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#### Abstract

Let $G, H$ be finite groups. We asymptotically compute $\left|\operatorname{Hom}\left(G, H / A_{n}\right)\right|$, thereby establishing a conjecture of T. Müller.


Let $G, H$ be finite groups. T. Müller[2] developed an enumerative theory of homomorphisms $\varphi: G \rightarrow H\left\{S_{n}\right.$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and asked to generalize this theory to other sequences of groups. In particular, he conjectured the following.
Conjecture 1. Let $G, H$ be a finite groups. Then we have for $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$
\left|\operatorname{Hom}\left(G, H \succ A_{n}\right)\right|=\left(\frac{1}{1+s_{2}(G)}+\mathcal{O}\left(e^{-c n^{1 /|G|}}\right)\right)\left|\operatorname{Hom}\left(G, H \imath S_{n}\right)\right|
$$

where $s_{2}(G)$ is the number of subgroups of index 2 in $G$.
It is the aim of this note to proof this conjecture.
Theorem 1. Conjecture 1 holds true for all finite groups $G$ and $H$.
One of the applications of wreath product representations is the recognition of finite index subgroups of infinite groups. Let $\Gamma$ be an infinite group, $\Delta$ a subgroup of index $n$. The action of $\Gamma$ on the cosets $\Gamma / \Delta$ by shift defines a homomorphism $\varphi: \Gamma \rightarrow S_{n}$. If in addition we know the number of lifts of $\varphi$ to homomorphisms $\psi: \Gamma \rightarrow H$ < $S_{n}$, we can compute $|\operatorname{Hom}(\Delta, H)|$. Doing so for different choices of $H$ one can in certain situations gather sufficient information to reconstruct $\Delta$. For $\Gamma$ being a free product of cyclic groups of prime order this reconstruction was completed in [3], for free products of arbitrary finite groups in [5].

[^0]Comparing homomorphisms into $H$ l $A_{n}$ with homomorphisms into $H$ l $S_{n}$ gives information on the embedding of finite index subgroups in large groups. More precisely define for a subgroup $\Delta$ of a group $\Gamma$ the core $\Delta^{c}$ as the normal subgroup $\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \Delta^{\gamma}$. Then the case $H=1$ of Theorem 1 implies that the probability that a random subgroup $\Delta$ of index $n$ of a free product $\Gamma=G_{1} * \ldots G_{r}$ of finite groups satisfies $\Gamma / \Delta^{c} \cong A_{n}$ converges to $\prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{1}{1+s_{2}\left(G_{i}\right)}$. The case of general $H$ yields that the property $\Gamma / \Delta^{c} \cong A_{n}$ and the isomorphism type of $\Delta$ are asymptotically independent. It would be interesting to generalize such considerations to arbitrary virtually free groups.

We now turn to the proof of the Theorem. We denote by $\pi$ the canonical projection $H$ l $S_{n} \rightarrow S_{n}$, and by $\epsilon$ the sign homomorphism $S_{n} \rightarrow C_{2}$. We view $C_{2}$ as $\{ \pm 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, that is, we write the group operation of $C_{2}$ multiplicatively, but allow for the addition of values as in $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $\varphi: G \rightarrow H \backslash S_{n}$ be a homomorphism. Then $\epsilon \circ \pi \circ \varphi: G \rightarrow C_{2}$ has a kernel containing $G^{2} G^{\prime}$. We denote the induced homomorphism $V=G / G^{2} G^{\prime} \rightarrow C_{2}$ by $\bar{\varphi}$. To prove our theorem it is therefore sufficient to show that if $\varphi \in \operatorname{Hom}\left(G, H \succ S_{n}\right)$ is chosen at random, then the distribution of $\bar{\varphi}$ converges to a uniform distribution. This is certainly true if $s_{2}(G)=0$, because then $G=G^{2} G^{\prime}$. We shall therefore from now on assume that $s_{2}(G)>0$, that is, $V$ is a non-trivial elementary abelian 2-group. Then our claim is equivalent to the statement that for every non-trivial $v \in V$ we have

$$
h_{n}^{v}(G, H):=\frac{1}{\left|\operatorname{Hom}\left(G, H \succ S_{n}\right)\right|} \sum_{\varphi \in \operatorname{Hom}\left(G, H \imath S_{n}\right)} \bar{\varphi}(v) \ll e^{-c n^{-1 /|G|}},
$$

where we identified $C_{2}$ with $\{ \pm 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$.
We first compute the dependence of $h_{n}^{v}(G, H)$ on $H$.
Lemma 1. Let $G, H$ be finite groups, $\varphi: G \rightarrow S_{n}$ a transitive permutation representation, $\pi: H \backslash S_{n} \rightarrow S_{n}$ the canonical projection. Then the number of homomorphisms $\psi: G \rightarrow H \imath S_{n}$ satisfying $\pi \circ \psi=\varphi$ equals $|H|^{n-1}$.

Proof. This follows form the proof of [3, Proposition 1], more precisely the equality between [3, (8)] and [3, (9)].

Next we compute the generating series of $h_{n}^{v}(G, H)$.
Lemma 2. We have

$$
\sum_{v \geq 0} \frac{h_{n}^{v}(G, H)}{n!} x^{n}=\exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{|G|} \sum_{\psi: G \rightarrow S_{k} \text { transitive }} \bar{\psi}(v) \frac{|H|^{k-1} x^{k}}{k!}\right)
$$

Proof. This is a weighted version of the exponential principle, see e.g. [6, Theorem 5.1.4]. We only have to show that if $\pi \circ \varphi$ decomposes as $\pi \circ \varphi=\bigoplus a_{i} \psi_{i}$, where the $\psi_{i}$ are transitive permutation representations, then $\bar{\varphi}(v)=\Pi \bar{\psi}(v)^{a_{i}}$. However, this follows immediately from the fact that $\epsilon$ is a homomorphism.

To deal with the generating series we need a stability result similar to [4], note however, that here we do not require $P_{2}$ to be Hayman admissible. In fact it is easy to see that $\sum_{v \geq 0} \frac{h_{n}^{v}(G, H)}{n!} x^{n}$ is Hayman admissible if and only if $s_{2}(G)=0$, which is precisely the case we are not interested in.

Lemma 3. Let $P_{1}(x)=\sum_{v=1}^{d} a_{v}^{(1)} x^{v}$ be a polynomial with non-negative real coefficients, $a_{d}^{(1)} \neq 0$, and let $P_{2}=\sum_{n=1}^{d} a_{v}^{(2)} x^{v}$ be a polynomial with complex coefficients satisfying $\left|a_{v}^{(2)}\right| \leq a_{v}^{(1)}$ for all $v \leq d$. Define the sequences $b_{v}^{(1)}, b_{v}^{(2)}$ by the relation $\sum_{v=0}^{\infty} \frac{b_{v}^{(i)}}{v!} x^{v}=$ $e^{P_{i}(x)}$. Then either there exists some complex number $\zeta$ with $|\zeta|=1$, such that $P_{1}(x)=$ $P_{2}(\zeta x)$, or there is some $c>0$ such that $\left|b_{v}^{(2)}\right|<e^{-c v^{1 / d}}\left|b_{v}^{(1)}\right|$ for all $v$ sufficiently large.

Proof. Let $\rho_{n}$ be the unique real solution of the equation $\rho P^{\prime}(\rho)=n$. It then follows from Hayman's theorem [1, Theorem I] that

$$
b_{n}^{(1)} \sim \frac{\exp \left(P_{1}\left(\rho_{n}\right)\right)}{\rho_{n}^{n} \sqrt{2 \pi\left(\rho_{n} P_{1}^{\prime}\left(\rho_{n}\right)+\rho_{n}^{2} P^{\prime \prime}\left(\rho_{n}\right)\right)}} .
$$

We now express $b_{n}^{(2)}$ using Cauchy's integral formula as

$$
b_{n}^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{\partial B_{\rho_{n}}(0)} \frac{\exp \left(P_{2}(z)\right)}{z^{n+1}} d z
$$

to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|b_{n}^{(2)}\right| & \leq \frac{\max _{|z|=\rho_{n}} \mid \exp \left(P_{2}(z) \mid\right.}{\rho_{n}^{n}} \\
& \leq(\sqrt{2 \pi} d+o(1)) \rho_{n}^{d / 2} \frac{\max _{|z|=\rho_{n}} \mid \exp \left(P_{2}(z) \mid\right.}{\exp \left(P_{1}\left(\rho_{n}\right)\right)} b_{n}^{(1)} \\
& \ll n^{1 / 2} \frac{\max _{|z|=\rho_{n}}^{\exp \left(P_{1}\left(\rho_{n}\right)\right)}}{\exp \left(P_{2}(z) \mid\right.} b_{n}^{(1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used the fact that for $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\rho_{n} \sim c n^{1 / d}$. Hence it suffices to show that either there is some $\zeta$ with $P_{1}(x)=P_{2}(\zeta x)$, or

$$
\max _{|z|=\rho_{n}} \Re P_{2}(z)<P_{1}\left(\rho_{n}\right)-c n^{1 / d}
$$

for some $c>0$. If there exists some $v$ with $\left|a_{v}^{(2)}\right|<a_{v}^{(1)}$, then this follows immediately from the triangle inequality. Define the function $f:[0,2 \pi] \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ by

$$
f(\theta)=\max _{\substack{1 \leq v \leq d \\ a_{v} \neq 0}}\left|v \theta+\arg a_{v}^{(2)} \bmod 2 \pi\right|,
$$

where we normalize mod in such a way that it takes values in $[-\pi, \pi)$. Being continuous, this function either has a zero $\xi$, or it is uniformly bounded from below by some positive constant $\delta$. In the first case we obtain $P_{2}(x)=P_{1}\left(e^{i \xi} x\right)$,
while in the second we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{1}\left(\rho_{n}\right)-\Re P_{2}\left(e^{i \theta} \rho_{n}\right) & =\sum_{v=1}^{d}\left(1-\Re e^{i\left(v \theta+\arg a_{v}^{(2)}\right)}\right) a_{v}^{(1)} \rho_{n}^{v} \\
& \geq\left(1-\Re e^{i \delta}\right) \min _{\substack{1 \leq v \leq d \\
a_{v} \neq 0}} a_{v} \rho_{n}^{v} \\
& \geq\left((1-\cos \delta) \min _{\substack{1 \leq v \leq d \\
a_{v} \neq 0}} a_{v}\right) n^{1 / d}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence in either case our claim follows.
We can now finish the proof of the theorem. We have to show that for $v \neq 0$ we have $h_{n}^{v}(G, H) \ll e^{-c n^{1 / d}} h_{n}^{0}(G, H)$. We have

$$
\left|\sum_{\psi: G \rightarrow S_{k} \text { transitive }} \bar{\psi}(v) \frac{|H|^{k-1}}{k!}\right| \leq \sum_{\psi: G \rightarrow S_{k} \text { transitive }} \frac{|H|^{k-1}}{k!}
$$

for every $k$, hence we can apply Lemma 3 to find that either our claim holds true, or there exists some $\zeta$ with $|\zeta|=1$, such that

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{|G|} \sum_{\psi: G \rightarrow S_{k} \text { transitive }} \bar{\psi}(v) \frac{|H|^{k-1} x^{k}}{k!}=\sum_{k=1}^{|G|} \sum_{\psi: G \rightarrow S_{k} \text { transitive }} \frac{|H|^{k-1}(\zeta x)^{k}}{k!}
$$

Consider first the coefficient of $x$ in these polynomials. There is only the trivial representation $G \rightarrow S_{1}=1$, hence the coefficient of $x$ on both sides equals 1 , and we conclude $\zeta=1$.

Next we consider the coefficient of $x^{2}$. Let $\bar{U}<G / G^{2} G^{\prime}$ be a subspace of codimension 1, which does not contain $v$, and $U$ be the preimage of $\bar{U}$ under the canonical map $G \rightarrow G / G^{2} G^{\prime}$. Then $\psi_{0}: G \rightarrow G / U \cong S_{2}$ is a homomorphism, for which $\overline{\psi_{0}}(v)=-1$, and we conclude that

$$
\Sigma_{1}=\sum_{\psi: G \rightarrow S_{2} \text { transitive }} \bar{\psi}(v) \frac{|H|}{2}<\sum_{\psi: G \rightarrow S_{2} \text { transitive }} \frac{|H|}{2}=\Sigma_{2}
$$

say, while the equality $P_{1}(x)=P_{2}(\zeta x)$ implies that $\Sigma_{1}=\zeta^{2} \Sigma_{2}$. Clearly both $\Sigma_{1}$ and $\Sigma_{2}$ are real, and we conclude that $\zeta^{2}=-1$. However, this contradicts the condition $\zeta=1$ obtained from the coefficient of $x$, and our claim follows.
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