

On the minimum degree of power graphs of finite nilpotent groups

Ramesh Prasad Panda Kamal Lochan Patra Binod Kumar Sahoo

Abstract

The power graph $\mathcal{P}(G)$ of a group G is the simple graph with vertex set G and two vertices are adjacent whenever one of them is a positive power of the other. In this paper, for a finite noncyclic nilpotent group G , we study the minimum degree $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ of $\mathcal{P}(G)$. Under some conditions involving the prime divisors of $|G|$ and the Sylow subgroups of G , we identify certain vertices associated with the generators of maximal cyclic subgroups of G such that $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ is equal to the degree of one of these vertices. As an application, we obtain $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ for some classes of finite noncyclic abelian groups G .

Keywords. Nilpotent group, Power graph, Minimum degree, Euler's totient function

AMS subject classification. 20D15, 05C25, 05C07

1 Introduction

There are various graphs associated with groups which have been studied in the literature, e.g., Cayley graphs, commuting graphs, prime graphs, generating graphs. The notion of directed power graph of a group was introduced by Kelarev and Quinn in [9]. The underlying undirected graph, simply termed as the 'power graph', of a group was first considered by Chakrabarty et al. in [3]. Several researchers have then studied both the directed and undirected power graphs of groups from different viewpoints, see [1, 11] and the references therein.

The *power graph* of a group G , denoted by $\mathcal{P}(G)$, is the simple graph with vertex set G and two vertices are adjacent whenever one of them is a positive power of the other. Cameron and Ghosh [2] studied an isomorphism problem associated with a finite group and its power graph. Curtin and Pourgholi [6] investigated an extremal property concerning the clique number of power graphs of finite groups. Kirkland et al. [10] derived explicit formulas for the complexity of power graphs of various finite groups. Additionally, parameters of power graphs, such as chromatic number [16], spectra [12], metric dimension [8], etc., have been studied recently. In [7], Doostabadi et al. considered power graphs of finite nilpotent groups and obtained their diameter and number of components. Whereas, Chattopadhyay et al. [5] investigated the vertex connectivity of the aforementioned graphs.

In this paper, for a finite noncyclic nilpotent group G , we study the minimum degree of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ under certain conditions involving the prime divisors of the order $|G|$ of G and the Sylow subgroups of G . Our objective will be to identify certain vertices of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ such that the minimum degree of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is equal to the degree of one of these vertices.

1.1 Graphs and groups

Let Γ be a simple graph with vertex set V . The *edge connectivity* of Γ , denoted by $\kappa'(\Gamma)$, is the minimum number of edges whose deletion gives a disconnected subgraph of Γ . For $v \in V$, we denote by $\deg(v)$ the degree of v in Γ . The *minimum degree* of Γ , denoted by $\delta(\Gamma)$, is defined by $\delta(\Gamma) = \min\{\deg(v) : v \in V\}$. It is known that $\kappa'(\Gamma) \leq \delta(\Gamma)$ and that $\kappa'(\Gamma) = \delta(\Gamma)$ if the diameter of Γ is at most 2.

Let G be a group with identity element e . The order of an element $x \in G$ is denoted by $o(x)$. Recall that G is said to be *nilpotent* if its lower central series $G = G_1 \geq G_2 \geq G_3 \geq G_4 \geq \dots$ terminates at $\{e\}$ after a finite number of steps, where $G_{i+1} = [G_i, G]$ for $i \geq 1$. If G is a finite group, then G being nilpotent is equivalent to any of the following statements:

- (a) Every Sylow subgroup of G is normal (equivalently, there is a unique Sylow p -subgroup of G for every prime divisor p of $|G|$).
- (b) G is the direct product of its Sylow subgroups.
- (c) For $x, y \in G$, x and y commute whenever $o(x)$ and $o(y)$ are relatively prime.

Every abelian group is nilpotent. Also, every finite group of prime power order is nilpotent.

A cyclic subgroup M of G is called a *maximal cyclic subgroup* if it is not properly contained in any cyclic subgroup of G . We denote by $\langle x \rangle$ the cyclic subgroup of G generated by an element $x \in G$ and by $\mathcal{M}(G)$ the collection of all maximal cyclic subgroups of G . If G is finite, then every element of G is contained in a maximal cyclic subgroup. This statement, however, need not hold in an infinite group: $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$ is an example.

1.2 Euler's totient function

We denote by ϕ the Euler's totient function. Then $\phi(p^k) = p^{k-1}(p-1) = p^{k-1}\phi(p)$ for any prime p and positive integer k , and $\sum_{d|m} \phi(d) = m$ for every positive integer m . Recall that

ϕ is a multiplicative function, that is, $\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b)$ for any two positive integers a, b which are relatively prime.

Throughout the paper, $n > 1$ is a positive integer and r is the number of distinct prime divisors of n . We write the prime power factorization of n as

$$n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r},$$

where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r$ are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_r$. For a positive integer m , we define $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.

We have $\phi(n) = \phi(p_1^{\alpha_1}) \phi(p_2^{\alpha_2}) \cdots \phi(p_r^{\alpha_r})$. By [5, Lemma 3.1], $(r+1)\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$ and equality holds if and only if $(r, p_1) = (1, 2)$ or $(r, p_1, p_2) = (2, 2, 3)$. If $p_1 \geq r+1$, then it follows from the proof of Corollary 1.4 in [4] that $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$ and equality holds if and only if $(r, p_1) = (1, 2)$. Note that if $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$, then $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in I} p_i\right) > \prod_{i \in I} p_i$ for any proper subset I of $[r]$, where $\prod_{i \in I} p_i = 1$ if $I = \emptyset$.

1.3 Known results

Let G be a finite group. Note that two distinct vertices $x, y \in G$ are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ if and only if $x \in \langle y \rangle$ or $y \in \langle x \rangle$. Observe that $\deg(x) = \deg(y)$ if $\langle x \rangle = \langle y \rangle$ and that $\deg(x) = o(x) - 1$ if $\langle x \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. The identity element e of G is adjacent to all other vertices of $\mathcal{P}(G)$. So $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is of diameter at most 2 and hence $\kappa'(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$. Thus it is enough to find the minimum degree of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ in order to determine the edge connectivity of $\mathcal{P}(G)$. By [3, Theorem 2.12], $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is a complete graph if and only if G is cyclic group of prime power order.

Let C_n denote the cyclic group of order n . If $r = 1$, then n is a prime power and so $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ is a complete graph. In this case, $\delta(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = n - 1 = \deg(x)$ for every $x \in C_n$. For $r = 2$, the minimum degree of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ was obtained in [13, Theorem 4.6(i)]. For $r \geq 3$, if $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$ or if $\phi(p_{j+1}) \geq r\phi(p_j)$ for every $j \in [r-1]$, then at most $r-1$ vertices of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ are identified in [15, Theorem 1.3] such that $\delta(\mathcal{P}(C_n))$ is equal to the degree of one of these vertices. Further, when $r = 3$ or n is a product of distinct primes, two such vertices of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ are obtained in [15, Theorems 1.2, 1.5] without imposing any condition on the prime divisors of n .

If G is a finite p -group for some prime p , then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y)$ for any $y \in G$ such that $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order. This can be proved as follows: We show that $\deg(x) \geq \deg(y)$ for every $x \in G$. Consider $\langle z \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ containing x . Then $o(z) \geq o(y)$. Since $\langle z \rangle$ is a cyclic p -group, the induced subgraph $\mathcal{P}(\langle z \rangle)$ of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is complete. Then $\deg(x) \geq o(z) - 1 \geq o(y) - 1 = \deg(y)$.

Recently, it is proved in [14, Proposition 2.7] that if G is a noncyclic nilpotent group of order n with $r = 2$ in which the Sylow p_1 -subgroup is noncyclic and the Sylow p_2 -subgroup is cyclic, then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y_1)$, where $\langle y_1 \rangle$ is a maximal cyclic subgroup of the Sylow p_1 -subgroup of G of minimum order.

1.4 Main results

Let G be a noncyclic nilpotent group of order n . We denote by P_i the unique Sylow p_i -subgroup of G for $i \in [r]$. Then $|P_i| = p_i^{\alpha_i}$ for $i \in [r]$. The following theorem is proved in Section 3.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $r \geq 2$ and that $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$. If $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(x)$ for some $x \in G$, then the following hold:*

- (i) x is contained in a unique element M of $\mathcal{M}(G)$.
- (ii) There exist $i \in [r]$ and a generator y of M such that $x = y^{p_i^{\lambda_i}}$, where $|M \cap P_i| = p_i^{\gamma_i}$ and $\lambda_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \gamma_i\}$ is the largest integer with the property that M is the only element of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ containing $y^{p_i^{\lambda_i}}$.

In Theorem 1.1(ii), observe that $\lambda_i = \gamma_i$ if and only if P_i is cyclic if and only if $\gamma_i = \alpha_i$. We prove the following theorem in Section 4 improving Theorem 1.1 under the assumption that the center $Z(P_j)$ of P_j is noncyclic whenever P_j is noncyclic for $j \in [r]$.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $r \geq 2$ and that $Z(P_j)$ is noncyclic for every $j \in J := \{i \in [r] : P_i \text{ is noncyclic}\}$. Then the following hold:*

(i) If $J \neq [r]$ and $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$, then there exists $k \in [r] \setminus J$ such that $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg\left(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}\right)$, where $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order.

(ii) If $J = [r]$ and $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} p_i$ for every $l \in [r]$, then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y)$, where $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order.

Note that if $p_1 \geq r + 1$, then $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$ and hence Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 hold good. For $r \geq 3$, each of the conditions in Theorem 1.2 involving the prime divisors of n implies that $p_1 \geq 3$. We prove the following theorem in Section 4 without any condition on the prime divisors of n , thus improving Theorem 1.2(ii) when $r = 3$.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $r = 3$ and that $Z(P_j)$ is noncyclic for every $j \in [r]$. Then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y)$, where $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order.*

Now consider $r = 2$. If both $Z(P_1)$ and $Z(P_2)$ are noncyclic, then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ is determined by Theorem 1.2(ii). If P_1 is noncyclic and P_2 is cyclic, then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ is determined by [14, Proposition 2.7]. We prove the following theorem in Section 5.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that $r = 2$ and that P_1 is cyclic and $Z(P_2)$ is noncyclic. Then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y_2)$, where $\langle y_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_2)$ is of minimum order.*

If a Sylow subgroup of a finite abelian group is noncyclic, then it automatically implies that the center of that Sylow subgroup is noncyclic. Since every abelian group is nilpotent, we have the following corollaries for $r \in \{2, 3\}$.

Corollary 1.5. *Let G be a noncyclic abelian group of order n with $r = 2$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *If both P_1 and P_2 are noncyclic, then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y)$, where $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order.*
- (ii) *If P_1 is noncyclic and P_2 is cyclic, then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y_1)$, where $\langle y_1 \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_1)$ is of minimum order.*
- (iii) *If P_1 is cyclic and P_2 is noncyclic, then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y_2)$, where $\langle y_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_2)$ is of minimum order.*

Corollary 1.6. *Let G be an abelian group of order n with $r = 3$ in which every Sylow subgroup is noncyclic. Then $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y)$, where $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order.*

2 Comparison of vertex degrees

Throughout this section, G is a nilpotent group of order n with $r \geq 2$. Then $G = P_1 P_2 \cdots P_r$, an internal direct product of the Sylow subgroups P_1, P_2, \dots, P_r of G . For a given $x \in G$, there exists a unique element in P_i , denoted by x_i , for $i \in [r]$ such that $x = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_r$. Then $\langle x \rangle = \langle x_1 \rangle \langle x_2 \rangle \cdots \langle x_r \rangle$. Further, $\langle x \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ if and only if

$\langle x_i \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_i)$ for every $i \in [r]$, see [5, Lemma 2.11]. Therefore, $\langle x \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order if and only if $\langle x_i \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_i)$ is of minimum order for every $i \in [r]$. For a given $M \in \mathcal{M}(G)$, we have $M_i := M \cap P_i \in \mathcal{M}(P_i)$ for $i \in [r]$ and $M = M_1 M_2 \cdots M_r$.

For $x \in G$, let τ_x denote the subset of $[r]$ consisting of those elements $j \in [r]$ for which the j -th component x_j of x is nonidentity, that is, $\tau_x := \{j \in [r] : x_j \neq e\}$. Note that $\tau_x = [r]$ if $\langle x \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ and that τ_x is empty if and only if $x = e$. We have $\deg(e) = |G| - 1 = n - 1 \geq \deg(x)$ for every $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$.

The following two results were proved in [14, Propositions 2.3, 2.4]. The first one gives a lower bound for the degrees of vertices of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ and provides necessary and sufficient conditions to attain that bound. The second one determines certain vertices of minimum degree among the vertices contained in a Sylow subgroup of G .

Proposition 2.1 ([14]). *Let $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ containing x . If $|M| = p_1^{\gamma_1} p_2^{\gamma_2} \cdots p_r^{\gamma_r}$ and $o(x) = \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i}$, where $1 \leq \gamma_j \leq \alpha_j$ for $j \in [r]$ and $1 \leq \beta_i \leq \gamma_i$ for $i \in \tau_x$, then*

$$\deg(x) \geq o(x) - \phi(o(x)) + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1}) \right) - 1. \quad (1)$$

Further, equality holds in (1) if and only if x belongs to exactly one maximal cyclic subgroup of $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} P_i$, namely $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} M_i$.

Proposition 2.2 ([14]). *For $k \in [r]$, suppose that $\langle y_k \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_k)$ is of minimum order. Then for any $x_k \in P_k$, $\deg(y_k) \leq \deg(x_k)$ in $\mathcal{P}(G)$.*

As an application of Proposition 2.1, we have the following.

Corollary 2.3. *Let $x, y \in G$ with $\tau_x = \tau_y$. If $\langle x \rangle$ and $\langle y \rangle$ are maximal cyclic subgroups of $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} P_i$ of equal order, then $\deg(x) = \deg(y)$ in $\mathcal{P}(G)$.*

In the following proposition, we obtain a comparison between the degree of a vertex generating a maximal cyclic subgroup of G and that of some related vertex.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ and I be a nonempty proper subset of $[r]$. For $x := \prod_{i \in I} y_i$, the following hold:*

- (i) *If P_j is cyclic for every $j \in [r] \setminus I$, then $\deg(y) > \deg(x)$.*
- (ii) *If P_k is noncyclic for some $k \in [r] \setminus I$ and $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in I} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in I} p_i$, then $\deg(y) < \deg(x)$.*

Proof. We have $\tau_y = [r]$ and $\tau_x = I$. Put $o(y) = p_1^{\gamma_1} p_2^{\gamma_2} \cdots p_r^{\gamma_r}$, where $1 \leq \gamma_i \leq \alpha_i$ for $i \in [r]$. Then $\deg(y) = o(y) - 1 = p_1^{\gamma_1} p_2^{\gamma_2} \cdots p_r^{\gamma_r} - 1$ and $o(x) = \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\gamma_i}$. Since $\langle x \rangle$ is a maximal cyclic

subgroup of $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} P_i$, Proposition 2.1 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(x) &= o(x) - \phi(o(x)) + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\gamma_i - 1}) \right) - 1 \\ &= o(x) - \phi(o(x)) + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \phi(o(x)) - 1 \\ &= o(x) + \phi(o(x)) \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} - 1 \right) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\deg(x) - \deg(y) = \phi(o(x)) \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} - 1 \right) - o(x) \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\gamma_j} - 1 \right). \quad (2)$$

(i) Since P_j is cyclic for every $j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x$, we have $\gamma_j = \alpha_j$ for $j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x$ and it follows from (2) that $\deg(x) < \deg(y)$ as $\phi(o(x)) < o(x)$.

(ii) Since P_k is noncyclic for some $k \in [r] \setminus \tau_x$, we have $\alpha_k > \gamma_k$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} - 1 \right) - 2 \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\gamma_j} - 1 \right) &= \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) - 2 \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\gamma_j} \right) + 1 \\ &\geq \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus (\tau_x \cup \{k\})} p_j^{\gamma_j} \right) (p_k^{\alpha_k} - 2p_k^{\gamma_k}) + 1 > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Since $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$ by the given hypothesis, we have

$$2\phi(o(x)) - o(x) = \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\gamma_i - 1} \right) \left[2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i\right) - \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right] \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

Using (2), (3) and (4), it follows that $2[\deg(x) - \deg(y)] > 0$ and hence $\deg(x) > \deg(y)$. \square

Note that $2\phi(p_j) \geq p_j$ for every $j \in [r]$. So we have the following corollary as an application of Proposition 2.4(ii).

Corollary 2.5. *For any $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$, the following hold:*

- (i) *If P_k is noncyclic for some $k \in [r]$, then $\deg(y) < \deg(y_j)$ for every $j \in [r] \setminus \{k\}$.*
- (ii) *If P_k and P_l are noncyclic for distinct $k, l \in [r]$, then $\deg(y) < \deg(y_i)$ for every $i \in [r]$.*

In the following proposition, under some conditions, we compare the degree of a vertex x with that of some vertex y such that $x \in \langle y \rangle$.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $x \in G$ be such that $|\tau_x| \geq 2$ and x is contained in exactly one maximal cyclic subgroup of $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} P_i$. Suppose that, for some $k, l \in \tau_x$ with $k < l$, there exists*

$y \in G$ such that $y^{p_k} = x$ and $\langle y_l \rangle \notin \mathcal{M}(P_l)$. If $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$, then $\deg(y) < \deg(x)$.

Proof. For $i \in \tau_x$, let M_i be the unique element of $\mathcal{M}(P_i)$ containing x_i . Since $y^{p_k} = x$, it follows that $\tau_y = \tau_x$ and that $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} M_i$ is the unique maximal cyclic subgroup of $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} P_i$ containing y .

Put $|M_i| = p_i^{\gamma_i}$ and $o(y) = \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i}$, where $1 \leq \beta_i \leq \gamma_i$ for $i \in \tau_x$. Since $y^{p_k} = x$ and p_k divides $o(y)$, we have $o(x) = o(y)/p_k$. Then $x_k \neq e$ implies that $\beta_k \geq 2$. By Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\deg(x) = o(x) - \phi(o(x)) + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1}) \right) (p_k^{\gamma_k} - p_k^{\beta_k - 2}) - 1$$

and

$$\deg(y) = o(y) - \phi(o(y)) + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1}) \right) - 1.$$

Writing $\Theta = \deg(x) - \deg(y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta &= \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1}) \right) (p_k^{\beta_k - 1} - p_k^{\beta_k - 2}) \\ &\quad - p_k^{\beta_k - 2} \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \right) \left[\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i - \phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i\right) \right] (p_k - 1) \\ &= \phi(p_k^{\beta_k - 1}) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \right) \times \\ &\quad \left[\left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i - \beta_i + 1} - 1) \right) + \phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i\right) - \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right] \\ &= \phi(p_k^{\beta_k - 1}) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \right) \times \\ &\quad \left[\phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i\right) \left[\left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i - \beta_i} + \dots + p_i + 1) \right) + \phi(p_k) \right] - \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\beta_l < \gamma_l$ as $\langle x_l \rangle$ is not a maximal cyclic subgroup of P_l . Since $k < l$, we have $p_k < p_l$ and so $p_l + 1 > \phi(p_k)$. This gives

$$\left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i - \beta_i} + \dots + p_i + 1) \right) > \phi(p_k).$$

Therefore,

$$\Theta > \phi(p_{n_k}^{\beta_k-1}) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\beta_i-1} \right) \left[2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) - \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right] \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality holds using the given hypothesis that $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, G is a noncyclic nilpotent group of order n with $r \geq 2$. We start with the following lemma, which gives a sufficient condition for a vertex attaining the minimum degree in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ to be contained in a unique maximal cyclic subgroup of G .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$ be such that $\deg(x) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$. If $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$, then x is contained in a unique element of $\mathcal{M}(G)$.*

Proof. Suppose that M and M' are two distinct elements of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ containing x , where M is of least possible order among all such maximal cyclic subgroups of G . Then M_i is an element of $\mathcal{M}(P_i)$ of minimum order containing x_i for each $i \in [r]$. So $|M_i| \leq |M'_i|$ and hence $\phi(|M_i|) \leq \phi(|M'_i|)$ for each $i \in [r]$. Then $\phi(|M'|) = \prod_{i \in [r]} \phi(|M'_i|) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} \phi(|M_i|) = \phi(|M|)$.

Let $M = \langle y \rangle$ for some $y \in G$. We have $\deg(y) = o(y) - 1 = |M| - 1$. Since x is neither a generator of M nor a generator of M' , it follows that

$$\deg(x) \geq o(x) - 1 + \phi(|M'|) + \phi(|M|) \geq o(x) - 1 + 2\phi(|M|) = o(x) - 1 + 2\phi(o(y)).$$

Then

$$\deg(x) - \deg(y) > 2\phi(o(y)) - o(y) = \frac{o(y)}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \left[2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i \right) - \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i \right] \geq 0.$$

This gives $\deg(x) > \deg(y) \geq \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$, a contradiction. \square

The proof of the following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(x)$ for some $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$ contained in a unique element of $\mathcal{M}(G)$. Then P_k is cyclic for every $k \in [r] \setminus \tau_x$. In particular, $\tau_x = [r]$ if every Sylow subgroup of G is noncyclic.*

The following proposition gives a sufficient condition so that the order of a vertex attaining the minimum degree in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is divisible by at least $r - 1$ distinct primes.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(x)$ for some $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$. Suppose that x is contained in a unique element of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ and that $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$. Then $|[r] \setminus \tau_x| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Let M be the unique element of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ containing x . Put $|M| = \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i^{\gamma_i}$ and $o(x) =$

$\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i}$, where $1 \leq \gamma_i \leq \alpha_i$ for $i \in [r]$ and $1 \leq \beta_i \leq \gamma_i$ for $i \in \tau_x$.

On the contrary, suppose that $|[r] \setminus \tau_x| \geq 2$. Let $k, l \in [r] \setminus \tau_x$ with $k < l$. Consider $z_k \in M_k$ with $o(z_k) = p_k$. Then $x \in \langle xz_k \rangle$, as $(xz_k)^{p_k} = x^{p_k} z_k^{p_k} = x^{p_k}$ and $\langle x \rangle = \langle x^{p_k} \rangle$. Note that M is the only element of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ containing xz_k as the same is true for x . Thus, $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} M_i$ is the only maximal cyclic subgroup of $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} P_i$ containing x , and $\prod_{i \in \tau_x \cup \{k\}} M_i$ is the only maximal cyclic subgroup of $\prod_{i \in \tau_x \cup \{k\}} P_i$ containing xz_k . By Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\deg(x) = o(x) - \phi(o(x)) + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1}) \right) - 1$$

and

$$\deg(xz_k) = o(xz_k) - \phi(o(xz_k)) + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus (\tau_x \cup \{k\})} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) (p_k^{\gamma_k} - 1) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1}) \right) - 1,$$

as $o(z_k) = p_k$. Writing $\Theta := \deg(x) - \deg(xz_k)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta &= \phi(o(x))[\phi(p_k) - 1] - o(x)(p_k - 1) \\ &\quad + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus (\tau_x \cup \{k\})} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1}) \right) (p_k^{\alpha_k} - p_k^{\gamma_k} + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For $i \in \tau_x$, we have

$$p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\beta_i - 1} = p_i^{\beta_i - 1} (p_i - 1) (p_i^{\gamma_i - \beta_i} + \cdots + p_i + 1) = \phi(p_i^{\beta_i}) (p_i^{\gamma_i - \beta_i} + \cdots + p_i + 1).$$

So (5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta &= \phi(o(x)) \left[p_k - 2 + \left(\prod_{j \in [r] \setminus (\tau_x \cup \{k\})} p_j^{\alpha_j} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} (p_i^{\gamma_i - \beta_i} + \cdots + p_i + 1) \right) (p_k^{\alpha_k} - p_k^{\gamma_k} + 1) \right] \\ &\quad - o(x)(p_k - 1) \\ &\geq \phi(o(x)) [p_k - 2 + p_l^{\alpha_l}] - o(x)(p_k - 1). \end{aligned}$$

As $k < l$, we have $p_k < p_l$ and so $p_k - 2 + p_l^{\alpha_l} > 2(p_k - 1)$. Then

$$\Theta > (p_k - 1)[2\phi(o(x)) - o(x)] = (p_k - 1) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \right) \left[2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) - \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right] \geq 0,$$

where the last inequality holds using the given hypothesis that $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$. We thus get $\deg(x) > \deg(xz_k)$, which contradicts the fact that $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(x)$. \square

In the following proposition, we consider the case when the order of a vertex attaining the minimum degree in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is divisible by exactly $r - 1$ distinct primes.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(x)$ for some $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$. Suppose that x is contained in a unique element M of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ and that $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$. If $[r] \setminus \tau_x = \{k\}$ for some $k \in [r]$, then $x = y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}$ for some generator y of M .*

Proof. Put $|M| = p_1^{\gamma_1} p_2^{\gamma_2} \cdots p_r^{\gamma_r}$, where $1 \leq \gamma_i \leq \alpha_i$ for $i \in [r]$. Since P_k is cyclic by Lemma 3.2, we have $\gamma_k = \alpha_k$. Let z be a generator of M . Then $z^m = x$ for some integer m with $1 < m < |M|$. Since $x_k = e$, we have $z_k^m = e$ and so m is divisible by $o(z_k) = p_k^{\alpha_k}$. We can write

$$m = ap_1^{\eta_1} \cdots p_{k-1}^{\eta_{k-1}} p_k^{\alpha_k} p_{k+1}^{\eta_{k+1}} \cdots p_r^{\eta_r},$$

where $0 \leq \eta_i < \gamma_i$ for $i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}$ and a is a positive integer relatively prime to p_i for every $i \in [r]$. Define $y := z^a$ and $I := \{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\} : \eta_i \geq 1\} \subseteq \tau_x$. Then y is a generator of M and $y^t = x$, where the integer t is given by

$$t = p_k^{\alpha_k} \prod_{i \in I} p_i^{\eta_i}.$$

In order to prove the proposition, it is enough to show that I is empty.

Suppose that I is nonempty. First consider that $|I| \geq 2$. Let $j, l \in I \subseteq \tau_x$ with $j < l$. Taking $w := y^{t/p_j}$, we get $w^{p_j} = x$. Further, $\langle w_l \rangle = \langle y_l^{t/p_j} \rangle$ is not a maximal cyclic subgroup of P_l as $\eta_l \geq 1$. Since $2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$, Proposition 2.6 then implies that $\deg(w) < \deg(x)$, which contradicts the fact that $\deg(x) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$.

Now consider that $I = \{l\}$ for some $l \in [r] \setminus \{k\}$. Then $x = y^{p_k^{\alpha_k} p_l^{\eta_l}}$ with $\eta_l \geq 1$. In this case, we shall get a contradiction to the fact $\deg(x) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ by showing that $\Theta_1 := \deg(x) - \deg(y^{p_l^{\eta_l}}) > 0$ if $k < l$, and $\Theta_2 := \deg(x) - \deg(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) > 0$ if $k > l$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} o(x) &= o\left(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k} p_l^{\eta_l}}\right) = o(y)/p_k^{\alpha_k} p_l^{\eta_l} = p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l} \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right), \\ o\left(y^{p_l^{\eta_l}}\right) &= o(y)/p_l^{\eta_l} = p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l} \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) p_k^{\alpha_k}, \\ o\left(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}\right) &= o(y)/p_k^{\alpha_k} = p_l^{\gamma_l} \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that M is the only maximal cyclic subgroup of G containing each of $y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}$ and $y^{p_l^{\eta_l}}$ as the same is true for x . By Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(x) &= o(x) - \phi(o(x)) + p_k^{\alpha_k} (p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1}) \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\gamma_i - 1}) \right) - 1, \\ \deg\left(y^{p_l^{\eta_l}}\right) &= o\left(y^{p_l^{\eta_l}}\right) - \phi\left(o\left(y^{p_l^{\eta_l}}\right)\right) + (p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1}) \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\gamma_i - 1}) \right) - 1, \\ \deg\left(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}\right) &= o\left(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}\right) - \phi\left(o\left(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}\right)\right) + p_k^{\alpha_k} \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} (p_i^{\gamma_i} - p_i^{\gamma_i - 1}) \right) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_k = \alpha_k$ in the second equality. First consider the case $k > l$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_2 &= \phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) [\phi(p_l^{\gamma_l}) - \phi(p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l})] - \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) (p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l}) \\ &\quad + p_k^{\alpha_k} (p_l^{\gamma_l - 1} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1}) \phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) \\ &= \phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) [\phi(p_l^{\gamma_l}) - \phi(p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l}) + p_k^{\alpha_k} (p_l^{\gamma_l - 1} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1})] \\ &\quad - \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) (p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $k > l$, we have $p_k > p_l \geq 2$ and so $p_k \geq p_l + 1$. Using $1 \leq \eta_l < \gamma_l$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(p_l^{\gamma_l}) - \phi(p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l}) + p_k^{\alpha_k} (p_l^{\gamma_l - 1} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1}) - 2(p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l}) \\ = (p_l^{\gamma_l - 1} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1}) [p_k^{\alpha_k} - (p_l + 1)] \geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

giving $\phi(p_l^{\gamma_l}) - \phi(p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l}) + p_k^{\alpha_k} (p_l^{\gamma_l - 1} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1}) \geq 2(p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l})$. Thus

$$\Theta_2 \geq (p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l}) \left[2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) - \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) \right].$$

Since $l \in \tau_x$, the hypothesis that $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$ implies $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{l\}} p_i \right) > \prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{l\}} p_i$. It then follows that $\Theta_2 > 0$ as $\eta_l < \gamma_l$ and $[r] \setminus \{k, l\} = \tau_x \setminus \{l\}$. Next consider the case $k < l$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_1 &= \phi \left(p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l} \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) (\phi(p_k^{\alpha_k}) - 1) - \left(p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l} \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) (p_k^{\alpha_k} - 1) \\ &\quad + p_k^{\alpha_k - 1} (p_l^{\gamma_l} - p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1}) \phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i} \right) \\ &= p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1} \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i - 1} \right) \times \left[\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right) (\phi(p_k^{\alpha_k}) - 1) - \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right) (p_k^{\alpha_k} - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p_k^{\alpha_k - 1} (p_l^{\eta_l + 1} - 1) \phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i \right) \right] \\ &= p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1} \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i - 1} \right) \times \\ &\quad \left[\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right) [\phi(p_k^{\alpha_k}) - 1 + p_k^{\alpha_k - 1} (p_l^{\eta_l} + \dots + p_l + 1)] - \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right) (p_k^{\alpha_k} - 1) \right].\end{aligned}$$

In the second equality above, we have used the fact that $\eta_l < \gamma_l$. Using $p_k < p_l$ (as $k < l$) and $\eta_l \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(p_k^{\alpha_k}) - 1 + p_k^{\alpha_k-1}(p_l^{\eta_l} + \cdots + p_l + 1) - 2(p_k^{\alpha_k} - 1) &= p_k^{\alpha_k-1}(p_l^{\eta_l} + \cdots + p_l) - p_k^{\alpha_k} + 1 \\ &> p_k^{\alpha_k-1}(p_l^{\eta_l} + \cdots + p_l - p_k) \\ &\geq p_k^{\alpha_k-1}(p_l - p_k) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\Theta_1 > p_l^{\gamma_l - \eta_l - 1} \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k, l\}} p_i^{\gamma_i - 1} \right) \times (p_k^{\alpha_k} - 1) \left[2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right) - \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right) \right].$$

Since $\tau_x = [r] \setminus \{k\}$ and $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$, it follows that $\Theta_1 > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

For a nonempty proper subset A of G , we denote by $\mathcal{P}(A)$ the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ with vertex set A . In that case, for $x \in A$, the degree of x in $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is denoted by $\deg_{\mathcal{P}(A)}(x)$.

Certain inequalities involving degree of vertices of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ were proved in [13, Proposition 4.5]. From the proof of [13, Proposition 4.5(ii)], the following result with strict inequality can be obtained which we shall use in the proof Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.5 ([13]). *Let y be a generator of C_n , where $r \geq 2$. Then $\deg(y^{p_i^\gamma}) > \deg(y^{p_i^\beta})$ in $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ for every $i \in [r]$, where $0 \leq \gamma < \beta \leq \alpha_i$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(x)$ for some $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$. The given hypothesis $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$ implies that $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i$ and that there is a unique element M of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ containing x by Lemma 3.1. Put $|M| = p_1^{\gamma_1} p_2^{\gamma_2} \cdots p_r^{\gamma_r}$, where $1 \leq \gamma_i \leq \alpha_i$ for $i \in [r]$.

We first claim that $x = y^{p_j^{\lambda_j}}$ for some generator y of M and for some $j \in [r]$, where $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq \gamma_j$. If $M = \langle x \rangle$, then the claim follows by taking $y = x$ and any $j \in [r]$ with $\lambda_j = 0$. Assume that $M \neq \langle x \rangle$. By Proposition 3.3, we have either $[r] \setminus \tau_x = \{j\}$ for some $j \in [r]$, or $\tau_x = [r]$. In the first case, $\gamma_j = \alpha_j$ as P_j is cyclic by Lemma 3.2 and then the claim follows from Proposition 3.4 with $\lambda_j = \gamma_j = \alpha_j$.

Next consider $\tau_x = [r]$. Let z be a generator of M . Then $z^m = x$ for some integer m with $1 < m < |M|$. We can write $m = ap_1^{\eta_1} p_2^{\eta_2} \cdots p_r^{\eta_r}$, where $0 \leq \eta_i < \gamma_i$ for $i \in [r]$ and a is a positive integer relatively prime to p_i for every $i \in [r]$. We note that at least one η_i is nonzero as x is not a generator of M . Define $y := z^a$ and $I := \{i \in [r] : \eta_i > 0\}$. Then $|I| \geq 1$, y is a generator of M and $y^t = x$, where t is given by

$$t = \prod_{i \in I} p_i^{\eta_i}.$$

If we show that $|I| = 1$, then the claim will follow. Suppose that $|I| \geq 2$. Let $k, l \in I$ with $k < l$. Taking $w := y^{t/p_k}$, we get $w^{p_k} = y^t = x$. Further, $\langle w_l \rangle = \langle y_l^{t/p_k} \rangle \notin \mathcal{M}(P_l)$

as $\eta_l \geq 1$. Proposition 2.6 then implies that $\deg(w) < \deg(x) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of our claim.

Now we determine the value of λ_j . Let m be the largest integer in $\{0, 1, \dots, \gamma_j\}$ such that M is the only maximal cyclic subgroup of G containing $y^{p_j^m}$. We show that $\lambda_j = m$. Since M is the only maximal cyclic group of G containing each of $y^{p_j^{\lambda_j}} = x$ and $y^{p_j^m}$, we have $m \geq \lambda_j$, $\deg_{\mathcal{P}(M)}(y^{p_j^{\lambda_j}}) = \deg(y^{p_j^{\lambda_j}})$ and $\deg_{\mathcal{P}(M)}(y^{p_j^m}) = \deg(y^{p_j^m})$. If $m > \lambda_j$, then $\deg_{\mathcal{P}(M)}(y^{p_j^m}) < \deg_{\mathcal{P}(M)}(y^{p_j^{\lambda_j}})$ by Lemma 3.5. Thus

$$\deg(y^{p_j^m}) = \deg_{\mathcal{P}(M)}(y^{p_j^m}) < \deg_{\mathcal{P}(M)}(y^{p_j^{\lambda_j}}) = \deg(y^{p_j^{\lambda_j}}) = \deg(x) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G)),$$

a contradiction. This completes the proof. \square

4 Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3

In this section, G is a noncyclic nilpotent group of order n with $r \geq 2$. For two distinct vertices $u, v \in G$, we write $u \sim v$ if they are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$. Suppose that the center $Z(P_k)$ of P_k is noncyclic for some $k \in \tau_x$ and that one of the following two conditions holds:*

(i) $r = 3$,

$$(ii) \ 2\phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i\right) \geq \prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i.$$

Then $\deg(x) \leq \deg(x^{p_k})$.

Proof. Let $y = x^{p_k}$, $H = \langle x \rangle$ and $K = \langle y \rangle$. Note that if $z \sim x$ for some $z \in G \setminus H$, then $z \sim y$. If $|\tau_x| = 1$, then x is of prime power order and so the induced subgraph $\mathcal{P}(H)$ of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is complete. This implies that $\deg_{\mathcal{P}(H)}(x) = \deg_{\mathcal{P}(H)}(y)$ and it follows that $\deg(x) \leq \deg(y)$. So assume that $|\tau_x| \geq 2$. Define the following three subsets of G :

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{z \in G : z \sim x, z \not\sim y\}, \\ B &= \{z \in G : z \sim y, z \not\sim x\}, \\ C &= \{z \in G : z \sim x, z \sim y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then A, B, C are pairwise disjoint with $y \in A$ and $x \in B$. We have $\deg(x) = |A| + |C|$ and $\deg(y) = |B| + |C|$. In order to prove the proposition, it is enough to show that $|A| \leq |B|$.

Let S be the set of generators of H . Then $A = (H \setminus (S \cup K)) \cup \{y\}$. Since $S \cap K$ is empty, we have $|A| = |H| - \phi(|H|) - |K| + 1 = o(x) - \phi(o(x)) - o(y) + 1$, where $o(y) = o(x)/p_k$. Let $o(x) = \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i}$, where $1 \leq \beta_i \leq \alpha_i$ for $i \in \tau_x$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &= \prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \left[\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i - \phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i\right) - \prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right] + 1 \\ &= \phi(p_k) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \right) \left[\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i - \phi\left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i\right) \right] + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Z(P_k)$ is noncyclic, there exists an element $u \in Z(P_k) \setminus H$ of order p_k . Take $z := ux$. Then $\tau_z = \tau_x$, $z \notin H = \langle x \rangle$ and $o(z) = o(x)$. This implies that $x \notin \langle z \rangle$ and so $z \not\sim x$. But $z \sim y$ as $z^{p_k} = x^{p_k} = y$. Thus $z \in B$. Note that B is contained in $(G \setminus H) \cup \{x\}$ and that if $v \in G \setminus H$ such that $\prod_{i \in \tau_x} v_i$ is a generator for $\langle z \rangle$, then $v \in B$. Since $o(z) = o(x)$, we get

$$|B| \geq \phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i} \right) \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_i^{\alpha_i} \right) + 1 \geq \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \right) \phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i \right) \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_i \right) + 1,$$

where $\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_i = 1$ if $\tau_x = [r]$. Then

$$|B| - |A| \geq \phi(p_k) \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x} p_i^{\beta_i - 1} \right) \left[\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right) \left(1 + \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_i \right) - \prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{k\}} p_i \right]. \quad (6)$$

Since $1 + \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \tau_x} p_i \geq 2$, the inequality (6) implies that $|B| - |A| \geq 0$ if condition (ii) holds.

Now, suppose that condition (i) holds, that is, $r = 3$. Then $|\tau_x| \in \{2, 3\}$. If $|\tau_x| = 2$, then the condition (ii) holds and so we get $|A| \leq |B|$. Assume that $|\tau_x| = 3 = r$. If $p_1 \geq 3$ or $(p_1, k) = (2, 1)$, then the condition (ii) holds and so $|A| \leq |B|$.

So assume that $p_1 = 2$ and $k > 1$. Then $p_k \geq 3$ and $o(u^2) = o(u) = p_k$. Take $w := u^2x$. Then $w \notin H$ and $o(w) = o(x)$. The same argument used for z in the above gives that $w \in B$. We have $o(w) = o(z)$, but $\langle w \rangle \neq \langle z \rangle$. The latter follows from the fact that $\langle w_k \rangle = \langle u^2x_k \rangle \neq \langle ux_k \rangle = \langle z_k \rangle$ as $\langle u \rangle \cap \langle x_k \rangle = \{e\}$. Thus

$$|B| \geq \phi(o(z)) + \phi(o(w)) + 1 = 2\phi(o(x)) + 1 = 2\phi \left(p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\beta_2} p_3^{\beta_3} \right) + 1.$$

Since $|A| = \phi(p_k) \left(p_1^{\beta_1 - 1} p_2^{\beta_2 - 1} p_3^{\beta_3 - 1} \right) \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 p_3}{p_k} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 p_3}{p_k} \right) \right] + 1$, we get

$$|B| - |A| \geq p_1^{\beta_1 - 1} p_2^{\beta_2 - 1} p_3^{\beta_3 - 1} \phi(p_k) \left[3\phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 p_3}{p_k} \right) - \frac{p_1 p_2 p_3}{p_k} \right] \geq 0.$$

Hence $|A| \leq |B|$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. Observe that if the condition $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$ holds, then $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} p_i \right) > \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} p_i$ for every $l \in [r]$ and hence $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{l\}} p_i \right) > \prod_{i \in \tau_x \setminus \{l\}} p_i$ for every $x \in G$ and every $l \in \tau_x$. Note that $J \neq \emptyset$ as G is noncyclic. By the given hypothesis, $Z(P_j)$ is noncyclic if and only if $j \in J$.

Suppose that $r = 3$ or $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} p_i$ for every $l \in [r]$. Consider two subsets A and B of G defined by

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{u \in G : \deg(u) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) \text{ and } J \subseteq \tau_u\}, \\ B &:= \{u \in A : \langle u_j \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_j) \text{ for every } j \in J\}. \end{aligned}$$

We assert that A and B are nonempty.

$A \neq \emptyset$: Choose an element $w \in G$ such that $\deg(w) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ and $|\tau_w \cap J|$ is maximum. We claim that $J \subseteq \tau_w$. Suppose that $k \notin \tau_w$ for some $k \in J$. Let $z_k \in P_k$ be an element of order p_k . Define $x := wz_k \in G \setminus \{e\}$. Then $x^{p_k} = (wz_k)^{p_k} = w^{p_k}$. Since $o(w)$ and p_k are relatively prime, we have $\langle w \rangle = \langle w^{p_k} \rangle$ and so $\deg(w) = \deg(w^{p_k}) = \deg(x^{p_k})$. Since $Z(P_k)$ is noncyclic, we apply Proposition 4.1 to get $\deg(x) \leq \deg(x^{p_k}) = \deg(w) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$. This implies $\deg(x) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$. Since $|\tau_x \cap J| = |\tau_w \cap J| + 1$, we get a contradiction to the maximality of $|\tau_w \cap J|$.

$B \neq \emptyset$: Choose an element $v \in A$ such that the order of $\prod_{j \in J} v_j$ is maximum. We claim that $\langle v_j \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_j)$ for every $j \in J$. Suppose that this is not the case for some $k \in J$. Then there exists $z_k \in P_k$ such that $z_k^{p_k} = v_k$. Define $x \in G$ such that

$$x_i = \begin{cases} v_i & \text{if } i \neq k \\ z_k & \text{if } i = k \end{cases}.$$

Then $J \subseteq \tau_x$. For $i \in [r] \setminus \{k\}$, we have $\langle v_i \rangle = \langle v_i^{p_k} \rangle$ as $o(v_i)$ and p_k are relatively prime. It follows that $\langle v \rangle = \langle x^{p_k} \rangle$ and so $\deg(v) = \deg(x^{p_k})$. Since $Z(P_k)$ is noncyclic, apply Proposition 4.1 to get $\deg(x) \leq \deg(x^{p_k}) = \deg(v) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$. This implies $\deg(x) = \delta(\mathcal{P}(G))$ and so $x \in A$. Since $o(z_k) > o(v_k)$, the order of the element $\prod_{j \in J} x_j$ is greater than that of $\prod_{j \in J} v_j$. This contradicts to the maximality of the order of $\prod_{j \in J} v_j$.

Now let $z \in B$. Then $\langle z_j \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(P_j)$ for every $j \in J$. Since P_i is cyclic for every $i \in [r] \setminus J$, it follows that z is contained in a unique element M of $\mathcal{M}(G)$.

First consider $J = [r]$. Then $\langle z \rangle = M$ and so $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(z) = o(z) - 1$. Since $\deg(x) = o(x) - 1$ for every $\langle x \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$, it follows that $\langle z \rangle$ must be of minimum order among all maximal cyclic subgroups of G . This proves Theorems 1.2(ii) and 1.3.

Next we prove Theorem 1.2(i). Accordingly, we consider $J \neq [r]$ and assume that $2\phi \left(\prod_{i \in [r]} p_i \right) \geq \prod_{i \in [r]} p_i$. Since $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(z)$, by Theorem 1.1(ii), there exists $k \in [r]$ and a generator y of M such that

$$z = y^{p_k^{\lambda_k}},$$

where $o(y_k) = p_k^{\gamma_k}$ with $1 \leq \gamma_k \leq \alpha_k$ and $\lambda_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ is the largest integer with the property that M is the only maximal cyclic subgroup of G containing $y^{p_k^{\lambda_k}}$.

Suppose that $\lambda_k = 0$. Then $z = y$ generates $M \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. Define $x := \prod_{j \in J} z_j \in G$. Since P_i cyclic for every $i \in [r] \setminus J$, Proposition 2.4(i) implies that $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(z) > \deg(x)$, a contradiction. Thus $\lambda_k \geq 1$. This implies that $z_k = y_k^{p_k^{\lambda_k}}$ does not generate a maximal cyclic subgroup of P_k . So $k \notin J$, that is, $k \in [r] \setminus J$. Since P_k is cyclic, it then follows from the definition of λ_k that $\lambda_k = \gamma_k = \alpha_k$. Thus, $z = y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}$. We note that $\deg(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}})$ is independent of the generator y of M by Corollary 2.3.

It remains to prove that $\langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order. Consider $\langle w \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ of minimum order. Then $o(y) \geq o(w)$. Define $I := [r] \setminus J \neq \emptyset$. Put $o(y) = \left(\prod_{i \in I} p_i^{\alpha_i} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} p_j^{\gamma_j} \right)$

and $o(w) = \left(\prod_{i \in I} p_i^{\alpha_i} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} p_j^{\delta_j} \right)$, where $1 \leq \delta_j \leq \gamma_j < \alpha_j$ for every $j \in J$. Then $o(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) = \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\alpha_i} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} p_j^{\gamma_j} \right)$ and $o(w^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) = \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\alpha_i} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} p_j^{\delta_j} \right)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} o(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) - \phi(o(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}})) &= \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\alpha_i - 1} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} p_j^{\gamma_j - 1} \right) \left[\prod_{l \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_l - \phi \left(\prod_{l \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_l \right) \right] \\ &\geq \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} p_i^{\alpha_i - 1} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} p_j^{\delta_j - 1} \right) \left[\prod_{l \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_l - \phi \left(\prod_{l \in [r] \setminus \{k\}} p_l \right) \right] \\ &= o(w^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) - \phi(o(w^{p_k^{\alpha_k}})). \end{aligned}$$

Then by Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) &= o(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) - \phi(o(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}})) + p_k^{\alpha_k} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} \phi(p_i^{\alpha_i}) \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} \phi(p_j^{\gamma_j}) \right) - 1 \\ &\geq o(w^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) - \phi(o(w^{p_k^{\alpha_k}})) + p_k^{\alpha_k} \left(\prod_{i \in I \setminus \{k\}} \phi(p_i^{\alpha_i}) \right) \left(\prod_{j \in J} \phi(p_j^{\delta_j}) \right) - 1 \\ &= \deg(w^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta(\mathcal{P}(G)) = \deg(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}})$, we must have $\deg(w^{p_k^{\alpha_k}}) = \deg(y^{p_k^{\alpha_k}})$. This happens if only if $\delta_j = \gamma_j$ for every $j \in J$ and it follows that $o(y) = o(w)$. Thus the maximal cyclic subgroup $\langle y \rangle = M$ of G is of minimum order. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Suppose that G is a noncyclic nilpotent group of order $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2}$ in which P_1 is cyclic and $Z(P_2)$ is noncyclic. Let $y \in G$ be such that $M := \langle y \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is of minimum order. Put $|M| = o(y) = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\gamma_2}$, where $1 \leq \gamma_2 < \alpha_2$. Let $x \in G \setminus \{e\}$ be arbitrary. We claim that $\deg(x) \geq \deg(y_2)$. Applying Proposition 2.4, we have

$$\deg(y_1) > \deg(y) > \deg(y_2). \quad (7)$$

If $|\tau_x| = 1$, then $\deg(x) \geq \min\{\deg(y_1), \deg(y_2)\} = \deg(y_2)$ using (7) and Proposition 2.2.

So assume that $|\tau_x| = 2$. Consider $\langle z \rangle \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ containing x . Proposition 2.1 gives that $\deg(y_2) = \frac{o(y_2)}{p_2} + p_1^{\alpha_1} \phi(o(y_2)) - 1$ and $\deg(z_2) = \frac{o(z_2)}{p_2} + p_1^{\alpha_1} \phi(o(z_2)) - 1$. Since $o(z_2) \geq o(y_2)$, it follows that $\deg(z_2) \geq \deg(y_2)$. We show that $\deg(x) \geq \deg(z_2)$.

Put $o(x) = p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\beta_2}$ and $o(z) = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\eta_2}$ for some positive integers β_1, β_2, η_2 with $\beta_2 \leq \eta_2 < \alpha_2$. Suppose that $\langle x_2 \rangle = \langle z_2 \rangle$. Then $\beta_2 = \eta_2$. By Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(x) &= p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\eta_2} - \phi(p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\eta_2}) + (p_1^{\alpha_1} - p_1^{\beta_1 - 1}) (p_2^{\eta_2} - p_2^{\eta_2 - 1}) - 1 \\ &= p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\eta_2 - 1} + p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\eta_2} - p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\eta_2 - 1} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\deg(z_2) = p_2^{\eta_2-1} + p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\eta_2} - p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\eta_2-1} - 1.$$

Then $\deg(x) - \deg(z_2) = p_1^{\beta_1} p_2^{\eta_2-1} - p_2^{\eta_2-1} > 0$ gives $\deg(x) > \deg(z_2)$. In particular, $\deg(x_1 z_2) > \deg(z_2)$.

Now suppose that x_2 is not a generator of $\langle z_2 \rangle$. Then $l := \eta_2 - \beta_2 > 0$. There exist elements

$$x_2 = x_{2,0}, x_{2,1}, x_{2,2}, \dots, x_{2,l-1}, x_{2,l}$$

in $\langle z_2 \rangle$ such that $o(x_{2,k}) = p_2^{\beta_2+k}$ and $x_{2,k}^{p_2} = x_{2,k-1}$ for $1 \leq k \leq l$. We have $\langle x_{2,l} \rangle = \langle z_2 \rangle$, as $o(x_{2,l}) = p_2^{\beta_2+l} = p_2^{\eta_2} = o(z_2)$. The fact that p_2 and $o(x_1)$ are relatively prime implies $\langle x_1 x_{2,k-1} \rangle = \langle x_1 x_{2,k}^{p_2} \rangle = \langle (x_1 x_{2,k})^{p_2} \rangle$. So

$$\deg(x_1 x_{2,k-1}) = \deg((x_1 x_{2,k})^{p_2}) \geq \deg(x_1 x_{2,k})$$

for $1 \leq k \leq l$, where the last inequality holds by Proposition 4.1 as $Z(P_2)$ is noncyclic and $2\phi(p_1) \geq p_1$. We thus have

$$\deg(x) = \deg(x_1 x_2) = \deg(x_1 x_{2,0}) \geq \deg(x_1 x_{2,1}) \geq \dots \geq \deg(x_1 x_{2,l}) = \deg(x_1 z_2) > \deg(z_2),$$

where the second last equality holds as $\langle x_1 x_{2,l} \rangle = \langle x_1 z_2 \rangle$. This completes the proof.

Acknowledgement

The first author would like to thank the National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, for the facilities provided when working as a visiting fellow in the School of Mathematical Sciences.

References

- [1] J. Abawajy, A. Kelarev, and M. Chowdhury. Power graphs: a survey. *Electron. J. Graph Theory Appl.*, 1(2): 125–147, 2013.
- [2] P. J. Cameron and S. Ghosh. The power graph of a finite group. *Discrete Math.*, 311(13):1220–1222, 2011.
- [3] I. Chakrabarty, S. Ghosh, and M. K. Sen. Undirected power graphs of semigroups. *Semigroup Forum*, 78(3):410–426, 2009.
- [4] S. Chattopadhyay, K. L. Patra, and B. K. Sahoo. Vertex connectivity of the power graph of a finite cyclic group. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 266:259–271, 2019.
- [5] S. Chattopadhyay, K. L. Patra, and B. K. Sahoo. Minimal cut-sets in the power graphs of certain finite non-cyclic groups. *Comm. Algebra*, 49(3):1195–1211, 2021.
- [6] B. Curtin and G. R. Pourgholi. An Euler totient sum inequality. *J. Number Theory*, 163:101–113, 2016.
- [7] A. Doostabadi and M. F. D. Ghouchan. On the connectivity of proper power graphs of finite groups. *Comm. Algebra*, 43(10):4305–4319, 2015.

- [8] M. Feng, X. Ma and K. Wang. The structure and metric dimension of the power graph of a finite group. *European J. Combin.*, 43:82–97, 2015.
- [9] A. V. Kelarev and S. J. Quinn. A combinatorial property and power graphs of groups. In *Contributions to General Algebra, 12 (Vienna, 1999)*, pp. 229–235. Heyn, Klagenfurt, 2000.
- [10] S. Kirkland, A. R. Moghaddamfar, S. Navid Salehy, S. Nima Salehy, and M. Zohourattar. The complexity of power graphs associated with finite groups. *Contrib. Discrete Math.*, 13(2):124–136, 2018.
- [11] A. Kumar, L. Selvaganesh, P. J. Cameron, and T. Tamizh Chelvam. Recent developments on the power graph of finite groups - a survey. *AKCE Int. J. Graphs Comb.*, DOI: 10.1080/09728600.2021.1953359
- [12] Z. Mehranian, A. Gholami, and A. R. Ashrafi. The Spectra of power graphs of certain finite groups. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 65(5):1003–1010, 2017.
- [13] R. P. Panda and K. V. Krishna. On the minimum degree, edge-connectivity and connectivity of power graphs of finite groups. *Comm. Algebra*, 46(7):3182–3197, 2018.
- [14] R. P. Panda, K. L. Patra, and B. K. Sahoo. Characterizing finite nilpotent groups associated with a graph theoretic equality, communicated (arXiv:2105.13322).
- [15] R. P. Panda, K. L. Patra, and B. K. Sahoo. On the minimum degree of the power graph of a finite cyclic group. *J. Algebra Appl.*, 20(3):2150044, 18pp., 2021
- [16] Y. Shitov. Coloring the power graph of a semigroup. *Graphs Combin.*, 33(2):485–487, 2017.

Addresses

Ramesh Prasad Panda (rppanda@iitk.ac.in)

- (1) Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh–208016, India.

Kamal Lochan Patra (klpatra@niser.ac.in)

Binod Kumar Sahoo (bksahoo@niser.ac.in)

- (1) School of Mathematical Sciences, National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, P.O.-Jatni, District-Khurda, Odisha-752050, India.
- (2) Homi Bhabha National Institute, Training School Complex, Anushakti Nagar, Mumbai-400094, India.