

A NOTE ON LOCALIZATIONS OF PERFECT GROUPS

BERNARD BADZIOCH AND MARK FESHBACH

ABSTRACT. We describe a perfect group whose localization is not perfect.

1. INTRODUCTION

A localization is a type of a functor $L: \mathbf{Groups} \rightarrow \mathbf{Groups}$ which is idempotent (that is $LLG \cong LG$) and admits a coaugmentation $\eta: G \rightarrow LG$ [1]. Localizations are ubiquitous in group theory: abelianization, killing of the p -torsion and inversion of a prime in a group are all examples of such functors.

The natural question – which classes of groups are preserved by all localizations – has been a focus of a lot of study recently. This work yield both classes which are preserved (e.g. abelian groups, nilpotent groups of class 2 [2]), and these which do not have this property, like finite [3] or solvable groups [5]. The goal of this note is to prove the following

Theorem 1.1. *The class of perfect groups is not closed with respect to taking localizations. That is, there exists a perfect group P and a localization $\eta: P \rightarrow LP$ such that LP is not perfect.*

This answers a question posed by Casacuberta in [1].

The groups P and LP we construct in the proof of Theorem 1.1 are infinite. It would be interesting to know if one can find a finite perfect group with a non-perfect localization. The following shows however that the localized group would have to be infinite.

Proposition 1.2. *If $\eta: P \rightarrow LP$ is a localization of a perfect group P and LP is finite then LP is a perfect group.*

2. PROOFS

Our main tool will be the following fact which characterizes all possible localizations of a group. It is a direct ramification of the definition of localization functors (see e.g. [1, Lemma 2.1]).

Lemma 2.1. *A homomorphism $\eta: G \rightarrow H$ is a localization of G with respect to some localization functor iff η induces a bijection of sets*

$$\mathrm{Hom}(H, H) \xrightarrow{\eta^*} \mathrm{Hom}(G, H)$$

Date: January 10, 2003.

As an application we obtain

Lemma 2.2. *If $\eta: G \rightarrow H$ is a localization and G is a perfect group then there are no non-trivial homomorphisms $H/[H, H] \rightarrow H$.*

Proof. Let $g: H/[H, H] \rightarrow H$ be any homomorphism. and let f denote the composition $H \rightarrow H/[H, H] \xrightarrow{g} H$. Since G is perfect the composition $f \circ \eta$ is the trivial map. Lemma 2.1 implies then that f is also trivial, and thus so is g . \square

Since every finite group H admits a non-trivial map $H/[H, H] \rightarrow H$ unless H is perfect, Proposition 1.2 is a consequence of Lemma 2.1.

Next, we turn to the proof of Theorem 1.1. We start with

Construction of the group P . For $n \geq 0$ let \tilde{P}_n be a free group on 2^n generators $x_1^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}, \dots, x_{2^n}^{(n)}$, and let $\tilde{\phi}_n: \tilde{P}_n \rightarrow \tilde{P}_{n+1}$ be a group homomorphism defined by

$$\tilde{\phi}_n(x_i^{(n)}) = [x_{2i-1}^{(n+1)}, x_{2i}^{(n+1)}]$$

where $[a, b] = a^{-1}b^{-1}ab$ is the commutator of a and b . Define $\tilde{P} := \varinjlim_n \tilde{P}_n$.

Notice, that since \tilde{P} is generated by the elements $x_i^{(n)} \in [\tilde{P}, \tilde{P}]$ the group \tilde{P} is perfect. Let K be the smallest normal subgroup of \tilde{P} containing the elements $[x_1^{(0)}, x_i^{(n)}]$ for all $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq 2^n$. Define $P := \tilde{P}/K$.

Proposition 2.3. *The group P is perfect and $x_1^{(0)}$ is a central element of P . Moreover, $x_1^{(0)}$ is an element of infinite order, and as a consequence P is a non-trivial group.*

Proof. The first two claims are obvious. To see that $x_1^{(0)} \in P$ has infinite order notice that P can be viewed as a limit

$$P = \varinjlim_n P_n$$

where P_n is a group with the presentation

$$P_n := \langle x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_{2^n}^{(n)} \mid [x_1^{(0)}, x_i^{(n)}] = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2^n \rangle$$

(by abuse of notation we denote here by $x_1^{(0)}$ the image of the element $x_1^{(0)}$ under the map $P_0 \rightarrow P_n$). It is then enough to show that $x_1^{(0)}$ has infinite order in P_n for all $n \geq 0$. To see this consider $GL(\mathbb{Z}, 2^n + 1)$ – the group of invertible matrices of dimension $2^n + 1$ with integer coefficients. For $n > 0$ there is a homomorphism

$$\psi_n: P_n \rightarrow GL(\mathbb{Z}, 2^n + 1)$$

defined by $\psi_n(x_i^{(n)}) = e_{i, i+1}^1$, where $e_{i, j}^a$ denote the matrix with 1's on the diagonal, a as the (i, j) -th entry, and 0's elsewhere. One can check that $\psi_n(x_1^{(0)}) = e_{1, 2^n+1}^{\pm 1}$. Since $(e_{1, 2^n+1}^{\pm 1})^k = e_{1, 2^n+1}^{\pm k}$ this is a non-torsion

element of $GL(\mathbb{Z}, 2^n + 1)$, and as a consequence $x_1^{(0)}$ has infinite order in P_n as claimed. \square

Construction of the map $\eta: P \rightarrow LP$. Let \mathbb{Q} be the group of rational numbers. Define

$$LP := P \oplus \mathbb{Q} / \langle (x_1^{(0)}, -1) \rangle$$

and let the map $\eta: P \rightarrow LP$ be given by the composition of the inclusion $P \hookrightarrow P \oplus \mathbb{Q}$ and the projection $P \oplus \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow LP$. Since η is a monomorphism we will identify P with its image $\eta(P)$. Notice that P is a normal subgroup of LP and that $LP/P \cong \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$. Since \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} is not a perfect group neither is LP .

It remains to prove that η is a localization of P . By Lemma 2.1 this amounts showing that any homomorphism $f: P \rightarrow LP$ admits a unique factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{\eta} & LP \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow \bar{f} \\ & & LP \end{array}$$

Uniqueness of \bar{f} . Assume that $\bar{f}_1, \bar{f}_2: LP \rightarrow LP$ are homomorphisms such that $\eta\bar{f}_1 = \eta\bar{f}_2$, and consider the homomorphism

$$g := (\bar{f}_1|_{\mathbb{Q}} - \bar{f}_2|_{\mathbb{Q}}): \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow LP$$

We have $\bar{f}_1(1) = \bar{f}_1(x_1^{(0)}) = \bar{f}_2(x_1^{(0)}) = \bar{f}_2(1)$, and thus $\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \ker g$. Therefore we get a factorization

$$g: \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow LP$$

and $g \equiv 1$ iff $\bar{f}_1 = \bar{f}_2$. Thus, our claim is a consequence of the following

Lemma 2.4. *The group LP is torsion free.*

Proof. Let $(w, \frac{p}{q})$ represents a torsion element of LP . Then $q \cdot (w, \frac{p}{q}) = (w^q, p) = w^q(x_1^{(0)})^p$ is a torsion element in P . Consider the group $R := P / \langle x_1^{(0)} \rangle$. The element $w^q(x_1^{(0)})^p = w^q$ is torsion in R , and thus so is w . Notice that $R = \varinjlim_n R_n$ where

$$R_n = \langle x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_{2^n}^{(n)} | x_1^{(0)} = 1 \rangle$$

It follows that w is a torsion element in R_n for n large enough. On the other hand, R_n is a group with one relator given by a word which is not a proper power of any element in the free group. By [4, Thm. 4.12, p. 266] R_n must be torsion free. Therefore $w = 1$ in R , and so $(w, \frac{p}{q}) = ((x_1^{(0)})^l, \frac{p}{q}) = l + \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} \subseteq LP$ for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since by assumption $(w, \frac{p}{q})$ is a torsion element it must be trivial. \square

Existence of \bar{f} . We need to show that every homomorphism $f: P \rightarrow LP$ admits an extension $\bar{f}: LP \rightarrow LP$. Assume for a moment that $f(x_1^{(0)}) = (x_1^{(0)})^k \in LP$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. From the definition of LP it follows then that \bar{f} can be defined by setting $\bar{f}(r) = kr$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}$. Next, notice that since P is perfect $f(P) \subseteq [LP, LP] = P$. Combining these observations we get that the existence of \bar{f} follows from

Lemma 2.5. *If $g: P \rightarrow P$ is any homomorphism then $g(x_1^{(0)}) = (x_1^{(0)})^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$*

Recall the group $R = P/\langle x_1^{(0)} \rangle$ defined in the proof of Lemma 2.4. Lemma 2.5 will follow if we show that for any homomorphism $g: P \rightarrow R$ the element $x_1^{(0)}$ is in the kernel of g . In the proof of Proposition 2.3 we also defined the group

$$P_1 = \langle x_1^{(1)}, x_2^{(1)} \mid [x_1^{(0)}, x_i^{(1)}] = 1, i = 1, 2 \rangle$$

Since $x_1^{(0)}$ is not in the kernel of the map $P_1 \rightarrow P$ it is enough to show that for any $g: P_1 \rightarrow R$ we have $x_1^{(0)} \in \ker g$. Furthermore, since $R = \varinjlim R_n$ (see 2.4), and P_1 is a finitely presented group it suffices to prove that $g(x_1^{(0)}) = 1$ for all $g \in \text{Hom}(P_1, R_n)$. Finally, notice that by the definition of P_1 the elements $x_1^{(1)}, x_2^{(1)}$ commute with their commutator $x_1^{(0)} = [x_1^{(1)}, x_2^{(1)}]$. These observations and the presentation of R_n show that Lemma 2.5 is a special case of

Lemma 2.6. *Let F_1, F_2 be two free groups, and let u_i be a word in F_i which is not a proper power. Let G be the quotient group of $F_1 * F_2$ by the normal subgroup generated by $[u_1, u_2]$. If $x, y \in G$ are elements commuting with $[x, y]$ then $[x, y] = 1$.*

Proof. Consider the map $h: G \rightarrow F_1 \oplus F_2$. Its kernel K is a free group whose set of generators can be described as follows. Let S_i be a set of representatives of cosets of $\langle u_i \rangle \backslash F_i$. Then the generators of K are all commutators $[v_1, v_2]$ where $v_1 \in S_1$ represents a coset other than $\langle u_1 \rangle$ and v_2 is any nontrivial element of F_2 , or $v_2 \in S_2$ represents a coset different from $\langle u_2 \rangle$, and v_1 is a nontrivial element F_1 . To see this recall [6, Prop. 4, p. 6] that the kernel K' of the map $F_1 * F_2 \rightarrow F_1 \oplus F_2$ is a free group whose generators are all commutators $[v_1, v_2]$ where $v_i \in F_i$ and $v_i \neq 1$. The group K is obtained as the quotient of K' by its normal subgroup generated by the set $\{w^{-1}[u_1, u_2]w \mid w \in F_1 * F_2\}$. This is equivalent to imposing the following relations in K' :

$$[u_1 w_1, u_2 w_2] = [u_1 w_1, w_2][w_2, w_1][w_1, u_2 w_2]$$

where w_i is an arbitrary element of F_i . The above description of K can be derived from here. Notice, that using the above relations any commutator $[w_1, w_2]$ such that $w_i \in F_i$ can be expressed in terms of generators of K

using the formula

$$(2.7) \quad [w_1, w_2] = [w_1, s_2][s_2, s_1][s_1, w_2]$$

where $s_i \in S_i$ represents the coset $\langle u_i \rangle w_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Next, take elements $x, y \in G$ as in the statement of the lemma. Notice that $[x, y] \in K$ since otherwise $h(x), h(y)$ would have to commute with a nontrivial element $h([x, y]) = [h(x), h(y)]$ in $F_1 \oplus F_2$ which is impossible. Furthermore, since centralizers of all nontrivial elements in a free group are abelian and since x, y are in the centralizer of $[x, y]$, if $x, y \in K$ then we get $xy = yx$ and the statement of the lemma holds. Therefore we can assume that $x \notin K$ and $[x, y] \in K$. In this case we can uniquely represent x and $[x, y]$ in the form

$$x = x_1 x_2 \prod_{i=1}^p [a_i, b_i]^{\delta_i} \quad \text{and} \quad [x, y] = \prod_{j=1}^q [c_j, d_j]^{\delta_j}$$

where $x_i \in F_i$, $x_1 x_2 \neq 1$, $[a_i, b_i], [c_j, d_j]$ are generators of K , and $\delta_i, \delta_j = \pm 1$. We can also assume that $[x, y]$ is represented by a cyclically reduced word in the free group K , that is $[c_1, d_1]^{\delta_1} \neq [c_q, d_q]^{-\delta_q}$. Consider the element

$$(2.8) \quad x_2^{-n} x_1^{-n} [x, y] x_1^n x_2^n = \prod_j ([x_2^n, c_j x_1^n] [c_j x_1^n, d_j x_2^n] [d_j x_2^n, x_1^n] [x_1^n, x_2^n])^{\delta_j}$$

Commutativity of x and $[x, y]$ implies that for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ this element is conjugate to $[x, y]$ in K . We will show that this is not possible unless $[x, y] = 1$. One can check that the following holds.

Lemma 2.9. *Let F be a free group and let w, v be words in F . If w is cyclically reduced and v is conjugated in F to w then all generators of F appearing in w must appear in v .*

We apply it to $w = [x, y]$ and $v = x_2^{-n} x_1^{-n} [x, y] x_1^n x_2^n$. The commutators appearing on the right hand side of formula 2.8 are not generators of the group K . Each of them, however, can be written as a product of generators of K using formula 2.7. By lemma 2.9 all commutators $[c_j, d_j]$ must appear among these generators. One can check however that (since u_1, u_2 are not proper powers) if $x_1 \neq 1$, $x_2 \neq 1$, and n is large enough this can happen only if $x_1 = c^{-1} u_1^k c$, $x_2 = d^{-1} u_2^l d$ and $[x, y] = [c, d]^m$ for some $c \in F_1$, $d \in F_2$, and $k, l, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. By inspection, in this case $x_1^{-n} x_2^{-n} [x, y] x_1^n x_2^n$ is not conjugated to $[x, y]$ unless $m = 0$, and $[x, y] = 1$. Assume in turn that e.g. $x_2 = 1$. Then we have

$$x_1^{-n} [x, y] x_1^n = \prod_{j=1}^q ([c_j x_1^n, d_j] [d_j, x_1^n])^{\delta_j}$$

Again, combining this with formula 2.7 we get an expression of $x_1^{-n} [x, y] x_1^n$ as a product of generators of K . In order for $[c_j, d_j]$ to appear among these generators for large n we must have $x_1 = c^{-1} u_1^k c$ and $[x, y] = \prod_j [c, d_j]^{\delta_j}$ for

some $c \in F_1$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. As before, by inspection we obtain that also in this case $x_1^{-n}[x, y]x_1^n$ cannot be conjugate to $[x, y]$ if $[x, y] \neq 1$.

□

REFERENCES

- [1] Carles Casacuberta. On structures preserved by idempotent transformations of groups and homotopy types. In *Crystallographic groups and their generalizations (Kortrijk, 1999)*, volume 262 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 39–68. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
- [2] Assaf Libman. Cardinality and nilpotency of localizations of groups and G -modules. *Israel J. Math.*, 117:221–237, 2000.
- [3] Assaf Libman. A note on the localization of finite groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 148(3):271–274, 2000.
- [4] Wilhelm Magnus, Abraham Karrass, and Donald Solitar. *Combinatorial group theory: Presentations of groups in terms of generators and relations*. Interscience Publishers [John Wiley & Sons, Inc.], New York-London-Sydney, 1966.
- [5] Niamh O’Sullivan. Localizations of free soluble groups. *J. Group Theory*, 4(1):89–96, 2001.
- [6] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Trees*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455,
E-mail address, B. Badzioch: `badzioch@math.umn.edu`

E-mail address, M. Feshbach: `feshbach@math.umn.edu`