

THE p -HUPPERT-SUBGROUP AND THE SET OF p -QUASI-SUPERFLUOUS ELEMENTS IN A FINITE GROUP

by ANGEL CAROCCA and RUDOLF MAIER

(Received 31st July 1991)

Based on the theory of p -supersoluble and supersoluble groups, a prime-number parametrized family of canonical characteristic subgroups $\Gamma_p(G)$ and their intersection $\Gamma(G)$ is introduced in every finite group G and some of its properties are studied. Special interest is dedicated to an elementwise description of the largest p -nilpotent normal subgroup of $\Gamma_p(G)$ and of the Fitting subgroup of $\Gamma(G)$.

1991 Mathematics subject classification: 20D25, 20E28.

0. Introduction

Let p be a prime number. The p -supersoluble groups ([4, p. 713]) are characterized among the p -soluble groups by a famous theorem due to Huppert ([4, p. 717, Th. 9.2/9.3], [5]). The p -soluble group G is p -supersoluble, if and only if, for every maximal subgroup V of G , the index $|G:V|$ is p or relatively prime to p .

Huppert's theorem has a general significance in all finite groups G : For every prime p we introduce the characteristic subgroup $\Gamma_p(G)$ (the p -Huppert-subgroup of G) as being the intersection of all maximal subgroups of G which have composite index divisible by p . Let $A_p(G)$ be the largest normal p -soluble subgroup of G . Then $A_p(\Gamma_p(G)) = A_p(G) \cap \Gamma_p(G)$ is p -supersoluble for every G . Moreover, $\Gamma(G) = \bigcap_p \Gamma_p(G)$, the intersection of all maximal subgroups of G of composite indices, is supersoluble. These results can be deduced from recent literature [2]. Using Huppert's theorem and a natural generalization for p -soluble groups of Gaschütz' theory of saturated formations, we give independently a short proof of these facts.

Our main attention we direct to $F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$, the largest p -nilpotent normal subgroup of $\Gamma_p(G)$ and $F(\Gamma(G))$, the Fitting subgroup of $\Gamma(G)$. These subgroups merit special interest: The elements of the Frattini-subgroup $\Phi(G)$, the intersection of all maximal subgroups of G , are known as the *superfluous* elements of G (see [4, p. 268]). We call an $x \in G$ a *quasi-superfluous* element of G , if the cyclic group $\langle x \rangle$ is permutable with every maximal subgroup of G . With respect to a prime number p , we call x a p -*quasi-superfluous* element of G if $\langle x \rangle V = V \langle x \rangle$ holds for the maximal subgroups V of G which have index divisible by p . Let $Qs_p(G)$ denote the set of all p -quasi-superfluous elements, $Qs(G) = \bigcap_p Qs_p(G)$ the set of all quasi-superfluous elements of G . We show: For every group G , the set $Qs(G)$ coincides with $F(\Gamma(G))$ and, for odd prime p , the set $Qs_p(G) \cap A_p(G)$ is

$F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$. In particular these sets are subgroups of G which from their definition is not immediate. We use conventional notions and notation.

1. The p -Huppert-subgroup

Definition. Let G be a group.

(a) For every prime number p , the p -Huppert-subgroup $\Gamma_p(G)$ of G is the intersection of all maximal subgroups V of G such that $p \mid |G:V| \neq p$.

(b) The intersection $\Gamma(G) = \bigcap_p \Gamma_p(G)$ we call the Huppert-subgroup of G .

Obviously $\Gamma_p(G)$ and $\Gamma(G)$ are characteristic subgroups of G which contain $\Phi(G)$. We have $\Gamma_p(G) = G$ if and only if every maximal subgroup of G is of index p or relatively prime to p . $\Gamma(G) = G$ if and only if every maximal subgroup of G is of prime index in G .

By the definition it is clear that, for a normal subgroup N of G such that $N \leq \Gamma_p(G)$, one has $\Gamma_p(G/N) = \Gamma_p(G)/N$. Moreover, the largest normal p' -subgroup $O_{p'}(G) \leq \Gamma_p(G)$.

One first observation is:

Proposition 1.1. (a) *The p -soluble group G is p -supersoluble if and only if $F_p(G) \leq \Gamma_p(G)$.*

(b) *The soluble group G is supersoluble if and only if $F(G) \leq \Gamma(G)$.*

Proof. Applying (a) for all p , we see that (b) is a consequence of (a). To prove (a) we mention that, by Huppert's theorem, the p -soluble group G is p -supersoluble if and only if $\Gamma_p(G) = G$. So we only have to prove that $\Gamma_p(G) = G$ if $F_p(G) \leq \Gamma_p(G)$. By definition of $\Gamma_p(G)$, it suffices to show that $G/\Gamma_p(G)$ is abelian. We induct on $|G|$ to show that $G/F_p(G)$ is abelian. If $N = \Phi(G)$ or $N = O_{p'}(G)$, then $\Gamma_p(G/N) = \Gamma_p(G)/N$ and $F_p(G/N) = F_p(G)/N$. Therefore the result holds by induction in the case $N > 1$. So we may assume that $\Phi(G) = O_{p'}(G) = 1$. Now $F_p(G)$ is a p -group and $1 = \Phi(G) = \Gamma_p(G) \cap F_p(G) \cap D = F_p(G) \cap D$, where D is the intersection of all maximal subgroups U of G such that $F_p(G) \not\leq U$. For every such U we have that $|G:U| = p$ and $F_p(G)/F_p(G) \cap U$ is a chief factor of G of order p . Therefore the commutator subgroup $G' \leq \bigcap_U C_G(F_p(G)/F_p(G) \cap U) = C_G(F_p(G)/F_p(G) \cap D) = C_G(F_p(G)) \leq F_p(G)$ ([4, p. 690, Th. 6.5]). □

The following lemmas are straightforward.

Lemma 1.2. *Let G be a group, V a subgroup of G of prime index $|G:V| = p$ and let $V_G = \bigcap_{g \in G} V^g = 1$. Suppose there exists a normal p -soluble subgroup N of G , such that $G = VN$. Then G is metacyclic.*

Proof. If N is chosen minimal with $G = VN$, then $|N| = p$, N is self-centralizing in G and G/N is cyclic.

Corollary 1.3. *Let G be a group, V a subgroup of G of prime index p and let N be a p -soluble normal subgroup of G , such that $G = VN$. Then G/V_G is metacyclic.*

Proof. The group G/V_G fulfills the hypothesis of Lemma 1.2 with NV_G/V_G as p -soluble normal subgroup.

If G is a group, \mathcal{F} a formation (see [4, p. 696]), we denote by $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ the smallest normal subgroup of G having \mathcal{F} -factor group ($G^{\mathcal{F}}$ is the so-called \mathcal{F} -residual of G). We remember that a subgroup $H \leq G$ is called a *covering \mathcal{F} -subgroup* or *Sylow- \mathcal{F} -subgroup* of G , if $H \in \mathcal{F}$ and if for $H \leq X \leq G$ we have $HX^{\mathcal{F}} = X$.

Let $Syl_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ denote the set of Sylow- \mathcal{F} -subgroups of G .

Lemma 1.4 ([4, p. 701, Th. 7.11]). *Let G be a group and \mathcal{F} a formation. Suppose $H \in Syl_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$. If \mathcal{F} contains all groups of prime orders, then $N_G(H) = H$.*

We are interested in formations which satisfy the following:

Condition (*). Let p be a prime number, \mathcal{F} a non-empty formation of p -soluble groups such that for any group G :

- (a) If $G/\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{F}$, then $G \in \mathcal{F}$ (\mathcal{F} is a so-called *saturated* formation).
- (b) If $G/O_p(G) \in \mathcal{F}$, then $G \in \mathcal{F}$.

Examples of formations which satisfy the condition (*) are: The class of p -nilpotent groups and the class of all p -soluble groups whose p -length does not exceed a given upper limit. It is clear that the essential contents of Huppert's theorem, cited in the introduction, can be stated as:

Lemma 1.5. *For any prime number p , the class of p -supersoluble groups is a formation satisfying (*) and which contains all metacyclic groups.*

It is not hard to show (see [4, p. 700, Th. 7.10]):

Lemma 1.6. *Let G be a p -soluble group, \mathcal{F} a formation which satisfies the condition (*). Then*

- (a) G has a Sylow- \mathcal{F} -subgroup.
- (b) Any two Sylow- \mathcal{F} -subgroups of G are conjugate.

Lemma 1.7 (The Frattini Argument). *Let G be a group, \mathcal{F} a formation which satisfies the condition (*) and let U be a normal p -soluble subgroup of G . If $H \in Syl_{\mathcal{F}}(U)$, then $G = N_G(H)U$.*

Proof. If $g \in G$, then $H, H^g \in Syl_{\mathcal{F}}(U)$. By Lemma 1.6 there is a $u \in U$ such that $H^u = H^g$. Now, $g = (gu^{-1})u$ with $gu^{-1} \in N_G(H)$.

With these preparations we are now able to prove:

Proposition 1.8. *Let p be a prime number, G a group, U a p -soluble normal subgroup of G and let $\Gamma_p(G)$ be the p -Huppert-subgroup of G . Let \mathcal{F} be a formation which satisfies the condition (*) and which contains all metacyclic groups. Then the following holds:*

If $U\Gamma_p(G)/\Gamma_p(G) \in \mathcal{F}$, then $U \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Suppose that the proposition fails, and let G be a minimal counterexample to the statement. We will prove a series of consequences of this assumption.

We put $D = \Gamma_p(G) \cap U$.

(i) *We have $D > 1$:*

If $D = 1$, then $U \cong U\Gamma_p(G)/\Gamma_p(G) \in \mathcal{F}$ by hypothesis, which contradicts the choice of G . Let N be a minimal normal subgroup of G , such that $N \leq D$.

(ii) *$U/N \in \mathcal{F}$ and N is a p -group:*

Since

$$\frac{(U/N)\Gamma_p(G/N)}{\Gamma_p(G/N)} = \frac{(U/N)(\Gamma_p(G)/N)}{\Gamma_p(G)/N} \cong U\Gamma_p(G)/\Gamma_p(G) \in \mathcal{F},$$

by the minimality of $|G|$, we have $U/N \in \mathcal{F}$. By the p -solubility of U , certainly N is a p -group or a p' -group. If N is a p' -group, then $U/\mathbf{O}_{p'}(U) \in \mathcal{F}$ and by the condition (*) $U \in \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction.

(iii) *Let $H \in \text{Syl}_{p'}(U)$. Then H is not normal in G and $|N| = p$:*

Certainly \mathcal{F} contains all groups of prime orders. So $\mathbf{N}_U(H) = H$ by Lemma 1.4. If $H \trianglelefteq G$, then $U = G \cap U = \mathbf{N}_G(H) \cap U = \mathbf{N}_U(H) = H \in \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction. Since $U/N \in \mathcal{F}$, clearly $HN = U$ and by the Frattini argument $G = \mathbf{N}_G(H)U = \mathbf{N}_G(H)N$. Since $\mathbf{N}_G(H) \neq G$, we may choose V a maximal subgroup of G such that $\mathbf{N}_G(H) \leq V$. Since $N \not\leq V$, the index $|G:V| = |N:N \cap V|$ is a p -power. Since $\Gamma_p(G) \not\leq V$, we have $|N| = |G:V| = p$.

(iv) *The contradiction*

Since N is a normal p -soluble subgroup of G and $NV = G$, we have that G/V_G is metacyclic by Corollary 1.3. Also $U/U \cap V_G \cong UV_G/V_G$ is metacyclic and therefore an \mathcal{F} -group. So $N = U^{\mathcal{F}} \leq V_G \cap U \leq V_G \leq V$, contradicting the choice of V . □

Our Proposition 1.8 contains:

Theorem 1.9. *For any prime number p and any group G we have that $\mathbf{A}_p(\Gamma_p(G)) = \Gamma_p(G) \cap \mathbf{A}_p(G)$ is p -supersoluble.*

Proof. In our proposition we choose $U = \mathbf{A}_p(\Gamma_p(G))$. By Lemma 1.5 we take for \mathcal{F} the formation of the p -supersoluble groups. Since the unit group $\Gamma_p(G)/\Gamma_p(G)$ surely is p -supersoluble, the p -supersolubility of $\mathbf{A}_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ follows. □

Remark. The p -supersolubility of $A_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ can also be deduced from [2]: $A_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ is obtained as $\Phi_f(G)$ in [2], choosing there the formation function f to be:

$$f(q) = \begin{cases} \text{the class of the abelian groups whose exponent divides } p-1 & \text{if } q = p \\ \text{the class of all finite groups} & \text{if } q \neq p. \end{cases}$$

Since this f defines locally the formation of all p -supersoluble groups, the result of [2] shows the p -supersolubility of $A_p(\Gamma_p(G))$.

Corollary 1.10. *Let G be a group and p a prime number. Suppose that for all maximal subgroups V of G we have*

$$p = |G:V| \quad \text{or} \quad p | |G:V|.$$

Then $A_p(G)$ is p -supersoluble.

Proof. By hypothesis, $\Gamma_p(G) = G$. □

Corollary 1.11 (see [1] and [2]). *For every group G , the Huppert subgroup $\Gamma(G)$ is supersoluble.*

Proof. By definition $\Gamma(G) = \bigcap_p \Gamma_p(G)$. Let $M = \bigcap_p A_p(\Gamma_p(G))$. By Theorem 1.9, M is supersoluble and $M \leq \Gamma(G)$. If we know that $\Gamma(G)$ is soluble, then $\Gamma(G) \leq \bigcap_p A_p(G)$ and $\Gamma(G) = M$.

So we have to prove that $\Gamma(G)$ is soluble. We proceed by induction on $|G|$: Clearly we may assume $\Gamma(G) \neq 1$. Let p be the largest prime divisor of $|G|$ and consider a Sylow- p -subgroup P of $\Gamma(G)$. The (ordinary) Frattini argument yields that $G = N_G(P)\Gamma(G)$. If P is not normal in G , choose a maximal subgroup V of G , such that $N_G(P) \leq V$. Since $\Gamma(G) \not\leq V$, $|G:V| = q$ for some prime number q .

We put $U = \Gamma(G) \cap V$ and obtain

$$q = |G:V| = |\Gamma(G)V:V| = |\Gamma(G):U|.$$

Applying Sylow's Theorem for P in $\Gamma(G)$ and in U , we obtain

$$1 \equiv |\Gamma(G):N_{\Gamma(G)}(P)| = |\Gamma(G):U| |U:N_U(P)| \equiv q \cdot 1 \pmod{p},$$

whence $q \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Since q divides $|\Gamma(G)|$, q is not bigger than p , a contradiction. So $P \trianglelefteq G$. By induction, $\Gamma(G)/P = \Gamma(G/P)$ is soluble. Therefore also $\Gamma(G)$ is soluble. □

2. The p -quasi-superfluous elements

The purpose of this second section is to describe the elements of $F(\Gamma(G))$ and (for odd p) those of $F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ by means of permutability properties.

Definition. Let G be a group and $x \in G$.

(a) If p is a prime number, we call x a p -quasi-superfluous element of G , if $\langle x \rangle V = V \langle x \rangle$ holds for the maximal subgroup V of G , whenever $p \mid |G:V|$.

(b) We call x a quasi-superfluous element of G , if x is p -quasi-superfluous for every p .

Let $Qs_p(G)$ denote the set of p -quasi-superfluous elements, $Qs(G) = \bigcap_p Qs_p(G)$ the set of the quasi-superfluous elements of G .

Certainly, $Qs_p(G)$ and $Qs(G)$ are characteristic subsets of G . $Qs(G)$ is exactly the set of elements x of G such that $\langle x \rangle$ is M -embedded (M -eingebettet) in G in the sense of [6].

Let $\Delta(G)$ denote the intersection of the non-normal maximal subgroups of G (see [3]). Clearly all elements of $\Delta(G)$, in particular the elements of the Frattini subgroup, as well as the elements of the hypercentre of G , are quasi-superfluous.

In the simple group $G = PSL(2, 7)$ we have $Qs_3(G) = G$ whereas $Qs_7(G) = \{x \in G \mid x^7 = 1\}$ is not a subgroup of G .

In the symmetric group S_4 of degree four we get $Qs_3(S_4) = A_4$, the alternating group, whereas $Qs_2(S_4)$ is not a subgroup of S_4 , because the four cycle $(iklm) \in Qs_2(S_4)$, but $(il)(km) = (iklm)^2 \notin Qs_2(S_4)$.

Our aim is to prove:

Theorem 2.1. Let G be a group and p a prime number.

(a) $F_p(\Gamma_p(G)) \subseteq Qs_p(G) \cap A_p(G)$.

(b) If p is odd or if G has no factor group isomorphic to S_4 , then $Qs_p(G) \cap A_p(G) = F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$. In particular, $Qs_p(G) \cap A_p(G)$ is a p -nilpotent characteristic subgroup of G .

(c) $Qs(G) = F(\Gamma(G))$. In particular, $Qs(G)$ is always a nilpotent characteristic subgroup of G .

Remark. Since $Qs_2(S_4)$ is not a subgroup of S_4 , the hypothesis in (b) can not be omitted.

We mention the following interesting and immediate consequence, which is not at all evident from the definition of the sets $Qs(G)$ and $Qs_p(G)$.

Corollary 2.2. (a) Let $x, y \in G$ be elements such that $\langle x \rangle$ and $\langle y \rangle$ are permutable with every maximal subgroup of G . Then for all $z \in \langle x, y \rangle$, the group $\langle z \rangle$ is also permutable with every maximal subgroup of G .

(b) Let $p > 2$ be a prime number and G a p -soluble group. If $x, y \in G$ are elements such that $\langle x \rangle$ and $\langle y \rangle$ are permutable with every maximal subgroup of G of index divisible by p , then, for all $z \in \langle x, y \rangle$, also $\langle z \rangle$ is permutable with the same maximal subgroups.

As a consequence of 2.1 and 1.1 we have:

Corollary 2.3. (a) *Let G be a p-soluble group. Suppose p > 2 or G has no factor group isomorphic to S₄. Then G is p-supersoluble if and only if F_p(G) = Qs_p(G).*

(b) *The soluble group G is supersoluble if and only if F(G) = Qs(G).*

Proof. (a) Since A_p(G) = G, we conclude Qs_p(G) = F_p(Γ_p(G)) by 2.1(b). Now F_p(G) = F_p(Γ_p(G)) if and only if F_p(G) ≤ Γ_p(G). We apply 1.1(a).

(b) The proof is similar to (a).

We prepare the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.4. *Let p be a prime number, G a group and V a maximal subgroup of G. Suppose there exists a normal p-soluble subgroup N of G and a p-element x ∈ G, such that G = VN = V⟨x⟩. Then |G: V| = p or p = 2 and |G: V| = 4.*

Proof. This is a generalization of a classical result due to Ritt [8]. See [7, Th. 2.5].

Lemma 2.5. *Let G be a group, V a maximal subgroup of G and let X be a subgroup of G such that X ≤ V. If V^gX = XV^g for every g ∈ G, then X^G ≤ ∩_{g ∈ G} V^g.*

Proof. See [6, Th. 2.6].

Let G be a group and π a set of prime numbers. We recall that G is said to satisfy the Sylow-π-theorem, if there exists a Hall-π-subgroup H of G and if every π-subgroup of G is conjugate to a subgroup of H (see [4, p. 284]).

Lemma 2.6. *Let G be a group and π a set of prime numbers, π' its complementary set in the set of all prime numbers. If x ∈ ∩_{q ∈ π} Qs_q(G) and if the normal closure Y = (O_{π'}(⟨x⟩))^G is a group which satisfies the Sylow-π'-theorem, then O_{π'}(⟨x⟩) ≤ O_{π'}(G).*

Proof. Let H be a Hall-π'-subgroup of Y, such that O_{π'}(⟨x⟩) ≤ H. By the Frattini argument G = N_G(H)Y. If H ≅ G, then O_{π'}(⟨x⟩) ≤ H ≤ O_{π'}(G). Suppose N_G(H) ≠ G and let V be a maximal subgroup of G such that N_G(H) ≤ V. Then Y ≰ V. Clearly the index |G: V| is divisible (only) by primes in π. Therefore ⟨x⟩ is permutable with all conjugates of V. If ⟨x⟩ ≤ V, then Y ≤ ⟨x⟩^G ≤ ∩_{g ∈ G} V^g ≤ V by Lemma 2.5, a contradiction. If ⟨x⟩ ≰ V, we get that G = ⟨x⟩V = V⟨x⟩, whence Y = (O_{π'}(⟨x⟩))^G = (O_{π'}(⟨x⟩))^{⟨x⟩^V} = (O_{π'}(⟨x⟩))^V ≤ H^V ≤ V, the same contradiction. □

Corollary 2.7. *Let G be a group.*

(a) *We have Qs(G) ⊆ F(G).*

(b) *If x ∈ Qs_p(G) ∩ A_p(G) for some prime number p, then O_{p'}(⟨x⟩) ≤ O_{p'}(G).*

Proof. (a) Let p be a prime number and π the set of all primes ≠ p. If x ∈ Qs(G), then also x ∈ ∩_{q ∈ π} Qs_q(G). Since π' = {p}, the group Y = (O_p(⟨x⟩))^G certainly satisfies the

Sylow- π' -theorem. Therefore $O_p(\langle x \rangle) \leq O_p(G) \leq F(G)$. Since this holds for all p , we conclude $x \in \langle x \rangle \leq F(G)$.

(b) Let $x \in Qs_p(G) \cap A_p(G)$. The group $Y = (O_p(\langle x \rangle))^G \leq A_p(G)$ certainly satisfies the Sylow- p' -theorem. Therefore $O_p(\langle x \rangle) \leq O_p(G)$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. (a) Let $x \in F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ be an arbitrary element. Certainly $x \in A_p(G)$. To show that $x \in Qs_p(G)$, let V be a maximal subgroup of G , such that $p \mid |G:V|$. We prove $\langle x \rangle V = V \langle x \rangle$ by induction on $|G|$. Clearly we may assume $|G| > 1$ and $x \notin V$.

Case I: $O_p(G) > 1$.

Let $L = O_p(G)$. We have $L \leq \Gamma_p(G)$ and $L \leq F_p(G)$. Since $F_p(G/L) = F_p(G)/L$ and $\Gamma_p(G/L) = \Gamma_p(G)/L$ we see that $xL \in F_p(\Gamma_p(G))/L = F_p(\Gamma_p(G/L))$. Since $L \leq V$, we conclude by the inductive hypothesis $\langle xL \rangle (V/L) = (V/L) \langle xL \rangle$ and therefore $\langle x \rangle V = V \langle x \rangle$.

Case II: $O_p(G) = 1$.

We have that $R = F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ is now a p -group, $RV = G$ and since $\Gamma_p(G) \not\leq V$ we get that $|R:V \cap R| = |G:V| = p$ by definition of $\Gamma_p(G)$. So $V \cap R \cong R$. We conclude $R = \langle x \rangle (V \cap R) = (V \cap R) \langle x \rangle$, whence $V \langle x \rangle = V(V \cap R) \langle x \rangle = VR = G = \langle x \rangle V$.

(b) By (a) we only have to show that $Qs_p(G) \cap A_p(G) \leq F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$. Suppose that this is false, and let G be a minimal counterexample. Let x be an element of $Qs_p(G) \cap A_p(G)$ such that $x \notin F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$.

We will prove a series of items under this assumption, which will lead to a contradiction. Certainly the hypothesis in (b) is inherited by factor groups.

(i) $O_p(G) = 1$:

Suppose $L = O_p(G) > 1$. Then $xL \in Qs_p(G/L) \cap A_p(G/L)$. Since $|G|$ is minimal, we get that $xL \in F_p(\Gamma_p(G/L)) = F_p(\Gamma_p(G))/L$. So $x \in F_p(\Gamma_p(G))$, a contradiction.

(ii) x is a p -element:

$O_p(\langle x \rangle) \leq O_p(G) = 1$ by Corollary 2.7.

(iii) $x \notin \Gamma_p(G)$:

If $x \in \Gamma_p(G)$, then $x \in A_p(\Gamma_p(G))$. Since $A_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ is p -supersoluble by Theorem 1.9 and $O_p(G) = 1$, we have that $A_p(\Gamma_p(G))$ has a normal Sylow- p -subgroup (see [4, p. 691, Th. 6.6]). We conclude that $x \in F_p(\Gamma_p(G)) \in Syl_p(A_p(\Gamma_p(G)))$, contradicting the choice of x .

(iv) *The contradiction*

Let $N = \langle x \rangle^G$. Since $x \notin \Gamma_p(G)$, there exists a maximal subgroup V of G such that $p \mid |G:V| \neq p$ and $N \not\leq V$. Then $G = \langle x \rangle V = NV$ and by Lemma 2.4 we have that $|G:V| = 4$. So $G/V_G \cong S_4$, a contradiction. □

(c) By (a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}(\Gamma(G)) &= \mathbf{F}(G) \cap \Gamma(G) = \bigcap_p \mathbf{F}_p(G) \cap \bigcap_p \Gamma_p(G) \\ &= \bigcap_p \mathbf{F}_p(\Gamma_p(G)) \subseteq \bigcap_p \mathbf{Qs}_p(G) \cap \bigcap_p \mathbf{A}_p(G) \subseteq \mathbf{Qs}(G). \end{aligned}$$

Let $x \in \mathbf{Qs}(G)$ be an arbitrary element. By Corollary 2.7(a) we have $x \in \mathbf{F}(G)$. If V is a maximal subgroup of G such that $x \notin V$, then $\mathbf{F}(G) \not\leq V$ and $G = V\mathbf{F}(G)$. Moreover $D = \mathbf{F}(G) \cap V \cong G$ because of the maximality of V and the nilpotency of $\mathbf{F}(G)$. So $\mathbf{F}(G)/D$ is a chief factor of G of prime exponent. Also $\langle x \rangle V = V \langle x \rangle = G$, whence $\mathbf{F}(G) = G \cap \mathbf{F}(G) = V \langle x \rangle \cap \mathbf{F}(G) = (V \cap \mathbf{F}(G)) \langle x \rangle = D \langle x \rangle$. So $\mathbf{F}(G)/D \cong \langle x \rangle / D \cap \langle x \rangle$ is also cyclic. We conclude that $|\mathbf{F}(G)/D| = |G:V|$ is a prime number. Therefore $x \in \Gamma(G)$ by the definition of $\Gamma(G)$ and finally $x \in \Gamma(G) \cap \mathbf{F}(G) = \mathbf{F}(\Gamma(G))$. \square

REFERENCES

1. H. C. BHATIA, *A Generalized Frattini Subgroup of a Finite Group* (Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, 1972).
2. Y.-Q. FENG and B.-L. ZHANG, Frattini subgroup relative to formation functions, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **64** (1990), 145–148.
3. W. GASCHÜTZ, Über die Φ -Untergruppe endlicher Gruppen, *Math. Z.* **58** (1953), 160–170.
4. B. HUPPERT, *Endliche Gruppen I* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1967).
5. B. HUPPERT, Normalteiler und maximale Untergruppen endlicher Gruppen, *Math. Z.* **60** (1954), 409–434.
6. R. MAIER, Zur Vertauschbarkeit und Subnormalität von Untergruppen, *Arch. Math.* **53** (1989), 110–120.
7. R. MAIER, Faktorierte p -auflösbare Gruppen, *Arch. Math.* **27** (1976), 576–583.
8. I. F. RITT, On algebraic functions which can be expressed in terms of radicals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **24** (1923), 21–30.

UNIVERSIDADE DE BRASÍLIA
 DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA-IE
 70.910 BRASÍLIA-D.F.
 BRAZIL

E-Mail: MAIERR @ BRUNB