ON A THEOREM OF WIELANDT FOR FUSION SYSTEMS AND LOCALITIES

ELLEN HENKE

ABSTRACT. A classical theorem of Wielandt states that any two subnormal subgroups of a finite group G generate a subnormal subgroup of G. We prove versions of this theorem for regular localities and for fusion systems. Along the way we prove also a purely group-theoretical result which may be of independent interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

Helmut Wielandt proved in his habilitation thesis [17] that any two subnormal subgroups H_1 and H_2 of a finite group G generate a subnormal subgroup of G. It is moreover known that $\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle \cap S = \langle H_1 \cap S, H_2 \cap S \rangle$ for any Sylow *p*-subgroup S of G; as far as we are aware, this is a Lemma due to Ulrich Meierfrankenfeld (see Lemma 2.1). In the present paper we prove versions of these results for regular localities and for fusion systems.

Localities are group-like structures introduced by Chermak [2, 4]. Slightly more precisely, a locality is a triple (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) , where \mathcal{L} is a *partial group* (i.e. a set \mathcal{L} together with an "inversion" and a "partial multiplication" which is only defined on certain words in \mathcal{L}), S is a "Sylow *p*subgroup" of \mathcal{L} , and Δ is a set of subgroups of S subject to certain axioms. Given a partial group \mathcal{L} , there are natural notions of *partial normal subgroups* of \mathcal{L} and of *partial subnormal subgroups* of \mathcal{L} . A nice theory of partial subnormal subgroups and of components can be developed for *regular localities*. Regular localities were introduced by Chermak [3] (see also [10]). It turns out that partial subnormal subgroups of regular localities form regular localities. The existence and uniqueness of centric linking systems implies that there is an essentially unique regular locality associated to every saturated fusion system.

Wielandt's Theorem and Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma have the following very natural translation to regular localities. The proof uses Wielandt's Theorem and Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma for groups.

Theorem A. Let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality. Fix moreover two partial subnormal subgroups \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 of \mathcal{L} . Then $\langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2 \rangle$ is a partial subnormal subgroup of \mathcal{L} with

$$\langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2 \rangle \cap S = \langle \mathcal{H}_1 \cap S, \mathcal{H}_2 \cap S \rangle.$$

Finding a formulation of Wielandt's Theorem for fusion systems is slightly more tricky. As we show in Example 5.9, the subsystem generated by two subnormal subsystems of a saturated fusion system \mathcal{F} is in some cases not even saturated (and is thus in particular not a subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F}). However, we are able to prove the following result.

Theorem B. Let \mathcal{F} be a saturated fusion systems, and suppose that \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal subsystems of \mathcal{F} over S_1 and S_2 respectively. Then there is a (with respect to inclusion) smallest saturated subsystem $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle$ of \mathcal{F} in which \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal. The subsystem $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle$ is a subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $\langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$.

The reader is referred to Theorem 5.4 for more information. It should be pointed out that there is in many cases not a unique smallest saturated subsystem (or a unique smallest subnormal subsystem) of \mathcal{F} containing \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 (cf. Example 5.9).

If \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are *normal* subsystems of \mathcal{F} , then we have introduced a product subsystem $\mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{E}_2$ already in [5, Theorem C]. In some sense we generalize this construction above, as it turns out that $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{E}_2$ if \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are normal subsystems. Theorem B implies thus that $\mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{E}_2$ is the smallest saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} in which \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal. Thereby, we also obtain a new characterization of $\mathcal{E}_1\mathcal{E}_2$.

Let us now say a few words about the proof of Theorem B. As mentioned before, there is an essentially unique regular locality associated to every saturated fusion system. Moreover, if (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is a regular locality over a saturated fusion system \mathcal{F} , then it was shown by Chermak and the author of this paper that there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the partial subnormal subgroups of \mathcal{L} and the subnormal subsystems of \mathcal{F} . Therefore, if \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are two subnormal subsystems of \mathcal{F} , then Theorem A can be used to show that there is a smallest subnormal subsystem \mathcal{E} of \mathcal{F} in which \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal. Showing that \mathcal{E} is the smallest *saturated subsystem* in which \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal is however still somewhat difficult. The essential ingredient in the proof of this property is the following group-theoretical result.

Theorem C. Let G be a finite group and $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. Let H_1 and H_2 be two subnormal subgroups of G. Then $T := \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle \cap S = \langle H_1 \cap S, H_2 \cap S \rangle$ and

$$\mathcal{F}_T(\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(\langle H_1, T \rangle), \mathcal{F}_T(\langle H_2, T \rangle) \rangle.$$

We feel that Theorem C might be of independent interest to finite group theorists. Therefore, we seek to keep the proof of this theorem elementary (cf. Subsection 2.2). Theorem C can also be used to show the following Proposition.

Proposition D. Let G be a finite group and $S \in Syl_p(G)$. Suppose H_1 and H_2 are subnormal subgroups of G. Then

$$\mathcal{F}_{\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle \cap S}(\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle) = \langle \langle \mathcal{F}_{H_1 \cap S}(H_1), \mathcal{F}_{H_2 \cap S}(H_2) \rangle \rangle.$$

This says in particular that the fusion system of $\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$ is determined by the fusion systems of G, H_1 and H_2 .

Organization of the paper. We start by proving the basic group-theoretical results in Section 2. More precisely, Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma is proved in Subsection 2.1 and building on that, Theorem C is proved in Subsection 2.2. Then Theorem A and some related results are proved in Section 4. Finally, Theorem B and Proposition D are shown in Section 5.

Throughout this paper, homomorphisms are written on the right hand side of the argument (and the composition of homomorphisms is defined accordingly). The reader is referred to [1, Sections I.1-I.7] for basic definitions and results on fusion systems.

Acknowledgements. I'd like to thank Bernd Stellmacher for pointing out to me that Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma (Lemma 2.1) holds. Moreover, I'm very grateful to Ulrich Meierfrankenfeld for allowing me to include his lemma and its proof in this paper.

2. Group-theoretic results

Throughout this section let G be a finite group and $S \in Syl_p(G)$.

2.1. The proof of Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma. The following lemma and the idea for its proof are due to Ulrich Meierfrankenfeld.

Lemma 2.1 (Meierfrankenfeld). Let H_1 and H_2 be subnormal subgroups of G. Then

$$\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle \cap S = \langle H_1 \cap S, H_2 \cap S \rangle.$$

Proof. Let (G, H_1, H_2) be a counterexample such that first |G| and then $|G : H_1| + |G : H_2|$ is minimal. The minimality of G implies that $G = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$. As (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample, we have moreover $H_1 \leq H_2$ and $H_2 \leq H_1$. Similarly, one observes that

$$G \neq S$$
 and p divides the order of G . (2.1)

Assume $H_1 \subseteq G$. Then $G = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle = H_1 H_2$, $H_1 \cap S \subseteq S$ and $\langle H_1 \cap S, H_2 \cap S \rangle = (H_1 \cap S)(H_2 \cap S)$. As $S \cap H_1 \cap H_2 \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(H_1 \cap H_2)$, the order formula for products of subgroups (cf. [14, 1.1.6]) yields that $(H_1 \cap S)(H_2 \cap S)$ is a Sylow *p*-subgroup of $G = H_1 H_2$ and thus equal to *S*. This contradicts the assumption that (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample and shows thus that

$$H_1$$
 is not normal in G . (2.2)

As $H_i \neq G$ is subnormal in G for each i = 1, 2, there exists $M_i \leq G$ such that $H_i \leq M_i$ and G/M_i is simple. Set

$$H := \langle H_1, H_2 \cap M_1 \rangle$$

As H_1 and $H_2 \cap M_1$ are subnormal in G, it follows from Wielandt's Theorem that H is subnormal in G and thus $H \cap S \in \text{Syl}_p(H)$. The minimality of |G| implies that $(H, H_1, H_2 \cap M_1)$ is not a counterexample. Hence,

$$H \cap S = \langle H_1 \cap S, H_2 \cap M_1 \cap S \rangle. \tag{2.3}$$

Assume now that $H_2 \cap M_1 \leq H_1$ and so $|G:H| < |G:H_1|$. As $G = \langle H, H_2 \rangle$, the minimality of $|G:H_1| + |G:H_2|$ implies then that $S = \langle H \cap S, H_2 \cap S \rangle$. So $S = \langle H_1 \cap S, H_2 \cap S \rangle$ by (2.3), contradicting the assumption that (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample. This proves that $H_2 \cap M_1 \leq H_1$, which yields $H_1 \cap H_2 = H_2 \cap M_1 \leq H_2$. A symmetric argument shows that $H_1 \cap H_2 = H_1 \cap M_2 \leq H_1$ and thus

$$H_1 \cap H_2 = H_1 \cap M_2 = H_2 \cap M_1 \trianglelefteq \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle = G.$$

Consider now $\overline{G} := G/H_1 \cap H_2$. If $H_1 \cap H_2 \neq 1$, then the minimality of |G| implies that $(\overline{G}, \overline{H_1}, \overline{H_2})$ is not a counterexample and hence

$$\overline{S} = \langle \overline{H_1} \cap \overline{S}, \overline{H_2} \cap \overline{S} \rangle = \langle \overline{H_1} \cap \overline{S}, \overline{H_2} \cap \overline{S} \rangle.$$

As $S \cap H_1 \cap H_2 \in \text{Syl}_p(H_1 \cap H_2)$, it follows in this case from order considerations that $S = \langle H_1 \cap S, H_2 \cap S \rangle$, again a contradiction. Thus, we have

$$1 = H_1 \cap H_2 = H_1 \cap M_2 = H_2 \cap M_1.$$

Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and set j := 3 - i. Recall that G/M_j is simple and has thus no non-trivial subnormal subgroup. Since $H_i \leq M_j$ and $H_i \cap M_j = 1$, it follows that

$$G/M_i = H_i M_i / M_i \cong H_i / H_i \cap M_i \cong H_i.$$

In particular, H_i is simple. As H_i is subnormal, it follows that H_i is a component of G if H_i is non-abelian. Otherwise, H_i is cyclic of prime order q, and then contained in $O_q(G)$ (cf. [14, 6.3.1]). Since any two distinct components centralize each other, and every component centralizes

$$F(G) = \underset{q \text{ prime}}{\times} O_q(G),$$

it follows that H_1 and H_2 either centralize each other, or $\langle H_1, H_2 \rangle \leq O_q(G)$ for the some prime q. As $G = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$, we get a contradiction to (2.2) in the first case, and a contradiction to (2.1) in the second case. This proves the assertion.

2.2. The proof of Theorem C. As before we assume that G is a finite group and $S \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. If Δ is the set of all subgroups of S, then (G, Δ, S) is a locality. Thus, we can adopt the usual notation for localities and we could cite theorems on localities. However, since Theorem C might be of independent interest to group theorists, we will keep its proof self-contained. As in localities we define for $f \in G$

$$S_f := \{s \in S : s^f \in S\} = (S \cap S^f)^{f^{-1}}.$$

Note that S_f is a subgroup of S. If $u = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ is a word in G, then we set similarly

 $S_u := \{ s \in S : s^{f_1 \cdots f_i} \in S \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, n \}.$

Again one observes easily that S_u is a subgroup of S. Notice moreover that the following holds:

If
$$u = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$$
 is a word in G and $f = f_1 f_2 \cdots f_n$, then $S_u \leq S_f$. (2.4)

Lemma 2.2. Let $N \trianglelefteq G$ and $T := S \cap N$. Then for every $g \in G$ there exist $n \in N$ and $f \in N_G(T)$ with g = nf and $S_g = S_{(n,f)}$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{F}_S(G) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(NS), \mathcal{F}_S(N_G(T)) \rangle$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the first part of the assertion. Indeed, this part is a special case of Stellmacher's Splitting Lemma for localities [4, Lemma 3.12], but we give an elementary proof.

Let $g \in G$. By the Frattini Argument, there exist $m \in N$ and $h \in N_G(T)$ with g = mh. Set $P := S_g$. As $(P^m)^h = P^g \leq S \leq N_G(T)$ and $h \in N_G(T)$, we have $P^m \leq N_G(T)$. Moreover, $P^m \leq SN$, so by a Dedekind Argument $P^m \leq N_G(T) \cap SN = SN_N(T)$. By Sylow's theorem, there exists thus $x \in N_N(T)$ with $P^{mx} = (P^m)^x \leq S$. Notice that $n := mx \in N$, $f := x^{-1}h \in N_G(T)$ and g = mh = nf. In particular, $S_{(n,f)} \leq S_{nf} = P$ by (2.4). As $P^n \leq S$ and $P^{nf} = P^g \leq S$, we have also $P \leq S_{(n,f)}$. This proves the assertion.

Lemma 2.3. Let $M, N \leq G$ and $g \in MN$. Then there exist $m \in M$ and $n \in N$ with g = mn and $S_g = S_{(m,n)}$.

Proof. This is a special case of [8, Theorem 1], but again, we give an elementary proof. Let $g \in MN$ and write g = m'n' for some $m' \in M$ and $n' \in N$. Notice that $Q := S_g^{m'} \leq S^{m'} \leq \langle S, M \rangle = SM$. Moreover, $Q^{n'} = S_g^g \leq S$ and thus $Q \leq S^{(n')^{-1}} \leq \langle S, N \rangle = SN$. Hence, $Q \leq SM \cap SN$. Notice that $O^p(SM \cap SN) \leq O^p(SM) \cap O^p(SN) \leq M \cap N$ and thus $SM \cap SN = S(M \cap N)$. It follows now from Sylow's theorem that there exists $x \in M \cap N$ with $S_g^{m'x} = Q^x \leq S$. Now $m := m'x \in M$, $n := x^{-1}n' \in N$, g = mn, $S_g^m \leq S$ and $S_g^{mn} = S_g^g \leq S$. In particular, $S_g \leq S_{(m,n)}$. Together with (2.4), we obtain $S_g = S_{(m,n)}$.

Lemma 2.4. Let $H \leq G$ and $M := \langle H^G \rangle$. If $G = MN_G(H)$, then $H = M \leq G$.

Proof. Assume $G = MN_G(H)$ and consider $K := \langle H^M \rangle$. Notice that G acts on the set of normal subgroups of M, and thus $N_G(H)$ acts on the set of normal subgroups of M containing H. As K is the smallest normal subgroup of M containing H, it follows $N_G(H) \leq N_G(K)$. By construction, $K \leq M$, and so K is normal in $G = MN_G(H)$. This implies that $M = \langle H^G \rangle = K$. Using the definition of K and the fact that H is subnormal in M, we can therefore conclude that $H = M \leq G$.

Lemma 2.5. Let $N \leq G$ and $H \leq G$ such that S normalizes H. Then for every $g \in NH$, there exist $n \in N$ and $h \in H$ with g = nh and $S_g = S_{(n,h)}$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{F}_S(NHS) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(NS), \mathcal{F}_S(HS) \rangle.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to show that, for every $g \in NH$, there exist $n \in N$ and $h \in H$ with g = nh and $S_g = S_{(n,h)}$. Let (G, N, H, g) be a counterexample to that assertion such that |G| + |N| is minimal. Set $M := \langle H^G \rangle$.

Notice that $g \in NH \subseteq NM$. Hence, by Lemma 2.3, there exist $n' \in N$ and $m \in M$ such that g = n'm and $S_g = S_{(n',m)}$. In particular, as (G, N, H, g) is a counterexample, it follows

$$H \neq M. \tag{2.5}$$

Write g = ab with $a \in N$ and $b \in H$. Then ab = n'm and so $mb^{-1} = (n')^{-1}a \in M \cap N$. We obtain thus $m \in (M \cap N)b \subseteq (M \cap N)H$.

Assume now that $N \leq M$. Then $M \cap N$ is a proper subgroup of N, which is normal in G. The minimality of |G| + |N| yields thus that $(G, M \cap N, H, m)$ is not a counterexample. Hence, there exist $y \in M \cap N$ and $h \in H$ with m = yh and $S_m = S_{(y,h)}$. This implies g = n'm = n'yh = (n'y)h and

$$S_g = S_{(n',m)} = S_{(n',y,h)} \leqslant S_{(n'y,h)} \leqslant S_{(n'y)h} = S_g,$$

where the second equality uses $S_m = S_{(y,h)}$ and the inclusions use (2.4). So $n := n'y \in N$ with g = nh and $S_{(n,h)} = S_g$. This contradicts the assumption that (G, N, H, g) is a counterexample.

Hence, $N \leq M \leq MS$. By (2.5) and Lemma 2.4, we have $G \neq MN_G(H)$. In particular, as $S \leq N_G(H)$, it follows $MS \neq G$. Thus, the minimality of |G| + |N| yields that (MS, N, H, g) is not a counterexample. However, this implies that (G, N, H, g) is not a counterexample, contradicting our assumption.

Lemma 2.6. Let $H \leq G$. Then there exists a subnormal series

$$H = H_0 \trianglelefteq H_1 \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq H_{n-1} \trianglelefteq H_n = G$$

such that $H_{i-1} = \langle H^{H_i} \rangle$ for i = 1, 2, ..., n. Such a subnormal series is always invariant under conjugation by $N_G(H)$.

Proof. If H is properly contained in a subgroup H_i of G, then $\langle H^{H_i} \rangle$ is a proper subgroup of H_i , as H is subnormal in H_i . It follows thus by induction on |G:H| that we can construct a subnormal series as above.

If i > 1 and H_i is $N_G(H)$ -invariant, then $N_G(H)$ acts via conjugation on the set of normal subgroups of H_i containing H, and thus also on $H_{i-1} = \langle H^{H_i} \rangle$, which is the smallest normal subgroup of H_i containing H. Thus, by induction on n-i, one proves that H_i is $N_G(H)$ -invariant for i = 1, 2, ..., n.

We are now in a position to give the proof of Theorem C. In the proof we use the following notation: If X and Y are subgroups of G, then $\operatorname{Aut}_X(Y)$ is the group of automorphisms of Y which are induced by conjugation with an element of $N_X(Y)$.

Proof of Theorem C. Let (G, H_1, H_2) be a counterexample to Theorem C such that first |G| and then $|G: H_1| + |G: H_2|$ is minimal. Set

$$S_1 := S \cap H_1$$
 and $S_2 := S \cap H_2$.

The minimality of |G| together with Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma 2.1 yields that

$$G = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$$
 and $S = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$. (2.6)

If $H_1 \neq H_1^x$ for some $x \in S$, then $H_1 < H_1^* := \langle H_1, H_1^x \rangle \leq G$ by Wielandt's Theorem. Hence, it follows from the minimality of $|G:H_1| + |G:H_2|$ that

$$\mathcal{F}_S(G) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(\langle H_1^*, S \rangle), \mathcal{F}_S(\langle H_2, S \rangle) \rangle.$$

As $\langle H_1^*, S \rangle = \langle H_1, S \rangle$, this contradicts the assumption that (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample. So H_1 is S-invariant. As the situation is symmetric in H_1 and H_2 , we have thus shown that

$$S \leqslant N_G(H_1) \cap N_G(H_2). \tag{2.7}$$

In particular, we need to show that $\mathcal{F}_S(G) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(H_1S), \mathcal{F}_S(H_2S) \rangle$ to obtain a contradiction to the assumption that (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample. We will use (2.6) and (2.7) throughout this proof, most of the time without further reference.

Set

$$N_i := \langle H_i^G \rangle$$
 for $i = 1, 2$.

As (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample, it follows from Lemma 2.5 (applied with (H_i, H_{3-i}) in place of (N, H)) that H_i is not normal in G for each i = 1, 2. In particular, Lemma 2.4 together with (2.7) yields

$$N_1 S \neq G \neq N_2 S. \tag{2.8}$$

We prove now that

$$H_1 \cap N_2 = H_1 \cap H_2 = H_2 \cap N_1 \trianglelefteq G.$$
 (2.9)

For the proof assume first that $N_2 \cap H_1 \leq H_2$. Then

$$H_2 < \tilde{H}_2 := \langle H_2, N_2 \cap H_1 \rangle$$

Notice that $N_2 \cap H_1$ is subnormal in G and hence, by Wielandt's theorem, H_2 is subnormal in G. The minimality of $|G:H_1| + |G:H_2|$ yields thus

$$\mathcal{F}_S(G) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(H_1S), \mathcal{F}_S(\tilde{H}_2S) \rangle$$

Notice that $K_1 := H_1 \cap N_2 S \leq N_2 S$ and $K_1 \cap S = S_1$. Using (2.6) and a Dedekind argument, observe moreover that

$$K_1 = H_1 \cap N_2 S = H_1 \cap N_2 S_1 = (H_1 \cap N_2) S_1.$$

In particular, we can conclude that $\tilde{H}_2 S = \langle K_1, H_2 \rangle$ and $K_1 S = (H_1 \cap N_2)S$. By (2.8) and the minimality of |G|, $(N_2 S, K_1, H_2)$ is not a counterexample. Hence,

$$\mathcal{F}_S(H_2S) = \mathcal{F}_S(\langle K_1, H_2 \rangle) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(K_1S), \mathcal{F}_S(H_2S) \rangle$$

where $\mathcal{F}_S(K_1S) = \mathcal{F}_S((H_1 \cap N_2)S) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_S(H_1S)$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{F}_{S}(G) = \langle \mathcal{F}_{S}(H_{1}S), \mathcal{F}_{S}(\tilde{H}_{2}S) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{F}_{S}(H_{1}S), \mathcal{F}_{S}(H_{2}S) \rangle,$$

which contradicts the assumption that (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample. This shows that $N_2 \cap H_1 \leq H_2$ and so $N_2 \cap H_1 = H_1 \cap H_2$. A symmetric argument gives $N_1 \cap H_2 = H_1 \cap H_2$. Thus,

 $N_2 \cap H_1 = H_1 \cap H_2 = N_1 \cap H_2 \trianglelefteq \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle = G$

and so (2.9) holds. We argue next that

$$H_1 = (H_1 \cap H_2) N_{H_1}(S_2). \tag{2.10}$$

For the proof recall that H_1 is S-invariant by (2.7) and $S_2 \leq N_2 \leq G$. Hence (2.9) yields

$$[H_1, S_2] \leqslant H_1 \cap N_2 = H_1 \cap H_2 \trianglelefteq G_1$$

Thus, H_1 normalizes $(H_1 \cap H_2)S_2$. In particular, H_1 acts on $\text{Syl}_p((H_1 \cap H_2)S_2)$ and $H_1 \cap H_2$ acts transitively. As $S_2 \in \text{Syl}_p((H_1 \cap H_2)S_2)$, the general Frattini Argument [14, 3.1.4] implies thus (2.10). As a next step we prove

$$O^{p'}(H_2) = O^{p'}(N_2) \trianglelefteq G.$$
(2.11)

For the proof, Lemma 2.6 allows us to pick a subnormal series

$$H_2 = M_0 \trianglelefteq M_1 \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq M_k = N_2 \trianglelefteq M_{k+1} = G$$

for H_2 in G with $M_i = \langle H_2^{M_{i+1}} \rangle$ for i = 0, 1, 2, ..., k. Moreover, $M_0, M_1, ..., M_k$ are $N_G(H_2)$ invariant. In particular, $M_0, M_1, ..., M_k$ are S-invariant by (2.7). Fix now $i \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., k\}$ minimal with $O^{p'}(M_i) = O^{p'}(N_2)$. Notice that such i exists as $M_k = N_2$. Assume (2.11) fails.

Then i > 0 and $H_2 < M_i$. In particular, the minimality of $|G : H_1| + |G : H_2|$ yields that (G, H_1, M_i) is not a counterexample and thus

$$\mathcal{F}_S(G) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(H_1S), \mathcal{F}_S(M_iS) \rangle.$$

As $S \cap N_2$ is strongly closed in S, this implies

$$\operatorname{Aut}_G(S \cap N_2) = \langle \operatorname{Aut}_{H_1}(S \cap N_2), \operatorname{Aut}_{M_i}(S \cap N_2), \operatorname{Aut}_S(S \cap N_2) \rangle$$

Recall that M_{i-1} is normalized by M_i and by S. Thus, $M_{i-1} \cap S$ is $\operatorname{Aut}_{M_i}(S \cap N_2)$ -invariant and $\operatorname{Aut}_S(S \cap N_2)$ -invariant. Moreover, using (2.9) and that fact that H_1 is S-invariant, we see that $[N_{H_1}(S \cap N_2), S \cap M_{i-1}] \leq [N_{H_1}(S \cap N_2), S \cap N_2] \leq S \cap N_2 \cap H_1 = S \cap H_1 \cap H_2 \leq S_2 \leq S \cap M_{i-1}$. This implies that $S \cap M_{i-1}$ is $\operatorname{Aut}_{H_1}(S \cap N_2)$ -invariant. Altogether, we have seen that $S \cap M_{i-1}$ is $\operatorname{Aut}_G(S \cap N_2)$ -invariant and thus

$$N_G(S \cap N_2) \leqslant N_G(S \cap M_{i-1}).$$

As $O^{p'}(N_2)$ is normal in G and by assumption contained in M_i , a Frattini Argument yields now

$$G = O^{p'}(N_2)N_G(S \cap N_2) = M_i N_G(S \cap M_{i-1}).$$

Hence, by a Dedekind Argument, setting $X := N_{M_{i+1}}(S \cap M_{i-1})$, we have $M_{i+1} = M_i X$. As $H_2 \leq M_{i-1} \leq M_i \leq M_{i+1}$, it follows that

$$\begin{split} M_i &= \langle H_2^{M_{i+1}} \rangle = \langle M_{i-1}^{M_{i+1}} \rangle = \langle M_{i-1}^X \rangle \\ &= \prod_{x \in X} M_{i-1}^x. \end{split}$$

Notice that, for every $x \in X$, M_{i-1}^x is a normal subgroup of M_i with $M_{i-1}^x \cap S = (M_{i-1} \cap S)^x = M_{i-1} \cap S$. Hence, using Lemma 2.1 (or an elementary argument for this special case), one sees that

$$M_i \cap S = \prod_{x \in X} (M_{i-1}^x \cap S) = M_{i-1} \cap S.$$

As $M_{i-1} \leq M_i$, it follows that $O^{p'}(M_{i-1}) = O^{p'}(M_i) = O^{p'}(N_2)$, contradicting the minimality of *i*. Thus, (2.11) holds. We show next that

$$S_2 \trianglelefteq G. \tag{2.12}$$

For the proof we use that, by (2.9) and (2.11), $H_1 \cap H_2$ and $O^{p'}(H_2)$ are normal in G. In particular,

$$\hat{H}_2 := (H_1 \cap H_2) O^{p'}(H_2) \trianglelefteq G.$$

A Frattini Argument yields $H_2 = O^{p'}(H_2)N_{H_2}(S_2)$ and (2.10) gives $H_1 = (H_1 \cap H_2)N_{H_1}(S_2)$. Hence,

$$G = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle = \hat{H}_2 \langle N_{H_1}(S_2), N_{H_2}(S_2) \rangle.$$

Notice that $\hat{H}_2 \leq H_2$ and so $N_{\hat{H}_2}(S_2) \leq N_{H_2}(S_2)$. Hence, a Dedekind Argument gives that

$$N_G(S_2) = N_{\hat{H}_2}(S_2) \langle N_{H_1}(S_2), N_{H_2}(S_2) \rangle = \langle N_{H_1}(S_2), N_{H_2}(S_2) \rangle.$$

Notice that $S_2 \leq S$ by (2.7). Assume now that S_2 is not normal in G. Then the minimality of |G| yields that $(N_G(S_2), N_{H_1}(S_2), N_{H_2}(S_2))$ is not a counterexample, i.e.

$$\mathcal{F}_S(N_G(S_2)) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(N_{H_1}(S_2)S), \mathcal{F}_S(N_{H_2}(S_2)S) \rangle.$$

As $O^{p'}(H_2)$ is normal in G, Lemma 2.2 yields thus that

$$\mathcal{F}_S(G) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(O^{p'}(H_2)S), \mathcal{F}_S(N_G(S_2)) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(H_1S), \mathcal{F}_S(H_2S) \rangle,$$

which contradicts the assumption that (G, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample. Hence, (2.12) holds.

The fact that S_2 is normal in G implies by Wielandt's Theorem in particular that H_1S_2 is subnormal in G. If $S_2 \leq H_1$, then the minimality of $|G:H_1| + |G:H_2|$ yields that (G, H_1S_2, H_2)

is not a counterexample. As $(H_1S_2)S = H_1S$, this would imply that (G, H_1, H_2) is not a counterexample, a contradiction. Hence, $S_2 \leq H_1 \cap S = S_1$. A symmetric argument yields $S_1 \leq S_2$ and thus

$$S = S_1 = S_2 \trianglelefteq G.$$

It follows now easily that (G, H_1, H_2) is not a counterexample contradicting our assumption. \Box

3. Some background on partial groups and localities

3.1. Partial groups and localities. We will start by summarizing some basic background on partial groups and localities here, but the reader is referred to Chermak's original papers [2, 4] or to the summary in [5, Section 3] for a detailed introduction to the required definitions and results concerning partial groups and localities.

Following Chermak's notation, we write $\mathbf{W}(\mathcal{L})$ for the set of words in a set \mathcal{L}, \emptyset for the empty word, and $v_1 \circ v_2 \circ \cdots \circ v_n$ for the concatenation of words $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in \mathbf{W}(\mathcal{L})$. Recall that a partial group consists of a set \mathcal{L} , a "product" $\Pi: \mathbf{D} \to \mathcal{L}$ defined on $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{W}(\mathcal{L})$, and an involutory bijection $\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}, f \mapsto f^{-1}$ called an "inversion map", subject to certain group-like axioms (cf. [2, Definition 2.1] or [4, Definition 1.1]). If \mathcal{L} is a partial group with a product $\Pi: \mathbf{D} \to \mathcal{L}$ then, given $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbf{D}$, we write also $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$ for $\Pi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. We will moreover use the following definitions.

- A subset $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is called a *partial subgroup* of \mathcal{L} if $\Pi(w) \in \mathcal{H}$ for every $w \in \mathbf{W}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \mathbf{D}$ and $h^{-1} \in \mathcal{H}$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$.
- A partial subgroup \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{L} is called a *subgroup* of \mathcal{L} if $\mathbf{W}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathbf{D}$. Observe that every subgroup of \mathcal{L} forms an actual group. We call a subgroup \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{L} a *p*-subgroup if it is a *p*-group.
- Given $f \in \mathcal{L}$, we write $\mathbf{D}(f) := \{x \in \mathcal{L} : (f^{-1}, x, f) \in \mathbf{D}\}$ for the set of elements $x \in \mathcal{L}$ for which the *conjugate* $x^f := \Pi(f^{-1}, x, f)$ is defined. This gives us a conjugation map $c_f : \mathbf{D}(f) \to \mathcal{L}$ defined by $x \mapsto x^f$.
- Let S be a p-subgroup of \mathcal{L} . Then set

$$S_f := \{x \in S : x \in \mathbf{D}(f), x^f \in S\}$$
 for all $f \in \mathcal{L}$.

More generally, if $w = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \in \mathbf{W}(\mathcal{L})$, then write S_w for the subset of S consisting of all elements $s \in S$ such that there exists a series $s = s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_n \in S$ with $s_{i-1}^{f_i} = s_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

- We say that a partial subgroup \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{L} is a *partial normal subgroup* of \mathcal{L} (and write $\mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{L}$) if $x^f \in \mathcal{N}$ for every $f \in \mathcal{L}$ and every $x \in \mathbf{D}(f) \cap \mathcal{N}$.
- We call a partial subgroup \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{L} a *partial subnormal subgroup* of \mathcal{L} (and write $\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}$) if there is a sequence $\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_k$ of partial subgroups of \mathcal{L} such that

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 \trianglelefteq \mathcal{H}_1 \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq \mathcal{H}_{k-1} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{H}_k = \mathcal{L}$$

• If $f \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbf{D}(f)$ set $\mathcal{X}^f := \{x^f : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. For every $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, call

$$N_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}) := \{ f \in \mathcal{L} \colon \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbf{D}(f) \text{ and } \mathcal{X}^f = \mathcal{X} \}$$

the normalizer of \mathcal{X} in \mathcal{L} .

• For $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, we call

$$C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}) := \{ f \in \mathcal{L} \colon \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbf{D}(f), \ x^f = x \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X} \}$$

the *centralizer* of \mathcal{X} in \mathcal{L} .

• For any two subsets $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, their *product* can be naturally defined by

$$\mathcal{XY} := \{ \Pi(x, y) \colon x \in \mathcal{X}, \ y \in \mathcal{Y}, \ (x, y) \in \mathbf{D} \}.$$

A locality is a triple (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) such that \mathcal{L} is a partial group, S is maximal among the p-subgroups of \mathcal{L} , and Δ is a set of subgroups of S subject to certain axioms, which imply in particular that $N_{\mathcal{L}}(P)$ is a subgroup of \mathcal{L} for every $P \in \Delta$. As part of the axioms, a word $w = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ is an element of **D** if and only if there exist $P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_n \in \Delta$ such that

$$P_{i-1} \subseteq \mathbf{D}(f_i)$$
 and $P_{i-1}^{f_i} = P_i$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., n$.

If the above holds, then we say also that $w \in \mathbf{D}$ via P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_n or that $w \in \mathbf{D}$ via P_0 .

If (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is a locality, then [4, Corollary 2.6] gives that, for every word $w \in \mathbf{W}(\mathcal{L})$, the subset S_w is a subgroup of S and

$$S_w \in \Delta$$
 if and only if $w \in \mathbf{D}$. (3.1)

In particular, S_f is a subgroup of S with $S_f \in \Delta$, for every $f \in \mathcal{L}$. We will also frequently use the following property, which follows from [4, Lemma 2.3(c)]:

$$S_w \leq S_{\Pi(w)}$$
 and $(\cdots (S_w^{f_1})^{f_2} \cdots)^{f_n} = S_w^{\Pi(w)}$ for every $w = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \in \mathbf{D}.$ (3.2)

Fix now a locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) . For $f \in \mathcal{L}$, the conjugation map $c_f \colon S_f \to S, x \mapsto x^f$ is by [4, Proposition 2.5(b)] an injective group homomorphism. For every partial subgroup \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{L} , we write $\mathcal{F}_{S \cap \mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{H})$ for the fusion system over $S \cap \mathcal{H}$ which is generated by the conjugation maps $c_h \colon S_h \cap \mathcal{H} \to S \cap \mathcal{H}, x \mapsto x^h$ with $h \in \mathcal{H}$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{L})$ is the fusion system over S which is generated by the conjugation maps $c_f \colon S_f \to S$. We say that (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is a locality over \mathcal{F} if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{L})$.

Lemma 3.1. Let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a locality and $\mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{L}$. Set $T := S \cap \mathcal{N}$. Then the following hold:

(a) For every $g \in \mathcal{L}$, there exist $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $h \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$ such that $(n,h) \in \mathbf{D}$, g = nh and $S_g = S_{(n,h)}$.

(b)
$$\mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{L}) = \langle \mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{N}S), \mathcal{F}_S(N_{\mathcal{L}}(T)) \rangle.$$

Proof. (a) Let $g \in \mathcal{L}$. By the Frattini Lemma [4, Corollary 3.11], there exist $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $h \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $(n, h) \in \mathbf{D}$ and h is \uparrow -maximal with respect to \mathcal{N} in the sense of [4, Definition 3.6]. Then $S_g = S_{(n,h)}$ by the Splitting Lemma [4, Lemma 3.12]. Using first [4, Proposition 3.9] and then [4, Lemma 3.1(a)], it follows that $h \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$.

(b) As $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{L})$ is generated by maps of the form $c_g: S_g \to S$, it is sufficient to prove that such a map is in $\langle \mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{N}S), \mathcal{F}_S(N_{\mathcal{L}}(T)) \rangle$. Fixing $g \in \mathcal{L}$, it follows from (a) that there exist $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $h \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$ such that $(n,h) \in \mathbf{D}$, g = nh and $S_g = S_{(n,h)}$. So $c_g: S_g \to S$ can be written as a composite of restrictions of the conjugation map $c_n: S_n \to S$ (which is a morphism in $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{N}S)$) and of $c_h: S_h \to S$ (which is a morphism in $\mathcal{F}_S(N_{\mathcal{L}}(T))$). This implies (b). \Box

3.2. Linking localities and regular localities. A finite group G is said to be of *characteristic* p, if $C_G(O_p(G)) \leq O_p(G)$, where $O_p(G)$ denotes the largest normal p-subgroup of G. A locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is called a *linking locality*, if $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{L})$ is saturated, $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{L})^{cr} \subseteq \Delta$ and $N_{\mathcal{L}}(P)$ is a group of characteristic p for every $P \in \Delta$.

For every fusion system \mathcal{F} over S, there is the set \mathcal{F}^s of \mathcal{F} -subcentric subgroups of S defined in [9, Definition 1]. It is shown in [9, Theorem A] that, for every saturated fusion system \mathcal{F} , there exists a linking locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) over \mathcal{F} with $\Delta = \mathcal{F}^s$. We call such a linking locality a subcentric locality over \mathcal{F} .

Regular localities were first introduced by Chermak [3], but we will refer to the treatment of the subject in [10]. Building on Chermak's work, we introduced in [10, Definition 9.17] a certain partial normal subgroup $F^*(\mathcal{L})$ of \mathcal{L} , for every linking locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) . If (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is a subcentric locality over a saturated fusion system \mathcal{F} , then the set $\delta(\mathcal{F})$ is defined as

$$\delta(\mathcal{F}) := \{ P \leqslant S \colon P \cap F^*(\mathcal{L}) \in \mathcal{F}^s \}.$$
(3.3)

It is shown in [10, Lemma 10.2] that the set $\delta(\mathcal{F})$ depends only on \mathcal{F} and not on the choice of of the subcentric locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) , and that (3.3) holds indeed for every linking locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) .

A linking locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is called a *regular locality*, if $\Delta = \delta(\mathcal{F})$. For every saturated fusion system \mathcal{F} , there exists a regular locality over \mathcal{F} (cf. [10, Lemma 10.4]). Note that (3.3) holds in particular if (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is a regular locality over \mathcal{F} . In that case, we have $\Delta = \delta(\mathcal{F})$, so (3.3) yields that $P \in \Delta$ if and only if $P \cap F^*(\mathcal{L}) \in \Delta$. Thus, if (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) is a regular locality and $T^* := F^*(\mathcal{L}) \cap S$, then (3.1) yields

$$w \in \mathbf{D}$$
 if and only if $S_w \cap T^* \in \Delta$. (3.4)

In particular, $S_f \cap T^* \in \Delta$ for every $f \in \mathcal{L}$. The next theorem states one of the most important properties of regular localities.

Theorem 3.2 ([3, Corollary 7.9], [10, Corollary 10.19]). Let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality and $\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{F}_{S \cap \mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{H})$ is saturated and $(\mathcal{H}, \delta(\mathcal{F}_{S \cap \mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{H})), S \cap \mathcal{H})$ is a regular locality.

The theorem above leads to a natural definition of components of regular localities (cf. [10, Definition 7.9, Definition 11.1]). Let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality. We will write $\text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$ for the set of components of \mathcal{L} . If $\mathcal{K}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{K}_r \in \text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$, then the product $\prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{K}_i$ does not depend on the order of the factors and is a partial normal subgroup of $F^*(\mathcal{L})$ (cf. [10, Proposition 11.7]). In particular, for $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$, the product $\prod_{\mathcal{K}\in\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{K}$ is well-defined.

The product of all components of \mathcal{L} is denoted by $E(\mathcal{L})$ and turns out to be a partial normal subgroup of \mathcal{L} (cf. [10, Lemma 11.13]). We have moreover $F^*(\mathcal{L}) = E(\mathcal{L})O_p(\mathcal{L})$ (cf. [10, Lemma 11.9]). Note that Theorem 3.2 makes it possible to consider $\text{Comp}(\mathcal{H})$ and $E(\mathcal{H})$ for every partial subnormal subgroup \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{L} . By [10, Remark 11.2], $\text{Comp}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$. In particular, $E(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq E(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq F^*(\mathcal{L})$.

3.3. Some further properties of regular localities. We state now some slightly more specialized results on regular localities which will be needed in the proof of Theorem A.

Throughout this subsection let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality and $T^* := S \cap F^*(\mathcal{L})$.

As $S \in \mathcal{F}^s$, (3.3) yields in particular that $T^* \in \delta(\mathcal{F}) = \Delta$. In particular, $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ is a group of characteristic p.

Lemma 3.3. For every $f \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and every $g \in \mathcal{L}$, the words (f,g), (g,f), (f,f^{-1},g,f) are in \mathbf{D} , $gf = fg^f$,

$$S_{(f,g)} \cap T^* = S_{fg} \cap T^* \text{ and } S_{(g,f)} \cap T^* = S_{gf} \cap T^*.$$

Proof. It is a special case of (3.4) that $S_g \cap T^* \in \Delta$. Hence, as T^* is strongly closed, (g, f), $u := (f, f^{-1}, g, f)$ and (g, f, f^{-1}) are in **D** via $S_g \cap T^*$. In particular, by the axioms of a partial group, $gf = \Pi(u) = fg^f$ and $(gf)f^{-1} = \Pi(g, f, f^{-1}) = g$. So

$$S_{(g,f)} \cap T^* \leq S_{gf} \cap T^* \leq S_{(gf,f^{-1},f)} \cap T^* \leq S_{((gf)f^{-1},f)} \cap T^* = S_{(g,f)} \cap T^*,$$

where the first and the third inclusion use (3.2) and the second inclusion uses $f \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$. Thus, $S_{(g,f)} \cap T^* = S_{gf} \cap T^*$. Observe also that $(f^{-1}, f, g) \in \mathbf{D}$ via $S_g \cap T^*$. In particular, $(f,g) \in \mathbf{D}$ and $g = \Pi(f^{-1}, f, g) = f^{-1}(fg)$. It follows that

$$S_{(f,g)} \cap T^* \leq S_{fg} \cap T^* \leq S_{(f,f^{-1},fg)} \cap T^* \leq S_{(f,f^{-1}(fg))} \cap T^* = S_{(f,g)} \cap T^*,$$

where again the first and the third inclusion use (3.2) and the second inclusion uses $f \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$. Hence, $S_{(f,g)} \cap T^* = S_{fg} \cap T^*$.

Lemma 3.4. We have $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*) = N_{\mathcal{L}}(S \cap E(\mathcal{L}))$.

Proof. By [10, Lemma 11.9], we have

 $T^* = S \cap F^*(\mathcal{L}) = (S \cap E(\mathcal{L}))O_p(\mathcal{L}).$

As $E(\mathcal{L}) \leq \mathcal{L}$, $S \cap E(\mathcal{L}) = T^* \cap E(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L} = N_{\mathcal{L}}(O_p(\mathcal{L}))$, the assertion follows.

Lemma 3.5. $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ acts on \mathcal{L} and also on the set $\text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$ of components of \mathcal{L} via conjugation. More precisely, for every $f \in \mathcal{L}$, we have $\mathbf{D}(f) = \mathcal{L}$ and c_f is an automorphism of \mathcal{L} .

Proof. It is a consequence of Lemma 3.19(b) or Lemma 10.11(c) in [10] that, for every $f \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$, we have $\mathcal{L} = \mathbf{D}(f)$ and the conjugation map c_f is an automorphism of \mathcal{L} . Moreover, by [12, Lemma 2.13], $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ acts on the set \mathcal{L} by conjugation. Thus, by [10, Lemma 11.12], $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ acts also on the set of components of \mathcal{L} .

Lemma 3.6. Let $\mathfrak{C}_1, \mathfrak{C}_2 \subseteq \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{L}), \mathfrak{C} := \mathfrak{C}_1 \cup \mathfrak{C}_2, \mathcal{N}_i := \prod_{\mathcal{K} \in \mathfrak{C}_i} \mathcal{K} \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mathcal{N} := \prod_{\mathcal{K} \in \mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{K}.$ Then the following hold:

- (a) $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2$ and $\mathcal{N} \cap S = (\mathcal{N}_1 \cap S)(\mathcal{N}_2 \cap S)$. In particular, if $\mathfrak{C} = \text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$, then $E(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2$ and $E(\mathcal{L}) \cap S = (\mathcal{N}_1 \cap S)(\mathcal{N}_2 \cap S)$.
- (b) Suppose $\mathfrak{C}_1 \cap \mathfrak{C}_2 = \emptyset$. Then $\mathcal{N}_i \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{N}_{3-i})$ for i = 1, 2. Moreover, for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and $m \in \mathcal{N}_2$, we have $(n, m) \in \mathbf{D}$ and $S_{nm} \cap T^* = S_{(n,m)} \cap T^*$.
- (c) $N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*) = N_{\mathcal{N}_1}(T^*)N_{\mathcal{N}_2}(T^*).$

Proof. By [10, Proposition 11.7], \mathcal{N}_1 , \mathcal{N}_2 and \mathcal{N} are partial normal subgroups of $F^*(\mathcal{L})$. As $F^*(\mathcal{L})$ forms by Theorem 3.2 a regular locality with Sylow subgroup $S_0 := S \cap F^*(\mathcal{L})$, it follows in particular from [9, Theorem 1] applied with $F^*(\mathcal{L})$ in place of \mathcal{L} that $(\mathcal{N}_1\mathcal{N}_2) \cap S = (\mathcal{N}_1\mathcal{N}_2) \cap S_0 = (\mathcal{N}_1 \cap S_0)(\mathcal{N}_2 \cap S_0) = (\mathcal{N}_1 \cap S)(\mathcal{N}_2 \cap S)$. Thus, for (a), it remains only to prove that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1\mathcal{N}_2$. In fact, as $\mathcal{N}_i \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ for i = 1, 2 and \mathcal{N} is a partial subgroup, we have $\mathcal{N}_1\mathcal{N}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. So for (a) it is sufficient to prove that

$$\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2. \tag{3.5}$$

As $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ is a subgroup, we have also $N_{\mathcal{N}_1}(T^*)N_{\mathcal{N}_2}(T^*) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)$. So for (c) it remains only to show that

$$N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{N}_1}(T^*)N_{\mathcal{N}_2}(T^*). \tag{3.6}$$

Observe now that, replacing \mathfrak{C}_2 by $\mathfrak{C}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{C}_1$, we may assume for the proof of (3.5) and (3.6) that $\mathfrak{C}_1 \cap \mathfrak{C}_2 = \emptyset$. So we will assume this property from now on throughout.

Applying first [10, Theorem 11.18(a)] and then [10, Lemma 4.5, Lemma 4.8], one sees that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \mathcal{N}_2$, and that $\mathcal{N}_i \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{N}_{3-i})$ for i = 1, 2. In particular, (3.5) holds.

For the proof of the remaining statement in (b) let now $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and $m \in \mathcal{N}_2$. As $\mathcal{N}_1 \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{N}_2)$, it follows from [10, Lemma 3.5] that (n, m) and (m, n) are in **D** and that nm = mn. In particular, \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 commute in the sense of [10, Definition 2], i.e. they are commuting partial normal subgroups of $F^*(\mathcal{L})$. Hence, it follows from [10, Theorem 1(d)] applied with $F^*(\mathcal{L})$ in place of \mathcal{L} that $S_{nm} \cap T^* = S_{(n,m)} \cap T^*$. This proves (b).

For the proof of (3.6) let $f \in N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)$. By (a), we may pick $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and $m \in \mathcal{N}_2$ with $(n, m) \in \mathbf{D}$ and f = nm. It follows then from (b) that $T^* = T^* \cap S_f = T^* \cap S_{nm} \leq S_{(n,m)}$. As T^* is strongly closed in $\mathcal{F}_S(\mathcal{L})$, it follows that $n \in N_{\mathcal{N}_1}(T^*)$ and $m \in N_{\mathcal{N}_2}(T^*)$. This proves (3.6).

Lemma 3.7. Let $\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}$. Then $N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(E(\mathcal{H}) \cap S) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and $S \cap \mathcal{H} = S \cap N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*)$.

Proof. Since $T^* \leq S$, we have $S \cap \mathcal{H} \subseteq N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*)$ and thus $S \cap \mathcal{H} = S \cap N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*)$. Since $\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}$, it follows moreover easily that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) = \mathcal{H} \cap N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ is subnormal in $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$.

We remarked before that $E(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq E(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq F^*(\mathcal{L})$. Thus, $E(\mathcal{H}) \cap S = E(\mathcal{H}) \cap T^*$. Since $E(\mathcal{H}) \leq \mathcal{H}$ by [10, Lemma 11.13], it follows that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^* \cap E(\mathcal{H})) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap E(\mathcal{H}))$. It remains thus only to show that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap E(\mathcal{H})) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*)$.

Applying first [10, Theorem 11.18(c)] and then [10, Lemma 4.8], one sees that \mathcal{H} is in the centralizer of $\mathcal{M} := \prod_{\mathcal{K} \in \text{Comp}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \text{Comp}(\mathcal{H})} \mathcal{K}$. In particular, $\mathcal{H} \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M} \cap S)$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.6(a), $E(\mathcal{L}) \cap S = (E(\mathcal{H}) \cap S)(\mathcal{M} \cap S)$. Using Lemma 3.4, we can thus conclude that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap E(\mathcal{H})) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{L}}(S \cap E(\mathcal{L})) = N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$. This proves the assertion.

4. WIELANDT'S THEOREM FOR REGULAR LOCALITIES

4.1. Some products in regular localities. In this subsection we prove some general results on products in regular localities, which allow us later to reduce the proof of Theorem A to Wielandt's Theorem for groups and to Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma.

Throughout this subsection let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality and $T^* := S \cap F^*(\mathcal{L})$.

Lemma 4.1. Let $H \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and $\mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{N}H = H\mathcal{N}$ is a partial subgroup of \mathcal{L} . If $H \cap S \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(H)$, then $(\mathcal{N}H) \cap S = (\mathcal{N} \cap S)(H \cap S)$ is a maximal p-subgroup of $\mathcal{N}H$.

Proof. It is shown in [7, Theorem 6.1(a)] that $\mathcal{N}H = H\mathcal{N}$ is a partial subgroup; essentially, the argument uses the property stated in Lemma 3.3. Suppose now $H \cap S \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(H)$. As $N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*) \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ with $\mathcal{N} \cap S = N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*) \cap S \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*))$, Lemma 2.1 (or a short direct argument) gives that $S_0 := (\mathcal{N} \cap S)(H \cap S) \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)H)$. Thus, it follows from [7, Theorem 6.1(c)] that S_0 is a maximal *p*-subgroup of $\mathcal{N}H$. Since $S_0 \leq S \cap (\mathcal{N}H)$ and $S \cap (\mathcal{N}H)$ is a *p*-subgroup of $\mathcal{N}H$, we can conclude that $S \cap \mathcal{N}H = S_0$ is a maximal *p*-subgroup of $\mathcal{N}H$. \Box

Lemma 4.2. Let $H \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{H}} := E(\mathcal{L})H = HE(\mathcal{L}) \leq \mathcal{L}$ and $E(\hat{\mathcal{H}}) = E(\mathcal{L})$.

Proof. It is a special case of [13, Theorem 2] that $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is subnormal in \mathcal{L} , but we supply a shorter direct argument here: Let $H = H_0 \trianglelefteq H_1 \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq H_n = N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ be a subnormal series for H in $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$. Then by Lemma 4.1, $E(\mathcal{L})H_i = H_iE(\mathcal{L})$ is a partial subgroup of \mathcal{L} for all $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n$. By the Frattini Lemma [4, Corollary 3.11] and Lemma 3.7, we have $\mathcal{L} = N_{\mathcal{L}}(S \cap E(\mathcal{L}))E(\mathcal{L}) =$ $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)E(\mathcal{L}) = H_nE(\mathcal{L})$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that $H_{i-1}E(\mathcal{L}) \trianglelefteq H_iE(\mathcal{L})$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. So fix $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $x, y \in E(\mathcal{L})$, $h \in H_{i-1}$ and $f \in H_i$ with

$$v := ((fy)^{-1}, hx, fy) \in \mathbf{D}.$$

By [4, Lemma 1.4(f)], $(fy)^{-1} = y^{-1}f^{-1}$. Moreover, Lemma 3.3 gives

$$S_{hx} \cap T^* = S_{(h,x)} \cap T^*,$$

$$S_{fy} \cap T^* = S_{(f,y)} \cap T^*$$
 and $S_{(fy)^{-1}} \cap T^* = S_{y^{-1}f^{-1}} \cap T^* = S_{(y^{-1},f^{-1})} \cap T^*$.

Hence, setting $u := (y^{-1}, f^{-1}, h, x, f, y) \in \mathbf{D}$, it follows that $S_u \cap T^* = S_w \cap T^*$. As $w \in \mathbf{D}$, the property (3.4) yields now first that $S_u \cap T^* = S_w \cap T^* \in \Delta$ and then $u \in \mathbf{D}$. Using $f \in N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$, we see also that

$$v := (y^{-1}, f^{-1}, h, f, f^{-1}, x, f, y) \in \mathbf{D}$$

via $S_w \cap T^*$. Hence,

$$(hx)^{fy} = \Pi(w) = \Pi(u) = \Pi(v) = (h^f x^f)^y$$

As $h \in H_{i-1} \leq H_i$ and $f \in H_i$, we have $h^f \in H_{i-1}$. Moreover, $x \in E(\mathcal{L}) \leq \mathcal{L}$ implies $x^f \in E(\mathcal{L})$. Hence, $h^f x^f \in H_{i-1}E(\mathcal{L})$. Since $y \in E(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq H_{i-1}E(\mathcal{L})$ and $H_{i-1}E(\mathcal{L})$ is a partial subgroup, it follows $(hx)^{fy} = (h^f x^f)^y \in H_{i-1}E(\mathcal{L})$. This proves $H_{i-1}E(\mathcal{L}) \leq H_iE(\mathcal{L})$ and thus $\hat{\mathcal{H}} := E(\mathcal{L})H = HE(\mathcal{L}) \leq \mathcal{L}$. It follows from [10, Remark 11.2] that $\operatorname{Comp}(\hat{\mathcal{H}}) = \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$ and thus $E(\hat{\mathcal{H}}) = E(\mathcal{L})$.

Recall that, by Lemma 3.5, $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ acts on \mathcal{L} and on the set of components of \mathcal{L} . In particular, if $H \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$, then it makes sense to say that a subset of $\text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$ is *H*-invariant.

Lemma 4.3. Let $H \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$ be H-invariant. Set

$$\mathcal{N} := \prod_{\mathcal{K} \in \mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{K} \text{ and } \mathcal{M} := \prod_{\mathcal{K} \in \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{K}.$$

Assume $H \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$. Then $\mathcal{N}H \trianglelefteq E(\mathcal{L})H$, and $\mathcal{N}H = H\mathcal{N}$ is a partial subnormal subgroup of \mathcal{L} with $\mathcal{N}H \cap S = (\mathcal{N} \cap S)(H \cap S)$. Moreover,

$$N_{\mathcal{N}H}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) = N_{\mathcal{N}}(S \cap \mathcal{N})H = N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)H$$
, $\operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{N}H) = \mathfrak{C}$ and $E(\mathcal{N}H) = \mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{N}H$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, $\hat{\mathcal{H}} := E(\mathcal{L})H = HE(\mathcal{L})$ is a partial subnormal subgroup of \mathcal{L} with $E(\mathcal{L}) = E(\hat{\mathcal{H}})$. We argue now that

$$\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq \hat{\mathcal{H}}.\tag{4.1}$$

For that let $x \in E(\mathcal{L})$, $h \in H$ and $n \in \mathcal{N}$ with $u := ((xh)^{-1}, n, (xh)) \in \mathbf{D}$. By [4, Lemma 1.4(f)], $(xh)^{-1} = h^{-1}x^{-1}$. Set $v := (h^{-1}, x^{-1}, n, x, h) \in \mathbf{D}$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that $S_v \cap T^* = S_u \cap T^*$. Now (3.4) yields first $S_v \cap T^* = S_u \cap T^* \in \Delta$ and then $v \in \mathbf{D}$. Hence,

$$n^{xh} = \Pi(u) = \Pi(v) = (n^x)^h.$$

By [10, Proposition 11.7], $\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq F^*(\mathcal{L}) \supseteq E(\mathcal{L})$ and thus $n^x \in \mathcal{N}$. As \mathfrak{C} is by assumption *H*-invariant and since *H* induces automorphisms of \mathcal{L} via conjugation (cf. Lemma 3.5), it follows that \mathcal{N} is invariant under conjugation by *H*. Thus, $n^{xh} = (n^x)^h \in \mathcal{N}$. This proves (4.1).

Since $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is a subnormal, it is a regular locality with Sylow subgroup $S_0 := S \cap \hat{\mathcal{H}}$. Note that $H \cap S_0 = H \cap S \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(H)$, as $H \leq \mathbb{N} N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and $S \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*))$. Moreover, since $E(\hat{\mathcal{H}}) = E(\mathcal{L})$, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $N_{\hat{\mathcal{H}}}(F^*(\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \cap S) = N_{\hat{\mathcal{H}}}(E(\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \cap S) = N_{\hat{\mathcal{H}}}(E(\mathcal{L}) \cap S) = N_{\hat{\mathcal{H}}}(T^*)$ and thus $H \leq \mathbb{N}_{\hat{\mathcal{H}}}(F^*(\hat{\mathcal{H}}) \cap S)$. The property (4.1) allows us now to apply Lemma 4.1 with $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ in place of \mathcal{L} to obtain that

 $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{N}H = H\mathcal{N}$

is a partial subgroup of \mathcal{L} with $\mathcal{N}H \cap S = \mathcal{N}H \cap S_0 = (\mathcal{N} \cap S_0)(H \cap S_0) = (\mathcal{N} \cap S)(H \cap S)$. We show next that

$$\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}.$$
 (4.2)

As $\hat{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathcal{L}$, it is indeed sufficient to prove that $\mathcal{H} \leq \hat{\mathcal{H}}$. For the proof fix $a \in \mathcal{H}$ and $f \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $w := (f^{-1}, a, f) \in \mathbf{D}$. As \mathcal{H} is a partial subgroup, we only need to prove that $a^f \in \mathcal{H}$. Write f = yh with $y \in E(\mathcal{L})$ and $h \in H$. Then [4, Lemma 1.4(f)] gives $f^{-1} = h^{-1}y^{-1}$. Setting $w' := (h^{-1}, y^{-1}, a, y, h)$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that $S_{w'} \cap T^* = S_w \cap T^*$. Hence, (3.4) gives first $S_w \cap T^* \in \Delta$ and then $w' \in \mathbf{D}$. Using the axioms of a partial group, we can thus conclude that

$$a^{f} = \Pi(w) = \Pi(w') = (a^{y})^{h}.$$

By part (a) of Lemma 3.6, there exist $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$ with y = nm. Moreover, part (b) of that lemma yields then $S_y \cap T^* = S_{nm} \cap T^* = S_{(n,m)} \cap T^*$. So by (3.4), we have $(m^{-1}, n^{-1}, a, n, m) \in \mathbf{D}$ via $S_{(y^{-1}, a, y)} \cap T^*$ and thus

$$a^y = (a^n)^m.$$

Notice that $a, n \in \mathcal{N}H = \mathcal{H}$ and thus $a^n \in \mathcal{H}$. Lemma 3.6(b) gives that $\mathcal{N} \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$. By assumption we have moreover $H \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$. As $\mathcal{M} \trianglelefteq F^*(\mathcal{L})$ is subnormal in \mathcal{L} by [10, Proposition 11.7], it follows from [12, Theorem A(f)] that $C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ is a partial subgroup of \mathcal{L} . Hence, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{N}H \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ and thus $\mathcal{M} \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{H})$ by [10, Lemma 3.5]. It follows that $a^y = (a^n)^m = a^n \in \mathcal{H}$. Recall that $h \in H \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Hence, $a^f = (a^y)^h \in \mathcal{H}$. This completes the proof of (4.2). We prove next that

$$N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) = N_{\mathcal{N}}(S \cap \mathcal{N})H \text{ and } N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) \underline{\triangleleft} N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$$

$$(4.3)$$

To see this notice that $H \subseteq N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^* \cap \mathcal{N}) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N})$ as $\mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{H} \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ by (4.1). Hence, by the Dedekind Lemma [4, Lemma 1.10], we have $N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) = N_{\mathcal{N}}(S \cap \mathcal{N})H$. Applying Lemma 3.7 with \mathcal{N} in place of \mathcal{H} and noting that $\mathcal{N} = E(\mathcal{N})$, we obtain $N_{\mathcal{N}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) = N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)$. Hence, $N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) \leq N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*)$. This shows $N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*)$. As $\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}$, one sees easily that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$. This completes the proof of (4.3). It remains now only to prove that

$$\operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathfrak{C}.\tag{4.4}$$

Note first that, by [10, Remark 11.2(a)], we have $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \text{Comp}(\mathcal{H})$. Assuming that (4.4) is false, there exists thus $\mathcal{K} \in \text{Comp}(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \mathfrak{C}$. Then \mathcal{K} centralizes \mathcal{N} by [10, Theorem 11.18(e)]. In particular, $\mathcal{K} \subseteq C_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) \subseteq N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N})$. Using (4.3) and the fact that \mathcal{K} is subnormal in \mathcal{H} , we see then

that $\mathcal{K} \leq \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) \leq \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and so \mathcal{K} is a subnormal subgroup of the group $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$. As $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ is a group of characteristic p, it follows from [15, Lemma 1.2(a)] that \mathcal{K} is a group of characteristic p. As \mathcal{K} is quasisimple, [10, Lemma 7.10] gives $Z(\mathcal{K}) = O_p(\mathcal{K}) \neq \mathcal{K}$. This yields a contradiction. Hence, (4.4) holds. In particular, $E(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{N}$ and the proof is complete. \Box

4.2. The proof of Theorem A. In this subsection we prove Theorem A as well as some additional properties. Except in Corollary 4.11, we assume throughout this subsection the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4.4. Let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality and set $T^* := F^*(\mathcal{L}) \cap S$. Let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 be partial subnormal subgroups of \mathcal{L} . Set

$$\mathcal{H} := \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2 \rangle,$$

 $S_i := \mathcal{H}_i \cap S, \ T_i = E(\mathcal{H}_i) \cap S \ and \ H_i := N_{\mathcal{H}_i}(T_i) \ for \ i = 1, 2.$

 $Set\ moreover$

$$H := \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle, \ \mathfrak{C} := \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}_1) \cup \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}_2), \ \mathcal{N} := \prod_{\mathcal{K} \in \mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{K} \ and \ \mathcal{M} := \prod_{\mathcal{K} \in \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{K}.$$

It follows from [10, Remark 11.2(b)] that the $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \text{Comp}(\mathcal{L})$. In particular, $T_i \leq E(\mathcal{L}) \cap S \leq T^*$ for i = 1, 2. Moreover, as remarked before, \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} are well-defined by [10, Proposition 11.7] (i.e. the order of the factors in these products does not matter). We will use these properties throughout without further reference.

Lemma 4.5. We have $H_i = N_{\mathcal{H}_i}(T^*) \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and $S_i = H_i \cap S$. In particular,

 $H = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*) \text{ and } H \cap S = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle.$

Proof. Lemma 3.7 implies that $H_i = N_{\mathcal{H}_i}(T^*) \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and $S_i = S \cap H_i$ for each i = 1, 2. In particular, it follows from Wielandt's Theorem for groups that $H = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$ is a subnormal subgroup of $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ and from Meierfrankenfeld's Lemma 2.1 that $H \cap S = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$. \Box

Recall that $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ (and thus also H) acts on the set of components of \mathcal{L} by Lemma 3.5.

Lemma 4.6. The set \mathfrak{C} is *H*-invariant.

Proof. It is sufficient to argue that \mathfrak{C} is H_i -invariant for each i = 1, 2. For the proof fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By Lemma 3.5 (applied with \mathcal{H}_i in place of \mathcal{L}), $\operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ is H_i -invariant. Moreover, applying first [10, 11.17] and then [10, Lemma 3.5], one sees that $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{K})$ for every $\mathcal{K} \in \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}_i)$. In particular, H_i centralizes every component in $\mathfrak{C} \setminus \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}_i)$. Thus \mathfrak{C} is H_i -invariant. \Box

Lemma 4.7. We have $\mathcal{H} \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ and so $H \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. By [10, Proposition 11.7], $\mathcal{M} \leq F^*(\mathcal{L})$ is subnormal in \mathcal{L} . Hence, it follows from [12, Theorem A(f)] that $C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ is a partial subgroup of \mathcal{L} . Therefore, it is sufficient to show that $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ for each i = 1, 2.

Fix now $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and notice that $\mathfrak{C}' := \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \mathfrak{C} \subseteq \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}_i)$. Hence, it is a special case of [10, Theorem 11.18(c)] that $\mathcal{H}_i \mathcal{M}$ is an internal central product of the elements of $\{\mathcal{H}_i\} \cup \mathfrak{C}'$ (in the sense defined in [10, Definition 4.1]). In particular, by [10, Lemma 4.8], we have $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ as required. \Box

Theorem 4.8. We have $\mathcal{H} := \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2 \rangle = \mathcal{N}H = H\mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{L}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{H} \cap S = H \cap S = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$, Comp $(\mathcal{H}) = \mathfrak{C}$, $E(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{N} = E(\mathcal{H}_1)E(\mathcal{H}_2) \leq \mathcal{H}$ and

$$N_{\mathcal{H}}(F^*(\mathcal{H}) \cap S) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{N} \cap S) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) = H.$$

Proof. Recall that $H \leq N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ by Lemma 4.5, that \mathfrak{C} is *H*-invariant by Lemma 4.6 and that $H \subseteq C_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ by Lemma 4.7. Hence, it follows from Lemma 4.3 that $\mathcal{N}H = H\mathcal{N}$ is a partial subnormal subgroup of \mathcal{L} ,

Comp $(\mathcal{N}H) = \mathfrak{C}$, $E(\mathcal{N}H) = \mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{N}H$, $(\mathcal{N}H) \cap S = (\mathcal{N} \cap S)(H \cap S)$ and $N_{\mathcal{N}H}(\mathcal{N} \cap S) = N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)H$. It follows from the Frattini Lemma [4, Corollary 3.11] that $\mathcal{H}_i = E(\mathcal{H}_i)H_i \subseteq \mathcal{N}H$ for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$. So the fact that $\mathcal{N}H$ is a partial subgroup implies $\mathcal{H} := \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2 \rangle \subseteq \mathcal{N}H$. As \mathcal{N} and H are both contained in \mathcal{H} , we can conclude that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{N}H = H\mathcal{N}$. In particular, \mathcal{H} is subnormal in \mathcal{L} ,

 $\operatorname{Comp}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathfrak{C}, \ E(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{N} \trianglelefteq \mathcal{H}, \ \mathcal{H} \cap S = (\mathcal{N} \cap S)(\mathcal{H} \cap S) \text{ and } N_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{N} \cap S) = N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)\mathcal{H}.$

By Lemma 4.5, $H \cap S = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$. It follows moreover from Lemma 3.6(a) that

 $\mathcal{N} \cap S = (E(\mathcal{H}_1) \cap S)(E(\mathcal{H}_2) \cap S) \leq \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle = H \cap S.$

Hence, $\mathcal{H} \cap S = (\mathcal{N} \cap S)(\mathcal{H} \cap S) = \mathcal{H} \cap S = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$. Notice that Lemma 3.6(a) yields also that $\mathcal{N} = E(\mathcal{H}_1)E(\mathcal{H}_2)$, i.e. $E(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{N} = E(\mathcal{H}_1)E(\mathcal{H}_2)$.

As $\mathcal{N} = E(\mathcal{H})$, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap F^*(\mathcal{H})) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N})$ and from Lemma 3.7 that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{N} \cap S) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*)$. It remains thus only to show that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) = H$. By Lemma 3.6(c), we have $N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*) = N_{E(\mathcal{H}_1)}(T^*)N_{E(\mathcal{H}_2)}(T^*)$. Note that $N_{E(\mathcal{H}_i)}(T^*) \leq N_{\mathcal{H}_i}(T^*) =$ H_i for each i = 1, 2 by Lemma 4.5. Thus, it follows that $N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*) \leq \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle = H$. Using the properties above, we obtain therefore that $N_{\mathcal{H}}(T^*) = N_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{N} \cap S) = N_{\mathcal{N}}(T^*)H = H$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 4.9. Set $T := \mathcal{H} \cap S = H \cap S$. Then

$$\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{N}T), \mathcal{F}_T(H) \rangle.$$

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}$ and $N_{\mathcal{H}}(S \cap \mathcal{N}) = H$ by Theorem 4.8. In particular, by Theorem 3.2, \mathcal{H} supports the structure of a regular locality. Hence, the assertion follows from Lemma 3.1(b) applied with \mathcal{H} in place of \mathcal{L} .

When we show Theorem B using Theorem A, we need the following lemma. Note that its proof relies on Theorem C.

Lemma 4.10. Assume that $T := S \cap \mathcal{H} \leq N_S(\mathcal{H}_1) \cap N_S(\mathcal{H}_2)$. Then

$$\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_1 T), \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_2 T) \rangle.$$

Proof. As $T \leq N_S(\mathcal{H}_i)$ and $E(\mathcal{H}_i)$ is by [10, Lemma 11.12] invariant under automorphisms of \mathcal{H}_i , we have

 $T \leq N_S(E(\mathcal{H}_i))$ and $T_i \leq T$ for i = 1, 2.

Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By [12, Lemma 3.19(a)], $\mathcal{H}_i T$ is a partial subgroup of \mathcal{L} and $(\mathcal{H}_i T, \delta(\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_i T)), T)$ is a regular locality with $E(\mathcal{H}_i) = E(\mathcal{H}_i T)$. In particular, $E(\mathcal{H}_i) = E(\mathcal{H}_i T) \trianglelefteq \mathcal{H}_i T$ by [10, Lemma 11.13]. It follows thus from Lemma 3.1(b) that

 $\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_i T) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_i)T), \mathcal{F}_T(N_{\mathcal{H}_i T}(T_i)) \rangle$ for i = 1, 2.

By the Dedekind Lemma [4, Lemma 1.10], $N_{\mathcal{H}_iT}(T_i) = N_{\mathcal{H}_i}(T_i)T = H_iT$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_i T) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_i)T), \mathcal{F}_T(H_i T) \rangle \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$
(4.5)

As $\mathcal{N} \leq \mathcal{H}$ by Theorem 4.8, the product $\mathcal{N}T$ is a partial subgroup of \mathcal{L} by [10, Lemma 3.15]. We show next that

$$E(\mathcal{H}_i) \leq \mathcal{N}T$$
 for each $i = 1, 2.$ (4.6)

For the proof let $i \in \{1,2\}$, $x \in E(\mathcal{H}_i)$ and $f \in \mathcal{N}T$ with $u := (f^{-1}, x, f) \in \mathbf{D}$. Then there exist $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $s \in T$ with f = ns. By [4, Lemma 1.4(f)], $f^{-1} = s^{-1}n^{-1}$. Moreover, by [11, Lemma 2.8], we have $S_f = S_{(n,s)}$ and $S_{f^{-1}} = S_{(s^{-1},n^{-1})}$. Hence, for $v := (s^{-1}, n^{-1}, x, n, s)$, we have

 $S_v = S_u$. Applying (3.1) twice, it follows first that $S_v = S_u \in \Delta$ and then that $v \in \mathbf{D}$. Hence, by the axioms of a partial group, we have $x^f = \Pi(u) = \Pi(v) = (x^n)^s$. As $E(\mathcal{H}_i) \leq F^*(\mathcal{L}) \geq \mathcal{N}$ by [10, Proposition 11.7], we have $x^n \in E(\mathcal{H}_i)$. So $s \in T \leq N_S(E(\mathcal{H}_i))$ implies that $x^f = (x^n)^s \in E(\mathcal{H}_i)$. This shows (4.6). We show next:

$$\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{N}T) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_1)T), \mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_2)T) \rangle$$
(4.7)

As $E(\mathcal{H}_i)T \subseteq \mathcal{N}T$ for i = 1, 2, we have clearly $\mathcal{F}_0 := \langle \mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_1)T), \mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_2)T) \rangle \subseteq \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{N}T)$ and so it remains to show the opposite inclusion. Thus, fixing $f \in \mathcal{N}T$, we need to show that $c_f|_{S_f \cap T}$ is a morphism in \mathcal{F}_0 . Write f = nt for some $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $t \in T$. By [11, Lemma 2.8], we have $S_f = S_{(n,t)}$, which implies that $c_f : S_f \cap T \to T$ is a composite of restrictions of $c_n|_{S_n \cap T}$ and $c_t|_T$. As $c_t|_T$ is a morphism in \mathcal{F}_0 , it is thus sufficient to show that $c_n|_{S_n \cap T}$ is a morphism in \mathcal{F}_0 . By [12, Lemma 3.19(a)] $(\mathcal{N}T, \delta(\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{N}T)), T)$ is a regular locality. Moreover, by Theorem 4.8, $\mathcal{N} = E(\mathcal{H}_1)E(\mathcal{H}_2)$ and by (4.6), $E(\mathcal{H}_i) \leq \mathcal{N}T$ for each i = 1, 2. Therefore, [9, Theorem 1] applied with $\mathcal{N}T$ in place of \mathcal{L} yields the existence of elements $x \in E(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $y \in E(\mathcal{H}_2)$ with $(x, y) \in \mathbf{D}$, n = xy and $S_n \cap T = S_{(x,y)} \cap T$. So $c_n|_{S_n \cap T}$ is the composite of restrictions of $c_x|_{S_x \cap T}$ (which is a morphism in $\mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_1)T)$) and of $c_y|_{S_y \cap T}$ (which is a morphism in $\mathcal{F}_T(E(\mathcal{H}_2)T)$). So $c_n|_{S_n \cap T}$ is a morphism in \mathcal{F}_0 and (4.7) holds.

We use now that $T = \mathcal{H} \cap S = H \cap S$ by Theorem 4.8. Recall also that H_1 and H_2 are subnormal in $N_{\mathcal{L}}(T^*)$ by Lemma 4.5. Our assumption yields moreover that H_1 and H_2 are T-invariant and so $\langle H_i, T \rangle = H_i T$ for i = 1, 2. Hence, it follows from Theorem C that

$$\mathcal{F}_T(H) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(H_1T), \mathcal{F}_T(H_2T) \rangle.$$

So Lemma 4.9 implies

$$\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}) = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{N}T), \mathcal{F}_T(H) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{N}T), \mathcal{F}_T(H_1T), \mathcal{F}_T(H_2T) \rangle$$

Hence, the assertion follows from (4.5) and (4.7).

We remove now the standing Hypothesis 4.4 to record the following corollary to Theorem A.

Corollary 4.11. Let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality and suppose $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_n$ are partial subnormal subgroups of \mathcal{L} . Then $\langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_n \rangle$ is a partial subnormal subgroup of \mathcal{L} with

$$\langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, \mathcal{H}_n \rangle \cap S = \langle \mathcal{H}_1 \cap S, \mathcal{H}_2 \cap S, \dots, \mathcal{H}_n \cap S \rangle.$$

Proof. This follows from Theorem A using induction on n.

5. WIELANDT'S THEOREM FOR FUSION SYSTEMS AND RELATED RESULTS

After collecting some background, we prove Theorem B in this section. Indeed, Theorem 5.4 below gives some additional information. Some of the difficulties in formulating Wielandt's Theorem for fusion systems are illustrated in Example 5.9. At the end we prove Proposition D.

5.1. Some background. Throughout this subsection let \mathcal{F} be a saturated fusion system over S. Let \mathcal{E} be a subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $T \leq S$. Given $\alpha \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(T, S)$, write \mathcal{E}^{α} for the subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $T\alpha$ such that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}^{\alpha}}(P\alpha, Q\alpha) = \{\alpha^{-1}\varphi\alpha \colon \varphi \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}}(P, Q)\}$ for all $P, Q \leq T$. For $a \in S$ set $\mathcal{E}^{a} \coloneqq \mathcal{E}^{\alpha}$ where $\alpha = c_{a}$ is the conjugation map $T \to S$. Set

$$N_S(\mathcal{E}) := \{ a \in N_S(T) \colon \mathcal{E}^a = \mathcal{E} \}.$$

One observes easily that $N_S(\mathcal{E})$ is a subgroup of S.

The reader might want to recall the definition of $O^p(\mathcal{F})$ from [1, Definition I.7.3, Theorem I.7.4]. If \mathcal{E} is a subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $T \leq S$ and $P \leq N_S(\mathcal{E})$, then a concrete description of a subsystem $\mathcal{E}P = (\mathcal{E}P)_{\mathcal{F}}$ of \mathcal{F} is given in [12, Definition 2.7]. The subsystem $\mathcal{E}P$ should be thought of as a product of \mathcal{E} with P. It depends however not only on \mathcal{E} and P, but also on \mathcal{F} . We write $(\mathcal{E}P)_{\mathcal{F}}$ if we want to emphasize that dependence. It is shown in [12, Theorem D(a)]

that $\mathcal{E}P = (\mathcal{E}P)_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the unique saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} over TP with $O^p(\mathcal{E}P) = O^p(\mathcal{E})$. This characterization implies immediately the following remark:

Remark 5.1. Let \mathcal{E} be a subnormal subsystem of the saturated fusion system \mathcal{F} , and let \mathcal{G} be a saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $S' \leq S$ such that \mathcal{E} is also subnormal in \mathcal{G} . If $P \leq N_{S'}(\mathcal{E})$, then $(\mathcal{E}P)_{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{E}P)_{\mathcal{F}}$.

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Proposition D. Part (a) goes back to Puig.

Lemma 5.2. Let G be a finite group, $S \in Syl_p(G)$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_S(G)$. Then the following hold:

- (a) $\mathcal{F}_{S \cap O^p(G)}(O^p(G)) = O^p(\mathcal{F}).$
- (b) Let $H \leq G$, $T = S \cap H$ and $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{F}_T(H)$. Then $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{F}$ and $N_S(H) \leq N_S(\mathcal{E})$. Moreover, $(\mathcal{E}P)_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_{TP}(HP)$ for every $P \leq N_S(\mathcal{E})$.

Proof. (a) It was first observed by Puig [16, § 1.1] that $S \cap O^p(G) = \mathfrak{hyp}(\mathcal{F})$; a detailed proof can be found in [6, Theorem 1.33]. Thus $\mathcal{F}_{S \cap O^p(\mathcal{F})}(O^p(\mathcal{F}))$ is a saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $\mathfrak{hyp}(\mathcal{F})$. As $O^p(\mathcal{F})$ is characterized in [1, Theorem I.7.4] as the unique saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $\mathfrak{hyp}(\mathcal{F})$, part (a) follows.

(b) It follows from [1, Proposition I.6.2] that \mathcal{E} is subnormal in \mathcal{F} , and one observes easily that $N_S(H) \leq N_S(\mathcal{E})$. For $P \leq N_S(H)$ notice that $O^p(HP) = O^p(H)$ and so (a) yields $O^p(\mathcal{F}_{TP}(HP)) = \mathcal{F}_{O^p(H)\cap S}(O^p(H)) = O^p(\mathcal{E})$. As $\mathcal{E}P = (\mathcal{E}P)_{\mathcal{F}}$ is by [12, Theorem D(a)] the unique saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} over TP with $O^p(\mathcal{E}P) = O^p(\mathcal{E})$, statement (b) follows.

5.2. Wielandt's Theorem for fusion systems. In this subsection we assume the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5.3. Let \mathcal{F} be a saturated fusion system and $n \ge 1$. For i = 1, 2, ..., n let \mathcal{E}_i be a subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F} over $S_i \le S$.

We will show the following theorem, which implies Theorem B.

Theorem 5.4. Assume Hypothesis 5.3. Then there exists a subsystem

$$\mathcal{E} := \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots, \mathcal{E}_n \rangle\!\rangle$$

of \mathcal{F} over $T := \langle S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n \rangle$ such that the following hold.

- (a) \mathcal{E} is subnormal in \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{E}_i \leq \mathcal{E}$ for i = 1, 2, ..., n.
- (b) If \mathcal{G} is a saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} with $\mathcal{E}_i \leq \mathcal{G}$ for i = 1, 2, ..., n, then $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{G}$. In particular, \mathcal{E} is the smallest saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} in which $\mathcal{E}_1, ..., \mathcal{E}_n$ are subnormal.
- (c) Let $0 = i_0 < i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k = n$. Then

$$\mathcal{E} = \langle\!\langle \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \dots \mathcal{E}_{i_1} \rangle\!\rangle, \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_{i_1+1}, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{i_2} \rangle\!\rangle, \dots, \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_{i_{k-1}+1}, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{i_k} \rangle\!\rangle\rangle\rangle$$

(where for j = 1, ..., k, $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_{i_{j-1}+1}, ..., \mathcal{E}_{i_j} \rangle\!\rangle$ is the smallest saturated subsystem in which $\mathcal{E}_{i_{j-1}+1}, ..., \mathcal{E}_{i_j}$ are subnormal).

(d) Let (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) be a regular locality over \mathcal{F} . For i = 1, 2, ..., n let $\mathcal{H}_i \leq \mathcal{L}$ with $S_i = \mathcal{H}_i \cap S$ and $\mathcal{F}_{S_i}(\mathcal{H}_i) = \mathcal{E}_i$. Then, setting $\mathcal{H} := \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, ..., \mathcal{H}_n \rangle$, we have

$$T = \mathcal{H} \cap S \text{ and } \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}).$$

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5.4. For that we fix a regular locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) over \mathcal{F} . Such a regular locality exists always by [10, Lemma 10.4]. By [5, Theorem E(a)], for each i = 1, 2, ..., n, there exists a unique partial subnormal subgroup \mathcal{H}_i of \mathcal{L} with $\mathcal{H}_i \cap S = S_i$ and $\mathcal{F}_{S_i}(\mathcal{H}_i) = \mathcal{E}_i$. Set now

$$T := \langle S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n \rangle$$
 and $\mathcal{H} := \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, \mathcal{H}_n \rangle$.

Moreover, define

$$\mathcal{E} := \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots, \mathcal{E}_n \rangle\!\rangle := \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H} \cap S}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Similarly, we define $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_r \rangle\!\rangle$ whenever $\mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_r$ are subnormal subsystems of \mathcal{F} . Note that the definition depends a priori on the choice of the regular locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) . However, we will show below that Theorem 5.4(b) holds for this choice of \mathcal{E} , and thus \mathcal{E} is in fact uniquely determined by \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{E}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n$.

Lemma 5.5. The following hold:

- (a) $\mathcal{H} \cap S = T$ and \mathcal{E} is a subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F} over T. Moreover, $\mathcal{E}_i \leq \mathcal{E}$ for all i = 1, 2, ..., n.
- (b) Let $1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k = n$. Then

$$\mathcal{E} = \langle\!\langle \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \dots \mathcal{E}_{i_1} \rangle\!\rangle, \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_{i_1+1}, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{i_2} \rangle\!\rangle, \dots, \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_{i_{k-1}+1}, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{i_k} \rangle\!\rangle \rangle\!\rangle.$$

Proof. (a) By Corollary 4.11, we have $\mathcal{H} \cap S = T$ and $\mathcal{H} \leq \mathcal{L}$. In particular, $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H} \cap S}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H})$ is a subsystem over T. Moreover, it follows from [5, Proposition 7.1(a)] that \mathcal{E} is subnormal in \mathcal{F} . As $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_i \leq \mathcal{L}$, it is a consequence of [5, Proposition 7.1(c)] that $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{F}_{S \cap \mathcal{H}_i}(\mathcal{H}_i) \leq \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{E}$ for all i = 1, 2, ..., n.

(b) This follows since

$$\mathcal{H} := \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \dots, \mathcal{H}_n \rangle = \langle \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{i_1} \rangle, \langle \mathcal{H}_{i_1+1}, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{i_2} \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathcal{H}_{i_{k-1}+1}, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{i_k} \rangle \rangle.$$

The next goal is the proof of Theorem 5.4(b). We start with two preliminary results, which will also be used in the proof of Proposition D.

Lemma 5.6. Suppose n = 2 and $T \leq N_S(\mathcal{E}_1) \cap N_S(\mathcal{E}_2)$. Then $\mathcal{E} = \langle (\mathcal{E}_1 T)_{\mathcal{F}}, (\mathcal{E}_2 T)_{\mathcal{F}} \rangle.$

Proof. We use throughout that $T = \mathcal{H} \cap S$ by Lemma 5.5(a). By [12, Lemma 3.8], $N_S(\mathcal{E}_i) = N_S(\mathcal{H}_i)$ for i = 1, 2. Hence, $T \leq N_S(\mathcal{H}_1) \cap N_S(\mathcal{H}_2)$ and so Lemma 4.10 gives

$$\mathcal{E} = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_1 T), \mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_2 T) \rangle.$$

By [12, Theorem D(b)], $\mathcal{F}_T(\mathcal{H}_i T) = (\mathcal{E}_i T)_{\mathcal{F}}$ for i = 1, 2. Hence the assertion holds.

Lemma 5.7. Let $x \in T$. Then $\mathcal{E}_1^x \leq \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E} = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3, \dots, \mathcal{E}_n \rangle\!\rangle$.

Proof. Since $c_x \in \operatorname{Aut}(S)$ induces an automorphism of \mathcal{F} , we have $\mathcal{E}_1^x \leq \mathcal{I} \mathcal{F}$. Indeed, it is shown in [12, Lemma 3.26(a)] that $\mathcal{H}_1^x \leq \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{E}_1^x = \mathcal{F}_{S \cap \mathcal{H}_1^x}(\mathcal{H}_1^x)$ (which implies by [5, Theorem 7.1(a)] also that $\mathcal{E}_1^x \leq \mathcal{I} \mathcal{F}$). As $x \in T \subseteq \mathcal{H} = \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_n \rangle$, we have moreover that $\mathcal{H} = \langle \mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_1^x, \mathcal{H}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_n \rangle$. It follows now from the definitions of \mathcal{E} and of $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x, \mathcal{E}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n \rangle\!\rangle$ that

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{H} \cap S}(\mathcal{H}) = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots, \mathcal{E}_n \rangle\!\rangle$$

Lemma 5.8. Let \mathcal{G} be a saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} with $\mathcal{E}_i \leq \mathcal{G}$ for i = 1, 2, ..., n. Then $\mathcal{E} \leq \mathcal{G}$.

Proof. If n = 1, then $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_1 \leq \mathcal{G}$. Hence, using Lemma 5.5(b) and induction on n, we can reduce to the case n = 2. Thus, we assume from now on that

n = 2.

Suppose moreover that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{L}, \Delta, S)$ is a counterexample such that first |S:T| and then $|\mathcal{E}_1| + |\mathcal{E}_2|$ is maximal, where $T = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$ as before and $|\mathcal{E}_i|$ denotes the number of morphisms in \mathcal{E}_i for i = 1, 2.

Let $S' \leq S$ such that \mathcal{G} is a subsystem over S'. As \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are contained in \mathcal{G} , we have $T \leq S'$. Fix now a regular locality $(\mathcal{L}', \Delta', S')$ over \mathcal{G} (which exists by [10, Lemma 10.4]). By [5,

Theorem E(a)], there exist partial subnormal subgroups $\mathcal{H}'_1, \mathcal{H}'_2$ of \mathcal{L}' such that $S_i = \mathcal{H}'_i \cap S'$ and $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{F}_{S_i}(\mathcal{H}'_i)$ for i = 1, 2. So we may define

$$\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle_{\mathcal{G}} := \mathcal{F}_{S \cap \mathcal{H}'}(\mathcal{H}')$$
 where $\mathcal{H}' := \langle \mathcal{H}'_1, \mathcal{H}'_2 \rangle$.

Notice that $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle_{\mathcal{G}} \leq \mathcal{G}$ by Lemma 5.5(a) applied with $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{L}', \Delta', S')$ in place of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L}, \Delta, S)$.

Assume now first that $T \leq N_S(\mathcal{E}_1) \cap N_S(\mathcal{E}_2)$. Then Lemma 5.6 yields $\mathcal{E} = \langle (\mathcal{E}_1T)_{\mathcal{F}}, (\mathcal{E}_2T)_{\mathcal{F}} \rangle$. As $T \leq S'$, we have $T \leq N_{S'}(\mathcal{E}_1) \cap N_{S'}(\mathcal{E}_2)$. Hence, Lemma 5.6 applied with $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{L}', \Delta', S')$ in place of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L}, \Delta, S)$ yields also that $\langle \langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle \rangle_{\mathcal{G}} = \langle (\mathcal{E}_1T)_{\mathcal{G}}, (\mathcal{E}_2T)_{\mathcal{G}} \rangle$. It follows now from Remark 5.1 that $(\mathcal{E}_iT)_{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{E}_iT)_{\mathcal{F}}$ for i = 1, 2 and thus

This contradicts the assumption that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{L}, \Delta, S)$ is a counterexample. Hence, $T \leq N_S(\mathcal{E}_i)$ for some i = 1, 2. Since the situation is symmetric in \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , we may assume without loss of generality that

$$T \leq N_S(\mathcal{E}_1).$$

This means that $T_0 := T \cap N_S(\mathcal{E}_1) < T$ and thus $T_0 < N_T(T_0)$. Fix $x \in N_T(T_0) \setminus T_0$. By Lemma 5.7, we have $\mathcal{E}_1^x \leq \mathcal{I} \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E}_1^x \leq \mathcal{I} \mathcal{G}$. Set now

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1 := \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x \rangle\!\rangle.$$

Notice that \mathcal{E}_1^x is a subsystem over S_1^x and $\tilde{S}_1 := \langle S_1, S_1^x \rangle \leq T_0 < T$ as $S_1 \leq T_0$. Thus, $|S : \tilde{S}_1| > |S : T|$, and so the maximality of |S : T| yields that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x, \mathcal{L}, \Delta, S)$ is not a counterexample. Hence,

 $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1 \leq \mathcal{G}.$

By Lemma 5.5(a), $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ is a subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F} over \tilde{S}_1 . As $x \in T$ and $\tilde{S}_1 = \langle S_1, S_1^x \rangle$, it follows that $T = \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle = \langle \tilde{S}_1, S_2 \rangle$. The choice of x yields that $\mathcal{E}_1^x \neq \mathcal{E}_1$. Since \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_1^x are contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$, the subsystem \mathcal{E}_1 is therefore properly contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$. So $|\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1| > |\mathcal{E}_1|$ and the maximality of $|\mathcal{E}_1| + |\mathcal{E}_2|$ yields that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{L}, \Delta, S)$ is not a counterexample. As $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1$ and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal in \mathcal{F} and in \mathcal{G} , this means that

$$\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle \leq \mathcal{G}$$

Applying first Lemma 5.7 and then Lemma 5.5(b), we can conclude now that

$$\mathcal{E} = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle \leq \leq \mathcal{G}.$$

This contradicts the assumption that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{L}, \Delta, S)$ is a counterexample and completes thereby the proof.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. Note that Lemma 5.5(a) verifies part (a) and that Lemma 5.8 verifies part (b), if \mathcal{E} is defined as above (a priori in dependence of (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S)). In particular, \mathcal{E} is the smallest saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} in which $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n$ are subnormal. So (c) follows from Lemma 5.5(b). Moreover, \mathcal{E} depends in fact only on $\mathcal{E}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n$ and \mathcal{F} , but not on the choice of the regular locality (\mathcal{L}, Δ, S) . Therefore, part (d) follows from the definition of \mathcal{E} .

We end this subsection with an example which helps to motivate why we formulate Theorem B and Theorem 5.4 as we do.

Example 5.9. Let $G = G_1 \times G_2$ with $G_1 \cong G_2 \cong A_4$. Setting $T_i := O_p(G_i)$ for i = 1, 2 and $S := T_1 \times T_2$, we have $S \in \operatorname{Syl}_p(G)$. Set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_S(G)$ and $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{F}_{T_i}(G_i)$ for i = 1, 2. Note that $G_i \subseteq G$ and thus $\mathcal{E}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ for i = 1, 2. In particular, \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal in \mathcal{F} .

If \mathcal{E}_1 is contained in a saturated fusion system \mathcal{D} over S, then, by the extension axiom, every element of $\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{E}_1}(S_1)$ extends to a \mathcal{D} -automorphism of S, which yields $\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{D}}(S) \neq \operatorname{Aut}_S(S)$. In particular, the following holds:

If \mathcal{D} is a saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} containing \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , then $\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{D}}(S) \neq \operatorname{Aut}_S(S)$. (5.1)

Note that $\operatorname{Aut}_{\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle}(S) = \operatorname{Aut}_S(S)$. Hence, $\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle$ is by (5.1) not saturated (and is so in particular not subnormal in \mathcal{F}).

We argue now that there is no smallest saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} containing \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , and indeed also no smallest subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F} containing \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 . Fix $d_i \in G_i$ of order 3 for i = 1, 2. Set $N_1 := S\langle d_1 d_2 \rangle$, $N_2 := S\langle d_1 d_2^2 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{D}_i := \mathcal{F}_S(N_i)$ for i = 1, 2. Notice that $N_i \leq G$ and thus $\mathcal{D}_i \leq \mathcal{F}$ for i = 1, 2. In particular, \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are subnormal in \mathcal{F} . Observe also that \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are contained in \mathcal{D}_i for i = 1, 2. However, if \mathcal{D} is a saturated fusion system containing \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , then \mathcal{D} is not contained in $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$, as otherwise $\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{D}}(S) = \operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2}(S) = \operatorname{Aut}_S(S)$, contradicting (5.1). Thus, there is no smallest saturated and no smallest subnormal subsystem of \mathcal{F} containing \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 .

It might also be worth observing that in this example, $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \mathcal{F}$. (One can see this by noting that $(G, \delta(\mathcal{F}), S)$ is a regular locality, and so $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle$ is by Theorem 5.4(d) realized by $\langle G_1, G_2 \rangle = G$.) So $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle$ is neither contained in \mathcal{D}_1 nor in \mathcal{D}_2 , even though both subsystems contain \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 .

5.3. The proof of Proposition D. Throughout this subsection let \mathcal{F} be a saturated fusion system over S. If $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n$ are subnormal subsystems of \mathcal{F} , then $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n \rangle\!\rangle$ denotes the subsystem of \mathcal{F} , which is characterized by Theorem 5.4(b) as the smallest saturated subsystem of \mathcal{F} in which $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_n$ are subnormal.

Lemma 5.10. Let \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 be subnormal subsystems of \mathcal{F} over subgroups S_1 and S_2 of S respectively. Set $T := \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$. Then the following hold:

- (a) If $T \leq N_S(\mathcal{E}_1) \cap N_S(\mathcal{E}_2)$, then $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \langle (\mathcal{E}_1 T)_{\mathcal{F}}, (\mathcal{E}_2 T)_{\mathcal{F}} \rangle$.
- (b) For every $x \in T$, we have $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle$.

Proof. Using Theorem 5.4(d), part (a) is a restatement of Lemma 5.6 and part (b) follows from Lemma 5.7. \Box

We are now able to prove Proposition D using a similar strategy as in the proof of Lemma 5.8.

Proof of Proposition D. Set $S_i = S \cap H_i$ and $\mathcal{E}_i := \mathcal{F}_{S_i}(H_i)$ for i = 1, 2. Set moreover $T := \langle S_1, S_2 \rangle$ and $H := \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$. Note that \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are subnormal in \mathcal{F} as stated in Lemma 5.2(b). Thus, the statement of the proposition makes sense. Assume now that (G, S, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample to the proposition such that first |S:T| and then $|H_1| + |H_2|$ is maximal.

To start with, assume that $T \leq N_S(H_1) \cap N_S(H_2)$. Then Lemma 5.2(b) gives that $T \leq N_S(\mathcal{E}_1) \cap N_S(\mathcal{E}_2)$ and $(\mathcal{E}_i T)_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}_T(H_i T)$ for i = 1, 2. Thus, Lemma 5.10(a) yields that

$$\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \langle (\mathcal{E}_1 T)_{\mathcal{F}}, (\mathcal{E}_2 T)_{\mathcal{F}} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{F}_T(H_1 T), \mathcal{F}_T(H_2 T) \rangle.$$

Hence, it follows from Theorem C that $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \mathcal{F}_{H \cap S}(H)$, contradicting the assumption that (G, S, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample. Hence, $T \leq N_S(H_1) \cap N_S(H_2)$. Since the situation is symmetric in H_1 and H_2 , we may assume that

 $T \leq N_S(H_1).$

This means that $T_0 := N_T(H_1) < T$ and thus $T_0 < N_T(T_0)$ as T is a p-group. Fix $x \in N_T(T_0) \setminus T_0$. Note that $S_1 \leq T_0$ and so $H_1^x \cap S = S_1^x \leq T_0 \leq S$. Hence, $\tilde{S}_1 := \langle S_1, S_1^x \rangle \leq T_0 < T$ and $|S: \tilde{S}_1| > |S: T|$. Observe also that $\mathcal{F}_{H_1^x \cap S}(H_1^x) = \mathcal{E}_1^x$. Setting $\tilde{H}_1 := \langle H_1, H_1^x \rangle$, the maximality of |S: T| yields thus that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{H}_1 \cap S}(\tilde{H}_1) = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x \rangle\!\rangle.$$

Recall that x is chosen such that $H_1 \neq H_1^x$ and $x \in T \leq H = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle$. Hence, $H_1 < H_1$ and $H = \langle \tilde{H}_1, H_2 \rangle$. By Wielandt's Theorem, \tilde{H}_1 is subnormal in G. Therefore, the maximality of $|H_1| + |H_2|$ yields that

$$\mathcal{F}_{H\cap S}(H) = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{H}_1 \cap S}(H_1), \mathcal{F}_{H_2 \cap S}(H_2) \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x \rangle\!\rangle, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle.$$

Using first Theorem 5.4(c) and then Lemma 5.10(b), we obtain now

$$\mathcal{F}_{H\cap S}(H) = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1^x, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2 \rangle\!\rangle$$

contradicting the assumption that (G, S, H_1, H_2) is a counterexample.

References

- 1. M. Aschbacher, R. Kessar, and B. Oliver, *Fusion systems in algebra and topology*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, vol. 391, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- 2. A. Chermak, Fusion systems and localities, Acta Math. 211 (2013), no. 1, 47-139.
- 3. _____, Finite Localities III, arXiv:1505.06161 (2016).
- 4. _____, Finite Localities I, arXiv:1505.07786v4 (revised 2021, first version 2015).
- 5. A. Chermak and E. Henke, Fusion systems and localities a dictionary, arXiv:1706.05343v3 (revised 2021, first version 2017).
- 6. David A. Craven, The theory of fusion systems an algebraic approach, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 131.
- 7. V. Grazian and E. Henke, Kernels of localities, arXiv:2109.10962 (2021).
- 8. E. Henke, Products of partial normal subgroups, Pacific J. Math. 279 (2015), no. 1-2, 255–268.
- 9. _____, Subcentric linking systems, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **371** (2019), no. 5, 3325–3373.
- 10. _____, Commuting partial normal subgroups and regular localities, arXiv:2103.00955v3 (2021).
- 11. _____, Extensions of homomorphisms between localities, Forum Math. Sigma 9 (2021), Paper No. e63.
- 12. _____, Normalizers and centralizers of subnormal subsystems of fusion systems, arXiv:2109.14038 (2021).
- 13. _____, Some products in fusion systems and localities, arXiv:2107.00301 (2021).
- 14. H. Kurzweil and B. Stellmacher, The theory of finite groups, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- U. Meierfrankenfeld and B. Stellmacher, Applications of the FF-Module Theorem and related results, J. Algebra 351 (2012), 64–106.
- 16. Lluis Puig, The hyperfocal subalgebra of a block, Invent. Math. 141 (2000), no. 2, 365–397.
- 17. H. Wielandt, Eine Verallgemeinerung der invarianten Untergruppen, Math.Z. 45 (1939), 209-244.

Institut für Algebra, Fakultät Mathematik, Technische Universität Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany

Email address: ellen.henke@tu-dresden.de