Lifts and generalized vertices for Brauer characters of solvable groups

Mark L. Lewis

Kent State University

April 14, 2010

Ischia Group Theory Conference 2010

(Joint work with J. P. Cossey – University of Akron)

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Throughout G will be a finite group and p will be a prime.

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Throughout G will be a finite group and p will be a prime.
- $\mathrm{IBr}(G)$ is the set of irreducible p-Brauer characters of G.

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Throughout G will be a finite group and p will be a prime.
- $\mathrm{IBr}(G)$ is the set of irreducible p-Brauer characters of G.
- G^o denotes the p-regular elements of G. If χ is a character of G, then we use χ^o to denote the restriction of χ to G^o.

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Throughout G will be a finite group and p will be a prime.
- $\mathrm{IBr}(G)$ is the set of irreducible p-Brauer characters of G.
- G^o denotes the p-regular elements of G. If χ is a character of G, then we use χ^o to denote the restriction of χ to G^o.

Definition

Given a p-Brauer character $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$, we say $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ is a *lift* of φ if $\chi^o = \varphi$.

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Throughout G will be a finite group and p will be a prime.
- $\mathrm{IBr}(G)$ is the set of irreducible p-Brauer characters of G.
- G^o denotes the p-regular elements of G. If χ is a character of G, then we use χ^o to denote the restriction of χ to G^o.

Definition

Given a p-Brauer character $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$, we say $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ is a *lift* of φ if $\chi^o = \varphi$.

- When G is p-solvable, the Fong-Swan theorem implies that φ has a lift.

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Much of the study of lifts has focused on particular canonical sets of lifts.

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Much of the study of lifts has focused on particular canonical sets of lifts.
- J. P. Cossey has initiated the study of all lifts of φ. For example, when $|G|$ is odd, he has shown that the number of lifts of φ can be bounded in terms of a vertex for φ.

Lifts of Brauer Characters

- Much of the study of lifts has focused on particular canonical sets of lifts.
- J. P. Cossey has initiated the study of all lifts of φ. For example, when $|G|$ is odd, he has shown that the number of lifts of φ can be bounded in terms of a vertex for φ.
- We will show that the oddness hypothesis in Cossey's results can be removed in certain cases.

Vertices

- In a p-solvable group G, we say Q is a *vertex* for $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ if there is a subgroup U so that φ is induced from a p-Brauer character of U having p'-degree and Q is a Sylow p-subgroup of U.

Vertices

- In a p-solvable group G, we say Q is a *vertex* for $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ if there is a subgroup U so that φ is induced from a p-Brauer character of U having p'-degree and Q is a Sylow p-subgroup of U.

- It is known that all of the vertices for φ are conjugate in G.

Vertices

- In a p-solvable group G, we say Q is a *vertex* for $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ if there is a subgroup U so that φ is induced from a p-Brauer character of U having p'-degree and Q is a Sylow p-subgroup of U.
- It is known that all of the vertices for φ are conjugate in G.
- Cossey showed that if $|G|$ is odd and Q is a vertex for φ, then the number of lifts of φ is at most $|Q : Q'|$.

Vertices

We now remove the hypothesis that $|G|$ is odd.

However, we do need to add some hypotheses:

1. G is p-solvable
2. p is an odd prime
3. Q is abelian

Vertices

We now remove the hypothesis that $|G|$ is odd.

However, we do need to add some hypotheses:

1. G is p-solvable
2. p is an odd prime
3. Q is abelian

Theorem

Let G be a p-solvable group and let p be an odd prime. If $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ has abelian vertex Q, then the number of lifts of φ is at most $|Q|$.

Generalized vertices

We use the generalized vertices defined by Cossey. To do this, we need p-factored characters.

Generalized vertices

We use the generalized vertices defined by Cossey. To do this, we need p-factored characters.

- A character $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ is p-factored if $\chi = \alpha\beta$ where α is p-special and β is p'-special.

Generalized vertices

We use the generalized vertices defined by Cossey. To do this, we need p-factored characters.

- A character $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ is p-factored if $\chi = \alpha\beta$ where α is p-special and β is p'-special.
- Let $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$. Then (Q, δ) is a *generalized vertex* for χ if there is a subgroup U with a p-factored character $\psi \in \mathrm{Irr}(U)$ and Sylow p-subgroup Q of U so that $\psi^G = \chi$ and δ is the restriction to Q of the p-special factor of ψ.

Generalized vertices

Since any primitive irreducible character of a p-solvable group is p-factored and p-special characters restrict irreducibly to a Sylow p-subgroup, all characters have generalized vertices.

However, for a general irreducible character χ, it seems unlikely that one can say anything useful about the set of all generalized vertices for χ.

Generalized vertices

Since any primitive irreducible character of a *p*-solvable group is *p*-factored and *p*-special characters restrict irreducibly to a Sylow *p*-subgroup, all characters have generalized vertices.

However, for a general irreducible character χ, it seems unlikely that one can say anything useful about the set of all generalized vertices for χ.

Theorem

(Cossey) Suppose $|G|$ is odd and $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$. Let (Q, δ) be a generalized vertex for χ. If $\chi^0 \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$, then

Generalized vertices

Since any primitive irreducible character of a p-solvable group is p-factored and p-special characters restrict irreducibly to a Sylow p-subgroup, all characters have generalized vertices.

However, for a general irreducible character χ, it seems unlikely that one can say anything useful about the set of all generalized vertices for χ.

Theorem

(Cossey) Suppose $|G|$ is odd and $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$. Let (Q, δ) be a generalized vertex for χ. If $\chi^0 \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$, then

1. *δ is linear*

Generalized vertices

Since any primitive irreducible character of a p-solvable group is p-factored and p-special characters restrict irreducibly to a Sylow p-subgroup, all characters have generalized vertices.

However, for a general irreducible character χ, it seems unlikely that one can say anything useful about the set of all generalized vertices for χ.

Theorem

(Cossey) Suppose $|G|$ is odd and $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$. Let (Q, δ) be a generalized vertex for χ. If $\chi^0 \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$, then

1. *δ is linear*
2. *all generalized vertices for χ are conjugate to (Q, δ).*

Generalized vertices

Again, we will remove the hypothesis that $|G|$ is odd.

We do need to assume that p is odd.

Generalized vertices

Again, we will remove the hypothesis that $|G|$ is odd.

We do need to assume that p is odd.

To get δ linear, we use a recent theorem of Navarro:

Theorem

(Navarro) Let G be a p-solvable group for odd prime p. Let $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ be p-special. If $\chi(1) > 1$, then χ^o is not in $\mathrm{IBr}(G)$.

Generalized vertices

Again, we will remove the hypothesis that $|G|$ is odd.

We do need to assume that p is odd.

To get δ linear, we use a recent theorem of Navarro:

Theorem

(Navarro) Let G be a p-solvable group for odd prime p. Let $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ be p-special. If $\chi(1) > 1$, then χ^o is not in $\mathrm{IBr}(G)$.

Note: this theorem is not true if $p = 2$.

Generalized vertices

As a corollary to Navarro's result, we obtain the following:

Corollary

Let G be a p-solvable group where p is an odd prime. If $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ satisfies $\chi^o \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ and has generalized vertex (Q, δ), then δ is linear.

Generalized vertices

As a corollary to Navarro's result, we obtain the following:

Corollary

Let G be a p-solvable group where p is an odd prime. If $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ satisfies $\chi^o \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ and has generalized vertex (Q, δ), then δ is linear.

Notice that Q is now a vertex for χ^o.

Generalized vertices

As a corollary to Navarro's result, we obtain the following:

Corollary

Let G be a p-solvable group where p is an odd prime. If $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ satisfies $\chi^o \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ and has generalized vertex (Q, δ), then δ is linear.

Notice that Q is now a vertex for χ^o.

If $p = 2$, this corollary is not true. In $\mathrm{GL}_2(3)$, there is a counterexample.

Generalized vertices

We now prove:

Theorem

Let G be a p-solvable group and p an odd prime. If $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ with $\chi^o \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$, then all the generalized vertices for χ are conjugate.

Generalized vertices

We now prove:

Theorem

Let G be a p-solvable group and p an odd prime. If $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ with $\chi^o \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$, then all the generalized vertices for χ are conjugate.

When $p = 2$, the theorem is not true.

Counting lifts

Now, we return to our original question of counting the number of lifts of a given Brauer character $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$.

Counting lifts

Now, we return to our original question of counting the number of lifts of a given Brauer character $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$.

The main work is to count the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex.

Counting lifts

Now, we return to our original question of counting the number of lifts of a given Brauer character $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$.

The main work is to count the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex.

Theorem

Assume that G is a p-solvable group and p is an odd prime. Suppose that $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ has vertex subgroup Q that is abelian, and let $\delta \in \mathrm{Irr}(Q)$. Then $|L_\varphi(Q,\delta)| \leq |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_G(Q,\delta)|$.

Counting lifts

We use the count on the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex to get the bound on the total number of lifts of φ:

Counting lifts

We use the count on the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex to get the bound on the total number of lifts of φ:

Take $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ to be representatives of the $\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$ orbits of the characters of Q.

Counting lifts

We use the count on the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex to get the bound on the total number of lifts of φ:

Take $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ to be representatives of the $\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$ orbits of the characters of Q.

One can show that every generalized vertex for a lift of φ is G-conjugate to (Q, δ_i) for some i. Thus, $|L_\varphi| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |L_\varphi(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Counting lifts

We use the count on the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex to get the bound on the total number of lifts of φ:

Take $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ to be representatives of the $\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$ orbits of the characters of Q.

One can show that every generalized vertex for a lift of φ is G-conjugate to (Q, δ_i) for some i. Thus, $|L_\varphi| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |L_\varphi(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Applying the count for the generalized vertices:
$\sum_{i=1}^{k} |L_\varphi(Q, \delta_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_G(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Counting lifts

We use the count on the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex to get the bound on the total number of lifts of φ:

Take $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ to be representatives of the $\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$ orbits of the characters of Q.

One can show that every generalized vertex for a lift of φ is G-conjugate to (Q, δ_i) for some i. Thus, $|L_\varphi| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |L_\varphi(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Applying the count for the generalized vertices:
$\sum_{i=1}^{k} |L_\varphi(Q, \delta_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_G(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Finally, counting the sizes of the orbits of $\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$ on the linear characters of Q, we obtain $\sum_{i=1}^{k} |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_G(Q, \delta_i)| = |Q|$.

Counting lifts

We use the count on the number of lifts of φ with a given generalized vertex to get the bound on the total number of lifts of φ:

Take $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ to be representatives of the $\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$ orbits of the characters of Q.

One can show that every generalized vertex for a lift of φ is G-conjugate to (Q, δ_i) for some i. Thus, $|L_\varphi| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |L_\varphi(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Applying the count for the generalized vertices:
$\sum_{i=1}^{k} |L_\varphi(Q, \delta_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_G(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Finally, counting the sizes of the orbits of $\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$ on the linear characters of Q, we obtain $\sum_{i=1}^{k} |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_G(Q, \delta_i)| = |Q|$.

Combining: $|L_\varphi| \leq |Q|$. (As desired.)

Q abelian?

We would like to remove the hypothesis that Q is abelian.

Q abelian?

We would like to remove the hypothesis that Q is abelian.

The point where Q is abelian is needed is in counting the number of lifts of φ with vertex (Q, δ).

Q abelian?

We would like to remove the hypothesis that Q is abelian.

The point where Q is abelian is needed is in counting the number of lifts of φ with vertex (Q, δ).

We review the proof of the number of lifts with a given vertex. Our proof is an inductive argument.

Q abelian?

We would like to remove the hypothesis that Q is abelian.

The point where Q is abelian is needed is in counting the number of lifts of φ with vertex (Q, δ).

We review the proof of the number of lifts with a given vertex. Our proof is an inductive argument.

Let $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ be a lift of φ with vertex (Q, δ). Let N be maximal so that N is normal in G and the irreducible constituents of χ_N are factored.

Q abelian?

We would like to remove the hypothesis that Q is abelian.

The point where Q is abelian is needed is in counting the number of lifts of φ with vertex (Q, δ).

We review the proof of the number of lifts with a given vertex. Our proof is an inductive argument.

Let $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ be a lift of φ with vertex (Q, δ). Let N be maximal so that N is normal in G and the irreducible constituents of χ_N are factored.

Let $\alpha\beta$ be an irreducible constituent of χ_N where α is p'-special and β is p-special.

Q abelian?

We first show that we may assume that α is G-invariant using the inductive hypothesis.

Q abelian?

We first show that we may assume that α is G-invariant using the inductive hypothesis.

Let T be the stabilizer of α in G.

Q abelian?

We first show that we may assume that α is G-invariant using the inductive hypothesis.

Let T be the stabilizer of α in G.

There is a unique Brauer character η on T so that $\eta^G = \varphi$ and α^o is a constituent of η_N.

Q abelian?

We first show that we may assume that α is G-invariant using the inductive hypothesis.

Let T be the stabilizer of α in G.

There is a unique Brauer character η on T so that $\eta^G = \varphi$ and α^o is a constituent of η_N.

By replacing α with a G-conjugate if necessary, we may assume that $Q \leq T$ and Q is a vertex for η.

Q abelian?

We first show that we may assume that α is G-invariant using the inductive hypothesis.

Let T be the stabilizer of α in G.

There is a unique Brauer character η on T so that $\eta^G = \varphi$ and α^o is a constituent of η_N.

By replacing α with a G-conjugate if necessary, we may assume that $Q \leq T$ and Q is a vertex for η.

Let $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_l$ be representatives for the orbits of the action $N_T(Q)$ on the $N_G(Q)$-orbit of δ.

Q abelian?

It is not difficult to see that there is a bijection between $\bigcup L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)$ and $L_\varphi(Q, \delta)$.

Q abelian?

It is not difficult to see that there is a bijection between $\bigcup L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)$ and $L_\varphi(Q, \delta)$.

So, $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)|$.

Q abelian?

It is not difficult to see that there is a bijection between $\bigcup L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)$ and $L_\varphi(Q, \delta)$.

So, $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)|$.

If $T < G$, then $|L_\eta(Q, \delta_i) \leq |N_T(Q) : N_T(Q, \delta_i)|$ for all i.

Q abelian?

It is not difficult to see that there is a bijection between $\bigcup L_\eta(Q,\delta_i)$ and $L_\varphi(Q,\delta)$.

So, $|L_\varphi(Q,\delta)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |L_\eta(Q,\delta_i)|$.

If $T < G$, then $|L_\eta(Q,\delta_i) \le |N_T(Q) : N_T(Q,\delta_i)|$ for all i.

Also, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |N_T(Q) : N_T(Q,\delta_i)| = |N_G(Q) : N_G(Q,\delta)|$.

Q abelian?

It is not difficult to see that there is a bijection between $\bigcup L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)$ and $L_\varphi(Q, \delta)$.

So, $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)| = \sum_{i=1}^n |L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)|$.

If $T < G$, then $|L_\eta(Q, \delta_i) \leq |N_T(Q) : N_T(Q, \delta_i)|$ for all i.

Also, $\sum_{i=1}^n |N_T(Q) : N_T(Q, \delta_i)| = |N_G(Q) : N_G(Q, \delta)|$.

Combining, we obtain: $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)| \leq |N_G(Q) : N_G(Q, \delta)|$.

Q abelian?

It is not difficult to see that there is a bijection between $\bigcup L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)$ and $L_\varphi(Q, \delta)$.

So, $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |L_\eta(Q, \delta_i)|$.

If $T < G$, then $|L_\eta(Q, \delta_i) \leq |N_T(Q) : N_T(Q, \delta_i)|$ for all i.

Also, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |N_T(Q) : N_T(Q, \delta_i)| = |N_G(Q) : N_G(Q, \delta)|$.

Combining, we obtain: $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)| \leq |N_G(Q) : N_G(Q, \delta)|$.

Thus, $T = G$ and α is G-invariant.

Q abelian?

However, when we go to use the inductive hypothesis on β, things do not work as well.

Q abelian?

However, when we go to use the inductive hypothesis on β, things do not work as well.

Suppose I, the stabilizer of β in G, is chosen so that $Q \leq I$ and $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_m$ are the characters in $\mathrm{IBr}(I)$ with vertex Q that induce φ.

Q abelian?

However, when we go to use the inductive hypothesis on β, things do not work as well.

Suppose I, the stabilizer of β in G, is chosen so that $Q \leq I$ and $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_m$ are the characters in $\mathrm{IBr}(I)$ with vertex Q that induce φ.

We can show that $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)|$ equals $\sum_{i=1}^m |L_{\zeta_i}(Q, \delta)|$.

Q abelian?

If $I < G$, we can use the inductive hypothesis to see that the result holds for each ζ_i.

Q abelian?

If $I < G$, we can use the inductive hypothesis to see that the result holds for each ζ_i.

That is, $|L_{\zeta_i}(Q,\delta)|$ is at most $|\mathrm{N}_I(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q,\delta)|$.

Q abelian?

If $I < G$, we can use the inductive hypothesis to see that the result holds for each ζ_i.

That is, $|L_{\zeta_i}(Q, \delta)|$ is at most $|\mathrm{N}_I(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q, \delta)|$.

With this, we deduce $|L_{\varphi}(Q, \delta)|$ is at most $m|\mathrm{N}_I(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q, \delta)|$.

Q abelian?

If $I < G$, we can use the inductive hypothesis to see that the result holds for each ζ_i.

That is, $|L_{\zeta_i}(Q, \delta)|$ is at most $|\mathrm{N}_I(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q, \delta)|$.

With this, we deduce $|L_\varphi(Q, \delta)|$ is at most $m|\mathrm{N}_I(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q, \delta)|$.

To prove the result, we need $m \leq |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q)|$.

Q abelian?

When Q is abelian, we can prove that $Q \leq N$.

Q abelian?

When Q is abelian, we can prove that $Q \leq N$.

We then have the Frattini argument available to see that $G = N\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$.

Q abelian?

When Q is abelian, we can prove that $Q \leq N$.

We then have the Frattini argument available to see that $G = N\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$.

It follows $|G : I| = |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q)|$.

Q abelian?

When Q is abelian, we can prove that $Q \leq N$.

We then have the Frattini argument available to see that $G = N\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$.

It follows $|G : I| = |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q)|$.

Also, $\varphi(1) = |G : I|\zeta_1(1)$ and $\varphi(1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \zeta_i(1) = m\zeta_1(1)$.

Q abelian?

When Q is abelian, we can prove that $Q \leq N$.

We then have the Frattini argument available to see that $G = N\mathrm{N}_G(Q)$.

It follows $|G : I| = |\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q)|$.

Also, $\varphi(1) = |G : I|\zeta_1(1)$ and $\varphi(1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \zeta_i(1) = m\zeta_1(1)$.

We conclude that $m \leq |G : I|$.

Q abelian?

Thus, when Q is abelian, we may assume β is G-invariant.

Q abelian?

Thus, when Q is abelian, we may assume β is G-invariant.

Now, α and β both G-invariant implies $N = G$.

Q abelian?

Thus, when Q is abelian, we may assume β is G-invariant.

Now, α and β both G-invariant implies $N = G$.

The result is immediate when $G = N$.

Q abelian?

Thus, when Q is abelian, we may assume β is G-invariant.

Now, α and β both G-invariant implies $N = G$.

The result is immediate when $G = N$.

When Q is not abelian, there is no reason to believe that $Q \leq N$.

An open question

Hence, we ask the follow question:

An open question

Hence, we ask the follow question:

Question:
Let G be a p-solvable group. Suppose $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ has vertex Q. Suppose $Q \leq I \leq G$. Is it true that the number of characters in $\mathrm{IBr}(I)$ with vertex Q that induce φ is at most $|\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q)|$?

An open question

Hence, we ask the follow question:

Question:
Let G be a p-solvable group. Suppose $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ has vertex Q. Suppose $Q \leq I \leq G$. Is it true that the number of characters in $\mathrm{IBr}(I)$ with vertex Q that induce φ is at most $|\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q)|$?

If the answer is yes, when p is odd, then we can remove the hypothesis that Q is abelian.

An open question

Hence, we ask the follow question:

Question:
Let G be a p-solvable group. Suppose $\varphi \in \mathrm{IBr}(G)$ has vertex Q. Suppose $Q \leq I \leq G$. Is it true that the number of characters in $\mathrm{IBr}(I)$ with vertex Q that induce φ is at most $|\mathrm{N}_G(Q) : \mathrm{N}_I(Q)|$?

If the answer is yes, when p is odd, then we can remove the hypothesis that Q is abelian.

We have not been able to settle this question at this time.

An open question

Interestingly, the question does have a positive answer when $|G|$ is odd or when $p = 2$.

An open question

Interestingly, the question does have a positive answer when $|G|$ is odd or when $p = 2$.

Also, when p is odd, we can prove that if G is a minimal counterexample, then I is a maximal subgroup, $|G : I|$ is a power of 2, and φ restricts homogeneously to every normal subgroup of G contained in I. Furthermore, writing N for the core of I in G and M for a normal subgroup of G so that M/N is a chief factor of G, if α is the irreducible constituent of φ_N, then α^M has a unique irreducible constituent.