

EXAMPLES OF θ -PAIRS

W. Herfort, TU Vienna

The Definition of a θ -Pair

In [1] Xianhua Li and Shiheng Li, generalizing a concept from [2], gave the definition of a θ -pair (C, D) for a proper subgroup H of a finite group G :

- (1) C is a subgroup of H and $G = \langle C, H \rangle$.
- (2) The normal closure $D := (C \cap H)_G$ of $C \cap H$ in G is a subgroup of C . Whenever $C_1/D < C/D$ then $\langle C_1, H \rangle < G$.

A Simple Example

Let G be a finite non-abelian simple group and P_1 any maximal subgroup of a non-cyclic Sylow subgroup P . Then $(C, D) := (G, (P_1)_G) = (G, G)$ is a θ -pair for P_1 .

A Solvable Example

Let $V = GF(3) \oplus GF(3)$ be the vector space of dimension 2 over the 3-element field $GF(3)$ and $x := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Note that $\langle x \rangle \cong C_4$, the cyclic group of order 4 and that V does not contain an x -invariant proper subspace.

The only non-cyclic Sylow subgroup of G is V . Any maximal subgroup P_1 of V is a 1-dimensional subspace and hence $D := (P_1)_G$ coincides with V . Setting $C := G$ it turns out that (C, D) is a θ -pair for P_1 .

Every 2-Sylow subgroup of G is conjugate to $\langle x \rangle$. The only maximal subgroup P_1 of $P := \langle x \rangle$ coincides with $\langle x^2 \rangle$ and $D := (P_1)_G = V \langle x^2 \rangle$.

Discussion

- 1 The first example is not supersolvable since it is a finite non-abelian simple group.
- The second example is not supersolvable since V does not possess a 1-dimensional x -invariant subspace.
- In both examples for every θ -pair (C, D) the factor group C/D is supersolvable.

Conclusion

In [2], N.P. Mukherjee and P. Bhattacharya conclude from $|C/D|$ a prime for every maximal θ -pair (C, D) of a maximal subgroup M that G is supersolvable. However, in *their* definition of a θ -pair they stipulate the stronger condition $D < C$.

In [1] they authors show that G is supersolvable if for every maximal subgroup of every non-cyclic Sylow subgroup there is a θ -pair (C, D) with C/D supersolvable. It is this result that confuses me in light of the above examples.

References

- [1] X. Li and S. Li, *Theta pairs and the structure of finite groups*, Sib.Math.J. 45(2004)
- [2] N.P. Mukherjee and P. Bhattacharya, *On theta pairs for a maximal subgroup*, Proc.Am.Soc. 109(1990)