

INDEPENDENCE AND STRONG INDEPENDENCE COMPLEXES OF FINITE GROUPS

ANDREA LUCCHINI AND MIMA STANOJKOVSKI

ABSTRACT. Let G be a finite group. In [10] two different concepts of independence (namely *independence* and *strong independence*) are introduced for the subsets of G , yielding to the definition of two simplicial complexes whose vertices are the elements of G . The *strong independence complex* $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ turns out to be a subcomplex of the *independence complex* $\Sigma(G)$. We discuss several invariant properties related to these complexes and ask a number of questions inspired by our results and the examples we construct. We study then the particular case of complexes on finite abelian groups, giving a characterization of the finite groups realizing them. In conclusion, answering a question of Peter Cameron, we classify all finite groups in which the two concepts of independence coincide.

1 Introduction

There are a number of graphs whose vertex set is a group G and whose edges reflect the structure of G in some way. These include the commuting graph (first studied in 1955), the generating graph (from 1996), the power graph (from 2000), and the enhanced power graph (from 2007), all of which have a considerable and growing literature; cf. Section 2.1. In a recent paper Cameron made some preliminary observations towards an extension of current work on graphs defined on groups to simplicial complexes; cf. [10].

Recall that a simplicial complex Δ is a downward-closed collection of finite subsets (called simplices or simplexes) of a set X . We assume that every singleton of X belongs to Δ . For geometric reasons, a simplex of cardinality k has dimension $k - 1$ and is referred to as a $(k - 1)$ -simplex.

Cameron has drawn particular attention to two complexes on groups defined in terms of independence, one of which had already been partially investigated by Pinckney [30] in her doctoral thesis. A subset A of a group G is called *independent* if none of its elements can be expressed as a word in the other elements and their inverses; or equivalently, there is no $a \in A$ such that $a \in \langle A \setminus \{a\} \rangle$. The independence complex $\Sigma(G)$ of G consists of all the independent subsets of G . A subset A of a group G is called *strongly independent* if no subgroup of G containing A has fewer than $|A|$ generators. The strong independence complex $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ of G is the complex whose simplices are the strongly independent subsets of G . With these definitions, $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ turns out to be a subcomplex of $\Sigma(G)$.

Recall that the k -skeleton of a simplicial complex Δ consists of all the simplices of dimension at most k . Thus, the 1-skeleton of a simplicial complex is a graph. The 1-skeleton of the independence complex $\Sigma(G)$ is the complement of the power graph of G , while the 1-skeleton of the strong independence complex $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ is the complement of the enhanced power graph of G (see Definition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4).

A natural question is how much the independence complex $\Sigma(G)$ and the strong independence complex $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ can tell us about the defining group G . We address this question when G is a finite group. As we have just observed, from the 1-skeleton of G we can

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20D15, 20D30, 20D60, 05E45, 20F05, 20F16.

Key words and phrases. Independence complex, subgroup lattice, modular p -groups.

deduce the power graph of G . In some cases, this graph already contains relevant information about the structure of the group. In fact, it allows us to recover, for every integer n the number of elements of G of order n . With this information, we can decide whether or not the group is, for instance, nilpotent or simple. Furthermore, a simple group is uniquely determined by its power graph, and therefore by its independence complex.

In general, there exist non-isomorphic groups G_1 and G_2 such that their independence complexes are isomorphic. For example, it is not difficult to prove that if there exists a bijection between the elements of G_1 and those of G_2 that induces an isomorphism between their subgroup lattices, then this bijection induces also an isomorphism between their independence complexes (see Proposition 2.23). The existence of such a bijection is guaranteed whenever there exists an isomorphism between the subgroup lattices of G_1 and G_2 which maps subgroups of G_1 to subgroups of G_2 of the same order. Some situations in which this can occur are described in Section 2.3, see in particular Example 2.24 and Example 2.26. On the other hand, all the examples available to us of non-isomorphic finite groups whose independence complexes are isomorphic are of this type. This brought us to conjecture that, given two finite groups G_1 and G_2 , the complex $\Sigma(G_1)$ is isomorphic to $\Sigma(G_2)$ if and only if there exists an isomorphism between their subgroup lattices that preserves orders. The first main result of this paper is presented below as Theorem 1.1 and confirms this conjecture in the particular case where G_1 is an abelian group. In order to state it we recall some definitions. A finite group G is called *modular* if its subgroup lattice is modular, i.e. $(H_1 \vee H_2) \cap H_3 = H_1 \vee (H_2 \cap H_3)$ for all subgroups H_1, H_2, H_3 of G with $H_1 \leq H_3$. A finite group G is called *hamiltonian* if it is nonabelian and all of its subgroups are normal.

Theorem 1.1. *Let G_2 be a finite group. Then there exists a finite abelian group G_1 such that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ if and only if G_2 is nilpotent and its Sylow subgroups are modular and nonhamiltonian, and this is equivalent to saying that there exists an index-preserving isomorphism between the subgroup lattice of G_1 and the subgroup lattice of G_2 .*

Finite modular p -groups have been classified by Iwasawa, and therefore the previous theorem provides a complete description of finite groups that have the same independence complex as an abelian group. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is easily reduced to the case where G_2 is a p -group, and in the case of p -groups, our statement is equivalent to saying that two p -groups G_1 and G_2 have the same independence complex if and only if they have the same order and the same subgroup lattice. We are not aware of any arguments that allow us to derive information about the lattice of subgroups of G directly from the knowledge of the independence complex $\Sigma(G)$. Indeed, to prove Theorem 1.1, we take a less direct route, aimed at proving that if a p -group G_2 has the same independence complex as a finite abelian p -group G_1 , then all of its 2-generated subgroups are metacyclic. This ensures that the subgroup lattice of G_2 is modular. To then exclude that G_2 is hamiltonian, it is sufficient to prove that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ implies that no subgroup of G_2 can be isomorphic to the quaternion group of order 8.

By [34, Corollary 3.1], if G_1 and G_2 are two finite groups, then the power graphs of G_1 and G_2 are isomorphic if and only if their enhanced power graphs are isomorphic. In particular, the 1-skeleton of $\Sigma(G_1)$ is isomorphic to the 1-skeleton of $\Sigma(G_2)$ if and only if the 1-skeleton of $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$ is isomorphic to the 1-skeleton of $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. This prompts the natural question of whether the independence complexes are isomorphic if and only if the strong ones are. We answer this question in the negative by providing examples of finite p -groups G_1 and G_2 such that the strong independence complexes $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$ are isomorphic, but the independence complexes $\Sigma(G_1)$ and $\Sigma(G_2)$ are not (see Example 2.7). However, we also demonstrate that, if G_2 is abelian, then $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_2) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$

implies $\Sigma(G_2) \cong \Sigma(G_1)$. We don't have a direct proof of this statement, but it follows as a consequence of the following result, combined with Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite groups. If G_1 is abelian and $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$, then the subgroup lattices of G_1 and G_2 are isomorphic.*

We do not know, in general, if $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ implies $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. What makes this question difficult to answer is that, at present, we do not have a method to directly extract $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ from $\Sigma(G)$.

In his paper Cameron asked the following question [10, Qs. 3]: for which groups do the notions of independence and strong independence coincide? In Section 4 we give a complete answer to this question for finite groups. If G is a finite nilpotent group it can be easily seen that $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ if and only if G is a monotone p -group, i.e. G has the property that for every pair H, K of subgroups of G and for every positive integer d , if H is d -generated and $K \leq H$, then K is also d -generated. For p an odd prime number, the monotone p -groups are classified by Mann in [25, 26], while the monotone 2-groups have been classified by Crestani and Menegazzo in [14]. The case where G is not nilpotent requires more work. It turns out that the property $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ strongly constrains the structure of G . Specifically, we have the following.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be a finite non-nilpotent group. Then $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ if and only if $G = PQ$ is a Frobenius group such that:*

- (a) P is a normal abelian p -subgroup of G , where p is a prime;
- (b) Q is a cyclic q -subgroup of G , where $q \neq p$ is a prime;
- (c) if α is a generator of Q , then exactly one of the following holds:
 - there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime to p such that, for every $x \in P$, one has $x^\alpha = x^m$;
 - P is homocyclic with $d(P) = 2$ and $|\alpha|$ does not divide $p - 1$.

Notation. We use standard group theoretic notation and, for a group G , write

- $H \leq G$ to indicate that H is a subgroup of G ,
- $|g|$ to denote the order of an element $g \in G$;
- $d(G)$ and $m(G)$ to denote respectively the minimum and the maximum cardinality of a minimal generating set of G ;
- $|X|$ and $\langle X \rangle$ for the cardinality of and subgroup generated by $X \subseteq G$, respectively;
- $Z(G)$ for the center of G ;
- $\Phi(G)$ for the Frattini subgroup of G ;
- $(\gamma_i(G))_{i \geq 1}$ for the lower central series of G .

If p is a prime number, n a non-negative integer, and P a finite p -group, we write $\Omega_n(P)$ and $\mathcal{U}_n(P)$ for the following subgroups:

$$\Omega_n(P) = \langle x \in P \mid x^{p^n} = 1 \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{U}_n(G) = \langle x^{p^n} \mid x \in G \rangle.$$

We write C_n to indicate a cyclic group of order n and $\text{SmallGroup}(n, i)$ to indicate the group of order n and index i in the Small Groups Library of GAP [16]. We use the symbol \cong to denote isomorphism between mathematical objects, when there is no doubt on which category they are considered in.

Acknowledgements. This project is funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU under the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), Mission 4 Component 2 Investment 1.1 - Call PRIN 2022 No. 104 of February 2, 2022 of the Italian Ministry of University and Research; Project 2022PSTWLB (subject area: PE - Physical Sciences and Engineering) “Group Theory and Applications”. The second author is funded by the Italian program Rita Levi Montalcini for young researchers, Edition 2020.

2 Graphs and invariant properties

We start by recalling and expanding some of the concepts seen in the introduction to this article.

Definition 2.1. Let G be a finite group and let X be a subset of G . Then X is called

- *independent* if, for every $x \in X$, one has that x does not belong to $\langle X \setminus \{x\} \rangle$.
- *strongly independent* if $X \subseteq H \leq G$ implies that $|X| \leq d(H)$.

Remark 2.2. Let G be a finite group and let X be a subset of G . If X is independent, then X is a minimal generating set of $\langle X \rangle$. Assume now that X is strongly independent. Then it follows from the definition that $d(\langle X \rangle) = |X| \leq d(G)$. In other words, the cardinality of a strongly independent subset of G cannot exceed the minimum number of generators of G . The strongly independent subsets of G are in particular independent.

The collection of independent subsets of a finite group G forms a simplicial complex $\Sigma(G)$ called the *independence complex* of G ; cf. [10, Prop. 2.1] or [30, Lem. 2.4.2]. Analogously, the collection of strongly independence subsets of G forms a subcomplex of $\Sigma(G)$, called the *strong independence complex* of G and which we denote with $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$; cf. [10, Prop. 2.3]. We note that, if G_1 and G_2 are finite groups and $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$, then the number of 0-simplices of the complexes are the same and so G_1 and G_2 have the same order. Moreover, it is also a straightforward consequence of the definitions that, if G_1 and G_2 have isomorphic (strong) independence complexes, then one is cyclic if and only if the other one is.

2.1. Graphs associated to independence complexes. The following notions of graphs on groups are well-studied. See [1, 4, 8, 13, 18, 24], or the survey [9] for a broader outlook.

Definition 2.3. Let G be a finite group. Then the

- *power graph* of G is the undirected graph $\mathcal{P}(G) = (G, E)$ such that $\{x, y\} \subseteq G$ belongs to E if and only if $x \neq y$ and $x \in \langle y \rangle$ or $y \in \langle x \rangle$.
- *directed power graph* of G is the directed graph $\mathcal{G}(G) = (G, E)$ with $(x, y) \in G^2$ belonging to E if and only if $x \neq y$ and $y \in \langle x \rangle$.
- *enhanced power graph* of G is the undirected graph $\mathcal{E}(G) = (G, E)$ such that $\{x, y\} \subseteq G$ belongs to E if and only if $x \neq y$ and $\langle x, y \rangle$ is cyclic.

The following is an easy consequence of the definitions of $\Sigma(G)$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$; see also Propositions 2.1 and 2.3 in [10].

Proposition 2.4. Let G be a finite group. Denote, moreover, by $\Sigma_1(G)$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_1(G)$ the 1-skeletons of $\Sigma(G)$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$, respectively. Then the following hold:

- The graph complement of $\Sigma_1(G)$ equals $\mathcal{P}(G)$.
- The graph complement of $\tilde{\Sigma}_1(G)$ equals $\mathcal{E}(G)$.

The following results are respectively [8, Prop. 1] and a combination of [34, Cor. 3.1] and [8, Prop. 1].

Lemma 2.5. Let G and H be finite groups and let $\varphi : \mathcal{G}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(H)$ be an isomorphism of directed graphs. Then, for every $x \in G$, one has $|\varphi(x)| = |x|$.

Proposition 2.6. Let G and H be finite groups. The following are equivalent:

- (1) $\mathcal{P}(G)$ and $\mathcal{P}(H)$ are isomorphic;
- (2) $\mathcal{G}(G)$ and $\mathcal{G}(H)$ are isomorphic;
- (3) $\mathcal{E}(G)$ and $\mathcal{E}(H)$ are isomorphic.

Moreover, if any of the previous equivalent conditions is satisfied, for every integer n , the following equality is satisfied: $|\{g \in G : |g| = n\}| = |\{h \in H : |h| = n\}|$.

Combining Proposition 2.4 and Proposition 2.6, a natural question is whether there is any clear relationship between independence and strong independence complexes of a finite group. The next example provides an infinite family of pairs of p -groups with isomorphic strong independence complexes, but whose independence complexes are not isomorphic. We remind the reader that the *rank* of a finite group G , denoted $\text{rk}(G)$, is the smallest nonnegative integer r such that every subgroup of G can be generated by r elements. It is easy to see that, when p is a prime number and G is a p -group, then the largest simplices in $\Sigma(G)$ have cardinality $\text{rk}(G)$, i.e. dimension $\text{rk}(G) - 1$.

Example 2.7. Let $p \geq 5$ be a prime number and let

- G_1 be the unique group of maximal class of order p^5 and exponent p , up to isomorphism, containing a maximal abelian subgroup; cf. [5, Thm. 4.3] (in Blackburn's classification take $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = \delta = 0$).
- $G_2 = F/\mathcal{U}_1(F)\gamma_4(F)$, where F is a free group of rank 2, so G_2 is free with the property that it is 2-generated, of exponent p and class 3; then $|G_2| = p^5$.

The group G_1 has clearly rank 4, while G_2 has rank 3 as $\gamma_2(G_2)$ is self-centralizing in G_2 . Moreover, both groups are 2-generated so, in the study of their strong independence complexes, we are only concerned with minimal generating sets of 2-generated subgroups. The exponent of both groups being p , the number of 1- and 2-simplices is the same and equal to

- $p^5 - 1$ for 1-simplices,
- $\binom{p^5-1}{2} - \binom{\frac{p^5-1}{p-1}}{2} \binom{p-1}{2}$ for 2-simplices.

It follows easily from this information that the strong independence complexes of G_1 and G_2 are therefore isomorphic.

In the direction of better understanding the relationship between independence and strong independence, in [10, Qs. 3] Cameron asks the following.

Question 2.8. What are the finite groups G for which $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$?

Thanks to Remark 2.2, Question 2.8 is equivalent to asking which are the finite groups G for which the following is satisfied:

$$(2.1) \quad H \leq K \leq G \implies m(H) \leq d(K).$$

In [10, Thm. 2.4], Cameron remarks that in a finite group G with $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ every element has prime power order. Moreover, if p is a prime number and G is a finite abelian p -group, then [10, Thm. 2.5] ensures that $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$. Though we give a complete classification of the groups from Question 2.8 in Section 4, the following remains open.

Question 2.9. For finite groups G_1 and G_2 , if $\Sigma(G_1) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$ and $\Sigma(G_2) \cong \Sigma(G_1)$, then does it necessarily hold that $\Sigma(G_2) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$?

The last question once again hints at the fact that, at this moment, we still have no method for telling which simplices of $\Sigma(G)$ belong to $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$.

2.2. Invariant properties under isomorphism of complexes. In this section we collect some invariant properties of the (strong) independence complexes of a finite group, in connection to (the complement of) its 1-skeleton. We will build upon ideas from [7],

[8], and [34]. In the following lemma we adopt the notation from [8], but remark that \approx is denoted \diamond in [7]. Additionally, for x in a group G , we will write

$$\begin{aligned} N(x) &= \{z \in G : \{x, z\} \text{ is an edge in } \mathcal{P}(G)\} \cup \{x\}, \\ N[x] &= \{z \in G : N(x) = N(z)\}, \\ C[x] &= \{z \in G : \langle x \rangle = \langle z \rangle\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given a non-empty subset X of G , we will write moreover

$$N(X) = \bigcap_{x \in X} N(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{X} = N(N(X)).$$

We let $\mathcal{S}(G) = N[1] = \{z \in G : N(z) = G\}$ be the collection of *star vertices* of G .

Lemma 2.10. *Let p be a prime number and G a finite group. For x and y in G , write*

- $x \equiv y$ if $N(x) = N(y)$, and
- $x \approx y$ if $\langle x \rangle = \langle y \rangle$.

Then \equiv and \approx are equivalence relations on G and, if G is a noncyclic abelian p -group, every $x \in G$ satisfies $N[x] = C[x]$.

Proof. These equivalence relations are discussed in [7, 8], where it is also remarked that \equiv -classes are unions of \approx -classes. Assume now that G is an abelian p -group that is not cyclic. We show that every \equiv -class of elements of G is also a \approx -equivalence class. To see this, let x and y in G satisfy $N(x) = N(y)$: we show that $\langle x \rangle = \langle y \rangle$. As x and y are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G)$, we assume for a contradiction that $|x| \neq |y|$ and, without loss of generality, that $y \in \langle x^p \rangle$. Let now $z \in G \setminus \langle x \rangle$ be of order p , where the existence of z is guaranteed by the fact that G is not cyclic. Then the following are satisfied:

- y and xz are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ because $y \in \langle x^p \rangle = \langle (xz)^p \rangle$, while
- x and xz are not adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ because $z \notin \langle x \rangle$.

We deduce that $xz \in N(y) \setminus N(x)$. This contradicts the fact that x and y are in the same \equiv -class and so the proof is complete. \square

Until the end of the present section, we will make use of the notation introduced above (including that from Lemma 2.10) without further mention. Following [7], we will call *N -class* an equivalence class with respect to \equiv . Moreover, we call *C -classes* the equivalence classes with respect to \approx .

Remark 2.11. Let G be a finite group and let $N = N[x]$ be an N -class. Then N is a union of equivalence classes with respect to \approx . Following [7], we say that N is

- *of plain type* if it consists of a single C -class, i.e. if every $y \in N$ satisfies $x \approx y$;
- *of compound type* if it is not of plain type.

With the new terminology, if p is a prime number and G is a finite noncyclic abelian p -group, then Lemma 2.10 guarantees that every N -class in G is plain. In Cameron's paper [8], classes of plain type are referred to as classes of type (a), while those of compound type are called of type (b); cf. [8, Prop. 5]. In various cases, the results of [7] allow us to tell plain classes apart from compound ones as we explain below.

Following [7], a *critical class* in G is an N -class N such that $\hat{N} = N \cup \{1\}$ and there exist a prime p and an integer $r \geq 2$ with $|\hat{N}| = p^r$ (see [7, Def. 16]). An N -class $N \neq \mathcal{S}(G)$ which is not critical can be immediately recognized as plain or compound by arithmetical considerations on $|N|$ and $|\hat{N}|$ (see [7, Prop. 17]). On the other hand, when $\mathcal{S}(G) = \{1\}$, it is possible to recognize if a critical class is plain or compound by purely graph theoretic considerations, using the following criterion (see [7, Prop. 19]): a critical class $N = N[y]$

is of plain type if and only if there exists $x \in G \setminus \hat{N}$ such that x is adjacent to y in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ and $|N[x]| \leq |N|$.

The next lemma follows directly from Remark 2.11.

Lemma 2.12. *Assume that G_1 and G_2 are finite groups and that $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_2)$ is an isomorphism between their power graphs. If $\mathcal{S}(G_1) = \{1\}$, then, for every $x \in G_1$, the class $N[x]$ is of plain type if and only if the class $N[\varphi(x)]$ is of plain type.*

Lemma 2.13. *Let G be a finite group and let N be an N -class in G . The following hold:*

- (1) *If N is of plain type then all elements of N have the same order, say n , and $|N| = \phi(n)$, where ϕ denotes Euler's function.*
- (2) *If $N \neq \mathcal{S}(G)$ is of compound type then there exist a prime p and a positive integer r such that $|\hat{N}| = p^r$ and the elements of N have order a power of p .*

Proof. The first point follows immediately from the definition of plain class, while the second is a consequence of Propositions 10 and 13 from [7]. \square

Lemma 2.14. *Let G be a finite noncyclic abelian group. Then $\mathcal{S}(G) = \{1\}$.*

Proof. It follows from [7, Proposition 4]. \square

Proposition 2.15. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite groups with the property that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Let, moreover, p be a prime number, n an integer, and $y \in G_1$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) *One has $|\{x \in G_1 : |x| = n\}| = |\{y \in G_2 : |y| = n\}|$.*
- (2) *If G_1 and G_2 are p -groups, then:*
 - $|\{x^p : x \in G_1\}| = |\{z^p : z \in G_2\}|$;
 - *there is $\tilde{y} \in G_2$ with $|y| = |\tilde{y}|$ and $|\{x \in G_1 : x^p = y\}| = |\{z \in G_2 : z^p = \tilde{y}\}|$.*
- (3) *If G_1 and G_2 are p -groups such that G_1 is noncyclic abelian and $\varphi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ is the bijection induced by the isomorphism of simplicial complexes, then $|\varphi(y)| = |y|$.*

Proof. (1) This is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.4 and Proposition 2.6.

(2) We start by proving the first bullet point. Again by Proposition 2.4 and Proposition 2.6, the 1-skeletons of the complexes are isomorphic and $\mathcal{G}(G_1) \cong \mathcal{G}(G_2)$. The groups being p -groups, one can easily read off p -th powers from the directed power graphs.

We now proceed with the second bullet point and, for this, let $f : \mathcal{G}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(G_2)$ be an isomorphism of directed graphs. Call $\tilde{y} = f(y)$ and note that $|\tilde{y}| = |y|$ as isomorphisms of directed graphs respect element orders; cf. Lemma 2.5. It is not difficult to extract $X = \{x \in G_1 : x^p = y\}$ from $\mathcal{G}(G_1)$ and so $f(X) = \{z \in G_2 : z^p = \tilde{y}\}$.

(3) By slight abuse of notation we call φ also the graph isomorphism $\mathcal{P}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_2)$ that is induced by the isomorphism of complexes. Thanks to Lemma 2.13, the N -class $\mathcal{S}(G_1)$ is trivial and therefore so is $\mathcal{S}(G_2)$. Let now $N = N[x] \neq \{1\}$ be a nontrivial N -class in G_1 , which is of plain type thanks to Lemma 2.10. By Lemma 2.12 the class $\varphi(N)$ is also of plain type. Now Lemma 2.13(1) ensures that $\phi(|\varphi(x)|) = |\varphi(N[x])| = |N[x]| = \phi(|x|)$, and, since $|\varphi(x)|$ and $|x|$ are p -powers, we conclude that $|\varphi(x)| = |x|$. \square

Remark 2.16. The spectrum $\omega(G)$ of a finite group G is the set of its element orders. Thanks to Proposition 2.15(1), for every integer n , from the (strong) independence complex of G we deduce the number of elements of G of order n and, in particular, also $\omega(G)$. The main theorem of [33] states that if L is a finite simple group and G is finite with $\omega(G) = \omega(L)$ and $|G| = |L|$, then G is isomorphic to L . Hence a finite simple group G can be recognized from its (strong) independence complex.

Because of Remark 2.16, the case of finite simple groups is completely settled, so we focus on the case of nilpotent groups in Section 3. In this direction, we show that nilpotency is a property that is preserved by both isomorphism of complexes and, in view of Section 2.3, of subgroup lattices.

Proposition 2.17. *Let G and H be finite groups with H nilpotent. The following hold:*

- (1) *If G and H have isomorphic independence complexes, then G is nilpotent.*
- (2) *If G and H have isomorphic strong independence complexes, then G is nilpotent.*
- (3) *If G and H have the same orders and isomorphic subgroup lattices, then G is nilpotent.*

Proof. (1)-(2) The (strong) independence complexes of G and H being isomorphic, Proposition 2.6 ensures that G and H have the same orders and isomorphic power graphs. [29, Corollary 3.2] yields that G is nilpotent.

(3) This is a consequence of [31, Thm. 1.6.5]. \square

Remark 2.18. Let G be a finite group and call a simplex Y in $\Sigma(G)$ a *generating simplex* if $\langle Y \rangle = G$. Assume that we are able, for any simplex Y in $\Sigma(G)$, to tell whether Y is a generating simplex. Then we also know which subsets of G are generating sets: indeed, by the minimality of independent sets, $X \subseteq G$ is a generating set if and only if it contains a generating simplex of $\Sigma(G)$. Knowing the generating simplices in G implies, in the language of [22], being in Situation 1 and *having enough information on the generating properties* of G to deduce, for instance:

- whether G is nilpotent, supersolvable, perfect, [22, Prop. 6];
- whether G is solvable, [22, Thm. 9];
- the number of non-Frattini resp. non-abelian factors in a chief series of G , [22, Thm. 10].

In particular, in this favourable situation, a much more general version of Proposition 2.17(1) holds.

The following proposition ensures that, for noncyclic groups having the same independence complex as a finite abelian group, the information provided by the complex can be localized at the primes dividing the number of its vertices.

Proposition 2.19. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite groups with G_1 abelian and noncyclic. Let, moreover, p be a prime number and S a Sylow p -subgroup of G_1 . Assume $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ and let $\varphi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ be the bijection induced by the isomorphism of complexes. Then $\varphi(S)$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of G_2 .*

Proof. We recall that an isomorphism $\Sigma(G_1) \rightarrow \Sigma(G_2)$ induces, by Proposition 2.4, an isomorphism $\mathcal{P}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_2)$, which we also denote by φ . Moreover, from Proposition 2.17(1), we know that G_2 is nilpotent and, from Lemma 2.14, that $\mathcal{S}(G_1) = \{1\}$, so that also $\mathcal{S}(G_2) = \{1\}$. It follows from Lemma 2.12 that if N is a class of plain type (respectively compound type), then the class $\varphi(N)$ is also of plain type (respectively compound type). Let now x be an element in S . We show that the order of $\varphi(x)$ is necessarily a power of p . Since $\mathcal{S}(G_1) = \{1\}$ and $\mathcal{S}(G_2) = \{1\}$ $\varphi(1) = 1$. Since $\mathcal{S}(G_2) = \{1\}$, we clearly have $\varphi(1) = 1$ and so we assume $x \neq 1$.

Assume first that $N[x]$ is of compound type. Then, by Lemma 2.13(2), the elements of $N[x]$ belong to S and $|\widehat{N[x]}| = p^n$ for some integer n . Since φ is an isomorphism, we have that $\varphi(N[x]) = N[\varphi(x)]$ is of compound type and $|\widehat{N[\varphi(x)]}| = |\widehat{\varphi(N[x])}| = p^n$. It follows from Lemma 2.13(2) that the elements of $\varphi(N[x])$, and in particular $\varphi(x)$, all have order a power of p .

Assume now that $N[x]$ is of plain type. Lemma 2.13(1) yields that $|N[x]| = \phi(|x|)$ and since φ is a graph isomorphism, we have that $\varphi(N[x])$ is a plain class of size $\phi(|x|)$ and therefore Lemma 2.13(1) implies that $\phi(|\varphi(x)|) = |\varphi(N[x])| = \phi(|x|)$. The last equality implies that either $|\varphi(x)| = |x|$ or $|\varphi(x)| = 2|x|$, in which case p is odd. If $p = 2$, then we clearly have that $\varphi(x)$ has order a power of p and so the case of elements of order a power of 2 is completely settled. We assume now that p is odd and, for a contradiction, that $|\varphi(x)| = 2|x|$. We let $y \in G_1$ be such that $\varphi(y) = \varphi(x)^{|x|}$. Then $\varphi(y)$ and $\varphi(x)$ are connected by an edge in the power graph of G_2 and so, x and y are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G_1)$. Since $|\varphi(y)| = 2$, applying the inverse of φ , we deduce that $|y| = |\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(y))|$ is a power of 2 and so x and y have coprime orders. This is a contradiction to x and y being adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G_1)$.

We have proven that, in any case, $|\varphi(x)|$ is a p -th power and therefore, x being arbitrary, $|G_1| = |G_2|$ implies that $\varphi(S)$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of G_2 . \square

We now proceed towards proving an analogue of Proposition 2.19 for strong independence complexes; cf. Proposition 2.22. In this direction, the next lemma is an analogue of Lemma 2.10 for enhanced power graphs.

Lemma 2.20. *Let G be a finite abelian group and let $X \subseteq G$. For an element $g \in G$ and a prime p , if m_p is the largest positive divisor of $|g|$ that is coprime to p , write g_p for g^{m_p} . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is strongly independent in G ;
- (2) there exists a prime p such that $X_p = \{x_p : x \in X\}$ is strongly independent in G and $|X_p| = |X|$.

Proof. (2) \implies (1) Let p be such that X_p is strongly independent and $|X| = |X_p|$. Let, moreover, H be a subgroup of G containing X . Then H also contains X_p , which is strongly independent in G . In particular $|X| = |X_p| \leq d(H)$ and so X is strongly independent.

(1) \implies (2) Assume that X is strongly independent. Write $K = \langle X \rangle$ and note that $d(K) = |X|$; cf. Remark 2.2. Moreover, for every prime p , write K_p for the Sylow p -subgroup of K . Since G is finite abelian, there exists a prime p such that $d(K_p) = d(K)$. Since X_p generates K_p and clearly $|X_p| \leq |X|$, we deduce that $|X_p| = |X|$. Now, G being abelian, every subgroup H of G such that $X_p \subseteq H$ satisfies $|X_p| \leq d(H)$ and so X_p is strongly independent. \square

In the next proposition, (1) is equivalent to saying that x and y have same neighbours in the enhanced power graph (see also [34, Lem. 3.2]), while (2) is the same as saying that x and y have the same neighbours in the strong independence complex of the group.

Proposition 2.21. *Let G be a finite group and let x and y be elements of G . Define:*

- (1) $x \sim_c y$ if x and y belong to the same maximal cyclic subgroups of G ;
- (2) $x \asymp y$ if for every $T \subseteq G$ the following are equivalent:
 - $\{x\} \cup T$ is a strong independence subset of G ;
 - $\{y\} \cup T$ is a strong independence subset of G .

Then \sim_c and \asymp are equivalence relations on G and, if G is an abelian group, then their equivalence classes coincide.

Proof. It is easy to see that \sim_c and \asymp are equivalence classes on G by observing that they can both be interpreted as “having the same neighbors” in a given simplicial complex, namely the enhanced graph for \sim_c and the strong independence complex for \asymp . Assume now that G is abelian. We will show that

$$x \sim_c y \iff x \asymp y.$$

We start by showing the implication from right to left. To this end, let $C = \langle c \rangle$ be a maximal cyclic subgroup of G . Then, by the maximality of C , we have

$$x \in C \iff \{x, c\} \text{ is not strongly independent.}$$

Assuming that x and y have the same neighbours in $\tilde{\Sigma}(G)$, we then have that $x \in C$ is equivalent to $\{y, c\}$ not being strongly independent, and so, by the maximality of C , to y being an element of C .

We now prove the other implication. To this end, assume that x and y belong to the same maximal cyclic subgroups. Let now $g_1, \dots, g_t \in G$ be such that $X = \{x, g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ is strongly independent: we show that $Y = \{y, g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ is also strongly independent. Write $H = \langle g_1, \dots, g_t \rangle$ and use the same notation from Lemma 2.20. Since G is abelian, by the same lemma, there exists a prime number p such that $X_p = \{x_p, g_{1,p}, \dots, g_{t,p}\}$ is strongly independent in G and $|X| = |X_p|$. Fix such a prime p : we prove that $Y_p = \{y_p, g_{1,p}, \dots, g_{t,p}\}$ is strongly independent in G . Since x and y belong to the same maximal cyclic subgroups, $x_p \in \langle y_p \rangle$ or $y_p \in \langle x_p \rangle$. If $x_p \in \langle y_p \rangle$, it is clear that Y_p is also strongly independent. We assume therefore that $\langle y_p \rangle$ is properly contained in $\langle x_p \rangle$, in other words $y_p \in \langle x_p^p \rangle$. Assume for a contradiction that Y_p is not strongly independent. From $y_p \in \langle x_p^p \rangle \subseteq \langle x_p \rangle$ we deduce then that $y_p \in H$. If $y_p \notin \Phi(H) = \mathcal{U}_1(H)$, then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ such that

$$g_{i,p} \in \langle y_p, g_{1,p}, \dots, g_{i-1,p}, g_{i+1,p}, \dots, g_{t,p} \rangle \subseteq \langle x_p, g_{1,p}, \dots, g_{i-1,p}, g_{i+1,p}, \dots, g_{t,p} \rangle,$$

contradicting the strong independence of X_p . We have thus $y_p \in \mathcal{U}_1(H)$. Let $h \in H \setminus \Phi(H)$ and $s > 0$ be such that $h^{p^s} = y_p$. Since y and x are contained in the same maximal cyclic subgroups, there exists $a \in G$ such that x_p and h both belong to $\langle a_p \rangle$. Since X_p is strongly independent, we deduce that x_p does not belong to $\langle h \rangle \subseteq H$ and so $h \in \langle x_p^p \rangle$. The fact that $h \notin \Phi(H)$ again contradicts the strong independence of X_p . Indeed, if $h = g_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots g_t^{\alpha_t}$ and $\alpha_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$, then

$$g_{j,p} \in \langle h, g_{1,p}, \dots, g_{j-1,p}, g_{j+1,p}, \dots, g_{t,p} \rangle \subseteq \langle x_p, g_{1,p}, \dots, g_{j-1,p}, g_{j+1,p}, \dots, g_{t,p} \rangle;$$

contradiction. This shows that Y_p is strongly independent in G . Since G is abelian, we conclude from Lemma 2.20 that Y is strongly independent in G . \square

Proposition 2.22. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite groups with G_1 abelian. Let, moreover, p be a prime number and S a Sylow p -subgroup of G_1 . Assume that $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$ and let $\varphi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ be the bijection induced by the isomorphism of complexes. Then $\varphi(S)$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of G_2 .*

Proof. We recall that an isomorphism $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$ induces, by Proposition 2.4, an isomorphism $\mathcal{E}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(G_2)$, which we also denote by φ . Moreover, from Proposition 2.17(2), we know that G_2 is nilpotent. Let now x be an element in S .

With the notation from Proposition 2.21, we write $R[x]$ for the \asymp -class, which coincides with the \sim_c -class, of x in G_1 . It follows that the \asymp -class and the \sim_c -class of $\varphi(x)$ in G_2 also coincide. Denote this class by $R[\varphi(x)]$. As a consequence of [34, Thm. 3.2] there exists a bijection $f : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ such that for each $y \in G_1$, the orders of y and $f(y)$ are the same, and $f(R[y]) = R[f(y)]$. Thanks to Proposition 2.21, we assume without loss of generality that $\varphi = f$. It follows in particular that $\varphi(x)$ has order a power of p and thus, x being arbitrary, $\varphi(S)$ is contained in a Sylow p -subgroup of G_2 . Since $|G_1| = |G_2|$ and G_2 is nilpotent, we conclude that $\varphi(S)$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of G_2 . \square

2.3. Independence complexes and subgroup lattices. In the following we refer to [31] for the knowledge on subgroup lattices and isomorphisms between them; these are called *projectivities* in [31]. We use the standard notation from the textbook without

introduction. For a finite group G , we will denote by $\mathcal{L}(G)$ its subgroup lattice. If G_1 and G_2 are finite groups and $\alpha : \mathcal{L}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(G_2)$ is a lattice isomorphism, α is called *index-preserving* if it preserves indices of subgroups, i.e., the groups being finite, if every subgroup H of G satisfies $|\alpha(H)| = |H|$; cf. [31, §. 4.2].

Proposition 2.23. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite groups and let p be a prime number. Then the following hold:*

- (1) *An index-preserving lattice isomorphism $\mathcal{L}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(G_2)$ induces an isomorphism $\Sigma(G_1) \rightarrow \Sigma(G_2)$ and, moreover, this isomorphism maps $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$ to $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$.*
- (2) *If G_1 and G_2 are p -groups with isomorphic subgroup lattices, then $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$.*

Proof. (1) Let $\alpha : \mathcal{L}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(G_2)$ be an index-preserving isomorphism, so in particular $|G_1| = |G_2|$. We start by showing that $\Sigma(G_1)$ and $\Sigma(G_2)$ are isomorphic through a map induced by α . To this end, let $H \leq G_1$ be cyclic and so $\alpha(H)$ is also cyclic, as a consequence of [31, Thm. 1.2.3]. Moreover, $|\alpha(H)| = |H|$ because α is index-preserving. In other words, α induces an order-preserving bijection between the cyclic subgroups of G_1 and the cyclic subgroups of G_2 . Let $\gamma : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ be a bijection compatible with α , i.e. satisfying, for every $g \in G$, that $\langle \gamma(g) \rangle = \alpha(\langle g \rangle)$. We claim that γ induces an isomorphism $\Sigma(G_1) \rightarrow \Sigma(G_2)$. For this, let $\{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ be a simplex in $\Sigma(G_1)$: we will prove that $\{\gamma(g_1), \dots, \gamma(g_t)\}$ is an independent subset of G_2 . Assume, for a contradiction, that it is not and, without loss of generality, that $\gamma(g_t) \in \langle \gamma(g_1), \dots, \gamma(g_{t-1}) \rangle$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\langle g_t \rangle) &= \langle \gamma(g_t) \rangle \leq \langle \gamma(g_1), \dots, \gamma(g_{t-1}) \rangle = \langle \gamma(g_1) \rangle \vee \dots \vee \langle \gamma(g_{t-1}) \rangle = \\ &= \alpha(\langle g_1 \rangle) \vee \dots \vee \alpha(\langle g_{t-1} \rangle) = \alpha(\langle g_1 \rangle \vee \dots \vee \langle g_{t-1} \rangle) = \alpha(\langle g_1, \dots, g_{t-1} \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\langle g_t \rangle \leq \langle g_1 \rangle \vee \dots \vee \langle g_{t-1} \rangle$, and $\{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ is not independent. This is a contradiction and so we deduce that $\Sigma(G_1)$ and $\Sigma(G_2)$ are isomorphic via γ .

We conclude by showing that γ maps strong independent sets of G_1 to strong independent sets of G_2 . For this, assume that $X = \{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ is a strongly independent subset of G_1 and let K be a subgroup of G_2 containing $\gamma(X)$. Write $K = \alpha(H)$, so that $\langle X \rangle \leq H$. Since X is strongly independent, $|\gamma(X)| = |X| \leq d(H)$. Moreover, as α induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(K)$ and α preserves cyclicity, the minimum number of cyclic subgroups needed to generate H and K is the same, i.e. $d(H) = d(K)$. It follows that $|\gamma(X)| \leq d(K)$ and, K being arbitrary, $\gamma(X)$ is strongly independent in G_2 .

(2) This follows directly from (1) combined with the fact that every lattice isomorphism involving a finite p -group is index-preserving; cf. [31, Lem. 4.2.1]. \square

The most well-known examples of pairs of prime power order groups with isomorphic subgroup lattices involve a finite abelian p -group and a modular p -group of the same order that is not hamiltonian; cf. [31, Thm. 2.5.9]. This construction is due to Baer [3] and we give an example below.

Example 2.24. Let G_1 be an abelian group of order 27 and exponent 9 and let G_2 be non-abelian, with the same order and the same exponent. Then $G_1 \cong C_9 \times C_3$ and G_2 is the unique extraspecial group of order 27 and exponent 9. It is not difficult to show that G_1 and G_2 have isomorphic subgroup lattices and correspond to each other via Baer's construction. Thanks to Proposition 2.23(2), the independence complexes of G_1 and G_2 are isomorphic.

Example 2.24 also fits within the framework of [12], where more examples involving groups of maximal class can be found. For other examples involving p -groups, without necessarily listing abelian representatives in the class, see for instance [15].

Remark 2.25. Let p be a prime number and let G be a finite p -group. For every positive integer r set

$$\ell_r(G) = \sum_{H \leq G, d(H)=r} \left(\frac{|H|}{p^r} \right)^r.$$

Up to a factor $|\mathrm{GL}(r, p)|$, the summand corresponding to a fixed $H \leq G$ with $d(H) = r$ counts the possible r -element sets generating H . In particular, the sequence $(\ell_r(G))_{r>0}$ is an invariant of $\Sigma(G)$. In other words, any two p -groups with isomorphic independence complexes have the same ℓ -sequence. We have no example of two groups with the same ℓ -sequence but non-isomorphic independence complexes.

We proceed by considering the case of groups whose order has more than one prime divisor. The following example can be found in [31, Ex. 5.6.8] and satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 2.23(1).

Example 2.26. Let p and q be prime numbers such that $q \geq 5$ and q divides $p - 1$. Let $N = \mathbb{F}_p^2$ be the standard 2-dimensional vector space over the field of p elements. Let, moreover, ω be a generator of the q -torsion subgroup of \mathbb{F}_p^\times and let $\lambda \in \{2, \dots, q - 1\}$. Then

$$H_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^\lambda \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{GL}(2, p)$$

has order q and $G_\lambda = N \rtimes H_\lambda$ is a non-abelian group of order p^2q . Moreover, N is a normal Sylow p -subgroup of G_λ . If $\mu \in \{2, \dots, q - 1\}$, then there exists an index preserving isomorphism $\mathcal{L}(G_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(G_\mu)$; cf. [31, Thm. 4.1.8]. Moreover, if $\mu \neq \lambda$, then $G_\lambda \cong G_\mu$ if and only if $\lambda\mu = 1$ (and the isomorphism is induced by swapping the eigenspaces in N). In summary, this general construction yields $((q - 2) + 1)/2 = (q - 1)/2$ pairwise non-isomorphic groups with isomorphic independence complexes and so we obtain arbitrary large families as q grows.

The smallest order in this collection of examples is realized for $q = 5$ and $p = 11$, yielding two non-isomorphic groups of order 605. These correspond to `SmallGroup(605,5)` and `SmallGroup(605,6)` and can also be found in [23, § 2].

In the following we collect many observations. For instance, Example 2.27 shows that, in Proposition 2.23(1) the assumption that the isomorphism of lattices preserves indices is really necessary. It also provides an example of two groups of the same orders whose lattices of subgroups are isomorphic, but not via an index preserving map.

Example 2.27. Let H be a cyclic group of order 6 and define $N = \mathbb{F}_7$ to be the (underlying group of the) field of 7 elements. Note that $\mathrm{Aut}(N) \cong \mathbb{F}_7^\times$ and let $\varphi_1 : H \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(N)$ and $\varphi_2 : H \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(N)$ be homomorphisms such that $|\varphi_1(H)| = 2$ and $|\varphi_2(H)| = 3$. Then the groups $G_1 = N \rtimes_{\varphi_1} H$ and $G_2 = N \rtimes_{\varphi_2} H$ are non-isomorphic groups of order 42, with $G_1 \cong \mathrm{SmallGroup}(42, 4)$ and $G_2 \cong \mathrm{SmallGroup}(42, 2)$. The subgroup lattices of G_1 and G_2 are isomorphic. However, the first group has seven subgroups of order 2 and one of order 3, while in the second the situation is reversed. In particular, the isomorphism between the lattices is not index-preserving. Moreover, since the power graphs of the groups are distinct, Proposition 2.15(1) yields that the independence complexes of G_1 and G_2 are non-isomorphic.

The following is a natural question in relation to Proposition 2.23.

Question 2.28. For finite groups G_1 and G_2 , can it happen that $\Sigma(G_1)$ and $\Sigma(G_2)$ are isomorphic even if G_1 and G_2 do not have isomorphic subgroup lattices?

Since groups with isomorphic independence complexes have the same order, we only consider pairs of groups with this property. Note in fact that there exist finite groups of different orders with isomorphic subgroup lattices, e.g. $G_1 = C_3 \times C_3$ and $G_2 = \text{Sym}(3)$. We conclude the section with a last question that is motivated by Example 2.7 and Proposition 2.23.

Question 2.29. For finite groups G_1 and G_2 , can it happen that $\Sigma(G_1)$ and $\Sigma(G_2)$ are isomorphic, but $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$ are not?

We remark that, should the answer to Question 2.28 be negative in the sense that there even exists an index-preserving lattice isomorphism, then Proposition 2.23 would imply a negative answer to Question 2.29, too. We show that Question 2.28 and Question 2.29 have both negative answers when G_1 is a finite abelian group; cf. Theorem 3.15.

3 Complexes of abelian groups

In this section, we answer Question 2.28 in the negative in the case where one of the groups involved is an abelian group. We first settle the case of groups of prime power, cf. Theorem 3.12 and Corollary 3.14. We leverage on these results to prove Theorem 3.15 and Corollary 3.16. We recall that, two finite groups having isomorphic (strong) independence complexes have the same order; in particular, if for some prime number p one is a p -group, then so is the other.

Lemma 3.1. *Let p be a prime number and let G_1 and G_2 be finite p -groups. Let, moreover $H \leq G_2$ be such that $d(H) = 2$. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) $|\Omega_1(H)| \leq p^2$;
- (2) $\Omega_1(G_2)$ is elementary abelian.

Proof. In this proof, for a subset X , we will refer to X as (strongly) independent for arguments that work both for X considered as an independent set or a strongly independent set. Recall that every strongly independent subset is in particular independent and also that in abelian p -groups, strong independence and independence coincide; cf. Section 2.1.

(1) We start by remarking that, since $d(H) = 2$, the group G_2 is noncyclic and so G_1 is also noncyclic. Since G_1 is abelian, if $x, y, z \in G_1$ with $\{x, y\}$ independent and $z \in \Omega_1(G_1)$, then either $z \in \langle x, y \rangle$ or $\{x, y, z\}$ is itself independent. It follows that, given a 1-simplex $\{x, y\}$ in $\Sigma(G_1) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$, there are precisely $p^2 - 1$ vertices z of order p in $\Sigma(G_1)$ such that $\{x, y, z\}$ is not a simplex. Moreover, as H is minimally 2-generated, G_1 is not cyclic. As a consequence of Proposition 2.15(3), the same must be true in $\Sigma(G_2)$ or in $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$, depending on the simplex that is considered. A minimal generating set $\{a, b\}$ of H is a (strongly) independent subset of G_2 and so there are precisely $p^2 - 1$ elements c of order p in G_2 such that $\{a, b, c\}$ is not (strongly) independent. It follows that H has at most $p^2 - 1$ elements of order p and so $|\Omega_1(H)| \leq p^2$.

(2) Let x and y in G_2 be of order p : we prove that $[x, y] = 1$. To this end, define $L = \langle x, y \rangle$ so that, with L in the role of H in (1), the subgroup $\Omega_1(L)$ has order dividing p^2 . In particular $\Omega_1(L)$ is abelian and, since $x, y \in \Omega_1(L)$, the claim is proven. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let p be a prime number and let G_1 and G_2 be finite p -groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Let, moreover $H \leq G_2$, $y \in G_2$, and $z \in \Omega_1(G_2)$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) $[y, z] \in \langle y \rangle \langle z \rangle$;
- (2) $\langle H \cup \{z\} \rangle = H \langle z \rangle$;

Proof. (1) We have $[y, z] = y^{-1}z^{-1}yz \in \Omega_1(\langle y, z \rangle)$ and, if $y = 1$, then the claim is clearly true. Assume now that $y \neq 1$ and let $y_1 \in \langle y \rangle$ have order p . Then Lemma 3.1 yields $\langle z \rangle = \langle y_1 \rangle$ or $\Omega_1(\langle z, y \rangle) = \langle z \rangle \langle y_1 \rangle$. In both cases, $[y, z] \in \langle z \rangle \langle y_1 \rangle \subset \langle z \rangle \langle y \rangle$.

(2) The inclusion from right to left is clear so we consider the other one. To this end, let $x \in \langle H \cup \{z\} \rangle$ and let $x_1, \dots, x_t \in H \cup \{z\}$ be such that $x = x_1 \cdots x_t$. We show by induction on t that there are $h \in H$ and $\zeta \in \langle z \rangle$ such that $x = h\zeta$. When $t = 0$ the claim is clear so we assume $t > 0$ and let $h \in H$ and $\zeta \in \langle z \rangle$ be such that $x_1 \cdots x_{t-1} = h\zeta$. It follows that $x = h\zeta x_t$. If $x_t \in \langle z \rangle$ we are clearly done, so we assume $x_t \in H$. It then follows from (1) that

$$x = h\zeta x_t = hx_t[x_t, \zeta^{-1}]\zeta \in H\langle x_t \rangle \langle \zeta^{-1} \rangle \langle \zeta \rangle \in H\langle \zeta \rangle \subseteq H\langle z \rangle.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let p be a prime number and let G_1 and G_2 be finite p -groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$. Let, moreover $H \leq G_2$. Then $d(H) \leq d(\Omega_1(H))$.*

Proof. If G_1 is cyclic, then the statement is clearly true; we assume therefore that G_1 is not cyclic. Write $d(H) = t$ and $H = \langle y_1, \dots, y_t \rangle$. Then $\{y_1, \dots, y_t\}$ is a simplex in $\Sigma(G_2)$ corresponding to a simplex $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$ of $\Sigma(G_1)$. Assume that z is an element of order p of G_2 that does not belong to H : we claim that $\{y_1, \dots, y_t, z\}$ is independent. For a contradiction, assume that this is not the case and, since z does not belong to H , up to reordering, we have $y_1 \in \langle y_2, \dots, y_t, z \rangle$. It follows then from Lemma 3.2(2) that there are $\tilde{h} \in \tilde{H} = \langle y_2, \dots, y_t \rangle$ and $\zeta \in \langle z \rangle$ such that $y_1 = \tilde{h}\zeta$. As a result, $\zeta \in H \cap \langle z \rangle = \{1\}$ and so $\{y_1, \dots, y_t\}$ is not independent. Contradiction.

The last argument, combined with Lemma 3.1(2) and Proposition 2.15(1), shows that, writing

$$d = d(\Omega_1(G_2)) \quad \text{and} \quad r = d(\Omega_1(H))$$

there are $p^d - p^r$ elements of G_2 of order p that are independent from $\{y_1, \dots, y_t\}$. It follows from Proposition 2.15(3) that there are $p^d - p^r$ elements of order p in G_1 that are independent from $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$. The group G_1 being abelian, this means that

$$p^d - p^r \leq |\Omega_1(G_1)| - |\Omega_1(\langle x_1, \dots, x_t \rangle)| = p^d - |\Omega_1(\langle x_1, \dots, x_t \rangle)|$$

from which we derive that $d(H) = t = d(\Omega_1(\langle x_1, \dots, x_t \rangle)) \leq r = d(\Omega_1(H))$. \square

Remark 3.4. We remark that, when p is odd and $\Omega_1(H)$ is abelian, Lemma 3.3 could be also deduced from [19, Cor. 3].

The following results are extracted from the classification of minimal metacyclic p -groups given in [6, Thm. 3.2]; see also [35, Thm. 2].

Lemma 3.5. *Let p be a prime number and let K be a finite p -group with $d(K) = 2$. Assume that all proper subgroups of K are metacyclic, but K itself is not. Then $p > 2$ and one of the following holds:*

- (1) K is isomorphic to the Heisenberg group of order p^3 ;
- (2) K is isomorphic to `SmallGroup(81,10)`.

Lemma 3.6. *Let K be a finite 2-group such that all proper subgroups of K are metacyclic, but K itself is not. Then one of the following holds:*

- (1) K is elementary abelian of order 8.
- (2) K contains a subgroup isomorphic to the quaternion group Q_8 ;
- (3) K is isomorphic to `SmallGroup(32,32)`.

Proposition 3.7. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite 2-groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Then G_2 does not have subgroups isomorphic to Q_8 .*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that X is a subgroup of G_2 that is isomorphic to the quaternion group and note that $\Phi(X) = \mathcal{U}_1(X) = Z(X)$. Let now z be an element of order 2 of G_2 that does not belong to X and define $K = \langle X \cup \{z\} \rangle$. By Lemma 3.2(2) we have that $K = X\langle z \rangle$ and K has order 32. In particular, X is normal in K and so z maps to an element φ_z of $\text{Aut}(X)$ of order dividing 2. It follows that z centralizes X or $|\varphi_z| = 2$. Moreover, it follows from Lemma 3.1(2) that $\Omega_1(K)$ is abelian. Intersecting all conditions, a search in the Small Group Library of GAP shows that K is necessarily isomorphic to the direct product of X and $\langle z \rangle$, and so z centralizes X .

Again by Lemma 3.1(2) we have that $\Omega_1(G_2)$ is elementary abelian and we write $|\Omega_1(G_2)| = 2^t$. From the argument above, we derive that $\Omega_1(G_2)$ centralizes X and so G_2 contains at least $(8 - 2)2^{t-1} = 3 \cdot 2^t$ elements of order 4 whose square equals the unique element of order 2 of X . Thanks to Proposition 2.15(1), we have $|\Omega_1(G_1)| = |\Omega_1(G_2)| = 2^t$ and, by Proposition 2.15(2), also that, in G_1 , there are at least $3 \cdot 2^t$ elements whose square is the same element of order 2. This is a contradiction to the fact that G_1 is abelian and so squaring is a homomorphism. \square

Proposition 3.8. *Let $p > 2$ be a prime number and let G_1 and G_2 be finite p -groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Then G_2 is powerful.*

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 2.15(2), there is a bijection between the sets

$$A = \{x^p \mid x \in G_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{z^p \mid z \in G_2\}.$$

Write $|G_1| = |G_2| = p^n$. Since $A = \Phi(G_1)$, we have that $|B| = |A| = p^{n-d}$. This yields in particular $|B| = |\Phi(G_2)|$. Since $B \subseteq \Phi(G_2)$, we conclude that $B = \Phi(G_2) = \mathcal{U}_1(G_2)$. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite 2-groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Let, moreover, K be a subgroup of G_2 such that $d(K) = 2$. Then K is metacyclic.*

Proof. For a contradiction, assume that K is not metacyclic and let $J \leq K$ be of minimal order with this property. It follows that J is non-trivial and that every proper subgroup of J is metacyclic. Since every subgroup L of K satisfies $\Omega_1(L) \leq \Omega_1(K)$, Lemma 3.1(1) ensures that $|\Omega_1(L)| \leq 4$ and so, as a consequence of Lemma 3.6, the group J is not abelian. Moreover, if $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$, then Lemma 3.3 implies that $d(J) \leq d(\Omega_1(K)) = 2$, contradicting Lemma 3.5.

Assume now that $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Then Lemma 3.6 combined with Proposition 3.7 yields that $J \cong \text{SmallGroup}(32, 32)$. We represent J as in [35, Thm. 2(5)]:

$$J = \langle a, b, c \mid a^4 = b^4 = 1, c^2 = a^2b^2, [a, b] = b^2, [a, c] = a^2, [b, c] = 1 \rangle.$$

Then in J the following are satisfied:

- (i) $\Omega_1(J) = \mathcal{U}_1(J) = \gamma_2(J) = \Phi(J) = Z(J)$ and $|\mathcal{U}_1(J)| = 4$;
- (ii) $c^2 = a^2b^2 = (ab)^2b^2$ and $\Omega_1(J) = \langle b^2, c^2 \rangle$.

Let now z be an element of order 2 of G_2 that does not belong to J . Define $L = \langle J \cup \{z\} \rangle$ and so Lemma 3.2(2) ensures that $L = J\langle z \rangle$ and L has order 64. In particular, J is normal in L and so z maps to an element φ_z of $\text{Aut}(J)$ with $\varphi_z^2 = 1$. We claim that $\varphi_z = 1$ and so that z centralizes J . To this end, we recall that every 2-generated subgroup H of L (and thus of G_2) satisfies $|\Omega_1(L)| \leq 4$. This holds in particular for every $H = \langle x, z \rangle$ with $x \in J \setminus \Phi(J)$, and so (i) yields that $\varphi_z(x) \in \langle x \rangle$. In other words, if $x \in J \setminus \Phi(J)$, then $\varphi_z(x) = x$ or $\varphi_z(x) = x^3$. We start by showing that $\varphi_z(b) = b$. Assume this is not the case and that $\varphi_z(b) = b^3$. Then $\varphi_z(a) = a$ or $\varphi_z(a) = a^3$ and so we have two possibilities:

- $\varphi_z(ab) = ab^3 = (ab)b^2$, or

$$\bullet \varphi_z(ab) = a^3b^3 = (ab)a^2b^2 = (ab)c^2.$$

In both cases, from (ii) we derive that $\varphi_z(ab) \in \langle ab \rangle$ implies that $\Omega_1(J) = \langle b^2, c^2 \rangle \subseteq \langle ab \rangle$, which is a contradiction. So we have proven that $\varphi_z(b) = b$. With similar arguments one shows that $\varphi_z(a) = a$ and $\varphi_z(c) = c$. We derive thus that z centralizes J .

Thanks to Lemma 3.1(2), recall now that $\Omega_1(G_2)$ is elementary abelian and write $|\Omega_1(G_2)| = 2^t$. By (i), we have that $t \geq 2$ and it follows from the discussion above that $\Omega_1(G_2)$ centralizes J . In particular the number of elements of G_2 whose square is in $J \setminus \{1\}$ is lower-bounded by $(32-4)2^{t-2} = 7 \cdot 2^{t-1}$. It follows from Proposition 2.15(1) that $|\Omega_1(G_1)| = 2^t$ and, from Proposition 2.15(2), that there are, in G_1 , at least $7 \cdot 2^{t-1}$ elements whose square lives in a set of cardinality 3. This contradicts the fact that squaring is a homomorphism in G_1 . \square

Proposition 3.10. *Let p be a prime number and let G_1 and G_2 be finite p -groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ or $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$. Let, moreover, K be a subgroup of G_2 such that $d(K) = 2$. Then K is metacyclic.*

Proof. Since K is minimally 2-generated, G_2 is not cyclic and therefore neither is G_1 . As a consequence of Lemma 3.9, we assume that p is odd. Since every subgroup L of K satisfies $\Omega_1(L) \leq \Omega_1(K)$, Lemma 3.1(1) together with Remark 3.4 ensure that $d(L) \leq d(\Omega_1(K)) = 2$. For a contradiction, assume that K is not metacyclic and, without loss of generality, assume also that K is of minimal order with this property. It follows that K is non-trivial and that every proper subgroup of K is metacyclic. Then, Lemma 3.5(1) combined with Lemma 3.1(1) yields that $p = 3$ and $K \cong \text{SmallGroup}(81, 10)$. We represent K as in [35, Thm. 2(3)] (where a and b correspond to s and s_1 from [6, Thm. 3.2(iii)]):

$$K = \langle a, b, c \mid a^9 = b^9 = c^3 = 1, a^3 = b^{-3}, [c, b] = 1, [b, a] = c, [c, a] = a^3 \rangle.$$

Now G_2 is powerful, thanks to Proposition 3.8, and therefore $\mathcal{U}_2(G_2) = \{x \in G_2 \mid x^9 = 1\}$. Proposition 2.15(3) yields then that it is not restrictive to assume that G_2 has exponent 9, so we do. Thanks to G_2 being powerful, cubing defines a homomorphism $\rho : G_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_1(G_2)$ and, since $\mathcal{U}_1(K) = \langle \rho(a) \rangle$, we have that $\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_1(K)) = \Omega_1(G_2)\langle a \rangle$. In particular K is contained in $\Omega_1(G_2)\langle a \rangle$ and Dedekind's Lemma, combined with G_2 being powerful, implies

$$K = K \cap (\Omega_1(G_2)\langle a \rangle) = \langle a \rangle(K \cap \Omega_1(G_2)) = \langle a \rangle\Omega_1(K).$$

This yields a contradiction, because $|\langle a \rangle\Omega_1(K)| = 27 \neq 81$. \square

The following is a summary of the discussion around [20, Thm. 3.1].

Theorem 3.11. *Let p be a prime number and let G be a finite p -group. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The group G is modular.*
- (2) *All subgroups of G are powerful.*
- (3) *All 2-generated subgroups of G are powerful.*
- (4) *All 2-generated subgroups of G are metacyclic.*

Theorem 3.12. *Let G_2 be a finite p -group. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a finite abelian p -group G_1 such that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$.*
- (2) *There exists a finite abelian p -group G_1 such that $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$.*
- (3) *G_2 is modular and nonhamiltonian.*
- (4) *There exists a finite abelian p -group G_1 such that G_1 and G_2 have isomorphic subgroup lattices.*

Proof. (1)-(2) \implies (3). It follows from Theorem 3.11 that G_2 is modular if and only if all 2-generated subgroups of G_2 are metacyclic. So we apply Proposition 3.10 to deduce that

G_2 is modular. Moreover, Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.7 imply that G_2 has no subgroup isomorphic to the quaternion group, and therefore G_2 is not hamiltonian.

(3) \implies (4). This follows from [31, Theorem 2.5.10].

(4) \implies (1)-(2). This follows from Proposition 2.23(2). \square

The following is [17, Thm. 14]; see also Theorem 2.3.1 in [31]. Combined with this result, Theorem 3.12 yields a full classification of prime power order groups whose independence complex is isomorphic to that of an abelian group.

Theorem 3.13. *Let p be a prime number and let G be a finite p -group. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) G is modular nonhamiltonian.
- (2) There exist a normal abelian subgroup A of G , an element $b \in G$ and a positive integer s such that the following hold:
 - $G = A\langle b \rangle$,
 - for all $a \in A$, one has $b^{-1}ab = a^{1+p^s}$, and
 - if $p = 2$, then $s \geq 2$.

Corollary 3.14. *Let p be a prime number and let G_1 and G_2 be finite p -groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$.
- (2) $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$.
- (3) G_1 and G_2 have isomorphic subgroup lattices.

Proof. (1) \implies (3). Thanks to Theorem 3.12, there exists an abelian p -group G_3 such that G_2 and G_3 have isomorphic subgroup lattices. It follows from Proposition 2.23(2) that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2) \cong \Sigma(G_3)$ and so that G_1 and G_3 have isomorphic power graphs. Since power graphs are isomorphism invariants for the family of finite abelian groups, cf. [11, Thm. 1], we derive that $G_1 \cong G_3$ and so G_1 and G_2 have isomorphic subgroup lattices. The proof of (2) \implies (3) is analogous.

(3) \implies (1)-(2). This is Proposition 2.23(2). \square

Theorem 3.15. *Let G_2 be a finite group. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) There exists a finite abelian group G_1 such that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$.
- (2) There exists a finite abelian group G_1 such that $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$.
- (3) G_2 is nilpotent and its Sylow subgroups are modular and nonhamiltonian.
- (4) There exists a finite abelian group G_1 such that G_1 and G_2 have the same order and isomorphic subgroup lattices.

Proof. (1) \implies (3). Suppose $\Sigma(G_2) \cong \Sigma(G_1)$, with G_1 abelian. Then G_2 is nilpotent, by Proposition 2.17(1). If G_1 is cyclic then $G_1 \cong G_2$. Otherwise, by Proposition 2.19, the isomorphism $\Sigma(G_1) \rightarrow \Sigma(G_2)$ induces, for every prime p , an isomorphism between $\Sigma(P_1)$ and $\Sigma(P_2)$, where P_1 and P_2 are, respectively, the Sylow p -subgroups of G_1 and G_2 . Thanks to Theorem 3.12, the group P_2 is modular and nonhamiltonian.

(2) \implies (3). Suppose $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_2) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_1)$, with G_1 abelian. Then G_2 is nilpotent, by Proposition 2.17(2), and, by Proposition 2.22, the isomorphism $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$ induces, for every prime p , an isomorphism between $\tilde{\Sigma}(P_1)$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}(P_2)$, where P_1 and P_2 are, respectively, the Sylow p -subgroups of G_1 and G_2 . Thanks to Theorem 3.12, the group P_2 is modular and nonhamiltonian.

(3) \implies (4). There exists a finite abelian group G_1 such that the subgroup lattices of G_1 and G_2 are isomorphic thanks to [31, Thm. 2.5.10]. The group G_1 can be taken so that $|G_1| = |G_2|$; see [31, Thm. 2.5.9], on which the proof of [31, Thm. 2.5.10] is based.

(4) \implies (1)-(2). Fix G_1 as in (4): we show that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$. By Proposition 2.17(3), the group G_2 is itself nilpotent and, if p is a prime number and P and Q are Sylow p -subgroups of G_1 and G_2 respectively, then P and Q have isomorphic subgroup lattices. It follows from Theorem 3.12 that $\Sigma(P) \cong \Sigma(Q)$. Calling P_1, \dots, P_s and Q_1, \dots, Q_s the Sylow subgroups of G_1 and G_2 respectively, we have isomorphisms $f_i : \Sigma(P_i) \rightarrow \Sigma(Q_i)$. Using now the fact that G_1 and G_2 are nilpotent, the bijection

$$G = P_1 \times \dots \times P_s \longrightarrow G_2 = Q_1 \times \dots \times Q_s, \quad (x_1, \dots, x_s) \longmapsto (f_1(x_1), \dots, f_s(x_s))$$

induces an isomorphism $\Sigma(G_1) \rightarrow \Sigma(G_2)$. The proof for strong independence complexes is analogous. \square

In the language of [32, Thm. 7], the groups from Theorem 3.15(3) are called quasi-Hamiltonian. The following give negative answers to Question 2.28 and Question 2.29 for complexes over abelian groups.

Corollary 3.16. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$.
- (2) *There exists an index-preserving isomorphism $\mathcal{L}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(G_2)$.*

Proof. (1) \implies (2). If G_1 is cyclic then $G_1 \cong G_2$ and so (2) is easily seen to hold. Assume now that G_1 is not cyclic. By Proposition 2.17(1), the group G_2 is nilpotent and $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$ ensures, thanks to Proposition 2.19, for every prime p , that $\Sigma(P_1)$ and $\Sigma(P_2)$ are isomorphic, where P_1 and P_2 are, respectively, the Sylow p -subgroups of G_1 and G_2 . Thanks to Corollary 3.14, the groups P_1 and P_2 have isomorphic subgroup lattices. By lifting the isomorphisms corresponding to the different prime numbers, we obtain an index-preserving isomorphism $\mathcal{L}(G_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(G_2)$

(2) \implies (1). The proof of (4) \implies (1) in Theorem 3.15 actually covers this stronger statement. \square

Corollary 3.17. *Let G_1 and G_2 be finite groups. Assume that G_1 is abelian and that $\Sigma(G_1) \cong \Sigma(G_2)$. Then $\tilde{\Sigma}(G_1) \cong \tilde{\Sigma}(G_2)$.*

Proof. Combine Corollary 3.16 and Proposition 2.23. \square

4 When independent sets are strongly independent

In this section we give a complete answer to Question 2.8, i.e. we classify the finite groups G for which $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$. Recall that this last condition is equivalent to (2.1): we will use this fact without further mention.

4.1. Monotone groups and the basis property. In the following we will refer to [2] for \mathcal{B} -groups, to [2, App. A] (see also [27]) for groups with the basis property, and to [25, 26] for monotone groups. We recall that, as given in the introduction, $d(G)$ and $m(G)$ denote the minimum and the maximum cardinality of a minimal generating set of a finite group G , respectively.

Definition 4.1. Let G be a finite group. Then

- G is a \mathcal{B} -group if $d(G) = m(G)$.
- G has the *basis property* if every subgroup of G is a \mathcal{B} -group.
- G is *monotone* if $H \leq K \leq G$ implies that $d(H) \leq d(K)$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let G be a finite group. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$.

(2) G is a monotone group with the basis property.

Proof. Assume first that G satisfies $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$. Taking $H = K$ in (2.1) one immediately derives that G has the basis property. Now for every subgroup H of G one has $d(H) = m(H)$ and so (2.1) rewrites as

$$H \leq K \leq G \implies d(H) \leq d(K)$$

so G is monotone.

Assume now that G is monotone with the basis property and let $H \leq K \leq G$. Then, G being monotone, we have $d(H) \leq d(K)$ and, H being a \mathcal{B} -group, we deduce $m(H) \leq d(K)$. The choice of H and K being arbitrary, G satisfies (2.1). \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let G be a finite group with $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ and let H and N be subgroups of G , with N normal. Then $\Sigma(H) = \tilde{\Sigma}(H)$ and $\Sigma(G/N) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G/N)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.2, a finite group satisfying (2.1) is the same as a monotone group with the basis property. The last properties are easily seen to be preserved by subgroups and are preserved by quotients thanks to [2, Prop. 1.1] and [26, Prop. 1]. \square

The following is a consequence of Proposition 4.2 and [2, Thm. 1.6].

Proposition 4.4. *Let G be a finite nilpotent group satisfying $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$. Then G is a monotone group of prime power order.*

For p an odd prime number, the monotone p -groups are classified by Mann; cf. [25, 26]. The monotone 2-groups have been classified by Crestani and Menegazzo in [14].

4.2. The non-nilpotent case. The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.5. *Let G be a finite non-nilpotent group. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$.
- (2) $G = PQ$ is a Frobenius group such that:
 - (a) P is a normal abelian p -subgroup of G , where p is a prime;
 - (b) Q is a cyclic q -subgroup of G , where $q \neq p$ is a prime;
 - (c) if α is a generator of Q , then exactly one of the following holds:
 - there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime to p such that, for every $x \in P$, one has $x^\alpha = x^m$;
 - P is homocyclic with $d(P) = 2$ and $|\alpha|$ does not divide $p - 1$.

Remark 4.6. Let G be a finite group satisfying $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$. Thanks to Theorem 4.5, the group G is isomorphic to a semidirect product $P \rtimes_\varphi Q$ where P is a p -group, Q is a q -group, and the action $\varphi : Q \rightarrow \text{Aut}(P)$ of Q on P is faithful. In particular, Q can be viewed as a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(P)$. Moreover, since the order of Q is coprime to p , the canonical map $\text{Aut}(P) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(P/\Phi(P))$ induces an isomorphism of Q with a subgroup \overline{Q} of $\text{Aut}(P/\Phi(P))$. If $\omega : \mathbb{F}_p^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$ denotes the Teichmüller character and P is abelian, we write $\chi : \mathbb{F}_p^\times \rightarrow \text{Aut}(P)$ for the composition of ω with the map giving the \mathbb{Z}_p -module structure of P . Then condition (c) can then be interpreted in the following way:

- the order of Q divides $p - 1$ and $\varphi(Q) \subseteq \chi(\mathbb{F}_p^\times)$; or
- the order of Q does not divide $p - 1$ and there exists a positive integer n such that $P \cong C_{p^n} \times C_{p^n}$.

For P abelian, in the first case $\varphi(Q)$ consists of automorphisms of the form $x \mapsto x^m$, where m is an integer coprime to p . In the second case we still have that $|Q| = |\overline{Q}|$ divides $|\text{GL}(2, p)| = p(p - 1)^2(p + 1)$.

We dedicate the remaining part of the section to the proof of Theorem 4.5. In the following result, which is [2, Cor. A.1], an $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -section of a p -group P , acted upon by another group Q , is an $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module H/N , where $N \leq H \leq P$ are Q -invariant subgroups such that N is normal in H and N contains $\Phi(H)$.

Proposition 4.7. *Let G be a finite non-nilpotent group. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) G has the basis property.
- (2) $G = PQ$ where:
 - (a) P is a normal p -subgroup of G , where p is a prime;
 - (b) Q is a cyclic q -subgroup of G , where $q \neq p$ is a prime;
 - (c) if \tilde{Q} is a non-trivial subgroup of Q and S is an $\mathbb{F}_p[\tilde{Q}]$ section of P , then the action of \tilde{Q} on S is faithful and S is isomorphic to a direct sum of isomorphic copies of one simple module.

Proposition 4.8. *Let p, q be prime numbers. Let P be a finite abelian p -group and let $Q = \langle \alpha \rangle$ be a q -subgroup of $\text{Aut}(P)$ such that there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime to p such that, for every $x \in P$, one has $x^\alpha = x^m$. Then $G = P \rtimes Q$ satisfies $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$.*

Proof. Write, for simplicity, $G = PQ$ where the action of Q on $P/\Phi(P)$ is through power automorphisms. Since q divides $p - 1$, the primes p and q are distinct. Relying on Proposition 4.2, we show that G is monotone and has the basis property. The second is guaranteed by Proposition 4.7(c), so we show monotonicity. To this end, note that $d(G) = d(P) + 1$. Let now $H \leq K$ be subgroups of G . Write $H = P_H Q_H$ where $P_H = H \cap P$ and Q_H is a q -group; in the same way write $K = P_K Q_K$. Clearly $P_H \leq P_K$ and, P being abelian, $d(P_H) \leq d(P_K)$. Moreover, if K is contained in P , then so is H and so $d(H) = d(P_H) \leq d(P_K) = d(K)$. If, on the other hand, K is not contained in P , then $d(K) = d(P_K) + 1 \geq d(P_H) + 1 \geq d(H)$. This proves monotonicity and thus the proof is complete. \square

The following result is a consequence of the Cayley-Hamilton Theorem.

Lemma 4.9. *Let p be a prime number and let A be an element of $\text{GL}(2, p)$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) if $|A|$ divides $p - 1$, then A has at least one eigenvalue in \mathbb{F}_p .
- (2) if $|A|$ does not divide $p(p - 1)$, then the characteristic polynomial of A is irreducible.

Proposition 4.10. *Let p, q be prime numbers. Let P be a finite abelian p -group and let Q be a cyclic subgroup of $\text{Aut}(P)$ of order not dividing $p(p - 1)$. Assume that P is homocyclic and that $d(P) = 2$. Then $G = P \rtimes Q$ satisfies $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$.*

Proof. Write, for simplicity, $G = PQ$ and note that q is odd and different from p . Moreover, since P is abelian, we have $\Phi(P) = \mathcal{U}_1(P)$ and, P being homocyclic with $d(P) = 2$, for n a non-negative integer we have

$$(4.1) \quad |\mathcal{U}_n(P) : \mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)| = \begin{cases} p^2 & \text{if } p^{n+1} \leq \exp(P), \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Write $Q = \langle \alpha \rangle$ and $\overline{Q} = \langle \overline{\alpha} \rangle$ for the image of Q under the canonical map $\text{Aut}(P) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(P/\Phi(P)) \cong \text{GL}(2, p)$. Since $|Q|$ does not divide $p(p - 1)$, by Lemma 4.9(2), the $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module $P/\Phi(P)$ is simple. Moreover, since Q acts on P by automorphisms and p -th powering induces a surjective homomorphism $\mathcal{U}_n(P)/\mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)/\mathcal{U}_{n+2}(P)$, the equality in (4.1) ensures, for every nonnegative integer n with $p^n \leq \exp(P)$, that $\mathcal{U}_n(P)/\mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)$ is a simple $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module. The same applies to every nontrivial subgroup \tilde{Q} of Q .

Let now $\tilde{Q} \leq Q$ be non-trivial and let H be a subgroup of P that is \tilde{Q} -stable. Assume that $H \neq \{1\}$ and let n be the smallest non-negative integer such that H is contained in $\mathcal{U}_n(P)$ but is not contained in $\mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)$. The induced action of \tilde{Q} on $\mathcal{U}_n(P)/\mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)$ being irreducible, we deduce that $\mathcal{U}_n(P) = H\mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)$ and so (4.1) yields that $H = \mathcal{U}_n(P)$.

This shows in particular that the $\mathbb{F}_p[\tilde{Q}]$ -sections of P are precisely the quotients of the form $\mathcal{U}_n(P)/\mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)$ and so Proposition 4.7 yields that G has the basis property.

In view of Proposition 4.2, we are only left with showing that G is monotone. For this, let $H \leq K$ be subgroups of G . Write $H = P_H Q_H$ where $P_H = H \cap P$ and Q_H is a q -group; in the same way write $K = P_K Q_K$. Then $P_H \leq P_K$ and, P being abelian, $d(P_H) \leq d(P_K)$. Moreover, if K is contained in P , then so is H and so $d(H) = d(P_H) \leq d(P_K) = d(K)$. If, on the other hand, K is not contained in P , then $d(K) = d(P_K) + 1 \geq d(P_H) + 1 \geq d(H)$. This proves monotonicity and thus the proof is complete. \square

Proposition 4.11. *Let G be a finite non-nilpotent group such that $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$. Write $G = PQ$ as in Proposition 4.7 and $Q = \langle \alpha \rangle$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (1) $d(P) = d(G) = 2$ and $P/\Phi(P)$ is a simple $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module.
- (2) P is abelian and there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime to p such that, for every $x \in P$, one has $x^\alpha = x^m$.

Proof. We prove (1) and (2) together. Let V be a simple $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module and t a positive integer such that, as $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -modules, $P/\Phi(P)$ and V^t are isomorphic; the existence of V and t is guaranteed by Proposition 4.7(c). Proposition 4.2 yields that G is monotone, so

$$t d(V) = d(P) \leq d(G) \leq t + 1.$$

Only two cases can therefore occur:

- (a) $d(V) = 1$ or
- (b) $d(V) = 2$ and $t = 1$.

It is clear that, in the second case, $d(P) = d(P/\Phi(P)) = d(V) = 2$, so we now consider the first. Assume therefore that $d(V) = 1$ and write $\bar{\alpha}$ for the non-trivial automorphism of $\bar{P} = P/\Phi(P)$ that is induced by α . Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that, for every $\bar{x} \in \bar{P}$, one has $\bar{\alpha}(\bar{x}) = \bar{x}^m$. Then m does not belong to $p\mathbb{Z} \cup (1 + p\mathbb{Z})$.

For a contradiction, we assume now, without loss of generality, that P has class 2 and that $\gamma_2(P)$ has exponent p (in other words, with the aid of Lemma 4.3, we are replacing P with $P/\gamma_3(P)\mathcal{U}_1(\gamma_2(P))$). Then $\Phi(P)$ is central and so the commutator map induces a bilinear map $P/\Phi(P) \times P/\Phi(P) \rightarrow \gamma_2(P)$. We deduce that, for every $x \in \gamma_2(P)$, one has $\alpha(x) = x^{a^2}$. Let now $g \in P \setminus \Phi(P)$ and note that $H = \langle g \rangle \gamma_2(P)$ is abelian and Q -stable. Since $g \in P \setminus \Phi(P)$ and $a \not\equiv a^2 \pmod{p}$, we derive a contradiction from Proposition 4.7(c). We have thus proven that P is abelian. \square

Example 4.12. Let $P = Q_8$ and recall that $\text{Aut}(P) \cong \text{Sym}(4)$. Let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(P)$ correspond to (1 2 3) via a chosen isomorphism and let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the image of α in $\text{Aut}(P/\Phi(P))$. Define $Q = \langle \alpha \rangle$ and $G = P \rtimes Q$. The characteristic polynomial of $\bar{\alpha}$ is $x^2 + x + 1 \in \mathbb{F}_2[x]$, which is irreducible. In particular, the only Q -stable subgroups of P are 1, P , and $\Phi(P)$. However α restricted to $\Phi(P)$ is the identity map and so G does not satisfy (2.1).

The following is [21, Thm. 2]. Recall that a chief factor X/Y of a finite group G is *non-Frattini* if X/Y is not a subgroup of $\Phi(G/Y)$.

Proposition 4.13. *Let G be a finite solvable group. Then $m(G)$ coincides with the number of non-Frattini factors in a chief series of G .*

Lemma 4.14. *Let G be a finite non-nilpotent group such that $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ and write $G = PQ$ as in Proposition 4.7. Assume that P has class 2 and that $Z(P)$ has exponent p . Then $|P| = p^3$ and p is odd.*

Proof. Since P is not abelian, Proposition 4.11(1) yields that $d(P) = d(G) = 2$. Moreover, the exponent of $\gamma_2(P)$ being p , the subgroup $\Phi(P)$ is central and so $\gamma_2(P)$ has order p . Since both $Z(P)$ and $\gamma_2(P)$ are $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -modules, there exists a submodule M of $Z(P)$ such that $Z(P) = \gamma_2(P) \oplus M$. We claim that $M = \{1\}$. For a contradiction, assume that M is not trivial. Then Proposition 4.2, together with Proposition 4.13, yields that $2 = d(G) \geq d(Z(P)Q) = m(Z(P)Q) \geq 3$; a contradiction. We have proven that $M = \{1\}$ and so $Z(P) = \gamma_2(P)$. Since $\Phi(P)$ is central and contains $\gamma_2(P)$, we get that $\gamma_2(P) = \Phi(P) = Z(P)$ and so $|P| = p^3$.

In conclusion, there are only two non-abelian groups of order 8, up to isomorphism, being D_8 and Q_8 . The group D_8 cannot figure as a normal 2-Sylow of a group satisfying (2.1) because $\text{Aut}(D_8) \cong D_8$, while Q_8 is excluded by Example 4.12. \square

The following is a consequence of [25, Theorem 4].

Lemma 4.15. *Let p be a prime number and let P be a finite monotone p -group such that $d(P) \leq 2$. Then P is metacyclic or $Z(P)$ has exponent p .*

Proposition 4.16. *Let G be a finite non-nilpotent group such that $\Sigma(G) = \tilde{\Sigma}(G)$ and write $G = PQ$ as in Proposition 4.7. Assume that P has class 2. Then P is metacyclic.*

Proof. Since P is not abelian, Proposition 4.11(1) ensures $d(P) = 2$ and that $P/\Phi(P)$ is a simple $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module. Moreover, P is monotone, so Lemma 4.15 yields that P is metacyclic or $Z(G)$ has exponent p . Assume, for a contradiction, that P is not metacyclic. Then, by Lemma 4.14, the prime p is odd and P has order p^3 and so, P not being metacyclic, the exponent of P is p . Thanks to Proposition 4.7(c), the subgroup $\gamma_2(P)$ is not fixed by Q and $|Q|$ divides $p - 1 = |\text{Aut}(\gamma_2(P))|$. Now Lemma 4.9(1) ensures that the elements of Q fix a 1-dimensional subspace of $P/\Phi(P)$ and so $P/\Phi(P)$ is not simple. Contradiction. \square

The following result is a consequence of [28, Sec. 1].

Proposition 4.17. *Let p be an odd prime number and let P be a finite metacyclic p -group. Let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(P)$ have order coprime to p . Then one of the following holds:*

- P is homocyclic with $d(P) = 2$; or
- the order of α divides $p - 1$.

We conclude the section by finally giving the proof of Theorem 4.5.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. We prove the equivalence of the two statements.

(2) \implies (1). This is the combination of Proposition 4.8 and Proposition 4.10.

(1) \implies (2). We borrow the notation from Proposition 4.7, which also ensures that the group G is Frobenius and the action of Q on $P/\Phi(P)$ is faithful.

We now show that P is abelian. Assume for a contradiction that this is not the case. Then, thanks to Lemma 4.3, we assume without loss of generality that P has class 2. Proposition 4.16 yields that P is metacyclic.

Assume first that $p = 2$ and let K be the unique subgroup of order 2 of $\gamma_2(P)$. Then K is characteristic in P and, in particular, it is Q -stable. The order of K being 2, it follows that Q acts trivially on K . Contradiction to Proposition 4.7(c).

Assume now that p is odd. Since P is not abelian, Proposition 4.17 yields that $|Q|$ divides $p - 1$ and Proposition 4.11(1) that $P/\Phi(P)$ is a simple $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module. Contradiction to Lemma 4.9(1).

We have thus proven that P is abelian and proceed with showing that one of the conditions in (c) holds. To this end, let α be a generator of Q and assume that α is not a power automorphism on $P/\Phi(P)$. It follows from Proposition 4.11 that $d(P) = 2$ and that $P/\Phi(P)$ is a simple $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module. In particular, Lemma 4.9(1) implies that

the order of α does not divide $p - 1$. Moreover, Proposition 4.7(c) ensures that for every non-negative integer n , the quotient $\mathcal{U}_n(P)/\mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)$ is trivial or a simple $\mathbb{F}_p[Q]$ -module, where the action of Q is faithful. Assuming that $\mathcal{U}_n(P) \neq \mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)$, from the fact that $|Q|$ does not divide $p - 1$ we derive that $|\mathcal{U}_n(P) : \mathcal{U}_{n+1}(P)| = p^2$. We conclude that P is homocyclic. \square

References

- [1] J. Abawajy, A. Kelarev, and M. Chowdhury. Power graphs: a survey. *Electron. J. Graph Theory Appl. (EJGTA)*, 1(2):125–147, 2013.
- [2] P. Apisa and B. Klopsch. A generalization of the Burnside basis theorem. *J. Algebra*, 400:8–16, 2014.
- [3] R. Baer. Crossed isomorphisms. *Amer. J. Math.*, 64:341–404, 1944.
- [4] S. Biswas, P. J. Cameron, A. Das, and H. K. Dey. On the difference of the enhanced power graph and the power graph of a finite group. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 208:Paper No. 105932, 31, 2024.
- [5] N. Blackburn. On a special class of p -groups. *Acta Math.*, 100:45–92, 1958.
- [6] N. Blackburn. Generalizations of certain elementary theorems on p -groups. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 11:1–22, 1961.
- [7] D. Bubboloni and N. Pinzauti. Critical classes of power graphs and reconstruction of directed power graphs. *J. Group Theory*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jgth-2023-0181>.
- [8] P. J. Cameron. The power graph of a finite group, II. *J. Group Theory*, 13(6):779–783, 2010.
- [9] P. J. Cameron. Graphs defined on groups. *Int. J. Group Theory*, 11(2):53–107, 2022.
- [10] P. J. Cameron. Simplicial complexes defined on groups, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.22260>.
- [11] P. J. Cameron and S. Ghosh. The power graph of a finite group. *Discrete Math.*, 311(13):1220–1222, 2011.
- [12] A. Caranti. Projectivity of p -groups of maximal class. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 61:393–404, 1979.
- [13] I. Chakrabarty, S. Ghosh, and M. K. Sen. Undirected power graphs of semigroups. *Semigroup Forum*, 78(3):410–426, 2009.
- [14] E. Crestani and F. Menegazzo. On monotone 2-groups. *J. Group Theory*, 15(3):359–383, 2012.
- [15] G. Daues and H. Heineken. Dualitäten und Gruppen der Ordnung p^6 . *Geometriae Dedicata*, 4(2):215–220, 1975.
- [16] The GAP Group. *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.12.2*, 2022. See <https://www.gap-system.org>.
- [17] K. Iwasawa. über die endlichen Gruppen und die Verbände ihrer Untergruppen. *J. Fac. Sci. Imp. Univ. Tokyo Sect. I.*, 4:171–199, 1941.
- [18] A. V. Kelarev and S. J. Quinn. A combinatorial property and power graphs of groups. In *Contributions to general algebra, 12 (Vienna, 1999)*, pages 229–235. Heyn, Klagenfurt, 2000.
- [19] T. J. Laffey. The minimum number of generators of a finite p -group. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 5:288–290, 1973.
- [20] A. Lubotzky and A. Mann. Powerful p -groups. I. Finite groups. *J. Algebra*, 105(2):484–505, 1987.
- [21] A. Lucchini. The largest size of a minimal generating set of a finite group. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 101(1):1–8, 2013.
- [22] A. Lucchini. Recognizing a finite group from the generating properties of its subsets. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 200(1):117–123, 2021.
- [23] A. Lucchini, A. Maróti, and C. M. Roney-Dougal. On the generating graph of a simple group. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.*, 103(1):91–103, 2017.
- [24] X. Ma, A. Kelarev, Y. Lin, and K. Wang. A survey on enhanced power graphs of finite groups. *Electron. J. Graph Theory Appl. (EJGTA)*, 10(1):89–111, 2022.
- [25] A. Mann. The number of generators of finite p -groups. *J. Group Theory*, 8(3):317–337, 2005.
- [26] A. Mann. Corrigendum: “The number of generators of finite p -groups”. *J. Group Theory*, 14(2):329–331, 2011.
- [27] J. McDougall-Bagnall and M. Quick. Groups with the basis property. *J. Algebra*, 346(1):332–339, 2011.
- [28] F. Menegazzo. Automorphisms of p -groups with cyclic commutator subgroup. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 90:81–101, 1993.
- [29] M. Mirzargar and R. Scapellato. Finite groups with the same power graph. *Comm. Algebra*, 50(4):1400–1406, 2022.

- [30] C. M. Pinckney. *Independence complexes of finite groups*. PhD thesis, Colorado State University, 2021. <https://mountainscholar.org/items/c9ef0221-d9a4-4a8d-9308-cb04c3a4bde4>.
- [31] R. Schmidt. *Subgroup lattices of groups*, volume 14 of *De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1994.
- [32] M. Suzuki. *Structure of a group and the structure of its lattice of subgroups*, volume Heft 10 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, (N.F.)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, 1956.
- [33] A. V. Vasil'ev, M. A. Grechkoseeva, and V. D. Mazurov. Recognizability of finite simple groups by the spectrum and order. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk*, 431(3):295–297, 2010.
- [34] S. Zahirović, I. Bošnjak, and R. Madarász. A study of enhanced power graphs of finite groups. *J. Algebra Appl.*, 19(4):2050062, 20, 2020.
- [35] Q. Zhang, L. An, and M. Xu. Finite p -groups all of whose non-abelian proper subgroups are metacyclic. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 87(1):1–5, 2006.

(Andrea Lucchini) UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA “TULLIO LEVI-CIVITA”
Email address: `lucchini@math.unipd.it`

(Mima Stanojkovski) UNIVERSITÀ DI TRENTO, DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA
Email address: `mima.stanojkovski@unitn.it`