On a class of generalised Schmidt groups

A. Ballester-Bolinches* R. Esteban-Romero†
Qinhui Jiang‡ Xianhua Li§

Abstract

In this paper families of non-nilpotent subgroups covering the non-nilpotent part of a finite group are considered. An A_5-free group possessing one of these families is soluble, and soluble groups with this property have Fitting length at most three. A bound on the number of primes dividing the order of the group is also obtained.
Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 20D05, 20D10, 20F16,
Keywords: finite groups, nilpotent groups, maximal subgroups.

1 Introduction and statement of results

All groups considered in this paper are finite.

The results presented here spring from the classical results of Schmidt [13] about the structure of the minimal non-nilpotent groups and later developments from them ([12], [2], [3], [9], [10]). Schmidt proved that if all the maximal subgroups of a group G are nilpotent, then G is soluble, and that, in addition, if G is not nilpotent, $|G|$ has exactly two distinct prime factors, G has a normal Sylow subgroup and a cyclic non-normal Sylow subgroup. These groups are called *minimal non-nilpotent groups* or *Schmidt groups.*

Rose [12] studied the effects of replacing maximal subgroups by non-normal (or abnormal) maximal subgroups in the hypothesis of Schmidt's result, and the following fact is established:

*Departament d'Àlgebra, Universitat de València; Dr. Moliner, 50; 46100, Burjassot, València, Spain; email: Adolfo.Ballester@uv.es

†Institut Universitari de Matemàtica Pura i Aplicada, Universitat Politècnica de València; Camí de Vera, s/n; 46022 València, Spain, email: resteban@mat.upv.es

‡Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, 200444, Shanghai, School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Jinan, 250002 Jinan, China; email: syjqh2001@163.com

§School of Mathematical Science, Soochow University, Suzhou 215006, China; email: xhli@suda.edu.cn

Theorem A. *If every non-normal maximal subgroup of a group G is nilpotent, then G has a normal Sylow subgroup P such that G/P is nilpotent.*

We shall say that a group G is a *Rose group* if every non-normal maximal subgroup of G is nilpotent.

In a recent paper [11], Li and Guo characterised Rose groups by means of certain families of normal non-nilpotent subgroups, and obtained more detailed information about the number of primes dividing the order of the group. They also gave an alternative proof for solubility.

Theorem B. *Let G be a Rose group. Then*

1. *G is soluble;*

2. *G is p-nilpotent for some prime p;*

3. *If G is non-nilpotent, then $2 \leq |\pi(G)| \leq k+2$, where k is the number of normal maximal subgroups of G which are not nilpotent.*

The present paper furnishes extensions of the main results of Rose, Li and Guo, and was motivated by some ideas of the paper [11]. We consider families of non-nilpotent subgroups covering the non-nilpotent part of the group, and analyse how they determine the group structure.

It is abundantly clear that our results are not a mere exercise in generalisation. In fact, Theorem A and Theorem B cannot be extended directly: the alternating group of degree 5 is a fundamental obstruction to get solubility. We must seek to discover how nearly a non-nilpotent group with some of our coverings is soluble. With this purpose in view, we consider the solubility question (Theorem C), and give more detailed structural information in the soluble case.

Definition 1.1. Let G be a non-nilpotent group. A *Schmidt covering* of G is a, possibly empty, family of non-nilpotent proper subgroups $\{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$ of G satisfying the following two conditions:

1. If $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $i \neq j$, then K_i is not contained in K_j.

2. If T is a proper subgroup of G such that $T \notin \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$ and T is not contained in K_t for some $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then T is nilpotent provided that T is a supplement in G of the nilpotent residual $G^{\mathfrak{N}}$ of G.

Recall that the nilpotent residual of a group is the smallest normal subgroup with nilpotent quotient. We say that a group G is an *NNC-group* if G has a Schmidt covering. If G is a Schmidt group, then G is an *NNC*-group with an empty Schmidt covering, and if G is a non-nilpotent Rose group, then the empty set and the set of all non-nilpotent normal maximal subgroups of G are both Schmidt coverings of G. Hence G is an *NNC*-group. However, the symmetric group of degree 4 shows that the class of Rose groups is a proper subclass of the class of all *NNC*-groups.

Our first main theorem is the following.

Theorem C. *Let G be an NNC-group. If G has no section isomorphic to A_5, then G is soluble.*

We note that the proof of the above result relays on the Classification of Finite Simple Groups.

For G a nontrivial soluble group, we let $F(G)$ denote the Fitting subgroup of G. The subgroups $F_i(G)$ are defined inductively by $F_0(G) = 1$, and $F_{i+1}(G)/F_i(G) = F(G/F_i(G))$. The smallest non-negative integer n such that $F_n(G) = G$ is the Fitting length $l(G)$ of G. The trivial group has Fitting length 0; a nontrivial nilpotent group has Fitting length 1; and if $G \neq 1$, then $l(G/\mathrm{F}(G)) = l(G) - 1$.

According to Theorem A, a Rose group has Fitting length at most 2. The symmetric group of degree 4 is an *NNC*-group of Fitting length 3. Hence, Theorem A does not hold for soluble *NNC*-groups. However, we have:

Theorem D. *Let G be a soluble NNC-group. Then the Fitting length of G is at most* 3.

In view of the third assertion of Theorem B, it is of interest to inquire whether there is a bound on the number of distinct prime factors of $|G|$, at least when G is a soluble *NNC*-group. Note that every non-empty Schmidt covering contains every conjugacy class of abnormal maximal subgroups, and a bound for the number of distinct primes dividing the order of a group is naturally related to the number of conjugacy classes of subgroups contained in the maximal covering.

Let G be an *NNC*-group. We say that the Schmidt covering $\mathscr{A}$ is the *maximal covering* of G if $\mathscr{A}$ contains every non-nilpotent maximal subgroup of G.

Theorem E. *Let G be a soluble NNC-group. Let $\mathscr{A}$ be the maximal covering of G. Then $2 \leq |\pi(G)| \leq l + 2$, where l is the number of conjugacy classes of subgroups contained in $\mathscr{A}$.*

Note that the order of a Schmidt group is divisible by two different primes, and if A is a Schmidt group and p is a prime which does not divide its order, then $G = A \times B$, where B is a cyclic group of order p, is an *NNC*-group and $\{A\}$ is the maximal Schmidt covering of G. Hence the bounds of the above theorem are best possible.

2 Preliminaries

Before taking up the proofs of our main results, we shall give in this section a few very useful results on *NNC*-groups.

Recall that a subgroup H of a group G is abnormal in G if $g \in < H, H^g >$ for all $g \in G$. Our first result shows that every abnormal subgroup in a Schmidt covering of G should be a maximal subgroup of G.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$ be a Schmidt covering of an NNC-group G. If, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, K_j is not maximal in G, then there exists a normal maximal subgroup L of G containing K_j such that $\{L\} \bigcup \{K_t : K_t \nleq L\}$ is a Schmidt covering of G.*

Proof. Suppose that K_j is not maximal in G, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let L be a maximal subgroup of G containing K_j. Clearly, $L \notin \{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$ and $L \nleq K_j$. If L were not normal in G, we would have $G = G^{\mathfrak{N}}L$; and since $\{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$ is a Schmidt covering of G, this would imply the nilpotency of L. Hence L is normal in G. Clearly $\{L\} \cup \{K_t : K_t \nleq L\}$ is a Schmidt covering of G. □

Corollary 2.2. *Let G be an NNC-group which is not a Schmidt group. Then G has a Schmidt covering composed of maximal subgroups of G, and every Schmidt covering of G contains each non-nilpotent abnormal maximal subgroup of G.*

As we said in the introduction, the symmetric group of degree 4 is a typical example of an *NNC*-group which is not a Rose group. However, *NNC*-groups with small Schmidt coverings are Rose groups.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\mathscr{A} = \{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$ be a Schmidt covering of an NNC-group G. If the number of maximal subgroups of G in $\mathscr{A}$ is at most 2, then G is a Rose group.*

Proof. We may suppose that $\mathscr{A}$ is non-empty. Let k denote the number of maximal subgroups of G in $\mathscr{A}$.

Assume $k = 1$, and K_1 is the unique maximal subgroup of G in $\mathscr{A}$. Let $L \neq K_1$ be a maximal subgroup of G conjugate to K_1 in G. Since L is not nilpotent, it follows that L belongs to $\mathscr{A}$. Hence K_1 is normal in G and then every abnormal maximal subgroup of G is nilpotent. Then G is a Rose group.

Suppose $k = 2$, and that K_1 is one of the maximal subgroups of G in $\mathscr{A}$. If K_1 were not normal in G, then $\mathscr{A}$ would contain any conjugate of K_1 in G. This would mean that $|G : K_1| = 2$, and $K_1 \trianglelefteq G$, contrary to our assumption. Hence the maximal subgroups of G in $\mathscr{A}$ are normal in G, and G is a Rose group. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let G be an NNC-group with a Schmidt covering $\{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$. Assume that, for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, K_i is not contained in any normal maximal subgroup of G. Then $n > 2$, and K_i is a Rose group.*

Proof. According to Proposition 2.1, K_i is an abnormal maximal subgroup of G. Hence, $G = G^{\mathfrak{N}} K_i$. Since K_i is not nilpotent, it follows that $n > 2$. Let T be a maximal subgroup of K_i such that $K_i = K_i^{\mathfrak{N}} T$. Then $G = G^{\mathfrak{N}} T$. Since $T \notin \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$, we conclude that that T is nilpotent. Consequently, K_i is a Rose group, □

The next result is particularly useful when an inductive argument involving quotient groups is applied.

Lemma 2.5. *Let G be an NNC-group with a Schmidt covering $\mathscr{S} = \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$. If N is a normal subgroup of G, then one of the following statements holds:*

1. *G/N is nilpotent;*
2. *$G = NK_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and G/N is a Rose group;*
3. *$\{K_i/N : N \leq K_i, K_i/N$ is non-nilpotent$\}$ is a Schmidt covering of G/N.*

In other words, G/N is either nilpotent or an NNC-group.

Proof. Suppose that G is a Schmidt group. If N is contained in the Frattini subgroup of G, it follows that G/N is a Schmidt group, and if N is supplemented in G by a maximal subgroup of G, then G/N is nilpotent. Hence lemma holds in this case. Therefore, by Corollary 2.2, we may assume that $\mathscr{S}$ is a non-empty Schmidt covering of G composed of maximal subgroups. Suppose, now, that G/N is not nilpotent. If N is not contained in any K_i, then $G = NK_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Let T/N be an arbitrary maximal subgroup of G/N. Then $T \notin \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$, and so either $T \trianglelefteq G$ or T is nilpotent. Consequently, G/N is a Rose group and Statement 2 holds.

Assume that $\mathscr{A} := \{K_1, \ldots, K_r\}$ is the non-empty set of subgroups of $\{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$ containing N, $1 \leq r \leq n$, and write $\mathscr{C} := \{K_i/N : K_i/N$ is non-nilpotent, $1 \leq i \leq r\}$. We show that $\mathscr{C}$ is a Schmidt covering of G/N. If $\mathscr{C}$ is empty, then every abnormal maximal subgroup of G containing N is nilpotent. Hence G/N is a Rose group and lemma holds in this case. Suppose that $\mathscr{C}$ is non-empty. It is clear that $\mathscr{C}$ satisfies Condition 1 of Definition 1.1. Let T/N be a proper subgroup of G/N such that $T/N \notin \mathscr{C}$, $T/N \nleq K_t/N \in \mathscr{C}$, and $G/N = (G/N)^{\mathfrak{N}} \cdot T/N$. Then $G = G^{\mathfrak{N}} T$. If $T \leq K_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq r$ such that K_j/N is nilpotent, then T/N is also nilpotent. Otherwise, $T \notin \{K_1, \ldots, K_n\}$. Since $\mathscr{S}$ is a Schmidt covering of G, T is nilpotent. In both cases, we conclude that T/N is nilpotent. Therefore $\mathscr{C}$ is a Schmidt covering of G/N and Statement 3 holds. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathscr{A} = \{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$ be a family of non-nilpotent subgroups of a group G such that K_i is not contained in K_j, if $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then $\mathscr{A}$ is a Schmidt covering of G if and only if every proper supplement of the nilpotent residual of G not belonging to $\mathscr{A}$ is nilpotent.*

Proof. It is clear that only the necessity of the condition is in doubt. Assume that $\mathscr{A}$ is a Schmidt covering of G and let $1 \neq T$ be a proper subgroup of G such that $G = G^{\mathfrak{N}}T$ and T does not belong to $\mathscr{A}$. We prove that T is nilpotent by induction on the order of G. If T is not contained in some K_i, then T is nilpotent. Hence we may assume that $T \leq \cap\{K_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $1 \neq G^{\mathfrak{N}}$. In particular, $\mathscr{A}$ is non-empty and so $\mathscr{A}$ contains every abnormal maximal subgroup of G. Let X be the intersection of the abnormal maximal subgroups of G. Then, X is normal in G and, if G is non-soluble, X is nilpotent by [14]. Hence T is nilpotent. Assume that G is soluble. Since X is a proper normal subgroup of G, there exists a maximal normal subgroup Y of G containing X. Then G/Y is nilpotent, and so $G^{\mathfrak{N}}$ is contained in Y. Therefore $G = Y$, contradicting the maximality of Y. □

3 Proofs of the main results

Proof of Theorem C. Suppose that the result is false, and let the group G provide a counterexample of least possible order. Then, by Proposition 2.3 and Theorem A, the number of abnormal maximal subgroups in every Schmidt covering of G is greater than 2. Since the properties of G, as enunciated in the statement of the theorem, are inherited by non-nilpotent quotients of G, the minimality of G implies that G has a unique minimal normal subgroup, say N. N must be insoluble, $C_G(N) = 1$, and N is a direct power of a simple non-abelian group. Assume that G/N is not nilpotent, and let H/N be a non-normal maximal subgroup of G/N. Then H is a non-normal maximal subgroup of G supplementing the nilpotent residual of G. If H is not in any Schmidt covering of G, then H is nilpotent; otherwise, H is a Rose group by Lemma 2.4. In both cases, H should be soluble, contrary to assumption. Therefore G/N is nilpotent and $N = G^{\mathfrak{N}}$ is the nilpotent residual of G.

Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a Schmidt covering of G composed of maximal subgroups. Write $N = S_1 \times \cdots \times S_m$, where S_j are pairwise isomorphic non-abelian simple groups, $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Let us denote $C = \mathrm{C}_G(S_1)$, $M = \mathrm{N}_G(S_1)$, and $K = S_2 \times \cdots \times S_m$. Let H be a core-free maximal subgroup of G. Then H is soluble. Write $V = M \cap H$.

Applying [1, 1.1.52] one of the following statements holds:

1. G is an almost simple group;

2. (G, H) is equivalent to a primitive pair with simple diagonal action; in this case, $H \cap N$ is a full diagonal subgroup of N;

3. (G, H) is equivalent to a primitive pair with product action such that $H \cap N \cong D_1 \times \cdots \times D_l$, a direct product product of $l > 1$ subgroups such that, for each $j = 1, \ldots, l$, the subgroup D_j is a full diagonal subgroup of a direct product $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} S_i$.

4. (G, H) is equivalent to a primitive pair with product action such that the projection $R_1 = (H \cap N)^{\pi_1}$ is a non-trivial proper subgroup of S_1; in this case $R_1 = VC \cap S_1$ and VC/C is a maximal subgroup of the almost simple group M/C, where π_1 is a projection from N to S_1;

5. $H \cap N = 1$.

The solubility of H implies that $H \cap N$ cannot contain any copy of the composition factor of N. If $H \cap N = 1$, we know, by a result of Lafuente (see [1, 1.1.51 (2)]), that H would be a primitive group with non-abelian socle. Since H is soluble, it follows that G is an almost simple group or (G, H) is equivalent to a primitive pair with product action such that the projection $R_1 = (H \cap N)^{\pi_1}$ is a non-trivial proper subgroup of S_1. Assume that N is not simple. Since M/C is almost simple, we have that M/K is neither nilpotent nor a Rose group. In addition, N/K is the nilpotent residual of M/K. Let L/K a non-nilpotent maximal subgroup of M/K supplementing N/K in M/K. Applying [1, 1.1.35], there exists a maximal subgroup A of $G = AN$ such that $L = (A \cap M)K$. Then A belongs to $\mathscr{A}$. Since every supplement U/K of N/K in M/K is of the form $U/K = (B \cap M)K/K$ for some supplement B of N in G by [1, 1.1.35], we conclude that the set of all non-nilpotent maximal subgroups of M/K supplementing N/K is a Schmidt covering of M/K. Therefore M/K is an NNC-group with no sections isomorphic to A_5. The minimal choice of G implies that M/K is soluble, contradicting the fact that N/K is non-abelian simple. Thus G must be an almost simple group.

Let $p \geq 5$ be a prime dividing $|N|$, and let P be a Sylow p-subgroup of N. Then $G = N\mathrm{N}_G(P) = G^{\mathfrak{N}}\mathrm{N}_G(P)$, and so $\mathrm{N}_G(P)$ is either contained in some maximal abnormal subgroup of $\mathscr{A}$ or $\mathrm{N}_G(P)$ is nilpotent. If the latter were true, then we would have $\mathrm{O}^p(N) < N$ by [6, X, 8.13], contrary to hypothesis. Therefore $Z = \mathrm{N}_G(P)$ is contained in some abnormal maximal subgroup E belonging to $\mathscr{A}$. By Lemma 2.4, E is a Rose group. Applying Theorem A, $Z^{\mathfrak{N}}$ is a q-group for some prime q. Suppose that $q \neq p$, and let Q be a Sylow q-subgroup of Z. Then Q is normal in Z and $Z = QZ_{q'}$, where $Z_{q'}$ is a Hall q'-subgroup of Z. In particular, $Z_{q'}$ is nilpotent. Moreover, $Z_{q'}$ cannot be a normal subgroup of Z, otherwise, we should have Z nilpotent, contradicting our hypothesis. Hence $\mathrm{N}_Z(Z_{q'})$ is contained in a non-normal maximal subgroup Y of Z. Let W be a maximal subgroup of E containing Y. Then W is not normal in E and so W is nilpotent. Thus Y is nilpotent and $Z_{q'}$ centralises P. Since Q also centralises P, we have that $Z/\mathrm{C}_G(P)$ is a p-group. Applying [6, X, 8.13], $\mathrm{O}^p(N) < N$, contradicting the prescribed minimality of N. Consequently $q = p$. Then the nilpotent residual of E is a p-group and so a Sylow p-subgroup of E is normal in E. It implies that $E = Z$. In this case, P is a Sylow p-subgroup of G.

Assume that G is not simple. Applying [8, 1.1], there exists a normal subgroup G_0 of G which is minimal such that $E_0 := E \cap G_0$ is maximal in G_0, and E is isomorphic to $E_0.G/G_0$. Moreover, with the exceptions for which the numbers c of conjugacy classes of such subgroups E_0 are listed in [8, Table 1], all of such subgroups E_0 are conjugate. Note that the subgroups E_0 contain a Sylow subgroup of G for a prime $p \geq 5$. Therefore N cannot be isomorphic to any simple group in [8, Table 1]. Hence all of such subgroups E_0 are conjugate and they are the normalisers of a Sylow p-subgroup of G for fixed prime $p \geq 5$ dividing the order of N. This implies that $|N|$ is divisible by exactly three different primes. According to [7, Table 1], N is isomorphic to A_5, A_6, $\mathrm{PSU}(4,2)$, $\mathrm{PSL}(2,7)$, $\mathrm{PSL}(2,8)$, $\mathrm{PSU}(3,3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}(3,3)$ or $\mathrm{PSL}(2,17)$. Clearly N cannot be isomorphic to A_5, A_6 or $PSU(4,2)$ since G is A_5-free. Since the nilpotent residual of G is isomorphic to N, $G \cong Aut(N)$ and G is an almost simple group, it follows by Atlas [4] that $|G : N| = 2$ if $N \in \{\mathrm{PSL}(2,7), \mathrm{PSU}(3,3), \mathrm{PSL}(3,3), \mathrm{PSL}(2,17)\}$ and $|G : N| = 3$ if $N = \mathrm{PSL}(2,8)$. Let p be the largest prime divisor of $|N|$ and P a Sylow p-subgroup of N. Then $|P| = p$ and $N_G(P)$ belongs to $\mathscr{A}$. By [4], $N_G(P)$ is isomorphic to $7:6$ if N is isomorphic to one of the groups $\mathrm{PSL}(2,7)$, $\mathrm{PSL}(2,8)$, or $\mathrm{PSU}(3,3)$; it is isomorphic to $13:6$ if $N \cong \mathrm{PSL}(3,3)$, or isomorphic to $17:16$ if $N \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,17)$. Hence $N_G(P)$ has a subgroup K isomorphic to $7:2$, $7:3$, $7:2$, $13:2$, $17:8$, if N is isomorphic to $\mathrm{PSL}(2,7)$, $\mathrm{PSL}(2,8)$, $\mathrm{PSU}(3,3)$, $\mathrm{PSL}(3,3)$, or $\mathrm{PSL}(2,17)$ respectively. Since $N_G(P)$ is a Rose group, we have K is nilpotent. This contradiction implies that G cannot be an almost simple group.

Consequently, G is a simple group. Then every maximal subgroup of G either is nilpotent or belongs to $\mathscr{A}$. Therefore every maximal subgroup is either nilpotent or a Schmidt group. By [5, II, 7.5], G is isomorphic to one of the following groups:

1. $\mathrm{PSL}(2,p)$, where p is a prime, $p > 3$, and $p^2 - 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod 5$;
2. $\mathrm{PSL}(2,2^q)$, where q is a prime,
3. $\mathrm{PSL}(2,3^q)$, where q is an odd prime,
4. $\mathrm{PSL}(3,3)$, or
5. $\mathrm{Sz}(2^q)$, where q is an odd prime.

In the following, we analyse each one of these cases and derive a contradiction.

1. $G \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,p)$, where $p > 3$ is a prime and $p^2 - 1 \not\equiv 0(5)$.

Applying [5, II, 8.27], G has subgroups $G_1 \cong D_r$ and $G_2 \cong D_s$, where $r = 2 \cdot \frac{p+1}{(2,p-1)} = p+1$ and $s = 2 \cdot \frac{p-1}{(2,p-1)} = p-1$. Since G_1 and G_2 are either nilpotent or Schmidt groups, it follows that $\frac{r}{2} = \frac{p+1}{2}$ and $\frac{s}{2} = \frac{p-1}{2}$ are either a power of 2 or a prime, Note that $p-1$, p, $p-1$ are consecutive integers, and so 3 must divide one of them. As $p > 3$ is a prime, we have that $3 \nmid p$. Assume that $3 \mid p+1$. Then $6 \mid p+1$, which implies $3 \mid \frac{p+1}{2}$ and thus $\frac{p+1}{2} = 3$ since $\frac{p+1}{2}$ is a prime. Hence $p = 5$. In this case, $G \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,5) \cong A_5$, contradicting our assumption. Analogously, $3 \mid p-1$ yields $p = 7$. Then G has a maximal subgroup isomorphic to S_4 which is neither nilpotent nor a Schmidt group. This is a contradiction.

2. $G \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,2^q)$, where q is a prime.

With similar arguments to those used above, we have that $3 \mid 2^q - 1$ and $q = 2$. Then $G \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,4) \cong A_5$, a contradiction.

3. $G \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,3^q)$, where q is an odd prime.

We again argue as in the above cases. Since p is odd and $\frac{3^q+1}{2}$, $\frac{3^q-1}{2}$ are consecutive integers, it implies only one of them is a power of 2.

Assume first $\frac{3^q+1}{2} = 2^{\alpha_1}$ for some integer α_1. Then

$$3^q + 1 = 2^\alpha \tag{1}$$

where $\alpha = \alpha_1 + 1$. Write $q = 2k+1$. If $\alpha \geq 3$, we can take classes module 8 to conclude that $\overline{3}^{2k+1} + \overline{1} = \overline{0}$, and so $\overline{4} = \overline{0}$. This contradiction yields $\alpha = 1$ or 2. As a result, $q = 0$ or 1. This is impossible.

Hence

$$3^q - 1 = 2^{\beta_1} \tag{2}$$

for some integer β_1. We can argue as above to get a contradiction.

4. $G \cong \mathrm{PSL}(3,3)$.

In this case, G has a subgroup isomorphic to $\mathrm{GL}(2,3)$ which is neither nilpotent nor a Schmidt group.

5. $G \cong \mathrm{Sz}(2^q)$*, where* q *is an odd prime.*

It is known that G has a subgroup isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sz}(2)$, which is neither nilpotent nor a Schmidt group.

Consequently, G cannot be a non-abelian simple group, and this contradiction establishes the theorem.

□

Proof of Theorem D. We use induction on the order of G. We may assume that G is not a Rose group by Theorem A. Then, by Lemma 2.5, quotient groups of G which are non-nilpotent also are *NNC*-groups. Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a Schmidt covering of G, and let N be a minimal normal subgroup of G contained in $G^{\mathfrak{N}}$. Then G/N is either nilpotent or an *NNC*-group. Therefore the Fitting length of G/N is at most three. If $N \leq \Phi(G)$, then G has length at most three since the class of groups of Fitting length at most three is a saturated formation. Assume that $N \not\leq \Phi(G)$. Let M be a maximal subgroup of G such that $G = NM$. If M does not belong to $\mathscr{A}$, then M is nilpotent and hence the Fitting length of G is two. Suppose that $M \in \mathscr{A}$. Since $G = G^{\mathfrak{N}}M$, we conclude that M is abnormal in G. Then M is a Rose group by Proposition 2.4. Applying Theorem A, M has Fitting length at most two, and so the Fitting length of G is at most three. The proof of the theorem is now complete. □

Proof of Theorem E. Assume that the result is false, and let the *NNC*-group G provide a counterexample of minimal order. Put $\mathscr{A} = \{K_1, \dots, K_n\}$.

Let N be a minimal normal subgroup of G contained in $G^{\mathfrak{N}}$. Then Lemma 2.5 implies that G/N is either nilpotent or an *NNC*-group.

Assume that G/N is an *NNC*-group. There are two possibilities:

1. There exists $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathrm{Core}_G(K_j) = 1$. In this case, G is a primitive group and $G = NK_j$. Write $A = K_j$. Then A is a Rose group and $A^{\mathfrak{N}}$ is a q-group for some prime $q \neq p \in \pi(N)$. Moreover, all core-free maximal subgroups of G are conjugate (see [1, 1.1.10]). Let

C be a Carter subgroup of A. Then $A = A^{\mathfrak{N}}C$ and NC is a proper subgroup of G supplementing the nilpotent residual of G.

Assume that NC does not belong to $\mathscr{A}$. Since $\mathscr{A}$ is a Schmidt covering of G, NC is nilpotent. Suppose that we have two distinct primes dividing the order of the Hall q'-subgroup of A. Then there exists a Sylow subgroup of NC centralising N. This contradicts the fact that $C_G(N) = N$ ([1, 1.1.7]). This contradiction implies $|\pi(G)| \leq 3 \leq l+2$, against our choice of G.

Consequently, we may assume that NC is a maximal subgroup of G belonging to $\mathscr{A}$. All these maximal subgroups are conjugate in G because C is a Carter subgoup of G and all Carter subgroups are conjugate (see [1, 2.3.2]). Put $\pi(C) = \{p_1, \dots, p_t\}$. Then $|\pi(G)| \leq t+2$. If $t = 1$, then $|\pi(G)| \leq 3 \leq l+2$. Hence we may assume that $t > 1$. Let C_i be a maximal subgroup of C such that $|C : C_i| = p_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. We have that $S_i = NA^{\mathfrak{N}}C_i$ is a non-nilpotent maximal normal subgroup of G for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, and hence $\{S_1, \dots, S_t\}$ is contained in $\mathscr{A}$. This means that $l \geq t+2$. This contradicts our supposition.

2. $\mathrm{Core}_G(K_j) \neq 1$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Assume there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $C = K_i$ is an abnormal maximal subgroup of G. Let L be a minimal normal subgroup of G contained in C. Then G/L is not nilpotent, and by Lemma 2.5, $\mathscr{C}$=$\{K_j/L : L \leq K_j, K_j/L$ is non-nilpotent$\}$ is a Schmidt covering of G/L. Assume that $\mathscr{C}$ is empty. Then every maximal subgroup of G/L is nilpotent and so G/L is a Schmidt group. In this case $|\pi(G/L)| = 2$ and so $|\pi(G)| \leq 3$, contrary to supposition. Assume that $\mathscr{C}$ is non-empty. If L is not contained in some K_t for some $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then the minimal choice of G forces $2 \leq |\pi(G/L)| \leq (l-1)+2$. Therefore $2 \leq |\pi(G)| \leq l+2$. Hence we can assume that L is contained in every element of $\mathscr{A}$. If G/L were a Rose group, then C/L would be nilpotent and the number of conjugacy classes of maximal subgroups in $\mathscr{C}$ is less or equal than $l-1$. The minimal choice of G would imply $2 \leq |\pi(G/L)| \leq (l-1)+2$ and then $2 \leq |\pi(G)| \leq l+2$. This would be a contradiction. Therefore we may assume that C/L is not nilpotent. Since C is a Rose group by Lemma 2.4, it follows that L is not a Sylow subgroup of C. This means that $|\pi(G/L)| = |\pi(G)|$. The minimality of G and Lemma 2.5 lead $2 \leq |\pi(G)| \leq l+2$, contrary to assumption.

   Then we may assume that every maximal subgroup of G belonging to $\mathscr{A}$ is normal in G and so $N \leq \cap\{K_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. If N were not a Sylow subgroup of G, then theorem would be applied to the the group

G/N, and we would get $2 \leq |\pi(G)| \leq n+2$. Thus we may assume that N is a Sylow subgroup of G and so N is a complement of an abnormal maximal subgroup of G. This means that $N = G^{\mathfrak{N}}$, and G/N is nilpotent. This impossibility clearly shows that G/N must not be an NNC-group.

If G/N is nilpotent, then $N = G^{\mathfrak{N}}$, and $N \leq \cap\{K_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ because otherwise some of the subgroups in $\mathscr{A}$ would be nilpotent, and G is a Rose group. The minimal choice of G implies that N is a Sylow subgroup of G, and so N is complemented by a nilpotent Hall subgroup C of G. Write $\pi(C) = \{p_1, \dots, p_t\}$. Again we may assume that $t > 2$. Let C_i be a maximal subgroup of C such that $|C : C_i| = p_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. Then $S_i = NC_i$ belongs to $\mathscr{A}$ for all i. We conclude that $t \leq n$ and so $|\pi(G)| = t+1 \leq n+2$. This final contradiction proves the result. □

Acknowledgements

The first and second author have been supported by the research grant MTM2010-19938-C03-01 from MICINN (Spain). The third author has been supported by the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation funded project (No: 20100480582) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (No: 11101258). The fourth author has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No: 11171243).

References

[1] A. Ballester-Bolinches and L. M. Ezquerro. *Classes of Finite Groups*, volume 584 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Springer, New York, 2006.

[2] J. C. Beidleman and H. Heineken. Finite minimal non-T_1-groups. *J. Algebra*, 319(4):1685–1695, 2008.

[3] J. C. Beidleman and H. Heineken. Minimal non-$\mathcal{F}$-groups. *Ric. Mat.*, 58(1):33–41, 2009.

[4] J. H. Conway, R. T. Curtis, S. P. Norton, R. A. Parker, and R. A. Wilson. *Atlas of Finite Groups*. Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1985.

[5] B. Huppert. *Endliche Gruppen I*, volume 134 of *Grund. Math. Wiss.* Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1967.

[6] B. Huppert and N. Blackburn. *Finite groups III*, volume 243 of *Grund. Math. Wiss.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1982.

[7] B. Huppert and W. Lempken. Simple groups of order divisible by at most four primes. *Izv. Gomel. Gos. Univ. Im. F. Skoriny*, 3:64–75, 2000.

[8] C. H. Li and H. Zhang. The finite primitive groups with soluble stabilizers, and the edge-primitive s-arc transitive graphs. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 103:441–472, 2011.

[9] Q. Li and X. Guo. On generalization of minimal non-nilpotent groups. *Lobachevskii J. Math.*, 31(3):239–243, 2010.

[10] Q. Li and X. Guo. On p-nilpotence and solubility of groups. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 96:1–7, 2011.

[11] Q. Li and X. Guo. On p-nilpotence and solubility of groups. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 96:1–7, 2011.

[12] J. S. Rose. The influence on a finite group of its proper abnormal structure. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 40:348–361, 1965.

[13] O. J. Schmidt. Über Gruppen, deren sämtliche Teiler spezielle Gruppen sind. *Mat. Sbornik*, 31:366–372, 1924.

[14] L. I. Šidov. Maximal subgroups of finite groups. *Sibirsk. Mat. Ž.*, 12:682–683, 1971.