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Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the difference between weak second maximal subgroups and second maximal subgroups. A sufficient and necessary condition is also given to describe such class of groups whose weak second maximal subgroups coincide with its second maximal subgroups (called WSM-groups) under the solvable case. As an application, we show that every non-vanishing element of a solvable WSM-group lies in its Fitting subgroup.
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1 Introduction

All groups considered in paper are finite.

Recall that an element $x$ of a group $G$ is said to be the non-vanishing element of $G$ if $\chi(x) \neq 0$ for all $\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)$, where $\text{Irr}(G)$ is the set of all irreducible complex character of $G$. It is clear that every central element of a group is non-vanishing. However, as the authors point out in [6], not only may a non-vanishing element of a group be noncentral, it can even fail to lie in an abelian normal subgroup of the group. For all that, I. Issacs, G. Navarro and T. Wolf prove that every non-vanishing element of odd order in a solvable group must always lie in a nilpotent normal subgroup of the group (see Theorem D in [6]). They also conjecture that every non-vanishing
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element of a solvable group $G$ is contained in $F(G)$, the Fitting subgroup of $G$. In this paper we find a sub-class of the class of solvable groups, which is called solvable WSM-groups. We can prove that:

**Theorem A.** Let $G$ be a solvable WSM-group and $x$ is a non-vanishing element of $G$. Then $x \in F(G)$.

Now we introduce WSM-groups, which also has its independent meaning since WSM-groups can be regard as a generalization of supersolvable groups and the class of all solvable WSM-groups is a saturated formation. Let $H$ be a proper subgroup of a group $G$. We use $\text{Max}(G, H)$ to denote the set of all maximal subgroups of $G$ containing $H$. A proper subgroup $H$ of $G$ is called a second maximal subgroup of $G$ if $H$ is a maximal subgroup of every member of $\text{Max}(G, H)$, and we say $H$ is a weak second maximal subgroup of $G$ if $H$ is a maximal subgroup of some member of $\text{Max}(G, H)$. (See equivalent definitions in [2])

It is clear that a second maximal subgroup must be a weak second maximal subgroup. However, the converse is not true. For instance, $H = \langle (12) \rangle$ is a weak second maximal subgroup of $G = S_4$ but it is not a second maximal subgroup of $G$. It is natural to ask what is happen for a group $G$ if every weak second maximal subgroup of $G$ is a second maximal subgroup of $G$?

For this purpose, we should investigate the difference between weak second maximal subgroups and second maximal subgroups.

**Theorem B.** Let $G$ be a solvable group and $H$ be a weak second maximal subgroup of $G$. Then there exists at most one member $X$ of $\text{Max}(G, H)$ such that $H$ is not maximal in $X$.

Theorem B does not hold for the non-solvable case and the counterexample will be shown in Section 2. For convenience, we say a group is a WSM-group if its every weak second maximal subgroup must be a second maximal subgroup. Our next result give a equivalent series condition for solvable WSM-groups so that we may use it to prove Theorem A. Our original motivation is the problem on chief factors of WSM-groups proposed in [7, Problem 19.54].

In order to state our theorem, we make the following non-standard definition about modules. Let $G$ be a group and $V$ be a $G$-module. We call an irreducible $G$-module $V$ strongly irreducible if $G = 1$ or $V$ is an irreducible $M$-module for every maximal subgroup $M$ of $G$. A chief factor $H/K$ of $G$ is called non-Frattini if $H/K \not\subseteq \Phi(G/K)$.

**Theorem C.** Let $G$ be a solvable group. Then the following statements is equivalent:
(a) \(G\) is a WSM-group;
(b) Every non-Frattini chief factor of \(G\), as a \(G\)-module, is strongly irreducible.

2 The proof of Theorem B

The following lemma is for the general case.

**Lemma 1.** Let \(G\) be a group and \(H\) be a subgroup of \(G\). If there exist \(M, X \in \text{Max}(G, H)\) such that \(H\) is maximal in \(M\) but not maximal in \(X\), then \(H_G = M_G\).

**Proof.** It is clear that we may assume \(H_G = 1\). If \(M_G \neq 1\), then we may take a minimal normal subgroup \(N\) of \(G\) such that \(N \leq M\). Since \(H_G = 1\), we see \(N \not\leq H\) and therefore \(NH = M\) by the maximality of \(H\) in \(M\). Thus \(H \leq H(X \cap N) = X \cap M < M\). The maximality of \(H\) in \(M\) implies \(H = X \cap M\) and so \(X \cap N \leq H\). Thus \(N \not\leq X\) and \(G = NX\). Consider the natural group isomorphism \(\varphi\) from \(NX/N\) to \(X/X \cap N\) defined by \(\varphi(xN) = x(X \cap N)\) with \(x \in X\). Noticing that \(HN/N = M/N\) is maximal in \(G/N = X/N\), we see \(H/X \cap N = H(X \cap N)/X \cap N = \varphi(HN/N)\) is maximal in \(\varphi(XN/N) = X/X \cap N\). It follows that \(H\) is maximal in \(X\), a contradiction. Thus \(M_G = 1\) and the lemma is true. \(\square\)

**Proof of Theorem B**. It is clear that we may assume \(H_G = 1\) and that \(H\) is maximal in \(M\) with \(M \in \text{Max}(G, H)\). If there are \(X_1, X_2\) in \(\text{Max}(G, H)\) such that \(H\) is not maximal in \(X_i\) for \(i = 1, 2\). Our aim is to prove that \(X_1 = X_2\). Since \(H \leq M \cap X_i < M\) for \(i = 1, 2\), we see \(H = M \cap X_i\) by the maximality of \(H\).

It follows from Lemma 1 that \(M_G = 1\) and \(G\) is a solvable primitive group. By [1, Theorem A.15.2(1)], there exists an unique minimal normal subgroup \(S\) of \(G\) such that \(G = SM\) and \(S \cap M = 1\). If \(S \not\leq X_1\), then \(G = X_1S\) and \(X_1 \cap S = 1\) since \(X_1\) is an abelian minimal normal subgroup of \(G\). Consider natural isomorphisms between \(M\) and \(MS/S\) and between \(X_1S/S\) and \(X_1\). Noticing that \(HS/S\) is maximal in \(MS/S = G/S = X_1S/S\), we see \(H\) is maximal in \(X_1\), in contradiction to the choice of \(X_1\). Thus we may assume that \(S \leq X_i\) for \(i = 1, 2\), and therefore \(X_i = X_i \cap SM = S(X_i \cap M) = SH\), which implies that \(X_1 = SH = X_2\), as desired. \(\square\)

**Remark 2.** Theorem B does not hold if we remove the hypothesis that \(G\) is solvable. In fact, let \(A = A_p, B = A_{p-1}\), the alternating groups of degree \(p\) and \(p - 1\), where \(p\) is a prime greater than 5. Here \(B\) can be viewed as
a maximal subgroup of $A$. Now set $G = A \times A$. Then $X_1 = A \times B$ and $X_2 = B \times A$ are maximal subgroups of $G$. Also set the diagonal groups

$$M = \{(x, x) | x \in A\} \quad \text{and} \quad H = \{(x, x) | x \in B\}.$$ 

Since $A, B$ are non-abelian simple groups, it follows from Theorem [4, Theorem 1.9.14] that $M$ is maximal in $G$ and that $H$ is maximal in $B \times B = X_1 \cap X_2 < X_i$. It is easy to see that $X_i \in \text{Max}(G, H)$ and $H$ is not maximal in $X_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Also $H$ is maximal in $M$ since $|M : H| = |A : B| = p$. Thus $H$ is a weak second maximal subgroup of $G$ but not a second maximal subgroup of $G$.

3 The proof of Theorem C

Recall that an irreducible $G$-module $V$ is strongly irreducible if $G = 1$ or $V$ is also an irreducible $M$-module for every maximal subgroup $M$ of $G$. It is clear that $V$ is an irreducible (reducible) $G$-module if and only if $V$ is an irreducible (reducible) $G/N$-module whenever $N$ is a normal subgroup of $G$ contained in $C_G(V)$. Now we begin with the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.** Let $G$ be a group and $V$ be a $G$-module. Suppose that $N \triangleleft G$ and $N \leq C_G(V)$. Then $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G$-module if and only if $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G/N$-module.

**Proof.** If $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G$-module, then it is clear that $V$ is an irreducible $G/N$-module. Now we may assume that $G/N \neq 1$ and so $G \neq 1$. If $M/N$ is a maximal subgroup of $G/N$, then $M$ is maximal in $G$ and therefore $V$ is an irreducible $M$-module. It follows immediately that $V$, as $M/N$-module, is irreducible. Hence $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G/N$-module.

Conversely, if $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G/N$-module, then it is clear that $V$ is an irreducible $G$-module. Now we may assume that $G \neq 1$ and $M$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$. Then $MN = M$ or $MN = G$ by the maximality of $M$, which implies that $MN/N = M/N$ is maximal in $G/N$ or $MN/N = G/N$. Thus $V$ is an irreducible $MN/N$-module and immediately $V$ is an irreducible $M$-module. Hence $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G$-module. \qed

**Proof of Theorem C.** If $G$ is a WSM-group and $N$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$, then it is clear that $G/N$ is also a WSM-group. By induction, $\overline{G} = G/N$ satisfies Statement (b). Then for any chief factor series of $\overline{G}$

$$1 = \overline{G}_1 < \overline{G}_2 < \ldots < \overline{G}_n = \overline{G},$$
\( \overline{G}_i/\overline{G}_{i-1} \) is a strongly irreducible \( \overline{G} \)-module if \( \overline{G}_i/\overline{G}_{i-1} \) is a non-Frattini chief factor, where \( i \geq 2 \). Write \( G_i/N = \overline{G}_i \). Then the following series

\[
1 < N = G_1 < G_2 < \ldots < G_n = G \quad (*)
\]
is a chief factor series of \( G \). By Jordan-Höld Theorem, it suffices to prove that every non-Frattini chief factor in series (*) as \( G \)-module is strongly irreducible. In fact, for any non-Frattini chief factor \( G_i/G_{i-1} \) of \( G \) with \( i \geq 2 \), we see \( \overline{G}_i/\overline{G}_{i-1} \not\in \Phi(\overline{G}/\overline{G}_{i-1}) \) and \( \overline{G}_i/\overline{G}_{i-1} \) is a strongly irreducible \( \overline{G} \)-module, which implies that \( G_i/G_{i-1} \) is a strongly irreducible \( G/N \)-module. Since \( N \leq C_G(G_i/G_{i-1}) \), it follows from Lemma 3 that \( G_i/G_{i-1} \) is a strongly irreducible \( G \)-module. If \( N \not\in \Phi(G) \), then nothing to be proved and Statement (b) holds.

Now we assume that \( N \not\in \Phi(G) \). Then it is clear that \( N \), as a minimal normal subgroup of \( G \), is an irreducible \( G \)-module. Since \( N \not\in \Phi(G) \), there exists a maximal subgroup \( M \) of \( G \) such that \( G = MN \) and \( M \cap N = 1 \). The commutativity of \( N \) implies that we only need to prove that \( N \) is a strongly irreducible \( M \)-module. In fact, if there exists a maximal subgroup \( H \) of \( M \) such that \( N \), as \( H \)-module, is reducible. Then there exists a subgroup \( N_1 \) of \( N \) such that \( 1 < N_1 < N \) and \( N_1 \) is \( H \)-invariant. In this case, \( H < HN_1 < HN < MN = G \) implies that \( H \) is not a second maximal subgroup of \( G \), in contradiction to that \( G \) is a WSM-group. Hence \( N \) is a strongly irreducible \( G \)-module and therefore Statement (b) is true.

Conversely, we show Statement (b) implies Statement (a). Now assume that \( H \) is a weak second maximal subgroup but not a second maximal subgroup of \( G \). Then there exist \( M, X \in \text{Max}(G, H) \) such that \( H \) is maximal in \( M \) and not maximal in \( X \). Lemma 1 implies that \( H_G = M_G \), written by \( U \). Then \( M/U \) is a core-free maximal subgroup of \( G/U \). By Theorem A.15.2(1)], there exists an unique minimal normal subgroup \( V/U \) of \( G/U \) such that \( G = VM \) and \( V \cap M = U \). Observe that \( X/U \) is also a maximal subgroup of \( G/U \). If \( V \not\subseteq X \), then \( G = VX \) and \( V \cap X = U \). Since \( H/U \) is maximal in \( M/U \), we have \( HV/V \) is maximal in \( MV/V = G/V = XV/V \). It follows that \( H \) is maximal in \( X \), a contradiction. Thus we may assume that \( V \subseteq X \), and so \( X = V(X \cap M) = VH \). Since \( V/U \) is a non-Frattini chief factor of \( G \), by the hypothesis, \( V/U \) is a strongly irreducible \( G \)-module. It follows from Lemma 3 that \( V/U \) is a strongly irreducible \( G/V \)-module since \( V \leq C_G(V/U) \).

Observe that the action of \( G/V \) on \( V/U \) and the action of \( M/U \) on \( V/U \) are equivalent. Thus, by hypothesis, \( V/U \) is a strongly irreducible \( M/U \)-module. The maximality of \( H/U \) in \( M/U \) implies that \( V/U \) is an irreducible \( H/U \)-module. It follows that \( H/U \) is maximal in \( HV/U = X/U \) and there-
fore $H$ is maximal in $X$, in contradiction to the choice of $H$ and $X$. Thus Statement (a) holds and the theorem is proved.

**Remark 4.** It is clear that every one-dimensional module must be strongly irreducible. Thus, by Theorem C every supersolvable group is a WSM-group. However, the converse is generally not true. For example, if $V$ is an elementary abelian 3-group of order 9 and $\alpha$ is a fixed-point-free automorphism of $V$ of order 8, then $G = V\langle \alpha \rangle$ is not supersolvable but $G$ is a WSM-group.

In this viewpoint, solvable WSM-groups can be regard as a generalization of supersolvable groups.

### 4 The proof of Theorem A

Recall that a $G$-module $V$ over a field $F$ is called *imprimitive* if there is a non-trivial decomposition of $V$ into a direct sum of $F$-subspaces $V = V_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus V_n$ ($n > 1$) such that $G$ permutes transitively on the set $\{V_1, \ldots V_n\}$. We say $G$-module $V$ *primitive* if $V$ is irreducible and not imprimitive (see [5, Definition 5.7]).

**Lemma 5.** Every strongly irreducible module is primitive.

**Proof.** Assume that $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G$-module but not primitive. Then there is non-trivial decomposition of $V$ into a direct sum of $F$-subspaces $V = V_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus V_n$ ($n > 1$) such that $G$ permutes transitively on the set $\{V_1, \ldots V_n\}$. Do such decomposition and make $n$ as small as possible. In this case, $N_G(V_1)$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$ and $V$ is a reducible $N_G(V_1)$-module, in contradiction to that $V$ is a strongly irreducible $G$-module. Thus the lemma is proved.

Suppose that $V$ is a $G$-module. We can define the action of $G$ on its dual group $\text{Irr}(V)$, the set of all complex characters of $V$. For any $\chi \in \text{Irr}(V)$ and $g \in G$, define $\chi^g$ by

$$\chi^g(a) = \chi(a^g a^{-1}), a \in V.$$

**Lemma 6.** Let $G$ be a group and $V$ be a $G$-module. Then

(a) $C_G(V) = C_G(\text{Irr}(V))$.

(b) If $V$ is an irreducible $G$-module, then $\text{Irr}(V)$ is an irreducible $G$-module.

(c) If $V$ is a faithful strongly irreducible $G$-module, then $\text{Irr}(V)$ is a faithful strongly irreducible $G$-module.
Proof. (a), (b) easily follow from the definition and [8 Proposition 12.1]. We only prove (c). Suppose that $V$ is a faithful strong irreducible $G$-module and we may assume $G \neq 1$. We see that (a) implies that $\text{Irr}(V)$ is a faithful $G$-module. For every maximal subgroup $M$ of $G$, by hypothesis, $V$ is an irreducible $M$-module. It follows from (b) that $\text{Irr}(V)$ is an irreducible $M$-module. Hence $\text{Irr}(V)$ is a strongly irreducible $G$-module, as desired. 

Let $G$ be a group and denote $\text{c.d.}(G)$ the set $\{\chi(1) | \chi \in \text{Irr}(G)\}$. Given a positive integer $f$, we denote $\text{Irr}_f(G) = \{\chi \in \text{Irr}(G) | \chi(1) = f\}$. It is clear that $f \in \text{c.d.}(G)$ if and only if $\text{Irr}_f(G) \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 7. Let $p$ be a prime and let $G$ be a $p$-group such that $|G'| = p$. If $x \notin Z(G)$, then $\chi(x) = 0$ for all nonlinear irreducible character $\chi$ of $G$.

Proof. By the Second Orthogonality Relation [5, Theorem 2.18], we have

$$\sum_{\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)} |\chi(x)|^2 = \sum_{\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)} \chi(x)\overline{\chi(x)} = |C_G(x)|.$$  

Observe that if $\chi$ is a linear character of $G$, then $|\chi(x)| = 1$. Thus by [5, Corollary 2.23(b)],

$$|G : G'| + \sum_{\chi \in \text{Irr}(G), \chi(1) > 1} |\chi(x)|^2 = |C_G(x)|,$$

and it suffices to show that $|G : G'| = |C_G(x)|$, or equivalently $|G : C_G(x)| = |G'|$. Since $[x, g] \in G'$, it implies that $x^g \in xG'$ for any $g \in G$. Thus we have

$$|G : C_G(x)| = |x^G| \leq |xG'| = |G'| = p.$$  

On the other hand, it follows from $x \notin Z(G)$ that $|G : C_G(x)| > 1$. Hence we have $|G : C_G(x)| = |G'|$ and the lemma is proved.

Now we recall the definition relations of dihedral groups $D_{2^n}(n \geq 3)$, generalized quaternion groups $Q_{2^n}(n \geq 3)$ and semi-dihedral groups $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$ as follows.

$$D_{2^n} = \langle a, b | a^{2^{n-1}} = b^2 = 1, a^b = a^{-1} \rangle (n \geq 3),$$

$$Q_{2^n} = \langle a, b | a^{2^{n-2}} = b^2, b^4 = 1, a^b = a^{-1} \rangle (n \geq 3),$$

$$SD_{2^n} = \langle a, b | a^{2^{n-1}} = b^2 = 1, a^b = a^{-1+2^{n-2}} \rangle (n \geq 4).$$

Lemma 8. Let $G$ be a group isomorphic to $D_{2^n}(n \geq 3)$ or $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$. If $x \in G$ but $x \notin Z(G)$ with $o(x) = 2$, then $\chi(x) = 0$ for all nonlinear irreducible character $\chi$ of $G$. 
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Proof. According to the proof of Lemma \[\ref{lem:7}\] we only need to prove \(|G : G'| = |C_G(x)|\).

If \(G = D_{2^n}(n \geq 3)\), then it follows from \(x \notin Z(G) = \langle a^{2^{n-2}} \rangle\) that \(x \notin \langle a \rangle\). Thus we may assume \(x = a^ib\) for some \(i\) and so \(G = \langle a \rangle \langle x \rangle\) with \(a^i = a^{-1}\).

It is clear that \(C_G(x) = \langle a^{2^{n-2}} \rangle \times \langle x \rangle\) and so \(|C_G(x)| = 4 = |G : G'|\), as claimed. If \(G = SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)\), then, by using the same reason as the above, we see \(x \notin Z(G) = \langle a^{2^{n-2}} \rangle\) and so \(x \notin \langle a \rangle\). Thus \(x = a^ib\) for some \(i\) and \(G = \langle a \rangle \langle x \rangle\) with \(a^i = a^{-1}2^{n-2}\). It is clear that \(C_G(x) = \langle a^{2^{n-2}} \rangle \times \langle x \rangle\) and therefore \(|C_G(x)| = 4 = |G : G'|\), as claimed. Now the lemma is proved. \(\square\)

Lemma 9. [\ref{thm:12.11} Theorem 12.11] Let \(G\) be nonabelian and let \(p\) be a prime. Then \(c.d.(G) = \{1, p\}\) if and only if one of the following holds.

(a) There exists abelian subgroup \(A \triangleleft G\) with \(|G : A| = p\).

(b) \(|G : Z(G)| = p^3\).

Lemma 10. Let \(G\) and \(\hat{G}\) be groups and \(\pi : \hat{G} \to G\) be a surjective group homomorphism. If \(\chi \in \text{Irr}(\hat{G})\) for some \(f \in c.d.(G)\), then \(\chi \circ \pi \in \text{Irr}(\hat{G})\).

Proof. Assume the irreducible representation \(\hat{X} : \hat{G} \to GL(f, \mathbb{C})\) affords \(\chi\), that is, \(\chi(g) = tr(\hat{X}(g))\) for each \(g \in G\). Then \(\hat{X} \circ \pi\) is a representation of \(\hat{G}\). Since \(\pi\) is surjective, we have \((\hat{X} \circ \pi)(\hat{g}) = \hat{X}((\pi(\hat{g}))) = \hat{X}(G)\) and thus \(\hat{X} \circ \pi\) is irreducible since \(\hat{X}\) is irreducible. Observe that for any \(\hat{g} \in \hat{G}\),

\[
(\chi \circ \pi)(\hat{g}) = \chi((\pi(\hat{g}))) = tr(\hat{X}(\pi(\hat{g}))) = tr((\hat{X} \circ \pi)(\hat{g})).
\]

Thus \(\hat{X} \circ \pi\) affords \(\chi \circ \pi\) and so \(\chi \circ \pi \in \text{Irr}(\hat{G})\). Since \((\chi \circ \pi)(1_{\hat{G}}) = \chi(1_{\hat{G}})) = \chi(1_G) = f\), it implies that \(\chi \circ \pi \in \text{Irr}(\hat{G})\). \(\square\)

Lemma 11. Let \(G\) be a nilpotent group acting faithfully and irreducibly on a finite vector space \(V\). If every abelian characteristic subgroup of \(G\) is cyclic, then there exists a vector \(v \in V\) such that \(|C_G(v)| \leq 2\) and \(C_{Z(G)}(v) = 1\).

Proof. Since \(X\) is normal in \(G\) for any subgroup \(X\) of \(Z(G)\), \(C_G(X) = G\)-invariant. Thus \(C_V(X) = \{0\}\) if \(X \neq 1\) since \(G\) acts faithfully and irreducibly on \(V\), and therefore \(C_{Z(G)}(v) = 1\) for any \(0 \neq v \in V\). Now we show that there exists a vector \(0 \neq v \in V\) such that \(|C_G(v)| \leq 2\). By the hypothesis, \(Z(G')\) is cyclic, and furthermore by [\ref{thm:8}] Lemma 4.1, \(G'\) is also cyclic. It follows from [\ref{thm:8}] Theorem 3.2] that there exists \(v \in V\) such that \(|C_G(v)| \leq 2\). If \(v = 0\), then the order of \(G = Z(G) = C_G(v)\) is at most 2. In this case, \(G\) has a regular orbit on \(V\), and so the lemma is proved. Thus \(v \neq 0\), as claimed. \(\square\)

Lemma 12. Let \(G\) be a 2-group such that every abelian characteristic subgroup of \(G\) is cyclic. If there is an element \(x \in G\) of order 2 with \(x \notin Z(G)\), then there exists \(f \in c.d.(G)\) such that \(\chi(x) = 0\) for each \(\chi \in \text{Irr}(\hat{G})\).
Proof. Since every abelian characteristic subgroup of $G$ is cyclic, we see that $G$ is the central product of subgroups $E$ and $R$ by [3, Chap. 5, Theorem 4.9], where either $E = 1$ or $E$ is an extra-special 2-group and either $R$ is cyclic or isomorphic to $D_{2^n}, Q_{2^n}$, or $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$.

If $E = 1$, then $G = R$ is cyclic or isomorphic to $D_{2^n}, Q_{2^n}$, or $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$. Since $G$ has a noncentral element $x$ of order 2, $G$ is isomorphic to $D_{2^n}$ or $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$. By Lemma 8 we see $\chi(x) = 0$ for each nonlinear character $\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)$. It is clear that $G$ has at least one nonlinear irreducible character since $G$ is non-abelian, and so the lemma holds.

Now we assume that $E$ is extra-special. If $R$ is cyclic, then $G' = [ER, ER] = [E, E][R, R] = E'$ is of order 2. It follows from Lemma 7 that $\chi(x) = 0$ for each non-linear character $\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)$ and the lemma holds. Thus we assume that $R$ is isomorphic to $D_{2^n}, Q_{2^n}$ or $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$. In this case we have $|Z(R)| = |Z(E)| = 2$. Since $[R, E] = 1$, we have $R \cap E = Z(R) \cap Z(E) \subseteq Z(G)$. If $E \cap R = 1$, then $Z(R) = Z(E) \times Z(R)$ is non-cyclic, a contradiction. Thus $R \cap E = Z(R) = Z(E)$ is of order 2. Also since $R \cap E \subseteq Z(G) \subseteq Z(E) \cap Z(R)$, we have $R \cap E = Z(R) = Z(E) = Z(G)$. If $x \in R$, then $x \notin Z(G) = Z(R)$. In this case, $R \cong D_{2^n}$ or $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$ since $Q_{2^n}$ has the unique element of order 2 which is in its center. It follows from Lemma 9 that $|R : C_R(x)| = |R'| = 4$. It is clear that $G' = E'R' = Z(E)R' = Z(R)R' = R'$. Thus $|G : C_G(x)| = |ER : E C_R(x)| = |R : C_R(x)(E \cap R)| = |R : C_R(x)| = |R'| = |G'|$ since $E \subseteq C_G(x)$. Hence $\chi(x) = 0$ for all nonlinear irreducible character $\chi$ of $G$ by using the same argument in Lemma 7 and so the lemma holds.

So we assume $x \notin R$. In this case, there exist $a \in E$ and $b \in R$ such that $x = ab$ and $a \notin Z(E)$. Take $f = \max \text{c.d.}(G)$ and we claim that $f > 2$. In fact, by Lemma 3 it suffices to show $G$ has no abelian subgroup whose index in $G$ is 2 and $|G : Z(G)| \neq 2^2$. First we see that $|G : Z(G)| = |ER : Z(R)| = |ER : R||R : Z(R)| > |R : Z(R)| = 2^{n-1} \geq 2^3$ since $E \nsubseteq R$ and $n \geq 4$. Next if there is an abelian subgroup $A \triangleleft G$ with $|G : A| = 2$, then, since $E$ is nonabelian, we have $G = EA$. Thus $R/Z(R) = R/(R \cap E) \cong G/E \cong A/A \cap E$ is abelian and therefore $R' \leq Z(R)$, in contradiction to that $Z(R) < R'$ whenever $R \cong D_{2^n}, Q_{2^n}$ or $SD_{2^n}(n \geq 4)$. So the claim holds.

Considering the map $\pi : E \times R \to G; (e, r) \mapsto er$. Since $[E, R] = 1$ and $G = ER$, we have $\pi$ is a surjective group homomorphism. Denote $\hat{G} = E \times R$, and it follows from Lemma 10 that the set $\{\chi \circ \pi \mid \chi \in \text{Irr}_f(\hat{G})\} \subseteq \text{Irr}_f(\hat{G})$. We want to prove $\chi(x) = 0$, that is, $(\chi \circ \pi)((a, b)) = 0$ for each $\chi \in \text{Irr}_f(\hat{G})$. It suffices to prove that $(\hat{\chi})(a, b) = 0$ for each $\hat{\chi} \in \text{Irr}_f(\hat{G})$. For any $\hat{\chi} \in \text{Irr}_f(\hat{G})$, by [3, Theorem 4.21], we have $\hat{\chi} = \varphi \times \theta$ for some $\varphi \in \text{Irr}(E)$ and $\theta \in \text{Irr}(R)$, defined by the law $\hat{\chi}((e, r)) = \varphi(e)\theta(r)$, where $e \in E$ and $r \in R$. Since $R$ has a cyclic maximal subgroup, we
Notice that each $\vartheta \in W$. Since $\vartheta \neq 0$, it follows from Lemma 7 that $\varphi(a) = 0$. Thus $\hat{\varphi}((a, b)) = \varphi(a)\theta(b) = 0$. Hence $\chi(x) = 0$ for all $\chi \in \text{Irr}_f(G)$ and the lemma is proved completely.

**Theorem 13.** Let a group $G$ act faithfully and primitively on a finite vector space $V$ and $x$ be a non-vanishing element of $G$. If $x \in F(G)$ and $x$ fixes some member of each $G$-orbit in $V$, then $x = 1$.

**Proof.** Let $K$ be the normal closure of $\langle x \rangle$ in $G$ and so $K$ is nilpotent since $x \in F(G)$. By the hypothesis and [1, Theorem 17.3], $V$ is a direct sum of isomorphic irreducible $K$-modules, $W$ say, and so $K$ acts faithfully on $W$. Since $V$ is a primitive $G$-module, also a quasi-primitive $G$-module, we have that every abelian normal subgroup of $G$ is cyclic. In particular, every abelian characteristic subgroup of $K$ is cyclic since $K$ is normal in $G$. It follows from Lemma 6 that there exists $w \in W$ such that $|C_K(w)| \leq 2$ and $C_{Z(K)}(w) = 1$. By the hypothesis, $x$ fixes one point of the $G$-orbit generated by $w$ in $V$, and thus we have $x^g \in C_K(w)$ for some $g \in G$ and denote $y = x^g$.

If $y \neq 1$, then we can assume that $C_K(w) = \{1, y\}$ and $y \notin Z(K)$ since $C_{Z(K)}(w) = 1$. Note that $y$ belongs to $K$ and is of order $2$, we have $K = \langle y^G \rangle$ is a $2$-group. Since every abelian characteristic subgroup of $K$ is cyclic, applying Lemma 12 on $K$ and $y$, there exists $f \in c.d.(K)$ such that $\vartheta(y) = 0$ for each $\vartheta \in \text{Irr}_f(K)$. Choose a character $\vartheta \in \text{Irr}_f(K)$ and take $\chi \in \text{Irr}(G)$ such that $\vartheta$ is a constituent of $\chi_K$ by [5, Corollary 5.4]. It follows from Clifford’s Theorem [5, Theorem 6.2] that

$$
\chi_K = e \sum_{i=1}^t \vartheta_i,
$$

where $\vartheta_1 = \vartheta, \ldots, \vartheta_t$ are the distinct conjugates of $\vartheta$ in $G$ and $e = [\chi_K, \vartheta]$. Notice that each $\vartheta_i$ is an irreducible character of $K$ with degree $f$, that is, $\vartheta_i \in \text{Irr}_f(K)$. Thus we have $\vartheta_i(y) = 0$ for each $i$. Hence $\chi(x) = \chi(y) = \chi_K(y) = e \sum_{i=1}^t \vartheta_i(y) = 0$, in contradiction to that $x$ is a nonvanishing element of $G$. Thus $y = 1$ and therefore $x = 1$. The proof of the theorem is complete.

**Proof of Theorem [7] We work by induction on $|G|$. Apply induction on $G/\Phi(G)$, we may assume $\Phi(G) = 1$. Since $G$ is solvable, by [1, Theorem 13.8(b)], we write $F(G) = K_1 \times \ldots \times K_r$, where $K_i$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G$ and $F(G) = \cap_{i=1}^r C_i$, where $C_i = C_G(K_i)$. We want to prove $x \in F(G)$. It suffices to prove that $x \in C_i$ for each $i$. 10
Since $xC_i$ is a non-vanishing element of the WSM-group $G/C_i$, by induction, we have $xC_i \in F(G/C_i)$. Observe that $K_i$ is a non-Frattini chief factor of $G$. By Theorem $[\square]$ $K_i$ is a strongly irreducible $G$-module. By Lemma $[\bigcirc]$ $K_i$ is a faithful strongly irreducible $G/C_i$-module. Thus $\text{Irr}(K_i)$ is a faithful strongly irreducible $G/C_i$-module by Lemma $[\square](c)$. It follows from Lemma $[\square]$ that $G/C_i$ acts faithfully and primitively on $\text{Irr}(K_i)$. Since $x$ fixes some member of each $G$-orbit of $\text{Irr}(K_i)$ by $[6, \text{Lemma 2.3}]$, we have that $xC_i$ fixes some member of each $G/C_i$-orbit in $\text{Irr}(K_i)$. Hence it follows from Theorem $[\bigcirc]$ that $x \in C_i$ and the theorem is proved.
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