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Abstract

For a finite set $M$ and functions $f, g : M \to M$, say that $g$ approximates $f$ to the degree $N$ if and only if $f(x) = g(x)$ for at least $N$ elements $x \in X$. In this paper, we study the minimum degree to which any function on a given finite group $G$ can be approximated by a suitable endomorphism of $G$, and also the analogous minimum approximability degree by affine functions on $G$, a certain generalization of endomorphisms. We give general bounds on these two approximability degrees and prove results concerning their asymptotic behavior as $|G| \to \infty$.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation and main results

In this paper, whenever we speak of a function on some set $M$, we mean a function $M \to M$. As a motivation for the main results of this paper, consider the following general concept:

Definition 1.1.1. Let $M_1, M_2$ be finite sets, $\mathcal{F}$ a set of functions $M_1 \to M_2$. For a function $g : M_1 \to M_2$, we denote by $\text{app}_F(g) := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\{x \in M_1 \mid f(x) = g(x)\}|$ the $\mathcal{F}$-approximability of $f$ and set $\text{app}_F(M_1, M_2) := \min_{g : M_1 \to M_2} \text{app}_F(g)$, the minimum (or worst-case) $\mathcal{F}$-approximability between $M_1$ and $M_2$. In case $M_1 = M_2 = M$, we also write $\text{app}_F(M)$ instead of $\text{app}_F(M_1, M_2)$ and call it the minimum (or worst-case) $\mathcal{F}$-approximability on $M$.
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Various authors have studied \( \text{app}_{\mathcal{F}}(f) \) for particular choices of \( \mathcal{F} \) and \( f \) when \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) are (general or particular) finite groups. For example, there is a particularly rich literature on the \( \text{Aut}(G) \)-approximability of power functions on a finite group \( G \), particularly the inversion, squaring and cubing function, see [3, Subsection 1.1] for an overview. Furthermore, the main result of [8] can be viewed as providing nontrivial upper bounds on the approximability of word maps on nonabelian finite simple groups \( S \) by constant functions (here, \( M_1 = S^d \) with \( d \) the number of variables in the word, and \( M_2 = S \)).

In this paper, we will mainly be concerned with the case when \( M_1 = M_2 = G \) for a finite group \( G \) (we will prove one general combinatorial result for functions \( M_1 \to M_2 \) though, Lemma 3.1). Our goal is to study the minimum approximability of a function on a finite group by endomorphisms and by functions of a slightly more general type, which we call affine maps:

**Definition 1.1.2.** Let \( G \) be a group, \( g \in G \), \( \varphi \) an endomorphism of \( G \). Then the function \( A_{g,\varphi} : G \to G, x \mapsto g\varphi(x) \), is called the (left-)affine map of \( G \) with respect to \( g \) and \( \varphi \). We denote the set of affine maps on \( G \) by \( \text{Aff}(G) \).

We note that the notion of an affine map on a group and the notation \( \text{Aff}(G) \) already appeared in the author’s paper [2], where \( \text{Aff}(G) \) denoted something different, namely \( \{A_{g,\alpha} \mid g \in G, \alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)\} \), the set of bijective affine maps on \( G \), which forms a subgroup of the symmetric group on \( G \). We also note the earlier paper [7], which used the terminology “affine transformation” instead of “bijective affine map”.

In order to motivate the study of the approximability of functions on finite groups by affine maps and not just endomorphisms, observe the following:

1. For many, though not all, finite groups \( G \), determining the precise value of \( \text{app}_{\text{End}(G)}(G) \) is a relatively easy problem (see, for instance, Proposition 2.7 and the remarks thereafter), whereas \( \text{app}_{\text{Aff}(G)}(G) \) is more delicate in general (due to the greater “freedom in mapping behavior” which affine maps enjoy compared to endomorphisms), thus leading to interesting problems and questions even in cases where \( \text{app}_{\text{End}(G)}(G) \) is trivial.

2. For special choices of the finite groups \( G_1, G_2 \) (mostly elementary abelian \( p \)-groups, i.e., vector spaces over the finite prime field \( \mathbb{F}_p \)), the problem of finding functions \( f : G_1 \to G_2 \) which are “as far away from being affine as possible” (with different precise definitions of this) is heavily studied in cryptography, *inter alia* due to the need of encryption procedures which resist so-called linear attacks, see [4, Introduction]. One of these measures is simply the Hamming distance of \( f \) to the set \( \text{Aff}(G_1, G_2) := \{A_{g,\varphi} : x \mapsto g\varphi(x) \mid g \in G_2, \varphi \in \text{Hom}(G_1, G_2)\} \) of affine functions \( G_1 \to G_2 \),

\[ \text{dist}_{\text{Aff}(G_1, G_2)}(f) := \min_{g \in \text{Aff}(G_1, G_2)} |\{x \in G_1 \mid f(x) \neq g(x)\}|, \]

which is complementary to our notion of approximability in the sense that \( \text{dist}_{\text{Aff}(G_1, G_2)}(f) + \text{app}_{\text{Aff}(G_1, G_2)}(f) = |G_1| \). It is of intrinsic interest to study generalizations of this cryptographic problem to larger classes of algebraic structures such as finite groups in general (see also, for instance, the paper [6]).
In the following, we will present our main results in the form of Theorem 1.1.4 below, but before, we introduce some more notation for a more concise formulation:

**Notation 1.1.3.** Let $G$ be a finite group, $f$ a function on $G$.

1. We denote by $\text{endapp}(f) := \text{app}_{\text{End}}(G)(f)$ the endomorphic approximability of $f$.
2. We denote by $\text{affapp}(f) := \text{app}_{\text{Aff}}(G)(f)$ the affine approximability of $f$.
3. We denote by $\text{endapp}(G) := \text{app}_{\text{End}}(G)(G) = \min_{f : G \to G} \text{endapp}(f)$ the minimum (or worst-case) endomorphic approximability on $G$.
4. We denote by $\text{affapp}(G) := \text{app}_{\text{Aff}}(G)(G) = \min_{f : G \to G} \text{affapp}(f)$ the minimum (or worst-case) affine approximability on $G$.

Note that $\text{endapp}(G) \leq \text{affapp}(G)$, as all endomorphisms are affine maps, and that since $\text{Aff}(G)$ contains all constant functions on $G$, we always have $\text{affapp}(G) \geq 1$, whereas there are various examples of finite groups $G$ such that $\text{endapp}(G) = 0$ (see Proposition 2.7 and the remarks thereafter).

In this paper, we will show the following bounds and asymptotic results on endapp and affapp:

**Theorem 1.1.4.** The following hold for all finite groups $G$:

1. If $G$ is nontrivial, then $0 \leq \text{endapp}(G) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\log 2} + \frac{1}{\log |G|}\right) \log^2 |G|$ and $1 \leq \text{affapp}(G) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\log 2} + \frac{2}{\log |G|}\right) \log^2 |G|$. In particular, we have $\text{endapp}(G) = o(|G|)$ as $|G| \to \infty$.

2. There is an infinite class of finite groups $H$ with $\text{endapp}(H) \geq \log_2 |H|$ and $\text{affapp}(H) \geq \log_2 |H| + 1$. In particular, we have $\limsup_{|G| \to \infty} \text{endapp}(G) = \limsup_{|G| \to \infty} \text{affapp}(G) = \infty$.

3. There is an infinite class of finite groups with both minimum endomorphic approximability 0 and minimum affine approximability 1. In particular, we have $\liminf_{|G| \to \infty} \text{endapp}(G) = 0$ and $\liminf_{|G| \to \infty} \text{affapp}(G) = 1$.

Theorem 1.1.4(3) is interesting in view of the aforementioned connections to cryptography, since we will see later (in Corollary 2.5) that in the abelian setting in which cryptographers usually work, one cannot bring the endomorphic (resp. affine) approximability of a function below 1 (resp. 2), whereas Theorem 1.1.4(2) asserts that it is possible to do so on suitably chosen (nonabelian) finite groups. Therefore, at least with respect to that particular “measure of non-affineness”, one can do a little bit better on some nonabelian groups than in the well-studied abelian setting.

Moreover, we note that the infinite class of finite groups which we will give as an example to prove Theorem 1.1.4(3) also has another interesting property, which was already noted by the author in his unpublished preprint [1]. These groups are nonabelian with commutative endomorphism monoid. Nonabelian groups with the weaker property of having an abelian automorphism group have been studied by several authors before (see [3, Introduction] for an overview), and “our” groups with commutative endomorphism monoid were first introduced and studied in [6], where it was shown that their automorphism groups are abelian.
1.2 Overview of this paper

Sections 2–4 of this paper serve to prove the three parts of Theorem 1.1.4.

In Section 2, we discuss some methods to prove lower bounds on \text{endapp}(G) and \text{affapp}(G), which will allow us to prove Theorem 1.1.4(2). As a further application, we determine the precise values of \text{endapp}(G) and \text{affapp}(G) for \(|G| \leq 7\), which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.4(1) in Section 3.

Section 3 consists mainly of the proof of Lemma 3.1, which provides some general bounds on the worst-case \(\mathcal{F}\)-approximability of functions \(M_1 \to M_2\) where \(M_1\) and \(M_2\) are sets and \(\mathcal{F}\) is a “small” family of functions \(M_1 \to M_2\). Theorem 1.1.4(1) will follow swiftly from this and the case study of groups up to order 7 from the previous section.

Section 4 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.1.4(3) by a careful examination of the groups already studied by Jonah and Konvisser in [6].

Finally, Section 5 provides some open problems and questions for further research.

1.3 Notation and terminology

The notation and terminology defined in this subsection will be used throughout the paper without further explanation; more notation and terminology will be explicitly introduced throughout the text where appropriate.

We denote by \(\mathbb{N}\) the set of natural numbers, including 0, and by \(\mathbb{N}^+\) the set of positive integers. For a function \(f\), the image of \(f\) is denoted by \(\text{im}(f)\), and the restriction of \(f\) to a set \(M\) by \(f|_M\).

The exponent of a finite group \(G\) is denoted by \(\text{exp}(G)\), its center by \(\zeta G\) and its derived (or commutator) subgroup by \(G'\). \(D_{2n}\) and \(\text{Dic}_{4n}\) respectively denote the dihedral group of order \(2n\) and the dicyclic group of order \(4n\) respectively. The symmetric and alternating groups of degree \(n\) are denoted by \(S_n\) and \(A_n\) respectively. The kernel of a group homomorphism \(\varphi\) is denoted by \(\ker(\varphi)\). For a prime \(p\), the finite field with \(p\) elements is denoted by \(\mathbb{F}_p\).

As usual, Euler’s constant is denoted by \(e\), and for a positive real number \(c \neq 1\), \(\log_c\) denotes the base \(c\) logarithm, with \(\log := \log_e\).

2 On Theorem 1.1.4(2): Lower bounds on \text{endapp}(G) and \text{affapp}(G)

The following simple lemma, whose morale is that just as in the abelian case, all affine maps on finite groups are “difference-preserving”, can be used in arguments for both upper and lower bounds on \text{affapp}(G):

Lemma 2.1. Let \(G\) be a group, \(X \subseteq G\), \(f\) a function on \(G\). The following are equivalent:

1. There exists an affine map \(A\) on \(G\) such that \(f|_X = A|_X\).
2. There exists an endomorphism \(\varphi\) of \(G\) such that for all \(x, y \in X\), we have \(\varphi(y^{-1}x) = f(y)^{-1}f(x)\).
3. There exists an endomorphism \( \varphi \) of \( G \) and \( x \in X \) such that for all \( y \in X \),
\[ \varphi(y^{-1}x) = f(y)^{-1}f(x). \]

Proof. For “(1) \( \Rightarrow \) (2)”: Write \( A = A_{g, \varphi} \). Then for all \( x, y \in X \), it follows that
\[ f(y)^{-1}f(x) = A(y)^{-1}A(x) = (g\varphi(y))^{-1}g\varphi(x) = \varphi(y)^{-1}\varphi(x) = \varphi(y^{-1}x), \]
as required.

For “(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (3)”: Trivial.

For “(3) \( \Rightarrow \) (1)”: Set \( g := f(x)\varphi(x)^{-1} \). Then for all \( y \in X \), it follows that
\[ f(y) = f(x)\varphi(y^{-1}x)^{-1} = f(x)\varphi(x)^{-1}\varphi(y) = g\varphi(y), \]
so \( A := A_{g, \varphi} \) does the job. \( \square \)

The following is also useful for reduction arguments:

Lemma 2.2. Let \( G \) be a finite group, \( f \) a function on \( G \). If \( A \) is any bijective affine map on \( G \), then \( \text{affapp}(f) = \text{affapp}(f \circ A) = \text{affapp}(A \circ f) \).

Proof. Noting that \( A^{-1} \) is a bijective affine map on \( G \) as well, one sees that it suffices to show \( \text{affapp}(f) \leq \text{affapp}(A \circ f) \) and \( \text{affapp}(f) \leq \text{affapp}(f \circ A) \). To this end, let \( X \subseteq G \) with \( |X| = \text{affapp}(f) \) and \( B \in \text{Aff}(G) \) with \( f|X| = B|X| \). Then \( (A \circ f)|X| = (A \circ B)|X| \), which proves the first inequality, and \( (f \circ A)|A^{-1}|X| = (B \circ A)|A^{-1}|X| \), which proves the second inequality. \( \square \)

From Lemma 2.1 one can immediately derive a sufficient criterion for the simultaneous validity of \( \text{endapp}(G) \geq l \) and \( \text{affapp}(G) \geq l + 1 \) for some fixed \( l \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) based on the following concepts:

Definition 2.3. Let \( G \) be a group.

1. A universal element in \( G \) is an element \( u \in G \) such that for all \( g \in G \), there exists \( \varphi = \varphi_g \in \text{End}(G) \) such that \( \varphi(u) = g \).
2. More generally, for \( l \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), a universal \( l \)-tuple in \( G \) is an \( l \)-tuple \( (u_1, \ldots, u_l) \in G^l \) such that for all \( (g_1, \ldots, g_l) \in G^l \), there exists \( \varphi = \varphi_{(g_1, \ldots, g_l)} \in \text{End}(G) \) such that \( \varphi(u_i) = g_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, l \).

Note that a universal element in a finite group \( G \) is necessarily of order \( \exp(G) \).

Proposition 2.4. Let \( G \) be a nontrivial finite group.

1. If \( G \) has a universal element, then \( \text{endapp}(G) \geq 1 \) and \( \text{affapp}(G) \geq 2 \).
2. More generally, if, for some \( l \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), \( G \) has a universal \( l \)-tuple, then \( \text{endapp}(G) \geq l \) and \( \text{affapp}(G) \geq l + 1 \).

Proof. It suffices to show point (2). Let \( (u_1, \ldots, u_l) \) be a universal \( l \)-tuple in \( G \). Then \( \text{endapp}(G) \geq l \) holds because by the definition of “universal \( l \)-tuple”, every function on \( G \) agrees with a suitable endomorphism of \( G \) on the set \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_l\} \) (and the \( u_i \) must be pairwise distinct). For the bound on \( \text{affapp}(G) \), it suffices to show that any function on \( G \) agrees with some affine map on \( G \) on the subset \( \{1, u_1^{-1}, \ldots, u_l^{-1}\} \). But for this, it is, by Lemma 2.1, sufficient to check that there is some endomorphism \( \varphi \) of \( G \) such that for \( i = 1, \ldots, l \), we have \( \varphi((u_i^{-1})^{-1} \cdot 1) = f(u_i^{-1})^{-1}f(1) \), which is clear by universality. \( \square \)
We note two interesting consequences of Proposition 2.4, the latter of which also directly implies Theorem 1.1.4(2):

**Corollary 2.5.** Let \( G \) be a nontrivial finite abelian group. Then \( \text{endapp}(G) \geq 1 \) and \( \text{affapp}(G) \geq 2 \).

**Proof.** This follows from Proposition 2.4(1), since by the structure theorem for finite abelian groups, it is clear that every such group \( G \) has a universal element (actually, by [10, 4.2.7, p. 102], any cyclic subgroup of \( G \) generated by an element of order \( \exp(G) \) always admits a direct complement in \( G \), so that any such element is universal).

**Corollary 2.6.** For \( m, r \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), \( m \geq 2 \), we have \( \text{endapp}(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^r) \geq r \) and \( \text{affapp}(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^r) \geq r + 1 \).

**Proof.** This follows from Proposition 2.4(2) by observing that the “standard” generators of \( (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^r \) form a universal \( r \)-tuple in that group.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.4(2).** This follows from Corollary 2.6 with \( m := 2 \).

The rest of this section serves either as direct preparation for determining the precise values of \( \text{endapp}(G) \) and \( \text{affapp}(G) \) for small \( G \) at the end of the section (see Proposition 2.14) or to raise some other interesting points. First, let us note the following simple fact, which shows that in many finite groups, the problem of determining the minimum endomorphic approximability is trivial:

**Proposition 2.7.** Let \( G \) be a finite group. The following are equivalent:

1. \( \text{endapp}(G) \geq 1 \).
2. \( G \) has a universal element.

**Proof.** For “(1) \( \Rightarrow \) (2)”: We show the contraposition. So assume that \( G \) has no universal element. Then we can choose, for every element \( g \in G \), an element \( f(g) \in G \) which is not an image of \( g \) under any endomorphism of \( G \). The resulting function \( f \) on \( G \) clearly has endomorphic approximability 0.

For “(2) \( \Rightarrow \) (1)”: This implication is part of Proposition 2.4(1).

Hence \( \text{endapp}(G) = 0 \) whenever \( G \) has no universal element, which holds true for example when \( G \) is any nonabelian finite simple group. The problem of determining the minimum affine approximability of a function on a finite group seems less trivial. For example, below, we will give another criterion on nontrivial finite groups \( G \) which is sufficient for \( \text{affapp}(G) \geq 2 \) (Proposition 2.9) and which holds, for example, for \( G = A_4 \), which also has no universal element (see also Example 2.11(1) below). The new criterion is based on the following concepts:

**Definition 2.8.** Let \( G \) be a nontrivial finite group.

1. We call the orbits of the natural action of \( \text{Aut}(G) \) on \( G \) the automorphism orbits of \( G \), and \( \{1_G\} \) the trivial automorphism orbit of \( G \).
2. A dominating automorphism orbit of $G$ is a nontrivial automorphism orbit $O$ of $G$ such that $|O| > \frac{1}{2}(|G| - 1)$.

3. A function $f$ on $G$ with $f(1) = 1$ is called automorphism orbit avoiding (henceforth abbreviated by a.o.a.) if and only if for all $g \in G \setminus \{1\}$, $g$ and $f(g)$ lie in different automorphism orbits of $G$.

**Proposition 2.9.** Consider the following conditions on nontrivial finite groups $G$:

1. $G$ has a dominating automorphism orbit.
2. $G$ has no a.o.a. functions which are bijective (i.e., permutations on $G$).
3. $\text{affapp}(G) \geq 2$.

Conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent, and either of them implies condition (3).

The following combinatorial lemma will be used in the proof of Proposition 2.9:

**Lemma 2.10.** For a partition $\mathcal{P}$ on a nonempty finite set $M$, call a function $f$ on $M$ $\mathcal{P}$-avoiding if and only if for all $x \in M$, $x$ and $f(x)$ lie in different partition classes from $\mathcal{P}$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. One of the elements of $\mathcal{P}$ is of size larger than $\frac{1}{2}|M|$.
2. There is no $\mathcal{P}$-avoiding permutation on $M$.

**Proof.** For “(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)”: Let $P$ denote the unique element of $\mathcal{P}$ of size larger than $\frac{1}{2}|M|$. Assume, by contradiction, that there is a $\mathcal{P}$-avoiding permutation $f$ on $M$. Then $f$ would have to map $P$ injectively into the smaller set $M \setminus P$, which is impossible.

For “(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)”: We show the contraposition of this implication, i.e., that there is a $\mathcal{P}$-avoiding permutation on $M$ if all partition classes from $\mathcal{P}$ have size at most $\frac{1}{2}|M|$, by induction on $|M|$. To this end, one first verifies directly that this holds for $|M| \leq 5$. Now assume that $|M| \geq 6$. Note that $\mathcal{P}$ must consist of at least two nonempty partition classes, and choose distinct $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $|P_1| \geq |P_2| \geq |P|$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{P_1, P_2\}$. Fix $p_1 \in P_1$ and $p_2 \in P_2$, and set $M' := M \setminus \{p_1, p_2\}$ and $\mathcal{P}' := \{P \setminus \{p_1, p_2\} \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\}$. Then $\mathcal{P}'$ is a partition of $M'$, and it still has the property that none of its members has size larger than $\frac{1}{2}|M'|$. Indeed, an element of $\mathcal{P}'$ is either obtained from $P_1$ or $P_2$ by deleting an element and thus has size at most $|P_1| - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}|M| - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(|M| - 2) = \frac{1}{2}|M'|$, or it is equal to an element of $\mathcal{P}$ distinct from $P_1$ and $P_2$, whence it can only have size at most $\frac{1}{2}|M'|$, which is less than or equal to $\frac{1}{2}|M| - 1$ by the assumption $|M| \geq 6$. Hence by the induction hypothesis, there exists a $\mathcal{P}'$-avoiding permutation $g$ on $M'$, and it is clear that $f := g \cup \{(p_1, p_2), (p_2, p_1)\}$ (less formally: the permutation on $M$ obtained by adding the transposition of $p_1$ and $p_2$ to $g$) is a $\mathcal{P}$-avoiding permutation on $M$. \hfill \Box

**Proof of Proposition 2.9.** The equivalence of (1) and (2) follows immediately from Lemma 2.10 with $M := G \setminus \{1\}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ the collection of nontrivial automorphism orbits of $G$.

For “(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3)”: Let $f$ be any function on $G$. We need to show that $f$ agrees with a suitable affine map on $G$ on some subset of $G$ of size at least 2. Since all
constant functions on $G$ are affine, this is clear if $f$ is not a permutation on $G$, so assume that $f : G \to G$ is bijective. Composing $f$ with a suitable translation on $G$, we may, by Lemma 2.2 also assume w.l.o.g. that $f(1) = 1$. But since $G$ has no a.o.a. permutations by assumption, it follows that for some $g \in G \setminus \{1\}$ and some automorphism $\alpha$ of $G$, $f(g) = \alpha(g)$. Hence $f$ agrees with $\alpha$ on $\{1, g\}$, and we are done.

Example 2.11. We now give some applications of Proposition 2.9 some of which will also be used later, and in point (4), we give an example which shows that the condition $\text{affapp}(G) \geq 2$ is not equivalent to either of conditions (1) or (2) in Proposition 2.9.

1. The alternating group $A_4$ has no universal element, whence $\text{endapp}(A_4) = 0$ by Proposition 2.7. On the other hand, $A_4$ has a dominating automorphism orbit, namely the one consisting of elements of order 3, which has size 8. Hence $\text{affapp}(A_4) \geq 2$ by Proposition 2.9.

2. In any finite dihedral group $D_{2n} = \langle r, s \mid r^n = s^2 = 1, srs^{-1} = r^{-1} \rangle$ with $n \geq 3$, the reflections, i.e., the elements of the form $sr^k$ with $k \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, form a dominating automorphism orbit, so $\text{affapp}(D_{2n}) \geq 2$ for all $n \geq 3$. Similarly, one shows that $\text{affapp}(D_{4n}) \geq 2$ for $n \geq 2$.

3. Let $p$ be an odd prime, and denote by $G_p^{(1)} := (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^2 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} = \langle x, y, t \mid x^p = y^p = [x, y] = t^p = [x, t] = 1, tyt^{-1} = xy \rangle$ the unique nonabelian group of order $p^3$ and exponent $p$. We claim that the elements of the form $x^{k_1}y^{k_2}t^l$ with $k_1, k_2 \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$ and $l \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ form an automorphism orbit of $G_p^{(1)}$, which clearly is dominating. It is easy to verify that for any fixed $k_1, k_2, l$ as above, the map $x \mapsto x, y \mapsto y, t^l \mapsto x^{k_1}y^{k_2}t^l$ extends to an automorphism of $G$, so it suffices to argue why for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$, $t$ and $t^l$ lie in the same automorphism orbit. But for this, it is sufficient to show that the automorphisms of $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^2$ which $t$ and $t^l$ induce by conjugation are conjugate. Now these automorphisms are represented by the $(2 \times 2)$-matrices

\[
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} 1 & l \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]

over $\mathbb{F}_p$, and these are conjugate because they must have the same rational canonical form (namely the Frobenius companion matrix of the polynomial $(X - 1)^2 \in \mathbb{F}_p[X]$). Hence we conclude that $\text{affapp}(G_p^{(1)}) \geq 2$ for all odd primes $p$.

4. Again, let $p$ be an odd prime and consider now $G_p^{(2)} := \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} = \langle x, t \mid x^{p^2} = t^p = 1, txt^{-1} = x^{1+p} \rangle$, the unique nonabelian group of order $p^3$ and exponent $p^2$. As all elements of $G_p^{(2)}$ outside $\langle x \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ have order $p$, $\langle x \rangle$ is characteristic in $G_p^{(2)}$, and thus, since elements in $G_p^{(2)}$ from different cosets of $\langle x \rangle$ act on $\langle x \rangle$ via conjugation by distinct (and hence, by commutativity of $\text{Aut}(\langle x \rangle)$, by non-conjugate) automorphisms, such elements cannot be in the same automorphism orbit of $G_p^{(2)}$, so that $G_p^{(2)}$ has no dominating automorphism orbit. However, it is not difficult to check that $x$ is a universal element in $G_p^{(2)}$, so that $\text{affapp}(G_p^{(2)}) \geq 2$ by Proposition 2.4(1) nonetheless. This shows that for
nontrivial finite groups $G$, having a dominating automorphism orbit is indeed only sufficient (not necessary) for $\text{affapp}(G) \geq 2$.

Points (2)–(4) of Example 1.11 together with Corollary 2.5 also imply the following:

**Proposition 2.12.** Let $p$ be a prime and $G$ a finite group of order $p^k$, $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then $\text{affapp}(G) \geq 2$.

Note, however, that not all nontrivial finite $p$-groups have $\text{affapp}$-value at least 2, as the examples for Theorem 1.1.4(3) are of order $p^k$.

We can also say something about $\text{endapp}$- and $\text{affapp}$-values of finite cyclic groups:

**Lemma 2.13.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Then the following hold:

1. $\text{endapp}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) = 1$.
2. If $n$ is a prime, then $\text{affapp}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) = 2$.
3. If $n = p^k$, $p$ a prime and $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then $\text{affapp}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) = \text{affapp}(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}) \leq p$.

**Proof.** For (1): Note that by Corollary 2.5 $\text{endapp}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \geq 1$, so it suffices to give an example of a function $f$ on $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\text{endapp}(f) \leq 1$. To this end, fix a generator $g$ of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, and consider the following function $f$ on $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$: It maps all non-generators of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ (i.e., elements that generate a proper subgroup) to $g$, and it maps each generator $x$ of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ to $x^2$ (squaring modulo $n$). Then any set $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ on which $f$ agrees with some endomorphism $\varphi$ of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, say $\varphi(t) = a \cdot t$ for a suitable fixed $a \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, cannot contain any non-generators, and it also cannot contain two distinct generators $x_1, x_2$, since that would imply $x_1^2 = f(x_1) = \varphi(x_1) = ax_1$, and thus $a = x_1$, although one can analogously show $a = x_2$ as well.

For (2): Again by Corollary 2.5 we have $\text{affapp}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \geq 2$, so it suffices to give an example of a function $f$ on $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ with $\text{affapp}(f) \leq 2$. Let $f$ be the square function of the ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. Note that any fixed affine map on $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is of the form $x \mapsto ax + b$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ fixed, so that the elements of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ on which $f$ and that affine map agree are the solutions to the quadratic equation $x^2 = ax + b$ in the ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. Since $n$ is a prime, that ring is a field, whence each such equation has at most 2 solutions in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, as required.

For (3): We give an example of a function $f$ on $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\text{affapp}(f) \leq p$. To define $f$, take as the underlying set of the group $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}$ the standard representatives $0, 1, \ldots, p^k - 1$ of the integer residue classes modulo $p^k$, and as the group operation addition modulo $p^k$. By integer division, every element $x$ of $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}$ can be uniquely written as $r(x) + q(x) \cdot p$ with $r(x) \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p - 1\}$ and $q(x) \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p^{k-1} - 1\}$. Then we define $f$ through $f(x) := r(x) + q(x)$. Let us argue why $f$ cannot agree with an affine map of $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}$ on any subset $X$ with $|X| \geq p + 1$. Indeed, such a subset $X$ contains two distinct elements $x$ and $y$ such that $r(x) = r(y)$, say w.l.o.g. $x \geq y$ in $\mathbb{Z}$. Then by Lemma 2.1 it would follow that some endomorphism $\varphi$ of $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}$ maps $x - y = p \cdot (q(x) - q(y))$ to $f(x) - f(y) = q(x) - q(y)$, which is impossible, because the order in $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}$ of $q(x) - q(y)$ is strictly larger than the order of $p \cdot (q(x) - q(y))$. \qed
We are now ready for determining the precise endapp- and affapp-values of groups of order up to 7:

**Proposition 2.14.** The precise values of endapp($G$) and affapp($G$) for finite groups $G$ with $|G| \leq 7$ are as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$G$</th>
<th>${1}$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$</th>
<th>$(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^4$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$</th>
<th>$S_3$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>endapp($G$)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affapp($G$)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proof of Proposition 2.14.** By Lemma 2.13 all the assertions on endapp($G$) and affapp($G$) in the cases where $G$ is cyclic are clear except for the one assertion affapp($\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$) = 2. To see that this holds, it suffices to give an example of a function $f$ on $G = \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ such that affapp($f$) ≤ 2. Using that $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$, we write the elements of $G$ as $(x, y)$ with $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and $y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Consider the following function $f$ on $G$, which is a kind of “component swap”: $f(x, y) := (y \pmod{2}, x)$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and $y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. We argue why $f$ cannot agree with any affine function of $G$ on any subset of size 3. Note that since the component subgroups $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ of $G$ are fully invariant, any affine map of $G$ can be written as a product (in the sense of component-wise application) of an affine map on $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and an affine map on $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, any affine map of $G$ maps pairs with the same first (resp. second) coordinate to pairs whose first (resp. second) coordinates agree as well. But by its definition, $f$ never maps distinct pairs with the same second coordinate (which are necessarily of the form $(0, x)$ and $(1, x)$ for some $x \in \{0, 1, 2\}$) to such pairs. Hence if there are any three pairwise distinct elements $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_3, y_3)$ of $G$ on which $f$ agrees with some affine function, then their second coordinates must be pairwise distinct, so that we can assume w.l.o.g. that $y_1 = 0$, $y_2 = 1$ and $y_3 = 2$. Hence it remains to show that no affine map $A = A_{y, \varphi}$ on $G$ can show the following mapping behavior for some $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \{0, 1\}$: $(x_1, 0) \mapsto (0, x_1), (x_2, 1) \mapsto (1, x_2)$ and $(x_3, 2) \mapsto (0, x_3)$. If $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\} = \{0, 1\}$, then choosing $p_1, p_2 \in \{(x_1, 0), (x_2, 1), (x_3, 2)\}$ with the same first coordinate and using that by the proof of Lemma 2.1, $\varphi(p_1 - p_2) = f(p_1) - f(p_2)$, we see that $\varphi|_{\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}}$ is trivial, and thus $A|_{\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}}$ is constant, contradicting the fact that in the images of the three pairs $(x_1, 0), (x_2, 1)$ and $(x_3, 2)$, there appear two distinct values in the second coordinates. Hence $x_1 = x_2 = x_3$ so that all three pairs must be mapped to pairs with the same first coordinate, which is not the case, the final contradiction.

We now turn to the two non-cyclic groups in the list: $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$ and $S_3 \cong D_6$.

For $G = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$, write the four elements of $G$ as $(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)$, and note that by Corollary 2.6 endapp($G$) ≥ 2 and affapp($G$) ≥ 3. It is easy to check that endapp($f$) ≤ 2 for the following function $f$ on $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$(0, 0)$</th>
<th>$(1, 0)$</th>
<th>$(0, 1)$</th>
<th>$(1, 1)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f(x)$</td>
<td>$(0, 0)$</td>
<td>$(1, 0)$</td>
<td>$(0, 1)$</td>
<td>$(0, 1)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For affapp($G$) = 3, we only need to argue that there is some non-affine function on $G$, which is clear, since $G$ has precisely $2^2 = 16$ endomorphisms, thus precisely $4 \cdot 16 = 64$ affine maps, but there are $4^4 = 256$ functions on $G$ altogether.
Finally, for $G = S_3 \cong D_6$, we note that $\text{endapp}(G) = 0$ holds by Proposition 2.7 since $G$ has no elements of order $\exp(G) = 6$ and thus no universal elements. Moreover, $\text{affapp}(G) \geq 2$ by Example 2.11(2), so it suffices to give an example of a function $f$ on $G$ such that $\text{affapp}(f) \leq 2$. Since $G = D_6 = \langle r, s \mid r^3 = s^2 = 1, srs^{-1} = r^{-1} \rangle$, we can write the elements of $G$ in normal form as $1, r, r^2, s, sr, sr^2$. We define $f$ via the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$f(x)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$r^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>$sr$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$sr^2$</td>
<td>$r^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let $X \subseteq G$ with $|X| = 3$. We show by contradiction that $f$ cannot agree with any affine map $A = A_{g, \varphi}$ of $G$ on $X$. First, consider the case when $X$ consists only of rotations, i.e., $X = \{1, r, r^2\}$. Then if $f|_X = A|_X$, we would in particular have $A(1) = 1$ and thus that $A = \varphi$ is an endomorphism of $G$, but then the mapping behavior of $A$ on $\{r, r^2\}$ is contradictory. Next, consider the case when $X$ contains both a rotation $r^k$ and a reflection $sr^l$ for suitable $k, l \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Then by the proof of Lemma 2.1 $\varphi(sr^k r^l) = \varphi(r^{-k} sr^l) = f(r^k)^{-1} f(sr^l) \in \langle r \rangle$, which is only possible if $\varphi$ is the trivial endomorphism of $G$ so that $A$ is constant. But by the definition of $f$, $A$ certainly takes at least two distinct values on the three elements of $X$, another contradiction. The only case left is when $X$ only consists of reflections, i.e., $X = \{s, sr, sr^2\}$. Denoting by $\mu_s$ the left translation by $s$ on $G$, we get in this case that $A \circ \mu_s$ is an affine map of $G$ showing the following mapping behavior: $1 \mapsto 1, r \mapsto r^2, r^2 \mapsto r^2$. From this, we can derive a contradiction like we did in the case $X = \{1, r, r^2\}$.

\[\square\]

3 On Theorem 1.1.4(1): Upper bounds on $\text{endapp}(G)$ and $\text{affapp}(G)$

Recall the general approximability notion $\text{app}_F(M_1, M_2)$ from Definition 1.1.1. We will now show the following general combinatorial lemma:

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be finite sets of cardinality at least 2, $f : N \to (0, \infty)$ and $F$ a set of functions $M_1 \to M_2$.

1. If $F$ contains all constant functions $M_1 \to M_2$, then $\text{app}_F(M_1, M_2) \geq \max\{1, \frac{|M_1|}{|M_2|}\}$.
2. If $|F| \leq |M_2|^{|F|(|M_1|)}$, then

\[
\text{app}_F(M_1, M_2) \leq \max\{e^2 \cdot \frac{|M_1|}{|M_2|}, f(|M_1|) \log |M_2| + \log |M_1|\}.
\]

**Proof.** For (1): Each function $g : M_1 \to M_2$ can be approximated at each single argument $x \in M_1$ by the constant $g(x)$ function $M_1 \to M_2$, so $\text{app}_F(M_1, M_2) \geq 1$. Similarly, one sees that $\text{app}_F(M_1, M_2) \geq \frac{|M_1|}{|M_2|}$ as at least one of the fibers of $g$ must be of size at least $\frac{|M_1|}{|M_2|}$.
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For (2): Consider the Hamming metric dist on the set \( M_{M_1}^M \) of all functions \( M_1 \to M_2 \). For \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( G \subseteq M_{M_1}^M \), denote by \( N_k(G) := \{ h \in M_{M_1}^M \mid \exists g \in G : \text{dist}(g, h) \leq k \} \) the \( k \)-neighborhood of \( G \) in \( M_{M_1}^M \) with respect to dist. For \( g \in M_{M_1}^M \), we also write \( N_k(g) \) instead of \( N_k(\{g\}) \) for the \( k \)-ball around \( g \), and we denote by \( C_k(g) := \{ h \in M_{M_1}^M \mid \text{dist}(g, h) = k \} \) the \( k \)-circle around \( g \). \( |N_k(g)| \) and \( |C_k(g)| \) do not depend on \( g \); indeed, \( |C_k(g)| = (|M_1|^k) \cdot (|M_2| - 1)^k \), and \( |N_k(g)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k} |C_i(g)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \binom{|M_1|}{i} \cdot (|M_2| - 1)^i \). Henceforth, we will denote by \( \nu_k \) resp. \( \gamma_k \) the size of the \( k \)-ball resp. \( k \)-circle around any function \( M_1 \to M_2 \).

The proof is based on the following observation: For each \( k \in \{0, \ldots, |M_1| - 1\} \), \( \text{app}_F(M_1, M_2) \leq |M_1| - (k + 1) \) is equivalent to the inclusion \( N_k(F) \subseteq M_{M_1}^M \) being proper. We thus want to show \( |N_k(F)| < |M_{M_1}^M| = |M_2|^{|M_1|} \) for as large \( k \) as possible. Now

\[
|N_k(F)| = |\bigcup_{g \in F} N_k(g)| \leq |F| \cdot \nu_k \leq |M_2|^{|M_1|} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{k} \gamma_i \leq |M_2|^{|M_1|} \cdot |M_1| \max_{i=0, \ldots, k} \gamma_i,
\]

and so, setting \( L := \log_{|M_2|}(|M_1|) \), for \( |N_k(F)| < |M_{M_1}^M| \) to hold, it is sufficient to have \( \gamma_i = \binom{|M_1|}{i} \cdot (|M_2| - 1)^i \leq |M_2|^{|M_1| - f(|M_1|) - L} \) for \( i = 0, \ldots, k \). We make the ansatz \( i = |M_1| - l \) and transform the substituted inequality

\[
\left( \frac{|M_1|}{|M_1| - l} \right) \cdot (|M_2| - 1)^{|M_1| - l} < |M_2|^{|M_1| - f(|M_1|) - L}
\]

(1)

to obtain a (preferably small) lower bound on \( l \), which is also an upper bound on \( \text{app}_F(M_1, M_2) \). Using that

\[
\left( \frac{|M_1|}{|M_1| - l} \right) = \frac{|M_1|^l}{l!} = \frac{|M_2|^{L-l}}{l!}
\]

we see that for Formula (1) to hold, it is sufficient to have

\[
|M_2|^{|M_1| + l(L-1) + L} < l!
\]

(2)

Now \( l! > (l/e)^l \) (see, for instance, [1]), so Formula (2) is implied by

\[
|M_2|^{|M_1| + l(L-1) + L} \leq \left( \frac{l}{e} \right)^l,
\]

which by taking logarithms on both sides and bringing all summands involving \( l \) as a factor on one side is equivalent to

\[
(f(|M_1|) + L) \cdot \log |M_2| \leq l \cdot (\log l - 1 - (L - 1) \log |M_2|).
\]

Finally, we note that for Formula (3) to hold, it is sufficient to have \( l \geq (f(|M_1|) + L) \cdot \log |M_2| \) and \( \log l - 1 - (L - 1) \log |M_2| \geq 1 \), i.e.,

\[
l \geq \max\{ (f(|M_1|) + L) \cdot \log |M_2|, e^2 \cdot |M_2|^{L-1} \} = \max\{ (f(|M_1|) + L) \cdot \log |M_2|, e^2 \cdot |M_1| \}.
\]

This concludes the proof. \( \square \)
Proof of Theorem 1.1.4(1). For $|G| = 2, \ldots , 7$, the validity of the asserted inequalities can be checked case by case using Proposition 2.4 so we may assume that $|G| \geq 8$. Note that since endomorphisms of $G$ are determined by their values on any generating subset of $G$ and the size of a minimal (with respect to inclusion) generating subset of $G$ is always bounded from above by $\log_2 |G|$ due to Lagrange’s theorem, we have $|\text{End}(G)| \leq |G|^{|\log_2 |G|}$ and $|\text{Aff}(G)| = |G| \cdot |\text{End}(G)| \leq |G|^{1 + \log_2 |G|}$.

We can therefore apply Lemma 3.1(2) with $M_1 := M_2 := G$ and $f : x \mapsto \log_2 x$ (resp. $f : x \mapsto 1 + \log_2 x$) to conclude that

$$\text{endapp}(G) \leq \max\{e^2, \log_2 |G| \log |G| + \log |G|\} = \max\{e^2, (\frac{1}{\log 2} + \frac{1}{\log |G|}) \log^2 |G|\}$$

resp.

$$\text{affapp}(G) \leq \max\{e^2, (1 + \log_2 |G|) \log |G| + \log |G|\} = \max\{e^2, (\frac{1}{\log 2} + \frac{2}{\log |G|}) \log^2 |G|\}.$$

As it is easily checked that for all real numbers $x \geq 8$, $(\frac{1}{\log 2} + \frac{1}{2}) \log^2 x \geq e^2$, the asserted upper bounds on $\text{endapp}(G)$ and $\text{affapp}(G)$ follow from the just derived inequalities.

4 On Theorem 1.1.4(3): Finite groups $G$ minimizing $\text{endapp}(G)$ and $\text{affapp}(G)$

The following finite groups are the ones studied by Jonah and Konvisser in [6], as mentioned in the Introduction:

Definition 4.1. Let $p$ be a prime, $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ an element of the set $\{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), \ldots , (p-1, 1)\}$ of representatives of 1-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_p^2$. The JK-group $\text{JK}_{p, \lambda}$ is defined as the $p$-group of nilpotency class 2 generated by 4 elements $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2$ subject to the following additional relations:

$$a_1^p = [a_1, b_1], a_2^p = [a_1, b_1^{\lambda_1} b_2^{\lambda_2}], b_1^p = [a_2, b_1 b_2], b_2^p = [a_2, b_2], [a_1, a_2] = [b_1, b_2] = 1.$$

We now collect some basic facts on the JK$_{p, \lambda}$ which Jonah and Konvisser already used in their proof that $\text{Aut}(\text{JK}_{p, \lambda})$ is abelian. It is elementary to check that every element of JK$_{p, \lambda}$ has a unique normal form representation as

$$a_1^{k_1} a_2^{k_2} b_1^{l_1} b_2^{l_2} [a_1, b_1]^{r_1} [a_1, b_2]^{r_2} [a_2, b_1]^{r_3} [a_2, b_2]^{r_4}$$

with $k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2, r_1, \ldots , r_4 \in \{0, \ldots , p-1\}$, so that JK$_{p, \lambda}$ is a special $p$-group of order $p^8$ with $\zeta \text{JK}_{p, \lambda} = \text{JK}_{p, \lambda}^o$ elementary abelian of order $p^4$ with $\mathbb{F}_p$-basis $[a_1, b_1], [a_1, b_2], [a_2, b_1], [a_2, b_2]$. The central quotient of JK$_{p, \lambda}$ is elementary abelian of order $p^4$ too, with $\mathbb{F}_p$-basis the images of $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2$ under the canonical projection.
Alexander Bors

Worst-case approximability

Jonah and Konvisser showed that all automorphisms of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ are central, i.e., of the form $g \mapsto (\text{id} + \varphi)(g) := g\varphi(g)$ for some fixed homomorphism $\varphi : \text{JK}_{p,\lambda} \to \zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ (and conversely, all such maps on $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ actually are automorphisms, so that the automorphisms of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ are completely understood), which immediately implies that any two automorphisms of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ commute, since $\text{im}(\varphi) \subseteq \zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda} = \text{JK}'_{p,\lambda} \leq \ker(\varphi)$ for every homomorphism $\varphi : \text{JK}_{p,\lambda} \to \zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$, whence the composition of any two such homomorphisms is the trivial endomorphism of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$.

The author’s approach in [1] to show that for “most” of the $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$, even any two endomorphisms of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ commute, is analogous to the one of Jonah and Konvisser, i.e., it essentially consists of gaining a complete understanding of all endomorphisms of those $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ in the form of the following key lemma:

**Lemma 4.2.** Let $p$ be an odd prime, $\lambda_1 \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$, $\lambda_2 := 1$ and $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. Then every endomorphism of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ which is not an automorphism is a homomorphism $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda} \to \zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$.

In other words, every endomorphism of such a $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ is of one of the two forms $\varphi$ or $\text{id} + \varphi$ for a homomorphism $\varphi : \text{JK}_{p,\lambda} \to \zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$, which implies the commutativity of $\text{End}(\text{JK}_{p,\lambda})$ in a simple case distinction. It is also this complete understanding of the endomorphisms of “most” $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ which will allow us to prove that both $\text{endapp}(\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}) = 0$ and $\text{affapp}(\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}) = 1$ (the latter via Lemma 4.2; for the reader’s convenience, we now recall the proof of Lemma 4.2 as in [1].

**Proof of Lemma 4.2.** Since $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ is nilpotent of class 2, $p$ is odd and $\text{JK}'_{p,\lambda}$ has exponent $p$, it follows that $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ satisfies the identity $(xy)^p = x^py^p$ (see also [10, 5.3.5, p. 141]). Using this, the defining relations and that $\lambda_2 = 1$ by assumption, it follows that

\[
(a_1^{k_1}a_2^{k_2}b_1^{l_1}b_2^{l_2}[a_1, b_1]^{r_1}[a_2, b_1]^{r_2}[a_2, b_2]^{r_3})^p = [a_1, b_1]^{\lambda_1k_2l_1}[a_2, b_1]^{r_1}[a_1, b_2]^{k_2l_2}.
\]

But the (linear) map

\[
(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^4 \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^4, (k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2) \rightarrow (k_1 + \lambda_1k_2, k_2, l_1, l_1 + l_2),
\]

is a bijection. Hence by Equation (4), it follows that the elements of order a divisor of $p$ in $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ are just those from $\text{JK}'_{p,\lambda} = \zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ and that each such element has precisely one $p$-th root in $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ of the form $a_1^{k_1}a_2^{k_2}b_1^{l_1}b_2^{l_2}$.

Now let $\varphi$ be an endomorphism of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ with nontrivial kernel. Fix $x \in \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ of order $p$ in $\ker(\varphi)$, and let $y = a_1^{s_1}a_2^{s_2}b_1^{t_1}b_2^{t_2}, (s_1, s_2, t_1, t_2) \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}^4 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0, 0)\}$, be a $p$-th root of $x$ in $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$. Then $\varphi$ maps $y$ to an element of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ of order a divisor of $p$, i.e., to an element of $\zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$.

Note that for showing $\text{im}(\varphi) \subseteq \zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$, by the defining relations of $\text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$, it suffices to show that at least one of the three elements $a_1, a_2, b_1$ gets mapped into $\zeta \text{JK}_{p,\lambda}$ by $\varphi$. Moreover, for any element $g \in \text{JK}_{\lambda,p}$, if $\varphi(g) \in \zeta \text{JK}_{\lambda,p}$, then all commutators of the form $[h, g]$ with $h \in \text{JK}_{\lambda,p}$ are in $\ker(\varphi)$.
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We now agree on the following notational conventions: \((k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2) \mapsto \zeta\) is an abbreviation for \(\varphi(a_1, b_2) \in \zeta_{JK_{p, \lambda}}\), and \((K_1, K_2, L_1, L_2) \mapsto 1\) abbreviates \(\{a_1, b_1\} \subseteq K_1, a_2 \in K_2, b_1 L_1, b_2 L_2 \in \ker(\varphi)\). Then the following implications hold: Firstly, by “taking brackets” with the generators \(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2,\)

\[
(k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2) \mapsto \zeta \Rightarrow (l_1, l_2, 0, 0) \mapsto 1, (0, 0, l_1, l_2) \mapsto 1, (k_1, 0, k_2, 0) \mapsto 1 \text{ and } (0, k_1, 0, k_2) \mapsto 1.
\]

(5)

Secondly, using Formula (4), the observation that an element is mapped into the center if and only if its \(p\)-th power is in the kernel of \(\varphi\) translates as

\[
(k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2) \mapsto \zeta \iff (k_1 + \lambda_1 k_2, k_2, l_1 + l_2) \mapsto 1,
\]

which is equivalent to

\[
(K_1, K_2, L_1, L_2) \mapsto 1 \iff (K_1 - \lambda_1 K_2, K_2, L_1, L_2 - L_1) \mapsto \zeta.
\]

(6)

Our assumption that \(\varphi(y) \in \zeta_{JK_{p, \lambda}}\) translates to \((s_1, s_2, t_1, t_2) \mapsto \zeta\). We now make a case distinction according to the values of \(s_1, s_2, t_1, t_2\). First, assume that \(t_1 \neq 0\). By Formula (5), we have \((0, 0, t_1, t_2) \mapsto 1\), and by Formula (6), this implies \((0, 0, t_1, t_2 - t_1) \mapsto \zeta\). Applying Formula (5), we deduce from this that \((0, 0, t_1, t_2 - t_1) \mapsto 1\). Iteration of this argumentation yields \((0, 0, t_1, t_2 - n \cdot t_1) \mapsto 1\) for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), i.e., \((0, 0, t_1, t) \mapsto 1\) for all \(t \in \{0, \ldots, p - 1\}\). In particular, \((0, 0, 1, 0) \mapsto 1\), which by \(t_1 \neq 0\) implies \((0, 0, 1, 0) \mapsto 1\), and thus \((0, 0, 1, -1) \mapsto \zeta\) by Formula (6). Spelled out, this means \(\varphi(b_1 b_2^{-1}) \in \zeta_{JK_{p, \lambda}}\). But also, by an appropriate subtraction among the \((0, 0, t_1, t - n \cdot t_2) \mapsto 1\), we derive \((0, 0, 0, 1) \mapsto 1\), which by Formula (6) yields \((0, 0, 0, 1) \mapsto \zeta\), or explicitly, \(\varphi(b_2) \in \zeta_{JK_{p, \lambda}}\). In combination with the already derived \(\varphi(b_1 b_2^{-1}) \in \zeta_{JK_{p, \lambda}}\), this yields \(\varphi(b_1) \in \zeta_{JK_{p, \lambda}}\), so that we are done in this case.

Now assume \(t_1 = 0\). The subcase \(s_2 \neq 0\) reduces to the first case, since Formula (5) yields \((s_1, 0, s_2, 0) \mapsto 1\), which in turn gives \((s_1, 0, s_2, -s_2) \mapsto \zeta\) by Formula (6). Hence we can assume that \(t_1 = s_2 = 0\). But then another successive application of Formulas (5) and (6) yields \((s_1, 0, 0, 0) \mapsto \zeta\), which in case \(s_1 \neq 0\) implies \((1, 0, 0, 0) \mapsto \zeta\), i.e., the sufficient \(\varphi(a_1) \in \zeta_{JK_{p, \lambda}}\). Hence we can assume \(s_1 = s_2 = t_1 = 0\) and \(t_2 \neq 0\). In this case, \((t_1, t_2, 0) \mapsto 1\), valid by Formula (5), simplifies to \((0, t_2, 0) \mapsto 1\), which by Formula (6) yields \((-\lambda_2 t_2, 0, 0) \mapsto \zeta\) and hence reduces the situation to the case \(t_1 = 0, s_2 \neq 0\) dealt with before.

By Proposition 4.1, it is now clear that the \(JK_{p, \lambda}\) with \(p > 2\) and \(\lambda \neq (1, 0)\) satisfy \(\text{endapp}(JK_{p, \lambda}) = 0\). Indeed, a hypothetical universal element \(u \in JK_{p, \lambda}\) would need to be of order \(\exp(JK_{p, \lambda}) = p^2\), so that \(u \in JK_{p, \lambda} \setminus \zeta JK_{p, \lambda}\), and thus can only be mapped to elements from \(\zeta JK_{p, \lambda} \cup u \zeta JK_{p, \lambda} \subsetneq JK_{p, \lambda}\) by Lemma 4.2 and Jonah and Konvisser’s results. It remains to show \(\text{affapp}(JK_{p, \lambda}) = 1\), which is done by the proof of the following proposition:

**Proposition 4.3.** Let \(p\) be an odd prime, \(\lambda_1 \in \{0, \ldots, p - 1\}\), \(\lambda_2 := 1\), \(\lambda := (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)\), and \(\sigma\) any fixed-point free automorphism of \((\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^4 = \mathbb{F}_p^4\) (for example, \(\sigma\) could be chosen as a Singer cycle). Denote, for \(i = 1, 2, 3, 4\), by \(\pi_i : (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}\), the
projection onto the $i$-th coordinate. Then the following function $f$ on $\JK_{p,\lambda}$, defined on elements in normal form, satisfies $\affapp(f) = 1$:

$$f(a_1^{k_1}a_2^{k_2}b_1^{l_1}b_2^{l_2}[a_1,b_1]^{r_1}[a_2,b_2]^{r_2}[a_2,b_1]^{r_3}[a_2,b_2]^{r_4}) :=$$

$$a_1^{\pi_1(\sigma(k_1,k_2, l_1, l_2))} a_2^{\pi_2(\sigma(k_1,k_2, l_1, l_2))} b_1^{\pi_3(\sigma(k_1,k_2, l_1, l_2))} b_2^{\pi_4(\sigma(k_1,k_2, l_1, l_2))}.$$

In other words, if we identify the elements of $\JK_{p,\lambda}$ via their normal forms with octuples $(k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2, r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4) \in \mathbb{F}_p^8$, then $f$ consists in applying $\sigma$ to both $(k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2)$ and $(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4)$ and concatenating the resulting images.

**Proof of Proposition 4.3.** By Lemma 2.1 we need to show that there do not exist two distinct elements $x, y \in \JK_{p,\lambda}$ such that some endomorphism of $\JK_{p,\lambda}$ maps $y^{-1}x$ to $f(y)^{-1}f(x)$. We do so in a case distinction:

1. Case: $x, y$ lie in a common coset of $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$. Then by definition of $f$ and choice of $\sigma$, $y^{-1}x$ and $f(y)^{-1}f(x)$ are distinct nontrivial elements of $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$. By Jonah and Konvisser’s results, any automorphism of $\JK_{p,\lambda}$ of the form $\id + \varphi$ with $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda} \leq \ker(\varphi)$, in particular fixes $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$ element-wise, and by Lemma 4.2 any endomorphism of $\JK_{p,\lambda}$ which is not an automorphism maps all elements of $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$ to 1. Hence no endomorphism of $\JK_{p,\lambda}$ can map $y^{-1}x$ to $f(y)^{-1}f(x)$ in this case, as required.

2. Case: $x, y$ lie in different cosets of $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$. Then by definition of $f$ and choice of $\sigma$, $y^{-1}x$ and $f(y)^{-1}f(x)$ lie in different cosets of $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$, both distinct from $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$ itself. Jonah and Konvisser’s result that all automorphisms of $\JK_{p,\lambda}$ are central just means that they leave all cosets of $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$ invariant, and by Lemma 4.2 all other endomorphisms have their image contained in $\zeta \JK_{p,\lambda}$, so no endomorphism mapping $y^{-1}x$ to $f(y)^{-1}f(x)$ can exist in this case either. 

\[\square\]

## 5 Concluding remarks

We conclude this paper with some open questions and problems for further research.

Note that while we gained a deeper understanding of the asymptotic behavior of $\endapp(G)$ and $\affapp(G)$ as $|G| \to \infty$ in this paper, determining the precise values of the two functions on a given finite group remains a challenging problem (just consider the effort we had to put into it for small groups such as $S_3$ or $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ in the proof of Proposition 2.14). Nonetheless, it would be nice to know these precise values at least on a few “basic” classes of groups. For example, consider the following question, which is, to the author’s knowledge, open in this generality:

**Question 5.1.** Is $\affapp(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) = 2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$?
By Lemma 2.13(2,3), we do know that $\text{affapp}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) = 2$ when $n$ is prime or a power of 2, and it also holds for $n = 6$ by Proposition 2.14.

In this context, it would also be nice to extend our list of $\text{endapp}(G)$ and $\text{affapp}(G)$ for “small” $G$ from Proposition 2.14 further, which might also lead to more interesting conjectures about their behavior on certain classes of finite groups:

**Problem 5.2.** Determine the precise values of $\text{endapp}(G)$ and $\text{affapp}(G)$ for all finite groups $G$ of order up to $N$, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ as large as possible.

Finally, it would be interesting to determine provably asymptotically best possible upper bounds on $\text{endapp}(G)$ and $\text{affapp}(G)$ in general. In this context, we note the following: If a finite group $G$ has a universal $k$-tuple, then $|G|^\log_2 |G| \geq |\text{End}(G)| \geq |G|^k$, so that the lower bounds on $\text{endapp}(G)$ and $\text{affapp}(G)$ which we can prove with our current methods from Section 2 are at best logarithmic in $|G|$. This leads to the question whether we hit this boundary for a good reason:

**Question 5.3.** Is $\text{endapp}(G) \leq \log_2 |G|$ and $\text{affapp}(G) \leq 1 + \log_2 |G|$ for all non-trivial finite groups $G$? If not, is it at least the case that $\text{affapp}(G) = \mathcal{O}(\log |G|)$ as $|G| \to \infty$ for finite groups $G$?

At least, we do know by Theorem 1.1.4(1) that $\text{affapp}(G) = \mathcal{O}(\log^2 |G|)$ as $|G| \to \infty$.
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