



www.theoryofgroups.ir

International Journal of Group Theory
ISSN (print): 2251-7650, ISSN (on-line): 2251-7669
Vol. 2 No. 4 (2013), pp. 7-16.
© 2013 University of Isfahan



www.ui.ac.ir

PARTIALLY S -EMBEDDED MINIMAL SUBGROUPS OF FINITE GROUPS

T. ZHAO* AND Q. ZHANG

Communicated by Bernhard Amberg

ABSTRACT. Suppose that H is a subgroup of G , then H is said to be s -permutable in G , if H permutes with every Sylow subgroup of G . If $HP = PH$ hold for every Sylow subgroup P of G with $(|P|, |H|) = 1$, then H is called an s -semipermutable subgroup of G . In this paper, we say that H is partially S -embedded in G if G has a normal subgroup T such that HT is s -permutable in G and $H \cap T \leq H_{\bar{s}G}$, where $H_{\bar{s}G}$ is generated by all s -semipermutable subgroups of G contained in H . We investigate the influence of some partially S -embedded minimal subgroups on the nilpotency and supersolubility of a finite group G . A series of known results in the literature are unified and generalized.

1. Introduction

All groups considered in this paper are finite and G stands for a group. We use conventional notions and notation, as in Robinson [15]. Let \mathcal{F} be a formation, $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ and $Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ denote the \mathcal{F} -residual and \mathcal{F} -hypercenter of G , respectively.

From minimal subgroup's generalized normalities to characterize the structure of a finite group is an active topic in the group theory. For example, Buckley and Itô have got some well-known results about the supersolubility and nilpotency of a finite group, respectively. Since then, a series of papers have dealt with generalizations of the results of Itô and Buckley by using the theory of formations and some generalized normal subgroups (see, for example, [1], [2], [4], [9], [14]). Following Kegel in [13], a subgroup H of G is said to be s -permutable in G , if H permutes with every Sylow subgroup of G . After that, Wang in [17] introduced that: a subgroup H is said to be c -normal in G , if G has a normal subgroup T such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T \leq H_G$, where H_G is the normal core of H in G . These

MSC(2010): Primary: 20D10; Secondary: 20D20.

Keywords: s -permutable subgroup, partially S -embedded subgroup, nilpotent group, formation.

Received: 13 February 2013, Accepted: 21 March 2013.

*Corresponding author.

concepts have been investigated extensively by many scholars, a lot of meaningful results have been obtained. Recently, Guo et al [8] integrated the above two concepts and introduced that: a subgroup H is said to be S -embedded in G , if there exists a normal subgroup N such that HN is s -permutable in G and $H \cap N \leq H_{sG}$, where H_{sG} is the largest s -permutable subgroup of G contained in H . By assuming that some subgroups of G satisfy the S -embedded property, many meaningful results have been derived (see [8], [10] etc.), a series of known results in the literature were generalized. As another generation of the s -permutable subgroup, following Chen in [3], a subgroup H of a group G is said to be s -semipermutable (or s -seminormal) in G if $PH = HP$ for all Sylow p -subgroups P of G with $(p, |H|) = 1$. Based on the above concepts, in this paper we introduce that:

Definition 1.1. *A subgroup H of a group G is said to be partially S -embedded in G , if G has a normal subgroup T such that HT is an s -permutable subgroup of G and $H \cap T \leq H_{\bar{s}G}$, where $H_{\bar{s}G}$ is generated by all those subgroups of H which are s -semipermutable in G .*

It is easy to see that $H_{\bar{s}G}$ is the largest s -semipermutable subgroup of G contained in H . Besides that, every subgroup of G , whether it is s -permutable, c -normal, s -semipermutable or S -embedded in G is partially S -embedded in G . In general, a partially S -embedded subgroup of G need not be S -embedded or s -semipermutable in G . For instance, let $G = S_5$ be the symmetric group of degree 5.

Example 1. Since $H = S_4$ permutes with every Sylow 5-subgroup of G , H is s -semipermutable and thus partially S -embedded in G . But neither H nor $H \cap A_5 = A_4$ is s -permutable in G , as they are not subnormal subgroups of G . Since the only normal subgroups of G are A_5 and G itself, $H = S_4$ is not S -embedded in G .

Example 2. Let $K = \langle(12)\rangle$ and $T = A_5$. Since $T \trianglelefteq G$ and $K \cap T = 1 \leq K_{\bar{s}G}$, K is partially S -embedded in G . But the fact $K\langle(12345)\rangle \neq \langle(12345)\rangle K$ implies that K is not s -semipermutable in G .

In this paper, we investigate the influence of some partially S -embedded minimal subgroups on the structure of a finite group, our results generalized some known ones.

2. Preliminaries

We list here some basic results which are useful in the sequel.

Lemma 2.1. ([13]) *Suppose that H is an s -permutable subgroup of G , $H \leq G$ and $N \trianglelefteq G$.*

- (1) *If $K \leq G$, then $H \cap K$ is s -permutable in K .*
- (2) *HN and $H \cap N$ are s -permutable in G , HN/N is s -permutable in G/N .*
- (3) *H is subnormal in G .*
- (4) *If H is a p -group for some prime p , then $N_G(H) \geq O^p(G)$.*

Lemma 2.2. ([18]) *Let G be a group and $H \leq K \leq G$.*

- (1) *If H is s -semipermutable in G , then H is s -semipermutable in K .*
- (2) *Suppose that N is normal in G , and H is a p -group. If H is s -semipermutable in G , then HN/N is s -semipermutable in G/N .*

Lemma 2.3. ([18, Lemma 3]) *Let H be a subnormal p -subgroup of G . If H is s -semipermutable in G , then H is s -permutable in G .*

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that $H \leq K \leq G$, N is a normal subgroup of G .*

- (1) *If H is partially S -embedded in G , then H is partially S -embedded in K .*
- (2) *Suppose that H is a partially S -embedded p -subgroup of G . If $N \leq H$ or $(p, |N|) = 1$, then HN/N is partially S -embedded in G/N .*
- (3) *If $H \leq K \trianglelefteq G$ and H is partially S -embedded in G , then G has a normal subgroup N contained in K such that HN is s -permutable in G and $H \cap N \leq H_{\bar{s}G}$.*

Proof. Suppose that for some $T \trianglelefteq G$, HT is s -permutable in G and $H \cap T \leq H_{\bar{s}G}$.

(1) Clearly, $K \cap T$ is a normal subgroup of K . By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we know that $H(K \cap T) = K \cap HT$ is s -permutable in K and $H \cap (K \cap T) = H \cap T \leq H_{\bar{s}G} \leq H_{\bar{s}K}$. Hence, H is partially S -embedded in K .

(2) It is easy to see that $TN/N \trianglelefteq G/N$ and $(HN/N)(TN/N) = HTN/N$ is s -permutable in G/N . If $N \leq H$, then $H/N \cap TN/N = (H \cap T)N/N \leq H_{\bar{s}G}N/N$. If N is a p' -group, then

$$|H \cap TN| = \frac{|H| \cdot |TN|_p}{|HTN|_p} = \frac{|H| \cdot |T|_p}{|HT|_p} = |H \cap T|.$$

This implies that $H \cap TN = H \cap T$, we also deduce that $(HN/N) \cap (TN/N) = (HN \cap TN)/N = (H \cap TN)N/N = (H \cap T)N/N \leq H_{\bar{s}G}N/N$. By Lemma 2.2, we know $H_{\bar{s}G}N/N$ is s -semipermutable in G/N . Hence, HN/N is partially S -embedded in G/N .

(3) Let $N = K \cap T$, then $HN = H(K \cap T) = K \cap HT$ is s -permutable in G and $H \cap N = H \cap K \cap T = H \cap T \leq H_{\bar{s}G}$. □

$T \leq G$ is said to be a supplement of H in G , if $HT = G$. If some supplement K of H belongs to a formation \mathcal{F} , then we say that K is an \mathcal{F} -supplement of H in G . We can easily deduce that:

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that K is an \mathcal{F} -supplement of H in G .*

- (1) *If $N \trianglelefteq G$, then HN/N is an \mathcal{F} -supplement of KN/N in G/N .*
- (2) *If $H \leq M \leq G$ and \mathcal{F} is a subgroup-closed formation, then $K \cap M$ is an \mathcal{F} -supplement of H in M .*

Lemma 2.6. ([9, Lemma 2.5]) *Let G be a group and p a prime such that $p^{n+1} \nmid |G|$ for some integer $n \geq 1$. If $(|G|, (p-1)(p^2-1) \cdots (p^n-1)) = 1$, then G is p -nilpotent.*

Lemma 2.7. ([14, Lemma 2.8]) *Suppose G is a group and P is a normal p -subgroup of G contained in $Z_\infty(G)$, then $C_G(P) \geq O^p(G)$.*

Lemma 2.8. *Let \mathcal{F} be a saturated formation containing the class of all nilpotent groups \mathcal{N} , H a normal subgroup of G . If $G/H \in \mathcal{F}$ and $H \leq Z(G)$, then $G \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let f and F be the canonical definitions of \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{F} , respectively. Pick an chief factor M/N of G contained in H , then M/N is a p -group for some prime p . Since $M \leq H \leq Z(G)$, $M/N \leq Z(G/N)$.

Thus $G/C_G(M/N) = 1 \in f(p)$. Since $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, $f(p) \subseteq F(p)$ by [6, IV, Proposition 3.11]. It follows that $G/C_G(M/N) \in F(p)$. The arbitrary choice of M/N implies that there exists a normal chain of G contained in H such that every G -chief factor is F -central. Since $G/H \in \mathcal{F}$, it follows that $G \in \mathcal{F}$. \square

Lemma 2.9. ([12, X. 13]) *Let $F^*(G)$ be the generalized Fitting subgroup of G .*

- (1) *If M is a normal subgroup of G , then $F^*(M) \leq F^*(G)$.*
- (2) *$F^*(G) \neq 1$, if $G \neq 1$; in fact, $F^*(G)/F(G) = \text{Soc}(F(G)C_G(F(G)))/F(G)$.*
- (3) *$F^*(F^*(G)) = F^*(G) \geq F(G)$; if $F^*(G)$ is soluble, then $F^*(G) = F(G)$.*
- (4) *If $K \leq Z(G)$, then $F^*(G/K) = F^*(G)/K$.*

3. Main results

Theorem 3.1. *Let p be a prime and G a group with $(|G|, (p-1)(p^2-1)\cdots(p^n-1)) = 1$ for some integer $n \geq 1$. Then G is p -nilpotent if and only if every subgroup H of $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ with order p^n or cyclic of order 4 (if P is a non-abelian 2-group, $n = 1$ and $|P| > 4$) not having a p -nilpotent supplement in G is partially S -embedded in G .*

Proof. The necessity is obvious, we need to prove only the sufficiency. Suppose that the result is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Then we have:

- (1) $p^{n+1} \mid |G|$ and every proper subgroup of G is p -nilpotent.

The fact that $p^{n+1} \mid |G|$ follows from Lemma 2.6. Let L be a proper subgroup of G , then $(|L|, (p-1)(p^2-1)\cdots(p^n-1)) = 1$. If $p^{n+1} \nmid |L|$, then Lemma 2.6 implies that L is p -nilpotent. Now we assume that $p^{n+1} \mid |L|$ and let H be a subgroup of L with order p^n . By hypothesis, H either has a p -nilpotent supplement T in G or is partially S -embedded in G . In the former case, $L = L \cap HT = H(L \cap T)$ and $L \cap T$ is a p -nilpotent supplement of H in L . In the latter case, H is partially S -embedded in L by Lemma 2.4. Thus L satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. The minimal choice of G implies that L is p -nilpotent. Then by [11, IV, Theorem 5.4] we have: $G = PQ$, where P is a normal Sylow p -subgroup and Q a non-normal cyclic Sylow q -subgroup of G for some prime $q \neq p$; $P/\Phi(P)$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G/\Phi(P)$; $\exp(P) = p$ if $p > 2$, while $\exp(P)$ is at most 4 if $p = 2$.

- (2) Every subgroup of P with order p^n or cyclic of order 4 (if P is a non-abelian 2-group, $n = 1$ and $|P| > 4$) not contained in $\Phi(P)$ is s -permutable in G .

Let H be a subgroup of P with order p^n or cyclic of order 4 (if P is a non-abelian 2-group, $n = 1$ and $|P| > 4$) and T a supplement of H in G . Then $HT = G$ and $P = P \cap HT = H(P \cap T)$. Since $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G , $P/\Phi(P)$ is an elementary abelian p -group and hence $(P \cap T)\Phi(P)/\Phi(P)$ is normal in $G/\Phi(P)$. It follows that $P \cap T \leq \Phi(P)$ or $P \cap T = P$. If $P \cap T \leq \Phi(P)$, then $H = P$ is of order p^n , which contradicts with (1). If $P \cap T = P$, then $T = G$ is not p -nilpotent. Thus, every subgroup of P with order p^n is partially S -embedded in G .

Suppose that $H \not\leq \Phi(P)$ is a subgroup of P with order p^n . Then by Lemma 2.4(3), there exists a normal subgroup T of G contained in P such that HT is s -permutable in G and $H \cap T \leq H_{\bar{s}G}$. If $T < P$, then $T \leq \Phi(P)$ as $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G . Thus $H\Phi(P)/\Phi(P) = HT\Phi(P)/\Phi(P)$ is

s -permutable in $G/\Phi(P)$. By Lemma 2.1(4), we know $N_{G/\Phi(P)}(H\Phi(P)/\Phi(P)) \geq O^p(G/\Phi(P))$. Since $H\Phi(P)/\Phi(P) \trianglelefteq P/\Phi(P)$, $H\Phi(P)$ is normal in G . Therefore, we conclude that $H\Phi(P) = P$. This contradicts with (1). Thus we have $T = P$ and then $H = H_{\bar{s}G}$ is an s -semipermutable subgroup of G . Since $H \leq P \trianglelefteq G$, Lemma 2.3 implies that H is s -permutable in G .

(3) The final contradiction.

For any element $x \in P \setminus \Phi(P)$, we have $|x| = p$ or 4 by (1). If $n > 1$, then there exists a subgroup H of P with order p^n such that $x \in H \not\subseteq \Phi(P)$. Since H is s -permutable in G , HQ is a proper subgroup of G . Hence HQ is p -nilpotent by (1), which implies that $\langle x \rangle \leq H \leq N_G(Q)$. If $n = 1$, then by hypothesis and (2), $\langle x \rangle$ is s -permutable in G . Since P is not cyclic, $\langle x \rangle Q$ is a proper subgroup of G . Thus $\langle x \rangle Q$ is p -nilpotent and so $\langle x \rangle \leq N_G(Q)$. Therefore, in any case, we can both conclude that Q is normalized by P and so $Q \trianglelefteq G$. This final contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. \square

In Theorem 3.1, when we take $n = 1$ we have:

Corollary 3.2. *Let P be a Sylow p -subgroup of G , where p is a prime divisor of $|G|$ with $(|G|, p-1) = 1$. Then G is p -nilpotent if and only if every minimal subgroup and cyclic subgroup with order 4 (if $p = 2$ and P is non-abelian) of P not having a p -nilpotent supplement in G is partially S -embedded in G .*

Next, we prove that:

Theorem 3.3. *Let \mathcal{F} be a saturated formation containing the class of all supersolvable groups \mathcal{U} . Then $G \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if there is a normal subgroup E of G such that $G/E \in \mathcal{F}$ and every cyclic subgroup of any noncyclic Sylow subgroup of E with prime order or order 4 (if the Sylow 2-subgroup of E is non-abelian) not having a supersoluble supplement in G is partially S -embedded in G .*

Proof. The necessity is obvious, we need to prove only the sufficiency. Suppose that the result is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Then we have:

(1) The Sylow q -subgroup Q of E is normal in G , where $q = \max \pi(E)$.

Let p be the smallest prime divisor of $|E|$ and $P \in Syl_p(E)$. If P is cyclic, then E is p -nilpotent by [11, IV, Theorem 2.8]. Now we assume that P is not cyclic. Since a supersoluble subgroup of E is p -nilpotent, any subgroup of E has no p -nilpotent supplement in E also has no supersoluble supplement in E . Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 3.2 implies that E is p -nilpotent. Let K be the normal p -complement of E , then K is of odd order and every minimal subgroup of any noncyclic Sylow subgroup of K not having a supersoluble supplement in K is partially S -embedded in K . Then we can also deduce that K is r -nilpotent for its minimal prime divisor r . This implies that E is a Sylow tower group of supersoluble type. Let q be the largest prime divisor and Q a Sylow q -subgroup of E , then $Q \text{ char } E \trianglelefteq G$ which implies that $Q \trianglelefteq G$.

(2) The \mathcal{F} -residual $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ of G is contained in Q and it is not cyclic, $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a chief factor of G and $\exp(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = q$ or 4 .

By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5, we can easily deduce that every cyclic subgroup of any non-cyclic Sylow subgroup of E/Q with prime order or order 4 (if the Sylow 2-subgroup of E/Q is non-abelian) not having a supersoluble supplement in G/Q is partially S -embedded in G/Q . Thus $G/Q \in \mathcal{F}$ by

induction and $G^{\mathcal{F}} \leq Q$ is a q -group. By [16, Lemma 2.16], we know $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ is not cyclic. Since \mathcal{F} is a saturated formation, $G^{\mathcal{F}} \not\leq \Phi(G)$. Let M be a maximal subgroup of G such that $G^{\mathcal{F}} \not\leq M$, then $G = MG^{\mathcal{F}} = MF(G)$. Since $M/M \cap E \cong ME/E = G/E \in \mathcal{F}$, a trivial argument shows that the hypothesis holds for M (respect to $M \cap E$). Thus $M \in \mathcal{F}$ by induction. By [7, Theorem 3.4.2], we know $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a chief factor of G , $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ has exponent q if $q > 2$ and exponent at most 4 if $q = 2$.

(3) Some minimal subgroup $X/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ of $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is not s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$.

If every minimal subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$, then by [16, Lemma 2.11] we know some maximal subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is normal in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. Since $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a chief factor of G , $|G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})| = q$ and so $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ is cyclic, contradicts with (2). Thus, there exists some minimal subgroup $X/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ of $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ which is not s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$.

(4) The final contradiction.

Let $x \in X \setminus \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$, then by (2) we know $\langle x \rangle$ is a cyclic group of prime order or order 4. Let T be any supplement of $\langle x \rangle$ in G , then $G = \langle x \rangle T$ and $G^{\mathcal{F}} = G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap \langle x \rangle T = \langle x \rangle (G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap T)$. Since $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is abelian, $(G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap T)\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \trianglelefteq G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ and hence $(G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap T)\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \trianglelefteq G$. Thus $G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap T \leq \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ or $G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap T = G^{\mathcal{F}}$, as $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a chief factor of G . If $G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap T \leq \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ for some supplement T , then $G^{\mathcal{F}} = \langle x \rangle$ is cyclic, which contradicts with (2). Thus we have $G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap T = G^{\mathcal{F}}$, hence $T = G$ is the unique supplement of $\langle x \rangle$ in G . Since G is not supersoluble, by the hypothesis $\langle x \rangle$ is partially S -embedded in G . Then there exists a normal subgroup K of G contained in $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ such that $\langle x \rangle K$ is s -permutable in G and $\langle x \rangle \cap K \leq \langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$. Since $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a chief factor of G , $K \leq \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ or $K = G^{\mathcal{F}}$. If $K \leq \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$, then $X/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = \langle x \rangle K \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$, this contradicts with (3). If $K = G^{\mathcal{F}}$, then $\langle x \rangle = \langle x \rangle \cap K = \langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$ is an s -semipermutable subgroup of G . Since $\langle x \rangle \leq O_p(G)$ is subnormal in G , by Lemma 2.3 we know $\langle x \rangle$ is s -permutable in G . Thus we can conclude that $X/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = \langle x \rangle \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$, which contradicts with (3). This contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. \square

From Theorem 3.3, when we take $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{U}$, we have the following result:

Corollary 3.4. *A group G is supersoluble if and only if there exists a normal subgroup E of G such that G/E is supersoluble, and every noncyclic Sylow subgroup of E with prime order or order 4 (if the Sylow 2-subgroup of E is non-abelian) not having a supersoluble supplement in G is partially S -embedded in G .*

Next, by assuming that some cyclic subgroups of prime order or order 4 having the partially S -embedded properties, we give out some new criteria about the nilpotency of a group G .

Theorem 3.5. *Let E be a normal subgroup of G such that G/E is nilpotent. If every minimal subgroup of E is contained in $Z_{\infty}(G)$ and every cyclic subgroup of E with order 4 is partially S -embedded in G or lies in $Z_{\infty}(G)$, then G is nilpotent.*

Proof. Suppose that the result is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Then we have:

(1) Every proper subgroup of G is nilpotent.

Let K be an arbitrary proper subgroup of G . Since G/E is nilpotent, $K/K \cap E \cong KE/E$ is nilpotent. Let H be a minimal subgroup of $K \cap E$, then $H \leq Z_\infty(G) \cap K \leq Z_\infty(K)$. By hypotheses, any cyclic subgroup U of $K \cap E$ with order 4 is partially S -embedded in G or lies in $Z_\infty(G)$. By Lemma 2.4, U is partially S -embedded in K or lies in $Z_\infty(G) \cap K \leq Z_\infty(K)$. Thus $(K, K \cap E)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem in any case. The minimal choice of G implies that K is nilpotent, thus G is a group which is not nilpotent but every proper subgroup of G is nilpotent. By [11, III, Theorem 5.2], we can deduce that $G = PQ$, where P is a normal Sylow p -subgroup and Q a non-normal cyclic Sylow q -subgroup of G ; $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G ; $\exp(P) = p$ or 4.

(2) $p = 2$, $\exp(P) = 4$. Moreover, every cyclic subgroup of $P \leq E$ with order 4 is partially S -embedded in G .

Since both G/E and G/P are nilpotent, $G/P \cap E \lesssim G/P \times G/E$ is nilpotent. If $P \not\leq E$, then $P \cap E < P$ and $(P \cap E)Q$ is a proper subgroup of G . By (1), we know $(P \cap E)Q$ is nilpotent. Thus, $(P \cap E)Q = (P \cap E) \times Q$ and $Q \text{ char } (P \cap E)Q$. On the other hand, $G/P \cap E = P/P \cap E \times Q(P \cap E)/P \cap E$, it follows that $Q(P \cap E)/P \cap E \trianglelefteq G/P \cap E$ and $Q(P \cap E) \trianglelefteq G$. Therefore, $Q \trianglelefteq G$ and $G = P \times Q$, a contradiction. Thus we have $P \leq E$. Since $P \trianglelefteq G$, all elements of order p or 4 (if $p = 2$) of G are contained in P and so contained in E . If $p > 2$ or $p = 2$ and every cyclic subgroup of P with order 4 lies in $Z_\infty(G)$, then $P \leq Z_\infty(G)$ by the hypotheses. Therefore, Lemma 2.7 implies that $G = PQ = P \times Q$ is nilpotent, a contradiction. Hence, (2) holds.

(3) Every element $x \in P \setminus \Phi(P)$ is of order 4.

If there exists some $x \in P \setminus \Phi(P)$ such that $o(x) = 2$, denote $M = \langle x \rangle^G \leq P$. Then $M \leq Z_\infty(G)$ and $M\Phi(P)/\Phi(P) \trianglelefteq G/\Phi(P)$. Since $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G and $M \not\leq \Phi(P)$, $P = M\Phi(P) = M \leq Z_\infty(G)$. Therefore, Lemma 2.7 implies that $G = PQ = P \times Q$ is nilpotent, a contradiction. Thus every element of P not contained in $\Phi(P)$ is of order 4. By (2), we know that it is partially S -embedded in G .

(4) Some minimal subgroup $X/\Phi(P)$ of $P/\Phi(P)$ is not s -permutable in $G/\Phi(P)$.

If every minimal subgroup of $P/\Phi(P)$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(P)$, then by [16, Lemma 2.11] we know some maximal subgroup of $P/\Phi(P)$ is normal in $G/\Phi(P)$. Since $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G , $|P/\Phi(P)| = p$. Since $\exp(P) = 4$, P is a cyclic group of order 4. Then [11, IV, Theorem 2.8] implies that G is 2-nilpotent and thus it is nilpotent, a contradiction. Thus some minimal subgroup $X/\Phi(P)$ of $P/\Phi(P)$ is not s -permutable in $G/\Phi(P)$.

(5) The final contradiction.

Let $x \in X \setminus \Phi(P)$, by (2) and (3) we know x is of order 4 and $\langle x \rangle$ is partially S -embedded in G . Thus there exists a normal subgroup K of G contained in P such that $\langle x \rangle K$ is s -permutable in G and $\langle x \rangle \cap K \leq \langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$. Since $\langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G} \leq P$ is subnormal in G , $\langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$ is s -permutable in G . Since $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G , $K \leq \Phi(P)$ or $K = P$. If $K \leq \Phi(P)$, then $X/\Phi(P) = \langle x \rangle K \Phi(P) / \Phi(P)$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(P)$, a contradiction. If $K = P$, then $\langle x \rangle = \langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$ is s -permutable in G and so $X/\Phi(P) = \langle x \rangle \Phi(P) / \Phi(P)$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(P)$, a contradiction too. This final contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. □

Now, we can prove that:

Theorem 3.6. *Let \mathcal{F} be a saturated formation containing the class of all nilpotent groups \mathcal{N} . Suppose that every cyclic subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ of order 4 is partially S -embedded in G . Then $G \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if every minimal subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ lies in the \mathcal{F} -hypercenter $Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ of G .*

Proof. The necessity is obvious, we need to prove only the sufficiency. Let $\langle x \rangle$ be a minimal subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}$, then $\langle x \rangle \leq Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G) \cap G^{\mathcal{F}}$ which is contained in $Z(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ by [6, IV, 6.10]. From Lemma 2.4, we know that every cyclic subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ with order 4 is partially S -embedded in $G^{\mathcal{F}}$. Theorem 3.5 implies that $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ is nilpotent and so it is soluble. If $G^{\mathcal{F}} \leq \Phi(G)$, then $G \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus we may assume that there exists a maximal subgroup M of G such that $G = MG^{\mathcal{F}} = MF(G)$. By [6, IV, 1.17], we know $M^{\mathcal{F}} \leq G^{\mathcal{F}}$. Hence every minimal subgroup of $M^{\mathcal{F}}$ is contained in $Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G) \cap M \leq Z_{\mathcal{F}}(M)$ and every cyclic subgroup of $M^{\mathcal{F}}$ of order 4 is partially S -embedded in M . Therefore, M satisfies the hypotheses of the theorem. Then $M \in \mathcal{F}$ by induction. From [1, Theorem 1 and Proposition 1], we know $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ is a p -group for some prime p ; $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$; $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ has exponent p if $p > 2$ and exponent at most 4 if $p = 2$.

If $\exp(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = p$, then $G^{\mathcal{F}} = \Omega_1(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \leq Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ by the hypotheses, this would imply that $G \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus we may assume that $p = 2$ and $\exp(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = 4$. If there exists some $x \in G^{\mathcal{F}} \setminus \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ such that $o(x) = 2$, let $H = \langle x \rangle^G$. Then $H \trianglelefteq G$ and $H \leq \Omega_1(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \leq Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$. On the other hand, $G^{\mathcal{F}} = H\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = H$ as $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a minimal normal subgroup of $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. In this case, $G \in \mathcal{F}$. Next we assume that every $x \in G^{\mathcal{F}} \setminus \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is of order 4, then $\langle x \rangle$ is partially S -embedded in G . Let $X/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ be an arbitrary minimal subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ and $x \in X \setminus \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. Then there exists a normal subgroup K of G contained in $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ such that $\langle x \rangle K$ is s -permutable in G and $\langle x \rangle \cap K \leq \langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$. Since $\langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G} \leq G^{\mathcal{F}} \leq O_2(G)$ is subnormal in G , $\langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$ is s -permutable in G by Lemma 2.3. Since $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a chief factor of G , $K \leq \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ or $K = G^{\mathcal{F}}$. If $K \leq \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$, then $X/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = \langle x \rangle K \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. If $K = G^{\mathcal{F}}$, then $\langle x \rangle = \langle x \rangle_{\bar{s}G}$ is s -permutable in G and we also deduce that $X/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = \langle x \rangle \Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. This means that every minimal subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is s -permutable in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. Then by [16, Lemma 2.11] we know $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ has a maximal subgroup which is normal in $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. Since $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is a chief factor of G , $|G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})| = 2$. Thus, we know $G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \leq Z(G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}))$. Since $(G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}))/(G^{\mathcal{F}}/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}})) \cong G/G^{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathcal{F}$, Lemma 2.8 implies that $G/\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \in \mathcal{F}$. Since $\Phi(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \leq \Phi(G)$ and \mathcal{F} is a saturated formation, $G \in \mathcal{F}$, as desired. \square

Theorem 3.7. *A group G is nilpotent if and only if every minimal subgroup of $F^*(G^{\mathcal{N}})$ lies in $Z_{\infty}(G)$ and every cyclic subgroup of $F^*(G^{\mathcal{N}})$ with order 4 is partially S -embedded in G .*

Proof. The necessity is obvious, we need to prove only the sufficiency. Suppose that the result is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Then

(1) Every proper normal subgroup of G is nilpotent.

Let M be a proper normal subgroup of G . Since $M/(M \cap G^{\mathcal{N}}) \cong MG^{\mathcal{N}}/G^{\mathcal{N}} \leq G/G^{\mathcal{N}}$ is nilpotent, $M^{\mathcal{N}} \trianglelefteq M \cap G^{\mathcal{N}} \trianglelefteq G^{\mathcal{N}}$. Then by Lemma 2.9, we know $F^*(M^{\mathcal{N}}) \leq F^*(M \cap G^{\mathcal{N}}) \leq F^*(G^{\mathcal{N}})$. Moreover,

$M \cap Z_\infty(G) \leq Z_\infty(M)$. Thus, M satisfies the hypotheses of the theorem. The minimal choice of G implies that M is nilpotent.

(2) $F(G)$ is the unique maximal normal subgroup of G .

Let M be a maximal normal subgroup of G , then M is nilpotent by (1). Since the class of all nilpotent groups formed a Fitting class, the nilpotency of M implies that $M = F(G)$ is the unique maximal normal subgroup of G .

(3) $G^{\mathcal{N}} = G = G'$ and $F^*(G) = F(G) < G$.

If $G^{\mathcal{N}} < G$, then $G^{\mathcal{N}}$ is nilpotent. Thus, by Lemma 2.9 we know $F^*(G^{\mathcal{N}}) = G^{\mathcal{N}}$. Now Theorem 3.5 implies immediately that G is nilpotent, a contradiction. Hence, we have $G^{\mathcal{N}} = G$. Since $G^{\mathcal{N}} \leq G'$, it follows that $G' = G$. Hence $G/F(G)$ cannot be cyclic of prime order. Thus $G/F(G)$ is a non-abelian simple group. If $F(G) < F^*(G)$, then $F^*(G^{\mathcal{N}}) = F^*(G) = G$ by (2). Again by Theorem 3.5, we can deduce that G is nilpotent, which is a contradiction.

(4) The final contradiction.

Since $F(G) = F^*(G) \neq 1$, we may choose the smallest prime divisor p of $|F(G)|$ such that $O_p(G) \neq 1$. For any Sylow q -subgroup Q of G ($q \neq p$), we consider the subgroup $G_0 = O_p(G)Q$. It is clear that $G_0^{\mathcal{N}} \leq O_p(G)$ and $G_0 \cap Z_\infty(G) \leq Z_\infty(G_0)$. Hence, every minimal subgroup of $G_0^{\mathcal{N}}$ lies in $Z_\infty(G_0)$ and every cyclic subgroup of $G_0^{\mathcal{N}}$ with order 4 is partially S -embedded in G_0 . By Theorem 3.5, we know that G_0 is nilpotent. Hence, $G_0 = O_p(G) \times Q$ and $Q \leq C_G(O_p(G))$. Consequently, $G/C_G(O_p(G))$ is a p -group. Thus we have $C_G(O_p(G)) = G$ by (3), namely $O_p(G) \leq Z(G)$. Now we consider the factor group $\bar{G} = G/O_p(G)$. First we have $F^*(\bar{G}) = F^*(G)/O_p(G)$ by Lemma 2.9(4). For any element \bar{x} of odd prime order in $F^*(\bar{G})$, since $O_p(G)$ is the Sylow p -subgroup of $F^*(G)$, \bar{x} can be viewed as the image of an element x of odd prime order in $F^*(G)$. It follows that x lies in $Z_\infty(G)$ and \bar{x} lies in $Z_\infty(\bar{G})$, for $Z_\infty(G/O_p(G)) = Z_\infty(G)/O_p(G)$. This shows that \bar{G} satisfies the hypotheses of the theorem. Thus \bar{G} is nilpotent by the minimal choice of G . Consequently, G is also nilpotent. This final contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.8. *Let \mathcal{F} be a saturated formation containing \mathcal{N} . Then a group $G \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if every minimal subgroup of $F^*(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ lies in $Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and every cyclic subgroup of $F^*(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ with order 4 is partially S -embedded in G .*

Proof. Only the sufficiency needs to be verified. By [6, IV, 6.10], $G^{\mathcal{F}} \cap Z_{\mathcal{F}}(G) \leq Z(G^{\mathcal{F}}) \leq Z_\infty(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. Consequently, every minimal subgroup of $F^*(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ is contained in $Z_\infty(G^{\mathcal{F}})$. By the hypotheses and Lemma 2.4, every cyclic subgroup of $F^*(G^{\mathcal{F}})$ with order 4 is partially S -embedded in $G^{\mathcal{F}}$. By Theorem 3.7, we see that $G^{\mathcal{F}}$ is nilpotent and so $F^*(G^{\mathcal{F}}) = G^{\mathcal{F}}$. Now by Theorem 3.6, we can deduce that $G \in \mathcal{F}$, as required. □

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the referee and editor who read the manuscript carefully and provided a lot of valuable suggestions and useful comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ballester-Bolinches and M. C. Pedraza-Aguilera, On minimal subgroups of finite group, *Acta Math. Hungar.*, **73** (1996) 335–342.
- [2] A. Ballester-Bolinches and Y. M. Wang, Finite groups with some c -normal minimal subgroups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **153** (2000) 121–127.
- [3] Z. M. Chen, On a theorem of Srinivasan, *J. Southwest Normal Univ (Nat Sci)*, **12** no. 1 (1987) 1–4.
- [4] J. B. Derr, W. E. Deskins and N. P. Mukherjee, The influence of minimal p -subgroups on the structure of finite groups, *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, **45** (1985) 1–4.
- [5] W. E. Deskins, On quasinormal subgroups of finite groups, *Math. Z.*, **82** no. 2 (1963) 125–132 .
- [6] K. Doerk and T. Hawkes, *Finite Soluble Groups*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1992.
- [7] W. B. Guo, *The Theory of Classes of Groups*, Science Press-Kluwer Academic Publishers, Beijing, New York, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 2000.
- [8] W. B. Guo, K. P. Shum and A. N. Skiba, On solubility and supersolubility of some classes of finite groups, *Sci. China Ser. A*, **52** no. 2 (2009) 272–286.
- [9] W. B. Guo, K. P. Shum and F. Y. Xie, Finite groups with some weakly s -supplemented subgroups, *Glasg. Math. J.*, **53** (2011) 211–222.
- [10] W. B. Guo, Y. Lu and W. Niu, S -embedded subgroups of finite groups, *Algebra Logic*, **49** no. 4 (2010) 293–304.
- [11] B. Huppert, *Endliche Gruppen. I.*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1967.
- [12] B. Huppert and N. Blackburn, *Finite Groups III*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1982.
- [13] O. H. Kegel, Sylow-Gruppen und Sbnormalteiler endlicher Gruppen, *Math. Z.*, **78** (1962) 205–221.
- [14] Y. M. Li and Y. M. Wang, On π -quasinormally embedded subgroups of finite group, *J. Algebra*, **281** (2004) 109–123.
- [15] D. J. S. Robinson, *A Course in the Theory of Groups*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1993.
- [16] A. N. Skiba, On weakly s -permutable subgroups of finite groups, *J. Algebra*, **315** (2007) 192–209.
- [17] Y. M. Wang, C -normality of groups and its properties, *J. Algebra*, **180** (1996) 954–965.
- [18] Q. H. Zhang and L. F. Wang, The influence of s -semipermutable properties of subgroups on the structure of finite groups, *Acta Math. Sinica Acta Math. Sin.*, **48** no. 1 (2005) 81–88.

Tao Zhao

School of Science, Shandong University of Technology, Zibo, Shandong 255049, P. R. China

E-mail: zht198109@163.com

Qingliang Zhang

School of Sciences, Nantong University, Nantong, Jiangsu 226007, P. R. China

E-mail: qingliangzhang@ntu.edu.cn