

CONSEQUENCES OF THE SYLOW THEOREMS

KEITH CONRAD

For a group theorist, Sylow's Theorem is such a basic tool, and so fundamental, that it is used almost without thinking, like breathing.
Geoff Robinson

1. STATEMENT OF THE SYLOW THEOREMS

We recall here the statement of the Sylow theorems.

Theorem 1.1 (Sylow I). *A finite group G has a p -Sylow subgroup for every prime p and every p -subgroup of G lies in a p -Sylow subgroup of G .*

Theorem 1.2 (Sylow II). *For each prime p , the p -Sylow subgroups of G are conjugate.*

Theorem 1.3 (Sylow III). *Let n_p be the number of p -Sylow subgroups of G . Write $|G| = p^k m$, where p doesn't divide m . Then*

$$n_p \mid m \text{ and } n_p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

Theorem 1.4 (Sylow III*). *Let n_p be the number of p -Sylow subgroups of G . Then $n_p = [G : N(P)]$, where P is an arbitrary p -Sylow subgroup and $N(P)$ is its normalizer in G .*

We will first show how the conditions on n_p in the Sylow theorems let us compute n_p for several specific groups. Then we will see applications of the Sylow theorems to group structure: commutativity, normal subgroups, and classifying groups of order 105 and simple groups of order 60.

We will not have too much use for Sylow III* here.¹

2. APPLICATIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUPS

Theorem 2.1. *The groups A_5 and S_5 each have 10 subgroups of size 3 and 6 subgroups of size 5.*

Proof. An element of odd order in a symmetric group is an even permutation, so the 3-Sylow and 5-Sylow subgroups of S_5 lie in A_5 . Therefore it suffices to focus on A_5 .

Since $|A_5| = 60 = 2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$, the 3-Sylow subgroups have size 3 and the 5-Sylows have size 5. Call the numbers n_3 and n_5 . By Sylow III, $n_3 \mid 20$ and $n_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, so $n_3 = 1, 4$, or 10 . The number of 3-cycles (abc) in A_5 is 20, and these come in inverse pairs, giving us 10 subgroups of size 3. So $n_3 = 10$. Turning to the 5-Sylows, $n_5 \mid 12$ and $n_5 \equiv 1 \pmod{5}$, so n_5 is 1 or 6. Since A_5 has at least two subgroups of size 5 (the subgroups generated by (12345) and by (21345) are different), $n_5 > 1$ and therefore $n_5 = 6$. \square

Theorem 2.2. *In $\text{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(5))$, $n_2 = 5$ and $n_5 = 1$.*

¹It is used in Theorems 2.4 and 2.8, Corollary 8.5, and Theorem 9.4.

Proof. This group has size 20, so the 2-Sylows have size 4 and the 5-Sylows have size 5.

By Sylow III, $n_2 \mid 5$, so $n_2 = 1$ or 5. The matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ generate different 2-Sylow subgroups, so $n_2 = 5$.

Now we turn to the 5-Sylow subgroups. By Sylow III, $n_5 \mid 4$ and $n_5 \equiv 1 \pmod{5}$. The only choice is $n_5 = 1$. \square

Let's explore $\text{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(5))$ a little further. Since we know the number of 2-Sylow and 5-Sylow subgroups, we can search for all the Sylow subgroups and know when to stop. There are five 2-Sylow subgroups and the five matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & j \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, where $j \in \mathbf{Z}/(5)$, generate different subgroups of size 4, so these are all of the 2-Sylow subgroups (and they are cyclic). The matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ has order 5 and therefore generates the unique 5-Sylow subgroup.

As an illustration of Sylow II in $\text{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(5))$, each element of 2-power order is conjugate to an element of the subgroup $\langle \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \rangle$. For instance, $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ has order 4 and an explicit search reveals

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

The matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ has order 2 and

$$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^2 \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Remark 2.3. Here is a *misapplication* of the Sylow theorems. Suppose $|G| = 42 = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 7$. Using the third Sylow theorem, $n_2 \in \{1, 3, 7, 21\}$, $n_3 = 1$ or 7, and $n_7 = 1$. For prime p , different subgroups of order p intersect trivially and all $p - 1$ nontrivial elements in a subgroup of order p have order p , so there are $n_p(p - 1)$ elements of order p . Therefore G has 6 elements of order seven. Using the maximal possibilities for n_2 and n_3 , there are at most 21 elements of order two and at most 14 elements of order three. Adding to this count the single element of order one, we have counted at most $6 + 21 + 14 + 1 = 42$ elements, which is the size of G . Since we used the maximal possibilities for n_2 and n_3 , and got 42 elements, n_2 and n_3 can't be smaller than the maximal choices, so $n_2 = 21$ and $n_3 = 7$. This reasoning is false, since $\mathbf{Z}/(42)$ has $n_2 = n_3 = 1$ and $\text{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(7))$ has $n_2 = n_3 = 7$. The source of the error is that some elements may have an order *other than* 1, 2, 3, or 7.

Theorem 2.4. *For a prime p , each element of $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ with order p is conjugate to a strictly upper-triangular matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. The number of p -Sylow subgroups is $p + 1$.*

Proof. The size of $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ is $(p^2 - 1)(p^2 - p) = p(p - 1)(p^2 - 1)$. Therefore a p -Sylow subgroup has size p . The matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ has order p , so it generates a p -Sylow subgroup $P = \langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \rangle = \{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & * \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \}$. Since all p -Sylow subgroups are conjugate, a matrix with order p is conjugate to some power of $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

The number of p -Sylow subgroups is $[\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(p)) : N(P)]$ by Sylow III*. We'll compute $N(P)$ and then find its index. For $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ to lie in $N(P)$ means it conjugates $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ to some power $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & * \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Since

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - ac/\Delta & a^2/\Delta \\ -c^2/\Delta & 1 + ac/\Delta \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Delta = ad - bc \neq 0$, $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in N(P)$ precisely when $c = 0$. Therefore $N(P) = \{ \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix} \}$ in $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$. The size of $N(P)$ is $(p - 1)^2 p$. Since $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ has size $p(p - 1)(p^2 - 1)$, the index of $N(P)$ is $n_p = p + 1$. \square

Corollary 2.5. *The number of elements of order p in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ is $p^2 - 1$.*

Proof. Each p -Sylow subgroup has $p - 1$ elements of order p . Different p -Sylow subgroups intersect trivially, so the number of elements of order p is $(p - 1)n_p = p^2 - 1$. \square

Theorem 2.6. *There is a unique p -Sylow subgroup of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(p^2))$.*

Proof. The group has size $p^2\varphi(p^2) = p^3(p - 1)$, so a p -Sylow subgroup has order p^3 .

Letting n_p be the number of p -Sylow subgroups, Sylow III says $n_p \mid (p - 1)$ and $n_p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Therefore $n_p = 1$.

As an alternate proof, we can locate a p -Sylow subgroup of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(p^2))$ explicitly, namely the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $a^p = 1$ in $(\mathbf{Z}/(p^2))^\times$. (There are p choices for a and p^2 choices for b .) This subgroup is the kernel of the homomorphism $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(p^2)) \rightarrow (\mathbf{Z}/(p^2))^\times$ given by $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto a^p$, so it is a *normal* subgroup, and therefore is the unique p -Sylow subgroup by Sylow II. \square

Note the unique p -Sylow subgroup of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(p^2))$ is a nonabelian group of size p^3 . It has an element of order p^2 , namely $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and therefore is not isomorphic to $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ when $p \neq 2$, since every non-identity element of $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ has order p . (It can be shown for odd primes p that a nonabelian group of size p^3 is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ or to this p -Sylow subgroup of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{Z}/(p^2))$.²)

Can we characterize $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ as the unique p -Sylow subgroup of a larger group? Yes.

Theorem 2.7. *For prime p , $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ is the unique p -Sylow subgroup of the group of invertible upper-triangular matrices*

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & a & b \\ 0 & d_2 & c \\ 0 & 0 & d_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

in $\mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$.

Proof. This matrix group, call it U , has size $(p - 1)^3 p^3$, so $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$ is a p -Sylow subgroup of U . To show it is the only p -Sylow subgroup, the relations in Sylow III are *not* adequate. They tell us $n_p \mid (p - 1)^3$ and $n_p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, but it does not follow from this that n_p must be 1. For instance, $(p - 1)^2$ satisfies these two conditions in place of n_p .

To show $n_p = 1$, we will prove $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p)) \triangleleft U$. Projecting a matrix in U onto its 3 diagonal entries is a function from U to the 3-fold direct product $(\mathbf{Z}/(p))^\times \times (\mathbf{Z}/(p))^\times \times (\mathbf{Z}/(p))^\times$. This is a homomorphism with kernel $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p))$, so $\mathrm{Heis}(\mathbf{Z}/(p)) \triangleleft U$. \square

Theorem 2.8. *Let \mathbf{F} be a finite field and $q = |\mathbf{F}|$. For each prime p dividing $q - 1$, the number of p -Sylow subgroups of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{F})$ is q .*

Proof. The group $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{F})$ has size $q(q - 1)$ and contains $H = \{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} : a \in \mathbf{F}^\times \}$, which has size $q - 1$. Let p^r be the highest power of p dividing $q - 1$. Let P be the p -Sylow subgroup of H (it's unique since H is abelian). Then P is a p -Sylow subgroup of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{F})$ too and the number of p -Sylow subgroups of $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{F})$ is $[\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{F}) : N(P)]$ by Sylow III*, where $N(P)$ is the normalizer of P in $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbf{F})$.

²See <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/groupsp3.pdf>.

We will show $N(P) = H$. Since H is abelian, $P \triangleleft H$, so $H \subset N(P)$. To get the reverse inclusion, suppose $\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ is in $N(P)$. Pick a non-identity element of P , say $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} a & y(1-a) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. For this to be in P at least requires $y(1-a) = 0$, so $y = 0$ since $a \neq 1$. Thus $N(P) \subset H$.

The number of p -Sylow subgroups of $\text{Aff}(\mathbf{F})$ is $[\text{Aff}(\mathbf{F}) : H] = q(q-1)/q-1 = q$. \square

Remark 2.9. From the theory of finite fields, every finite field has prime-power size and for every prime power there is a field of that size. (Warning: a field of size 9 is not constructed as $\mathbf{Z}/(9)$, since that is not a field. Fields of non-prime size can't be constructed as quotient rings of \mathbf{Z} . Another method is needed.) Therefore Theorem 2.8 shows each prime power $\equiv 1 \pmod p$ is the number of p -Sylow subgroups of some finite group. For example, $81 \equiv 1 \pmod 5$ and there are 81 different 5-Sylow subgroups of $\text{Aff}(\mathbf{F}_{81})$, where \mathbf{F}_{81} is a field of size 81.

It is an interesting question to ask if the congruence condition $n \equiv 1 \pmod p$ from Sylow III is the only constraint on p -Sylow counts: for $n \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ with $n \equiv 1 \pmod p$ is there a finite group in which the number of p -Sylow subgroups is n ? The answer is affirmative when $n = 1$ using $\mathbf{Z}/(p)$, so we only consider $n > 1$. When $p = 2$ the answer is affirmative using dihedral groups: when $n > 1$ is odd a 2-Sylow subgroup of D_n has order 2 and the elements of order 2 are precisely the n reflections, so the number of 2-Sylow subgroups of D_n is n . If $p \neq 2$, there is an $n \equiv 1 \pmod p$ that does not arise as a p -Sylow count: there is no finite group G in which $n_3(G) = 22$ or $n_5(G) = 21$ or $n_p(G) = 1 + 3p$ for prime $p \geq 7$. This is proved in [2].

3. NORMAL SYLOW SUBGROUPS

Theorem 3.1. *The condition $n_p = 1$ means a p -Sylow subgroup is a normal subgroup.*

Proof. All p -Sylow subgroups are conjugate by Sylow II, so $n_p = 1$ precisely when a p -Sylow subgroup of G is self-conjugate, i.e., is a normal subgroup of G . \square

Be sure you understand that reasoning. We will often shift back and forth between the condition $n_p = 1$ (if it holds) and the condition that G has a normal p -Sylow subgroup.³ In particular, the Sylow theorems are a tool for proving a group has a normal subgroup besides the trivial subgroup and the whole group, because we can try to show $n_p = 1$ for some p .⁴ This is based on the following consequence of the Sylow theorems.

Theorem 3.2. *If p and q are different prime factors of $|G|$ and $n_p = 1$ and $n_q = 1$ then the elements of the p -Sylow subgroup commute with the elements of the q -Sylow subgroup.*

Proof. Let P be the p -Sylow subgroup and Q be the q -Sylow subgroup. Since P and Q have relatively prime sizes, $P \cap Q = \{e\}$ by Lagrange. The subgroups P and Q are normal in G by Theorem 3.1. For $x \in P$ and $y \in Q$,

$$xyx^{-1}y^{-1} = (xyx^{-1})y^{-1} = x(yx^{-1}y^{-1}) \in P \cap Q = \{e\},$$

³If a subgroup H of a finite group G has order relatively prime to its index $[G : H]$, then H is the unique subgroup of its size if and only if $H \triangleleft G$. In one direction, if H is the unique subgroup of its size then $gHg^{-1} = H$ for all $g \in G$, so $H \triangleleft G$. In the other direction, assume $N \triangleleft G$ and $(|N|, [G : N]) = 1$. If $|K| = |N|$ then the group homomorphism $K \rightarrow G \rightarrow G/N$ is trivial since $\gcd(|K|, |G/N|) = 1$, so $K \subset N$, and that implies $K = N$ by comparing sizes. A Sylow subgroup of G is a special type of subgroup with order relatively prime to its index in G .

⁴There are groups that have nontrivial normal subgroups but no nontrivial normal Sylow subgroups, such as S_4 . See Example 5.6.

so $xy = yx$. □

Note Theorem 3.2 is *not* saying the p -Sylow and q -Sylow subgroups of G are abelian, but rather that elements of either subgroup commutes with elements of the other subgroup if the two Sylow subgroups are the only subgroups of their size.

Theorem 3.3. *All the Sylow subgroups of a finite group are normal if and only if the group is isomorphic to the direct product of its Sylow subgroups.*

Proof. If a group is isomorphic to the direct product of its Sylow subgroups then its Sylow subgroups are normal since a group that is one of the factors in a direct product is a normal subgroup of the direct product. Conversely, suppose G is finite and its Sylow subgroups are all normal. Write the nontrivial Sylow subgroups as P_1, \dots, P_m . Elements in P_i and P_j commute with each other for $i \neq j$, by Theorem 3.2, so the map $P_1 \times \dots \times P_m \rightarrow G$ given by

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto x_1 \cdots x_m$$

is a homomorphism. It is injective since the order of a product of commuting elements with relatively prime orders is equal to the product of their orders. Our map is between two groups of equal size, so from injectivity we get surjectivity, so we have an isomorphism. □

4. COMMUTATIVITY PROPERTIES BASED ON $|G|$

All groups of order p^2 are abelian.⁵ Cauchy's theorem can be used to show all groups of order pq with primes $p < q$ and $q \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ (e.g., $pq = 15$) are abelian (and in fact cyclic)⁶. The Sylow theorems provide further tools to show all groups of a given size are abelian.

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a group with subgroups H and N , where N is a normal subgroup.*

- a) *The set of products $NH = \{nh : n \in N, h \in H\}$ is a subgroup of G .*
- b) *$NH = HN = \{hn : h \in H, n \in N\}$.*
- c) *If $|N|$ and $|H|$ are relatively prime, then $|NH| = |N||H|$.*

Proof. a) The set NH obviously contains $e = e \cdot e$.

Since $N \triangleleft G$, we can show NH is closed under multiplication: for $n_1, n_2 \in N$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$,

$$n_1 h_1 \cdot n_2 h_2 = n_1 (h_1 n_2 h_1^{-1}) \cdot h_1 h_2,$$

which is in NH since $h_1 n_2 h_1^{-1} \in h_1 N h_1^{-1} \in N$ and $h_1 h_2 \in H$.

To show NH is closed under inversion, for $n \in N$ and $h \in H$,

$$(nh)^{-1} = h^{-1} n^{-1} = (h^{-1} n^{-1} h) h^{-1}$$

and $h^{-1} n^{-1} h \in h^{-1} N h = N$.

b) That $NH = HN$ ⁷ follows from showing each side is a subset of the other: for $n \in N$ and $h \in H$,

$$nh = h(h^{-1}nh), \quad hn = (hnh^{-1})h$$

and $h^{-1}nh, hnh^{-1} \in N$ since N is a normal subgroup of G . So $NH \subset HN$ and $HN \subset NH$.

⁵See Section 6 of <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/conjclass.pdf>.

⁶See Section 3 of <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/cauchyapp.pdf>.

⁷Saying $NH = HN$ as sets does *not* mean $nh = hn$ for $n \in N$ and $h \in H$, but instead it means each nh is some $h'n'$ and each hn is some $n''h''$.

c) Each element of NH has the form nh for an $n \in N$ and $h \in H$. This expression for an element of NH is unique, by the condition $(|N|, |H|) = 1$:

$$nh = n'h' \implies n'^{-1}n = h'h^{-1} \in N \cap H,$$

and since N and H have relatively prime orders, $N \cap H$ is a subgroup with order dividing $|N|$ and $|H|$, so $|N \cap H| = 1$. Thus $N \cap H = \{1\}$, so $n'^{-1}n = h'h^{-1} = 1$. Hence $n' = n$ and $h' = h$, so counting different products nh where $n \in N$ and $h \in H$ is the same as counting ordered pairs (n, h) for $n \in N$ and $h \in H$. The number of those pairs is $|N||H|$. \square

Remark 4.2. If we remove the normality condition for one of the subgroups, the set-product need not be a subgroup: for subgroups H and K of G that are both non-normal, the set $HK = \{hk : h \in H, k \in K\}$ might not be closed under multiplication or inversion.

Theorem 4.3. *Every group of size 45 is abelian.*

Proof. Let G have size 45. In G , a 3-Sylow subgroup has size 9 and a 5-Sylow subgroup has size 5. Using Sylow III,

$$n_3 \mid 5, \quad n_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \implies n_3 = 1$$

and

$$n_5 \mid 9, \quad n_5 \equiv 1 \pmod{5} \implies n_5 = 1.$$

Therefore G has normal 3-Sylow and 5-Sylow subgroups. Denote them by P and Q respectively, so $|P| = 9$ and $|Q| = 5$. Then P is abelian and Q is cyclic (thus abelian).

The set $PQ = \{ab : a \in P, b \in Q\}$ is a subgroup of G by Lemma 4.1 since P and Q are normal subgroups (we really only need one of them to be normal to use that lemma). Since PQ contains P and Q as subgroups, Lagrange tells us $|PQ|$ is divisible by both 9 and 5. Therefore $45 \mid |PQ|$, so $PQ = G$. Since P and Q are both abelian, we will know G is abelian once we show each element of P commutes with each element of Q . This commutativity is Theorem 3.2. \square

Remark 4.4. The reader can check that the same argument shows every group of size p^2q with primes $p < q$ and $q \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ is abelian. Examples include $99 = 2^2 \cdot 11$ and $175 = 5^2 \cdot 7$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let p and q be primes where $p < q$ and $q \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Then every group of size pq is cyclic.*

This can be proved using only Cauchy's theorem.⁸ The proof we give here is in the same spirit, but it uses the Sylow theorems to handle more *efficiently* certain parts of the proof.

Proof. Let $|G| = pq$, where $p < q$ and $q \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. By Cauchy's theorem, G has an element a of order p and an element b of order q . Let $P = \langle a \rangle$ and $Q = \langle b \rangle$.

These subgroups P and Q have respective sizes p and q and are p -Sylow and q -Sylow subgroups of G . By Sylow III, $n_p \mid q$ and $n_p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Then n_p is 1 or q , but since $q \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ we have $n_p \neq q$. So $n_p = 1$. Also by Sylow III, $n_q \mid p$ and $n_q \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$. Since $1 < p < q$ we can't have $p \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$, so $n_q = 1$.⁹

From $n_p = 1$ and $n_q = 1$, P and Q are both normal subgroups of G . Theorem 3.2 implies elements of P commute with elements of Q , so a and b commute and they have relatively prime orders p and q . Hence the product ab has order pq . Since $|G| = pq$, G is cyclic. \square

⁸See Section 3 of <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/cauchyapp.pdf>.

⁹Compare this to the proof in Lemma 3.4 of <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/cauchyapp.pdf> that G has only one subgroup of size q .

5. NON-TRIVIAL NORMAL SUBGROUPS

The consequences of the Sylow theorems in this section are cases where the size of G forces G to have a nontrivial normal subgroup (usually, but not always, a normal Sylow subgroup). This topic is a popular source of exercises in algebra textbooks, in part because it can be used to determine all groups of various sizes up to isomorphism. For instance, near the end of this section we will find all the groups of size 105.

Theorem 5.1. *If $|G| = 20$ or 100 then G has a normal 5-Sylow subgroup.*

Proof. By Sylow III, $n_5 \mid 4$ and $n_5 \equiv 1 \pmod{5}$. Thus $n_5 = 1$. \square

This proof is identical to part of the proof of Theorem 2.2, which was concerned with a specific group of size 20.

Theorem 5.2. *If $|G| = pq$, where $p < q$ are distinct primes, then G has a normal q -Sylow subgroup.*

Proof. Read the proof of Theorem 4.5, where it is shown that $n_q = 1$. This part of the proof did not use the congruence condition $q \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ from that theorem, so $n_q = 1$ whether or not that congruence condition holds. \square

The following lemma does not involve the Sylow theorems, but will be used in conjunction with the Sylow theorems to prove more theorems about the existence of normal subgroups.

Lemma 5.3. *If G has k subgroups of size p , it has $k(p-1)$ elements of order p .*

Proof. In a subgroup of size p , all nonidentity elements have order p . Conversely, an element of order p generates a subgroup of size p . By Lagrange, distinct subgroups of size p must intersect trivially, so their nonidentity elements are disjoint from each other. Therefore each subgroup of size p has its own $p-1$ elements of order p , not shared by the other subgroups of size p . The number of elements of order p is therefore $k(p-1)$. \square

Theorem 5.4. *If $|G| = 12$ then G has a normal 2-Sylow or 3-Sylow subgroup.*

Proof. By Sylow III, $n_2 \mid 3$, so $n_2 = 1$ or 3 . Also $n_3 \mid 4$ and $n_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, so $n_3 = 1$ or 4 . We want to show $n_2 = 1$ or $n_3 = 1$.

Assume $n_3 \neq 1$, so $n_3 = 4$. Since the 3-Sylows have size 3, Lemma 5.3 says G has $n_3 \cdot 2 = 8$ elements of order 3. The number of remaining elements is $12 - 8 = 4$. A 2-Sylow subgroup has size 4, and thus fills up the remaining elements. Therefore $n_2 = 1$. \square

For example, A_4 has $n_2 = 1$ and $n_3 = 4$, while D_6 has $n_2 = 3$ and $n_3 = 1$.

Theorem 5.5. *If $|G| = 24$ then G has a normal subgroup of size 4 or 8.*

Proof. Let P be a 2-Sylow subgroup, so $|P| = 8$. Consider the left multiplication action $\ell: G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G/P) \cong S_3$. Set K to be the kernel of ℓ . Then

- $K \subset P$, so $|K| \mid 8$,
- G/K embeds into S_3 , so $[G : K] \mid 6$. That is, $4 \mid |K|$.

This tells us $|K| = 4$ or 8 . Since K is the kernel of ℓ , $K \triangleleft G$. \square

Example 5.6. Let $G = S_4$. The number of 2-Sylow subgroups is 3, so S_4 does not have a normal subgroup of size 8 (Theorem 3.1). Theorem 5.5 then says S_4 must have a normal subgroup of size 4. Indeed, one is

$$\{(1), (12)(34), (13)(24), (14)(23)\}.$$

There are other subgroups of size 4, such as $\langle(1234)\rangle$, but they are not normal.

Example 5.7. Let $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(3))$. This group has size 24 and a normal 2-Sylow subgroup.

Lemma 5.8. *If $N \triangleleft G$ and a p -Sylow subgroup P of N is normal in N , then P is normal in G .*

Proof. Since $P \triangleleft N$, P is the only p -Sylow subgroup of N . For all $g \in G$, $gPg^{-1} \subset gNg^{-1} = N$, so gPg^{-1} is a subgroup of N with the same order as P . Therefore $gPg^{-1} = P$. Since g is arbitrary in G , $gPg^{-1} = P$. \square

Theorem 5.9. *If $|G| = 30$ then G has normal 3-Sylow and 5-Sylow subgroups.*

Proof. Pick $g \in G$ of order 2. Since $|G| = 30$, left multiplication $\ell_g: G \rightarrow G$ as a permutation is a product of 15 disjoint transpositions, so $\mathrm{sgn}(\ell_g) = -1$. The composition $\mathrm{sgn} \circ \ell: G \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$, where $g \mapsto \mathrm{sgn}(\ell_g)$, is a surjective homomorphism, so its kernel is normal in G with size 15. Call it N . Then N is cyclic (Theorem 4.5). Its 3-Sylow and 5-Sylow subgroups are normal in N (since N is abelian), so they are also normal in G by Lemma 5.8. \square

Corollary 5.10. *Each group of order 30 is isomorphic to $\mathbf{Z}/(30)$, D_{15} , $\mathbf{Z}/(3) \times D_5$, or $\mathbf{Z}/(5) \times S_3$.*

Proof. Let G be a group of order 30. By the proof of Theorem 5.9, G has a normal subgroup N of order 15 and N has to be cyclic by Theorem 4.5. Some $g \in G$ has order 2, so $G = N\langle g \rangle$ by Lemma 4.1 with $N \cap \langle g \rangle = \{e\}$. Since $N \triangleleft G$, $G \cong \mathbf{Z}/(15) \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathbf{Z}/(2)$ for some homomorphism $\varphi: \mathbf{Z}/(2) \rightarrow (\mathbf{Z}/(15))^{\times}$, where the group law in the semidirect product is

$$(a, b)(c, d) = (a + \varphi_b(c), b + d) = (a + u^b c, b + d),$$

where $u = \varphi_1$, which has to be a solution of $u^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{15}$. There are 4 possible values for u : $\pm 1, \pm 4 \pmod{15}$. Therefore there are at most four semidirect products $\mathbf{Z}/(15) \rtimes_{\varphi} \mathbf{Z}/(2)$, so there are *at most* four groups of order 30 up to isomorphism.

To see there are four non-isomorphic groups of order 30, use examples: $\mathbf{Z}/(30)$, D_{15} , $\mathbf{Z}/(3) \times D_5$, and $\mathbf{Z}/(5) \times S_3$. They are nonisomorphic since their centers have different sizes: 30, 1, 3, and 5, respectively. Alternatively, count elements of order 2 in each group:

- in $\mathbf{Z}/(30)$ there is one element of order 2,
- in D_{15} , there are 15 elements of order 2 (the reflections),
- in $\mathbf{Z}/(3) \times D_5$, there are 5 elements of order 2 (the reflections in D_5),
- in $\mathbf{Z}/(5) \times S_3$, there are 3 elements of order 2 (the 2-cycles in S_3). \square

We turn next to groups of order 105.

Theorem 5.11. *Every group of size 105 has normal 5-Sylow and 7-Sylow subgroups. In other words, every group of size 105 has unique subgroups of size 5 and 7.*

Proof. We will first prove $n_5 = 1$ or $n_7 = 1$. Then we will refine this to $n_5 = 1$ and $n_7 = 1$.

By Sylow III,

$$n_3 \mid 35, n_3 \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \implies n_3 = 1 \text{ or } 7,$$

$$n_5 \mid 21, n_5 \equiv 1 \pmod{5} \implies n_5 = 1 \text{ or } 21,$$

$$n_7 \mid 15, n_7 \equiv 1 \pmod{7} \implies n_7 = 1 \text{ or } 15.$$

Could both $n_5 > 1$ and $n_7 > 1$? If so, then $n_5 = 21$ and $n_7 = 15$. Using Lemma 5.3, the number of elements with order 5 is $21 \cdot 4 = 84$ and the number of elements with order 7 is

$15 \cdot 6 = 90$. Since $84 + 90 > |G|$, we have a contradiction, so $n_5 = 1$ or $n_7 = 1$. In either case we will show G has a subgroup with order 35.

Suppose $n_5 = 1$ and let N_5 be the (normal) 5-Sylow subgroup of G . Let P_7 be a 7-Sylow subgroup, so $|P_7| = 7$ and P_7N_5 is a subgroup of G with order $7 \cdot 5 = 35$ by Lemma 4.1.

If $n_7 = 1$, then let N_7 be the (normal) 7-Sylow subgroup of G . Let P_5 be a 5-Sylow subgroup, so $|P_5| = 5$ and P_5N_7 is a subgroup of G with order $5 \cdot 7 = 35$ by Lemma 4.1.

We have proved, whether $n_5 = 1$ or $n_7 = 1$, that G has a subgroup H of order 35, so $[G : H] = |G|/|H| = 105/35 = 3$. We'll show H is a *normal* subgroup of G by looking at how G permutes the 3 left H -cosets. Left multiplication of each $g \in G$ on the three left H -cosets in G is a permutation ℓ_g of the left H -cosets, so we get a homomorphism

$$\ell: G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G/H) \cong S_3, \text{ where } g \mapsto \ell_g.$$

Let $K = \ker(\ell)$, so $G/K \cong \ell(G)$. Thus $|G/K| \mid 6$. Also $|G/K| = |G|/|K|$ divides $|G| = 105$, so $|G/K|$ divides $(6, 105) = 3$.

We are going to show $K = H$, so $H \triangleleft G$ (all kernels of homomorphisms are normal subgroups). Each $k \in K$ fixes all the left H -cosets using left multiplication: $kgH = gH$ for all $g \in G$. In particular, $kH = H$, so $k \in H$. Thus $K \subset H \subset G$, so $|G/K| = [G : K]$ is divisible by $[G : H] = 3$. Since $|G/K|$ divides 3 and is divisible by 3, $|G/K| = 3$. Thus $3 = [G : K] = [G : H][H : K] = 3[H : K]$, so $[H : K] = 1$, which proves $H = K$, so $H \triangleleft G$.¹⁰

Every group of size 35 is cyclic, by Theorem 4.5, so H is cyclic. In particular, each Sylow subgroup of H is a normal subgroup of H . Since $H \triangleleft G$, Lemma 5.8 tells us each Sylow subgroup of H is a normal subgroup of G . A 5-Sylow or 7-Sylow subgroup of H is also a 5-Sylow or 7-Sylow subgroup of G , so their normality in G implies $n_5 = 1$ and $n_7 = 1$. \square

Theorem 5.12. *Every group of size 105 is isomorphic to $\mathbf{Z}/(5) \times H$, where $|H| = 21$.*

Proof. Let $|G| = 105$. By Theorem 5.11 we have $n_5 = n_7 = 1$. Let N_5 and N_7 denote the 5-Sylow and 7-Sylow subgroups of G . Let P be a 3-Sylow subgroup of G , so $|P| = 3$. Then the product set $H = N_7P$ is a subgroup of G with size 21 by Lemma 4.1. Since $N_5 \triangleleft G$, N_5H is a subgroup of G with size 105 by Lemma 4.1, so $G = N_5H$. It remains to show $G \cong N_5 \times H$, which amounts to showing the elements of N_5 commute with the elements of H . Because $|N_5|$ and $|H|$ are relatively prime, we could show elements of H and N_5 commute if $H \triangleleft G$ by the argument used to prove Theorem 3.2, but H need not be normal in G . So we need another method.

Consider the conjugation action of H on N_5 , which makes sense since $N_5 \triangleleft G$. It gives us a homomorphism $H \rightarrow \text{Aut}(N_5) \cong (\mathbf{Z}/(5))^\times$. Since H has size 21 and $(\mathbf{Z}/(5))^\times$ has order 4, this homomorphism on H is trivial, so elements of H fix elements of N_5 by conjugation: $hnh^{-1} = n$ for all $h \in H$ and $n \in N$. Rewriting that as $hn = nh$, all elements of N_5 commute with all elements of H , so $N_5H \cong N_5 \times H \cong \mathbf{Z}/(5) \times H$. \square

Corollary 5.13. *Up to isomorphism there are two groups of size 105.*

Proof. Groups of order pq for distinct primes p and q are classified in the handout on consequences of Cauchy's theorem¹¹, which shows there are two groups of size 21 up to isomorphism. One is abelian (the cyclic group) and one is not. Using these for H in

¹⁰This approach to showing $H \triangleleft G$ also shows each subgroup of a group G having index equal to the least prime factor of $|G|$ is normal. See Theorem 6.12 in <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/gpaction.pdf>.

¹¹See Section 3 of <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/cauchyapp.pdf>.

Theorem 5.12 gives two groups of size 105, one being abelian (in fact cyclic) and the other being nonabelian. \square

Theorem 5.14. *If $|G| = p^2q$, where p and q are distinct primes, then G has a normal p -Sylow subgroup if $p > q$ and a normal q -Sylow subgroup if $q > p$ unless $|G| = 2^2 \cdot 3$, in which case G has a normal 2-Sylow or 3-Sylow subgroup.*

Proof. First suppose $p > q$. By Sylow III we have $n_p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and $n_p \mid q$. Since $1 < q < p$ we can't have $n_p = q$, so $n_p = 1$.

Now suppose $q > p$. By Sylow III, $n_q \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$ and $n_q \mid p^2$. Since $1 < p < q$ we can't have $n_q = p$, so $n_q = 1$ or $n_q = p^2$. If $n_q = p^2$ then $p^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$, so $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{q}$. Since $p \not\equiv 1 \pmod{q}$ we have $p \equiv -1 \pmod{q}$, so $q \leq p + 1$. Thus $p < q \leq p + 1$, so $q = p + 1$. The only consecutive primes are 2 and 3, so $p = 2$ and $q = 3$. Thus except when $|G| = 2^2 \cdot 3 = 12$ we can't have $n_q = p^2$, so $n_q = 1$.

That a group of order $2^2 \cdot 3 = 12$ has a normal 2-Sylow or 3-Sylow subgroup is Theorem 5.4. For example, A_4 has $n_2 = 1$ and $n_3 = 4$, and D_6 has $n_2 = 3$ and $n_3 = 1$. \square

Theorem 5.15. *If $|G| = p^2q^2$, where $p < q$ are distinct primes, then G has a normal q -Sylow subgroup unless $|G| = 36$, in which case G has either a normal 2-Sylow or 3-Sylow subgroup.*

The size 36 is a genuine exception: here $q = 3$ and $\mathbf{Z}/(3) \times A_4$ has $n_3 = 4$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, $p < q$. By the Sylow theorems, $n_q \mid p^2$ and $n_q \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$, so $n_q = 1$ or p^2 . If $n_q = 1$ then the q -Sylow subgroup is normal. Now suppose $n_q = p^2$. Then $p^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$, so $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{q}$. Since $p < q$, the congruence forces $p = q - 1$. As consecutive primes, $p = 2$ and $q = 3$, which shows for $|G| \neq 36$ that $n_q = 1$. (The reader who doesn't care too much about this theorem can skip the rest of the proof, which analyzes the remaining case $|G| = 36$.)

For the rest of the proof, let $|G| = 36$. Then $n_3 = 1$ or 4. We will show that if $n_3 = 4$ then $n_2 = 1$. Assume $n_3 = 4$ and $n_2 > 1$. Since $n_2 > 1$, G has no subgroup of size 18 (it would have index 2 and therefore be normal, so a 3-Sylow subgroup of it would be normal in G by Lemma 5.8, which contradicts $n_3 > 1$). Since $n_2 > 1$, G is nonabelian. Our goal is to get a contradiction. We will try to count elements of different orders in G and find the total comes out to more than 36 elements. That will be our contradiction.

Let Q be a 3-Sylow in G , so $[G : Q] = 4$. Left multiplication of G on G/Q gives a homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G/Q) \cong S_4$. Since $|G| > |S_4|$, the kernel K is nontrivial. Since $K \subset Q$, either $|K| = 3$ or $K = Q$. Since $Q \not\triangleleft G$, Q does not equal K , so $|K| = 3$.

Since $K \triangleleft G$, we can make G act on K by conjugations. This is a homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(K) \cong \mathbf{Z}/(2)$. If this homomorphism is onto (that is, some element of G conjugates on K in a nontrivial way) then the kernel is a subgroup of G with size 18, which G does not have. So the conjugation action of G on K is trivial, which means every element of G commutes with the elements of K , so $K \subset Z(G)$. Then $3 \mid |Z(G)|$, so the size of $Z(G)$ is one of the numbers in $\{3, 6, 9, 12, 18, 36\}$. Since G is nonabelian and a group is abelian when the quotient by its center is cyclic, $|Z(G)|$ can't be 12, 18, or 36. Since $n_3 > 1$ there is no normal subgroup of size 9, so $|Z(G)| \neq 9$. If $|Z(G)| = 6$ then the product set $Z(G)Q$ is a subgroup of size 18, a contradiction. So we must have $|Z(G)| = 3$, which means $Z(G) = K$.

Now we start counting elements with various orders. The center is a 3-subgroup of G , so by the conjugacy of 3-Sylow subgroups every 3-Sylow subgroup contains K . Each pair of

different 3-Sylow subgroups have K as their intersection, so we can count the total number of elements of 3-power order: $|K| + n_3 \cdot (9 - 3) = 27$.

Let $g \in G$ have order 2. Then $K\langle g \rangle$ is a subgroup of order 6 by Lemma 4.1, and it is is abelian and in fact cyclic since $K \subset Z(G)$. The cyclic group $K\langle g \rangle$ has a unique element of order 2, which must be g . Therefore when g and g' are different elements of order 2 in G , the groups $K\langle g \rangle$ and $K\langle g' \rangle$ have K as their intersection. So each element of order 2 in G provides us with 2 new elements of order 6. Let n be the number of elements of order 2 in G , so there are at least $2n$ elements of order 6, giving at least $3n$ elements in total with order 2 or 6. Since we already found 27 elements with 3-power order (including the identity), $3n \leq 36 - 27$, or $n \leq 3$. We can get an inequality on n in the other direction: $n \geq 2$. Indeed, no element of order 2 lies in $Z(G) = K$, so some conjugate of an element of order 2 is a second element of order 2. Thus $n \geq 2$.

Since $|\{g \in G : g^2 = e\}|$ is even (by McKay's proof of Cauchy's theorem) and this number is $1+n$, n is odd, so $n = 3$. Therefore G has 3 elements of order 2, so at least $3n = 9$ elements of order 2 or 6. Adding this to 27 from before gives $9 + 27 = 36 = |G|$, so each element of G has 3-power order or order 2 or 6. In particular, the 2-Sylow subgroup of G is isomorphic to $\mathbf{Z}/(2) \times \mathbf{Z}/(2)$ (no elements of order 4 in G). Then different 2-Sylow subgroups meet at most in a group of order 2, which gives us 5 elements of order 2 from both subgroups. We saw before that there are only 3 elements of order 2. This is a contradiction. \square

6. SYLOW NUMBERS OF SUBGROUPS AND QUOTIENT GROUPS

If $H \subset G$ and $N \triangleleft G$, we will show $n_p(H) \leq n_p(G)$ and $n_p(G/N) \leq n_p(G)$.

Theorem 6.1. *Let H be a subgroup of G . For each $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$, there is a conjugate gPg^{-1} such that $gPg^{-1} \cap H \in \text{Syl}_p(H)$.*

Proof. Let H act on G/P by left multiplication. Since the size of G/P is not divisible by p , some H -orbit in G/P has size not divisible by p . Let this be the H -orbit of gP . Since $|\text{Orb}_{gP}| = |H|/|\text{Stab}_{gP}|$, Stab_{gP} is a subgroup of H containing the maximal power of p in $|H|$. We will show $|\text{Stab}_{gP}|$ has p -power order, and that would make Stab_{gP} a p -Sylow subgroup of H :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Stab}_{gP} &= \{h \in H : hgP = gP\} \\ &= \{h \in H : g^{-1}hg \in P\} \\ &= \{h : h \in gPg^{-1}\} \\ &= gPg^{-1} \cap H, \end{aligned}$$

so Stab_{gP} is a subgroup of the p -group gPg^{-1} . \square

The conjugation of P in Theorem 6.1 is important: it is false in general that if $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ and H is a subgroup of G then $P \cap H \in \text{Syl}_p(H)$. For example, if P and H are two different p -Sylow subgroups of G then $P \cap H$ is a proper subgroup of H , so $P \cap H$ is not in $\text{Syl}_p(H) = \{H\}$.

Example 6.2. Let $G = D_n = \langle r, s \rangle$ with $n \geq 3$ odd, so 2-Sylow subgroups of G have order 2. Use $P = \{1, s\}$ and $H = \{1, rs\}$.

An interesting application of Theorem 6.1 is the following: if a finite group G has subgroups H and K such that $G = HK$ as a set then for each prime p there is a $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$

such that $P \cap H \in \text{Syl}_p(H)$, $P \cap K \in \text{Syl}_p(K)$, and $P = (P \cap H)(P \cap K)$ as sets. Here we allow H and K to overlap nontrivially and we don't assume elements of H commute with elements of K . See <https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/610094/>.

Remark 6.3. The proof of Theorem 6.1 did not use the Sylow theorems for H , so it shows the existence of Sylow subgroups of a group implies the existence of Sylow subgroups of each subgroup. In particular, we can show a finite group has a p -Sylow subgroup by embedding it in a larger group where it might be easier to write down a p -Sylow subgroup.

For example, every finite group can be embedded in a symmetric group (Cayley's theorem). To be precise, the left multiplication action of G on G gives an embedding of G into $\text{Sym}(G) \cong S_n$, where $n = |G|$. Therefore if one can construct, for each prime p , a p -Sylow subgroup of every symmetric group then we obtain the existence of a p -Sylow subgroup of every finite group. Exercises 15 and 16 in [4, p. 84] give a construction of Sylow subgroups of symmetric groups using wreath products. A construction of a p -Sylow subgroup of the symmetric groups S_{p^k} actually suffices, since S_n embeds into S_{p^k} for $p^k \geq n$; the construction in this special case can be found in the discussion of the Sylow theorems in [3, pp. 95–97].

Corollary 6.4. *Let $N \triangleleft G$. For each p -Sylow P of G , $P \cap N$ is a p -Sylow of N and all p -Sylows of N arise in this way. In particular, $n_p(N) \leq n_p(G)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.1, there is a g such that $gPg^{-1} \cap N$ is a p -Sylow in N . Since N is a normal subgroup of G ,

$$gPg^{-1} \cap N = gPg^{-1} \cap gNg^{-1} = g(P \cap N)g^{-1}.$$

Therefore $P \cap N$ is a p -Sylow subgroup of $g^{-1}Ng = N$.

(There are proofs that $P \cap N$ is a p -Sylow subgroup of N that do not rely on Theorem 6.1. Since $P \cap N$ is a p -group, as it is contained in P , it remains to show $P \cap N$ has maximal p -power order in N . Here are two ways of showing that. First, we will show the index $[N : P \cap N]$ is not divisible by p . The set PN is a subgroup of G since $N \triangleleft G$ and $|PN| = |P||N|/|P \cap N|$, so $[N : P \cap N] = |N|/|P \cap N| = |PN|/|P| = [PN : P]$, which is a factor of $[G : P]$ and thus is not divisible by p . Second, by the Sylow theorems $P \cap N$ is contained in a p -Sylow subgroup of N , say K . Then K , being a p -subgroup of G , is contained in a conjugate of P : $K \subset gPg^{-1}$. Thus $g^{-1}Kg \subset P$. Also $g^{-1}Kg \subset g^{-1}Ng = N$, so $g^{-1}Kg \subset P \cap N \subset K$. Since $|K| = |g^{-1}Kg|$, we get $|P \cap N| = |K|$, so $P \cap N = K$ is a p -Sylow subgroup of N .)

Let Q be a p -Sylow subgroup of N . Pick a p -Sylow of G , say P , which contains Q . Then $Q \subset P \cap N$, and $P \cap N$ is a p -Sylow of N , so $Q = P \cap N$. \square

There is an extension of Corollary 6.4 to certain non-normal subgroups. Suppose $H \triangleleft K \triangleleft G$ (perhaps H is not normal in G). If P is a Sylow subgroup of G then $P \cap K$ is a Sylow subgroup of K , so $(P \cap K) \cap H = P \cap H$ is a Sylow subgroup of H . It is left to the reader to show every Sylow subgroup of H arises in this way. This can be extended to every subgroup that is at the bottom of a chain of subgroups increasing up to G with each one normal in the next. Such subgroups are called subnormal. (For example, in D_4 the subgroup $\langle s \rangle$ satisfies $\langle s \rangle \triangleleft \langle s, r^2 \rangle \triangleleft D_4$, so $\langle s \rangle$ is subnormal in D_4 but not normal in D_4 .) The condition on a subgroup $H \subset G$ that $P \cap H$ is a Sylow subgroup of H for each Sylow subgroup P of G is actually equivalent to H being subnormal. This was the Kegel–Wielandt conjecture, and its proof [5] depends on the classification of finite simple groups.

We now show the inequality at the very end of Corollary 6.4 is true for all subgroups of a finite group.

Theorem 6.5. *Let G be a finite group and H be a subgroup. Choose a prime p . Distinct p -Sylow subgroups of H do not lie in a common p -Sylow subgroup of G . In particular, $n_p(H) \leq n_p(G)$.*

Proof. Let Q and Q' be distinct p -Sylow subgroups of H . If they lie in a common p -Sylow subgroup of G then the group $\langle Q, Q' \rangle$ is a p -group and it lies in H . However its size is too large, since it is a p -subgroup of H that properly contains the p -Sylow subgroup Q .

If we associate to each p -Sylow subgroup of H a p -Sylow subgroup of G it lies inside of (there is no canonical way to do this if we have choices available) then this correspondence from $\text{Syl}_p(H)$ to $\text{Syl}_p(G)$ is one-to-one, so $n_p(H) \leq n_p(G)$. \square

Theorem 6.6. *Let $N \triangleleft G$. For every p -Sylow P of G , PN/N is a p -Sylow of G/N and all p -Sylows of G/N arise in this way. In particular, $n_p(G/N) \leq n_p(G)$.*

Proof. First, we will show for every p -Sylow P of G that PN/N is a p -Sylow of G/N . The group PN/N is a p -group (either because every element has p -power order or because $PN/N \cong P/(P \cap N)$). Using the inclusions

$$G \supset PN \supset N, \quad G \supset PN \supset P,$$

the first one shows $[G/N : PN/N] = [G : PN]$ and the second one shows $[G : PN] \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Therefore PN/N is a p -Sylow of G/N .

Now we show every p -Sylow of G/N has the form PN/N for some p -Sylow P of G . Let $Q \in \text{Syl}_p(G/N)$ and write $Q = H/N$ for some subgroup $H \subset G$ containing N . Then $[G : H] = [G/N : Q] \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Choose $P \in \text{Syl}_p(H)$, so $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ too by the previous congruence. Then PN/N is a subgroup of Q . It is also a p -Sylow subgroup of G/N by the previous paragraph, so $Q = PN/N$. \square

Corollary 6.4 and Theorem 6.6 tell us the maps $\text{Syl}_p(G) \rightarrow \text{Syl}_p(N)$ and $\text{Syl}_p(G) \rightarrow \text{Syl}_p(G/N)$ given by $P \mapsto P \cap N$ and $P \mapsto PN/N$ are surjective. By comparison, although $|\text{Syl}_p(G)| \geq |\text{Syl}_p(H)|$ for every subgroup H , there are no natural maps between $\text{Syl}_p(G)$ and $\text{Syl}_p(H)$ when H is non-normal in G . (The function $\text{Syl}_p(H) \rightarrow \text{Syl}_p(G)$ in the proof of Theorem 6.5 is not natural.)

The inequality $n_p(H) \leq n_p(G)$ can't generally be refined to divisibility. For example, $n_3(A_4) = 4$ and $n_3(A_5) = 10$. As an exercise, decide if $n_p(N) \mid n_p(G)$ or $n_p(G/N) \mid n_p(G)$ when $N \triangleleft G$.

Corollary 6.7. *If a group has a unique p -Sylow subgroup for some prime p then all subgroups and quotient groups have a unique p -Sylow subgroup.*

Proof. By Theorems 6.5 and 6.6, an upper bound on the number of p -Sylow subgroups in a subgroup or quotient group of the group is 1, and there is at least one p -Sylow subgroup in each subgroup and quotient group of the group by the Sylow theorems. \square

Theorem 6.6 gives another proof of Corollary 6.4: since PN/N is a p -Sylow subgroup of G/N , its size $[PN : N] = [P : P \cap N]$ is the highest power of p in $[G : N]$. Since $|P|$ is the highest power of p in $|G|$, we conclude that $|P \cap N|$ is the highest power of p in $|N|$, so $P \cap N$ is a p -Sylow subgroup of N .

The proof of the next theorem is a nice application of the preservation of the Sylow property when intersecting with a normal subgroup (Corollary 6.4).

Theorem 6.8. *Write $|G| = 2^n m$, where m is not divisible by 2. If G has a cyclic 2-Sylow subgroup then G has a normal subgroup of order m and it is the unique subgroup of G with order m .*

Proof. First let's show that if G has a normal subgroup M of order m then M is the only subgroup with order m . In fact, we'll show every subgroup M' of G with odd order is contained in M . The reduction homomorphism $G \rightarrow G/M$ maps G to a group of order 2^n , so the image of the odd-order subgroup M' has to be trivial. Therefore M' is contained in the kernel, which is M .¹²

The theorem is clear if $n = 0$, so we can suppose $n \geq 1$.

Every 2-Sylow subgroup of G is cyclic if one is (they are conjugate to each other). Let H be a 2-Sylow subgroup of G , with generator h_0 , so h_0 has order 2^n . First we will show G has a subgroup of index 2, which must be normal since subgroups of index 2 are normal.

Consider the action of G on G by left multiplication. This action is a group homomorphism $\ell: G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G)$. Let's look in particular at $\ell(h_0)$, the left multiplication by h_0 on G . Decompose G into m right H -cosets Hg_1, \dots, Hg_m . Each $Hg_i = \{g_i, h_0g_i, h_0^2g_i, \dots, h_0^{2^n-1}g_i\}$ is an orbit for left multiplication by h_0 on G , so the left multiplication by h_0 on G is a permutation that consists of m different cycles of length 2^n . Therefore the sign for left multiplication by h_0 on G is $((-1)^{2^n-1})^m = (-1)^m = -1$. Thus the composite homomorphism $\text{sgn} \circ \ell \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ is onto. Its kernel is a normal subgroup of G with index 2. Call it N , so $|N| = 2^{n-1}m$.

If $n = 1$ we are done; N is a normal subgroup of G with order m . (This part repeats the case when $2m = 30$ from the proof of Theorem 5.9.) Suppose $n \geq 2$. The intersection $H \cap N$ is a 2-Sylow subgroup of N (Corollary 6.4) so it has order 2^{n-1} and is cyclic since every subgroup of the cyclic group H is cyclic. Therefore, by induction on n (using N in place of G), the group N has a normal subgroup $M \triangleleft N$ of order m . At the start of the proof, our argument that a normal subgroup of order m in G is the only subgroup of G with order m also shows that a normal subgroup of N with order m is the only subgroup of N with order m . For each $g \in G$, gMg^{-1} is a subgroup of $gNg^{-1} = N$ with order m , so $gMg^{-1} = M$. \square

Remark 6.9. Theorem 6.8 generalizes to odd $|G|$, with 2 replaced by the smallest prime factor p of $|G|$: if $|G| = p^n m$ with p not dividing m and G has a cyclic p -Sylow subgroup, then G has a normal subgroup of order m and that is the only subgroup of G with order m . See [8, p. 138] for a proof, which is different from the case $p = 2$ above.

Corollary 6.10. *If $|G| = 2m$ where m is odd then G contains a normal subgroup of size m and all elements of order 2 in G are conjugate to each other.*

Proof. A 2-Sylow subgroup of G has size 2, which must be cyclic. Therefore, by Theorem 6.8 (the base case $n = 1$), there is a normal subgroup of size m , or equivalently index 2. From the proof of Theorem 6.8, this subgroup has a concrete description: it is the set of $g \in G$ such that left multiplication by g is an even permutation of G .

Since the 2-Sylow subgroups of G have size 2, the elements of order 2 each generate conjugate subgroups by Sylow II, and therefore the elements themselves are conjugate. \square

Example 6.11. A group of size 70 has a normal subgroup of size 35.

¹²The same argument shows that every normal subgroup whose order is relatively prime to its index is the only subgroup with its order.

Example 6.12. For odd m , all reflections in D_m are conjugate and there is a normal subgroup of size m . Of course this is something we already know by explicit calculation in dihedral groups, but Corollary 6.10 puts this situation into a larger context.

7. SYLOW NUMBERS OF DIRECT PRODUCTS

In a direct product of finite groups $H \times K$, not every subgroup needs to have the form $A \times B$ where A is a subgroup of H and B is a subgroup of K . For example, in $\mathbf{Z}/(p) \times \mathbf{Z}/(p)$ for prime p the diagonal subgroup $\langle (1, 1) \rangle$ is not $A \times B$, and this is true more generally in $\mathbf{Z}/(n) \times \mathbf{Z}/(n)$ for every $n > 1$.¹³ It turns out that the Sylow subgroups in a direct product must occur as $A \times B$.

Theorem 7.1. *For a prime p and finite groups H and K , every p -Sylow subgroup of $H \times K$ is $P \times Q$, where $P \in \text{Syl}_p(H)$ and $Q \in \text{Syl}_p(K)$. In particular, $n_p(H \times K) = n_p(H)n_p(K)$.*

Proof. By the Sylow theorems, H and K each have a p -Sylow subgroup, say S_H and S_K respectively. All p -Sylow subgroups of $H \times K$ are conjugate, so a general p -Sylow subgroup of $H \times K$ is

$$(h, k)(S_H \times S_K)(h, k)^{-1} = (hS_Hh^{-1}) \times (kS_Kk^{-1}),$$

which is a direct product of p -Sylow subgroups of H and K .

From this description of $\text{Syl}_p(H \times K)$, counting p -Sylow subgroups of $H \times K$ is the same as counting pairs (P, Q) where $P \in \text{Syl}_p(H)$ and $Q \in \text{Syl}_p(K)$. The number of such pairs is $n_p(H)n_p(K)$. \square

8. NORMALIZERS OF SYLOW SUBGROUPS

The normalizers of Sylow subgroups occur in Sylow III: the number of p -Sylow subgroups is the index of the normalizer of a p -Sylow subgroup. We record here some additional properties of Sylow normalizers.

We write $\text{Syl}_p(G)$ for the set of p -Sylow subgroups of G . It will be convenient sometimes to denote the normalizer of a subgroup $K \subset G$ as $N_G(K)$ rather than as $N(K)$ to stress the ambient group in which the normalizer is being computed.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. Then P is the unique p -Sylow subgroup of $N(P)$ and $N(P)$ is the largest subgroup of G with this property.*

Proof. Since $P \in \text{Syl}_p(N(P))$, Sylow II for $N(P)$ says each p -Sylow subgroup of $N(P)$ is gPg^{-1} for some $g \in N(P)$. By the definition of $N(P)$, $gPg^{-1} = P$. So P is the unique p -Sylow subgroup of $N(P)$. (This kind of argument was used in the proof of Sylow III to show $n_p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$.)

Now suppose $P \subset H \subset G$ and the only p -Sylow subgroup of H is P . For $h \in H$, hPh^{-1} is a p -Sylow subgroup of H , so $hPh^{-1} = P$. Thus $h \in N(P)$, so $H \subset N(P)$. \square

Corollary 8.2. *Let $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. Then $N(N(P)) = N(P)$.*

Proof. Every subgroup is contained in its normalizer, so $N(P) \subset N(N(P))$. To prove the reverse containment, let $g \in N(N(P))$. Then $gN(P)g^{-1} = N(P)$, so $gPg^{-1} \subset gN(P)g^{-1} \subset N(P)$. Thus gPg^{-1} is a p -Sylow subgroup of $N(P)$, so $gPg^{-1} = P$. Thus $g \in N(P)$. \square

Theorem 8.3. *Let $N \triangleleft G$ and $P \in \text{Syl}_p(N)$.*

¹³If H and K have relatively prime orders then every subgroup of $H \times K$ is of the form $A \times B$.

- (1) [*Frattini argument*] If $N \triangleleft G$ and $P \in \text{Syl}_p(N)$ then $G = N \cdot N_G(P)$.
 (2) If $P \triangleleft N$ then $P \triangleleft G$.

Note P is a Sylow subgroup of N , not necessarily of G . The second part was met before as Lemma 5.8 and was used multiple times. We will give a new proof of it here, using the first part of Theorem 8.3.

Proof. Pick $g \in G$. Since $P \subset N$ and $N \triangleleft G$, $gPg^{-1} \subset N$. Then by Sylow II for the group N , there is an $n \in N$ such that $gPg^{-1} = nPn^{-1}$, so $n^{-1}gPg^{-1}n = P$. That means $n^{-1}g \in N_G(P)$, so $g \in nN_G(P)$. Thus $G = N \cdot N_G(P)$.

If $P \triangleleft N$ then $N \subset N_G(P)$, so $N \cdot N_G(P) = N_G(P)$. Thus $G = N_G(P)$, so $P \triangleleft G$. \square

The Frattini argument is very useful in finite group theory (*e.g.*, in the study of nilpotent groups). We will apply the second part of Theorem 8.3 several times in the next section.

Normality is not usually transitive: if $N_1 \triangleleft N_2$ and $N_2 \triangleleft G$, it need not follow that $N_1 \triangleleft G$. (This is illustrated by $\langle s \rangle \triangleleft \langle r^2, s \rangle \triangleleft D_4$.) Theorem 8.3 gives a setting where something like this is true: a normal Sylow subgroup of a normal subgroup is a normal subgroup.

Example 8.4. Let $G = \text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(3))$ and $N = \text{SL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/(3))$. There is a unique 2-Sylow subgroup of N , so it is normal in N , and thus normal in G . Thus the 2-Sylow subgroup of N lies in every 2-Sylow subgroup of G (but is not itself a 2-Sylow subgroup of G).

Corollary 8.5. Let $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. If $N_G(P) \subset H \subset G$ then $N_G(H) = H$ and $[G : H] \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$.

When $H = N_G(P)$, the conclusions here are Corollary 8.2 and the third Sylow theorem (since $[G : N_G(P)] = n_p$).

Proof. Since P is a Sylow subgroup of G and $P \subset N_G(P) \subset H$, P is a Sylow subgroup of H . Then, since $H \triangleleft N_G(H)$, Theorem 8.3 (with $N_G(H)$ in place of G) implies $N_G(H) = HN_{N_G(H)}(P) \subset HN_G(P) \subset H$. The reverse inclusion is obvious, so $N_G(H) = H$.

Since $N_G(P) \subset H$, the normalizer of P in H is also $N_G(P)$ (that is, $N_H(P) = N_G(P)$). By Sylow III and III* applied to H and to G , we have

$$n_p(G) = [G : N_G(P)] \equiv 1 \pmod{p},$$

$$n_p(H) = [H : N_H(P)] = [H : N_G(P)] \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

Thus their ratio, which is $[G : H]$, is $\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. \square

9. SIMPLE GROUPS OF ORDER 60

We call a group *simple* when it is nontrivial and its only normal subgroups are the trivial subgroup and the whole group. For example, a group of prime size is simple for the crude reason that it has no subgroups at all besides the trivial subgroup and the whole group. An abelian group of non-prime size is not simple, since it always has a proper nontrivial subgroup, which is necessarily normal. Thus all simple groups other than a group of prime size are nonabelian.

Simple groups can be characterized in terms of group homomorphisms, as follows.

Theorem 9.1. A nontrivial group G is simple if and only if every nontrivial group homomorphism out of G is an embedding.

Proof. Suppose G is simple. Let $f: G \rightarrow H$ be a homomorphism, with $f(g) \neq e$ for some g . Then the kernel of f is a proper normal subgroup of G . Since G is simple, its only proper normal subgroup is trivial, so the kernel of f is trivial, which means f is an embedding. Conversely, suppose all nontrivial homomorphisms out of G are embeddings. If $N \triangleleft G$ and $N \neq G$ then the reduction map $G \rightarrow G/N$ is a homomorphism with kernel N . The image is not just the identity, so by hypothesis this is an embedding. Therefore the kernel N is trivial, so G is simple. \square

Theorem 9.2. *The group A_5 is simple.*

Proof. We want to show the only normal subgroups of A_5 are (1) and A_5 .

There are 5 conjugacy classes in A_5 , with representatives and sizes as indicated in the following table.

Rep.	(1)	(12345)	(21345)	(12)(34)	(123)
Size	1	12	12	15	20

If A_5 has a normal subgroup N then N is a union of conjugacy classes – including (1) – whose total size divides 60. However, no sum of the above numbers that includes 1 is a factor of 60 except for 1 and 60. Therefore N is trivial or A_5 . \square

The proof of Theorem 9.2 required knowledge of the conjugacy classes in A_5 . We now prove A_5 is simple using much less information: its size and that it has more than one 5-Sylow subgroup. (cf. Theorem 2.1). The result will apply to each group with the same two properties. Our discussion is based on [1, pp. 145–146].

Theorem 9.3. *If $|G| = 60$ and $n_5 > 1$ then G is a simple group.*

Proof. Assume G is not simple, so there is $N \triangleleft G$ with $1 < |N| < 60$. That means

$$|N| \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 20, 30\}.$$

We will get a contradiction. Our argument will use many of the previous consequences we drew from the Sylow theorems (to groups of size 12, 15, 20, and 30).

First we show $|N|$ is not divisible by 5. Assume $5 \mid |N|$, so N contains a 5-Sylow subgroup, which is also a 5-Sylow subgroup of G since $60 = 5 \cdot 12$. Because $N \triangleleft G$, Sylow II shows all the 5-Sylow subgroups of G lie in N . Let n_5 be the number of 5-Sylows in G (which we know are all subgroups of N). Since $n_5 \mid 12$ and $n_5 \equiv 1 \pmod{5}$, $n_5 = 1$ or 6. Because $n_5 > 1$ by hypothesis, $n_5 = 6$. Therefore N contains six different subgroups of size 5. Counting elements of N with orders 1 or 5, Lemma 5.3 says

$$|N| \geq n_5 \cdot 4 + 1 = 25.$$

Since $|N|$ is a proper factor of 60, $|N| = 30$. But then, by Theorem 5.9, N has only one 5-Sylow subgroup. This is a contradiction of $n_5 = 6$, so $|N|$ is not divisible by 5. This means

$$|N| \in \{2, 3, 4, 6, 12\}.$$

If $|N|$ equals 6 then Theorem 5.2 says N contains a normal 3-Sylow subgroup. If $|N|$ equals 12 then Theorem 5.4 says N contains a normal 2-Sylow or 3-Sylow subgroup. A normal Sylow subgroup of N is a normal subgroup of G by Lemma 5.8 or Theorem 8.3. Because such a normal subgroup of G has size 3 or 4, which is one of the possibilities already under consideration for $|N|$, we are reduced to eliminating the possibility that $|N| = 2, 3$, or 4.

If $|N|$ equals 2, 3, or 4, let $\overline{G} = G/N$, so \overline{G} is a group with size 30, 20, or 15. By Theorem 4.5, a group of size 15 is cyclic and thus has a normal 5-Sylow subgroup. By Theorem 5.1, a group of size 20 has a normal 5-Sylow subgroup. By Theorem 5.9, a group of size 30 has a normal 5-Sylow subgroup. Therefore in all cases \overline{G} contains a normal 5-Sylow subgroup, say \overline{P} , with $|\overline{P}| = 5$.

Consider the projection $\pi: G \rightarrow \overline{G}$. Set $H = \pi^{-1}(\overline{P})$. Since $\overline{P} \triangleleft \overline{G}$, $H \triangleleft G$. Since $H \neq G$, H is a proper normal subgroup of G . Since π sends H onto \overline{P} , $|H|$ is divisible by 5. But we showed earlier that G contains no proper normal subgroups of size divisible by 5.

Since all choices for $|N|$ have been eliminated, there is no such N . Thus G is simple. \square

The next result shows that A_5 is the only *simple* group of size 60, up to isomorphism. (In total, there are 13 groups of size 60 up to isomorphism.) The proof will use Sylow III*.

Theorem 9.4. *Every simple group of size 60 is isomorphic to A_5 .*

Proof. Let G be a simple group of size 60. To prove G is isomorphic to A_5 , we will make G act on a set of 5 objects and then show this action is given by the even permutations of the 5 objects.

We seek an action on cosets. Suppose G has a subgroup H with $[G : H] = 5$ (i.e., $|H| = 12$), so the left multiplication action of G on the coset space G/H gives a homomorphism

$$\varphi: G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G/H) \cong S_5.$$

The kernel of φ is a normal subgroup of G , and therefore is trivial or is G since G is simple. If $g \in G$ is in the kernel of φ then $gH = H$, so $g \in H$. In particular, the kernel of φ is a subgroup of H and therefore the kernel can't be G . Thus the kernel of φ is trivial, so φ is an embedding of G into S_5 ; G is isomorphic to its image $\varphi(G)$. In particular, $\varphi(G)$ is a *simple group of size 60*. Let's prove this image is A_5 .

If $\varphi(G) \not\subset A_5$ then $\varphi(G)$ contains an odd permutation. That means the sign homomorphism

$$\text{sgn}: \varphi(G) \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$$

is surjective, so its kernel is a normal subgroup of $\varphi(G)$ with index 2. However, $\varphi(G)$ doesn't have such normal subgroups since it is simple. (Remember, φ gives an isomorphism of G with $\varphi(G)$.) We conclude that all elements of $\varphi(G)$ have sign 1, so $\varphi(G) \subset A_5$. Both groups have size 60, so $\varphi(G) = A_5$.

We have shown that *if* G has a subgroup H with index 5 then the left multiplication action of G on the coset space G/H gives an isomorphism of G with A_5 . The rest of the proof is devoted to showing G has a subgroup with index 5.

Step 1: For each proper subgroup $H \subset G$, $[G : H] \geq 5$. Thus $|H| \leq 12$.

Let $t = [G : H]$. The left multiplication action of G on G/H gives a homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G/H) \cong S_t$. Since H is a proper subgroup and G is simple, this homomorphism has trivial kernel. (The reason follows as before, when we were only concerned with index 5 subgroups: the kernel is a subgroup of H and therefore is a proper normal subgroup of G , which must be trivial since G is simple.) Therefore we have an embedding of G into S_t , so $60 \mid t!$. This can happen only when $t \geq 5$.

Step 2: G has a subgroup with index 5.

We use Sylow III for the primes 2, 3, and 5. They tell us that

$$n_2 \in \{1, 3, 5, 15\}, \quad n_3 \in \{1, 4, 10\}, \quad n_5 \in \{1, 6\}.$$

Since G is simple, the nontrivial Sylow subgroups are not normal, so n_2, n_3 , and n_5 all exceed 1. Moreover, because Sylow III* says each n_p is the *index* of a subgroup of G , Step 1 tells us $n_2, n_3, n_5 \geq 5$. Therefore

$$n_2 \in \{5, 15\}, \quad n_3 = 10, \quad n_5 = 6.$$

If $n_2 = 5$ then Sylow III* says there is a subgroup of G with index 5 and we're done. What should we do now: show the only other possibility, that $n_2 = 15$, leads to a contradiction? Instead we will show that if $n_2 = 15$ then there is a second way to show G has a subgroup with index 5.

Assume $n_2 = 15$. By Lemma 5.3, G has $n_3 \cdot 2 = 20$ elements of order 3 and $n_5 \cdot 4 = 24$ elements of order 5. This is a total of 44 elements, which leaves at most $60 - 44 = 16$ elements that can lie in the 2-Sylow subgroups of G . Each 2-Sylow subgroup of G has size 4 (and thus is abelian), so if $n_2 = 15$ then we have 15 different subgroups of size 4 squeezed into a 16-element subset of G . These 2-Sylow subgroups can't all pairwise intersect trivially (otherwise there would be $3 \cdot 15 = 45$ non-identity elements among them). Pick two different 2-Sylows, say P and Q , which intersect nontrivially. Let $I = P \cap Q$. Both P and Q are abelian (they have size 4), so I is normal in each. Therefore the normalizer of I in G contains both P and Q , so it has size properly divisible by 4. The normalizer of I is not all of G since G has no proper nontrivial normal subgroups. Since proper subgroups of G have size 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, or 12, the normalizer of I has size 12 and thus $[G : I] = 5$. \square

Since $n_2(A_5) = 5$, we know after the proof that the assumption $n_2 = 15$ in the last paragraph does not actually occur.

APPENDIX A. CHARACTERIZING CYCLIC GROUPS

The Sylow theorems can be used to prove some theorems about all finite groups after they are proved for p -groups. Here is an example.

Theorem A.1. *A finite group with at most one subgroup of each size is cyclic.*

Proof. Our argument has two steps: verify the theorem for groups of prime-power order and then use Sylow I to derive the general case from the prime-power case.

Step 1: Let $|G| = p^k$ where p is prime, $k \geq 1$, and assume G has at most one subgroup of each size. To show G is cyclic, let g be an element of G with maximal order. We want $\langle g \rangle = G$. Pick $h \in G$, so the order of h is a power of p by Lagrange. Let g have order p^m and h have order p^n , so $n \leq m$. Then $p^n \mid p^m$, so there is a subgroup of the cyclic group $\langle g \rangle$ with order p^n . (Explicitly, it is $\langle g^{p^{m-n}} \rangle$.) Also $\langle h \rangle$ has order p^n , so our hypothesis that G has at most one subgroup per size implies $\langle h \rangle \subset \langle g \rangle$, so $h \in \langle g \rangle$. Therefore $G \subset \langle g \rangle$, so $\langle g \rangle = G$. (I learned this argument from Trevor Hyde.)

Step 2: Let G be a finite group with at most one subgroup per size. Therefore $n_p = 1$ for all primes p . For different primes p and q dividing $|G|$, the elements of the p -Sylow and q -Sylow subgroups commute with each other by Theorem 3.2.

All subgroups of G have at most one subgroup of each size (otherwise G itself would have two subgroups of the same size), so by Step 1 the p -Sylow subgroup of G is cyclic. Choose a generator g_p of the p -Sylow subgroup of G . The order of g_p is the size of the p -Sylow subgroup of G . These g_p 's commute as p varies, by the previous paragraph, and their orders are relatively prime, so the product of the g_p 's has order equal to the product of the sizes of the Sylow subgroups of G . This product of sizes is $|G|$, so G is cyclic. \square

Here is another application of Sylow I to prove a similar theorem.

Theorem A.2. *Let G be a finite group such that, for each n dividing $|G|$, the equation $x^n = 1$ in G has at most n solutions. Then G is cyclic.*

Proof. We again argue in two steps: check the prime power case (not using the Sylow theorems) and reduce the general case to the prime-power case using Sylow I.

Step 1: Let $|G| = p^k$. Our argument will be similar to that of Step 1 in the previous theorem. Choose $g \in G$ with maximal order, say p^m . All p^m elements of $\langle g \rangle$ satisfy $x^{p^m} = 1$, so by hypothesis the solutions to $x^{p^m} = 1$ in G are precisely the elements of $\langle g \rangle$. For each $h \in G$, its order is a p -power at most p^m , so the order of h divides p^m , which implies $h^{p^m} = 1$. Thus $h \in \langle g \rangle$. Since h was arbitrary, $G = \langle g \rangle$.

Step 2: Let p be a prime dividing $|G|$ and p^k be the largest power of p in $|G|$. Every $g \in G$ of p -power order in G has order dividing p^k (all orders divide $|G|$), so g is a solution to $x^{p^k} = 1$. Let P be a p -Sylow subgroup of G . It provides us with p^k solutions to this equation, so by assumption these are all the solutions. Therefore all elements of p -power order are in P , so P is the only p -Sylow subgroup.

The hypothesis on G passes to its subgroups, such as its Sylow subgroups, so by step 1 every Sylow subgroup of G is cyclic. That G is cyclic now follows by the same argument as in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem A.1. \square

The theorems in this section are not as impressive as they might appear because they can be proved using only information about cyclic groups and Lagrange's theorem.¹⁴

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Dummit and R. Foote, "Abstract Algebra," 3rd ed., Wiley, 2004.
- [2] M. Hall, On the Number of Sylow Subgroups in a Finite Group, *J. Algebra* **7** (1961), 363–371.
- [3] I. Herstein, "Topics in Algebra," 2nd ed., Wiley, 1975.
- [4] N. Jacobson, "Basic Algebra I," 2nd ed., W. H. Freeman & Co., New York, 1985
- [5] P. B. Kleidman, A proof of the Kegel–Wielandt conjecture on subnormal subgroups, *Ann. of Math.* **133** (1991), 369–428.
- [6] C. Leedham-Green, "The Structure of Groups of Prime Power Order," Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2002.
- [7] D. J. S. Robinson, "A Course in the Theory of Groups," Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
- [8] W. R. Scott, "Group Theory," Dover, New York, 1987.

¹⁴See Section 7 in <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/grouptheory/coset.pdf>.