



---

Soviet-era science, translated into English

# Reports of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

1962

SovietRxiv

---

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-196201.07738>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

**Abstract**

**Full Text**

## Reports of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

1962. Vol. 147, No. 5

**MATHEMATICS**

**S. A. CHUNIKHIN**

### ON THE DECOMPOSITION OF $\Pi$ -SOLVABLE GROUPS INTO A DIRECT PRODUCT OF SUBGROUPS

*(Presented by Academician I. M. Vinogradov on 23 VI 1962)*

§ 1. In papers <sup>(4-6)</sup> we introduced and, to a certain extent, investigated  $p$ -solvable and the more general  $\Pi$ -solvable groups, which subsequently also found application among other authors (P. Hall, G. Higman, B. Huppert, and others). In the present paper, which adjoins the note <sup>(2)</sup>, a method is established for decomposing  $\Pi$ -solvable groups into a direct product of subgroups constructed with the aid of the concept of  $S$ -connectedness of prime divisors of the order of a group (cf. <sup>(2)</sup>). At the same time Theorem 6 of <sup>(2)</sup> is generalized.

§ 2. We use the following definitions and notation (cf. <sup>(1, 2)</sup>).  $\mathfrak{G}$  is a certain finite group of order  $(\mathfrak{G})$ ;  $\mathfrak{E}$  is the identity group; if  $n$  is a natural number, then  $\Pi(n)$  is the set of all distinct prime divisors of  $n$ ;  $\Pi$  is some empty or nonempty subset of the set  $\Pi((\mathfrak{G}))$ ; a divisor  $d$  of the number  $(\mathfrak{G})$  will be called a  $\Pi$ -divisor of  $(\mathfrak{G})$  if  $\Pi(d) \subseteq \Pi$ ; a  $\Pi$ -subgroup ( $\Pi$ -element) of the group  $\mathfrak{G}$  is a subgroup (element) whose order is a  $\Pi$ -divisor of  $(\mathfrak{G})$ ; a  $\Pi$ -subgroup whose order is the greatest  $\Pi$ -divisor of  $(\mathfrak{G})$  will be called a  $\Pi$ -Sylow subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}$ ;  $\mathfrak{G}_\Pi$  is the set of all  $\Pi$ -elements of the group  $\mathfrak{G}$ ;  $p$  and  $q$  are prime numbers; a  $p$ -decomposable group is a finite group that is the direct product of its  $p$ -Sylow subgroup and a  $p$ -Sylow complement;  $\mathfrak{P}$  is some  $p$ -Sylow subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}$ ; a special group is a finite group in which all Sylow subgroups are invariant; a group of type  $S$  is a finite nonspecial group all of whose nontrivial subgroups are special <sup>(7)</sup>; the order of a group of type  $S$  has the form  $p^\alpha q^\beta$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta > 0$  <sup>(8)</sup>; a symbol of the form  $\mathfrak{S}_i(p, q) = \mathfrak{S}_i(q, p)$  will denote some subgroup of type  $S$  and of order of the form  $p^\alpha q^\beta$ ; a  $pd$ -subgroup is a subgroup whose order is divisible by  $p$ .

**Definition 1.** If in  $\mathfrak{G} \neq \mathfrak{E}$  there exists a sequence of subgroups of type  $S$ , which can be written in the form

$$\mathfrak{S}_1(p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}), \quad \mathfrak{S}_2(p^{(2)}, p^{(3)}), \quad \mathfrak{S}_3(p^{(3)}, p^{(4)}), \dots, \quad \mathfrak{S}_t(p^{(t)}, p^{(t+1)}),$$

where  $p^{(1)} = p \in \Pi(\mathfrak{G})$  and  $p^{(t+1)} = q \in \Pi(\mathfrak{G})$ , then  $p$  and  $q$  will be called  $S$ -connected in the group  $\mathfrak{G}$ , and the indicated chain of subgroups will be called a chain  $S$ -connecting  $p$  and  $q$ .

Let now  $M$  be the set of all those  $p \in \Pi(\mathfrak{G})$  for which  $\mathfrak{G}$  is not  $p$ -decomposable. With the aid of Theorem 3 of (3) it is not difficult to see that, if  $M$  is nonempty, then the property of  $S$ -connectedness divides  $M$  into classes  $M_1, \dots, \dots, M_r$  of mutually  $S$ -connected numbers, which we shall call the  $S$ -classes of  $\mathfrak{G}$ .

**Definition 2.** A subset  $\sigma$  of the set  $\Pi(\mathfrak{G})$  will be called an  $S$ -portion of the group  $\mathfrak{G}$  if  $\sigma$  consists of only one number  $p$  and  $\mathfrak{G}$  is  $p$ -decomposable, or if  $\sigma$  is an  $S$ -class of  $\mathfrak{G}$ .

**Theorem.** Let  $\mathfrak{G} \neq \mathfrak{E}$  be a  $\Pi$ -solvable group, let  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_\mu$ ,  $\mu \geq 0$ , be all the  $S$ -portions of the group  $\mathfrak{G}$  contained in  $\Pi$ , and let

$\tau$  is the union of all the remaining  $S$ -portions of  $\mathfrak{G}$ . Then:

- 1)  $\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_1}, \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_2}, \dots, \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_\mu}, \mathfrak{G}_\tau$  are subgroups and

$$\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_1} \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_\mu} \times \mathfrak{G}_\tau;$$

- 2) the subgroup  $\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \mu$ , is no longer decomposable into a direct product of nontrivial subgroups of pairwise coprime orders.

**Proof.** We shall first show that assertion 2) of the theorem follows from assertion 1).

Suppose the contrary:  $\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i} = \mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_1 \times \mathfrak{H}_2$ , where  $(\mathfrak{H}_1)$  and  $(\mathfrak{H}_2)$  are relatively prime and greater than 1. Let  $p \in \Pi((\mathfrak{H}_1))$  and  $q \in \Pi((\mathfrak{H}_2))$ . Since  $\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}$  is an invariant  $\sigma_i$ -Sylow subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}$  and  $\sigma_i$  is an  $S$ -portion of  $\mathfrak{G}$ ,  $p$  and  $q$  are  $S$ -connected not only in  $\mathfrak{G}$ , but also in  $\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i} = \mathfrak{H}$ . Therefore, in the chain  $S$ -connecting  $p$  and  $q$ , there will be a subgroup  $\mathfrak{S}_i(p^{(i)}, p^{(i+1)})$  of type  $S$  from  $\mathfrak{H}$ , for which  $p^{(i)} \in \Pi((\mathfrak{H}_1))$  and  $p^{(i+1)} \in \Pi((\mathfrak{H}_2))$ . But then, since  $((\mathfrak{H}_1), (\mathfrak{H}_2)) = 1$ , the  $p^{(i)}$ -Sylow subgroup  $\mathfrak{S}_i$  will lie in  $\mathfrak{H}_1$ , while the  $p^{(i+1)}$ -Sylow subgroup  $\mathfrak{S}_i$  will lie in  $\mathfrak{H}_2$ . Hence, in view of  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_1 \times \mathfrak{H}_2$ , it follows that  $\mathfrak{S}_i$  is a special group. A contradiction has been obtained.

Now suppose that  $\mathfrak{G}$  is one of the groups of least order for which assertion 1) of the theorem fails. Since for  $\Pi$  empty  $\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{G}_\tau$ ,  $\Pi$  is nonempty. Consequently,  $(\mathfrak{G}) > 1$ . Let then

$$\mathfrak{G} \supset \mathfrak{G}' \supset \dots$$

be some composition series of  $\mathfrak{G}$ .

Only the following two cases are possible:

- 1) The index of  $\mathfrak{G}'$  in  $\mathfrak{G}$  is not divisible by any prime from  $\Pi$ . Then  $\tau$  is nonempty.

Since  $(\mathfrak{G}') < (\mathfrak{G})$ , for  $\mathfrak{G}'$  there exists the required direct decomposition, which, as is not difficult to see, in the case under consideration may be given the form

$$\mathfrak{G}' = \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma_1} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma_\mu} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\tau'}, \quad \text{where } \tau' \subseteq \tau.$$

By Theorem 2 of <sup>(6)</sup>, in  $\mathfrak{G}$  there exist  $\tau$ -Sylow subgroups. Let  $\mathfrak{H}$  be one of them. Let now  $p \in \tau$ . Since  $\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \mu$ , is a characteristic subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}'$ ,  $\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}$  is invariant in  $\mathfrak{G}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}$  is a subgroup. Since  $p$  does not enter the  $S$ -portion  $\sigma_i$  of the group  $\mathfrak{G}$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}$  has no  $pd$ -subgroups of type  $S$ . Then, by Theorem 3 of paper <sup>(3)</sup>,  $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}$  will be  $p$ -decomposable:

$$\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i} = \mathfrak{P} \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{P}$  is an arbitrary  $p$ -Sylow subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}$ , in view of the fact that  $\mathfrak{H}$  is a  $\tau$ -Sylow subgroup of  $\mathfrak{G}$ , one may regard  $\mathfrak{P}$  also as an arbitrary  $p$ -Sylow subgroup of  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Hence, taking into account

$$\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i} = \mathfrak{P} \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i},$$

we see that

$$\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i} = \mathfrak{H} \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq \mu.$$

But it is obvious that

$$\mathfrak{G} = (\mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_1} \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_\mu} \times \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'})\mathfrak{H}.$$

Hence, taking the preceding equalities into account, we see that

$$\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_1} \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma_\mu} \times (\mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}\mathfrak{H}),$$

whence

$$\mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{G}_{\tau'}.$$

A contradiction has been obtained.

2) The index of  $\mathfrak{G}'$  in  $\mathfrak{G}$  is equal to  $p \in \Pi$ .

Since  $\mathfrak{G}'$  is also  $\Pi$ -solvable, and  $(\mathfrak{G}') < (\mathfrak{G})$ , for  $\mathfrak{G}'$  there exists the decomposition required by the theorem:

$$\mathfrak{G}' = \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_1} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_{\mu'}} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\tau''}, \quad \mu' \geq 0, \quad \tau' \subseteq \tau,$$

and each  $\sigma'_i \subseteq \Pi$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \mu'$ , is contained in some  $S$ -portion of  $\mathfrak{G}$ . Then

$$\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}'.$$

Further, two cases are possible.

a)  $\mathfrak{G}$  is  $p$ -decomposable. If  $\mathfrak{G}'$  is not a  $pd$ -subgroup, then

$$\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{P} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_1} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_{\mu'}} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\tau'}$$

will obviously be the desired decomposition of  $\mathfrak{G}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{G}'$  be a  $pd$ -group. Since  $\mathfrak{G}'$  is also  $p$ -decomposable, one of the sets  $\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \dots, \sigma'_{\mu'}$  (for example,  $\sigma'_1$ ) will be of the form  $\{p\}$ . Then

$$\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{P} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_{\mu'}} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\tau'}$$

will obviously be a decomposition of the required form. A contradiction has been obtained.

b)  $\mathfrak{G}$  is not  $p$ -decomposable. Then, by Theorem 3 of <sup>(3)</sup>, the number  $p$  is  $S$ -connected with some elements of  $\Pi((\mathfrak{G}'))$ . Let  $\rho$  be the union of all those

sets from the collection  $\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \dots, \sigma'_{\mu'}, \tau'$ , which contain at least one element  $S$ -connected with  $\rho$ . In the present case  $\rho$  is nonempty.

It is clear that  $\mathfrak{G}'_{\rho}$  will be the product of the elements of some nonempty collection  $\mathfrak{M}$  of direct factors of the decomposition

$$\mathfrak{G}' = \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_1} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\sigma'_{\mu'}} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\tau'}.$$

If outside  $\mathfrak{M}$  there are no longer any factors of this decomposition, then  $\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}'_{\rho}$ . It is clear that then  $\Pi((\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}'_{\rho}))$  will be either the union  $\tau$  of the  $S$ -portions of the group  $\mathfrak{G}$  not entering into  $\Pi$ , or the  $S$ -portion  $\sigma = \Pi$  of the group  $\mathfrak{G}$ . Then either  $\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{G}_{\tau}$ , or  $\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{G}_{\sigma}$ . We have obtained a contradiction.

Let outside  $\mathfrak{M}$  there exist factors  $\mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_1}, \mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_2}, \dots, \mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_{\lambda}}$  of the above decomposition of  $\mathfrak{G}'$  (clearly,  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_{\lambda}$  coincide with some of the sets  $\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \dots, \sigma'_{\mu'}, \tau'$ ).

Since  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_{\lambda}$  have no elements in common with the set  $\rho$ , as in case 1), we are convinced that

$$\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_i} = \mathfrak{P} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, \lambda.$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}' = (\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}'_{\rho}) \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_1} \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{G}'_{\omega_{\lambda}}.$$

If  $\tau'$  is nonempty and enters into  $\rho$ , then put  $\tau = \Pi((\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}'_{\rho}))$ ; then all  $\omega_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \lambda$ , will be  $S$ -portions of  $\mathfrak{G}$  entering into  $\Pi$ .

If, however,  $\tau'$  is nonempty and coincides with one of the sets  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_{\lambda}$  (or is empty), then the remaining ones among them (or all of them), as well

as  $\Pi(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{G}'_\rho)$ , will clearly be  $S$ -portions of  $\mathfrak{G}$  entering into  $\Pi$ . In all cases the decomposition of  $\mathfrak{G}$  obtained will be of the required type. A contradiction has been obtained. The theorem is proved.

Gomel Branch  
of the Institute of Mathematics and Computer Technology  
of the Academy of Sciences of the BSSR

Received  
20 VI 1962

## REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup> S. A. Chunikhin, DAN, **118**, No. 4, 654 (1958). <sup>2</sup> S. A. Chunikhin, DAN, **146**, No. 6 (1962). <sup>3</sup> I. K. Chunikhin, S. A. Chunikhin, Matem. sborn., **15** (57), 2, 325 (1944). <sup>4</sup> S. A. Chunikhin, DAN, **55**, No. 6, 481 (1947). <sup>5</sup> S. A. Chunikhin, Matem. sborn., **25** (67), 3, 321 (1949). <sup>6</sup> S. A. Chunikhin, DAN, **73**, No. 1, 29 (1950). <sup>7</sup> S. A. Chunikhin, Matem. sborn., **40**, 1, 39 (1933). <sup>8</sup> O. Yu. Schmidt, Matem. sborn., **31**, 366 (1924).

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.*