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Abstract

Let G be a finite group and $\pi(G)$ be the set of prime divisors of the order of G. For $t \in \pi(G)$ denote by $n_t(G)$ the order of a normalizer of t-Sylow subgroup of G and put $n(G) = \{n_t(G) : t \in \pi(G)\}$. In this paper, we give an answer to the following problem, for the groups of Lie type $B_n$, $C_n$ and $D_n$:

Let L be a finite non-abelian simple group and G be a finite group with $n(L) = n(G)$. Is it true that $L \cong G$?

In this paper, we find the first examples of non-abelian finite simple groups which are not isomorphic and they have the same set of orders of Sylow normalizers and hence, we show that the question above is not correct always. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of prime numbers of order $2n$, $2(n-1)$ and $2(n-2) \bmod q$. The latter condition is necessary if $n \geq 5$. Also, we show that $D_{n+1}(q)$ is determined uniquely by its order and $\{n_t(D_{n+1}(q)) : t \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{2\}\}$ and if $n = 2$ or $q \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, then $B_n(q)$ and $C_n(q)$ are characterizable by their orders and orders of t-Sylow normalizers, where $t \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{2\}$. If $n \geq 3$ and $q \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, then $B_n(q)$ and $C_n(q)$ are 2-characterizable by their orders and the orders of t-Sylow normalizers, where $t \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{2\}$.
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**1 Introduction**

For a finite group $K$, let $\pi(K)$ and $n_t(K)$ denote the set of prime divisors of $|K|$ and the order of the normalizer of a $t$-Sylow subgroup of $K$, respectively. Also, let $n(K) = \{n_t(K) : t \in \pi(K)\}$. Characterization of finite groups is one of the central themes of research in group theory. There are various characterizations of finite groups by given properties, such as the set of orders of maximal abelian subgroup or order components, etc (see [1, 13]). A finite group $G$ is said to be characterizable by the orders of its Sylow normalizers, if $G$ is uniquely (up to isomorphism) determined by orders of its Sylow normalizers. A group $G$ is said to be 2-characterizable by the orders of Sylow normalizers, if there is exactly one group $H$ (up to isomorphism) such that $H$ is not isomorphic to $G$ and $n(H) = n(G)$. Characterization by the orders of their Sylow normalizers were first given by Bi [2]. Some finite non-abelian simple groups are characterizable by orders of Sylow normalizers (see [3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16]).

Assume that $n \geq 3$ is a natural number, $q$ is a power of $p$ $(q = p^k)$ and $A$ is a set of prime numbers of order $2n$, $2(n-1)$ and $2(n-2) \mod q$. The latter condition is necessary if $n \geq 5$.

The main theorem of this paper is the following:

**Main Theorem.** Let $S_{n,q} \in \{B_n(q), C_n(q), D_{n+1}(q)\}$ and, suppose that $|G| = |S_{n,q}|$ and $\{n_t(S_{n,q}) : t \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{2\}\} = \{n_t(G) : t \in \mathcal{A} \cup \{2\}\}$. Then, if $S_{n,q} = D_{n+1}(q)$ or $n = 2$ or $q \equiv \pm 1 \mod 8$, $G \cong S_{n,q}$. Further, if $q \equiv \pm 1 \mod 8$ and $n \geq 3$, then either $G \cong S_{n,q}$ or $\{G, S_{n,q}\} = \{B_n(q), C_n(q)\}$.

Let $M_n(q)$ be the group of all $(n \times n)$ matrices with coefficients in $GF(q)$. If $m$ is a natural number and $r$ is prime, then $|m|_r$ denotes the $r$-part of $m$, in fact $|m|_r = r^t$ if $r^t||m$. Also, $S_t$ is the Symmetric group of degree $t$ and $(m,n)$ stands for the greatest common divisor of $m$ and $n$. All further unexplained notations are standard and can be found in [8], [12] and [18].

**2 On The Orders of Sylow Normalizers Of Some Simple Classical Groups**

In this section, we calculate the orders of Sylow normalizers of $B_n(q)$ and $C_n(q)$. First, let $s \in \pi(B_n(q)) = \pi(C_n(q))$. When we say $\exp_s(q) = m$, we mean $s$ divides $q^m - 1$ and $s$ doesn’t divide $q^h - 1$ for all $0 < h < m$. Since $|B_n(q)| = |C_n(q)| = q^{n^2}(q^2 - 1)...(q^{2n} - 1)/(2, q - 1)$,
we have $s \in \{p\} \cup \{r : \exp_r(q) = i \text{ or } 2i \text{ such that } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

**Lemma 2.1** [9]. Let $n > 2$ be a natural number. If $p^n \neq 2^6$, then there is a prime factor $r$ of $p^n - 1$ such that $\exp_r(p) = n$. And if $p$ is not a Mersenne prime, then there is a prime factor $r$ of $p^2 - 1$ such that $\exp_r(p) = 2$.

For a given number $n$, we define

$$\tau(n) = \begin{cases} 2n, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ n, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau'(n) = \begin{cases} n, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ n/2, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}.$$

**Lemma 2.2**. If $\exp_s(q) = m$ such that $s \neq 2$, then

$$|n_s(B_n(q))| = |n_s(C_n(q))| = |Sp_{a_0}(q)(\tau(m)(q^{\tau(m)} + (-1)^m))_{1}a_0\Pi_{i=1}^{t}n_s(S_{s^i})\tau(m)(q^{\tau(m)} + (-1)^m)(|q^{\tau(m)} + (-1)^m|s)^{s^i-1}a_{i+1}(a_{i+1})/(2, q - 1),$$

where $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $s^t \tau(m) \leq 2n < s^{t+1} \tau(m)$ and $2n = a_0 + a_1 \tau(m) + a_2 s \tau(m) + \ldots + a_{t+1}s^t \tau(m)$.

**Proof.** Frattini’s argument and [19] complete the proof. □

**Corollary 2.3**. If $\exp_s(q) = 2n$, then

$$|n_s(B_n(q))| = |n_s(C_n(q))| = 2n(q^n + 1)/(2, q - 1),$$

and if $\exp_s(q) = 2(n - 1)$, then

$$|n_s(B_n(q))| = |n_s(C_n(q))| = 2q(n - 1)(q^{n-1} + 1)/(2, q - 1).$$

Using the orders of Cartan subgroups of $B_n(q)$ and $C_n(q)$, we can prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4**. Let $\bar{P} \in \text{Syl}_p(C_n(q))$ and $P' \in \text{Syl}_p(B_n(q))$, then $|N_{C_n(q)}(\bar{P})| = |N_{B_n(q)}(P')| = q^{n^2}(q - 1)^n/(2, q - 1)$.

**Corollary 2.5**. If $p \neq 2$, then $n_t(B_n(q)) = n_t(C_n(q))$ for every odd prime $t$.

Again using Frattini’s argument and [19], we can reach to the following results:
Lemma 2.6. If \( \exp_r(q) = 2n \), then \( |N_{D_{n+1}(q)}(\bar{R})| = 2(q^n + 1)(q + 1)n/(q^{n+1} - 1, 4) \), where \( \bar{R} \in \text{Syl}_r(D_{n+1}(q)) \).

Lemma 2.7. Let \( \exp_{r_1}(q) = 2(n-1) \) and \( \bar{R}_1 \in \text{Syl}_{r_1}(D_{n+1}(q)) \). If \( n \geq 4 \), then \( |N_{D_{n+1}(q)}(\bar{R}_1)| = 2q^2(q^4 - 1)(q^{n-1} + 1)(n-1)/(4, q^{n+1} - 1) \). Also, \( |N_{D_4(q)}(\bar{R}_1)| = 8(q^2 + 1)^2/(4, q^4 - 1) \).

Corollary 2.8. Let \( n \geq 3 \). If \( r, r_1 \in \pi(S_{n,q}) \) such that \( \exp_r(q) = 2n \) and \( \exp_{r_1}(q) = 2(n-1) \), then \( r_1 \nmid n_r(S_{n,q}) \) and \( r \nmid n_{r_1}(S_{n,q}) \).

Proof. We claim that \( r \nmid n_{r_1}(S_{n,q}) \). If not, \( r \mid n_{r_1}(S_{n,q}) \). Since \( \exp_r(q) = 2n \), we have \( 2n \mid r - 1 \). Moreover, by Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.7, we have \( r \mid n - 1 \). Thus \( 2n < n \), a contradiction. Similar to the previous procedure, by Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.6, \( r_1 \nmid n_r(S_{n,q}) \), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

Lemma 2.9 [17, Corollary after Theorem 3]. Let \( n \geq 3 \) and \( p \neq 2 \). Then \( n_2(B_n(q)) = |B_n(q)|_2 \). If \( q \equiv \pm 3 \, (\text{mod } 8) \), then \( n_2(C_n(q)) = 3^t|C_n(q)|_2 \), where the number \( t \) can be found from the 2-adic expansion \( 2n = 2^{s_1} + ... + 2^{s_t}, s_1 > ... > s_t \). Unless, \( n_2(C_n(q)) = |C_n(q)|_2 \).

Corollary 2.10. Let \( n \geq 3 \) and \( q \) be any prime power. Then \( n(B_n(q)) = n(C_n(q)) \), unless \( q \equiv \pm 3 \, (\text{mod } 8) \).

3 Main Theorem

Lemma 3.1. Let \( G \) be a finite non-abelian simple group and \( |G|_p = p^e \). If \( p^{7e/3} \leq |G| < p^{8e/3} \), then \( G \) is isomorphic to one of the following groups: \( L_n(q) \) (for \( 2 \leq n \leq 5 \) and \( (n, q) \neq (5, 11) \)); \( U_n(q) \) (for \( 3 \leq n \leq 5 \), \( (n, q) \neq (3, 2), (n, q) \neq (4, 3) \) and \( (n, q) \neq (5, 4) \)); \( B_n(q) \) (for \( n = 2 \) and \( (n, q) \neq (2, 3) \)); \( 2B_2(q); 2F_4(2). \)

Proof. [6, Lemma 2] and the orders of all finite simple groups of Lie type in characteristic \( p \) complete the proof. \( \square \)

Remark 3.2. Let \( G \) be a finite non-abelian simple group and \( |G|_p = p^e \). If \( |G| < p^{7e/3} \), then \( G \) is isomorphic to a simple group of Lie type in characteristic \( p \). Moreover \( G \) is not isomorphic to any of the groups stated in Lemma 3.1.
Lemma 3.3. [3] Let $G$ be a finite group, $N < G$ and $R \in Syl_r(G)$. If $r \mid |G/N|$ and $r \nmid |N|$ ($r$ is prime and $r \neq p$), and if, in addition, $p^k \mid |N|$ and $p^l \mid |C_N(R)|$, then $r \mid p^{r-t} - 1$.

In Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5, let $G$ be a finite group such that $n_\ell(G) \mid n_\ell(S_n,q)$, for every $t \in \pi(G)$. Also, assume that $r$, $r_1 \in \pi(S_n,q)$ such that $\exp_r(p) = 2nk$ and $\exp_{r_1}(p) = 2(n-1)k$. For every prime number $t$ and a natural number $m$, if $\exp_r(p) = mk$, then it is obvious that $\exp_r(q) = m$. Thus we can use the results of Section 2, when $\exp_r(p) = mk$.

Lemma 3.4. Let $S_{n,q} \in \{B_n(q), C_n(q)\}$, $N < G$, $r$, $r_1 \in \pi(G)$ and $|N|_p = p^l$. If $r$, $r_1 \notin \pi(N)$, $R \in Syl_r(G)$ and $R_1 \in Syl_{r_1}(G)$, then $|C_N(R)|_p = |C_N(R_1)|_p = p^l$ or $|C_N(R)|_p = p^u$ and $p^{(2a-1)k}p^u|2(n-1)$ such that $p^u \in \{1,2\}$, $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t = 2nka + u$.

Proof. Let $|C_N(R)|_p = p^u$ and $|C_N(R_1)|_p = p^v$. If $t - u = 0$, we claim that $t - v = 0$. If not, then Lemma 3.3 allows us to assume that

$$2(n-1) | t - v,$$

because $\exp_{r_1}(q) = 2(n-1)$. Recall that $n_r(G) \mid 2n(q^n + 1)$ and $n_{r_1}(G) \mid 2(n-1)q(q^2 - 1)(q^n - 1)$, considering Corollary 2.3. Since $u = t$, $n_r(G) \mid 2n(q^n + 1)$ and $|C_G(R)| \mid n_r(G)$, we have $p^l \mid 2n$. Hence $t \leq \log_{p^l}^{2n} \leq 2n/2 < n$. Thus (1) implies that $2(n-1) < n$, which is impossible. Similarly, we can see that if $t - v = 0$, then $t - u = 0$. In addition, $(t - u, t - v) = (0,0)$ or there are $a$, $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t - u = 2nka$ and $t - v = 2(n-1)kb$.

If $(t - u, t - v) \neq (0,0)$, then we can consider similar to the previous argument that $v > u$, $a = b$ and $v = 2ka + u$. So, Corollary 2.3 completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. Let $S_{n,q} = D_{n+1}(q)$, $n \geq 3$, $N < G$, $r$, $r_1 \in \pi(G)$ and $|N|_p = p^l$. If $r$, $r_1 \notin \pi(N)$, $R \in Syl_r(G)$ and $R_1 \in Syl_{r_1}(G)$, then $|C_N(R)|_p = |C_N(R_1)|_p = p^l$ or $|C_N(R)|_p = p^u \in \{1,2\}$ and $p^{(2a-2)k}p^u|2(n-1)$ with $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t = 2nka + u$ or $u = 2$, $t = 18$ and $S_{n,q} = D_6(2)$.

Proof. By long and easy calculation, similar to the procedure of the proof of Lemma 3.4, this lemma can be proved. $\square$

Proof of the Main Theorem. We note that $B_2(q) \cong C_2(q)$ and $D_3(q) \cong L_4(q)$. Also, $L_2(q)$, $C_2(q)$ and $L_n(q)$ have been characterized in [2, 3, 4]. Thus we may and do, assume
that \( n \geq 3 \). Let \( 1 = G_0 \leq G_1 \leq \ldots \leq G_f = G \) be a chief series of \( G \). Let \( r, r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) be prime numbers such that \( \exp_r(q) = 2n \), \( \exp_{r_1}(q) = 2(n - 1) \) and \( \exp_{r_2}(q) = 2(n - 2) \). Let \( R \in \text{Syl}_r(G) \) and \( R_1 \in \text{Syl}_{r_1}(G) \). We have the following cases:

1) Let \( S_{n,q} \neq D_{n+1}(q) \) or \( n \geq 5 \). If \( (n, q) \neq (3, 2), (4, 2), (5, 2) \), then by Lemma 2.1, \( \pi(G) \) contains prime numbers \( r, r_1 \) and \( r_2 \). Let \( j_0 = \text{Max}\{1 \leq i \leq f : r \in \pi(G_i/G_{i-1})\} \) and, fix \( H := G_{j_0-1} \) and \( K := G_{j_0} \). By Frattini’s argument, \( |G/K| = n_r(G)/n_r(K) \). According to Corollary 2.8, \( r_1 \nmid n_r(G) \) and hence, \( r_1 \notin \pi(G/K) \). We can repeat the same argument to show that \( r_1 \in \pi(K/H) \) and if \( n \geq 4 \), then \( r_2 \notin \pi(G/K) \) and \( r_2 \in \pi(K/H) \). Since \( |G| = |S_{n,q}| = p^e \) and \( |G| = |S_{n,q}| \), we have \( |G| < p^{7e/3} \), considering Lemma 3.1. Thus, there is \( 1 \leq j \leq f \) such that \( |G_j/G_{j-1}| = p^{e_j} > p \) and \( |G_j/G_{j-1}| < p^{7e_j/3} \). We claim that there exists \( 1 \leq h \leq f \) such that \( r \) or \( r_1 \) (or \( r_2 \), when \( n \geq 4 \)) is an element of \( \pi(G_h/G_{h-1}) \), \( |G_h/G_{h-1}| = p^{e_h} > p \) and \( |G_h/G_{h-1}| < p^{5e_h/2} \). If not, then \( r \notin \pi(G_j/G_{j-1}) \) and \( r_1 \notin \pi(G_j/G_{j-1}) \) (moreover \( r_2 \notin \pi(G_j/G_{j-1}) \), for \( n \geq 4 \)). Also, by Frattini’s argument, \( |G/K| = n_r(G)/n_r(K) \) and \( |G/K| = n_r(G)/n_r(K) \). This implies that \( |G/K| \mid (n_r(G), n_r(G)) \) and hence, \( |G/K| \mid (2q^2, 2n) \). If there exist \( j_1, ..., j_k > j_0 \) such that \( |G_{j_i}/G_{j_i-1}| = p^{e_{j_i}} > p \) and \( |G_{j_i}/G_{j_i-1}| < p^{e_{j_i}/3} \), then \( p^{e_{j_1} + \ldots + e_{j_k}} \leq 2q^2 \) and \( \prod_{i=1}^k |G_{j_i}/G_{j_i-1}| > p^{2(e_{j_1} + \ldots + e_{j_k})} \). Hence, \( |G|/\prod_{i=1}^k |G_{j_i}/G_{j_i-1}| \leq p^{7e_{j_1} + \ldots + e_{j_k}} < p^{4k - (e_{j_1} + \ldots + e_{j_k})/2} \), because \( e_{j_1} + \ldots + e_{j_k} < 2k + 1 \). Thus we may assume that \( j < j_0 \) and we continue the proof in the following subcases:

\[ C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(XG_{j-1}/G_{j-1}) \leq N_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(XG_{j-1}/G_{j-1}) \leq N_{G/G_{j-1}}(XG_{j-1}/G_{j-1}) \cong N_G(X)/N_{G_{j-1}}(X), \] (2)

for every \( x \in \pi(G) \) and \( X \in \text{Syl}_x(G) \). Note that \( n_r(G) \mid 2n(q^a + 1)(q + 1) \), using Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.6. So, \( p^{e_j} \mid 2n \) and hence, \( p^{e_j} \mid 2 \) which is a contradiction, because \( e_j > 1 \).

ii) If \( p \nmid n \), \( |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(RG_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p \neq |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p \) and \( S_{n,q} \neq D_{n+1}(q) \), then applying Lemma 3.4 to \( G/G_{i-1} \) and \( G_i/G_{i-1} \) implies that \( e_j = 2nka + u \) with \( a \in \mathbb{N} \), \( |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(RG_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = p^u \in \{1, 2\} \) and \( q^{(2a-1)}p^u \geq 2(n - 1) \). Since \( p^{(2a-1)k}p^n \geq 2(n - 1) \) and \( p \nmid n \), we can consider that \( p \mid n - 1 \). Let \( (n, q) \neq (4, 3) \). Also, \( (n, q) \notin \{3, 2\}, \{5, 2\} \). Therefore, \( p \mid n - 1 \) shows that \( n \geq 6 \) or \( n = 5 \) and \( k \geq 2 \). On the other hand, Lemma
3.3 allows us to assume that $r_2 \mid p^{s_i - c} - 1$, where $p^c \mid |C_{G_i/G_{i-1}}(RG_{i-1}/G_{i-1})|$. Repeating the argument used for (2), we obtain that $c = e_j$ or $p^c \mid |n_{r_2}(G)|_p = |2q^4|_p$ (using the results appearing in [19]). In addition, we conclude that $2(n - 2)k \mid 4ka - c + u$, because $\exp_{r_2}(p) = 2(n - 2)k$ and $e_j = 2nka + u$. Hence

$$2(n - 2)k \leq 4ka - c + u \text{ or } 4ka - c + u = 0. \tag{3}$$

But $p^{2ka+u} \mid 2p^k(n - 1)$. Hence, if $p$ is even, then $n - 1$ is even and if $p$ is odd, then $p^{2ka+u} \mid p^k(n - 1)$. Thus

$$2ka + u \leq \log_p^{2(n-1)/2} < (n - 1)/2 + k + 1.$$ 

So, we can consider that $2ka + u \leq (n - 1)/2 + k$, because $p^{2ka+u} \mid 2p^k(n - 1)$. We claim that $4ka - c + u = 0$. If not, then (3) implies that $2(n - 2)k \leq 4ka - c + u$ and hence, $n \leq 3 + 2/(2k - 1)$. Thus $n \leq 4$ or $n = 5$ and $k = 1$, which is a contradiction. This shows that $4ka - c + u = 0$. But $p^c \mid 2q^4$ and hence $a = 1$. Since $n \geq 5$, $e_j = 2nk + u$ and $G_j/G_{j-1}$ is a direct product of some simple groups of Lie type (by Lemma 3.1), we observe that $|G_j/G_{j-1}| > p^{2c_j}$ and it is easy to see that there exists $1 \leq i \leq j_0$ such that $i \neq j$, $|G_i/G_{i-1}|_p = p^{c_i} > p$ and $|G_i/G_{i-1}| < p^{5c_i/2}$. Again, repeating the argument used for (2), we can see that

$$\prod_{k=1}^f |C_{G_k/G_{k-1}}(R_2G_{k-1}/G_{k-1})|_p \prod_{k=1}^f |N_{G_k}(R_2)|/|N_{G_{k-1}}(R_2)| = n_{r_2}(G), \tag{4}$$

where $R_2 \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ and hence using Corollary 2.3, $\prod_{k=1}^f |C_{G_k/G_{k-1}}(R_2G_{k-1}/G_{k-1})|_p \mid |2q^4|_p$. So, $|C_{G_i/G_{i-1}}(R_2G_{i-1}/G_{i-1})|_p \in \{1, 2\}$, because it had been considered that

$$|C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_2G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = p^{4ka+u}.$$ 

The same argument as the case $G_j/G_{j-1}$ guarantees that

$$|C_{G_i/G_{i-1}}(RG_{i-1}/G_{i-1})|_p = |C_{G_i/G_{i-1}}(R_1G_{i-1}/G_{i-1})|_p$$

which is impossible, considering (i). If $(n, q) = (4, 3)$, then $7, 13, 41 \mid |G|$. Moreover, $\pi(n_7(G)) = \{2, 3, 7\}$, $\pi(n_{13}(G)) = \{2, 3, 13\}$ and $\pi(n_{41}(G)) = \{2, 41\}$. Hence, we can see that $G_j/G_{j-1}$ is a $k_3$-simple group and hence, $G_j/G_{j-1}$ is isomorphic to one of the following groups (see [11]):

$$A_5, A_6, L_2(7), L_2(8), L_2(17), L_3(3), U_3(3), U_4(2),$$
which contradicts Remark 3.2.

iii) If $p 
mid n$, $|C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(RG_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p \neq |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p$ and $S_{n,q} = D_{n+1}(q)$, then by Lemma 3.5, $e_j = 2nka + u$ ($a \in \mathbb{N}$), $|C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(RG_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = p^u \in \{1, 2\}$ and $q^{2a-2}p^u|2(n-1)$. But $n \geq 5$. Thus applying the results of [19] and the argument of previous case, we can see that $r_2 | p^e - c - 1$, where $p^e = |n_{r_2(G)}|_p$ and $|n_{r_2(G)}|_p | 2q^6(n-2)$. Since $e_j = 2nka + u$ and $\exp_{r_2}(p) = 2(n-2)k$, we have $2(n-2)k | 4ka + u - c$. So,

$$2(n-2)k \leq 4ka - c + u \quad \text{or} \quad 4ka - c + u = 0. \quad (5)$$

Also, $q^{2a}p^u | 2q^2(n-1)$ and hence, we observe that $2ka + u \leq (n-1)/2 + 2k$. If $2(n-2)k \leq 4ka - c + u$, we conclude that $2(n-2)k \leq (n-1) + 4k$. Hence $n - 1 \leq 3 + 3/(2k-1)$. Thus $n \leq 7$. We claim that $a = 1$. If not, then $q^2 \mid 2(n-1)$. So, $(n, q, a) = (7, 2, 2)$, because $(n, q) \neq (5, 2)$ and $5 \leq n \leq 7$. Therefore, $2(n-2)k = 10 | 4ka + u - c = 8 + u - c$. It follows that $u \geq 2$ which is a contradiction, because $p^u \mid 2$. In addition, we conclude that

$$4ka - c + u = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad a = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2(n-2)k \leq 4k + u - c. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, the results of [19] imply that $|n_{r_1(G)}|_p \mid 2q^2(n-1)$ and $|n_{r_2(G)}|_p \mid 2q^6(n-2)$, and hence, repeating the argument used for (4), we observe that

$$\prod_{y=1}^{f} |C_{G_y/G_{y-1}}(R_1G_{y-1}/G_{y-1})|_p \mid 2q^2(n-1), \text{ where } R_1 \in Syl_{r_1}(G), \quad (7)$$

$$\prod_{y=1}^{f} |C_{G_y/G_{y-1}}(R_2G_{y-1}/G_{y-1})|_p \mid 2q^6(n-2), \text{ where } R_2 \in Syl_{r_2}(G). \quad (8)$$

We have two following subcases:

a) If $p \mid n - 1$, then $p \nmid n - 2$. We claim that $4ka + u - c = 0$. If not, then (6) implies that $2(n-2)k \leq 4k + u - c$ and so, $n \leq 4$, which is a contradiction, as required. Hence, $4ka + u - c = 0$. Under our assumption, $p \nmid n - 2$ and by (8), $p^{4ka+u} = p^e = |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(RG_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p \mid 2q^6(n-2)$. These imply that $a = 1$. Set

$$\Pi = \{1 \leq i \leq j_0 : |G_i/G_{i-1}|_p = p^{e_i} > p, |G_i/G_{i-1}| < p^{5e_i/2}\}. \quad (9)$$

With the same reasoning in the previous sub-case and using (8), we can see that $\Pi = \{j\}$. On the other hand,

$$|G_j/G_{j-1}| < p^{5((n+1)-2n)k-u)/2}$$
and \( |G|_p/|G_j/G_{j-1}|_p = |G|_p/p^{4nk+2n} = p^{(n(1)+4n)k-2n} \). These imply that there exists \( x \in \{1, \ldots, j_0\} \), where \( x \neq j \), \( |G_x/G_{x-1}|_p = p^{e_x} > p \) and \( |G_x/G_{x-1}| < p^{5e_x/2} \). Therefore, similar to the argument given for \( I(i) \), we observe that \( x \in \Pi - \{j\} \), which is a contradiction.

b) Let \( p \mid n - 1 \). If \( p \mid n - 2 \), then Sub-case (a) completes the proof. If \( p \mid n - 2 \), then by the same argument as used for Sub-case (a), we can see that there exists \( x \in \Pi = \{1 \leq i \leq j_0 : |G_i/G_{i-1}|_p = p^{e_i} > p, |G_i/G_{i-1}| < p^{5e_i/2} \}. According to (7),

\[
|C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p |C_{G_x/G_{x-1}}(R_1G_{x-1}/G_{x-1})|_p | 2q^2.
\]

But Lemma 3.4 and previous argument imply that \( |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = p^{2ak+u} \) and hence, \( |C_{G_x/G_{x-1}}(R_1G_{x-1}/G_{x-1})|_p \leq p \). Thus Lemma 3.4 allows us to assume that \( |C_{G_x/G_{x-1}}(R_1G_{x-1}/G_{x-1})|_p = |C_{G_i/G_{i-1}}(RG_{x-1}/G_{x-1})|_p \), which is a contradiction using Sub-case (i).

iv) If \( p \mid n \) and \( S_{n,q} \neq D_{n+1}(q) \), then by Lemma 3.4,

\[
|C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(RG_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = p^{e_j} \text{ or } (10) \]
\[
p^u = 1, \quad p^{(2a-1)k} = 2. \quad (11)
\]

If \( p, k, u \) satisfy (11), then \((p, k, u) = (2, 1, 0)\). Hence \( |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = 4 \). On the other hand, with the same reasoning as in Sub-case (ii), \( \prod_{i=1}^f |C_{G_i/G_{i-1}}(R_1G_{y-1}/G_{y-1})|_p \mid 4 \). Thus Lemma 3.4 implies that \( \Pi = \{1 \leq i \leq j_0 : |G_i/G_{i-1}|_p = p^{e_i} > p, |G_i/G_{i-1}| < p^{5e_i/2} \} = \{j\} \). Since \( q = 2, p \mid n \) and \((n, q) \neq (4, 2)\), we have \( n \geq 6 \). Also, \( e_j = 2n \) and \( |S_{n,q}| \leq q^n(q^2-1)(q^{2n-1}) < q^{n+2}q^{n(n+1)} \). Thus \( n(n+1)-2n < 4(n^2-2n)/3 \), because \( n \geq 6 \). It follows that \( |G|/|G_j/G_{j-1}| < (|G|_p/|G_j/G_{j-1}|)_p^{7/3} \) and hence, there exists \( x \in \Pi - \{j\} \), which is a contradiction. Therefore \( e_j \) satisfies (10). We conclude that \( p^{e_j} \mid (n_{r_1}(G), n_{r_1}(G)) \) and thus \( p^{e_j} \mid 2p^k \). We can consider similar to the previous procedure that for every \( i \in \Pi \), \( e_i \) satisfies (10) and \( n(n + 1)k < 4[n^2k - k - 1]/3 \). Since \( |C_G(R_1)|_p \leq 2p^k \), by continuation of this procedure, we can find \( x \in \Pi \) such that \( |C_{G_x/G_{x-1}}(R_1G_{x-1}/G_{x-1})|_p = 1 \), which is a contradiction.

v) If \( p \mid n \) and \( S_{n,q} = D_{n+1}(q) \), then by Lemma 3.5,

\[
|C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(RG_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_{j-1})|_p = p^{e_j} \text{ or } (12)
\]
\[
p^u \mid 2, \quad a = 1. \quad (13)
\]
Since \( |C_{G_j/G_{j-1}}(R_1G_{j-1}/G_j)|_p = q^2p^n \), \( \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} |C_{G_k/G_{k-1}}(R_1G_{k-1}/G_k)|_p \mid |C_G(R_1)| \) and \( |C_G(R_1)|_p \mid 2q^2p^n \), similar to the previous procedure, we can get a contradiction.

Therefore, we conclude that there is \( 1 \leq h \leq f \) such that \( r = r_1 \) (or \( r_2 \), for \( n \geq 5 \)) is an element of \( \pi(G_{h}/G_{h-1}) \), \( |G_{h}/G_{h-1}|_p = p^e > p \) and \( |G_{h}/G_{h-1}| < p^{5e_h/2} \). Hence \( G_{h}/G_{h-1} \) is a direct product of isomorphic simple groups of Lie type in characteristic \( p \). But \( r_i \in \pi(G_{h}/G_{h-1}) \), for some \( i \in \{0, 1, 2\} \) such that \( r_0 = r \) (if \( n \geq 5 \), then \( i \) can be equal to 2). Hence \( G_{h}/G_{h-1} \) is a simple group of Lie type in characteristic \( p \). We claim that \( h = j_0 \).

If not, then we conclude by checking the orders of all finite simple groups of Lie type in characteristic \( p \). We set \( H = K/H \), for some \( i \in \{0, 1, 2\} \) such that \( r_0 = r \) (if \( n \geq 5 \), then \( i \) can be equal to 2). Hence \( G_{h}/G_{h-1} \) is a simple group of Lie type in characteristic \( p \). We claim that \( h = j_0 \).

If not, then we conclude by checking the orders of all finite simple groups of Lie type in characteristic \( p \) that \( h \notin \pi(K/H) \) or \( r_1 \notin \pi(K/H) \) (or \( r_2 \notin \pi(K/H) \), where \( n \geq 5 \)) which is a contradiction. Thus \( h = j_0 \). Therefore \( K/H \) is a simple group of Lie type in characteristic \( p \). It follows that for all \( 1 \leq i \leq f \) (\( i \neq j_0 \), \( r \)), \( r_1 \notin \pi(G_{i}/G_{i-1}) \) (moreover, \( r_2 \notin \pi(G_{i}/G_{i-1}) \), where \( n \geq 5 \)). Hence, \( r \nmid |H| \). Let \( |H||_p = p^t \) and \( |G||_p = p^r \). Lemma 3.3 allows us to assume that \( r \mid p^{e_h-1} - 1 \), where \( |C_{H}(R)||_p = p^r \) and hence, we may consider that \( 2nk \mid t - x \). But

\[
|C_{H}(R)||K/H| \mid (|N_{H}(R)|n_{r}(K))/|N_{H}(R)|,
\]

using Frattini’s argument. According to [19], \( |n_{r}(G)||_p \leq |2n||_p < p^n \). Therefore, if \( t = x \), then \( |H/K||_p > p^{e_h+n} \). In addition, we conclude that \( |H/K|_p < q^{e-2n} \) or \( |K/H||_p > p^{e_h-n} \). Also, \( K/H \mid |S_{n,q}| \), \( \exp_{r}(p) \in \text{Max}\{\exp_{s}(p) : s \in \pi(S_{n,q})\} \) and \( \exp_{r_1}(p) \in \text{Max}\{\exp_{s}(p) : s \in \pi(S_{n,q}) \text{ and } \exp_{s}(p) \neq \exp_{r}(p)\} \) (moreover for \( n \geq 4 \), \( \exp_{r_2}(p) \in \text{Max}\{\exp_{s}(p) : s \in \pi(S_{n,q}) \text{ and } \exp_{s}(p) \neq \exp_{r_1}(p)\}\)). It follows that by checking the orders of all finite simple groups of Lie type, if \( S_{n,q} = D_{n+1}(q) \), then \( K/H \cong D_{n+1}(q) \) and if \( S_{n,q} \neq D_{n+1}(q) \), then \( K/H \cong B_{n}(q) \) or \( K/H \cong C_{n}(q) \). So, \( |G| = |S_{n,q}| = |K/H| \). Therefore \( G = K \) and \( H = 1 \). In addition, by Lemma 2.9, we conclude that \( G \cong S_{n,q} \) if and only if \( q \neq \pm 1 \) (mod 8) or \( n \leq 3 \) or \( S_{n,q} = D_{n+1}(q) \). Unless, \( S_{n,q} \cong B_{n}(q) \) or \( S_{n,q} \cong C_{n}(q) \).

II) If \((n,q) = (3,2)\), then similar to the above argument, there is \( 1 \leq j \leq f \) such that \( |G_j/G_{j-1}|_p = p^{e_j} > p \) and \( |G_j/G_{j-1}| < p^{5e_j/3} \). Since \( |G_j/G_{j-1}| \mid |S_{n,q}| \) and by Remark (3.2), we can consider that \( G_j/G_{j-1} \cong S_{n,q} \). Thus \( G \cong S_{n,q} \) and the proof is complete.

III) If \((n,q) = (4,2)\), then \( r = 17 \). Let \( j_0 = \text{Max}\{1 \leq i \leq f : 17 \in \pi(G_{i}/G_{i-1})\} \), \( H := G_{j_0-1} \) and \( K := G_{j_0} \). We claim that \( j_0 \in \Pi \). If not, then there is \( i \in \Pi \) such that \( j_0 \neq i \).
We can see that by the orders of Sylow normalizers of $G$, $i < j_0$ and $\pi(G_i/G_{i-1}) = \{2, 3, 5\}$. Hence $G_i/G_{i-1}$ is isomorphic to one of the following groups (see [11]):

$$A_5, A_6, U_4(2)$$

which is a contradiction to Remark 3.2. Hence $j_0 \in \Pi$ and we conclude that by Remark 3.2, $K/H \cong S_{n,q}$. Therefore, $G \cong S_{n,q}$ and the proof is complete. The same argument applies if $(n, q) = (5, 2)$ and $(n, q) = (3, 4)$.

V) Let $q \neq 2$, $S_{n,q} = D_5(q)$ and $r, r_1, r_2 \in \pi(S_{n,q})$ such that $\exp_r(p) = 8k$, $\exp_{r_1}(p) = 6k$ and $\exp_{r_2}(p) = 5k$. We can consider that by Corollary 2.3,

$$n_r(G) = 8(q+1)(q^4+1)/(q^5-1, 4);$$
$$n_{r_1}(G) = 6q^2(q^4-1)(q^3+1)/(q^5-1, 4);$$
$$n_{r_2}(G) = 5(q^5-1)/(q^5-1, 4),$$

which easily, we can complete the proof. Also, if $q \neq 2$ and $S_{n,q} = D_4(q)$, then we assume that $r, r_1 \in \pi(S_{n,q})$ such that $\exp_r(p) = 6k$ and $\exp_{r_1}(p) = 4k$. We can consider that by Corollary 2.3, $n_r(G) = 6(q+1)(q^3+1)/(q^4-1, 4)$ and $n_{r_1}(G) = 8(q^2+1)^2/(q^4-1, 4)$, which easily, we can complete the proof. □

**Corollary 3.6** Let $S_{n,q} \in \{B_n(q), C_n(q), D_{n+1}(q)\}$ and suppose that $n(S_{n,q}) = n(G)$. Then, if $S_{n,q} = D_{n+1}(q)$ or $n = 2$ or $q \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, $G \cong S_{n,q}$. Further, if $n \geq 3$ and $q \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, then either $G \cong S_{n,q}$ or $\{G, S_{n,q}\} = \{B_n(q), C_n(q)\}$.

Using the results about the characterization of finite groups by the orders of Sylow normalizers, we can put forward the following conjecture:

**Conjecture:** If $S$ is a non-abelian finite simple group, then either $S$ is characterizable by the orders of Sylow normalizers or $S \in \{B_n(q), C_n(q)\}$, where $n \geq 3$ and $q \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, and in the latter case, $S$ is 2-characterizable.
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