

On one generalization of modular subgroups ^{*}

Jianhong Huang

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Jiangsu Normal University,
Xuzhou, 221116, P.R. China
E-mail: jhh320@126.com

Bin Hu [†]

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Jiangsu Normal University,
Xuzhou 221116, P. R. China
E-mail: hubin118@126.com

Xun Zheng

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Jiangsu Normal University,
Xuzhou 221116, P. R. China
E-mail: zx309556477@126.com

Abstract

Let G be a finite group. If $M_n < M_{n-1} < \dots < M_1 < M_0 = G$ where M_i is a maximal subgroup of M_{i-1} for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, then M_n ($n > 0$) is an n -maximal subgroup of G . A subgroup M of G is called *modular* if the following conditions are held: (i) $\langle X, M \cap Z \rangle = \langle X, M \rangle \cap Z$ for all $X \leq G, Z \leq G$ such that $X \leq Z$, and (ii) $\langle M, Y \cap Z \rangle = \langle M, Y \rangle \cap Z$ for all $Y \leq G, Z \leq G$ such that $M \leq Z$.

In this paper, we study finite groups whose n -maximal subgroups are modular.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, all groups are finite and G always denotes a finite group. Moreover, \mathbb{P} is the set of all primes and the symbol $\pi(G)$ stands for the set of prime divisors of the order of G .

We say that G is: *nearly nilpotent* if G is supersoluble and G induces on any its non-Frattini chief factor H/K (that is, $H/K \not\leq \Phi(G/K)$) an automorphism group of order dividing a prime; *strongly*

^{*}Research is supported by an NNSF grant of China (Grant No. 11401264) and a TAPP of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PPZY 2015A013)

[†]Corresponding author

⁰Keywords: finite group, modular subgroup, n -maximal subgroup, nearly nilpotent group, strongly supersoluble group.

⁰Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 20D10, 20D15, 20D20

supersoluble if G is supersoluble and G induces on any its chief factor H/K an automorphism group of square free order. We use \mathfrak{N}_n and \mathfrak{U}_s to denote the classes of all nearly nilpotent and of all strongly supersoluble groups, respectively. Nearly nilpotent and strongly supersoluble groups were studied respectively in [1] and [2, 3].

It is clear that: the group $C_7 \rtimes \text{Aut}(C_7)$ is strongly supersoluble but it is not nearly nilpotent; the group $C_{13} \rtimes \text{Aut}(C_{13})$ is supersoluble but it is not strongly supersoluble; the group S_3 is nearly nilpotent but it is not nilpotent.

A subgroup M of G is called *modular* if M is a modular element (in the sense of Kurosh [4, p. 43]) of the lattice $\mathcal{L}(G)$ of all subgroups of G , that is,

- (i) $\langle X, M \cap Z \rangle = \langle X, M \rangle \cap Z$ for all $X \leq G, Z \leq G$ such that $X \leq Z$, and
- (ii) $\langle M, Y \cap Z \rangle = \langle M, Y \rangle \cap Z$ for all $Y \leq G, Z \leq G$ such that $M \leq Z$.

Recall that a subgroup H of G is called a *2-maximal* (*second maximal*) subgroup of G whenever H is a maximal subgroup of some maximal subgroup M of G . Similarly we can define *3-maximal* subgroups, and so on.

The relationship between n -maximal subgroups (where $n > 1$) of G and the structure of G was studied by many authors (see, in particular, the recent papers [5]–[12] and Chapter 4 in the book [13]). One of the earliest results in this line research was obtained by Huppert in the article [14] who established the supersolubility of the group whose all second maximal subgroups are normal. In the same article Huppert proved that if all 3-maximal subgroups of G are normal in G , then the commutator subgroup G' of G is a nilpotent group and the principal rank of G is at most 2. These two results were developed by many authors. In particular, Schmidt proved [1] that: if all 2-maximal subgroups of G are modular in G , then G is nearly nilpotent; if all 3-maximal subgroups of G are modular in G and G is not supersoluble, then either G is a group of order pq^2 for primes p and q or $G = Q \rtimes P$, where $Q = C_G(Q)$ is a quaternion group of order 8 and $|P| = 3$. Mann proved [15] that if all n -maximal subgroups of a soluble group G are subnormal and $n < |\pi(G)|$, then G is nilpotent; but if $n \leq |\pi(G)| + 1$, then G is ϕ -dispersive for some ordering ϕ of \mathbb{P} . Finally, in the case $n \leq |\pi(G)|$ Mann described G completely.

In this paper, we prove the following modular analogues of the above-mentioned Mann's results.

Theorem A. *Suppose that G is soluble and every n -maximal subgroup of G is modular. If $n \leq |\pi(G)|$, then G is strongly supersoluble and G induces on any its non-Frattini chief factor H/K an automorphism group of order $p_1 \cdots p_m$ where $m \leq n$ and p_1, \dots, p_m are distinct primes.*

We use $G^{\mathfrak{U}_s}$ to denote the intersection of all normal subgroups N of G with strongly supersoluble quotient G/N .

Theorem B. *Suppose that G is soluble and every n -maximal subgroup of G is modular. If $n \leq |\pi(G)| + 1$, then $G^{\mathfrak{U}_s}$ is a nilpotent Hall subgroup of G .*

Finally, note that the restrictions on $|\pi(G)|$ in Theorems A and B cannot be weakened (see

Section 4 below).

2 Proof of theorem A

A normal subgroup A of G is said to be *hypercyclically embedded* in G [4, p. 217] if either $A = 1$ or $A \neq 1$ and every chief factor of G below A is cyclic. We use $Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$ to denote the product of all normal hypercyclically embedded subgroups of G . It is clear that a normal subgroup A of G is hypercyclically embedded in G if and only if $A \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$.

Recall that G is said to be a *P-group* [4, p. 49] if $G = A \rtimes \langle t \rangle$ with an elementary abelian p -group A and an element t of prime order $q \neq p$ induces a non-trivial power automorphism on A .

The following two lemmas collect the properties of modular subgroups which we use in our proofs.

Lemma 2.1 (See Theorems 5.1.14 and 5.2.5 in [4]). *Let M be a modular subgroup of G .*

(i) *M/M_G is nilpotent and $M^G/M_G \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G/M_G)$.*

(ii) *If $M_G = 1$, then*

$$G = S_1 \times \cdots \times S_r \times K,$$

where $0 \leq r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,

(a) *S_i is a non-abelian P -group,*

(b) *$(|S_i|, |S_j|) = 1 = (|S_i|, |K|)$ for all $i \neq j$,*

(c) *$M = Q_1 \times \cdots \times Q_r \times (M \cap K)$ and Q_i is a non-normal Sylow subgroup of S_i ,*

(d) *$M \cap K$ is quasinormal in G .*

Lemma 2.2 (See p. 201 in [4]). *Let A , B and N be subgroups of G , where A is modular in G and N is normal in G .*

(1) *If B is modular in G , then $\langle A, B \rangle$ is modular in G .*

(2) *AN/N is modular in G/N .*

(3) *N is modular in G .*

(4) *If $A \leq B$, then A is modular in B .*

(5) *If φ is an isomorphism of G onto \bar{G} , then A^φ is modular in \bar{G} .*

A subgroup H of G is said to be *quasinormal* (respectively *S-quasinormal*) in G if $HP = PH$ for all subgroups (for all Sylow subgroups) P of G .

Lemma 2.3 (See Chapter 1 in [16]). *Let $H \leq K \leq G$.*

(1) *If H is S-quasinormal in G , then H is S-quasinormal in K .*

(2) *Suppose that H is normal in G . Then K/H is S-quasinormal in G/H if and only if K is S-quasinormal in G .*

(3) If H is S -quasinormal in G , then H is subnormal in G and H^G/H_G is nilpotent.

Lemma 2.4. Suppose that G is soluble, and let $N \neq G$ be a minimal normal subgroup of G . Suppose also that every n -maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G , where $n \leq |\pi(G)| + r$ for some integer r . Then there is a natural number $m \leq n$ such that every m -maximal subgroup of G/N is either modular or S -quasinormal in G/N and $m \leq |\pi(G/N)| + r$.

Proof. First assume that N is not a Sylow subgroup of G . Then $|\pi(G/N)| = |\pi(G)|$. Moreover, if H/N is an n -maximal subgroup of G/N , then H is an n -maximal subgroup of G , so H is either modular or S -quasinormal in G by hypothesis. Consequently, H/N is either modular or S -quasinormal in G/N by Lemmas 2.2(2) and 2.3(2). On the other hand, if G/N includes no n -maximal subgroups, then, by the solubility of G , the trivial subgroup of G/N is modular in G/N and is a unique m -maximal subgroup of G/N for some $m < n$ with $m < |\pi(G/N)|$. Hence $m < |\pi(G/N)| + r$. Thus the conclusion of the lemma is fulfilled for G/N .

Finally, consider the case that N is a Sylow p -subgroup of G . Let E be a Hall p' -subgroup of G . It is clear that $|\pi(E)| = |\pi(G)| - 1$ and E is a maximal subgroup of G . Therefore, every $(n-1)$ -maximal subgroup of E is either modular or S -quasinormal in E by Lemmas 2.2(4) and 2.3(1). Thus, by the isomorphism $G/N \simeq E$, Lemma 2.2(5) implies that every $(n-1)$ -maximal subgroup of G/N is either modular or S -quasinormal in G/N , and also we have $n-1 \leq |\pi(G/N)| + r$. The lemma is proved.

A *formation* is a class \mathfrak{F} of groups with the following properties: (i) Every homomorphic image of any group in \mathfrak{F} belongs to \mathfrak{F} ; (ii) $G/N \cap R \in \mathfrak{F}$ whenever $G/N \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $G/R \in \mathfrak{F}$. A formation \mathfrak{F} is said to be: *saturated* if $G \in \mathfrak{F}$ whenever $G/\Phi(G) \in \mathfrak{F}$; *hereditary* if $H \in \mathfrak{F}$ whenever $H \leq G \in \mathfrak{F}$.

Lemma 2.5 (See Theorem A in [3]). *The class of all strongly supersoluble groups is a hereditary saturated formation.*

Let \mathfrak{X} be a class of groups. A group G is called a *minimal non- \mathfrak{X} -group* [13] or *\mathfrak{X} -critical group* [17] if G is not in \mathfrak{X} but all proper subgroups of G are in \mathfrak{X} . An \mathfrak{N} -critical group is also called a *Schmidt group*.

Fix some ordering ϕ of \mathbb{P} . The record $p\phi q$ means that p precedes q in ϕ and $p \neq q$. Recall that a group G of order $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_n^{\alpha_n}$ is called ϕ -*dispersive* whenever $p_1 \phi p_2 \phi \dots \phi p_n$ and for every i there is a normal subgroup of G of order $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_i^{\alpha_i}$. Furthermore, if ϕ is such that $p\phi q$ always implies $p > q$ then every ϕ -dispersive group is called *Ore dispersive*.

Lemma 2.6 (See [13, I, Propositions 1.8, 1.11 and 1.12]). *The following claims hold for every \mathfrak{U} -critical group G :*

- (1) G is soluble and $|\pi(G)| \leq 3$.
- (2) If G is not a Schmidt group, then G is Ore dispersive.
- (3) $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is a unique normal Sylow subgroup of G .
- (4) If S is a complement to $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ in G , then $S/S \cap \Phi(G)$ is either a cyclic prime power order group

or a Miller-Moreno (that is, a minimal non-abelian) group.

(5) $G^{\mathfrak{U}}/\Phi(G^{\mathfrak{U}})$ is a non-cyclic chief factor of G .

(6) If $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is non-abelian, then the center, commutator subgroup, and Frattini subgroup of $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ coincide with one another.

(7) If $p > 2$, then $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is of exponent p ; for $p = 2$ the exponent of $G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ is at most 4.

Lemma 2.7 (See Lemma 12.8 in [18]). *If H/K is an abelian chief factor of G and M is a maximal subgroup of G such that $K \leq M$ and $MH = G$, then*

$$G/M_G \simeq (H/K) \rtimes (G/C_G(H/K)) \simeq (HM_G/M_G) \rtimes (G/C_G(HM_G/M_G)).$$

The following lemma is evident.

Lemma 2.8. *If H/K and T/L are G -isomorphic chief factors of G , then $(H/K) \rtimes (G/C_G(H/K)) \simeq (T/L) \rtimes (G/C_G(T/L))$.*

Recall that a class of soluble groups \mathfrak{X} is a *Schunck class* [17, III, 2.7] if $G \in \mathfrak{X}$ whenever $G/M_G \in \mathfrak{X}$ for all maximal subgroups M of G .

Proposition 2.9. *The class of all nearly nilpotent groups \mathfrak{N}_n is a Schunck class, and $\mathfrak{N}_n \subseteq \mathfrak{U}_s$. Hence every homomorphic image of any nearly nilpotent group is nearly nilpotent, and G is nearly nilpotent whenever $G/\Phi(G)$ is nearly nilpotent.*

Proof. Suppose that for every maximal subgroup M of G we have $G/M_G \in \mathfrak{N}_n$. Then $G/\Phi(G)$ is supersoluble, so G is supersoluble. If H/K is a non-Frattini chief factor of G and M is a maximal subgroup of G such that $K \leq M$ and $MH = G$, then $G/M_G \simeq (H/K) \rtimes (G/C_G(H/K))$ by Lemma 2.7. Since clearly $C_{(H/K) \rtimes (G/C_G(H/K))}(H/K) = H/K$, it follows that $|G/C_G(H/K)| = p$ is a prime. Hence $G \in \mathfrak{N}_n$. Therefore \mathfrak{N}_n is a Schunck class, so every homomorphic image of any nearly nilpotent group is nearly nilpotent, and G is nearly nilpotent whenever $G/\Phi(G)$ is nearly nilpotent by [17, III, 2.7].

Now we show that every nearly nilpotent group G is strongly supersoluble. Assume that this is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G . Then G/R is strongly supersoluble by the choice of G since G/R is nearly nilpotent. Moreover, if $R \leq \Phi(G)$, then G is strongly supersoluble by Lemma 2.5, contrary to the choice of G . Therefore $R \not\leq \Phi(G)$, so $G/C_G(R)$ is of prime order since G is nearly nilpotent. Therefore G is strongly supersoluble by the Jordan-Hölder theorem. This contradiction completes the proof of the proposition.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $G = R \rtimes M$ be a soluble primitive group, where $R = C_G(R)$ is a minimal normal subgroup of G . Let $T \neq 1$ be a subgroup of G . Suppose that G is not nearly nilpotent.*

(1) *If $T < M$, then T is neither modular nor S -quasinormal in G .*

(2) *If $T < R$ and $|M|$ is a prime, then some subgroup V of R with $|V| = |T|$ is neither modular nor S -quasinormal in G .*

Proof. (1) First assume that T is modular in G but it is not S -quasinormal in G . Then T is not quasinormal in G , so Lemma 2.1(ii) implies that G is a non-abelian P -group since $T_G \leq M_G = 1$. But then G is supersoluble. This contradiction shows that T is S -quasinormal in G , so T is subnormal in G by Lemma 2.3(3). Hence $1 < T^G = T^{RM} = T^M \leq M_G = 1$ by [17, A, 14.3], a contradiction. Hence we have (1).

(2) Let V be a subgroup of R with $|V| = |T|$ such that V is normal in a Sylow p -subgroup of G . If V is S -quasinormal in G , then for every Sylow q -subgroup Q of G , where $q \neq p$, we have $VQ = QV$ and so $V = R \cap VQ$. Hence $Q \leq N_G(V)$. Thus V is normal in G , a contradiction. Hence V is modular in G , which implies that $1 < V \leq R \cap Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$ by Lemma 2.1(i) and so $R \leq Z_{\mathfrak{U}}(G)$. But then $|R| = p$, which implies that G is nearly nilpotent, a contradiction.

The lemma is proved.

Proposition 2.11. *If every maximal subgroup of G or every 2-maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G , then G is nearly nilpotent. Hence G is strongly supersoluble.*

Proof. Assume this proposition is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order.

First we show that G is soluble. Indeed, if M is a maximal subgroup of G and either M is modular in G or M is S -quasinormal in G , then $|G : M|$ is a prime by Lemmas 2.1(i) and 2.3(3). Therefore if every maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G , then G is supersoluble. On the other hand, if every 2-maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G , then every maximal subgroup of G is supersoluble by Lemmas 2.2(4) and 2.3(1) and so G is soluble by Lemma 2.6(1).

Therefore, in view of Proposition 2.9, we need only to show that for every maximal subgroup M of G we have $G/M_G \in \mathfrak{N}_n$. If $M_G \neq 1$, then the choice of G and Lemmas 2.2(2) and 2.3(2) imply that $G/M_G \in \mathfrak{N}_n$. Now assume that $M_G = 1$, so there is a minimal normal subgroup R of G such that $G = R \rtimes M$ and $R = C_G(R)$ by [17, A, 15.6]. Then M is not S -quasinormal in G by Lemma 2.3(3). On the other hand, if M is modular in G , then $G = M^G$ is a non-abelian P -group by Lemma 2.1(ii). It follows that G is nearly nilpotent, a contradiction. Hence every 2-maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G .

Now let T be any maximal subgroup of M . Then T is either modular or S -quasinormal in G , so $T = 1$ and hence $|M| = q$ for some prime q . Therefore R is a maximal subgroup of G . Then every maximal subgroup of R is either modular or S -quasinormal in G and so $|R| = p$ by Lemma 2.10(2), which implies that $|G| = pq$. Hence G is nearly nilpotent, a contradiction.

The proposition is proved.

In fact, Theorem A is a special case of the following

Theorem 2.12. *Suppose that G is soluble and every n -maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . If $n \leq |\pi(G)|$, then G is strongly supersoluble and G induces on any its non-Frattini chief factor H/K an automorphism group of order $p_1 \cdots p_m$, where $m \leq n$ and p_1, \dots, p_m*

are distinct primes.

Proof. Assume this theorem is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order.

First we show that G is strongly supersoluble. Suppose that this is false. Let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G .

(1) G/R is strongly supersoluble. Hence G is primitive and so $R \not\leq \Phi(G)$ and $R = C_G(R) = O_p(G)$ for some prime p .

Lemma 2.4 implies that the hypothesis holds for G/R , so the choice of G implies that G/R is strongly supersoluble. Therefore, again by the choice of G , R is a unique minimal normal subgroup of G and $R \not\leq \Phi(G)$ by Lemma 2.5. Hence G is primitive and so $R = C_G(R) = O_p(G)$ for some prime p by [17, A, 15.6].

(2) Every maximal subgroup M of G is strongly supersoluble.

By hypothesis every $(n-1)$ -maximal subgroup T of M is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . Hence T is modular in M by Lemma 2.2(4) in the former case, and it is S -quasinormal in M by Lemma 2.3(1) in the second case. Since the solubility of G implies that either $|\pi(M)| = |\pi(G)|$ or $|\pi(M)| = |\pi(G)| - 1$, the hypothesis holds for M . It follows that M is strongly supersoluble by the choice of G .

(3) G is supersoluble.

Suppose that this is false. Since every maximal subgroup M of G is strongly supersoluble by Claim (2), G is a minimal non-supersoluble group. Then Lemma 2.6(1) yields that $|\pi(G)| = 2$ or $|\pi(G)| = 3$. But in the former case G is strongly supersoluble by Proposition 2.11, so $|\pi(G)| = 3$ and every 3-maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . Claim (1) and Lemma 2.6 imply that $G = R \rtimes S$, where S is a Miller-Moreno group. Moreover, since $|\pi(S)| = 2$ and S is strongly supersoluble, S is not nilpotent and so $S = Q \rtimes T$, where $|Q| = q$, $|T| = t$ and $C_S(Q) = Q$ for some distinct primes q and t by [13, I, Proposition 1.9]. Hence R is a 2-maximal subgroup of G , so every maximal subgroup of R is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . Therefore G is supersoluble by Lemma 2.10(2).

(4) G is strongly supersoluble.

From Claims (1) and (3) we get that for some maximal subgroup M of G we have $G = R \rtimes M = C_G(R) \rtimes M$ and $|R| = p$, so M is cyclic. Since G is not strongly supersoluble, for some prime q dividing $|M|$ and for the Sylow q -subgroup Q of M we have $|Q| > q$. First assume that $RQ \neq G$, and let $RQ \leq V$, where V is a maximal subgroup of G . Then V is strongly supersoluble by Claim (2). Hence $C_Q(R) \neq 1$, contrary to $R = C_G(R)$. Hence $RQ = G$ and so $|\pi(G)| = 2$. Therefore G is strongly supersoluble by Proposition 2.11, a contradiction. Thus we have (4).

(5) G induces on any its non-Frattini chief factor H/K an automorphism group $G/C_G(H/K)$ of order $p_1 \cdots p_m$ where $m \leq n$ and p_1, \dots, p_m are distinct primes.

If G is nearly nilpotent, it is clear. Now suppose that G is not nearly nilpotent. Let M be a maximal subgroup of G such that $K \leq M$ and $MH = G$. Then $G/M_G \simeq (H/K) \rtimes (G/C_G(H/K))$ by Lemma 2.7. If $M_G \neq 1$, the choice of G implies that $m \leq n$. Now suppose that $M_G = 1$, so $G = H \rtimes M$, where $|H|$ is a prime and $H = C_G(H)$. Then, by Claim (4), M is a cyclic group of order $p_1 \dots p_m$ for some distinct primes p_1, \dots, p_m . Assume that $n < m$. Then G has an n -maximal subgroup T such that $T \leq M$ and $|T|$ is not a prime. But since G is not nearly nilpotent, this is not possible by Lemma 2.10(1). This contradiction completes the proof of the result.

3 Proof of Theorem B

Lemma 3.1 (See p. 359 in [17]). *Given any ordering ϕ of the set of all primes, the class of all ϕ -dispersive groups is a saturated formation.*

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that every 3-maximal subgroup of G is either S -quasinormal or modular in G . If G is not supersoluble, then either G is a group of order pq^2 for some distinct primes p and q , or $G = Q \rtimes P$, where $Q = C_G(Q)$ is a quaternion group of order 8 and $|P| = 3$.*

Proof. Assume that this proposition is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Lemmas 2.2(4), 2.3(1) and Proposition 2.11 imply that every maximal subgroup of G is strongly supersoluble. Hence G is soluble by Lemma 2.6(1), so $|\pi(G)| = 2$ by Theorem 2.12.

Since G is not supersoluble, G is a \mathfrak{U} -critical group. Let $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}}$ be the supersoluble residual of G . Lemma 2.6 implies that the following hold: (a) D is a Sylow p -subgroup of G for some prime p , and if Q is a Sylow q -subgroup of G , where $q \neq p$, then $DQ = G$ and $Q/Q \cap \Phi(G)$ is either a cyclic prime power order group or a Miller-Moreno group; (b) $D/\Phi(D)$ is a non-cyclic chief factor of G and if D is non-abelian, then the center, commutator subgroup, and Frattini subgroup of D coincide with one another; (c) if $p > 2$, then D is of exponent p , for $p = 2$ the exponent of D is at most 4. From Assertion (b) it follows that $Q^G = G$.

First we show that $|\Phi(D)| \leq p$. Indeed, assume that $|\Phi(D)| > p$, and let M be a maximal subgroup of G with $G = DM$ and $Q \leq M$. Then M is supersoluble, so G has a 3-maximal subgroup T such that $Q \leq T$. Then $T^G = G$. If T is S -quasinormal in G , then G/T_G is nilpotent by Lemma 2.3(3). Hence QT_G/T_G is normal in G/T_G , which implies that $QT_G = G \leq M$. This contradiction shows that T is modular in G . Therefore G/T_G is a P -group by Lemma 2.1(ii). But then from the G -isomorphism

$$DT_G/T_G\Phi(D) \simeq D/D \cap T_G\Phi(D) = D/\Phi(D)(D \cap T_G) = D/\Phi(D)$$

we get that $D/\Phi(D)$ is cyclic. This contradiction shows that $|\Phi(D)| \leq p$.

Now we show that $|Q| = q$. Assume that $|Q| > q$. Let M be a maximal subgroup of G with $|G : M| = q$. Then M is supersoluble, so G has a 3-maximal subgroup T such that $|G : T| = pq^2$. Then $D \leq T^G$ and also we have $T_G \cap D \leq \Phi(D)$ and $T_G \leq \Phi(D)Q$. Moreover, T is not S -quasinormal

in G since Q is a Sylow q -subgroup of G and $|T \cap \Phi(D)| > p$. Hence $G/T_G = (T^G/T_G) \times (K/T_G)$ where T^G/T_G is a non-abelian P -group of order prime to $|K/T_G|$ by Lemma 2.1(ii). But, clearly, q divides $|(G/T_G) : (T^G/T_G)|$, so $Q \leq K$ and hence

$$QT_G/T_G \leq C_{G/T_G}(T^G/T_G) \leq C_{G/T_G}(DT_G/T_G\Phi(D)),$$

where $DT_G/T_G\Phi(D)$ is G -isomorphic to $D/\Phi(D)$. Therefore $|D/\Phi(D)| = p$, a contradiction. Hence $|Q| = q$.

Note that if $|D/\Phi(D)| > p^2$ and T is a subgroup of D with $|D : T| = p^2$, then T is a 3-maximal subgroup of G . But T is neither S -quasinormal nor modular in G , a contradiction. Hence $|D/\Phi(D)| = p^2$.

Finally, assume that $\Phi(D) \neq 1$, so $|D| = p^3$. Assume also that $p \neq 2$. First note that since $|Q| = q$, D is a maximal subgroup of G . On the other hand, from Assertions (b) and (c) we get that some subgroup T of D of order p is not contained in $\Phi(D)$. It is clear that T is a 3-maximal subgroup of G and it is not S -quasinormal in G . Hence T is modular in G , so $T^G = D$ is a non-abelian P -group by Lemma 2.1(ii). This contradiction shows that $p = 2$. Hence $q = 3$, since $G/C_G(D/\Phi(D)) \simeq Q$ and $|D/\Phi(D)| = 4$.

The proposition is proved.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that G is soluble and every n -maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . If $n \leq |\pi(G)| + 1$, then G is ϕ -dispersive for some ordering ϕ of \mathbb{P} .*

Proof. Suppose that this lemma is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Let N be a minimal normal subgroup of G and P a Sylow p -subgroup of G where p divides $|N|$. Then $N \leq P$.

(1) $C_G(N) = N$ and G/N is strongly supersoluble. Hence $N < P$.

Lemma 2.4 implies that the hypothesis holds for G/N . Hence the choice of G implies that G/N is ϕ -dispersive for some ordering ϕ of \mathbb{P} , so $N < P$. Therefore the choice of G and Lemma 3.1 imply that $N \not\leq \Phi(G)$. Hence for some maximal subgroup M of G we have $G = N \rtimes M$. Then $\pi(M) = \pi(G)$, so $G/N \simeq M$ is strongly supersoluble by Theorem 2.12. Therefore N is a unique minimal normal subgroup of G by Lemma 2.5. Hence $C_G(N) = N$.

(2) $|\pi(G)| > 2$.

Indeed, assume that $\pi(G) = \{p, q\}$, and let Q be a Sylow q -subgroup of G . Since G/N is Ore dispersive by Claim (1) and P is not normal in G , NQ/N is a normal Sylow subgroup of G/N , so for some normal subgroup V of G we have $N \leq V$ and $|G : V| = p$. Then $\pi(V) = \pi(G)$. Hence V is strongly supersoluble by Theorem 2.12. It follows that for the largest prime $r \in \pi(V)$ a Sylow r -subgroup R of V is characteristic in V and so R is normal in G . Hence $r = p$ is the largest prime in $\pi(G)$. Since M is also Ore dispersive, a Sylow p -subgroup M_p of M is normal in M , so it is normal in G since $N_G(M_p) \not\leq M$. But then NM_p is a normal Sylow subgroup of G . This contradiction shows that $|\pi(G)| > 2$.

Take a prime divisor q of the order of G distinct from p . Take a Hall q' -subgroup E of G , and let $E \leq W$ where W is a maximal subgroup of G . Then $N \leq E$ and since G is soluble, Lemmas 2.2(4) and 2.3(1) imply that the hypothesis holds for W . Consequently, the choice of G implies that for some prime t dividing $|E|$ a Sylow t -subgroup Q of E is normal in E . Furthermore, since $C_G(N) = N$ we have $N \leq Q$. Hence, Q is a Sylow p -subgroup of E . It is clear also that Q is a Sylow p -subgroup of G and $(|G : N_G(Q)|, r) = 1$ for every prime $r \neq q$. Since $|\pi(G)| > 2$, it follows that Q is normal in G , so $N = Q = P$. This contradiction completes the proof of the lemma.

In fact, Theorem B is a special case of the following

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that G is soluble and every n -maximal subgroup of G is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . If $n \leq |\pi(G)| + 1$, then $G^{\mathfrak{U}_s}$ is a nilpotent Hall subgroup of G .*

Proof. Suppose that this theorem is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Then G is not strongly supersoluble, so $D = G^{\mathfrak{U}_s} \neq 1$. By Lemma 3.3, G has a normal Sylow p -subgroup P for some prime p dividing $|G|$.

(1) *The conclusion of the theorem holds for every quotient $G/R \neq G/1$ (This directly follows from Lemma 2.4).*

(2) *D is nilpotent.*

Assume that this is false. Then, since $G^{\mathfrak{U}_s} \leq G'$, G is not supersoluble.

Let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G . By Claim (1) and [19, 2.2.8], $(G/R)^{\mathfrak{U}_s} = DR/D \simeq D/D \cap R$ is nilpotent. If G has a minimal normal subgroup $N \neq R$, then $D/D \cap (R \cap N)$ is nilpotent. Hence R is a unique minimal normal subgroup of G and, by [17, A, 13.2], $R \not\leq \Phi(G)$. Therefore $R = C_G(R)$ by [17, A, 15.6], and $G = R \rtimes M$ for some maximal subgroup M of G with $M_G = 1$. Then $R = P$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of G by [17, A, 13.8]. It is clear that M is not supersoluble, so $|R| > p$ since otherwise $M \simeq G/R = G/C_G(R)$ is cyclic.

Now let T be any maximal subgroup of M . Then RT is a maximal subgroup of G and $|\pi(RT)| = |\pi(G)|$ or $|\pi(RT)| = |\pi(G)| - 1$. Hence, by Lemmas 2.2(4) and 2.3(1), RM satisfies the same assumptions as G , with $n - 1$ replacing n . The choice of G implies that $(RT)^{\mathfrak{U}_s} \leq F(RT) = R$. Therefore $T \simeq T/(T \cap (RT)^{\mathfrak{U}_s}) \simeq (RT)^{\mathfrak{U}_s}T/(RT)^{\mathfrak{U}_s}$ is strongly supersoluble. Hence M is a \mathfrak{U} -critical group.

By Lemma 2.6(1), $1 < |\pi(M)| \leq 3$. First assume that $|\pi(M)| = 2$, then $n = 4$ by Theorem 2.12 since M is not supersoluble. Hence every 3-maximal subgroup of M is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . Proposition 3.2 implies that M either is a non-supersoluble group of order qr^2 for some distinct primes q and r , or $M = Q \rtimes L$, where $Q = C_M(Q)$ is a quaternion group of order 8 and $|L| = 3$. Then R is a 3-maximal subgroup of G . Thus every maximal subgroup of R is either modular or S -quasinormal in G and so $|R| = p$ by Lemma 2.10(2), a contradiction. Thus $|\pi(M)| = 3$, so $n = 5$ and hence every 4-maximal subgroup of M is either modular or S -quasinormal in G . Let $|M| = q^a r^b t^c$, where p, r and t are primes. If $a + b + c > 4$, then some member T of

a composition series of M is a non-identity 4-maximal subgroup of M since G is soluble, which is impossible by Lemma 2.10. Hence $a + b + c = 4$ since M is not supersoluble. Therefore, by Lemma 2.6, $M = Q \rtimes (L \rtimes T)$, where $|Q| = q^2$, $|L| = r$ and $|T| = t$. Then R is a 4-maximal subgroup of G , so every maximal subgroup of R is either modular or S -quasinormal in G , which is impossible by Lemma 2.10(2). This contradiction completes the proof of Claim (2).

(3) D is a Hall subgroup of G .

Suppose that this is false. Then G is not strongly supersoluble. Let P be a Sylow p -subgroup of D such that $1 < P < G_p$, where $G_p \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$.

(a) $D = P$ is a minimal normal subgroup of G .

Let R be a minimal normal subgroup of G contained in D . Then R is a q -group for some prime q . Moreover, $D/R = (G/R)^{\mathcal{U}_s}$ is a Hall subgroup of G/R by Claim (1) and [19, 2.2.8]. Suppose that $PR/R \neq 1$. Then $PR/R \in \text{Syl}_p(G/R)$. If $q \neq p$, then $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. This contradicts the fact that $P < G_p$. Hence $q = p$, so $R \leq P$ and therefore $P/R \in \text{Syl}_p(G/R)$ and we again get that $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. This contradiction shows that $PR/R = 1$, which implies that $R = P$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G contained in D . Since D is nilpotent by Claim (2), a p' -complement E of D is characteristic in D and so it is normal in G . Hence $E = 1$, which implies that $R = D = P$.

(b) $D \not\leq \Phi(G)$. Hence for some maximal subgroup M of G we have $G = D \rtimes M$ (This follows from Lemma 2.5 since G is not strongly supersoluble).

(c) If G has a minimal normal subgroup $L \neq D$, then $G_p = D \times L$. Hence $O_{p'}(G) = 1$.

Indeed, $DL/L \simeq D$ is a Hall subgroup of G/L by Claim (1). Hence $G_p L/L = RL/L$, so $G_p = D \times (L \cap G_p)$. But $D < G_p$, so $(L \cap G_p)$ is a non-trivial subgroup of L . Since G is soluble, it follows that L is a p -group and so $G_p = D \times L$. Thus $O_{p'}(G) = 1$.

(d) $\Phi(G_p) = 1$.

Suppose that $\Phi = \Phi(G_p) \neq 1$. Then, since G_p is normal in G by Claim (c), Φ is normal in G and so we can take a minimal normal subgroup L of G contained in Φ . But then $G_p = D \times L = D$ by Claim (c), a contradiction. Hence we have (d).

Final contradiction for (3). Claim (d) implies that G_p is an elementary abelian normal subgroup of G . By Maschke's theorem $G_p = N_1 \times N_2$ is the direct product of some minimal normal subgroups of G . Claim (a) implies that $N_1 < G_p$. Let $M = N_2 E$, where E is a complement to G_p in G . Then M is a maximal subgroup of G and $\pi(M) = \pi(G)$. On the other hand, every $(n-1)$ -maximal subgroup of M is either modular or S -quasinormal in M by hypothesis and Lemmas 2.2(4) and 2.3(1). Thus $M \simeq G/N_1$ is strongly supersoluble by Theorem 2.12. Similarly we get that G/N_2 is strongly supersoluble. Hence $G \simeq G/N_1 \cap N_2$ is strongly supersoluble by Lemma 2.5. This contradiction shows that $D = G^{\mathcal{U}_s}$ a Hall subgroup of G .

The proof of the theorem is complete.

4 Final remarks

1. Some preliminary results are of independent significance because they generalize some known results.

From Proposition 2.11 we get the following

Corollary 4.1 (Schmidt [1]). *If Every 2-maximal subgroup M of G is modular, then G is nearly nilpotent.*

Corollary 4.2. *If every 2-maximal subgroup of G is S -quasinormal in G , then G is nearly nilpotent.*

Corollary 4.3 (Agrawal [20]). *If every 2-maximal subgroup of G is S -quasinormal in G , then G is supersoluble.*

From Proposition 3.2 we get the following known result.

Corollary 4.4 (Schmidt [1]). *If every 3-maximal subgroup M of G is modular in G and G is not supersoluble, then either G is a group of order pq^2 for some distinct primes p and q or $G = Q \rtimes P$, where $Q = C_G(Q)$ is a quaternion group of order 8 and $|P| = 3$.*

2. In closing note that the restrictions on $|\pi(G)|$ in Theorems A and B cannot be weakened. Indeed, for Theorem A this follows from the example of the alternating group A_4 of degree 4. For Theorem B this follows from the example of the $A_4 \times C_2$, where C_2 is a group of order 2.

References

- [1] R. Schmidt, Endliche Gruppen mit vilen modularen Untergruppen, *Abhan. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, **34** (1970), 115–125.
- [2] I. Zimmermann, Submodular subgroups in finite Groups, *Math. Z.*, 1989. **202** (1989), 545–557.
- [3] V. A. Vasilyev, Finite groups with submodular Sylow subgroups, *Siberian Math. J.*, **56**(6) (2015), 1019–1027.
- [4] R. Schmidt, *Subgroup Lattices of Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1994.
- [5] S. Li, Finite non-nilpotent groups all of whose second maximal subgroups are TI -groups, *Math. Proc. Royal Irish Acad.*, **100** (2000), 65–71.
- [6] X. Guo, K. P. Shum, Cover-avoidance properties and the structure of finite groups, *J. Pure and Appl. Algebra*, **181** (2003), 297–308.
- [7] B. Li, A. N. Skiba, New characterizations of finite supersoluble groups, *Science in China Series A: Mathematics*, **50** (2008), 827–841.

- [8] V. N. Kniahina, V. S. Monakhov, On the permutability of n -maximal subgroups with Schmidt subgroups, *Trudy Inst. Mat. i Mekh. UrO RAN*, **18**(3) (2012), 125–130.
- [9] V. S. Monakhov, V. N. Kniahina, Finite groups with \mathbb{P} -subnormal subgroups, *Ricerche di Matematica*, **62**(2) (2013), 307-322
- [10] V. A. Kovaleva, A. N. Skiba, Finite soluble groups with all n -maximal subgroups \mathfrak{F} -subnormal, *J. Group Theory*, **17** (2014), 273–290.
- [11] V. A. Kovaleva, Finite groups with generalized \mathbb{P} -subnormal second maximal subgroups, *Asian-Europ. J. Math.*, **7** (2014), 1450047-1-1450047-8.
- [12] V. A. Kovaleva, X. Yi, Finite biprimary groups with all 3-maximal subgroups \mathcal{U} -subnormal, *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, **146** (2015), 47-55.
- [13] W. Guo, *Structure Theory for Canonical Classes of Finite Groups*, Springer, Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London, 2015.
- [14] B. Huppert, Normalteiler und maximale Untergruppen endlicher Gruppen, *Math. Z.*, **60** (1954) 409-434.
- [15] A. Mann, Finite groups whose n -maximal subgroups are subnormal, *Trans Amer. Math. Soc.*, **132** (1968), 395-409.
- [16] A. Ballester-Bolinches, R. Esteban-Romero, M. Asaad, *Products of Finite Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 2010.
- [17] K. Doerk, T. Hawkes, *Finite Soluble Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 1992.
- [18] L.A. Shemetkov, A.N. Skiba, *Formations of Algebraic Systems*, Nauka, Moscow, 1989.
- [19] A. Ballester-Bolinches, L. M. Ezquerro, *Classes of Finite Groups*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.
- [20] R. K. Agrawal, Generalized center and hypercenter of a finite group, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **54** (1976), 13-21.