

# Unramified Brauer groups and isoclinism

Primož Moravec

*Department of Mathematics, University of Ljubljana  
Jadranska 21, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

Received 4 October 2012, accepted 9 April 2013, published online 1 June 2013

---

## Abstract

We show that the Bogomolov multipliers of isoclinic groups are isomorphic.

*Keywords:* Unramified Brauer group, Bogomolov multiplier, isoclinism.

*Math. Subj. Class.:* 20F12, 20F35, 13A50

---

## 1 Introduction

Let  $G$  be a finite group and  $V$  a faithful representation of  $G$  over an algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic zero. Suppose that the action of  $G$  upon  $V$  is generically free. A relaxed version of Noether's problem [11] asks as to whether the fixed field  $k(V)^G$  is purely transcendental over  $k$ , i.e., whether the quotient space  $V/G$  is *rational*. A question related to the above mentioned is whether  $V/G$  is *stably rational*, that is, whether there exist independent variables  $x_1, \dots, x_r$  such that  $k(V)^G(x_1, \dots, x_r)$  becomes a pure transcendental extension of  $k$ . This problem has close connection with Lüroth's problem [12] and the inverse Galois problem [14, 13]. By the so-called *no-name lemma*, stable rationality of  $V/G$  does not depend upon the choice of  $V$ , but only on the group  $G$ , cf. [4, Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.4]. Saltman [13] found examples of groups  $G$  of order  $p^9$  such that  $V/G$  is not stably rational over  $k$ . His main method was application of the unramified cohomology group  $H_{\text{nr}}^2(k(V)^G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$  as an obstruction. A version of this invariant had been used before by Artin and Mumford [1] who constructed unirational varieties over  $k$  that were not rational. Bogomolov [2] proved that  $H_{\text{nr}}^2(k(V)^G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$  is canonically isomorphic to

$$B_0(G) = \bigcap_{\substack{A \leq G, \\ A \text{ abelian}}} \ker \text{res}_A^G,$$

where  $\text{res}_A^G : H^2(G, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^2(A, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$  is the usual cohomological restriction map. Following Kunyavskii [7], we say that  $B_0(G)$  is the *Bogomolov multiplier* of  $G$ .

---

*E-mail address:* primo.z.moravec@fmf.uni-lj.si (Primož Moravec)

We recently proved [9] that  $B_0(G)$  is naturally isomorphic to  $\text{Hom}(\tilde{B}_0(G), \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ , where  $\tilde{B}_0(G)$  is the kernel of the commutator map  $G \wr G \rightarrow [G, G]$ , and  $G \wr G$  is a quotient of the *non-abelian exterior square* of  $G$  (see Section 2 for further details). This description of  $B_0(G)$  is purely combinatorial, and allows for efficient computations of  $B_0(G)$ , and a Hopf formula for  $B_0(G)$ . We also note here that the group  $\tilde{B}_0(G)$  can be defined for any (possibly infinite) group  $G$ .

Recently, Hoshi, Kang, and Kunyavskiĭ [6] classified all groups of order  $p^5$  with non-trivial Bogomolov multiplier; the question was dealt with independently in [10]. It turns out that the only examples of such groups appear within the same isoclinism family, where isoclinism is the notion defined by P. Hall in his seminal paper [5]. The following question was posed in [6]:

**Question 1.1** ([6]). *Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be isoclinic  $p$ -groups. Is it true that the fields  $k(V)^{G_1}$  and  $k(V)^{G_2}$  are stably isomorphic, or at least, that  $B_0(G_1)$  is isomorphic to  $B_0(G_2)$ ?*

The purpose of this note is to answer the second part of the above question in the affirmative:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be isoclinic groups. Then  $\tilde{B}_0(G_1) \cong \tilde{B}_0(G_2)$ . In particular, if  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are finite, then  $B_0(G_1)$  is isomorphic to  $B_0(G_2)$ .*

The proof relies on the theory developed in [9]. We note here that we have recently become aware of a paper by Bogomolov and Böhning [3] who fully answer the above question using different techniques. We point out that our approach here is purely combinatorial and does not require cohomological machinery.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We first recall the definition of  $G \wr G$  from [9]. For  $x, y \in G$  we write  ${}^x y = xyx^{-1}$  and  $[x, y] = xyx^{-1}y^{-1}$ . Let  $G$  be any group. We form the group  $G \wr G$ , generated by the symbols  $g \wr h$ , where  $g, h \in G$ , subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} gg' \wr h &= ({}^g g' \wr {}^g h)(g \wr h), \\ g \wr hh' &= (g \wr h)({}^h g \wr {}^h h'), \\ x \wr y &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $g, g', h, h' \in G$ , and all  $x, y \in G$  with  $[x, y] = 1$ . The group  $G \wr G$  is a quotient of the non-abelian exterior square  $G \wedge G$  of  $G$  defined by Miller [8]. There is a surjective homomorphism  $\kappa : G \wr G \rightarrow [G, G]$  defined by  $\kappa(x \wr y) = [x, y]$  for all  $x, y \in G$ . Denote  $\tilde{B}_0(G) = \ker \kappa$ . By [9] we have the following:

**Theorem 2.1** ([9]). *Let  $G$  be a finite group. Then  $B_0(G)$  is naturally isomorphic to  $\text{Hom}(\tilde{B}_0(G), \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ , and thus  $B_0(G) \cong \tilde{B}_0(G)$ .*

Let  $L$  be a group. A function  $\phi : G \times G \rightarrow L$  is called a  $\tilde{B}_0$ -pairing if for all  $g, g', h, h' \in G$ , and for all  $x, y \in G$  with  $[x, y] = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(gg', h) &= \phi({}^g g', {}^g h)\phi(g, h), \\ \phi(g, hh') &= \phi(g, h)\phi({}^h g, {}^h h'), \\ \phi(x, y) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly a  $\tilde{B}_0$ -pairing  $\phi$  determines a unique homomorphism of groups  $\phi^* : G \wr G \rightarrow L$  such that  $\phi^*(g \wr h) = \phi(g, h)$  for all  $g, h \in G$ .

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  be isoclinic groups, and denote  $Z_1 = Z(G_1)$ ,  $Z_2 = Z(G_2)$ . By definition [5], there exist isomorphisms  $\alpha : G_1/Z_1 \rightarrow G_2/Z_2$  and  $\beta : [G_1, G_1] \rightarrow [G_2, G_2]$  such that whenever  $\alpha(a_1Z_1) = a_2Z_2$  and  $\alpha(b_1Z_1) = b_2Z_2$ , then  $\beta([a_1, b_1]) = [a_2, b_2]$  for  $a_1, b_1 \in G_1$ . Define a map  $\phi : G_1 \times G_1 \rightarrow G_2 \wr G_2$  by  $\phi(a_1, b_1) = a_2 \wr b_2$ , where  $a_i, b_i$  are as above. To see that this is well defined, suppose that  $\alpha(\bar{a}_1Z_1) = a_2Z_2 = \bar{a}_2Z_2$  and  $\alpha(\bar{b}_1Z_1) = b_2Z_2 = \bar{b}_2Z_2$ . Then we can write  $\bar{a}_2 = a_2z$  and  $\bar{b}_2 = b_2w$  for some  $w, z \in Z_2$ . By the definition of  $G_2 \wr G_2$  we have that  $\bar{a}_2 \wr \bar{b}_2 = a_2z \wr b_2w = a_2 \wr b_2$ , hence  $\phi$  is well defined.

Suppose that  $a_1, b_1 \in G_1$  commute, and let  $a_2, b_2 \in G_2$  be as above. By definition,  $[a_2, b_2] = \beta([a_1, b_1]) = 1$ , hence  $a_2 \wr b_2 = 1$ . This, and the relations of  $G_2 \wr G_2$ , ensure that  $\phi$  is a  $\tilde{B}_0$ -pairing. Thus  $\phi$  induces a homomorphism  $\gamma : G_1 \wr G_1 \rightarrow G_2 \wr G_2$  such that  $\gamma(a_1 \wr b_1) = a_2 \wr b_2$  for all  $a_1, b_1 \in G_1$ . By symmetry there exists a homomorphism  $\delta : G_2 \wr G_2 \rightarrow G_1 \wr G_1$  defined via  $\alpha^{-1}$ . It is straightforward to see that  $\delta$  is the inverse of  $\gamma$ , hence  $\gamma$  is an isomorphism.

Let  $\kappa_1 : G_1 \wr G_1 \rightarrow [G_1, G_1]$  and  $\kappa_2 : G_2 \wr G_2 \rightarrow [G_2, G_2]$  be the commutator maps. Since  $\beta\kappa_1(a_1 \wr b_1) = \beta([a_1, b_1]) = [a_2, b_2] = \kappa_2\gamma(a_1 \wr b_1)$ , we have the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{B}_0(G_1) & \longrightarrow & G_1 \wr G_1 & \xrightarrow{\kappa_1} & [G_1, G_1] \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \tilde{\gamma} \downarrow & & \gamma \downarrow & & \beta \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{B}_0(G_2) & \longrightarrow & G_2 \wr G_2 & \xrightarrow{\kappa_2} & [G_2, G_2] \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

Here  $\tilde{\gamma}$  is the restriction of  $\gamma$  to  $\tilde{B}_0(G_1)$ . Since  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  are isomorphisms, so is  $\tilde{\gamma}$ . This concludes the proof.

### References

- [1] M. Artin and D. Mumford, Some elementary examples of unirational varieties which are not rational, *Proc. London. Math. Soc.* **25** (1972), 75–95.
- [2] F. A. Bogomolov, The Brauer group of quotient spaces by linear group actions, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* **51** (1987), 485–516.
- [3] F. Bogomolov and C. Böhning, Isoclinism and stable cohomology of wreath products, arXiv:1204.4747v1.
- [4] J.-L. Colliot-Thélène and J.-J. Sansuc, The rationality problem for fields of invariants under linear algebraic groups (with special regards to the rationality problem), in: V. Mehta (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Algebraic groups and Homogeneous Spaces (Mumbai 2004)*, TIFR, Mumbai, Narosa Publishing House (2007), 113–186.
- [5] P. Hall, The classification of prime-power groups, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **182** (1940), 130–141.
- [6] A. Hoshi, M. Kang and B. E. Kunyavskii, Noether problem and unramified Brauer groups, ArXiv:1202.5812v1, 2012.
- [7] B. E. Kunyavskii, *The Bogomolov multiplier of finite simple groups*, Cohomological and geometric approaches to rationality problems, 209–217, *Progr. Math.*, 282, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2010.

- [8] C. Miller, The second homology of a group, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **3** (1952), 588–595.
- [9] P. Moravec, Unramified groups of finite and infinite groups, *Amer. J. Math.*, to appear, arXiv:1203.3190v1.
- [10] P. Moravec, Groups of order  $p^5$  and their unramified Brauer groups, *J. Algebra*, to appear, arXiv:1203.3289v1.
- [11] E. Noether, Gleichungen mit vorgeschriebener Gruppe, *Math. Ann.* **78** (1916), 221–229.
- [12] I. R. Šafarevič, The Lüroth problem, *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **183** (1991), 241–246.
- [13] D. J. Saltman, Noether’s problem over an algebraically closed field, *Invent. Math.* **77** (1984), 71–84.
- [14] R. G. Swan, *Noether’s problem in Galois theory*, in ‘Emmy Noether in Bryn Mawr’, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.