b):
 - (a) r = 1 and L is cyclic over k; or
 - (b) $\operatorname{Gal}(L/k) \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$ for some $\nu \ge 1$, there is $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that $\operatorname{Gal}(L/K_i) \cong \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{m_i} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle$ for each *i*, and $\{m_i \mod 2 \mid 1 \le i \le r\} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

For a quasi-trivial torus (or, an induced torus) over k, we mean a k-torus that is isomorphic to $\operatorname{Res}_{\mathbf{K}/k} \mathbb{G}_m$ for some finite étale algebra **K** over k. The notion of quasi-trivial tori are introduced in [CS77, §2, p. 187].

Theorem 1.4. Let k be a field, $\mathbf{K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} K_i$ a finite étale k-algebra with $r \ge 1$, and L the Galois closure of the composite field of K_1, \ldots, K_r over k. Assume

• $\operatorname{Gal}(L/k)$ is nilpotent.

Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k;
- (ii) $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is retract rational over k;

(iii) there exists an isomorphism of k-tori

$$T_{\mathbf{K}/k} \times S \cong T_{\mathbf{K}'/k} \times S',$$

where S and S' are quasi-trivial tori over k, and $\mathbf{K}' = \prod_{i=1}^{r'} K'_i$ is a finite product of intermediate fields K'_i of L/k that satisfies the condition (a) or (b): (a) r' = 1 and L'/k which is cyclic over k; or

(b) r' = 2, $\operatorname{Gal}(L'/k) \cong C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and there is $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that $\operatorname{Gal}(L'/K'_i) \cong \langle (1, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m_i+i}\tau_{2^{\nu}}) \rangle$ for each *i*.

Here L' is the Galois closure of the composite field of $K'_1, \ldots, K'_{r'}$ over k.

Note that the condition (iii) implies that $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ and $T_{\mathbf{K}'/k}$ are stably birationally equivalent over k.

Remark 1.5. Theorem 1.4 in the case r = 1 is a consequence of the results of Endo–Miyata ([EM75, Theorem 1.5, Theorem 2.3]) and Endo ([End11, Theorem 2.1]). For a norm one torus associated with a non-Galois extension K/k whose Galois closure is nilpotent, it was always not retract rational ([End11, Theorem 2.1]). On the other hand, by extending the scope to multinorm tori, we obtain a new stably rational family as in (b) of Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

The following is a biproduct of our proof of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.6. Let k be a field, and $\mathbf{K} = K_1 \times K_2$ a finite étale algebra over k. Assume that

- K_1K_2/k is Galois with Galois group D_{2m} for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$;
- $[K_1K_2:K_i] = 2$ and K_i/k is non-Galois for each i; and
- K_1 and K_2 are not conjugate to each other.

Then the multinorm one torus $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k.

Our proofs of the main theorems are based on the study of *character groups* of the corresponding tori. Let T be a torus over k. Then the character group of T is defined as follows:

$$X^*(T) := \operatorname{Hom}_{k^{\operatorname{sep}}\operatorname{-groups}}(T \otimes_k k^{\operatorname{sep}}, \mathbb{G}_{m, k^{\operatorname{sep}}}).$$

Take a finite Galois extension with L/k with Galois group G over which T splits, which is possible in any case. Then $X^*(T)$ is a G-lattice, that is, a finitely generated free abelian group equipped with an action of G. On the other hand, there exist two notions for G-lattices: quasi-permutation and quasi-invertible. One can confirm the following:

Moreover, we can determine a G-lattice M to be quasi-permutation or quasi-invertible by using a *flabby resolution* of M. This efficient technique was introduced by Endo-Miyata [EM75] and Voskresenskii [Vos69], and further developed by Colliot-Thélène-Sansuc [CS77]. The details of this will be discussed in Section 2. In particular, our theorems are reduced to the determination of G-lattices corresponding to multinorm one tori to be quasi-permutation or quasi-invertible, in the case where G is a finite nilpotent group.

As another motivation for studying the rationality problem for multinorm one tori, we discuss their applications to the multinorm principle. Here we assume that k is a global field. Hasse [Has31] states that the norm principle holds for finite cyclic extensions; in other words, every local norm is a global norm. This is equivalent to III(K/k) = 1, where the left-hand side is defined as

$$\operatorname{III}(K/k) := (\operatorname{N}_{K/k}(\mathbb{A}_K^{\times}) \cap k^{\times}) / \operatorname{N}_{K/k}(K^{\times})$$

with $N_{K/k}$ denoting the norm map for K/k. We say that the Hasse norm principle holds for K/k if III(K/k) = 1.

The study of the Hasse norm principle for general extensions, not necessarily cyclic, is one of the classical problems in algebraic number theory. For a finite étale algebra \mathbf{K}/k , the group $\mathrm{III}(\mathbf{K}/k)$ is defined analogously. We say that the multinorm principle holds for \mathbf{K}/k if $\mathrm{III}(\mathbf{K}/k) = 1$. This broader question has also been the subject of extensive study, for example, [Hür84], [DW14], [BLP19], [Lee22], and [LOY24].

Ono [Ono63] shows that $\operatorname{III}(K/k)$ is isomorphic to the Tate–Shafarevich group of the norm one torus $T_{K/k}$ associated to K/k, which is defined by

$$\operatorname{III}(T_{K/k}) := \operatorname{Ker}\left(H^1(k, T_{K/k}) \xrightarrow{(\operatorname{Res}_{kv/k})_v} \bigoplus_v H^1(k_v, T_{K/k})\right)$$

where v runs over all places of k, and k_v denotes the completion of k at v (see also [PR94, Section 6.3]). By a similar argument, the isomorphism $\operatorname{III}(\mathbf{K}/k) \cong \operatorname{III}(T_{\mathbf{K}/k})$ holds for the multinorm one torus $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ associated to \mathbf{K}/k as well (for details, see [LOY24, Section 2.2]). On the other hand, Voskresenskii [Vos69, Theorem 5, p. 1213] gave the following sequence:

(1.1)
$$0 \to A(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) \to H^1(k, \operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X}))^{\vee} \to \operatorname{III}(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) \to 0$$

where X is a smooth k-compactification of $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$, $\operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X})$ is the Picard group of $\overline{X} = X \times_k k^{\operatorname{sep}}$, $M^{\vee} = \operatorname{Hom}(M, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ is the Pontryagin dual of M, and $A(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) := (\prod_v T_{\mathbf{K}/k}(k_v))/\overline{T_{\mathbf{K}/k}(k)}$ is the defect of the weak approximation of $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$. It follows from the sequence (1.1) that if $H^1(k, \operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X})) =$ 0, then $\operatorname{III}(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) = 0$, that is, the multinorm principle holds for \mathbf{K}/k . If T is retract rational over k, then $H^1(k, \operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X})) = 0$ (for details, see Section 2). Therefore, determining the retract rationality (alternatively, computing $H^1(k, \operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X}))$) of multinorm one tori can be regarded as a first step in studying the multinorm principle.

Organization of this paper. In Section 2, we prepare some basic definitions and known results about the rationality of algebraic tori. In particular, we discuss the relationship between algebraic tori and G-lattices. In Section 3, we introduce the concept of multinorm tori, and provide a generalization of their corresponding G-lattices. Furthermore, we develop the technique of Endo [End11], and construct some reduction methods for an investigation of the rationality problem for arbitrary multinorm one tori. In Section 4, we review some properties of p-groups used in this paper. In Section 5, we give a proof of Theorem 1.2. In Section 6, for certain G-lattices, we determine whether they are stably permutation or not quasi-invertible using the theory of flabby resolutions. These lattices play a crucial role in Section 7 and Section 8. In Section 7, we give a proof of Theorem 1.3 by dividing into four steps. In Section 8, we give a proof of Theorem 1.4. That is, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the multinorm one tori to be stably rational and retract rational in the case that split over finite Galois extensions with nilpotent Galois groups.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Seidai Yasuda for his helpful comments on this paper. The third author was carried out with the support of the JSPS Research Fellowship for Young Scientists and KAKENHI Grant Number JP22KJ0041.

Notations. Let G be a finite group.

• For a subgroup H of G, we write $N_G(H)$ for the normalizer of H in G, that is,

$$N_G(H) := \{ g \in G \mid gHg^{-1} = H \}.$$

• For a G-lattice, we mean a finitely generated free abelian group equipped with a left action of G. For a G-lattice M, the dual lattice of M is denoted by

$$M^{\circ} := \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathbb{Z})$$

Here we define a left action of G on M° as

$$G \times M^{\circ} \to M^{\circ}; (g, f) \mapsto [x \mapsto f(g^{-1}x)].$$

2. BASIC FACTS ON THE RATIONALITY OF TORI

Let k be a field. For a non-negative integer n, we denote by \mathbb{P}_k^n the projective space of dimension n over k. Consider an algebraic variety over k. We say that X is

- rational over k if it is birationally equivalent to a projective space over k;
- stably rational over k if $X \times_k \mathbb{P}_k^m$ is rational over k for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$;
- retract rational over k if there exist rational maps $f: \mathbb{P}^n_k \dashrightarrow X$ and $g: X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n_k$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $f \circ g = \mathrm{id}_X$;
- unirational over k if there is a dominant rational map from \mathbb{P}_k^n to X for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

The notion of retract rationality was originally introduced by Saltman ([Sal84]) in the case where k is infinite (see also [Kan12]). It has been generalized for all varieties over arbitrary fields by Merkurjev ([Mer17]). Note that one has implications

rational \Rightarrow stably rational \Rightarrow retract rational \Rightarrow unirational.

In this paper, we concentrate on the case where X is an algebraic torus over k. In this case, we can rephrase the stably rationality and the retract rationality by means of G-lattices, where G is a finite group. We follow the same terminology as [Lor05] and [End11].

Definition 2.1 ([End11]). Let G be a finite group. We say that a G-lattice M is

- (i) *permutation* if M has a \mathbb{Z} -basis permuted by G, that is, $M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{Z}[G/H_i]$ for some subgroups H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_m ;
- (ii) quasi-permutation if there is an exact sequence of G-lattices

$$0 \to M \to R \to U \to 0,$$

where R and U are permutation;

(iii) quasi-invertible if it is a direct summand of a quasi-permutation G-lattice.

It is not difficult to confirm that

permutation \Rightarrow quasi-permutation \Rightarrow quasi-invertible.

Definition 2.2. Let G be a finite group. We say that a G-lattice M is

- (i) stably permutation if $M \oplus R \cong R'$ for some permutation G-lattices R and R';
- (ii) *invertible* (or, *permutation projective*) if it is a direct summand of a permutation G-lattice;
- (iii) coflabby if $H^1(H, M) = 0$ for any subgroup H of G;
- (iv) *flabby* if M° is coflabby.

It is known that the following hold:

permutation \Rightarrow stably permutation \Rightarrow invertible \Rightarrow flabby and coflabby.

Here the rightmost implication is a consequence of [Len74, (1.2) Proposition].

Let G be a finite group. We say that G-lattices M_1 and M_2 are similar if there exist permutation G-lattices R_1 and R_2 such that $M_1 \oplus R_1 \cong M_2 \oplus R_2$. We denote by $\mathscr{S}(G)$ the set of similarity classes of G-lattices. For a G-lattice M, we write for [M] the similarity class containing M. Then $\mathscr{S}(G)$ is a commutative monoid with respect to the sum

$$[M_1] + [M_2] := [M_1 \oplus M_2].$$

By definition, for a G-lattice M, we have

- [M] = 0 if and only if M is stably permutation; and
- [M] is invertible in $\mathscr{S}(G)$ if and only if M is invertible.

Definition 2.3. Let G be a finite group, and M a G-lattice.

(i) A coflabby resolution of M is an exact sequence of G-lattices

$$0 \to F \to R \to M \to 0,$$

where P is permutation and F is coflabby.

(ii) A *flabby resolution* of M is an exact sequence of G-lattices

$$0 \to M \to R \to F \to 0,$$

where P is permutation and F is flabby.

There is a coflabby resolution for any G-lattice, which is a consequence of [EM75, Lemma 1.1]. This implies the existence of a flabby resolution of every G-lattice. Moreover, if

$$0 \to M \to R \to F \to 0$$

is a flabby resolution of M, then the class [F] in $\mathscr{S}(G)$ only depends on M. In the sequel, we denote [F] by $[M]^{\text{fl}}$. It is known that the map

$$\mathscr{S}(G) \to \mathscr{S}(G); [M] \mapsto [M]^{\mathrm{ff}}$$

is an endomorphism of monoids.

Lemma 2.4 ([Lor05, Lemma 2.7.1 (a)]). Let G be a finite group, and F an invertible G-lattice. Then we have

$$[F]^{\mathrm{fl}} = -[F].$$

Proposition 2.5. Let G be a finite group.

- (i) A G-lattice M is quasi-permutation if and only if $[M]^{\text{fl}} = 0$.
- (ii) A G-lattice M is quasi-invertible if and only if $[M]^{\text{fl}}$ is invertible.

Proof. (i): It is clear that $[M]^{\text{fl}} = 0$ if M is quasi-permutation. For the reverse implication, assume $[M]^{\text{fl}} = 0$. Take a flabby resolution of M:

$$0 \to M \to R \xrightarrow{\pi} F \to 0.$$

By assumption, F is stably permutation. Hence, there is a permutation G-lattice R such that $F \oplus R'$ is permutation. Moreover, the sequence

$$0 \to M \xrightarrow{x \mapsto (\iota(x), 0)} R \oplus R' \xrightarrow{\pi \oplus \mathrm{id}_{R'}} F \oplus R' \to 0$$

is exact. This implies that M is quasi-permutation as desired.

(ii): We first prove that $[M]^{\text{fl}}$ is invertible if M is quasi-invertible. By assumption, there is a G-lattice M' such that $M \oplus M'$ is quasi-permutation. Combining this result with (i), we obtain

$$[M]^{\mathrm{fl}} + [M']^{\mathrm{fl}} = [M \oplus M']^{\mathrm{fl}} = [0].$$

Hence $[M]^{\text{fl}}$ is invertible.

On the other hand, assume that $[M]^{\text{fl}}$ is invertible. Take a flabby resolution

$$0 \to M \to R \to F \to 0$$

of M, where F is invertible by assumption. Since F is invertible, we have $[F]^{\text{fl}} = -[F]$ by Lemma 2.4. In particular, we obtain an equality

$$[M \oplus F]^{\mathrm{fl}} = [0].$$

This is equivalent to the condition that $M \oplus F$ is quasi-permutation, which follows from (i). This completes the proof.

As a corollary of Proposition 2.5, we obtain implications as follows:

stably permutation \Rightarrow quasi-permutation, invertible \Rightarrow quasi-invertible.

Proposition 2.6. Let G be a finite group, and H its subgroup. Consider a G-lattice M. If M is a quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible) G-module, then so is as an H-lattice.

Lemma 2.7 ([CS77, p. 179, Lemme 2 (i), (ii), (iii)]). Let G be a finite group, and N its normal subgroup. Consider a G-lattice M.

- (i) If M is a permutation G-lattice, then M^N is a permutation G/N-lattice.
- (ii) If M is a coflabby G-lattice, then M^N is a coflabby G/N-lattice.

(iii) Let

$$0 \to F \to R \to M \to 0$$

be a coflabby resolution of M in G-lattices. Then

$$0 \to F^N \to R^N \to M^N \to 0$$

is a coflabby resolution of M^N in G/N-lattices.

Lemma 2.8 ([CS77, p. 179, Lemme 2]). Let G be a finite group, and N its normal subgroup. Consider a G/N-lattice M.

- (i) The G-lattice M is permutation (resp. stably permutation; invertible; coflabby; flabby) if and only if it is so as a G/N-lattice.
- (ii) Let

$$0 \to F \to R \to M \to 0$$

be a coflabby resolution of M in G/N-lattices. Then it is a coflabby resolution of M in G-lattices.

Let G be a finite group, and M a G-lattice. For a normal subgroup N of G, we define a G/N-lattice $M^{[N]}$ as follows:

$$M^{[N]} := \left((M^{\circ})^N \right)^{\circ}.$$

It is isomorphic to $M_N/M_{N,tor}$, where M_N the coinvariant part of M, and $M_{N,tor}$ is the torsion part of M_N . Note that M^N and $M^{[N]}$ may not coincide in general.

Corollary 2.9. Let G be a finite group, and N its normal subgroup. Consider a G-lattice M.

 (i) If the G-lattice M is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible), then so is for the G/Nlattice M^[N]. (ii) If N acts on M trivially, then M is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible) G-lattice if and only if it is so as an G/N-lattice.

Proof. (i) follows from Lemma 2.7. (ii) is a consequence of Lemma 2.7 (iii) and Lemma 2.8. For a G-lattice M, we set

$$\operatorname{III}^{2}_{\omega}(G,M) := \operatorname{Ker}\left(H^{2}(G,M) \to \bigoplus_{g \in G} H^{2}(\langle g \rangle, M)\right).$$

Proposition 2.10 ([Lor05, Proposition 2.9.2 (a)]). Let G be a finite group, and

 $0 \to M \to R \to F \to 0$

a flabby resolution of a G-lattice M. Then, there is an isomorphism

$$\amalg^2_{\omega}(G,M) \cong H^1(G,F).$$

In particular, if M is quasi-invertible, then we have $\coprod_{\omega}^2(G,M) = 0$.

For a G-lattice M, we can be summarized as follows:

permutation
$$\Rightarrow$$
 stably permutation \Rightarrow invertible \Rightarrow flabby and coflabby
 \Downarrow \Downarrow \Downarrow \Downarrow
quasi-permutation \Rightarrow quasi-invertible \Rightarrow $\coprod^2_{\omega}(G, M) = 0$
 \updownarrow \updownarrow \updownarrow
 $[M]^{\text{fl}} = 0 \Rightarrow [M]^{\text{fl}}$ is invertible.

For a torus T over a field k, we define the cocharacter module $X_*(T)$ and the character module $X^*(T)$ as

 $X_*(T) := \operatorname{Hom}_{k^{\operatorname{sep}}\operatorname{-groups}}(\mathbb{G}_{m,k^{\operatorname{sep}}}, T \otimes_k k^{\operatorname{sep}}), \quad X^*(T) := \operatorname{Hom}_{k^{\operatorname{sep}}\operatorname{-groups}}(T \otimes_k k^{\operatorname{sep}}, \mathbb{G}_{m,k^{\operatorname{sep}}}).$

These are finite free abelian groups equipped with continuous actions of $\operatorname{Gal}(k^{\operatorname{sep}}/k)$ (with respect to discrete topology).

Proposition 2.11 ([Lor05, Proposition 9.5.3, Proposition 9.5.4]). Let k be a field, and T a torus over k which splits over a finite Galois extension L of k. Put G := Gal(L/k). Then T is stably rational (resp. retract rational) over k if and only if the G-lattice $X^*(T)$ is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible).

Let Y be an algebraic variety over k. A smooth compactification of Y over k refers to a proper smooth algebraic variety X over k that admits an open immersion $Y \hookrightarrow X$. Note that a smooth compactification of Y over k always exists if k has characteristic 0, which is a consequence of Hironaka ([Hir64]). Moreover, Colliot-Thélène, Harari and Skorobogatov ([CHS05]) gave the existence of smooth compactifications of all tori over arbitrary fields.

Proposition 2.12 ([Vos69, Section 4, p. 1213]). Let k be a field, and T a torus over k which splits over a finite Galois extension L over k. Take a smooth compactification of X over k, and put $\overline{X} := X \otimes_k k^{\text{sep}}$. Then there is an exact sequence of $\text{Gal}(k^{\text{sep}}/k)$ -lattices

$$0 \to X^*(T) \to R \to \operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X}) \to 0,$$

where R is permutation and $\operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X})$ is flabby. In particular, we have $[X^*(T)]^{\text{fl}} = [\operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X})]$.

Combining Proposition 2.12 with Proposition 2.10, we obtain the following.

Corollary 2.13 (cf. [CS87, Proposition 9.5 (ii)], [San81, Proposition 9.8]). Let k be a field, and T a torus over k which splits over a finite Galois extension L of k. Take a smooth compactification of X over k, and put $\overline{X} := X \otimes_k k^{\text{sep}}$. Then there is an isomorphism

$$H^1(k, \operatorname{Pic}(\overline{X})) \cong \operatorname{III}^2_{\omega}(G, X^*(T)),$$

where $G := \operatorname{Gal}(L/k)$.

3. Multinorm one tori and their character groups

3.1. Multinorm one tori. Let k be a field. Consider a finite étale algebra $\mathbf{K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} K_i$ over k, that is, a finite product of finite separable subextensions of k^{sep} . The multinorm one torus associated to \mathbf{K}/k is defined as

$$T_{\mathbf{K}/k} = \operatorname{Ker}(\operatorname{N}_{\mathbf{K}/k} \colon \operatorname{Res}_{\mathbf{K}/k} \mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{G}_m).$$

Let G be a finite group, and H a subgroup of G. Then one has a surjection

$$\varepsilon_{G/H} \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \to \mathbb{Z}; 1 \mapsto 1,$$

which is called the *augumentation map*. Moreover, the dual of $\varepsilon_{G/H}^{\circ}$ coincides with the homomorphism

$$\varepsilon_{G/H}^{\circ} \colon \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}[G/H]; 1 \mapsto \sum_{g \in G/H} g.$$

On the other hand, consider a finite group G and subgroups $H' \subset H$ of G. Then the homomorphisms of H-lattices

$$\varepsilon_{H/H'} \colon \mathbb{Z}[H/H'] \to \mathbb{Z}, \quad \varepsilon_{H/H'}^{\circ} \colon \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}[H/H']$$

induce homomorphisms of G-lattices

$$\operatorname{Ind}_{H}^{G} \varepsilon_{H/H'} \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/H'] \to \mathbb{Z}[G/H], \quad \operatorname{Ind}_{H}^{G} \varepsilon_{H/H'}^{\circ} \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \to \mathbb{Z}[G/H'].$$

For a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G, we define a G-module $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ by an exact sequence

$$0 \to I_{G/\mathcal{H}} \to \bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \xrightarrow{(\varepsilon_{G/H})_{H \in \mathcal{H}}} \mathbb{Z} \to 0.$$

Furthermore, we define $J_{G/\mathcal{H}} := I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{\circ}$. Then one has an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{(\varepsilon_{G/H}^{\circ})_{H \in \mathcal{H}}} \bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \to J_{G/\mathcal{H}} \to 0.$$

Proposition 3.1. Let k be a field, $\mathbf{K} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} K_i$ a finite étale algebra over k. Take a finite Galois extension L of k containing K_1, \ldots, K_r . Put $G := \operatorname{Gal}(L/k)$ and $\mathcal{H} := \{\operatorname{Gal}(L/K_i) \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}\}$. Then there are isomorphisms of G-modules

$$X_*(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}}, \quad X^*(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}}.$$

In this paper, we determine whether the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-permutation or quasi-invertible in order to classify the stably/retract rationality of multinorm one tori. In the sequel of this section, we discuss

• how to reduce the problem to a smaller *G*-lattice (Corollary 3.13, Proposition 3.17, Corollary 3.19, Proposition 3.16);

- behavior of $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ with respect to the restriction to subgroups of G (Proposition 3.20); and
- description of $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^N$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{[N]}$ for a normal subgroup N of G (Proposition 3.22).

Accordingly, we extend the notions of character groups and cocharacter groups of multinorm one tori, and set up a framework for dealing with them.

3.2. *G*-lattices $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$. For a multiset \mathcal{H} , we use the notation as follows.

- Denote by \mathcal{H}^{set} the underlying set of \mathcal{H} .
- For $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$, write $m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)$ for the multiplicity of H in \mathcal{H} . Moreover, we set $m_{\mathcal{H}}(H) := 0$ if a subgroup H of G does not belong to \mathcal{H}^{set} .

We define Δ as follows:

$$\Delta := \coprod_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \Delta_m.$$

Here, $\Delta_m := \{(d_1, \ldots, d_m) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^m \mid d_1 \leq \cdots \leq d_m\}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_m$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, we denote by \mathbf{d}_i the *i*-th factor of \mathbf{d} .

Definition 3.2. Let \mathcal{H} be a multiset. A *function on* \mathcal{H} is defined as a map

$$\varphi \colon \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{set}} \to \Delta$$

such that $\varphi(H) \in \Delta_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}$ for any $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$.

Definition 3.3. Let G be a finite group, \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups, and φ a function on \mathcal{H} .

(i) We define a function d_{φ} of \mathcal{H}^{set} as follows:

$$d_{\varphi} \colon \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \to \Delta_1; H \mapsto \gcd(\varphi(H)_1, \dots, \varphi(H)_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}).$$

(ii) We say that φ is normalized if $gcd(d_{\varphi}(H) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}^{set}) = 1$.

The following can be confirmed from the definition:

Lemma 3.4. Let G be a finite group, \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups, and φ a function on \mathcal{H} . Put $\varphi^{\text{nor}} \colon \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \to \Delta; \ H \mapsto (d^{-1}\varphi(H)_1, \ldots, d^{-1}\varphi(H)_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}),$

where $d := \gcd(d_{\varphi}(H) \mid H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}})$. Then φ^{nor} is a normalized function on \mathcal{H} .

Definition 3.5. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups. Consider a function φ of \mathcal{H} . We define a G-lattice $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ by the exact sequence

(3.1)
$$0 \to I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \to \bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)} \xrightarrow{(\varphi(H)_1 \cdot \varepsilon_{G/H}, \dots, \varphi(H)_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)} \cdot \varepsilon_{G/H})_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}}} \mathbb{Z}.$$

Furthermore, set $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} := (I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^{\circ}$.

If φ is normalized, then the rightmost homomorphism of (3.1) is surjective. Moreover, we have an exact sequence of *G*-lattices

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\left(\varphi(H)\varepsilon_{G/H}^{\circ}\right)_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}}} \bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)} \to J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \to 0.$$

Remark 3.6. (i) If $\varphi(H) = \underbrace{(1, \ldots, 1)}_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$, then the *G*-lattices $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$

coincide with $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ respectively.

(ii) Assume that G is an elementary p-abelian group, where p is a prime number, and \mathcal{H} consists of subgroups of index p and the whole group G. Let

$$\varphi \colon \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \to \Delta; H \mapsto \begin{cases} \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)} & \text{if } H \neq G; \\ \underbrace{(p, \dots, p)}_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(G)} & \text{if } H = G. \end{cases}$$

Then the *G*-lattice $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ is the same as $L = \text{Ker } \Phi$ in [End01, §2, l9–14].

Lemma 3.7. Let G be a finite group, \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups, and φ a function on \mathcal{H} . Then one has $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} = I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi^{\text{nor}})}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} = J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi^{\text{nor}})}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} = I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi^{\text{nor}})}$. However, it follows from the fact that the multiplication by a non-zero integer on \mathbb{Z} is injective.

3.3. Reduction to smaller G-lattices. We give two types of reduction to smaller G-lattices. To accomplish it, we first prepare some lemmas.

Lemma 3.8. Let A be a (non-necessarily commutative) ring with unit. Consider a commutative diagram of left A-modules

$$0 \longrightarrow M_0 \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow 0$$

$$\downarrow^{h_0} \qquad \downarrow^{h_1}$$

$$N = N,$$

where the horizontal sequence is exact and the images of h_0 and h_1 coincide. Assume that there is a left splitting $f': M_1 \to M_0$ of the exact sequence satisfying $h_0 \circ f' = h_1$. Then there is a split exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker}(h_0) \to \operatorname{Ker}(h_1) \to M_2 \to 0.$$

Proof. This follows from the snake lemma.

Lemma 3.9. Let G be a finite group, and H its subgroup. Consider a homomorphism of G-lattices

$$f := (c_i \varepsilon_{G/H})_i \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m} \to \mathbb{Z},$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and c_1, \ldots, c_m are integers with great common divisor d. Then there is an automorphism λ of G-lattices $\mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m}$ such that $f \circ \lambda$ coincides with the composite

$$\mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m} \xrightarrow{\operatorname{pr}_1} \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \xrightarrow{d\varepsilon_{G/H}} \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. By the Frobenius reciprocity, there is an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[G]}(\mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m}, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}[H]}(\mathbb{Z}^{\oplus m}, \mathbb{Z}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}^{\oplus m}, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Hence the assertion follows from the theory of invariant factors for finitely generated abelian groups. ■

The following is the first type of reduction to smaller G-lattices.

Lemma 3.10. Let G be a finite group, \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups, and φ a function on \mathcal{H} . Assume that there exist $H_0, H'_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $i_0, i'_0 \in \{1, \ldots, m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)\}$ such that

•
$$H_0 \subset H'_0$$
; and

• $\varphi(H_0)_{i_0} \in \varphi(H'_0)_{i'_0}\mathbb{Z}.$

We denote by \mathcal{H}' the multiset of subgroups of G that satisfies the following for every subgroup H of G:

$$m_{\mathcal{H}'}(H') = \begin{cases} m_{\mathcal{H}}(H') & \text{if } H' \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \setminus \{H_0\} \\ m_{\mathcal{H}}(H_0) - 1 & \text{if } H' = H_0. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we define a function φ' of \mathcal{H}' as

$$\varphi'(H') = \begin{cases} \varphi(H') & \text{if } H' \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \setminus \{H_0\};\\ (\varphi(H_0)_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)\} \setminus \{i_0\}} & \text{if } H' = H_0. \end{cases}$$

Then there exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_0], \quad J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_0]$$

Remark 3.11. If $\varphi(H) = (\underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$, then Lemma 3.10 is essentially the same as

[End11, Proposition 1.3].

Proof. It suffices to give an isomorphism

(3.2)
$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]$$

which easily implies an isomorphism $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]$. Fix $H'_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$ containing H_0 , $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, m_{\mathcal{H}}(H_0)\}$ and $i'_0 \in \{1, \ldots, m_{\mathcal{H}}(H'_0)\}$ such that $\varphi(H_0)_{i_0} \in \varphi(H'_0)_{i'_0}\mathbb{Z}$. Then one has a commutative diagram

where the horizontal sequence is the canonical split exact sequence. Then the images of the vertical homomorphisms coincide. Now we define a homomorphism Φ as the direct sum of the identity maps on $\mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \setminus \{H_0\}$ and the map

$$\mathbb{Z}[G/H_0]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H_0)} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H'_0] \to \mathbb{Z}[G/H_0]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H_0)-1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H'_0]$$

defined by

$$((x_i)_i, y) \mapsto \left((x_i)_{i \neq i_0}, \frac{\varphi(H_0)_{i_0}}{\varphi(H'_0)_{i_0}} \operatorname{Ind}_{H'_0}^G (\varepsilon_{H'_0/H_0})(x) + y \right).$$

Then the map Φ gives a left splitting of the exact sequence in (3.3). Furthermore, by definition, the diagram

is commutative. Therefore Lemma 3.8 implies the existence of (3.2). This completes the proof of Lemma 3.10. $\hfill\blacksquare$

Definition 3.12. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a set of its subgroups (that is, all elements in \mathcal{H} have multiplicity 1). We say that \mathcal{H} is *reduced* if $H \not\subset H'$ for any $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$ with $H \neq H'$ as subgroups of G.

For a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of a finite group G, we denote by \mathcal{H}^{red} the subset of \mathcal{H}^{set} consisting of all elements of \mathcal{H}^{set} that are maximal with respect to inclusion. Note that it is reduced in the sense of Definition 3.12.

Corollary 3.13. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups.

(i) Let φ be a normalized function on \mathcal{H} . Then there exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}}^{(d_{\varphi})} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)-1}\right);$$
$$J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}}^{(d_{\varphi})} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)-1}\right).$$

In particular, the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible) if and only if $J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}}^{(d_{\varphi})}$ is so.

(ii) There exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{red}}} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{red}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)-1}\right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{set}} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{red}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}\right);$$
$$J_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{red}}} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{red}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)-1}\right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{set}} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{red}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}\right).$$

In particular, the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible) if and only if $J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{red}}$ is so.

Proof. (i): It suffices to construct an isomorphism on $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$. By Lemma 3.9, there is an isomorphism

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\widetilde{d}_{\varphi})},$$

where \widetilde{d}_{φ} is defined as

 $\widetilde{d}_{\varphi}(H) := (0, \dots, 0, d_{\varphi}(H)) \in \Delta_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}$

for every $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$. In this case, we have $\widetilde{d}_{\varphi}(H)_i \in \widetilde{d}_{\varphi}(H)_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}\mathbb{Z}$ for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, m_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{H}) - 1\}$. Then the assertion follows from Lemma 3.10.

(ii): By (i), we may assume that \mathcal{H} is a set. Let φ be the function on \mathcal{H} which takes the value 1. Then, we have $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} = I_{G/\mathcal{H}}$. Moreover, for every $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\text{red}}$, there is $H' \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{red}}$ such that $H \subset H'$ and $\varphi(H) \in \varphi(H')\mathbb{Z}$. Hence the assertion is a consequence of Lemma 3.10.

Proposition 3.14. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups. Take $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g \in G$. Consider a multiset \mathcal{H}' of subgroups of G which satisfies the following for any subgroup H of G:

$$m_{\mathcal{H}'}(H) = \begin{cases} m_{\mathcal{H}}(gH_0g^{-1}) + 1 & \text{if } H = gH_0g^{-1}; \\ m_{\mathcal{H}}(H_0) - 1 & \text{if } H = H_0; \\ m_{\mathcal{H}}(H) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then there exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}, \quad J_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}'}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the left isomorphism. Consider a homomorphism of G-lattices

$$\mathbb{Z}[G/H_0] \to \mathbb{Z}[G/gH_0g^{-1}]; \ 1 \mapsto g,$$

which is an isomorphism. Then the direct summand of this map and the identity map on $\mathbb{Z}[G/H]$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$ induce a commutative diagram

Hence the assertion follows from snake lemma.

Definition 3.15. Let G be a finite group. We say that a set of subgroups \mathcal{H} of G is *strongly* reduced if $H \not\subset gH'g^{-1}$ for any $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$ with $H \neq H'$ as subgroups of G and any $g \in G$.

For a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of a finite group G, we denote by \mathcal{H}^{srd} a subset of \mathcal{H}^{set} that is strongly reduced and maximal with respect to inclusion. Note that the subset \mathcal{H}^{srd} is not uniquely determined. However, we have $\mathcal{H}^{\text{srd}} \subset \mathcal{H}^{\text{red}}$ by definition.

Proposition 3.16. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups. Then there exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)-1}\right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{set}} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}\right),$$
$$J_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}} \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)-1}\right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{set}} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)}\right).$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{H}' be the multiset of subgroups of G that satisfies $(\mathcal{H}')^{\text{set}} = \mathcal{H}^{\text{srd}}$ and

$$m_{\mathcal{H}'}(H) = \sum_{g \in G/N_G(H)} m_{\mathcal{H}}(gHg^{-1})$$

for every $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{srd}}$. Then, Proposition 3.14 implies that there exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}, \quad J_{G/\mathcal{H}'} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$$

Hence the assertion follows from Corollary 3.13 (ii).

The following is the second type of reduction to smaller G-lattices.

Proposition 3.17. Let G be a finite group, \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups, and φ be a function on \mathcal{H} . Assume that there exist $H_0, H'_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)\}$ such that

H'₀ ⊂ H₀; and
 φ(H₀)_{i0} ∈ (H₀ : H'₀)d_φ(H'₀)ℤ.

We denote by \mathcal{H}' the multiset of subgroups of G that satisfies the following for every subgroup H of G:

$$m_{\mathcal{H}'}(H) = \begin{cases} m_{\mathcal{H}}(H_0) - 1 & \text{if } H = H_0; \\ m_{\mathcal{H}}(H) & \text{if } H \neq H_0. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we define a function φ' of \mathcal{H}' as

$$\varphi'(H) := \begin{cases} (\varphi(H_0)_1, \dots, \varphi(H_0)_{i-1}, \varphi(H_0)_{i+1}, \dots, \varphi(H_0)_i) & \text{if } H = H_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}};\\ \varphi(H) & \text{if } H \neq H_0, \end{cases}$$

which is normalized. Then there exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

(3.4)
$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_0], \quad J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_0].$$

In particular, the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible) if and only if $J_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')}$ is so.

Remark 3.18. Assume that

- $G \cong (C_p)^{\nu}$ for some prime number p and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$;
- \mathcal{H} consists of G and some subgroups of index p in G; and

•
$$\varphi(H) = \begin{cases} \underbrace{(1,\ldots,1)}_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)} & \text{if } H \neq G; \\ \underbrace{(p,\ldots,p)}_{m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)} & \text{if } H = G. \end{cases}$$

Then Theorem 3.17 implies [End01, p. 29, Lemma].

Proof. It suffices to prove the isomorphism on $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$. Consider the commutative diagram

where the horizontal sequence is the canonical split exact sequence. By the definitions of \mathcal{H}' and φ' , the images of the vertical maps coincide. Now, we define the map Ψ as the direct sum of the identity maps on $\mathbb{Z}[G/H_0]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H_0)-1}$ and $\mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}'}(H)}$ for all $H \in (\mathcal{H}')^{\text{set}}$, and the map

$$\mathbb{Z}[G/H_0]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)} \to \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{\oplus m_{\mathcal{H}'}(H)}$$

defined as

$$(x_i)_i \mapsto (x_i)_{i \neq i_0} + \frac{\varphi(H_0)_{i_0}}{(H_0 : H'_0)d_{\varphi}(H_0)} \operatorname{Ind}_{H_0}^G \varepsilon_{H_0/H'_0}(x_{i_0})$$

Then it gives a left splitting of the exact sequence in (3.5). Moreover, the diagram

is commutative. Hence we obtain the left isomorphism in (3.4) as desired.

Corollary 3.19. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups. Consider a normalized function φ on \mathcal{H} , and define a set of subgroup of G as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1] := \{ H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \mid d_{\varphi}(H) = 1 \}.$$

Assume that

(a) $\mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1] \neq \emptyset$; and

(b) for each $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]$, there is $H' \in \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]$ such that $d_{\varphi}(H) \in (H : H \cap H')\mathbb{Z}$. Then the following hold:

$$[I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}] = [I_{G/\mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]}], \quad [J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}] = [J_{G/\mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]}].$$

In particular, the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible) if and only if $J_{G/\mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]}$ is so.

Proof. It suffices to prove the isomorphism on $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$. By Corollary 3.13 (i), we may assume $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}}$. In particular, we have $\varphi = d_{\varphi}$. Write $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1] = \{H_1, \ldots, H_s\}$. For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$, take $H_i^{\dagger} \in \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]$ so that

(3.6)
$$d_{\varphi}(H_i) \in (H_i : H_i \cap H_i^{\dagger})\mathbb{Z}.$$

Note that this is possible by (b). Consider a set $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger} := \{H_i \cap H_i^{\dagger} \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}\}$, and we define a multiset $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$ of subgroups of G as the disjoint union of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^{\dagger} . Moreover, let $\widetilde{\varphi}$ be the normalized function on $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$ defined as

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(H') := \begin{cases} (1, \varphi(H')) & \text{if } H' \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}; \\ 1 & \text{if } H' \in \mathcal{H}^{\dagger} \setminus \mathcal{H}; \\ \varphi(H') & \text{if } H' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}. \end{cases}$$

Since $\widetilde{\varphi}(H')_1 = 1$ for any $H' \in \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$, Lemma 3.10 gives an equality

$$[I_{G/\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}}^{(\widetilde{\varphi})}] = [I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}].$$

Moreover, since $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{set}} = \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$, Corollary 3.13 (i) implies

$$[I_{G/\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}}^{(\widetilde{\varphi})}] = [I_{G/(\mathcal{H}\cup\mathcal{H}^{\dagger})}^{(d_{\widetilde{\varphi}})}].$$

On the other hand, take $H \in (\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}) \setminus \mathcal{H}'$. Then we have $H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]$, and hence $H = H_i$ for some *i*. Moreover, one has

$$d_{\widetilde{\varphi}}(H_i) = \varphi(H_i) \in (H_i : H_i \cap H_i^{\dagger})\mathbb{Z} = (H_i : H_i \cap H_i^{\dagger})d_{\widetilde{\varphi}}(H_i \cap H_i^{\dagger})\mathbb{Z}$$

by (3.6). Therefore, we can apply Proposition 3.17 to $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$, $d_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ and the inclusion $H_i \cap H_i^{\dagger} \subset H_i = H$. Consequently, we obtain an equality

$$[I_{G/(\mathcal{H}\cup\mathcal{H}^{\dagger})}^{(d_{\widetilde{\varphi}})}] = [I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')}].$$

Here, $\mathcal{H}' := \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1] \cup \mathcal{H}^{\dagger}$, and φ' is the restriction to \mathcal{H}' of $d_{\tilde{\varphi}}$. Then we have $\varphi'(H') = 1$ for any $H' \in \mathcal{H}'$, and hence we obtain an equality

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}^{(\varphi')} = I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}.$$

Now, recall that any element H' of $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]$ satisfies $H' = H_i \cap H_i^{\dagger}$ for some *i*. Since H_i^{\dagger} is an element of $\mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]$, we can apply Lemma 3.10 to \mathcal{H}' , φ' and the inclusion $H' \subset H_i^{\dagger}$. Repeating this argument for all $H' \in \mathcal{H}^{\dagger} \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\varphi}[1]$, we get

$$[I_{G/\mathcal{H}'}] = [I_{G/\mathcal{H}_{\omega}[1]}].$$

Consequently, we obtain the desired assertion.

3.4. Reduction to lattices over smaller groups. We first describe $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ as *P*-lattices, where *P* is a subgroup of *G*.

Proposition 3.20. Let G be a finite group, and P a subgroup of G. Consider a multiset of subgroups \mathcal{H} of G and a normalized function φ on G. Then there are isomorphisms of P-modules

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong I_{P/\mathcal{H}_P}^{(\varphi_P)}, \quad J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \cong J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P}^{(\varphi_P)}.$$

Here φ_P is defined as follows:

- C_H is a complete representative of $P \setminus G/H$ in G;
- \mathcal{H}_P the multiset of subgroups of G consisting $P \cap gHg^{-1}$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g \in C_H$; and
- φ_P is the normalized function on \mathcal{H}_P which sends $H' \in \mathcal{H}_P$ to the element of Δ defined by $\varphi(H)$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ with $H' = P \cap gHg^{-1}$ for some $g \in C_H$.

In particular, if $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible), then $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P}^{(\varphi_P)}$ is so.

Proof. This is a consequence of Mackey's decomposition.

Next, we describe $(I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^N$ and $(J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^{[N]}$ for a normal subgroup N of G.

Lemma 3.21. Let G be a finite group, and H its subgroup.

(i) For any subgroup H' of G containing H, the diagram

$$\mathbb{Z}[G/H'] \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \xrightarrow{\operatorname{Ind}_{H'}^G(\varepsilon_{H'/H})} \mathbb{Z}[G/H']$$

$$\stackrel{\varepsilon_{G/H'}}{\cong} \bigvee_{(H':H)} \bigvee_{\mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{\varepsilon_{G/H}}{\longrightarrow} \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}$$

is commutative.

(ii) Let N be a normal subgroup of G. Then the image of the canonical injection

$$\mathbb{Z}[G/HN] \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[G/H]$$

coincides with $\mathbb{Z}[G/H]^N$.

Proof. This follows from the definitions of the augumentation maps and their induced maps.

Proposition 3.22. Let G be a finite group, and N its normal subgroup. Take a multiset of subgroups \mathcal{H} of G and a normalized function φ of \mathcal{H} . Then there are isomorphisms

$$(I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^N \cong I_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}^{\text{nor}})}, \quad (J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^{[N]} \cong J_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}^{\text{nor}})}$$

Here \mathcal{H}^N and $\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}^{\mathrm{nor}}$ are defined as follows:

- \mathcal{H}^N is the multiset of subgroups of G/N consisting of HN/N for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ (in particular, the multiplicity of \overline{H} in \mathcal{H}^N is the sum of $m_{\mathcal{H}}(H)$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ with $HN/N = \overline{H}$); and
- the function $\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}$ of \mathcal{H}^N maps $\overline{H} \in \mathcal{H}^N$ to the element of Δ defined by $(HN : H)\varphi(H)$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$ with $HN/N = \overline{H}$; and

• $\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}^{\text{nor}}$ is as in Lemma 3.4.

In particular, if $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ is quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible), then $J_{G/\mathcal{H}^N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N})}$ is so.

Proof. By Lemma 3.21, we obtain an isomorphism of G/N-lattice $(I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^N \cong I_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N})}$. On the other hand, we have $I_{G/N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N})} = I_{G/N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}^{\text{nor}})}$ by Lemma 3.4. Hence we obtain $(I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^N \cong I_{G/N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}^{\text{nor}})}$ as desired. The isomorphism on $(J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^{[N]}$ is a consequence of that on $(I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)})^N$.

For a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G, we denote by $N^G(\mathcal{H})$ the maximal normal subgroup of G which is contained in H for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, we simply denote $N^G(\mathcal{H})$ by $N^G(H)$ if \mathcal{H} consists of a single subgroup H.

Corollary 3.23. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a multiset of subgroups of G. Consider a normal subgroup N of G that is contained in $N^G(\mathcal{H})$. Then there exist isomorphisms of G-lattices

$$I_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong I_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}, \quad J_{G/\mathcal{H}} \cong J_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}.$$

Here we regard $I_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}$ and $J_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}$ as G-lattices by the natural surjection $G \twoheadrightarrow G/N$.

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.22 since the actions of N on $I_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ and $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ are trivial.

4. p-GROUPS

For a finite group G, we write for $\Phi(G)$ the Frattini subgroup of G, that is, the intersection of all maximal subgroups of G. Here maximal subgroups mean *proper* subgroups which are maximal with respect to inclusion.

Proposition 4.1 ([Hal59, Theorem 4.3.2]). Let G be a p-group, where p is a prime number. Then all maximal subgroups of G are normal of index p. In particular, the Frattini subgroup $\Phi(G)$ contains the derived subgroup of G, and $G/\Phi(G)$ is an elementary p-abelian group.

Corollary 4.2. Let p be a prime number, G a p-group, and H its subgroup.

- (i) The subgroups $\Phi(G)$ and H do not generate G.
- (ii) We further assume $(N_G(H) : H) = p$. If a subgroup P of G contains H properly, then we have $N_G(H) \subset P$.

Proof. (i): Let P be a maximal subgroup of G containing H. Then it contains $\Phi(G)$ by definition, and hence $\Phi(G)H \subset P \subsetneq G$ as desired.

(ii): By Proposition 4.1, there exists a subgroup P' of P of order $p \cdot \#H$ that contains H. On the other hand, the assumption $(N_G(H) : H) = p$ implies that $N_G(H)$ is the unique subgroup of G of order $p \cdot \#H$ that contains H. Hence we obtain $P' = N_G(H)$, which concludes the desired assertion.

Lemma 4.3. Let p be a prime number, G a p-group, and N a normal subgroup of G. Then we have $Z(G) \cap N \neq \{1\}$.

Proof. Since N is normal in G, it is a disjoint union of $Z(G) \cap N$ and finitely many conjugacy classes C_1, \ldots, C_l in G with $\#C_i \neq 1$. In particular, one has an equality

$$#G = #(Z(G) \cap N) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} #C_i.$$

On the other hand, since G is a p-group, the integers #G and $\#C_i$ are powers of p. Hence we obtain $\#(Z(G) \cap N) \in p\mathbb{Z}$, which implies $Z(G) \cap N \neq \{1\}$ as desired.

In the sequel of this paper, for a positive integer n, we denote by D_n the dihedral group of order 2n, that is,

$$D_n = \langle \sigma_n, \tau_n \mid \sigma_n^n = \tau_n^2 = 1, \tau_n \sigma_n \tau_n = \sigma_n^{-1} \rangle.$$

Let p be a prime number. Recall that a finite group G of order p^n is said to be of maximal class if its nilpotency class is n - 1.

Proposition 4.4 ([Ber08, Corollary 1.7]). Let G be a 2-group of maximal class. Then G is isomorphic to one of the following:

- (i) the dihedral group $D_{2^{\nu}}$ of order $2^{\nu+1}$ for $\nu \geq 2$;
- (ii) the semi-dihedral group $SD_{2^{\nu+1}}$ of order $2^{\nu+1}$ for $\nu \geq 3$;
- (iii) the generalized quaternion group $Q_{2^{\nu}}$ of order 2^{ν} for $\nu \geq 3$, that is,

$$Q_{2^{\nu}} = \langle i_{\nu}, j_{\nu} \mid i_{\nu}^{2^{\nu-1}} = 1, j_{\nu}^{2} = i_{\nu}^{2^{\nu-2}}, j_{\nu}i_{\nu}j_{\nu}^{-1} = i_{\nu}^{-1} \rangle.$$

Proposition 4.5. Let G be a 2-group of order a multiple of 8 which is not of maximal class.

- (i) There exists an abelian normal subgroup E of G of order 8.
- (ii) Under the notation in (i), we further assume $E \cong C_4 \times C_2$. Then $\Phi(E)$ is contained in the center of G.

Proof. This is explained in [End11, p. 91, Proof of Step 4]. However, we give a proof for reader's convenience.

(i): By [Ber08, Lemma 1.4], one can take a non-cyclic normal subgroup E' of G of order 4 since G is not of maximal class. Furthermore, [Ber08, Proposition 1.8] implies that the centralizer of E' in G does not coincide with E'. Now, let E be the subgroup of G generated by E' and an element whose image in G/E' is central of order 2. Then E is normal in G and has order 8.

(ii): This follows from the fact that $\Phi(E)$ is a characteristic subgroup of E.

The following two lemmas can be obtained by direct computation.

Lemma 4.6. Let $\nu \geq 2$ be an integer.

- (i) For any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $N_{D_{2^{\nu}}}(\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^m \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle) = \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-1}}, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^m \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle$.
- (ii) For two integers m and m', $\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{m} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle$ and $\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{m'} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle$ are conjugate in $D_{2^{\nu}}$ if and only if m m' is even.

(iii) Every non-normal subgroup of $D_{2^{\nu}}$ is of the form $\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^m \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle$ for some integer m.

Lemma 4.7. Let $\nu \geq 3$ be an integer.

- (i) All non-normal subgroups of order 2 in $SD_{2^{\nu+1}}$ are conjugate to each other.
- (ii) There exists a unique subgroup of order 2 in $Q_{2^{\nu}}$, which is the center of $Q_{2^{\nu}}$.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

First, we specify previous results given by Endo-Miyata ([EM75]) and Endo ([End01], [End11]).

Proposition 5.1 (cf. [EM75, (1.5), (2.3)], [End11, Theorem 2.1]). Let p be a prime number, G a p-group and H a subgroup of G. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $J_{G/H}$ is a quasi-permutation G-lattice;
- (ii) $J_{G/H}$ is a quasi-invertible G-lattice;
- (iii) $G/N^G(H)$ is cyclic.

Proposition 5.2 ([End01, Theorem 1]). Let p be a prime number, and G an elementary p-abelian group. Take a reduced set \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G. If (G : H) = p for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-permutation G-lattice;
- (ii) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-invertible G-lattice;
- (iii) $#\mathcal{H} = 1 \text{ or } p = #\mathcal{H} = 2.$

Definition 5.3. For a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of a finite group G, put

 $\mu(\mathcal{H}) := \min\{(G:H) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid H \in \mathcal{H}\}, \quad M(\mathcal{H}) := \{(G:H) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid H \in \mathcal{H}\}.$

Lemma 5.4. Let G be a finite group, and \mathcal{H} a reduced set of its subgroups. If $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$, then we have $(G : N^G(\mathcal{H})) > M(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. Take $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G : H_0) = M(\mathcal{H})$. If $(G : N^G(H_0)) > M(\mathcal{H})$, then the assertion is clear. Otherwise, H_0 is normal in G. Take $H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{H_0\}$, then $N^G(H)$ does not contain H_0 since \mathcal{H} is reduced. Hence $(G : N^G(\{H, H_0\})) > M(\mathcal{H})$. This implies the desired assertion since $N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is contained in $N^G(\{H, H_0\})$.

Definition 5.5. For a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of a finite group G, set

$$\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{nor}} := \{ H \in \mathcal{H} \mid H \triangleleft G \}.$$

Lemma 5.6. Let p be a prime number, G a p-group, and \mathcal{H} a reduced set of its subgroups. If $G/N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is cyclic, then $\#\mathcal{H} = 1$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}} = \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. Take $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$. By definition, H and H' contain $N^G(\mathcal{H})$. Since $G/N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is cyclic, we have $H \subset H'$ or $H' \subset H$. This implies H = H' since \mathcal{H} is reduced. Hence, we obtain $\#\mathcal{H} = 1$. The equality $\mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}} = \mathcal{H}$ follows from the fact that all subgroups of G containing its derived subgroup are normal in G.

Definition 5.7. Let G be a finite group, and P its subgroup. For a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G, set

$$\mathcal{H}_{\subset P} := \{ H \in \mathcal{H} \mid H \subset P \}.$$

Lemma 5.8. Let p be a prime number, $\nu \geq 3$ a positive integer, and G a finite group of order p^{ν} . Consider a reduced set \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G satisfying $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$ and $\mu(\mathcal{H}) \geq p^2$. Take a maximal subgroup P of G. Assume that there is $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G : H_1) = \mu(\mathcal{H})$ such that all elements of $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ are conjugate to H_1 . If $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}} \setminus \{H_1\}$ has index $\mu(\mathcal{H})$ in G, then it is contained in $N_G(H_1)$. Moreover, we can take a maximal subgroup P' of G so that $\mathcal{H}_{\subset P'}$ contains H_0 and H_1 (in particular, $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ contains H_0).

Proof. We first prove $H_0 \subset N_G(H_1)$. By assumption, $P \cap H_0$ is contained in gH_1g^{-1} for some $g \in G$. This is equivalent to $P \cap H_0 \subset H_1$ since P and H_0 are normal in G Hence one has

$$H_0 \cap H_1 = P \cap H_0 \cap H_1 = P \cap H_1.$$

Combining this equality with the normality of H_0 in G, we obtain

$$(H_0H_1:H_1) = (H_0H_1:H_0) = (H_1:H_0 \cap H_1) = p.$$

On the other hand, H_0H_1 is a p-group since G is so. Consequently we have

$$H_0 \subset H_0 H_1 \subset N_G(H_1)$$

by Proposition 4.1.

Secondly, we construct a maximal subgroup P' of G that satisfies $\{H_0, H_1\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\subset P}$. Since $\mu(\mathcal{H}) \geq p^2$, one has

$$(G: H_0H_1) = p^{-1}(G: H_1) = p^{-1}\mu(\mathcal{H}) \ge p.$$

Hence we may take P' so that H_0H_1 is contained.

Theorem 5.9. Let p be an odd prime number, and G a p-group. Consider a reduced set \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-permutation G-lattice;
- (ii) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-invertible G-lattice;
- (iii) $\#\mathcal{H} = 1$ and $G/N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is cyclic.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is clear. (iii) \Rightarrow (i) follows from Proposition 5.1. In the following, we prove (ii) \Rightarrow (iii), which is archived by giving a proof of the contraposition. We may assume that \mathcal{H} contains at least two elements. In particular, G is not cyclic according to Lemma 5.6. It suffices to prove that $J_{G/H}$ is not quasi-invertible if $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$. Write $\#G = p^{\nu}$. We give a proof of the above assertion by induction on ν . If $\nu = 2$, the assertion follows from Proposition 5.2. Now suppose $\nu \geq 3$, and the assertion holds for all $\nu - 1$. If $N^G(\mathcal{H}) \neq \{1\}$, take a subgroup N of order p in $Z(G) \cap N^G(\mathcal{H})$. Note that $Z(G) \cap N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is non-trivial by Lemma 4.3. Then it suffices to prove the assertion for the G/N-lattice $J_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}$. Since $\#(G/N) = p^{\nu-1}$, the assertion follows from the induction hypothesis. Hence, we may further assume $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. If $M(\mathcal{H}) = p$, then G is elementary p-abelian since $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. Therefore, the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible by Proposition 5.2. Therefore, we can impose $M(\mathcal{H}) \geq p^2$ in the sequel. By the induction hypothesis, it suffices to prove that there is a maximal subgroup P of G that satisfies $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}} \geq 2$.

Case 1. $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{nor}$.

Recall the notations in Definition 5.3, that is,

 $M(\mathcal{H}) := \max\{ (G:H) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid (G:H) \in \mathcal{H} \}, \quad \mu(\mathcal{H}) := \min\{ (G:H) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid (G:H) \in \mathcal{H} \}.$

Case 1-a. $\mu(\mathcal{H}) < M(\mathcal{H})$. Take $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G : H_0) = M(\mathcal{H})$. Pick a maximal subgroup P of G containing H_0 . Then, for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G : H) < M(\mathcal{H})$, one has $H_0 \not\subset P \cap H$ and $H_0 \not\supset P \cap H$. In particular, $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ contains at least two elements. This completes the proof in this case.

Case 1-b. $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = M(\mathcal{H})$. In this case, the assertion follows from Lemma 5.8 since $\#\mathcal{H} \ge 2$ and $\mu(\mathcal{H}) \ge p^2$.

Case 2. $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{nor}$ is non-empty.

Note that one has $M(\mathcal{H}) \geq p^2$ by Proposition 4.1. Put

$$\sigma := \mu(\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{nor}}).$$

Take $H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}}$ with $(G : H) = \sigma$, and pick a maximal subgroup P of G containing $N_G(H)$. Fix a complete representative C of $P \setminus G/H \cong G/P$ in G. Let $H' \in \mathcal{H}$. If $H' \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}}$, then $gHg^{-1} \not\subset P \cap H'$ since H' is normal in G. On the other hand, if $H' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}}$, then the inclusion $gHg^{-1} \not\subset P \cap g'H'(g')^{-1}$ holds for any $g' \in G$ since $(G : H) = \sigma$. Therefore, $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ contains gHg^{-1} for any $g \in C$. In particular, $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ contains at least p elements. Hence the proof is complete.

Remark 5.10. In the proof of Theorem 5.9, Case 2 does not use the assumption $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$. In particular, we also obtain an alternative proof of Proposition 5.1 in the case where H is not normal in G.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We may assume $r \ge 2$. Put $G := \operatorname{Gal}(L/k)$ and $\mathcal{H} := \{\operatorname{Gal}(L/K_1), \dots, \operatorname{Gal}(L/K_r)\}.$ Then Proposition 3.1 gives an isomorphism $X^*(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$. Hence, by Proposition 2.11, it suffices to prove that the *G*-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible. In this case, \mathcal{H} is a reduced set that satisfies $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$. Therefore, the assertion follows from Theorem 5.9.

6. FLABBY RESOLUTIONS OF PARTICULAR LATTICES

6.1. Quasi-permutation lattices. Here we give some examples of G-lattices $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}$ that are quasipermutation. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we denote by D_n the dihedral group of order 2n, that is,

$$D_n := \langle \sigma_n, \tau_n \mid \sigma_n^n = \tau_n^2 = 1, \tau_n \sigma_n \tau_n = \sigma_n^{-1} \rangle.$$

Theorem 6.1. Let m be a positive integer. Consider a strongly reduced set

$$\mathcal{H} := \{ \langle \tau_{2m} \rangle, \langle \sigma_{2m} \tau_{2m} \rangle \}$$

of subgroups of D_{2m} . Then there is an exact sequence of D_{2m} -lattices

$$0 \to J_{D_{2m}/\mathcal{H}} \to \mathbb{Z}[D_{2m}] \oplus \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}[D_{2m}/\langle \sigma \rangle] \to 0.$$

In particular, $J_{D_{2m}/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-permutation.

Theorem 1.6 follows from Theorem 6.1 by the same argument as Theorem 1.2.

Proof. Consider two three homomorphisms of D_n -lattices as follows:

$$\iota_m \colon \mathbb{Z}[D_{2m}/\langle \sigma_{2m} \rangle] \to \mathbb{Z}[D_{2m}] \oplus \mathbb{Z}; \ 1 \mapsto (1 + \dots + \sigma_{2m}^{2m-1}, -1);$$
$$\omega_m \colon \mathbb{Z}[D_{2m}] \to I_{D_{2m}/\mathcal{H}}; \ 1 \mapsto (1, -1);$$
$$\psi_m \colon \mathbb{Z} \to I_{D_{2m}/\mathcal{H}}; \ 1 \mapsto (1 + \dots + \sigma_{2m}^{2m-1}, -(1 + \dots + \sigma_{2m}^{2m-1})).$$

It suffices to prove that the sequence of D_n -lattices

(6.1)
$$0 \to \mathbb{Z}[D_{2m}/\langle \sigma_{2m} \rangle] \xrightarrow{\iota_m} \mathbb{Z}[D_{2m}] \oplus \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{(\omega_m, \psi_m)} I_{D_{2m}/\mathcal{H}} \to 0$$

is exact. Inclusion $\operatorname{Im}(\iota_m) \subset \operatorname{Ker}(\omega_m, \psi_m)$ can be confirmed by direct computation. For reverse inclusion, pick an element $x = (x_1, x_2)$ from $\operatorname{Ker}(\omega_m, \psi_m)$. Then we have

$$x - x_2 \iota_m(1) = (x_1 - x_2(1 + \dots + \sigma_{2m}^{2m-1}), 0).$$

This implies that the first factor of $x - x_2 \iota_m(1)$ is contained in $\operatorname{Ker}(\omega_m)$. However, since $\operatorname{Ker}(\omega_m)$ is generated by $(1 - \tau_{2m})(1 + \cdots + \sigma_{2m}^{2m-1})$ as an abelian group, we see that $x - x_2 \iota_m(1)$ is a multiple of $\iota_m(1 - \tau_{2m})$ by an integer. Consequently, one has $x \in \operatorname{Im}(\iota_m)$ as desired.

Remark 6.2. If m = 1, then the exact sequence (6.1) is given by [End01].

Lemma 6.3. Let G be a finite group, and

$$0 \to F \to R \xrightarrow{\Phi} M \to 0$$

a coflabby resolution of a G-lattice M. Consider a homomorphism of G-lattices $\psi \colon R' \to M$, where R' is a permutation G-lattice, and we denote by Φ' the sum of Φ and ψ . Then there is an exact sequence

(6.2)
$$0 \to F \oplus R' \xrightarrow{\iota} R \oplus R' \xrightarrow{\Phi} M \to 0$$

which satisfies a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} R' \xrightarrow{x \mapsto (0,x)} F \oplus R' \\ \parallel & \qquad \downarrow^{\iota} \\ R' \xleftarrow{\operatorname{pr}_2} R \oplus R'. \end{array}$$

In particular, (6.2) is also a coflabby resolution of M.

Proof. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & \longrightarrow R & \longrightarrow R \oplus R' & \longrightarrow R' & \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow \\ \phi & & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow M & \longrightarrow M & \longrightarrow 0 & \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

where the horizontal sequences are exact. Applying the snake lemma to this diagram, we get an exact sequence

Here F' is the kernel of Φ' . However, one has $\operatorname{Ext}^{1}_{\mathbb{Z}[G]}(R', F) = 0$ by [CS77, Lemme 1]. Hence (6.3) splits, and the proof is complete.

Lemma 6.4. Consider a commutative diagram of finite free abelian groups

$$0 \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow M_3 \longrightarrow 0$$
$$\downarrow f_2 \qquad \qquad \downarrow f_2 \qquad \qquad \downarrow f_3$$
$$0 \longrightarrow M'_1 \longrightarrow M'_2 \longrightarrow M'_3,$$

where the horizontal sequences are exact. We further assume that

- $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M_1) = \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M'_1);$
- f_2 and f_3 are injective; and
- the cokernel of f_2 is torsion-free.

Then the homomorphism f_1 is an isomorphism.

Proof. By the snake lemma, one has an exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker}(f_1) \to \operatorname{Ker}(f_2) \to \operatorname{Ker}(f_3) \to \operatorname{Coker}(f_1) \to \operatorname{Coker}(f_2).$$

Since $\operatorname{Ker}(f_2)$ is trivial by assumption, we have $\operatorname{Ker}(f_1) = 0$. On the other hand, since $\operatorname{Ker}(f_3) = 0$ and $\operatorname{Coker}(f_2)$ is torsion-free, we obtain that $\operatorname{Coker}(f_1)$ has no torsion. However, the equality $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M_1) = \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M_1')$ implies $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\operatorname{Coker}(f_1)) = 0$, and hence $\operatorname{Coker}(f_1) = 0$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 6.5. Let G be a finite group, and N its normal subgroup. Consider a commutative diagram of G-lattices as follows:

$$0 \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow M_3 \longrightarrow 0$$
$$\downarrow^{f_1} \qquad \downarrow^{f_2} \qquad \downarrow^{f_3}$$
$$0 \longrightarrow M'_1 \longrightarrow M'_2 \longrightarrow M'_3 \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the horizontal sequences are exact. We further assume that

- (a) $H^1(N, \text{Ker}(f_1)) = 0$; and
- (b) N acts trivially on M_3 .

Then $\operatorname{Ker}(f_2)$ is generated by $\operatorname{Ker}(f_1)$ and $\operatorname{Ker}(f_2)^N$.

Proof. We denote by M_3^{\dagger} the image of Ker (f_2) under the surjection $M_2 \rightarrow M_3$. Then one has an exact sequence

(6.4)
$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker}(f_1) \to \operatorname{Ker}(f_2) \to M_3^{\dagger} \to 0.$$

Since M_3^{\dagger} is contained in M_3 , the assumption (b) implies that the action of N on M_3^{\dagger} is trivial. Taking N-fixed parts of (6.4), we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker}(f_1)^N \to \operatorname{Ker}(f_2)^N \to M_3^{\dagger} \to 0.$$

Here we use (a) for the surjectivity. This implies the desired assertion.

Lemma 6.6. Let G be a finite group, H its subgroups, and N_1 and N_2 normal subgroups of G. Consider homomorphisms of G-lattices as follows:

$$f_1 \colon M_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_1} \to M'_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H];$$

$$f_2 \colon M_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_2} \to M'_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \oplus M'_2.$$

Denote by $M' \subset M'_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H] \oplus M'_2$ the image of the sum of f_1 and f_2 . We further assume that

- (1) $gcd((HN_1N_2:HN_1),(HN_1N_2:N_2)) = 1;$
- (2) $H \cap N_1 N_2 = \{1\};$

(3) there exist commutative diagrams

(4) $M' \cap (M'_1 \oplus \{0\} \oplus M'_2)^{N_1N_2} \subset f_1(M_1 \oplus \{0\}) + f_2(M_2 \oplus \{0\}) \subset M'_1 \oplus \{0\} \oplus M'_2$; and (5) $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} \operatorname{Ker}(f) = (G : HN_1N_2).$

Then there is an isomorphism

$$M' \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_1N_2] \cong M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_2].$$

Proof. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the homomorphism $\operatorname{Ind}_{H}^{G} \varepsilon_{HN_{i}/H}^{\circ}$ induces an isomorphism

$$\varepsilon_i \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_i] \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_i}$$

Take two integers c_1 and c_2 which satisfy $c_1(HN_1N_2:N_1) - c_2(HN_1N_2:N_2) = 1$. Note that it is possible by (2). We define π as the composite

$$(M_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_1}) \oplus (M_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_2}) \xrightarrow{(\varepsilon_1^{-1} \circ \mathrm{pr}_2) \oplus (\varepsilon_2^{-1} \circ \mathrm{pr}_2)} \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_2]$$

$$\xrightarrow{(c_1 \operatorname{Ind}_{HN_1N_2}^G \varepsilon_{HN_1N_2/HN_1}, c_2 \operatorname{Ind}_{HN_1N_2}^G \varepsilon_{HN_1N_2/HN_2})} \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_1N_2]$$

We denote by f the sum of f_1 and f_2 , and put E := Ker(f).

Claim. The restriction of π to E is an isomorphism.

We first prove the surjectivity. Put

$$y := \operatorname{Ind}_{H}^{G} \varepsilon_{HN_{1}N_{2}/H}^{\circ}(1) \in \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_{1}N_{2}}.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\pi((0,y),(0,-y)) = c_1(HN_1N_2:HN_1) - c_2(HN_1N_2:HN_2) = 1,$$

$$f((0,y),(0,-y)) \in M' \cap (M'_1 \oplus \{0\} \oplus M'_2)^{N_1N_2}.$$

Here we use (2) and (3) for the lower assertion. By (4), there exist $x_1 \in M_1$ and $x_2 \in M_2$ so that $f((x_1, 0), (x_2, 0)) = f((0, y), (0, -y))$. Then $((-x_1, y), (-x_2, -y))$ lies in *E* and

$$\pi((-x_1, y), (-x_2, -y)) = \pi((0, y), (0, -y)) = 1.$$

Now, (5) implies that the kernel of the restriction of π to E has rank 0. Hence it must be trivial, and the proof of Claim is complete.

By Claim, we get a commutative diagram

$$0 \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow (M_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_1}) \oplus (M_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_2}) \xrightarrow{J} M' \longrightarrow 0$$
$$\downarrow^{\pi}_{\mathbb{Z}[G/HN_1N_2],}$$

where the horizontal sequence is exact. In particular, this exact sequence splits, and therefore we obtain an isomorphism

$$M' \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/HN_1N_2] \cong M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]^{N_2}.$$

This implies the desired assertion.

Theorem 6.7. Let m be an odd positive, and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Consider the finite group

$$G_{m,\nu} := C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}}$$
$$= \langle \rho_m, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}, \tau_{2^{\nu}} \mid \rho_m^m = \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu}} = \tau_{2^{\nu}}^2 = 1, \rho_m \sigma_{2^{\nu}} = \sigma_{2^{\nu}} \rho_m, \rho_m \tau_{2^{\nu}} = \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rho_m, \tau_{2^{\nu}} \sigma_{2^{\nu}} \tau_{2^{\nu}}^{-1} = \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{-1} \rangle,$$

and put $\mathcal{H} := \{ \langle \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle, \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle \}$. Then the $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattice $J_{G_{m,\nu}/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-permutation.

Proof. In this proof, put $I_{m,\nu} := I_{G_{m,\nu}/\mathcal{H}_{m,\nu}}$. By Theorem 6.1, we may assume m > 1. Consider homomorphisms of G-lattices as follows:

$$\begin{split} \psi_{m,\nu,0} \colon R_{m,\nu,0} &:= \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \rho_m \rangle] \to I_{m,\nu}; \ 1 \mapsto \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \rho_m^i - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \rho_m^i \right); \\ \psi_{m,\nu,1} \colon R_{m,\nu,1} &:= \mathbb{Z} \to I_{m,\nu}; \ 1 \mapsto \left(\left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \rho_m^i \right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{2n-1} \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^j \right), - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \rho_m^i \right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^{2n-1} \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^j \right) \right); \\ \psi_{m,\nu,2} \colon R_{m,\nu,2} &:= \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle] \to I_{m,\nu}; \ 1 \mapsto (1 + \rho_m, -(1 + \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^n)); \\ \omega_{m,\nu,i} \colon R'_{m,\nu,i} &:= \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-i}n'}, \sigma\tau \rangle] \to I_{m,\nu}; \ 1 \mapsto \left(0, \left(\sum_{j=0}^{2^{i-1}} \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-i}j} \right) (1 - \rho_m \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-i-1}}) \right). \end{split}$$

Here $i \in \{0, \ldots, \nu - 1\}$. We denote by $\Phi_{m,\nu,*} \colon R_{m,\nu,*} \to I_{m,\nu}$ the sum of $\psi_{m,\nu,i}$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\omega_{m,\nu,0}$. Then there is an isomorphism $\operatorname{Coker}(\Phi_{m,\nu,*}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^{\oplus 2^{\nu-1}-1}$, which follows from the following:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1, \sum_{j=0}^{(m-3/2)} \rho_m^{1+2j} (1+\sigma_{2^{\nu}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \rho_m^i \\ 0, 1-\rho_m \end{pmatrix} = \psi_{m,\nu,0} (1) - \sum_{j=0}^{(m-3)/2} \psi_{m,\nu,2} (\rho_m^{1+2j}); \\ (0, 1-\rho_m) = \omega_{m,\nu,0} ((1+\rho_m^2+\dots+\rho_m^{m-1})(1+\rho_m\sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-1}})); \\ (0, 1-\sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-1}}) = \omega_{m,\nu,0} (1+\rho_m\sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-1}}+\dots+(\rho_m\sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-1}})^{m-1}); \\ m(0, 1-\sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{-1}) = \psi_{m,\nu,0} (1-\tau_{2^{\nu}}) + (1-\sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{-1}) \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (0, 1-\rho_m^i).$$

On the other hand, we write for $\Psi_{m,\nu,\bullet} \colon R'_{m,\nu,\bullet} \to I_{m,\nu}$ for the sum of $\omega_{m,\nu,i}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$. Moreover, $\Phi_{m,\nu} \colon R_{m,\nu} \to I_{m,\nu}$ denotes the sum of $\Phi_{m,\nu,*}$ and $\Phi_{m,\nu,\bullet}$. Then, for $n \ge 2$, we have

$$2^{i}(0, 1 - \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-i-1}}) = \omega_{m,\nu,i}(1) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (0, 1 - \sigma^{2^{\nu-i}j})$$

for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, \nu - 1\}$. Hence we obtain by induction that the sum $R_{m,\nu} \to I_{m,\nu}$ is surjective. In particular, on has an exact sequence of *G*-lattices

$$0 \to F_{m,\nu} \to R_{m,\nu} \to I_{m,\nu} \to 0.$$

In the following, we write C_m and Z_{ν} for the subgroups of $G_{m,\nu}$ generated by ρ_m and $\sigma_{2\nu}^{2^{\nu-1}}$ respectively. In addition, we define $G_{m,\nu}$ -sublattices of $R_{m,\nu}$ as follows:

$$R^{-}_{m,\nu,*} := R_{m,\nu,0} \oplus R_{m,\nu,1} \oplus R_{m,\nu,2}, \quad R^{-}_{m,\nu} := R^{-}_{m,\nu,*} \oplus R'_{m,\nu,\bullet},$$

Claim. (i) There exist isomorphisms of $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattices

(6.5)
$$F_{m,\nu} \cap R^-_{m,\nu,*} \cong \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \rho_m, \sigma_{2^{\nu}} \rangle] \oplus R^{C_m}_{m,\nu,2},$$

(6.6)
$$F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*} \cong (F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}^{-}) \oplus (R'_{m,\nu,0})^{C_m}.$$

Moreover, the following holds:

Here the left vertical map is the natural inclusion, and the right vertical map is defined by (6.6).

- (ii) We have $F_{m,\nu} = (F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{n,*}) + F_{m,\nu}^{Z_{\nu}}$.
- (i): By the definition of $\Phi_{m,\nu,*}$, we have a commutative diagram

where the horizontal sequences are exact. Note that the central and the rightmost vertical maps are injective, and the cokernel of the central vertical map is torsion-free. Moreover, since the the cokernel of $\Phi_{m,\nu,*}$ is torsion, we have

$$\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}) = \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(R_{m,\nu,*}) - \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(I_{m,\nu})$$
$$= (2^{\nu+1}(m+1)+1) - (2^{\nu+1}m-1)$$
$$= 2^{\nu+1}+2.$$

Therefore, the ranks of $F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}$ and $F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}^{C_m}$ coincide. Hence Lemma 6.4 implies

$$F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}^{C_m} = F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}$$

On the other hand, Theorem 6.1 gives an exact sequence of $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattices

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \rho_m, \sigma_{2^{\nu}} \rangle] \to R_{m,\nu,0} \oplus R_{m,\nu,1} \to I^{C_m}_{G_{m,\nu}/\mathcal{H}_{m,\nu}} \to 0.$$

Hence the assertion follows from Lemma 6.3.

(ii): By (i), $F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*} = \text{Ker}(\Phi_{m,\nu,*})$ is a permutation $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattice. In particular, we have $H^1(Z_{\nu}, F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}) = 0$. Moreover, one has $(R'_{m,\nu,\bullet})^{Z_{\nu}} = R'_{m,\nu,\bullet}$ by definition. Hence the assertion follows follows from Lemma 6.5 for the commutative diagram

$$0 \longrightarrow R_{m,\nu,*} \longrightarrow R_{m,\nu} \xrightarrow{\pi'_{m,\nu}} R'_{m,\nu,\bullet} \longrightarrow 0$$
$$\downarrow \Phi_{m,\nu,*} \qquad \qquad \downarrow \Phi_{m,\nu} \qquad \qquad \downarrow 0$$
$$0 \longrightarrow I_{m,\nu} = I_{m,\nu} \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\pi'_{m,\nu}$ is the canonical projection $R_{m,\nu} \twoheadrightarrow R'_{m,\nu,\bullet}$.

In the following, we prove that there is an isomorphism of $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattices

(6.7)
$$F_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu} \cong (F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}) \oplus S'_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu},$$

where

$$S_{m,\nu} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\nu-1} \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \rho_m, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-i}}, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}\tau_{2^{\nu}}\rangle], \quad S'_{m,\nu} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\nu-1} \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-i}}, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}\tau_{2^{\nu}}\rangle].$$

This clearly implies the desired assertion. We prove (6.7) by induction on n. If n = 1, then the $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattice $R_{m,\nu,\bullet}$ is zero. Hence the assertion follows from Claim (i). Next, let $n \ge 2$, and suppose that the assertion holds for n - 1. By definition, there is a canonical isomorphism $I_{m,\nu-1} \cong I_{m,\nu}^{Z_{\nu}}$. Moreover, the restriction of $\Phi_{m,\nu}$ to $R_{m,\nu}^-$ induces a coflabby resolution of $I_{m,\nu}^{Z_{\nu}}$ as follows:

$$0 \to F_{m,\nu} \cap (R_{m,\nu}^-)^{Z_{\nu}} \to (R_{m,\nu}^-)^{Z_{\nu}} \to I_{m,\nu}^{Z_{\nu}} \to 0.$$

Consequently, Lemma 6.3 gives an isomorphism

$$F_{m,\nu}^{Z_{\nu}} \cong (F_{m,\nu} \cap (R_{m,\nu}^{-})^{Z_{\nu}}) \oplus (R_{m,\nu,0}^{\prime})^{Z_{\nu}}$$

that satisfy the following:

(6.8)
$$(R'_{m,\nu,0})^{Z_{\nu}} \longrightarrow F^{Z_{\nu}}_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1}$$

$$\downarrow^{x \mapsto x} \qquad \qquad \downarrow^{x \mapsto x}$$

$$R'_{m,\nu,0} \xleftarrow{\operatorname{pr}_{2}} R^{-}_{m,\nu} \oplus R'_{m,\nu,0} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1}.$$

On the other hand, by the induction hypothesis, we obtain an isomorphism of $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattices

$$(F_{m,\nu} \cap (R_{m,\nu}^{-})^{Z_{\nu}}) \oplus S_{m,\nu-1} \cong (F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,\diamond}^{Z_{\nu}}) \oplus S'_{m,\nu-1} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1},$$

where $R_{m,\nu,\diamond} := R_{m,\nu,0} \oplus R_{m,\nu,1} \oplus R_{m,\nu,2} \oplus R'_{m,\nu,1}$. In addition, by Claim (i), one has an isomorphism

$$F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,\diamond}^{Z_{\nu}} \cong (F_{m,\nu} \cap (R_{m,\nu,*}^{-})^{Z_{\nu}}) \oplus (R_{m,\nu,1}^{\prime})^{C_{m}}$$

In summary, we obtain an isomorphism of $G_{m,\nu}$ -lattices

(6.9)
$$(F_{m,\nu} \cap (R_{m,\nu}^{-})^{Z_{\nu}}) \oplus S_{m,\nu-1} \cong (F_{m,\nu} \cap (R_{m,\nu,*}^{-})^{Z_{\nu}}) \oplus F_{m,\nu-1}^{\dagger}.$$

where

$$F_{m,\nu-1}^{\dagger} := (R'_{m,\nu,1})^{C_m} \oplus S'_{m,\nu-1} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1} = S'_{m,\nu-1} \oplus S_{m,\nu}.$$

Now, consider two homomorphisms as follows:

$$\Xi_{m,\nu,1} \colon F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*} = (F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}^{-}) \oplus (R'_{m,\nu,0})^{C_m} \to R_{m,\nu,*} = R_{m,\nu,*}^{-} \oplus R'_{m,\nu,0};$$

$$\Xi_{m,\nu,2} \colon F_{m,\nu-1}^{\dagger} \oplus (R'_{m,\nu,0})^{Z_{\nu}} \to R_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1} = R_{m,\nu,*}^{-} \oplus R'_{m,\nu,0} \oplus (R'_{m,\nu,\bullet} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1}),$$

where $\Xi_{m,\nu,1}$ and $\Xi_{m,\nu,2}$ are induced by $F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*} \subset R_{m,\nu,*}$ and (6.9) respectively. Denote by $\Xi_{m,\nu}$ the sum of $\Xi_{m,\nu,1}$ and $\Xi_{m,\nu,2}$. Then we have $\operatorname{Im}(\Xi_{m,\nu}) = F_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1}$, which is a consequence of Claim (ii) and (6.9). In particular, one has an exact sequence

(6.10)
$$0 \to E_{m,\nu} \to (F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}) \oplus F_{m,\nu-1}^{\dagger} \xrightarrow{\Xi_{m,\nu}} F_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1} \to 0.$$

Now, we confirm that $\Xi_{m,\nu,1}$ and $\Xi_{m,\nu,2}$ satisfy the five assumptions in Lemma 6.6. The conditions (1) and (2) are not difficult by using the property that m is odd. Moreover, (3) is a consequence of Claim (i) and (6.8). On the other hand, (6.9) implies the following:

$$\Xi_{m,\nu,1}(F_{m,\nu} \cap (R^-_{m,\nu,*})^{Z_{\nu}}) + \Xi_{m,\nu,2}(F^{\dagger}_{m,\nu-1}) = (F_{m,\nu} \cap (R^-_{m,\nu})^{Z_{\nu}}) \oplus S_{m,\nu-1}$$
$$= (F_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1}) \cap (R^-_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1})^{Z_{\nu}}.$$

Note that the second equality follows from the fact that Z_{ν} acts trivially on $S_{m,\nu-1}$. Hence (4) is valid. Finally, (6.10) implies $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\operatorname{Ker}(\Xi_{m,\nu})) = 2^{\nu-1}m$, that is, (5) holds true. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 6.6, and hence one has an isomorphism

$$F_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu-1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \rho_m, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-1}}, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}\tau_{2^{\nu}}\rangle] \cong (F_{m,\nu} \cap R_{m,\nu,*}) \oplus F_{m,\nu-1}^{\dagger} \oplus (R'_{m,\nu,0})^{Z_{\nu}}$$

Then the equality

$$S_{m,\nu-1} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G_{m,\nu}/\langle \rho_m, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2^{\nu-1}}, \sigma_{2^{\nu}}\tau_{2^{\nu}}\rangle] = S_{m,\nu}$$

and an isomorphism

$$F_{m,\nu-1}^{\dagger} \oplus (R'_{m,\nu,0})^{Z_{\nu}} = S'_{m,\nu-1} \oplus S_{m,\nu} \oplus (R'_{m,\nu,0})^{Z_{\nu}} \cong S'_{m,\nu} \oplus S_{m,\nu}$$

imply (6.7). Hence the proof is complete.

The following will be used in the next subsection.

Proposition 6.8. Let $G := (C_2)^2 = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^2 = \tau^2 = 1, \sigma\tau = \tau\sigma \rangle$, $\mathcal{H} := \{\{1\}, G\}$, and φ the function on \mathcal{H} defined as $\varphi(\{1\}) = 1$ and $\varphi(G) = 2$. Then there is an exact sequence of G-lattices

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus 2} \to \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \tau \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \tau \rangle] \to I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)} \to 0.$$

Proof. Consider homomorphisms as follows:

$$f_1: \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \rangle] \to I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}; 1 \mapsto (1 + \sigma, -1);$$

$$f_2: \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \tau \rangle] \to I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}; 1 \mapsto (1 + \tau, -1);$$

$$f_3: \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \tau \rangle] \to I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}; 1 \mapsto (1 + \sigma \tau, -1).$$

We set

$$f: \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \tau \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \tau \rangle] \to I_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{(\varphi)}; \ (x_1, x_2, x_3) \mapsto f_1(x_1) + f_2(x_2) + f_3(x_3)$$

By definition, the kernel of the sum of f_1 is generated by $(1+\tau, -(1+\sigma), 0)$ and $(0, 1+\sigma, -(1+\sigma))$. These elements are fixed under G, and hence the assertion holds.

6.2. Non-quasi-invertible lattices. we prove that some $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ are not quasi-invertible. The proofs are based on [End01, §§3–4] and [End11, Lemma 2.2]. For a *G*-lattice *M*, put $M_2 := M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_2$ where \mathbb{Z}_2 is the ring of 2-adic integers.

Proposition 6.9. Let $G := (C_2)^3$ and $\mathcal{H} := \{C_2 \times \{1\} \times \{1\}, \{1\} \times C_2 \times C_2\}$. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. Write

$$G = \langle \rho, \sigma, \tau \mid \rho^2 = \sigma^2 = \tau^2 = 1, \rho\sigma = \sigma\rho, \sigma\tau = \tau\sigma, \tau\rho = \rho\tau \rangle.$$

We may assume $\mathcal{H} := \{H_1, H_2\}$, where $H_1 = \langle \rho \rangle$ and $H_2 = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$. Let $I = I_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ and $J = J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$. We regard I as a G-submodule of $\mathbb{Z}[G/H_1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_2]$, which induces an exact sequence

(6.11)
$$0 \to I \to \mathbb{Z}[G/H_1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_2] \xrightarrow{(\varepsilon_{G/H_1}, \varepsilon_{G/H_2})} \mathbb{Z} \to 0.$$

Put $\overline{G} := G/H_1 \cong (C_2)^2$. By definition, there is an isomorphism of \overline{G} -lattices

$$I^{H_1} \cong I^{(\varphi)}_{\overline{G}/\overline{\mathcal{H}}}$$

Here $\overline{\mathcal{H}} := \{\{1\}, \overline{G}\}$ and φ is the function on $\overline{\mathcal{H}}$ defined as $\varphi(\{1\}) = 1$ and $\varphi(\overline{G}) = 2$. Hence, by Proposition 6.8, we obtain a coflabby resolution

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus 2} \to \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \rho, \tau \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \rho, \sigma \tau \rangle] \xrightarrow{f'} I^{\langle \rho \rangle} \to 0.$$

On the other hand, we have the following for any $g \in \{\sigma, \tau, \sigma\tau\}$:

$$I^{\langle g \rangle} = I^{\langle \rho, g \rangle} + \langle (0, 1 - \rho) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}, \quad I^{\langle g \rangle} = I^{\langle \rho, g \rangle}$$

Moreover, I is generated by (1, -1) as a G-lattice. Now consider homomorphisms

$$f_1 \colon \mathbb{Z}[G] \to I; \ 1 \mapsto (1, -1);$$
$$f_2 \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle] \to I; \ 1 \mapsto (0, 1 - \rho).$$

Then f', f_1 and f_2 induce a coflabby resolution of I:

$$0 \to F \to R \xrightarrow{J} I \to 0.$$

Claim. The exponent of $\widehat{H}^0(G, F)$ is a divisor of 4.

Consider an exact sequence

$$\widehat{H}^{-1}(G,I) \to \widehat{H}^0(G,F) \to \widehat{H}^0(G,R).$$

Then we have $\widehat{H}^{-1}(G, I) = 0$, which follows from the surjectivity of the horizontal homomorphisms of the commutative diagram

Moreover, there is an isomorphism $\widehat{H}^0(G, P) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^{\oplus 4}$. This implies that the exponent of $\widehat{H}^0(G, F)$ is a divisor of 4.

Now suppose that J is quasi-invertible, that is, F° is invertible. Then F is also invertible. Moreover, by the same argument as [End11, Lemma 2.2], F_2 is a permutation $\mathbb{Z}_2[G]$ -lattice. Hence F_2 contains \mathbb{Z}_2 as a direct summand of $\mathbb{Z}_2[G]$ -modules since $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(F) = 11$. In particular, $\hat{H}^0(G, F)$ has exponent 8, which contradicts Claim. Therefore, the G-lattice J is not quasi-invertible as desired.

Proposition 6.10. Let $G := C_4 \times C_2$ and $\mathcal{H} := \{C_4 \times \{1\}, \{1\} \times C_2\}$. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. Write

$$G = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^4 = \tau^2 = 1, \sigma \tau = \tau \sigma \rangle,$$

and put $H_1 := \langle \sigma \rangle$ and $H_2 := \langle \tau \rangle$. We may assume $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2\}$. Let $I = I_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ and $J = J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$. We regard I as a sublattice of $\mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \tau \rangle]$. Then one has an exact sequence

(6.12)
$$0 \to I \to \mathbb{Z}[G/H_1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_2] \xrightarrow{(\varepsilon_{G/H_1}, \varepsilon_{G/H_2})} \mathbb{Z} \to 0.$$

We regard I as a sublattice of $\mathbb{Z}[G/H_1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_2]$. Write

$$G = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^4 = \tau^2 = 1, \sigma\tau = \tau\sigma \rangle.$$

Then we have

$$I = \langle (1 - \tau, 0), (0, 1 - \sigma), (0, \sigma(1 - \sigma)), (0, \sigma^2(1 - \sigma)), (1, -1) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Moreover, the following hold:

$$\begin{split} I^{\langle \sigma^2 \rangle} &= \langle (1 - \tau, 0), (1 + \tau, -(1 + \sigma^2)), (1 + \tau, -\sigma(1 + \sigma^2)) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}, \\ I^{\langle \tau \rangle} &= \langle (0, 1 - \sigma), (0, \sigma(1 - \sigma)), (0, \sigma^2(1 - \sigma)), (1 + \tau, -(1 + \sigma^2)) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}, \\ I^{\langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle} &= I^{\langle \sigma^2, \tau \rangle} = \langle (1 + \tau, -(1 + \sigma^2)), (1 + \tau, -\sigma(1 + \sigma^2))) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma^2, \tau \rangle](1 + \tau, -(1 + \sigma^2)), \\ I^{\langle \sigma \rangle} &= \langle (1 - \tau, 0), (2(1 + \tau), -(1 + \sigma + \sigma^2 + \sigma^3)) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}, \\ I^{\langle \sigma \tau \rangle} &= I^G = \langle (2(1 + \tau), -(1 + \sigma + \sigma^2 + \sigma^3)) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}, \end{split}$$

Now consider homomorphisms

$$f_1 \colon \mathbb{Z}[G] \to I; \ 1 \mapsto (1, -1),$$

$$f_2 \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \tau \rangle] \to I; \ 1 \mapsto (0, 1 - \sigma),$$

$$f_3 \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma^2, \tau \rangle] \to I; \ 1 \mapsto (1 + \tau, -(1 + \sigma^2)),$$

$$f_4 \colon \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma \rangle] \to I; \ 1 \mapsto (1 - \tau, 0).$$

Then the sum of these maps induce a coflabby resolution

$$0 \to F \to R \xrightarrow{f} I \to 0$$

of I which admits an isomorphism

(6.13)
$$F^{\langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle} \cong \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/\langle \sigma^2, \tau \rangle] \oplus \mathbb{Z}$$

Now suppose that J is quasi-invertible. Since $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(F) = 11$ and $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}}(F^G) = 3$, there exist a subgroup H of G of order 4 and an isomorphism

$$F_2 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[G] \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2[G/H] \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$$

In particular, we obtain an isomorphism

$$\widehat{H}^0(G,F) \cong \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}.$$

However, since $\widehat{H}^0(G, R) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^{\oplus 2}$, the same argument as Claim in Proposition 6.9 implies that the exponent of $\widehat{H}^0(G, F)$ is a divisor of 4. Hence we obtain a contradiction, and the proof is complete.

7. Proof of Theorem 1.3

We give a proof of Theorem 1.3 by dividing into four steps.

7.1. First step: The case for groups of order 8.

Proposition 7.1. Let G be a p-group, where p is a prime number. Consider a reduced set \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G which contains a normal subgroup H_0 of G of index $\mu(\mathcal{H})$ such that G/H_0 is not cyclic. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. Let φ be the function on \mathcal{H} that takes the value 1 for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 3.22, one has an isomorphism

$$J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^{[H_0]} \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{H_0}}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/H_0})}.$$

Note that $\overline{\varphi}_{G/H_0}$ is normalized since $\overline{\varphi}_{G/H_0}(\{1\}) = 1$. Moreover, since $(G : H_0) = \mu(H)$, all the factors of $\overline{\varphi}_{G/H_0}(\overline{H})$ are divisible by $(\pi^{-1}(\overline{H}) : H_0)$ for any $\overline{H} \in \mathcal{H}^{H_0}$. Here π denotes the natural surjection from G onto G/H_0 . Therefore Corollary 3.19 implies the existence of permutation G-lattices R_1 and R_2 and an isomorphism of G-lattices

$$J_{(G/H_0)/\mathcal{H}^{H_0}}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/H_0})} \oplus R_1 \cong J_{G/H_0} \oplus R_2.$$

However, the G-lattice J_{G/H_0} is not quasi-invertible, which is a consequence of Proposition 5.1. Hence the assertion follows from Proposition 2.6 (ii).

Lemma 7.2. Let p be a prime number, and G a p-group. Consider a reduced set of subgroups \mathcal{H} of G. If \mathcal{H} contains all maximal subgroups that are not cyclic, then $N^G(\mathcal{H})$ contains $\Phi(G)$.

Proof. If all maximal subgroups of G are cyclic, then the assertion follows from the definition of $\Phi(G)$. From now on, assume that G admits its cyclic maximal subgroup. Pick $H \in \mathcal{H}$ which is not contained in any non-cyclic maximal subgroup of G. It suffices to prove that H is maximal in G. Take a maximal subgroup P of G containing H. Then the assumption on \mathcal{H} implies that P is cyclic. On the other hand, Proposition 4.1 implies that $\Phi(G)$ contains the unique subgroup of P of index p. Hence we must have H = P, which completes the proof.

Proposition 7.3. Put $G := (C_2)^3$ and let \mathcal{H} be a reduced set of its subgroups with $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$ and $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. For $i \in \{2, 4\}$, put

$$r_i := \# \{ H \in \mathcal{H} \mid (G : H) = i \}.$$

By Propositions 5.2 and 7.1, we may assume that r_2 and r_4 are grater than 0.

Case 1. $r_2 = r_4 = 1$.

In this case, the assertion follows from Proposition 6.9.

Case 2. $r_4 \ge 2$.

Pick $H_0, H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ which satisfy $(G : H_0) = 2$ and $(G : H_1) = (G : H_2) = 4$. Put $P := H_1H_2$, which is isomorphic to $(C_2)^2$. Then we have $(P : P \cap H_0) = 2$ and $(P \cap H_0) \cap H_1 = (P \cap H_0) \cap H_2 =$ {1}. Hence we have $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}} = \{P \cap H_0, H_1, H_2\}$. On the other hand, Proposition 5.2 implies that the *P*-lattice $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}}$ is not quasi-invertible. Therefore, the assertion follows from Proposition 2.6.

Case 3. $r_2 \ge 2$.

Write $G = \langle \rho, \sigma, \tau \mid \rho^2 = \sigma^2 = \tau^2 = 1, \rho\sigma = \sigma\rho, \sigma\tau = \tau\sigma, \tau\rho = \rho\tau \rangle$. Take $H_1, H_2, H_3 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G:H_1) = (G:H_2) = 2$ and $(G:H_3) = 4$. We may assume

$$H_1 = \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle, \quad H_2 = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle, \quad H_3 = \langle \rho \tau \rangle.$$

Now put $P := \langle \rho \sigma, \sigma \tau \rangle$, which is isomorphic to $(C_2)^2$. Note that P is not contained in \mathcal{H} since $H_3 \subset P$ and \mathcal{H} is reduced. Then we have

$$P \cap H_1 = \langle \rho \sigma \rangle, \quad P \cap H_2 = \langle \sigma \tau \rangle, \quad P \cap H_3 = H_3 = \langle \rho \tau \rangle.$$

Therefore, the assertion follows from the same argument as Case 2.

Proposition 7.4. Put $G := C_4 \times C_2$ and let \mathcal{H} a reduced set of its subgroups with $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$ and $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. By Propositions 5.2 and 7.1, we may assume that \mathcal{H} contains a subgroup H_0 of index 4 such that G/H_0 is cyclic. Write $G = \langle \sigma, \tau | \sigma^4 = \tau^2 = 1, \sigma\tau = \tau\sigma \rangle$, and set

$$N := \langle \sigma^2, \tau \rangle.$$

Since N is the unique non-cyclic maximal subgroup of G, it must not be contained in \mathcal{H} by Lemma 7.2. Consequently we may consider the case where \mathcal{H} satisfies at least one of (i)–(iv) as follows:

(i)
$$\mathcal{H} = \{ \langle \sigma \rangle, \langle \tau \rangle \};$$

(ii) $\mathcal{H} = \{ \langle \sigma \rangle, \langle \sigma \tau \rangle, \langle \tau \rangle \};$
(iii) $\mathcal{H} = \{ \langle \tau \rangle, \langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle \};$
(iv) $\{ \langle \tau \rangle, \langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle \} \subsetneq \mathcal{H}.$

In the following, we prove the assertion case-by-case.

Case (i): In this case, the assertion follows from Proposition 6.10.

Case (ii): It suffices to prove that there is an isomorphism

(7.1)
$$\operatorname{III}^{2}_{\omega}(G, J_{G/\mathcal{H}}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}.$$

In fact, if it holds, then Proposition 2.10 gives the desired assertion. Put

$$H_0 := \langle \sigma \rangle, \quad H_1 := \langle \sigma \tau \rangle, \quad H_2 := \langle \tau \rangle,$$

By the global class field theory, we can take a finite abelian extension L/\mathbb{Q} with group G. Let $\mathbf{K} := \prod_{i=0}^{2} K_i$, where K_i is the H_i -fixed subfield of L for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Then, combining Proposition 3.1 with [BP20, Lemma 3.3], we get an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{III}^{2}_{\omega}(G, J_{G/\mathcal{H}}) \cong \operatorname{III}^{2}_{\omega}(\mathbb{Q}, X^{*}(T_{\mathbf{K}/\mathbb{Q}})).$$

Here the right-hand side is defined as follows:

$$\mathrm{III}^{2}_{\omega}(\mathbb{Q}, X^{*}(T_{\mathbf{K}/\mathbb{Q}})) := \{ x \in H^{2}(\mathbb{Q}, X^{*}(T_{\mathbf{K}/\mathbb{Q}})) \mid \mathrm{Res}_{\mathbb{Q}_{v}/\mathbb{Q}}(x) = 0 \text{ for almost all place } v \text{ of } \mathbb{Q} \}.$$

Therefore, we can apply the theory of [Lee22]. First, note that the numbering of elements of \mathcal{H} satisfies the assumption in [Lee22, p. 8, l. 6]. Put $\mathcal{I} := \{1, 2\}$. Since $H_0H_1 = H_0H_2 = G$, we have $U_0 = \mathcal{I}$. Furthermore, one has

$$n_l(\mathcal{I}) := \#(\mathcal{I}/\sim_l) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } l = 0, \\ 2 & \text{if } l > 0. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we obtain

- $L(\mathcal{I}) = 0$ (see [Lee22, p. 17, Section 5, l. 17–18]); and
- $n_{l+1}(c) = 1$ for every l > 0 and $c \in \mathcal{I} / \sim_l$.

On the other hand, since H_0 contains $H_1 \cap N = \Phi(G)$, the integer $f_{\mathcal{I}}^{\omega}$ in [Lee22, p. 18, l.10–12] must be 1. Here we use the fact that N is the unique subgroup of index 2 containing H_2 . Therefore [Lee22, Corollary 6.3 (1)] gives an isomorphism

$$\operatorname{III}^{2}_{\omega}(G, J_{G/\mathcal{H}}) \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}^{f_{\mathcal{I}}^{\omega}})^{\oplus n_{1}(\mathcal{I})-1} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

which concludes the proof of (7.1).

Case (iii): This is the same as [End11, Lemma 2.2].

Case (iv): By assumption, there is $H \in \mathcal{H}$ which has index 2 in G. We may assume $H = \langle \sigma \rangle$. Then $\mathcal{H}_N^{\text{red}}$ contains $P \cap H$, H_1 and H_2 . Since they are distinct from each other, the assertion follows from the same argument as Case 1 in the proof of Proposition 7.3.

Proposition 7.5. Put $G := D_4$ and let \mathcal{H} be a reduced set of its subgroups satisfying $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$ and $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. We further assume that \mathcal{H}^{nor} is non-empty. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. By Proposition 5.2, we may assume that \mathcal{H} contains a subgroup of index 4. Furthermore, we may further assume that \mathcal{H} does not contain $\langle \sigma_4^2 \rangle$, which is a consequence of Proposition 7.1. Hence, it suffices to consider the case where \mathcal{H} contains $\langle \tau_4 \rangle$. combining this with the non-emptiness of \mathcal{H}^{nor} , we obtain that \mathcal{H} contains a subgroup H_0 of index 2. Then H_0 coincides with $\langle \sigma_4 \rangle$ or $\langle \sigma_4^2, \sigma_4 \tau_4 \rangle$ since \mathcal{H} is reduced. Now put $P := \langle \sigma_4^2, \tau_4 \rangle$, which is isomorphic to $(C_2)^2$. Then $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ contains $\langle \sigma_4^2 \rangle$, $\langle \tau_4 \rangle$ and $\langle \sigma_4^2 \tau_4 \rangle$. Therefore, the same argument as Case 1 in the proof of Proposition 7.3 gives the desired assertion.

In summary, we obtain the following.

Theorem 7.6. Let G be a 2-group of order 8, and \mathcal{H} a reduced set of its subgroups satisfying $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$ and $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. We further assume that \mathcal{H}^{nor} is non-empty. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. By the assumption on \mathcal{H} and the classification of groups of order 8, we obtain that G is isomorphic to $(C_2)^3$, $C_4 \times C_2$ or D_4 . Hence, the assertion follows from Propositions 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5.

7.2. Second step: The case consisting of normal subgroups with indices ≤ 4 . Here we generalize Theorem 7.6, which will be needed in the final step.

Proposition 7.7. Let G be a 2-group, and \mathcal{H} a reduced set of its subgroups that satisfy $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = 2$, $M(\mathcal{H}) = 4$ and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}}$. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/H}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. Take $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $(G : H_1) = 2$ and $(G : H_2) = 4$. Put $N := H_1 \cap H_2$, which has index 8 in G. Write φ for the function on \mathcal{H} that takes the value 1 for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then Proposition 3.22 gives an isomorphism

$$J_{G/\mathcal{H}}^N \cong J_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N})}.$$

Note that $\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}$ is normalized since $\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}(H_1/N) = \overline{\varphi}_{G/N}(H_2/N) = 1$. Let $\mathcal{H}^N_{\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}}[1]$ be as in Corollary 3.19, that is,

$$\mathcal{H}^{N}_{\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}}[1] := \{ H' \in \mathcal{H}^{N} \mid d_{\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}}(H') = 1 \}.$$

Denote by H'_i the image of H_i in G/N for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If $H' \notin \mathcal{H}^N \setminus \mathcal{H}_{\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}}$ satisfies (G/N : H') = 2, then the assumption $M(\mathcal{H}) = 4$ implies an equality

$$\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}(H') = (\underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{m_{\mathcal{H}^N}(H')}).$$

Hence we have $d_{\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}}(H') = (H': H'_1 \cap H') = 2$. On the other hand, $\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}(G/N) \in \Delta_{m_{\mathcal{H}^N}(G/N)}$ is a sequence consisting of 2 and 4. Consequently, one has $d_{\overline{\varphi}_{G/N}}(G) = (G/N: H'_1) = 2$. Therefore, we can apply Corollary 3.19. In particular we obtain an equality

$$[J_{(G/N)/\mathcal{H}^N}^{(\overline{\varphi}_{G/N})}] = [J_{(G/N)/\{H_1', H_2'\}}].$$

However, the *G*-lattice $J_{(G/N)/\{H'_1,H'_2\}}$ is not quasi-invertible by Theorem 7.6. Combining this result with Proposition 2.6 (ii), we obtain the desired assertion.

Lemma 7.8. Let p be a prime number, and G a p-group. Consider a reduced set \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G satisfying $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$, $\mathcal{H}^{nor} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = M(\mathcal{H}) \geq p^2$. Assume that a maximal subgroup P of G that satisfies $\mathcal{H}_{\subseteq P} = \emptyset$ and $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{red} = 1$. Then one has

$$M(\mathcal{H}) = p^{-1} \# G.$$

Proof. Pick $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}}$. Then the assumption on P implies $P \cap H = P \cap H'$ for any $H' \in \mathcal{H}$. In particular, one has $P \cap N^G(\mathcal{H}) = P \cap H$. Hence we have

$$#G = (G : N^G(\mathcal{H})) \le (G : P \cap N^G(\mathcal{H})) = p(P : P \cap H) = p(G : H) = pM(\mathcal{H}).$$

Combining the above inequality with $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$, we obtain $\#G = pM(\mathcal{H})$ as desired.

Lemma 7.9. Let p be a prime number, and G a p-group. Fix $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Consider a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G satisfying $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. Suppose

(i) $H \triangleleft G$ and $G/H \cong C_{p^m}$ for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$; and

(ii) every maximal subgroup of G contains an element of \mathcal{H} .

Then the group G is isomorphic to a product of finite copies of C_{p^m} .

Proof. Assume that the conclusion fails. Then there is an element $g \in G$ whose order is smaller than p^m so that $g \neq h^p$ for all $h \in G$. Take a maximal subgroup P of G which does not contain g and $H \in \mathcal{H}_{\subset P}$. Then the image \overline{g} of g in G/H must be a generator. However, we have $\overline{g}^{p^{m-1}} = 1$ since $g^{p^{m-1}} = 1$. This contradicts the cyclicity of G/H_0 , and hence the proof is complete.

Theorem 7.10. Let G be a 2-group, and \mathcal{H} a reduced set of its subgroups satisfying $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$, $M(\mathcal{H}) = 4$ and $\mathcal{H}^{nor} = \mathcal{H}$. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/H}$ is not quasi-invertible.

Proof. By Proposition 7.7, we may assume $M(\mathcal{H}) = 4$.

Step 1. Here we prove the assertion in the case where all maximal subgroups of G contain a member of \mathcal{H} . By Proposition 7.1, we may further assume that G/H is cyclic for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then Lemma 7.9 gives an isomorphism $G \cong (C_4)^m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Take a maximal subgroup P of G, which is possible by assumption. Then it is clear that $\mu(\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}) = 2$. In the following, we shall give $H' \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $P \cap H \in \mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ and $(P : P \cap H') = 4$. Fix

In the following, we shall give $H' \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $P \cap H \in \mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ and $(P : P \cap H') = 4$. Fix elements g_1, \ldots, g_m of G satisfying

$$G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_m \mid g_1^4 = \dots = g_n^4 = 1, g_i g_j = g_j g_i \ (i \neq j) \rangle$$

and

$$P = \langle g_1^2, g_2, \dots, g_m \rangle.$$

Pick $H \in \mathcal{H}_P$. Then there are $a_2, \ldots, a_m \in \{0, 2\}$ so that

$$H = \langle g_1^{a_2} g_2, \dots, g_1^{a_n} g_m \rangle.$$

Now let

$$P':=\langle g_1^2,g_1g_2,g_3,\ldots,g_m\rangle,$$

and pick $H' \in \mathcal{H}_{\subset P'}$. We prove that this H' satisfies the desired properties. There exist $b_2, \ldots, b_m \in \{0, 2\}$ so that

$$H' = \langle g_1^{b_2+1} g_2, g_1^{b_3} g_3 \dots, g_1^{b_n} g_m \rangle.$$

In particular, one has an equality

$$P \cap H' = \langle g_1^2 g_2^2, g_1^{b_3} g_3 \dots, g_1^{b_n} g_m \rangle$$

Hence we obtain $P/(P \cap H') \cong G/H' \cong C_4$. Furthermore, this isomorphism implies that

$$H_0 := \langle g_1^2, g_2^2, g_3 \dots, g_m \rangle$$

is the unique subgroup of P of index 2 containing $P \cap H'$. Hence, if $P \cap H_3$ does not lie in $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$, then the assumption $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = 4$ implies that H_0 is an element of \mathcal{H} . However, it is a contradiction since we assume the cyclicity of G/H for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore we obtain $P \cap H' \in \mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ as desired.

As above, we know that $\mu(\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}) = 2$ and $M(\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}) = 4$. Then it follows from Proposition 7.7 that the *P*-lattice $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}}$ is not quasi-invertible. Hence the assertion follows from Proposition 3.20 and Proposition 2.6 (i).

Step 2. Let $\#G = 2^{\nu}$, where $\nu \geq 3$ is an integer. Here we give a proof of the assertion in general by induction on ν . If $\nu = 3$, then the claim is contained in Theorem 7.6. In the following, suppose $\nu \geq 4$ and that the assertion holds for $\nu - 1$. By Step 1, we may further assume that $\mathcal{H}_{\subset P}$ is empty for some maximal subgroup P of G. Then we have $M(\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{red}}) = 4$. Moreover, the inequality

$$#G = 2^{\nu} \ge 2^4 > 8 = 2M(\mathcal{H})$$

and Lemma 7.8 imply $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}} \geq 2$. By the induction hypothesis, the *P*-lattice $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}}$ is not quasi-invertible. Therefore the assertion follows from Proposition 3.20 and Proposition 2.6 (i).

7.3. Third step: The case admitting normal factors.

Theorem 7.11. Let G be a 2-group, and \mathcal{H} a reduced set of subgroups of G. We further assume that \mathcal{H}^{nor} is non-empty. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-permutation if and only if it is quasi-invertible. Moreover, the above two conditions hold if and only if

(i) $\#\mathcal{H} = 1$ and $G/N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is cyclic; or

(ii)
$$\#\mathcal{H} = 2$$
 and $G/N^G(\mathcal{H}) \cong (C_2)^2$.

Proof. We may assume that \mathcal{H} contains at least two elements. In particular, G is not cyclic by Lemma 5.6. Write $\#G = 2^{\nu}$. The assertion holds for $\nu \geq 2$, which is a consequence of Proposition 5.2. In the sequel of the proof, assume $\nu \geq 3$. It suffices to prove that $J_{G/H}$ is not quasi-invertible if $(G : N^G(\mathcal{H})) \geq 8$ or $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 3$.

We give a proof of the above assertion by induction on ν . If $\nu = 3$, the claim follows from Theorem 7.6. Now suppose $\nu \geq 4$ and the assertion holds for $\nu - 1$. If $N^G(\mathcal{H}) \neq \{1\}$, then the same argument as Theorem 5.9 implies that the assertion follows from the induction hypothesis. Hence we may further assume $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. By the induction hypothesis, it suffices to prove that there is a maximal subgroup P of G which satisfies $(P : N^P(\mathcal{H}_P^{red})) \geq 8$ or $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{red} \geq 3$.

Case 1. $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{nor}$.

By Theorem 7.10, we may assume $M(\mathcal{H}) \geq 8$. Take $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G : H_0) = M(\mathcal{H})$. By the same argument as Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 5.9, there is a maximal subgroup P of Gsatisfying $H_0 \subset P$ and $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}} \geq 2$. Then we have $M(\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}) \geq M(\mathcal{H})/2 \geq 4$. Hence the inequality $(P : N^P(\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}})) \geq 8$ follows from Lemma 5.4.

Case 2. \mathcal{H}^{nor} and $\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{nor}$ are non-empty.

Note that one has $M(\mathcal{H}) \geq p^2$ by Proposition 4.1. Consider positive integers as follows:

(7.2)
$$\Sigma := \min\{(G:H) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid H \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{nor}}\}, \quad \sigma := \min\{(G:H) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{nor}}\}.$$

Take $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}}$ with $(G: H_0) = \Sigma$ and $H_1 \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}}$ with $(G: H_1) = \sigma$.

Case 2-a. $\Sigma < \sigma$. Pick a maximal subgroup P of G containing $N_G(H_1)$. Then we have $gH_1g^{-1} \not\subset P \cap H_0 \subsetneq H_0$ and $gH_1g^{-1} \not\supset P \cap H_0$ for any $g \in G$. Hence $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ has at least 3 elements.

Case 2-b. $\Sigma > \sigma$. Take a maximal subgroup P of G containing H_0 . Then one has $H_0 \not\subset P \cap H_1 \subsetneq H_1$ and $H_0 \not\supset P \cap H_1$. In particular, $P \cap H_1$ is contained in $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ since $(G : H_1) = \sigma = \mu(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore we obtain the desired inequality

$$(P: N^{P}(\mathcal{H}_{P}^{red})) \ge (P: H_{0} \cap (P \cap H_{1})) \ge 2(P: H_{0}) = 2\Sigma \ge 8.$$

Case 2-c. $\Sigma = \sigma$. Let *P* be a maximal subgroup of *G* containing $N_G(H_1)$. It suffices to prove that $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ is not a subset of $\{gH_1g^{-1} \mid g \in G\}$. This implies $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}} \geq 3$ since H_1 is not normal in *G*. Assume not, that is, $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$ is contained in $\{gH_1g^{-1} \mid g \in G\}$. Since H_0 is normal of index $\Sigma = \sigma = \mu(\mathcal{H})$, it is contained in $N_G(H_1)$ by Lemma 5.8. In particular, H_0 is an element of $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$, which contradicts to the assumption. Hence the proof is complete.

7.4. Final step: General case.

Lemma 7.12. Let G be a finite group, H a subgroup of G, and E an abelian normal subgroup of G. For $g_1, g_2 \in G$, assume $Eg_1H = Eg_2H$ in $E \setminus G/H$. Then we have $E \cap g_1Hg_1^{-1} = E \cap g_2Hg_2^{-1}$.

Proof. By assumption, we have $g_2 = xg_1h$ for some $x \in E$ and $h \in H$. This implies an equality

$$E \cap g_2 H g_2^{-1} = x(E \cap g_1 H g_1^{-1}) x^{-1}.$$

Now, the right-hand side equals $E \cap g_1 H g_1^{-1}$ since E is abelian. Hence the proof is complete.

Proposition 7.13. Let G be a group of order 2^{ν} , where $\nu \geq 3$. Consider a strongly reduced set \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G satisfying $\#\mathcal{H} \geq 2$, $\mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}} = \emptyset$ and $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = \#G/2$. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-permutation G-lattice;
- (ii) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-invertible G-lattice;
- (iii) $G \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{ \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle, \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m'+1} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle \}$ for some integers m and m'.

Proof. If $G \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$, then the assumption on \mathcal{H} implies $\mathcal{H} = \{\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle, \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m'+1} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle\}$ for some integers m and m'. Hence the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-permutation by Theorem 6.1. Otherwise, by Proposition 4.4 and Lemma 4.7, the group G is not of maximal class. This implies that we can take a non-cyclic abelian normal subgroup E of G of order 8, which is a consequence of Proposition 4.5.

Case 1. $\mu(\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{red}}) = 8$.

In this case, we have $\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{red}} = \{\{1\}\}\ \text{and}\ E/N^E(\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{red}})\ \text{is not cyclic.}$ Then Proposition 5.1 gives the desired assertion.

Case 2. $\mu(\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{red}}) = 4$ and $E \cong (C_2)^3$.

By assumption, there is an isomorphism

$$E/N^{E}(\mathcal{H}_{E}^{\mathrm{red}}) \cong \begin{cases} (C_{2})^{2} & \text{if } \#\mathcal{H}_{E}^{\mathrm{red}} = 1; \\ (C_{2})^{3} & \text{if } \#\mathcal{H}_{E}^{\mathrm{red}} \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Then the assertion follows from Theorem 7.11.

Case 3. $\mu(\mathcal{H}_E^{\mathrm{red}}) = 4$ and $E \cong C_4 \times C_2$.

Write $E = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^4 = \tau^2 = 1, \sigma\tau = \tau\sigma \rangle$. Then, by Lemma 4.7, $\Phi(G)$ is contained in the center of G. Pick $H \in \mathcal{H}_E^{\text{red}}$, then $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = 2$ implies $H \subset E$ and $H = g_0 H_0 g_0^{-1}$ for some $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g \in G$. Then, H coincides with $\langle \tau \rangle$ or $\langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle$ since it is not normal in G. We may assume $H = \langle \tau \rangle$. On the other hand, the elements τ and $\sigma^2 \tau$ are conjugate in G. In particular, there is $g \in G$ such that $gHg^{-1} = \langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle$. Then one has $Eg_0H_0 \neq Egg_0H_0$ in $E \setminus H/H_0$, which is a consequence of Lemma 7.12. Therefore, $\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{red}}$ contains $\langle \tau \rangle$ and $\langle \sigma^2 \tau \rangle$. In particular, we have $\mathcal{H}_N^{\text{red}} \geq 2$ and $N^E(\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{red}}) = \{1\}$. Now, the assertion follows from Theorem 7.11.

Lemma 7.14. Let G be a 2-group, and \mathcal{H} a strongly reduced set of its subgroups. Assume

- $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\};$
- $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = M(\mathcal{H}); and$
- $(H: N^G(H)) = (N_G(H): H) = 2$ and $N^G(H) \neq \{1\}$ for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Then there is a maximal subgroup P of G such that $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}} \geq 3$.

Proof. By assumption, there exist $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $N^G(H) \neq N^G(H')$. Case 1. $N^G(H)H' = G$.

Let P be a maximal subgroup of G containing $N_G(H)$. Fix $g \in G \setminus P$, then $\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}}$ contains H and gHg^{-1} . On the other hand, we have

$$(G: N^G(H) \cdot (P \cap H')) \le 2$$

since $N^G(H)H' = G$. Combining this inequality with the inclusion $N^G(H) \cdot (P \cap H') \subset P$, we obtain an equality

$$N^G(H) \cdot (P \cap H') = P.$$

In particular, $P \cap H'$ is not contained in H or gHg^{-1} . If $P \cap H' \in \mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$, then $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}} \geq 3$ is clear. Otherwise, there exist $g_0 \in G$ and $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ so that $P \cap H' \subsetneq P \cap g_0 Hg_0^{-1}$. Since

 $#(P \cap H') = #H'/2 = #H_0/2$, we have $P \cap g_0 H g_0^{-1} = g_0 H_0 g_0^{-1}$, that is, $g_0 H_0 g_0^{-1} \subset P$. In particular, we obtain H_0 and $g H_0 g^{-1}$ are contained in P. Therefore, one has $#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{srd}} \ge 4$, which completes the proof in this case.

Case 2. $N^G(H)H' \neq G$.

Let P be a maximal subgroup of G containing $N^G(H)H'$. Since $(N_G(H'): H') = 2$, Corollary 4.2 implies $N_G(H') \subset P$. Fix $g \in G \setminus P$. If $H \subset P$, then the same argument as above yields $N_G(H') \subset P$. Then, one has $H, H', gHg^{-1}, gH'g^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}}$, in particular $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}} \geq 4$. If $H \not\subset P$, then we have $P \cap H = N^G(H)$ since P contains $N^G(H)$. Therefore, the same argument as Case 1 implies the desired assertion.

Lemma 7.15. Let G be a 2-group, and \mathcal{H} a strongly reduced set of subgroups of G. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $G/N^G(\mathcal{H}) \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{ \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle, \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m'+1} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle \}$ for some integer $\nu \ge 2$ and $m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}$; (ii) \mathcal{H} satisfies all the conditions as follows:
 - $#\mathcal{H} = 2;$
 - $(G: N^G(\mathcal{H})) = 2\mu(\mathcal{H});$
 - $G/N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is a 2-group of maximal class; and
 - $(H: N^G(H)) = (N_G(H): H) = 2$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is clear, where we use Lemma 4.6 (i). In the following, we prove the reverse implication. We may assume $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. Then G is of maximal class. Hence Proposition 4.4 yields one of the following:

- (a) $G \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$ for some $\nu \ge 2$;
- (b) $G \cong SD_{2^{\nu+1}}$ for some $\nu \ge 3$; or
- (c) $G \cong Q_{2^{\nu}}$ for some $\nu \geq 3$.

Moreover, since $\#\mathcal{H} = 2$ and $(H : N^G(H)) = 2$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$, only (a) is valid by Lemma 4.7. Hence the assertion follows from Lemma 4.6 (ii), (iii).

Theorem 7.16. Let G be a 2-group, and \mathcal{H} a strongly reduced set of its subgroups. Then the G-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-permutation if and only if it is quasi-invertible. Moreover, the above two conditions hold if and only if

- (i) $\#\mathcal{H} = 1$ and $G/N^G(\mathcal{H})$ is cyclic; or
- (ii) $G/N^G(\mathcal{H}) \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle, \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m'+1} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle\}$ for some $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. We may assume that \mathcal{H}^{nor} is empty, which is a consequence of Theorem 7.11. Write $\#G = 2^{\nu}$, where $\nu \geq 2$. We prove the assertion by induction on ν . If $\nu = 2$, then the assertion is clear. If $\nu = 3$, then Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 7.11 imply the desired assertion. In the following, suppose $\nu \geq 4$ and that the assertion holds for $\nu - 1$. It suffices to discuss the case $N^G(\mathcal{H}) = \{1\}$. Furthermore, we may assume $\mathcal{H}^{\text{nor}} = \emptyset$, which follows from Theorem 7.11. In addition, we only need a consideration for $\mu(\mathcal{H}) < \#G/2$, which is a consequence of Proposition 7.13.

Case 1. $\mu(\mathcal{H}) < M(\mathcal{H})$.

Take $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G : H_0) = M(\mathcal{H})$, and pick a maximal subgroup of P of G containing $N_G(H_0)$. Fix $g \in G \setminus P$. Then $P \cap H$ does not contain H_0 or gH_0g^{-1} for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$ with $(G : H) < M(\mathcal{H})$. This implies $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}} \geq 3$, and hence the P-lattice $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}}}$ is not quasi-invertible by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 7.15. Therefore the assertion follows from Proposition 3.20.

Case 2. $(N_G(H):H) \ge 4$ for some $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Let P be a maximal subgroup of G containing $N_G(H)$. Pick $g \in G \setminus P$. Then H and gHg^{-1} lie in $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}$. Moreover, we have $N_P(H) = N_G(H)$ since P contains $N_G(H)$. This implies $(N_P(H) : H) \ge 4$, and hence the P-lattice $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}}}$ is not quasi-invertible by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 7.15. Hence the assertion follows from Proposition 3.20.

Case 3. $(H : N^G(H)) \ge 4$ for some $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

By assumption, we have $(G:H) \geq 8$. Take a maximal subgroup P of G containing $\Phi(G)H$. Then it also contains $N_G(H)$ by Corollary 4.2 (ii). Moreover, we have $N_G(H) \neq P$ since $(G:H) \geq 8$. Now, pick $g \in G \setminus P$, then H and gHg^{-1} are non-normal subgroups of P that are not conjugate to each other. This is a consequence of the inclusion $N_G(H) \subsetneq P$ and the inequality $(G:H) \geq 8$. Moreover, they are contained in $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}}$. In particular, we have $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{red}} \geq 2$. If $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{srd}} \geq 3$, then the P-lattice $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{srd}}}$ is not quasi-invertible by the induction hypothesis. In the following, suppose $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{srd}} = 2$, which implies $\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{srd}} = \{H, gHg^{-1}\}$ for some $g \in G \setminus P$. Moreover, the equality $N^G(H) = N^P(H) \cap N^P(gHg^{-1})$ implies that

- (a) $N^{P}(H) = N^{G}(H)$; or
- (b) $N^{P}(H) \neq N^{G}(H)$ and $N^{P}(H) \neq N^{P}(gHg^{-1})$.

In both cases, the inequality $(G : N^P(\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}})) \ge 4\mu(\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}})$ follows. Now, the *P*-lattice $J_{P/\mathcal{H}_P^{\mathrm{srd}}}$ is not quasi-invertible by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 7.15. Consequently, the *G*-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is not quasi-invertible by Proposition 3.20.

Case 4. $\mu(\mathcal{H}) = M(\mathcal{H})$ and $(H : N^G(H)) = (N_G(H) : H) = 2$ for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Since we assume $\mu(\mathcal{H}) < \#G/2$, we have $N^G(\mathcal{H}) \neq \{1\}$ for all $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence, Lemma 7.14 yields that there is a maximal subgroup P of G satisfying $\#\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{srd}} \geq 3$. Then the P-lattice $J_{G/\mathcal{H}_P^{\text{srd}}}$ is not quasi-invertible, which is a consequence of the induction hypothesis and Lemma 7.15. Now, Proposition 3.20 gives the desired assertion.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We may assume $r \ge 2$. Put $G := \operatorname{Gal}(L/k)$ and

$$\mathcal{H} := \{ \operatorname{Gal}(L/K_1), \dots, \operatorname{Gal}(L/K_r) \}.$$

Then Proposition 3.1 gives an isomorphism $X^*(T_{\mathbf{K}/k}) \cong J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$. Moreover, one has

$$[J_{G/\mathcal{H}}] = [J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}}],$$

which is a consequence of Proposition 3.16. Combining this isomorphism with Proposition 2.11, we obtain that $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably (resp. retract) rational over k if and only if $J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}}$ is a quasi-permutation (resp. quasi-invertible) G-lattice. Therefore, by Theorem 7.16, the k-torus $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k if and only if it is retract rational over k.

On the other hand, the condition (1) holds if and only if $\#\mathcal{H} = \#\mathcal{H}^{\text{srd}} = 1$ and $G/N^G(\mathcal{H}^{\text{srd}})$ is cyclic. Hence Theorem 7.16 implies that $T_{\mathbf{K}/k}$ is stably rational over k. Then we may assume

$$\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}} = \{ \pi^{-1}(\langle \tau_2 \rangle), \pi^{-1}(\langle \sigma_2 \tau_2 \rangle) \},\$$

where $\pi: G \to D_2$ is the surjection induced by $G/N^G(\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}) \cong D_2$. On the other hand, (iii) is valid if and only if $\nu \ge 2$, $G \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$, $\#\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}} = 2$ and $(\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}})^{\mathrm{nor}} = \emptyset$. In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}} = \{ \pi^{-1}(\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle), \pi^{-1}(\langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}}^{2m'+1} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle) \}$$

for some $m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}$. Here $\pi \colon G \to D_{2^{\nu}}$ is the surjection induced by $G/N^G(\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{srd}}) \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$. Consequently, the assertion follows from Theorem 7.16.

8. Proof of Theorem 1.4

Lemma 8.1. Let $G = G_p \times G'$, where G_p is a p-group and G' is a finite group of order coprime to p. Consider a multiset \mathcal{H} of subgroups of G. Then there is a strongly reduced set \mathcal{H}_0 of G such that

(i) $(\mathcal{H}_0)_{G_p}^{\text{set}} = \mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\text{srd}}; and$ (ii) $[J_{G/\mathcal{H}}] = [J_{G/\mathcal{H}_0}].$

Proof. By Proposition 3.16, we may assume that \mathcal{H} is strongly reduced and $\mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\text{red}} = \mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\text{srd}}$. Note that all elements of \mathcal{H}_{G_p} are of the form $G_p \cap H$ for some $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Now, pick $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $G_p \cap H_0 \notin \mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\text{srd}}$. Take $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ so that $G_p \cap H_0 \subset N_1 := G_p \cap H_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\text{srd}}$. Then we have $H_0N_1 \notin \mathcal{H}$ since \mathcal{H} is strongly reduced. Moreover, $H_1 \cap H_0N_1$ is strictly contained in H_0N_1 , which follows from $H_0 \not\subset H_1$. In particular, it is not contained in $\mathcal{H} \cup \{H_0N_1\}$. Now we consider the multiset $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}$ of subgroup of G which satisfies

- $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{set}} = \mathcal{H} \cup \{H_0 N_1, H_1 \cap H_0 N_1\};$
- $m_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}}(H_0N_1) = 2$; and

•
$$m_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}}(H_0) = 1$$
 for each $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{set}} \setminus \{H_0N_1\}$.

Moreover, we write for φ the function on \mathcal{H} defined as follows:

$$\varphi(H) = \begin{cases} ((H_0N_1 : H_0), (H_0N_1 : H_1 \cap H_0N_1)) & \text{if } H = H_0N_1 \text{ and } \#H > \#(H_1 \cap HN_1); \\ ((H_0N_1 : H_1 \cap H_0N_1), (H_0N_1 : H_0)) & \text{if } H = H_0N_1 \text{ and } \#H_0 \le \#(H_1 \cap H_0N_1); \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then Proposition 3.16 gives an isomorphism of *G*-lattices

$$J_{G/\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}} \cong \begin{cases} J_{G/\mathcal{H}} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_0N_1] & \text{if } H_1 \subset H_0N_1; \\ J_{G/\mathcal{H}} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H_0N_1]^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/(H_1 \cap H_0N_1)] & \text{if } H_1 \not\subset HN_1. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, since $(H_0N_1:H_0)$ is a power of p and $(H_0N_1:H_1\cap H_0N_1)$ is coprime to p, we obtain that d_{φ} is the constant function on $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{set}}$ that takes value 1. Therefore, if we set $\mathcal{H}^{\dagger} := \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{srd}}$, then Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 3.16 follow that there is an equality

$$[J_{G/\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}}^{(\varphi)}] = [J_{G/\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{\mathrm{srd}}}].$$

In summary, one has

$$[J_{G/\mathcal{H}}] = [J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}}].$$

Note that the inclusions $H_0 \subset H_0 N_1$ and $H_1 \cap H_0 N_1 \subset H_0 N_1$ imply that H_0 and $H_1 \cap H_0 N_1$ are not contained in \mathcal{H}^{\dagger} . Moreover, $H_0 N_1$ are contained in \mathcal{H}^{\dagger} since \mathcal{H} is strongly reduced. In particular, we have $(\mathcal{H}^{\dagger})_{G_1}^{\mathrm{srd}} = \mathcal{H}_{G_1}^{\mathrm{srd}}$. Furthermore, one has

$$\#\{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\dagger} \mid G_p \cap H \notin \mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\mathrm{srd}}\} < \#\{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid G_p \cap H \notin \mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\mathrm{srd}}\}.$$

By applying the above procedure for all $H_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $G_p \cap H_0 \notin \mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\mathrm{srd}}$, we obtain a strongly reduced set of subgroups \mathcal{H}_0 of G satisfying (i) and (ii).

Theorem 8.2. Let G be a finite nilpotent group, and \mathcal{H} a multiset of its subgroups. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-permutation G-lattice;
- (ii) $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is a quasi-invertible G-lattice;
- (iii) $[J_{G/\mathcal{H}}] = [J_{G/\mathcal{H}'}]$, where \mathcal{H}' satisfies one of the following:

- (a) $\mathcal{H}' = \{N\}, N \triangleleft G \text{ and } G/N \text{ is cyclic; or }$
- (b) $\mathcal{H}' = \{H, H'\}, G/N^G(\mathcal{H}') \cong C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, H/N^G(\mathcal{H}') \cong C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, H/N^G(\mathcal{H}') \cong C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, H/N^G(\mathcal{H}') \cong C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, H/N^G(\mathcal{H}') \cong C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, H/N^G(\mathcal{H}') \cong C_m \times D_{2^{\nu}} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ for$ $\langle (1, \tau_{2\nu}) \rangle$, and $H'/N^G(\mathcal{H}') \cong \langle (1, \sigma_{2\nu}\tau_{2\nu}) \rangle$.

Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorem 8.2 by the same argument as Theorem 1.3.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): This is clear.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): We may assume that \mathcal{H} is strongly reduced. For each odd prime divisor p of #G, we denote by G_p the unique p-Sylow subgroup of G. Then $J_{G/\mathcal{H}}$ is quasi-invertible as a G_p -lattice. On the other hand, the set $\mathcal{H}_{G_p}^{\text{set}}$ consists of $G_p \cap H$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence, by Theorem 5.9, there is $H_p \in \mathcal{H}$ so that $N_p := G_p \cap H_p \triangleleft G_p, G_p/N_p$ is cyclic and $G_p \cap H \subset N_p$ for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$. In particular, the subgroup N_p is normal in G. Because G is nilpotent, it is a product of G_p for all prime divisors p of #G, Lemma 8.1 implies the existence of a strongly reduced set of subgroups \mathcal{H}' of G so that

• $(\mathcal{H}')_{G_p}^{\text{set}} = \{N_p\}$ for any odd prime p, where $N_p \triangleleft G_p$ and G_p/N_p is cyclic; and

•
$$[J_{G/\mathcal{H}}] = [J_{G/\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}}]$$

Therefore, by replacing \mathcal{H} and G with \mathcal{H}^{\dagger} and $G/N^{G}(\mathcal{H}^{\dagger})$, respectively, we may assume G = $C_m \times G_2$ for some odd integer m and #H is a power of 2 for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$. In this case, the set of subgroups $\mathcal{H}_{G_2}^{\text{set}}$ of G_2 is strongly reduced since \mathcal{H} is so. Hence, the assumption that $J_{G/\mathcal{H}''}$ is quasi-invertible implies that

- (A) $\mathcal{H}_{G_2}^{\text{set}} = \{N_2\}$ for some $N \triangleleft G_2$ so that G_2/N_2 is cyclic; or (B) $\mathcal{H}_{G_2}^{\text{set}} = \{H, H'\}, \ G_2/N^{G_2}(\mathcal{H}_{G_2}^{\text{set}}) \cong D_{2^{\nu}}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, \ H/N^{G_2}(\mathcal{H}_{G_2}^{\text{set}}) \cong \langle \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle$ and $H'/N^{G_2}(\mathcal{H}_{G_2}^{\text{set}}) \cong \langle \sigma_{2^{\nu}} \tau_{2^{\nu}} \rangle.$

If (A) holds, then the set $\mathcal{H}' := \{N_2\}$ satisfies the condition (a). On the other hand, if (B) is valid, then the set $\mathcal{H}' := \{H, H'\}$ is the one that satisfies (b).

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): This is a consequence of Theorem 6.7.

References

- [BLP19] E. Bayer-Fluckiger, T.-Y. Lee, R. Parimala, Hasse principle for multinorm equations, Adv. Math. 356 (2019), 106818.
- [BP20] E. Bayer-Fluckiger, R. Parimala, On unramified Brauer groups of torsors over tori, Documenta Math. 25 (2020), 1263-1284.
- [Ber08] Y. Berkovich, Groups of prime power order, I, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2008.
- [CS77] J.-L. Colliot-Thélène, J-J. Sansuc, La R-équivalence sur les tores, Ann. sci. de l'É.N.S. 4^e série, 10 no. 2 (1977), 175-229.
- [CS87] J.-L. Colliot-Thélène, J-J. Sansuc, Principal homogeneous spaces under flasque tori: applications, J. Algebra **106** (1987), no. 1, 148–205.
- [CHS05] J.-L. Colliot-Thélène, D. Harari, A. N. Skorobogatov, Compactification équivariante d'un tore (d'après Brylinski et Künnemann), Expo. Math., 23 (2005), 161–170.
- [CK00] A. Cortella, B. Kunyavskii, Rationality problem for generic tori in simple groups, J. Algebra, 225 (2000), 771-793.
- [DW14] C. Demarche, D. Wei, Hasse principle and weak approximation for multinorm equations, Israel J. Math. 202 (2014), 275-293.
- [EM75] S. Endo, T. Miyata, On a classification of the function fields of algebraic tori, Nagoya Math. J. 56 (1975), 85 - 104.
- [End01] S. Endo, On the rationality of algebraic tori of norm type, J. Alg. 235 (2001), 27–35.
- [End11] S. Endo, The rationality problem for norm one tori, Nagoya Math. J. 202 (2011), 83–106.
- [Flo] M. Florence, Non rationality of some norm-one tori, preprint (2006).
- [Hal59] M. Hall, The theory of groups, McMillam Comp., 1959.

- [Has31] H. Hasse, Beweis eines Satzes und Wiederlegung einer Vermutung über das allgemeine Normenrestsymbol, Nschrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse (1931), 64–69.
- [HHY20] S. Hasegawa, A. Hoshi, A. Yamasaki, Rationality problem for norm one tori in small dimensions, Math. Comp. 89 (2020), 923–940.
- [Hir64] H. Hironaka, Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. I, II, Ann. Math., (2) 79 (1964), 109–203; 205–326.
- [HY17] A. Hoshi, A. Yamasaki, Rationality problem for algebraic tori, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 248 (2017), no. 1176, v+215 pp.
- [HY21] A. Hoshi, A. Yamasaki, Rationality problem for norm one tori, Israel J. Math. 241 (2021), 849-867.
- [HY24] A. Hoshi, A. Yamasaki, Rationality problem for norm one tori for dihedral extensions, J. Alg. 640 (2024), 368–384.
- [HY] A. Hoshi, A. Yamasaki, Rationality problem for norm one tori for A_5 and $PSL_2(\mathbb{F}_8)$ -extensions, preprint, arXiv:2309.16187, 2023.
- [Hür84] W. Hürlimann, On algebraic tori of norm type, Comment. Math. Helv., 59, no. 4 (1984), 539–549.
- [Kan12] M. Kang, Retract rational fields, J. Algebra, 349 (2012), 22-37.
- [Kun90] B. E. Kunyavskii, Three-dimensional algebraic tori, Selecta Math. Soviet. 9 (1990), 1–21.
- [LeB95] L. Le Bruyn, Generic norm one tori, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. (4), 13 (1995), 401–407.
- [Lee22] T.-Y. Lee, The Tate-Shafarevich groups of multinorm-one tori, J. Pure Appl. Alg., 226 (2022), 106906.
- [LL00] N. Lemire, M. Lorenz, On certain lattices associated with generic division algebras, J. Group Theory, 3 (2000), 385–405.
- [Len74] H. W. Lenstra Jr., Rational functions invariant under a finite abelian group, Invent. Math. 25 (1974), 299–325.
- [LOY24] P.-X. Liang, Y. Oki, C.-F. Yu, Cohomological properties on multinorm-one tori, Results Math., 79 (2024), article number 277.
- [Lor05] M. Lorenz, Multiplicative Invariant Theory, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 135, Springer, 2005.
- [Mer17] A. S. Merkurjev, Invariants of algebraic groups and retract rationality of classifying spaces, Algebraic groups: structure and actions, 277–294, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 94, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2017.
- [Ono63] T. Ono, On Tamagawa numbers of algebraic tori, Ann. Math. (2) 78 (1963), 47–73.
- [PR94] V. P. Platonov, A. Rapinchuk, Algebraic groups and number theory, Translated from the 1991 Russian original by Rachel Rowen, Pure and applied mathematics, 139, Academic Press, 1994.
- [Sal84] D. J. Saltman, Retract rational fields and cyclic Galois extensions, Israel J. Math., 47 (1984), 165–215.
- [San81] J.-J. Sansuc, Groupe de Brauer et arithmétique des groupes algébriques linéaires sur un corps de nombres, (French) J. Reine Angew. Math., 327 (1981), 12–80.
- [Vos67] V. E. Voskresenskii, On two-dimensional algebraic tori II, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. 31 (1967), 711–716; translation in Math. USSR-Izv. 8 (1974), 1–7.
- [Vos69] V. E. Voskresenskii, The birational equivalence of linear algebraic groups, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 188 (1969), 978–981; translation in Soviet Math. Dokl. 10 (1969) 1212–1215.
- [Vos98] V. E. Voskresenskii, Algebraic groups and their birational invariants, translated from the Russian manuscript by B. Kunyavskii, Trans. Math. Monographs, 179, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 1998.

(HASEGAWA)

Email address: sumito.hasegawa@gmail.com

(KANAI) GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (KOSEN), KURE COLLEGE, 2-2-11, AGAMINAMI, KURE, HIROSHIMA, 737-8506, JAPAN

Email address: k-kanai@kure-nct.ac.jp

(OKI) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, RIKKYO UNIVERSITY, 3-34-1, NISHI-IKEBUKURO, TOSHIMA-KU, TOKYO, 171-8501, JAPAN.

Email address: oki@rikkyo.ac.jp