(a) We prove the claim directly. Suppose that G/Z(G) is indeed cyclic, then  $\exists /, a \in G$  such that aZ(G) generates the entire quotient group. We know that cosets partition the group, and in particular if  $g, h \in G$ , then  $\exists g_Z, h_Z \in Z(G)$  and  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that

$$g = a^n g_Z \qquad \& \qquad h = a^m h_Z \,.$$

Then, using the fact that  $g_Z$  and  $h_Z$  are in the centre,

$$gh = (a^n g_Z)(a^m h_Z) = a^n a^m g_Z h_Z = a^m a^n h_Z g_Z = (a^m h_Z)(a^n g_Z) = hg$$

and so we see that G is abelian.

(b) We first use Lagrange's theorem, since we know Z(G) is a normal subgroup of G, then we know that |Z(G)| divides |G|. So, we get that |Z(G)| = 1, p or  $p_2$ . Well, if  $|Z(G)| = p^2$ , then G = Z(G) and G is abelian.

Next, we suppose |Z(G)| = 1. By the class equation, we have that

$$|G| = |Z(G)| + \sum |G: C_G(a_i)|$$

and since  $p \nmid |Z(G)|$ , we see that  $p \nmid |G:C_G(a_i)|$ . However, since the centre is trivial, we know that  $a_i \notin Z(G)$  and the groups  $C_G(a_i)$  are proper subgroups of G, and hence  $p \mid |G:C_G(a_i)|$ , which is a contradiction. Thus, the centre is non-trival.

Next we assume |Z(G)| = p. Then, |G|/|Z(G)| = |G| : Z(G)| = p and we recall that groups of prime order are cyclic, and hence from the above proof we know that G is abelian.

Thus, we have shown what is required.

We first factor 132 into it's primes to get  $2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 11$ . Looking at  $n_{11}$ , we see that

$$n_{11} = 1 \pmod{11}$$
 &  $n_{11}|12$ 

so we require that  $n_{11} = 1$  or 12. If  $n_{11} = 1$  then we have a normal subgroup so we assume  $n_{11} = 12$ . Next, we look at  $n_3$ ,

$$n_3 = 1 \pmod{3}$$
 &  $n_3 | 44 = 2^2 \cdot 11$ .

We have way more choices than we did with our Sylow 11-group, so we reduce this by counting the number of elements that are actually left after having 12 Sylow 11-subgroups. We see that  $132 - (12 \times 10) = 12$ , so we must have that  $n_3 = 1, 4$ . However, if  $n_3 = 4$ , then there are no Sylow 2-subgroups, which is a contradiction with Sylows first theorem, and hence  $n_3 = 1$  and we see that we have no simple groups of order 132.

(a) We prove this by looking at the action of left multiplication to cosets of H in G. In particular, since |G:H|=n>1, we know that  $\{a_1H,a_2H,\ldots,a_nH\}$  forms the set of left cosets, where  $a_0=e$ . Suppose  $g\in G$ , then the action will be  $g\cdot a_iH=ga_iH=a_jH$ , which we can define as a map, call it  $f_g$ . Notice that this action of left multiplication only permutes the representatives. So, define a map  $f:G\to S_n$  with  $f(g)=f_g$ , and thus elements of G are sent to their action on the left cosets of H, which is exactly a subset of  $S_n$ . Now we need to convince ourselves this is injection and homomorphism. Well, notice that the homomorphism property holds quite naturally, as if  $g,h\in G$ , then

$$f(gh)(a_i) = f_{gh}(a_i) = (gh)(a_i) = g(ha_i) = g(f_h(a_i)) = f_g(f_h(a_i)) = f(g) \circ f(h)(a_i)$$

and  $f(e)(a_i) = f_e(a_i) = e(a_i) = a_i$ . To see injection, we need to show that distinct elements map uniquely. Suppose f(g) = f(h), then

$$f(g)(a_i) = f_g(a_i) = ga_i$$
 &  $f(h)(a_i) = f_h(a_i) = ha_i$   
 $f(g) = f(h) \implies ga_i = ha_i \implies g = h$ 

and so we have injection.

Thus there is indeed an injective homomorphism from G to a subgroup of  $S_n$  (where we know it is a subgroup since it is a homomorphism).

- (b) Since G is not simple, we can assume no proper normal subgroups and hence we have that  $n_p > 1$ . Furthermore, we see that  $|G:N_G(P)| = n_p$ , where we note that the normalizer forms a subgroup. This means we can apply the previous proof! Thus, we have an injective map  $\varphi: G \to S_{n_p}$ , and in particular,  $\varphi(G) \leq S_{n_p}$ , so |G| divides  $|S_{n_p}| = n_p!$  by Lagrange's Theorem.
- (c) We start by factoring, in particular we see that  $|G| = 48 = 2^4 \cdot 3$ . We first note that

$$n_3 = 1 \pmod{3}$$
 &  $n_3 \mid 16$ .

So, we have that  $n_3 \in \{1, 4, 16\}$ . We assume  $n_3 \neq 1$ , since then we would have that G has a normal subgroup and hence not simple. Suppose instead that  $n_3 = 4$ , but by the contrapositive of the previous proof, we see that then |G| = 48 does not divide 4!, and since 3 | |G|, and  $|G| \neq 3$ , we see that G would not be simple. Then, we only have  $n_3 = 16$  left, which by counting tells us that we have  $48 - (16 \cdot 2) = 16$  elements left. Well, we know that then  $n_2 = 1$  since there is only enough room for one Sylow 2-subgroup, but then G has a normal subgroup and is not simple. Thus, we have no simple subgroups of order 48.

We prove this statement by induction on the group order. First, notice that |G| = 2 gives us the trivial Sylow 2-subgroup of itself and the statement is trivially true. Thus, suppose  $|G| = p^n m > 2$  where  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $p \nmid m$ , and we assume the result for all groups of smaller order. We consider two cases:

Case 1 Suppose  $p \mid |Z(G)|$ . Then by Cauchy's Theorem we have that  $\exists a \in Z(G)$  such that |a| = p, and  $\langle a \rangle \leq Z(G)$ , and thus  $\langle a \rangle$  is normal in G. Then, we can consider the subgroup  $G/\langle a \rangle$ , which has order less than G, and hence by induction the result holds and we have a Sylow p-subgroup and subgroups of all orders of p less than the Sylow p-subgroup. We can order these subgroups by their order in p and call them

$$\{\bar{H}_1, \bar{H}_2, \dots, \bar{H}_{n-1}\}.$$

We notice that if n = 1, then we only have  $\langle a \rangle$  as our subgroup and that gives us our result, so we suppose n > 1. Then, we see the order of our subgroups is given by  $\{p, p^2, \ldots, p^{n-1}\}$  respectively. Then, by the correspondance theorem, we have that

$$\bar{H}_i = H_i / < a > 1 \le i \le n - 1$$

where  $H \leq G$ , and buy looking at orders

$$p^i = \frac{|H_i|}{p} \implies |H| = p^{i+1}$$
.

So, we see that G has subgroups of orders  $p^k$  for  $k \in \{1, ..., p\}$ .

Case 2 Suppose  $p \nmid |Z(G)|$ . Then by the class equation, we see that

$$p^{n}m = |Z(G)| + \sum |G: C_{G}(a_{i})|$$

and thus  $\exists a_i$  such that  $p \nmid |G: C_G(a_i)| \implies p^n ||C_G(a_i)|$ . We know that  $C_G(a_i) \neq G$  since  $a_i \notin Z(G)$ , so  $|C_G(a_i)| < |G|$ , and by induction  $C(a_i)$  has a Sylow p-subgroup and subgroups of order  $p^k$  for  $k = 1, \ldots, n$ .

Thus, we have that G has subgroups of order  $p^k$  for k = 1, ..., n given that  $|G| = p^n m$ .

We prove this statement by contradiction. Suppose that  $\exists Q \leq G$  a p-subgroup such that it is not contained in any of the Sylow p-subgroups. In particular, suppose P is a Sylow p-subgroup of G and that G, and thus Q, acts on P by conjugation to produce  $K = \{gPg^{-1} : g \in G\}$ , where we order them to get  $K = \{P = P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_r\}$ . So, we have assumed  $Q \cap P_i = \{e\} \leq Q$ ,  $i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ . Then, by theorem,

$$|K| = \sum_{i=1}^{r} |Q: Q \cap P_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{r} |Q|/1 \implies p |K|.$$

But, we know from the third Sylow Theorem that  $n_p = |K| = 1 \pmod{p}$ , and hence this is a contradiction. So, we must have that  $Q \leq P_i$  for some  $P_i \in K$ .