

THE INDEX PROBLEM FOR SUBGROUP INTERSECTIONS

HARAN MOULI 

ABSTRACT. In [DDL13] and [DM19], Drungilas et al. study the problem of which triples of positive integers (a, b, c) can be realized as $([E : \mathbb{Q}], [F : \mathbb{Q}], [EF : \mathbb{Q}])$, where E and F are number fields, using techniques from field theory. We shall study this problem rephrased in the language of groups using the Galois correspondence to simplify and generalize their results.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
Acknowledgements	2
2. Basic Results	2
3. Coset Intersection Graph	4
4. Small Triples	8
References	10

1. INTRODUCTION

Definition 1.1. We say that a triple (a, b, c) of positive integers is **index-realizable** if there exists a group G with finite index subgroups H and K such that $a = [G : H]$, $b = [G : K]$, and $c = [G : H \cap K]$.

Note that in Definition 1.1, we may assume without loss of generality that G is a *finite* group by replacing all of $G, H, K, H \cap K$ with their quotients by a finite index normal subgroup of G contained in $H \cap K$.

In [DDL13] and [DM19], the authors study the notion of **compositum-feasible** triples over \mathbb{Q} : these are triples of positive integers (a, b, c) for which there exist number fields E and F such that $a = [E : \mathbb{Q}]$, $b = [F : \mathbb{Q}]$, and $c = [EF : \mathbb{Q}]$. By the Galois correspondence, this is equivalent to finding subgroups H and K as in Definition 1.1 with the absolute Galois group $G = \text{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$. In particular, all compositum-feasible triples over \mathbb{Q} (or any other perfect field) are index-realizable. The converse is true if one assumes a positive answer to the inverse Galois problem.

Date: December 1, 2025.

Consequently, one can prove slightly stronger results by focusing on the group-theoretic problem of classifying index-realizable triples. Indeed, if (a, b, c) is not index-realizable, then it is certainly not compositum-feasible over \mathbb{Q} . On the other hand, whenever we prove that (a, b, c) is index-realizable, we shall do so by example, and the interested reader can verify that the groups G used in our examples are all Galois groups over \mathbb{Q} . One might find class field theory or Shafarevich's theorem on solvable Galois groups useful for this purpose.

In Section 2, we establish some simple facts about index-realizable triples. In Section 3, we introduce our main tool, the **coset intersection graph**, which will encode the problem of index-realizability in terms of graph theory. We then provide simpler proofs to (generalizations of) results in [DDL13] and [DM19]. Finally, in Section 4, we shall classify all index-realizable triples (a, b, c) with $\min(a, b) \leq 15$ using the tools from the previous sections.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks Brian Lawrence for his helpful feedback, and Nigel Boston for directing him to [DM19].

2. BASIC RESULTS

Proposition 2.1. *If (a, b, c) is index-realizable, then $\text{lcm}(a, b) \mid c$ and $c \leq ab$.*

Proof. Let G be a finite group with subgroups H and K realizing the triple (a, b, c) . The first part follows from Lagrange's theorem since $|H \cap K|$ must divide both $|H|$ and $|K|$. For the second part, apply the formula:

$$|HK| = \frac{|H| \cdot |K|}{|H \cap K|}$$

and use the fact that $|HK| \leq |G|$. □

The converse to Proposition 2.1 is false. It is proven in [DDL13] that the triple $(5, 5, 15)$ is the smallest triple satisfying the constraints in Proposition 2.1 which is not compositum-realizable over \mathbb{Q} . We shall prove in Section 3 that it is an not index-realizable triple either.

Proposition 2.2. *If (a, b, c) and (a', b', c') are both index-realizable, then so is (aa', bb', cc') .*

Proof. If the triples (a, b, c) and (a', b', c') are realized by (G, H, K) and (G', H', K') , then the product (aa', bb', cc') is realized by $(G \times G', H \times H', K \times K')$. □

Lemma 2.3. *For any positive integers a and b , the triple (a, b, ab) is index-realizable.*

Proof. Use $G = \mathbb{Z}/a \times \mathbb{Z}/b$ with subgroups $H = \mathbb{Z}/b$ and $K = \mathbb{Z}/a$. □

The following proposition generalizes [Lemma 2.3](#):

Proposition 2.4. *If (a, b, c) is a triple of positive integers with $\text{lcm}(a, b) \mid c$ and $c \mid ab$, then (a, b, c) is index-realizable.*

Proof. Let $d = \gcd(a, b)$, $a = dm$, and $b = dn$. We can rewrite the constraints in the proposition as $dmn \mid c$ and $c \mid d^2mn$. Thus, there exists a positive integer e such that $e \mid d$ and $c = demn$. Let f be such that $d = ef$; the triple (a, b, c) is the product of the triples (e, e, e^2) , (f, f, f) , and (m, n, mn) . The first and third triples are index-realizable by [Lemma 2.3](#), and so is the second since we can choose $G = \mathbb{Z}/f$ with H and K both trivial. The proposition follows from [Proposition 2.2](#). \square

Theorem 2.5. *Let k be any field, not necessary perfect. If E/k and F/k are finite field extensions, then the triple $([E : k], [F : k], [EF : k])$ is index-realizable.*

Proof. For any finite extension L/k , let L^{sep}/k be the maximal separable subextension. Then, we can decompose $([E : k], [F : k], [EF : k])$ as the product:

$$([E^{\text{sep}} : k], [F^{\text{sep}} : k], [(EF)^{\text{sep}} : k]) \cdot (p^\alpha, p^\beta, p^\gamma)$$

where $p = \max(1, \text{char}(k))$ and $p^\alpha, p^\beta, p^\gamma$ are the inseparable degrees of E/k , F/k , and EF/k respectively. The first triple is index-realizable by the Galois correspondence and the second is index-realizable by [Proposition 2.4](#). It follows that the triple $([E : k], [F : k], [EF : k])$ is index-realizable by [Proposition 2.2](#). \square

Corollary 2.6. *For a triple of positive integers (a, b, c) , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) (a, b, c) is index-realizable.
- (2) (a, b, c) is compositum-feasible over some number field k , depending on (a, b, c) .
- (3) (a, b, c) is compositum-feasible over some field k , depending on (a, b, c) .

Proof. We have (1) \Rightarrow (2) since every finite group can be realized as a Galois group over some number field. (2) \Rightarrow (3) is trivial and (3) \Rightarrow (1) is [Theorem 2.5](#). \square

Finally, we include some specific examples of index-realizable triples.

Lemma 2.7. *For any positive integer $n > 1$, the triple $(n, n, n(n-1))$ is index-realizable.*

Proof. Let $G = S_n$, $H = \text{Stab}(1)$, and $K = \text{Stab}(2)$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *For any positive integer n and prime divisor $p \mid \varphi(n)$, the triple (n, n, np) is index-realizable.*

Proof. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}/n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/p$ be a non-trivial semidirect product; such semidirect products exist since $p \mid \varphi(n)$. Pick H and K to be any two distinct complements to the normal subgroup \mathbb{Z}/n . \square

3. COSET INTERSECTION GRAPH

Definition 3.1. Let H and K be finite index subgroups of a group G . The **coset intersection graph** for (G, H, K) is the bipartite graph \mathcal{G} with:

- partitions as the coset spaces $\mathcal{H} = G/H$ and $\mathcal{K} = G/K$.
- $(yH, zK) \in E(\mathcal{G})$ if and only if $yH \cap zK \neq \emptyset$.

Proposition 3.2. Let \mathcal{G} be the coset intersection graph corresponding to (G, H, K) . The map $G/(H \cap K) \rightarrow E(\mathcal{G})$ given by:

$$x(H \cap K) \mapsto (xH, xK)$$

is a well-defined and canonical bijection.

Proof. It is easy to see that the map is well-defined, and hence, canonical. It is injective since $xH \cap xK = x(H \cap K)$. On the other hand, for any $(yH, zK) \in E(\mathcal{G})$, we can pick some $x \in yH \cap zK$ and relabel the edge as (xH, xK) , proving that the map is surjective, and hence a bijection. \square

In particular, observe that any vertex yH in \mathcal{H} has incident edges as the $(H \cap K)$ -cosets contained in yH , and similarly for \mathcal{K} . Thus, the vertices in \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{K} have degrees $[H : H \cap K]$ and $[K : H \cap K]$ respectively.

Definition 3.3. For a bipartite graph Γ with partitions η and κ , $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is the group of automorphisms of Γ stabilizing η and κ set-wise.

If \mathcal{G} is the coset intersection graph of (G, H, K) , then it is easy to check that the action of G on G/H , G/K , and $G/(H \cap K)$ translates into an action of G on \mathcal{G} which is transitive on the edges. This implies that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ also acts transitively on $E(\mathcal{G})$.

Theorem 3.4. A triple (a, b, c) of positive integers is index-realizable if and only if there exists a bipartite graph Γ with partitions η and κ such that:

- (1) Γ has no isolated vertices.
- (2) $|\eta| = a$, $|\kappa| = b$, and $|E(\Gamma)| = c$.
- (3) $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on $E(\Gamma)$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let (G, H, K) realize the triple (a, b, c) . If \mathcal{G} is the corresponding coset intersection graph, then the action of G on G/H , G/K , and $G/(H \cap K)$ translates

into an action of G on \mathcal{G} , which is transitive on $E(\mathcal{G}) = G/(H \cap K)$. This implies that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ also acts transitively on $E(\mathcal{G})$.

(\Leftarrow) Pick any vertices $h \in \eta$ and $k \in \kappa$. Let $(G, H, K) = (\text{Aut}(\Gamma), \text{Stab}(h), \text{Stab}(k))$. By (1) and (3), we see that $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on η and κ , so we have $[G : H] = a$ and $[G : K] = b$. On the other hand, $H \cap K = \text{Stab}(hk)$, so by (2) and (3), we have $[G : H \cap K] = c$. It follows that (a, b, c) is index-realizable. \square

We shall use [Theorem 3.4](#) to prove that certain triples are not index-realizable. We begin with the following theorem; (1) is Theorem 2 in [\[DM19\]](#) (where it is proven using field theory) and (2) is a generalization of (1). We provide independent proofs for both for the sake of clarity and leave it to the reader to choose their cups of tea.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $n > 2$ be a positive integer.*

- (1) *The triple $(n, n, n(n-2))$ is not index-realizable if and only if n is odd and $n \neq 3$.*
- (2) *For any positive integer ℓ , the triple $(n, n\ell, n(n-2)\ell)$ is not index-realizable if and only if n is odd and $(n-1) \nmid 2\ell$.*

Proof of (1). If $n = 2m$ is an even positive integer, then the triple $(n, n, n(n-2))$ is the product of $(m, m, m(m-1))$ and $(2, 2, 4)$, which are realizable by [Lemma 2.7](#) and [Lemma 2.3](#). It follows that $(n, n, n(n-2))$ is index-realizable when n is even. We also know that the triple $(3, 3, 3)$ is obviously index-realizable.

Now, let $n > 3$ be odd. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $(n, n, n(n-2))$ is index-realizable. By [Theorem 3.4](#), there exists a bipartite graph Γ with partitions η and κ with $|\eta| = |\kappa| = n$ such that $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on $E(\Gamma)$ and all vertices being $(n-2)$ -regular.

Let $\bar{\Gamma}$ be the complementary bipartite graph; we see that $\text{Aut}(\bar{\Gamma})$ acts transitively on $(\eta \times \kappa) \setminus E(\bar{\Gamma})$ and all vertices have degree 2. This forces $\bar{\Gamma}$ to be the disjoint union of even cycle graphs, and since $\text{Aut}(\bar{\Gamma})$ acts transitively on η and κ , all these cycles must have equal length.

Say that $\bar{\Gamma}$ is the disjoint union of $\frac{n}{m}$ cycles of length $2m$, where $m > 1$. We know that $m \neq 2$ since n is odd and $\frac{n}{m}$ is an integer. If $m \neq n$, we can find $h \in \eta$ and $k_1, k_2 \in \kappa$ such that h and k_1 lie in the same cycle, k_2 lies in a different cycle, and $(h, k_1) \notin E(\bar{\Gamma})$. This would be a contradiction since no automorphism can send (h, k_1) to (h, k_2) . On the other hand, if $m = n$, then $\text{Aut}(\bar{\Gamma})$ is the dihedral group of order $2n$, so $n(n-2) \leq 2n$, implying that $n \leq 4$, a contradiction. \square

Proof of (2). If $n = 2m$ is an even positive integer, then the triple $(n, n\ell, n(n-2)\ell)$ is the product of $(m, m, m(m-1))$ and $(2, 2\ell, 2\ell)$, which are realizable by [Lemma 2.7](#) and [Proposition 2.4](#), so $(n, n\ell, n(n-2)\ell)$ is also realizable by [Proposition 2.2](#).

Now, let n be odd and assume that $(n, n\ell, n(n-2)\ell)$ is index-realizable. By [Theorem 3.4](#), there exists a bipartite graph Γ with partitions η and κ with $|\eta| = n$ and $|\kappa| = n\ell$ such that $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on $E(\Gamma)$, all vertices in η have degree $(n-2)\ell$, and all vertices in κ have degree $(n-2)$. If $\bar{\Gamma}$ be the complementary bipartite graph, then $\text{Aut}(\bar{\Gamma})$ acts transitively on $(\eta \times \kappa) \setminus E(\bar{\Gamma})$, the vertices of η have degree 2ℓ , and the vertices of κ have degree 2.

We can equivalently record the data of $\bar{\Gamma}$ using a 2ℓ -regular multigraph \mathcal{G} with $V(\mathcal{G}) = \eta$ and $E(\mathcal{G}) = \kappa$, where each $k \in \kappa$ connects its neighbors in $\bar{\Gamma}$. The condition on $\text{Aut}(\bar{\Gamma})$ acting transitively on $(\eta \times \kappa) \setminus E(\bar{\Gamma})$ now translates to $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ acting transitively on the non-incident pairs in $\eta \times \kappa = V(\mathcal{G}) \times E(\mathcal{G})$.

Since $n > 2$, any edge in κ has a vertex not incident on it, so it follows that $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ acts transitively on $E(\mathcal{G})$. This means that the connected components of \mathcal{G} must be isomorphic. First, assume that \mathcal{G} has more than one connected component. For any edge $h_1h_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ and vertex h in another component, there is no automorphism sending h to the component of h_1h_2 . This means that the component containing h_1h_2 has no vertices other than h_1 and h_2 , so every component has two vertices. This contradicts the fact that n is odd.

Next, consider the case where \mathcal{G} is connected. Let $k = h_1h_2$ be an arbitrary edge. Since $\text{Stab}(k)$ acts transitively on $\eta \setminus \{h_1, h_2\}$, every $h \in \eta \setminus \{h_1, h_2\}$ is adjacent to the same number of vertices in $\{h_1, h_2\}$.

- This number cannot be 0 since \mathcal{G} is connected and $n > 3$.
- If the number is 1, then since $\deg(h_1) = \deg(h_2)$, exactly half of all vertices in $\eta \setminus \{h_1, h_2\}$ must be connected to h_1 . This implies that $n-2$, and consequently n , is even, which is a contradiction.
- If the number is 2, this would mean that h_1 and h_2 are connected to all other vertices. Applying this to every edge k , we see that any pair of vertices in \mathcal{G} are adjacent. Furthermore, since $n > 2$ and $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ acts transitively on non-incident pairs, we can conclude that \mathcal{G} has an equal number of edges between any two vertices; this number must be $\frac{2\ell}{n-1}$. Thus, we must have $(n-1) \mid 2\ell$, and in this case, \mathcal{G} indeed satisfies the required conditions. \square

In our next theorem, (1) is Theorem 3 in [\[DM19\]](#) (where it is proven using field theory) and (2) is a generalization of (1). Once again, we shall first prove (1) since it is simpler, and then prove (2). For any vertex v in a graph, let $\text{nbhd}(v)$ denote the set of vertices adjacent to v .

Theorem 3.6. *Let n be a positive integer and p be a prime such that $p+1 < n < 2p$.*

- (1) *The triple (n, n, np) is not index-realizable.*
- (2) *For any positive integer ℓ , $(n, n\ell, n\ell)$ is index-realizable if and only if $\binom{n}{p} \mid n\ell$.*

Proof of (1). Assume for the sake of contradiction that (n, n, np) is index-realizable. Let Γ be a bipartite graph with partitions η and κ satisfying the conditions of [Theorem 3.4](#) for the triple (n, n, np) ; note that Γ is p -regular. Pick any $hk \in E(\Gamma)$; we know that $[\text{Stab}(k) : \text{Stab}(hk)] = p$, so any Sylow p -subgroup of $\text{Stab}(k)$ is not contained in $\text{Stab}(hk)$. Consequently, there exists $\sigma \in \text{Stab}(k)$ with order equal to a power of p which does not fix h . Since $p < n < 2p$, we see that σ acts on $\text{nbhd}(k)$ as a p -cycle and fixes the points in $\eta \setminus \text{nbhd}(k)$.

For any $k' \in \kappa$, since $p > \frac{n}{2}$, we have $\text{nbhd}(k) \cap \text{nbhd}(k') \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, if k' is fixed by σ , we must have $\text{nbhd}(k') = \text{nbhd}(k)$ since $\text{nbhd}(k')$ must be σ -stable and σ acts transitively on $\text{nbhd}(k)$. This cannot be the case for all $k' \in \kappa$, so σ has one p -cycle and $n - p$ fixed points in κ . Repeating the same argument:

- Every σ -fixed point in each partition is adjacent to the points in the p -cycle of σ in the opposite partition.
- Each point not fixed by σ in one partition must have $p - (n - p) = 2p - n$ neighbors not fixed by σ in the opposite partition.

Since $n - p > 1$, we see that η contains points with the same neighbor set. Since $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on η , if we pick $h' \in \eta$ not fixed by σ , there must exist another $h'' \in \eta$ with $\text{nbhd}(h'') = \text{nbhd}(h')$. Note that h'' must also not be fixed by σ , so $h'' = \sigma^i h'$ for some $0 \leq i < p$. However, the set of $2p - n$ neighbors of h' not fixed by σ cannot be stable under σ^i for any $0 \leq i < p$ since p is prime. Thus, $\text{nbhd}(\sigma^i h') \neq \text{nbhd}(h')$ for any $0 \leq i < p$, yielding the required contradiction and proving that (n, n, np) is not index-realizable. \square

Proof of (2). First, note that the case $n = p + 2$ is a special case of [Theorem 3.5](#), so assume that $p + 2 < n < 2p$. Let Γ be a bipartite graph with partitions η and κ satisfying the conditions of [Theorem 3.4](#) for the triple $(n, n\ell, np\ell)$. The vertices in κ are p -regular, so for any $hk \in E(\Gamma)$, we have $[\text{Stab}(k) : \text{Stab}(hk)] = p$. As before, we can find $\sigma \in \text{Stab}(k)$ of order equal to a power of p which acts on $\text{nbhd}(k)$ as a p -cycle and fixes $\eta \setminus \text{nbhd}(k)$.

We claim that the action of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on η is primitive. Since p is prime and the points in $\text{nbhd}(k)$ form a p -cycle under σ , these points must all lie in the same block or in pairwise distinct blocks. The latter is impossible since it would imply that we have at least $p > \frac{n}{2}$ blocks, implying that there are n blocks, which is absurd since $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts non-trivially on η . In the former case, since the block containing $\text{nbhd}(k)$ has more than $\frac{n}{2}$ points, it must contain all of η , proving that the action of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on η is primitive.

Now, the primitive transitive action of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on η has a p -cycle, and $p < n - 2$, so by Jordan's theorem [\[Isa08\]](#), the image of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ in $S_\eta = S_n$ must be either S_n or A_n . In particular, $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ must act $(n - 2)$ -transitively on η , and since $p < n - 2$, it also acts p -transitively. This means that every p -subset of η is the image of $\text{nbhd}(k)$

under some automorphism of Γ , and hence of the form $\text{nbhd}(k')$ for some $k' \in \kappa$. Since $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts transitively on κ , it follows that $\binom{n}{p} \mid n\ell$, and in this case, we have constructed a bipartite graph Γ with the required properties. \square

A common theme of the previous two theorems is that it is difficult for triples of the form (n, n, nt) with large t to be index-realized. The following proposition exhibits examples of such kind arising naturally from geometry.

Proposition 3.7. *Let q be a prime power and $n > d$ be any positive integers. The triple:*

$$(a, b, c) = \left(\binom{n}{d}_q, \binom{n}{d}_q, q^{d(n-d)} \binom{n}{d}_q \right)$$

is index-realizable, where $(\bullet)_q$ is the q -binomial coefficient.

Proof. Let Γ be the bipartite graph with η and κ corresponding to the subspaces of dimension d and codimension d in \mathbb{F}_q^n respectively, such that for any $hk \in \eta \times \kappa$, we have $hk \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if h and k are complements. For any subspace of dimension d , there are:

$$\frac{(q^n - q^d)(q^n - q^{d+1}) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})}{(q^{n-d} - 1)(q^{n-d} - q) \cdots (q^{n-d} - q^{n-d-1})} = q^{d(n-d)}$$

complementary subspaces, so Γ is $q^{d(n-d)}$ -regular. Using [Theorem 3.4](#), we see that (a, b, c) is index-realizable. \square

4. SMALL TRIPLES

We conclude by classifying all triples (a, b, c) of positive integers with $\min(a, b) \leq 10$ that are index-realizable. By [Proposition 2.1](#) and [Proposition 2.4](#), it suffices to look at triples (a, b, c) such that $\text{lcm}(a, b) \mid c$, $c < ab$, and $c \nmid ab$.

Our procedure will be to go through the cases $1 \leq a \leq 10$. Letting b be arbitrary, we must look at $c = db$ for positive integers $1 < d < a$ such that $a \mid db$ and $c \nmid ab$, i.e. $d \nmid a$. We can filter the following cases:

- (1) If $d = a - 1$, then the condition $a \mid db$ implies that $a \mid b$, so $b = ae$ for some positive integer e . Then, the triple has the form $(a, ae, a(a-1)e)$, which is the product of $(a, a, a(a-1))$ and $(1, e, e)$. These triples are index-realizable, the former by [Lemma 2.7](#). By [Proposition 2.2](#), (a, b, c) is index-realizable.
- (2) If $d = p$ is a prime and $p \mid \varphi(a)$, since $p \nmid a$ and $a \mid pb$, we obtain $a \mid b$, so $b = ae$ for some positive integer e . Then, the triple has the form (a, ae, ape) , which is the product of (a, a, ap) and $(1, e, e)$. These triples are index-realizable, the former by [Lemma 2.8](#). By [Proposition 2.2](#), (a, b, c) is index-realizable.

- (3) If $d = a - 2$, then we must have $a \mid (a - 2)b$, so $a \mid 2b$. If a is odd, this implies $a \mid b$, so $b = ae$ for some positive integer e . In this case, we have $(a, ae, a(a - 2)e)$, which is not index-realizable by [Theorem 3.5](#). On the other hand, if a is even, then we have $a = 2e$ for some positive integer e . We know that $e \mid b$, so $b = ef$ for some positive integer f . We have $(a, b, c) = (2e, ef, 2e(e - 1)f) = (e, e, e(e - 1)) \cdot (2, f, 2f)$, where the two factors are index-realizable by [Lemma 2.7](#) and [Lemma 2.3](#), so (a, b, c) is index-realizable.
- (4) If $d = p$ is a prime and $p + 1 < a < 2p$, since $p \nmid a$, we see that our triple must have the form (a, ae, ape) . By [Theorem 3.6](#), such a triple is index-realizable if and only if $\binom{a}{p} \mid ae$.

Since we understand what happens for the above d , we may iterate through all values $1 \leq a \leq 10$ and look at all values $1 < d < a$ such that $d \nmid a$, which haven't been dealt with above. For $1 \leq a \leq 6$, there are no such values.

- For $a = 7$, we must look at $d = 4$. In this case, we have $7 \mid 4b$, so $b = 7e$ for some positive integer e . Our triple has the form $(7, 7e, 28e) = (7, 7, 28) \cdot (1, e, e)$. We know that $(7, 7, 28)$ is index-realizable by [Proposition 3.7](#) using $(q, n, d) = (2, 3, 1)$. It follows that (a, b, c) is index-realizable.
- For $a = 8$, we must look at $d = 3$. In this case, $(a, b, c) = (8, 8e, 24e)$. The triple $(8, 8, 24)$ is realized using $G = S_4$, with H and K being any two distinct Sylow 3-subgroups, so by [Proposition 2.2](#), $(8, 8e, 24e)$ is index-realizable.
- For $a = 9$, we must look at $d = 4$ and $d = 6$. In these cases, we have triples of the form $(a, b, c) = (9, 9e, 36e)$ and $(a, b, c) = (9, 3e, 18e)$ respectively. In both cases, the triples are index-realizable by [Proposition 2.2](#):
 - $(9, 9e, 36e) = (3, 3, 6)^2 \cdot (1, e, e)$
 - $(9, 3e, 18e) = (3, 3, 6) \cdot (3, e, 3e)$
- For $a = 10$, we must look at the values $d = 3, 4, 6$. The corresponding triples are $(a, b, c) = (10, 10e, 30e), (10, 5e, 20e), (10, 5e, 30e)$.
 - The triple $(10, 10, 30)$ is index-realizable using $G = S_5$, $H = \text{Stab}(\{1, 2\})$, and $K = \text{Stab}(\{3, 4\})$. By [Proposition 2.2](#), so is $(10, 10e, 30e)$.
 - The triple $(10, 5e, 20e)$ is index-realizable by [Proposition 2.2](#) since it can be decomposed as $(5, 5, 10) \cdot (2, e, 2e)$.
 - The triple $(10, 5, 30)$ is index-realizable by [Theorem 3.5](#). By [Proposition 2.2](#), so is $(10, 5e, 30e)$.

This concludes the classification of index-realizable triples for $\min(a, b) \leq 10$.

REFERENCES

- [DDL13] Paulius Drungilas, Arturas Dubickas, and Florian Luca. On the degree of compositum of two number fields. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 286(2–3):171–180, 2013.
- [DM19] Paulius Drungilas and Lukas Maciulevičius. A degree problem for the compositum of two number fields. *Lithuanian Mathematical Journal*, 59(1):39–47, 2019.
- [Isa08] I. Martin Isaacs. *Finite Group Theory*. American Mathematical Society, 2008. See Theorem 8.17 (Jordan’s theorem on primitive permutation groups).

Email address: `hmouli@wisc.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WI, 53706