PSEUDO-REFLECTION GROUPS AND ESSENTIAL DIMENSION
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Abstract. We give a simple formula for the essential dimension of a finite pseudo-reflection group at a prime $p$ and determine the absolute essential dimension for most irreducible pseudo-reflection groups. We also study the “poor man’s essential dimension” of an arbitrary finite group, an intermediate notion between the absolute essential dimension and the essential dimension at a prime $p$.

1. Introduction

Let $k$ be a field and $G$ be a finite group. We begin by recalling the definition of the essential dimension $\operatorname{ed}_G(G)$.

A $G$-variety is a $k$-variety $X$ with a $G$-action. A $G$-variety $X$ is primitive if $G$ acts transitively on the irreducible components of $X_{\overline{k}}$. Here $\overline{k}$ denotes the algebraic closure of $k$. A compression is a dominant $G$-equivariant $k$-map $X \to Y$, where $X$ and $Y$ are primitive faithful $G$-varieties defined over $k$. The essential dimension of a primitive faithful $G$-variety $X$, denoted by $\operatorname{ed}(X)$, is defined as the minimal dimension of $Y$, where $X$ is fixed, $Y$ varies, and the minimum is taken over all compressions $X \to Y$.

The essential dimension $\operatorname{ed}_k(G)$ of $G$ is the maximal value of $\operatorname{ed}(X)$ over all primitive faithful $G$-varieties $X$ defined over $k$. This maximal value is attained in the case where $X = V$ is a finite-dimensional $k$-vector space on which $G$ acts via a faithful representation $G \to \operatorname{GL}(V)$. We will denote this numerical invariant of $G$ by $\operatorname{ed}_k(G)$, or simply $\operatorname{ed}(G)$ when the base field $k$ is clear.

The notion of essential dimension has classical origins, even though it was only formalized relatively recently [BR97]. In particular, Felix Klein showed (using different terminology) that $\operatorname{ed}_C(S_5) = 2$ in his 1884 book [Kl84]. In Galois-theoretic language, $\operatorname{ed}_k(G)$ is the minimal integer $d \geq 0$ such that for every field $K/k$ and every $G$-Galois field extension $L/K$, one can write $L \simeq K[x]/(f(x))$, where at most $d$ of the coefficients of the polynomial $f(x) \in K[x]$ are algebraically independent over $k$. This number naturally comes up in the construction of so-called “generic polynomials” for the group $G$ in inverse Galois theory; see [JLY02, Chapter 8]. Essential dimension can also be defined in a broader context as a numerical invariant of more general algebraic objects. In this paper our focus will be solely on finite groups. For surveys of the broader theory, we refer an interested reader to [Rei10, Rei11, Mer13].

The essential dimension has turned out to be surprisingly difficult to compute for many finite groups. For example, the exact value of $\operatorname{ed}_Q(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ is only known for a few small values of $n$. The relative version of essential dimension at a prime integer $p$, denoted
by \(\text{ed}(G; p)\), has proved to be more accessible. If \(X\) is a primitive faithful \(G\)-variety, \(\text{ed}(X; p)\) is defined as the minimum of \(\dim(Y)\) over all primitive faithful \(G\)-varieties \(Y\) which admit a \(G\)-equivariant correspondence \(X \rightsquigarrow Y\) of degree prime to \(p\). The essential dimension \(\text{ed}(G; p)\) is, once again, defined as the minimal value of \(\text{ed}(X; p)\). Recall that a correspondence \(X \rightsquigarrow Y\) of degree 1 is the same thing as a dominant rational map \(X \dashrightarrow Y\). Thus \(\text{ed}(X; p) \leq \text{ed}(X)\) and \(\text{ed}(G; p) \leq \text{ed}(G)\) for every prime \(p\). The best known lower bound for \(\text{ed}(G)\) is usually deduced from this inequality.

The computation of \(\text{ed}(G; p)\) is greatly facilitated by a theorem of N. A. Karpenko and A. S. Merkurjev [KM08], which asserts that

\[
\text{ed}(G; p) = \text{ed}(G_p) = \text{rdim}(G_p).
\]

Here \(G_p\) is any Sylow \(p\)-subgroup of \(G\), and for a finite group \(H\), \(\text{rdim}(H)\) denotes the minimal dimension of a faithful representation of \(H\) defined over \(k\), and we assume that \(\zeta_p \in k\), where \(\zeta_p\) is a primitive \(p\)th root of unity. Note that since \([k(\zeta_p) : k]\) is prime to \(p\), \(\text{ed}_k(G; p) = \text{ed}_k(\zeta_p)(G/p)\).

The case where \(G = S_n\) is the symmetric group is of particular interest because it relates to classical questions in the theory of polynomials; see [BR97, BR99]. Here the relative essential dimension is known exactly for every prime \(p\),

\[
\text{ed}(S_n; p) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p} \right\rfloor;
\]

see [MR09, Corollary 4.2]. The absolute essential dimension \(\text{ed}(S_n)\) is largely unknown. In characteristic zero we know only that

\[
\max_p \text{ed}(S_n; p) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rfloor \leq \text{ed}(S_n) \leq n - 3
\]

for any \(n \geq 6\); see [BR97], [Dun10] and [Mac11]. We know even less about \(\text{ed}(S_n)\) in prime characteristic.

The symmetric groups \(S_n\) belong to the larger family of pseudo-reflection groups. Pseudo-reflection groups play an important role in representation theory and invariant theory of finite groups; see, e.g., [Kan01, LT09, ST54]. It is thus natural to try to compute \(\text{ed}(G)\) and \(\text{ed}(G; p)\), where \(G\) is a finite pseudo-reflection group, and \(p\) is a prime. The first steps in this direction were taken by M. MacDonald [Mac11, Section 5.1], who computed \(\text{ed}(G; p)\) for all primes \(p\) and all irreducible Weyl groups \(G\). He also computed \(\text{ed}(G)\) for every irreducible Weyl group \(G\), except for \(G = S_n\) and \(G = W(E_6)\), the Weyl group of the root system of type \(E_6\). His proofs are based on case-by-case analysis.

The aim of this paper is twofold. First, we will generalize MacDonald’s results to all finite pseudo-reflection groups except the symmetric groups, with a more uniform statement and proof. Second, we will investigate a new intermediate notion between \(\max_p \text{ed}(G; p)\) and \(\text{ed}(G)\), which we call “poor man’s essential dimension.”

Throughout this paper we will assume that \(\text{char}(k)\) does not divide the order of \(G\). Our finite groups will be viewed as split algebraic groups over \(k\). We will denote by \(\overline{k}\) the algebraic closure of \(k\) and by \(\zeta_d\) a primitive \(d\)th root of unity in \(\overline{k}\) where \(d\) is a positive integer coprime to \(\text{char}(k)\). By a variety we will mean a separated reduced scheme of finite type over \(k\), not necessarily irreducible. We will also adopt the following notational conventions inspired by [Spr74]. Let \(\phi : G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V)\) be a faithful representation of \(G\) and \(m\) be a positive integer prime to the characteristic of \(k\). Set \(V(g, \zeta_m) := \ker(\zeta_m I - \phi(g))\)
to be the $\zeta_m$-eigenspace of $g$ and let

$$a_\phi(m) := \max_{g \in G} \dim V(g, \zeta_m).$$

Note that $V(g, \zeta_m)$ is defined over $k(\zeta_m)$ but may not be defined over $k$. Replacing $g$ by a suitable power, we see that $a_\phi(m)$ depends only on $\phi$ and $m$ and not on the choice of the primitive $m$th root of unity $\zeta_m$. If the reference to $\phi$ is clear from the context, we will write $g$ in place of $\phi(g)$ and $a(m)$ in place of $a_\phi(m)$. By convention, we set $a(m) = 0$ if $m$ is a multiple of the characteristic of $k$.

Recall that an element $g \in \text{GL}(V)$ is a pseudo-reflection if it is conjugate to a diagonal matrix of the form $\text{diag}(1, \ldots, 1, \zeta)$, where $\zeta \neq 1$ is a root of unity.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $G$ be a finite subgroup of $\text{GL}(V)$. Assume that the characteristic of the base field $k$ does not divide $|G|$. Then

(a) $\text{ed}(G; p) \leq a(p)$ for every prime $p$.

(b) Moreover, if $G$ is generated by pseudo-reflections then $\text{ed}(G; p) = a(p)$ for every prime $p$.

Suppose that $\phi: G \to \text{GL}(V)$ is generated by pseudo-reflections with $n = \dim(V)$. Then $k[V]^G = k[f_1, \ldots, f_n]$ for some homogeneous polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_n$. Set $d_i := \text{deg}(f_i)$. The integers $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ are called the degrees of the fundamental invariants of $\phi$. These numbers are uniquely determined by $\phi$ up to reordering. They are independent of the choice of $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ and can be recovered directly from the Poincaré series of $k[V]^G$; see, e.g., [Kan01] or [LT09]. T. A. Springer [Spr74, Theorem 3.4(i)] showed that

$$a(m) = |\{i \mid d_i \text{ is divisible by } m\}|.$$

Note that while the base field $k$ is assumed to be the field of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$ in [Spr74, Theorem 3.4(i)], the above formula remains valid under our less restrictive assumptions on $k$; see, e.g., [Kan01, Section 33-1].

Complex groups generated by pseudo-reflections have been classified by G. C. Shephard and J. A. Todd [ST54]. Their classification lists $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ in every case: Springer’s theorem (1.4) makes it possible to read $a(m)$ directly off their table for every $G$ and every $m$. The same can be done for other base fields $k$, as long as $\text{char}(k)$ does not divide $|G|$; for details and further references, see Section 4.

**Example 1.2.** For $G = W(E_8)$ (group number 37 in the Shephard-Todd classification), the values of $d_1, \ldots, d_8$ are

$$2, 8, 12, 14, 18, 20, 24 \text{ and } 30,$$

respectively; see, e.g., [LT09, Appendix D]. Counting how many of these numbers are divisible by each prime $p$ and applying Theorem 1.1(b) in combination with (1.4), we recover the following values from [Mac11, Table IV]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$2$</th>
<th>$3$</th>
<th>$5$</th>
<th>$7$</th>
<th>$&gt; 7$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ed$(W(E_8); p)$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on both the uniform arguments in Section 2 and 3 and some case-by-case analysis using the Shephard-Todd classification in Section 4.

Our next result, Theorem 1.3, gives the exact value for the absolute essential dimension of all irreducible pseudo-reflection groups, except for $S_n$. Recall that, in the Shephard-Todd classification there are three infinite families: the symmetric groups, the family
Let $G \subset \text{GL}(V)$ be an irreducible representation of a finite group generated by pseudo-reflections. Suppose $G$ is not isomorphic to a symmetric group $S_n$ and $\text{char}(k)$ does not divide $|G|$. Then

(a) $\text{ed}(G) = \dim(V) - 2 = 4$, if $G \simeq W(E_6)$,

(b) $\text{ed}(G) = \dim(V) - 1 = n - 1$, if $G \simeq G(m,m,n)$ with $m, n$ relatively prime,

(c) $\text{ed}(G) = \dim(V)$ in all other cases.

As we mentioned above, the exact value of $\text{ed}(S_n)$ is not known; see (1.3). Part (a) answers an open question posed in [Mac11, Remark 5.2]. The proof of this part relies on a geometric construction suggested to us by I. Dolgachev.

We now recall that $\text{ed}(G)$ is the minimal dimension of a versal $G$-variety and $\text{ed}(G; p)$ is the minimal dimension of a $p$-versal $G$-variety; see [Ser03, Section 5] and [DR13, Remark 2.5]. Poor man’s essential dimension, denoted $\text{pmed}(G)$, is defined as the minimal dimension of a $G$-variety which is simultaneously $p$-versal for every prime $p$. We have

\begin{equation}
\max_p \text{ed}(G; p) \leq \text{pmed}(G) \leq \text{ed}(G).
\end{equation}

The term “poor man’s essential dimension” is meant to suggest that $\text{pmed}(G)$ is a more accessible substitute for $\text{ed}(G)$. Where exactly it fits between $\max_p \text{ed}(G; p)$ and $\text{ed}(G)$, is a key motivating question for this paper.

**Theorem 1.4.** Let $G$ be a finite subgroup of $\text{GL}(V)$. Assume that $\text{char}(k)$ does not divide $|G|$. Then

(a) $\text{pmed}(G) \leq \max_p a(p)$.

(b) Moreover, if $G$ is generated by pseudo-reflections then

\[ \text{pmed}(G) = \max_p a(p) = \max_p \text{ed}(G; p). \]

In both parts the maximum is taken over all prime integers $p$.

In particular, $\text{pmed}(S_n) = \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil$ for every $n$, assuming $\text{char}(k) = 0$, a result we found somewhat surprising, considering that $\text{ed}(S_n) > \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil$ for every odd $n \geq 7$; see (1.3).

Our proof of Theorem 1.4 relies on a variant of Bertini’s Theorem; see Theorem 8.1. If $k$ is an infinite field, Theorem 8.1 is classical. If $k$ is a finite field, we make use of the probabilistic versions of Bertini’s smoothness and irreducibility theorems, due to B. Poonen [Poo04, Poo08] and F. Charles and B. Poonen [CP13], respectively. Note that [CP13] was motivated, in part, by the application in this paper.

In view of Theorem 1.4(b), it is natural to ask if

\begin{equation}
\text{pmed}(G) = \max_p \text{ed}(G; p)
\end{equation}

for every finite group $G$. In addition to the case of pseudo-reflection groups covered by Theorem 1.4(b), we will also prove that this is the case for alternating groups (Example 12.1) and for groups all of whose Sylow subgroups are abelian (Proposition 11.1). A conjectural approach to proving (1.6) for other finite groups is outlined at the end of Section 11.
2. Proof of Theorem 1.1(a)

Throughout this section we fix a prime $p$ and assume that the base field $k$ is of characteristic $\neq p$.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $V$ be a finite-dimensional $k$-vector space, and $G_p \subset \text{GL}(V)$ be a finite $p$-group. Assume $\zeta_p \in k$ and $V'$ is a minimal (with respect to inclusion) faithful $G_p$-subrepresentation of $V$. Then there exists a central element $g \in G_p$ of order $p$ such that $V' \subset V(g, \zeta_p)$, where $\zeta_p$ is a primitive $p$th root of unity.

**Proof.** Let $C$ be the socle of $G_p$; i.e., the $p$-torsion subgroup of the centre $Z(G_p)$.

Decompose $V' = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_r$ as a direct sum of irreducible $G_p$-representations. Each $V_i$ decomposes into a direct sum of character spaces for $C$. Since $C$ is central, each of these character spaces is $G_p$-invariant. As $V_i$ is irreducible as a $G_p$-module, there is only one such component. That is, $C$ acts on each $V_i$ by scalar multiplication via a character $\chi_i : C \to k^*$.

We will view the characters $\chi_i$ as elements of the dual group $C^* = \text{Hom}(C, k^*)$. Note that since $C$ is an elementary abelian $p$-group, $C^*$ has the natural structure of an $\mathbb{F}_p$-vector space. Since $V'$ is minimal, an easy argument shows that $\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r$ form an $\mathbb{F}_p$-basis of $C^*$; see [MR10, Lemma 2.3]. Consequently, there is a unique element $g \in C$ such that $\chi_i(g) = \zeta_p$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, r$. In other words, $V' \subset V(g, \zeta_p)$, as desired. \hfill $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.1(a).** Neither $\text{ed}(G; p)$ nor $a(p)$ will change if we replace $k$ by $k(\zeta_p)$. Hence, we may assume without loss of generality that $k$ contains $\zeta_p$. Let $G_p$ be a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $G$ and define $V'$ and $g$ as in Lemma 2.1. Then $V' \subset V(g, \zeta_p)$. Thus

$$\text{ed}(G; p) = \text{ed}(G_p; p) \leq \text{ed}(G_p) \leq \dim(V') \leq \dim V(g, \zeta_p) \leq a(p),$$

as desired. Note that the inequality $\text{ed}(G_p) \leq \dim(V')$ is a consequence of the definition of essential dimension; see, e.g., [Rei10, (2.3)]. \hfill $\square$

We conclude this section with a refinement of Lemma 2.1 which will be used in the proofs of both Theorem 1.1(b) and Corollary 5.1.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $V$ be a finite-dimensional $k$-vector space, $G \subset \text{GL}(V)$ be a finite group generated by pseudo-reflections, and $G_p$ be a $p$-Sylow subgroup of $G$. Assume that $\zeta_p \in k$ and $V'$, $g$ are as in statement of Lemma 2.1. Then $\dim V(g, \zeta_p) = a(p)$.

**Proof.** By a theorem of Springer [Spr74, Theorem 3.4(ii)] there exists an $h \in G$ such that $\dim V(h, \zeta_p) = a(p)$ and $V' \subset V(g, \zeta_p) \subset V(h, \zeta_p)$; see [Spr74, Theorem 3.4(ii)]. Springer originally proved this result over $\mathbb{C}$; a proof over an arbitrary base field (containing $\zeta_p$) can be found in [Kan01, Chapter 33].

After replacing $h$ by a suitable power, we may assume that the order of $h$ is a power of $p$. Let $N = \{ x \in G \mid x(V') = V' \}$ be the stabilizer of $V'$ in $G$. Note that $G_p \subset N$ and thus $G_p$ is a $p$-Sylow subgroup of $N$. Since $V' \subset V(h, \zeta_p)$, we clearly have $h \in N$. On the other hand, since the order of $h$ is a power of $p$, there exists an element $n \in N$ such that $h^n = nhn^{-1}$ is in $G_p$. Note that $h$ acts on $V'$ as $\zeta_p \text{id}_{V'}$, and hence, so does $h'$. Now, $h'$ and $g$ both lie in $G_p$ and have identical actions on $V'$, which is a faithful representation of $G_p$. Thus $h' = g$, and $a(p) = \dim V(h, \zeta_p) = \dim V(h', \zeta_p) = \dim V(g, \zeta_p)$, as desired. \hfill $\square$

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1(b): First reductions

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.1(b). In view of part (a), it suffices to show that $\text{ed}(G; p) \geq a(p)$. Since $\text{ed}_k(G; p) \geq \text{ed}_l(G; p)$, for any field extension $l/k$, we may
assume without loss of generality that \(k\) is algebraically closed, and, in particular, that \(\zeta_p \in k\).

Our proof of Theorem 1.1(b) will proceed by contradiction. We begin by studying a minimal counterexample, with the ultimate goal of showing that it cannot exist.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let \(\phi: G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V)\) be a counterexample to Theorem 1.1(b) of minimal dimension. That is, \(V\) is a vector space of minimal dimension with the following properties: there exists a finite group \(G\), a faithful representation \(\phi: G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V)\), and a prime \(p\), such that \(\phi(G)\) is generated by pseudo-reflections, and

\[
(3.1) \quad \text{ed}(G; p) < a_\phi(p).
\]

Then

(a) \(\dim(V) \geq 2\).
(b) \(\phi\) is irreducible.
(c) Some element \(g \in G\) of order \(p\) acts on \(V\) as a scalar. In particular, \(a_\phi(p) = \dim(V)\).
(d) \(G\) contains no elements of order \(p\) with exactly two eigenvalues.
(e) \(G\) contains no pseudo-reflections of order \(p\).
(f) If \(p = 2\) then \(g = -\text{id}_V\) is the unique element of order 2 in \(G\).
(g) \(G_p\) is contained in the commutator subgroup \([G, G]\). Here, as usual, \(G_p\) denotes a \(p\)-Sylow subgroup of \(G\).
(h) Let \(g \in G\) be as in part (c) and \(\phi': G \to \text{GL}(V')\) be an irreducible representation such that \(\phi'(g) \neq 1\). Then \(\dim(V')\) is a multiple of \(p\). In particular, \(\dim(V)\) is a multiple of \(p\).
(i) \(\dim(V) \geq 2p\).

**Proof.**

(a) Assume the contrary: \(\dim(V) = 1\). In this case \(G\) is a cyclic group. If \(|G|\) is divisible by \(p\) then \(\text{ed}(G; p) = a(p) = 1\); otherwise \(\text{ed}(G; p) = a(p) = 0\). In both cases, (3.1) fails, a contradiction.

(b) Assume the contrary: \(V = V_1 \oplus V_2\), where \(V_1\) and \(V_2\) are proper \(G\)-stable subspaces. Each pseudo-reflection \(g \in G\) acts non-trivially on exactly one summand \(V_i\). For \(i = 1, 2\), let \(G_i\) be the subgroup of \(G\) generated by those reflections that act non-trivially on \(V_i\). Then \(G\) is isomorphic to the direct product \(G_1 \times G_2\), and \(\phi = \phi_1 \oplus \phi_2\), where \(\phi\) restricts to \(\phi_i: G_i \to \text{GL}(V_i)\), and \(\phi_1(G_1), \phi_2(G_2)\) are generated by pseudo-reflections. Note that \(a_\phi(p) = a_{\phi_1}(p) + a_{\phi_2}(p)\). In addition, by [KM08, Theorem 5.1],

\[
\text{ed}(G; p) = \text{ed}(G_1; p) + \text{ed}(G_2; p).
\]

By minimality of \(\phi\), we have that \(\text{ed}(G_1; p) \geq a_{\phi_1}(p)\) and \(\text{ed}(G_2; p) \geq a_{\phi_2}(p)\). Thus \(\text{ed}(G; p) \geq a_\phi(p)\), a contradiction.

(c) Choose \(V'\) and \(g\) as in Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2. Recall that \(g\) is a central element of \(G_p\) of order \(p\) and \(a_\phi(p) = \dim V(g, \zeta_p)\). Set \(W := V(g, \zeta_p)\). The element \(g\) acts on \(W\) as a scalar; our goal is to show that \(W = V\).

Let \(S = \{s \in G \mid s(W) = W\}\) be the stabilizer of \(W\) in \(G\) and let \(S_0\) be the subgroup of \(S\) consisting of elements that fix \(W\) pointwise. Note that since \(g\) is central in \(G_p\), we have \(G_p \subset S\). Moreover, since \(G_p\) acts faithfully on \(V' \subset W\), we have \(G_p \cap S_0 = \{1\}\). Restricting the action of \(S\) to \(W\), we obtain a faithful representation of \(H = S/S_0\) on \(W\), which we will denote by \(\psi\). By [LM03, Theorem 1.1], \(\psi(H) \subset \text{GL}(W)\) is generated by pseudo-reflections. (Note that, while [LM03, Theorem 1.1] assumes \(k = \mathbb{C}\), its proof
Since \( G_p \subset S \) and \( G_p \cap S_0 = \{1\} \), the quotient \( H = S/S_0 \) contains an isomorphic image of \( G_p \), which is a Sylow \( p \)-subgroup of \( H \), so that
\[
ed(G; p) = \ed(G_p; p) = \ed(H; p).
\]
Thus by (3.1), \( \dim(V) = \dim(W) \), i.e., \( V = W = V(g, \zeta_p) \). This proves part (c).

(d) Assume the contrary: an element \( h \) of \( G \) of order divisible by \( p \). The resulting inequality contradicts (3.1).

Note that \( \phi \) restricts to faithful representations \( \phi_0: G \to \GL(V_0) \) and \( \phi_1: G_1 \to \GL(V_1) \). Since \( \phi_0(gh^{-1}) = \zeta_p \id_{V_0} \) and \( \phi_1(h) = \zeta_p \id_{V_1} \), we have
\[
a_{\phi_0}(p) = \dim(V_0) \quad \text{and} \quad a_{\phi_1}(p) = \dim(V_1).
\]
We now recall that by a theorem of R. Steinberg [Ste64, Theorem 1.5], \( G_0 \) and \( G_1 \subset \GL(V) \) are both generated by pseudo-reflections. (In positive characteristic this is due to J.-P. Serre [Ser68]; cf. [DK01, Proposition 3.7.8].) Since \( G_1 \) acts trivially on \( V_0 \) and \( G_0 \) acts trivially on \( V_1 \), we conclude that \( \phi_0(G_0) \) and \( \phi_1(G_1) \) are also generated by pseudo-reflections.

By the minimality of \( \phi \), Theorem 1.1(b) holds for \( \phi_0 \) and \( \phi_1 \). Thus
\[
ed(G; p) \geq \ed(G_0 \times G_1; p) = \ed(G_0; p) + \ed(G_1; p) = a_{\phi_0}(p) + a_{\phi_1}(p) = \dim(V_0) + \dim(V_1) = \dim(V) = a_{\phi}(p).
\]
Here the first equality is [KM08, Theorem 5.1], and the second follows from the minimality of \( \phi \). The resulting inequality contradicts (3.1).

(e) By part (a), \( \dim(V) \geq 2 \). Hence, a pseudo-reflection has exactly two distinct eigenvalues, and (e) follows from (d).

(f) Every element of \( \GL(V) \) of order 2, other than \(-\id_V \), has exactly two distinct eigenvalues and thus cannot lie in \( G \) by (d).

(g) By (e), \( G \) does not have any pseudo-reflections of order \( p \), and hence of any order divisible by \( p \). The finite abelian group \( G/[G,G] \) is generated by the images of the pseudo-reflections. All of these images have order prime to \( p \). Hence, the order of \( G/[G,G] \) is prime to \( p \). We conclude that \( G_p \subset [G,G] \).

(h) Since \( g \) is central, \( \phi'(g) = \lambda \id_V \), where \( \lambda \) is a primitive \( p \)-th root of unity. Thus \( \det \phi'(g) = \lambda^{\dim(V)} \). On the other hand, by part (g), \( g \in G_p \subset [G,G] \) and hence, \( \det \phi'(g) = 1 \). Thus \( \dim(V') \) is divisible by \( p \).
(i) Let $C = \langle g \rangle$, where $g$ is as in part (c). Applying [Rei10, Theorem 4.1] (with $r = 1$) to the central exact sequence $1 \to C \to G \to G/C \to 1$ we obtain the inequality
\begin{equation}
\text{ed}(G; p) \geq \gcd(\dim(\phi')_p),
\end{equation}
where $\phi': G \to \text{GL}(V')$ runs over all irreducible representations of $G$ such that the restriction of $\phi'$ to $C$ is non-trivial, or equivalently, $\phi'(g) \neq 1$. Note that the statement of [Rei10, Theorem 4.1] only gives this inequality for $\text{ed}(G)$. However, it remains valid for $\text{ed}(G; p)$; see [Rei10, Section 5] or the proof of [LMMR13, Theorem 3.1].

By part (h), $\dim(\phi')$ is divisible by $p$ for every such $\phi'$. Thus $\text{ed}(G; p) \geq p$. Assumption (3.1) now tells us that $\dim(V) > p$. Since $\dim(V)$ is divisible by $p$ by (h), we conclude that $\dim(V) \geq 2p$. 

4. Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.1(b)

The remainder of the proof of Theorem 1.1(b) relies on the classification of irreducible pseudo-reflection groups due to Shephard and Todd [ST54]. Their classification consists of three infinite families and 34 exceptional groups. The first family contains the natural pseudo-reflection groups due to Shephard and Todd [ST54]. Their classification consists of three infinite families and 34 exceptional groups. The first family contains the natural pseudo-reflection groups due to Shephard and Todd [ST54]. Their classification consists of three infinite families and 34 exceptional groups. The first family contains the natural pseudo-reflection groups due to Shephard and Todd [ST54]. Their classification consists of three infinite families and 34 exceptional groups. The first family contains the natural pseudo-reflection groups due to Shephard and Todd [ST54]. Their classification consists of three infinite families and 34 exceptional groups.

Shephard and Todd worked over the field $k = \mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers. We are working over a base field $k$ such that $\text{char}(k)$ does not divide $|G|$. As we explained at the beginning of the previous section, we may (and will) assume that $k$ is algebraically closed. Before we proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.1(b), we would like to explain how the Shephard-Todd classification applies in this more general situation.

If $k$ is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, then any representation of a finite group over $k$ descends to $\overline{k} \subset k$; see [Ser77, Section 12.3]. Hence, this representation is defined over $\mathbb{C}$, and the entire Shephard-Todd classification remains valid over $k$.

Now suppose $k$ is an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic. Let $A = W(k)$ be its Witt ring. Recall that $A$ is a complete discrete valuation ring of characteristic zero, whose residue field is $k$. Denote the fraction field of $A$ by $K$ and the maximal ideal by $M$. It is well known that if $\text{char}(k)$ does not divide $|G|$ (which is our standing assumption) then every $n$-dimensional $k[G]$-module $V$ lifts to a unique $A[G]$-module $V_A$, which is free of rank $n$ over $A$.

It is shown in [Ser77, Section 15.5] that the lifting operation $V \mapsto V_K := V_A \otimes K$ and the “reduction mod $M$” operation $V_K \mapsto V$ give rise to mutually inverse bijections between the representation rings $R_k(G)$ and $R_K(G)$ of $G$. These bijections send irreducible $k$-representations to irreducible $K$-representations of the same dimension, and they are functorial in both $V$ and $G$. In particular, if $g \in G$ and $\zeta_d \in k$ is a primitive $d$th root of unity then the eigenspace $V(g, \zeta_d)$, viewed as a representation of the cyclic subgroup $\langle g \rangle \subset G$, lifts to $V_K(g, \eta_d)$ for some primitive $d$th root of unity $\eta_d \in A$ such that
\begin{equation}
\zeta_d = \eta_d \pmod{M}
\end{equation}
Taking $d = 1$, we see that if $g \in G$ acts on $V$ as a pseudo-reflection if and only if it acts on $V_K$ as a pseudo-reflection.
This shows that for every pseudo-reflection group \( \phi: G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V) \) over \( k \) there is an abstractly isomorphic pseudo-reflection group \( \phi_K: G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V_K) \) over \( K \). For each \( g \in G \), the eigenvalues of \( \phi(g) \) and \( \phi_K(g) \) are the same, modulo \( M \), in the sense that if \( \eta_d \) is an eigenvalue of \( \phi_K(g) \) then \( \zeta_d \) is an eigenvalue of \( \phi(g) \), as in (4.1). Thus \( \dim_k V(g, \zeta_d) = \dim_K V(g, \eta_d) \) and consequently,
\[
a_\phi(d) = \max_{g \in G} \dim_k V(g, \zeta_d) = \max_{g \in G} \dim_K V(g, \eta_d) = a_\phi_K(d)
\]
for every \( d \geq 1 \). Note also that the degrees of the fundamental invariants are the same since they can be recovered from the \( a(d) \)'s as \( d \) varies; cf. (1.4).

We conclude that if \( k \) is an algebraically closed field satisfying the above assumptions, then many properties of irreducible pseudo-reflection groups, whose orders are prime to \( \text{char}(k) \), are the same over \( k \) as they are over \( \mathbb{C} \): their isomorphism types, the numbers \( a(d) \) for each \( d \geq 1 \), the numbers of pseudo-reflections of each order, the number of central elements of each order, and the degrees of the fundamental invariants. This allows us to use the Shephard-Todd classification (e.g., from [LT09, Appendix D], where \( k \) is assumed to be \( \mathbb{C} \)) in our setting; cf. [Kan01, Section 15.3].

We now proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.1(b). Let \( \phi: G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V) \) be a minimal counterexample, as in the statement of Proposition 3.1. Then by Proposition 3.1, \( \phi \) is irreducible.

**The infinite families ST\(_1\) – ST\(_3\).**

Case ST\(_1\): Here \( V \) is the natural \((n - 1)\)-dimensional representation of \( G := S_n \). For \( n \geq 3 \), \( G \) has trivial centre and hence, cannot be minimal by Proposition 3.1(c). For \( n = 2 \), \( \dim(V) = 1 \), contradicting Proposition 3.1(a).

Case ST\(_2\): Here \( G = G(m, l, n) \subset \text{GL}_n \), where \( m, n > 1 \), \( l \) divides \( m \), and \( (m, l, n) \neq (2, 2, 2) \). Here \( G(m, l, n) \) is defined as a semidirect product of the diagonal subgroup
\[
A(m, l, n) = \{ \text{diag}(\zeta_m^{a_1}, \ldots, \zeta_m^{a_n}) \mid a_1 + \cdots + a_n \equiv 0 \pmod{l} \} \subset \text{GL}_n
\]
and the symmetric group \( S_n \), whose elements are viewed as permutation matrices in \( \text{GL}_n \); see [LT09, Chapter 2]. (Note that [LT09] assumes \( k = \mathbb{C} \), but the same construction works in our more general context.) By Proposition 3.1(c), \( G(m, l, n) \) contains the scalar matrix \( \zeta_p \text{id} \). This matrix has to be contained in \( A(m, l, n) \); hence, \( p \) divides \( m \). Moreover by Proposition 3.1(i), we may assume \( n \geq 2p \). Consider \( g = \text{diag}(\zeta_m^{m/p}, \ldots, \zeta_m^{m/p}, 1, \ldots, 1) \in A(m, l, n) \subset G(m, l, n) \), where \( \zeta_m^{m/p} \) occurs \( p \) times. This element has order \( p \) and exactly two eigenvalues, contradicting Proposition 3.1(d).

Case ST\(_3\): Here \( G \) is cyclic and \( V \) is a 1-dimensional. Once again, this contradicts Proposition 3.1(a).

**The exceptional cases ST\(_4\) – ST\(_{37}\).**

All of the exceptional cases satisfy \( \dim(V) \leq 8 \). On the other hand, by Proposition 3.1(h) and (i), \( \dim(V) = mp \), where \( m \geq 2 \). We conclude that either (I) \( p = 2 \) and \( \dim(V) = 4 \), \( 6 \), or \( 8 \), or (II) \( p = 3 \) and \( \dim(V) = 6 \).

Case I: We need to consider the groups ST\(_{28}\) – ST\(_{32}\), ST\(_{34}\), ST\(_{35}\), and ST\(_{37}\), with \( p = 2 \). With the exception of ST\(_{32}\), each of these groups has a reflection of order 2 and thus is ruled out by Proposition 3.1(c). The group ST\(_{32}\) is isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \times \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_3) \) (see [LT09, Theorem 8.43]). The group \( \text{Sp}_4(\mathbb{F}_3) \) has non-central elements of order 2, contradicting Proposition 3.1(f).

Case II: Here \( p = 3 \) and we only need to consider two groups, ST\(_{34}\) and ST\(_{35}\). The group ST\(_{35}\) has trivial centre and thus is ruled out by Proposition 3.1(c). (Recall that the order of the centre is the greatest common divisor of the degrees \( d_1, \ldots, d_6 \). For ST\(_{35}\) =
W(E_6) these are, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12.) This leaves us with G = ST_{34}, otherwise known as the Mitchell group. The structure of this group was investigated by J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane. In [CSS3, Section 2] they constructed four isomorphic lattices, \Lambda^{(i)} \ (i = 2, 3, 4, 7), whose automorphism group is ST_{34}. In subsection 2.3 they showed that ST_{34} \simeq \text{Aut}(\Lambda^{(3)}) contains the group (2 \times 3^2) \rtimes S_6, which, in turn, contains a 3-group \( H \simeq (3^2 \times ((123))) \times (3^2 \times ((456))) \simeq P \times P, \) where \( P \) is a non-abelian group of order 27. By [MR10, Theorem 1.3] (or, alternatively, by [MR10, Theorem 1.4(b)]), ed(\( P \)) = 3. On the other hand, by [KM08, Theorem 4.1], ed(H; 3) = ed(H), and by [KM08, Theorem 5.1], ed(H) = ed(P \times P) = ed(P) + ed(P) = 6. Since we are assuming that ST_{34}, with its natural 6-dimensional representation, is a counterexample to Theorem 1.1(b), we obtain

\[ 6 = \text{ed}(H) = \text{ed}(H; 3) \leq \text{ed}(	ext{ST}_{34}; 3) < a(3) = 6. \]

This contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 1.1(b). \( \square \)

5. A representation-theoretic corollary

Before proceeding further we record a representation-theoretic corollary of our proof of Theorem 1.1(b), which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been previously noticed. Recall that \( \text{rdim}(H) \) denotes the minimal dimension of a faithful representation of a finite group \( H \) over the base field \( k \).

**Corollary 5.1.** Suppose \( \zeta_p \in k \). Let \( G \subset \text{GL}(V) \) be a finite subgroup generated by pseudo-reflections, \( G_p \) be a \( p \)-Sylow subgroup of \( G \), and \( V' \subset V \) be a minimal (with respect to inclusion) faithful \( k \)-subrepresentation of \( G_p \). Then \( \text{dim}(V') = \text{rdim}(G_p) \).

**Proof.** Since \( \zeta_p \in k \), \( \text{rdim}(G_p) = \text{ed}(G; p) \) by the Karpenko-Merkurjev theorem (1.1). Choose \( g \) as in Lemma 2.1. Then, by Lemma 2.2,

\[ \text{ed}(G; p) = \text{rdim}(G_p) \leq \text{dim}(V') \leq \text{dim}(V, g, \zeta_p) = a(p). \]

By Theorem 1.1(b), \( \text{ed}(G; p) = a(p) \) and thus the above inequalities are all equalities. This completes the proof of Corollary 5.1. \( \square \)

The following example shows that Corollary 5.1 fails if \( G \subset \text{GL}(V) \) is not assumed to be generated by pseudo-reflections.

**Example 5.2.** Let \( p > 2 \) be a prime, \( P \) be a non-abelian group of order \( p^2 \), and \( \psi: P \to \text{GL}(U) \) be a faithful \( p \)-dimensional representation of \( P \). Set \( G = P \times P \) and

\[ \phi = \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \otimes \psi_1: G \to \text{GL}(U \otimes U \otimes U), \]

where for \( i = 1, 2 \), \( \psi_i \) is the composition of \( \psi \) with the projection \( G \to P \) to the \( i \)-th factor. Both \( \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \) and \( \psi_1 \) are irreducible representations of \( G \); the irreducibility of \( \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \) follows from [Ser77, Theorem 3.2.10(i)]. These irreducible representations are distinct, because \( \text{dim}(\psi_1 \otimes \psi_2) = p^2 \) and \( \text{dim}(\psi_1) = p \).

Note that \( G = G_p \) is a group of order \( p^6 \), and \( V = U \otimes U \oplus U \) is a faithful representation of \( G \). Since it is a direct sum of two distinct irreducibles, neither of which is faithful, the only faithful \( G_p \)-subrepresentation \( V' \) of \( V \) is itself. On the other hand, \( G \) has a \( 2p \)-dimensional faithful representation \( \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \); hence, \( \text{rdim}(G) \leq 2p \). In summary, \( G = G_p \), \( V = V' \) and \( \text{dim}(V') = p^2 + p > 2p \geq \text{rdim}(G_p) \). Thus the assertion of Corollary 5.1 fails for \( \phi(G) \subset \text{GL}(V) \).
6. Proof of Theorem 1.3(a)

The degrees of the fundamental invariants of $W(E_6)$ are 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 12; see, e.g., [LT09, p. 275]. Thus by Theorem 1.1(b), $\text{ed}(W(E_6); 2) = 4$. This shows that $\text{ed}(W(E_6)) \geq 4$.

Recall that $\text{ed}(W(E_6))$ is the minimal value of $\dim(Y)$ such that there exists a dominant rational $W(E_6)$-equivariant map $V \to Y$ defined over $k$, where $V$ is a linear representation of $W(E_6)$, and $Y$ is a a $k$-variety with a faithful action of $W(E_6)$; see, e.g., [Rei10, Section 2]. To prove the opposite inequality, $\text{ed}(W(E_6)) \leq 4$, it thus suffices to establish the following lemma suggested to us by I. Dolgachev.

**Lemma 6.1.** Let $k$ be a field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. There exists a dominant $W(E_6)$-equivariant map

$$f: \mathbb{A}^6 \to Y,$$

defined over $k$, where $\mathbb{A}^6$ is a linear representation of $W(E_6)$ and $Y$ is a 4-dimensional variety with a faithful action of $W(E_6)$.

**Proof.** First, we construct $Y$. Consider the space $(\mathbb{P}^2)^6$ of ordered 6-tuples of points in the projective plane, and let $U \subset (\mathbb{P}^2)^6$ be the dense open consisting of 6-tuples $(a_1, \ldots, a_6)$ such that no two of the points $a_i$ lie on the same line, and no six lie on the same conic. This open subset is invariant under the natural (diagonal) $\text{PGL}_3$-action on $(\mathbb{P}^2)^6$. Moreover, $U$ is contained in the stable locus of $(\mathbb{P}^2)^6$ for this action; see, e.g., [DO88, p. 116]. Thus there exists a geometric quotient $q: U \to Y := U/\text{PGL}_3$. The explicit description in [DO88, Example I.3] show that $Y$ and $q$ are defined over $k$. Note that

$$\dim(Y) = \dim(U) - \dim(\text{PGL}_3) = \dim((\mathbb{P}^2)^6) - \dim(\text{PGL}_3) = 12 - 8 = 4,$$

as desired.

Now, we construct the affine space $\mathbb{A}^6$ and its map to $Y$. Let $x, y, z$ be projective coordinates on $\mathbb{P}^2$ and $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be the cubic $yz^2 = x^3$. Note that $C$ has a cusp at $(0 : 1 : 0)$. The smooth locus $C_{\text{sm}} = C \setminus \{(0 : 1 : 0)\}$ is an algebraic group isomorphic to the additive group $\mathbb{G}_a$. Indeed, we identify $\mathbb{G}_a \simeq \mathbb{A}^1$ with $C_{\text{sm}}$ via $t \mapsto (t : t^3 : 1)$. Thus the space $C_{\text{sm}}^6$ is isomorphic to affine space $\mathbb{A}^6$.

This yields a rational map

$$\phi: C_{\text{sm}}^6 \to C^6 \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{P}^2)^6.$$  

Three points $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in C_{\text{sm}}$ lie on a line if and only if $t_1 + t_2 + t_3 = 0$; six points $t_1, \ldots, t_6 \in C_{\text{sm}}$ lie on a conic if and only $t_1 + \cdots + t_6 = 0$. Thus for general $(t_1, \ldots, t_6) \in C_{\text{sm}}^6$, we have $\phi(t_1, \ldots, t_6) \in U$. In other words, we may view $\phi$ as a rational map $C_{\text{sm}}^6 \to U$. We now define the map $f: C_{\text{sm}}^6 \to Y$ as the composition

$$f: C_{\text{sm}}^6 \xrightarrow{\phi} U \xrightarrow{q} Y.$$  

By [Sh95, Lemma 13], over the algebraic closure, if $(t_1, \ldots, t_6)$ is a 6-tuple of points in general position in $\mathbb{P}^2$ then there is a cuspidal cubic $C' \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ such that $t_1, \ldots, t_6$ lie in the smooth locus of $C'$. Since any two cuspidal cubics in $\mathbb{P}^2$ are projectively equivalent (recall our assumptions on the characteristic), we conclude that $f$ is dominant.

It remains to construct actions of $W(E_6)$ on $\mathbb{A}^6$ and $Y$, and to show that $f$ is equivariant. Recall that blowing up 6 points in $\mathbb{P}^2$ produces a cubic surface $X$ with the 6 exceptional divisors of the blow-up corresponding to a “sixer”: 6 pairwise disjoint lines in $X$. Conversely, any sixer can be blown down to produce 6 points on $\mathbb{P}^2$. Over an
algebraically closed field, the elements of \( W(\mathbb{E}_6) \) act freely and transitively on the set of sixers in \( X \) (where we keep track of the ordering of the 6 lines). This produces a faithful action of \( W(\mathbb{E}_6) \) on \( Y \) which is defined over \( k \). This action of the Weyl group \( W(\mathbb{E}_6) \) on \( Y \) is sometimes called the Cremona representation or the Coble representation. For more details, see [Dol83, Section 7], [Dol08, Section 6], and [DO88, Chapter 6].

We recall how \( W(\mathbb{E}_6) \) acts on the Picard group \( N \) of a smooth cubic surface \( X \subset \mathbb{P}^3 \) over an algebraically closed field; see, e.g., [Dol83, Sections 4 and 5] or [Man86, Section 26]. The Picard group \( N \simeq \mathbb{Z}^7 \) with its intersection form is a lattice with a symmetric bilinear form given by \( \text{diag}(1, -1, \ldots, -1) \) with respect to the basis \( e_0, \ldots, e_6 \), where \( e_0 \) is the hyperplane section of \( X \) and \( e_1, \ldots, e_6 \) is a collection of 6 mutually disjoint lines on \( X \).

Consider a set of fundamental roots in \( N \) given by
\[
\alpha_1 = e_0 - e_1 - e_2 - e_3, \quad \alpha_2 = e_2 - e_1, \quad \ldots \quad \alpha_6 = e_6 - e_5.
\]
The reflections associated to these roots generate a group isomorphic to \( W(\mathbb{E}_6) \). (Note that \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_6 \) are the same as the fundamental roots used by I. Dolgachev in [Dol83], up to reordering, and as the fundamental roots used by Yu. Manin in [Man86], up to sign; see [Man86, Proof of Proposition 25.2].) The reflections associated to \( \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_6 \) generate a subgroup isomorphic to \( S_6 \) which permutes the basis elements \( e_1, \ldots, e_6 \). The symmetric group \( S_6 \) naturally acts on \( C^6_{\text{sm}} \) and \( (\mathbb{P}^2)^6 \) by permutations; thus \( f \) is \( S_6 \)-equivariant. It remains to consider the reflection \( g \in W(\mathbb{E}_6) \) associated to the root \( \alpha_1 \).

First, we identify the action of \( g \) on \( Y \). Suppose \( \pi : X \to \mathbb{P}^2 \) is the blowup of 6 points \( a_1, \ldots, a_6 \). Identifying each \( e_i \) with the class of each exceptional divisor \( E_i := \pi^{-1}(a_i) \) in the cubic surface \( X \) we may determine the action of \( g \). Indeed, for \( i \neq j \neq k \) taken from \( \{1, 2, 3\} \), the line \( E_j \) is taken to the strict transform of the line between \( a_j \) and \( a_k \); while \( E_4, E_5, E_6 \) are all left fixed. Recall that the standard quadratic transform \( s : \mathbb{P}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2 \) at the points \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) is the map obtained by blowing up the points and then blowing down the strict transforms of the lines between them. In this language, \( g : Y \to Y \) is given by
\[
[a_1, \ldots, a_6] \mapsto [s(a_1'), s(a_2'), s(a_3'), s(a_4), s(a_5), s(a_6)]
\]
where \( a_1' \) is any point on the line between \( a_2 \) and \( a_3 \) (and similarly for \( a_2' \) and \( a_3' \)).

We now construct an action of \( g \) on \( C^6_{\text{sm}} \) following H. Pinkham [Pin80]. If \( C \subset \mathbb{P}^2 \) is a cuspidal cubic, then, for any three points \( u_1, u_2 \) and \( u_3 \) in the smooth locus \( C_{\text{sm}} \) of \( C \), \( C' = s(C) \) is also a cuspidal cubic in \( \mathbb{P}^2 \). Since any two cuspidal cubics in \( \mathbb{P}^2 \) are linear translates of each other, there exists an \( l \in \text{PGL}_3 \) such that \( l(C') = C \). Composing \( s \) with \( l \), one obtains a rational map \( l \cdot s : C_{\text{sm}} \dashrightarrow C_{\text{sm}} \) which is regular on \( C_{\text{sm}} \setminus \{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \). Let \( u_1' \) be the unique third intersection point of \( C \) with the line passing through \( u_2 \) and \( u_3 \) (and similarly for \( u_2' \) and \( u_3' \)). We define a map \( g : C^6_{\text{sm}} \to C^6_{\text{sm}} \) via
\[
(u_1, \ldots, u_6) \to (l \cdot s(u_1'), l \cdot s(u_2'), l \cdot s(u_3'), l \cdot s(u_4), l \cdot s(u_5), l \cdot s(u_6))
\]
By construction, we see that \( f \) is \( g \)-equivariant.

Note that the choice of \( l \) and thus of the map \( l \cdot s : C_{\text{sm}} \dashrightarrow C_{\text{sm}} \) above is not unique. Pinkham’s observation [Pin80, pp. 196–197] is that there is a choice of \( l \) such that the resulting map \( g \) gives rise to a linear representation of \( W(\mathbb{E}_6) = \langle g, S_6 \rangle \) on \( C^6_{\text{sm}} \simeq \mathbb{A}^6 \). In fact, \( C^6_{\text{sm}} \) can be identified with a Cartan subalgebra of the Lie algebra of type \( \mathbb{E}_6 \) with the standard action of the Weyl group. This construction is valid over
any field $k$ of characteristic $\neq 2,3$. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1 and thus of Theorem 1.3(a). 

7. Proof of Theorem 1.3(b) and (c)

As we have previously pointed out, $\text{ed}(G) \leq \dim(V)$; see, e.g., [Rei10, (2.3)]. In the case where $G = G(m,m,n)$ and $m \geq 2$ and $(m,n)$ are relatively prime, no element of $G$ acts as a scalar on $V$. The natural $G$-equivariant dominant rational map $V \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}(V)$ tells us that $\text{ed}(G) \leq \dim(V) - 1$.

It now suffices to show that for every irreducible $G \subset \text{GL}(V)$ generated by pseudo-reflections there exists a prime $p$ such that

$$a(p) = \begin{cases} \dim(V) - 1, & \text{if } G \simeq G(m,m,n) \text{ with } m, n \text{ relatively prime}, \\ \dim(V), & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, Theorem 1.1(b) will then tell us that $\text{ed}(G) \geq \text{ed}(G;p) \geq a(p) \geq \dim(V) - 1$ in the first case and $\text{ed}(G) \geq \text{ed}(G;p) \geq a(p) \geq \dim(V)$ in the second. Since we have established the opposite inequalities, this will complete the proof in both cases.

By Springer’s theorem (1.4), $a(p)$ is equal to the number of invariant degrees $d_i$ which are divisible by $p$. In the case where $G = G(m,m,n)$, $m \geq 2$ and $(m,n)$ are relatively prime, the degrees $d_i$ are $m, 2m, \ldots, (n-1)m$, and $n$. Taking $p$ to be a prime divisor of $m$, we see that $a(p) = n - 1 = \dim(V) - 1$, as desired.

For all other groups of the form $G = G(m,l,n)$, with $m \geq 2$ the degrees $d_i$ are $m, 2m, \ldots, (n-1)m$, and $\frac{mn}{l}$. All of them are divisible by every prime factor $p$ of $\gcd(m, \frac{mn}{l}) > 1$. Hence, in this case $a(p) = n = \dim(V)$, as desired.

Finally, in the case where $m = 1$, $G(m,l,n) = G(1,1,n) = S_n$ is excluded by our hypothesis.

This leaves us with the exceptional groups $ST_4 - ST_{37}$. If $G \neq ST_{25}, ST_{35}$ then every degree $d_i$ of $G$ is divisible by 2. If $G = ST_{25}$ then every degree $d_i$ of $G$ is divisible by 3. Finally, $ST_{35} = W(E_6)$ was treated in part (a). 

Remark 7.1. Our proof shows that for every $G$ in the statement of Theorem 1.3 there is a prime $p$ such that $\text{ed}(G) = a(p) = \text{ed}(G;p)$.

Remark 7.2. Pinkham’s construction applies in greater generality than the case of $W(E_6)$ used in Lemma 6.1. In particular, one can use it to construct a dominant rational $W(E_7)$-equivariant map $\mathbb{A}^7 \dashrightarrow Z$, where $Z$ is a dense open subset of the 6-dimensional variety $(\mathbb{P}^2)_{\text{ss}}//\text{PGL}_3$. Here the subscript $\text{ss}$ denotes the semistable locus. Since we know that $\text{ed}(W(E_7)) = 7$ by Theorem 1.3(c), this gives an alternative (indirect) proof of the classical fact that the Coble representation of $W(E_7)$ on $(\mathbb{P}^2)^7_{\text{ss}}//\text{PGL}_3$ is not faithful; see [Do83, p. 293] or [DO88, p. 122].

8. A variant of Bertini’s theorem

Our proof of Theorem 1.4 will rely on the following variant of Bertini’s theorem.

Theorem 8.1. Let $Y$ be a smooth, geometrically irreducible subscheme of the space $\mathbb{P}^N := \text{Proj}(k[y_0, \ldots, y_N])$, $C \subset Y$ be a smooth 0-dimensional closed subscheme of $Y$, $X$ be a geometrically irreducible variety, and $\psi : X \rightarrow Y$ be a smooth morphism, all defined over $k$. Assume that $\dim(Y) \geq 2$. When $k$ is an infinite field of positive characteristic, we also assume that $\psi$ is étale.
Given a homogeneous polynomial \( f \in k[y_0, \ldots, y_N] \), let \( Y^f \) be the intersection of \( Y \) with the hypersurface \( \{ f = 0 \} \) and let \( X^f \) denote the preimage of \( Y^f \) under \( \psi \). Then for \( a \gg 0 \) there exists a homogeneous polynomial \( f \) of degree \( a \) satisfying the following conditions:

(i) \( X^f \) is geometrically irreducible,
(ii) \( Y^f \) is smooth,
(iii) \( Y^f \) contains \( C \),
(iv) \( \dim(X^f) = \dim(X) - 1 \).

In the case where \( k \) is infinite, Theorem 8.1 can be deduced from the classical Bertini theorem. In the situation where \( X = Y \) and \( \psi = \text{id} \), this is done in [KA79]. A similar argument can be used to prove Theorem 8.1 in full generality (here \( k \) is still assumed to be infinite). For the sake of completeness we briefly outline this argument below.

Proof of Theorem 8.1 in the case where \( k \) is an infinite field. Denote the ideal of \( C \subset \mathbb{P}^N \) by \( \mathcal{I} \subset k[y_0, \ldots, y_N] \). Let \( \mathcal{I}_a \) be the homogeneous part of \( \mathcal{I} \) of degree \( a \). For \( f \in \mathcal{I}_a \) in general position, \( Y^f \) is smooth at \( C \) and of dimension \( \dim(Y) - 1 \). Now consider the map

\[
\phi_a : X \setminus \psi^{-1}(C) \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}_a)
\]

obtained by composing \( \psi \) with the morphism \( \iota : Y \setminus C \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}_a) \), given by the linear system of degree \( a \) hypersurfaces passing through \( C \). (Note that \( \iota \) is an embedding for \( a \gg 0 \).) By Bertini’s Smoothness Theorem [Jou83, Corollaire 6.11(2)], for \( f \in \mathcal{I}_a \) in general position, \( Y^f \) is smooth away from \( C \). Since \( Y^f \) is also smooth at \( C \), we conclude that \( Y^f \) is smooth, every irreducible component of \( Y^f \) is of dimension \( \dim(Y) - 1 \) and hence, every irreducible component of \( X^f \) is smooth of dimension \( \dim(X) - 1 \). By Bertini’s Irreducibility Theorem [Jou83, Corollaire 6.11(3)], for \( f \in \mathcal{I}_a \) in general position, \( X^f \setminus \psi^{-1}(C) \) is geometrically irreducible of dimension \( \dim(X) - 1 \). (This is where the assumption that \( \psi \) is étale is used when \( k \) is of positive characteristic.) Since \( \dim(Y) \geq 2 \), we have \( \dim(X) - \dim(Y) \leq \dim(X) - 2 \) and thus \( \psi^{-1}(C) \) cannot contain a component of \( X^f \). Hence, \( X^f \) itself is geometrically irreducible. This completes the proof of Theorem 8.1 in the case where \( k \) is infinite. \( \square \)

If \( k \) is a finite field, the classical Bertini theorems break down. In this case our proof will be based on the probabilistic versions of Bertini’s smoothness and irreducibility theorems, due to B. Poonen [Poo08] and F. Charles and B. Poonen [CP13], respectively.

We begin by recalling the notion of density from [Poo04]. Let \( S = k[y_0, \ldots, y_N] \) be the homogeneous coordinate ring of \( \mathbb{P}^N \), \( S_a \subset S \) be the \( k \)-vector subspace of homogeneous polynomials of degree \( a \), and \( S_{\text{hom}} = \bigcup_{a \geq 0} S_a \). The density \( \mu(\mathcal{P}) \) of any subset \( \mathcal{P} \subset S_{\text{hom}} \) is defined as

\[
\mu(\mathcal{P}) := \lim_{a \to \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{P} \cap S_a|}{|S_a|}.
\]

Note \( \mu(\mathcal{P}) \) is either a real number between 0 and 1 or undefined (if the above limit does not exist).

Lemma 8.2. Suppose \( \mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \subset S_{\text{hom}} \). If \( \mu(\mathcal{P}_1) = 1 \) then \( \mu(\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2) = \mu(\mathcal{P}_2) \).

Proof. The lemma is a consequence of the inequalities

\[
|\mathcal{P}_2 \cap S_a| - |S_a \setminus \mathcal{P}_1| \leq |\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2 \cap S_a| \leq |\mathcal{P}_2 \cap S_a|,
\]
since \( \lim_{a \to \infty} \frac{|S_a \setminus P_1|}{|S_a|} = 0. \)

**Proof of Theorem 8.1 in the case where \( k \) is a finite field.** Let \( S := k[y_0, \ldots, y_N] \) and \( I \) be the ideal in \( S \) corresponding to \( C \subset \mathbb{P}^N \); and let \( S_{\text{hom}}, I_{\text{hom}} \) be the set of homogeneous polynomials in \( S, I \), respectively.

We define \( P_1 \) as the set of \( f \in S_{\text{hom}} \) such that \( X^f \) is geometrically irreducible, and \( P_2 \) as the set of \( f \in I_{\text{hom}} \) such that \( Y^f \) is smooth and \( \dim(Y^f) = \dim(Y) - 1 \). Thus \( P_1 \cap P_2 \) is precisely the set of homogeneous polynomials satisfying conditions (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) of the theorem. Our goal is to show that \( \mu(P_1 \cap P_2) \) exists and is \( > 0 \). If we can prove this, the theorem will immediately follow.

Since we are assuming that all fibers of \( \psi \) have dimension \( \leq \dim(X) - 2 \), no irreducible component of \( X^f \) can be contained in a fiber of \( \psi \). Thus, by [CP13, Theorem 1.6],

\[ \mu(P_1) = 1. \]

Note that here we use the assumption that \( \dim(Y) \geq 2 \). On the other hand, by [Poo08, Theorem 1.1], the local density

\[ \mu_C(P_2) = \lim_{a \to \infty} \frac{|P_2 \cap I_a|}{|I_a|} \text{ exists and is } > 0. \]

(This uses our assumptions that \( C \) is smooth and 0-dimensional. In particular, \( \dim(X) > 2 \dim(C) \).) Since \( C \) is a zero-dimensional subscheme of \( \mathbb{P}^n \), we have \( \dim_k(I_a) = \dim_k(S_a) - \deg(C) \), for large \( a \). Here \( \deg(C) \) denotes the degree of \( C \) in \( \mathbb{P}^n \). Thus

\[ \lim_{a \to \infty} \frac{|I_a|}{|S_a|} = |k|^{-\deg(C)} > 0. \]

Since \( P_2 \) is, by definition, a subset of \( I_{\text{hom}} \), we have \( P_2 \cap I_a = P_2 \cap S_a \) and thus

\[ \mu(P_2) = \lim_{a \to \infty} \frac{|P_2 \cap S_a|}{|S_a|} = \lim_{a \to \infty} \frac{|P_2 \cap I_a|}{|I_a|} \cdot \frac{|I_a|}{|S_a|} \text{ also exists and is } > 0. \]

Lemma 8.2 now tells us that \( \mu(P_1 \cap P_2) \) exists and is \( > 0 \), as desired. \( \square \)

9. **Proof of Theorem 1.4: preliminaries**

First we observe that part (b) is an immediate consequence of part (a). Indeed, combining the first inequality in (1.5) with part (a), we have

\[ \max_p \frac{\text{ed}(G; p)}{p} \leq \text{pmed}(G) \leq \max_p a(p), \]

Theorem 1.1(b) now tells us that \( a(p) = \text{ed}(G; p) \) for each prime \( p \), and part (b) follows.

From now on we will focus on the proof of Theorem 1.4(a). Let \( G \) be a finite group and \( G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V) \) be a faithful linear representation defined over \( k \). We will assume throughout that \( \text{char}(k) \) does not divide \( |G| \). Consider the closed subscheme

\[ B := \bigcup_{g \in G, \zeta \neq 1} V(g, \zeta) \text{ or equivalently, } B = \bigcup_{g \in G, \zeta^p = 1, \zeta \neq 1, p \text{ prime}} V(g, \zeta), \]

where \( \zeta \) ranges over the roots of unity in \( \bar{k} \). Note that, although each \( V(g, \zeta) \) is defined only over \( k(\zeta) \), their union \( B \) is defined over \( k \).

The following lemma may be viewed as a variant of [Spr74, Proposition 3.2].
Lemma 9.1. Let $m \geq |G|$ be an integer. Suppose $v \in V$ has the property that $f(v) = 0$ for every $G$-invariant homogeneous polynomial $f \in k[V]$ of degree $m$. Then $v \in B$.

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that $v$ is an eigenvector for $G$ with $v \in W$. By our assumption, $v$ is an eigenvector for every $G$-invariant homogeneous polynomial $f \in k[V]$ of degree $m$. Let $h = f(v)$.

We claim that there exists a homogeneous polynomial $h' \in k[V]$ of degree $m$ such that $h'\ | \ h = 1$ for some $h' \in k[V]$. To construct $h'$, we choose a linear form $l_i \in V^*$ such that $l_i(v) = 0$ but $l_i(v') \neq 0$. Now set $h = l_{i_1}^{m+2-r}l_{i_2} \ldots l_{i_r}$. Thus $h'$ proves the claim.

We now define a $G$-invariant homogeneous polynomial $f$ of degree $m$ by summing the translates of $h$ over $G$:

$$f(v') = \sum_{g \in G} h(g \cdot v') \quad \forall v' \in V.$$  

(9.1)

By our assumption, $f(v) = 0$.

Let $S \subset G$ be the stabilizer of $v$, i.e., the subgroup of elements $s \in G$ such that $v$ is an eigenvector for $s$. Then $s(v) = \chi(s)v$ for some multiplicative character $\chi : S \to k^*$. It now suffices to show that $\chi(s) \neq 1$ for some $s \in S$. Indeed, if we denote $\chi(s)$ by $\zeta$, for this $s$, then $v \in V(s, \zeta) \subset B$, as desired.

To show that $\chi(s) \neq 1$ for some $s \in S$, recall that by our choice of $h$, $h(g \cdot v) = 0$ unless $g \in S$. Thus

$$0 = f(v) = \sum_{s \in S} h(s \cdot v) = \sum_{s \in S} h(\chi(s)v) = \sum_{s \in S} \chi(s)^m h(v).$$

If $\chi(s) = 1$ for every $s \in S$, this yields $0 = |S| \cdot h(v)$. This is a contradiction since $h(v) \neq 0$, and we are assuming that $\text{char}(k)$ does not divide $|G|$. Thus $\chi(s) \neq 1$ for some $s \in S$, as claimed.

Denote the direct sum of $V$ and the trivial 1-dimensional representation of $G$ by $W := V \times k$. Let $z$ be the coordinate along the second factor in $W = V \times k$. We will identify $V$ with the open subvariety of $\mathbb{P}(W)$ given by $z \neq 0$, and $\mathbb{P}(V)$ with the closed subvariety of $\mathbb{P}(W)$ given by $z = 0$. Set $n := \dim(V) = \dim(\mathbb{P}(W))$. If $C$ is a cone in $V$ with vertex at the origin, we will denote by $\mathbb{P}(C)$ the image of $C \setminus \{0\}$ under the natural projection $(V \setminus \{0\}) \to \mathbb{P}(V)$.

Proposition 9.2. Consider the rational map

$$\psi_m : \mathbb{P}(W) \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$$

given by the linear system $k[W]^G_m$ of $G$-invariant homogeneous polynomials of degree $m$ on $W$. Denote the closure of the image of $\psi_m$ by $Y \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. Assume $m \geq |G|$. Then:

(a) The map $\psi_m$ is regular away from $\mathbb{P}(B)$.

(b) $\psi_m : \mathbb{P}(W) \dashrightarrow Y$ induces an isomorphism between $k(Y)$ and the field of $G$-invariant rational functions on $\mathbb{P}(W)$.

(c) For a prime $q \gg 0$, every fiber of the morphism $\psi_q : \mathbb{P}(W \setminus B) \to Y$ is finite.

Proof. (a) We may assume without loss of generality that $k$ is algebraically closed. Since $z^m \in k[W]^G_m$, we see that the indeterminacy locus of $\psi_m$ consists of points $(v : a) \in \mathbb{P}(W)$ with $a = 0$ and $f(v) = 0$ for every $f \in k[V]^G_m$, where $k[V]^G_m$ denotes the $k$-vector space of $G$-invariant homogeneous polynomials on $V$ of degree $m$. By Lemma 9.1, $v \in B$. Thus $(v : a) \in \mathbb{P}(B) \subset \mathbb{P}(V \times \{0\}) \subset \mathbb{P}(W)$, as claimed.
(b) To show that the natural inclusion \( \psi^*_m : k(Y) \to k(\mathbb{P}(W))^G \) of fields is an isomorphism, we restrict \( \psi_m \) to the dense open subset \( V \subset \mathbb{P}(W) \) given by \( z \neq 0 \). This restriction is the morphism

\[
V \to \mathbb{A}^N,
\]

\[
v \mapsto (f_1(v), \ldots, f_N(v)),
\]

where \( f_1, \ldots, f_N \) form a basis of the vector space \( k[V]_{\leq m}^G \) of \( G \)-invariant polynomials of degree \( \leq m \). Consequently, \( f_1, \ldots, f_N \in \psi_m^* k(Y) \). By the Noether bound \( k[V]^G \) is generated by polynomials of degree \( \leq |G| \) as a \( k \)-algebra; see Remark 9.3 below. Since \( \psi_m^* k(Y) \) contains \( k[V]^G \) and thus its fraction field \( k(V)^G \).

Since \( V \) is a \( G \)-invariant dense open subset of \( \mathbb{P}(W) \), we have \( k(V) = k(\mathbb{P}(W)) \). Therefore, \( \psi_m^* k(Y) \supset k(V)^G = k(\mathbb{P}(W))^G \), as desired.

(c) Suppose \( v \in V \subset \mathbb{P}(W) \), i.e., \( z(v) \neq 0 \). The argument of part (b) shows that in this case \( w \) lies in the same fiber of \( \psi \) as \( v \) if and only if \( w \in V \) and \( f(v) = f(w) \) for every \( f \in k[V]^G \). Since elements of \( k[V]^G \) separate the \( G \)-orbits in \( V \), this shows that the fibers of \( \psi_q \) in \( V \) are precisely the \( G \)-orbits in \( V \), and hence, are finite.

We may thus restrict \( \psi_q \) to \( \mathbb{P}(V) \subset \mathbb{P}(W) \), where \( z = 0 \). That is, it suffices to show that if \( q \) is a large enough prime, every fiber of the morphism \( \psi_q : \mathbb{P}(V \setminus B) \to \mathbb{P}^N \) is finite. Equivalently, it suffices to show that every fiber of the morphism

\[
\phi_q : V \setminus B \to k(k[V]^G)
\]

given by the linear system \( k[V]^G_q \) of \( G \)-invariant polynomials of degree \( q \), is finite. In particular, we may assume without loss of generality that \( B \subset V \).

Choose homogeneous generators \( g_1, \ldots, g_r \) for \( k[V]^G \) and fix them for the rest of the proof. Denote their degrees by \( d_1, \ldots, d_r \), respectively. By the Noether bound we may assume that \( d_1, \ldots, d_r \leq |G| \).

Let \( \Lambda^q_{d_1, \ldots, d_r} \subset \mathbb{Z}^r_{\geq 0} \) be the set of non-negative integers solutions \( (a_1, \ldots, a_r) \) of the linear Diophantine equation

\[
a_1 d_1 + \cdots + a_r d_r = q.
\]

Then the polynomials \( g_1^{a_1} \cdots g_r^{a_r} \) span \( k[V]^G_q \), as \( (a_1, \ldots, a_r) \) ranges over \( \Lambda^q_{d_1, \ldots, d_r} \). In other words \( \phi_q(v) = \phi_q(w) \) if and only if \( g_1^{a_1}(v) \cdots g_r^{a_r}(v) = g_1^{a_1}(w) \cdots g_r^{a_r}(w) \) for every \( (a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \Lambda^q_{d_1, \ldots, d_r} \).

Let us now fix \( v \in V \setminus B \) and consider \( w \in V \setminus B \) such that \( \phi_q(w) = \phi_q(v) \). Our ultimate goal is to show that, if \( q \) is a large enough prime, there are only finitely many such \( w \). After renumbering \( g_1, \ldots, g_r \), we may assume that \( g_1(v), \ldots, g_s(v) \neq 0 \) but \( g_{s+1}(v) = \cdots = g_r(v) = 0 \).

Claim 1: \( d_1, \ldots, d_s \) are relatively prime.

Indeed, assume the contrary: \( \gcd(d_1, \ldots, d_s) \geq 2 \). Choose a prime \( q > |G| \). Since \( v \not\in B \), Lemma 9.1 tells us that there exists an \( f \in k[V]^G_q \) such that \( f(v) \neq 0 \). Since \( f \) is a polynomial in \( g_1, \ldots, g_s \), some monomial \( f^{a_1} \cdots f^{a_r} \) of total degree \( a_1 d_1 + \cdots + a_r d_r = q \) does not vanish at \( v \). After replacing \( f \) by this monomial, we may assume that \( f = f_1^{a_1} \cdots f_r^{a_r} \). Note that \( a_j \geq 1 \) for some \( j \geq s + 1, \ldots, r \). Otherwise \( q \) would be divisible by \( \gcd(d_1, \ldots, d_s) \), which is not possible, because \( q \) is a prime and \( q > |G| \). Since \( g_1(v) = 0 \), we conclude that \( f(v) = g_1^{a_1}(v) \cdots g_r^{a_r}(v) = 0 \), a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 1.

It is well known that if \( d_1, \ldots, d_s \geq 1 \) are relatively prime integers then for large enough integers \( q \) (not necessarily prime), \( \Lambda^q_{d_1, \ldots, d_s} \neq \emptyset \). The largest integer \( q \geq 0 \) such
that \( \Lambda^q_{d_1,\ldots,d_s} = \emptyset \) is called the Frobenius number; we will denote it by \( F(d_1,\ldots,d_s) \).

This number has been extensively studied; for an explicit upper bound on \( F \) in terms of \( d_1,\ldots,d_s \), see, e.g., [EG72].

Claim 2: Suppose our prime \( q \) is \( > |G| + F(d_1,\ldots,d_s) + d_1 + \cdots + d_s \). Then

(i) \( g_i(w) \neq 0 \) for every \( i = 1,\ldots,s \) and (ii) \( g_j(w) = 0 \) for every \( j = s + 1,\ldots,r \).

To prove (i), note that since \( q - d_1 - \cdots - d_s > F(d_1,\ldots,d_s) \), there is an \( s \)-tuple \( (a_1,\ldots,a_s) \) of non-negative integers such that \( a_1d_1 + \cdots + a_sd_s = q - d_1 - \cdots - d_s \). Thus the polynomial \( P := g_1^{a_1+1}\cdots g_s^{a_s+1} \) lies in \( k[V]^G \). By our assumption, \( P(w) = P(v) \neq 0 \). Hence, \( g_i(w) \neq 0 \) for any \( i = 1,\ldots,s \).

To prove (ii), choose \( j \) between \( s + 1 \) and \( r \). Since \( q > |G| + F(d_1,\ldots,d_s) \geq d_j + F(d_1,\ldots,d_s) \), there is an \( s \)-tuple \( (b_1,\ldots,b_s) \) of non-negative integers such that \( b_1d_1 + \cdots + b_sd_s = q - d_j \). Now the polynomial \( Q := g_1^{b_1}\cdots g_s^{b_s}g_j \) lies in \( k[V]^G \). Since \( g_j(v) = 0 \), we have \( Q(w) = Q(v) = 0 \). By (i), \( Q(w) = 0 \) is only possible if \( g_j(w) = 0 \).

This completes the proof of Claim 2.

Claim 3. There exists an \( q_0 > 0 \) such that for any integer \( q \geq q_0 \) (not necessarily a prime), the set \( \Lambda^q_{d_1,\ldots,d_s} \) spans \( \mathbb{Q}^s \) as a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector space.

To prove Claim 3, choose an integer basis \( z_1,\ldots,z_{r-1} \in \mathbb{Z}^s \) for the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector space of solutions of the homogeneous linear equation \( a_1d_1 + \cdots + a_sd_s = 0 \). Denote the maximal absolute value of the coordinates of \( z_1,\ldots,z_{r-1} \) by \( M \) and set \( q_0 := F(d_1,\ldots,d_s) + (d_1 + \cdots + d_s)M \).

For every \( q > q_0 \) we will construct an \( \vec{a} = (a_1,\ldots,a_s) \in \Lambda^q_{d_1,\ldots,d_s} \) such that \( a_i \geq M \) for every \( i \). Indeed, since \( q - (d_1 + \cdots + d_s)M > F(d_1,\ldots,d_s) \), there are non-negative \( b_1,\ldots,b_s \) such that \( b_1d_1 + \cdots + b_sd_s = q - (d_1 + \cdots + d_s)M \). We can now take \( \vec{a} := (b_1 + M,\ldots,b_s + M) \).

Finally, for \( q > q_0 \), the \( s \) integer vectors

\[
\vec{a}, \vec{a} + z_1,\ldots, \vec{a} + z_{r-1}
\]

lie in \( \Lambda^q_{d_1,\ldots,d_s} \) and are linearly independent. This completes the proof of Claim 3.

Suppose \( q \) is a prime, large enough to satisfy the assumptions of Claims 2 and 3. We are now in a position to show that for any \( v \in V \setminus B \), there are only finitely many \( w \in V \setminus B \) such that \( \phi_q(v) = \phi_q(w) \). By Claim 3, there exist \( s \) linearly independent vectors \( (a_{11},\ldots,a_{1s}),\ldots,(a_{s1},\ldots,a_{ss}) \) in \( \Lambda^q_{d_1,\ldots,d_s} \). Thus

\[
\begin{align*}
&g_1(w)^{a_{11}}\cdots g_s(w)^{a_{1s}} = g_1(v)^{a_{11}}\cdots g_s(v)^{a_{1s}}, \\
g_1(w)^{a_{21}}\cdots g_s(w)^{a_{2s}} = g_1(v)^{a_{21}}\cdots g_s(v)^{a_{2s}}, \\
&\quad \vdots \\
&g_1(w)^{a_{s1}}\cdots g_s(w)^{a_{ss}} = g_1(v)^{a_{s1}}\cdots g_s(v)^{a_{ss}},
\end{align*}
\]

where the elements on the right hand side are non-zero. We view \( v \) as fixed and allow \( w \) to range over the fiber of \( \phi(v) \). The matrix \( A := (a_{ij}) \) is invertible and \( \det(A) \cdot A^{-1} \) has integer entries. Thus, we can solve the above system for \( g_1^{\det(A)}(w),\ldots,g_s^{\det(A)}(w) \).

In conclusion, as \( w \) ranges over the fiber of \( \phi_q(v) \), we see that \( g_{s+1}(w) = \cdots = g_r(w) = 0 \) (by Claim 2) and \( g_1(w) = \cdots = g_s(w) \) assume only finitely many values. Thus \( w \) can only lie in finitely many \( G \)-orbits, as desired.

\[\Box\]

Remark 9.3. E. Noether showed that \( k[V]^G \) is generated by polynomials of degree \( \leq |G| \) as a \( k \)-algebra under the assumption that \( \text{char}(k) = 0 \). The more general variant of the Noether bound used in the proof of Proposition 9.2 (where \( \text{char}(k) > 0 \) is allowed, as
long as char($k$) does not divide $|G|$) is due to P. Fleischmann, J. Fogarty, and D. Benson. For details and further references, see [DK01, Section 3.8].

10. Proof of Theorem 1.4(a)

Set $d := \dim(B) = \max_p a(p)$. Our goal is to construct a $d$-dimensional irreducible faithful $G$-variety $X_d$ which is $p$-versal for every prime $p$. This would imply $\pmed(G) \leq \dim(X_d) = d$, as desired.

If $|G| = 1$ (or, equivalently, $d = 0$), we can take $X_d$ to be a point. Thus, from now on, we will assume that $G$ is non-trivial or, equivalently, $d \geq 1$.

Choose a sufficiently large prime integer $q$ so that $q \neq \text{char}(k)$, and every part of Lemma 9.2 holds; in particular, we will assume $q > |G|$. This prime will remain fixed throughout the proof. For notational simplicity we will write $\psi: \mathbb{P}(W) \dashrightarrow Y \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ for the rational map given by the linear system $k[W]^G_0$ of $G$-invariant homogeneous polynomials of degree $q$, instead of $\psi_q$. By part (a) of Lemma 9.2, $\psi$ is regular away from $B$, and by part (b), $\psi$ is generically a $G$-torsor.

Let $Y_n$ be a dense open subset of $Y$ such that $\psi: X_n \rightarrow Y_n$ is a $G$-torsor (and in particular, étale). Here $X_n$ is the preimage of $Y_n$ in $\mathbb{P}(W \setminus B)$. The subscript $n$ in $X_n$ and $Y_n$ is intended to remind us that $\dim(X_n) = \dim(Y_n) = n$, where $n = \dim(V) = \dim(\mathbb{P}(W))$, as before. The idea of our construction of $X_d$ is to start with a $G$-invariant open subset $X_n$ of $\mathbb{P}(W \setminus B)$ and to construct successive hyperplane sections $X_{n-1}, \ldots, X_d$ recursively by appealing to Bertini’s Theorem 8.1.

If $n = d$ then we are done. Indeed, our variety $X_n$ is $G$-equivariantly birationally isomorphic to a vector space $V$, with a faithful linear $G$-action. Hence, $X_n$ is versal, and, in particular, $p$-versal for every prime $p$. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that $n \geq d + 1 \geq 2$.

Since $X_n$ is birationally isomorphic to $V$, there exists an $F$-point $x \in X_n(F)$, where $F/k$ is a finite separable field extension of degree prime to $q$. In fact, such points are dense in $X_n$. Note that if $k$ is infinite, we can take $F = k$.

By Theorem 8.1 for sufficiently large $s_1$ there is a homogeneous polynomial $f \in k[y_0, \ldots, y_N]$ of degree $q^{s_1}$ such that

(i) $(X_n)^{f_1}$ is geometrically irreducible,

(ii) $(Y_n)^{f_1}$ is smooth,

(iii) $\psi(x) \in (Y_n)^{f_1}$,

(iv) $\dim((X_n)^{f_1}) = \dim(X_n) - 1$.

Here $y_0, \ldots, y_N$ denote homogeneous coordinates on $\mathbb{P}^N$.

We now set $X_{n-1} := (X_n)^{f_1}$, $Y_{n-1} := (Y_n)^{f_1}$ and proceed to construct $Y_{n-2}, \ldots, Y_{n-d}$ and $X_{n-2}, \ldots, X_d$ recursively, where each $X_{n-i}$ is the preimage of $Y_{n-i}$ in $\mathbb{P}(W \setminus B)$ under $\psi$, each $X_{n-i}$ is irreducible, each $Y_{n-i}$ is smooth of dimension $n - i$, each $Y_{n-i}$ contains $\psi(x)$, and each $Y_{n-i}$ is obtained by intersecting $Y_{n-i}$ with a hypersurface $f_i = 0$ in $\mathbb{P}^N$, for a homogeneous polynomial $f_i \in k[y_0, \ldots, y_N]$ of degree $q^{s_i}$.

Note that since $\psi$ is given by the linear system of $k[V]^G_q$ of homogeneous $G$-invariant polynomials of degree $q$, $f_i$ lifts to a homogeneous polynomial $\psi^*(f_i)$ of degree $q^{s_i+1}$ on $\mathbb{P}(W)$. In other words,

\begin{equation}
X_d = (H[1] \cap \cdots \cap H[n-d]) \setminus (\mathbb{P}(B) \cup \psi^{-1}(Y_d \setminus Y_d)),
\end{equation}
where \( \overline{V}_d \) is the closure of \( Y_d \) in \( \mathbb{P}^N \) and \( H[i] \) is a hypersurface of degree \( q^{s_i+1} \) in \( \mathbb{P}(W) \) cut out by \( \psi^*(f_i) \).

Since each \( \psi: X_{n-i} \rightarrow Y_{n-i} \) is a \( G \)-torsor, the \( G \)-action on \( X_d \) is faithful. Thus it remains to show that the \( G \)-action on \( X_d \) is \( p \)-versal for every prime \( p \).

Case 1: \( p = q \). Recall that the \( G \)-action on \( X_d \) is \( p \)-versal if and only the \( G_p \)-action on \( X_d \) is \( p \)-versal, where \( G_p \) is a Sylow \( p \)-subgroup of \( G \); see [DR13, Corollary 8.6]. Since \( q > |G| \), we have \( G_q = \{1\} \). Thus in order to show that \( X_d \) is \( q \)-versal it suffices to show that \( X_d \) has a 0-cycle of degree prime to \( q \); see [DR13, Lemma 8.2 and Theorem 8.3]. By our construction \( Y_d \) contains \( \psi(x) \) and hence, \( X_d \) contains \( x \), where \( x \) is a point of degree prime to \( q \). This shows that \( X_d \) is \( q \)-versal.

Case 2: \( p \neq q \). To show that the \( G \)-action on \( X_d \) is \( p \)-versal it suffices to prove that for every field extension \( K/k \), with \( K \) infinite, and every \( G \)-torsor \( T \rightarrow \text{Spec}(K) \), the twisted \( K \)-variety \( T X_d \) contains a 0-cycle \( Z \), whose degree over \( K \) is a power of \( q \) (and thus prime to \( p \)); see [DR13, Section 8].

Since the \( G \)-action on \( \mathbb{P}(W) \) lifts to a linear \( G \)-action on \( W \), Hilbert’s Theorem 90 tells us that \( T \mathbb{P}(W) = \mathbb{P}(W_K) \) is a projective space over \( K \); see, e.g., [DR13, Lemma 10.1]. Twisting both sides of (10.1) by \( T \), we obtain

\[
T X_d = (T H[1] \cap \cdots \cap T H[n-d]) \setminus (T \mathbb{P}(B) \cup T \psi^{-1}(\overline{V}_d \setminus Y_d))
\]

in \( \mathbb{P}(W_K) \). We will construct the desired zero cycle \( Z \) on \( T X_d \) by intersecting \( T X_d \) with \( d \) hyperplanes \( M_1, \ldots, M_d \) in \( \mathbb{P}(W_K) \) in general position. Note that since \( Y_d \) is irreducible, Lemma 9.2(c) tells us that

\[
\dim_k \psi^{-1}(\overline{V}_d \setminus Y_d) \leq \dim_k(\overline{V}_d \setminus Y_d) \leq \dim_k(Y_d) - 1 = d - 1.
\]

Since \( \dim_k(\mathbb{P}(B)) = \dim_k(B) - 1 = d - 1 \), we see that a linear subspace \( M = M_1 \cap \cdots \cap M_d \) of codimension \( d \) in \( \mathbb{P}(W_K) \) in general position misses both \( T \mathbb{P}(B) \) and \( T \psi^{-1}(\overline{V}_d \setminus Y_d) \).

Let \( Z \) be the intersection cycle obtained by intersecting \( T X_d \) with \( M \). By [DR13, Lemma 10.1(c)], each \( T H[i] \) is a hypersurface of degree \( q^{s_i+1} \) in \( \mathbb{P}(W_K) \). Hence, by Bezout’s theorem [Ful84, Proposition 8.4],

\[
\deg_K(Z) = \deg(T H[1]) \cdot \cdots \cdot \deg(T H[n-d]) \cdot \deg(M_1) \cdot \cdots \cdot \deg(M_d)
\]

\[
= q^{s_1+1} \cdot \cdots \cdot q^{s_{n-d}+1} \cdot 1 \cdot \cdots \cdot 1 \quad \text{times}
\]

is a power of \( q \), as desired. \( \square \)

11. \( A \)-GROUPS

Let \( G \) be a finite group, \( p \) be a prime and \( G_p \) be a Sylow \( p \)-subgroup of \( G \). Recall that \( G \) is called an \( A \)-group if \( G_p \) is abelian for every \( p \); see, e.g., [Itô52, Wal69, Bro71]. For the rest of this section, with the exception of Conjecture 11.5 below, we will assume that the base field \( k \) is of characteristic zero and \( \zeta_e \in k \), where \( e \) is the exponent of \( G \).

**Proposition 11.1.** Let \( G \) be an \( A \)-group. Then

\[
p\text{med}(G) = \max \text{ed}(G; p) = \max \text{rank}(G_p)
\]

where the maximum is taken over all primes \( p \).

Here, as usual, by the rank of a finite abelian group \( H \) we mean the minimal number of generators of \( H \).
Proof. The second equality is well known; see, e.g., [RY00, Corollary 7.3]. Note also that this is a very special case of (1.1). In view of (1.3), in order to prove the first equality, we only need to show that \( \text{pmed}(G) \leq \max_p \text{rank}(G_p) \).

Let \( p_1, \ldots, p_r \) be the prime divisors of \( |G| \) and \( d = \max \text{rank}(G_p) \), as \( i \) ranges from 1 to \( r \). By [RY01, Theorem 8.6] there exists a faithful primitive \( d \)-dimensional \( G \)-variety \( Y \) with smooth \( k \)-points \( y_1, \ldots, y_r \) such that \( G_{p_i} \subset \text{Stab}_{G}(y_i) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, r \).

Recall that “primitive” means that \( G \) transitively permutes the irreducible components of \( Y_k \). We claim that any such \( Y \) is, in fact, absolutely irreducible. Let us assume this claim for a moment. The \( G \)-orbit of \( y_i \) is a zero cycle of degree prime to \( p_i \). Thus, for any given prime \( p \), the degree of one of these orbits is prime to \( p \). By [DR13, Corollary 8.6(b)], this implies that \( Y \) is \( p \)-versal for every \( p \). Hence, \( \text{pmed}(G) \leq \dim(Y) = d \), and the proposition follows.

It remains to show that \( Y \) is absolutely irreducible. After replacing \( k \) by its algebraic closure \( \bar{k} \), we may assume that \( k \) is algebraically closed. Let \( Y_0 \) be an irreducible component of \( Y \) and \( H \) be the stabilizer of \( Y_0 \) in \( G \). Our goal is to prove that \( H = G \). Since \( G \) acts transitively on the irreducible components of \( Y \), this will imply that \( Y = Y_0 \).

Since \( y_i \) is a smooth point of \( Y \), it lies on exactly one irreducible component of \( Y \), say on \( g_i(Y_0) \) for some \( g_i \in G \). Since \( y_i \) is \( G_{p_i} \)-invariant, \( y_i \) also lies on \( g g_i(Y_0) \) for every \( g \in G_{p_i} \). In other words, \( g g_i(Y_0) = g_i(Y_0) \) for every \( g \in G_{p_i} \) or equivalently, \( g^{-1} G_{p_i} g_i \subset H \) for every \( i = 1, \ldots, s \). This shows that \( H \) contains a Sylow \( p_i \)-subgroup of \( G \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, r \). Hence, \( |H| \) is divisible by \( |G_{p_i}| \) for every \( i = 1, \ldots, r \). We conclude that \( |H| \) is divisible by \( |G| = |G_{p_1}| \cdots |G_{p_s}| \) and hence, \( H = G \).

Remark 11.2. The above argument relies, in a key way, on [RY01, Theorem 8.6]. This theorem is proved in [RY01] over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 but the proof goes through for any \( k \) as above. The condition that \( \zeta \in k \), is necessary; it is not mentioned in [RY01, Remark 9.9] due to an oversight.

Example 11.3. If \( G \) is a non-abelian group of order \( pq \), where \( p \) and \( q \) are odd primes. Then Proposition 11.1 tells us that \( \text{pmed}(G) = 1 \). On the other hand, \( \text{ed}(G) \geq 2 \); see [BR97, Theorem 6.2]. This is, perhaps, the simplest example where \( \text{pmed}(G) < \text{ed}(G) \).

Remark 11.4. Non-abelian simple \( A \)-groups are classified in [Bro71, Theorem 3.2]: they are \( J_1 \), the first Janko group, and \( \text{PSL}_2(q) \) for \( q > 3 \) and \( q \equiv 0, 3, \text{or } 5 \pmod{8} \). By Proposition 11.1,

\[
\text{pmed}(G) = \begin{cases} 
3, & \text{if } G \simeq J_1, \\
2, & \text{if } G \simeq \text{PSL}_2(q), \text{with } q \text{ as above.}
\end{cases}
\]

On the other hand, by [Bea11], \( \text{ed}(G) \geq 4 \) for any of these groups, except for \( G \simeq \text{PSL}_2(5) \) and (possibly) \( \text{PSL}_2(11) \).

It is natural to conjecture the following generalization of [RY01, Theorem 8.6].

Conjecture 11.5. Let \( d \) be a positive integer. Suppose \( G \) is a finite group with subgroups \( H_1, \ldots, H_r \) such that \( \text{rdim}(H_i) \leq d \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, r \). Then there exists a \( d \)-dimensional \( k \)-variety \( X \) with a faithful \( G \)-action and smooth \( k \)-points \( x_1, \ldots, x_r \in X \) such that \( H_i \) fixes \( x_i \) for each \( i = 1, \ldots, r \).

Note that each \( H_i \) must act faithfully on the tangent space of the corresponding \( x_i \), and so the condition that the representation dimension of each \( H_i \) should be \( \leq d \) is necessary.
Of particular interest is the special case where $p_1, \ldots, p_r$ are the distinct primes dividing $|G|$, each $H_i$ is a Sylow $p_i$-subgroup, and $d$ is the maximum of $\text{ed}_k(G; p_i) = \text{rdim}_k(H_i)$. If Conjecture 11.5 could be established in this special case, then the argument we used in the proof of Proposition 11.1 would show that the $G$-action on $X$ is $p$-versal for every prime $p$ and, consequently, that (1.6) holds for $G$. We have not been able to prove (1.6) by this method beyond the case of $A$-groups.

12. Examples

In this section we present two examples that complement Theorem 1.4(b). Example 12.1 shows that the inequality of Theorem 1.4(a) is in fact an equality, for the natural $n$-dimensional representation $V$ of the alternating group $A_n$. Note that Theorem 1.4(b) cannot be applied to $A_n \subset \text{GL}(V)$, since $A_n$ contains no pseudo-reflections. Nevertheless, the conclusion of Theorem 1.4(b) continues to hold in this case. On the other hand, Example 12.2 shows that for $G = \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ the inequality of Theorem 1.4(a) is strict for every faithful representation $G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V)$.

Example 12.1. $\text{pmed}(A_n) = \text{ed}(A_n; 2) = 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor$ for any $n \geq 4$.

Proof. Since $A_n$ contains an elementary abelian subgroup of rank $2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor$, generated by \((12)(34), (13)(24), (56)(78), \ldots\), we have $\text{pmed}(A_n) \geq \text{ed}(A_n; 2) = 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor$; see [BR97, Theorem 6.7(c)].

We will now deduce the opposite inequality,

\[(12.1) \quad \text{pmed}(A_n) \leq 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor\]

from Theorem 1.4(a). Let $V = k^n$ be the natural representation of $S_n$. One checks that for any $g \in S_n$ and any prime $p$, the dimension of the eigenspace $V(g, \zeta_p)$ is the number of cycles of length divisible by $p$ in the cycle decomposition of $g$. Thus

\[a(p) = \max_{g \in A_n} \dim V(g, \zeta_p) = \begin{cases} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p} \right\rfloor, & \text{if } p \text{ is odd, and} \\ 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor, & \text{if } p = 2, \end{cases}\]

Since we are assuming that $n \geq 4$, the maximal value of $a(p)$ is attained at $p = 2$. The inequality (12.1) now follows from Theorem 1.4(a), as desired. \hfill \Box

Example 12.2. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$, where $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ acts faithfully on $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$. Assume $\zeta_{20} \in k$. Then

(a) $\text{pmed}(G) = 1$, but

(b) $a_\phi(2) \geq 2$ for every faithful representation $\phi: G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V)$.

Proof. Since the Sylow subgroups of $G$ are $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$, part (a) follows from Proposition 11.1.

(b) Each of the four characters $\zeta_{20}^{k^*}$ induces a 1-dimensional representation $G \rightarrow \text{GL}_1$. We will denote these representations by $\phi_0 = \text{id}$, $\phi_1$, $\phi_2$, and $\phi_3$. Let $\phi_4 = \text{Ind}_{\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}}^{G} (\chi)$, where $\chi$ is a non-trivial multiplicative character $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow k^*$. We see that $\phi_4$ is a faithful irreducible 4-dimensional representation of $G$ (irreducibility follows, e.g., from Mackey’s criterion) and $a_{\phi_4}(2) = 2$. Since $\text{dim}(\phi_0)^2 + \cdots + \text{dim}(\phi_4)^2 = 4 \cdot 1^2 + 4^2 = 20 = |G|$, $\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_4$ are the only irreducible representations of $G$. Moreover, since $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$ lies in the kernel of $\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_3$, every faithful representation $\phi: G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}(V)$ must contain a copy of $\phi_4$. Thus $a_\phi(2) \geq a_{\phi_4}(2) = 2$. \hfill \Box
Remark 12.3. A. Ledet showed that $\text{ed}(\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}) = 2$; see [Led02, p. 426]. Note that in [Led02] this group is denoted by $C_5$.
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