

# HOPF-GALOIS STRUCTURES ON FINITE EXTENSIONS WITH QUASISIMPLE GALOIS GROUP

CINDY (SIN YI) TSANG

ABSTRACT. Let  $L/K$  be a finite Galois extension of fields with Galois group  $G$ . It is known that  $L/K$  admits exactly two Hopf-Galois structures when  $G$  is non-abelian simple. In this paper, we extend this result to the case when  $G$  is quasisimple.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Crossed homomorphisms	3
3. Consequences of CFSG	5
4. Proof of Theorem 1.4	6
4.1. Non-perfect groups	7
4.2. Perfect groups	11
Acknowledgments	17
References	17

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $L/K$  be a finite Galois extension of fields with Galois group  $G$ . By [10], we know that each Hopf-Galois structure  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $L/K$  is associated to a group  $N_{\mathcal{H}}$  of the same order as  $G$ . For each group  $N$  of order  $|G|$ , define

$$e(G, N) = \#\{\text{Hopf-Galois structures } \mathcal{H} \text{ on } L/K \text{ with } N_{\mathcal{H}} \simeq N\}.$$

Let  $\text{Perm}(N)$  be the group of all permutations on  $N$ . Recall that a subgroup of  $\text{Perm}(N)$  is *regular* if its action on  $N$  is regular. For example, clearly  $\lambda(N)$  and  $\rho(N)$  are regular subgroups of  $\text{Perm}(N)$ , where

$$\begin{cases} \lambda : N \longrightarrow \text{Perm}(N); & \lambda(\eta) = (x \mapsto \eta x) \\ \rho : N \longrightarrow \text{Perm}(N); & \rho(\eta) = (x \mapsto x\eta^{-1}) \end{cases}$$

are the left and right regular representations of  $N$ . By work of [10] and [4], we have the formula

$$e(G, N) = \frac{|\text{Aut}(G)|}{|\text{Aut}(N)|} \cdot \# \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{regular subgroups of } \text{Hol}(N) \\ \text{which are isomorphic to } G \end{array} \right\},$$

where  $\text{Hol}(N)$  is the *holomorph* of  $N$  and is defined to be

$$\text{Hol}(N) = \rho(N) \rtimes \text{Aut}(N).$$

The calculation of  $e(G, N)$  has been an active line of research because Hopf-Galois structures have application in Galois module theory; see [7] for more details. Let us also note in passing that regular subgroups of the holomorph are related to set-theoretic solutions to the Yang-Baxter equation; see [11].

For  $N \simeq G$ , the number  $e(G, N)$  must be non-zero because  $\lambda(N)$  and  $\rho(N)$  are regular subgroups of  $\text{Hol}(N)$ ; note that  $\lambda(N)$  and  $\rho(N)$  are equal exactly when  $N$  is abelian. For  $N \not\simeq G$ , the number  $e(G, N)$  could very well be zero. In certain extreme cases, it might happen that

$$(1.1) \quad e(G, N) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } N \simeq G \text{ when } G \text{ is abelian,} \\ 2 & \text{for } N \simeq G \text{ when } G \text{ is non-abelian,} \\ 0 & \text{for all other } N \not\simeq G. \end{cases}$$

For  $G$  abelian, by [4, Theorem 1] we know exactly when (1.1) occurs:

**Theorem 1.1.** *If  $G$  is a finite abelian group, then (1.1) holds precisely when the orders of  $G$  and  $(\mathbb{Z}/|G|\mathbb{Z})^\times$  are coprime.*

For  $G$  non-abelian, the situation is more complicated. By [5, 6], we have:

**Theorem 1.2.** *If  $G$  is a finite non-abelian simple group, then (1.1) holds.*

It is natural to ask whether Theorem 1.2 may be generalized to other non-abelian groups  $G$  which are close to being simple. Recall that  $G$  is said to be *quasisimple* if  $G = [G, G]$  and  $G/Z(G)$  is a simple group, where  $[G, G]$  is the commutator subgroup and  $Z(G)$  is the center of  $G$ . In [16, Theorem 1.3], the author has already shown that:

**Theorem 1.3.** *If  $G$  is a finite quasisimple group, then  $e(G, G) = 2$ .*

It remains to consider the groups  $N \not\cong G$ . In [16, Theorem 1.6], the author has shown that if  $G$  is the double cover of  $A_n$  with  $n \geq 5$ , then  $e(G, N) = 0$  for all groups  $N \not\cong G$  of order  $n!$ . We shall extend this result and prove:

**Theorem 1.4.** *If  $G$  is a finite quasisimple group, then  $e(G, N) = 0$  for all groups  $N \not\cong G$  of order  $|G|$ .*

In view of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4, one might guess that (1.1) is also true for say, finite almost simple or non-abelian characteristically simple groups  $G$ . If  $G = S_n$  with  $n \geq 5$ , however, then by [6, Theorems 5 and 9], we have

$$e(G, G) \neq 2 \text{ and } e(G, N) \neq 0 \text{ for some } N \not\cong G.$$

See [19, 21] for generalizations to other finite almost simple groups  $G$ . If  $G$  is a finite non-abelian characteristically simple group which is not simple, then  $e(G, G) \neq 2$  by [17], but as far as the author knows, there is no investigation yet on whether there exists  $N \not\cong G$  such that  $e(G, N) \neq 0$ .

## 2. CROSSED HOMOMORPHISMS

In this section, let  $G$  and  $\Gamma$  be finite groups, whose orders are not assumed to be equal. Given  $\mathfrak{f} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(\Gamma))$ , recall that a *crossed homomorphism* (with respect to  $\mathfrak{f}$ ) is a map  $\mathfrak{g} : G \rightarrow \Gamma$  which satisfies

$$\mathfrak{g}(\sigma\tau) = \mathfrak{g}(\sigma) \cdot \mathfrak{f}(\sigma)(\mathfrak{g}(\tau)) \text{ for all } \sigma, \tau \in G.$$

Let  $Z_{\mathfrak{f}}^1(G, \Gamma)$  be the set of all such maps  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The regular subgroups of  $\text{Hol}(\Gamma)$  isomorphic to  $G$  may be parametrized by the bijective maps in  $Z_{\mathfrak{f}}^1(G, \Gamma)$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *The regular subgroups of  $\text{Hol}(\Gamma)$  isomorphic to  $G$  are precisely the sets  $\{\rho(\mathfrak{g}(\sigma)) \cdot \mathfrak{f}(\sigma) : \sigma \in G\}$ , as  $\mathfrak{f}$  ranges over  $\text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(\Gamma))$  and  $\mathfrak{g}$  over the bijective maps in  $Z_{\mathfrak{f}}^1(G, \Gamma)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is straightforward; see [16, Proposition 2.1]. □

Hence, when  $\Gamma$  has order  $|G|$ , that  $e(G, \Gamma)$  is non-zero is equivalent to the existence of a bijective map  $\mathfrak{g} \in Z_{\mathfrak{f}}^1(G, \Gamma)$  for some  $\mathfrak{f} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(\Gamma))$ . Let us give two approaches to study these crossed homomorphisms. The first is to define another  $\mathfrak{h} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(\Gamma))$ . The idea originates from [6] and was

formalized by the author in [19, Proposition 3.4] or [21, Proposition 2.3]. The second is to use *characteristic* subgroups of  $\Gamma$ , that is, subgroups  $\Lambda$  such that  $\varphi(\Lambda) = \Lambda$  for all  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ . The idea comes from [5] and was restated in terms of crossed homomorphisms by the author in [16, Lemma 4.1].

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\mathfrak{f} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(\Gamma))$  and  $\mathfrak{g} \in Z_{\mathfrak{f}}^1(G, \Gamma)$ . Define*

$$\mathfrak{h} : G \longrightarrow \text{Aut}(\Gamma); \quad \mathfrak{h}(\sigma) = \text{conj}(\mathfrak{g}(\sigma)) \cdot \mathfrak{f}(\sigma),$$

where  $\text{conj}(\cdot) = \lambda(\cdot)\rho(\cdot)$ . Then:

- (a) We have  $\mathfrak{h} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(\Gamma))$ .
- (b) For any  $\sigma \in G$ , we have  $\mathfrak{f}(\sigma) = \mathfrak{h}(\sigma)$  if and only if  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{g}^{-1}(Z(\Gamma))$ .
- (c) The map  $\sigma \mapsto \mathfrak{g}(\sigma)$  defines a homomorphism  $\ker(\mathfrak{f}) \longrightarrow \Gamma$ .
- (d) The map  $\sigma \mapsto \mathfrak{g}(\sigma)^{-1}$  defines a homomorphism  $\ker(\mathfrak{h}) \longrightarrow \Gamma$ .

*Proof.* Part (a) appeared in [19, Proposition 3.4], while parts (b) – (d) were stated in [21, Proposition 2.3]. The proofs are straightforward.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\mathfrak{f} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(\Gamma))$  and  $\mathfrak{g} \in Z_{\mathfrak{f}}^1(G, \Gamma)$ . Let  $\Lambda$  be any characteristic subgroup of  $\Gamma$ . Consider the homomorphism*

$$\bar{\mathfrak{f}} : G \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{f}} \text{Aut}(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\varphi \mapsto (\gamma\Lambda \mapsto \varphi(\gamma)\Lambda)} \text{Aut}(\Gamma/\Lambda)$$

induced by  $\mathfrak{f}$  and the map

$$\bar{\mathfrak{g}} : G \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{g}} \Gamma \xrightarrow{\text{quotient map}} \Gamma/\Lambda$$

induced by  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then:

- (a) We have  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} \in Z_{\bar{\mathfrak{f}}}^1(G, \Gamma/\Lambda)$ .
- (b) The preimage  $\mathfrak{g}^{-1}(\Lambda)$  is a subgroup of  $G$ .
- (c) In the case that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is bijective, there is a regular subgroup of  $\text{Hol}(\Lambda)$  which is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{g}^{-1}(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Parts (a) and (b) are clear; see [16, Proposition 4.1] for a proof of the latter. For part (c), see [20, Proposition 3.3].  $\square$

Following [5], we shall take  $\Lambda$  to be a maximal characteristically subgroup of  $\Gamma$ . Then, the quotient  $\Gamma/\Lambda$  is a non-trivial characteristically simple group,

and since  $\Gamma$  is finite, we know that

$$(2.1) \quad \Gamma/\Lambda \simeq T^m, \text{ where } T \text{ is a simple group and } m \in \mathbb{N},$$

in which case the structure of  $\text{Aut}(\Gamma/\Lambda)$  is well-known. This approach turns out to be very useful and was crucial in all of [16, 18, 20, 21].

### 3. CONSEQUENCES OF CFSG

In this section, let  $A$  be a finite non-abelian simple group. We shall require some consequences of the classification of finite simple groups (CFSG).

One difficulty in dealing with finite quasisimple groups, as opposed to non-abelian simple groups, is that they need not be centerless. But their center is a quotient of the Schur multiplier of the associated finite non-abelian simple group; see [1, Section 33] for more on Schur multipliers.

Let  $\mathfrak{m}(A)$  denote the order of the Schur multiplier of  $A$ . We shall say that  $\text{PSL}_n(q)$  and  $\text{PSU}_n(q)$ , respectively, are *non-exceptional* if

$$(3.1) \quad \mathfrak{m}(\text{PSL}_n(q)) = \gcd(n, q-1) \text{ and } \mathfrak{m}(\text{PSU}_n(q)) = \gcd(n, q+1).$$

As a consequence of CFSG, we know that  $\mathfrak{m}(A)$  is small, in fact at most 12, except when  $A \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q)$ . More specifically:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{M} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 12\}$ .*

- (a) *If  $A \not\simeq \text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q)$ , then  $\mathfrak{m}(A) \in \mathfrak{M}$ .*
- (b) *If  $A = \text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q)$ , then  $\mathfrak{m}(A) \in \mathfrak{M}$  or  $A$  is non-exceptional, except that  $\mathfrak{m}(\text{PSL}_3(4)) = 48$  and  $\mathfrak{m}(\text{PSU}_4(3)) = 36$ .*

*Proof.* See [15, Theorem 5.1.4]. □

**Lemma 3.2.** *The outer automorphism group  $\text{Out}(A)$  of  $A$  is solvable.*

*Proof.* This is known as Schreier conjecture; see [9, Theorem 1.46]. □

**Lemma 3.3.** *Every  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(A)$  has a fixed point other than  $1_A$ .*

*Proof.* See [9, Theorem 1.48]. □

**Lemma 3.4.** *There do not exist subgroups  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  of  $A$  such that both of them have non-trivial center and  $A = B_1B_2$ .*

*Proof.* This was a conjecture of Szep and was proven in [8].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Suppose that  $A$  has a subgroup of index  $p^a$ , where  $p$  is a prime and  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, one of the following holds:*

- (a)  $A \simeq A_{p^a}$  with  $p^a \geq 5$ ;
- (b)  $A \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q)$  with  $p^a = (q^n - 1)/(q - 1)$ ;
- (c)  $A \simeq \text{PSL}_2(11)$  with  $p^a = 11$ ;
- (d)  $A \simeq M_{11}$  with  $p^a = 11$ , or  $A \simeq M_{23}$  with  $p^a = 23$ ;
- (e)  $A \simeq \text{PSU}_4(2)$  with  $p^a = 27$ .

*Proof.* See [12, Theorem 1].  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In this section, let  $G$  be a finite quasisimple group, and let  $N$  be any group of order  $|G|$ . Suppose that  $e(G, N) \neq 0$ , namely there is a regular subgroup  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $\text{Hol}(N)$  isomorphic to  $G$ . In the next two subsections, we shall prove:

**Proposition 4.1.** *The group  $N$  must be perfect, namely  $N = [N, N]$ .*

**Proposition 4.2.** *The regular subgroup  $\mathcal{G}$  is either  $\rho(N)$  or  $\lambda(N)$ .*

Theorem 1.4 would follow, because then  $N \simeq \mathcal{G} \simeq G$ .

Let us first set up the notation. By Proposition 2.1, we know that

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\rho(\mathfrak{g}(\sigma)) \cdot \mathfrak{f}(\sigma) : \sigma \in G\}, \text{ where } \begin{cases} \mathfrak{f} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(N)), \\ \mathfrak{g} \in Z_{\mathfrak{f}}^1(G, N) \text{ is bijective.} \end{cases}$$

Alternatively, we may rewrite it as

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\lambda(\mathfrak{g}(\sigma))^{-1} \cdot \mathfrak{h}(\sigma) : \sigma \in G\}, \text{ where } \mathfrak{h} \in \text{Hom}(G, \text{Aut}(N))$$

is defined as in Proposition 2.2. Let  $M$  be any maximal characteristic subgroup of  $N$ . Then, as in Proposition 2.3, we have homomorphisms

$$\bar{\mathfrak{f}}, \bar{\mathfrak{h}} : G \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{h}} \text{Aut}(N) \xrightarrow{\varphi \mapsto (\eta M \mapsto \varphi(\eta)M)} \text{Aut}(N/M)$$

induced by  $\mathfrak{f}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$ , respectively, and a surjective crossed homomorphism

$$\bar{\mathfrak{g}} : G \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{g}} N \xrightarrow{\text{quotient map}} N/M$$

with respect to  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  induced by  $\mathfrak{g}$ . We shall also need the facts that

$$(4.1) \quad Z(G) \text{ is a quotient of the Schur multiplier of } G/Z(G),$$

$$(4.2) \quad \text{all proper normal subgroups of } G \text{ are contained in } Z(G).$$

See [1, (33.8)] for the former, and the latter is an easy exercise.

**4.1. Non-perfect groups.** Suppose for contradiction that  $N$  is not perfect, in which case we may take  $M$  to contain  $[N, N]$ . By (2.1), we then have

$$N/M \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^m, \text{ where } p \text{ is a prime and } m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let us first make a simple observation.

**Lemma 4.3.** *The homomorphism  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  is non-trivial and  $m \geq 2$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for contradiction that  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  is trivial. Then, the map

$$G \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathfrak{g}}} N/M \xrightarrow{\simeq} (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^m$$

is a homomorphism by Proposition 2.2(c), and so must be trivial because  $G$  is perfect. This contradicts that  $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$  is surjective, so indeed  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  is non-trivial. It follows that  $m \geq 2$ , for otherwise

$$G \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathfrak{f}}} \text{Aut}(N/M) \xrightarrow{\simeq} (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$$

would be trivial again because  $G$  is perfect, which we know is impossible.  $\square$

Define  $H = \mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M)$ , which is a subgroup of  $G$  by Proposition 2.3(b), and whose order is  $|M|$  because  $\mathfrak{g}$  is bijective. Thus, we have  $[G : H] = p^m$ . Put

$$p^z = [HZ(G) : H] = [Z(G) : H \cap Z(G)], \text{ where } 0 \leq z \leq m.$$

Note that  $p$  divides  $|Z(G)|$  unless  $z = 0$ . Also  $m - z \geq 1$ , for otherwise

$$G = HZ(G) \text{ and in particular } G = [G, G] = [H, H],$$

which is impossible because  $H$  is a proper subgroup. Since

$$\left[ \frac{G}{Z(G)} : \frac{HZ(G)}{Z(G)} \right] = \frac{[G : H]}{[HZ(G) : H]} = p^{m-z},$$

by Lemma 3.5 one of the following holds:

- (a)  $G/Z(G) \simeq A_{p^{m-z}}$  with  $p^{m-z} \geq 5$ ;
- (b)  $G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q)$  with  $p^{m-z} = (q^n - 1)/(q - 1)$ ;
- (c)  $G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_2(11)$  with  $p^{m-z} = 11$ ;
- (d)  $G/Z(G) \simeq M_{11}$  with  $p^{m-z} = 11$ , or  $G/Z(G) \simeq M_{23}$  with  $p^{m-z} = 23$ ;
- (e)  $G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSU}_4(2)$  with  $p^{m-z} = 27$ .

Since Theorem 1.4 holds when  $G$  is a finite non-abelian simple group by [5], and when  $G$  is the double cover of  $A_n$  with  $n \geq 5$  by [16, Theorem 1.6], we may henceforth assume that:

**Assumption.** The center  $Z(G)$  of  $G$  is non-trivial.

Recall from (4.1) that  $|Z(G)|$  divides  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G))$ . Hence, this assumption in particular restricts that  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G)) \neq 1$ .

**Assumption.** The group  $G$  is not the double cover of an alternating group.

**Lemma 4.4.** *We must be in case (b).*

*Proof.* Case (d) does not occur by our first assumption because

$$\mathfrak{m}(M_{11}) = 1 = \mathfrak{m}(M_{23}).$$

To deal with cases (a), (c), and (e), note that

$$\mathfrak{m}(A_n) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n = 5 \text{ or } n \geq 8 \\ 6 & \text{if } n = 6, 7 \end{cases} \quad \text{and } \mathfrak{m}(\text{PSL}_2(11)) = 2 = \mathfrak{m}(\text{PSU}_4(2)).$$

For case (a), we must have  $p^{m-z} = 7$  by our second assumption. For case (c), we have  $p^{m-z} = 11$ . In both cases, note that  $p$  does not divide  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G))$ , so  $z = 0$  and  $m = 1$ . But this contradicts Lemma 4.3. For case (e), we have  $p^{m-z} = 27$ . Since  $p$  does not divide  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G))$ , we have  $z = 0$  and  $m = 3$ . Also, by our first assumption, necessarily

$$|Z(G)| = 2, \text{ and so } |G| = 2|\text{PSU}_4(2)| = 51840.$$

But  $|\text{GL}_m(p)| = |\text{GL}_3(3)| = 11232$ , so the homomorphism

$$G \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \text{Aut}(N/M) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{GL}_3(3)$$

is trivial by (4.2) and by comparing orders. But this contradicts Lemma 4.3. Thus, indeed we must be in case (b).  $\square$

In view of Lemma 4.4, we now know that

$$G/Z(G) \simeq \mathrm{PSL}_n(q) \text{ with } p^{m-z} = (q^n - 1)/(q - 1).$$

By [15, Theorem 5.1.4], we also know that  $\mathfrak{m}(\mathrm{PSL}_n(q)) = \gcd(n, q - 1)$ , unless  $(n, q)$  equals one of the five pairs stated in the next lemma. Let us first rule out these cases.

**Lemma 4.5.** *We have  $(n, q) \neq (2, 4), (2, 9), (3, 2), (3, 4), (4, 2)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for contradiction that  $(n, q)$  is one of the stated pairs. Then this pair must be  $(2, 4)$  or  $(3, 2)$  because  $(q^n - 1)/(q - 1)$  is a prime power. Note that

$$p^{m-z} = \frac{q^n - 1}{q - 1} = \begin{cases} 5 & \text{if } (n, q) = (2, 4), \\ 7 & \text{if } (n, q) = (3, 2). \end{cases}$$

But  $\mathfrak{m}(\mathrm{PSL}_2(4)) = 2 = \mathfrak{m}(\mathrm{PSL}_3(2))$ . In either case, since  $p$  does not divide 2, we see that  $z = 0$ , and so  $m = 1$ . But this contradicts Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *We have  $G \simeq \mathrm{SL}_n(q)$  and  $|Z(G)| = n = p$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.5 and our first assumption, respectively, we have

$$\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G)) = \gcd(n, q - 1) \text{ and } \mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G)) \neq 1.$$

As noted in [12, (3.3)], that  $p^{m-z} = (q^n - 1)/(q - 1)$  implies that  $n$  is a prime. It then follows that

$$\gcd(n, q - 1) = n, \text{ and so } q \equiv 1 \pmod{n}.$$

Moreover, we must have  $|Z(G)| = n$  and also  $G \simeq \mathrm{SL}_n(q)$ , the universal cover of  $\mathrm{PSL}_n(q)$ . Note that

$$p^{m-z} \equiv q^{n-1} + \cdots + q + 1 \equiv 1 + \cdots + 1 + 1 \equiv n \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$$

so in fact  $n = p$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We shall now use the next proposition to get a contradiction and thus prove Proposition 4.1; cf. [5, Theorem 4.3] and the argument in [5, Section 4].

**Proposition 4.7.** *Suppose that  $\mathrm{SL}_n(q)$  has a non-trivial irreducible representation of degree  $d$  over a field of characteristic coprime to  $q$ , where*

$$(n, q) \neq (3, 2), (3, 4), (4, 2), (4, 3).$$

Then, we have

$$d \geq \begin{cases} (q-1)/\gcd(2, q-1) & \text{if } n = 2, \\ (q^n - 1)/(q-1) - 2 & \text{if } n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* See [13, Lemma 9.1.1 and Theorem 9.1.5]. □

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.6, we have  $m \geq 2$  and there is a non-trivial homomorphism

$$\mathrm{SL}_n(q) \xrightarrow{\simeq} G \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \mathrm{Aut}(N/M) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{GL}_m(p).$$

Since  $p^{m-z} = (q^n - 1)/(q - 1)$ , we have  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$  and also  $(n, q) \neq (4, 3)$ . By Lemma 4.5, we may then apply Proposition 4.7 as follows. Recall that  $|Z(G)| = n = p$  by Lemma 4.6, which in turn implies  $z = 0, 1$ .

For  $n = 2$ , note that  $p^{m-z} = q + 1$ , and we obtain

$$m \geq \frac{q-1}{\gcd(2, q-1)} = \frac{p^{m-z} - 2}{\gcd(2, p^{m-z} - 2)} \geq \frac{2^{m-1} - 2}{2}.$$

For  $n \geq 3$ , similarly we have

$$m \geq \frac{q^n - 1}{q - 1} - 2 = p^{m-z} - 2 \geq 3^{m-1} - 2.$$

From the above inequalities, we deduce that

$$(m, p) = \begin{cases} (2, 2), (3, 2), (4, 2) & \text{if } n = 2, \\ (2, 3) & \text{if } n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Since  $n^{m-z} = p^{m-z} = (q^n - 1)/(q - 1)$  and  $z = 0, 1$ , it follows that

$$(n, q) = (2, 3), (2, 7), \text{ and in fact necessarily } (n, q) = (2, 7)$$

because  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(3)$  is not simple. We are left with the possibility  $G \simeq \mathrm{SL}_2(7)$ .

Using the `Holomorph` and `RegularSubgroups` commands in `MAGMA` [2], we checked that  $\mathrm{Hol}(N)$  has no regular subgroup isomorphic to  $G \simeq \mathrm{SL}_2(7)$

for all non-perfect groups  $N$  of order 336. We remark that in fact it suffices to check the insolvable groups  $N$  of order 336 by [20, Theorem 1.10]. Thus, we obtain a contradiction, so indeed  $N$  must be perfect.  $\square$

**4.2. Perfect groups.** By Proposition 4.1, we know that  $N$  must be perfect, in which case all quotients of  $N$  are also perfect. By (2.1), we then have

$$N/M \simeq T^m, \text{ where } T \text{ is non-abelian simple and } m \in \mathbb{N},$$

and by [5, Lemma 3.2] for example, we know that

$$\text{Aut}(T^m) = \text{Aut}(T)^m \rtimes S_m.$$

We shall also use Burnside's theorem, which states that the order of a finite insolvable group is divisible by at least three distinct primes.

The cases  $G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q)$  require special arguments because then  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G))$  and so  $|Z(G)|$  could be arbitrarily large. Let us recall that

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} |\text{PSL}_n(q)| &= \frac{1}{\gcd(n, q-1)} \left( q^{\binom{n}{2}} \prod_{i=2}^n (q^i - 1) \right), \\ |\text{PSU}_n(q)| &= \frac{1}{\gcd(n, q+1)} \left( q^{\binom{n}{2}} \prod_{i=2}^n (q^i - (-1)^i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We shall prove that either  $\mathfrak{f}$  or  $\mathfrak{h}$  is trivial in a sequence of steps.

**Lemma 4.8.** *The image  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}(G)$  lies in  $\text{Inn}(N/M)$ .*

*Proof.* Below, we shall show that the homomorphism

$$\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{S_m} : G \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathfrak{f}}} \text{Aut}(N/M) \xrightarrow{\text{identification}} \text{Aut}(T)^m \rtimes S_m \xrightarrow{\text{projection}} S_m$$

is trivial. Then, the image  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}(G)$  lies in  $\text{Aut}(T)^m$ , and the homomorphism

$$G \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathfrak{f}}} \text{Aut}(T)^m \xrightarrow{\text{projection}} \text{Out}(T)^m$$

is also trivial, because  $G$  is perfect while  $\text{Out}(T)$  is solvable by Lemma 3.2.

It follows that  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}(G)$  lies in  $\text{Inn}(T)^m$ , which is identified with  $\text{Inn}(N/M)$ .

To prove that  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{S_m}$  is trivial, let  $\ell$  be any prime factor of  $|T|$ . For any finite group  $\Gamma$ , let  $v_\ell(\Gamma)$  be the non-negative integer such that  $\ell^{v_\ell(\Gamma)}$  exactly divides

$|\Gamma|$ . We have  $v_\ell(G) \geq m$  because  $|G| = |N| = |T|^m |M|$ . It is well-known that

$$v_\ell(S_m) = \left\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell^2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{m}{\ell^3} \right\rfloor + \cdots \text{ and so } v_\ell(S_m) < \frac{m}{\ell - 1}.$$

Since  $G/\ker(\bar{f}_{S_m})$  embeds into  $S_m$ , we then deduce that

$$(4.4) \quad v_\ell(G) - v_\ell(\ker(\bar{f}_{S_m})) \leq v_\ell(S_m) < \frac{m}{\ell - 1}.$$

Suppose now for contradiction that  $\bar{f}_{S_m}$  is non-trivial, in which case  $\ker(\bar{f}_{S_m})$  lies in  $Z(G)$  by (4.2). From  $m \leq v_\ell(G)$  and (4.4), we see that

$$m - v_\ell(Z(G)) \leq v_\ell(G) - v_\ell(Z(G)) \leq v_\ell(G) - v_\ell(\ker(\bar{f}_{S_m})) < \frac{m}{\ell - 1},$$

and so  $v_\ell(Z(G)) \geq 1$ . This implies that every prime factor of  $|T|$  also divides  $|Z(G)|$ . From Burnside's theorem and (4.1), it then follows that  $\mathbf{m}(G/Z(G))$  has at least three distinct prime divisors. From Lemma 3.1, we deduce that

$$G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q) \text{ with } \text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q) \text{ non-exceptional.}$$

Put  $v_\ell(G) = x$  and  $v_\ell(Z(G)) = y$ , where  $x, y \geq 1$ . Then, we have

$$x - y < \frac{m}{\ell - 1} \leq \frac{x}{\ell - 1} \text{ and in particular } y > \frac{\ell - 2}{\ell - 1} \cdot x.$$

Also, from (3.1) and (4.1), we see that

$$(4.5) \quad |Z(G)| \text{ divides } \begin{cases} \gcd(n, q - 1) & \text{if } G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q), \\ \gcd(n, q + 1) & \text{if } G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSU}_n(q). \end{cases}$$

Since  $\ell^y$  divides  $|Z(G)|$ , from (4.5) we have  $\ell^y \leq n$ , that is  $y \leq \log(n)/\log(\ell)$ .

Observe that the order formulae in (4.3) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} (q - 1)^{n-2} &\text{ divides } |\text{PSL}_n(q)|, \\ (q + 1)^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1} &\text{ divides } |\text{PSU}_n(q)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\ell^y$  divides  $|Z(G)|$ , again from (4.5) we see that  $\ell$  divides  $q - 1$  and  $q + 1$ , respectively, and in particular

$$v_\ell(G) - v_\ell(Z(G)) \geq \begin{cases} n - 2 & \text{if } G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q), \\ \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1 & \text{if } G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSU}_n(q). \end{cases}$$

In either case, this in turns yields

$$x - 1 \geq x - y \geq \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2} - 1 \text{ and so } x \geq \frac{n-1}{2}.$$

Again, by Burnside's theorem, we may take  $\ell \geq 5$ . We obtain

$$\frac{4}{3} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\log(5)} \geq \frac{\ell-1}{\ell-2} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\log(\ell)} \geq \frac{\ell-1}{\ell-2} \cdot y > x \geq \frac{n-1}{2}.$$

But then  $n = 2$ , which contradicts that  $5 \leq \ell^y \leq n$ . Hence, indeed  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}_{S_m}$  must be trivial, and this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.** *We have  $N/M \simeq T$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $\text{Inn}(N/M) \simeq N/M \simeq T^m$ . Depending on whether  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  is trivial or not, by Proposition 2.2(c) and Lemma 4.8, respectively, we see that there is a non-trivial homomorphism  $\varphi : G \rightarrow T^m$ . Let  $1 \leq i \leq m$  be such that

$$\varphi^{(i)} : G \xrightarrow{\varphi} T^m \xrightarrow{\text{projection}} T^{(i)} \text{ (the } i\text{th copy of } T\text{)}$$

is non-trivial. Since  $\ker(\varphi^{(i)})$  lies in  $Z(G)$  by (4.2), we have

$$\frac{|T|^m |M|}{|Z(G)|} [Z(G) : \ker(\varphi^{(i)})] = \frac{|G|}{|\ker(\varphi^{(i)})|} = |\varphi^{(i)}(G)| = \frac{|T|}{[T^{(i)} : \varphi^{(i)}(G)]},$$

and in particular

$$(4.6) \quad |Z(G)| = |T|^{m-1} |M| [Z(G) : \ker(\varphi^{(i)})] [T^{(i)} : \varphi^{(i)}(G)].$$

Suppose for contradiction that  $m \geq 2$ , in which case  $|T|$  divides  $|Z(G)|$  and hence  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G))$  by (4.1). Since all groups of order at most 48 are solvable, from Lemma 3.1 and (3.1), we see that

$$G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_n(\ell^a), \text{PSU}_n(\ell^a), \text{ where } \ell \text{ is a prime, and } \ell \nmid |Z(G)|.$$

But  $\ell$  divides  $|G| = |T|^m |M|$  by (4.3) and thus  $|T| |M|$ . This shows that (4.6) cannot hold, so indeed  $m = 1$ , and we have  $N/M \simeq T$ .  $\square$

For any  $\sigma \in G$ , recall that  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}(\sigma) = \text{conj}(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}(\sigma)) \cdot \bar{\mathfrak{f}}(\sigma)$  by definition, and so

$$(4.7) \quad \bar{\mathfrak{f}}(\sigma) = \bar{\mathfrak{h}}(\sigma) \iff \bar{\mathfrak{g}}(\sigma) = 1_{N/M} \iff \sigma \in \mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M)$$

because  $N/M$  has trivial center.

**Lemma 4.10.** *We have  $G/Z(G) \simeq T$  and  $|M| = |Z(G)|$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.8, the image  $\bar{f}(G)$  lies in  $\text{Inn}(N/M)$ , and so plainly  $\bar{h}(G)$  lies in  $\text{Inn}(N/M)$  as well. Since  $\text{Inn}(N/M) \simeq N/M$ , we then have

$$|G/\ker(\bar{f})|, |G/\ker(\bar{h})| \leq |N/M|, \text{ and so } |M| \leq |\ker(\bar{f})|, |\ker(\bar{h})|.$$

Trivially  $\bar{f}(\sigma) = \bar{h}(\sigma)$  for all  $\sigma \in \ker(\bar{f}) \cap \ker(\bar{h})$ , so by (4.7) we have

$$|\ker(\bar{f}) \cap \ker(\bar{h})| \leq |\mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M)|, \text{ and } |\mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M)| = |M|$$

because  $\mathfrak{g}$  is bijective. Since  $\bar{g}$  is surjective, we also have the factorization

$$\text{Inn}(N/M) = \bar{f}(G)\bar{h}(G), \text{ whence } \bar{f}(G) \text{ or } \bar{h}(G) \text{ has trivial center}$$

by Lemmas 3.4 and 4.9. This implies that  $\ker(\bar{f}) \subset \ker(\bar{h})$  or  $\ker(\bar{h}) \subset \ker(\bar{f})$  has to hold, for otherwise  $\ker(\bar{f}), \ker(\bar{h}) \not\subseteq Z(G)$  by (4.2), and both  $\bar{f}(G)$  and  $\bar{h}(G)$  would have non-trivial center. By symmetry, we may assume that the former inclusion holds. Then, from the above inequalities, we deduce that

$$|M| = |\ker(\bar{f})|, \text{ and so } G/\ker(\bar{f}) \simeq \text{Inn}(N/M) \simeq T$$

by comparing orders. But  $\ker(\bar{f})$  lies in  $Z(G)$  again by (4.2), and  $T$  has trivial center, so in fact  $\ker(\bar{f}) = Z(G)$ . Both claims now follow.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.11.** *Either  $\bar{f}$  or  $\bar{h}$  is trivial, and  $Z(G) = \mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for contradiction that both  $\bar{f}$  and  $\bar{h}$  are non-trivial. By (4.2), this means that both  $\ker(\bar{f})$  and  $\ker(\bar{h})$  lie in  $Z(G)$ . Since  $G/\ker(\bar{f}), G/\ker(\bar{h})$  embed into  $\text{Inn}(N/M)$ , by comparing orders and by Lemma 4.10, we have

$$\ker(\bar{f}) = Z(G) = \ker(\bar{h}) \text{ and } \bar{f}(G) = \text{Inn}(N/M) = \bar{h}(G).$$

From (4.7), we then deduce that  $Z(G) \subset \mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M)$ , which must be an equality by Lemma 4.10 and the bijectivity of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The above also implies that  $\bar{f}$  and  $\bar{h}$ , respectively, induce isomorphisms

$$\varphi_f, \varphi_h : G/Z(G) \longrightarrow \text{Inn}(N/M), \text{ and } \varphi_h^{-1} \circ \varphi_f \in \text{Aut}(G/Z(G)).$$

But for any  $\sigma \in G$ , again by (4.7), we have

$$(\varphi_h^{-1} \circ \varphi_f)(\sigma Z(G)) = \sigma Z(G) \iff \sigma \in \mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M) \iff \sigma Z(G) = 1_{G/Z(G)}.$$

This contradicts Lemma 3.3. Thus, at least one of  $\bar{f}$  or  $\bar{h}$  is trivial.

Now, by Proposition 2.2(c),(d), the surjective map

$$\varphi : G \longrightarrow N/M; \quad \varphi(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \bar{g}(\sigma) & \text{if } \bar{f} \text{ is trivial} \\ \bar{g}(\sigma)^{-1} & \text{if } \bar{h} \text{ is trivial} \end{cases}$$

is a homomorphism, and  $\ker(\varphi)$  lies in  $Z(G)$  by (4.2). By comparing orders, we see from Lemma 4.10 that in fact  $\ker(\varphi) = Z(G)$ . But in both cases, we have  $\ker(\varphi) = \mathfrak{g}^{-1}(M)$  by definition, so the claim follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.12.** *We have  $M \subset Z(N)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $M$  is normal in  $N$ , we have a homomorphism

$$\Phi : N \xrightarrow{\eta \mapsto (x \mapsto \eta x \eta^{-1})} \text{Aut}(M) \xrightarrow{\text{projection}} \text{Out}(M)$$

whose kernel clearly contains  $M$ . Either  $\Phi$  is trivial or  $\ker(\Phi) = M$  because  $N/M$  is simple by Lemma 4.9.

Suppose first that  $\Phi$  is trivial. This implies that

$$N = MC, \text{ where } C \text{ is the centralizer of } M \text{ in } N.$$

Given  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$  and a group  $\Gamma$ , let  $\Gamma^{(i)}$  denote its  $i$ th derived subgroup. Since elements in  $M$  and  $C$  commute, we easily see that

$$N^{(i)} = M^{(i)}C^{(i)} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}.$$

By Lemma 4.11 and Proposition 2.3(c), there is a regular subgroup of  $\text{Hol}(M)$  which is isomorphic to  $Z(G)$ . Since  $Z(G)$  is abelian, it then follows from [20, Theorem 1.3(b)] that  $M$  is metabelian, namely  $M^{(2)} = 1$ . Since  $N$  is perfect, we deduce that

$$N = N^{(1)} = N^{(2)} = M^{(2)}C^{(2)} = C^{(2)} \text{ and so } N = C.$$

This means that all elements in  $N$  centralize  $M$ , that is  $M \subset Z(N)$ .

Suppose now that  $\ker(\Phi) = M$ , in which case  $N/M$  embeds into  $\text{Out}(M)$ . From Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10, we then see that

$$G/Z(G) \text{ embeds into } \text{Out}(M), \text{ and recall } |M| = |Z(G)|.$$

Notice that then  $\text{Out}(M)$  and in particular  $\text{Aut}(M)$  must be insolvable. Let  $\mathfrak{M} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 12\}$  be as in Lemma 3.1. We consider three cases.

1.  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G))$  lies in  $\mathfrak{M}$ : By (4.1) we know that  $|M| = |Z(G)|$  divides one of the numbers in  $\mathfrak{M}$ . But we checked in MAGMA [2] that no such group  $M$  has insolvable  $\text{Aut}(M)$ .
2.  $G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_3(4), \text{PSU}_4(3)$ : Recall Lemma 3.1. Again by (4.1) we know that  $|M| = |Z(G)|$  divides 48 or 36. Since  $\text{Aut}(M)$  must be insolvable, we checked in MAGMA that  $M$  has SMALLGROUP ID equal to one of

$$(4.8) \quad (8, 5), (16, 14), (24, 15), (48, 50), (48, 51), (48, 52),$$

and in particular  $\mathfrak{m}(G/Z(G))$  is divisible by 8. Hence, we have

$$G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_3(4), \text{ and note that } |\text{PSL}_3(4)| = 20160.$$

Again, using the `OuterOrder` command, we computed in MAGMA that

$$|\text{Out}(M)| = 168, 20160, 336, 120, 1344, 40320,$$

respectively, when  $M$  has SMALLGROUP ID in (4.8). Moreover, the group  $M$  is abelian and there is no subgroup isomorphic to  $\text{PSL}_3(4)$  in  $\text{Aut}(M)$ , when  $M$  has SMALLGROUP ID equal to  $(16, 14), (48, 52)$ . We then deduce that  $G/Z(G)$  cannot embed into  $\text{Out}(M)$ .

3.  $G/Z(G) \simeq \text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q)$  with  $\text{PSL}_n(q), \text{PSU}_n(q)$  non-exceptional: We may assume that  $M \neq 1$ . Then, by [14, Corollary 3.3], we have

$$|\varphi| \leq |M| - 1 \text{ for all } \varphi \in \text{Aut}(M).$$

Since  $|M| = |Z(G)|$ , from (3.1) and (4.1), we deduce that

$$|\varphi \text{Inn}(M)| \leq |\varphi| \leq \min\{n - 1, q\} \text{ for all } \varphi \in \text{Aut}(M).$$

Since  $\text{Aut}(M)$  is insolvable, we must have  $n \geq 4$ , and so  $n = 2 + 1 + n_0$  for some integer  $n_0 \geq 1$ . But then  $G/Z(G)$  would contain an element of order  $q^2 - 1 > q$  by [3, Corollary 3(3)] and so cannot embed into  $\text{Out}(M)$ .

In all cases, we obtained a contradiction. Hence, the case  $\ker(\Phi) = M$  in fact does not occur, so indeed  $M \subset Z(N)$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.2.

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* By Lemma 4.11, either  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  or  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}$  is trivial. Since  $N$  is perfect, and  $M \subset Z(N)$  by Lemma 4.12, the homomorphism

$$\mathrm{Aut}(N) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(N/M); \quad \varphi \mapsto (\eta M \mapsto \varphi(\eta)M)$$

is injective; see the proof of [16, Proposition 3.5(c)], for example. Therefore, either  $\mathfrak{f}$  or  $\mathfrak{h}$  is trivial. But clearly

$$\mathcal{G} = \begin{cases} \rho(N) & \text{if } \mathfrak{f} \text{ is trivial,} \\ \lambda(N) & \text{if } \mathfrak{h} \text{ is trivial.} \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof. □

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research supported by the Young Scientists Fund of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Award No.: 11901587).

The author thanks the referee for helpful comments.

### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aschbacher, *Finite group theory*. Second edition. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 10. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [2] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust, *The Magma algebra system. I. The user language*, J. Symbolic Comput., 24 (1997), 23–265.
- [3] A. A. Buturlakin, *Spectra of finite linear and unitary groups* (Russian), Algebra Logika 47 (2008), no. 2, 157–173, 264; translation in Algebra Logic 47 (2008), no. 2, 91–99.
- [4] N. P. Byott, *Uniqueness of Hopf-Galois structure of separable field extensions*, Comm. Algebra 24 (1996), no. 10, 3217–3228. Corrigendum, *ibid.* no. 11, 3705.
- [5] N. P. Byott, *Hopf-Galois structures on field extensions with simple Galois groups*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 36 (2004), no. 1, 23–29.
- [6] S. Carnahan and L. N. Childs, *Counting Hopf-Galois structures on non-abelian Galois field extensions*, J. Algebra 218 (1999), no. 1, 81–92.
- [7] L. N. Childs, *Taming wild extensions: Hopf algebras and local Galois module theory*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 80. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [8] E. Fisman and Z. Arad, *A proof of Szep’s conjecture on nonsimplicity of certain finite groups*, J. Algebra 108 (1987), no. 2, 340–354.
- [9] D. Gorenstein, *Finite simple groups. An introduction to their classification*. University Series in Mathematics. Plenum Publishing Corp., New York, 1982.
- [10] C. Greither and B. Pareigis, *Hopf-Galois theory for separable field extensions*, J. Algebra 106 (1987), no. 1, 261–290.

- [11] L. Guarnieri and L. Vendramin, *Skew braces and the Yang-Baxter equation*, Math. Comp. 86 (2017), no. 307, 2519–2534.
- [12] R. M. Guralnick, *Subgroups of prime power index in a simple group*, J. Algebra 81 (1983), no. 2, 304–311.
- [13] R. Guralnick, T. Penttila, C. E. Praeger, and J. Saxl, *Linear groups with orders having certain large prime divisors*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 78 (1999), no. 1, 167–214.
- [14] I. M. Isaacs, *Finite group theory*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 92. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [15] P. Kleidman and M. Liebeck, *The subgroup structure of the finite classical groups*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 129. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [16] C. Tsang, *Non-existence of Hopf-Galois structures and bijective crossed homomorphisms*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 223 (2019), no. 7, 2804–2821.
- [17] C. Tsang, *Hopf-Galois structures of isomorphic-type on a non-abelian characteristically simple extension*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 147 (2019), no. 12, 5093–5103.
- [18] C. Tsang, *Hopf-Galois structures on a Galois  $S_n$ -extension*, J. Algebra 531 (2019), 349–361.
- [19] C. Tsang, *On the multiple holomorph of a finite almost simple group*, New York J. Math. 25 (2019), 949–963.
- [20] C. Tsang and C. Qin, *On the solvability of regular subgroups in the holomorph of a finite solvable group*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. 30 (2020), no. 2, 253–265.
- [21] C. Tsang, *Hopf-Galois structures on finite extensions with almost simple Galois group*, J. Number Theory 214 (2020), 286–311.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS (ZHUHAI), SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY, ZHUHAI, GUANGDONG, CHINA

*E-mail address:* zengshy26@mail.sysu.edu.cn

*URL:* <http://sites.google.com/site/cindysinyitsang/>