

Finite groups admitting fixed-point free automorphisms of order pqr

Gülin Ercan and İsmail Ş. Güloğlu

(Communicated by E. I. Khukhro)

1 Introduction

Let G be a finite group and A be a group of operators of G with $C_G(A) = 1$. In [14], Turull proved that if $(|G|, |A|) = 1$ then (with certain exceptions for A), the Fitting height of G is bounded by the length of the longest chain of subgroups of A . We expect a similar bound for the Fitting height of G when the assumption $(|G|, |A|) = 1$ is replaced by the assumption that A is nilpotent (see [1]). In [9], Cheng Kei-Nah showed that G is metanilpotent if A is a cyclic group whose order is a product of two distinct primes. Here we obtain a result that takes Kei-Nah's work one step further:

Theorem. *Let G be a finite group admitting a fixed-point free automorphism α of order pqr for pairwise distinct primes p, q and r . Then G has Fitting height at most 3.*

2 Preliminary results

First we state a well-known fact which is frequently used in this paper.

Lemma 1 (see [5]). *Let p, q, r be distinct primes and $G = QA$ where A is cyclic of order p and Q is a q -group with $[Q, A] = Q$. Assume further that G acts on a vector space V over a field k of characteristic r in such a way that $[V, A] = V$. If $[V, Q] \neq 0$, then $q = 2$.*

Lemma 2. *Let $H = ST$, where $S \triangleleft H$, S is a p -group and T is a t -group for distinct primes p and t , and let α be an automorphism of H of order p^n which leaves T invariant. Assume that $C_{T/T_0}(z) = 1$ where $T_0 = C_T(S)$ and $z = \alpha^{p^{n-1}}$. Let V be a $kH\langle\alpha\rangle$ -module on which S acts faithfully, and k a field of characteristic different from p . If $[C_V(z), C_S(z)] = 1$, then $[S, T] = 1$.*

Proof. We set $G = H\langle\alpha\rangle$ and argue by induction on $|G| + \dim_k V$. We may assume that $n = 1$.

$$[T/T_0, z] = T/T_0$$

(1) $S/\Phi(S)$ is an irreducible $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -module with $[S, T] = S$, $[\Phi(S), T] = 1$ and S is special. Moreover $\Phi(T/T_0) = 1$ and $\langle\alpha\rangle$ acts irreducibly on T/T_0 .

Let S_1 be a minimal element of

$$\{A \mid A \leq S, A \text{ is } T\langle\alpha\rangle\text{-invariant and } [A, T] \neq 1\}.$$

Then $S_1/\Phi(S_1)$ is an irreducible $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -module with $[S_1, T] = S_1$, $[\Phi(S_1), T] = 1$ and S_1 is special. By induction we see that $S_1 = S$.

Next let T_1/T_0 be a minimal proper $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant subgroup of T/T_0 on which $\langle\alpha\rangle$ acts non-trivially. Then $\Phi(T_1/T_0) = 1$. Induction applied to $S[T_1, \alpha]$ on V gives that $[T_1, \alpha] \leq T_0$, which is impossible. Hence $[T_1, \alpha] = T = T_1$.

(2) S is abelian.

Assume the contrary. Then $\Phi(S) \neq 1$ and so $C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha) \neq 1$. Now

$$U = [V, C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha)] \neq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad C_U(C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha)) = 1.$$

This shows that $C_U(\alpha) = 1$, as $[C_U(\alpha), C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha)] = 1$.

If $\text{char } k = t$ then for any irreducible G -submodule W of U , $[W, T_0]$ is G -invariant and properly contained in W . Hence $[W, T_0] = 1$. Set $K = \text{Ker}(G \text{ on } W)$ and $\bar{G} = G/K$. Now \bar{T} is abelian and $[\bar{T}, \alpha] = \bar{T} \leq [\bar{H}, \alpha]$. In this case, we may consider the action of \bar{G} on W and apply [4, Lemma 1.1]. We conclude that $[[\bar{H}, \alpha], \bar{S}/\Phi(\bar{S})] = 1$, which is impossible as $[\bar{S}, \bar{T}] = \bar{S}$. Thus $\text{char } k \neq |G|$.

Consider $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ on U . Now $[U, T] \neq 1$, because otherwise $[U, S] = 1$ and so $[V, S, C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha)] = 1$ which is not the case. Using Lemma 1 we get $t = 2$ as $C_U(\alpha) = 1$. On the other hand, let R be a maximal abelian normal subgroup of the p -group $S\langle\alpha\rangle$. Now $R = C_{S\langle\alpha\rangle}(R)$. If $\alpha \notin R$, then $[R, \alpha] \neq 1$. If $Y = [U, [R, \alpha]] = 1$, then $[R, \alpha] \leq C_S(U) \leq \Phi(S)$ and so $1 \neq C_{[R, \alpha]}(\alpha) \leq C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha)$. It follows that

$$C_V(C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha)) \leq C_V(C_{[R, \alpha]}(\alpha)).$$

As $V = U \oplus C_V(C_{\Phi(S)}(\alpha))$, we get $[V, C_{[R, \alpha]}(\alpha)] = 1$ which is a contradiction. Thus $Y \neq 1$. As $[Y, [R, \alpha]] = Y$, by [6, Lemma 4.5] we have $|Y| = |C_Y(\alpha)|^2$, which is impossible since $C_Y(\alpha) = 1$. Therefore $[R, \alpha] = 1$, that is, $\alpha \in R$. It follows that

$$[S\langle\alpha\rangle, \alpha, \alpha] \leq [S\langle\alpha\rangle, R, \alpha] \leq [R, \alpha] = 1$$

and so the minimal polynomial of α on $S/\Phi(S)$ has degree at most 2. On the other hand, [7, Theorem IX. 1.10] gives that the minimal polynomial of α on $S/\Phi(S)$ is $x^p - 1$ as T/T_0 is abelian. Consequently $p = 2 = t$, a contradiction. Therefore S is abelian.

As V is a completely reducible S -module we have $V|_S = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_l$, where V_1, \dots, V_l are the homogeneous S -components of V and $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ permutes V_1, \dots, V_l .

(3) There exists an $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant homogeneous S -component.

If no V_i is α -invariant, put

$$\{v +$$

for $i = 1, \dots, l$, the subgroup not the case.

(4) Each $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbit of $\{V_1,$

Let U and W belong to fixed by α . Since $U^y = W$ $yN_T(U) \in C_{T/N_T(U)}(\alpha)$. As C

(5) S acts trivially on each T

Let V_i be a $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant reducible $ST\langle\alpha\rangle$ -submodule homogeneous and so $[S/\text{Ker}(S$

(6) $C_S(\alpha)$ centralizes every element.

An orbit having no $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant and the same argument as in

(7) Let $\{y_0 = 1, y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ homogeneous S -component.

Consider the $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbit $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant, it is a union of $C_S(\alpha) \leq \text{Ker}(S \text{ on } U^{y_i})$ for

(8) Finally, let L be the invariant homogeneous S -component

we have $C_S(\alpha) \cap L = 1$ by (5)

Hence

$$C_S(\alpha) \cap C$$

This gives that $C_S(\alpha)^{y_i} \cap C$

a $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -submodule of S . We

$= S$, $[\Phi(S), T] = 1$ and S is on T/T_0 .

If no V_i is α -invariant, put $X_i = V_i \oplus V_i^\alpha \oplus \dots \oplus V_i^{\alpha^{p-1}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$. Since

$$\{v + v^\alpha + \dots + v^{\alpha^{p-1}} \mid v \in V_i\} \leq C_{X_i}(\alpha)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, l$, the subgroup $C_S(\alpha)$ acts trivially on each V_i and hence on V , which is not the case.

(4) Each $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbit of $\{V_1, \dots, V_l\}$ contains at most one $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant element.

Let U and W belong to the same $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbit, and suppose that both are fixed by α . Since $U^y = W$ for some $y \in T\langle\alpha\rangle$, we have $[y, \alpha] \in N_T(U)$ and so $yN_T(U) \in C_{T/N_T(U)}(\alpha)$. As $C_T(\alpha) \leq T_0 \leq N_T(U)$, we see that $y \in N_T(U)$.

(5) S acts trivially on each $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant homogeneous S -component.

Let V_i be a $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant subspace on which S acts non-trivially. Choose an irreducible $ST\langle\alpha\rangle$ -submodule M of V_i on which S acts non-trivially. Now $M|_S$ is homogeneous and so $[S/\text{Ker}(S \text{ on } M), T] = 1$, which is not the case.

(6) $C_S(\alpha)$ centralizes every element of a $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbit containing no $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant element.

An orbit having no $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant element can be written as a union of $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbits, and the same argument as in (3) gives the result.

(7) Let $\{y_0 = 1, y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ be a transversal to T_0 in T and let U be a $T_0\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant homogeneous S -component. Then $C_S(\alpha)^{y_j^{-1}} \leq \text{Ker}(S \text{ on } U)$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$.

Consider the $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbit $\{U, U^{y_1}, \dots, U^{y_m}\}$ containing U . As $\{U^{y_1}, \dots, U^{y_m}\}$ is $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant, it is a union of $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -orbits and the same argument as in (3) gives that $C_S(\alpha) \leq \text{Ker}(S \text{ on } U^{y_j})$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, that is, $C_S(\alpha)^{y_j^{-1}} \leq \text{Ker}(S \text{ on } U)$.

(8) Finally, let L be the intersection of the kernels of the actions of S on all $\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant homogeneous S -components which are not $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -invariant. As

$$[V, C_S(\alpha)] \neq 1,$$

we have $C_S(\alpha) \cap L = 1$ by (5) and (6). Also (7) shows that

$$\langle C_S(\alpha)^t \mid t \in T - T_0 \rangle \leq L.$$

Hence

$$C_S(\alpha) \cap \langle C_S(\alpha)^t \mid t \in T - T_0 \rangle \leq C_S(\alpha) \cap L = 1.$$

This gives that $C_S(\alpha)^{y_i} \cap \langle C_S(\alpha)^{y_j} \mid y_i \neq y_j \rangle = 1$ and so

$$\sum_{\bar{i} \in T/T_0} C_S(\alpha)^{\bar{i}} = \bigoplus_{\bar{i} \in T/T_0} C_S(\alpha)^{\bar{i}},$$

a $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ -submodule of S . We conclude that

$[T] \neq 1$.

$T] = S_1$, $[\Phi(S_1), T] = 1$ and

group of T/T_0 on which $\langle\alpha\rangle$ is fixed to $S[T_1, \alpha]$ on V gives that

$\neq 1$. Now

$y(\alpha) = 1$.

e W of U , $[W, T_0]$ is G -invariant. Set $K = \text{Ker}(G \text{ on } W)$

$\bar{i}, \alpha]$. In this case, we may assume $\bar{i} = 1$. We conclude that

thus $\text{char } k \nmid |G|$.

otherwise $[U, S] = 1$ and so $[U, Y] = 1$ and so

we get $t = 2$ as $C_U(\alpha) = 1$. U is a

subgroup of the p -group U . If $Y = [U, [R, \alpha]] = 1$, then

It follows that

which is a contradiction. Thus

$|Y| = |C_Y(\alpha)|^p$, which is impossible. It follows that

$= 1$

free at most 2. On the other hand, the polynomial of α on $S/\Phi(S)$ is

contradiction. Therefore S is

$V|_S = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_l$, where $T\langle\alpha\rangle$ permutes V_1, \dots, V_l .

mt.

$$S = \bigoplus_{i \in T/T_0} C_S(\alpha)^i$$

as S is irreducible, and so $|S| = |C_S(\alpha)|^{|T/T_0|}$. On the other hand, $[S, [T/T_0, \alpha]] = S$ and so $|S| = |C_S(\alpha)|^p$ by [6, Lemma 4.5]. As $t \neq p$ we get a contradiction and this completes the proof.

We write $f(G)$ for the Fitting length of a group G .

Corollary 3 (Cheng Kei-Nah [9]). *Let G be a finite group admitting a fixed-point free automorphism α of order pq , where p and q are distinct primes. Then $f(G) \leq 2$.*

Proof. Set $\langle \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle$ where $|\alpha_p| = p$ and $|\alpha_q| = q$. We argue by induction on $|G|$. As $C_G(\alpha) = 1$, for any prime dividing $|G|$ we have a unique $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -invariant Sylow subgroup of G and so we obtain an $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -tower (C_i) ($i = 1, 2, 3$) in the sense of [13] except that we have reversed the order of the indices, that is, we let C_j normalize C_i for $i < j$. By induction we have $G = C_1 C_2 C_3$ where $C_1 = F(G)$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G . By the Fong-Swan Theorem we may assume that $(|C_1|, |C_2 C_3 \langle \alpha \rangle|) = 1$. If $pq \nmid |C_2 C_3|$, then we know the result. Hence assume that p divides $|C_2 C_3|$. If G is a q' -group, [13, Theorem 3.1] implies that

$$[C_{C_1}(\alpha_q), C_{C_3}(\alpha_q)] \neq 1.$$

As $C_G(\alpha_q)$ is nilpotent, we get that $\pi(C_1) = \pi(C_3)$, which is not the case. Hence p and q both divide $|C_2 C_3|$. Let $\pi(C_2) = \{p\}$ and $\pi(C_3) = \{q\}$. Now $C_{C_3}(\alpha_p) = 1$. As $[C_{C_1}(\alpha_p), C_{C_2}(\alpha_p)] = 1$, we may apply Lemma 2 to $C_2 C_3 \langle \alpha_p \rangle$ on C_1 and obtain that $[C_2, C_3] = 1$, a contradiction.

Lemma 4. *Let VST be an $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -tower in the sense of [13] where*

- (i) $\langle \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle$ with $|\alpha_p| = p^n$ and $|\alpha_q| = q$ for distinct primes p and q ,
- (ii) $\pi(S) = \{p\}$, $\pi(T) = \{t\}$ with $t \notin \{p, q\}$, $\pi(V) \notin \{p, q\}$,
- (iii) $\Phi(\Phi(S)) = 1$, $[S, T] = S$, $[\Phi(S), T] = 1$,
- (iv) $C_V(\alpha) = 1$, $[S, \alpha_q] = S$ and $[T, z] = T$ where $z = \alpha_p^{p^{n-1}}$.

Then $[C_V(\alpha_q), C_T(\alpha_q)] \neq 1$.

Proof. Let $T_0 = C_T(S)$. If there exists $\bar{i} \in C_{T/T_0}(\alpha_q)$ with $|\bar{i}| > 2$, then we get $[C_V(\alpha_q), C_T(\alpha_q)] \neq 1$ as desired, by [13, Theorem 2.1.B]. So either $C_T(\alpha_q) \leq T_0$ or $C_{T/T_0}(\alpha_q)$ is an elementary abelian 2-group. The first is impossible since

$$C_{S/\Phi(S)}(\alpha_q) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad [S, T] = S.$$

Hence $t = 2$, that is, $p \neq 2$. As $t \neq q$ and $C_T(\alpha_q) \not\leq T_0$, we may assume that $[T, \alpha_q] = 1$.

Now we consider V the only possible tower:

$$(a) \quad C_S(\alpha_q) C_T(\alpha_q)$$

Now (a) is impossible. Then $[[C_S(\alpha_q), z], C_V(\alpha)]$ of [3, Lemma 1.1] to C and so $[C_V(\alpha_q), C_T(\alpha_q)]$

Set $\langle \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle$ minimal counter-example to have a unique $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -invariant $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -tower (C_i) ($i = 1, 2, 3$).

- (i) $\pi(C_i) = \{p_i\}$ consists $i = 1, 2, 3$;
- (ii) C_i is $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -invariant $i = 1, 2, 3$;
- (iii) $\bar{C}_i = C_i/D_i$ is a special p_i -group acts irreducibly for $i = 1, 2, 3$;
- (iv) $[C_i, C_{i+1}] = C_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Then by induction we get minimal normal subgroup $H \langle \alpha \rangle$ of C_1 with $(|C_1|, |H \langle \alpha \rangle|) = 1$.

Let W be a homogeneous $B = N_{\langle \alpha \rangle}(W)$ and $\bar{H} = H \langle \alpha \rangle$ \bar{H} -module and $C_W(B) = 1$.

If $(|H|, |B|) = 1$, we see $C_B(\text{supp}_B(\bar{H})) \neq 1$ and $C_B(\bar{C}_2) = 1$, because \bar{H} is a centralizer of a Sylow subgroup since $f(\bar{H}) = 3$. This is a contradiction.

On the other hand if p divides $|H|$, H is irreducible by [10, Theorem 1.1]. Thus $C_H(B) = 1$. Now $C_Y(B) = 1$. If $|B| = p$, $C_H(C_1) = 1$, and now t divides $|B|$. Let $|B| = p$. Observe that $D_2 = 1$ and

Now we consider $VST\langle z \rangle$ as an $\langle \alpha_q \rangle$ -tower. Since $p \neq 2$, by [13, Theorem 3.1], the only possible towers for centralizers inside this tower are the following:

$$(a) C_S(\alpha_q)C_T(\alpha_q)\langle z \rangle; \quad (b) C_V(\alpha_q)C_S(\alpha_q)\langle z \rangle; \quad (c) C_V(\alpha_q)C_T(\alpha_q)\langle z \rangle.$$

Now (a) is impossible since $C_S(\alpha_q) \leq \Phi(S)$ and $[\Phi(S), T] = 1$. Assume that (b) holds. Then $[[C_S(\alpha_q), z], C_V(\alpha_q)] \neq 1$. As α_p acts fixed-point freely on $C_V(\alpha_q)$, an application of [3, Lemma 1.1] to $C_S(\alpha_q)\langle \alpha_p \rangle$ on $C_V(\alpha_q)$ leads to a contradiction. Thus (c) holds and so $[C_V(\alpha_q), C_T(\alpha_q)] \neq 1$.

group admitting a fixed-point free automorphism of order pqr . Then $f(G) \leq 2$.

$p = q$. We argue by induction on n . Let C_i be a unique $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -invariant Sylow p -subgroup of C_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) in the sense of [13] that is, we let C_j normalize C_i ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$). Since $C_1 = F(G)$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G , by the theorem we may assume that C_2 normalizes C_1 . Hence assume that $p \neq q$. This implies that

which is not the case. Hence $p = q$. Now $C_{C_3}(\alpha_p) = 1$. As C_3 acts fixed-point freely on C_1 and obtain that

where p, q are distinct primes p and q , and $p \neq q$.

with $|i| > 2$, then we get a contradiction. So either $C_T(\alpha_q) \leq T_0$ or $C_T(\alpha_q) \not\leq T_0$.

S.

T_0 , we may assume that

3 Proof of the Theorem

Set $\langle \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle \times \langle \alpha_r \rangle$ where $|\alpha_p| = p$, $|\alpha_q| = q$ and $|\alpha_r| = r$. Let G be a minimal counter-example to the theorem. As $C_G(\alpha) = 1$, for any prime dividing $|G|$ we have a unique $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -invariant Sylow subgroup of G , and so we obtain an irreducible $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -tower (C_i) ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) in the sense of [13] satisfying the following:

- (i) $\pi(C_i) = \{p_i\}$ consists of a single prime for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $p_i \neq p_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$;
- (ii) C_i is $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -invariant for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and C_i is normalized by C_j for $j > i$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$;
- (iii) $\bar{C}_i = C_i/D_i$ is a special group on the Frattini factor group of which $(\prod_{j>i} C_j)\langle \alpha \rangle$ acts irreducibly for $i = 1, 2, 3$ where $D_i = C_{C_i}(C_{i-1}/D_{i-1})$ for $i > 1$ and $D_1 = 1$;
- (iv) $[C_i, C_{i+1}] = C_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Then by induction we see that $G = C_1 C_2 C_3 C_4$ where $C_1 = F(G)$ is the unique minimal normal subgroup of G . Put $H = C_2 C_3 C_4$. Now $C_H(C_1) = 1$. As C_1 is an irreducible $H\langle \alpha \rangle$ -module, by the Fong-Swan Theorem, we may assume that $(|C_1|, |H\langle \alpha \rangle|) = 1$.

Let W be a homogeneous H -component of C_1 on which C_2 acts non-trivially. Put $B = N_{\langle \alpha \rangle}(W)$ and $\bar{H} = H/\text{Ker}(H \text{ on } W)$. Then W is a homogeneous and faithful \bar{H} -module and $C_W(B) = 0$ as $C_{C_1}(\alpha) = 1$. Therefore $B \neq 1$.

If $(|H|, |B|) = 1$, we see that $C_W(C_B(\text{supp}_B(\bar{H}))) = 0$ by [12, Proposition 4.5]. Then $C_B(\text{supp}_B(\bar{H})) \neq 1$ and $1 \neq \bar{C}_2 \leq \text{supp}_B(\bar{H})$. It follows that $C_B(\text{supp}_B(\bar{H})) \leq C_B(\bar{C}_2)$. But $C_B(\bar{C}_2) = 1$, because otherwise $[\bar{H}, C_B(\bar{C}_2)] = 1$, which is not the case as the centralizer of a Sylow subgroup of $\langle \alpha \rangle$ has Fitting height at most 2 by the Corollary and since $f(\bar{H}) = 3$. This contradiction shows that $(|H|, |B|) \neq 1$.

On the other hand if $B = \langle \alpha \rangle$, then C_1 is a homogeneous H -module and so it is irreducible by [10, Theorem B.7.11]. Then we apply [8, Theorem] and get $C_H(\alpha) \neq 1$, a contradiction. Thus $1 \neq B < \langle \alpha \rangle$. Set $\langle \alpha \rangle = B \oplus B'$ and consider $Y = C_1 C_H(B')$. Now $C_Y(B) = 1$. If $|B|$ is a prime, then Y is nilpotent. It follows that $C_H(B') = 1$ as $C_H(C_1) = 1$, and now the Corollary gives that $f(H) \leq 2$ which is not the case. Thus $|\pi(B)| = 2$. Let $|B| = pq$ and let \bar{C}_i/D_i denote the Frattini factor group of C_i/D_i . Observe that $D_2 = 1$ and that C_4/D_4 is elementary abelian. Also note that $C_H(\alpha_r)$ is

nilpotent because $C_1 C_H(\alpha_r)$, as a group on which $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely, is of Fitting height at most 2.

We shall frequently use [13, Theorem 3.1], which implies the following:

Let A be a group of prime order acting on a group G with $(|G|, |A|) = 1$. Let (C_i) ($i = 1, \dots, h$) be an A -tower and assume that A centralizes C_k (possibly with $k = h + 1$ and $C_{h+1} = 1$). Then for some $j \leq k$ the tower

$$(C_i(A)) \quad (i = 1, \dots, j - 1, j + 1, \dots, h)$$

satisfies $[C_s(A), C_t(A)] \neq 1$ for $s \neq t$. If $|C_k|$ is odd, we may take $j < k$.

We call $(C_i(A))$ ($i = 1, \dots, j - 1, j + 1, \dots, h$) a possible A -tower inside $C_G(A)$.

(1) p and q divide $|H|$.

Suppose that p divides $|H|$ but q does not. Then [13, Theorem 3.1] shows that the only possible tower inside $C_G(\alpha_q)$ is $C_{C_1}(\alpha_q)C_{C_2}(\alpha_q)C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)$ and $\pi(C_2) = \pi(C_4)$ as $f(C_G(\alpha_q)) \leq 2$, by the Corollary.

First assume that $\pi(C_2) = \pi(C_4) = \{p\}$. Here we have $D_4 = C_{C_4}(C_2)$ and $[C_4, \alpha_p] \leq D_4$. If $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_p) \neq 1$, then α_p acts trivially on $C_2(C_3/D_3)(C_4/D_4)$ and so $\alpha_q \alpha_r$ acts fixed-point freely on it, and this is impossible by the Corollary. Hence $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_p) = 1$. Also observe that $[C_4, \alpha_q] \leq D_4$; otherwise $C_{C_4}(\alpha_q) \leq D_4 = C_{C_4}(C_2)$ and this is not the case as $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_q), C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)] \neq 1$. We may assume that $[C_4, \alpha_q] = 1$ as $\pi(C_4) \neq \{q\}$ which implies that $C_{C_4}(\alpha_r) = 1$. If $\pi(C_3) \neq \{r\}$, then G is an r' -group and applying [13, Theorem 3.1] we see that the only possible tower inside $C_G(\alpha_r)$ is $C_{C_1}(\alpha_r)C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)C_{C_4}(\alpha_r)$. Consequently $C_{C_4}(\alpha_r) \neq 1$ which is not the case. Thus $\pi(C_3) = \{r\}$. If $r = 2$ then, as α_r acts fixed-point freely on $C_{C_2}(\alpha_q)C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)$, we must have $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_q), C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)] = 1$ and this is not the case. Hence $r \neq 2$. Now an application of Lemma 2 to $\overline{C_2}(C_3/D_3)C_4\langle\alpha_r\rangle$ gives that

$$[C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r), C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r)] \neq 1.$$

If $[C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r), [C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r), \alpha_q]] \neq 1$, then $r = 2$ by Lemma 1, which is not the case. Hence

$$[C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r), C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r, \alpha_q)] \neq 1 \quad \text{as} \quad C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = [C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r), \alpha_q]C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r, \alpha_q).$$

Now $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r, \alpha_q) = C_{X/D_3}(\alpha_q) = C_X(\alpha_q)D_3/D_3$ where $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = X/D_3$. So

$$[C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r), C_X(\alpha_q)] \neq 1.$$

Note that X normalizes $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$ by the three subgroup lemma as $[\alpha_r, C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), X] = 1$ and $[X, \alpha_r, C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)] \leq [D_3, C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)] = 1$. But then $C_1 C_{C_2}(\alpha_r) C_X(\alpha_q)$ is a group of Fitting height 3 on which $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely, a contradiction by the Corollary. Thus $\{s\} = \pi(C_2) = \pi(C_4) \neq \{p\}$ and $\pi(C_3) = \{p\}$. Now $C_{C_4}(\alpha_p \alpha_q) \neq 1$, because otherwise α_p acts fixed-point freely on $C_{C_1}(\alpha_q)C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)$ which is impossible as $[C_{C_1}(\alpha_q), C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)] \neq 1$. Then $s \neq r$ and $[C_4, \alpha_r] \neq 1$.

It follows that G is an r' -group [13, Theorem 3.1] shows that $(C_G(\alpha_r), \alpha_r)$, that is, $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), C_{C_4}(\alpha_r)] \neq 1$. (2) r divides $|H|$.

Assume the contrary. Then a tower inside $C_G(\alpha_r)$ implies $f(C_G(\alpha_r)) \leq 2$ by the Corollary and $\pi(C_3) = \{q\}$.

If $[C_4, \alpha_r] \not\leq D_4$, we get C_C may assume that $[C_4, \alpha_r] = 1$ since $C_{C_2 C_4}(\alpha_q \alpha_r) = 1$ and C_C otherwise $[C_3, \alpha_r] = 1$ as $\pi(C_3)$ which is impossible by the Corollary. On the other hand Lemma 2

If C_3/D_3 is abelian, then $\overline{C_2}(C_3/D_3)(C_4/D_4)$ which is non-abelian. Let W be a h -module stabilizer of any other homomorphism $N \neq \langle\alpha\rangle$, because otherwise

As $C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r) \neq 1 \neq C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_q)$, properly contained in N , as the first case $C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_q) = 1$ and by our observations above. Applying that

$$C_{C_3/D_3}$$

It follows that $[C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r), \Phi(C_{C_3/D_3})] \neq 1$

$$1 \neq$$

a contradiction.

(3) $\pi(C_2) \subset \{p, q\}$.

Now H is a $\{p, q, r\}$ -group which $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely on $C_1 C_2$ $[C_2, C_{C_3}(\alpha_r)] = 1$ by the Corollary. If $\pi(C_4) \neq \{r\}$, we may assume α_r acts fixed-point freely on $C_1 C_2$

(4) $\pi(C_3) \subset \{p, q\}$.

Assume that $\pi(C_2) = \{p, q\}$. If $[C_4, \alpha_r] = 1$, then $C_{C_4}(\alpha_p) = 1$ and $C_{C_1}(\alpha_p)C_{C_3}(\alpha_p)$ is the centralizer of α_p in $C_G(\alpha_p)$.

$\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely, is of

h implies the following:

group G with $(|G|, |A|) = 1$. Let t A centralizes C_k (possibly with tower

$i + 1, \dots, h$)

ld, we may take $j < k$.

t possible A -tower inside $C_G(A)$.

en [13, Theorem 3.1] shows that $\alpha_q C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)$ and $\pi(C_2) = \pi(C_4)$ as

we have $D_4 = C_{C_4}(C_2)$ and ly on $C_2(C_3/D_3)(C_4/D_4)$ and so possible by the Corollary. Hence erwise $C_{C_4}(\alpha_q) \leq D_4 = C_{C_4}(C_2)$

We may assume that $[C_4, \alpha_q] = 1$ $\pi(C_3) \neq \{r\}$, then G is an r' - the only possible tower inside $(\alpha_r) \neq 1$ which is not the case. nt freely on $C_{C_2}(\alpha_q)C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)$, we he case. Hence $r \neq 2$. Now an hat

1.

1, which is not the case. Hence

$C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r, \alpha_q)C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r \alpha_q)$.

e $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = X/D_3$. So

lemma as $[\alpha_r, C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), X] = 1$ $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)C_X(\alpha_q)$ is a group of , a contradiction by the Cor- $\{p\}$. Now $C_{C_4}(\alpha_p \alpha_q) \neq 1$, be- $C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)$ which is impossible as

It follows that G is an r' -group and $C_{C_4}(\alpha_r) \leq D_4 = C_{C_4}(C_2)$. But an application of [13, Theorem 3.1] shows that $C_{C_1}(\alpha_r)C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)C_{C_4}(\alpha_r)$ is the only possible tower inside $C_G(\alpha_r)$, that is, $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), C_{C_4}(\alpha_r)] \neq 1$, a contradiction.

(2) r divides $|H|$.

Assume the contrary. Then as in the above argument, $C_{C_1}(\alpha_r)C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)C_{C_4}(\alpha_r)$ is a tower inside $C_G(\alpha_r)$ implying that $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), C_{C_4}(\alpha_r)] \neq 1$ and $\pi(C_2) = \pi(C_4)$ as $f(C_G(\alpha_r)) \leq 2$ by the Corollary. Now H is a $\{p, q\}$ -group; let $\pi(C_2) = \pi(C_4) = \{p\}$ and $\pi(C_3) = \{q\}$.

If $[C_4, \alpha_r] \not\leq D_4$, we get $C_{C_4}(\alpha_r) \leq C_{C_4}(C_2) = D_4$ which is not the case. Thus we may assume that $[C_4, \alpha_r] = 1$ as $\pi(C_4) \neq \{r\}$ and so $C_{C_4}(\alpha_q) = 1$. We have $q \neq 2$, since $C_{C_2 C_4}(\alpha_q \alpha_r) = 1$ and $C_{C_2 C_4}(\alpha_r)$ is non-abelian. Moreover $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = 1$, since otherwise $[C_3, \alpha_r] = 1$ as $\pi(C_3) \neq \{r\}$ and so $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely on $C_1 C_3 C_4$, which is impossible by the Corollary. Then by Lemma 1 we have $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r) \neq 1$ as $q \neq 2$. On the other hand Lemma 2 applied to $C_{C_2}(C_3/D_3)C_4 \langle \alpha_q \rangle$ gives that $C_{C_2}(\alpha_q) \neq 1$.

If C_3/D_3 is abelian, then $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = 1$ and so $\alpha_q \alpha_r$ acts fixed-point freely on $C_{C_2}(C_3/D_3)(C_4/D_4)$ which is not the case by the Corollary. Therefore C_3/D_3 is non-abelian. Let W be a homogeneous $\Phi(C_3/D_3)$ -component of the irreducible $(C_3/D_3)(C_4/D_4) \langle \alpha \rangle$ -module C_{C_2} . Set $N = N_{\langle \alpha \rangle}(W)$. Note that N coincides with the stabilizer of any other homogeneous component and $C_{C_2}(N) = 1$ and $N \neq 1$. Also $N \neq \langle \alpha \rangle$, because otherwise $1 \neq \Phi(C_3/D_3) \leq C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha)$, a contradiction.

As $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r) \neq 1 \neq C_{C_2}(\alpha_q)$, either $N = \langle \alpha_q \alpha_r \rangle$ or $\alpha_p \in N$. If $\alpha_p \in N$, then $\langle \alpha_p \rangle$ is properly contained in N , as $\pi(C_2) = \{p\}$, i.e. either $N = \langle \alpha_p \alpha_q \rangle$ or $N = \langle \alpha_p \alpha_r \rangle$. In the first case $C_{C_2}(\alpha_q) = 1$ and in the latter case $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r) = 1$; and both are impossible by our observations above. Therefore $N = \langle \alpha_q \alpha_r \rangle$ and so $[\Phi(C_3/D_3), \alpha_q \alpha_r] = 1$, implying that

$$C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = \Phi(C_3/D_3) = C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_q \alpha_r).$$

It follows that $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), \Phi(C_3/D_3)] = 1$ as $C_H(\alpha_r)$ is nilpotent. Thus

$$1 \neq C_{C_2}(\alpha_r) \leq C_{C_2}(\Phi(C_3/D_3)) = 1,$$

a contradiction.

(3) $\pi(C_2) \subset \{p, q\}$.

Now H is a $\{p, q, r\}$ -group. If $\pi(C_2) = \{r\}$, then $C_1 C_2 C_3(\alpha_r)$ is a group on which $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely. It follows that $[C_2, C_{C_3}(\alpha_r), C_1] = 1$ and so $[C_2, C_{C_3}(\alpha_r)] = 1$ by the Corollary, that is, $C_{C_3}(\alpha_r) \leq D_3$. Thus $[C_4, \alpha_r] \leq D_4$. As $\pi(C_4) \neq \{r\}$, we may assume that $[C_4, \alpha_r] = 1$. Then $C_{C_4}(\alpha_p \alpha_q) = 1$ and so $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely on $C_1 C_2 C_4$ which is impossible by the Corollary.

(4) $\pi(C_3) \subset \{p, q\}$.

Assume that $\pi(C_2) = \{p\}$, $\pi(C_3) = \{r\}$ and $\pi(C_4) = \{q\}$. Then $[C_4, \alpha_q] \leq D_4$. If $[C_4, \alpha_r] = 1$, then $C_{C_4}(\alpha_p) = 1$ and [12, Theorem 3.1] applied to $C_3 C_4 \langle \alpha_p \rangle$ on C_1 gives that $C_{C_1}(\alpha_p)C_{C_3}(\alpha_p)$ is the only tower inside $C_{C_1 C_3 C_4}(\alpha_p)$, that is, $[C_{C_1}(\alpha_p), C_{C_3}(\alpha_p)] \neq 1$.

This contradicts the fact that $C_{C_1 C_3}(\alpha_p \alpha_q) = 1$ as $\pi(C_3) = \{r\}$. Therefore $[C_4, \alpha_r] \neq 1$ which implies that $[C_4, \alpha_r] = C_4$, i.e. $C_{C_4/D_4}(\alpha_r) = 1$.

Now Lemma 2 applied to $\overline{C_2}(C_3/D_3)C_4 \langle \alpha_r \rangle$ shows that $[C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r), C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r)] \neq 1$. It follows that $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), X] \neq 1$ where $X/D_3 = C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r)$. We observe that $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$ is normalized by X and $C_1 C_2(\alpha_r)X$ is a group of Fitting height 3. But this is not the case by the Corollary since $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely on it.

(5) The final contradiction.

By (3) and (4), we see that $\pi(C_4) = \{r\}$. Let $\pi(C_2) = \{p\}$ and $\pi(C_3) = \{q\}$. If $[C_4, \alpha_q] \leq D_4$, we may assume that $[C_4, \alpha_q] = 1$ as $\pi(C_4) \neq \{q\}$. It follows that $C_{C_4}(\alpha_p) = 1$ and $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_q] = 1$ and so $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_q] = 1$ by the three subgroup lemma as $\pi(C_3) = \{q\}$. Then $C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_q) = 1$ because otherwise $[\overline{C_2}(C_3/D_3)C_4, \alpha_q] = 1$ and so $\langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_r \rangle$ acts fixed-point freely on $\overline{C_2}(C_3/D_3)C_4$ which is impossible by the Corollary.

Now $C_1 C_2 C_4$ is an $(\langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle)$ -tower, where $[C_2, \alpha_q] = C_2$ and $[C_4, \alpha_p] = C_4$. We choose an irreducible $(\langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle)$ -tower $E_1 E_2 E_4$ where $[E_2, \alpha_q] = E_2$ and $[E_4, \alpha_p] = E_4$ inside this tower and apply Lemma 3. It follows that

$$[C_{C_1}(\alpha_q), C_{C_4}(\alpha_q)] \neq 1,$$

which is impossible as α_p acts fixed-point freely on $C_{C_1 C_4}(\alpha_q)$. Thus $[C_4, \alpha_q] = C_4$.

Also observe that $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_p] \neq 1$, because otherwise $\overline{C_2}(C_3/D_3)C_4$ is centralized by α_p , which is impossible by the Corollary.

If $[C_{C_4}(\alpha_p), [C_3, \alpha_p]] \neq 1$, we consider $C_1[C_3, \alpha_p]C_{C_4}(\alpha_p)$ as an $(\langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle)$ -tower and pass to an irreducible tower $E_1 E_3 E_4$ where $[E_4, \alpha_q] = E_4$, $[E_3, \alpha_p] = E_3$. Now $[E_4, \alpha_p] = 1$ and $C_{E_1 E_4}(\alpha_p \alpha_q) = 1$. But an application of Lemma 3 gives that $[C_{E_1}(\alpha_p), C_{E_4}(\alpha_p)] \neq 1$, a contradiction. Hence $[C_{C_4}(\alpha_p), [C_3, \alpha_p]] = 1$.

On the other hand, if $[C_{C_4}(\alpha_p), C_{C_3}(\alpha_p)] \not\leq D_3$, then $\overline{C_2}C_3(C_4)C_{C_4}(\alpha_p)$ is a group of Fitting height 3 on which $\alpha_q \alpha_r$ acts fixed-point freely. This contradicts the Corollary. Therefore $[C_{C_4}(\alpha_p), C_3/D_3] = 1$, that is, $C_{C_4}(\alpha_p) \leq D_4$.

We also observe that $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_r] = C_3/D_3$, because otherwise α_r centralizes $\overline{C_3/D_3}$ as it centralizes C_4/D_4 , and so α_p acts fixed-point freely on $(\overline{C_3/D_3})(C_4/D_4)$, which is impossible.

Next assume that C_3/D_3 is non-abelian and consider the Wedderburn decomposition of $\overline{C_2}$ with respect to $(C_3/D_3)C_4$. Now $\alpha_r \notin N = N_{\langle \alpha \rangle}(W)$ for any homogeneous component W , because otherwise $[\Phi(C_3/D_3), \alpha_r] = 1$ as C_3/D_3 acts faithfully on $\overline{C_2}$. Then

$$C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_r) \leq C_{\overline{C_2}}(\Phi(C_3/D_3)) = 1,$$

because $C_H(\alpha_r)$ is nilpotent as $f(C_1 C_H(\alpha_r)) \leq 2$ by the Corollary and $C_H(C_1) = 1$. It follows that α_r acts fixed-point freely on $\overline{C_2}C_3(\alpha_p)$ and so $C_{C_3}(\alpha_p) \leq D_3$. But then α_p acts fixed-point freely on $(C_3/D_3)(C_4/D_4)$, which is impossible.

This shows that $\alpha_r \notin N$. Also $N \neq \langle \alpha_p \rangle$ since $C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_p) \neq 1$. Therefore either $N = \langle \alpha_q \rangle$ or $N = \langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle$, each of which implies that $C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_q) = 1$. But

$$[C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_q), \dots]$$

and hence $C_{\overline{C_2}}(\alpha_q) \neq 1$ by Lemma as $C_{C_4/D_4}(\alpha_q) = 1$. This contradicts $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = 1$. Set $X/C_{C_4}(\overline{C_2}) =$ subgroup of C_4 such that

$$C_{C_4}(\alpha_r) \leq X \not\leq C$$

We also observe that $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$ is on $C_1 C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)X$, its Fitting height is $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$.

If $C_1 C_2 C_3 X < G$, then $f(C_1 C_2 C_3 X) \leq D_4$. Then X stabilizes every observe that $[W, C_3/D_3] = W$ follows that there is no α_r -invariant $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_r] = C_3/D_3$ must act triv

$$Y =$$

where W is a homogeneous group X acts trivially on

$$C_Y(\alpha_r) =$$

and hence on W , as $[X, \alpha_r] \leq C$ case. It follows that $C_1 C_2 C_3 X =$

Next observe that $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_q (C_3/D_3)C_4(\langle \alpha_q \rangle \times \langle \alpha_r \rangle)$ -subm. Now $[V, C_3/D_3] = V$ and we are homogeneous C_3/D_3 -comp $[W_i, C_3/D_3] = W_i$ for each i an

$$Y_i :$$

for each i . Thus $V = Y_1 \oplus \dots$

$$C_{Y_i}(\alpha_r) =$$

is centralized by C_4 , we have $Y_i = Y_i^x$ for all $x \in C_4$. Let Ω element of Ω . Hence

and so t is either 1 or q .

$C_3) = \{r\}$. Therefore $[C_4, \alpha_r] \neq 1$

$$[C_{\bar{C}_2}(\alpha_q), C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_q)] \neq 1$$

such that $[C_{\bar{C}_2}(\alpha_r), C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r)] \neq 1$. We observe that $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$ is of height 3. But this is not the case on it.

and hence $C_{\bar{C}_2}(\alpha_q) \neq 1$ by Lemma 2 applied to $(C_3/D_3)C_4(\langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle)$ on \bar{C}_2 as $C_{C_4/D_4}(\alpha_q) = 1$. This contradiction shows that C_3/D_3 is abelian. In this case $C_{C_3/D_3}(\alpha_r) = 1$. Set $X/C_{C_4}(\bar{C}_2) = C_{C_4/C_{C_4}(\bar{C}_2)}(\alpha_r)$. Obviously X is an $\langle \alpha \rangle$ -invariant subgroup of C_4 such that

$$C_{C_4}(\alpha_r) \leq X \leq C_{C_4}(\bar{C}_2) \quad \text{and} \quad [X, \alpha_r] \leq C_{C_4}(\bar{C}_2).$$

$C_2) = \{p\}$ and $\pi(C_3) = \{q\}$. If $\pi(C_4) \neq \{q\}$. It follows that C_4 is not centralized by the three subgroup lemma and so $[C_2(C_3/D_3)C_4, \alpha_q] = 1$ and so which is impossible by the Cor-

We also observe that $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$ is normalized by X . Since $\alpha_p \alpha_q$ acts fixed-point freely on $C_1 C_2(\alpha_r)X$, its Fitting height is at most 2 by the Corollary. Therefore X centralizes $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$.

$C_2, \alpha_q] = C_2$ and $[C_4, \alpha_p] = C_4$. $E_2 E_4$ where $[E_2, \alpha_q] = E_2$ and it follows that

If $C_1 C_2 C_3 X < G$, then $f(C_1 C_2 C_3 X) \leq 3$ by induction and so $[C_3, X] \leq D_3$, that is, $X \leq D_4$. Then X stabilizes every homogeneous C_3/D_3 component of \bar{C}_2 . We also observe that $[W, C_3/D_3] = W$ for any such component W as $[\bar{C}_2, C_3/D_3] = \bar{C}_2$. It follows that there is no α_r -invariant homogeneous C_3/D_3 -component of \bar{C}_2 because $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_r] = C_3/D_3$ must act trivially on any such component. Now put

$$Y = W \oplus W^{\alpha_r} \oplus \dots \oplus W^{\alpha_r^{-1}}$$

$C_4(\alpha_q)$. Thus $[C_4, \alpha_q] = C_4$. Since $C_2(C_3/D_3)C_4$ is centralized

where W is a homogeneous C_3/D_3 -component of \bar{C}_2 . Since $[C_{C_2}(\alpha_r), X] = 1$, the group X acts trivially on

$$C_Y(\alpha_r) = \{w + w^{\alpha_r} + \dots + w^{\alpha_r^{-1}} \mid w \in W\}$$

$C_4(\alpha_p)$ as an $(\langle \alpha_p \rangle \times \langle \alpha_q \rangle)$ -module. Let $[E_4, \alpha_q] = E_4$, $[E_3, \alpha_p] = E_3$. The application of Lemma 3 gives that $[C_3, \alpha_p] = 1$.

and hence on W , as $[X, \alpha_r] \leq C_{C_4}(\bar{C}_2)$. Thus X acts trivially on \bar{C}_2 , which is not the case. It follows that $C_1 C_2 C_3 X = G$, that is, $X = C_4$. Now C_4 centralizes $C_{C_2}(\alpha_r)$.

$C_2 C_3(\alpha_p) C_{C_4}(\alpha_p)$ is a group of order $p^2 q^2$. This contradicts the Corollary.

Next observe that $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_q] \neq 1$ since $[C_4, \alpha_q] = C_4$ and let V be an irreducible $(C_3/D_3)C_4(\langle \alpha_q \rangle \times \langle \alpha_r \rangle)$ -submodule of \bar{C}_2 on which $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_q]$ acts non-trivially. Now $[V, C_3/D_3] = V$ and we have $V|_{C_3/D_3} = W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_s$ where the modules W_i are homogeneous C_3/D_3 -components of V . We see that no W_i is α_r -invariant, since $[W_i, C_3/D_3] = W_i$ for each i and $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_r] = C_3/D_3$. Put

otherwise α_r centralizes \bar{C}_3/D_3 on $(\bar{C}_3/D_3)(C_4/D_4)$, which is

$$Y_i = W_i \oplus W_i^{\alpha_r} \oplus \dots \oplus W_i^{\alpha_r^{-1}}$$

the Wedderburn decomposition of $(\langle \alpha \rangle)(W)$ for any homogeneous C_3/D_3 acts faithfully on \bar{C}_2 .

for each i . Thus $V = Y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Y_t$. Since

$$C_{Y_i}(\alpha_r) = \{w + w^{\alpha_r} + \dots + w^{\alpha_r^{-1}} \mid w \in W_i\}$$

1,

is centralized by C_4 , we have $C_{Y_i}(\alpha_r) \leq Y_i \cap Y_i^x$ for all $x \in C_4$. This gives that $Y_i = Y_i^x$ for all $x \in C_4$. Let $\Omega = \{Y_1, \dots, Y_t\}$. We observed that $C_4 \langle \alpha_r \rangle$ fixes every element of Ω . Hence

Corollary and $C_H(C_1) = 1$. It follows that $C_{C_3}(\alpha_p) \leq D_3$. But then α_p is not centralized by D_3 .

$$t = |\Omega| = |\langle \alpha_q \rangle : N_{\langle \alpha_q \rangle}(\Omega)|$$

$C_2(\alpha_p) \neq 1$. Therefore either $C_{C_2}(\alpha_p) = 1$. But

and so t is either 1 or q .

If $t = 1$, then $V = Y_1$ and so $s = r$; thus α_q stabilizes each W_i . It follows that $[C_3/D_3, \alpha_q]$ acts trivially on each W_i and hence on V , which is not the case. Thus $t = q$, so that no W_i is α_q -invariant. Then

$$C_V(\alpha_q \alpha_r) = \{u + u^{\alpha_q} + \cdots + u^{\alpha_q^{q-1}} \mid u \in C_{Y_1}(\alpha_r)\} \neq 1,$$

a contradiction which completes the proof.

References

- [1] S. D. Bell and B. Hartley. A note on fixed-point-free actions of finite groups. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)* **41** (1990), 127–130.
- [2] T. R. Berger. Nilpotent fixed point free automorphism groups of solvable groups. *Math. Z.* **131** (1973), 305–312.
- [3] A. Espuelas. The Fitting length of the Hughes subgroup. *J. Algebra* **105** (1987), 365–371.
- [4] A. Espuelas. A noncoprime Shult type theorem. *Math. Z.* **196** (1987), 323–329.
- [5] S. Gagola Jr. Solvable groups admitting an “almost fixed point free” automorphism of prime order. *Illinois J. Math.* **22** (1978), 191–207.
- [6] B. Hartley and V. Turau. Finite soluble groups admitting an automorphism of prime power order with few fixed points. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **102** (1987), 431–441.
- [7] B. Huppert and N. Blackburn. *Finite groups*, vol. 2 (Springer-Verlag, 1981).
- [8] I. M. Isaacs. Fixed points and characters in groups with non-coprime operator groups. *Canad. J. Math.* **20** (1968), 1315–1320.
- [9] C. Kei-Nah. Finite groups admitting automorphisms of order pq . (Groups–St Andrews 1985.) *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2)* **30** (1987), 51–56.
- [10] K. Doerk and T. O. Hawkes. *Finite soluble groups* (de Gruyter, 1992).
- [11] T. Meixner. The Fitting length of solvable H_{p^n} -groups. *Israel J. Math.* **51** (1985), 68–78.
- [12] A. Turull. Supersolvable automorphism groups of solvable groups. *Math. Z.* **183** (1983), 47–73.
- [13] A. Turull. Fitting height of groups and of fixed points. *J. Algebra* **86** (1984), 555–566.
- [14] A. Turull. Fixed point free action with regular orbits. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **371** (1986), 67–91.

Received 18 June, 2003; revised 22 October, 2003

G. Ercan, Middle East Technical University, Department of Mathematics, 06531 Ankara, Turkey
E-mail: ercan@metu.edu.tr

İ. Ş. Güloğlu, Tubitak-UEKAE Pk. 74, 41470 Gebze-Kocaeli, Turkey