

# AN ISOPERIMETRIC FUNCTION FOR STALLINGS' GROUP

W.DISON, M.ELDER, AND T.R.RILEY

ABSTRACT. We prove that  $n^{7/3}$  is an isoperimetric function for a group of Stallings that is finitely presented but not of type  $\mathcal{F}_3$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the early 1960s Stallings [9] constructed a group  $S$  enjoying the finiteness property  $\mathcal{F}_2$  but not  $\mathcal{F}_3$ . (A group is of type  $\mathcal{F}_1$  when it can be finitely generated,  $\mathcal{F}_2$  when it can be finitely presented, and more generally  $\mathcal{F}_n$  when it admits an Eilenberg-MacLane space with finite  $n$ -skeleton.) Bieri [2] recognised  $S$  to be

$$(1) \quad \text{Ker}(F(\alpha, \beta) \times F(\gamma, \delta) \times F(\epsilon, \zeta) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$$

where the map is that from the product of three rank-2 free groups to  $\mathbb{Z} = \langle t \rangle$  which sends all six generators to  $t$ , and he showed that using  $(F_2)^n$  in place of  $(F_2)^3$  gives a family of groups (the *Bieri-Stallings* groups) of type  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$  but not  $\mathcal{F}_n$  [2].

Isoperimetric functions (defined below) for  $S$  have been investigated by a number of authors. Gersten proved that for  $n \geq 3$ , the groups in this family admit quintic isoperimetric functions [6]; this was sharpened to cubic by Baumslag, Bridson, Miller & Short in the case of  $S$  [1, §6]. Bridson [5] argued that whenever  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are finitely presentable groups admitting quadratic isoperimetric functions and epimorphisms  $\phi_i : G_i \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , if one doubles  $G_1 \times G_2$  along the kernel of the map  $\phi : G_1 \times G_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , defined by  $\phi(g_1, g_2) = \phi_1(g_1) + \phi_2(g_2)$ , then the resulting group also admits a quadratic isoperimetric function. The Bieri-Stallings groups are examples of such *doubles*. But Groves found an error in his proof [4, 7], and it seems that Bridson's approach, in fact, gives cubic isoperimetric functions, generalising the result in [1]. In this article we prove:

**Theorem 1.** *Stallings' group  $S$  has  $n^{7/3}$  as an isoperimetric function.*

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F65.

*Key words and phrases.* Dehn function, Stallings' group, isoperimetric function, finiteness properties.

If the Dehn function of  $S$  is not quadratic (i.e. not  $\simeq n^2$ , in the sense defined below) then it would be the first example of a subgroup of a CAT(0) group, namely  $(F_2)^3$ , with Dehn function bounded above by a polynomial, but not  $\simeq n^\alpha$  for any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$  — we thank N.Brady for pointing this out. Also, it would be an example of such a Dehn function ‘occurring naturally’ rather than in a group especially constructed for the purpose such as in [3, 8]. If, on the other hand, the Dehn function of  $S$  is quadratic then it would show the class of groups with quadratic Dehn functions to be wild enough to contain groups that are not of type  $\mathcal{F}_3$ , fulfilling Bridson’s aim in [5].

Our theorem makes no reference to a specific finite presentation since, as is well-known, if such an isoperimetric function holds for one finite presentation of a group then it holds for all. We will work with the presentation

$$(2) \quad \langle a, b, c, d, s \mid [a, c], [a, d], [b, c], [b, d], s^a = s^b = s^c = s^d \rangle$$

for  $S$  of [1, 6], with  $s^a = s^b = s^c = s^d$  shorthand for the six defining relations  $s^a s^{-b}$ ,  $s^a s^{-c}$ ,  $s^a s^{-d}$ ,  $s^b s^{-c}$ ,  $s^b s^{-d}$ ,  $s^c s^{-d}$ . One can view  $S$  as an HNN-extension of the product of free groups  $F(a, b) \times F(c, d)$  with stable letter  $s$  commuting with all elements represented by words on  $a^{\pm 1}, b^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}$  of zero exponent-sum. Gersten [6] shows this is related to the expression for  $S$  as a kernel (1) via  $a = \epsilon\alpha^{-1}, b = \epsilon\beta^{-1}, c = \epsilon\gamma^{-1}, d = \epsilon\delta^{-1}, s = \zeta\epsilon^{-1}$ .

Essentially, our strategy for establishing an  $n^{7/3}$  isoperimetric function is to interplay two approaches to reducing words  $w$  representing 1 to  $\varepsilon$ . Both involve identifying a suitable subword  $s^{\pm 1}\tau s^{\mp 1}$  of  $w$ , where  $\tau = \tau(a, b, c, d)$ , then converting  $\tau$  to a word  $\hat{\tau}$  in which the letters alternate between positive and negative exponent, and then cancelling off the  $s^{\pm 1}$  with the  $s^{\mp 1}$ . Repeating until all  $s^{\pm 1}$  have been eliminated gives a word on  $a, b, c, d$  that represents 1 in  $F(a, b) \times F(c, d)$ .

In the first of these two approaches (Algorithm I) all  $a^{\pm 1}, b^{\pm 1}$  are shuffled to the start of  $\tau$ , leaving all the  $c^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}$  at the end, and then letters  $a^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}$  are inserted to achieve the word  $\hat{\tau}$  in the required *alternating* form. The cost (see below) of converting  $\tau$  to  $\hat{\tau}$  in this way is potentially great: it can be as much as  $\sim \ell(\tau)^2$ ; however control on the length of  $\hat{\tau}$  is good: it is always no more than  $3\ell(\tau)$ .

The second approach (Algorithm III) is to work through  $\tau$  from left to right inserting letters  $a^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}$  as necessary to achieve alternating form. The cost of this algorithm and the length of its output are heavily dependent on the internal structure of  $\tau$ , but if  $\tau$  possesses certain properties then good bounds can be found.

In both cases the cost of cancelling off the  $s^{\pm 1}, s^{\mp 1}$  is  $\sim \ell(\hat{\tau})$ . Used alone, either approach would lead to a cubic isoperimetric inequality.

*Basic definitions.*  $[x, y] := x^{-1}y^{-1}xy$ ,  $x^y := y^{-1}xy$ ,  $x^{-y} := y^{-1}x^{-1}y$ . Write  $u = u(a_1, \dots, a_k)$  when  $u$  is a word on the letters  $a_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, a_k^{\pm 1}$ . The length of  $u$  as a word (with no free reductions performed) is  $\ell(u)$ . The total number of occurrences of letters  $a_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, a_l^{\pm 1}$  in  $u$  is  $\ell_{a_1, \dots, a_l}(u)$ . Unless otherwise indicated, we consider two words to be the equal when they are identical letter-by-letter.

Given words  $w, w'$  representing the same element of a group with finite presentation  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ , one can convert  $w$  to  $w'$  via a sequence of words  $W = (w_i)_{i=0}^m$  in which  $w_0 = w$ ,  $w_m = w'$  and for each  $i$ ,  $w_{i+1}$  is obtained from  $w_i$  by free reduction ( $w_i = \alpha a a^{-1} \beta \mapsto \alpha \beta = w_{i+1}$  where  $a \in \mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ ), by free expansion (the inverse of a free reduction), or by applying a relator ( $w_i = \alpha u \beta \mapsto \alpha v \beta = w_{i+1}$  where a cyclic conjugate of  $uv^{-1}$  is in  $\mathcal{R}^{\pm 1}$ ). The *cost* of  $W$  is the number of  $i$  such that  $w_i \mapsto w_{i+1}$  is an *application-of-a-relator* move. If  $w$  represents the identity (i.e. *is null-homotopic*) then  $\text{Area}(w)$  is defined to be the minimal cost amongst all  $W$  converting  $w$  to the empty word  $\varepsilon$ , and the *Dehn function*  $\text{Area} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  of  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$  is

$$\text{Area}(n) := \max \{ \text{Area}(w) \mid w = 1 \text{ in } \Gamma \text{ and } \ell(w) \leq n \}.$$

An *isoperimetric function* for  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$  is any  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that there exists  $K > 0$  for which  $\text{Area}(n) \leq K f(n)$  for all  $n$ . (The constant  $K$  is not used by all authors, but is convenient for us here.)

For  $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , we write  $f \preceq g$  when  $\exists C > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, f(n) \leq Cg(Cn + C) + Cn + C$ , and we say  $f \simeq g$  when  $f \preceq g$  and  $g \preceq f$ .

*Article organisation.* We give a number of definitions, lemmas and algorithms in Section 2. In Section 3 we use these to prove Theorem 1.

*Acknowledgements.* We thank Noel Brady, Martin Bridson, Daniel Groves and especially Steve Pride for many fruitful discussions. The third author is grateful for support from NSF grant DMS-0540830 and for the hospitality of the Institut des Hautes Études Scientifique in Paris during the writing of this article.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES.

Our proof of Theorem 1 will involve three classes of words.

**Definition 2.** (*Alternating words.*) A word  $u = u(a, b, c, d)$  is *alternating* if it is a concatenation of words  $xy^{-1}$  in which  $x, y \in \{a, b, c, d\}$ .

[The reader familiar with van Kampen diagrams and corridors (also known as bands) may find it helpful to note that alternating words are those which, after removing all  $aa^{-1}$ ,  $bb^{-1}$ ,  $cc^{-1}$  and  $dd^{-1}$  subwords, can be read along the sides of  $s$ -corridors in van Kampen diagrams over  $S$ .]

**Definition 3.** (*Balanced words.*) A word  $u = u(a, b, c, d, s)$  is *balanced* if it has exponent sum zero and in  $S$  it represents an element of the subgroup  $\langle a, b, c, d \rangle$ .

The following algorithm converts a word  $u = u(a, b, c, d)$  of exponent-sum zero into an alternating word of a *preferred* form that represents the same element of  $S$ .

**Algorithm I.**

Input a word of exponent-sum zero  $u = u(a, b, c, d)$ .

- (1) Shuffle the letters  $a^{\pm 1}, b^{\pm 1}$  to the start of  $u$  and freely reduce to give a word  $\mu\lambda$  where  $\mu = \mu(a, b)$  and  $\lambda = \lambda(c, d)$ .
- (2) Intersperse  $c^{\pm 1}$  through  $\mu$  to give a word  $\bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}(a, b, c)$ , and  $a^{\pm 1}$  through  $\lambda$  to give  $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(a, c, d)$ , such that:
  - (a)  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $\bar{\lambda}$  are alternating,
  - (b) for all  $1 \leq i < \ell(\bar{\mu})/2$ , exactly one of the  $(2i - 1)$ -st and  $(2i)$ -th letters in  $\bar{\mu}$  is  $c$  or  $c^{-1}$ , and
  - (c) for all  $1 \leq j < \ell(\bar{\lambda})/2$ , exactly one of the  $(2j - 1)$ -st and  $(2j)$ -th letters in  $\bar{\mu}$  is  $a$  or  $a^{-1}$ .
- (3) Let  $\kappa$  be the exponent-sum of  $\mu$ . Insert  $(ac^{-1})^\kappa$  between  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $\bar{\lambda}$ .

Output  $\bar{\mu}(ac^{-1})^\kappa\bar{\lambda}$ .

**Definition 4.** (*Preferred alternating words.*) A word  $v = v(a, b, c, d)$  is in *preferred alternating form* if there is some  $u$  such that the output of Algorithm I on input  $u$  is  $v$ .

**Lemma 5.** *The output  $\bar{\mu}(ac^{-1})^\kappa\bar{\lambda}$  of Algorithm I has length at most  $3\ell(u)$  and  $u$  can be converted to  $\bar{\mu}(ac^{-1})^\kappa\bar{\lambda}$  at a cost of at most  $10\ell(u)^2$ .*

*Proof.* The exponent sum of  $\mu$  is  $\kappa$  and so that of  $\lambda$  is  $-\kappa$ . So  $|2\kappa| \leq \ell(\mu\lambda) \leq \ell(u)$  and  $\ell(\bar{\mu}(ac^{-1})^\kappa\bar{\lambda}) \leq \ell(\bar{\mu}\bar{\lambda}) + |2\kappa| \leq 3\ell(u)$ .

The (crude) upper bound of  $10\ell(u)^2$  on the cost of converting  $u$  to  $\bar{\mu}(ac^{-1})^\kappa\bar{\lambda}$  holds because both  $u$  and  $\bar{\mu}(ac^{-1})^\kappa\bar{\lambda}$  can be converted to  $\mu\lambda$  by shuffling letters and freely reducing at costs of at most  $\ell(u)^2$  and  $\ell(\bar{\mu}(ac^{-1})^\kappa\bar{\lambda})^2 \leq (3\ell(u))^2$ , respectively.  $\square$

The following lemma reveals balanced words to be those representing elements of the subgroup of  $F(a, b) \times F(c, d)$  commuting with  $s$  in the HNN-presentation of  $S$ . We denote the centraliser of  $s$  in  $S$  by  $C_S(s)$ .

**Lemma 6.** *A word  $u = u(a, b, c, d, s)$  represents an element  $g$  of*

$$\langle a, b, c, d \rangle \cap C_S(s)$$

*in  $S$  if and only if  $u$  is balanced.*

*Proof.* Note that all the relations of presentation (2) have exponent-sum zero, so this quantity is preserved whenever a relation is applied to a word. Thus, if two words on the letters  $a, b, c, d, s$  represent the same element in  $S$  then they have the same exponent sum.

A word  $u$  represents an element of  $\langle a, b, c, d \rangle \cap C_S(s)$  if and only if there exists an alternating word  $v = v(a, b, c, d)$  with  $u$  and  $v$  representing the same element of  $S$ . Since any word on the letters  $a, b, c, d$  with exponent-sum zero can be converted into an alternating word by an application of Algorithm I, this is if and only if there exists a word  $v = v(a, b, c, d)$  with  $u = v$  in  $S$  and with  $v$  having exponent-sum zero. And by the above remark this is if and only if  $u$  represents an element of  $\langle a, b, c, d \rangle$  and itself has exponent-sum zero.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose word  $v_0 = v_0(a, b, c, d, s)$  is expressed as  $v_0 = \alpha v_1 \beta$  in which  $v_1$  is a balanced subword. Then  $v_0$  is balanced if and only if  $\alpha \beta$  is balanced.*

*Proof.* Induct on  $\ell_s(v_0)$ , with the base case  $\ell_s(v_0) = 0$  immediate and the induction step an application of Britton's Lemma. Alternatively, this result is an observation on the layout of  $s$ -corridors in a van Kampen diagram demonstrating that  $v_0$  equates to some alternating word in  $S$ .  $\square$

The next lemma concerns the existence of balanced subwords within prescribed length-bounds in balanced words.

**Lemma 8.** *If  $\mu = \mu(a, b, c, d, s)$  is a balanced word with  $\ell(\mu) \geq 4$ , then for all  $k \in [4, \ell(\mu)]$  there is a balanced subword  $u$  of  $\mu$  with  $k/2 \leq \ell(u) \leq k$ .*

*Proof.* We induct on  $\ell(\mu)$ . First we identify certain balanced subwords  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in  $\mu$ .

*Case:*  $\mu$  starts with a letter  $x = s^{\pm 1}$ . By Britton's Lemma,  $\mu = x\alpha y\beta$  for  $y = x^{-1}$  and for some balanced subword  $\alpha$ .

*Case:*  $\mu$  starts with a letter  $x \neq s^{\pm 1}$ . Set a counter to 0, then read through  $\mu$  from left to right altering the counter as follows. If the letter being read is not  $s^{\pm 1}$  then add the exponent of that letter to the counter. If it is  $s^{\pm 1}$  then by Britton's Lemma that  $s^{\pm 1}$  is the first letter of a subword  $s^{\pm 1}\gamma s^{\mp 1}$  such that  $\gamma$  is balanced; hold the counter constant throughout  $s^{\pm 1}\gamma s^{\mp 1}$  and then continue as before. As  $\mu$  is balanced, the

counter will return to 0 on reading some letter  $y \neq s^{\pm 1}$  of opposite exponent to  $x$ . Accordingly,  $\mu = x\alpha y\beta$  in which  $\alpha$  is balanced.

In both cases, as  $\alpha$  is balanced, so is  $x\alpha y$ , and hence so is  $\beta$ .

Now, in the base case of the induction we have  $\ell(\mu) = 4$  and so  $k = 4$ , and we can take  $u = \mu$ . Indeed, whenever  $\ell(\mu) = k$  we can take  $u = \mu$ , so let us assume henceforth that  $\ell(\mu) > k$ .

For the induction step, first suppose  $\beta \neq \varepsilon$ . If  $\max(\ell(x\alpha y), \ell(\beta)) \geq k$  then as  $\ell(x\alpha y), \ell(\beta) < \ell(\mu)$  we can apply the induction hypothesis to obtain  $u$ . If  $\max(\ell(x\alpha y), \ell(\beta)) < k$  then both  $x\alpha y$  and  $\beta$  have length less than  $k$  and, as  $k < \ell(\mu) = \ell(x\alpha y) + \ell(\beta)$ , either  $\ell(x\alpha y)$  or  $\ell(\beta)$  is at least  $k/2$  and so serves as  $u$ .

Finally suppose  $\beta = \varepsilon$ . If  $\ell(\alpha) \geq k$  then, as  $\ell(\alpha) < \ell(\mu)$ , the induction hypothesis gives us  $u$ . If  $\ell(\alpha) < k$  then  $\alpha$  serves as  $u$  because  $\ell(\alpha) = \ell(\mu) - 2 > k - 2 \geq k/2$  since  $k \geq 4$ .  $\square$

The remainder of this section works towards Algorithm IV which will convert a balanced word  $u = u(a, b, c, d, s)$  into a preferred alternating word  $v$  representing the same element of  $S$ .

The next algorithm concerns converting a word  $\tau_0 = \tau_0(a, b, c, d)$  into alternating form by working through it from left to right inserting letters  $a^{\pm 1}$  as needed. In contrast to Algorithm III, which is an elaboration of this algorithm, the group element represented will not be preserved. The purpose of this algorithm is to define a number  $P(\tau_0)$  which will be the difference in length of the input and output words, a quantity which plays an important role in our analysis of Algorithm III.

### Algorithm II.

Input a word  $\tau = \tau(a, b, c, d)$ . Define  $\beta_i$  to be the length- $(\ell(\tau) - i)$  suffix of  $\tau$ . Define  $\tau_0 := \tau$  and  $\alpha_0 := \varepsilon$ .

The algorithm will produce a sequence of words  $(\tau_i)_{i=0}^{\ell(\tau)}$  of the form  $\tau_i = \alpha_i \beta_i$ , where  $\alpha_i$  is an alternating word or an alternating word concatenated with an  $a, b, c, d$ . For  $0 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$ , obtain  $\alpha_{i+1}$  from  $\alpha_i$  as follows. We have  $\beta_i = x\beta_{i+1}$  for some letter  $x$ .

Case:  $\ell(\alpha_i)$  is even.

- If  $x \in \{a, b, c, d\}$ , then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i x$ .
- If  $x \in \{a^{-1}, b^{-1}, c^{-1}, d^{-1}\}$ , then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i a x$ .

Case:  $\ell(\alpha_i)$  is odd.

- If  $x \in \{a, b, c, d\}$ , then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i a^{-1} x$ .
- If  $x \in \{a^{-1}, b^{-1}, c^{-1}, d^{-1}\}$ , then  $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i x$ .

Output  $\tau_{\ell(\tau)}$ .

**Definition 9.** For words  $\tau = \tau(a, b, c, d)$ , define  $P(\tau)$  to be the number of letters  $a^{\pm 1}$  inserted by Algorithm II on input  $\tau$ .

**Lemma 10.** Let  $\Pi$  be a collection of  $p$  disjoint alternating subwords of a word  $\tau = \tau(a, b, c, d)$ , and let  $\bar{\tau}$  be the word formed from  $\tau$  by removing all the subwords specified by  $\Pi$ . Then  $P(\tau) \leq P(\bar{\tau}) + 2p$ .

*Proof.* For a letter  $l \in \{a^{\pm 1}, b^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}\}$  write  $\chi(l) \in \{\pm 1\}$  for the exponent of  $l$ . For a word  $w = w(a, b, c, d)$  write  $w[i]$  for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  letter of  $w$ . For  $i \in \{2, \dots, \ell(w)\}$  define

$$d_i(w) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \chi(w[i]) = \chi(w[i-1]), \\ 0 & \text{if } \chi(w[i]) \neq \chi(w[i-1]), \end{cases}$$

and define

$$d_1(w) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \chi(w[1]) = -1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \chi(w[1]) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that, during the running of Algorithm II on a word  $\tau$ , an  $a^{\pm 1}$  is inserted during the transition from  $\tau_{i-1}$  to  $\tau_i$  precisely when  $d_i(w) = 1$ . Thus  $P(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(\tau)} d_i(\tau)$ .

By induction, it suffices to prove the lemma in the case  $p = 1$ . Suppose  $\tau = uvw$  and  $\bar{\tau} = uw$  for some words  $u, v, w$  with  $v$  alternating. Note that:

$$\begin{aligned} d_i(\tau) &= d_i(u) = d_i(\bar{\tau}) & i &= 1, \dots, \ell(u); \\ d_{\ell(u)+i}(\tau) &= d_i(v) = 0 & i &= 2, \dots, \ell(v); \\ d_{\ell(uv)+i}(\tau) &= d_i(w) = d_{\ell(u)+i}(\bar{\tau}) & i &= 2, \dots, \ell(w). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tau) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(\tau)} d_i(\tau) \\ &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(u)} d_i(\bar{\tau}) \right] + d_{\ell(u)+1}(\tau) + d_{\ell(uv)+1}(\tau) + \left[ \sum_{i=2}^{\ell(w)} d_{\ell(u)+i}(\bar{\tau}) \right] \\ &\leq \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(\bar{\tau})} d_i(\bar{\tau}) \right] + d_{\ell(u)+1}(\tau) + d_{\ell(uv)+1}(\tau) \\ &\leq P(\bar{\tau}) + 2. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Definition 11.** For words  $\sigma = \sigma(a, b, c, d, s)$ , define  $Q(\sigma)$  to be the number of times letters  $b^{\pm 1}$  alternate with letters  $d^{\pm 1}$  in  $\sigma$ . More precisely, if the word obtained from  $\sigma$  by deleting all letters  $a^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}, s^{\pm 1}$  is  $\mu_1\nu_1\mu_2\nu_2\ldots\mu_q\nu_q$ , in which  $\nu_1, \mu_2, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_{q-1}, \mu_q \neq \varepsilon$  and  $\mu_i = \mu_i(b)$  and  $\nu_i = \nu_i(d)$  for all  $i$ , then  $Q(\sigma) = q$ .

**Definition 12.** For words  $\sigma = \sigma(a, b, c, d, s)$ , define  $R(\sigma)$  to be the maximum over all suffixes  $\beta$  of  $\sigma$  of the absolute value of the exponent sum of  $\beta$ .

The following algorithm works through a word  $\tau_0 = \tau_0(a, b, c, d)$  from left to right inserting letters  $a^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}$  without changing the element of  $F(a, b) \times F(c, d)$  it represents. If the exponent-sum of  $\tau$  is zero then the output will be alternating.

**Algorithm III.**

Input a word  $\tau_0 = \tau_0(a, b, c, d)$ . Define  $\beta_i$  to be the length- $(\ell(\tau) - i)$  suffix of  $\tau_0$ . Define  $\alpha_0 := \varepsilon$  and  $\Delta_0 := \varepsilon$ .

The algorithm will produce a sequence of words  $(\tau_i)_{i=0}^{\ell(\tau)}$  of the form  $\tau_i = \alpha_i \Delta_i \beta_i$ , where  $\alpha_i$  is an alternating word or an alternating word concatenated with an  $a, b, c, d$ , and  $\Delta_i$  is  $a^r$  or  $c^r$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

For  $0 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$ , obtain  $\alpha_{i+1}, \Delta_{i+1}$  from  $\alpha_i, \Delta_i$  as follows. We have  $\beta_i = x\beta_{i+1}$  for some letter  $x$ .

Case (1)  $\Delta_i = a^r$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $\ell(\alpha_i)$  is even.

- (1.1) If  $x \in \{a, c, d\}$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := \Delta_i$ .
- (1.2) If  $x = b$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i (ac^{-1})^r x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := c^r$ .
- (1.3) If  $x \in \{a^{-1}, c^{-1}, d^{-1}\}$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i a x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := a^{r-1}$ .
- (1.4) If  $x = b^{-1}$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i (ac^{-1})^r c x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := c^{r-1}$ .

Case (2)  $\Delta_i = c^r$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $\ell(\alpha)$  is odd.

- (2.1) If  $x \in \{a, c, d\}$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i a^{-1} x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := a^{r+1}$ .
- (2.2) If  $x = b$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i (c^{-1}a)^r c^{-1} x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := c^{r+1}$ .
- (2.3) If  $x \in \{a^{-1}, c^{-1}, d^{-1}\}$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := \Delta_i$ .
- (2.4) If  $x = b^{-1}$  then  $\alpha_{i+1} := \alpha_i (c^{-1}a)^r x$  and  $\Delta_{i+1} := c^r$ .

When  $\Delta_i = c^r$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ , obtain  $\alpha_{i+1}$  and  $\Delta_{i+1}$  similarly, but with  $a, b$  interchanging roles with  $c, d$ . Call the cases involved (3.1–3.4) and (4.1–4.4).

Output  $\tau_{\ell(\tau)}$ .

**Lemma 13.** Suppose  $\tau = \tau(a, b, c, d)$  is a word of exponent sum zero. Then Algorithm III converts  $\tau$  to an alternating word  $\hat{\tau}$  with  $\ell(\hat{\tau}) \geq \ell(\tau)$ , with  $Q(\hat{\tau}) = Q(\tau)$ , and with

$$(3) \quad \ell(\hat{\tau}) - \ell(\tau) \leq P(\tau) + 4(R(\tau) + 1)Q(\tau).$$

Moreover, the cost of transforming  $\tau$  to  $\hat{\tau}$  is at most

$$(4) \quad (R(\tau) + 2)\ell(\tau) + 2(R(\tau) + 2)^2Q(\tau).$$

*Proof.* As the exponent sum of each  $\tau_{i+1}$  is the same as that of  $\tau_i$ , it remains at zero throughout the run of the algorithm and  $\Delta_{\ell(\tau)}$  must be  $\varepsilon$ . It follows that  $\hat{\tau} = \tau_{\ell(\tau)}$  is alternating.

If one removes all letters  $a^{\pm 1}$  and  $c^{\pm 1}$  from  $\hat{\tau}$  and  $\tau$ , they become identical words, and so  $Q(\hat{\tau}) = Q(\tau)$ .

The transformation  $\tau_i$  to  $\tau_{i+1}$  can be achieved at a cost of at most  $|r| + 1$  in Cases  $\star.1$ ,  $\star.3$  and at most  $(|r| + 1)^2$  in Cases  $\star.2$ ,  $\star.4$ , where  $r$  is the exponent in  $\Delta_i$ . In every instance,

$$(5) \quad |r| \leq R(\tau) + 1.$$

Suppose removing all letters  $a^{\pm 1}$  and  $c^{\pm 1}$  from  $\tau$  gives  $\mu_1\nu_1\mu_2\nu_2\cdots\mu_q\nu_q$ , in which  $\nu_1, \mu_2, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_{q-1}, \mu_q \neq \varepsilon$  and  $\mu_i = \mu_i(b)$  and  $\nu_i = \nu_i(d)$  for all  $i$ . By definition,  $Q(\tau) = q$ . The process described above will carry a power of  $c$  through the word from the left until it hits  $\nu_1$ , when it will be converted to a power of  $a$ , which will then be carried until it hits  $\mu_2$  when it reverts to a power of  $c$ , and so on. So Cases  $\star.2$  and  $\star.4$  are invoked either  $2Q(\tau) - 1$  or  $2Q(\tau) - 2$  times depending on whether or not  $\nu_q = \varepsilon$ . Cases  $\star.1$  and  $\star.3$  are invoked the remaining  $\ell(\tau) - 2Q(\tau) + 1$  or  $\ell(\tau) - 2Q(\tau) + 2$  times. Combining these estimates we see that the total cost of converting  $\tau$  to  $\hat{\tau}$  is at most

$$(6) \quad (R(\tau) + 2)(\ell(\tau) - 2Q(\tau) + 2) + (R(\tau) + 2)^2(2Q(\tau) - 1),$$

which, discarding some negative terms and noting that  $Q(\tau) \geq 1$ , gives (4).

The length estimate (3) comes from counting the letters deposited into  $\tau$  in the above process en route to reaching  $\hat{\tau}$ . They occur in two forms. (Note: we do not consider the powers of  $a$  and  $c$  carried through the word as *deposited*.) Firstly, there are the single letters  $a^{\pm 1}$  or  $c^{\pm 1}$  inserted in Cases 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.2. These total  $P(\tau)$ . And, secondly, there are the  $(ac^{-1})^r$  of Cases 1.2 and 1.4, the  $(c^{-1}a)^r$  of 2.2 and 2.4, the  $(ca^{-1})^r$  of 3.2 and 3.4, and the  $(a^{-1}c)^r$  of 4.2 and 4.4. These cases occur less than  $2Q(\tau)$  times and by (5) each inserts a word of length at most  $2|r| \leq 2(R(\tau) + 1)$ .  $\square$

Our next algorithm transforms a balanced word on  $a, b, c, d, s$  to a word in preferred alternating form that represents the same element of  $S$ .

**Algorithm IV.**

Input a balanced word  $u = u(a, b, c, d, s)$ . Define  $u_0 := u$  and  $L := \ell_s(u)/2$ . Then for  $0 \leq i < L$  recursively obtain  $u_{i+1}$  from  $u_i$  by the following two steps.

- (A) Locate a subword  $s^{\pm 1} \tau_i s^{\mp 1}$  in  $u_i$  such that  $\tau_i = \tau_i(a, b, c, d)$  and has zero exponent sum (which, by Britton's Lemma, we know exists). Use Algorithm III to transform  $\tau_i$  into alternating form  $\hat{\tau}_i$ .
- (B) Shuffle the  $s^{\pm 1}$  through  $\hat{\tau}_i$  and cancel it with the  $s^{\mp 1}$  to give  $u_{i+1}$ .

This produces  $u_L$ , which contains no letters  $s^{\pm 1}$ . Next –

- (C) Reverse every instance of Step A to get a word  $\bar{u}$ , which is  $u$  with all letters  $s^{\pm 1}$  deleted.
- (D) Run Algorithm I on  $\bar{u}$  to give a word  $v$  in preferred alternating form.

Output  $v$ .

**Lemma 14.** *Suppose  $u = u(a, b, c, d, s)$  is a balanced word with  $2 \leq \ell(u) \leq m$ . Suppose  $\Pi$  is some collection of at most  $p$  disjoint subwords in  $u$ , each in preferred alternating form, such that deleting these subwords leaves a word of length at most  $k$ . Then Algorithm IV transforms  $u$  into  $v$  at a cost of no more than*

$$80k^3 + 75k^2p + 16m^2.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 13, performing Step A on  $\tau_i$  costs at most

$$(7) \quad (R(\tau_i) + 2)\ell(\tau_i) + 2(R(\tau_i) + 2)^2Q(\tau_i).$$

Now, for all  $i$ ,

$$(8) \quad Q(\tau_i) \leq Q(u_i) = Q(u) \leq k + p,$$

as letters  $b^{\pm 1}$  alternate with letters  $d^{\pm 1}$  at most once in each preferred-alternating-form subword of  $u$ , and transformations as per Lemma 13 do not alter  $Q$ .

Note that if  $\sigma'$  is obtained from a word  $\sigma$  by deleting a collection of disjoint alternating subwords, then  $R(\sigma) \leq R(\sigma') + 1$ . We recursively define a collection  $\Pi_i$  of disjoint alternating subwords of  $u_i$  in the letters  $a^{\pm 1}, b^{\pm 1}, c^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}$  by  $\Pi_0 := \Pi$  and for  $0 \leq i < L$ ,

$$\Pi_{i+1} := (\Pi_i \setminus \Pi'_i) \cup \{\hat{\tau}_i\}.$$

Let  $\Pi'_i$  be the subset of  $\Pi_i$  consisting of those words which have letters in common with  $\tau_i$ . Note that each word in  $\Pi'_i$  is a subword of  $\tau_i$  since it contains no occurrence of a letter  $s^{\pm 1}$ . Removing the subwords  $\Pi'_i$  from  $\tau_i$  produces a word  $\tau'_i$  whose letters all originate in  $u$  but not in

any of its subwords  $\Pi$ . If  $i \neq j$  then  $\tau'_i$  and  $\tau'_j$  originate from different letters in  $u$  so

$$(9) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \ell(\tau'_i) \leq k.$$

Furthermore, since  $L \leq k/2$  and  $R(\tau'_i) \leq \ell(\tau'_i)$  one has

$$(10) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} R(\tau_i) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (R(\tau'_i) + 1) \leq \frac{k}{2} + \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \ell(\tau'_i) \leq \frac{3k}{2}.$$

Similarly

$$(11) \quad P(\tau_i) \leq \ell(\tau'_i) + 2|\Pi'_i| \leq \ell(\tau'_i) + 2|\Pi_i| \leq \ell(\tau'_i) + 2p + k$$

for all  $i$ , by Lemma 10 applied to removing the subwords  $\Pi'_i$  from  $\tau_i$  and noting that  $|\Pi_{j+1}| \leq |\Pi_j| + 1$  for all  $j$  and that  $i \leq L \leq k/2$ . It follows from 11 and 9 that

$$(12) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} P(\tau_i) \leq k + pk + \frac{k^2}{2} \leq 2k^2 + pk.$$

Now, for all  $j$ ,

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \ell(u_{j+1}) - \ell(u_j) &= \ell(\hat{\tau}_j) - \ell(\tau_j) \\ &\leq P(\tau_j) + 4(R(\tau_j) + 1)Q(\tau_j) \\ &\leq P(\tau_j) + 4(R(\tau_j) + 1)(k + p), \end{aligned}$$

where the first and second inequalities are applications of (3) and (8), respectively. So, for all  $i \leq L$ ,

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \ell(u_i) &\leq m + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (P(\tau_j) + 4(R(\tau_j) + 1)(k + p)) \\ &\leq m + 2k^2 + pk + (6k + 4i)(k + p) \\ &\leq m + 2k^2 + pk + 8k(k + p) \\ &\leq m + 10k^2 + 9kp \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses  $\ell(u_0) = m$  and (13), the second uses (10) and (12), and the third uses the inequality  $i \leq L \leq k/2$ . We thus find

$$(15) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \ell(u_i) \leq \frac{1}{2}km + 5k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k^2p.$$

The total cost of all instances of Step A, including those implemented within Step C, is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} [(R(\tau_i) + 2)\ell(\tau_i) + 2(R(\tau_i) + 2)^2 Q(\tau_i)] \\
& \leq 2 \max_i (\ell(\tau_i)) \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (R(\tau_i) + 2) + 4 \max_i Q(\tau_i) \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (R(\tau_i) + 2) \right]^2 \\
& \leq 2(m + 10k^2 + 9kp) \left( \frac{3}{2}k + k \right) + 4(k + p) \left( \frac{3}{2}k + k \right)^2 \\
(16) \quad & \leq 75k^3 + 70k^2p + 5mk
\end{aligned}$$

where the initial estimate comes from (7), and the second inequality uses  $L \leq k/2$ ,  $\ell(\tau_i) \leq \ell(u_i)$ , (8), (10), and (14).

The total cost of all instances of Step B is  $\sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \ell(\hat{\tau}_i)$  which, by (15), is at most  $\frac{1}{2}km + 5k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k^2p$ , as  $\ell(\hat{\tau}_i) \leq \ell(u_i)$ . As  $\ell(\bar{u}) \leq m$ , Lemma 5 tells us that the cost of Step D is at most  $10m^2$ . Summing these three cost estimates gives the total cost as at most

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{1}{2}km + 5k^3 + \frac{9}{2}k^2p \right) + (75k^3 + 70k^2p + 5mk) + 10m^2 \\
& \leq 80k^3 + \frac{149}{2}k^2p + \frac{11}{2}km + 10m^2 \\
(17) \quad & \leq 80k^3 + 75k^2p + 16m^2.
\end{aligned}$$

where for the final inequality we have used that  $k \leq m$ .  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.

Our final algorithm concerns converts null-homotopic words in  $S$  to  $\varepsilon$ . Its cost analysis will establish Theorem 1. (The finitely many  $w$  of length less than 8 are irrelevant for the asymptotics of the Dehn function of  $S$ .) It constructs a sequence of null-homotopic words  $(w_i)_{i=0}^l$  and a subset  $T_i$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, \ell(w_i)\}$  specifying a collection of the letters of  $w_i$  by their locations.

**Algorithm V.**

Input a word  $w$  of length at least 8 representing 1 in  $S$ . Let  $n := \ell(w)$ .

Input a parameter  $k \in [4, n]$ .

Define  $w_0 := w$  and let  $T_0$  be the empty set. For successive  $i$  such that  $T_i \neq \{1, 2, \dots, \ell(w_i)\}$ , obtain  $w_{i+1}$  and  $T_{i+1}$  from  $w_i$  and  $T_i$  by performing the following steps.

- (i) Let  $\bar{w}_i$  be the word obtained from  $w_i$  by deleting the letters in the positions  $T_i$ . If  $\ell(\bar{w}_i) \leq k$ , then define  $u := w_i$ . If  $\ell(\bar{w}_i) > k$  then let  $\bar{u}$  be a balanced subword of  $\bar{w}_i$  with  $k/2 \leq \ell(\bar{u}) \leq k$  and take  $u$  to be the longest subword of  $w_i$  which reduces to  $\bar{u}$  when all the letters specified by  $T_i$  are removed. In either case,  $u$  is a balanced subword of  $w_i$  of which between  $k/2$  and  $k$  letters are not in positions in  $T_i$ .
- (ii) Use Algorithm IV to convert  $u$  to a word  $v$  in preferred alternating form. Obtain  $w_{i+1}$  from  $w_i$  by replacing  $u$  with  $v$ . Let  $T_{i+1}$  be the locations in  $w_{i+1}$  of the letters of  $v$  and of the letters that originate in  $w_i$  (but not in  $u$ ) and have locations in  $T_i$ .

Define  $l := i + 1$  where  $i$  is the value in the final run of Steps (i) and (ii).

- (iii) Reduce  $w_l$  to  $\varepsilon$  by shuffling the letters  $a^{\pm 1}, b^{\pm 1}$  to the start of the word and then freely reducing.

*Notes.* Steps (i) and (ii) are repeated at most  $((n - k)/(k/2)) + 1 = (2n/k) - 1$  times and so  $l \leq 2n/k$ .

The reason  $w_i = w_{i+1}$  for all  $0 \leq i < l$  is that the words  $u$  and  $v$  in Step (ii) represent the same element of  $S$ . One effect of each instance of Step (ii) is to remove any letters  $s^{\pm 1}$  in  $u$ . In particular none of the letters of  $w_i$  specified by  $T_i$  are  $s^{\pm 1}$  and so there are no  $s^{\pm 1}$  in  $w_l$ .

For all  $i$ , the letters of  $w_i$  specified by  $T_i$  comprises  $\leq i$  subwords, each in preferred alternating form. (The number of these subwords rises by at most one with each run of Steps (i) and (ii).)

The existence of the  $u$  of Step (i) follows from Lemmas 7 and 8 as follows. As  $w_i$  is null-homotopic and hence balanced, Lemma 7 applies and tells us that  $\bar{w}_i$  is also balanced, since  $T_i$  specifies a number of alternating subwords in  $w_i$ . As  $\ell(\bar{w}_i) > k \geq 4$ , Lemma 8 applies and tells us that  $\bar{w}_i$  contains a balanced subword  $\bar{u}$  with  $k/2 \leq \ell(\bar{u}) \leq k$ . An appeal to Lemma 7 tells us that  $u$  is balanced. In the final case, where  $u$  is  $w_{l-1}$ , we see that  $u$  is balanced because it is null-homotopic.

The viability of Step (iii) follows from the facts that  $w_l$  is null-homotopic in  $S$  and contains no letters  $s^{\pm 1}$ , and so is null-homotopic

in

$$F(a, b) \times F(c, d) = \langle a, b, c, d \mid [a, c], [a, d], [b, c], [b, d] \rangle.$$

*Cost analysis.* For all  $i$ , the letters of  $w_i$  specified by  $T_i$  comprise a number of subwords in preferred alternating form. The number of such subwords specified by  $T_i$  is at most  $i \leq l \leq 2n/k$ , since the number increases by at most one for each transition  $T_j$  to  $T_{j+1}$ . Each specified subword has length at most three times the length of a corresponding subword of  $w$ , by Lemma 5. Thus  $\ell(w_i) \leq 3\ell(w)$  and so, for each  $i$ , the subword  $u$  of step (i) has  $\ell(u) \leq 3\ell(w)$ . Applying Lemma 14 with  $p = 2n/k$  and  $m = 3n$  tells us that the cost of each instance of Step (ii) is at most

$$80k^3 + 150nk + 144n^2.$$

Multiplying by  $l \leq 2n/k$  and adding  $(3n)^2$ , which is an upper bound on the cost of Step (iii) as  $\ell(w_l) \leq 3n$ , gives the estimate

$$\text{Area}(w) \leq 160nk^2 + 309n^2 + 288\frac{n^3}{k}.$$

So  $k = n^{2/3}$ , which is compatible with the condition  $k \geq 4$  since we assumed that  $n \geq 8$ , gives our  $n^{7/3}$  isoperimetric function.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Baumslag, M. R. Bridson, C. F. Miller, and H. Short. Finitely presented subgroups of automatic groups and their isoperimetric functions. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 56(2):292–304, 1997.
- [2] R. Bieri. Homological dimension of discrete groups. Queen Mary Lecture Notes, 1976.
- [3] N. Brady and M. R. Bridson. There is only one gap in the isoperimetric spectrum. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(5):1053–1070, 2000.
- [4] M. R. Bridson. personal communication.
- [5] M. R. Bridson. Doubles, finiteness properties of groups, and quadratic isoperimetric inequalities. *Journal of Algebra*, 214:652–667, 1999.
- [6] S. M. Gersten. Finiteness properties of asynchronously automatic groups. In R. Charney, M. Davis, and M. Shapiro, editors, *Geometric Group Theory*, volume 3 of *Ohio State University, Mathematical Research Institute Publications*, pages 121–133. de Gruyter, 1995.
- [7] D. Groves. personal communication.
- [8] M. V. Sapir, J.-C. Birget, and E. Rips. Isoperimetric and isodiametric functions of groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 156(2):345–466, 2002.
- [9] J. Stallings. A finitely presented group whose 3-dimensional integral homology is not finitely generated. *Amer. J. Math.*, 85:541–543, 1963.

W.DISON, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON,  
LONDON, SW7 2AZ, U.K.

*E-mail address: [william.dison@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:william.dison@imperial.ac.uk)*

M.ELDER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, STEVENS INSTITUTE  
OF TECHNOLOGY, HOBOKEN, NJ 07030, USA

*E-mail address: [melder@stevens.edu](mailto:melder@stevens.edu)*

T.R.RILEY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 310 MALOTT HALL, CORNELL  
UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NY 14853-4201, USA

*E-mail address: [tim.riley@math.cornell.edu](mailto:tim.riley@math.cornell.edu)*