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1. Introduction. Let $G$ be a group. A precrossed $G$-module is a group homomorphism $\partial: M \rightarrow G$ together with a group action $(\mathrm{g}, \mathrm{m}) \mapsto{ }^{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{m}$ of G on M , such that $\partial\left(\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)=\mathrm{g}(\partial \mathrm{m}) \mathrm{g}^{-1}$. The Peiffer commutator $<\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{m}^{\prime}>$ of two elements $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{m}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{M}$ is defined as

$$
<\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{~m}^{\prime}>=\mathrm{mm}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{-1}\left({ }^{2 \mathrm{~m}} \mathrm{~m}^{\prime}\right)^{-1}
$$

If all Peiffer commutators are trivial, the precrossed G-module is said to be a crossed $G$-module. The subgroup $<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}>$ generated by all Peiffer commutators is called the Peiffer subgroup of $\mathbf{M}$; it is the second term of a lower Peiffer central series (see below). The following table indicates how these concepts reduce to more standard concepts when restrictions are placed on $\partial$ and $G$.

## Restrictions:

| Concepts: | $\partial(\mathrm{M})=1$ | $\partial(\mathrm{M})=\mathrm{G}$ | $\operatorname{ker}(\partial)=1$ | $\mathrm{G}=1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| precrossed <br> G-module | group with G-action | - | normal <br> subgroup of G | group |
| crossed G- module | ZG-module | central extension of G | $\begin{aligned} & \text { normal } \\ & \text { subgroup of } \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | abelian group |
| Peiffer commutator | commutator | - | trivial element | commutator |
| Peiffer subgroup | $\bullet$ | - | trivial subgroup | derived subgroup |
| Peiffer central series | - | - | - | central series. |

Furthermore, any $Z G$-module $A$ gives rise to a precrossed $G$-module $\partial: A \rtimes G \rightarrow G$, $(a, g) \mapsto g$ in which the action of $G$ on the direct product $M=A \rtimes G$ is given by ${ }^{g}\left(a, g^{\prime}\right)=\left({ }^{g} a, g g^{\prime} g^{-1}\right)$. In this example the Peiffer subgroup of M lies in the module A . More precisely, $<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}>=\mathrm{IG} . \mathrm{A}$ where $\mathrm{IG}=\operatorname{ker}(\mathrm{ZG} \rightarrow \mathrm{Z})$ is the augmentation ideal of G .

Interest in precrossed G-modules stems from algebraic topology: a precrossed G-module corresponds exactly to that low dimensional part of a CW-space which gives a presentation of the fundamental group. Thus (pre)crossed modules arise in combinatorial group theory (see [3] and [13] for references) and in low dimensional homotopy (see [1] and [3] for references); they are also central to a body of work on nonabelian cohomology (see [6] and [10] for references).

It would be of interest to know just how much of the extensive algebraic theory on group commutators extends to Peiffer commutators. For instance, it is shown in a substantial paper of H. J. Baues and D. Conduché [2] that the Magnus-Witt result on the quotients of the lower central series of a free group extends to a result on lower Peiffer central series. Furthermore, it is shown in [7] that results of C. Miller [12] and J. Stallings [14] on homology and central series of groups extend to Peiffer central series.

The aim of the present paper is to obtain a Peiffer commutator version of the result of P . Hall [11] which states that $\gamma_{c+1} G$ is finite whenever $G / Z_{c}(G)$ is finite (where $\gamma_{c+1}(G)$ and $Z_{c}(G)$ denote terms of the lower and upper central series of the group $\left.G\right)$. The appropriate lower Peiffer central series was defined in [2], and a corresponding upper central series is introduced below. We also obtain a Peiffer commutator version of J. Wiegold's bound [15] on the order of $\gamma_{2}(G)$ given that $G / Z_{1}(G)$ is of prime power order $p^{\text {a }}$. Our proofs of the Peiffer versions of these results rely on the finiteness of a nonabelian tensor product of groups [8], which in turn relies on the transfer homomorphism in group homology.
2. Statement of results. Let $\partial: \mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}$ be a precrossed G -module. Given two subgroups N and $\mathrm{N}^{\prime}$ of M , we let $<\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}^{\prime}>$ denote the subgroup of M generated by the Peiffer commutators $<\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{n}^{\prime}>$ for $\mathrm{n} \in \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{n}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{N}^{\prime}$. We let $\ll \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}^{\prime} \gg$ denote the subgroup of M generated by the Peiffer commutators $<n, n^{\prime}>$ and $<n^{\prime}, n>$ for $n \in N, n^{\prime} \in N^{\prime}$. We say that a subgroup N of M is $G$-invariant if $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{n}} \in \mathrm{N}$ for all $\mathrm{g} \in \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{n} \in \mathrm{N}$.

Recall from [2] that the lower Peiffer central series $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})(\mathrm{n} \geq 1)$ is defined by inductively setting

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P \gamma_{1}(M)=M \\
& P \gamma_{n}(M)=\ll M, P \gamma_{n-1}(M) \gg \quad \text { for } n \geq 2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $P \gamma_{2}(M)$ is just the Peiffer subgroup $<M, M>$, and that $P \gamma_{n}(M)$ contains $P \gamma_{n+1}(M)$. We observe in Section 3 that each $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ is a G -invariant normal subgroup of M .

Let us define the Peiffer centre to be

$$
P Z(M)=\{a \in M:<x, a>=1=<a, x>\text { for all } x \in M\}
$$

More generally, given two subsets Z and $\Gamma$ of M , define

$$
V(Z, \Gamma)=\{a \in M:<x, a>\in Z \text { and }<a, x>\in Z \text { for all } x \in \Gamma\}
$$

Note that $\mathrm{PZ}(\mathrm{M})=\mathrm{V}(1, \mathrm{M})$. We observe in Section 3 that, if $Z$ and $\Gamma$ are $G$-invariant normal subgroups of M , then $V(Z, \Gamma)$ is a G -invariant (but not necessarily normal) subgroup of M .

Let us define an upper Peiffer central series $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})(\mathrm{n} \geq 1)$ by inductively setting

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
P Z_{0}(\mathrm{M})=1 \\
\mathrm{PZ} Z_{1}(\mathrm{M})=\mathrm{PZ}(\mathrm{M}), \\
\mathrm{PZ} Z_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})=\bigcap_{\substack{i+j=\mathrm{n} \\
i \geq 0 . j \geq 1}} \mathrm{~V}(\mathrm{PZ}
\end{array} \mathrm{i}(\mathrm{M}), \mathrm{P} \gamma_{j}(\mathrm{M})\right)(\mathrm{n} \geq 1) .
$$

In other words $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ is the intersection of those subsets $\mathrm{V}\left(\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{M}), \mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{j}}(\mathrm{M})\right)$ with $\mathrm{i}+\mathrm{j}=\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{i} \geq 0, \mathrm{j} \geq 1$.

Observe (by induction) that $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ is contained in $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}+1}(\mathrm{M})$. In Section 3 we show that each $P Z_{n}(M)$ is a $G$-invariant normal subgroup of $M$, and that $P Z_{n}(M)=M$ if and only if $P \gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1}(\mathrm{M})=1$.

Following [2] we say that the precrossed module $\partial: M \rightarrow G$ is Peiffer nilpotent of class $n$ if $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1}(\mathrm{M})=1$. Thus precrossed modules of Peiffer nilpotency class 1 are just crossed modules, and as such were introduced by J. H. C. Whitehead (cf. [1][3]) as an algebraic model of homotopy 2 -types. Precrossed modules of Peiffer nilpotency class 2 are an essential ingredient in the algebraic model of homotopy 3-types introduced and developed by Baues in [1].

Our main results are:
Theorem 1. For $\mathrm{n} \geq 0$, if the quotient group $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ is finite, then so too is the subgroup $\mathrm{P}_{\gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1}}(\mathrm{M})$.

Theorem 2. If $|\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}(\mathrm{M})|=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{a}}$ for some prime p , then $|<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}>| \leq \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{a}^{2}}$.
The bound of Theorem 2 is not "best possible". For instance, if $G=1$ then $M$ is just a group and $<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}>=[\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}], \mathrm{PZ}(\mathrm{M})=\mathrm{Z}_{1}(\mathrm{M})$. In this case Wiegold's bound [15] states that $|[M, M]| \leq p^{\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{a}-1) / 2}$ when $\left|\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{Z}_{1}(\mathrm{M})\right|=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{a}}$.
3. Proof of results. Recall from [2], [7] that Peiffer commutators satisfy the following easily verified identities for all $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z} \in \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{g} \in \mathrm{G}$, and $\mathrm{k} \in \operatorname{ker}(\partial)$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
&<x, y z>\left.=<x, y\rangle^{\partial x} y<x, z\right\rangle^{\partial x} y^{-1},  \tag{1}\\
&<x y, z>=x<y, z>x^{-1}<x^{\partial y} z>  \tag{2}\\
& g^{g}<x, y>=<^{g} x,{ }^{g} y>  \tag{3}\\
&<k, m>=k m k^{-1} m^{-1},  \tag{4}\\
&<k, m><m, k>=k^{\partial m} k^{-1} . \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

We shall write $\mathrm{N} \leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ to indicate that N is a G-invariant normal subgroup of M . The following lemma is an easy consequence of the Peiffer identities (1)-(3).

Lemma 3. (i) If $\mathrm{N} \leq{ }_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ then $<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{N}>\leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ and $<\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{M}>\leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$. (ii) If $\mathrm{N} \leq{ }_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ then $\ll \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{N} \gg \leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$.

Assertion (ii) of this lemma implies that each term of the lower Peiffer central series $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ is a G -invariant normal subgroup of M .

Identities (1) and (2) imply that the Peiffer centre $\mathrm{PZ}(\mathrm{M})$ is a subgroup of M . Identity (3) implies that $\mathrm{PZ}(\mathrm{M})$ is G -invariant (and hence normal in M ). More generally we have:

Lemma 4. If $\mathrm{Z} \leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ and $\Gamma \leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ then $\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{Z}, \Gamma)$ is a G -invariant subgroup of M .
Lemma 5. $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M}) \leq{ }_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ for all $\mathrm{n} \geq 0$.
Proof. Certainly $\mathrm{PZ}_{0}(\mathrm{M}) \leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$. Suppose, as an inductive hypothesis, that $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{j}}(\mathrm{M}) \leq_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{M}$ for $\mathrm{j}<\mathrm{n}$. Lemma 4 implies that $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ is a G -invariant subgroup of M . To prove normality, choose $\mathrm{a} \in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ and $m \in M$, and note that

$$
\left.\mathrm{mam}^{-1}=<\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{a}\right\rangle^{\partial \mathrm{m}} \mathrm{a} .
$$

Since $<\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{a}>\in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}-1}(\mathrm{M}) \subseteq \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$ and ${ }^{\partial \mathrm{m}} \mathrm{a} \in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$, it follows that mam ${ }^{-1}$ lies in $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$.

For an indeterminate x we set

$$
<\mathrm{x}\rangle=\mathrm{x}
$$

and call $<\mathrm{x}>$ a bracketing of weight 1 with variable $x$. For $\mathrm{n} \geq 2$ we define a bracketing of weight $n$ to be an arrangement $<u, u^{\prime}>$ with $u$ and $u^{\prime}$ bracketings of weights $i, j \geq 1$ where $\mathrm{i}+\mathrm{j}=\mathrm{n}$ and where u and $\mathrm{u}^{\prime}$ have distinct variables. The variables involved in $u$ and $u^{\prime}$ will be the variables of $\left\langle u, u^{\prime}\right\rangle$. For example,

$$
\ll \mathrm{v}, \mathrm{w}>, \ll \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}>, \mathrm{z} \gg
$$

is a bracketing of weight 5 with variables $\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{w}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$. We shall let

$$
\ll x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \gg
$$

denote an arbitrary bracketing of weight $n$ with variables $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$. For instance $\ll \mathrm{w}, \mathrm{v}, \mathrm{z}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \gg$ could denote the above bracketing of weight 5 .

Lemma 2.11 in [2] implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
<x, y>\in P \gamma_{i+j}(M) \quad \text { whenever } \quad x \in P \gamma_{i}(M), \quad y \in P \gamma_{j}(M) . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, if each variable of a bracketing $\ll \mathrm{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}} \gg$ is set equal to some element of M , the bracketing determines an element of $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$.

Lemma 6. For $\mathrm{n} \geq 1$ the following two conditions on an element a in M are equivalent:
(i) $\mathrm{a} \in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})$;
(ii) a is such that $\ll \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{t}} \gg=1$ for all bracketings of weight $\mathrm{t}+1$ with $\mathrm{l} \leq \mathrm{t} \leq \mathrm{n}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}} \in \mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{j}}}(\mathrm{M})$, and $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}}+\ldots+\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}} \geq \mathrm{n}$.

Proof. Let us first show that (ii) implies (i). This is certainly true for $\mathrm{n}=1$. As an inductive hypothesis suppose that (ii) implies (i) when $n=k$. Let $a \in M$ satisfy (ii) for $n=k+1$. We need to show that $\mathrm{a} \in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{k}+1}(\mathrm{M})$. We set $\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{k}+1$. For an arbitrary integer $\mathrm{l} \leq i \leq n$, and an arbitrary element $\mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{M})$, let us set $\alpha=<\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{y}>$ and $\alpha^{\prime}=<\mathrm{y}, \mathrm{a}>$. We need to show that
$\alpha, \alpha^{\prime} \in \mathrm{P} Z_{\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{M})$. But $\ll \alpha, \mathrm{x}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{s}} \gg=1$ for $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}} \in \mathrm{P} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathrm{i}_{j}}(\mathrm{M})$ with $\mathrm{i}_{1}+\ldots+\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{s}} \geq \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}$. The inductive hypothesis implies that $\alpha \in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{M})$. Similarly $\alpha^{\prime} \in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{M})$. It follows by induction that (ii) implies (i).

Let us now show that (i) implies (ii). This is true for $n=1$. As an inductive hypothesis suppose that (i) implies (ii) when $n=k$. Let $a \in P Z_{k+1}(M)$. We need to show that a satisfies (ii) for $\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{k}+1$. So set $\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{k}+1$. Let $\ll a, x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t} \gg$ be some bracketing of weight $\mathrm{t}+\mathrm{l}$ with $\mathrm{l} \leq \mathrm{t} \leq \mathrm{n}$. Let $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}} \in \mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{j}}}(\mathrm{M})$ be such that $\mathrm{i}_{1}+\ldots+\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}} \geq \mathrm{n}$. Then, using (6), we have

$$
\ll \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{x}_{1}, \ldots ., \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{t}} \gg=\ll \alpha, \mathrm{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{s}} \gg
$$

with $\alpha=<\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{o}}, \mathrm{a}>$ or $\alpha=<\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{o}}>$ and $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{j}} \in \mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{j}}}(\mathrm{M})$ with $\mathrm{i}_{1}+\ldots+\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{s}} \geq \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{o}}$. Note that $\alpha \in \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{o}}}(\mathrm{M})$. By the inductive hypothesis $\ll \alpha, \mathrm{y}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{s}} \gg=1$.

It follows by induction that (i) implies (ii).
Notation. Given group elements $x$ and $y$, we let $x$ denote the conjugate $x y x^{-1}$, and we let $[\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}]$ denote the commutator $\mathrm{xyx}^{-1} \mathrm{y}^{-1}$.

Proposition 7. $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})=\mathrm{M}$ if and only if $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1}(\mathrm{M})=1$.
Proof. Suppose that $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1}(\mathrm{M})=1$. Then Lemma 6 in conjunction with (6) implies that $\mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{M})=\mathrm{M}$.

Conversely, suppose that $P Z_{n}(M)=M$. Then, by Lemma $\left.6, \ll x_{1}, \ldots, x_{t}\right\rangle>=1$ for all bracketings of weight $t \geq n+1$ and all $x_{i} \in M$. We claim that $P \gamma_{n+1}(M)$ is normally generated by all such $t$-fold Peiffer commutators $\left.\ll x_{1}, \ldots, x_{1}\right\rangle>$. This claim implies $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1}(\mathrm{M})=1$. The claim is certainly true for $\mathrm{n}=1$. Suppose the claim is true for $\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{k}-1$. Then any element $c \in P \gamma_{k}(M)$ has the form $c=x_{1} c_{1} x_{1}^{-1} \ldots x_{m} c_{m} x_{m}^{-1}$ with $c_{i}$ a $t$-fold Peiffer commutator $\ll y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k} \gg$ and $t \geq k, x_{i}, y_{i} \in M$. Now $P \gamma_{k+1}(M)$ is generated by Peiffer commutators of the form $\langle\mathrm{c}, \mathrm{m}\rangle$ and $\langle\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{c}\rangle$ with $\mathrm{m} \in \mathrm{M}$. Identities (2) and (4) imply that $\langle\mathrm{c}, \mathrm{m}\rangle$ is a product of conjugates of elements of the form $\left\langle\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{-1}, \mathrm{~m}^{\prime}\right\rangle=$ $\left[\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{-1}, \mathrm{~m}^{\prime}\right]=\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\left[\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{m}^{\prime \prime}\right] \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}^{-1}=\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}<\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{m}^{\prime \prime}>\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}^{-1}$ where $m^{\prime}, m^{\prime \prime} \in M$. Identity (1) implies that $\langle\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{c}\rangle$ is a product of conjugates of elements of the form $\left\langle\mathrm{m}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}^{-1}\right\rangle=$ $\left.\left.<\mathrm{m}^{\prime}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right\rangle^{\left(\partial \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right\rangle=\left\langle\mathrm{m}^{\prime},\left\langle\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right\rangle>\mathrm{m}^{\prime \prime}<\mathrm{m}^{\prime},{ }^{\left(\partial \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\right\rangle \mathrm{m}^{\prime \prime-1}$. The claim follows by induction.

Our proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 involve a nonabelian tensor product $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$, where V and $W$ are two groups equipped with an action ( $v, w) \mapsto^{v} w$ of $V$ on $W$ and an action $(w, v) \mapsto^{w} v$ of $W$ on $V$. When $x, y \in V$, or $x, y \in W$, the expression ${ }^{x} y$ denotes the conjugate $\mathrm{xyx}^{-1}$. The tensor product $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$ is the group generated by symbols $\mathrm{v} \otimes \mathrm{w}$ for $\mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V}$ and $\mathrm{w} \in \mathrm{W}$ subject to the relations

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{vv}^{\prime} \otimes \mathrm{w} & =\left({ }^{v} v^{\prime} \otimes^{v} \mathrm{w}\right)(\mathrm{v} \otimes \mathrm{w})  \tag{7}\\
\mathrm{v} \otimes \mathrm{ww}^{\prime} & =(\mathrm{v} \otimes \mathrm{w})\left({ }^{w} v \otimes^{w} w^{\prime}\right) \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

for $\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{v}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{w}, \mathrm{w}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{W}$. An account of this tensor product is given in [4]. The tensor product is of most interest when the given actions are compatible in the following sense:

$$
\left(v_{w}\right) v^{\prime}={ }^{v}\left({ }^{w}\left(v^{-1} v^{\prime}\right)\right) \text { and }{ }^{\left(w_{v}\right)} w^{\prime}={ }^{w}\left({ }^{v}\left({ }^{\left(w^{-1}\right.} w^{\prime}\right)\right)
$$

for $\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{v}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{w}, \mathrm{w}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{W}$. Compatible actions occur for instance when V and W belong to precrossed G-modules $\partial: \mathrm{V} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}, \partial^{\prime}: \mathrm{W} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}$ and V (resp. W) acts on W (resp. V) via $\partial$ (resp. $\partial^{\prime}$ ) and the actions of G.

For convenience we compile several known properties of the tensor product into the following proposition.

Proposition 8. (i) [5] Let $\partial: \mathrm{V} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}, \partial^{\prime}: \mathrm{W} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}$ be two precrossed G -modules. Then G acts on the resulting tensor product $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$ by ${ }^{\mathrm{g}}(\mathrm{v} \otimes \mathrm{w})=^{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{v} \otimes^{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{w}$ for $\mathrm{g} \in \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{w} \in \mathrm{W}$. Also, there is a homomorphism $\delta: \mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}$ which is defined on generators by $\delta(\mathrm{v} \otimes \mathrm{w})=$ $\left[\delta v, \partial^{\prime} w\right]$. Moreover, this homomorphism and action form a crossed G-module.
(ii) [8] Let V and W be two finite groups which act compatibly on each other. Then the resulting tensor product $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$ is a finite group.
(iii) [9] Let E be a group with two normal subgroups V and W of finite prime power orders $|\mathrm{V}|=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{n}}$ and $|\mathrm{W}|=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{n}^{\prime}}$. Let $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$ be the tensor product formed using the actions given by conjugation in E . Then $|\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}| \leq \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{nn}^{\prime}}$.

Given subgroups $\mathrm{A} \leq \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{B} \leq \mathrm{W}$ we let ${ }^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{AA}^{-1}$ denote the subgroup of V generated by the elements ${ }^{b}{ } a^{-1}$ for $a \in A, b \in B$.

Lemma 9. Let V and W act compatibly on each other, let A be a normal subgroup of V , and let B be a normal subgroup of W . Suppose that ${ }^{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{AA}^{-1} \subseteq \mathrm{~A},{ }^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{VV}^{-1} \subseteq \mathrm{~A},{ }^{\mathrm{V}} \mathrm{BB}^{-1} \subseteq \mathrm{~B}$, ${ }^{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{WW}^{-1} \subseteq \mathrm{~B}$. Then $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{A}$ and $\mathrm{W} / \mathrm{B}$ act compatibly on each other, as do A and W , and V and B ; the actions are induced from the actions of V and W . The tensor products constructed from these actions fit into a short exact sequence

$$
\iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{~W}) \iota(\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{~B})>\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{~W} \longrightarrow \mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{B}
$$

where $t: \mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W} \rightarrow \mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}, \iota: \mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$ denote the canonical homomorphisms.
Proof. The canonical homomorphism $\phi: \mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W} \rightarrow \mathrm{V} / \mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{B}$ is clearly surjective. Moreover, identities (7) and (8) imply that the tensors $1 \otimes \mathrm{w}$ and $\mathrm{v} \otimes 1$ both represent the identity element in $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$ for $\mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{w} \in \mathrm{W}$. Let $\overline{\mathrm{v}}$ denote the image of $\mathrm{v} \in \mathrm{V}$ in $V / A$, and $\overline{\mathrm{w}}$ denote the image of $w \in W$ in $W / B$. Then $\bar{a} \otimes \bar{w}$ and $\bar{v} \otimes \bar{b}$ both represent the identity element in $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{B}$ for $\mathrm{a} \in \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{b} \in \mathrm{B}$. Hence $\iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W})$ and $\iota(\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{B})$ both lie in the kernel of $\phi$. To prove that $\iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W}) \iota(\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{B})=\operatorname{ker}(\phi)$ one readily verifies that $\iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W})$ and $t(\mathrm{~V} \otimes \mathrm{~B})$ are normal in $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W}$, that the function

$$
\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{A} \times \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{~V} \otimes \mathrm{~W} / \iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{~W}) \iota(\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{~B}), \quad(\overline{\mathrm{v}}, \overline{\mathrm{w}}) \mapsto \mathrm{v} \otimes \mathrm{w}
$$

is well-defined, and that it induces a homomorphism $\psi: \mathrm{V} / \mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{B} \rightarrow$ $\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W} / \iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W}) \iota(\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{B})$. Since $\psi$ is mutually inverse to the induced homomorphism $\bar{\phi}: \mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{W} / \iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W}) \iota(\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{B}) \rightarrow \mathrm{V} / \mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{B}, \quad$ it follows that $\bar{\phi}$ is injective. Hence $\iota(\mathrm{A} \otimes \mathrm{W}) \iota(\mathrm{V} \otimes \mathrm{B})=\operatorname{ker}(\phi)$.

Let us consider the precrossed G-module $\partial: \mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}$. Using the action of G on M we can form the semi-direct product $S=M \rtimes G$, in which elements are multiplied by the rule

$$
(\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{~g})\left(\mathrm{m}^{\prime}, \mathrm{g}^{\prime}\right)=\left(\mathrm{m}^{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{~m}^{\prime}, \mathrm{gg}^{\prime}\right)
$$

Let

$$
\bar{M}=\left\{(\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{~g}) \in \mathrm{M} \rtimes \mathrm{G}: \mathrm{m} \in \mathrm{M} \quad \text { and } \quad \mathrm{g}=\partial\left(\mathrm{m}^{-1}\right)\right\}
$$

and note that $\bar{M}$ is a normal subgroup of S . Since the inclusion homomorphisms $M \hookrightarrow S$, $\bar{M} \hookrightarrow S$ are examples of crossed S-modules, we can use Proposition 8(i) to form crossed Smodules $\delta: \mathrm{M} \otimes \mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{S}$ and $\delta: \mathrm{M} \otimes \overline{\mathrm{M}} \rightarrow \mathrm{S}$.

Let $\mathrm{n} \geq 1$, let $\beta=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ be an arbitrary sequence of 0 s and 1 (i.e. $\beta_{i}=0$ or 1 ), and let $\beta^{\prime}=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n-1}\right)$. Using Proposition 8(i) we define a crossed S-module $\delta: \mathrm{T}^{\beta} \rightarrow \mathrm{S}$ by inductively setting

$$
T^{\beta}= \begin{cases}M \otimes M & \text { if } n=1 \text { and } \beta_{1}=0 \\ \bar{M} \otimes M & \text { if } n=1 \text { and } \beta_{1}=1 \\ M \otimes T^{\beta^{\prime}} & \text { if } n \geq 2 \text { and } \beta_{n}=0 \\ \bar{M} \otimes T^{\beta^{\prime}} & \text { if } n \geq 2 \text { and } \beta_{n}=1\end{cases}
$$

Using Lemma 3(i) we can define a $G$-invariant normal subgroup $M^{\beta}$ in $M$ by inductively setting

$$
\mathbf{M}^{\beta}=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
{[\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}]} & \text { if } \mathrm{n}=1 \text { and } \beta_{1}=0 \\
<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}> & \text { if } \mathrm{n}=1 \text { and } \beta_{1}=1, \\
<\mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}, \mathrm{M}> & \text { if } \mathrm{n} \geq 2 \text { and } \beta_{\mathrm{n}}=0, \\
<\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}> & \text { if } \mathrm{n} \geq 2 \text { and } \beta_{\mathrm{n}}=1
\end{array}\right.
$$

Lemma 10. (i) For $\mathrm{n} \geq 1$ and for each sequence $\beta=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n}\right)$ of $0 s$ and $1 s$ with $\beta_{1}=1$, the image of the crossed S -module $\delta: \mathrm{T}^{\beta} \rightarrow \mathrm{S}$ satisfies

$$
\operatorname{im}(\delta)=\mathrm{M}^{\beta}
$$

(ii) For a fixed $n \geq 1$, the family of $G$-invariant normal subgroups $\left\{\mathbf{M}^{\beta}: \beta=\right.$ $\left.\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n}\right), \beta_{1}=1\right\}$ generates $\mathbf{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1}(\mathrm{M})$.

Proof. One readily verifies that the identity

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\left(y, \partial y^{-1}\right),(x, 1)\right]=(<y, \partial y-1 x>, 1) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds in $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{M} \rtimes \mathrm{G}$ for all $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathrm{M}$. Hence the crossed module $\delta: \overline{\mathrm{M}} \otimes \mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{S}$ has image $\operatorname{im}(\delta)=[\bar{M}, M]=<M, M>$. Therefore assertion (i) holds for $n=1$. The assertion can be proved inductively for $n \geq 2$ (using the inductive hypothesis $\delta \mathrm{T}^{\beta^{\prime}}=\mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}$ ): when $\beta_{\mathrm{n}}=1$ we have

$$
\delta\left(\mathrm{T}^{\beta}\right)=\delta\left(\overline{\mathrm{M}} \otimes \mathrm{~T}^{\beta^{\prime}}\right)=\left[\overline{\mathrm{M}}, \delta \mathrm{~T}^{\beta^{\prime}}\right]=\left[\overline{\mathrm{M}}, \mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}\right]=<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}>=\mathrm{M}^{\beta} ;
$$

when $\beta_{n}=0$ we have

$$
\delta\left(\mathrm{T}^{\beta}\right)=\delta\left(\mathrm{M} \otimes \mathrm{~T}^{\beta^{\prime}}\right)=\left[\mathrm{M}, \delta \mathrm{~T}^{\beta^{\prime}}\right]=\left[\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}\right]=\left[\mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}, \mathrm{M}\right]
$$

and (as we shall see)

$$
\left[\mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}, \mathrm{M}\right]=<\mathrm{M}^{\beta^{\prime}}, \mathrm{M}>.
$$

To prove this last equality it suffices to note that there are inclusions

$$
M^{\beta^{\prime}} \subseteq<M, M>\subseteq \operatorname{ker}(\partial: M \rightarrow G)
$$

for any sequence $\beta^{\prime}=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n-1}\right)$ with $\beta_{1}=1$.
Assertion (ii) clearly holds.
Suppose that $A$ is a $G$-invariant normal subgroup of $M$ such that $\ll A, M \gg \subseteq A$. Let us set

$$
\overline{\mathrm{A}}=\left\{\left(\mathrm{a}, \partial \mathrm{a}^{-1}\right) \in \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{a} \in \mathrm{~A}\right\} .
$$

Note that conjugation in $S$ yields an action of $G$ on $\bar{A}$. Moreover, $\bar{A}$ is a $G$-invariant normal subgroup of $\bar{M}$ and, for $N=A \bar{A}$, we have $A=N \cap M$ and $\bar{A}=N \cap \bar{M}$. Note also that if $M / A$ is finite then so too is $\bar{M} / \bar{A}$ since one can readily verify that $|M / A|=|\bar{M} / \bar{A}|$.

Taking $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{PZ}_{1} \mathrm{M}$, we have a commutative diagram of group homomorphisms

in which the row and column are exact. The exact row follows from Lemma 9. The surjectivity of $\delta$ follows from Lemma 10 (i). The homomorphism $\delta$ induces a homomorphism $\bar{\delta}$ thanks to the exactness of the row and Lemma 6.

Suppose that $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}_{1} \mathrm{M}$ is finite. Then so too is $\overline{\mathrm{M}} / \overline{\mathrm{PZ}} \overline{1} \bar{M}$, and so Proposition 8 (ii) implies the finiteness of $\left(\overline{\mathrm{M}} / \overline{\mathrm{PZ}} \mathrm{Z}_{1} \mathrm{M}\right) \otimes\left(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}_{1} \mathrm{M}\right)$. The surjectivity of $\bar{\delta}$ then implies that $<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}>$ is finite, thus proving Theorem 1 for $\mathrm{n}=1$.

Suppose that $\left|\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}_{1} \mathrm{M}\right|=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{a}}$ for some prime p . The $\left|\overline{\mathrm{M}} / \overline{\mathrm{PZ}_{1} \mathrm{M}}\right|=\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{a}}$. Consider the normal subgroup $N=\left(P Z_{1} M\right) \overline{\left(P Z_{1} \mathrm{M}\right)}$ in $S$. Since $N \cap M=P Z_{1} M$ and $N \cap \bar{M}=\overline{P Z_{1} M}$, both $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}_{1} \mathrm{M}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{M}} / \overline{\mathrm{PZ}}{ }_{1} \mathrm{M}$ are normal subgroups of $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$. Thus Lemma 8 (iii) and the surjectivity of $\bar{\delta}$ imply that $|<\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}>| \leq \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{a}^{2}}$. This proves Theorem 2.

The proof of Theorem 1 for $n \geq 1$ is similar to that for $n=1$. There is an induced precrossed module $\partial: M / \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{G} /\left(\partial \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{M}\right)$. Observe that the induced action is well-defined since, for $a \in P Z_{n} M$ and $m \in M$, we have ${ }^{\partial_{a} m}=<a, m>a m a^{-1}$ and $<a, m>\in P Z_{n} M$.

The above construction of the precrossed module $\delta: \mathrm{T}^{\beta} \rightarrow \mathrm{S}$ depends on the precrossed module $\partial: M \rightarrow G$. To emphasize this dependence let us write $T^{\beta}(M)=T^{\beta}$. Then for each sequence $\beta$ of 0 s and ls , with $\beta_{1}=1$, we have a commutative triangle of group homomorphisms.


The homomorphism $\bar{\delta}$ is induced by $\delta$ thanks to Lemmas 6 and 9 .
Suppose that $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{M}$ is finite. Then $\mathrm{T}^{\beta}\left(\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{PZ}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{M}\right)$ is finite by Proposition 8 (ii). Lemma 10(i) implies that $\mathrm{M}^{\beta}$ is finite. So Lemma 10 (ii) implies that $\mathrm{P} \gamma_{\mathrm{n}+1} \mathrm{M}$ is finite, thus proving Theorem 1.
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