

Existential questions in (relatively) hyperbolic groups *and* Finding relative hyperbolic structures

François Dahmani

Abstract. This arXived paper has two independant parts, that are improved and corrected versions of different parts of a single paper, once named “On equations in relatively hyperbolic groups”.

The first part is entitled “Existential questions in (relatively) hyperbolic groups” (to appear in *Israel J. Math.*). We study there the existential theory of torsion free hyperbolic and relatively hyperbolic groups, in particular those with virtually abelian parabolic subgroups. We show that the satisfiability of systems of equations and inequations is decidable in these groups.

In the second part, called “Finding relative hyperbolic structures” (to appear in *Bull. London Math. Soc.*), we provide a general algorithm that recognizes the class of groups that are hyperbolic relative to abelian subgroups.

Part I

Existential questions in (relatively) hyperbolic groups

The existential theory of a group G is the set of all sentences of first order logic, in the language of groups, that contain only existential quantifiers \exists , and that evaluate to true in G . Each such sentence is equivalent to the existence of a solution of the disjunction of finitely many finite systems of equations (of the form $x_1x_2\ldots x_k = 1$) and inequations (of the form $y_1y_2\ldots y_n \neq 1$), with parameters in the group. Thus deciding whether a sentence in the existential theory of a group is true amounts to deciding whether a system of equations and inequations (with parameters) admits a solution in the group. If an algorithm can perform this task, we say that the group under consideration has decidable existential theory with parameters. Sometimes, one is more interested in solving finite systems of equations, with parameters, without considering inequations, and one then speaks of the Diophantine theory. Also commonly used is the universal theory of a group, that is the set of sentences of first order logic that use only universal quantifier \forall . The latter is decidable if and only if the existential theory is, since one goes from one to the other by negations.

To have decidable Diophantine theory, or even better, existential theory, is a very strong property. For example, the Conjugacy Problem (deciding whether two given elements of a group are conjugate to each other) is only a single instance of the Diophantine theory. The study of existential and Diophantine theory of a group G is also closely related to the study of morphisms from finitely presented groups to G , since each morphism $H \rightarrow G$ is a solution to a system of equations in G : the unknowns are the images of the generators of H and the equations in G are the defining relations of H .

There are rather few classes of groups that are known to have decidable existential theory. Clearly this is true for each finite group, and abelian group. For free groups, this is a celebrated result of G. Makanin [19]. Recently, V. Diekert and A. Muscholl proved the decidability for right-angle Artin groups [13], and more generally, V. Diekert and M. Lohrey [12] proved the stability of the decidability of existential theory under graph products (in particular free products, and direct products). For torsion free hyperbolic groups, the problem has been open for some time, since their Diophantine theory was proved decidable by E. Rips and Z. Sela [23]. The question indeed appears in Sela's list of problems [26]. In fact, he gave himself an answer in the very last pages of his seventh paper [25] of his series about elementary theory of free and hyperbolic groups, [25], using deep results about strict Makanin-Razborov resolutions. We propose an alternative proof here, possibly simpler, although still relying on Rips and Sela's method for the Diophantine theory.

Solving equations in groups is an important and difficult problem, and has many applications. But the problem of "solving" can be interpreted in several ways, for instance in finding the algebraic structure of the set of solutions, or in algorithmically deciding the existence of solutions. As we said, we are interested here in the second (weaker) interpretation, but we believe (and this is illustrated in further work [8]) that our methods allow to tackle the first, to some extent.

Thus, the general problem addressed in this paper is to find, for certain groups, an algorithm that, given a finite system of equations and inequations with parameters in the group, indicates whether it admits a solution. The groups we are interested in are hyperbolic, and relatively hyperbolic groups. Both classes were introduced by M. Gromov [16] and the theory of relatively hyperbolic groups was developed by B. Farb [15], B. Bowditch [2], and recently by many authors. These groups are coarse analogues of the fundamental groups of finite volume hyperbolic manifolds. The latter are hyperbolic relative to the collection of their cusps subgroups. In this point of view, we say that a group is hyperbolic relative to a collection of subgroups (called its parabolic subgroups) if it acts on a proper Gromov-hyperbolic space, preserving a collection of disjoint horoballs, cocompactly on the complement of these horoballs, and such that the stabilizers of the horoballs, are exactly the parabolic subgroups.

In principle, relatively hyperbolic groups can have parabolic subgroups of arbitrary algebraic nature. However, in my opinion, the most natural examples of relatively hyperbolic groups have abelian or virtually abelian parabolic subgroups. This is the case for fundamental groups of finite volume (or even geometrically finite) hyperbolic (or even sufficiently pinched negative curvature) manifolds, for limit groups, or fully residually free groups, as I observed in previous work [6], as well as for the larger class of groups acting freely on \mathbb{R}^n -trees (for the same reason actually), and for co-compact isometry groups of $CAT(0)$ spaces with isolated flats (as proved by B. Kleiner and C. Hruska [17]). Of course it is even the case for hyperbolic groups.

We prove:

Theorem 0.1. *Let Γ be a torsion-free group, hyperbolic relative to a family of subgroups that have decidable existential theories with parameters. Then the existential theory with parameters of Γ is decidable.*

In particular, the existential theory with parameters of any torsion free hyperbolic group is decidable.

For the latter assertion, we also refer to [25, Theorem 7.12].

Theorem 0.1 immediately implies that torsion-free groups that are hyperbolic relative to free abelian subgroups have decidable existential theory. A special case is the study of O. Kharlampovich, A. Miasnikov's of satisfiability of equations in fully residually free (or limit) groups [18], which we thus recover in a possibly simpler way. However their result is stronger in the direction of systems of equations, since it gives the structure of solutions in the form of Makanin-Razborov diagrams.

A folklore result states that virtually abelian groups have decidable existential theory. We did not know any reference for that, so we provide a proof here. It follows that:

Corollary 0.2. *The existential theory with parameters of any torsion free relatively hyperbolic group with virtually abelian parabolic subgroups, is decidable.*

This answers, in particular, a question of Sela in his problem list [26] about the Diophantine theory of $CAT(0)$ groups with isolated flats.

The “next” most natural class of relatively hyperbolic groups is probably that of groups with virtually nilpotent parabolic subgroups, since it contains all pinched negatively curved finite volume manifolds. Unfortunately, there seems to be little hope in this direction. In fact, Roman'kov has produced a 4-step nilpotent group with undecidable existential theory [24]. His proof uses Yu. Matijasevic's solution to the tenth Hilbert problem on the un-decidability of the existential theory of the ring of integers.

In this work, only the torsion free case has been considered. At the end of the first part, we give a brief account of the difficulties occurring in presence of torsion. The general approach follows that of Rips and Sela: to use canonical representatives, in order to lift equations in a hyperbolic group into equations in a free group. For equations in a relatively hyperbolic group, we will use an appropriate free product instead of a free group. The main new idea, that allows to solve inequations, is to consider rational constraints, that are requirements that some unknowns lie in a language recognized by a finite state automaton, in some way. We in fact simulate the inequations in a hyperbolic group by rational constraints in the free group into which the system of equations is lifted. In general such a tactic has little chance to work, since the kernel of a quotient of a free group is never rational unless it is of finite index. However, our study can be done by first restricting the search of lifts to a specific subset of the free group, or the free product, that will be proven rational. This is the technical part of the paper.

All the procedure is first illustrated in the easier case of hyperbolic groups in the first section. In this context many technical difficulties are avoided, and the proof is much shorter.

It should be noted that the algorithms we provide are explicit and can be (theoretically) implemented provided the following technical items are known or given: a presentation of the ambient group, generators and defining relations for each parabolic subgroup up to conjugacy, a hyperbolicity constant of the associated coned-off graph, the list of simple loops of any given length up to some explicit length κ , up to translation in this graph, and finally machines that solve the existential theories of the parabolic subgroups. Thus, the computability of different tools involved in this work is to be understood with this preliminary knowledge given, or found. It might be interesting to note that, if the parabolic subgroups are abelian, we reduce this in part 2 (Coro. 7.4, or 2.4 in the published paper), to the single preliminary knowledge of a finite presentation.

I wish to thank M. Sapir, O. Kharlampovich and T. Delzant, for their encouragements, and I. Bumagin, V. Guirardel, and D. Groves for interesting related discussions. My acknowledgments also go to the referee for some useful remarks.

1 Existential Ideas

The aim of this first section is to introduce notations and formalism of equations inequations and constraints, and to expose the ideas of the paper in the special, but motivating, case of torsion free hyperbolic groups.

As said in the introduction, the *existential theory* of a group is the set of all first order logic sentences that use only the existential quantifier \exists , and that are satisfied by the group. Any such sentence is equivalent to a disjunction of finitely many pairs of systems of equations and of inequations. Thus deciding whether an existential sentence is true in a group is equivalent to deciding whether a system of equations and inequations has a solution.

It is worth noting that we allow the presence of parameters (or constants) in our equations. This is standard for systems of equations alone (indeed any system of equations without parameter has a trivial solution), but not always for systems of equations and inequations.

1.1 Formalities about equations.

Let us start with a group Γ . Let Ω be an abstract finite set, that we will call the set of unknowns, and let P be a finite subset of Γ that we will call the set of parameters.

Systems. A *system of equations* in Γ , with unknowns in Ω , and parameters in P , is a family of expressions of the form $\mathbf{eq} = 1$, where \mathbf{eq} is an element of $(\Omega \cup P)^*$, that is a word with letters in $(\Omega \cup P)$. Let us choose notations for the future, and denote a finite system of equations by $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{eq}_1 = 1, \mathbf{eq}_2 = 1, \dots, \mathbf{eq}_n = 1\}$, where each \mathbf{eq}_i is in $(\Omega \cup P)^*$. Let us remark that one usually considers equations where inverses of the unknowns appear. This can easily be reduced to the setting above by adding an equation $xy = 1$ and using y instead of x^{-1} everywhere else.

A system of *inequations* in Γ , is a family of expressions of the form $\mathbf{ineq} \neq 1$, where \mathbf{ineq} is an element of $(\Omega \cup P)^*$. Similarly let us denote a finite system of inequations by $\mathcal{I} = \{\mathbf{ineq}_1 \neq 1, \mathbf{ineq}_2 \neq 1, \dots, \mathbf{ineq}_m \neq 1\}$, where each \mathbf{ineq}_i is in $(\Omega \cup P)^*$.

There is a refinement to the concept of inequations, that is the concept of constraint. A system of *constraints* in Γ , is a family of expressions of the form $\mathbf{cons} \in L$, where \mathbf{cons} is an element of $(\Omega \cup P)^*$, and L is a subset of Γ . For the moment, we do not wish to add restriction on what kind of subset it is, this topic will be developed later on. Let us denote a finite system of constraints by $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{cons}_1 \in L_1, \dots, \mathbf{cons}_p \in L_p\}$.

Solutions, and satisfiability. Any application $s : \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$, induces a morphism of monoids $s : (\Omega \cup P)^* \rightarrow \Gamma$, simply by deciding that s is the identity on P .

A *solution* to the system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{C})$ is an application $s : \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that the induced morphism satisfies $\forall i \leq n, s(\mathbf{eq}_i) = 1$ in Γ , $\forall j \leq m, s(\mathbf{ineq}_j) \neq 1$ in Γ , and $s(\mathbf{cons}_k) \in L_k, \forall k \leq p$.

We say that a system of equations, with possibly inequations and constraints, is *satisfiable*, if there exists at least one solution.

Triangulation. With an easy triangulation procedure, given a system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{C})$ with unknowns Ω , one can construct another system $(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{I}', \mathcal{C}')$, satisfiable if and only if $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{C})$ is satisfiable, such that each constraint $\mathbf{cons}' \in \mathcal{C}'$ and each inequation $\mathbf{ineq}' \in \mathcal{I}'$ is a word of only one letter in Ω' , and such that each equation $\mathbf{eq}' \in \mathcal{E}'$ has length 3 as a word in

$(\Omega' \cup P)^*$ (equations of length 2 can be made of length 3 by multiplying with the neutral element of the group, seen as a parameter in P , or alternatively, one can discard them using the assumption of absence of element of order 2 in the group).

Of course, this triangulation may increase the number of unknowns, and of equations.

We will always assume that this reduction has been done.

1.2 Hyperbolic groups.

We now turn to a more informal discussion of the case of hyperbolic groups. Let Γ be a torsion free hyperbolic group. The problem of deciding the satisfiability of equations (with parameters) in Γ was solved in the positive way by E. Rips and Z. Sela in [23].

Their strategy is as follows. Given a system of equations \mathcal{E} , they transform it into a system of equations whose unknowns are paths in the Cayley graph. This is interpreted as equations in the free group over the generators of Γ .

In their construction, a solution of the new equations of paths always produces a solution of \mathcal{E} . The converse is by no way easy, and is the object of the theorem of canonical representatives which we state now, because we will need the constants κ, λ, μ for the construction.

Theorem 1.1. ([23], *Canonical representatives*)

Let Γ be a torsion free hyperbolic group, and S a finite symmetric generating set. There exists computable constants $\kappa, \lambda, \mu > 0$, such that the following holds.

Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary finite subset of Γ , n be an integer, and $\mathbf{eq}_1, \dots, \mathbf{eq}_n$ be n words of three letters in \mathcal{A} , such that, for all i , $\mathbf{eq}_i \equiv 1$ in Γ . Let us note $\mathbf{eq}_i = a(i)_1 a(i)_2 a(i)_3$ for all i .

Then, for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists $\tilde{a} \in F_S$, labeling a (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic in $\text{Cay}\Gamma$ from 1 to a , such that

$$\forall i, \exists l_1, l_2, l_3, \exists r_1, r_2, r_3, \exists c_1, c_2, c_3$$

satisfying

$$\forall j \leq 3, |c_j| \leq \kappa n, \quad \widetilde{a(i)}_j = l_j c_j r_j \quad r_j = (l_{j+1} [3])^{-1}.$$

We call the elements \tilde{a} the canonical representatives of the elements of \mathcal{A} . In [23], the authors introduce a number of candidates, depending on a parameter, to be canonical representatives, and prove that for a certain parameter, they satisfy the relations stated. But there seems to be no way to find the parameter *a priori*. We are not interested here in that computability, but only on the existence of such representatives.

Path equations. We explain now how to transform a system of equations in Γ into a family of systems of equations of paths in $\text{Cay}\Gamma$ (for a certain finite symmetric generating set S of Γ).

First, let us denote by F_S the free group over S . Each element of F_S has a normal form which is a word over the alphabet S , and thus labels a unique path in $\text{Cay}\Gamma$ starting at 1. Conversely, for any path in $\text{Cay}\Gamma$, the word read on the consecutive edges of the path defines a unique element of F_S . If $w \in F_S$, let us denote by \bar{w} its image in Γ .

Let us write each equation in \mathcal{E} as $\mathbf{eq}_i = z(i)_1 z(i)_2 z(i)_3$, where $z(i)_j$ is an element of $(\Omega \cup P)$.

Let \mathcal{C}_0 be the set of all possible n -tuples of triples $((c(i)_1, c(i)_2, c(i)_3))_{i \leq n}$ in which $c(i)_j$ is an element of F_S of length at most κn satisfying $\overline{c(i)_1 c(i)_2 c(i)_3} = 1$. Since κ is an explicit constant depending on δ and the group presentation, this is a finite computable set.

For all parameter $p \in P$, Let \mathcal{C}_p be the set of all elements of F_S labeling a (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic from 1 to $p \in \Gamma$. This is again a computable set.

Now for all choice of $c \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and of $rep(p) \in \mathcal{C}_p$, we write the system $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ in F_S :

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{z(i)_1} &= l(i)_1 c(i)_1 r(i)_1 & r(i)_1 &= l(i)_2^{-1} \\ \widetilde{z(i)_2} &= l(i)_2 c(i)_2 r(i)_1 & r(i)_2 &= l(i)_3^{-1} \\ \widetilde{z(i)_3} &= l(i)_3 c(i)_3 r(i)_1 & r(i)_3 &= l(i)_1^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

The $c(i)_j$ are parameters (given by the choice $c \in \mathcal{C}$) that satisfy $\overline{c(i)_1 c(i)_2 c(i)_3} = 1$. The set of unknowns is $\tilde{\Omega} \cup \{l(i)_j, r(i)_j, i \leq n, j \leq 3\}$, where $\tilde{\Omega} \simeq \Omega$. If $z(i)_j \in \Omega$ then $\widetilde{z(i)_j}$ has the corresponding value in $\tilde{\Omega}$, and if $z(i)_j \in P$, then $\widetilde{z(i)_j} = rep(z(i)_j)$ is our chosen parameter in F_S .

Proposition 1.2. *The system \mathcal{E} has a solution in Γ if and only if, for some choice of c and $rep(p), p \in P$ as above, the system $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ has a solution.*

It is clear that any solution s of any $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ provides a solution for \mathcal{E} , by taking the images in Γ of the values of $s(\tilde{\Omega})$, that is by considering \bar{s} on Ω : $\bar{s}(\omega) = \overline{s(\tilde{\omega})}$.

The converse is the Theorem 1.1. \square

Satisfiability of equations. This is already sufficient to decide the satisfiability of \mathcal{E} in Γ . Indeed, this is now equivalent to the satisfiability of one of the systems $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ in F_S . Recall that these systems were effectively computed from \mathcal{E} . We can use known solutions to the satisfiability problem for equations in free groups, such as those proposed by Makanin [19], or Diekert-Gutiérrez-Hagenah [10].

We have finished our review of Rips and Sela's result on equations in torsion free hyperbolic groups. We now go further, and explain how to deal with inequations.

Geometric solutions. Theorem 1.1 says more than already used. It allows to lift any solution of \mathcal{E} into a solution of one of the $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$, which has the particularity that it consists of elements that label quasi-geodesic paths in $Cay\Gamma$. Many solutions to $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ probably do not have this property, and thus are of little relevance for our study of \mathcal{E} .

In particular, if one wants to consider some inequations in Γ in addition of \mathcal{E} , then it will be hard to tell which solutions of \mathcal{E}' actually map on solutions of \mathcal{E} that satisfy the inequation. But if one considers only solution with a geometric relevance, this control is made easier.

Recall that a L -local (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic is an arc-length parameterized path such that any subsegment of length at most L is a (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic. We use the classical result of hyperbolic geometry, that for all (λ, μ) , there exists L, λ', μ' so that any L -local (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic is a global (λ', μ') -quasi-geodesic (see [5, Chap. 3, Thm 1.4], including explicit values of these constants in term of δ).

We then call *geometric* an element of F_S that labels a L -local (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic in $Cay\Gamma$. Let us denote by \mathcal{L} the set of geometric elements in F_S .

Every canonical representative is geometric, and therefore, the equivalence of Proposition 1.2 can be refined: the solutions of \mathcal{E} are exactly the images of the geometric solutions of $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ for $c \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and $rep(p) \in \mathcal{C}_p \forall p \in P$.

Inequations in Γ as constraints in geometric solutions. It is then easy to translate what it means to satisfy inequations in Γ . Indeed, the geometric elements of Γ that define the trivial element of Γ form a finite computable set, since they are all of length at most μ' . Let \mathcal{L}_0 be this set.

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{\text{ineq}_1 \neq 1, \text{ineq}_2 \neq 1, \dots, \text{ineq}_m \neq 1\}$, be a system of inequations where each ineq_i is in Ω .

Then the system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I})$ has a solution if and only if one of the $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ has a solution s consisting of geometric elements, and such that each $s(\widetilde{\text{ineq}_i})$, for $i \leq m$, is outside \mathcal{L}_0 .

In other words, we have the proposition:

Proposition 1.3. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I})$ be a system of equations and inequations in Γ , triangulated as above. Let $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ be the finite family of systems of equations in F_S constructed above.*

Let us define the constraints in F_S , $\mathcal{C}' = \{\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{L}, \forall \tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\Omega}\} \cup \{\widetilde{\text{ineq}_i} \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_0, \forall i \leq m\}$.

Then the system $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I})$ has a solution in Γ if and only if one of the systems $(\mathcal{E}'(c, rep), \mathcal{C}')$ has a solution in F_S .

Satisfiability. The interest of this transformation is that the satisfiability of the system $(\mathcal{E}'(c, rep), \mathcal{C}')$ in F_S is decidable.

The decidability of existential theory for free groups is originally due to G. Makanin [19], who previously solved the case of “word” equations, in free monoids (without involution), in the 80’s. K. Schulz introduced treatment of constraints in his algorithm for word equations, in the 90’s. An alternative solution for word equations, with rational constraints, was found by Plandowski. This has advantages about complexity, and could be also used for equations with constraints in free groups.

A rational language in a free group is a subset whose set of normal forms is a word language recognized by a finite state automaton. A rational constraint is a constraint defined by a rational language.

Theorem 1.4. *(Diekert, Gutiérrez, Hagenah, [10])*

The existential theory with rational constraints of a free group is decidable.

This is why we wanted to define “geometric” elements in a local way. As we did, \mathcal{L} is a rational language. Indeed it is not hard to design a finite state automaton that recognize the presence of a sub-word of length at most L that fails to define a (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic in $\text{Cay}\Gamma$, since there are only finitely many such possible words, and their list is computable with a solution to the word problem.

From the Theorem above, and the equivalence of Proposition 1.3, we deduce:

Theorem 1.5. *The existential theory of a torsion free hyperbolic group (with parameters) is decidable.*

Looking further. It appears, in fact, that such a result might not be sufficient to provide the main expected application: a significant simplification of Z. Sela's algorithm on the Isomorphism Problem for torsion free hyperbolic groups. However, we have not demonstrated the full strength of the use of rational languages, but merely used the concept of geometric elements, and \mathcal{L}_0 among them.

In this perspective, in [8] we use more refined languages, in order to get more control (in particular inside conjugacy classes of solutions). We use the following statement, which is a direct consequence of the study above.

Proposition 1.6. *Given Γ a torsion free hyperbolic group, generated by S as above, there is an algorithm, explicit from the data of a presentation and the hyperbolicity constant, that performs the following.*

Given a finite system \mathcal{E} of equations in Γ , and, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, a rational language \mathcal{L}_ω of geometric elements (i.e. such that $\mathcal{L}_\omega \subset \mathcal{L}$), the algorithm always terminates, and says “yes” if there exists a solution s of \mathcal{E} with the property that, for all ω , any pre-image of $s(\omega)$ in \mathcal{L} is in \mathcal{L}_ω , and only if there exists a solution s of \mathcal{E} with the property that, for all ω , some pre-image of $s(\omega)$ in \mathcal{L} is in \mathcal{L}_ω .

The algorithm is explicit from the value of the hyperbolicity constant δ and the presentation of Γ . Since there is an algorithm for computing δ from the presentation (see [21]), we can actually deduce an algorithm that takes as input a presentation of a hyperbolic group, and a system of equations and inequations, and gives as output the answer to the satisfiability of the system.

We will obtain such a statement in the generality of relatively hyperbolic groups, but for now, it is easy to see that a suitable algorithm for Proposition 1.6 is: find $\mathcal{E}'(c, rep)$ as above, and apply the algorithm from 1.4 for the systems $(\mathcal{E}'(c, rep), \mathcal{C}')$ where $\mathcal{C}' = \{\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{L}_\omega, \forall \omega \in \Omega\}$. Answer yes if one of these systems have a solution.

We emphasize that the algorithm can answer either yes or no when there is a solution s to \mathcal{E} with the property that, for all ω , *some but not all* pre-image of $s(\omega)$ in \mathcal{L} (not necessarily the canonical representative) is in \mathcal{L}_ω . Depending on the nature on the \mathcal{L}_ω , this uncertainty might never happen (this is the case for $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_0$, since if a pre-image is inside, any pre-image is also inside), or happen only on finitely many solutions, or worse.

It is also reasonable to ask whether such techniques can be used for the study of hyperbolic groups with torsion. Indeed, some specific cases can be handled, but the technical condition we need to require is rather unpleasant. The difficulty is the construction of canonical representatives. In what we develop, in the relative setting, the difficulty occurs precisely in paragraph 3.2. The difficulty is already apparent for virtually free groups, although most of Rips and Sela's construction becomes trivial in this case: the associated Bass-Serre tree almost provides canonical representatives, but in fact only so-called canonical cylinders (with ordered slice decomposition, see section 3.1), from which it is sometimes impossible to extract a preferred path in the Cayley graph, in an equivariant way.

Because it might shed light on the nature of the difficulty, let us try to explain how far the construction can be generalized, but note that an argument of Delzant (ref [9, Rem. III.1]) shows that the theorem of canonical representatives in its usual form cannot be extended to all hyperbolic groups.

Let us qualify the action of Γ on $Cay\Gamma$ as *acylindrical* if there is a number κ such that the stabilizer of any finite subset of $Cay\Gamma$ of diameter at least κ , is trivial.

It is rather easy to adapt the construction of canonical representatives for hyperbolic groups with an acylindrical action of $\text{Cay}\Gamma$, by considering, in paragraph 3.2, not slices, but finite unions of slices, so that stabilizers of these unions are trivial. Note also that Delzant's counterexample is virtually free, with a non-acylindrical action on its Bass-Serre tree.

Although easy in the hyperbolic case, this operation turns out to be rather delicate in the relative case. The specific technical difficulties are due to so-called angular slices, in the canonical cylinders. Nonetheless we claim that it is still possible, but we chose not to present the construction here because, as far as we can see, it does not help to solve the case of torsion in generality, even in the hyperbolic case, and is perhaps of little interest, compared to its technicality.

2 Relative hyperbolicity, and paths in the coned-off graph

2.1 Relative hyperbolicity, coned-off graph, angles and cones.

Let Γ be a finitely generated group, with a finite symmetric set of generators S . Let P_1, \dots, P_q be finitely generated subgroups of Γ . We define, after Farb [15], the *coned-off* graph $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ of Γ with respect to the P_i as follows. Start with the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}\Gamma$, and for each k , and each left coset $[gP_k]$ of P_k , add a vertex $v_{[gP_k]}$ together with a family of edges $(v_{[gP_k]}, gh)$, for all $h \in P_k$. The graph obtained is denoted by $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$.

Notice that the group Γ acts by left translations on the coned-off graph $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, and for all g , the subgroup $gP_k g^{-1}$ fixes the vertex $v_{[gP_k]}$. Whenever P_k is infinite, the vertex $v_{[P_k]}$ is of infinite valence (and also all of its translates), and thus $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ is not locally finite.

However, it may or may not be *fine* (in Bowditch's terminology [2]). A graph is fine if any edge is contained in only finitely many simple loops of given arbitrary length.

We say that Γ is *relatively hyperbolic* with respect to P_1, \dots, P_q , if $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ is hyperbolic and fine.

This notion is indeed very robust, and rich. We refer the reader to the now abundant literature on the subject for further discussion on properties, naturality of the definition, and equivalent definitions (see for instance, works of B. Bowditch, B. Farb, A. Yaman, C. Druţu, M. Sapir, D. Osin, I. Bumagin, and myself).

In an arbitrary graph G (but indeed we will be interested in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$), the *angle* at a vertex v between two edges $e_1 = (v, v_1), e_2 = (v, v_2)$ adjacent at v is the path distance (non-negative, possibly infinite) in $G \setminus \{v\}$ between v_1 and v_2 . It is denoted by $\text{Ang}_v(e_1, e_2)$.

Let now ρ and θ be a positive number. Given an oriented edge $e = (v, v')$ in G , the *cone* centered at e , of radius ρ and angle θ , denoted by $\text{Cone}_{\rho, \theta}(e)$ is the set of vertices w in G that can be reached from v' by a path starting by the edge e , of length at most ρ , and whose consecutive edges make angles at most θ .

2.2 The group $\tilde{\Gamma}$ labeling paths in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$.

In $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, there are two kinds of (oriented) edges. Those that are in $\text{Cay}\Gamma$ carry natural labels in S . On the other hand, those that are adjacent to a vertex not in $\text{Cay}\Gamma$ don't. Nevertheless, if $e_1 = (\gamma_1, v_{[gP_k]})$ and $e_2 = (v_{[gP_k]}, \gamma_2)$ are two adjacent such edges, then we can associate to the ordered pair (e_1, e_2) a well defined element of P_k , namely $\gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2 \in P_k$. We thus choose to

label the (ordered) pairs of consecutive edges containing a same vertex $v_{[gP_k]}$ by elements of P_k . Clearly, this labeling is invariant by left translation.

Let us now define the group $\tilde{\Gamma} = F_S * P_1 * P_2 * \dots * P_q$, where F_S is the free group over S . For convenience of notations, we write $F_S = P_0$. As $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a free product, every $\tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ has a unique normal form $\tilde{\gamma} = x_1 \dots x_r$, where $\forall i, \exists j, x_i \in P_j \setminus \{1\}$, and x_i and x_{i+1} are in different factors, for all i .

Let us also define the *long normal form* of $\tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, to be the word obtained from its normal form after substituting to every $x_i \in P_0$, the normal form of $x_i \in P_0 = F_S$.

There is a natural quotient $\tilde{\Gamma} \rightarrow \Gamma$, that is identity on S and on each P_i . We can interpret the elements of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as labeling paths in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, via their long normal forms, according to the labels defined above. Notice that paths of $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ starting at 1, and not using twice the same edge consecutively, are in one-to-one correspondence with long normal forms: two different long normal forms (in the free product $\tilde{\Gamma}$) will give two different paths and any such path has a long normal form associated.

We thus denote by $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ the path in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, starting at 1, and labeled by the long normal form of $\tilde{\gamma}$.

We define the *sector* of angle θ of $P_k(< \tilde{\Gamma})$, denoted by $\text{Sec}_k(\theta)$, to be the set of elements that label pairs of edges in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, adjacent to $v_{[P_k]}$, with angle at most θ at $v_{[P_k]}$.

It is easy to check that the fineness of $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ implies the finiteness of every cone in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, and of every sector $\text{Sec}_k(\theta)$, for arbitrary k and θ .

2.3 Digression: speaking languages in groups.

Let us recall that a regular language on an alphabet is one which is the accepted language of a finite state automaton. We refer to the first chapter of [14] for a presentation of the theory.

We recall definitions of a few class of languages in groups. Let G be a group, and S be a finite symmetric generating set, with an order.

A *rational language* of G is a subset of G that is the image of a regular language in the set of words S^* on the alphabet S .

Given an element g of G , the *lexicographical normal form* of G is the word in S^* that is the first in the lexicographical order, among the shortest words representing g . A *normalized regular language* of G is a subset A of G such that the language $\tilde{A} \subset S^*$, consisting of the lexicographical normal forms of the elements of A , is regular.

We mentioned normalized regular languages because in case $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a free product of abelian groups, these languages are of rather easy use, and they allow a large number of possibilities, but the case we want to deal with is when $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is more general.

Let us now explain another class of languages useful for general free products, that was introduced by V. Diekert and M. Lohrey [12] for (even more general) graph products of monoids. There are several simplifications in our exposition, compared to [12], due to the specific case we consider (*e.g.* for free products, the set they note I is empty, their assumption 3.8 is always true for groups, their notations U_σ and V_σ are redundant with M_σ for groups, for a free product $IRR(R)$ is simply the set of normal forms, etc). Still we introduce the next tools according to notations in [12, Sec. 3.3], to allow the comparison.

Let Σ be a finite set, and for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, a group M_σ is given. Let $\mathbb{F}(\Sigma)$ be the free product of the M_σ .

For each σ let \mathcal{C}_σ be a family of subsets of M_σ , and $\mathcal{C}_\sigma^\bullet$ be the family of the same subsets where 1_σ has been removed in each of them. Let us write $\mathcal{C}^\bullet = \bigcup_\sigma \mathcal{C}_\sigma^\bullet$.

Let us define a \mathcal{C}^\bullet -automaton to be a finite state automaton such that every edge is labeled by an element of \mathcal{C}^\bullet (*i.e.* a language in some M_σ). If \mathbb{A} is such an automaton, the language accepted by \mathbb{A} , noted $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A})$ is defined as usual, and is a subset of $(\bigcup M_\sigma^\bullet)^*$ where $M_\sigma^\bullet = M_\sigma \setminus \{1_\sigma\}$: a word $a_1 \dots a_m \in (\bigcup M_\sigma^\bullet)^*$ is accepted if there is a sequence of states $q_0 \dots q_m$, with q_0 initial, and q_m accepted, and transition edges e_i from q_{i-1} to q_i , labeled by languages L_i with $a_i \in L_i$.

The set of all accepted languages, for all possible \mathcal{C}^\bullet -automata is noted $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}^\bullet)$, and is a subset of $\mathcal{P}((\bigcup M_\sigma^\bullet)^*)$.

Note that, apart from languages accepted by \mathcal{C}^\bullet -automata, another remarkable element of $\mathcal{P}((\bigcup M_\sigma^\bullet)^*)$ is the family of normal forms of elements of $\mathbb{F}(\Sigma)$, noted NF , which is in natural bijection with $\mathbb{F}(\Sigma)$. Thus if $L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}^\bullet)$, the set $L \cap NF$ consists of all normal forms of elements in $\mathbb{F}(\Sigma)$ that are accepted by the automaton.

Finally, we define $\mathcal{IL}(\mathcal{C}) = \{L \cap NF, L \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}^\bullet)\}$. This is a family of subsets of $(\bigcup M_\sigma^\bullet)^*$, and each such subset is included in NF , which allows to interpret it as a set of elements of $\mathbb{F}(\Sigma)$.

Let us now consider our group $\tilde{\Gamma} = P_0 * \dots * P_q$, where P_0 is the free group F_S . In the notation above, the M_σ are the factors P_i , $i \geq 1$, and the cyclic factors of P_0 generated by each element of S . For each i , we choose \mathcal{C}_i to be the family of finite or co-finite subsets of P_i . To justify this choice, we note that the decidability of the existential theory with parameters of P_i is equivalent to the decidability of the existential theory of P_i with constraints in \mathcal{C}_i , which is the correct assumption for using the results in [12].

Let us denote by **gnr** the union of the \mathcal{C}_i . The considerations above give rise to some specific class of languages, accepted by **gnr** $^\bullet$ -automata, denoted by $\mathcal{IL}(\mathbf{gnr})$, and let us then qualify these languages in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as *generalized normalized regular* (or **gnr**) languages. Let us emphasize that this class of languages is associated to a given free splitting of the group $\tilde{\Gamma}$, and that a **gnr** $^\bullet$ -automaton reads the long normal forms of elements of $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

The aim of this tool is to define a class of constraints for which the existential theory of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ with constraints would be decidable, provided that the existential theory of each P_i , with parameters, is decidable. This will follow from the main result of [12] (see 5.2 below), and from the decidability of the existential theory of P_i with constraints in \mathcal{C}_i (which, as noted above, follows from our assumption, by choice of the \mathcal{C}_i).

Let us try to clarify the difference between normalized regular languages and **gnr** languages. The following lemma claims that any **gnr** language is normalized regular, but the converse is not true. In the case of free products of abelian groups, it can be interesting to use this latter class (together with the main result of [13], see 5.1 below), since it gives more latitude in the choice of constraints. On the other hand, when the free product has non-abelian factors, normalized regular languages may not be useful since the main theorem of [12] may not apply.

Lemma 2.1. *With the above assumptions, given arbitrary orders in generating sets of each P_i , any **gnr** language is normalized regular.*

Consider a language L in $\mathcal{IL}(\mathbf{gnr})$, and an associated **gnr** $^\bullet$ -automaton \mathbb{A} . Given an (oriented) edge e of the automaton, it is associated to a finite or co-finite subset X of some P_i . In both cases, there is an automaton A_e whose alphabet is the generating set of P_i , and whose accepted language is that of lexicographical normal forms of elements of X .

Replace then the edge e by an automaton A_e in the following way: the initial state of A_e is identified to the origin state of e , and the end state of e is duplicated and identified

to each accepted state of A_e , all other state of A_e being non-accepted. Thus, it requires a lexicographical normal form of an element of X to go through this automaton.

Perform the construction for each edge of the original \mathbf{gnr}^\bullet -automaton \mathbb{A} , the result is a finite state automaton whose alphabet is the union of generating set of the P_i .

It is then a direct consequence of the construction that a lexicographical normal form is accepted if and only if it defines an element in L . Thus, L is normalized regular. \square

2.4 Choosing a language without detour.

The remaining of this section is devoted to the choice of a good class of “geometric” elements in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ (similarly to the hyperbolic case in the previous section). We look for a class of elements that label geometrically relevant paths in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$ and that is recognizable by a finite state automaton, in the sense of generalized normalized regular languages.

2.4.1 Detours and small detours.

Let now $\tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, with normal form $\tilde{\gamma} = x_1 x_2 \dots x_r$. Let $i_0 \geq 2$ and $s \leq r - i_0 - 1$, and let $\tilde{d} = x_{i_0} x_{i_0+1} \dots x_{i_0+s}$.

We say that \tilde{d} is a θ -detour of $\tilde{\gamma}$ if there is k such that both x_{i_0-1} and x_{i_0+s+1} are in $P_k \setminus \text{Sec}_k(\theta)$ and if $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{d})$ starts and ends at distance 1 from $v_{[P_k]}$ in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$. We call length of a detour, the length of the path it labels in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$. Intuitively, if $\tilde{\gamma}$ has a detour, the path $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ contains a severe backtracking on some vertex translated of $v_{[P_k]}$. We also say that a path has a θ -detour if it is labeled by an element of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ with a θ -detour.

Let $\mu \geq 1$. Let us consider a θ -detour \tilde{d} of $\tilde{\gamma}$, with the notations as above. We say that it is μ -small if all the x_{i_0+j} , $j = 0, \dots, s$ are in $F_S \cup (\bigcup_{k=1}^q \text{Sec}_k(5\mu(\mu + \theta)))$. Intuitively, a small detour is a detour without large angle inside.

The choice of constants will be justified in the following.

2.4.2 The language \mathcal{L} .

We want to define a class of elements of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, that we wish to call geometric, in the sense that they are relevant to the geometry of $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$.

Let M be a bound on the cardinality of cones of radius and angle 50δ . Let $L_1 = 10^4\delta M$, $L_2 = 10^6\delta^2 M$, and let θ be the computable constant that we denoted by Θ in [7] (for instance $10^4(D + 60\delta)$ is suitable, where D is a fellow traveling constant for 1000δ -quasi-geodesics, and greater than any angles at finite valence vertices).

As already mentioned, it is a classical property of hyperbolic geometry that there exists¹ $L, L'_1 > 0$ and L'_2 such that any L -local (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic is a (global) (L'_1, L'_2) -quasi-geodesic. One can choose $L > L'_2$.

We then qualify as *geometric*, the elements $\tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ that do not have any θ -detour such that $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a L -local (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic. We denote by $\mathcal{L} \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$ the set of geometric elements of $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

The aim of the next paragraphs is to prove that \mathcal{L} is generalized normalized regular, and that so is the subset of \mathcal{L} representing the trivial element of Γ .

¹In fact there are explicit values in [5, p.30-31]

It will turn out that there are good canonical representatives in \mathcal{L} for turning equations in Γ into equations in $\tilde{\Gamma}$, hence the interest of this language.

2.4.3 A local characterization of \mathcal{L} .

The aim of this part is to prove the following characterization of \mathcal{L} , that weakens the absence of detours to the absence of small detours.

Proposition 2.2. *An element $\tilde{\gamma}$ is in \mathcal{L} if and only if it has no L'_2 -small θ -detour of length at most L'_2 , and $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a L -local (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic.*

This characterization will be used in order to prove the regularity of \mathcal{L} , whereas we will need the property stated as definition in order to show later the fellow traveling property of elements of \mathcal{L} .

Before proving the characterization itself, we establish a couple of lemmata.

Lemma 2.3. *(Loops in absence of detours)*

Let $\theta > 0$, and consider the family of oriented edges of an oriented path of length T , without θ -detour.

Let v be a non-extremal vertex on the path, and let us denote by e_1, \dots, e_k the edges of our family that arrive at v , and f_1, \dots, f_k be the edges of our family that start at v .

Let $a > 0$. If $\text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_k) \leq a$, then $\text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_1) \leq a + T(T + \theta)$. Moreover for all $i \leq k - 1$, $\text{Ang}_v(f_i, e_{i+1}) \leq T$ for all $i \leq k - 1$.

Proof. First let us notice that f_i and e_{i+1} are the first and last edges of a loop that passes only once at v and that has length at most T . This provides immediately $\text{Ang}_v(f_i, e_{i+1}) \leq T$ for all $i \leq k - 1$.

By triangular inequality for angles, $\text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_1) \leq \text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_k) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \text{Ang}_v(f_i, f_{i+1}) \leq \text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_k) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\text{Ang}_v(f_i, e_{i+1}) + \text{Ang}_v(e_{i+1}, f_{i+1}))$, and therefore $\text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_1) \leq a + (k - 1)T + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \text{Ang}_v(e_{i+1}, f_{i+1})$.

We can assume that $\text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_1) > \theta$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. Then if for some $i \leq k - 1$, $\text{Ang}_v(e_{i+1}, f_{i+1}) > \theta$, this produces a θ -detour for our path, between the edges f_1 and e_{i+1} , which is opposed to our assumption. Thus, for all i , $\text{Ang}_v(e_{i+1}, f_{i+1}) \leq \theta$, and therefore, $\text{Ang}_v(e_1, f_1) \leq a + (k - 1)(\theta + T)$. Since $k \leq T$, this proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, $\theta > 0$, and $\mu > 0$.*

Any θ -detour \tilde{d} of $\tilde{\gamma}$, such that the length of $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{d})$ is at most μ , contains, or is, a μ -small θ -detour.

Proof. Let us argue by contradiction, and consider $\tilde{d} = x_{i_0}x_{i_0+1}\dots x_{i_0+s}$ a θ -detour of length at most μ , without μ -small θ -detour. Let us assume that \tilde{d} has minimal length s among θ -detours of $\tilde{\gamma}$. Since it is assumed not to be small, one letter x_{i_0+j} is in some $P_{k'} \setminus \text{Sec}_{k'}(5\mu(\mu + \theta))$.

By definition of detour, the path $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{d})$, together with two edges from its end points to $v_{[P_k]}$, defines a loop, which we denote by $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{d})^+$, of length at most $\mu + 2$. Because of x_{i_0+j} , this loop contains a vertex v at which its two consecutive edges make an angle of at least $5\mu(\mu + \theta)$.

Since this angle is greater than μ , the end points of the edges cannot be joined by a loop of length μ avoiding v , hence, $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{d})^+$ has to pass at least twice on v .

One can then apply Lemma 2.3 to \tilde{d} , for which $T \leq 2\mu$, at the vertex v . One can use $a = \mu$, since the first and last edges of $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{d})$ containing v are in a sub-loop of $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{d})^+$ of length at most μ that does not pass twice by v , and make therefore an angle at most μ . One thus gets $5\mu(\mu + \theta) < \mu + 2\mu(2\mu + \theta)$ which is a contradiction. \square

Let us now prove Proposition 2.2. By definition an element $\tilde{\gamma}$ is in \mathcal{L} if and only if it has no θ -detour, and if $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a L -local (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic. Any such element satisfies the condition of Proposition 2.2, and for the converse, given an element such that $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a L -local (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic, since $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a global (L'_1, L'_2) -quasi-geodesic, any detour is of length at most L'_2 , and therefore, by Lemma 2.4 (with $\mu = L'_2$), any θ -detour contains a L'_2 -small θ -detour, of length at most L'_2 . Hence the equivalence stated. \square

2.4.4 Normalized regularity of \mathcal{L} .

Proposition 2.5. *The language $\mathcal{L} \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$ is generalized normalized regular (hence in particular normalized regular).*

Proof. We need an automaton that reads the long normal forms of elements of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and accepts exactly those in \mathcal{L} .

Let \mathcal{D} the list of all long normal forms w of elements of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that are L'_2 -small θ -detours with $\text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w)) \leq L'_2$ (as in Proposition 2.2). The long normal form of a small detour consists of elements of $S \cup (\bigcup_{k=1}^q \text{Sec}_k(5L'_2(L'_2 + \theta)))$. Therefore \mathcal{D} is finite and computable (indeed the sets $\text{Sec}_k(\kappa)$ are computable if one knows the list of simple loops of $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ of length 2κ , which we know, or are given, by assumption).

It is then easy to design a \mathbf{gnr}^\bullet -automaton that checks whether a long normal form of an element contains a L'_2 -small detour of length at most L'_2 . Indeed it suffices to check whether the given word contains a sub-word in \mathcal{D} , preceded and followed by two elements in some same $P_k \setminus \text{Sec}_k(\theta)$ (which is co-finite in P_k).

It remains to design a \mathbf{gnr}^\bullet -automaton that, given a long normal form without L'_2 -small θ -detour of length less than L'_2 , checks whether it labels a L -local (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$.

A path fails to be a L -local (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic if and only if one of its sub-paths of length $\ell \leq L$ is labeled by an element $g_L \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ satisfying in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ the inequality $d(1, \overline{g_L}) < (\ell - L_2)/L_1$. We say that the long normal form of such a g_L , is *forbidden*.

Moreover, since $L > L'_2$, a path of length at most L without θ -detour have no L'_2 -small θ -detour of length less than L'_2 .

These observations reduce the problem to finding an automaton that checks whether a long normal form w with $\text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w)) \leq L$, and without θ -detour, is forbidden.

Let $A = 2(L + \theta)^2$. The long normal form w of an element of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ can be written in a unique way $w = w_1 a_1 w_2 \dots a_{k-1} w_k a_k w_{k+1}$, for some k , with, for all i , a_i an element in $P_k \setminus \text{Sec}_k(A)$ for some $k \leq q$ (i.e. defining in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ an angle greater than A) maximal for this property, and with w_i the long normal form of an element defining a path in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ with no angle greater than A . By maximality of the a_i , one has $\text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w)) = 2k + \sum \text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w_i))$.

Let us now prove the following lemma, before finishing the proof of Proposition 2.5

Lemma 2.6. *Assume that the element defined by the long normal form w has no θ -detour, and that $\text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w)) \leq L$. Then, with the notations as above, it is forbidden if and only if $(2k + \sum \text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w_i)) - L_2)/L_1 > 2k + \sum d(1, \bar{w}_i)$, where \bar{w}_i is the element of Γ defined by w_i .*

The word w labels a path $\mathbf{p}(w)$ in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ of length $\text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w)) = 2k + \sum \text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w_i))$ from 1 to $\bar{w} \in \Gamma$. It is forbidden if and only if $\text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w)) > L_1 d(1, \bar{w}) + L_2$. It remains to show that $d(1, \bar{w}) \geq 2k + \sum d(1, \bar{w}_i)$.

Let us denote by $v_i, i = 1, \dots, k-1$, the consecutive vertices of $\mathbf{p}(w)$ where the letters a_i label an angle. In $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, for $i \in [1, k-1]$, the word w_i labels a path between finite valence vertices adjacent to v_i and v_{i+1} , thus $d(v_i, v_{i+1}) = d(1, \bar{w}_{i+1}) + 2$ for all $i \in [1, k-1]$. Similarly, with the convention $v_0 = 1$ and $v_{k+1} = \bar{w}$, one has $d(v_0, v_1) = d(1, \bar{w}_1) + 1$, and $d(v_k, v_{k+1}) = d(1, \bar{w}_{k+1}) + 1$.

Thus, $\sum_{i=0}^k d(v_i, v_{i+1}) = 2k + \sum d(1, \bar{w}_i)$. Therefore it suffices to check that $\sum_{i=0}^k d(v_i, v_{i+1}) = d(1, \bar{w})$, which is true if all the v_i are on some geodesic $[1, \bar{w}]$.

Consider a geodesic $[1, \bar{w}]$, and assume that $v_i \in [1, \bar{w}]$ for some i . The path defined by the union of the sub-path $\mathbf{p}(w)$ from 1 to \bar{w} , and of a geodesic $[1, \bar{w}]$, is a loop of length at most $2L$. Since the angle of $\mathbf{p}(w)$ at v_i is greater than $A > 2L$, the loop has to pass at least twice on this point. Since $v_i \notin [1, \bar{w}]$, the path $\mathbf{p}(w)$ passes twice at v_i . One can then apply Lemma 2.3 for $a = 2L$ to obtain that the angle at a_i is at most $2L + L(L + \theta)$. Since it is also at least $A = 2(L + \theta)^2$, this contradicts the choice of A . \square

Let us then finish the proof of Proposition 2.5. Recall that it is enough to find an automaton that, given a long normal form w with $\text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w))$ at most L , without θ -detour, checks whether it is forbidden.

Consider the set \mathcal{S} of all the words in long normal form, that define in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ a path of length at most L and of maximal angle at most A . This set is finite, and for all $k \leq L/2$, the set \mathcal{S}_k of $(k+1)$ -tuple of elements of \mathcal{S} that satisfy the inequalities $(2k + \sum \text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w_i)) - L_2)/L_1 > 2k + \sum d(1, \gamma_{w_i})$ and $2k + \sum \text{length}(\mathbf{p}(w_i)) \leq L$ is finite and computable. The lemma asserts that the forbidden words without θ -detour are exactly the concatenations the elements w_i of a certain set $\mathcal{S}_k, k \leq L/2$ with elements of the factor groups in one of the $P_k \setminus \text{Sec}_k(A)$ (which are co-finite in the P_k). This can be easily recognized by a \mathbf{gnr}^\bullet -automaton. \square

2.5 Conical fellow-traveling, and finiteness of \mathcal{L}_0 .

We now prove that quasi-geodesics without small detours fellow travel in a strong sense.

Proposition 2.7. *Let λ, μ, χ be positive constants, and let ϵ be a constant of fellow traveling for (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesics in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, which is hyperbolic. Set $\epsilon' = 4(\epsilon + \lambda(3\epsilon + \mu) + (\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu))(\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu) + \chi)) + 50\delta$.*

Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be an element of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, without χ -detour. Assume moreover that $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a (λ, μ) -quasi-geodesic of $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$. Denote by 1 and v its starting and ending point, and assume $v \neq 1$.

Then, if $[1, v]$ is a geodesic segment with set of edges \mathcal{E} , the path $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is contained in the union $\bigcup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \text{Cone}_{e', e'}(e)$.

Let $\rho : [0, T] \rightarrow \widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ be an arc-length parameterization of $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$. Let $v = \rho(t)$, and assume it is not in $[x, y]$. Let us define $t_- = \max\{0, t - \lambda(3\epsilon + \mu)\}$, and $t_+ = \min\{T, t + \lambda(3\epsilon + \mu)\}$. Let us also choose τ_- a geodesic from $\rho(t_-)$ to a closest point x' of $[x, y]$, and τ_+ in the same way. The choice of t_- and t_+ guarantees that τ_- and τ_+ are disjoint, and that $[x', y']$ is not

reduced to a point. We now choose t'_- such that $\rho(t'_-)$ is the last common point of ρ and τ_- , and τ'_- is the subsegment of τ_- joining $\rho(t'_-)$ to x' (and similarly for t_+). Since the length of τ_- and τ_+ is at most ϵ , one still has $t \in [t'_-, t'_+]$. We now consider the loop equal to the concatenation $\tau'_-, \rho|_{[t'_-, t'_+]}, \tau'_+, [y', x']$. It contains an edge e of $[x, y]$ and the vertex v , and it is of length at most $2\epsilon + 2\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu) + d(x', y')$, that can be bounded by $4\epsilon + 4\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu)$.

We now need to bound the angles in this (not necessarily simple) loop. The multiple points of the loop are all on $\rho|_{[t'_-, t'_+]}$. This path has no χ -detour, and is of length at most $2\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu)$, therefore, by Lemma 2.3, its angles on multiple points are at most $4\epsilon + 4\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu) + (2\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu))(2\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu) + \chi)$. On the other hand the angle on every simple point of the loop is at most $4\epsilon + 4\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu)$. This provides a path from the edge $e \in [x, y]$ to v of length at most $4\epsilon + 4\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu)$ and maximal angle at most $4\epsilon + 4\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu) + (2\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu))(2\lambda(3\epsilon + \mu) + \chi) \leq \epsilon'$. Therefore, $v \in \text{Cone}_{\epsilon', \epsilon'}(e)$. \square

Corollary 2.8. *The language \mathcal{L}_0 of the elements of \mathcal{L} that represent the identity of Γ is finite and computable, and $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_0$ is generalized normalized regular.*

Proof. For the choice of constants $\lambda = L_1, \mu = L_2, \chi = \theta$, Proposition 2.7 indicates that for all $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{L}_0$, the path $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$ remains in $\text{Cone}_{\epsilon', \epsilon'}(e)$, where e is the first edge of $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$, being in particular one of the finitely many edges adjacent to the base vertex 1 of $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$.

Since it is a (L'_1, L'_2) -quasi-geodesic, and a closed loop, it has length at most L'_2 . This leaves only finitely many possibilities for $\mathbf{p}(\tilde{\gamma})$, therefore for $\tilde{\gamma}$. The rest of the corollary follows immediately from Proposition 2.5. \square

3 Canonical Representatives in $\tilde{\Gamma}$

We are now interested in providing canonical representatives, in the way of Rips and Sela [23], for elements in Γ . We want these representatives to be “geometric”, that is to belong to \mathcal{L} , in order to have control on them.

Fortunately, the most technical part was already done in our previous work [7]. We recall the main result we need.

3.1 Sliced cylinders.

Let us briefly recall the results of our constructions of [7] (where details can be found). In the following, for a and b in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, and $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\text{Cyl}_l(a, b)$ (read “cylinder of parameter l for the pair (a, b) ”) is a finite, computable subset of $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, lying in a union of cones of known radius and angle, and centered on the edges of a geodesic path from a to b .

Any cylinder has an ordered decomposition in slices, that we write $\text{Cyl}_l(a, b) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^s S_l(a, b)_i$ [7, Def. 2.16].

These slices are equivalence classes for a certain relation (defined by a cocycle [7, Def. 2.15]). There exists a universal constant such that any two consecutive slices of a cylinder are in a cone of that angle and radius [7, Corollary 2.20].

In particular, in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, there are only finitely many orbits of subsets that are slices of some cylinder, and also of subsets that are pairs of consecutive slices in some cylinder.

The definitions of these slices and cylinders are compatible with isometries, so that one has the important property that $\text{Cyl}_l(a, b) = \gamma^{-1}\text{Cyl}_l(\gamma a, \gamma b)$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ (see [7, Lemma 2.7]).

The main property of cylinders and slices is a stability property, which we rephrase now, that states that they almost coincide in selected triangles.

Theorem 3.1. ([7, Theorems 2.9 and 2.22])

Let Γ be a relatively hyperbolic group, with a finite generating set. Let δ be a hyperbolicity constant of a coned-graph. There exists computable constants κ_1, κ_2 , depending only on the generating set such that the following holds.

Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary finite subset of Γ , n be an integer, and consider n words of three letters in \mathcal{A} , $\mathbf{eq}_i = a(i)_1 a(i)_2 a(i)_3$, with $i \leq n$, such that, for all i , $\mathbf{eq}_i \equiv 1$ in Γ .

Then, there exists an integer $l \in [1, 10^{30}(\delta + 1)^{10}]$, such that, for all $i \leq n$, the unique ordered slice decomposition of $\text{Cyl}_l(1, a(i)_j)$ can be written

$$\text{Cyl}_l(1, a(i)_j) = \left(\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{l(j)} L(j)_k \right) \sqcup \left(\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{c(j)} C(j)_k \right) \sqcup \left(\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{r(j)} R(j)_k \right)$$

where the following equalities hold: $r(j) = l(j + 1[3])$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, and $(a(i)_j)^{-1} R(j)_k = L(j + 1[3])_{r(j)-k+1}$ for all $j \leq 3$, and all k , and where moreover, $c(j) \leq \kappa_1 n + \kappa_2$ and no slice $C(j)_k$ is an angular slice of angle greater than κ_2 .

In other words, the theorem states that for the considered relations $\mathbf{eq}_i = a(i)_1 a(i)_2 a(i)_3$, there is l such that the cylinders are of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cyl}(1, a(i)_1) &= (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k, \mathcal{H}_z, T_m, T_{m-1}, \dots, T_1) \\ \text{Cyl}(a(i)_1, a(i)_1 a(i)_2) &= (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k, \mathcal{H}_y, V_p, V_{p-1}, \dots, V_1) \\ \text{Cyl}(a(i)_1 a(i)_2, 1) &= (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m, \mathcal{H}_x, V_p, V_{p-1}, \dots, V_1), \end{aligned}$$

where $S_1, \dots, S_k, T_1, \dots, T_m$ and V_1, \dots, V_p are slices and where each \mathcal{H}_v , ($v = x, y, z$) is a set of at most $\kappa_1 n + \kappa_2$ consecutive slices, without parabolic slice of angle more than κ_2 .

The constants κ_1 and κ_2 can easily be made explicit from [7, Theorems 2.9, 2.22], to which we refer the reader (note that they do not depend on the parameter noted l in [7, Theorem 2.9], which may not be computable).

3.2 Centers and junctions between slices.

Let \mathcal{F}_1 be a finite family of representative of Γ -orbits of subsets of $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ that are slices of some cylinder.

Let us make the choice, for each $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_1$, of a point $x_\sigma \in \sigma$, which we call the *center* of σ . We can choose it to be a point of Γ as soon as σ is not reduced to a single parabolic point, since in this case, a slice always contains a non-parabolic point.

Similarly let \mathcal{F}_2 be a finite set of representatives of equivalence classes of Γ -orbits of pairs of points belonging to two consecutive slices in some cylinder. The existence of such a finite set is ensured by the fact that any slice is finite, and that there are finitely many orbits of pairs of consecutive slices (as already mentioned).

For all pair of points x_1, x_2 in \mathcal{F}_2 , let us choose a geodesic path $j_{(x_1, x_2)}$ in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ joining them, and let us call this path a *junction*.

Note that by [7, Corollary 2.20], every junction is shorter than 1000δ , and has maximal angle at most θ .

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ be a torsion free relatively hyperbolic group. Let $Cyl_l(x, y)$ be a cylinder in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$ with ordered slice decomposition $Cyl_l(x, y) = \sqcup_{j=1}^s S_j$.*

For all $j \leq s - 1$, there is a unique pair of points $(x_j, x_{j+1}) \in S_j \times S_{j+1}$, such that there is γ_j, γ_{j+1} such that $\gamma_j S_j \in \mathcal{F}_1$ has center $\gamma_j x_j$, and similarly for $j + 1$.

There is also a unique segment $j_{(x_j, x_{j+1})}$, depending only on S_j and S_{j+1} , such that there is $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\gamma(x_j, x_{j+1}) \in \mathcal{F}_2$ and $\gamma j_{(x_j, x_{j+1})} = j_{(\gamma x_j, \gamma x_{j+1})}$.

Proof. The existence of such objects is clear since \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 are orbit representatives. The interesting issue is uniqueness. Assume that x'_j, x'_{j+1} and $j'_{(x_j, x_{j+1})}$ also satisfy the conclusion.

Let us first prove that $x_j = x'_j$ (and the same will hold for x'_{j+1}, x_{j+1}). By assumption there are γ and γ' such that $\gamma S_j = \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_1$, of center γx_j , and $\gamma' S_j = \sigma$, of center $\gamma' x'_j$. Therefore, $\gamma'^{-1} \gamma \sigma = \sigma$, and $\langle \gamma'^{-1} \gamma \rangle$ has a finite orbit in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$. This implies that either $\gamma'^{-1} \gamma$ has finite order or is parabolic. If it has finite order, by absence of torsion, $\gamma' = \gamma$, and $x_j = x'_j$. If it is parabolic (of infinite order), it fixes a single point in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$, and it is its only finite orbit. Thus σ is reduced to this single point, and clearly $x_j = x'_j$.

Now, there is a unique pair in \mathcal{F}_2 in the orbit of (x_j, x'_j) , by definition of \mathcal{F}_2 .

Therefore, there are γ and γ' in Γ such that $\gamma j_{(x_j, x_{j+1})} = \gamma' j'_{(x_j, x_{j+1})}$. This means that $\gamma'^{-1} \gamma$ fixes two different points in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$, and therefore that it is in two distinct parabolic subgroups. This easily implies that it has finite order, and since Γ is torsion free, $\gamma = \gamma'$ hence $j_{(x_j, x_{j+1})} = j'_{(x_j, x_{j+1})}$. \square

With the notations of the lemma above, we call *junction* the geodesic path $j_{(x_j, x_{j+1})}$.

3.3 Canonical representatives.

There are two possibilities for a junction: either it is between two points of Γ , and it is labeled by a well defined element of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, or one of its ends is a parabolic point. Note that it is not possible that both its ends are parabolic points since in the consecutive slices of a cylinder there are no consecutive parabolic slices (see [7, Def. 2.6]). In this case, the two consecutive junctions at the parabolic point provide a path from two points of Γ , and it corresponds to a well defined element of $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

This allows to define $\mathbf{rep}_l(\gamma) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ the canonical representative for $\gamma \in \Gamma$ (for the parameter l) to be the product in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ of all the elements associated to junctions or pairs of consecutive junctions between the ordered slices of $Cyl_l(1, \gamma)$. Theorem 3.1 therefore gives the following.

Theorem 3.3. *Let Γ be a torsion free relatively hyperbolic group, with notations as above. There exists an explicit constant κ such that the following holds.*

Let \mathcal{A} be a finite subset of Γ , and n words of three letters in \mathcal{A} , $\mathbf{eq}_i = a(i)_1 a(i)_2 a(i)_3$, with $i \leq n$, such that, for all i , $\mathbf{eq}_i \neq 1$ in Γ .

Then, there exists an integer $l \in [1, 10^{30}(\delta + 1)^{10}]$, such that,

$$\forall i \leq n, \exists l_1, l_2, l_3 \in \tilde{\Gamma}, \exists r_1, r_2, r_3 \in \tilde{\Gamma}, \exists c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \tilde{\Gamma}$$

satisfying

$$\forall j \leq 3, \mathbf{rep}_l(a(i)_j) = l_j c_j r_j \quad r_j = (l_{j+1} [3])^{-1}.$$

and either $\forall j \leq 3$, c_j has a long normal form of length at most κn with letters in $S \cup (\bigcup_{k=1}^q \text{Sec}_k(\kappa))$, or $\exists k, \forall j \leq 3$, $c_j \in P_k$.

Note that the elements r_j and l_j represent elements of the group $\tilde{\Gamma}$, and therefore paths up to translation in $\widehat{Cay}\Gamma$ (which makes a syntactic difference with the situation in Theorem 3.1, where the cylinders were *not* considered modulo translation).

We say that a triangle \mathbf{eq}_i is singular for its canonical representatives, if it falls in the second case of the theorem, and regular otherwise.

Let us describe the picture on the paths defined by \mathbf{p} . Each regular equation gives a triangle $(1, z(i)_1, z(i)_1 z(i)_2)$ that looks like a tripod, with a small defect at its center, that is neither long in perimeter, nor in maximal angle. Each singular equation gives a triangle $(1, z(i)_1, z(i)_1 z(i)_2)$ that is a tripod, whose center is a vertex fixed by a parabolic subgroup.

3.4 Canonical representatives are geometric.

We need geometric properties of canonical representatives in order to get some control on them.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$, and l an integer, then its canonical representative $\mathbf{rep}_l(\gamma)$ is geometric, in the sense that it is in $\mathcal{L} \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$.*

Recall (see the remark before Lemma 3.2) that no junction has an angle greater than θ . Therefore if the path $\mathbf{rep}_l(\gamma)$ has an angle greater than θ , it must be between two junctions, that is on the center of a slice. If it pass again at this vertex with an angle greater than θ , this means that two slices have same center, but this is impossible. Therefore $\mathbf{rep}_l(\gamma)$ does not have any θ -detour.

Let us show that it is in fact a (L_1, L_2) -quasi-geodesic. Let f be an arc-length parameterization of the path.

Since junctions are geodesics of length at most 1000δ , it is enough to check the inequality $|b' - a'| = \text{length}(f([a', b'])) \leq 10^4 \delta M d(f(a'), f(b')) + (10^7 \delta M - 2000\delta)$, between centers of slices. Let a' and b' be so that $f(a')$ and $f(b')$ are centers of slices in the slice decomposition. Since any junction is shorter than 1000δ , the path contains at least $|b' - a'|/(1000\delta)$ junctions between these two points. Therefore, $|b' - a'| \leq 1000\delta \times (n + 1)$, where n is the number of slices between $f(b')$ and $f(a')$.

Now, let us bound from below the distance between two points x and y separated by n slices in the decomposition of an arbitrary cylinder $Cyl(g, g')$. We need to refer to structural details in [7] about cylinders, in order to compute this bound. First, cylinders are union of cylinders that contain no parabolic slice, separated by very large angles (see 2.14 in [7]). So it is enough to treat only the case of cylinders without parabolic slice, since their concatenation with large angle would remain quasi-geodesic.

In these cylinders, by the definition of slices (see [7] Def. 2.15), $n \leq |\sharp(N_L^{g,g'}(x) \setminus N_L^{g,g'}(y)) - \sharp(N_L^{g,g'}(y) \setminus N_L^{g,g'}(x)) + \sharp(N_R^{g,g'}(y) \setminus N_R^{g,g'}(x)) - \sharp(N_R^{g,g'}(x) \setminus N_R^{g,g'}(y))|$, where the set $N_L^{g,g'}(x)$ represents the set of points of $Cyl(g, g')$ at distance at least 100δ from x and that are closer to g than x (L stands for left, and R for right: the role of g and g' are permuted). Therefore, one of these four sets must have cardinality at least $n/4$: say without loss of generality that $\sharp(N_L^{g,g'}(x) \setminus N_L^{g,g'}(y)) \geq n/4$. But a cylinder is contained in the union of cones of radius and angle 50δ centered at the edges of a geodesic between g and g' . Therefore, as M is an upper bound to the cardinality of cones of radius and angle 50δ , there are at least $n/(4M)$ different cones centered on edges of a geodesic $[g, g']$ that intersect $(N_L^{g,g'}(x) \setminus N_L^{g,g'}(y))$. Considering the extremal cones of this family, one gets two points at least $n/(4M)$ apart in this set. One concludes that $d(x, y) \geq n/(4M) - 200\delta$.

With the minoration $1000\delta(n+1) \geq |b' - a'|$ previously obtained, one gets, for $x = f(a')$ and $y = f(b')$: $d(f(a'), f(b')) \geq |b' - a'|/(4000\delta M) - 1/(4M) - 200\delta$ and thus $|b' - a'| \leq 4000\delta M \times d(f(a'), f(b')) + 800000\delta^2 M + 4000$. \square

4 Lifting Solutions in \mathcal{L}

We can now reproduce in the relative case the idea, presented in the hyperbolic case in section 1, that one can lift a solution of a system of equations as a solution of another system in the group $\tilde{\Gamma}$.

Let $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{eq}_1 = 1, \mathbf{eq}_2 = 1, \dots, \mathbf{eq}_n = 1\}$ be a finite system of triangular equations in Γ , with set of unknowns Ω , and set of parameters P . Let us write $\mathbf{eq}_i = z(i)_1 z(i)_2 z(i)_3$.

Let us consider another instance of Ω , which we distinguish: $\tilde{\Omega} \simeq \Omega$. Let $\Omega' = \tilde{\Omega} \cup \{l(i)_j, c(i)_j, r(i)_j \mid i \leq n, j \leq 3\}$.

Given $i \leq n$, let us define the $6n$ equations $\widetilde{\mathbf{eq}}_{i,j}$, for $j \leq 6$:

$$\forall j \leq 3, \widetilde{\mathbf{eq}}_{i,j} = (\widetilde{z(i)_j})^{-1} l(i)_j c(i)_j r(i)_j \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{eq}}_{i,j+3} = r(i)_j l(i)_{j+1} [3]$$

We may or may not use the following equations, but we need to define them.

$$\forall i \leq n \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{eq}}_{i,c} = c(i)_1 c(i)_2 c(i)_3$$

Let us now define the set \mathcal{T} of triples (c_1, c_2, c_3) of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, whose long normal form is of length at most κn , contains only letters in $S \cup (\bigcup_{k=1}^q \text{Sec}_k(\kappa))$ and such that the concatenation of $\mathbf{p}(c_1), \mathbf{p}(c_2)$ and $\mathbf{p}(c_3)$ is a closed loop, as in the statement of Theorem 3.3. In order to compute effectively this set \mathcal{T} , it is enough, first, to compute $\text{Sec}_k(\kappa)$ for any k and the explicit constant κ (this can be done knowing the list of simple loops of length 2κ in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$), and second, to use a solution to the word problem in Γ , which we have [15].

We can now define a family \mathfrak{F} of systems of equations with parameters in $\tilde{\Gamma}$: a system of \mathfrak{F} contains all the equations $\widetilde{\mathbf{eq}}_{i,j} = 1$, for $i \leq n, j \leq 6$, and, for all i , either it contains $\widetilde{\mathbf{eq}}_{i,c}$ (in which case we call the index i singular), or it contains equations $c(i)_1 = c_1, c(i)_2 = c_2, c(i)_3 = c_3$ for some triple of parameters $(c_1, c_2, c_3) \in \mathcal{T}$ (in which case we call the index i regular). With the preliminary knowledge of the items mentioned at the end of the introduction, since \mathcal{T} is computable, \mathfrak{F} is computable.

Proposition 4.1. *Let Γ be a torsion free relatively hyperbolic group, and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as above.*

Given a finite triangular system \mathcal{E} of equations in Γ , of set of unknowns Ω , there is a computable finite family \mathfrak{F} of finite systems of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, of set of unknowns containing a copy $\tilde{\Omega}$ of Ω , that satisfy the following.

Given a solution s of \mathcal{E} , there is a system $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ in \mathfrak{F} that admits a solution \tilde{s} such that $\tilde{s}(\tilde{\omega})$ is in \mathcal{L} , and $\overline{\tilde{s}(\tilde{\omega})} = s(\omega)$.

If a system in \mathfrak{F} has a solution \tilde{s} , then \tilde{s} restricted to $\tilde{\Omega}$ (pre-composed with the bijection between Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$) is a solution to \mathcal{E} .

We choose \mathfrak{F} as before the statement of the proposition. As already said, \mathfrak{F} is computable.

In order to prove the first assertion, let us first choose correctly $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ (note that it may not be computable a priori, however we only need its existence). We need to choose which indices are singular, and which are regular. Given s , we consider the canonical representatives of

the solution given by Theorem 3.3. We say that an index i is singular if and only if the corresponding triangle is singular, as defined in the theorem.

With the notations as in the beginning of the section, let $\omega = z(i)_j$. We then assign the values for $l(i)_j, c(i)_j, r(i)_j$ for $i \leq n, j \leq 3$ as given by Theorem 3.3 for the element $\text{rep}_l(z(i)_j)$. This theorem precisely tells that this is a solution to the corresponding system of equations in \mathfrak{F} .

To check the last assertion, simply consider the image in Γ of the solution in $\tilde{\Gamma}$, by definition, this is a solution of \mathcal{E} . \square

5 Results, and Conclusion

We make use of important results about decidability of existential theory for free products of groups. We are interested in results of V. Diekert, M. Lohrey, and A. Muscholl. In the case our parabolic groups are free abelian, we considered a free product of abelian subgroups, and the following is sufficient for our study (recall that in our context, generalized normalized regular languages are normalized regular).

Theorem 5.1. (*Diekert, Muscholl, [13, Thm 25]*)

The existential theory with normalized rational constraints of a free product of abelian groups is decidable.

For general free products, we use a special case of Theorem 3.10 in [12] (or Theorem 4 in [11]), for the class of generalized rational constraints that we introduced above:

Theorem 5.2. (*Diekert, Lohrey, [12]*)

For any free product of groups whose existential theory with parameters is decidable, the existential theory, with generalized normalized rational constraints (with respect to the given free product), is decidable.

We obtain the following result which is slightly stronger than needed for proving that existential theories are decidable. However, while discussing with D. Groves on how to apply these results to the Isomorphism Problem, it became apparent that it would be useful for this purpose at least. It is the analogue of Proposition 1.6 that was stated in the hyperbolic case.

Proposition 5.3. *Let Γ a torsion free relatively hyperbolic group, and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ the free product of its parabolic subgroups and of a free group, as above. Let \mathcal{L} the set of geometric elements of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ defined before.*

There is an algorithm that performs the following.

*Given a finite system \mathcal{E} of triangular equations in Γ , of set of unknowns Ω , and given, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, a **gnr** language \mathcal{L}_ω of geometric elements (i.e. such that $\mathcal{L}_\omega \subset \mathcal{L}$), the algorithm always terminates, and says “yes” if there exists a solution s of \mathcal{E} with the property that, for all ω , any pre-image of $s(\omega)$ in \mathcal{L} is in \mathcal{L}_ω , and only if there exists a solution s of \mathcal{E} with the property that, for all ω , some pre-image of $s(\omega)$ in \mathcal{L} is in \mathcal{L}_ω*

Moreover if Γ has only free abelian parabolic subgroups, the same is true with \mathcal{L}_ω normalized regular (not necessarily generalized).

Proof. Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a set in bijection with Ω , that we interpret as a set of unknowns in $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Let us define the set of constraints $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} = \{\tilde{\omega} \in \mathcal{L}_\omega, \forall \tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\Omega}\}$, where ω is the element of Ω in bijection with $\tilde{\omega}$.

Then we apply Proposition 4.1, to compute a finite family \mathfrak{F} of systems of equations in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that satisfy then the following (namely the first and second conclusions of Proposition 4.1).

First, if s is a solution of \mathcal{E} with the property that, for all ω , *any* pre-image of $s(\omega)$ in \mathcal{L} is in \mathcal{L}_ω , then there is a system of \mathfrak{F} with a solution \tilde{s} such that $\tilde{s}(\tilde{\omega})$ is a pre-image of $s(\omega)$ in \mathcal{L} , hence by assumption, in \mathcal{L}_ω .

Second, if \tilde{s} is a solution of some system of \mathfrak{F} , with constraints $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, then \tilde{s} induces a solution of \mathcal{E} , and clearly, for all ω , some pre-image of $\tilde{s}(\omega)$ is in \mathcal{L}_ω (namely $\tilde{s}(\omega)$).

Thus, it is enough to have an algorithm that solves the following question: is there a system among those in \mathfrak{F} that has a solution in $\tilde{\Gamma}$, with the constraints $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$?

This is exactly what Theorem 5.2 provides in the case of **gnr** languages.

In the case of free abelian parabolic subgroups and normalized regular languages, $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is a free product of abelian groups, and Theorem 5.1 can be applied instead to give the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 0.1. Let \mathcal{E} be a finite system of equations, and \mathcal{I} be a finite system of inequations. As already discussed in the first section, one can assume that all the equations are triangular, and that $\mathcal{I} = \{\omega \neq 1, \omega \in \Omega_i\}$, for some $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$.

We then apply Proposition 5.3 for $\mathcal{L}_\omega = \mathcal{L}$ when $\omega \notin \Omega_i$, and $\mathcal{L}_\omega = \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_0$ when $\omega \in \Omega_i$, which are generalized normalized regular languages (with explicit **gnr**[•]-automata) by Proposition 2.5, and Corollary 2.8.

Let us now notice that a possible solution s has one of its lifts in \mathcal{L} satisfying these constraints if and only if it has all of them, since a lift of $s(\omega)$ belongs to \mathcal{L}_0 if and only if $s(\omega) = 1$.

Therefore, the algorithm provided by Proposition 5.3 answers the question whether $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I})$ has a solution. \square

Proof of Corollary 0.2. The corollary is implied by Theorem 0.1 and the fact that existential theory of finitely generated virtually abelian groups is decidable. This latter property is folklore, but note that it is not immediate (for instance it is unknown whether virtually free groups have decidable existential theory, although, needless to say at this point, it is known for free groups). Thus we give a proof here.

Any such group Γ is abelian-by-finite: it splits as an exact sequence $1 \rightarrow A \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow F \rightarrow 1$ where A is free abelian of finite rank, and F is finite. Hence we are left with the lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists an algorithm satisfying:*

Input: an integer n , a finite group F , a morphism $\rho: F \rightarrow GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$, a finite presentation of Γ splitting as $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow F \rightarrow 1$, with the given action of F on \mathbb{Z}^n , a (set theoretic) cross section $s: F \rightarrow \Gamma$, $s(F) = \bar{F}$, and a system of equations and inequations in Γ .

Output: whether there exists a solution of the system in Γ .

Given a finite system of equations and inequations in Γ , one can project the system in F and find all the solutions. For each solution (f) of the projected system, one can lift (f) by the cross section s in Γ in the preferred set \bar{F} of representatives of F , in order to get a system in Γ where unknowns are in $A = \mathbb{Z}^n$. For example, if an equation of the original system is $\phi_j : z_{(j,1)} z_{(j,2)} z_{(j,3)} = 1$, one changes it into

$$\phi'_j : (\bar{f}_{(j,1)} a_{(j,1)}) (\bar{f}_{(j,2)} a_{(j,2)}) (\bar{f}_{(j,3)} a_{(j,3)}) = 1,$$

where $\bar{f}_{(j,i)} \in \bar{F}$ are the images by s of the solutions in (f) , (hence are known parameters), and where $a_{(j,i)}$ is a parameter if $z_{(j,i)}$ is a parameter, or unknown, if $z_{(j,i)}$ is an unknown, in A . One gathers all the $\bar{f}_{(j,i)}$ to the left, by using the action of $\rho(F) < GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ on A : for all $f \in \bar{F}$, $af = f(\rho(f)(a))$ for all $a \in A$. As we know explicitly the map ρ , one can compute $a'_{(j,i)}$ satisfying $\bar{f}_{(j,i+1)} a'_{(j,i)} = a_{(j,i)} \bar{f}_{(j,i+1)}$, in terms of the coefficients of $a_{(j,i)}$ expressed in our basis of A . Therefore one is left with the equation

$$(\bar{f}_{(j,1)} \bar{f}_{(j,2)} \bar{f}_{(j,3)}) (a''_{(j,1)} a'_{(j,2)} a_{(j,3)}) = 1$$

(and similarly for inequations). The first product of three terms is assumed to be in A , since we started with a solution of the projected system in F . The results of these products of three elements in \bar{F} that are in A (there are finitely many) are computable, thus one is left with a system of linear equations in the coefficients of the $a_{(j,i)}$ in a chosen basis of A . Such systems are decidable, and, by construction, the original system has a solution if, and only if, one of the new linear systems (associated to solutions of the projected system in F) has a solution. \square

Part II

Finding relative hyperbolic structures

The aim of this note is to provide a general algorithm that recognizes a class of groups, and that allows to unify a certain number of algorithms originally designed for every group in this class.

The class in question is that of relatively hyperbolic groups. It was introduced by M. Gromov [16], and there is now a rich growing literature on this subject (see works of B. Bowditch, C. Druţu, A. Yaman, D. Osin, D. Groves, myself, and many others). It generalizes the class of geometrically finite Kleinian groups, in Gromov's hyperbolicity spirit.

In order to run a certain number of known algorithms in these groups (*e.g.* B. Farb's solution to word problem [15], I. Bumagin's solution to conjugacy problem [4], D. Osin's solution to the root problem [20], my solutions to Diophantine and existential theory decidability presented in part 1 of the present e-print, etc.), one needs to first find correct values for some characteristic constants, such as hyperbolicity constant. Our algorithm will provide a way to do this, when given a candidate presentation compatible with the relative structure. Better: we can detect whether a given finitely presented group is hyperbolic relative to abelian subgroups, and find the structure in such case. Thus, for each algorithmic problem mentioned, a single algorithm solves it for all the groups hyperbolic relative to abelian subgroups (and torsion free for those in part 1).

This was inspired by the algorithm of P. Papasoglu for recognizing hyperbolic groups, and motivated by the author's collaboration with D. Groves to study the isomorphism problem (also known as isomorphism problem) for relatively hyperbolic groups, in which our algorithm is an important tool.

Theorem 5.5. *There is an algorithm such that, given a finite presentation of a group Γ , the generators in Γ of finitely many subgroups H_1, \dots, H_n , and a solution to the word problem in each of the H_i with the given generators, terminates if and only if the group is hyperbolic relative to H_1, \dots, H_n .*

In this case, the algorithm provides an explicit bound for the linear relative isoperimetric inequality satisfied by the relative presentation.

We give explicitly such an algorithm, and we use it in Corollary 7.4, to find explicitly the hyperbolicity constant and the list of simple loops of given length of Farb's coned-off graph.

In the case of abelian parabolic subgroups, we propose here a sharper result. Again, the algorithm is explicitly given.

Theorem 5.6. *There is an algorithm whose input is a finite presentation of a group, that terminates if and only if the group is hyperbolic relative to abelian subgroups, and gives as output an exact relative presentation.*

In particular, the languages of the presentations of relatively hyperbolic groups with abelian parabolics, and of those with free abelian parabolics are recursively enumerable.

This latter property features in Sela's list of problems for limit groups (which I proved hyperbolic relatively to free abelian parabolics in previous work).

6 Relative presentations, and hyperbolicity

6.1 Lengths and areas

We present here the framework, which is inspired by [20] and [22].

For any group H , we denote by $\mathcal{T}(H)$ its table of multiplication of H , $\mathcal{T}(H) = \{((a, b, c) \in H^3, abc =_H 1)\}$.

We denote by Γ a finitely generated group, and X a finite symmetric set of generators. Assume that we are given n subgroups H_1, \dots, H_n of Γ , and, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, finitely generated groups \tilde{H}_i , with epimorphisms $\pi_i : \tilde{H}_i \twoheadrightarrow H_i$. We define the free product $F = F_X * \tilde{H}_1 * \dots * \tilde{H}_n$, where F_X is the free group on X . We define $\mathcal{X} = X \sqcup \tilde{H}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \tilde{H}_n$, and $\mathcal{S} = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}(\tilde{H}_i)$. By abuse of language, we do not make any distinction between a triple (a, b, c) in \mathcal{S} , and the word abc in the alphabet \mathcal{X} .

We say that the group Γ has a finite $(\tilde{H}_i)_{i \leq n}$ -relative presentation if there exists a finite set $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{X}^*$ of words over \mathcal{X} (which can, without loss of generality, be assumed to consists of words of 2 or 3 letters) such that $F/\langle\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle\rangle$ is isomorphic to Γ , by a morphism that is identity on X and induces π_i on each of the \tilde{H}_i .

One easily checks that, in this case, $\Gamma \simeq \langle \mathcal{X} \mid \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S} \rangle$ (thus \mathcal{X} is seen as generating set of Γ). The elements of Γ can be measured with the word metric on X (which we call the absolute length) and also with the word metric on \mathcal{X} (which is the relative length).

Let us notice the finite subset $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}}$ of \mathcal{X} consisting of the elements of X and those in some \tilde{H}_i appearing (as letters) in some word in \mathcal{R} . They have relative length 1 but their absolute length can be large.

We say that the finite relative presentation is *exact* if $\tilde{H}_i \simeq H_i$ for all i , and each π_i is the identity.

Remark. In general we say that Γ is *finitely presented relative to* H_1, \dots, H_n if it admits an exact finite relative presentation (see for instance [20]). If a group admits a non-exact finite relative presentation, then it admits an exact one, and if Γ is finitely presented it has a finite relative presentation for every family of groups \tilde{H}_i that maps onto H_i .

Let us temporarily consider more generality. Given a group presentation $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, a Van-Kampen diagram for a relation $w \in S^*$, $w =_G 1$, in the alphabet S , is a finite, planar,

simply connected, 2-complex whose oriented edges are labeled by elements of S , such that the word labeling of the boundary of any cell is (up to a cyclic permutation, and choice of orientation) an element of R , and such that the boundary of the complex consists of one loop, labeled by the word w (up to cyclic permutation).

The *combinatorial area* of a relation $w \in S^*$ of G (i.e. $w =_G 1$) is the minimum, over the set of Van Kampen diagrams of w for the presentation $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, of the number of cells of the diagram.

In the following, we use these notions for the relative (not necessarily exact) presentation given.

The following definition is coherent with other definitions of relative hyperbolicity.

Definition/Proposition 6.1. (*Osin [20], Rebbechi [22]*)

A group Γ is *hyperbolic relative to a family of subgroups* H_1, \dots, H_n if, and only if, it admits an exact relative presentation that satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality (i. e. there exists $K > 0$, such that for all relation w of Γ the combinatorial area of w for the relative presentation is at most K times the relative length of w).

In this case, we call the subgroups H_1, \dots, H_n and their conjugates, the *parabolic subgroups* of Γ .

6.2 Clusters in Van Kampen Diagrams

In this paragraph, Γ is a group with a (non necessarily exact) relative presentation, and $w \in \mathcal{X}^*$ is a relation of Γ ($w =_\Gamma 1$). The lengths and combinatorial areas are measured in this relative presentation. We intend to gather some useful results on the structure of Van Kampen diagrams for w , with cells labeled by elements of $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}$.

Given $i \leq n$, a *i -cluster* of a Van Kampen diagram D is a sub-complex of D that contains only cells labeled by elements of $\mathcal{T}(\tilde{H}_i)$, that is connected, without global cut point, and that is maximal for this property. Sometimes we do not specify the index i . For a cluster C , the boundary ∂C of C consists of its edges that belong to only one cell of C . The *exterior boundary* of C is the unique component of ∂C that is homotopic to ∂D in $D \setminus C$.

Lemma 6.2. (*Inner edges of D*)

Any edge of a Van Kampen diagram belongs to at most one of its clusters.

For any cluster C of a Van Kampen diagram D , any edge in ∂C is either in ∂D , or is in another cell of D labeled by an element of \mathcal{R} .

Proof. If an edge e belongs to a i -cluster C , then the label s of e belongs to \tilde{H}_i . If C' is a j -cluster containing e , $s \in \tilde{H}_j$, and since in \mathcal{X} , \tilde{H}_i and \tilde{H}_j are disjoint or equal, one has $j = i$, and by maximality, $C = C'$.

Thus an edge of ∂C does not belong to any other cluster. If it is not in ∂D , it belongs to another cell in D , that must be therefore labeled by an element of \mathcal{R} . \square

Lemma 6.3. (*Small clusters in a non minimal diagram*)

Let $A > 0$, and w be a relation of Γ . Assume that w labels the boundary of a (non necessarily minimal) Van Kampen diagram D with less than A cells. Assume furthermore that each cluster contains at most one edge in the boundary ∂D .

Then, w is labeled by letters of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}}$, or letters in some \tilde{H}_i that are product, as elements of this group, of at most $3A$ elements of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$. Moreover, there exists a minimal Van Kampen diagram for w with at most A cells, whose every cluster has perimeter at most $3A$.

Proof. Consider a letter s in w , and consider the edge e it labels in ∂D . Either it belongs to a cell of D labeled by an element of \mathcal{R} , or it belongs to some cluster, and then e is homotopic in D to a path b such that the concatenation (be) is a boundary component of the cluster. Now b is assumed to contain no edge in ∂D , thus, according to Lemma 6.2, only edges that are labeled by elements of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Moreover, since there are at most $3A$ different edges in D , the length of b is at most $3A$. This shows the first assertion.

Now consider a minimal Van Kampen diagram D_m for w . It contains at most A cells, by assumption. Any cell not labeled by an element of \mathcal{R} is in a cluster, by definition. The length of boundary components of a cluster cannot exceed the total number of edges of D_m , that is at most $3A$. This proves the lemma. \square

In order to prove the next proposition we will use several times the following observation.

Lemma 6.4. *Let D be a planar simplicial 2-complex, and let b be a simple loop of length $l(b)$, in its 1-skeleton. If D_b is a simply connected sub-complex, such that any edge of b is contained in a triangle of D_b , then its area is at least $l(b) - 2$.*

Proof. The Euler characteristic of D_b is $\chi(D_b) = 1$ and if D_b contains N triangles, it contains $3N/2 + l(b)/2$ edges. If the number of vertices that are not in b is x , one gets $\chi(D_b) = N - (3N/2 + l(b)/2) + l(b) + x$. Hence $N = l(b) - 2 + 2x \geq l(b) - 2$. \square

Proposition 6.5. *(Simplifying examples of high ratio (area/perimeter))*

Let $A > 0$. Assume that, for all i , all $r \leq 3A$, and all $s_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$, for $j = 1, \dots, r$, the word $s_1 \dots s_r$ is a relation of Γ only if it is a relation of \tilde{H}_i .

For any relation w , with $\text{Area}(w) \leq A$, and $\frac{\text{Area}(w)}{|w|_{\mathcal{X}}} > 3$, there exists a relation w' such that:

- one has $\frac{\text{Area}(w')}{|w'|_{\mathcal{X}}} \geq \frac{\text{Area}(w)}{3|w|_{\mathcal{X}}}$,
- every letter of w' is either in $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}}$ or is a letter in some \tilde{H}_i that is product, as element of this group, of at most $3A$ elements of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$.
- there exists a minimal Van Kampen diagram for w' with at most A cells, each of which either is labeled by an element of \mathcal{R} , or is in a simply connected cluster of perimeter at most $(A + 2)$.

Proof. Let w be a relation, and D a Van Kampen diagram for w , that is minimal for the area, and among all possible minimal diagrams, that is minimal for the number of cells labeled by \mathcal{R} . Let C_1, \dots, C_r be the clusters of D that contain two edges of ∂D . Clearly $r \leq |w|_{\mathcal{X}}/2$. Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_s\}$ the collection of all the maximal arcs in the boundary of these clusters, joining ∂D to ∂D , that do not contain an edge in ∂D . Each arc a_j is labeled by a certain word h_j with letters in some \tilde{H}_i . Let s_j be the element of \tilde{H}_i defined by h_j .

An arc a_j cannot cross a cluster, it follows easily that there are at most $|w|_{\mathcal{X}} - 1$ such arcs. A *piece* of D is the closure of a component of $D \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^s a_j$. Thus a piece is a connected sub-diagram of D , and there are thus at most $s + 1 \leq |w|_{\mathcal{X}}$ different pieces.

Let p be a piece of D , and b a boundary component of p . It is labeled by $w_p = w_1 h_{i_1} \dots w_{n(p)} h_{i_{n(p)}}$ where the w_i are sub-words of w , corresponding to arcs of $\partial D \cap b$, and the h_i are as previously defined.

We then define the word $w'_p = w_1 s_1 \dots w_{n(p)} s_{n(p)}$. Note that $|w'_p|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the sum of length of sub-words of w involved, plus $n(p)$. Moreover, since D is planar, each arc a_i appears in exactly two pieces, and therefore the sum of the perimeter of all the w'_p is $|w|_{\mathcal{X}} + 2s \leq 3|w|_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Let D_p a minimal Van Kampen diagram for w'_p . Gluing all the diagrams D_p along the edges corresponding to the letters s_j provides a Van Kampen diagram for w , and therefore $\text{Area}(w) \leq \sum_p \text{Area}(w'_p)$.

If for all p , $\text{Area}(w'_p) < \frac{\text{Area}(w)}{3|w|_{\mathcal{X}}} |w'_p|_{\mathcal{X}}$, then $\text{Area}(w) < \frac{\text{Area}(w)}{3|w|_{\mathcal{X}}} \sum_p |w'_p|_{\mathcal{X}}$, which contradicts that the sum of perimeter of pieces is at most $3|w|_{\mathcal{X}}$. Therefore, there is a piece such that $\text{Area}(w'_p) \geq \frac{\text{Area}(w)}{3|w|_{\mathcal{X}}} |w'_p|_{\mathcal{X}}$, which is $> |w'_p|_{\mathcal{X}}$ by assumption.

Assume that p is the component of a cluster C . We will show that C is a simply connected cluster, and then derive a contradiction. Assuming the contrary, there is a boundary component b of C , different from the exterior boundary of C , labeled by letters of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and its length is at most the total number of edges, that is at most $3\text{Area}(w) \leq 3A$. But by assumption, a word w_b labeling such a boundary b is a relation of the group \tilde{H}_i . One gets easily a Van Kampen diagram for w_b with $|w_b|_{\mathcal{X}} - 2 (= l(b) - 2)$ cells labeled by elements of $\mathcal{T}(\tilde{H}_i)$. On the other hand, if D_b is the minimal simply connected sub-diagram of D bounded by b , by Lemma 6.4 it has area greater than $l(b) - 2$. Therefore, one can replace, without changing the area of D , and decreasing the number of cells labeled by \mathcal{R} , the sub-complex D_b by another whose cells are labeled by elements of $\mathcal{T}(\tilde{H}_i)$. Since D was chosen minimal for these properties, this means that all cells of D_b belong to a cluster, which by Lemma 6.2 is necessarily C , and this contradicts the maximality of the cluster C . Thus, the cluster C is simply connected, and therefore equals p . But then, its boundary is labeled by a relation of \tilde{H}_i , and by minimality of the area, the number of cells of the piece p is at most its perimeter, contradicting the assumption on p . Therefore, p is not the component of a cluster.

Let us now propose a (not necessarily minimal) Van Kampen diagram for w'_p . Start with the diagram p itself. By assumption on the maximality of the family C_1, \dots, C_r , there is no cluster of p that has two edges on ∂p . Moreover, for all i , such that a_i is an arc of ∂p , each edge of a_i belongs to a cluster of D that has no cell in p . Therefore, no cluster of p has an edge in any of the arcs a_i in ∂p . Now, for each i for which a_i is an arc of ∂p , by definition of s_i the word $h_i(s_i)^{-1}$ is a relation of \tilde{H}_i . Hence, there exists a diagram δ_i bounded by this word, consisting of at most $|h_i|_{\mathcal{X}}$ cells, all of them labeled by elements of some $\mathcal{T}(\tilde{H}_i)$. Let us define D_p to be the diagram obtained by gluing each δ_i on p along the arc a_i . This is a diagram of w'_p , and its clusters are exactly the δ_i , and the clusters of p . In any case, each of them contains only one edge in ∂D_p .

Now $\text{Area}(D_p) \leq \text{Area}(p) + \sum_i \text{Area}(\delta_i) \leq \text{Area}(p) + \sum_i (|h_i|_{\mathcal{X}} - 1)$. The exterior boundary b_i of the cluster C_i is a simple loop longer than $|h_i|_{\mathcal{X}} + 1$, thus by Lemma 6.4, if C'_i is a minimal simply connected diagram bounded by b_i , $\text{Area}(C'_i) \geq |h_i|_{\mathcal{X}} - 1$. Therefore $\text{Area}(D_p) \leq \text{Area}(p) + \sum_i \text{Area}(C'_i)$, and one gets that $\text{Area}(D_p) \leq \text{Area}(D) \leq A$.

Therefore, the relation w'_p satisfies the assumption of the Lemma 6.3, hence its letters have the requested form, and there exists a minimal Van Kampen diagram D'_p for w'_p with at most A cells either labeled by elements of \mathcal{R} , or in a cluster whose boundary components are labeled by at most $3A$ letters.

It remains to see that every cluster can be assumed simply connected, and of perimeter $\leq A + 2$. For that we proceed as before. Given a cluster C of D'_p , denote by b its exterior boundary, and by D'_b the minimal simply connected sub-complex bounded by b . By Lemma 6.4, it contains at least $l(b) - 2$ triangles. On the other hand, since $l(b) \leq 3A$, by assumption

of the lemma, the loop b can be filled with only cells labeled by elements in some $\mathcal{T}(\tilde{H}_i)$, and clearly, only $l(b) - 2$ such cells are sufficient. Therefore, one can assume, without enlarging the area of D'_p , that every cluster is simply connected. By Lemma 6.4, its perimeter is at most $A + 2$. This proves the lemma. \square

7 Algorithms

7.1 Algorithm of recognition.

In [21], P. Papasoglu proves the following result, that appears in a different form in B. Bowditch's work ([1] Proposition 8.7.1) (see also M. Gromov [16]). We choose to state it in the context of group theory, rather than hyperbolic spaces, so we use the formulation of Papasoglu.

Proposition 7.1. (*[21, Main theorem]*) *Let G be a group, with a triangular presentation $G = \langle S | R \rangle$. Let $K > 0$. If there exists a word w in S that represents the trivial element in G , with combinatorial area $A(w) > Kl(w)$, then there exists another word w' with combinatorial area $A(w') > \frac{1}{2 \cdot 10^4} l(w')^2$ and $A(w') \in [\frac{K}{2}, 240K]$.*

The proof takes place in a single Van Kampen diagram, with triangular cells, and thus does not need finiteness of the presentation.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $K > 0$. Assume that, for all i , all $r \leq 3(240K)$, and all $s_j \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$, for $j = 1, \dots, r$, the word $s_1 \dots s_r$ is a relation of Γ , only if it is a relation of \tilde{H}_i .*

Then, either the presentation satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality of factor K , or there is a relation w'' of area at most $240K$ such that

- *one has $\frac{\text{Area}(w'')}{|w''|_{\mathcal{X}}} > \frac{\sqrt{K}}{600}$*
- *every letter of w'' is either in $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}}$ or is a letter in some \tilde{H}_i that is product, as element of this group, of at most $3 \times 240K$ elements of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$.*
- *and w'' admits a minimal Van Kampen diagram whose every cell is either labeled by an element of \mathcal{R} , or is contained in a simply connected cluster of perimeter at most $(240K + 2)$.*

In particular, the letters labelling the boundaries of the clusters of a minimal Van Kampen diagram of w'' are equal to products of at most $3 \times 240K$ elements of some $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$.

Proof. If there is a relation w of area $\text{Area}(w) > K|w|_{\mathcal{X}}$, then by Proposition 7.1, there is a relation w' with area in $[\frac{K}{2}, 240K]$, and such that $\text{Area}(w') > \frac{1}{2 \cdot 10^4} |w'|_{\mathcal{X}}^2$. Therefore, by Proposition 6.5, there is a relation w'' of area at most $240K$ such that $\frac{\text{Area}(w'')}{|w''|_{\mathcal{X}}} \geq (\text{Area}(w')/|w'|_{\mathcal{X}}^2)^{1/2} \times \text{Area}(w')^{1/2}/3$, and whose letters have the suitable form, and that has a suitable Van Kampen diagram. One gets that $\frac{\text{Area}(w'')}{|w''|_{\mathcal{X}}} > \sqrt{1/(2 \cdot 10^4)} \times \frac{\sqrt{K/2}}{3} \geq \frac{\sqrt{K}}{600}$.

The last assertion is then a consequence of Lemma 6.2. \square

Proposition 7.3. *There is an algorithm that has the following properties.*

The input is a non necessarily exact relative presentation, of a finitely generated group Γ , relative to some groups $\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_n$: specifically, the finite generating set X of Γ is given,

generators of each \tilde{H}_i are given, the sets $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and \mathcal{R} are given, solutions to the word problem of each \tilde{H}_i (for the respective generating sets) are given. Moreover, as input the algorithm takes either a solution to the word problem of Γ , or a blank entry.

Assume that, either the presentation given is exact, or a solution to the word problem of Γ has been given.

- Either the algorithm detects that the presentation given is non exact, or it stops if and only if it satisfies an isoperimetric inequality, and provides a correct factor K such that, for all relator w , $\text{Area}(w) \leq K|w|_{\mathcal{X}}$.
- If the presentation is non-exact, and such that one quotient $\tilde{H}_i \twoheadrightarrow H_i$ has infinite kernel, and if a solution to the word problem for Γ is given, then the algorithm stops and tells that the presentation is non-exact.

Note that Theorem 5.5 is a direct consequence of the Proposition.

Proof. Our algorithm is as follows. Let K be an integer variable. While the algorithm is not stopped, do the following instructions in order.

1. If no solution of the word problem of Γ is given in input, skip this instruction. Otherwise, make, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, the list of all words of at most $3(240K)$ letters in $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$, that are relations of Γ (the solution of the word problem for Γ provided in input allows to compute this finite list). With the solution to the word problem for \tilde{H}_i given as input, check whether these words are relations of \tilde{H}_i . If all of them are, proceed to instruction 2. If one of them is not, stop the algorithm, and return “The presentation is not exact”.
2. For all $i = 1, \dots, n$, make the list $\mathcal{V}_i \subset \mathcal{X}$ of all products in \tilde{H}_i of at most $3(240K)$ elements of $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$. This list is finite and easily computable. Make the list \mathcal{V}'_i of all the words of at most $(240K + 2)$ letters in \mathcal{V}_i that are trivial in the group \tilde{H}_i (this requires a solution to the word problem in \tilde{H}_i , which is provided).
3. For all $i = 1, \dots, n$, make the finite list \mathcal{C} of minimal Van Kampen diagrams in \tilde{H}_i for the words in \mathcal{V}'_i . Since every triangular relation of \tilde{H}_i is allowed, this amounts to find minimal triangulations of a polygon.
4. Make the list \mathcal{D} of all Van Kampen diagrams with at most $240K$ cells in \mathcal{R} or in a diagram in the list \mathcal{C} . Since the set of permitted cells, and their numbers are finite and known, this list is finite, and can be found by enumeration.
5. Make \mathcal{W} the list of words labeling the boundary of a diagram in \mathcal{D} .
6. For each element w of the (finite) list \mathcal{W} , find the subset of \mathcal{D} of diagrams whose boundaries are labeled by w , and find a smallest element (for the area) in this subset, and finally compute $A(w)$ the area of this smallest element.
7. For all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, such that $A(w) \leq 240K$, check whether $A(w) > (\sqrt{K}/600)|w|_{\mathcal{X}}$. If this is true for some w , then $K := K + 1$ and go back to the first instruction, and if this is false for every w , then stop the algorithm, and return the integer K .

We assume that either the presentation is exact, or a solution to the word problem of Γ was given as input.

Either the algorithm stops at step 1 for some K , or it stops at step 7 for some K , or it never stops.

If the algorithm stops at step 1, this is because it has found a relation of Γ with letters in \tilde{H}_i that is not a relation of \tilde{H}_i , and therefore, the presentation was indeed non exact.

If the algorithm does not detect that the presentation is non-exact, it does not stop at step 1 (for instance because the presentation is indeed exact). Then, for all K , the assumption of Lemma 7.2 is still satisfied. In this case, by Lemma 6.3, for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, $A(w) = \text{Area}(w)$.

If the presentation satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality with factor K_0 , then the algorithm will stop (at step 7) for some $K \leq (600K_0)^2$.

Conversely, if the algorithm stops at step 7 for K , then every relation w'' with a minimal Van Kampen diagram in \mathcal{D} satisfies $\text{Area}(w'') \leq \sqrt{K}/600|w''|_{\mathcal{X}}$, and therefore by Lemma 7.2, for all relation w , $\text{Area}(w) \leq K|w|_{\mathcal{X}}$. The presentation satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality of factor K .

This ensures that if no isoperimetric relation is satisfied, and if the algorithm does not stop at step 1, it will never stop.

Assume, finally, that the presentation provided is non exact, but a solution to the word problem of Γ was given in input. Assume moreover that some quotient $\tilde{H}_i \twoheadrightarrow H_i$ has infinite kernel. There is a sequence w_k of different letters in \tilde{H}_i in the kernel. They produce an infinite sequence of relations of Γ of relative length 1, and by Lemma 6.3, their areas cannot remain bounded.

Thus the presentation satisfies no isoperimetric inequality, and as proved before, the algorithm cannot stop at step 7. Therefore it will stop at step 1 for some K smaller than the length of the element w_1 for the word metric induced by $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \tilde{H}_i$. \square

Let us recall that Farb's coned-off cayley graph $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ of a relatively hyperbolic group Γ is defined by the following construction. Take the Cayley graph on the given generating set, and add one vertex $v_{[\gamma H_k]}$ for each left coset $[\gamma H_k]$ of each parabolic subgroup H_k , and one edge $(v_{[\gamma H_k]}, \gamma h)$, for each element $h \in H_k$. If Γ is relatively hyperbolic, this is a hyperbolic graph, acted upon by Γ , and although it is non locally finite in general (when some H_k is infinite), there are only finitely many orbits of simple loops of given length (see [15], [2] for details).

Corollary 7.4. *There is an algorithm that, given an exact finite relative presentation of a relatively hyperbolic group, provides an hyperbolicity constant for $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$, and the consecutive lists of orbits of simple loops in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ of given length.*

Proof. An hyperbolicity constant of the Cayley graph with set of generators \mathcal{X} , can be computed from an explicit linear Dehn function (see [3, 2.9 p. 419], or [22, p. 61] (in which constants are given at the end of the argument page 69-70)). Therefore, one can compute such a constant for the coned-off graph on X , since the identity on the vertices of $\text{Cay}\Gamma$ is 2-bi-Lipshitz.

The list of simple loops of given length in $\widehat{\text{Cay}}\Gamma$ is easily seen to correspond to the list of relations of given relative length, whose Van Kampen diagram do not have a cluster with two edges on the boundary. To make the list of those of given length, it is enough to make the list of those of given area, but according to Lemma 6.3, one only needs to use cells with perimeter labeled by letters of absolute length bounded by an explicit constant. This is enough to

enumerate effectively all possible candidates, and a comparison with the list of shorter simple loops indicates which are actually simple. \square

7.2 Abelian parabolics: an algorithm to find them.

In general, given a finite subset of a group, it is hard to tell what kind of subgroup it generates. But if the elements commute pairwise, they generate an abelian subgroup. This motivates the sharper study of relatively hyperbolic groups, with abelian parabolic subgroups. We start with an arbitrary presentation of such a group, and we want to find where are the parabolic subgroups, and an exact relative presentation.

The word problem is solvable for these groups, but some solutions require the preliminary knowledge of the hyperbolicity constant, and of the ranks of the abelian subgroups, which we don't have *a priori*, since we don't have an exact relative presentation yet. But fortunately, we can proceed without this assumption, as pointed out to us by M. Bridson.

Recall that, by a theorem of D. Rebbeci [22], any relatively hyperbolic group with abelian subgroups is bi-automatic. Thus one can use first the following, derived from the algorithm of Todd-Coxeter, and the quadratic time solution to the word problem for automatic groups:

Proposition 7.5. ([14, Theorems 5.2.4 and 2.3.10])

There is an algorithm whose input is a finite presentation of a group, that stops if and only if the group is automatic, and that outputs a solution to the word problem.

of Theorem 5.6. Let Γ be a group with a finite presentation $\langle X | R \rangle$, and assume that Γ is hyperbolic relative to abelian subgroups.

Enumerate the triples of integers (n, k, s) , and for each of them, the families of n subsets π_1, \dots, π_n of at most k elements of Γ , such that for all i , all the elements in π_i commute pairwise in Γ (for that we use a solution of the word problem in Γ , which we have, by Proposition 7.5).

Given such a family, each π_i generates an abelian subgroup H_i of Γ . For each element of π_i , check with a solution to the word problem whether it is of order s or less in Γ .

One can then compute a (not necessarily exact) relative presentation of Γ , by considering \tilde{H}_i the abelian group of basis π_i , whose every generator has either infinite order, or order at most s as found by the latter verification.

By structure of finitely generated abelian groups, one of the relative presentations above (for some correct (n, k, s) and π_i) corresponds to an exact relative presentation of Γ .

In order to finish the proof, it suffices to recognize when such a presentation is exact, and corresponds to the relative structure, that is, when the sets π_i are actually basis in Γ of maximal abelian subgroups of Γ , with correct orders.

For each i , if the map $\tilde{H}_i \rightarrow H_i$ has non trivial but finite kernel, then it lies in the factor of \tilde{H}_i generated by the elements of \tilde{H}_i of finite order. This implies that one of them is in Γ of order less than s , but we assumed that we checked that it does not happen. Therefore the map $\tilde{H}_i \rightarrow H_i$ is either injective, or has infinite kernel. The algorithm of Proposition 7.3, with, as input, the proposed presentation, and a solution to the word problem for Γ , will then stop if the presentation is non-exact, indicating this fact. On the other hand, if the presentation is exact, it will stop if and only if the presentation satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality. In such case, the presentation corresponds to the structure of a relatively hyperbolic group. \square

References

- [1] *B. Bowditch*, “Notes on Gromov’s Hyperbolicity Criterion for Path-metric Spaces”, Group theory from a geometrical viewpoint (Trieste, 1990), 64–167, World Sci. Publishing, (1991)
- [2] *B. Bowditch*, “Relatively Hyperbolic Groups” *preprint*, Southampton University (1999).
- [3] *M. Bridson, A. Haefliger* “Metric Spaces of Non-positive Curvature”, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 319. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. xxii+643 pp.
- [4] *I. Bumagin* “The conjugacy problem for relatively hyperbolic groups” *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* **4** (2004), 1013–1040.
- [5] *M. Coornaert, T. Delzant, A. Papadopoulos* “Géométrie et théorie des groupes. Les groupes hyperboliques de M. Gromov.” *Lecture Notes in Math.* 1441, Springer (1991).
- [6] *F. Dahmani*, “Combination of Convergence Groups”, *Geom. & Top.* **7** (2003) 933–963.
- [7] *F. Dahmani*, “Accidental Parabolics and Relatively Hyperbolic Groups”, *Israel J. Math* **153** (2006) 93–127.
- [8] *F. Dahmani, D. Groves*, “The Isomorphism Problem for Toral Relatively Hyperbolic Groups”, *preprint* (2006).
- [9] *T. Delzant*, “Images d’un group dans un groupe hyperbolique”, *Comm. Math. Helv.* (1995).
- [10] *V. Diekert, C. Gutiérrez, C. Hagenah* “The Existential Theory of Equations with Rational Constraints in Free Groups is PSPACE-Complete”, *STACS 2001* (Dresden), 170–182, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* 2010, Springer (2001).
- [11] *V. Diekert, M. Lohrey*, “Word Equations over Graph Products”, *Proceedings of FSTTCS 2003*, *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* 2914, pp. 156–167, Springer (2003).
- [12] *V. Diekert, M. Lohrey*, “Word Equations over Graph Products”, to appear in *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*
- [13] *V. Diekert, A. Muscholl*, “Solvability of Equations in Graph Groups is Decidable”, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* **16** (6) (2006) 1047–1070.
- [14] *D. Epstein et al.* “Word Processing in Groups”, Jones & Bartlett Pub. (1992).
- [15] *B. Farb*, “Relatively Hyperbolic Groups” *Geom. and Funct. Anal.* **8** (1998), no. 5, 810–840.
- [16] *M. Gromov*, “Hyperbolic Groups”, *Essays in group theory*, 75–263, *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, 8, (1987).
- [17] *C. Hruska, B. Kleiner*, “Hadamard Spaces with Isolated Flats” *Geom. Topol.*, **9** (2005), 1501–1538
- [18] *A. Kharlampovich, A. Myasnikov*, “Effective JSJ Decompositions” *Contemp. Math. “Group Theory: Algorithms, Languages, Logic”*, **378**, (2004) 82–212.
- [19] *G. Makanin*, “Decidability of Universal and Positive Theories of a Free Group”, (English translation) *Math. USSR Izvestija* **25** (1985), 75–88. (original: *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Mat.* **48** (1984), 735–749).
- [20] *D. Osin* “Relatively Hyperbolic Groups: Intrinsic Geometry, Algebraic Properties, and algorithmic problems” *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **179** (2006), no. 843, vi+100 pp.
- [21] *P. Papasoglu* “An Algorithm Detecting Hyperbolicity”, in “Geometric and computational perspectives on infinite groups”, *AMS, DIMACS Series* **25** (1996), 193–200.
- [22] *D. Rebbeci*, “Algorithmic Properties of Relatively Hyperbolic Groups”, *PhD Thesis* (2001). *ArXiv: math.GR/0302245*.
- [23] *E. Rips, Z. Sela*, “Canonical Representatives and Equations in Hyperbolic Groups.” *Invent. Math.* **120** (1995), no. 3, 489–512.
- [24] *V. Roman’kov*, “Universal Theory of Nilpotent Groups.” *Mat. Zametki* **25** (1979), no. 4, 487–495, 635.
- [25] *Z. Sela*, “The Diophantine Theory over Groups VII: the Elementary Theory of Hyperbolic Groups” *preprint*. (2002).
- [26] *Z. Sela*, “Diophantine Geometry over Groups: a List of Research Problems.” *electronic* <http://www.ma.huji.ac.il/~zlil/>

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE TOULOUSE LABORATOIRE E. PICARD, UNIV. P. SABATIER, F-31062 TOULOUSE, FRANCE.
E-mail: dahmani@math.univ-toulouse.fr