

# Lie algebras with Frobenius dihedral groups of automorphisms

N. Yu. Makarenko\*

Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Novosibirsk, 630 090, Russia  
natalia\_makarenko@yahoo.fr

## Abstract

Suppose that a Lie algebra  $L$  admits a finite Frobenius group of automorphisms  $FH$  with cyclic kernel  $F$  and complement  $H$  of order 2, such that the fixed-point subalgebra of  $F$  is trivial and the fixed-point subalgebra of  $H$  is metabelian. Then the derived length of  $L$  is bounded by a constant.

**Keywords.** Lie algebras, Frobenius group, dihedral group of automorphisms, graded, solvable

## 1 Introduction

Let  $L$  be a Lie algebra,  $G$  its group of automorphisms. We denote the fixed-point subalgebra of  $G$  in  $L$  by

$$C_L(G) = \{l \in L \mid l^\varphi = l \text{ for all } \varphi \in G\}.$$

Suppose that  $L$  admits a Frobenius group of automorphisms  $FH$  with kernel  $F$  and complement  $H$  of order  $q$  such that the fixed-point subalgebra of  $F$  is trivial, i.e.  $C_L(F) = 0$ . In [1] it was proved, that if the fixed-point subalgebra  $C_L(H)$  of  $H$  is nilpotent of class  $c$ , then  $L$  is nilpotent of class bounded by a function depending only on  $q$  and  $c$ .

In this paper we make the first attempt to extend this result to the case of solvability of  $C_L(H)$  (instead of nilpotency). We consider a Frobenius dihedral group acting on a Lie algebra in such a way that  $C_L(F) = 0$  and  $C_L(H)$  is metabelian, and prove the solvability of bounded length of the whole algebra.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that a Lie algebra  $L$  of arbitrary dimension admits a finite Frobenius group of automorphisms  $FH$  with cyclic kernel  $F$  and complement  $H$  of order 2, such that the fixed-point subalgebra of  $F$  is trivial and the fixed-point subalgebra of  $H$  is metabelian. Then the derived length of  $L$  is bounded by a constant.*

---

\*The work is supported by Russian Science Foundation, project 21-11-00286

*Mathematics Subject Classification* (2010): Primary 17B40, 17B30, 17B70; Secondary 17B65

The proof is based on combinatorial calculus in a  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ -graded Lie algebra for  $n$  being the order of the Frobenius kernel  $F$ . Such a  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ -graded algebra arises naturally, as we extend the ground field by a primitive  $n$ th root  $\omega$  of 1 and consider the eigenspaces  $L_i = \{x \in L \mid x^\varphi = \omega^i x\}$  for the eigenvalues  $\omega^i$  of the automorphism  $\varphi$ , a generator of  $F$ . These subspaces satisfy the properties:

$$[L_i, L_j] \subseteq L_{i+j \pmod{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i,$$

and thus form a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -grading. It is clear that  $L_0 = C_L(F)$ . The assumptions of Theorem 1.1 can be translated into the language of graded algebras by introducing two notions: so called “(-1)-independent sequence” and the “selective metabelian condition”. We call a sequence  $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ ,  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ , *(-1)-independent*, if for any  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ ,  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$t_1 a_1 + t_2 a_2 + t_3 a_3 + t_4 a_4 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 0, 0, 0).$$

We say that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  satisfies the *selective metabelian condition* if

$$[[L_{d_1}, L_{d_2}], [L_{d_3}, L_{d_4}]] = 0 \quad \text{whenever } (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) \text{ is } (-1)\text{-independent.}$$

To demonstrate Theorem 1.1 it suffices to prove the solvability of bounded length of a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra with  $L_0 = 0$  satisfying selective metabelian condition (see section 3).

The general idea and many arguments are borrowed from [1] and [2]. In particular, in [1] and [2] there were already obtained some analogues of Lemmas 4.4, 4.5, 4.7 and Corollary 4.6.

## 2 Preliminaries

If  $M, N$  are subspaces of  $L$ , then  $[M, N]$  denotes the subspace, generated by all the products  $[m, n]$  for  $m \in M, n \in N$ . If  $M$  and  $N$  are ideals, then  $[M, N]$  is also an ideal; if  $H$  is a (sub)algebra, then  $[H, H]$  is an ideal of  $H$  and, in particular, its subalgebra.

A simple product  $[a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_s]$  is by definition the left-normalized product

$$[\dots[[a_1, a_2], a_3], \dots, a_s].$$

Note that any (complex) product in elements in  $L$  can be expressed as a linear combination of simple products of the same length in the same elements. Also, it follows that the ideal in  $L$  generated by a subspace  $S$  is the subspace generated by all the simple products  $[y_j, x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_t}]$ , where  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x_{i_k} \in L, y_j \in S$ . In particular, if  $L$  is generated by a subspace  $M$ , then its space is spanned by simple products in elements of  $M$ .

The derived series of an algebra  $L$  is defined as

$$L^{(0)} = L, \quad L^{(i+1)} = [L^{(i)}, L^{(i)}].$$

Then  $L$  is solvable of derived length at most  $n$  if  $L^{(n)} = 0$ . An algebra of derived length 2 is called *metabelian*.

A Lie algebra  $L$  over a field is  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded if

$$L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i \quad \text{and} \quad [L_i, L_j] \subseteq L_{i+j \pmod{n}},$$

where  $L_i$  are subspaces of  $L$ . Elements of  $L_i$  are referred to as *homogeneous* and the subspaces  $L_i$  are called *homogeneous components* or *grading components*. In particular,  $L_0$  is called the zero homogeneous component or simply zero component.

An additive subgroup  $H$  of  $L$  is called *homogeneous* if  $H = \bigoplus_i (H \cap L_i)$  and we set  $H_i = H \cap L_i$ . Obviously, any subalgebra or an ideal generated by homogeneous subspaces is homogeneous. A homogeneous subalgebra can be regarded as a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded algebra with the induced grading. It follows that the terms of the derived series of  $L$ , the ideals  $L^{(k)}$  are also  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded algebras with induced grading

$$L_i^{(k)} = L^{(k)} \cap L_i.$$

**Index Convention.** Henceforth a small Latin letter with an index  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  will denote a homogeneous element in the grading component  $L_i$ , with the index only indicating which component this element belongs to:  $x_i \in L_i$ . We will not be using numbering indices for elements of the  $L_i$ , so that different elements can be denoted by the same symbol when it only matters which component the elements belong to. For example,  $x_i$  and  $x_i$  can be different elements of  $L_i$ , so that  $[x_i, x_i]$  can be a non-zero element of  $L_{2i}$ .

### 3 Reduction to $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ -graded Lie algebras with metabelian selection condition

Let  $L$  be a Lie algebra  $L$  that satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1. Denote a generator of the Frobenius kernel  $F$  by  $\varphi$ . Let  $n$  be the order of  $\varphi$ . If the ground field  $\mathbb{K}$  does not contain a primitive  $n$ th root  $\omega$  of 1, we extend  $K$  by  $\omega$  and denote the resulting Lie algebra by  $\tilde{L}$ . The group  $FH$  acts on  $\tilde{L}$  this action inherits the conditions that  $C_{\tilde{L}}(F) = 0$  and  $C_{\tilde{L}}(H)$  is metabelian. Thus, we can assume that  $L = \tilde{L}$  and the ground field contains  $\omega$ .

We consider the eigenspaces  $L_i = \{x \in L \mid x^\varphi = \omega^i x\}$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ , of  $\varphi$ , for the eigenvalues  $\omega^i$ . One can verify that

$$[L_i, L_j] \subseteq L_{i+j \pmod{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad L = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} L_i,$$

so this is a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -grading. We also have  $L_0 = C_L(F) = 0$ .

Let  $h$  be a generator of  $H$ . By definition of the Frobenius group  $C_H(f) = 1$  for every non-identity  $f$  in  $F$ . It follows that  $h$  acts on  $F$  without non-trivial fixed points. Hence,  $\varphi^{h^{-1}} = \varphi^{-1}$  and 2 does not divide  $n$ .

The group  $H$  permutes the components  $L_i$  in the following way:  $L_i^h = L_{-i}$ . In fact, if  $x_i \in L_i$ , then  $(x_i^h)^\varphi = x_i^{h\varphi h^{-1}h} = (x_i^{\varphi^{-1}})^h = \omega^{-i}x_i^h$ .

In what follows, to simplify the notations, (under the Index Convention) we will denote  $(x_s)^h$  by  $x_{-s}$  for  $x_s \in L_s$ .

Let  $x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}, x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}$  be homogeneous elements in  $L_{a_1}, L_{a_2}, L_{a_3}, L_{a_4}$  respectively. Consider the sums

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= x_{a_1} + x_{-a_1}, \\ &\vdots \\ X_4 &= x_{a_4} + x_{-a_4}. \end{aligned}$$

Since all of them lie in subalgebra  $C_L(H)$ , which is metabelian, it follows that

$$[[X_1, X_2], [X_3, X_4]] = 0.$$

We expand the expressions to obtain on the left a linear combination of products in the  $x_{\pm a_i}$ , which in particular involves the term  $[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}]]$ . Suppose that the product  $[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}]]$  is non-zero. Then there must be other terms in the expanded expression that belong to the same component  $L_{a_1+a_2+a_3+a_4}$ , that is

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_2 + a_4 = \epsilon_1 a_1 + \epsilon_2 a_2 + \epsilon_3 a_3 + \epsilon_4 a_4$$

for some  $\epsilon_i \in \{1, -1\}$  not all of which are 1, or equivalently (since  $n$  is odd),

$$t_1 a_1 + t_2 a_2 + t_3 a_3 + t_4 a_4 = 0$$

for some  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$  not all of which are 0.

This leads us to the followings definitions.

**Definition.** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  be not necessarily distinct non-zero elements of  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ . We say that the sequence  $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$  is  $(-1)$ -dependent if

$$t_1 a_1 + t_2 a_2 + t_3 a_3 + t_4 a_4 = 0$$

for some  $t \in \{0, 1\}$  not all of which are 0. If the sequence  $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$  is not  $(-1)$ -dependent, i.e. if for any  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ ,  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$t_1 a_1 + t_2 a_2 + t_3 a_3 + t_4 a_4 = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 0, 0, 0),$$

we call it  $(-1)$ -independent.

**Definition.** We say that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  satisfies the *selective metabelian condition* if, under the Index Convention,

$$[[x_{d_1}, x_{d_2}], [x_{d_3}, x_{d_4}]] = 0 \quad \text{whenever } (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) \text{ is } (-1)\text{-independent.} \quad (1)$$

To demonstrate Theorem 1.1 it suffices to prove the solvability of bounded length of a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra with trivial zero-component satisfying the selective metabelian condition.

## 4 Proof

We begin with some technical Lemmas.

**Notation.** For a given  $(-1)$ -independent sequence  $(a_1, \dots, a_k)$  we denote by  $D(a_1, \dots, a_k)$  the set of all  $j \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $(a_1, \dots, a_k, j)$  is  $(-1)$ -dependent.

**Notation.** For an arbitrary sequence  $(b_1, \dots, b_s)$  we denote by  $\tilde{D}(b_1, \dots, b_s)$  the set of all linear combinations of the form  $u_1 b_1 + \dots + u_k b_k$  with  $u_i \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2\}$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Suppose that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  with  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $n$  odd, satisfies the selective metabelian condition (1). Let  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $(a_1, a_2, a_3)$  is an  $(-1)$ -independent sequence and  $a_4 \in D(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ . Then (under the Index Convention)*

$$[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}], x_b] = 0$$

for all  $x_b$  with  $b \notin \tilde{D}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose by contradiction that

$$[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}], x_b] \quad (2)$$

is not trivial. We rewrite (2) using the Jacobi identity and anti-commutativity

$$\begin{aligned} & [[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}], x_b] = \\ & \left[ [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}, x_b], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}] \right] + \left[ [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}, x_b] \right] = \\ & - \left[ [x_b, [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}]], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}] \right] + \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\left[ [x_b, [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}]], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}] \right]. \quad (4)$$

By the selective metabelian condition the summand (3) is not trivial only if the sequence  $(b, a_1 + a_2, a_3, a_4)$  is  $(-1)$ -dependent, i.e. there is a tuple  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \neq (0, 0, 0, 0)$  with  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , such that

$$t_1 b + t_2(a_1 + a_2) + t_3 a_3 + t_4 a_4 = 0.$$

We consider all possible 4-tuples  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$  with  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . If  $t_1 \neq 0$ , then  $b$  is a linear combination of elements  $(a_1 + a_2), a_3, a_4$  with coefficients from  $\{0, -1\}$ . It follows that  $b \in \widetilde{D}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$  that contradicts the assumption. Thus,  $t_1 = 0$ . If among the  $t_i$  only one integer is non zero, the corresponding index and consequently the element with this index is trivial (since  $L_0 = 0$ ), that contradicts non-triviality of (2). The tuples  $(0, 0, 1, 1), (0, 1, 1, 1)$  give accordingly the triviality of the subproducts  $[x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}]$  and  $\left[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}]\right]$  in (2), since they belong to  $L_0 = 0$ . It remains to consider only 2 following tuples:  $(0, 1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 1)$ . The tuple  $(0, 1, 1, 0)$  gives  $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 0$  that is impossible since  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  are  $(-1)$ -independent. Thus, (2) and (3) are both not trivial only if  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 0, 1)$  and  $\mathbf{a}_4 = -\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2$ .

In the same way, we determine under what condition the products (2) and (4) are simultaneously not trivial. The sequence  $(b, a_3 + a_4, a_1, a_2)$  should be  $(-1)$ -dependent. The only tuples that do not imply the triviality of (4) are  $(0, 1, 0, 1)$  and  $(0, 1, 1, 0)$ . This corresponds respectively to

$$\mathbf{a}_4 = -\mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}_3 \text{ and } \mathbf{a}_4 = -\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_3.$$

These two conditions are actually equivalent and one can be obtained from the other by interchanging  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  due to anti-commutativity.

We will examine separately the two cases:  $a_4 = -a_1 - a_2$  and  $a_4 = -a_1 - a_3$ .

**Case:  $\mathbf{a}_4 = -\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2$ .**

We substitute  $a_4 = -a_1 - a_2$  in (2), rewrite it as the sum of (3) and (4) and expand the inner product in (3) by the Jacobi identity:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_2}], x_b\right] = \\ & -\left[[x_b, [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}]], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_2}]\right] + \left[[x_b, [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_2}]], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}]\right] = \\ & = -\left[[\mathbf{x}_b, x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_2}]\right] + \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\left[[\mathbf{x}_b, x_{a_2}, x_{a_1}], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_2}]\right] + \tag{6}$$

$$\left[[x_b, [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_2}]], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}]\right]. \tag{7}$$

The product (2) is not trivial only if at least one of the following 3 sequences of indices is  $(-1)$ -dependent:

$$((b + a_1), a_2, a_3, (-a_1 - a_2)), \tag{8}$$

$$((b + a_2), a_1, a_3, (-a_1 - a_2)), \tag{9}$$

$$(b, (a_3 - a_1 - a_2), a_1, a_2). \tag{10}$$

We consider all possible tuples  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$  with  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$  and investigate the corresponding equations on the indices. If  $t_1 \neq 0$ , then  $b$  is a linear combination of  $a_1, a_2,$

$a_3$  with coefficients belonging to  $\{1, -1\}$  that contradicts the hypothesis of the lemma. Suppose that  $t_1 = 0$ . If among the  $t_i$  only one integer is not zero, the product is trivial, since the corresponding element in the products (5), (6), (7) belongs to  $L_0 = 0$ . If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 0, 1, 1)$  then the products equals to 0, since the sum of the indices of the second subproduct is 0. It remains to consider the tuples  $(0, 1, 1, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1, 0, 1)$ ,  $(0, 1, 1, 1)$ .

Let  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 0)$ . Then  $a_2 + a_3 = 0$  in (8);  $a_1 + a_3 = 0$  in (9),  $\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{a}_2$  in (10). The first two equations are impossible, since  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  are  $(-1)$ -independent.

If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 0, 1)$ , then  $a_1 = 0$  in (8);  $a_2 = 0$  (9);  $\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{a}_1$  in (10). The first and the second equalities imply respectively that  $x_{a_1} \in L_0 = 0$  or  $x_{a_2} \in L_0 = 0$ , and thus, (2) is trivial.

For  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 1)$  we have  $\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{a}_1$  in (8);  $\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{a}_2$  in (9);  $a_3 = 0$  in (10) that corresponds to the trivial product.

Thus, if  $a_4 = -a_1 - a_2$ , (2) is not trivial only if  $\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{a}_1$  or  $\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{a}_2$ . These cases are equivalent as one can be obtained from the other by interchanging  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ .

Let  $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_3$ . In (2) we replace  $a_4$  by  $-a_1 - a_2$  and  $a_3$  by  $a_2$ , represent the obtained product as the sum of (3) and (4) and expand the first subproducts in both summands by the Jacobi identity:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}], x_b \right] = \\ & - \left[ [x_b, x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}] \right] + \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}, x_{a_1}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}] \right] + \quad (12)$$

$$\left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}] \right] + \quad (13)$$

$$- \left[ [x_b, x_{-a_1-a_2}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}] \right]. \quad (14)$$

In (12) we can move the element  $x_{a_1} \in L_{a_i}$  to the right over the product  $[x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}] \in L_{-a_1}$ , since  $[L_{a_i}, L_{-a_i}] = 0$ . We obtain

$$\left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}, \mathbf{x}_{a_1}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}] \right] = \left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}], \mathbf{x}_{a_1} \right].$$

In the same way, in (13) we move the element  $x_{-a_1-a_2}$  to the right over the product  $[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}] \in L_{a_1+a_2}$  to get

$$\left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}, \mathbf{x}_{-a_1-a_2}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}] \right] = \left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], \mathbf{x}_{-a_1-a_2} \right].$$

It suffices to prove that the products (11), (14),  $\left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}] \right]$ ,  $\left[ [x_b, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}] \right]$  are trivial. The corresponding sequences of indices are:

$$\left( (b + a_1), a_2, a_2, (-a_1 - a_2) \right) \quad (15)$$

$$\left( (b - a_1 - a_2), a_2, a_1, a_2 \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\left( b, a_2, a_2, (-a_1 - a_2) \right) \quad (17)$$

$$\left( b, a_2, a_1, a_2 \right). \quad (18)$$

We consider all possible 4-tuples  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ ,  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , and the solutions of the equations  $t_1 y_1 + t_2 y_2 + t_3 y_3 + t_4 y_4 = 0$  for  $(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$  being successively (15), (16), (17) and (18).

If  $t_1 \neq 0$ , then  $b \in \tilde{D}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$  for all the sequences under consideration. This contradicts the hypothesis of the lemma. Thus,  $t_1 = 0$ . As we have already noticed above, a tuple  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$  with only one non-zero value implies the triviality of the product, as well as the tuple  $(0, 0, 1, 1)$ . It remains to consider the tuples  $(0, 1, 1, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1, 0, 1)$ ,  $(0, 1, 1, 1)$ .

Let  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 0)$ . Then  $2a_2 = 0$  in (15) and (17), that corresponds to the trivial product as  $n$  is odd;  $a_1 + a_2 = 0$  in (16) and (18), which is impossible since  $a_1, a_2$  are  $(-1)$ -independent.

If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 0, 1)$ , then  $-a_1 = 0$  in (15) and (17);  $2a_2 = 0$  in (16) and (18). Both these conditions imply the triviality of the corresponding products.

Let now  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 1)$ . Then  $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_1$  in (15);  $2\mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{0}$  in (16) and (18);  $-a_1 = 0$  in (17), which corresponds to the trivial product.

It follows that either  $\mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{a}_2$ , or  $\mathbf{a}_1 = -2\mathbf{a}_2$ . Hence, (2) has the initial segment either of the form

$$\left[ [x_{a_2}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-2a_2}] \right]$$

or of the form

$$\left[ [x_{-2a_2}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{a_2}] \right].$$

The first product is trivial since

$$\left[ [x_{a_2}, \mathbf{x}_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-2a_2}] \right] = \left[ [x_{a_2}, [x_{a_2}, x_{-2a_2}]], \mathbf{x}_{a_2} \right] + \left[ x_{a_2}, [\mathbf{x}_{a_2}, [x_{a_2}, x_{-2a_2}]] \right]$$

and the subproducts  $[x_{a_2}, [x_{a_2}, x_{-2a_2}]]$ ,  $[\mathbf{x}_{a_2}, [x_{a_2}, x_{-2a_2}]]$  have zero sum of indices. The second product is actually the same as the first one due to anti-commutativity.

**Case:  $\mathbf{a}_4 = -\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}_3$ .**

We substitute  $-a_1 - a_3$  instead of  $a_4$  in (2), rewrite it as the sum of (3) and (4) and expand the first inner product in (4) by the Jacobi identity:

$$\left[ [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}], x_b \right] = \left[ [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_3}] x_b \right] = \quad (19)$$

$$= - \left[ [x_b, [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}]], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_3}] \right] \quad (20)$$



$$+ [[x_b, x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_3}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}]] \quad (21)$$

$$- [[x_b, x_{-a_1-a_3}, x_{a_3}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}]]. \quad (22)$$

The corresponding sequences of indices are:

$$(b, (a_1 + a_2), a_3, (-a_1 - a_3)), \quad (23)$$

$$((b + a_3), (-a_1 - a_3), a_1, a_2), \quad (24)$$

$$((b - a_1 - a_3), a_3, a_1, a_2). \quad (25)$$

As in the previous arguments we need to consider only the tuples  $(0, 1, 1, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1, 0, 1)$ ,  $(0, 1, 1, 0)$ , since the other tuples lead to the triviality of all the products under consideration.

Let  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 0)$ . Then  $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 0$  for (23), which is impossible since  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  are  $(-1)$ -independent;  $a_3 = 0$  for (24), which implies the triviality of the product;  $a_1 + a_3 = 0$  for (25), which is impossible, since  $a_1, a_3$  are  $(-1)$ -independent.

If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 0, 1)$ , then we have  $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_3$  for (23);  $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_3$  for (24);  $a_3 + a_2 = 0$  for (25), which is impossible, since  $a_1, a_3$  are  $(-1)$ -independent.

The last case  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 1)$  gives:  $a_2 = 0$  for (23), which implies the triviality of the product;  $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_3$  for (24);  $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 0$  for (25), which is impossible, since  $a_1, a_2, a_3$  are  $(-1)$ -independent.

If  $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_3$ , the product (2) becomes  $[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_2}, x_{-a_1-a_2}], x_b]$ . It was already considered above.

It remains the case  $\mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_3$ . We substitute  $a_4 = -a_1 - a_3, a_2 = a_1 + a_3$  in (2), represent (2) as the sum of (3) and (4) and expand the inner brackets in the first inner product of (4) by the Jacobi identity:

$$[[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}], x_b] = [[x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_3}], x_b] =$$

$$- [[x_b, [x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}]], [x_{a_3}, x_{-a_1-a_3}]] \quad (26)$$

$$+ [[x_b, x_{a_3}, \mathbf{x}_{-a_1-a_3}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}]]$$

$$- [[x_b, x_{-a_1-a_3}, x_{a_3}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}]]. \quad (27)$$

In the second summand we move the element  $\mathbf{x}_{-a_1-a_3}$  to the right over  $[x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}]$  by the Jacobi identity:

$$[[x_b, x_{a_3}, \mathbf{x}_{-a_1-a_3}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}]]$$

$$= [[x_b, x_{a_3}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}], \mathbf{x}_{-a_1-a_3}].$$

$$+ [[x_b, x_{a_3}], [[x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}], \mathbf{x}_{-a_1-a_3}]] \quad (28)$$

It suffices to prove that the products (26), (27), (28) and  $[[x_b, x_{a_3}], [x_{a_1}, x_{a_1+a_3}]]$  are trivial. The corresponding sequences of indices are

$$(b, (2a_1 + a_3), a_3, (-a_1 - a_3)), \quad (29)$$

$$((b - a_1 - a_3), a_3, a_1, (a_1 + a_3)), \quad (30)$$

$$(b, a_3, (2a_1 + a_3), (-a_1 - a_3)), \quad (31)$$

$$(b, a_3, a_1, (a_1 + a_3)). \quad (32)$$

As in the previous arguments it suffices to consider the tuples  $(0, 1, 1, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1, 0, 1)$ ,  $(0, 1, 1, 1)$ .

If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 0)$ , then the conditions of non-triviality of the corresponding product are:  $2a_1 + 2a_3 = 0$  in (29) and (31);  $a_3 + a_1 = 0$  in (30) and (32). Both equations are impossible since  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are  $(-1)$ -independent and  $n$  is odd.

If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 0, 1)$ , then the conditions of non-triviality of the corresponding product are:  $a_1 = 0$  in (29) and (31) which implies the triviality of the corresponding commutator;  $2a_3 + a_1 = 0$  in (30) and (32).

If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (0, 1, 1, 1)$ , then the conditions of non-triviality of the corresponding product are:  $a_1 + a_3 = 0$  in (29), (31);  $2a_1 + 2a_3 = 0$  in (30), (32). The both conditions are impossible since  $a_1, a_3$  are  $(-1)$ -independent and  $n$  is odd.

Thus, the product (2) can be non-trivial only if  $a_1 = -2a_3$ . Then  $a_2 = a_1 + a_3 = -a_3$ ,  $a_4 = -a_1 - a_3 = a_3$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & [[x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_4}]] = [[x_{-2a_3}, x_{-a_3}], [x_{a_3}, x_{a_3}]] = \\ & = [x_{-2a_3}, [x_{a_3}, x_{a_3}], x_{-a_3}] + [x_{-2a_3}, [x_{-a_3}, [x_{a_3}, x_{a_3}]]]. \end{aligned}$$

The first summand is trivial since it contains an initial segment with zero sum of indices. The inner product  $[x_{-a_3}, [x_{a_3}, x_{a_3}]]$  of the second summand can be represented as the sum of two products of the form  $[x_{-a_3}, x_{a_3}, x_{a_3}]$  by expanding the brackets by the Jacobi identity. As  $[x_{-a_3}, x_{a_3}, x_{a_3}]$  also contains an initial segment with zero sum of indices, the second summand is trivial and, consequently, (2) is trivial as well.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  with  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $n$  odd, satisfies the selective metabelian condition (1). Let  $c, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n$  odd,  $o(a) > 3$ . Then (under the Index Convention)*

$$[x_c, \underbrace{x_a, x_a, \dots, x_a}_7] = 0$$

for all  $x_c \in L_c$ ,  $x_a = [x_b, x_{a-b}] \in [L_b, L_{a-b}]$ .

Note that under the Index Convention the elements  $x_a$  in the product above can be different.

*Proof.* We denote  $[x_c, \underbrace{x_a, x_a, \dots, x_a}_k]$ ,  $k = 0, 1, \dots, 5$ , by  $x_{c+ka}$  under the Index Convention. Suppose by contradiction that

$$X = [x_c, \underbrace{x_a, x_a, \dots, x_a}_7] \neq 0.$$

It follows that for all  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 5$  the products

$$[x_c, \underbrace{x_a, x_a, \dots, x_a}_k, x_a, x_a] = [[x_{c+ka}, x_a], [x_b, x_{a-b}]] \quad (33)$$

are not trivial as well. Hence, the corresponding sequences of indices

$$((c + ka), a, b, (a - b))$$

for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 5$  are all  $(-1)$ -dependent, i.e. for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 5$  there are  $t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, \in \{0, 1\}$  (depending on  $k$ ) such that  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \neq (0, 0, 0, 0)$  and

$$t_1(c + ka) + t_2a + t_3b + t_4(a - b) = 0.$$

Suppose first that  $(a, b, (a - b))$  is  $(-1)$ -independent, i.e.  $t_1 = 1$ . If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 1)$  or  $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ , then (33) is trivial since it contains an inner product with zero sum of indices. If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$ , then  $c + ka = -b$ . If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (1, 0, 0, 1)$ , then  $c + ka = -a + b$ . If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (1, 1, 1, 0)$ , then  $c + ka = -a - b$ . If  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) = (1, 1, 0, 1)$ , then  $c + ka = -2a + b$ .

It follows that for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, 5$   $c + ka \in \{(-b), (-a + b), (-a - b), (-2a + b)\}$ . It is impossible, since  $o(a)$  is actually greater than 4 (as 2 does not divide  $n$ ) and  $c + ka$  takes at least 5 different values for  $k = 0, \dots, 5$ .

Let now  $a, b, a - b$  be  $(-1)$ -dependent. By definition there are  $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $t_1a + t_2b + t_3(a - b) = 0$  and  $(t_1, t_2, t_3) \neq (0, 0, 0)$ . We consider all possible 3-tuple  $(t_1, t_2, t_3)$ . Each of the tuples  $(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1)$  implies the triviality of (33). For  $(1, 0, 1)$  we obtain  $\mathbf{2a} - \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$  and for  $(1, 1, 0)$   $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ .

Consider the case  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{2a}$ . Then  $x_a = [x_{2a}, x_{-a}]$  and

$$\begin{aligned} [[x_{c+ak}, x_a], [x_b, x_{a-b}]] &= [x_{c+ak}, [x_{2a}, x_{-a}], [x_{2a}, x_{-a}]] = \\ &= [x_{c+ak}, x_{2a}, \mathbf{x}_{-a}], [x_{2a}, x_{-a}] \\ &- [x_{c+ak}, x_{-a}, x_{2a}], [x_{2a}, x_{-a}]. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In the first summand we move  $\mathbf{x}_{-a}$  to the right over the  $[x_{2a}, x_{-a}] \in L_a$  to get

$$[[x_{c+ak}, x_{2a}], [x_{2a}, x_{-a}], \mathbf{x}_{-a}]. \quad (35)$$

(The additional term, which arises by the Jacobi identity, is trivial as it contains an inner product  $[[\mathbf{x}_{-a}, [x_{2a}, x_{-a}]] \in L_0$ .) We determine under which conditions (34) or (35) could be non-trivial. The sequence  $((c + ka - a), 2a, 2a, (-a))$  or  $((c + ka), 2a, 2a, (-a))$  should be  $(-1)$ -dependent. As in the previous arguments, considering all possible tuples  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ ,  $t_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , and equations

$$t_1(c + ka - a) + t_2 \cdot 2a + t_3 \cdot 2a + t_4 \cdot (-a) = 0, \quad t_1(c + ka) + t_2 \cdot 2a + t_3 \cdot 2a + t_4 \cdot (-a) = 0,$$

we obtain that

$$c + ka \in \{(-4a), (-3a), (-2a), (-a), a, 2a\}$$

for  $t_1 = 1$  and  $3a = 0$  for  $t_1 = 0$ . The case of  $o(a) = 3$  is impossible by assumption. If  $c \in \{(-4a), (-3a), (-2a), (-a)\}$ , then the product

$$X = [x_c, \underbrace{x_a, \dots, x_a}_7]$$

is trivial as it contains an inner product with zero sum of indices. If  $c = a$  or  $c = 2a$ , then respectively  $c + 2a$  or  $c + a$  is equal to  $3a$ , which belongs to the set

$$\{(-4a), (-3a), (-2a), (-a), a, 2a\}.$$

It follows that  $o(a) = 5$  or  $7$ . In this case the product  $X$  is also trivial since there is an initial segment with zero sum of indices.

The case where  $\mathbf{b}_1 = -\mathbf{a}$  is actually the same as the previous one, since  $x_a = [x_{-a}, x_{2a}] = -[x_{2a}, x_{-a}]$ .

We have proved that in all the cases  $X$  is trivial that contradicts our assumption.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  with  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $n$  odd, satisfies the following selective condition (under the Index Convention):*

$$[[x_{d_1}, x_{d_2}], [x_{d_3}, x]] = 0 \quad \text{whenever } (d_1, d_2, d_3) \text{ is } (-1)\text{-independent.} \quad (36)$$

*Then  $L$  is metabelian.*

*Proof.* Let  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $x_a \in L_a, x_b \in L_b, x_c \in L_c, x_d \in L_d$ . It suffices to prove that

$$Y = [[x_a, x_b], [x_c, x_d]] = 0.$$

Suppose by contradiction that  $Y \neq 0$ . Note that if  $(a, b)$  or  $(c, d)$  is  $(-1)$ -dependent, then respectively  $a = -b$  or  $c = -d$ . It follows that  $Y = 0$ , since it contains a subproduct with zero sum of indices. Therefore, we can assume that  $(a, b)$  and  $(c, d)$  are  $(-1)$ -independent. If  $c$  or  $d$  does not belong to  $D(a, b)$ , then by (36) the product  $Y$  is trivial. Thus, we can suppose that  $c, d \in D(a, b)$ . This means that  $c, d \in \{-a, -b, -a - b\}$ .

We will consider all possible cases for the pair  $(c, d)$ .

**Case:  $\mathbf{c} = -\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = -\mathbf{a}$ .** If the sequence  $((-a), (-a), b)$  is  $(-1)$ -independent, then  $Y = 0$  by (36). Suppose that  $((-a), (-a), b)$  is  $(-1)$ -dependent. It follows that  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}$  or  $\mathbf{b} = 2\mathbf{a}$ . In the case where  $b = a$  we have

$$Y = [[x_a, x_a], [x_{-a}, x_{-a}]] = 0,$$

and in the case where  $b = 2a$  we have

$$Y = [[x_a, \mathbf{x}_{2\mathbf{a}}], [x_{-a}, x_{-a}]] = [x_a, [x_{-a}, x_{-a}], \mathbf{x}_{2\mathbf{a}}] + [x_a, [\mathbf{x}_{2\mathbf{a}}, [x_{-a}, x_{-a}]]]. \quad (37)$$

Expanding the inner brackets of the subproducts  $[x_a, [x_{-a}, x_{-a}]]$  and  $[\mathbf{x}_{2\mathbf{a}}, [x_{-a}, x_{-a}]]$  by the Jacobi identity in the above terms, we obtain a linear combinations of products, each of them contains an initial segment with zero sum of indices. Hence, (37) is trivial.

**Case:  $\mathbf{c} = -\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = -\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$ .** If  $((-a), (-a - b), b)$  is  $(-1)$ -independent, then  $Y = 0$  by (36). If  $((-a), (-a - b), b)$  is  $(-1)$ -dependent, then  $b = a$  (recall that  $(c, d) = ((-a), (-a - b))$  is  $(-1)$ -independent). Thus,

$$Y = [[x_a, x_a], [x_{-a}, x_{-2a}]] = -[[x_{-a}, x_{-2a}], [x_a, x_a]].$$

If we replace  $a$  by  $-a$ , we get the product (37) considered above. Thus,  $Y$  is trivial in this case as well.

**Case:  $\mathbf{c} = -\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = -\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}$ .** As in the previous cases we can suppose that  $((-a - b), (-a - b), b)$  is  $(-1)$ -dependent. Then  $b = -2a$  and

$$Y = [[x_a, x_{-2a}], [x_a, x_a]].$$

Expanding the inner brackets by the Jacobi identity we get a linear combination of products with initial segments from  $L_0$ . Therefore,  $Y$  is zero as well.

The case of  $\mathbf{c} = -\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = -\mathbf{b}$  is trivial, since the sum of indices in  $Y$  is equal to zero in this case.

The remaining cases are the same as treated above by interchanging  $a$ ,  $b$  or  $c$  and  $d$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  with  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $n$  odd, satisfies the selective metabelian condition (1). Let  $u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}, u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}$  be homogeneous elements of  $L$  (under the Index Convention), such that the sequence of indices  $(d_1, d_2, d_3)$  is  $(-1)$ -independent and  $d_4 \in D(d_1, d_2, d_3)$ . Then (under the Index Convention) every product of the form*

$$[[u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}], [u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}], x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}], \quad (38)$$

where the  $x_{i_k} = [x_{w_k}, x_{i_k - w_k}]$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, t$ , are homogeneous products of length 2, can be written as a linear combination of products of the form

$$[[u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}], [u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}], m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_s}], \quad (39)$$

where  $s \leq t$ ,  $m_{j_k} = [m_{u_k}, m_{j_k - u_k}]$  such that  $j_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  and at least one of the indices  $u_k$  or  $j_k - u_k$  belongs to  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  as well.

*Proof.* Set  $U = [[u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}], [u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}]]$ . We use induction on  $t$ . If  $t = 0$ , (38) has the required form. If  $t = 1$  and  $i_1 \notin \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ , then (38) is equal to zero by Lemma 4.1. Suppose that  $i_1 \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ . If either  $w_1$  or  $i_1 - w_1$  belongs to  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ , the product (38) has the required form. Otherwise, we expand the brackets of the subproduct  $[x_{w_1}, x_{i_1-w_1}]$  by the Jacobi identity:

$$[U, x_{i_1}] = [U, [x_{w_1}, x_{i_1-w_1}]] = [U, x_{w_1}, x_{i_1-w_1}] - [U, x_{i_1-w_1}, x_{w_1}].$$

The both summands are equal to zero by Lemma 4.1.

Assume that  $t > 1$ . If all the indices  $i_k$  belong to  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$  and for each  $k$  either  $w_k$  or  $i_k - w_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$ , then the product (38) is of the required form with  $s = t$ . Suppose that in (38) there is an element  $x_{i_k}$  such that

- either  $i_k \notin \tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$
- or  $i_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$ , but both  $w_k, i_k - w_k$  do not belong to  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$ .

We choose such an element with  $k$  as small as possible and use  $k$  as a second induction parameter to prove that (38) can be represented as a linear combination of the products of the form (39) and a linear combination of products in which the number of the “good” elements after  $U$  is equal to  $k$ , i.e. the products of the form

$$[U, m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_k}, x_{i_{k+1}}, \dots, x_{i_t}], \quad (40)$$

where for  $l = 1, \dots, k$   $m_{j_l} = [m_{u_l}, m_{j_l-u_l}]$  with  $j_l \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  and at least one of the indices  $u_l$  or  $j_l - u_l$  belongs to  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ .

If  $k = 1$  and  $i_1 \notin \tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$ , then the product (38) is zero by Lemma 4.1. If  $i_1 \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$ , but  $w_1, i_1 - w_1 \notin \tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$ , we expand the brackets of the subproduct  $[x_{w_1}, x_{i_1-w_1}]$  in (38) by the Jacobi identity (as for  $t = 1$ ) and obtain the sum of two products that are trivial by Lemma 4.1. Hence,  $i_1 \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_1, d_3, d_4)$  and at least one of the indices  $w_1$  or  $i_1 - w_1$  belongs to  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ . Thus, the product (38) has at least 1 element of the required form after  $U$ .

Suppose that  $k \geq 2$  and write

$$\begin{aligned} [U, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}, x_{i_k} \dots] &= [U, \dots, x_{i_k}, x_{i_{k-1}}, \dots] + \\ &[U, \dots, [x_{i_{k-1}}, x_{i_k}], \dots]. \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, the second summand and the initial segment  $[U, \dots, x_{i_{k-2}}, x_{i_k}]$  of the first summand have the required form (39) because they are shorter than (38). Since  $x_{i_{k-1}}$  is already “good” by our assumption, the first term is equal to a linear combination of products of the form (40) in which the number of the “good” elements is  $k$  as required.

Since the length of the products does not increase, but the number of “good” elements grows, the induction process will end with the representation of the original product in the required form.  $\square$

Let  $d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ . Recall that  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  is the set of all linear combination of the form  $\alpha_1 d_1 + \alpha_2 d_2 + \alpha_3 d_3 + \alpha_4 d_4$  with  $\alpha_i \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2\}$ . Set  $\tilde{D} = 5^4$ . Note that the number of elements in the set  $\tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  is at most  $\tilde{D}$  for all  $d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  with  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $n$  odd, satisfies the selective metabelian condition (1). Let  $u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}, u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}$  be homogeneous elements of  $L$  (under the Index Convention) with the  $(-1)$ -independent sequence of indices  $(d_1, d_2, d_3)$  and  $d_4 \in D(d_1, d_2, d_3)$ . The ideal of  $[L, L]$  generated by*

$$U = [[u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}], [u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}]]$$

is spanned by products of the form

$$[U, m_{i_1}, \dots, m_{i_u}, m_{i_{u+1}}, \dots, m_{i_v}], \quad (41)$$

where  $m_{i_k} \in [L, L] \cap L_{i_k}$ ,  $u \leq 6\tilde{D}^2$ ,  $i_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ , such that  $o(i_k) > 3$  for  $k \leq u$ , and  $o(i_k) = 3$  for  $k > u$ .

*Proof.* Let  $R$  be the span of all products of the form (41). The ideal of  $[L, L]$  generated by  $U$  is spanned by products of the form  $[U, x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_t}]$ , where each  $x_{i_k} = [x_{w_k}, x_{i_k - w_k}]$  (under the Index Convention). By Lemma 4.4 each of such product can be represented as a linear combination of products of the form (39):

$$W = [[u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}], [u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}], m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_s}],$$

where  $s \leq t$  and  $m_{j_k} = [m_{u_k}, m_{j_k - u_k}]$  such that  $j_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ , and either  $u_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  or  $j_k - u_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ . It is sufficient to show that  $W$  belongs to  $R$ .

We use induction on  $s$ . If  $s = 1$ , it is clear that  $W \in R$ , so we assume that  $s > 1$ . We will prove that  $W$  does not change modulo  $R$  under any permutation of the  $m_{j_k}$ . Write

$$W = [U, m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_v}, m_{j_{v-1}}, \dots, m_{j_s}] + [U, m_{j_1}, \dots, [m_{j_{v-1}}, m_{j_v}], \dots, m_{j_s}]. \quad (42)$$

By Lemma 4.4 the second summand is a linear combination of products of the form (39) each of which is shorter than  $W$ . Thus, the second summand in (42) belongs to  $R$  by induction. It follows that we can freely permute  $m_{j_k}$  modulo  $R$ .

For each pair of indices  $j_k, u_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$ , such that  $o(j_k) > 3$ , we place the elements  $m_{j_k} = [m_{u_k}, m_{j_k - u_k}]$  or  $m_{j_k} = [m_{j_k - u_k}, m_{u_k}]$  (if there are any) with the same unordered pair of indices  $u_k, j_k - u_k$  next to each other. If for some pair there are at least 7 of them, the product  $W$  is trivial by Lemma 4.2. Suppose that for each pair  $(j_k, u_k)$ , all such  $m_{j_k}$  occur less than 7 times. We place all these elements right after the  $U$ . Since the number of pairs  $(i_k, u_k) \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)^2$  is at most  $\tilde{D}^2$ , the initial segment has length at most  $6\tilde{D}^2$ , so the resulting product takes the required form (41).  $\square$

**Corollary 4.6.** *Suppose that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  with  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $n$  odd, satisfies the selective metabelian condition (1), and let  $M = [L, L]$ . Suppose that  $(d_1, d_2, d_3)$  is an  $(-1)$ -independent sequence and  $d_4 \in D(d_1, d_2, d_3)$ . Then the ideal in  $[L, L]$  generated by  $[[L_{d_1}, L_{d_2}], [L_{d_3}, L_{d_4}]]$  has at most  $3\tilde{D}^u$  non-trivial components of the induced grading, where  $\tilde{D} = 5^4$ ,  $u \leq 6\tilde{D}^2 = 6 \cdot 5^8$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $U = [[u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}], [u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}]]$  be an arbitrary homogeneous product in  $L$  with the given indices (under the Index Convention) representation of the original product into the required form and let  $I = I(u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}, u_{d_3}, u_{d_4})$  be the ideal in  $[L, L]$  generated by  $U$ . By Lemma 4.5 an element of  $I$  can be represented as a linear combination of the products of the form (41). Since in (41) we have  $i_k \in \tilde{D}(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, u$ , the sum of all indices of the initial segment  $[U, m_{i_1}, \dots, m_{i_u}]$  can take at most  $\tilde{D}^u$  values. Let  $B$  be the set of elements of order 3 in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ . This is an additive subgroup of order 3. Clearly, the sum of the remaining indices in (41) belongs to  $B$ . It follows that the sum of all indices in (41) can take at most  $3\tilde{D}^u$  values. By Lemma 4.5 the number  $u$  is at most  $6\tilde{D}^2 = 6 \cdot 5^8$ . So  $I$  has the number of nontrivial components bounded by a constant  $3\tilde{D}^u$ , where  $\tilde{D} = 5^4$ ,  $u \leq 6 \cdot 5^8$ .

It follows from the proofs of Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 that the set of indices of all possible non-trivial components in  $I$  is completely determined by the tuple  $(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4)$  and does not depend on the choice of  $U = [[u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}], [u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}]]$ . Since the ideal in  $[L, L]$  generated by  $[[L_{d_1}, L_{d_2}], [L_{d_3}, L_{d_4}]]$  is the sum of ideals  $I(u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}, u_{d_3}, u_{d_4})$  over all possible  $u_{d_1}, u_{d_2}, u_{d_3}, u_{d_4}$ , the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** *Suppose that a homogeneous ideal  $T$  of a Lie algebra  $L$  has only  $e$  non-trivial components. Then  $L$  has at most  $e^2$  components that do not centralize  $T$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_e}$  be the non-trivial homogeneous components of  $T$  and let  $S = \{i_1, \dots, i_e\}$ . Suppose that  $L_i$  does not centralize  $T$ . Then for some  $j \in S$  we have  $i + j \in S$ . So there are at most  $|S| \times |S|$  possibilities for  $i$ , as required.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8.** *Suppose that a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra  $L$  with  $L_0 = 0$ ,  $n$  odd, satisfies the selective metabelian condition (1). Then  $L$  is solvable of derived length bounded by a constant.*

Note that  $L$  is solvable of  $n$ -bounded derived length by Kreknin's theorem, but we need a constant bound that does not depend of  $n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $J$  be the ideal of  $M = [L, L]$  generated by all products  $[[M_{i_1}, M_{i_2}], [M_{i_3}, M_{i_4}]]$ , where  $(i_1, i_2, i_3)$  ranges through all  $(-1)$ -independent sequences of length 3 and  $i_4$  ranges through all elements of  $D(i_1, i_2, i_3)$ . The induced  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -grading of  $M/J$  has trivial zero-component and  $M/J$  satisfies the following selective condition (under the Index Condition):

$$[[x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}], [x_{i_3}, x_j]] = 0$$



whenever  $(i_1, i_2, i_3)$  is  $(-1)$ -independent sequence. Indeed, if  $j \notin D(i_1, i_2, i_3)$ , then  $(i_1, i_2, i_3, j)$  is  $(-1)$ -independent sequence and the product is trivial by selective metabelian condition (1); otherwise it belongs to  $J$ . By Lemma 4.3  $M/J$  is metabelian, that is,  $L^{(3)} \leq J$ .

Consider now an arbitrary  $(-1)$ -independent sequence  $(i_1, i_2, i_3)$  and  $i_4 \in D(i_1, i_2, i_3)$ . The ideal  $T$  in  $[L, L]$  generated by  $[[M_{i_1}, M_{i_2}], [M_{i_3}, M_{i_4}]]$  has at most  $e = 3\tilde{D}^u$  (where, recall,  $\tilde{D} = 5^4$ ,  $u \leq 6\tilde{D}^2$ ) non-trivial grading components by Corollary 4.6. Therefore, by Lemma 4.7, there are at most  $e^2$  components that do not centralize  $T$ . Since  $C_M(T)$  is also a homogeneous ideal, it follows that the quotient  $M/C_M(T)$  has at most  $e^2$  non-trivial components. Since the induced  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -grading of  $M/C_M(T)$  also has trivial zero component, by Shalev's generalization [3] of Kreknin's theorem we conclude that  $M/C_M(T)$  is solvable of  $e$ -bounded derived length, say,  $f_1$ . Therefore,  $M^{(f_1)}$ , the corresponding term of the derived series, centralizes  $T$ . Since  $f_1$  does not depend on the choice of the  $(-1)$ -independent sequence  $(i_1, i_2, i_3)$  and  $i_4 \in D(i_1, i_2, i_3)$ , and  $J$  is the sum of all such ideals  $T$ , it follows that  $[M^{(f_1)}, J] = 0$ . Recall that  $L^{(3)} \leq J$ . Hence,  $[L^{(f_1+1)}, L^{(3)}] = 0$ . Thus,  $L$  is solvable of derived length at most  $\max\{3, f_1 + 1\} + 1$ .  $\square$

As shown in section 3, to prove the theorem 1.1 it is enough to show the solvability of bounded length of a  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ -graded Lie algebra with trivial zero-component satisfying the selective metabelian condition. Thus, Proposition 4.8 implies Theorem 1.1.

## References

- [1] E. I. KHUKHRO, N. YU. MAKARENKO, P. SHUMYATSKY, Frobenius groups of automorphisms and their fixed points, *Forum Mathematicum*, **26** (2014), 73–112–12. <https://doi.org/10.1515/form.2011.152>
- [2] N. YU. MAKARENKO, P. SHUMYATSKY, Frobenius groups as groups of automorphisms, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **138** (2010), 3425–3436. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-2010-10494-X>
- [3] A. Shalev, Automorphisms of finite groups of bounded rank, *Israel J. Math.* **82** (1993), 395–404.
- [4] V. A. Kreknin, The solubility of Lie algebras with regular automorphisms of finite period, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **150** (1963), 467–469 (in Russian); English transl., *Math. USSR Doklady* **4** (1963), 683–685.
- [5] E. I. Khukhro, *Nilpotent Groups and their Automorphisms*, de Gruyter–Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [6] P. Hall, Some sufficient conditions for a group to be nilpotent, *Illinois J. Math.* **2** (1958), 787–801.