

# On relational complexity and base size of finite primitive groups

Veronica Kelsey and Colva M. Roney-Dougal \*

July 30, 2021

## Abstract

In this paper we show that if  $G$  is a primitive subgroup of  $S_n$  that is not large base, then any irredundant base for  $G$  has size at most  $5 \log n$ . This is the first logarithmic bound on the size of an irredundant base for such groups, and is best possible up to a small constant. As a corollary, the relational complexity of  $G$  is at most  $5 \log n + 1$ , and the maximal size of a minimal base and the height are both at most  $5 \log n$ . Furthermore, we deduce that a base for  $G$  of size at most  $5 \log n$  can be computed in polynomial time.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\Omega$  be a finite set. A *base* for a subgroup  $G$  of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$  is a sequence  $\Lambda = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l)$  of points of  $\Omega$  such that  $G_\Lambda = G_{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l} = 1$ . The *minimum base size*, denoted  $b(G, \Omega)$  or just  $b(G)$  if the meaning is clear, is the minimum length of a base for  $G$ . Base size has important applications in computational group theory; see, for example, [20] for the importance of a base and strong generating set.

In [16] Liebeck proved the landmark result that with the exception of one family of groups, if  $G$  is a primitive subgroup of  $S_n = \text{Sym}(\{1, \dots, n\})$  then  $b(G) < 9 \log n$ . The exceptional family are called *large-base* groups: product action or almost simple groups whose socle is one or more copies of the alternating group  $A_r$  acting on  $k$ -sets. In [18] Moscattello and Roney-Dougal improve this bound, and show that if  $G$  is not large base then either  $G = M_{24}$  in its 5-transitive action of degree 24, or  $b(G) \leq \lceil \log n \rceil + 1$ . Here and throughout all logs are of base 2.

We say that a base  $\Lambda = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k)$  for a permutation group  $G$  is *irredundant* if

$$G > G_{\omega_1} > G_{\omega_1, \omega_2} > \dots > G_{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l} = 1.$$

If no irredundant base is longer than  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  is a *maximal* irredundant base and we denote the length of  $\Lambda$  by  $I(G, \Omega)$  or  $I(G)$ .

From Liebeck's  $9 \log n$  bound on base size, a straightforward argument (see Lemma 1.2) shows that if  $G$  is a primitive non-large-base subgroup of  $S_n$ , then  $I(G) \leq 9 \log^2 n$ . However, in [14] Gill, Lodá and Spiga conjecture that for such groups  $G$  there exists a constant  $c$  such that  $I(G) \leq c \log n$ . They show that for some families of groups the conjecture holds with  $c = 7$ . Our main result establishes this conjecture, whilst also improving the constant.

---

\* *Acknowledgements:* The authors would like to thank Nick Gill for encouraging us to look at this problem and Peter Cameron for his helpful remarks, which improved the paper.

*Key words:* permutation group; base size; relational complexity; computational complexity  
*MSC2020:* 20B15; 20B25; 20E32; 20-08

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G$  be a primitive subgroup of  $S_n$ . If  $G$  is not large base, then*

$$I(G) < 5 \log n.$$

There are infinitely many primitive groups for which the maximal irredundant base size is greater than  $\lceil \log n \rceil + 1$ . For example, if  $d \geq 5$ ,  $G = \text{PGL}_d(3)$  and  $\Omega$  is the set of 1-spaces of  $\mathbb{F}_3^d$ , then by Theorem 3.1  $I(G, \Omega) = 2d - 1 > \lceil \log n \rceil + 1$ . Hence, up to a small constant the bounds in Theorem 1.1 are the best possible.

Relational complexity has been extensively studied in model theory, see for example [15]. A rephrasing of the definition, to make it easier to work with for permutation groups, was introduced more recently in [11]. For an excellent discussion and more context, see [13]. Let  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \leq l$ , and let  $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l), \Sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l) \in \Omega^l$ . We say that  $\Lambda$  and  $\Sigma$  are  $k$ -subtuple complete with respect to a subgroup  $G$  of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ , and write  $\Lambda \sim_k \Sigma$ , if for every subset of  $k$  indices  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  there exists  $g \in G$  such that  $(\lambda_{i_1}^g, \dots, \lambda_{i_k}^g) = (\sigma_{i_1}, \dots, \sigma_{i_k})$ . The *relational complexity* of  $G$ , denoted  $\text{RC}(G)$ , is the smallest  $k$  such that for all  $l \geq k$  and all  $\Lambda, \Sigma \in \Omega^l$ , if  $\Lambda \sim_k \Sigma$  then  $\Lambda \in \Sigma^G$ . In [10] Cherlin gives examples of groups with relational complexity 2, called *binary groups*, and conjectures that this list is complete. In a dramatic breakthrough, Gill, Liebeck and Spiga have just announced a proof of this conjecture, see [13].

Let  $\Lambda$  be a base for a permutation group  $G$ . Then  $\Lambda$  is *minimal* if no proper subsequence of  $\Lambda$  is a base. We denote the maximum size of a minimal base by  $B(G)$ . The *height*  $H(G)$  of  $G$ , is the size of the largest subset  $\Delta$  of  $\Omega$  with the property that  $G_{(\Gamma)} \neq G_{(\Delta)}$  for each  $\Gamma \subsetneq \Delta$ . The following key lemma relates all of these group statistics studied in this paper.

**Lemma 1.2.** [14, Equation 1.1 and Lemma 2.1] *Let  $G$  be a subgroup of  $S_n$ . Then*

$$b(G) \leq B(G) \leq H(G) \leq I(G) \leq b(G) \log n,$$

and

$$\text{RC}(G) \leq H(G) + 1.$$

In [14], Gill, Lodá and Spiga prove that if  $G \leq S_n$  is primitive and not large base, then  $H(G) < 9 \log n$  and so  $\text{RC}(G) < 9 \log n + 1$  and  $B(G) < 9 \log n$ .

It will follow immediately from Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 1.2 that we can tighten the all of these bounds.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $G$  be a primitive subgroup of  $S_n$ . If  $G$  is not large base then*

$$\text{RC}(G) < 5 \log n + 1, \quad B(G) < 5 \log n, \quad \text{and} \quad H(G) < 5 \log n.$$

Blaha proved in [1] that the problem of computing a minimal base for a permutation group  $G$  is NP-hard. Furthermore, he showed that the obvious greedy algorithm to construct an irredundant base for  $G$  produces one of size  $O(b(G) \log \log n)$ . Thus if  $G$  is primitive and not large base, it follows from Liebeck's result that in polynomial time one can construct a base of size  $O(\log n \log \log n)$ . Since an irredundant base size can be computed in polynomial time (see for example [20]), we get the following corollary, which improves this bound to the best possible result, up to a constant.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let  $G$  be a primitive subgroup of  $S_n$  which is not large base. Then a base for  $G$  of size at most  $5 \log n$  can be constructed in polynomial time.*

(We note that using the bound on  $B(G)$  from [14], a very slightly more complicated argument

would yield a similar result, but with  $9 \log n$  in place of  $5 \log n$ .)

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we prove some preliminary lemmas about  $I(G)$ . In Section 3 we give upper and lower bounds on the size of an irredundant base for  $\text{PGL}_d(q)$  acting on subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^d$ , which differ by only a small amount. In Section 4 we prove a result which is a slight strengthening of Theorem 1.1 for almost simple groups. Finally, in Section 5 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 2 Preliminary bounds on group statistics

Here we collect various lemmas about bases, and about the connection between  $I(G)$  and other group statistics.

For a subgroup  $G$  of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$  and a fixed sequence  $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l)$  of points from  $\Omega$ , we let  $G^{(i)} = G_{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_i}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq l$ , so  $G^{(0)} = G$ . Furthermore, the maximum length of a chain of subgroups in  $G$  is denoted by  $\ell(G)$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $G$  be a subgroup of  $S_n$ .*

- (i) *If  $G$  is insoluble, then  $I(G) < \log |G| - 1$ .*
- (ii) *If  $G$  is transitive and  $n \geq 5$ , then  $I(G) \leq \log |G| - 1$ .*
- (iii) *If  $G$  is transitive and  $b = b(G)$ , then  $I(G) \leq (b - 1) \log n + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $a$  be the number of prime divisors of  $|G|$ , counting multiplicity. Since  $G$  is insoluble there exists a prime greater than  $2^2$  dividing  $|G|$ , and so  $|G| > 2^{a+1}$ . It is clear that  $I(G) \leq \ell(G) \leq a$ , and so Part (i) follows, and we assume from now on that  $G$  is transitive.

Let  $l = I(G)$  with a corresponding base  $\Lambda = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l)$ . Since  $G$  is transitive,  $[G^{(0)} : G^{(1)}] = n$  by the Orbit-Stabiliser Theorem. From  $[G^{(i-1)} : G^{(i)}] \geq 2$  for  $2 \leq i \leq l$ , it follows that  $|G| \geq 2^{l-1}n$ . Hence if  $n \geq 5$  then  $|G| \geq 2^{l-1} \cdot 5 > 2^{l+1}$ . Therefore by taking logs Part (ii) follows.

Similarly,  $|G| < n^b$ , and so  $2^{l-1}n \leq |G| \leq n^b$ . Hence

$$l - 1 + \log n = \log(2^{l-1}n) \leq \log |G| \leq b \log n,$$

and so

$$l \leq b \log n - \log n + 1 = (b - 1) \log n + 1$$

and Part (iii) follows. □

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $G$  be a subgroup of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ , let  $l \geq 1$  and let  $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l) \in \Omega^l$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $\Sigma$  of  $\Lambda$  such that  $\Sigma$  can be extended to an irredundant base and  $G_\Sigma = G_\Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* The sequence  $\Lambda$  cannot be extended to an irredundant base if and only if there exists a subsequence  $\lambda_i, \dots, \lambda_{i+j}$  of  $\Lambda$  with  $j \geq 1$  such that

$$G^{(i)} = G^{(i+1)} = \dots = G^{(i+j)}.$$

Let  $\Sigma$  be the subsequence of  $\Lambda$  given by deleting all such  $\lambda_{i+1}, \dots, \lambda_{i+j}$ . Since  $G^{(i)} = G^{(i+j)}$  it follows that  $G_\Lambda = G_\Sigma$ . □

The following describes the relationship between the irredundant base size of a group and that of a subgroup.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $H$  and  $G$  be subgroups of  $S_n$ , with  $H \leq G$ . Then the following hold.*

- (i)  $I(H) \leq I(G)$ .
- (ii) *If  $H \trianglelefteq G$  then  $I(G) \leq I(H) + \ell(G/H)$ .*
- (iii) *If  $H \trianglelefteq G$  and  $[G : H]$  is prime, then  $I(H) \leq I(G) \leq I(H) + 1$ .*

*Proof.* An irredundant base for  $H \leq G$  can be extended to an irredundant base for  $G$ , so Part (i) is clear. Part (ii) is [14, Lemma 2.8] and Part (iii) follows immediately from Parts (i) and (ii).  $\square$

### 3 Groups with socle $\mathrm{PSL}_d(q)$ acting on subspaces

Throughout this section, let  $q = p^f$  for  $p$  a prime and  $f \geq 1$ , let  $V$  be a  $d$ -dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , let  $\Omega = \mathcal{PG}_m(V)$  be the set of all  $m$ -dimensional subspaces of  $V$ , and let  $n = |\Omega|$ . In this section we begin by proving Theorem 3.1 which bounds  $I(\mathrm{PGL}_d(q), \Omega)$  in terms of  $d$  and  $m$ . By finding lower bounds on  $|\Omega|$  we then prove Proposition 3.6, which bounds  $I(\mathrm{PGL}_d(q), \Omega)$  in terms of  $|\Omega|$ .

#### 3.1 Bounds as a function of $d$ and $m$

In this subsection we prove the following theorem, which in the case  $m = 1$  recovers the lower bounds found by Lodá in [17].

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\mathrm{PGL}_d(q)$  act on  $\Omega$ . Then*

$$I(\mathrm{PGL}_d(q)) \leq (m + 1)d - 2m + 1,$$

and

$$I(\mathrm{PGL}_d(q)) \geq \begin{cases} md - m^2 + 1 & \text{if } q = 2, \\ (m + 1)d - m^2 & \text{if } q \neq 2. \end{cases}$$

We begin by proving the upper bound in Theorem 3.1. Let  $M = M(V)$  be the algebra of all linear maps from  $V$  to itself. Furthermore, let  $\omega_0 = \langle \mathbf{0} \rangle$ , let  $l > 1$  be an integer, let  $\Lambda = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_l) \in \Omega^l$  and for  $0 \leq k \leq l$ , let

$$M_k = \{g \in M \mid \omega_i g \leq \omega_i \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq k\}, \text{ so that } M_0 = M.$$

For  $0 \leq k \leq l - 1$ , it is easily verified that  $M_{k+1}$  is a subspace of  $M_k$ . Now assume in addition that

$$M_0 > M_1 > \dots > M_l = \mathbb{F}_q I \tag{1}$$

with  $l$  as large as possible. Fix a basis  $\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle$  of  $V$  which first goes through  $\omega_1 \cap \omega_2$ , then extends to a basis of  $\omega_1$ , and then for each  $k \geq 2$  extends successively to a basis of  $\langle \omega_1, \dots, \omega_k \rangle$ . Therefore there exist integers

$$m = a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_l = d \text{ such that } \langle e_1, \dots, e_{a_k} \rangle = \langle \omega_1, \dots, \omega_k \rangle.$$

Since  $\omega_0 = \langle \mathbf{0} \rangle$ , we may let  $a_0 = 0$ . From now, on we identify  $M$  with the algebra of  $d \times d$  matrices over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with respect to this basis.

We will show that  $l \leq (m + 1)d - 2m + 1$ , from which the upper bound in Theorem 3.1 will follow. For  $0 \leq k \leq l - 1$ , let

$$f_k = \dim(M_k) - \dim(M_{k+1})$$

and let  $b_k = a_{k+1} - a_k$  so that  $0 \leq b_k \leq m$ . In the following lemmas we consider the possible values of  $f_k$  based on  $b_k$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $f_k$  and  $b_k$  be as above.*

- (i) *The dimension of  $M_1$  is  $d^2 - m(d - m)$ , and so  $f_0 = m(d - m)$ .*
- (ii)  *$f_1 = b_1(d - b_1)$ .*

*Proof.* First consider Part (i). Since  $\omega_1 = \langle e_1, \dots, e_m \rangle$  it follows that  $g = (g_{ij}) \in M_1$  if and only if  $e_i g \in \omega_1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Equivalently,  $g_{ij} = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $m + 1 \leq j \leq d$ . Hence  $\dim(M_1) = d^2 - m(d - m)$ , and the final claim follows from  $\dim(M_0) = d^2$ .

Now consider (ii). The subspace  $M_2$  contains all matrices of shape

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_2 & x_3 & 0 & 0 \\ x_4 & 0 & x_5 & 0 \\ y_1 & y_2 & y_3 & y_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $x_1, x_3$  and  $x_5$  are square with  $m - b_1, b_1$  and  $b_1$  rows respectively. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(M_2) &= (m - b_1)^2 + 2b_1(m - b_1) + 2b_1^2 + (d - m - b_1)d \\ &= d^2 - m(d - m) - b_1(d - b_1), \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows from Part (i). □

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $k \geq 2$ . Then  $f_k \geq \max\{1, b_k(d - m)\}$ .*

*Proof.* For  $0 \leq k \leq l$  we define two subspaces of  $M_k$ , namely

$$\begin{aligned} X_k &= \{g \in M_k \mid e_i g = 0 \text{ for } a_k + 1 \leq i \leq d\} \text{ and} \\ Y_k &= \{g \in M \mid e_i g = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq a_k\}. \end{aligned}$$

We begin by showing that

$$M_k = X_k \oplus Y_k \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(Y_k) = d(d - a_k). \tag{2}$$

It is clear that  $X_k \cap Y_k = \{0_M\}$ . Let  $g = (g_{ij}) \in M_k$ . Then there exist  $x = (x_{ij}), y = (y_{ij}) \in M$  with  $x_{ij} = g_{ij}$  and  $y_{ij} = 0$  for  $i \leq a_k$ , and  $x_{ij} = 0$  and  $y_{ij} = g_{ij}$  for  $i \geq a_k + 1$ . Then  $g = x + y$  with  $x \in X_k$  and  $y \in Y_k$ , hence  $M_k = X_k \oplus Y_k$ . Since  $g \in Y_k$  if and only if  $g_{ij} = 0$  for  $i \leq a_k$ , it follows that  $\dim(Y_k) = d(d - a_k)$ . Hence (2) holds.

Our assumption that  $M_k > M_{k+1}$  implies that  $f_k \geq 1$ , so we may assume that  $b_k \geq 1$ . By (2),

$$\begin{aligned} f_k &= \dim(M_k) - \dim(M_{k+1}) \\ &= (\dim(X_k) + \dim(Y_k)) - (\dim(X_{k+1}) + \dim(Y_{k+1})) \\ &= \dim(X_k) - \dim(X_{k+1}) + d(d - a_k) - d(d - a_{k+1}) \\ &= \dim(X_k) - \dim(X_{k+1}) + b_k d. \end{aligned}$$

We now bound  $\dim(X_k) - \dim(X_{k+1})$ . By choice of basis  $\omega_{k+1} = \langle u_1, \dots, u_{m-b_k}, e_{a_k+1}, \dots, e_{a_k+b_k} \rangle$  for some  $u_1, \dots, u_{m-b_k} \in \langle \omega_1, \dots, \omega_k \rangle$ . Hence if  $v \in \{e_{a_k+1}, \dots, e_{a_k+b_k}\}$  then  $\langle v \rangle M_{k+1} \leq \omega_{k+1}$ . Therefore  $\langle v M_{k+1} \rangle$  has dimension at most  $m$ , and so  $\dim(X_{k+1}) \leq \dim(X_k) + b_k m$ . Hence

$$f_k = \dim(X_k) - \dim(X_{k+1}) + b_k d \geq -b_k m + b_k d = b_k(d - m).$$

□

*Proof of upper bound of Theorem 3.1.* We shall show that  $l \leq (m+1)d - 2m + 1$ , from which the result will follow, since  $I(\text{PGL}_d(q), \Omega) = I(\text{GL}_d(q), \Omega)$ , and  $\text{GL}_d(q)$  is a subgroup of  $M$ .

For  $0 \leq b \leq m$ , let

$$C_b = \{k \in \{0, \dots, l-1\} \mid b_k = b\}.$$

and let  $c_b = |C_b|$ . Then

$$l = \sum_{b=0}^m c_b. \quad (3)$$

Since  $a_l = d$  and  $a_0 = 0$  it follows that

$$d = a_l - a_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} (a_{k+1} - a_k) = \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} b_k = \sum_{b=0}^m b c_b = \sum_{b=1}^m b c_b. \quad (4)$$

Since  $a_1 = m$  and  $a_0 = 0$  it follows that  $b_0 = m$ , so  $0 \in C_m$ , and  $c_m \geq 1$ . Since  $\omega_1 \neq \omega_2$  it follows that  $b_1 \neq 0$ , and  $1 \in C_{b_1}$ , so

$$c_{b_1} \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad c_m \geq 1 + \delta_{mb_1}. \quad (5)$$

Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 yield

$$f_0 = m(d-m), \quad f_1 = b_1(d-b_1) = b_1(m-b_1) + b_1(d-m), \quad \text{and} \quad f_k \geq \max\{1, b_k(d-m)\} \quad \text{for } k \geq 2. \quad (6)$$

Since  $M_0 = M$  and  $M_l = \mathbb{F}_q I$  it follows from the definition of  $f_k$  that

$$\begin{aligned} d^2 - 1 &= \dim(M_0) - \dim(M_l) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} (\dim(M_k) - \dim(M_{k+1})) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} f_k \\ &= \sum_{k \in C_0} f_k + f_1 + \sum_{k \in C_{b_1} \setminus \{1\}} f_k + \sum_{k \notin C_0 \cup C_{b_1}} f_k \\ &\geq \sum_{k \in C_0} 1 + b_1(m-b_1) + b_1(d-m) + \sum_{k \in C_{b_1} \setminus \{1\}} b_1(d-m) + \sum_{k \notin C_0 \cup C_{b_1}} b_k(d-m) \quad \text{by (6)} \\ &= c_0 + b_1(m-b_1) + \sum_{k \in C_{b_1}} b_1(d-m) + \sum_{k \notin C_0 \cup C_{b_1}} b_k(d-m) \\ &= c_0 + b_1(m-b_1) + \sum_{k \notin C_0} b_k(d-m) \\ &= c_0 + b_1(m-b_1) + (d-m) \sum_{b=1}^m b c_b \\ &= c_0 + b_1(m-b_1) + (d-m)d \quad \text{by (4)}. \end{aligned}$$

By rearranging we find that

$$c_0 \leq md - b_1(m-b_1) - 1. \quad (7)$$

We bound  $I(G)$  by maximizing  $l = \sum_{b=0}^m c_b$  subject only to Equations (4), (5) and (7). By (4) an upper bound on  $\sum_{b=0}^m c_b$  is given by maximizing  $c_0$ , maximizing  $c_b$  for  $b$  small and minimizing  $c_b$  for

$b$  large. Hence we substitute  $c_0 = md - b_1(m - b_1) - 1$  by (7), substitute  $c_b = 0$  for  $b \notin \{0, 1, b_1, m\}$ , and maximise  $c_1$  and minimise  $c_m$  subject to (5).

First let  $m = 1$ . Since  $b_1 \neq 0$  it follows that  $b_1 = 1$ , and hence  $c_1 = d$  by (4). Now let  $m \geq 2$ . Then there are three possibilities for  $b_1$ . If  $b_1 = m$  then to minimise  $c_m$  subject to (5) let  $c_m = 2$ , and so (4) yields  $c_1 = d - 2m$ . If  $b_1 = 1$  then  $c_m = 1$ , and (4) yields  $c_1 = d - m$ . Otherwise  $c_m = c_{b_1} = 1$ , and (4) yields  $c_1 = d - m - b_1$ . Hence in all cases

$$|C_1 \cup C_{b_1} \cup C_m| = 2 + d - m - b_1.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{b=0}^m c_b \leq (md - b_1(m - b_1) - 1) + 2 + d - m - b_1 = (m + 1)d - m + 1 - b_1(m - b_1 + 1).$$

Hence if  $\sum_{b=0}^m c_b$  is maximal then  $b_1(m - b_1 + 1)$  is minimal subject to  $1 \leq b_1 \leq m$ . Therefore  $b_1$  is 1 or  $m$ , and so

$$\sum_{b=0}^m c_b \leq (m + 1)d - 2m + 1.$$

The result now follows from (3).  $\square$

We now consider the lower bounds in Theorem 3.1.

*Proof of lower bound of Theorem 3.1.* Let  $G = \text{GL}_n(q)$ . Here we give a sequence of  $m$ -spaces of  $V$  such that each successive point stabilizer in  $G$  is a proper subgroup of its predecessor. Its length is therefore a lower bound on  $I(\text{PGL}_n(q), \Omega)$ .

For  $1 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + d$ , we define the following three variables

$$r_k = \left\lfloor \frac{k-2}{m} \right\rfloor + m + 1, \quad s_k = m - (k - 2 \bmod m), \quad \text{and} \quad t_k = k - md + m^2.$$

Notice that if  $m + 2 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + 1$ , then

$$m + 2 \leq r_k \leq d \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq s_k \leq m, \tag{8}$$

whilst  $t_k \leq d$  for all  $k$  and

$$2 \leq t_k \leq m + 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad md - m^2 + 2 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + m + 1.$$

Hence the following sets  $W_k$  of  $m$  linearly independent vectors of  $V$  are well defined.

$$W_k = \begin{cases} \{e_i \mid i \in \{1, \dots, m+1\} \setminus \{m+2-k\}\} & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq m+1, \\ \{e_i \mid i \in \{1, \dots, m, r_k\} \setminus \{s_k\}\} & \text{for } m+2 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + 1, \\ \{e_1 + e_{t_k}, e_i \mid i \in \{2, \dots, m+1\} \setminus \{t_k\}\} & \text{for } md - m^2 + 2 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + m + 1, \\ \{e_1 + e_{t_k}, e_i \mid i \in \{2, \dots, m\}\} & \text{for } md - m^2 + m + 2 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + d. \end{cases}$$

Let  $\omega_k = \langle W_k \rangle \in \Omega$  and let  $G^{(k)} = G_{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k}$ . For  $1 \leq x, y \leq d$  let  $T(x, y)$  be the matrix  $I + E_{x,y}$  and let  $\text{Supp}_x(W_k)$  be the set of vectors in  $W_k$  which are non-zero in position  $x$ . Recall that

$$e_i T(x, y) = \begin{cases} e_i + e_y & \text{if } i = x, \\ e_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence if a vector  $v$  is zero in position  $x$ , then  $vT(x, y) = v$ . Therefore  $\omega_k T(x, y) = \omega_k$  if and only if  $\text{Supp}_x(W_k)T(x, y) \subseteq \omega_k$ . In particular, if  $\text{Supp}_x(W_k) = \emptyset$  then  $\omega_k T(x, y) = \omega_k$ . Furthermore,  $T(x, y) \in G$  unless  $q = 2$  and  $x = y$ .

It is clear that  $G > G^{(1)}$ , so let  $k \in \{2, \dots, md - m^2 + 1\}$  and let  $j \leq k$ . We shall show that there exist  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $\omega_k T(x, y) \neq \omega_k$  and  $\omega_j T(x, y) = \omega_j$  for all  $j < k$ . Hence  $T(x, y) \in G^{(k-1)} \setminus G^{(k)}$  and so  $G^{(k-1)} > G^{(k)}$ .

First consider  $k \in \{2, \dots, m + 1\}$ , and let  $T = T(m + 1, m + 2 - k)$ . Then  $\text{Supp}_{m+1}(W_1) = \emptyset$ , and for  $1 < j \leq k$

$$\text{Supp}_{m+1}(W_j)T = \{e_{m+1}\}T = \{e_{m+1} + e_{m+2-k}\}.$$

Hence  $\text{Supp}_{m+1}(W_j)T \subseteq \omega_j$  if and only if  $j \neq k$ . Therefore  $\omega_j T = \omega_j$  for  $j < k$ , and  $\omega_k T \neq \omega_k$ .

Next consider  $k \in \{m + 2, \dots, md - m^2 + 1\}$ . Hence (8) holds, and so we may let  $T$  be the matrix  $T(r_k, s_k)$ . If  $j \leq m + 1$  or if  $r_j \neq r_k$ , then  $\text{Supp}_{r_k}(W_j) = \emptyset$  and so  $\omega_j T = \omega_j$ . Therefore assume that  $j \geq m + 2$  and  $r_j = r_k$ . Then

$$\text{Supp}_{r_k}(W_j)T = \{e_{r_k}\}T = \{e_{r_k} + e_{s_k}\}.$$

Since  $(r_j, s_j) = (r_k, s_k)$  if and only if  $j = k$ , it follows that  $\text{Supp}_{r_k}(W_j)T \subseteq \omega_j$  if and only if  $j \neq k$ . Therefore  $\omega_j T = \omega_j$  for  $j < k$ , and  $\omega_k T \neq \omega_k$ . Hence  $G^{(k-1)} > G^{(k)}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + 1$ , and so if  $q = 2$  then the result follows.

It remains to consider  $q > 2$  and  $k \geq md - m^2 + 2$ . Let  $T = T(t_k, t_k)$  and let  $u \in \{e_i, e_1 + e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ . Then

$$uT = \begin{cases} e_1 + 2e_{t_k} & \text{if } u = e_1 + e_{t_k}, \\ 2u & \text{if } u = e_{t_k}, \\ u & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $1 \leq j \leq md - m^2 + 1$  then  $W_j \subseteq \{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ , and if  $md - m^2 + 1 < j < k$  then  $W_j \subseteq \{e_1 + e_{t_j}, e_1, \dots, e_d\}$  with  $t_j \neq t_k$ . Hence, if  $j < k$  then  $\text{Supp}_{t_k}(W_j)T \subseteq \omega_j$ , and so  $\omega_j T = \omega_j$ . Since  $e_1 + e_{t_k} \in \omega_k$  but  $e_1 + 2e_{t_k} \notin \omega_k$  it follows that  $\omega_k T(t_k, t_k) \neq \omega_k$ . Hence  $G^{(k-1)} > G^{(k)}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq md - m^2 + d$ , and so the result follows.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** The interested reader may wish to check, using the notation of the previous proof, that the following holds. Let  $\Lambda = (\omega_i)_{2 \leq i \leq md - m^2 + 1}$  if  $q = 2$ , and let  $\Lambda = (\omega_i)_{m+1 \leq i \leq md - m^2 + d}$  if  $q > 2$ . Then  $\Lambda$  is a minimal base for the action of  $\text{PGL}_d(q)$  on  $\mathcal{PG}_m(q)$ . Hence

$$B(\text{PGL}_d(q), \mathcal{PG}_m(q)) \geq \begin{cases} md - m^2 & \text{if } q = 2, \\ (m + 1)d - m^2 - m & \text{if } q \neq 2. \end{cases}$$

### 3.2 Upper bounds as a function of $|\Omega|$

Our main result in this subsection is Proposition 3.6, which bounds  $I(\text{PGL}_d(q), \Omega)$  as a function of  $n = |\Omega|$ , rather than of  $m$ ,  $d$  and  $q$ . We begin by bounding the size of  $\Omega = \mathcal{PG}_m(\mathbb{F}_q^d)$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $n(d, m, q) = |\mathcal{PG}_m(\mathbb{F}_q^d)|$ . Then*

$$\log |\Omega| = \log (n(d, m, q)) > \begin{cases} \frac{d^2}{4} + \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } q = 2 \text{ and } m = \frac{d}{2} \geq 2, \\ m(d - m) \log q & \text{for all } m \text{ and } q. \end{cases}$$



*Proof.* If either  $q \neq 2$  or  $m \neq \frac{d}{2}$  then the result holds by [17, Lemma 4.2.8], so assume otherwise and let  $k = \frac{d}{2} + 1 = m + 1 \geq 3$ . The statement is then equivalent to  $n(2k - 2, k - 1, 2) > 2^{(k-1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}}$ .

We now induct on  $k$ . Since  $n(4, 2, 2) = 35 > 2^{2^2 + \frac{1}{2}}$ , the result holds for  $k = 3$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} n(2k, k, 2) &= \frac{(2^{2k} - 1)(2^{2k-1} - 1)(2^{2k-2} - 1) \cdots (2^{k+1} - 1)}{(2^k - 1)(2^{k-1} - 1)(2^{k-2} - 1) \cdots (2 - 1)} \\ &= \frac{(2^{2k} - 1)(2^{2k-1} - 1)}{(2^k - 1)^2} \cdot \frac{(2^{2k-2} - 1) \cdots (2^{k+1} - 1)(2^k - 1)}{(2^{k-1} - 1)(2^{k-2} - 1) \cdots (2 - 1)} \\ &= \frac{(2^{2k} - 1)(2^{2k-1} - 1)}{(2^k - 1)^2} \cdot n(2k - 2, k - 1, 2) \\ &\geq \frac{(2^{2k} - 1)(2^{2k-1} - 1)}{(2^k - 1)^2} \cdot 2^{(k-1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{by induction.} \end{aligned}$$

It is easily verified that

$$(2^k + 1)(2^{2k-1} - 1) = 2^{3k-1} + 2^{2k-1} - 2^k - 1 > 2^{3k-1} - 2^{2k-1} = 2^{2k-1}(2^k - 1).$$

Hence

$$\frac{(2^{2k} - 1)(2^{2k-1} - 1)}{(2^k - 1)^2} 2^{(k-1)^2} = \frac{(2^k + 1)(2^{2k-1} - 1)}{(2^k - 1)} 2^{(k-1)^2} > \frac{2^{2k-1}(2^k - 1)}{(2^k - 1)} 2^{(k-1)^2} = 2^{k^2},$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

Recall that  $q = p^f$  with  $p$  prime, and  $\Omega = \mathcal{PG}_m(\mathbb{F}_q^d)$ , with  $n = |\Omega|$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $G = \text{PGL}_d(q)$  and assume that  $m \leq \frac{d}{2}$ . Then*

$$I(G, \Omega) \leq \begin{cases} 2(d-1) + 1 & \leq 2 \log n + 1 & \text{if } m = 1 \text{ and } q = 2, \\ \frac{4}{3}(d-1) \log q + 1 + \log f & \leq \frac{4}{3} \log n + 1 + \log f & \text{if } m = 1 \text{ and } q \geq 3, \\ \frac{d^2}{2} + 1 & \leq 2 \log n & \text{if } m = \frac{d}{2} \geq 2 \text{ and } q = 2, \\ 2m(d-m) \log q + \log f & \leq 2 \log n + \log f & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Since  $G = \text{PGL}_n(q) \times C_f$ , Lemma 2.3(ii) and Theorem 3.1 imply that

$$I(G) = I(\text{PGL}_n(q)) + \ell(C_f) \leq (m+1)d - 2m + 1 + \log f. \quad (9)$$

First let  $m = 1$ , so that  $I(G) \leq 2(d-1) + 1 + \log f$ . By Lemma 3.5  $(d-1) \log q < \log n$ . Hence the result is immediate for  $q = 2$ , and follows from  $\log q > \frac{3}{2}$  for  $q \geq 3$ .

Now let  $m = \frac{d}{2} \geq 2$  so that  $I(G) \leq \frac{d^2}{2} + 1 + \log f$ . If  $q = 2$  then  $\frac{d^2}{4} + \frac{1}{2} < \log n$  by Lemma 3.5, and so the result follows. If  $q \geq 3$ , then it follows from  $d \geq 4$  that  $1 \leq \frac{d^2}{4}$ , and so

$$\frac{d^2}{2} + 1 \leq \frac{3d^2}{4} < \frac{d^2}{2} \log q = 2m(d-m) \log q.$$

Therefore

$$I(G) \leq 2m(d-m) \log q + \log f < 2 \log n + \log f,$$

by Lemma 3.5. Finally consider  $1 < m < \frac{d}{2}$ . Then  $1 \leq d - 2m$ , and so

$$d - 2m + 1 \leq 2(d - 2m) \leq m(d - 2m).$$

Hence by (9)

$$I(G) - \log f \leq md + d - 2m + 1 \leq md + m(d - 2m) = 2m(d - m) \leq 2m(d - m) \log q.$$

Therefore,  $I(G) \leq 2m(d - m) \log q + \log f \leq 2 \log n + \log f$ , by Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

## 4 Almost simple groups

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 for almost simple groups. More precisely, we prove the following result.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $G$  be an almost simple primitive subgroup of  $S_n$ . If  $G$  is not large base then*

$$I(G, \Omega) < 5 \log n - 1.$$

We begin with two definitions which we shall use to divide this section into cases.

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $G$  be almost simple with socle  $G_0$ , a classical group with natural module  $V$ . A subgroup  $H$  of  $G$  not containing  $G_0$  is a *subspace subgroup* if for each maximal subgroup  $M$  of  $G_0$  containing  $H \cap G_0$  one of the following holds.

- (i)  $M = G_U$  for some proper non-zero subspace  $U$  of  $V$ , where if  $G_0 \neq \text{PSL}(V)$  then  $U$  is either totally singular or non-degenerate, or if  $G$  is orthogonal and  $p = 2$  a non-singular 1-space.
- (ii)  $G_0 = \text{Sp}_d(2^f)$  and  $M \cap G_0 = \text{GO}_d^\pm(2^f)$ .

A transitive action of  $G$  is a *subspace action* if the point stabilizer is a subspace subgroup of  $G$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $G$  be almost simple with socle  $G_0$ . A transitive action of  $G$  on  $\Omega$  is *standard* if up to equivalence of actions one of the following holds, and is *non-standard* otherwise.

- (i)  $G_0 = A_r$  and  $\Omega$  is an orbit of subsets or partitions of  $\{1, \dots, r\}$ .
- (ii)  $G$  is a classical group in a subspace action.

This section is split into three subsections. The first considers  $G_0 = \text{PSL}_d(q)$  acting on subspaces and pairs of subspaces. In the second, we deal with the case of  $G$  another classical group in a subspace action. Finally in the third we prove Theorem 4.1.

### 4.1 $G_0 = \text{PSL}_d(q)$

Let  $G$  be almost simple with socle  $\text{PSL}_d(q)$ , in a subspace action on a set  $\Omega$ . We shall use the results in Section 3 to bound  $I(G, \Omega)$ .

We begin with a preliminary lemma.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $1 \leq m \leq \frac{d}{2}$ , let  $p$  be a prime, let  $f \geq 1$  and let  $q = p^f$ . Then*

$$m(d-m) \log q \geq \begin{cases} \log f + 1 & \text{if } m = 1, \\ 3 \log f + 4 & \text{if } m \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Let  $m = 1$ . Then

$$m(d-m) \log q = (d-1) \log q = (d-1)f \log p \geq f \geq \log f + 1.$$

Now let  $m \geq 2$ , so that  $m(d-m) \geq 4$ . Then

$$m(d-m) \log q \geq 4 \log q \geq 3 \log q + 1 = 3f \log p + 1 \geq 3f + 1 \geq 3(\log f + 1) + 1 = 3 \log f + 4$$

as required. □

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $G$  be almost simple with socle  $\mathrm{PSL}_d(q)$  acting on  $\Omega = \mathcal{PG}_m(V)$ , and let  $n = |\Omega|$ . Then*

$$I(G) < 3 \log n.$$

*Proof.* If  $m = 1$  then  $G \leq \mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q)$ , so  $I(G) \leq I(\mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q))$  by Lemma 2.3(i). Otherwise  $G \cap \mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q)$  has index at most 2 in  $G$ , so by Lemma 2.3(i) and (iii)

$$I(G) \leq I(G \cap \mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q)) + 1 \leq I(\mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q)) + 1.$$

Therefore we can bound  $I(G)$  by our bound for  $I(\mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q))$  when  $m = 1$ , and by one more than that when  $m > 1$ . Thus Proposition 3.6 yields  $I(G) \leq 2 \log n + \log f + 1$ . Combining Lemmas 3.5 and 4.4 gives  $\log f + 1 \leq m(d - m) \log q < \log n$ , hence the result holds.  $\square$

We now consider the action of  $G$  on the following subsets of  $\mathcal{PG}_m(V) \times \mathcal{PG}_{d-m}(V)$ , with  $m < \frac{d}{2}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^\oplus &= \left\{ \{U, W\} \mid U, W \leq V, \dim U = m, \dim W = d - m \text{ with } U \oplus W = V \right\}, \\ \Omega^\leq &= \left\{ \{U, W\} \mid U, W \leq V, \dim U = m, \dim W = d - m \text{ with } U \leq W \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in both cases we require  $d \geq 3$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $G$  be almost simple with socle  $\mathrm{PSL}_d(q)$ , let  $H = G \cap \mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q)$  and let  $\Omega$  be either  $\Omega^\oplus$  or  $\Omega^\leq$ . Then*

$$I(G, \Omega) \leq 2I(H, \mathcal{PG}_m(V)) + 1.$$

*Proof.* We first show that

$$I(H, \Omega) \leq I(H, \mathcal{PG}_m(V)) + I(H, \mathcal{PG}_{d-m}(V)). \quad (10)$$

Let  $l = I(H, \Omega)$  and let  $\Lambda = (\{U_1, W_1\}, \dots, \{U_l, W_l\})$  be a corresponding base, where  $\dim(U_i) = m$  for all  $i$ . Let  $\Pi = (U_1, \dots, U_l)$  and let  $\Sigma = (W_1, \dots, W_l)$ . Then by Lemma 2.2  $\Pi$  and  $\Sigma$  contain subsequences which can be extended to irredundant bases for the action of  $H$  on  $\mathcal{PG}_m(V)$  and  $\mathcal{PG}_{d-m}(V)$  respectively.

Let  $\Pi'$  be the subsequence of  $\Pi$  which contains  $U_i$  if and only if  $H_{U_1, \dots, U_{i-1}} > H_{U_1, \dots, U_{i-1}, U_i}$ . Then  $\Pi'$  can be extended to an irredundant base for the action of  $H$  on  $\mathcal{PG}_m(V)$ . Let  $k = |\Pi'|$ , so  $k \leq I(H, \mathcal{PG}_m(V))$ .

Let  $\Sigma' = (W_{j_1}, \dots, W_{j_{(l-k)}})$  be the subsequence of  $\Sigma$  which contains  $W_i$  if and only if  $H_{U_1, \dots, U_{i-1}} = H_{U_1, \dots, U_{i-1}, U_i}$ . Assume, for a contradiction, that  $\Sigma'$  cannot be extended to an irredundant base for the action of  $H$  on  $\mathcal{PG}_{d-m}(V)$ . Since  $H$  is irreducible,  $H > H_{W_{j_1}}$ . Therefore there exists  $s \geq 2$  such that

$$H_{W_{j_1}, W_{j_2}, \dots, W_{j_{(s-1)}}} = H_{W_{j_1}, W_{j_2}, \dots, W_{j_{(s-1)}}, W_{j_s}}.$$

Let  $i = j_s$ . Then intersecting both sides of the above expression with  $H_{W_1, \dots, W_{i-1}}$  gives

$$H_{W_1, \dots, W_{i-1}} = H_{W_1, \dots, W_{i-1}, W_i}. \quad (11)$$

Since  $W_i \in \Sigma'$  it follows that

$$H_{U_1, \dots, U_{i-1}} = H_{U_1, \dots, U_{i-1}, U_i}. \quad (12)$$

Elements of  $H = G \cap \mathrm{P}\Gamma\mathrm{L}_d(q)$  cannot map  $U_i$  to  $W_i$ . Therefore (11) and (12) imply that

$$H_{\{U_1, W_1\}, \dots, \{U_{i-1}, W_{i-1}\}} = H_{\{U_1, W_1\}, \dots, \{U_{i-1}, W_{i-1}\}, \{U_i, W_i\}},$$

a contradiction since  $\Lambda$  is irredundant. Hence  $l - k \leq \mathbf{I}(H, \mathcal{PG}_{n-m}(V))$ , and so (10) holds.

The subgroups of  $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{PG}_m(V))$  and  $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{PG}_{n-m}(V))$  representing the actions of  $H$  are permutation isomorphic. Therefore (10) implies that  $\mathbf{I}(H, \Omega) \leq 2\mathbf{I}(H, \mathcal{PG}_m(V))$ . Since  $H$  has index at most 2 in  $G$ , the result follows from Lemma 2.3(iii).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $\Omega$  be either  $\Omega^\oplus$  or  $\Omega^\leq$ , and let  $n = |\Omega|$ . Let  $G$  be an almost simple subgroup of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$  with socle  $\text{PSL}_d(q)$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{I}(G) < 5(\log n - 1).$$

*Proof.* Let  $H = G \cap \text{PTL}_d(q)$ , then by Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 4.6

$$\mathbf{I}(G) \leq 2\mathbf{I}(H, \mathcal{PG}_m) + 1 \leq \begin{cases} 4(d-1) + 3 & \text{if } m = 1 \text{ and } q = 2, \\ \frac{8}{3}(d-1) \log q + 2 \log f + 3 & \text{if } m = 1 \text{ and } q \geq 3, \\ 4m(d-m) \log q + 2 \log f + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Since  $n \geq 2|\mathcal{PG}_m(V)|$ , Lemma 3.5 gives

$$m(d-m) \log q < \log \frac{n}{2} = \log n - 1. \quad (14)$$

Recall that  $d \geq 3$ . First let  $m = 1$ . If  $(d, q) = (3, 2)$ , then  $n \in \{21, 28\}$ . Therefore by (13) it follows that  $\mathbf{I}(G) \leq 11 < 5(\log n - 1)$ . Hence if  $q = 2$  then we may assume that  $d \geq 4$ , and so by (13) and (14)

$$\mathbf{I}(G) \leq 4(d-1) + 3 \leq 5(d-1) < 5(\log n - 1).$$

Still with  $m = 1$ , let  $q \geq 3$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}(G) &\leq \frac{8}{3}(d-1) \log q + 2 \log f + 3 && \text{by (13),} \\ &\leq \frac{8}{3}(d-1) \log q + 2(d-1) \log q + 1 && \text{by Lemma 4.4,} \\ &< 5(d-1) \log q && \text{since } 1 < \frac{1}{3}(d-1) \log q, \\ &< 5(\log n - 1) && \text{by (14).} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let  $m \geq 2$ . Then  $2 \log f + 1 \leq m(d-m) \log q$  by Lemma 4.4. Hence by (13) and (14) it follows that

$$\mathbf{I}(G) \leq 4m(d-m) \log q + 2 \log f + 1 \leq 5m(d-m) \log q < 5(\log n - 1).$$

$\square$

## 4.2 $G_0$ another classical group

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $G$  be almost simple with socle  $G_0 = \text{P}\Omega_8^+(q)$ , acting faithfully and primitively on a set  $\Omega$  of size  $n$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{I}(G) < 5 \log n - 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $q \geq 3$ . Then the reader may check that  $6f < q^2$ , and so by [14, (6.19)]

$$|G| < 6fq^{28} \leq q^{30}.$$

If  $q = 2$ , then  $|G| \leq 6|G_0| < q^{30}$  also. Hence by Lemma 2.1(ii), since  $n > 4$ ,

$$\mathbf{I}(G) \leq \log q^{30} - 1 = 5 \log q^6 - 1 < 5 \log n - 1,$$

by [14, (6.20)].  $\square$

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $G$  be almost simple with socle  $G_0$ , a classical group with natural module  $V$ . Assume that  $G_0 \neq \text{PSL}(V)$  and  $G_0 \neq \text{P}\Omega_8^+(q)$ . Let  $0 < m < d$ , let  $\Omega$  be a  $G$ -orbit of totally isotropic, totally singular, or non-degenerate subspaces of  $V$  of dimension  $m$ , and let  $n = |\Omega|$ . Then*

$$I(G, \Omega) < 5 \log n - 1.$$

*Proof.* First let  $G_0 = \text{P}\Omega_d^+(q)$  and  $m = \frac{d}{2}$ . Then  $d \geq 10$ , and so  $2d^2 - 12d - 16 > 0$ . Hence  $10d^2 - 20d > 8d^2 - 8d + 16$  and it follows that  $\frac{d^2}{8} - \frac{d}{4} > \frac{d^2}{10} - \frac{d}{10} + \frac{1}{5}$ . By [5, Table 4.12 ]

$$n = \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{d}{2}-1} (q^i + 1) > \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{d}{2}-1} q^i = q^{\frac{d^2}{8} - \frac{d}{4}} > q^{\frac{d^2}{10} - \frac{d}{10} + \frac{1}{5}}. \quad (15)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} I(G) &\leq \log |G| - 1 && \text{by Lemma 2.1(ii),} \\ &\leq \log \left( q^{\frac{d^2}{2} - \frac{d}{2} + 1} \right) - 1 && \text{by [14, p25],} \\ &= 5 \log \left( q^{\frac{d^2}{10} - \frac{d}{10} + \frac{1}{5}} \right) - 1 \\ &< 5 \log n - 1 && \text{by (15).} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we may assume for the rest of the proof that  $G_0 \neq \text{P}\Omega_d^+(q)$ , so by [14, Lemma 7.14]

$$\frac{1}{2}m(d-m) \log q < \log n. \quad (16)$$

Since  $\Omega$  is a  $G$ -orbit of subspaces, if  $G_0 = \text{P}\text{Sp}_4(q)$  then  $G$  does not induce the graph isomorphism by [2, Table 8.14]. Hence since  $G_0 \neq \text{P}\Omega_8^+(q)$  and  $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{G}_m(V)$ , we may assume that  $G \leq \text{P}\Gamma\text{L}_d(q)$ . Then Lemma 2.3(i) implies that

$$I(G) \leq I(\text{P}\Gamma\text{L}_d(q), \mathcal{P}\mathcal{G}_m(V)),$$

and so in particular the bounds from Proposition 3.6 apply.

We begin with  $m = 1$ . If  $q = 2$  then we split into two cases. If  $d \leq 4$  then by Proposition 3.6

$$I(G) \leq 2(d-1) + 1 \leq 7 < 5 \log n - 1.$$

If instead  $d \geq 5$ , so that  $\frac{1}{2}(d-1) \geq 2$ , then by Proposition 3.6 and (16)

$$I(G) \leq 2(d-1) + 1 \leq 2(d-1) + \frac{1}{2}(d-1) - 1 < 5 \log n - 1.$$

To complete the case of  $m = 1$ , let  $q \geq 3$ . Since  $G_0 \neq \text{PSL}_d(q)$  we may assume that  $d \geq 3$  and so it can be verified that  $\frac{6}{7f}(2 + \log f) + 1 < d$ . Hence

$$2 + \log f < \frac{7}{6}f(d-1) \leq \frac{7}{6}f(d-1) \log p = \frac{7}{6}(d-1) \log q.$$

Therefore it follows from Proposition 3.6 and (16) that

$$I(G) \leq \frac{4}{3}(d-1) \log q + \log f + 1 < \frac{5}{2}(d-1) \log q - 1 < 5 \log n - 1.$$

Now let  $m = \frac{d}{2}$  and  $q = 2$ . Then by Proposition 3.6 and (16)

$$I(G) \leq \frac{d^2}{2} + 1 = 4 \left( \frac{1}{2}m(d-m) \right) + 1 < 4 \log n + 1 < 5 \log n - 1,$$

since  $n > 4$ .

Hence we may assume that  $m \geq 2$ , and that if  $m = \frac{d}{2}$  then  $q \geq 3$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} I(G) &\leq 2m(d-m)\log q + \log f && \text{by Proposition 3.6,} \\ &\leq 2m(d-m)\log q + \frac{1}{3}m(d-m)\log q - \frac{4}{3} && \text{by Lemma 4.4,} \\ &< \frac{14}{3}\log n - \frac{4}{3} && \text{by (16),} \\ &< 5\log n - 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

### 4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We begin by proving Theorem 4.1 for non-standard actions.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $G$  be an almost simple, primitive non-standard subgroup of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$  and let  $n = |\Omega|$ . Then*

$$I(G, \Omega) \leq 4\log n + 1.$$

*Proof.* By a landmark result of Burness and others [4, 5, 6, 8], either  $(G, \Omega) = (M_{24}, \{1, \dots, 24\})$  or  $b(G, \Omega) \leq 6$ . By [14, p10],  $I(M_{24}, \{1, \dots, 24\}) = 7 < 2\log 24$ . If  $b(G) \leq 5$ , then the result follows by Lemma 2.1(iii). Hence we may assume that  $b(G, \Omega) = 6$ .

Let  $G$  have point stabilizer  $H$ . By a further result of Burness [3, Theorem 1], either

$$(G, H) \in \{(M_{23}, M_{22}), (Co_3, \text{McL}.2), (Co_2, U_6(2).2), (Fi_{22}.2, 2.U_6(2).2)\} \text{ or} \quad (17)$$

$$(\text{Soc}(G), H) \in \{(E_7(q), P_7), (E_6(q), P_1), (E_6(q), P_6)\}. \quad (18)$$

Therefore  $H$  is insoluble, and so  $I(H) + 1 < \log |H|$  by Lemma 2.1(i). Hence if we can prove in each case that  $|H| < [G : H]^4$  then the result will follow, since

$$I(G) = I(H) + 1 < \log |H| < \log [G : H]^4 = 4\log n.$$

Since  $M_{23}$  is the point stabilizer of  $M_{24}$  it follows that

$$I(M_{23}, \{1, \dots, 23\}) = I(M_{24}, \{1, \dots, 23, 24\}) - 1 = 6 < 2\log 23.$$

If  $G$  is  $Co_3$ ,  $Co_2$  or  $Fi_{22}.2$ , then using [12] it is easily verified that  $|H| < [G : H]^4$ , so the result follows.

Therefore assume that  $(\text{Soc}(G), H)$  is as in (18). Let  $m(G)$  be the smallest degree of a faithful transitive permutation representation of  $G$ . If  $|G| < m(G)^5$ , then

$$|H| = \frac{|G|}{[G : H]} < \frac{m(G)^5}{[G : H]} \leq [G : H]^4,$$

and so the result will follow.

First let  $G_0 = E_6(q)$ . By [12]

$$|E_6(q)| = \frac{q^{36}(q^{12}-1)(q^9-1)(q^8-1)(q^6-1)(q^5-1)(q^2-1)}{(3, q-1)}$$

and  $|\text{Out}(E_6(q))| \leq 2f(3, q-1) \leq q(3, q-1)$ . Hence

$$|G| \leq q^{37}(q^{12}-1)(q^9-1)(q^8-1)(q^6-1)(q^5-1)(q^2-1) < q^{37+12+9+8+6+5+2} = q^{79}.$$

By [21, p2]

$$m(G) \geq m(G_0) \geq \frac{(q^9 - 1)(q^8 + q^4 + 1)}{q - 1} = (q^8 + q^7 + \cdots + q + 1)(q^8 + q^4 + 1) > q^{16}.$$

Hence  $|G| < q^{79} < q^{80} < m(G)^5$  as required.

Now let  $G_0 = E_7(q)$ . By [12]

$$|E_7(q)| = \frac{q^{63}(q^{18} - 1)(q^{14} - 1)(q^{12} - 1)(q^{10} - 1)(q^8 - 1)(q^6 - 1)(q^2 - 1)}{(2, q - 1)}$$

and  $|\text{Out}(E_7(q))| = (2, q - 1)f < (2, q - 1)q$ . Hence

$$|G| \leq q^{64}(q^{18} - 1)(q^{14} - 1)(q^{12} - 1)(q^{10} - 1)(q^8 - 1)(q^6 - 1)(q^2 - 1) < q^{64+18+14+12+10+8+6+2} = q^{134}.$$

By [21, p5]

$$m(G) = \frac{(q^{14} - 1)(q^9 + 1)(q^5 + 1)}{q - 1} = (q^{13} + q^{12} + \cdots + q + 1)(q^9 + 1)(q^5 + 1) > q^{13+9+5} = q^{27}.$$

Hence  $|G| < q^{134} < q^{135} < m(G)^5$ .  $\square$

We note that this bound could be improved if the groups with minimal base size 5 were classified.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* If the action of  $G$  on  $\Omega$  is non-standard then the result follows by Proposition 4.10. Hence we may assume that  $G$  is standard.

If  $G$  is alternating and not large base, then  $\Omega$  is a set of partitions. Hence  $I(G, \Omega) < 2 \log |\Omega|$  by [14, Lemma 6.6].

Therefore  $G$  is classical, and the action of  $G$  on  $\Omega$  is a subspace action. If  $G$  is as in Case (ii) of Definition 4.2, then  $I(G, \Omega) < \frac{11}{3} \log |\Omega|$  by [14, Lemma 6.7]. If  $G_0 = \text{PSL}_d(q)$  and  $\Omega$  is a set of subspaces, or a set of pairs of subspaces, of  $V$ , then the result holds by Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 4.7 respectively. If  $G_0 \neq \text{PSL}_d(q)$  and  $\Omega$  is a set of subspaces, then the result follows by Proposition 4.9. Hence by [7, 5.4] we may assume that either  $G_0 = \text{P}\Omega_3^+(q)$  and  $G$  contains a triality automorphism; or  $G_0 = \text{Sp}_4(2^f)'$  and  $G$  contains a graph automorphism. In the former case the result holds by Lemma 4.8. In the latter  $I(G, \Omega) < \frac{11}{3} \log |\Omega|$  by [14, Lemma 6.12].  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Here we use the form and notation of the O'Nan Scott Theorem from [19]. We begin by considering groups of type PA, and then we prove Theorem 1.1.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $G$  be a subgroup of  $S_n$  of type PA that is not large base. Then*

$$I(G) < 5 \log n.$$

*Proof.* Since  $G$  is of type PA there exists an integer  $r \geq 2$ , a finite set  $\Delta$  and an almost simple subgroup  $H$  of  $\text{Sym}(\Delta)$  such that  $G \leq H \wr S_r$ . Since  $G$  is not large base, neither is  $H$ . Let  $s = |\Delta|$ , so that  $n = s^r$  with  $s \geq 5$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} I(G, \Omega) &\leq I(H^r, \Delta^r) + \ell(S_r) && \text{by Lemma 2.3(i) and (ii),} \\ &\leq I(H^r, \Delta^r) + \frac{3}{2}r && \text{by [9],} \\ &\leq r(I(H, \Delta) - 1) + 1 + \frac{3}{2}r && \text{by [14, Lemma 2.6],} \\ &< r(5 \log s - 2) + 1 + \frac{3}{2}r && \text{by Theorem 4.1,} \\ &< 5 \log s^r - \frac{1}{2}r + 1 \\ &\leq 5 \log n && \text{since } r \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now prove Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1* Let  $G$  be a primitive group which is not large base. If  $G$  is almost simple, then the result holds by Theorem 4.1. If  $G$  is of type PA then the result holds by Lemma 5.1. For all other  $G$ , the result holds by [14, Props 3.1, 4.1 and 5.1] □

## References

- [1] K.D. Blaha. *Minimum bases for permutation groups: the greedy approximation*. J. Algorithms 13 (1992), no. 2, 297–306.
- [2] J.N. Bray, D.F Holt, C.M. Roney-Dougal. *The maximal subgroups of the low-dimensional finite classical groups*. Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 407. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [3] T. Burness. *On base sizes for almost simple primitive groups*. J. Algebra 516 (2018), 38–74.
- [4] T. Burness. *On base sizes for actions of finite classical groups*. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 75 (2007), no. 3, 545–562.
- [5] T. Burness and M. Giudici. *Classical groups, derangements and primes*. Volume 25 of Aust. Math. Soc. Lect. Ser. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [6] T. Burness, M. Liebeck and A. Shalev. *Base sizes for simple groups and a conjecture of Cameron*. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 98 (2009), no. 1, 116–162.
- [7] T. Burness, M. Liebeck and A. Shalev. *Generation and random generation: from simple groups to maximal subgroups*. Adv. Math. 248 (2013), 59–95.
- [8] T. Burness, E. O’Brien and R. Wilson. *Base sizes for sporadic simple groups*. Israel J. Math. 177 (2010), 307–333.
- [9] P. Cameron, R. Solomon and A. Turull. *Chains of subgroups in symmetric groups*. J. Algebra 127 (1989), no. 2, 340–352.
- [10] G. Cherlin. *Sporadic homogeneous structures*. The Gelfand Mathematical Seminars, 1996–1999, 15–48, Gelfand Math. Sem., Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2000.
- [11] G. Cherlin, G. Martin and D. Saracino. *Arities of permutation groups: wreath products and  $k$ -sets*. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 74 (1996), no. 2, 249–286.
- [12] J. H. Conway, R.T. Curtis, S.P. Norton, R.A. Parker and R.A. Wilson. *ATLAS of finite groups. Maximal subgroups and ordinary characters for simple groups*. Oxford University Press, Eynsham, 1985.
- [13] N. Gill, M. Liebeck and P. Spiga. *Cherlin’s conjecture on finite primitive binary permutation groups* arXiv:2106.05154.
- [14] N. Gill, B. Lodá and P. Spiga. *On the height and relational complexity of a finite permutation group*. Nagoya Math. J, to appear.



- [15] A. Lachlan. *On countable stable structures which are homogeneous for a finite relational language*. Israel J. Math. 49 (1984), no. 1-3, 69-153.
- [16] M. Liebeck. *On minimal degrees and base sizes of primitive permutation groups*. Arch. Math. (Basel) 43 (1984), no. 1, 11-15.
- [17] B. Lodá. *The height and relational complexity of finite primitive permutation groups*. PhD Thesis, University of South Wales, 2020.
- [18] M. Moscatiello and C.M. Roney-Dougal. *Base size of primitive permutation groups*. Monatsh. Math, to appear.
- [19] C.E. Praeger. *The inclusion problem for finite primitive permutation groups*. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3), 60(1):68-88, (1990).
- [20] C.C. Sims. *Computation with finitely presented groups*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 48. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [21] A.V. Vasilyev, *Minimal permutation representations of finite simple exceptional groups of types  $E_6$ ,  $E_7$  and  $E_8$* . Alg. and Logic 36, 302-310 (1997).

Veronica Kelsey & Colva M. Roney-Dougal: Mathematical Institute, Univ. St Andrews, KY16 9SS, UK  
 vk49@st-andrews.ac.uk  
 Colva.Roney-Dougal@st-andrews.ac.uk