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## 1. Introduction

If $n$ is an integer greater than 1 , then a group $G$ belongs to the class $P_{n}$ if every ordered product of $n$ elements can be reordered in at least one way; in other words, to each $n$-tuple ( $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$ ) of elements of $G$ there corresponds a non-trivial element $\sigma$ of the symmetric group $\Sigma_{n}$ such that

$$
x_{1} x_{2} \cdots x_{n}=x_{\sigma(1)} x_{\sigma(2)} \cdots x_{\sigma(n)}
$$

The union of the classes $P_{n}, n \geq 2$, is denoted by $P$. It was shown in [4] that $P$ consists precisely of the finite-by-abelian-by-finite groups.

Clearly $P_{2}$ is the class of abelian groups, while $G \in P_{3}$ if and only if $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 2$ [3]. Graham Higman [6] characterised finite groups of odd order in $P_{4}$ and also proved that a group $G$ with $G^{\prime} \cong V_{4}$ (the 4-group) always belongs to $P_{4}$. Then in [8], improving a result in [1], it was shown that all $P_{4}$-groups are metabelian. Finally in [9] the non-nilpotent $P_{4}$-groups were classified and the nilpotent $P_{4}$-groups were shown to have class at most 4 . We recall the details of these results in §2.

The present work is a further contribution to the classification of $P_{4}$-groups. We determine precisely which finite 2 -groups of class 2 belong to $P_{4}$. Combining this work with the results of [9] it has been possible to classify all $P_{4}$-groups and a complete description by M. Maj and the present authors will appear elsewhere. The finite 2 -groups of class 2 , however, are most conveniently treated independently. If $G$ is such a group in $P_{4}$, we shall see that $G^{\prime}$ has exponent at most 4 . Our main results are:

Theorem A. Let $G$ be a finite 2-group of class 2 with $G^{\prime}$ of exponent 4. Then $G \in P_{4}$ if and only if $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$ and $G$ has a subgroup $B$ of index 2 with $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$.

[^0]Theorem B. Let $G$ be a finite 2-group of class 2 with $G^{\prime}$ of exponent 2. Then $G \in P_{4}$ if and only if
(i) $G$ has an abelian subgroup of index 2 , or
(ii) $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$, or
(iii) $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$ and $G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 3 elements, or
(iv) $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8, G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 4 elements and $G$ is not the product of two abelian subgroups.

Notation is as follows.
$C_{n} \quad$ a cyclic group of order $n$,
$V_{4}$ the 4-group,
$\Sigma_{n} \quad$ the symmetric group of degree $n$,
$G^{\prime} \quad$ derived subgroup of $G$,
$Z(G)$ centre of $G$,
$C_{G}$ centraliser in $G$,
$\Phi(G) \quad$ Frattini subgroup of $G$,
$|g|$ order of element $g$,
$g^{x} \quad x^{-1} g x$,
[ $x, y$ ] $\quad x^{-1} y^{-1} x y$,
$\exp G$ exponent of $G$.

## 2. Known results

First we state Higman's two contributions [6]. ${ }^{2}$
2.1. Let $G$ be a group with $G^{\prime} \cong V_{4}$. Then $G \in P_{4}$.
2.2. Let $G$ be a finite group of odd order. Then $G \in P_{4}$ if and only if one of the following holds:
(i) $G$ is abelian;
(ii) $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=3$;
(iii) $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=5$ and $|G / Z(G)|=25$.

The result which first suggested that a complete description of the class $P_{4}$ might be possible is:
2.3. [8]. If a group $G$ belongs to $P_{4}$, then $G$ is metabelian.

A useful result from [9] (namely 2.1.3) is:

[^1]2.4. Let $G$ be a finite 2-group belonging to $P_{4}$ and let $A$ be an abelian subgroup of $G$ containing $G^{\prime}$. If $G=A\langle x\rangle$, then one of the following holds:
(1) $\left[A, x^{2}\right]=1$;
(2) $G^{\prime} \cong V_{4}$;
(3) $\quad G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$ and $G^{\prime} \leq Z(G)$.

Finally the main theorem of [9], which characterizes the non-nilpotent groups in $P_{4}$, is:
2.5. $A$ group $G$ belongs to $P_{4}$ if and only if one of the following holds:
(i) $G$ has an abelian subgroup of index 2;
(ii) $G$ is nilpotent of class $\leq 4$ and $G \in P_{4}$;
(iii) $\quad G^{\prime} \cong V_{4}$;
(iv) $G=B\langle a, x\rangle$, where $B \leq Z(G),|a|=5$ and $a^{x}=a^{2}$.

## 3. Proofs of Theorems A and B

Throughout
$G$ denotes a finite 2-group of class $\leq 2$.
Our objective is to find necessary and sufficient conditions for $G$ to belong to $P_{4}$. If $G \in P_{4}$, then since each element of $G$ belongs to an abelian subgroup containing $G^{\prime}$, it follows from 2.4 that $\exp G^{\prime} \leq 4$. In 3.1 we study the case where $\exp G^{\prime}=4$. It turns out then that $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$ (3.1.2) in which case necessary and sufficient conditions for $G \in P_{4}$ are founded in Theorem A. The case when $\exp G^{\prime}=2$ is considered in 3.2. If $G \in P_{4}$, then either $G$ has an abelian subgroup of index 2 or $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 8$. The complete description of this case is given in Theorem B.

## 3.1. $G^{\prime}$ of exponent 4.

Following Philip Hall we call a group diabelian if it is the product of two abelian subgroups. Then we have:

### 3.1.1. Let $G$ be diabelian with $\exp G^{\prime}=4$. If $G \in P_{4}$, then $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$.

Proof. We have $G=A X$ with $A$ and $X$ abelian and $Z(G) \leq A \cap X$. Let $a \in A, x \in X$ such that $|[a, x]|=4$. Then $\left[a, x^{2}\right] \neq 1$ and so, by 2.4, $[A, x] \leq\langle[a, x]\rangle$. Similarly $[a, X] \leq\langle[a, x]\rangle$. Now for each $x_{1} \in X$, either $\left|\left[a, x_{1}\right]\right|=4$ or $\left|\left[a, x x_{1}\right]\right|=4$. Thus either $\left[A, x_{1}\right] \leq\left\langle\left[a, x_{1}\right]\right\rangle$ or $\left[A, x x_{1}\right] \leq$ $\left\langle\left[a, x x_{1}\right]\right\rangle$. Therefore $G^{\prime}=[A, X]=\langle[a, x]\rangle$.

Now we can dispense with the hypothesis that $G$ is diabelian.
3.1.2. Let $G \in P_{4}$ and $\exp G^{\prime}=4$. Then $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$.

Proof. Let $a, x \in G$ such that $|[a, x]|=4$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle a, x, y\rangle^{\prime}=\langle[a, x]\rangle \quad \text { for all } y \in G \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For, write $X=\langle a, x, y\rangle$ and $b=[x, y]$. Suppose that $|b| \leq 2$. By 3.1.1, it suffices to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
X \text { is diabelian. } \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we may assume that $b \neq 1$. If $\left[a, x^{2}\right] \in\langle b\rangle$, then $\left[x, a^{2} y\right]=1$ and (2) follows. Assume therefore that $\left[a, x^{2}\right] \notin\langle b\rangle$. Since $X /\langle b\rangle$ is diabelian, 3.1.1 gives $(X /\langle b\rangle)^{\prime}=\langle[a, x]\langle b\rangle\rangle$ and so

$$
[a, y] \in\langle[a, x], b\rangle \cong C_{4} \times C_{2}
$$

If $[a, y]=[a, x]^{i}$ for some integer $i$, then $\left[a, y^{-1} x^{i}\right]=1$ and

$$
X=\left\langle a, y^{-1}, x^{i}\right\rangle\langle x\rangle Z(X)
$$

is diabelian, If $[a, y]=[a, x]^{i} b$, then $\left[x a^{-1}, a^{-i} y\right]=1$ and again

$$
X=\langle x\rangle\left\langle x a^{-1}, a^{-i} y\right\rangle Z(X)
$$

is diabelian.
Now suppose that $|b|=4$. Then $\left|\left[x, y^{2}\right]\right|=2$ and by the previous case

$$
\left[x, y^{2}\right] \in\left\langle a, x, y^{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}=\langle[a, x]\rangle
$$

Therefore $\left[x, y^{2}\right]=\left[a^{2}, x\right]$ and $[x, a y]^{2}=1$. Thus again by the previous case (with $y$ replaced by $a y$ )

$$
X^{\prime}=\langle a, x, a y\rangle^{\prime}=\langle[a, x]\rangle
$$

Now we have established (1).
Let $g, z \in G$. It suffices to show that $[g, z] \in\langle[a, x]\rangle$. By (1),

$$
[a, g] \text { and }[x, z] \quad \text { belong to }\langle[a, x]\rangle .
$$

If $|[a, g]|=4$, then again by (1)

$$
\langle a, g, z\rangle^{\prime}=\langle[a, g]\rangle=\langle[a, x]\rangle
$$

and so $[g, z] \in\langle[a, x]\rangle$. If $|[a, g]| \leq 2$, then $|[a, x g]|=4$ and (1) gives

$$
\langle a, x g, z\rangle^{\prime}=\langle[a, x g]\rangle=\langle[a, x]\rangle
$$

and hence $[g, z]=[x, z]^{-1}[x g, z] \in\langle[a, x]\rangle$.
If $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$, then $G$ does not necessarily belong to $P_{4}$. The following result (which we need for our classification purposes anyway) will enable us to construct an example of this fact.
3.1.3. Suppose that $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$. Then the following are equivalent:
(i) $G \notin P_{4}$;
(ii) there are elements $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4} \in G$ such that $\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]=\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]=$ $\left[x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$ of order 4 and $\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{1}, x_{4}\right]=\left[x_{2}, x_{4}\right]=1$.

Proof. Suppose that $G \notin P_{4}$ and that the product $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}$ cannot be reordered. Then

$$
x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}=x_{4} x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} a=x_{4} x_{3} x_{1} x_{2} b=x_{4} x_{3} x_{2} x_{1} c
$$

with $G^{\prime}=\{1, a, b, c\}$. Let $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}=x_{4} x_{1} x_{3} x_{2} d$. Clearly $d \neq a$; and if $d=c$, then

$$
x_{1} x_{3} x_{2}=x_{3} x_{2} x_{1}
$$

giving

$$
1=\left[x_{1}, x_{3} x_{2}\right]=\left[x_{1}, x_{2} x_{3}\right]
$$

a contradiction. Therefore $d=b$ and so

$$
\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]=1
$$

In the same way we obtain $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}=x_{4} x_{2} x_{1} x_{3} b$ and so $x_{2} x_{1} x_{3}=x_{3} x_{1} x_{2}$ $=x_{1} x_{3} x_{2}$. Therefore $\left[x_{2}, x_{1} x_{3}\right]=1$ and

$$
\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]=\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]
$$

Since $x_{4}^{-1} x_{3}^{-1} x_{2}^{-1} x_{1}^{-1}$ also cannot be reordered, we have, by the same argument,

$$
\left[x_{2}, x_{4}\right]=1 \quad \text { and } \quad\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{3}, x_{4}\right]
$$

Now consider $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}=x_{1} x_{4} x_{2} x_{3} e$. If $e=b$, then $x_{4} x_{3} x_{1} x_{2}=$ $x_{1} x_{4} x_{2} x_{3}=x_{1} x_{2} x_{4} x_{3}$ and $1=\left[x_{1} x_{2}, x_{4} x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{1} x_{2}, x_{3} x_{4}\right]$, a contradiction. If $e=c$, then $x_{4} x_{3} x_{2} x_{1}=x_{1} x_{4} x_{2} x_{3}=x_{1} x_{2} x_{4} x_{3}$ and $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}=x_{3} x_{4} x_{2} x_{1}$,
again a contradiction. Therefore $e=a$ and

$$
\left[x_{1}, x_{4}\right]=1
$$

Finally, $a=\left[x_{3}, x_{4}\right]=\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]$ cannot have order 2, otherwise $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}=x_{2} x_{1} x_{4} x_{3}$. Thus (i) implies (ii).

Conversely, if (ii) is true, a routine check shows that $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}$ cannot be reordered and so (i) follows.

We can now construct an example of a finite 2 -group $G$ of class 2 with $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$ and $G \notin P_{4}$. Thus let

$$
G=\left(\left\langle x_{2}\right\rangle \times\left\langle x_{4}\right\rangle \times\langle a\rangle\right) \rtimes\left(\left\langle x_{1}\right\rangle \times\left\langle x_{3}\right\rangle\right)
$$

where $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}$ and $a$ all have order 4,

$$
\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]=\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{3}, x_{4}\right]=a
$$

and

$$
\left[x_{1}, x_{4}\right]=\left[x_{1}, a\right]=\left[x_{3}, a\right]=1
$$

Then $G^{\prime}=\langle a\rangle \leq Z(G)$ and $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$. Moreover the elements $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}$ satisfy (ii) of 3.1.3 and so $G \notin P_{4}$.

The structure of the groups under consideration which belong to $P_{4}$ can now be described.
3.1.4. Suppose that $G^{\prime} \cong C_{4}$. Then $G \in P_{4}$ if and only if $G$ has a subgroup $B$ of index 2 with $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$.

Proof. Suppose that $G \in P_{4}$ and let $B$ be a subgroup of $G$, maximal subject to $\left|B^{\prime}\right|=2$. Then $Z(G) \leq B \triangleleft G$. We show that $|G / B|=2$.

Since for all $g \in G,\left\langle B, g^{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}=B^{\prime}$, we have

## $G / B$ is elementary abelian.

Suppose, to the contrary, that $G$ has 2 independent elements modulo $B$, say $w, y$. By choice of $B$, there is an element $x \in B$ such that $|[x, w]|=4$. Put $a=[x, w]$. Thus $G^{\prime}=\langle a\rangle$ and $B^{\prime}=\left\langle a^{2}\right\rangle$. For some integer $i$, we have $[w, y]=\left[x^{i}, w\right]$ and so $\left[w, x^{i} y\right]=1$. Therefore taking $x^{i} y$ for $y$, we may assume that $[w, y]=1$.

Now $B=C_{B}(w)\langle x\rangle$. If $\left[C_{B}(w), y\right] \leq B^{\prime}$, then $|[x, y]|=4$, since $\langle B, y\rangle^{\prime}=$ $\langle a\rangle$. Thus $\left[x, w^{2} y^{2}\right]=1$ and so $\langle B, w y\rangle^{\prime}=B^{\prime}$, again contradicting our choice of $B$. Therefore there is an element $z \in C_{B}(w)$ such that

$$
|[z, y]|=4
$$

If $[x, z] \neq 1$, then $[x, z]=a^{2}$ and hence $\left[x y^{2}, z\right]=1$; and $x y^{2} \in B$, $\left[x y^{2}, w\right]=[x, w]$. Thus taking $x y^{2}$ for $x$, we may assume that

$$
[x, z]=1
$$

and (replacing $z$ by $z^{-1}$ if necessary) that $[y, z]=a$. Also replacing $x$ by $x z$ if necessary, we may assume that $|[x, y]|=4$. Then replacing $x$ by $x z^{2}$ if necessary, we may assume that $[x, y]=a$.

Taking $w, x, y^{-1}, z$ for $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}$ respectively, we see that (ii) of 3.1.3 holds, contradicting $G \in P_{4}$. It follows that $|G / B|=2$.

Conversely, suppose that there is a subgroup $B \triangleleft G$ with $|G / B|=\left|B^{\prime}\right|=$ 2. Assume, to the contrary, that $G \notin P_{4}$. By 3.1.3 there are elements $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4} \in G$ such that $\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{1}, x_{4}\right]=1$ and $\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]=\left[x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$ of order 4. Thus $C_{G}\left(x_{1}\right)^{\prime}=G^{\prime}$. If $x_{1} \notin B$, then $G=\left\langle B, x_{1}\right\rangle$ and $C_{G}\left(x_{1}\right)=$ $\left\langle x_{1}\right\rangle C_{B}\left(x_{1}\right)$, giving $C_{G}\left(x_{1}\right)^{\prime}=C_{B}\left(x_{1}\right)^{\prime} \leq B^{\prime}$, a contradiction. Therefore $x_{1} \in$ $B$. Hence $x_{2} \notin B$ and so $C_{G}\left(x_{1}\right) \leq B$, again a contradiction. Then $G \in P_{4}$ as required.

From 3.1.2 and 3.1.4 we obtain Theorem A.

## 3.2. $G^{\prime}$ of exponent 2.

Throughout this section (except for 3.2.6)

## $G$ denotes a finite 2-group of class $\leq 2$ and with $G^{\prime}$ elementary.

First we show that if $G$ can be generated by 3 elements, then $G \in P_{4}$. After this we find necessary and sufficient conditions for $G \in P_{4}$ when $G$ is generated by 4 elements. The general case (Theorem B) is handled by studying the situation in which $G / A$ is generated by 3 elements, for some maximal normal abelian subgroup $A$ of $G$.

In the proof of the following result, and occasionally thereafter, we make use of the Burnside Basis Theorem (see, for example, [13]).

### 3.2.1. Let $G$ be generated by 3 elements. Then $G \in P_{4}$.

Proof. Let $B$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$. Then $B / \Phi(G)$ can be generated by 2 elements and so $\left|B^{\prime}\right| \leq 2$, since $\Phi(G) \leq Z(G)$. Therefore $B \in P_{3}$.

Now let $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4} \in G$ and suppose, for a contradiction, that $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}$ cannot be reordered. Then $\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle \notin P_{3}$ and so $G=\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$. Thus

$$
x_{4}=x_{1}^{i} x_{2}^{j} x_{3}^{k} z
$$

where $z \in Z(G)$ and $0 \leq i, j, k \leq 1$. If $i=0$, then

$$
x_{1} x_{2}^{1-j} x_{4} x_{3}^{1-k} x_{2}^{j} x_{3}^{k}=x_{1} x_{2}^{1-j} \cdot x_{2}^{j} x_{3}^{k} z \cdot x_{3}^{1-k} x_{2}^{j} x_{3}^{k}=x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4},
$$

a contradiction for all choices of $j$ and $k$. Therefore $i=1$ and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{4} x_{2}^{1-j} x_{3}^{1-k} x_{1} x_{2}^{j} x_{3}^{k} & =x_{4} x_{2}^{1-j} x_{3}^{1-k} x_{4} z^{-1} \\
& =x_{4} z^{-1} x_{2}^{1-j} x_{3}^{1-k} x_{4} \\
& =x_{1} x_{2}^{j} x_{3}^{k} x_{2}^{1-j} x_{3}^{1-k} x_{4} \\
& =x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4} \quad \text { if } j=k=0 \quad \text { or } \quad j=1,
\end{aligned}
$$

again a contradiction. It follows that $x_{4}=x_{1} x_{3} z$ and so

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4} & =x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\left(x_{1} x_{3} z\right) \\
& =x_{3} x_{1} x_{2}\left(x_{1} x_{3} z\right)\left[x_{1} x_{2}, x_{3}\right] \\
& =x_{3} x_{1}\left(x_{3} x_{2} x_{1}\right) z\left[x_{2} x_{1}, x_{3}\right]\left[x_{1} x_{2}, x_{3}\right] \\
& =x_{3}\left(x_{1} x_{3} z\right) x_{2} x_{1} \\
& =x_{3} x_{4} x_{2} x_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

a final contradiction. Therefore $G \in P_{4}$.
Now we proceed to the case when $G$ can be generated by 4 elements and record first some routine observations.
3.2.2. Let $w, x, y, z \in G$ and put $a=[w, x], b=[w, y], c=[w, z], d=$ $[x, y], e=[x, z], f=[y, z]$. Then the product wxyz can be reordered if and only if at least one of the following elements is equal to 1 :

$$
\begin{align*}
& a, d, f, \\
& a b, a f, b d, d e, e f, \\
& a b c, a b d, a c f, b d e, c e f, d e f, \\
& a b c d, a b c f, a c e f, b c d e, c d e f,  \tag{*}\\
& a b c d e, a b c e f, b c d e f, \\
& \text { abcdef. }
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. This follows by setting the product wxyz equal to each of its 23 reorderings in turn.

As a straightforward corollary, we have:
3.2.3. With the same notation as 3.2.2, let $r$ be the rank of $\langle w, x, y, z\rangle$. Then the product wxyz cannot be reordered in each of the following cases:
(i) $r=5, b=1$ :
(ii) $r=4, b=c=1$;
(iii) $r=4, b=e=1$;
(iv) $r=3, b=c=e=1$;
(v) $r=3, b=c d=a d e=1$;
(vi) $r=3, b=c d f=a d e f=1$.

Using these results we can establish:
3.2.4. Suppose that $G=\langle w, x, y, z\rangle$ with $[w, y]=[x, z]=1$ and $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \geq$ 8. Then $G \notin P_{4}$.

Proof. We adopt the notation of 3.2.2 with $r=\operatorname{rank} G^{\prime}$. By hypothesis $b=e=1$. If $r=4$, then $G \notin P_{4}$ by 3.2.3(iii). Therefore suppose that $r=3$. Then there are $i, j, k, l \in\{0,1\}$, not all 0 , such that $a^{i} c^{j} d^{k} f^{l}=1$. If $i=1$, then replacing the 4-tuple $(w, x, y, z)$ by $(w, z, y, x), c$ is interchanged with $a$ and so we may assume that $j=1$. Similarly if $k=1$, we can argue with $(x, w, z, y)$ and if $l=1$ with $(y, x, w, z)$ so that we may assume $j=1$ in all cases.

Thus $\{a, d, f\}$ is a basis for $G^{\prime}$ and

$$
c=a^{i} d^{k} f^{l}
$$

If $c=1$, then $G \notin P_{4}$ by 3.2.3(iv). For the other values of $c$, there are 4 elements (indicated in column 2 below), which we may substitute for $w, x, y, z$, whose product cannot be reordered, again by 3.2.3 (the relevant part being indicated in column 3).

| $c$ | 4 elements | 3.2 .3 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $a$ | $w, x, y, x z$ | (iv) |
| $d$ | $w, x, y, w y z$ | (v) |
| $f$ | $w y, x, y$ | (iv) |
| $d f$ | $w, x y, y, w y z$ | (vi) |
| $a f$ | $w y, x, y, w x z$ | (v) |
| $a d$ | $w, w x, w y, w z$ | (v) |
| $a d f$ | $w y, x, y, x z$ | (iv) |

Thus $G \notin P_{4}$.
Now we can exclude from $P_{4}$ those 4-generator groups $G$ with $\left|G^{\prime}\right|>8$.

### 3.2.5. Let $G$ be generated by 4 elements and $\left|G^{\prime}\right|>8$. Then $G \notin P_{4}$.

Proof. Since $G$ has a quotient with derived subgroup of order 16, we may assume that $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=16$. Suppose that $G=\langle w, x, y, z\rangle$ with $[w, y]=1$. By 3.2.4 we may assume that $[x, z] \neq 1$. Let $N=\langle x, z\rangle^{\prime}$ and write $\bar{G}=G / N$, $\bar{g}=N g$ for all $g \in G$. Then $\bar{G}=\langle\bar{w}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}\rangle,\left|\bar{G}^{\prime}\right|=8$ and $[\bar{w}, \bar{y}]=$ $[\bar{x}, \bar{z}]=1$ and so $\bar{G} \notin P_{4}$, by 3.2.4. Therefore $G \notin P_{4}$.

Thus we can assume that
among any 4 elements which generate $G$, no two commute.
Let $G=\langle w, x, y, z\rangle$ and $X=\langle[w, x],[w, y],[w, z]\rangle$. By (3), $|X|=8$ and so $\left|G^{\prime} / X\right|=2$. Therefore at least one of the commutators $[x, y],[x, z],[x, y z]$ belongs to $X$ and clearly we may assume that $[x, y] \in X$. By (3) we have

$$
[x, y] \notin\langle[w, x],[w, y]\rangle
$$

for, if, for example, $[x, y]=[w, x][w, y]$, then $[w x, x y]=1$, contradicting (3). Hence $[x, y]=\left[w, x^{i} y^{j} z\right]$ for some integers $i, j$. Then $G /\langle x, y\rangle^{\prime} \notin P_{4}$ by 3.2.4. Therefore $G \notin P_{4}$.

If $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=2$, then $G \in P_{3}$ [3] and if $G^{\prime} \cong V_{4}$, then $G \in P_{4}$ (2.1). Thus among the 4-generator groups $G$, we have to consider only those with $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$. In this case $G$ has an abelian subgroup of index 4 . For, if $V$ is a 4-dimensional vector space over a finite field, then for any 3 antisymmetric bilinear forms on $V$, there is a subspace of dimension 2 on which all 3 forms are trivial [5]. Take $G / \Phi(G)$ for $V$ and let $N_{i}(i=1,2,3)$ be subgroups of order 4 in $G^{\prime}$ with $N_{1} \cap N_{2} \cap N_{3}=1$. Writing $\bar{g}=\Phi(G) g$ for all $g \in G$, and observing that $\Phi(G) \leq Z(G)$,

$$
\left(\bar{g}_{1}, \bar{g}_{2}\right)=N_{i}\left[g_{1}, g_{2}\right]
$$

defines an antisymmetric bilinear form in $V$ for each $i$, and so there is a subgroup $A / \Phi(G)$ of order 4 such that, for all $a_{1}, a_{2} \in A,\left[a_{1}, a_{2}\right] \in N_{i}$ ( $i=1,2,3$ ), i.e. $A$ is abelian.

An alternative argument suggested by Caranti may have independent interest.
3.2.6. Let $G$ be a 4-generator finite p-group of class 2 with $G^{\prime}$ elementary of rank 3. Then $G$ has an abelian subgroup of index $p^{2}$.

Proof. Since $\Phi(G) \leq Z(G)$, we may assume that $G / \Phi(G)$ has rank 4 and it suffices to show that $G$ has 2 commuting elements which are independent modulo $\Phi(G)$. Consider $V=G / \Phi(G)$ and $G^{\prime}$ as vector spaces over $G F(p)$.

Then there is a natural linear map from the wedge product $\Lambda^{2} V$ to $G^{\prime}$, namely

$$
\bar{g}_{1} \wedge \bar{g}_{2} \rightarrow\left[g_{1}, g_{2}\right]
$$

where $\bar{g}=\Phi(G) g$ for all $g \in G$. Let $K$ be the kernel of this map. We must show that $K$ contains a decomposable tensor $\bar{g}_{1} \wedge \bar{g}_{2} \neq 0$, i.e., that $K$ intersects non-trivially the (affine) Grassman manifold $\mathscr{G}$ of decomposable elements of $\Lambda^{2} V$. Now $\mathscr{G}$ is defined by a single quadratic equation in the 6-dimensional space $\Lambda^{2} V$. In fact $\mathscr{G}$ consists of all ( $\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{6}$ ) such that $\lambda_{1} \lambda_{6}-\lambda_{2} \lambda_{5}+\lambda_{3} \lambda_{4}=0$. (See [11], page 234.) Since $K$ has dimension 3, it is defined by 3 linear equations. The sum of the degrees of these 4 equations is $5<6$, and so by the theorem of Chevalley-Warning (see [12]), the 4 equations have a common non-trivial solution.

Remark. This result will be used later in 3.2.12 and the proof of Theorem B , and a chain of results terminating with those proofs now follows.

Reverting to our convention that $G$ is a finite 2-group of class $\leq 2$ with $G^{\prime}$ elementary, we have:
3.2.7. Let $G$ be generated by 4 elements. Then $G \in P_{4}$ if and only if
(i) $G$ has an abelian subgroup of index 2, or
(ii) $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$, or
(iii) $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$ and $G$ is not diabelian.

Proof. Let $G \in P_{4}$. Then, by $3.2 .5,\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 8$. If $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$ and $G$ does not have an abelian subgroup of index 2 , then $G$ is not diabelian by 3.2.4.

Conversely, if (i) or (ii) holds, then $G \in P_{4}$ by 2.5 . Thus suppose that

$$
\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8 \quad \text { and } \quad G \text { is not diabelian } .
$$

For a contradiction, assume that there are elements $w, x, y, z$ in $G$ such that

> wxyz cannot be reordered.

Let $H=\langle w, x, y, z\rangle$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=G \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For, if $H<G$, then $H \Phi(G) / \Phi(G) \cong H / H \cap \Phi(G)$ can be generated by 3 elements and hence $H / Z(H)$ can be generated by 3 elements. But then $H \in P_{4}$, by 3.2.1, a contradiction. Therefore (4) is true.

Adopt the notation for commutators used in 3.2.2. Then the elements (*) are all different from 1. It follows that

$$
G^{\prime}=\langle a\rangle \times\langle b c d e\rangle \times\langle f\rangle .
$$

Consider the element $a b c e f$. By 3.2.2 this element is not equal to 1 or $a b c d e f$ and so it must be equal to one of $a, a b c d e, a f, b c d e, b c d e f$ or $f$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (i) } \quad b c e f=1, \quad \text { or (ii) } d f=1, \quad \text { or (iii) } \quad b c e=1, \quad \text { or } \\
& \text { (iv) } a d f=1, \quad \text { or (v) } a d=1, \quad \text { or (vi) } a b c e=1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $z^{-1} y^{-1} x^{-1} w^{-1}$ also cannot be reordered, the situation is symmetric in $a$ and $f, b$ and $e$ and hence it suffices to consider only the cases (i)-(iv).

Case (i). bcef $=1$. Then $G^{\prime}=\langle a\rangle \times\langle d\rangle \times\langle f\rangle$ and from 3.2.2 it follows that either $e=1$ or $e=a d$. But if $e=1$, then $[x, z]=1$ and hence $b c e f=b c f=[w y, w z] \neq 1$, since $G$ is not diabelian, a contradiction. Also if $e=a d$, then $[x, w y z]=1$ and again $b c e f=a b c d f=[w y, w x z] \neq 1$ for the same reason.

Case (ii). $d f=[y, x z]=1$. Now $G^{\prime}=\langle a\rangle \times\langle b c e\rangle \times\langle f\rangle$ and 3.2.2 gives $e=a$, af, bce or bcef. Each possibility implies respectively that $[x, w z]$, [ $x, w y z$ ], $[w, y z]$ or $[w y, w z$ ] is 1 , contradicting the fact that $G$ is not diabelian.

Case (iii). bce =1. We have $G^{\prime}=\langle a\rangle \times\langle d\rangle \times\langle f\rangle$. If $b=e=a d f$, then $[w, z]=c=1$ and $[w y, w x z]=a b c d f=c=1$, again contradicting $G$ not diabelian. Thus by the symmetry referred to above, we may assume that $b \neq a d f$. Then the only possibility consistent with 3.2.2 is $b=[w, y]=1$ and hence $[w x, z]=c e=1$, giving $G$ diabelian.

Case (iv). adf $=1$. Now $G^{\prime}=\langle a\rangle \times\langle b c e\rangle \times\langle f\rangle$. Since $b=[w, y]$ and $e=[x, z], b$ and $e$ cannot both be 1 . Thus we may assume that $b \neq 1$ and then 3.2.2 implies that $b=b c e$, i.e. $[w x, z]=c e=1$. Also $[w x y, x z]=a c d e f$ $=1$, contradicting $G$ not diabelian.

Now we move towards the general situation which involves considering $G$ modulo a maximal abelian subgroup under different conditions. These results build up to a proof of Theorem B.

We need the following result from [10]:
If $G$ is a group with proper subgroups $H_{1}, H_{2}, H_{3}$, then

$$
G=H_{1} \cup H_{2} \cup H_{3}
$$

if and only if

$$
H_{1} \cap H_{2}=H_{1} \cap H_{3}=H_{2} \cap H_{3} \quad \text { and } \quad G / H_{1} \cap H_{2} \cong V_{4} .
$$

3.2.8. Let $G=\langle A, x, y\rangle \in P_{4}$ where $A$ is a maximal abelian subgroup of $G$ with $G / A$ not cyclic and suppose that $[x, y]=1$. Then $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$.

Proof. Assume first that $A \leq C_{G}(x) \cup C_{G}(y) \cup C_{G}(x y)$. Then $A$ is covered by the 3 proper subgroups $C_{A}(x), C_{A}(y), C_{A}(x y)$. Thus, by [10],

$$
A / Z(G)=A / C_{A}(x) \cap C_{A}(y) \cong V_{4}
$$

and so $A / Z(G)$ is generated by 2 elements. Therefore $G=Z(G)\langle a, b, x, y\rangle$ for some $a, b \in A$ and $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$ by 3.2.4.

Now suppose that $A \nsubseteq C_{G}(x) \cup C_{G}(y) \cup C_{G}(x y)$. Then there is an element $a \in A$ such that $\left|\langle a, x, y\rangle^{\prime}\right|=4$. If $b \in A$, again by 3.2.4 we have $\left|\langle a, b, x, y\rangle^{\prime}\right|=4$. Therefore $G^{\prime}=[A,\langle x, y\rangle]$ has order 4 .

If $[x, y] \neq 1$, we have:
3.2.9. Let $G=\langle A, x, y\rangle \in P_{4}$ where $A$ is a maximal abelian subgroup of $G$ with $G / A$ not cyclic and $[x, y] \neq 1$. Then either $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$ or $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$ and $G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 4 elements.

Proof. Arguing as in the first part of 3.2.8 and using 3.2.5, we may assume that

$$
A \nsubseteq C_{G}(x) \cup C_{G}(y) \cup C_{G}(x y)
$$

and so for some $a \in A$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\langle[a, x],[a, y]\rangle|=4 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $[x, y] \in[A, x][A, y]$, then $[x, y]=[a, x][b, y]$ for suitable $a, b \in A$ and $G=\langle A, a y, b x\rangle$ with $[a y, b x]=1$. Thus, by $3.2 .8,\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$. Therefore we may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
[x, y] \notin[A, x][A, y] \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then $A /\langle[x, y]\rangle$ is a maximal abelian subgroup of $G /\langle[x, y]\rangle$ and so, by 3.2.8,

$$
\left|(G /\langle[x, y]\rangle)^{\prime}\right| \leq 4 \quad \text { and } \quad\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 8
$$

as required. Also $|[A, x]| \leq 4$ and $|[A, y]| \leq 4$. Therefore

$$
\left|A: C_{A}(x)\right| \leq \quad \text { and } \quad\left|A: C_{A}(y)\right| \leq 4
$$

Suppose that $C_{A}(x) \nsubseteq C_{A}(y)$ and $C_{A}(y) \nsubseteq C_{A}(x)$. Then there are elements $b, c \in A$ such that

$$
[b, x]=[c, y]=1, \quad[b, y] \neq 1 \neq[c, x]
$$

Let $X=\langle b, c, x, y\rangle$. Thus $\left|X^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$, by 3.2.4, and hence $[b, y]=[c, x]$, by (6). Therefore, by. (5) and (6), $[b, y]=[c, x]=\left[a, x^{\gamma} y^{\delta}\right]$, for some $\gamma, \delta \in$ $\{0,1\}$, not both 0 . Let

$$
Y=\left\langle a b^{\delta(1-\gamma)} c^{\gamma}, x^{\gamma} y^{\delta}, b^{\delta(1-\gamma)} c^{\gamma}, x^{\delta(1-\gamma)} y^{\gamma}\right\rangle
$$

Using (5) and (6) it is straightforward to check that $\left|Y^{\prime}\right|=8$. But

$$
\left[a b^{\delta(1-\gamma)} c^{\gamma}, x^{\gamma} y^{\delta}\right]=\left[b^{\delta(1-\gamma)} c^{\gamma}, x^{\delta(1-\gamma)} y^{\gamma}\right]=1
$$

contradicting 3.2.4.
It follows that either $C_{A}(x) \leq C_{A}(y)$ or $C_{A}(y) \leq C_{A}(x)$ and hence $|A: Z(G)| \leq 4$. Thus $G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 4 elements.

The next 3 results deal with the case when $G / A$ can be generated by 3 (and not 2) elements.
3.2.10. Let $G=\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle \in P_{4}$ where $A$ is a maximal abelian subgroup of $G,\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$ is abelian and $G / A$ cannot be generated by 2 elements. Then either $G$ has an abelian subgroup of index 2 or $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$.

Proof. Suppose that $G$ does not have an abelian subgroup of index 2. By 3.2.8, we have for any $i, j, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left\langle A, x_{i}, x_{j}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 4 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for any $a, b \in A$, independent modulo $Z(G)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left\langle a, b, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 4 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

since $H=\left\langle a, b, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$ will not be cyclic modulo a maximal abelian subgroup $B$ containing $\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$. In fact, if $a B=b B$, then

$$
a b^{-1} \in B \cap\langle a, b\rangle \leq Z(G) \quad \text { and } \quad a, b \in Z(G) \cap A \leq Z(H) \leq B
$$

Assume, to the contrary, that $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \geq 8$. Since $\left[A, x_{1}\right] \neq 1$, there is an element $a_{1} \in A$ such that $\left[a_{1}, x_{1}\right] \neq 1$. It is easy to see from 3.2.7 that
$A / Z(G)$ has rank $\geq 2$, otherwise

$$
G=Z(G)\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle
$$

for suitable $a \in A$ with $\left|\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \geq 8$ and $\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$ diabelian. If all elements of $A$, which are independent of $a_{1}$ modulo $Z(G)$, commute with $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$ modulo $\left\langle\left[a_{1}, x_{1}\right]\right\rangle$, then $\left\langle A, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime} \leq\left\langle A, x_{1}\right\rangle^{\prime}$ and $G^{\prime}=\left\langle A, x_{1}\right\rangle^{\prime}$ has order $\leq 4$, by (7), a contradiction. Thus there is an element $a_{2} \in A$, independent of $a_{1}$ modulo $Z(G)$, such that (interchanging $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$ if necessary)

$$
\left|\left\langle\left[a_{1}, x_{1}\right],\left[a_{2}, x_{2}\right]\right\rangle\right|=4
$$

Now rank $A / Z(G) \geq 3$, by (8), otherwise $G^{\prime}=\left\langle a_{1}, a_{2}, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}$ of order at most 4. In the same way we find an element $a_{3} \in A$ with $a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}$ independent modulo $Z(G)$ and

$$
X=\left\langle\left[a_{1}, x_{1}\right],\left[a_{2}, x_{2}\right],\left[a_{3}, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \text { has order } 8
$$

Hence $\left\langle A, x_{i}, x_{j}\right\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle\left[a_{i}, x_{i}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[a_{j}, x_{j}\right]\right\rangle$, for any $i \neq j$, by (7), and so $G^{\prime}=X$.

Let $\{i, j, k\}=\{1,2,3\}$. Then $\left[a_{i}, x_{j}\right]=\left[a_{i}, x_{i}\right]^{l}\left[a_{j}, x_{j}\right]^{m}$ for some $l, m$, $0 \leq l, m \leq 1$. If $l=1$, then $G^{\prime} \leq\left\langle A, x_{j}, x_{k}\right\rangle^{\prime}$, contradicting (7). Thus $l=0$. If $m=1$, then

$$
G^{\prime} \leq\left\langle a_{i}, a_{k}, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}
$$

contradicting (8). Therefore $\left[a_{i}, x_{j}\right]=1$ and so $G^{\prime}=\left\langle a_{1} a_{2} a_{3}, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}$, again contradicting (8). Hence $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$.

Next we assume that $\left|\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=2$.
3.2.11. Let $G=\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle \in P_{4}$ where $A$ is a maximal abelian subgroup of $G,\left|\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=2$ and $G / A$ cannot be generated by 2 elements. Then either $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$ or $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$ and $G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 4 elements.

Proof. suppose that $\left|G^{\prime}\right|>4$ and without loss of generality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \neq 1, \quad\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]=1 \tag{*}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $X=\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}, Y=\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{2} x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}, T=\left\langle A, x_{2}, x_{1} x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}$. Suppose that $|X|,|Y|,|T| \leq 4$. Then $|X \cap T| \leq 2$, otherwise $X=T$ and $G^{\prime}=X$, a contradiction. Thus $\left[A, x_{2}\right] \leq X \cap T=\left\langle\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]\right\rangle$ and so $G^{\prime}=Y$, again a contradiction. Hence at least one of $X, Y, T$ has order 8 (using 3.2.9) and we
may assume without loss of generality that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=8 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $H=\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle$. If $\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]=\left[a_{1}, x_{1}\right]^{i}\left[a_{2}, x_{2}\right]^{j}$ for some $a_{1}, a_{2} \in A$, $0 \leq i, j \leq 1$, then $\left[a_{2}^{j} x_{1}, a_{1}^{i} x_{2}\right]=1$. Therefore $H=\left\langle A, a_{2}^{j} x_{1}, a_{1}^{i} x_{2}\right\rangle$ and $\left|H^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$, by 3.2.8, contradicting (9). Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \notin\left[A,\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle\right] . \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that there is an element $a \in A$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=8 \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

For, certainly $\left|\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 8$ for all $a \in A$, by 3.2.5. Thus suppose to the contrary that $\left|\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$ for all $a \in A$. Then, by (10), $\mid\left\langle\left[a, x_{1}\right]\right.$, $\left.\left[a, x_{2}\right]\right\rangle \mid \leq 2$ and so

$$
A \leq C_{A}\left(x_{1}\right) \cup C_{A}\left(x_{2}\right) \cup C_{A}\left(x_{1} x_{2}\right)
$$

Hence $A / Z(H) \cong V_{4}$ (by [10]) and $H=\left\langle Z(H), h_{1}, h_{2}, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle$ for some $h_{1}, h_{2} \in A$. Moreover we can choose $h_{1}, h_{2}$ such that $\left[h_{1}, x_{1}\right]=\left[h_{2}, x_{2}\right]=1$. But then $H^{\prime}=\left\langle h_{1}, h_{2}, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}$ has order 8 , by (9), contradicting 3.2.4. Thus (11) holds for some $a \in A$.

From 3.2.4, (10) and (*) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right],\left[a, x_{1}\right],\left[a, x_{2}\right]\right\rangle=K \text { say. } \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now using 3.2.4 and (*) again, it follows that $\left[a, x_{3}\right] \in\left\langle\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]\right\rangle$. Thus suppose first that $\left[a, x_{3}\right]=1$. Since $A$ is a maximal abelian subgroup, it follows from ( $*$ ) that there is an element $b \in A$ such that $\left[b, x_{3}\right] \neq 1$. Also, by 3.2 .5 , (11) and (12),

$$
\left\langle a, b, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle a, b, x_{1}, x_{2} x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}=K \text { of order } 8
$$

Therefore, by (10), $\left[b, x_{2}\right] \in\left\langle\left[a, x_{1}\right],\left[a, x_{2}\right]\right\rangle=L$ say. Since (9) holds with $x_{2}$ replaced by $x_{2} x_{3}$, so does (10), i.e. $\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \notin\left[A,\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2} x_{3}\right\rangle\right]$. Thus $\left[b, x_{2} x_{3}\right] \in L$ and therefore $\left[b, x_{3}\right] \in L$. Write $\left[b, x_{3}\right]=\left[a, x_{1}\right]^{i}\left[a, x_{2}\right]^{j}$, $0 \leq i, j \leq 1, i, j$ not both 0 . Then one checks (using (10)) that

$$
\left\langle a x_{3}, b x_{1}^{i} x_{2}^{j}, x_{1}^{j} x_{2}^{i-j}, x_{3}\right\rangle
$$

has derived subgroup of order 8 and so does not belong to $P_{4}$, by 3.2 .4 , a
contradiction. Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[a, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right] \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now by 3.2.8, $\left|\left\langle A, x_{i}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=4$, for $i=1,2$, and by (11) and (13)

$$
\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime} \neq\left\langle A, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[A, x_{3}\right]=\left\langle\left[a, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle, \text { and }} \\
& {\left[A, x_{1}\right]=\left\langle\left[a, x_{1}\right]\right\rangle,\left[A, x_{2}\right]=\left\langle\left[a, x_{2}\right]\right\rangle \text { by }(10)} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Since (9) holds with $x_{1}$ replaced by $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}$, in the same way we obtain $\left|\left[A, x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right]\right|=2$ and hence

$$
\left[A, x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right]=\left\langle\left[a, x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right]\right\rangle
$$

Therefore $A=\left\langle a, C_{A}\left(x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right)\right\rangle$. Finally, from (11)-(14), it follows that

$$
C_{A}\left(x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right)=C_{A}\left(x_{1}\right) \cap C_{A}\left(x_{2}\right) \cap C_{A}\left(x_{3}\right)=Z(G)
$$

and thus $G=\left\langle Z(G), a, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$ and $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$.
Having considered (in 3.2 .10 and 3.2.11) the situation when $\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}$ has order at most 2 , there remains the case $\left|\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \geq 4$.
3.2.12. Let $G=\left\langle A, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle \in P_{4}$, where $A$ is a maximal abelian subgroup of $G,\left|\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \geq 4$ and $G / A$ cannot be generated by 2 elements. Then either $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$ or $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$ and $G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 4 elements.

Proof. Let $X=\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$. We distinguish two cases.
Case (i). Suppose that $\left|X^{\prime}\right|=4$. Without loss of generality we may assume that

$$
\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]=1
$$

If $\left|\langle a, X\rangle^{\prime}\right|=4$ for all $a \in A$, then $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=4$. Therefore suppose that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\langle a, X\rangle^{\prime}\right|=8 \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $a \in A$ (using 3.2.5). Now

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[a, x_{3}\right] \notin\left\langle\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle=X^{\prime}, \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

otherwise $\left[a x_{1}^{i} x_{2}^{j}, x_{3}\right]=1=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]$, for some $0 \leq i, j \leq 1$, and $\left|\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, a x_{1}^{i} x_{2}^{j}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=8$, by (15), contradicting 3.2.4. Hence

$$
\langle a, X\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle\left[a, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle .
$$

Likewise, by 3.2.4,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[a, x_{1}\right] \neq\left[a, x_{3}\right] \quad \text { and }\left[a, x_{2}\right] \neq\left[a, x_{3}\right] \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume to the contrary that $G / Z(G)$ cannot be generated by 4 elements. Then there exists $b \in A$ such that $a$ and $b$ are independent modulo $Z(G)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle a, b, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime} \neq 1 \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

otherwise $A\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle(>A)$ would be abelian.
Let $H=\langle a, b, X\rangle$. So $\left|H^{\prime}\right| \geq 8$, by (16). We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
H / Z(H) \text { cannot be generated by } 4 \text { elements. } \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

For, since $Z(H) \cap A \leq Z(G)$, the elements $a$ and $b$, which are independent modulo $Z(G)$, are also independent modulo $Z(H) ;|A \cap H / Z(H) \cap A| \geq$ $2^{2}$, and $|H / Z(H) \cap A| \geq 2^{5}$ since

$$
H / A \cap H \cong A H / A=G / A
$$

If $H / Z(H)$ can be generated by 4 elements, then $|H / Z(H)| \leq 2^{4}$ and there is an element $g \in Z(H) \backslash A$. Moreover $g \not \equiv x_{3} \bmod A$, by (16), and so

$$
G=A X=\left\langle A, g, x_{i}, x_{3}\right\rangle
$$

for $i=1$ or 2 . But $\left|\left\langle g, x_{i}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=2$ and thus, by 3.2.11, $G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 4 elements, contradicting our assumption. Therefore (19) must be true.

Also we claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
H \text { does not have an abelian subgroup of index } 2 . \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

For, suppose that $B$ is such a subgroup. Suppose also that $a, b \in B$. Then, by (16), $x_{3} \notin B$ and hence, by (17), $x_{1}, x_{2} \in B$, contradicting (18). Therefore
$H=B\langle a, b\rangle$ and $B \cap\langle a, b\rangle \leq Z(H)$, contradicting the independence of $a$ and $b$ modulo $Z(H)$. Thus (20) is established.

Now $H=\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{H}\left\langle a, b, x_{3}\right\rangle$ and $\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{H}$ is abelian. Let $A_{1}$ be a maximal abelian subgroup of $H$ containing $\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle$. Thus $H / A_{1}$ is not cyclic (by (20)) and cannot be generated by 2 elements (by 3.2.8 and 3.2.9, using (19)). Therefore, by 3.2.11,

$$
\left|\left\langle a, b, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=4
$$

By 3.2.9, $\left|\left\langle A, x_{i}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 8$, for $i=1$, 2. If $\left|\left[A,\left\langle x_{i}, x_{3}\right\rangle\right]\right|=8$, then $\left[x_{i}, x_{3}\right]$ $=\left[a_{1}, x_{i}\right]\left[a_{2}, x_{3}\right]$, for some $a_{1}, a_{2} \in A$, and $\left[a_{2} x_{i}, a_{1} x_{3}\right]=1$, contradicting 3.2.8. It follows that

$$
\left|\left[A,\left\langle x_{i}, x_{3}\right\rangle\right]\right| \leq 4, \quad i=1,2
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[A,\left\langle x_{1}, x_{3}\right\rangle\right]=\left[A,\left\langle x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle\right]=\left\langle a, b, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle\left[a, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[b, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\left[a, x_{1}\right]=\left[a, x_{2}\right]=1$, then from 3.2.9 applied to $H=\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, a\right\rangle^{H}\left\langle b, x_{3}\right\rangle$ with $\left\langle x_{1}, x_{2}, a\right\rangle^{H}$ abelian, we see that $H / Z(H)$ can be generated by 4 elements, contradicting (19). Therefore we may assume that

$$
\left[a, x_{1}\right] \neq 1
$$

Thus, since $\left[a, x_{1}\right] \neq\left[a, x_{3}\right]$ (by (17)), (21) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[A,\left\langle x_{1}, x_{3}\right\rangle\right]=\left\langle\left[a, x_{1}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[a, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle\left[a, x_{1}\right]\right\rangle \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

For, if not, then (17), (21) and (22) give [a, $\left.x_{2}\right]=\left[a, x_{1}\right]\left[a, x_{3}\right]$ and so [ $a, x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}$ ] $=1$; then, by 3.2.4, $\left|\left\langle a, x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$, contradicting (15). Therefore (23) holds.

Now, by (21) and (22),

$$
\left[b, x_{3}\right] \in\langle a, X\rangle^{\prime}=\left\langle\left[a, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle \times\left\langle\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]\right\rangle
$$

Thus, for suitable $i, j, k$,

$$
\left[b, x_{3}\right]=\left[a, x_{3}\right]^{i}\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]^{j}\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]^{k}
$$

and so $\left[a^{i} b x_{1}^{j} x_{2}^{k}, x_{3}\right]=1$. Therefore

$$
H=\left\langle a^{i} b x_{1}^{j} x_{2}^{k}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{H}\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle
$$

with the first factor abelian and $\left|\left\langle a, x_{1}, x_{2}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right|=2$, by (23). As we observed before, $H$ cannot be generated by 2 elements modulo a maximal abelian subgroup, and so 3.2 .11 shows that $H / Z(H)$ can be generated by 4 elements, contradicting (19). Thus $G / Z(G)$ can be generated by 4 elements and then $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=8$, by 3.2.5.

Case (ii). Suppose that $\left|X^{\prime}\right|=8$. By 3.2.5, $\langle a, X\rangle^{\prime}=X^{\prime}$, for all $a \in A$, and so $G^{\prime}=X^{\prime}$. Assume to the contrary that $G / Z(G)$ cannot be generated by 4 elements. Then there are elements $a, b \in A$ which are independent modulo $Z(G)$. Let $H=\langle a, b, X\rangle$. As in case (i), $H / Z(H)$ cannot be generated by 4 elements. For otherwise there is an element $g \in Z(H) \backslash A$ and $G=\left\langle A, g, x_{i}, x_{j}\right\rangle$, for suitable $i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, contradicting 3.2.11.

Let $K=\langle a, X\rangle$. By 3.2.6, there are generators $y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, y_{4}$ of $K$ with $\left[y_{1}, y_{2}\right]=1$. We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a, y_{1}, y_{2} \text { are dependent modulo } \Phi(K) \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

For, if not, then $K=\left\langle a, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{i}\right\rangle, i=3$ or 4. Thus

$$
H=\langle a, b\rangle^{H}\left\langle y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{i}\right\rangle
$$

and $\left|\left\langle y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{i}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$. Let $A_{1}$ be a maximal abelian subgroup of $H$ containing $\langle a, b\rangle$. It is easy to see that $H$ does not have an abelian subgroup of index 2. For, assume $H=D\langle y\rangle$, where $D$ is abelian and $y^{2} \in D$. If, for example, $x_{1}, x_{2} \notin D$ and $x_{3} \in D$, then from $x_{1} D=x_{2} D$ it follows that $x_{1}^{-1} x_{2} \in D$ and $\left[x_{1}, x_{3}\right]=\left[x_{2}, x_{3}\right]$, a contradiction. If $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3} \notin D$, then $\left[x_{1}^{-1} x_{2}, x_{1}^{-1} x_{3}\right]=1$, again a contradiction. So

$$
\begin{equation*}
H / A_{1} \text { cannot be generated by } 2 \text { elements, } \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

by 3.2.8 and 3.2.9. But this contradicts 3.2.10, 3.2.11 or case (i) above. Therefore (24) is true.

Since $y_{1}, y_{2}$ are independent modulo $\Phi(K)$ (otherwise $K$ would be 3-generator and $H 4$-generator), we have (interchanging $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ if necessary)

$$
K=\left\langle a, y_{1}, y_{3}, y_{4}\right\rangle
$$

and $\left[a, y_{1}\right]=1$. Thus without loss of generality we may assume that $\left[a, x_{1}\right]=$ 1. Then $\left[b, x_{1}\right] \neq 1$, by (25). Therefore arguing analogously with $\left\langle b, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle$, we may assume that $\left[b, x_{2}\right]=1$. Thus

$$
H=\left\langle a, x_{1}\right\rangle^{H}\left\langle b, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle,
$$

$\left|\left\langle b, x_{2}, x_{3}\right\rangle^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$ and we obtain a contradiction just as we did when establishing (25).

The classification of the groups considered in this section which belong to $P_{4}$ can now be given.

Proof of Theorem B. Suppose that $G \in P_{4}$ and proceed by induction on $|G|$. Suppose that there is a maximal subgroup $M$ of $G$ with $\left|M^{\prime}\right| \geq 8$. Then, by induction, $M$ has a normal abelian subgroup $B\left(\geq G^{\prime}\right)$ with $M / B$ elementary abelian of rank $\leq 2$ (using 3.2.6). Let $A$ be a maximal abelian subgroup of $G$ containing $B$. Thus $G / A$ can be generated by 3 elements. If $G / A$ is cyclic, then (i) holds. Otherwise if $G / A$ can be generated by 2 elements, then (ii), (iii) or (iv) holds, using 3.2.7, 3.2.8 and 3.2.9. (Observe that if $G$ is diabelian, then so is every subgroup $K$ of $G$ such that $G=Z(G) K$ ). If $G / A$ cannot be generated by 2 elements, then the result follows using 3.2.7, 3.2.10, 3.2.11 and 3.2.12. If $G$ can be generated by 4 elements, then 3.2 .7 suffices. Therefore we may assume that every 4 -generator subgroup $H$ of $G$ has $\left|H^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$. In this case it is known that $\left|G^{\prime}\right| \leq 4$ (Theorem A of [2]).

Conversely if $G$ satisfies (i) or (ii), then $G \in P_{4}$, by 2.5 . If $G$ satisfies (iii), then $G \in P_{4}$, by 3.2.1; and if $G$ satisfies (iv), then $G \in P_{4}$, by 3.2.7.
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