A GENERALIZATION OF HALL-WIELANDT THEOREM
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Abstract. Let $G$ be a finite group and $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. We denote the $k$’th term of the upper central series of $G$ by $Z_k(G)$ and the norm of $G$ by $Z^*(G)$. In this article, we prove that if for every tame intersection $P \cap Q$ such that $Z_{p-1}(P) < P \cap Q < P$, the group $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$. For $p = 2$, we sharpen our results by proving if for every tame intersection $P \cap Q$ such that $Z^*(P) < P \cap Q < P$, the group $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$. We also obtain several corollaries which give sufficient conditions for $N_G(P)$ to controls $p$-transfer in $G$ as a generalization of some well known theorems, including Hall-Wielandt theorem and Frobenius normal complement theorem.

1. Introduction

Throughout the article, we assume that all groups are finite. Notation and terminology are standard as in [1]. Let $G$ be a group and $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. We say that $G$ is $p$-nilpotent if it has a normal Hall $p'$-subgroup. Let $N$ be a subgroup of $G$ such that $[G : N]$ is coprime to $p$. Then $N$ is said to control $p$-transfer in $G$ if $N/A^p(N) \cong G/A^p(G)$. A famous result of Tate in [2] shows that $N/A^p(N) \cong G/A^p(G)$ if and only if $N/O^p(N) \cong G/O^p(G)$. Thus, $N$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ if and only if $N/O^p(N) \cong G/O^p(G)$. In this case, one can also deduce that $N$ is $p$-nilpotent if and only if $G$ is $p$-nilpotent.

By a result due to Burnside, $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ if $P$ is abelian. Later works of Hall and Wielandt showed that $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ if the class of $P$ is not “too large”. Namely, they proved the following generalization of Burnside’s result.

Theorem 1.1 (Hall-Wielandt). If the class of $P$ is less than $p$, then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

In 1958, Yoshida introduced the concept of character theoretic transfer and by the means of it, he obtained the following generalization of Hall-Wielandt theorem.

Theorem 1.2. [7, Theorem 4.2] If $P$ has no quotient isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_p \wr \mathbb{Z}_p$ then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

The original proof of this strong theorem depends on character theory. However, Isaacs provided a character free proof to Yoshida’s theorem in his book (see section 2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 20D10, 20D20.
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Taking advantages of his method, we obtain another generalization of Hall-Wielandt theorem.

Before presenting our main theorem, it is convenient here to give some conventions that we adopt throughout the paper. Let $P, Q \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ (possibly $P = Q$). We say that $P \cap Q$ is a \textit{tame intersection} if both $N_P(P \cap Q)$ and $N_Q(P \cap Q)$ are Sylow $p$-subgroups of $N_G(P \cap Q)$. For simplicity, we use directly “$X \cap Y$ is a tame intersection” without specifying what $X$ and $Y$ are. In this case, it should be understood that $X$ and $Y$ are Sylow $p$-subgroups of $G$ for a prime $p$ dividing order of $G$ and $X \cap Y$ is a tame intersection according to the formal definition.

The following is the main theorem of our article.

\textbf{Theorem 1.3.} \textit{Assume that for each tame intersection $Z_{p-1}(P) < P \cap Q < P$, the group $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent. Then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.}

The next remark shows that our theorem extends the result of Hall-Wielandt theorem in a different direction than what Yoshida’s theorem does.

\textbf{Remark 1.4.} Let $G$ be a group having a Sylow $p$-subgroup $P$ isomorphic to $Z_p \wr Z_p$. Clearly, Yoshida’s theorem is not applicable here. If $N_G(P)$ does not control $p$-transfer in $G$ then there exists a Sylow $p$-subgroup $Q$ of $G$ such that $|P : P \cap Q| = p$ and $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is not $p$-nilpotent by Theorem 1.3. Notice that this is exactly the case where $G = S_4$ and $p = 2$. We can say in other way that $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ if $|P : P \cap P^x| > p$ for each $x \in G \setminus N_G(P)$.

Some of the immediate corollaries of Theorem 1.3 are as follows.

\textbf{Corollary 1.5.} \textit{Assume that for any two distinct Sylow $p$-subgroups $P$ and $Q$ of $G$, the inequality $|P \cap Q| \leq |Z_{p-1}(P)|$ is satisfied. Then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.}

The next corollary is a generalization of the well-known Frobenius normal complement theorem, which guarantees the $p$-nilpotency of $G$ if $N_G(X)$ is $p$-nilpotent for each nontrivial $p$-subgroup $X$ of $P$.

\textbf{Corollary 1.6.} \textit{Assume that for each tame intersection $Z_{p-1}(P) < P \cap Q$, the group $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent. Then $G$ is $p$-nilpotent.}

\textbf{Remark 1.7.} The main ingredient in proving most of the $p$-nilpotency theorems including Thompson-Glauberman $p$-nilpotency theorems is the Frobenius normal complement theorem, and hence its above generalization can be used in proving more strong $p$-nilpotency theorems.

When $p = 2$, Theorem 1.3 guarantees that if $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent for each tame intersection $Z(P) < P \cap Q < P$, then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$. In fact, we shall extend this result further.

Let $Z^*(P)$ denote the norm of $P$, which is defined as

$$Z^*(P) := \bigcap_{H \leq P} N_P(H).$$
We have clearly $Z(P) \leq Z^*(P)$. One can recursively define $Z^*_i(P)$ for $i \geq 1$ as the full inverse image of $Z^*_i(P/Z^*_{i-1}(P))$ in $P$ and set $Z^*_1(P) = 1$. We also say that $P$ is of norm length at most $i$ if $Z^*_i(P) = 1$. We should also note that it is well known that $Z^*(P)$ is contained in the second center of $P$.

**Theorem 1.8.** Assume that for each tame intersection $Z^*(P) < P \cap Q < P$, the group $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent. Then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

The following corollary is stronger than Corollary [1.6] when $p = 2$ although it is also true for odd primes (as Theorem [1.8] is also true for odd primes).

**Corollary 1.9.** Assume that for each tame intersection $Z^*(P) < P \cap Q$, the group $N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent. Then $G$ is $p$-nilpotent.

The following theorem is a generalization of a theorem due to Grün (see Theorem 14.4.4 in [3]), which states that the normalizer of a $p$-normal subgroup controls $p$-transfer in $G$. We also use our next theorem in the proof of Theorem [1.8].

**Theorem 1.10.** Let $K \leq Z^*(P)$ be a weakly closed subgroup of $P$. Then $N_G(K)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

The next corollary can also be easily deduced by the means of Theorem [1.8]

**Corollary 1.11.** Assume that for any two distinct Sylow $p$-subgroups $P$ and $Q$ of $G$, the inequality $|P \cap Q| \leq |Z^*(P)|$ is satisfied. Then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

**Remark 1.12.** In above theorems, the assumption ”$N_G(P \cap Q)$ is $p$-nilpotent” could be replaced with a weaker assumption ”$N_G(P \cap Q)/C_G(P \cap Q)$ is a $p$-group”. This can be observed with the proofs of Theorems [1.3] and [1.8].

2. Preliminaries

Let $H \leq G$ and $T = \{t_i \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ be a right transversal for $H$ in $G$. The map $V : G \to H$ defined by

$$V(g) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} t_i g(t_i, g)^{-1}$$

is called a pretransfer map from $G$ to $H$. When the order of the product is not needed to specify, we simply write $V(g) = \prod_{t \in T} t g(t, g)^{-1}$. Notice that the kernel of “dot action” is $Core_G(H)$, and so $t g = t$ for all $g \in Core_G(H)$. In the case that $G$ is a $p$-group, $Z(G/Core_G(H)) \neq 1$ whenever $H$ is a proper subgroup of $G$. If $x \in G$ such that $x Core_G(H) \in Z(G/Core_G(H))$ of order $p$, then each $\langle x \rangle$-orbit has length $p$ when we consider the action of $\langle x \rangle$ on $T$.

Let $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k$ be representatives of all distinct orbits of $\langle x \rangle$ on $T$. As $t x$ and $t x^j$ represent the same right coset of $H$ in $G$ for each $t \in T$, the set $T^* = \{t_i x^j \mid i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p - 1\}\}$ is also a right transversal for $H$ in $G$. Let $V^*$ be a pretransfer map constructed by using $T^*$. Since $V(u) \equiv V^*(u) \mod H'$, we may replace $T$ with $T^*$ without loss of generality whenever such a situation occurs.
We denote all pretransfer maps with upper case letters and each corresponding lower case letter shows the corresponding transfer map.

**Theorem 2.1.** [1] Theorem 10.8] Let $G$ be a group, and suppose that $H \leq K \leq G$. Let $U : G \to K$, $W : K \to H$ and $V : G \to H$ be pretransfer maps. Then for all $g \in G$, we have $V(g) \equiv W(U(g)) \mod H'$, that is, $v(g) = w(u(g))$.

**Theorem 2.2.** [1] Theorem 10.10] Let $X$ be a set of representatives for the $(H, K)$ double cosets in a group $G$, where $H$ and $K$ are subgroups of $G$. Let $V : G \to H$ be a pretransfer map, and for each element $x \in X$, let $W_x : K \to K \cap H^x$ be a pretransfer map. Then for $k \in K$, we have

$$V(k) \equiv \prod_{x \in X} xW_x(k)x^{-1} \mod H'.$$

Now we give a technical lemma, which is essentially the method used in the proof of Yoshida’s theorem (see proof of Theorem 10.1 in [1]). For the sake completeness, we give the proof of this lemma here.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let $G$ be a group and, let $P \in Syl_p(G)$ and $N_G(P) \leq N$. Suppose that $N$ does not control $p$-transfer in $G$ and let $X$ be a set of representatives for the $(N, P)$ double cosets in $G$, which contains the identity $e$. Then the following hold:

(a) There exists a normal subgroup $M$ of $N$ of index $p$ such that $V(G) \leq M$ for every pretransfer map $V$ from $G$ to $N$.

(b) For each $u \in P \setminus M$, there exists a nonidentity $x \in X$ such that $W(u) \notin P \cap M^x$ where $W$ is a pretransfer map from $P$ to $P \cap N^x$.

(c) For the $x$ in part (b), we have $P \cap N^x < P$ and $|P \cap N^x : P \cap M^x| = p$.

**Proof.** (a) It follows by ([1], Lemma 10.11).

(b) Let $u \in P \setminus M$. Let $W_x$ be a pretransfer map from $P$ to $P \cap N^x$ for each $x \in X$. Then we have

$$V(u) \equiv \prod_{x \in X} xW_x(u)x^{-1} \mod N'. $$

by Theorem 2.2 Since $N' \leq M$ and $V(u) \in M$, we get

$$\prod_{x \in X} xW_x(u)x^{-1} \in M.$$ 

Notice that for $x = e$, $W_e : P \to P$ and $W_e(u) = u = eW_e(u)e^{-1} \notin M$. Thus, there also exists $e \neq x \in X$ such that $xW_x(u)x^{-1} \notin M$. Set $W_x = W$. Then we get $W(u) \in P \cap N^x \setminus P \cap M^x$.

(c) Set $R = P \cap N^x$ and $Q = P \cap M^x$. If $R = P$ then $P^{x-1} \leq N$, and hence there exists $y \in N$ such that $P^{x-1}y = P$. Since $x^{-1}y \in N_G(P) \leq N$, we get $x \in N$. This is not possible as $NxP = NeP$ and $x \neq e$. It follows that $R < P$. Note that $R \neq Q$ by part (b). Moreover, the inequality $1 < |R : Q| \leq |N^x : M^x| = p$ forces that $|R : Q| = p$. 

$\square$
3. Main Results

The following lemma serves as the key tool in proving our main theorems since it enables us to use induction in the proof “control $p$-transfer theorems”. Throughout the section, $G$ is a group and $P$ is a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $G$ for a prime $p$ dividing the order of $G$.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $N_G(P) \leq N \leq G$, $Z \leq P$ and $Z \lhd G$. Assume that $N/Z$ controls $p$-transfer in $G/Z$ and that one of the following holds:

1. $[Z,g,\ldots,g]_{p-1} \leq \Phi(Z)$ for all $g \in P$.
2. $Z \leq \Phi(P)$.

Then $N$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

We need the following lemma in the proof of Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $N_G(P) \leq N \leq G$, $Z \leq P$ and $Z \lhd G$. Assume that $N$ does not control $p$-transfer in $G$ and $N/Z$ controls $p$-transfer in $G/Z$. Then $Z \nsubseteq M$ and we have $W(u) \in P \cap N^x \setminus P \cap M^x$ for each $u \in Z \setminus M$ where $W, M$ and $x$ are as in Lemma 2.3.

**Proof.** Set $G/Z = \overline{G}$. Let $V$ be a pretransfer map from $G$ to $N$. Let $T$ be a right transversal set used for constructing $V$. It follows that there exist a normal subgroup $M$ of $N$ with index $p$ such that $V(G) \subseteq M$ by Lemma 2.3(a).

Now we claim that $Z \nsubseteq M$. Assume to the contrary. Notice that the set $\overline{T} = \{ \overline{t} \mid t \in T \}$ is a right transversal set for $N$ in $\overline{G}$. Thus if we construct a pretransfer map $\overline{V}$ by using $\overline{T}$, then $\overline{V}(g) = \overline{V}(g)$. It follows that $\overline{V}(G) = \overline{V}(G) \subseteq M \lhd N$. Let $W$ be a pretransfer map from $N$ to $\overline{T}$. Note that $\ker(w) = \langle P(N) \rangle \leq M$ as $|N : M| = p$, and hence $w(M) < w(N)$. It then follows that $w(\overline{V}(G)) < w(N)$. Since $w \circ \overline{V}$ is the transfer map from $\overline{G}$ to $\overline{T}$ by Theorem 2.1, we get $|\overline{G} : A^p(\overline{G})| \neq |\overline{N} : A^p(\overline{N})|$, which contradicts the hypothesis. Thus there exists $u \in Z$ such that $u \in N \setminus M$. Then we have $W(u) \in P \cap N^x \setminus P \cap M^x$ for each $u \in Z \setminus M$ by Lemma 2.3(b). □

**Proof of Lemma 3.1.** Assume that $N$ does not control $p$-transfer in $G$. We derive contradiction for both parts.

First assume that (b) holds, that is, $Z \leq \Phi(P)$. Note that $|P : P \cap M| = p$, and so $Z \leq \Phi(P) \leq M \cap P$. However, this is not possible by Lemma 3.2. This contradiction shows that $N$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ when (b) holds.

Now assume that (a) holds. Let $X$ be a set of representatives for the $(N,P)$ double cosets in $G$, which contains the identity $e$. By Lemma 2.3(b), we have a pretransfer $W : P \to P \cap N^x$ such that $W(u) \notin P \cap M^x$ for some nonidentity $x \in X$. Set $R = P \cap N^x$ and $Q = P \cap M^x$.

Now let $S$ be a right transversal set for $R$ in $P$ used for constructing $W$ so that we have $W(u) = \prod_{s \in S} s u(s,u)^{-1}$. Since $u \in Z \leq \Core_P(R)$, we have $(s,u) = s$ for all $s \in S$. Thus we get $W(u) = \prod_{s \in S} su(s)^{-1}$.

Set $C = \Core_P(R)$. Since $R < P$ by Lemma 2.3(c), $C$ is also proper in $P$. So we see that $Z(P/C) \neq 1$. Now choose $n \in P$ such that $nC \in Z(P/C)$ of
order \( p \). Then each \( (n) \)-orbit has length \( p \). Let \( s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k \) be representatives of all distinct orbits of \( (n) \) on \( S \). Without loss of generality, we can suppose that \( S = \{ s_n^j \mid i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \text{ and } j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p - 1\} \} \). Now we compute the contribution of a single \( (n) \)-orbit to \( W(u) \). Fix \( s \in S \).

\[
(snun^{-1}s^{-1})(sn^2un^{-2}s^{-1}) \ldots (sn^{p-1}un^{-p+1}s^{-1})(sus^{-1}) = (nu)p^{-1}n^{-p+1}us^{-1}.
\]

We have \( (nu)p^{-1}n^{-p+1}us^{-1} = (su)n^{-1}p^{-1}us^{-1} \). Set \( H = \langle n, u \rangle \). Due to the fact that \( |(n)C : C| = p \), we have \( H' \leq C \). Note that \( u \in Z \leq C \), and so

\[
[H', u] \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \Phi(C).
\]

We can expand the power of the product as in the following form

\[
(nu)^p \equiv (n^p u^p)[u, n, n] \ldots [u, n, \ldots, n]_{p-2}[u, n, \ldots, n]_{p-1} \text{ mod } \Phi(C)
\]
due to the previous congruence.

As \( C \triangleleft P \), we observe that \( s[iu, n, \ldots, n]_{i-1}s^{-1} \in C \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, p - 1 \), and so \( [s[iu, n, \ldots, n]_{i-1}s^{-1}]^p \in \Phi(C) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, p - 1 \). By using the fact that \( \left(\begin{array}{c}
p \\
-1
\end{array}\right) \) is divisible by \( p \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, p - 2 \), we see that

\[
(s[iu, n, \ldots, n]_{i-1}s^{-1}]^p_{i+1} \in \Phi(C) \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, p - 2.
\]

Note also that \( [u, n, \ldots, n]_{p-1} \in \Phi(Z) \leq \Phi(C) \) by hypothesis, and so we get that \( s[iu, n, \ldots, n]_{p-1}s^{-1} \in \Phi(C) \) since \( \Phi(C) \triangleleft P \). As a consequence, we obtain that

\[
s(nu)p^{-1}s^{-1} \equiv (su)n^{-1}p^{-1}s^{-1} \equiv sn^p s^{-1} \text{ mod } \Phi(C).
\]

It then follows that

\[
(s(nu)p^{-1}s^{-1})(su^{-1}n^{-p}us^{-1}) \equiv (sn^p s^{-1})(su^{-1}n^{-p}us^{-1}) \equiv sn^p, u^{-1} \equiv 1 \text{ mod } \Phi(C).
\]

We only need to explain why the last congruence holds: Since both \( n^{-p} \) and \( u \) are elements of \( C \), we see that \( [n^{-p}, u] \in \Phi(C) \). It follows that \( s[n^{-p}, u]s^{-1} \in \Phi(C) \) due to the normality of \( \Phi(C) \) in \( P \). Then \( W(u) \in \Phi(C) \) as the chosen \( (n) \)-orbit is arbitrary. Since \( |R : Q| = p \) by Lemma 2.23(c), the containment \( \Phi(C) \leq \Phi(R) \leq Q \) holds. As a consequence, \( W(u) \in Q \). This contradiction completes the proof. \( \Box \)

**Remark 3.3.** In the proofs of many \( p \)-nilpotency theorems, the minimal counterexample \( G \) is a \( p \)-soluble group such that \( O_p(G) = 1 \) and \( G/O_p(G) \) is \( p \)-nilpotent. Lemma 3.1(a) guarantees the \( p \)-nilpotency of \( G \) if \( [O_p(G), g, \ldots, g]_{p-1} \leq \Phi(O_p(G)) \) for all \( g \in P \). In particular if \( O_p(G) \leq Z_{p-1}(P) \) then the \( p \)-nilpotency of \( G \) follows. This bound seems to be best possible since in the symmetric group \( S_4 \), \( O_2(S_4) \leq Z_2(P) \) and \( O_2(G) \notin Z(P) \). Even if \( S_4/O_2(S_4) \) is 2-nilpotent, \( S_4 \) fails to be 2-nilpotent.

It is well known that if \( G/Z \) is \( p \)-nilpotent and \( Z \leq \Phi(P) \) then \( G \) is \( p \)-nilpotent. Lemma 3.1(b) generalizes this particular case by stating that if \( G/O_p(G) \cong N/O_p(N) \) then \( G/O_p(G) \cong N/O_p(N) \) where \( C = G/Z \) and \( Z \leq \Phi(P) \).

We also should note that in Lemma 3.1 we prove little more than what we need here as we see that it may have other applications too.
Proposition 3.4. Let $G$ be a group and $P \in Syl_p(G)$. Assume that for every characteristic subgroup of $P$ that contains $Z_{p-1}(P)$ is weakly closed in $P$. Then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the order $G$. Let $Z = Z_{p-1}(P)$. Then $N_G(Z)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ by (H, Theorem 14.4.2). If $N_G(Z) < G$ then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer with respect to group $N_G(Z)$ by induction applied to $N_G(Z)$. It follows that $P \cap G' = P \cap N_G(Z)' = P \cap N_G(P)'$, that is, $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

Therefore we may assume $Z \leq G$. It is easy to see that $G/Z$ satisfies the hypothesis of the proposition, and hence we get $N_{G/Z}(P/Z) = N_G(P)/Z$ controls $p$-transfer in $G/Z$ by induction applied to $G/Z$. Then the result follows by Lemma 3.1(a). \[ \square \]

Remark 3.5. In the above proposition, the assumption that every characteristic subgroup containing $Z_{p-1}(P)$ is weakly closed can be weakened to $Z_{k(p-1)}(P)$ is weakly closed for each $k = 1, ..., n$ where $Z_{n(p-1)}(P) = P$. Yet we shall not need this fact.

After Proposition 3.4 it is natural to ask the following question.

Question 3.6. Does a Sylow $p$-subgroup $P$ of a group $G$ have a single characteristic subgroup whose being weakly closed in $P$ is sufficient to conclude that $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$?

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $Z_{p-1} \leq C$ be a characteristic subgroup of $P$. We claim that $C$ is normal in each Sylow subgroup of $G$ that contains $C$. Assume the contrary and let $Q \in Syl_p(G)$ such that $C \leq Q$ and $N_Q(C) < Q$. There exists $x \in N_G(C)$ such that $N_Q(C)^x = N_Q(C) \leq P$, and hence $N_Q(C) \leq P \cap Q^x$.

Set $Q^x = R$. By Alperin Fusion theorem, we have $R \sim P$. Thus there are Sylow subgroups $Q_i$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ such that $P \cap R \leq P \cap Q_1$ and $(P \cap R)^{x_1x_2...x_i} \leq P \cap Q_{i+1}$ where $x_i \in N_G(P \cap Q_1)$, $P \cap Q_1$ is a tame intersection and $R^{x_1x_2...x_n} = P$.

Note that $N_P(P \cap Q_1)$ is a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $N_G(P \cap Q_1)$ as $P \cap Q_1$ is a tame intersection. Moreover, $N_G(P \cap Q_1)$ is $p$-nilpotent by the hypothesis as $Z_{p-1} \leq C < N_Q(C)^x \leq P \cap R \leq P \cap Q_1$. Then we have

$$N_G(P \cap Q_1) = N_P(P \cap Q_1)C_G(P \cap Q_1).$$

Thus, we can write $x_1 = s_1t_1$ where $t_1 \in C_G(P \cap Q_1)$ and $s_1 \in N_P(P \cap Q_1)$. Notice that $t_1$ also centralizes $C$ as $C \leq P \cap Q_1$ and $s_1$ normalizes $C$ as $C \leq P$. It follows that $C^{s_1} = C^{s_1t_1} = C \leq (P \cap R)^{x_1} \leq P \cap Q_2$. Then we get that $N_G(P \cap Q_2)$ is $p$-nilpotent by the hypothesis and we may write $x_2 = s_2t_2$ where $t_2 \in C_G(P \cap Q_2)$ and $s_2 \in N_P(P \cap Q_2)$ in a similar way. Notice also that $C^{x_1x_2} = C^{x_2} = C$.

Proceding inductively, we obtain that $N_G(P \cap Q_i)$ is $p$-nilpotent for all $i$ and $C^{x_1x_2...x_n} = C$. Since $C^{x_1x_2...x_n} = C < P = R^{x_1x_2...x_n}$, we get $C < R = Q^x$. Since $x \in N_G(C)$, $C < Q$. This contradiction shows that $C$ is weakly closed in $P$ and the theorem follows by Proposition 3.4. \[ \square \]
Lemma 2.3(a). Set $S = P \cap N^x$ and $yx$ a subgroup of $P$ of order $p$. Assume that $N$ does not control $p$-transfer in $G$. By Lemma 2.3(b), we have a pretransfer map $W : P \to P \cap N^x$ such that $W(u) \notin P \cap N^x$ for each $u \in P \setminus M$ where $e \neq x \in X$ and $M$ is as in Lemma 2.3(a). Set $R = P \cap N^x$ and $Q = P \cap M^x$.

Now choose $u \in P \setminus M$ and $u^* \in N \setminus M$ such that both $u$ and $u^*$ are of minimal possible order. We first argue that $|u| = |u^*|$. Clearly we have $|u^*| \leq |u|$ as $u \in N \setminus M$. Note that $(u^*)^q \in M$ if $q$ is a prime dividing the order $u^*$ by the choice of $u^*$. The previous argument shows that $p = q$ as $|N : M| = p$, and so $u^*$ is a $p$-element. Thus, a conjugate of $u^*$ via an element of $N$ lies in $P \setminus M$. It follows that $|u| \leq |u^*|$, which give us the desired equality.

Let $S$ be a right transversal set for $R$ in $P$ used for constructing $W$ so that we have $W(u) = \prod_{s \in S} su(s.u)^{-1}$. Let $S_0$ be a set of orbit representatives of the action of $(u)$ on $S$. Then we have $W(u) = \prod_{s \in S_0} su^n.s^{-1}$ by transfer evaluation lemma. Note that $su^n.s^{-1} \in R \leq N^x$, and hence $x_{su^n.s^{-1}x}^{-1} \in N$. If $n > 1$ then $|x_{su^n.s^{-1}x}^{-1}| < |u|$, and so $x_{su^n.s^{-1}x}^{-1} \in M$ by the previous paragraph. Thus we get $su^n.s^{-1} \in Q$. As a consequence, we observe that

$$W(u) \equiv \prod_{s \in S^*} su^{-1} \mod Q$$

where $S^* = \{s \in S \mid su = s\}$.

We claim that $K$ is not contained in $R$. Since otherwise: both $K$ and $K^x$ are contained in $N^x$, and so $K^x$ and $K$ are contained in $N$. Since $K$ is a weakly closed subgroup of $P$, there exists $y \in N$ such that $K^y = K^x$ (see problem 5C.6(c) in $\Pi$). As a result $yx \in N$, and so $x \in N$. Thus, we get $NKP = NKP$ which is a contradiction as $x \neq e$. Since $R < P$ by Lemma 2.3(c), Core$_P(R)$ is also proper in $P$. So we see that $Z(P/\text{Core}_P(R)) \neq 1$. Since $K$ is not contained in Core$_P(R)$ and $K$ is normal in $P$, we can pick $k \in K$ such that $k\text{Core}_P(R) \in Z(P/\text{Core}_P(R))$ of order $p$. Now consider the action of $(k)$ on $S$. Then each ($k$)-orbit has length $p$ and let $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ be representatives of all distinct orbits of $(k)$ on $S$. Note that we may replace $S$ with $\{s_i^{j} \mid i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \text{ and } j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p - 1\}\}$. We also note that

$s.(uk) = (s.(ku)).[u,k] = s.(ku)$ for all $s \in S$.

The last equality holds as $[u,k] \in \text{Core}_P(R)$. It follows that $S^*$ is ($k$)-invariant. Note that $k$ normalizes $(u)$ as $k \in Z^*(P)$, and so $u^{k^{-1}} = u^n$ where $n$ is a natural number which is coprime to $p$. Clearly $n$ is odd when $p = 2$. On the other hand, if $p$ is odd then it is well known that $n = (1 + p)^r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ as $k^{-1}$ induces a $p$-automorphism on a cyclic $p$-group. Thus, we obtain $n \equiv 1 \mod p$ in both case.

Now we compute the contribution of a single $(k)$-orbit to $W(u)$. Fix $s \in S^*$. ($su^n(suk^{-1}s^{-1})(sk^2uk^{-2}s^{-1})\ldots(sk^{p^{-1}}uk^{-p+1}s^{-1}) = su^n.u^z\ldots.u^{z-1}s^{-1} = su^zs^{-1}$ where $z = 1 + n + n^2 + \ldots + n^{p-1}$. Note that $z \equiv 0 \mod p$, $su^n \in R$ and $|R : Q| = p$ by Lemma 2.3(c), and hence $su^{z}s^{-1} = (su^{-1})^z \in Q$. Since the
chosen \( (k) \)-orbit is arbitrary, we obtain \( W(u) \in Q \). This contradiction completes the proof.

Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.8.

**Proof of Theorem 1.8** First notice that if \( p \) is odd then the result follows by Theorem 1.3 due to the fact that \( Z^*(P) \leq Z_2(P) \leq Z_{p-1}(P) \). Thus, it is sufficient to prove the theorem for \( p = 2 \). Let \( G \) be a minimal counter example to the theorem. We derive a contradiction over a series of steps. Write \( Z = Z^*(P) \) and \( N = N_G(P) \).

(1) Each characteristic subgroup \( C \) of \( P \) that contains \( Z \) is weakly closed in \( P \). Moreover, \( Z \) is a normal subgroup of \( G \).

By using the same strategy used in the proof of Theorem 1.3 we can show that any characteristic subgroup \( C \) of \( P \) that contains \( Z \) is weakly closed in \( P \). In particular, \( Z \) is weakly closed in \( P \).

Suppose that \( N_G(Z) < G \). Clearly \( N_G(Z) \) satisfies the hypothesis and \( N \leq N_G(Z) \). Thus, \( N \) controls \( p \)-transfer with respect to the group \( N_G(Z) \) by the minimality of \( G \). On the other hand, \( N_G(Z) \) controls \( p \)-transfer in \( G \) by Theorem 1.10. As a consequence, \( G' \cap P = (N_G(Z))' \cap P = N' \cap P \). This contradiction shows that \( Z < G \).

(2) \( N/Z \) controls \( p \)-transfer in \( G/Z \).

Write \( \overline{G} = G/Z \). Clearly \( \overline{N} = N_G(P) \). If \( Y \) is a characteristic subgroup of \( \overline{P} \) then \( Y \) is a characteristic subgroup of \( P \) that contains \( Z \). Then \( Y \) is weakly closed in \( P \) by (1). It follows that \( \overline{Y} \) is weakly closed in \( \overline{P} \). Then we get \( \overline{N} \) controls \( p \)-transfer in \( \overline{G} \) by Proposition 3.4.

(3) \( |P : R| = 2 \).

By Lemma 3.2 there exists \( u \in Z \setminus M \) such that \( W(u) \in P \cap N^x \setminus P \cap M^x \) where \( W, M \) and \( x \) are as in Lemma 2.3. Set \( R = P \cap N^x \) and \( Q = P \cap M^x \). Let \( S \) be a right transversal set for \( R \) in \( P \) used for constructing \( W \). Since \( u \in Z \leq Core_P(R) \), we get \( W(u) = \prod_{s \in S} su(s, u)^{-1} = \prod_{s \in S} sus^{-1} \).

Since \( R < P \) by Lemma 2.3(c), \( Core_P(R) \) is also proper in \( P \). So we see that \( Z(P/Core_P(R)) \neq 1 \). Now choose \( n \in P \) such that \( nCore_P(R) \in Z(P/Core_P(R)) \) of order \( p \) and consider the action of \( \langle n \rangle \) on \( S \). Without loss of generality, we may take \( S = \{ s_i, n^j \mid i \in \{1, 2, ..., k\} \text{ and } j \in \{0, 1\}\} \) where \( s_1, s_2, ..., s_k \) are representatives of all distinct orbits of \( \langle n \rangle \) on \( S \). Fix \( s \in S \). We have

\[
(sus^{-1})(snun^{-1}s^{-1}) = su^2[u, n^{-1}]s^{-1} = su^2s^{-1}[u, n^{-1}] = \]

The last equality holds as \( u \in Z = Z^*(P) \leq Z_2(P) \). We see that \( su^2s^{-1} \in Q \) as \( sus^{-1} \in Z \leq R \) and \( |R : Q| = 2 \). Thus the contribution of a single orbit is congruent to \( [u, n^{-1}] \) at mod \( Q \) by Lemma 2.3(c). As a consequence, we obtain that \( W(u) \equiv [u, n^{-1}]|S|/2 \mod Q \). Suppose that \( |S|/2 \) is an even number. We get
\[ [u, n^{-1}] |^{S/2} \in Q \text{ as } [u, n^{-1}] \in Z \leq R. \text{ This contradicts the fact that } W(u) \notin Q, \text{ and so } |S|/2 \text{ is odd. It follows that } |P : R| = |S| = 2 \text{ as required.} \]

(4) \( R = Z. \)

Suppose that \( Z < R. \text{ Note that } R = P \cap N^x = P \cap N_G(P)^x, \text{ and so } R = P \cap P^x. \)

Since \( |P : R| = 2 \) by \((3), |P^x : R| \) is also equal to 2. As a result, \( R \) is normal in both \( P \) and \( P^x \), that is, \( R \) is a tame intersection. Thus, we see that \( N_G(R) \) is \( p \)-nilpotent by hypothesis. Pick \( x_0 \in N_G(R) \) such that \( P^x = P^{x_0}. \) Then \( x_0 x^{-1} \in N \) which implies \( x_0 = tx \) for some \( t \in N. \) We observe that \( N x_0 P = N t x P = N x P, \) and so we may replace the double coset representative \( x \) with \( x_0. \)

Since \( N_G(R) \) is \( p \)-nilpotent, we can write \( x = c_1 c_2 \) for some \( c_1 \in P \) and \( c_2 \in C_G(R). \) As \( W(u) \notin Q = P \cap M^x, \) we see that \( x W(u) x^{-1} = c_1 c_2 W(u) c_2^{-1} c_1^{-1} = c_1 W(u) c_1^{-1} \notin M. \) Thus, \( W(u) \notin M^{c_1} = M. \) Recall that \( |P : M \cap P| = p = 2, \) and so \( P' \leq M. \) Hence, we obtain that

\[
W(u) = \prod_{s \in S} s u s^{-1} = \prod_{s \in S} [s^{-1}, u^{-1}]u \equiv \prod_{s \in S} u = u^2 \equiv 1 \mod M \cap P.
\]

It follows \( W(u) \in M, \) which is not the case. This contradiction shows that \( Z = R. \)

(5) Final contradiction.

We observe that \( |P : Z| = |P : Z^*(P)| = 2 \) by \( (4). \) If \( T \) is a homomorphic image of \( P, \) we can conclude that \( |T : Z^*(T)| \leq 2. \) Since \( N \) does not control \( p \)-transfer in \( G, \) \( P \) has a homomorphic image which is isomorphic to \( Z_2 \ast Z_2 \cong D_8 \) by Yoshida’s theorem. However, \( |D_8 : Z^*(D_8)| = |D_8 : Z(D_8)| = 4. \) This contradiction completes the proof. \( \square \)

4. Applications

**Theorem 4.1.** Assume that for any two distinct Sylow \( p \)-subgroups \( P \) and \( Q \) of \( G, \)

\( |P \cap Q| \leq p^{r-1}. \) Then \( N_G(P) \) controls \( p \)-transfer in \( G. \)

**Proof.** We may suppose that \( c(P) \geq p. \) Notice that the inequality \( |Z_{p-1}(P)| \geq p^{r-1} \) holds in this case. Then the result follows by Corollary \( \Box \).


The main theorem of [3] states that if \( N_G(P) \) is \( p \)-nilpotent and for any two distinct Sylow \( p \)-subgroups \( P \) and \( Q \) of \( G, |P \cap Q| \leq p^{r-1} \) then \( G \) is \( p \)-nilpotent. The above theorem is a generalization of this fact.

**Theorem 4.2.** Let \( P \in \text{Syl}_p(G). \) Suppose that \( P \) is of classes \( p \) and \( N_G(P) \) is \( p \)-nilpotent. If \( N_G(P) \) is a maximal subgroup of \( G \) then \( G \) is a \( p \)-solvable group of length 1.

**Proof.** We may suppose that \( G \) is not \( p \)-nilpotent. Then there exists \( U \leq G \) such that \( Z_{p-1} < U < P \) and \( N_G(U) \) is not \( p \)-nilpotent by Corollary \( \Box. \) Since \( Z_{p-1} < U, U \leq P. \) It follows that \( U \leq N_G(P) \) as \( N_G(P) \) is \( p \)-nilpotent. Note that \( N_G(P) \neq N_G(U) \) as \( N_G(U) \) is not \( p \)-nilpotent. Thus we get \( N_G(P) < N_G(U), \) and hence \( U \triangleleft G. \) On the other hand, \( G/U \) is \( p \)-nilpotent as \( P/U \) is an abelian Sylow
subgroup of $G/U$ where $N_G(P)/U = N_{G/U}(P/U)$ is $p$-nilpotent. Then the result follows.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. Suppose that $P$ is of class $p$ and the number of Sylow $p$-subgroups of $G$ is $p+1$. Then either $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ or $O_p(G) \neq 1$.

**Proof.** Suppose that $N_G(P)$ does not control $p$-transfer in $G$. Then there exists a tame intersection $Z_{p-1} < P \cap Q < P$ by Theorem 1.3. Since $P \cap Q \triangleleft P$ and $P \cap Q$ is a tame intersection, we have also $P \cap Q \triangleleft Q$. It then follows that $P \cap Q \triangleleft \langle P, Q \rangle$. Due to the fact that $G$ has $p+1$ Sylow $p$-subgroups and $P \neq Q$, $\langle P, Q \rangle = \langle P^g \mid g \in G \rangle$, and hence it is a normal subgroup of $G$. Then we obtain that $1 < P \cap Q \leq O_p((P, Q)) \leq O_p(G)$ as desired.

Thompson proved that if $G$ posses a nilpotent maximal subgroup of odd order then $G$ is solvable. Later Janko extended this result in [5] as follows:

**Theorem 4.4** (Janko). Let $G$ be a group having a nilpotent maximal subgroup $M$. If a Sylow $2$-subgroup of $M$ is of class at most $2$ then $G$ is solvable.

The above theorem can be deduced by the means of Theorem 4.2. We extend the result of Janko by using Corollary 1.9 with the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let $G$ be a group with a nilpotent maximal subgroup $M$. If a Sylow $2$-subgroup of $M$ is of norm length at most $2$ then $G$ is solvable.

**Proof.** We proceed by induction on the order of $G$. Suppose $O_p(G) \neq 1$ for a prime $p$ dividing the order of $M$. If $O_p(G) \leq M$ then $G/O_p(G)$ satisfies the hypothesis and hence $G/O_p(G)$ is solvable by induction. If $O_p(G) \nleq M$ then $G = MO_p(G)$ due to the maximality of $M$. Thus, $G/O_p(G)$ is solvable as $M$ is nilpotent. Then we see that $G$ is solvable in both cases. Thus, we may suppose that $O_p(G) = 1$ for any prime $p$ dividing the order of $M$.

Now let $P \in \text{Syl}_p(M)$. Since $M$ is nilpotent, we get $M \leq N_G(P)$. On the other hand, $N_G(P) < G$ as $O_p(G) = 1$. Then we have $N_G(P) = M$ by the maximality of $M$. Thus $P$ is also a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $G$, that is, $M$ is a Hall subgroup of $G$. Let $X$ be a characteristic subgroup of $P$. Then $N_G(X) = M$ with a similar argument, and hence $N_G(X)$ is $p$-nilpotent. It follows that $G$ is $p$-nilpotent by Thompson $p$-nilpotency theorem when $p$ is odd.

Now assume that $p = 2$. Let $Z^*(P) \leq U \leq P = Z_2^*(P)$. Since $P/Z^*(P)$ is a Dedekind group, $U/Z^*(P) \triangleleft P/Z^*(P)$. It follows that $U \triangleleft P$, and hence $U \triangleleft M$. Then we get $N_G(U) = M$ which is $p$-nilpotent. Thus, we obtain that $G$ is $p$-nilpotent by Corollary 1.9.

As a result $G$ is $p$-nilpotent for each prime $p$ dividing the order of $M$. Then $M$ has a normal complement $N$ in $G$. Notice that $M$ acts on $N$ coprimely, and so we may choose an $M$-invariant Sylow $q$-subgroup $Q$ of $N$ for a prime $q$ dividing the order of $N$. The maximality of $M$ forces that $MQ = G$, that is, $N = Q$. Since $N$ is a $q$-group, we see that $G$ is solvable.
Remark 4.6. We should note that there are groups of class $3$, which have norm length $2$. For example, one can consider the quaternion group $Q_{16}$. We also note that the bound in terms of norm length is the best possible. For example, $D_{16}$ is of norm length $3$ and it is isomorphic to a Sylow $2$-subgroup $P$ of $PSL(2,17)$ and $P$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$.

Definition 4.7. A group $G$ is called $p^i$-central of height $k$ if every element of order $p^i$ of $G$ is contained in $Z_k(G)$.

Theorem 4.8. Let $G$ be a group and $P$ be a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $G$ where $p$ is an odd prime. Assume that either $P$ is $p$-central of height $p - 2$ or $p^2$-central of height of $p - 1$. Then $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

Remark 4.9. Let $G$ be a group and $P \in Syl_p(G)$. Assume that $P$ is $p$-central of height $p - 2$ for an odd prime $p$. By ([6], Theorem E), $N_G(P)$ controls $G$-fusion if $G$ is a $p$-solvable group. In this case, $N_G(P)$ also controls $p$-transfer in $G$. On the other hand, Theorem 4.8 guarantees that $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ for an arbitrary finite group $G$.

We need the following result in the proof of Theorem 4.8.

Theorem 4.10. ([6] Theorem B] Let $G$ be a group. If $G$ is $p$-central of height $p - 2$ or $p^2$-central of height of $p - 1$, then so is $G/\Omega(G)$.

Proof of Theorem 4.8. We proceed by induction on the order $G$. Set $Z = \Omega(P)$. Clearly, $Z$ is weakly closed in $P$. Since $\Omega(P) \leq Z_{p - 1}(P)$, $N_G(Z)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ by ([6], Theorem 14.4.2).

If $N_G(Z) < G$ then $N_G(Z)$ clearly satisfies the hypothesis, and hence $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $N_G(Z)$. It follows that $P \cap G' = P \cap N_G(Z)' = P \cap N_G(P)'$, and hence $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$.

Now assume that $Z \leq G$. By Theorem 4.10, $P/Z$ is a Sylow $p$-subgroup of $G/Z$, which is $p$-central of height $p - 2$ or $p^2$-central of height of $p - 1$. Thus, $N_G(P)/Z = N_G/Z(P/Z)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G/Z$ by induction. Since $Z \leq Z_{p - 1}(P)$, the result follows by Lemma 3.1. □

Conclusion. “Control $p$-transfer theorems” supply many nonsimplicity theorems by their nature. Let $N$ be a subgroup of a group $G$ such that $|G : N|$ is coprime to $p$. If $N$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$ and $O_p(N) < N$ then $G$ is not simple of course.

It is an easy exercise to observe that if $K$ is a normal $p^i$-subgroup of $G$, and write $\overline{G} = G/K$, then $N$ controls $p$-transfer in $\overline{G}$ if and only if $N$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$. However, this need not be true if $K$ is a $p$-group. Thus, Lemma 3.1 supplies an important criterion for that purpose and it enables the usage of the induction in the proof of “Control $p$-transfer theorems”. It also seems that Lemma 4.8 can be improved further by better commutator tricks or more careful analysis of the transfer map.

Proposition 3.4 shows that when some certain characteristic subgroups of a Sylow subgroup are weakly closed in $P$, $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer in $G$. One can ask that
whether the converse of this statement is true? Another natural question is that whether “control fusion” analogue of Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.4 are possible.

When we combine Proposition 3.7 with Alperin Fusion theorem, we obtain our main theorems, which simply say that $N_G(P)$ tends to controls $p$-transfer in $G$ if intersection of Sylow subgroups is not “too big”. We also sharpen our result when $p = 2$ via Theorem 4.8 and deduce two new versions of Frobenius normal complement theorem namely, Corollary 1.6 and Corollary 1.9. Since, we can not directly appeal to Thompson-Glauberman $p$-nilpotency theorems when $p = 2$ (and $G$ is not $S_4$ free), the contribution of Corollary 1.9 is important.

Besides the other applications, Theorem 4.8 shows that $N_G(P)$ controls $p$-transfer for groups which have Sylow subgroup isomorphic to one of the two important classes of $p$-groups, namely, $p$-central of height $p - 2$ or $p^2$-central of height of $p - 1$.

Even if we supply some limited applications here, we think that above theorems have nice potential of proving nonsimplicity theorems in finite group theory.
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