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#### Abstract

For an odd prime $p$, finite $p$-groups whose non-abelian subgroups have the same center are classified in this paper.


## 1. Introduction

The center $Z(G)$ of a group $G$ is a very important concept in group theory. In some sense, the size of $Z(G)$ can be regarded as a measure of how far $G$ is from an abelian group. Clearly, $Z(G)=G$ if and only if $G$ is an abelian group. If $G$ is non-abelian, then, naturally, we hope to investigate finite groups with "large" center or abelian subgroups. As is well known, the center of a group may be trivial. However, the center of a finite $p$-group is always nontrivial. So we pay our attention to finite $p$-groups. Some scholars classified finite $p$ groups with "large" abelian subgroups. For example, Rédei [6] classified finite non-abelian groups $G$ of order $p^{n}$ all of whose maximal subgroups are abelian. Obviously, such groups have "large" center. In fact, $|Z(G)|=p^{n-2}$. Along Rédei's line, Zhang et al. [12,13] classified finite non-abelian $p$-groups of all of whose subgroups of index at most $p^{3}$ are abelian. On the other hand, some scholars have studied the structure of finite $p$-groups with conditions on its center or centers of its subgroups. For example, Janko [4] studied finite nonabelian $p$-groups having exactly one maximal subgroup with a noncyclic center. Finogenov [2] studied finite $p$-groups with cyclic commutator group and cyclic center.

The start point in this paper is to study the influence of the relationship between the center of a finite $p$-group and the centers of its non-abelian subgroups on the structure of a finite $p$-groups. As is well known, $H \cap Z(G) \leq Z(H)$ for a group $G$ and its each subgroup $H$. The extreme case is $H \cap Z(G)=Z(H)$. In other words, $Z(H) \leq Z(G)$. We try to classify such finite $p$-groups $G$ with $Z(H) \leq Z(G)$ for each non-abelian subgroup $H$. However, by using the

[^0]Magma project, we observed there are too many $p$-groups satisfying the condition. Moreover, it is not difficult to prove that all finite $p$-groups $G$ with $|G: Z(G)| \leq p^{3}$ satisfy the condition. Hence it is quite difficult to classify such finite $p$-groups. A natural question is:

Is it possible to classify finite p-groups $G$ with $Z(H)=Z(G)$ for each nonabelian subgroup $H$ of $G$ ?

The answer is positive. For $p=2$, such $p$-groups were classified in [8]. The present paper is devoted to the case of $p \neq 2$. Hence finite $p$-groups $G$ with $Z(H)=Z(G)$ are completely classified. It is worth to be mentioned that the argument of the case of $p \neq 2$ is quite different from that of $p=2$.

For convenience, we introduce the following notation and concepts.
$\mathcal{P}$-group: A finite $p$-group in which centers of all non-abelian subgroups coincide.
$\mathcal{Q}$-group: A $\mathcal{P}$-group all of whose non-abelian subgroups are generated by two elements.
$\mathcal{S}$-group: A $\mathcal{P}$-group which has at least one non-abelian subgroup $H$ with $d(H)>2$.

Obviously, $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{S}=\emptyset$.
We notice that the non-abelian subgroup of a minimal non-abelian $p$-group is itself. We assume a $\mathcal{P}$-group is not minimal non-abelian in this paper.

Suppose that $G$ is a finite $p$-group. If all subgroups of index $p^{t}$ of $G$ are abelian and at least one subgroup of index $p^{t-1}$ of $G$ is not abelian, then $G$ is called an $\mathcal{A}_{t}$-group. Obviously, an $\mathcal{A}_{1}$-group is a minimal non-abelian $p$-group, and for arbitrary a fixed integer $i$, all $\mathcal{A}_{i}$-subgroups of a $\mathcal{P}$-group have the same order.

Groups in this paper are finite $p$-groups and $p$ is an odd prime. We use $c(G)$ and $d(G)$ to denote the nilpotency class and the minimal number of generators of a group $G$ respectively. Other notation and terminology are consistent with that in [3].

## 2. Preliminary

In this section, we give some lemmas which are useful in the proof of our results.

Lemma 2.1 ([9, Lemma 2]). Let $G$ be a metabelian p-group and $a, b \in G$. For any positive integer $i$ and $j$, let

$$
[i a, j b]=[a, b, \underbrace{a, \ldots, a}_{i-1}, \underbrace{b, \ldots, b}_{j-1}] .
$$

Then
(1) For any positive integers $m$ and $n,\left[a^{m}, b^{n}\right]=\prod_{i=1}^{m} \prod_{j=1}^{n}[i a, j b] \begin{gathered}\binom{m}{i}\binom{n}{j}\end{gathered}$.
(2) Let $n$ be a positive integer. Then $\left(a b^{-1}\right)^{n}=a^{n} \prod_{i+j \leq n}[i a, j b]^{\left({ }_{i+j}^{n}\right)} b^{-n}$.

Lemma 2.2 ([3] or [7], Aufgabe 2, p. 259). Suppose that a finite non-abelian pgroup $G$ has an abelian normal subgroup $A$, and $G / A=\langle b A\rangle$ is cyclic. Then the map $a \mapsto[a, b], a \in A$ is an epimorphism from $A$ to $G^{\prime}$ and $G^{\prime} \cong A / A \cap Z(G)$. In particular, if a non-abelian p-group $G$ has an abelian maximal subgroup, then $|G|=p\left|G^{\prime}\right||Z(G)|$.

Lemma 2.3 ([10, Lemma 2.2]). Suppose that $G$ is a finite non-abelian p-group. Then the following conditions are equivalent:
(1) $G$ is minimal non-abelian;
(2) $d(G)=2$ and $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=p$;
(3) $d(G)=2$ and $\Phi(G)=Z(G)$.

The following lemma is simple but often used.
Lemma 2.4. If $G=\langle x, y\rangle$ is a minimal non-abelian $p$-group, then $Z(G)=$ $\left\langle x^{p}, y^{p},[x, y]\right\rangle$.
Lemma 2.5 ([8, Lemma 2.4]). Let $G$ be a $\mathcal{P}$-group. If $x, y \in G \backslash Z(G)$ and $[x, y]=1$, then $C_{G}(x)=C_{G}(y)$.

Some results about $\mathcal{P}$-groups are given in following lemmas.
Lemma 2.6. Let $G$ be a metacyclic $p$-group, and $p$ an odd prime. Then $G$ is not a $\mathcal{P}$-group.

Proof. By [11, Theorem 2.1] or see [5] we have

$$
G=\left\langle a, b \mid a^{p^{r+s+u}}=1, b^{p^{r+s+t}}=a^{p^{r+s}},[a, b]=a^{p^{r}}\right\rangle,
$$

where $r, s, t, u$ are non-negative integers, $r \geq 1$ and $u \leq r$. Since

$$
\left[a^{p^{s+u-1}}, b\right]=[a, b]^{]^{s+u-1}}=a^{p^{r+s+u-1}}
$$

$H=\left\langle a^{p^{s+u-1}}, b\right\rangle$ is minimal non-abelian by Lemma 2.3. If $G$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group, then $b^{p} \in Z(H)=Z(G)$ by Lemma 2.4. Therefore, $1=\left[a, b^{p}\right]$. On the other hand,

$$
\left[a, b^{p}\right]=[a, b]^{\binom{p}{1}}[a, b]^{\binom{p}{2}} \cdots[a, b, \ldots, b]^{\binom{p}{p}}=a^{p^{r+1}+p^{2 r}\binom{p}{2}+\cdots+p^{p r}\binom{p}{p}}
$$

by Lemma 2.1(1). It follows that $a^{p^{r+1}}=1$. Since $o(a)=p^{r+s+u}, s+u=1$. Thus $\left|G^{\prime}\right|=\left|\left\langle a^{p^{r}}\right\rangle\right|=p$. Hence $G$ is minimal non-abelian by Lemma 2.3, which contradicts to the hypothesis.
Lemma 2.7. If $G$ is a p-group of maximal class with an abelian maximal subgroup, then $G$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.
Proof. Let $A$ be an abelian maximal subgroup of $G$ and $H$ any non-abelian subgroup of $G$. Then $G=A H$ and $A \cap H$ is an abelian maximal subgroup of $H$. Hence, $Z(H) \leq A \cap H$. Since $A$ is abelian, $Z(H) \leq Z(G)$. By [10, Theorem 2.5], $|Z(G)|=p$. It follows that $Z(H)=Z(G)$. Hence, $G$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.

Lemma 2.8. Let $G$ be an $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-group. Then $G$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group if and only if $Z(G) \leq \Phi(G)$ and $|G: Z(G)|=p^{3}$.

Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ Take one non-abelian proper subgroup $H$ of $G$. Since $G$ is an $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-group, $H$ is minimal non-abelian and $|G: H|=p$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $Z(H)=\Phi(H)$ and $|H: Z(H)|=p^{2}$. Since $Z(H)=Z(G)$ and $\Phi(H) \leq \Phi(G)$, $Z(G) \leq \Phi(G)$ and $|G: Z(G)|=p^{3}$.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Let $H$ be any non-abelian proper subgroup of $G$. Since $G$ ia an $\mathcal{A}_{2^{-}}$ group, $H$ is maximal in $G$ and $H$ is an $\mathcal{A}_{1}$-group. Since $Z(G) \leq \Phi(G), Z(G) \leq$ $H$ and $Z(G) \leq Z(H)$. It follows by $|G: Z(G)|=p^{3}$ that $|H: Z(G)|=p^{2}$. Since $H$ is an $\mathcal{A}_{1}$-group, $|H: Z(H)|=p^{2}$ by Lemma 2.3. Hence $Z(G)=Z(H)$ and $G$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group.
Lemma 2.9. Let $G$ be an $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-group. Then $G$ is a $\mathcal{P}$-group if and only if $G$ is isomorphic to one of the following pairwise non-isomorphic groups:
(I) $d(G)=2$. In this case, $G$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-group.
(I-1) $G$ is a group of maximal class of order $p^{4}$, that is, $G$ is one of the groups (ii)-(iv) listed in [12, Theorem 3.2(2)];
(I-2) $G$ is one of the groups listed in [12, Theorems 3.5 and 3.9];
(II) $d(G)=3$. In this case, $G$ is an $\mathcal{S}$-group and $G$ is one of the groups (5-7) listed in [12, Theorem 3.6].

Proof. $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-groups are classified in [12] and they are listed in [12, Theorems 3.1, $3.2,3.5,3.6,3.9]$. Next, we check the groups one by one.

The groups in [12, Theorem 3.1] are metacyclic. They are not the required groups by Lemma 2.6.

If $G$ is one of the groups listed in [12, Theorem 3.2], then $|G|=p^{4}$. By Lemma 2.8, we get the groups (I-1).

If $G$ is one of groups listed in [12], Theorems 3.5 and 3.9], then $Z(G) \leq \Phi(G)$ and $|G: Z(G)|=p^{3}$ by a simple checking. Thus we get the groups (I-2) by Lemma 2.8.

Assume that $G$ is one of the groups (1-7) listed in [12, Theorem 3.6]. We have $Z(G) \not \leq \Phi(G)$ for the groups (1-3). Hence they are not $\mathcal{Q}$-groups by Lemma 2.8. Since $p$ is odd, the group (4) is not a $\mathcal{Q}$-group. On the other hand, by computation we have $Z(G)=\Phi(G)$ and $|G: Z(G)|=p^{3}$ for the groups (5-7), we get the groups (II) by Lemma 2.8 .

## 3. Main results

In this section, we give the classification of $\mathcal{P}$-groups. We know that $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{Q} \cup$ $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{S}=\emptyset$. It is enough to classify $\mathcal{Q}$-groups and $\mathcal{S}$-groups, respectively.

Theorem 3.1. Let $G$ be a finite non-abelian p-group. Then $G$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-group if and only if $G$ is isomorphic to one of the following pairwise non-isomorphic groups:
(I) $G$ is one of non-metacyclic $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-groups of order $\geq p^{5}$ with $d(G)=2$, that is, $G$ is one of the groups listed in [12, Theorems 3.5 and 3.9].
(II) $G$ is one of groups of maximal class with an abelian maximal subgroup;
(III) $G$ is one of the groups listed in [10, Theorem 3.13].

Proof. Let $G$ be a $\mathcal{Q}$-group. Due to the classification of finite $p$-groups whose non-abelian proper subgroups are generated by two elements in [10], what we need to do is to check those groups to be $\mathcal{Q}$-groups in the groups (1-7) listed in [10, Main Theorem].

Assume that $G$ is one of the groups (1), i.e., $G$ is an $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-groups. Since $G$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-group, $d(G)=2$. By Lemma 2.9, we get the groups (I) and the groups of maximal class of order $p^{4}$ which are contained in (II).

Assume that $G$ is one of the groups (2), i.e., $G$ is metacyclic. It follows by Lemma 2.6 that $G$ is not a $\mathcal{Q}$-group.

Assume that $G$ is one of the groups (3), i.e., $G$ is of maximal class with an abelian maximal subgroup. Then we get the groups (II) by Lemma 2.7.

Assume that $G$ is one of the groups (4), i.e., $G$ is a 3 -group of maximal class. Let $G_{1}$ be the fundamental subgroup of $G$. Then $G_{1}$ is abelian or minimal non-abelian by $\left[1, \S 9\right.$, Excise 10]. If $G_{1}$ is minimal non-abelian, then $\left|G_{1}: Z\left(G_{1}\right)\right|=9$. Since $G$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-group, $Z(G)=Z\left(G_{1}\right)$. Now we have $|G: Z(G)|=27$. It follows that $|G|=3^{4}$. Hence $G$ has an abelian maximal subgroup. However, all maximal subgroups except $G_{1}$ are of maximal class by [1, Theorem 9.6(e)], a contradiction. Thus $G_{1}$ is abelian. We get $G$ is one of the groups (II).

Assume that $G$ is one of the groups (5), i.e., $G$ is a $D_{p}^{\prime}(2)$-group. It follows by [10, Lemma 3.1(4)] that $G$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$-group. We get the groups (III).

Assume that $G$ is one of the groups (6) and (7). Clearly, there exists a subgroup $H$ of $G$ such that $Z(H) \neq Z(G)$. Hence, $G$ is not a $\mathcal{Q}$-group.

Theorem 3.2. Let $G$ be a finite non-abelian p-group. Then $G$ is an $\mathcal{S}$-group if and only if $G$ is isomorphic to one of the following pairwise non-isomorphic groups:
(1) $G=\left\langle a, b, c \mid a^{p^{n}}=b^{p^{2}}=c^{p^{2}}=1,[a, b]=c^{p},[c, a]=b^{-\nu p},[c, b]=1\right\rangle$, where $\nu$ is a fixed quadratic non-residue modulo $p$ and $n \geq 1$;
(2) $G=\left\langle a, b, c \mid a^{p^{n}}=b^{p^{2}}=c^{p^{2}}=1,[a, b]=c^{p},[c, a]=b^{u p} c^{p},[c, b]=1\right\rangle$, where $4 u=1-\rho^{2 r+1}$ with $1 \leq r \leq \frac{1}{2}(p-1)$ and $\rho$ the smallest positive integer which is a primitive root modulo $p$ and $n \geq 1$;
(3) $G=\left\langle a_{1}, a_{2}, b\right| a_{1}^{p^{2}}=a_{i}^{p^{q+1}}=a_{j}^{p^{q}}=b^{p^{n}}=1, a_{1}^{p}=a_{r+1}^{p^{q}},\left[a_{1}, b\right]=b^{p^{n-1}}$, $\left.\left[a_{k}, b\right]=a_{k+1},\left[a_{p}, b\right]=\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{-\binom{p}{t-1}},\left[a_{u}, a_{v}\right]=1\right\rangle$, where $2 \leq c=(p-1) q+r$, $1 \leq r \leq p-1,2 \leq i \leq r+1, r+2 \leq j \leq p, 2 \leq k \leq p-1,1 \leq u, v \leq p, n \geq 2$ and $|G|=p^{n+c+1}$.

In brief, each $\mathcal{S}$-group is an extension of an abelian p-group by a cyclic group.
Proof. First, we prove that the groups listed in the theorem are $\mathcal{S}$-groups. Suppose that $G$ is (1) or (2). Then $G$ is an $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-group by [12, Theorem 3.6]. It follows by Lemma 2.9(II) that $G$ is an $\mathcal{S}$-group.

Suppose that $G$ is one of the groups (3). Then

$$
Z(G)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle \text { and } G^{\prime}=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, a_{2}^{p}, a_{3}, \ldots, a_{p}, b^{p^{n-1}}\right\rangle
$$

Moreover, $M=\left\langle a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle$ is the unique abelian maximal subgroup of $G$.

Let $H$ be a non-abelian subgroup of $G$. We prove $Z(H)=Z(G)$.
First, $Z(H) \leq H \cap M$ since $H \cap M$ is an abelian maximal subgroup of $H$. Notice that $G=M H$ and $M$ is abelian. Thus $Z(H) \leq Z(G)$. On the other hand, since every non-abelian subgroup $H$ contains a minimal non-abelian subgroup $K$, it is enough to prove $Z(G) \leq Z(K)$.

Clearly, there exists an element $k \in K \backslash M$. Since $G=M\langle b\rangle$, we can assume that $k=b m$ and $K=\left\langle k, m^{\prime}\right\rangle$, where $m, m^{\prime} \in M$. Since

$$
k^{p} \in C_{M}(k)=C_{M}(b m)=C_{M}(b)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle,
$$

$k^{p}=(b m)^{p}=a_{1}^{i p} b^{j p}$ for some $i$ and $j$. By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$
\left.k^{p}=(b m)^{p}=b^{p} m^{p}\left[b, m^{-1}\right]^{\binom{p}{2}}\left[2 b, m^{-1}\right]\right]_{\binom{p}{3}} \cdots\left[(p-1) b, m^{-1}\right] \begin{gathered}
\binom{p}{p}
\end{gathered} .
$$

Hence, $j \equiv 1(\bmod p)$ and $k^{p}=a_{1}^{i p} b^{(1+v p) p}$. Moreover, $b^{p^{2}} \in K$.
It is clear that

$$
\left[b, m^{\prime}\right]=\left[k, m^{\prime}\right] \in C_{G^{\prime}}(k)=C_{G^{\prime}}(b)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p^{n-1}}\right\rangle
$$

Hence, we can assume that $\left[b, m^{\prime}\right]=a_{1}^{i^{\prime} p} b^{j^{\prime} p^{n-1}}$, where $p \nmid i^{\prime}$ or $p \nmid j^{\prime}$. Since

$$
\left[a_{1}, b\right]=b^{p^{n-1}} \text { and }\left[a_{r}^{p^{q}}, b\right]=a_{r+1}^{p^{q}}=a_{1}^{p}
$$

$\left[b, m^{\prime} a_{1}^{j^{\prime}} a_{r}^{i^{\prime} p^{q}}\right]=1$ and $m^{\prime} a_{1}^{j^{\prime}} a_{r}^{i^{\prime} p^{q}} \in C_{M}(b)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle$. Thus

$$
m^{\prime}=a_{1}^{-j_{1}^{\prime}+s p} a_{r}^{-i^{\prime} p^{q}} b^{p l}
$$

for some integers $s, t$ and $l$.
If $p \nmid j^{\prime}$, then $m^{\prime p}=a_{1}^{-p j^{\prime}} b^{p^{2} l}$. Since $b^{p^{2}} \in K, a_{1}^{p} \in K$. If $p \mid j^{\prime}$, then $p \nmid i^{\prime}$ and $\left[k, m^{\prime}\right]=a_{1}^{i^{\prime} p}$. Hence $a_{1}^{p} \in K$.

It follows by $k^{p}=a_{1}^{i p} b^{p(1+v p)}$ that $b^{p} \in K$. Therefore, $Z(G)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle \leq K$, and hence $Z(G) \leq Z(K)$. Thus $G$ is an $\mathcal{S}$-group.

Now we prove $\mathcal{S}$-groups are exactly the groups listed in the theorem.
Let $G$ be an $\mathcal{S}$-group. Then $G$ has one non-abelian subgroup $H$ with $d(H)>$ 2. Assume $H$ is the subgroup of $G$ with the smallest order such that $d(H)>2$. Let $|G: H|=p^{s}$. We prove the result by induction on $s$.

If $s=0$, then $H=G$. It follows that all non-abelian proper subgroups $H$ of $G$ are generated by two elements. Hence, $d(G)=d(H)=3$. By [10, Main Results], $G$ is an $\mathcal{A}_{2}$-group with an abelian maximal subgroup. It follows by Lemma 2.9 that $G$ is one of the groups (5-7) listed in [12, Theorem 3.6], that is, one of the groups ( $1-2$ ) and (3) with $c=2$. In other words, the theorem is true for $s=0$. Now, let $M$ be a maximal subgroup of $G$ such that $H \leq M$. Then $|M: H|=p^{s-1}$. By induction hypothesis, $M$ is an $\mathcal{S}$-group. Thus $M$ is isomorphic to one of the groups listed in the theorem. Let $x \in G \backslash M$. Then $G$ is a cyclic extension of $M$ by $\langle x\rangle$. We will prove $G$ is exactly the group (3) with $c>2$.

Case 1. $M$ is isomorphic to the group (1) in the theorem. That is, $M \cong$ $\left\langle a, b, c \mid a^{p^{n}}=b^{p^{2}}=c^{p^{2}}=1,[a, b]=c^{p},[c, a]=b^{-\nu p},[c, b]=1\right\rangle$, where $\nu$ is a fixed quadratic non-residue modulo $p, n \geq 1$.

We will prove there is no $\mathcal{S}$-group $G$ which contains $M$ as its maximal subgroup in this case. Otherwise, we will deduce a contradiction.

First we have $Z(M)=\left\langle a^{p}, b^{p}, c^{p}\right\rangle$ and $M$ has exactly one abelian maximal subgroup $A=\left\langle a^{p}, b, c\right\rangle$. Hence, $A \unlhd G$ and $G^{\prime} \leq A$ since $|G / A|=p^{2}$. By hypotheses,

$$
Z(G)=Z(M)=\left\langle a^{p}, b^{p}, c^{p}\right\rangle
$$

Let $x \in G \backslash M$. Then $G=\langle x, a, b, c\rangle$. We will deduce a contradiction by the following steps.
(1) $[b, x]=[c, x]=1$.

Since
$[M, A, G] \leq\left[M^{\prime}, G\right] \leq[Z(M), G]=[Z(G), G]=1$ and $[G, M, A] \leq\left[G^{\prime}, A\right]=1$, $[A, G, M]=1$ by the Three Subgroups Lemma. Hence,

$$
[A, G] \leq C_{A}(M)=Z(M)=\left\langle a^{p}, b^{p}, c^{p}\right\rangle
$$

Let $[b, x]=a^{p s} b^{p t} c^{p u}$. Since $1=\left[b^{p}, x\right]=[b, x]^{p}=a^{p^{2} s}, p^{n-2} \mid s$. Hence we can assume that $[b, x]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{2}} b^{p j_{2}} c^{p k_{2}}$. Since $\left[b, x a^{k_{2}}\right]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{2}} b^{p j_{2}}$, we can assume by replacing $x$ with $x a^{k_{2}}$ that

$$
[b, x]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{2}} b^{p j_{2}}
$$

If $[b, x] \neq 1$, then $p \nmid i_{2}$ or $p \nmid j_{2}$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that $\langle b, x\rangle$ is minimal non-abelian. By Lemma 2.4,

$$
x^{p} \in Z(\langle b, x\rangle)=Z(G)=\left\langle a^{p}, b^{p}, c^{p}\right\rangle
$$

Let $x^{p}=a^{p i} b^{p j} c^{p k}$. Since

$$
\left[b, x c^{-k}\right]=[b, x]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{2}} b^{p j_{2}} \neq 1
$$

$\left\langle b, x c^{-k}\right\rangle$ is minimal non-abelian by Lemma 2.3. Since $\left(x c^{-k}\right)^{p}=x^{p} c^{-p k}=$ $a^{p i} b^{p j}$, we have, by Lemma 2.4,

$$
Z\left(\left\langle b, x c^{-k}\right\rangle\right)=\left\langle b^{p},\left(x c^{-k}\right)^{p},\left[b, x c^{-k}\right]\right\rangle=\left\langle b^{p}, a^{p i} b^{p j}, a^{p^{n-1} i_{2}} b^{p j_{2}}\right\rangle
$$

Since $c^{p} \in Z(G)$ and $c^{p} \notin Z\left(\left\langle b, x c^{-k}\right\rangle\right)$,

$$
Z\left(\left\langle b, x c^{-k}\right\rangle\right) \neq Z(G)
$$

This is a contradiction. Hence, $[b, x]=1$. By Lemma 2.5, we also have $[c, x]=$ 1.
(2) $[a, x]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{1}}$.

Let $[a, x]=a^{p m} b^{s} c^{t}$. By Lemma 2.1, $\left[a^{p}, x\right]=\prod_{i=1}^{p}[i a, x]^{\binom{p}{i}}$. Moreover, since

$$
[a, x, a]=\left[a^{p m} b^{s} c^{t}, a\right]=b^{-t v p} c^{-s p} \text { and } G_{4}=1
$$

we have

$$
\left[a^{p}, x\right]=\prod_{i=1}^{p}[i a, x]^{\binom{p}{i}}=[a, x]^{p}=a^{p^{2} m} b^{p s} c^{p t}
$$

On the other hand, $\left[a^{p}, x\right]=1$ since $a^{p} \in Z(G)$. Thus

$$
a^{p^{2} m} b^{p s} c^{p t}=1
$$

It follows that $p^{n-2}|m, p| s$ and $p \mid t$. Hence, we can assume that

$$
[a, x]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{1}} b^{p j_{1}} c^{p k_{1}}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[a, x b^{-k_{1}} c^{-j_{1} v^{-1}}\right]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{1}},\left[b, x b^{-k_{1}} c^{-j_{1} v^{-1}}\right]=[b, x] \text { and }} \\
& {\left[c, x b^{-k_{1}} c^{-j_{1} v^{-1}}\right]=[c, x]}
\end{aligned}
$$

we can assume by replacing $x$ with $x b^{-k_{1}} c^{-j_{1} v^{-1}}$ that

$$
[a, x]=a^{p^{n-1} i_{1}}
$$

(3) a final contradiction

Since $x \notin Z(G),[a, x] \neq 1$. Thus $\langle a, x\rangle$ is minimal non-abelian. Moreover, by Lemma 2.6 we have

$$
Z(\langle a, x\rangle)=\left\langle a^{p}, x^{p},[a, x]\right\rangle=\left\langle a^{p}, x^{p}\right\rangle .
$$

On the other hand, $Z(G)=\left\langle a^{p}, b^{p}, c^{p}\right\rangle$. Thus

$$
Z(\langle a, x\rangle) \neq Z(G)
$$

This is a contradiction.
Case 2. $M$ is isomorphic to the group (2) in the theorem. That is, $M=$ $\left\langle a, b, c \mid a^{p^{n}}=b^{p^{2}}=c^{p^{2}}=1,[a, b]=c^{p},[c, a]=b^{u p} c^{p},[c, b]=1\right\rangle$, where $4 u=1-\rho^{2 r+1}$ with $1 \leq r \leq \frac{1}{2}(p-1)$ and $\rho$ the smallest positive integer which is a primitive root modular $p, n \geq 1$.

Using the same argument as that of Case 1, we also prove that there is no $\mathcal{S}$-group which contains $M$ as its maximal subgroup in this case. The details are omitted.

Case 3. $M$ is isomorphic to the group (3) in the theorem. That is,

$$
M=\left\langle a_{1}, a_{2}, b\right| a_{1}^{p^{2}}=a_{i}^{p^{q+1}}=a_{j}^{p^{q}}=b^{p^{n}}=1, a_{1}^{p}=a_{r+1}^{p^{q}},\left[a_{1}, b\right]=b^{p^{n-1}},
$$ $\left.\left[a_{k}, b\right]=a_{k+1},\left[a_{p}, b\right]=\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{-\binom{p}{t-1}},\left[a_{u}, a_{v}\right]=1\right\rangle$, where $2 \leq c=(p-1) q+r$, $1 \leq r \leq p-1,2 \leq i \leq r+1, r+2 \leq j \leq p, 2 \leq k \leq p-1,1 \leq u, v \leq p, n \geq 2$.

It is clear that $Z(M)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle$ and $M$ has exactly one abelian maximal subgroup $A=\left\langle b^{p}, a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{p}\right\rangle$. Hence, $A \unlhd G$ and $G^{\prime} \leq A$ since $|G / A|=p^{2}$. Take $x \in G \backslash M$. Then $G=\langle x, a, b, c\rangle$. We prove there exists an $\mathcal{S}$-group $G$ such that $M$ is a maximal subgroup of $G$ by the following steps.
(1) $\left[x, a_{i}\right]=1$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$, i.e., $x \in C_{G}(A)$.

Since

$$
\left[M_{c-1}, M, G\right] \leq[Z(M), G]=1 \text { and }\left[M, G, M_{c-1}\right] \leq[A, A]=1
$$

$\left[G, M_{c-1}, M\right]=1$ by the Three Subgroup Lemma. Hence $\left[x, M_{c-1}\right] \leq Z(M)=$ $Z(G)$. Since $M_{c-1}=\left\langle a_{r}^{p^{q}}, a_{r+1}^{p^{q}}\right\rangle,\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]=a_{1}^{p i_{c}} b^{p j_{c}}$. Notice that $a_{r}^{p^{q+1}}=1$. Thus

$$
1=\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q+1}}\right]=\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]^{p}=b^{p^{2} j_{c}}
$$

It follows that

$$
p^{n-2} \mid j_{c} \text { and }\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]=a_{1}^{p i_{c}} b^{p^{n-1} j_{c}^{\prime}}
$$

Since $\left[a_{r}^{p^{q}}, b\right]=a_{1}^{p}$, we can assume that $\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]=b^{j_{c}^{\prime} p^{n-1}}$ by replacing $x$ with $x b^{i_{c}}$. We will prove $\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]=1$.

Otherwise, $\left\langle x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right\rangle$ is minimal non-abelian. Hence

$$
Z\left(\left\langle x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right\rangle\right)=\left\langle x^{p},\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]\right\rangle=\left\langle x^{p}, b^{j^{\prime} p^{n-1}}\right\rangle=Z(G)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle .
$$

It follows that $n=2$ and $x^{p}=a_{1}^{i p} b^{j p}$, where $p \nmid i$.
Let $H=\left\langle a_{r}^{p^{q}}, a_{1}^{-i} x\right\rangle$. Then $\left[a_{1}^{-i} x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]=b_{c}^{j_{c}^{\prime} p}$ and $H$ is minimal non-abelian. By Lemma 2.4, we get $Z(H)=\left\langle\left(a_{1}^{-i} x\right)^{p},\left[a_{1}^{-i} x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]\right\rangle$. Moreover, we have

$$
Z(H)=\left\langle b^{p}\right\rangle \neq Z(G)
$$

since $\left(a_{1}^{-i} x\right)^{p}=b^{j p}$ and $\left[a_{1}^{-i} x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]=b^{j_{c}^{\prime} p}$. This is a contradiction. Hence, $\left[x, a_{r}^{p^{q}}\right]=1$. It follows by Lemma 2.5 that

$$
\left[x, a_{1}\right]=\left[x, a_{2}\right]=\cdots=\left[x, a_{p}\right]=1
$$

(2) $[x, b]=a_{2}$.

Let

$$
[x, b]=a_{1}^{i_{1}} a_{2}^{i_{2}} \cdots a_{p}^{i_{p}} b^{p j} .
$$

Since $\left[a_{k}, b\right]=a_{k+1}$ for $k=2, \ldots, p-1$, we can assume by replacing $x$ with $x a_{2}^{-i_{3}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{-i_{p}}$ that

$$
[x, b]=a_{1}^{i_{1}} a_{2}^{i_{2}} b^{p j}
$$

Hence, $[x, 2 b]=b^{i_{1} p^{n-1}} a_{3}^{i_{2}},[x, 3 b]=a_{4}^{i_{2}}, \ldots,[x,(p-1) b]=a_{p}^{i_{2}}, \quad[x, p b]=$ $\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{-\left({ }_{t-1}^{p}\right) i_{2}}$.

Since $b^{p} \in Z(G)$, we have by Lemma 2.1

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 & =\left[x, b^{p}\right]=[x, b]^{\binom{p}{1}}[x, 2 b]^{\binom{p}{2}} \cdots[x, p b]^{\binom{p}{p}} \\
& =a_{1}^{p i_{1}} a_{2}^{p i_{2}} b^{p^{2} j} a_{3}^{i_{2}\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p}^{i_{2}\binom{p}{2}} \prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{-\binom{p}{t-1} i_{2}} \\
& =a_{1}^{p i_{1}} b^{p^{2} j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that $p \mid i_{1}$ and $p^{n-2} \mid j$. Thus

$$
[x, b]=a_{1}^{p i_{1}} a_{2}^{i_{2}} b^{p^{n-1} j}
$$

Moreover, by Lemma 2.2 we can do a suitable replacement such that

$$
[x, b]=a_{2}^{i_{2}}
$$

If $p \mid i_{2}$, then $[x, b]=a_{2}^{p i_{2}^{\prime}}$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists $a \in A$ such that $[a, b]=a_{2}^{p}$. Hence, $\left[x a^{-i_{2}^{\prime}}, b\right]=1$ and $x a^{-i_{2}^{\prime}} \in Z(G)=Z(M) \leq M$. It follows that $x \in M$, a contradiction. Thus, $p \nmid i_{2}$. Replacing $x$ by $x^{i_{2}^{-1}}$, we can assume that $[x, b]=a_{2}$.
(3) $x^{p}=\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{-\binom{p}{t}}$.

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\left[a_{p}, b\right] } & =\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{-\binom{p}{t-1}}=a_{2}^{-\binom{p}{1}} a_{3}^{-\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p}^{-\binom{p}{p-1}} \\
& =a_{2}^{-p}\left[a_{2}, b\right]^{-\binom{p}{2}} \cdots\left[a_{p-1}, b\right]^{-\binom{p}{p-1}} \\
& =a_{2}^{-p}\left[a_{2}^{-\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{-\left(\begin{array}{c}
p-1
\end{array}\right)}, b\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

we have

$$
a_{2}^{p}=\left[a_{2}^{-\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{-\left(\begin{array}{c}
p-1
\end{array}\right)} a_{p}^{-\binom{p}{p}}, b\right] .
$$

On the other hand, $a_{2}^{p}=[x, b]^{p}=\left[x^{p}, b\right]$ by (2). It follows that

$$
\left[x^{p} a_{2}^{\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{\binom{p}{p-1}} a_{p}^{\binom{p}{p}}, b\right]=1
$$

and

$$
x^{p} a_{2}^{\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{\binom{p}{p}} a_{p}^{\binom{p}{p}} \in Z(G)=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}, b^{p}\right\rangle .
$$

Hence, we can assume that

$$
x^{p}=a_{1}^{i p} b^{j p} a_{2}^{-\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{-\binom{p}{p}} a_{p}^{-\binom{p}{p}}
$$

If $p \nmid j$, then $\left(x^{j^{-1}} b^{-1}\right)^{p}=a_{1}^{p j^{-1} i}$ by Lemma 2.1. Let $H=\left\langle a_{r}^{p^{q}}, x^{j^{-1}} b^{-1}\right\rangle$. Then $H^{\prime}=\left\langle a_{1}^{p}\right\rangle$. By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6, we have $H$ is minimal non-abelian and $Z(H)=\left\langle a^{p}\right\rangle \neq Z(G)$, a contradiction. Hence $p \mid j$. Thus

$$
x^{p}=a_{1}^{i p} b^{p^{2} j^{\prime}} a_{2}^{-\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{-\binom{p}{p}} a_{p}^{-\binom{p}{p}} .
$$

Replacing $x$ by $x a_{1}^{-i} b^{-p j^{\prime}}$, we have

$$
x^{p}=a_{2}^{-\binom{p}{2}} \cdots a_{p-1}^{-\binom{p}{p}} a_{p}^{-\binom{p}{p}} .
$$

Let

$$
a_{1}^{\prime}=a_{1}, a_{2}^{\prime}=x, a_{3}^{\prime}=a_{2} b^{-i p^{n-1}}, a_{4}^{\prime}=a_{3}, \ldots, a_{p}^{\prime}=a_{p-1}
$$

Then, by an argument above, now we have

$$
a_{1}^{\prime p^{2}}=b^{p^{n}}=1,\left[a_{1}^{\prime}, b\right]=b^{p^{n-1}},\left[a_{2}^{\prime}, b\right]=a_{3}^{\prime}, \ldots,\left[a_{p-1}^{\prime}, b\right]=a_{p}^{\prime},\left[a_{p}^{\prime}, b\right]=\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{-\left({ }_{t-1}^{p}\right)}
$$

Moreover, by the hypothesis of $M$ and the relations between $a_{i}$ and $a_{i}^{\prime}$ we get the following:

If $r \leq p-2$, then

$$
a_{2}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=a_{3}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=\cdots=a_{r+2}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=a_{r+3}^{\prime p^{q}}=\cdots=a_{p}^{\prime p^{q}}=1, a_{1}^{p}=a_{r+2}^{\prime p^{q}}
$$

Thus
$G=\left\langle a_{1}^{\prime}, a_{2}^{\prime}, x\right| a_{1}^{\prime p^{2}}=a_{2}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=a_{3}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=\cdots=a_{r+2}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=a_{r+3}^{\prime p^{q}}=\cdots=a_{p}^{\prime p^{q}}=$ $b^{p^{n}}=1, a_{1}^{p}=a_{r+2}^{\prime p^{q}},\left[a_{1}^{\prime}, b\right]=b^{p^{n-1}},\left[a_{2}^{\prime}, b\right]=a_{3}^{\prime}, \ldots,\left[a_{p-1}^{\prime}, b\right]=a_{p}^{\prime},\left[a_{p}^{\prime}, b\right]=$ $\left.\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{\binom{p-1}{t-1}},\left[a_{u}^{\prime}, a_{v}^{\prime}\right]=1\right\rangle$, where $1 \leq u, v \leq p$, which is a group (3) in the theorem with $q^{\prime}=q$ and $r^{\prime}=r+1$.

If $r=p-1$, then

$$
a_{2}^{\prime p^{q+2}}=a_{3}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=\cdots=a_{p}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=1, a_{1}^{p}=a_{2}^{\prime p^{q+1}}
$$

Hence
$\quad G=\left\langle a_{1}^{\prime}, a_{2}^{\prime}, x\right| a_{1}^{\prime p^{2}}=a_{2}^{\prime p^{q+2}}=a_{3}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=\cdots=a_{p}^{\prime p^{q+1}}=b^{p^{n}}=1, a_{1}^{p}=a_{2}^{\prime p^{q+1}}$,
$\left.\left[a_{1}^{\prime}, b\right]=b^{p^{n-1}},\left[a_{2}^{\prime}, b\right]=a_{3}^{\prime}, \ldots,\left[a_{p-1}^{\prime}, b\right]=a_{p}^{\prime},\left[a_{p}^{\prime}, b\right]=\prod_{t=2}^{p} a_{t}^{\left({ }_{t-1}^{p}\right)},\left[a_{u}^{\prime}, a_{v}^{\prime}\right]=1\right\rangle$, where $1 \leq u, v \leq p$, which is a group (3) in the theorem with $q^{\prime}=q+1$ and $r^{\prime}=1$.

Finally, we prove that the groups listed in the theorem are pairwise nonisomorphic. It is clear that $d(Z(G))=3$ for the groups (1-2) and $d(Z(G))=2$ for the groups (3). Thus, the groups (1) and (2) are not isomorphic to the groups (3). By [12, Theorem 3.6], the groups (1) are not isomorphic to the groups (2).

Remark. From Theorem 3.2, we observe that an $\mathcal{S}$-group is generated by three elements and has a unique abelian maximal subgroup.
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