

# General Thesis Problem Notes

Sam Kim Miller

October 2021

## 1 $C_2$ Splendid Rickard Complex Construction

### Overview of the problem

For simplicity, let us assume we have a  $p$ -group  $G$  and a  $p$ -modular system  $(K, \mathcal{O}, k)$ . Then in this case,  $B_p(G) = \mathcal{O}G$ , that is,  $G$  has only one block. Our goal is to construct a Splendid Rickard complex for  $G$  in the following manner: we have a sequence of maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & \text{Spl}(G, G) \\ & & & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ B(G)^\times & \longrightarrow & O(B(G, G)) & \longrightarrow & O(T(G, G)) \end{array}$$

where  $B(G)^\times$  is the multiplicative group of the Burnside ring  $B(G)$  of  $G$ ,  $O(B(G, G))$  is the group of orthogonal units of the Burnside  $(G, G)$ -biset ring,  $B(G, G)$ , and  $O(T(G, G))$  is the group of orthogonal units in the Burnside ring of trivial source  $(G, G)$ -bimodules,  $T(G, G)$ . One has that in  $B(G)$ , all unit elements have order 2, that is,  $[U] = [U]^{-1}$ . In  $B(G, G)$ , all elements  $u$  satisfy  $[U] = [U^{\text{op}}]$ , that is, there is an adjoint operator (but its action is trivial). Finally in  $T(G, G)$ , we have an adjoint operator given by  $[M^*] = \text{Hom}_k(M, k)$  (or whatever ring  $M$  is defined over). It is known that if  $[M]$  is invertible, that  $[M]^{-1} = [N^*]$  for some trivial source module  $N$ .

The maps are as follows: for  $B(G)^\times \rightarrow O(B(G, G))$ , given  $[U] \in B(G)^\times$ , define the map by linear extension of the assignment  $[U] \mapsto [\tilde{U}] \in O(B(G, G))$ . This is a group homomorphism when restricted to the multiplicative groups of the respective rings. Note that since  $[U] = [U]^{-1}$ ,  $[\tilde{U}] = [\tilde{U}]^{-1} = [\tilde{U}^{\text{op}}]$ .

For  $O(B(G, G)) \rightarrow O(T(G, G))$ , given  $[U] \in O(B(G, G))$ , define the map by extension of the assignment  $U \mapsto \mathcal{O}U$ , the free module with basis elements given by the elements of  $U$ . The  $\mathcal{O}G$  actions are given by the left and right actions on  $U$ , respectively. Again, this is a group homomorphism when restricted to the multiplicative groups. Note that  $[\mathcal{O}U] = [\mathcal{O}U^*] =$

$[\mathcal{O}U]^{-1}$  by the transport of properties of  $O(B(G, G))$ .

Finally, given a splendid Rickard complex of  $(G, G)$  bimodules over  $p$ , we form an alternating sum of its components. That is, if  $0 \rightarrow M_n \rightarrow M_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_m \rightarrow 0$  is a splendid Rickard complex, send it to the element  $\sum_{i=m}^n (-1)^i [M_i] \in O(T(G, G))$ . It was proven by Boltje that this indeed forms a  $p$ -permutation equivalence.

Given some  $U \in B(G)^\times$ , we wish to construct a splendid Rickard complex which makes the above diagram commute. The image of  $U$  in  $O(T(G, G))$  will immediately suggest the components of a splendid Rickard complex - however, the difficulty is first in the choice of transition maps, and second in verifying that the constructed chain complex is indeed a splendid Rickard complex.

## Splendid Rickard Complexes

First recall that any  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}H)$ -bimodule  $M$  can equivalently be considered a left  $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)$ -module with action  $(g, h) \cdot m = g \cdot m \cdot h^{-1}$ . Let

$$\Gamma := \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow M_m \xrightarrow{d_m} M_{m-1} \xrightarrow{d_{m-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_{m-(a-1)}} M_{m-a} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots$$

be a bounded chain complex of modules on some  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra. Then, the  $\mathcal{O}$ -dual of  $\Gamma$  is defined as the complex

$$\Gamma^* := \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(M_{m-a}, \mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{d_{m-(a-1)}^*} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_m^*} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(M_m, \mathcal{O}) \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots$$

in other words, the chain complex applied by taking the contravariant functor  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(-, \mathcal{O})$ . Let  $G$  be a finite group whose Sylow  $p$ -subgroups are abelian. We denote by  $S_p$  one of those Sylow  $p$ -subgroups, and set  $H := N_G(S_p)$ .

Then  $\Gamma$  is a **Rickard complex** for the principal blocks  $B_p(G)$  and  $B_p(H)$  if it is a complex of  $(B_p(G), B_p(H))$ -bimodules, and satisfies the following properties:

1. Each  $M_n$  of  $\Gamma$ , viewed as a  $\mathcal{O}(G \times H)$  module, is a  $p$ -permutation module with vertex contained in  $\Delta_{G \times H^{\text{op}}}(S_p)$ , where  $\Delta_{G \times H^{\text{op}}}(S_p) = \{(x, x^{-1}) \in G \times H : x \in S_p\}$ .
2. We have homotopy equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}H} \Gamma^* &\simeq B_p(G) \text{ as complexes of } (B_p(G), B_p(G))\text{-bimodules,} \\ \Gamma^* \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma &\simeq B_p(H) \text{ as complexes of } (B_p(H), B_p(H))\text{-bimodules.} \end{aligned}$$

**Side Note:** We may loosen these restrictions a bit - for the purposes of this problem, we will reformulate the definition as follows:

Let  $\Gamma$  be a bounded complex of  $(kG, kG)$ -bimodules with the following properties:

- Every indecomposable summand of  $\Gamma_n$  is a trivial source module, in other words,  $\Gamma_n$  is a  $p$ -permutation module.
- Every indecomposable summand has twisted diagonal vertices (condition 1 above). This is equivalent to  $\Gamma_n$  being projective as left- and as right- $kG$  modules.
- $\Gamma \otimes_{kG} \Gamma^* \simeq kG$  and  $\Gamma^* \otimes_{kG} \Gamma \simeq kG$ .

Then  $\Gamma$  is a **splendid Rickard Equivalence** for  $kG$  and  $kG$ . It is conjectured that  $kG - kG$  Rickard Equivalences lead to Rickard complexes of blocks via idempotents. For our purposes, we will mainly focus on  $kG - kG$  Rickard equivalences for the time being.

## The $G = C_2$ case

Fix  $G = C_2$ . As we have an injective homomorphism  $B(G) \rightarrow \prod_{[s_G]} \mathbb{Z}$  where  $[s_G]$  indexes conjugacy classes of subgroups of  $G$ ,  $|B(G)^\times| \leq 4$  (since there are only 2 subgroups of  $G$ ). One may compute that in this case,  $B(G)^\times$  has 4 elements, given by  $[G/G]$ ,  $[G/G] - [G/1]$  and their negative counterparts.

We will take the element  $g = [G/1] - [G/G]$ . First let us compute its image in  $O(B(G, G))$ . Since the ring homomorphism is unital,  $[G/G] = [G]$ .  $\widetilde{G/1} = G \times G$  as a set, and with the group action it is not hard to compute that all elements have stabilizer  $1 \times 1$ , hence  $[\widetilde{G/1}] = [G \times G]$ . Hence the image in  $O(B(G, G))$  is  $[G \times G] - [G]$

Now, the image of  $g$  in  $O(T(G, G))$  will be given by  $[\mathcal{O}(G \times G)] - [\mathcal{O}G] = [\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G] - [\mathcal{O}G]$ . We wish to find a splendid Rickard complex send to that - the fairly clear choice is

$$\Gamma = \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots,$$

where  $\mathcal{O}G$  occurs at the 0 index, and the transition map  $d : \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G$  is given by  $d(a \otimes b) = ab$ . It is clear that this complex satisfies condition (1), as these modules are permutation modules which are free, and hence have trivial source. Moreover, one may verify in general that for any  $h \leq G$ ,  $\text{Ind}_{\Delta H}^{G \times G}(\mathcal{O}) \cong \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}H} \mathcal{O}G$ , so each module has diagonal vertices. The difficulty lies in verifying (2).

## The Dual Complex

Let us compute what  $\Gamma^*$  is and attempt to simplify as much as possible. By definition, it is

$$\Gamma^* = \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G^* \xrightarrow{d^*} (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G)^* \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots.$$

Here,  $d^*$  is given by precomposition. It sends a map  $f : \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  to a map  $f' : \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$  defined by  $f'(a \otimes b) := f(ab)$ .

Recall that for any  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}H)$ -bimodule  $M$ ,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(M, \mathcal{O})$  has  $(\mathcal{O}H, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodule structure given by

$$(h \cdot f \cdot g)(m) = f(g \cdot m \cdot h), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{O}G, h \in \mathcal{O}H, m \in M, f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(M, \mathcal{O})$$

With this, we have an isomorphism of  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodules  $\mathcal{O}G \cong \mathcal{O}G^*$  given by the  $\mathcal{O}$ -linear extension of

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 : \mathcal{O}G &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}G^* \\ g &\mapsto \delta_{g^{-1}} \\ \sum_{g \in G} f(g^{-1}) \cdot g &\mapsto f \end{aligned}$$

Call the map in the  $\mathcal{O}G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G^*$  direction  $\Phi_1$ . We may consider  $\Gamma^*$  as a chain complex

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \xrightarrow{d^* \circ \Phi_1} (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G)^* \rightarrow 0$$

Note that by the Burnside ring structure of  $B(G)^\times$  and  $O(T(G, G))$  that we have an equality

$$[\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G] - [\mathcal{O}G] = [(\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G)^*] - [\mathcal{O}G^*] = [\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G]^{-1} - [\mathcal{O}G]^{-1},$$

and we have demonstrated  $[\mathcal{O}G] = [\mathcal{O}G]^*$ , so we must have an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{O}G$ -modules  $(\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G)^* \cong \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G$ . In fact, we have a similar construction as before for the isomorphism. Set  $\mathcal{B} = \{(g \otimes h) : g, h \in G\}$ , an  $\mathcal{O}$ -basis of  $\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G$ . Then, for any  $g \otimes h \in \mathcal{B}$ , we denote  $(g \otimes h)^{-1} := h^{-1} \otimes g^{-1}$ . One then may verify that the  $\mathcal{O}$ -linear extension of the map:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2 : \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G &\xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G)^* \\ g \otimes h &\mapsto \delta_{h^{-1} \otimes g^{-1}} \\ \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} f(b^{-1}) \cdot b &\mapsto f \end{aligned}$$

is indeed an isomorphism of  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodules.

Now given these, we may try to find an isomorphism of complexes  $\Gamma^* \cong \Gamma'$ , where  $\Gamma'$  is of the form

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow 0.$$

More precisely, we wish to find the transition map  $d'$  that makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}G & \xrightarrow{d'} & \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \Phi_1 & & \downarrow \Phi_2 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}G^* & \xrightarrow{d^*} & (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G)^* & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

We compute how  $d'$  acts on  $\mathcal{O}$ -basis elements to define it:

$$d'(1) = 1 \otimes 1 + c \otimes c, \quad d'(c) = 1 \otimes c + c \otimes 1,$$

and check that it is indeed a  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodule homomorphism (it is). Thus we have an isomorphism of  $(kG, kG)$ -bimodules  $\Gamma^* \cong \Gamma'$ . We may identify the two interchangeably for computing the conditions of Rickard complexes.

## Tensoring and simplifying

We now wish to take the tensor product  $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma'$  - in this case we only need to perform one computation since  $B_p(G) = B_p(H) = G$ , and  $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma' \cong \Gamma' \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma$ .

Let's recall what the construction is for the tensor product of bounded chain complexes is. Given two chain complexes  $C_\bullet$  and  $D_\bullet$  of  $\mathcal{O}G$ -bimodules

$$(C \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} D)_n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n} C_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} D_j.$$

Transition maps are defined over the direct sum as follows: given  $c_i \otimes d_j \in C_i \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} D_j$ , we set

$$d_n(c_i \otimes d_j) = d_i^C(c_i) \otimes d_j + (-1)^i c_i \otimes d_j^D(d_j),$$

then define  $d_n$  by linearizing. In our case, the tensor product  $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma'$  will have three nonzero components. The modules are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma')_1 &= (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \mathcal{O}G \\ (\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma')_0 &= (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \mathcal{O}G) \oplus ((\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G)) \\ (\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma')_{-1} &= \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \end{aligned}$$

and the transition maps are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_1 : (a \otimes b) \otimes c &\mapsto (ab \otimes c, a \otimes b \otimes d^*(c)) \\ d_0 : (a \otimes b, c \otimes d \otimes e \otimes f) &\mapsto -a \otimes d^*(b) + cd \otimes e \otimes f \end{aligned}$$

We may simplify this chain complex by finding an isomorphism of chain complexes in what will follow. Denote for ease of notation  $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma' = C_\bullet$  and  $(\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma')_i = C_i$ . Then, we have obvious isomorphisms of  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodules as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &\cong \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G, \quad a \otimes b \otimes c \mapsto a \otimes bc \\ C_0 &\cong \mathcal{O}G \oplus (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G), \quad (a \otimes b, c \otimes d \otimes e \otimes f) \mapsto (ab, c \otimes de \otimes f) \\ C_{-1} &\cong \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G, \quad a \otimes b \otimes c \mapsto ab \otimes c \end{aligned}$$

Then, one may verify that the following squares both commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
C_1 & \xrightarrow{d_1} & C_0 & \xrightarrow{d_0} & C_{-1} \\
\downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\
\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{O}G \oplus (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G
\end{array}$$

where  $f(x \otimes y) = (xy, x \otimes d'(y))$  and  $g(w, x \otimes y \otimes z) = xy \otimes z - d'(w)$ . We conclude we have an isomorphism of chain complexes:

$$\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma^* \cong \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \oplus (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots$$

and will henceforth refer to this complex as  $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma^*$  instead, with differentials defined above.

## Finding a homotopy equivalence

Before we do this, let's double check to make sure that this chain complex is the “right” one, that is, that it has the same homology as  $\mathcal{O}G$  as a chain complex. Computing the full homology may be nontrivial but it's easier to at least show that  $f$  is injective and  $g$  is surjective, showing  $H_1 = H_{-1} = 0$ .

To see  $f$  is injective, first one may verify that  $d'$  as defined for  $\Gamma'$  is injective. Since  $\mathcal{O}$  has no zero divisors,  $x \otimes d'(y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = 0$  or  $d'(y) = 0$ , which in turn is true only when  $x = 0$  or  $y = 0$ , so  $x \otimes y = 0$ . Therefore  $\ker f = 0$ , and  $\operatorname{im} f \cong \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G$ .

On the other hand it is clear that  $g$  is surjective, as  $a \otimes b \in \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G$  is mapped to by  $g$  via  $(0, a \otimes 1 \otimes b)$ , so all basis elements have preimage, and thus  $g$  is surjective. It follows that  $H_1 = H_{-1} = 0$ . We have everything we need to prove the homotopy equivalence.

**Theorem.**  $\mathcal{O}G \simeq \Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma^*$

*Proof.* First, observe that  $\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G$  is a free  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodule, hence projective and injective. Since  $f$  is injective, by injectivity of  $\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G$ ,  $f$  splits with section  $f'$ , and moreover, there is a decomposition

$$\mathcal{O}G \oplus \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G = \operatorname{im} f \oplus \ker f'.$$

Similarly, since  $g$  is surjective, by projectivity of  $\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G$ ,  $g$  splits with section  $g'$ , and moreover, there is a decomposition

$$\mathcal{O}G \oplus \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G = \ker g \oplus \operatorname{im} g'.$$

Since  $\Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma^*$  is a complex,  $\operatorname{im} f \subseteq \ker g$ , and so we may write

$$\mathcal{O}G \oplus \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G = \operatorname{im} f \oplus \ker g' \oplus M, \quad \text{with } M \oplus \operatorname{im} f = \ker g$$

Therefore,  $\text{im } f \cap \ker g' = \{0\}$ . Now, by injectivity of  $f$  and surjectivity of  $g$ , we have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} f &: \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{im } f \\ g &: \ker g' \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \end{aligned}$$

from which we can form an acyclic, split chain complex:

$$A = \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \xrightarrow{f} \text{im } f \oplus \ker g' \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots.$$

(Linkelmann 1.18.15) implies that  $A$  is contractible. Moreover, we have that  $A \oplus M = \Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma^*$ , where  $M$  is the chain complex with  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodule  $M$  at degree 0, and 0s elsewhere, and  $\mathcal{O}G \oplus \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \cong \text{im } f \oplus \ker g' \oplus M$ . (Linkelmann 1.18.19) then implies that  $M \simeq \Gamma \otimes_{\mathcal{O}G} \Gamma^*$ , so it remains to show that  $M \cong \mathcal{O}G$ .

On the other hand, observe that

$$\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \cong \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G,$$

as  $(\mathcal{O}G, \mathcal{O}G)$ -bimodules, since the middle term in the triple tensor product can be restricted to be considered an  $(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$ -bimodule. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G &\cong \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \\ &\cong ((\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}) \oplus (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O})) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \\ &\cong (\mathcal{O}G \oplus \mathcal{O}G) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \\ &\cong (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \oplus (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \end{aligned}$$

Since we have a decomposition:

$$\mathcal{O}G \oplus (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) = \text{im } f \oplus \text{im } g' \oplus M \cong (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \oplus (\mathcal{O}G \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}G) \oplus M,$$

it follows that  $M \cong \mathcal{O}G$  by the Krull-Schmidt theorem, as desired.  $\square$

Thus, we have constructed a Splendid Rickard complex for  $G = C_2$ !