

# UNIFORM GROWTH IN SMALL CANCELLATION GROUPS

XABIER LEGASPI AND MARKUS STEENBOCK

ABSTRACT. An open question asks whether every group acting acylindrically on a hyperbolic space has uniform exponential growth. We prove that the class of groups of uniform exponential growth acting acylindrically on a hyperbolic space is closed under taking certain geometric small cancellation quotients. There are two consequences: firstly, there is a finitely generated acylindrically hyperbolic group that has uniform exponential growth but has arbitrarily large torsion balls. Secondly, the uniform exponential growth rate of a classical  $C''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation group, for sufficiently small  $\lambda$ , is bounded from below by a universal positive constant. We give a similar result for uniform entropy-cardinality estimates. This yields an explicit upper bound on the isomorphism class of marked  $\delta$ -hyperbolic  $C''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation groups of uniformly bounded entropy in terms of  $\delta$  and the entropy bound.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $G$  be a group with finite symmetric generating set  $U$ . The  $n$ -th product  $U^n$  is the subset of elements  $g = u_1 \cdots u_n \in G$  such that  $u_1, \dots, u_n \in U$ . We study the *exponential growth rate*

$$\omega(U) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |U^n|$$

where  $|U^n|$  denotes the cardinality of the subset  $U^n \subset G$ . The exponential growth rate of a generating set is sometimes also referred to as of the *entropy* of the group with respect to the generating set. Let  $\xi > 0$ . The group  $G$  has  $\xi$ -uniform exponential growth if for every finite symmetric generating set  $U$  of  $G$ , we have  $\omega(U) > \xi$ . A group has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth if every finitely generated subgroup is either virtually nilpotent or has  $\xi$ -uniform exponential growth. A group  $G$  has uniform exponential growth or uniform uniform exponential growth if there is  $\xi > 0$  such that  $G$  has  $\xi$ -uniform exponential growth, or  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, respectively.

Uniform exponential growth is particularly well-studied in groups of non-positive curvature. Indeed, groups of uniform uniform exponential growth include hyperbolic groups [Kou98,AL06,BF21,BCGS20], free products of countable families of groups with  $\xi$ -uniform

---

*Date:* May 24, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F65, 20F67, 20F06, 20F69.

*Key words and phrases.* Growth, hyperbolic groups, acylindrical actions, small cancellation.

uniform exponential growth (folklore), as well as mapping class groups [AAS07, Man10]. All groups in this list admit non-elementary acylindrical actions on hyperbolic spaces in the sense of [Sel97, Bow08, DGO17]. Uniform exponential growth is known for a wider class of groups, including, for example,  $Out(F_n)$  or cocompactly special cubulated CAT(0) groups and generalisations of the latter [EMO05, AAS07, GJN23, ANS<sup>+</sup>24, Za123]. It is open whether every group acting acylindrically on a hyperbolic space has uniform exponential growth.

**1.1. Growth of small cancellation quotients.** We prove that the class of groups of uniform exponential growth acting acylindrically on a hyperbolic space is closed under taking  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -small cancellation quotients in the sense of [DGO17, Definition 6.25]. More precisely, this holds for sufficiently small  $\lambda$  and sufficiently large  $\mu$  respectively. We refer to the  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -small cancellation as of  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation.

The following captures the essence of our main theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G$  be a group acting acylindrically and non-elementarily on a hyperbolic space and suppose that the maximal finite normal subgroup of  $G$  is trivial. Then there are  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\mu > 0$  such that the following are equivalent.*

- (i)  *$G$  has uniform exponential growth.*
- (ii) *Every  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  has uniform exponential growth.*
- (iii) *There is a  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  that has uniform exponential growth.*

The precise result is Theorem 1.3 below. It shows that the respective growth rates do not depend on the acylindricity parameters. Before stating it, we fix some notation.

Let  $\delta > 0$ . Let  $G$  be a group acting by isometries on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic metric space  $X$ .

*Acylindricity.* Let  $\kappa, N > 0$ . The action of  $G$  on  $X$  is  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrical if for every pair of points  $x, y \in X$  of distance at least  $\kappa$ , the number of elements  $u \in G$  moving each of the points  $x, y$  at distance at most  $100\delta$  is bounded above by  $N$ .

*Small cancellation.* Let  $R \subset G$  be a set of loxodromic isometries, the *relators*, that is closed under conjugation and inversion. Every relator  $r \in R$  stabilises its quasi-convex axis  $Y_r \subset X$ . Let  $T(R)$  be the minimal translation length of the elements of  $R$ . The set  $R$  satisfies the  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -condition (see Definition 6.1 below) if

$$T(R) > \mu\delta \text{ and } \text{diam}(Y_{r_1}^{+\delta} \cap Y_{r_2}^{+\delta}) < \lambda T(R), \text{ unless } r_1 = r_2^{\pm 1}.$$

In this case, the quotient by the normal closure of  $R$  is a  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$ .

**Remark 1.2.** The  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -condition is sensitive to the choice of  $X$  and the action of  $G$ . If  $r_1$  and  $r_2 \in R$  are in the same maximal loxodromic subgroup, then  $r_1 = r_2^{\pm 1}$ . In addition, for every  $r \in R$ , the cyclic subgroup  $\langle r \rangle$  is normal in the maximal loxodromic subgroup containing  $r$ .

*Main theorem.* The main theorem of this article is the following.

**Theorem 1.3** (Theorem 8.2 & Theorem 8.3). *For every  $N > 0$ , there is  $\lambda > 0$  such that the following holds. For every  $\delta > 0$  and  $\kappa \geq \delta$  there is  $\mu > \kappa/\delta$  with the following property. Let  $G$  be a group acting  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space.*

- (i) *If  $G$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, then every  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  has  $\xi'$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, where  $\xi' \geq \frac{\xi}{10^8}$ .*
- (ii) *If there is a  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  of  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, then  $G$  has  $\xi'$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, where  $\xi' \geq \frac{\xi}{10^8}$ .*

*Moreover, every  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  acts acylindrically on a hyperbolic space. The action is non-elementary, if the action of  $G$  is non-elementary.*

The growth rate  $\xi'$  of such a  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient is independent of the acylindricity and hyperbolicity constants, see Theorem 1.3(i). This contrasts the usual bounds on the growth rate: if  $G$  is hyperbolic, the known lower bounds on the exponential growth rate of a symmetric generating set depend on  $\delta$ . See [BF21, Theorem 1.14] and [BCGS20, Corollary 1.4]. The known lower bounds on the uniform uniform exponential growth rate depend on the size of the ball of radius  $10\delta$  [Kou98, AL06] or on the covering constant of balls of radius  $10\delta$  [BF21, Theorem 1.13].

**Remark 1.4.** A priori Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 apply only to groups with trivial maximal normal finite subgroup. However, if  $G$  acts acylindrically on  $X$  and  $F$  is the maximal normal finite subgroup in  $G$ , then  $G/F$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth whenever  $G$  has. Moreover, the orbit space  $X/F$  is hyperbolic, and  $G/F$  acts acylindrically on  $X/F$ . We may thus assume that  $F$  is trivial.

**Remark 1.5.** The dependence of the small cancellation parameter  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  on  $N$  can be slightly relaxed. In fact  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  depend on the maximal cardinality of the finite normal subgroups of loxodromic subgroups. In particular, there is a universal constant  $\lambda$  so that Theorem 1.3 holds if all loxodromic subgroups of  $G$  are cyclic.

**Remark 1.6.** The dependence of the relator length  $\mu$  on  $N$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\delta$  is not a strong condition. Indeed, the diameter of the intersection of the axis of two independent loxodromic elements is controlled in terms of  $\kappa$ ,  $N$ ,  $\delta$  and the injectivity radius. Thus, to prove that a set of relators satisfies the  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -condition, one usually considers relators of sufficiently large translation length compared to  $\kappa$ ,  $N$  and  $\delta$  anyway.

**1.2. Beyond short loxodromics.** The standard strategy to show uniform exponential growth in a negative curvature setting applies if every finite symmetric generating set  $U$  has the *short loxodromic property*, that is, if every  $n$ -th power  $U^n$  contains a loxodromic isometry, for some number  $n$  that does not depend on the set  $U$ . See e.g. [Kou98] or [Man10]. By a theorem of [MO19], this is not always the case:

**Example 1.7.** Let  $Q$  be a finitely generated group that is a quotient of every hyperbolic group and that admits an acylindrical action on a hyperbolic space [MO19, Theorem 1.1]. This group does not have the short loxodromic property [MO19, Corollary 1.4]. In addition, it is open whether  $Q$  has uniform exponential growth. A positive answer would imply that there is a uniform bound on the exponential growth rates of all hyperbolic groups, independent of the hyperbolicity constant. This is a long-standing open question, see [BF21, Section 14, Question 2].

Our main result, Theorem 1.3, does not make use of the short loxodromic property.

**Example 1.8.** There are infinite families of hyperbolic groups with arbitrarily large torsion balls that act  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space and have  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, for some uniform  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\kappa \geq \delta$ ,  $N > 0$  and  $\xi > 0$ , see [CS22]. Thus, the uniform uniform exponential growth rate of the respective small cancellation quotients, see Theorem 1.3 (i), does not depend on the cardinality of large torsion balls.

In fact, we obtain finitely generated groups with the following properties.

**Corollary 1.9.** *There are finitely generated groups without the short loxodromic property that have uniform exponential growth and that act acylindrically on a hyperbolic space.*

These groups, see Corollary 1.9, are common quotients of the groups in Example 1.8. We build them as a  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -quotient so that Theorem 1.3 applies. It remains open whether the groups of [MO19], see Example 1.7, have uniform exponential growth.

**1.3. Classical small cancellation groups.** We turn to groups given by a presentation under the the classical  $C''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation condition. We refer to a group that admits such a presentation as classical  $C''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation group. These are  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small

cancellation quotients of free groups, where the parameter  $\mu = 0$ . If  $\lambda \leq 1/6$ , a classical  $C''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation group is always finitely presented and hyperbolic. Thus it has uniform uniform exponential growth by [Gro87, Kou98]. However, in that approach the uniform uniform exponential growth rate depends on the length of the relators. In other words, it depends on the hyperbolicity constant of the Cayley graph.

The following is a consequence of Theorem 1.3.

**Corollary 1.10.** *There are  $\xi > 0$  and  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that every classical  $C''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation group has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, for all  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ .*

There is a generic class of classical  $C''(1/6)$ -small cancellation groups such that every 2-generated subgroup is free [AO96]. This immediately implies Corollary 1.10 for this generic class of classical  $C''(1/6)$ -small cancellation groups [dlH00, p. 194].

**Question 1.11.** Is there a constant  $\xi > 0$  such that every  $C''(1/6)$ -small cancellation group has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth? Is there a constant  $\xi > 0$  such that every  $C'(1/6)$ -small cancellation group has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth?

**Remark 1.12.** The classical  $C''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation condition in Corollary 1.10 is reminiscent of our proof that uses geometric small cancellation theory. To this date, geometric small cancellation theory has not been developed under a  $C'(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation condition. We expect, however, that this is possible, and thus that our results hold for classical  $C'(\lambda)$ -small cancellation groups - finitely and infinitely presented.

**1.4. Product set growth.** We say that a group has *product set growth* (for its symmetric subsets) if there is  $a > 0$  such that for all finite symmetric sets  $U$  that are not in a virtually nilpotent subgroup  $\omega(U) \geq a \log(|U|)$ . In this case, we say that  $G$  has *product set growth with constant  $a$* . If  $G$  acts acylindrically on a hyperbolic space and has the short loxodromic property then  $G$  has product set growth for its symmetric generating sets [Fuj21, Proposition 2.10], see Theorem 1.19 below. See also [Ker21] for groups acting on quasi-trees, and [DS20, CS22] for results on the growth of products of general subsets of  $G$ . The following is a variant of Theorem 1.3.

**Theorem 1.13** (Remark 8.4). *For every  $N > 0$ , there is  $\lambda > 0$  such that the following holds. For every  $\delta > 0$  and  $\kappa \geq \delta$  there is  $\mu > \kappa/\delta$  with the following property. Let  $G$  be a group acting  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space.*

- (i) *If  $G$  has product set growth, then every  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  has product set growth.*

(ii) *If there is a  $C'''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  that has product set growth, then  $G$  has product set growth.*

Again, the short loxodromic property is not used in the proof of Theorem 1.13.

**Remark 1.14.** If all elementary subgroups of  $G$  are cyclic and if  $G$  has product set growth with constant  $a$ , then every  $C'''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient of  $G$  of Theorem 1.13(i) has product set growth with a constant  $a' = a'(a, N)$  that can be explicitly computed.

Product set growth of hyperbolic groups is the starting point in Fujiwara-Sela's proof that the minimal growth rate in hyperbolic groups is attained [FS23]. Indeed, product set growth allows to restrict to generating sets of bounded cardinality. Also, the minimal growth rate of every equationally Noetherian group that acts acylindrically on a hyperbolic space and that has the short loxodromic property is attained [Fuj21]. In view of Theorem 1.13, it would be interesting to adapt this result for small cancellation quotients of such groups.

Product set growth has also been used in the context of finiteness results for marked  $\delta$ -hyperbolic groups. See [CS21]. Here a marked group  $(G, \Sigma)$  is  $\delta$ -hyperbolic if its Cayley graph with respect to the generating set  $\Sigma$  is  $\delta$ -hyperbolic. In fact, the isomorphism class of marked  $\delta$ -hyperbolic groups with product set growth with a uniform constant  $a > 0$  and of uniformly bounded entropy is bounded by an explicit function in  $\delta$ ,  $a$  and the entropy bound [CS21, Proof of Theorem 3.1]. Thus Theorem 1.13 and Remark 1.14 applied to classical  $C'''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation groups yields the following.

**Corollary 1.15.** *There is  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that for all  $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$  the following holds. Let  $\delta, E > 0$ . The number of isomorphism classes of marked  $\delta$ -hyperbolic groups with an entropy bounded by  $E$  and that admit a classical  $C'''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation presentation is bounded by an explicit number  $M = M(\delta, E)$ .*

Note that the  $C'''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation presentation, see Corollary 1.15, is not necessarily with respect to the fixed generating set. In general, the number of isomorphism classes of marked torsion-free non-elementary  $\delta$ -hyperbolic groups of uniformly bounded entropy is bounded by a number that only depends on  $\delta$  and the entropy bound [BCGS21, Theorem 1.4]. It is not known whether this number can be explicitly computed in the case of torsion-free  $\delta$ -hyperbolic groups.

**1.5. Strategy of proof.** Let  $G$  act by isometries on  $X$ . The  $\ell^\infty$ -energy  $L(U)$  of a finite subset  $U \subset G$  is defined by

$$L(U) = \inf_{x \in X} \max_{u \in U} |ux - x|.$$

If  $U = \{g\}$ , the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy coincides with the translation length of  $g$ . The following example explains why the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy is relevant in our context.

**Example 1.16.** If  $G$  is the fundamental group of a compact hyperbolic manifold, there exists a constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  – the *Margulis constant* – such that if  $U \subset G$  is a finite set with  $L(U) < \varepsilon$ , then the subgroup of  $G$  generated by  $U$  is virtually nilpotent.

If  $U \subset G$ , we denote by  $U^{-1}$  the set of the inverses of the elements of  $U$ .

**Definition 1.17** (cf. Definition 4.1). A subset  $U \subset G$  is *reduced at*  $p \in X$  if  $U \cap U^{-1} = \emptyset$  and for every pair of distinct  $u_1, u_2 \in U \sqcup U^{-1}$ , the Gromov product satisfies

$$(u_1 p, u_2 p)_p < \frac{1}{2} \min\{|u_1 p - p|, |u_2 p - p|\} - 250\delta.$$

**Remark 1.18.** Roughly speaking, if a set  $U \subset G$  is reduced then the orbit map from the free group generated by  $U$  to  $X$  is a quasi-isometric embedding.

The following is a theorem of [Kou98, AL06, Fuj21], see Remark 5.6 below.

**Theorem 1.19.** *For every  $N > 0$ , there is an integer  $c > 1$  with the following property. Let  $\delta > 0$  and  $\kappa > 0$ . Let  $G$  be a group acting  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space. Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i)  $L(U) \leq 10^4 \max\{\kappa, \delta\}$ .
- (ii) The subgroup  $\langle U \rangle$  is virtually cyclic and contains a loxodromic element.
- (iii) There is a reduced subset  $S \subset U^c$  such that

$$|S| \geq \max\{2, \frac{1}{c}|U|\}.$$

Moreover,

$$\omega(U) \geq \frac{1}{2c} \log |U|.$$

**Remark 1.20.** The numbers  $c$  and  $\omega(U)$  in Theorem 1.19 only depend on  $N$ , and not on  $\kappa$  as could perhaps be expected from [Fuj21, Proposition 2.10]. This eventually allows to show that the small cancellation parameter  $\lambda$  of Theorem 1.3 only depends on  $N$ .

**Remark 1.21.** If the injectivity radius of the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is large, then every finite symmetric subset of  $G$  satisfies either (ii) or (iii). In general this is however not the case.

To prove Theorem 1.3 (i), we closely follow a strategy of [CS22] that estimates product set growth in Burnside groups. Let  $\delta > 0$  and  $G$  act acylindrically on  $X$ . Geometric small cancellation theory provides a universal constant  $\bar{\delta} > 0$  such that every  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -quotient, for appropriately chosen  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , acts acylindrically on a  $\bar{\delta}$ -hyperbolic space. Let  $\bar{U} \subset \bar{G}$

be a finite symmetric set that is not contained in an elliptic or virtually cyclic subgroup. If  $L(\overline{U}) > 10^4\delta$ , then the exponential growth rate of  $\overline{U}$  is bounded below by a universal strictly positive constant. Otherwise, we fix a pre-image  $U$  of  $\overline{U}$  in  $G$  of minimal energy. Such a pre-image may not have large energy  $> 10^4\delta$ . Indeed, it may consist entirely of torsion-elements and thus have energy  $< 10^4\delta$ . However,  $U$  is not contained in any elliptic subgroup. Thus some power of  $U$  contains a loxodromic element, hence, for some exponent  $n$ , we have  $L(U^n) > 10^4\delta$ . We stress that the exponent  $n$  depends on the set  $U$ .

Let us apply Theorem 1.19 to  $U^n$ . Since  $U$  is not contained in any virtually cyclic subgroup, we obtain a reduced subset  $S$  in  $U^{cn}$ , which freely generates a free subgroup. Next, we adapt a counting argument of [Cou13, CS22] for aperiodic words to prove that, for every  $r \geq 1$ , the proportion of elements in  $S^r$  that contain a large part of a relator is small compared to  $|S^r|$  (Theorem 7.8). A priori, the argument of [CS22] is for “strongly reduced subsets” in the sense of [CS22, Definition 3.1]. We adapt the set up of the counting argument accordingly, so that the argument carries over to reduced subsets in the sense of Definition 1.17. A combination of Greendlinger’s Lemma and Fekete’s Subadditive Lemma then implies that the exponential growth rate of  $\overline{U}$  satisfies

$$\omega(\overline{U}) \geq \frac{\omega(U)}{2c},$$

see Lemma 8.1 below. Recall that  $c$  depends on  $N$ . To correct for this, we increase the exponent  $n$  as to make it grow with  $N$ . This yields Proposition 5.1 below. Then the dependencies of  $c$  and  $n$  on  $N$  cancel out in the final estimate, see Lemma 8.1 below. The proof of Theorem 1.3 (ii) is similar.

**Remark 1.22.** We give a proof of Proposition 5.1 below. We also point out that the proof of Theorem 1.19 is based on the same kind of arguments. Alternatively, one could first prove Theorem 1.19 and then apply it to  $U^{c^2n}$  to obtain a variant of Proposition 5.1.

**1.6. Acknowledgements.** A previous version of this article is part of the doctoral thesis of the first author [LJ23]. We thank Rémi Coulon for encouraging us to do this work, and for useful discussions and comments on a previous version of this work, and Yago Antolín for a careful reading and comments on previous versions. We also thank Goulnara Arzhantseva, Chris Cashen and Ashot Minasyan for useful discussions.

Both authors were supported in parts by LabEx CARMIN, ANR-10-LABX-59-01 of the Institut Henri Poincaré (UAR 839 CNRS-Sorbonne Université) during the program *Groups Acting on Fractals, Hyperbolicity and Self-Similarity*. The first author was supported by *Centre Henri Lebesgue* ANR-11-LABX-0020-01 and the grants SEV-2015-0554-18-4



and PID2021-126254NB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033. The second author was supported by Austrian Science Fund (FWF) project P 35079-N.

## 2. HYPERBOLIC GEOMETRY

We collect some facts on hyperbolic geometry in the sense of [Gro87, CDP90, GdlH90].

**2.1. Hyperbolicity.** Let  $X$  be a geodesic metric space. Given  $x, x' \in X$  we write  $|x - x'|$  for their distance and  $[x, x']$  for a geodesic joining them. If  $Y \subset X$  is a subset and  $x \in X$ , we write  $d(x, Y) = \inf_{y \in Y} |x - y|$  to denote the *distance from  $x$  to  $Y$* . Given  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ , we let  $Y^{+\varepsilon} = \{x \in X \mid d(x, Y) \leq \varepsilon\}$  be the  $\varepsilon$ -*neighbourhood of  $Y$* . The *Gromov product* of  $x, y, z \in X$  is defined by

$$(x, y)_z = \frac{1}{2} \{|x - z| + |y - z| - |x - y|\}.$$

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\delta \geq 0$ . The space  $X$  is  $\delta$ -*hyperbolic* if it is geodesic and for every  $x, y, z$  and  $t \in X$ , the *four point inequality* holds, that is

$$(x, z)_t \geq \min\{(x, y)_t, (y, z)_t\} - \delta.$$

From now on, we assume that the space  $X$  is  $\delta$ -hyperbolic. Note that  $X$  is  $\delta'$ -hyperbolic for every  $\delta' \geq \delta$ . Without restriction we also assume that  $\delta > 0$ .

Hyperbolicity has the following consequences.

**Lemma 2.2** ([DS20, Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4]). *Let  $x, y, z \in X$ . Then*

$$(x, y)_z \leq d(z, [x, y]) \leq (x, y)_z + 4\delta.$$

**Lemma 2.3** ([AL06, Lemma 2]). *Let  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Let  $x_i, y_i \in X$ . Then*

$$|x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2| \leq |x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2| + 2 \operatorname{diam}([x_1, y_1]^{+8\delta} \cap [x_2, y_2]^{+8\delta}).$$

Let  $k \geq 1$  and  $l \geq 0$ . Let  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow X$  be a rectifiable path with  $a, b \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ . The path  $\gamma$  is a  $(k, l)$ -*quasi-geodesic* if for all  $[a', b'] \subset [a, b]$ ,

$$\operatorname{length}(\gamma[a', b']) \leq k|\gamma(a') - \gamma(b')| + l.$$

Let  $L \geq 0$ . We say that  $\gamma$  is a  $L$ -*local  $(k, l)$ -quasi-geodesic* if any subpath of  $\gamma$  of length at most  $L$  is a  $(k, l)$ -quasi-geodesic.

**Lemma 2.4** ([Cou14, Corollary 2.7]). *Let  $\gamma : I \rightarrow X$  be a  $10^3\delta$ -local  $(1, \delta)$ -quasi-geodesic. Then:*

- (i) *For every  $t, t', s \in I$  such that  $t \leq s \leq t'$ , we have  $(\gamma(t), \gamma(t'))_{\gamma(s)} \leq 6\delta$ .*
- (ii) *For every  $x \in X$  and for every  $y, y' \in \gamma$ , we have  $d(x, \gamma) \leq (y, y')_x + 9\delta$ .*

From now on let  $G$  be a group acting by isometries on  $X$ . Let  $x \in X$  be a point.

**2.2. Translation lengths.** To measure the displacement of an isometry  $g$  on  $X$  we define the *translation length* and the *stable translation length* as

$$\|g\| = \inf_{x \in X} |gx - x|, \quad \text{and} \quad \|g\|^\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} |g^n x - x|.$$

The definition of  $\|g\|^\infty$  does not depend on choice of  $x$ . These two lengths are related as follows, [CDP90, Chapitre 10, Proposition 6.4].

$$(1) \quad \|g\|^\infty \leq \|g\| \leq \|g\|^\infty + 16\delta.$$

Note that  $g$  is *loxodromic* if, and only if,  $\|g\|^\infty > 0$ , [CDP90, Ch. 10, Prop. 6.3].

**2.3. Acylindricity.** We use the following definition of acylindricity of the action, see [DGO17, Proposition 5.31]. Recall that  $\delta > 0$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\kappa, N > 0$ . The group  $G$  acts  $(\kappa, N)$ -*acylindrically* on  $X$  if the following holds: for every  $x, y \in X$  with  $|x - y| \geq \kappa$ , the number of elements  $u \in G$  satisfying  $|ux - x| \leq 100\delta$  and  $|uy - y| \leq 100\delta$  is bounded above by  $N$ .

We write  $\partial X$  for the boundary of  $X$ , see [CDP90, Chapitre 2, Définition 1.1]. We denote by  $\partial G$  the set of all accumulation points of an orbit  $G \cdot x$  in  $\partial X$ . This set does not depend on the choice of the point  $x$ . A subgroup  $H$  of  $G$  is *non-elementary* if  $\partial H$  contains at least 3 points, or equivalently if  $\partial H$  is infinite. Otherwise  $H$  is called *elementary*. Under the assumption that the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is acylindrical, an elementary subgroup is either elliptic, that is,  $\partial H$  is empty, or loxodromic, that is,  $\partial H$  contains exactly 2 points.

Let  $H \leq G$  be a loxodromic subgroup with limit set  $\partial H = \{\xi, \eta\}$ . The *maximal loxodromic subgroup containing  $H$*  is the stabiliser of the set  $\partial H$ . For a loxodromic element  $g \in G$ , we denote by  $E(g)$  the *maximal loxodromic subgroup containing  $g$* .

**2.4. Loxodromic subgroups.** From now on we assume that  $\kappa \geq \delta$  and that the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrical.

**Lemma 2.6** ([DGO17, Lemma 6.5]). *Let  $g \in G$  be a loxodromic element. Then  $E(g)$  is virtually cyclic.*

The subgroup  $H^+ \leq G$  fixing pointwise  $\partial H$  is a subgroup of  $H$  of index at most 2. The next corollary is a consequence of Lemma 2.6 and [Wal67, Lemma 4.1].

**Corollary 2.7.** *The set  $F$  of all elements of finite order of  $H^+$  is a finite normal subgroup of  $H$ . Moreover there is a loxodromic element  $h \in H^+$  such that the map  $F \rtimes_\phi \langle h \rangle \rightarrow H^+$  that sends  $(f, g)$  to  $fg$  is an isomorphism, where  $\phi: \langle h \rangle \rightarrow \text{Aut}(F)$  is conjugation on  $F$ .*

For a loxodromic element  $g \in G$ , we denote by  $F(g)$  the set of all elements of finite order of  $E^+(g)$ . We say that  $g$  is *primitive* if its image in  $E^+(g)/F(g)$  generates the quotient.

The  $H$ -invariant cylinder, denoted by  $C_H$ , is the open  $20\delta$ -neighbourhood of all  $10^3\delta$ -local  $(1, \delta)$ -quasi-geodesics with endpoints  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  at infinity.

**Lemma 2.8** (Invariant cylinder; [Cou16a, Lemma 3.13]). *Let  $H \leq G$  be a loxodromic subgroup. Then  $C_H$  is invariant under the action of  $H$  and strongly quasiconvex. In particular,  $C_H$  is  $2\delta$ -quasi-convex.*

**2.5. Fellow-traveling constant.** The axis of  $g \in G$  is the set

$$A_g = \{x \in X \mid |gx - x| \leq \|g\| + 8\delta\}.$$

**Remark 2.9.** If  $g$  is hyperbolic, then  $C_g \subset A_g^{+52\delta}$ . If  $\|g\|^\infty > 10^3\delta$ , then  $A_g \subset C_g$ , [Cou14, Lemma 2.33].

**Lemma 2.10** ([DG08, Proposition 2.3.3]; [Cou14, Proposition 2.28]). *Let  $g \in G$ . Then  $A_g$  is  $10\delta$ -quasi-convex and  $\langle g \rangle$ -invariant. Moreover, for every  $x \in X$ ,*

$$\|g\| + 2d(x, A_g) - 10\delta \leq |gx - x| \leq \|g\| + 2d(x, A_g) + 10\delta.$$

Let  $g \in G$  be a loxodromic element and recall that  $E(g)$  is the maximal loxodromic subgroup containing  $g$ . We write  $u \sim_g v$  if and only if  $u^{-1}v \in E(g)$ , for every  $u, v \in G$ . In other words,  $u \sim_g v$  if and only if  $uE(g) = vE(g)$ . The *fellow travelling constant* of  $g$  is

$$\Delta(g) = \sup\{\text{diam}(uA_g^{+20\delta} \cap vA_g^{+20\delta}) : u, v \in G, u \not\sim_g v\}.$$

**Lemma 2.11** ([DGO17, Proof of Proposition 6.29]). *If  $g \in G$  is loxodromic, then*

$$\Delta(g) \leq \kappa + (N + 2)\|g\|^\infty + 100\delta.$$

We also note the following fact:

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $g \in G$  with  $\|g\|^\infty > 10^3\delta$ . Then, for all  $m \geq 1$ , we have :*

$$\Delta(g^m) \leq \Delta(g) + 150\delta.$$

*Proof.* By Remark 2.9,  $A_{g^m} \subset C_{g^m} = C_g \subset A_g^{+52\delta}$ . Thus

$$\Delta(g^m) \leq \text{diam}\left(A_g^{+72\delta} \cap A_{ugu^{-1}}^{+72\delta}\right).$$

Quasi-convexity of  $A_g$  now yields the claim, see [DG08, Lemma 2.2.2 (2)].  $\square$

**2.6.  $\ell^\infty$ -Energy.** To measure the displacement of a finite subset of isometries  $U$  of  $X$  we define the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy of  $U$  at  $x$  and the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy of  $U$  as

$$L(U, x) = \max_{u \in U} |ux - x|, \quad \text{and} \quad L(U) = \inf_{x \in X} L(U, x).$$

The point  $x$  is *almost-minimizing the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy of  $U$*  if  $L(U, x) \leq L(U) + \delta$ .

The translation length and the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy are related as follows. For every  $g \in U$ ,

$$(2) \quad \|g\|^\infty \leq \|g\| \leq L(U).$$

Moreover, we have the following.

**Proposition 2.13** ([Kou98, Proposition 3.2]). *Let  $U$  be a finite set of isometries of a hyperbolic space. If  $L(U) > 100\delta$ , then  $U^2$  contains a loxodromic isometry.*

If  $U \subset G$  is symmetric and not contained in an elementary subgroup, Proposition 2.13 can be used to find an independent pair of loxodromic elements in ping pong configuration. This yields that symmetric sets of sufficiently large energy have exponential growth.

**Lemma 2.14** ([BF21, Theorem 13.1]). *Let  $G$  act acylindrically on  $X$ . Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset containing the identity. Then one of the following hold:*

- (1)  $L(U) \leq 10^4\delta$ .
- (2) The subgroup  $\langle U \rangle$  is virtually cyclic and contains a loxodromic element.
- (3)  $\omega(U) \geq \frac{1}{10^3} \log 3$ .

### 3. GROWTH OF MAXIMAL LOXODROMIC SUBGROUPS.

Recall that  $\kappa \geq \delta$  and  $G$  acts  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on the  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space  $X$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset. Let  $g \in G$  be a primitive loxodromic element. Then, for every  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$|U^n \cap E(g)| \leq 2N \left( \frac{L(U)}{\|g\|^\infty} 4n + 1 \right).$$

This is proved as in the case of hyperbolic groups, and we follow the argument of [AMV17, p. 484]. First, we treat the cyclic group generated by a loxodromic isometry.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset. Let  $g \in G$  be a loxodromic element. Then, for every  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$|U^n \cap \langle g \rangle| \leq \frac{L(U)}{\|g\|^\infty} 2n + 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $n \geq 1$ . Since  $U$  is symmetric,

$$|U^n \cap \langle g \rangle| = |\{k \in \mathbf{Z} : g^k \in U^n\}| \leq 2|\{k \in \mathbf{N} \setminus \{0\} : g^k \in U^n\}| + 1.$$

Let  $k \geq 1$  such that  $g^k \in U^n$ . Then  $\|g^k\|^\infty \leq L(U^n)$ , see (2). By the triangle inequality,  $L(U^n) \leq nL(U)$ . Hence,

$$k = \frac{\|g^k\|^\infty}{\|g\|^\infty} \leq \frac{L(U)}{\|g\|^\infty} n.$$

This yields the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Let  $g$  be primitive. Recall that  $F(g)$  is set of all elements of finite order of  $E^+(g)$  and that  $F(g) \rtimes_\phi \langle g \rangle$  is isomorphic to  $E^+(g)$ . Let  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $E_0$  be a set of representatives of  $E(g)/\langle g \rangle$ . Then

$$|U^n \cap E(g)| = \sum_{r \in E_0} |U^n \cap r \langle g \rangle|.$$

First we estimate  $|E_0|$ . By definition,  $[E(g) : E^+(g)] \leq 2$ . As  $E^+(g) = F(g) \rtimes_\phi \langle g \rangle$ , we have  $[E^+(g) : \langle g \rangle] = |F(g)|$ . By acylindricity,  $|F(g)| \leq N$ . Thus,  $|E_0| \leq 2N$ .

Now we estimate  $|U^n \cap r \langle g \rangle|$  for  $r \in E_0$ . We may assume that  $U^n \cap r \langle g \rangle$  is non-empty. Then there exist  $s \in U^n \cap r \langle g \rangle$ . In particular  $r \langle g \rangle = s \langle g \rangle$ . Hence,

$$|U^n \cap r \langle g \rangle| = |U^n \cap s \langle g \rangle| = |s(s^{-1}U^n \cap \langle g \rangle)| = |s^{-1}U^n \cap \langle g \rangle|.$$

Since  $U$  is symmetric,  $s^{-1} \in U^n$ . Thus,  $s^{-1}U^n \subset U^{2n}$ . Therefore,

$$|U^n \cap r \langle g \rangle| \leq |U^{2n} \cap \langle g \rangle|.$$

By Lemma 3.2, the latter is bounded by  $\frac{L(U)}{\|g\|^\infty} 4n + 1$ . Consequently,

$$|U^n \cap r \langle g \rangle| \leq \frac{L(U)}{\|g\|^\infty} 4n + 1.$$

Combining the above estimates yields the claim.  $\square$

Given  $U \subset G$  and a loxodromic element  $g \in G$ , we fix a set of representatives  $U(g)$  of the equivalence relation induced on  $U$  by  $\sim_g$ , that is,  $u \sim_g v$  if and only if  $u^{-1}v \in E(g)$ , for every  $u, v \in U$ . We obtain the following.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $G$  be a group acting  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on a hyperbolic space  $X$ . Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset. Let  $g \in G$  be a primitive loxodromic element. Let*

$$a_0 = 2N \left( \frac{L(U)}{\|g\|^\infty} 8 + 1 \right).$$

*Then,*

$$|U(g)| \geq \frac{1}{a_0} |U|.$$

*Proof.* Let  $u, v \in U$  such that  $u \sim_g v$ . By definition,  $u^{-1}v \in E(g)$ . As  $U$  is symmetric,  $u^{-1}v \in U^2$ . Therefore,  $v \in u(U^2 \cap E(g))$ . Note that  $|u(U^2 \cap E(g))| = |U^2 \cap E(g)|$ . Consequently, each  $u \in U(g)$  has at most  $|U^2 \cap E(g)|$  elements in its equivalence class. By Proposition 3.1,  $|U^2 \cap E(g)| \leq a_0$ , hence, the claim follows.  $\square$

#### 4. REDUCED SUBSETS

Recall that  $G$  acts by isometries on the  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space  $X$ . If  $U \subset G$  we denote by  $U^{-1}$  the set of the inverses of the elements of  $G$ .

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\alpha \geq 3\delta$ . A finite subset  $U \subset G$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p \in X$  if  $U \cap U^{-1} = \emptyset$  and for every pair of distinct  $u_1, u_2 \in U \sqcup U^{-1}$ ,

$$(u_1p, u_2p)_p < \frac{1}{2} \min\{|u_1p - p|, |u_2p - p|\} - \alpha - 50\delta.$$

**Remark 4.2.** If  $U \subset G$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p \in X$ , then  $|up - p| > 2(\alpha + 50\delta)$ , for every  $u \in U \sqcup U^{-1}$ .

We clarify some vocabulary. Let  $U \subset G$  be a subset. We denote by  $\mathbf{F}(U)$  the free group on  $U$ . Every element  $w \in \mathbf{F}(U)$  is represented as a reduced word  $w = u_1 \cdots u_n$  with  $u_i \in U \sqcup U^{-1}$ . The number  $n$  is called the *length* of  $w$ , denoted by  $|w|_U$ . We write  $w_1 \equiv w_2$  to express letter-for-letter equality of words  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  over  $U \sqcup U^{-1}$ . The *natural homomorphism*  $\psi: \mathbf{F}(U) \rightarrow G$  is the evaluation of the elements of  $\mathbf{F}(U)$  in  $G$ . We usually abuse notation and identify  $w$  with its image under  $\psi$ .

**4.1. Broken geodesics.** The next lemma is used to produce quasi-geodesics.

**Lemma 4.3** (Broken Geodesic Lemma [AL06, Lemma 1]). *Let  $n \geq 2$ . Let  $x_0, \dots, x_n$  be a sequence of  $n + 1$  points of  $X$ . Assume that*

$$(3) \quad (x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})_{x_i} + (x_i, x_{i+2})_{x_{i+1}} < |x_i - x_{i+1}| - 3\delta,$$

for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-2 \rrbracket$ . Then the following holds.

$$(i) \quad |x_0 - x_n| \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |x_i - x_{i+1}| - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})_{x_i} - 2(n-2)\delta.$$

$$(ii) \quad (x_0, x_n)_{x_j} \leq (x_{j-1}, x_{j+1})_{x_j} + 2\delta, \text{ for every } j \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket.$$

(iii) *The geodesic  $[x_0, x_n]$  lies in the  $5\delta$ -neighbourhood of the broken geodesic  $\gamma = [x_0, x_1] \cup \cdots \cup [x_{n-1}, x_n]$ , while  $\gamma$  is contained in the  $r$ -neighbourhood of  $[x_0, x_n]$ , where*

$$r = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} (x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})_{x_i} + 14\delta.$$

We apply Lemma 4.3 as follows. Let  $\alpha > 0$  and let  $U \subset G$  be an  $\alpha$ -reduced subset at  $p \in X$ . Let  $n \geq 2$ . Given a word  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n \in \mathbf{F}(U)$ , we fix

$$x_0 = p, \quad x_1 = u_1 p, \quad x_2 = u_1 u_2 p, \quad \cdots, \quad x_n = u_1 \cdots u_n p.$$

Then we have the following.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  and let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n \in \mathbf{F}(U)$ . Then*

- (i)  $(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})_{x_i} + (x_i, x_{i+2})_{x_{i+1}} < |x_i - x_{i+1}| - 2(\alpha + 50\delta)$ , for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-2 \rrbracket$ .
- (ii)  $|wp - p| \geq \frac{1}{2}|u_1 p - p| + \frac{1}{2}|u_n p - p| + 2(n-1)(\alpha + 40\delta) + 4(n-1)\delta$ ,
- (iii)  $(p, wp)_{x_i} \leq (u_i^{-1} p, u_{i+1} p)_p + 2\delta$ , for all  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-2 \rrbracket$ .

*Proof.* Let  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-2 \rrbracket$ . We have  $(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})_{x_i} = (u_i^{-1} p, u_{i+1} p)_p$  and  $|x_i - x_{i+1}| = |p - u_{i+1} p|$ . As  $w$  is reduced,  $u_i^{-1} \neq u_{i+1}$  and  $u_{i+1}^{-1} \neq u_{i+2}$ . As  $U$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p$ ,  $(u_i^{-1} p, u_{i+1} p)_p < \frac{1}{2}|u_{i+1} p - p| - \alpha - 50\delta$ ,  $(u_{i+1}^{-1} p, u_{i+2} p)_p < \frac{1}{2}|u_{i+1}^{-1} p - p| - \alpha - 50\delta$ .

Adding the two above inequalities we obtain assertion (i).

Applying (i) and Lemma 4.3 (i) to the sequence  $x_0, \dots, x_n$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |wp - p| &\geq |u_1 p - p| + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} |u_i p - p| + |u_n p - p| \\ &\quad - (u_1^{-1} p, u_2 p)_p - \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} [(u_i^{-1} p, u_{i+1} p)_p + (u_{i-1}^{-1} p, u_i p)_p] - (u_{n-1}^{-1} p, u_n p) \\ &\quad - 2(n-2)\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $U$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p$ ,

$$(u_1^{-1} p, u_2 p)_p < \frac{1}{2}|u_1 p - p| - \alpha - 50\delta, \quad (u_{n-1}^{-1} p, u_n p) < \frac{1}{2}|u_n p - p| - \alpha - 50\delta,$$

and by assertion (i) we have that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} [(u_i^{-1} p, u_{i+1} p)_p + (u_{i-1}^{-1} p, u_i p)_p] < \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} |u_i p - p| - 2(n-2)(\alpha + 50\delta).$$

This yields assertion (ii). Assertion (iii) follows directly from Lemma 4.3(ii).  $\square$

**4.2. Quasi-isometric embedding of a free group.** Recall that  $L(U, p)$  denotes the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy of  $U \subset G$  at  $p \in X$ .

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $U \subset G$  be an  $\alpha$ -reduced subset at  $p \in X$ . Then, for every  $w \in \mathbf{F}(U)$ , we have*

$$2\alpha|w|_U \leq |wp - p| \leq L(U, p)|w|_U.$$

*In particular, the natural homomorphism  $\psi: \mathbf{F}(U) \rightarrow G$  is injective.*

*Proof.* Let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n \in \mathbf{F}(U)$ . If  $n = 0$  or if  $n = 1$ , the result is by Definition. Let  $n \geq 2$ . By the triangle inequality,  $|wp - p| \leq L(U, p)n$ . By Proposition 4.4 (ii)

$$|wp - p| \geq \frac{1}{2}|u_1p - p| + \frac{1}{2}|u_np - p| + 2(n-1)(\alpha + \delta) + 2\delta.$$

Combined with Remark 4.2 this yields that  $|wp - p| \geq 2\alpha n$ . In particular, if  $w \in \mathbf{F}(U)$  is non-trivial, then  $|wp - p| > 0$  and  $w \neq 1$  in  $G$ . In other words,  $\psi$  is injective.  $\square$

**4.3. Geodesic extension property.** We prepare for running the counting argument of [CS22, Section 3] for strongly reduced sets in our setting of  $\alpha$ -reduced sets. For this purpose we need the following version of [CS22, Lemma 3.2].

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $U \subset G$  be an  $\alpha$ -reduced subset at  $p$ . Let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_m$  and  $w' \equiv u'_1 \cdots u'_m$  be two elements of  $\mathbf{F}(U)$ . Then  $U$  satisfies the geodesic extension property, that is, if*

$$(p, w'p)_{wp} \leq \frac{1}{2}|u_m p - p|,$$

*then  $w$  is a prefix of  $w'$ .*

**Remark 4.7.** The *geodesic extension property* has the following meaning: if the geodesic  $[p, w'p]$  extends  $[p, wp]$  as a path in  $X$ , then  $w'$  extends  $w$  as a word over  $U \sqcup U^{-1}$ .

Up to some minor technical differences, the proof of Proposition 4.6 is the same as the proof of [CS22, Lemma 3.2]. We include it here.

*Proof.* The proof is by contradiction. Assume that  $w$  is not a prefix of  $w'$ . Let  $r < m$  be the largest integer such that  $u_i = u'_i$ , for every  $i \in \llbracket 1, r-1 \rrbracket$ . We let

$$q = u_1 \cdots u_{r-1}p = u'_1 \cdots u'_{r-1}p.$$

We show that  $\min\{(p, q)_{wp}, (q, w'p)_{wp}\} > \frac{1}{2}|u_m p - p| + \delta$ . Hyperbolicity then implies the proposition. The definition of Gromov product implies that

$$(4) \quad (p, q)_{wp} = |wp - q| - (p, wp)_q, \quad (q, w'p)_{wp} = |wp - q| - (wp, w'p)_q.$$

We estimate  $|wp - q|$ ,  $(p, wp)_q$ , and  $(wp, w'p)_q$ . Firstly, by Proposition 4.4 (ii),

$$(5) \quad |wp - q| \geq \frac{1}{2}|u_r p - p| + \frac{1}{2}|u_m p - p| + 2(m-r)(\alpha + \delta).$$

Next by Proposition 4.4(iii), and as  $U$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced,

$$(6) \quad (p, wp)_q < \frac{1}{2}|u_r p - p|.$$

Finally, we prove that

$$(7) \quad (wp, w'p)_q < \frac{1}{2}|u_r p - p|.$$



Indeed, if  $r - 1 = m'$ , then  $wp = q$  and (7) holds. Let  $r - 1 < m'$ . By choice of  $r$  we have that  $u_r \neq u'_r$ . For simplicity, denote

$$t = u_1 \cdots u_r p \quad \text{and} \quad t' = u'_1 \cdots u'_r p.$$

By hyperbolicity

$$\min\{(t, wp)_q, (wp, w'p)_q, (w'p, t')_q\} \leq (t, t')_q + 2\delta = (u_r p, u'_r p)_q + 2\delta.$$

Since  $U$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p$ ,

$$(8) \quad \min\{(t, wp)_q, (wp, w'p)_q, (w'p, t')_q\} < \frac{1}{2} \min\{|u_r p - p|, |u'_r p - p|\} - \alpha.$$

We prove that the minimum of (8) is attained by  $(wp, w'p)_q$ . Indeed,

$$(t, wp)_q = |q - t| - (q, wp)_t.$$

By definition,  $|q - t| = |u_r p - p|$ . Recall that  $m \geq r + 1$ . By Proposition 4.4(iii),

$$(q, wp)_t \leq (u_r^{-1} p, u_{r+1} p)_p + 2\delta < \frac{1}{2} |u_r p - p| - \alpha.$$

Consequently,  $(t, wp)_q > \frac{1}{2} |u_r p - p| + \alpha$ . Thus, the minimum of (8) cannot be attained by  $(t, wp)_q$ . Similarly, it cannot be attained by  $(w'p, t')_q$ . This proves Equation (7). Finally, combining Equations (4-7), yields the claim.  $\square$

**4.4. Producing reduced subsets.** Recall that the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrical and that  $\Delta(g)$  is the fellow travelling constant of a loxodromic  $g \in G$  (Subsection 2.3). Also, if  $U$  is a finite symmetric subset of  $G$ , then  $U(g) = U / \sim_g$  where  $u \sim_g v$  if and only if  $uv^{-1} \in E(g)$ .

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $\alpha \geq 3\delta$ . Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset containing a loxodromic isometry  $g$  such that  $\|g\|^\infty > 10^3\delta$ . Let  $p \in X$ . Let*

$$b_0 = \frac{2}{\|g\|^\infty} [\Delta(g) + 4L(U, p) + 104\delta + \alpha].$$

*Then for every  $b \geq b_0$ , the set  $S = \{ug^b u^{-1} : u \in U(g)\}$  satisfies the following:*

- (1)  $S \subset U^{b+2}$ .
- (2)  $|S| = |U(g)|$ .
- (3)  $S$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p$ .

The proof is by standard arguments. See for example [Kou98], [AL06] or [Fuj21]. We give it here to justify the given formula for  $b_0$ .

*Proof.* The conclusions (1) and (2) are immediate. We now prove (3). By definition,  $S \cap S^{-1} = \emptyset$ . Let  $i \in \llbracket 1, 2 \rrbracket$ . Let  $u_i \in U$ . Let  $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ . Assume that  $u_1 g^{\varepsilon_1 b} u_1^{-1}$  and  $u_2 g^{\varepsilon_2 b} u_2^{-1}$  are distinct.

Case  $u_1 = u_2$ . In this case,  $\varepsilon_1 = -\varepsilon_2$ . Let  $h = u_1 g^{\varepsilon_1 b} u_1^{-1}$ . It is enough to prove that

$$(hp, h^{-1}p)_p \leq \frac{b}{2} \|g\|^\infty - \alpha - 50\delta.$$

This follows from Lemma 2.4 applied to an  $h$ -invariant quasi-geodesic line.

Case  $u_1 \neq u_2$ . Then  $u_1 \not\sim_g u_2$ , which means that  $u_1^{-1}u_2 \notin E(g)$ . By Lemma 2.10,

$$(9) \quad d(p, A_g) \leq \frac{1}{2}|gp - p| + 5\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}L(U, p) + 5\delta.$$

Now let  $x_i = u_i p$  and  $y_i = u_i g^{\varepsilon_i b} p$ . We then have that

$$(10) \quad \text{diam}([x_1, y_1]^{+8\delta} \cap [x_2, y_2]^{+8\delta}) \leq \Delta(g) + L(U, p) + 54\delta.$$

Indeed, let  $\sigma = d(p, A_g) + 10\delta$ , so that  $\max\{d(x_i, u_i A_g), d(y_i, u_i A_g)\} \leq \sigma$ . As  $A_g$  is  $10\delta$ -quasi-convex (Lemma 2.10), the subset  $u_i A_g^{+\sigma}$  is  $2\delta$ -quasi-convex. Consequently,  $[x_i, y_i] \subset u_i A_g^{+\sigma+2\delta}$ . Therefore, and by quasi-convexity, [DG08, Lemma 2.2.2 (2)],

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diam}([x_1, y_1]^{+8\delta} \cap [x_2, y_2]^{+8\delta}) &\leq \text{diam}(u_1 A_g^{+\sigma+10\delta} \cap u_2 A_g^{+\sigma+10\delta}) \\ &\leq \text{diam}(u_1 A_g^{+13\delta} \cap u_2 A_g^{+13\delta}) + 2(\sigma + 10\delta) + 4\delta \\ &\leq \Delta(g) + 2(\sigma + 10\delta) + 4\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimations with (9), we obtain (10).

Finally, let  $s_i = u_i g^{\varepsilon_i b} u_i^{-1}$ . We estimate  $(s_1 p, s_2 p)_p$ : by the triangle inequality,

$$(s_1 p, s_2 p)_p \leq \frac{1}{2}(|x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2| - |y_1 - y_2|) + \frac{3}{2}(|x_1 - p| + |x_2 - p|).$$

Combining (10) with Lemma 2.3, we obtain

$$|x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2| - |y_1 - y_2| \leq |x_1 - x_2| + 2(\Delta(g) + L(U, p) + 54\delta).$$

By the triangle inequality,  $|x_1 - x_2| \leq 2L(U, p)$ . We obtain that

$$(11) \quad (s_1 p, s_2 p)_p \leq \Delta(g) + 4L(U, p) + 54\delta.$$

Finally, note that  $\min\{|s_1 p - p|, |s_2 p - p|\} \geq b \|g\|^\infty$ . By the choice of  $b_0$ ,

$$(s_1 p, s_2 p)_p < \frac{1}{2} \min\{|s_1 p - p|, |s_2 p - p|\} - \alpha - 50\delta,$$

which shows that  $S$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced.  $\square$

5. PING-PONG IN POWERS OF  $U$ 

We recall that  $N > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $\kappa \geq \delta$  and that  $G$  acts  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrical on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space. The goal of this section is to find a generating set of a free subgroup in some power of  $U \subset G$  whose cardinality and energy is comparable to that of  $U$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $C = 10^6(N + 1)$ , let  $L > 200\kappa$  and let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset such that  $L(U) \leq L$ . If  $U$  is not contained in an elementary subgroup there are  $n > C^3$ ,  $S \subset U^{10^7 n}$  and  $p \in X$  such that*

- (1)  $S$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p$ , for  $\alpha = 200\delta$ ,
- (2)  $|S| \geq \frac{1}{C^2}|U^n|$ ,
- (3)  $L(S, p) \leq L(U^n, p) \leq 10^5 C^3 L$ .

*In particular  $S$  freely generates a free subgroup and  $|S| > C$ .*

We now prove this proposition. Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset that is not contained in an elementary subgroup. Moreover, we let  $L > 200\kappa$  and suppose that  $L \geq L(U)$ . As  $U$  is not contained in an elliptic subgroup, the subgroup generated by  $U$  contains a loxodromic element. More precisely, we have the following.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $a < L$ . Then there is  $n > 0$ , depending only on  $U$ , such that*

$$a < L(U^n) \leq 2L.$$

*Proof.* If  $L(U) > a$ ,  $n = 1$ . Otherwise we proceed as follows. As  $U$  is not contained in an elliptic subgroup,  $U^m$  contains a loxodromic element, for some  $m > 0$ . Then  $L(U^n)$  is linearly growing in the exponent  $n > m$ . Thus we can pick  $n > 1$  to be the maximal number such that  $L(U^{n-1}) \leq a$ . Then  $L(U^n) > a$ , and  $L(U^n) \leq 2L$  by the triangle inequality.  $\square$

If  $L(U) > 100\delta$ , then  $U^2$  contains a loxodromic element [Kou98, Proposition 3.2]. We may choose this loxodromic element of length  $\|h\|^\infty > L(U)/2$ , [AL06, Lemma 7] [BF21, Theorem 5.7] [Fuj21, Lemma 2.7]. This yields the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.** *There is  $n > 0$ , depending only on  $U$ , and  $h \in U^n$  such that*

$$L/4 \leq \|h\|^\infty \text{ and } L(U^n) \leq 4L.$$

*In particular,  $h$  is loxodromic and  $\|h\|^\infty \leq 4L$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $a = L/2$ , and let  $n$  be the number given by Lemma 5.2, so that

$$L/2 \leq L(U^n) \leq 2L.$$

As  $L/2 > 100\delta$ , we obtain a loxodromic  $h \in U^{2n}$  of length  $\|h\|^\infty \geq L/4$ .  $\square$

This implies the following. We let  $C = 10^6(N + 1)$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** *There are  $n_1 > C^2$  and  $h \in U^{n_1}$  such that*

- $L(U^{n_1}) \leq 16C^2L$
- $h$  is loxodromic and  $\|h\|^\infty \geq C^2L$
- for all  $m \geq 1$ ,  $\Delta(h^m) \leq CL$ .

*Proof.* Let  $n$  and  $g \in U^n$  be the loxodromic element of length  $\|g\|^\infty \geq L/4$  and  $\|g\|^\infty \leq 4L$  given by the previous lemma. Let  $n_1 = 4C^2n$ . The first assertion is by the triangle inequality. Let  $h = g^{4C^2} \in U^{n_1}$ . The second assertion follows from the fact that  $\|g^m\|^\infty = m\|g\|^\infty$ . Finally let  $m > 0$ . By Lemmas 2.12 and 2.11,  $\Delta(h^m) = \Delta(g^{4C^2m}) \leq \Delta(g) + 150\delta \leq (N + 2)\|g\|^\infty + \kappa + 10^3\delta + 150\delta \leq CL$ . This proves the third assertion.  $\square$

Let  $n_1$  and  $h \in U^{n_1}$  be given by Proposition 5.4. As  $U$  is not contained in an elementary subgroup, there is  $u \in U$  such that  $h$  and  $uhu^{-1}$  do not generate an elementary subgroup. Moreover,  $g = h^{100}uh^{1000}u^{-1}h^{2000}uh^{100}u^{-1}h^{100} \in U^{3304n_1}$  is a primitive loxodromic element and  $\|g\|^\infty > C^2L$ . See [Fuj21, Lemma 2.8]. Moreover,  $\|g\|^\infty \leq L(U^{3304n_1}) \leq 52864C^2L$ . Thus,  $\Delta(g^m) \leq 52864C^3L$ , for all  $m \geq 1$ . This yields:

**Proposition 5.5.** *There are  $n_1 > C^2$  and  $h \in U^{n_1}$  such that*

- $L(U^{n_1}) \leq 52864C^2L$
- $h$  is primitive, loxodromic and  $\|h\|^\infty \geq C^2L$
- for all  $m \geq 1$ ,  $\Delta(h^m) \leq 52864C^3L$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* Let  $n_1 > C^2$  and  $h \in U^{n_1}$  be a loxodromic and primitive element given by Proposition 5.5. Let  $n = Cn_1$ . As  $U^{n_1}$  is symmetric, it contains the identity, hence,  $h \in U^n$ . Let  $S := \{uh^{10^6C}u^{-1} \mid u \in U^n[h]\} \subset U^{10^7n}$  and let  $p \in X$  be a point almost minimising the  $\ell^\infty$ -energy of  $U^n$ . By Proposition 4.8,  $S$  is reduced at  $p$  and  $|S| = |U^n[h]|$ . Indeed, in our case, by choice of  $C$ ,  $h$  and  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} b_0 &= \frac{2}{\|h\|^\infty} (\Delta(h) + 4L(U^n, p) + 104\delta + \alpha) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{C^2L} (52864C^3L + 4 \cdot 52864C^3L + \delta + 104\delta + 200\delta) \leq 10^6C \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.3, and as  $\|h\|^\infty > L(U^n)/52864C$  and  $C > 10^6N$ , we have that

$$|S| = |U^n[h]| > \frac{|U^n|}{C^2}.$$

As  $U$  is not contained in a finite subgroup the growth of  $U^n$  is linear in  $n$ . Thus  $|U^n| > C^3$ , which implies that  $|S| > C$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.6** (Proof of Theorem 1.19). Here  $L = L(U) > 10^4\kappa$ . Thus Lemma 5.3 holds for  $n = 2$ . Then  $n_1$  of Propositions 5.4 and 5.5 is independent of  $U$  as well. Invoking Proposition 4.8 and Corollary 3.3 as above yields Theorem 1.19.

## 6. SMALL CANCELLATION THEORY

Let  $G$  be a group acting by isometries on  $X$ . We recall that  $X$  is a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space.

**6.1. Loxodromic moving family.** Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a set of pairs  $(H, Y)$ , where  $H$  is a loxodromic subgroup of  $G$  and  $Y = C_H$  its invariant cylinder. We further assume that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is invariant under the action of  $G$  defined by  $g \cdot (H, Y) = (gHg^{-1}, gY)$ . In this case we refer to  $\mathcal{Q}$  as of a *loxodromic moving family*. The *fellow travelling constant* of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is

$$\Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X) = \sup\{\text{diam}(Y_1^{+20\delta} \cap Y_2^{+20\delta}) : (H_1, Y_1) \neq (H_2, Y_2) \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

The *injectivity radius* of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is

$$T(\mathcal{Q}, X) = \inf\{\|h\| : h \in H - \{1\}, (H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

We denote  $K = \langle\langle H \mid (H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q} \rangle\rangle$  and  $\bar{G} = G/K$ . We denote by  $\pi: G \rightarrow \bar{G}$  the natural projection and write  $\bar{g}$  for  $\pi(g)$  for short, for every  $g \in G$ .

**Definition 6.1** (Small cancellation condition). Let  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\mu > 0$ . We say that  $\mathcal{Q}$  satisfies the  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation condition if

$$(SC1) \quad \Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X) < \lambda T(\mathcal{Q}, X),$$

$$(SC2) \quad T(\mathcal{Q}, X) > \mu\delta.$$

In this case we say that  $\bar{G}$  is a  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation quotient.

**Remark 6.2.** Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a loxodromic moving family under the  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation condition, where  $\lambda < 1$  and  $\mu > 10^3$ . Let  $(H_1, Y_1)$  and  $(H_2, Y_2) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Condition (SC1) implies that  $Y_1 = Y_2$  if and only if  $H_1 = H_2$ . Condition (SC2) implies that all elements in the loxodromic subgroups  $H$ , for  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ , are loxodromic. Thus, the groups  $H$  are all cyclic. Moreover, as  $\mathcal{Q}$  is invariant under the action of  $G$  by conjugation, the groups  $H$  are normal in the the stabiliser of  $Y$ , that is, the maximal loxodromic subgroup containing  $H$ .

**6.2. Cone-off space.** Let  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be the collection of cylinders  $Y = C_H$  such that  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . The *cone of radius  $\rho$  over  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$* , denoted by  $Z_\rho(Y)$ , is the quotient of  $Y \times [0, \rho]$  by the equivalence relation that identifies all points  $(y, 0)$ , for  $y \in Y$ . The *apex of the cone  $Z_\rho(Y)$*  is the equivalence class of  $(y, 0)$ . We abuse notation and write  $(y, p)$  for the equivalence class of  $(y, p)$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{V}$  the collection of apices of the cones over the elements of  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Let  $\iota: Y \hookrightarrow Z_\rho(Y)$  be the map that sends  $y$  to  $(y, \rho)$ . The *cone-off space*

of radius  $\rho$  over  $X$  relative to  $\mathcal{Q}$ , denoted by  $\dot{X}_\rho = \dot{X}_\rho(\mathcal{Q}, X)$ , is obtained by attaching for every  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , the cone  $Z_\rho(Y)$  on  $X$  along  $Y$  according to  $\iota: Y \hookrightarrow Z_\rho(Y)$ . There is a natural metric on  $\dot{X}_\rho(\mathcal{Q})$  and an action by isometries of  $G$  on  $\dot{X}_\rho$ , [Cou14, Section 5.1].

**6.3. Quotient space.** The *quotient space of radius  $\rho$  over  $X$  relative to  $\mathcal{Q}$* , denoted by  $\overline{X}_\rho = \overline{X}_\rho(\mathcal{Q}, X)$ , is the orbit space  $\dot{X}_\rho/K$ . We denote by  $\zeta: \dot{X}_\rho \rightarrow \overline{X}_\rho$  the natural projection and write  $\overline{x}$  for  $\zeta(x)$  for short. Furthermore, we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$  the image in  $\overline{X}_\rho$  of the apices  $\mathcal{V}$ . We consider  $\overline{X}_\rho$  as a metric space equipped with the quotient metric, that is for every  $x, x' \in \dot{X}_\rho$

$$|\overline{x} - \overline{x}'|_{\overline{X}} = \inf_{h \in K} |hx - x'|_{\dot{X}}.$$

We note that the action of  $G$  on  $\dot{X}_\rho$  induces an action by isometries of  $\overline{G}$  on  $\overline{X}_\rho$ .

**6.4. Small cancellation groups.** The following lemma summarises Proposition 3.15 and Theorem 6.11 of [Cou14]. It is fundamental in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 6.3** (Small Cancellation Theorem [Cou14]). *There exist positive numbers  $\delta_0, \overline{\delta}, \Delta_0, \rho_0$  satisfying the following. Let  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$  and  $\rho > \rho_0$ . Let  $G$  be a group acting by isometries on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a loxodromic moving family such that  $\Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X) \leq \Delta_0$  and  $T(\mathcal{Q}, X) > 100\pi \sinh \rho$ . Then:*

- (i)  $\overline{X}_\rho$  is a  $\overline{\delta}$ -hyperbolic space on which  $\overline{G}$  acts by isometries.
- (ii) Let  $r \in (0, \rho/20]$ . If for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , the distance  $|x - v| \geq 2r$  then the projection  $\zeta: \dot{X}_\rho \rightarrow \overline{X}_\rho$  induces an isometry from  $B(x, r)$  onto  $B(\overline{x}, r)$ .
- (iii) Let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . If  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  stands for the apex of the cone  $Z_\rho(Y)$ , then the natural projection  $\pi: G \rightarrow \overline{G}$  induces an isomorphism from  $\text{Stab}(Y)/H$  onto  $\text{Stab}(\overline{v})$ . □

**Remark 6.4.** The constants  $\delta_0, \overline{\delta}, \Delta_0, \rho_0$  are independent of  $G, X, \mathcal{Q}$  or  $\delta$ . Moreover  $\delta_0$  and  $\Delta_0$  (respectively  $\rho_0$ ) can be chosen arbitrarily small (respectively large). We refer to  $\delta_0, \overline{\delta}, \Delta_0, \rho_0$  as *the constants of the Small Cancellation Theorem*.

Due to a standard rescaling argument, see for instance [Cou16b], we can assume that  $G, X, \mathcal{Q}$  and  $\delta$  satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 6.3. This is explained in the next remark.

**Remark 6.5.** Let  $G$  be a group acting  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a loxodromic moving family satisfying the geometric  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation condition for the action of  $G$  on  $X$ , where

$$\lambda \leq \frac{\Delta_0}{100\pi \sinh \rho} \text{ and } \mu \geq \frac{100\pi \sinh \rho}{\delta_0} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\overline{\delta}}.$$

We define a rescaling parameter

$$\sigma = \min \left\{ \frac{\delta_0}{\kappa}, \frac{\Delta_0}{\Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X)} \right\}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $\sigma\delta$ -hyperbolic and the action of  $G$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $(\sigma\kappa, N)$ -acylindrical. Also,

$$\sigma\delta \leq \sigma\kappa \leq \delta_0,$$

by the standing assumption that  $\kappa \geq \delta$ . In particular, the action of  $G$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  is  $(\delta_0, N)$ -acylindrical. In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{X}) &\leq \sigma\Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X) \leq \Delta_0, \\ T(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{X}) &\geq \sigma T(\mathcal{Q}, X) \geq \sigma \max \left\{ \mu\delta, \frac{\Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X)}{\lambda} \right\} \geq 100\pi \sinh \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $G$ ,  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  satisfy the hypothesis of the Small Cancellation Theorem (Lemma 6.3).

From now on we assume that  $\delta \leq \delta_0$ ,  $\rho \geq \rho_0$ ,  $G$ ,  $X$ , and  $\mathcal{Q}$  satisfy the hypothesis of the Small Cancellation Theorem (Lemma 6.3). We also assume that the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrical, with  $\kappa = \delta_0$ . This is justified by Remark 6.5.

We now have the following useful results at our disposal.

**Lemma 6.6** ([Cou16a, Proposition 5.16]). *Let  $E$  be an elliptic (respectively loxodromic) subgroup of  $G$  acting on  $X$ . Then the image of  $E$  under the natural projection  $\pi: G \rightarrow \overline{G}$  is elliptic (respectively elementary) for its action on  $\overline{X}_\rho$ .*

**Lemma 6.7** ([Cou16a, Proposition 5.17]). *Let  $E$  be an elliptic subgroup of  $G$  acting on  $X$ . Then the natural projection  $\pi: G \rightarrow \overline{G}$  induces an isomorphism from  $E$  onto its image.*

**Lemma 6.8** ([Cou16a, Proposition 5.18]). *Let  $\overline{E}$  be an elliptic subgroup of  $\overline{G}$  for its action on  $\overline{X}_\rho$ . One of the following holds.*

- (i) *There exists an elliptic subgroup  $E$  of  $G$  for its action on  $X$  such that the natural projection  $\pi: G \rightarrow \overline{G}$  induces an isomorphism from  $E$  onto  $\overline{E}$ .*
- (ii) *There exists  $\overline{v} \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}$  such that  $\overline{E} \subset \text{Stab}(\overline{v})$ .*

**Lemma 6.9** ([CS22, Proposition 9.13]). *Let  $\overline{U} \subset \overline{G}$  be a finite set such that  $L(\overline{U}) \leq \rho/5$ . If, for every  $\overline{v} \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ , the set  $\overline{U}$  is not contained in  $\text{Stab}(\overline{v})$ , then there exists a pre-image  $U \subset G$  of  $\overline{U}$  of energy  $L(U) \leq \pi \sinh L(\overline{U})$ .*

**Lemma 6.10** (Greendlinger's Lemma, [Cou18, Theorem 3.5]). *Let  $x \in X$ . Let  $g \in G$ . If  $g \in K - \{1\}$ , then there is  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$  with the following property. Let  $y_0$  and  $y_1$  be the respective projections of  $x$  and  $gx$  on  $Y$ . Then*

$$|y_0 - y_1| > T(H, X) - 2\pi \sinh \rho - 23\delta.$$

**Remark 6.11.** Lemma 6.10 is obtained from [Cou18, Theorem 3.5] after applying [Cou18, Proposition 1.11], [Cou14, Proposition 2.4 (2)] and [Cou14, Lemma 2.31]. In [Cou18, Theorem 3.5] there is the additional assumption that the loxodromic moving family is finite up to conjugacy. This assumption is only needed to make sure that the action is co-compact, hence, that the quotient group is hyperbolic. We do not need it here.

**Lemma 6.12** ([DGO17, Proposition 5.33]). *If the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is acylindrical, then so is the action of  $\overline{G}$  on  $\overline{X}_\rho$ .*

**Remark 6.13.** If all elementary subgroups of  $G$  are cyclic and the action on  $X$  is  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrical, then the action of  $\overline{G}$  on  $\overline{X}_\rho$  is  $(\overline{\kappa}, \overline{N})$ -acylindrical, where  $\overline{\kappa}$  can be explicitly computed in  $\kappa$  and  $\rho$ , and  $\overline{N}$  can be explicitly computed in  $N$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\rho$ . See [DGO17, Proof of Proposition 5.33] and [CS22, Proposition 9.9].

## 7. SHORTENING AND SHORTENING-FREE WORDS

Let  $\delta_0 > 0$ ,  $\Delta_0 > 0$  and  $L_0 > 0$ ,  $\delta < \delta_0$  and  $\alpha = 200\delta$ .

**7.1. Shortening words.** Let  $U \subset G$  be an  $\alpha$ -reduced subset at a point  $p \in X$  (Definition 4.1). Recall that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a loxodromic moving family. We assume that

$$0 < L(U, p) \leq L_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X) \leq \Delta_0.$$

Given  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n \in \mathbf{F}(U)$  and  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ , we fix

$$x_0 = p, \quad x_1 = u_1 p, \quad x_2 = u_1 u_2 p, \quad \cdots, \quad x_n = u_1 \cdots u_n p,$$

and let  $y_i$  be a projection of  $x_i$  on  $Y$ , for every  $i \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ .

**Definition 7.1** (*Shortening word*). Let  $\tau \geq \Delta_0 + 2L_0 + 223\delta$  and let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n \in \mathbf{F}(U)$ . Let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . We say that  $w$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$  if the following holds:

$$(S1) \quad |y_0 - y_n| > \tau,$$

$$(S2) \quad |x_0 - y_0| \leq \frac{1}{2}|u_1 p - p| - \alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad |x_n - y_n| \leq \frac{1}{2}|u_n p - p| - \alpha.$$

A *minimal*  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$  none of whose proper prefixes are  $\tau$ -shortening words over  $(H, Y)$ .

**Remark 7.2.** By the triangle inequality and the choice of  $\tau_0$ ,  $|x_0 - x_n| \geq |y_0 - y_n| - |x_0 - y_0| - |x_n - y_n| > 0$ . In particular,  $\tau$ -shortening words are always non-trivial.

We now collect some properties of  $\tau$ -shortening words that we later use in our counting argument, see Proposition 7.8 below.

By the next proposition, condition (S2) of Definition 7.1 is closed under taking subwords.



**Proposition 7.3.** *Let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n$  be a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Then,*

$$|x_i - y_i| < \frac{1}{2} \min\{|u_i p - p|, |u_{i+1} p - p|\} - \alpha, \text{ for every } i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket.$$

*Proof.* Let  $i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ . Let  $z_i$  be a projection of  $x_i$  on  $[y_0, y_n]$ . Since  $Y$  is  $10\delta$ -quasi-convex (Lemma 2.8), there exist  $z'_i \in Y$  such that  $|z_i - z'_i| \leq 11\delta$ . By definition,  $|x_i - y_i| \leq d(x_i, Y) + \delta \leq |x_i - z'_i| + \delta$ . Thus, by the triangle inequality,

$$|x_i - y_i| \leq |x_i - z_i| + |z_i - z'_i| + \delta \leq |x_i - z_i| + 12\delta.$$

By definition and Lemma 2.2,

$$|x_i - z_i| \leq d(x_i, [y_0, y_n]) \leq (y_0, y_n)_{x_i} + 4\delta.$$

We claim that  $(y_0, y_n)_{x_i} \leq (x_0, x_n)_{x_i} + 2\delta$ . By hyperbolicity,

$$\min\{(x_0, y_0)_{x_i}, (y_0, y_n)_{x_i}, (y_n, x_n)_{x_i}\} \leq (x_0, x_n)_{x_i} + 2\delta.$$

The minimum is attained by  $(y_0, y_n)_{x_i}$ . Indeed, by the triangle inequality, Proposition 4.4(ii) and assumption (S2) of Definition 7.1,

$$(x_0, y_0)_{x_i} \geq |x_0 - x_i| - |x_0 - y_0| > \frac{1}{2}|u_i p - p| + 2(i-1)(\alpha + \delta) + \alpha.$$

The estimate for  $(y_n, x_n)_{x_i}$  is similar. On the other hand, by Proposition 4.4(iii),

$$(x_0, x_n)_{x_i} < \frac{1}{2} \min\{|u_i p - p|, |u_{i+1} p - p|\} - \alpha - 48\delta.$$

Combining the estimates then yields the assertion of the lemma.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.4.** *Let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n$  be a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ .*

(i) *We have*

$$|w|_U \geq \frac{\tau - 50\delta}{L(U, p)}.$$

(ii) *If  $w$  is a minimal  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ , then*

$$|w|_U \leq \frac{\tau}{\alpha} + 1.$$

*Proof.* We first prove (i). By the triangle inequality,  $|x_0 - x_n| \leq L(U, p)|w|_U$ . Since  $Y$  is  $10\delta$ -quasi-convex and  $|y_0 - y_n| \geq \tau \geq 23\delta$  (see [CDP90, Chapitre 2, Proposition 2.1])

$$|x_0 - x_n| \geq |x_0 - y_0| + |y_0 - y_n| + |y_n - x_n| - 46\delta > \tau - 50\delta.$$

This proves (i), and we turn to (ii). Let  $w$  be a minimal  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ . Let  $w' \equiv u_1 \cdots u_{n-1}$ . By definition,  $|w|_U = |w'|_U + 1$ . By Proposition 4.4 (ii),

$$|w'x_0 - x_0| \geq \frac{1}{2}|u_1 p - p| + \frac{1}{2}|u_{n-1} p - p| + \alpha(|w'|_U - 1).$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$|w'x_0 - x_0| \leq |x_{n-1} - y_{n-1}| + |y_{n-1} - y_0| + |y_0 - x_0|.$$

By Property (S2),  $|x_0 - y_0| < \frac{1}{2}|u_1p - p| - \alpha$ . By Proposition 7.3,  $|x_{n-1} - y_{n-1}| < \frac{1}{2}|u_{n-1}p - p| - \alpha$ . As  $w'$  is not a  $\tau$ -shortening over  $(H, Y)$ , we conclude that  $|y_{n-1} - y_0| \leq \tau$ . Consequently,  $|w'|_U \leq \frac{\tau}{\alpha}$ . Thus,  $|w|_U \leq \frac{\tau}{\alpha} + 1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 7.5.** *Let  $(H_1, Y_1), (H_2, Y_2) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Let  $w \in \mathbf{F}(U)$ . If  $w$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening word over both  $(H_1, Y_1)$  and  $(H_2, Y_2)$ , then  $(H_1, Y_1) = (H_2, Y_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $w$  be a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H_1, Y_1)$  and  $(H_2, Y_2)$ . By assumptions, it is enough to show that  $\text{diam}(Y_1^{+20\delta} \cap Y_2^{+20\delta}) > \Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X)$ . By quasi-convexity, see [DG08, Lemma 2.2.2],

$$\text{diam}(Y_1^{+20\delta} \cap Y_2^{+20\delta}) \geq \text{diam}(Y_1^{+L_0} \cap Y_2^{+L_0}) - 2L_0 - 4\delta.$$

Let  $i \in \llbracket 1, 2 \rrbracket$ . Let  $s_i$  and  $t_i$  be respective projections of  $p$  and  $wp$  on  $Y_i$ . We claim that  $s_1, t_1 \in Y_1^{+L_0} \cap Y_2^{+L_0}$ . Indeed, by condition (S2) for  $w$ , we have that  $\max\{|p - s_i|, |wp - t_i|\} \leq L_0/2$ , hence, the claim. Thus,  $\text{diam}(Y_1^{+L_0} \cap Y_2^{+L_0}) \geq |s_1 - t_1| > \tau$ . By choice of  $\tau_0$ ,  $\text{diam}(Y_1^{+20\delta} \cap Y_2^{+20\delta}) > \Delta(\mathcal{Q}, X)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 7.6.** *For every  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ , there are at most two minimal  $\tau$ -shortening words over  $(H, Y)$ .*

Proposition 7.6 should be compared to Proposition 3.8 of [CS22]. The proof of these two statements relies on the geometric extension property (in our setting Proposition 4.6 above). For convenience of the reader we translate the argument of [CS22] to our setting.

*Proof.* Let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Let  $\partial H = \{\eta^-, \eta^+\}$  and let  $\gamma: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow X$  be a  $10^3\delta$ -local  $(1, \delta)$ -quasi-geodesic from  $\eta^-$  to  $\eta^+$ . Let  $q$  be a projection of  $p$  on  $\gamma$ . We assume that  $q = \gamma(0)$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}$  be the set of  $\tau$ -shortening words in  $\mathbf{F}(U)$  over  $(H, Y)$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}$  is non-empty, otherwise the statement is true. Let  $\mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}$  (respectively,  $\mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}^- \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}$ ) be the set of words  $w \in \mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}$  such that  $wp$  has a projection  $\gamma(t)$  on  $\gamma$  with  $t \geq 0$  (respectively,  $t \leq 0$ ). We note that  $\mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)} = \mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}^+ \cup \mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}^-$ .

Let  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}^+$ . Without loss of generality, the projection of  $w_1p$  on  $\gamma$  is closer to 0 than the projection of  $w_2p$ , that is,  $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2$ . We prove that  $(p, w_2p)_{w_1p} < \frac{1}{2}|u_m p - p|$ . Proposition 4.6 then implies that  $w_1$  is a prefix of  $w_2$ . Thus, there is at most one minimal  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}^+$ . By symmetry, there is at most one minimal  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{(H, Y)}^-$ , which yields the assertion.

Let  $q_1 = \gamma(t_1)$  and  $q_2 = \gamma(t_2)$  be the respective projections of  $w_1p$  and  $w_2p$  on  $\gamma$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$(12) \quad (p, w_2p)_{w_1p} \leq |w_1p - q_1| + (w_2p, p)_{q_1}.$$

Assume that  $w_1 \equiv u_1 \cdots u_m$ .

We note that  $|w_1p - q_1| < \frac{1}{2}|u_m p - p| - \alpha + 100\delta$ . Indeed, by definition,  $\gamma \in Y$ . Consequently,  $|w_1p - q_1| \leq d(w_1p, Y) + 100\delta$ . Property (S2) of  $w_1$  then implies the claim.

Next, we prove that  $(w_2p, p)_{q_1} \leq 29\delta$ . Indeed, by definition

$$(w_2p, p)_{q_1} = \frac{1}{2}(|w_2p - q_1| + |p - q_1| - |w_2p - p|).$$

Since  $w_2$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ , the property (S1) implies  $|q_2 - q| > \tau \geq 23\delta$ . By  $10\delta$ -quasi-convexity of  $Y$ , [CDP90, Chapitre 2, Proposition 2.1],

$$|w_2p - p| \geq |w_2p - q_2| + |q_2 - q| + |q - p| - 46\delta.$$

As  $(q_2, q)_{q_1} \leq 6\delta$  (Lemma 2.4 (i)),

$$|q_2 - q| = |q_2 - q_1| + |q_1 - q| - (q_2, q)_{q_1} \geq |q_2 - q_1| + |q_1 - q| - 6\delta.$$

Note that here we have used that  $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2$ . By the triangle inequality,  $|w_2p - q_2| \geq |w_2p - q_1| - |q_2 - q_1|$ , so that  $|w_2p - p| \geq |w_2p - q_1| + |q_1 - p| - 58\delta$ . Consequently,  $(w_2p, p)_{q_1} \leq 29\delta$ , as claimed.

Plugging the two estimates into (12) finishes the proof.  $\square$

**7.2. The growth of shortening-free words.** Here we count shortening-free words.

**Definition 7.7** (*Shortening-free word*). Let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n$  be an element of  $\mathbf{F}(U)$ . Let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . We say that  $w$  contains a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$  if  $w$  splits as  $w \equiv w_0w_1w_2$ , where  $w_1$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ . We say that  $w$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening-free word if for every  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ , the word  $w$  does not contain any  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ . We denote by  $F(\tau) \subset \mathbf{F}(U)$  the subset of  $\tau$ -shortening-free words.

We first discuss the counting argument to estimate the number of shortening-free words. Then we show that shortening-free words embed into  $\overline{G}$ , see Proposition 7.17 below.

Recall that the natural homomorphism  $\mathbf{F}(U) \rightarrow G$  is injective (Proposition 4.5). Also, we identify the elements of  $\mathbf{F}(U)$  with their images in  $G$ . Let  $B_U(n) \subset \mathbf{F}(U)$  be the ball of radius  $|w|_U \leq n$ , where  $n \geq 0$ . Note that  $B_U(n) = (U \sqcup U^{-1} \sqcup \{1\})^n$  when  $n \geq 1$ .

**Proposition 7.8.** *Let  $U$  be an  $\alpha$ -reduced subset of at least two elements such that  $L(U) \leq L_0$ . There is  $\tau_1$  depending on  $L_0, \Delta_0$  and  $\delta$  such that, for all  $\tau \geq \tau_1$  and for all  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$|F(\tau) \cap B_U(n+1)| \geq |U| |F(\tau) \cap B_U(n)|.$$

In particular,  $|F(\tau) \cap B_U(n)| \geq |U|^n$ .

Proposition 7.8 brings Proposition 3.11 of [CS22] for the growth of aperiodic elements in strongly reduced sets to our setting of shortening-free words in  $\alpha$ -reduced subsets.

**Remark 7.9.** As a semi-group  $\mathbf{F}(U)$  is generated by  $V = U \sqcup U^{-1}$ . As  $|V| = 2|U|$ , the estimate of Proposition 7.8 is as expected from [CS22, Proposition 3.11].

The proof of Proposition 7.8 is as the proof of Proposition 3.11 in [CS22], where [CS22, Proposition 3.6] and [CS22, Proposition 3.8] are replaced by our Proposition 7.5 and Proposition 7.6 respectively. Essentially, all that is left to do is to adapt notation. We let

$$Z = \{w \in \mathbf{F}(U) : w \equiv w_0 u, w_0 \in F(\tau), u \in U \sqcup U^{-1}\}.$$

For every  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ , we denote by  $Z_{(H, Y)} \subset Z$  the set of elements  $w \in Z$  that split as  $w \equiv w_1 w_2$ , where  $w_1 \in F(\tau)$  and  $w_2$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ .

**Lemma 7.10.** *The set  $Z$  is contained in the disjoint union of  $F(\tau)$  and  $\bigcup_{(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}} Z_{(H, Y)}$ .*

*Proof.* By definition,  $F(\tau)$  and  $\bigcup_{(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}} Z_{(H, Y)}$  are disjoint. Let  $w \in Z - F(\tau)$ . Then there is  $w_0 \in F(\tau)$  and  $u \in U \sqcup U^{-1}$  such that  $w \equiv w_0 u$ . Moreover,  $w$  contains  $\tau$ -shortening word over some  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$  that we call  $w_2$ . By definition,  $w_2$  cannot be a subword of  $w_0$ . Hence,  $w_2$  is a suffix of  $w$ . Therefore,  $w \in Z_{(H, Y)}$ .  $\square$

Let  $n \geq 0$ . Lemma 7.10 implies that

$$(13) \quad |F(\tau) \cap B_U(n)| \geq |Z \cap B_U(n)| - \sum_{(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}} |Z_{(H, Y)} \cap B_U(n)|.$$

The next step is to estimate each term in the right side of the above inequality. The following lemma is a direct consequence of the definition of  $Z$ .

**Lemma 7.11.** *For every  $n \geq 0$ ,  $|Z \cap B_U(n+1)| = (2|U|)|F(\tau) \cap B_U(n)|$ .*

We now let  $\tau_0 = \Delta_0 + 2L_0 + 223\delta$ ,  $\tau > \tau_0$ ,  $b = \lceil \frac{\tau_0}{200\delta} + 2 \rceil + 1$ , and  $M = \lfloor \frac{\tau_0 - 50\delta}{L_0} \rfloor$ .

**Lemma 7.12.** *For every  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$\sum_{(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}} |Z_{(H, Y)} \cap B_U(n)| \leq 2(2|U|)^b |F(\tau) \cap B_U(n-M)|.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Q}_0$  be the set of  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$  for which there is a  $\tau$ -shortening word in  $\mathbf{F}(U)$  over  $(H, Y)$ . We have,

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{Q}} |Z_{(H, Y)} \cap B_U(n)| = \sum_{(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}_0} |Z_{(H, Y)} \cap B_U(n)|.$$

**Claim 7.13.**  $|Z_{(H,Y)} \cap B_U(n)| \leq 2|F(\tau) \cap B_U(n-M)|$ , for every  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}_0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}_0$ . Let  $w \in Z_{(H,Y)} \cap B_U(n)$ . Since  $w \in Z_{(H,Y)}$ , there are  $w_1 \in F(\tau)$  and a  $\tau$ -shortening word  $w_2$  over  $(H, Y)$  such that  $w \equiv w_1 w_2$ . In particular,  $|w_1|_U = |w|_U - |w_2|_U$ . By Proposition 7.4 (i),

$$|w_2|_U \geq \frac{\tau - 50\delta}{L_0} \geq M > 0.$$

Therefore,  $w_1 \in F(\tau) \cap B_U(n-M)$ . As  $w \in Z$ , no proper prefix of  $w_2$  is a  $\tau$ -shortening word. By Proposition 7.6 there are most 2 possible choices for  $w_2$ . In total, there are at most  $2|F(\tau) \cap B_U(n-M)|$  choices for  $w$ . This proves our claim.  $\square$

**Claim 7.14.**  $|\mathcal{Q}_0| \leq (2|U|)^b$

*Proof.* As  $|U| \geq 2$ ,  $|B_U(b)| \leq (2|U|)^b$ . Consequently, it suffices to show that there exists an injective map  $\chi: \mathcal{Q}_0 \rightarrow B_U(b)$ . Let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}_0$ , and let  $w$  be a  $\tau$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ . As  $\tau \geq \tau_0$ ,  $w$  is a  $\tau_0$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$  as well. Let  $w'$  be the shortest prefix of  $w$  that is a  $\tau_0$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ . In particular,  $w'$  is a minimal  $\tau_0$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ . We define  $\chi(H, Y) = w'$ . Since  $\alpha = 200\delta$ , by Proposition 7.4 (ii),  $|w'|_U \leq b$ . By Proposition 7.5, there is at most one  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $w'$  is a  $\tau_0$ -shortening word over  $(H, Y)$ . Hence  $\chi$  is well-defined and injective.  $\square$

The desired estimation is obtained from the two claims above.  $\square$

Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, 3/4)$  be an auxiliary parameter. Given  $\varepsilon$ , we fix

$$\nu = (1 - \varepsilon)2|U|, \quad \xi = 2(2|U|)^b, \quad \text{and } \sigma = \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1 - \varepsilon)\xi}.$$

**Lemma 7.15.** *For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 3/4)$  and  $b > 1$ , there is  $M_0 \geq 0$  with the following property. If  $|U| \geq 2$ , then for every  $M \geq M_0$ , we have*

$$\frac{1}{\nu^M} \leq \sigma.$$

*Proof.* Let  $M \geq b$ . A computation yields

$$\log\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\nu^M}\right) \leq (b-M)\log(2|U|) - M\log(1-\varepsilon) - \log\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4(1-\varepsilon)}\right).$$

Since  $M \geq b$  and  $|U| \geq 2$ , we have  $(b-M)\log(2|U|) \leq (b-M)\log 4$ . Therefore,

$$\log\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\nu^M}\right) \leq -M[\log 4 + \log(1-\varepsilon)] + b\log 4 - \log\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4(1-\varepsilon)}\right).$$

We put

$$d_1 = b\log 4 - \log\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right), \quad d_2 = \log 4 + \log(1-\varepsilon).$$

As  $b \geq 1$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 3/4)$ ,  $d_1 > 0$  and  $d_2 > 0$ . If  $M \geq \frac{d_1}{d_2}$ , then  $\log\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\nu^M}\right) \leq 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 7.8.* Let  $M_0 \geq 0$  be given by Lemma 7.15. We let

$$\tau_1 = \max\{\tau_0, L_0(M_0 + 1) + 50\delta_0\}$$

and note that  $\tau_1$  depends only on  $L_0, \varepsilon, b$  and  $\delta_0$ . Recall that  $|U| \geq 2$ , that  $\tau \geq \tau_1$  and that

$$\nu = (1 - \varepsilon)(2|U|), \quad \xi = 2(2|U| - 1)^b, \quad \sigma = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\xi(1 - \varepsilon)}, \quad \text{and } M = \left\lfloor \frac{\tau - 50\delta_0}{L_0} \right\rfloor.$$

In particular,  $M \geq M_0$ . For every  $n \geq 0$ , we let

$$c(n) = |F(\tau) \cap B_U(n)|.$$

We must prove that for every  $n \geq 1$ ,  $c(n) \geq \nu c(n - 1)$ . We prove this by induction.

First note that  $c(1) \geq \nu$ . Indeed, as  $B_U(1) > 2|U|$ , it suffices to show that  $B_U(1) \subset F(\tau)$ . Let  $w \in F(\tau)$  then, by Proposition 7.4 (i),  $|w|_U \geq \frac{\tau - 50\delta_0}{L_0}$ . By choice of  $\tau_0$ ,  $|w|_U > 1$ . This proves our claim.

Next let  $n \geq 1$  and assume that  $c(m) \geq \nu c(m - 1)$ , for every  $m \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ . We claim that  $c(n + 1) \geq \nu c(n)$ . Indeed, by (13),

$$c(n + 1) \geq |Z \cap B_U(n + 1)| - \sum_{(H,Y) \in \mathcal{Q}} |Z_{(H,Y)} \cap B_U(n + 1)|.$$

It follows from Lemma 7.11 and Lemma 7.12 that

$$c(n + 1) \geq 2|U|c(n) - \xi c(n + 1 - M).$$

The induction hypothesis implies that  $c(n - k) \leq \nu^{-k} c(n)$ , for every  $k \geq 0$ . Note that  $M - 1 \geq 0$ . Letting  $k = M - 1$ , we obtain

$$c(n + 1) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\xi\nu}{2|U|} \frac{1}{\nu^M}\right) (2|U|)c(n).$$

Recall that  $\nu = (1 - \varepsilon)2|U|$ . In addition, Lemma 7.15 yields that  $\frac{1}{\nu^M} \leq \sigma$ . Now

$$\frac{\xi\nu}{2|U|} \sigma = \frac{\xi(1 - \varepsilon)(2|U|)}{2|U|} \frac{\varepsilon}{2\xi(1 - \varepsilon)} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq \varepsilon.$$

This proves our claim. Fixing  $\varepsilon = 1/2$  implies the proposition.  $\square$

**7.3. The injection of shortening-free words.** Finally, we show that shortening-free words inject in  $\overline{G}$ , see Proposition 7.17 below. We first prove a version of [CS22, Proposition 4.2] in our setting of shortening-free words and  $\alpha$ -reduced sets.

We recall that  $U$  denotes an  $\alpha$ -reduced subset of  $G$ .

**Lemma 7.16.** *Let  $\tau \geq \Delta_0 + 5L_0$ . Let  $w \equiv u_1 \cdots u_n$  be an element of  $\mathbf{F}(U)$ . Let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Let  $y_0$  and  $y_n$  be respective projections of  $p$  and  $wp$  on  $Y$ . If  $|y_0 - y_n| > \tau$ , then  $w$  contains a  $(\tau - 3L_0 + 4\delta)$ -shortening word over a conjugate of  $(H, Y)$ .*

The main point is to promote the proof of [CS22, Proposition 4.2] from strongly  $\alpha$ -reduced sets to  $\alpha$ -reduced sets. Besides this technical point the argument is the same.

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma$  be a geodesic from  $p$  to  $wp$  and let  $z_i$  be a projection of  $x_i$  on  $\gamma$ . We first claim that the points  $z_0, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$  lie in this order on  $\gamma$  going from  $z_0 = p$  to  $z_n = wp$ . Indeed, if  $i > 0$ , by Proposition 4.4(iii)

$$\begin{aligned} (x_0, x_i)_{x_{i+1}} &= |x_i - x_{i+1}| - (x_0, x_{i+1})_{x_i} \geq |p - u_{i+1}p| - (x_{i-1}, x_{i+1})_{x_i} - 2\delta \\ &> \frac{1}{2}|p - u_{i+1}p| + \alpha \geq (x_i, x_{i+2})_{x_{i+1}} + 2\alpha + 2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

If  $z_{i+1}$  lies before  $z_i$  on  $\gamma$ , then hyperbolicity, Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 4.4(iii) implies that

$$(x_0, x_i)_{x_{i+1}} \leq |z_{i+1} - x_{i+1}| + 2\delta \leq (x_0, x_n)_{x_{i+1}} + 6\delta \leq (x_i, x_{i+2})_{x_{i+1}} + 8\delta.$$

Combined with the previous estimate this yields that  $\alpha \leq 3\delta$ , a contradiction.

Next recall that  $y_0, y_i$  and  $y_n$  are projections of  $x_0 = p, u_1 \cdots u_i p = x_i$  and  $wp = x_n$ , respectively, on  $Y$ . Assume that  $|y_0 - y_n| > \tau$ . Since  $Y$  is  $10\delta$ -quasi-convex (Lemma 2.8) and  $\tau \geq 23\delta$ , there are  $y'_0, y'_n \in \gamma_w$  such that  $\max\{|y_0 - y'_0|, |y_n - y'_n|\} \leq 46\delta$ . Up to permuting  $y'_0$  and  $y'_n$  we assume that  $p, y'_0, y'_n$  and  $wp$  are ordered in this way along  $\gamma_w$ . In particular, there are  $i \leq j \leq n-1$  such that  $y'_0 \in [z_i, z_{i+1}] \subset \gamma_w$  and  $y'_n \in [z_j, z_{j+1}] \subset \gamma_w$ . Let  $w_0 \equiv u_1 \cdots u_{i+1}$  and take the word  $w_1$  such that  $w_0 w_1 \equiv u_1 \cdots u_j$ . We prove that  $w_1$  is a  $(2\tau - 2L_0 - 5\delta)$ -shortening word over  $(w_0^{-1} H w_0, w_0^{-1} Y)$ . Property (S2) follows from Proposition 4.4(iii). Indeed, this implies that  $d(x_{i+2}, \gamma_w) \leq \frac{1}{2}|u_{i+2}p - p| - \alpha - 48\delta$ , hence, that  $d(x_{i+2}, Y) \leq \frac{1}{2}|u_{i+2}p - p| - \alpha$ . The argument for  $x_j$  is similar. It remains to estimate  $|y_{i+1} - y_j|$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |y_{i+1} - y_j| &\geq |y_0 - y_n| - |y_0 - y_{i+1}| - |y_n - y_j|, \\ |y_0 - y_{i+1}| &\leq |y_0 - y'_0| + |y'_0 - x_{i+1}| + |x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}|, \\ |y_n - y_j| &\leq |y_n - y'_n| + |y'_n - x_j| + |x_j - y_j|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $y'_0 \in (u_1 \cdots u_i)[p, u_{i+1}p]$  and  $y'_n \in (u_1 \cdots u_j)[p, u_{j+1}p]$ ,

$$\max\{|y'_0 - x_{i+1}|, |y'_n - x_j|\} \leq L(U, p) \leq L_0.$$

It follows from Property (S2) that,

$$\max\{|x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}|, |x_j - y_j|\} \leq \frac{1}{2}L(U, p) - \alpha + 2\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}L_0 - \alpha + 2\delta.$$

Combining the previous estimations,  $|y_{i+1} - y_j| > \tau - 3L_0 + 4\delta \geq \Delta_0 + 2L_0 + 4\delta$ .  $\square$

Let  $\tau_1$  be the constant of Proposition 7.8 depending on  $L_0$ ,  $\Delta_0$  and  $\delta_0$ . Recall that  $\tau_1 \geq \Delta_0 + 3L_0$  and let  $\rho \geq \max\{\rho_0, \log(2[2\tau_1 + 23\delta_0] + 1)\}$ . In addition, we recall that  $T(\mathcal{Q}, X) \geq 100\pi \sinh \rho$ , that  $K = \langle\langle H \mid (H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q} \rangle\rangle$  and that  $\bar{G} = G/K$ .

**Proposition 7.17.** *There exists  $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1$  depending on  $\delta_0$ ,  $L_0$  and  $\Delta_0$  with the following property. The restriction of the natural homomorphism  $\mathbf{F}(U) \rightarrow \bar{G}$  to the subset of  $\tau_2$ -shortening-free words is an injection.*

*Proof.* We put  $\tau_2 = \tau_1 + 2L_0 + 5\delta$ . Let  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbf{F}(U)$  be two  $\tau_2$ -shortening-free words such that  $w_1w_2 \in K$ . Assume that  $w_1w_2 \neq 1$  in  $G$ . By Greendlinger's Lemma (Lemma 6.10), there is  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$  and projections  $y_0$  and  $y_2$  on  $Y$  of  $p$ , and  $w_1w_2p$  respectively, such that

$$|y_0 - y_2| > T(H, X) - 2\pi \sinh \rho - 23\delta.$$

By definition,  $T(H, X) \geq T(\mathcal{Q}, X) \geq 100\pi \sinh \rho$ . By choice of  $\rho$ ,

$$|y_0 - y_2| > 2\tau_1.$$

Let  $y_1$  be a projection of  $w_1p$  on  $Y$ . Note that  $w_1^{-1}y_1$  and  $w_1^{-1}y_2$  are projections of  $p$  and  $w_2p$  on  $w_1^{-1}Y$ . Also,  $(w_1^{-1}Hw_1, w_1^{-1}Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Since  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are  $\tau_2$ -shortening-free words, it follows from Lemma 7.16 that  $\max\{|y_0 - y_1|, |y_1 - y_2|\} < \tau_1$ . By the triangle inequality,  $|y_0 - y_2| \leq 2\tau_1$ . This is a contradiction, hence,  $w_1w_2 = 1$ .  $\square$

## 8. GROWTH IN SMALL CANCELLATION GROUPS

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. Recall that the constants of the Small Cancellation Theorem (Lemma 6.3) are  $\delta_0, \bar{\delta}, \Delta_0, \rho_0$ , and that  $X$  is  $\delta$ -hyperbolic, for  $\delta \leq \delta_0$ . Moreover,  $G$  acts  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on  $X$ , where  $\kappa = \delta_0$ . For convenience, let

$$\delta_0 \leq \frac{\pi \sinh 10^4 \bar{\delta}}{10^4 \cdot 200} \text{ and that } \rho_0 > 5 \cdot 10^4 \bar{\delta}.$$

We fix  $L = 2\pi \sinh 10^4 \bar{\delta} + \delta_0$  and note that  $L > 200\kappa$ . Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset containing the identity such that  $L(U) \leq L$ , and suppose that  $U$  is not contained in an elementary subgroup. Let  $C = 10^6(N + 1)$ ,  $n > C^3$ ,  $S \subset U^{10^7 n}$  and  $p \in X$  be given by Proposition 5.1, so that

- (1)  $S$  is  $\alpha$ -reduced at  $p$ , for  $\alpha = 200\delta$ ,
- (2)  $|S| \geq \frac{1}{C^2}|U^n|$ ,
- (3)  $L(S, p) \leq L(U^n, p) \leq 10^5 C^3 L$ .

Moreover,  $|S| > C$ . Note that  $C > 0$  depends on  $N$  but not on the choice of  $U$ .



We let  $L_0 = 10^5 C^3 L$  and let  $\tau_1$  be the constant of Proposition 7.8 depending on  $L_0$ ,  $\Delta_0$  and  $\delta_0$ . Let  $\rho = \max\{\rho_0, \log(2[2\tau_1 + 23\delta_0] + 1)\}$ , so that Proposition 7.17 holds. Note that  $\rho$  depends on  $N$ , but not on the choice of  $U$  or  $S$ , and also not on  $\kappa$  or  $\delta$ .

Recall that  $K = \langle\langle H \mid (H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q} \rangle\rangle$  and  $\bar{G} = G/K$ . Moreover,  $\bar{U}$  is the image of a set  $U \subset G$  under the natural projection  $\pi: G \rightarrow \bar{G}$ . The following is our key observation.

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset containing the identity such that  $L(U) \leq L$ . If  $U$  is not contained in an elementary subgroup, then*

$$\omega(\bar{U}) \geq \frac{1}{10^8} \omega(U).$$

*Proof.* To estimate  $\omega(\bar{U})$  we proceed as follows. Let  $r \geq 1$ . Since  $U$  is symmetric and contains the identity,  $B_S(r) \subset U^{10^7 nr}$ . Let  $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1$  be the constant given by Proposition 7.17 and let  $F(\tau_2) \subset \mathbf{F}(U)$  be the set of  $\tau_2$ -shortening-free words. We have that

$$|\bar{U}^{10^7 nr}| \geq |\overline{B_S(r)}| \geq |\overline{F(\tau_2) \cap B_S(r)}|.$$

By Propositions 7.17 and 7.8,

$$|\overline{F(\tau_2) \cap B_S(r)}| = |F(\tau_2) \cap B_S(r)| \geq |S|^r.$$

Combining these estimates, we get

$$\omega(\bar{U}) \geq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{10^7 nr} \log |\bar{U}^{10^7 nr}| \geq \frac{1}{10^7 n} \log |S|.$$

Let  $\gamma = 4 \frac{\log(C)}{\omega(U)}$ . If  $n \leq \gamma$ , then as  $|S| > C$ ,

$$\omega(\bar{U}) \geq \frac{1}{10^7 n} \log |S| \geq \frac{1}{10^8} \omega(U).$$

If  $n > \gamma$ , we use that  $|S| \geq \frac{1}{C^2} |U^n|$ . By Fekete's inequality,  $|S| \geq \frac{1}{C^2} 2^{n\omega(U)}$ . Thus

$$\omega(\bar{U}) \geq \frac{1}{10^7} \left( \omega(U) - \frac{1}{n} 2 \log(C) \right) > \frac{1}{10^8} \omega(U).$$

Altogether, this shows that  $\omega(\bar{U}) \geq \frac{1}{10^8} \omega(U)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 8.2** (Theorem 1.3 (i)). *Let  $\xi > 0$ . If  $G$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, then  $\bar{G}$  has  $\xi'$ -uniform uniform exponential growth where  $\xi' \geq \xi/10^8$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{U} \subset \bar{G}$  be a finite symmetric subset containing the identity and denote  $\bar{\Gamma} = \langle \bar{U} \rangle$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{V}$  denotes the set of apices of the cone-off space  $\dot{X}_\rho$ . Also recall that the quotient space  $\bar{X}_\rho$  is  $\bar{\delta}$ -hyperbolic (Lemma 6.3 (i)) and the action of  $\bar{\Gamma}$  on  $\bar{X}_\rho$  is acylindrical (Lemma 6.12). There are two cases:

**Case 1.**  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is elementary. If  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is loxodromic,  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is virtually nilpotent. Hence we assume that  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is elliptic. If  $\bar{\Gamma} \leq \text{Stab}(\bar{v})$ , for some  $\bar{v} \in \bar{\mathcal{V}}$ , then let  $(H, Y) \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $v$  is

the apex of the cone  $Z(Y)$ . The natural projection  $\pi: G \rightarrow \overline{G}$  induces an isomorphism  $\text{Stab}(Y)/H \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Stab}(\overline{v})$  (Lemma 6.3 (iii)). Since the moving family  $\mathcal{Q}$  is loxodromic,  $H$  has finite index in  $\text{Stab}(Y)$ . Hence  $\overline{\Gamma}$  is finite, in particular virtually nilpotent.

Thus we may assume that  $\overline{\Gamma}$  does not stabilise any point  $\overline{v}$ , for every  $\overline{v} \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ . Then there is an elliptic subgroup  $E \subset G$  such that the natural projection  $\pi: G \rightarrow \overline{G}$  induces an isomorphism  $E \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\Gamma}$  (Lemma 6.8). Since  $G$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, the subgroup  $E$  is either virtually nilpotent or has  $\xi$ -uniform exponential growth. In combination with the isomorphism  $F \xrightarrow{\sim} \overline{\Gamma}$ , we deduce that  $\overline{\Gamma}$  either is virtually nilpotent or has  $\xi$ -uniform exponential growth.

**Case 2.**  $\overline{\Gamma}$  is non-elementary. If  $L(\overline{U}) > 10^4 \delta$ , then  $\omega(\overline{U}) \geq \frac{1}{10^8} \log 2$  by Lemma 2.14. Otherwise,  $L(\overline{U}) \leq 10^4 \delta$ . As  $\overline{\Gamma}$  is not elementary,  $\overline{U}$  is not contained in  $\text{Stab}(\overline{v})$ , for every  $\overline{v} \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ . As  $10^4 \delta \leq \rho/5$ , there exists a pre-image  $U \subset G$  of  $\overline{U}$  of energy  $L(U) \leq \pi \sinh 10^4 \delta$  (Lemma 6.9). Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $U$  is symmetric and contains the identity. Since  $\overline{\Gamma}$  is non-elementary for the action on  $\overline{X}_\rho$ , the subgroup  $\Gamma$  is non-elementary for the action on  $X$  (Lemma 6.6). By Lemma 8.1,  $\omega(\overline{U}) \geq \frac{1}{10^8} \omega(U) \geq \frac{1}{10^8} \xi$ . This completes the proof of our theorem.  $\square$

**Theorem 8.3** (Theorem 1.3 (ii)). *Let  $\xi > 0$ . If  $\overline{G}$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, then  $G$  has  $\xi'$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, where  $\xi' \geq \xi/10^8$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\xi > 0$ . Assume that  $\overline{G}$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth. Let  $U \subset G$  be a finite symmetric subset containing the identity and denote  $\Gamma = \langle U \rangle$ . Then  $\Gamma$  falls exactly in one of the following two cases.

**Case 1.**  $\Gamma$  is elementary. If  $\Gamma$  is loxodromic, it is virtually nilpotent. If  $\Gamma$  is elliptic, then  $\Gamma$  and  $\overline{\Gamma}$  are isomorphic (Lemma 6.7). Since  $\overline{G}$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth, the subgroup  $\overline{\Gamma}$  is either virtually nilpotent or has  $\xi$ -uniform exponential growth. Thus  $\Gamma$  is either virtually nilpotent or has  $\xi$ -uniform exponential growth.

**Case 2.**  $\Gamma$  is non-elementary. If  $L(U) > 10^4 \delta_0$ , then  $\omega(U) \geq \frac{1}{10^8} \log 2$  by Lemma 2.14. If  $L(U) \leq 10^4 \delta_0$ , then by Lemma 8.1,  $\omega(\overline{U}) > \frac{1}{10^8} \omega(U)$ . As  $\Gamma$  is non-elementary,  $\omega(U) > 0$ . In particular  $\overline{\Gamma}$  is not virtually nilpotent. Since  $\overline{G}$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth,  $\omega(\overline{U}) \geq \xi$ . By definition,  $\omega(U) \geq \omega(\overline{U}) \geq \xi$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Let  $\lambda \leq \frac{\Delta_0}{100\pi \sinh \rho}$  and  $\mu \geq \frac{100\pi \sinh \rho}{\delta_0} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\delta}$ . By the choice of  $\rho$  above,  $\lambda$  depends on  $1/N$ , and  $\mu$  on  $N$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\delta$ , as claimed. After rescaling  $X$ , see Remark 6.5, Theorems 8.2 and 8.3 apply. This yields the assertions of Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

**Remark 8.4.** Recall that a group has *product set growth* (for its symmetric subsets) if there is  $a > 0$  such that for all finite symmetric subsets  $U$  that are not in a virtually nilpotent

subgroup, we have that  $\omega(U) \geq a \log(|U|)$ . If  $G$  has product set growth then  $\overline{G}$  has product set growth, and vice versa. This is proved by replacing Lemma 2.14 by Theorem 1.19 in the proof of Theorem 8.2, Theorem 8.3 respectively. Indeed, let  $\overline{U} \subset \overline{G}$  such that  $L(\overline{U}) > 10^4 \overline{\delta}$  be a non-empty symmetric set. Then  $\overline{U}^2$  contains a loxodromic isometry. Thus there is  $n > 0$ , that does not depend on the choice of  $\overline{U}$ , such that  $L(U^n) > 10^4 \overline{\kappa}$ . Therefore Theorem 1.19 yields the required estimates in this case.

We note that the constant of Theorem 1.19 can be explicitly given and depends only on  $N$ . Also, the number  $n$  can be made explicit and depends on  $\overline{\delta}$  and  $\overline{\kappa}$ . Combined with Remark 6.13 and Remark 6.5 this yields Remark 1.14.

## 9. COMMON QUOTIENTS

Finally, we explain the proof of Corollary 1.9. Let  $(H_i)$  be a family of 2 generated groups with arbitrarily large torsion balls. More precisely, we let the group  $H_i$  be generated by  $S_i := \{s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}\}$  and assume that all elements in  $(S_i \cup S_i^{-1})^i$  are torsion elements.

**Example 9.1.** The free product  $H_1 * H_2 * \cdots * H_i \cdots$  does not have the short loxodromic property for every acylindrical action on a hyperbolic space. Indeed, all elements in  $(S_i \cup S_i^{-1})^i$  are torsion elements. Thus there is no uniform upper bound  $n$  such that  $S_i^n$  contains a loxodromic element.

By [CS22], see Example 1.8, we assume the following. Let  $\xi > 0$ ,  $N > 0$ ,  $\kappa > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $\delta$ -hyperbolic spaces  $X_i$  such that, for all  $i > 0$ ,

- (1) the group  $H_i$  acts  $(\kappa, N)$ -acylindrically on  $X_i$ ,
- (2) the group  $H_i$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth,
- (3) every loxodromic subgroup of  $H_i$  is cyclic.

**Remark 9.2.** The energy  $L(S_i^i) \leq 200\delta$ . Indeed, if  $L(S_i^{i/2}) > 100\delta$ , then  $S_i^i$  contains a loxodromic isometry by Proposition 2.13. This contradicts the choice of  $S_i$ . Thus  $L(S_i^{i/2}) \leq 100\delta$  and the triangle inequality implies the claim.

Let

$$G = \langle t_1 \rangle * \langle t_2 \rangle * H_3 * H_4 * \cdots * H_i \cdots$$

Then  $G$  has  $\xi$ -uniform uniform exponential growth. Moreover, there is a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic space  $X$  on which  $G$  acts  $(\kappa', N)$ -acylindrically, where  $\kappa' = \kappa + 200\delta$ . This space is a tree of the spaces  $X_i$  that is constructed as follows. We let  $X_0 = \{x_0\}$  and  $X_1 = \{x_1\}$  be a space consisting of one point, and define  $H_1 = \langle t_1 \rangle$  and  $H_2 = \langle t_2 \rangle$ . For  $i > 2$ , let  $x_i \in X_i$  be a point almost minimising the energy of  $S_i^i$ . We denote by  $(X_i, x_i)$  the space  $X_i$  with the

fixed base point  $x_i$ . Let  $T$  be the Bass-Serre tree of  $G$ . For each coset (i.e. vertex of  $T$ )  $gH_i$  we take a copy of  $(X_i, x_i)$  that we denote by  $(X_i^g, x_i^g)$ . We build  $X$  from the disjoint union of the spaces  $(X_i^g, x_i^g)$  by adding a segment  $(hx_i^g, x_j^{gh})$  if and only if  $(gH_i, ghH_j)$  is an edge of  $T$ . We furthermore assume that the segments  $(hx_i^g, x_j^{gh})$  in  $X$  have length  $100\delta$ . We observe that  $X$  is a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic metric space, that  $G$  acts by isometries on  $X$  and that there is a  $G$ -equivariant projection from  $X$  onto  $T$ . Moreover, the action is indeed  $(\kappa + 200\delta, N)$ -acylindrical.

**Remark 9.3.** Let  $i > 2$ . Then there are two independent loxodromic elements  $h_{i_1}, h_{i_2}$  of  $H_i$  such that  $|h_{i_j}x_i - x_i| < 10^3\delta$ . In particular,  $\|h_{i_j}\| \leq 10^3\delta$ . Indeed, recall that  $L(S_i) \leq 100\delta$ . By Lemma 5.2 there is  $n_i > 0$  such that  $100\delta < L(S_i^{2n_i}) \leq 200\delta$ . Thus there is a loxodromic element  $h_{i_1}$  in  $S_i^{2n_i}$  [Kou98, Proposition 3.2]. Moreover,

$$400\delta \geq L(S_i^{2n_i}) \geq |h_{i_1}x_i - x_i| - \delta.$$

As  $S_i$  generates  $H_i$  there is  $s_i \in S_i$  such that  $h_{i_2} = s_i h_{i_1} s_i^{-1}$  and  $h_{i_1}$  do not generate an elementary subgroup. In other words,  $h_{i_1}$  and  $h_{i_2}$  are independent.

Next we define a set of relators  $R$ . We let  $\{h_{i_1}, h_{i_2}\}$  be two independent loxodromic elements of  $H_i$ ,  $i > 2$  such that  $\|h_{i_j}\| \leq |h_{i_j}x_i - x_i| < 10^3\delta$ . See Remark 9.3.

Let  $\mu > 0$  and let  $\alpha > \mu, \beta_i > 0$  and  $\gamma$  be positive numbers. We then define  $R_1$  to be the set of the following elements of  $G$ : for each  $i > 2$  the set  $R_1$  contains the elements

$$\begin{aligned} & s_{i_1} t_1 t_2^{\alpha 20(i-1)+1} t_1 t_2^{\alpha 20(i-1)+2} \dots t_1 t_2^{\alpha 20i} \\ & s_{i_2} t_2 t_1^{\alpha 20(i-1)+1} t_2 t_1^{\alpha 20(i-1)+2} \dots t_2 t_1^{\alpha 20i}. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $R_2$  contains, for each  $i > 2$ , the elements

$$\begin{aligned} & t_1 h_{i_1}^\gamma h_{i_2}^{\beta_1 \gamma} h_{i_1}^\gamma h_{i_2}^{\beta_2 \gamma} \dots h_{i_1}^\gamma h_{i_2}^{\beta_\mu \gamma} \\ & t_2 h_{i_1}^{\beta_1 \gamma} h_{i_2}^\gamma h_{i_1}^{\beta_2 \gamma} h_{i_2}^\gamma \dots h_{i_1}^{\beta_\mu \gamma} h_{i_2}^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

We let  $R = R_1 \cup R_2$  and fix  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\mu > 0$  so that the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 are fulfilled. As usual, there are  $\mu, \alpha, \beta_i$  and  $\gamma > 0$  such that  $R$  satisfies the  $C'''(\lambda, \mu)$ -small cancellation condition for the action of  $G$  on  $X$ .

**Remark 9.4.** In a setting of a proper action on a hyperbolic space, the  $C'''(\lambda, \mu)$ -condition implies that the relator set is finite up to conjugation. For instance, as previously mentioned, every classical  $C'''(\lambda)$ -small cancellation group is finitely presented. In the above situation the action of  $G$  on  $X$  is not proper. This allows for the choice of  $R$  under the  $C'''(\lambda, \mu)$ -condition, even though  $R$  is not finite up to conjugation. Another example is the action

of a free product on its Bass-Serre tree. In this case the  $C''(\lambda, \mu)$ -condition corresponds to the classical  $C''_*(\lambda)$ -condition over the free product, and one can indeed make infinitely presented classical  $C''_*(\lambda)$ -groups over a free product.

Finally, by Theorem 1.3, the group  $\overline{G} = G/\langle\langle R \rangle\rangle$  has uniform uniform exponential growth, and acts acylindrically on a hyperbolic space. By the choice of the set  $R_1$ , the group  $\overline{G}$  is finitely generated. By the choice of the set  $R_2$ , the group  $\overline{G}$  is generated by each of the sets  $S_i$ . Moreover, the sets  $S_i^z$  inject into  $\overline{G}$ . Indeed, by construction the energy  $L(S_i^z) \leq 200\delta$  for the action of  $G$  on  $X$ , for all  $i > 2$ . The claim then follows from Lemma 6.3(ii). This implies that  $\overline{G}$  does not have the short loxodromic property, and concludes the proof of Corollary 1.9.

#### REFERENCES

- [AAS07] J. W. Anderson, J. Aramayona, and K. J. Shackleton. Uniformly exponential growth and mapping class groups of surfaces. In *In the tradition of Ahlfors-Bers. IV*, volume 432 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 1–6. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [AL06] Goulnara N. Arzhantseva and Igor G. Lysenok. A lower bound on the growth of word hyperbolic groups. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society. Second Series*, 73(1):109–125, 2006. Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, Chichester; London Mathematical Society, London.
- [AMV17] Yago Antolín, Armando Martino, and Enric Ventura. Degree of commutativity of infinite groups. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 145(2):479–485, 2017.
- [ANS<sup>+</sup>24] Carolyn R. Abbott, Thomas Ng, Davide Spriano, Radhika Gupta, and Harry Petyt. Hierarchically hyperbolic groups and uniform exponential growth. *Math. Z.*, 306(1):33, 2024. Id/No 18.
- [AO96] Goulnara N. Arzhantseva and Alexander Yu. Ol’shanskii. Generality of the class of groups in which subgroups with a lesser number of generators are free. *Matematicheskie Zametki*, 59(4):489–496, 638, 1996.
- [BCGS20] Gérard Besson, Gilles Courtois, Sylvestre Gallot, and Andrea Sambusetti. Curvature-free margulis lemma for gromov-hyperbolic spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08386*, 2020.
- [BCGS21] Gérard Besson, Gilles Courtois, Sylvestre Gallot, and Andrea Sambusetti. Finiteness theorems for gromov-hyperbolic spaces and groups. *arXiv preprint: arXiv:2109.13025*, 2021.
- [BF21] Emmanuel Breuillard and Koji Fujiwara. On the joint spectral radius for isometries of non-positively curved spaces and uniform growth. *Université de Grenoble. Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 71(1):317–391, 2021.
- [Bow08] Brian H. Bowditch. Tight geodesics in the curve complex. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 171(2):281–300, 2008.
- [CDP90] Michel Coornaert, Thomas Delzant, and Athanase Papadopoulos. *Géométrie et théorie des groupes*, volume 1441 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.
- [Cou13] Rémi Coulon. Growth of periodic quotients of hyperbolic groups. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 13(6):3111–3133, 2013.
- [Cou14] Rémi Coulon. On the geometry of Burnside quotients of torsion free hyperbolic groups. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 24(3):251–345, 2014.

- [Cou16a] Rémi Coulon. Partial periodic quotients of groups acting on a hyperbolic space. *Université de Grenoble. Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 66(5):1773–1857, 2016.
- [Cou16b] Rémi Coulon. Théorie de la petite simplification: une approche géométrique [d'après F. Dahmani, V. Guirardel, D. Osin et S. Cantat, S. Lamy]. *Astérisque*, (380, Séminaire Bourbaki. Vol. 2014/2015):Exp. No. 1089, 1–33, 2016. ISBN: 978-2-85629-836-7.
- [Cou18] Rémi Coulon. Detecting trivial elements of periodic quotient of hyperbolic groups. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 146(4):745–806, 2018.
- [CS21] Filippo Cerocchi and Andrea Sambusetti. Entropy and finiteness of groups with acylindrical splittings. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 15(3):755–799, 2021.
- [CS22] Rémi Coulon and Markus Steenbock. Product set growth in Burnside groups. *Journal de l'École polytechnique. Mathématiques*, 9:463–504, 2022.
- [DG08] Thomas Delzant and Misha Gromov. Courbure mésoscopique et théorie de la toute petite simplification. *Journal of Topology*, 1(4):804–836, 2008.
- [DGO17] F. Dahmani, V. Guirardel, and D. Osin. Hyperbolically embedded subgroups and rotating families in groups acting on hyperbolic spaces. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 245(1156):v+152, 2017. ISBN: 978-1-4704-2194-6; 978-1-4704-3601-8.
- [dlH00] Pierre de la Harpe. *Topics in geometric group theory*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2000.
- [DS20] Thomas Delzant and Markus Steenbock. Product set growth in groups and hyperbolic geometry. *J. Topol.*, 13(3):1183–1215, 2020.
- [EMO05] Alex Eskin, Shahar Mozes, and Hee Oh. On uniform exponential growth for linear groups. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 160(1):1–30, 2005.
- [FS23] Koji Fujiwara and Zlil Sela. The rates of growth in a hyperbolic group. *Invent. Math.*, 233(3):1427–1470, 2023.
- [Fuj21] Koji Fujiwara. The rates of growth in an acylindrically hyperbolic group. *arXiv : 2103.01430*, 2021.
- [GdlH90] Etienne Ghys and Pierre de la Harpe, editors. *Sur les groupes hyperboliques d'après Mikhael Gromov*, volume 83 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1990.
- [GJN23] Radhika Gupta, Kasia Jankiewicz, and Thomas Ng. Groups acting on CAT(0) cube complexes with uniform exponential growth. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 23(1):13–42, 2023.
- [Gro87] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In *Essays in group theory*, volume 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.
- [Ker21] Alice Kerr. Product set growth in mapping class groups. *arXiv:2103.12643*, 2021.
- [Kou98] Malik Koubi. Croissance uniforme dans les groupes hyperboliques. *Université de Grenoble. Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 48(5):1441–1453, 1998.
- [LJ23] Xabier Legaspi Juanatey. *Growth in groups of non-positive curvature*. Theses, Université de Rennes ; Universidad Complutense de Madrid, July 2023.
- [Man10] Johanna Mangahas. Uniform uniform exponential growth of subgroups of the mapping class group. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 19(5):1468–1480, 2010.
- [MO19] Ashot Minasyan and Denis Osin. Acylindrically hyperbolic groups with exotic properties. *Journal of Algebra*, 522:218–235, 2019.
- [Sel97] Z. Sela. Acylindrical accessibility for groups. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 129(3):527–565, 1997.
- [Wal67] C. T. C. Wall. Poincaré complexes. I. *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series*, 86:213–245, 1967.

- [Zal23] Abdul Zalloum. Effective flipping, skewering and rank rigidity for cubulated groups with factor systems. *arXiv-preprint arXiv:2305.16298*, 2023.

ICMAT, CSIC, 28049 MADRID, SPAIN, &, IRMAR, UNIVERSITÉ DE RENNES 1, 35000 RENNES,  
FRANCE

*Email address:* xabier.legaspi@icmat.es

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA

*Email address:* markus.steenbock@univie.ac.at