

SMALL NON-LEIGHTON TWO-COMPLEXES

Natalia S. Dergacheva Anton A. Klyachko

*Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics of Moscow State University**Moscow 119991, Leninskie gory, MSU.**Moscow Center for Fundamental and Applied Mathematics**nataliya.dergacheva@gmail.com klyachko@mech.math.msu.su*

How many 2-cells must two finite CW-complexes have to admit a common, but not finite common, covering? Leighton's theorem says that both complexes must have 2-cells. We construct an almost (?) minimal example with two 2-cells in each complex.

0. Introduction

Leighton's theorem [Lei82]. *If two finite graph have a common covering, then they have a common finite covering.*

Alternative proofs and various generalisations of this result can be found, e.g., in [Neu10], [BaK90], [SGW19], [Woo21], [BrS21], and references therein.

Does a similar result hold for any CW-complexes, i.e.

is it true that, if, for finite CW-complexes K_1 and K_2 , there exist a CW-complex K and cellular coverings $K_1 \leftarrow K \rightarrow K_2$, then there exists a finite CW-complex K with this property?

This natural question was posed (in other terms) in [Tuc90] and [AFS91]. Notice the cellularity requirement. Surely, we would obtain an equivalent question if we replace this condition with a formally stronger *combinatorialness* one: the image of each cell is a cell. However, without the cellularity condition, the answer would be negative: indeed, the torus and the genus-two surface have no finite common coverings (as the fundamental group the genus-two orientable surface $\langle x, y, z, t \mid [x, y][z, t] = 1 \rangle$ contains no abelian subgroups of finite index), while the universal coverings of these surfaces are homeomorphic, because they are the plane. The cellularity condition rules out such examples: if we take, e.g., the standard one-vertex cell structures on the torus and genus-two surface, then, on the covering plane, we obtain

- the usual square lattice on the (Euclidean) plane (in the torus-case)
- and an octagonal lattice on the (Lobachevskii) plane (in the genus-two case)

(i.e. though the universal coverings are homeomorphic, the cell structure on them are principally different). This example cannot be saved by a complication of the cell structures on the torus and genus-two surface (as was noted in [Tuc90] and [AFS91]; the authors of [AFS91] even conjectured that the answer to the (cellular version of) the question is positive).

Nevertheless, the answer turned out to be negative as was shown in [Wis07] (and actually, much earlier in [Wis96]); the complexes K_1, K_2 forming such a *non-Leighton* pair from [Wis07] contain as few as six 2-cells each. In [JaW09], this number was reduced to four:*)

there exist two two-complexes containing four 2-cells each that have a common covering but have not finite common coverings.

(Henceforth, we omit the prefix “CW-” and word “cellular”: a *complex* means a CW-complex, and all mapping between complexes are assumed to be cellular in this paper.) The non-Leighton complexes K_1 and K_2 from [JaW09] are the *standard complexes* of the following group presentations Γ_i , i.e. one-vertex complexes with edges corresponding to the generators and 2-cells attached by the relators:

$$\Gamma_1 = F_2 \times F_2 = \langle a, b, x, y \mid [a, x], [a, y], [b, x], [b, y] \rangle \text{ and } \Gamma_2 = \langle a, b, x, y \mid axay, ax^{-1}by^{-1}, ay^{-1}b^{-1}x^{-1}, bxb^{-1}y^{-1} \rangle.$$

Both of these complex are covered by the Cartesian product of two trees (Cayley graphs of the free group F_2); and no finite common cover exists, because the fundamental group of such hypothetical covering complex would embed in both groups Γ_i as finite-index subgroups, but, in Γ_1 , any finite-index subgroup contains a finite-index subgroup which is the direct product of free groups, while Γ_2 has no such finite-index subgroups [JaW09] (Γ_2 is not even residually finite [CaW18], [BoK21]). The results of [JaW09] implies also a minimality of this example in the sense that

if we restrict ourselves to complexes K_i covered by products of trees, then four two-dimensional cells is the minimum among all non-Leighton pairs.

If we do not restrict ourselves, then smaller non-Leighton pairs arise.

This work was supported by the Russian Science Foundation, project no. 22-11-00075.

*) although the authors of [JaW09] did not pursue this purpose; it was rather a byproduct of their results.

Main theorem (a simplified version). *There exist two finite two-complexes containing two 2-cells each that have a common covering, but have not finite common coverings.*

(Explicit forms of these two two-2-cell two-complexes can be found at the very end of this paper.) Thus, the only question remaining open concerns complexes with a single 2-cell. This question seems to be difficult (although it is closely related to the well-developed theory one-relator groups). The point is that a classification of one-relator groups up to commensurability is not an easy task even for the *Baumslag–Solitar groups* $BS(n, m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle c, d \mid c^{nd} = c^m \rangle$ (though, in this special case, it was recently obtained [CKZ19]). Henceforth, $x^{ky} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y^{-1}x^ky$, where x and y are elements of a group and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

In conclusion, note that results on coverings of two-complexes can imply nontrivial facts about graphs, because one can “model” 2-cells in graphs by means of additional vertices and edges, see [BrS21]. Higher dimensional complexes are of little sense here: if complexes K_1 and K_2 form a non-Leighton pair, then their two-skeleta also form such a pair, as is easy to verify. A detailed exposition of the general theory of coverings and CW-complexes can be found, e.g., in [FoF89].

1. Algebraic lemmata

The following fact is well and long known [Mes72], we give a short proof for the reader’s convenience.

Commutator lemma. *In the group $H = BS(3, 5) = \langle c, d \mid c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle$, the commutator $h = [c^d, c]$ belongs to any finite-index subgroup.*

Proof. Each finite-index subgroup contains a normal finite-index subgroup (see, e.g., [KaM82]) Therefore, it suffices to show that h lies in the kernel of any homomorphism $\varphi: H \rightarrow K$ to any finite group K .

The elements $\varphi(c^3)$ and $\varphi(c^5)$ have the same order (because they are conjugate); hence, the order of $\varphi(c)$ is not divisible by three. Therefore, $\varphi(c) \in \langle \varphi(c^3) \rangle$. Thus, $\varphi(c)^{\varphi(d)} \in \langle \varphi(c) \rangle$ and $h = [c^d, c]$ belongs to the kernel of φ . This completes the proof.

Bottle lemma. *If a group G has a subgroup $\langle a, b \mid a^b = a^{-1} \rangle \simeq BS(1, -1)$, and the element b lies in all finite-index subgroups of G , then any finite-index subgroup of G contains a subgroup isomorphic to the Klein-bottle group $BS(1, -1)$.*

Proof. Any finite-index subgroup contains all elements conjugate to b , because the intersection R of all finite-index subgroups is normal. Therefore, $a^2 = b^{-1}b^a \in R$ and $\langle a^2, b \rangle \subseteq R$. It remains to note that $a^{2b} = a^{-2}$, and the groups $\langle a^2 \rangle$ and $\langle b \rangle$ are infinite; hence, the subgroup $\langle a^2, b \rangle$ is isomorphic to $BS(1, -1)$, because,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{in any group, infinite-order elements } x \text{ and } y \text{ such that } x^y = x^{-1} \\ & \text{generate a subgroup isomorphic to the Klein-bottle group.} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Indeed, there is obvious epimorphism $\varphi: BS(1, -1) = \langle a, b \rangle \rightarrow \langle x, y \rangle$. Any element $g \in BS(1, -1)$ can be written in the form $g = a^k b^l$. If $g = a^k b^l \in \ker \varphi$, then $\ker \varphi \ni [b, g] = b^{-1}b^{-l}a^{-k}ba^k b^l = a^{\pm 2k}$. Therefore, $k = 0$ (because $|\langle x \rangle| = \infty$). But then $l = 0$ too, because $1 = \varphi(g) = \varphi(b^l) = y^l$, and $|\langle y \rangle| = \infty$. Thus, $\ker \varphi = \{1\}$ and φ is an isomorphism. This completes the proof.

No-bottle lemma. *The amalgamated free product*

$$G = \langle a, c, d \mid [a, [c^d, c]] = 1, c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle = \langle a, b \mid [a, b] = 1 \rangle \underset{b=[c^d, c]}{*} \langle c, d \mid c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle$$

of the free abelian group and the Baumslag–Solitar group $BS(3, 5)$ contains no subgroups isomorphic to the Klein-bottle group $K = BS(1, -1)$.

Proof. The group $BS(3, 5)$ does not contain subgroups isomorphic to K [Lev15] and is torsion-free. Therefore, applying once again (1), we obtain that the quotient $G / \langle\langle [a, G] \rangle\rangle = \langle a \rangle_\infty \times BS(3, 5)$ by the normal closure $\langle\langle [a, G] \rangle\rangle$ of the set $[a, G]$ of commutators of a and all elements of G has no nonidentity elements conjugate their inverse. Therefore, any element of G conjugate to its inverse lies in $N = \langle\langle [a, G] \rangle\rangle$. This subgroup intersects trivially the free factors (and their conjugates). Thus, all elements of N have length at least two, and the following conjugation criterion (see, e.g., [LS80]) applies:

two cyclically reduced words of length ≥ 2 in an amalgamated free product $U \underset{W}{} V$ are conjugate if and only if one of them can be obtained from the other by a cyclic permutation and subsequent conjugation by an element of W .*

In $U \underset{W}{*} V$, an equality of reduced words $u_1 v_1 \dots = u'_1 v'_1 \dots$ implies the equalities of the double cosets $W u_1 W = W u'_1 W$, $W v_1 W = W v'_1 W, \dots$. Therefore, if a cyclically reduced word $x \in N \triangleleft \langle a, b \mid [a, b] = 1 \rangle \underset{b=[c^d, c]}{*} \langle c, d \mid c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle$ is conjugate

to its inverse, then, for a letter x_1 of x , we obtain the equality $x_1 = b^k x_1^{-1} b^l$ (because the map $f_{k,n}: i \mapsto k - i \pmod n$ from the set (of subscripts) $\{1, \dots, n\}$ to itself has either a fixed point, or an almost fixed point: $f_{k,n}(i) = i + 1 \pmod n$ for some i ; the latter case would imply that $x_1 = b^k x_2^{-1} b^l$ for some adjacent letters x_1 and x_2 of the reduced word x , which is impossible). Substituting $x_1 = b^k \hat{x}_1$, we obtain $\hat{x}_1^2 = b^{l-k}$; thus

- either $\hat{x}_1^2 \in \langle b \rangle$ for some $\hat{x}_1 \in (\langle a \rangle_\infty \times \langle b \rangle_\infty) \setminus \langle b \rangle$,
- or $\hat{x}_1^2 \in \langle [c^d, c] \rangle$ for some $\hat{x}_1 \in \langle c, d \mid c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle \setminus \langle [c^d, c] \rangle$.

The first is impossible of course. The impossibility of the second case can be verified, e.g., as follows.

- The quotient group $Q = \langle c, d \mid c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle / \langle\langle [c^d, c] \rangle\rangle$ is torsion-free; indeed, Q is the HNN-extension $Q = \langle c, e, d \mid [e, c] = 1, e^3 = c^5, c^d = e \rangle$ of the abelian group $A = \langle c, e \mid [e, c] = 1, e^3 = c^5 \rangle$, which is torsion-free (moreover, it is easy to verify that $A \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ and $Q \simeq \text{BS}(3, 5)$);
- therefore, \hat{x}_1 lies in the normal closure $F = \langle\langle [c^d, c] \rangle\rangle$, which is a free group, because, by the Karrass–Solitar theorem (see, e.g., [LS80]), any subgroup of an HNN-extension is free if it intersects conjugates of the base trivially. It remains to show that $[c^d, c]$ is not a square in F (because in a free group an inclusion $\alpha^2 \in \langle \beta \rangle$ implies that $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$ is cyclic by the Nielsen–Schreier theorem and, hence, $\alpha \in \langle \beta \rangle$ if β is not a square). The commutator $[c^d, c]$ is not a square in F , because, assuming the contrary and noting that automorphic images of squares are squares too, we obtain $F = \langle\langle [c^d, c] \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \hat{x}^2 \rangle\rangle \subseteq \langle\{f^2 \mid f \in F\}\rangle$, which cannot hold in a nontrivial free group F . This completes the proof.

2. Proof of the main theorem


Take the fundamental groups of the torus and the Klein bottle:

$$G_1 = \text{BS}(1, 1) = \langle a, b \mid [a, b] = 1 \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad G_{-1} = \text{BS}(1, -1) = \langle a, b \mid a^b = a^{-1} \rangle$$

and consider the amalgamated free products $H_\varepsilon = G_\varepsilon *_b H$ of G_ε and a group $H = \langle X \mid R \rangle \supseteq \langle h \rangle_\infty$ (henceforth $\varepsilon = \pm 1$). Let K_ε be the standard complex of the (standard) presentation of H_ε :

$$H_\varepsilon = \langle \{a\} \sqcup X \mid \{a^{\hat{h}} a^{-\varepsilon}\} \sqcup R \rangle, \quad \text{where } \hat{h} \text{ is a word in the alphabet } X^{\pm 1} \text{ representing the element } h \in H.$$

The Cayley graphs of G_ε are isomorphic surely (as abstract undirected graphs), the same is true for the universal coverings of the standard complexes of presentations of the groups G_ε (these covering complexes are planes partitioned on squares, Fig. 1).



Universal coverings of the standard complexes of presentations G_1 (left) and G_{-1} (right);
vertical/horizontal edge are labeled by a and b , respectively;
each small square is filled with a 2-cell.

Fig. 1

A slightly less trivial observation is that, for groups H_ε , the universal coverings are isomorphic too:

for any infinite-order element h of any group H , the universal coverings of complexes K_ε are isomorphic. (*)

In what follows, we explain this simple fact in details; the readers who regard this fact as obvious, can skip to Observation (**).

It suffices to show that some coverings $\widehat{K}_\varepsilon \rightarrow K_\varepsilon$ have isomorphic \widehat{K}_ε ; we prefer to take the coverings corresponding to the normal closure $\langle\langle a \rangle\rangle$ of $a \in H_\varepsilon$. In explicit form, these complexes \widehat{K}_ε are the following ones:

- the vertices are elements of H ;

- the edges with labels from X are drawn as in the Cayley graph of the group H : an edge with label $x \in X$ go from each vertex $h' \in H$ to the vertex $h'x \in H$;
- in addition, to each vertex $h' \in H$, a directed loop (edge) $a_{h'}$ labelled by a is attached;
- to each cycle whose label is a relator from R , an oriented 2-cell is attached;
- to each cycle with label $\widehat{h}a^{-\varepsilon}$, an oriented 2-cell (a *special* cell) is attached; thus, going along the boundary of a special cell in the positive direction, we meet two edges labelled by a , namely, $a_{h'}$ and $a_{h'h}^{-\varepsilon}$, where, as usual, $a_{h'h}^{-1}$ means that the edge $a_{h'h}$ is traversed against its direction.

The isomorphism $\Phi: \widehat{K}_1 \rightarrow \widehat{K}_{-1}$ is the following:

- the vertices, edges with labels from X and nonspecial 2-cells (corresponding to relators from R) are mapped identically;
- to define the mapping Φ on edges labelled by a and special 2-cells, we choose a set T of left-coset representatives of $\langle h \rangle$ in H , and put $\Phi(a_{th^k}) = a_{th^k}^{(-1)^k}$ for all $t \in T$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ (i.e., in each coset, each second loop labelled by a is inverted); then the mapping of singular cells are defined naturally: a cell of \widehat{K}_1 with edges $a_{h'}$ and $a_{h'h}^{-1}$ on its boundary is mapped to the cell of \widehat{K}_{-1} containing $a_{h'}$ and $a_{h'h}$ on its boundary.

The next simple observation is that,

if $h \in H$ belongs to all finite-index subgroups of H , and the complexes K_ε have a finite common covering, then the group H_1 contains a subgroup isomorphic to the Klein-bottle group $BS(1, -1)$. (**)

Indeed, in H_{-1} , the element $b = h$ is contained in all subgroups of finite index (because the intersection of each such subgroup with H is of finite index in H and, therefore, contains h). By the bottle lemma (applied to $G = H_{-1}$), we obtain that each finite-index subgroup contains a subgroup isomorphic to the Klein-bottle group. It remains to note that, if a finite complex \widehat{K} covers K_1 and K_{-1} , then its fundamental group $\pi_1(\widehat{K})$ embeds into $\pi_1(K_\varepsilon) = H_\varepsilon$ as a finite-index subgroup.

Now, we take a particular group H , namely, let H be the Baumslag–Solitar group: $H = BS(3, 5) = \langle c, d \mid c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle$, and let $h \in H$ be the commutator: $h = [c^d, c]$. This element h is contained in any finite-index subgroup of H by the commutator lemma. According to (**), this means that, if complexes K_ε would have a common finite covering, then $H_1 = \langle a, c, d \mid [a, [c^d, c]] = 1, c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle$ would contain the Klein-bottle group as a subgroup, which contradicts the no-bottle lemma. Therefore, there are no finite common coverings for complexes K_ε ; while an infinite common covering exists according to (*). Thus, the following fact is proven.

Main theorem. *The standard complexes of presentations $H_\varepsilon = \langle a, c, d \mid a^{[c^d, c]} = a^\varepsilon, c^{3d} = c^5 \rangle$, where $\varepsilon = \pm 1$, containing two 2-cells (and one vertex, and three edges) have a common covering, but have no finite common coverings.*

REFERENCES

- [AFS91] J. Abello, M. R. Fellows, J. C. Stillwell, On the complexity and combinatorics of covering finite complexes, *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics*, 4 (1991), 103-112.
- [BaK90] H. Bass, R. Kulkarni, Uniform tree lattices, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3:4 (1990), 843-902.
- [BoK21] I. Bondarenko, B. Kivva, Automaton groups and complete square complexes, *Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics*, 16:1 (2022), 305-332. See also arXiv:1707.00215.
- [BrS21] M. Bridson, S. Shepherd, Leighton’s theorem: extensions, limitations, and quasitrees, *Algebraic and Geometric Topology* (to appear). See also arXiv:2009.04305.
- [CaW18] P.-E. Caprace, P. Wesolek, Indicability, residual finiteness, and simple subquotients of groups acting on trees, *Geometry and Topology*, 22:7 (2018), 4163-4204. See also arXiv:1708.04590.
- [CKZ19] M. Casals-Ruiz, I. Kazachkov, A. Zakharov, Commensurability of Baumslag–Solitar groups, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 70:6 (2021), 2527-2555. See also arXiv:1910.02117.
- [FoF89] A. Fomenko, D. Fuchs, *Homotopical topology*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 273, Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [JaW09] D. Janzen, D. T. Wise, A smallest irreducible lattice in the product of trees, *Algebraic and Geometric Topology*, 9:4 (2009), 2191-2201.
- [KaM82] M. I. Kargapolov, Yu. I. Merzljakov, *Fundamentals of the theory of groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 62, Springer, 1979.
- [Lei82] F. T. Leighton, Finite common coverings of graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Series B*, 33:3 (1982), 231-238.
- [Lev15] G. Levitt, Quotients and subgroups of Baumslag–Solitar groups, *J. Group Theory*, 18:1 (2015), 1-43. See also arXiv:1308.5122.
- [LS80] R. Lyndon, P. Schupp, *Combinatorial group theory*, Springer, 2015.
- [Mes72] S. Meskin, Nonresidually finite one-relator groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 164 (1972), 105-114.

- [Neu10] W. D. Neumann, On Leighton's graph covering theorem, *Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics*, 4:4 (2010), 863-872. See also arXiv:0906.2496.
- [SGW19] S. Shepherd, G. Gardam, D. J. Woodhouse, Two generalisations of Leighton's Theorem, arXiv:1908.00830.
- [Tuc90] T. W. Tucker, Some topological graph theory for topologists: A sampler of covering space constructions. In: Latiolais P. (eds) *Topology and Combinatorial Group Theory*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1440 (1990). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [Wis96] D. T. Wise, Non-positively curved squared complexes: Aperiodic tilings and non-residually finite groups. PhD Thesis, Princeton University, 1996.
- [Wis07] D. T. Wise, Complete square complexes, *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 82:4 (2007), 683-724.
- [Woo21] D. Woodhouse, Revisiting Leighton's theorem with the Haar measure, *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 170:3 (2021), 615-623. See also arXiv:1806.08196.